Art. X.—*Courtship in Ancient India.* By P. Peterson, M.A., D. Sc.

[Read, 29th July 1891.]

Among the 540 manuscripts collected by Horace Hayman Wilson in Benares and Calcutta, and now deposited in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, there is one which contains the Kamasutra of Vatsyayana along with a commentary by one Bhaskara Nrisinha. The commentary was written in 1788 at the request of a Prince Vrajalal. It is described as being the work of a man who was not sufficiently acquainted either with the language or with the subject-matter of his author. The Kamasutra itself is a work which is destined, I believe, to throw a great deal of light on much that is still dark in the ancient history of this country. Aufrecht, who denounces the subject-matter of the book with all a scholar's asceticism, saw its importance, and gives up seven columns of his Catalogue to a long account of it. He notes that Vatsyayana refers to the following previous writers on the subject of love :—Auddalaki, Gonikaputra, Gonardiya, Ghotakamukha, Charayana, Dattaka, Babhravya and the Babhraviyas. Aufrecht also pointed out that Vatsyayana must be put before Subandhu, the author of the Vasavadatta. For both Mahesvara and Hemachandra tell us that Vatsyayana is another name for Mallanaga, whom Subandhu quotes.

The extracts given by Aufrecht attracted the attention of scholars, but the book itself has only been generally accessible very recently. The translation into English (1883) was printed and circulated privately only; and it was besides for scholars a very inadequate representation of the original. We owe it to Pandit Durga Prasad of Jeypore that we have at last an excellent edition of the book, accompanied by a better commentary than that which Aufrecht describes. This is the commentary a fragment of which I secured in 1883 for the Bombay Government collection, and which is referred to in my Second Report, p. 67. It is called the Jayamangala. The author gives his name as Yasodhara, but states that he wrote this "explanation of sutras which Vatsyayana collected, after he had retired from the world in grief at the loss of a beloved wife, and had, under the name of Indrapada, entered the ascetic life." It can be shown that the book, as we have it now, was known to Bhavabhuti, who flourished at the end of the seventh century, and that he makes

constant reference to it in his Malatimadhava. There is a statement to that effect at the beginning of the play itself, the point of which has been hitherto missed. I refer to the phrase "auddhatyam âyojitakâmasûtram," which occurs in the enumeration by the actor of the qualities the audience may expect to find in the play about to be represented before them. Jagaddhara sees no reference to a book here, and Bhandarkar, differing from Jagaddhara, translates, "bold or adventurous deeds, intended to assist the progress of love (*lit.* in which is introduced the thread of love)." Bhavabhuti may mean this too. But his words are primarily a reference to this book, of which he makes great use. When Kamandaki slyly suggests, while professing to put aside, the tales of how Sakuntala and others followed the dictates of their own hearts in love, she is following Vatsyayana. When she tells Avalokita that the one auspicious omen of a happy marriage is that bride and bridegroom should love one another, and quotes the "old saying" that the happy husband is he who marries the girl who has bound to her his heart and his eye, she is following Vatsyayana. And so in many other parts of the play. One of the most conspicuous passages is in the seventh act, where Buddharakshita breaks through her Prakrit to quote the Sanskrit phrase, "Kusumasadharmâno hi yoshitah sukumâropakramâḥ., For women are like flowers, and should be approached gently." Buddharakshita is quoting our book (p. 199), and the whole of the context refers to a matter which Vatsyayana treats of at great length, and which is interwoven with the plot of the Malatimadhava.

I will say only in passing that I hope on some future occasion to show that what is true of Bhavabhuti is true of his great predecessor Kalidasa.* If that is so, a vista of antiquity opens up for our book. For it is certain now that Kalidasa must be put earlier than has lately been very generally supposed. He stands near the beginning of our era, if indeed he does not overtop it, and date from the year one of Vikrama's era. It is enough, however, for my present purpose, if you will bear in mind that this Kamasutra of Vatsyayana can be shown to have been known to Subandhu and Bhavabhuti. It contains much that is in conflict with the poet's dream of the "unchanging

---

* In a paper "On the duties of a Hindu wife" read before the Anthropological Society of Bombay, 16th October 1891, I showed that Kalidasa quotes Vatsyayana *verbally*. *Note added while printing.*

East," the belief that India is a country in which all things have continued as they were from the beginning. But its evidence cannot, I believe, be overturned. It is with a full conviction of the authenticity and antiquity of the book that I proceed to lay before you a translation of that chapter in which Vatsyayana lays down the rules which, in his opinion, in all ordinary cases, should govern the relations of the sexes before marriage.

I.—"By a marriage, lawfully contracted, with a woman of his own caste, who is not another's betrothed, a man secures these six things—increase of religious merit, increase of means, offspring, alliance, increase of the dignity of his House, and true love."

That the woman should be of the same caste is, of course, an universal rule. She must not be at the time the betrothed of another man. Manu declares that the man who gives his daughter to one man after having promised her to another is as guilty as if he had slain a thousand relations by false witness in court (IX. 71 and VIII. 98). By a marriage lawfully contracted is meant one contracted in one of the four ways approved of in the Shastras. The fruits of marriage explain themselves. Notice only that the third and sixth correspond to the first and second in the preamble to the marriage service of the Church of England. The other four correspond, more or less roughly, to the third there. The commentator explains that the increase of means refers, not only to the dowry the woman brings with her, but to her careful management of her husband's house, "She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness."

II.—"Therefore, let a man select a girl who is such an one as follows. She should be of good family. Her father and mother should both be alive. She should be younger, and younger by at least three years, than himself. She should be the daughter of a house that reverences the sacred ordinances, that is rich, the members of which are kindly disposed one to the other, and that is rich in adherents. Her connections both on the mother's and on the father's side should be influential. She should have beauty, virtue, and auspicious marks. Her teeth, nails, ears, hair, eyes, and breasts must be neither too large nor too small, and she must not have lost any of these parts. She must be of sound constitution. (*Mutatis mutandis*) the young man should be of the same kind; but, in addition he must have completed the prescribed cour - of tudy."

The choice is to come from the man. The considerations which are to guide his choice call only for occasional comment. He himself, it is stipulated, must have gone through the prescribed course of study, and should therefore be sixteen or eighteen years of age. The provision that his choice ought to fall upon a girl who is at least two years younger than himself does not seem to contemplate a much greater disparity. The belief in the significance of marks on the body and other such indications was universal in antiquity, and has not yet died out. Varahamihira (died 587 A. D.), who can be shown to have used our book, devotes a chapter of his Brihat Sanhita to the subject in this connection, of which the last verse may be cited :—" A female having the upper lip very high, and the hair coarse at the ends, is fond of quarrelling. Generally speaking, vices will be found with the ugly, whereas the virtues reside where beauty dwells."

Vatsyayana now, according to a manner he much affects, qualifies what has been said by quoting the more liberal rule of an earlier writer.

III.—" According to Ghotakamukha, a man should marry the woman whom he deems likely to make him happy, if he can do so without incurring the censure of his friends."

The lad has made his choice, whether with due regard to all the considerations set out in the second rule, or in accordance with the more liberal rule of Ghotakamukha. How is his suit to be presented to the parents of the bride?

IV.—" The proper persons to present the suit are the father and mother of the young man, and their connexions : friends, too, on both sides, who are likely to be trusted."

The commentator explains " on both sides " as meaning " on the father's and on the mother's side. " The three rules immediately following, which are of an extremely entertaining character, refer to these friends, and suggest to me that what it really meant is friends intimate with both the families concerned. Kamandaki, in the Malatimadhava, is such a friend. The father and mother can only prefer the request : what the friends have to do is something quite different.

V.—" Such friends should din into the ears of the girl's mother and father the faults, observed, and by them foretold, of other suitors for her hand ; when they see an inclination to consent, they should cultivate that by dwelling on the good qualities, personal and hereditary, of their man. Let them dwell very specially on such of his advantages as are likely to commend themselves to the girl's mother."

VI.—"One may get himself up as an astrologer, and give a glowing account of the wealth that, if there be any truth in birds, omens, the courses of the stars, and marks on the body, must one day come to their friend."

VII.—Others in the same disguise may drive the mother of the girl wild by declaring that their friend stands a good chance of a much better alliance (with regard to which they are being consulted)."

The last clause here is the addition of the commentator. It seems to express the meaning intended. It is remarkable that directions, which have the effect, if indeed that was not the intention, of throwing ridicule on the whole of this astrological flummery, are followed immediately by a solemn statement of its importance. The explanation is perhaps afforded by the rule which follows next, from which it would appear that Vatsyayana is citing, out of respect, Ghotakamukha here.

VIII.—"For both he who sues for a maiden's hand and he who gives it should act in accordance with signs, omens, birds, and voices."

IX.—"Not by mere human choice : So says Ghotakamukha."

The flight of a blue jay on the left is an omen of success; the appearance of a cat an omen of failure. Kamandaki's left eye throbs as the action of the Malatimadhava begins, and she knows that that organ, which sees into the heart of things, bids her be of good hope. In the case of a man, the throbbing of the left eye would have been a bad omen. The "voices" are a little strange perhaps to us. In the dead of night an indication of how your undertaking is likely to prosper may be got from the words of belated wayfarers, passing under your windows; or you may rise early in the morning, go to a neighbouring house, and learn from the first words you hear whether the fates are going to be kind or not. The wooer and the father must make a careful study of all these things before doing anything rash : and as we have seen, the former at least would do well to see to it that human contrivings are not palmed off upon him.

X.—"Let him give up a girl who, when the wooers come to woo, is found asleep, in tears, or out. Let him shun also these sixteen—1, a girl with an unlucky name; 2, one who has been kept in concealment; 3, one who is betrothed to another man; 4, one with red hair; 5, one with spots; 6, a masculine woman; 7, one with a big head; 8, a bandy-legged woman; 9, one with a broad forehead; 10, one ceremonially

impure; 11, the fruit of an improper marriage; 12, one who has menstruated; 13, one who is or has been pregnant; 14, an old friend; 15, one who has a younger sister much handsomer than herself; and 16, one 'that hath a moist hand.'

"Let him not woo a girl, who is called after a constellation, or a river, or a tree, or one who is despised, or one who bears a name ending in l or r."

It ought to be said that the text here is a little uncertain, and that the meaning of some of the terms used is obscure. For 13, I have departed from the commentator, who takes phalinî to mean "dumb." For 16, as you will have noticed, I have been able to use a phrase which occurs, in a similar connection, in Othello.

XI.—"He will be a happy husband who marries the woman on whom his heart and his eye are set. Let a man not think of any other: So some say."

Vatsyayana is quoting Apastamba, and we are to understand that this rule, for those who accept it, is to brush away a good deal of what has gone before. The commentator, after the manner of his kind, makes a desperate effort to establish a harmony between such conflicting rules, and would have us believe that all that Vatsyayana means is, that this rule is to come in only when more maidens than one are eligible under the previous rules, when there is an embarassment of choice. But the "So some say" of the original is a clear indication of a rule that is conflicting with, not supplementary of, the preceding matter. The doctrine of the present rule is developed and illustrated in the next, in which Vatsyayana speaks of the art which should be used to induce the young man to fall into that condition which according to this text of the venerable Apastamba is the only legitimate precedent of a happy marriage. Apastamba deserves a place in our esteem with the "dead shepherd" whom Shakespeare praised—

> Now I find thy saw of might
> Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?

XII.—"Accordingly, when a girl is of an age to be given in marriage, her parents should dress her well. Every afternoon she should play with the girls of her acquaintance, always faultlessly got up. At a sacrifice, or a marriage, or wherever people come together, care should be taken to show her off. So also at festivals. For she is of the nature of merchandise."

This is not a rule which calls for much comment Doubtless, the last remark is not to be stretched unduly, beyond the context. But there are many references in the law books to the practice of the actual sale of daughters. Manu, III. 51, declares that no father who knows the law should take even the smallest gratuity for his daughter, for a man who, through avarice, takes a gratuity is a seller of his offspring. But in another place he has a rule regarding the practice, which is evidence that it must at one time have been to some extent prevalent. His rule will recall to those who know it the story of Jacob and Laban. Jacob served Laban seven years for his daughter Rachel, and when the time came was put off with her elder sister Leah. When he complained of this treatment, Laban gave him Rachel too, but made it a condition that he should serve over seven years for her. Now Manu, (VIII. 204) in a context where he is dealing with the law between buyer and seller, declares that "one commodity mixed with another must not be sold as pure, nor a bad one as good, nor less than the proper quantity of weight, nor anything that is not at hand or that is concealed." And he goes on to provide *enter alia* that "if, after one damsel has been shown, another be given to the bridegroom, he may marry them both for the same price."

XIII.—"When men fair to look on, courteous in speech, and accompanied by their connexions, come to propose marriage, the parent of the girl should receive them hospitably, and on some pretext or another show them the girl in all her ornaments. They should come to no decision as to giving the girl before they have consulted the oracles.

This consultation of the oracles (*daivaparikshana*) was, of course, done on both sides. The parents of the girl were bound in her interest to enquire of astrologers and the like as to whether the proposed marriage was likely or not to be to her advantage. So, too, the parents of the youth. But, in addition, as the Grihya Sutras show, the parents of the man were entitled to require the girl to submit herself, to a test of an extremely curious and unscientific character. I translate the passage in Asvalayana's manual of domestic religion. The person addressed in the following rules is the Hindoo who wishes to observe the whole law :—I.—"Let him first make an enquiry into the family (*i.e.*, of the bride or bridegroom as the case may be) according to the text 'Both on the mother's side, and on that of the father.'" A reference to the text cited shows that it was required that, on the

mother's and on the father's side, the family should for ten generations back have been conspicuous for knowledge of the Scriptures, penance, and good work. II.—"Let him give his daughter to a man of understanding." It is very noteworthy, and should be remembered to his credit, that intelligence is the only personal qualification on which Asvalayana insists as indispensable in a son-in-law. III.—"Let him marry a woman who has intelligence, beauty, virtue, and lucky marks upon her body; who is, moreover, of sound health." In addition to sound health, which is put separately, as if to mark its special importance, four things are required, of which three are perfectly intelligible to us—intelligence, beauty, and virtue—in that order be it noted. The fourth wears such an unfamiliar character to us, in the Europe of to-day, that it has misled the learned translator of the Grihya Sutras, who takes *buddhirûpasilalakshana* to mean, not "intelligence, beauty, virtue, and lucky marks on her body," but "the characteristics of intelligence, beauty, and moral conduct." The translation is not very intelligible, and it obscures the sense of what follows. For Asvalayana goes on IV.—"The lucky marks are hard to read." Dr. Oldenberg prefers the reading, "Since the lucky marks are hard to read," connecting this rule with the one which follows. This is the interpretation of the Hindoo commentator. I follow Stenzler in rejecting the "since." The quaint procedure which follows is not to take the place of an enquiry into the "intelligence, beauty, virtue and lucky marks of the girl," but to be superadded. In the present rule Asvalayana is only giving a caution, which is echoed by Vatsyayana, against attaching too much importance to marks that may deceive. V.—"Let him take eight clods of earth, and reciting over them the verse '*ritam agre*,' &c., say to the girl, 'Take one of these.'" VI.—"If she choose the piece that has been taken from a field that bears a double crop, let him know that her children will be rich in grain; if a piece from the byre, rich in cattle; if from the *débris* on the altar, rich in piety; if from a lake that never dries up, rich in all things; if from the gaming-ground, addicted to gambling; if from a place where four roads meet, addicted to wandering; if from barren land, barren: if from the burning ground, a death to their husbands."

The commentator, Gargya, says that the three last adjectives refer to the woman herself, but there is nothing in the text to justifiy this. Oldenberg's construction, according to which the last adjective only refers to the woman, is not supported by anything either in the text

or the commentary. It seems to me that the ordeal has reference only to the kind of children the woman is likely to bring forth—her own horoscope has been already read—and that the three last adjectives mean that she will bring forth wanton, barren, or murderous daughters.

XIV.—"The wooer's party will be asked to bathe, and so forth. They should say 'All that will come later.' They should not that day accept such attentions."

XV.—"Or let him woo according to the custom of the country, and then marry in one of the ways approved of in the Scriptures. Here ends the chapter on wooing."

At the end of his chapter on wooing Vatsyayana quotes some old verses—

"Social games, such as, for example, filling up '*bouts rimes*,' marriages, and intercourse generally, should be with a man's equals, not with those either above him or below him.

"A man marries above him when he marries a girl only to be treated by her and her friends as a servant ever afterwards; no man of spirit will do that."

"He marries below him when he and his people lord it over the girl, that is a bad marriage, it too is censured by the good."

"Where the love between husband and wife adds lustre to both, and is a source of joy to both families, that is the only marriage which is approved."

"Let a man if he will marry above him, and walk humbly among his wife's relations ever afterwards; but on no account let him do, what all good men disapprove of, marry beneath him."

This chapter, which I have given in full, treats of the usual preliminaries to marriage in the ordinary case, where the man selects the girl of his choice, but leaves it to go-betweens to arrange the match. Vatsyayana proceeds to speak of cases where, for one reason or another, this is not found practicable. A poor man, however excellent, a man who has all other virtues, but is of mean birth, a rich man, if he be a neighbour (this is noteworthy: the commentary refers it to the quarrels that are certain to come if the families to be connected by marriage live near each other!), a man who is not his own master, and one or two others, need not hope for a favourable answer to any deputation they may send. They are accordingly enjoined to woo the girls for themselves. They get minute directions how to do this,

and are in the end warned that, however great their success may be they must not expect their lady to confess her love. "For all the world knows that a girl, however much she may be in love, will not herself make any overtures to the man." Accordingly he must be quick to read the signs by which she will betray her passion. I must pass these over. There is much of the "touch of nature" in them. It ought, for example, to interest the sufferer of the present day to know that Vatsyayana held that the girl might be taken to be yielding if it was found that she could not look her lover in the face, and was put out when he looked at her, if she liked to be in his company, and made his friends her friends, if she gave him the flower from her hair, and made a point of wearing the flowers he sent her.

The state of society described in the Kamasutra is, as was to be expected, reflected in the literature. I propose to close this paper with an illustration of this. It is taken from Dandin's "Dasakumara-charita," a work written, so far as I can judge, in the ninth or tenth century. It would take me too far to show in detail how closely Dandin, in the extracts I am about to make, follows the Kamasutra. I will ask you to believe that the references are frequent and obvious. To give one example only, Vatsyayana lays it down that a good wife will waste nothing, use even the chaff of rice as polishing stuff. You will see how this comes out in the tale of how Saktikumara chose a wife. In the story Mitragupta, one of the ten princes who give the book its name, has fallen into the hands of a goblin, who puts four questions to him, and assures him that if he does not answer them, he will be eaten. One of the questions is, "What is the most pleasing and at the same time the most profitable possession of a 'householder'?" Mitragupta answers, "A good wife," and in support of his answer he tells the story of Gomini :—

"In the country of the Dravidas there is a town called Kanchi. A young merchant, by name Saktikumara, lived there, who was worth many crores. He, being eighteen years of age, fell a thinking. 'The man who has no wife, and the man who has a wife that does not suit him, are neither of them happy. How am I to find a good wife?' It seemed to him that if he took a wife on the report of others it must be a mere chance whether he made a happy marriage or not. Accordingly he disguised himself as an astrologer, and wandered from town to town with a small parcel of rice tied up in the end of his garment. All the people who had girls to marry brought them to

him, believing that he, as an astrologer, could read their fortunes from their appearance and the marks on their bodies. Whenever he saw a girl of his own caste, with the proper features and marks, he would say to her 'My good girl, could you make me a dinner out of this handful of rice?' From house to house he was laughed away with scorn. In the course of his wanderings he came to a town on the bank of the Kaveri river, in the country of the Sibis. There he saw a girl, with hardly any ornaments on, who was shown to him by her foster-mother. She had lost with her father and mother all her fortune, and her house was poverty-stricken. But his eye clave to her. And he said to himself (I spare the Society and myself the inventory of female charms which follows, noting only that it is closely modelled on our book) 'A form like this cannot give the lie to her disposition. And my heart cleaves to this girl. Still I must put her to the test before I marry her. For he who acts without reflection, has many occasions to be sorry afterwards.' Accordingly, with a kindly smile, he said to her: 'My good girl, do you think you could make me a dinner, with all the usual accompaniments, out of this handful of rice?' She made a sign to the old nurse, who took the rice out of his hand, washed his feet, and made him sit down on a terrace that had been well washed and rubbed with cow-dung. While the nurse was doing this the girl dried the rice for a little in the sun, turning the heap over every now and then. When it was sufficiently dry, she beat it gently with a hollow rod so as to separate the grain from the husk. Then she said to the nurse, 'Mother, take these husks to the goldsmiths, who use them for burnishing their ornaments, and with the cowries you get for them bring some pieces of wood. See that they are hard, and neither too moist nor too dry at the heart. Buy also an earthen cooking pot so big, and two drinking vessels.' When she had arranged for this she put the rice into a mortar of kakhubha wood, which was neither too deep nor too shallow, and which bulged out in the middle. With a long heavy pestle of khadira wood, bound at the head with iron, and sloping a little inwardly at the middle, she pounded the rice, gracefully exercising her arm with the up and down stroke, and every now and then with the fingers of her other hand sifting the rice. Next she winnowed the rice of all impurities, washed it more than once in water, and, after due worship paid to the hearth, [she threw a little rice in the fire] she put the rice into five times its own quantity of boiling water. When the rice

softened, and leapt in the pot, the moment it was past the condition of buds on a tree, she lessened the fire, and putting a cover on the pot, tilted it over, and drew off the water. Then she stirred the rice for a little, and when the whole of it was equally well cooked, she took the pot off the fire, and set it down face downwards. The wood was still sound at the core: she poured water on it, and extinguishing the fire, made charcoal. This she sent to the dealers in that article, bidding the nurse bring, with the cowries got for it, vegetables, ghee, curds, oil, an amala berry and a tamarind, as much as she could get. With these she made two or three relishes. The rice water had all this time been standing in a new jug, round which earth kept moist had been heaped. She gently fanned it with a palm leaf. She put salt in, and perfumed it by exposing it to the smoke of burning charcoal. Next she polished the amala berry and flavoured it with a lotus. And now she bade him, by the mouth of her nurse, bathe. She herself bathed and made herself clean, and was ready to hand him the oil and amala berry in due order. After his bath he mounted a bench on the clean dry terrace, and fell to wiping the drinking vessels, which, with a little water in them, she had placed before him on a pale green leaf from the plantain tree in the court of her house, which she had been careful to cut so as to leave the joint and a quarter of the leaf on the tree. She gave him first the drink she had prepared. He drank and forgot his weariness: his heart rejoiced and the water moistened every limb. Then she gave him two spoonfuls of the rice water, a little butter, dall, and one of her relishes. The rest of the rice she made him eat with the curds, cardamoms, green stuff, and cool and fragrant buttermilk and rice water. He was satisfied, and there was food over. He called for water. She poured into a platter for him water from a new jar fragrant with aloe, the patala and the lotus flowers. He put his mouth to the platter; the pattering drops cold as snow made his eyes redden and his eyelids curve, the sound of the falling stream gladdened his ears, his cheeks roughened as the pile on them rose to the pleasure of the cold touch, his nostrils opened wide to take in the rush of perfume, his tongue revelled in the sweetness of the draught: he drunk the clear bright water till he was full up to the throat. He shook his head for her to stop, when from another vessel she gave him water to rinse his mouth. The nurse took away the remains of the dinner, and he, spreading his garments on the clean floor, lay down for a little. He was satisfied, and

married her according to law. Some time afterwards, showing in that little regard for her, he took a dancing girl into his harem. She waited on her as a friend. Her husband she served continuously as her god. She fully discharged all her household duties. By an ocean of courtesy she attached her husband's kinsfolk to her. Enslaved by her merits Saktikumara put her in charge of all his house, and made her lord of his life and body. In her he found the three things men desire—religion, wealth, and pleasure. Said I not well that a good wife is her husband's choicest treasure?"

Art. XI.—*Carlyle's hitherto unpublished Lectures on the periods of European Culture, as preserved in the Anstey MS., in the possession of the Society. Part. I.* By R. P. Karkaria, Esq.

[Read, 31st August 1891.]

When our Honorary Secretary, whose brief tenure of office has already been signalised by the re-discovery, as I may term it, of our valuable Dante MS., by the tracing and settling of the history of our Assyrian Relics and Inscriptions, whose decipherment promises to throw some new light on ancient Assyrian history, and the order that has been slowly evolved out of the chaotic mass of geological specimens in our Museum, requested me to write a paper on another precious literary MS. in our possession, I hesitated a good deal before I consented. For what, I thought, has an Asiatic Society to do with Carlyle and the periods of European Culture? But I was encouraged by the fact that only last year our Asiatic Society had shown its readiness to listen to a valuable paper by Mr. Macdonell on Dante, a subject equally, if not further removed from the aims of an Oriental Society. Nay, to judge from the unusually large attendance of members on that occasion, it seemed that the Society liked such papers better than other purely Oriental ones. Therefore I hoped that the indulgence which was granted to Dante might be extended to Carlyle, especially as the words, spoken by him more than half a century ago, are here given out to the world almost for the first time since they were uttered. Nor are some parts of his lectures so very removed from our legitimate province. What he says about Belief and Unbelief, for example, at great length and from different points of view, is applicable to the East as well as to the West. Again his sympathetic manner of looking at old and worn-out creeds like those of the ancient Greeks and Romans, and his vindication of the sincerity of these peoples from the charges of quackery and falsehood, should be very instructive to those who treat the ancient though by no means worn-out creeds of India and the East.

The immediate occasion of Carlyle mounting the platform and giving lectures to a 'dandiacal' audience, against whom he had inveighed

in *Sartor*, was his straitened pecuniary circumstances His object was, as he himself says in these lectures of Shakespeare, 'to gather a little money, for he was very necessitous.' Thus it was his poverty consented not his will. Though by the year 1838 he had done some of his best work, written *Sartor*, which is now the most widely read of his works (Dr. Smiles, *Memoir of Murray*, Vol. II., p. 325), and just finished his grand epic of the French Revolution, besides having written some of his best shorter essays, Carlyle had not yet emerged into fame. The vast public which later on learnt to admire his writings, in spite of their superficial uncouthness and repulsiveness, had not yet arisen. He had yet to educate and almost to create the public taste to appreciate his works. His books therefore could either find no publisher at all, or, if published, bring him no profit whatever. He was, as a consequence, in constant dread of misery and ruin. But amidst this gloom of darkness there was one ray of hope. A prophet has proverbially no honour in his own country. But beyond the Atlantic, in the new home which his countrymen had found for their shattered liberties, they showed greater discernment. Carlyle was honoured there as a rising great teacher. The Americans could appreciate the philosophy of Herr Teufelsdröch, and, what was of more vital importance, could pay in hard dollars for it, much earlier than the British Philistine. Moreover, he had kind friends there especially, the Emersons, who would willingly do everything for him. So Carlyle almost resolved to have nothing more to do with the Old England that had treated him so harshly, and to start for New and kinder England,—'to buy a rifle and spade, and withdraw to the Transatlantic Wilderness, far from human beggaries and basenesses,' as he himself put it vigorously. (Reminiscences ed. Froude, Vol. II., p. 180.) Thus his country was about to lose him just at the time when he had reached the maturity of his powers. Some keen-sighted friends, who knew what a loss and a shame it would be to let such a man go, resolved to keep him back still. It was known that he was going to America in response to an invitation to lecture there. So these friends, chief among whom was Harriet Martineau and the Wilsons, prevailed upon him to remain and lecture at home.

Carlyle had a great horror of mounting the platform, and hated this kind of work. "The excitement of lecturing," says Mr. Froude, whose *Life* of his great master, is worthy to rank by the side of Boswell and

Lockhart, Carlyle's own *Sterling* and Sir George Trevelyan's *Macaulay* as one of the very best biographies in any literature, "so elevating and agreeable to most men, seemed to depress, and irritate him." (*Life in Lonn*, Vol. I., p. 188.) An observer, Sir George Pollock, who had just then been called to the bar, writes of 'Carlyle in the agony of lecturing with firmset mouth, painful eyes, and his hands convulsively grasped, suffering as one might fancy an Indian would at the stake!" (Personal Reminiscences, Vol I., 177.) Carlyle himself writes to Emerson: "I shall be in the agonies of lecturing! Ah me! Often when I think of the matter how my one sole wish is to be left to hold my tongue, and by what bayonets of Necessity clapt to my back, I am driven to that lecture-room, and in what mood, and ordered to speak or die, I feel as if my only utterance should be a flood of tears and blubbering! But that, clearly will not do. Then, again, I think it is perhaps better so; who knows?" (Correspondence of Carlyle and Emerson. ed. Prof. Norton, Vol. I., p. 156.) It was better so, and he was persuaded in the end, 'Detestable mixture of prophecy and play actorism, as I sorrowfully defined it,' he grumbles; 'nothing could well be hatefuller to me; but I was obliged. And she, oh she was my angel, and unwearied helper and comforter in all that; how we drove together, we poor two, to our place of execution; she with a little drop of brandy to give me as the very last; and shone round me like a bright aureola, when all else was black and chaos!' (Reminiscences ed. Froude, Vol. II., p. 187.) Miss Martineau got together about 200 friends who consented to listen to him discoursing on German literature, his favourite subject. This was the first course of lectures, and it proved a success, though Henry Taylor, who was present at the first lecture, had augured otherwise. Writing to Miss Fenwick on May 6, 1837, he says: 'He was nervous in the extreme insomuch that he told me nothing but the determination not to be beaten could have brought him through the first lecture. Nervous difficulties take much of course from the effect, which they might otherwise have; but I doubt whether under any circumstances, he would have much charm for a fashionable London auditory. He wants all the arts and dexterities which might propitiate them. But though I fear he has no chance of much success, I think his *naiveté* and the occasional outbreaks of his genius and spirit will save him from being considered as a signal failure. His nervousness makes me dreadfully nervous in listening to him, so that I find the greatest relief when he is done.'

(Correspondence of Henry Taylor ed. Dr. Dowden, p. 81.) Carlyle did not write out his lectures, but insisted on *speaking* to his audience. As it does not appear that this course was reported in full, it seems to be now lost.

Encouraged by this success, his friends got up a second course. It was to be on the periods of European Culture. The lectures were to be twelve in number, the subscription for each ticket being two guineas. They were delivered in 17, Edward Street, Portman Square, during the months of April, May and June, 1838. The first lecture was given on Monday, April 30, and the rest on the succeeding Mondays and Fridays of each week. The portrait which Caroline Fox has drawn two years later of Carlyle as he appeared while lecturing is graphic and may be given here: "Carlyle soon appeared and looked as if he felt a well-dressed London audience scarcely the arena for him to figure in as popular lecturer. He is a tall, robust-looking man; rugged simplicity and indomitable strength are in his face, and such a glow of genius in it—not always smouldering there, but flashing from his beautiful grey eyes, from the remoteness of their deep setting under that massive brow. His manner is very quiet, but he speaks like one tremendously convinced of what he utters, and who had much—very much—in him that was quite unutterable, quite unfit to be uttered to the uninitiated ear; and when the Englishman's sense of beauty or truth exhibited itself in vociferous cheers, he would impatiently, almost contemptuously, wave his hand, as if that were not the sort of homage which Truth demanded. He began in a rather low nervous voice with a broad Scotch accent, but it soon grew firm and shrank not abashed from its great task." (Journals and Letters, Vol. I., p. 152.) Monckton Milnes, afterwards Lord Houghton, too, was favourably impressed. 'The most notable things in your way,' wrote he to Aubrey de Vere in 1838, 'have been Carlyle's Lectures; they have been perhaps more interesting than anything else, as all picturesque history must be, and he talks as graphically as his "French Revolution." His personality is most attractive. There he stands, simple as a child, and his happy thought dances on his lips and in his eyes, and takes word and goes away, and he bids it God-speed, whatever it be.' (*Life of Lord Houghton* by Mr. Wemyss Reid, Vol. I., p. 220.) But Carlyle struck another observer quite differently. George Ticknor, the American historian of Spanish literature, was in London while Carlyle was

delivering his second course of lectures, and he thus writes of him in his journal: "He is a rather small, spare, ugly Scotchman, with a strong accent, which I should think he takes no pains to mitigate. His manners are plain and simple, but not polished, and his conversation much of the severe sort. To-day he spoke, as I think he commonly does, without notes, and therefore as nearly extempore as a man can who prepares himself carefully, as it was plain he had done. He was impressive, I think, though such lecturing could not well be very popular, and in some parts, if not poetical, he was picturesque. He was nowhere obscure, nor were his sentences artificially constructed, though some of them no doubt savoured of his peculiar manner." (*Life of Ticknor,* Vol. II., p. 180.) "This time," says Mr. Froude, "he succeeded brilliantly, far better than on his first experiment." The money result was nearly £300 after all expenses had been paid,—a great blessing, as Carlyle said, to a man that had been haunted by the squalid spectre of beggary. But a greater blessing was that it had a great influence on many men who have since become famous. Frederic Denison Maurice, another great 'guide of English thought in matters of faith' in this century, said that 'he had been more edified by Carlyle's Lectures of 1838 than by anything he had heard for a long while, and that he had then the greatest reverence for Carlyle. (*Life of Maurice* by his Son, Vol. I., p. 251.)

As to his method of lecturing it appears that Carlyle usually brought some notes with him to the lecture-room, but never used them. Miss Kate Perry, writing to Sir Henry Taylor in 1882 about her reminiscences of Carlyle's Lectures of 1840, says: "I remember Jenny imitating him very funnily when looking at his notes. After his hour was over, he said: 'I find I have been talking to you all for one hour and twenty minutes, and not said *one word* of what is down on this sheet of paper, the subject-matter of our lecture to-day. I ask your indulgence, though you have good right not to give it to me, so good morning.' I dare say you were also present at that lecture, and remember the amusement it caused." (Correspondence of Sir H. Taylor ed. Dowden, p. 400.) The present course, too, was not written out, but strictly spoken though he had prepared himself carefully for it, especially the Greek and Roman parts. "Classics," as Mr. Froude says, "are not the strong point of an Edinburgh education, and the little he had learnt there was rusty." So he had to

read up his classics for the first three lectures. The lectures were briefly reported in the *Examiner* by Leigh Hunt, who, as Dr. Granett truly says, is always forgetting the reporter in the critic. Thus with the exception of this short notice of Hunt, the course was supposed to have been lost. "It must ever be a source of regret," says Mr. Wylie, in his 'Life of Carlyle,' "to the students of Carlyle's writings that, while the reporters of the London Press were, in that summer of 1838, busy preserving every word of the orations of men who are already forgotten, this poor fragment is all that has come down to us of a series of lectures which would have thrown so much light on the story of Carlyle's spiritual life" (p. 169).

But since this was written Dr. Dowden has published in the *Nineteenth Century* (May 1881) some extracts from a note-book containing a report of the lectures. Dr. Dowden's report, however, to judge from the extracts he has given, is, as Dr. Garnett says, a blundering one, and he has omitted many characteristic passages. Our MS., though like Dr. Dowden's, it wants one lecture, *viz.*, the ninth, is very accurate and has no other omissions like those in the latter. This omission of the ninth Lecture, which was on French Scepticism, is not, I think, a serious one. For Carlyle himself notes in his Journal: 'On Voltaire and French Scepticism is the worst, as I compute, of all. On the day I was stupid and sick beyond expression; also I did not *like* the man, a fatal circumstance of itself, I had to hover vague on the surface. The people seemed content enough. I myself felt sincerely disgusted. That is the word.' (Froude, I., 137.) Moreover, there is an excellent summary of this lecture at the beginning of the tenth. On collating all the extracts given by Dr. Dowden with the corresponding passages in our MS., I have found that the reading of the latter is in every case superior, and is free from the blunders of the former. In a passage in the first lecture the Dowden MS. has this sentence: "Their first feature was what we may call the central feature of all others *existing vehemence*.' *Existing* clearly gives no sense, and Dr. Dowden, suspecting this, has conjectured *exhausting*. But our MS. has *exciting vehemence*, which is the apposite epithet. A little further there is this: "The sun of Poetry stared upon him." We have *shone* instead of *stared*, which is much better. In the sixth lecture, speaking of the great favour which Calderon has with the Germans, he says: "But I suspect that there is very much of *forced*

taste in this." Both MSS. give "forced taste," but in our MS. there is a marginal note which says that this was not the expression used, "but I suppose it was the meaning of a technical word, which I did not catch." In the tenth lecture there is a ludicrous mistake in the Dowden MS. "In spite of early training I never do see sorites of logic hanging together, put in regular order, but Ic onclude that it is going to end in some *niaiserie*, in some miserable delusion." This is our reading. But the Dowden MS. has *measure*, the reading evidently of an ignorant transcriber, instead of the French word *niaiserie*, which is, of course, the only appropriate one in the place. In the eleventh lecture there is this sentence in the Dowden MS.: "It was the primeval feeling of nature they came to crush but * * rallied." Dr. Dowden says that there is a word omitted in his MS., and he conjectures "the spirit of France rallied." But our MS. has the full sentence, "It was the primeval feeling of nature they came to crush, and round it the old spirit of fanaticism had rallied." Towards the close of the third lecture, the Dowden MS. omits a 'no' in a sentence and thus makes it illogical. 'It was given to Tacitus to see *no* deeper into the matter than appears from the above account of it.' The *no* is in our MS. In the first lecture, instead of 'faculty' which is in our MS. and is the proper word, the other has 'facility.' These are only the more prominent discrepancies. I have noted many more of a less serious nature. They all prove our MS. to be superior and more accurate; and, as far as can be judged, a correct and full report of Carlyle's famous lectures.

A few words now about the writer of the MS., who has preserved these lectures for the world. The audience which attended his lectures is thus described by Jane Welsh Carlyle. 'In quality the audience is unsurpassable; there are women so beautiful and intelligent that they look like emancipations from the moon; and men whose faces are histories in which one may read with ever new interest.' (Letters and Memorials ed. Froude, Vol. I., p. 93.) Carlyle himself in one of his letters to his mother, writes: "My audience was supposed to be the best, for rank, beauty, and intelligence, ever collected in London. I had bonnie braw dames, Ladies this, Ladies that, though I dared not look at them for fear they should put me out. I had old men of fourscore; men middle-aged, with fine steel-grey beards; young men of the Universities, of the law profession, all sitting quite mum there, and the Annandale voice golly-

ing at them." (Froude, *Life in London*, Vol. I., p. 140.) Among these last, mentioned by Carlyle, was a young man who afterwards lived to achieve a great success in his profession, as well as some in politics, in two continents. Mr. Thomas Anstey was studying law at about this time in London and was this year called to the bar. It speaks much about his critical discrimination and foresight that he should have been at so much pains to have a full report of these lectures for his private use, at a time when Carlyle was not much known beyond the little circle of his personal friends. Later on, taking notes of Carlyle's lectures became it seems fashionable, among ladies especially, as Caroline Fox records in her Journal, April 19, 1841, that 'Sterling spoke of ladies taking notes at Carlyle's lectures of dates, not thoughts, and these all wrong.' (*op. cit.* Vol. I., p. 230.) Mr. Anstey has preserved also his ticket of admission to the course, which is signed by Carlyle himself, and is numbered 64. It is pasted on the inside of the cover of the MS. When Anstey's vast library was dispersed at his death in 1873, our Society bought this MS. among other valuable books. And we owe it to the excellent judgment of our then Honorary Secretary, the late Mr. James Taylor, that we possess this precious MS. of lectures, whose supposed loss has been lamented by students of Carlyle.

The method which has been followed in the treatment of the MS. is something like that which Carlyle has himself graphically described in one of his Essays. "You go through his writings and all other writings, where he or his pursuits are treated of, and whereever you find a passage with his name in it, you cut it out, and carry it away. In this manner a mass of materials is collected, and the building now proceeds apace. Stone is laid on the top of stone, a trowel or two of biographic mortar, if perfectly convenient, being spread in here and there, by way of cement; and so the strange pile suddenly arises; amorphous, pointing every way but to the zenith, here a block of granite, there a mass of pipeclay; till the whole finishes, when the materials are finished!" (*Miscellanies*, Vol. I., p. 3.) Such a thing therefore will be the following paper. The sole object is to give some idea of the wealth of matter and manner contained in these lectures. Typical passages will therefore be quoted in full. As Dr. Garnett says, these Lectures contain 'Carlyle's opinions on a number of topics not elsewhere treated by him,' care will be taken to present such. On the whole, there will be little of my own, and I shall achieve my object if I earn Charles II.'s famous

compliment to Godolphin of being never in the way and never out of it.

Carlyle commences his course with a few introductory words on the greatness and dignity of Literature and on the importance of treating literary history, that is, the record of what men have thought, before political history, the narration of what they have done. "It must surely be an interesting occupation to follow the stream of mind from the period at which the first great spirits of our Western World wrote and flourished, down to these times. He who would pursue the investigation, however, must commence by inquiring what it was these men *thought*, before he enquires what they *did*, for after all they were solely remarkable for Mind, Thought, Opinion,—opinion which clothed itself in Action. And their opinions have survived in their books. A Book affords matter for deep meditation. Upon the shelves books seem queer, insignificant things—but in reality there is nothing so important as a book is. It stirs up the minds of men long after the author has sunk into the grave and continues to exert its corresponding influence for ages. Authors, unlike heroes, therefore, do not need to be illuminated by others, they are themselves luminous. This thought that was produced to-day,—the pamphlet that was published to-day, are only as it were reprints of thoughts that have circulated ever since the world began. And we are interested in its history for the thought is alive with us, and it lives when we are dead." It may be noted that later on, at the close of the fourth lecture, Carlyle, in a passage seemingly—but seemingly only—contradictory to this, places noble action above even noble utterance through books. Speaking of the comtempt with which the medieval warriors looked upon the art of writing, he says: "Though writing is one of the noblest utterances, for speech is so,—there are other ways besides that of expressing one's self; and to lead a Heroic life is, perhaps, on the whole, a greater thing to do than to write a Heroic Poem . . . Actions only will be found to have been preserved when writers are forgotten. Homer will one day be swallowed up in Time, and so will all the greatest writers that have ever lived; and comparatively this is very little matter. But actions will not be destroyed; their influence must live: good or bad, they will live through Eternity, for the weal or woe of the doer! In particular the good actions will flow on in the course of time, unseen perhaps, but just as a vein of water flowing underground, hidden in general,

but at intervals breaking out to the surface in many a well for the refreshment of men!" No one need blame Carlyle for thus dissenting from the famous view of Aristotle, in order to agree with Bacon in preferring an active to a contemplative life.

Carlyle has no sympathy with those who would frame a theory for explaining every fact in the political, social, as well as literary world. Though he later on adopted what Mr. Herbert Spencer sarcastically calls the "great man theory," though he is capable of saying the "history of the world is but the Biographies of great men" (*Heroes*, p. 1), and though he may be said to have written his greatest and most laborious works to illustrate this cardinal theory which runs like a fine thread through all his teaching, yet at the outset of these lectures, he refuses to frame any theory about the history of European culture. Indeed, somewhat strangely, he says that such theories are almost impossible, not only in the present subject but almost everywhere else in human things. "There is very great difficulty in reducing this generation of thought to a perfect theory, as indeed there is with everything else, except perhaps the stars only, and even they are not reduced to theory,—not perfectly at least,—for although the solar system is quite established as such, it seems doubtful whether it does not in its turn revolve round other solar systems; and so any theory is in fact only imperfect. This phenomenon therefore is not to be theorised on." It is to be wished that these wise words had been borne in mind by another historian of the same subject as this of Carlyle, Dr. Draper, whose "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe" is thoroughly vitiated by his absurd "physiological theory" that the progress of society resembles that of a human being from childhood to old age. Emerson, whose lectures on Human culture were delivered in Boston at about the same time as his friend Carlyle's, and were, as Carlyle himself noted, 'on the very subject I am to discourse upon here in May coming,' treated the subject in the light of a curious theory of his own. Culture, according to him, is the unfolding of a man's potentialities, and is a discipline so universal as to demonstrate that no part of a man is made in vain. And he demonstrated this in successive lectures on the hands, the head, the eye and ear, the heart, etc. (cf. Memoir of Emerson, by J. E. Cabot, Vol. I., p. 322, Vol. II., 351). In spite however of his disclaimer, Carlyle too has a theory in these lectures or rather a central idea, which runs through them all and connects the whole. With him belief and

faith is the one thing needful in human affairs, and disbelief and doubt the cancer of the mind eating all life and vigour out of it and paralyzing its activity. He judges periods and nations by this standard, and according as belief or doubt prevails, he praises or condemns them. In the history of European culture he views the steady progress of belief retarded at certain points by periods of doubt and unbelief. A succession of faiths runs through all the ages from the earliest times to the nineteenth century, with intervals of scepticism between them at certain periods. In the early times there prevailed the faiths of Greece and Rome. These were followed by the Christian faith, after a short reign of scepticism under Pyrrho, Sextus Empiricus and Seneca. The Christian faith had continued to rule for a long time till it was seriously checked by the scepticism of the eighteenth century, represented by Hume in England, Voltaire in France, and the early writings of Goethe, especially his *Werther* in Germany. This again was followed by the revival of faith in the beginning of the nineteenth century, faith not exactly Christian, but a considerably modified form of it, of which Goethe was the herald on the continent. Carlyle has divided his course into four periods accordingly, corresponding to these successions of faith. The first period treated in three lectures is taken up with Greece and Rome, their Pagan faith as well as Pagan scepticism. The second and longest period, treated in five lectures, treats of the Christian Faith and its influence on culture in the four chief countries of Europe: Italy, Spain, Germany and England. France has the chief place in the third period of scepticism, which interrupted and modified the course of the Christian Faith, and is treated in three lectures. The last period of the revival of faith in this century is treated at great length in a single closing lecture on Modern German literature, especially Goethe and his works.

He begins the first period of European culture with the Greeks in whose history he traces three epochs, after the introduction of civilized arts into the country and the formation of societies. The first is the siege of Troy, which happened in the 12th century B.C. The second was that of the Persian invasion, during which 'their fate trembled in the iron scale of destinay for while.' "It is a pity that during this time we have but little information as to the influence produced upon them by the aspect of their beautiful country, its lofty mountains and fertile valleys, the gigantic trees which clothed the

summits and sides of their craggy precipices, and all so beautifully set off by the bright sky which was shining upon them; as well as the means by which all this was rendered serviceable to them in the ways of daily life. It is only battles that are marked by historians, but subjects like these are rarely noticed." Carlyle, it would thus seem, has adopted the views of Montesquieu, whose great work, as is well known, treats of such influences upon history, views which have been carried to an absurd extreme by the late Mr. Buckle in his great historical fragment. The third epoch is that of Alexander the Great. Like the other two it also has reference to the East. "It was the flower-time of Greece,—her history is as that of a tree from its sapling state to its decline,—and at this period she developed an efflorescence of genius such as no other country ever beheld. But it speedily ended in the shedding of her flowers and in her own decay. From that time she continued to fall and Greece has never again been such as she then was. Europe was henceforth to develop herself on an independent footing, and it had been so ordered that Greece was to begin that. As to their peculiar physiognomy among nations, they were in one respect an extremely interesting people, but in another unamiable and weak entirely. There is a remarkable similarity in character of the French to these Greeks. Their first feature was what we may call the central feature of all others, exciting vehemence, not exactly strength, for there was no permanent coherence in it as in strength, but a sort of fiery impetuosity or vehemence, never anywhere so remarkable as among the Greeks, except among the French. But connected with this vehemence and the savageness to which it led, they had an extraordinary delicacy of taste and genius in them. They had a prompt dexterity in seizing the relations of objects, a beautiful and quick sense in perceiving the places in which the things lay all round the world which they had to work with; and which without being entirely admirable was in their own internal province highly useful. So the French, with their undeniable barrenness of genius, have yet in a remarkable manner the faculty of expressing themselves with precision and elegance, to so singular a degree that no ideas or inventions can possibly become popularised till they are presented to the world by means of the French language.*

* *Cf.* "The French are great indeed as cooks of everything, whether an idea or a lump of meat; they will make something palatable of the poorest notion and the barest bone," one of the sayings of Carlyle recorded by Lord Houghton in his Commonplace Book, and now first published in his *Life* by Mr. W. Reid, Vol. II., 479.

"And this is true of history and of all things now in the world of all philosophy, of everything else. But in philosophy, poetry and all things, the Greek *genius* displayed itself with as curious a felicity as the French does in frivolous exercises. Singing or music was the central principle of the Greeks, not a subordinate one. And they were right. What is not musical is rough and hard and cannot be harmonised. Harmony is the essence of art and science. The mind moulds to itself the clay and makes it what it will. The Pelasgic Architecture, which still subsists in its huge walls of stones formed of immense *bolars* piled one upon another, presents, I am told now, at the distance of 3,000 years, the evidence of most magnificent symmetry and an eye to what is beautiful. Their poems are equally admirable. Their statuary comprise still the highest things that we have to show for ourselves in that art. Phidias, for example, had the same spirit of harmony, and the matter of his art was obedient to him * * * This spirit of harmony operated directly in him, informing all parts of his mind,—thence transferring itself into statuary and seen with the eye and filling the hearts of all people. Thence Carlyle passes to consider the religion of the Greeks. Polytheism at first sight seems an inextricable mass of confusions and delusions. But there was no doubt some meaning in it for the people. It may be explained in one of two ways: the first is that the fable was only an allegory to explain the various relations of natural facts, of spiritual facts and material; and much learning has been expended on this theory, which is called Hermenism.* Bacon himself wrote upon it in his treatise 'De Sapientia Veterum.' But Carlyle characteristically inclines to the other theory that their gods were simply their Kings and Heroes whom they afterwards deified. 'Man is always venerable to man ; great men are sure to attract worship or reverence in all ages, and in ancient times it is not wonderful that sometimes they were accounted as gods. For the most imaginative of us can scarcely conceive the feelings with which the earliest of the human species looked abroad on the world around them. At first doubtless they regarded nothing but the gratifications of their wants, as in fact wild people do yet. But the man would soon begin to ask himself whence he was, what were his flesh and blood, what he

* *Sic.* in MS., but Anstey has himself queried it on the margin, as it is obviously wrong.

himself was who was not here a short time ago, who will not be here much longer, but still existing a conscious individual in this immense universe. The theories so formed would be extremely extravagant, and little would suffice to shape this system into Polytheism. For it is really in my opinion a blasphemy against human nature to attribute the whole of the system to quackery and falsehood."

Carlyle then defends their Divination, the grand nucleus round which Polytheism formed itself, the constituted core of the whole matter. He sees no quackery about it. On the contrary he sees a great deal of reason in their oracles. If the divine who entered into the deep dark chasm at Dodona for inspiration, "was a man of devout frame of mind, he must surely have then been in the best state of feeling for foreseeing the future and giving advice to others. No matter how this was carried, by divination or otherwise, so long as the individual suffered himself to be wrapt in union with a higher being. I like to believe better of Greece than that she was completely at the mercy of fraud and falsehood in these matters." Surely this sympathetic way of inquiring into the past, entering into the minds and hearts of men of a distant age to think and feel as they thought and felt more than two thousand years ago, is much superior to the supercilious manner of viewing and criticising the creeds and customs of ancient times by importing our modern views into the distant and dim past. And this sympathetic manner, this trying to see good and wisdom in ancient customs, to find out their true basis in sincerity and reason in no way inferior to our own, if applied to the customs and creeds of our ancestors and of ancient India, would lead to much better results, would tend to make us much wiser than the negative barren criticism of antiquity pursued with the vanity of extolling our times at the expense of the past. But to return to Carlyle. This acquittal of Greece from the charge of fraud and falsehood and quackery in her ancient religious system is all the more emphatic, coming as it does from such a hater of sham and quackery in every shape and guise as Carlyle. 'The Greeks discovered, indenpedently of their idolatry, that truth which is in every man's heart, and to which no thinking man can refuse his assent, they recognised a destiny, a great dumb black power ruling during time, which knew nobody for its master, and in its decrees was as inflexible as adamant, and every one knew that it was there.' Such therefore was the Religion of the Greeks to whose Literature he passes in the second lecture.

The first to be treated are the poems of Homer which Carlyle, quoting Joannes von Müller, says are the oldest books of importance, next after the Bible. 'There are none older even among the Chinese, for in spite of what has been said about their works, there is no evidence that any of them are older than the poems of Homer, some there are about the same age, but very insignificant, such as romances or chronicles.' Carlyle was misinformed as regards the earliest Chinese book of importance, which is the celebrated *Yih-king* or Book of Changes, the first of the famous Nine Classics. This work, which is a philosophical treatise, first saw the light according to Prof. R. K. Douglas within a prison's walls in 1150 B. C., its author, Wan-Wang, having been imprisoned for a political offence. As to Homer, who he was and whether he was the real author of the Homeric poems, very little is known. Carlyle does not believe in one Homer, the author of the Homeric poems. 'Indeed, the only argument in favour of Homer being the real author, is derived from the common opinion on the point, and from the unity of the poem, of which it was once said, that it was as unlikely that it should be owing to an accidental concurrence of different writers as that by an accidental arrangement of the types it should have been printed.' But Carlyle on reading the poem again, could not find this unity, 'I became completely convinced that it was not the work of one man. One may cut out two or three books without making any alteration in its unity.' But yet the character of Homer's poems is the best among all poems. For in the first place they are the delineation of something more ancient than themselves and more simple, and therefore more interesting, as being the impressions of a primeval mind, the proceedings of a set of men, our spiritual progenitors. The first things of importance in 'the world's history are mentioned there. Secondly, they possess qualities of the highest character of whatever age or country. The Greek genius never exceeded what was done by the authors of those poems which are known as the writings of Homer.* ' And these qualities may be reduced to two heads: " First, Homer does not believe his story to be a fiction. He believed his

* *Cf.* "All history should aim at resembling the Iliad, remembering it is a greater task than the human mind is capable of, really and literally, to present the smallest fact as it itself appeared," one of Carlyle's sayings (*apud* Reid, *Life of Lord Houghton*, Vol. II., p. 441).

narratives to be strictly true. Secondly, the poem of the Iliad was actually intended to be sung—*it sings itself*—not only the cadence, but the whole thought of the poem sings itself, as it were. Now, if we take these two things and add them together, the combination makes up the essence of the best poem that can be written. There is more of character in his second poem, which treats of a higher state of civilization. Its hero Ulysses, is the very model of the Type-Greek, a perfect image of the Greek genius, a shifty, nimble active man involved in difficulties, but every now and then bobbing up out of darkness and confusion, victorious and intact."

But we must leave Homer interesting as he is, and pass on to the philosophers of the Greeks, among whom Pythagoras was the greatest in the earlier times. 'What will immortalise Pythagoras is his discovery of the square of the hypotenuse. It seems that he may rather be said not to have invented it, but imported, for I understand the Hindoos and other people of the East have long known it.' Next comes the historian Herodotus whose 'work is, properly speaking, an Encyclopædia of the various nations, and displays in a striking manner the innate spirit of harmony that was in the Greeks. It is the spirit of order which has constituted him the prose poet of his century.' As regards his credibility, Herodotus is most veracious when he writes from his own observation; but 'when he does not profess to know the truth of his narratives, it is curious to see the sort of Arabian Tales which he collects together.' Of the great Tragedians, Æschylus is held the greatest. 'It is said that when composing he had on a look of the greatest fierceness. He has been accused of bombast; from his obscurity he is often exceedingly difficult, but bombast is not the word at all. His words come up from the great volcano of his heart, and often he has no voice for it, and he copulates his words together and tears his heart asunder.' Sophocles completed his work and was of a more chastened and cultivated mind. He translated it into a choral peal of melody; Æschylus only excels in his grand bursts of feeling. The *Antigone* is the finest thing of the kind ever sketched by man. Euripides carried his compositions occasionally to the very verge of disease, and displays a distinct commencement of the age of speculation and scepticism. He writes often *for the effect's sake*, not as Homer or Æschylus, wrapt away in the train of action; but how touching is effect so produced. He was accused of impiety. In a sceptical kind

of man these two things go together very often—impiety and desire of effect. There is a decline in all kinds of literature when it ceases to be poetical and becomes speculative. Socrates was the emblem of the decline of the Greeks in its transitive state; he was the friend of Euripides. It seems strange to call him so. I willingly admit that he was a man of deep feeling and morality.' But Carlyle characteristically does not approve of his hostile attitude towards the religion of the Greeks. 'I can well understand the idea which Aristophanes had of him, that he was a man going to destroy all Greece with his innovations. To understand that, we have only to go back to what I said in my last lecture on the peculiar character of the Greek system of religion, the crown of all their beliefs. The Greek system, you will remember, was of a great significance and value for the Greeks, even the most absurd-looking part of the whole—the Oracle—this too was shown to have been not a quackery, but the result of a sincere belief on the part of the priests themselves. No matter what you call the process, if the man believed in what he was about and listened to his faith in a higher power, surely by looking into himself, apart from earthly feeling, he would be in that frame of mind by far the best adapted for judging correctly and wisely of the future. They send the most pious, intelligent and reverend among them to join themselves to this system, and thus was formed a sort of non-pagan Church to the people. There were also the Greek games. The mind of the whole nation by its means obtained a strength and coherence. If I may not be permitted to say that through it the nation became united to the Divine power, I may at any rate assert that the highest considerations and motives thus became familiar to each person, and were put at the very top of his mind. But at Socrates' time this devotional feeling had in a great measure given way. He himself was not more sceptical than the rest. He shows a lingering kind of aim and attachment for the old religion of his country, and often we cannot make out whether he believed in it or not. He must have had but a painful intellectual life, a painful kind of life altogether, we would think.' These last sentences, one would think, can very well be applied to Carlyle himself with regard to his attitude towards the old religion of his country. Socrates seems to him to have been an entirely unprofitable character. 'I have a great desire to admire Socrates, but I confess that his writings seem to be made up of very wire-drawn notions about virtue; there is no conclusion in him; there is no word of life in Socrates.' After

Socrates the Greek nation became more and more sophistical. The Greek genius lost its originality; it lost its poetry, and gave way to the spirit of speculation. Alexander subdued them, and no great genius of any very remarkable quality appeared in Greece.

In the third lecture Carlyle treats of the Romans: their character, their fortune, and what they did. At the outset, comparing the Romans with the Greeks, he says: 'We may say of this nation that, as the Greeks may be compared to the *children* of antiquity from their *naiveté* and gracefulness, while their whole history is an aurora, the dawn of a higher culture and civilization,—so the Romans were the *men* of antiquity and their history a glorious, warm laborious day; less beautiful and graceful no doubt than the Greeks, but most essentially useful.' The Romans will not require much discussion in connection with our subject because 'the Roman life, and the Roman opinions are quite a sequel to those of the Greeks; a second edition, we may say, of the Pagan system of belief and actions.' The Greek life itself 'was shattered to pieces against the harder, stronger life of the Romans. It was just as a beautiful crystal jar becomes dashed to pieces upon the hard rocks;—so inexpressible was the force of the strong Roman energy.' The Romans evince the characters of two distinct species of people,—the Pelasgi, and the Etruscans or Tuscans, entirely different from these. The latter had a gloomy heaviness, austerity and sullenness. They were men of a gloomy character, very different from the liveliness and gracefulness of the Greeks. 'In the Romans we have the traces of these two races joined together,—the one proved the noblesse,—the other, the commonalty. The Etruscans had a sort of sullen energy, and, above all, a kind of rigorous thrift. And thrift, though generally regarded as mean, includes in itself the best virtues that a man can have in this world. It includes all that man can do in his vocation. 'Even in its worst state, it indicates a great people, I think. The Dutch, for example,—there is no stronger people than them; the people of New England, the Scotch, all great nations! In short, it is the foundation of all manner of virtue in a nation.'*

Along with this there was in the Roman character a great seriousness and devoutness; and it was natural that 'the Greek religion was light

* Carlyle eulogises thrift in several places in his works, especially in *Frederic the Great*, Vol. II.

and sportful compared to the Roman.' 'Their notion of Fate, which we observed was the central element of Paganism, was much more productive of consequences than the Greek notion; and it depended entirely on the original character which had been given to this people. Their notion was that Rome was always meant to be the Capital of the whole world, that right was on the side of every man who was with Rome, and that, therefore, it was their duty to do everything for Rome. This belief tended very principally to produce its own fulfilment,—nay, it was itself founded on fact: 'Did not Rome do so and so?' they would reason.' The stubborn energy of their ancestors was employed by the Romans in all the concerns of their ordinary life, and by it they raised themselves above all other people. 'Method was their great principle, just as Harmony was of the Greeks. The Method of the Romans was a sort of Harmony, but not that beautiful, graceful thing which was the Greek Harmony. Theirs was the harmony of plan—an architectural harmony which was displayed in the arranging of practical antecedents and consequences. Their whole genius was practical. Speculation with them was nothing in the comparison. Their vocation was not to teach the sciences—what sciences they knew they had received from the Greeks—but to teach practical wisdom, to subdue people into polity.' *

Pliny, says Carlyle, declares that he cannot describe Rome: "so great is it that it appears to make heaven more illustrious, and to bring the whole World into civilization and obedience under its authority." This is what it did. It went on fighting and subduing the world. But it was not with the spirit of a robber. "Some have thought that the Romans had done nothing else but fight to establish their dominion where they had not the least claim of right, and that they were a mere nest of robbers. But this is evidently a misapprehension. Historians have generally managed to write down such facts as are apt to strike the memory of the vulgar, while they omit the circumstances which display the real character of the Romans. The Romans were at first an agricultural people; they built, it appears, their barns within their walls for protection. But they got incidentally

* *Cf.* The celebrated lines of Virgil:—

> Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento:
> Hæ tibi erunt artes, pacisque imponere morem,
> Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.

into quarrels with other neighbouring state; and it is not strange that they should have taken the opportunity to compel them by force to adopt their civilization, such as it was, in preference to the more foolish and savage method of their own. I do not say that the Roman was a mild kind of discipline. Far from that, it was established only by hard contests and fighting. But it was of all the most beneficial. In spite of all that has been said and ought to be said about Liberty, it is true Liberty to obey the best personal guidance, either out of our own head or out of that of some other. No one could wish to see some fool wandering about at his will and without any restraint or guidance. We must admit it to be far better for him even if some wise man were to take charge of him, even though by force, although that seems but a coarse kind of operation. But fighting was not at all the fundamental principle in their conquests; it was their superior civilization which attracted the surrounding nations to their centre. If their course had been entirely unwise all the world would have risen in arms against these domineering tyrants for ever claiming to be rulers where they had no right at all, and their power could not have subsisted there as it did." This is quite characteristic of Carlyle, with whom power and supreme authority pass as by right from the weak to the strong, from those who were unfit to enjoy them to those who were capable of wielding them. The great contest of the Romans with Carthage which 'as far as probabilities went was more likely to subject the whole world,' was the 'crowning phenomenon of their history.' But the Carthaginians, between whom and the Jews Carlyle sees a great resemblance, were subdued, and he rejoices in their overthrow. Carlyle characteristically does not like the constitutional struggles between the Patricians and the Plebeians, and the internal discord which characterised the history of the later Roman Republic. He therefore rejoices in its overthrow and the elevation of Cæsar. 'I cannot join in the lamentation made by some over the downfall of the Republic, when Cæsar took hold of it. It had been but a constant struggling and scramble for prey; and it was well to end it, and to see the wisest, cleanest and most judicious man of them place himself at the top of it. The Romans, under the Empire, attained to their complete grandeur. Their dominion reached from the River Euphrates to Cadiz, and from the border of the Arabian desert to Severus' wall up in the north of England. And what an empire was it; teaching

mankind that they should be tilling the ground as they ought to do, instead of fighting one another. For that is the real thing which every man is called on to do,—to till the ground,—and not to slay his poor brother man.'

Passing from their history to their language and literature, he finds the latter to be but a copy of that of the Greeks; but still 'there is a kind of Roman worth in many of their books.' Their language, too, has a character belonging to Rome. 'Its peculiar distinguishing character is its imperative sound and structure finely adapted to command. So in their books, as, for instance, the poems of Virgil and Horace, we see the Roman character of a still strength." But their greatest work was practical. It was written on the face of the planet in which we live,—their Cyclopean highways, extending from country to country, their Aqueducts, their Coliseums, their whole Polity! And how spontaneous all these things were! How little any Roman knew what Rome was!" Then he goes on to say that there can be no preconceived plan for the creation of national greatness in the minds of the individuals who follow their own particular aims and plans. "There is a tendency in all historians to place a plan in the head of every one of their great characters, by which he regulated his actions; forgetting that it is not possible for any man to have foreseen events, and to have embraced at once the vast complication of the circumstances that were to happen. It is more reasonable to attribute national progress to a great, deep instinct in every individual actor. Who of us, for example, knows England, though he may contribute to her prosperity? Everyone here follows his own object,—one goes to India, another aspires to the army, and each after his own ends. But all thus co-operate together after all, one Englishman with another, in adding to the strength and wealth of the whole nation. The wisest Government has only to direct this spirit into a proper channel. But to believe that it can lay down a plan for the creation of national enterprise is an entire folly. These incidents form the deep foundation of a national character; when they fall, the nation falls too; just as when the roots of a tree fall and the sap can mount the trunk and diffuse itself among the leaves no longer, the tree stops too!" All greatness therefore as is well known is unconscious with him. Pursuing this train of thought Carlyle starts the paradox that literature makes itself remarkable only during the decline of a nation. "During a healthy, sound, progressive period of national

existence, there is, in general, no literature at all. In a time of active exertion the nation will not speak out its mind. It is not till a nation is ready to decline that its literature makes itself remarkable. And this is observable in all nations. For there are many ways in which a man or a nation expresses itself besides books. The point is not to be able to write a book: the point is *to have the true mind* for it. Everything in that case which the nation does will be equally significant of its mind. If any great man among the Romans,—Julius Cæsar or Cato, for example, had never done anything but till the ground, they would have acquired equal excellence in that way, they would have ploughed as they conquered. Everything a great man does carries the traces of a great man. Perhaps even there is the most energetic virtue when there is no talk about virtue at all! I wish my friends here," emphasises Carlyle, " to consider and keep this in view: that progress and civilization may go on unknown to the people themselves: that there may be a primeval feeling of energy and virtue in the founders of a state, whether they can fathom it or not. This feeling gets nearer every generation to be uttered. For though the son only learns such things as his father invented, yet he will discover other things, and teach as well his own as his father's inventions in his turn to his children. And so it will go on working itself out, till it gets into conversation and speech. We shall observe this precisely when we come to the reign of Elizabeth [VIII. Lecture]. All great things, in short, whether national or individual, are unconscious things! I cannot get room to insist on this here, but we shall see them as we go on, like seeds thrown out upon a wide, fertile field; no man sees what they are, but they grow up before us and become great. What did that man, when he built his house, know of Rome or of Julius Cæsar that were to come? These were the products of Time. Faust of Mentz, who invented Printing, that subject of so much admiration in our times, never thought of the results that were to follow; he found it a cheaper way of publishing his Bibles, and he used it for no other purpose than to undersell the other booksellers. In short, from the Christian Religion down to the poorest genuine song, there has been no consciousness in the minds of the first authors of anything of excellence. Shakespeare, too, never seemed to imagine that he had any talent at all, his only object seems to have been to gather a little money, for he was very necessitous. And when we do find consciousness the thing done is sure to be not a great thing at all. It

is a very suspicious circumstance when anything makes a great noise about itself; it is like a drum, producing a great deal of sound, but very like to be empty!" This test of unconsciousness, embodied in the maxim of Schiller that 'Genius is ever a secret to itself,' he had already announced and applied to greatness in 1831, in an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, afterwards reprinted as 'Characteristics' in his *Miscellanies*. It provoked even Sterling, one of his staunchest admirers, to a long refutation in his article in the *Westminster Review* for 1839 (reprinted in his Miscellaneous Essays ed. J. Hare, Vol. I.).

Next Carlyle takes a short survey of the famous masterpieces of Roman literature. Virgil's Æneid he thinks entirely inferior to Homer, because there is the fatal consciousness, on which he has just enlarged,—"that knowledge that he is writing an Epic,—the plot, the style, all is vitiated by that one fault." Then the characters are also inferior. "Æneas is a lachrymose sort of man altogether. But when this fatal consciousness left Virgil he became a great poet, as is to be seen in his minor poems. He was a great poet when he did not observe himself, and when he let himself alone." In his women he succeeded wonderfully. "Virgil was an amiable man and always in bad health, much subject to dyspepsia and to all kinds of maladies that afflict men of genius" and with which Carlyle was but too familiar. And it would have been curious to know whether they moved Virgil's spleen as they did that of his critic and made him vent his anger in the most vehement language in his journals. "We must, on the whole, conclude that Virgil was, properly speaking, not an Epic poet." Horace too has the same consciousness; and Carlyle finds another hindrance in admiring him, in his perverse moral philosophy, the Epicurean system. Another poet who had an ever-present consciousness of himself is Ovid, who is thus very inferior to Horace or Virgil. From his time "we get more and more into self-consciousness and into scepticism not long afterwards, without being able to find any bottom at all to it!" And Roman literature continued to degenerate till it reached its lowest point in Seneca. "If we want an example of a diseased self-consciousness, an exaggerated imagination, a mind blown up with all sorts of strange conceits, the spasmodic state of intellect, in short, of a man morally unable to speak the truth on any subject,—we have it in Seneca. He was led away by this strange humour into all sorts of cant and insincerity. He had that spirit of self-conceit, pride and vanity, which is the

ruin of all things in this world, and always will be." This decline in their literature was the consequence of their decline in virtue. "The vices of this kind of literature connect themselves in a natural sequence with the decline of Roman virtue altogether. When that people had once come to disbelief in their own gods, and to put all their confidence in their money, believing that with their money they could always buy their money's worth, this order of things was closely succeeded by moral abominations of the most dreadful kind, such as were not known before and never since, the most fearful abominations under the sun." But even in deserts there are oases, and in this dreary age there was one great writer, the greatest of Roman writers, Tacitus,—such is the power of genius to make itself heard and felt in all times. Tacitus displays more of the Roman spirit perhaps than any one before him. In eloquent words does Carlyle eulogise this truly great man. "In the middle of all those facts in the literature of his country, which correspond so well with what we know of the history of Rome itself—in the middle of all that quackery and puffery coming into play time about in every department, when critics wrote books to teach you how to hold out your arm and your leg—in the middle of all this absurd and wicked period Tacitus was born and was enabled to be a Roman after all! He stood like a Colossus at the edge of a dark night, and he saw events of all kinds hurrying past him and plunging he knew not where, but evidently to no good, for falsehood and cowardice never yet ended anywhere but in destruction! He was full of the old feelings of goodness and honesty; he has no belief but the old Roman belief." With Tacitus Carlyle quits the subject of Pagan literature, for after him all things went on sinking down more and more into all kinds of disease and ruin. "After the survey which we have made, we come to the conclusion that there is a strange coherence between the healthy belief and outward destiny of a nation. Thus the Greeks went on with their wars and everything else most prosperously, till they became *conscious* of their condition, till the man became solicitous after other times. Socrates, we said, is a kind of starting point from which we trace their fall into confusion and wreck of all sorts. So it was with the Romans. Cato the elder, used to tell them, "the instant you get the Greek literature among you there will be an end of the old Roman spirit." He was not listened to; the rage for Greek speculation increased; he himself found it impossible to keep back, although he grew very angry about it, and in his

old age he learned the Greek language and had it taught to his sons. It was too late; nobody could believe any longer, and every one had set his mind on being a man and thinking for himself." In the middle of all this occurred an event which was destined to change it all and to regenerate the effete ancient world, the advent of Christ, the new character in which all the future world lay hid. The rise of Christianity may be said to have put a stop to ancient history; and here I stop for the present, and shall resume the subject on another occasion.

ART. XII.—*Subandhu and Kumârila.* By the Hon'ble MR. JUSTICE K. T. TELANG, M.A., LL.B., C.I.E.

[Read 29th September 1891.]

Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall, in the very learned Preface to his edition of the Vâsavadattâ, has assigned Subandhu, the author of that work, to some period prior to the age of Bâṇa, the famous author of the Harsha Charita and the Kâdambarî.[1] And Bâṇa, being generally admitted to have been a contemporary of Harshavardhana of Kanuj and Hiuen Tsiang, belongs to the early part of the seventh century A.D.[2] Subandhu accordingly, has been generally regarded as belonging to the close of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century A.D.[3] In 1885, however, Prof. Peterson, in the Preface to his edition of the Kâdambarî of Bâṇa, threw some doubts on the identification of the Vâsavadattâ which we possess with the Vâsavadattâ mentioned in Bâṇa's famous introductory verses to the Harsha Charita.[4] But soon afterwards, he saw reason to change his opinion.[5] And now Dr. Cartellieri has adduced elaborate reasons in detail for adhering to the received view, that Bâṇa knew our Vâsavadattâ, and in fact for holding further that Bâṇa composed his work for the express purpose of eclipsing Subandhu's fame.[6] Under these circumstances we are, I think,

---

[1] P. 11. And compare Prof. Cowell's Nyâyakusumânjali, Preface p. vi.

[2] I notice that the late Pandit Bhagvânlâl expressed a view similar to mine about the period of Harsha's reign at which the Harsha Charita was written (Vol. XIII., Ind. Antiquary, p. 74). See my Mudrârâkshasa, Introduction, note 55 (P. L.)

[3] See, *inter alia*, Max Müller's India; what it can teach us, p. 331, Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. III., p. 143.

[4] Introduction, pp. 71—2.

[5] Subhâshitâvali of Vallabhadeva. Introduction, p. 133 and note. Vâsavadattâ's story is referred to by Daṇḍin also (as to his date see below) for a somewhat similar purpose to that in the Mâlatî Mâdhava. See Daśakumâracharita (Bühler's Ed.), p. 69.

[6] Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. II., p. 115 et seq. (at p. 132) See also, Ibid. Vol. III., p. 143, and J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XVII., p. 81. I confess that I find it difficult to agree with those who regard the verses in the Harsha Charita as indicating the existence of Subandhu and Kâlidâsa at the same time with Bâṇa

as safe as we can be in dealing with any dates in the history of Sanskrit Literature, if we proceed on the assumption that books and events which can be shown to be referred to by the author of the Vâsavadattâ must belong *at the latest* to about the middle of the sixth century A.D.

One of the books which the Vâsavadattâ refers to is a book named Alankâra, by the famous Buddhist writer Dharmakîrti[7]. This is the writer about whom some interesting facts have been brought together by Mr. K. B. Pâthak in his recent paper on Dharmakîrti and Śankarâchârya, read before our Society.[8] In that paper, Mr. Pâthak refers to I-tsing's account of his travels, and from the information contained in that account deduces the conclusion, that "it is clear that Dharmakîrti could have flourished only in the first half of the seventh century.[9]" In the first place, I may point out that Mr. Pâthak is

---

(e.g. Dr. Hall, at p. 14 note of the Preface to the Vâsavadatta, and Dr. Peterson's Introduction to the Kâdambarî, p. 81.) But the point cannot be discussed here. I will only add that if Dr. Jacobi is right in placing Mâgha before Bâna and Subandhu, and Bhâravi and Kâlidâsa before Mâgha (see Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. III., p. 144,) the contemporaneous existence of Kâlidâsa and Subandhu cannot be admitted (see further, as to the date of Mâgha, Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. IV., p. 61 *et seq.* and 236 *et seq.*; and as to that of Kâlidâsa, Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIX., p. 285, with which compare Bühler's remarks about the date of Bhâravi and the grounds for it in the very elaborate Introduction to his Manu, p. cxiii. (Sacred Books of the East.) I may, perhaps, be allowed to take this opportunity of drawing attention to the allusion to Manu contained in Raghu, xiv. 67, which is not noticed by Dr. Bühler in this Introduction, and which seems to be based on Manu vii. 35. And with reference to the remarks at p. cxii., I may add that Manu is named in the Śâbara Bhâshya at p. 4, though in a very colourless way. Prof. Bhândârkar has pointed out (Report on Sanskrit MSS., 1883-84, p. 32) that Kumârila comes after Kâlidâsa, and he appears to have criticised the Dignâga who is believed to have been a contemporary of Kâlidâsa. (See J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XVII., p. 572.) That circumstance does not, however, in the present state of the question regarding Kâlidâsa's date, affect the conclusions set forth in the present paper, although, no doubt, in view of the remarks of Prof. Max Müller at pp. 306-7 of India: what it can teach us, the dates of Kâlidâsa, Kumârila, and Dharmakîrti must be admitted to be all more or less closely connected with each other.

[7] P. 235 (Hall's Ed.) and Preface, p. 10.

[8] See J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XVIII., p. 88.

[9] P. 90. Dr. Peterson says he is believed to have lived in the middle of the sixth century. (Vallabhadeva's Subhâshitâvali, Introduction, p. 133.) And looking at what is said about Asanga and Vasubandhu and Dharmakîrti, as well

somewhat inaccurate in his statement of the premise from which he draws this conclusion, for it is not at all "clear" from the passage in the Indian Antiquary to which he refers, that I-tsing does, really and truly, speak of Dharmakîrti as his contemporary[10]. Secondly, I have already indicated the sort of mistakes which may sometimes be committed by a too rigid adherence to information like that which Dr. Burnell has relied on as conclusive on this point, and which Mr. Pâthak has unhesitatingly accepted as conclusive on Dr. Burnell's authority[11]. But thirdly, I think, that it is almost impossible to accept any one line of reasoning, or any single group of facts, as conclusive about the precise date of any book in Sanskrit Literature, at all events in the present condition of Sanskrit Chronology, when it is almost literally true that, as I think an American Sanskritist puts it, Indian literary dates are, for the most part, only 'so many pins set up to be bowled down again.' The date of Dharmakîrti, therefore, ought not to be fixed, even upon the unanimous testimony of Chinese[12]

---

as about Gunamati and others connected with them, in Max Müller's India: what it can teach us, pp. 282 n, 290, and 305, 308 *et seq.*, and in numerous passages in Mr. Beal's Buddhist Records of the Western World, e. g., Vol. I., pp. 105, 193 (where Dharmakîrti does not appear to be mentioned) and also in Târanâth's work (see Indian Antiquary, Vol. IV., p. 141) and elsewhere (e. g., Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX., pp. 149, 316) I own I feel very great doubts about the accuracy of Mr. Pâthak's date for Dharmakîrti. The whole of the facts need yet another comprehensive survey like Prof. Max Müller's. For instance, we must consider, *inter alia*, the fact that Sthiramati, who must have been a contemporary of Dharmakîrti (Max Müller's India: what it can teach us, p. 305) had probably died some considerable time before 587 A. D. (see Indian Antiquary, Vol. VI., p. 9). See also, on the other side, Kern's Saddharmapundarîka (S. B. E.) Introduction, p. xxii., which should be compared with Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. I, p. 192, among other passages.

[10] That is only the interpretation placed on I-tsing's words by one of his translators. Prof. Vasiliev, as stated in the passage quoted from the Indian Antiquary, thinks the meaning to be merely that Dharmakîrti was one of "the teachers nearest in time." It appears to me that Prof. Vasiliev's interpretation is that which agrees better with the other known facts. But, at all events, the rival interpretation, standing by itself, is obviously an unsafe basis for ulterior conclusions. See also Max Müller's India: what it can teach us, p. 312.

[11] See my Mudrârâkshasa, Introduction, pp. xlviii. xlix.

[12] That even Hiuen Tsiang is not to be implicitly trusted in everything he states, follows from what Dr. Bühler has pointed out in his paper in the Vienna Journal, Vol. II., 269. And as to I-tsing himself, see J. B. B. R. A. S, Vol. XVI., pp. 199-200, and Max Muller's India: what it can teach us, pp. 212-3.

and Tibetan writers, and even if that testimony were much more precise than it actually is, without considering the bearing upon that date of this fact among others, that Dharmakîrti is alluded to by Subandhu.

The existence of this allusion has been generally admitted, and I do not now propose to discuss it any further. I wish in the present paper rather to draw attention to some passages in the Vâsavadattâ which seem to me to involve an allusion to the famous Pûrva-Mîmâmsâ writer Kumârila. I must begin by stating at once that the allusions I rely upon are by no means perfectly obvious, nor do I venture to suggest that the views which I am putting forward regarding them may not be quite reasonably disputed. But such as they are, I state the views I have myself formed, and scholars will be able to judge how far they are well founded. I may, however, add as a matter not to be forgotten, that even if the allusions to Kumârila alleged by me are held not to be made out, that circumstance will not affect the further inferences based here on the fact of such allusions. Because, if the allusion to Dharmakîrti is admitted, as it generally is admitted, to exist, then Kumârila being a contemporary of his, as we know from other evidence, the substantial basis for such further inferences is established, independently of the allusions to Kumârila here relied upon.

There are, then, four different passages in the Vâsavadattâ in which the Mîmâmsâ, and Buddhism or Jainism are brought together in Subandhu's *double entendres*. I will set out these passages together before making any comments upon them. The first occurs in a description of the Vindhya mountain, which is described thus[18]—मीमांसान्याय इव पिहितदिगम्बरदर्शनः which may be rendered as follows: the Vindhya mountain which prevents the sky and the quarters from being seen is like the Mîmâmsâ philosophy which has overcome (literally, covered) the doctrine of the Digambaras. The second passage forms part of the description of the various princes, who had come as

Mr. Beal in the Introduction to his Life of Buddha (Sacred Books of the East), p. xxxi., mentions circumstances showing that Chinese and Tibetan historical writings require to be subjected to critical examination like all others; and see Max Müller's India, what it can teach us, p. 302.

[18] Hall's Ed. p. 93. The translations in the text, of course, do not, and cannot, bring out the point of the original. But they may be allowed for our present purpose.

suitors for the hand of Vâsavadattâ. Some of the princes are there stated to be[14] केचिज्जैमिनिमतानुसारिण इव तथागतमतध्वंसिनः that is to say, some of the princes who opposed the opinions of those that came in ordinary costume, were like the followers of the doctrines of Jaimini, who destroyed the doctrines of Buddha. The third passage is contained in a description of the darkness of night which is said to be[15] श्रुतिवचनमिव परिहृतदिगम्बरदर्शनम् that is to say, that the darkness which prevents the sky and the quarters from being seen is like the texts of the Sruti or Vedas by which the doctrines of the Digambaras have been refuted. The fourth passage is met with in the course of the narrative of the engagement between the two armies which occurs towards the close of the story. The dust raised on the battlefield is there spoken of, and we are told that मीमांसकदर्शनेनेव तिरस्कृतदिगम्बरदर्शनेन रजसा जजृम्भे,[16] which may be thus translated—Dust was raised preventing the sky and the quarters from being seen, which was like the doctrine of the Mîmâmsâ, by which the doctrine of the Digambaras was eclipsed.

It will be noticed that in two of these passages, the Pûrva Mîmâmsâ, or system of Jaimini, is spoken of as having overcome the doctrines of the Digambaras, that is, the sect of Digambara Jainas. In the third passage, the texts of the Vedas are described in substantially the same terms. In the fourth passage, the Mîmâmsâ system receives the credit of having destroyed the doctrines of Tathâgata or Buddha. And the question is, what historical events do these passages refer to? I am not aware, that the earlier Mîmâmsâ writers, Jaimini or Śabara, had any special contest with the Jainas, or Bauddhas; and in the Sûtras of Jaimini, and the Bhâshya of Śabara Svâmin, I have not come across any such special reference to either sect, as can be of service to us in explaining the allusions contained in the passages quoted above. If the reference had been to the later Mîmâmsâ, it might, perhaps, have been easier to explain the allusions, because both the Jaina and Bauddha systems come up for criticism in the Sûtras of Bâdarâyaṇa, and the Bhâshya of Śankarâchârya.[17] Under these circumstances, it appears to me that we must explain the allusions in question as being suggested by that contest between Brahminism on the one hand, and Buddhism

---

[14] P. 144. The original is obscure. I follow the commentator.

[15] P. 187.

[16] P. 297.

[17] See Vedânta Sûtras (Bibliotheca Indica), Vol. I., pp. 546 *et seq.*

and Jainism on the other,[18] in which Kumârila Svâmin[19] is stated by tradition to have taken a prominent part—Kumârila Svâmin who is well known as the most conspicuous of modern writers on the Pûrva Mîmâmsâ, and who must have lived somewhere about the time —I say no more at the present moment—in which the author of the Vâsavadattâ flourished.

Of that contest the traditional account may be seen most conveniently given, perhaps, in the Śankara Vijaya attributed[20] to Mâdhavâchârya. In the first canto of that work[21], we are informed that the gods, strongly impressed with the religious corruption prevalent in the world, repaired to Kailâsa, and asked Mahâdeva to adopt some means by which such corruption might be cured, and the Vedic system rehabilitated for the ultimate happiness of mankind. The Śankara Vijaya then states that Mahâdeva promised to grant the prayer of the gods; and by way of commencing work at once addressed himself to his son, Kârtikeya. Mahâdeva, we read, told Kârtikeya that the gods Vishṇu and Śesha had already become incarnate on earth as Sankarshaṇa and Patanjali, for the purpose of saving the Upâsanâ Kâṇḍa from destruction; that he himself proposed to appear on earth as Śankarâchârya to rescue the Jñâna Kâṇḍa; but that before he did so, Kârtikeya should take upon himself the human form, "become the full-moon of the Śarad season to the ocean-like philosophy of Jaimini,[22] and preserve the Karma Kâṇḍa": Mahâdeva, then, according to the Śankara Vijaya, went on to say as follows: "Descending to the earth, fix all regulations in accordance with the Vedas, after overcoming all the Saugatas who are

[18] Comp. on this subject the remarks of Prof. Bhâṇḍârkar in his Report on Sanskrit MSS. for 1883-4, p. 74. I am bound to add here that my attention has been kindly drawn by Prof. Bhâṇḍârkar to pp. 9, 19, 20 of the Śâbara Bhâshya as containing refutations of Buddhistic doctrines, though Buddhists are not expressly named there. It is important to bear this in mind, though I do not consider that it seriously affects the view I am here putting forward.

[19] It is curious to note, that Kumârila is the name of one of the Bauddha patriarchs enumerated in the list at Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX., p. 149.

[20] The late Dr. Burnell considered this work not to be worthy of the great writer to whom it is attributed. This is true, in the sense that the work is not really historical in the proper signification of the word. Whether nevertheless the great Mâdhavâchârya did in fact write it, is a question which cannot be here discussed.

[21] See pp. 15-16 (Ânandâśrama series).

[22] P. 20, st. 51.

enemies of the teaching of the Vedas. And in order to help you, Brahmadeva also will become a Brahman named Maṇḍana, and Indra a king named Sudhanvan." After these preliminary arrangements are concluded in heaven, the scene changes to the earth, and we are told that Indra in human form became a model king in this world, and Kârtikeya, as Bhatta *par excellence* or Kumârila, also appeared at his court, "having acquired fame in elucidating the true teaching of the Vedas as expounded in the Sûtras of Jaimini." Mâdhava then gives an account of the contest between Kumârila and the Saugatas before the king Sudhanvan, in which Kumârila is, of course, represented as victorious along the whole line[23]. The upshot of it all is that

---

It may be interesting to epitomize in a note the account given by Mâdhava. After Kumârila reached the capital of Sudhanvan, he and the Buddhist Pandits were on one occasion present in a great assembly held by the king. And there Kumârila made a remark which was intended to provoke the Buddhists and put them on their mettle, and succeeded in doing so. Then, Mâdhava goes on to say, the Buddhists held high debate with Kumârila, in the course of which there was much mutual criticism, and assertion by each party of its own dogmas. Ultimately, however, the Bauddhas were silenced, and Kumârila expounded the Vedic system before the king. But the king said: "Success and ill success in controversy depend upon extent of learning"—meaning to say that it did not depend necessarily on truth or untruth of opinion. He then proposed another test, and said, "Whoever throws himself down from a hill and remains uninjured, his is the true opinion." All parties were taken aback by this proposal, but Kumârila, "remembering the Vedas"—as Mâdhava takes care to note—ascended to the top of a hill, and proceeded to throw himself down from there, saying aloud, "If the Vedas are true, let me sustain no injury." Seeing him uninjured by the fall, the king became a believer in the Vedas. But the Saugatas said, "This is no proof of the truth of his doctrines. The body can be kept safe in this way by means of protecting gems (or talismans) by incantations, and by medicines." Then the king, seeing that they raised disputes about what had occurred in their very presence, declared that he would ask them all a question, and those who failed to answer it, he said he would destroy by engines of torture. Having said this, he brought an earthen jar closed at the mouth with a snake coiled up within it, and asked the Brâhmanas and Buddhists to say what was in the jar. Both parties obtained time till the next day to give their answers, and on that day, both having in the meanwhile received hints from their own superhuman sources of information, the Saugatas said that the jar contained a snake, and the Brâhmaṇas that it contained Vishṇu lying on the body of the great serpent. The king was disconcerted, as he had now become a friend of the Brâhmanist party, but a voice from heaven reassured him, and when the jar was opened, there in good sooth appeared the figure of Vishṇu as described by the Brâhmaṇas. Then the king was satisfied, and

Sudhanvan, it is stated, issued a proclamation announcing that he would put to death any servant of his who did not destroy all Bauddhas, including old men and children, from the Himâlaya to Râma's bridge. And thus the king, "following the guidance of Kumârila, destroyed the Jainas, the enemies of religion. And when the elephant-like Jainas were thus destroyed by the lion-like Kumârila, the Vedic system spread around on all sides without any obstruction."[24]

We thus see that, according to the tradition embodied in the work of Mâdhava, Bhaṭṭa Kumârila, the great authority on the Mîmâmsâ philosophy, was the most prominent actor[25] in a successful attack on the Bauddhas and Jainas—for both are indiscriminately mentioned[26] in Mâdhava's narrative, as may be observed even in the epitome of it which I have given above. If we turn now to the Śankaravijaya, which is supposed, though, as I hold, erroneously supposed,[27] to be a work of Ânandagiri, there, too, we are told that Kumârila, having defeated "innumerable Bauddhas and Jainas" in intellectual contests, and having also employed more material weapons against them, destroyed their "wicked opinions."[28] It rather appears from a comparison of the two accounts, given by Mâdhava and the pseudo-Ânandagiri, that their narratives were probably not derived from one and the same source. But however that may be, I am disposed to think that the allusion contained in the passages from the Vâsavadattâ which we have quoted above, is to the historical events which form the basis of the statements contained in the two Śankaravijayas that have been now referred to. In saying this, I wish to guard

---

issued the order for the destruction of the Bauddhas which is mentioned in the text. Such contests as this appear to have been not very uncommon in those days. The following passages in Hiuen Tsiang may be compared. Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. I., pp. 221, 237, Vol. II., p. 99, Life of Hiuen Tsiang, p. 164, and with the last passage compare the debate between Śankarâchârya and Maṇḍana Miśra as reported in the Śankaravijaya.

[24] Pp. 28-9 and Cf. Prof. H. H. Wilson's Essays on Sanskrit Literature, Vol. III., p. 95. See also Wilson's Religion of the Hindus, Vol. II., p. 60.

[25] See Mâdhava's Śankara Vijaya, VII. 6 (p. 290), where Śankara says to Kumârila "I know you are Kârtikeya, come down to the earth to destroy the Saugatas, the enemies of the Vedic ceremonial."

[26] Comp. Mudrârâkshasa, Introduction, pp. xvi., xvii. and note.

[27] See Indian Antiquary, Vol. V., 28 *et seq.*; also Barth's Religions of India, pp. 189-90.

[28] P. 225 (Bibliotheca Indica).

myself against being understood to withdraw from the opinion I have already expressed, on more than one occasion, to the effect that the alleged persecution of Buddhists or Jainas by Śankarâchârya and Kumârila is not a historic fact.[29] But the traditions, embodied in the two Śankaravijayas and also in the various other sources of information referred to by Professor Wilson in his discussion of this topic, appear to point to the actual historic occurrence of an intellectual or theological debate or debates of, probably, a somewhat special character,[30] in which the Brahmanas, headed by Kumârila, were, at all events, in their own opinion, successful against all opponents of the Vedas, whether Jainas or Bauddhas. And it appears to me, that those debates, with the result here indicated, explain in their entirety the phrases we have quoted from Subandhu, and also that we possess no information about any other event which can afford any explanation of them. It must be borne in mind that the phrases in question afford no hint of any interference by the civil power in the defeat of the Jaina and Bauddha systems to which they refer. They suggest only the defeat of the two heretical systems of Buddhism and Jainism by the orthodox system of the Mîmâmsâ. And such a defeat,[31] according to the Brahmanical report of the contest, we may,

[29] See Mudrârâkshasa, Introduction, pp. xlviii. note and liii. The mention of Jainas in note 49 at p. xliv. there was due to the reading of the old edition of Mâdhava's Śankaravijaya being जैनान् instead of बौद्धान् in what Prof. Wilson calls King Sudhanvan's fatal decree. In forming a comprehensive judgment on the point made in the text, we must also take note of such an expression as नास्तिकान्कदर्थयन् which occurs in the Daśâkumâracharita, p. 171 (Ed. by Goḍbole and Parab), and also, perhaps, of the quotation in Beal's Fo-Sho-Hing-Tsang-King (Sacred Books of the East), p. xii., although that seems to belong to comparatively more ancient times. See, too, Barth's Religions of India, p. 89, *et seq*. But I think the general truth of what is said in the text is not affected by these considerations.

[30] As to such debates generally, see, *inter alia*, Max Müller's India; what it can teach us, p. 298, and Beal's Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol I., p. 214. See also Vol. II., pp. 263-4, and the Life of Hiuen Tsiang, pp. 56, 69, 160, 176, 180.

[31] Probably Târânâtha's statements may be fairly regarded as to some extent corroborating the Brahmanical accounts, see Indian Antiquary, Vol. IV., p. 365. And it is, perhaps, not altogether unwarrantable to suggest that his defeat was synchronous with the "new impulses to the worship of Buddha" in China, &c., to which reference is made by Prof. Wilson, Essays on Sanskrit Literature, Vol. III., p. 198, *et seq*. See also Wilson's Essays on the Religion

I think, accept as the historical nucleus around which the fables of the various Śankaravijayas have gathered together.

I ought to add, that in one of the passages above referred to, Subandhu speaks of श्रुतिवचन or Vedic texts, instead of the Mîmâmsâ philosophy. I think, however, that the difference of words there does not involve any substantial difference in the signification—the Vedic texts, the philosophy of Jaimini, the Karma Kânda, all being, in substance, almost synonymous expressions in such a context as we have here to deal with. And the victory of the Vedic system over the Jaina and Bauddha systems which is what they all allude to can, I think, be most properly interpreted as referring to the successful movement of Kumârila Bhaṭṭa.

Only a few lines after the last of the passages quoted above from the Vâsavadattâ occurs another, to which also, I think, attention ought to be drawn, as it is one which may be used, to a certain extent, to throw doubt on the theory I have here propounded. Describing the condition of the warriors engaged in the conflict referred to, Subandhu says कश्चिद्बौद्धसिद्धान्त इव क्षपितश्रुतिवचनदर्शनोभवत्[32].—One warrior was deprived of the capacity of hearing, speaking and seeing, like the system of the Bauddhas, by which the Vedic system was destroyed or much impaired. I think the allusion here must be taken to be to the condition of Indian society before the movement of Kumârila Bhaṭṭa—a graphic description of which is put by Mâdhavâchârya into the mouth of one of the gods who went to Kailâsa to invoke the help of Śiva. I will give a free translation of the passage, as illustrating what were supposed to be the main features of the corrupt condition referred to.[33]

"You are aware, O Lord! that for our sake Vishṇu, in the form of Buddha, has been imposing[34] upon the Sugatas. The earth is now overcrowded by those Bauddhas, who put faith in his doctrines and vilify the orthodox philosophies. The enemies of Brahmanism hate the regulations of the castes and orders, and speak of the Vedic texts

---

of the Hindus, Vol. II., p. 367. And as to the Jainas, see Indian Antiquary, Vol. II., p. 227. May we look upon the fact that the Jainas were influential in the South in the time of Pulakeśi (Indian Antiquary, Vol. II., p. 194) as pointing in the same direction?

[32] P. 297.

[33] Compare the extract given in Albiruni's India by Sachau, Vol. I., p. 381.

[34] Cf. the quotation from the Padma Purâṇa in Vijnâna Bhikshu's Sânkhya Pravachana Bhâshya, p. 7 (ed. Jibânanda Vidyâsâgar).

as merely means of livelihood for the priest.[35] No man ever performs the Sandhyâ and other ceremonies, nor the Samnyâsa; all are become heretics. They close their ears immediately on hearing any one speaking of sacrifices. How then can religious rites go on, how can we enjoy the fruit of sacrifices? Heretics who believe in the Śaiva and Vaishṇava books, and who bear the marks of the Linga, the discus, &c., have given up all religious ceremonies. What holy Vedic text is there, referring exclusively to the Supreme Being, that has not been mauled by the besotted Bauddhas? What rule of conduct has not been violated by those wicked Kâpâlikas[36] who worship Bhairava by means of the fresh-cut head of a twice-born man? Other systems too,[37] there are on earth, full of mischief, to which men resort and come to misery. Therefore do you destroy all wicked people, and for the protection of mankind, establish the Vedic system so that the world may become happy."

It appears to me that the last of the passages, above quoted from Subandhu, may very fairly and reasonably be interpreted as referring to the condition of things thus described as existing prior to the appearance of Kumârila, and so interpreted it does not in any way militate against the interpretation of the other passages which has been proposed above.

The result of these arguments, if correct, is that at the time when the Vâsavadattâ was composed, the teachings and controversies of Kumârila Bhaṭṭa had already yielded results satisfactory from the Brahmanical point of view, and that the religious revival, which Kumârila is believed to have inaugurated, had made remarkable headway against the heretical views and practices then current, and, in fact, had successfully restrained the prevalence of such views and practices. Before passing to the conclusions which may be deduced from this proposition, it may be of interest to note, that in the Kâdambarî[38] and Harsha Charita[39] of

---

[35] Cf. the verses at the end of the Chârvâka Darśana in the Sarvadarśanasangraha.

[36] These sectaries are mentioned several times by Hiuen Tsiang. See Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. I., pp. 55, 76, and Life of Hiuen Tsiang, pp. 159-62 among other passages. And see Śankaravijaya, Canto xi.

[37] See the verses referred to in note 34 supra. and Ânandagiri's Śankaravijaya *passim*.

[38] See *inter alia*, pp. 51, 95, 131, 209 (Peterson's Ed.).

[39] See *inter alia*, pp. 141, 158, 167, 181, 185, 194, 224, 466, 489, 504, 227 (Kâśmîr Ed.).

Bâṇa, and in the Daśakumâra Charita[40] of Daṇḍin, we find allusions to the Mîmâmsâ, and to the Bauddha and Jaina systems as well, but there is no allusion to any contest between them. I do not know that we can draw any historic conclusion from these facts with any certainty. But as we know now that Bâṇa came some time after Subandhu, and in all probability deliberately set himself to outdo the latter, the circumstance that he makes no use of the incidents which Subandhu refers to with so much frequency may be used as suggesting an inference, that while the impression created by those incidents was fresh or at all events had not died out in the time of Subandhu, in Bâṇa's time it was no longer such a living recollection as to be made use of for literary purposes. And, on the other hand, the absence of all allusion to those incidents in Daṇḍin's work, though it seems to me to be an even weaker basis for any chronological theory, may, so far as it goes, be looked upon as explained either by the circumstance that Daṇḍin lived before those incidents occurred at all, or that he lived at too great a distance after them. The former view would be in harmony with the opinion of those who assign Daṇḍin to somewhere about the sixth century A. D.;[41] the latter with that of those who agree with Prof. H. H. Wilson in allotting him to about the eleventh or twelfth.[42] In saying this, I have not lost sight of the fact, that in my paper on the date of Sankarâchârya, I threw out the suggestion, that Mâdhavâchârya's statement about Śankarâchârya having overcome Dandin among others in philosophic controversy is not altogether to be scouted and dismissed out of court in a historical investigation.[43] If it should turn

---

[40] See *inter alia*, pp. 11, 46, 47, 54, 55 (Bühler), and p. 187 of the edition by Godbole and Parab.

[41] See for references Indian Antiquary, Vol. III., p. 82, and Cf. Max Müller, India; what it can teach us, pp. 332, 358.

[42] See Preface to Daśakumâracharita in Essays on Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I., p. 346, and Peterson's recent paper on Courtship in India. Compare with this Indian Antiquary, Vol. IV., p. 83, where Dr. Bühler mentions a copy of the Kâvyâdarśa made in 1105 A.D. In his Preface to the Daśakumâracharita, Part II., Peterson has argued this question at some length. In reference to the name Chhandovichiti, alluded to in that Preface, it may hereafter be of use to point out that Subandhu mentions a work of that name. (See Vâsavadattâ, pp. 119-235.) I will not, however, go further into this question on the present occasion.

[43] See my Mudrârâkshasa, Introduction, p. L. I have since noticed, that Prof. Wilson speaks of the author of the Daśakumâracharita as one of the

out hereafter that the tentative chronological assignments here propounded are correct, Mâdhava's statement above referred to may, perhaps, have to be taken *cum grano*, and modified to this extent, that Śankarâchârya should be held not to be exactly a contemporary of Daṇḍin, but to belong to the next generation, his youth, perhaps, synchronizing with the last years of Daṇḍin's life. Or that statement may, perhaps, have to be rejected altogether, in view of the other evidence. But all this is at present too conjectural throughout as regards the premises and the conclusion and the logical bond that unites them, and it is needless therefore to pursue the matter any further.

The main conclusions to which we have thus far been led are, first, that Subandhu in all likelihood belongs to the latter part of the sixth century, or at the very latest to the beginning of the seventh; secondly, that Subandhu knows of the eminent Buddhist authority Dharmakîrti, who must, therefore, have flourished some considerable time before the end of the sixth century; thirdly, that Subandhu probably knew of Bhaṭṭa Kumârila, and the success of his movement for a revival of the Vedic religion as against the Jainas and Buddhists; and therefore, that Kumârila must likewise have flourished some considerable time before the end of the sixth century. These various conclusions, it will be noticed, are, so far as they go, in complete harmony with the proposition which Dr. Burnell puts forward on the faith of the Tibetan authorities examined by him—namely, that Dharmakîrti and Kumârila were contemporaries. I doubt, however, whether they can be reconciled with the statement which Mr. S. P. Pandit has discovered in one of the MSS. of the Mâlatî Mâdhava of Bhavabhûti—namely, that Bhavabhûti was a pupil of Kumârila Svâmin.[44] Now Bhavabhûti is assigned by Prof. Bhândârkar[45] to the end of the seventh century and the beginning of the eighth. If that assignment is correct, it is hardly probable, though it is not, perhaps, absolutely impossible, that Bhavabhûti's teacher can have been referred to by a writer who belongs at the latest to the beginning of the seventh century.

---

class of ascetics "descended from Śankarâchârya." See his Essays on the Religion of the Hindus, Vol. I., p. 203 note. But no authority is adduced for the statement.

[44] See Gauḍavaho, Introduction, Note iv., pp. 205, *et seq.*

[45] Mâlatî Mâdhava, preface, p. iv. See also his Report on Sanskrit MSS. for 1883-84, p. 15.

Mr. Pandit himself allots Bhavabhûti to about 625 to 685 A.D.; and Kumârila to between 590 and 650 A.D. Even if these dates are accepted,[46] the conclusions we have arrived at, having regard to the grounds upon which they are rested, can scarcely be reconciled with them. If, therefore, the suggested relation between Kumârila and Bhavabhûti is established, the theory I have here propounded will, in all probability, have to be abandoned. But can we accept the suggested relation on the authority simply of the statement in the colophon of one MS. of the Mâlatî Mâdhava? In the first place, of course, we have no means for forming a judgment on the authority for that statement or its value, for we do not even know who makes it.[47] Secondly, if upon the uncorroborated authority of such a statement, we are to accept the alleged relationship between Bhavabhûti and Kumârila, we cannot properly refuse credence to a similar statement about Subandhu being the sister's son of Vararuchi,[48] in which case Dharmakîrti and Kumârila and many others will have to be placed some three or four centuries at least before the Christian Era. Again it is to be remarked that the author of the Mâlatî Mâdhava, in one of these colophons is described as श्रीकुमारिलस्वामिप्रसादप्राप्तवाग्वैभवश्रीमदुंवेकाचार्य. And it is a curious circumstance that Umvekâchârya is stated in Mâdhavâchârya's Śankaravijaya[49] to have been the popular name of Maṇḍana Miśra, now better known by his later title of Sureśvarâchârya.[50] And we also learn from the same work that this Umveka *alias* Maṇḍana Miśra *alias* Sureśvara was a favourite pupil of Kumârila,[51] and according to the other Śankaravijaya, his sister's husband too.[52] If this information is accepted, the name Bhavabhûti will have to be added to the three *aliases* already enumerated! But the puzzle thus presented to us must be left here in that condition. I cannot deal with

---

[46] As to which see Dr. Bühler's remarks. Vienna Journal, Vol. II., p. 332, *et seq.*

[47] As a general principle, I should say that information of this character is of little or no historical value except when it is quite consistent with all else known as bearing on the same topic, and fits in quite well with such previous knowledge.

[48] See Hall's Vâsavadattâ, Preface, pp. 6-7 and notes there.

[49] See Canto VII. st. 116.

[50] Mâdhava's Śankaravijaya, Canto X. st. 104.

[51] *Ibid.* Canto VII. st. 117. He was also known as Viśvarûpa.

[52] P. 236.

it now. Returning to the affiliation of Bhavabhûti to Kumârila, it is to be noted, that Mr. Pandit does not appear to have compared the statement of his MS. on that point with the statement of Bhavabhûti himself made in the Mahâvîracharita (and, according to one Palmleaf MS., in the Mâlatî Mâdhava[53] also) that his Guru was a person who rejoiced in "the well-deserved name of Jñânanidhi." There is no evidence at present available to us which would in any way warrant our holding that Jñânanidhi was one of the *aliases* of Kumârila. And again, although there is some force in Mr. Pandit's argument, that "the tradition that he (*scil.* Bhavabhûti) was a pupil of Kumârila Bhaṭṭa was not invented by his admirers from his being known to be learned in the Mîmâmsâ,"—it would, on the other hand, be a most remarkable circumstance that a pupil of the most conspicuous of the modern authorities on the Pûrva-Mîmâmsâ—and so excellent a pupil, too, as Bhavabhûti must have been—should say nothing about his own qualifications in that particular branch of learning, when he was stating his qualifications in the Sânkhya and the Yoga. It is further remarkable that he should fail to make any allusion to that eminent teacher, who must, if the traditions about him are of any value, have filled a very large space indeed in the eyes, at all events, of his Hindu contemporaries,—and this, while he does make express mention of his Guru Jñânanidhi, who, apparently has long been consigned to the limbo of oblivion. Nor must we omit to note, that there is considerable weight due to the suggestion of Prof. Bhânḍârkar, that Bhavabhûti was probably initiated in the secrets of the Vedânta,[54] and therefore, too, this association of him with Kumârila and the Pûrva Mîmâmsâ cannot be accepted except on very much stronger evidence than is forthcoming in this case. Upon the whole, I think, we are not at present in a position so far to trust the statement about Bhavabhûti having been a pupil of the famous Mîmâmsâ commentator Kumârila,[55] as to be called upon, on the strength of that statement, to abandon conclusions inconsistent with it, which are deducible from the other materials available to us.

I allow myself only a very few words on the paper of Mr. K. B. Pâthak on Dharmakîrti and Śankarâchârya, to which I have already

---

[53] Prof. Bhanḍârkar's Preface, P. V. and also p. 372.

[54] See Preface, *loc. cit.* I cannot recall any allusion to Pûrva Mîmâmsâ doctrines in the dramas of Bhavabhûti.

[55] Dr. Bühler's caveat on the subject is also a perfectly fair one, see Vienna Journal, Vol. II., p. 340.

once referred. His main conclusion is intended to be supported by further evidence which he promises to deal with in a subsequent paper or papers. And holding, as I do, very strongly to the opinion, that most conclusions in Sanskrit chronology must depend on whatever may be the cumulative force of all the evidence that bears upon them,[66] I do not think it fair or desirable that I should now deal with those arguments which alone he has at present put forward. It is, however, allowable to point out even now, that Mr. Pâthak, in his paper, has failed to compare the facts which he brings forward, with other facts bearing upon the question, even those which are attested by at least equally good evidence. Thus, while he deals with the Chinese evidence about Dharmakîrti's date, he omits to deal with evidence derived from the same quarter regarding the date of Gauḍapâda,[67] which has, of course, a most important bearing on the date of Śankarâchârya;—or again, when he argues that Śankarâchârya must have flourished more than half a century after Dharmakîrti, "who had already attained the rank of a classical authority" in the time of the former, Mr. Pâthak must also, on the other hand, weigh the fact that that argument, when applied to the mutual chronological relations of Dharmakîrti, Subandhu, and Bâṇa, would place Dharmakîrti about the early part of the sixth century. However, as I have said, I do not wish to examine Mr. Pâthak's argument, while it is yet imperfectly elaborated. When the additional information which he promises is brought forward, then will be the proper time to re-examine

---

[66] Cf. the observation of Prof. Max Müller in his Preface to the Dhammapada (Sacred Books of the East), pp. x. xi.

[67] See J. R. A. S. (N. S.), Vol. X., p. 355. The reference given in the Introduction to my Mudrârâkshasa is erroneous. And compare the remarks on the work mentioned by Mr. Beal at Bunyiu Nanjio's Catalogue, p. 287. We have not here a case of only equivalence of names—which Mr. R. Davids has very properly refused to accept as conclusive evidence of the identity of the things indicated by the names. (See Introduction, Buddhist Suttas in Sacred Books of the East, p. xxxviii.) Mr. Beal, after comparing the contents of the two works, holds that the Chinese work is a translation of Îśvara Krishṇa's Kârikâs and Gauḍapâda's Bhâshya. If then the Gauḍapâda, who wrote that Bhâshya was the teacher of Śankarâchârya's teacher, Govinda Yati (see Colebrooke's Essays, Vol. I., p. 233, and Weber's History of Indian Literature, pp. 236-7, and also Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall's Preface to the Sânkhyasâra, Bibliotheca Indica, p. 39, and note and Wilson's Sânkhya Kârikâ, p. 257), it is absolutely impossible to accept 788 A.D. as the date of the birth of Śankara.

the whole case. The points I have now thrown out have been thrown out rather with the wish that when Mr. Pâthak does discuss the fresh facts he is going to adduce, he should discuss them in the light of other facts which are equally well ascertained, and even of those which, though not so well ascertained, have a reasonably satisfactory historical basis of evidence to rest upon. I will add only one word more—and that to point out that if Mr. Pâthak's conclusion, as he indicates in more than one place in his last paper, is that Śankarâchârya "flourished" in the eighth century, that conclusion, as thus put, is *not* consistent with Śankara's having been born in 788 A.D.—which was the conclusion arrived at in his first paper. In 788 A.D. there were only twelve years of the eighth century left, and one could hardly be speaking accurately in speaking of Śankarâchârya as "flourishing," at a time when he was a boy of not more than twelve years of age.[58] The stories contained in the books of Mâdhava and Ânandagiri which make out that Śankarâchârya was a prodigy of learning at that or even an earlier age,[59] of course, cannot be treated as historical upon their voucher exclusively.

In this connexion, it is also curious to note, that in Albiruni's famous book, there appears to be no reference to the Vedânta philosophy, or to the followers of Śankarâchârya. There are allusions

---

[58] I notice that in Bühler's Introduction to his Manu (Sacred Books of the East, p. cxi.) the date assigned to the Sârîraka Bhâshya is 804 A.D. As Dr. Bühler accepts the so-called traditional date of 788 A.D. for Śankara's birth, this would make him only sixteen years of age when his greatest work was written. I cannot help suspecting some mistake here. I may, perhaps, be permitted to add, as Dr. Bühler's acceptance of the "traditional" date is due partly to its being supposed to be corroborated by the Śringeri records, that such supposition would seem to be in fact incorrect. The evidence of the Śringeri records has been adduced by me and commented on at J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. X., 372, *et seq*. The circumstance mentioned in the note there at p. 374 would rather seem to point to the list set out being based on the Kudalgi list. But it is actually stated to have come from Śringeri. With that list may be compared the one given in Prof. H. H. Wilson's Essays on the Religion of the Hindus, Vol. I., p. 201, *et seq*. I am sorry I cannot refer to Deussen's book, which is cited in Dr. Bühler's note.

[59] With reference to the observations contained in note 9 in my Introduction to the Mudrârâkshasa (p. xxxviii.), it is worthy of remark that in the list referred to in the last note (see. p. 373) 32 years is stated to be the period of "the duration of office" of Śankarâchârya.

to the Sânkhya and Yoga systems, and quotations from writers appertaining to them,[60] and there are also allusions to the Bhagavadgîtâ and quotations in considerable number from that work.[61] And yet there is no allusion to Śankarâchârya, or his school. The fact is curious in any case, but it appears to me that, if Śankarâchârya's career falls about the middle of the ninth century, as it must if he was born in 788 A.D., it is much more curious than if that career fell about the middle or end of the sixth century. It can hardly be considered probable, that the great movement which is connected with the name of Śankarâchârya should so early as within about one hundred and fifty years, have been wiped off from the memories of men, so that a minute and careful inquirer as Albiruni is by his works shown to have been, should hear nothing about Śankara or his sect from any of his informants.[62] It may be added, that of the Buddhists, also, Albiruni failed to obtain anything like a full or satisfactory account.[63] His references to them are few, and such as he himself is not satisfied with. May it be that the decadence of Buddhism, which had doubtless become accelerated soon after the movement of Kumârila and Śankarâchârya, had in the three centuries following become almost complete?[64]

The same considerations which, as above stated, have induced me to forego for the present an examination of the fresh evidence adduced by Mr. Pâthak, have led me to the conclusion, that it is also advisable to hold over at present that re-examination of the old evidence bearing on the date of Kumârila and Śankarâchârya, which Mr. Fleet invited me to institute in 1887.[65] Mr. Fleet's discussion of the Nepâl chronology has led him to the conclusion, that according to the traditions of that province Śankarâchârya's date would fall somewhere between 635 and 655 A.D., as between those dates flourished the king Vṛishadêva, in whose reign Śankarâchârya visited the province of

---

[60] See *inter alia*, Vol. I. Preface, p. 8, and pp. 27, 30.

[61] See *inter alia*, Vol. I., p 29.

[62] Dr. Bühler has shown (see Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIX., p. 382) that Albiruni speaks of a period which was 270 years before his (according to Sir A. Cunningham's Chronology) as *not much anterior to our time*. I may add that the Pûrva Mîmâmsâ of Jaimini is named by Albiruni, Vol. I., p. 132.

[63] See Vol. I., pp. 40-1.

[64] This, of course, is not the only possible explanation. See Prof. Sachau's suggestion at Albiruni, Vol. I., p. xlvii.

[65] Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVI., p. 42.

Nepâl, and who named his son after the great philosopher.[66] Upon this Mr. Fleet naturally thinks, that as the date thus ascertained comes so near to the date deduced by me from other evidence, a re-examination of both, with a view, if possible, to harmonise them by some slight adjustments is very desirable. Although I concur in this view, still I think that as we may now fairly consider ourselves to be "within measurable distance" of some new facts bearing on the whole question, the endeavour to harmonise the dates above referred to should be made in the light of those new facts when published, if, indeed, those new facts do not dispense with the necessity of any harmonising at all, as Mr. Pâthak seems to anticipate. While, however, I do not wish to enter upon a re-examination of the whole question just now, I may add here a remark or two with reference to the point made by Mr. Fleet. It is to be observed, then, that if we accept Mr. Fleet's dates and the Nepâl tradition, the activity, both of Kumârila Bhaṭṭa,[67] and of Śankarâchârya, will have to be assigned to about the very period in which Hiuen Tsiang was making his famous journey in India, and we must also hold apparently that at least Śankarâchârya must have been in the midst of his career when the Chinese traveller was in the country. If so, it would certainly be a very remarkable circumstance that Hiuen Tsiang should have said nothing about either of the great champions of Brahmanism in his writings. The late Dr. Burnell relied on the absence of all reference in Hiuen Tsiang's writings to Kumârila—"the great and dangerous Brahman enemy of the Buddhists"[68]—as proving that Kumârila must have flourished after 645 A.D. This "negative argument," is, in this particular case, even stronger than as put by Dr. Burnell. For, in the Life of Hiuen Tsiang, we have an account of a discussion between Hiuen Tsiang and a heretic, in the course of which the former noticed in succession the various opinions

[66] *Ibid.* and Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII. p. 350.

[67] I assume here, of course, in accordance with our old tradition, that Kumârila and Śankara may be treated practically as contemporaries. That tradition has not been impeached, as far as I am aware, by those who have written about it, though Prof. Wilson's remarks at Essays on the Religion of the Hindus, Vol. II. p. 366, may be read, to some extent, as consistent with a doubt about its correctness. I am not aware, however, of any specific reason for doubting that tradition.

[68] See his Śamavidhâna Brâhmaṇa Preface, p. vi.

of the different heretical schools.[69] Neither the school of Kumârila nor that of Śankara is there alluded to, although if they were just then becoming so conspicuous as the works and the oral controversies of those two philosophers must have made them, one might very fairly expect such an allusion. Nor can we account for Hiuen Tsiang's silence on the ground that the fame of Śankarâchârya or Kumârila may not then have been established, and that they may not have filled the same large space in the eyes of their contemporaries that they do in the view of posterity. This, as a general observation, would doubtless be perfectly reasonable. But on the hypothesis of the Nepâl tradition, we are bound to hold that Śankarâchârya's fame, and probably also Kumârila's, must have been both widespread and thoroughly established some considerable time before 655 A.D. On the other hand, Bâṇa's Harsha Charita enables us to fix the Aupanishada sect as one which must have flourished at a time before the journey of Hiuen Tsiang in India.[70] I am, therefore, at present rather inclined to hold, that the careers of Kumârila and Śankarâchârya had both become so much things of the past in his time, as to have had no interest for a Buddhist like Hiuen Tsiang; and that the progress of the heretics noted by Hiuen Tsiang,[71] when contrasted with the flourishing condition of Buddhism, as we gather it from the earlier narrative of Fa-Hien,[72] must be taken to be indicative of the success which, in the interval between the tours of the two pilgrims, had already been achieved by Brahmanism under Kumârila and Śankara.[73]

---

[69] See Beal's Life of Hiuen Tsiang, p. 168. I have not noticed any reference to this incident in the Buddhist Records of the Western World.

[70] See p. 459 (Kâśmîr Ed.) and the Introduction to my Edition of Bhartṛiharî, pp. ix., x. In connexion with this, however, it is necessary also to consider the remarks of Prof. Bhâṇḍârkar in his Report on Sanskrit MSS. for 1883-4, p. 74, and see Kern's Introduction to the Saddharmapuṇḍarîka (Sacred Books of the East), p. xxviii. note.

[71] See the references collected in the notes pp. xxiv. xxv. to my Introduction to the Mudrârâkshasa. And compare Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. II. p. 216.

[72] See *inter alia* Beal's Buddhist Records of the Western World, Introduction Vol. I. pp. xxix. xxx. xxxvii. lvi. lxxi. xxxii.

[73] This is also the conclusion indicated in a note at J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. XVIII. p. 4, on the strength of the facts there alluded to. I have noticed

Since writing the above, I have seen the observation of Prof. Max Müller in a note in "India: what it can teach us," to the effect that "Subandhu in his Vâsavadattâ recurs several times to the eclipse that has come over the Mîmâmsâ and Nyâya through the teaching of the Buddhists."[74] I have not noticed any such passages except the last one of those I have quoted. It is, therefore, unlucky that no references are given to them. Prof. Max Müller, however, does refer to Prof. Weber's *Indische Streifen*. On turning up the passage in that work which is relied on,[75] I find that as far back as 1854 Prof. Weber drew attention to the various passages which I have made the basis of my theory in this paper. None of those passages, however, as already shown, alludes to an eclipse having come over the Mîmâmsâ through Buddhist teaching, but rather the contrary. Nor again have I come across any reference whatever to an eclipse coming over the Nyâya Philosophy.[76] Perhaps Prof. Max Müller's note was based on an imperfect reminiscence of the passage in Subandhu where मीमांसान्याय[77] is spoken of. But there the Nyâya Philosophy is not the subject alluded to. The only passage, as already stated, pointing in the direction indicated by Prof. Max Müller is the fifth of those which I have quoted above, and which is the only one of the five that Prof. Weber has not mentioned in his essay. My explanation of that passage I have already set forth.

---

several passages in Hiuen Tsiang which speak of many classes of Hindu Sectaries dwelling together in Temples in his time, see e. g. Vol. I. pp. 198, 200, Vol. II. p. 14. Might not this fact be taken as indicating that union of all the Vedic sects which must have been in existence at the time of the movement of Kumârila and Śankara against the enemies of the Vedic system, and which probably continued for some generations after the success of that movement? If this suggestion is correct, it will support to some extent the view thrown out in the text.

[74] See p. 308, note 2.

[75] Vol. I. pp. 378, 9.

[76] It is not quite clear why such an eclipse should come "through the teaching of the Buddhists," for as Prof. Max Müller himself points out, eminent Buddhist authorities cultivated the Nyâya Philosophy, and even wrote works on topics connected with it. See India, what it can teach us; pp. 305, 308, 361, and J. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XVII. pp. 47, *et seq.*

[77] P. 93.

Art. XIII.—*A Brief Sketch of the Portuguese and their Language in the East.* By J. Gerson da Cunha, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., K.C.J., K.G.G., K.C.I., &c.

[Read, 1st December 1891.]

"History arrests the wings of Time in his flight to the Gulf of Oblivion."

Edmund Burke.

When I promised the Honorary Secretary to read a paper before this Society, I at the same time apprized him of the choice of the subject, which was "The Vicissitudes of Mombasa." This theme is of some importance at present, and one with which my studies of the Portuguese, their great maritime discoveries, their conquests, and the influence of their civilisation in the East for about four centuries, as well as my long connection with this learned Society, had made me somewhat familiar.

It was in September 1875 that copies of some Portuguese inscriptions, discovered on the walls of the Fort of Mombasa by Major Euan Smith, Political Agent and Consul-General, Zanzibar (now, I believe, British Minister at Morocco), were sent to me through this Society for decipherment and translation for the Foreign Department of the Government of India, and were eventually published in the *Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* for that year.

Seventeen years—*grande mortalis aevi spatium*, a long span of one's mortal days,—which are sufficient to bring a man from youth to middle age, have alas! carried off many of my early associates here. With two or three exceptions, the faces of those who were then present have been mostly removed by death, and a few by retirement to a distant land.

There was then no forecast, no indication of the actual partition of Africa. There were no Congo Free States, nor the British Protectorate of Egypt. The British Sovereign chartered companies, such as the Imperial East Africa, the South Africa, the Royal Niger, were hardly in an embryonic stage; while the German *Ostafrikanische Gesellschaft* and the Italian *Colonia Eritrea* had not been dreamt of.

The Portuguese alone, being the first among the modern nations of Europe to penetrate into the unknown regions of the dark continent, held some possessions on both its western and eastern coasts. Their presence there was the outcome of their early geographical researches, and vindicated the legitimacy of their title to occupation; but their subsequent vacillating policy had encouraged younger and more vigorous nations to contest those rights, to forget that the tradition of their ancient glory entitled them to a degree of regard, and to seek territorial aggrandizement at their expense. The Portuguese, in spite of their comparative decrepitude, resisted these violent attempts at spoliation, although not with much success; for in the end *la force prime le droit.*

But within the period of seventeen years which has intervened, the settlements above mentioned have been fully equipped with the usual concomitants of such establishments. Among the different manifestations of sovereignty, the most tangible are, doubtless, the striking of money and its circulation. The currencies issued by each of these States or companies have added new coins to our numismatic collections. My own coin-cabinet has not been remiss in acquiring specimens of these interesting historical documents, an exhibition of which may, perhaps, interest some of the members present, to whom I shall be glad to show them.

A comparison of the Mombasa copper coin with the early Bombay pice, issued soon after the cession of the island, shows a great difference in the patterns of the two coinages. The East African Company has reproduced, on both silver and copper, the reverse type of the later copper coin of the East India Co., the balance with the word *adel* in Arabic characters between the scales,—a symbol of even-handed or equally-balanced justice which had once such a fascination for the imaginative Hindu.

Mombasa, which was one of the most flourishing and wealthy cities on the eastern coast of Africa during the Portuguese rule, carried on a large trade with both the interior of that continent and the Indian coast, especially with the towns of Diu, Damaun, Bassein, Chaul, and Goa. It was strongly fortified, and contained some remarkable churches and convents. Its history is full of romantic episodes, and its rise, decline and fall, like the vicissitudes of nations or families, cannot fail to teach us useful lessons of the little stability there is even in the highest gifts of fortune.

It is now reported that this ruined city is, like the mythological Phœnix, springing up from its ashes. Its revival, in connection with the progress and development of the recently formed African companies, cannot fail to redound to the welfare of this great peninsula. I have already met with not a few Indians who have inaugurated emigration to Africa—a movement which must eventually swell to large proportions, by leading the overplus of our overcrowded districts to its vast equatorial regions, where no other foreign race can thrive so well. The Portuguese settlements illustrate this fact. A prosperous Indian colonization will, in process of time, not only promote materially the advancement of commerce, but multiply the resources of India by the demand created for its products.

In spite of the attractiveness of this subject, I am obliged to leave it aside for the present and pass on to the one which possesses now for us at least an element of actuality. It is what the French, with their characteristic *verve*, would call *une question palpitante d'intérêt.*

I.

My aim in undertaking this evening, in redemption of a pledge, to read this paper,—a paper written amidst distractions of an absorbing nature—has been not only to record a protest against the degradation involved in the levelling down of the noble language and literature of a European nation to the plane of the Indian vernaculars without any literature worthy of the name, but also to demonstrate the benefits and the civilising influence of this language, wherever it is spoken in the two hemispheres, and that its true place is by the side of the French and the Italian, the Spanish and the German.

In order to attain this object I think I could not select a better platform than this Society. Sir William Jones, the pioneer of British Orientalists in India, said when founding the Bengal Society:—"The bounds of its investigation will be the geographical limits of Asia; and within these limits its inquiries will be extended to whatever is performed by man, or produced by nature." These words are applicable to our Society. Considering the extent of its researches into the various languages of the East, during the ninety years of its existence, it will not be inappropriate to devote a few lines to the historical survey of the language of the pioneers of Western civilisation into India. The Index carefully prepared and lately published by our intelligent and active Assistant Secretary and librarian, Mr. Tivarekar,

displays, at a glance, the richness of the materials embodied in the 21 volumes of the Transactions and Journals of this Society, which contain more articles and memoirs relating to the history and archæology of the Portuguese in the East than all other Asiatic Journals, and to which it has been my privilege to contribute, within the narrow sphere of my humble efforts, whatever my limited opportunities enabled me to investigate.

Although the dominant note of this paper is the Portuguese language, it is nevertheless surrounded by a series of collateral subjects, which naturally creep in from a close connection with the main theme. It is like the motive in a musical piece almost smothered amidst apparently incongruous and engrossing variations—a mere part and parcel, a *pezzo*, as an Italian maestro would say, of a symphony. Even in the rapid survey of a landscape one cannot overlook the colour, and the light and shade, which make themselves visible. For it is not the Portuguese language alone, but religion, polity, laws, social habits, and numerous other subtle psychic influences, first imported into this country, and imprinted almost indelibly on some sections of the Indian mind, that are so many factors in the moulding of the Indo-Portuguese community. It is, indeed, impossible to detach one part from the other without doing violence to the synchronous character of this social organism.

A recent writer on Portugal, Mr. H. Morse Stephens, treating of the period of the Portuguese navigation and conquests in India, says:—"Yet this period, in spite of all the work which has been done upon it, still remains without an historian, fitted by a thorough knowledge, both of Indian history and of the state of civilization in India at the period in question, to draw out the salient and interesting points of the first direct contact between modern Europe and modern Asia, between the East and the West."

"Yet it is work which well deserves to be done. Prescott, the great American historian, has shown the interest attaching to the first conflict between Spanish chivalry and the Aztecs of Mexico and the Incas of Peru; but when will an historian arise to tell worthily the story of the contact between the heroes of Portugal and the more civilized inhabitants of Hindustan? Apart from the fascination of this side of the subject, there remains the fact that for a century the intercourse between Asia and Europe remained in the hands of the Portuguese. The history of the Dutch and the English in the

Eastern seas has its own peculiar interest, but they did not find their way in that direction until the nations of the East had been for a whole century in contact with Europeans, and until their attitude had been greatly modified by this contact. Besides, the Dutch and English both went to the East as traders, and not as conquerors, colonizers, and preachers as well. Far different was the intention of the Portuguese. Regardless of the small size and slender population of their fatherland, they dreamed of nothing less than conquering the mighty empires of the East, and imposing Christianity upon them, if need be, by the edge of their swords. Grandiose as this intention was, and full of inconsequence as the idea seems to modern eyes, which have seen with what difficulty England with its teeming population has managed to maintain its hold upon India, even while it has discouraged proselytism and protected native religions, there is something noble in the confidence of the Portuguese warriors in their God, and in their belief that through their means He would spread Christianity throughout the East. For the ambitions of the Portuguese were not confined to India; Portuguese adventurers actually established themselves in power in parts of Arabia, in Burma, and in the district of Chittagong at the head of the Bay of Bengal; Portuguese emissaries found their way to Pekin and Japan, closely followed by the missionaries of the Roman Church; and it was while on his way to convert the millions of China to Christianity that St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of the Indies, gave up his life. And, lastly, it must be remembered at what odds the Portuguese fought and tried to proselytize in Asia: at many months' voyage from their homes and base of operations; only able to reach their destinations after sailing in feeble craft round the hardly known, unexplored, and dangerous coast of Africa; deprived of the modern knowledge alike of tides and winds, and of the means to promote existence in tropical climates; they arrived amidst the hostile millions armed only with clumsy arquebuses and their swords; and yet with all these drawbacks they were victorious in many hard-fought fights against more powerful armies than their European successors in the East ever met."

Though this is a long quotation, it is nevertheless an admirable *résumé* and brief epitome of the facts treated of in this paper—facts which it is a fashion with some and a policy with others to ignore or to allow, in the words of Burke, to fly "to the gulf of oblivion." But the epoch, to which no historian has hitherto dedicated himself,

affords suitable work for a mind fitted for minute researches and for large speculations. No justice can, therefore, be done to it within the narrow bounds of this paper, where compression rather than expansion is the object; nor do I possess the necessary qualifications for the literary treatment of a subject which lends itself peculiarly to the artistic beauty of form.

Besides, without unbroken time there can be no consecutive thought. The versatile American scholar, Lowell, who recently died, says, in one of his literary essays: "It is my misfortune that in the midst of a reflexion or of a sentence I am liable to be called away by the bell of private or public duty." If literature, allied to diplomacy, is thus liable to be disturbed, it is more so when combined with medicine. This essay is an instance in point. After I began it I was repeatedly interrupted by the call of duty, and it was not till the third day that I was able to resume its continuation. This is the principal reason why the History of the Portuguese in India, announced under my authorship for a long time in the list of his works of the Oriental Series by the late Mr. Nicholas Trübner, an eminent London publisher, has yet remained a *desideratum*. Nor is it possible, at present, with all the best materials available, to have more than an episodical history, which may eventually go to form a consecutive narrative, with all those details which, according to Thierry, are the soul of history.

Perhaps this tentative and fragmentary work, this parcelling out of a great subject into separate and independent sections is, after all, an advantage. "Beware," said Goethe to Eckermann, "of attempting a large work. It is exactly that which injures our best minds, even those distinguished by the finest talents and the most earnest efforts. I have suffered from this cause, and know how much it has injured me. * * * * * if you have a great work in your head, nothing else thrives near it; all other thoughts are repelled and the pleasantness of life itself is for the time lost." This opinion, the result of "the lifelong experience of the greatest master who ever consciously made an art of literature," comes with the force of an advice to us all.

In size Portugal is a little larger than Greece, and its inhabitants seemed, like those of that glorious peninsula, destined by nature to confide themselves to the sea. Without the artistic genius and the philosophic culture of the Hellenes, they had nevertheless, in common with the latter, that love of freedom and spirit of adventure which have invariably characterised those born in maritime districts.

Dwelling on the western side of the Iberian Peninsula, which is washed by the waves of the Atlantic, the Portuguese, from their early nautical propensities, have been likened to the Phoenicians of old; but the similarity is only partial as the Lusitanian family unfortunately lacks the commercial instinct which appears to have been inborn in that race of almost prehistoric traders.

The renaissance in Europe, however, gave Portugal, aided by its race, climate, and admirable geographical position, what Prof. Cesare Lombroso, in *Les petites et les grandes causes de Révolution*, calls the *élan évolutif*, which all nations, worthy of the name, are doomed to experience during the active phase of their existence. Mr. Herbert Spencer has shown that peoples do not all follow the same course of development, and are not governed by the identical *à priori* reasons in their successive stages of evolution. To them, then, one may apply what Horace says of books: *habent sua fata*.

The first Portuguese expeditions to India, their proudest achievements beyond the seas, formed but a continuation of the crusade and of the religious propagandism, which had led them some years before to the coast of Africa. With the support of imagination fostered by an age of faith, with strong and practical convictions and with belief, as Wordsworth says: "ripened into faith and faith become a passionate intuition," it was easy for the countrymen of Viriato to crowd into the life of three generations the work of some centuries.

Convictions when well grounded are always the keynote of triumph and the tochstone of success. Leopardi, the saddest of that brilliant galaxy of Italian poets, who illumined the early part of this century, says that to feel with intense conviction about anything is among the lost arts; but he must have written this jeremiad when he was at Recanati in his abnormally satiric mood. The Lusitanian race, however, does not appear to have ceased to believe. At least that batch of the Indians, who were first brought within the sphere of their influence by the early preachers, seems, on the contrary, to suffer from an excess of convictions. But one must not underrate the force which the past exerts on the present. There is a moral law which limits the violence of even modern culture or of any social change by the conditions which precede it. This may be partly the result of the indolence which is inherent in human nature.

The apparent scepticism of our times is perhaps due less to the democratic spirit of the age than to the absence of guiding individualities, who were formerly the inspirers of the stirring events which grace the annals of mankind and in whom the *élan évolutif* of the people became incarnate. When nations like the Portuguese were governed by absolute monarchies, and princes reigned as well as governed, it was possible for one strong-willed personage to organize and to carry out an historical enterprise to completion. To-day princes reign but do not govern, and no great scheme can succeed without the co-operation of the people, in whose hands are the custody of the laws and the key of the coffers. Prince Henry "the navigator" could alone realize his ideal, embodied in the device of *Talent de bien faire*, by the maritime explorations which he undertook for "the glory of God and the extension of the faith." The single design and inspiration of the Solitary of Sagres did more than all the collective strength of the *doctrinaires* of his time. His example did not take long to communicate itself to the other princes of the reigning dynasty, his individualism passed into a corporate enthusiasm, and the impulse imparted to his bold mariners soon became general.

Camoens gives expression to this national feeling :

> "Onde vem semear de Christo a lei,
> E dar novo costume, e novo Rei."

Lusiadas, c. vii., e. 15.

Burton translates it thus :—

> "And where the Saviour's seed they wend to sow,
> Enthrone new lords, new lights, new laws bestow."

Burton's name enforces a digression, and affords me a rare opportunity for the acknowledgment of my debt to him. When, in reading the fasciculus III. of my *Indo-Portuguese Numismatics* in this room, a short while ago, I alluded to Sir Richard Burton's *Lusiads*, the greater part of this work was in the press. I met him subsequently at Trieste, within a few months of his death, and received from his hands the complete poem and commentary in six volumes. And now that this gifted man has passed away, lamented by all, leaving his production behind him to testify to the high endowments of his head and heart, I cannot let this occasion slip without rendering a tribute of homage to the memory of one who has done so signal a service to Portuguese Scholarship. As a translator and commentator of the great "epic of

commerce" he has doubtless helped to make it more popular amongst the large English-speaking community in the world than all his predecessors in either Europe or America.

In the two lines I have quoted above from Camoens, the poet not only points out the final scope of the fleet in quest of the route by sea to the east, commanded by admiral Vasco da Gama, but with a prophetic instinct and unselfish aim foresees in the following stanzas the successive participation of other nations in the glorious task of civilising the world, when he addresses a notable and poetic exhortation to the princes of Christendom exhorting them to like enterprises in India.

The kings of Portugal always impressed on their viceroys the necessity of promoting the propagation of Christianity in India, a remarkable instance of which is given by D. João de Castro's biographer, who prefaces a letter from John III. to that eminent viceroy thus:—"*para que veja o mundo, que nossas armas no Oriente trouxérão mais filhos á Igreja, que vassallos ao Estado*," 'in order that the world may see that our arms in the East brought more sons to the Church than vassals to the State.'

The weight of evidence, both documentary and traditional, establishes the fact that the propagation of religion was with the Portuguese a far greater object than either trade or politics, and that the conversion of a heathen was deemed of greater importance than the acquisition of a kingdom. Affonso d'Albuquerque, the founder of the Portuguese Empire in the East, used to call the merchants *attentadores de Satanaz*, 'Satanic tempters.' But Albuquerque's estimate of the trading class is a privileged one, and will not be generally concurred in in this mercantile age. The *Lendas* of his private Secretary, Gaspar Correa, the *Commentarios*, edited by his son, and his letters addressed to king Emmanuel, prove that this modern Cæsar had most of the virtues without the failings of his celebrated Roman prototype. A great statesman, an eminent scholar, a brave soldier and sailor, Albuquerque was a theologian as well. His attempt, although unsuccessful, to convert with technical arguments the Rajah of Cochin to Christianity proves it. This fact I have but lately ascertained in a letter addressed by Albuquerque himself from Cochin to king Emmanuel on Dec. 20th, 1514, just one year before his death on board the *Flôr de Roza* in the Goa harbour.

His interpreter during this religious controversy was Duarte

Barbosa, the renowned author of a work on the East Coast of Africa and the Malabar, translated by the Hon. H. Stanley for the Hakluyt Society.

Like Wellington, Albuquerque neglected no details. He was the first to conceive the idea of enlisting various races of men as soldiers in his army, the originality of which has been ascribed to Dupleix. He knew that for a small country, like Portugal, whose rapid rise was phenomenal, an intelligent system of colonisation was the only means of preserving the conquests he had made. He knew also that the safest way to spread his king's dominion was, like that of Rome, by creating new interests, and binding them together less by the force of arms than by broad human sympathies. But he did not know the climate and its deleterious effects when he planned the organization of his Indo-Portuguese colony, and that he was adding one more caste, from various causes an overbearing one, to the already long list of castes.

Albuquerque was, moreover, a man of extraordinary courage and unparalleled boldness. His audacious and gigantic projects to destroy the city of Mecca and to divert the course of the Nile into the Red Sea, in order to both smite and starve the Turk, Commander of the Faithful and Guardian of the Kaaba, who was then the greatest enemy of Christendom, evince the daring and fearlessness of his character and the magnitude of his conceptions. Of him may truly be said what Louis Enault says of Justinian:—*Il y a plusieurs personnages dans sa personnalité complexe.*

I have mentioned only Albuquerque and Castro—the latter also a scholar and author of three valuable *Roteiros* or works on navigation—as they are the two of the representative historical characters about whom have gathered the great traditions of their nation in this country. Possessing a certain archaic simplicity of character, developing into the noble traits of frankness, honesty and outspoken truth, they have been accepted as types of the several national ideals of that glorious epoch. With opportunities of amassing a fortune and becoming as rich as a Crœsus or a Clive, Albuquerque died nevertheless poor, recommending his successor to avoid a public sale of his garments as they had rents in them. Castro, who during a financial crisis brought on by the second siege of Diu had mortgaged a few white hairs of his venerable beard, on the security of which the ladies hastened to offer their jewels, expired in the arms of Francis Xavier, having

for his bed a coverlet, and his effects consisting of only three *larins* or silver pieces. Both of them felt the charm of sacrifice, the proud satisfaction of having done their duty, the poetry of self-denial, and an utter contempt for the prosaic realities and material interests of life.

There were other personages, whose heroic deeds filled a large space in the eyes of their contemporaries, and the eclecticism of whose tastes was displayed in the building of palaces, the laying out of gardens, and the adornment of churches, which now lie scattered all along the coast in picturesque ruins, a silent epitaph of departed greatness; but they were not in the foremost rank of the founders of the empire or of the architects of the fortunes of the nation. Nor have they earned the verdict of history for any extraordinary gifts, except perhaps that of humanising chivalry, which was a national characteristic. It is this racial peculiarity, then, which has made the Portuguese a nation of missionaries.

I come to the threshold of another great subject, equal in magnitude as well as in interest to the Portuguese language in India—the royal patronage of the eastern missions. *Padroado* or "Portuguese royal patronage of the Catholic missions in the East" is a phrase which has become one of the commonplaces in Indian conversation; and it requires some effort to bring it from the region of formulæ to that of realities. It is a subject which, even if its bare outlines were rapidly sketched, would form an admirable religious romance. The convictions of a million of Indian Catholics, amongst whom the development and spread of the idea of solidarity have led to the spiritual ties, which bind and weave together into one whole the web of the Indian Catholic family—have won for the *Padroado* an attachment which receives its consecration from public conscience. The loyalty of this mass of people is based on sentiment and not on policy, for policy is changeable, while sentiment, especially when deep-rooted, has in it all the elements of stability. Even when violated it reasserts itself.

The *Padroado* represents one of the many franchises or immunities which the Lusitanian, like the Gallican Church, prizes and fights for against the spirit of Ultramontanism. The prerogative of the *Padroado* consists not in the mere investiture with an ecclesiastical dignity. One has but a faint conception of the amount of treasure, blood and martyrdom which went to the winning of the Portuguese royal patronage of the Catholic missions in the East. The

record of such achievements, however poor the words in which they may be described, is worthy of being regarded as the missionary epic of modern times.

Having thus far endeavoured to demonstrate that the largest factor in the historic development of this foreign group of crusaders, whose evangelical spirit acted as leaven on the mass of the inert indigenous population, was proselytism; it remains now to briefly allude to the other factors—trade, political dominion and education, which, though only in a subordinate degree, helped considerably to spread the Portuguese tongue—a tongue whose vitality is, indeed, remarkable, for it is still spoken in Cochin, Colombo, Malacca, and other places in the East, after the political influence which introduced it had ceased for about two centuries and a half, thus affording a striking contrast to the Dutch language, which, on the contrary, has disappeared almost entirely from those localities, which only less than a hundred years ago owed allegiance to Holland. It is true that Portuguese, without direct touch with the mother country, has in such outlandish corners, where it so tenaciously survives, fallen into an obsolete form, or degenerated into several dialectic variations, but it is nevertheless an offshoot of the parent tongue.

II.

We shall pass to consider first the two important factors—trade and political power—which were, after the missions, mainly instrumental in the diffusion of Portuguese in this country; although trade amongst that nation, it must be confessed, was not so efficacious as among the Anglo-Saxons, in rendering the use of its tongue almost general in the commercial community. The Portuguese are not a trading nation. They have no business aptitude nor mercantile tactics, which latter faculty, however, some qualify as mere greed for gain, unscrupulousness, and absence of conscience. Be this as it may, the Portuguese commerce in the East was a royal monopoly, for monopoly was in those days the universal rule, and monopolies do not help a people to be commercial. They had inherited, besides, an uncommercial propensity—bigotry—which repelled the advances of the heathen, and refused to negotiate conventions with the infidel. It led eventually to the establishment of the inquisition, which, in spite of all the good its advocates say of it, destroyed all except

what Lombroso calls *pauperes spiritu*, showing signs of premature decay or approaching senility, now well evident throughout the Iberian Peninsula, and possibly the result of the sombre drama of heredity. The Portuguese would hold no commercial intercourse with the infidels, unless sanctioned by the Pope. As early as 1454 Nicholas V. granted Prince Henry of Portugal a licence to trade with Mahomedans. Happily it came in time, for without the papal bull the doubling of the Cape of Good Hope would have been only a voyage of exploration, without any other practical results, and Vasco da Gama the Humboldt of the renaissance.

Notwithstanding their disinclination to trade, and nourishing the feudal idea of commerce being a derogatory pursuit, in which only the inferior classes could join, the Portuguese had, nevertheless, two chivalrous traits in their national character—integrity and unselfishness,—although associated with a little seignorial arrogance, which made them in the end win the affections of the Indians and diffuse their language. Integrity is, indeed, the main support of a people, for without it "wealth is as poor as poverty, and knowledge as blind as ignorance." It is true that in the distribution of the gifts of humanity, in which more or less satire is mingled, the good and the bad are always mated—and the Portuguese chronicles in the East are unluckily not free from the stain of rapine and peculation, but egotism is the defect least visible in them. Nature and breeding seem to have intended them for types of generosity. There is discernible among them none of that illiberal heart and withered conscience, none of those tragedies of selfishness which abound elsewhere, nor are there found among them millionaires, whose careers are nothing but an apotheosis of egotism, but who are withal a constant object of worship with an unthinking and gaping populace.

The first and most beneficial effect of commerce is the removal of prejudices. There are already so many social antipathies in the world, that men of science are trying their utmost to remove them. Prof. Virchow at the Anthropological Association of Germany and Austria said lately :—"If different races would recognize one another as independent co-labourers in the great field of humanity, if all possessed a modesty which would allow them to see merits in neighbouring people, much of the strife now agitating the world would disappear." There is, however, no more effectual remedy for the cure of this great social malady than commerce, or as Victor Cherbuliez puts it tersely

thus:—"Le préjugé est un meurtrier, les blessures qu'il fait sont redoutables, et le commerce est un médecin qui les guerit; c'est presque un drame." And the Portuguese royal trading monopoly in the East was, indeed, a drama, while the Lusiads are the epic of commerce. There is, anyhow, a certain dramatic fitness about the deeds of the early navigators, soldiers, priests, and merchants, which claim admiration on account of their epic completeness.

The political influence of the Portuguese in India has already been treated at length by some distinguished writers. Language, like trade, follows the flag, and it is but natural that where Portugal held dominion there its language should become official. This political power combined with trading relations with the native courts made Portuguese a *lingua franca* long after the star of the Portuguese was on the decline; for as late as the time of Lord Clive and his immediate successors, the diplomatic language with the Indian princes was Portuguese, as is attested by the documents which have been lately published. To add a few details: a traveller in 1636 says that Portuguese was spoken at Gombron by the people, being introduced from Hormus. An edition of the Bible was published in Portuguese for Batavia and the other isles of the Eastern Archipelago. Hamilton about 1700 remarks: "Along the sea coast the Portuguese have left the vestiges of their language; though much corrupted, yet it is the language that most Europeans learn first, to qualify themselves for a general converse with one another as well as with the different inhabitants of India." The early Protestant missionaries, Ziegenbalg, Clarke, Kiernander, Ringletaube and others, about a hundred years ago, employed it as the medium of intercourse with the natives until they learned the vernaculars. Le Bas remarks, in his life of Bishop Middleton, "The Portuguese language may perhaps be considered as one favourable medium for the diffusion of the true religion throughout the maritime provinces of the East." It is no wonder, then, that these statements should have led Sismondi to form a somewhat exaggerated notion and write, "in India Portuguese is the language of commerce," and a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, as late as 1814, to assert that "if in the eventual triumph of Christianity in India, a Romish Church should be formed, Portuguese will be the language of that church wherever it extends."

The results of this influence, especially the antagonism to the Turk, have been described with great critical acumen by Robertson in his *His-*

torical Disquisition concerning Ancient India, and by others. Mr. J. Morley, referring to that work in the *Fortnightly Review*, says:—"The chief point worked out here, Bk. I., § 7 (already indicated by Raynal, Sec. IV., § 8) is that the "most remarkable and momentous thing about the Portuguese conquests was the check they inflicted on the growth of the Ottoman Power, at a moment in European history when the Christian states were least able to resist and least likely to combine against the designs of Solyman. This is the observation best worth making about the Portuguese conquests."

III.

It remains lastly to mention the influence of the educational establishments founded by the Portuguese in India, since their arrival, for promoting the cultivation of their language, and its present condition.

The earliest document on the subject, or, to use a bureaucratic phrase, the first royal ordinance to organise a department of Public Instruction in India, is a letter from King John III. to Viceroy D. João de Castro, dated March 8th, 1546. It runs thus:—*Além do que vos encommendo mui apertadamente, que em lugares acommodados fundeis estudos, e casas de devoção,* "I urgently recommend you, besides, to found in suitable places schools and houses of devotion." This led to the foundation of the *Seminario da Santa Fé*, or "Seminary of the Holy Faith" in Goa, which was but an initial step towards the establishment and progressive advancement of many other kindred institutions both in Goa and in the other settlements throughout the East. The object was, *se creassem em letras e bons costumes meninos de todas as Nações Orientaes,* "to educate in letters and good customs boys of all the Eastern nations." No more conclusive evidence is necessary to convince one of the solicitude and anxiety with which the king and his successors looked forward to the prosperity of this seminary. They revert with fondness to this subject in their correspondence with successive Viceroys from Castro downwards.

The "Seminary of the Holy Faith" was soon in working order, having admitted youths of diverse Asiatic and African races, which comprised the "Canarins, Decanis do Norte, Malavares, Chingalás, Bengalas, Pegús, Malayos, Jaos, Chinas e Abexins." Those who have visited the *Esplanade des Invalides* during the late Paris Exhibition, will be able to realize the charm and interest attaching to such an

anthropological collection of living specimens. Even the Roman Propaganda College does not hold such a curious agglomeration of varied Oriental types as the "Seminary of the Holy Faith" in Goa, the Rome of the East, once did within its historical precincts. There is an omission in the above list,—there is no representative of Japan; but at that time "the flowery island" was not known. It did not take long, however, before St. Francis Xavier added a genuine Japanese, by name Angiró, whom he baptized with the additional cognomen of 'Paulo da Santa Fé.' It was about this time that they began in earnest "to create," as the document states, "Evangelical workers for the missions of India."

This was an epoch big with problems, social and spiritual, that four succeeding centuries have in vain toiled to solve. This was a time full of seeds of promise, if only these seeds had had time to germinate and ripen into harvest. One's mind is powerless to evolve a revelation from this cosmopolitan congeries of youthful intellects of various Eastern nationalities, in which one might love to see mirrored some of the early stages through which the subtle influence of Christian civilisation must have passed in its slow evolutional progress. It would have been highly interesting to observe how the discipline of caste and the sobriety of habits were being gradually replaced by principles inspired by lofty motives and theoretically divine, but requiring in practice a constant watchful care to turn them into good habits.

But, in spite of all this great and noble exertion, and of the enormous sacrifices of all kinds, this outburst of religious enthusiasm failed to add more than a million of adherents to the Church of Rome, a number which is, after all, but a drop in the ocean of the teeming millions amongst whom the Faith was preached. Gustav Mosen, quoted by Prof. Max Müller in his *Biographies of Words*, says, speaking of the Home of the Aryas, that one couple, having two children, would, if every successive marriage was blest with two children only, produce a population of some thousands of millions in about 1,200 years. It is more than a fourth of this period since the Apostle of the Indies converted according to his biographers 1,200,000 souls. They were most probably all bachelors. Allowing, however, for exaggerations, it appears that had it not been for freaks of intolerance and of blindness to the true nature of the interests of the people, the slow and sure and constant though unseen forces that Mr. Lecky, the historian of morals, believes

to permeate human society would have perhaps of themselves spread the Catholic faith broader and deeper tha by violence. History teems with rebukes, with repentances and with lessons of experience that tell of rare opportunities lost and never to return. The cycle of the missionary activity in India is now closed. There are no more conversions as there are no more *autos da fé*.

Each of these boys became a centre from which irradiated Catholic learning and the dissemination of the Portuguese tongue. They had most probably some share in the production of the innumerable Portuguese dialects now spoken in Asia and Africa. M. Hugo Schuchardt, of Gratz, has been publishing in Vienna since 1882 a work, in parts, entitled *Kreolische Studien,* in which specimens of these dialects are given. I have had the pleasure to contribute to this interesting study, especially to that relating to the dialect of Ceylon, in which the New Testament was published in 1852 by the Wesleyan Mission, and of which there is a grammar, printed at Colombo in 1811. A copy of this curious book is in the library of this Society.

As religious orders were introduced into India, they likewise opened colleges in connection with their convents. There were the Franciscans, who had their colleges of St. Boaventura and Reis Magos, the Jesuits those of St. Paul, attached to the seminary, and of St. Roch, the latter also called "the University of Goa," the Dominicans had the college of St. Thomas, and the Augustinians, of Popolo. Then there were branches of these establishments in Bassein, Thana, Cranganore, Cochin, Malacca, &c. Even laymen vied with the religious in founding colleges. Antonio Galvão, styled "the apostle of the Moluccas," founded one as early as 1540 at Ternate, for the children of the native converts in Java and the neighbourhood. He was one of those extraordinary men, as Coleridge in his *Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier* remarks, who graced from time to time the pages of the history of Portuguese Asia. He was also the author of a work on navigation, which was translated in 1862 by Vice-Admiral Bethune for the Hakluyt Society. I have referred to these institutions more at length in my "Materials for the history of Oriental studies amongst the Portuguese," in the *Atti del IV. Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti,* published in Florence in 1880, and also in the *brochure* on the *Konkani Language and Literature,* contributed by me to the Bombay Gazetteer in 1881. Those who are disposed to go deeper into the subject will find in those two works ampler information than

can be conveyed by brief extracts. Besides, next to quoting others, there is nothing so wearisome as to quote oneself.

In a small country like Portugal with an extensive colonial empire a painful feeling of disproportion awoke the nation to the necessity of finding among the natives the missionary agency, just as Albuquerque had found the military one. Still the religious orders were reluctant to admit the natives into their ranks. The new gospel of brotherhood had brought with it, and in spite of it, that kind of Portuguese jingoism, which was based on an assumption of superiority of race, as their prowess in war was encouraged by the conscious possession of improved arms of precision. In the absence of authentic records the value and importance of testimony of contemporary European travellers are of great interest in elucidating many obscure points in the annals of the time. One of these travellers writes:—" A native was not thought worthy of being a religious in this life, although he be a saint in the next." They did not object to his company in heaven, as there they are all equal; not so on this planet, where no equality exists except before the law, at least since the French Revolution.

But Vico in his *Scienza Nuova* has laid down the axiom that selfishness itself, under the restraint of religion, is the source of civilization and humanity. " L'uomo nello stato bestiale ama solamente la sua salvezza;......distesi gl' imperj sopra piu popoli ama la sua salvezza con la salvezza delle Nazioni." Thus the Portuguese were at last obliged to love the Indians and admit them into their various orders; and the natives became their best co-operators. "The people of India," says Macaulay, " when we subdued them, were ten times as numerous as the Americans whom the Spaniards vanquished, and were at the same time quite as highly civilised as the victorious Spaniards. They had reared cities larger and fairer than Saragossa or Toledo, and buildings more beautiful and costly than the Cathedral of Seville. They could show bankers richer than the richest firms of Barcelona or Cadiz, viceroys whose splendour far surpassed that of Ferdinand the Catholic, myriads of cavalry and long trains of artillery which would have astonished the Great Captain." Albuquerque knew this, and the great Marquis of Pombal still better, when he wrote to the Viceroy in Goa to consider the youths of the best native families in the country as equal to the cadets of the nobility at home.

The religious orders in Goa at last agreed not only to an equality of rank with themselves, but instituted the orders of the Theatins and

Nerysts exclusively for the Brahman converts, who justified the privilege conferred on them by subsequently spreading the Catholic religion in Malabar, Ceylon, Madras and Madagascar, where no European had succeeded in preaching the gospel of Christ. The Brahman is a born missionary. He may be said to be literate from his infancy, while among the Portuguese there were and are many who did not know to read and write. He has persuasiveness and meekness—two qualities essential for the inculcation of religious doctrine—inherited from times far anterior to that of the gloomy prophet of the *Nirvána*, the Indian sage of Kapilavastu. This true *dvija* or 'twice-born,' then, was a most welcome associate in the vineyard of the Lord, whose divine precepts extol meekness above all the Christian virtues. These missionaries, Brahman in blood but denationalized by the adoption of Portuguese nationality, also helped to spread the use of Portuguese in India and elsewhere, by preaching, by writing works in that language and translating them into Tamil, Sinhalese, Canarese, etc. The names of the most conspicuous among them are Vas, Rego, Miranda, Jacome Gonçalves, Ribeiro, Menezes, Barreto, Ferrão, and Saldanha.

Next to the colleges where secondary or superior education was imparted in Portuguese, Latin, Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Theology, each parish had a school of its own for elementary instruction. Prior to the advent of the Portuguese, each village community had its pagoda, dedicated to its *gramadevata*, and not seldom its *pathashala*. The Portuguese pulled down the Hindu temple and substituted his own, devoted to a saint or to the Virgin under several appellations, or to the Trinity. He instituted for each parish an annual feast of the saint. In a world where there is a prevailing feeling of weariness, and a tendency to confine the attention to the worst side of life, these religious anniversaries of saints were a boon to the Catholic community in India. And to keep alive the traditional love of the native for his *jathra*, a fair was held in connection with each feast in the vicinity of the church. Then, in obedience to the decree of a Council of the Church that each parish should have a school, he built one where rudimentary Portuguese and music were taught. The greatest benefit that has accrued from these primary schools to the Indians who have frequented them, from the beginning of the 16th century to the present, is the cultivation of music. Art in any form demands imagination, sympathy and power of identification with other natures,

which the generous character of the Portuguese enabled them to teach to their Indian fellow-subjects, who had hardly any music of their own. A few grotesque *lavnis* and the recitation of some vulgar and odd *abhangas* constitute even now the whole *repertorio* of the Hindus. The Christian converts had, on the contrary, instilled into them, with the love of music, the most spiritual of arts, the highest religious aspirations. They were taught the *Veni Creator, O salutaris Hostia, Ave Maris Stella, O Gloriosa Virginum*, and many other melodious hymns and songs in Latin and Portuguese, in which emotion finds its fullest expression, carrying him who listens to the very zenith of aspiration, and which seem to have the wonderful power to link the present with the past. Besides, the Portuguese *modinha, chacara* and *solúo*. which are analogous in style to the Spanish *tango* and *cancion morisca* and the Napolitan *mandolinata* and *Santa Lucia*, have also influenced deeply the Indian popular *mandos*, and *zotis'*: These parish schools are still flourishing in Portuguese India and in the missions of the " Padroado." But most of the colleges with their churches have become shapeless ruins. One can discern in the stones of the ruined buildings that still crowd the cities of Old Goa, Bassein, and Chaul, the pervading sentiment of the time in which they were built, and read more sermons in them than in text-books. What a fine place one of these dismantled towns would be for the erection of a sort of Grande Chartreuse, dedicated to the genius of solitude, a retreat from the importunate dissonances of life, inviting communion with things that are unseen, sacred, and eternal.

In my last excursion to the ruins of Chaul I discovered that the altar of a church, where once the holy sacrifice of Mass was celebrated, formed the pedestal for the hideous image of Hanuman. There was, besides, the aggravating circumstance of a Hindu villager with grim humour pointing out to me this irony of fate. One knows that political dominion is often precarious, that not a few invaders have come and gone, and India has become a natural ground for such ephemerides, but I did not expect to see such a desecration, this acme of profanation. It reminds me of what F. Harrison says:—" The whirligig of time verily brings about its revenges."

When one remembers the time when the Portuguese demolished the pagodas and broke their idols to pieces, it seems that the Hanuman of Chaul is pointing a moral and adorning a tale. This is one of the many evidences that show up the vanity of human power. I believe

there is no study where the grandeur and wild ambitions of the world are so thoroughly rebuked and dwarfed into littleness as that of the churches of these old Portuguese towns in the vicinity of our prosperous city. This may be the reason why historians, like astronomers, laugh at the fussiness of the world, and are less disturbed by worldly affairs and by the quarrels of vain and fatuous men.

The present condition of the Portuguese tongue in India is far from flattering. It is not understood by the peasants in any part of their small settlements, nor spoken habitually by the *bourgeoisie.* It is the official tongue, and spoken by the upper classes only, and is as much a vernacular in Goa and elsewhere as French is in Pondicherry or English in Bombay. In British India it is being rapidly supplanted by English. Besides, Portuguese is a difficult language, and there are but few in this country who can speak and write it correctly. And it is beautiful. The following opinion of one who knew it well is certainly worth quoting here: "Par sa grammaire et son vocabulaire, elle se rapproche du latin plus que toute autre langue méridionale. L'italien a plus de grâce, d'harmonie, de douceur; l'espagnol, plus de majesté et de pompe, le français, plus de clarté et de simplicité; mais le portugais est plus latin, et il ne cède à aucune autre langue pour la suavité, pour la force, et pour l'abondance. Il se prête également à la prose élégante, à la poésie sublime, aux sujets familiers et nobles, à la joie et à la douleur, à la gravité et à l'enthousiasme."

Although it has lost much in territorial extent, in the domain of literature Portuguese is the language of an autonomous and historic people, whose university is among the oldest in the world, for it was founded in Lisbon in 1290, and transferred to Coimbra in 1308. Its literature is both vast and rich. As early as the 13th century, at the dawn of the first spontaneous revival of letters since the fall of the Roman Empire, about two hundred years earlier than the great renaissance, Portugal, though a young kingdom, contributed its share to the general awakening of the literary spirit of the continent of Europe. King Dom Diniz wrote his *Cancioneiro,* which developed the Portuguese dialect into a beautiful and flexible literary language, while King Alfonso 'the wise' of Spain was writing his *Cantigas de Santa Maria,* the poets of the north the *Niebelungen,* Petrarca his Italian *Canzoniere,* and the troubadours were laying the foundation of the national poetry of France. Then followed, somewhat later, Antonio Ferreira, Sá de Miranda, Bernardim Ribeiro and others, who, in spite of

their provincialisms, which we call nationality, deserve universal recognition. Its historical works are immense, out of all proportion, perhaps, to the size of the little kingdom. There are the old Chroniclers who told the story of the war against the Moors,—Ruy de Pina, Gracia de Rezende, Azurara, and Duarte Galvão; then, somewhat later, Barros, Couto, Freire, Correa, Goes, Castanheda, Osorio, Lucena and others. Under the influence of the German Historical School, of which the most illustrious masters were Niebuhr and von Ranke, Herculano, Correa da Serra, Viscount of Santarem, Rebello da Silva, Soriano and others have left us invaluable works. There are others of a younger generation who, taking their inspiration from the old writers, have become diligent seekers after truth from contemporary documents.

In other branches of literature there is a manifest tendency to surpass the activity of the neighbouring kingdom, in spite of its Alarcon, Valdès and Clarin. In poetry, drama and fiction there are more writers in Portugal than in Spain. Historical novels on the model of Sir Walter Scott have been in vogue for nearly half a century. The old pastoral novels, originated by Bernardim Ribeiro, purely national, exhibiting the love of nature, which is inherent in the Portuguese character, are now substituted by a new form initiated by Castello Branco. This is also national, as far as the portrayal of the intimate life of the Portuguese society and of the picturesque habits and customs of modern Portugal are concerned. The spirit of the romance of chivalry, of the type of *Amadis of Gaul* and of *Palmeirim of England*, once most popular throughout the peninsula, is now extinct or has been so, perhaps, from the time of Cervantes. An attempt has of late been made to introduce into the kingdom the realistic or psychological style, or *il romanzo sperimentale*, as Villari calls it, but it is too early to judge of its acceptance by the public. It is traced to the school of *L'Assommoir*, containing episodes relating to, in the words of the master, "l'ivrognerie et la fainéantise, le relâche des liens de famille, les ordures de la promiscuité, l'oubli progressif des sentiments honnêtes." This pornographic literature delights now millions of readers in the progressive West; but in this our benighted East, where there is evidently more decorum, it cannot but meet with disfavour, notwithstanding its advocates calling it "the epic in prose," most suitable to democratic times and manners.

A comparison, or rather a parallel, has been instituted of late between the Colonial policies of Spain and Portugal. It is true that historical

parallels cannot be exact in all details; they often accentuate the points of difference, and many of their illustrations are by contrast rather than by resemblance. Thus while the Portuguese only possessed settlements, which easily changed hands, the Spaniards owned vast countries which could not be attacked, much less occupied; they could only change the form of government, declare their independence, and then fight among themselves. The vast extent of the Portuguese dominions, scattered over four thousand leagues of coast, with only a chain of factories and forts to bind them together, offered a tempting prize, and when a determined rival appeared on the scene, the links gave way, while the Spanish empire being compact resisted like an adamant. Many writers seem to be fond of speculating on the causes of the decay of the Portuguese in India. But disintegrating agencies are more or less in operation among all nations, just as, according to the Burial Service, "In the midst of life we are in death." In historical creations there is no such thing as birth and growth—only decay and death; in the midst of great or apparent splendour there is necessarily no prosperity, but germs of decadence and symptoms of dissolution.

The Portuguese exhibited signs of decay long ago, and the only individual who still strives to keep up the traditions of that nation in this country against all odds is the missionary. He lives, from Bengal to Cape Comorin, among the people, he adapts himself to their environments, and instils among them his aesthetic perceptions and his intellectual sympathies, however humble and limited these may be; the sobriety of his mind is always useful in a medium, where the low-class Hindus, like the *Meridionales* of Alphonse Daudet, delight themselves with the strain of excessiveness, the humour of enormity, and the instinct of the gigantic and the abnormal, which Christianity has the power to correct.

IV.

I shall conclude by an allusion to the late debate, transferred from the arena of the Senate-hall to that of the Press and elsewhere, on the merits of the new scheme of the Bombay University for remodelling the course of the study of languages, classical, foreign and vernacular,—a debate which led me to consult the last University Calendar. The result was the discovery of the striking anomaly that, while Portuguese is at page 37 classed with the living vernaculars—Marathi, Gujarati, Canarese, &c.,—French is at page 57 ranked with the dead Sanskrit, Greek,

Latin and Hebrew. This classification is evidently, to borrow Prof. Max Müller's phrase, "a Babylonian confusion of tongues." It means, in short, that Sá de Miranda, Camoens, Almeida Garrett and Castilho are in the same category as Namdev, Tukaram, Waman and Samalabhat; while Corneille, Racine, Molière, Lamartine and Victor Hugo are to be studied in the same spirit as Euripides and Sophocles, Terence and Virgil, or Kálidásá and Bhávabhúti.

If the University of Bombay will retain Portuguese on its list of second languages, it is necessary to introduce reforms in both the teaching and examining methods, and in the selection of men of academic position and of wide culture for its executive body. I know that wide culture is rare everywhere, especially in a commercial city like Bombay, where the almighty rupee possesses greater merit and carries more weight than either learning or virtue. But one must know something of everything in order that he may know everything of something. We want men not of brilliant parts, but of general reading,—men, not without a department of their own, but with the scholarship and all-round ability which can appreciate the languages and literatures of various nations. The Senate is in the habit of choosing for Syndics some estimable men, about half of whom are natives, who do not, as a rule, know a single European language with the exception of English.

It is obvious that men who are utterly incompetent even to distinguish Bocage from Schiller, and Ariosto from Calderon, as I have often noticed, cannot be fit to select examiners in living European languages from their own knowledge of their merit, and have no alternative but to yield to the pressure brought to bear upon them of recommendations and solicitations. This surely cannot be a desirable state of things. And, lastly, if the Portuguese language is not to take its proper place by the side of its European sisters, if it is to be depressed to the level of the Indian Vernaculars, it would be much better to abolish it altogether as a second language in the University examination. An honourable death is far preferable to an ignominious life, which is but a parody of the noble motto of king Dom Sebastian:—

"Un bel morir tutta la vita honora."