THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY

Town Hall, Bombay.

ART. I.—*Gleanings from the Śârîraka Bhâshya of Śankarâchârya.* By the Hon'ble Mr. Justice K. T. TELANG, M.A. LL.B., C.I.E.

Read 14th July 1890.

I PROPOSE in the present paper to collect together some of the historical data which have come to my notice from time to time in the course of my studies in the Brahmasûtra Bhâshya of Śankarâchârya. In a work expounding the Vedantic philosophy, one of course naturally expects but few references to sublunary matters. But some passages containing such references interested me when I read them, and I place them before the Society for what they are worth, in the hope that they may interest others as they did myself.

Looking, first, at the political condition of the country in the time of Śankarâchârya, it appears that there was then no Sârvabhauma Râjâ or Emperor. Śankara in one place asserts that Vyâsa and others had personal communication with the Gods. And then in the usual manner he propounds a doubt about the assertion, saying "Doubtless one might say that people of old times had no more power to hold communication with the Gods than those of the present day." His answer to the doubt is, that the objector might as well argue that "there never was a Sârvabhauma king as there is none now."[1] This answer obviously involves a statement that in Śankara's time there was no acknowledged king of all India, and further, apparently, that that fact was one universally known and admitted. It is interesting to note that some other sources of historical information accessible to us point to the existence of a similar state of things at other periods of Indian history. According to the Greek writers, "the number of independent governments existing in India about the time of the invasion of Alexander the Great seems to have been as great as at other times. Alexander in his partial invasion met with many; and Megasthenes heard that in all there were 118. Many of these may have been very inconsiderable; but some (the Prasii, for instance), possessed

[1] See Bhâshya (Bibl. Ind.) Vol. I., p. 314 under Sûtra I., 3, 33.

great kingdoms."[2] Similarly we learn from the famous Chinese traveller, Hiuen-Thsang, that in his time there were seventy kingdoms in India.[3] The early Arab geographers, Masudi and others, writing of a somewhat later period, give in substance a similar account.[4] And our ordinary text-books of Indian history show that at the time of the Mahomedan invasions, both those of Mahomed of Ghazni and those of the Deccan by Alla-ud-din Khilji and others, the country was still parcelled out among a number of sovereigns. It is true that the late Mr. Fergusson has propounded a theory[5] that there may have been many Râjâs and Mahârâjâs at one time in different parts of the country, but that there could not be more than one Mahârâjâdhirâja in the country at one and the same time. This may or may not be correct. But it seems to be clear that even the Mahârâjâdhirâja was not *really* a paramount sovereign, to whom the other Râjâs owed allegiance as subordinates or feudatories in any way. Pulakeśî II. was a Mahârâjâdhirâja, who defeated Harshavardhana. But Harshavardhana still was an independent sovereign.[6] And the above-quoted passage from Śankarâchârya seems to point to a similar conclusion.

Among the kingdoms specified by name in the Śârîraka-Bhâshya is that of Ayodhyâ, the modern Oude. It may, however, be doubted whether this is intended to refer to a then existing kingdom. What Śankara says is this: "As that which is all-pervading exists in all parts of space, it may, under certain circumstances, be described as existing in a certain defined part, just as a person, though he be sovereign of all the earth, may be described as sovereign of Ayodhyâ."[7] Seeing that Śankara, in the passage first dwelt upon, spoke of there being no Sârvabhauma in his time, this allusion to a "sovereign of all the earth" must probably be interpreted as referring to some pre-historic sove-

---

[2] See Elphinstone's India, by Prof. Cowell, p. 265.

[3] Elphinstone, by Cowell, p. 298 note, and Beal's Buddh. Rec. of West. World, Vol. I., p. 70. Cf. also Elphinstone, by Cowell, p. 313. In Fa-Hien's account too, (*circa* 400 A.D.) we read of many kingdoms. See *inter alia* Fa-Hien by Legge, p. 98.

[4] See *inter alia* Elliott's India, by Prof. Dowson, Vol. I., pp. 6, 19, 20.

[5] See Journ. R. A. S. (N. S.), Vol. IV., pp. 84-5.

[6] Cf. Buddh. Rec. of West. World, Vol. I., 214; and Vol. II., 256; Journ. R. A. S. (N. S.), Vol. IV., p. 86. The passage in Dowson's Elliott, Vol. I., p. 8, can hardly be held enough authority for an opposite view, especially when coupled with the passage at pp. 6-7.

[7] See Bhâshya, Vol. I., p. 174 under Sûtra I., 2, 7.

reign like Râma. In another passage we have a reference to limited and defined authorities; and as an illustrative parallel Śankara adduces this: "This is the kingdom of Mâgadha, this is the kingdom of Vaideha."[8] This passage may be coupled with the passage about Pûrṇavarma, which forms the basis of my previous papers on the age of Śankarâchârya.[9] It lends some, though not much, support to my identification of the Pûrṇavarma mentioned by Śankarâchârya with the Pûrṇavarma, King of Magadha, mentioned by Hiuen-Thsang.

With the above passages, we may now proceed to compare a third, where Śankara, in speaking of the march of the emancipated soul to the Brahman by various stages, remarks: "We see in the world that it is intelligent creatures, appointed by kings, who guide travellers through difficult regions."[10] And, a little further on, it is said: "In ordinary life, too, travellers are told, for instance, go hence to Balavarma, thence to Jayasimha, and from there to Vishṇugupta."[11] The implication of the passage seems to be that a traveller may be directed to go to each of these kings in succession, who would afford him the necessary help of guides, &c., each presumably within the limits of his own jurisdiction. It is interesting to compare what we learn from the passage of Śankarâchârya's Bhâshya, now under consideration, with what we are told by the Chinese traveller, Fa-Hien. He says: "The country of the Deccan 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 deputes 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. Fa-Hien finding himself in the end unable to proceed to that country reports in the above passages merely what he has heard."[12] The striking coincidence between Fa-Hien's information and what we gather from the above-quoted words of Śankarâchârya is worthy of note. The only point in Fa-Hien's statement that is not actually borne out by what Śankara says is as to the

---

[8] See Bhâshya, Vol. II., p. 833 under Sûtra III., 2, 31.

[9] See Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII., p. 97, and J. B. B, R. A. S., Vol. XVII., p. 63 *et seq.*

[10] See Bhâshya, Vol. II., p. 1116 under Sûtra IV., 3, 4.

[11] See p 1118 (IV., 3, 5).

[12] See Beal's Fa Hien, p. 141; also Fa-Hien by Legge, p 97.

payment to the king which the traveller used to be called upon to make. When, however, the residue of the information is seen to be so accurate, it is probable that Fa-Hien's account on this point also is correct.

Passing next to the social and religious condition of the people, it may be noted, in the first place, that Śankarâchârya indicates his own dissatisfaction with the mode in which the regulations connected with the castes and orders prescribed in the books were observed in his time. Hiuen-Thsang, on the other hand, "seems to have been particularly struck with the minute observances of caste." [13] It is possible, of course, that this discrepancy is to be explained by Hiuen-Thsang's priority in time to Śânkara.[14] If that proves to be the true explanation, the date to which I have assigned Śankarâchârya must be abandoned as untenable. It appears to me, however, that there are other considerations deserving to be taken note of in this connection. In Hiuen-Thsang's time, as I have elsewhere pointed out, Buddhism in India was no longer a religion of power and capacity of growth. Brahmanism had then been gradually pressing its way to a position of strength and influence.[15] And it is not, therefore, to be expected, that in the century or two following Hiuen-Thsang's journey, the bonds of the Brahmanical system were becoming more and more loosened. On the contrary, one would rather expect that the religious revival should result in the better definition and in a more careful observance of the regulations of the reviving faith.[16] If, then, the chronological priority of Hiuen-Thsang to Śankara is not the true explanation of the discrepancy alluded to, we must seek for some other

---

[13] Elphinstone, by Cowell, p. 298. Cf. *inter alia* Buddh. Rec. of West. World, Vol. I., p. 77, 82.

[14] See Burnell quoted in Max Müller's *India*: what it can teach us, p. 308n. And my remarks on that in the Introduction to my Mudrârâkshasa, p. 40. Hiuen-Thsang's silence about Kumârila and Śankara is just as well explained by their having flourished more than half a century before his time, as Dr. Burnell thinks it is explained by their coming after him.

[15] See Preface to my Mudrârâkshasa, p. 16 *et seq.*

[16] If this is correct, the facts will fit in better with my theory than with the opposite one. If Śankara flourished, say, about half a century before Hiuen-Thsang's visit to India, the revival of Hinduism, with which tradition credits Śankarâchârya, would be in full operation during the period of that visit. And the "minute observances of caste" and other similar features of the then existing condition of Hindu society, which Hiuen-Thsang describes, would be just what we should expect.

explanation. And that we can readily find, I think, in the different points of view occupied by the two observers. Śankarâchârya, surveying the condition of his people from the Brahmanical point of view, only perceives how far the actual practices of the people have deviated from the rules laid down for their guidance. Hiuen-Thsang, looking on as an outsider, not himself believing in the Brahmanical rules, is struck by the extent to which the restrictions contained in them were still practically in force. To take an illustration from our own times, one of our old Shastris may still be heard to lament the break-up of caste rules which he sees about him; while the non-Hindu complains that the Hindus are still undelivered from the bondage of a system that has become quite antiquated and unsuited to present conditions.

With regard to idolatry, which is one of the most conspicuous features of our present religious state, it is worthy of note that the opinion which is iterated and reiterated by Śankarâchârya appears to be entirely inconsistent with the form which idol worship has now assumed among us. Śankarâchârya, it may be conceded, does not object to idolatry in the way in which it is objected to by the Jewish or the Mahomedan religion. But, on the other hand, he frequently insists that the idol is not the deity it professes to represent. The passages are numerous in which Śankara speaks of प्रतिमादिषु विष्ण्वादि-बुद्ध्यध्यासः[17] the belief that the idol is Vishṇu, &c.,—a belief which is not, in fact, true. He allows the symbolism for purposes of worship, but insists that it is a symbolism.[18] In this connection it may be noted that Śankarâchârya specifically mentions the Śâlagrâma stone which is still ordinarily worshipped.[19] A further remark may be added. In all these passages, of which there is a not inconsiderable number even in the Śârîraka Bhâshya, the allusion always is to Vishṇu.[20] I am disposed to think that we may infer from this, that the popular notion of Śankara having especially favoured Śiva worship is not correct. That is, no doubt, the prevalent notion in this part of the country. But it is to be remarked that M. Barth, in his work on the "Religions of India," speaks of "Śankara in the eighth century, Sâyana in the fourteenth" as "Vaishṇavas, and even reported to have

[17] See *inter alia* Bhâshya, Vol. II., pp. 860 (III., 3, 9) 1058, (IV., 1, 3) 1065 (IV., I, 5) (IV., 1, 6) and the references in note 19.

[18] Cf. Max Müller's Chips, Vol. I., p. xvii (Preface).

[19] See Bhâshya, Vol. I., pp. 174 (I., 2, 7), 188 (I., 2, 14) 253, (I., 3, 14).

[20] See the next note and Cf. Bṛihadâraṇyaka p. 615 (Ed. Jîvânanda).

been incarnations of Vishṇu."[21] Unless this is a mistake as regards Śankara, it must have reference to traditions prevailing in other parts of the country. The tradition among us is that which is embodied in some of our Puranic compositions, namely, that Śankara was an incarnation, not of Vishṇu, but of Śiva.[22] And it is further to be noted that the principal teachers of the philosophical schools which oppose the Advaita doctrine of Śankarâchârya, namely, Râmânuja, and Madhva, and also, we may add, Vallabhâchârya, are the heads of Vaishṇava sects.

A question has arisen in recent years as to how far back the veneration for the cow in India can be traced. In the preface to my new edition of Bhartṛihari, I have ventured to dissent from the view put forward by Prof. Tawney that the idea of such veneration belongs to a time subsequent to Bhavabhûti.[23] In support of my dissent I have relied on two passages occurring in Patanjali's Mahâbhâshya, upon which, however, a friend made to me the observation that the reference to Gomûtra in those passages did not necessarily involve the idea of sacredness, but might be connected with its supposed medicinal properties. A passage in Śankara's Bhâshya, however, puts the matter beyond doubt in this respect, because it expressly refers to the sacredness of two of the "products of the cow."[24] Now Bhavabhûti's date may be taken to be satisfactorily fixed at the end of the seventh century,[25] and if I am right in the date which I have assigned to

---

[21] See Barth, p. 86. M. Barth (p. 184) speaks of Śankara as "one who appears to have inclined rather to Vishṇuism." This is, perhaps, hardly justified by the evidence before us. Prof. Weber, however, seems to agree with M. Barth, see his History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 51, and see contra. Colebrooke's Essays, Vol. I., p. 196 (Madras Ed.).

[22] I have some recollection of noticing the other statement, too, in one of our Puranic works, I believe, but I have mislaid the reference. Mâdhava's Śankaravijaya and the preface to the Bhâmatî by its Editor adopt our usual tradition. Colebrooke, in his Essays, Vol. I., p. 103 (Madras Ed.) mentions the Bṛihaddharma Purâṇa as calling Śankara an incarnation of Vishṇu. And it is to be remarked that Ânandagiri, who is so intimately associated with Śankara's works, begins some of his works by invoking Vishṇu, and in his commentary on Gaudapâda's Kârikâs, declares that they were composed by the special grace of Nârâyaṇa or Vishṇu. (See p. 1 of the excellent edition by Prof. Kâthavaṭe).

[23] See my Bhartṛihari (2nd Ed.), pp. xii, xiii n

[24] Bhâshya, Vol. II., p. 694 under Sûtra II., 3, 48.

[25] Prof. Bhândârkar's Mâlati Mâdhava (Bombay Sanskrit Classics), p. x.

Śankarâchârya, this reference gives us an earlier period than Bhavabhûti's, up to which we can trace the veneration for the cow in this country.

We may now pass from this subject to one or two points of interest and importance connected with the history of Indian literature and philosophy, on which some sidelight is thrown by the Bhâshya of Śankarâchârya. In his work on the Philosophy of the Upanishads, Mr. A. E. Gough seems to maintain that the true Vedantic doctrine was handed down by an unbroken series of teachers intervening between the author of the Vedânta-sûtras, and Śankarâchârya, the most famous of the commentators upon those Sûtras.[36] I am not prepared to accept this view, and I think there is internal evidence afforded by Śankarâchârya's Bhâshya which conclusively negatives it. Dr. Thibaut, in his volume on the Vedânta-sûtras in the Sacred Books of the East, which has only just been received in Bombay, disputes Mr. Gough's theory, and relies on two passages in the Bhâshya, in one of which reference is made to certain expositors of the Sûtras, who interpret certain Sûtras as stating the Pûrvapaksha which Śankara understands to lay down the Siddhânta; and another in which Śankara refers to certain doctors of his own school, who held a different opinion from his as regards the individual soul. From these passages Dr. Thibaut deduces the conclusion that "the Vedântins of the school to which Śankara himself belonged, acknowledged the existence of Vedantic teaching of a type essentially different from their own."[37] This doubtless is so, and it is to a certain extent inconsistent with some of the contentions of Mr. Gough, regarding the unity of Vedantic doctrine, against which Dr. Thibaut is arguing. It appears to me, however, that neither passage is necessarily inconsistent with the theory of Mr. Gough touching a traditional interpretation of the Sûtras traceable in its origin to Bâdarâyana himself, and handed down to the time of Śankarâchârya. That theory of Mr. Gough stands in close congruity, at all events, with the traditional verse which connects Śankarâchârya, through Govindanâtha and Gauḍapâda and Śuka, with Vyâsa, who is supposed to be the author of the Vedântasûtras.[38] Nevertheless, I think the evidence furnished by Śankarâ-

[36] *Op. cit.*, p. 240.

[37] *Op. cit.*, p. xxi.

[38] See J. B. B., R. A. S., Vol. XVI., pp. 190-8. I see that Colebrooke (Essays, Vol. I., p. 104n. Madras ed.) had pretty plainly suggested that this tradition was a mere "fable."

chârya's Bhâshya compels us to reject both our tradition and Mr. Gough's theory. In various places in the Bhâshya, we find Śankarâchârya propounding alternative interpretations of the Sûtras, and even alternative arrangements of them into Adhikaraṇas, and at least once alternative readings of them. I need not go in detail into all these passages, the references to which I have collected in the footnote.[29] They afford a considerable aggregate of instances, in which it is obvious that Śankarâchârya is not in possession of the real meaning of the author of the Sûtras in such a way as to dispense with the exercise of his own powers of interpretation. For it is certain that if the true signification of the Sûtras, as it existed in the mind of their author, had descended by a Guruparamparâ to Śankarâchârya, he would have stated that signification alone, and need not, in fact could not, have resorted to an अपरा योजना, nor in answering opponents need he have resorted to arguments and inferences[30] instead of saying directly and point-blank—this is the meaning of the Sûtra as intended by its author, for I have received it from himself through my preceptors—"in a regular line of succession, an unbroken series of exponents." The references I have given show no fewer than eleven cases in which Śankarâchârya proposes these alternative interpretations like any ordinary exegete. And they afford, I think, very strong warrant for the conclusion, that if Śankarâchârya was in possession of any traditional interpretation of the Brahma-Sûtras,[31] he did not consider that tradition to be traceable in the last

---

[29] See Bhâshya, Vol. I., p. 104 (Sûtra I., 1, 7), p. 284 (I., 3, 27), p. 402 (I., 4, 26), p. 459 (II., 1, 15), p. 589 (II., 2, 35), p. 597 (II., 2, 40). Vol. II., p. 712 (II., 4, 6), p. 750 (III., 1, 7), p. 835 (III., 2, 33), p. 875 (III., 3, 17), p. 904 (III., 3, 26). I do not include in this list such cases as that at Vol. II., p. 812 (III., 2, 21), where the alternative interpretation is mentioned only to be rejected by Śankara. Cf. J. B. B., R. A. S., Vol. XVI., p. 197.

[30] As in the case last mentioned in the foregoing note. See also p. 963 (III., 3, 57), p. 1134 (IV., 3, 14).

[31] Colebrooke's remarks (Essays, Vol. I., p. 331, Madras ed. Cf. Thibaut's Vedânta, Sûtras pp. xiv, lxxxvi.; my own observations in the Introduction to the Bhagavadgîtâ in the Sacred Books of the East, pp. 30–1, point somewhat in the same direction) are, I have no doubt, correct enough in a general way. But the series of teachers cannot have been as short as is represented in the traditional verse alluded to above and the traditional interpretation must, in process of time, have been varied and added to by some of the teachers. Of this, in truth, we have some little evidence even in Śankarâchârya's own school, and even after his own great Bhâshya, in the Bhâmatî. See p. 521.

resort to the author of the Sûtras himself. And if he did not so consider it, no more can we.

Some light is thrown by the Śârîraka Bhâshya on a question which, many years ago, formed the subject of a somewhat elaborate controversy between Professor Weber on the one side and Professors Bhândârkar and Kielhorn upon the other.[32] The question was as to who was the आचार्य referred to in such phrases as आचार्यः सुहृदुत्वान्वाचष्टे, पठति त्वाचार्यः and the like, which occur with so much frequency in Patanjali's Mahâbhâshya. Both Professors Bhândârkar and Kielhorn argued that आचार्य never meant Patanjali in those phrases, but always designated either Kâtyâyana or Pâṇini. Some light may be thrown on the subject by the use of similar phrases in the Vedânta Sûtra Bhâshya. The phrase आचार्यः सुहृद्—the preceptor, the friend of the student—I have noticed in two places in this Bhâshya. In both cases there can, I think, be no possible doubt, that the आचार्य meant is Bâdarâyaṇa, the author of the Sûtras. The first passage occurs in the commentary on Vedânta-Sûtra, IV., I., 11,[33] where it is laid down that meditation should be practised wherever concentration of mind can be secured. And then, after showing that in some texts specific directions are given as to the sort of place where it should be practised, Śankarâchârya says: "True, there are such limitations, but still the Âchârya out of friendship lays down that they are immaterial." And the author of the gloss on Śankara's Bhâshya expressly says, what is indeed clear enough otherwise, सुहृद्भावेन सूचकृदुपदिशति "the author of the Sûtras in a friendly spirit lays down," &c. The second passage is in the commentary on IV., 3, 2,[34] where Śankara says that "the Âchârya out of friendship states in detail the arrangement of the various paths to the Brahman." Other passages, where the word सुहृद् does not occur, but where, too, the word आचार्य plainly signifies the author of the Sûtras, may now be referred to. It will not be necessary to go into these in much detail. Sûtra II., 3, 40, runs as follows, यथाच तक्षोभयथा and after some introductory remarks of his

---

[32] See Indian Antiquary, Vol. V., pp. 248-345 *et seq.*; Vol. VI., p. 303 *et seq.*

[33] See Vol. II., 1073. In some passages Śankara refers to Bâdarâyaṇa under the designation of Śatrakâra. See Vol. I., p. 140 (I., 1, 23), p. 148 (I., 1, 24), Vol. II., p. 953 (III., 3, 53), and p. 902 (III., 3, 57) among other instances.

[34] See Vol. II., 1113.

own on this Sûtra, Śankara says तदेतत्सूत्राचार्यः वयाच्च तत्तोभवया, and then proceeds to comment on the words of the Sûtra.[36] Again, commenting on III., 1, 1 after the usual introduction, Śankara says इत्येवं प्राप्ते पठत्याचार्यः तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति संपरिष्वक्त इति.[38] These last words form the commencement of the Sûtra, and plainly prove the आचार्य named to be the author of the Sûtras. This instance is specially noteworthy, because the particular mode of expression here used, *viz.*, इत्येवं प्राप्ते पठति, occurs with great frequency throughout the Bhâshya, though sometimes without the word आचार्यः. This passage shows that in those cases we are to understand the author of the Sûtras as the subject of the verbs occurring in those expressions. Another noteworthy passage is to be found under the Sûtra IV., 2, 1,[37] which runs thus वाङ्मनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च, and which Śankara interprets by वाग्वृत्तिर्मनसि संपद्यते. And then he goes on to ask कथं वाग्वृत्तिरितिव्याख्यायते यावता वाङ्मनसीत्येवमाचार्यः पठति—Why do you in your interpretation use the word वाग्वृत्ति while the Âchârya says वाक्—thus contrasting the आचार्य the author of the Sûtras with himself, the interpreter. It would take too long to go through all the other passages of this sort which I have noticed. I give references to several of them in the foot-note.[38] But I may say this, that in all the cases I have noticed, आचार्य always means the author of the Sûtras. Sometimes the Sûtras refer to their author by name as Bâdarâyaṇa. Śankara then always, I believe, calls him in his commentary बादरायणाचार्यः and the last Sûtra of the collection is introduced with the words अत उत्तरं भगवान्बादरायणाचार्यः पठति. It may be added, that the Sûtras sometimes refer to बादरि and other authorities, and Śankara always, in his commentary, speaks of them as बादरिराचार्यः जैमिनिराचार्यः &c.[39] I have noticed a number of other passages

---

[36] See Vol. II., 675.

[36] See Vol. II., 741.

[37] See Vol. II., p. 1088.

[38] See Vol. I., p. 91 (I., 1, 4), p. 299 (I., 3, 30), p. 368 (I., 4, 12), p. 374 (I., 4, 14), p. 496 (II., 1, 37), p. 602 (II., 2, 42); Vol. II., p. 736 (II., 4, 20), p. 844 III., 3, 1), p. 868 (III., 3, 13), p 890 (III., 3, 24), p. 1019 (III., 4, 34), 1123 (IV., 3, 14).

[39] Śankara also speaks of Gautama, the author of the Nyâya Sûtras as an आचार्य see Vol. I., p. 67 (I., 1, 4); also Śabarasvâmin see Vol. II., p. 953 (III., 3, 53), and his own teacher's teacher Gaudapâda (see the references at J. B. B., R. A. S., Vol. XVII., p. 198).

in which the word पठति or some equivalent word is used, the subject not being expressed, and there, as already pointed out, the subject to be understood is the author of the Sûtras. These passages, to some of which references are given in the note at foot,[40] may be compared with those collected by Professor Kielhorn in his paper in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. V., p. 250. No doubt in some cases like these the expression is different. Instead of पठत्याचार्यः, with the subject expressed or understood, we have the first personal form इत्येवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः followed by the words of the Sûtra. But it is not to be inferred from this, that the subject of the first personal form is Śankarâchârya, and that he, therefore, is the आचार्य intended in the corresponding third personal expression. In the first personal expressions, doubtless, we are to understand the commentator as for the moment speaking on behalf of all those holding the सिद्धान्त view, the author of the Sûtras and the commentator also. In some cases, however, the first personal expression, whether singular or plural, is apparently meant for the commentator himself.[41] In one place the commentator speaks of himself in the third person, as भाष्यकृत्.[42]

All the passages here alluded to afford an interesting and instructive parallel to the passages relied upon in the course of the controversy between Professors Weber, Bhândârkar, and Kielhorn above referred to. I think a comparison of them may fairly be looked upon as affording strong warrant for the conclusion that the phrases and expressions under discussion formed part of the established technical language, so to say, appropriate to be used in such cases.[43] And if so, the conclusion contended for by Professors Bhândârkar and Kielhorn as to the meaning of the word âchârya in Patanjali's Mahâbhâshya is very

---

[40] See Vol. I., p. 269 (I., 3, 18), p. 401 (I., 4, 25) [where the gloss of Govindânanda may be noted as making it clear that the author of the Sûtras is intended]; Vol. II., p. 906 (III., 3, 27), p. 911 (III., 3, 31), p. 920 (III., 3, 34), p. 931 (III., 3, 49), p. 946 (III., 3, 48), p. 984 (III., 4, 11).

[41] See *e.g.* Vol. II., p. 676 (III., 3, 40), p. 797 (III., 2, 9), p. 874 (III., 3, 17).

[42] See Vol. II., p. 953 (III., 3, 53).

[43] Some other expressions which occur frequently in Patanjali's Mahâbhâshya, I have noticed in the Vedânta Sûtra Bhâshya, *viz.*, अवश्यं चैतदेवं विज्ञेयम्; see Vol. II., p. 755 (III., 1, 8), also विषम उपन्यासः see Vol. I., p. 311 (I., 3, 33). And अपर आह which Professor Bhândârkar has observed upon at Indian Antiquary, Vol. V. p. 346n, occurs pretty often in Śankara's Bhâshya too, see Vol. I., p. 150 (I., 1, 25), p. 153 (I., 1, 27), p. 184 (I., 2, 12), p 228 (I., 3, 1).

considerably strengthened.** The further bearings of that conclusion upon the history of the Mahâbhâshya, and the critical condition of its

p. 247 (I., 3, 13). In passing I may observe that the Bhâmatî designates as मण्डूकप्लुति the interpretation of Sûtra I., 3, 39 by means of Sûtra I., 3, 34. As to the style of the great Bhâshyas generally, see J. B. B., R. A. S., Vol. XVI., pp. 266 *et seq.* I may perhaps also point out here that at Vol. I., p. 57, under Sûtra I., 1 4, Śankara refers to certain objectors, saying अत्र अपरे प्रत्यवतिष्ठन्ते The Glossator Govindânanda renders that by वृत्तिकाराः पूर्वपक्षयन्ति. And Vâchaspati Miśra (Bhâmatî, p. 82) referring to the same passage says: आचार्यदेशीयानां मतमुत्थापयति. Cf. also Bhâmatî, p. 286, with Govindânanda at Vol. I., p. 343. This throws some light on the word आचार्यदेशीयः occurring in the Mahâbhâshya, on which also Professors Bhândârkar, Goldstücker and Weber have had some discussion. See Indian Antiquary, Vol. II., p. 96. Dr. Kielhorn, in his excellent little Essay on Kâtyâyana and Patanjali, also has some remarks on this expression आचार्यदेशीय (See p. 52 note). One or two of the things said there would probably require modification. But the passages in the Bhâmatî, referred to in this note, show that Dr. Kielhorn is right in taking आचार्यदेशीय, as he seems to do, as equivalent to सिद्धान्तैकदेशी (p. 54). I should, however, not accept "an unaccomplished teacher" as a satisfactory rendering for आचार्यदेशीय as Dr. Kielhorn, following Prof. Weber, seems inclined to do (p. 53). I think Dr. Bhândârkar's rendering is a closer one—perhaps "a teacher of somewhat inferior authority" would be closer still. *That* is the sense of ईषदसमाप्त. There is no "disparagement" involved in the expression at all, any more than there is in Kâlidâsa's applying to Aja the phrase कुमारकल्प (Raghu, v. 36), which is formed by means of an affix synonymous with देशीय. See too Bhâmatî, pp 315-6, where Âśmarathya and Audulomin are called आचार्यदेशीय. As to the वृत्तिकार there referred to, see Colebrooke's Essays, Vol. I., 331-2 (Madras Ed.) and Thibaut's Vedânta Sûtras (Sacred books of the East), Preface, p. xxi. *et seq.* According to Govindânanda, the वृत्तिकार's opinion is again dealt with by Śankarâchârya at Vol. I., p. 122 (I., 1, 19), and the Bhâmatî, referring to that passage, says स्वमतपरिग्रहार्थमेकदेशिमतं दूषयति (p. 138), the same phrase being here used to designate the वृत्तिकार's opinion as at Bhâmatî, p. 85, for the same purpose. एकदेशिमत is again referred to in the Bhâmatî, pp. 151, 244, 256, 668.

** We may, perhaps, also refer to the Śâbara Bhâshya (Bibl. Ind. Ed.) p. 1, where the आचार्य mentioned is plainly Jaimini. I have not noticed in that Bhâshya any other place where an आचार्य is mentioned, except such places as pp. 209-10 (where बादरिराचार्यः, जैमिनिराचार्यः are mentioned in the same way as is referred to above in the text). See also p. 320. The passage at p. 72-3 has no bearing here. It may also be noted that at p. 17 we have the phrase अपर आह dwelt on in note 43.

text as now extant, are matters which lie outside the scope of the present paper.

Before concluding this collection of *diejecta membra*, I add one remark suggested by what is said in Dr. Thibaut's introduction to his translation of the Śârîraka Bhâshya. Dr. Thibaut mentions Draviḍâchârya as one of the commentators on the Vedânta.[46] I have not come across any reference to this writer in the Śârîraka Bhâsya, but he is referred to by Vâchaspati Miśra in the Bhâmatî under I., 1, 4.[46] He is also mentioned by Ânandagiri in his comment on the Chhândogya Upanishad Bhâshya, where he, raising a question as to the necessity for Śankarâchârya's Bhâshya, when there already existed the Draviḍa Bhâshya on the same Upanishad, answers the question by saying that Śankara's was intended to be a shorter work.[47] Coupling these passages with the one to which Dr. Thibaut has drawn attention, one would suppose that the Draviḍa Bhâshya belonged to the same school as Śankara's. On the other hand, as Dr. Thibaut has also pointed out, the Draviḍa Bhâshya is frequently quoted by Râmânuja in *his* Bhâshya on the Vedânta. And as there does not seem to be any strong ground for supposing that the two groups of references refer to two different writers, it seems as if the Draviḍa Bhâshya was a tolerably old work in Śankarâchâryâ's time, but that it did not very distinctly identify itself with either of the conflicting modes of Vedantic interpretation represented in subsequent times by Śankara and Râmânuja respectively.

---

[46] See Introd. p. xxi.—xxii.

[46] See p. 92 (Bibl. Ind. Ed.)

[47] See p. 1 (Bibl. Ind. Ed.) In the commentary on Gauḍapâdaś kârikâs Śankara says सिद्धं तु निर्वतैकत्वादिस्वागमविदां सूत्रम् || And Ânandagiri, commenting on that says उक्तेर्थे द्रविडाचार्यसंमतिमाह || See p. 89 of the excellent edition of the Mâṇḍûkya and Gauḍapâda in the Ânandâśrama Sanskrit series by Prof. A. V. Kâthavaṭe.

ART. II.—*Mount Ábú and the Jain Temples of Daîlwádá.*

By the Hon'ble MR. JAVERILÁL UMIASHANKAR YÁJNIK.

[Read August 25, 1890.]

MOUNTAIN ranges in India have been regarded by the Hindus more as *Tirthas*, or sacred places for the gods to reside in, more as suitable sites for temples and fit abodes of Rishis, Mahátmás, Sanyásis, and Sádhus devoted to religious and philosophical contemplation and saintly life, than as health resorts for men engaged in the struggle for life in the plains below. There is, perhaps, scarcely a noted hill-range in the country on the cliff or cliffs of which you do not meet with Hindu or Jain temples consecrated to one or other of their gods or Tirthankars. Mahábleshwar, Girnár, Śatrúnjaya in this Presidency, and Badrikáshram and other places on the Kailás range on the Himálayas, are illustrations of this remark. In later periods of Indian history some of the hill-ranges have served as harbours for plunderers, free-booters and criminal classes, or as places of refuge to ruling Chiefs or their rivals engaged in actual warfare; and, in recent times, we find that they are the places chiefly inhabited by the aboriginal classes. The existence of hill-forts, such as those of Pratápgad, Siṇhagad, Pándavgad and others on the Sahyádri range, testifies to the value for defensive and offensive purposes which was attached to such works by Śivaji and the Maráthá rulers before the advent of the British Government in India. With the peace and security of life and property enjoyed under British rule, hill-ranges have developed their utility in other directions. They have acquired importance and value as summer seats, where their cool and salubrious climate imparts vigour, health, and life to weak constitutions, or as places for industrial settlements by Europeans. Private enterprise of this kind by English planters has enabled India to grow and export tea, coffee, cinchona, and to grow European vegetables and fruits for consumption in the country. Indian hill-stations present varied beauties at different seasons of the year. It is, however, in the month of May, the most trying season of the year, when the temperature in the plains below rises from 96° to 106° in the shade, that the comparative merits of the different hill-stations as health resorts come to be

somewhat severely tested. There is an increasing number of European and Indian gentlemen, to whom such health resorts become objects of special attraction in the hot weather. They are eagerly sought by those who can manage to relieve themselves from business or professional engagements and to escape from those depressing influences in the plains below, which manifest themselves in cholera, fevers, and other diseases; in sunstrokes, brought on by a direct exposure to the sun's rays; in a feeling of languor and lassitude; in exhaustion after ordinary work; in the loss of appetite during the day and of sound sleep during the night. No doubt temporary means are devised for protection from the heat by persons in good conditions of life who must live in the plains. Punkhas and fans, Khuskhus (*Andropogon muricatus*) and Jawásá (*Linum Usitatissimum*) tatties kept cool by constantly pouring water over them, ice, lime, rose *sherbet*, and other refrigerating beverages are called into requisition. In fact, all shifts are resorted to which human ingenuity suggests for keeping the body cool. But such shifts, good as they are, in the case of the great majority of those who must reside in the plains, are as nothing compared to the benefits derived by a run up to a hill station. On European constitutions the debilitating effects of a tropical climate are doubtless more visible, as they are more powerful, but Indians are not exempt from them. In the case of both, "the cooler hill climate," in the words of Sir William Moore, "is a tonic not only to the body, but also to the mind; and while disease is often prevented by the change, work is always better done in the hills."[1] Fortunately, in Mahábleshwar, Panchgani, Matheran, Khandálá, Lonávali, Bombay has such charming health resorts, within a few hours' reach by rail, that few of its citizens, who can afford to visit them during the hot-season, would care to go to more distant mountain-ranges, except for special reasons. They can enjoy a change without neglecting their work, or are perhaps better prepared for work after a few days' rest. But a visit to hill-stations outside the limits of this Presidency often gives opportunities for comparison and points of contrast, which are not without their value or interest. It is with a view to place such points that I submit these notes to the Society of a visit to Mount Ábú paid by me in May last, partly for a change and partly for curiosity.

Ábú is a lofty isolated range of mountains on the northern limits of the Bombay Presidency. It is situated in the middle of the Sirohi

[1] "Tropical Climates and Indian Diseases," by Sir W. Moore, K.C.I.E., p. 22.

state, about seven miles west of the Árávali range, and in a line almost parallel. In shape Mount Ábú is long and narrow, the length at the top being about fourteen miles by only two to four miles in breadth. The length at the base is about twenty miles.[8] Its direction lies north-north-east and south-south-west. The highest peak of Mount Ábú lying near its north end is called Guru Śikhar or the Saint's Pinnacle. It rises to a height of 5,653 feet above the level of the sea. The Sanitarium is some 3,000 feet over the plains below and about 4,000 feet above the sea-level. Colonel Tod was the first European who visited Mount Ábú in 1822 and discovered its suitability as a hill sanitarium. Till 1840 it was used chiefly as the summer residence of the Political Superintendent of Sirohi and of the officers of the Jodhpur Legion. In 1843 barracks and hospitals for European soldiers in Rajputana were put up. About this time also the hill-station came to be occupied by the Agent to the Governor-General for Rajputana and his Assistants and their establishments for the hot season. The Vakils of the different states in Rajputana, who had business relations with the political officers stationed on the hill, also came to reside there during the hot weather. That useful institution, the Ábú Lawrence Asylum or School for the education of the children of soldiers serving in Rajputana and Western India, was established in 1854 by the late Sir Henry Lawrence. In this manner the station has slowly developed, and now it is for nine months out of twelve the head-quarters of the Agent to the Governor-General for the Rajputana States, his Assistants and the Durbar Vakils. Some forty to fifty bungalows are thus in occupation by the Agency officials. Then there are the Government offices, such as the post-office, the telegraph office, a club, bungalows for the officers and soldiers in the military station and residences for the state Vakils. Other bungalows have also been put up for the Mahárájás of Jodhpur, Jeypur, Ulwar, and Sirohi. To visitors from the burning plains of Rajputana, Mount Ábú is a pleasant retreat in the month of May. Not so, however, to dwellers in Bombay, who would find the journey in the month of May through the hot plains of Gujarát sorely trying. The traveller, starting from the Grant Road station (Bombay) at about 10 P.M. (Madras time), finds the journey comfortable as far as Ahmedabad, but from Ahmedabad to Ábú Road station, he feels that he is passing through a hot furnace. The blast of piercing

[8] "Rajputana Gazetteer," Vol. III., p. 129.

wind blowing about adds fury to the fire. Ábú Road station is reached by the mail train at 3-46 P.M. The traveller from Bombay will, however, do well to halt at Ahmedabad and spend the afternoon there. He could then proceed by the evening local train, which leaves at 9-2) P.M. and travel in the cool hours of the night and early morning, reaching Ábú Road station at 7-25 A.M. Ábú Road or Kharedi is now the main route in use by tourists to Mount Ábú, the old route by Girwar,—a town about three miles distant from Kharedi,—having been given up since the opening of the Rajputana-Malwa railway. There is a third route to Mount Ábú by the village of Anádrá, but it is very narrow and steep, and country carts cannot pass over it. Ábú Road is an instance of the rise of a townsbip forming a railway station, and the trade centre of the surrounding territory; the passenger traffic has also been growing on account of its being the terminal point of two important routes,—one to Mount Ábú and the other to Mount Árásur, on which is situated the famous temple of Ambá Bhaváni. At Ábú Road the tourist prepares for his ascent to Mount Ábú,—a distance of 17 miles. The means of conveyance to the hill are horses, ponies, jinrikshaws or rikshaws, as they are called, and bullock-carts for luggage and servants: all supplied at fixed rates by the contractor at Kharedi. No tongas, shigrams, phaetons or broughams are to be had, the roads up the hill not being wide enough for the purpose. For about four miles the road is plain enough. At about the fifth mile the ascent commences over one of the spurs. Our path lay winding like a thread round the hill-side, at one time rising and then sinking to its former level. Then followed another ascent. We felt ourselves moving in another world, silence reigning all round and but few persons meeting on the road. As we went along, hills after hills rose in succession before us, presenting a sombre and barren appearance. The slopes of many of the hills in the vicinity of the Ábú Road station were at one time covered with dense jungles containing varieties of trees and bamboo forests, but the railway demand for sleepers and the increasing need for wood-fuel have resulted in the destruction of these forests not far from the base of the hill. This denudation of the hills seemed to have a marked effect on the valleys between them. The perennial springs which fed the little sparkling rills and streams that formerly flowed in the valleys have become extinguished. Attempts are being made by the Sirohi Durbar, under the advice of Colonel P. W. Powlett,

Agent for the Western Rajputana States and of the able Dewan of the state, Mr. Melápchand Ánandji, to re-afforest the hill by providing for a due preservation of the saplings of trees from the ravages of cattle. As we went up, however, the natural landscape showed itself to better advantage. The crests of some of the cliffs seemed to assume weird and phantastic shapes bearing striking resemblances to animals, such as a lion, an elephant, or a hawk. Two rocks not far from the station are named Nun Rock and Toad Rock, from resemblances to a veiled woman and a toad. Further on, about the tenth or the eleventh mile, we reached what looked like circular terraces over-topping one another. Standing on the topmost of them, one could realize vividly the description by Colonel Tod of the romantic scenery around.[3] At last the wafting of cool breezes warned us that we were near the table-land of Mount Ábú and a few hours brought us to the sanitarium. This table-land is comprised within a wide basin extending over two or three miles, surrounded on all sides by hills with slopes running down the plains below. There are good wide roads leading to the civil station, with a bazaar well laid out with bridle-paths to the Gaomukh, Vasistha Muni's Seat, to Dailwádá, Achalghad, and Guru Sikhar or the Saint's Pinnacle, so called from there being supposed to be on the cliff of the hill, (which is the highest eminence in the north of Mount Ábú), the footprints (*páduká*) of Guru Dattátraya.

And here it may not, perhaps, be uninteresting to present a few points of comparison between Mount Ábú and Mahábleshwar. While Ábú is the residence of the Agent to the Governor-General for Rajputana for the greater part of the year, Mahábleshwar is the head-quarters of His Excellency the Governor of Bombay for the hot season of April, May, and part of June, and for the month of October. Mahábleshwar is 4,540 feet above the sea-level. It is

---

[3] "All," says Colonel Tod, "is grand in this region, lovely and wild, as if it were destined by nature to be the haunt of her favourite progeny, where human passions should never intrude to disturb the harmony of the scene. The sky is cloudless, the notes of the cuckoo are heard responding to each other from amidst the deep foliage, while the jungle fowl are crowing their matinals in the groves of bamboo which shelter them, and groups of grey partridge nestled in the trees vie with the ringdoves in expressions of delight as the sun clears the Alpine cliffs and darts his fervent rays among them." *Tod's "Travels in Western India," p.*

about forty miles distant from the coast of the Arabian Sea. Mount Ábú, on the other hand, is much more inland. Its distance from the coast of the Arabian Sea proper is 290 miles, from the Runn of Cutch, 105 miles, from the Gulf of Cutch (south-west) 200 miles, and from the Gulf of Cambay (south), 160 miles. The respective distances of the two hill-ranges from the sea-coast mark most of their peculiarities as regards climate, weather, rainfall, and other meteorological features. Mount Ábú is habitable throughout the greater part of the year, the average rainfall on the hill being about 68 inches,[4] while the mean average temperature is 70° F.[5] The rains usually cease as they begin, with thunderstorms, about the middle of September, after which, for a few weeks, an occasional shower falls. January is the coolest month of the year, when the temperature is 58° F. Mahábleshwar during the rains is almost uninhabitable, except by the wild tribes living in the hill villages. Its average yearly rainfall is 263·82 inches. At the close of the rainy season, Ábú and Mahábleshwar both present beautiful landscapes. The hill tops and sides are still covered with grass and moss. The streams in the valleys are still flowing, and the faces of the various cliffs are white with numerous little rills and sprays. At Mount Ábú the close of the rainy season in September is followed by warmer weather, during which there is a good deal of fever and ague prevalent on the hill. Mahábleshwar is thought by many persons at its best in October, when it is hot in Bombay. "The breezes, though strong, are sweet, and the bracing cold of the evenings is met with a cheerful fire."[6] During the cold season Mount Abú is deserted by the Agent to the Governnor-General for Rajputana and the political officers, who go on tour through their respective charges. The vakils of the several Durbars follow suite. From Mahábleshwar, also, the Governor of Bombay returns to the capital and goes on a cold weather tour through the districts of the presidency. It is, however, in the hot season that the peculiarities of Mount Ábú and Mahábleshwar become most marked. The hot weather at Mahábleshwar begins about the end of February or the beginning of March, and is at its height from the middle of March to the middle of April,—a period of the year when the weather in the plains is pleasant enough.[7] But it is in

[4] "Rajputana Gazetteer," Vol. III., p. 135.

[5] *Ibid*, p. 135.

[6] "*Bombay Gazetteer*," *Sattara*, Vol., XIX, p. 491.

[7] *Ibid* p. 494.

the month of May that Mahábleshwar is most enjoyable. A change of wind towards the west takes place about the 20th April, and cool breezes, imparting health and vigour to the body, set in and become stronger as the season advances. In May the atmosphere becomes overcharged with moisture, and there are occasional showers and thunderstorms. These showers render the atmosphere cool, pleasant, and enjoyable. Except during the monsoon, Mahábleshwar is attractive at all seasons of the year; but at no time, perhaps, more so than in the month of May. Its broad and nicely-kept roads, and its charming scenery, afford excellent opportunities for long walks and drives to the numerous well-known points of the hill. Then, there are the beautiful waterfalls, such as those near Lingmala—the Dhobi's Fall and the Chinaman's Fall. All these well repay the trouble of a visit. It is, however, complained that of late years the climate of Mahábleshwar in May is much hotter than it was in years gone by, owing partly to the destruction of the jungle on the hill and partly to over-crowding.[8] Turning to Mount Ábú, we find that, placed far in the interior and at a distance from the sea-coast, the hill has, especially in the month of May, a dry and warm climate. For those suffering from bronchitis, heart-disease, and other affections of the lungs, Mount Ábú would probably be found more suitable than Mahábleshwar.[9] There is not much moisture in the atmosphere of Mount Ábú. The nights are cool and pleasant; but during daytime there is nothing like the cool and bracing winds, nor the occasional showers and thunderstorms, of which one sees and enjoys so much at Mahábleshwar.[10] Nor does Mount Ábú possess those conveniences in respect of residential bungalows and food-supplies and vegetables of the freshest kind for native gentlemen of respectability which Mahábleshwar affords. English vegetables are grown on Mahábleshwar intermixed with beds of strawberries on the banks of the Yenna. Its potatoes are much famed in the markets of Bombay and Poona, where they fetch handsome prices. The water-supply on the hill is good. The water-bearing trap in the wells on the hill is known to contain peroxide of iron.[11] The water

[8] See Bandford's "Climates and Weather of India, Ceylon and Burmah," p. 117.

[9] "Bombay Gazetteer," Sattara, Vol. XIX., p. 494.

[10] *Ibid*, p. 492.

[11] "Bombay Gazetteer," Sattara, Vol. XIX., p. 494.

thus serves as a tonic. It, however, results in a stiffening of the bowels, which may be overcome by good, long exercise. There is a good lake on the hill, fed by perennial springs and occupying an area of about twenty-six acres. It was built by the late Raja of Sattara. It helps to keep the springs in the wells at work.

The Nukki Talao on Mount Ábú is a much larger and more beautiful lake, being about half a mile long and a quarter of a mile broad. It seems to have been formed in a natural way out of the gorges of the surrounding hills, on the tops of which are erected bungalows for European officers. The lake presents a most picturesque scenery. There are also wells on the hill which supply drinking water of good quality to the residents. Their supply, however, exhausts during the dry season. On the south side of Mount Ábú, and many hundred feet below the crest of one of its peaks, lie Gaomukh and the shrine of Vasistha Muni. The ascent to the crest of the hill is by a bridle-path, over which you can ride on horseback till you reach the summit. On this summit, which is about three miles from the civil station, you get a charming view of the distant Árávalis and of the thickly-wooded slopes below. Silence and solitude, which reign all round, make a deep impression upon you. Immediately in front of you lies the abyss, through which you have to descend to reach the Gaomukh and the Vasistha Muni's shrine, by means of a rough and rugged flight of steps. One such step missed sends you to Yamaloka, that is, to perdition. The steps are said to be 700 in number. The ascent and descent are both troublesome and fatiguing, as we found to our cost. At the same time there is nothing striking about the place. At the Gaomukh there is a perennial spring of water, emptying itself, through a stone representation of the cow's mouth, into a masonry reservoir, said to have been built by Rao Gumán Sinhji, of Sirohi, in Samvat year 1845 (A.C. 1789). In the close vicinity of the Gaomukh is the shrine of Vasistha Muni. The temple has lost much of its antiquity through repairs executed at several times. In the interior of it is the image, in black stone, of Vasistha, the Guru or Preceptor of Rama—the hero of the Ramayana. Tradition gives to the sage the credit of having helped in the creation of the four Agnikula races of the Paramar Rajputs from the fire fountain at Achaleśwar. There is a cenotaph opposite the temple, containing a brass figure of the Dhar Parmar (Dharabuz), the last of the Parmar princes of Chandrávati. It stands in an attitude of supplica-

tion to the Muni. On one of the rocks commanding the Dailwádá valley is the shrine of Adhar Devi or Arbudá Devi, "the goddess of Ábú." It immediately catches the sight of the passenger going to Dailwádá by the white walls of the small temple erected over the rock, in the inside of which the shrine of Adhar Devi is enclosed. The shrine is formed out of the hollow of a rock. "Adhar" means "suspended in the air without support." It is the belief of the Ráhtis, or the Rajput clans on Mount Ábú, that the goddess does not touch the ground. It seems the whole image is carved out of the rock with its feet in suspension. We expected to see the Aghori on one of these hills, but the race has evidently become extinct.

About a mile from the Nukki Talao is situated Dailwádá, one of the thirteen villages on Mount Ábú. It is so called from its being the "Deval-wád," literally, "the region or group of temples." The name suggests that there must have been a larger number of temples, Brahmanical or Jain, at or near Dailwádá than are to be met with at the present day, though certainly not so numerous as at Pálitana or Girnár. It seems to be a characteristic of the Jain method of temple-building to have "cities of temples." Thus the Śatrunjaya Hill, near Pálitana, is little more than a "City of Temples." You see nothing but clusters of temples on every available nook and corner of the hill; and so at Girnár, though perhaps, in a lesser degree. At Dailwádá, however, there are only five Jain temples to be seen at the present day. This paucity in number is, perhaps, due to the fact that Ábú is more distant and less accessible than Pálitana or Girnár. The number of Jain pilgrims going annually to Mount Ábú is, from the same cause, very much smaller than that to Pálitana or Girnár. The five temples at Dailwádá are, however, as Fergusson says, "the pride and boast of the hill." It is true that, when looked at from a distance, they present no striking features about them, either in respect of size or external appearance. It is only when you examine their interior parts that you are struck with elaborate and finished artistic skill attained by the Hindus of the time. Four out of the five temples lie in a group on the left-hand side of the bridle-path leading to Úria and Achalghad, while the fifth temple is on the right-hand side of the path. Two out of the four temples belong to a comparatively modern period, but the remaining two, erected in honour of Vrishabhadeva and Neminátha, are those in which, according to Kinloch Forbes, "an elaboration almost incredible, and a finish worthy the hand of a Cellini, seem to express

the founders' steadfast refusal to believe in Mleecch invaders or iconoclastic destroyers as other than the horrid phantoms of a disturbing dream."[13] Even at the present day, the architectural beauties of the two temples rivet the attention and excite the admiration of tourists and antiquarians. In good weather, when the hill-station is filled with visitors, hardly a day passes without the temples being visited by European ladies and gentlemen. Of the two temples, that consecrated to Vṛishabhadeva is the older. It was built by Vimal Śah, a Jain merchant of Anahilwád in A.C. 1030. Of the architecture of this temple, Colonel Tod says: "Beyond controversy this is the most superb of all the temples of India, and there is not an edifice, besides the Taj Mehel, that can approach to it. The pen is incompetent to describe the exuberant beauties of this proud monument of the Jains raised by one of the richest of their votaries (by whose name, and not by that of the pontiff enshrined within, it is designated), and which continues to attract pilgrims from every region of India."[14] The general opinion, however, is that the more modern of the two temples, namely, that dedicated to Neminath and built by the two brothers, Vastupál and Tejahpál, presents superior architectural beauties, and I must say that I am inclined to favour the common opinion. Fergusson, however, thinks differently. "Were twenty persons," says he, "asked which of the two temples were the most beautiful, a large majority would, I think, give their vote in favour of the more modern one, which is rich and exuberant in ornament to an extent not easily conceived by one not familiar with the usual forms of Hindu architecture. The difference between the two is much the same that exists between the Choir of the Westminster Abbey and Henry the Seventh's Chapel, that stands behind it. I prefer infinitely the former, but I believe that nine-tenths of those that go over the building prefer the latter." In justice, however, to the elaborate and exuberant carving of the temple of Vastupál and Tejahpál, Fergusson observes: "No time and no pains would ever have enabled me to transfer to paper the lace-like delicacy of the fairy forms into which the patient chisel of the Hindu has carved the white marble of which it is composed."[15] No doubt, a glance at the two

[13] Forbes' "Rasa Mala," Vol. I., page 263.

[14] Tod's "Travels in Western India," pp. 101-102.

[15] Fergusson's "Picturesque Illustrations of Ancient Architecture in Hindustan," page 39.

temples will show[15] that that built by Vimal Śah is the older. An inscription recording a repair of the temple executed in the Samvat year 1379 (A.C. 1323) gives the date of the building of the temple as Samvat year 1088 (A.C. 1032). Before the year 1032, it appears there existed no other Jain temple on Mount Ábú. Vimal Śah's temple may, therefore, be taken as the oldest Jain temple on the hill. The tradition still current at Dailwádá is that the spot on which the temples stand was occupied by the shrines of Shiva and Vishnu. The Brahman priests of these temples objected to have in their neighbourhood temples dedicated to a hostile faith. But Vimal Śah and the other wealthy merchants of Anahilwád having conceived a special liking for the spot, were determined to have it at any cost. They accordingly offered to cover with silver coin as much ground as they wanted. This temptation was too much for the Paramár Prince, named Dhárávurz, lord of Mount Ábú, and he yielded to the sale of the spot in exchange for several lakhs of coin. Vimal Śah's temple is said to have cost eighteen crores and fifteen lakhs of *dams*. Both the temples are built of white marble of superior quality. As no quarries of white marble are to be met with on Mount Ábú, it is thought that the marble required for the temples was brought from the quarries at Jari Wao, in the wild hilly tract, called Bhakhar, which forms part of the Árávali range to the south-east of Ábú, and not far from the noted shrine of Ambá Bhaváni.[16] Supposing this was correct, and that the marble was brought from the Bhakhar hill, it is a puzzle to know by what road on Mount Ábú was the immense quantity of material required for the temples transported from the Bhakhar hill to Dailwádá. A local tradition says that a cart-road was built for the express purpose of bringing up the marble; but if so, there must be some trace of that cart-road. No such trace, however, is to be found at the present day, and, as a writer in the *Rajputana Gazetteer* suggests, "considering the time, trouble, and expense incurred in the construction of a road up the Rukhi Kishan Valley (the most favourable line) by our engineer officers, it is difficult to conceive how a cart-road could have been made at the time the temples were built."[17] However, the fact remains that the temples exist as gems of Indian art workmanship and as monu-

[15] *Ibid*, p. 40.

[16] "Rajputana Gazetteer," Vol. III., p. 150.

[17] *Ibid*, p. 150.

ments of the golden age of Jain architecture. They testify to the immense wealth and the great religious zeal of the famous bankers of Gujarát in the eleventh century of the Christian era.

Entering Vimal Śah's temple, the visitor finds himself in a large portico surrounding the inner temple of Vṛishabhadeva located in the middle. This portico or peristyle is about 140 feet in length and 90 feet in breadth. It is three steps higher than the level of the middle court. Within the internal faces of the walls forming the portico there are fifty-two cells, each containing an image of one of the twenty-four Jain Tirthankars. Opposite each cell is a double colonnade of small pillars. Over these pillars are architraves passing from each pair of columns and constituting a separate vestibule to each cell. Each compartment enclosing the four columns has a vaulted or flat roof. On the ceiling, which constitutes the flat roof or the dome, there are engravings of flowers, especially of the lotus, in its various stages of development, animals, inanimate objects, and incidents from religious books. The designs are chaste and simple, while the use of the chisel shows exquisite workmanship. The figures engraved are true to nature. No labour, no money, no skill, and no taste have been spared to make them masterpieces of their kind. Some of these cells have inscriptions in front of their door sides, with varying dates, and the names of the wealthy Jains from one or other of the great cities of India, at whose cost the image of its Tirthankar was put up in each cell. But all these cells appear to be the work of one master-mind. Descending three steps from the main doorway, you reach the tesselated marble pavement, which forms the Mandap in a direction exactly opposite the shrine of Vṛishabhadeva. The Mandap, with its fluted columns and the architraves over them supporting the dome, forms by itself a curious work of art. The bracket capital and the *toran* form peculiar ornaments of Indian architecture. The dome is adorned with engravings which indicate the splendour and richness of the Indian art at this period of Jain supremacy. These engravings, so finely executed, at once rivet the attention of the observer. The pendant in the dome is especially worthy of notice. There is also a representation in the dome of Rás Mandali or Gopis playing and singing in a chorus, relieved by festoons of foliage, flowers, fruits, animals, &c. Of the architectural beauties of the dome, Colonel Tod says: "While the eye detects a want of ease in the figures of the animals, the most fastidious critic could not find fault with copies

from inanimate nature. The flowing lines and graceful pendant flowers could not be surpassed by the work of any chisel in Europe."[18]

Going three steps higher, you are brought to the colonnaded portico. Passing this you get at the sanctum, within which is the image of Vṛishabhadeva. Popular tradition says that the image now in the shrine is not the original one consecrated by Vimal Śah. This was taken away in the time of Alla-ud-deen Khilji, the great Mahomedan iconoclast. For a considerable number of years the shrine remained without an image in it, probably from the dread of another Mahomedan sacrilege. And it was not until the fears of the Jains on this point were allayed that the image which now enshrines the temple was put up many years after. Many of the breakages in the engraved portions of the temple, noticeable at the present day, belong also to that period. But barring these slight injuries, both the temple of Vimal Śah and that of the brothers Vastupál and Tejahpál in the near vicinity, seem to have had a miraculous escape from the ravages of the Mahomedans. It may appear strange, but is nevertheless the fact, that in the south-west corner on the right side of Vṛishabhadeva is the temple, in an elevated cell, of Ambá Bhaváni—a Hindu and not a Jain goddess. Leaving the doorway of Vṛishabhadeva's temple, you meet at once with a square chamber nearly opposite to the Temple. It contains the equestrian statue of Vimal Śah, with his nephew seated behind him, and a *chhatri*, or parasol, over him. The parasol is indicative of the nobility of this prince of merchants of the time. The statue is somewhat larger than life-size. It is surrounded by ten elephants with their riders. Some of the elephants are deprived of their riders; while the riders of others have four arms and are dressed in a military fashion. Behind Vimal Śah's equestrian statue is a column several feet high. It is divided into three circular parts, having three round marble slabs and tapering towards the top. It contains numerous small niches, each containing an image of one of the Jain Tirthankars.

The visitor now passes on to an open court leading to a flight of steps, over which is the temple dedicated to Neminath, the twenty-second Tirthankar. It was built by the brothers, Vastupál and Tejahpál, ministers of King Víradhavala, the Waghela Chief of Dhuwalgurh or Dholka. The design and execution of this temple resemble very much those of Vimal Śah's; but in point of architectural beauty and

[18] Tod's "Travels in Western India," chap. vi., p. 105.

skill, and, especially in respect of the ornamentation of the dome of the mandap, it greatly surpasses the temple of Vimal Śah. The fluted columns supporting the dome are much higher, and the ornamentation in the interior of the dome much superior. The peristyle in this temple is very much like that of the older temple. But, as will be seen from the photograph taken of it by Lala Deen Dayal, the most enchanting portion in the dome is the circular pendant hanging from the centre of the dome. It is of exquisite workmanship. "It is impossible," says Colonel Tod, "to give a distinct idea of the richness and variety of the bas-reliefs, either of the principal dome or the minor ones which surround it. We must not, however, overlook a singular ornament pendant from the larger vault, the dedication of which defies the pen, and would tax to the utmost the pencil of the most patient artist. Although it has some analogy to the *corneille* of a Gothic cathedral, there is nothing in the most florid style of Gothic architecture that can be compared with this in richness. Its form is cylindrical, about three feet in length, and where it drops from the ceiling, it appears like a cluster of the half-disclosed lotus, whose cups are so thin, so transparent, and so accurately wrought, that it fixes the eye in admiration."[19] So rich was the ornamentation of the inner dome that we spent many a long hour each morning for a week gazing at it, and yet we could not say we were satiated with the beauties of it. The dome is divided into concentric compartments, by richly sculptured cordons, and each intervening space is filled with elaborate and elegant devices.[20] Going up a few steps, we come to the vestibule. On each side of it is a niche, partly in the wall and partly projecting from it. The tradition in respect of these niches is that they were erected to commemorate the two wives (*derani—jethani*) of the brothers Vastupál and Tejahpál. The name of Vastupál's wife was Lalitádevi,[21] and that of Tejahpál's was Anupamá or Anupamá Devi. Anupamá is said to have given the first impulse to the building of the temple. The two brothers had amassed so much wealth that they were at a loss to know where they could keep it secure. So deeply were they engaged one day in deliberating over this point, that it did not occur to them that their usual evening mealtime was over. Anupamá sent servants to remind them of this,

[19] Tod's "Travels in Western India," pp. 109-110.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

[21] See inscription, dated Samvat year 1287 (A.C. 1231) on the temple of Vastupal and Tejahpal, given at the end of Prof. A. V. Kathavate's *Kirtikaumudi*.

but to no effect. At last she went to them herself and asked them to leave their deliberations aside. They accordingly went to their meal. Whilst taking it, they were asked by Anupamá what it was that so much exercised their minds. They then revealed to her their difficulty. She told them that the best way to dispose of their wealth was to keep it on the top of mountains in such a way that everybody could see it, but none could misappropriate it.[92] When they could not understand the meaning of this puzzle, she explained to them that their wealth should be devoted to the building of temples on Mount Ábú, Śatrunjaya and Girnár. The Ministers pondered over this advice and resolved to act upon it. The Jain *Prabandhas* have also another tradition. The Ministers found that the work on Mount Ábú was progressing slowly. They were not satisfied with the men in charge of it, and so they went to superintend it themselves. Their wives also took part in this work. When the Ministers found that it was too cold on the hill for the workmen to go and work, they directed, on the recommendation of Anupamá, that each workman should have fire provided for him to warm himself while working, and that ready dinner should be provided for all the workmen in the evening.[93] There is also a tradition which says that in order to encourage workmen to display their skill to the best advantage, she recommended that for every little piece of fine art work done by the artists, he was to be paid for in silver for every stated weight of powdered dust resulting from his chiselling work. The encouragements thus held out were rewarded by the fine and skilful workmanship displayed by the artists. We may well believe, therefore, that the cost of erecting this temple was 12 crores and 53 lakhs of *dams*. In his description of this temple, Colonel Tod omits the mention of Háthi Sháłá, or the hall on the back part of the temple containing ten marble elephants in front with figures behind them in the wall, representing persons who had contributed money towards the building. They hold purses or money-bags in their hands. The inscription on this temple, dated Samvat 1287 (A.C. 1231) is the composition of Someshwar, the author of *Kírtikaumudi*, a Sanskrit poem, written in praise of Vastupál, whose special favourite the poet was. There is another temple erected about the same time by the same two brothers on the Śatrunjaya Hill and dedicated to

[92] See Prof. Abaji Vishnu Kathavate's "Introduction to the *Kírtikaumudi*," p. xx., Sanskrit Series, No. xxv.

[93] *Ibid.*, p. xx.

Neminátb. It bears the date of the Samvat year 1288 (A.C. 1232) The inscription upon it is also the composition of Someshwar.

Now here are monuments of the architectural, plastic, and decorative arts based on sound principles of design and imbued with the hereditary skill of the artists, and preserved to us from the ravages of time and the iconoclastic tendencies of the Mahomedan rulers of India. They indicate the splendour of Indian Art,—a true art feeling in the Hindu artist, at a period of Indian history anterior to the establishment of the Mahomedan rule. And no one who wishes well to the indigenous arts and finer handicrafts of India, need doubt that it is possible to conserve and perpetuate the industrial arts of India, if enlightened and liberal patronage is given to genuine examples of them. I would humbly suggest to Mr. Griffiths, the able Principal of the Sir J. J. School of Arts in Bombay, to send to Mount Ábú, Śatrunjaya, and Girnár, some of his clever pupils to copy or have photographs and drawings taken of some of the most beautiful of these genuine specimens of Hindu artistic style. They have only to be properly reproduced and exhibited to be appreciated by those who can afford to patronize them. As Mr. Purdon-Clarke, in his recent paper, entitled "Is the Preservation of the Industrial Arts of India possible," truly remarks—"By bringing the old patterns again before the people, we cannot fail to have a good effect and improve the quality of the demand; and, perhaps, when back again in their own legitimate lines, the artizan will produce nobler work in the style they really understood than they do at present, when attempting a compromise between their arts and our own."[24] It is in these and similar other monuments that the early history of Indian Art is written. The arts of the Hindus are of the highest antiquity; and Sir George Birdwood, than whom there is, perhaps, no Anglo-Indian who has studied them to any useful purpose, has shown, in tracing their history to recent times, in his "Industrial Arts of India," that these arts still remain in all their essential characteristics what they always have been from the very earliest records of them that have survived to our day. All that is needed to prevent their decay or degeneracy from false imitations is enlightened patronage of genuine examples of Indian Art by the public in private buildings, as well as by the Government and municipalities in different parts of India, in works of local as well as of general public utility.

[24] Journal of the East India Association, Vol. xxii., No. 2, page 38.

ART. III.—*Notes on the Cabinet of Coins of the Bombay Branch, Royal Asiatic Society.* By O. CODRINGTON, M.D., M.R.A.S., Memb. Num. Soc., Lond.

As I have recently arranged the Cabinet of Coins and revised the Catalogue, I send a few notes giving a summary of the collection, in order chiefly that it may be seen in what it is defective, but also that attention may be drawn to the value of it; and in the hope that more interest in Oriental Numismatics may be excited amongst the members of the Society, and that the collection be made more perfect.

KHALIFS, *Amawi.*—Fine specimens of the rare silver coins described in Vol. XVI. of the Journal, page 93, found near Thull Chotiali, Beluchistan, some of which are varieties not elsewhere noted as far as I know.

Abbasi.—Nothing of any importance except one gold coin of El Moatemid, San'a mint, A.H. 258.

Obv.—As B. M. C.* No. 367.

Rev.— الله

محمد

رسول الله

المعتمد على الله

احمد بن الموفق بالله

Benee Rasool Dynasty.—A fine collection of the silver coins of the 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th Sultans, and a pretender; of the mints 'Aden, Mahjam, T'aizz, Zebeed, Thaabat, fully described by Col. Prideaux, Journal Vol. XVI., p. 8, many of which are not in other known collections.

Bahri Mamluks of Egypt.—Twenty-six very fine gold coins of the 5th, 8th, 10th, 14th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd & 24th Sultans, described in Vol. XV. of the Journal, page 339. Also a number of silver coins of the 5th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 23rd Sultans. Forming a valuable and unusually full collection of the coinage of this dynasty.

---

* B. M. C. is Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum.

Unattributed Arabic.—The two gold and two silver coins described by me in Vol. XV. of the Journal, pages 352, 356 and 364.

Persia.—A few good specimens of the Mudhafari and Jelairs in gold and silver, and a number of the Zand and Kajah, but nothing unusual. There are very few coins of the Safavi dynasty and only two silver ones remarkable, *viz.*, (1) Safi I., Ardebil, (?) A.H. 1050; (2) Abbas I., Erivan, A. H. • • • 3.

Durani.—The coinage of Ahmad and Timur, represented by specimens of Ahmadshahi, Kabul, Meshhed, Lahore, Dera, Bhakar and Herat mints, in silver.

Armenia.—Some interesting silver specimens of Kings Leo (V?) and Constantine, described in Vol. XV. of the Journal, page 369; one of Leo's coin having been counterstruck with the die of Nasir Muhammad, the Mamluk Sultan.

Kings of Dehli.—In gold there are seven specimens of one coin of Ala-ud-din Muhammad, some of which might be advantageously disposed of by exchange or sale. Other kings, of whom there are gold coins, are Ghias-ud-din Taghlak (1), Muhammad bin Taghlak (6 different), Firuz III. (3 different).

In silver there are but 22 sorts of coins, and but of nine kings; there are a great number of specimens of some of these, which might be exchanged.

In copper the collection is better, but there are many gaps which might be filled up by exchange of spare specimens.

Kings of Malwa.—There are two fine gold coins, one of Nasir, dated 913, and one of Ghias-ud-din undated. Silver of Mahmud Khilji, and Mahmud II., and copper of Hushang and Muhammad Ghori, and of the four Khilji kings.

Kings of Gujarat.—A fine gold coin of Muhammad III., dated 947; a fair collection of the silver and copper coinage of the later kings.

Bahmani.—There is not a single specimen in gold or silver, but a good collection in copper of the varieties described in Vol. XVI. of the Journal, page 99.

Emperors of Dehli—Akbar.—A beautiful gold piece, weighing 841 grains, being the 25th part of a Sihansah.

Obv.—Centre in oblong square—

اکبر بادشاہ غازي
محمد
جلال الدین

around centre.

السلطان العظم الخاقان

خلد الله المكرم تعالى و دولته و ملكه و سلطانه ضرب اكبر ١٨٢

Rev.—Centre in ornamented pentagon

لا اله الا الله

محمد

رسول الله

Arounnd centre in five looped divisions

ابي بكر صديق — عمر الفاروق — عثمان العفان — علي المرتضى — رضي الله عنهم

Twelve fine round Mohurs, lately received from Indian Government, of four types, and three others, of Lahore, Agra, Dehli, Ahmadabad, Akbarabad mints, and years 970, 971, 973, 975, 976, 977, 981, 982, 984, 990. Two square Mohurs, one of Ujjain mint A. H. 988.

Seventeen silver, various—some good specimens of Ahmadabad coinage with Ilahi dates.

Copper.—A fine tanka, Ahmadabad, Ardibihist Ilahi 40, and a few good falus.

Jehangir, Gold.—Bust with drinking cup in hand, dated 1020. Zodiacal—Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Virgo, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces, Leo, Aries.

Silver.—A good collection of Ahmadabad rupees, some Zodiacal and some with Ilahi dates, one being of the first year of the reign.

Obv.— نور الدين جهانگير شاه اكبر شاه

Rev.— لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله احمد آباد ١٠١٣

and one of Jehangir and Nur Jehan, coined at Surat in 1034.

Copper.—A few falus.

Shahjehan.—Four gold, unimportant. A large collection of rupees, mostly of the square centre type and chiefly of Surat mint. Other mints being Ahmadabad, Junagar, Dehli, Golconda, Kambait, Agra, Akbarnagar. The earliest date is 1038, and the latest 1069 which appears on one coin of Surat and on one of Kambait, although 1068 is given as the first year of Aurangzib's reign.

Murad Baksh.—Five Surat and one Ahmadabad rupees of 1068.

Aurangzib.—Fourteen Gold. Mints—Multan, Golconda, Akbarabad, Aurangabad, Surat. And a large number of rupees, one coined at Akbarabad in the first year of his reign.—

Obv.—In square centre. بادشاه غازی عالمگیر

Margin. ابوالظفر محي الدين محمد اورنگ زيب بهادر سنه احد

Rev.—In square centre ضرب اکبرابا د

Margin جلوس ميمنت مانوس سنه احد

Other mints represented, are Surat, Katak, Kambait, Etawa, Alamgirpoor, Lucknow, Ajmir, Ahmadabad, Bareilly, Islambad, Golconda, Ahmadnagar, Aurangabad, Junagar, Shahjehanabad, Bijapur. On the rupees of Surat are a variety of symbols in the loop of س on Rev. In the cabinet are some thirty of such varieties, which seem to indicate the years of mintage.

Bahadur Shah.—A rupee of Shahjehanabad and of Surat undated, and one without mint of the year 3.

Jehandar.—A rupee of Bareilly, dated 1124.

Obv.— * * قران جهاندار بادشاه حا * *

Rev.— ضرب بريلي سنه جلوس احد ميمنت مانوس

Faraksir.—A mohur of Lahore, dated 1030. Rupees of Surat, Kambait, Ahmadnagar, Shahjehanabad, Etawa, Murshedabad, Lahore mints, and of years 1125 to 1130.

Rafie ed derjat.—A mohur of doubtful mint, undated

Obv.— ت

ح الدرج *

كا شاهنشه • • • ا

* • • •

Rev.— مانوس

سنه احد جلوس

ضرب

* *

Rafie ed doulat.—A mohur of Akbarabad or Agra 1131, but legend not very distinct.

Mohammad Shah.—Six mohurs, one of Shahjehanabad of first year of reign, and ten or twelve varieties of rupees of the mints Shahjehanabad, Akbarabad, Murshedabad, Barhanpur, Multan, Azimabad, Kambait, Ahmadabad, Etawa, Kota, Allahabad, Machlipatan, Lahore; the earliest date being on one of Akbarabad, 1131.

Ahmad Shah.—Rupees of Lahore, 1165; Muhammadabad, Benares, 1166; Patna; Shahjehanabad, 1161; Azimabad, year احد.

Alamgir II.—Three mohurs of different varieties of Shahjehanabad, mint and years 1168-1170. Rupees of Ahmadabad, Muhamadabad,

Benares, Azimabad, Patna, Shahjehanabad, Azimabad, Benares, Arkat, Lahore, dates 1170-1171.

Shahjehan II.—Rupee of Ahmadabad year ۱۱. Symbol, an Ankus.

Modern India.—The rupees bearing part of the Shah Alam legend and symbols of mint towns are grouped together with others bearing parts of other legends and arranged, as far as possible, under the name of the State or Mint where issued, and of these there is a large collection. Coins of the following places or designations have been identified:—

	Varieties.		Varieties.
Ahmadabad	10	Chicani, Kolhapur	1
Surat	10	Nepani, Kolhapur	1
Broach	1	Hukari, Kolhapur	1
Baroda	22	Marech, Kolhapur	1
coins of different Gaekwars being differentiated.		Bhatur	1
		Jamkhandi	1
Sind	11	Toragal	2
Sujawal	1	Jaripatka, Nasik	1
Habshi of Janjira	2	Aurangabad	1
Alibag	1	Narainpet	7
Poona	4	Raichur	1
Wai	1	Haidarabad, Deccan	3
Bhore, Pant Pradhani	1	Trinomali	1
Panala, Kolhapur	1		

Kutch.—Specimens of coinage of Bhoraji, Bharmalji, Khengarji, Tamachi, Rayadhanji, Pragmalji, Gohadaji, Desalji, Rayadhanji II., Gohadaji II., Bharmalji II., Desalji II., Pragmalji II., Khengarji II. Described in Journal Vol. XVII., page 49.

	Varieties.		Varieties.
Navanagar	3	Jaipur	2
Junagarh	2	Kotah	3
Porbandar	1	Kerauli	1
Ajmir	2	Jodhpur	5
Shahpuri	1	Deig	1
Pali	1	Datiah	1
Ujjain	1	Jhansi	2
Udaipur	2	Bagalkot	4
Chitor	2	Chandor	1
Dholpur	1	Sepri	1

	Varieties.		Varieties.
Gwalior	6	Multan	1
Wadgaon	2	Kochaman, Jodhpur	1
Bhopal	2	Dhulia	1
Bhilsa	3	Sohagpur	1
Sironj	1	Jabalpur	1
Partabghar	1	Harda	1
Gopalghar	1	Nagpur	1
Bindraban	1	Chanda	1
Farukhabad	1	Kandusi Narwar	1
Lucknow	3	Saugor	1
Benares	3	Kishangarh	1
Agra	1	Sadosa	1
Alwar	1	Malwa	1
Etawa	1	Bareilly	1
Patna	2	Arkat	2
Rohilkhand	1	Chatrapur	1
Punjab	2	Akbarabad	1
Jalaun	1	Patna	1
Patiala	1	Unknown	5

A large collection of copper pice has been arranged in the same way according to the mint marks, and identified as far as possible, but a great number still remain unattributed.

British India.—There is a good collection of the British Indian coinage, especially that for Bombay. In gold the rarest is the 15-Rupee Mohur of Bombay of 1770 figured in Thurston's catalogue of the coinage in the Madras Museum, plate XX., fig. 5; in silver the Bombaim rupee of Charles II. (Thurston, plate XVIII., fig. 2); in Tutenag the Bombay double pice of George I. (Thurston, plate XVI., page 8); and in copper the double pice of George II., 1728 (Thurston, late XIX., fig. 8), and the Charles II. pice (Thurston, plate XVIII., fig 3). Of this last there are a large number, some of which might be distributed; it appears from Thurston's list that there is not one in the Madras Central Museum.

Ceylon, Straits, &c.—There is a gold coin of Lankesvara as No. 1 in Mr. Rhys Davids list of Ceylon coins and copper ones in nine varieties of the early Ceylon kings, of some of which also there are many specimens.

Indo-Portuguese.—There is a fair collection of the later coinage from King Jão V. and two tutenag of Fillippe I.

Considering the advantages of the propinqnity of Goa, and that the greatest collector and describer of this coinage is in Bombay, I think the collection could be made more complete with a little trouble.

Indo-Dutch, French and Danish.—There are a very few specimens of these coinages.

Hindu.—There are in silver many fine specimens of the punched coins and three fine ones in gold. The coins found at Wai, described in the Journal, Vol. XII., page 400, and some of the stamped variety shown in Sir W. Elliot's Coinage of Southern India, Plate II., fig. 61, and some in lead and copper with Buddhist signs, such as are also given in Elliot's work; and also a large number of the Andhrabhritya in lead and copper, described in the Journal, Vol. XIII., page 303, some of which should be distributed.

The gold Kadambi coins as Elliot, Plate II., Nos. 68 to 71.

Of Gupta there are some fine gold ones and a good assortment in silver; as well as Valabhi and Rashtrakuta coins. Of the Sah or Kshatrap kings there is a fine collection in silver, arranged by Pundit Bhagvanlal Indraji, of 14 of the kings.

There are good specimens of horseman and bull coins of Samanta Deva, and a great number of Gadhia coins, including a set arranged to show the gradual corruption of the design from the Sassanian coinage as described in the Journal, Vol. XII, page 325.

Southern India.—In gold one Ramtanka described in Mr. Gibbs' paper in Bengal Asiatic Journal, 1884. A large collection of huns, pagodas and fanams presenting many varieties, and in silver some fine fanams.

Larines.—There is a valuable assortment of silver larines chiefly of two varieties. One made of thin wire and two and-a-half inches long, having stamped on one side part of the Kalimah of the Shiah formula, and on the other part of a legend of which only the words,

المظفر — المعبد — بادشاه — سلطان — ضرب

are to be gathered, but two bear very distinct dates, ٩٨٧ and ٩٩٣. These I believe to be of Persian make, and, if so, would be of the time of Muhammad Khudabanda. The others, of somewhat thicker wire and shorter, have on them, more or less distinctly, legends of Adil Shah.

One has on *Obv.* سلطان علي عادل شاه

Rev. • • • • ضرب

Another, *Obv.* * علی عادال شاہ
Rev. ضرب * * ۱۰۷۱
Another, *Obv.* علي عادل شاہ
Rev. ضرب لاري آباد ? ۷۷

These were, I have no doubt, struck by the 'Adil Kings of Bijapur in imitation of the other kind, the Persian of Lar.

Dr. Wilson, *Journal*, Vol. III., page 138, read the word سایر on this variety, and speaks of them as Sairi coins. Prof. H. H. Wilson, *Numismatic Chronicle*, XVI., page 179, gives a good account and also figures of them. He reads on one side سلطان عادل شاہ, and on the other ضرب لاری دنکر سکر. I can see the word دنکر doubtfully on one or two, but have never been able to see the word سایر on any. The name of the king is written plainly عادالشاہ instead of عادل, and I think I have seen that it is so spelt in some Bijapur inscription. Ten or fifteen years ago Larines were more commonly sent to the Society as Treasure Trove than any other silver coins from the Southern Konkan and Western Deccan, but none have been so sent during the last five years. Probably they may not be recognised as coins by officials, and therefore not treated as such under the Treasure Trôve Acts; but as we know so little about the coinage of the 'Adil Shah and other dynasties in those regions, it would be very desirable that the attention of the Collectors of Districts be called to them, in order that as many as possible might be examined, and thus a more complete legend made out. Whilst on this subject, I would also note that no silver coins of Sivaji are known, though we are told that he did strike silver coin (see *Grant Duff* and *Bombay Gazetteer*) and Prof. Wilson, in his article above refered to, shows that in all probability the Larine was adopted by him also. I have, therefore, long looked for some Larines with Nagari letters or Sivaji's name on them, for it seems unlikely that a ruler of his character would have been content to issue coins bearing merely a part of a Persian inscription, or one having the name of the Bijapur king, without his own name also, or, at any rate, some sign of his Marathi Raj. It would be interesting to have this in view in examining Larines found in the Konkan or Deccan. The Satara Chhatrapati pice is well known.

Kashmir and Kangra.—There is a set of the copper coins of Hindu kings, and a very rare silver one of Sri Didda and of Kalasa, both presented by Mr. W. Theobald.

Greek-Bactrian.—The collection is a poor one, but there are fine specimens of Euthydemus I., Demetrius, Euthydemus II., and Heliokles similar to ones in the British Museum.

Parthian.—A very poor lot.

Sassanian.—Have been arranged by Mr. Kursatjee Rustomji Cama, and there are some very good specimens, especially of the later kings. The collection, considering the position of the Parsi community of Bombay, should be made a complete one and the finest possible.

Roman.—There are a number of various copper coins of little value and two silver of Tiberius and one of Lucius Verus.

The Society are fortunate in having recently acquired two fine Roman gold coins, *viz.*—

Lucius Verus (Cohen, Medailles Imperiales, No. 73).

Obv.—Bust of Emperor, laureate, to right, with paludament and cuirass.

L VERVS AVG ARM PARTH MAX *i.e.*, Lucius Verus Augustus Armenicus Parthicus Maximus.

Rev.—Victory standing to left, holding a crown and a palm.

TRP VII IMP IIII COS III. *i.e.*, Tribunicia potestate VII., Imperator IV., Consul III., the figures indicating the number of years he had exercised the several powers or offices at the time the coin was struck. Size ·8; weight, 107 grs.

This coin, which is in very fine preservation, was found in a field at the village of Nagdhara, Jalalpur taluka, Surat. It is not a very rare variety, but of undoubted Roman fabric. Its value in London is about £2.

Septimius Severus. (Cohen No. 444.)

Obv.—Head of Emperor, laureate, to right, SEVERVS PIVS AVG.

Rev.—Severus and his two sons Caracalla and Geta on horseback galloping to left.

VIRTVS AVGVSTORVM. Size ·8, Weight 107 grs.

This coin was found in Waghode village, Raverpeta, Sawda taluka, Khandeish, by a peasant when ploughing. It is in very fine condition, certainly of Roman work, and is a rare variety of the coinage of this Emperor. Its value in London is about £15.

European and American.—There are a number of coins of all sorts in gold, silver and copper, many of which might just as well be turned into money or exchanged.

ART. IV.—*"The Game of Ball-Bat (Chowgân-gui) among the Ancient Persians, as described in the Epic of Firdousi."* By JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A.

Read September 26, 1890.

THE modern Parsees of India have made cricket, the national game of their esteemed rulers, their own. But it appears from the Shahnameh of Firdousi, the great epic poet of Persia, that a game of ball-bat, though not like that of cricket, was known to their ancestors, the ancient Persians. The game was played with great enthusiasm, not only in the later Sassanian period, but also in the earlier times of the Kaiânian dynasty. The young and the old, the rich and the poor, played it as a means of healthy exercise and recreation. Even friendly international matches were arranged under the captainship of the leading men of the rival races. They were played with an accompaniment of music just as we see at the present day. The result of the matches was looked to with great eagerness and anxiety.

Firdousi calls this game Chowgân-gui. Chowgân means a bat as well as the ground on which the game is played. Gui means a ball. The game was played on foot as well as on horseback. Young children generally played it on foot. It is said of the Duke of Wellington that he used to say that he won his Waterloo on the cricket-ground, meaning thereby that the precision and the discipline under which he played the game were of great use to determine his future character as a great commander. The following historical anecdote from the Shahnameh illustrates how this game of Chowgân-gui was made use of to know the character of a child and determine the nobility of its birth. This is one of the four references that I have been able to collect from the Shahnameh on the subject of this game.

Ardeshir Bâbegân (Artaxerxes I.) the founder of the Sassanian dynasty of Persia, having defeated Ardwân (Artabanes), the last monarch of the Parthian dynasty, on the classical field of Râm Hormuz, on the banks of the river Kârun, ascended the throne of Persia, and took a daughter of the deposed sovereign in marriage. She,

instigated by her eldest brother, Behman, who was then in India, tried to poison her husband, Ardeshir, with a view to bring about the return of the Parthian dynasty to the throne of Iran. Her wicked attempt was discovered by Ardeshir, who ordered one of his ministers to put her to death. This minister, while taking away the queen from the court of the king to put his royal master's order into execution, found that she was *enceinte*. With a view of bringing about a reconciliation in future, and of securing an heir to the throne in case the king had no other issue hereafter, the minister protected the queen in his palace. In order to guard against the suspicions of the king in future as a likely father of the child he got himself castrated. He put the castrated parts in a box, and though pale and weak through the effects of the operation went in a litter to the king, and requested him to let the box be kept in his treasury until the time he called for it. At the proper time the queen was delivered of a male child, whom the minister named Shahpur, *i. e.*, the son of the king. This was the Shapur who defeated the Roman Emperor Valerian at the battle of Edessa.

Time rolled on when seven years after this event, the minister one day found the king very gloomy. On enquiry he found that the thought of being heirless made the king sad. The king said to him, "A father without the son, is like a son without the father. Never will a stranger press him to his heart." The minister took hold of this golden opportunity and divulged the secret to the king. He sent for the box from the treasury of the king, showed him its contents, and said that he had done so to be above suspicion as a likely father of the child. The king, in order to further satisfy himself about the legitimacy of the child, ordered the boy to be brought to him in the company of one hundred children of the same age and countenance, and to be made to play the game of "Chowgân-gui" before him, so that he might determine by his own paternal affections which out of the hundred children was his prince. In the words of Firdousi he said:—

کنون صد پسر جوي همال اوی ∴ ببالا و چهر و بر و یال اوی
همه جامه پوشید ه با او بهم ∴ نباید که چیزی بود پیش و کم
همه کودکانرا بچوگان فرست ∴ بیارای گوی و بمیدان فرست
چوبردشت کودک بود خوبچهر ∴ بجنبد بفرزند جانم بمهر
برآن راستی دل گواهی دهد ∴ مرا با پسر آشنائی دهد

"Now find out a hundred children who resemble him in stature, appearance, form, and size, and are dressed like him without the slightest difference. Send all these children with bats, get a ball, and send them to the 'maidân.' When all the beautiful children will be on the plain, my soul will be moved by my affection for my child. My own heart will give evidence of the truth of thy words, and will recognize my child."

The minister followed the instructions of his master, and the king recognized his child out of the hundred children. To make matters more certain he asked one of his attendants to go in the midst of the children and throw the ball towards him. He said:—

ازآن کودکان تا که آید دلیر ∴ میان دلیران بکردار شیر
زدیدار من گوی بیرون برد ∴ ازین انجمن کس بکس نشمرد
بود بیگمان پاک فرزند من ∴ زتخم و برویال و پیوند من

"Whoever out of these children advances bravely in the midst of the brave like a lion and carries away the ball from my presence without respect for anybody in this assembly, he undoubtedly must be my real child, of my own blood, body, and family."

The attendant went among the children and threw the ball towards the king. All the children ran after the ball, but when they saw that it was very close to His Majesty they dared not go before him. But Shapur ran after it and threw it back among the children. This convinced Ardeshir that Shapur was a royal prince, and was therefore not at all afraid to go before his royal father.

Mirkhond differs a little from the version of Firdousi. According to this historian, the ball went close to the king in the usual course of the play, and was not thrown by an attendant. Again, according to the version of Shahzadeh Jalâl Kâjar, when the ball happened to be thrown towards the king, he picked it up and threw it into his palace through an adjoining window. No boy dared to go into the royal palace to fetch it, but Shapur went in as one would go into his own house.

An earlier reference to this game is found in the reign of king Lohrasp. Gustasp, the eldest son of this monarch, through the intelligence displayed by him in this game of Chowgân-gui, and in other athletic sports, won the good favour of the Kaisar of Roum. Gustasp, having quarrelled with his father, left his Persian court and went under an assumed name to the country of the Kaisar of Roum.

The Kaisar had a very beautiful marriageable daughter whom he asked to choose her husband from a large assembly of the *élite* of his city. The daughter, Kaitabun by name, found none in that assembly to meet her wishes. Thereupon the Kaisar called an assembly of the middle class of men in his city. Kaitabun chose Gustasp from the large assembly, having previously seen his features in a dream. The Kaisar did not like the choice, but having given his promise to Kaitabun to let her choose her husband he could not honourably withdraw it. He permitted the marriage, but asked Kaitabun to leave the royal palace with her husband. A short time after, when some public sports were held Gustasp went and showed such manliness and intelligence in the sports, and among them in the game of ball-bat, that the Kaisar was struck with his valour and received him and his daughter into his favour again. It appears from Firdousi that this game was played on horseback. He says:—

بفرمود تا بر نهادند زین ∴ براسپي کہ اندر نوردد زمین
بیامد بمیدان قیصر رسید ∴ ہمی بود تا زخم چوگان بدید
ازیشان یکی گوي و چوگان بخواست ∴ میان سواران براند اخت راست
بر انگیخت آن بارگي را زجای ∴ یلانرا ہمہ سست شد دست و پای
بمیدان یکي تیر گویش ندید ∴ شد از زخم او در جہان نا پدید
سواری کجا گوی او یافتی ∴ اگرچہ ہمي تیز بشتافتی

"He ordered to place a saddle upon his horse which enrolled the earth under his feet. He marched to the 'maidân' of the Kaisar, and went up to the place where he saw the strokes of the bat. He asked from them a ball and a bat, and threw it (the ball) right in the midst of the riders. He then spurred his horse from its place. The hands and the feet of the heroes (players) stopped short of playing. The ball disappeared so fast under his stroke that nobody in the plain could see it. How can a rider see his ball, however fast he rode?"

This reference to the game reminds us of the modern polo, which, let it be remembered, has been introduced into India in recent years from Kashmir and Afghanistan, countries which were formerly owned by the ancient Persians.

The third reference to this game is in the reign of Kaikâus, the Kavi Usadhan of the Avesta. His eldest son, Siavash, was sent by him against the Turanian king Afrasiab, with whom he entered into a treaty of peace. The Persian king not approving his conduct, Siavash delivered the command of his Persian army to a Persian

general, and then went over to the country of Afrasiab and made it his home, rather than return to the anger of his father and to the machinations of Soudabeh, his step-mother, who had done her best to bring him into the disfavour of his father. It was in his adopted country that the Persian prince played a game of "Chowgân-gui" with the Turanian king Afrasiab. It is a very interesting match that Firdousi describes. It is an international match between the Iranians and the Turanians. Siavash, the Persian prince, captains the Iranian team, and Afrasiab, the Turanian king, captains the Turanian team. The teams were made up of eight on either side.

According to Firdousi, the Turanian king having intimated the previous night his wish to play a game, both parties appeared on the "maidân" the next-morning, when Afrasiab said:—

چنین گفت پس شاه ترکان بدوي ∴ کہ یاران گزینیم در زخم کوي
توباشي بدان روي وزین روي‌من ∴ بدو نیمہ هم زین نشان انجمن

"Let us choose our companions for striking the ball. You place yourself on that side, I will remain here, and this assembly will also divide itself into two parties."

At first Siavash, who was a guest of the Turanian king, refused to take the opposite side, and to stand as an antagonist to the king. He offered to play on the side of the king. The Turanian king wished him to take the lead of the opposite party, saying, "One day, on the death of the Persian monarch Kaus, as his heir to the throne, you shall be my rival and my antagonist." Then the Turanian king selected his team. It consisted of the most elect of his courtiers,—Gulbad, Karsivaz, Jehan, Poulad, Piran, Nestihan, and Human formed his team. Among these one was his brother, another his prime minister, and the rest his military commanders. Then the king gave to Siavash, Rouin, Schideh, Anderiman, Arjasp, and three other Turanians to form his team. Siavash naturally objected. As the king desired Siavash to show his ability in the game as the future king of Iran, and therefore as his future antagonist, it was fair that he should have his Iranians as his colleagues. He said:—

سیاوش بدو گفت کہ اي نام جوي ∴ ازیشان کہ یارد شدن پیش گوئی
ہمہ یار شایند تنها منم ∴ نگهدار چوگان یکتا منم
گرایدون کہ یاري دہد شهریار ∴ بیارم از ایران بمیدان سوار
مرا یار باشند در زخم گوي ∴ بدان سان کہ آئین بود بردو روي

"Oh glorious monarch! Who among these will dare to place himself before the ball? They are all the friends of the king, and I am alone. I am the only one to look after the bat. If your Majesty will permit me, I will bring to the "maidân" my team from the Iranians. They will help me in striking the ball according to the rules of both the sides."

Afrasiab complied with this reasonable request, and Siavash chose his own team of eight from amongst the Iranians, and thus the game became an international match between the Iranians and the Turanians.

The playing of music as then known was a sign to commence the game. The music, which was like that of our modern fifes and drums, is thus described by Firdousi:—

خروش تبیره ز میدان بخاست ∴ بهر خاک با آسمان گشت راست

از آواز منج و دم کوه نای ∴ تو گفتی بجنبید میدان زجای.

"The tambour began to be heard over the 'maidân' and the dust raised by the players went up to the sky. With the music of the cymbal and the trumpets, the very 'maidân' began, as it were, to dance."

The description which follows shows that, though the game was played on horseback like the modern polo, it differed from it in an important point. The ball was not let to roll on the ground, but was thrown high in the air. The opposite team went running after it on the horse and threw it back in the air in the opposite direction. The ball was thrown back before it reached the ground. The game was something like the modern tennis on a very large scale and on horseback.

Now to resume the description of the above international match. Afrasiab, the captain of the Turanian team, first set the ball rolling, or rather we should say set the ball flying in the air. The Iranian captain Siavash spurred his horse and returned the blow before the ball touched the ground. He did so with such great force that none of the Turanian team could run after it and return the blow. The result of this first play then was a triumph for the Iranian team.

Then Afrasiab sent a new ball to Siavash to commence the second play. Siavash kissed the ball out of respect for the king. He took a fresh horse and the band played again. Siavash, tossing the ball a little in the air with his hand, gave such a strong blow with his "chowgân" (bat) that the ball disappeared in the distance before any

member of the Turanian team could run after it and return the blow. "The ball went up so high," says the poet, "that it appeared to go as it were to the moon." This second play again, then, was a victory for the Iranian team, brought about chiefly by the good play displayed by its captain. The poet does not proceed with any description of any further play between the royal personages, but says that as the game was intended by the king to test the power and the ability of the Persian prince, he was quite convinced of his excellence. Every spectator in the field acknowledged the excellence of the play of Siavash, and believed he had no equal in the play.

I will quote here the poet himself to describe the play between the two monarchs in his own words:—

سپهدار گوي زميدان بزد ∴ به ابر اندر آمد چنان چون سزد
سياوش برانگيخت اسپ نبرد ∴ چوگوي اندر آمد نمشتش بگرد
بزد چنان چون بميدان رسيد ∴ بدان سان کز از چشم شد نا پديد
بفرمود پس شهر يار بلند ∴ که گوي بنزد سياوش برند
سياوش بدآن گوي برداد بوس ∴ برآمد خروشيدن نای وکوس
سياوش به اسپ ديگر برنشست ∴ بينداخت اين گوي لختي بدست
پس آنگه بچوگان برو کار کرد ∴ چنان شد کز باماه ديدار کرد
ز چوگان او گوي شد نا پديد ∴ توگفتي سپهرش همي برکشيد

"The king threw from the maidân a ball high into the air, and it went up to the cloud as it deserved. Siavash spurred his warlike horse and when the ball came down he did not allow it to touch the ground, but no sooner did it come down he gave such a strong blow that it disappeared before the eyes. Then the powerful monarch sent to Siavash another ball. Siavash kissed the ball, and the noise of the trumpets and the cymbals went up to heaven. Siavash rode a fresh horse, threw the ball a little in the air with his hand, and gave a blow so forcibly with the bat that it appeared to go high up to the moon. The bat made it disappear so high in the air, that you may say the vault of heaven drew it towards itself."

The royal antagonists then retired from the field, and took their seats on a throne arranged on one side of the maidân. Afrasiab then asked the two teams to continue the play. They did so, and in the end the Iranians were victorious.

The next reference to this game of "Chowgân-gui" by Firdousi is that to the play between Siavash and Karsivaz, the brother of Afrasiab.

The passage is important, as it shows that the "chowgân" or bat then used had a "kham," *i.e.*, a slight hollow like that in the tennis bats. Again, Firdousi's phraseology in describing the play between Siavash and Afrasiab, and that between Siavash and Karsivaz, is very similar. In one place the poet uses almost the same couplets. Siavash won the game, and this success, it may be said, cost him his life. His rival, Karsivaz, seeing him victorious in this game and in other manly and military sports, began to entertain from that day feelings of jealousy for him. He one day went to his brother, the Turanian king Afrasiab, and grossly calumniated Siavash. This made the Turanian monarch suspicious about the motives of the Iranian prince staying at his court. He suspected him of bringing about an overthrow of his rule, and therefore got him put to death even against the lamentations of his own daughter Firanguiz, whom he had given in marriage to Siavash.

ART. V.—*The Sudarśana or Lake Beautiful of the Girnâr Inscriptions, B. C. 300—A. D. 450*, by KHÂN BAHÂDUR ARDESEER JAMSEDJEE, Naib Diwân of Junâgadh, with INTRODUCTION, by O. CODRINGTON, ESQ., M.D., MEMBER, ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

INTRODUCTION.

THE making of the Sudarśana or Beautiful Lake passes back to the beginning of Western Indian History.

One of the earliest historic references in Western India, in Rudradâman's Girnâr Inscription,[1] speaks of the making of the lake by the Vaiśya Pushyagupta, Viceroy of the modern Kâthiâwâr, and brother-in-law to the Maurya Raja Chandragupta (B. C. 300). About sixty years later in the time of the great Emperor Aśoka (B. C. 240), his Viceroy the Yavana Tushâspa embellished the lake with conduits worthy of a king. Tushâspa's lake remained unharmed for more than 350 years. In December A. D. 129 heavy universal rain turned the earth into an ocean. The floods of the Sonrekhâ, Palâsini, and other Girnâr streams were made fiercer by a hurricane that overthrew hill-tops trees rocks terraces gates houses and victory pillars, and forcing against the embankment, trees shrubs tangled creepers and other ruins, in spite of every device, swept away 360 feet of the embankment right to the river-bed, a depth of about 225 (?) feet. Through this rent the whole water escaped leaving the bed of the lake as dry as a sand desert.

So great was the gap that the king's advisers and engineers, though possessed of the qualifications of ministers, lost heart and gave up the undertaking; the people losing all hope that the ruined dam would be repaired raised woful cries. The great Kshatrap King Rudradâman, lord of Mâlwa, Gujarât, Kâthiâwâr, Kachh and the North Konkan, for (the sake of) cows and Brâhmans, and for the increase of his merit and fame, for one thousand years, without exacting special taxes forced labour or benevolences, by liberal grants from his treasury, enabled his Palhava Viceroy of Kâthiâwâr, Suviśâkha son of Kulaipa,

[1] Burgess' Archæological Survey of Kâthiâwâr and Kachh. 129; J. B. B. R. A. S. VII. 119; Ind. Ant. VII. 261-263.

Read 19th January 1891.

to make the Beautiful Lake more beautiful than ever stretching from Junâgadh to the roots of the hills.

When Suviśâkha's works were completed, according to Pandit Bhagwânlâl probably about A. D. 137,[2] the lake was in excellent condition. It was furnished with an embankment of mud and stones three times the length and breadth of the former dam, a well-joined construction rivalling the spurs of the hills, without holes, broad long and high. In the part of the lake's circuit where the hill spurs formed a natural bank, outlets for the water were made by means of curving conduits divided into three parts.[3]

Suviśâkha's dam remained unharmed for about 310 years. In September-October A. D. 449, when Skandagupta was Overlord of Kâthiâwâr and Chakrapâlita was Viceroy of Junâgadh, at night, after a long heavy and unbroken rainfall, the Sudarśana lake burst its dam: the Palâsini the Sonrekhâ and the other Girnâr streams flowed straight through what had been the lake-bed: the Beautiful Lake was turned to ugliness: night and morning the people cried "Who will ever again fill for us our sea-like Sudarśana?"

After seven years, in A. D. 456, the Viceroy Chakrapâlita determined to restore the broken dam. In the hot weather of A. D. 456, in the best way, by much kindliness and the expenditure of immense wealth, with great effort, a dam 150 feet long 102 feet broad and about 35 feet high, ornamented and with well-set stones was finished in two months.

The shortness of the time taken and the description of the work imply that Chakrapâlita repaired the gap in the lower dam. How long Chakrapâlita's dam lasted and what caused its ruin are points which are and are likely to remain unknown. According to Pandit Bhagwânlâl no tradition of the Beautiful Lake survives at Junâgadh.

The site of the lake has been much disputed.

In his paper on the Rudradâman inscription[4] Pandit Bhagwânlâl identifies the site with Bhâwanâth's pass about ¼ of a mile east of the city on the way to Girnâr. A narrow passage at the west or city end leads into a ravine about a mile long and a mile broad nearly surrounded by hills. To turn the pass into a lake all that is wanted is to close its western mouth. The Pandit found traces of an ancient

[2] Ind. Ant. VII. 258.
[3] Ind. Ant. VII. 261.
[4] Ind. Ant. VII. 257.

wall or embankment on the sides of the hills in the narrow opening of the valley a little above the so-called Dâmodar Kunda and opposite the sanctuary of the Musalmân fakir Jarâsa.

An examination of the locality in January 1889 suggested several objections to the Dâmodar Kunda site. The site is too far from Junâgadh to be useful to the city. It does not suit the description of the lake in the Rudradâman inscription 'At the foot of the Girinagara or Junâgadh hill.' If the ravine was dammed and turned into a lake—

(*a*) The way to Girnâr would be closed,

(*b*) The Dâmodar Kunda and other holy places would be submerged.

I did not detect the remains of the embankment to which Pandit Bhagwânlâl refers.

From the top of Girnâr the tree-covered garden land between the flat sandstone plateau of the citadel and the westmost spurs of the granite range of Girnâr is seen to form a hollow through which the bed of the Sonrekhâ winds, at first west and afterwards north-west. This hollow would form a lake most convenient for the use of the city if only a dam could be thrown across the Sonrekhâ at the north-west point of the hollow where the citadel rock forces the Sonrekhâ northwards close to some of the westmost spurs of Joginî hill. It is at this north-west corner of the hollow between the spurs of Joginî on the east and of the citadel rocks on the west that, in two places, an upper site near the north-west corner of the citadel wall and a lower site about 550 yards further near the north-west corner of the city wall, Khân Bahâdur Ardeseer has found the traces of embankments and masonry described in the accompanying paper.

When in Junâgadh in January 1890, I spent several days going over the ground with Mr. Ardeseer. I examined the remains of earth and stone work described by him. I am able to confirm his observations and agree with his conclusions. To my mind the only doubtful point is the embankment to the north of the fort. The mound which runs along the left or west bank of the river nearly parallel to its channel seemed to stretch too far to the north, and, even since Mr. Ardeseer's paper was written, there had been so much quarrying that it was less easy than elsewhere to follow the course of the earth-work. The remains of old stone work in the Sonrekhâ's bed described by Mr. Ardeseer are

very evident both at the Triveṇî or Triple Braid, the site of the dam of the first or Chandragupta lake close to the north-east corner of the citadel marked F on the map, and about 600 yards lower at the Besharam Guno or Shameless Pool,[5] the site of the dam of the second or Rudradâman lake close to the north-east corner of the city walls marked E on the map. The right-bank dam of the second lake can be traced from E eastwards to a convenient spur of the Joginî hill. The right-bank dam of the earlier lake, from the masonry at F to the spurs of Joginî hill, is less easily traced. Possibly the earth-work may have been removed when the building of the lower embankment made the earlier embankment of no value.

The south shore of the lake (embankment B on the map) is very conspicuous. The gap at the east end of B was at first taken to be an inlet for water. The lie of the land shewed that this gap must have been not an inlet but an outlet or overflow. And, as Mr. Ardeseer notices, the use of the long north and south bank marked A on the map was to turn the overflow waters into the Kalwa water-course.

One point more may be noted. In the sketch map of Junâgadh made by Col. Tod in 1823,[6] a little to the south-east of the Vâghesri gate is a small lake. This Col. Tod describes as a fine piece of water called the Goldsmith's Pool.[7] It might be supposed that Col. Tod had been told this was the Sonrekhâ pool and mistook the stream's name for the Hindustâni Sonârkâ or Goldsmith's. This is not the case. Col. Tod knew and uses the stream's name Sonrekhâ. Besides this pool cannot have been part of the lake on the Sonrekhâ stream. It lies to the south or outside of B, the south shore of the Sudarśana lake. The site of Col. Tod's Goldsmith's Pool though almost filled can still be traced. It is now known as the Vâghesri pool. Mr. Ardeseer explains Col. Tod's name by the fact that the Goldsmith community are the custodians of the Vâghesri temple close to the pool, and that the digging of the pool was probably connected with the management of the shrine.

---

[5] Perhaps a Hindusti meaning—making from the Gujarâti Vishrâm, Pool of Rest.

[6] Travels in Western India, 362 (Ed. 1839).

[7] Do. do. page 370.

THE SUDARŚANA LAKE.

I have found the site of the Sudarśana lake mentioned in the Girnâr inscriptions and of the dams thrown across the Sonrekhâ river which turned its valley into a lake. I have found clear traces of masonry in the bed of the Sonrekhâ as well as earthen mounds on the left bank of the river between its bed and the rocks and spurs of the Uparkot or Citadel Hill. Though wasted by time and quarrying the remains of the embankments are remarkably massive and lofty.

When Mr. Campbell was at Girnâr in January 1888 he interested me in the old unlucky Beautiful Lake and in the disputes over its unknown site. After Mr. Campbell left I used to search the banks of the Sonrekhâ and followed its course to a great distance in the hope of finding traces of a dam. Although the spot I afterwards discovered was only a few paces from my usual starting place, I for long failed to find any remains. I sat and talked with the watchmen of the mango groves on both banks of the river. They knew of no old dam or embankment. One day chance gave me the clue which has enabled me to trace the first (B. C. 300) or Chandragupta and the second (A. D. 450) or Rudradâman dam; to follow the whole circuit of the lake; and to discover the sluices or conduits which the Rudradâman inscription mentions with pride.

Looking at the Revenue Survey map of the lands to the east of the Citadel plateau, my interest was excited by a thick black line marked A on the map running north and south parallel to the Kalva water-course and ending in the extreme south close to the foot of Dâtâr Hill where the path up the hill leaves the plain. The surveyor said the black line represented an earth and stone embankment made either to shut off or to lead water. I asked myself, Can this bank be part of the lost lake? With the map as our guide we went to the south end of the line near the foot of Dâtâr Hill, and, from the foot of the hill, traced the Kalva embankment, which is 12 to 15 feet broad and 12 to 24 feet high, about 1,700 yards north to within a hundred yards of the Vâghesri city gate on the road to Girnâr. At the south-east spur of the Citadel rocks, a little to the north of the Vâghesri gate we found a second earthen mound marked B on the map, 30 to 35 feet high and 15 to 60 feet broad stretching from the south-east spurs of the Citadel rocks about 235 yards eastwards to

the spurs of Bhenslo Hill. This, which may be styled the Vâghesri mound, is much broken. What remains are two stretches of bank, one 66 yards long by 5 yards broad, the other 110 yards long by 20 yards broad, separated by a gap 60 yards in length. The view from the top of this Vâghesri mound impressed me with the conviction that the mound had been raised to stop the southward escape of the waters of a lake whose western shore ran north about 1,100 yards along the foot of the fifty to eighty feet high cliff on whose top stands the Uparkot or Citadel of Junâgadh. But the river Sonrekhâ was far to the north. Where had the dam been thrown across the Sonrekhâ to block its natural passage and turn its bed and valley into a lake?

Having satisfied ourselves as to the extent and the lie of the south shore of the lake, we started from the south-east point of the Uparkot following north along the base of the cliff. As we passed, we could see that the whole ground to our right lay in a hollow. I felt I was walking along the west shore of the lost lake. After about 1,100 yards we reached the Dhârâgir gate at the north-east end of the Uparkot cliff. Here we saw to the north of us the Sonrekhâ gliding along the foot of the new fort wall. We passed through the Dhârâgir gate in search of masonry. But, though the remains of what I afterwards ascertained was the dam of the first or Chandragupta lake were within a few yards of us, we looked in the wrong direction and found nothing. We re-entered the Dhârâgir gate and passed north on the chance that we might find traces of an embankment. The ground was low. Close in front it had been cleared to the rock by quarrymen. A little further, keeping still within the fortification, we came across a high earthen embankment running north parallel to the new city wall. We followed this embankment marked C on the map north for about 560 yards. The embankment varied in height from 24 to 39 feet and in breadth from 90 to 132 feet. Three gaps, of 32, 95, and 147 yards divided the bank into three blocks 95, 40, and 154 yards long. Taking these isolated blocks as fragments of an embankment we passed along till we were stopped by the north-east corner of the city wall.

At this point the whole ground to our right lay hollow like a lake-bed. Along the centre of the hollow from near the great Inscription Rock, where the Joginî and Bhenslo spurs meet, the channel of the Sonrekhâ stretches west about 1,000 yards to the spot known as the Triveṇî near the Dhârâgir gate, and is then forced north-west by the spurs of the Citadel hill. The town walls hid the foreground. But

the river clearly passed close under the walls. And across the river a mound seemed to stretch east from the bank of the Sonrekhâ towards the Joginî hills. Might not this river-crossing be the site of one of the Sudarśana dams? As we could not scale the town-wall we retraced our steps along the foot of the embankment towards the Dhârâgir gate. Passing through the gate we walked north along the foot of the city-walls till we reached the point where the town-wall had stopped our progress. The Sonrekhâ flowed at our feet. On its right bank rose the mound we had seen from inside the wall. We crossed the river at what is known as the Besharam Guno or Shameless Pool, and, from the top of the mound, found ourselves face to face with the embankment we had just left inside the city-wall. Only the bed of the Sonrekhâ separated the two mounds. We scrambled into the bed of the river. After a few paces to our great joy we came across blocks of masonry laid in a straight line between the ends of the mounds on either bank of the river. This pavement was almost certainly the foundation of one of the dams which blocking the stream of the Sonrekhâ formed either the first or the second lake. Stopped at this point the Sonrekhâ would overflow and turn into a reservoir the wide hollow that stretched east and south-east as far as the great Inscription Rock. The length of the gap in the river bed is 36 yards and the breadth of the dam at its base 43 to 53 yards. From the right or east bank, a part-natural part-artificial mound marked D on the map about 30 feet high stretches north-east to the spurs of Joginî hill. From where the mound joins them the spurs of Joginî hill curve east and form the north shore of the lake for about fifteen hundred yards, till opposite the great Inscription Rock the spurs of Joginî on the north and of Bhenslo on the south drawing close together must have prevented the waters of the lake passing further. From the Inscription Rock, avoiding the straight road leading to the town gate and walking along the skirts of the hills past the Vâghesri shrine, we reached the east end of the Vâghesri embankment marked B on the map. This completed the circuit of the lake.

Having satisfied ourselves from its position that the dam we had found was the greater dam mentioned in the Rudradâman inscription, we began to search for the older and shorter dam of the Chandragupta lake. Starting from the ruined masonry of the second or Rudradâman dam we threaded our way about 600 yards up the bed of the river as far as the Dhârâgir gate near the sacred Triveṇî, the point marked F on the

map. Here we found blocks of masonry in the bed of the river as well as in the high earthen mound on its bank. From the top of the mound on the right or north bank it was clear the blocks of masonry were remains of a dam that once lay across the river and stretched westward till it joined the eastmost spur of the Uparkot rocks. Surely this was the original Chandragupta dam of which we were in search. The length of the gap or breach in the dam is 36 yards. Of the mound that ran from the right bank of the Sonrekhâ to the Joginî spurs few traces remain. The height near the river bank is about thirty feet. The length of the embankment on the left or west side of the river between the bed and the Citadel spurs was 314 yards. Of this about 140 yards of masonry remain; 174 have been carried away for building. The breadth of the masonry varies from 43 to 53 yards.

When the dam burst at this spot, in searching for a fresh site, the engineers naturally chose one further down the river, as, if successful, it would so greatly add to the size of the lake. So far as we could roughly estimate the first lake when full would cover 140 acres and the second about 138 more or 278 acres in all.

If this identification of the dam is accepted, the boundaries of the first or Chandragupta Sudarśana would be, beginning from the foot of the hills opposite the Inscription Rock and working west, North the high river bank about 1,000 yards to near the Dhârâgir gate, then the ruined dam across the river and the mound running west about 300 yards to the spurs of the Uparkot rocks: West the scarp of the Uparkot hill stretching south about 1,100 yards to the Vâghesri gate: South the Vâghesri mound that from near the Vâghesri gate in the west stretches east 236 yards to the skirts of Bhenslo hill: East as far north as the Inscription Rock the slopes of Bhenslo hill.

If this circuit of the lake is correct, it shows that the north and south embankment first noticed, marked A on the map, did not form part of the banks either of the Chandragupta or of the Rudradâman lake. Inspection proved that this first noticed line, whose length is about 1,716 yards, breadth 12 to 15 feet, and height 12 to 24 feet, was a distinct embankment whose use was to dam back the overflow waters of the lake and confine them to the hollow of the Kalva water-course near the foot of Dâtâr hill.

There remained to identify the conduits or sluices which are mentioned as a marked feature both of the Aśoka and of the Rudradâman

lake. As the level of the lake would be much higher than the present river-bed level the canal or sluice was probably cut at some point in the high natural north bank of the lake. On the north side of the old bank of the lake lies a large garden known as the Dhârâgir garden. Here we found labourers digging out huge blocks of stone forming a pavement hollow in the centre which passed from the bank of the lake northward. The blocks of stone had all the appearance of being the remains of the paved bottom of some conduit or canal. The discovery of the conduit delighted me. It fitted well with the inscription details. Its position explained certain troublesome passages which seemed to me for the first time understood in Pandit Bhagwân-lâl's rendering of the Rudradâman inscription.

I would offer the following explanation of the references to conduits in the Rudradâman inscription. The original or Chandragupta river-bed dam was solid with no openings or conduits. The embellishment with conduits by Tushâspa Aśoka's Viceroy was the dangerous device of opening sluices in the main river-bed dam to scour silt and draw off floods. This is proved by the remark in the Rudradâman inscription that when the river bed dam was breached the structure of Tushâspa's conduits was visible in the breach. In the A. D. 129 flood the stones, bushes, trees and tangled creepers swept down by the flood and hurricane blocked the conduit openings. With the outlet closed the water rose till the dam was topped and burst. In the breach of the dam Suviśâkha's engineers saw the style of conduit, the work worthy of a king, and adopted it. But as the inscription notes they wisely made the new river-bed dam like the spur of a hill well joined and solid without holes. They opened a conduit and triple winding outlet through the natural high ground to the north of the lake which no flood pressure could burst. The Skandagupta inscription seems to imply that when the river-bed dam was repaired the north bank sluices continued unchanged. Some later unrecorded flood apparently repeated the performance of the A. D. 449 flood. The sluices failed to carry off the water, and the level of the lake rose till the dam was topped and breached.

ART. VI.—*On the MS. of Dante's Divina Commedia in the Library of the Society.*—By W. R. MACDONELL, M.A., formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford.

[Read March 5, 1891.]

No autograph copy of the *Divina Commedia* is known to exist. Not a trace of Dante's handwriting can be discovered, not even in the public archives of Florence, where he held high office; yet curiously enough, we possess a minute description of it, by one who had seen it, Lionardo Aretino (died 1444); he says in his life of Dante: "He "was a perfect writer; his letters were thin, long, and very correct, as "I myself have seen in some epistles written with his own hand."

No dated MS. even professes to be older than 1335-6, that is, they reach no further back on their own profession than fourteen or fifteen years after the poet's death.

When we come to examine existing MSS. we are at once struck by the fact that they differ amongst themselves, sometimes to an extraordinary extent. The documents which appear to be the earliest shew signs of a text that has been tampered with, and the earliest commentators, some of whom go back to seven or twelve years after Dante's death, exhibit false readings; they even discuss and imply various readings.

The very success of the poem was a fertile source of error in the text. It attained to a vast reputation as soon as it made its appearance; nor is it difficult to understand even after the lapse of six centuries the impression which it made on men's minds. It was a work unique in its scope in the history of the world, and its author was a master of all the science and theology of his time, as well as a poet endowed with the vision and faculty divine. He was also a fierce and bitter partisan, and in a country rent by faction he must have fanned to a fiercer glow the party hatreds of his day by his intensely personal treatment of Guelf and Ghibbeline.

This personal interest excited by the poem was in one way unfortunate; it led to the corruption of the text. Copies were rapidly multiplied—five to six hundred are known to exist,—and the copyists were, in many cases, neither accurate nor honest, and made reckless

alterations in the text, often from ignorance, and sometimes in the interests of orthodoxy. Of course, too, they committed numerous clerical errors.

From all this mass of error and restoration, it is the object of the textual critic in our day to ascertain what Dante is most likely to have written. It would lead me too far to describe the principles on which the problem is attacked; a few illustrations of the modern method of dealing with textual difficulties will come before us in the course of this paper. In the meantime I will only refer briefly to what has been done by two eminent critics towards settling the text of the *Divina Commedia*, and will begin with the greatest of all Dante scholars, the late Dr. Carl Witte, of Berlin.

Witte selected with extreme care four MSS.: the famous Codice di Santa Croce at Florence, which he considered probably the best in existence, one in the Vatican, a third in the Royal Library at Berlin, and the fourth in a private library at Rome. From these he formed his standard text, into which he admitted only such readings as he found in one or more of his selected MSS., registering all variations of any of the four from the Standard. Witte's text is recognised as by far the best yet published.

The other scholar to whom I refer is Dr. Moore, Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. He printed Witte's standard text of the *Inferno*, and registered, with certain exceptions, the variations from the Standard of seventeen MSS., fourteen of which are in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and three in the University Library, Cambridge. The exceptions are worth noting by the student of our MS.; they are of two kinds: (1) those which seemed to be not worth recording, such as differences in spelling; and (2) those which could not be recorded with any certainty because the evidence of the MSS. was inconclusive. In illustration of the second class, I may mention the varying practice of copyists in respect of the elision of final letters, the doubling or not doubling of consonants, the tendency towards irregular division of words, the confusion of *modo* and *mondo*, the common interchange of m and n, and the similarity of n, u and v.

Dr. Moore has further carefully selected 175 test passages, and discusses which rival readings in these passages are to be considered, on recognised critical principles, as primary, secondary, or derivative. For this purpose he has collated an enormous number of MSS.; on some passages his collations extend to over 200.

The work thus begun by Witte and Dr. Moore and others will not be complete until the variations of all the MSS. from a standard text are collated and registered. I now proceed to make a contribution towards this great work by describing the MS. of which we are the fortunate owners, and indicating its readings in Dr. Moore's test passages.

It is a beautiful MS. on vellum, a quinternion, $12\frac{1}{2}'' \times 8\frac{1}{4}''$, with wide margins, in single columns; the edges of the leaves are gilded. The writing is large, upright, and remarkably clear. The titles of the cantos, except the title of the *Inferno* which is in gold, are in red, the body of the initial letter of each canto is blue, surrounded by red scrolls and beautifully illuminated. (In many MSS. these initial letters are alternately blue and red.) The initial letters of each *terzina* is preceded by a simple ornament, alternately blue and red. Cōp°. or Comp°. is added in the margin to mark similes.

At the beginning of each *cantica* is a small picture. In the *Inferno*. the picture forms the initial letter, and represents a man in profile, perhaps Dante himself, in a red robe and red cap, clasping a book and looking upwards. He looks like a comfortable ecclesiastic, and his features bear no resemblance to the beautiful face by Giotto which one still sees on the wall of the Bargello at Florence.

In the *Purgatorio*, also, the picture forms the initial letter, an empty brown ship with sail full set on a green sea, a blue sky overhead: it is painted very carefully and minutely.

In the *Paradiso*, the picture is not an initial letter, but a separate miniature dividing the title from the text. It is square, in a frame of gold, and represents the Almighty surrounded by five little Angels in red; all have golden halos round their heads; the central figure is clothed in a pink tunic and blue cloak lined with yellow.

The titles and colophons are interesting, but I need not transcribe them all here; only I should like to mention the colophon of the *Paradiso*. It is somewhat illegible, but I think there is no doubt it runs thus: "Qui finisce la comedia del poeta novello dante alleghieri onorevole cittadino della citta di firençe deo gratias." The word *novello* would seem to indicate that Dante had not been long dead when our MS. was written, and that consequently it is one of the earliest; but perhaps this is pressing the word too much.

Two copyists appear to have been engaged on the MS.; the second begins at *Paradiso*, VII. 130, and continues to the end; his writing is

thicker than the first scribe's, and not so clear, accurate and elegant. One peculiarity of the second scribe is that he writes *tt* instead of *ct* as the first scribe invariably did, e. g. *tutto* for *tucto*; this is shown by the very first word he writes, viz., *tratto*. The first writer had written the word *tracto* at the foot of the last page of his quire, below the last line, to indicate the first word on the following page; the new scribe starts off on the new page with *tratto*. No doubt a careful examination would reveal other peculiarities. One curious oversight of the second scribe is worth noting. From Par. XXV. 79 at the top of the page, to XXIX. 79 at the foot, he has forgotten to write the first letter of each *terzina*; probably his practice was to paint his coloured ornament first, and then wait until the paint dried before writing the capital letter of the line opposite; but in this passage he forgot to go back to put in his capitals, although he had inserted them as he went on, in their proper places, in a small faint hand.

The following peculiarities in orthography may be noted:—

(1) Latin and unassimilated forms of words, common to all the oldest MSS. *et* for *e*, *ad* for *a*, justitia, dampnati, obscuro, sapientia, scripte, sompno, Piectola.

(2) I have observed the vulgar initial *h* only thrice, in *huopo*, *hore* and *hor*.

(3) There appears to be a marked absence of dialectic peculiarities.

(4) There are numerous instances where words are run together as if they had been taken down from dictation.

Erasures and corrections appear to be few, especially in the first scribe's work.

The MS. is bound in brown leather, and is in excellent preservation, barring a few small wormholes which extend through several pages at the beginning and end; the three last leaves are very slightly touched by damp, but the damage is insignificant.

So much for the outward form of the MS. I now proceed to give an account of the text, which, of course, is the main criterion of its value. I have examined and registered its readings in the 175 test passages given by Dr. Moore, and compared them with the readings of the Oxford MS. marked B, the Cambridge O, and Witte's A and C in Florence and Berlin. The two latter are probably the best in existence; the two in Oxford and Cambridge rank very high.

In an appendix I have given the readings of our MS. in detail; the

summary of my collation is as follows, and the principle I have followed is to accept Dr. Moore's readings as a standard, and register the agreements and differences of the various MSS. accordingly. I have put aside certain passages as being either no real tests or indeterminate.

In the *Inferno*, in 70 passages, Bombay has 44 agreements, Oxford 41, Cambridge 56, and Witte's A and C 60 and 56 respectively. Of the 26 differences of Bombay, 3 are unique and not of much interest, 1 is very bad and is supported by only one inferior MS., 7 are of moderate quality and fairly well supported, while 15 have considerable support, agreeing with 50 or more MSS.

In 6 cases Bombay has better readings than the great Florentian A, and in 7 cases than the Berlin C. One of these, *viz.*, XXVIII. 135, is a well-known battlefield of critics, and is of great interest to us. It occurs in the passage where Dante describes his meeting with Bertran di Born, the famous troubadour and turbulent noble of Hautefort in Guienne, in the ninth circle where those who "sowing discord gather guilt" are punished; and the problem to be solved is whether we should read *re giovane* or *re Giovanni*, *i. e.*, whether Bertran says, "I am he who gave evil counsel to the young king; I made the "father and the son rebels to each other," or "I am he who gave evil "counsels to king John." The great majority of MSS. examined by Dr. Moore, 214 including the best, read *re Giovanni*, while only 22 read *re giovane*.

The question can only be settled by an appeal to history. The allusion is either to Henry, or to John, afterwards king John, of Magna Charta renown, sons of Henry II. of England. Against *Giovanni* are these facts:—

(1) John was not called king John in his father's lifetime.
(2) It is true that John took part against his father, but it was in secret and in the very last days of King Henry's life.
(3) Bertran in his poems makes no allusion to John in Prince Henry's lifetime.
(4) It is doubtful whether he ever wrote to John at all.
(5) There is no evidence that he had any special friendship for John.

In favour of *Giovanni* the principal argument is the overwhelming weight of the MSS. evidence and the unanimity of the old commentators; but *giovane* might have been changed to *giovanni* in one of the

very earliest copies; we have already seen that changes in the text began at a very early date. The unanimity of the commentators does not seem to have much weight; they would agree because their texts agreed.

On the other hand in favour of *re giovane*, the young king, *i. e.* Prince Henry, it is pointed out:—

(1) Henry was crowned at Westminster and again at Winchester in his father's lifetime, and from this fact is derived his title of the "Young King."

(2) Soon after the second coronation, the son rebelled against his father, and fled to France, where a general league was formed against King Henry by all his sons except John, assisted by the kings of France and Scotland, the Norman barons, and others.

(3) In this league the "young king" was supported by Bertran di Born. One of the old Provençal writers says, King Henry hated Bertran because he was "the friend and "counsellor of the young king, his son, who had made war "against him, and he believed Sir Bertran bore the whole "guilt of it."

(4) Hueffer, in his "Troubadours," says, Bertran's "unwaver-"ing friendship for Young Henry is the redeeming feature "in the reckless warrior's character." In Bertran's poems there are numerous references to the young king, and "reys joves" is his regular title for him.

(5) Dante was familiar with the works of the Troubadours. In his treatise, *De vulgari eloquentia*, he quotes, amongst others, *Bertramus de Bornio* as an illustrious writer in the vulgar tongue, and refers to him also in the *Convito*.

The weight of the evidence seems to be conclusive for *re giovane* in spite of its slight support from the MSS., and if we turn to our MS. we shall find that reading there.

One curious unique reading occurs at XXXIII. 74; *due giorni*, where the best MSS. read *due di*; *giorni* seems to be a gloss on *di*, but it is puzzling to see why *di* should require a gloss.

In the *Purgatorio* out of 37 test passages, Bombay has 20 agreements, Oxford 16, Cambridge 27, Florence 27, and Berlin 24. Here, again, we see Bombay is better than Oxford. It is better than Florence in 4 cases, and than Berlin in 7; it has 2 extremely bad readings, regard-

ing one of which, XXX. 73, the scribe himself seems to have been in perplexity and left the line as hopelessly bad: *guardaci bene se ben — —se beatrice*, instead of *guardaci ben: ben sem ben sem Beatrice.*

In the *Paradiso* there are 41 test passages. Our MS. has 24 agreements, Oxford 20, Cambridge 22, Florence 28, and Berlin 33. Here Bombay is better than Oxford and Cambridge, and it has better readings than Florence in 7 places, and than Berlin in 5; but I should add that 5 of its differences are supported by very slight authority, and must be considered poor.

Paradiso XXVI. 104 is a very interesting line. It occurs in Adam's address to Dante, and the MSS. are divided between "Dante" and "da te," the majority being in favour of the former. If "Dante" be adopted, Adam's words will be "without it being set forth to me, "Dante, I better discern thy will than thou, &c.," but against this reading it has been pointed out that Dante's name occurs only once elsewhere in the whole of the *Divina Commedia*, viz., *Purgatorio*, XXX. 55, where Beatrice addresses him by name, and eight lines further on in the same canto, he expressly says that he set down his name only *di necessità*. In this passage in the *Paradiso* is there any necessity for mentioning his name? Moore says there is no pretence of any such *necessity* here, and the attempts to suggest at least some *propriety* for the occurrence of the name seem to him altogether unsatisfactory.

On the other hand if we read *date*, I think it will be recognised at once that the passage gains force: "without it being set forth to me by "thee, I better discern thy will than thou." As Butler says, the absence of *da te* would quite destroy the balance of the sentence. It is satisfactory to find that our MS. reads *da te*, and thus supports Moore and Butler.

Of course, the comparisons made above are rough and ready, but I trust I have brought forward facts which prove that our MS., although not in the very first rank, is one of great excellence, and will well repay a more extended examination than I have found possible. The great problem is to discover its relation to the MSS. in Europe, and on this question my short researches have not enabled me to come to any but negative conclusions. For instance, from an examination of certain other test passages, I believe it is not connected with the so-called "Vatican" family of MSS., nor with the Ashburnham combin-

ation of 6 MSS., nor does it agree with the Cambridge O in certain characteristic passages. It has been mentioned in connection with the famous MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, but I find that in the 15 passages given by Dr. Moore, in which the Ambrosian has peculiar readings, ours differs from it in every instance.

I trust some scholar, with leisure, will take up this extremely interesting problem and solve it.

As appendices to this paper will be found the readings of our MS.: (1) in Moore's 175 general test passages, (2) in his 60 test passages of the Vatican family, (3) in his 23 test passages of the Ashburnham combination, and (4) in the 16 passages where the Cambridge O has peculiar readings; also a collation of *Inferno*, III. with Witte's standard, and the titles and colophons to the 3 cantiche.

I beg to express my deep indebtedness to Dr. Moore, without whose scholarly book on the "Textual Criticism of the *Divina Commedia*," this paper could not have been written.

And, in conclusion, might I suggest to our Committee that, round this noble MS. they should gradually form, as opportunity offers, a good working collection of books on Dante's work, and life and times?

APPENDIX I.

List of Readings of the Bombay MS. in Dr. Moore's general test passages :—

Inferno.

I. 28, Poy chei posato; 42, fiera lagaecta; 48, me tremisse; 94, questa bestia.

II. 12, Prima che; 22, Laquale el quale; 55, piu chella stella; 60, quantolmoto; 81, no te huopo chaprirmi.

III. 8. Eterno duro; 31, derroi; 36, sença ifamia; 59-60, vidi et conobbi; 114, vede.

VI. 23, simise; 68, sõmo; 95, di quel signor; 141, Tulyo et alino.

V. 38, eran dampnati; 59, succidete; 102, modo; 126, faro come colei; 135, fia diviso.

VI. 43, allei.

VII. 108, maligne piagge.

VIII. 78, ferro fosse; 125, amen secreta porta.

IX. 54, mal non; 70, porta fuori; 125, che sepellite dentro.

X. 65, gia lecto il nome.

XI. 90, vendecta.

XII. 16, lo savio mio in ver lui; 66, mal fu; 125, coccea.

XIII. 20, ben si vederai; 21, torrien; 63, le vene et i polsi.

XIV. 48, marturi; 126, Pur a sinistra.

XV. 39, Sença rostarsi.

XVI. 3, challarme; 14, Volse il viso verme et disse aspecta; 15, Per che acostor si vuole esser cortese [*et* is written in a contracted form]; 104, Trovãmo.

XVII. 20, che parte stanno; 95, Ad alto forte.

XVIII. 12, rendon sicura; 42, Di gia veder; 55, Io fui celui; 91, consenno.

XIX. 3, et voi [*et* is written in a contracted form]; 23, li piedi et delle gambe [*et* again contracted]; 64, tucto.

XX. 30, conpassion porta; 69, se fesse quel.

XXI. 14, fan remi et altri volgon sarte; 46, cõ volto; 93 temi che non ten esser; 112, Ier piu oltre cinque hore; 113, Mille ducento.

XXII. 101, Sichio non tema; 142, schermidor.

XXIII. 83, coll'animo nel viso.

XXV. 8, Ribadendo ; 120, Per luna parte et dallaltra.

XXVI. 25, Quando villan.

XXVII. 21, istra.

XXVIII. 10, troiani ; 83, neptuno ; 135, che diedi al re giovane imali conforti.

XXIX. 46, fuora se.

XXX. 18, Et del suo ; 44, Falsificar ; 115, et tu falsastil conio [*et* contracted.]

XXXI. 75, Et vedi lui.

XXXII. 47, Gocciar giu ; 136, ad ragion.

XXXIII. 26, Piu lume ; 72, Tral quinto di el sexto.

XXXIII. 74, Due giorni; 78, che forar losso.

XXXIV. 13 altre stanno agiacerere altre stanno [*agiacerere* is not written distinctly] ; 53, Con sei occhi piangeva et datre menti ; 99, mal suolo.

Purgatorio.

I. 108, Prendete.

II. 13, Et ecco qual suol presso del mattino ; 26, aperser lali ; 44 parea . . . . perscripto ; 93, tanta terra tolta ; 118, Noi eravam.

IV. 22, la calle ; 72, che mal non seppe carreggiar feton ; 125, Quiritto.

V. 38, Di mecca nocte ; 88, Son bon conte ; 136, Disposando.

VII. 15, dovel minor ; 51, osaria che non potesse.

VIII. 64, laltro a me ; 94, comei parlava et sordello.

IX. 17, Piu . . . . . men.

X. 14, scemo ; 30, che di diricta salita.

XIII. 2, risega ; 154, li perdoneranno (*per* contracted thus $\tilde{p}$).

XIV. 126, ñra ragion.

XVI. 145, cosi parlo.

XVIII. 83, Piectola piu che villa.

XIX. 34, Io mossi li occhi el mio maestro almentre ; 35, Voci tomesso et dicea ; 132, dricta.

XX. 90, tra novi ladroni.

XXI. 19, parte andavam ; 25, per che lei ; 45, daltro ; 61, Sol voler fa prova.

XXII. 5, navran ; 6, consitio.

XXII. 97, amico.

XXIV. 61, piu aguardar.

XXV. 9, che per alteçça il salitor; 31, veduta; 131, si tenne.

XXVI. 41, entra; 72, nellialti quor tosto satuta; 75, morir.

XXVII. 4, da nova; 81, lor di posa serve; 111 men lontani.

XXX. 15, alluiando; (originally written *alluuando*, but the latter stroke of the second *u* is scored through); 73, Guardaci bene se ben —— se beatrice [*se* —— *se* partly written over an erasure.]

XXXI. 29, degli altri; 51, son terra sparte.

Paradiso.

I. 135, La terra a tolto; 141, coma terra quiete in.

II. 42, e dio; 124, a me; 141, in voi.

III. 15, men tosto.

V. 88 tacere.

VII. 21, Punita; 114, luno .... laltro.

IX. 129, tutta quanta.

X. 4, per mète oper loco (*per* contracted thus *p*); 112, nell a mente unsi profondo; 119, templi.

XI. 26, nacque; 82 ferace.

XIII. 27, persona.

XIV. 72, vista.

XVI. 47, portar.

XVII. 9, segniata ben della interna.

XVIII. 75, or tonda or altra; 123, sangue; 131, paol.

XIX. 141, mala vista.

XX. 117, gioco.

XXII. 17. mai chel pincer; 94, volte ritroso; 95, il mar fuggir.

XXIII. 115, linterna.

XXV. 3, piu anni; 14, spera; 29, la largheçça; 33, quando.

XXVI. 96, la ti dico; 104, Da te; 134, un sappellava; 136, El si chiamo poi.

XXVII. 57, Vendetta.

XXVIII. 23, alocinger; 50, rote.

XXIX. 4, quante dal punto che tiene in libra.

XXXI. 20, Moltitudine.

XXXIII. 57, Memoria; 89, quasi conflati; 126, te ame siridi; 128, Pareva intre.

APPENDIX II.

LIST OF READINGS of the Bombay MS. in Dr. Moore's test passages of the Vatican Family of MSS.

INFERNO.

II. 12, Prima che ; 53, beata et bella.

IX. 89, Giunse alla porta.

X. 20, ad te mio quor ; 111, E coi vivi.

XI. 90, vendecta.

XII. 16, lo savio mio in ver lui ; 28, via giu per lo scarco ; 125, coccea pur.

XIII. 25, Io credo che credette chio credesse ; 43, cosi di quella scheggia resciva.

XIV. 52, il suo fabro.

XVII. 50, or col ceffo or coi pie quando son morsi ; 96, colle braccia mavinse.

XVIII. 42, Di gia veder.

XXII. 6, corer giostra.

XXV. 144, la peña aborra.

XXVI. 41, del folso.

XXVII. 39, hor vi lasciai ; 65, non torno vivo alcun.

XXVIII. 71, Et cuio vidi su terra latina.

XXX. 87, Et men dun meççо.

XXXII. 128, Cosi li denti luno ad laltro pose.

XXXIII. 43, Gia era desti ; 74, Due giorni.

XXXIV. 93, qual era il puncto.

PURGATORIO.

V. 38, meççа noete ; 88, Son bonconte.

VI. 49, et io buon duca.

X. 14, lo scemo.

XIII. 105, Fammiti conto ; 121, chio volsi ; 144, di la perte.

XVI. 142, lo fumo ; 145, cosi parlo.

XVIII. 57, Ne dei primi appetibili ; 58, the sono in noi si come.

XX. 104, Et paricida.

XXI. 101, visse virgilio ; 112, inbene assommi.

XXIII. 36, Et quel dunacqua.

XXV. 51, fe gustare.

XXVI. 7, piu rovente.
XXVIII. 123, come fiume chaspetta.
XXIX. 14, la dõna mia: 71, solo illume.
XXX. 111, chelle stelle.
XXXII. 102, Di quella terra.

PARADISO.

IV. 121, tanto profonda.
V. 88, lo suo tacere.
X. 112, nella mente.
XXIII. 103, che spiro; 111, lo lume di maria.
XXV. 14, Di quella spera.
XXVI. 93, ciascuna sposa; 96, la ti dico.
XXVIII. 90, gli occhi stavillaro
XXX. 141, di fame.
XXXIII. 57, la memoria; 89, quasi conflati.

APPENDIX III.

LIST OF READINGS of the Bombay MS. in Dr. Moore's test passages of the Ashburnham Combination, βελο 33·46.

INFERNO.

III. 64, che mai non fur vivi; 72, Perchio dissi maestro; 116 dellicto; 128 e pero.
XIII. 20, si vederai.
XVII. 95, ad' alto forte.
XVIII. 91, Ivi consenno.
XX. 69, se fesse quel.
XXI. 14, fan .... volgon.
XXVIII. 83, si gram fallo neptuno.
XXXI. 75, Et vedi lui chel.
XXXIV. 99, suolo et di lume disagio.

PURGATORIO.

I. 108, Prendete.
II. 13, suol presso del; 93, tanta terra.
VII. 51, osaria che non.
XIV. 126, ñra ragion.
XIX. 34, Io mossi liocchi el mio maestro almentre.
XXII. 6, consitio.

PARADISO.

I. 135, La terra a tolto.
V. 88, Lo suo tacere.
VII. 4, alla nota sua.
XI. 82, Ferace.
XXVI. 136, el si chiamo.
XXVII. 57, O vendetta di dio.
XXVIII. 23, alocinger; 50, tanto piu divine.

APPENDIX IV.

LIST OF READINGS of the Bombay MS. in passages where the Cambridge O has peculiar readings.

INFERNO.

III. 16, Noi siam venuti; 100, ma quelle anime.
VI. 49, et ella ad me; 85, et quelli ei son tra lanime; 94, el duca disse ad me.
VII. 67, Maestro dissio lui or mi.
IX. 95, ad cui non puote il fine esser may moççο.
X. 111, che suo nato.
XI. 24, O con força o con frode.
XIX. 25, Piante.
XXII. 72, stracciando.
XXIII. 53, fondo.
XXV. 105, feruto.
XXVIII. 24, rocto; 33, fesso.
XXXII. 37, ogniuna.

APPENDIX V.

Collation of the Bombay MS., Inferno, canto III., Witte's text being taken as the standard.

Peculiarities of orthography are omitted.

7, furor; 8, eterno duro; 13, et queli ad me; 20, viso; 29, aura; 30, quando turbo; 31, derror; 33, Et qual; 36, ifamia; 39, furor ..... fuoro; 51, ragionar dilor gavarda et passa; 58, nebbi; 61, In contente 64, sciagurati; 73, qualei ..... qual costume;

80, chel n..o dir li fosse; 81, fin; 85, nonsperate; 87, ī caldo el gielo; 89, di cotesti; 90, et quando vide chio; 98, nocchiel; 101, dibacter identi; 103, Biastimavano dio ei lor parenti; 105, semente; 108, ciascun che dio non teme; 116, Gictavansi dellicto; 118, Senevanno; 119, innançi; 120, Ancor; 122, color che muoion; 126, lathema si volve; 128, si charon.

APPENDIX VI.

Inferno.

Title:—Il comincia il primo canto della prima cantica della comedia di dante allighieri da fiorença nel quale canto lauctore proemiça a tucta quanta la comedia.

Colophon:—Explicit prima cantica comedie dantis allegherij que dicitur infernus.

Purgatorio.

Title:—Il comincia il primo canto della seconda cantica della comedia di dante alligheri da firençe nel quale canto lauctōe prohemiçça singōlarmente questa seconda parte dicta purgatorio &c.

Colophon.—Finito qui la seconda cantica della comedia di dante deo gratias.

Paradiso.

Title.—Comincia la terça cantica della comedia di dante allighieri chiamata paradiso &c.

Colophon.—Qui finisce la comedia del poeta novello dante alleghieri, onorevole cittadino della citta di firençe deo gratias.

Art. VII. — *A Note on a Matter arising out of the Gupta Era*, By J. F. Fleet, Bo.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E.

Communicated, 9th March, 1891.

When I wrote the Introduction to my *Gupta Inscriptions*, Corpus inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III., I had three leading points under consideration :—

(1) The approximate historical period in which the rise of the Early Gupta power must be placed.

(2) The determination of the exact epoch of the era used by the kings of that dynasty. And —

(3) The origin of the era.

And the results at which I arrived, were as follows :—

(1) My newly discovered Mandasôr inscription, dated in the year Mâlava-Saṁvat 529 expired, proved that a supposed statement by Albêrûni, that the Gupta power came to an end in or about A. D. 319, must be wrong ; and that, on the contrary, we must place the rise of the Early Gupta power shortly after that year, and must find in or about that year the starting-point of the era used in the dates of the Early Gupta records, and in any others that belong to the same uniform series with them.[1] There remained the point, which no one had ever seriously taken in hand for conclusive disposal, that, according to M. Reinaud's translation, Albêrûnî distinctly said that the era commencing in or about the above year marked the epoch of the extermination of the Gupta power. But the difficulty connected with this was subsequently cleared away for me by Prof. Wright, whose translation of the passage in question shews that Albêrûnî did not, — of necessity, at any rate, — say anything of the kind.

(2) Taking the unqualified Gupta years as current years, and assuming them to be luni-solar years commencing, like Śaka years of the same class, with Chaitra śukla 1, the calculations of dates, made for me by Mr. Shankar Balkrishna Dikshit, proved that the epoch or year 0

[1] The only point in respect of which the chain of evidence was at all deficient when I left the case, — *viz.* the absence of absolute proof that the Mâlava era is the Vikrama era, — has been since supplied by Prof. Kielhorn (see *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XIX. p. 316.)

of the era was Śaka-Saṁvat 242 current; and that the first day of the first current year of the era was Chaitra śukla 1 of Śaka-Saṁvat 243 current, corresponding to the 26th February, A. D. 320. Whether the Gupta years were to be understood as current or as expired, when not distinctly specified either way, was a matter of opinion only; depending primarily on the question, whether the current regnal years in which the era originated, were ever systematically replaced by the corresponding expired years, and, if so, at what period. I gave my reasons for interpreting them as current years.[2] But I intimated at the same time, that evidence might be obtained subsequently, shewing that they are to be interpreted as expired years; and that, in this case, the results would be earlier by one year; *viz.*, the epoch would be Śaka-Saṁvat 241 current, and the first day of the first current year would be Chaitra śukla 1 of Śaka-Saṁvat 242 current, corresponding to the 9th March, A. D. 319. And I may as well take this opportunity of saying that such evidence is perhaps now forthcoming, in another statement by Albêrûnî, in which he says, —"In all chronological dates which we have mentioned already and shall still mention, we only reckon with *complete* years, for the Hindus are in the habit of disregarding *fractions* of a year" (Sachau's *Albêrûnî's India*, Translation, Vol. II. p. 3). This appears to s ew that, in the passage in which Albêrûnî gives Gupta-Valabhî-Saṁvat 712 as equivalent to Śaka-Saṁvat 953, he has quoted the expired Gupta-Valabhî year, — as well as the expired Śaka year, which is undoubtedly the case. But it will not do to form a final opinion on the question too hastily; and I have not had leisure as yet to think fully over one or two other points that must not be neglected.

(3) The era does not date from the commencement of the reign of any Early Gupta king, or from any historical event occurring in that

[2] To those reasons I might now,—if I wished to lay any stress on it, — add another, which was not available when I wrote. It is that, with the Kalachuri or Chêdi era, which belongs to that part of India from which have come all the dates of the Early Gupta period that include details that can be tested by calculation, the preference appears to have been for the use of current years; thus, out of the fourteen dates examined by Prof. Kielhorn, in each of which the year is not distinctly qualified either as current or as expired (see his "Epoch of the Kalachuri or Chêdi Era," *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XVII. p. 215 ff.) eleven have been found to be recorded in current years; two, in expired years; and one, in a year which is to be understood as expired if the first day of each year was Bhâdrapada śukla 1, but as current if the first day of each year is taken as Âśvina śukla 1, which may be done without in any way affecting the results for the other dates.

family; but it was adopted by the Early Guptas from some extraneous source. And, in the absence of definite proof, my opinion was, and is, that it was borrowed from the Lichchhavis of Nêpâl; and that in all likelihood it is in reality a Lichchhavi era, dating either from a time when the republican or tribal constitution of the Lichchhavis was abolished in favour of a monarchy, or from the commencement of the reign of Jayadêva I., as the founder of a royal house in a branch of the tribe that had settled in Nêpâl.

When I finished my work, I by no means expected that I had done with the necessity of writing on the subject; if only because my Introduction contains much matter that would have been stated more concisely and correctly, and some that would have been omitted altogether, if I had known then as much as I learned afterwards about the conversion of Hindu dates into their European equivalents.

As yet, however, with the exception of some remarks by Dr. Hoernle on my interpretation of the Uchchakalpa dates (see the *Jour. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. LVIII. Part I. p. 103 f. and *Ind. Ant.* Vol. XIX. p. 227 f.), I have seen no criticisms on my work, calling for any further statements by me to any useful purpose.

It is true, indeed, that there has appeared in this Journal, Vol. XVII. Part II. p. 80 ff., a paper by Dr. Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, entitled "the Epoch of the Gupta Era," the object of which was to controvert the conclusion arrived at by me as to the exact epoch of the era. That paper, however, contains but little genuine criticism, if any at all. It is essentially nothing but a personal attack upon me; made because I referred incidentally to a pointed mistake of his in connection with the Śaka era; and because, in respect of the exact epoch of the Gupta era, I finally, after full consideration, decided against a view, of which, though he merely adopted it, he seems to consider himself, not only an authoritative exponent, but the sole exponent.[3] Whether the exact epoch of the Gupta era is A. D. 319-20, or A. D. 318-19, is a

[3] Dr. Bhandarkar (*loc. cit.* p. 80, line 11 f.) has written of me, — "He is also at issue with me as to the accurate Epoch of the Gupta Era." But this is quite a mistake. I have not been at issue with him, either on the minor point in question, or on the major point; for the simple reason that, as he has never brought forward any new material arguments in support of the view that he adopted, I have not looked upon him as an authority on the subject. — I noticed what he had written on the general question, because, in shewing the state of confusion into which it had fallen, it was my object to bring together

point of comparatively very minor importance. What I did was to prove, for the first time, what had often been asserted but had never been proved before; *viz.* that the Early Gupta dates run, not from A. D. 77-78, 166-67, or 190-91, but from A. D. 319-20; or let it be from A. D. 318-19, — to which I have no objection, — if proof of this is obtained. Of the leading point proved by me, there is, in what Dr. Bhandarkar has written, plenty of assertion, but no proof at all.

With the dislike that I have for wasting my time over controversial writing, which, especially when it is of a personal nature, can seldom, if ever, serve a useful purpose, I should leave Dr. Bhandarkar's attack on me unnoticed altogether; because anyone who has a knowledge of the subject, can see for himself the weakness of all that he has written on the Gupta era. But he has made against me the charge of having treated him unfairly, and of having misquoted him; and this it is as well to refute. As it is, I have left the matter unnoticed for perhaps an undesirably long time. This, however, has been from causes beyond my control.[4] I have at length been able to make leisure for dealing with him. And I now do so.

Dr. Bhandarkar (*loc. cit.* p. 80) has charged me with treating him unfairly, through having made "a pure misquotation" of him. That I have misquoted him, is not true; as a simple reference to my words, where I have quoted actual words of his, will shew. But he might possibly have been justified in saying that I carelessly misapplied certain passages written by him, which I referred to. And I

---

anything that could be held, from any point of view, to be of interest in connection with the discussion. But I laid no special stress upon any of his mistakes, except two; one which threatened to complicate the history of the Valabhi family, by introducing a name which has not been found in its records; and one, in connection with the Śaka era, which was a peculiar mistake to be made by a Native of India who assumes to deal with chronological questions. It is this that has excited his wrath; though I shewed that he had gone astray in such good company as that of Dr. Burnell.

[4] Dr. Bhandarkar's article was communicated to the Society on the 1st August, 1889. At that time I was in England. The Journal was not forwarded to me there. I had no knowledge of the existence of the article until some time in November, after my return to India. And I did not see the article itself, till the 26th December following. Since then, until quite recently, my leisure time has been too fully occupied with really important and pressing matters, for me to be able to put into writing what I had to say about it.

will therefore shew that even such an assertion as this could not be upheld.

Dr. Bhandarkar's special reference is to the latter part of note 2 on page 64 of my Introduction, which runs thus:—"A most curious "confusion between current and expired years of the Śaka era runs "through his" [Dr. Bhandarkar's] "remarks. Thus, though quite "rightly taking Śaka-Saṁvat 406 expired to be equivalent to A. D. "484-85, with a difference of 78-79, he also, with the same difference, "took, *e. g.*, A. D. 511-12 as the equivalent of Śaka-Saṁvat 433 cur-"rent." On this, Dr. Bhandarkar says (*loc. cit.* p. 80, line 19 ff.)— "I did not; and this a pure misquotation. I did not say that Śaka-"Saṁvat 406 expired was equivalent to A. D. 484-85; nor did I say "that Śaka-Saṁvat 433 current was equivalent to A. D. 511-12."

To avoid mixing matters, I shall take first the first half of my second sentence given above.

It is almost too absurd, to have to point out the verbal quibble through which Dr. Bhandarkar charges me with having misquoted him. I did not say that he actually said that Śaka-Saṁvat 406 expired was equivalent to A. D. 484-85. I said that he took it as equivalent to A. D. 484-85. And he did so. His actual words (*Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 99, line 12) are: — "Śaka 406 corresponds to 484 A. D.;" and, in the immediately preceding sentence, he stamped it, quite correctly, as the *expired* year 406. Now, he knows perfectly well that, since, for purposes of comparison, it is always customary to treat the years A. D. as commencing with the 1st January, even for the period when that day was not actually the initial day of the year, Śaka-Saṁvat 406 expired does not *coincide* with A. D. 484; *i. e.* that it did not begin and end with that year. And he has now explained that, every Śaka year corresponding to parts of two Christian years, "to avoid pedantry it is usual" [with him] "to give one of the two "years only, except when something important is involved;" and that in this instance he used A. D. 484, because the given Hindu month is Âshâdha, which "falls in the first of the two Christian "years to which a Śaka year corresponds." He thus distinctly recognised, and quite correctly, that Śaka-Saṁvat 406 expired corresponds to a part of A. D. 484, and a part of A. D. 485. And, in representing him as doing so, I have neither misquoted him, nor misapplied his meaning. In passing, I would here remark, that the mistakes into which Dr. Bhandarkar fell, are probably due, in a

great measure, to the very fact of his omission to quote the two Christian years, to parts of which a Śaka year corresponds. There is no question of "pedantry" in the matter. It is simply a point of exactness and accuracy. It is practically as easy to write, *e. g.*, "Śaka-Saṁvat 406 expired, or A. D. 484-85," as it is to write "Śaka-Saṁvat 406 expired, or A. D. 484." And I know of no careful and reliable writer, who habitually neglects to indicate the two Christian years.

In connection with the latter part of my sentence given above, I shall have to quote fully certain passages by Dr. Bhandarkar, from which I gave only an extract in note 3 on page 141 of my Introduction. Here, again, a comparison of my note with his words will shew that, though on this occasion I quoted actual words of his, in no detail whatever did I misquote him. And here, again, he has intentionally charged me with "misquotation," simply because the use of that term would give a stronger colour to his attack upon me.

For ready reference, I give here my note in question. It is attached to a passage in which I was clearing away the general misunderstanding that, to turn current Śaka years into years A. D., the additive quantity is 78-79, instead of 77-78. And it runs: — "Thus, even "Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, — through whose 'Note on the Śaka Dates "and the years of the Bârhaspatya Cycle, occurring in the Inscrip- "tions' (*Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 105 ff.) my attention was "first drawn to the desirability of examining the details of the "almanacs, — has written (*id.* p. 99 ; the italics are his) '191 Gupta "*past* + 242 = 433 Śaka *current* + 78 = 511 A. D. *cur-* "*rent* . . . . . 209 Gupta *past* + 242 = 451 Śaka *current* "+ 78 = 529 A. D. *current*.' I myself had the same view, till not "very long ago. Other writers could easily be shewn to have lain "under the same misconception. And Dr. Burnell even went so far as "to say (*South-Indian Palæography*, p. 72, note) 'the rough equa- "tion for converting this era into the Christian date is, + 78¼. The "beginning of the year being at the March equinox ; if the Śaka "*atîta*' (*i. e.* expired) 'year be mentioned, the equation is + 79¼.'"

Before proceeding further, however, I must dispose of an incidental matter.

Dr. Bhandarkar (*loc. cit.* p. 81, line 10 ff.) has given prominence to my remark, that it was his note on the Śaka Dates which first drew my attention to the desirability of examining the details of the

almanacs. And in doing so, he has said that I "must have seen it "distinctly stated by (him) that the Śaka dates used by us in the "Bombay Presidency represent expired years and those on the Madras "side current years, the latter being in advance of the former by one "year;" and that "under these circumstances it is impossible that "(he) should think the addition of 79 to a current Śaka year would "give us the Christian year containing the second part of the Śaka "year." But Dr. Bhandarkar is here substituting what he wishes to have understood now, for the results that he demonstrated in the Note in question. And to clear the matter up, I must deal fully with the Note itself.

The Note in question is Appendix B. to his *Early History of the Dekkan*, which was published in 1884. The object of the Note was, to clear up certain difficulties connected with the Śaka dates and the *saṁvatsaras* of the Sixty-Year Cycle of Jupiter (according to the southern luni-solar system) coupled with them in inscriptions. Dr. Bhandarkar started by saying "thecurrent Śaka year (A.D. 1883-84) "in the Bombay Presidency is 1805, and the year of the sixty years' "cycle, *Subhânu*.[5] In the southern provinces and the Madras "Presidency, the current Śaka year is 1806, the cyclic year being "the same." And in these words he distinctly postulated an actual difference of one year in the Śaka reckonings of the two Presidencies; and the two English years quoted by him shewed that, to the equivalent current Śaka years, there was to be added 78-79 in Bombay, and 77-78 in Madras, in order to obtain the same year A.D. He then propounded three questions for consideration :— (1) "Do the dates in "the inscriptions conform to the Bombay reckoning or the Madras "reckoning?;" (2) "What is the cause of this difference of a year?;" and (3) "Whether the Śaka dates in the inscriptions represent the "number of years *that have expired* before the event recorded in them "or the *current* year in which the event took place?" The conclusions at which he arrived were (1) (*loc. cit.* p. 106, line 15 f.) that "the Madras mode of reckoning was the one in use;" (2) (p. 107, line 7 ff.) that "the Bombay mode of reckoning, which is one year behind "that prevalent in Madras, is, I believe, due to a mistake;" and (3) (p. 106, line 22 f.) that, "though in the majority of cases the inscrip- "tions give the *past* Śaka year, there is a large number in which the "*current* year is given and not the past." And here, again, Dr. Bhan-

[5] Here, and throughout, the italics are Dr. Bhandarkar's.

darkar distinctly differentiated the Bombay reckoning from the Madras reckoning; and in the same manner as at starting.

With regard to the mistake through which the Bombay mode of reckoning had come, in his opinion, to be one year behind that prevalent in Madras, Dr. Bhandarkar explained (*loc. cit.* p. 107, para. 1) that it had originated in an omission of the words *gatéshu*, 'having elapsed,' with the number of the Śaka year, and *pravartamáné*, 'being current,' with the name of the cyclic year; so that, "in the course of "time, the sense, to express which they were used, was also forgotten, "and the number came to be regarded as denoting the current year." And a few lines further on he used the words, "we, on this side of the "country, consider 1805 as the current year now, though it indicates "the past year." These words shew that Dr. Bhandarkar did recognise the fact, that the two reckonings were originally the same. But, as I have pointed out above, he most distinctly postulated and established the subsequent existence of a difference, not nominal but absolute, of one year between them, and he gave to this difference an epigraphical existence of at least nine centuries. For, he was then considering a record which connects the name of the Vikṛita *saṁvatsara* with Śaka-Saṁvat 911; according to the Tables which he was using, and which are quite correct on this point, 912 years had expired before the commencement of Vikṛita; and his explanation of the matter was, that "this discrepancy" (*viz.* the use of Śaka-Saṁvat 911 with Vikṛita, instead of 912) "is to be explained by the supposi-"tion that Śaka 912 which represented the years that had expired "came to be thought of as the current year, just as we, on this side of "the country, consider 1805 as the current year now, though it "indicates the past year, and the writer of the inscription wishing to "give the years that had expired before his current year, put them "as 911."

The matter is made, if possible, still more certain by the manner in which Dr. Bhandarkar interpreted the Tables that he was using (see *loc. cit.* p. 105, para. 2). The Tables in question are those which were published by Mr. Sewell in 1881, under the title of "Chronological Tables for Southern India from the Sixth Century A. D." Dr. Bhandarkar started by saying, quite correctly, that in these Tables Mr. Sewell had given in col. 1 the number of the Śaka years expired before the beginning of the cyclic year entered on the same line in col. 3. But he went on to say, — "Mr. Sewell follows the Madras

" reckoning. If we interpret the tables according to the Bombay " mode, the Śaka year appearing in the first column will be the " current year corresponding to the cyclic year in the same line in " the third column, while the number in the line immediately above " will represent the years that have expired before the beginning " of that cyclic year. Thus against 1805, the current Śaka year on " this side of the country, we have in the third column the current " cyclic year *Subhânu*, while 1804 in the line above shews the number " of years that have expired. By comparing the Śaka dates and " cyclic years occurring in the inscriptions with those in the tables we " shall be able to determine the points raised above." The words " Mr. Sewell follows the Madras reckoning" are in a way correct. I have shewn in my "Note on the Epoch and Reckoning of the Śaka Era" (*Gupta Inscriptions*, Introd., p. 137 ff.), that in the Madras Presidency there are two systems of reckoning; one of expired years, which is absolutely identical with the Bombay system; and one of current years, which is nominally one year in advance of the Bombay system. Mr. Sewell's Tables in question were prepared for the Madras (and Bombay) system of expired years. Dr. Bhandarkar's mistakes, — or, if he prefers it, the mistakes which he led me to attribute to him, — arose from his differentiating the Bombay system from *this* Madras system, with which, as a matter of fact, it absolutely coincides. And it was this mistake that led him into saying that the Madras mode of reckoning, as different from the Bombay mode, was the one used in the inscriptions. He arrived at this conclusion thus: — From my *Pâli, Sanskrit, and Old-Kanarese Inscriptions*, he first took fifty-eight cases, in each of which the Śaka year given in the inscription occurs, in Mr. Sewell's Tables, in the same line with the cyclic year connected with it in the inscription. And of these cases he said (*loc. cit.* p. 106, line 11 ff.) that, if we suppose the Bombay reckoning to have been in use, each of these dates would represent the current year. He then took twenty-eight cases, in each of which the Śaka year given in the inscription occurs, in Mr. Sewell's Tables, in the line below that in which is given the cyclic year connected with it in the inscription. Here, his special instance was *P. S. and O.-K. Inscrs.* No. 19, in which the Durmati *saṁvatsara* is coupled with Śaka-Saṁvat 1184. In Mr. Sewell's Tables, it is given in the same line with Śaka-Saṁvat 1183; and this is quit correct, because it coincided with Śaka-Saṁvat 1183 expired.

But, of this and the other twenty-seven instances, Dr. Bhandarkar (*loc. cit.* p. 106, line 11 ff.) said that, if we suppose the Bombay reckoning to have been in use, the date in each of them would represent "the *future* year and not the *past*. But since it is almost "absurd to suppose that the immediately next year should be stated "in the inscriptions, it follows that the Madras mode of reckoning "was the one in use." He thus, in the most emphatic terms, endorsed the assumption that there was an actual difference, and not merely a nominal one, between the two reckonings; and he established for it an existence of at least nine hundred years.[6]

We can now estimate aright the value of Dr. Bhandarkar's statements, in his attack upon me, that I "must have seen it distinctly "stated by (him) that the Śaka dates used by us in the Bombay "Presidency represent expired years and those on the Madras side "current years, the latter being in advance of the former by one year;" and that "under these circumstances it is impossible that "(he) should think the addition of 79 to a current Śaka year would "give us the Christian year containing the second part of the Śaka "year." From this he would wish it to be understood, that he had put the matter in such a way as to shew that, in all parts of the country, the additive quantity, to be applied to current Śaka years, was 77 to obtain the Christian year for the first part of the Śaka year, and 78 to obtain the Christian year for the second part of it. But this is most distinctly not the case. He established, on the contrary, most clearly, that 77 was to be added for Madras current years, and 78 for Bombay current years. And this is why, until I came to look into the actual conversion of dates, I felt no surprise at finding that he had obtained the A. D. equivalents of Śaka years by adding 78-(79), sometimes to expired years (according to his Madras system), and sometimes to current years (according to his Bombay system);

---

[6] Mr. Sewell has since edited, in 1889, another set of Tables, entitled "South-Indian Chronological Tables," which were prepared by the late W. S. Krishnasvami Naidu. These Tables really do follow that Madras system which is capable of being distinguished from the system of Bombay and the rest of India; *viz.* the Madras system of current years. Thus, *e. g.*, they shew Svabhânu (*i. e.* Subhânu) in the same line with Śaka-Saṁvat 1806 and Kaliyuga-Saṁvat 4985, both current. In his own Tables, on the contrary, — *viz.* in those used by Dr. Bhandarkar, — Subhânu is entered in the same line with Śaka-Saṁvat 1805 and Kaliyuga-Saṁvat 4984, both expired.

and why I ultimately came to examine a variety of Native almanacs, in the hope of finding out some tangible explanation for the difference that he had proved. If Dr. Bhandarkar had adopted the same course, he would probably have recast his Note very materially. In my examination of the almanacs, I found, almost at once, that there is in reality no such radical difference at all, as that which he had established ; and that the Bombay and Madras reckonings are still absolutely identical, the only distinction being that, in Bombay the expired year is always quoted, without being always defined as the expired year, while in Madras the same expired year is used in some parts, and in others the equivalent current year.

We are now in a position to consider the cases in which, I said, Dr. Bhandarkar actually did add 78-79 to current Śaka years, in connection with the Gupta era, in order to arrive at the corresponding current years A. D. Hitherto I have been compelled to be somewhat prolix, because of the disingenuous manner in which he has stated his denial. But the rest of the matter can be disposed of more briefly.

I must, however, here quote, in full, the passage in respect of which Dr. Bhandarkar has asserted that I misquoted him in this connection. It stands in his "Note on the Gupta Era," Appendix A. to his *Early History of the Dekkan*. It refers to the dates in the grants of the Parivrâjaka *Mahârâjas*, which mention certain years of the Twelve-Year Cycle of Jupiter. And it runs thus (*loc. cit.* p. 99, paras. 2, 3) :— "Then as to the dates in years of the 12-year cycle, General "Cunningham himself has placed before us the means of verifying "them. In the tables published by him in Volume X. of the Archæo-"logical Reports, the cyclic year corresponding to the *current* "Christian year is given, and if we substract 78 from the number "representing the year, we shall arrive at the *current* Śaka year.[7] "Now, if we take the Gupta figured dates to represent the years that "had elapsed before the cyclic year commenced, (and this way of "marking the dates is, as remarked above, the one we usually find), "then 173 Gupta, the third date in the above, corresponds to 414 "Śaka *past* and 415 *current*, 241 being added in the first case, and "242 in the second. If we add 78 to 415 we shall get the *current* "Christian year, which is 493. Now in General Cunningham's "tables we do find the year *Mahâśvayuja* given as corresponding

[7] Here again, the italics are Dr. Bhandarkar's ; as throughout.

" to 493 A. D. In the same way, 191 Gupta *past* + 242 = 433
" Śaka *current* + 78 = 511 A. D. *current*. In the tables we find
" 511 put down under *Mahâchaitra*. Similarly 209 Gupta *past*
" + 242 = 451 Śaka *current* + 78 = 529 A. D. *current* which
" was *Mahâśvayuja*. Now, as to the first of the dates in the 12-year
" cycle, 156 Gupta + 242 + 78 is equal to 476 A. D., which
" however is Mahâchaitra instead of Mahâvaisâkha. Here there
" is a discrepancy of one year; but such discrepancies do sometimes
" occur even in Śaka dates and the years of the 60-years cycle
" given along with them, and some of them will be noticed in
" the note forming the next Appendix. They are probably due
" to the fact that the frequent use of the past or expired year
" and also of the current year led sometimes the *past* year to be
" mistaken for the *current* year, just as we *now* mistake the year
" 1805 Śaka for the current year, though it really is the completed
" or past year. Thus the completed year 157 must, in the case before
" us, have come to be mistaken by the writer of the inscription for the
" current year, and he thought 156 to be the past year and thus gave
" that instead of 157. Now 157 Gupta + 242 + 78 = 477 A. D.,
" which is *Mahâvaiśâkha* according to the tables."

Now, even without the specific conclusions established by Dr. Bhandarkar in his Note on the Śaka Dates, &c., if plain language, even though not intensified by italics, is to be interpreted according to its plain meaning, the above passage, — coupled with Dr. Bhandarkar's habit (see all through his *Early History*) of quoting with a Śaka year that year A. D. which corresponds to the first and larger part of the Śaka year; and with the fact that he applied precisely the same subtractive or additive quantity in each of the four instances, in spite of the point that in three of them the given month is one of the first nine months of a Śaka year, whereas in the fourth it is one of the last three months, — can mean nothing but that, in order to present in comparison the current Śaka and Christian years, he deducted 78 from the first of the two Christian years, to arrive at the first and principal part of the Śaka year; and *vice versâ*, that, to turn the first part of a current Śaka year into its current Christian equivalent, he would, in these cases at any rate, add 78; and consequently, that, to arrive at the full Christian equivalent of an entire current Śaka year, he would, in these cases at any rate, add 78-79, just as I represented him as doing. And that is why I said explicitly that " he took, *e. g.*, A. D.

511-12 as the equivalent of Śaka-Saṁvat 433 current;" and treated him as doing precisely the same with the other three dates.

He now says, however, that, in doing so, I misquoted him, and was not fair to him. He explains (*loc. cit.* p. 80, line 4 ff. from the bottom) that in each of his equations he gave that one of the two Christian years with which he was concerned; that Śaka-Saṁvat 433 current corresponds to a part of A. D. 510 and a part of A. D. 511; (p. 81, line 3 ff.) that in this instance he gave A. D. 511, because the "something important" which was involved, was the Mahâ-Chaitra *saṁvatsara*, and because he found it in General Sir Alexander Cunningham's Tables opposite A. D. 511, and not opposite A. D. 510; and that I had no reason whatever to take his A. D. 511 as A. D. 511-12, but that, wanting to state the two years to which the Śaka year corresponds, I ought to have taken it as A. D. 510-11. And he applies the same explanation in general terms to the other equations given by him; adding explicitly in respect of one of them, that I ought to have taken his A. D. 529 as meaning A. D. 528-29, and not as meaning A. D. 529-30. Fortunately, the settlement of the question between us does not merely depend upon the interpretation of language, however plain; but is determined by absolute facts.

Dr. Bhandarkar's treatment of all the four dates in question was uniform and identical; except, of course, that, to suit his views, he had to adopt Gen. Sir Alexander Cunningham's opinion that, in one of them, the year 163 was a mistake for 173; and except that, in respect of another of them, he had to introduce an emendation of his own, and to assume that the year 156 was a mistake for 157. Also, each of the equations given by him, more or less fully, is to be analysed in precisely the same manner and with precisely the same results. It is sufficient, therefore, to examine in full one of his equations. And I select that which he gave in the most complete and explicit terms.

The full details of the date in question are (*Gupta Inscriptions*, Introd. p. 117): — The Gupta year 209, coupled with the Mahâ-Âśvayuja *saṁvatsara*; the month Chaitra; the bright fortnight; and the thirteenth *tithi* or lunar day. Dr. Bhandarkar turned to Gen. Sir Alexander Cunningham's Table, and found Mahâ-Âśvayuja entered for A. D. 529. And to agree with this entry, he gave the equation: — "209 Gupta *past* + 242 = 451 Śaka *current* + 78 = 529 A. D. *current* which was *Mahâśvayuja*."[3] From this I interpreted

[3] It is to be remembered that the italics are Dr. Bhandarkar's all through.

him as meaning that Śaka-Saṁvat 451 current is equivalent to A. D. 529-30. He says that I was unfair and misquoted him; and that I ought to have represented him as meaning that Śaka-Saṁvat current 451 is equivalent to A. D. 528-29. Let us, therefore, take it as equivalent to A. D. 528-29; as of course it is, if treated properly. Then, the whole of the current Śaka year at which he arrived as the equivalent of the given Gupta year, ran its course and expired on the day before the day on which commenced the Mahâ-Âśvayuja *saṁvatsara* with which he sought to make it coincide!!! There is no possibility of any mistake on this point. Gen. Sir Alexander Cunningham gave the *saṁvatsaras* according to the northern luni-solar system; by which they commence and end with the Śaka years, and absolutely coincide with those years. He also gave the year A. D. in which any particular *saṁvatsara* (and, with it, the coincident Śaka year) commenced. And Śaka-Saṁvat 451 current, as a luni-solar year, commenced with the 8th March, A. D. 528, and ended with the 24th February, A. D. 529; while the Mahâ-Âśvayuja *saṁvatsara* began with the 25th February, A. D. 529, and ended with the 15th March, A. D. 530!!![9]

As I have said, it is unnecessary to go fully through the other three dates; because in each case the treatment and the results are exactly similar. But, to exhibit the whole matter at a glance, I will give the equations as they would stand, if Dr. Bhandarkar had formulated each of them in the same precise manner. In doing so, I add what he now says are to be taken as the real intended equivalents of his current Śaka years; the full equivalents of the *saṁvatsaras*; and the

---

[9] I take these dates from Gen. Sir Alexander Cunningham's *Book of Indian Eras*, p. 154. They may be absolutely correct; or they may have to be varied by one day or two on either side. This point, however, is perfectly immaterial for present purposes. — I may add that, from A.D. 470 to 530, the years A.D., and the *saṁvatsaras*, given in *Indian Eras*, agree with the entries in the Table used by Dr. Bhandarkar. They probably agree throughout; but I have made the comparison for only the period with which we are concerned. — I have taken the Śaka years above, as luni-solar years. If they are taken as solar years, — which is the case in the processes exhibited by Gen. Sir Alexander Cunningham for the calculation of the *saṁvatsaras*, — the comparative results are precisely the same; simply, the days on which the Śaka year and the coincident *saṁvatsara* began and ended, are then determined by the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti.

months that are concerned. This last item requires to be noted, for the reason that I have given above. We have, then:—

157 Gupta *past* + 242 = 399 Śaka *current* + 78 = 477 A. D. *current* [*i. e.*, Dr. Bhandarkar now says, A. D. 476-77] = Mahâ-Vaiśâkha [which, however, in reality was A. D. 477-78. Here, the given month is Kârttika.]

173 Gupta *past* + 242 = 415 Śaka *current* + 78 = 493 A. D. *current* [*i.e.*, Dr. Bhandarkar now says, A. D. 492-93] = Mahâ-Âśvayuja [which, however, in reality was A. D. 493-94. Here, the given month is Chaitra.]

191 Gupta *past* + 242 = 433 Śaka *current* + 78 = 511 A. D. *current* [*i.e.*, Dr. Bhandarkar now says, A. D. 510-11] = Mahâ-Chaitra [which, however, in reality was A. D. 511-12. Here, the given month is Mâgha.]

209 Gupta *past* + 242 = 451 Śaka *current* + 78 = 529 A. D. *current* [*i.e.*, Dr. Bhandarkar now says, A. D. 528-29] = Mahâ-Âsvayuja [which, however, in reality was A. D. 529-30. Here, the given month is Chaitra.]

The matter thus lies in a nutshell. Either Dr. Bhandarkar did in these cases add 78-79 to current Śaka years, in order to arrive at the full equivalents A. D., in doing which no special fault was then involved ; or else he committed a really gross mistake, and based his views upon equations which were radically wrong and misleading. That, of these two things, he did the former, was my belief when I wrote; and I still consider that it was impossible for me to arrive at any other conclusion. If, in reality, I was wrong in that belief, the fault lies with Dr. Bhandarkar himself, and is in the manner in which his Note on the Śaka Dates, and his treatment of the Gupta dates, are expressed. If the second of the two alternatives stated above, is now to be understood to be the true state of the case, — as perhaps Dr. Bhandarkar himself wishes to indicate by his remark (*loc. cit.* p. 93, line 21 ff.) that " (he) forgot that the Christian years in General Cunning- " ham's tables were arrived at by uniformly adding 78 to an expired " Śaka year, while (he himself) added 79 because it suited the pur- " pose,"[10] — then I have no hesitation in admitting that I did misinter-

[10] This, however, does not do anything towards rectifying the mistake. Even if 79 is added, for the end of the expired substituted for the current Śaka year, the results are just the same in each case; the necessary year A. D. is

pret his meaning; unintentionally, and simply through understanding his language in its ordinary and evident sense, and through not going out of the way to attribute to him a mistake, the nature of which is such as to make the commission of it seem almost impossible. In the latter event, the result exhibits, more plainly than I could do if I wrote a volume on the subject, the general standard of his treatment of the Gupta era and its epoch.

Here I leave the matter; adding only a few words to illustrate the spirit in which Dr. Bhandarkar wrote his attack upon me; *viz.* with the desire to find fault somehow or other, no matter on what unsubstantial grounds.

For the purpose of determining the epoch of the era, none of the Gupta dates are of greater interest and importance than those in the Parivrâjaka grants. And they are proved by the heliacal-rising system of the Twelve-Year Cycle of Jupiter, by which each *saṁvatsara* begins about four hundred days after the preceding one. Dr. Bhandarkar wound up the text of his article by saying in respect of this system (*loc. cit.* p. 93, line 5 ff. from the bottom),—"though it agrees with "the four inscriptions and gives the correct *saṁvatsaras*, still it is a "question whether an astronomical year of 400 days that did not "correspond with the usual luni-solar year could have been used for "the purposes of recording dates by ordinary people." A more senseless, and a more wantonly mischievous remark than this, it is impossible to imagine. In the first place, the mean-sign system of the Sixty-Year Cycle, by which the *saṁvatsaras* do not coincide with the luni-solar years, is still in use (see the Gwalior almanac, *Gupta Inscriptions*, Introduction, p. 139); and also a rising system of some kind or another of the Twelve-Year Cycle is apparently still followed (see *id.* p. 173, note 1). Moreover, what Hindu, wishing to include in a date even a *saṁvatsara* that does coincide with a luni-solar year, pauses to reflect that it may consist of only 354 days, or that it may run to 384 on account of the occurrence of an intercalated month?; just as, what Englishman, except on a particular day once in four years, pauses to inquire whether his year consists of 365 days or of 366? The Hindu now finds the *saṁvatsara*

nominally arrived at; but in reality the period arrived by the Śaka year still falls one year before the period covered by the *saṁvatsara*; and the equation is still, in schoolboy language, fudged, in order "to suit his purpose" in arriving at "the something important with which he was concerned."

in the almanac that he consults ; and there is an end of the matter, as far as that point is concerned. Or in former times, before the general circulation of almanacs, he had the details calculated for him by an astrologer ; and neither would he wish to question them, nor would he be in a position to do so. And in the second place, as I have said, the dates in question are proved by the heliacal-rising system ; and, moreover, without taking any liberties with the texts of the passages that record them. Under the same conditions, neither will the heliacal-rising system prove any other epoch that has been proposed ; nor will the mean-sign system, or its offshoot, the northern luni-solar system, prove either any such other epoch, or the epoch of A. D. 318-19 or 319-20 itself. And, under these circumstances there is only one rational conclusion ; *viz.* that the heliacal-rising system is the one in accordance with which these dates were given, and consequently, that it was in actual use at that time.

Art. VIII.—*Dharmakîrti and Śaṁkarâchârya.* By K. B. Pathak, B.A., Dekkan College, Poona.

In the XIth Volume of the Indian Antiquary, p. 174, I contributed a paper on the date of Śaṁkarâchârya, containing extracts from a manuscript in which Śaka 710 or A. D. 788 is given as the date of the philosopher's birth. This date was accepted as correct by Prof. Max Müller.[1] This view, however, was dissented from by Mr. K. T. Telang in a paper which appeared in the XIIIth Volume of the same Journal, p. 96. I believe he also read several dissertations on the same subject before this Society, in none of which he seems to have improved his position. The gist of his arguments is contained in his first paper. He proposes to assign Śaṁkarâchârya to the sixth century. I will reserve the consideration of his arguments for another occasion. He asks, on what historical grounds is the testimony of such a work as the Keralotpatti, which gives 400 A. D. as the date of Śaṁkarâchârya's birth, to be rejected? To this question the subject of the present paper furnishes the best answer which it is possible to conceive. In the XIVth Volume of the Indian Antiquary, p. 64, while reviewing one of Dr. Bhandarkar's reports on Sanskrit MSS., Dr. Bühler says, "it is inadvisable to assail Śaṁkara's date." But this piece of advice, coming from so high an authority, has had no effect. Again in the XVIth Volume of the Indian Antiquary, p. 41, Mr. Fleet says that Śaṁkarâchârya must have been contemporary with king Vṛishadêva of Nepal, to whom Dr. Bhagvanlal assigned A. D. 260. This date Mr. Fleet thinks too early, and says that, according to his rectification of the Nepal Vaṁśâvali, the date of king Vrishadeva may be brought down to A. D. 630-655 and then the Nepal tradition, which represents Śaṁkarâchârya to have been contemporary with this king, may be relied upon. In a paper manuscript of the Mâlatî-Mâdhava, there occurs an entry in the colophons of two of the ten acts, describing Bhavabhûti as the pupil of Kumârilasvami. On this anonymous entry Mr. S. P. Pandit is content to rest his conclusions as to the age of Kumârila and Śaṁkarâchârya, and disputes the accuracy of the statement made by Mr. Colebrooke that Śaṁkarâchârya indirectly alludes to Kumârila. In the introduction to his edition of the Gaûdavaho Mr. Pandit says, "ransacking all the known works of Śaṁkarâchârya

[1] India, what can it teach us? p. 369.

(the Śârîrakabhâshya, the Bhâshya on the ten Upanishads, and the Gîtâbhâshya), I have failed to find any passages containing any reference to Kumârilabhaṭṭa personally or to his works." It is clear, however, that a person, who studied the Bṛihadâraṇyakabhâshya[2] by the light of Sureśvara's commentary, would never fall into such an absurd error, as the Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika frequently contrasts the peculiar views of Kumârila with those of Prabhâkara; and Śaṁkarâchârya himself distinctly refers to Kumârila in the Upadeśasahasrî.[3]

The truth is that the works of Śaṁkarâchârya have not been studied with that amount of care which the nature of the subject demands. The earliest commentaries, those of Sureśvarâchârya and Vâchaspatimiśra, are rarely consulted. Sureśvarâchârya was the most distinguished disciple and contemporary of Śaṁkarâchârya; and, after Sureśvara, Vâchaspatimiśra is the best exponent of Śaṁkarâchârya's views.

In the Sâṁkhyatatvakaumudî Vâchaspatimiśra quotes the Râjavârtika. This is said by Śrîbhâratî,[4] pupil of Bodhâraṇyayati, to be the Bhoja-râjavârtika or the vârtika of Bhojarâja (A. D. 993). And the earliest commentary on Vâchaspati's Bhâmatî was composed in the reign of the Yâdava king, Kṛishṇarâja. In the introduction to the Kalpataru Amalânanda tells us that he "commenced this work when King Kṛishṇa, son of the prosperous Jaityadêva, who raised the Yâdava Dynasty to eminence by his fame, was associated with Mahâdêva in governing the country." I have published an inscription of this king, dated in Śaka 1170, in the XIVth Vol. of the Indian Antiquary, p. 68. He reigned between 1247-1260 A. D.[5]

We also know that Vâchaspatimiśra preceded Udayanâchârya as the latter has written a commentary called Tâtparyaparišuddhi on one of Vâchaspatimiśra's works. A palm-leaf manuscript of this commentary is dated in Saṁvat 1304 or A. D. 1248.[6] And as it is a fact that Buddhism was all but extinct in India in the 13th century[7] and as we learn from Udayana himself that this religion still prevailed in his time, when he attacks[8] it on the ground that it admitted

[2] Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika, Chapter VI. Ânandâśrama MS p. 226 a.

[3] Upadeśasahasrî, verses 139, 140.

[4] Commentary on the Sâṁkhyatatvakaumudî, Benares Edition.

[5] Early History of the Dekkan, pp. 86, 87.

[6] No. 28 of 1880-81, Dekkan College Collection.

[7] Monier Williams' Buddhism, p. 170.

[8] The Âtmatatvavivêka, Calcutta Edition, p. 93. I owe this reference to Dr. Bhandarkar.

Read 13th April 1891.

within its pale men of the lowest caste, it is plain that he must have composed his commentary in the 12th century. We shall therefore not be far wrong if we place Vâchaspatimiśra himself, who preceded Udayanâchârya, in the 11th century.

It is well known that in elucidating that portion of the Śârîraka-bhâshya in which Śaṁkarâchârya deals with the Yogâchâra School of Buddhism, the author of the Bhâmatî frequently quotes Dharmakîrti. This circumstance suggests an inference that it is the illustrious Buddhist philosopher whose views Śaṁkarâchârya refutes in his great work. This inference is confirmed by a long and interesting passage which I have discovered in the Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika and in which Sureśvarâchârya, the disciple and contemporary of Śaṁkarâchârya, actually names and attacks Dharmakîrti.

Let us inquire what we know about this illustrious Buddhist author from Chinese and Thibetan sources. The Chinese pilgrim I-tsing,[9] who visited this country in the latter part of the 7th century, published an account of his travels on his return to China in A. D. 695. This interesting work has come down to us. A French translation[10] of part of this work has lately appeared in the Journal Asiatique for November-December 1888, according to which I-tsing speaks of Dharmakîrti as his contemporary. And as I-tsing died in A. D. 703 it is clear that Dharmakîrti could have only flourished in the first half of the 7th century.

Târânâtha, the Buddhist writer of Thibet, says that Dharmakîrti lived in the time of the Thibetan king Stron-tsan-Gampo, who was born in 617 A. D. and reigned from 629-698. About this date there can be no doubt,[11] for the king married a Chinese princess whose date is certain. We have thus seen that Chinese and Thibetan writers are unanimous in assigning Dharmakîrti to the 7th century.

The same result is obtained from a study of the Digambara Literature of the 8th century; and, what invests this evidence with special interest in our eyes, is the fact that the peculiar views which the Digambara Jaina writers attribute to Dharmakîrti are precisely those that are criticised by Kumârilabhaṭṭa, Śaṁkarâchârya and Sureśvarâchârya. But this evidence is too long to discuss here

---

[9] India, what can it teach us? p. 210

[10] Ind. Antiquary. Vol. XIX. p. 319

[11] Burnell. Preface to the Samavidhâna Brâhmaṇa.

and will form the subject of a separate paper. The position of Dharmakîrti in Sanskrit Literature is at once unique and interesting. His works are frequently quoted and we shall not be at all surprised if hereafter some of those works are discovered in the original Sanskrit or translations in the Buddhist temples of Thibet.

The passage, in which Sureśvarâchârya attacks the trilakshana hetu or the threefold reason of Dharmakîrti, is very long as well as interesting. I shall only quote a few lines of it and translate them into English. Sureśvara's view is that the mere statement of the proposition that a mountain has fire because it has smoke, is enough to convey a definite meaning, but if an individual feels doubts, they are removed by positive and negative judgments such as "wherever there is smoke, there is fire" and "wherever there is no fire, there is no smoke." On the other hand, Dharmakîrti holds that such judgments are entirely useless and that an invariable concomitance is found in three cases only, namely, identity, causation and non-perception, which constitute the threefold reason of the Buddhists. Sureśvarâchârya concedes that positive and negative judgments are not essential to establish the truth of a proposition, but he has attempted in the following verses to expose the absurdity involved in the supposition of Dharmakîrti's threefold reason.

उत्पन्न एव ज्ञाने तस्संदेहनिवृत्तये ।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ स्तो न ताभ्यामनुमेयधीः ॥

संदेहनिर्णयादन्यत्स्वभावादि वदुच्यते ।
तस्यानुमित्यनंगत्वात्मातं तज्जुषकंडनं ॥

अविनाभावसिद्ध्यर्थं नन्विदं वर्ण्यते त्रयं ।
त्रिष्वेव त्वविनाभावाद्वृत्तैरपि कीर्तितं ॥

स्वभावादविनाभावे स्यादौष्ण्यस्वाग्निलिंगता ।
स्वभावेऽयाविनाभावात्कार्ये प्राप्ता स्वभावता ॥

औष्ण्यस्वभावो दृष्टोऽग्निस्तस्यान्यत्रापि दर्शनात् ।
क्षितितोयाग्निमरुतां दृष्टा स्पर्शस्वभावता ॥

मतं चेदस्वभावोसौ योऽनेकार्थप्रवृत्तिमान् ।
धवाश्वादावपि तद्वृत्तेर्वृक्षात्मा शिंशपा न हि ॥

शिंशपा वृक्ष एवेति ह्यविनाभावकारणात् ।
व्यापिकत्वं न भावानां स्वभावः स्यात्तथा सति ॥

तस्यानेकार्थशाखित्वावहेतुत्वं प्रसज्यते ।
क्षणिकत्वं यथैकस्य तथासाधारणात्मता ॥

हेतोः साधारणात्मत्वं यथानेकस्य तन्मतं ।
अग्नेर्धूमाच्च धूमस्य कार्यत्वस्य समीक्षणात् ॥

अनैकांतिकता हेतोः कार्यत्वस्येह सज्यते ।
यदि नाम सता स्पर्शो वाय्वाद्यावपि वर्तते ॥

नैतावता भवेल्लोके गौरस्पर्शस्वभाविका ।
भुगो हि स्पर्शवत्त्वस्य लोकेऽस्मिन्नुपसिद्धितः ॥

किंचाप्यव्यभिचारेण स्वभावस्यं विवक्षतः ।
स्वभावाज्जैव संसिध्येद् वस्तुनोऽव्यभिचारिता ॥

त्रिष्वेव स्वविनाभावादिति यद्धर्मकीर्तिना ।
प्रत्यक्षादि प्रतिक्षेपं हीयेतासौ न संशयः ॥

अथैवाव्यभिचारेण स्वभावस्यं विवक्षतः ।
एवाव्यभिचारस्य संसिद्धेः किं ततःपरं ॥

स्वभावहेतुना साध्यं यद यत्रे विवक्षितं ।

Brihadâraṇyakavârtika, Chapter VI., p. 39. Dekkan College MS. No. 463 of 1882-83.

TRANSLATION.

When knowledge is gained, doubts in regard to its accuracy are removed by positive and negative judgments which however do not produce knowledge. Doubts being thus removed, the three principles, peculiar nature, causal relation, and non-perception, which are mentioned in addition, do not form part of the inferential process and are therefore as useless as though one were to beat chaff. It may be objected that these three are mentioned with a view to prove the constant attendance of the major term. The Bauddhas also assert that the constant attendance of the major term is found only in the three cases mentioned. If peculiar nature is included in the constant attendance of the major term, then heat may be regarded as the characteristic of fire. If peculiar nature includes the constant attendance of the major term, then causal relation may be identical with peculiar nature. Heat is observed to be the quality of fire; it is also found

elsewhere as in the sun. Perceptibility to the touch is the quality of the earth, water, fire and wind. If that which is inherent in many things cannot be peculiar to any one of them, then a Śiṁśapâ and a Dhava being trees, the being a tree cannot be predicated of the former only, because the attribute of a Śiṁśapâ is invariably found together with that of a tree. In that case momentariness cannot be said to be the peculiar nature of things. It ceases to be a reason as it is found in many things. Momentariness can be a characteristic only when it belongs to one thing; when it belongs to more things, it becomes the common property of them all. Smoke is observed to be the effect not only of fire but also of the smoke of the previous moment; therefore the effect is not invariably preceded by the same cause in this instance. If indeed perceptibility to the touch is always inherent in the wind and other things, this much will not justify in practical life the conclusion that the earth is not perceived by the sense of touch as it is very notorious in this world that the earth is capable of being touched. Moreover, a person, who bases his argument of peculiar nature on invariable concomitance, will find that his conclusion does not necessarily follow from peculiar nature alone. Thus the position of Dharmakîrti that the constant attendance of the major term is found in the three cases only falls to the ground without doubt.

In this portion of his work, from which the above extract is taken, Sureśvar has attempted to prove the existence of the soul, which was vehemently denied by the Buddhists whose religion dominated not only in India but in the whole East. He has presented an interesting survey of Buddhism, as it prevailed in his days, of the four schools into which it had become split up—the Mâdhyamika, the Yogâchâra, the Sautrântika and the Vaibhâshika, which have been adverted to by Śaṁkarâchârya himself. In point of fact this part of the Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika may serve as a commentary on the corresponding portion of the Śârîrakabhâshya. Regarded in this light, it is invaluable as it comes from the pen, of one who was a contemporary of Śaṁkarâchârya, and whose genius has shed an undying light on the literature of his period. This review of Buddhism is finely wound up by a long passage, part of which has been already quoted, and in which the individual views of Dharmakîrti are criticised in most courteous terms. Ânandajñâna the commentator on the Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika has acquitted himself of his task most creditably, as he frequently gives illustrative citations from the works of Dharmakîrti

whom he always calls Kîrti. It may be worth mentioning here that the Buddhist philosopher is also referred to as Kîrti by the Digambara Jaina author Vidyânanda in the Patraparîkshâ. In the following passage Ânandajñâna tells us that his author actually quotes Dharmakîrti.[12]

सर्वस्य ज्ञानमात्रस्यात्तदन्यासंभवस्ततः ॥
तस्यैव ज्ञानमात्रस्य ग्राह्यग्राहकलक्षणं ।
मलं प्रकल्प्य तस्यास्थं बुद्धिं व्याचक्षतेपरे ॥
अभिन्नोपि हि बुद्ध्यात्मा विपर्यासितबुद्धिभिः ।
ग्राह्यग्राहकसंवित्तिभेदवानिव लक्ष्यते ॥

On this Ânandajñâna's gloss runs thus :—

अपर इति विज्ञानवादिनामेवोक्तिः ग्राह्यग्राहकभावस्य कल्पितत्वं न बौद्धराद्धांतस्ते खल्वेकत्र ज्ञाने तद्भावं वास्तवमिच्छंतीत्याशंक्य तत्कल्पितत्वे कीर्तिवाक्यमुदाहरत्यभिन्नोपीति तस्मान्न वस्तुतो ग्राहकभेदोस्तीति शेषः ।

Here the last verse beginning with अभिन्नोपि is in the opinion of Ânandajnâna a quotation from Dharmakîrti; and, since the verses immediately preceding it faithfully reproduce the ideas and the expressions in the Bṛihadâraṇyakabhâshya, it may be conjectured that Śamkarâchârya himself refers to the Buddhist philosopher. But this is hardly open to question, especially when we find the verse of Dharmakîrti actually quoted in the Upadeśa-sahasrî where Śaṁkarâchârya makes the Vijnânavâdi Bauddha say [13]

अनुभूतेः किमन्यास्मिन्स्यात्तत्त्वापेक्षया वद ।
अनुभवितरीष्टा स्वात्सोप्यनुभूतिरेव नः ॥
अभिन्नोपि हि बुद्ध्यात्मा विपर्यासितदर्शनैः ।
ग्राह्यग्राहकसंवित्तिभेदवानिव लक्ष्यते ॥

Here the second verse is of course that of Dharmakîrti. It reads दर्शनैः instead of बुद्धिभिः; the latter, however, is the reading found in all the manuscripts of the Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika that I have examined. It is worth noting, however, that this difference of reading in no away affects the sense of the verse or the interesting historical

[12] Bṛihadâraṇy-akavârtika, Chapter VI., p. 28a, Dekkan College MS. No. 403 of 1882-83, commentary on the same, p. 78a. No. 409 of 1883-84.

[13] Upadeśasahasri, verses 141, 142, Bom. Ed., p. 308.

inference which it suggests. I may also add that this verse of Dharmakîrti is quoted in the Jaina work Ashṭasahasrî, Chapter I., and by Sâyaṇa-Mâdhava in his chapter on Buddhism thus[14]:—

यथोक्तं ।
सहोपलम्भनियमादभेदो नीलतद्धियोः ।
भेदश्च भ्रान्तिविज्ञानैर्दृश्यतेतैमिरादिवादृश्य इति ।
अविभागोऽपि बुद्ध्यात्मा विपर्यासितदर्शनैः ।
ग्राह्यग्राहकसंवित्तिभेदवानिव लक्ष्यत इति च ।

Here the second verse will be at once recognised as that of Dharmakîrti quoted by Śaṁkarâchârya and Sureśvara, though, as in the Ashṭasahasrî, it reads अविभागो ऽपि instead of अभिन्नोपि हि. This celebrated verse is thus translated into English by Professor Gough:[15] "Though there is no division, the soul or intellect, by reason of illusory perceptions, appears to possess a duality of cognitions, of percepts and of percipient."

I need hardly remark that this translation is inaccurate. The correct explanation of the verse is of course that which is given by Râmatîrtha in his commentary on the Upadeśashasrî and by the Jaina commentator Laghusamantabhadra.

We have thus seen that both Śaṁkarâchârya and his disciple Sureśvara quote Dharmakîrti, the illustrious contemporary of the Thibetan king Strongtsan-gampo. Our attention is next attracted to the way in which the Buddhist philosopher is quoted; the well known verse of Dharmakîrti is put into the mouth of a Bauddha. This shows conclusively that in the days of Śaṁkarâchârya it was the fashion for Bauddhas to shelter themselves behind the authority of their great philosopher, in their disputations with heretical teachers under the impression that a quotation from Dharmakîrti would silence adverse criticism. I would also invite the attention of Sanskrit Scholars to the tribute of homage which Sureśvarâchârya pays to the Buddhist philosopher, whom he calls Śakya-puṁgava or the eminent Bauddha. From these circumstances it will be allowable to infer that in the passages already indicated, Śaṁkarâchârya and Sureśvarâchârya refer not to a contemporary author who was still struggling into fame,

[14] Sarvadarśana saṁgraha Bibl. Ind. Ed., p. 16.
[15] Translation of the same, p. 25.

but to one who had already attained the rank of a classical authority and who consequently must have flourished more than half a century before. In other words, as Dharmakîrti is a writer of the 7th century, we may safely conclude that Śaṁkarâchârya who refers to him, flourished in the 8th century. On this point I have discovered interesting evidence in the Jaina Literature of Southern India, which will enable us to prove that the great Brahminical reformer lived in the 8th century. But, as I have already said, that evidence is too long to discuss here; I shall therefore be glad to communicate it to the Society in a future paper.

Before concluding I beg leave to mention one more interesting fact. Itsing says that Bhartṛihari, the author of the Vâkyapadîya, died in 650 A.D. [16] Now the 118th verse [17] in the Vâkyakâṇḍa of this grammarian is quoted by Kumârila in his Tantravârtika, page 251, Benares Edition. And since, as I have already remarked, the latter is referred to in the Upadeśasahasrî and the Bṛihadâraṇyakavârtika, it follows that both Kumârila and Saṁkarâchârya quote distinguished authors of the 7th century. But this subject will be discussed more at length in my second paper.

---

[16] India, what can it teach us? p. 348.

[17] अस्त्यर्थः सर्वशब्दानामिति प्रत्याय्य लक्षणम् ।
अपूर्वदेवतास्वर्गैः समनाहुर्गवादिषु ॥ इति ॥

Art. IX.—*Assyrian Relics from Nimroud in the Possession of the B. B. R. A. S.* By R. P. Karkabia, B. A.

[Read April 13, 1891.]

It was only a few months ago that our Society was discovered to be the fortunate possessor of an old Dante MS. worth, in the opinion of experts, ten times its weight in gold. And now I have to announce to our Society the possession of a treasure which, if not of the same market value, is at least equally interesting and better suited to our objects as an Oriental Society taking a deep interest in everything pertaining to the East—its archæology, history, and philology. This treasure has been lying in our possession for a long time unrecognised and unappreciated. Many of you must have seen large pieces of stone with exquisite sculptures upon them, and inscriptions engraved in queer wedge-shaped characters, lying on the landing-place, reclining against the walls near the northern entrance into the Hall. These slabs of stone, some of them of marble, are our new treasure. They are the relics of a once powerful Eastern monarchy, the famous Assyria, which flourished 3,000 years ago. It is needless for me to tell before a learned body like this how this Assyrian monarchy reached with its height of grandeur, also its depth of vices; how its capital city, Nineveh, with its palaces and temples was struck down in the blossom of its sins, and its destruction so completely effected that it was blotted out of the face of the earth, and the words of the Prophet (Nahum) literally fulfilled—"the place shall not be known where it was." Verily, the very site of Nineveh was not recognised after its destruction in the 7th century B.C. till the 19th A.C. The ground under which lay hid its glory and its shame was trodden under foot by the Persians under Xerxes marching westward to conquer Greece and Europe, by the Greeks under Alexander marching eastward to subdue Persia and Asia, and nearer our own time by the Arabs, under the early successors of the Prophet, going forth to conquer and convert the Western World. All these great nations were unconscious that the remains of a power once to the full as great as their own lay buried under their hurrying feet

steps. Time has rolled by, and those nations have met with the same fate as Ancient Assyria. Persians, Greeks, and Arabs have gone the way of their predecessors, and Assyria and Nineveh still continued in their subterranean solitude and obscurity till they were rescued from both by travellers from a nation which at the time of their grandeur, "wild in woods like the noble savage, ran"—in the woods of Germany and the centre of Europe. The honour of discovering Nineveh and of reviving its existence belongs to Englishmen, and especially to one who, happily, is still alive to enjoy his well-merited repose and honour—Sir Austen Henry Layard. He made excavations near Mosul on the site of the Ancient Nineveh, and recovered the remains of the gorgeous palaces of its rulers. These excavated remains and relics, Layard intended to send to the British Museum to form part of the national collection. For this purpose these huge and massive pieces of stone and marble were with great difficulty sent from Mosul down the Tigris to Bagdad and Busrah, the seaport on the Persian Gulf. Those who have read his graphic and picturesque account in Layard's first work can alone imagine and appreciate the immense trouble which it cost him to transport these relics from their original place to the port of Busrah, a distance of 1,000 miles. As from Busrah they could not directly be sent to London by sea, they had to be sent to Bombay, and thus began the connection of our city with these Assyrian relics. Layard's precious collection arrived in Bombay. The *Bombay Telegraph* of Dec. 11, 1846 says:—"At the Meeting of the B. B. R. A. Society held yesterday afternoon, a very interesting communication was made by a member, in reference to the recent excavation by Mr Layard at and near Mosul, the site of ancient Nineveh. Some of the splendid sculptures discovered by Mr. Layard at Khorsabad are, it appears, at present in Bombay, having been sent hither for shipment to England, as a donation to the British Museum. It was intimated to the Meeting that the gentleman in whose charge these magnificent relics of 'hoar antiquity' now are would be happy, on the expression by the Society of a wish to that effect, to allow the community of Bombay an opportunity of inspecting them. The Meeting readily acted on the suggestion; and we believe that arrangements will be at once made with a view to the opening of the sculptures to public inspection in the beginning of the ensuing week. It is not too much to say that the exhibition will be one of the most interesting and attractive that has ever taken place on the

Island. We shall endeavour to give a full account of the sculptures in our paper of to-morrow." The account given by the *Telegraph* and quoted by the *Athenæum* is too general for the purpose of identification. The *Athenæum* of February 6, 1847, informs its readers that "a collection of sculpture figures and cuneiform inscriptions from the mound of Nimroud on its way to England—lately excavated by Mr. Layard—has been on view in Bombay, by direction of the Asiatic Society" (p. 154).

With regard to their public exhibition here and its sad result, their illustrious discoverer thus speaks, or rather bitterly complains, in the preface, dated October, 1848, to his first great work, *Nineveh and its Remains*:—"The cases containing the small objects recently deposited in the British Museum were not only opened without authority at Bombay, but their contents exhibited, without proper precautions, to the public. It is remarkable that several of the most valuable (indeed, *the* most valuable) specimens are missing; and the whole collection was so carelessly re-packed that it has sustained material injury. Were these Assyrian relics, however valuable, such as could be again obtained, either by ingenuity or labour, their loss might not, perhaps, be so seriously lamented; but if once destroyed, they can never be restored, and it must be remembered that they are almost the only remains of a great city and of a great nation." The *Athenæum* of November 11, 1848, too, complains bitterly of the same facts. After saying that many of the relics have suffered in transit, it proceeds:—"But the worst is that many of the remains which actually reached Bombay have not arrived in England, and some of these are among the more interesting in point of subject, if we may judge from such of Layard's drawings as we have had the opportunity of seeing" (p. 1128). And in the first notice of Layard's work it quotes the author's complaint above copied, and says, "such facts assuredly require no comment" (1849, p. 45). Thus from what I have here brought together, there is no doubt as to the fact that some of Layard's most precious relics were missed in Bombay. Therefore I think they can also be traced back, if possible, in Bombay. And I think that some of the relics in our possession may be the missing remnants of the precious Layard collections. Our Society, as I said, knows nothing about these relics. There is no reference to them in the Proceedings and Journals. We do not know authentically how we came to possess them. So we are left to conjecture,

and I offer two explanations. The Layard collection was publicly exhibited in Bombay in the Town Hall, and, as Layard complained it was carelessly re-packed, some of the relics may have been left behind in the Hall. As our Society possesses other stone relics, these Assyrian relics in course of time must have come to be put by the side of these by the natural inference that the Society, being the possessor of other stone relics, may also be the possessor of these. There is another fact which also supports the theory that we have got in our possession the missing remnant of the Layard collection. Layard has published a folio of sketches of the relics he had excavated. This folio which was published through the munificent patronage of the East India Company, is now lying on the table. Indeed, through the bounty of the East India Directors, we have got two copies of this noble and costly work. Now I compared the slabs we have got with the sketches in this folio for the purpose of identification, and have succeeded in identifying some: *e.g.*, we have got a figure which resembles the figure to the extreme right in plate 5 of the folio. In plate 7*a* there is a representation of "winged figures kneeling before a sacred tree." We have got a slab which is exactly the left half of this, *i.e.*, we have got the figure to the left with one half of the tree. As to how we have got one-half of the slab, I may mention that Layard, as he himself says, had the heavier and larger slabs sawn for facility of transit. And Mr. Bonomi, who had been to Mosul to see Mr. Layard, says in the *Athenæum* of October 2, 1847, that "previous to removal, the slabs, usually about a foot in thickness, are sawn as thin as can be done with safety, to save freight" (p. 1034). Again, in plate 36 is drawn an eagle-headed figure which Layard identifies with Nisroch, the eagle-headed Assyrian divinity, but which Sir H. Rawlinson and Mr. G. Smith do not think to be that. We have got a beautiful slab of greyish and yellowish marble which resembles this. Thus all these facts point, I think, to the conclusion that we have got the missing remnant of Layard's collection. In connection with these relics there is another thing which may throw some light. In the *Bombay Times* of 1847—which, I regret to say, our Library has not got in its excellent collection of past periodicals and newspapers, and which I had, therefore, to procure from elsewhere—I found that Major (now Sir) Henry Rawlinson, of the Bombay Army, sent some Assyrian relics in the form of slabs as a present to the Governor of Bombay of the time, Mr. (later Sir) George Clerk.

These slabs had been excavated from nearly the same place as the Layard slabs, *viz.*, the palace of Nimroud. "Governor Clerk," says the *Times*, "anxious for the promotion of the Economic Museum now forming, determined to present them to the embryo establishment as beautiful specimens of ancient Assyrian art. They have accordingly been placed in the apartments provisionally devoted to the infant collection." Thus these relics may be the slabs spoken of by the *Times*. So they may henceforward be called the Rawlinson-Clerk slabs. But whatever may be their history, whether they are the missing remnant of the Layard collection or are the present of Rawlinson to Governor Clerk, there can be no doubt as to their preciousness and great historical and archæological value, coming as they evidently do from the same place, and belonging to the same remote period of antiquity as the Layard collection now in the British Museum. And our Society may justly feel proud of owning these treasures, however acquired, especially as nowhere else in the whole of this country does there exist any such collection of Assyrian relics, either in the possession of individuals or of societies. And now I conclude by suggesting to some of our learned members deep in Assyrian lore and in the reading of cuneiform inscriptions to examine these sculptures and the inscriptions which are engraved thereon, and to see whether these latter throw any new light on Assyrian history and give any new names of Assyrian kings and emperors of the early or the late period. They may thereby do some service to the cause of Assyriology and of knowledge in general, and reflect additional lustre on our Society. I have only in an humble way drawn the attention of the Society to what, I think, is a precious treasure which has long been lying neglected and unappreciated, but which deserves to be treated so no longer.

On a motion by the Honourable Mr. Javerilal Umiashunkar Yajnik, seconded by Mr. Jeewanjee J. Mody, a vote of thanks to Mr. Karkaria for his interesting paper was passed by the meeting.

P. S.—Since the above paper was read, Mr. Karkaria has addressed the following letter to the Honorary Seceretary:—

"Dear Mr. Javerilal,—In the paper which I read before our Society on the 13th instant I called attention to the valuable Assyrian relics which have been lying in our possession for a long time neglected and unappreciated. As I said, our Society does not know how these precious slabs came to Bombay at all and into our possession. There is no reference to them in our Journals and

proceedings. None of our members, it seems, knows anything about them. Only one gentleman, an official of the Government Archæological Survey, Mr. Cousens, seemed to know the great importance and archæological value of the inscriptions on these relics; but he is not a member of the Society, nor has he brought the matter before it. I undertook this neglected subject and tried to trace the history of the slabs. Owing to certain facts I came across in the course of my research, I started two hypotheses to explain this question. I was not certain whether these relics belonged to the Layard collection, which was, at the instance of our Society, *publicly* exhibited in Bombay whilst on its way through our city to Europe, and part of which was afterwards found to have been missing, or were the slabs which Major Rawlinson presented to Governor Clerk in 1847. I distinctly said that I halted between these two opinions. I was wedded to neither theory. My object in bringing forward the matter was to obtain help from persons who could assist the Society in solving this question. But though newspapers in various parts of the country have noticed this subject, no one has been able to give any positive information which could settle it. By continuing my researches, I have now succeeded in substantiating my second hypothesis. Our relics *are* the slabs presented by Major Rawlinson to Sir George Clerk. I have completely identified them with these.

"In the *Bombay Times and Journal of Commerce* of the year 1847 I have found a minute description of the slabs presented by Major Rawlinson to Governor Clerk. The slabs in our possession, with the exception of two, answer perfectly and in many respects to this description. Major Rawlinson presented ten slabs according to the *Times;* of these ten we have got nine, *i.e.*, all except one, and we have got two more which were not in the Rawlinson collection. These are the exceptions. An inquiry about them I reserve at present. Meanwhile I proceed to identify some of our slabs with the Rawlinson present. 'No. 1 is a small slab, 3 feet by 1½, considerably corroded in two or three places, but the sculpture very distinct and perfect. It represents the heads of two warriors, the one behind the other. The heads and hair of both are neatly plaited and curled. Both wear earrings. One wears a neat conical helmet with the apex cut off and a small tuft in the centre of the crown. This is believed to represent the figure of the King. A long lace ornament or ribbon hangs down behind on the shoulder. The hand of the other is up and contains a pine or

custard apple or some similar fruit. The helmet is rounded in the crown and richly ornamented around the brow. This is most probably a fragment only of a sculpture, the slab next below in all likelihood containing the remainder of the figures—probably a representation of the sovereign and some chief of much distinction presenting him with gifts. On the wrist is a large bracelet, with a rosette over the back of the hand.' This description applies in every particular to the slab in our possession, which I have also marked 1. We have examined the slab together and measured it, and you were perfectly convinced of its identity with No. 1 of the Rawlinson group. 'No. 2 is in perfect preservation. It is 2 feet by 1½. It contains the head of a warrior like that last described in No. 1, but much more neatly sculptured. A gorgeous necklace and neatly-embroidered vestment is seen just from under the mass of flowing hair and beard. There are no written characters on either of these two.' The slab marked 2 in our collection is this very one here described.

"'No. 3 is 3 feet 3 inches by 2 feet 2. The stone is a mottled alabaster, the same in substance as the other, but altogether different in appearance. The ground is yellowish grey, like the rest, the spots pearly white. The sculpture is of very peculiar interest. It represents a human figure wearing a richly-ornamented petticoat or tunic which descends to the knee: over this is an apron about two-thirds down the limb, and shorter considerably than the garment under it. This also is neatly fringed, or perhaps rather furred, the fibres or threads resembling long hard fur more than any woven texture. These two are confined by a rich girdle round the waist. Over the whole is a loose flowing vestment consisting of a cape and long shirt, the latter extending to the heels; both are richly fringed and at the bottom ornamented with bobbins. Two double cords with tassels depend from the waist to the ground. The left leg is well formed: it is bare from a little above the knee. The corrugations of the skin of the knee and muscles of the calf, knee and instep are very elaborately detailed. The right foot is visible from the ankle: both are bare. The left arm hangs downward and forward, and there is a small basket in the hand. A heavy bracelet appears around the wrist, and armlets above the elbows: neither has clasps. The ends at the joinings pass a little over each other—meant, perhaps, to indicate the metal to be fine soft gold which bent and kept its place without assistance. The hilts of two daggers appear above the arm. The blades are sheathed

in the girdle. From the throat upwards the form of the figure is that of a carnivorous bird with a hooked beak of enormous size. From the shoulders project a pair of wings half extended, about two-thirds the length of the figure — one slanting upwards, the other downwards. From the insertion of the wings along the back of the neck, the crown, and in and near the nostrils, is a row of feathers standing on end like a half-cropped mane, and from under these appears a true hairy mane, hanging down and curled like the beards of the male figures. The right hand is held upwards and forwards, presenting a pine or other similar fruit. On the side of the slab towards which the figure looks is a long wreath of a sort of honeysuckle ornament, such as is seen on some Greek sculptures.' I have no doubt whatever that the slab marked 3 in our collection is the beautiful sculpture here described, which is, according to Layard, the representation of Nisroch.

"'No. 4 is a large slab 3 feet by 5. It represents a man bareheaded, with long hair and beard, sitting in a curricle-like chariot. The horses are straining on the reins; they draw by a bent-pole yoke and collars—there is no other appearance of harness. The breast-leather is highly ornamented, and on their crests are high conical ornaments. The tails are long and tied round with bandages. They are obviously striving to start. The muscles of the head and neck, as also those of the legs, are very elaborately carved. Two men with round caps, short tunics and swords in their hands stand at their head, holding by the bearing-rein, which is loose; they are bare from the knee downwards. A human figure, without a head, lies prostrate under the horses, apparently just cut down and still struggling in the throes of death. The slab is without inscription and freer of ornament than any of the others.' Our slab marked 4 is this very sculpture here described.

"No. 5 of the Rawlinson slabs seems to be missing from our collection, for I can find none to which its description can at all apply. How this particular one was missed, and where at present it may be, I have not succeeded yet in finding out. Perhaps further inquiry may lead to its discovery. Meanwhile I proceed to the remaining relics.

"'No 6 represents a man standing bareheaded. The right hand is held up as if in the attitude of addressing some one. In his left is a three-tailed thong or lash, tasselled at the extremities, and supposed

to be the badge of office. A short frock or tunic descends from the waist to the knee, beneath which the left leg is exposed downwards. The feet are naked and well exposed. A loose garment reaching the ground hangs over the shoulder by a belt: the breast and shoulders are naked. There is a bracelet on the wrist, and another above the elbow; on the former, over the back of the hand, is a rosette: both are folded, not clasped. The double cord, with tassels and tasselled fringe, referred to in No. 4, ornament his tunic. He wears long earrings: his hair and beard are neatly curled and knotted. Round his head is a band, apparently of gems, with a large rosette over the forehead, another above the ear, and a third near the place where it is united behind. Here there is a large tassel hanging over the occiput, and a piece of drapery with a fringe depends from the neck to well down between the shoulders. The slab is without inscription.' Our slab marked 6 is exactly the one here described.

"'No. 7 is a fine large slab 3 feet by $3\frac{1}{2}$. It represents a group of warriors in action. The centre figure next the spectator is in the act of discharging an arrow. Just before him in the group is a shield-bearer, by which, in the marbles, archers are always represented as being accompanied. He holds forward a large square shield—apparently about five feet in length; in his right hand is a short sword or dagger. Immediately behind the two is a light-armed soldier, with a circular shield, about three feet in diameter, held high in the air; in his right hand is a short double-edged sword: he stands as if in readiness to spring forward and despatch any one who may have fallen wounded within reach. The dimensions here given are estimated from the proportions of the human frame—probably those of men of 5 feet 8: the representations are three and a half feet. In advance of the group and probably intended to appear in the back ground, had the perspective been properly arranged, is a wheeled machine, somewhat in the form of the early locomotive engines—the Rocket for example. It seems to be drawn by a rope up a steep acclivity; and out of the funnel, which is a half too short for steam purposes, peeps an archer in the act of letting fly his arrow. The scaffolding supporting the platform over which this war chariot—for such, doubtless, it was—advances is supported by broken palm-trees. There are three date-palms on the slab, very badly represented. On the edge is a bow and arrow directed at the warriors first described.

and in all likelihood the slab which followed this afforded a representation of the place they attacked. The whole of the warriors, with the exception of the charioteer, who is bare-headed, are dressed alike, with peaked head-dresses, like a modern Persian cap, and loose tunics extending to the knee and richly fringed at bottom. The centre figure is shewn; the others have long beards ornamented in the usual fashion.' Our slab marked likewise 7 corresponds to this most minute description in every particular except one which is very trifling. There are, I think, two date-palms in our slab, instead of the three mentioned in this description. This can, however, best be explained as a mistake of the describer. But our slab is most undoubtedly the one here described.

"'No. 8. The next three slabs all represent winged figures, supposed to be divinities. No. 8 is 4 feet high and $2\frac{1}{4}$ across. The figure is that of a man of herculean strength, the muscles of the legs, arms, and shoulders being enormously developed; the right side is turned towards the spectator. The dress is exactly the same as that of the figure in No. 3, with the exception that on the feet are sandals, and a large rosette on the bracelet and armlets. The wings, moreover, are somewhat larger and more developed. The beard and hair are very profuse; they are ornamented like the others. A large band covered with circular metal-looking ornaments surrounds the head. The expression of the face is of sternness or anger; the brow is knit, and lips much compressed. The right hand is held upwards and forwards and is open; in the left, which hangs down, is a bunch of flowers. There are five lines of cuneiform characters at the top of the slab.' This is exactly the slab I have marked No. 8 in our collection.

"'No. 9 is $3\frac{1}{3}$ feet in height and $2\frac{1}{4}$ across. It represents a winged figure, in many respects similar to the preceding one. The dress is almost exactly the same. The left side is turned towards the spectator; the feet are bare. Seven lines of cuneiform characters run right across as high up as the calf. In the left hand is a bag or basket; the right is held upwards and forwards, holding a pine or some similar fruit. The head is covered with a round-topped and horned helmet similar to that on the greater part of the stones. The expression of the face contrasts strikingly with that of the preceding one: it is one of extreme placidity and mildness: the lips are thin and smooth, the brow open, the eye fully expanded.' This is our No. 9. Seven lines of cuneiform characters run right across the legs, as is said here in the

description, and there are besides, three more lines immediately beneath the feet.

"'No. 10 in all respects closely resembles the last one. Slab is 2½ feet square. The winged figure is kneeling on one knee. Both hands are held forward. The left hand is raised, and the fingers held down; those of the right hand are bent upwards, as if flowers or fruit were being gathered. A long wreath of honeysuckle-looking flowers decorates the left side of the slab, to which the figure looks. The expression of the face is that of one intent on some occupation—smooth, placid, and attentive. There is a single line of cuneiform characters beneath.' This is our No. 10 also.

"Thus, taking the slabs one by one, it has been shown that this description of the Rawlinson slabs given by the *Times* applies most exactly to them. The accurate measurement of the stones given by the describer is exactly the measurement of ours. We have had them measured in our presence, and the result was perfectly satisfactory. To my mind there is no doubt whatever that these 9 are the Rawlinson slabs. So then, as I have said in my paper, these slabs in our possession may well be called the Rawlinson-Clerk slabs. It is but meet that the names of the two generous donors should be coupled together to give the proper name to their munificent gift to the Museum and the community of Bombay. Of the two pieces which still remain to be accounted for, one is a small slab which consists entirely of nine lines of cuneiform characters, and the other, which I do not think is an Assyrian relic at all, is a slab two feet by one and a half, on which are represented two heads of men, one behind the other, while above them are what look like five rosettes. I have not had time yet to inquire into their history, as also into the history of the missing No. 5 of the Rawlinson-Clerk slabs. Thus, with this trifling exception, the whole question is, I think, settled. The conclusion is that our Assyrian relics are the slabs sent by Major Rawlinson as a present to Governor Clerk in 1847, and presented by the latter to the new Museum then forming, which was located in the Town Hall.

Yours, etc.,
"R. P. KARKARIA."

"*Bombay, 30th April* 1891."

MEMO.

I examined, in company with Mr. Karkaria, the slabs referred to in the above letter, and found the minute description given in the *Bombay Times* of the year 1847 to answer in the case of the nine out of the ten slabs of the Rawlinson present. The description agrees not only in respect of the measurements of each slab but also in respect of its sculpured figures and their ornamentation. I am satisfied that Mr. Karkaria has succeeded in identifying these 9 out of the 10 slabs in the possession of the Society with those forming part of the Rawlinson present. Much credit is, in my opinion, undoubtedly due to Mr. Karkaria for his persevering efforts in this direction.

JAVERILAL U. YAJNIK,
Honorary Secretary.

TOWN HALL, BOMBAY,

4th May 1891.