

JOURNAL  
OF THE  
BOMBAY BRANCH  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
(NEW SERIES)

EDITED BY

DR. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, AND PROF. SHAIK ABDUL KADIR,  
M.A., PH.D. (Berlin) M.A., I.E.S.

---

VOLUME IV

---

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY

---

LONDON AGENT:  
ARTHUR PROBSTHAEN  
41, Great Russell Street, London, W.C. 1  
1928

---

THE TIMES OF INDIA PRESS, BOMBAY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NEW SERIES, VOL. IV.

### ARTICLES.

	PAGE
Pañca Tantra Studies, Nos. 2 & 3. By A. VENKATASUBBIAH ..	1
Fire Arms in Ancient India. By G. N. VAIDYA .. ..	27
Sātavāhanas and the Contemporary Kṣatrapas, Part II. By V. S. BAKHLE .. .. .	39
Archæological and Historical Research, its Scope in the Satara District. By Y. R. GUPTA .. .. .	81
Position of Woman in Rabbinical Literature, Part II. By E. M. EZEKIEL .. .. .	95
Some points of Contact between the Mahābhārata and the Jātakas. By N. B. UTGIKAR .. .. .	115
Persian MSS. belonging to the Government Collection now deposited in the library of the University of Bombay. By PROF. SHAIK ABDUL KADIR .. .. .	135
Vedic Studies. By A. VENKATASUBBIAH .. .. .	147
Epic Studies. By V. S. SUKTHANKAR .. .. .	157

### BRIEF NOTE.

The date of the transcription of the Keršhāspnāma. By A. A. A. FYZEE .. .. .	170
Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists. By V. P. Vaidya .. .. .	180

### REVIEWS.

Iranian Studies. By JIVANJI J. MODI .. .. .	182
Satzlehre der aramaischen Sprache des babylonischen Talmunds. By E. M. EZEKIEL .. .. .	183
Kāvya-prakāśa. By G. N. VAIDYA .. .. .	190
State in Ancient India. By M. D. ALTEKAR .. .. .	192
Theory of Government in Ancient India. By M. D. ALTEKAR.	195
Religions of the Empire. By G. V. ACHARYA .. .. .	196
Ta'rikh-i-Fakhr'u'd-din Mubārakshah. By A. A. A. FYZEE ..	198

---

PROCEEDINGS (Annual Report, 1927) .. .. .	201
REPORT OF THE TRANSLITERATION SUB-COMMITTEE .. .. .	233

JOURNAL  
OF THE  
BOMBAY BRANCH  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

---

---

VOL. 4

1928

Nos. 1 & 2

---

---

PAÑCATANTRA STUDIES.

BY A. VENKATASUBBLAH.

2<sup>1</sup>. *Duṣṭabuddhi and Dharmabuddhi.*

The story of Duṣṭabuddhi and Dharmabuddhi is found in all the older Pañcatantra versions (that is to say, in Tantra,<sup>2</sup> Spl, Pn Ks, So, SP, Pa and Durgasimha's Pañcatantra) except Hitopadeśa. It presents two problems that require solution.

---

1. No. 1 of these *Studies* is published in the *Asia Major*, III, pp. 307-320.

2. The following abbreviations are used in this article :—

Ks : for Kṣemendra the author of *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (BKM) and also for the Pañcatantra version contained in that work.

N : for the Nepalese version of the Pañcatantra as published by Hertel in his editions of the Southern Pañcatantra and the *Tantrākhyāyika*.

Pa : for the original Pahlavi translation of the Pañcatantra and also for the Syrian and Arabic versions derived from it.

Pañca : for Pañcatantra and also for Hertel's book, *Das Pañcatantra. Seine Geschichte und Verbreitung* and for the *Pañcatantra Reconstructed* of Prof. Franklin Edgerton.

Pn : for Pūrṇabhadra, author of the so-called *textus ornatior* of the Pañcatantra and also for that work (edited by Hertel in the HOS).

So : for Somadeva, author of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (KSS) and also for the Pañcatantra version contained in that book.

SP : for the Southern Pañcatantra (Hertel's edition).

Spl : for the so-called *textus simplicior* of the Pañcatantra (edited by Bühler and Kiellhorn in the BSS).

T and Tantra : for *Tantrākhyāyikā* (Hertel's *editio princeps*).

## I.

The *kathāsamgraha* verse that introduces the story in Tantra reads as

*duṣṭabuddhir abuddhiś ca dvāv etau dhiñ-matau mama |  
tanayenāti-pāṇḍityāt pitā dhūmena mārītaḥ ||*<sup>3</sup>

and refers to Duṣṭabuddhi and Abuddhi while the prose story that follows is, on the other hand, concerned with the doings of Duṣṭabuddhi and Dharmabuddhi, and does not mention Abuddhi at all. It has therefore been assumed by later interpreters, for instance, by Prof. Hertel (*ZDMG.* 68, 72), that the Abuddhi of the introductory verse is the same as the Dharmabuddhi of the prose story. And Hertel has even gone to the length of asserting (l. c. p. 73) that it is quite certain that the inconsistency is derived from the original Pañcatantra itself.

This opinion is controverted by Prof. Edgerton in an article entitled 'Evil-wit, No-wit, and Honest-wit' that he has published in Vol. 40 of the *JAOS*, pp. 271 ff. Prof. Edgerton has there justly observed that only a very slovenly story-teller—which the writer of the original Pañcatantra certainly was not—, would without a word of explanation call one of his characters by the name of Abuddhi first and Dharmabuddhi afterwards, and that there is nothing in the story to show that Dharmabuddhi deserved in the least to be called by the name Abuddhi. He then points out (1) that the name Dharmabuddhi is used in the story in all the other versions also, (with the exception of the Pahlavi versions which use a word meaning 'simpleton' or *abuddhi* and which are clearly influenced in this by the word *abuddhi* which must have occurred in the introductory verse of the Sanskrit original), to denote the companion of Duṣṭabuddhi ; (2) that Duṣṭabuddhi is called by that name in the story in all versions excepting Spl (and one or two passages of Pn) where he is called Pāpabuddhi, and Ks where he is called Abuddhi (twice) and Durbuddhi (once), in addition to being called Duṣṭabuddhi twice ; and (3) that Pn's reading of the

---

<sup>3</sup>. Hertel has translated this as : " Duṣṭabuddhi und Abuddhi werden beide von mir gemissbilligt. Von seinem Sohne wurde der Vater infolge allzugrosser Klugheit durch Rauch getötet."

first half of the above *kathāsaṃgraha* verse, *Dharmabuddhir Abuddhiś ca dvāv etau vidītau mama* and Spl's reading of *Kubuddhiḥ* instead of *Abuddhiḥ* in pāda above, show clearly that, to the authors of these versions, *Abuddhi* is the same as *Duṣṭabuddhi*. He has therefore, on the basis of these facts, arrived at the conclusion (1) that the original *kathāsaṃgraha* verse read like T, but that *Abuddhi* was not intended to refer to *Dharmabuddhi* in the following story; and (2) that the verse is intended to teach the moral that "Duṣṭabuddhi, Evil-wit, is just as bad as (any, indefinite) *Abuddhi*, No-wit; in short, that 'honesty is the best policy.'" The meaning of the above verse is, according to him: "I have just as low an opinion of Evil-wit as of No-wit; one is bad as the other. And to prove it, I refer you to the case of Evil-wit who caused his father's death by his excess of cunning, thereby showing himself no better than a fool or No-wit."

The considerations set forth above by Edgerton seem to me to be conclusive on one point, and I agree unreservedly with him that the word *Abuddhi* in T's reading of the introductory verses does not refer to *Dharmabuddhi*. I do not, however, think that he is right when he says that the original *kathāsaṃgraha* verse read as in T. For, in the first place, there is no instance to be found in the whole range of Sanskrit literature of the combination of the word *dhik* with the word *mata* or other forms derived from the root *man* (see PW)<sup>4</sup>; and I cannot believe that the author of the original Pāñcatantra would use in his book a combination of words that is quite unknown elsewhere. It can be seen from the conspectus of different readings given on p. 154 of Edgerton's *Pañca*. (Vol. I) that the reading *dhiṃmatau mama* is found in T only. The Jain versions have, as already noted above, the reading *dvāv etau vidītau mama*, and SP. *dvāv etau vaṇigātmajau*; and the Pāñcatantra of Durgasīrṃha reads the first half-verse as *Duṣṭabuddhes Subuddhes ca dvayor dharmasya saṃśayāt*. The fact that each version has quite a different reading of pāda b seems to show that all these readings are secondary, being emendations, paraphrases

4. Not only that, but the two words *dhik* and *mata* signify mutually incompatible things. *Dhik* signifies contempt, reproach and *mata*, regard honour; see PW.

or restorations in the place of the original reading which must have been quite different from all these and must have been lost long before the archetypes of the above versions were written down.

Secondly, the verse *duṣṭabuddhir abuddhiś ca dvāv etau dhiñ-matau mama* . . . should, in case the reading *dhiñ-matau mama* be original, have been spoken by some character appearing in the story introduced by this verse. For, it is the rule in the *Pañca tantra* that pronouns of the first person, that occur in *kathāsaṅgraha* verses, refer to characters in the story following and that such verses are spoken by such characters. Compare *Tantra*. I, 51 : *pūrvam eva mayā jñātam* . . . ; I, 54 : *jambuko huḍṇuyuddhena vayañ cāṣāḍhabhūtina* . . . ; and *Pn*, I, 247, 309, 407 ; II, 93, 142 ; III, 118, 166, 193 ; IV, 40, 50 ; and V, 39 all of which verses contain pronouns of the first person and are spoken by characters in the stories that follow, and are introduced by, the respective verses. Neither in *Tantra*. nor in *Pn*. have I found any exception to this rule, and we may therefore regard it as a fixed rule. If then T's reading *dvāv etau dhiñ-matau mama* had been original, this verse would have been placed in the mouth of one of the characters appearing in the following story. We see that, in fact, it has not been so placed and that the verse is placed in the mouth of *Karaṭaka*.

And, thirdly, it should also be noted in this connection that it is foreign to the style of the *Pañca*. to give expression to personal opinions like " I have a very low opinion of both the evil-minded man (*Evil-wit*) and the fool (*No-wit*) alike " (this, according to *Edgerton*, is the meaning of the first half-verse) in *kathāsaṅgraha* verses. Such verses, in the original *Pañca*., contain statements of definite facts ; compare *avyāpāreṣu vyāpāraṁ yo naraḥ kartum icchati / su eva nihataḥ sete*. " The man who tries to concern himself with what is not his concern, he it is that lies slain " ; *upāyena hi yac chakyaṁ na tac chakyaṁ parākramañiḥ* " By guile, verily, can be done what cannot be done by violence " ; *na tv aviññātaśīlāya gr̥he dadyāt pratiśrayam* " Not to one whose character is unknown should shelter ever be granted " etc.

These considerations make it sufficiently clear that the reading

*dhiñ-matau mama* is corrupt and not original. Now it is upon this reading that Edgerton bases his above-mentioned conclusion that the word *Abuddhi*, in the above verse, refers in effect to *Duṣṭabuddhi*. Such a conclusion is incompatible with any other reading of pāda b, and since it has been shown that the reading *dhiñ-matau mama* is corrupt, it follows that the above conclusion is wrong.

— Similarly, Edgerton's contention that *Abuddhi* is not a proper name but a common one and denotes a no-wit or fool is likewise wrong. For not only does the prose story not mention any no-wit or fool, but the word *ca* in pāda a (*Duṣṭabuddhir Abuddhiś ca*), that joins the two words *Duṣṭabuddhi* and *Abuddhi*, goes to show that, since the word *Duṣṭabuddhi* is a proper name (this is clear from the prose story), the word *Abuddhi* too is such.

There is thus no doubt that the word *Abuddhi* in the above verse is a proper name, the name of a person ; and since this person is not mentioned in the prose story, one is confronted with the problem, ' Who is this *Abuddhi* that is mentioned in pāda a of the verse but not in the prose story ? '

The clue to the solution of this problem is, it seems to me, contained in the context in which the story of *Duṣṭabuddhi* and *Dharmabuddhi* appears, that is to say, in the sentences of the frame-story that precede and follow this story. It has been said in this connection by Edgerton (*JAOS.* 40, 275), that the location of this fable in the frame-story of the first book of the *Pañca*, shows that ' honesty is the best policy ' is what it intends to teach, that it is told by the jackal *Karaṭaka* to warn the evil-minded and treacherous *Damanaka* of the fate that is in store for him if he follows in the course he has begun, that *Damanaka* is the prototype of *Duṣṭabuddhi*, and that *Karaṭaka* means to let him see that evil-mindedness is really folly and brings one to disaster. This seems to me to be a mistaken view : honesty may indeed be the best policy ; but the *Pañca* is a book intended to teach, not moral lessons, but lessons of *nīti* (see Hertel, *Tantra.—Über.* I, 127). The story of *Duṣṭabuddhi* and *Dharmabuddhi* with which we are now concerned has nothing to do with dishonesty or evil-mindedness : it merely depicts the unfortunate results that are caused by

*atipāṇḍitya* or too much cleverness. This is made clear, not only by the introductory verse which mentions *atipāṇḍitya* in pāda 0 and the story itself which sets forth how Duṣṭabuddhi's father came to an untimely end through his son's too much cleverness, but also from the words of the frame-story that precede and follow this story. In Tantra., for instance, the section of the frame-story that introduces the story of Duṣṭabuddhi and Dharmabuddhi may be said to begin with Abschnitt 95 (p. 51) which says that Karaṭaka became much perturbed at seeing his master Piṅgalaka in such a dire strait, and began to administer a severe reproof to Damanaka beginning with the words: *kaṣṭam idam āpatitam nīcopadeśāt/athavā sādhu idam ucyate/narādhipā nīcamatānūvartino budhopadiṣṭena na yānti vartmanā/viśanti te durganamārganir-gamaṁ samastasambādham anartha-pañjaram.* (" This disaster has happened through following the advice of the base. For after all, it is well said:—Kings who follow the advice of the base, and do not walk in the path pointed out by the wise, enter into a maze of misfortunes containing all manner of afflictions, egress from which is very difficult.") Karaṭaka then charges Damanaka with having separated his master from reliable friends so that he might follow the crooked counsel that he (Damanaka) gives, with being envious at seeing others enjoy happiness, and with being small-minded. He then goes on to say to Damanaka: " After all, the fault lies with your master who, (instead of taking counsel of proper persons) in matters concerning *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*, indiscriminatingly takes counsel of men like you who are utter strangers to the six forms of policy, and who make their living out of a mere pretence of statesmanship; [ for as ] is well-said:—Kings who delight in servants that speak brilliant and pleasing words but do not bend their bows—their dominions are enjoyed by their enemies." Karaṭaka then proceeds to say that such statesmanship must have been inherited by Damanaka from his father and that there is no use in advising Damanaka (since he is incapable of profiting by it) and that he would be another Sūcimukha (whose story he relates) if he were to do so. He then says that Damanaka is a disgrace to his family, and after relating the story of Duṣṭabuddhi and Dharmabuddhi to him, says again to him *mūrkhā atipāṇḍityena te dagdho*



*vamsaḥ*. 'Fool, you have set fire to your own family through too much cleverness.'

From the foregoing it is clear that Karatāka thinks (1) that his master, the lion Piṅgalaka, is in a sad plight; (2) that he is in such plight because he took counsel of Damanaka; and (3) that Piṅgalaka, too, is partly to blame because, like Duṣṭabuddhi's father who allowed himself to be persuaded by Duṣṭabuddhi to follow a course of action that seemed wrong and inadvisable to him, he allowed himself to be persuaded by the seemingly statesmanlike counsel of Damanaka—to follow a course of action that seemed wrong to him, and thus brought the evil plight on himself. If then we bear this in mind and read again the *kathāsamgraha* verse,

*duṣṭabuddhir abuddhiś ca . . . . .* |

*tanayenātīpāṇḍityāt pitā dhūmena māritaḥ ||*

"Duṣṭabuddhi and Abuddhi, . . . . . the son because he was all too clever, caused his father's death by smoke" (pāda b, as observed above, is corrupt and should not be taken into consideration), we find ourselves led irresistibly to the conclusion that the persons denoted by the names Duṣṭabuddhi and Abuddhi in the first half-verse are no other than the 'son' (*tanaya*) and the 'father' (*pitṛ*) mentioned in the second half-verse. In other words, Abuddhi in the above verse denotes the father of Duṣṭabuddhi and not some indefinite 'No-wit' as Edgerton thinks or Dharmabuddhi as Hertel thinks.

That this is so, is shown, apart from considerations of the context, by the words of the verse itself. This verse is understood by Edgerton to mean, "I have a very low opinion of both the evil-minded man (Evil-wit) and the fool (No-wit). The son, because he was all too clever, caused his father's death by smoke." That is to say, he breaks up the verse into two halves that are quite unconnected with each other—a mode of interpretation that seems to me to be unnatural. The most natural way is, as indicated above, to construe the two half-verses together and to understand that Duṣṭabuddhi and Abuddhi mentioned in the first half-verse are the same as the son and the father mentioned in the second.

It may be observed in this connection that Ks reproduces the original *kathāsaṅgraha* verse as

*abuddhiyogād adhamāḥ sarvadā vipadāspadam |*  
*pitā dhūmena nihataḥ sutenādharmabuddhinā ||*

“ Because of their folly, the base are always subject to disasters, The father was killed with smoke by his evil-minded son ” ; and he thus seems to have thought that Duṣṭabuddhi’s father was an *abuddhi* or fool. And though it is true that the term *abuddhi* is not, in any of the extant Pañca. versions actually applied to Duṣṭabuddhi’s father (excepting Durgasimha’s Pañca. which calls him Premamati, the other versions all refer to him merely as ‘ Duṣṭabuddhi’s father ’ and do not specifically name him), it cannot, in the light of what is related of him in the story, be gainsaid that the epithet is one that is suited to him. For, a man who feels that the plan suggested by Duṣṭabuddhi, that he should hide himself in the tree and bear false witness, is fraught with danger<sup>5</sup> and who yet allows himself to be over-persuaded by his son and undertakes to carry it out, cannot but be said to be foolish. And similarly, the lion Piṅgalaka who, in the frame-story, is the prototype of Duṣṭabuddhi’s father and who, allowing himself to be persuaded by the wily Damanaka into the belief that Sañjivaka is his enemy and plotting to oust him from his throne, sets forth to fight with him risking his life and vanquishes him only after he himself has received many wounds, is without doubt foolish.

The word *atipāṇḍitya* which has been translated above as ‘ too much cleverness ’ and which Hertel translates as ‘ allzugrosso Klugheit ’ means properly ‘ too much learning ’ and signifies in the above Pañca. passage not so much ‘ cleverness ’ in general as ‘ cleverness in arguing or dialectic ’. In the above *kathāsaṅgraha*

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that there is no word said by the father about *dharmavyatikara* or sin in this connection, though the *Dharma-śāstras* do, as a matter of fact, declare that it is a sin to bear false witness. All that the father says in his connection is about the danger involved in such course of action, that ‘ the wise man should consider the means (for attaining the desired object) and also the danger (involved in the use of such means). ’ This is quite in character with the *Pañcatantra* whose object is to teach lessons, not of morality, but of *nīti*.

verse, it refers, firstly, to Duṣṭabuddhi's cleverness in dialectic and the arguments (these are not given in any of the extant Pañca-versions) that he must undoubtedly have used in order to overbear those of his father, and secondly, to the arguments used by Damanaka (see p. 27 ff. in Tantra.) to persuade Piṅgalaka that Sañjīvaka was a traitor and ought to be destroyed. In addition, I cannot help thinking that there is an underlying reference in it to Karāṭaka's being worsted in argument by Damanaka and being obliged to yield that Piṅgalaka's association with Sañjīvaka was a *vyasana* of which it was necessary to rid Piṅgalaka; see Ab. 38-40 in Tantra. (p. 41-42). Compare also the following passages in Tantra. in which he reproves Damanaka :

*yad api ca mantri-putroham ity avalepād atibhūmiṃ  
gatosi tad apy ātmavināśāya |  
yām kṛtvendriya-nigraho ' pi mahatām bhāve na sañjāyate  
yā buddher na vidheyatām prakurute dharme na yā vartate  
loke kevalavākyamātra-racanā yām prāpya sañjāyate  
yā naivopaśamāya naiva yaśase vidvattayā kiṃ tayā ||*  
(Ab. 92 : p. 51.)

*tan mūrkhā viparīta-buddhir asi | vidvan-mānitvād ātmano  
'nartham utpādayasi | sādhu cedam ucyate—  
jñānam madopasamanam khalānām kurute madam |  
cakṣus-saṃskārajam teja ulūkānām ivāndhatām ||*  
(Ab. 94 ; p. 51.)

*kiṃ kariṣyati pāṇḍityam vastuṣv apratipāditam |  
sa-pidhāne dhṛtaḥ kumbhe pradīpa iva veśmani ||*  
(Ab. 107 ; p. 54.)

and especially Ab. 105 (p. 53) :

*kiṃ tavopadeśenāpasadasya | uktaṃ ca—  
nānāmyam nāmyate dāru na śastraṃ vahate 'śmani |  
sūcīmukhaṃ nu jānīhi yo 'śiṣyāyopadiṣṭavān ||*

and the story of Sūcīmukha and the ape that follows. These show clearly that Karāṭaka had tried to bring round Damanaka to his view, but that he had failed to do so, and having been, on the other hand, vanquished by the specious arguments of the clever

Damanaka, and given way, is now feeling that he had done wrong in thus having given up his own views and having authorised Damanaka to act as he desired.

The SP reading of the verse has, as already noted above, *duṣṭabuddhir dharmabuddhiḥ* in pāda a while three MSS of recension a—NAB—have *Duṣṭabuddhis Subuddhis ca* there. Regarding these readings, Edgerton has expressed the opinion (l. c. p. 274), that they have been adopted by the writers of these codices or of the archetype because they 'felt averse to a reading which seemed to identify Abuddhi with Dharmabuddhi, the simpleton with the honest man, when the intention of the story is inconsistent therewith.' For my part, I am inclined to think that these readings (and the similar reading, *Duṣṭabuddhes Subuddhes ca dvayor dharmasya samśayāt* of Durgasimha) were adopted by the writers, not for the reason mentioned above by Edgerton but because the prose story which they had before them made no mention of Abuddhi and his relationship with Duṣṭabuddhi, and they felt averse to have a *kathāsaṅgraha* verse that mentioned a character who did not appear in the story following. Pn's reading *Dharambuddhir Abuddhis ca* is anomalous; Abuddhi, mentioned here in pāda a, does not appear in the story following, and the author of the version therefore shows himself to be very slovenly in this matter.

It seems thus clear to me that the setting of this fable as also the words of the *kathāsaṅgraha* verse show unmistakably (1) that Abuddhi mentioned in pāda a, was the father of Duṣṭabuddhi; and (2) that this fact was mentioned, not only in the original prose story, but also in the original *kathāsaṅgraha* verse, in pāda b of that verse. This feature, namely, the express mention of the relationship between Duṣṭabuddhi and Abuddhi, disappeared long ago from the prose story and became quite obscured in pāda b of the verse. This pāda was therefore re-written in many forms and likewise pāda a also re-written with the view of discarding the word Abuddhi that occurred there, but not in the prose story.

## II.

The second problem in connection with this story that requires solution is concerned with what may be called 'the incident of the snake.' It is said in T that, after (the supposed genius of) the tree had declared that Dharmabuddhi had stolen the money, this person was much surprised that a tree should talk, and suspecting some trick, resolved to find it out. He therefore, (it is related in T), said to the officers of the court, "I came here alone, at a time when no other person was in this wood, and took the money. Then I saw an unusually large snake coming, and thought, 'Here is a difficulty.' I said, 'Objects of pleasure can be had again, but not life. I shall come again'; and buried (the money) here near the root of the tree. It must be now necessarily given up because of (the order of) the king. Station yourselves a little away from this place while I drive out the black snake that is guarding the treasure"; and then after collecting a quantity of dry wood and leaves, he filled the hollow of the tree with it and set fire to it. Similarly, Ks, too, mentions in his version of the story a guardian of treasure (*nidhipāla*) or snake, which Dharmabuddhi wanted to drive off. The other versions, however, namely, Spl, SP, So, Pn, and Pa, contain no reference to a snake. And hence the question arises: is the incident of the snake taken over by T from the original Pañca., or has it been newly introduced by the writer of T or its archetype?

This question has been discussed by Hertel in *Tantra.—Über*. I, 92-94, where he has arrived at the conclusion that T's reading is original and that of the other versions corrupt. "As soon as the tree has spoken," writes Hertel, "the decision is pronounced against Dharmabuddhi. Being the accused, he is not free to act as he would like to [and to find out if there is any one concealed in the tree], and is therefore obliged to make a confession of guilt in order to get an opportunity of investigating this matter. This difficulty seems to have been felt by the writers of the later versions also (except SP), who therefore make the judges undertake the investigation—the same judges who have accepted the evidence of the tree, and who, therefore, though with doubts, believe in the proba-

bility that it is true! But the Indians regard trees as the abode of deities. And when a deity has given evidence, it would be a sin on the part of the judge to doubt its truth. The fear of punishment therefore [ in the next world ] would therefore hold him back from undertaking any investigation into the matter. It is Dharmabuddhi alone who thinks that there is some trickery in it, because he knows his own innocence."

These views have been discussed and controverted by Edgerton on pp. 165-166 of his *Pañca.*, Vol. 1 (see also p. 97 of Vol. 2). He has there observed (1) that T's reading of this passage, even with Hertel's emendations, reads very ill and sounds bizarre and badly constructed ; (2) that there is no support for it in any other version except Ks which is known to be dependent on T ; (3) that Hertel is wrong in stating that the later versions except SP agree in making the judges start the bonfire, since, as a matter of fact, the Jain versions agree with T, Ks and SP in making Dharmabuddhi start the fire ; and (4) that Hertel's argument that Dharmabuddhi, because he stood condemned on *prima facie* evidence, could not take any further action (such as setting fire to the tree) without first making a confession as in T, is most unconvincing, as there is nothing in Hindu law or any other law to prevent a defendant, against whom *prima facie* evidence of guilt has been presented, from trying to disprove the credibility of the hostile testimony, which is what Dharmabuddhi does, successfully.

There is no doubt, it seems to me, about the justness of the third and the first of the above observations. The readings of the Jain versions reported by Edgerton on p. 165 (l.c.) testify to the correctness of the former, while Duṣṭabuddhi's announcement that he had a witness only after a confinement of five days, and Dharmabuddhi's statement that he buried the money at the foot of the tree (and went off quickly) when he saw the large snake, etc., bear out the latter. But it is otherwise as regards the fourth observation. In this Edgerton seems, in the first place, to mix up two different things. An attempt on the part of the defendant against whom *prima facie* evidence of guilt has been presented, to disprove the credibility of the hostile testimony is one thing ; a

similar attempt on the part of the defendant after he has been condemned on the strength of the evidence produced, is quite another thing. The first course is permitted to the defendant, though not by Hindu law, by other systems of law; the second is not, I conceive, permitted to the defendant by any law. So long as the court has not pronounced its judgment on the matter in question, that is, so long as a matter is *res sub judice*, it may be open to the defendant to discredit the evidence against him. But as soon as the court pronounces its judgment on the matter,<sup>6</sup> it becomes *res judicata*; the matter is to be considered as disposed of and the defendant can do nothing more in the matter, either by way of discrediting the evidence against him or by way of bringing forward new evidence in his favour.

So far as Hindu law is concerned, however, it does not permit the defendant to make any attempts at all to disprove the credibility of plaintiff's witnesses; see Yājñavalkya-smṛti 2, 1-8; 68-83. In Hindu law, witnesses were questioned and their answers explained to the *s a b h y ā ḥ* (assessors or jurors), not by the plaintiff, but by the presiding officer of the court or by a Questioner—Explainer (*p r ā ḍ v i v ā k a*) appointed by him. If a defendant felt dissatisfied with the judgment on the ground that it was based on false evidence, all that he could do was to make aspersions about the veracity of plaintiff's witnesses and be content therewith or to wait for seven days and see if any illness, fire-accident, or bereavement by death of a near relative (or any other evil that may be

---

<sup>6</sup> But even after judgment was pronounced (and carried out) it was enjoined on the judges that they should recall it and try the cause *de novo* when it became clear that such judgment was based on false evidence, Compare Manu, 8, 117 :

*yasmin-yasmin vivāde tu kauṣṭha-sākṣyam kṛtaṁ bhavet |*

*tat-tat kāryaṁ nivarteta kṛtaṁ cāpy akṛtaṁ bhavet ||*

and the observation of Kullūka in his comment thereupon, that this rule applies even when punishment has been awarded and inflicted—*yad api ca daṇḍa-samāpti-paryuntatām nūtaṁ tad api punaḥ parikṣet.*

Accordingly, the judges who, in the Pañca. story, recalled their judgment against Dharmabuddhi on its becoming apparent that it was based on false evidence, and condemned Duṣṭabuddhi instead, to punishment, did not act contrary to the above doctrine.

looked upon as a punishment inflicted by the gods for bearing false witness) happened to the witnesses. If such an event occurred, he could demand that the judgment against him be recalled and the witnesses punished ; if it did not, he was to console himself with the reflection that things were no worse. Compare in this respect Manu 8, 108 :

*yasya dṛśyeta saptāhād ukta-vākyasya sākṣinaḥ |*

*rogo 'gnir jñāti-marāṇam ṛṇam dāpyo damaṁ ca saḥ ||*

and Vijñānośvara's observation (in the course of his comment on Yājñavalkya 2, 80 ) : *yatra tu pratyarthinaḥ svapratyaya-visaṁvādītvena sākṣi-vacunasyaḥ prāmāṇyam manyamānasya sākṣiṣu doṣāropaṇenāparitoṣas tatra pratyarthinaḥ kriyopanyāsāvasarābhāvāt saptāhāvadhika-daivika-rājika-vyusanodbhavaena sākṣi-parikṣaṇam kartavyam | tatra ca doṣāvadhāraṇe vivādāspadibhūtam ṛṇam dāpyāḥ sārānusāreṇa daṇḍaniyās ca || atha doṣānavadhāraṇam pratyarthinā tāvatā santoṣṭavyam.* In charges for theft, etc., it was in addition open to the accused to clear himself by undergoing an ordeal. It was not in any case permissible to him to try to show that the evidence of plaintiff's witnesses was false ; and it thus becomes clear that Edgerton's above-quoted observation is a mistake.

Let us turn now to the story. It is said in So and Pa that, on hearing the tree say that Dharma,<sup>7</sup> had stolen the money, the judges feeling much astonishment, ordered that the tree be examined on all sides, and when the hollow was discovered, caused it to be filled with dry grass and set on fire. In SP it is merely said that Dharma. thought it was a most extraordinary thing, and climbing on to the tree and seeing the hollow, set fire to it. In the Jain versions, on the other hand, it is said that when the judges, with their eyes opened wide in astonishment, were discussing what punishment should, according to the law-books, be meted out to Dharma. for stealing money, Dharma. heaped up some combustible material round the hollow and set it on fire. The versions of T and Ks have already been given above.

It will thus be seen that while T, Ks, SP, Spl and Pn all say that it was Dharma. who set fire to the hollow of the tree, Pa

<sup>7</sup> The abbreviations *Dharma.* and *Duṣṭa.* are used for *Dharmabuddhi* and *Duṣṭabuddhi* respectively.



and So alone say that it was the judges that were responsible for it. This is most improbable ; and there can be no doubt that these two versions have, in this respect, departed from the original (as suggested by Edgerton, p.165 l.c) and the other versions remained true to it.

Again, it is explicitly said in Spl and Pn that it was after the judges had decided that Dharma. was guilty and were discussing about the punishment to be awarded to him, that he set fire to the hollow of the tree. SP is silent about the matter because it gives a much condensed form of the original, and has left out this, along with many other details. T and Ks are likewise silent ; but their wording, *adhunā 'vaśyam rājaviśāt samarpitavyam* 'it must now be necessarily restored by order of the king,' and *hṛtam tan nidhipālena tam nudāmitī abhāṣatu*, 'it has been stolen by (the serpent that is) the guardian of buried treasure ; I shall drive it away' make it clear that the judges had decided that Dharma. was guilty before he began to set fire to the hollow of the tree. There is thus no doubt that the original Pañca. made Dharma. fill the hollow of the tree with smoke after the judges had said that he was guilty, that is, after the matter of his guilt had become *res judicata* (when no further evidence or attempts to discredit evidence already tendered were, even according to other systems of law, permissible).

I may mention here another consideration which likewise points to the same conclusion. It is said in all the versions that the judges felt much surprise when Duṣṭa. said that the tree would give evidence. It is reasonable therefore to conjecture that when they went with him to the spot, they caused an examination to be made of the tree on all sides in order to assure themselves that there was no trickery. They must have however, found nothing to arouse their suspicion ; for, Duṣṭa., who was a clever man, had managed things well, so well, that even when his father with his body burnt, fell from the hollow of the tree, the judges who saw him did not in the least suspect that he had lain hidden in the hollow and given evidence but asked him (T., p. 58), 'Why did you resolve to fall like this into the fire (*kim idam idṛśam agnipatanam adhyavisitam bhavatā*)?' In fact it was only after he told them, 'I have been

brought to this plight by this wicked son of mine' that the judges understood the affair and ordered the punishment of Duṣṭa. Since thus in all probability the tree would have been examined by order of the judges before being questioned, Dharma. would not be allowed to examine it again.

Further, it is the rule in Hindu law that a plaintiff who relies on the evidence of witnesses has to produce not less than three such of good character before the court (Yājñavalkya 2, 68, 69); but if for any reason, he cannot produce three witnesses, he is allowed to produce one or two only provided that the defendant consents to their being examined as witnesses (*ibid.*, 2, 72). In this instance, as Duṣṭa. had but one witness, *viz.*, the tree, that he wanted to be examined on his behalf, it was necessary to obtain the consent of Dharma. before its evidence could be accepted. Compare in this connection the following passage from Durgasimha's version:—

The two [*scil.* Duṣṭa. and Dharma.] came to the officers of the court of justice and related the matter in detail. And, at the end, Duṣṭa. said "I have a witness to prove that this man stole and took away all the money". The jurors asked "Who is it?" [to which Duṣṭa.] replied, "Excepting this man and myself, there were no other persons [present] when we deposited the money. The banyan tree that stood near—that is the witness". The officers of the court of justice were surprised thereat and [saying to themselves], "The like of this person's talk has not been heard of before. Let us see the wonder", called Dharma. and said, "You must accept this witness". He said, "Nobody has ever before this either said or heard of a tree being a witness. Besides, it is said in the verse :

*gṛhiṇaḥ putriṇo mūlāḥ kṣatra-viṭ-chūdra-yonayaḥ |*  
*atyuktāḥ sākṣyam arhanti nayakovidam āpadi ||*<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> This verse is corrupt. The correct reading of the verse,

*gṛhiṇaḥ putriṇo maulāḥ kṣatra-viṭ-śūdra-yonayaḥ |*  
*arthy-uktāḥ sākṣyam arhanti na ye ke cid anāpadi ||*

is found in Manu (8, 62) and has been translated by Bühler as "House holders, men with male issue, and indigenious (inhabitants of the country be they) Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, or Śūdras, are competent, when called by a suitor, to give evidence, not any persons whatever (their condition may be) except in cases of urgency."

[and] following [verses], that, in all matters, the witnesses are the PERSONS that were presented. There is none that has said that a TREE is a witness. How then can I accept?" The officers of the court of justice then said: "There is a saying, *āḍitya-candrāv anilo 'nalaś ca dyaur bhūmir āpo hṛdayam yamaś ca | ahaś ca rātriś ca ubhe ca sandhye dharmas ca jānāti narasya vṛttam.*<sup>9</sup> Superhuman beings are witnesses of men's good and evil deeds; therefore this is a proper witness. When it is a wonderful thing that man and others should speak, it is a most wonderful thing to make a tree speak. You should [therefore] accept this witness". And Dharma, saying, "Very well, I accept", the officers of the court of justice said, "Today it is too late; we shall go and hear tomorrow", and all went to their homes.

The situation, then, is this:—After Duṣṭa, announces that he had one witness, namely, the tree, the consent of Dharma, is obtained for examining it as witness, and the officers of the court, together with Duṣṭa, and Dharma, repair to the spot on the next day. The tree, in all probability, is examined on all sides to make sure that there is no trickery, is solemnly adjured to speak the truth and give evidence on the matter, and says that Dharma, is guilty. Dharma, has no defence to offer except of course saying that he did not take the money. The judges therefore pronounce him to be guilty and proceed to discuss what punishment should be meted out to him. Dharma, on his part, being conscious of his innocence, is struck with wonder that the tree should bear false witness. As the genius of the tree could not speak an untruth, he suspects that there is some trickery in it, examines the tree carefully, and discovers that there is a hollow in it with signs of human passage. He is now convinced that there is some one concealed in the hollow and that it is this concealed person who has given the evidence. But how to bring this fact home to the minds of the judges? He cannot say that he objects to a tree being examined as witness; for he has already given consent to it; and it is futile for him to suggest that its testimony is not to be believed. Nor does it serve any useful purpose for him to say to the judges that

<sup>9</sup> "The sun, the moon, the air, the fire, the sky, earth and water, the mind, Yama, day, night and the two twilights and Dharma are witnesses of man's deeds."

he believes that there is a man concealed in the hollow of the tree for when questioned, he would have to admit that his belief rests on mere suspicion, that he had no such suspicion at the time the judges asked the tree to give evidence, and that it arose in his mind because he knew that he was innocent and the tree had said that he was guilty. Such statements would, naturally, not be believed by the judges and would have no effect on them ; the more so since the tree was (in all probability) examined once by order of the judges before it was questioned and nothing suspicious discovered.

The position of Dharma, then is such that he cannot, with advantage to himself, make any statement to the judges. Nor can he, without a word of explanation, proceed to fill the hollow of the tree with dry grass, etc., and set fire to it. It would be looked upon as an act of revenge on the tree for speaking out the truth and revealing the secret crime of Dharma. and the officers of the court would surely prevent him from doing any such thing.

The circumstances, then, are such as to force Dharma. in case he wants to avert from himself the impending punishment, to create for himself an opportunity to set fire to the hollow of the tree and 'smoke out' the person concealed in it,<sup>10</sup> making it

---

<sup>10</sup> The other two courses mentioned above, namely, waiting for seven days to see if some accident befalls the witness and the establishment of one's innocence by means of ordeal (*divya*), that would usually be open to person, accused of theft, would not be open to Dharma, because of the peculiar nature of the witness that bore testimony to his guilt. This witness being a tree, the evidence given by it would be regarded as the evidence given by the deity presiding over it. The accidents, on the other hand, that are referred to in Manu 8, 108 cited above, are in connection with human beings and obviously do not refer to superhuman deities. And moreover, since the evidence of the tree, declaring the guilt of Dharma, is itself superhuman evidence, it would not be permitted to Dharma, to again, by undergoing an ordeal, beseech superhuman beings to give evidence in the matter. Nor is this all. Even supposing that either of the above two courses were open to Dharma, he could thereby but clear himself of the charge of theft and show that he was innocent ; it would not be possible for him to show that Duṣṭa was the thief or to recover his share of the money that Duṣṭa, had stolen. By setting fire to the hollow of the tree and 'smoking out' the person concealed therein, on the other hand, he could not only clear himself of guilt but show to the judges that Duṣṭa, was the thief and recover his share of money from him.

patent to the judges that they have been tricked ; and this he does by saying to them that he stole the money, that a large snake came along, etc. It should be noted however that T's version here, is, (as observed by Edgerton) bizarre and badly constructed and that Dharma.'s statement to the judges does not in the least serve the purpose which he has in view ; for it is said there that Dharma. frightened at seeing the approach of a snake, buried the money at the foot of the tree and fled. It is difficult to believe that, when it is so much easier to carry the money, only 600 *dināra*, to another place and conceal it safely there, Dharma. should be frightened as he was, have chosen to remain in the place, to dig at the foot of the tree, (the same tree under which the money was originally buried) bury the money in it, fill up the hole and then flee. Granting however, that this is a natural thing for Dharma to do, it is still more difficult to see what reason Dharma has to set fire to the hollow of the tree. It is not anywhere suggested in T that the snake came out of the hollow or was at that moment concealed in the hollow ; and even if one supposes that it was so concealed, one still fails to see why it should be driven away first. As the money was buried at the foot of the tree, where it could be seen there was no snake, Dharma. could easily dig it out and make it over to the judges. T's version of the story thus fails wholly in making out the necessity for Dharma. to set fire to the hollow of the tree.

In the versions of Yaśodhīra and Durgasīrṃha on the other hand, the story is related in a better manner. Of these, the original and the translation of the former are given by Hertel on pp. 160 ff. of his *Pañca*. I give here a translation of the latter version :

Duṣṭa.'s father, Premamati, who lay hidden in the hollow, . . . said, "It is Dharma. that took the money", whereat the assemblage and the officers of the court of justice were filled with astonishment. Dharma.[thought], "The saying *dharmo jayati nādharmo ity amoghakṛtaṁ vacaḥ* ('Dharma wins, no' adharma ; this is an infallible saying') cannot be falsified. Therefore this is a surprise to me. This cannot be a superhuman being ; if it were so, why does it not speak the truth ? There must therefore be some trickery in this"; and going round the tree keeping it always to his right, he saw the large hollow

and signs of human passage. Having determined [on his course of action], he said to the officers of the court of justice; "According to the meaning of the saying, *kirāto nāsti niśśaṭhaḥ*<sup>11</sup> ('there is no tradesman who is not a rogue'), there is no tradesman who is not a liar. Because I am a tradesman, and in the light of our caste-dharma, a virtuous mind (i.e., honesty) is evil, I deceitfully took the money and was about to carry it to my home when the sun rose and there was no opportunity to carry it away. I therefore put it in the hollow of the tree and departed. When I went there the next day, I found a snake lying there, enfolding the money in its coils; and not daring to take it, I departed. Do you stay here and watch. I shall fill the hollow with smoke, drive out the snake, and make over to you the stolen goods". Thus saying, Dharma caused some straw and dry brushwood to be brought, filled the hollow with it, and set fire to it.

In both these versions, it is related that Dharma hid the money in the hollow of the tree, and that, when he went there again to take it, he saw a snake coming out of the hollow or lying in the hollow enfolding the money. As the money is to be restored to the proper owner, it is necessary to drive out the snake. And hence Dharma, gets the opportunity he desired of filling the hollow of the tree with smoke.

It hardly needs to be pointed out that this is the original form of the story and that T's version is a corruption. Hertel has

<sup>11</sup> This is the fourth pāda of the following verse:—

*abhrāntaś ca nṛpo nāsti śrotṛiyo nāsti buddhimān |*

*avidagdhā 'nganā nāsti kirāto nāsti niśśaṭhaḥ ||*

that is found on p. 95 of Durgasiṃha's Pañcatantra.

*Kirāta* is a rare word that is not mentioned in the PW, Apto or any of the Sanskrit lexicons. It is interpreted (in all probability, correctly) by Durgasiṃha as 'merchant; tradesman' in the above passage and this meaning fits well in Spl. I, verse 17:

*pūrṇāpūrṇe māne paricita-jana-vañcanaṃ tathā nityam |*

*mithyā-krayasya kathanaṃ nija-dharmo 'yam kirātānām ||*

which is the only other passage that I know in which this word is used (*kirātānām* in Kielhorn's edition is obviously a mistake for *kirātānām*). The word is therefore evidently derived from the root *kṛi* 'to barter, to purchase or sell' (*kṛiṇ* dravya-vinimaye).

indeed expressed the opinion (*op. cit.* p. 159) that Yaśodhīra has, in his version, made use of Tantrākhyāyika β or some other version derived from it. This cannot be correct; for, in that case, it is difficult to explain how Yaśodhīra could have arrived at a form of the story that is so much better constructed than its original source. Regarding Durgasimha's version, I shall show in a subsequent article that it, too, is quite independent of the Tantrākhyāyika. It follows hence that the incident of the snake is found, not in one Pañca. version only, but at least in two. And as I have shown above that some such incident is absolutely needed in the story I have no doubt that this incident formed part of the original Pañcatantra.

### 3. THE APE AND THE CROCODILE.

On pp. 70 ff. of Vol. I of his *Tantra-Über.*, Prof. Hertel has given in parallel columns the translation of the beginning of this Pañca. story (which forms the frame of Book IV) as related in T,<sup>12</sup> SP, Spl, So, Ks and the Pahlavi versions. Of these versions T alone relates (Ab. 286) that the crocodile, after mentioning the three young and beautiful she-apes on the island in the sea, offered to carry the ape there on his back as a sort of requital of the debt of gratitude owed by him to the ape, and thus makes out that the motive which prompted the ape to undertake the sea-voyage on the crocodile's back was a sexual one. SP, Spl., So, Ks and Pa, on the other hand, relate that the crocodile, after mentioning that there were sweet fruits on the island, invited the ape to visit his house there and thus give him an opportunity to return the ape's hospitality. These different versions are then compared by

---

<sup>12</sup> Besides the abbreviations mentioned on p. 1 above, I have here made use of the following ones also:—

Du : for the Pañcatantra version of Durgasimha written in Kannaḍa or Canarese. I have given a full account of its contents in Vol. VI of the *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*.

Durga : for the author of the above.

PR: for the *Pañcatantra Reconstructed* of Prof. Franklin Edgerton.

Hertel (pp. 88 ff.), who, as the result of such comparison, arrive at the following conclusions :—

(1) T's version alone of the passage, Ab. 286, is 'echt,' and those of SP, Pa and other recensions are corrupt.

(2) The corruption is due to the fact that the codex K (from which all recensions except T are derived) had the reading *nāryo* (this is the reading found in all the MSS of T also) which being misunderstood by the writer or copyist of K, was supposed by him to refer to the wives of the crocodile. Since the passage, so interpreted, did not yield good sense, the word 'women' was changed into 'my house.'

The latter conclusion is patently incorrect; for as pointed out by Prof. Edgerton in PR. 2, 102 f. (see also *AJP.* 36, 260 ff.), though the crocodile does not, in T, invite the ape to visit his house, the ape's words in T (Ab. 284): *yac ca bhavatā' bhīhitam gṛhagamana-dāradarsanaikapātrābhi-sambandhī mayā bhavān na kṛtaḥ* show clearly that the crocodile did really invite the ape (as is stated in SP, Spl and other versions) to visit his house, and that Hertel's opinion about 'my house' being a corruption for *nāryaḥ* (women) is untenable. Edgerton has similarly shown (PR. 2. 101 ff.) that there is no basis for Hertel's contention about the existence of the MS K.

The former conclusion too is incorrect according to Prof. Edgerton who has likewise criticised it on p. 103 of PR, Vol. 2. He there urges: (1) that all the Pañca. versions except T (which is here corrupt) state that the crocodile invited the ape to visit his house on the island and mention sweet fruits only, and not she-apes, on that island; (2) that there is no hint of the sexual motive in any Pañca. version except T; (3) that the motive which induced the ape to accept the invitation was the greed for delicious fruits; and (4) that the words *rāga* and *rāgin* in SP, verse IV, 6, which Hertel has translated as 'Geschlechtsliebe' and 'die Verliebten' refer in reality to this greed. And he therefore concludes that the passage in T which mentions the she-apes is an interpolation, and that SP and Pa are in that respect faithful to the original while T is not.



It seems to me that this conclusion is not well-founded ; and in particular, I find it difficult to assent to his proposition that the motive which induced the ape to visit the island was greediness for the delicious fruits that were to be found there. For, it becomes clear from the following passages, namely, SP. l. 1547 : *tasmim eva tīre Madhugarbho nāmodumbaras tiṣṭhati* and l. 1552 : *tatraiva mulhurāhārālābhāt sthitaḥ* ; Spl. p. 1, ll. 23 ff. : *nātha kvaivam-vidhāny amṛta-kalpāni phalāni prāpnōti bhavān | sa āha | bhadre mamāsti parama-suhṛd Rakta-mukho nāma vānaraḥ . . . yaḥ sudvivāmṛtaprāyāṇīdṛṣāni phalāni bhakṣayati* ; T. Ab. 274 : *kasmimś cit tīre Madhugarbho nāmodumbaraḥ* ; and Du, verse 207 : *phalāny amṛta-kalpāni tṛptim dāsyanti yāni me | tāni bhadra na rocante tavāpy audumbarāṇi ca ||* that the Fig-tree on the sea-shore in which the ape dwelt bore sweet fruit resembling nectar in taste ; and since the ape used to eat this fruit every day, it is hardly likely that he could have been tempted by the mention of sweet fruits on the island. There is thus no question of GREEDINESS for delicious fruits, and it is clear that the motive which induced the ape to accept the crocodile's invitation was, according to SP, Spl and Pa, merely the desire to please the crocodile and give him an opportunity to return his hospitality. The words 'magna concupiscentia' (John of Capua), 'Ungeniüsamkeit und Habgier' (Wolff), 'greedy and grasping' (Arabic ; see PR, 1, 382) in the Pahlavi versions do not therefore fit in with what precedes them in these versions ; and it is very probable that they are, as observed by Hertel (*Tantra.-Über.*, I, 91), due to the Pahlavi translator not understanding correctly the words *rāga* and *rāgin* (or other similar words) referring to sexual desire that were used in his Sanskrit original. On the other hand, these words (as pointed out by Hertel, l. c.) fit in very well with T's version of the story, and indicate that that version of the story is original and that the other versions are corrupt.

This is shown by the story of the *Ass without Heart and Ears* also, that follows here and that is related by the ape to the crocodile when the latter tried to tempt the ape and persuade him a second time to visit the island in the sea. This story is found in all the Pañca. versions and is concerned with an ass that gives

way to sexual desire, and believing the fox's statement that it was an amorous she-ass and not a beast of prey that impatiently leapt upon him in the cave, allows himself to be persuaded to visit it a second time, and is killed by the lion. Now the ape tells the crocodile, both before and after relating the story, that he is not like this ass; that is, he makes it clear to the crocodile that, though like the ass he has a failing which led him once to place himself in a situation where he would lose his life, still he is not so overcome by this failing as to become totally oblivious to the danger and place himself (as the ass in the story did) in such a situation again. The question therefore arises in our mind, what is this failing which the ape implicitly acknowledged that he had, and which led him into danger?

According to SP, Spl and the Pahlavi versions, it was with a desire to please that the ape accepted the invitation of the crocodile, and so placed himself in a situation of danger. This complaisance or amiability cannot in any way be said to be a failing; and it therefore becomes evident that this story and the ape's saying to the crocodile 'I am not like the ass' are out of place and inexplicable in these versions. According to T, on the other hand, it was the ape's libidinousness that led him into danger; and this, clearly, is a failing. The story and the ape's above-cited words suit the context in T only, and not in SP, Spl or Pa; and this too indicates therefore that these versions are corrupt and that the mention of the she-apes in T is a feature of the original Pañca.

It is interesting to find that the she-apes are mentioned in the corresponding passage of Du also, of which I give a translation here:

(Pp. 278-279) "The ape saw him and with face smiling approached and placed before him fig-fruits; and then looking at his face, said, 'Not seeing you today, for a long time, I had become anxious. Where were you gone?' Krakaca said: "Considering in my mind, 'When shall I repay you for the great benefit that you have conferred on me?'—

In the middle of the sea is an island that is glorious with hosts of lotuses and beautiful with many *nameru*, *pārijāta*, *mandāra* and celestial trees (409).

There is friendship between me and two beautiful she-apes that are on that island. Therefore.—

I went there when they came to meet me and said in sorrow, 'Even when we have a friend like you, our lives, like that of one who becomes a celibate while yet a boy, are passing away in emptiness.' And they are beautiful and endowed with much wealth. Moreover, all the fruits on that island are elixirs of life (*rasāyana*); and those that eat them will at once get rid of grey hair and wrinkles and become fresh youths. Hear therefore; I shall immediately take you upon my back and carry you to the ape-maidens on the island and thus attain my object. Therefore come quickly and get upon my back". Hearing this the old ape, with mind full of exuberant joy, said thus to himself :

'The ripe fruits destroy old age and the bevy of she-apes too longs for males! If one considers properly, is there anything more fortunate (lit.; are there better results of merit, *puṇya*, than this)?' (410).

Thus saying the love-sick ape, without thinking about dangers to come, got upon the crocodile's back."

I have shown elsewhere<sup>13</sup> that Vasubhāga's recension of the Pañca., of which Du is a sub-recension, is more faithful to the original than the recension of Viṣṇuśarman of which T is a sub-recension. The mention of she-apes in Du<sup>14</sup> and T therefore seems to me to show conclusively that this was a feature of the

---

<sup>13</sup> In the latter part (this will be published in Vol. VII of the *Zeitschrift für Indologie and Iranistik*) of my article on "The Pañcatantra of Durgasimha."

<sup>14</sup> The word used in Du is the plural of *vānara-nārt*, which therefore seems to justify Hertel's emendation of *nāryo* into *vānara-nāryo* in Ab. 286.

T mentions three she-apes while Du mentions only two. Similarly in the story of the *Ass without Heart and Ears*, T mentions four she-asses while Du mentions only two. Such variations in number do not however signify anything; see PR, 2. 110.

original Pañca. Hertel, I conceive, is therefore right in thinking that Ab. 286 in T is 'echt' and Edgerton wrong in holding that it is a later interpolation and that the versions of SP and Pa are original.

The above passage of Du, it will be noted, speaks of 'fruits that are elixirs of life (*rasāyana*)', while the corresponding passage in the Pahlavi versions speaks of 'sweet fruits' (PR. 1. 380 ; Ar. 30) or 'honorum fructuum' only, and T (Ab. 286), of *amṛtāsvādātulyāḥ kalpavṛkṣa-sadṛśās taravāḥ*, that is, of 'trees that are like to ambrosia in savour and that are like the kalpa tree.' It is obvious that this passage of T is corrupt, for, it is the fruits of trees that are eaten and not trees themselves. The original Pañca. passage must have therefore referred like Du, to the savour, not of the trees, but of the fruits of the trees, and must have mentioned that the fruits were 'like *amṛta* (ambrosia)' and also that they destroyed old age and restored youth to all that ate them. For this is the characteristic of *amṛta*,<sup>15</sup> and it is with special reference to this characteristic that the crocodile must have, in the original Pañca., used the word *amṛta* here, and pointed out to the ape (who, it is emphasised in all the versions, was old) that he would, by eating the fruits, regain his youth and enjoy the company of the she-apes.

This original feature is preserved in Du only ; the other versions are all corrupt, and though mentioning the fruits on the island, say nothing about their peculiar property of destroying old age and restoring youth.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Amṛta*, as is well-known is the *rasāyana* par excellence (compare Bhāgavata, 8. 9. 21 : *daityān gṛhīta-kalāśo vañcayann upasañcaruḥ | dūrasthān pāyayāmāsa jarāmṛtyuharām sudhām*) ; and it is because of its use that the gods (*devāḥ*) are *ajarāḥ*, ever young, as also *amarāḥ*, immortal.

## FIRE-ARMS IN ANCIENT INDIA

G. N. VAIDYA, M.A.

At the beginning of the last century, very little attention and less respect was paid to the achievements of the ancient Indians in the domain of science. Political needs, however, necessitated a more thorough understanding of the civilization of the conquered race, and the victors discovered that the ancestors of their subjects had made very marked advances in many departments, *e.g.*, medicine, astronomy, mathematics. Some scholars thought that they saw the germs of some discoveries which had been made very recently in the western world. Some went yet further and declared that a few departments of science had been developed on a much greater scale by the ancient *Rsis*. It was claimed that these great sages had perfected the arts of painting and music, architecture and polity; that they knew and used aeroplanes and gun powder!

No scholar is now prepared to deny the high achievements of the ancient sages. But every such alleged discovery must be carefully examined before we come to any conclusion about it. We are here concerned with the contention that gunpowder and fire arms were used in warfare in ancient India.

Many learned scholars have given their opinions on this interesting topic, but I think that the arguments on both sides have not been subjected to a critical and exhaustive inspection. It is, therefore, the aim of this article to state the pros and cons of the question and examine them in detail.

Halhead started this discussion in his introduction to the *Code of Gentoo Laws*<sup>1</sup>. He relied mainly on the words *agnyastra* and *Sataghni*: "The word fire-arms is literally sanskr̥t *agni-astra*, *i.e.*, a weapon of fire". These fire-arms were condemned in the 'Code', and as the Code was based on authoritative Sm̥rtis, Halhead argued that the Sm̥rtis knew of the fire-arms, but looked on them with disfavour. Elliot<sup>2</sup> comes to the same conclusion but

---

<sup>1</sup> Halhead, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. 52f.

<sup>2</sup> Elliot, *History of India*, Vol VI, pp. 455-482.

maintains that somehow these weapons had fallen into disuse at the time of the Mahomedan invasion. Bohlen<sup>3</sup>, who gives a number of quotations from various commentaries, contributes to the same opinion. Wilson<sup>4</sup>, in his studies, has argued on nearly the same lines as above. He has specially emphasized the thundrous impact of the *Vajra* and concludes that this could have been only due to some sort of explosive substance. He, moreover, points out that all the principal ingredients of gunpowder were found in abundance in North India and so a discovery of the compound could be easily explained.

The evidence used by all these authors is mostly Purāṇic, describing wonderful weapons and their miraculous effects. Other scholars could say that poets and mythologists use their imagination rather freely and that conclusions drawn from their statements would not be sound. But Oppert<sup>5</sup> now came forward and was able to give convincing descriptions of real guns in works on polity. The Śukranītisāra and the Nītiprakāśika, indeed, offer us an account of a weapon, which is, in every respect, like the cannons of the seventeenth century. On the description of Nalikā in the Nītiprakāśikā, Rajendralal Mitra<sup>6</sup> observes, "It is difficult to read the above, without a feeling of suspicion about its authenticity ; the flint-lock of the last three centuries comes so vividly to mind that it is difficult to set it aside ; but the arguments urged by Dr. Oppert are strong and I must leave them to speak for themselves." Oppert maintained that the Śukranītisāra was composed by the same Śukra, who is quoted in the Mahābhārata and that the author of the Nītiprakāśika is the same Vaiśampāyana, who is supposed to narrate a greater portion of the epic. Har Bilas Sarda<sup>7</sup> has reiterated the same conclusion, without adding any new argument. But it must be noted that this work is absolutely uncritical and hence unreliable. The author, in his zeal to prove that the ancient

<sup>3</sup> Bohlen, *Alt-Indien*, pp. 64-68.

<sup>4</sup> H. H. Wilson, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 303.

<sup>5</sup> Oppert, *Nītiprakāśikā* (1882) pp. 10-13 ; Śukranītisāra, pp. 194 ff.; *On Weapons, etc.*, p. 32.

<sup>6</sup> R. Mitra, *Indo-Āryans*, Vol. I, p. 311.

<sup>7</sup> Har Bilas Sarda, *Hindu Superiority*, pp. 300-309.

Indians had perfected the most modern inventions, has relied on passages, wrenched violently from their context, and has quoted from the works of European scholars, out of date and exploded theories, without any comments or justification. He is thus able to prove that the old sages and kings possessed a highly developed artillery as also a large flotilla of aeroplanes. This work has been rendered into Marathi; but the translator<sup>8</sup> has taken no pains to improve upon the original.

The arguments of Oppert did not convince some scholars, who regarded the Śukranītisāra and the Nītiprakāśikā either as later works, or as full of interpolations. Quite a new colouring is, however, given to the problem by the discovery of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Prof. Banerjee<sup>9</sup> has thus analysed the composition of the "fire-powders" in the Arthaśāstra,<sup>10</sup> and shown that one of them agrees very closely with the 'gun-powder' in the Śukranītisāra and that the ingredients given are even to-day used for the same purpose. The authenticity of the passage has not been questioned and the problem, therefore, presents quite a new appearance.

This is only one side of the problem; as against it a number of scholars have all along contended that the invention is too complex to be known in very ancient times. They also point to numerous descriptions of ancient battles, in all of which fire-arms are conspicuously absent. Hopkins<sup>11</sup> has thoroughly sifted and examined the passages from the great epic, which are alleged to refer to the fire-arms. Maclagen<sup>12</sup> has also come to the conclusion that fire-arms in the sense of a modern gun or cannon were unknown in ancient India. Many other scholars have similarly expressed themselves against the view of Oppert and others, but a detailed examination was not attempted. Especially in view of the fresh data supplied by the Arthaśāstra, the problem must be thoroughly

<sup>8</sup> *Bhāratiya Śreṣṭhatva* (Chitraśālā Press, Poona).

<sup>9</sup> Pramathanatha Banerjee, "International Law and Customs in Ancient India", *Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta*, Vol. I, pp. 343-348.

<sup>10</sup> Arthaśāstra, XIII, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Hopkins, "The Ruling Caste in Ancient India" *JAOS*. XIII, pp. 297-304; also C X V ff.

<sup>12</sup> R. Maclagen, "On early fire-weapons" *JASB*. 1876. pp. 40-56.

investigated. Dr. Banerjee<sup>13</sup> rightly says (*op. cit.* p. 206), "The question is yet unsettled and open for further discussion."

But before we launch into a detailed examination of the various arguments, some issues of great importance must be settled. Thus let us be clear about the exact scope of the word 'fire-arms.'

'Fire-arms' do not include any weapons which are in some way connected with fire. The term is used with reference to those weapons which are discharged by the force of fire. A modern gun, which propels large shells by means of an explosion of burning gunpowder, is one of the 'fire-arms' in the fullest sense of the word. But a torch in flames, flung at an opponent and used like a weapon, cannot lay claim to the title. It *does* carry fire and it is destructive, but it is not discharged or propelled by fire. Similarly arrows, which are tipped with burning rags, do not fall under the category of 'fire-arms.' The distinction between combustibles and explosives has to be carefully borne in mind. The essential characteristics of fire-arms is not that they burn, but that they are discharged by an explosion.

We have also to remember that the use of gunpowder and fire-arms cannot have obtained at a single stride. It presupposed several other things. Thus the three principal ingredients of gunpowder, *viz.*, saltpetre, charcoal and sulphur must be known. Then again their cumulative effect in a compound must also be discovered and finally such a property must be exploited for use in war, in order to discharge volleys of bullets and shells, etc. With this distinction in mind we can now turn to the discussion proper.

The argument most emphasised is the presence of the miraculous astras in the epic war and elsewhere. The agnyastra, which burnt up whole armies, is thus believed to be nothing less than a mighty cannon. Now with regard to this it must be noted that the power of these missiles was not inherent, but wholly due to the incantations which accompanied them. Their appearance and the mode of discharging them are generally not different from the ordinary weapons. An ordinary quoit or an arrow or even a blade of grass, when discharged to the accompaniment of the mysterious

---

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Banerjee, *Public Administration in ancient India.*



mantra, would obtain miraculous powers. Now fire-arms are discharged in a conspicuously peculiar way, and cannot therefore be the same as these astras. Moreover, the effect of these astras can very well be doubted and the instruments are perhaps not to be taken literally. In any case the astras did not materially affect the conclusion of the great war<sup>14</sup>. Miraculous spells and incantations are a regular feature in Indian civilization ever since the age of the Atharvaveda, and whatever actual effect these weapons may have had, was certainly not due to any explosive material, but to the mantras. In the minute description of the epic war, we have not a shred of evidence for assuming the presence of a weapon like the modern cannon.

Leaving then these miraculous weapons, which certainly do not correspond to 'fire-arms' in our sense of the word, we turn towards some other words which are supposed to denote some kinds of fire-arms.

The Śataghni,—This weapon is mentioned very frequently in the epics and in the later literature. Much emphasis has been laid on the literal meaning of the word, "a hundred-killer"; apparently, this can be nothing less than a cannon. Then again, it is very often mentioned as stationed on the walls of fortresses<sup>15</sup>. The references can be roughly divided into two sets. One seems to refer to a handy weapon. Such a Śataghni is often mentioned as being thrown by the hand<sup>16</sup>, and as stored in the chariot by the side of other weapons like the sword and the mace<sup>17</sup>. Among a mass of weapons flung at Bhīma is the Śataghni, which he splits with an arrow<sup>18</sup>. Yudhiṣṭhira also casts a Śataghni at Śalya, who deals with it in a similar manner<sup>19</sup>. Other references in the war are of a similar nature. The apparent implications of the title Śataghni do not lead to any conclusion, as, even an ordinary añkuśa is sometimes called a Sahasraghātīn<sup>20</sup>. It will thus be clear, that in epic usage Śataghni

<sup>14</sup> C. V. Vaidya, *Mahābhāratācī Upasamhāra*, p. 515.

<sup>15</sup> *Mahābhārata*, XII, 69. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 5. 9; V. 3, 18; V. 4, 17-20.

<sup>16</sup> *Mahābhārata*, XI. 12-21.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* VIII. 10, 17; VIII. 11.8.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* VI. 113.39 ff.; VI. 96-57.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* IX. 12.21.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* VII 29-17. cf. *JAOS.* XIII, CXCVI.

did not mean a species of fire-arms, but only a sort of mace. Even as late as Kālidāsa, a Śataghni, covered with iron knobs, is mentioned. It is then cut down with an arrow <sup>21</sup>. As to the other kind of the Śataghni, which is stationed on the walls of a fortress, we must remember that ammunition is nowhere mentioned. The Śataghni must have been some machine in the nature of a catapult, which would suit the general picture of warfare in ancient India. This conclusion is convincingly established by a reference to the old lexicons. In their copious lists, fire-arms are conspicuous by their absence. On the other hand, the 'Śataghni' is expressly defined in the Vaijayanti as

*'śataghni tu catustālā loha-kaṇṭaka-saṅcitā |  
ayahkaṇṭaka-saṅchinnā śataghniveva mahāśilā ||* <sup>22</sup>.

Thus the Śataghni is a long weapon, covered with iron knobs; it is also a large slab of stone, bristling with iron spikes. Obviously, the two species are here explained, and they have nothing to do with fire-arms.

Nālīka is supposed to mean a 'gun' in all cases. This is supposed to be the same as the Nalikā, which, according to the Nītiprakāśikā, is a kind of flint-lock. But this latter word never occurs in the older works. Nālīka, which is often mentioned there, is only a particular kind of arrow. It is frequently grouped with the Nārāca and the Karṇin. The lexicons again come to our help. The Vaijayanti says '*nālīkamabje bāṇe vā.*' In the works on the Dhanurveda, the Nālīka is described as a small dart, propelled by means of a hollow tube and particularly serviceable for the purpose of a seige :

*nālīkā laghavo bāṇā nala-yantreṇa noditāh |  
atyucca-dīrgha-pāteṣu durgayuddheṣu te matāh ||* <sup>23</sup>.

These references are clear enough.

A similar claim has been made about the Bhuṣuṇḍi or the Bhusuṇḍhi. Monier Williams in his dictionary is half inclined to accept this meaning. But looking up the passages in the epic,

<sup>21</sup> Raghuvamśa, XII. 95.96.

<sup>22</sup> Vaijayanti, Bhūmi-Kānda; Kṣatriyādhyāya., 169.

<sup>23</sup> Śārṅgadhara-padhati, Dhanurveda (1788).

where this weapon is mentioned, we discover that it occurs by the side of clubs and spits<sup>24</sup>. Many times it is also used along with the Śūla and Paṭṭiśa and probably meant a longer spear; that it cannot mean a gun is, however, quite obvious. The Vaijayanti again defines *Blhusuṅṭhi* as a wooden club with iron knobs<sup>25</sup>.

Oppert<sup>26</sup> contends that the *sūrmī* was also a sort of gun. The word occurs in the Vedas<sup>27</sup>, and if the meaning given were acceptable, it would prove a very high antiquity, for the use of gun-powder, in ancient India. But the interpretation does not stand a critical scrutiny. The passage in the Ṛgveda reads:

प्रेध्दो अग्ने दीदिदि पुरो नो जल्लया सूर्म्या यविष्ठ ।  
त्वां शश्वन्त उपयन्ति वाजा : ॥

and it is quite obvious that the *sūrmī* is only the bright flame of agni. The passage from the other Veda deserves greater attention. It runs :

एषा इ वै सूर्मि कर्णकावती । एतया इस्म वै देवा असुराणां शततर्हस्तुंहन्ति  
यदेतया समिधमादधाति वज्रमेवैतच्छतघ्नो यजमानो भ्रातृव्याय प्रहरति ॥  
On *Sūrmī Karṇakāvati*, Bhaṭṭa-bhāskara remarks :

ज्वलन्ती लोहमया स्थूणा सूर्मि कर्णकावती अन्तःसुधिरवति अन्तर्बहिश्च  
ज्वलन्तीत्यर्थः ॥

and Sāyana says :

ज्वलन्ती लोहमयी स्थूणा सूर्मि सा च कर्णकावती ।  
छिद्रवती अत एव ज्वलन्तीत्यर्थः । तत्समानेयमृक् ॥

Oppert has brandished this verse as a triumphant stroke which would completely settle the much-debated problem. But we have to note that the *sūrmī* here is a divine weapon and in the interests of sober history, it is dangerous to jump to any conclusions. Then again, even the commentators do not necessarily understand a gun by this word. The word *Karṇakāvati* is not sufficient to lead us to such a drastic conclusion. It is better to construe it to mean 'with a handle' or 'with a hole' as the PW. has done. *Sūrmī* then

<sup>24</sup> Mahābhārata III, 170.3; JAOS. XIII, CXXVĪ.

<sup>25</sup> Vaijayanti, Bhūmikāṇḍa, Kṣatriyādhyāya 171.

<sup>26</sup> Nitiprakāśikā, pp. 11.13.

<sup>27</sup> Ṛgveda VII., 1-3; Yajurveda (Vājasaneyi), I 5-7-6.

would mean a blazing weapon with a handle or a hole. It was moreover used by the gods only.

Similarly as regards the thundrous impact of the Vajra<sup>28</sup>, it is clear that the terrific sound ensues when the Vajra dashes against its objective. In the case of the fire-arms, the sound of the explosion occurs when the weapon is discharged.

All these arguments, I think, prove conclusively that 'fire-arms' were not known in the Vedic and the epic periods. At the same time, the possibility that they were known in the classical age has also to be considered. Emphasis is, in this case, laid on the Śukranītisāra and the Nītiprakāśikā, which are supposed to be very old. There is no doubt, that both these works make unmistakable references<sup>29</sup> to fire-arms. The only question is about their dates. The doctrines propounded in them are generally on the same lines as those in the Arthaśāstra and the Kāmandakiya Nītisāra but in many respects very peculiar differences can be noted. The budget system<sup>30</sup>, the proportions of elephants and chariots in the army<sup>31</sup>, the posts of some high officials, etc., all mark out a much later age for the Nītisāra. The same remarks hold good about the Nītiprakāśikā. Oppert<sup>32</sup> has attempted to place these works at a high age, because they are ascribed to Śukra and Vaiṣampāyana respectively. But such a conclusion is obviously as absurd as the attempt to put the Yājñavalkya Smṛti in the Vedic age, merely because he is referred to in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads. The Nītisāra and the Nītiprakāśikā do not, therefore, entitle us to detect fire-arms in the warfare of ancient India.

In the *Code of Gentoo Laws* we read, "The Magistrate shall not make war with any deceitful machine or with cannons and guns or with any kind of fire-arms." This code was compiled in the 18th century by learned Pandits, who drew mainly on the most authoritative Smṛtis. But we must note that the Smṛtis are not

<sup>28</sup> Wilson, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 302.

<sup>29</sup> Nītiprakāśika, II. 17, Nītisāra IV, 7, 195-211.; Oppert, *Weapons, etc.*, pp. 12-14.

<sup>30</sup> Nītisāra, IV, 7, 26-29.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. IV, 7, 20-26.

<sup>32</sup> Oppert, *op. cit.*

quoted verbatim and that changes have been made according to the times. The original passage in view, seems to be from the *Manusmṛti*<sup>33</sup>, which speaks only of barbed and poisoned arrows, etc. Now just as the Pandits in their code substituted the 'Magistrate' for the 'King' so did they substitute 'cannons and guns' for the out-of-date arrows. We cannot, therefore, infer the presence of old *Smṛtis*, which forbade fire-arms.

Similarly *Nīlakaṇṭha* has also read later inventions in the original epic verses. Thus on the verse :

पुरी समंताद्विहिता सपताका सतोरणा ।  
सचक्रा सहुडा चैव सयंत्रखनका तथा ॥<sup>34</sup>

he remarks :

यन्त्राप्याग्नेयौषधबलेन दृषत्यडोत्क्षेपणानि महान्ति कमानसंज्ञानि ।  
क्षुद्राणि सीसगुलिकोत्क्षेपणानि बंदूखसंज्ञानि ॥

But, as no such weapon is in evidence, in the actual descriptions of the fighting, we may again assume that the commentator is trying to give an up-to-date garb to the old terms ; for gun-powder is never once mentioned in the epic, the only powder, which is referred to, being *aśma-cūrṇa*. This again is classed among the number of unimportant weapons used by the lowest class of ordinary soldiers. Had fire-arms been known, they would surely have commanded a better position.

Lastly we proceed to consider the fire-powders, mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*.<sup>35</sup> Prof. Pramathanath Banerjee in his "International Law and Customs in Ancient India" has prominently relied upon them : "It is almost certain, however, that the mechanical composition given by *Kauṭilya*, of a second kind of inflammable powder, is almost identical with the second variety of gun-powder, mentioned by *Śukrācārya*. . . . . The ingredients were (1) the powder of all metals as red as fire, (2) the mixture of the powder of *kumbhī*, (3) lead, (4) *Trapu* (zinc), mixed with the charcoal-powder of the flowers of (5) *Paribhadra* (deodar), (6) *Palāśa* and (7) hair and (8) with oil, wax and turpentine. It will

<sup>33</sup> Manu, VII, 90.

<sup>34</sup> *Mahābhārata*, III, 15, 5.

<sup>35</sup> *Arthaśāstra*, XIII, 4.

be seen that, powdered metals, lead and zinc as well as charcoal powder mixed up with the other substances, produce a kind of inflammable powder. The recipe of Śukrācārya for preparing gun powder is as follows :—(1) charcoal, (2) sulphur, (3) *Suvarci*, (4) stones, (5) *Harital*, (6) lead, (7) *Hingūl*, (8) Iron filings, (9) camphor, (10) *Jatu*, (11) Indigo, (12) Juice of sarala tree, etc. It will be seen, therefore, that the constituent elements of gun-powder in both Kautilya's Arthaśāstra and the Śukranītīsāra agree. Even if the passages in the Śukranītīsāra be regarded as interpolations, the passages in the Arthaśāstra cannot be regarded as 'literary fraud' and therefore, the inevitable conclusion is that the ancient Hindus knew the composition of the gun-powder and actually used it, in whatever rudimentary a form it might be, at least fifteen hundred years before the Saracens introduced it into the Christian Europe."<sup>30</sup>

I have ventured to reproduce this rather lengthy passage, because very important issues depend upon it. If the argument given, were to prove convincing, we would have to admit the presence of gun-powder in ancient India. The main contention is that the two powders are identical in composition. But a closer examination, discloses the fact, that *suvarci* or saltpetre, is absent in the recipe of the Arthaśāstra. In a modern formula of gun-powder the proportion of saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal was twenty-five, five and three respectively. In a standard formula of the Śukra, nītīsāra it is five, one and one. So the importance of saltpetre (*suvarci*) is admitted by our modern process and by the Śukra-nītīsāra. The Arthaśāstra, on the other hand, does not even mention it. A number of other common inflammable material can never prove the identity of the two recipes. The powder, described in the Arthaśāstra, is only inflammable and not explosive. The distinction between the two is very important.

The powders given in the Arthaśāstra are combustible material, which would set fire to the possessions of the enemy. Arrows tipped with fire were quite well known and these powders display only a variant of the same theme. The Manusmṛti (VII, 90) refers to burning arrows ; so does the Mahābhārata (V, 155, 5-7). Ktesias

<sup>30</sup> *Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, Vol. I p. 347.*

also describes them ; and the *Mānasollāsa* (II. 1213) <sup>37</sup> mentions them in passages like *agnitailārcitair bāṇair nirbhindyād dvipāyūthapān*. The *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* <sup>38</sup> speaks of King Kandarpa, who threw burning arrows covered with vegetable oil, on the mass of his foes and thus caused them to fly in a panic. The *Agni-taila* of the *Mānasollāsa* and the vegetable-oil of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, point to some substance like the 'Greek fire.' But this is quite different from gun-powder and fire-arms.

Dr. P. C. Ray <sup>39</sup> has come to this same conclusion, "In Sanskrit literature, there are frequent but vague references to *Agni-āstra* or fire-arms, but we have no reason to suppose that the combustible matter the fire-arms contained, supplied the motive-power of the nature of gun-powder. The fire-missiles were probably of the same category, as the 'Greek fire,' i.e., arrows or darts tipped with oiled flax, resin, regalar, naphtha or other bituminous substances, discharged from bows ; sometimes elaborate machines being devised, to hurl the weapons with more deadly effect." Dr. Ray has further shown that saltpetre was not used to prepare gun-powder. "The manufacture of nitre was therefore most probably introduced into India after the adoption of gun-powder as an instrument of warfare." <sup>40</sup>

We have thus examined all the principal arguments in favour of the view that the ancient Hindus knew the use of gun-powder in war ; and we found them unsatisfactory. The negative conclusion, to which we arrive, is considerably strengthened by the noteworthy fact that these weapons are nowhere mentioned in the list of arms, in use at that time. We have a number of works on the military science, but, no authentically old composition alludes to gun-powder or fire-arms. The ancient lexicons, while they give a complete list of the important weapons, have not a word to say about these fire-arms. The number of such works increases considerably when we turn towards other books which give direct and indirect descriptions of actual warfare. From our own knowledge

<sup>37</sup> Cf. also 1065 and 1071.

<sup>38</sup> *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, VII, 983,989.

<sup>39</sup> *History of Hindu Chemistry*, Vol. I, pp. 179-180.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* P. 184.

of other nations, we know how artillery has revolutionised all warfare, and it would be wonderful indeed if such an epoch-making invention were to be passed over so consistently. Then again elephants and the bow were reckoned as the most potent forces in the warfare of ancient India, and it is quite obvious that they could not have held their own against artillery of the most inferior type. We must also remember that the life of the people and their environments, make a deep impression on their language and idiom. Objects of their experience are bound to be mentioned directly and indirectly. Had fire-arms been known to the ancient Hindus, they would surely have supplanted the arrow, not only in warfare, but in the similes and metaphors used by the people. We do not observe any such occurrence, and are therefore thoroughly justified in attaching very potent significance to this otherwise inexplicable silence.

This conclusion, however unpalatable to orthodox sentimentalists and uncritical theorists, has to be accepted. The noble achievements of our illustrious ancestors have rightly earned for them a high pedestal; and the addition of a fake decoration or two would in no way enhance their real worth.

---



# SATAVAHANAS AND THE CONTEMPORARY KSATRAPAS.

By V. S. BAKHLE, M.A., LL.B.

## VI

### SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ORGANISATIONS.

THE system of government during the period was certainly monarchical, whether under the Sātavāhanas or under the Kṣaharātas. The inscriptions of the Sātavāhanas or of the Kṣaharātas in the Western India Caves do not unfortunately reveal any evidence of an "organised institution of state to voice forth the peoples' view" like the five great assemblies which wielded sovereign power. All the same, read in a proper light they unmistakably indicate that the people had a voice in the administration and enjoyed local self-government. The anxiety of the king to please his subjects and, in times when two rival sects of Buddhism were flourishing in Mahārāṣṭra side by side with Brahmanism, to bestow gifts both on Brahmins and Buddhists points certainly to the strong power wielded by the people. And, if any tangible proof were needed, it is furnished by the mention in a Kṣaharāta inscription at Nasik of the 'Nigumasabhā', the Township Corporation.

We need not pause to enquire what the conception of the duties of a king was in those times. Much has been written on that subject; and the information supplied by the inscriptions does not add much to what we already know from the various works on ancient Indian Polity.

The succession to the throne was hereditary; it may be, however, that during the period of the Kṣaharātas, each Kṣatrapa was appointed by the 'King of Kings' at Taxila. We know only of two Kṣaharāta Kṣatrapas; and with this knowledge it is not possible to be definite on this point. During the Sātavāhana period, however, it is almost certain that on the death of a king, his brother or his son succeeded him. We have at Nasik an inscription of Kaṇha who usurped the throne, setting aside the legitimate claims of Sātakarṇi, the son of Śimuka and the rightful heir. Later on,

after Puḷumāvi, when the empire became unwieldy, the king's brother was probably appointed as Viceroy in the distant provinces. The normal mode of disposition, however, we may assume in the absence of any contradictory evidence, was the selection of the eldest son as the successor to the kingdom.

When the heir to the throne happened to be a minor, it was generally his mother who acted as regent. It is now generally admitted that the accession of Aśoka Maurya took place in B.C. 273 ; but the actual consecration was delayed by about four years. Vincent Smith takes this fact to indicate that his accession was disputed<sup>172</sup> ; but the revised readings of the Khāravēla inscription point definitely to the practice of those times which required that for obtaining the royal Abhiṣeka, the age of twenty-five was a condition precedent<sup>173</sup>. This appears to be the reason why Aśoka's coronation was delayed. Coming to the Sātavāhana period, we learn from the inscription at Nūnāghāṭ that the wife of Sātakarṇi was acting as regent for her son. In his case also, therefore, it would seem that the actual coronation did not take place till he had attained the age of twenty-five, although according to Hindu Law he was probably a major at the time of the inser.

The whole country was divided into districts or administrative divisions known as Āhāras, each of which was under an Amātya. In later epigraphic records, we often come across the term Maṇḍala employed in the same sense as Deśa or Rāṣṭra ; and it was larger in extent than Viṣaya or Bhukti. The terms, Viṣaya and Deśa, are sometimes indiscriminately applied to the same tract of country. Lesser than a Viṣaya was an Āhāra ; and lesser than an Āhāra was a Pathaka. In the inscriptions at Nasik, we have mention only of the territorial division which was known as an Āhāra ; the specific divisions mentioned are the Āhāras of Govardhana, Kāpura and Māmala. The Kanheri inscription No. 5, in alphabet of the time after Puḷumāvi, mentions besides the benefactions at Kanheri six other gifts bestowed by the donor at various places amongst which there is a gift of three cells at Sopāragāhāra and another perpetual

<sup>172</sup> Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 150.

<sup>173</sup> Jayaswal, *JBORS*, 3, 438.

endowment at Pratiṣṭhānapatha. In the Poona Plate of the Vākāṭaka queen, Prabhāvatīguptā, we have mention of a Supra-tiṣṭhāhāra, a district round about Paithan. A Patha, therefore, may be a lesser division than an Āhāra; or like the terms, Viṣaya and Deśa, the two words might have been used indiscriminately for the same tract of country.

We know from the inscriptions at Nasik that each Āhāra was under an Amātya, a ministerial officer. Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra gives the qualifications of an Amātya and probably divides them into three classes: *uttama*, *madhyama* and *avarā* <sup>174</sup>. It is but natural to suppose that the Amātya in charge of an Āhāra belonged to the last class. Perhaps he was what we may now call a Revenue Collector; and Kauṭilya has observed that only those whose purity has been tested under monetary allurements shall be appointed to this post <sup>175</sup>. An Amātya of the first class was probably in personal attendance on the king and is the Rājāmātya mentioned in the inscriptions.

Besides the Amātya and the Rājāmātya, we have mention of two other officers in the inscriptions, Mahāmātra and Bhāṇḍāgārika. The former is mentioned in the very early inscription of Kaṇha and his duties were to supervise, to inspect and to look after the comforts of the Buddhist mendicants. He is called there the Samaṇamahāmāta; and this office compares favourably with that created by Aśoka to supervise the progress of his Law of Piety. The excavation of the cave by the Samaṇamahāmāta was perhaps in order to provide protection and look after the comforts of the Śramaṇas; and both these formed part of his duties. The officer was probably himself a Śramaṇa and was posted at every important place of resort of the Buddhist ascetics. Under the later Sātavāhanas, we see no traces of this officer; and it may be, the office was in course of time abolished.

The Bhāṇḍāgārika, who figures in the inscriptions as the donor of several benefactions, has been regarded as a Treasury Officer. So often is the word Bhāṇḍa used in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya

<sup>174</sup> Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra (ed. Shama Sastri), p. 15.

<sup>175</sup> *ibid.* p. 17.

in the sense of commodity that we prefer to take this office as that of the Superintendent of Stores <sup>176</sup>. We have a Jātaka story which says that the office of the Bhāndāgārika carried with it the judgeship of the guilds <sup>177</sup>; and this indicates that his duties concerned merchandise and mercantile guilds rather than the treasury.

The next officer of state mentioned in the inscriptions of the period is the Lekhaka. Senart and other scholars have regarded him as a mere writer; but it appears that he was a high ministerial officer and his office was analogous to that of a Secretary to the Government in modern times <sup>178</sup>. In inscription No. 26 at Nasik, the Lekhaka Vudhika is called a Śaka; and apart from the fact that a mere writer could hardly afford to bestow any benefactions on the Buddhist mendicants, we cannot expect a foreigner to occupy so low a position under the rule of the Śakas.

Of the Mahārāṭhis and Mahābhojas, Rapson observes that they were evidently high officers of state, probably viceroys in the Āndhra empire <sup>179</sup>. The importance of their position is clear from the fact that they were often intimately connected by family ties with the ruling sovereign. Separating the honorific suffix mahā, we get Rāṭhi and Bhoja or the Rāṣṭrikas and the Bhojakas who have been mentioned in the Rock Edicts of Asoka and in the Hathigumphā inscription of Khāravela. "They are known to have lived in the Mahārāṣṭra country and the Berar. . . . The Bhojakas according to Aitareya Brāhmaṇa had a non-monarchical constitution peculiar to themselves. <sup>180</sup>" Raghuvamśa mentions king Bhoja of the Krathakaisikas, where Mallinātha explains that this was the country of Vidarbha. The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya and the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana both mention a Dāṇḍakya Bhoja and Yaśodhara a commentator on the latter explains that Dāṇḍakya was the sarjñā and Bhoja was the name of the dynasty <sup>181</sup>. D.R. Bhandarkar believes that the Mahābhojas were in possession of the

176 Majumdar, *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, p. 23.

177 Jātaka, 4, p. 23.

178 Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra*, (ed. Shama Sastri), pp. 71ff.

179 Rapson, *Catalogue*, p. xxi.

180 *JBORS*, 3, 443.

181 *Kāmasūtra* (ed. Parab), p. 24.

Thana and Kolaba Districts of the Bombay Presidency "as is clearly seen from the Kuḍā and Kānheri cave inscriptions and the Mahārāṭhis, the Poona and neighbouring districts as is attested by Bhājā, Bedsa and Karle epigraphs; and that both were feudatory chieftains.<sup>182</sup> So were also the Rāṣṭrikas who were originally the governors of a province or a rāṣṭra; but afterwards made themselves more or less independent and became hereditary rulers.

Another officer was Mahāsenāpati. A Nasik inscription mentions the wife of Mahāsenāpati who was originally the commander-in-chief of the king; but later became independent like the Mahārāṭhi, for the Aṅguttara Nikāya mentions him as a class of rulers.<sup>183</sup>

Nasik inscription No. 5 mentions, according to Senart, a Prati-hārarakṣa. The original word is Paṭihārakhīyā; and Pandit Bhagvanlal takes it to mean 'paṭṭikalikhitaṁ,' while Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar regards it as a proper name. If, however, Bühler's conjecture is correct, we have mention in the inscriptions of another officer, the door-keeper or the chamberlain, who was one of the eighteen Tirthas enumerated in the Mahābhārata<sup>184</sup> and by Kauṭilya<sup>185</sup>.

Most of the officers enumerated above are what may be called Imperial Officers, the mahābhojas and the mahārāṭhis who were governors, the amātyas some of whom had the whole āhāra under their charge, the rājāmātyas who formed the king's cabinet, the lekhaka who was secretary to the government and drafted all orders emanating from the king and the bhāṇḍāgārika who probably supervised over the commerce of the country. This does not exhaust the list of the various officers under the Sātavāhanas; there are many others the existence of whom has to be inferred, the heads of the revenue and judicial services, the superintendents of the various departments of the government and other numerous officers, not mentioned in these inscriptions simply because they

182 *Ind. Ant.* 1918, 80.

183 *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, 3, 70; 3, 300.

184 *Mbh.* 2, 5, 38.

185 *Kauṭilya, Arthasāstra* (ed. Shama Sastri), p. 20.

have not preferred to record their benefactions in the caves. Epigraphic evidence cannot, indeed, be more complete; and for detailed information, we must necessarily turn to a book dealing with ancient Indian Polity like the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya.

We have mention in the inscriptions of several towns; and even then it appears that their importance rested more or less on their commercial activity. Broach, Sopārā and Kalyan were the chief towns on the coast; and trade with Western countries was carried on from these places. Among the inland towns Paithan, Tagara and Junnar were of great importance, the first being the capital of the Sātavāhanas and the last of the Kṣatrapas. Nagara was the name for a large city, perhaps the capital itself; and when Puṣumāvi took his capital to Paithan after about a century of banishment, the place came to be known as Navanagara. Besides the towns named above, there was also Govardhana, the capital of the āhāra which went by the same name, Poṣkara, Dhanakaṭa, and Daśapura which, according to J. R. Bhandarkar, was the capital of Nahapāna. Karād which is mentioned at Kuḍā and Barahut was also an important town and possessed a nigamasabhā.

In inscription No. 11 at Nasik is mentioned the nigamasabhā where Uṣavadāta required his grants to be read out. It was an assembly of the Pauras, the corporate association of the capital. In the Jātaka and Pali canon, naigama and paura are convertible terms. Hindu commentators on law books also equate naigama with paura<sup>180</sup>. Originally the guild of city merchants, it came later to be identified with the Paura Assembly, so intimate was the connection between the two. The influence wielded by the merchants of the city no doubt contributed a great deal to this identification.

The nigamasabhā, therefore, was a corporate organisation of the whole city; the epigraphic records at various places indicate that many important towns possessed this sabhā. On the Sanchi Stūpa we have Padukulika-nigama, on the Amarāvati Stūpa Dhanakaṭa-nigama, and at Barahut we have Karahakaṭa-nigama. At Nasik we come across it first in the inscription of the time of

<sup>180</sup> Jayaswal, *Modern Review*, 1913, p. 125.

Kaṇha Sātavāhana which, as we have shown below, has to be interpreted as recording the grant of a village by the Corporation of Nasik. The corporation possessed landed property of its own and could make gifts and endowments in the name of the whole town<sup>187</sup>.

The president of the corporate assembly of the town was called the śreṣṭhin; and he often figures as donor in the inscriptions in Western India Caves. The assembly had perhaps an executive council, an inner body, and Jayaswal thinks that the pauravṛddhas constituted a council of elders which was probably identical with the inner body of the Rāmāyaṇa. The assembly had also a Registrār; and in the Nasik inscription, Uṣavadāta takes particular care to have his document not only read out to the assembly but also registered according to custom, that a document thus registered had a very great value as evidence is indicated by Vasiṣṭha, who observes: *chirakam nāma likhitam purāṇaiḥ pauralekhakaiḥ*. That the son-in-law of the ruling sovereign should be required to register his grants in the nigamasabhā, only with a view that they should become *ciratiṭṭhikāḥ* shows the influence and the power of this assembly. In days of revolution and chaos, when monarchies were upturned, when the period for which a dynasty may rule over the country was quite uncertain, this assembly of the people was the only place where even the king would register his grants in order that with the fall of his dynasty, his grant may not turn out to be scrap of paper. Another reason why the grant was recorded in the nigamasabhā was that it was a grant to the Buddhist mendicants living in the caves; and this nigamasabhā had the charge of all secular and public places within its jurisdiction.

After the Kṣaharatas there is no mention of the nigamasabhā. It does not appear, however, that it was abolished; such an inference has no foundations to rest upon. We find on the contrary that Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi and his son take the same care to register their documents. Thus inscription No. 4 at Nasik says: *etā nibadhāpehi. Avijena āṇataṃ amātena śivagutena chato mahāsāmiyehi uparakhito*. The word nibadhūpehi shows that the grant

<sup>187</sup> Sarkar, *Political Institutions and Theories*, p. 145.

was duly registered. There is no indication, however, that it was registered at the *nigamasabhā*; but the phrase that follows, *mahāsā-miyehi uparakhito*, which has given trouble to most interpreters points, we believe, to the existence of such an assembly. It will thus be seen that down to the times of the later *Sātavāhanas*, the corporate assembly of the city was in existence, whatever the name by which in later times it was known, and all documents even those emanating from the king himself, had to be registered there. It was a body which wielded no mean influence and enjoyed independent authority.

Of the administration of the villages we have no information worth the name. The *Sattasāi* of *Hāla* mentions the *Grāmaṇī* who was the village headman<sup>188</sup>. "It was through the *grāmaṇī* that all government business was carried on and he had both opportunity and power to represent their case to higher officials<sup>189</sup>." The *grāmaṇī* was a rich man, a *vaiśya* according to Vedic reference and a *Kṣatriya* according to the Pali canon. During the Maurya period the *grāmaṇī* was responsible for the assignment and payment of land revenue; he decided all questions about the rights and duties of the *Balutis* in consultation with the *pañcāyats*. Over the *grāmaṇī* were the *gopas* and the *sthānikas*. Neither of these officers are mentioned in the inscriptions; but that they must have been there, and especially the *grāmaṇī*, can hardly be doubted.

From a careful examination of the inscriptions it will appear that the grants made by the kings or their ministers usually consisted of the village proper or the habitat. In some cases the village was smaller than the larger type (*padraka*) and in a few cases these were attached to big villages, to cities or to towns. The village we come across more frequently in the epigraphs in Western India Caves is the *Padraka*. Fleet translates *padraka* as a common land, land adjacent to a village left uncultivated<sup>190</sup>. Bühler explains it as the modern 'padr,' a grazing place. But the real sense of *padra*,

<sup>188</sup> *Hāla, Sattasāi* (ed. Parab), 7, vv. 28, 31.

<sup>189</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 48.

<sup>190</sup> Fleet, *Gupta Inscrs.* 170, n. (3).



as Kishori Mohan Gupta has shown, is a village <sup>101</sup>; and padraka would, therefore, mean a small village.

The other grants of land are of kṣetras which meant lands under cultivation or cultivable lands lying temporarily fallow to recover fertility. We have also the grant of a rājakaṁ kṣetraṁ, which was perhaps the private property of the king. The kṣetras in some cases were very extensive; the kṣetra granted by Gautami-putra in inscription No. 4 at Nasik was two hundred nivartanas in area. It was the king's duty to organise agricultural productivity by encouraging the people to cultivate the fields which were temporarily lying fallow <sup>102</sup>; and the grant of an extensive field by Gautami-putra was perhaps made with this view. The land, however, remained uncultivated; and later on another field had to be granted in exchange.

The great field was divided into plots corresponding in number to that of the heads of households in the village <sup>103</sup>. Some of the kṣetras, further, were known by names which were mentioned in the grants. The practice of giving the catuṣṣiṁas in land-grants was not then begun; or, it may be, they were recorded in the actual deed and the inscriptions were meant only to record the fact that the land was granted.

The king had the right to confiscate the land if it was not cultivated <sup>104</sup>; and in the case of the kṣetra granted in inscription No. 4, it is probable that it was confiscated because nobody cultivated it; and this explains why the intervention of the queen-mother was necessary to grant another field in exchange.

Every owner of land was liable to pay taxes and was subject to some restrictions. What these taxes were, we can only infer from the information supplied by Kauṭilya and the Smṛtis. The king had the power of remitting these taxes and also of bestowing other special privileges. Thus the lands granted to the Buddhist ascetics enjoyed full immunity from all taxation; they were not to be entered

---

<sup>101</sup> *Ind. Ant.*, 1922, 73. The modern 'pada' in Marathi is probably derived from padraka.

<sup>102</sup> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* (ed. Shama Sastri), p. 45.

<sup>103</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 46.

<sup>104</sup> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra*, p. 47.

by high officers of the king and were probably not subject to the jurisdiction of the governor of the province. Nor were they to be entered by actors, dancers, singers, drummers and bafoons—necessary restrictions in order that the cultivators should not be driven away from their more important duty. The salt-tax and the plough-tax were also remitted in cases of such grants.

The land was measured in nivartanas. The Arthaśāstra explains a nivartana as *trirajjuka*; and a *rajju* was equivalent to ten *daṇḍas* or sixty feet.<sup>196</sup>

The king's right to give away lands as gifts was unquestioned. He had also the right of resumption in case of a breach of condition and also of revoking the grant. A deed of transfer of land, it appears, had to be registered in the *nigamasabhā*.

From the benefactions recorded at Nasik by persons from distant places, it is but natural to suppose that communication between the different parts of India and the Deccan was not very difficult. Amongst the donors at Nasik we have persons from *Dattāmitrā*, *Sopārā* and *Broach*; and inscription No. 18 at Nasik records the gift by an *auttarāha*. Unless, therefore, there was frequent communication between all the places mentioned in the epigraphic records in the Western India Caves, it is difficult to understand how a person from the north, without apparently any political motives, came all the way to Nasik and made religious endowments there. The *Periplus of the Erythraean Seas* no doubt says that commodities from *Paithan* and *Tagara* were carried down on waggons to *Barugaza* along roads of extreme difficulty; but that was natural enough considering that the route lay mainly through mountainous regions.

It was *Uṣavadāta* who, we learn from his inscriptions at Nasik, looked to the comforts of travellers. Quadrangular rest-houses were erected at various places, wells were dug on the way, stands for free distribution of water were raised in many places and free ferries by boats were provided to cross some of the rivers. As we have observed above, these reforms introduced by him remind us of the exertions of *Aśoka* to make communication easy and smooth within his dominions.

---

<sup>196</sup> *ibid.*, p. 207.

Whatever the condition of the four varṇas in ancient times, howsoever strict the restrictions about connubium and commensality during the early part, at any rate, of the period we are considering there was undoubtedly a considerable amalgamation between them during the regime of the foreign Kṣatrapas. The struggle between Brahmanism and Buddhism is really a struggle for the maintenance of the rule of caste and the supremacy of the Brahmin; and while considering the period during a greater part of which Buddhism thrived in the country and exercised greater influence than Brahmanism, and during which for at least half a century the country was under the rule of the Śakas, we can hardly expect the various castes to remain detached and under the restrictions which we read of in the Smṛtis.

We can safely assume that the four varṇas existed in the times of the Early Sātavāhanas; but within the borders of each of these there were insensible gradations. Even in our inscriptions we find so many caste-names that it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that they were the sub-castes which were embraced by one of the four varṇas. "The vaiśyas and śūdras never formed a homogeneous people. Distinct groups must have existed among them from the earliest period, and these have ultimately developed into classes or castes."<sup>100</sup> It is not, of course, proper to suppose that each of the caste-names we find in the inscriptions formed a distinct and separate class; but as the names themselves would indicate, these classes were formed according to the profession (karman) of the persons who formed them.

One curious social feature is represented by the term gahapati which, as Jayaswal observes, was a class composed of ordinary citizens, vaiśyas or śūdras, freemen cultivating land or following their trade, lords of their households. From the references in Kauṭilya, it is clear that the gahapatis were distinct from the vaidehika or the merchant class. Kauṭilya points out what information should be supplied by spies in the guise of gahapatis and by those in the guise of Vaidehikas. The gahapati spy shall ascertain the validity of the accounts of the village and district officers re-

garding the fields, houses, and families of each village, the area and output of produce regarding the fields, right of ownership and remission of taxes with regard to houses, the total number of men and beasts, etc.<sup>107</sup> This indicates the scope of the duties of a gahapati; for a spy in the guise of a gahapati must be expected to make such enquiries as would naturally be made by a real gahapati. We have references in the *Sattasaī* to the gahapati and the gahapati *nandana*. From these the conclusion that the gahapati was of the cultivator class becomes irresistible; for the *Sattasaī* frequently refers to the philandering of the gahapati with a girl of the *halika* class.<sup>108</sup> These references point to frequent connubium between the gahapati class and the *halika* class; and it seems therefore, that the gahapati was a cultivator by caste and occupied a higher position by reason of his being the head of a certain number of houses. Some of these gahapatis were members of the *nigamasabhā*.

We have said above that during the period we are considering, the country was for some time under the rule of foreigners. "There is no doubt that Buddhism took a strong hold on the invaders of India from the north-west. . . . The reason is not far to seek; the invaders quickly settling in the land of their adoption had none of the prejudices, the conscious desire for isolation which creates so infinite a gulf between rulers and ruled in the East of to-day; they were ready to adopt the customs and gods of the country, to worship, as the precept of Socrates enjoined after the fashion of the state they dwelt in."<sup>109</sup> These foreigners were also taken into the fold of Hinduism as is indicated by their Hinduised names. The fact, further, that the queen of *Vasiṣṭhīputra Śātakarṇi* was the daughter of *Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman* places it above doubt that not only was there commensality but also connubium between these Brahmanical Hindus and Śaka-Pallavas. But long before this marriage, the influence of Buddhism, and the influence of the foreigners to boot, had completely disorganised the caste system: and it was therefore that when *Gautamīputra* conquered his ancestral regions,

<sup>107</sup> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra*, p. 142; also p. 18.

<sup>108</sup> Hala, *Sattasaī*, ii, 7; vi, 100.

<sup>109</sup> Rawlinson, *Bactria*, p. 103.

he at once engaged himself in doing away the cāturvarṇyasaṅkara. That he failed in his attempts is evidenced by the fact that not many years later a prince of his own family married a princess who was the daughter of a foreigner. The Śakas and Yavanas whom we find bestowing numerous gifts on the Buddhist ascetics undoubtedly professed Buddhism ; and in some cases even their names also point to a similar inference.

Besides the classes mentioned above, there may be many more whose names are not recorded in the inscriptions. The Brahmins, of course, were there ; they had numerous gifts from the son-in-law of Nahapāna. We do not hear of the Kṣatriyas so often except in one place where Gautamīputra is spoken of as having crushed their pride, a statement which if read with the title ekabrāhmaṇa applied to him would indicate that the Sātavāhanas were Brahmins. The vaiśyas were the merchant class ; and of the śūdras we know only of the cultivator and his head, gaḥapati. Each of these, especially the last, had its sub-castes some of which are mentioned in the cave epigraphs ; it is not, however, possible to point out definitely to which of the four varṇas each of these sub-castes belonged.

Of the various religious festivities there is no mention ; but that such festivities were held is certain enough. A Nasik inscription mentions samāja which has been variously interpreted by scholars. Such samājas were often performed ; and unlike the Mighty Asoka, even the king encouraged them by giving liberal presents.<sup>200</sup>

From notices in the Periplus of the Erythraean Seas we learn that trade with Western countries thrived during the period. The mercantile class formed, as ever, a rich and influential community. The well known Caitya at Karle is mainly the work of a merchant from Vaijayanti ; and even at Nasik, we have ample evidence to indicate the power, influence and opulence of the mercantile class. Kalyan, Sopara and Broach were some of the sea-ports which had connection with the inland marts such as Paithan and Tagara. The various classes of traders might be inferred from the caste-

<sup>200</sup> *JRAS*, 1914. If samāja is regarded as equivalent to samajyā, it can be identified on the authority of the Amarakośa with goṣṭhi described by Vatsyāyana. See also *JBORS*, 3, 411.

names mentioned in the inscriptions. Tagara supplied muslin in abundance and Paithan supplied onyx stones.

Each class of traders had a guild of its own which was known as śreni. They were corporate bodies ; and wielded great influence in the state. We have six such guilds mentioned at Nasik and Junnar : odayantrika, tilapiṣaka, kularika, kolika, dhanika and varṁśakara. The picture of guilds presented by the inscriptions at Nasik resembles that of our modern co-operative banks. The guilds, it appears, received deposits of money and paid yearly or monthly interest thereon. It was not certainly a monopolistic organisation for we hear of two weavers' guilds at Govardhana in the inscription of Uṣavadāta at Nasik. The money deposited in the guilds was utilised, it appears, for the purposes of trade. "The guilds must have been of long standing and characterised by honesty and fair dealing for otherwise, men would scarcely have made perpetual endowments with them."<sup>201</sup> Their constitution, their probable responsibility to the nigamasabhā, and the influence of the members themselves,—these induced the people no less to deposit their money in these guilds. The deposits in the guilds supplied capital to the traders ; and that is the reason why we have guilds of the various classes of these traders.

The rate of interest allowed on deposits in these guilds varied between 12 per cent. and 9 per cent. per annum. A guild which was perhaps in greater need of capital paid a higher rate of interest. In the inscription of Uṣavadāta at Nasik, we have two weavers' guilds at Govardhana one of which gave 12 per cent. per annum and the other 9 per cent. per annum as interest. And even Uṣavadāta, with the true instinct of a modern businessman, has deposited a larger sum in the latter.

We have remarked above that during the period under consideration, Buddhism was in a very flourishing condition. This is evidenced by the fact that the caves at Nasik, Karle, Junnar and other places are dedicated to the Buddhist monks. It is worthy of note that the caves were made by all sorts of people, a fact which shows the popularity and influence of Buddhism. Ample provision

---

<sup>201</sup> Majumdar, *Corporate Life*, pp. 37-38.

was made for the repairs of the caves, for the maintenance of the ascetics living therein and for their clothes, medicines, etc. For this purpose lands and villages were granted and often money deposited in the guilds.

The specific sects of Buddhism mentioned in the inscriptions of the period are the Bhādrāyaniyas, Mahāsaṃghikas, and the Dharmottariyas. The first have a cave specially allotted to them at Nasik which was probably their headquarters. The Mahāsaṃghikas were at Karle and the Dharmottariyas at Junnar. We need not enter into the different views held by the members of each of these sects ; it forms a part of the history of Buddhist Philosophy. The Mahāsaṃghikas were a Hīnayāna School, although the Chinese writers include it among the Mahāyānas. After the Council of Vaiśali, the Mahāsaṃghikas broke away as a sequel of the condemnation of the Vajjiputtakas. In doctrine they formed a bridge to Mahāyāna ideas ; but were closely distinct from them. In the same century in which the Mahāsaṃghikas broke away, the Vajjiputtakas gave rise to four branches, two of which, the Dharmottariyas and the Bhādrāyaniyas, are mentioned in the inscriptions of this period. <sup>202</sup>

Besides the Buddhist Saṃgha, we find in the inscription of Uṣavadāta a reference to the corporation of the Carakas who were a certain special category of the Brahmanical ascetics. Religious corporations existed not among the Buddhists only ; there were many such corporations at the time when Buddhism arose and their continued existence in later times is proved by the Dharmasāstras and inscriptions. <sup>203</sup>

Inscription No. 7 at Nasik records the gift of a Tāpasini who was a pravrajitā. Pravrajikas were wanderers who spent eight or nine months of every year in wandering about precisely with the object of engaging in conversational discussions on matters of ethics and philosophy, nature lore and mysticism. Some of these were women ; and they were ascetics only in so far as they were celibates. These wanderers were very popular amongst the

---

<sup>202</sup> Keith, *Buddhism*, pp. 149 ff.

<sup>203</sup> Majumdar, *Corporate Life*, p. 328.

villagers and the townsfolk;<sup>204</sup> but it is difficult to understand how the tāpasinī here, living admittedly a life of poverty, could afford to defray the expenses of a cave.

Even Brahmanism thrived during the early period especially although later on its influence was subordinated to that of Buddhism. The Nānāghāṭ inscription of Queen Nāganikā mentions the sacrifices performed by her husband and the gifts of cows and elephants bestowed on Brahmins. "The government like all other concerns of life is associated in the eye of a Hindu with an ultimate spiritual purpose;" and we need not be surprised, therefore, at the mention of more than a dozen sacrifices performed by Sātakarṇi. On the whole the Nānāghāṭ inscription leaves an impression that the early king was a very staunch believer in Brahmanism.

Passing next to the inscriptions of the Kṣatrapas, we find that although for obvious reasons they did not perform any sacrifices, the gifts bestowed by them on Brahmins are, indeed, numerous. The mention of gods and Brahmins side by side indicates the deification of the Brahmins. What deserves to be noted here, however, is that *pari passu* with these conceptions, there were tenets of Buddhism flourishing rapidly and threatening to subvert Brahmanism. A few years before Sātakarṇi, his uncle Kaṇha had appointed officers in his dominion to look after the comforts of the Buddhist ascetics.

The existence of Vaiṣṇavism in early times is evidenced, as is well known, by the reference to Saṁkarṣaṇa in the Nānāghāṭ inscription. The worship of Kṛṣṇa was prevalent even in later times; for in the Sattasaī of Hāla there are numerous references to Kṛṣṇa.<sup>205</sup> Of other deities worshipped by the people in those days we have no information unless we accept D. R. Bhandarkar's inferences from the names of persons mentioned in the inscriptions. From these names he infers that the worship of Vedic gods like Indra, Mitra and Agni was current in those times; the names, Gopāla, Viṣṇudatta, etc., show the development of Vaiṣṇavism; the worship of Śiva is indicated by the names, Śivadatta, Śivapālita,

<sup>204</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 141 ff.

<sup>205</sup> For example Sattasaī, 2, vv. 98-100.



etc. It cannot certainly be said that these inferences are wrong ; it is possible that all these deities were worshipped in those time ; but the evidence furnished is not sufficient to warrant a definite assertion.

That Hinduism is a non-proselytising religion is a pure myth ; and no evidence on this point is more convincing than that furnished by the epigraphic records. The fact that Śāka Uṣavadāta bestowed gifts on Brahmins and fed thousands of them would indicate his Brahmanic inclinations. The foreigners, again, appear to have borne Hinduised names. A Sātavāhana king, as we have said above had married the daughter of a Śāka Kṣatrapa of Ujjain. The Ābhīra king mentioned in an inscription at Nasik was undoubtedly a Hindu since he bears the name Īśvarasena and uses the metronymic Māḍharīputra. These facts point out that Brahmanism accepted the foreigners in its fold. It was later that it closed its doors to all those who were without, a step which has undoubtedly resulted in the weakening of the religion.

The progress of literature for the most part during the period is only a matter of inference. We have only one work in Prakrit which can, with some degree of certainty, be placed in this period, and it is the Sattasaī of Hāla. "The grace and poetry of this poem, in which art most happily succeeds in concealing art, has rarely been excelled in the literature of its kind. Hāla's work is important not only on its own account but also as showing the existence of a large Prākṛt literature at the time when it was compiled." <sup>206</sup> Inscription No. 2 at Nasik bears a close relationship with the gadya kāvyas presented to us and contains many comparisons current in the latter.

## VII.

### THE VILIVAYAKURAS OF KOLHAPUR.

A consideration of three princes whose coins were found at Kolhapur is necessary here since they have been identified by scholars with some kings of the Sātavāhana dynasty whose account is given above. Many years ago some coins were found at

<sup>206</sup> *Encycl. Brit.* Vol. 22, S. V. Prakrit.

Kolhapur<sup>207</sup> which bear three kinds of legends : (1) Rāño vaśiṭhiputasa viḷivāyakurasa, (2) Rāño mādharīputasa śivalakurasa, (3) Rāño gotamīputasa viḷivāyakurasa. This order is based on the evidence of the coins themselves, since No. 2 restrikes coins of No. 1 ; and No. 3 restrikes coins of Nos. 1 and 2.<sup>208</sup>

The find-spot of the coins indicates that the princes mentioned in the coin-legends ruled over the country round about Kolhapur. This place is included in Southern Māhārāṣṭra ; and we have suggested above that Benākāṭaka mentioned in the Nasik inscription, was the same tract of country. Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi was thus ruling over the Kolhapur territory before the extirpation of the Kṣaharātas. There can, therefore, be no difficulty if we regard the names in the coin-legends as those of the kings of the main dynasty ; but if they are the names of the viceroys or the local governors of the Sātavāhanas, we must place them after the extirpation of the Kṣaharātas, when only the extent of the dominion, of the Sātavāhana kings necessitated the appointment of viceroys. It has also been suggested that they are the names of kings of a different dynasty. In any case, however, they must have been subordinate to the Sātavāhanas ; since it is too much to expect that either Gautamīputra or Puḷumāvi could have failed to subdue this Kolhapur dynasty.

Ptolemy, the Greek geographer, mentions Baleokouros whose royal seat was Hippokoura.<sup>209</sup> Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar's identification of Baleokouros with Viḷivāyakura has now been generally accepted ;<sup>210</sup> and if this identification is correct, Hippokoura can be no other place than Kolhapur. Ptolemy also mentions Tiastanes and Siro Polemaios who have been identified with Caṣṭana and Puḷumāvi respectively and regarded as contemporaries. Baleokouros also must have been a contemporary of Puḷumāvi ; and of the two Viḷivāyakuras whose names have been recovered from the coins, it must have been the first Viḷivāyakura who ruled over the Kolhapur country while Puḷumāvi ruled at Paithan.

<sup>207</sup> *JBBRAS*. Vols, 13 and 14.

<sup>208</sup> Rapson, *Catalogue*, pp. xxvii ff.

<sup>209</sup> Mac Crindle, *Ptolemy*, pp. 175-76.

<sup>210</sup> *Ind. Ant.* 1920, 34.

Ptolemy's mention of Siro Polemaios at Paithan and Baleokouros at Hippokoura must dispose of the possibility of the latter being a local title of the king of the main dynasty. And what are the grounds on which we can rely in regarding these three names on Kolhapur coins as merely local titles of the Sātavāhana kings? The mere use of the metronymic signifies nothing; so many kings use it. At Nasik we have Mādharīputra Īśvarasena and at Kanheri we have Mādharīputra Śakasena. The Ujjain symbol, which is characteristic of the Sātavāhanas, is absent on these coins of the Viḷivāyakuras. These names, further, are found at Kolhapur only; and if they were really the local names of the kings of the main dynasty, how is it that we do not find any mention of them elsewhere? There are thus no very cogent reasons for regarding these names as local titles of the Sātavāhana kings; and the separate mention of Baleokouros by Ptolemy places it above doubt that they are the names of kings quite different from those of the main dynasty.

Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar split up the coin-legends into two parts and regarded Vaśiṣṭhiputra Mādharīputra and Gautamīputra as the names of Sātavāhana kings; and Viḷivāyakura and Śivalakura as those of the viceroys. He regarded Viḷivāyakura mentioned in (1) and (3) as the viceroy of Gautamīputra and Puḷumāvi; and thus explained the difference in the two coin-legends. After Viḷivāyakura, Śivalakura succeeded as the viceroy of Mādharīputra.<sup>211</sup> This ignores, however, the evidence of coins which requires the coins of (3) to be placed last in the serial order. Mādharīputra Śivalakura intervened between (1) and (3); the Viḷivāyakura mentioned in (3) cannot be the Viḷivāyakura who is mentioned in (1). Further, as D. R. Bhandarkar has shown, the division of the legends is arbitrary and unknown to Indian numismatists.<sup>212</sup>

Accepting the order in which these kings have been placed and without dividing the coin-legends, we can regard these names either of the viceroys of the Sātavāhanas or of kings who were subordinate to them. In that case, having shown above that they could not have been ruling prior to Gautamīputra, the Baleokouros of Ptolemy must be identified with Viḷivāyakura mentioned in (1).

<sup>211</sup> *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. 1, Pt. 2, p. 153.

<sup>212</sup> *Ind. Ant.* 1920, 32.

It is highly probable that when Puḷumāvi transferred his capital to Paithan, VaśiṣṭhIputra Viḷivāyakura who is mentioned by Ptolemy and who, if the identical metronymic cannot be altogether ignored, was the brother of Puḷumāvi, was appointed to rule as viceroy at the old capital. He was succeeded by MādharIputra Śivalakura and GautamIputra Viḷivāyakura; and the end of the reign of the last probably synchronised with the end of the Sātavāhana rule in Mahārāṣṭra. Having seen that the names in the coin-legends cannot be local titles of the kings of the main dynasty and that we cannot attach great importance to the use of the metronymic, this is the only probable explanation.

## VIII.

DATES ASSIGNED TO THE KINGS OF THE SATAVAHANA DYNASTY  
AND THE CONTEMPORARY KṢATRAPAS.

Name (Sātavāhanas.)	Period assigned.	Name (Kṣatrapas.)	Period assigned.
1 Śimuka .. ..	B.C. 220—197		
2 Kṛṣṇa .. ..	197—170		
3 Sātakarṇi ..	170—169		
4 Pūrṇotsaṅga ..	169—151		
5 Skandhastambhi	151—133		
6 Sātakarṇi ..	133—104		
7 Lambodara ..	104— 86		
8 Āpilaka .. ..	86— 74		
9 Meghasvāti ..	74— 56		
10 Svāti .. ..	56— 45		
11 Skandasvāti ..	45— 39		
12 Mṛgendra ..	39— 37		

Name (Sātavāhanas.)	Period assigned.	Name (Ksatrapas.)	Period assigned.
13 Kuntala .. ..	37— 29		
14 Svātivarṇa .. ..	29— 28		
15 Pulumāvi .. ..	28— 4	1 Bhūmaka.	?
16 Ariṣṭakarna .. ..	B.C. 4—A.D. 21	2 Nahapāna.	B.C. 20—10.
17 Hāla .. ..	A.D. 21— 26		
18 Mantalaka .. ..	26— 31		
19 Purīndrasena .. ..	31— 42		
20 Sundara .. ..	42— 43		
21 Cakora .. ..	43		
22 Śīvasvāti .. ..	43— 60		
23 Gautamiputra .. ..	60— 85		
24 Pulumāvi .. ..	85—113	1 Caṣṭaṇa.	A.D. 86—110.
25 Sātakarṇi .. ..	113—127	2 Jayadāman.	A.D. 110—125.
26 Śivaśri .. ..	113—126		
27 Śivaskanda .. ..	113—126		
28 Yajñaśri .. ..	127—156	3 Rudradāman.	A.D. 125—150.
29 Vijaya .. ..	156—162		
30 Caṇḍaśri .. ..	162—172		
31 Pulumavi .. ..	172—180		

IX.

THE INSCRIPTIONS AT NASIK.

The inscriptions in the caves at Nasik hold the first place among Western India Cave inscriptions on account of their length and fullness, value of the information they supply and their excellent

preservation. There are as many as twenty-six inscriptions in these caves ; and they have all been edited by Bühler in *ASWI*. Vol. 4, by Senart in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. 8, by Pandit Bhagvanlal in *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. 16, and by Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar in the *Transactions of the Congress of Orientalists*, 1874.

All the inscriptions in these caves are in the Brāhmī alphabet ; the oldest is that of Kaṇha and it shows many common peculiarities with the South Indian alphabet. Inscription No. 19 of Senart by the grand-daughter of Hākusiri is separated from that of Kaṇha by more than half a century ; and it shows the development which the alphabet of the time of Kaṇha had undergone during this period. The verticals of letters are now equalised and the process of rounding the lower parts of the verticals of some of the letters is also begun. Far different from these are the letters of the inscriptions of the Kṣatrapas, the ductus of which resembles that of the inscriptions of the Northern Satraps. There are no archaic forms ; the curves of letters are angularised and the lower portions of the verticals of some of the letters show a tendency towards roundness. There is no thickening yet at the top of letters which first appears in the inscriptions of Gautamīputra and Puḷumāvi ; and all the letters are neatly built. Coming next to the inscriptions of Gautamīputra and Puḷumāvi, we find the curves in the lower parts of the verticals of letters clearly perceptible. Unlike the Kṣatrapa inscriptions, the letters in these are not neatly built. The one inscription of Yajñaśri at Nasik shows a further stage of development in its *ta* and *na* derived from looped forms, its *ya* with a curve on the left, the strong curve of its *ra*, and the bent towards the left of its *la*. A majority of inscriptions fall generally in the period between Kaṇha and Yajñaśri.

There are only two inscriptions of the Early Sātavāhanas at Nasik ; one of these No. 1143 of Lüders' list belongs certainly to these princes, but the other No. 1141 has been doubtfully attributed to an early prince of this dynasty. The only other inscription of the Early Sātavāhanas is the one in the caves on the Nana Pass. Inscription No. 1143 is on the upper side of the right window in cave No. 19. It belongs to the time of king Kaṇha who was born in the family of the Sātavāhanas. The cave was caused to be made, it

records, by samaṇa mahāmāta. As we have said above, this samaṇa mahāmāta seems to be an officer appointed to look after the comforts of the śramaṇas. The word, samaṇa, should really have been in the genitive, which would have given us the sense, the officer of the śramaṇas. Senart considers it easier to admit that samaṇena ought really to be read as samaṇānaṁ than to take samaṇena as the proper noun. A close scrutiny of the third letter in the second line shows that the medial *e* of *ṇe* is quite clear. We cannot, therefore, read *ṇa* instead of *ṇe*; and the best interpretation of the reading, samaṇena mahāmātena, is 'by the mahāmāta (of the samaṇas) who was a samaṇa.' Thus in all probability the officer of the śramaṇas, although a royal officer, was himself a Buddhist mendicant. This is natural enough; for it does not appear from what we know of the Buddhist mendicants, that they would have tolerated a layman to be entrusted with their inspection. Nasik was the centre of the Govardhana āhāra; and this samaṇa mahāmāta had probably his head-quarters at Nasik. It may be, perhaps, that this cave was caused to be made by him in the discharge of his duties; for he mentions only his official designation.

Inscription No. 1142 of Lüders' List records the gift of the village of Darṁbhikā by the people of Nasik. It runs: Nasikakanāṁ Darṁbhikagāmasa dānaṁ; and is written in nearly pure Mauryan characters. It is engraved over the arch of the doorway of Cave No. 18; and in the same cave on the fifth and sixth pillars of the right hand row, are inscriptions Nos. 1141 and 1143. By whom the cave was originally caused to be made is not recorded. No. 1143 mentions those who caused the rail pattern and the yakṣa to be made; and No. 1141 mentions the person who caused the cave to be perfected. It seems, however, that the people of Nasik caused this cave to be executed; and granted a village for provision to the residents therein out of its revenue. The cave thus caused to be made was perfected by Bhaṭṭapālikā, grand-daughter of Mahāhakuṣiri; and a rail-pattern and Yakṣa were added to it later by Nadāsiri. Unfortunately the facsimile of inscription No. 1143 given by Senart is too mutilated to enable us to ascertain the peculiarities of the characters used. It seems probable, however, that it was not far removed in point of time from the other two inscriptions in the

same cave. Of the latter, No. 1142 is placed on palæographic grounds earlier than No. 1141; and, as said above, since No. 1141 speaks of the perfecting of the cave originally caused to be made by the people of Nasik, the order in which these inscriptions are arranged can hardly be incorrect.

Senart interprets No. 1142 as the gift by the people of Nasik of an "ornated arcade which rises above the door, at the base of which the inscription is engraved." The *Dam̄bhikā* village, he supposes, which had contrived at the common expense to decorate the entrance to the cave must have belonged to the general population or the township of Nasik. Pandit Bhagvanlal understood it to mean, 'gift of the village of *Dam̄bhikā* by the inhabitants of Nasik.' Senart rests his interpretation on the fact that the architectural line is carefully adhered to; but that is hardly a sufficient justification. We can always expect an inscription on the doorway to be neatly and carefully engraved, and the architectural line carefully adhered to. And, further, it remains a question whether the village of *Dam̄bhikā* could have defrayed all the expenses of an ornated arcade; and it sounds all the more strange that they should have done so when the township of Nasik to whom this village belonged has not a single donation to its credit. Again, there is no inscription to show by whom this cave was originally caused to be made. Faced with all these difficulties, the only sound interpretation appears to be that the inscription records the gift of the village *Dam̄bhikā* by the township of Nasik. One great difficulty that confronted Bhagvanlal and Senart was how, if it records the gift of a village by the inhabitants of Nasik, such a community could have made a gift; and hence Senart's explanation that it records only the grant of an arcade at common expense by the people of the village. He adds: "Nothing is more frequent than the paying of religious expenses from the resources of the community." The new light that has recently been thrown on the subject of corporate life in ancient India leaves no doubt now how a community like the one mentioned here could have made the gift of a village.<sup>213</sup>

Lüders' No. 1141 which has been referred to above is the only other inscription which we can assign to the early period

<sup>213</sup> Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures on Ancient India*, p. 177.



with certainty. On palæographic considerations, it comes later than Nos. 1142 and 1144; and this is supported by internal evidence. The inscription mentions Haksiri who is probably the same as the Haksiri mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ inscription; and records the gift by his granddaughter. The inscription says that the caityagr̥ha was caused to be perfected by Bhaṭṭapālikā who, according to the conjectured reading of the first word in the second line, was the grand-daughter of Haksiri. Senart has shown that the word niṭhapāpita conveys as in Pali the idea of finishing or bringing to perfection. The cave was there already, made probably by the corporation of Nasik. After half a century at least, Bhaṭṭapālikā gave a finish to it as the original work was probably too clumsy or needed repairs. Senart says that the cave had been begun and excavated before the present donor put the last hand to it. Half a century at least must have elapsed before Bhaṭṭapālikā came forward to do this; and it is more probable that the cave was not only begun but also completed and Bhaṭṭapālikā only repaired it or made it more perfect. The father of Bhaṭṭapālikā was Arhalaya and her husband was Agiyatānaka. Both of them were relations of the royalty; and held high and responsible posts. The father is mentioned here as a minister; we have no information of the department in his charge. The husband was a Bhāṇḍāgarika, the Superintendent of Stores.

In all the Western India Caves, we have not more than eight inscriptions of the Kṣaharātas. One of these, the inscription of Mitradevanaka, son of Uṣavadāta, has been doubtfully attributed to them relying mainly on the mention of Uṣavadāta in the inscription. Besides this there is one inscription at Karle which records the grant of the village Karajika. The name of this village occurs in another inscription of the Sātavāhanas where the Buddhist sect of Mahāsarṅghikas for whom the grant was made is specifically mentioned. The only other inscription of the Kṣaharātas outside Nasik is the one at Junnar, an inscription of the Minister Ayama of Nahapāna, dated in the year 46.

All the five inscriptions of the Kṣaharātas at Nasik are in the same cave. The excavation of the cave itself is due to Uṣavadāta;

but two cells on each side were added by his wife Dakṣamitrā, the daughter of Nahapāna. Inscriptions Nos. 1132 and 1134 of Lüders' List record the grant of these cells by the wife of Uṣavadāta ; and both are almost identical. No. 1131 occupies a central place and is on the back wall of the verandah under the ceiling. Karle inscription No. 6 and a part of this inscription are almost similar with the only difference that the latter is in Sanskrit orthography. The inscription records that the cave and the cistern were caused to be made by Uṣavadāta and that a field was granted for procuring food, etc., for the monks dwelling therein. The importance of this inscription lies in the proud mention there by Uṣavadāta of his numerous benefactions and the places where they were made.

The inscription may be divided into three parts : the first speaks of the numerous benefactions of Uṣavadāta ; the second about his campaign against the Mālavas ; and the third mentions his grant of a village. Although it gives no date, it appears from inscription No. 1133, that we must place it in the 42nd year.

The numerous benefactions of Uṣavadāta mentioned in the first part of the inscription are :—

1. Gift of three hundred cows.
2. Gifts of money and construction of steps on the river Bāraṇasi.
3. Gift of sixteen villages to gods and Brahmins.
4. Feeding a thousand Brahmins the whole year round.
5. Gift of eight wives to the Brahmins at Prabhāsa.
6. Gifts of quadrangular rest-houses at Sopara, Broach and Daśapura.
7. Wells, tanks and gardens.
8. Establishment of free ferries by boats on the rivers Ibā, Pārādā, Tāpi, Karabeṇā and Dahanukā.
9. Meeting halls and balls for drinking water on these rivers.
10. Gift of 32,000 cocoanut trees to the Carakas at Govardhana, Suvarṇamukha, Sopāraga, Vāmatīrtha, and

Piṇḍitakāvada. We may complete this list by adding his other benefactions mentioned in other parts of this inscription.

11. An abhiṣeka at Poṣkara and a gift of 3,000 cows.
12. Cave No. 10 at Nasik and the cisterns.
13. Gift of a field for the maintenance of ascetics in the cave.

Such is the long catalogue of Uṣavadāta's benefactions and it is, indeed, notable that they were bestowed not only on the Brahmins but also on the Buddhists of all sects and from all quarters and the Carakas.

The second part supplies the information about Uṣavadāta's campaign against the Mālavas, who are probably identical with the Mallois defeated by Alexander and who settled later in the country of Avantikā now known after them.<sup>214</sup> They had besieged the chief of the Uttamabhadras during the rainy season ; and Uṣavadāta went to his succour by order of his lord who must have been Nahapāna. By the mere roar of his approaching, he boastfully declares, the Mālavas fled away and were made prisoners of the Uttamabhadrā warriors. As regards the two clans mentioned here, Senart observes, " of the Uttamabhadras, we know nothing, and as to the Mālavas, though it seems natural to look for them in the inhabitants of Malaya or the Southern Hills, it must be owned that if, as seems possible, they were on the way or at least in the direction towards Poṣkara *i.e.* Ajmer, the equation of Mālaya=Mālavas as proposed by Bhagvanlal would be well worthy of consideration." The Mālavas were a republican tribe ; and their antagonists were also probably a similar tribe. The inscription reads : mālayehi rūḍham uttamablādraṁ, the chief of the Uttamabhadras; and even this supports the inference<sup>215</sup> that the Uttamabhadras were a tribe like the Mālavas. The inscription further adds that they were a Kṣatriya tribe. The Mahābhārata mentions the mālavas with the Bhadrās in Vanaparva, 255, v. 20 ; and the Bhadrās mentioned in that verse appear to be the Uttamabhadras of the inscription.

<sup>214</sup> MacCrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 115.

<sup>215</sup> D. R. Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, pp. 147 ff.

After defeating the Mālavas, Uṣavadāta went to Ajmer. That Nahapāna's dominions extended as far as Ajmer seem certain ; for Uṣavadāta during his visit to that place granted a village to the Brahmins of Poṣkara. Even his coins have been found in Rājputānā ; and this supports the above inference.

At Poṣkara Uṣavadāta made an abhiṣeka : Tato'smiri gato poṣkarāṇi tatra ca mayā abhiṣeko kṛto. Senart's interpretation of the later part, 'and there I bathed,' is hardly acceptable, especially when we read it with what follows : Triṇi ca gosahasrāṇi detāni grāmo ca. The word, abhiṣeka, here appears to mean 'bathing or sprinkling with water of a divinity to whom worship is offered.' The practice of making such an abhiṣeka and giving presents to the Brahmins is current even to this day. What Uṣavadāta wants to declare here is that he sprinkled the image of god with water and worshipped it. Poṣkara is a celebrated sacred place; and it has got one of the few temples in India which are dedicated to Brahmā. The temple which stands there to-day is not certainly so old ; but as the creation of the tīrtha itself is attributed to Brahmā, there must have been a temple of Brahmā even in times of Uṣavadāta.

Although himself a Śaka, it is noteworthy that Uṣavadāta distributed gifts amongst the Brahmins and the Buddhists. It is not possible, however, to go further and assert, relying on the phrase, govardhane tiraśmiṣu parveteṣu dharmātmanā idaṁ lenaṁ kṛitaṁ, and taking dharma in the sense of Buddhist religion and interpreting the whole phrase as 'imbued at Govardhana on the Tiraśmi Hills with true religion', that it either expresses Uṣavadāta's conversion to Buddhism or puts a first gift in favour of Buddhism in contrast with the previous grants which were inspired by Brahmanical feelings. Dharmātmanā has its natural meaning here. Both the early and the later Sātavāhanas, though decidedly of Brahmanical leanings, gave similar gifts to the Buddhists ; can we say with regard to them that they too were imbued with dharma ?

We now come to the third and the last part of the inscription. It records the grant of a field for procuring food to all the ascetics living in the cave of Uṣavadāta. Looking to the facsimile of the

inscription given by Senart, we find that the first part of the inscription is written continuously and the characters are of the same size ; and the second part is in small letters. But when we come to this part of the inscription, we find that a short space has been left after the end of the second part. The characters now become smaller still and are not so well marked as those of the other two parts, although on palæographic grounds they have to be assigned to the same period.

The interpretation of this part is beset with difficulties. It must be remembered while trying to interpret this last part of the inscription that Uṣavadāta has just mentioned above his campaign against the Mālayas in which, he says, they were made prisoners of the Uttamabhadra warriors. This is followed by what may be called a parenthetical sentence describing the visit of Uṣavadāta to the Poṣkara lake and his benefactions there. The principal difficulty lies in the word, *yasapitusataka*. Buhler's interpretation is: *ya sa (sva) pitusātaka*, 'which belongs to my father'; Senart separates *ya* and *svapitusataka* and applies it to Aśvabhūti's father, and Pandit Bhagvanlal reads *yasa pitusataka*, 'belonging to whose father'. The *ya* obviously goes with *kṣetra* and the clause, *ya. . . . disaya*, qualifies *kṣetra*. We thus get the meaning, the field which was on the north-west boundary of the town which belongs to my father. Senart observes that if we take *svapitusataka*, it is meaningless ; we suggest, however, that reading *ya svapitusataka* and taking the word with *nagarasīmāya* gives a better sense than that proposed by Senart. It would not be wrong to suppose that what Uṣavadāta means is his father-in-law, Nahapāna; the field which was granted was on the north-west boundary of the town which belonged to his father-in-law.

The field again was bought at the hands of the Brāhmaṇa Aśvibhūti, the son of Vārāhī, for the price of four thousand Kārṣāpaṇas. The difficulty here is in *data ca anena*. Does *anena* stand for Uṣavadāta or for Aśvibhūti? Senart appears to take it with the latter ; and he observes, "It is just because the field does not belong to this Brāhmaṇa himself and because he plays in this transaction the part of the representative of his father, that the epigraph uses the expression, 'aśvibhūtisa hathe' instead of the

ablative case 'at the hands of Aśvibhūti,' a shade of meaning which ought not to have passed unnoticed." The inscription clearly states that the field was bought; and, therefore, it belonged to neither of the persons mentioned here. But it is difficult to agree with Senart when he says that Aśvibhūti is here playing the part of the representative of his father. There is no mention of his father in the inscription; Vārāhi is the name of his mother and even if we take sa pitusataka as proposed by Senart, it cannot give this sense. The field was surely given by some person at the hands of Aśvibhūti; and that person is in all probability the chief of the Uttamabhadras. We get this meaning if we take anena with uttamabhādraṁ. The special mention of the Uttamabhadras in the second part has a meaning. The Uttamabhadra warriors after they were successful against the Mālavas granted a field to the Buddhist mendicants living on this hill, probably to show their gratitude to the people who fought for them. That is the reason why the field was bought at the hands of Aśvibhūti. As suggested by Senart, he was playing the part of a representative, but not a representative of his father but of the chief of the Uttamabhadras. The whole sentence would then be translated thus:--

By him (the chief of Uttamabhadras) a field bought at the hands of the Brahamaṇa Aśvibhūti, son of Vārāhi, for the price of four thousand Kārṣāpaṇas and situated on the boundary of the town belonging to my father (that is, father-in-law) has been given. From it food will be procured for all monks without distinction dwelling in my cave.

In the beginning of the second part of the inscription Uṣavadāta resorts to the first person; and one advantage of this interpretation is that the first person is continued to the end. And, further, if the pronoun, anena, can stand for pitu which comes after it and is separated by about a dozen words, there can hardly be any objection to taking it with the word, uttamabhādraṁ, which precedes the pronoun. The question is, who granted the field? He can either be Uṣavadāta or Aśvibhūti or the father of Aśvibhūti or Nahapāna. Bhagvanlal thinks that the field was purchased by Uṣavadāta; but

why should he buy the field at the hands of Aśvibhūti? As the field is mentioned as bought at his hands, we cannot say that Aśvibhūti was the real donor. As regards his father, we have considered that possibility above. Nahapāna, of course, is out of question; for as the lord of the whole territory, he had no reason to buy the field, much less at the hands of Aśvibhūti. The best way is, therefore, to regard the chief of the Uttamabhadras as the donor of the field which he bought at the hands of Aśvibhūti. What deserves to be particularly noted here is that beyond describing his past benefactions, Uṣavadāta does not record any grant of his own. And as the last part looks clearly like a postscript, the mention in the first part of his benefactions may be left out of account. So if Uṣavadāta has not mentioned any of his own grants here, it is because the object of the inscription is to record the grant of the chief of the Uttamabhadras. The Northern tribes had embraced Buddhism long before this time; and we may easily understand why they expressed their gratitude by granting a field to the Buddhist ascetics living in caves adjacent to the headquarters of their saviour.

We turn next to inser. No. 1133. Even this inser. may be roughly divided into three parts. The object is to record the arrangements for food and comforts made by Uṣavadāta. The first part states when the cave was made. The cave was complete in the 42nd year. Later on it mentions the 45th year to which the inser. has to be assigned. The reason why some of the gifts made before this year have been now recorded appears to be that the inser. was incised on the occasion of the registration of the former grants.

The first part records the grant of 3000 Kārṣāpaṇas as cloth money and money for outside life for the members of any saṃgha of any sect and any origin dwelling in the cave. The sum was deposited with the guilds at Govardhana; and provision for cloth and maintenance of the ascetics was to be made out of the interest. D. R. Bhandarkar has recently suggested that kuśāṇa in kuśāṇamūle was a currency of the Kṣatrapas. It seems more natural, says he, to take kuśāṇa like paḍika as denoting a specific coin; but paḍika is mentioned in this inser. itself and the only

mention of kuśāṇa is in this inscr. We have shown above that Nahapāna lived before the advent of the Kushanas ; and the mention of kuśāṇa here cannot justify the assignment of a later date to Nahapāna. On the whole Senart's meaning, money for outside life, is more plausible. "Such a proceeding," he observes, "is from the point of view of principle most incorrect, the monks being expected to live on alms and being precluded from even touching any money." Can it mean kuśāya or kuśāpa which mean a drinking vessel or bowl ? The clothes and the almsbowl were the two possessions of the Buddhist mendicants ; and it is natural to expect that when they came to the caves for their vassa, clothes and almsbowls were distributed amongst them before they again started on their wanderings.

The second part of the inscr. speaks of the gift of 8000 stems of cocoanut trees at the village of Cikhalapadra in Kāpura Āhara. The grant was also ordered to be declared to the nigamasabhā and registered on the phalakavāra according to custom. There are no instances from literature from which the meaning of phalakavāra can be ascertained ; Senart observes that he prefers taking vara in phalakavāra as denoting the enclosure, the premises where the official documents were kept on board.

The final portion records that a gift of 7000 kārṣāpaṇas made in the 41st year was settled on gods and Brāhmins in the 45th year. We have thus a double date for the donation ; first, observes Senart, the donation and afterwards its dedication to a special category of the donees. It appears, however, that niyuta like nibaddha means 'fastened to,' that is, 'registered.' The grant was no doubt made in the 41st year, when the work of making the cave was nearing completion. Four years later this grant as well as the investments of 3000 kārṣāpaṇas were registered at the office of the nigamasabhā.

About 7000 kārṣāpaṇas bestowed on gods and Brāhmins, the inscr. adds that each thirty-five kārṣāpaṇas make up a suvarṇa and thus the whole amounted to a capital of two thousand suvarṇas. This reference to the gold currency cannot definitely indicate that Nahapāna was a viceroy of the Kushana sovereigns. Gold currency was current in India even before the advent of the



Kushanas as evidenced by the mention of gold coins in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya.

There remain two more inscrs. of the Kṣatrapas, Nos. 1135 and 1136 ; but as they are partly mutilated and also do not supply any further information, they may be passed over.

We have at Nasik only seven inscrs. of the later Sātavāhanas ; of these Nos. 1125 and 1126 of Lüders' List are dated in the regnal years of Gautamīputra ; Nos. 1122, 1123, 1124 and 1147 are dated in the regnal years of Puḷumāvi and No. 1146 in those of Yajñasri. Four of these inscrs. are in the same cave and this fact has considerably affected their interpretations and given rise to Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar's theory of the conjoint rule of Gautamīputra and Puḷumāvi.

Inscr. No. 1125 is engraved on the east wall of the veranda of cave No. 3 under the ceiling. It records an order by Gautamīputra who is here called Banākaṭakasvāmi. The order is issued from the camp of victory of the Vaijayanti army. Govardhana, as we have seen already, was the name of an āhāra ; the officer in charge of the āhara was Viṣṇupālita. We have shown above that Benākaṭaka refers to the country watered by the river Beṇā, that is, the modern Kṛṣṇā ; and that Vaijayanti is an adjective meaning 'victorious.' The field granted by Gautamīputra in this inscr. to commemorate his victory was situated in the village of Aparakakhadi and is said to be ajakālakiyaṁ uṣavadatena bhūtam. Senart has pointed out that ajakālakiyaṁ was the name of the field; and that it does not mean 'till to-day,' the meaning given by Bhagvanlal. As regards the meaning of bhūtam, it appears to mean 'acquired' rather than 'enjoyed.' Kauṭilya gives three ways in which a territory can be acquired 'trividhaścāsya lambhah navo bhūtapūrvopitryaḥ iti. Bhūtapūrva here means 'formerly acquired' ; and the meaning of bhūta would be 'acquired.' The whole clause in the inscr. would then appear to mean 'the field which was formerly acquired by Uṣavadāta.'

The immunities granted by the king were that it was not to be entered, not to be injured, not to be dug for salt and not to be interfered with by the city police. As regards aloṇakhādaka it is

difficult to understand the meaning attributed to it. The root, *khād* means 'to consume'; and the word appears to mean 'free from the tax on salt meant for consumption.' In this connection it may be pointed out that Kauṭilya has said that salt taken for food by the men learned in the Vedas, etc., was not subject to the payment of toll.

The concluding portion says that the order was written by Amātya, Śivagupta. The deed was given in the 18th year and executed by Tāpasa. Kaṭa here means probably 'engraved'; the order of the king which was written by Śivagupta was engraved on the rock by Tāpasa.

With regard to mahāsāmiyehi uparakhito, Senart feels tempted to compare with it the titles, mahāāryaka, culaāryaka. Uparakhita obviously means 'kept' or 'registered', and we have seen in an inscr. of Uṣavadāta that a deed of grant was registered in the nigamasabhā. Samaya means an agreement and samayas were laws or resolutions agreed upon in an assembly, resolutions which primarily regulated the conduct of the corporate bodies and their business *inter se*. Mahāsāmiya seems therefore to refer to the resolutions of that body or to that body itself, samaya meaning a compact.

The grant of this field was made soon after the conquest of Govardhana by Gautamīputra. The cave in which the grant is recorded could not have been made before this; since Gautamīputra had just acquired this province. The work of making the cave to be dedicated to the ascetics was commenced immediately after the conquest of Govardhana and when the outer veranda was complete, the inscr. was engraved on its walls. It is not necessary to suppose that when the inscr. was engraved the work of making the cave was complete. It has been almost unanimously admitted that Gautamīputra extirpated the Kṣaharātas in his eighteenth regnal year; how could the cave have been ready when he records his grant immediately after his conquest? Even a casual reading of the inscription would show that the order of the king which it records is sent not long after the victory in the Govardhana district. It is improbable that either Gautamīputra or his officials could have selected one of the old caves to record this grant

especially as it commemorates his victory against the Kṣaharātas. Further, as we have observed above, the land granted in this inser. was to the ascetics dwelling on the hill. If there had been a cave of Gautamīputra already in existence, would it be too much to expect that he would have bestowed the gift on the ascetics dwelling in his cave? This contrast clearly indicates that when the grant recorded in inser. No. 1125 was first made there was no cave already existing made by Gautamīputra.

Five years later, the ascetics having probably pointed out that the land granted was not cultivated, the king granted another field in its place and the inser. recording this grant was engraved just below No. 1125. Still the cave was not complete. The original grant of land was to all ascetics on the hill; but this inser. mentions ascetics dwelling in the cave "which is a pious gift of ours." *Leṇa*, however, does not mean a completed cave; a portion of the cave, the veranda as here, would as well be called a *leṇa*. Perhaps the veranda was completed at the instance of Gautamīputra's mother who has a hand in this grant. More than fifteen years rolled by. Gautamīputra died and he was succeeded by his son Puḷumāvi. In the 19th year of the latter, the cave was completed and the mother of Gautamīputra who was still living dedicated it to the Bhādrāyanīyas. The extraordinary delay may be attributed to the fact that Puḷumāvi was engaged in his campaign in the eastern regions.

Turning to inser. No. 1126, which is separated by a svastika from inser. No. 1125, we find that it refers to the grant made in the latter. Perhaps the original field was at a distance from the Tiraśmi Hill and was therefore left uncultivated. The new field which this inser. grants was on the boundary of the city. The ministerial officer at Govardhana is now Śyāmaka and the order was issued in the name of Gautamīputra and his mother "whose son was living." The inser. is dated in the 24th year of Gautamīputra and the date on which the order was issued and the date on which it was inscribed are both given in the inser. The order was inscribed by Lota who was, according to Bühler, a doorkeeper. Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar takes the word, *paṭihārakhiyā* to be a

proper noun ; but it is very likely a misspelling for parihārarakhiye, 'for the protection of the immunities granted.'

Passing next to inscr. No. 1123, the most important inscr. at Nasik, we find that it is dated in the 19th regnal year of Puḷumāvi. The cave now completed is gifted away by the mother of Gautami-putra. She was then a very old woman and was, in conformity with her advanced age, bent on penance, self-control, restraint and abstinence. At this advanced age when her husband and her son were long dead and herself "delighting in truth, charity, patience and respect for life," no wonder she took a prominent part in the making of this cave. Even when her own son was living, she had a hand in the grant made by him of a royal field on the outskirts of the city ; and having now completed this cave on the top of the tiran̄hu which she compares to the Mount Kailasa, it is no wonder if, in describing herself as the mother of Śri Sātakarṇi, she indulges in a lengthy eulogy of her son who first acquired the regions in which the cave was situated and who was of "unchecked obedience to his mother."

A postscript to the inscr. mentions Puḷumāvi's grant of a village for the purpose of taking care of the cave (citana). The grant of a village could be made by the king only and it is only for this purpose that Puḷumāvi's name is mentioned here. He granted the village in order to please his grand-mother who dedicated the cave to the Bhādrāyanīyas. The word dharmasetu, of course, refers to the cave ; and it is mentioned in many of later epigraphs. The field granted enjoyed all the immunities. The word, nirathi means niṣṛṣṭi, meaning 'license or permission' ; and sarvajātabhoganirāṭhi would, therefore, mean 'with immunities of all kinds.'

Three years later another village was granted in exchange for the one granted in inscr. No. 1123. Inscr. No. 1124 which records this grant is engraved in continuation of inscr. No. 1123 and is separated from it by a svastika followed by another symbol. It records the grant dated in the 22nd year of Puḷumāvi's reign ; the other date mentioned therein corresponds with that of inscr. No. 1123. The village mentioned as granted here on the former occasion is Sudisaṅḅ while in inscr. No. 1123 its name is given as Pisājipadaka. In this inscr. the village is mentioned as granted dhamasetusa

leṅasa patisatharaṇe ; while in inscr. No. 1123, it was granted citana nimita . . . . pitupatiyo dhamasetusa. As regards patisatharaṇe, its proper meaning is 'friendly greeting, welcome, etc. ;' but, says Senart, the word points not so much to the feelings as to the material care which is involved by the duty of hospitality . . . . It seems to me the general meaning of 'care' is more conformable to what analogy requires. Chitaṇa in the previous inscription has, however, been translated by him as 'embellishment' although Bühler rightly interpreted the expression as 'to allow this cave to be taken care of' "To be sure" observes Senart, "the two expressions cannot contradict each other ; but nothing requires a priori that they should be exactly synonymous." It is difficult to agree with Senart's argument here. Everything in the inscr. requires that the two expressions should be synonymous. The inscr. which records the grant made only three years before says that the village was given for patisatharaṇa ; and if citana and patisatharaṇa are not synonymous, we have to explain how a village which was granted for one purpose came to be utilised for a different, though not perhaps a contradictory purpose ; how a village which was granted for the embellishment of the cave came to be used for the care of the cave. Only three years have passed since the original grant was made and there is no likelihood of its purpose being forgotten.

The village granted enjoyed all the immunities mentioned above in the case of other grants. In addition to these, we have here bhikhuhalaparihāra, immunity from plough-tax. Near the end of the inscr., Bhagvanlal reads : sātakaninā chato binikatavāsakhahi, 'the grant was touched by Satakani while living in Binikata (Benakataka)'. The exact significance of this clause has been discussed above ; when the paper grant was made the king was still at Benākaṭaka, but when it was engraved he had transferred his capital to Navanagara.

Cave No. 2 of Nasik is inscribed with a short inscr., Lüders' No. 1122. It is dated in the 6th year of Puḷumāvi. The latter part of the inscr. is mutilated ; but it is clear that it only mentions that the cave was caused to be made by Puḷumāvi. This is the only inscr. of that king here which is dated in the early days of his regime.

In cave No. 20 on the back wall of the veranda is inscr. No. 1146 which mentions one of the Sātavāhana kings in the seventh year of whose reign it is inscribed. It records the grant of a cave by the mahāsenāpatini vāsu. The cave was begun by the ascetic Bopaki ; but was left unfinished for a number of years until the mahāsenāpatini put the last finishing touch and bestowed it on the universal saṅgha of monks. This supplies an additional proof, if, indeed, a proof were necessary, that caves were often left incomplete to be completed later by some munificent donor. While considering the inscr. in cave No. 3, we have said that the cave was left unfinished by Gautamīputra and it was only after a score of years that it was finished by his old mother. If this suggestion had a shade of improbability, it will be removed by the unmistakable mention in this inscr. of the cave being left unfinished.

The inscr. is dated in the 7th year of Yajñaśri, the last king of the Sātavāhana dynasty who has left any epigraphic records in Western India. It is curious, however, that on this hill where we find records of at least three of his ancestors, he should not have thought it fit to bestow a meritorious gift on the universal saṅgha. Although also we have at Kanheri many insers. which can be assigned to his reign on palæographic grounds, we rarely come across there or even at Karle an official grant by the king. Perhaps the days of the decline of the Sātavāhana power had set in.

We have examined above the insers. of the Kṣatrapas and the Sātavāhanas. There remain other insers. in the caves at Nasik which, or a majority of which, though not of either of these princes, belong certainly to the period during which they held the district of Govardhana in their possession. They hardly supply any information about the political history of the period ; but as the insers. are of private individuals, they tell us something about the state of society during the period.

Inscr. No. 1127 records the gift of a cave by the Nyegama Vīragahapati. It is in cave No. 6 at Nasik ; and the inscr. is on the back wall of the veranda. The cave itself has four cells of which one is a gift of the wife of the principal donor and the other of his daughter. The two words that deserve special notice are gahapati and nyegama. The meaning of the latter is not a merchant certain-

ly ; but only a member of the nigamasabhā. The gahapati, as we have shown above, was a prominent member of the halika class.

Going to cave No. 7 we find inscr. No. 1128 on its back wall to the left of the doorway. It records the pious gift of Tāpasini who was a pravrajitā. Except so far as these wanderers were celibates, they were in no sense ascetics ; and Senart's translation, ' female ascetic ' is, therefore, evidently wrong. We have a story of Buddha who before he attained nirvāṇa under the tree of wisdom was a self-torturer (tāpasa) in the woods on the banks of the Nirañjarā. Thenceforward he became a wanderer. A tāpasa, therefore, was different from a pravrajika or parivrājaka. " They were quite distinct ; spoken by different names and in the priestly law books we find quite different regulations laid down for the hermits on the one hand and the wanderers on the other." <sup>216</sup> This shows clearly enough that Tāpasini is a proper name, a name which she probably took up in her stage of hermitship and retained it even subsequently.

Inscr. No. 1128 records that the gift was by Mugudāsaka together with his parivāra. It is inscribed on the back wall of the veranda to the right of the doorway ; and on the left we have another inscr. mentioning the same person as the donor.

Inscr. No. 1137 is the only inscr. at Nasik in the Sanskrit language. It is dated in the ninth year of the Ābhira king, Īśvara-sena, and records the investment of a perpetual endowment with the guilds at Govardhana for sarva-satva-suhita, and for providing medicine to the sick. The inscr. is in cave No. 10, the Kṣaharāta cave, and the grant which it records is made by Viṣṇudattā, a lay devotee. The word, gaṇapaka, here has always puzzled the commentators. The donor is the wife of Gaṇapaka Rebhila and the mother of Gaṇapaka Viśvavarman. Bühler regards gaṇapaka as the leader or protector of gaṇa which consists of three gulmas or battalions and may be taken as equivalent of a colonel. Bhagvanlal calls it a professional name or a surname, the head of a group ; and Senart observes that the only correct derivation of the word would be from ' gaṇayati,' so that gaṇapaka would be an equivalent of gaṇaka meaning an accountant or an astrologer. Apart from the

improbability of an accountant being rich enough to make these endowments, it becomes difficult to see how gaṇapaka can be equivalent to gaṇaka. Later researches have now fully established the existence of gaṇas or republics in the Punjab, Eastern Rajputana, and Malva. The leader of these gaṇas was known as gaṇapa. Viṣṇudattā, therefore, was the wife and the mother of the presidents of one of these republics. It is possible that her husband was dead at the time the grant was made; and the son succeeded him as the president. From the fact that the inscr. was found at Nasik, we cannot infer that the gaṇa system of government was current even in the Govardhana district. Viṣṇudattā must have made the grant from Northern India where there were many such republics; or, perhaps, she had come to Nasik and there made the grant. Indeed, it is more than a mere coincidence that this inscr. is found in the cave of the Kṣaharātas, where, as we have pointed out above, was recorded a grant by another leader of the gaṇas, Uttamabhādra.

In cave No. 11 on the back of the veranda is inscribed inscr. No. 1138 which records the gift of a cave by Ramaṇaka, son of Śivanitra who was a lekhaka. A lekhaka, as we have pointed out above, was a ministerial officer.

The back wall of the veranda in cave No. 12 bears an inscr. which records the grant of Ramaṇaka, son of Velidatta. The investment of one hundred kārsāpaṇas was not in this case with the guilds but with the saṅgha itself. Out of the total investment, a sum of twelve kārsāpaṇas was to be paid annually to the ascetics as cloth money. Presumably the amount was to be paid out of the interest of the endowment.

Inscr. No. 1140 records the gift of a cave by Indrāgnidatta, son of Dhammadeva, a Yavana and a northerner from Dattāmitri. Inside the cave is a caitya and a cistern bestowed on the universal saṅgha of monks by Indrāgnidatta together with his son, Dharmarākṣita. It should be noted here that the donor is a Yavana and yet his name sounds distinctly as an Indian name. Dattāmitri, according to Bühler and Bhandarkar, is an Indian adaptation of Arachosian Demetrius, a name mentioned by Isidore of Kharax. Pandit Bhagvanlal regards it as a city in Sauvira, a province in



Sindh, relying mainly on the mention in Patañjali who says ;  
*sauvirā dattāmitrī nagarī*.

Going again to cave No. 20, there is a short inser. on the doorway of the last cell which says that the gift was by the *Upāsaka Mamma*. In the same cave on the back of the veranda is another inser., No. 1146. Considering the script of these two insers. it appears that No. 1145 is later than No. 1146. It is clear that unless the cave was completed by *Vāsu* as recorded in No. 1146, there could not have been any cells in the cave ; and this apart, the palæographic evidence proves conclusively that the word *layana* of which *leṇa* is a corruption refers not necessarily to a cave but even to a part thereof. *Senart* translates *leṇa* as a cave ; but he does not explain how a cave could be granted twice.

In cave No. 24 on the ruined back wall of the veranda is engraved inser. No. 1148, which records the grant of a cave and two cisterns, one of which was on behalf of the parents of the donor, *Śaka Dāmacika Vudhika*, from *Daśapura*. Again, on one of the cisterns he reiterates that it is by *Śaka Vudhika* of *Dāmacika*. *Pandit Bhagvanlal* throws out an ingenious suggestion that *Dāmacika* here means *Damascus*. The inser. records that this *Vudhika* was a *lekḥaka* ; and here certainly he could not have been a mere writer for on palæographic grounds the inser. has to be placed in the period of the *Kṣaharātas*. It is not possible that a *Śaka* was a mere writer in those times.

---

## ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH. ITS SCOPE IN THE SATARA DISTRICT \*

By Y. R. GUPTE, B.A., M.R.A.S.

Archæology has of late attracted the learned world. Indian archæology is studied in almost all the renowned universities on the continent. For the post-graduate studies, it is often preferred to many other subjects. † We see that European scholars are visiting India every year, examining her antiquities, writing volumes on the places of antiquities and making useful additions to the workable materials. The other day, I had the pleasure to attend Prof. Lüders' lecture in Poona, to show him some photographs of the antiquities of the place, to which I have been posted in my official capacity, and in particular, to discuss the date of a fragmentary inscription in one of its caves. What attracted me was not the subject of his lecture, but rather the detailed, careful and ingenious way of dealing with it. The theme was "An ancient Indian kingdom on the borders of China." The Prof. proved that there was an Indian colony in the south of Chinese Turkestan in the fifth or the sixth century A.D. and that the Indians of those days were very enterprising. The credit of bringing home to us all such matters is largely due to European scholars. But what are we doing in India? Our apathy towards archæology is remarkable. Hundreds and thousands of images and inscribed stones are lying uncared for in the jungles in the Vindhya, in the Nasik and the Satara districts and elsewhere. From a few photographs which I have brought here to show you, you will be convinced what valuable treasure of antiquities we possess. European scholars are trying their level best to unravel

---

\* A public lecture delivered at Satara under the auspices of the "Union Club" and under the presidentship of Mr. J. Abbott, I.C.S., Collector of Satara, on the 29th January 1928.

† The Kern Research Institute of Leiden (Holland) has even undertaken to issue an annual Bibliography of all the books and articles on Archæology published in India, even in Marāṭhi.

the secrets. But unless we assist them whole-heartedly, the materials will lose a part of their value. And why? Because they are not likely to be thoroughly conversant with our religious books, manners and customs, ancient and modern. An exquisite sculpture in the Vindyas upto now believed by Dr. Smith and others to be that of two yogis (ascetics) has been shewn by me to represent Nara and Nārāyana practising penance on the Himalayas. This interpretation has now been accepted. So unless we join hands and exchange our views, archæological finds will not be properly explained.

The first and essential qualification of a research student is impartiality. Treatises on history and archæology are often marred by biassed minds. Often it happens that the historians approach a subject with a prejudiced mind. Their productions then are of little practical value.

Secondly the sifting of evidence must be critical. If one is gifted with an acumen, so much the better. But at any rate he must pause and weigh evidence before committing himself.

A research scholar must not rely on the statements made by one party. Sometimes a communal, national or religious colour is given to accounts. This is often the case when we read conflicting accounts of the historians of different countries.

To turn to Marāthā history. The wealth of raw materials covers, as Prof. Sarkar has pointed out, 6,000 printed pages. The greatest need to-day is that of a historian who would properly synthesize them, construe his own chart and give the readers the net results of these materials. There are aspects which may not present themselves to the superficial observer and yet they may be of moment. Fresh materials we do want. But we have no funds to publish promiscuously all the papers or the bakhars, to which we have access. We can afford to publish only the most important papers which will enlighten us on doubtful points.

With these general remarks I proceed to the subject in hand.

Archæology means the science of antiquities or a treatise on ancient usages, customs, architecture and so forth. Hence it will be understood that it has to deal with architecture, images, their attitude, dresses, etc.

For the sake of convenience we may divide archæology into two parts, conservation and research. We can hardly draw hard and fast lines of demarcation, however, between these two branches. To conserve ancient monuments, an acquaintance with the research branch is an absolute necessity. Conservation must be undertaken in ways which would suit them. Additions which would conflict with the old designs, would be out of place. So we must understand all these designs. Even the plaster which is to be used must be of the same colour as the original. Gardens were to be laid out in the Tāj Mahāl compound at Agra. Unless careful enquiries were made as regards their plans, in the Moghul times, the present ones designed could hardly have heightened the beauty of one of the nine wonders of the world.

Though the main conservation work can be, and as a matter of fact is, done by the Archæological department, a good deal can be done by municipalities, historical societies, village elders and even by private individuals. It would not be out of place to bring to your notice a strange method of conservation, which struck me in this district and which is referred to in my pamphlet on Parli. The village elders at Parli found that nicely carved stones which formed the pillars and panels of a Hemādpanṭī temple, at some distance, were being stolen by night. So they devised a method to remove that very temple to the midst of their village. They numbered all the stones and shifted the old temple. But instead of putting in a *ling*, they installed the images of Rāma and Sitā. When I repaired to that temple, I was not a little puzzled to see these remains of the Hemādpanṭī temple on a new platform! Curious way of preservation, no doubt, not dreamed by the archæological officers!

For all practical purposes, I may restrict my remarks to-day, to the research branch. Research may be divided into Excavation and Epigraphy. Before the ancient sites of Taxila (the Takṣaśilā of the Mahābhārata) and Sārnāth (Mṛigadāva of the Buddhists) were excavated, none could have imagined that underneath the mounds there were ancient hidden treasures of such interest. Chance

*Conservation.*  
*The temple at*  
*Parli.*

*Research. Its*  
*divisions.*

discoveries revealed the sites. But to explore them thoroughly has been a patient and thankless task of years together.

The arrangement of excavation is something like this. Archaeological assistants and scholars are entrusted with the task of giving instructions to the mates, who are to convey them to the coolies. The coolies are to make use of their tools, as long as nothing of importance is seen. If anything unusual turns up, the mates are to stop work for a while and to run to the assistants, who hurry to the spot where the curiosities await them. If it is within the power of the assistants to enlighten the mates, instructions are immediately given. If they entertain doubts, they approach the D.G. or the officer in charge, who advises them. Regular charts and plans of the excavations as they proceed, are prepared and the finds carefully recorded. This is essential, for antiquities of a particular time are unearthed at a certain level. Below this layer antiquities of an earlier age are found. If we go still deeper, treasures of a still earlier date are exposed.

The most successful excavations which may interest you all are those which are carried on at Mohenjo Daro in Sindh. They have revealed a wealth of antiquities about 4,000 to 6,000 years old. The relics are pre-Rgvedic. The seals and other antiquities discovered in Sindh are similar to those at Harappa, which I picked up. The cities of the Indians, by the time the Āryans were settling in Northern India, apparently spread from the Indus to the Montgomery District in the Punjab. To judge from the excavations in Sindh, the Āryans were a nomad race, whose civilization was of a far inferior kind than that of the conquered race, at the time when the cities round Mohenjo Daro were prosperous. These conquered Indians (who were most probably the Paṇis or the Dāsas) were far advanced. They had their seals very carefully and nicely wrought. Their system of drainage would vie with that of our own times. The Āryans relentlessly destroyed their cities. Probably the towns, which in the R̥gveda, Indra, the chief god of the Āryans, is represented to have destroyed are these. The animals figured on

these seals are now not extant in India. This fact alone will prove their great antiquity. Some archæologists may differ from me. But I make bold to express my views.

The Lalitavistāra and the Jain works make references to the Bahmī or the Brāhmī script. Most of the edicts of Aśoka are cut in that script. The Lalitavistāra mentions the 64 scripts in use in Buddha's time. The alphabet of the seals, discovered at Harappa and unearthened at Mohenjo Daro, approaches the pictorial one.

In Akbar's time an attempt was made to read the Aśoka edicts at Delhi. A high reward was offered to the successful scholar but to no purpose.

The study of Epigraphy was seriously undertaken in 1836 by Mr. Lassen. He deciphered the legend on the coins of Agathokles in the oldest Brāhmī characters. Dr. Bühler prepared charts, wrote a book entitled "Indian Palæography" in 1896 and added plates to illustrate it. That and a translation of it by the late Dr. J. F. Fleet are now the standard books on the subject. Patient study has proved that modifications are required. But the pioneer work was done by Dr. Bühler.

The credit of deciphering the Kharōṣṭhī alphabet, which was used in the Punjab, at Mathura and on the frontiers, is mainly due to European scholars, among whom Masson, Princep, Lassen, Cunningham, Lüders and Konow may be mentioned. Some letters in that script, such as v, b and r are so alike that only the context can warrant us to decide which one is to be understood. There is great confusion about vowels. The only Indian scholar of note who has written a paper and attempted to read the inscriptions in that script, though with varying success, is Mr. R. D. Banerji. I had the good luck to be asked to furnish Dr. Sten Konow, my notes on the reading of the Āra inscription, housed in the Lahore Museum. Most of my readings were accepted by the Doctor. Only one will be of sufficient general interest to be mentioned here. It was "Kaisarasa." The title "Kaisarasa" was extant in India till the time of Kanishka II, in whose time the Āra inscription was incised.

Epigraphy is now considered as a special branch of archæology. There is a staff, whose sole business it is to record epigraphs, to take estampages of inscriptions, to publish the most important of them in the *Epigraphia Indica* and to encourage scholars and professors to contribute articles to it. Excellent plates are given to illustrate the articles. So they have a permanent value. The expense is borne by the Government of India.

Having given you a general idea of archæological and historical research, I turn to the chief object of my paper, viz., the scope for this in the Satara district. The position of this district is unique. It has always been a religious centre from the earliest times. In it we can study history from about the Aśokan period to the present day. The <sup>Pratyakṣa</sup> Mahāyānism, that is, the (early) sect of

*Peculiar position of the Satara district.*

Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism flourished here. The Śātakarnis, the Kṣatrapas, the Vākātakas, the Calukyas, the Śilahāras, the Yādavas of Devagiri or Daulatabad, the Bāhamni, the Adilshahi kings and the Marāthas in succession held sway here, before the advent of the British rule. Monuments of all these are to be met with here. Historical records are available to research students. The British too have erected a monument of exceptional interest, I mean the "Historical Museum," which has been named after that historian of indefatigable energy, the late Rao Bahadur Parasanis.

*The Parasanis Museum.*

Though it may be a small beginning, it is likely to be fraught with fruitful results.

The first place of note, in this district, is Karād. A pamphlet on it and its antiquities in English with many illustrations will be of great interest to all students of Indian archæology and even to the general readers.

It may be of the size of the one on the Caves of Elephanta published by the P.W.D. in which my notes on them are incorporated. I have made a modest attempt and intend to bring out one on Karād within a year or two provided I can defray the expenses.

I may proceed to refer to the antiquities in this district according to the dates.

The Karād caves are Buddhist monuments of the earliest type.

*The antiquities—the Karād caves.*

The date assigned to them in the Gazetteer is 250 B.C. But on the strength of palæographic evidence and the head-dress of a figure in a cave (I have

brought photographs to show you) one is inclined to assign an earlier date for them. The Buddhist rail ornament

*Palæographic evidence and the evidence of the head-dress of a figure.*

met with in three or four caves (you may please see the photographs) on the Koyanā side and in the Bahiravā Darā is also of the earliest pattern.

This question will be discussed fully in an article to be published soon.

The caves are all of the Hinayānist or of the early Buddhist

*Triratna.*

sect. In this sect, the images of Buddha were not worshipped. The 'dagoba' represented him, the lion the congregation or the saṅgha, and the cakra or the wheel, the 'dharma.' These are called the triratna of the Buddhist school.

In the Mahābhārata, Karahāṭaka, that is Karād, is censured as Pāṣaṇḍa. There were heretics there. Apparently they were Buddhists.

We have only one complete inscription in a Karād cave. It reads: Gōpāla-putasa Saghāmitarasa leṇa deyaḍhamarṇ; that is "this dwelling cave is the gift of Saṅghamitra, the son of Gōpāla."

The only other inscription is a fragmentary one and will be edited

*Inscriptions in the Karād caves.*

later. It cannot, however, be removed far in date, from the former. We expect many more short

epigraphs. But the parts of the rock on which they were cut must have peeled off. The rock is of a coarser kind as compared with the material in the Nasik and the Karla caves. So if we are to get at the antiquities of this period at Karād, we must take a trial pit and excavate the earliest site. We expect not less than 12 to 15 feet layers of earth over the Buddhist ruins. We will be hoping against hope, to expect antiquities on the surface, unless of course an ancient site is washed off or is dug for a building. This will be a chance discovery.

No traces of the later Mahāyānist sect of Buddhism, which



flourished from about the 5th or the 6th century A.D. onwards, are traceable in this district.

An interesting point is elucidated by Dr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, by the identification of the kings of the Bhōjas with the Vākātakas. They ruled over Vidarbha and Kuntala. By Kuntala the Doctor understands the Marāthā country. "The southern Marāthā country" is a more accurate expression. The river Kṛṣṇā or perhaps the Tungabhadra nearly formed its boundary. Probably Kuṇḍala and Kuṇḍala-vāḍi in this district are reminiscences of Kuntala. Samudragupta's conquests in the

Doctor's opinion do not include any part of the Deccan proper. As Chandragupta's daughter Prabhāvati-guptā was married to Rudrasena II, who must have been ruling over Vidarbha and Kuntala, the conqueror did not pass through the territories of his relatives, lest they might molest them. As a matter of fact this could hardly have been the case. The marriage of Rudrasena II and Prabhāvati-guptā took place after Samudragupta's campaigns. Though I have toured in Orissa that is Kuntala, my acquaintance with it, is not very thick. But I agree with Dr. Fleet, in holding that Eraṇḍapalli and Daivarāṣṭra lay somewhere in the Deccan. Nay, I go further. Eraṇḍapalli is Erandol in the East Khandesh district, which abounds in the remains of the

Gupta period. In Daivarāṣṭra or more correctly Devarāṣṭra, parts of the Khānāpur and the Karād talukas were apparently included. There is still a village called Devarāṣṭre in the Khānāpur taluka, 6 miles from the Kuṇḍala Railway station, now called Kirloskarvāḍi. Curiously enough the holiest object there, a ling of Śiva, is named Samudreśvara, in the grants made. What grounds are there for disbelieving that the god was not named after Samudragupta? The god enshrined may not occupy the very site. But his name suggests a reminiscence of the great conqueror Samudragupta. If this identification be correct. Dr. Aiyangar's statement, viz., "It is certain that Samudragupta's southern invasion kept clearly and distinctly outside the frontiers of the Vākātakas" falls to the ground. I am informed by Mr. Dossabhoj and others, that there

are two inscriptions at Devarāṣṭre. It is to be seen what information they will give us.

Lately I have been fortunate to decipher a copper-plate grant, which I got hold of, at Khānāpur. The owner of it, Mr. Dadasaheb Mane, was under the impression that it was a sanad given to his forefathers by the kings of Bedar. But as a matter of fact it is of much more importance for the history and geography of this district. It is generally believed that the river is known as Kṛishṇā-Veṇṇā up to its confluence at Māhulī not far from Satara. But it is now positively proved from this record that it was named Kṛishṇā-Beṇṇā (a prakṛit form of Kṛishṇā-Veṇṇā) at any rate upto Rethare Budruk, in the Karād taluka. Nor need this confound us. The river, in earlier inscriptions, is even called Veṇṇā. The

*The Reṭṭūraka* present grant can roughly be assigned to the 5th or 6th century A.D. The grantor is Mādhava-varmman not known to history. The donees are Bolasvāmin and Keśavasvāmin. The stock word "Sanātana-dharma" occurs in the grant. The village granted is Reṭṭūraka, now called "Rethare Budruk." Other important villages mentioned are Belavāṭikā, Kolikā-vāṭikā and Vaṭṭarikā. Belavade represents the ancient Belavāṭikā. Kōlikāvāṭikā is Kōle—Khubi in the Islampur taluka. Vaṭṭarikā has assumed the form Vāthār. All these villages were Vāṭikās, that is Vāḍis, gardens, that is, suburbs of Rethare Budruk. The document is written by Śrīpāla, a Kāyastha. I have reason to believe that a good many copper-plate grants in this district await decipherment. But the people are so ignorant that they are afraid to show these to Government officers. They imagine that they will be defrauded and their hereditary rights affected.

The remains of the Cālukya period are few and far between. Though rare, they can be classed among the finest of the lot. The other day, I came across a fine miniature temple, with a fine female figure of about the 6th century A.D., that is, of this period. It is partly buried in the wall owned by Srimant Pant Pratinidhi of Aundh at Karād. A fragmentary inscription, of about the 8th century, was discovered about a year ago, while a temple of about the 9th century, I have found partly *in situ* in a field belonging to

the **Kazisahib**. This site then was occupied in the 9th century for religious purposes at any rate at Karād. Later architectural fragments and sculptures of the Śilāhāra period are not uncommon at Karād and elsewhere. The Śilāhāras, it is believed, espoused the Jain religion later on. Some historians like Rao Bahadur Vaidya advocate that they were only tolerant towards Jainism. Be that

*The Śilāhāras.* as it may, Jain tirthankar images were found  
*The marriage of* among the ruins at Karād and at Jakhinvāḍi.  
*Chandralekhā.* I produce photographs of some. Karād may have been the capital of the Śilāhāras, as the marriage of Chandralekhā, the daughter of a Śilāhāra prince, was celebrated there. But in Dr. Fleets's opinion, it was never the capital of the dynasty. Perhaps he is right as we have two more Śilāhāra capitals, viz., Kolhapur and Valva. The latter place was called Vāluvāḍa. We expect archæological finds there. That site deserves excavation.

The Satara district is dotted with Hemādpanti temples and  
*Hemādpanti* abunds in warrior stones. In my pamphlet on  
*temples.* Parli, I have shewn how to distinguish them. No mortar is used and the figures and designs enable us to assign approximate dates to them.

The Satara district has not been properly surveyed from the  
*Satara dist.* archæological point of view. While in the Nasik  
*not properly* and the Poona Gazetteers, no stone is left unturned,  
*surveyed.* the Satara Gazetteer does not take note of even the important inscriptions and archæological remains. Here, I say emphatically, the soil is virgin. Sculptures and images are lying uncared for, in the jungles and some on the gutters and in the old ditches. Some broken images were thrown  
*Sculptures* in the river Kṛishṇā at Karād and a good many  
*lying uncared* were buried beneath the Sitā-Rāmji's temple.  
*for.*

Warrior stones referred to above will give ample food to the  
*Warrior* antiquarians. Unfortunately, the majority of  
*stones.* them, are not inscribed, and so naturally detract somewhat from the value which would otherwise have been attached to them. Still, they are not without interest.

The dresses of the figures on them differ from age to age. The scenes vary. The episodes and the ways of fighting are different.

No doubt the general idea, *viz.*, to be rewarded with a seat in heaven, is the same. Still on some, the combatants are figured as fighting on foot. On others, warriors on horseback are shewn as falling on foot-soldiers. On one stone at Kāle, the wrestler in the lowest panel is represented as holding a shield. On another stone lying by the Kṛiṣṭhābāi's temple at Karād, the warrior lays both of his hands on his forehead.

Some of these warrior stones depict real campaigns while others are meant to represent local petty quarrels, which led to bloodshed. All these representative stones should be photographed and a memoir on them published.

Sati stones in the Satara district are often inscribed. One such stone from Parli was taken to Poona by Prof. Potdar. From certain expressions used in the inscription on it such as Prithvipālaka, it appears that the lady who consummated the awful rite of burning herself on the funeral pile of her husband was not an ordinary woman but apparently was a royal personage.

*Sati stones and other inscriptions.* A Hindu inscription outside the mosque at Khānāpur is yet to be read. The stone tablet that we now see inserted in the Idgā at

Karād, recording that one chāhur land was given to Moslems for burial and conservation of the Idgā when Allī Adilshah (II) was ruling was not known to them. Only last year I took a note of it in my pamphlet on Karād and supplied Persian scholars with ink impressions of it.

A good many inscriptions near Ner and Pusesavli have not been noticed in the Gazetteer. Mr. Shankarrao Joshi of Wai, a member of the Bhārata-Itihāsa-Saṁśōdhaka-Maṇḍala, Poona, brought these to my notice. But I have had no time to examine these or to take their estampages. Those who have leisure may take trips and explore them.

Boundary stones are often inscribed. A good many of them have representations of what is called the ass-curse. Some have Persian inscriptions as well. One boundary stone of about the 16th century is lying on a gutter at Karād. But the owner would not condescend to send it to me for examination and for taking estampage of the inscription. In such

cases we must bring pressure on the owners of such antiquities and induce them to take good care of them.

All representative antiquities, such as sculptures, architectural fragments, pottery and coins should be collected from such places as Karād, Parli, Khānāpur and housed in the Satara Museum. Certain antiquities have local interest only. These can be taken care of by the taluka boards or the municipalities. Out of the district antiquities, such as have an exceptional interest should be transferred to the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay.

A list of the inscribed copperplates in this district may well be kept by the officer in charge of the Satara Museum. The owners who are prepared to present them to it should be publicly thanked. This will be an inducement.

Arrangements for decipherment can also be made, without any serious difficulties. There are certain rules observed by the Archæological department. The finder of an inscription has the primary right to read it. If he is unable to do so, the Supdt. or the Asstt. Supdt. has a preference to the decipherment. If he cannot manage it, the Government Epigraphist, his staff or an epigraphist of acknowledged merits may read it. The Satara district is fortunate in this respect. Leaving aside my name (for I come from the Poona district) there are three epigraphists, viz., Messrs. Bakhle, Diskalkar and Altekar. The first of the three is always available. The others are serving in distant provinces, but stay for some months or days in this district. So long as I am here, I am ready to decipher the inscriptions at my leisure.

Kṣatrap coins were once very common at Karād. Apparently from about the beginning of the Christian era to the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D. they formed the currency of the country. These are now rare. But Vijayanagar, Bāhmni, Moghal, Adilshahi and Chatrapati coins are rather common. These are met with as a rule singly. We expect that a few must be washed off every year after the rains. But the finders dare not show them to experts. It should be remembered that coins

become a treasure trove only when their value is Rs. 10 or upwards. If a small reward is offered to the finders, it is possible to make a good collection for the Satara Museum.

Another line of research I may chalk out. Names of certain fields are very significant. The village patel in ancient days was called a grāma-bhojaka or simply bhojaka from the Aśokan period. At the time of registering a document, I noticed that one piece of land was named "bhojāce dale," the patel's field. *Bhojāce dale and Adilshahi dale.* The village system has been in existence from time immemorial and the name of the field is a reminiscence of the name for the headman. It is also not quite unlikely, that the field might have taken its name from the grantor, perhaps the Śilāhāra Bhoja, who held sway in this province. From the copper-plate inscriptions of the emperor Kṛṣṇarāya of the Vijayānagara dynasty, we learn that more than three villages were first named Kṛṣṇarāyapura and then gifted away. Another field in the Karād taluka I noted was called "Adilshahi", indicating that it was a land-grant, made by the Adilshahi kings of Bijapur. Instances might be added. But the above two will suffice to point to a new field of research.

In the Indian Antiquary\* I have tried to show that the "Kharātas" among the shepherds may perhaps be the descendants of the Kshaharātas (prākṛit Khakharātas) among the ancient Scythians. *Philology.*

For historical research, this district is much more important than for archæological explorations. In the Adilshahi period, Karād was a religious centre and pilgrims from distant provinces thronged there and thence they were escorted safely to Dabhol, whence they were shipped to Mecca. Hundreds of Adilshahi sanads of interest are still extant. Khatibshahib of Karād has a good many. The Kazishahib is reported to have two boxes full of the papers of the Adilshahi period. Few are aware that the descendants of Alli Adilshah (II) by his daughter are still living at Bāgnī in the Islampur taluka. I have sent one sanad given to me by a Mutavalli, to the Government Epigraphist at Hyderabad for being translated. The

Ghâtges of Malavadi and other Marāthā families of note were peers of the Adilshahi dynasty. Mr. Joshi recently got hold of some papers relating to their family. During the early Marāthā period, the daftars were kept, it is proved, by the ministers. Some historical papers, perhaps more valuable than many even in the Parasnīs collection, are still at Boragaon with Mr. Annasahib Chitnis, a descendant of Balājī Āvaji, Shivājī's private secretary. But it is doubtful whether they will see the light of day during his lifetime! The *yādis* in Shāhu's handwriting in another branch of his family, were photographed by me and published in the *Itihāsa-saṅgraha*, edited by the late Rao Bahadur Parasnīs, and patronized by the Bombay Government. One of them is the Magna Charta of the Peshwas and is now quoted as an authority since it was reproduced. I had the good-luck also to edit in the *Itihāsa-saṅgraha* a bakhar that is an account of the Mores of Jāvli. The records of the Chatrapati of Satara are of inestimable value. They should be properly arranged and relabelled. In them, it is reported, are still to be seen some letters of Aurangzeb, addressed to Shivājī. It is a pity that hundreds of important papers in these records were clandestinely removed, stolen we may say, or at least kept back by some persons. To quote an instance, a thoroughly reliable gentleman when I was serving at Satara showed me a letter addressed to Shivājī, Rājārām's son on his installation as a king, by the Pujārī of Pratāpḡad. The Pujārī sent greeting, flowers and sweets (prasād) to the minor king. Should we not expect such a letter in the records of the family? How is it that it left their hands?

The Ināmdars of Khatāv were Manasabdārs of the Moghals and were styled Rājās. Their holy character won them the surname Mahārājās. This high-sounding title is still borne by the present Ināmdars, their descendants. We expect important Moghal papers, showing the manoeuvres of Aurangzeb and his attempts to alienate peers from their kings and to induce them to espouse his cause.

We may also launch a scheme of copying these papers even if the owners may not be willing to part with them.

# THE POSITION OF WOMAN IN RABBINICAL LITERATURE

## PART II.

(Continued from page 183 of Vol. III, N. S.)

BY PROF. EZEKIEL MOSES EZEKIEL, B.A., LL.B., J.P.

### *Modes of Acquiring a Woman as Wife.*

While English law holds marriage (connubium) a civil contract, the Roman Catholic and the Episcopal Churches esteem it a sacrament and, as such, indissoluble. In the estimation of the Jews, it is, as between husband and wife, more than a warranty constituting reciprocal performance of sacred obligations imposed upon the parties by religion and morality. *Kiddushin*, as the Hebrews term marriage, conveys, etymologically the sense of consecration, and expresses an act by which the wife is exclusively set apart for the husband with the express understanding that both parties keep the tie sacred from infraction or profanation.

The custom of marriage by capture prevailed among the ancient Semites (W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia*, New Ed. 1907. Chap. III); while among the Hebrews, an only instance is traceable (*Judges XXI. 6 ff*). Though intermarriage with the Gentiles was forbidden to the Jews, the Hebrew military class were allowed to marry foreign women captured in distant wars (*Deut. XXI. 10.*)

The Romans from the earliest times recognised 3 modes of contracting the tie of marriage: (1) the religious ceremony of *confarreatio*, (2) *coemptio*—fictitious sale, and (3) *usus*—cohabitation resulting in marriage by a prescriptive process. Similarly the Jewish legal code—the Mishnah (*Kid I.1*) records: "A wife is



acquired (*kanah*) in 3 ways (1) by *money*, (2) by a *marriage deed* (Kethubah) and (3) by *copulatio carnalis*, provided that in the adoption of the third method the husband says: 'Behold thou art wedded to me with this connection.' Although such a marriage is a legal one and cannot be dissolved except by a bill of divorce or by the death of either of the parties, the Rabbins do not countenance it, and have pronounced that a man who thus marries is punishable by the Tribunal with the infliction of '*stripes for rebellion*,' for transgressing against morality and decency. The ancient Hebrew method of obtaining a wife was by paying a bride consideration called *mohar* (Jahn, *Archæologia Biblica*, Upham's Eng. trans. Oxford, 1836 p. 152.) Dr. Driver holds that Heb. *mohar*, Arab *mahr* is marriage price paid for the wife to her parents or family (*Exodus*, Camb. Bib. 1918 p. 229.), In patriarchal times, the dowry was not known. Whether the *mohar* was given as a gift to the bride or as price in the form of a ransom to the father, is uncertain. Luther has translated *mohar* by *Morgengabe* i.e., bridegroom's gift to the bride. Cases of both, the marriage price and the voluntary gifts to the bride, are found in the Bible (Vide *Gen.* XXXIV. 11-12; XXIV. 53; XXX. 26; XXIV. 29; XXIV. 59; XXX. 26, *Exod.* XXII. 15-16; *Jud. T.* 15; *Kings* IX. 16; *Hos.* III. 2.)<sup>1</sup>

The laws of Hammurabi give us a hint of general custom in Babylonia for a man to pay to his father-in-law a bride-price, the amount of which varied according to the rank of the parties (Johns' trans: *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws* § 138 and § 163 Edinb. 1904.) In the case of the wife dying without any issue, her father returned the price her husband paid for her (Ibid: 161.) Jewish law, in its further development, insisted upon the payment to the bride of *keseph* (money) in order to give validity to the marriage contract. In fixing the sum of money required to acquire a wife in marriage, the two great schools of Shammai and Hillel (10 B.C.) differ in their opinions. The former says: "It must

<sup>1</sup> Among the Parsees it is not deemed proper for the bride to enter her husband's house empty-handed (Cf. Spiegel, *Avesta* II. p. XXX).

Referring to the Arabs, Lane remarks: "the giving of a dowry is indispensable" (*Modern Egypt* I. 211).

not be less than a *denarius* (90 grs. of pure silver) or its value;" while the latter remarks: "It is sufficient if it be a *perutah* ( $\frac{1}{2}$  gr. of silver) or the value thereof." In the presence of two witnesses the bridgeroom gave to the bride the smallest coin saying to her "*Be thou consecrated to me*" (Kid. 5b)<sup>2</sup> Her silent acceptance of the same implied her consent. This may appear to indicate a survival of the yet older method of acquisition of a bride by direct purchase. The custom runs parallel with the Roman ceremony of *co-emptio* although they differ materially in ceremony (Bouvier, *Law Dict. Vol. I. S. V. "Co-emptio"*.) The Roman conceptions of *mancipatio*, *patria potestas*, and *manus* are foreign to the Jews. The ceremony of *co-emptio* is based on the principle of *mancipatio*. The fact that both the schools of Shammai and of Hillel set the price for the acquisition of a wife at a nominal amount, led Dr. Ed. Gans to conclude that in the Talmudic law the purchase of the wife appears as merely symbolic. He further remarks: "The Talmud uses the word *kanah* 'to buy, to acquire', indiscriminately of marriage by contract or cohabitation (*Das Erbrecht*: Stuttgart 1824, Vol. I. p., 138.) On the other hand we have the authority of Dr. P. Bucholz, that the *perutah* may not be deemed as a *symbol* of purchase since the verb *kanah* is used also in connection with abstract things as objects; e.g., "He, who has gotten (*kanah*) for himself words of the Torah, has gotten (*kanah*) to himself the life of the world to come (Aboth II. 8)." Besides the ceremony of *perutah*, the Mishnah refers to other kinds of marriage by *contract* and by *concubitus*. The Talmud dictates that an expression of one's will, can have its right sequel through a manifest deed: For instance, as a symbol of possession one has to set his foot upon the landmark (Metz. 14a). Large cattle (bovine race) is taken possession of by seizing the reins, and small cattle (sheep) by lifting it up (Kid. 25b.) If one fastened (something on the property), fenced in or tore-down, it is possession (Bath. 42a). The Talmud, further, employs the two terms *halifin* and *m'shikha*. The former indicates a form

<sup>2</sup> In later times the words "according to the law of Moses and Israel" were added (*Tosafot* to Ket 3a) to the formula. J. Yeb. 15, 3 quotes a formula in which occur the words *according to the law of Moses and the Jews*.

of possession by handing over to the purchaser an object as a symbolic substitute (Ruth. IV. 7); and the latter expresses an act of taking possession by drawing towards one's self the object to be acquired (Kid. 22b; Kid I. 4). An exception is only made in the case of the wishes of a dying person, where the symbolical form, of making an agreement binding (by handing over an object from one to the other) is not insisted upon (Bath. 151b). The conditions for the validity of marriage are not only consent but also confirmation by an act. They are threefold: (1) Delivery of money or its value and the acceptance of it on the part of the wife or through an approved service by the man to the woman; (2) delivery of a marriage writ, containing a contract between the man and the woman entered into with the knowledge of the woman, with distinct mention of the names of the contracting parties. (Kid 9b; Maim. *Ishut* 3, 4; & *Eben Haezer*, § 32); (3) concubitus by which the woman willingly yields to the man. The last in early Talmudic times was tabooed as an impudent act. Now the idea of a symbol implies a fixity, as with the *as* in the ceremony of co-emptio; but according to Jewish view of marriage by money, the amount can be raised as it may please the bridegroom. The *perutah* or its value has been fixed as a mere *minimum*.<sup>3</sup> The *perutah* with other gifts was given, without any condition or reservation, to the woman herself. The Talmud (Bath. 145a) even records an opinion that the money, or its value, given at betrothal, is parted with as a present even at the risk of receiving no consideration (*i.e.*, before the consummation of marriage) on account of the premature decease of the bride.<sup>4</sup> Later on, during the middle ages, a plain ring of pure gold or silver was placed on the fore-finger

---

<sup>3</sup> Buchholz. *Die Familie nach mosaïsch—talmudischen Lehre* 1867. Breslau, p. 44 ff.

<sup>4</sup> It may, however, be noted that the Talmud emphasises that, on the girl's wish, no marriage was concluded before her majority. This ordinance was not followed, in the middle ages, by the Jews in France and Germany. The Tosafists (Kid. 41a) argue persuasively: "Sufferings in the exile increase day by day. If there be possibility for one to provide for his daughter, he may give his minor daughter in marriage, lest later on he may no longer have the chance and she will then remain unwedded."

of the bride as a substitute for the *perutah* or its value.<sup>5</sup> The purity of the metal was symbolic of conjugal fidelity. We find references in the Talmud to a finger-ring and seal-ring (Sab. 57a), as also to the authority given by transfer of the ring (Meg. 14a). No mention is made therein of a wedding ring. The ring appears to have been introduced among the Jews into the marriage ceremony in the seventh or eighth century. It is not easy to trace the exact stages by which the wedding ring developed from the betrothal ring. The giving of a ring to mark a betrothal was an old custom. The ring was probably a mere pledge, a *pignus*, that the contract would be fulfilled. In Pliny's time conservative custom still required a plain ring of iron, but the gold ring was introduced in the course of the second century (*Encycl. Britt. 11th Ed. Art. "Ring"*). William Jones, in assigning the reason why a ring was pitched upon for the pledge, rather than anything else, says: "Because anciently the ring was a seal, by which all orders were signed, and things of value secured, and therefore the delivery of it was a sign that the person to whom it was given was admitted into the highest friendship and trust. For this reason it was adopted as a ceremony in marriage to denote that a wife, in consideration of being espoused to the man, was admitted, as a sharer in her husband's counsels, and a joint partner in his honour and estate. (*Finger Ring Lore*, London, 1884, p. 79.)"

#### *The Kethubah—Marriage Deed.*

The precise object of the husband in provisioning his wife with dowry or marriage portion is to protect her in the event of her being widowed or divorced. The husband, therefore, made before the nuptials an obligation in writing which entitled the

---

<sup>5</sup> The following remark of Havelock Ellis in "*Man and Woman*" (5th Ed.) p. 57 may be noted with interest: "Weissenberg found the predominance of the index-finger unusually marked in Jews, and especially in Jewesses, and he noted that in Assyrian reliefs and Egyptian statues the ringfinger is generally longer than the index, and in the former case at all events, of beautiful type. (S. Weissenberg, "*Die Formen der Hand und des Fusses*," *Zt. f. Eth.* 1895, Heft 2.).

wife to receive from the husband's estate a settlement in the event of his death, or in the case of her divorcement. It is practically a "widowhood endowment" and as such, remarks the Talmud "it is intimated in the Torah (Yeb. 89a; Ket. 10a and *Tosafoth* thereto; cf. Tobit VII. 4;) whereas the endowment of one that is married as a widow or a divorced woman, is an enactment post-Biblical (Ket. 82b.) A minimum sum of 200 *denarii* was fixed for a virgin and 100 for a widow or a divorced woman upon her re-marriage (Ket. 10a). R. Meir has said: "Whoever giveth to a virgin less than 200 *denarii* or to a widow less than 100 (for their respective marriage portions), his intercourse with either one or the other is (like) fornication (Ket. V. 1)." This minimum could be enhanced at the option of the husband (Ket. 54b.) This increase, termed, *tosefeth Kethubah*, formed the additional jointure beyond the legally prescribed minimum sum (Ket. 90a). The *donatio propter nuptias* (Kethubah) was also increased by 3 *denarii* or 3 *trapiken*<sup>6</sup> a day or 36 grs. of silver every week as a penalty, should the husband prove, and continue to be, refractory against his wife or refuse her conjugal rights (Ket. V. 7). The fixed price (minimum) and the additional jointure came to be supplemented by *dota* (Aram. *nedunya*) or her portion or wedding equipment, consisting in money, or goods or estate donated to her by her father (cf. Ket. 54a). The total value of the three was mentioned in a deed termed the *Kethubah* which became null and void unless signed and attested by two witnesses. There runs a parallel custom with the ancient Assyrians. A husband might make a settlement on his wife, which in the time of Hammurabi was called *nudunnu*—an expression bearing close affinity with the Aramaic *Nedunya* (Delitzsch, *Assyrische Wörterbuch*, Leipzig 1896 p. 451). By a deed of gift it covered income-producing estate as well as personal property. She could leave it as she chose to her children from that marriage, but not to members of her own family. . . . She forfeited it, if she married again (Code of Hammurabi 171 and 172 C. H. H. Johns, *Babylonian & Assyrian Laws, Contracts, etc.* Edinburgh, 1904, p. 132.)

<sup>6</sup> Greek *Tropaecon* corresponding to *Victoriatius*=*Quinarius*, half a denar.

*The Lien of the Kethubah.*

The amounts settled on the wife in the *Kethubah* vested in the husband as trustee for her. For their security the property of the husband was pledged. One of the terms entered into by the husband as binding on him runs thus: "I take upon myself and my heirs the responsibility for the amount due according to this *Kethubah* and of the marriage portion, and of the additional jointure (by which I promised to increase it) so that all this shall be paid from the best part of my property, real and personal, such as I now possess or may hereafter acquire.<sup>7</sup> All my property, even the mantle on my shoulders, shall be mortgaged for the security of the claims above stated, until paid, now and for ever." Thus the amounts settled on her became an encumbrance on the estate of the husband. If the husband sold his property, the wife could claim her *Kethubah* moneys from the purchaser (Git. 48b; 55b). The *Kethubah* was the inalienable right of the woman. She could not sell it to her husband or release him from its obligation or even from a part of it (Maim. Ishuth, X. 10), though she could sell her right to a stranger, who would be entitled to collect the amount on her divorce, or on the death of her husband. In point of the waiving of the dowry the Mahomedan Law differs from the Jewish Law. The Quran says: "Give the women their dower according to what is ordained, but it shall be no crime in you to make any other agreement among yourselves. If they (the women) voluntarily remit unto you any part of it, enjoy it with satisfaction and advantage (Sura IV. 27)"<sup>8</sup>. A Jewess is forbidden to stay with her husband without a marriage deed (*Kethubah*). In case the deed was lost, a new one had to be drawn up bearing

---

<sup>7</sup> Credit is due to the Geonim (the Chiefs of the Babylonian Academies in the post-Talmudic period) who strengthened the security by making the personal estate of the husband liable for the *Kethubah* (Maim. Ishuth XVI. 7.)

<sup>8</sup> Shukri interprets that by this passage Muhammedan law sanctions *Khul*, which signifies a separation with the consent and at the instance of the wife, in which she gives or agrees to give a consideration to the husband for the release of the marriage tie (*Muhammedan Law of Marriage and Divorce*. New York 1917, p. 106).

the same date if the date was known, or else the actual date of the preparation of the second deed.

#### *Release of to the Kethubah.*

In the post-Talmudic times the Rabbis invented a deed, whereby the wife released the husband from the financial obligations as under the *Kethubah*. This empowered the husband to sell, as sole owner, the property or land without any encumbrance. After such sale the husband executed a new deed (*Kethubah*) with the effect of charging with the amount stated therein, only such property as he possessed at or after its date. Such a deed of release was liable to grave abuses so risky to the woman. Hence, in course of time, with a view to securing the woman's interest, a clause came to be inserted in the marriage deed providing that should the wife, through coercion or other similar cause, release her husband from financial obligations to her, such release should be held void<sup>o</sup>.

#### *Pecus ferreum—property of iron sheep.*

Dotal property, consisting in money, goods or estate, which the wife brings, to the husband and the value of which is mentioned in the marriage deed, vests in the husband as a trustee. He is authorised to enjoy the profits thereof. It is *mortmain*, wife's estate held by her husband, which, in case of her death or divorce, he must restore *in specie*, being responsible with all his real and personal property for loss or deterioration. This property is termed, in Hebrew, *property of iron sheep*. Dr. Mielziner, in explaining the term says: "It was like sheep, from which profit (wool) is derived, and, on the other hand, it resembled iron, in so much, as its substance could not be destroyed nor its value deteriorated (The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce, New York, 1884, p. 105).

#### *A 13th Century Kethubah.*

Of the documents, rescued from the spoils of the Cairo Geniza, there has been traced a *Kethubah* (marriage writ) dated 1220 C.E., in which one curiously finds the following three conditions

---

<sup>o</sup> G. J. Weber, *Jewish Legal Documents* in the Jewish Chronicle Literary Supplement, Feb. 24, 1928, p. VII.

included:—(1) the husband covenants to observe monogamy; (2) he undertakes not to force on the wife a hand-maiden whom she dislikes; (3) the wife promises to observe the full ritual obligations of *tebila*<sup>10</sup> (*Jews College Jubilee Volume, London, pp. 101*).

*An Egyptian Marriage Contract.*

Among the treasures the discovery of Egyptian papyri has brought us, they have traced an Egyptian marriage writ dated 92 B.C., belonging to the Ptolemaic period, when Greek influence was predominant. We can advantageously compare it with a Jewish marriage deed with respect to the position of women in Egypt. The bridegroom and the bride are respectively Philiscus and Apollonia. The important conditions are: "It shall not be lawful for Philiscus to bring in any other wife but Apollonia, nor to keep a concubine or lover, nor to beget children by another woman in the lifetime of Apollonia, nor to live in another house over which Apollonia is not mistress. Similarly it shall not be lawful for Apollonia to spend the night or day away from the house of Philiscus without consent of Philiscus or to have intercourse with another man, or to bring shame upon Philiscus."<sup>11</sup>

*Origin and Aim of the Kethubah.*

It is difficult to trace the *origin* of the *Kethubah* (marriage writ). Hammurabi enacts: "If a man has taken a wife and has not executed a marriage contract, that woman is not a wife (Johns' trans. § 128.) Bruno Meissner has brought to light two Babylonian marriage contracts in connection with the simultaneous marriage of a man to his chief wife and to her slave-subsidiary wife (*Aus dem alt-babylonischen Recht*, 1905, p. 23, Quoted in Bertholet: *A History of Hebrew Civilisation*, London, 1926, p. 155). In the early period of Hebrew history we find no trace of the existence of marriage contracts. The sages unanimously, though after a keen discussion in the folios of the Tractate *Kethuboth*, base its

---

<sup>10</sup> Ritual bath of purification obligatory on every married Jewess a week after the cessation of menses.

<sup>11</sup> Donaldson—*Woman, her position and influence in ancient Greece and Rome*—London, 1907, pp. 245 ff.



origin to a precept in the Pentateuch (Exod. XXII, 16). Among the "fine touches in its descriptions of family life, social customs, and individual experiences" the Book of Tobit (probably composed between 200 and 50 B. C.) records (VII, 14) as follows: "And Reuel called Ednah his wife to bring paper to write thereon the deed of marriage (*Kethubah*) and witnesses signed it (Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit*, Oxford, 1878 pp. XXXVIII, LVII)."

The aim of the institution of the *Kethubah* was to safeguard the interests of the bride. It was after the return from Babylon that the Rabbis considered the necessity of securing the future of the girls, who being by their very nature weak, laboured, comparatively, under a disadvantage. After marriage they could be repudiated by their husbands, whom they could not inherit. The husbands enjoyed freedom of divorce, to obtain which no consent was required on the part of a woman. To remain under the paternal roof the girls expected a provision. They could not inherit their fathers when the brothers were living. Hence they had to depend only on the marriage settlement which they could claim either from the husband on the dissolution of marriage, or in the event of the husband's death from his heirs. Under these disheartening conditions, the girls avoided marriage, believing that after marriage the heirs of the husbands would possibly conceal the property and would fail to satisfy their claims for the marriage portion.

To remove this difficulty, the Rabbis decided that the marriage portion of married women should be deposited in her father's house—a provision which might facilitate divorce, as the husband in a fit of anger might say "Go to your bond." It was then decided that the sum should be handed over to the wife herself, who would naturally invest it in the household to the joint interest of herself and her husband's, in which case the husband would easily say "Take your goods and be off." Still further as against the facilities in the way of a husband to divorce his wife there was a bar from the wife's side to compel her husband to divorce her. Hence women refused to enter wedlock and men grew grey and celibate (Ket. 82b). Consequent to these drawbacks so unfavourable to the interests of a girl, R. Simon ben Shetah

(I.B.C.) Prince of the Sanhedrin and reputed brother of Queen Alexandra, about two centuries before the destruction of Jerusalem, decided that the wife's *Kethubah* or marriage settlement should be merged into the husband's estate, so that he might have its usufruct, but that his entire estate, even such property of his as might have passed into other hands, should be charged with the payment of it (Ket. 82b). This enactment effectively checked hasty divorce (cf. Erub. 41b), and the *Kethubah* became a genuine safeguard<sup>12</sup> in giving the wife means of maintenance when she became *sui juris*.

### *Polyamy; its Transition to Monogamy.*

The scriptural statement "man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, so that they shall be one flesh" breathes the highest sentiment and respect for the woman and gives a clue to its basis on the idea of monogamy. From this declaration in Genesis (II, 24) one could expect to find in the Mosaic Law a direct prohibition against plurality of wives.<sup>13</sup> At the creation of *man*, he was given only one *wife*. Even in the description of the virtuous woman (Prov. XXXI) she is described as the sole mistress. The praise too bestowed on her, and the fidelity recommended towards the wife of the youth (Prov. XXXI, 18) presuppose monogamy as the rule (Saalschutz, *Archæologie der Hebräer*, Königsberg, 1855-56; II, p. 205).

Polygamy was looked upon with disfavour by the prophets and the scribes. None of the prophets lived in polygamy. Monogamous marriage is the subject of Hosea's picture (II, 8) so gloriously delineated by him as the symbol of the union of God with Israel. Some of the precepts in the Pentateuch (Deut. XXXI, 15-17; XXV, 5-10) do tend to favour bigamy and poly-

<sup>12</sup> S. Mayor, *Die Recht der Israeliten Athener und Römer*, Leipzig, 1862, Vol. I, pp. 340 ff, and I. Abrahams *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1st series; Cambridge, 1917, p. 68.

<sup>13</sup> Von Dollinger remarks: "It was the 'hardness of heart' and ill-restrained sensuality of the people, manifested in their passion for the licentious idolatry of the Syrians, that determined the law-giver to permit polygamy or the keeping of concubines as the lesser evil" (*The Gentile and the Jew*, Vol. II, p. 359).

gamy ; but the general tenor of those times is a proof that there was a growing tendency among the Hebrews for discouraging polygamy amidst them. The Jewish High Priest, in view of Levit. XXI, 13, is enjoined to take one wife (Yeb. 59a).

Polygamy, remarks Montesquieu, became a necessity in the East from the conditions of the surrounding nations (*Esp. des Lois* XVI, 2-7). With the Assyrians monogamy prevailed in the earlier times. Polygamy was not, however, unknown. In later times it was fairly prevalent among the slaves and serfs. In the later Babylonian era polygamy existed. But taking a second wife was deemed to cast a slur (Johns' trans. Hammur. Code, § 134). Just before Zoroaster, polygamy was beginning to occur amongst the higher classes. To be childless was the greatest possible calamity which could befall a household. It was doubtless childlessness, or the fear of it, which led to the change (cf. de Harlez, quoted Westermarck, *Hist. Human Marriage*, III, 44). Among the Hebrews even the common people practised polygamy. In some cases the wife being childless offered her husband her own slave for a concubine (Gen. XVI, 2). This could be then evaded if the ancient Hebrews followed the custom of the adoption of children.

Bigamy, as defined by Bouvier, means the wilfully contracting a second marriage when the contracting party knows that the first is subsisting. It is the state of a man who has two wives, or of a woman who has two husbands, living at the same time. A man having more than two wives, or a woman having more than two husbands, living at the same time, is said to have committed polygamy (*Law Dictionary*, Vol. I, 1897, s. v. *Bigamy*). The Jewish view of polygamy does not come under the purview of this legal definition. Under Jewish law the marriage of a married woman (neither widowed nor divorced) is void and has no binding force, while the marriage of a man (having a wife) to another woman is legally valid and needs the formality of a divorce for its dissolution (*Eben Haezer* I, 10). In some exceptional cases the Rabbis could not but tolerate bigamy which after all is permitted in the Bible, as for instance:—

(1) in places where levirate marriage is practised as in the

East ; (2) in the case of a barren marriage or where a union has not been blessed with an off-spring for a continuous period of ten years ; (3) in the case of a wife who is hopelessly insane, in which the consent of 100 learned men of three different states was required—all precautions being taken to ensure the support of the woman while insane ; (4) where the wife openly leads an immoral life or embraces another religion and refuses to accept a divorce ; (5) in the case where the wife abandons her husband without any reason and refuses to accept a divorce.

Despite the general tone of the Talmud in favour of monogamous marriage as ideal, stray opinions of individual Rabbis are fanciful. While Raba (279-352) says that a man may take as many wives as he can support (Yeb. 65a), and the sages recommend that no one should marry more than four wives (Yeb. 44a), it came to be codified in *Eben Haezer* (I, 9) that in the place where bigamy is strictly prohibited, one should restrict himself to one wife only. R. Ammi expressed his view in remarking that a woman had a legal right to claim a bill of divorce, if her husband took another without her consent (Yeb. 65a). Rab and Rab Nahman of Babylon boldly expressed their opinions so fantastic, that on their travels they would willingly enter into a marriage contract to subsist only during their sojourn.<sup>14</sup> Against this there stands a clear dictum of R. Eliezer ben Jacob to the effect that a man, having a wife in a city, should not marry in another city, lest the offspring of such polygamous marriages might, in course of time, unconsciously come into contact and form incestuous connections as between step-brothers and step-sisters (Yeb. 37b ; cf. Kid. II, 7 ; *Vide* Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, Vol. II, 1911, pp. 26-28). Polygamy is repugnant to the Hebrew mind. The Hebrew expression for associate or rival wives of a man is *tsaroth*, meaning troubles. The word first occurs in I. Sam. T. 6. Kimchi in his Hebrew Lexicon says it is so termed because the rival wives are

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. What is known among the Shiah Moslems- *Mul'ah* marriage, which is limited to a specified term. A. Shukri says : Three days after the entry of the Prophet into Mecca these marriages were forbidden by him as contrary to the Islamic principles (*Muhammedan Law of Marriage and Divorce*, pp. 51-52, New York, 1917).

most often sources of trouble, jealousy, and vexation to each other (*Shorashim* s.v. *tzur*). How far the opinions of the individual Rabbis convey seriousness of purpose may be seen through the following advice of Rab. (154-247) proffered to R. Asi, so brimful of humour: "Do not, where polygamy is not prohibited, marry two wives, as they are sure to be in conspiracy against you; but if you do marry two wives, marry a third and she will divulge the plot against you" (*Pesaḥim*, 103a).

Whewell points out that polygamy, among the Jews, ceased after the return from the Babylonian exile (*Elements of Morality*, Bk. IV Chap. p. 375). Its cessation derived its impetus from the development of the Talmudic enactments. In the age of Tannaim—in the first century of the Christian era,—it was evidently not common among Palestinian Jews, and at least very rare among the learned class. The Targum, an Aramic paraphrase to Ruth IV, 6, clearly states, that Ruth's hand was refused by the kinsman of Elimelech, for the reason that he already had a wife. His words are: "*Marry thou in this way; I cannot marry her, for I have a wife and I am not permitted to marry another wife in addition to her, lest there be a contention in my house and I destroy my inheritance.*"

How monogamy came to hold an undivided sway over the people in Talmudic times is shown by an example set by Rabbi Yehudah the Prince. In the 2nd century of the Vulgar era, the son of R. Yehudah the Prince left his youthful wife in search of wisdom. He happened to stay at the College much longer than he was expected. On his return he found his wife aged down fast (Rashi: "She lost the capacity of bearing forth"). Then said R. Jehuda to his son: "My son, if you divorce her the people will say, 'In vain has this poor woman waited so long.' If you marry another wife, they will say, 'the one is his wife, and the other is his mistress.'" So he prayed to God on her behalf and she got well and restored to health and beauty (*Ket.* 62b). Of the Rabbins named in the Talmud not one is mentioned to have lived in polygamy.

The institution of the marriage writ and settlement (*Kethubah*) introduced by the Rabbis not only operated as a check upon the freedom of divorce but discouraged polygamy, which later

on, came to be interdicted by a French Rabbi Rabenu Gershom (960-1040) called the "Light of the exile." In about 1025 C.E., he issued a decree interdicting polygamy. The decree was passed by a self constituted Synod which met at Worms and was presided over by R. Gershom. Though this decree was originally ordained for the Jews living in Germany and Northern France, it was successively adopted by the Jews in all European countries. In the East the Jews have not accepted the binding force of this decree, and still favour bigamy in two cases—if the first wife be found childless after 10 years of conjugal life, or if she bore only girls. The ban of Rabenu Gershom was to hold no longer than till the end of 5000 A. M. (*Eben Haezer*, §1). The Rabbi very likely thought that with the beginning of the 6th thousand year, the Messianic epoch (Sanh. 97a) would usher in with the times when neither monogamy nor polygamy will prevail, and sexual impulses will sink (Ber. 17a). This sounds somewhat similar to the views of Strauss and Renan, which Havelock Ellis quotes with his dissenting note. "Many writers—I think especially of Strauss (*The Old Faith and the New*) and Renan (Introduction to translation of *Le Cantique des Cantiques*)—have spoken in glowing terms of a future of humanity in which sensuality, by which they mean the sexual emotions, shall have almost disappeared to give place to pure rationality" (*Man and Woman*, 5th, p. 86).

#### *The Duty of Propagating the Human Race.*

The Rabbis disapprove of celibacy and deliberate renunciation of marriage. They teach that one who has passed the age of twenty without taking a wife transgresses a divine command, thus incurring God's displeasure (Kid. 29b). The Greeks in Homeric times, as well as the Hindoos, Arabs and Persians, have looked upon childlessness as a misfortune. The Hebrews deem marriage a divine ordinance. It was Isaiah who said that 'the world was created to produce life. He created it not a waste. He formed it to be inhabited (Is. XLV, 18).' Marriage has been made imperative for the multiplication of the species (Gen. I, 28; Sotah. 12a). Every sexual intercourse that has not for its object the propagation of species is like adultery (Yeb. 61 b). We learn

from Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, Bk. II, Ch. VIII, 13) that the Essenes abstained from intercourse during the pregnancy of their wives "as a demonstration that they do not marry out of regard to pleasure, but for the sake of posterity." Whether the injunction to marry is obligatory on woman was a point of dispute among the Rabbis (Yeb. VI, and 6 b) which was decided in the negative.<sup>15</sup> The Talmud records an instance of one Simeon ben Azzai (3rd Cent.) living a life of celibacy and saying: 'A man who did not marry was like one who shed blood and diminished the divine image' (Yeb. 63b)<sup>16</sup>. His only plea of defence against the charge of breaking his own precept was that his soul was enamoured of the Torah, and that the propagation of the human race could be kept up by others (Yeb. 63 b). Children, especially sons, were deemed to be the future supporters of God's kingdom. They are a bond of union between husband and wife (Ket. 50a). A man is said to have fulfilled his duty of propagating the race, when he has had two children (i.e., two boys according to the school of Shammai, or a boy and a girl according to the school of Hillel (Yeb 62a).<sup>17</sup>

The Talmud strictly prohibits adoption of any means to prevent conception except in three cases. A tradition is incorporated in the Talmud (Yeb 12b ; 100b ; Ket. 39a, Ned. 35b ; and Nid. 45b), which reads as follows :—R. Bebai says : Married women, in three conditions are permitted the use of a resorbent to prevent concep-

---

<sup>15</sup> Rashi (1040-1105) on Gen. I, 28 comments : " The Biblical obligation to marry lies on the husband in respect of the commandment to propagate the species and not on the wife." James H. Lowe adds a note " She is not bound, according to the Bible to carry out that Commandment because it might lead to immodesty " (Lowe : *Rashi on Genesis*, London, 1928, Pt. I. p. 42).

<sup>16</sup> The scriptures say : " *In the image of God He made the man* " and thereafter " *Be fruitful and multiply* " (Gen. I, 27 and 28).

<sup>17</sup> The Midrash speaks of a town in Palestine named *K'far Dichrin* the inhabitants of which counted double the number of the Hebrews who went out of Egypt. The "*K'far Dichrin*" means 'boy village', and was so called because the women therein gave birth to boys only. Any woman desiring to have male child moved into it ; and a woman desiring to have female children moved out of it (Lamentations R. II, 4).

tion, viz. (1) a minor girl, (2) a pregnant woman, and (3) a nursing woman. The reason is that a minor girl (between the ages of 11 years and one day and twelve years and one day) after conception may have labour at the child birth resulting in death of both herself and her child (Yeb 12b).

(2) The embryo of the pregnant woman, in the event of another conception may have to face the danger of superfoetation. Aristotle and Pliny both believed superfoetation to be possible ("Hist. Nat." VII, Ch. VI; "His. Anim." VII, Ch. V).

(3) In the case of a nursing woman, pregnancy was considered to have injurious effect upon the mother's milk which would affect the health of the child.

Sterility was considered a curse (Deut. 7, 14). The Talmud places the blind, the pauper, the leper, and the barren on a level with a dead person (Ned. 64b). We find Rachel saying to Jacob: "Give me children, or else I die." On her being blessed with a son she said "God hath taken away my reproach (Gen. XXX, 2-3). The Talmud records a Boraitha (an alien Mishnah) as remarking that, if a couple have lived together for ten years without any issue of marriage, the object of marriage being defeated, the husband ought to divorce his wife, unless the wife had an abortion, in which case the ten years are counted from that event (Ket. 77a).<sup>18</sup> In case the parties would not consent to a separation, the husband could take another wife in order to attain the object of marriage. Even so philosophic a person as Philo seems to favour a divorce in such a case, lest the gratification of the senses be deemed more desirable than progeny (Philo, *On Special Laws*: Vol. III, p. 312). This practice, however, soon fell into desuetude (*Eben Haezer* Ch. IV. 10.) An interesting legend is preserved in the Midrash to the Canticles. A man went from Zidon to Rabbi Simeon b. Johai (3rd Cent.) to request him to grant him a divorce from his wife on the ground that his ten years of conjugal life had brought him no offspring. It was not difficult for the

---

<sup>18</sup> Roper gives plato's views: "The period of child-bearing is to last for ten years; at the end of that period, if there are no children and the parents are free from censure, honourable divorce is to be conceded. (*Ancient Eugenics*, Oxford, 1913, p. 55.)



Rabbi to judge how impulsive the husband had shown himself. Yet he advised both the husband and the wife to feast together in commemoration of the event, thereby indicating that it was not improper to celebrate the severance of the marriage-knot in the same manner as the tying of it. In the midst of the joy and merriment of the banquet, the husband expressed a wish to the wife that she could take away with her, on returning to her paternal roof, anything from his house that she deemed valuable, provided she brought no obstacle in the way of divorce. The wife consented and after the banquet was concluded, she got her servants to carry away to her father's house her husband who had fallen into a deep slumber from excessive indulgence in drink. On awakening next morning the husband found himself, to his surprise, in the house of the man whose daughter he contemplated to divorce. He inquired the cause and was answered by his wife who said: "I have acted in no way against your expressed desire, but could I take anything more precious to me than yourself?" This true affection on the part of the wife touched the husband's heart. They both went to the Rabbi who, greeting them with a smile, prayed for them that the Lord might grant them an heir. The Rabbi's prayer was heard, and the loving couple was soon blessed with a male child (Cant. R. on chap. I. V. 4).

#### CONJUGAL INFIDELITY.

The Talmudists hold conjugal fidelity in the highest esteem, requiring it not of a woman alone, but expecting it from man also. The marriage tie which has a divine sanction (Malachi II, 4) constitutes the husband the faithful friend of his wife (Sotah 10a; Ket. 10a; Yoma 75a). Malachi (II, 14,16) rightly describes conjugal faithlessness as inviting the displeasure of God. The violation of the sacred bond of marriage, culminating in adultery, is strongly denounced as a punishable crime. The Rabbins condemn it so vehemently that they consider from a social view-point even the husband's disloyalty to his marriage vows as a crime. Hence they have ruled that the woman is legally entitled to demand a bill of divorce on proof of her husband's infidelity (*Eben Haezer*, § 154). Going a step further they decide that a man should sacrifice his

life rather than commit adultery (San. 75a). A person, bachelor or married, should never turn his mind to obscene thoughts (Nid. 20b ; Yoma 29a). It is a remarkable fact that among the Jews there has never been any institution such as that of the temple-prostitute. In the impure worship of antiquity, it was not uncommon for the gains of prostitution to be dedicated to a deity (Driver, *Deut. Int. Crit. Comm.* p. 265 ; cf. Deut. 23. 19).

Punishment for the unchastity and seduction for one of either sex is the same—death by strangulation (Levit. XX, 10 ; XVIII, 20, Deut. XXII, 22 Sanh. 52b). Several nations—the Arabian, Muhamedan, Babylonian, Celtic, Chinese, Christian, Greek, Hindu, Iranian, Malagasy, Roman, Slavonic, and the Teutonic punished the woman suspected of adultery by subjecting her to some kind of "Ordeal" (*vide Hastings Ency. of Religion and Ethics*, S. V. "Ordeal"). They deemed sexual infidelity a grave moral offence and a violation of the sanctity of the marriage tie. Under the Mosaic law, a woman suspected of incontinence was brought by her husband before a priest with an offering of flour. The priest, placed her before the Lord, and after pronouncing before her a curse (which he later on wrote down) and making her endorse it by responding *Amen, Amen*, he gave her to drink a potion made of dust from the floor of the Tabernacle, and holy water into which the written words of the curse were washed off. Thus she was obliged to undergo the severe 'Ordeal of the bitter waters' as detailed in Num. V, 11-31. If she were guilty the blight of the curse fell upon her ; if innocent she took no harm and could be fruitful. The procedure, detailed in Num. V came to be amplified by the Rabbins. The husband charged his wife at the local court (Sot. 2b). Two learned men were directed to escort the parties to the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. If the woman confessed at the higher tribunal, she was divorced from the husband (Sot. I, 5) ; if she denied, she was taken to the East Gate of the Temple in front of the Nicanor Gate, and the ceremony of the Ordeal was there performed. If the woman refused to undergo the ordeal and there was circumstantial evidence of criminalty, she was declared guilty and was ordered to be separated from the husband (Sot. III. 6, IV. 2.) Fear of the result often led to a confession

of guilt.<sup>19</sup> The Talmud remarks that the 'Ordeal' is the fate (Numb. V, 10 and 12) of the man who withholds his offerings and tithes (Ber. 63a). The chiefs of the Sanhedrin administered the bitter waters to female proselytes and to manumitted female slaves, though R. Akabiah ben Mahalael (1 and 2 Cent.) held the opposite opinion. In the view of the Talmudists the ordeal has a moral meaning (Eduyoth B. 6). R. Akiba (1st and 2nd Cent.) says: "Only when the husband himself is free from guilt, will the waters be an effective test of his wife's guilt or innocence; but if he has been ever guilty of illicit sexual intercourse, the waters will have no effect (Sot. 47b). The "Ordeal" soon fell into disuse. R. Johānnan ben Zakkai (1st Cent.) suspended it, because during the Roman invasion of Palestine the adulterers became very numerous (Sot. IX, 9; Sot. 47b). In doing so he made a pretty remark: "If a man be lewd, his wife will think of faithlessness against him" (Sot. 10a.)

---

<sup>19</sup> The Midrash records a curious legend. There happened to be two sisters (twins looking quite alike) married but living in two different cities. One of them suspected of adultery by her husband was to be subjected to the 'Ordeal of bitter waters' in the Temple. At the request of the suspected wife, the innocent sister took her place, drank the potion and was set free. While returning the innocent woman, meeting her sister, in her joy kissed her. The breath issuing from the bitter waters was sufficient to produce the same effect on the latter as if she had drunk the waters destined for the suspected woman, thus proving that "no evil subterfuge (Ecol. VIII 8) can save the crafty and wicked" (Tanhuma, Nasso 6).

# SOME POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA AND THE JĀTAKAS

(PART I.) \*

BY NARAYAN BAPUJI UTGIKAR, M.A.

The general nature of the non-epic portion of the Mahābhārata is well-known. This non-epic matter—this extraneous stuff—is not of one set pattern, but of diverse kinds. Here there are ancient myths of gods, of sages and Brahmins ; stories of ancient kings, many of whose names reach back to the Vedic period ; rules of polity, attributed to sages, whose works—if such there were—have evidently been otherwise lost ; philosophical dialogues ; ethical or moral maxims and a pretty full abundance of gnomic poetry. A large number of these stories are given as Purātana Itihāsas, or contain some ancient Gāthās or Ślokas round which they centre. And we have also seen that such “itihāsāḥ purātanāḥ ” and Gāthās are in greater abundance than one would be apt to concede first. Had the Mahābhārata, even after the inclusion of this all, and other material, stood apart as an accomplished entity—that is, without its having any relations to any other literary works, belonging approximately, or even quite roughly, to the same period, to which by general agreement the Mahābhārata itself belongs, say roughly 400 B.C. to 400 A.D. a period of 8 centuries,<sup>1</sup> we could have certainly proceeded to investigate

---

\* This article is the fifth of the series of seven lectures on ‘The Mahābhārata : its Origin and Development’ delivered by the writer at the University of Bombay under its Wilson Philological Lectureship Endowment during 1923-24. The present lecture was delivered on Thursday, December 20, 1923, and is being printed here with but a few verbal changes.

<sup>1</sup> Hopkins says : “The time of the whole Mahābhārata, generally speaking, may then be from 200—400 A.D.” (*The Great Epic of India*, p. 389). On pp. 307-8 he mentions the “approximate dates of the whole work in its different stages” as lying between 400 B.C. and 400 A.D., but says that there is no “date of the epic,” which will cover all its parts, though handbook-makers may safely assign it in general to the second century B.C. This last sounds a striking concession indeed ! Winternitz, (*Geschichte* I. p. 403) says : “The transformation of the Epos Mahābhārata into our present encyclopædia” was completed, probably gradually, between the 4th century B.C. and the 4th century A.D. Reference may also be made to the Prospectus to the Pant Pratinidhi Edition of the Mahābhārata, pp. 21 ff where I have dealt with this question in greater detail.

the origin of the work, as also of its different constituent parts. But fortunately, some of the stories contained in the Mahābhārata have been found to occur in some other works, for instance, the Buddhist works and notably the Jātakas, and also the Cariyāpīṭaka, while some stories have been referred to incidentally, for instance, in the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, a work which many scholars agree in assigning to 300 B.C.<sup>2</sup> The spirit, though not the exact form, of much of the moral and sententious philosophy to be found in the Mahābhārata, is the same as is to be observed in some of the other Buddhistic works, of which the Suttanipāta may be cited as a striking example. Then there is the whole body of the Purāṇas, some of which also contain many of the stories which are narrated in the Mahābhārata. And when such means of comparison are available, it is almost a sin to shut out light, howsoever faint and meagre it be, from the other sources for purposes of the elucidation of the various problems about the formation of our epic. As, however, it is not possible to deal here exhaustively with all such parallels, or even to allude to the numerous epic stories to be found outside that work, the best course would probably be to indicate in brief the broader points of contact, either by way of similarity or of divergence, between the Mahābhāratīc and the non-Mahābhāratīc versions of some of the more important common stories and legends.

Now many of such common stories occur (as remarked above) in the Jātakas. The Jātakas are a number of stories which narrate the previous births, as Bodhisattva, of the Buddha, and his actions in those births. Every Jātaka begins with the words: "At such and such a time (as for instance, when King Brahmadatta

---

<sup>2</sup> I am not unaware of the sharp difference of opinion existing among scholars regarding the date of this work. But when scholars like Sir R. G. Bhandarkar (*Proceedings of the First Oriental Conference, Presidential Address*, p. 25) and Winternitz (*Some Problems of Indian Literature*, p. 109) on the one hand, assign the work, respectively, to "the first or the second century A.D.", and "the third century A.D.," while others like Jacobi, on the other hand (*Sitzungsb. d.k. Preu. Aka. d. Wissen.*, 1911, p. 954: English tran. by N. B. Utgikar, *Indian Antiquary*, 1924, p. 129) emphatically regard the work as belonging to the time of Candragupta Maurya (accession cir. 320 B.C.) perhaps one may be allowed to speak of it by its traditional date.

was reigning at Benares or when Korabya Dhanañjaya ruled at Indrapatta) the Bhoddisattva was born, say, either as the son of the king or some noble or merchant or Brahmin, or even in the form of some animal, or of a super-human being, and thereafter the story is narrated as to what occurred then . . . . .”

The number of the Jātakas is about 550, and their contents are of the most diverse kind. The Jātakas are, to quote the words of Rhys Davids, who, more than any one else, was a pioneer in the revival of Buddhistic studies in modern times, “really a collection of the most popular folk-lore tales of all kinds, fables, fairy tales, riddles, puzzles, old-world legends, clever and witty judgments, instances of current superstitions, good humouredly laughed at, tales of magic, . . . . . stories of old mythology and so on.”

“It is the most complete, the most authentic, and the most ancient collection of folk-lore in the world.” Being so very ancient and of diverse contents, it is no wonder that some of the stories therein, have travelled through the folk-lore of most of the other nations. In form, they are partly in verses, known as Gāthās, and partly in prose, the latter predominating. The Jātakas are included in the Buddhist Canon, being a part of the Tripiṭaka, and included in the Khuddakanikāya, the collection of miscellaneous appendages. But only the verses of the Jātakas, and not their prose part, are to be regarded as belonging to the Buddhist canon proper. Investigations have established, beyond doubt, the fact that the prose portion of the Jātakas received its present form possibly in the 5th century A.D. Another interesting and important point about these Jātakas is that the scenes and incidents of some of the Jātakas, together with the names of the Jātakas themselves, were engraved in stone on the sculptures, the Stūpas, at Barahut and Sanchi, which, on epigraphical grounds, belong to the third or second century B.C. Twenty-eight of the Jātakas, which are thus illustrated by the bas-reliefs on the Barahut Stūpa have been identified, many of the present Jātaka-titles being there incised along with the scenes themselves; and the others have since been identified. A number of Jātaka stories and events are also depicted in the Ajanta frescoes of world-wide repute, but these sculptures belong to a comparatively modern period. Apart from these facts

however, the date of these Jātakas in general and of the social condition reflected therein, has been keenly disputed. While some scholars like Bühler and Davids would, generally speaking, assign them a high antiquity reaching back to nearly seven or eight hundred B.C., *i.e.*, even to the period before Buddha's birth, others, like Hopkins and Winternitz, are disposed to hold, that no good ground exists to assign them earlier than the third or the fourth century B.C.<sup>3</sup>

From these general remarks it will be seen that there is a very close resemblance between the compilations of the Jātakas and the Mahābhārata, apart from their sharing, in common, the uncertainty of the date of their composition. As the Mahābhārata has received in its corpus diverse sort of stories, myths and fables, woven round the epic kernel, so the Jātakas too, have brought round the loose *nexu*s of the personality of Buddha, the fiction, if one may say so, of the previous births of the Buddha, and similar other diverse material. And where the material happens to be common, the question naturally suggests itself whether one form is older than the other, and if no sufficient evidence is available for deciding the priority of the one to the other, the next question is whether both derive their materials from a preceding common source, working them up, changing, modifying or transforming or even twisting them later, as need be. This is what we have to see, if possible, on the basis of a portion of the material, common to the Mahābhārata and the Jātaka literature.

Of the stories in the Jātakas woven round the names of personages who also figure much in either of the two epics, *viz.*, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana, and have also served for giving the names of the Jātakas themselves, the following may be mentioned :—

- (1) The Kaṇhadīpāyana Jātaka *i.e.*, Kṛṣṇadvīpāyana Jātaka. Kṛṣṇa Dvīpāyana, as we all know, is the famous Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Mahābhārata itself : No. 444 in Fausboll's edition.

---

<sup>3</sup> For the Jātakas, see the account given by Winternitz (*Geschichte* II. pp. 89 ff., and p. 95 f. for the Jātakas on the Sanchi Stūpa).

- (2) The Ghaṭa Jātaka : No. 454, which relates to a part of the Kṛṣṇa story, and besides, contains an allusion to Kaṇhadīpāyana, and to the destruction of the Vṛṣṇi tribe.
- (3) The Sibi Jātaka : No. 499, containing a form of the story of Śibi Auśīnara, mentioned in the Mahābhārata.
- (4) The Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka : No. 545, the Vidhura-  
paṇḍita being none else than the wise Vidura of the Mahābhāratic fame.
- (5 & 6) The Alambusa and the Naḷinikā Jātakas : Nos. 523 and 526, containing the story of the sage Isisiṅga, *i.e.*, Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, the son of the sage Vibhāṇḍaka, whose story is mentioned in the Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata.
- (7) Dasaratha Jātaka : No. 461, which narrates a part, or more exactly, one incident only, in Rāma's life.
- (8) Setaketu Jātaka ; No. 377, Śvetaketu is the son of Uddālaka and his story has been mentioned in the Ādi and Vana parvans of the Mahābhārata.
- (9) Uddālaka Jātaka : No. 487, Uddālaka is the father of Śvetaketu as mentioned above.
- (10) Mahājanaka Jātaka : No. 539, Janaka being the father of Sitā, wife of Rāma.
- (11) Citta-Sambhūta Jātaka : No. 498, this story occurs, not in the Mahābhārata, but in the Harivaṁśa and the Purāṇas.
- (12) Nimi Jātaka : No. 541, Nimi being the king of Mithilā, in Videha.

Some of the stories contained in the Jātakas mentioned above have already been fully investigated. Thus the Kṛṣṇa story, reflected in the Ghaṭa and other Jātakas, was examined by Jacobi, Hardy and then by Lüders in very valuable essays.<sup>4</sup> Lüders has also subjected the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga story (occurring in Jātaka 523 and

---

<sup>4</sup> Hardy, *ZDMG.* 53, pp. 25-50 ; Lüders, *Ibid.*, Vol. 58, pp. 687-714 ; Jacobi (with reference to Jain sources), *ibid.* 42, pp. 493-529.



526) to a similar treatment,<sup>5</sup> and has come to the conclusion that the Jātakas preserve a more ancient form of the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga legend, because in the Buddhist story, it was the Princess Śāntā (and not the courtesans as stated in the Mahābhārata) that seduced and brought over the sage from the forest, this being as Lüders thinks the original trait of the story, corroborated by other pieces of evidence. In this, as in his other conclusions in the matter, embodied in his third contribution<sup>6</sup> in this direction, *viz.*, "Setaketu," one may or may not agree with that eminent *savant*, though his treatment of the whole subject is a masterly piece of erudition.

The present writer has in his own very humble way dealt with two others of these Jātaka stories, *viz.*, the Aṅḍī Māṇḍavya story<sup>7</sup> as found in the Kaṇhadīpāyana Jātaka mentioned above, and with a reconsideration of the story contained in the Dasaratha Jātaka.<sup>8</sup>

The purely linguistic parallelisms, *i.e.*, similarity of diction, phraseology, etc., between the Mahābhārata and the Buddhist Suttanipāta, have been ably and exhaustively pointed out by O. Franke.<sup>9</sup> Even of these and the remaining stories, we cannot here, by the very nature of the case, claim to do anything more than to indicate briefly some points in the two forms of only a few of the common stories. And we may begin with the story of Kaṇhadīpāyana.

Now from a perusal of the prose part of the Kaṇhadīpāyana Jātaka it will at once be apparent that it consists of two parts, which have nothing to do with each other. Thus while the former part deals with Dvīpāyana's rescuing the sage Aṅḍī-Māṇḍavya from the stake on which he is impaled by a king, the latter part of the story concerns itself with a miracle which Dīpāyana did in saving another of Māṇḍavya's sons from a serpent bite. The two parts are

<sup>5</sup> In Nachrichten d.k. Gesell. d. Wissen. zu Gottingen, 1897 and 1901.

<sup>6</sup> *Windisch Festschrift*, pp. 228-245.

<sup>7</sup> *Proceedings of the Second Oriental Conference*, Calcutta, 1922 pp. 221-238.

<sup>8</sup> In the Centenary Supplement to the Journal Royal Asiatic Society, 1924, pp. 203-211.

<sup>9</sup> *ZDMG*, Vols. 63, 64 and 66.

thus absolutely unconnected. This is all the more necessary to bear in mind, since the identity of the names of Dipāyana's two friends is likely to cause confusion, as the translators of the Kaṇhadīpāyana Jātaka have already warned. It will also be noted that the story, in so far as it concerns Kaṇha Dipāyana and Aṇi-Māṇḍavya, has no Gāthā to centre about, *i.e.*, none of the Gāthās in the Jātaka relate to Aṇi-Māṇḍavya or to Dipāyana's having anything to do with him. That part of the story might therefore as well not have been narrated at all. Now the miracle here attributed to Dvīpāyana, is restoring to life a boy, bit by serpent, by force of the merit that he might have earned by more than fifty years' Brahmacharya. He says :—

पुञ्जधिको अचरं ब्रह्मचरिभं ।  
वस्त्वानि पञ्चासं समाधिकानि ॥

This is what the first three Gāthās refer to, each of which ends with the refrain हतं विसं जीवतु यञ्जदत्तो । *i.e.*, may the poison be destroyed and Yaññadatta, that is the boy, revive. The name itself of Kaṇha Dipāyana, occurs first in Gāthā 4, where his friend asks him, as to why he has been leading the life of an ascetic. . . . . अकामो “unwillingly” as the translators translate. In the fifth Gāthā, Dipāyana gives out the reason of his unwilling Brahmachariya and ascetic life. He says that having once taken up that path, but now being discontented with it, were he to again become a house-holder, he would be laughed at by the world who would call him a fool. His words are :—

..... वाले बतायं ।  
एतस्स वादस्स जुगुच्छमानो ।  
अकामको चरामि ब्रह्मचरिभं ॥

May be, he continues, thus too he would make some merit. In the sixth Gāthā Dipāyana in his turn asks Māṇḍavya why he unwillingly fed Brāhmaṇas and Samaṇas. In the seventh Gāthā Māṇḍavya replies it was so, being the practice observed by his fore-fathers, (तं कुलवत्तं अनुवत्तमानो). Gāthā eight, now unexpectedly introduces us to quite a different subject. There have been upto now two persons, who against their will, (Akāmaka), in spite of themselves, have been doing something good. Māṇḍavya suddenly turns to

his wife, and confronts her with the question as to why she lived all her life as his wife, but without love, and without showing any sign of indifference to him.

.....अञ्जत्रकामा परिचारयन्ती ।

अथ केन वण्णेन (=कारणेन commentary) मया ते भोति ।

संवासधम्मो अहु एवरूपो ।

The wife, however, feels, undaunted by the suddenness of the question, and boldly replies that she did what she did, because it was not the custom in the family for "wedded wife to take a new mate" (as the translation puts it) and that she was afraid of popular censure, if she behaved otherwise.

आरादूरे न इद्ध कदाचि अत्थि ।

परंपरा नाम कुले इमस्मि ।

तं कुल्लवन्नं अनुवत्तमाना ।

अकामिका वद्ध चरामि तुषं ।

The wife, however, soon repents of her boldness, and says in the concluding, *i.e.*, the tenth Gāthā of the Jātaka, that the secret between them, having come out in an untoward manner, had better be buried for all future time for the sake of their dear child Yaññadatta, who, behold, had been in the meanwhile, brought back to life. There is a short conclusion in prose to the whole story which says that the three persons corrected their ways, and each thereafter followed his path not in a spirit of unwillingness, but with willing faith.

These are the Gāthās and the story of the Kaṇhadipāyana Jātaka. Their contents will at once make it clear that none of the traces mentioned in the Buddhistic story of the ways and character of the renowned sage Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana of the Mahābhārata fame, can be discovered in any Sanskrit version, either in the Mahābhārata itself or in the many Purāṇas. Kaṇhadipāyana's saving Aṅgī-Māṇḍavya from the stake, his saving a boy, bit by a serpent, from death, his unwilling ascetic life, are traits which are all found in another Buddhistic work, the Cariyāpīṭaka, (Nekhkhamaṇapāramitā, story XI) but they are all entirely unknown to the Sanskrit stories. Kṛṣṇa Dvīpāyana is, to the Sanskrit works, almost a mythic and deified sage.

This very sage is also mentioned at some other places in the Jātaka stories. Thus in the Ghaṭa-Jātaka referred to above, which treats of the Kṛṣṇa and Kaṁsa story, and of the former's killing the wrestlers Cāṇūra and Muṭṭhika, Kaṇhadīpāyana was consulted by the ten brothers, the bandit son of Devagabbhā, the sister of Kaṁsa, as to the surest means of capturing Dvāravatī *i.e.*, Dvārakā; and Kaṇhadīpāyana tells the way, which was, to lay hold of an ass that brayed at the sight of the enemy, and the braying was a sign for the city to be raised aloft in the sky and thus render it unassailable to attack. But the whole story is, as Lüders has shown, confused and inconsistent; and the reference to Kṛṣṇa Dvīpāyana occurs here in the prose part and not in any of the Gāthās. And we have seen above that the prose part of the Jātaka with the stories contained in it, is not to be regarded as being very reliable. The same is the case with the mention of this sage in the Tesakuna Jātaka (V.521; p. 114), where he is mentioned by the commentator. More important, however, is the next and last allusion to him (Sāmkicca Jātaka, 530; p. 267). Gāthā 29 says:—

कण्हदीपायनमासज्ज इसि अन्धकवेणहुयो ।

अञ्जञ्जं मुसले हत्वा संपत्ता यमसादनम् ॥

The Andhakaveṇhus, by assailing the Ṛṣi Kaṇhadīpāyana went to Yama's realm, mutually killing themselves by the mace (Musala). The Andhakaveṇhus have been differently interpreted to mean either the Andhaka tribe and the Vṛṣṇi tribe, or the Andhaka and the men of Viṣṇu (*i.e.*, Kṛṣṇa's) race. In any case the two tribes constitute the Yādava clan, and the Gāthā says that it was because the tribes assailed or insulted Kṛṣṇadvīpāyana, that they were cursed to die at each other's hands, or more correctly, through the instrumentality of the deadly Musala. Now, the destruction of the Vṛṣṇis, who were Kṛṣṇa's kinfolk, by this same means of a Musala, is well-known, and the story occurs in the Mausalaparvan of the Mahābhārata (Book XVI), in the Harivaṁśa and the Purāṇas. But the sage who is maltreated by the Vṛṣṇis on the occasion of a feasting and drinking picnic at Prabhāsa and through whose curse the Musala originates and destroys the tribe, is not Kṛṣṇadvīpāyana, as is stated to be the case in this Gāthā, but some other sages.

The Mahābhārata says, that the Vṛṣṇi Princes once insulted the sages Viśvāmitra, Kaṇva and Nārada, by taking before them Sām̄ba (the son of Kṛṣṇa) dressed as a pregnant woman and asking them whether the woman would deliver a son or daughter. The sages were angry and said that a Musala would be born to her, which would destroy the whole race of the Vṛṣṇis. Evidently therefore, the same central story of the destruction of the Vṛṣṇis by a Musala is preserved in the Buddhistic version but in a different form. In this particular case, *viz.*, about the Ṛṣi insulted by the Vṛṣṇi people, the Buddhist version is corroborated as we shall see later,<sup>10</sup> by evidence coming from two other different sources, *viz.*, the Jain literature and the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra; we may therefore reserve further comment till later on, when also the significance of this striking divergence and the conclusions to be drawn therefrom might be alluded to.

We may now proceed to see how one other story has been preserved in the Jātakas, and compare it with its epic form. This is the story of king Śibi, which, in its Buddhist form, is preserved in Jātaka 499, and also in the Cariyāpiṭaka. The story as given in the latter is substantially the same as in the Jātaka. The prose part of the Jātaka narrates that Sivikumāra was the son of Sivimahārāja ruling at Ariṭṭanagara in the Sivi country. The prince studied at Takkaṣilā (Takṣaśilā, the famous Taxila) and in course of time, became the king, giving off evil ways and living a very religious life. One day he desired that as he had given gifts in all ordinary or humanly possible forms of gift, there should be some extraordinary gift, given by him; and he exclaimed to himself that if any one begged his eyes of him, he would give them, unmoved:

योपि याचेय्य चख्खुं ददेयं अबिकम्पितो ।

With this thought in his mind he approached his Hall of Gift. Now Sakka, *i.e.*, Indra (Śakra) knew of this resolve of Sibi and assuming the form of a blind Brahmin (अन्ध ब्राह्मणो विय हुत्वा), came to the king. The king sent a messenger on an elephant to inquire what the blind man wanted. The Brahmin-Śakra said: 'I am

<sup>10</sup> This has been done in the next, *i.e.*, the sixth lecture, which will be published soon.

blind. You have two eyes'; and begging an eye, uttered the first Gāthā, saying that an eye should be given to him (the blind fellow) so that both of them (*i.e.*, he and the king) would be one-eyed persons (एकनेत्रा भविस्साम ।). A dialogue now ensues between the two. In the second Gāthā the king asks at whose instance the Brahmin had come to beg an eye of him, a thing difficult to be given (पुरिसेन दुच्चं ।). In the third Gāthā, the Brahmin says that he did so at the instance of Śakra, known as Sujampati in Heaven, and Maghavā on earth. The boon is granted in the words लभ चस्खूनि ब्राह्मण । in Gāthā 5. The next Gāthā says, the Brahmin would have now two eyes, instead of one. The next three Gāthās (7, 8, 9) contain the pleadings of the king's commander-in-chief, friends and citizens, against the rash action contemplated by the king, saying that instead of the eyes the king might give away anything he liked, wealth, jewels, furnished chariots, caparisoned elephants, etc. Gāthās 10, 11, 12 say that the king was firm in his resolve, because having once said that he would give, he shall give, since otherwise after death, a man becomes more wretched than a wretch (पापा पापतरो होति संपन्नो यमसादनं ।). In the next Gāthā (13) the king's ministers asked him with what object the king was bent on giving away his eyes, whether for long life or good birth, or happiness or strength, etc. The king replies (Gāthā 14) that he did so not through any motive, but simply because it was the old course of merit followed by the wise (सतां च धम्मो चरितो पुराणो ।). The Brahmin now says that the eyes be given to him and the attendant of the king, Sivaka by name (16th Gāthā) takes out the king's eyes and hands them over to the Brahmin. From this point the story takes a different turn. The king once ordered his chariot to be yoked and going to his pleasure gardens, was placed on the bank of a tank. Here the Sakka Sujampati, Indra, came again and showed himself (Gāthā 19), and saying who he is, asks the king to choose a boon. Śibi says that he has sufficient wealth, etc., and being blind, would fain die (अन्धस्स मे सतो दानि मरणं एव राञ्चति ।). Indra, evidently moved by pity, says that he would have his eyes back (Gāthā 22), and says that since whosoever begged of him, he never failed to give, by that truth (एतेन सञ्चवज्जेन), by the merit of that vow of his, one of his eyes would reappear. The second eye is called

on to reappear on the force of the merit in giving away his eyes to the blind Brahmin (Gāthās 24 and 25). By the favour of Indra, the eyes penetrate even mountains, and the king says delightedly that by giving human eyes he got divine eyes and the story ends with the king's exhorting his subjects to give similar gifts.

This is what the Jātaka story says of Śibi and his magnanimity. As has been already pointed out in a preceding lecture, the Mahābhārata tells Śibi's story, in more than one place (III, 130 f.; 197 XIII. 32) and elsewhere also it is referred to (I. 86 and 93 ; VII. 58). But in none of these places, do we have anything corresponding to the Jātaka story, the central point of which is the king's giving away his eyes to Indra in the form of a blind Brahmin, and the eyes being restored to the king after the lapse of some time, when as we may infer from his words, he had grown tired of a blind man's life and would fain die.

The differences in this form of the story and the Mahābhārata version, are clear enough. It is not Indra alone, clad as a blind person that comes to put to test Śibi's generosity, but Indra and Agni, in the form of a dove and falcon. It is not the eyes that are begged of him, but in the first instance, his right thigh, then the whole of the king's flesh, and then the king himself. The epic version in the two places of the Vanaparvan shows no subsequent change in the king's feeling, or any dissatisfaction with the state brought on himself by his own action, as is contained in the king's desire to be rid of life, as stated in the Jātaka. The version of the Śibi story preserved in the Anuśāsanaparvan is later than the two other versions. This conclusion follows first from the purpose or motive for which the story is told : Yudhiṣṭhira is represented as asking Bhīṣma the fruit or merit which accrues to a person who grants safety to a person seeking protection. Bhīṣma says that, by way of reply to this question of his, he would narrate the Pūrvavṛtta Itihāsa, *i.e.*, the ancient story of Śibi and the falcon and the dove. The Itihāsa, that is the story, either in a written or an oral form, is therefore, already implied. And secondly, the story is told with great poetic and imaginative details ; thus while the king is taking off lumps of flesh from his body a tumultuous cry of

wail bursts out from the ladies' quarters. The dove is also described by such epithets as

नवनीलोत्पलापीड चारुवर्ण सुदर्शन ।  
दाडीभाशोकपुष्पाक्ष.....

All such traits are absent from the earlier versions in the Vanaparvan. And lastly the presence of this Adhyāya in the northern edition becomes of a doubtful authority because of a foot-note attached to this Adhyāya, in the recent Kumbhakonam edition, which says that this Adhyāya is found only in the Northern edition, implying that it is not found in the Southern MSS consulted for that edition.

To sum up this part of our remarks, we may, therefore, say that in any case the Buddhistic version of the Śibi story is a different one from the epic version. And in this Śibi story, as also in the Kaṇhadīpāyana story referred to above, and in fact, in most of the stories common to the two sources, the question becomes, which of the two versions, whether the epic or the Buddhistic, may probably be regarded as being older or original of the two, it being evident that decisive evidence, one way or the other, is wanting with regard to both the sources.

It would indeed have been better if it was possible to see here how the story of another personage famous in the epic, viz., that of Vidura, has been preserved in the Buddhistic literature, more especially as this question remains yet to be fully examined. But our limits do not permit of this being done at any great length. His story is told at great length in Jātaka 545 which is called after his name Vidhura-Paṇḍita-Jātaka. It may, however, be stated that in the Jātakas his character as a sage adviser is frequently brought out, though the advice he proffers, is not, as in the Mahābhārata with reference to Dhṛtarāṣṭra, his half-brother, but to Korabhya Dhanañjaya, King of Indapatta in Kururattha. He is made also the latter's minister, and not of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. He is also represented as having once met in encounter with a Yakṣa by name Puṇṇaka, who manages to win Vidhura-Paṇḍita as the stake in a game of dice with Dhanañjaya Korabhya. This gambling scene is described in the above named Jātaka (Jātaka 545)



with great force and liveliness, and reminds one of the similarly forceful scene between Yudhiṣṭhira and Śakuni described with such vividness in the Sabhāparvan of the Mahābhārata. The incidents here referred to in connection with Vidura are known to the Mahābhārata, and the only common feature of the two stories is that Vidura is a very wise counsellor and minister connected with a Kuru king.

Besides these major resemblances, as evidenced by narratives of the common epic personages, there are numerous other points of similarity in language, thought and general atmosphere, between the epics and the Jātakas, some of which may be mentioned here.

(1) Thus Gāthā 2 of Jātaka 472 runs :

अदण्डियं दण्डयति दण्डियं च अदण्डियं ।  
अन्यो न विसिमं मग्गं न जानाति समासमं ॥

The first line of this Gāthā constantly occurs in the Mahābhārata (Vanaparvan and Śāntiparvan) and in the Manusmṛti in the form :

अदण्ड्यान्दण्डयन्राजा दण्डयं चैवाप्यदण्डयन् ।

(2) Jātaka 495 is called Daśa-Brahmaṇa-Jātaka and contains the ten essential qualities of a true Brahmin, narrated again by Vidhuara to Raja Yudhiṣṭhira, i.e., Yudhiṣṭhira, the eldest Pāṇḍava brother. The king expresses a desire to give a dinner to true Brahmins, but Vidura says :

दुल्लभा ब्राह्मणा देव सोलवंतो बहुरसुता ।  
विरता मेथुनाधम्मा ये ते भुञ्जेय्यु भोजनं ॥

The general drift of the dialogue that follows, is the same as the question of the essentials of true Brahminhood referred to above, and we may not go here into it at any great length.

(3) The subject of Jātaka 447, called the Mahādhammapāla-Jātaka is Brahmācārya and Dharma-themes, constantly dilated upon in the Vana, Udyoga and Śānti parvans, and other places in the Mahābhārata ; and the Jātaka has the same in Gāthās, beginning in the following manner :—

धम्मं चराम न मुसा भणाम ।  
पावानि कम्मनि विवज्जयाम ।

अनरियं परिवज्जेमु सञ्चं ।  
तस्माति अहं दहरा न मांयरे ।

again

धम्मो हवे रत्थस्सति धम्मचारि ।  
छत्तं महत्तं विय वस्स काले ॥

etc.,

etc.,

etc.

4. Jātaka 450 mentions Pañcaśikha, who is also mentioned in the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata ; but the Jātaka calls him the son of Gandhabba, and not in any way connected with the promulgation of the Sāṅkhya system of philosophy, as the epic docs.

5. Jātaka 459, called the Yuvañjaya Jātaka, is significant, because it contains a long tirade against Kāma or love. The same theme recurs in Jātaka 467 called the Kāma Jātaka, which is more interesting, because there is a strong marked resemblance in spirit and sometimes in words too, between many of the Gāthās of this Jātaka and the Gāthās, in which, as we saw before, in a previous lecture, Yuyāti expresses his disgust of Kāma. The Sanskrit Gāthās are :—

न जालु कामः कामानामुपभोगेन शाम्यति ।  
हविषा कृष्णवर्त्मैव भूय एवाभिवर्धते ॥  
यत्पृथिव्यां ब्रीहियवं हिरण्यं पशवः स्त्रियः ।  
एकस्यापि न पर्याप्तं तस्मात्तृष्णां परित्यजेत् ॥  
या दुस्त्यजा दुर्मतिभिर्या न जीर्यति जीर्यतः ।  
योऽसौ प्राणान्तिको रोगस्तां स्तृष्णां त्यजतः सुखं ॥

Ādiparvan. 85.12-14 (Bombay edition.)

The Kumbhakonum edition has, besides these, two other slokas. The first two of these Sanskrit Gāthās recur in many of the Purāṇas (Matsya, 33,10, 11 ; Vāyu 93, 95, 96 with many other similar ślokas, both Ānandāśrama Series ; Modavṛtta, Wai edition ; Viṣṇu, IV. 9.9 ff., as in Vāyu).

The Jātaka has

कामं कामयमानस्स तस्स चेतं समिच्छति ।  
ततो नं अपरे कामे घम्मे तण्हं व विन्दति ॥  
गवं वा सिद्धिणो सिद्धं वड्डमाणस्स वड्डति ।

भिय्यो तण्डा पिपासा च वड्डमाणस्स वड्डति ॥

पथव्या सालियवकं गवास्सं दासपोरिसं ।

दत्त्वा वानालं एकस्स इवि विध्वा समं चरे ॥

This last Gāthā, it will be noted, is the same as the Sanskrit śloka यत्पथिव्यां व्रीहियवं हिरण्यं परावः स्त्रियः । etc., quoted above.

The Buddhistic Gāthās are uttered by Bodhisattva to cure a king who had fallen ill. The king says in the 10th Gāthā

अट्ट ते भासिता गाथा सन्धा ह्येन्ति सहस्सियो ।

पतिगण्ह महावह्म साधे तं तव भासितम् ॥

“Thou hast spoken eight Gāthās : in all, they are a thousand : accept this gift, O great Brahmin : thou hast spoken well.” I am not quite sure whether these words cannot really be interpreted to mean that the Gāthās that precede this last Gāthā, viz., the 10th, are to be regarded as being quoted from a collection of Gāthās already existent. It is, therefore, quite possible that the source of the Buddhistic work may, in this case, be the Sanskrit epic. In any case the fact that these Gāthās bear a strong affinity to Yayāti's wail on the insatiable nature of passion, would be readily seen.

5. Jātaka 477 mentions two sages well-known in Brahmanic mythology, viz., Kāśyapa and Nārada. The former we have already found mentioned in the Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata. Nārada is also a sage mentioned, besides our epic, in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa he is mentioned along with another sage Parvata, and it is interesting to note that this pair of sages is mentioned in close association in the last Jātaka of our collection, No. 547, called the Vessantarāja Jātaka.

It is evident, therefore, that the Buddhistic works were taking over famous personages from Indian mythology, and engrafting them in their system, and utilising them in their moral disquisitions, and generally employing them to suit their, i.e., the Buddhistic, purposes. This view may also solve to some extent at least the divergences of many of the stories referred to above, as will also be made clearer in the next lecture.

6. Another Jātaka, No. 544, is named after two of the sages mentioned above, and is called Mahā Nārada-Kassapa-Jātaka,

where the king Aringati asks Nārada among other things, to teach him the sacred test and its meaning ; and also the path of purity. Then the great being who is none else than Nārada told him the path of purity by describing by way of examples, various former kings who had followed righteousness :

यथा आहू धतरङ्गो वेसामित्तो च अट्टको ।

यामतग्गी.....उशीनरो चापी सिबी च राजा ।

.....परिवारका समणब्राह्मणानां ।

एते चाब्बे च राजानो य सक्कविसयं गता ।

अधम्मं परिवज्जेत्वा धम्मं चर महीपति ॥

Most of the kings named here, are figures famous in the epics. Thus Dhatarattho is Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the blind king of the Kurus. Viśvāmitra is the king of the Gadhis who attained to Brahminhood—the rival of Vasiṣṭha ; and his story goes back to Vedic times. Aṭṭhako, Aṣṭaka, is one of the descendants of Puru, and figures largely in the latter half of the Yayāti episode. Yāmataggi, Jamadagni is a well-known sage ; perhaps if Jāmadagnya be meant, he is Paraśurāma. Śibi is well-known. Then there is another interesting fact about this list of kings. They, along with other kings, are spoken of as having gone to the world of Indra by their righteous deeds, which the king in the story of the Jātaka is exhorted to follow. The list is similar to lists, occurring more than once in the Mahābhārata, of sixteen ancient kings who left behind them a great name. One section in the epic is called Ṣoḍaśarājīya,<sup>11</sup> and it purports to give a sort of life of each of these sixteen kings. The history, if it can be so called, of the kings is, however, narrated for quite a different purpose, viz., to console Yudhiṣṭhira and Dhṛtarāṣṭra, on the loss of their respective sons, by citing the instances of those ancient kings, who, howsoever glorious, had one day to die.

7. Another such list occurs in Jātaka 541, called the Nimi-Jātaka where it is said that (Gāthā 2) the question that rises in the

<sup>11</sup> Droṇaparvan, Adhyāyas 55-70 ; the names of the ' sixteen kings ' occur in Śāntiparvan, Adh. 28, and of ' twenty-four kings ' in Ādiparvan, Adh. 1.

mind of Nimi, the king of Mithilā, is, which of the two gives greater merit whether Dāna or Brahmācārya :—

दानं वा ब्रह्मचरियं वा कतमं सुमहत्फलं ।

The question is almost the same, as we saw before, as the conversation between the Ajagara-Nahūṣa and Yudhiṣṭhira, on which of the two is better : whether Dāna or Satya<sup>12</sup>

दानान्द्रा सर्प सत्याद्वा किमतो गुरु दृश्यते ।

The list mentions kings who were unable to get beyond the domain of sense by giving great gifts

दुर्दीपो सागरो सेले मुचल्लिदो भगीरसो ।

उसीनरो अट्टको च अस्सको पुथुज्जो ।

and then follows a list of ascetics (tapassino) who went by force of Brahmācārya to the Brahmāloka.

8. A Gāthā, No. 14 of Jātaka 539, called the Mahā-Janaka-Jātaka, contains the Buddhistic version of the śloka which, in a slightly different form, Duryodhana ascribes in the Mahābhārata to Mātanga : उचच्छेदेव न ग्लायेदुद्यमो ह्येव पौरुषम् । 'Ever be striving : despair not : work alone is manliness.' The Buddhistic version is आसिसेधेव पुरिसो न निब्बिन्देय पण्डितो । : A man should ever hope for the best ; a wise man should never feel dejected.

This Jātaka also contains the famous stanza (Gāthā 125), attributed to Janaka and found in that connection in the Mahābhārata<sup>13</sup> also, regarding the burning of Mithilā :

सुसुखं वत्त जीवाम येसं नो नत्थि किञ्चनं ।

मिथिलाय उत्तमानाय न मे किञ्चि अदृष्टत ॥

The Sanskrit form is :—

अनन्तं वत्त मे वित्तं यस्य मे नास्ति किञ्चन ।

मिथिलायां प्रदीप्तायां न मे दृष्टति किञ्चन ॥

9. A reference to two more Jātakas only, must bring this our part to a close. The Ādiccupaṭṭhāna Jātaka (175, Vol. II) contains the story of a monkey, who in order to gain some food that

<sup>12</sup> Mahābhārata, III. 180. 3.

<sup>13</sup> Mahābhārata, XII. 17-19.

was to be served to the Brahmin ascetics, worshipped, in imitation of the latter, the sun ; and in that connection a Gāthā is quoted, which in its Sanskrit form is so far not traced to any of the epics ; but which as Sir R. G. Bhandarkar,<sup>14</sup> showed, exists in a Sanskrit version in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. Here, to show the difference between the Parasmaipada and the Ātmanepada use of the root *sthā* with *upa*, Patañjali quotes a line एतदप्यस्य कापेयं यदादित्यमुपतिष्ठति। which strikingly corresponds to the last Pāda of the Buddhist Gāthā :—

सन्धेसु क्रिर भूतेसु सन्ति सीलसमाहिता ।

एस साखामिगं जम्मं आदिच्च उपतिष्ठति ॥

10. Jātaka 536 (Kuṇāla Jātaka) has a Gāthā in which it is said that, though married to the five Pāṇḍava brothers, Kaṇhā, *i.e.*, Draupadī had a love intrigue with a sixth person, who was a hump-backed dwarf :

अथञ्जनो नकुलो भीमसेनो ।

युधिष्ठिलो सहदेवो च राजा ॥

एते पती पञ्चमतिच्च नारी ।

अकासि खुज्जवामनेन पापं ॥

The parentage of Draupadī is also given in quite a different manner in the commentary (p. 427). The king of Kāśī attacked the king of Kosala, defeated him and carried away his wife, who was pregnant. Still he married her, and they had the daughter named Kaṇhā. The subsequent story tells rather in an indecent manner how she fell in love with the five Pāṇḍava brothers all at once, and still how she sinned with the hump-backed cripple, and how on an occasion, when she was ill and the five husbands and the cripple were all attending by her bedside, the secret leaked out, and the brothers lost their love for their wife, and turned to ascetic life.

This story can be regarded in no other light except of a slandering perversity. We shall have to investigate in the next

<sup>14</sup> Transactions of the 9th International Congress of Orientalists, London, 1892, Vol. 1, pp. 421 ff., with reference to Patañjali under Pāṇini, I.3.25.

lecture the motives underlying the Buddhistic version of this and those of the other stories we have so far dealt with.

The List of Jātakas referred to in the above is the following :—

- |                            |                                  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 Alambusa, No. 523.       | 13 Nimi, No. 541.                |
| 2 Ādiccupatthāna, No. 175. | 14 Bilārikosiya, No. 450.        |
| 3 Uddālaka, No. 487.       | 15 Mahājanaka, No. 539.          |
| 4 Kaṇhadīpāyana, No. 444.  | 16 Mahādhammapāla, No. 447.      |
| 5 Kuṇāla, No. 536.         | 17 Mahā-Nārada-Kassapa, No. 544. |
| 6 Ghata, No. 454.          | 18 Mahāpaduma, No. 472.          |
| 7 Citta-Sambhūta, No. 408. | 19 Yuvañjaya, No. 460.           |
| 8 Culla Nārada, No. 477.   | 20 Vidhura-Paṇḍita, No. 545.     |
| 9 Tesakūṇa, No. 521.       | 21 Vessantara, No. 547.          |
| 10 Dasabrāhmaṇa, No. 495.  | 22 Saṅkiccha, No. 530.           |
| 11 Dasaratha, No. 461.     | 23 Sivi, No. 400.                |
| 12 Naḥinikā, No. 526.      | 24 Setaketu, No. 377.            |

PERSIAN MSS. BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT  
COLLECTION NOW DEPOSITED IN THE LIBRARY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BOMBAY

BY PROF. SHAIKH 'ABDUL KADIR SURFRĀZ.

(DECCAN COLLEGE, POONA.)

THE importance of a good collection of MSS. for purposes of critical study and research, especially in Oriental learning, cannot be over-estimated. The large and rich collections of oriental MSS. preserved in European Libraries have amply justified the labour and money bestowed on them by their collectors. Every Orientalist knows what incalculable help they have rendered in the furtherance of Oriental Scholarship in the West. India has ever been a veritable nursery of these rich flowers of Oriental learning—Hindu as well as Moslem. The great Libraries of the Emperors of Delhi, the Sultāns of Gujarāt and Mysore, the Ādilshāhs of Bījāpūr, the Nawābs of Oudh and the numerous members of the Nobility and the Clergy scattered through the length and breadth of the Country, bear ample testimony to the fact that ancient India was very rich in Arabic and Persian MSS.

With the change in the political Government of the Country, these MSS. also seem to have changed hands ; for a good many of them have gone to stay in Europe, the home of the conquerors, where they have, by their presence, greatly stimulated Western scholarship in Oriental learning. The monumental *Annals* of Ṭabari (once given up for lost, but on being discovered in India, were printed in twenty-three volumes in Holland), the charming *Chahār Maqāla* (of which, until a few years ago, only three manuscripts, all defective, were known to exist, two in England, whither they had travelled from India, and one in Constantinople, and of which the fourth and the only complete manuscript yet known was discovered by me some years ago), the *Lubāb*, the oldest extant biography of Persian Poets, the *Bāburnāma*, etc., could not have seen the light of the day, if their manuscripts had not been preserved in and supplied by India.



While it is true that a very large number of MSS. have left India, it is equally true that quite a large number have preferred to stay at home. Of the latter, the more fortunate ones have found shelter in the Libraries of H. E. H. The Nizām of Hyderabad, H. H. The Nawāb of Rāmpur, H. H. The Begam of Bhopāl, the late Khān Bahādur Moulawī Khodābakhsh Khān of Patna, the Bengal Asiatic Society of Calcutta, the Nadwat-ul-Ulamā of Lucknow, and elsewhere; but the unfortunate ones,—and there is a very large number of them—are still lying in their dungeons eagerly awaiting the hand of the rescuer. Those MSS. which Western tourists and travellers fail to entice away, but which are won over by their Indian suitors, are being gradually rescued and comfortably lodged in new homes, which are mostly outside the Bombay Presidency. This Presidency is far behind others in the matter of search for and acquisition of Arabic and Persian MSS., and the consequent encouragement of Moslem learning dependent on them. The attention of Government was drawn to the fact in 1917, when I formulated a scheme and submitted it for their acceptance. It was mainly through the sympathetic and large-hearted support of Mr. J. G. Covernton, I.E.S. (then Director of Public Instruction), and Mr. C. N. Seddon, I.C.S. (then Commissioner, C. D., and President, Civil and Military Examinations Committee), that the Scheme was accepted by Government, and I was able to make a short tour and collect for them one hundred and fourteen manuscripts. Some of them are in Arabic and old Urdu (Dakhnī) languages and the rest in Persian. Classified according to subjects they extend over a pretty wide range: History, Biography, Prose, Poetry, Sufism, Prosody, Mathematics, Astronomy, Falconry, Archery, Translations from Sanskrit, Logic, Metaphysics, etc.

The majority of these MSS. appear to be unpublished and several of them do not exist even in the Bodleian Library, the British Museum, the India Office, the Cambridge University or the Bengal Asiatic Society's Library. When a descriptive catalogue of these MSS. comes to be prepared, each of them will be described in detail. For the present I must content myself with noticing a few MSS. out of those which appear to me to be really interesting and rare.

**No. 1.**—This is a composite manuscript containing nine separate

short treatises on Persian Prosody, Rhyme, and Figures of Speech. Of these, four are unpublished, two are older than those in the British Museum, one does not appear to exist either in the British Museum, or the Bodleian; another is neither in the India Office, the Bengal Asiatic Society's Library, nor in the Cambridge University Library. One of these nine treatises, viz., No. 7, is specially interesting. It contains the Ornate Qaṣīda by Qiwāmī Muṭarrizī, brother of the celebrated poet Nizāmī of Ganjah which illustrates almost all the Figures of Speech generally used in Persian poetry and which is edited and translated with explanatory notes by the late lamented Professor E. G. Browne of Cambridge. Couplets 53-62 contain a riddle (*luḡhaz*), concerning which he says "these riddles are generally very obscure, and I regret to say that of the one here given I do not know the answer." This MS. gives the answer, which is to the effect that the riddle is on Love (p. 3 of this treatise, last line). A detailed note on this Qaṣīda is published by me in the JBBRAS, for Nov. 1925.

**No. 2 (Vol. 17).**

This is a very rare and unpublished astronomical and astrological work entitled (اشجار و اثمار) 'Trees and Fruits,' by علي شاه بن محمد بن قاسم الخوارزمي known as علاء المنجم البخاري

No copy appears to exist either in the British Museum, the Bodleian, the India Office, the Cambridge University or the Bengal Asiatic Society.

It is mentioned in the *Kashf-uz-Zunūn* as follows:—

اشجار و الاثمار في الاحكام، فارسي لعلي شاه محمد بن قاسم الخوارزمي المعروف بالعلي البخاري المنجم الفه لشمس الدين خواجہ محمد، اوله حمد و ثنا آفرید گاري رالغ.

In the introduction, the author says that the minister شمس الدين والدنيا محمد بن صدر السعيد سيف الدين احمد شاه بن صدر السعيد بدر الدين مبارك شاه was very kind to him, that his two sons, سيف الدين احمد شاه and بدر الدين مبارك شاه

being desirous of studying Astrology had requested him to compose a book containing all useful information regarding the science, and that he, though old and infirm, complied with their request. The date of composition is not given in the preface, and there is no colophon at the end. There are, however, several passages in the book itself, which supply us with interesting biographical details. From them we learn not only some particulars of his family, early life, study, acquirements, vicissitudes of fortune, etc., but we can deduce the dates of his birth and of the composition of the book as well. We learn that he was the author of a *dīwān* and of an astronomical work entitled “*Zīch-e-Umdah*” (زیچ عمده), that on the morning of the 27th Ramazān of the year 662 A.H. (1264 A.C.), there appeared a Comet which he had seen, and which foreboded evil to the countries over which it passed, viz., Tibet, Turkistān, Khotan, Kāshghar, Farghāna, Transoxania and Khorāsān, that its duration was 85 days; that in its train followed pestilence, plague, plunder and pillage, culminating in fights and battles and deaths of Kings and Princes, that in 666 A.H. (1267-68) there occurred a conjunction of the two inauspicious planets in the sign of the Cancer, which aggravated the misery of the people, that Burāq raided and plundered Khorāsān, but was subsequently defeated by Abāqā and that afterwards he died in Transoxania; that Naishāpūr suffered from a severe shock of earthquake, which continued to be felt throughout Khorāsān for seven years, and in consequence of which the very bricks of the city shook and separated from one another, and black water came out of the soil; that the modern city was founded a league further from the old site; that in 671 A.H. (1272-73) Abāqā's Army entered Bokhārā and a general massacre of old and young took place, and that the surviving inhabitants were exiled to Khorāsān.

He continues:

چون خلائق بسیار بودند در ضبطنمی توانستند آوزد بیشتری از مردم بگریخت و باز گشت، و دیگر بار بخارا خوش شد و انبوه، اما آنچه از جیحون بگذرانیده بودند بچگان و جوانان را بفر و خنند و باقی را گرسنه و برهنه سر بزمین ایران دادند و ازینست که

از در خطا تا بخارا خلیق را در ولایت های ایران هم بخاری می خوانند، اما بعد از آن غارت بزرگ چون مردم جمع شدند در بخارا سیزده کورت دیگر غارت کردند تا چنان شد که دروی جز وحوش نمی باشید، و قصیده گفته ام این هم حالات زار ذکر غارت و اسیر شدن فرزند خود کرده چون او را بعد از دو سال در سیاه کوه خریدم که اسیر شده بود بسر روضه مقدسه امیرالمومنین و امام المتقین علی ابن طالب بردم و قصیده دیگر در مدح ایشان گفتم، و بر سر تربت بخواندم شب آدینه که اصحاب بغداد حاضر بودند و هر دو قصیده در دیوان اشعار بنده ثبت است و ذکر اسیر و غارت شدن این پسر در دیده چه زیچ عمده که ساخته ام رفته است، و ما که در این اقلیم افتاده ایم و سرگردان مانده سبب این است و پانزده سال از واقع غارت بخارا گذشته است هنوز جمع نمی آئیم و آرام نمی گیریم بگوشه و هر روزی و هر لحظه چیزی بتن و دل میرسد که سبب هزار غم و اندیشه میشود، و تمنای مرگ میبریم و در تدبیر کار خود عاجز مانده،

نظم

چيست تدبیر که تدبیر بدست کس نیست  
 اللهم احفظنا من هذه الشدا ئد و البلاء یا  
 آمین رب العالمین

In the Section dealing with conjunctions (قرانات) after mentioning the conjunctions of the years 623 (1226), 684 (1285-86) he refers to the historic assemblage of the planets in the mansion of the Libra, which took place in the days of Anwarī, and adds that judging from subsequent events, especially, the irruption of the the Moghul hordes and consequent bloodshed, it appears that the forecast of Anwarī referred rather to a 'storm of blood' (طوفان خون) than to a 'storm of wind' (طوفان باد) and that Changizkhān appears to have been born under this historic conjunction.

Towards the end of the work, while interpreting his own

horoscope he gives further particulars of his own life, amongst which he mentions his journey from Bokhārā to Turkistān to see his father, who had gone thither as a merchant, his arrival at Samarcand and his meeting a certain Shaikh Ḥusāmuddīn, from whom he learns the art of wrestling and the use of the bow and the arrow, the sword, the shield, and the spear; his coming to Shāgh, on the frontier of Turkistān, where he waits on Shaikh Bābā Majīn, who was 320 years old and who had a son, ‘Abdullāh, six months old from an Indian “kanīzak”, and another son of 19 years, Muḥammad by name. He refers to his own proficiency in Poetry and Music, which earns him respect and esteem, wherever he goes, and which enables him to enjoy the company of kings and great men; to his coming in contact with a celebrated Ḥakīm (بدیع الیمن) who induces him to study Mathematics, which later on develops into a study of Astronomy and Astrology; and to his return to Bokhārā in 659 A.H. (1261).

It was in this year, he tells us, that the Shaikh died, when his own age was 36. From this statement we can infer that he was born about 623 A.H. (1226). A few lines further he says:—

چون بعراق رسید بنده و زحل بطالع در آمد آن فرزند در  
سیاه کوه حاصل گشت، بسعی اکابر و روزگار و از آن تاریخ چند آنکه  
جهد می کند بنده تا بسفر حجاز رود یا در گوشه نشیند که استغفار  
کرده و گفته خود کند دور زمان بدست نمی دهد و درین وقت  
سال عمر بشصت چهار رسیده است

It follows therefore that the date of the composition of the book is about 686 or 687 A.H. (1287-88), i.e., about 15 years after the invasion of Bokhārā by Abāqā’s army in 671 A.H. (1272-73) as stated above.

The book is divided into 5 parts called trees:—

شجره اول در صفات و منسوبات بروج و کواکب (۷ شعبات)  
شجره دوم در احکام قرانات و اتصالات (۱۲ شعبات)، شجره ثالث  
در احکام طالع تحویل سال و فصول و احوال نیکی و بدی سال

عالم ( ۶ شعبات ) شجرهٔ رابع در احکام طالعهای مولود ( ۱۷ شعبات )  
شجرهٔ پنجم در احکام اعمال تسیرات ( ۵ شعبات )

**No. 3 (Vol. 32).**

This is a commentary on Abū Ja'far Taḥāwī's (843-933 A.C.) celebrated work on Ḥanafite jurisprudence entitled 'Mukhtaṣar'. This copy is especially interesting, because it once belonged to the royal library of the 'Ādilshāhs of Bījāpūr. The flyleaf bears a round seal of Sulṭān Muḥammad Ghāzī, who died in 1067 (1656) and lies buried in the famous 'Gol or Bol Gumbaz' one of the wonders of the World. The *Saj'* of the seal reads as follows:—

دارد از لطف حق سرافرازی شاه سلطان محمد غازی

Below the seal is the following remark:—

شرح مذکور بتاریخ شهر رمضان المبارک داخل کتابخانه  
عامره شده بابت قاضی خوشحال فی سنه اربع و خمسين بعد  
الالف

From this it is clear that it was included in the royal library in 1054 (1644).

**No. 4 (Vol. 41).**

This MS. also is specially interesting for it is the *autograph copy* of an unpublished Persian allegorical poem entitled *حسن و دل* by Muhammad Dā'ūd Elchī(?) (محمد داود الیحی), who says, in the section headed, *در سبب نظم کتاب* :—

بسی هست منظوم افسانها	بلطف عبارت چو در داناها
زهر نکتہ سنجی در اطوار عشق	بطرزی که بنماید آثار عشق
دلی ایلیچی با پریشان دلی	سری پرز سودای بے حاصلی
بری از تکلف بطرز غریب	ادا میکند قصه بس عجیب

Towards the end he observes:—

بگو حمد لله که این گفت و گو	بسرحد اتمام آوردن رو
دل و حسن گشتند از عشق شاد	گرفتند از هم کمال مراد
نتایج از ایشان بے حاصلست	شنا سد کسی کو بحق واصلست

یکی زان فتایح بود این کذاب که حسن دلش نام شد از صواب  
 ز اجر نبی زکی در شمار گذشته هزارست و پنجاه و چار  
 که ترکیب این نظم ترتیب دید نکو داستانی بآخر رسید

The Poem ends with the following couplets:—

قلم رفته رفته باینجا رسید ز سر گشتگیهای خود آرزو مید  
 درود نبی گشت آخر کلام علیه الصلوة و علیه السلام

After this is the colophon which runs as follows:—

بتاریخ ۲۶ شعبان المعظم سنه ۱۰۵۴ هـ از قلم شکسته رقم ناظم  
 این کتاب که عررسی ست در مشکین نقاب یوم الاحد زیور تحریر یافت  
 العبد محمد داود ایلحی غفر الله ذنبه تم بالخیر والسعادة

The date of the composition and transcription of the MS. is 1054/1644.

#### No. 5 (Vol. 43).

This is another very interesting MS. It is a *Tazkirah* (Memoirs) of *Rekhta* Poets of Gujrāt, written in Persian by Qāzī Nūruddīn b. Qāzī Sayyed Ahmad Husain Razawī, "Fā'iq". As far as I am aware, it is not yet published, and I do not find it amongst the *Tazkirahs* of *Rekhta* poets mentioned by Sprenger.

Besides, the MS. is an Autograph copy finished at Broach in 1270 A.H. (1853-54) as stated in the colophon, which runs as follows:—

تمت هذا تذكرة تاريخ شانزدهم شوال المكرم روز جمعه سنه  
 هزار و دو صد و هفتاد من هجرة المبارک در بندر بروچ با تمام  
 رسید کاتب و مولف و مالک هذا یکی است

The composition of the *Tazkirah* was finished in 1268/1851-52, as proved by the Chronograms which precede the colophon. It was submitted for correction to the great Delhi poet Mirzā Ghālib, whose opinion is copied on the margin of the last page of the *Tazkirah*. It runs as follows:—

عبارتی که جناب مرزا اسدالله خان صاحب بعد مطالعه این  
 اوراق و اصلاح آن تحریر فرمود برای یادگار تحریر نمود

مخدوم مکرم حضرت قاضی محمد نورالدین حسین خان بہادر کی خدمت میں عرض ہے کہ برخوردار مرزا شہاب الدین خان بہادر نے یہ اجزا مجکو دیئے، نظم سے میں نے بالکل قطع نظر کی، کامل صاحب کی نثر جو آغاز میں ہے اسکو بھی نہیں دیکھا صرف آپ کی نثر کو دیکھا اور اسکو موافق حکم آپ کے بعض جا درست کر دیا، بعض موقع پر منشاء اصلاح بھی لکھ دیا ہے، مجکو یہ پایہ نہیں کہ آپ کی نثر میں دخل کروں، بفقوای الامر فوق الادب حکم بجا لایا ہوں مرحبا آفرین بخدا خوب نثر لکھی ہے، اللہ سبحانہ آپکو مدارج اعلیٰ کو پہنچا دے اور سلامت رکھے

مرقومہ در شنبہ جولائی سنہ ۱۸۶۲ عیسوی

خوشنودی احباب کا طالب

غالب

The *Tazkirah* opens with a prose preface in Persian, by "Kāmil" who showers praises on it. It is followed by the author's introduction in which he says that he compiled the Memoirs of the Poets of Gujrāt, at the request of his friends, Mir 'Abbās 'Alī Shāh and Mir Haidar Shāh "Mā'il", and called it *مخزن الشعراء*. It contains notices of nearly 107 poets, including a poetess, Hījāb, written in Persian, arranged alphabetically, and giving very brief particulars of their lives. These are followed by extracts from their verses. The author mentions himself under "Fā'iq". The *Tazkirah* is followed by a Persian *Mathnawī* entitled *مرآت الحسن* (Mirror of Beauty), describing the beauty of the whole body, cap-apie ( سراپا ), by Niẓāmuddīn Khān "Fā'iq". It is followed by another Persian *Mathnawī* on the same subject by Mihri, a Persian poetess brought up and patronized by Nūrjahān Begam (the Queen of Jahāngīr) and afterwards married to Ḥakīm Khwāja Maḥram 'Alī.

No. 6 (Vol. 50).

This unique manuscript of *Dīwān-e-Zuhūrī* was presented to this collection by Mr. Baqir 'Alī then Secretary, Urdu Text and



Translation Board, Poona, and now Deputy Educational Inspector for Urdu Schools, C. D., Poona.

The value of this MS. lies in the facts that it contains several couplets written in the handwriting of the famous poet Zuhūrī himself, who flourished at the Court of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm 'Ādilshāh' of Bijāpūr, and that the whole of the Dīwān has been revised by him. On the flyleaf there is a remark which runs as follows.—

دیوان افضل الشعراء حضرت مولانا ظہوری علیہ الرحمہ  
والمغفرة و جا بجا خط شریف ایشان است و از اول تا باخر بنظر  
مبارک فیض اثر ایشان گذشتہ

It bears the seal of a former owner, viz.

ز ستم خانہ زاد بادشاہ محمد عالمگیر

which bears the date 1108 (1696-97).

This copy is older than any in the British Museum. It is certainly more correct and more full than the text printed by Naval-kishor in 1897. The latter does not contain the quatrains (rubā'iyāt) at all; but this copy contains a large number of them. Besides, the odes in the printed edition are arranged in alphabetical order, while in this MS. they are not so arranged.

#### No. 7 (Vol. 53).

A splendid MS. of گوی و چوگان an unpublished poem by محمود عازفی. It is an allegorical poem, in which the "ball" and the "bat" typify mystic love, the images being taken from the game of Chaugān. The author, a celebrated poet of his day, sometimes called سلمان ثانی, lived in Herāt, where he died in 853 (1449). He wrote the poem within the short space of two weeks, when he was above fifty; and as a reward he received a horse and a thousand dinars.

This MS. is a fine specimen of Persian calligraphy. It is written on good thick paper in elegant Nasta'liq inscribed within gold ruled borders. Each page has a different shading of colour and is sprinkled with "zarafshān". There are four beautiful coloured

paintings. The number of couplets is 436, which indicates that probably five or six pages are wanting in this copy ; for the Bankipore copy has 495 verses, and the catalogue contains the following remark :—" According to some the poem consists of 510 and according to others 505 verses ".

On the back of the first page of our MS. there is an undated signature in English which reads as "Sidney I. Churchill, Tehrān," probably the name of one of its former owners. There are two dates of "Arz-dākhils," viz., 1105 (1694) and 1127 (1715). Moreover, there is a remark in Persian in which mention is made of the title, the size of the volume, the kind of paper used, the margins and borders of pages, and the variety of binding, etc. It runs as follows :—

گوی و چوگان قطع وسط کاغذ می افشان حاشیه دونت  
آبادی چسیانیده الوان افشان مسجدول مذهب مصور جلد  
ساغری مشکي کذب و ترنج دار طلاپوش از باب پيشکش محمد جان  
حاکم کهدم مسجد بتاریخ ۱۸ شهر ربیع الثاني سنه ۱۱۰۵ داخل  
عرض شد

**No. 8 (Vol. 114).**

This is a composite MS. comprising three treatises, viz., (1) by تشریح الافلاک (2) علي قوشجي by رساله در هیئت ابوالقاسم سمرقندی by تحفة الاستاد (3) and بهاءالدین آملي  
The first is an astronomical manual which first gives preliminaries of geometry and physics, and then deals with the heavenly bodies, the figure of the globe, the climes, relative distances, and sizes of the planets, etc. The illustrations are wanting here ; spaces for figures, diagrams, etc., are left blank. The second treatise is in Arabic by Bahū'uddīn Āmulī. It also is astronomical and is followed by a short Persian treatise which gives directions for determining the "qiblah" (قبله), the point towards which Muslims turn their faces while praying. The author says :—

این بذء کترین ابوالقاسم المشهور به بقراط السمرقندی از  
برای بیان سمت قبله خاص که رساله ترتیب دهد و این لایق

فہم ہر مبدعی نبود بہ این سبب این را بنام نامی نسخہ دوم  
 استادى حضرت مولانا يوسف قزباغى مدظلہ العالی ز تم زدہ  
 کلک تحریر گردانیدہ تحفۃ الاستاد لقب دادمش : تحفہ باستاد  
 فرستادمش

In conclusion he says :—

محرز این نسخہ ابوالقاسم مشتہر بہ بقراط سمرقندى در سال  
 ہزار و نہ ( ? ) در بلد کابل کہ عمرش بہ ہفتاد رسیدہ بود نوشت  
 From the above remark it is clear that this Risālā is an autograph  
 of the author himself.

(To be continued).

## VEDIC STUDIES.

BY A. VENKATASUBBIAH.

Second Series <sup>1</sup>

### 1. *Nireka*.

This word occurs in eight passages of the RV and in no independent passage elsewhere. It is not mentioned in the Nighaṅṭu, and since, moreover, it does not occur in any of the passages cited in the *Nirukta*, Yāska and Durga have had no occasion of explaining it. Sāyaṇa derives the word from *ni+ric* 'to empty' or *nir+i* 'to go' (comm. on 8.96.3: *ni-pūrvād ricyater vā niḥ-pūrvād eter veti samdehād anavagrahaḥ*) and explains it differently as *nairdhanya*, *durgati* or *dāridrya* (1.51.14 ; 7.18.23 ; 7.90.3), *dāna* (7.20.8), *dhana* (8.24.4) and *nirgamana* (8.24.3 ; 8.33.2 ; 8.96.3) in his commentary on the RV and as *reko riktatvam | tadrahitaṁ karma nirekaṁ tādṛṣe sarvasā-dhanasampūrṇe karmaṇi* in his commentary on TB. 2.8.1.1 (=RV. 7.90.3). Uvaṭa and Mahidhara, on the other hand, in their commentaries on the same verse (VS. 27.24 RV. 7.90.3) interpret the word as *janair ākīrṇa-pradeśe* and *nirgataḥ rekaḥ recanaṁ rekaḥ sūnyatā yasmāt tādṛṣe bahu-janākīrṇa-sthāne* respectively.

Roth, too, in the PW, derives the word from *ni+ric* and explains *nirekam* (obj.) as 'etwa bleibender Besitz ; Eigenthum' and *nireke* (loc) as '(eigenthümlich) bleibend ; auf die Dauer ; für immer'. This interpretation was considered unsatisfactory by Geldner (Ved. St., 1,155) who therefore proposed (ibid., p. 157) the meanings : 1. Subst. bevorzugter-,Ehren-platz, Vorrang, Vortritt 7.20.8 ; 1.51.14 ; 8.33.2 ; 7.18.23 ; 8.24.3 ; 8.96.3 ; (2) Adj. eine bevorzugte Stellung einnehmend, bevorzugt 8.24.4 ; 7.90.3 dunkel'. In his Glossary however he has, following Roth, interpreted *nireka* as "alleiniger Besitz 8.24.4 ; Ausschliesslichkeit ; loc. in alleinigem Besitz 1.51.14 ; 7.18.23 ; 7.90.3 ; 8.96.3 ; ausschliesslich, ganz allein 7.20.8 ; 8.24.3 ; 8.33.2". Similarly Oldenberg too writes (RV. Noten,

<sup>1</sup> The first series of these *Studies* are published in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 55 ff.

I, 49): " Wie *prareka* Hinausreichen, Ueberschiessen ist *nireka* m. E. wörtlich etwa Hineinreichen d. h. das Stehen im engsten Zusammenhang mit Jemand, Zugehören zum intimsten Besitz Jemandes; vgl. *nitya* ".

The above interpretations are all based on the supposed derivation of the word from the root *ric* with *ni*, and are mere guesses. None of them fits into the context in, for instance, 1.51.14 : *indro aśrāyi sudhyo nireke* and 7.90.3 : *adha vāyūṁ niyutaḥ saścata svā uta śvetam vasudhitim nireke* ; and a comparison of the passages in which this word occurs with other connected passages shows that the real meaning of the word is something quite different from those mentioned above.

In 8.24.4 : *ā nirekam uta priyam indra darṣi janānām*, we find *nireka* used as the object of *ādarṣi*, while in the preceding verse (8.24.3) : *sa na stavāna ā bhara rayim citra-śravastamam | nireke cid yo harivo vasur dadiḥ ||*, it is said of Indra that he gives (wealth : *vasur dadiḥ*) in *nireka*. A comparison therefore of the words that are used in RV. passages as objects of the root *dr* or *dar* 'to burst open' with the words used in the locative case in connection with the word *dadi* in the passages in which that word occurs<sup>2</sup> will show what is common to both groups of words and will thus guide one to the meaning of *nireka*.

Now the words used as the objects of the verb *dr* or *dar* are, besides *nireka*, the following, namely, *atka*, *adri*, *ap*, *apihita*, *amitra*, *aśvya*, *iṣ*, *utsa*, (*diraḥ*) *kavandha*, *kośa*, *go*, *gotra*, *godhāyas*, *dasyu*, *dānu*, *dr̥ḥa*, *pur*, *bhuvana*, *rābhah*, *vala*, *vāja*, *vraja*, *śata*, *śatru*, *śambara*, *sahasra*, *suṅrathita* and *sūkara*.

The word *dadi* is used in twelve verses in nine of which it is not connected with any word in the locative case. Of the remaining

2. As a matter of fact, it is necessary that one should, if one desires one's survey to be comprehensive, include in the comparison (1) not only the words used as objects of the verb *dr* or *dar* 'to burst open', but also those used as objects of *tṛh*, *bhid* and similar verbs, and (2) not only the words used in the locative case in connection with the word *dadi*, but also those used in that case in connection with the verbs *dā*, *rī*, etc., meaning 'to give'. It will however become manifest from the sequel that such a comprehensive comparison is unnecessary and that the limited comparison indicated above is enough to lead one to the correct meaning.

verses, it is connected with the locative *nireka* in 8.24.3 as we have seen above; and in 1.81.7: *made-made hi no dadir yūthā gavām ṛjukratuḥ | sam̄ gṛbhāya purū śatobhayahastyā vasu śiśīhi rāya ā bhara ||* and 8.46.15: *dadī rekṇas tanve dadir vasu dadir vājeṣu puruhūta vājinam | nūnam atha ||*, it is connected with the locatives *made-made* and *vājeṣu* respectively.

It will be seen that, besides *nireka* whose meaning we are now endeavouring to determine, the word *vāja* is the only one that is common to both groups; and this indicates that *nireka* is probably equivalent to *vāja*.

The comparison of 7.20.8: *yas ta indra priyo jano dadāśad asan nireke adrivaḥ sakhā te* with its parallel passages and of 7.90.3: *adha vāyūm niyutaḥ saścata svā uta śvetam̄ vasudhitiṁ nireke* with its parallel passages points likewise to such equivalence and hence makes it certain that *nireka* = *vāja*. In 7.20.8, Indra is exhorted to regard, in *nireka*, the offerer (of oblations) as his friend, that is, to befriend the offerer (of oblations) in *nireka*. The only other verses in the RV. in which a similar prayer or exhortation is addressed to Indra, and words in the locative case are used in connection with *sakhi*, are 8.13.3: *tam ahve vājasataya indram̄ bhārāya suṣmiṇam̄ | bhavā naḥ sumne antamah̄ sakhā vṛdhe*; 6.33.4: *sa tvam̄ na indrākavābhīr ūti sakhā viśvāyur avitā vṛdhe bhūḥ | svarṣātā yad dhvayāmasi tvā yudhyanto nemadhitā pṛtsu sūra*; and 1.129.4: *asmākam̄ va indram̄ usmasiṣṭāye sakhāyam̄ viśvāyūm̄ prāsaham̄ yujam̄ vājeṣu prāsaham̄ yujam̄ | asmākam̄ brahmotāye vā pṛtuṣu kāsū cit | nahi tvā satru starate stṛṇoṣi yam̄ viśvam̄ satrum̄ stṛṇoṣi yam̄ ||*. In the first of these verses, Indra is exhorted to befriend the suppliant in *sumna*, in the second, in *svarṣāti* and *pṛt* (note that these are synonyms of *vāja*), and in the third, in *vāja*. Compare also in this connection 4.24.6: *kṛṇoty asma varivo ya itthendrāya somam̄ usate sunotīśadhricīnena manasāvivenntam̄ it sakhāyam̄ kṛṇute samatsu*; 8.21.8: *vidmā sakhitvam̄ uta sūra bhojyam̄ ā te tā vajrinn̄ imāhe | uto samasminn̄ ā śiśīhi no vaso vāje susīpra gomati*; 3.51.9: *aptūrye maruta āpir̄ eṣo amandan̄ indram̄ anu dātivārāḥ | tebhiḥ sākam̄ pibatu vṛtrakhādaḥ sutam̄ somam̄ dāsūṣaḥ sve sadhasthe*; and 6.21.8: *sa tu śrudhīndra nūtanasya brahmaṇyato vīra kārudhāyaḥ | tvam̄ hy āpiḥ pradivi*

*putṛṇām śasvad bahbūtha suhava eṣṭau* and the locatives *vāje, samatsu, aptūrye* and *eṣṭau*, (these three are synonyms of *vāja*), used therein.

In 7.90.3 : *adha vāyum . . . nireke*, it is said that the team (of horses) accompany Vāyu in *nireka*. Compare with this verse 7.91.6 : *yā vām śataṁ niyuto yāḥ sahasram indravāyū viśvavārāḥ sacante | ābhir yātām suvidatṛābhir arvāk pātām narā pratibhṛtasya madhvaḥ* in which the word *niyutaḥ* and the verb *sac* occur, and in which Indra and Vāyu are exhorted to come to the sacrifice (this, be it noted, is one of the meanings of *vāja*), accompanied by the team (of horses). Compare also 7.91.5 : *a no niyudbhīḥ śatinībhir adhvarām sahasriṇībhir upa yāhi yajñam | vāyo asmin sarane mādayasva* ; 7.92.3 : *pra yābhir yāsi dāśvāṁsam acchā niyudbhīr vāyav iṣṭaye duroṇe* ; and 1.135.7 : *ati vāyo sasato yāhi śasvato yatra grāvā vadati tatra gacchataṁ gṛham indraś ca gacchataṁ | vi sūnṛiṇ dadrṣe rīyate ghṛtam ā pūrṇayā niyutā yātho adhvaram indraś ca yātho adhvaram* in which Vāyu is prayed to come with his team to the *yajña* or *adhvara* (which also is a synonym of *vāja*).

All this makes it certain and places it beyond doubt that *nireka* is equivalent to *vāja*. And hence it becomes evident that this word is derived, not from *ni+ric*, but from *ni+ri* or *rī* 'to run' (*ri gatau*; *rī gati-reṣaṇayoḥ*) by the addition of the suffix *ka* ; compare *śloka* (from *śru*) and (*su*)*meka* (from *mi*). *Nireka* thus denotes, like its equivalent *vāja* which is derived from *vaj* 'to go' (*vaja gatau*). strength, quickness, race, booty, prize, battle, sacrifice, etc. (see PW. and Grassmann s. v. *vāja*) ; and I shall now show that these meanings fit well into the context in all the verses in which the word occurs.

8.24.4 : *ā nirekam uta priyam  
indra darṣi janānām |  
dhṛṣatā dhṛṣṇo stavamāna ā bhara ||*

“Thou, O Indra, also cuttest open (the receptacle of, and makest accessible) for people, the dear wealth. O thou valiant one, bring (us wealth) boldly, being praised.” Regarding the expression *nirekam ādarṣi*, compare 2.12.15 : *yāḥ sunvate pacate dudhra ā cid vāṁ dardarṣi sa kilāsi*

*satyaḥ* ; 4.16.8 : *sa no netā vājam ā darṣi bhūriṁ gotrā rujann aṅ-girobhir grṇānaḥ*; and specially, 8.33.3: *kaṇvebhir dhṛṣṇav ā dhṛṣad vājam darṣi sahasriṇam*; and 8.45.40-41 : *bhindhī viśvā apa dviṣaḥ pari bādho jahī mṛdhaḥ | vasu spārhaṁ tad ā bhara || yad vīlāv indra yatsthire yat parśāne pārabhṛtam | vasu spārhaṁ tad ā bhara ||* all addressed to Indra, and also 9.68.7 : *avyo vārebhir uta devahūtibhir nṛbhir yato vājam ā darṣi sātaye* addressed to Soma, and 10.69.3: *sa revac choca sa giro juṣasva sa vājam darṣi sa iha śravo dhāḥ* addressed to Agni. And regarding the phrase *priyaṁ nirekam*, compare the expressions *priyaṁ vasu*, *spārhaṁ vasu*, *kāmyaṁ vasu*, *vāmaṁ vasu*, etc. (for references, see Grassmann under these vocables).

1.51.14 : *indro aśrāyi sudhyo nireke  
pajreṣu stomo duryo na yūpaḥ |  
aśvayur gavyū rathayur vasūyur  
indra id rāyāḥ kṣayati prayantā ||*

“ Indra has been raised high (i.e., highly praised or glorified) in the sacrifice of the pious (sacrificer), and the hymn that longs for horses, cows, chariots, and wealth, has been raised high among the Pajras, like the door post. Indra alone rules over wealth and is (its) bestower”. In pāda a, *aśrāyi* has been translated by Geldner (RV. Über., I, 58) as ‘gegeben’, which seems to me to be incorrect. Compare 6.11.5: *aśrāyi yajñāḥ sūrye na cakṣuḥ* ‘the sacrifice has been raised high as the eye to the sun’; 5.1.12 : *gaviṣṭhiro namasā stomam agnau. . aśret* ‘Gaviṣṭhira has, with adoration, raised high the hymn for Agni’; 5.28.1 : *samidhho agnir divi śocir aśret* ‘Agni, kindled, has raised high his light in the sky’; 4.6.2 : *ūrdhvaṁ bhānuṁ savitā devo aśret* ‘God Savitṛ has raised high his ray’; and 1.10.1 : *gāyanti tvā gāyatṛiṇo ‘rcanty arkaṁ arkiṇaḥ | brahmāṇas tvā śatakrata ud vaṁśam iva yemire* ‘The singers besing thee, the chanters chant chants; the priests, O thou that art hundred-fold wise, have raised thee high like a pole.’ The last-cited verse, it may be observed, indicates that the comparison *duryo na yūpaḥ* in pāda b is to be understood of *indraḥ* also in pāda a.

Pāda b is somewhat cryptic. It is translated by Geldner (RV. Über.) as ‘wie ein Türpfosten ist das Preislied bei den Pajra’s’; and this is explained by him as “ Das Loblied hält so fest wie der Türpfosten. Dasselbe Bild in 8.23.24 : *stomebhiḥ sthūrayūpavat* ”.



But there seems to be no doubt that in this verse, the word *sthūrayūpa* is, like the word *vyasva* in the preceding verse, *jyēṣṭhābhīrvyasvavat*, a proper name (see Grassmann s. v., PW. s. v., and Sāyaṇa) and that it has nothing to do with a 'stout post'. The meaning of 8.23.24 is, "Jetzt singe dem gewaltigen mit Lied nach Sthūrayūpa's Art" as given by Grassmann (*RV. Translation*). I believe therefore that the verb *āsrāyi* in pāda a is the predicate of *stoma* and *yūpa* also in pāda b (this is the opinion of Oldenberg also; see *RV. Noten I*) and that the tertium comparationis is 'raising high' or (*uc*) *chrayaṇa*. Compare 3.8.2-3: *uc chrayasva mahate saubhagāya | ucchrayasva vanaspate varṣman pṛthivyā adhi* addressed to the sacrificial post (*yūpa*); compare likewise the expressions *ūrdhvas tiṣṭha*, *tasthi-vāṁsaḥ*, *un nayanti*, *unnīyamānāḥ*, *śrayamāṇaḥ*, etc., used of this post in that hymn and also the other verses referred to on p. 102 of Oldenberg's *Vedaforschung* and *sthūṅārājam ucchrayati* in Śāṅkh. GS. 3.2.8 (Sāyaṇa, it may be observed explains *duryo yūpaḥ* in 1.51.14 as *deāri nikhātā sthūṅā*). Regarding the expression *stoma āsrāyi*, compare 3.14.2: *ayāmi te namauktim juṣasva*; 1.153.2: *prastutir vān dhāma na prayuktir ayāmi mitravaruṇā surṛktih*; 10.50.6: *yajño mantro brahmodyatam vacaḥ*; 1.80.9: *indrāya brahmodyatam*; and 1.190.3: *upastutim namasa udyatim ca ślokaṁ yaṁsat saviteva pra bāhū* which all refer to hymns 'being raised high': compare also 7.83.3: *indrāvaruṇā divi ghoṣa āruhat*.

The words *āsvayuh*, etc., are, according to Sāyaṇa, Grassmann and Ludwig, attributes of Indra. This opinion seems to me to be untenable; for it is difficult to conceive of Indra that he is 'longing for horses, cows, chariots and wealth'. I therefore agree with Geldner (*op. cit.*) in thinking that they are the attributes of *stomaḥ* in pāda b. Compare 7.67.5: *prācīm u devāsvinā dhiyaṁ me 'mṛdhrām sātaye kṛtām vasūyum* and 1.62.11: *vasūyavo matayo dasma dadruḥ* in which the epithet *vasūyu* is applied to *mati* or hymn; compare also 8.78.9: *tvām id yacayur mama kāmo gavayur hiraṇyayuh | tvām āsvayur eṣate | |*.

8.96.3: *indrasya vajra āyaso nimisla  
indrasya bāhvor bhūyisṭham ojaḥ |  
śīrṣann indrasya kratavo nireka  
āsann eṣanta śrutya upāke | |*

“ In Indra is attached the iron Vajra (thunderbolt) ; in Indra's two arms is the greatest strength ; in Indra's head are insights . In the sacrifice, there run remarkable (praises or offerings) into (his) near mouth”. With regard to pādas a,b,c, compare 1.55.8 : *aprakṣitam vasu bibharsī hastayoḥ aśāḥḥam sahas tanvi śruto dadhe |āvṛtāso 'vatāso na kartṛbhis tanūṣu te kratava indra bhūrayaḥ* “ In thy hands, thou carriest inexhaustible wealth. The famed one bore invincible strength in his body. In thy body, O Indra, are many insights, concealed, like wells hidden by the makers”, and 2.16.2 : *yasmād indrād bṛhataḥ kiṁ canem ṛte cisvāny asmin sambhṛtādhi vīryā jaḥhare somaṁ tanvī saho maho haste vajraṁ bharati śīrṣaṇi kratum* “ Without whom, the great Indra, nothing (happens), in him all might are gathered. In his belly, he bears Soma, in his body, great strength, in his hand, the thunderbolt, in his head, insight”.

The sense of pāda d is obscure. The Padapāṭha reads *śrutyai* here (as it does in 2.2.7 : *duro na vājam śrutyā apā vṛdhi* and 10.111. 3 : *indraḥ kila śrutyā asya veda*) for which Grassmann (s. v. *śrutyā*) proposes *śrutyāḥ*, a suggestion which I have adopted in my above translation. Śaṅkara explains the pāda as: *āsan āsye ca yāni karmāṇi yuddhārtham vājino gajān sannāhayatetyādīni bhavanti | kiṁ ca śrutyai samgrāmāya nirgacchato 'nuśāsata indrasya vākya-śravaṇārtham sarva upajīvino bhṛtyā upāke 'ntika eṣanta ayam indro 'smān kutra kutra kārye nīyokṣyatīty etena manasā tudantike samantād āgucchanti ;* and Oldenberg observes (RV. Noten II) : “*śrutyā* : man erwartet zunächst Nom. ; in der Tat *śrutyāḥ* nicht unwahrscheinlich (vgl.Gr. WB ; zu II, 2, 7 ; X, 111, 3) : “ zu seinem Mund (Lok. des Ziels) streben *śr°* (Hören) ; d. h. an seinem Mund hängt Hören und Gehorchen des Andern. Doch kann auch *śrutyai* (Pp) richtig sein ; die *krutu* in seinem Haupt (c) strebt auf seinem Munde fort um Gehör zu finden (so Ludw.), oder : ‘nach seinem Munde drängen sich (alle) um . . . zu Hören’ (Geldner *Rel. Lesebuch*, 79)”. These explanations seem to me to be unsatisfactory, and the more so, as there is nothing parallel to the ideas contained in them in any other verse of the RV. The word *śrutyā* is used as an epithet of *brahman*, hymn, in 1.165. 11 : *amandan mā marutaḥ stomo atra yan me naraḥ śrutyāṁ brahma cakra ;* and the verb is found used with *mati*, hymn, in

5.67.5 : *tat su vām eṣate matiḥ*. Compare with this 6.47.14 : *ava tve indra pravato normir giro brahmāṇi niyuto dhavante* 'in thee, O Indra, run hymns and praises in teams (i. e., many hymns of praise) as (swiftly as) the current down an incline,' and also 6.36.3 : *samudraṁ nu sindhava ukthaśuṣmā uruvyacasam gira ā viśanti* ; 1.176.2 : *tasminn ā veśayā giro ya ekaś carṣaṇīnām* which refer to hymns running into or 'entering into' Indra. This, presumably, is through the mouth ; and hence it is probable that *śrutyāḥ* refers to *giraḥ* and that the meaning of the pāda is, as given above, 'the remarkable praises run into (his) near mouth'. Regarding the expression *upāka āsan*, compare the analogous expression *upākayor hastayoḥ* in 1.181.4 : *śriya ṛṣva upākayor ni śipri harivān dadhe hastayor vajram āyasam*.

At the same time, it must be observed that Grassmann's suggestion (l. c.), too, that *śrutyāḥ* refers to *somāḥ*, is not improbable. Compare 3.46.4 : *indraṁ somāsaḥ pradivi sutāsaḥ samudraṁ na sravata ā viśanti* 'into Indra enter at all times the Soma juices that have been expressed as rivers into the ocean' ; 9.85.7 : *endram viśanti madirāsa indavaḥ* ; 9.97.36 : *indram ā viśa bṛhatā raveṇa* ; 9.2.1 : *indram indo vṛṣā viśa* ; 9.108.16 : *indrasya hārdi somadhānam ā viśa samudram iva sindhavaḥ* ; and 9.66.15 : *endrasya jāthare viśa* in which the Soma juice is said to enter into Indra, presumably through the mouth. Compare also 7.15.1 : *upasadyāya mīlhuṣa āsye juhutā hariḥ* ; 7.102.3 : *tasmā id āsye havir juhutā madhumattamam* ; 10.91.3 : *ahāvya agne havir āsye te* ; and 4.49.1 : *idaṁ vām āsye hariḥ priyam indrā-bṛhaspatī* in which the word *hariḥ* is used in connection with *āsye*, 'in the mouth'. Hence it is not improbable that *śrutyāḥ* denotes 'remarkable offerings (of Soma or oblations)'.

The sense of the pāda remains unchanged even if one agrees with the Pūdapāṭha that the word used in it is *śrutyai* and not *śrutyāḥ*. The meaning of *śrutyai* is 'so that it is heard of ; i. e., as is well-known' ; and we have still to supply as the subject of *eṣanta* the word *giraḥ* or *somāḥ* or *haviṁśi*. The meaning of the pāda would thus be, the 'hymns (or offerings) run, as is well-known, nto (his) near mouth in the sacrifice'.

7.18.23 : *catvāro ma pajjavanasya dānāḥ  
smaddiṣṭayah kṛsanino nireke |  
rjṛāso mā ṛṛthiviṣṭhāḥ sudāsas  
tokaṁ tokāya śrūvase vahanti ||*

This will be explained in the next article on *smaddiṣṭi*. Regarding *nireke*, compare 8.4.19 : *sthūraṁ rādhaḥ śatāśvaṁ kuraṅgasya diviṣṭiṣu* 'great is the gift, comprising hundred horses, of Kuraṅga in the sacrifices'.

7.20.8 : *yas ta indra priyo jano dadāśad  
asan nireke adriṣaḥ sakhā te |  
vayaṁ te aśyāṁ sumatau caniṣṭhāḥ  
syāma varūthe agrato nṛpītau ||*

"The dear one, O Indra, who makes offerings to thee, may he, O thou with the thunderbolt, be thy friend in battle (i.e., when he is fighting, be thou his friend and aid him). May we be most acceptable in this thy favour (and) first in (thy) shelter in the protection of men". With regard to pāda b, compare 6.33.4 ; 4.24.6 ; 1.129.4 ; 3.51.9 ; and 6.21.8 cited above (p. 149).

7.90.3 : *rāye nu yaṁ jajñatū rodasīme  
rāye devī dhiṣaṇā dhāti devam |  
adha vāyūṁ niyutaḥ saścata svā  
uta śvetaṁ vasudhitiṁ nireke ||*

"Whom these bright Heaven and Earth bore for prosperity, him, the god, the goddess Dhiṣaṇā raises high (i.e., glorifies) for prosperity. And then the own teams of Vāyu accompanied the white one, who bestows wealth, to the sacrifice". Compare 7.91.6 ; 7.91.5 ; 7.92.3 ; and 1.135.7 cited above (p. 150).

8.24.3 : *sa na stavāna ā bhara  
rayiṁ citraśravastamam |  
nireke cid yo harivo vasur dadīḥ ||*

"Bring to us, being praised, wealth that is most wonderful and renowned, O thou with bay horses, that, being bright, bestowest wealth even in sacrifice". Compare 1.81.7 and 8.46.15 cited above (p. 151)

8.33.2: *svaranti tvā sule naro*  
*vaso nireka ukthinaḥ |*  
*kadā sutam tṛṣṇāṇa oka ā gama*  
*indra svabdīva vaṁsagaḥ ||*

“ O thou bright one, when (the Soma juice) is expressed, the men that are reciting praises, call to thee in the sacrifice. When wilt thou, O Indra, thirsting for the Soma juice, come to the house (i.e., the sacrificial place), as (swiftly as) a roaring bull (to a pool of water) ” ? Regarding the simile in pāda d, compare 1.130.2: *pibā somam indra suvānam adribhiḥ koṣena siktam avatam na vaṁsagas tātṛṣṇāṇo na vaṁsagaḥ* ; 5.36.1 : *sa ā gamad indro yo vasūnām ciketaḍ dātum dāmano rayiṇām | dhanvacaro na vaṁsagas tṛṣṇāś cakamānaḥ pibatu dugdham aṁsum ||* and also 8.4.3 : *yathā gauro apā kṛtam tṛṣyam ety averiṇam | āpitve naḥ prapitve tūyam a gāhi kaṇveṣu su sacā piba ||*.

( To be continued. )

---

## EPIC STUDIES.

BY V. S. SUKTHANKAR

BRANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE. POONA.

### I. SOME ASPECTS OF THE MAHABHARATA CANON.

THE PROBLEM of the Mahābhārata textual criticism is a problem *sui generis*. Here the principles of textual reconstruction must first be evolved from an intensive study of the manuscript material and the manuscript tradition.<sup>1</sup> They can be finally considered as settled only after prolonged and considerable discussion and exchange of ideas and opinions.

The vulgate text of the Mbh. is fairly readable and appears, in places, to be even "better" than the critical text, because the former has been purged by the continuous emendations of scholars for centuries. The reader is consequently apt to prefer, at first sight, the readings of the vulgate text, but a thorough and sympathetic study of the author's language and thought and a critical evaluation of the variants would show him that the constituted text is sound.

Of the many reviews of the first fascicule of the critical edition of the Mahābhārata that have appeared during the past year there are two that deserve my special attention: the review by Dr. Hermann Weller in the *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* (vol. 6, pp. 166ff.), and that by Professor Edgerton in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (vol. 48, pp. 186-190). Both reviews are evidently products of a very close study of the text and the critical apparatus. Particularly valuable is the review by Prof. Edgerton, who can appreciate the difficulties of the problem I have had to confront perhaps better than most scholars, since he has had to struggle with problems of a like nature in his valuable work on the Pañcatantra and the Vikramacarita.

In the succeeding pages I have endeavoured to set forth my reasons for adopting in the text the readings that have commended

---

<sup>1</sup> Valuable hints are to be found especially in the writings of Prof. Lüders.

themselves to me, in those cases which have been discussed by Weller and Edgerton in the reviews mentioned above. They concern the readings of I. 1. 19, 42, 49, 62, 201, and of the identification of the hundred sub-parvans of the Mbh. enumerated in the second adhyāya of the Ādiparvan, that is, in the Parvasaṅgrahaparvan.<sup>2</sup>

\*                     \*                     \*                     \*

1. 1. 19 :

*vedaiḥ caturbhiḥ samitām* (v. 1. *saṁmitām*).

Weller suggests an emendation—in fact, two alternative emendations. He first proposes to read *saṁmitām* for my *samitām*. The former variant is found only in one MS. which besides transposes the first two words of the pāda. His alternative suggestion is more radical. Seeing that the variant preferred by him yields a pāda metrically defective, he proposes to mend matters by recasting the pāda thus : *caturbhiḥ saṁmitām vedaiḥ*. This pāthya, he thinks, must have been the original reading of the pāda. The only reason Weller has adduced for rejecting the text reading is the supposed intrinsic fitness of the alternate ; it suits the context much better, he believes. K<sub>3</sub>, the solitary MS. which contains the reading preferred by Weller, stands sixth on my list of K MSS., whose relative value diminishes in the order there given ; it is full of clerical mistakes, due probably to the difficulty experienced by the copyist (either of this MS. or of one of its ancestors) in deciphering the (? Śāradā) exemplar. I consider it an inferior codex. With Weller's reading we get a prior pāda with the scansion — — — — / — — — — . Hopkins' statistical study of the relative frequency of the different forms of the pādas (*Great Epic*, p. 236) shows that this is a "rare" combination. Even Weller realizes that the line does not read smoothly and calls therefore the length of the sixth syllable a "metrical archaism." Now *samitām* (of the text,

<sup>2</sup> As most of the references in these studies will be to the Mahābhārata, all numbers without alphabetical prefix refer to the *critical edition* of the epic. When a reference is made to other editions of the epic, I have prefixed to the reference an indicatory letter enclosed within parentheses thus (C.) denotes the Calcutta edition, (B.) the Bombay edition, and (K.) the Kumbhakonam edition.

without the anusvāra) recurs in a similar context, also at the end of a prior pāda, and apparently in the same sense in (B.) 1. 95. 90 : *idam hi vedaiḥ samitām*. It also occurs, in a different context, in Susruta 2. 346. 3 : *angusṭha-parvasamitam*. If we read *saṁmitām* in the passage under discussion, we should have *pari passu* to read it in the two latter passages also, both of which then would be metrically defective ; the scansion of the first would be nearly the same as that of the pāda in question, the second would end with three consecutive iambs. Are these all instances of "metrical archaisms" ? For that, it seems to me, the documental probability of the reading preferred by Weller is not strong enough. The text reading, which is mentioned by Nīlakaṇṭha as a variant, is supported indirectly by K<sub>2</sub> (*samatām*) and directly by K<sub>3,4,6</sub> M<sub>1,3,4</sub>. On the other hand, Weller's reading, as has already been remarked, is found only in one inferior MS. Worthy of note is Nīlakaṇṭha's gloss : *samitām iti pāṭhe tulyām ity arthaḥ*. The initial mistake of Weller lies in supposing that *saṁmitām* suits the context better than *samitām*, whereas, in point of fact, *saṁmitām* is nothing more than a doublet of the other word. Weller does not realize that his attempt to substitute an "easier reading" has been anticipated by the scribe of K<sub>5</sub>, who *likewise* finding the emended line (metrically) unreadable has transposed the words of the pāda, reaching a new combination : *caturbhir vedaiḥ saṁmitām*, which according to Hopkins (*loc. cit.*) is of "very rare, sporadic" occurrence. The word *samita* has been perfectly correctly explained in PW. : *samita* (*sa + mita*) = *saṁmita*, "gleiches Maas habend, gleich". The relation between the two words is clearly revealed by the more familiar doublets *satata* : *saṁtata*, *sahita* : *saṁhita* and so on, *sa-* and *saṁ-* being the unaccented and accented forms of one and the same prefix. When the accentual factor became inoperative, the choice was conditioned solely by metrical considerations. The identification in the case of *samita* may have been helped by contamination with *sam + ita* (= *saṁgata*), "conformable to, in harmony with" ( a meaning not unsuitable even here), or by its supposed connection with *sama*, "equal" (cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.* II, 1. § 30 bβ). The semantic values of the words in question being the same, the combined



force of documental probability and metrical preference decides the question of choice incontestably in favour of the adopted text.

The text reading really needs some further justification. Weller's misunderstanding of the text is, in my opinion, a direct confirmation of my remark in the Foreword (p. vi) that it is a *lectio difficilior*. The word was, I suppose, early misunderstood. To judge by the character of the variants, it was commonly, though erroneously, interpreted as *sam+ita*, "united, combined with". In this sense, in course of time, it must have been ousted by its easier synonyms *saṁyukta* (substituted for it in V, B D) and *sahita* (mainly in T and G). Both these readings are inadequate. Nīlakaṇṭha's explanation *caturvedārthavatīm* is inadmissible; the phrase can at best mean *caturvedavatīm* ("possessing the four Vedas"), which is of course sheer nonsense. Roy's "comprehendeth the sense of the four Vedas" and Dutt's "contains the sense of the four Vedas" are equally inaccurate paraphrases (based upon the explanation furnished by the scholiast), because the passage in the vulgate cannot bear the meaning here forced upon it. On the other hand, the *literal* meaning of *saṁyukta* or *sahita* is, as already remarked, wholly unsuitable. For what could the assembled sages mean by saying that they wished to hear the Mahābhārata Saṁhitā "combined with the four Vedas"?

To return to the manuscript evidence. The K group is partly corrupt and indecisive though the majority has the text reading: K<sub>1,3,4,6</sub> as in text; K<sub>2</sub> *sahitām*; K<sub>5</sub> *saṁhitām*; K<sub>7</sub> *saṁmitām*. All these stand resolutely against *saṁyuktām* of the vulgate: but, from the point of view of transcriptional probability, none of them is wholly incompatible with *saṁmitām* of the text. Three out of the four Malayālam MSS. have also preserved the true reading; the remaining Malayālam MS. has *sahitām*, the reading of the TG group. With this data I should explain the genesis of the variants thus. The text reading is a *lectio difficilior*, preserved in the majority of K intact, and in the remaining MSS. of the K version in a corrupt condition. The K reading being partly supported by M, there is a partial agreement between two more or less independent versions, a condition almost wholly absent in the case of the rejected variants. Being a difficult and unfamiliar word, it was

early misunderstood and finally dropped—independently in certain groups of the Southern and Northern recensions—in favour of such words as were thought to be its equivalents in sense but which do not fit the context and are wholly inadequate.

After what has been said above, it is hardly necessary to consider the alternative proposed by Weller. But in passing it may be pointed out that it is methodologically wrong to expect to find the original reading by picking out a stray variant which appears to give a better meaning, and shuffling the words of the pāda until the pathyā form turns up. For one thing, it is by no means certain that the original must be a pathyā; the MS. evidence, so far as I have examined it, is all in favour of the hypothesis that originally the vipulās were far more numerous than what one is led to suppose from the study of the vulgate text, which has modernized many of the archaic lines of the original and successfully covered up the traces of the metamorphosis.

\* \* \* \*

1. 1. 42 :

*daśajyotiḥ śatajyotiḥ sahasrajyotir ātmavān* (v. 1. *eva ca*.)

Here the situation is much clearer. According to Weller the variant *eva ca* is not quite wrong (“abwegig”). Quite true. But about the text reading, I think we can say much more than that. In point of grammar, metre or even sense, there is not much to choose between the variants. But in point of documental probability, their values are totally different. *eva ca* is the variant offered by Ko.<sub>2,4</sub> Da Dn Dr D<sub>1,2</sub>; the text, on the other hand, is documented by a much stronger group, K<sub>1,5,6</sub> V, B Da, (marg.) D<sub>1,4</sub> S. It is further attested by another good MS. of a different category, I have since compared: a Nepālī MS. belonging to the Benares Sanskrit College Manuscripts Library. The text reading figures also in Goldstücker’s collations from European codices, of which I have photo copies.<sup>3</sup> The position then, is this. On the

---

<sup>3</sup> The photographs were kindly presented to the Bhandarkar Institute by the University of Strassburg, through the kind offices of the late Prof. Emile Senart. I take this opportunity to thank the University publicly for this service.

one hand the K version is indecisive, agreeing partly with D, which is the main witness for the rejected variant; on the other hand BS (probably together with the Nepālī-Maithilī version) form a solid group in favour of the text, further attested by three K MSS. including the important India Office codex K<sub>1</sub>. It will be seen that the documental authority is almost wholly on the side of the text. For a contamination between Devanāgarī transcripts of Kāśmīrī MSS. and Devanāgarī MSS. must be postulated to be far more likely than a contamination between the entire Bangālī version and the entire Southern recension. The different Indian scripts being all but unintelligible outside the provinces where they were developed, there is already a *prima facie* reason for assuming the independence of B and S. This principle was long ago recognized and enunciated by Prof. Lüders, than whom no scholar has a profounder acquaintance with and a clearer insight in the problem of Mahābhārata textual criticism. In *Die Grantha-recension des Mahābhārata* (Berlin 1901), Prof. Lüders has said: "Das beweist, dass die Grantha-handschriften nicht etwa auf Bengali-Handschriften zurückgehen,—etwa, was von vornherein nicht gerade wahrscheinlich ist,—sondern dass in den Fällen wo B und G zusammengehen, ihre Lesarten als alt zu sehen sind". Now what is true of the consensus of B and G is *a fortiori* true of the consensus of B and S. This presumptive independence is wholly confirmed by my intensive study of the first 3,000 stanzas of the Ādiparvan from the extensive collations at my disposal, during which study I have not been able to detect the slightest trace of "secondary interrelationship" between the Bangālī version *as a whole* and the Southern recension *as a whole*. Equally fundamental in character is the agreement between K and S, the only difference between K and B being that K is comparatively purer and freer from interpolation than the other. The canon of Mbh. textual criticism, in its simplest form, may therefore be said to be the fundamental character of the consensus of K and S on the one hand, and of B and S on the other, provided of course the concordant reading is of such a nature that it could not be the result of a fortuitous coincidence.

Doubt can, and frequently, does arise when K B (then generally

with D ; in other words the whole of N) stands against S. Here each case must be judged and decided on its own merits. It may sometimes be possible to adduce evidence of a decisive character on one side or the other. Such evidence may be intrinsic ; one reading may be intrinsically better than the other. Or it may be extrinsic ; when it is possible to supplement the evidence of MSS. from other ancient and independent sources. But as a rule, when there is a conflict between N and S, the evidence is so nicely balanced that no definite decision is possible.

To return to the instance under consideration. The agreement between B and S raises such a strong presumption in favour of the text reading that its evidence cannot be rebutted by the possibility conceived by Weller that *ātmaṅvān* might have crept into the text secondarily, under the influence of *ātmanaḥ* and *ātmaṅjāḥ* in the following lines.

In this particular instance, I think, intrinsic probability is, to some extent, also on the side of the text. It is a feature of epic technique that out of three consecutive proper names occurring in the same hemistich, the last name is very frequently accompanied by a qualifying adjective. Scores of illustrations may be produced ; here are thirteen selected at random.

1. 31. 14 : *Virajāś ca Subākuś ca Śālipiṇḍaś ca vīryavān.*  
 (K.) 1. 88. 9 : *Rceyur atha Kakṣeyuḥ Kṛkaṇeyuś ca vīryavān*  
*Sthaṇḍīleyur Vaneyuś ca Jaleyuś ca Mahāyaśāḥ.*  
 (K.) 6. 25. 4-5 : *Yuyudhāno Virāṭaś ca Druṇḍaś ca mahārathaḥ*  
*Dhr̥ṣṭaketuś Cekitānaḥ Kāśīrājaś ca vīryavān*  
*Puruḅit Kuntibhojaś ca Śaibyāś ca narapuniyavaḥ*  
 17 : *Dhr̥ṣṭadyumno Virāṭaś ca Sātyakiś ca parāḅitāḥ*  
 (K.) 8.83. 9 : *Kṛpaś ca Kṛṭavarmā ca Drauṇiś caiva mahārathaḥ*  
 (K.) 9. 2. 17 : *Aśvatthāmā ca Bhojaś ca Māḅgadhaś ca mahābalaḥ*  
*Bṛhadbalaś ca Kr̥āthaś ca Śakuniś cāpi Saubalaḥ*  
 (K.) 9. 3. 12 : *hate Bhīṣme ca Droṇe ca Karṇe caiva mahārathe*  
 (K.) 9. 5. 2 : *Śalyāś ca Citrasenaś ca Śakuniś ca mahārathaḥ*  
 (K.) 9. 24. 40 : *Aśvatthāmā Kṛpaś caiva Kṛṭavarmā ca sātvaṭaḥ.*

The practice being the outcome of a natural desire to avoid the monotony of a bald enumeration of names, it is not surprising to find that even the Homeric epics furnish ample illustrations of it; here is one with the trick repeated in consecutive hemistiches (Iliad, 24. 250-1):

Πάμμονά τ', Ἀντίφονόν τε, βοήν ἀγαθόν τε Πολίτην,  
Δηΐφοβόν τε, καὶ Ἴππόθοον, καὶ Δῖον ἀγαυον.

After having proved that the text reading is not only better documented but in itself very plausible, we may proceed to consider whether any reason can be suggested how the variant *eva ca* may have arisen. Two explanations—both mere possibilities—occur to me. It is for one thing possible that the original *ātmavān* may have been deliberately suppressed in order to avoid the monotonous reiteration of *ātma* at the end of three consecutive verses. A more likely reason for the suppression may have been the lack of a copula in the original line, which had been crowded out by the succession of three unusually long names (two of four syllables each, and the third one of not less than five), taking up by themselves 13 syllables out of an aggregate of 16 of the śloka line.

\*                                 \*                                 \*                                 \*

1.1.49 :

*visṭiryuitan mahaj jñānam ṛṣiḥ saṁkṣepam abravīt*  
(v.l. *saṁkṣepato 'bravīt*).

The two rejected variants are: *saṁkṣepato 'bravīt* K V, B<sub>1m</sub> D<sub>1</sub>, and *saṁkṣipyā cābravīt* B Da Dn Dr D<sub>1,12</sub> S (except G<sub>1,3</sub> M<sub>3</sub>). Weller finds *saṁkṣepato* satisfactory ("befriedigend"). As a matter of fact, of the rejected variants, the reading *saṁkṣipyā cābravīt* is far superior to the other. In it the sense is clear; grammatically it is correct, metrically flawless. It is moreover the reading indicated by the principle of agreement between independent versions, being supported by the Bangālī and Devanāgarī versions on the one hand and by one section of the Southern recension on the other. But the compelling power of this agreement is weakened by the circumstance that one Malayālam MS. and three (out of the seven) Grantha MSS. are outside the group. Had the whole of B agreed with the whole of S, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for reasons explained in the previous section,

to reject the concordant reading. The weak point of this variant lies in the fact that it does not at all explain, as far as I can judge, how the other readings may have arisen. There is the same flaw in the other rejected variant, though not in the same degree. The text reading, though weakly supported by MSS, serves admirably, in my opinion, to account for the existence of the variants, especially if *saṁkṣepam* is taken as an adverbial gerund in-*am* (Pāṇini's *ṇamul*), as I think it should be; cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 995. For there would then be an inherent tendency to substitute for it simpler readings. *saṁkṣipyā ca* and *saṁkṣepataḥ* would be very neat paraphrases of the awkward adverbial gerund: the second (*saṁkṣepataḥ*) preserving nearly intact the original akṣaras, the first (*saṁkṣipyā*) involving a more radical change from the view-point of form, but closely following the original in sense. The latter may, moreover, have been directly suggested by *ristīrya* in the first pāda which it nicely balances. I assume, of course, that *saṁkṣipyā* was introduced independently in B D on the one hand and S on the other. In other words, I think that the concordance between certain sections of the Northern and the Southern recensions is purely accidental, and it is unquestionable that it *could* be that. I must frankly admit, however, that there is a strong element of subjectivity in this choice, which can in no way be said to be compelling. I prefer the text reading, fully realizing that others may prefer either of the other two readings; but that is precisely why a wavy line has been printed in the text below *saṁkṣepam*. I doubt very much whether any compelling reason can be advanced to prove the absolute superiority of any one of the variants over the others.

\* \* \* \*

### 1. 1. 62:

*anukramaṇim adhyāyam* (v.l. *anukramaṇikādhyāyam*)

This again is a somewhat difficult and complicated case. The text reading is perhaps less than certain, as has been indicated by the use of the wavy line; but it can, I think, claim for itself greater certitude than the reading in the preceding case. The apparatus contains five variants for this pāda. They are:

K<sub>c.</sub> 2-6 V<sub>1</sub> B<sub>3</sub> D<sub>a</sub> D<sub>n</sub> D<sub>r</sub> D<sub>1-1</sub>. 6-12-14 G<sub>4</sub> *anukramaṇikādhyāyam*  
K, °*kramāṇimādhyā*°

T <sub>1</sub> G <sub>1, 3, 7</sub>	°krāmiṇam adhyāt°
T <sub>2</sub>	°krāmikam a°
G <sub>2, 3</sub>	°kramaṇam a°
B <sub>1, 2, 4</sub> D <sub>5</sub>	as in text

Along with this passage, we must consider 1.1.199, where the pāda recurs and where again there are five variants, in part different from those of the passage under discussion. The second set of variants is :

K <sub>1, 2, 4, 6</sub> V <sub>1</sub> Dn Dr D <sub>1, 2, 4, 5, 1, 1, 1, 4</sub>		<i>anukramaṇikādhyāyam</i>
T G <sub>4, 5</sub> M <sub>1, 2, 4</sub>	} (S Recension)	°krāmiṇam a°
G <sub>1</sub>		°krāmaṇim a°
G <sub>1, 7</sub> M <sub>3</sub>		°krāmaṇam a°
G <sub>3</sub>		°kramaṇam a°
K <sub>1, 5</sub> B Da D <sub>3, 5</sub>		as in text.

We have here very remarkable vacillation for a perfectly simple pāda. Every textual variation presupposes a cause. Therefore that reading is best which best explains how the various different readings may have arisen. The variant preferred by Weller, which is also the reading of the vulgate text, though perfectly satisfactory in itself, fails wholly to explain why there are so many variants. What is wrong with *anukramaṇikādhyāyam*? Nothing apparently, if taken by itself. But let us have a closer look at the variants and try to understand the cause of the variation. We shall first consider the variants at 1. 1. 199, where the situation is slightly clearer. The text reading is supported by K<sub>1, 5</sub> B Da D<sub>3, 5</sub>; that is, two of the K MSS. (including the important K<sub>1</sub>) together with the whole of Bangālī and Arjunamīśra and two Devanāgarī MSS., a combination not to be despised. The rejected variants fall into two natural groups; on the one hand we have the majority of K and Devanāgarī (with the notable exception of Arjunamīśra MSS., which, as remarked in the Foreword, p. v, frequently side with Bangālī) having *anukramaṇikādhyāyam*; on the other hand we have the Southern MSS., which show *anukramiṇam adhyāyam*, with some unimportant variations. The case is somewhat similar at 1. 1. 62, the difference being that the manuscript support for the text reading is slightly weaker. The two sets of variants, it may be remarked, have this noteworthy feature

in common that in both places there is partial agreement between K B on the one hand and S on the other, in so far that they both have as the first part of the pāda, a word uncompounded with *adhyāyam*. The explanation of this chaos is, I think, furnished by 1.2.34, where the name of the adhyāya (or rather of the parvan) is found to be *anukramaṇī* (and not *anukramaṇikā*):<sup>4</sup>

*parvānukramaṇī pūrvam.*

Here the reading is certain, the variants (mainly in G) being negligible. All printed editions of the text without exception have the same reading, an indication that the large majority of all reliable MSS. hitherto examined read the name of the adhyāya as in text. The name in this form occurs at 1. 1. 200 :

*anukramaṇyā yīvat syād ahnā rātryā ca saṁcitam,*

where again the variants though numerous, do not concern us since they are also mainly restricted to a single version, the Grantha.

As remarked already there is partial agreement between K B Da and S in so far that they break up the compound of the vulgate text into two words, one standing in epithetical or appositional relation to the other. A little reflection will show that, used by a writer familiar with the older name of the adhyāya, the first word *uncompounded* with adhyāya could be no other than *anukramaṇīm*. With this word, however, we should get the awkward prior pāda  $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim$ , which, according to Hopkins (*op. cit.* p. 236), is a "very rare, sporadic" combination. Now it is well known that, in the epic, grammatical accuracy is often sacrificed to the observance of preferred vipulā forms. The awkwardness of the pāda was removed by the (anomalous) shortening of the troublesome long ī in the final syllable of the word. Examples of shortening metri causā, cited from the epics by Hopkins (*op. cit.* p. 246) are : *svadhā ca svadhabhojinam*, Rām. 7. 23. 23 (again in the fifth syllable); *apakramat*, (B.) 9. 11. 62; *sakhigaṇāvṛtā*, Nala 1. 24; *na śrīr jahati vai tanuḥ*, (B.) 11. 25. 5. The examples, as is well known, can be very easily multiplied.

<sup>4</sup> Accordingly I have called the parvan Anukramaṇī—parvan, differing from the Calcutta, Bombay and Kumbhakonam editions, in which it is called Anukramaṇikā-parvan.



The assumption of an original *anukramaṇim adhyāyam* could, as far as I can judge, satisfactorily explain all the different variants of this pāda. It accounts for the neat bifurcation of the manuscript evidence into the vulgate text (with partial reflexes in the K version) and the Southern group. The vulgate text may be seen to have successfully overcome the difficulty of the anomalous shortening by substituting in the lame foot a form with a legitimate short vowel where required by the (later) stringent rule: *pañcamam laghu sarvatra*; it had to sacrifice the original appositional construction and substitute for it a compound. The Southern editors, on the other hand, adhered firmly to the appositional construction, and eked out a tolerable pāda with various synonyms having a short vowel in the fifth syllable such as: *krāmiṇam*, *°kramikam*, *°krāmaṇam*, *°krāmaṇim*.

It may be argued that even *anukramaṇikādhyāyam* as the original reading might likewise furnish reasons for the growth of this singular crop of various readings, because the name *anukramaṇikā* here given to the adhyāya was felt to be inappropriate, the correct name being *anukramaṇī* as given in 1. 2. 34. But such an interpretation would not be valid, because the original postulated here would at best serve to explain only one variant, namely, *anukramaṇim adhyāyam*; it fails wholly to account for the vascillations of the entire Southern recension, since nothing would have been gained by substituting *anukramiṇam*, *°kramikam* and so forth, which all equally fall short of reproducing the original name of the adhyāya. So at least it seems to me must the variants be interpreted. I consider the text reading all but certain. A comparison of the extant manuscript material should show that, clerical errors and occasional anomalies apart, the Bangali MSS. uniformly, Arjunamisra (? together with Devabodha) MSS. frequently, and K MSS. sporadically will have the text reading; MSS. of the vulgate text and other MSS. contaminated from this source will have the compound; while MSS. of the Southern recension will mostly have synonyms of *anukramaṇim* such as *°kramaṇam*, *°kramikam* and so on.

1. 1. 201 :

*bhāratasya vapur hy etat satyam cāmṛtam (v. 1. cāmṛtam)  
eva ca.*

Edgerton discusses at some length the variation *amṛtam* : *amṛtam* and decides emphatically in favour of *amṛtam*. Edgerton's arguments are briefly these : first and foremost, the text reading does not do justice to the emphatic particle *eva* in the same line, which is a " crucial word ;" secondly, *amṛtam* is intrinsically far superior to the innocuous *amṛtam*, which has been substituted for the original *lectio difficilior* by ignorant copyists who, missing the ' paradox " intended, " naturally gagged at attributing ' falsehood ' to the epic." In the first place I differ from Edgerton radically as to the value and importance of the word *eva* in the sentence. It is unquestionably true that *eva* does emphasize the preceding word or words, but this is neither necessarily nor universally true. Very frequently, especially in the epics and the Purāṇas, the emphasis is so slight that it is almost negligible, and the word is nothing more than an expletive. My experience fully corroborates P. W., which has the following note s. v. *eva* : " Nicht selten, namenlich nach einigen Partikeln, ist die Bedeutung von *eva* abgeschwächt, dass wir auch den Nachdruck aufgeben." But the best answer to Edgerton's contention as to the value of *eva* is to show that it figures very frequently at the end of the pāda, in long enumerations of names and attributes where no emphasis could be intended whatsoever. Here are some examples chosen at random :

(K.) 1. 68. 95 : *Durmarṣaṇo Durmukhaś ca Duṣkaraṇaḥ Karṇa eva ca*

(B.) 2. 100. 2 : *Droṇam Kṛpam nrpāṁś cānyān Aśvatthāmānam  
eva ca*

(B.) 13. 254. 17 : *avyayaḥ puruṣaḥ sākṣī kṣetrajño 'kṣara eva ca*

120 : *yajñāntakṛd yajñaguhyam annam annāda eva ca*

Brahma Pur. 182. 7 : *tvam svāhā tvam svadhā vidyā suhā tvam  
jyotir eva ca*

Bhaviṣya Pur. 10. 8. 38 : *jyotiś cakram jalam tejo nabhasvān  
vidyud eva ca*

It would be clearly preposterous to see in these *eva ca* " emphatic particles " or " crucial words " emphasizing paradoxes ;

they are nothing more than copulative expletives. My impression is that the epic "poets" use the conjunctions *ca*, *caiva* or *eva ca* according as they require one, two or three syllables to fill their line! This, I hope, will suffice to dispose of the alleged necessity of looking for and finding any striking paradox in this line.

But I think Edgerton is making another and a graver mistake. His remark that "the panegyrist of the *epic* [italics mine] starts out to claim that it contains everything" makes me suspect that Edgerton has possibly misunderstood the hemistich in question. Here the subject matter of glorification is not the *epic* at all, but merely the first *adhyāya* thereof. The hemistich occurs in a passage at the end of the first *adhyāya*, and the passage is evidently of the nature of a *phalaśruti*. The hemistich says: "This is the body of the (Mahā-) Bhārata." Here "this" refers not to the whole epic but merely to the *Anukramaṇī* chapter mentioned in the previous stanzas. The whole line is a subordinate (*hi*) clause depending upon the main clause contained in the immediately preceding stanza. "(201) He who repeats (in an undertone, even) a little of the *Anukramaṇī* at both twilights is freed immediately from as much sin as has been accumulated during the day and the night; (201) for, this is the body of the (Mahā-) Bhārata (that is) Truth and also Immortality!" It is owing to its partaking of the qualities of (or, as the panegyrist of the *adhyāya* will have it, owing to its being) Truth and Immortality that it is able to absolve the devout reciter of the *adhyāya* immediately from sin. The emphasis, if any, is on *hi* ("for"), not on *eva*. Objection may be taken to the neuter gender of *etat*, since it is made to refer the *Anukramaṇī* (f.) chapter as I do here. The gender may be explained either as a case of attraction by the gender of the predicate (*vapus*, n.) or as referring indiscriminately to *anukramaṇī* (f.) or *adhyāya* (m.). But if Edgerton does not like that, I have no great objection to his translating: "For this form of the (Mahā-) Bhārata is Truth and Immortality." According to this interpretation, the variant *amṛtam* is wholly inappropriate and inadmissible; and in fact on second thoughts I am inclined even to dispense with the wavy line under *amṛtam*.

The paradox conceived by Edgerton might apply fitly to the whole epic, which may be said to mirror all phases of life, "Truth,—yes, and Falsehood too!," but it is clearly unreasonable and even impossible to say that the Anukramaṇī chapter by itself could be "Truth,—yes and Falsehood too." Furthermore, even if this wonderful chapter be the Truth as well as Falsehood, I fail to see how it should follow that such a chapter could on that account be able to give absolution to a sinner. If one bears in mind that the subject matter of the panegyric is the Anukramaṇī chapter (and *not* the epic), one cannot, I think, come to any other conclusion than that the true reading is *amṛtam*.

It may be added that Edgerton's mistake is quite natural and is caused primarily by the misleading division of the passage (stanzas 200-202) into distiches, which suggests that the subject matter of the praśasti is the Mahābhārata. The first half of stanza 201 is logically and grammatically connected with the preceding stanza (200); on the other hand the second half is part and parcel of the following stanza (202). The first half clearly refers to the Anukramaṇī chapter; the second half equally clearly to the epic as a whole. Could I have foreseen the confusion it is apt to cause, I would certainly have joined the first half of stanza 201 to 200 and the second half to stanza 202, notwithstanding that this arrangement yields two consecutive three-line stanzas. In such cases I have mostly made three distiches, sometimes, I fear, as in this instance, clouding the sense.

There remains now only one point to be considered. By saying that *amṛtam* is a *lectio difficilior*, Edgerton implies that the change from *amṛtam* into *anṛtam* is ordinarily inconceivable, since any copyist would have fought shy of attributing falsehood to the epic. Such a view would, in my opinion, be entirely incorrect. The distinguishing feature of scribes' emendations is that it is superficial. The scribe does not stop to think very deeply about the consequences of the change. Here, I fancy, the variant has arisen merely because, in entirely different contexts, *satyam* and *anṛtam* are found frequently combined into a phrase, sometimes even combined into the compound *satyānṛta* (e.g. *satyānṛte yo rivinakte lōke*, 1. 3. 152; *satyānṛte avapaśyañ janānām* RV. 7. 49. 3). I

therefore hold that the substitutions of *anṛtam* for *amṛtam* is wholly within the range of probability and even quite natural for an Indian scribe.

\*                         \*                         \*                         \*

1. 2. 70 :

*etat parvaśataṁ pūrṇaṁ Vyāsenoktaṁ maharṣiṇā.*

Although it is perfectly true that all previous efforts to make the text of the Mbh. agree with the numerical data of its extent and size have ended in dismal failures, Edgerton is needlessly nervous about my attempt to reduce the number of the (sub-) parvans exactly to one hundred. Edgerton's view is that the traditional hundred should be regarded as an approximate or "round" number. This is the explanation given also by C. V. Vaidya in his *Epic India* (p. 189) when he is faced with the anomaly that his list of "hundred parvans" contains 107 titles. In support of the view, one might cite the use of the word *śataka* in titles of anthologies like the Śṛṅgāraśataka, which frequently, if not uniformly, contain more than 100 stanzas. The parallelism would, in my opinion, be not quite exact, because, I think, here the suffix *ka* (miscalled *svārthe* by Indian grammarians) probably suggests, if it does not actually connote, the approximate character of the denomination. Less convincing still is the analogy (mentioned by C. V. Vaidya, *loc. cit.*) of the appellation *śatasāhasrī* of the Mbh. This expression is admittedly *not* intended to mean exactly one hundred thousand, whatever else it may mean. But the latitude implicitly allowed in the use of the expression *śatasahasra* in stating the number of stanzas which are approximately a lakh cannot, it seems to me, be claimed by a person giving the number of chapters which are approximately only one hundred. That question apart, when the old experts of the Great Epic (*bhāratacinakā*, 1. 2. 172) had calculated and stated the exact number of adhyāyas and ślokas. parvan by parvan for all the eighteen parvans, apparently correct to the last digit, would it not be exceedingly strange if the number of the chapter-groups alone, given in the very same adhyāya, in the same context, were to be only approximate? A few stanzas more or less in an aggregate of several thousand stanzas, or a few adhyāyas more or less

in an aggregate of several hundred adhyāyas would not have mattered very much one way or the other; but a few parvans more or less when the total was only in the neighbourhood of hundred! So careless I suppose even the careless custodians of the fifth Veda were not. Their calculations may have been wrong, but their intention is perfectly clear. They say and mean that the number was exactly one hundred: notice the *pūrṇam* in the first pāda of the hemistich. In fact, the amazing difference in the lengths and characters of these chapter-groups—there are some containing only 1 adhyāya and less than 70 stanzas, there are others which contain more than 70 adhyāyas and considerably more than 3,000 stanzas!—could, I think, only have been the result of an over-mastering desire on the part of some old editor or editors to reach, by hook or crook, some such predetermined “round” number.

Edgerton is perfectly right when he says that the attempt to reconstruct the original text of this passage presents some very serious textual difficulties. Whether my text will finally prove correct in every respect or not remains of course to be seen. I hope it will fit the constituted text of the whole epic; but I shall not be greatly shocked if it does not. The texts of the present editions, Calcutta, Bombay or Kumbhakonam, do not conform to the details given in the “Table of Contents.” There are all kinds of discrepancies between them: the śloka numbers do not agree; the same is true of the adhyāya and the parvan number. These discrepancies cannot be helped,—so long as we do not know who had done the counting and when it was done. As for the constituted text of the passage in question, I will only say that I have formed it rigidly on the principles of textual criticism worked out by me and followed elsewhere in the course of my work on the edition. These principles have been applied independently of the question of the past, present or future form and divisions of the epic. The constituted text is based mainly on documental and intrinsic probability. It is more than likely that it contains some slight errors; the different versions are interwoven in such an intricate manner that to disentangle them with complete assurance or to one’s complete satisfaction is not yet possible, or perhaps is no longer possible. I honestly believe that the discrepancies between the constituted

text and the present "Table of Contents," will be very considerably diminished. But about one thing I feel perfectly confident and that is that the number is intended to be exactly one hundred. Edgerton himself would probably have been less sceptical had he known that both Arjunamiśra and Nilakaṇṭha have left behind them in their scholia mnemonic stanzas, stating the exact number of (sub-)parvans in each of the eighteen (major) parvans. In both cases the total is exactly one hundred; besides that, the individual figures tally exactly in the two lists.

Here are the stanzas themselves.

Arjunamiśra<sup>5</sup> towards the end of the second adhyāya (Da, fol. 45)

ekonaviṁśati tu parvabhir Ādiparva  
 khyātam, Sabhā navabhir, aṣṭabhir aṣṭayuktaiḥ  
 Āraṇyakam, nanu Virāṭakathā caturbhir,  
 ekādhikair daśabhir Udyamam āmananti || 1 ||  
 Bhaiṣmam ca pañcabhir, atho Gurur aṣṭasamkhyair  
 ekena Karṇam, atha Mudrakathā caturbhiḥ  
 Sauptam tribhis, tad anu pañcabhir Aṅganānām,  
 Śāntis caturbhir, -Anusāsanam ekakena || 2 ||  
 dvābhyām uṣanti Hayamedham, ath-Āśramākhyam  
 āhus tribhir, Muśalaparva tathaikakena  
 ekaikaśo gamana-Nākatatī, ubhābhyām  
 Vamśo Harer, iti kṛtā śūta parvasamkhyā || 3 ||

Nilakaṇṭha (ad 1. 2. 396) :

Ādi-dhyāna-Sabhā-dhanam Vana-cayam Vairāṭa-bhūdyoga-yuk,  
 Bhiṣma Droṇa-majam ca Karṇa-ku tathā Śalye-bha Sauṣupta-  
 gan.  
 Strī-sam Śānti-bha Dānadharma-ku Hayejyā-r-Āśramāvāsa-gam  
 kam kam Mausala-Yānayor Dyugati-kam Vamśe-kham etac  
 chatam ||

<sup>5</sup> The *a priori* attempt of Brockhaus (ZDMG. 6. 528-532) to identify the hundred parvans from these stanzas of Arjunamiśra was premature and doomed to fail.

According to my list the various sub-parvans are distributed among the eighteen major parvans as under :

- I. Ādi (19) : 1 Anukramaṇī.<sup>6</sup> 2 Parvasaṁgraha. 3 Pauṣya. 4 Pauloma. 5 Āstika. 6 Ādivaṁśāvatarāṇa. 7 Saṁbhava. 8 Jatugṛhadāha. 9 Haidimba. 10 Bakavadha. 11 Caitraratha. 12 Svayaṁvara. 13 Vaivāhika. 14 Vidurāgamana. 15 Rājyalambha. 16 Arjunavanavāsa. 17 Subhadrāharaṇa. 18 Haraṇahārīka. 19 Khāṇḍavadāha.
- II. Sabhā (9) : 20 Sabhā. 21 Mantra. 22 Jarāsaṁdhavadha. 23 Digvijaya. 24 Rājasūyika. 25 Arghābhiharaṇa. 26 Śiśupālavadha. 27 Dyūta. 28 Anudyūta.
- III. Āraṇyaka<sup>7</sup> (16) : 29 Āraṇyaka. 30 Kirmīravadha. 31 Kairāta. 32 Indralokābhigamana. 33 Tirthayātrā. 34 Jaṭāsuraavadha. 35 Yakṣayuddha. 36 Ājagara. 37 Mārkaṇḍeysamasyā. 38 Draupadī Satyabhāmāsāmvāda. 39. Ghoṣayātrā. 40 Mṛgasvapnabhaya. 41 Vṛihīdraṇīka. 42 Draupadīharaṇa. 43 Kuṇḍalāharaṇa. 44 Āraṇeya.
- IV. Virāṭa (4) : 45 Vairāṭa. 46 Kīcakavadha. 47 Gograhaṇa. 48 Vaivāhika.

<sup>6</sup> This is the correct name of the first (sub-) parvan, miscalled Anukramaṇīkā in modern editions. See above, the discussion on I. 1. 62.

<sup>7</sup> This is the orthodox name of the third parvan, miscalled Vana-parvan in most Northern MSS., and modern editions. The Southern MSS. generally adhere consecutively to the older names.



- V. Udyoga (11) : 49 Udyoga. 50 Sañjayayāna. 51 Prajāgara. 52 Sanatsujāta. 53 Yānasarndhi. 54 Bhagavadya. 55 Vivāda, 56 Niryaṇa. 57 Rathātirathasarṅkhyā. 58 Ulūkadūtāgamana. 59 Ambopākhyāna.
- VI. Bhīṣma (5) : 60 Bhīṣmābhiṣecana. 61 Jambukhaṇḍanirmāṇa. 62 Bhūmi. 63 Bhagavadgītā. 64 Bhīṣmavadha.
- VII. Droṇa (8) . 65 Droṇābhiṣeka. 66 Saṁsaptakavadha. 67 Abhimanyuvadha 68 Pratijñā. 69 Jayadrathavadha. 70 Ghatotkacavadha. 71 Droṇavadha. 72 Nārāyaṇāstramokṣa.
- VIII. Karṇa (1) : 73 Karṇa.
- IX. Śalya (4) : 74 Śalya. 75 Hradapraveśa. 76 Gadāyuddha. 77 Śārasvata.
- X. Sauptika (3) : 78 Sauptika. 79 Aiṣika. 80 Jalapradānika.
- XI. Strī (5) : 81 Strī. 82 Śrāddha. 83 Abhiṣecanika. 84 Cārvākanigraha 85 Gṛhapravibhāga.
- XII. Śānti (3) : 86 Rājadharmā. 87 Āpaddharma. 88 Mokṣadharmā.
- XIII. Anuśāsana (2) : 89 Ānuśāsānika. 90 Bhīṣmasvargārohaṇa.
- XIV. Aśvamedhika (2) : 91 Aśvamedhika. 92 Anugītā.
- XV. Āśramavāsika (3) : 93 Āśramavāsa. 94 Putradarśana 95 Nārādāgamana.
- XVI. Mausala (1) : 96 Mausala.
- XVII. Mahāprasthānika (1) : 97 Mahāprasthānika.

XVIII. Svargārohaṇa (1) : 98 Svargārohaṇa.  
 (Khila) Harivaṁśa (2) : 99 Harivaṁśa. 100 Bhaviṣyat.<sup>8</sup>

My series differs from that of the mnemonic stanzas only as regards the two (consecutive) parvans Śānti and Anuśāsana. The aggregate number of the two parvans is the same in our lists; the discrepancy is only with regard to the division of the five sub-parvans between the two major parvans. My figures for these parvans are 3 and 2; those given by the scholiasts in their stanzas are 4 and 1 respectively, differing only by one each from mine. I am unable to account for this discrepancy at present.

These stanzas, it will have to be admitted, make the case for the exactitude of the figure 100 very much stronger. Is it conceivable that two different scholiasts would make up two different mnemonic stanzas, each giving a perfectly fictitious series of figures, with the total exactly hundred, for the number of chapter-groups in each of the eighteen books of the epic? These stanzas establish, in my opinion, irrefutably that as late as the time of Arjunamiśra the total number of (sub-)parvans was believed to be *exactly* one hundred, and (what is much more important) the exact number of (sub-)parvans in *each* of the (major) parvans was also believed to be *accurately* known. Whether or not these figures tallied exactly with the actual divisions of the version of the text prepared by these commentators is an entirely different question, which I am not yet prepared to answer in the affirmative. These stanzas stand, in my opinion, for an effort to save from the limbo of oblivion some precious fragment of traditional knowledge regarding the epic. Like fossils these skeletons of the old Parvasaṅgrāhaparva have survived, despite the frantic efforts of centuries of editors and critics to make the "Table of Contents" agree with the form of the text known to them.

Many of Edgerton's suggestions and queries relate to the uses of the wavy line: mostly cases where he has either less or

<sup>8</sup> It will be noticed that 17 (out of the aggregate of 19) names of the (major) parvans, in this scheme, are identical with the names of the *initial* (sub-)parvan of each group. This is valuable because it suggests how the names of the 19 (major) parvans were obtained from the (older) list of the hundred (sub-)parvans.

more confidence in the readings I have adopted. This device, as Edgerton himself admits, is "by its very nature hard to apply strictly and consistently." Moreover, most of the words cited by him are merely commonplace adverbs, conjunctions and other expletives like *caiva*, *āhuḥ* (v. l. *viduḥ*), *iha*, *vai*, *tv-atra*, *cāpi*, *kim-vā* (v. l. *vā kim*) and so on. I will therefore forbear from entering into a detailed discussion of the relative merits of the variants, especially as, in the majority of the cases, the manuscript evidence is so conflicting that absolute certainty is impossible.

I cannot conclude this paper without expressing both to Professor Edgerton and to Dr. Weller my cordial thanks for the very kind remarks they have to make regarding the work in general, and my keen appreciation of the uniformly courteous tone of their very sympathetic reviews.

## BRIEF NOTE.

### *The Date of the Transcription of the Ker<sub>sh</sub>āspnāma.*

In this brief note, I wish to correct two mistakes which I have committed with regard to the date of the transcription of our copy of the Ker<sub>sh</sub>ūspnāma, Pers. 3. <sup>1</sup>

First of all, 7 Rajab 625 is *not* 13 June 1227, but 12 June 1228, as the first of Rajab that year is Tuesday, 6 June 1228. It should also be noted that the 7th of Rajab is a *Monday* <sup>2</sup>, whereas the day mentioned in the colophon is *Friday*.

The second mistake is still more inexcusable. In a footnote to the same page <sup>1</sup>, I have given reasons why I think the figure 6 has been substituted for the figure 10. Therefore the date should be 1025/1616, and not 1045/1635 as I have put it.

Now the 7th of Rajab 1025 is Thursday, 21 July 1616 <sup>3</sup>. This fact confirms the view that this is probably the real date. The copyist mentions Friday, and the difference of one day can be explained on the basis that often, as in the current year, the prevalent dates in the Muslim calendar, based on the actual visibility of the moon, differ, by a day or so, from dates in scientifically calculated calendars like those of Wüstenfeld and Mahler or of Woolhouse <sup>4</sup>.

A. A. A. F.

---

1.—A descriptive list of the Arabic, Persian, and Urdu Mss. in the BBRAS, JBBRAS, (N.S.), vol iii, p. 13.

2.—Wüstenfeld-Mahler, Vergleichungs-Tabellen der mohammedanischen und christlichen Zeitrechnung, 2nd ed., by Ed. Mahler, Leipzig, 1926; p. 18.

3.—*Ibid.*, p. 26.

4.—Enc. Brit., 13th ed., vol. 4, p. 1001 *et seq.*

## SEVENTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS

The XVIIth International Congress of Orientalists met at Oxford on the 27th August, 1928, where assembled not less than 800 delegates from different parts of the world and more than an equal number had joined the Congress with the idea of supporting the present situation of learning and research work in oriental studies which had been begun in or about the year 1888.

The B. B. R. A. Society nominated four delegates out of which Mr. Vishvanath P. Vaidya, one of our Vice-Presidents, and Mr. R. E. Enthoven, C.I.E., I.C.S., an old member of the Society and a trustee of the Campbell Memorial Fund, attended the Congress. Dr. Grierson, the veteran scholar who has prepared the Linguistic survey of India, was absent on account of ill-health and so was Dr. Sukthankar on account of other personal engagements.

The Congress worked for five days and not less than 70—80 papers on researches made in Mesopotamia, Baluchistan, India, Egypt and other places were read, some of them with explanatory magic lantern slides.

One important question which attracted the attention of the Congress was the mention of the preparation of a critical edition of the Mbh. as to which Prof. Winternitz of Prague moved three resolutions which were seconded by Prof. Lüders of Berlin and supported by Prof. Lanman, who was in the chair, Mr. Vaidya of Bombay and several others. The resolutions were as follows :—

1. That this Congress is gratified to find that the preparation of a critical edition of the Mahābhārata, a work of such tremendous importance for the future of Sanskrit research, has been undertaken by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute and congratulates the Institute on the first fruits of its labours, the first fascicule of the critical edition, which was published in July 1927. (The second fascicule was ready and an advance copy of it was presented to the Congress at the time when the resolutions were moved.)

2. That in view of the eminently satisfactory manner in which the work is being done, this Congress is of opinion that the

Mss. collations made and the funds collected for the critical edition of the epic planned by the Association of Academies be now utilized for the purpose of the critical edition being prepared in India, without prejudice to the original project of the Association of Academies.

3. That the Congress therefore recommends that (a) such collations of the Mbh. text as have already been prepared by the Association of Academies for Mbh. work be now utilized for doing further collation from Mbh. Mss. preserved in European libraries, these collations being in due course likewise made available for the purpose of the work of the critical edition now undertaken by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Another important resolution which affected India was moved by Prof. Konow and seconded by Prof. Bloch which appreciated the work done through the help of Government and private scholars, for the elucidation of spoken languages of the country even when they are minor languages and dialects insufficiently known and which are gradually disappearing. The resolution further recommended that the knowledge of the linguistic history of India and especially of the Dardic, Dravidian and Munda languages must not be lost for ever; and that there should be no delay in organising a comprehensive survey in order to record not only the leading grammatical features but also, as fully as possible, the vocabulary of such forms of speech. The resolution further said that the Indian Universities could do great service in training young scholars for such work and the assistance of Indian missionaries would be invaluable. Under the circumstances the Congress earnestly requests the Government of India to take necessary steps at the earliest possible opportunity obtaining, if desired, the co-operation of the commission constituted by the Linguistic Congress of Hague.

In connection with the Congress, there was a reception at Widha College and another was given by the Master of the Magdalen College when photographs were taken as a record of the persons, delegates and members. Some of the Indian delegates were also photographed with the leading members of the Indian section.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

IRANIAN STUDIES BY CURSETJI ERACHJI PAVRY, LATE PRINCIPAL OF THE NASARVANJI RATANJI TATA ZEND PAHLAVI MADRESSA, BOMBAY; CAPTAIN PRINTING WORKS.

The learned author of this book is a grand-pupil of the late Mr. Cursetjee Rustomji Cama, one of the then Vice-President of this Society. Mr. Cama, had, in the late Mr. Sheriarji Dadabhoy Bharucha, a brilliant pupil and Mr. Sheriarji Bharucha has left in Mr. Cursetji Pavri, a brilliant pupil after him. Mr. Pavri is a fully fledged priest of the old type who has officiated as a priest in all the liturgical ceremonies of the Parsees. Again, like a Hindu Pandit, he can recite by heart many of the Zoroastrian scriptures. This traditional knowledge has stood well with him and has helped him much. Like the Pandits of the old type, he does not know English. So, he had up to now placed the results of his study before the public in the Gujarati language. These studies were appreciated by Parsee friends who recommended him to publish his studies in an English garb and the present work is the result. Most of the work—ten chapters out of eleven—is the translation from the pen of Prof. P. A. Wadya, who has done his best to do justice to the work of Mr. Pavri.

The first five chapters give the author's views on Parsee Fire-temples and Towers of Silence. The next three speak of the astronomy of the Avesta, the Avestan divisions of time and the Avestan Golden age of the Avestan Yasna. The last three treat of the Haoma and other ceremonies. In all his studies, the author has given his touches of originality to old traditional thought and as such, his work is to be welcomed as one adding to the literature of Avestan subjects—a work of mature original thought. Scholars of the type of our learned author, form a link between the past and the present and the Parsees will do well if they encourage his work and take all advantage of the old traditional learning, refreshed by the light of the West. It is gratifying to note that, at the

present time, when with some of those who have drunk deep in the learning of the West, it is a fashion to look at the west with suspicion, this scholar, who has drunk deep in the learning of the old traditional school, has given in his dedication "to the Scholars of the West," due credit for their patient and tireless studies of "the lore and learning of ancient, mediæval and modern Iran."

M.

---

SATZLEHRE DER ARAMÄISCHEN SPRACHE DES BABY-  
LONISCHEN TALMUDS Von MICHAEL SCHLESINGER.

(Veröffentlichungen der Alexander Kohut—Stiftung  
Band I) Verlag *Asia Major* (Leipzig, 1928).

Pp. XIX—330.

This book aims to be, what its title indicates, a syntax of the Aramaic language of the Babylonian Talmud. With painstaking care the author seeks to smooth the path, of the student of the Talmud, so beset with difficulties in comprehending the spirit of the Aramaic dialect, and the terse, concise and succinct style in which the Talmud is couched.

Dr. Emanuel Deutsch, whose article on "What is the Talmud?" in the *Quarterly Review* for October 1867 aroused great curiosity and amazing interest in England, says: "Schooled in the harmonising, methodising systems of the West—systems that condense, and arrange, and classify, and give everything its fitting place and its fitting position in that place—he feels stupified here. The language, the style, the method, the very sequence of things (a sequence that often appears as logical as our dreams), the amazingly varied nature of these things—everything seems tangled, confused, chaotic" (*Literary Remains*, London 1874, p. 16). Hence any scientific guide to lead a beginner steer clear through the linguistic maze of the Babylonian Talmud and make the same understandable should be extremely welcome and more so for the fact that this thesaurus of Jewish traditional lore is, till now, very zealously and strenuously studied by millions of Hebrews in the world.



In 586 B.C., when Jerusalem was captured, considerable numbers of Jews were transported from Palestine to Babylon. Only a small band of the Hebrews took benefit of the edict of Cyrus and returned to Palestine. The large majority of the exiled Jews remained in Babylonia and increased in population. During the Parthian period (160 B.C.—226 A.C.) they gained, for a time, complete political control over a certain district of the country. In fact, soon after they were transported to Babylon “they entered every phase of the economic life of the country.” Even upto the Sassanid period they enjoyed the rights and privileges of free citizens. They became *babylonized* in Babylonia adopting Babylonian names as personal, Babylonian words and phrases, mostly legal and commercial, in the Talmudic literature. The *babylonization* reached its climax in the fact of their adopting “the language of the country, which was Aramaic in vocabulary and grammar and seemingly Assyro-Babylonian in its phonetic.” Even later on as the Arabic came to hold ascendancy, the Jews strictly adhered to the use of Aramaic which Sandiah, in his commentary on *Sefer Yetsira* reverently terms “the language of the fathers” (Krauss, *Jew. Ency.* Art. Babylonia)<sup>1</sup>.

Now the Babyl. Talmudic idiom, as one belonging to the group of Eastern Aramaic dialects, was spoken in Babylonia including the towns of Nehardea, Sora and Pumbeditha during the 4th, 5th and 6th centuries of the Christian era, and did not die out till the 9th century. Later on it became influenced by the language of the Hebrews. For ten more centuries no attempt was made to frame, from the vast existing materials, any rules to elucidate the Phonology and Morphology of the Eastern Aramaic.

It was in the latter half of the 19th century that the learned Italian Jewish critic—Samuel David Luzzatto, brought out his *Elementi grammaticale del caldeo biblico e del dialetto talmudico babilionese*, Padua, 1865. (German trans. by M. S. Krüger, Breslau,

<sup>1</sup> The writer is indebted for this to Dr. H. S. Linfield for the valuable information contained in his excellent doctorate dissertation on “*The Relation of Jewish to Babylonian Law*” presented to the Chicago University—vide *American Journal of Semitic Languages & Literature*. Vol. XXXVI No. 1, Oct. 1919.

1873 ; Engl. Vers. by J. Goldammer, New York, 1876 ; and Hebrew rendering of the 2nd pt. (Talmudic) by Ch. Z. Lerner, St. Petersburg, 1880). Though Luzzatto compressed his materials for the Talmudic part within small limits, his grammar, nevertheless, received the commendation and admiration of Nöldeke (*Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875, p. V). A few German scholars then came into the field and contributed to the grammatical discussion of the Eastern Aramaic by means of their doctorate dissertations, to wit: (1) G. Rülff: *Zur Lautlehre der aramäischen talmudischen Dialekte I, Die Kehllaute* (Leipzig, 1879), (2) A. Liebermann: *Das Pronomen und das Adverbium des babylonisch-talmudischen Dialektes* (Berlin, 1895), and (4) M. Lewin: *Aramäische Sprichwörter and Volkssprüche* (Berlin, 1899).<sup>2</sup> These monographs written by different scholars from their respective linguistic viewpoints, cannot claim for each of them merit, for being in itself exhaustive. It was reserved for America to win laurels in the field of Talmudic philology ; and the stimulus given there to the close study of the Talmud, in the various Collegiate Institutes of New York, Philadelphia and Cincinnati, Ohio, resulted in the production of a copious and comprehensive *Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom of the Babylonian Talmud with constant reference to Gaonic Literature* (Cincinnati, 1900) by C. Levias. America took a still forward step, and within a decade Professor M. Margolis of the Dropsie College, Philadelphia, after a strenuous study of the Talmud for 20 years, brought out to light his researches at the kind suggestion of Dr. H. Strack, Prof. of Theology at the Berlin University, both in German and in English (separately) as *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Baby. Talmud* (Grammar, Chrestomathy, and Glossaries, München, 1910), forming the 3rd part of the *Clavis Linguarum Semiticarum*, edited by Prof. Strack (now of revered memory).

By the recent death of Dr. Strack, Semitic learning has sustained an irreparable loss. As Hebraist Dr. Strack stood at high eminence. He was after Reuchlin's heart. What Reuchlin (15th cent.) did in his days to restore Hebrew and promote Greek studies

<sup>2</sup> To these may be added (5) I. Rosenberg: *Das aramaische Verbum in babylonischen Talmud*, Marburg, 1888.

in Germany, Strack did to encourage Hebrew and Rabbinic learning in the Continental Universities. His *Einleitung in Talmud und Midras* (5th Ed.) stands a monument acknowledged by the Talmudists as a work couched in thoroughness and impartiality.

In 13th Century the Talmud faced a trial before the Court of Inquisitors appointed by Louis IX of France (known to fame as St. Louis); and the Court denounced it "as a farrago of blasphemy, slander, superstition, immorality and folly." In 1242 fourteen—some say four and twenty—cart-loads of copies of the Talmud fed the bonfire to the bitter grief of the French Jews, some pious of whom observed the anniversary of the cremation as a day of fasting. With time, as instrument in the hands of Providence to heal the long inflicted wounds, the Talmud has, during the last seven centuries, regained in vigour and vivacity, even as it is now appreciated by Christian Theologians as a valuable asset in the study of theology and Semitic philology. The crowning efforts of Dr. Strack, which have immortalised his name, constitute his signal service to the world of scholars by his publication of the photographed edition of the unique complete Munich manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud, which, by constant use for collating various readings, has arrived at the sad condition of being crumbled, and the further preservation of which is being threatened at every moment.

Dr. Margolis' *Manual* is, in its dealing with Phonology and Morphology, characteristically concise, leaving the reader considerable exercise for comprehending the rules from the examples. The finest trait of it, so absent in the works of Luzzatto and Levias, is the discussion therein of *Syntax* for which Margolis has followed the guidance of Nöldeke in his excellent *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle, 1875) and *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1898). Margolis' *Syntax*, restricted to rules three and thirty but enriched with copious examples, could comprise only a few pages. Consequently there has been a great desideratum of an elaborate treatise on the syntax of the Aramaic of the Babil-Talmud which would be a fitting complement to Levias' Grammar. This has, fortunately, been supplied by Schlesinger, who in his *Satzlehre*

devotes 300 pages to an analytic and systematic elucidation of the Aramaic of the Babylonian dialect.

In formulating and grouping these syntactical rules, the author highly deserves the merit of having succeeded in presenting in a wide scope all that is essential. While treating of a simple sentence he dwells on the nominal, verbal and adverbial clauses, the personal pronoun as copula, paranomasia, the subject in a noun clause (Muḥtada'), the predicate in a noun clause (Ḥabar), and the theory of the so-called nominative absolute construction (*casus pendens*) on the lines laid out by H. Reckendorf in his solid work (*Die Syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, Leiden, 1898).

Then follow remarks on the distributive repetitions, the use of the genitive construction, the genitive signification of the superlative, the substantive in opposition to the personal pronoun, the comparison of adjectives, numerals, fractional numbers, negative attributes, double negation, the essentials of a verbal clause, the use of the tenses, use of the participle with or without the auxiliary "hawa," indefinite subject, and the concord of the parts of a sentence. He also discusses status constructus, pronouns and pronominal suffixes, adjectives used as nouns, close determination of the noun in adverbial and prepositional forms, accusative of circumstance, place and time, a negative and a interrogative sentence, joining together of the parts of a sentence. While treating of the peculiarity of the compound sentence, he elucidates a co-ordinate, parallel and a double sentence, the syndeton for various logical relations, as well as the asyndetic conditional clauses and secondary clauses. We have touched here only a few points, in the discussion of which (as well of other points not mentioned here) the author has exhibited his erudition by scientifically sifting his illustrations culled from the text of the Talmud, with their renderings in German.

The examples number 2,568, and show by distribution as drawn from the six *Sedarim* or *Orders* of the Talmud in the following manner:—

- (1) The *Order* of Zeraim (Seeds) 125 ;
- (2) The *Order* of Moed (Festivals) 1020 ;

- (3) The *Order* of Nashim (Women) 363 ;
- (4) The *Order* of Nezikin (Damages) 576 ;
- (5) The *Order* of Kodashim (Sacred Things) 441 ; and
- (6) The *Order* of Taharoth (Purification) 43.

We might quote here a few examples illustrating *asyndeton* (§ 174). This rhetorical figure, present in the Hebrew (Is. 52. 1 ; Hos. 1. 6) and common in all Semitic Languages, is very prominent in Talmudic proverbs and other prose of elevated style. By way of illustrating the figure in the case of *verb* in protasis, our author quotes (p. 281) the following proverbs which rendered into English from the Aramaic stand thus :—

- (a) The proverb says : “ If a dispute be put off for one night, it will cease altogether ” (Sanh. 95a).
- (b) “ If thou goest to the roof (*i.e.* on a journey ever so short), take thy provisions with thee. Though a 100 gourds be had in a city for a *zuz* (smallest coin), nevertheless take them under thy wings.<sup>3</sup> (Pes. 113a : this reference is wrongly printed as 13a and needs correction).
- (c) There goes a proverb in Palestine : “ If the clouds are bright, their waters are little ; if the clouds are dark,\* their waters pour abundant ” (Ta’ an. 10a).

In the case of a *noun* in the protasis :—

- (d) “ Music in the house—destruction at the threshold ” (Sota 48a).
- (e) “ A mist before rain—a sign of coming rain ; a mist after rain—a sign of the cessation of rain ” (Ta’ an. 9b).
- (f) A proverb says : “ When the day is high the sick man is (temporarily) relieved ” (B. Bath. 16b).

With *imperative* as sequel :—

- (g) A proverb says : “ If thy wife be dwarf, bend down and listen to her (advice) ” (B. Metz. 59a).

---

<sup>3</sup> It means “ However short be the journey, or however cheap be food, never travel without provisions.”

- (h) A proverb says of certain uncivilised peoples:—"If a Narashean kissed thee, count thy teeth; if one of Nehar—Pekudaah escort thee, take care of the fine mantle which he has seen over thee; if one of Pumbeditha escort thee, change thy inn" (Hullin 127a).
- (i) "Even when the ox has its head in the (fodder) basket, go up to the roof, and remove the ladder from under thee" (Ber. 33a).
- (j) "If thou bringest dates home, with thy *sinus* (before ungirding) run up to the brewery (Pes. 113a).

In the rules of Syntax the author has emphasised the salient points in the light of Semitic Grammar, for which he rightly holds Brockelmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* Bd. II "Syntax" as Standard authority. We should not, however, overlook the fact that before Brockelmann published his *syntax*, Dr. Frank R. Blake of John Hopkins University had written his erudite article on "Comparative Syntax of the Combinations formed by the Noun and its Modifiers in Semitic" (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXXII, 1912, pp. 135, 201). The frequent references not only to the Mandaic—the dialect of the Mandeans or gnostics, but also to the later Hebrew and the other Jewish—Aramaic dialects make one realise that this *Satzlehre* is sufficient to arouse interest in, and to be helpful to, the student of the Talmud. The rules therein are further marked with precision and clearness of expression. We should have no hesitation in pronouncing it as scientifically sound and highly practical in value. The author has utilised for his illustrations the Talmudic text as in the Wilna edition, and has freely consulted the *variae lectiones* in the Mishnah and the Talmud by Rabbinnowicz, (Munich 1868—86), the Munich codex, and the glosses recommended by the ancient Jewish commentators as well as the authors of the Halachaic and Aggadic compendiums including Rabbi Bezalel Ashkenazi's *Schittah Megubeseth*. It is a matter of extreme satisfaction that with Levy, Kohut and Jastrow in the front rank of Talmudic Lexicographers, and Levias, Margolis and Schlesinger as Talm. Grammarians,

the Talmud—the voluminous Encyclopædia of Jewish Science and lore—cannot remain now a *terra incognita*. Before we bring this review to a close we might say passingly that the author concludes his foreword to the *Satzlehre* with expression of gratefulness and filial reverence to his father Dr. Lipmann Schlesinger of Hamburg who, as his teacher and guide, enlightened the author both in his early and advanced study of the Talmud and counselled him throughout his academical career, and, last but not the least, gave the benefit of his deep Talmudic erudition by going through this laborious work and making valuable and healthy suggestions. Praise is due to the publishers of the *Asia Major* for bringing out in fine print this work which forms Vol. I of a series of works, appertaining to Semitic Philology to be published under the auspices of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation established in 1923 in Berlin.

EZEKIEL MOSES EZEKIEL.

---

KĀVYA-PRAKĀŚĀ OF MAMMATA TRANSLATED BY MAHAMAHOPĀ-DHIYĀYA GANGANATHA JHA, INDIAN PRESS, ALLAHABAD.

In the whole range of the works on Sāhitya-sāstra the Kāvya-prakāśa occupies a unique position. “It sums up in itself,” as Mr. Kane has said, “all the activities that had been going on for centuries in the field of poetics; while it becomes itself, a fountain-head from which fresh streams of doctrines issue forth. Like the Śārirakabhāṣya in Vedānta or the Mahābhāṣya in grammar, the Kāvya-prakāśa becomes a starting-point for future exegesis and expansion.”

To the student of poetics, then, this work is indispensable. Numerous commentaries have been written on it. Recently, that of Zalkikar, is very lucid. But for a student of comparative poetics, a reliable translation is absolutely necessary. The commentaries are either too technical for him or too voluminous.

Dr. Jha first published a translation in the *Pundit* about 30 years ago. Even then it was a very creditable performance. He now publishes a second revised edition. Over and above numerous corrections, short, useful and explanatory notes have been added.

Amaranath Jha, the son of the author, has also added some notes, 'which would help the comparative study of this interesting subject.'

The translation is in most places accurate and lucid. A noteworthy feature is that verses, which contain a Śleṣa, have been quoted in a transliterated form. This would be very useful to students who cannot go to the original text. A translation, without the original verses, is in such cases meaningless. The short notes in brackets and in small type, are very illuminating and very often give in a nutshell the result of a long and involved technical disquisition. But the distinction between the rectangular and the ordinary brackets is not kept up consistently.

The translation of technical terms is always a difficulty. Dr. Jha has generally succeeded in finding appropriate English equivalents; a few, however, are not so happy: Thus Arthālaṅkāra (ideal figure of speech), Anucitārtha (the shameful), Viśeṣokti (Peculiar allegation), Arthāntaranyāsa (transition), etc. The best method in the case of these technical terms, is to give the original name side by side with the proposed translation. This has been adopted in the greater portion of the translation, but not everywhere. The want is very prominently felt in the seventh Ullāsa, which deals with the kāvya-doṣas.

During the last thirty years, we have advanced very much in our knowledge about Sanskrit poetics and the teachers of the s̥ahitya-śāstra. A few knotty points, however, still defy solution. Thus whether Mammaṭa wrote the whole work or not is yet an unsettled problem (see V. Sukthankar, *ZDMG* 66 (1912), 477ff., 533ff. Winternitz, *Geschichte*, III, 20; P. V. Kane; *History of Alāṅkāra literature*, CIII). An attempt at the solution of this and other kindred problems might have formed a fitting introduction to this noteworthy translation.

In conclusion, we recommend this work to all the students of Sanskrit S̥ahitya-śāstra, and to the general reader, who is interested in Indian learning. We can, without hesitation, maintain that this work will occupy a prominent position in the remarkable literary activity of Dr. Jha.



THE STATE IN ANCIENT INDIA, BY DR. BENI PRASAD, M.A., PH.D., D. SC. The Indian Press Limited, Allahabad. (Price Rs. 10).

The State in Ancient India, is another valuable addition to the study of ancient Indian polity, by Dr. Beni Prasad, Reader in Civics and Politics, at the Allahabad University. The work was submitted as a thesis for the D.Sc. degree of the University of London and is now published in book form. It contains a study in the structure and practical working of political institutions in North India in ancient times. The author does not attach particular importance to the political institutions that flourished in the South of India since they came considerably after the institutions in North India. The "ancient history," therefore, according to the view that the author has taken, must take the North of the continent as its proper subject. The point here raised is not free from controversy, but the author has certainly followed the sounder course in confining himself to the North. The work under review has been prepared with great care, and the spirit of true scientific investigation is evident throughout its five hundred pages. Liberal use has been made of original sources in the Vedic and the post-Vedic Sanskrit literature in gleaning relevant information, and no important foreign source is neglected. The author displays a spirit of reasonable discussion, and has handled controversial points with praiseworthy balance of judgment. His book should prove an excellent antidote to the wild assertions of some Bengal scholars with regard to the prevalence of modern democratic institutions in ancient India. From the Rigveda down to twelfth century of the Christian era, Dr. Beni Prasad has tried to trace the political history of India, and in doing so he has not fallen into the temptation of ascribing things that did not exist to the political organisation in this country. At the same time, he has brought out all the salient points about that organisation which must explode once for all the theory that the political institutions of ancient India do not deserve the attention of serious scholars. The work of Dr. Beni Prasad proves that in spite of the scanty material which is available for the study, there is a definite evolution of

the theory of a state and of the art of government, discernible through the long centuries of India's history.

The conclusions that the author has ventured to draw from his careful study are invariably sane. His contention that the caste system of the Hindus is subversive of the democratic spirit and entirely loses sight of the individual value in man is widely shared by students. He has tried to trace the development of the village organisation and his conclusion that in earlier times what is called the democratic village government is unknown is based on sound evidence. His tribute to Buddhism for its organisation and for its spirit of toleration is well deserved and he appears to be on more solid ground than some researchers in ancient Indian history when he says :—" The principles which underlay the Hindu system of governance as a whole . . . . . bear a partial resemblance to the principles of mediæval European polity." The Hindu state was undoubtedly monarchical for the very good reason that the institution of caste supports neither democracy nor aristocracy. At the same time, the monarchy was sought to be made an ideal institution and various checks were provided against oppressive kings. The Hindu state was not a theocratic state, though the Brahmins wielded considerable influence in government. The concluding sentences of the author bring out both the strong and the weak points of the Hindu State. " The Hindu state sanctioned too many tolls and petty dues and too much forced labour. It failed signally to reclaim the tribes on the frontiers or in the centre of India. It fell a victim to caste and deliberately refused to bring the lower classes into line with the rest of Hindu society or to encourage their higher life. It allied itself with priestcraft and conservatism and helped to perpetuate the distinctions between man and man. Lastly, the Hindu state, parochial, short-sighted and isolated from the rest of the world, failed to keep abreast of the times and to organise the resources of the country against foreign invasions. At last, in the thirteenth century, it shipwrecked in the storms it was incapable of weathering. On the other hand, the Hindu state was generally alive to some vital interests of the people. It encouraged agriculture and looked after irrigation. It stepped in to save the consumers from exorbitant profiteering and allowed

all classes of craftsmen to band together. It cared for the means of communication and had no small share in promoting the homogeneity of culture throughout the country. The rulers often provided for the comforts of travellers and sick people and showed unstinted generosity to the poor people. The Hindu courts favoured poets and scholars and endowed academies and veritable universities which won the enthusiastic admiration of great Chinese scholars. The Hindu state succeeded in maintaining conditions favourable to the rise of systems of philosophy which still command respect, religions, which in certain aspects, touch the sublimest heights, and a literature which ranks among the great literatures of the world."

The author has not only utilised the old epics but has also made use of the works of Sanskrit classic poets like Kalidas in the course of his investigation. That is a departure from the beaten path, but it is a welcome departure. The Sanskrit classic works can yield an amount of information valuable to both the historian and the student of the social sciences. In the matter of dates, the author has preferred to overlook the claims for higher dates. That is a matter on which there is likely to be a difference among scholars. Wild claims for higher dates must be sternly rejected. At the same time, there is a tendency among European scholars to accept the later dates and to create the impression that the Hindu history is not ancient enough. Some European scholars have shown an almost feverish eagerness to jump to that conclusion. Before we finish this short review of a valuable book, we might congratulate Dr. Beni Prasad on the care and balanced judgment that he displays in its composition. To essay the survey of a literature extending over nearly three thousand years for the purpose of extracting a particular kind of information was by no means an easy task. It is a matter for profound satisfaction that Dr. Beni Prasad has performed that task with conspicuous ability.

M. D. ALTEKAR.

---

**THE THEORY OF GOVERNMENT IN ANCIENT INDIA, BY DR. BENI PRASAD ; The Indian Press, Allahabad ; Price Rs. 8-8-0.**

Dr. Beni Prasad of the Allahabad University secured his Ph. D. in Political Science at the University of London by submitting a thesis on the "Theory of Government in Ancient India." He has now published it in the book form. Prof. Beni Prasad has tried, by reference to original authorities, to describe in detail the basic principles of Government in Ancient India, and he has traced the growth of ideas about Government and the state from the Vedic times right down to the days of classical Sanskrit literature, and he has performed his task in a very commendable manner indeed. That the ancient Hindus had any theory of Government was not even recognised for a long time by western scholars. The discovery and publication of the treatises on Arthaśāstra attributed to Cāṇakya led these scholars to entertain the claim seriously, though there are portions of the Mahābhārata, particularly the Śānti Parvan, which provide a good deal of material to formulate a theory of Government. The continued and at times arrogant assumption of the western scholars, that the Hindus never developed a theory of Government had its reaction in India when a school of thought arose particularly in Bengal which claimed that India had a fully developed system of government and had even democratic institutions which would stand comparison with similar modern institutions. Professor Beni Prasad has fortunately allowed his reason to rule his sentiments and thus his book presents an accurate picture of the political life in India in post-vedic times and he has proved that the science of politics had developed in India to a considerable degree, without attributing to it institutions which it did not know. The author has treated the troubled question of caste in a thoroughly dispassionate manner and his statement that "whatever its original causes, caste which fixes the station of man according to birth and which restricts intermarriage among groups, is taken for granted throughout the greater period of Hindu history and obtrudes at innumerable points into Government organisation and theory" will be accepted as correct by all thinking men. And his conclusion that the theory of caste "strikes at the root of individuality and amounts almost to a denial of personality" will not be

seriously contested. The Arthaśāstras of Kauṭilya and Brhaspati have been noticed at length in the fifth chapter of the book and an interesting description is given how the theory of Government was worked in practice. A chapter describing the Buddhist and the Jain theories of Government is also included and it undoubtedly adds to the value of the book as a fully representative story of the ancient political ideas in this country. To a student who carefully studies this work, the conclusion is irresistible that (to use the words of Professor A. B. Keith who writes a foreword to the book) the author's "work should serve to dispel the prevalent impression that India in ancient times was pre-eminently a land of transcendental philosophers and had no place for men of practical thought, skilled in state craft and capable of wise and efficient Government." To dispel such wrong impressions entertained due to ignorance or to mischievous intention is a great service both to the people of India and to historical research, and Dr. Beni Prasad deserves to be congratulated on having written a book which will serve as a safe guide to all those who wish to know the truth about ancient India.

M. D. ALTEKAR.

---

RELIGIONS OF THE EMPIRE.—*A Conference on some Living Religions within the Empire.* BY WILLIAM LOFTUS HARE, Pp. 519, 8 vo. London, Duckworth.

India can well be proud of a move in this direction made by Akbar, the great Moghul Emperor, some 330 years ago. In Europe this idea took a material shape in the early eighties and the result was the publication of the *Sacred Books of the East* series. In the nineties, the movement gathered force and the world's Parliament of Religions was held at Chicago in 1893. "The credit for the idea of this parliament of religions must be given to a band of American ministers of religion who in 1891 issued the proposal to the world and gained a notable response." The Congress was attended not only by representatives, but by specialists and experts. Later on the Congress met at Paris in 1900, and thereafter at Basel, Oxford and Leiden at the interval of every four years. After an

interruption of about twelve years due to the tragedy of the war the Congress resumed the activities at Paris in the year 1924.

These congresses are meant to create healthy emulation to bring each religion to a higher status. They bring nations into more friendly fellowship in the hope of securing permanent international peace. It should be understood that the enemy of religion is not criticism or science, but simply irreligion.

The fine array of papers in this volume speaks for itself and can be taken as a sure sign of the success of the session. It is easy to imagine the difficult situation both of the readers of the papers and the editor of this volume. It is difficult for the editor to accommodate all the papers in their entirety within the limited bulk of the volume and much more for the scholars who have to incorporate in a paper of this type all the important dogmas and truths about the particular religion and that too in a manner as would be easily grasped by those who are outside the fold of that religion. One should not, therefore, approach these papers with the expectation of getting detailed information about the various religions discussed therein. Volumes can be written not only on each of these religions but even on different sub-sects of several of them. These are meant just to kindle the fire of curiosity or the love for the study of the various religions. The barest outlines or head-notes are given by individual experts in a fashion as would be readily available to students of comparative religion. If we go through these papers we cannot but feel that these writers, one and all, were fully alive to the requirements and limitations of the situation and wrote not with the idea of showing off their proficiency but with the idea of showing what important truths each religion holds and teaches in common.

We sincerely congratulate the writers of these papers and especially the organisers of this movement for the slow yet steady and signal success they have achieved during the course of a few years.

The volume is ably edited and the printing and get-up can be considered as excellent.

TA'RĪKH-I FAKHRU'D-DĪN MUBĀRAKSHĀH. EDITED BY E. DENISON ROSS. pp. xx+84. ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, LONDON, 1927. (JAMES G. FORLONG FUND.)

Students of Persian are indebted to Sir Denison Ross, for introducing to them Fakhr-Mudīr and his work. He first gave us an excellent account of this little work, with an abridged translation (see '*Ajabnāma*: A volume of Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne on his 60th Birthday, p. 392), and now we have before us this neatly edited text.

Apart from its historical importance, the most interesting part of this little work, to my mind, is the author's spirited vindication of the Turks and the Turkish character. The common and erroneous notion, that the Turks are a barbarous nation, and that they have only produced monsters and tyrants like Hulagu, and Tamerlane, and Nādirshāh, does not take into account that Bābur and Akbar and the great Moghul Emperors were Turks; that Chengiz Khan, one of the world's greatest conquerors was a Turk; that the rise of the House of 'Uthmān and its achievements are a great chapter in the history of the world.

Fakhr-Mudīr, by his extravagant praise, provides a corrective to this view. He says that 'never since the days of Adam, have we seen a slave bought at a price rise to regal dignity, except among the Turks (how joyful he would have been to see the rise of Mustafa Kemal!).' Other races are honoured at home; the Turks make themselves honoured abroad. Their country is enormous in extent (37), and wonderful in its products (38). And all this greatness is principally due to their firmness in religion when once they embrace the true faith—Islam (35).

The text is well-edited and clearly printed. Barring a few inconsequential misprints, I have not detected any important mistakes. (P. xvi—Account of Adam and Eve, read ۷۵ -end; on p. xviii, p. ۲۰, l. 10=p. ۲۰, l. 11 and سپنج occurs in l. 14, not 13, of the same page. 9<sup>13</sup> read اِذَا; 17<sup>16</sup> read بِالسِّيَاسَةِ; 28<sup>13</sup> read بهلوان; 76<sup>4</sup> read بزهارت ).

There is an excellent summary of contents, and the notes and corrections are useful. The translation of 4<sup>2,3</sup> is not quite satisfactory. *الاتايم جماعة* seems to indicate that the Climes *inter se* are like a community, inter-related and inter-dependent. In 47<sup>0</sup>, the insertion of *ذكر* after *قبيله* does not seem necessary and at 78<sup>10</sup> *ونواميزد* makes good sense and the emendation suggested is not happy.

It is unfortunate, however, that there is no index : but what most of all miss, is a Glossary of selected words. The book, though small, is particularly rich in interesting words and the author's vocabulary would repay careful study. In Arabic we have scholars like De Goeje, Sir Charles Lyall and Prof. A. A. Bevan, who have given us excellent glossaries to the texts they have edited or studied ; and it is only such material that has made possible the compilation of a scientific Dictionary of the Arabic Language. I wish Sir Denison had also recorded all the interesting words and usages in the text, and thus lightened the labour of the future lexicographer of Persian.

Page 38 of the text is full of rare words. It is to be noted that in 1.9 we have *شاهين*, which presents no difficulty ; whereas the editor was puzzled when he read " Shāmīn " earlier, ' *Ajabnāma*, 404 (19). Here are a few words and usages selected at random :—

*درفشان* (for *درخشان*, see Horn, *Neupers. Etym.*, no. 553, p. 123), 1<sup>4</sup>, 2<sup>0</sup>. *قماش* 20<sup>4</sup>, 28<sup>10</sup>. *رداله* 20<sup>7</sup>. *سپنج* 20<sup>14</sup>, 33<sup>11</sup>. *جبحون*, in the sense of " river " (see Notes), 40<sup>0</sup>. *جفراوات* 41<sup>0</sup>. Note use of *سخت* in phrases like *سخت بسيار* etc., 47<sup>1</sup>, 69<sup>1</sup>. *بيلک* 49<sup>0</sup>. *نا چم* 49<sup>0</sup>.

A. A. A. F.



PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
BOMBAY BRANCH  
OF THE  
**Royal Asiatic Society**

---

**Annual Report for 1927**

The Society was honoured during the past year by a visit from His Excellency the Governor of Bombay. The occasion was the presentation of the Campbell Memorial Gold Medal for 1926 to Professor Jadunath Sarkar, the Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University, for his researches in Indian History. After presenting the medal and speaking appreciatively of the work of the Society and of the unique position it holds in the intellectual life of the Presidency, Sir Leslie Wilson made the circuit of the library, being particularly impressed with its size and fine appearance and with the manuscript collection.

Two other pleasurable occasions were the "At Home" which our President, Sir Amberson Marton, gave to the members of the Society on 4th October 1927 and which was attended and greatly enjoyed by over 100 members, and the reception accorded by the Society to Dr. Heinrich Lüders, the Senior Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Berlin. Dr. Lüders is a Fellow of our Society and gave us on this occasion a very remarkable survey of the scientific needs and future of Oriental studies. We were specially pleased to meet also Frau Lüders, his able collaborator in Sanskrit studies.

Extension of facilities in the use of our library has been one of the outstanding developments of the year. The arrangement for reciprocal use of libraries between the University of Bombay and ourselves, having proved a success in its first year of trial, was continued, special arrangements for reading by University students being the one alteration suggested by experience. A much greater step has been taken by the Society by throwing open the use of the library to persons living in any part of India. Hitherto we have confined this privilege to members residing within the limits of our Presidency but it is hoped that this great extension may lead to a corresponding increase in our non-resident membership, a very desirable event as the final paragraph of this report will show.

At the same time a very welcome extension has been made to our library accommodation by the addition of ground-floor rooms in the Town Hall to our filing department so that, from occupying about one-tenth we now occupy about one-third of the total ground-floor of the Hall. Our need of such additional space had been growing more and more pressing of recent years, and our heartiest thanks are due to Mr. G. A. Thomas, the Collector of Bombay, for meeting our need of this extension with his recommendation to Government and securing rooms at a nominal rental for twenty years. At the same time and through the same assistance, the Durbar Hall on the first floor, which corresponds in size and position with our Committee Room, has been opened for our use as a meeting and lecture room whenever the Legislative Council or Public Commissions do not require it. We close the year, therefore, in a very favourable position as regards space for books and meetings and are not likely to require any addition in this respect for several years to come. The existing racks left by the Government Book Depot on the ground floor have been acquired by us at a special concession price and will suffice for present needs.

With respect to our collection, it has been decided to retain our Numismatic Collection and the former resolution to hand it over, after listing, to the Prince of Wales Museum, along with the other collections, has been rescinded. To cover the Archaeological, Epigraphical and Geological collections already handed over to the Museum a draft agreement of loan has been submitted to the Museum for approval.

So that special attention might be paid to the Oriental activities of the Society, a new office of Honorary Oriental Secretary has been set up, and Mr. V. P. Vaidya, one of our Vice-Presidents and a well-known Oriental scholar, has held the position for the first year.

Another plan to further encourage Oriental research among our members, *viz.*, the institution of a Silver Medal, is at the stage of preparation of dies for the mould from which the Medal can be cast. The Medal is for award biennially to the member who shall be considered to have made the most signal contribution to Oriental scholarship during the previous two years.

For several years since our resident membership reached its present proportions, the insufficiency of copies of our weekly and monthly magazines and journals for circulation has been strongly felt. Some relief has been found in purchasing second-hand copies of a few in greatest demand, but the importance of our circulation system for the welfare of the library has demanded fuller attention to this problem. It has been decided, therefore, by the Managing Committee to follow a new system of purchasing one additional copy of certain periodicals most in demand for every twenty-five members who enter their names for it to be circulated to them.

A statement of the receipts and expenditure is subjoined. It is regretted that, whilst the expenditure remains practically the same as last year, our

income from all sources is less by Rs. 825-7-6. This reduction is due largely to the falling off in membership and in an increased number of members going on to the absent list. At the end of the year under review we have a membership of 661 against 668 at the end of 1926 and 693 at the end of 1925. Every effort is made to keep the expenditure down as low as possible, but there is little that can be done in this direction without affecting the efficiency of the library.

It is necessary, therefore, that an effort be made to increase our income, which can only be done by the introduction of new members. We appeal to all members to try and arrest this decline in membership and to make an effort to bring it back to its former strength of 700 by introducing the advantages of the Society and its library to their friends.

### Members

#### RESIDENT

On the roll on 1-1-27.	New admissions.	Non-Res. become Resident.	Resigned or ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Non-Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1-1-28.
503	61	5	55	10	4	500

#### NON-RESIDENT

On the roll on 1-1-27.	New admissions.	Resident become Non-Res.	Resigned or ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1-1-28.
165	13	10	20	5	2	161

Of the 500 Resident Members, 45 are Life-Members, and of the 161 Non-Resident Members, 12 are Life-Members.

### Obituary

The Committee regret to record the death of the following Members :—

#### RESIDENT

Mr. Gulabchand Devchand.

Mr. T. G. S. Little.

Dr. V. G. Desai.

„ Madhavji D. Morarji.

#### NON-RESIDENT

Mr. U. R. Rao.

Rev. R. S. Rose.

### Papers read and lectures delivered before the Society

30th March 1927—Indian Sculpture. By Dr. K. N. Sitaram, M.A., Ph.D.

5th April 1927—Position of Woman in Rabbinical Literature. By Prof. E. M. Ezekiel, B.A., LL.B.

20th November 1927—The Complete Identity of the Avestic Yima with the Vedic Yama and Manu, and the Pre-Historic Iranian Migration to India in two Independent Waves. By R. K. Dadachanji, B.A., LL.B.

16th December 1927—A lantern lecture on the Ajanta Caves. By Shrimant Bulasaheb, Pant Pratinidhi, Chief of Aundh.

### Library

#### ISSUES

Old Books.	New Books.	Loose Periodicals	Total.	Average per working day.
26,747	16,603	30,430	73,780	245·9

The total number of issues in the previous year was 68,082.

#### ADDITIONS

The total number of volumes added was 1,521, of which 1,232 were purchased and 289 were presented.

Books presented to the Society were received, as usual, from the Government of India, the Government of Bombay, and other Provincial Governments, as well as from the Trustees of the Parsi Panchayat Funds, other public bodies and individual donors.

A meeting of the Society, under Art. XXI of the Rules, was held on the 21st of November for the purpose of revising the list of the papers and periodicals received by the Society, and it was decided—

(a) to add the following from 1928—

- (1) *Manchester Guardian (Weekly)*, (2) *Mask*, (3) *Writers' and Artists' Year Book*, (4) *Photograms of the Year*, (5) *Der Islam*, (6) *Standard Bearer*, (7) *Islamic Culture*, (8) *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* ;

(b) to omit the following from 1928—

- (1) *Manchester Guardian (Daily)*, (2) *Times Trade Supplement*, (3) *Publishers' Circular*, (4) *Lancet*, (5) *Saturday Review*, (6) *Argosy*, (7) *National Review*, (8) *Quest*, (9) *World Lore*, (10) *American Journal of Science*, (11) *Current History*, (12) *Nation (American)*, (13) *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, (14) *Indian Medical Gazette* ;

and to make an attempt to obtain the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* in exchange for the Society's Journal.

### The Journal

One number of the Journal, *viz.*, No. 2 of Vol. II., was published during the year. The following are the principal articles in the number:—

JIVANJI J. MODI.—Eighteen Remarkable Things or Events of the Reign (593-628) of Khusru Parviz (Khosrocs II) of Persia.

C. R. K. CHARLU.—The Cradle of Indian History.

V. A. GADGIL.—The Village in Sanskrit Literature.

JEHANGIR C. TAVADIA.—Some important publications on Indology.

D. B. DISKALKAR.—Epigraphic Notes and Questions.

JIVANJI J. MODI.—A Few Persian Inscriptions of Kashmir.

### Coin Cabinet

80 coins were added to the Society's Cabinet during the year under report. The coins are of the following description.

#### KSHATRAPA COINS

##### Silver—

4	Vijayasena.	Type M. K. 16 (5) or (6); 16 × ; 171; no date.
3	Rudrasena II.	„ M. K. 189; 18 × ; no date.
1	Visvasinha	„ K.
2	Bhartridaman	„ M. K. 2 × × ; no date.
1	„	„ K. N. M. K.
1	„	„ K.
4	Visvasena	„ K. 217; 2 × × ; 22 (1) or (6); no date.
3	Rudra Sinha II	„ K. 2 × × ; 22 × ; no date.
3	Yashodaman II.	„ K. 2 × × ; 24 × ; no date.
1	Son of Rudrasena.	
1	Visva.	
1	Unassignable.	

*C. P. Government.*

#### SULTANS OF DELHI

##### Silver—

1	Ala-ud-din Masaud.	
1	Nasiruddin Mahmud I.	Mint Delhi ? 65 ×.

*Bikaner Durbar.*

#### MUGHAL EMPERORS

##### Silver—

1	Shah Jahan.	Mint Surat	
1	Aurangzeb	„ „	27-1095.
1	„	„ „	34-1102.
1	Aurangzeb.	Mint Patna	44-1111.
1	Alamgir II	„ Azimabad	2-1168.
1	„	„ „	2-1169.

*C. P. Government.*

*Bihar & Orissa Government.*

1	Ahmad Shah Durani.	Mint Moradabad	14-1173
1	Alamgir II	" "	6-117 ×
1	Shah Alam II	" "	8-1180
1	"	" Bisauli	11-1183
			10-1183
4	"	" Bareli	10-1184
			11-1184
			12-1184
1	"	" Anwala	11-1184
1	"	" Mustafabad	11-1184
1	"	" "	12-1184
1	"	" Mohammadnagar	12-1184
1	"	" Nasrullanagar	12-1184
1	"	"	12-1184

## SULTANS OF GUJERAT

## Copper—

14	Mahmud I.	900, 902, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 916, 917, & 919.
4	Muzaffar II.	930, 92 ×, 92 (8) or (7), no date.
1	"	new type
4	Bahadur Shah.	937, 938, 939 and 942.
4	"	new type. one N.D. and 3 of 93 ×.
4	"	" 932, 933, 934, & 938.

U. P. Government.

## Treasure Trove Coins

There were 696 coins with the Society at the end of 1926. The following finds, consisting of 217 coins, were received for examination during 1927.

8 Gold from the Mamlatdar of Rajapur.

74 Silver from the Collector of Satara.

96 Copper from the Collector of East Khandesh.

39 Silver from the Mamlatdar of North Daskroi.

Out of these 913 coins 96 copper received during 1927 from the Collector of East Khandesh and one copper received during 1926 from the Collector of Ahmedabad were returned, as they were found to be of no numismatic value; and 154 were reported to Government and, with their approval, were presented to the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. 662 coins remained with the Society at the close of 1927 awaiting examination or distribution.

The Society had the assistance of Mr. G. V. Acharya, B.A., Curator, Archaeological Section, Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, in the examination of Non-Mahomedan coins, and of his Gallery Assistant, Mr. C. R. Singhal, in the examination of Mahomedan coins. The Society takes this opportunity to thank these numismatists for their kind assistance.

# STATEMENT

## The Bombay Branch of

### Abstract of Receipts and Payments

RECEIPTS	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
To Cash Balance 1st January 1927 ..						
Current Account .. .. .	137	9	1			
Savings Bank .. .. .	8,119	13	10			
In Office .. .. .	125	12	6			
				8,383	3	5
„ Subscriptions—						
Resident Life Members ..	500	0	0			
Non-Resident Life Members ..	120	0	0			
				620	0	0
Resident Members .. .. .	24,334	8	0			
Non-Resident Members .. .. .	3,665	0	0			
				27,999	8	0
„ Entrance Fees .. .. .				1,480	0	0
„ Grants : Government of India .. .. .				3,600	0	0
„ Publications : Journal Sales .. .. .				645	11	10
„ Catalogues.						
General						
Sale Proceeds .. .. .	116-3-0					
Interest on Fund invested .. .. .	200-0-0			316	3	0
Manuscripts .. .. .				24	0	0
Annual .. .. .				31	8	0
				371	11	0
„ Sundry Sales :						
Waste Paper .. .. .				45	12	0
Jackson's Folklore Notes .. .. .				3	3	0
Geographical Society's Journal .. .. .				23	10	0
				72	9	0
„ Interest on Investments						
Government Securities .. .. .				1,902	0	3
Savings Bank .. .. .				336	5	5
				2,238	14	8
„ Replacements .. .. .				316	12	0
				45,728	5	11
Total Rs. ..						

We have examined the above abstract of Receipts and Payments with the books and vouchers of the Society and we hereby certify the said abstract to be true and correct. We have also ascertained that all the securities belonging to the Society are held for safe custody by the Imperial Bank of India.

C. H. DENNISON,  
A. B. AGASKAR,  
*Auditors.*



# the Royal Asiatic Society

for the year ended 31st December 1927

PAYMENTS					Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
By Office :—						
Establishment	..	..	..	..	17,485 15 10	
General Charges	..	..	..	..	835 14 0	
Printing & Stationery	..	..	..	..	1,957 13 0	
Postage	..	..	..	..	302 1 0	
Insurance	..	..	..	..	468 12 0	
Electric Charges	..	..	..	..	480 2 6	
						21,530 10 4
Library Expenditure :—						
Books	..	..	..	..	6,879 15 0	
Indian Periodicals	..	..	..	..	601 0 0	
Foreign do.	..	..	..	..	2,285 10 0	
Book-Binding & Repairs	..	..	..	..	1,317 4 0	
Shelving & Furniture	..	..	..	..	99 1 0	
Annual Library Checking	..	..	..	..	500 0 0	
						11,772 14 0
„ Publication Account :—						
Journal Printing	..	..	..	..		1,124 15 0
„ Catalogues :—						
Card :—Preparation	..	..	..	..	720 0 0	
Ms.:—Printing and Preparation	..	..	..	..	451 0 0	
						1,171 0 0
„ Securities purchased during the year :						
Rs. 500 3½% Indian Loan 1865	..	..	..	..	378 12 0	
„ 500 3½% do. 1854-55	..	..	..	..	387 3 0	
„ 500 5% do. 1945-55	..	..	..	..	537 3 0	
						1,303 2 0
„ Campbell Memorial award						100 0 0
„ Balance on 31st December 1927 (including Rs. 148-7-3 General Catalogue Fund and Rs. 659-4-0 Reserve Fund)						
Current Account	..	..	..	..	248 13 0	
Savings Bank	..	..	..	..	8,420 11 1	
In Office	..	..	..	..	56 4 6	
						8,725 12 7
Total Rs. ..						45,728 5 11

### Invested Funds of the Society

Reserve Fund	..	{ 6½ p. c. Govt. Securities	..	Rs. 1,100
	..	{ 5 p. c. „ „	..	10,800
	..	{ 3½ p. c. „ „	..	27,700
Premchand Roychand	..	3½ p. c. „ „ ..	..	3,000
Catalogue Fund	..	5 p. c. „ „ ..	..	4,000
				Rs. 46,600

EDWARD PARKER,  
Hon. Secretary.

J. S. TILLEY,  
Hon. Fincl. Secretary.

## The Bombay Branch of

Budget Esti-

RECEIPTS.	Budget 1927.			Actual 1927.			Budget 1928.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Balance .. .. .	8,383	3	5	.....			8,725	12	7
Entrance Fees .. ..	1,750	0	0	1,480	0	0	1,500	0	0
Subn., Resident Members	25,500	0	0	24,334	8	0	24,500	0	0
„ Non-Resident Mem- bers .. .. .	3,900	0	0	3,065	0	0	3,750	0	0
Government Contribution	3,600	0	0	3,000	0	0	3,600	0	0
Sale of Journal Numbers	500	0	0	645	11	10	700	0	0
„ Annual Catalogue	50	0	0	31	8	0	25	0	0
„ Waste Paper .. ..	50	0	0	45	12	0	50	0	0
Interest .. .. .	2,100	0	0	2,238	14	8	2,000	0	0
Replacement A/c. .. ..	.....			310	12	0	0	0	0
Sale of Mss. Catalogue ..	.....			24	0	0	75	0	0
<b>Total Rs. ..</b>	<b>45,833</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>				<b>44,925</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>

## The Campbell

A Statement of Accounts for the

	Rs.	a.	p.
To Balance on 31st December 1926 .. .. .	435	15	4
„ Interest (less Bank Commission) and Renewal Fee	195	8	0
<b>Rs ..</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>

## the Royal Asiatic Society

notes for 1928

PAYMENTS	Budget 1927.			Actual 1927.			Budget 1928.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Books .. .. .	7,000	0	0	6,879	15	0	7,000	0	0
Subscription, Indian Pe- riodicals .. .. .	700	0	0	691	0	0	700	0	0
Subscription, Foreign .. .. .	2,600	0	0	2,285	10	0	2,250	0	0
Journal Printing .. .. .	2,200	0	0	1,124	15	0	2,100	0	0
Binding .. .. .	1,500	0	0	1,317	4	0	1,200	0	0
Printing and Stationery .. .. .	1,800	0	0	1,957	13	0	1,550	0	0
Office Establishment .. .. .	17,600	0	0	17,485	15	10	18,050	0	0
General Charges .. .. .	950	0	0	835	14	0	825	0	0
Postage .. .. .	400	0	0	302	1	0	325	0	0
Insurance .. .. .	468	12	0	468	12	0	281	4	0
Library Furniture and Fit- tings .. .. .	5,074	0	0	99	1	0	4,974	0	0
Electric Charges .. .. .	500	0	0	480	2	8	600	0	0
Provident Fund .. .. .	1,450	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	0	0
Library Checking .. .. .	500	0	0	500	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary Establishment .. .. .	720	0	0	720	0	0	144	0	0
Ms. Catalogue Printing .. .. .	2,000	0	0	251	0	0	1,750	0	0
Do. Preparation .. .. .	200	0	0	200	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution to the Staff's Provident Fund for 1927 .. .. .	.....						1,393	2	0
¼ of Entrance Fee to be invested .. .. .	.....			.....			370	0	0
Balance .. .. .	170	7	5	.....			13	5	19
Total Rs. .. .. .	45,833	3	5	.....			44,925	12	7

## Memorial Fund

year ending 31st December 1927

	Rs.	a.	p.
By Balance on 31st December 1927 .. .. .	631	7	4
	Rs. ..	631	7 4

## Invested Funds

5 per cent. Government Loan, 1929-47 .. Rs. 4,000 0 0

# The Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Provident Fund

*Income & Expenditure Account for the year ended 31st December 1927*

EXPENDITURE	Rs.	a.	p.	INCOME	Rs.	a.	p.
To Sundry Expenses .. .. .	7	15	0	By Members' Subscriptions .. .. .	1,393	2	9
„ Amounts repaid to members .. .. .	81	9	8	„ Society's Contribution .. .. .	1,393	2	9
„ Balance .. .. .	3,068	1	0	„ Interest .. .. .	371	4	2
Rs. ..	3,157	9	8	Rs. ..	3,157	9	8

## Balance Sheet, 31st December 1927

Members' Account—	Rs.	a.	p.	Cash at Bankers on Deposit .. .. .	Rs.	a.	p.
Balance at 31st December 1926	7,910	3	0	Sundry Debtors—	1,767	14	3
Add Balance for 1927 .. .. .	3,068	1	0	Society's Contribution for 1927 .. .. .	1,393	2	9
	10,978	4	0	Investments at Cost—	7,817	3	0
				Rs. 7,500, 5 % Govt. Loan, 1945-55 .. .. .	7,817	3	0
Rs. ..	10,978	4	0	Rs. ..	10,978	4	0

We have examined the above payments together with the Books and Vouchers and found same to be correctly stated. We have also ascertained that the securities relating to the investments of the fund are held for safe custody by the Imperial Bank of India.

EDWARD PARKER,  
*Hon. Secretary.*

J. S. TILLEY,  
*Hon. Fincl. Secretary.*

C. H. DENNISON,  
A. B. AGASKER,  
*Hon. Auditors.*

LIST OF MEMBERS  
OF THE  
BOMBAY BRANCH  
OF THE  
**Royal Asiatic Society.**

---

- † Resident Life Members.  
\* Non-Resident Members.  
\*† Non-Resident Life Members.

**Patron.**

H. E. Sir LESLIE WILSON, P.C., G.C.L.E., C.M.G., D.S.O.,  
Governor of Bombay.

**Members.**

- \*1917 ABBOTT, J., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
\*1921 ABBOTT, The Rev. J. E., 120, Hobart Avenue, Summit, New Jersey,  
U. S. A.  
†1925 ABDUL REHMAN MAHAMMAD YUSUF, Navha House, Queen's Road,  
Bombay 2.  
1928 ADHYANKAR, S. Y., High Court Vakil, No. 32, 3rd Parsi Wada,  
Bombay 4.  
1922 ABU N. FATEHALLY, 10, Bank Street, Bombay 1.  
1921 ACHARYA, G. V., B.A., Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay 1.  
1928 Addyman, J., Woollen Mills, Dadar, Bombay.  
1927 ADENWALA, Miss K. H., Woodlands, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.  
†1926 ADENWALA, KAIKHUSHROO RUSTOMJI, Hormazd Villa, Cumbala Hill,  
Bombay 6.  
†1923 ADENWALLA, Miss SEIRA K., 33, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.  
1927 ADHIKARI, J. M., 16-17, Simplex Building, Pawvala Street, Bombay 4.  
1893 AGA KHAN, H. H., G.C.S.I., Marina Mansions, Bombay 7.  
†1914 AGASKAR, ANANDRAO B., B.A., LL.B., 46, Warden Rd., Bombay 6.  
1924 AIYAR, K. S., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.  
1900 ALLUM, E. F., Empire of India Life Assurance Co., Singer Building,  
Bombay 1.  
1917 ALTEKAR, MADHAV D., M.A., Haji Kasam Blocks, French Bridge,  
Bombay 7.  
1926 ALTON, W. J. d'., Imperial Bank of Persia, Bombay 1.

- \*1910 AMDALAL SARADHAI, The Retreat, Shahibag. Ahmedabad.
- †1928 AMY B. H. J. RUSTOMJI, Miss, 4, Outram Road, Bombay 1.
- 1927 ANDERSON, I. H., Mackinnon Mackenzie & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
- 1919 APTE, WAMAN S., Peerbhoy Mansion, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.
- 1922 APTEKAR, Mrs. M. J., 2nd Peerkhan Street, Byculla, Bombay 8.
- 1892 APYAKHTIAR, BURJORJI N., 387, Wassiamull Building, Grant Road, Bombay 7.
- \*1923 ARNOLD, The Rev. F. C., Kolhar, Ahmednagar.
- 1921 ARTE, M. B., M.A., Royal Institute of Science, Bombay 1.
- 1919 ASHMEAD, W. K., Standard Oil Co., Ballard Road, Bombay 1.
- 1900 ASPINWALL, J. E., Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
- \*1927 ATHALYE, BHASKAR G., B.A., Wakad, Deogaon Post, Nasik District.
- 1923 BAKER, A. H., W. H. Brady & Co., Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
- 1927 BAKER, The Hon. Mr. Justice W. T. W., I.C.S., High Court, Bombay.
- 1923 BAKHLE, SADASHIV R., B.A., LL.B., Godavarinivas, Damar Lane, Bombay 7.
- \*1927 BAKHLE, V. S., M.A., LL.B., 270, Yadogopal Peth, Satara City.
- \*1902 BALASAMH PANT PRATINIDHI, Shrimant, Aundh, Satara District
- \*1924 BALKRISHNA, Dr., M.A., Ph.D., Rajaram College, Kolhapur.
- †1894 BALKRISHNA VINAYAK WASUDEV, B.A., 46, Warden Road, Bombay 6.
- 1907 BALL, H. P., C/o B. B. & C. I. Ry., Churchgate, Bombay 1.
- 1925 BANAJI, SORAB J., Dadysett Road, Bombay 7.
- 1925 BANATWALLA, Col. Sir HORMUSJI, Kt., I.M.S., Bandra.
- †1917 BANSUDE, Princess SAVITRIBAI SAHEB, Tukogunj, Indore.
- 1923 BAPASOLA, R. N., Mubarakh Manzil, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
- 1924 BARKER, A. W., Longmans Green & Co., 53, Nicol Rd., Bombay 1.
- 1928 BARNES, M. A., Eastern Telegraph Co., Bombay 1.
- 1928 BARNETT, F. L., Turner Morrison & Co., Bank Street, Bombay 1.
- \*1910 BARRON, W. G., Excise Department, Uran, Bombay.
- \*1925 BARVE, Dr. RAGHUNATH A., L.R.C.P. & S., Tarapore, Thana Dist.
- \*1921 BASKERVILLE, H. D., I.C.S. (Bombay.)
- 1926 BATLIVALA, R. D., 50, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1914 BECHER, R. A., M.L.C.E., M.I.M.E., Mint, Bombay 1.
- 1927 BEERLI, H., Volkart Bros., 19, Graham Rd., Ballard Estate, Bombay.
- †1916 BEHR, Mrs. N. E., Sohrab Mansion, Marzban Road, Bombay 1.
- 1924 BELGAMVALA, N. H., "Bombay Chronicle," Bombay.
- \*†1915 BELVALKAR, Dr. SHRIPAD KRISHNA, M.A., Ph.D., Bhamburda, Poona.
- 1928 BENES, Dr. O., Czechoslovak Consulate, 28, Rampart Row, Bombay 1.
- 1921 BEVIS, Miss K., Queen Mary High School, Bombay 4.
- 1915 BHABHA, H. J., M.A., 31, Peddor Road, Bombay 6.
- 1922 BHAGWAT, Prof. N. K., M.A., St. Xavier's College, Bombay 1.
- 1918 BHANDARKAR, SHIVRAM V., B.A., LL.B., Tata Blocks, Bandra.

- 1010 BHANDARKAR, VASUDEO G., B.A., LL.B., 60, Kotachi Wadi, Bombay 4.
- †1012 BIARUCHA, F. E., M.A., LL.B., Canada Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1928 BIHATE, Prinoipal G. C., M.A., Sangli.
- 1298 BHATIA, Capt. Sohan Lal, I. M. S., Mt. Pleasant Road, Bombay 6.
- \*1920 BHAVE, SHIVRAM G., B.A., Ganesh Sadan, Gokhale Road, Poona.
- 1921 BHENDE, VAIKUNTH R., Alice Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1927 BIHOPALE, T. B., B.A., S.T.C., Suburban Municipality, Poona.
- 1927 BIGWOOD, C. W., B. E. S. High School, Byculla, Bombay 8.
- 1926 BILIMORIA, B.A., Batlivala and Karani, Dalal Street, Bombay 1.
- \*1923 BILIMORIA, M. D., P. O. Box 44, Lahore.
- 1922 BODAS, MAHADEO R., M.A., LL.B., 40, Khotachi Wadi, Bombay 4.
- \*1921 BOGGS, The Rev. A. M., Narasaravupeta, Guntur District, S. I.
- 1928 BOLTON, J. R. G., Times of India, Bombay 1.
- 1911 BOMANJI, K. R., C.S., Meher Building, Chaupaty, Bombay 7.
- 1928 BOSE, KUMUDNI KANT, Indian Stores Dept., Ballard Estate, Bombay.
- 1919 BRANDER, J. P., I.C. S. (Bombay).
- 1923 BRANDON, H. E., Broul & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1914 BRISTOW, C. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- \*1921 BROOMFIELD, R. S., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1928 BROWN, A. W. C., 10, Bank Street, Bombay 1.
- 1912 BROWN, B., James Finlay & Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay.
- \*1917 BROWN, C., I.C.S. (Central Provinces).
- \*1927 BROWN, L. N., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1928 BURNETT, N. C., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.
- \*1925 BURT, B. C., Agricultural Department, Sabour, B. & O.
- 1928 BURWAY, M. W., B.A., 12, Imli Bazar, Indore City.
- 1915 BUTLER, H. E., D. S. P. (Bombay).
- †1910 CAMA, DADADHAI F., 4, Podder Road, Bombay 6.
- †1883 CAMA, Khan Bahadur JEHANGIR K. R., Victoria Road, Nagpur.
- †1880 CAMA, RUSTAM K. R., Yusuf Building, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- †1900 CAMA, T. R. N., 23, Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
- 1911 CAPTAIN, Mrs. G. M. S., 90, Murzabanabad, Andheri.
- 1906 CAPTAIN, M. S., C/o Captain & Vaidya, Solicitors, 12, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1925 CARMICHAEL, G. A., Andrew Yule & Co., Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
- 1927 CASSAMALLY SUBJALLY, Currimbhoy Ebrahim & Sons, 220-30, Shaik Memon St., Bombay 2.
- 1923 CHAGLA MAHAMMAD ALI CARIM, Bar-at-Law, 23, Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
- 1928 CHAMBERS, E. M., Crawford Bayley & Co., Ewart House, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.

- 1924 CHANDA AMIRUDDIN MUGHHALA, 103, Mody Street, Bombay 1.  
 1927 CHANDAVARKAR, V. N., Bar-at-Law, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.  
 \*1928 CHEEMA, G. S., Agrioulture College, Poona.  
 1923 CHOKSEY, R. D., M.A., Wilson College, Bombay 7.  
 1922 CHUNILAL GIRDHARLAL, 24, Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.  
 1928 CHURCH, E. E. R., Cathedral High School, Outram Road, Bombay 1.  
 1920 CLARKE, A. D. M., C/o P. Chrystal & Co., Fort, Bombay.  
 1923 CLAYTON, F., Fleming Shaw & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay.  
 \*1926 CLIFFORD, W. W., Dist., Supdt. Police, Belgaum.  
 \*†1892 COELHO, S., M.A.  
 \*1925 COGHLAN, J. A., D. S. P. (Bombay).  
 \*1928 COLLINS, G. F. S., I. C. S. (Bombay.)  
 1928 COLLINS, J. L., D. S. P. (Bombay).  
 \*1905 COMMISSARIAT, Prof. M. S., Gujarat College, Ahmedabad.  
 1922 COOPER, A. L., J. Duxbury & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1928 COOPER, NAVAL B., Longmans Green & Co., 50, Nicol Rd., Bombay 1,  
 \*1922 COVERTON, S. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1925 COX, F. S., Millar's Timber and Trading Co., Commerce House  
 Currimbhoy Rd. Bombay, 1.  
 1909 COYAJI, H. C., High Court, Bombay 1.  
 1920 CRONIN, J. P., Wm. Gossage & Sons, Nicol R.I., Bombay 1.  
 1926 CURRY, J. C., D.S.P., Poona.  
 1921 CURRY, J. E. PRINGLE, Government Shipping Office, Bombay 10.  
 1921 DABHOLKAR, LAXMIKANT S., Anandakanan, Chowpaty, Bombay 7.  
 †1924 DABHOLKAR, MANGESH, A., V. A. Dabholkar & Co., Princess Street  
 Bombay 2.  
 †1904 DABHOLKAR, SHANTARAM N., Anandakanan, Chowpaty, Bombay 7.  
 1914 DABHOLKAR, Sir VASANTRAO A., Kt., C.B.E., Chowpaty, Bombay 7.,  
 †1921 DADACHANJI, Dr. K. K., Corner, Grant Road, Bombay 7.  
 1924 DADACHANJI, R. K., B.A., LL.B., Old Small Causes Court Building,  
 Bombay 2.  
 1914 DALAL, A. R., I.C.S. (Bombay.)  
 1924 DALAL, M. B., Marine Villa, Colaba, Bombay 5.  
 †1913 DALAL, RUSTOMJI D., Sardar's Palace, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.  
 1921 DALVI, D. G., M.A., LL.B., Charni Road, Bombay 4.  
 \*1926 DALVI, MADHUSUDAN R., Pimpalgaon, Nasik District.  
 1921 DAMANIA, MANEKLAL G., Chowpaty, Bombay 7.  
 \*1928 DAMLE, B. R., B.A., LL.B., Acharya's Wada, Thana.  
 1924 DAPHTASY, BALKISAN, 13 19, Medows Street, Bombay 1.  
 1923 DAPHTARY, CHANDRAKISAN, M.A.-Bar-at-Law, 109, Medows Street,  
 Bombay 1.  
 1924 DABUVALA, J. C., Wilson College, Bombay 7



- 1925 DARUVALA, Dr. P. N., LL.D., Bar-at-Law, Block C, Gowalia Tank Building, Gowalia Tank Road, Bombay 7.
- 1926 DASTUR, H. P., Bar-at-Law, Presidency Magistrate, Bombay 1.
- \*†1920 DASTUR, Dr. N. H., Udwada, Surat District.
- 1927 DASTUR, T. N., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.
- 1904 DAVAR, Dr. M. B., M.A., Ph. D., 165, Lamington Road, Bombay 7.
- 1926 DAVAR, Mrs. V. J. D., Nepean Sea Road, Bombay 6.
- 1926 DAVID, DAVID VICTOR, 4, Queen's Road, Bombay.
- \*1910 DAVIS, G., L.C.S. (Bombay.)
- 1925 DAVISON, D. H., Apollo Bunder, Bombay 1.
- \*1928 DAWSON, F. W., Worthington Simpson, Ltd., Calcutta.
- 1910 DEHDASHTI, AGA MAHAMAD H., Kahwakhana, Fort, Bombay.
- 1927 DELAFONTAINE, A., West End Watch Co. Esplanade Road, Bombay.
- 1891 DEMONTE, Mgr. Dr. B., D.D., J.P., Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.
- 1887 DEMONTE, Dr. A., M.D., Summit View, Bandra.
- 1922 DENNISON, C. H., C/o B. S. N. Co., 120, Frere Road, Bombay.
- 1922 DESAI, BHULABHAI J., Advocate, Warden Road, Bombay 6.
- 1925 DESAI, Dr. K. J., B.A., L.M.&S., Coronation Building, C. P. Tank, Bombay.
- 1928 DESAI, LILAVATI MANGALDAS, Rama Prasad, Babulnath Road, Bombay 7.
- \*1928 DESAI, Prof. M. B., Karnatak College, Dharwar.
- 1922 DESAI, Dr. RUSTOMJI C., Gangaram Terrace, Tardeo, Bombay 7.
- 1926 DESAI, R. K., B.A., B.Sc. (Lond.), Bar-at-Law, Lalgir Mansions Gamdevi, Bombay 7.
- \*1920 DESHMUKH, D. V., B.A., LL.B., Sub-Judge (Bombay).
- 1928 DESHPANDE, S. R., Labour Office, Secretariat, Bombay 1.
- \*1911 DEVDHAR, G. K., M.A., C.I.E., Servants of India Society, Poona.
- 1924 DHURANDHAR, J. R., B.A., LL.B., Shanti Kunj, Khar.
- 1928 DIAS, J. L., Excise Dept., Old Customs, Bombay 1.
- 1927 DICKINSON, F., Duncan Stratton & Co., Fort, Bombay 1.
- \*1925 DIKSHIT, K. N., M.A., Archaeological Survey, E. C., Calcutta.
- 1921 DIVATIA, H. V., Maharaja Mansion, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.
- 1922 DIVATIA, Prof. N. B., B.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.
- 1925 DONALDSON, R., C/o B. B. & C. I. Ry. Workshop, Parel, Bombay.
- 1920 DONOVAN, E., Cox & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1925 DORAN, H. F., C/o B. B. & C. I. Ry., Fatehgarh, U. P.
- \*†1910 DORDI, Dr. J. B., Navsari.
- 1927 DOSTMAHAMMAD MUNJEE, 12-13, Dougall Road, Bombay 1.
- 1925 DOVE, W. G., South British Insurance Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- 1921 DOW, H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1926 DRACUP, A. H., General Department, Secretariat, Bombay 1.
- 1925 DUBASH, PHEROZESHA R., Carter Road, Gondowli, Andhori.
- 1924 DUNLOP, J., Imperial Bank of India, Bombay 1.

- 1920 DUNN, A., Municipality, Bombay 1.  
 1924 EASTWOOD, C., Braithwaite & Co., Lloyd Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1924 EDWARDS, H. B., Reuters Ltd., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1928 ELDER, A. G., Skofko Ball Bearing Co., 5, Bank Street, Bombay 1.  
 1918 EMSLIE, A. B., Minimax Ltd., Feltham House, Graham Road, Bombay 1.  
 1920 ERB, E., C/o E. Spinner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.  
 1925 ERICHSEN, E., Asian Building, Niccol Road, Bombay 1.  
 1924 EVERATT, E. L., Port Trust, Bombay 1.  
 \*1920 EVES, Graves, Barsi Light Railway, Kurduwadi, S. M. C.  
 \*1928 EWART, J. M., C.I.E., Indian Police (Punjab).  
 1917 EZEKIEL, Prof. E. M., B.A., LL.B., Israel Street, Khadak, Bombay.  
 1901 FAWCETT, The Hon. Justice Sir CHARLES, Kt., I.C.S., High Court, Bombay 1.  
 1924 FERARD, R. L., David Sassoon & Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.  
 1924 FERNANDES, B. A., 66, Carter Road, Bandra, Thana District.  
 1928 FINAN, A., Lamington Road Police Station, Bombay 7.  
 1914 FLEMING, R., Prier de Saone & Co., Menkwa Building, Outram Road, Bombay 1.  
 1925 FORBES, D. N., M. A., LL.B., Motilal Mansion, Hummum Street Bombay 1.  
 1925 FORBINGTON, A., Greaves Cotton & Co., Forbes Street, Bombay 1.  
 1925 FRASER, E., Chief Engineer's Office, G. I. P. Railway, Bombay 1.  
 1928 FRASER, R. D., Indo-Burma Petroleum Co., Allahabad Bank Bldg., Apollo St., Bombay 1.  
 1926 FREKE, C. G., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1922 FRENCHMAN, D. P., Gandamanayakunur, Madura District, S. I.  
 1918 FROHLICH, H., C/o E. Spinner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.  
 \*1923 FROST, J. A., Imperial Bank of India.  
 \*1913 FURDOONJI DORABJI PADAMJI, Ray Paper Mills, Madhuva, Poona.  
 †1919 FYZEE, A. A. A., B.A., LL.B., Bar-at-Law, 5, Chowpati Road, Bombay 7.  
 †\*1925 GADGIL, D. R., M.T.B., Arts College, Surat.  
 1926 GADGIL, Prof. V. A., Wilson College, Bombay 7.  
 1927 GAJENDRAGADKAR, Prof. A. B., M.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.  
 \*1905 GAMBHIR, Prof. J. S., Samaldas College, Bhavnagar.  
 1925 GANDEVIA, D. D., Fine Art Gallery, 69, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.  
 1918 GANNON, H., Gannon Dunkerley & Co., Chartered Bank Building, Bombay 1.  
 \*1912 GARRETT, J. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1921 GENNINGS, J. F., Secretariat, Bombay 1.  
 1928 GHANDY, P. J., Old Customs House, Bombay 1.  
 1912 GHARPURE, J. R., B.A., LL.B., Anglo's Wadi, Bombay 4.

- \*1028 GHARPURAY, Lt.-Col., K. G., I.M.S., Belgaum.
- \*1922 GHORPADE, M. H., 273 Somwar Peth, Poona City.
- †1010 GHORPADE, SHRIMANT MALOJIRAO NANASAHEB, Chief of Mudhol.
- †1801 GHORPADE, SHRIMANT NARAYANRAO GOVINDRAO, Ichalkaranji.
- \*1025 GHOSAL, J., I.C.S., (Bombay).
- 1924 GHIURYE, G. S., M.A., Ph. D., School of Sociology, University, Bombay 1.
- 1028 GIARA, H. C., 33, Wodehouse Road, Bombay 1.
- 1910 GILDER, Dr. M. D. D., Gazdar Mansion, Princess Street, Bombay 2.
- \*1921 GILLIGAN, W. B., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1922 GILROY, Major P. K., I.M.S., Sir J. J. Hospital, Bombay.
- 1926 GLEESON, H. J., 10, Bandra Hill, Bandra.
- \*1918 GODBOLE, Prof. V. N., 900, Sadashiv Peth, Poona City.
- \*1925 GODE, P. K., M.A., Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, Poona.
- 1927 GOFFIN, R. C., M.A., Oxford University Press, Ballard Estate, Bombay.
- \*1923 GOKILALE, A. G., M. A., B. Sc., Excise Analyst, Nasik Road.
- 1927 GOLDER, N. S., Eastern Bank, Bombay 1.
- 1921 GOODALL, C. H., Bombay Co., Fort, Bombay 1.
- \*1926 GORVALA, A. D., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1923 GRAHAM, H. J., C/o G. I. P. Ry., Bombay 1.
- 1926 GREAVES, J. B., Greaves Cotton Co., Forbes Street, Bombay 1.
- 1913 GREEN, A. M., I. C.S., Customs Department, Bombay 1.
- 1928 GREENFIELD, H., New Customs, Bombay 1.
- 1923 GREGSON, THOMAS, 11, Khatav Mansion, Bombay 1.
- \*1924 GUNE, J. G., Kunjavana, Lonavla.
- 1925 GUNJIKAR, K. R., M. A., B. Sc., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.
- 1922 GUPTA, G. M., B.A., LL.B., 56, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1925 GUPTA, G. S., B. A., L. C. E., City Survey & Land Records, Bombay 1.
- \*1920 GURBAXANI, Prof. H. M., Strachan Road, Karachi.
- \*1923 GUT, GEORGE, Volkart Bros., Karachi.
- \*1908 GUTIKAR, V. R., B. A., L. L. B., Sub-Judge, Hubli.
- \*1906 HAIGH, P. B., M. A., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1918 HAJI, S. N., Bar.-at-Law, Scindia Steam Nav. Co., Sudama House, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
- \*1910 HAMID, A. ALI, I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1927 HAMLEY, H. R., Secondary Training College, Bombay.
- 1925 HAMMOND, W. H., John Cannon School, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1916 HAMPTON, Prof. H. V., Karnatak College, Dharwar.
- 1917 HANHART, S., C/o E. Spinner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
- \*1926 HARDY, Miss M. E., Barnes Schools, Devlali.
- 1918 HARGREAVES, E., Wilson Latham & Co., Central Bank Building, Bombay 1.

- \*1924 HARNHALLI, A. S., B.A., High School, Karwar.  
 1925 HARPER, W., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.  
 1928 HARRINGTON, D., Graham's Trading Co., Bombay 1.  
 1919 HARVEY, G. E., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.  
 1920 HASKELL, I. F., B.A., 56, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.  
 1928 HAWKINS, T. B., Chief Engineer's Office, Port Trust, Bombay 1.  
 1921 HAYWARD, G. A., Geo. Service & Co., Sorab House, 235-241, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1924 HAZEN, The Rev. W., Sholapur.  
 1928 HEERJI-BEHEDIN, ERACHSIKAW R., Kaiser Chambers, Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
- 1925 HENDERSON, L. B., Oxford University Press, Bombay 1.  
 1926 HENNESSY, J. G., C/o Thomas Cook & Son, Bombay 1.  
 1925 HERAS, The Rev. Fr. H., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.  
 1919 HERBERT, L. W. A., 11-13, Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.  
 1917 HERBERTSON, J., James Finlay & Co., Bombay 1.  
 1920 HILLEL, E., C/o Meyer Nissim, 137, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1918 HODIVALA, Prof. S. H., Banoo Villa, Andheri.  
 1924 HOOPER, C. T., Exchange Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1927 HORLEY, W. G., Port Trust, Bombay 1.  
 1913 HORMASJI ARDESHIR, L.C.E., 321, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1927 HORNBLLOWER, T. J., P. O. Box 609, Bombay.  
 1907 HOTSON, The Hon'ble Mr. J. E. B., O.B.E., I.C.S. (Bombay.)  
 1928 HOVELL, T. R., Scottish Union & National Insurance Co., 16, Bank Street, Bombay 1.
- 1926 HUDLIKAR, S. B., Imperial Chambers, Wilson Road, Bombay 1.
- \*†1908 HUME, The Rev. Dr. R. E., M.A., Union Theological Seminary, New York, U.S.A.
- 1917 HUMPHERYS, S. E., Thomas Cook & Son, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1907 HUNT, N., Greaves Cotton & Co., Bombay 1.  
 1927 HUNTER, M., Eastern Telegraph Co., Bombay 1.
- \*1921 HUSAIN, ATA, B.A., Government Educational Inspector, Aden.
- \*1926 IDGUNJI, D. D., 7, Saraswatpur, Dharwar.  
 1926 IRANI, A. M., Imperial Film Co., Kennedy Bridge, Bombay.  
 1919 IRANI, D. J., C/o Mulla & Mulla, Gresham Building, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1925 IYER, S. R., Imperial Bank of India, Bombay.  
 1924 JAFFARBOY HAJIBHOY, Bar-at-Law, Akbar Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1926 JAGADISH NATARAJAN, 12, Bank Road, Allahabad.  
 1927 JAL A. D. NAOROJI, Tata Sons & Co., Bruce Street, Bombay 1.  
 1899 JAMSHEDJI JEEJEEBOY, Sir, Bart., Bombay 10.

- 1928 JAMSETJEE P. M. JEEJEEBHOY, Yorkshire Insurance Co., Fort, Bombay 1.
- \*1917 JATHAR, Prof. G. B., Deccan College, Poona.
- †1916 JAYAKAR, M. R., Bar-at-Law, 391, Girgaum Road, Bombay 2.
- 1927 JERAJANI, NANAL C., National High School, Ashok Building, Princess Street, Bombay 2.
- \*1926 JEWELL, E. de B., Ahmedabad.
- 1911 JHAVERI, K. M., M.A., LL.B., Small Causes Court, Bombay 2.
- 1924 JHOTE, R. B., B.A., Paradise, Shahibag, Ahmedabad.
- \*1928 JOHNSTON, E. A. F., B.B. & C.I. Ry., Wasad, Baroda.
- 1916 JONES, H. E., Oriental Insurance Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1922 JONES, H. P., C/o B. B. & C. I. Railway, Bombay 1.
- 1925 JONES, J. A., C/o B. B. & C. I. Railway, Bombay 1.
- 1921 JONES, W. E., Dronan & Co., Forbes Building, Bombay 1.
- 1924 JONES, W. T., Lewis & Jones, 17, Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
- 1928 JOSHI, Miss CHATURLAXMI, B., B. A., Anand Mahal, Chowpaty, Bombay 7.
- 1926 JOSHI, J. V., B.A., Finance Dept., Secretariat, Bombay 1.
- \*1926 JOSHI, NARAYAN BALVANT, Bijapur.
- 1921 JOSHI, Rao Bahadur P. B., Benham Hall Lane, Bombay 4.
- 1926 JUDAH, Dr. D., Oriental Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- 1902 JUDAH, S., B.A., LL.B., Examiner Press Building, Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
- 1924 JUDD, A. F., Hongkong Bank, Bombay 1.
- 1922 KABAD, M. S., B.A., Secretariat, Bombay 1.
- \*1927 KALE, K. Y., Deccan College, Poona.
- 1925 KALIANJI C. DAMJI, Curamsy Damji & Co., Sohrab House, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1915 KAMAT, B. S., B.A., Ganeshkhind Road, Poona.
- †1915 KANE, P. V., M.A., LL.M., Angre's Wadi, Bombay 4.
- 1919 KANGA, Miss JERBAI D. B., Rebsch Street, Jacob Circle, Bombay 11.
- 1920 KANGA, K. J., Satya Mitra Press, 14, Homji Street, Bombay 1.
- 1922 KANGA, P. J., M.A., Tata Iron & Steel Co., Bombay House, Bombay 1.
- \*1928 KANITKAR, Principal K. R., M.A., B.Sc., Poona.
- 1910 KANJI DWARKADAS, M.A., Yusuf Building, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1928 KAPADIA, CHUNILAL A., 165, Gulawadi, Bombay 4.
- 1917 KAPADIA, H. P., Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.
- 1927 KAPADIA, M. G., Solicitor, 31, Nanabhai Lane, Bombay.
- \*1927 KARANDIKAR, R. P., Satara.
- 1920 KARANDIKAR, S. V., M.A., Nene Building, Charni Road, Bombay.
- 1927 KARANDIKAR, V. R., Bar-at-Law, Topiwala Mansion, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.
- 1924 KATHOKE, Miss B. M., Kathoke House, Dadar, Bombay.

- 1924 KATRAK, M. N., 37, Altamont Road, Bombay 6.  
 1928 KEIP, O., Haverro Trading Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1927 KELKAR, K. H., B.A., LL.B., Angro's Wadi, Bombay 4.  
 \*1927 KELKAR, N. C., B.A., LL.B., Poona.  
 1921 KERKAR, W. R., B.A., LL.B., Bonham Hall Lane, Bombay 4.  
 1927 KERR, W., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.  
 \*1922 KESARCODI, S. N., Asst. Conservator of Forests (Bombay).  
 †1916 KESHAVRAO B. WASUDEV, B.A., LL.B., Surat.  
 \*1918 KETKAR, Dr. S. V., M.A., Ph.D., 21, Kahn Road, Poona.  
 1923 KHAMBATA, F. H., B.A., 684, Lalkaka House, Dadar, Bombay.  
 1926 KHAMNA, VINAYAKLAL, 12, Shib Thakur Lane, Calcutta.  
 1922 KHIARE, L. G., B.A. (Oxon.), Bharucha Building, Princess Street, Bombay 2.  
 1880 KHAREGHAT, M. P., I.C.S. (*Rtd.*), Mt. Pleasant Road, Bombay 6.  
 1927 KHATAO, LAXMIDAS M., Laxmi Bldg., Ballard Rd., Bombay 1.  
 †1923 KHER, B. G., B.A., LL.B., 53, Medows Street, Bombay 1.  
 †1904 KIKABHAI PREMCHAND, Share Bazar, Bombay 1.  
 1928 KIPPEN, Capt. R. R., Killick Nixon & Co., Home St., Bombay 1.  
 †1924 KISHORDAS P. MANGALDAS, Malabar Point, Bombay 6.  
 1912 KNIGHT, H. F., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1924 KOLASKAR, M. B., Bar-at-Law, Girgaum Road, Bombay 4.  
 \*1923 KOLMATKAR, Prof. G. B., Fergusson College, Poona.  
 1906 KOYAJI, K. N., High Court, Bombay.  
 †1925 KRISHNA JIVANJI, GOSWAMI, Bada Mandir, Bhuleshwar, Bombay 2.  
 \*1916 KRISHNAMACHARIAR, Raja Bahadur G., Srirangam, S.I.  
 1915 KUBALAYA RAJ, 30, Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.  
 1925 KURULKAR, Dr. G. M., G. S. Medical College, Parel, Bombay 12.  
 1922 KURWA, S. E., Bar-at-Law, Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.  
 1925 KYLE, J. C., Chartered Bank, Bombay 1.  
 \*1915 LAGU, Prof. R. K., New Poona College, Poona.  
 1923 LALJI NARANJI, Ewart House, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.  
 1918 LALKAKA, B. S., Land's End, Bandra.  
 1923 LANDOLF, W. A., Volkart Bros., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1928 LANDON, C., Indian Telegraph Dept., Bombay 1.  
 \*1909 LATIF HASSAN, M.I.E., A.M.I.E.E., Hanamkonda, Nizam's State.  
 \*1923 LATIF, S. C., Indian Stores Dept., Karachi.  
 1921 LAXMIDAS M. SHRIKANT, Kanji Bhavan, 79A, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.  
 1915 LAXMINARAYAN, Rao Bahadur D., Kampti, C.P.  
 1917 LENGACHER, W., Kahn & Kahn, Fort, Bombay 1.  
 1927 LESLIE, G., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.  
 1928 LEWIS, R. E., 18, Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.  
 1924 LENN, D. C., Alcock Ashdown & Co., Frere Road, Bombay.

- 1928 LOFTING, H. S., Eastern Telegraph Co., Central Tel. Office, Bombay 1.  
 1928 LOWJI, T. M., 23-25, Bora Bazar Street, Bombay 1.  
 \*1917 LOYD, The Rt. Rev. P., Ahmednagar.  
 1923 LUTTON, F. E., Greaves Cotton & Co., Bombay 1.  
 1924 LVOVSKY, Z., Czechoslovak Consulate, 28, Rampart Row, Bombay 1.  
 1928 LYTTLER, C. J. C., 8 Sargent House, Barrow Road, Bombay.  
 1906 MACIVER, K., Anglo-Siam Corporation, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.  
 1914 McKENZIE, The Rev. J., Wilson College, Bombay 7.  
 1927 MCKIE, P. W., Central Telegraph Office, Bombay 1.  
 \*1907 MACKIE, A. W. W., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 \*1908 MACMILLAN, A. M., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 \*1919 MADAN, J. A., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1927 MADGAVKAR, B. R., New Queen's Road, Bombay.  
 †1906 MADGAVKAR, The Hon'ble Justice G. D., I.C.S., Bombay.  
 1924 MADGAVKAR, Capt. V. D., I.M.S., Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.  
 1901 MADHAVJI DAMODAR THACKERSEY, 16, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.  
 1927 MADON, A. M., 9, Boll Lane, Bombay 1.  
 1921 MADON, K. J. B., Pereira Hill Road, Andheri.  
 1918 MADON, M. P., Serene Villa, Alexandra Road, Gamdevi, Bombay 7.  
 †1923 MADON, P. M., Shivalal Motilal Mansion, Dalal Street, Bombay 1.  
 1926 MAHAMMAD ALI, MOULVI, M.A. (Oxon), Dharavi, Bombay.  
 \*1921 MALAVIYA, RADHAKANT, M.A., LL.B., Kamadhenu Mines, Harihar S.I.  
 1924 MALONEY, T., Mill-Owners' Association, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 \*†1902 MARJORIBANKS, Lt.-Col. J. L., I.M.S., Aden.  
 1922 MARTEN, The Hon. Sir A. B., Kt., LL.D., High Court, Bombay 1.  
 1928 MASANI, R. P., Central Bank, Bombay.  
 \*1924 MASON, The Rev. C. D. T., Devlali.  
 \*1906 MASTER, A., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1928 MASTER, R. S., Solakoti Bldg., Grant Road, Bombay 7.  
 1924 MATANI, G. M., 53, Mint Road, Bombay 1.  
 1921 MATHEW, Mrs. A. E., Cama Hospital, Bombay 1.  
 1925 MAYENKAR, V. P., B.A., S.T.C., Wilson High School, Bombay 4.  
 1923 MEARS, R. P., C/o J. C. Gammon, Ltd., Goa Street, Bombay 1.  
 1922 MEHENDALE, B. K., Bar-at-Law, French Bridge, Bombay 7.  
 1927 MEHKRI, MD. ASADULLAH, Works Manager's Office, Matunga.  
 \*1921 MEHTA, A. C., Income Tax Office, Ahmedabad.  
 1927 MEHTA, BHASKAR B., Ramdas Khimji Trading Co., Albert Bldg., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1908 MEHTA, SIR CHUNILAL V., K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.B., Bombay 6.  
 1920 MEHTA, FRAMROZ M., 79, Meadows Street, Bombay 1.  
 1926 MEHTA, MRS. HANSA, 23, Nepean Sea Road, Bombay 6.  
 1921 MEHTA, INDRAVADAN N., Bar-at-Law, Purshotam Building, New Queen's Road, Bombay.

- 1918 MEHTA, J. K., M.A., Indian Merchants' Chamber, 31, Murzban Road, Bombay 1.
- 1900 MEHTA, Sir LALLUBHAI SAMALDAS, K.C.I.E., 65, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
- †1921 MEHTA, M. L., B.A., LL.B., Humnum Street, Bombay 1.
- 1920 MEHTA, R. A., Kalyan Moti Building, Kandevasi, Bombay 4.
- \*1927 MEHTA, RANCHOHLAL L., Karbhari, Vala State.
- \*1927 MEHTA, Dewan Bahadur THAKORRAM KAPILRAM, B.A., LL.B., C.I.E., Surat.
- 1927 MELVILLE, F. R., Love Grove Works, Worli, Dadar, Bombay.
- 1927 MENON, K. K., M.A., Fellowship School, Bombay 4.
- 1898 MINOCHER, K. M., Bombay Samachar, 8, Frere Road, Bombay 1.
- 1928 MINOCHERHOMJI, Prof. N. D., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.
- 1928 MODI, GUJJARMAL, SETT, Roller Flour Mills, Patiala.
- 1927 MODI, J. H., Solicitor, Daphtary and Ferreira, 13-19, Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
- 1920 MODI, Dr. JAMSHET JIVANJI, L.M. & S., L.D.S., Navsari Chambers, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- 1888 MODI, SHAMSUL-ULMA JIVANJI JAMSHETJI, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., 209, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- 1928 MODI, RUSTAM JIVANJI, Bar-at-Law, 211, Pilot Bunder Road, Colaba, Bombay 5.
- 1917 MODY, H.P., M. A., LL.B., Cumballa Hill, Bombay 6.
- 1926 MOGHE, Dr. H. G., L.M. & S., L. D.S., Girgaum Back Road, Bombay 4.
- 1921 MONTEATH, J., I.C.S. (Bombay.)
- 1928 MOORE, H. A., Northern Aluminium Co., Exchange Bldg., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
- 1928 MORE, J., Volkart Bros., 19, Graham Road, Bombay 1.
- 1914 MORRIS, C. F., James Finlay & Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- †1911 MUHAMMAD YUSUF, Sir, Kt., Amir of Navha, Daryanagar, N. Konkan.
- \*1918 MUJUMDAR, Sardar G. N., Kasba Peth, Poona City.
- 1925 MULGAVKAR, B. D., Gopal Narayan & Co., Kalbadevi, Bombay 2.
- 1924 MULGAVKAR, K.V., B.A., LL.B., Ridge View, Vachagandhi Road, Bombay 7.
- 1928 MULHERKAR, D. G., Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce, 31, Murzban Road, Bombay 1.
- 1925 MULLA, D. F., Bar-at-Law, C.I.E., High Court, Bombay 1.
- 1926 MULLA, Mrs. MANEKBAI S. F., 17, New Marine Lines, Bombay.
- 1921 MUNSHI, K. M., Advocate, High Court, Bombay 1.
- 1923 MUNSHI, R. F., Bar-at-Law, 40, Pickett Road, Bombay 2.
- \*1919 MUNSIEF, Dr. JAMSHYD D., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.S., D.P.H., Poona.
- 1922 MUNSTER, J., Port Office, Bombay 1.



- 1888 MURARJI GOULDAS DEWJI, Palm Cottage, Near Kennedy Bridge, Bombay 7.
- 1926 MURDESHWAR, G. P., B.A., LL.B., Saraswat Buildings, Bombay 7.
- 1924 MUZUMDAR, Rao Saheb M. S., Currency Office, Bombay 1.
- 1918 MUZUMDAR, V. D., M.A., Income Tax Office, Bombay 1.
- 1910 NADKARNI, V. J., Kennedy Bridge, Bombay 7.
- \*1921 NAGARKATTI, D. N., M.A., B.Sc., Jammu, Kashmir.
- \*1910 NAGARKATTI, R. S., Dharwar.
- \*1928 NAGARSHETH, M.P., N. L. Cattle Breeding Farm, Mul'und, Thana Dt.
- \*1919 NAIARSINGHJI ISHIVARSINGHJI, Sardar, Thakore of Amod, Surat.
- \*1918 NAIK, S. S., L.C.E., Khar Road, Bandra.
- \*†1916 NAIK, V. H., M.A., Bar-at-Law, Bijapur.
- 1924 NAIK, V. N., M.A., Benham Hall Lane, Bombay 4.
- †1917 NANABHAI TALAKCHAND.
- \*1924 NANAVATI, D.D., Bar-at-Law, I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1913 NANAVATI, H. D., B.A., LL.B., 80, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1917 NARIMAN, G. K., 3, Victoria Cross Lane, Mazgaon, Bombay 10.
- 1923 NARIMAN, S. B., 113, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1926 NARIMAN, Miss T. H., Tata Girls' School, Navsari.
- †1901 NAROTTAM MORARJI GOULDAS, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
- 1914 NATARAJAN, K., Editor, "Indian Social Reformer," Outram Road Bombay 1.
- 1921 NAZAR, O. H., Union Bank Building, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
- 1914 NERURKAR, Dr. J. S., L.M. & S., D.P.H., Municipality, Bombay 1.
- 1922 NIEDERER, GEORGE, Sulzer Bruderer & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- †1920 NIBALKAR, SHRIMANT MALOJIRAO MUDHOJIRAO Naik, Phaltan.
- 1924 NOPPER, C., West End Watch Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1902 NORMAND, Dr. A. R., M.A., B.Sc., Ph. D., Wilson College, Bombay 7.
- \*1922 OGILVIE, R. D., Imperial Bank of India, Ajmer.
- \*1928 OKA, W. P., M.A., LL.B., Joglekar's Bungalow, Kharkar Ali, Thana.
- 1926 OTTO, P. A., Volkart Bros., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
- 1923 PADGAOKAR, G. V., 32 B, Post Office Lane, Bombay 4.
- 1927 PADGETT, W. R., B. Roif, Ltd., Ismail Bldg., Bombay 1.
- \*1925 PADHYE, Prof. P. G., New Poona College, Poona.
- 1916 PAGE, F. J., C/o B. B. & C. I. Railway, Parel, Bombay.
- \*1923 PALEKAR, Rao Bahadur, B.A., Belgaum.
- 1924 PALMER, A. J., Union Insurance Society of Canton, Central Bank Building, Bombay 1.
- 1908 PALMER, The Rt. Rev. Dr. E. J., Bishop of Bombay.
- \*1916 PANDIT, A. G., Jamalpur Road, Ahmedabad.
- 1928 PANDIT, Mrs. SARASWATIBAI P., Meher House, Laburnum Road, Bombay 7.

- 1928 PANDIT, VENUGOPAL RAO, N. Sirur & Co., Bank Street, Bombay 1.  
 \*1928 PARADKAR, Prof. N. B., Madhav College, Ujjain.  
 \*1926 PAREKH, MOTILAL L., M.A., LL.B., Devgad-Baria.  
 \*1223 PARIKH, Dr. M. K., Godhra, Panch Mahals District.  
 1018 PARKER, EDWARD, M.A., Ph. D., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.  
 1921 PARKS, W. BATTERSBY, Ford, Rhodes & Parks, Examiner Press Building, Medows Street, Bombay 1.  
 \*1928 PARMANAND, Mrs. S., B.A., B. Lit., D. Phil. (Oxon), Bar-at-Law, Yeotmal.  
 1925 PARPIA, YUSUF R., Zainab Manzil, Turner Road, Bandra.  
 1912 PARUCK, Miss S. S., M.A., Habib Mansion, New Queen's Road, Bombay 4.  
 1925 PARULEKAR, R. V., M.A., M. Ed., Municipal Offices, Bombay 1.  
 1928 PASTA, M.G.L., Altmont Road, Bombay 6.  
 \*1927 PATASKAR, H. V., B.A., LL.B., M.L.C., Chalisgaon, E. Khandesh.  
 1912 PATKAR, The Hon. Mr. JUSTICE S. S., B.A., LL.B., Hughes Road, Bombay 7.  
 †1912 PATWARDHAN, SRIMANT CHINTAMANRAO DHUNDIRAJ *alias* APPASAHED, Chief of Sangli.  
 \*1922 PATWARDHAN, N. M., Bar-at-Law, Belgaum.  
 1917 PATWARDHAN, R. P., M.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.  
 1927 PAVRI, Dr. H. F., Coover Mansion, Harvey Rd., Bombay 7.  
 1910 PAVRI, N. P., M.A., LL.B., Silloo Villa, Cirrus Avenue, Jacob Circle, Bombay.  
 1922 PERSHA, SHANKAR S., Examiner Press Building, Medows Street, Bombay 1.  
 1922 PETIGARA, D. K., Bar-at-Law, 7, Bell Lane, Bombay 1.  
 1923 PETIGARA, Khan Bahadur K. J., Dy. Commr. of Police, Bombay.  
 †1922 PETIT, DINSHAW J., Mount Petit, Bombay 6.  
 †1807 PETIT, JEHANGIR B., 359, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1928 PETIT, SORAJI C., Framji Hall, Warden Road, Bombay 6.  
 1920 PHATAK, N. R., B.A., Khatao Building, Charni Road, Bombay 4.  
 1927 PICOT, C., Indian Radio Tel. Co., Bombay 1.  
 \*1928 PLOWDEN, P. C., I.C.S. (U.P.)  
 \*1928 POLLOCK, R. E., I. C. S. (C. P.)  
 1927 POOLEY, ALEX. St. P., Greaves Cotton & Co., Forbes St., Bombay 1.  
 \*1916 POPE, J. A., I.C.S., Imperial Customs, C.I.  
 1916 PORTLOCK, F., James Mackintosh & Co., Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.  
 \*1923 POTDAR, Prof. D. V., B.A., New Poona College, Poona.  
 1902 POWVALA, K. S., 251, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 1898 POWVALA, R. S. 251, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 \*1909 PRADHAN, R. G., B.A., LL.B., Nasik.  
 1921 PRADHAN, W. B., B.A., LL.B., Charni Road, Bombay 4.  
 1923 PRATAP, V. K., 84-02, Kandovadi, Bombay.

- 1009 PRICE, C. STANLEY, London Lancashire Insurance Co., Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
- 1027 PRICE, W., B. E. S. & T. Co., Bombay 1.
- 1922 PURSHOTTAM ISHIWARDAS, Garden View, Hughes Road, Bombay.
- 1923 PURSHOTTAM TRICUMDAS, Bar-at-Law, 5, Hirji Mansion, Darasha Road, Bombay 6.
- 1900 PURSHOTTAM V. MOWJEE, Malabar Hill, Bombay 4.
- \*1925 RABADE, R. V., 131, Shanwar Poth, Poona City.
- 1917 RAFIUDDIN AHMAD, Moulavi, M.L.C., Poona.
- 1918 RAMASUBBA AIYAR, K. N., B.A., B.L., Travancore.
- 1922 RANONEKAR, The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. S., B.A., LL.B., Bar-at-Law, High Court, Bombay 1.
- 1911 RAO, Dewan Bahadur G. S., B.A., LL.B., Bombay 2.
- 1925 RATANBAI V. T. MULJI, Lady, Jivan Lodge, Andheri.
- †1921 RATANSI DHARASISI MORARJI, Hon. Mr., Mt. Pleasant Road, Bombay 6.
- \*1910 RAWLINSON, Prof. H. G., M.A., I.E.S., Deccan College, Poona.
- 1924 REID, The Rev. A. R. R., The Grange, Wodehouse Road, Bombay.
- 1914 REITH, A. M., Geo. Service & Co., Sorab House, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- 1925 REMINGTON, G. L., B. B. & C. I. Railway, Bombay.
- 1910 REUBEN, Miss R., 9, Mazgaon Terrace, Bombay 10.
- 1926 REVIE, L., Richardson & Cruddas, Byculla, Bombay.
- 1928 RICHARDSON, H. J., Tata Sons & Co., Bruce Street, Bombay 1.
- 1922 RICKWOOD, H. A., Fire Insurance Association, Allahabad Bank Building, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
- 1921 ROBINSON, A. E., 17, Marine Lines, Bombay.
- 1919 RODDA, V. V., Oriental Translator's Office, Bombay 1.
- 1926 ROPEK, The Rev. H., Archbishop's House, Wodehouse Rd., Bombay 1
- 1907 ROW, Dr. RAGHAVENDRA, B.Sc., M.D. (Lond.), Marine Lines, Bombay.
- 1924 ROWE, G. C., Land Acquisition Officer, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- 1921 ROWLANDS, R. D., Croft and Forbes, Standard Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- 1910 ROWLANDSON, B. C., Port Trust, Bombay 1.
- \*1928 RUTNAM, D. R., I.C.S. (C.P.)
- \*1927 SABNIS, K. G., Himmat Bahadur's Huzur Office, Kolhapur.
- \*1902 SABNIS, Sir RAGHUNATHRAO V., Kt., Kolhapur.
- \*1924 SAMBZADA SURFRAZ ALI KHAN, Jaora, C. I.
- 1921 SAKLATWALA, J. E., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.
- 1920 SALDANHA, F., Marshall & Sons, Ballard Road, Bombay 1.
- 1927 SALIM A. ALI, Bombay Natural Hist. Soc., 6, Apollo St., Bombay 1.
- 9214 SANDERS, J. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- \*1928 SANKARA RAO, M., Post Palya, Mysore.

- 1927 SASHITAL, R. V., 43 A, Chaupati Rd., Bombay 7.
- \*†1905 SATHE, ACHYUT S., M.A., B.L., Wardha, C. P.
- 1019 SATHE, VAIDYA APPA SHASTRI, Kankadvadi, Bombay 4.
- \*1025 SATTIGIRI, B. D., M.A., New Poona Collogo, Poona.
- 1927 SAYED MUNIRUDDEN S. MOULVI, Oriental Translator, Bombay 1.
- 1023 SOARPA, Dr. G., Italian Consulate, Bombay 1.
- 1024 SCHILLING, Mrs. R., Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay 1.
- 1018 SCHMID, H. W., Volkart Bros., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
- \*1023 SEAMAN, Mrs. E., Aden.
- 1015 SEN, K. C., I.C.S. (Bombay).
- 1017 SETALWAD, MOTILAL C., 64, Nepean Sea Road, Bombay 6.
- 1927 SETHNA, H. D., 611, Girgaum Rd., Bombay 2.
- 1004 SETHNA, N. P., Fergusson Road, Parel, Bombay 1.
- 1020 SETT, ADI K., Podder Rd., Bombay 6.
- 1021 SHAH, B. C., Kalbadevi Road, Bombay 2.
- 1028 SHAH, C. J., Vijaya Mahal, 12, Walkoshwar Rd., Bombay 6.
- 1021 SHAH, C. R., Govardhan Mansion, Bhatvadi, Bombay 4.
- †1017 SHAH, HIRALAL A., B.A., New Ganpalak Lane, Mulji Jetha Market, Bombay 2.
- 1927 SHAH, Dr. T. L., Shashikant & Co., Mangaldas Building, Princess St., Bombay 2.
- \*1025 SHAHANI, Principal S. C., Karachi.
- 1017 SHAMJI HEMRAJ, Readymoney House, Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
- 1008 SHANKS, A. D., Vacuum Oil Co., Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1928 SHARPE, Miss E., Shrikrishna Nivas, Limbdi.
- \*1015 SHASTRI, Prof. M. G., 811, Ravivar, Poona City.
- 1922 SHEJWALKAR, T. S., Jagannath Chawl, Fanasvadi, Bombay 2.
- 1025 SHILOTRI, Dr. PRABHAKAR S., M.A., Ph.D., Shilotri Bank, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
- \*1028 SHIRGAVKAR, RAOJI R., Shahupuri, Kolhapur.
- \*1027 SHIWESHWARKAR, Dr. R. V., B.A., M.B.B.S., Karachi.
- 1018 SHOORJI VALLABHIDAS, Navsari Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*†1015 SIROFF, D. D., Amraoti, C.P.
- 1022 SHUTTLEWORTH, G. D., Croft and Forbes, Standard Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1928 SITA RAM, Dr. K. N., M.A., Ph.D., Rajaram Collogo, Kolhapur.
- 1923 SMITH, A. FORBES, C/o H. S. Smith & Co., Pathe Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
- 1023 SMITH, R. H., Anglo-Siam Corporation, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
- 1927 SMITH, R. M., Sun Insurance Office, Fort, Bombay 1.
- 1028 SODANI, OSMAN, Gresham Bldg., Esplanado Rd., Bombay 1.
- 1023 SOLOMON, Principal W. E. GLADSTONE, School of Art, Bombay 1.
- 1923 SOLOMON, R., Kalbadevi Road, Bombay 2.

- \*1921 SORLEY, H. T., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 \*1914 SOTHERS, D. B., I.F.S. (Bombay).  
 1928 SOUTHWELL, H. P., Lloyds Register, Exchange Bldg., Sprott Rd.,  
 Bombay 1.  
 1922 SOWANI, D. G., B.Sc., B.E., Tukaram Javji Building, Bombay 7.  
 1903 SPENCE, Sir REGINALD A., Kt., Phipson & Co., Apollo St., Bombay 1.  
 1927 STACE, Lt.-Col. R. E., R.E., Mint, Bombay 1.  
 1928 STAHELIN, A. J., Holland-Bombay Trading Co., 204, Hornby Rd.,  
 Bombay 1.  
 1924 STELLA, EUGENE, Wallace Street, Bombay 1.  
 \*1922 STEWART, P. M., D.S.P. (Bombay).  
 1928 STEWART, P. A., I.C.S., (Bombay).  
 1925 STCWELL, V. E., Imperial Bank of India, Bombay.  
 1927 STRONACH, L. A., Caxton House, Bombay.  
 1917 SUBEDAR, MANU, Kodak House, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.  
 †1910 SUKTHANKAR, BHALCHANDRA S., M.A., LL.B., Shantaram House  
 Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.  
 \*1915 SUKTHANKAR, VISHNU S., M.A., Ph.D., Bhandarkar Institute, Poona.  
 \*1928 SUKTHANKAR, Y. N., I.C.S. (C. P.)  
 1915 SULEMAN HAJI IBRAHIM, Nepean Sea Road, Bombay 6.  
 1917 SULTANBIHOY HAJIBHOY, Akbar Bldg., 203-5, Hornby Road,  
 Bombay 1.  
 1925 SURAJMAL LALLUBHAI, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay 2.  
 \*1906 SURFRAZ, Prof. SHAIKH ABDUL KADIR, M.A., Deccan College, Poona.  
 1920 SUTER, M., Maurice Suter & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1922 SYMONDS, S. L., Forbes, Forbes, Campbell & Co., Bombay 1.  
 1919 TAIRSEE, L. R., Borabazar, Holichakla, Bombay 1.  
 1924 TALAYARKHAN, DARIUS R., Davar Hall, Warden Road, Bombay 6.  
 1922 TALAYARKHAN, K. M. J., Bar-at-Law, 56, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.  
 1922 TARAPOREVALLA, V. F., Bar-at-Law, High Court, Bombay 1.  
 1896 TATA, Sir DORABJI J., Kt., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.  
 \*1915 TAYLOR, E. G., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 †1911 TELANG, P. K., M.A., LL.B., Theosophical Society, Benares City.  
 1928 THACKER, M. N., 49, Zaveri Bldg., Khetwadi 12 Cross Lane,  
 Bombay 4.  
 \*†1914 THAKORE, B. K., Madanzapa Road, Baroda.  
 1924 THAKORE, GOVINDLAL N., Ekadashi Building, Parekh Street,  
 Bombay 4.  
 †1906 THAKORE, ISHWARLAL N.  
 1928 THATTI, R. D., 55, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.  
 1920 THOMAS, G. A., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 \*1924 THOMPSON, Miss M. W., Kimmins High School, Panchgani.  
 1910 TILLEY, J. S., Mackenzies, Ltd., Sewry, Bombay 15.  
 1923 TODD, A., Phipson & Co., Apollo Street, Bombay 1.  
 1922 TOMLINSON, Miss J., Cathedral Girls' School, Bombay 1.

- †1915 TRIPATHI, D. T., China Baud, Bombay 4.  
 1920 TRIPP, W. D., Blundell Spence & Co., Rustom Bldg., Churchgate St., Bombay 1.  
 1915 TUCKER, L. F., Eastern Bank, Bombay 1.  
 1924 TURNER, A. JAMES, M.A., B.Sc., Technological Laboratory, Matunga, Bombay.
- †1921 TYABJI, AMIN M. B., Chowpaty Sea Face, Bombay 7.  
 1924 TYABJI, CAMAR S., 0, Forbes St., Bombay 1.  
 1916 TYABJI, FAIZ B., Bar-at-Law, Warden Road, Bombay 6.  
 1923 TYABJI, HUSAIN B., M.A., LL.M., Small Causes Court, Bombay 2.  
 \*1908 TYABJI SALMAN, B., A.M.I.C.E., P. W. D. (Bombay).  
 1927 TYEJI, DAWOODKHAN SHALEBHOY, M.L.C., Shalo Bldg., Bank Street, Bombay 1.
- \*1905 VAIDYA, C. V., M.A., LL.B., Kalyan.  
 1925 VAIDYA, G. N., B.A., Nono Bldg., Sadashiv St., Bombay 4.  
 †1921 VAIDYA, J. S., Zandu Pharmacy, Bombay 13.  
 \*†1926 VAIDYA, Dr. P. L., M.A., D. Litt., Willingdon Colloge, Sangli.  
 †1905 VAIDYA, V. P., B.A., Bar-at-Law, J.P., 18, Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.  
 1921 VAKIL, K. H., B.A., LL.B., Villa Vasant, Santa Cruz.  
 1927 VAKIL, M. M., B.A., LL.B., 95, Ash Lane, Bombay 1.  
 1921 VAKIL, M.R., LL.B., Bar-at-Law, 217, Charni Road, Bombay, 4.  
 1923 VASVANI, B. J., M.A., Modern Publishing Co., Charni Road, Bombay 4.
- \*1918 VAZE, S. G., Servants of India Society, Poona.  
 1927 VELINKAR, V. S., B.A. (Oxon), Bar-at-Law, 56, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
- \*1900 VENKOBIA RAO, B., B.A., Office of the Consulting Architect to Government, Lalbagh, Bangalore.  
 \*1920 VENS, T. W., C/o B. S. N. Co., Mangalore.  
 \*1923 VESUGAR, Mrs. P., C/o R. H. Readymoney, Nepoan Sea Road, Bombay 6.  
 1912 VICAJEE FRAMJI VICAJEE, Bar-at-Law, 22-A, Ormiston Road, Apollo Bunder, Bombay 1.
- \*1924 VIJAYARAI KALYANRAI, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad.  
 \*1920 VINCHURKAR, SHRIMANT NARAYANRAO GOVINDRAO, Nasik.  
 \*1920 VISVESWARAYYA, Sir M., K.C.I.E., Bangalore.  
 \*1910 VORA, C. H., Kalabhavan, Baroda.  
 1928 WADIA, A. K., Justice Shah's Bungalow, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.  
 1892 WADIA, C. N., Bella Vista, Cumballa Hill, Bombay 6.  
 1928 WADIA, FRAMJI DOSSADHOY, Merwanji & Sons, 70, Apollo St., Bombay 1.  
 1922 WADIA, N. J., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 1899 WADIA, Prof. P. A., Hormazd Villa, Bombay 6.  
 1926 WADIA, Mrs. PINOZA A. J., Wilderness Road, Bombay 6.

- 1914 WAGLE, B. K., B.A. (Cantab.), Kandevasi, Bombay 4.  
 1928 WALCHAND HIRACHAND, Phoenix Bldg., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1922 WALLACE, R. P., 16, New Queen's Road, Bombay 4.  
 1913 WALVEKAR, G. K., B.A., LL.B., Hubli.  
 1927 WATSON, D., Duncan Stratton & Co., 5, Bank Street, Bombay 1.  
 1923 WEBB, A. C., Lloyd Triestino S. N. Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.  
 1917 WEBSTER, J. H., Eastern Bank, Bombay 1.  
 \*1928 WESTON, E., I.C.S. (Bombay).  
 \*1922 WELINGKAR, R. N., B.A. (Oxon.), Gujarat College, Ahmedabad.  
 1922 WELMAN, P. H., Prior de Saona & Co., Menkwa Building, Outram Road, Bombay 1.  
 1926 WHELAN, A. H., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.  
 1927 WHITESIDE, W. B., Dunlop Tyre Co., Fort, Bombay 1.  
 1928 WHITTAKER, A., Greaves Cotton & Co., Forbes St., Bombay 1.  
 1927 WILLIS, F. W., Tata Sons & Co., Bruco Street, Bombay 1.  
 1928 WILSON, W. B., National Aniline and Chemical Co., 65-73, Argyle Rd., Bombay.  
 \*1924 WODEHOUSE, Prof. E. A., Deccan College, Poona.  
 1925 WOOD, EVELYN, Ralli Bros., 21, Ravelin Street, Bombay 1.  
 1921 WOODS, D. F., G. I. P. Railway, Bombay 1.  
 1925 WRIGHT, The Rev. ARTHUR Y., Wesleyan Chaplain, Apollo Bunder, Bombay 1.  
 1925 WRIGHT, FRANK, C/o B. E. S. & T. Co., Bombay 1.  
 \*1920 WRIGHT, The Rev. H. K., Ahmednagar.  
 1928 YAJNIK, I. K., Old Watson Hotel Bldg., Bombay 1.  
 1915 ZIMMERMANN, The Rev. Dr. R., S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.  
 \*1926 ZUBERBÜHLER, H. W., Duncan Stratton & Co., Calcutta.

### Fellows.

- 1921 DR. F. W. THOMAS, India Office, London.  
 1922 DR. SYLVAIN LEVI, Colloge de Franco, Paris.  
 1923 DR. M. WINTERNITZ, Prague University, Czechoslovakia.  
 1924 DR. GANGANATH JHA, Allahabad University.  
 1924 DR. HEINRICH LÜDERS, Sybolstrasse, 19, Charlottenburg, Germany.  
 1924 PROF. JADUNATH SARKAR, Calcutta University.  
 1924 MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA VASUDEO SHASTRI ADHYANKAR, Fergusson College, Poona.  
 1924 SHAMS-UL-ULMA JIVANJI J. MODI, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., 211, Pilot Bunder Road, Colaba, Bombay 5.  
 1924 VISHVANATH P. VAIDYA, B.A., Bar-at-Law, Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.  
 1924 P. V. KANE, M.A., LL.M., Anglo's Wadi, Bombay 4.  
 1924 DR. M. N. DIALLA, 15, R. A. Lines, Karachi.  
 1924 SIR GEORGE A. GRIERSON, Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey.  
 1924 PROF. N. B. DIVATLA, B.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay.  
 1924 THE REV. DR. D. MACKICHAN, M.A., D.D., 18, Douglas Crescent, Edinburgh.  
 1924 THE REV. DR. R. SCOTT, M.A., D.D., 7, Polwarth Grove, Edinburgh.  
 1924 PROF. SHAIKH ABDUL KADIR SURFRAZ, M.A., Deccan College, Poona.  
 1924 PROF. S. H. HODIVALA.

*Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to consider and recommend alterations in the Society's scheme of Transliteration of Arabic, Persian and allied Languages.*

The Sub-Committee, consisting of Rev. R. Zimmermann, Vice-president, Dr. Sukthankar, and Mr. A. A. A. Fysee met in the Society's rooms on May 2, 1928, at 6 p.m. and agreed to the following :—

The Committee is of opinion that the scheme of Transliteration for Sanskrit on the one hand, and Arabic and Persian on the other, should be independent of each other ; that is to say, no one language should be given preference as regards convenient symbols, and thus one and the same symbol may be used for indicating different sounds in different languages. Thus according to our recommendations,  $\text{q} = \text{ق}$  in Arabic and Persian, whereas in Sanskrit  $\text{q}$  stands for  $\text{क}$  ; and  $\text{t} = \text{ط}$  in Arabic, and  $\text{z}$  in Sanskrit and so on.

On the whole we are of opinion that this would not cause confusion, and we recommend the following changes in the existing scheme, thus bringing it more in a line with modern systems of Transliteration, such as those recommended by the British Academy and employed by the *Encyclopædia of Islam* and other scholars.

In making our recommendations we have specially kept in view the sound-values of the various letters, and we wish particularly to acknowledge the help we derived from Gairdner's *Phonetics of Arabic* (Cairo, 1925).

We recommend the following changes in the existing scheme :—

(Abbreviations : *EI* = *Encyclopædia of Islam*, by Houtsma, Arnold, Basset, Hartmann and others, in English, French and German. Brill, Leiden 1913. In the course of publication.

*BA* = *Report of the Committee appointed to draw up a practical scheme for the Transliteration into English of words and names belonging to the Languages of the Nearer East*. Proc. of the British Academy, Vol. VIII, London, Oxf. Univ. Press.)



(1)  $\dot{z}$  =  $\underline{dh}$  [instead of  $\underline{Z}$ .]

[As in *EI*. *BA* suggests *dh*. We have kept the dash as in all other 2-letter symbols, e.g. *th*, *kh*, *gh*, etc. Phonetically  $\underline{Z}$  is incorrect. Our scheme has four different variations of  $\underline{Z}$ , which is undesirable.]

(2)  $\mathcal{S}$  =  $\mathcal{S}$  [instead of  $\underline{S}$ .]

[As in *EI*, *BA* and most scholars. The existing symbol,  $\underline{S}$ , was suggested in order to distinguish it from Sans.  $\mathcal{r}$ . We however do not think that that is a sufficient ground to change a symbol that is of almost universal use among English speaking Orientalists.]

(3)  $\mathcal{Z}$  =  $\mathcal{d}$  [instead of  $\underline{Z}$ ]

[As in *EI*, *BA* and most scholars.  $\underline{Z}$  is phonetically undesirable.]

(4)  $\mathcal{t}$  =  $\mathcal{t}$  (instead of  $\underline{T}$ ) and

(5)  $\mathcal{z}$  =  $\mathcal{z}$  (instead of  $\underline{Z}$ )

[As in *EI*, *BA* and most scholars.]

*Adopted by the Journal Sub-Committee, 23rd June 1928 ; and by the Managing Committee on 3rd July 1928.*