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INTRODUCTORY.

I think I may take it for granted that an Indian who has received English education and has been introduced to the ancient history of European countries, naturally has a desire to be acquainted with the ancient history of his own country, to know by whom and how that country was governed in ancient times, or how its social and religious institutions have grown up, and what revolutions the country has gone through; but means for the satisfaction of this desire are wanting. India unfortunately has no written history. There are some chronicles written by Jains and others, referring to kings and princes who lived from about the eighth to the eleventh centuries of the Christian era and ruled over Gujrat and Rajputana. There are also lives of individual kings such as

the Śrī-Harṣacarita of Bāṇa and the Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Bilhana. The hero of the former ruled over Northern India in the first half of the seventh century, and of the latter, over Southern India in the latter part of the eleventh and the early part of the twelfth century. The Purāṇas contain genealogies of certain dynasties. With these exceptions, sometime ago we had absolutely no knowledge of the history of the different provinces of India before the foundation of the Mahomedan Empire. But the researches of European and some Native scholars and antiquarians have thrown considerable light over this dark period. The knowledge hitherto gathered cannot be pronounced to be very satisfactory or to be as good as written books would have supplied. Still, it is sufficient to give us a general idea of the political, social and religious movements that took place from remote times to the arrival of the Mahomedans. The materials for these researches I shall here shortly describe.

First—Gold, silver and copper coins of ancient kings are found in all parts of the country, especially in Northern India, when old mounds composed of the ruins of buildings are dug out. These coins bear certain emblems, and also legends in ancient characters containing the names of the princes who issued them, and sometimes of their fathers, with occasionally the date of their issue. From these we derive a knowledge of the kings and dynasties that ruled over the provinces in which the coins are found.

Secondly—We find inscriptions engraved on rocks and columns and on the remains of ancient temples wherein occur the names of princes, and sometimes of the provinces ruled over or conquered by them. In the case of temples and other benefactions we have the names of the donors, their profession, the description of the nature of their gift, and sometimes the name of the king in whose reign the gift was made. Again, we find in digging old ruins, charters of land-grants made by princes, inscribed on plates of copper. The grants therein recorded were made to individual Brahmins or to temples or to Buddhist Viharas. These copper-
plate inscriptions often give a full genealogy of the dynasty to which the grantor belonged, together with the most notable events in the reign of each of the princes belonging to the dynasty. Often-times, there is a mere vague praise of the different kings which can have no historical value, but one who possesses a little critical power, can without much difficulty distinguish between what is historically true and what is not. A very large number of such grants have been found in our own Maratha country, in consequence of which we have been able to construct a sort of continuous political history from about the beginning of the sixth century to the time of the Mahomedan invasion.

Thirdly—Another important source consists in the writings of foreigners who visited this country or obtained information about it from others. The invasion of Alexander the Great brought the Greeks in communication with India, and after his death his general Seleukos who obtained the province of Syria kept up a regular intercourse with a king who is called Sandrakottos by the Greeks, who reigned at Pātaliputra, and at whose court resided an ambassador of Seleukos of the name of Megasthenes. The work of Megasthenes, though not extant, was abridged by other writers, and in this form it has come down to us. Then we have Ptolemy's geography which was written between 151 and 163 A.D., the date of his death. He gives the names of Indian towns and sometimes of the princes who reigned there at the time. Similarly we have got another work called the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea whose author is unknown. He too gives valuable geographical and historical information. After Buddhism had penetrated into China, several Chinese pilgrims visited India from time to time, and have left us an account of what they saw. Such are Fa-Hian, Sung-yun, Hieun Tsiang, and I-ting. The Mahomedans who visited the country in later times have also left us similar works. Besides the information given by these writers about the people, their literature, and their kings, what is of the highest value is the help they afford in determining the dates of events in India. For, all these foreigners had good systems of chronology.
Besides these, some of the later Sanskrit and vernacular works contain what are called Praśastis or historical accounts of princes in whose reign they were composed, and sometimes of the dynasties to which they belonged.

These are the authorities for the political history of the country; but the history of thought as well as of religious and social institutions is to be gathered from the literature itself, which is vast. But though it is vast, still older works calculated to enable us to solve many a problem in literary and social history have perished.

In using all these materials, however, one should exercise a good deal of keen critical power. No one who does not possess this power can make a proper use of them. A good many years ago, I delivered a lecture on the critical and comparative method of study, which has been published. To what I have stated there, I shall only add that in dealing with all these materials, one should proceed on such principles of evidence as are followed by a judge. One must in the first place be impartial, with no particular disposition to find in the materials before him something that will tend to the glory of his race and country, nor should he have an opposite prejudice against the country or its people. Nothing but dry truth should be his object; and he should in every case determine the credibility of the witness before him and the probability or otherwise of what is stated by him. He should ascertain whether he was an eye-witness or a contemporary witness, and whether in describing a certain event he himself was not open to the temptation of exaggeration or to the influence of the marvellous. None of the current legends should be considered to be historically true, but an endeavour should be made to find any germ of truth that there may be in them by evidence of another nature.

THE MAURYAS (UPTO THE ACCESSION OF AŚOKA.)

I shall now proceed to give a short sketch of the history of India as determined by the critical use of these materials. As I have already observed, the Purāṇas give lists of kings, who, they say in

1 Printed in this volume later.
prophetic language, will reign in the future. In consequence of the
corruption of manuscripts there are a great many discrepancies in
the lists as given in different works of that class. Besides, there
is no chronological clue whatever to be found in them. We will,
therefore, begin with that dynasty of which we have intimation
elsewhere, and with that king whose date can be determined by
unimpeachable evidence. Candragupta is mentioned as the founder
of the Maurya dynasty. He is said to have uprooted the
family of the Nandas who ruled before him and to have been assist-
ed by a Brahmin of the name of Cāṇakya. He is one of those
whose memory has been preserved by both Buddhist and Brahman-
ic writers. We have a dramatic play in which his acquisition of
the throne through the help of Cāṇakya is alluded to. Buddhistic
works also give similar accounts about him. The grammarian
Patañjali alludes to the Mauryas and speaks of a Candragupta-
sabhā. In an inscription, dated in the year 72, which has been
referred to the Śaka era and is consequently equivalent to 150
A.D., Candragupta the Maurya is spoken of as having caused a
certain tank to be constructed; and we have contemporary evi-
dence also of the existence of the king and of his acquisition of the
throne in the writings of Greek authors. They speak of Candra-
gupta as being an ambitious man in his youth, and as having been
present in the Panjab at the time of Alexander's invasion. He is
said to have freed the country from the Macedonian yoke, to have
fought with Seleukos, who had obtained the Syrian province of
the Alexandrian empire, and to have finally concluded a treaty
with him. Seleukos sent an ambassador to his court of the name of Megasthenes. From this connection of Candragupta with
Seleukos, we have been able to determine the date of his accession,
which is about 322 B.C. Candragupta's capital was Pātaliputra,
which is represented by Greek writers to have been situated at the
confluence of the Ganges and the Erannoboas, which last corres-
donds to our Hiranyabāhā. Hiranyabāhā was another name of the
Śoṇa, and Patañjali speaks of Pātaliputra as situated on the
banks of the Śoṇa'. His (Candragupta's) successor, according

to one Purāṇa, was Bindusāra, and, according to another, Bhadra-
sāra. He is mentioned also in Buddhistic works, but the name does
not occur in any inscription or foreign writing. His son was called
Āsoka. This is a very important name in the ancient history of
the whole of India, and as the connection of the prince with
Buddhism was close, and that religion plays an important part in
the general history of India, I must here give a short account of it.

RISE OF BUDDHISM—ITS DOCTRINES AND AIMS.

After the Indian Āryas had established the system of sacrificial
religion fully, their speculation took its start from the sacrifice.
Every thing was identified with some sacrificial operation. The
gods are represented in the Puruṣasūkta (Rgveda, X. 90) to have
sacrificed the primordial Puruṣa, from whom thus sacrificed, arose
the whole creation. Brahman is a word which in the Rksaṁhitā
means a particular mantra or verse addressed to a god, or that
sort of power from which one is able to compose such a mantra.
Thence it came to signify the true power or virtue in a sacrifice, or
its essence; and when the whole universe was regarded as produced
from a kind of sacrifice, its essence also came to be named Brahman.
There was at the same time religious and philosophical speculation
upon an independent basis starting from the self-conscious soul.
In the Rgveda Sāthitā we have several philosophical hymns, and
the speculation which they indicate ran on in its course, and the
results of it we have in the Upaniṣads. In the celebrated hymn
beginning with Nasadasinno sadāsit, it is represented that in the
darkness which enveloped the whole world in the beginning, that
which was wrapped up in the Unsubstantial, developed through the
force of brooding energy, and there arose in it a Desire which is
spoken of as the first germ of the mind. This idea that our worldly
existence, with its definite modes of thinking is the result of desire,
developed in a variety of ways. This appears to be the idea ad-
opted or appropriated by Buddhism, and one sense of the name
Māra—the Buddhistic Prince of Darkness—is Kāma or desire.
Of the four noble truths of Buddhism the first is misery (Duḥkha),

1 Rgveda, X. 129.
and the second, the origin of misery. This is thirst or desire. If, therefore, the misery of worldly existence is due to desire, the conclusion follows that, in the words of the Kaṭha Upaniṣad, by uprooting your desire you are free from misery and attain immortality and eternal bliss. This is the third of the noble truths. But immortality or eternal bliss one can speak of, when one regards the soul as something different from and lying beyond the mind or thoughts which have been set in motion by desire. When, however, the existence of such a thing beyond the mind or thought is denied, the condition of eternal bliss when thought has ceased, means, what some people call annihilation. In one of the sections of the Brhadāraṇyaka, which Upaniṣad and the Chāndogya, might be regarded as collections of the speculations of various Ṛṣis, there occurs a passage which comes very near to the denial of the soul as a separate substance. “Yājñāvalkya,” says Ārta-bhāga, the son of Jaratkaru, “when the speech of a man or Puruṣa who is dead, goes to Agni or fire, his breath to the wind, his sight to the sun, his mind to the moon, his power of hearing to the quarters, the body to the earth, and the self to the Ākāśa or ether, the hairs of his body to the herbs, and the hairs on the head to the trees, and the blood and seminal fluid are placed in the waters where does the Puruṣa exist?” Yājñāvalkya answers “Ārta-bhāga give me your hand. We alone shall know of this and not the people here.” So then they went out and conversed with each other, and what they spoke of was Karma (deeds), and what they praised was Karma. He who does meritorious Karma or deeds, becomes holy, and he who does sinful deeds, becomes sinful. With this Ārta-bhāga, the son of Jaratkaru, was satisfied and remained silent. Here it will be seen that the different parts, of which man is composed are represented as being dissolved into the different parts of the Cosmos, and what remains is the Karma. The ideas therefore involved in this dialogue are three:—(1) That the soul is not a substance separate from the component parts of a human being:

1 यदा सवैः प्रमुच्छते कामा येदस्य ह्वदि स्ववतः।
बय वलोसुर्वती भवन्तम ब्रह्म समस्तते।। Kaṭha Up. VI. 14.
(2) that what renders transmigration or the production of a new being possible is the Karma, and (3) that according to the nature of the previous Karma, is the nature of the new being, holy or sinful. The third idea is common to all Hindu systems of philosophy or religion; but the first two are heterodox, and must have been considered so when the dialogue was composed, since it was to avoid the shock which the exposition of such doctrines would cause, that Yājñavalkya retires from the assembly and speaks to Ārta-bhāga alone. Still the ideas had been developed in the time of the Upaniṣad and were adopted by Buddhism. In the celebrated dialogue between the Greek king Milinda or Menander of Sākala, and Nāgasena, a Buddhist Saint, the king asks: "How is your reverence known? What is your name?" Nāgasena replies: "I am called Nāgasena by my parents, the priests, and others. But Nāgasena is not a separate entity." And going on further in this way, Nāgasena gives an instance of the chariot in which the king came, and says: "As the various parts of a chariot when united form the chariot, so the five Skandhas when united in one body, form a being or living existence." Here we see that as there is nothing like a chariot independently of its parts, so there is nothing like a man independently of the various elements of which he is composed. Further on in the same book we have:—"The king said, 'What, is it Nāgasena that is re-born?' 'Name-and-form is re-born'. 'What, is it this same name-and-form that is re-born?' 'No; but by this name-and-form deeds are done, good and evil, and by these deeds (this Karma) another name-and-form is re-born.'" In the external world also the Buddhist believes in the existence of no substance. To him all knowledge is phenomenal, and this is what appears to be meant by the doctrine that every thing is Kṣaṇika or momentary.

1 The five Skandhas are Rūpa, physical constituents, Viśeṣāna, self-consciousness, Vedanā, feeling of pleasure or pain, Saṁjñā, name, and Saṁskāra, love, hatred, and infatuation. These five constitute the human being.

2 नामरूप or name-and-form is equivalent to the five Skandhas of which a living being is composed. The expression, therefore, signifies a living individual.
But it was not the metaphysical doctrines of Buddhism that influenced the masses of the people. What proved attractive was its ethical side. The Buddhist preachers discoursed on Dharma or righteousness to the people. Such discourses on Dharma without the introduction of any theistic idea have their representatives in the Brahmanic literature. In many of the episodes of the Mahābhārata, especially in the Śanti and Anuśāsanika books, we have simple ethical discourses without any reference to God, of the nature of those we find in Buddhistic works; and sometimes the verses in the Mahābhārata, are the same as those occurring in the latter. There appears to be at one time a period in which the thoughts of the Hindus were directed to the delineation of right conduct in itself without any theistic bearing. And Buddhism on its ethical side represents that phase. Right conduct is the last of the four noble truths of Buddhism. The origin of misery alluded to above is destroyed by what is called the Eight-fold Path—viz., right views, right resolve, right speech, right action, right living, right effort, right self-knowledge, right contemplation.¹ Thus the Buddhistic gospel is, that righteous conduct is the means of the destruction of suffering, which may end in positive happiness or not, according as one regards his soul as substantial or phenomenal. It was this phase of Buddhism that, with the strenuous efforts of the missionaries and of the Emperor Aśoka, enabled it to achieve success amongst the masses of the people; and what was wanting on the theistic side, was supplied by the perfection and marvellous powers attributed to the founder of the religion. Without this faith in the perfection or, what we should call, the divine nature of Buddha, a mere ethical religion would probably not have succeeded. Buddhism was not a social revolution as has been thought by some writers. It was a religion established and propagated by persons

¹ श्रवङ्गः, सम्प्रभुक्तत्वः, सम्प्रभुत्यागः, सम्प्रभुत्यागान्तः, सम्प्रभुत्यागावः, सम्प्रभुत्यागावः, सम्प्रभुत्यागावः, सम्प्रभुत्यागावः, सम्प्रभुत्यागावः, सम्प्रभुत्यागावः. The true sense of (7) has, it appears to me, not yet been correctly given. Śrāvī is remembrance of what a man's true condition is; being blinded to it, is Śrāvīvibhrama or Śrāvībhrama, Bhag. G. ii. 63. Seeing where one's course of conduct is leading one, and remembering what one ought to do is Śrāvī, and that is awakened in one by God; Ibid. xv. 15. When infatuation disappears Śrāvī returns; Ibid. xviii. 73.

who had renounced the world and professed not to care for it. From times of old there existed in the Indian community such persons, who were called Šramaṇas and belonged originally to all castes. These gave themselves to contemplation and sometimes pronounced doctrines of salvation not in harmony with the prevalent creed. Buddhism was not even a revolt against caste, for though men from all castes were admitted to the monastic order, and though in the discourses of Buddha himself and others, the distinction of caste is pronounced to be entirely worthless, still the object of those who elaborated the system was not to level caste-distinctions. They even left the domestic ceremonies of their followers to be performed according to the Vedic ritual. This is one of the arguments brought against Buddhism by Udayanācārya. “There does not exist,” he says, “a sect, the followers of which do not perform the Vedic rites beginning with the Garbhādhāna and ending with the funeral, even though they regard them as having but a relative or tentative truth.”1 Buddhism, however, was a revolt against the sacrificial system, and denied the authority of the Vedas as calculated to point out the path to salvation. And this is at the root of the hostility between Buddhism and Brahmanism.

PROPAGATION OF BUDDHISM—AŚOKA’S EDICTS.

Buddhism was propagated by a number of devoted persons. But I think the efforts of Aśoka contributed a good deal to its acceptance by the large mass of the people. Though of course in his Edicts he does not inculcate upon his people faith in Buddha and Sarvāgha, still the Dharma or righteousness that he preaches is in the spirit of Buddhism. The inscriptions of Aśoka are engraved on rocks, pillars, and tablets of stone. Those of the first class are found at Girnar in Kathiawād on the west, Shahbazgarhi in Afghanistan, Manshera on the northern frontiers of the Panjab, Khalsī near the sources of the Jumna in the Himalaya, and Dhauli in Katak, and Jaugad in Ganjam on the east. All these contain the

1 नास्त्येऽव तद्हेषां यत्र सांहृत्मेतिश्रृव्यवत्वाृिः साधनायाध्यायमेविद्यम्यं दैवंता वैदिकाः कि त्रां जनो नास्तुतिहति। Atmatattvaviveka, Calc. Ed. of Sāuvat 1906, p. 89, धार्मिक is relating to संबृहित, a Buddhist technical term.
same edicts, their number in some cases being fourteen, and less in others. In the last two places there are two separate edicts not found on the other rocks. These inscriptions are in two different characters—those at Gîrnār, Khalsî, Dhauli and Jaugad being in the character called Brāhmi, which is the earliest form of our modern Devanāgarī, and those at Shahbazgarhi and Mansesahra are in the character called Kharoṣṭhī, and are written from right to left in the manner of the ancient Pahlavi and the modern Persian and Arabic documents. Two of the columns bearing inscriptions of the second class are now at Delhi. They were brought there by the Emperor Firozeshah from Siwalik and Meerut. The others exist at Allahabad, Radhia, Mathia, and Râmpurvā. The edicts are the same on these columns, but the number of these on the Siwalik Delhi pillar is seven, the second Delhi pillar contains five, that at Râmpurvā four, and the rest six. In the case of both these classes, the inscriptions are well-preserved in some cases and mutilated in others. Smaller edicts on rocks and tablets are found at Rupnâth and Sahasrām in Bhagelkhand, Bairat on the northeastern boundary of Rajputana and Siddāpur in the Mysore territory. There is also a tablet inscription addressed to the Māgadha Śaṁgha, and three small ones in caves at Barābar near Gayā. Two more inscriptions have been found at Paderia and Nigliva in the Nepal Terai.

**Extent of Asoka’s Empire and the Date of his Coronation.**

Now, in the first place, from the localities in which we find these inscriptions, it appears that Asoka’s dominions extended from Kāthaiwād on the west to Katak and Ganjam on the east, and to Afghanistan, Panjab, and the sources of the Jumna in the north. To the south it extended over the centre of the table-land of the Deccan upto Mysore. In the second rock-edict he speaks of “conquered” countries and the “neighbouring or bordering” countries. In the last class he mentions the Coḍas, the Pāṇḍyas, Satiyaputa, Ketalaputra or Keralaputra up to Tambapanṭi, and the countries of Antiyoko the Yoṇa king and his neighbours. In the thirteenth rock-edict he speaks of his having achieved religious
Victory “here” and in the neighbouring or bordering countries up to six hundred Yojanas, where reigns Antiyoko the Yona king, and further away from him where the four kings, Turamāya, Antikina, Maka, and Alikasadura hold sway, and down below where the Coḍa and the Pāṇḍya rule up to Tambapaṇṭi, and also in the countries of “Hidarāja.” This last expression must be translated by “the kings about here,” among whom he enumerates those of the countries of Viṣa, Vaji, Yona, Kamboja, Nābhāta, Nabhapanti, Bhoja, Pitinika, Andhra, and Pulinda. Here there is a threefold division, viz., his own empire, spoken of as “here”; the neighbouring independent countries ruled over by Antiochus and others, and those of the Coḍas and Pāṇḍyas; and the “Hidarājas” or “kings here,” i.e., in his empire. On comparing both these passages, it would appear that Antiochus and the other Greek princes as well as the princes of the Coḍas and Pāṇḍyas, were independent; while the kings of the Vajjis, whose country lay near Pāṭaliputra, and of the Bhojas, the Petenikas, and the Āndhras and the Pulindas were under his influence, i.e., were probably his feudatories; while the rest of the country was under his immediate sway. Among the feudatory princes must also be included those of the Gandhāras, Rāṣtikas, and the Aparāntas, who are mentioned in the fifth rock-edict, and to whose dominions he sent overseers of righteousness. From the mention of Antiyoko and others in the second and thirteenth edicts, the date when they were composed can be accurately determined. Antiyoko was Antiochus of Syria (260—247 B.C.), Turamāya was Ptolemy Philadelphos of Egypt (285—247 B.C.), Antikini was Antigonos Gontatus of Macedonia (278—242 B.C.), Maka was Magas of Cyrene.

1 Epi, Ind. Vol. II. pp. 449-450 and 462-465. Hidarāja has been taken to be a proper name by both M. Senart and Dr. Bühler. But Hida everywhere in these inscriptions means “here,” and the sense the “kings here” fits in very well with the context. Aśoka distinguishes between Hida and Anlesu—i.e., his own empire and the territories of his neighbours. The third class left must be of those who were kings in the extent of country that could be spoken of as Hida, i.e., princes comprised in his empire or dependent princes. Ib. p. 471, and Inscriptions of Piyadasi, by Senart, Vol. II, p. 84 and p. 92, note 63.

2 Dharmamahāmātrāḥ.
(died 258 B.C.), and Alikasudara was Alexander of Epirus (died between 262 and 258 B.C.). All of these were living between 250 and 258 B.C., wherefore the matter in the inscription was composed between those years, i.e., about 259 B.C., and Aśoka was crowned about 277 B.C., as the edict was promulgated in the thirteenth year after the event¹.

AŚOKA, A BUDDHIST—BUT TOLERANT AND LIBERAL.

In the edicts at Sahasaram, Bairat, Rūpnāth, and Siddāpur,² Aśoka says that he was an Upāsaka or lay follower of Buddhism for more than two years and a half, but did not exert himself to promote righteousness; but for more than a year afterwards, he did so, and the result was that those men and gods that had been regarded as true in Jambudvipa before, were rendered false. In the eighth rock-edict, he speaks of his having “set out for Saṃbodhi,” which technically means perfect knowledge, after the end of the tenth year since his coronation. This expression occurs in Buddhistic Pali works, and signifies ‘beginning to do such deeds as are calculated to lead in the end to perfection.’ From these two statements it appears that Aśoka was a Buddhistic lay follower, and worked with a view to gain the highest good promised by Buddhism. He visited the Lumbini grove, where Śākyamuni was born, after he had been a crowned king for twenty years, and, having done worship, erected a stone column on the site with a stone enclosure (enclosing wall)³. Paderia in the Nepal Terai, where the inscription, which mentions this, was found engraved on a mutilated pillar, must be the site of the birth-place of Buddha. The other Nepal inscription that was found at Nigliva represents his having increased the Stūpa raised to Konākamana, when fourteen years had elapsed since his coronation, and some years afterwards, probably in the same year in which he visited the Lumbini grove, he did worship

³ Epi. Ind. Vol. V. p. 4. I think मिताबिगड़कीचा must be an enclosure or railing made of stone. मीता is probably connected with bhitti or bhittika "a wall."
there. In the Bhabhra inscription addressed to the Magadha Church, Asoka expresses his faith in the Buddhist Triad of Buddha, Dharma (Righteousness) and Samgha (the Assembly) and recommends that certain works which he names should be read and pondered over by the priests as well as by lay followers. All this shows distinctly enough that Asoka was a Buddhist; but in the edicts, his notions seem to be so liberal and exalted, and his admission that there is truth in the teachings of all sects is so plain, that it must be concluded that he was not actuated by a sectarian spirit, but by a simple respect for truth; and his ethical discourses were such as to be acceptable to everybody, and his moral overseers worked amongst people of all classes and creeds.

Asoka’s Aims and Objects and the Means He Employed.

Asoka’s great object in publishing his edicts was to preach and promote righteousness amongst his subjects. Dharma or righteousness consists, as said by him in the second pillar-edict, (1) in doing no ill, (2) doing a great deal of good, (3) in sympathy, (4) beneficence, (5) truth, and (6) purity. In the seventh edict he adds, (7) gentleness, and (8) saintliness. Besides this, he prohibited the killing of animals for religious sacrifices, and was very particular about it. In the fifth pillar-edict he does seem to allow the flesh of certain animals to be used, but he carefully enumerates those that should not be killed at all, and the conditions under which others should not be killed. Large feasts or banquets, where hundreds of thousands of animals were killed, he prohibited. He directed his officers to go on tours every five years for the inculcation of Dharma or righteousness and for other matters. He had Mahāmatras or Governors of provinces before, but in the fifth

3 Epi Ind. Vol. II, pp. 249, 269-71, and also Senart, Vol. II. pp. 6, 26-27. The words are: (1) अप्राचिन्न, (2) बहुकल्पान (बहुकल्पण), (3) दया, (4) दान, (5) सच (सत्य), (6) सोचय (शोच), (7) मदव (मादव), and (8) साधव (साधुव).
4 First Rock Edict and also the Fourth.
5 First Rock Edict.
rock-edict he speaks of his having created the office of Dharma-mahāmātrās or overseers of righteousness in the fourteenth year after his coronation, and sent them to different countries—those under his immediate sway and those which were semi-independent. They were to work amongst old and young, rich and poor, householders and recluses, and amongst the followers of the different sects; and their business was to look to the good of all, to establish and promote righteousness, and to protect all from oppression. They were also to work amongst those who were near to him, in his family, and amongst his relations. In the fourth rock edict he tells us that by his efforts, the destruction of animals, which was enormous before, has almost ceased by his religious orders or instructions, and that a regard for one's relations, for Brahmins and Śramaṇas or holy recluses, obedience to father and mother and to the old, and general righteousness have increased and will increase, and he hopes that his sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons, &c., up to the end of the Kalpa will go on promoting it; and, being righteous themselves, will instruct their subjects in righteousness. For, "this," he says, "is the highest duty one can perform, viz., that of preaching righteousness." In the seventh rock-edict he allows the followers of all sects to live wherever they like, because what they all aim at is self-restraint and purity; and in the twelfth, he says that he shows his regard for the members of all sects, for the recluses and householders, by gifts and in various other ways; but the highest or the best way of showing regard is to seek to increase the importance of all sects. This importance is increased by ceasing to extol one's own sect or revile that of another, and by showing respect for the creed of another. Aśoka also speaks of his having planted trees and medicinal herbs, dug wells, and opened establishments for the distribution of water, for the good of men and animals in different places, even in the countries of his foreign neighbours. The inscriptions in two of the caves at Barābar mention their being dedicated after he had been a crowned monarch for twelve years, to the use of members of the Ājīva sect, which

1 Second Rock Edict.
like that of the Buddhists, was a sect of recluses; that in the third, does not give any name.¹

This will give the reader an idea of the sort of religion preached by Asoka. He prohibited animal sacrifices and taught that right conduct was the only way to heaven. He inculcated respect for Brahmins as well as Śramaṇas or ascetics of all sects, and was tolerant towards all. The old Vedic or sacrificial religion, i.e., the Karmakāṇḍa, thus received an effectual blow not only at the hands of Buddhists generally, but of Asoka particularly; so that though attempts were made later on to revive it, as I shall hereafter show, it became obsolete; and it is only rarely that one meets with an Agnihotrin or keeper of the sacred fires, and even the simplest of the old great sacrifices is performed in modern times, in but a few and stray instances.

BUDDHISTIC ACCOUNTS.

The Buddhist records give long accounts of Asoka and represent him as one of their great patrons; but they are more or less legendary, and it is difficult to separate the truth from falsehood. Some of their statements, such as that Asoka visited Buddha's birthplace are, as we have seen, confirmed by the inscriptions. A great council of Buddhist priests is said to have been held at his instance to settle the Buddhistic canon; and though there is nothing improbable in it, still it is rather remarkable that no reference to the event occurs in the inscriptions; and Asoka does not seem to have interested himself with doctrinal Buddhism so much as to seek its settlement.

SUCCESSORS OF ASOKA.

The names of the successors of Asoka given in the Purāṇas do not agree. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa gives Daśaratha as the name of his grandson, and there are three inscriptions in three caves in the Nāgārjuni hills, near Gayā, in which Daśaratha is represented immediately after his coronation to have dedicated them for the use

¹ Cunningham's Corpus Inscr. Ind, plate XVI.; Ind. Ant. Vol. XX p., 364.
of the Ājīvaka monks. We have seen that Asoka dedicated similar caves, which are in the Barābar hills, for the use of the Ājīvakas. No trace of any other successor of Asoka is found anywhere.

THE ŚUÑGAS AND THE KĀṆVĀYANAS.

The dynasty of the Mauryas was uprooted, according to the Purāṇas, by Puspamitra or Puṣyamitra, who founded the dynasty of the Śuṅgas. Puṣyamitra is several times alluded to by Patañjali in the Mahābhāṣya, and from the occurrence of his name in a particular passage, I have fixed Patañjali’s date to be about 142 B.C. Puṣyamitra is represented by the Buddhists to have been their persecutor. It appears from the Mahābhāṣya that he was a staunch adherent of Brahmanism and performed sacrifices. His son Agnimitra is the hero of Kālidāsa’s Mālaviṅgūṇīmitra, in which also there is an allusion to the Aśvamedha performed by Puṣyamitra. It will thus appear that he could by no means have been a patron of Buddhism, and the story of his having persecuted them may therefore be true. An inscription on the Buddhistic stūpa at Bharaut, between Jabalpur and Allahabad, represents the place to have been situated in the dominions of the Śuṅgas. Agnimitra was probably his father’s viceroy at Vidiśā in eastern Mālwa. The Śuṅgas are mentioned as having reigned for 112 years in the Purāṇas. They were followed by the KāṆvāyanas, the first of whom was Vāsudeva. A duration of forty-five years is assigned to this dynasty.

THE YAVANAS OR BACTRIAN GREEKS.

Long before this time, however, the Yavanas and even the Sakas make their appearance in Indian history. The instances given by Patañjali of the use of the Imperfect to indicate an action well-known to people, but not witnessed by the speaker, and still possible to have been seen by him, are, as is well known, Arunād Yavas-
nah Sāketam: Aruṇḍ Yavano Madyamikām.¹ This shows that a certain Yavana or Greek prince had besieged Sāketa or Ayodhyā and another place called Madhyamikā when Patanjali wrote this. The late Dr. Goldstücker identified this Yavana prince with Menander. He may, however, be identified with Apollodotos, since the coins of both were found near the Jumna, and, according to the author of the Periplus, were current at Barygaza (Broach) in the first century A.D.² But since Strabo represents Menander to have carried his arms as far as the Jumna, his identification with the Yavana prince is more probable. In another place, Patanjali, in the instances to the Sūtra, beginning with Śūdrāṇām.³ &c., gives Śakasyavanam as an instance of an aggregate Dvandva which signifies that they were Śūdras and lived beyond the confines of Aryavarta.

I have already alluded to a work in Pāli consisting of dialogues between Milinda and Nagasena, which is called Milinda-Pañho. Milinda has been identified with Menander, and is represented as a Yavana king whose capital was Śākala in the Panjab. The Purāṇas, too, in a passage which is greatly confused, assign the sovereignty of India to Śakas and other foreign tribes. But as the only reliable and definite evidence about these foreign kings is furnished by their coins, we shall now proceed to consider them.

COINS OF BACTRIAN KINGS.

Coins of silver and sometimes of copper have been found in Afghanistan and the Panjab, even as far eastward as Mathurā and the Jumna, which bear bilingual legends besides certain emblems characteristic of them. One of these is on the obverse, in Greek characters and language, giving the name of the prince as well as his titles; and the other, which is on the reverse, is in the Kharoṣṭhi characters, to which I have already drawn attention, and which are written from the right to the left, and in the Pāli or Prakrit language. For example, the coins of one of the earlier of these Bactro-Indian princes, Heliokles, contain on the obverse the legend Basileus Dikaioy Heliokleos, which means

¹ Under Pāṇini, III. 2, 111.
³ Under Pāṇini, II. 4, 10.
"of Heliokles, the righteous king," and on the reverse, the legend *Mahārājasa Dhramikasa Heliyakreyasa*, which is the northern Prakrit for the Sanskrit "Mahārājasya Dharmikasya Heliyakreyasaya." Now, this Prakrit legend could have been used only because the coins were intended to be current in provinces inhabited by Hindus. The princes, therefore, whose coins bear such legends must be considered to have held some province in India. The Kharoṣṭhī characters, as stated before, are used in the rock inscriptions of Asoka in Afghanistan, and on the northern frontiers of the Panjab. The Kharoṣṭhī legend used on the coins, therefore, indicates that in the beginning, the princes who used them, must have governed some parts of Afghanistan or the Panjab; and their use was continued even after their possessions extended further eastward. The founder of the Greco-Bactrian monarchy was Diodotus. He was followed by Euthydemus who appears to have been totally unconnected with him. Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus, succeeded him and even in the life-time of his father carried his arms to India and conquered some territory. Eucratides was his rival and they were at war with each other. But Eucratides in the end succeeded in making himself master of a province in India; and there appear to have been two dynasties or rather factions ruling contemporaneously. To the line of Demetrius belonged Euthydemus II—probably his son,—Agathocles and Pantaleon. A prince of the name of Antimachus seems also to have been connected with them.¹ The coins of the first two princes have no Prakrit legend; those of the next two have it in the Brāhmī or ancient Nāgarī characters, while those of the last have it in the Kharoṣṭhī. Eucratides was succeeded by Heliocles,² his son, who probably reigned from 160 B.C to 150 B.C.² There are bilingual legends on the coins of these. There were other princes who followed these, but whose order has not yet been determined, and the dates, too, have not been settled. There names are these:—Philoxenus, Lysias, Antialkidas, Theophilus, Amyntas, and Archebius. These and the preceding princes ruled over Bactria and Afgha-

¹ Percy Gardner’s Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings, &c., Introduction.
nistan to the south of the Paropamisus, but not over the Panjab. The names of those who held also the Panjab, and in some cases some of the eastern provinces as far as the Jumna, are as follows:—Menander, Apollodotus, Zoilus, Dionysius, Strato, Hippostratus, Diomedes, Nicias, Telephus, Hermaeus. Of these the name of Menander occurs, as already stated, in the Pāli work known as Milinda—Pañho. Milinda is the Indianized form of Menander; and the prince is represented as being very powerful. His capital was Śākala in the Panjab.

In the coins of some of these princes the middle word is apa-\textit{dihatasa} corresponding to \textit{Anikētou} in the Greek legend, as in \textit{Mahārājasa Apādihatasa Philasinasa}. In those of others we have \textit{Jayadharasa} corresponding to \textit{Nikēphorou} in the Greek legend, as in \textit{Mahārājasa Jayadharsa Anītaliṅkiaśa}. On the coins of Archebius, we have \textit{Mahārājasa Dhramikasa Jayadharasa Arkhebiyasa}, and on those of others, such as Menander, we have \textit{Tradarasa} corresponding to the Greek \textit{Sōtēros}, as in \textit{Mahārājasa Tradarasa Menāmārāsas}. \textit{Tradarasa} is a corruption of some such word as \textit{trātārasa} for Sanskrit \textit{tratūḥ}. On some coins we have \textit{Tejamasa Tādārāsas}, where \textit{tejamasa} stands for the Greek \textit{Epiphānos}, and means brilliant. Sometimes we have \textit{Mahatasa Jayalasa} after \textit{Mahārājasa}.

The chronology and the mutual relations of these Greco-Indian kings are by no means clear. Some of the princes reigned in one province contemporaneously with others in other provinces. But it may generally be stated,—especially in view of the passage quoted from Patanjali above, and of the tradition alluded to by Kālidāsa in the Mālavikāgnīmitra, that Puspamitra's sacrificial horse was captured on the banks of the Sindhu or Indus by Yavana cavalry—it may be concluded that these kings were in possession of parts of India from about the beginning of the second century before Christ to the arrival of the Śākas whom we shall now proceed to consider.

\textbf{THE IMPERIAL ŚAKAS.}

The Śaka coinage is an imitation of the Greco-Bactrian or Greco-Indian coinage, though there are some emblems peculiar to the

\footnote{Lassen, l. c. Vol. II., Bk. II.}
Sakas. There are two legends, as in the case of the former, on
the obverse in Greek letters, and the other on the reverse in Kharo-
ṣṭhī character and in the Prakrit language. Here, too, the mutual
relation between the princes, their order of succession, as well as
their dates, are by no means clear. Still, from the bilingual le-
gends on the coins, we have recently determined the order of the
princes, and endeavoured to fix the period when they ruled. The
following are the names arranged in the order thus determined:—
(i) Vonones, (ii) Spalirises, (iii) Azes I., (iv) Azilises, (v) Azes II.,
and (vi) Maues. There are coins of two others, viz., Spal-
hores and his son Spalgadames, who, however, did not succeed to
supreme power.1 Now, one thing to be remarked with reference
to these princes is that in the legends on their coins, unlike the
Greco-Indians, they style themselves Basileus Basileon, correpond-
ing to the Prakrit on the reverse Maharajasa Rājarājasa. Thus
they style themselves "kings of kings," i. e., emperors. They
also appropriate the epithet Mahatasa, corresponding to the Greek
Megalou, which we find on the coins of Greek kings. Now, the
title "king of kings" cannot in the beginning at least, have been
an empty boast. The Sakas must have conquered a very large
portion of the country before they found themselves in a position
to use this imperial title. And we have evidence of the spread of
their power. First of all, the era at present called Šalivahana
Šaka was up to about the thirteenth century, known by the name
of 'the era of the Šaka king of kings' and 'the era of the coronation
of the Šaka king.' Now, such an era, bearing the name of the Šaka
king that has lasted to the present day, cannot have come to be
generally used, unless the Šaka kings had been very powerful, and
their dominions extended over a very large portion of the country
and lasted for a long time. And we have positive evidence of the
extent of their power. Taxila in the Panjab, and Mathurā and the
surrounding provinces were ruled over by princes who use the
title of Kṣatrapa or Mahākṣatrapa. So also a very long dynasty of
Kṣtrapas or Mahākṣtrapas ruled over the part of the country ex-

1 See the paper written by Mr. Devadatta R. Bhandarkar, JBBRAS,
1900, Vol. XX, pp. 16ff.
tending from the coast of Kathiawād to Ujjayanī in Mālwā. Even the Maratha Country was for some time under the sovereignty of a Ksatrapa, who afterwards became a Mahāksatrapa. Evidence has been found to consider these Ksatrapas as belonging to the Śaka race, and the very title Ksatrapa, which is evidently the same as the Persian Ḫšāhrāpa, (ordinarily Satrap), shows that these princes were originally of a foreign origin. The coins of the early princes of the Western or Kathiawād-Mālwā Kstrapas bear on the obverse some Greek characters, and also a few Kharoṣṭhī letters, together with a Brāhmaṇī legend on the reverse. And this also points to their connection with the North. These princes give dates on their coins and use them in their inscriptions which have now been considered by all antiquarians to refer to the Śaka era. It is by no means unreasonable therefore to consider these and the Northern Ksatrapas to have been in the beginning at least Viceroy’s of the Śaka kings, and the Śaka era to have been founded by the most powerful of these kings. If these considerations have any weight, the Śaka kings, whose names have been given above, founded their power in the latter part of the first century of the Christian era. This goes against the opinion of all scholars and antiquarians who have hitherto written on the subject and who refer the foundation of the Śaka power to about the beginning of the first century before Christ.¹

NORTHERN KŚATRAPAS.

The names of Northern Kṣatrapas found on coins and in inscriptions are Zeionises, Kharamostis; Liaka and Patika who bore the surname Kusulaka and governed North-Western Panjab at Taxila; and Rājub(v)ula and his son Śoḍāsa who held power at Mathurā.² The names of Liaka and Patika are found in a copperplate inscrip.

¹ See D. R. Bhandarkar’s paper referred to above for the whole argument. Many circumstances have been brought forward, all of which point to the conclusion which we have arrived at, and thus render it highly probable. The objection against it, based on the style of the coins, has also been considered there.

² Numismatic Chronicle for 1890, pp. 125-129; Percy Gardner’s Coins of Greek and Scythic Kings of India.
tion in which the foundation of a monastery and the placing of a relic of Śākyamuni are recorded.\(^1\) Inscriptions have been discovered at Mathurā and Morā in Rajputana,\(^2\) which are dated in the reign of Śoḍāsa. There was also found a Lion Pillar at Mathurā on which there is an inscription in which the names of the mother of Śoḍāsa, his father Rājuvula, and other relatives are given, as well as those of the allied Kṣatrapas, \textit{viz.}, Patika of Taksāsilā and Miyika.\(^3\) The names of two other Kṣatrapas, Hagāna and Hagāmaṣa,\(^4\) have been discovered. The coins of Zeionises and Kharamostis, and some of Rājuvula bear on the obverse a Greek legend and on the reverse one in Kharoṣṭhī characters, thus showing their close connection with their Śaka masters. Some of Rājuvula and those of Śoḍāsa, Hagāna and Hagāmaṣa have a Brāhmī legend only. Rājuvula uses high-sounding imperial titles on some of his coins, whence it would appear that he made himself independent of his overlord. The date of his son Śoḍāsa is 72,\(^5\) equivalent, according to our view, to 150 A.D. It would thus appear that the Satraps who governed Mathurā and the eastern portion of the Śaka empire declared themselves independent some time before 150 A.D.; while those who governed north-western Panjab at Taxila, and consequently were nearer to their sovereign lords, acknowledged their authority till 78 Śaka or 150 A.D., as is evident from Patika’s mention of Moga who has been identified with the Śaka Emperor Maues, in the Taxila copperplate inscription referred to before.

**Kṣatrapas of Kāthiawād-Mālwa.**

Silver coins of the Kṣatrapas of Kāthiawād or Surāṣṭra and Mālwa have been found in large numbers in those provinces. The latest find was in the rock-cells and temples to the south of the Uparkot, a fortress of Junāgadh in Kāthiawād, which consisted

---

1 Epi. Ind. Vol. IV., pp. 54ff.
3 JRAS, 1894, pp. 533ff.
of twelve hundred coins of different kings. On the obverse, there is a bust of the reigning prince, very often with the date, and on the reverse, there is in the centre an emblem which has the appearance of a Stūpa with a wavy line below and the sun and the crescent of the moon at the top. Round this central emblem is the legend giving the name of the prince with that of his father and the title Kṣatrapa or Mahākṣatrapa, in Brāhmī or old Devanāgarī character and in mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit. The first prince of this dynasty was Caṣṭana son of Ghsamotika. There are Greek letters on the obverse of his coins which have but recently been read and found to contain the name of the prince. The legend on the reverse is Rājyō Mahākṣatrapasa Ghsamotikaputrasa Caṣṭanasa. The coins of this prince do not bear dates; but Caṣṭana is mentioned by Ptolemy as Tiastenes, a prince reigning at Ozene or Ujjayanī. And from this and other circumstances his date has been determined to be about 132 A.D. The name Caṣṭana and Ghsamotika are evidently foreign and not Indian. Caṣṭana had a large number of successors, some of whom are called Kṣatrapas only, and others Mahākṣatrapas. There are others again who were Kṣatrapas in the early part of their career, and Mahākṣatrapas in the later. The former was evidently an inferior title and showed that the bearer of it was a dependent prince, while a Mahākṣatrapa held supreme power. There are inscriptions also in which the names of some of these princes are mentioned. In one at Junāgadh, dated 72, Rudradāman’s minister Suviśākha, a Pahlava, son of Kulai, is represented to have re-constructed the dam that had broken away of the lake Sudarśana. In it Rudradāman is spoken of as having been at war with Śātakarni, the lord of the Deccan, and subjected to his sway a good many provinces to the north of Su­raśṭra. There is another inscription bearing the date 103 found at Gūndā, in the Jāmnagar State, in which Rudrabhūti is represented as having dug a tank and constructed it in the reign of the Kṣatrapa Rudrasimha, son of Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman, grand­son of Kṣatrapa Jayadāman, and great-grandson of Mahākṣatrapa

1 JBBRAS, Vol. XX., (1900) p. 201.
Caśtana. A third found at Jasdan in Kāthiawād and dated 127, while Rudrasena was ruling, records the construction of a Sattra or a feeding-house for travellers, by one whose name appears to be Mānasasagara, and who was the son of Pranāṭhaka and grand­son of Khara. The genealogy of Rudrasena, that is given, is, that he was [the son] of Rudrasimha, grandson of Rudradāman, grandson of the son of Jayadāman, and great-grandson of the son of Caśtana. Another inscription at Junāgadh of the grandson of Jayadāman represents some sort of gift in connection with those who had become Kevalis, i.e., perfect individuals, according to Jainas. And the last that I have to notice is that found at Mulwā­sar in Okhāmaṇḍala which refers itself to the reign of Rudrasena and bears the date 122.3

The following is a complete list of the Kṣatrapa princes with the dates occurring on the coins, and in the inscriptions:

I. Mahākṣatrapas.

1. Caśtana.
2. Rudradāman son of Jayadāman, 72.
3. Dāmaghsada son of Rudradāman.
5. Jīvadāman son of Dāmaghsada, 119, 120.

II. Kṣatrapas.

1. Caśtana.
2. Jayadāman son of Caśtana.
3. Dāmaghsada son of Rudradāman.
4. Rudrasimha son of Rudradāman, 102, 110, 112.
5. Satyadāman son Dāmaghsada.
6. Rudrasena son of Rudrasimha, 121.

1 Bhownagar Collection of Inscriptions, p. 22.
3 Bhownagar Coll. of Inscr., p. 7 and p. 23; see also JRAS, 1899, pp. 380ff.
I. Mahākṣātrapas.

7. Sāmghadāman son of Rudrasimha, 144.

8. Dāmasena son of Rudrasimha, 145, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.


13. Rudrasena son of Vīradāman, 17(8?), 180, 183, 185, 186, 188, 190, 194.


15. Bhaṭrīdāman 203, 207, 210, 211, 214, 217, 220?


17. Svāmi-Simhasena sister's son of Svāmi-Rudrasena, 304.

18. Svāmi-(Rudra?)sena son of Svāmi-Simhasena.


II. Kṣatrapas.

7. Prthvisena son of Rudrasena, 144.

8. Dāmajadāśrī son of Rudrasena, 154, 155.


11. Viśvasimha son of Rudrasena, 198, 199, 200, 201.


Though the Ksatrapas occupied a subordinate position, they issued coins in their name, and from that it would appear that they were put in charge of a separate province. Probably the Mahākṣatrapas reigned at the capital, whether it was Ujjayāni as in Caśāna's time, or any other town, and the Kṣatrapas in Kāṭhiawāḍ.

The Rule of Succession among the Kṣatrapas and the Imperial Śakas.

It will be seen that Rudradāman, the second in list I, was succeeded by his son Dāmaghsada, and he by his brother Rudrasimha and not by his son Satyadāman, who was only a Kṣatrapa under his uncle. After the two brothers, their sons became Mahākṣatrapas successively; and after Rudrasena, the eldest son of Rudrasimha, his two brothers held the supreme power one after another, and two sons of Rudrasena were only Kṣtrapas under their uncle. Similarly, three sons of Dāmasena (Nos. 10, 11 and 12) reigned one after another. The position of Kṣatrapa under the Mahākṣatrapa was occupied by the brother of the latter, as in the case of No. 4 in list II; in the absence of the brother, by the elder brother's son, and in his absence, his own son. After the brothers had been in power successsively, their sons, beginning with those of the eldest, got possession of the throne, as in the case of Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 in list I. Thus, according to the custom of this dynasty, the rightful heir to the throne was the next brother, and after the brothers, the sons in the order of their father's seniority. Dr. Bühler conjectures the existence of a similar custom among the northern Kṣatrapas from the fact of Kharoṣṭha's bearing the title of Yuvarāja, while his brother Śodāsa was a reigning Kṣatrapa. But it can be distinctly traced among the imperial Śakas. For, while the coins of Vonones represent him in Greek characters on the obverse as "King of kings," they show on the reverse in Kharoṣṭhī characters that his brother Spalahores held power under him, as the brother of a Mālwa Mahākṣatrapa did under the latter. On other coins we have Spalgadames, the son of

1 JRAS, 1894, p. 532.
Sphalahores, associated on the reverse with Vonones on the obverse. This Spalgadames is again connected on the obverse with Spalirises, who is styled "the king's brother." There are other coins on which Spalirises appears in both the Greek and Kharoṣṭhī legends as "King of kings." Still others we have, on which he, as supreme sovereign is associated with Azes on the reverse in Kharoṣṭhī characters. There is one coin described by Sir A. Cunningham, in which Azes on the reverse is associated with Vonones on the obverse. No coin has been discovered on which Vonones appears on the reverse in Kharoṣṭhī characters. All this shows that Vonones was the first supreme sovereign; that Azes was dependent first on him and afterwards on Spalirises; and consequently that Spalirises succeeded Vonones; and that the Mahārāja, or 'Great King,' whose brother Spalirises is represented to be, must have been Vonones. The latter had another brother named Spalahores; but since he is not represented as an independent sovereign on the obverse in Greek characters on any coin, and instead of him, his son's name is associated with Vonones, he must have died during the life-time of the latter, and Spalirises, another brother, assumed Spalahores' position, and Spalgadames was at one time subordinate to him, and also at another time directly to Vonones. Subsequently Spalirises, being Vonones' brother, obtained supreme power after his death. The phrase Mahārājājābrātā or "king's brother," is used pointedly to indicate the right of the person to be Crown Prince and subsequently to be successor. The prevalence of this custom among the imperial Śakas shows that the Mahākṣatrapas and Kṣatrapas of India were intimately connected with them, i.e., derived their authority originally from them and were Śakas.1

FORTUNES OF THE KṢATRAPA FAMILY OF KĀTHIĀWĀD-MĀLWA.

Caṣṭana was at first a Kṣatrapa and then a Mahākṣatrapa, probably because he first acknowledged the supremacy of his Śaka overlord and afterwards assumed independence. Jayadāman, his son, was a Kṣatrapa only; and the reason appears to have been

---

1 Percy Gardner, Coins of Greek and Scythic Kings, pp. 98-102; and Numismatic Chronicle, 1890, p. 138.
the same as that given by me in the "Early History of the Deccan," viz., that Gotamiputra and Pulumāyi invaded Ujjayainī and deprived him of supreme power. Rudradāman, his son, then acquired his lost kingdom and assumed the title of Mahākṣatrapa.1 After Rudradāman the succession is regular up to Bhartṛdāman, i.e., till about Śaka 226, or 304 A.D.. Then up to 270 Śaka, or rather 288, i.e., for about 62 years, we have no Mahākṣatrapa. This must have been due to a prince or princes of some other family having established their sway over Mālwa; and we have an inscription at Sāñchi of Vāsūṣka, Bazdeo, or Vāsudeva who belonged to the Kuśana family to be mentioned hereafter, bearing the date 78.2 If the interpretation of the date of the princes of that family given in the paper referred to above, and explained below, is correct, this corresponds to 278 Śaka. Very likely, therefore, Kanisṭha, the first or most famous prince of the family, whose dates range from 205 to 228 Śaka, subjugated Mālwa about the year 226 Śaka, and he and his successors retained possession of the province till about 288 Śaka. The earliest date of the restored Mahākṣatrapa is 270, but his coins are continuous only for four years. Then there is a gap of 15 years between 273 and 288, which shows that his power was not firmly established in 270, and that he was driven out again in 273. But a short time after, the Kuśanas were humbled by the rising Guptas; and this last circumstance must have been availed of by the Mahākṣatrapas to regain their power, which they did in 288 Śaka. It was, however, not long before the rising power turned its attention to Mālwa also, and the Mahākṣatrapa dynasty retained its regained sovereignty for about 22 or 23 years only, and was finally exterminated by the Guptas in 310 or 311 Śaka, i.e., 388 or 389 A.D.. There must have been some minor revolution before this, when a prince of the name of Īśvaradatta made himself a Mahākṣatrapa and issued coins dated in the first and second years of his reign. He does not appear to have belonged to this dynasty.

1 Second Ed., pp. 28-29.
From an inscription at Junnar and others in the Nasik and Karla caves, we see that the sovereignty of Satraps was established over Mahārāṣṭra also. But we find the name of one Mahākṣatrapa only, viz., Nahapāna, and after him we have no names of Satrapas that may be supposed to have ruled over the country, and find instead that the princes of the Śātavāhana or Śālivāhana race were in possession of Mahārāṣṭra. An inscription in one of the caves at Nasik speaks of Gotamiputra Śatakarni as having beaten the Śakas, the Yavanas and the Pahlavas, and left no remnant of the race of Khakharāta. In the inscriptions, Nahapāna is also named Kṣaharāta, which is but another form of Khakharāta. Gotamiputra, therefore, must be understood to have destroyed the lineal successor of Nahapāna. Again, in the inscription alluded to above, he is also represented to have re-established the power of the Śātavāhana family. Thus, the Śātavāhanas were in possession of Mahārāṣṭra before the Śakas invaded the country. The principal seat of the family was Dhanakataka, but the younger princes ruled over the Deccan and had Paithana for their capital. The earliest prince of this dynasty whose name is found in the inscriptions was Kṛṣṇa. The name of one still earlier—Simuka Śātavāhana—also occurs, but not as a prince reigning at the time. Kṛṣṇa was followed by Śatakarni. Śatakarni’s successors must have been in possession of the country till the latter part of the first century of the Christian era, when the Śakas established their power. These, however, were driven out of the country by Gotamiputra, and we have the names of Pulumāyi, Yajñaśri Śatakarni, Catusparṇa Śatakarni and Madhāriputra Śakasena, as the successors of Gotamiputra, in the inscriptions in the caves and on the coins found at Bassein and Kolhapur, and not that of any Kṣatrapa. So that the Śakas ruled over the Deccan for about one generation only.

The Śātavāhana dynasty is mentioned in the Purāṇas under the name of the Andhrabhṛtyas, and most of the names given above, Simuka, the founder, Kṛṣṇa Śatakarni, Gotamiputra Śatakarni,
Pulumāyi and Yajñāśrī Śātakarnī occur in the genealogy there given. The names of Catusparṇa and Śākasena, however, do not occur. This dynasty is represented in the Purāṇas to have succeeded the Kāṇvāyanas. But they do not appear to have held sway in Northern India. Nahapāna's dates occurring in the inscriptions of his son-in-law, Uṣavadāta, are 40, 41 and 42, and that occurring in the inscription at Junnar of his minister Ayama, is 46. On the supposition that the era is Śaka, these are 118, 119, 120 and 124 A.D. Pulumāyi is represented as ruling at Paithana by Ptolemy, as he has represented Čāstana to be the king of Ujjayānī. They were, therefore, contemporaries. Hence the Śakas or Satraps were driven away from Mahārāṣṭra between 124 and 132 A.D. They, however, as has been shown before, ruled over Surāṣṭra and Māḷwā with some intermissions till 389 A.D. In the earlier years Nahapāna is called a mere Kṣatrapa in the inscriptions; but in the Junnar inscription of his minister he is called a Mahākṣatrapa, which shows that like Čāstana he at first acknowledged the sovereign power of his Śaka lord in the North, and then assumed independence.

The Indo-Parthians or Pahlavas.

In the North, the Kṣatrapas and the Śaka emperors soon lost their power. They were succeeded by the Indo-Parthian or Pahlava kings. Their names, determined from coins, are as follows:—

1. Gondophares.
3. Ortaghnes.
4. Arasakes.
5. Pakores.

An inscription of Gondophares bearing date 103 has been discovered at Takht-i-Bahi, to the north-east of Peshāwar. This is represented as the 26th year of his reign, and if the date refers to
the Śaka era, and is equivalent to 181 A.D., Gondophares began to reign in 155 A.D. His coins are found in Seistan, Khandahar, and even in Western Panjáb. He had probably dispossessed the Śakas of their western provinces about the time his reign began, but they continued to hold those to the east as we know from the date 78, equivalent to 156 A.D. of Moga. The date in Takht-i-Bahi inscription has been referred to the Vikrama era and supposed to correspond to 47 A.D., and Gondophares' accession to the throne placed in 21 A.D.. A story that for the first time became current in the fourth century in Christian countries in the west, represents St. Thomas to have visited Gondophares and suffered martyrdom, and if regarded as true, it confirms the date 21 as that of his accession. But if such a prince was remembered in the fourth century, much more reasonable is it to suppose that he was not removed from it by so many as three hundred years, but only by about 150 at the most, and probably less than that. The coins of these kings have Greek legends on the obverse and Kharoṣṭhī in the Prakrit dialect, as in the case of the Śakas and the Greeks. But they use high titles like the Śakas. On some of Gondophares' coins we have in the Greek legend Basileus Basileon Megalou Gundropheronou, and in the Kharoṣṭhī Maharajasa rajarajasa Devatratasa Gudapharasa, meaning 'of Gudaphara the great king, king of kings, protected by the gods.' On his coins all the high-sounding epithets, one of which only was used by his predecessors, are found, such as Aprati-hata, Dhramika equivalent to Dhārmika, Mahata, and Trādata equivalent to trātuḥ. Some of his coins have not the Kharoṣṭhī legend at all, but only Greek—which probably shows that he added Indian provinces to his dominions after he had reigned for some time. The legends on the coins of his successors are more or less corrupt. This as well as the fact of the use of all the magniloquent epithets noticed above, shows that his dynasty succeeded those I have already noticed. The most important of these Parthian princes was Gondophares, and he held possession of a large extent of country; but he does not seem to have penetrated to the east of the Panjáb. The territories ruled over by his successors were much narrower.
The Advent of the Kuşanas

The Kuşanas.

After the Indo-Parthian or Pahlava dynasty, and perhaps, in the beginning, contemporaneous with it, we have another that gave itself the name of Kuşana. The Princes of this family known to us by name are as follows:

2. Wema-Kadphises.
4. Huviska.
5. Vāsudeva or Vāsuṣka.

Copper coins of a prince whose imperial titles are given thereon, but whose name does not occur, are found in large numbers in the Panjab, Khandahar, and the Kabul valley, and even in Mālwā. There are a few silver coins also. He probably belonged to this family and preceded Wema-Kadphises. The last three princes in the above list are noticed in the Rājatarāṅginī and are represented as belonging to the Turuṣka race—that is to say, they were Turks. And the dress, especially the cap, and the features of the royal figures on their coins appear Turkish. I have already observed that some of the Greek kings reigned contemporaneously with princes of the later dynasties. Some coins of Kujula-Kadphises, on the obverse of which is the name of the Greek prince Hermaeus, have on the reverse the name of Kujala-Kapsa or Kasa without high-sounding titles. This would show that he was subordinate to Hermaeus, and also that some Greek prince continued to reign somewhere, while the Śakas and the Indo-Parthians had supreme power. There are, however, other coins on which the name of Hermaeus does not occur, which indicates that he afterwards acquired independence. But it was his successor Wema-Kadphises who appears to have conquered a large extent of the country and risen to supreme power, as imperial titles appear on his coins, while they do not, on those of Kujula-Kadphises. The same conclusion is pointed to by the fact that his coins are not merely confined to the Kabul valley and the Panjab as those of Kujula, but are found eastward as far as Gorakhpur and Ghazipur, and along the line of railway from

Allahabad to Jabalpore. Some of his coins have the Greek legend: *Basileus Basileon Megas Wema Kadephises*, and the Kharoṣṭhī legend: *Maharajasa rajaḥhirajasa Sarvaloga-isvarasa Mahisvarasa Hima-Kathpisasa trdala*, i.e., 'Hima-Kadphises, the great king, king of kings, the sovereign lord of all people, devotee of Maheśvara and Saviour.' Several much later kings are called *Māheśvaras*, i.e., devotees of Maheśvara or Śiva, or belonging to the sect of Maheśvaras. Wema-Kadphises seems to be so spoken of on his coins; and that he was a worshipper of Śiva is shown also by the emblem of Nandin on the reverse of his coins accompanied by a human figure, which because it holds a trident in its right arm, must represent Śiva. He was the first of all the kings we have noticed, who used gold coinage and was in this respect followed by his successors.

**THE LAST THREE KUŚANAS.**

The three next kings call themselves Kuśanās on their coins. The royal figure on them has a dress similar to that on those of Wema-Kadphises. But these three Kuśanās seem to have struck an independent path for themselves in respect of their coins, which may perhaps point to their constituting an independent family. The legend is only one in Greek letters. On some coins of Kanisṭha it is in the Greek language also and reads, *Basileus Basileon Kanhes-kkoy* i.e., 'Kanisṭha, king of kings.' On the majority of his coins, however, and on those of his successors it is in Greek letters, and perhaps in the Turkish language, and reads *Shaonano Shao Kanheski Kushano, Shaonano Shao Havishki Kushano*, i.e., 'the Shah (king) of Shahs, Kanheski Kuśana, &c.' The emblems on the reverse are figures of deities from the Greek, Persian and Brahmanic pantheon and of Buddha. By the side of these figures their names also are given in Greek characters. Thus we have Salene, Helios, and Heraklio, Miiṛo=Mihira, Mazloho=Mazdaonho; Skando, Mahāśeno, Komaro, Bizago, which last is equivalent to Viśākha, Boddho =Buddho, and Saka Mana Boddho=Sākya Muni Buddha.1 Thus

---

1 Percy Gardner, l. c., pp. 129 ff; Cunningham, Num. Chron. 1892, pp. 69 ff.
these Turkish kings paid an equal respect to the gods of all these four religions. But the figures of Buddha in the sitting or meditative and the standing posture, occur on coins of Kaniska only. This may be regarded as evidence of the truth of what the Northern Buddhists say as to Kaniska being their patron. In his time and under his patronage a council of priests was held to settle the canon again, and it was at this time that Buddhism, which had gradually been veering towards the Mahayana form, had that character definitely impressed upon it.

**Their Dates.**

There are a great many inscriptions dated in the reigns of these three kings. They are chiefly dedications of Buddhistic and Jaina objects of worship for the use of the people, and occur principally at Mathura. As stated before, there is one inscription bearing the date 78 and referring itself to the reign of Vasudeva at Sāñchi. There is not a single Brahmanic inscription. The dates vary from 5 in the reign of Kaniska to 98 in the reign of Vasudeva. Most scholars and antiquarians a few years ago believed Kaniska to be the founder of the Śaka era, but the faith of some has been shaken. On this supposition the dates mentioned above run from 83 A.D. to 176 A.D. But, according to all accounts, the Guptas succeeded the Kuṣanās; like the latter and unlike the previous rulers, they issued a gold coinage which is a close imitation of that of the latter. The forms of letters in the inscriptions of the Kuṣanās appear to belong to a later period. For these reasons I have always believed Kaniska to have flourished later than the first century of the Christian era, and we have recently considered the whole question and come to the conclusion formerly stated that one of the Imperial Śaka kings founded the Śaka era. Kaniska, between whom and the Śaka founder of the Śaka era came the other Śaka princes—the Indo-Parthians and Wema-Kadphises—reigned much later. The practice of omitting hundreds in dates has long existed in that part of India; and in consideration of the fact that an inscription found at Mathurā, which, though the name of the prince is omitted, contains titles used by the Kuṣanās and
bears the date 290 and some units which are not distinct, the conclusion is reasonable that the dates in the inscriptions of these three Kusana princes are abbreviated by the omission of two hundreds. These dates must be referred to the Saka era, and will thus run from 205 Saka to 298 Saka, i.e., 283 A.D., to 376 A.D. And the period here assigned to the Kusana princes agrees with all that is known of them and their relations with other princes. The chronology of the previous dynasties also has been arranged in a manner consistent with it, and there is nothing against it, except numismatic theories, which, however, in consideration of the many types available for the princes of these dynasties, and the play of fancy, such as is presented to our view by the coins of the last three Kusana princes, cannot be rigidly adhered to.

**PREDOMINANCE OF EARLY BUDDHISM AND OF THE PRAKRIT DIALECTS DURING THE PERIOD GONE OVER.**

Thus from about the beginning of the second century before Christ, to about the end of the fourth century after, princes of foreign races were prominent in the history of India, and ruled sometimes over a large portion of the country upto the limits of Maharastra. The names of no Hindu princes appear in inscriptions or on coins during this period, except in Maharastra, where, as we have seen, the Satavahanas drove the foreigners and governed the country, and in the South to which the foreigners did not penetrate. During this period, it is the religion of Buddha alone that has left prominent traces, and was professed by the majority of the people. The vestiges of the time are the Stupas, or hemispherical structures purporting to contain a relic of Buddha or of saints, and the monasteries, and temples containing smaller Stupas or Caityas. These Stupas or Caityas were the objects of worship amongst the Buddhists. And wherever there is a stupendous Stupa, we find sculpture, representing Buddhistic sacred objects, such as the Bodhi or Pippala and other trees, under which Sakyamuni and the previous Buddhas attained perfection, wheels representing metaphorically, the Drhmacakra, or wheel of righteousness, which


2 See D. R. Bhandarkar's paper referred to before.
Spread of Early Buddhism

Buddha turned, and so forth. There are sculptures also representing events in the previous births of Buddha, about which many stories were current, and which we now find in the so-called Jātaka literature. Now, the remains of Vihāras, Caitya, and Stūpas are found in all parts of the country, including Afghanistan. Some of them contain inscriptions also, recording the gifts of public or private individuals. These gifts are the big structures themselves as well as smaller parts thereof, such as railings, pillars, and sculptures, and sometimes land or deposits of money for the maintenance of the priests. Now, from the inscriptions recording these gifts, we find the position of the persons who made them. The remains of two great Stūpas exist in Central India,—at Sāñchi in the Bhopal territory, and Bharaut between Jabalpur and Allahabad, near Sattan, a Railway Station. From the form of characters, existing in the inscriptions found in them, the ages of the Stūpas can be approximately determined. That at Bharaut was begun about the middle of the third century before Christ, and continued to be added to, till about the end of the second century. The Sāñchi Stūpa was probably first constructed about the same time; and it continued to be an object of adoration and additional gifts till about the eighth century of the Christian era. The donors, as recorded in these two places, were often-times the Buddhist monks and nuns themselves, but the names of a great many lay-followers also occur. Thus we have gifts from Grhapatis or householders or land-holders; Setthis or Šeths, who occupied a prominent position in a town or village; simple traders, who are called Vaṇija or Vaṇika; Rājalipikāras or royal scribes; Lekhakas or professional writers; and even Kārmikas, or ordinary workmen. In the cave-temples in Mahāraṣṭra, which began to be excavated about the middle of the first century before Christ, and continued to increase in number, and to have additional decorations till the end of the second century after, and were the objects of adoration and resort up to about the end of the ninth century, we find, among the donors, princes and chiefs, who called themselves Mahābhhojas and Mahārathis, Naigamas or merchants, Suvarnakāras or goldsmiths, Vardhakas or carpenters, Dhānayaṣreṇis or guilds of corn-dealers,
and Grhapatris, or ordinary householders. There are some Sakas and Yavanas also amongst them. The great cave-temple at Karla was originally excavated by Bhūtapāla, a Seth of Vaijayantī; the lion-pillar in the court in front was scooped out by a Mahāraṭhi named Agnimitra. One of the cave-temples at Nasik was the gift of Gotamī, mother of Gotamiputra Śātakarṇi, and grandmother of Pulumāyi. A monastery there was the benefaction of Uṣavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, who deposited sums of money also with the guilds of weavers and another guild at Govardhana near Nasik, out of the interest on which, new garments were to be given to the priests in the rainy season. Such money-benefactions were also made by private individuals, as recorded in the inscriptions at Nasik and Kanheri. The period that we have been speaking of, has left no trace of a building or sculpture devoted to the use of the Brahmanic religion. Of course, Brahmanism existed, and it was probably, during the period, being developed into the form which it assumed in later times. The large but unfortunately mutilated inscription at Nānāghāt, which is to be referred to the second half of the first century before Christ, opens with an invocation to Dharma, Indra, Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva, and seems to speak of the Daksīṇā, or fees given by a royal lady for the performance of several Brahmanic sacrifices. Gifts were made even by princes and chiefs to Brahmins. Uṣavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, was a patron of both Brahmins and Buddhists. Some of the Satraps of Surāśṭra and Mālwā were probably adherents of Brahmanism, as is indicated by their adoption of the name of the god Rudra as a component of their own names. Wema-Kadphises was as we have seen, a worshipper of Śiva. In the South, we have inscriptions of Śivaskandavarman, a ruler of Kāñchi, of Hāritiputra Śātakarṇi, and of a king of Banavāsī which are to be referred to the early part of the third century after Christ, and in which grants of land to Brahmins are recorded. But the religion certainly does not occupy a prominent position, and Buddhism was followed by the large mass of the people from princes down to the humble

1 Epi. Ind. Vol. VI, pp. 84ff, and Vol. I. pp. 2ff; also Ind. Ant., Vol. XXV. p. 28.
workman. Another peculiarity of the period was the use of the Pāli or the current Prakrit language in inscriptions. Even the Brahmanic inscription at Nānāghāṭ and those in the South just noticed, are composed in this dialect. Sanskrit was the language of learned Brahmins and Prakrit of ordinary people of all castes. The use of the latter, therefore, indicates a greater deference for these people than for Brahmanic learning. The inscriptions in Kāthiawād, however, of the reigns of the Satrap kings are in Sanskrit and those of Uṣavadāta are in mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit. But in the middle of the fourth century, the whole scene changes, and we now proceed to the consideration of the events which it presents to our view.

**Change of Scene—The Guptas**

I have already observed that the Guptas succeeded the Kuśānas. The first prince was named Gupta, and his son was Ghaṭotkaca, both of whom are styled Mahārāja. Ghaṭotkaca’s son was Candragupta I, who is styled Mahārājādhirāja, or “King of kings” in the inscriptions. It was during the time of this king that the power of the Guptas must have begun to rise. But his son Samudragupta seems to have been one of the most powerful princes of this dynasty. There is a long inscription describing his exploits, on the same pillar at Allahabad, which contains the inscriptions of Asoka. There he is called Parākramānka which title is also to be found in other inscriptions as well as on his coins. He is represented to have conquered and re-established in their dominions Mahendra, king of Kosala, Vyāghrarāja, king of Mahākāntāra, Maṇṭarāja of Keraḷa and many other kings of Dakṣiṇāpatha; to have rooted out kings reigning in Aryāvarta of the names of Rudraodega, Matila, Nāgadatta, Candrarvarman, Gaṇapatināga, Nāgasena, Acyutanandin, Balavarman and others, and probably established his supremacy over their provinces; to have reduced to submission the chiefs of the forest regions; to have exacted tribute from, and subjected to his power, the kings of Samatāta, Dāvaka, Kāmarūpa, Nepāla, Kartṛpura, and other countries on the borders, and the tribes of Mālavas, Arjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Mādrakas, Ābhiras, Prārjunas, Sanakānikas and Kākakharaparikas; to have
re-established certain royal families which had lost their kingdoms; and to have formed alliances with Daivaputra Śahi Śāhanuśāhi, princes of the Śaka and Murunda tribes, and with the Saimhalakas, who propitiated him with presents. There is an inscription referring itself to his reign found at Eran in the Sāgar district, which bears evidence to the fact that his dominions extended up-to that district.

He was followed by Candragupta II, one of whose inscriptions dated in the year 82, is found at Udayagiri, near Bhilāsā, in Eastern Mālwa. It must here be remarked that the Guptas established an era of their own, as to the initial date of which there were long controversies among antiquarians, though it was given by Alberuni, the Arabic traveller, as corresponding to 242 of the Śaka era. But the question is now settled. Alberuni's statement has been found to be correct and the first year of the Gupta era falls in 318-19 A.D. Candragupta's date 82, therefore, corresponds to 400 A.D. Another inscription of the same king occurs at Mathurā, showing that the Guptas had extended their power to that province which was subject before to the Kuśanas. There is one more at Gaḍhwā, near Allahabad, dated in the year 88, corresponding to 406 A.D., another at Sānchi, dated 93 corresponding to 411 A.D., and a third at Udayagiri, which bears no date. These inscriptions show that the dominions of the Guptas embraced in the time of Candragupta II, the whole of the North-Western Provinces and Mālwa and the Central Provinces. In the Udayagiri inscription which bears no date, that monarch is represented as "wonderful sunlike Brilliance" itself, and Śāba Virasena, who was his minister and a native of Pātaliputra, as having accompanied the king in his career of conquest (literally, "the king whose object was to conquer the whole world") to the place, i.e., Udayagiri, or the region in which it was situated. The conquest of Mālwa by Candragupta thus alluded to in this inscription, took place before 400 A.D., the date of the first Udayagiri inscription. The latest

1 Fleet, Inscriptions of Early Gupta Kings, No. 1.
2 Ibid, No. 2.
3 Ibid, No. 3.
4 Ibid, No. 4.
5 Ibid, Nos. 7, 5, 6.
date of the Ujjayinī Mahākṣatrapas, is as we have seen, 310 Śaka or 388 A.D.. These were exterminated by him in that year or about a year after, a conclusion which follows from the facts that the Kṣatrapas issued new coins nearly every year, and there is no issue later than 310 Śaka.

Candragupta II was followed by Kumāragupta. There are six inscriptions of his reign — two at Gaḍhwā, one at Bilsād in Eṭā district, North-Western Provinces, one at Māṅkuwār, in Allahabad district, one at Mathurā, and one at Mandasor in Western Mālwa. One Gaḍhwā inscription bears the date 98, corresponding to 41 A.D., that at Bilsād, the year 96, corresponding to 414 A.D., that at Mathurā, the year 113, i.e., 421 A.D., that at Mandasor, the year 493 of the Mālwa era, corresponding to 437 A.D., and that at Māṅkuwār, the year 129, i.e., 447 A.D..

The latest known date of Candragupta II is 411 A.D., and the earliest of Kumāragupta 414, wherefore, the latter must have acceded to the throne in the interval between those two years.

Kumāragupta was followed by his son Skandagupta, of whom we have five inscriptions. One of them, that at Junāgadh in Kathia-wād, represents the dyke of the celebrated Sudarśana lake to have burst in 136, and to have been repaired in 137. These years correspond to 454 and 455 A.D.. Another at Kahāuṁ, Gorakhpur district, North-Western Provinces, bears the year 141, corresponding to 459 A.D.; a third, engraved on a copperplate, and found in a stream at Indor in the Bulandshahr District, gives the year 146, i.e., 464 A.D.. There is another at Bihār, and the last or fifth is engraved on a pillar at Bhitārī, Ghazipur district, North-Western Provinces. In this inscription, a new foreign race makes its appearance for the first time—that of the Hūṇas or Huns. Skandagupta is represented to have defeated them and to have subjugated a tribe of the name of Pusyamitras.

After Skandagupta, the power of the dynasty began to decline. There is an inscription at Eran in the Sāgar district, which bears the name of Budhagupta, and the date 165, corresponding to 483 A.D.²

---

6 [R. G. Bhandarkar’s Collected Works, Vol. 1]
This Budhagupta, however, and even Skandagupta are not mentioned in the genealogy of the main branch found engraved on a certain seal discovered at Bhitāri. Very likely, therefore, the family broke up, about the time of Skandagupta, into two or three branches which ruled over different provinces. The Vāyu and Viśṇu Purāṇas, after a confused list of foreign princes and the rulers of certain provinces, state that the Guptas will rule alongside of the Gaṅgā and over Prayāga, Sāketa and Magadha.

THE HŪNAS OR HUNS AND THE AULIKARAS.

In the inscription of the reign of Budhagupta mentioned above, a Brahman Mahārāja of the name of Mātr-Viśṇu and his brother Dhanya-Viśṇu record the erection of a Dhvajastambha or flagstaff to the god Janārdana. In another of the first year of a prince named Toramāṇa, Dhanya-Viśṇu speaks of his brother Mātr-Viśṇu as having died in the interval, and of his erecting a temple to the Boar or Varāha incarnation of Viśṇu. There is another inscription at Gwalior, dated in the 15th year of Mihirakula, who is represented as Toramāṇa's son, and it records the erection of a temple of the sun by Mātrceṭā. Toramāṇa belonged to the Hūṇa race, so that it would appear that a short time after 174, G. E., or 492 A.D., the latest date of Budhagupta occurring on one of his coins, i.e., about 500 A.D., the Hūṇas established their power up to the Central Provinces. But since only two princes of this race are mentioned, it appears that they did not retain it for a long time. An inscription at Mandasor in Western Mālvā represents Yaśodharman to have subjugated Mihirakula. We have an inscription of the same prince, dated 589 of the Mālava era corresponding to 533 A.D. The engraver of both is the same person, and his name was Govinda. From the manner in which the different statements are made in this inscription, it appears that the family of the prince, which was known by the epithet of Aulikara, was brought into importance by Viśṇuvardhana, who was a pre-

2 Fleet, l.c., No. 36.
3 Ibid., No. 37.
4 Ibid, No. 33.
5 Ibid, No. 35.
decessor of Yaśodharman, and it was he who first assumed the title of "Supreme Lord, King of kings." From this date of Yaśo­dharman, therefore, it may be safely concluded that the two Hūna princes could not have reigned for more than forty years on the Cis-Satljaj side of India.

VIGOROUS BRAHMANIC REVIVAL AND RENOVATION—SUPERSESSION OF THE PRAKRITS BY THE SANSKRIT.

Now, in Candragupta's inscription at Mathurā, and Skanda­gupta's Bihār and Bhitāri inscriptions, Samudragupta is repre­sented as having performed the Aśvamedha, which is pointedly spoken of as having gone out of use for a long time. This is the first instance of the Brahmanic revival under this dynasty. This achievement was considered so important that Samudragupta struck golden coins or medals, on the obverse of which is the figure of a horse let loose, and the title Aśvamedhaparākrama, or "one who performed the achievement of a horse-sacrifice" on the re­verse. Similar coins, bearing on the reverse the legend Aśvamedha-Mahendra have been found. Mahendra was a title assumed by Kumāragupta, as is evident from some of his coins on which his proper name as well as the title occur. It appears, therefore that he too performed the horse-sacrifice indicative of supreme sovereignty. Candragupta II, Kumāragupta, and Skandagupta are called Parama-Bhāgavatas on their coins, which shows that they were worshippers of Bhagavat Vāsudeva. One of the two Udayagiri inscriptions dated 82 G.E. =400 A.D., is engraved on a panel over two figures,—one of a four-armed god attended by two female figures, and the other of a twelve-armed goddess. The god may be Viṣṇu and the goddess Cāndī. The other Udayagiri inscription records the dedication of a cave to Śaṁbhū. The Bilsād inscription of Kumāragupta speaks of the building of a Pratoli or gallery in the temple of Svāmi-Mahāśena by Dhrusva­śarman in the year 414 A.D.. The Bihār inscription represents the erection of a yūpa or a sacrificial post, and that on the Bhitāri pillar, records the installation of an image of Śārīgin and the grant

1 JRAS, 1889, p. 65.
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of a village by Skandagupta. In the Junagadh inscription, a temple of Cakrabhṛt (Viṣṇu) is spoken of as having been erected in 456 A.D. by Cakrapālita, son of Parnadatta, Skandagupta's governor of Surāśṭra. The Indore inscription of the time of Skandagupta records the endowment of Devaviṣṇu in 464 A.D., for lighting a lamp in a temple of the sun. The Mandasor inscription speaks of the erection of a temple of the sun by a guild of weavers in 437 A.D., and its repair by the same in 473 A.D. According to Budhagupta's Erān inscription, Mātr-Viṣṇu and his brother Dhanya Viṣṇu erected, as mentioned above, a Dhvajastambha or flagstaff, to the god Janārdana in 483 A.D. Mātr-Viṣṇu is called "a great devotee of Bhagavat," i.e., Viṣṇu. The inscriptions of minor chiefs and private individuals during this period record grants of villages to Brahmans, in the years 474, 481, 492, 495, and 509 A.D., to the temples of Piṣṭapurī (527 A.D. and 532 A.D.), Bhagavat or Viṣṇu (495 A.D.), and Āditya or the sun, (511 A.D.), the erection of a dhvaja of Viṣṇu, grants of villages for the performance of the five great rites, (570 A.D.), the erection of a yūpa, or sacrificial post on the completion of a Puṇḍarīka sacrifice, the establishment of Sattras or feeding places for Brahmans and others.

Here we have ample evidence of a powerful upheaval and the sacrificial rites, and the gods and the goddesses adopted into the Brahmanic Pantheon to which, except in one instance, there was not even an allusion in the epigraphical records of the country for more than five centuries, suddenly present themselves to our view about the end of the fourth century; and appear uninterruptedly for the whole of the subsequent period of about two centuries covered by
the inscriptions published in a collected form by Dr. Fleet. The worship of Śiva, Viṣṇu, the Sun, and Mahāsena seems to have become popular with all classes from princes and chiefs to ordinary individuals.

But a still more significant change is the universal adoption of the Sanskrit language for the documents inscribed on stone and metal instead of the Pali or Prakrit. It indicates the enhancement of Brahmanic influence. The Vernacular dialects had acquired such an importance that not only were they mostly used, as we have seen, in inscriptions, but a number of literary works presupposed by Hāla's Saptaśatī, and others like the Brahat-kathā, attributed to Guṇāḍhyā, were composed in them in the second or third century of the Christian era. Buddhism had, of course, used one of them for all its religious and literary purposes. But now we find that Sanskrit, or the language of learned Brahmans, rose in general estimation, and acquired such an overwhelming importance that the Vernaculars were driven out of the field; it was more generally studied and a new and more brilliant period in the history of Sanskrit literature dawned about this time.

REvIVAL IN THE SOUTH

The influence of this vigorous Brahmanical revival in the North extended itself to the Deccan. Of the early Cālukyas whose dynasty was established about the end of the fifth century, Pulakesi I solemnised the Aśvamedha sacrifice, and several later princes belonging to the family performed the other great sacrifices, and grants of land were made to Brahmans. A cave temple to Viṣṇu was dedicated by Maṅgalīśa in Śaka 500 or 578 A.D., at Bādāmi. And other temples to the same god, and to Śiva or Maheśvara were constructed in several other places. The worship of Śiva in the terrific form of Kāpālikeśvara seems also to have come into existence.

DECLINE OF BUDDHISM—RISE OF MAHĀYĀNISM.

While Brahmanism thus rose in importance and popular favour the influence of Buddhism declined in a corresponding degree. The number of records of Buddhist gifts during this period is smaller.
In the Sānchi inscription of Candragupta (411 A.D.) is recorded a grant by a royal military officer for feeding ten Buddhist mendicants and lighting two lamps in the jewel-house. The Mānkuwar inscription of Kumāragupta (447 A.D.) records the installation of an image of Buddha by a Bhikṣu of the name of Budhamitra. Harisvāminī, wife of Sanasiddha, records in 449 A.D., in an inscription at Sānchi, the grant of twelve Dīnāras as a fixed capital, out of the interest on which a mendicant belonging to the Āryasaṅgha was to be fed daily, and of three Dīnāras for the jewel-house, out of the interest on which three lamps were to be daily lighted before the Blessed Buddha, and of one Dīnāra, for the seats of four Buddhas, out of the interest on which a lamp was to be lighted daily at the seats. An image of Buddha was set up at Mathurā in 453 A.D., another in 548 A.D., and others at Deoriyā in the Allahabad District, Kasiā in the Gorakpur District, and in Buddhagayā. The last was set up by Mahānāman who also constructed a temple (Prāśāda) of Lokaśāstr in 587 A.D.

The language of these inscriptions, unlike that of those of the preceding period, is Sanskrit, and it will be seen that images of Buddha were set up and worshipped, like those of the Brahmanic gods. In both these respects it cannot be denied that Buddhism became subject to the same influences which were in operation in the case of Brahmanism, or rather, appropriated those points in the rival system, which increased its popularity about this time. The principles of faith in personal beings and devotion to them were incorporated into their creed; and Sanskrit was resorted to, to confer dignity on their religious books and teachers. The use of this learned language shows, at the same time, that, like Brahmanism, Buddhism now assumed a more exclusive character, and ceased to appeal to the people at large in their own language; and the sphere of its influence became much narrower. Thus it appears that the revival and renovation of Brahmanism went on side by side with corresponding changes in Buddhism, which impressed on it the form and character known by
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the name of Mahāyāna. The earlier form of Buddhism appealing only to the moral feelings of man, had split up into a number of schools and exhausted itself; and its place was taken up by Brahmanism and Mahāyānism. But the charm of the names Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha, the three jewels, was lost; and Mahāyānism was unable to regain what had been lost by primitive Buddhism. Compared with revived Brahmanism it was feeble; and from the first, it had to face the severe attacks of its renovated rival.

THE JAINAS.

We have two Jaina inscriptions also in this period, recording the installation of images in the years 424 A.D., and 459 A.D., at Udayagiri and Kahāumī respectively. Another inscription of the reign of Kumāragupta dated 113 G.E. or 431 A.D., records the setting up of an image at Mathurā. It would thus appear that that religion had not many adherents or patrons about this time.

CAUSES OF THE PREVIOUS DECLINE OF BRAHMANISM AND OF ITS REVIVAL AND RENOVATION AT THIS PERIOD.

The vigorous Brahmanical revival we have been considering must have been due, in a large measure, to the natural decay of early Buddhism. It was this Buddhism that had previously supplanted Brahmanism in popular favour,—and for the four or five centuries that it enjoyed the ascendancy it had acquired, Brahmanism and the Sanskrit language and literature were neglected. The Brahmins themselves regarded their decline as due to the triumph of Buddhism. Subandhu in one of his puns in the Vāsavadattā tells us that the Buddha doctrine had brought about the destruction of the system based on the words of the Veda. If so, the Brahmanic revival must be regarded as synchronous with the decline of early Buddhism and the rise of Mahāyānism. According to all accounts it was Nāgārjuna, the contemporary of Kaniṣka, that gave a distinct form to this Buddhism, though the movement may have begun a little earlier. As, according to our view, Kaniṣka
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reigned in the last quarter of the third century, the revival of Brahmanism must have already begun before that period.

But the ascendancy of early Buddhism was not the only cause that had kept down Brahmanism. For about a century before Christ and three centuries and a half after, there was no powerful Brahmanic prince; and this is shown by the Gupta inscriptions already noticed, which state that the horse-sacrifice, indicative of supreme sovereignty, had gone out of use for a long time, and also by the fact, that no inscription or coin reports the existence of such a prince during the period. This circumstance must have been the result of the political condition of the country. It was overrun again and again by foreign invaders each of whom established his power for a short time and had to yield to another. The Śakas of Mālwā and Kaṭhiawād only retained their sovereignty for about three hundred years. The argument which has been advanced, that these foreign princes held a comparatively small portion of the country, and could not have influenced its literary and religious condition for the worse, has no weight. The unsettled condition of the country consequent on their frequent invasions rendered the rise of a supreme Brahmanic ruler impossible; and the foreigners themselves could not be expected to favour Brahmanism in a manner to enable it to deprive Buddhism of its ascendancy. Some of them were no doubt Hinduized, but they were not Brahminized. And the Brahmans themselves complained of their being neglected by the Yavanas, Śakas and Pahlavas, as will hereafter be shown in connection with a passage from Manu and the Mahābhārata.

**PATRONS OF THE BRAHMANIC REVIVAL AND RENOVATION—WEMA-KADPHISES.**

Wema-Kadphises, however, seems to have become a more thorough Hindu than any other foreign prince, and in his time, the Brahmanic revival may be understood to have truly begun, i.e., in the middle of the third century of the Christian era. We have seen that his coins bear a figure of Nandin and Śiva on the reverse, and he styles himself a worshipper of Maheśvara or a member of the Maheśvara sect. The Śakas had figures of Greek deities on their
GUPTAS AS PATRONS OF BRAHMANISM

coins, and there are no distinct indications on them, or on those of the Parthians, of any Indian deity. But with Wema-Khadphises what might almost be called a revolution in this respect begins. His Kuṣana successors continue their respect towards Brahmanic deities, but extend it also to those of the Greeks and Zoroastrians as well as to Buddha. Kadphises, however, could not have been a patron of the old Vedic religion, nor of Brahmans in particular as a sacred caste, nor of the Sankrit language and literature. An all-sided revival and renovation could proceed only under the patronage of Hindu princes. And such were the Guptas.

THE GUPTAS — SAMUDRAGUPTA AND CANDRAGUPTA II, OR VIKRAMĀDITYA ŚAKĀRĪ.

The fact that the inscriptions recording gifts to Brahmanic deities, and for the daily sacrifices, begin about the end of the fourth century, shows unmistakably that the Brahmanic revival derived its force and vigour from the patronage of the Gupta princes. Samudragupta and Kumāragupta performed, as we have seen, the horse-sacrifice, which had gone out of use. The former is represented on his Allahabad inscription to have acquired the title of "Prince of poets" by writing works which served as models for learned men, or pleased them. He patronized poets, and thus put an end to the hostility between good poetry and worldly prosperity.

The tradition about a Vikramāditya, who was Śakārī or enemy of the Śakas, and drove them and other foreigners out of the country and patronized learning, is appropriately applicable only to Candragupta II of all the princes who flourished before him and after and whose names have come down to us. For he conquered Mālwa, as we have seen, before 400 A.D.,—and probably in 388 or 389 A.D.—and exterminated the Śakas, i.e., the Satraps of Mālwa, whose latest date is 388 A.D., and drove out the Kuṣanas, since he is the earliest Gupta prince whose inscription is found at Mathurā, a town which belonged to the Kuṣanas. He assumed the title of
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Vikramāditya, which we find on his coins. He made Ujjayini his capital. For, certain chieftains of the name of Guttas (Guptas) of Guttal in the Dharwar district, give themselves in their inscriptions the title of Ujjainipuravarādhīśvara, which, like similar titles, found in other places, signifies that they belonged to a family which once reigned in glory at Ujjayini. They trace their descent through Vikramāditya, specified as king of Ujjayini, and are styled full moons of the ocean of nectar in the shape of the lineage of Candragupta. Ujjayini was thus the capital of the Guptas from whom the Dharwar Guptas derived their descent. The Candragupta and Vikramāditya mentioned in their inscriptions are, it will be observed, one and the same person, and it is but right that he should be mentioned above all; for it was he who drove away the foreigners, and first established himself at Ujjayini. In one place, however, instead of Ujjayini we have Pāṭalī in the title, showing that Pāṭaliputra, the original capital, had not been forgotten by the Southern Guptas. There is no other Vikramāditya whose existence is authenticated by any contemporary document, and who can be construed as the destroyer of Śakas. The supposition of the existence of one in the middle of the sixth century has no ground to stand on.

Now, though Candragupta II was Vikramāditya Śakārī, and the patron of learning, it is by no means necessary to suppose that all the celebrated nine gems flourished at his court. Tradition often jumbles together persons and things belonging to different times and places. Varahamihira, who died in 509 Śaka, or 587 A.D., and the epoch year of whose Pañcasiddhāntikā is 427 Śaka, or 505 A.D., cannot have flourished at the court of Candragupta-Vikramāditya, who died between 411 and 414 A.D. But that Vikramāditya Śakārī was a patron of learning, is stated by the Rājatarangini. He is said to have made a poet of the name of Mātrgupta king of Kāśmir, and Mātrgupta had a poet dependent on him of the name of Menṭha or Bhartṛmenṭha, so that
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these two were contemporaries of Candragupta-Vikramāditya. The date assigned by Cunningham to Matṛgupta is 430 A.D., which is not far removed from that of the Gupta prince as determined from his inscriptions. Mentha has been associated with Vikramāditya by the compilers of anthologies who ascribe a certain verse to their joint authorship.¹

Kalidāsa.

And some of the nine gems, perhaps Kalidāsa himself, may have lived during the reign of Candragupta-Vikramāditya. Mallinātha, in his comment on verse 14 of the Meghadūta, states that there is in that verse an implied allusion to an opponent of Kalidāsa, named Diinnāga. This person is supposed to be the same as the celebrated Buddhist logician of that name, known also to Brahmanic writers; and the supposition is, I think, very probable. He is said to have been a pupil of a Buddhist patriarch of the name of Vasubandhu; and the date of the latter, and consequently that of his pupil and of Kalidāsa, has been determined by Professor Max Müller to be the middle of the sixth century. But the Professor goes, I think, upon the chronological traditions reported by the Chinese, and does not attach due weight to certain facts, which necessitate our placing Vasubandhu earlier. One of Vasubandhu’s works was translated into Chinese in the year 404 A.D. and another about the year 405 A.D.² This shows that Vasubandhu must have flourished before 404 A.D. At the same time, the Chinese authorities make him a contemporary of King Vikramāditya of Śrāvastī,³ or of Sāketa, since the town was situated in that province. If he was a contemporary of that King, the King may have lived in the last quarter of the fourth century. Sāketa, or Ayodhyā, over which he ruled, was a province belonging to the Guptas; and the attitude of the King towards the Bauddhas was hostile, as he convoked assemblies of learned Buddhists and Brahmans, for religious disputations, in which the
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former were defeated and lost the King's support. For these reasons, the Vikramāditya, whose contemporary Vasubandhu was, must, in all likelihood, have been the Brahmanic Gupta prince, Candragupta-Vikramāditya. And if he held his court at Śrāvastī, and is represented to have ruled over Sāketa, the time referred to must be that previous to the conquest of Mālwa, which took place about 389 A.D., and after which the King in all probability resided at Ujjayinī. Vasubandhu therefore lived in the last quarter of the fourth century; and his pupil Diṅnāga, about the end of that century; and if Kālidāsa was his contemporary, he too must have lived about that time, and thus, have been one of the gems at Vikramāditya's court.

**LITERARY REVIVAL AND RENOVATION.**

If then after several centuries of neglect on the part of princes and people, Brahmanism began to rise in influence and importance under Wema-Kadphises, about the middle of the third century after Christ, and made rapid strides in the time of the Gupta Emperors, we might expect the Brahmans to make every effort to widen their influence and render it permanent. And this is what, I think, we do find. With that object, they gave a new and more popular shape to the literature of their creed, and re-arranged it in a manner to meet the wants, and be in harmony with the changed feelings, of an increased number of followers, and strengthen their hold over them. They made a great endeavour to place it on a philosophical basis, and to show that the creed of their opponents had no such basis. This, therefore, was the age when metrical Smṛtis, Purāṇas, and Bhāṣyas or commentaries containing explanatory, apologetic, and controversial matter, began to be written; and the general literary impulse was communicated to other branches of learning including poetry. We shall now proceed to the elucidation of this point.

**WORKS ON RELIGIOUS LAW.**

In the olden times, the works on religious law existed in the form of Sūtras or prose aphorisms, and they were identified with parti-
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cular schools or Śākhās of Brahmans. We have thus the Dharma-
and the Grhya-Sūtras of Āpastamba, of Baudhāyana, Kāthā,
Āśvalāyana, &c. But afterwards books written in Anuṣṭubh-
slokas came to be used. They prescribed the same rules as those
given in the (Dharma—) and Grhya Sūtras, and in some cases, a
close resemblance has been found to exist between the words and
expressions used in the Sūtras and the metrical Law-books or
Smṛtis. Thus the Sūtras on the Vināyakaśānti in the Kātha-
Sūtra are reproduced almost word for word in the corresponding
portion of the Yājñavalkya Smṛti. But in the new books the
exposition is plainer than in the Sūtras, which were primarily meant
to be supplemented by oral explanation. Here, therefore, is an
attempt to disentangle the Brahmanic religious law from the nar­row schools to which it was before attached; and put it in a form
intelligible and applicable to all Brahmanic Hindus. Hence is the
choice of the Anuṣṭubh slokas instead of the old Sūtras, as it
was used ordinarily for all literary purposes. But in the revised
Hindu Law, certain customs such as the killing of cows even for
sacrificial purposes, and levirate—the feeling against which had
grown strong—were prohibited; while a compromise was effected
in the case of others, which had not become unpopular to that
extent. The old precept, for instance, about eating the flesh of five
species of animals, was hedged round by a number of restrictions;
but in order to satisfy the claims of the old Vedic religion, the
slaughter of some of them was freely allowed in religious rites.
These metrical Smṛtis, therefore, it would not be wrong to refer to
about the Kuśana-Gupta period.

There is a passage in the Smṛti of Manu, in which it is
stated that certain native Indian tribes, such as the Pundrakas
and Dravidas, and the Yavanas, Śakas and Pahlavas,
were originally Kṣatriyas, but they became Śūdras by their
setting the Brahmans at defiance and gradually ceasing to
perform the religious rites. In a chapter in the Anuṣṭubh-
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sanika Book of the Mahābhārata, Bṛhma says to Yudhiṣṭhīra:

"The highest duty of a crowned king is to worship learned Brahmans; they should be protected as one protects oneself or one's children; and be respected, bowed to, and revered as if they were one's parents. If Brahmans are contented, the whole country prospers; if they are discontented and angry, everything goes to destruction. They can make a god not a god, and a not-god, a god. One whom they praise prospers; one whom they reproach, becomes miserable. The different Kṣatriya tribes, Śakas, Yavanas, and Kāmbojas became Śūdras through not seeing or following Brahmans."

In these passages, a Kṣatriya origin is supposed in order that the Śūdrahood of these tribes, which was consequent on their being beyond the Aryan pale, and which, as stated before, is plainly asserted by Patañjali in the case of two of them, may appear as the result of their not paying deference to Brahmans. This shows that the neglect of the sacerdotal caste by the Yavanas, Śakas, Pahlavas and other tribes, was uppermost in the minds of those who invented a Kṣatriya origin for them; and the passages and, especially the chapter in the Mahābhārata, look as if they were written when the foreign domination had come to a close, and the Brahmans had fully triumphed, and were anxious to preserve their newly gained influence. The chapter, therefore, must have been interpolated into the epic in the Gupta period, and the Smṛti of Manu—based on a previous Sūtra work and traditional or floating texts—composed at about the same time. The Mahābhārata, however, already existed in its full form at the period; for it is mentioned by name in copperplate inscriptions of the years 174 G.E. (492-3 A.D.) and 177 G.E. (495-6 A.D.) and two more, and as a Śatasāhasrī, or a work of a hundred thousand verses, in one of the year 214 G.E. (532-3 A.D.). But it can hardly admit of a reasonable doubt that it was retouched about this period.

Works on the Sacrificial Ritual.

The works on the sacrificial ritual, and specially the Bhāsyas or great commentaries on the Sūtras of the several Vedas or Śākhās,
COMMENTARIES ON RITUAL WORKS

must have begun to be written about this time. Since the sacrificial religion was being revived, the necessity of a definite and authoritative ritual was felt; and as the sacrifices had been out of use for a long time, a knowledge of the ritual was rare and vague. The names of the writers of the Bhasyas and other works on the ritual, end in the honorific title Svāmin, such as a Devasvāmin, the commentator on the Sūtra of Āśvalāyana; Bhavasvāmin, on that of Baudhāyana; Dhūrtasvāmin, on that of Āpastamba; Agnisvāmin, on that of Lātyāyana, &c. This title we find used in Central India in the last quarter of the fifth century, and the first of the sixth. In the copperplate charters dated 474-5 A.D., 481-2 A.D., and 509-10 A.D., and issued by the Parivrājaka Maharājas, occur such names as Gopasvāmin,1 Bhavasvāmin,2 Devasvāmin the son of Agnisvāmin, Govindasvāmin,3 &c., among the grantees. In the Deccan, we find the title affixed to the names of some of the grantees in the copperplates, issued by the princes of the early Cālukya dynasty, in the second half of the seventh century and the early part of the eighth; and we have such names as Keśavasvāmin, Karkasvāmin, and Devasvāmin, which are the names of writers of commentaries on the sacrificial Sūtras, and other works on the ritual. The title Svāmin is indicative of the period between the fourth and the tenth centuries; for we do not find it used later.

PURAṆĀS.
The idea of recasting the Purāṇas into their present form must have originated about this time. They existed long before, since they are alluded to in the Upaniṣads and Śrautasūtras, but their contents must have been strictly in accordance with the rule given by Amarasiṁha in his lexicon;—they embraced an account of the creation and dissolution of the world, of the different families of Rṣis and princes, and of the deeds of the most heroic among them, and of the Manvantaras, or different ages of the world. But now the necessity of glorifying the different gods and goddesses, whose worship was rising in favour, and of firmly inculcating other religious duties, had been felt; and new
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Purāṇas were composed, having the frame-work of the old but with new matter introduced on every occasion. Thus, if we compare the chapters on Creation in the Vāyu, the Liṅga, and the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas, we shall find not only a similarity of contents but of language also. The Viṣṇu contains an abridged account of the matter; but often-times, the words are the same. Most of the existing Purāṇas,—perhaps all,—were written to promote the worship of particular deities, Viṣṇu, Śiva, and Durgā in their several forms, or to strengthen the authority of the religious practices that had begun to prevail. The Vāyu appears to be one of the oldest of these works, as it is quoted in Śaṅkara-cārya’s Bhāṣya. It mentions the Guptas, as I have already observed, as ruling alongside of the Gaṅgā, over Prayāga, Sāketa and Magadha. If this verse has undergone no corruption and was advisedly put in, the Purāṇa, in which we find it, must have been written before Candragupta-Vikramāditya conquered Mālwa and Mathurā and drove out the foreigners, that is, before the last quarter of the fourth century. The Viṣṇu has the text in a corrupt form. As the Purāṇa editors did not care very much for the matter, which did not immediately concern their purpose, they were not careful to give the original before them correctly, and even misunderstood it. The Viṣṇu is evidently later than the Vāyu. The Purāṇas began to be recast, when the worship of Hindu deities rose in popular estimation—about the time of Wema-Kadphis, circa 250 A.D., and the process continued through the Gupta period to a much later date, and new Purāṇas appeared from time to time; and it has hardly ceased even to this day, since we find Māhātmyas springing up now and then, though not Purāṇas in a complete shape.

FLOATING LITERATURE.

In considering the question of the recasting of the works on the religious creed of the Brahmans, and those on mythology, it should be borne in mind, that the art of writing was introduced into India at a comparatively late period, and even afterwards was resorted to, very rarely. Hence, literary works and detached verses, con-
taining religious and moral precepts and beautiful poetic sentiments, were, in the olden times, composed and transmitted orally. In the case of the latter, the name of the author was forgotten; and there was thus a floating mass of anonymous verses in the mouths of the learned. When, therefore, systematic writing had to be resorted to, to give fixity and permanence to the creed, and when writing came to be generally used even for purposes of profane literature, these floating verses were appropriated or used by several writers. Hence it is, that we often find the same verses in such works as the Smṛti of Manu, the Mahābhārata, and even in Pāli Buddhistic works, and sometimes, though very rarely, in dramatic plays and poems also. This source, therefore, was also drawn upon by the writers of Smṛtis and Purāṇas in the Gupta period, in addition to those already indicated.

ASTRONOMY.

Like the Dharma and legendary lore, the astronomy of the Hindus was also recast on the same principle as that which guided the re-edition of those two branches, namely to put it in a form suited to the condition of the new times. Hence, the old astronomical elements were combined with such ones of a Greek origin, as had found acceptance among the Hindus, and some new elements, discovered or thought out by the writers themselves being added, the works known as the original five Siddhāntas arose. As in the case of the new works on the first two subjects, the name of a profane author was not connected with these works; but it was expressly stated or left to be understood that they were composed by old Munis or gods. Dr. Thibaut thinks that two of them—the Romaka and the Pauliśa—must have been composed not later than 400 A.D.. Probably all the Siddhāntas were written about the middle of the fourth century or even earlier, especially as they were held in reverence by Varāhamihira who wrote about them in the middle of the sixth century. A direct borrowing from any particular Greek work is not contended for by any body. As in

1 Thibaut, Introduction to his Edition of the Pañcasiddhāntikā, pp. xlixff.
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the case of the art of coinage, the knowledge of some elements of Greek astronomy, must have reached the Hindus through the Bactrians, the Sakas, and the other foreign races with whom they came in contact; and this was made use of, in their works, when the Brahmans gained or regained influence in the fourth century. All the celebrated Indian astronomers flourished after this period. Aryabhatṭa was born in 476 A.D., and Varāhamihira died, as already stated, in 587 A.D..

Mīmāṁsā.

Subandhu in his Vāsavadattā tells us that the doctrine of Tathāgata or Buddha was destroyed or attacked by those who followed the system of Jaimini. Subandhu in his Vāsavadattā tells us that the doctrine of Tathāgata or Buddha was destroyed or attacked by those who followed the system of Jaimini.1 The earliest of these followers whose works are extant, is Śabaravāmin, the author of the Mīmāṁsā-bhāṣya. Śabaravāmin establishes the existence of the soul as an independent entity, and not identical with the feelings, which are phenomenal only, against the Buddhaśas generally, and the reality of the external world against the followers of the Yogācāra School, and refutes the nihilism taught by the Mādhyamika School.2 The Yogācāra School was founded by Āryāsaṅga, or Asaṅga, who was the elder brother of Vasubandhu, the preceptor of Diṅnāgacārya. Āryāsaṅga was thus a contemporary of Vasubandhu,3 and lived in the last quarter of the fourth century. Śabaravāmin, therefore, probably composed his Bhāṣya on Jaimini, in the fifth century, and we have seen that the honorific title, Svāmin which he bore, was in use in that century. Kumarila was the writer of a Vārtika on the Bhāṣya, and he was a strong combatant. He flourished about the end of the seventh century. There was another school of the Mīmāṁsā, thoroughly atheistic, founded by Prabhākara. But it appears to have been soon neglected. All these writers laboured also to establish the authoritative-

1 In the pun contained in the expression केचित्तेनिमित्ततुसारिण इव
तथामतत्त्वांतिनः: 1

that Śābara refutes in the last two cases the doctrines of the Yogācāra and
Mādhyamika Schools.

ness of the Vedas and their eternity, against the objections urged by the Buddhists and Jainas.

**Logic, Dialectics, and Sāṃkhya.**

Buddhists and Brahmans carried on controversies in the field of logic also. The well-known passage in the beginning of Vācaspati's work, entitled Vārtikatātparyaṭīkā, gives us valuable information about the matter. "The revered Aksapāda, having composed the Śāstra, calculated to lead to eternal bliss, and an exposition of it having been given by Pakṣilasvāmin, what is it that remains and requires that a Vārtika should be composed? Though the author of the Bhāṣya has given an exposition of the Śāstra, still modern (scholars) Dīnāga and others, having enveloped it in the darkness of fallacious arguments, that exposition is not sufficient for determining the truth; hence the author of the Uddyota dispels the darkness by his work—the Uddyota, *i.e.*, light (torch)."¹ Vācaspati here calls Dīnāga modern, in comparison with Pakṣilasvāmin or Vatsyāyana, the author of the Bhāṣya. If he had correct information, Vatsyāyana must be supposed to have lived about two or more centuries before Dīnāga. But it can hardly be expected that he should have a correct, historical knowledge of the matter. It is, therefore, not unlikely, especially in view of the fact that the title Svāmin is given to the author, that he flourished about half a century before Dīnāga, *i.e.*, about the middle of the fourth century. Bhāradvāja or the author of the Uddyota, is, as is well known, mentioned by Subandhu, who again is praised by Bāṣa in the middle of the seventh century. He may therefore have flourished in the middle of the sixth century, or even earlier.—In later times, the Buddhist doctrines in logic and metaphysics were criticised by the Vedāntins Śaṅkarācārya and his pupil Sureśvara.

The Sāṃkhya philosophy also was revived by Īśvarakṛṣṇa, who wrote the Sāṃkhya-Kārikās. The oldest commentary on the work is that by Gauḍapādācārya. The Kārikās and the commentary were translated into Chinese between the years 557 A.D.,

¹ Vizianagaram Series, p. 1.
and 569 A.D.. The Kārikās are in the Āryā metre; and this metre is used by Āryabhāṭṭa and others, and appears to have been a favourite one with the writers of the period. An author quoted by Dr. Hall says that Kālidāsa composed the Kārikās in the name of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, or using the name Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Whether this is true or not, all that we know about Īśvarakṛṣṇa, is not inconsistent with the supposition that he flourished in the beginning of the fifth century.

**ORNATE POETRY.**

Sanskrit poetry was cultivated and appreciated more generally in this period, than it could have been in the preceding ages, when the language itself was not generally studied, and the Prakrits were in favour. I have already spoken about Kālidāsa and Bhattarmantha. Though the dates of all the poets, from whose works we have excerpts in our anthologies are not known, my general feeling is that none of the writers of ornate poetry quoted therein is older than the fourth or the end of the third century. Aśvaghosa, the author of the Buddhacarita, which has often been compared to Kālidāsa's Rāghuvaṃśa, was a contemporary of Kaniska, as is admitted by all, and lived, according to our interpretation of the Kuṣana dates, at the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth century.

Professor Max Müller started several years ago the theory of the "Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature." It was powerfully contested by several able scholars, and now it seems almost to have been given up. But there is no question that the inscriptions place clearly before us the facts of the decline of Brahmanism, the ascendency of early Buddhism, and the neglect of the Sanskrit language and of the cultivation of the Prakrits, from about the first century before Christ to about the middle of the fourth, and a powerful Brahmanic revival about the end of the century. This phenomenon may be called "The Revival and Renovation of Brahmanism and of the Sanskrit Language and Literature." Professor Max Müller placed the Śakārī Vikramāditya in the middle of the sixth century, and

---

1 Hall, Sāṁkhyaśāra, Preface, p. 29. I understand the passage इंद्रक्रष्णानाम्मा कालिदास्यन् कुत्या कारिकाः as in the text.
assigned that period to the nine gems, and consequently later dates to the whole of the modern Sanskrit literature. I have identified him with Candragupta-Vikramāditya of the Gupta dynasty, who reigned about the end of the fourth century, and have referred Kālidāsa to that period. Under this supposition, most of the arguments, used by the late Professor Bühler lose their weight; and the only Sanskrit inscription left for him to go upon, is that of Rudradāman at Girnar of the year 150 A.D.. But, according to my way of understanding the matter, ornate poetry was not undeveloped or unknown in the centuries of Brahmanic depression; but the language chiefly used for its cultivation, was one or other of the Prakrits or Vernaculars, and Sanskrit was resorted to rarely. I attach full weight to the argument based upon the specimens of Sanskrit poetry occurring in the Mahābhāṣya. But I maintain that, like Brahmanism itself, it had not many votaries, and was not extensively cultivated. With the restoration of Brahmanic influence in the Gupta period, Sanskrit poetry received a fresh start along with the other branches of literature we have passed under review; and just as there were earlier works in those branches, so were there earlier poetic works. The decline in the previous period was due, not to any positive hostility of the foreign rulers, but to the popularity of early Buddhism and of the Prakrit languages; and the only way in which the foreigners exercised a baneful influence was, as has been already indicated, by not patronizing the Brahmanic learning in the manner, in which a Brahmanic universal sovereign would have done, and by rendering, by their frequent incursions and their power, the rise of such a one impossible.
The Sāmkhya Philosophy.


This essay was originally published by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar himself about the year 1870; it was subsequently reprinted in the (now defunct) Indian Philosophical Review, Vol. II, edited by Professors A. G. Widgery and R. D. Ranade, and published by the Oxford University Press, Bombay.—N. B. U.

Of the six systems of philosophy regarded as orthodox that of the Sāmkhyas is one. The Sāmkhya doctrines claim a very high antiquity. Perhaps the earliest philosophical speculations of the Indian Aryans ran in this direction, and in that of a kindred system known in later times as the Vedānta. Some of the terms characteristic of the Sāmkhya School are to be met with in the Upaniṣads;¹ and though Śaṁkarācārya in his Vedānta Bhāṣya has brought forward very elaborate arguments ² to prove that the terms have no reference to that system but to his own, an unsectarian reader can have very little difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the Sāmkhya doctrines are set forth in those places. There is scarcely a Purāṇa ³ that does not give an account of the creation of the universe in accordance with this system, though in a greatly modified form, and in a manner which indicates that the original significance of the Sāmkhya doctrines, as I conceive it, was not clearly

². Vedānta Sūtra Bhāṣya, chap. I, pāda 4, adhikaraṇa. I-II.
³. See Bhāgavata, sk. III. chap. V; Mātsya, Poona edn. Chap. III.; Agni; Bib. Ind. chap. 17, page 41; Mārkaṇḍeya, Bib. Ind. chap. 45, page 258.
understood. In the Bhagavadgītā allusions are now and then made to the philosophy of this school, and several chapters are devoted to it in the Śānti-parva of the Mahābhārata. So that, it appears that the system along with or supplemented by the Vedānta, with which however it is often confounded, has worked itself into the ordinary belief of the Hindus. But in spite of this, the Sāmkhya philosophy has long been driven away from the curriculum of Sanskrit students on this side of India, and I have not heard of any Śāstri in the Maratha or Gujrath country having devoted himself to it, and nearly all know but little about it. But in the North and in the Gauda country a better treatment is accorded to it. It is more generally studied, and a chair for it exists in the Benares Sanskrit College.

But from the mere fact that the doctrines of the Sāmkhyas are to be met with in very ancient works, it does not necessarily follow that these speculations were systematized at the time when those works were written. No fact is plainer in the history of Sanskrit literature than this—that the body of notions embodied under each Śāstra, was not conceived at once by the chief writer on the subject, but that before they were put into that shape, they had gone through a process of growth and development. But the Sāmkhya philosophy seems to have been very early reduced to a system. The name Sāmkhya, about the etymology of which there is much dispute, could not have been invented before the floating mass of the Sāmkhya doctrines obtained fixity and stability. And this name

1. Chap. III, 3; 27; 42.
2. Chap. 308, 9; 312, 17.
3. Mahābhārata—सांख्यद्विनेत्राते परिशेष्यात्म्यम् । एवं हि परिशेष्याय सांख्यम् केवलात गता ॥ तत्वांि न च चतुर्विवेर्षत् परिशेष्याय etc. Matsya—सांख्यं संम्यात्मकत्वाच कपिलादिभिभवते ॥ In these सांख्यम् is derived from संख्या 'number', and the Śāstra is so called on account of its enumeration of the 25 principles. This etymology appears to be correct. The scholiasts explain the term by संप्रख्यवेम शान्तम् true knowledge. See Śāmkara and Śrīdhara on Gitā II, 39; III, 3.
occurs in one at least of the earlier Upaniṣads, and in the Bhāgavagītā and other parts of the Mahābhārata. The person, to whom an almost unanimous tradition ascribes the authorship of the system, is Kapila. In the Bhāgavata, he is represented as an avatāra of Viṣṇu; and his name occurs in the Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, where the creator of the Universe is spoken of as having nourished Kapila the Ṛṣi with knowledge and seen him born." Śāṁkarācārya, whose great object is to show that the philosophy of the Śāṁkhyaśas has no basis in the hallowed Śruti, considers the Kapila here alluded to, to be that Ṛṣi who burnt the sons of Sagara to ashes by a curse and not the author of the system he is combating. But the Bhāgavata represents the enemy of Sagara’s sons to be the founder of the school of the Śāṁkhyaśas, and there can be little occasion for the mention of such a person as the former, if he is to be considered as a different individual from the latter, in such a work as the Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, devoted as it is, to the investigation of the soul of the Universe.

But which of the existing works on the system is to be ascribed to Kapila, or whether any work written by him has come down to us at all, is a question which it is not very easy to answer. A collection of Śūtras entitled Śāṁkhyā Pravacana is ascribed to him; but the very name of this work is unknown on this side of India. Mādhava in his Sarvadarśana Saṁgraha does not mention it, though in setting forth the doctrines of each school, he in most cases first gives the title of the work of the founder, and in several cases, an analysis of its contents. The only Śāṁkhyā Pravacana known to him is the leading treatise of the Yoga School, of which he gives a short abstract; while his observa-
tions on the Sāmkhya philosophy are based on Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s Kārikās. The Sāmkhya Pravacana, too, attributed to Kapila bears altogether a modern air about it. Next in importance to the leading treatise on a particular Śāstra is the bhāṣya on it. Such bhāṣyas in the case of the other Śāstras were written by persons, who, in consequence of their work, enjoy great reputation, and are to be referred to a pretty high antiquity. All subsequent writers never style their elucidatory works bhāṣyas, but give them the name of vṛtti or vārtika. Such for instance is the case with the Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Nyāya, and Vyākaraṇa bhāṣyas, the authors of which, Śabara, Śaṅkara, Vātsyāyana, and Patañjali are widely known and justly held in reverence, and flourished, all of them before the tenth century of the Christian Era. While the only bhāṣya on the Sāmkhya Pravacana, is that by Vijñāna Bhikṣu, who, Dr. Hall thinks, flourished in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and not earlier than Mādhava, since he does not appear to have known him. It is hard to believe, on the supposition of the high antiquity of the Sāmkhya Pravacana, that it could have remained without a bhāṣya for so many centuries, considering the importance of the Śāstra itself. For these and other reasons, I think that the Sāmkhya Pravacana is not a work of high antiquity, and could not have been written by Kapila. But there are several works of authority on the subject, and among these, that of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, the Kārikās, enjoys great reputation. Dr. Hall greatly praises Vijñāna Bhikṣu; but to me he appears to be a very unsafe guide since his great object seems to be to bring the Vedānta and the Sāmkhya as close as possible.

It is time now that I should enter into the philosophy of Kapila. The world is full of misery. Man’s sufferings in it are of three kinds; those originating with his body and his mind (Ādhyātmika). He is liable to disease, such as fever, dysentery or cholera, and to mental anguish caused by such an occurrence as the death of a

1 The Vṛtti on the Vedānta Śūtra alluded to by Śaṅkara, of course, existed before Śaṅkara.
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child, wife or friend. 2 Then again the creatures around him are often the source of great trouble to him. Mosquitoes, bugs, snakes, crocodiles, sharks, vultures, tigers, wolves, and even his fellow men render his existence intolerable to him (Ādhibhautika). 3 And even the gods will not let him alone. They will send down lightning on his head, or blow away his house by a hurricane (Ādhidaivika). Nothing that we see, will free us from these evils. Even after death we have another existence in which our fate pursues us, and we are again subjected to these very ills. The Śruti tells us to perform sacrifices or practise some other virtues, and for these deeds, promises us a place in Heaven where we shall be happy. But even here, the happiness allowed us, is just in proportion to our deserts, and after a time, must come to an end. It is not pure, complete, absolute. How then to secure this absolute bliss or this absolute cessation from pain? This is the problem Kapila has undertaken to solve. "Reflect," says he, "what your miseries arise from. If they arise from the nature of your soul, there is no help for you. But they do not arise from the nature of your soul; their cause is totally different; separate yourself from that cause, and you will be happy."

Then the nature of the soul and of the world, which is the source of affliction, are set forth in the shape of twenty-five tattvas or principles, a knowledge of which is necessary for the attainment of eternal beatitude. The first is prakṛti or pradhāna, the original principle or cause of all, which consists in the equipoise of the three qualities viz., sattva, light, brightness or goodness; rajas, passion or feeling, and tamas darkness, pain, ignorance. The first is the source of happiness and its function is to render anything manifest and clear; from the second, action originates, and from the third, pain, stolidity or stupour.

From this pradhāna, is produced by a process of development, the principle of mahat or buddhi which is translated intelligence, but which I consider to be equivalent to finite or conditioned intelligence. This buddhi assumes four forms when the quality of goodness prevails in it over the other two; viz., dharma or virtue, jñāna or knowledge, vairāgya or freedom from earthly
affection, and aśvarya or magical power, such as is ascribed to a yogin. When the quality of darkness prevails, this same buddhi appears in the form of adharma or vice, ajñāna or ignorance, avairāgya or earthly affection, and anāśvarya or absence of extraordinary power.

This mahat-tattva or buddhi gives birth to ahamkāra, consciousness of individuality or egoism; which in its turn, where sattva or light is predominant, produces the five senses and the five organs of action. The five senses are seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling; and the five organs of action are the speech, hand, foot, and the organs of excretion and regeneration. Manas which sets in motion both these groups, is an organ of sense as well as action. It is to be translated by the words will and attention. When in the principle of consciousness, the quality of tamas or darkness prevails, it produces the five subtle elements, the rudiments of the objects of the five senses.

And from these subtle elements are produced in a developed or grosser form, ākāśa or sky, tejas or light, prthivi or earth, vāyu or wind, and āpas or water, which are the object of the senses of hearing, seeing, smelling, touch and taste, respectively.

We thus get twenty-four principles, and the last is puruṣa or soul which is pure, eternal, and absolute. Puruṣa is incapable of action, but has light and life, while pradhāna or prakṛti whose products we have noticed, is acetana, i.e., has no life or light, but possesses the power of action. Puruṣa is like a paṅgu or man without legs who has got eyes, and prakṛti has got legs but no eyes (andha). Hence left to themselves, the andha and paṅgu would not be able to move, but if they agree that the paṅgu with no legs should sit on the shoulders of the andha, then they both can go over any distance they choose. In the same manner, if puruṣa and prakṛti were disjoined, the world would not exist, and it is their union that sets prakṛti in motion, and all things up to the five gross elements are produced. It is in consequence of this union that puruṣa appears to be active, though not so in reality, and prakṛti has the appearance of something living or cetana,
In every sensation or present act of sense, buddhi or intelligence ahamkāra or consciousness, manas or will and attention, together with the particular organ of sense, are concerned, while in a past or future act of sense, i.e., in recalling a past or conceiving a possible sensation, the first three only are employed. These three, therefore, are internal faculties of cognition, and the organs of sense and action are called external faculties. These thirteen faculties together with the five subtle elements form what is called the śūkṣma śarīra or subtle body. At death, the gross elements of the human body only are destroyed, while this subtle body assumes several gross bodies and appears in the world again. If this subtle body is instincit with virtue, it goes up, if with vice, it goes below; if with jñāna or real knowledge i.e., (of course) of the twenty-five principles, it is cast off, and the soul attains Mokṣa or its original absoluteness.

This, in brief, is the system of the Sāmkhya. To one who really attempts to understand it and to reduce it to a modern shape, not a few difficulties present themselves. What is the nature of this prakṛti or pradhāna which, united with the puruṣa, is said to be the origin of all things, and in what sense can it be said to produce intelligence, and through it, ahamkāra or consciousness, and through this again, the subtle elements and thence the world? The books themselves on the Śāstra, do not explain this satisfactorily, and Vijnana Bhikṣu says that the order of production of these principles rests on the authority of the Śāstra alone, and is a thing that cannot be proved. But a Śāstra which requires things to be taken on trust, is no Śāstra. The Purāṇas too afford us no

1. अन्त्र अक्षोभशिष्ठकार इत्याविष्ट्रितेऽशाष्ट्रेऽप्रमाणम् | अनुमानेन सामान्यतः कारणां संकारणकलशांतिः | न हुँ दृष्टि भूतार्द्धेऽशाष्ट्रे वास्तवर्ण- दिक्षितं वैत्यक्तराविश्वाश्वास्त्रान्तिमां संभवति | Sāmkhya Śāstra. "The only evidence for the production of Mahat from Prakṛti and of Ahamkāra from Mahat is the Śāstra itself; from inference, one can arrive only at the general conclusion that an effect has a cause; but as to production, there can be no inference calculated to show whether the gross elements are first produced and thence the internal organs, or these latter first and from them, the elements."
help. The Matsya\textsuperscript{1} tells us that from mahat-tattva is produced the Puranic Trinity. With an excess of sattva, mahat is Viśnu, of rajas it is Brahmā, and of tamas, it is Rudra. And as a general rule, the Śāṃkhyā principles are represented by them as having been first produced or set in motion by the creator, at the time of the creation, and are personified and put into the ranks of gods.\textsuperscript{2} Colebrooke thinks prakṛti to be "eternal matter, indiscr..." If so, it is like the eternal paramāṇus or atoms of the Vaiśeṣikas, and in this case, the Śāṃkhyas, ought to be consistent and represent, like the Vaiśeṣikas, the production of such things as dvyaṇuka, trasareṇu (small pieces of matter), and ghaṭa (pot) from it and not that of buddhi, jñāna, dharma, dayā, ahaṃkāra and such other purely mental states. We must also bear in mind, that the union of this prakṛti with the soul is considered necessary for the production of the result though the soul is regarded as incapable of action. What is the necessity of this union, if prakṛti were matter in the ordinary sense? Professor Wilson also considers prakṛti as the material cause of things.

To me, however, the system of Kapila appears to disclose an idealistic view of nature. The position of Idealism is this. I know directly what passes in my consciousness. I am conscious of certain sensations of which I believe myself not to be the cause. To account for them, I suppose the existence of an external nature. But this is simply an inference necessitated by the constitution of my mind, \textit{i.e.}, the external world for me exists in consequence of a law of my intellect. Beyond my consciousness and my intellect, there is no warranty for the existence of the external world. Whence arises the necessity of the supposition of its existence? In consciousness, there

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Bhagavata, Sk. III. Chap. V. and Mahābhārata, Santip., passim.
\end{itemize}
are feelings and representations i.e., I feel myself tied down to a particular state, my freedom is restrained, my free activity is limited. Who has limited me? Certainly not the external world, for it is my own creation. It is to account for that limitation of my free activity that I posit it. The limitation is prior, the supposition of the external world is subsequent. I feel my activity impaired, and so much, as I feel is taken away from me, I attribute to something else. I simply objectivise my subjective feeling. We must then look for this limitation of the me in the state of the intellect, previous to consciousness; for when the me awoke, it awoke with its limitations, with the not me. These limitations, therefore, point to the nature of the intellect, just as the little red, green, and blue clouds visible to the eye when it is dazzled, indicate the structure of the organ itself, and do not exist in themselves.

This is the Idealism of Fichte, the German philosopher. Let us compare Kapila's system with it. We must here distinguish between four things. In the state of consciousness when the me feels itself limited, the intellect first of all posits or affirms the me, and then opposes to itself the not me. The not me is apprehended as limiting the me, putting it into a definite state. The limitation of the me implies its previous freedom or unlimiteness. Had it not been absolutely free or unlimited, it would not have felt itself limited. If finiteness were its nature these limitations would not awaken it, i.e., consciousness would be impossible. The four things then are: —the ego i.e., the finite ego, the non-ego, the limitation or limiting, and the free, unlimited or absolute ego, i.e., the ego previous to consciousness. Now, Kapila's ahamkāra corresponds to the finite ego, and the five subtle and gross elements, together with their counterparts, the senses, which without this ego would not exist in consciousness, and which consequently, in the language of our philosopher, are produced by the ego, correspond to the non-ego. The free, unlimited, absolute ego is puruṣa, and its limitation by the non-ego is the bandha or saṅga which ties us down to this world. But Fichte has told us that the limitation of the ego is the result of something that had passed in the intellect previous to consciousness, previous to the positing of the ego. This according to Kapila,
KAPILA AND FICHTE COMPARED

is the principle of buddhi or mahat, which produces ahaṁkāra or the ego.

But here there is a difference between the two philosophers, a difference due to the object with which each started in this inquiry. Kapila had in view the liberation of the soul from its fetters. Fichte wanted to explain the world. That limitation of the free ego, then, which Fichte derives from the nature of that ego is ascribed by Kapila to a cause which is distinct from it. It is pradhāna, a combination of the three qualities and its product, the principle of mahat. But this is not an external object in the ordinary sense, for, buddhi and ahaṁkāra which are its immediate products and the manas are, as we observed before, called by the Sāṁkhyas, ābhyanţara karaṇas (internal organs), and virtue, compassion, the faculties of acquiring knowledge &c, which are comprehended under buddhi are, of course, not external things—these latter, as we have seen, are produced only after ahaṁkāra has been affirmed. Again, this remarkable peculiarity shows the logical consistency of Kapila. To state that the me believes itself to have been absolutely free and unlimited, and at the same time to deduce its limitations from its essence, involves a contradiction. It is tantamount to saying that the absolutely free and unlimited is not free and unlimited. This is one of the charges brought against Fichte by his critics, from which Kapila escapes by affirming that since the absolute and the infinite cannot be conditioned and finite, the limitations are due to a distinct cause, which in its nature is finite and whose finiteness, from its intimate connection with the infinite ego, the ego attributes to itself from ignorance. On this account, the system of Kapila is not a perfectly subjective Idealism as Fichte's is.

Now, since all our cognitions and feelings are either good or bad, quiescent or active, true or false, right or wrong, the finite cause of all these must be composed of the three qualities, sattva, rajas, and tamas. The finite ego is either a cognizing or a moral subject; it is, therefore prepared for these functions by buddhi which instills those principles into it. If it did not possess those principles or instincts, it would not be fit for an intellectual
or moral life, and perception or action would not follow \textit{i.e.}, the finite \textit{ego} would not be born at all. Hence it is, that it is said to be produced by \textit{buddhi}. Born with the intellectual and moral instincts, it realizes them and creates objects suited to them, and so the external world and the organs of sense and action come into existence. We thus see that the system of the Sâmkhyas distinguishes between the finite and the infinite soul, the limited and the free. The unlimited or infinite soul is not capable of our present life, the finite is; but this finiteness is, according to the system, not its own attribute, but of another principle, which in reality it is, that, in conjunction with the infinite soul, leads this moral and intellectual life which we call ours. If we separate ourselves from this principle, our bonds are broken, and we are again free and absolute. This is \textit{Mokṣa}.¹

This idea of the absolute or limitless soul and this kind of idealism more or less modified, runs through all the religio-philosophical literature of the country.² Indeed, if this were an isolated instance, grave doubts might reasonably be entertained about the explanation, I have attempted, of the Sâmkhya system. There are striking resemblances between the metaphysics of Kapila and of the Buddhistic Schools. The Vedânta, also, bears some affinity

¹. As this is the central idea of many of the most important Hindu systems, and as it is often, by modern writers on Indian Philosophy, confounded with non-existence or nihil, I quote the following lines from Wordsworth, which would give an idea of what is considered to be the state of the soul after it is freed from the trammels of the world. What is meant is a condition in which "thought is not," in which the soul is free from any definite representation.

\begin{quote}
His spirit drank
The spectacle: sensation, soul and form.
All melted into him; they swallowed up
His animal being; in them did he live,
And by them did he live; they were his life.
In such access of mind, in such high hour
Of visitation from the living God
Thought was not; in enjoyment it expired.
\end{quote}

This resembles closely the description of the freed soul given by the Vedântins, in particular.

². \textit{Bhagavadgîtā}, III. 27 and \textit{Śantiparvan}, fol 210, Bom. edn.
to it. The Māyā of that system is often regarded as equivalent to pradhāna or prakṛti, and the two expressions are frequently, in unsystematic works, confounded.

The doctrines of the Yogācāra school of the Buddhists are, that the only existing thing is the ego, and the external and finite world is a phantom. As, to one whose eyes are affected with the disease called timira, two moons appear instead of one, so does the world appear to exist to the ego affected with the disease called vāsanā (habit). This vāsanā assumes various forms, and this it is, that leads the ego to picture to itself the external world, and is the cause of all our feelings and passions. The great object of a human being, therefore, ought to be, by practising the virtues and duties imposed by Buddha on his followers, to free the soul from this vāsanā, the root of all evil. This, then, resembles the idealism of Kapila. The external world is reduced to states of consciousness, and along with our finite thoughts and feelings, is derived from a certain power called vāsanā which is not of the essence of the me, and though it resides in it, is separable from it.

Then by a transition not unusual in the history of Philosophy, the Mādhyamikas, another sect, deny the existence of both the internal and the external world, and end in nihilism. With them, vāsanā is the cause of both, and when, by the discipline enjoined by their master, this is rooted out, nothing remains and this is their nirvāṇa. Then, again, another school, that of the Sautrāntikas, starting from a subjective basis, similarly with these two, admits the existence of external objects, but only as the result of an inference that cannot be avoided. They say that if the vāsanā producing such a representation, as that of a blue object for instance, exists in the soul, it must always produce that representation, that is, we must always see a blue object. But we see it

2. Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha, p. 17.
3. Ibid. p. 15.
10 [R. G. Bhandarkar's Works, Vol. 1.]
only occasionally; therefore, the cause of that representation must exist out of the ego.\(^1\) But the forms of external objects are supplied to them by the intellect; they are the creations of our mind.\(^2\) This external world, and the internal one of finite thoughts and feelings, are capable of destruction or separation from the soul, (nirodha), and the way to this, is the discipline spoken of before (Mārga). When they are thus destroyed, pure intelligence alone remains and the soul attains Mokṣa.\(^3\) We thus see how closely these schools are connected. The philosophy of the Sautrāntikas may be compared to that of Kant, that of the Yogācāras to Fichte's, while that of the Mādhyamikas is nihilism. But all the schools start from a subjective basis and are idealistic, in which respect they resemble the Sāmkhya system.

Professor Max Müller remarks in the Chips that all authors who write on Buddhism always go on the supposition that the metaphysics of Buddhism were derived from Kapila, but he does not see any grounds for this belief. Such ideas as the transmigration of souls, are common to all Hindu philosophers, wherefore their occurrence in the Sāmkhya and Buddhistic systems would not afford an indication of the one having borrowed them from the other. This is quite true, but the special coincidences which he denies, I humbly think, do exist. Deriving the external world from states of consciousness; referring these along with the feelings and passions to a finite cause; and distinguishing this cause from the infinite soul—these are the essential doctrines of both the systems. The only difference is that the finite cause of the Sāmkhyas is indestructible, while that of the Buddhists is not. But this difference is more apparent than real. The pradhāna of the Sāmkhyas is capable of separation from the soul, and the word nirodha, used by the Sautrāntikas to denote the disappearance of their finite cause, means

---

1. Ibid. p. 19.
2. Jagaddhara, in his commentary on Mālati-Mādhava, incidentally gives the Sautrāntika doctrine thus:—लिखिते वेति वैद्यानितिकमोपविद्यम्।
तः हि जनन्ते स्वीकारार्थः विषयं कियति इति तत् तत्ओकारस्याभिव्यक्तिः।
much the same thing. However, even if we recognise a real difference on this point, it may well be considered as due to a further development of one and the same system.

Again, the denial of God, as the controller of the universe, which is common to both the systems, is not a mere accidental or general coincidence. It is a necessary consequence of the systems and indicates their essential identity. The problem which both undertake to solve is, freeing the soul from misery. Misery arises from the external world and from our feelings. The external world is subjectivised, and referred along with the feelings to a finite cause, the destruction of which sets the soul, infinite and absolute in its nature, at liberty. The problem is solved. And in this way of solving it, there is no room for a controller of the universe. The systems, however, do not deny the existence of gods or superhuman beings. They exist but their constitution is similar to that of man. There are prakṛti and puruṣa, even there, but some of the effects of prakṛti do not exist in their case. They have only subtle bodies or only the internal organs, and not the gross substances with which we find ourselves united.

There is another striking resemblance. Some Buddhistic schools give the order in which the world is produced, thus: —First of all there is ignorance from which arise feelings such as those of love and hatred. Then follows consciousness which gives birth to names and forms (the external world), and in this manner, the senses, the contact of the senses with the world, pleasure or pain, desire, virtue and vice, old age, death, lentionation, sorrow and distress, are successively produced, one from the other. This order closely resembles that of the Sāmkhyas. Ignorance corresponds to pradyāna, love and hatred to buddhi, consciousness to ahaṃkāra, and

[1] I. आविष्कारानिर्मिततेतस्तकारणतन्त्रुपपचयते संकायाचा | ते चाविष्काराविष्कारा संस्कारार्थको विकारिणां नामक्रयं धड़तनं सत्त्वां वेदना तृप्तियोद्धां भवो जातिजीर्ता मरणं शीमः पारिवेदना दुःख दुमेन्स्तेषेष्वजातियं इत्तेर्तम्रहवकः।

Śaṅkara-cārya's Vedānta Bhaṣya, Bib. Ind. p. 549. Vol. I. See also Govindānanda on the same.
so on. The principle of both is the same, though there may be differences in the particulars. For these reasons, there is, I think, sufficient ground to believe, that though the Buddhistic systems may not have sprung directly from the Sāṃkhya, they derived their origin from the same current of thought, and are to be referred to the same, or immediately successive ages. And having arrived thus far, the balance of probability is, in my opinion, in favour of the supposition that the Sāṃkhyas preceded the Buddhists.

Again, Professor Max Müller thinks the Buddhistic nirvāṇa to be total annihilation, and refers to the sacred book Abhidharma, said to have been written by Kaśyapa, the friend and pupil of Buddha. I have had no access to this book, but with due deference, I must say, that if Mādhava has given the doctrines of the several sects rightly, the nirvāṇa of the Mādhyamikas only is annihilation, while the summum bonum of the other schools is the separation of the free and unlimited soul from the finite force we observe in it, as the reader may have seen.¹

The coincidences between the Sāṃkhya and the Buddhistic systems will derive greater significance if we compare and contrast the Vedānta with them. The absolute soul is the central idea of the Vedānta as well as of the Sāṃkhya. But the problem with the Vedāntins was not simply to teach the way to eternal bliss, but also to restore the Indian race to the Śruti, which the Sāṃkhyas had affected to reverence, and the Buddhists openly defied, and to God. Revelation is, therefore, the basis of the system. The second sūtra of Bādarāyana, the first being simply introductory, brings in at once, the idea of God as the Creator of the world. According to the Vedānta, then, there is first, God and the individual soul. God is the sum total of the individual souls. He first creates the five elements, and from these five, the senses, and thence the two internal

¹ Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha: Mādhyamikas: परिनिर्वाणं ज्ञातवर्गं सत्त्वतं | Yogācāras: निखिलवास्तीं क्षेत्रविनिर्विभविषयाकरोपविकिरितविशालाद्वादशो महोदयं | Sautrāntikas: तदन्तरं विवक्षानिदेशं च युक्तं: | See also ibid, p. 116.
faculties (manas and buddhi). From the elements are also produced the organs of action, and the five winds in the body. The last seventeen constitute the subtle body, which follows us after death; and the gross one is created by a certain elaborate process of mixture, called pañcīkaraṇa. The sum total of the subtle bodies with the soul in it, is another body of God called Hiranyagarbha; and all the gross bodies with the souls, constitute a third, distinguished by the name of Vaiśvānara. Here, then, is an attempt to seek the Absolute objectively, which the Sāmkhyas arrive at, subjectively. But equally with these, the Vedāntins hold the subject also to be Absolute. To establish identity between these two, and secure mokṣa, finite thinking and the finite manifestations of the real or external absolute, must be dissolved, buddhi and matter—the creations of God, must be destroyed. If by creation is to be understood a development of the Divine essence, this object cannot be gained. For the development must be as real as the essence itself. Śaṅkarācārya, therefore, rejects this theory, and attributes creation to a certain power in the Divine essence, which cannot be considered as existing, because its effects would no less exist, nor as non-existing, for the effects are perceptible. It is Māyā or illusion which generates appearances, such as those of a mirage. And the individual soul which in its essence is the same as the Universal soul, is absolute, is enclosed by a similar veil of illusion, and confounds himself with the creations of God’s māyā and attributes their finiteness to himself. That the gross and subtle bodies are such creations, is shown by the conditions in which we find ourselves in sleep. In dreamy sleep, the gross body of flesh and blood does not exist for the individual soul, while the subtle

1. Vedānta Sāra; Pañcadaśī of Bhāratītirtha, Viveka I.
2. Śaṅkarācārya’s Vedānta Bhāṣya II.I.14, Bib. Ind, p. 447 and 453, vol. I. This theory called pariṇāmavāda was afterwards taken up fully and strictly by Vallabha and qualified by Rāmānuja, in the hands of both of whom, it became the basis of a religious system more practical than Śaṅkara’s.
3. सत्वात्त्ववाच्यमानिनिन्यम | Vedānta-Sāra; न शुच्यं नापि तथादृष्टादृष्ट लब्ध्यताम् | Bhāratītirtha, Pañca-Viveka II.
does, and this latter also ceases to be, in sound sleep. But even in sound sleep, the soul is still enveloped in avidyā or ignorance which is māyā itself as referring to the individual soul. These avidyā and māyā are got rid of by the concentration of the mind in the manner prescribed by the Yoga philosophers, joined with moral discipline, and as the result of the process, the soul issues forth into its transcendent condition, and is pure intelligence and joy.
CONSIDERATION OF THE DATE OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

IN CONNECTION WITH THE CORRESPONDENCE FROM COL. ELLIS


This paper was read before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society on 12th September 1872.

In the Ninth volume of the Asiatic Researches, there is a notice by Colebrooke of an inscription on copper-plates purporting to be a grant of land by Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣit, of the race of the Pāṇḍavas. The characters engraved being very modern, and the language very incorrect, Colebrooke came to the conclusion that it was a forgery. But this decision rests on the supposition that the Mahābhārata, which describes the great serpent-sacrifice held by Janamejaya, alluded to also in the grant, is a very ancient work. The antiquity of this work, however, may be denied, in which case there is nothing in the grant itself to show that it is spurious. Colonel Ellis, therefore, in the correspondence placed before us, considers the grant as genuine, and refers the composition of the Mahābhārata to a period subsequent to its execution. On the day on which the grant was made, there was a partial eclipse of the sun, which, from calculations made by the Rev. G.B. Gibbons and Prof. Airy, took place at about 11 A.M. on Sunday, the 9th of April 1521. The date of the grant being thus determined beyond any possibility of doubt, Colonel Ellis wishes us to prosecute further inquiries, with a view to find out whether any traces of the events and circumstances mentioned in the grant, or connected with the story of Janamejaya, exist at the present day. For instance, we are asked to ascertain whether the ruins of the palace in which Sarvadamana or Bharata, the
son of Dusyanta and Sakuntalā, was crowned, and of the court in which Janamejaya held the Aśvamedha ‘Jagg,’ or Horse-sacrifice, are still visible at Anagundi, with which the Colonel identifies Hastināpura, or whether any burnt remains of the sacrifice are found by digging for them on the spot. But the supposition on which the Colonel goes leads him into a difficulty. Kṛṣṇa Rāya, one of the ablest kings, of the local dynasty, and not Janamejaya of the Pāṇḍava race was on the throne of Vijayanagara, or Anagundi, about 1521. Since, then, both could not have been kings at the same time, Colonel Ellis suspects that Kṛṣṇa Rāya’s minister, Appāji, was the Janamejaya of the grant, i.e. it is considered not at all unlikely that a king who is represented in the plates as the king of kings and the refuge of the whole universe, and whom Col. Ellis himself speaks of as a renowned conqueror, should have been but an insignificant minister of the king of a minor state. Again, if the grant is genuine, and the Mahābhārata was written after 1521 A.D., we should certainly expect to find in it a picture of the state of society in the sixteenth century, when the Mahomedsans had been ruling over a large portion of the country for about four hundred years, and when the few remaining Hindu states were struggling for existence, and not such an archaic condition as that which the poem unfolds to our view. The current tradition which ascribes a high antiquity to the Mahābhārata, ought also to be explained and not lost sight of. How is it that it has come to be an almost intuitive belief with every intelligent Hindu that the epic is very old, while at the same time, he considers works written long before 1521 A.D., to be but very recent? At the same time it is very difficult to conceive how an epic only three hundred and fifty years old, could have worked itself into the thoughts and feelings of all the Hindu nationalities, from the Himalaya to Cape Comorin, so thoroughly as the Mahābhārata has done. Reasons such as these ought, I think, to be sufficient to enable one to pronounce the grant to be spurious. But Col. Ellis does not seem to consider them to be weighty, and in the view he has put forth, he but represents, in a somewhat exaggerated form, the tendency of most European scholars and antiqua-
rians to modernize everything Hindu. I will, however, not content myself with this general reasoning, but will give more specific proofs of the antiquity of the Mahābhārata.

If Col. Ellis's view is correct, the greater part of our existing Classical Literature must be supposed to have been written after 1521 A.D.; for there are but few works which, directly or indirectly, do not allude to the Mahābhārata or the principal characters in the poem. But such a conclusion is inadmissible, for there are some dates in the history of India and the history of Sanskrit literature which cannot be called in question. I will therefore set forth the principal testimonies to the existence of the Mahābhārata, in chronological order.

The earliest literary date is that of Patanjali, the author of the Mahābhāṣya, or the great commentary on Pāṇini's grammar. Prof. Goldstücker places him in the second century before Christ, and I have recently succeeded in making out that he lived in the reign of Puṣpadātra, the founder of the Śunga dynasty, who reigned from B.C. 178 to B.C. 142. Pāṇini must have preceded him, and the interval between them was probably about three centuries, or even much greater. The Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras of the three Vedas preceded the work of Pāṇini, or, according to some scholars, some of them were written at about the same time. The Brāhmaṇas or these Vedas must have preceded the Sūtras. Now Janamejaya, the son of Pārīkṣa, and Bharata, the son of Dusyanta, are mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as very powerful kings who conquered the whole earth. I do not mean to assert that the Mahābhārata existed before the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, but I bring forward this instance to show how very far into antiquity some of the elements of the story of the Mahābhārata run. In Asvalāyana Gṛhya, there is a Sūtra containing the names of the gods and Rṣis to whom water is to be given, i.e., technically, whose tarpāṇa is to be made every day by

1. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII. 21 and 22.
a Rgvedi Brahmana. In this list the name of the Mahabharata occurs. But it may perhaps be questioned whether the reference here is to the Mahabharata as we have it, or to some other work that existed in the time of Asvalayana. For the Rṣī mention several classes of literary works, such as Gāthās, Nārāśaṁsis &c., which are not now known. This objection amounts to this. A Mahabharata may have existed before Asvalayana, but there is nothing to show that it contained the story of the Kurus. But I do not see why this question should be raised, since a few centuries later we are told by another author that the story of these heroes was popular and current in his time and when, only a short time after, or about the same time, as Asvalayana, a third mentions the names of the Mahabharata and some of the principal characters. Pāṇini (VI. 2. 38) teaches us the accent of Mahā in the word Mahabharata. Another Sūtra of his teaches that the termination Aka should be applied to the nouns Vasudeva and Arjuna to form derivatives from them signifying one who is devoted to Vasudeva and Arjuna. In the Mahabharata these two persons are represented as great friends, and their being mentioned together by Pāṇini is very significant. Even Patañjali, commenting on the Sūtra, sees no reason why Vasudeva should have been put in here, since there is another and a more general rule under which the noun would come. He explains that the Vasudeva here meant was the god Vasudeva, and not the one that comes under the general rule. This is a subtlety which, however, shows that the characters in the Mahabharata had come to be regarded as demi-gods. But it is

1. Asvalayana Grhya III. 4. 4—माध्यभारतमद्भारततत्त्वन्तयाः...
3 Pāṇini IV. 3.98.
4. वासुदेवानामन्यूः। क्षमयं वासुदेवस्वयावदन्तीविधिचति। न गौत्तमक्षयावश्यभ्यो यहुदृ कुस्तियो सिद्धम्। न हतिन वियो वासुदेवस्वयावदन्ती। तद्वस एव एव हवः।...अधिवा नेषा क्षत्रियाः। समेत्ता तत्त्रभगवतः।
not unlikely that Pāṇini was let to put them together because they were always associated together in the minds of the people, as they are in the Mahābhārata. In a third Sūtra we have Yudhiṣṭhira. The words I have brought forward are not taken from the Gaṇas or groups which form an appendix of Pāṇini’s work nor are they the examples of his rules given by the grammarians, for there is no evidence to determine what portion of these is to be attributed to Pāṇini. But they occur in the Sūtras themselves Pāṇini’s authorship of which is unquestionable.

In Patañjali’s work we find in one place the names of Bhimasena, Sahadeva and Nakula, who are mentioned as descendants of Kuru, and of Duryodhana and Duḥṣasana. The compound Yudhiṣṭhirarjunau occurs in several places. In one of these, Patañjali, in explaining a Vārtika of Kātyāyana, tells us that the word Dvi becomes Dvandvam as applied to a copulative compound of the names of persons or things always mentioned together and well known to all. In the case of the compound Yudhiṣṭhirarjunau, though the persons are well known, says he, they are not always or invariably mentioned together; hence Dvi does not become dvandvam, i.e. we have to say Dvau Yudhiṣṭhirarjunau, and not dvandvam Yudhiṣṭhirarjanau. From this I infer that the story of Yudhiṣṭhira and Arjuna was current and popular in Patañjali’s time.

1. VIII. 3. 95.
2. Patañjali, IV 1. 4 Ahn. कुबेर्योक्तकाशः नाकुकः साहदेवः यज्ञस्य स एव। भौमसेनी नाम कुबेरसमादभयं प्राप्तिः। भ्यों भवति विपुतिषोऽयम्। भेमसेनेयः।
3. III. 3. 1 ann.
4. Under II. 2.34 यज्ञस्य कुबेर्योक्तकाशः। कुबेर्योक्तकाशः। यज्ञस्य स एव। भौमसेनी नाम कुबेरसमादभयं प्राप्तिः। भ्यों भवति विपुतिषोऽयम्। भेमसेनेयः।
5. Under Pāṇini, VIII. 1.15.—अय्युससहिष्ठिते थ�ौकर्किलि हमद्विभवमसंस्थानं कर्त्तवयः। हमद्विभवमसंस्थानं कर्त्तवयः। अय्युससहिष्ठिते इति किमभवेऽ। द्वो युधिष्ठिराजनू। लोकविकल्स्तिः इति किमभवेऽ। द्वो देवदेव्यज्ञाद्विना। Kaiyatā on this last:—द्वो युधिष्ठिराजनू। लोकविकल्स्तिः इति किमभवेऽ। द्वो देवदेव्यज्ञाद्विना।
In another place, Patañjali, in his comments on Panini III., 2. 122, gives, as an example of a counter-rule, III. 2. 118, Dharmena sma Kuravo yudhyante, i.e., the Kurus fought with fairness. Now the war between the sons of Pându and Dhrtrástra, both of whom belonged to the Kuru race, is known as Dharma-yuddha, i.e., a war in which it was not allowable for the hostile parties to carry their enmity beyond the field of battle, and in which, even in battle, no unfair advantage could be taken by either side. Besides, this is an instance in which the present Yudhyante, we are told, has the sense of the perfect, i.e., the action of fighting took place at a remote time and was not witnessed by the speaker. This shows that, when Patañjali wrote, the war was considered as having taken place at a remote time. From these quotations it follows that there was in Patañjali's time a work describing the war of the Kurus, that it was popularly read, that it contained a story concerning the five Pândavas also, and that it was regarded as ancient. This could be no other than the Mahábhárata. Perhaps the story in the epic was made the subject of new poems in Patañjali's time, for under II. 2 24 he quotes, as if from such a work, 'Asidvitýonúsasara Pándavam,' 'he followed the Pándava, sword in hand.' This forms a regular line in the Vámaśastha metre. Of course I do not assert that the poem existed in Patañjali's time in exactly the same form as we have it now. There can be no question that several additions have been subsequently made, and it has undergone a good deal of transformation. The very popularity of our epics has made it almost impossible now to secure a correct or reliable text. But the main story as we now have it, leaving the episodes out of consideration, was current long before Patañjali's time.

My next testimony is from Inscriptions. The Inscriptions in the Nasik caves—at least the earlier ones—appear, from the forms of the characters and the names of kings and other noted persons occurring therein, to date from the first to the third century of the Christian era. In one of these Gótamiputra's
COPPERPLATE INSCRIPTIONS

prowess and exploits are compared to those of Keśava, Bhima-seṇa, Arjuna, and Janamejaya, all of whom are Mahābhārata characters. The Calukya copper-plate grant translated by Professor Dowson, and one of the Gurjjara ones translated by me last year, contain verses, quoted from the work of Vyāsa, one of which is addressed to Yudhiṣṭhira. This clearly is a reference to the Mahābhārata. The date of the former is 394, and of the latter 417 which correspond to 472 A.D. and 495 A.D., on the supposition that the era referred to is the Śaka. An Inscription in a temple at Iwullee, in the Dharwar and Mysore Districts, bears the date 3730 in the era of the war of the Bhārata. The Śaka date corresponding to it is given as 506, i.e. 584 A.D. It thus appears that in the latter part of the sixth century the war which forms the theme of the Mahābhārata was considered to have taken place about four thousand years before.

The date of Kālidāsa is not yet thoroughly settled, but he must certainly have flourished long before Bāna, for he is mentioned by him in the Harṣacakrīta. Bāna, whose patron was Śri-Harṣa, as he himself tell us, lived in the first half of the seventh century, as is determined by a comparison of Hwan Thsang’s itinerary with what is known from Sanskrit sources and from the Calukya copperplates. Kālidāsa is also mentioned in the Iwullee Inscrip-

3. Jour. Bom. A. S., No. XXVII., p. cxcviii. Dr. Bhau Daji here reads the Mahābhārata date as three thousand eight hundred and fifty-five years, but 3730 as above at p. 315 of the same No. The mistake seems to have arisen from his having taken अष्ट्रेख्यु for अष्ट्रत्तु in the former place.
4. Dr. Hall’s edn. of Vāsavadattā, p. 14, notes.
5. Ibid. p. 17, notes. Journal Bom. A. S., Vol. III., p. 203. The Calukya prince who conquered Harsavardhana, the patron of Bāna, was Satyāśraya Śri Prthivī Vallabha, whose great grandson Vijayāditya was on the throne in Śaka 627, i.e. 705 A.D. From the Iwullee Inscription quoted above, it also appears that Satyāśraya was on the throne in 506 Śaka, or 584 A.D. This agrees pretty well with Hwan Thsang’s chronology.
tion, noticed above, as a famous poet. Now, the Yakṣa in Kālidāsa’s Meghadūta directs his messenger, the cloud, to go by Kurukṣetra, in which the Kṣatriyas fought a battle, “in the course of which he with the Gaṅḍiva bow (i.e. Arjuna) discharged showers of arrows at the faces of the assembled warriors.” Bāna himself in his Kādambarī makes Vilāsavatī, the queen of Tārāpīḍa, one of the characters in the tale, to go to the temple of Mahākāla in Ujjayini, where she hears the Mahābhārata read. By the way, this shows that the custom of reading the Mahābhārata or Purāṇas in temples for the edification of the visitors is as old as Bānabhaṭṭa. In another place we are told that the inhabitants of Ujjayini were fond of the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, and the Rāmāyaṇa. Elsewhere the Acchoda lake is compared to the Bhārata. For there were observable there disturbances caused by the Pakṣa of the race of Pāṇḍu Dhṛtarāṣtras. There is a double entendre here; in the case of the Bhārata the expression means the adherents of the races of Pāṇḍu and of Dhṛtarāṣtra, and in the other the wings of white swans. There is also another equivocation on the name of the Bhārata. Bāna also alludes in the same work to the death of Pāṇḍu caused by the curse of Kīlīndama Muni, to his wife Prthā having remained a widow all her life, to the death of Abhīmanya, and to the widowhood of his wife Uttarā, to Arjuna’s having killed Jayadratha, to Arjuna’s having been restored to life by Ulupī after he had been killed by his own son Babhruvahana, as related in the Āśvamedhika Parva, and to Kṛṣṇa’s having restored to life Parīkṣit, the
son of Abhimanyu, still-born in consequence of Āsvatthāma's charmed arrow.\(^1\) There can, therefore, be no question that the Mahābhārata existed in a form complete, so far as the story concerning the principal characters goes, in Bāna's time, i.e. in the first half of the seventh century.

In the Harṣacaritra, Bāna mentions a work called Vāsavadattā. It is very probable that the Vāsavadattā here meant is a work of that name by Subandhu. But even if it were thought otherwise, Subandhu is mentioned in a Śloka\(^2\) attributed to Rājaśekhara, from whose works again there are quotations\(^3\) in the Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa. This last work is attributed to king Bhoja. It contains a Śloka in the first chapter addressed to Muṇīja\(^4\) the uncle of the celebrated Bhoja of Dhārā, from which it appears that the work was written soon after the tenth century. Now Subandhu’s Vāsavadattā contains many allusions to the Mahābhārata and to some of the characters in the story. Bhima’s having killed the giant Baka, the skill of the Pāṇḍavas in gambling, the Kīcakas as officers of king Virāṭa, Duḥśasana, Arjuna, and such other persons and events are mentioned. The name of the epic also occurs several times.\(^5\)

The Mṛchchhāṭikā is one of the oldest dramas, though its exact date is not yet determined. It is mentioned in the commentary on the Daśarūpa\(^6\) of which more hereafter. In this play, the poet, in order to bring out the meanness, foolishness, and presumption of one of the characters makes him misquote

\(^{1}\) Ibid, pp. 196 and 197, from पृथ्वी च बाणेश्वरी to जयध्रेष्टुर्जुनेन तोकान्तर- मुप्पलितेन्द्रकम्पाणपित्यागाम्य and from अजुनेन च to उत्तमानवमन्दिपितवान्.

\(^{2}\) Sāṅgrdhara, chap. on Viśiṣṭha Kavipraśamsa: माघो भारविकाठि- दासतलाः स्कन्यं स्वकभुशं च:। Dr. Hall’s reading of the first name in this is नेऽ, which is evidently a mistake. (See his edn. of Vās., p. 20, notes.

\(^{3}\) Prof. Aufrecht’s Oxford Cat., p. 209a.

\(^{4}\) Ibid.

\(^{5}\) Dr. Hall’s edn., pp. 15, 21, 27, 33, 70, 106, & 147.

\(^{6}\) Dr. Hall’s edn. of Daśarūpa, p. 127.
The Date of the Mahābhārata

The Mahābhārata. Draupadi is, according to him, dragged by the hair by Rāma instead of Duḥśāsana, Subhadrā becomes the sister of Viśvavasu and not Krṣṇa, and she is carried away by Hanūman instead of Arjuna. In other parts of the play also there are several allusions.¹

There is a commentary by Śaṁkarācārya on the Bhagavadgītā, which forms an episode of the Mahābhārata. In his principal work—the Bhaṣya on the Vedānta Sūtras—there are many quotations from the Gītā and other parts of the Mahābhārata.² A verse from the Śāvitryupākhyāna, an episode in the Vana-Parva, occurs in his comments on the Sūtra I. 3. 24.³ The age of Śaṁkarācārya has not yet been fixed with certainty, but some scholars are of opinion that he flourished in the ninth century. In the Konga-Desa-Carita, a Tamil chronicle in the Mackenzie Collection, Śaṁkarācārya is mentioned as having converted a king of the Chera country named Tiru Vikrama from Jainism to the Śaiva faith. The date of the king given in the MS. is 100 Śaka. But Prof. Dowson thinks the MS. is not trustworthy here, and is of opinion that he reigned in the sixth century. He also thinks that, perhaps out of a desire to assign a remote antiquity to the reformer, the compiler of the MS. may have transferred him from the reign of Tiru Vikrama II., another king of the same country, to that of Tiru Vikrama I., and assigns the eighth century to the former.⁴ Mr. Burgess possesses a Copperplate Grant by Kongani Mahādhīrāja, another king of the dynasty, who appears, from a comparison of the plates and the chronicle, to have been the tenth after Tiru Vikrama I., and the third

¹. Calc. edn. of the play. Śaka 1792, pp. 28, 31, 109, 199.
before Tiru Vikrama II. The date of the grant is 388, which supposing the era to be the Śaka, as is very likely, since the dates in the MS. are all referred to that era, corresponds to 466 A. D. Now, taking twenty years as the average duration of each reign, Tiru Vikrama I. must have been reigning in 346 A. D., and Tiru Vikrama II. in 526 A. D. And this latter date, curiously enough, agrees with that given in the chronicle, while the former does not. It thus follows that if the king converted to the Śaiva faith was Tiru Vikrama I., Śaṅkarācārya must have flourished in the fourth century, and if he was Tiru Vikrama II., in the sixth century. The Mahābhārata then must have existed at the latter date.

The drama of the Venisamhāra by Bhatta Nārāyaṇa is based on the latter part of the story in the Mahābhārata. It dramatizes the incidents in the war between the sons of Pāṇdu and Dhrētarāṣṭra. In the prologue, Bhatta Nārāyaṇa thus speaks of the reputed author of the Mahābhārata:—“I adore Kṛṣṇa Dvaiṣṭyaṇa, who was no Kṛṣṇa, i.e. whose deeds were pure, who had conquered his passions and who composed the nectar of the Mahābhārata, drinkable by the ears.” The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi and the Śiśupālavadha of Māghta are also based on parts of the story in the Mahābhārata. The dates of these authors have not been determined, but it appears they must all have flourished before the tenth century. There are quotations1 from their works in Dhanika’s commentary on the Daśarūpa by Dhanāmijaya, who was patronised by Muṇja, the uncle of Bhoja, as appears from the last verse in the work. Dhanika seems to have been Dhanāmijaya’s brother, and from a Copperplate grant mentioned by Dr. Hall,2 he appears to have lived in the middle of the tenth century. There are also extracts from these three

1. Dr. Hall’s edn. of Daśarūpa, pp. 118, 142, 143, 146, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, &c. &c.
2. Dr. Hall’s Daśarūpa, p. 3, notes.

books in the Sarasvatikaṭṭhābharaṇa, a work which I have already noticed.

Hemādri, as he tells us in his works, was a minister of Mahādeva, a Yadava king of Devagiri, who, according to Sir Walter Elliot ascended the throne in 1182 Śaka, corresponding to 1260 A. D. In the Dānakhaṇḍa of this author, recently printed by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, there are many quotations from the Mahābhārata.

We will next turn our attention to a Marathi work. The Jñāneśvarī a Marathi commentary on the Bhagavadgītā, was finished as the author tells us, in the year of Śaka 1212 i.e., 1290 A. D. In the first chapter the Mahābhārata is spoken of in terms of praise and reverence, and we are told that the Bhagavadgītā was addressed by Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna and occurs in the Bhīṣmaparva of the work, as it does in our existing copies. Janamejaya also is mentioned by Jñāneśvara.

Sāyaṇa was minister to Bukka, king of Vijayanagara, whom he mentions in all his works. Bukka was on the throne in 1334 A.D.

Sāyaṇa quotes from the Mahābhārata in his commentary on the Taittiriya Upaniṣad. In the Sarvadarsana-Samgraha an

1. Dr. Aufrecht’s Oxford Cat., p. 208b, p. 209a. In the Iwullee Inscription noticed above, Dr. Bhau reads the name of Bhāravi, and in the copy given in the Bombay Society’s Journal the name does seem to occur in the last line, but in the photographic copy the Ra is wanting, and the word looks like Bhāvi. I cannot arrive at any definite conclusion on the point in the absence of a better copy of the Inscription.


4. ... "... || Last verse of chap. 18.

5. ... "... || Last verse of chap. 18.

6. Princep’s Chronological Tables.
argument is brought forward by a follower of Jaimini to prove that the Vedas are eternal. An objector is then introduced who says that it would apply equally well to the Mahābhārata. In another place also the epic is mentioned in the Sarvadarśana-Saṁgraha. In the same book quotations from the Kāvyaprakāśa occur. The Kāvyaprakāśa itself quotes from the Veniṣāṁhāra which I have already mentioned. Sayana quotes from the Mahābhārata in his comments on Parāśara also.

Sāṅgadhara, in his Paddhati or anthology, tells us that he was the grandson of Rāghava, who was in the service of Hammīra, a Cohan prince. Hammīra came to the throne, according to Col. Tod, in 1300 A. D. Sāṅgadhara must have therefore flourished in the latter part of the fourteenth century. In his

1. Sarva-Darśana-Saṁgraha, Bibl. Ind., p. 64 and p. 128.
2. Ibid., p. 172.
3. In the Chapters on Rasa and Dosa.
4. Prof. Aufrecht's Oxford Cat., p. 265a, 266b; Anuśāsana-parva and Asvamedha-parva are mentioned here.
5. Dr. Hall's Vāsavadatta, p. 48, notes.
Paddhati he quotes from the Venisamhara, Kiratårjuniya, Śiśupālavadha, Bhagavadgitā and other parts of the Mahābhārata.¹

I have thus briefly sketched the principal testimonies to the existence of the Mahābhārata from the time of Pāṇini and Āśvalayana, i.e., from about the fifth century before Christ to the time of Śāṅgadhara, i.e. the 14th century after Christ.

The antiquity of the Mahābhārata being thus established, the grant, which according to Prof. Airy’s calculations was made in 1521 A.D., must be pronounced to be a forgery. The fact that the villages conveyed by it are still in the possession of the descendents of the pretended donees agrees with the conclusions arrived at from the other data. Most of the queries of Col. Ellis contained in the letter before us, based as they are on the genuineness of the grant, require, I think, no answer. He refers to a passage in Anandagiri’s Šaṅkara-Vijaya in which the Matha of Maṇḍana Miśra is said to have been situated a few miles from Hastināpura, which, as I have before mentioned, the Colonel identifies with Anagūndi. There must have been some mistake here; for Maṇḍa in his Šaṅkara-vijaya tells us that Maṇḍana Miśra lived in Maḥiṣmati, on the Narmadā.² Anagūndi may have been called Hastināpura in some corner of the country, and there is some ground for it, for the name Anagūndi is derived from one, which in Canerese means, I am told, an elephant, and Guṇḍi a lane. But the classical Hastināpura was certainly far to the north. Paṭaṇjali, in his remarks on the Sūtra yasya cāyāmaḥ (Pāṇini II. 1. 16) gives Anugaṅgam Hāstinapuram as an example from which it is clear that Hastināpura was situated on the Ganges. Besides, in the grant, Janamejaya is represented as having gone from his capital to the south to subjugate the different parts of the country, and performed the Sarpasattra or

¹. Chapters on Viśiṣṭakavipraśaṁsā, Raudrarasa, Bhayānakarasa, Sāntarasa, Virarasa, &c. &c.

². See the Bombay Edition of Mādhava’s Šaṅkara-vijaya, chap. viii,
serpent-sacrifice at Harihara, at the junction of the Tungabhadrā with the Haridā. There is a place of that name on the map and it is situated at the junction of the Tungabhadrā with another river, but its bearing from Anagundī is South-east by east, so that it appears that even in the grant the Hastināpura that was meant was that one in the north. Some of the Colonel's questions to the identification of the places the names of which occur in the grant can only be answered by one acquainted with the locality.
THE ARYANS IN THE LAND OF THE ASSURS

(Skr. ASURA)


(Communicated)

Since the discovery1 in Asia Minor of a treaty between the King of the Hittites and the King of Mitani in which the latter invokes Indra, Mitrāvaruṇa and the Nāsatyas in those forms of the names which are found in the Rk-Sarhita, the question before scholars has been where in the course of Vedic culture to place what this Inscription exhibits. No satisfactory conclusion seems to have been arrived at, but one direction may be pointed out for inquiry which will enable us to arrive at a plausible solution of the problem. The enquiry should take its start from the word Asura. In the Brāhmaṇas it signifies a race of beings inimical to the Devas, or gods. In the Rk-Sarhita it is mostly used in the sense of “living”, “vigorou$, “powerful” and applied as an epithet to various gods such as Dyaus, Indra, Varuṇa, &c. But in three or four cases it denotes beings hostile or inimical to the gods. There are, however, a few passages in which what is said about the Asuras resembles that which is said in connection with the Dasyus, and there the word may be taken to denote enemies of men. In RV. VIII. 96. 9, Indra is called upon to destroy by his wheel the Asuras who are not gods or are godless. In other places the gods are said to have destroyed the hosts belonging to the Asuras Varcin and Pipru. Some gods (Indra, Agni and Sun) are called Asura-han or Asura-slayers.

In the following passages the term Asura denotes the enemies of men more distinctly:—In AV. XIX. 66. 1, the Asuras are spoken of as rivals (Sapatnān) by the worshipper and Agni is

1, See JRAS, for 1909, page 721 ff.
impleased to slaughter them. If they were rivals of the worshipper, they must have been men like the Dasyus. Again in AV. IX. 2. 17 and 18, Kama is invoked to dispel the worshipper's rivals as the gods did the Asuras and as Indra hurled the Dasyus into utter darkness. Here Asuras are compared with the Dasyus and may be like the latter the aborigines of a specific country. In AV. X. 3. 11, we have तमसु श्रवण स्वाहाभ्रोति दस्यनिषिद्धाराव. Here the amulet of the Varuna-tree is desired to “destroy the wearer's enemies as Indra did the Dasyus, the Asuras.” Here Dasyus and Asuras are put together, the former characterising the latter so as to make the whole signify “the Dasyu Asuras or aboriginal Asuras,” or the expression may be taken to mean “Dasyus and Asuras”; in which case it is possible to understand that if the aborigines of India were called by the first name, the Asuras also must signify the aborigines of some other country. These quotations point to the Asuras being the enemies of the Aryan wanderers like the Dasyus and to their having been destroyed by the gods of the emigrants.

There is a passage in Patanjali's Mahabhasya which shows that the name Asura denotes a certain class of Mlecchas or foreigners:—“तत्सु श्रवण हेलयो हेलय इति कुर्बन्तः दक्षशासु:। तस्माद दक्षशासु न म्योचितवे न नदमासितवे। स्वेच्छि ह वा एवं यदवशास्यः। स्वेच्छा मा भूस्मेच्छाययो व्याकरणः॥। Those Asuras uttering the words हेलयः हेलयः were

1. The word Dasyu is by some taken to mean demons or enemies of gods. But the preponderant sense being the dark-coloured aborigines of India who did not acknowledge the Aryan gods and did not obey the Aryan ordinances and whom the gods enabled the Aryan to vanquish, it must surely have led to the words having come to signify the enemies of gods. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which is to be referred to a period not far removed from the later hymns of the Atharva-Veda, plainly and distinctly understands by the word the aboriginal races amongst which it includes the Andhras, Pundras, Saritas, Pulindas and Mūtības (VII. 18). In the last two quotations in the text it is perfectly allowable to take the word Dasyu to mean human enemies or Indian aborigines; and the Asuras are contrasted with them in so far as they resembled the Dasyus in being an aboriginal people but differing from them as belonging to a country other than India.

baffled (were defeated), for say the commentators, instead of हे ॥ अर्यः हे ॥ अर्यः which is good Sanskrit, they omitted the long (Pluta) vowel, elided the श, and changed र to ल, and thus showed themselves not to be Āryans but Mlecchas.—Therefore, a Brāhmaṇa should not act like a Mleccha and speak incorrectly. An incorrect word, it is said, is a Mleccha (Mleccha-making). We should learn Vyākaraṇa in order that we may not become Mlecchas.” Here it is clear that by the word Asura is meant a foreign, un-Brahmanic race.

This passage occurring in Patañjali’s work must have been taken from some Brāhmaṇa which has not been traced yet. But there is a similar passage in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (III.2.1, 18-24). The gods and the Asuras, it is said, sprang, both of them, from Prajāpati and entered upon their father’s inheritance. The gods came in for the mind and the Asuras for speech. Thereby the gods came to have the sacrifice and the Asuras speech only; the gods came to have the yonder world (the heaven) and the Asuras this (earth). Thereafter the gods contrived to deprive the Asuras of the speech which they had inherited from Prajāpati and when this was effected the Asuras uttering हेलवः हेलवः were baffled. “Such was the unintelligible speech which they then uttered,—and he (who speaks thus), is a Mleccha (barbarian). Hence let no Brāhmaṇa speak barbarous language (न स्कृच्चेत्), since such is the speech of the Asuras”¹ (अनुया हेय बाक्ष). Here I lay stress on two statements. The heaven was assigned to the gods and the earth to the Asuras is one of them. It means that the Asuras were the denizens of this earth. The second statement is that the Brāhmaṇas are enjoined not to act like Mlecchas, i. e., not to speak Mleccha language. For it is Asurya speech or the speech of the Asuras. These show that the Asuras were regarded as dwellers of the earth, and as speaking Mleccha language; and consequently were Mlecchas or foreign barbarians. Who then were these Asuras,

¹ Eggeling’s Translation, Part II, Sacred Books of the East, p. 32.
who dwelt on the earth, were Mlecchas, were rivals or opponents of the Æryans and are compared with the Dasyus or aborigines of India, who contested the passage of the Æryans throughout India? The answer is supplied by the Inscription under notice.

Now the King of Mitani and the people over whom he ruled inhabited the northern portion of the plain between the Euphrates and the Tigris. Their neighbours were thus the Assyrians or Assuryans, if the Greek vowel which is generally represented by Y, may be translated by U as is often done. Amongst the Assyrians we find such names as Assur-bani-pal, Assur-Nazir-pal Tiglath-pileser, &c. The name Assyria itself is said to have been derived from Assur, the name of the ancient capital of the country and its gods. Assyria corresponds to Asuryah as applied to Lokāh in the Isāvāsyopanīṣad (verse 3) and may be regarded as meaning the country of the Asuras. Thus then it is not unlikely that just as in India the progress of the Æryans was contested by the Dasyus, so was it contested by the Asuras of Assyria and they were thus compared with the Dasyus in some of the passages quoted above. That the Assyrians were Mlecchas according to the ideas of Hindus is plain enough. In later times especially when Æryans settled in the region of the five rivers, and afterwards when their religious system was developed in Brahmāvarta, the reminiscences of the human Asuras and the fights of the Æryans with them and their civilisation led to the whole subject having transformed itself into a myth of the determined enmity between the Devas and the Asuras. It is said that the enmity resulted from a scism between the Avestic people and the Vedic people as regards the gods worshipped by them. The Devas worshipped by the Brāhmanas were stigmatised as demons by the Iranians, and the Indians repaid the compliment by representing the Ahuras or Asuras as fiends. But the objection to this is that Ahura is in Avesta the name of the Supreme Lord Ahuramazdā and the name does not denote a whole race of beings though it may be applied to two
or three angels. The explanation, therefore, that our mythical Asuras represent the Asuras of Assyria seems more plausible. Thus the word Asura first signifies (1) a "living spirit", "of wonderful power," and was used as an epithet of the gods, even the most ancient of them Dyaus. Then it came to denote (2) a human being hostile to the wandering Aryans, and the reason why it acquired this sense is that they came in contact with the Asuras of Assyria as is shown by the Inscription under discussion. This led in later times to the sense (3) of a race of mythical beings hostile to gods. Without the implication of hostileness the word came to denote (4) a Mleccha or a foreigner of that name. This is shown by the quotation from Patanjali and the Satapatha Brähmana and also by the name of Mayāsura to be mentioned below. The word Asura in the first sense appears entirely distinct from that which has the three last senses.

In AV. VI. 108.3, we are told of the wisdom which the Asuras possessed. They are credited with the possession of Māyā or magical power in AV. VI. 72. 1. The Śrauta Sūtra of Āśvalāyana (X. 7. 7) speaks of an Āsuri Vidyā as the Veda of the Asuras who constitute the subjects ruled over by a king of the name of Asita Dhānava. The Āsuri Vidyā is unquestionably magical skill and knowledge. Maya-Asura who had located himself in Khāṇḍava forest knew architecture and constructed an Audience Hall or a palace for the Pāṇḍavas in return for Arjuna's having saved his life while the forest was burning. Dr. Spooner, Archaeological Superintendent, Bengal Circle, ridiculously enough traced the name Asura-Mayā to a reminiscence of the great god Ahura-Mazda, thereby converting him into a craven creature that had taken refuge in the Khāṇḍava forest. The Assyrians, we are told, cultivated the art of architecture and were known for their skill in building, and it is more reasonable to trace the name of the architect of the Pāṇḍavas to an Assyrian or Asura proficient in architecture.
But the question arises, if the Vedic Aryans were, as the Inscription shows, the neighbours of the Assyrians of the 15th century B.C., about what time did they migrate to India and settle in the land of the five rivers. If they took about 500 years to reach the latter country and began their Vedic culture, i.e., the composition of the hymns and the systematising of the sacrificial worship, after that period, the time that elapsed between this event and the rise of the Buddhism in the 6th century B.C. is too short for the innumerable incidents that marked the progress of the Indians from the Vedic stage to the Buddhistic stage. This objection is certainly of great weight and to meet it we must resort to the theory of Brunnhofer that all hymns were composed not in the Punjab; but Vedic poetry began when the Indian Aryans lived in a more northerly region. It is "the work of poets of North Iran from Caspian Sea to the Punjab." I should, however, correct this North Iran into North Mesopotamia or the region thereabouts. If my derivation of the word Asura from the name of the inhabitants of Assyria is correct, the Aryans must have lived in their neighbourhood for a very long period, since the whole literature from the latest portion of the Samhítas and the subsequent literature is full of Asuras and incidents connected with them, showing that they had made a strong, indelible impression on the mind of the Aryans. The Vedic Rṣis cannot be considered to have been in a condition of literary inactivity during their wanderings from their original home, wherever it was, and suddenly thrown into a literary mood after they reached the Punjab. The object of those who collected those hymns into the ten Manadalas of the Rg-Veda and the twenty Kāṇḍas of the Atharva-veda was to look for any piece of composition existing in any corner of the Aryan country or in any family; and comparative antiquity of composition was not taken into consideration in arranging them, but other principles such as identity of the deity and the number of verses were resorted to in forming the present collection. The ten Manadalas and the twenty Kāṇḍas, therefore, may very well be taken as comprising
all the hymns and stanzas composed since the the time the Aryans lived in their original home, whether in the North of Mesopotamia or elsewhere and went on wandering until they settled in the land of the five rivers. By the middle of the 15th century B. C., the Indian Aryans had progressed so far in the development of their religion as to conceive of five deities, one single and four arranged in groups of two each. These groups along with the grammatical forms of the names are exactly as they exist in Rg-Veda. A great deal of hymnal literature must have gathered round those names by that time; and its origin may with Brunnhofer be pushed back to about 2500 B. C.

The question remains whether the Indian Aryans settled in the Punjab before the date of the Inscription or afterwards. The Aryans appear in India as divided into a number of tribes. Some tribes may have migrated before the 15th century B. C., but those who lived in the neighbourhood of Assyria must have gone afterwards. But that they did go is unquestionable. For they preserved the memory of their struggles with the Asuras who are compared to the Dasyus of India and of such other points about them as have already been detailed. Their memory, however, of the Asurya-Loka was certainly not agreeable to them. For they speak of it as enveloped in stark darkness to which those who commit suicides are sent. The Mādhyanandina Recension of the Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad condemns the ignorant to those regions and that of the Kāṇvas forgets that it was the Asura country and gives its general character only by calling it Anandāḥ or the joyless country.

I have thus simply indicated a new line of research. To work it out fully by comparing all the necessary passages in the

1. See the verse referred to above from the Isāvasyopaniṣad.
3. IV.4.11,
Vedic literature and also comparing what we find therein with what the Assyriologists have to tell us, is a task that at my age with my eyesight considerably impaired, is beyond my power. It will, of course, be taken up, if found to be a sound and promising line of research, by intelligent and accurate scholars, who, I see, are coming forward and who will maintain our reputation for critical scholarship and will carry on the work of research amongst us in a manner to win the appreciation of the great scholars of the West.1

1. The above constitutes in a somewhat expanded form the observations I made at a meeting of the Poona Literary and Philosophical Club held on the 15th August 1917, in connection with the paper read by Dr, S. K. Belvalkar on "Devas and Asuras."
PĀṆINI AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF AFGHANISTAN AND THE PANJAB.

[From the Indian Antiquary, Volume I, 1872, pp. 21 ff.]

The chief native authorities for ancient Indian geography, hitherto made use of by Antiquarians, are the Purāṇas and the Itihāsas. But there is another, and a very important one, which is not frequently referred to. The great Grammarian Pāṇini and his commentators, often give very useful information in cases where the Purāṇas and the Itihāsas afford no hint. We propose in the following remarks to show by examples, what use may be made of in this branch of Sanskrit literature, in illustrating the ancient geography of India.

In teaching the formation of the names of places and of the inhabitants thereof, Pāṇini, as is usual with him, gives general rules where possible; and where not, he groups together certain names, in which the grammatical peculiarity is the same. These groups are distinguished from each other by the name of the first in the list, with an expression which is equivalent to 'and others' added to it. In the body of the work, the names of the groups so formed, and the grammatical or etymological changes characteristic of them, are only given, while the words constituting each group are set forth, in what may be considered as an appendix to the work, called Gana-Pāṭha. Instances of the general rules are given by the commentators, but they are not, on that account, to be considered as recent. There is internal evidence to show that most of these must have been handed down from the time of Pāṇini himself. A good many are given by Patañjali, the author of the great commentary on Pāṇini's work. On the other hand, all the words comprised in each group ought not, because the Gana-pāṭha is attributed to Pāṇini, to be regarded as having been laid down by him.

Several of the Gaṇas, or groups, are what are called Ākritigaṇas, i.e., such as each subsequent writer has the liberty of adding to;
and we have no doubt, that even such as are not now considered
to be of this nature, must have fared similarly at the hands of the
early successors of Pāṇini. For instance, the name of the
mediæval Kāthiawād town Valabhi, occurs at the end of the
group called Varanāḍī (Pāṇini IV. 2. 82) and of Ujjayinī, in the
same group, and also at the end of Dhūmāḍi (Pāṇini IV. 2. 127).
No one would, we believe, push his specticism, as to the age of
Pāṇini so far as to urge that this proves him to have flourished
after Valabhi came into importance under the dynasty of Bhā-
ṭārka. And if any one were to do so, it would not be difficult
to satisfy him. For, independently of the mass of evidence
hitherto brought forward to prove that Pāṇini flourished long
before the Christian Era, we may state that in the Copperplate
grant1 of Dharasena IV we find puns on a good many of the
technical terms of Pāṇini, and the great grammarian himself is
alluded to under the name of Śalāturiya, (native of Śalātura).
This shews that Pāṇini was at that time a person of established
reputation, and consequently, was even then an ancient author.
The groups or Gaṇas, therefore, seem to have been tampered
with by his successors, but we think we are safe in ascribing the
first three names at least, in each, to him.

The number of names of towns, villages, rivers, mountains,
and warlike tribes, occurring in the works of Pāṇini and his com-
mentators, is very large. It would be difficult, or even impos-
sible, to identify them all, but the positions and modern names
of a good many can be determined with ease. It is not our
purpose in this article to notice all such places, but to confine
ourselves to such as may seen to throw new light on some
doubtful points connected with the Ancient Geography of
Afghanistan and the Panjab.

The northernmost kingdom of Afghanistan, in ancient times,
was known to some of the Greek and Roman Geographers by
the name of Kapisene, and the Chinese traveller Hwan Thsang

calls it Kia-pi-she. Panini mentions Kāpiš (IV. 2. 99), from which he derives Kāpišāyanī, the name of a wine, manufactured from grapes, produced in the district. The country about Kabul is still remarkable for its fine grapes. The name of another kingdom was Archosia, which was called Arkhoj or Rokhaj by the Arab geographers, and Tsaukuta, supposed to be equivalent to Raukuta by Hwan Thsang. European antiquarians trace the name, or that of the river Archotis, in the province, to the Zend Haraqaiti, corresponding to the Sanskrit Sarasvati. But we are not aware upon what evidence a river of the name of Sarasvati is fixed in this district. Sarasvati is one of the Sapta Sindhavah, or seven rivers of the Vedas, and if assigned a position here, would certainly be far away from the other six. The river Sarasvati was situated to the east of the Sutlej. Perhaps the name Archosia, Arkhoj, or Rokhoj, is to be derived from that of the mountain Riksoda, mentioned by Panini’s commentators, the Brahmans living about which, were called Ārkṣodas. This name is given as one to which Panini’s rule (IV. 3. 91) does not apply.

Another province of Afghanistan is called Fa-la-nu by Hwan Thsang, and identified with the modern Vaneh or Wanneh by some, and with Bannu by General Cunningham. The Sanskrit name corresponding to this is not known. Panini, however, mentions a country named Varṇu in several places (IV. 2. 103, and IV. 3. 93), which is very likely the same as Hwan Thsang’s Fa-la-nu. The country of Gandhāra is mentioned in the group Kacchhādi IV. 2. 133 and in IV. 1. 169, and the river Suvāstu, the modern Swat, a branch of the Kabul river, in IV. 2. 77.

The position of the hill-fort of Aornos, in the capture of which, Alexander the Great displayed very great valour, is still a matter of uncertainty. The Sanskrit name corresponding to it is also equally unknown. Professor Wilson traces it to the word Āvaraṇa, ‘enclosure,’ which, he thinks, forms the latter part of

1. See Wilson’s Ariana Antiqua.
many names of cities. Whether it was actually so used, is more than doubtful, and it would be necessary to suppose that the Greeks in their Aornos dropped the first part of the name, retaining only the latter. General Cunningham derives it from the name of a king, whom he calls Rāją-Varā. May it not be the Varānā mentioned by Pāṇini in IV. 2. 82? It was the name of a city as well as its people. There is a place on the right bank of the Indus, opposite to Attak, still called, we are told, Baranas or Varanas.

The Ortospan of the classical geographers has been identified with the modern Kabul. The Sanskrit name corresponding to it is not known. Professor Wilson derives it from such an original as Ürddhasthanā. But we do not meet with such a name, and the etymology is purely aimless and conjectural. To derive it from the name of a tribe would be more reasonable. Hwan-Thsang calls the country about the place Fo-li-shi-sa-tang-na. May not this name be derived from such a compound as Parsu-sthāna, the country of the Parsus, a warlike tribe mentioned by Pāṇini in V. 3. 117?

Pāṇini and Patañjali call the Panjab, Bāhlika (IV. 2. 117 and V. 3. 114). The historians of Alexander tell us, that after having crossed the Hydraotes or Rāvi, in the course of his march through the Panjab, he captured and destroyed a town of the name of Saṅgala. European antiquarians have identified it with the Sanskrit Śākala. But Śākala, from the evidence to be gathered from the Mahābhārata, and according to Hwan Thsang, who visited the place, was situated to the west of the Rāvi. Professor Wilson, therefore thinks, that after Alexander had destroyed the Śākala to the east of the Rāvi, another was founded to the west of the river. This is merely a gratuitous supposition. General Cunningham thinks that Alexander re-crossed the Rāvi to conquer the town. Would it not be better to suppose that the two places were distinct? Alexander destroyed Saṅgala, while Śākala existed in the time of Hwan Thsang. Saṅgala belonged to a tribe that had no King, while Śākala was the capital

of the Madras, who were governed by a king. Sangala is very probably to be traced to Saṅkala, a place mentioned by Panini in IV. 2. 75. Saṅkala was the name of the person who is said to have founded the city. It stands at the head of the group Saṅkalādi, the second name in which is Puškala, from whom the city of Pauṅkala, the ancient capital of Gāndhāra, [and the Peukalas of the ancient European geographers, derived its name. Saṅkala agrees more closely with Saṅgala than Śākala. If this identification is to be trusted, the occurrence of the name of Saṅgala in Panini may be taken as a proof of his having flourished before Alexander; for the Macedonian conqueror is said to have destroyed the city, on which account it must have ceased to exist after him.

The central province of the Panjab is called Pa-la-fa-to by Hwan Thsang, transcribed Parvata by M. Julien. General Cunningham proposes Sorvata for Parvata. But Parvata is given as the name of a country by Panini, IV. 2. 143 and in the group Takṣaśilādi, under IV. 3.93.

In the central and lower Panjab, Alexander met with two tribes of warriors, named the Malii and the Oxydrakae. The Sanskrit original of the former is unknown; and Professor Wilson identifies the latter with the Śūdrakas of the Purāṇas. But there is a rule in Panini V. 3. 114 which teaches us to form the singular and dual of the names of warlike tribes in the Panjab, by adding the termination -Ya and changing the vowel of the first syllable to its Vṛddhi. Of this rule, his commentators give Mālavas (pl. Mālavas) and Kṣaudrakyas (pl. Kṣudrakas) as instances. We thus learn that the Mālavas and Kṣaudrakas were two tribes of warriors in the Panjab. The name Mālavas corresponds with Malii, and Kṣudrakas with Oxydrakae. Kṣudrakas is nearer to the latter than Professor Wilson's Śūdrakas.

At the confluence of the Panjab rivers, Alexander came in contact with a tribe which is called Sambracaē or Sabrae. General Cunningham traces this name to Samvāgrī, which he
SAUBHREYAS, YAUDHEYAS &c.

considers a Sanskrit word. But we are not aware of the existence of such a word; and it has an unsanskrit look about it, meaning as it does, according to the General, 'united warriors.' The Sabracæ were probably the Šaubhreyas, grouped along with the Yaudheyas, in V. 3. 117.
ON THE DATE OF PATAÑJALI AND THE KING IN WHOSE REIGN HE LIVED

[ FROM THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY, VOLUME I, 1872, PP. 290ff. ]

In Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya or great commentary on Pāṇini, a rule ( Vartika ) laid down by Kātyāyana, is given, teaching that the Imperfect should be used to signify an action not witnessed by the speaker but capable of being witnessed by him and known to people in general. Of this rule Patañjali gives two instances: "The Yavana besieged [ Arunat ] Sāketa", and "The Yavana besieged [ Arunat ] the Mādhyaṃikas." The siege of Sāketa, therefore, must be considered to have been an event capable of being witnessed by the speaker, i.e., by Patañjali himself; in other words, some Yavana king must have besieged Sāketa in Patañjali's time. Sāketa is the usual name for Ayodhya. Reasoning in this way, the late Prof. Goldstücker arrived at the conclusion that the Yavana here spoken of must have been Menandros, King of Bactria, who is said to have pushed his conquests in India to the river Yamunā. Menandros, according to Prof. Lassen, became king about 144 B. C. Patañjali therefore must have lived about that time.

But there is another passage in Patañjali not noticed by Prof. Goldstücker, in which the name of the king of Pātaliputra, during whose reign he flourished, is given, and which enables us to arrive at the date of the author of the Mahābhāṣya in another way and from other data. In his remarks on Pāṇini, III. 2. 123, Patañjali quotes a Vartika of Kātyāyana, the meaning of which is: "A rule should be made teaching the use of the present tense [ Lat ] to denote an action or undertaking which has been begun but not finished." The examples given by Patañjali are:—"Here we study;" "Here we dwell;" "Here we perform (as priests) the sacrifices (instituted) by Puṣpamitra." Then Patañjali asks:—"How is it that Pāṇini's rule III. 2. 123,

(Vartamane lat), which teaches that the present tense should be used to denote present time, does not extend to these cases?"
The answer is: "The time here involved is not present time."
How not? This question is answered by Kaiyata, whose gloss upon this runs as follows:—"The phrase 'here we study' means that study has begun but not ended. When the students, being engaged in dining and doing such other things, do not study, they cannot then properly say 'we study' [according to Pāṇini III. 2. 123, i.e., they cannot use the present tense, for it is not study that is then going on, and consequently the time is not present;] hence the rule by Kātyāyana.”

The sense of the whole is, that when an action, such as that of studying or performing the great sacrifices, spreads over many days, the present tense should be used to denote it, if the action has begun but not ended, even though at the time of speaking the speaker may not be actually performing the action. “Here we sacrifice for Puṣpamitra,” is Patañjali’s example. Now this cannot be an imaginary instance, for such a one would not bring out the distinctive sense that Patañjali wishes to convey, namely, that the action has begun but not ended. This example, then, expresses a fact; namely that, at the time Patañjali wrote, there lived a person named Puṣpamitra, and a great sacrifice was being performed for him and under his orders. If he employed priests to perform the great sacrifices for him, he must have been a king, for in the olden days, it was Indian kings that propitiated the gods and patronized the Brahmans in this way. The sacrifices were always expensive, and were treated rather as extraordinary festivals than ordinary religious performances. But in another

1. Pāṇini: वर्तमाने लघु III.2.123; Kātyāyana: प्रवृत्तस्थितिमेण शिष्या भवन्य-दर्मात्मातु। Patañjali: प्रवृत्तस्थितिमेण शासितिव्या भवन्ति। इच्छामिहे। इह वसाम्। इह पुष्पमित्रे याज्ञाम्। किं पुनः कारण न सिद्धाति। अवतर्नमात्मातु। Kaiyata: प्रवृत्तस्थिति। इच्छायथ इत्यथय्यने प्रवृत्त पराध्यं न च तद्विरुतम्। यद्य च भोजनादिनः किं भुवेनातो तथावते तद्यथायमहि इति प्रयोगो न प्रामोद्यति वचनम्। Patañjali then proceeds to say that the sense is conveyed by Pāṇini III.2.123 and no new rule is required; but this has no bearing on the present question,
part of the Mahābhāṣya, we are actually told who this Puṣpa­mitra was. Pāṇini in I. i. 68 tells us that any grammatical change or operation that he may have in his work prescribed in the case of a certain word ought to be made applicable to that word alone and not to what it signifies, or to its synonyms. This, however, does not hold in the case of his own technical terms. Thus, for instance, to form derivatives in a certain sense from the word Agni (fire) the termination Eya should, he says, be applied to Agni. The meaning of this rule should not be stretched so as to make it applicable not only to Agni, but to other words also having the sense of Agni. Vahni for instance also means fire, but does not take that termination. But in the case of the technical terms of grammar, the change or operation should be effected in the case of the things (which of course are words) signified by that term. Thus, for instance, when he tells us to apply a certain termination to Ghu, it is to be applied, not to Ghu itself, but to the roots to which the name Ghu is given by him. Now Patañjali, after a long discussion of this rule, in the course of which he shows that it is not wanted, though out of respect for the great Acārya he does not distinctly say so, tells us that there are some Sūtras in which the rules given are applicable:—1, sometimes to the synonyms of the words:—2, sometimes to the individuals comprised under the species denoted by the word:—3, sometimes to the words alone, and, sometimes to any two of these three. In these cases some indicatory letters ought, he says, to be attached to the words to show to which, or to which two, of the three categories the rule is to be applied. Then in such rules as II. 4. 23, which teaches that a Tatpuruṣa compound ending in the word Sabhā (court or assembly) preceded by Rājan (king) becomes neuter, he tells us that J should be attached to Rājan and others, to show that the rule is applicable only to the synonyms of Rājan and others, and not to Rājan or others themselves, or to the individuals comprised under the species denoted by Rājan and others. And the instance he gives to show that it is not applicable to
individual Rājas or kings are Puspamitrasabhā (the assembly or court of Puspamitra) and Candragupta-sabhā (the assembly or court of Candragupta) in which we see that the compound is not neuter but feminine. We thus come to the conclusion that Puspamitra was the name of a king.

Now, we know that the most powerful kingdom during a few centuries before Christ, the sovereigns of which extended their sway over a large portion of India, was that of Magadha, the capital of which was Pataliputra. And Patañjali so often speaks of this city in his work that we must infer that he had a great deal to do with Pataliputra, and perhaps lived there for sometime, and that on that account the city and things concerning it were uppermost in his thoughts. The Pusmapitram then that he speaks of, in the two cases here pointed out, must have been king of Pataliputra in his time. And the fact of his being mentioned along with Candragupta in one of the two cases strengthens this inference. For Candragupta the Maurya was king of Magadha, and there was no Candragupta till several centuries afterwards when the Gupta dynasty came into power.

Now looking into the Purāṇas we find that there was only one king of Magadha of the name of Pusmapitra, the founder of the Śunga dynasty, which succeeded the Mauryas. He was the

1. Patañjali: जित्यायवचनस्येव राजायथम्। जित्यायवचनस्येव ग्रहण्य भवति। कि पशोनम्। राजायथम्। समा राजामन्नुथययायां। इनसमसू। इववसतसमू। तरथो न भवति। राजसभा। तत्त्वोर्षणां च न भवति। पुर्ण-मित्रसमा। चढ़न्यसमा।

2. See amongst others his comments on I. 3-2, II. 1.16, II. 3.28, III. 3.134, and 136 and V. 3.57. In the second of these, one of the examples given is अनुशोषण पातलिपुत्रम्। 'Pataliputra was situated on the banks of the Sona.'

3. And I may say that the Purāṇas do not mention another king of the same name of any country whatever. The name Pusmapitra does occur elsewhere, but in that case there is no agreement among the Purāṇas. The Viṣṇu and the Vaiyu Purāṇas make it the name of a dynasty, and according to the former it was a Bāhlika or foreign dynasty. The Bhūgavata only mentions it as the name of an individual; but this
Commander-in-Chief of Brhadratha, the last Maurya king, and Purāṇa, from the manner in which it has corrupted several names and some facts, is not much to be depended on. See Wilson, Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, 1st edition, p. 478.

This Puspamitra is spoken of in the Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa. Prof. Wilson calls him a general, and Prof. Lassen the general of his son, who is represented in the drama as the king of Vidiśā. Prof. Lassen, Ind. Alterthumsk. (vol. II. p. 271 and 346) is constrained however by other evidence to admit that he was king; but he thinks he reigned at Vidiśā, and that his son was co-regent with him. Prof. Wilson supposes that he usurped the throne for his son rather than for himself. But the first portion of the passage on which they seem to base their conclusions is thus:—Devasya senāpatēḥ Puspamitrasya sakṣat lekhah śūcīḥ. Professor Lassen understands this to mean “a letter has been received from Puspamitra, the general of the lord (i.e. Agnimitra).” But who ever heard of a father being Commander-in-Chief to his son? And immediately after, Puspamitra is represented as about to perform an Aśvamedha sacrifice, which none but kings who pretended to paramount supremacy could institute. In other authorities also it is Puspamitra that appears as the conqueror or usurper and not his son. Puspamitra therefore could not have been his son’s general; nor does Kālidāsa say that he was. Agnimitra’s commander-in-chief was Virasena, to whom he is more than once represented in the play as issuing orders. The words above quoted are to be thus interpreted:—“A letter has been received from the Lord Senāpati (general), Puspamitra” i.e., the genitive Devasya ought to be taken as an epithet of Puspamitra, and not as connected with or governed by Senāpati. Indeed the title Deva shows that Puspamitra was king, for it is applied in the dramatic works to kings only, and there is even a rule to this effect (See Dr. Hall’s Daśarūpa, p. 109: Devah svāmītṛī nrpatiḥ). And Senāpati (general) must have become a distinguishing epithet of Puspamitra, for he was the general of Brhadratha, the last Maurya king. And even in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, the epithet Senāpati seems to have been applied to him somewhat in this way:—“Tataḥ Puspamitrāḥ Senāpatiḥ Śvāminam hatvā rājyam kariṣyati.” The first two kings of the Valabhi dynasty in Surāṭṣṭra were called Senāpatis; nor does it follow from this passage that Vidiśā was the capital of Puspamitra, but rather the opposite. For, in the letter which he sends to Agnimitra, he invites the latter to come with his wife to be present at the Aśvamedha sacrifice. If Vidiśā had been his capital, the sacrifice would have been performed at that city, and no such invitation would have been necessary. It follows, therefore, that some other city was Puspamitra’s capital, and what other could it have been but Pāfaliputra, the capital of the Mauryas whom he had supplanted, and which in the Buddhistic account given by M. Burnouf is mentioned as his place of residence?
PATAṆJALI’S PROBABLE TIME

usurped the throne after having killed his master.1 The ten Mauryas are said to have ruled the kingdom for 137 years.2 The accession of Candragupta, the first of these ten, has been fixed about 315 B.C. Puspamitra, therefore, must have raised himself to the throne about 178 B.C. The Matsya Purāṇa assigns him a reign of 36 years, i.e., from 178 B.C. to 142 B.C. It follows then that Patañjali wrote his comments on Pañini III. 2. 123 some time between these limits. The limits assigned by Dr. Goldstucker, reasoning from the one example he considers, are 140 and 120 B.C. But there is apparently no reason why he should not take into account the earlier years of Menandros’s reign. For, according to Prof. Lassen, Menandros must have become king about 144 B.C.4 The passage in the Mahābhāṣya, Agnimitra his son may probably have been appointed by him Governor or King of Vidiśā, while he himself reigned as supreme monarch at Pātali-putra; for the practice of appointing sons to govern remote provinces existed in the time of the Mauryas. May not Patañjali be alluding to this Āsvamedha sacrifice in the instance quoted in the text? 1. The Buddhist Aśoka-Avadāna erroneously makes him the successor of Pusyadharman, and the last, of the Mauryas. See Burnouf, Introd. à la Hist. du Bud. I. p. 432; Lassen, Ind. Alt. II. pp. 271, 272, 345, 346. —This last is a Note by the Editor of the Indian Antiquary 1872 —[N. B. U.] 2. Vis. Pur. VI. 24, or Wilson’s translation. 3. Wilson’s Vis. P. 1st Edn. p. 471. The Brahmanda Purāṇa agrees with the Mātysya: See Dr. Hall’s note in his edition. 4. Various dates have been assigned to the accession of Menandros from B.C. 200 to B.C. 126. But the facts here brought forward may be used as a corrective. The manner in which Patañjali (in the passage alluded to in the next para of the text) contrasts the times in which the Mauryas lived with his own shews that when he wrote, the new polity had completely superseded the old. This may have taken twenty years or more. He could not have said “the Mauryas did such and such a thing but in these days it is not so,” if he wrote only five or six years after they were displaced. Patañjali therefore may have written the passage as early as B.C. 158. Now in order that about this time Puspamitra and Menandros should be contemporaries, it is necessary that the date of the accession of the latter should not be pushed higher than about 175 B.C. nor lower than 142 B.C., for Menandros reigned for about 20 years according to all the writers; and only the two dates that fall within these limits are those assigned by Gen. Cunningham (B.C. 160) and Prof. Lassen. If we take that of the former, the limits between which the third chapter of the Mahābhāṣya was written will be about 158 and 142 B.C. But I have adopted Prof. Lassen’s date as it agrees sufficiently with all the facts.

on which I base my conclusion, is not far from the one noticed by Dr. Goldstücker. The latter occurs in the comments on III. 2. 111, while the former in those on III. 2. 123. We thus see that when this portion of the Bhāṣya was written, a Yavana king (who must have been Menandros) had laid seige to Sāketa or Ayodhya, and Puspmitra was reigning at Pataliputra; and if we adhere to Lassen's chronology these two things could have happened only between 144 B.C. and 142 B.C.; for there is, I think, no reason to distrust the chronology of the Purāṇas here, since the date arrived at from the statements contained in them coincide in a remarkable degree with that determined from the evidence of coins. And even supposing that Prof. Lassen's date is not quite accurate, it must be admitted that it cannot be very far wrong.

We thus see that Patanjali lived in the reign of Puspmitra, and that he probably wrote the third chapter of his Bhāṣya between 144 B.C. and 142 B.C. And this agrees with the conclusion drawn by Prof. Goldstücker from a statement in another part of the work that the author of the Mahābhāṣya flourished after the Maurya dynasty was extinct. Since all the passages, then, and the different historical events they point to, lead us to about the same period, the date of Patanjali so derived must be regarded as trustworthy, and in the History of Sanskrit Literature, it is of great importance.
A NOTE ON PROFESSOR WEBER'S LETTER

[From the Indian Antiquary, Volume II, 1873, pp. 59-61].

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar read in manuscript Professor Weber's remarks on certain points regarding Puspamitra, Patanjali &c. the following is Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's reply to the same. [N. B. U.]

Through the courtesy of the editor of the Indian Antiquary, I have been permitted to see Professor Weber's letter, which contains notices of my article on the Date of Patanjali, and of my paper on the Age of the Mahābhārata. This is not the first time the Professor has been so kind to me. One of my humble productions he has deemed worthy of a place in his Indische Studien.1 While, therefore, I am thankful to him for these favours, I feel bound to consider his remarks on my articles, and to reply to them.

Professor Weber thinks it a pity that I should not have been acquainted with his Critique on Dr. Goldstücker's Panini. I hardly share in his regret, because the facts which I have brought forward are new, and my conclusions are not affected by anything he has said in the Review. He certainly brought to notice, in that Critique (as I now learn), the occurrence in Patanjali of the expression "Puspamitra-Sabhā."2 But Professor Weber will see that my argument is not at all based on that passage. I simply quoted it to show that even Patanjali tells us that the Puspamitra he speaks of in another place was a king, and not an ordinary individual or an imaginary person. My reasoning in the article in question is based on the words "Iha Puspamitraṃ yājayamaḥ." This is given by Patanjali as an instance of the Varttika, which teaches that the present tense (Lat) should be

1. The paper is printed in this volume later. [N. B. U.]

2. By the way, I prefer the form 'Puspamitra' to "Puṣyamitra" as the latter appears to me to be a mislektion for the former, which might easily occur, य-‘p’- being often by careless scribes written as य-‘y’.
used to denote an action which has begun but not ended. Now this passage was noticed neither by Professor Weber nor by Dr. Goldstucker; and hence the trouble I gave to the Editor of the Antiquary. The passage enables us, I think, to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as to the date of Patañjali, since it shows that the author of the Mahābhāṣya flourished in the reign of Puspanītra. And the conclusion based on this and on one of the two instances pointed out by Dr. Goldstucker, viz., Arunad Yavanah Sāketam, agree so thoroughly with each other, that they can leave but little doubt on the mind of the reader as to the true date of Patañjali.

But I must consider Professor Weber's argument for bringing Patañjali down to about 25 after Christ. The two instances brought forward by Dr. Goldstucker contain the name Yavana; and a king of that generic name is spoken of as having besieged Sāketa, commonly understood to be Ayodhya. This name was applied most unquestionably, though not exclusively, to the Greek Kings of Bactria. The Yavanas are spoken of, in a Sanskrit astronomical work noticed by Dr. Kern, as having pushed their conquests up to Sāketa; and Bactrian Kings are also mentioned by some classical writers as having done the same. Looked at independently, this passage leads us to the conclusion arrived at Dr. Goldstucker, that is, it fixes the date of Patañjali at about 150 B.C. But the other instance contains in addition the name Mādhyamikas. The Buddhist school of that name is said to have been founded by Nagarjuna, who, according to the Rajatarangini, flourished in the reigns of Kaniska and Abhiratnagiri, that is, a few years after Christ. This instance then brings the author of the Mahābhāṣya to some period after Christ. Here then is a case resembling those which are frequently discussed by our Panditas, in which a Śruti and a Smṛti (or a Śruti and an inference) conflict with each other. The Brahmanical rule is that the Śruti must be understood in its natural sense, and the Smṛti so interpreted as to agree with it, that is, any sort of violence may be done to the Smṛti to bring it into conformity
WEBER'S FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS

With the Sruti, and the inference must be somehow explained away. Now, in the present case, Professor Weber's Sruti is the instance containing the name of the Madhyamikas. But the word Yavana, occurring in it and in the other instance, cannot be taken to apply to the Greek kings of Bactria, for the dynasty had become extinct a pretty long time before Christ. Professor Weber therefore thinks that by it is to be understood the Indo-Scythic king Kaniska, who reigned before Abhimanyu. But Kaniska cannot be regarded as having oppressed or persecuted the Madhyamikas, for he was himself a Buddhist. This objection is obviated by the Professor by the supposition that he must have persecuted them before he became one of them.

I must confess this argument appears to me to be very weak. It has many inherent improbabilities. In the first place, I do not see why the passage containing the name Madhyamika and the name itself should be regarded as so much more important than the other passage and the name Yavana. Why may we not rather take our stand on this latter name, and the mention of the conquests of the King so designated up to Saketa, and interpret the word Madhyamika by the light thus thrown upon it? And the passage I have brought forward is, I think, so decisive, and agrees so well with this statement, that some other explanation must be sought for of the name Madhyamika; but of this more hereafter. In the next place, we have to suppose that the most important period of Nagarjuna's life was passed in the reign of Kaniska, that he lived so long in that reign as to have founded a school, and that in that reign the sect assumed the name Madhyamika, and grew into such importance that its fame spread so far and wide, and that even Patañjali in the far east knew of it. From the words of Rajatarangini, however, it would appear that Nagarjuna and his disciples or school rose into importance in the reign of Abhimanyu, the successor of Kaniska; for the words are—"About that time (i.e., in the reign of Abhimanyu) the Baudhas, protected by the wise Nagar-
juna, the Bodhisattva, became predominant." And in the same reign, we are told in the history of Kashmir, that the Bhāṣya of Patañjali was introduced by Candrācārya and others in that country. In the Vākyapadiya also it is stated that in the course of time it came to pass that Patañjali's work was possessed only by the inhabitants of the Deccan, and that too only in books, i.e., it was not studied. Afterwards Candrācārya brought it into vogue. Now even supposing for a time that the Bhāṣya was written in the reign of Kaniṣka, i.e., about 25 A.D., fifteen or twenty years are too small a period for it to have come to be regarded as a work of authority, to have ceased to be studied, to have existed only in books in the South, and to have obtained such wide reputation as to be introduced into Kashmir, a place far distant from Patañjali's native country and from the Deccan. Even Professor Weber is staggered by the shortness of the interval; but instead of being thus led to call in question his theory or the soundness of his argument, he is inclined to doubt the authenticity of the texts brought forward by Dr. Goldstücker. Besides, he gives no evidence to show that the name Yavana was applied to Indo-Scythic kings. I am aware that at different periods of Indian history it was applied to different races; but this vague knowledge ought not to be sufficient to lead us to believe as a matter of fact that it was applied to these kings. And the generic name by which they were known to the author of the Rājatarāṅgini was Turuṣka. This name is not unknown to Sanskrit Literature, for it occurs even in such recent work as the Viśvagunādārśa, I cannot, therefore, believe that Patañjali could not have known it, if he really lived so late as in the time of those kings. And that Kaniṣka persecuted the Buddhists before he himself became convert, is a mere supposition, not supported by any reliable authority. Kaniṣka is also not mentioned anywhere as having carried his conquests upto Sāketa, while, as before observed, the Yavanas are mentioned by Hindu writers, and the Bactrian King by Greek authors, as having done so,
The truth is that the name “Mādhyamika” has been misunderstood both by Dr. Goldstücker and Prof. Weber; and hence, in giving Dr. Goldstücker’s argument in my article, I omitted the portion based on that name. The expression Aruṇād Yavano Mādhyamikām makes no sense, if we understand by the last word, the Buddhist school of that name. The root \( \sqrt{\text{rudh}} \) means “to besiege” or “blockade”; and the besieging or the blockading of a sect is something I cannot understand. Places are besieged or blockaded, but not sects. I am aware that Professor Weber translates this verb by a word which in English means “to oppress”; but I am not aware that the root is ever used in that sense. By the word “Mādhyamika” is to be understood the people of a certain place, as Dr. Kern has pointed out in his preface to his edition of the Brhat-Saṁhitā, on the authority of the Saṁhitā itself. We are thus saved the necessity of making a string of very improbable suppositions; and in this way Professor Weber’s argument, based as it is on the hypothesis that the Mādhyamikas alluded to by Patañjali were the Buddhist sect of that name, falls to the ground. The first of Dr. Goldstücker’s passages (the word “Yavana” occuring in both of them), and the passage I have for the first time pointed out, taken together, determine the date of Patañjali to be about 144 B.C. And this agrees better with the other passages pointed out by Dr. Goldstücker. For, if Patañjali lived in the reign of the Śuṅga dynasty, one can understand why the Mauryas and their founder should have been uppermost in his thoughts; but if he lived in 25 A.D., when the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty was in power, one may well ask why he should have gone back for illustrating his rules to the Mauryas and Candra-gupta, and passed over the intermediate dynasties of the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas.

As to my paper on the Age of the Mahābhārata, I have to observe that it was written with a certain purpose. Colonel Ellis, going upon the authority of the Gowja Agrahāra grant,
translated by Colebrook in 1806, and again by Mr. Narasimmiyengar in Part II of the Indian Antiquary, had referred the composition of the Mahâbhârata to a period subsequent to 1521 A.D., and had asked the Asiatic Society of Bombay to make inquiries as to whether the ashes of the Sarpa-Sattra instituted by Janamejaya could be found by digging for them at Anagundi, with which the Colonel identified Hastinâpura; and whether the remains of the palace, in which Bharata, the son of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalâ, was crowned, were observable at the place. My object, therefore, was to show that the Mahâbhârata was far more ancient, and that it existed at and before all, the well-ascertained dates in Sanskrit Literature. It was not meant to collect all possible evidence, whether certain or doubtful, for the existence of the poem. Had I thought of doing so, it would have taken me much longer time than I could spare; and some of the books to which it would have been necessary to refer were also wanting. I have not even brought together all the passages bearing on the point to be found in Patañjali’s work. But I am content for the present to leave the task to the well-known industry and acuteness of Prof. Weber.
Since I wrote last on the subject, I have discovered a third passage in the Mahābhāṣya in which Puṣpamitra is spoken of. Pāṇini in III. 1. 26, teaches that the termination Aya, technically called Ni, should be applied to a root when the action of causing something to be done is implied. Upon this, the author of the Vārtikas observes that a rule should be made to provide for the use of the causal and primitive forms in the uninverted or the usual order in the case of the roots Yaj and others. This Patañjali explains thus:—"Puṣpamitra sacrifices (Yajate), and the sacrificing priests cause him to sacrifice (i.e., to be the sacrificer by performing the ceremonies for him). This is the usual or uninverted order of using the forms. But by Pāṇini's rule, the order ought to be 'Puṣpamitra causes (the priests) to sacrifice, and the priests sacrifice.' This objection is removed by the author of the Vārtikas himself, by saying that the root Yaj signifies several actions, the usual or uninverted order is provided for, and no new rule is necessary. How it is so, Patañjali tells us as follows:—"Yaj denotes several actions. It does not necessarily signify the throwing of the oblations into the fire, but also giving money, or providing the means of the sacrifice. For instance, they say 'O! how well he sacrifices,' in the case of one who provides the means properly. That providing of the means, or giving money, is done by Puṣpamitra, and the sacrificing priests cause him so to provide or so to become the sacrificer. In this sense, then, Puṣpamitra sacrifices (Yajate), and the priests cause him to perform it (Yajayanti.)" This is the uninverted or the usual order. In the sense of throwing the oblations into the fire, the other is the correct order.¹

¹ Pāṇini III.1.26:—Kātyāyana: यज्ञाधिष्ठु चाविपर्याप्तः। Patañjali: यज्ञाधिष्ठु चाविपर्याप्तो वश्च्य: पुष्पमित्रो जन्ते भाज्यः भाजयस्तीति। तत्र भविष्य वृष्ण: 16 [R. G. Bhandarkar's Works, Vol. I.]
In this instance we see Patanjali speaks of the sacrifices of Puṣpamitra as if he were familiar with them; and by itself this passage shows that he could not have lived long after him, certainly not so long as 175 years after, as Prof. Weber makes out. But the other instance pointed out on page 300 Volume I of the Antiquary, in which his sacrifices are spoken of as if going on, shows that he lived in Puṣpamitra’s time. The three passages, then, in which his name occurs are perfectly consistent with, and confirm, each other.

(II) Patanjali’s native place

Indian tradition makes the author of the Mahābhāṣya, a native of a country called Gonarda, which is spoken of by the grammarians as an eastern country. The Matsya-Purāṇa also enumerates it amongst the countries in that direction. The position of Patanjali’s native place, whether it was Gonarda or some other, can, I think, be pretty definitely fixed by means of certain passages in his work. In his comments on Pāṇini III. 3. 136, the two following passages occur: (1)-Yoyam adhva gata à Pātaliputratāsyayadavaraṁ Sāketat—‘Of the distance or path from Pātaliputra which has been traversed [such a thing was done in ] that part of it which is on this side of Sāketa;’ and (2) Yoyam adhva à Pātaliputrad gantavyas tasya yat param Sāketat—‘Of the distance or path up to Pātaliputra which is to be traversed [something will be done in ] that portion which lies on that side of Sāketa.’ In these two instances we see that the limit of the distance is Pātaliputra, and that it is divided into two parts, one of which is on this side of Sāketa, and the other on that. Sāketa, then, must be in the middle, i. e., on the way from the place represented by ‘this ’ in the expression ‘this side,’ to Pātaliputra.

1. I omit the grammatical details of this as not necessary.
putra. This place must be that where Patañjali speaks or writes; and it must, we see, be in the line connecting Sāketa and Pātaliputra on the side of it remote from Pātaliputra. The bearing of Oudh from Pātnā is north-west by west; Patañjali’s native place, therefore, must have been somewhere to the north-west by west of Oudh. Prof. Weber thinks he lived to the east of Pātaliputra; but of this I have spoken elsewhere.

Let us now see whether the information thus gathered can be brought into harmony with the tradition mentioned above. The exact position of Gonarda is not known; but if it really was Patañjali’s country, it must have been situated somewhere to the north or north-west of Oudh. Now, there is a district whereabouts which is known by the name of Gonda, and there is also a town of that name about 20 miles to the north-west of Oudh. According to the usual rules of corruption, Sanskrit rda (ṛ) is in the Prakrits corrupted to ḍḍa (ḍ), but sometimes also it is changed to ḍḍa (ḍḍ). Gonarda, therefore, must in the Prakrit assume the form Gonaḍḍa. Hasty pronunciation elides the A, and, in the later stages of the development of the Prakrits, one of the two similar consonants is rejected. The form is thus reduced to Gonda, which is the way in which it is now pronounced. General Cunningham derives Gonda from Gauda. But, so far as I am aware, there are no instances of the insertion of a nasal in a Prakrit word, when it does not exist in the corresponding Sanskrit one. It appears, therefore, very probable that the district of Gonda in Oudh was the ancient Gonarda, and had the honour of giving birth to the great author of the Mahābhāṣya.

(III) The native country of Kātyāyana.

Prof. Weber is of opinion that Kātyāyana was one of the eastern grammarians, and Dr. Goldstücker agrees with him. But it is a question whether the distinction between Northern

1 VararucT’s Prāktaprakāśa, III. 26.
or eastern grammarians, which Pāṇini mentions, really existed in the time of Kātyāyana. But to whatever school of grammarians he may have belonged, supposing such schools existed in his time, it appears, from a passage in the Mahābhāṣya, that the author of the Vārtikas was a Dākṣiṇātya, i. e., a native of the South or the Deccan. In the introduction to the Mahābhāṣya occurs a passage, the sense of which is this:—"If a man, who wishes to express his thoughts, does so by using some words or other simply from his acquaintance with the usage of the world, what is the use of grammar? The object of grammar is to restrict the liberty of speech in such a manner that religious good may arise from it; just as is done in the affairs of the world and in matters concerning the Vedas. In the world we find people saying 'A domesticated cock should not be eaten.' Things are eaten for the satisfaction of hunger. Hunger, however, can be satisfied even by eating dog's flesh, and such other things. But then though it is so, a restraint is put on us, and we are told such a thing is eatable and such a thing is uneatable. * * * In the same manner, while one is able to express his thoughts equally by correct or incorrect words, what grammar does is to restrict him to the use of correct words, in order that religious good may arise from it."

Now, this is Patañjali's explanation of two Vārtikas, the latter of which is: Yatha laukikavaidikeshu, i. e., 'as in the world and in the Veda.' On this Patañjali's remark is: Priya-taddhita Dākṣiṇātyāḥ Yatha loke vede cete pravoktavye yathā laukika-vaidikeśviti prayuṣijate, i. e., the Dākṣiṇātyas, i. e. people of the South or the Deccan, are fond of using (words with) Taddhita affixes, that is, instead of saying Yathā laukika-vaidikesu" (i. e., instead of using the words Loka and Veda, they use derivatives from them, formed by affixing the termination Ika.). This clearly means that Kātyāyana, the author of the Vārtika in which the words Laukika and Vaidika occur, was a Dākṣiṇātya.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF PATANJALI

[FROM THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY, VOL. II, 1873, p 94 ff.]

In the extract from Prof. Weber's critique on Dr. Goldstücker, given in the Indian Antiquary vol. II. p. 61, there are several points, besides the main one I took up which require notice. From the passage about the Mauryas quoted by Dr. Goldstücker, Prof. Weber infers that Panini, in making his rule V. 3, 99, had in his eye such images as those that had come down from the Mauryas. How the passage supports such an inference, I am at a loss to see. Pāṇini in that Sūtra tells us that the termination Ka applied to the names of objects, in the sense of images of those objects, is dropped in cases when the images enable one to earn his livelihood, but are not saleable. Upon this Patañjali observes that, because the word—'un-saleable' is used, such forms as Śivah, Skandah, and Viśākhaḥ (in which the termination Ka is dropped) are not valid. Why not? Because the Mauryas, desirous of obtaining gold, used, or applied, to their purpose, i.e., sold, objects of worship. Since, then, these (viz., images of Śiva, &c.) were sold by them, they were Panya, or 'saleable,' and hence the termination Ka should not be dropped. It may not be dropped in those cases (i.e., the proper forms must be Śivaka, &c.), says Patañjali, but it is dropped in the case of those images which are now used for worship.—This interpretation of the passage is consistent and proper. Prof. Weber understands it to mean, that the only cases in which the rule about the dropping of the termination does not apply, are those of images with which the Mauryas were concerned. But that it is inapplicable to all images that are saleable, is clear from the passage itself, and the two commentaries on it. Kaiyāṭa distinctly says that the rule does not

1. The reading in the Benares edition is Arcyḥ, and not Arcyḥ.
apply to those that are sold, and gives Śivakān Vikrini-te as an instance. What Patañjali means to say is that the termination Ka should be applied to the names of the images sold by the Mauryas, according to Pānini's rule; but the rule is set aside in this case, and the wrong forms Śiva, Skanda, and Viṣākha are used. Nagojibhaṭṭa expressly states:—Tatra pratyaya- śravanam istameveti vadan sūtrasyodāharanaṁ darśayati: (i.e., Saying that the use of the termination there is necessary, he points out an instance of the rule). Now, in all this there is not only nothing to show that Pānini had the images sold by the Mauryas in view, but that the names of those images violate his rule. Dr. Goldstücker's interpretation of this passage is also not correct.

In the next place, Prof. Weber thinks that the word Ācārya in such expressions as Paśyati tvācāryaḥ, occurring in the Mahābhaṣya, applies to Patañjali. It appears to me that Prof. Weber has overlooked the context of these passages. In all these cases the Ācārya meant is clearly Pānini, and not Patañjali. I will here briefly examine two or three of the passages referred to by the Professor, for I have no space for more. In the first of these, the question Patañjali discusses is this:—Which N is it that is used in the term An occurring in the Sūtra: Uran raparah,¹ i. e., does An here mean only A, I, and U, or all the vowels, semi-vowels, and H? He answers by saying that the n in this case is clearly the first, and not the second, that is, that which is at the end of the sutra a-ī- un, and hence An signifies only the vowels A, I, and U. And why is it to be so understood? The Sūtra Uranraparah means, when An is substituted for R, it is always followed by R, that is, if, for instance, you are told in a Sūtra to substitute A for R, you should substitute not A alone, but Ar. Now, the reason why, in this Sūtra, An signifies the first three vowels only, is that there is no other significate of the more comprehensive term An, that is, no other vowel or any semi-vowel or H which is ever substituted for r. "Why not? there is", says the objector. One instance brought forward by

---

¹ Pānini, I. 1. 51. [N. B. U.]
him is explained away, and an other that he adduces is Māṭṛṇāṃ. In this case, by the Sūtra Nāmī, \( \ddot{\text{r}} \) is substituted for the short \( \dot{\text{r}} \). \( \ddot{\text{r}} \) is a significate of the more comprehensive an and not of the less comprehensive. Hence, then, the objector would say the an, in the Sūtra ur an, &c., is the more comprehensive one. But, says the Siddhānti, this is not a case in which the substitute has an r added on to it. Does it follow from Pāṇini’s work itself that no r is to be added? For aught we know, Pāṇini may have meant that r should be added in this case also. Now, the evidence from Pāṇini for this is in the Sūtra Rita iddhātoḥ. ‘This is the reason,’ says, the siddhānti, ‘why the word dhātu is put in the sūtra,—that in such cases as Māṭṛṇāṃ and Piṭṛṇāṃ, which are not dhatus, ir may not be substituted for the long r. If the long vowel substitute in Māṭṛṇāṃ had an r following it, it would not be necessary to put the word dhātu in this Sūtra, for Māṭṛ would not then be an ānga or base ending in r and such bases only are intended in the sūtra rita iddhātoḥ. The use of the word Dhatu then shows that “the Acārya sees that in Māṭṛṇāṃ, &c., the long substitute has not an r following it, and hence he uses the word dhātu in the sūtra.”

—Now, it is evident from this that the Acārya is Pāṇini, for the Acārya is spoken of as having put the word dhātu in the Sūtra for a certain purpose. The author of the Sūtras being Pāṇini, the Acārya meant must be he himself. In the same manner, in the passage at 196 (Ballantyne’s edition), Pāṇini is intended, for the Acārya is there spoken of as having put t after r in the sūtra urṛt. Similarly, in page 197, the Acārya is represented as having used n twice in the Pratyāhāra Sūtras. The author of

1. Pāṇini, VI, 4. 3. [N. B. U.]
2. Ibid, VII, 1. 100. [N. B. U.]
3. Antyatvād, the reading in Ballantyne’s Mahābhāṣya, is wrong or not good. It ought to be Anantyatvād as in the new Benares edition.
4. Pasyati tvācaryo nātra raparatvam bhavati tato dhātu-agrahaañāṃ karoti.
5. Pāṇini, VII. 4. 7. [N. B. U.]
these Sūtras, then, is meant there. And I may say that, so far as I have seen the Bhāṣya, the word Ācārya used in this way, applies either to Pāṇini or Kātyāyana, and Patañjali never speaks of himself as Ācārya.

Thirdly.—Prof. Weber’s interpretation of the Vārtika: Parokṣe ca loka, &c., is different from Dr. Goldstucker’s and mine. But he will see that our interpretation is confirmed by Kaiyata and Nagojibhatā. He seems to take Parokṣam in the sense of the ‘past.’

But Patañjali’s own explanation is:—Param aksnoḥ parokṣam: (that which is turned away from the eyes, i.e., not seen), and one of his quotations from other writers about the sense of the word is: kudya-kaṭāntaritaḥ parokṣam (that which is hidden from one even by a fence), both of which show that the only essential sense of the word is ‘a thing not seen by the speaker.’ Darśana-viṣaya, the Professor interprets by a thing once seen, or that which once fell within the range of the speaker’s vision; but if it has been once seen, it can never be called parokṣa in the sense which is always attributed to the word.

Fourthly.—Prof. Weber quotes from Patañjali the passage Mathurāyāḥ Pātalipurtraṁ pūrvam, and infers that the author of the Mahābhāṣya lived to the east of Pātaliputra. His interpretation of the passage seems to be ‘Pātaliputra is first and Mathura afterwards.’ But the natural sense is—‘Pātaliputra is to the east of Mathura,’ as it is, or rather was, as a matter of fact. That Patañjali lived, not to the east of Pātaliputra, but to the north-west of Sāketa, I have shown in a separate article.

Lastly, Dr. Goldstucker and Prof. Weber understand the word Ācāryadesiya used by Kaiyata in some places in the sense of “Countryman of the Ācārya.” It is not unnatural that an antiquarian, looking for historical facts in what he reads; should

1. Vārtika 2 on III. 2. 111.
2. See Mahābhāṣya, under Parokṣa 112, III. 2. 115.
3. In the article, on “Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya,” under “Patañjali’s Native Place” printed earlier in this volume, p. 124. [N. B. U.]
interpret his author thus; but it is not natural that a Hindu commentator, caring only for his subject, and not at all for history, should use such an expression to contrast one of the authors he comments on with another. He will look to the scale of estimation in which he holds them. To the Hindu grammarian the greatest Acarya is Pânini, next to him is Kātyāyana, and next to this latter is Patañjali. If it is necessary in one place to contrast one of them with another, he would naturally use some such expression as Acarya and Acarya the younger. And this appears to me to be the sense of the word, and a Hindu would naturally understand it thus. It is derived according to Pânini V. 3. 67; but the sense ought not to be taken as ‘an unaccomplished teacher,’ as Dr. Goldstücker does, but a teacher who is lower in the scale, or the younger teacher. And that Patañjali was so, is plain. That there is very great reason to believe that Patañjali and Kātyāyana did not belong to the same country, I have shown elsewhere.1

1. Namely, at p. 124, above. [N. B. U.]

REPLY TO PROFESSOR WEBER.

[From the Indian Antiquary, Volume, II, 1873, pp. 238-40].

(Prof. Weber replied to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's observations, and the following is the latter's final reply.—N. B. U.)

Professor Weber does not, so far as I can see, refute my argument for inferring from the passage about Puṣpamitra I have brought forward, that Patañjali was a contemporary of the monarch, nor does he assign his own reasons for differing from me. In the passage containing the words "Iha Puṣpamitram yājayāmah," Patañjali does not merely speak of Puṣpamitra's sacrifices as one living after him might do, but he speaks of them in a definite manner. If those words illustrate the rule that the present tense (Lat) denotes actions that have begun but not ended, and if, again, Puṣpamitra was a historical personage, and not a mere Caius, it certainly does, in my opinion, follow that the action of sacrificing had not ended when the passage was written. If we were in these days required to give an instance of such a rule, an instance containing the name of a historical personage, should we give such a one as "Johnson edits the Rambler," or "Gibbon is writing the History of the Decline and Fall?" Would not on the contrary, our instances be such as "Drs. Böhtlingk and Roth are compiling a Dictionary of Sanskrit?" I think we should use such as this latter, for in the former the actions of editing and writing have long been over, and consequently they would be of no use to illustrate the rule, which specially requires that they should not be over. I perfectly agree with what Professor Weber says in the quotation he gives from his essay, and myself always thought that Dr. Goldstucker's inference from the instance about Kashmir was extremely weak. But I contend that my instance in not one containing merely the "first person," but it is one in the present tense, and given purposely to illustrate, the use of that tense in a certain sense, and that sense, therefore, the present tense in the instance given must have. The passage is
exactly similar to: Arunad Yavanah Saketam, the historical value of which is admitted by Professor Weber. The translation Professor Weber gives of the passage under discussion does not seem to remove the obscurity in which he says mine was shrouded.

With regard to the second point, I must complain of Professor Weber's not believing what I say with regard to myself. The exigencies of the controversy do not, I think, require this. I again distinctly state that the reason why I was silent as regards Dr. Goldstücker's second instance, was that I did not agree with him in his interpretation of it, and my object in the article was not to criticize him, but to throw additional light on the date of Patañjali. I considered his rendering very questionable when I first read the book, about ten years ago, and some time before I wrote an article in the Native Opinion reviewing his theory of Pañini's technical terms. My principal reason was the impropriety of speaking of a sect or school as besieged. And I had, and have, a feeling that the names of the Buddhistic Schools generally known to Sanskrit authors could not have originated so early. Dr. Kern's book I saw and glanced over the preface of it, several years ago, but I did not remember his explanation of the word Mādhyamikā when I wrote my article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. I. p. 299, though I always thought the word meant some such thing. But soon after the article appeared, and before Professor Weber's criticism on it was received, I read Dr. Kern's Preface again, so that it was not Professor Weber that first directed my attention to it.

Now to come to Professor Weber's remarks on my article [Indian Antiquary Vol. II. p. 69]. The Professor still adheres to his interpretation of the passage: Mathurāyāḥ Patañjali-putram pūrvam. And his reason is Patañjali's use of the word Vyavahita in that connection, which he thinks means 'distance.' Now the word Vyavahita, so far as I know,

1. This essay is printed here later. [N. B. U.]
2. Printed in this Volume, pp. 108ff. [N. B. U.]
never means 'distance' but 'covered,' 'concealed,' or 'separated' by something intervening; as, for instance, England is Vyavahita from us, by several countries and seas intervening; or in the word Rāmena, r is Vyavahita from n by ā, m, and e. The context of the passage in Patañjali is shortly this:— In the Sūtra Acaḥ parasmi'n purvavidhau, the question is with reference to what standard is the word Pūrva or 'preceding' to be understood? For a time he takes the Nimitta, or condition of a grammatical change, to be the standard, and says that the principal example of this Sūtra, viz. patvyā or mridvyā is also explained or shown to fit with the rule on this supposition. How does it fit? The state of the case in Patvya is this:—First we have Patu then i the feminine termination changed to y and after that, a, the termination of the instrumental singular. This last is the Nimitta of the change of the previous ī to y. Then what is to be done by applying the Sūtra is to regard y as a vowel and change the u of pātu to v. But says the objector, the rule in the Sūtra does not apply here on the supposition you have made, for the u of Patu is not pūrva from ā, which is the Nimitta, as it is separated from it by y substituted for ī. Then, says the original speaker, the word Pūrva is used not only to signify a thing that immediately precedes another, but also to signify one that precedes but is separated from it by something intervening, as in such expressions as this: "Pātaliputra is pūrvam from Mathurā," in which Pūrvam is used though several places intervene between the two towns.—Now, it is plain that this is given as a phrase in use and current among the people to serve as an authority for taking Pūrva in a certain sense, and therefore, if Professor Weber's inference is correct, all people using the expression, i.e., the Sanskrit-speaking population of India, must have lived to the east of Pātaliputra.—The only proper meaning therefore is "Pātaliputra is to the east of Mathurā." And even if we take Professor Weber's explanation, "Pātaliputra is before Mathurā," it does not follow that the speaker, supposing he was Patañjali—which however is not the case—was to the east of Pātaliputra, any more than it does when 1
say "The horse is before the cart" that I am to that side of the cart, and not this, or to this, and not that. The word Purva no doubt means primarily 'before,' but when applied to show the relations between places, the anteriorness of one from another is to be taken with reference to the usual standard in such comparisons, namely—the rising sun. Hence the word comes to signify the 'east,' and as used in connection with places it has always this sense. I have no doubt therefore that my interpretation of the passage is correct, and that it does not in any way militate against the conclusion I have drawn from another as to the native place of Patanjali. I do not see why a district very near Oudh may not be said to be situated Prācām deśe. Benares was not the point from which the bearings of different places in India were taken. Prāgdeśa, Udagdeša, &c were settled terms; and one living in Prāgdeśa could call himself Prācya. Amara defines Prāgdeśa as that lying to the south and east of the Sarasvati.

Professor Weber gives no reason for thinking that Yathā laukikāvaidikēsu is not a Vārtika. But this passage is explained by Patanjali and made the subject of a dissertation just as other Vārtikas are. The whole argument given by the author of the Mahābhāṣya, a portion of which was reproduced by me in my article, is contained in these three aphorisms, the last of which is the one under discussion:—1, Siddhe śabdārtha-sambandhe; 2, Lokatortha-prayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharma-niyamah; 3, Yathā laukika-vaidikēsu. These are all explained and, as texts, descanted upon by our author; he mentions Ācārya¹ incidentally as the author in connection with the first of these, which Ācārya must be Kātyāyana here, since these are not Sūtras, and Nagojibhāṭṭa² expressly calls the first two Vārtikas. The third also must then be a Vārtika, since it is of a piece in every respect with the other two, and completes the argument, which without it would be incomplete. The aphorism cannot be the composition of Patanjali, for he makes it the subject of his criticism,

¹ Ballantine, pp. 47, 49. ² Ibid. p. 53.
and says that the words contained in it are Deccani words. I cannot understand the connection between this passage and the one quoted by Professor Weber about the use of Sarasi in the South. What has that to do with the circumstance of this being a Vārtika? If Professor Weber means to show that Patanjali was acquainted with the lingual usages prevailing in the South, I do not deny that he was, and it is just the lingual usages in that part of the country that are noticed even here. But this does not destroy the character of the passage as a Vārtika. It must be a Vārtika for the above reasons: hence my inference that Kātyāyana was a southerner. The Professor is inclined to account for allusions to southern usage contained in the Mahābhāṣya from the fact that it was preserved in books in the South, i.e., probably, he thinks them interpolations. Are we similarly to think that the Mahābhāṣya was preserved in books and unfairly treated by the people of Surāṣṭra, by the Kambojas, and by the Prācyas and Madhyamas, because it contains allusions to their usage also1?

Inferiority in rank there is in Patañjali in comparison with Kātyāyana. It does not matter if Patañjali's views are adopted by Kāyata and others. They are so adopted because he was the last of the three Munis. When the three Munis differ, the rule for one's guidance is: Yathottaram muninām prāmānyam: the later the Muni, the greater the authority. But still Panini is always regarded as first in rank, Kātyāyana second, and Patañjali third.

I need not say anything on the few remaining points. Professor Weber has made one or two admissions, and as to the rest, I leave it to my readers to judge of the merits of the controversy. I reserve one point for discussion on some future occasion, especially as Professor Weber has not given prominence to it now. I do not believe that the Vākyapadiya and the Rājatarangini afford evidence of the Mahābhāṣya having been tampered with by Candrācārya and others. They appear to me

1. See page 62, ed. by Ballantine.
to say that these persons promoted the study of grammar, brought the Mahābhāṣya into use, and wrote several works themselves.

In conclusion, I give Professor Weber my sincere thanks for the many good and encouraging words he has said about me. I am gratified to find that my criticisms have not offended him. Controversies on philological or literary points ought not to embitter the feelings of the disputants against each other, but unfortunately they very often do so. I am therefore particularly glad that our controversy is an exception to the general rule in this respect.
When I closed my controversy with Prof. Weber on some points connected with the Mahābhāṣya, I said I reserved one question for discussion on a future occasion, and stated my belief that the Vākyapadīya and the Rājatarangini did not afford evidence of the Mahābhāṣya having been tampered with by Candracārya and others. I am very glad to see that Prof. Kielhorn has taken up this question, and discussed it in a very able and thorough manner, in the last number of this Journal. I agree with all that he has said, though I should translate the passage in the Vākyapadīya somewhat differently, but as the differences are unimportant, and have no bearing on the main point, it is not necessary to state them.

There are, however, some points alluded to by Prof. Kielhorn on which I have been thinking for some time. He has shown that the word Ācārya occurring in the first 240 pages of the Benares edition of the Mahābhāṣya, when it is used to denote a specific individual, refers to Pāṇini or Katyāyana, but never to Patañjali, except in one instance pointed out by Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa. Prof. Kielhorn expresses his doubts as regards the correctness of Nāgoji’s remark, and I also think Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa is wrong. In a case of this kind, the great grammarian, who flourished only about a hundred and fifty years ago, can be no great authority if we can adduce cogent reasons for differing from him. And I believe there are such reasons in the present case. The passage in which the word occurs is this:

1. Chap. I. p. 10a, Benares lith. ed.:—

1. Indian Antiquary, Vol. II. p. 240 [equal to this Volume, p. 134=N.B.U.]
The expression अचार्यः च युक्तिः occurs in several places in the Mahābhāṣya, in all of which we have to understand Kātyāyana by the term अचार्यः. For instance:—

2. I. 4, p. 271, Benares lith. ed.:—चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेवन्निरीक्षिततः इति। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च युक्ति च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः। ब्रैजमन्यावलोकितः।

3. II. 1. p. 316a:—तदेव एव &c. as above ... तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

4. II. 4. p. 401:—चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

5. III. 3. p. 93:—तदेव, विज्ञानयात्रिकेयार्थीति। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

6. III. 3. p. 97a:—चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

7. IV. 3. p. 76:—तदेव, (as in 2 and 3) ... तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

8. IV. 3. p. 86:—तदेव, विज्ञानयात्रिकेयार्थीति। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

9. V. 1 p. 12:—तदेव, विज्ञानयात्रिकेयार्थीति। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

10. V. 1 p. 19:—तदेव, विज्ञानयात्रिकेयार्थीति। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

11. V. 3 p. 55a:—तदेव, विज्ञानयात्रिकेयार्थीति। तदाचार्यः: चहन्ययाग्रमाभिमेव यथा च प्रत्य प्रस्तुतेः।

Now we see that in all these instances, the sentence indicated by इति, which stands in the place of an object to the verb अत्यावच्छे, is a वार्तिक, for it is explained just before by वार्तिक. as all
Vārtikas are. Hence the expression अचार्य: सूत्तान्वाचाचेप्रे refers unquestionably to Kātyāyana. Are we then to understand that in the first only out of these eleven passages it refers to Patañjali? Surely the evidence afforded by the other ten, occurring as they do in different parts of the Mahābhāṣya, is sufficient to warrant us in declaring that in No. 1 also the expression refers to Kātyāyana. The reason why Nāgojībhāṭṭa understands Patañjali by the term Ācārya here is this:—The author of the Mahābhāṣya tells us in his comments on the Vārtika ‘Siddhe Śabdārtha’ &c. that the word Siddha has been used at the beginning for the sake of Mangala, i. e., because it is an auspicious term, and such a term used at the beginning of a Śāstra conduces to the success of that Śāstra. The beginning, then, of the Śāstra composed by Kātyāyana, i. e. the first of his Vārtikas, is Siddhe Śabdārtha &c. If so, all that precedes this Vārtika, including the aphorisms in which the uses of grammar are given, is not the work of Kātyāyana. These aphorisms, therefore, are to be ascribed to Patañjali himself, and hence the Ācārya who sets forth the uses of grammar is the author of the Mahābhāṣya. To this it may be replied that these

1. There is a mistake in the Benares Edition in the last passage. The Vārtika is not given separately from the Bhāṣya on it. It is, however, so given in an old MS. in my possession. In passage No. 3 Patañjali gives the substance of the Vārtika and does not quote it. It is not necessary to discuss at length the question how a Vārtika is to be distinguished. It is sufficient to state that one unfailing criterion is its being paraphrased or explained by Patañjali. Because (1) the very fact that it is so paraphrased shows that it must be the work of another person than the one who paraphrases it; (2) Patañjali himself incidentally mentions Kātyāyana as the author of some of these aphorisms, and calls him the Vārtikakāra (See I. 101a, III. 64a, III. 76a, &c.), while he speaks of the author generally as Ācārya, in connection with a great many others, without naming him; (3) Pāṇini's Sūtras are never so paraphrased, though they may form the subject of a long discussion; and (4) most of the aphorisms so paraphrased by Patañjali are expressly called Vārtikas by Kātyāṭa and other grammarians. Very rarely the dicta of other Ācāryas are also paraphrased, but they are introduced by such an expression as अपर आदो indicat{e} of the authorship; while no such expression is used in introducing a Vārtika. Prof. Goldstücker does not seem to have called this criterion in question.
aphorisms are simply introductory, while the regular Śāstra begins with Siddhe Śabdārtha &c. The provision for Māṅgala is therefore made in this, and not in the preceding ones, just as Pāṇini secures Māṅgala in the first of his regular Sūtras, viz., Vṛddhira-daica and not in the Pratyāhāra-Sūtras. There is, therefore, no impropriety in ascribing these introductory aphorisms to Katyāyana. And the whole manner in which they are stated and explained by Patañjali, and the evidence of the ten passages containing the expression आचार्यः संहृद्धृत्व, &c., require that we should so ascribe them to him.

If, then, Katyāyana is the Ācārya alluded to in passage No. 1, this passage and the few lines that precede it enable us to determine the character, nature, and object of Katyāyana's work. Patañjali tells us that in the times preceding his own, after a Brāhmaṇa boy's Upanayana ceremony was performed, grammar was the first thing taught to him, and the study of the Veda followed. In his (or rather Katyāyana's) time, however, Veda was first taught, and after that was gone over, they said: "The Vedic words we have learnt from the Vedas, and the words current in popular usage we know from that usage. Grammar, therefore, is useless." For these students, "we are told," whose feeling is thus opposed, the Ācārya (Katyāyana) expounds the Śāstra,¹ (saying) "These are the uses; grammar should be studied." In the comment on Siddhe śabdārtha, &c. we are also told, as remarked above, that Katyāyana uses the word Siddha at the beginning, that it may augur well for the "great stream of the Śāstra." We thus see that what Katyāyana proposes to himself is the composition or edition of a Śāstra, and to attract students to it he explains its uses. And it appears to me that the opening words

1. Nāgojibhaṭṭa understands by the term Śāstra here "the explanation of the uses of grammar." But there is no reason to restrict the term thus. Besides, "the explanation of the uses of grammar" can with no propriety be called a Śāstra. Before and after, Patañjali uses the term in the sense of the whole science of grammar. Śāstra also properly signifies "a rule." It is, however, immaterial to the argument in the text in what sense we take it.
of the Mahābhāṣya: are Kātyāyana’s words, and form a Vārtika, notwithstanding what Kaiyata says about them. For they are explained by Patañjali, just as all Vārtikas are; and to suppose that this alone of similar aphorisms was composed by him, and commented on with all the formality of a scholiast, is, I think, unreasonable. There appears no reason why in this particular case Patañjali should have resorted to this plan. If he wanted to say that he now began the Śabdānuśāsanaśāstra, he might have done so more directly than by composing an aphorism and commenting on it.¹

From the passages quoted above, it seems that the verb Anvācaṣte is used by Patañjali as characteristic of the work of Kātyāyana, as describing specifically what he did. His own work Patañjali calls Vyakhyana, and frequently uses the verb Vyākhyāsyāmāḥ.² There is another word that is used in controversial writing, and occurs in the Mahābhāṣya, also, which is derived from the same root, viz. Pratyākhyāna. The differences in the senses of these words must be due to the prepositions or Upasargas that are used in each case. Pratyākhyāna is speaking against or refuting a thing; Vyākhyāna is speaking about a thing, or away, in varied ways, in detail, of a thing, i.e., writing a commentary on it, and Anvākyāna must mean ‘speaking in accordance with, agreeably to, or to the same purpose as a thing’. The word is used with reference to Kātyāyana in other forms in two other places, where it is contrasted with teaching something new.³ If, then, it properly denotes what Kātyāyana did mostly, if not altogether, with reference to Pāṇini’s Sūtras, his work must be in accordance,

1. It is only modern authors that say that the Vārtikas begin with Siddha śabdārtha, &c.


3. I. p. 22a & b. III. p. 58a, तत्तत्तवाचेष्टेनुसरं इत्यं चर्चित । नेतदशायक्यमाधिकारः अनूत्तमतः इति । एष एष स्थायोपस्ताधिकारः अनुवत्तेऽस्मितः ।
in keeping, in harmony with, Panini's, i.e. explain, develop, or support the latter. That the word 'Anvākhyāna' is peculiarly applicable to Katyayana's work is also confirmed by the fact that this is called Anutantra in the Vākyapadiya.¹ For these reasons it is clear that Katyayana's object in composing his work was to teach grammar, first, by developing and explaining Panini, and then supplementing him, and not "to find fault with him," as the late Prof. Goldstucker thought. The Vyākhyāna of the work of this author directly, and that of Panini indirectly, was what Patañjali proposed to himself. He himself explains what the duties of one who undertakes this task are. "Not only," says he, "does the division of a Sūtra into the individual words which compose it constitute Vyākhyāna, but example, counter-example, and the words to be understood or supplied, all these taken together make up Vyākhyāna."² To explain the Vartikas thus in detail, to discuss the Sūtras, and occasionally to give supplementary rules (Īṣṭis) where necessary, was Patañjali's main object, and not to refute Katyayana.

Now, if we look into the Mahābhāṣya, we shall find this view of the relations of the three Munis amply confirmed. In fact, the instances in which there is no refutation of one by another, but simply an explanation of the words, or the bearing of the words, of the earlier sage by the later one, are so many that it is difficult to see how any other view can be maintained. Not to go very far for the present, none of the eleven passages quoted above contains or is followed by a refutation, while they all give some expla-

¹ Prof. Kielhorn's article, Ind. Ant., Vol. V. p. 247, notes.
² न केवलानि चर्चाप्रार्थी व्यास्यांयां वृहद्या आत् ऐशिति | किं तद्भवन् प्रत्युदाहरण वाक्यवाच्यार्थं इत्येतत्समुद्भिः व्यास्याणां मतिः | I. p. 18a. By the way, this passage justifies those who ascribe the examples contained in the Mahābhāṣya to Patañjali, and draw historical inferences from them with regard to his age and other matters. For we are here told that it is the business of the author of Vyākhyāna to give examples. There is little reason, then, to suppose that the examples were handed down from the time of Panini to Katyayana.
nation. No. 1 explains why Kātyāyana gives the uses of grammar; in No. 2 Kātyāyana is spoken of as making a rule calculated to restrict the operation of another laid down by himself. In the Vārtika in No. 3, Kātyāyana tells us that another Vārtika of his which is likely to supersede Pāṇini VIII. 1. 24, ought not to do so; in the one in No. 4 he explains the word Anvādeśa used in Pāṇini II. 4. 32; in that in No. 5 he tells us in what relation the words Kartr and Karman occurring in Pāṇini III. 3. 127 are to be taken; in the one in No. 6 he explains Pāṇini III. 3. 141, and clears a doubt that naturally arises; in that in No. 7 he says that a Vārtika of his should not supersede Pāṇini IV. 3. 6; in the one in No. 8 he explains the word Etayoh occurring in Pāṇini IV. 3. 143; in that in No. 9 he tells us that the words Dvi and Tri occurring in Pāṇini V. 1. 30 are to be taken on to the next Sūtra only, i. e., they apply to these two Sūtras alone; in that in No. 10, that the termination given in the last Sūtra is to be brought on to this, and not the one in the previous Sūtra; and in No. 11 the Vārtika explains to what the pronoun Etayoh occurring in V. 3. 20 refers.

But let us examine the Bhasya more closely. In the Vārtikas on I. 2. 1, Kātyāyana explains that what Pāṇini means by saying that certain terminations are फिक्तत and किर्तस is, that before those terminations, those rules are to be applied to the preceding roots that are laid down with reference to such terminations as have actually got an indicatory क or क in them,—i. e. Pāṇini attributes the properties किर्तत or किर्तस to those terminations, though they have not got क or क in them. Before coming to this conclusion, however, the author of the Vārtikas refutes three other ways of taking this and the following Sūtras that may be suggested. Kātyāyana then gives reasons why किर्तस is attributed to some terminations, and किर्तस to others, and why one same property किर्तस or किर्तस is not mentioned with regard to all. In all this Patañjali confines himself to a detailed explanation of the Vārtikas, and there is no refutation of any one of them.

On I. 4. 14, there is only one Vārtika in which Kātyāyana explains why the word Anta is used in the Sūtra, and infers that in
other Sūtras in which technical terms are defined, those terms signify only the terminations that may have been mentioned, and not the words ending with those terminations,—i.e. for instance Gha signifies only the terminations Tara and Tama, and not Gauritara or Gauritama. Patañjali does not make any adverse remark, but explains the Vārtika. On III. 11. 134, Katyāyana remarks that the last termination Ac. must be stated generally as applicable to all roots, because there are such forms as Bhava and Sava. Why, then, does Pāṇini lay down the Gaṇa, Pac and others, and teach the addition of the termination to those roots? Katyāyana himself tells us, it is because in this way he may be able to add some indicatory letter or Anubandhas to some of the roots, and to prevent the application of special rules to others. On the next Sūtra the author of the Vārtikas remarks that the termination Ka should be taught as applicable to the roots indicated in the Sūtra, only when they have a preposition prefixed; for when without a preposition, the roots have forms made up by the addition of another, which necessitates the change of the vowel to its Guṇa. Then he himself answers this by saying, "No, it should not be so taught, because we have such forms as Budha and others," i.e., forms made up by the addition of Ka. On III. 2, 123, the first two Vārtikas require that the use of the present tense (Bhavanti) should be taught in cases which the Sūtra is supposed not to include; in the last three, we are told that the Sūtra does extend to these cases also, and reasons are given to show how it does. Patañjali has no adverse remark.

In all these instances, Katyāyana simply gives an Anvākhyāna or explanation of the Sūtras, and Patañjali agrees with him; and such instances may be multiplied to any extent. Of course, it is not to be denied that often there are adverse criticisms on Pāṇini, and that Patañjali defends him and refutes Katyāyana, i.e., makes Pratyākhyāna as well as Vyākhyāna of the Vārtikas. But Patañjali not seldom refutes Pāṇini also, i.e. makes Pratyākhyāna of the Sūtras, the expression अयं दोषः शक्यस्वकथम् occurring pretty often. On the other hand, he often says with regard to the Vārtikas, तस्मात् तुच्छते, &c. To show the nature of the Great
Commentary generally as regards this subject, I will here give a short analysis of a portion of the Bhāṣya on the Āṅgādhikāra in the order in which the Sūtras occur there, not here selecting my instances.

1. अवञ्जय  VI. 4. 1. Kātyāyana settles the meaning of the gen. अवञ्जय; Patañjali does not refute. Kātyāyana gives the objects of the Āṅgādhikāra, and says that they may be attained otherwise than by having such an Adhikāra. Patañjali agrees while Kāyātā re-establishes that Adhikāra.

2. In हजल: VI. 4. 2, Kātyāyana raises an objection and answers it. Patañjali accepts this explanation, but proposes also another.

3. In नामि VI. 4. 3, Kātyāyana justifies the use of नामिः for आमिः; Patañjali does not refute.

4. हहस्रप्पा &c. VI. 4. 12. Kātyāyana in the Vārtikas explains this Sūtra in a manner to avoid the lengthening of the penultimate vowel of व्रह्वन् necessitated by the Sūtra अहुनांवक &c. VI. 4. 15.


6. अवञ्जन &c. VI. 4. 16. Kātyāyana finds fault, not explicitly but tacitly. Patañjali avoids the objection by re-arranging the Sūtra. A Vārtika on another point is refuted by Patañjali.

7. चरीव-रङ्ग &c. VI. 4. 19. Kātyāyana shows that if फिंद comes down to this Sūtra, हृ must be inserted in the Sūtra वम्भवरस्त &c., VIII. 2. 36, and it must have तुक, i. e. ह्र, prefixed to it. This is done in that Sūtra. The Vārtikas therefore explain that हृ does come down. Patañjali does not refute.

8. असिद्धार्थ &c. VI. 4. 22. Kātyāyana refers to his explanation of the objects of considering a grammatical operation to be असिद्ध given under VI. 1. 86, explains the sense of अवर, and gives the objects of the अवभवविकार. These last, Patañjali shows, may be attained in other ways, and thus makes प्रत्याख्यान of them. Then objections to this Adhikāra are raised by Kātyāyana, and answered by Patañjali.
explaining अत्र as equivalent to समानायतन. Then follows a Vārtika stating cases in which, when we take this Adhikāra to extend to the beginning of Bhādahikāra, we arrive at incorrect forms; and another giving other cases when the same result ensues, if we take it to extend to the end or that Adhikāra. Patanjali refutes these Vārtikas by showing that the correct forms are arrived at, whether we take the one or the other as the limit of the Adhikāra.

9. श्राप &c. VI. 4. 23. No Vārtikas.
10. अनिवितां &c. VI. 4. 24. There are five supplementary or corrective Vārtikas, two of which are refuted by Patanjali.
11. शास इद &c. VI. 4. 34. The Vārtika is refuted by recasting the Sūtra.
12. अनुवादलों &c. VI. 4. 37. VI. 4. 38, as it is, would lead to wrong forms. Kātyāyana therefore proposes to recast these two; Patanjali does not object.
13. गमः को, &c. VI. 4. 40. Two supplementary Vārtikas; neither refuted by Patanjali.
14. जमसन &c. VI. 4. 42. Patanjali discusses the connection of ठाळ, and in the end divides the Sūtra into two, so as to render the use of ठाळ unnecessary. Then follows an explanatory Vārtika, which is discussed and defended by Patanjali at great length.
15. सन्तनिर्थि, VI. 4. 45. Patanjali says the word अन्येऽस्य यात्रा might well have been omitted in this Sūtra, as unnecessary. “Another” says that even the word होष्ण might be omitted. There is no Vārtika.
16. आङ्घचारके VI. 4. 46. A Karikā, very likely by Patanjali himself, gives the purposes of this Adhikāra; and they are discussed in detail afterwards. No Vārtikas.
17. बसोरोप VI. 4. 47. Some explanation by Patanjali. Then follow three Vārtikas on a certain point, which are refuted by Patanjali.
19. यस्य हसः : VI. 4. 49. Kātyāyana gives undesirable effects of taking य as two letters Y and A, and of taking it as Y only. Patañjali says one may take it either way; and the faults pointed out by Kātyāyana are explained away.

20. पेनरिदतः VI. 4. 51. Patañjali decides that the word अनिदि in this Sūtra is unnecessary, and explains the next Sūtra in a manner to avoid the objections that may arise. He also recasts VI. 4. 55. There is no Vārtika.

21. निष्ठायान सेंटि VI. 4. 52. Kātyāyana discusses, and explains the reason of using the word सेंटि here. Patañjali says this word, and even the whole Sūtra, might be omitted, and recasts VII. 2. 26, in a manner to include the sense of this. A Vārtika follows, which is refuted.

22. अपासनता &c. VI. 4. 55. There are three Vārtikas showing what rules should be laid down if we should have खु as an Unādi termination, and what if हतु. These last are actually laid down by Pāṇini, says Patañjali.

23. ल्परिलघु &c. VI. 4. 56. Kātyāyana brings objections to the reading लघुप्रभस्य, and settles that it should be लघुपुर्वस्य; Patañjali does not object.

24. विभायापः VI. 4. 57. आप should have its indicatory sign र here, observes Kātyāyana, to prevent the application of this rule to अव्यापि. Patañjali applies the Paribhāṣā दक्षिणाप्रतिपदन्ति &c. and refutes the Vārtika.

25. अय्यत्रिच्छ &c. VI. 4. 62. Patañjali discusses at great length the relations of the words भावकर्मणः, इति, and चिन्हत. Then, in a Kārikā which must be attributed to him, are set forth the purposes of attributing चिन्हवन्द्वार to these terminations after these roots. This is followed by Vārtikas, in the first of which the reason for the use of the word उपदेश is given, and in the second we are told that चिन्हवन्द्वार prevails over the Sūtra which lays down धर as a substitute for हन, in the precative. The next two provide that the substitutes for हन, इ to go, and इ to study, which are used before चिन्ह in the aroist, should not be used here. This, we are
told, follows from the context of this Sūtra. No adverse remarks from Patañjali.

We thus see (1) that Katyāyana explains and supports the Sūtras, sometimes by raising questions about them and answering them, sometimes without resorting to this procedure; (2) that he amends them, and thus must be understood to criticize them, or find fault with them; and (3) that he supplements them. Patanjali (1) comments on the Vārtikas in accordance with his own definition of Vyakhyāna; (2) agrees with Katyāyana; (3) refutes him; (4) recasts Panini's Sūtras; (5) affirms that they, or a word or words in them, are not wanted, even in cases when Katyāyana justifies them or defends Panini; (6) discusses and explains Sūtras or words in them, notwithstanding that there is no Vārtika; and (7) gives supplementary rules called Iṣṭis, which, however, occur very rarely, very little being left for him to do in this respect, by predecessors. It will thus appear that in writing the Vārtikas, Katyāyana did "mean to justify and to defend the rules of Panini" also, and that a Vārtika is often "a commentary which explains;" and that the Mahābhāṣya contains such varied matter, arguments of such length, so consistent, so well connected, and so subtle, that it by no means deserves the title of "a skilful compilation of the views of Panini's critics and of their refutation by Patanjali;" or of a "mere refutation of Katyāyana;" or of "a synopsis of arguments for and against the details of Panini's system, or a controversial manual." The only tenable theory is that Katyāyana's work is an edition of Panini with notes, explanatory, critical, and supplementary; and that Patanjali's is a commentary on this edition, explaining in detail the notes of Katyāyana, but discussing at length all points connected with the system of Panini and with grammar generally, whether Katyāyana notices them or not, in a manner favourable or otherwise to his author. The object of both was the same, viz., to teach grammar by following and explaining the system of Panini, endeavouring to perfect it, even though this sometimes required a remodelling of his Sūtras or their entire refutation, and to complete it by supplying the omissions and bringing up the knowledge of Sanskrit grammar conveyed therein to their own times.
THE MAURYA-PASSAGE IN THE MAHĀBHĀSYA

[FROM THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY, 1887, P. 156 FF.]

In the first number of the new Vienna Oriental Journal, just received, there is an article by my honoured friend, Dr. Kielhorn, in which he brings forward some objections against the interpretation of the Maurya-passage in the Mahābhāṣya given by other scholars. As I am one of these last, and as Dr. Kielhorn invites criticism on his observations by saying 'he would "be glad to be corrected by others," and that his reason for writing on the subject is "to give others an opportunity of removing his difficulties," I will here endeavour, to the best of my ability, to answer the difficulties raised by him.

The first expression, to the translation of which my friend objects, is Yas tv Etah. His objections in this, as well as in the other cases, are based on the supposition that the translations already given are opposed to the sense that the several expressions have in other parts of the Mahābhāṣya; and it will be my duty to show that my translation, at least, is not so opposed. Dr. Kielhorn says that (excepting, so far as his observation goes, a single passage) the pronoun Etad in such expressions as Ya eṣah, Yad etad, Ya ete, &c., does not refer to something stated before; but expresses a thing well-known, a thing to be met with generally in ordinary life. That it has the sense mentioned by him in the instances he quotes, is unquestionable. But this sense it derives from the fact that primarily, it means 'this'; i. e. it denotes 'proximity.' Now, the world in which a man moves and with which he is intimately acquainted, is from that point of view regarded by him as being 'near;' i. e. having proximity. Hence, everybody in that world is spoken of as 'this'; (1) but this is not the only way in which things come to have nearness or proximity. They may become near because they are actually before one; or, in the case of a writer, (2)
because he has just mentioned them, or (3) is going to mention them. Dr. Kielhorn has given instances from the Mahābhāṣya, in which Etad with Yad has the first sense. I will give others in which it has the two other senses. Two of my instances have Idam for Tad; which, however, makes no difference whatever.

a. Vol. I. p. 10, l. 1: Ye cāpy ete bhavato prayuktā abhimataḥ śabdā &c. The words alluded to here have been given by Patañjali before, at the beginning of the argument.

b. Vol. I. p. 31, last line. Ya esa bhavata vāṃnām arthavattāyāṁ hetur upaḍīśō’ṛthavanto vānā, &c. This Hetu has been given before and is here repeated.

c. Vol. II. p. 86, l. 3. Ya ete samjñāyāṁ vidhiyante teṣu &c. These have been mentioned just before.

d. Vol. II. p. 19, l. 19. Yad etat trntracor grahanam &c. The Sūtra in which the affixes here spoken of occur, has been quoted just before.

e. Vol. II. p. 326, l. 19. Na vaiṣa yukto vipratisedho yo’yam anō mayataś ca. The Vipratisedha has been given in the last but one Vārttika.

f. Vol. III. p. 238, l. 9. Yat tv idam Vārttikakārah pathati &c. What is referred to by Idam has been mentioned before, and is here repeated.


Here there are five instances in which Etad with Yad, and two in which Idam with Yad, denote ‘proximity’ to the passage in which they occur. In six of these cases, the pronoun refers to things mentioned before; and in one, to things mentioned afterwards. And I dare say a good many more instances will be found, if a diligent search is made for them. I do not see why Patañjali should not, in the nature of things, use Etad to denote this sort of proximity, and restrict himself to that conceived to exist in things well-known to us. And the expression, or its
several senses, are by no means peculiar to Patañjali, but are to be found in the language itself. The following instances occur to me at the present moment; and doubtless a long list can be made out if necessary:—

Yeyāṁ prete vicikitsā manusye,—Kātha-Upaniṣad (3 or 1)
Ya eṣa supṛteṣu jāgarti &c.—Ibid (1)
Yoyam yogas tvāyā proktah,—Bhagavadgītā, Ch. 6, v. 33, (2)
Yad etad anumaraṇam nāma tad atinīṣphalam,—Kādambari (1)
Yoyāṁ baddho yudhi parikaras tena vo &c.—Uttara-Rama-carita—Act. V. (2)
Yenānena jagatsu Khaṇḍaparaśur, &c.—Viracarita Act II. (2).
Yahi punar ayam ante'paro vikalpa &c. Saṅkara-Bhāṣya, Vol. I. (Bibl. Ind.) p. 434, l. 2. (2)

So that it does not appear to me that there is anything peculiar to Patañjali in this respect. He has used the expression under notice in those senses in which it is used elsewhere. Thus: Yās tv etāḥ: in the Maurya passage, may, if the context require it, be taken to refer to some of the images already mentioned.

Now as to the word Saṁprati. Purākalpa means ‘ancient time,’ a time so remote that nobody has a definite conception of it, and Adyatve, as opposed to it, signifies ‘modern times.’ But this is not the sense we require in the present passage, according to my translation. For the Maurya family became extinct only about thirty-five years before Patañjali wrote, according to Prof. Goldstiicker’s view and mine; and consequently the time when it reigned cannot be spoken of as Purākalpa. The word Saṁprati denotes ‘now,’ as opposed to a past time which is definite and not very remote; and this is exactly the sense required in the passage under discussion. Dr. Kielhorn, however, is led to think, from some of the instances quoted by him, that the past time, implied by the present which the word Saṁprati denotes, must refer to the same thing as that,
the present condition of which is expressed by that word. But this is by no means necessary. For Nivāsa (Vol. II. p. 314, l. 7) is spoken of by Patañjali as the place where one lives now; while Abhijana is the place where his ancestors lived. Here the past time implied by the word Sampratī or 'now,' is not the past of the man whose present Nivāsa is spoken of; but refers to his ancestors. And even the sense attached to the word by Dr. Kielhorn does not go entirely against my interpretation of the passage. We shall only have to suppose that the images now under worship were the same as those sold by the Mauryas, and not like them, or belonging to the same class with them. But this view I have rejected, after considerable deliberation.

The third expression the sense of which Dr. Kielhorn discusses, is Prakalpitaḥ. He thinks that Prakalpayati means 'to fashion or make one thing out of another,' 'to produce a thing which did not exist before out of something else;' and that it is equivalent to Nirvartayati. I feel no hesitation in saying that this sense does not appear to me to be at all appropriate, whether in the Mahābhāṣya or elsewhere. In the expressions in which the genitive is spoken of as Prakalpita, is the genitive really produced? In grammar we speak of the Utpatti or production of a termination, when it is applied to a base which did not possess it before, as the accusative is Utpanna after the noun Kātha and the termination kta after the root kr (Vol. I. p. 441, ll. 3, 4). Is the genitive so produced here and, if it is, why should Patañjali never use in the innumerable places where the phrase occurs, the word Utpādayati, as he does in these cases, or Nirvartayati, instead of Prakalpayati? And how are we to translate the phrase: Anuvāraḥ sthāni yanam anunāśikām prakalpayati (Vol. I. p. 16) that an original Anuvāra produces a Yan to be Anunāśika? How can we produce a thing such as a pot to be red? The word produce or Utpatti is out of place here; we can only say that an additional quality Anunāśikatva is given to an existing thing Yan. Again, when Patañjali says that the general rule operates after having Prakalpita the scope of the special rule (Vol.
I. p. 463, l. 2; Vol. II. p. 127, l. 5), does he mean “after having produced the scope of the special rule?” Is not “after having devised, arranged, or assigned scope to the special rule,” the proper translation? And, using the root in its primitive or non-causal from, when Patañjali says: Vyapadeso na prakalpate (Vol. I. p. 61, l. 21), does he mean “the appellation or description is not produced”? Is not “the description does not fit,” the proper sense here? When he says: Samanyaviśeṣau na prakalpete: if what is general may become particular, and what is particular, general, he does not mean that Sāmānyā and Viśeṣa are not ‘produced,’ but that they do not “fit each other” the relation ‘does not hold,’ ‘is not intelligible,’ ‘not proper’; (Vol. I. p. 172, l. 3). Avakāsāḥ praklptah (Vol. II. p. 297, l. 14) means the scope of the rules alluded to has been ‘devised,’ ‘arranged’ or ‘determined,’ not ‘produced.’ So also when Nigrahanam is said to be Śeṣaprakalpṭyartham (Vol. III. p. 159, l. 1), the sense cannot be that Nī is used in VI.3.43 for producing Śeṣa; for Śeṣa is not to be produced or transformed. The word occurs in the very next Sūtra; and being a relative term equivalent to, remainder or ‘residue,’ it can have no sense if Nī, with reference to which it is the residue, is not admitted in VI. 3. 43. So then Śeṣaprakalpṭyartham means ‘for making Śeṣa fit in with, answer to, or correspond with something else,’ for giving an intelligible sense to the word. Again, if Patañjali meant by Prakalpayati the same thing as Nirvartayati, why does he, fond as he is of the former word, not use it when he has occasion to speak of the production of a Ghaṭa or a Kaṭa, or of Odana, but use Nirvartayati or Karoti only? Thus he speaks of the Nirvṛtti of things which are made, not Prakalpi; makes a man say to a potter Kuru ghaṭam, not Pra kalpaya ghaṭam (Vol. I. p. 7, ll. 2 and 3 from bottom), uses the expressions Odanaṁ nirvartayati, not Odanaṁ prakalpayati (Vol. I. p. 332, l. 18), and Kaṭaṁ karoti, Kaṭaṁ kuru, Ghaṭaṁ kuru several times (Vol. I. pp. 440 and 441; Vol. III. p. 56, l. 8) and not Kaṭaṁ prakalpayati, &c. &c.
The central idea expressed by the root $\sqrt{\text{Klp}}$ is that of a plan, system, arrangement, device, mutual fitness or consistency. The genitive is Prakalpita by the ablative in the place of the nominative in virtue of Pāṇini's rule: Tasmād ity uttarasya: i.e., it is devised, arranged for, led to by a logical necessity or conditions of propriety, and has thus to be understood. The original Anuśvāro yaṇam anunāsikāṁ prakalpayati, i.e., 'devises or arranges that the Yaṇ which takes its place should be nasal.' The Anusvāra is a reason why the substituted Yaṇ should be nasalized. The general rule devises, arranges or plans out the scope of the special rule from the whole available region, and then operates (in the part that remains). Similarly in all the other instances given above, it will be seen that fitness, propriety, devising or planning is the sense involved. It will also be observed that that which is spoken of as the Prakalpaka, is, or involves, a reason or a principle which justifies, explains, or determines something else, and makes the Prakalpaka fit in with or answer to the Prakalpita; while that which is Nirvartaka produces a thing that did not exist before, and possesses voluntary agency only. Thus then, in the passage under discussion, the images were devised, fitted, or made to answer by the Mauryas who wanted gold, i.e., to answer or fit in with their desire for gold, just as Śeṣa answers to or fits in with Ni in VI. 3. 43, or Viśeṣa with Sāmānya, or the Vyapadesa (description or appellation) with the nature of the thing alluded to; the genitive with the previous ablative or the following locative, the Anunāsikatva with the Anusvāra and the province of the general rule with that of the special rule. In other words, they were used as means fit for the end, the attainment of gold.
A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON THE MAURYA-PASSAGE IN THE MAHĀBHĀSYA.

[From the Indian Antiquary, Volume XVI, 1887, p. 172 f.]

In connection with my previous note on the Maurya-Passage in the Mahābhāṣya, at page 156ff. above, I find that I have three more passages to quote, of the use of Etad or Idam with Yad; and it also appears to me desirable to put on record the full original passage, which is the subject of discussion, in order that the readers of this Journal may have it for easy reference in understanding the point that is at issue.

The original passage, which is Patañjali's comment on Pañini V. 3. 99, runs:

Apanya ity ucyaete tatredam na sidhyati Śivah Skando Viśākha iti Kiṁ kāraṇam Mauryair hiranyarthebhir archāh prakalpitah Bhavet tāsu na syād Yās tv etāh saṁpratī pūjārthās tāsu bhaviṣyati

And the following are my additional instances in which Etad or Idam, with Yad, refers to things occurring before or to be mentioned afterwards:


Vol. III. p. 277, l. 7. Ayukto'yaṁ vipraṁśedho yo'yaṁ guṇasyettvottvayoś ca.


I have stated in my previous note that I have rejected, after considerable deliberation, the view that the images spoken of in

1. That is the Indian Antiquary Volume XVI, 1887. N. B. U.

2. Equal to this Volume, p. 148ff above. — N. B. U.
the passage as under worship now, were the same as those sold by the Mauryas. As, however, the reverend Dr. Böhtlingk seems, if I understand him right, to favour that view in his 'Ein Versuch zur Beilegung,' &c., I must give my reasons. They are these:—

If the images, Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha, were the same as those sold or "introduced" by the Mauryas, Patañjali would have indicated the same by some expression in the sentence Mauryair hiranyārthibhir, &c. The pronoun Tāsu in the next sentence, and Etāḥ in the one that follows it, will both have to be taken as referring to the same images. The same images cannot be spoken of as 'those' and 'these'; and to remove this inconsistency, we shall have to understand Tāsu as equivalent to Tadānim so as to bring out the sense, that the rule about the dropping of Ka was not applicable to these images at the time when they were sold or introduced by the Mauryas. But the demonstrative Tad cannot by itself be so understood. According to Dr. Böhtlingk's way of looking at the matter, the passage has no grammatical point at all, the object of Patañjali being simply to cast a reflection on the Mauryas. This is not proper. Patañjali always makes out a grammatical point; and the point made out according to the view under discussion, as it appeared to me when I rejected it, is, that, in framing the names of idols under worship, we have not to look to the fact that they were sold before they were used for worship. But this point is almost evident, and is more appropriately made out, if necessary, by speaking of ordinary manufacturers as selling images which are afterwards used for worship. The point according to the view which I have accepted, is this;—Panya has two senses, "something that has the possibility of being sold" and "something that is exposed for sale." The idols, Śiva, &c., which are under worship now possess the possibility of being sold, because idols under worship were sold by the Mauryas. But, though they possess the possibility of being sold, they are not actually exposed for sale. Pāṇini's rule applies to idols of the latter description, and not of the former. The distinction between the two senses of
the word Paṇya and its grammatical effect, cannot be illustrated, except by taking instances of the sale of idols under actual worship; and since ordinary manufacturers do not do that, Patañjali, knowing that the Mauryas had done it, makes use of the fact for the purposes of his grammatical exposition. The word Etah is not superfluous in my translation as Dr. Böhtlingk thinks; for, it is used for pointing out the idols under discussion, Śiva, Skanda, Viṣākha, as contrasted with the idols sold by the Mauryas. All this I have explained at length in my Second Reply to Dr. Peterson on the Date of Patañjali; and especially in my Sanskrit comment on the passage. It will be seen that, even according to my view, the passage shows that Patañjali flourished but a short time after the Mauryas. For he remembers rather an unimportant incident with regard to the princes of that dynasty; and the word Saṁprati, as I have already observed, indicates ‘present time’ as contrasted, not with a remote past time—Adyatve is the word which has that sense—but with a past time fairly near to the person who uses the word.
THE DATE OF PATAÑJALI, No. I: BEING THE FIRST
REPLY TO PROFESSOR PETERSON.

[From the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal
Asiatic Society, Volume XVI, 1885, p. 199 ff.]

The Paper was read before the Society on May 1st, 1885.

The late Professor Goldstücker,1 from the examination of a
passage occurring in Patañjali's Mahābhaṣṭya, or the great commen-
tary on Kātyāyana's Vārtikas, i. e., short critical dicta on Pāṇini's
Grammatical Sūtras, arrived at the conclusion that the author of
the great commentary lived in the middle of the second century
before Christ. From another passage, the evidence afforded by
which is totally of a different kind, I arrived, more than twelve
years ago, at precisely the same conclusion. Two other pass-
ages in the work and everything else of a historical nature occur-
ring in it harmonize with our conclusion; and it has now been
accepted by a good many scholars. Professor Peterson1 of
Elphinston College has recently called it in question, and is in-
clined to refer Patañjali to the time of Skandagupta of the Gupta
Dynasty who was reigning in 146 of the Gupta Era2. This date
corresponds, according to what I consider to be unimpeachable
evidence as regards the initial date of the Gupta Era, to 465 A. D.,
but according to others it corresponds to 336 A. D. and 313 A. D.
Professor Peterson asserts that "recent speculation" has been
"slowly but surely" referring Patañjali to this date. One of
the references he gives in support of this assertion is to the
following statement of I-tsing, the Chinese pilgrim, given by
Professor Max Müller in his Note on the Renaissance3: "There is

1. In the article on "The Aucityālaṁkāra of Kṣemendra, with a note
on the Date of Patañjali" read by Prof. Peterson before the Bombay
Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society on the 6th of March 1885, and
The note on the Date of Patañjali appears at pp. 181 ff.—[N. B. U.]
3. The Note on the Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature was omitted
from the subsequent editions of that work, as also from the Collected
Edition of Max Müller's Works. [N. B. U.]
a commentary on it (the Vṛtti Sūtra, i.e. the Kāśikā Vṛtti), entitled Cūrṇī, containing 24,000 Ślokas; it is a work of the learned Patanjali.” To speak of Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya as a commentary on the Kāśikā is to speak something that is absurd. The author of the Kāśikā himself tells us that his work is based, among other works, on the Bhāṣya, which can be no other than the Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali, and there is internal evidence at every step to show that it is based on that work. And there can be no question whatever that the Mahābhāṣya is not a commentary on the Kāśikā. The absurdity of the statement is also patent from what I-tsing himself states with regard to the dates of the several grammarians. Jayāditya, the author of the Vṛtti Sūtra, i.e., the Kāśikā, according to Professor Max Müller, died thirty years before I-tsing wrote, or about 660 A.D., while Bhartrhari, the author of a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, died forty years before, or about 650 A.D., so that the author of the Kāśikā died ten years after the author of a commentary on a commentary on his own work; that is, he was so fortunate as to have these two large and very learned works, written in elucidation of his own during his own lifetime by men who died before him. And yet this is the evidence that, according to Professor Peterson is “slowly but surely” referring Patanjali to a date much later than that assigned to him by Professor Goldstucker and myself. When I-tsing speaks of Patanjali’s work as a commentary on the Vṛtti Sūtra and of Jayāditya as the author of the Vṛtti Sūtra, he is confounding the Vārtika Sūtras of Kātyāyana with the Kāśikā or some work of Jayāditya, or has been mis-understood and mis-translated.

Professor Peterson’s other reference is to the verses quoted as from Panini in the several anthologies noticed by him in his Reports on the Search for Manuscripts during the last two years. These verses are precisely similar in character to those to which dates between 600 and 1,000 A.D. have been assigned; and therefore he says, “it is impossible to admit a gap of a thousand years between them.” He therefore brings Panini down to about
Goldstucker's Opinion

that period. He does not deny the possibility of there being two Pāṇinis. But he thinks "there is no evidence for such a supposition." If the similarity between the verses attributed to Pāṇini and others is a sufficient reason for referring both to the same period, ought not the utter dissimilarity between them and the language of the Sūtras, as well as the great difference between the Sanskrit the rules of which the Sūtras give and the Sanskrit of the verses, to be considered a reason sufficiently urgent for assigning to the Sūtras a period separated by a long interval from that in which the verses were written? If the argument based on the similarity is valid, that based on the dissimilarity is equally so; and as I proceed, I shall show that the latter is so powerful, and there are so many circumstances which harmonize only with the conclusion deducible from it, that the only option left to us is to suppose that the Pāṇini of the verses was altogether a different man from the Great Grammarian. It does not advance the cause of research to forget the points clearly made out by Goldstucker more than twenty years ago. A substance of his arguments and my expansion of them I have given in my Early History of the Deccan, and since the matter is of importance in the present discussion I quote it here:—

"Professor Goldstucker has shown from an examination of the Vārtikas, that certain grammatical forms are not noticed by Pāṇini but are taught by Katyāyana, and concludes that they did not exist in the language in Pāṇini's time. I have followed up the argument in my lectures2 "On the Sanskrit and Prakrit languages," and given from the Vārtikas several ordinary instances of such forms. From these one of two conclusions only is possible, viz., either that Pāṇini was a very careless and ignorant grammarian, or that the forms did not exist in the language in his time. The first is of course inadmissible, where-

fore the second must be accepted. I have also shown from a passage in the introduction to Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya, that verbal forms such as those of the Perfect which are taught by Pāṇini as found in the Bhāṣā or current language, not the Chāndasa or obsolete language, had gone out of use in the time of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, and participles had come to be used instead. Professor Goldstücker has also given a list of words used by Pāṇini in his Sūtras in a sense which became obsolete in the time of Kātyāyana and has shown what portion of Sanskrit Literature did not probably exist in Pāṇini’s time but was known to Kātyāyana, and in one case comes to the not unjustifiable conclusion that the time that had elapsed between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was so great that certain literary works which either did not exist in Pāṇini’s time or were not old to him came to be considered by Kātyāyana to be as old as those which were old to Pāṇini.”

To this I may now add, what I showed in the Preface to my Second Book of Sanskrit seventeen years ago, that according to Pāṇini’s rules the Aorist expresses (1) past time generally, or the simple completion of an action, (2) the past time of this day and not previous to this day and (3) recent past time; and thus resembles in every respect the English Present Perfect. But in the later language the distinction between that tense and the other two past tenses is set aside and the Aorist is used exactly like these. Now, the language of the verses ascribed to Pāṇini and generally the language of what Professor Max Müller calls the Renaissance period is grammatically the same as that of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, and is the language of participles instead of verbs; and even from theirs it differs in making extensive use of compounds and neglecting the distinction between the Aorist and the other past tenses. The Sanskrit of Pāṇini’s time is more archaic than that of Kātyāyana’s time, and Pāṇini’s rules are nowhere more scrupulously observed than in

such an ancient work as the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. The many forms and expressions which he teaches, and which must have existed in the language, are nowhere found in the later literature; while specimens of them are to be seen in that Brāhmaṇa and like works. Between therefore the archaic language of the Sūtras and the language which Panini calls Bhāṣā and of which he teaches the grammar, on the one hand, and the language of the Renaissance period on the other, there is such a wide difference that no one will ever think of attributing a work written in the style and language of this period to the Great Grammario. I have in my first lecture assigned Yāska and Panini to the same period of Sanskrit Literature; and therefore, in my opinion, the style and manner of a work written by Panini, the grammarian must resemble those of the Nirukta; but in the few verses attributed to Panini there is no such resemblance whatever. Should the entire work be discovered and found as a whole to be written in an archaic style, there will be time enough to consider its claim to be the work of Panini; but at present we must reject that advanced on behalf of these artificial verses.

I will here briefly state the other arguments I have elsewhere used to prove Panini’s great antiquity. In the Early History of the Deccan I have mentioned that while in the Sūtras of Panini there are a great many names of places in Afghanistan, Panjab, and Northern India, there is none of any situated in Southern India. But Katyāyana inserts such names in his

1. I have shown this, so far as the Aorist is concerned, in the preface to my Second Book of Sanskrit, and I learn from Dr. Kielhorn that one of his German pupils has recently done the same as regards the cases, in his dissertation for his Ph. D.

2. See the Wilson Philological Lectures for 1877, printed separately, Bombay 1914 p. 30. These Wilson Philological Series 1877, are also now printed in Sir R. G. Bhandarkar’s Collected Works in Volume IV. [N. B. U.]


emendations of the Sūtras, and from this circumstance I have concluded, as Goldstücker has done in other cases, that Southern India was unknown to the Āryas of the North in the time of Pāṇini, while it was known in the time of Kātyāyana. The Aśoka Inscriptions contain a good many names of places in the South, which shows that the Āryas were familiar with that part of the country in his time, i.e. in the middle of the third century before Christ. Pāṇini therefore must have flourished before the third century at least. In a paper published in the first number of the Indian Antiquary I have given reasons for identifying a town of the name of Sāṅgala, destroyed by Alexander the Great, with Sāṅkala mentioned by Pāṇini under IV. 2. 75. Sāṅkala therefore existed in Pāṇini’s time, which it could not have done if he lived after Alexander the Great. Pāṇini must therefore have flourished before him. In a review of this paper Professor Weber states that certain Greek geographers speak of the existence of a town of that name even after the time of Alexander. But I believe it is a town of the name of Śākala that they mention, and Śākala, we know, was a flourishing town in Panjab up to a very late period, and was different from Saṅgala which was situated to the east of the Rāvi, while Śākala was situated to the west. Ptolemy mentions Sagala which must be Śākala and not Sāṅkala, as it wants the nasal. Śākala is mentioned in the Mahābhārata as the capital of the Madras, by Patañjali under Pāṇini IV. 2. 104, and in the form of Sāgala in Pāli Buddhistic books such as the Milinda-pañho. It appears to have been the capital of the Indo-Bactrian princes, since Milinda or Menander is spoken of as reigning at that place. But Sāṅkala is not mentioned in any Indian work, or Sangala by any Greek writer, in a manner to show that it existed after the time of Alexander. Śākala was an old city, and appears to have been re-built by an Indo-Bactrian king and called Euthydemia. Ptolemy gives this as another name of Sagala.

1. Printed in this volume pages 102–107. [N. B. U.]
2. See above. [N. B. U.]
Sāṅgala was destroyed by Alexander, and there is nothing to show that it was re-built. In a Copper-plate Grant of the Valabhi Dynasty, dated 326, a translation of which was published by me in that same number,\(^1\) and a Nāgarī Transcript in the tenth Volume of the Journal of this Society, puns on the technical terms of Pāṇini are used in describing a king, who is represented as thoroughly versed in the Tantra or art of the Śālāṭuriya, as well as in that of government. By the Śālāṭuriya is, of course, meant Pāṇini, he being a native of the town of Śālāṭura. Such a use of the name of Pāṇini and of his technical terms argues a great deal of everyday familiarity with his work on the part of the writer, and of those for whom he wrote, which would not have been possible unless he had for a very long time been in undisputed possession of the place he has occupied in Sanskrit Literature. Now the date 326 refers to the Gupta-Valabhi Era and corresponds according to my view to 645 A. D., and according to the views of others to 493 and 516 A. D. Thus then in the first half of the seventh century or about the end of the fifth, Pāṇini was an author of established repute, with whom everybody was familiar, and consequently, even then, of great antiquity. Hiuen Tsiang mentions Pāṇini, the author of the grammar, as having been born at Śālāṭura. Five hundred years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, he tells us, an Arhat converted a boy at Śālāṭura whom he saw undergoing chastisement at the hands of his teacher for not learning his lessons in Pāṇini's grammar. In connection with the Arhat's observation that the Rṣi Pāṇini had compiled the Śabdavidyā, the teacher said that the children of the town revered his eminent qualities, and that a statue erected to his memory still existed at Śālāṭura. The Arhat thereupon told the teacher that the boy whom he had been chastising was Pāṇini himself, who had come into the world again to study the holy doctrine of the Tathāgata. As Pāṇini he had wasted a vigorous intellect in studying worldly literature.

and composing heretical treatises, and therefore had, since that time, run through cycles of continued births. This boy therefore had no capacity for the study of grammar. From this it is clear that, according to the Buddhistic tradition prevalent in Huen Tsiang's time, i.e., in the first half of the seventh century, the length of time that elapsed between Panini and the end of the fifth century after the Nirvana, was computable by cycles of continued births. And the "recent speculation" also that Professor Peterson speaks of, instead of modernizing Panini, tends in the same direction. For, we now know that Bhartrhari lived before 650 A.D., and from the account that he gives of the fate of the Mahabhāṣya, it appears, as I shall mention further on more particularly, that that work was written several centuries before him. And Panini, of course, must have lived a long time before Patañjali, the author of the Mahabhāṣya. A very large variety of arguments such as these clearly prove Panini's high antiquity. The modern verses, therefore, attributed to him must be regarded as written by another author of that time.

In his Second Report, Professor Peterson quotes a verse ascribed to Rājaśekhara in which Panini, the author of the grammar, is represented to be the author of a poem entitled Jāmbubvatijaya. He also speaks of Professor Aufricht's having seen it stated in an anonymous verse that the poet Pāṇini was the son of Dākṣi. In themselves both these statements prove nothing as to the age of Pāṇini. The great Grammarians may have been a poet, and may have written a work called Jāmbubvatijaya. But if the verses brought to light are from that work and consequently the work is of the nature of those belonging to the period of the Renaissance then at once the tradition which represents the author of that work to be the same as the author of the Aṣṭādhyāyi must be rejected as conflicting with the clearest evidence, internal as well as external. It is a tradition of the same nature as that which represents the author of the Nalodaya to be the same as the author of Śakuntalā, or which refers Kālidāsa to the
first century before the Christian era, or which makes Kalidāsa
and Bhavabhūti contemporaries, or which identifies Hāla with
Kuntala, and both with Śālivāhana.

This, then, is what comes of the "recent speculation" which
is "slowly but surely" referring Patañjali to the fifth century
of the Christian era. And if I can show that the evidence on
which the author of the Mahābhāṣya is referred to the middle
of the second century before Christ not only remains totally
un-shaken by anything that Professor Peterson has directly urged
against it, but is corroborated by facts, recently brought to light,
the Professor's "recent speculation" will be utterly powerless
by itself to modernize Pāṇini and his commentators. Professor
Peterson himself sees this, and hence he makes only a passing
allusion to it, and does not bring it forward prominently.

The first thing against which Professor Peterson directs his
attack is the statement of Kalhāna, the chronicler of Kaśmir,
that Candrācārya and others introduced the study of the Mahā­
bhāṣya into that country in the reign of Abhimanyu. His state­
ment is considered as deserving of no credit, on the general
ground that the part of the Rajatarangini where it occurs is,
according to the Professor, full of improbabilities. In regard to
such a professedly historical work as the Rajtarangini the correct
principle to go upon is, in my opinion, to accept such statements
as are not improbable in themselves, and do not go against
stronger and more reliable evidence. If we adopt the principle
laid down by Professor Peterson, we shall have to reject every­
thing that is said in this part of the work, even his statement
that Kaśmir was ruled over a little before this time by three
princes of Tunuska extraction, Huśka, Juśka, and Kaniśka. But
Inscriptions and coins prove this statement of Kalhāna to be true,
and confirmation of this nature shows that he is entitled to our
credit, except, I repeat, in those cases where stronger evidence
proves him to be wrong. And in the present case not only is
here nothing that goes against his statement, but the passage in

1 Rajatarangini, I. 176, Bombay Sanskrit Series. [N. B. U.]
Bhartrhari’s Vākyapadlya confirms it, since, there also, we are told that Candrācārya revived the study of the Mahābhāṣya. Of course, Bhartrhari does not say that Candrācārya did that in the reign of Abhimanyu; but since the main portion of the statement is confirmed, it is in every way reasonable that we should believe in the remaining part. Professor Peterson says that Kalhana’s authority is the statement in the Vākyapadlya, but this is a mere assumption, and the fact that Bhartrhari does not mention the name of Abhimanyu would rather show that it was not the Vākyapadlya that Kalhana followed. In another place the Rājatarāṅgini states1 that a subsequent king, Jayāpiḍa, who is said to have reigned from 755 A. D. to 786 A. D., re-introduced the study of the Mahābhāṣya which had ceased to be studied in his realm. The word विस्तिर्च which occurs in the verse and signifies “cut off,” “interrupted,” and which, consequently, I have translated by “ceased to be studied,” shows that the Mahābhāṣya continued to be studied in Kāśmir for some time after Candrācārya had revived its study, but had fallen into disuse in that country. Hence it was that Jayāpiḍa brought Pāṇḍitas from other parts of India, and re-introduced the study of the book. For this statement, also, Professor Peterson thinks the passage in the Vākyapadlya to be Kalhana’s authority, and believes that the author of the Kāśmir chronicle divided the passage into two parts, and assigned Candrācārya to the reign of Abhimanyu for “greater glory” of that monarch. But why he should be so partial to that monarch, removed as he was from his time by centuries, it is difficult to conceive. The Professor thinks this latter statement of Kalhana about Jayāpiḍa’s revival of the study of the Mahābhāṣya “to be far more deserving of credit,” and understands by विस्तिर्च that cessation of the study of the work in the whole of India and not in Kāśmir alone, from which, according to the Vākyapadlya, Candrācārya “had (recently?) rescued” it. For these several assumptions, however, the Professor gives no grounds, and to me this looks like

1. Rājatarāṅgini IV. 488, Bombay Sanskrit Series. [N. B. U.]
a process of manufacturing history to order, and not interpreting history. But in this way Professor Peterson falls unawares into a trap which he has prepared for himself. He evidently seems to think that the revival of the study of the Mahābhāṣya by Candrācārya, mentioned by Bhartṛhari, took place in about 755 A.D., in the reign of Jayāpiṇḍa; but Bhartṛhari, who mentions the fact, died, according to I-tsing, the Chinese traveller, about the year 650 A.D.; so that according to the Professor's reading of history Bhartṛhari makes mention of a fact that took place about 105 years after his death! Thus then Kalhana did not assign one part of what took place in the time of Jayāpiṇḍa to Abhimanyu's reign "for the greater glory" of that monarch, and not only is there nothing that conflicts with that author's placing Candrācārya in the reign of Abhimanyu, but all that we know is in perfect harmony with it. Hence the statement of Kalhana must be accepted. Now, when Abhimanyu reigned it is somewhat difficult to determine, since the Kasmir chronology of this early period is not clear. Abhimanyu, according to Kalhana, got possession of the Kasmir throne after the three Turuṣka or Indo-Scythian princes. Kaniṣka, the first of these, is referred to the first century, and is by some considered to be the founder of the Śaka era which begins in 78 A.D. On this supposition the last of these princes reigned up to about 178 A.D. But I am inclined, for reasons elsewhere given, to place Kaniṣka about a century later, so as to bring the last Indo-Scythian prince about the end of the third century. Thus the study of the Mahābhāṣya was revived by Candrācārya about the end of the third century at the latest.

Professor Peterson next discusses the sense of the passage in the Mahābhāṣya in which the name Maurya occurs. This has been understood to be the name of the dynasty that ruled over Pātaliputra and the whole of Northern India at the end of the

2. "A Peep into the Early History of India", this Volume, p. 35. [N. B. U.]

fourth and in the third century before Christ. Professor Peterson criticises Professor Goldstücker's translation, says that no contrast between the Mauryas and common people, which he thinks led Goldstücker to understand the dynasty by that name, is here meant, and takes the word Maurya to mean a guild or caste of idol-makers, which is the interpretation put upon the word by Nāgojibhāṭṭa.

That Goldstücker misunderstood the grammatical import of the passage and that Professor Peterson gives it correctly is true. I myself published a translation of it in 1873, in accordance with the native commentators, and stated that Goldstücker's translation was wrong. But in other respects Professor Peterson's translation is incorrect, and the grounds for taking "Maurya" as the name of a dynasty that was extinct in Patanjali's time still remain. The contrast between a royal dynasty and common people is not that ground; but there is another contrast which Professor Peterson has lost sight of and which consequently has been neglected in his translation. That translation is:

"In that case [if अप्रण्वे is to be part of the rule] the following expression is not obtained [i.e., must be declared to be bad grammar, while as a matter of fact, it is in common use, and so it is the correctness of the Sūtra that is in peril]. स्कन्दो विशालः "A Skanda in act to shoot." "Why?" "It is for gain that the Mauryas make images." तां न स्वाद "Let it be admitted that so far to them the rule कनो लुप्त शुद्ध should not apply, but that the affix Ka should be used." यास्वेताः संम्बन्धत् पूजार्थाः "But whatever images among these even, are from the beginning intended for worship and not for sale, तां भविष्यति to them that rule will apply, and the affix Ka will be barred." The Italics are mine with the exception of those in the first expression.

1. This Volume, p. 154. [N.B.U.]
2. Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini, V. 3. 99. अप्रण्व इत्युत्स्थवेत तत्षेष न सिद्धितः। शिष्यः स्कन्दो विशालः हति। किं कारणम्। नैसिद्धिरसाधिकैर्चुः। प्रकल्पितः। भोजसु न स्वाद।। यास्वेताः संम्बन्धत् पूजाधीस्तात् भविष्यति।
Professor Peterson rejects the reading सिव: before स्कन्द:, why, I do not understand, unless the reason be that it goes against the translation which he was worked himself into believing to be correct. विशालः he translates by “in act to shoot” and his authority is a certain explanation of the word with a second-hand quotation in support from a commentary on the Amarakośa, contained in the St. Petersburg Lexicon, and copied from that as a matter of course by Monier Williams. But Böhtlingk and Roth have not found a single instance of the use of the word in that sense in the whole extent of the literature which they have examined. Still Professor Peterson thinks Patañjali has used it in that sense. But after all what Böhtlingk and Roth and Monier Williams say is that विशाल: expresses “an attitude in shooting”; and not “one in that attitude”; so that if the sense is to be admitted here at all, स्कन्द: विशालः would mean “Skanda who is an attitude in shooting,” which of course will not do. Patañjali, however, uses the word as expressive of a certain god who is always mentioned together with Skanda. Under Pāṇini VIII. 15, he gives द्वन्द्व स्कन्दविशालः along with द्वन्द्व पर्वतनारदः as an instance of a copulative compound of the names of things or persons always mentioned together, which admits of the use of the word Dvandva or “pair” instead of Dvau, or “two.” It is clear from this that Patañjali himself means to speak of them as two individuals always associated together, and forming a pair, and the dual also expresses that they were two.

Now Professor Peterson’s translation of मैथुनेः हिरण्याधिषिद्धिच्छः प्रकृतिलिंगात्: is “It is for gain that the Mauryas make images.” “Make” is present tense while the original प्रकृतिलिंगात्: is past tense, that being the past passive participle of the causal of हृष्: Again प्रकृतिलिंगात्: means “devised,” “planned,” “used as means,” and not simply “made.” A closer translation of हिरण्याधिषिद्धिच्छः than that we have in the expression “for gain” ought to be given; for an important point is involved in that. Patañjali applies several times the expression आयिनाः हिरण्येन भवति “seek for gold” to kings; and
the presumption it gives rise to is that here too those to whom he applies it must be kings. In the last sentence Professor Peterson's translation of the nominative एता: by "among these" is wrong. It is only the genitive एतसाध्य or the locative एतासाध्य that can be so translated. Similarly संप्रति cannot mean "from the beginning" as the Professor takes it to mean; it can only signify "now," "in these days," &c.

The sense of the passage is this:—Pāṇini lays down a rule that the termination Ka which is appended to the name of an object to signify something resembling that object (इवे), provided that something is an image (प्रतिक्षेत्र), is dropped (कऽलो लुप्त.), when the image is used for deriving a livelihood (आविकार्यं) and is not vendible (च अपवर्ये). Now, Patañjali raises this question. The addition of the condition that the image should not be vendible renders such forms as Śivah, Skandah, Viśakhah, grammatically not justifiable (तेवेंदं—विशाख इति). He must here be taken to mean that these forms are current, and that the description "not vendible" is not applicable to them. "Why not" (किं कारणम्), he asks. "Because the Mauryas, seeking for gold or money, used images of gods as means" (सौर्यं—प्रकल्पिताः). Here the author must be understood to say that the description "not vendible" is not applicable to the images now called Śivah, Skandah, and Viśakhah because such images were sold by the Mauryas. They are therefore vendible objects, though as a matter of fact they are not for sale, and though the selling of such images of gods is discreditable. It is the act of the Mauryas that has rendered them vendible objects. Hence the termination cannot be dropped in accordance with the rule, and they should be called Śivakah, Skandakah and Viśakhakah, but they are called Śivah, Skandah, and Viśakhah. "It may be (अवेदं) that the rule about the dropping of Ka is not applicable (न स्वाभ) to them, i.e. to those (तास) images of gods which were sold by the Mauryas. But as to these (एता:) [viz. those called by the names Śivah, Skandah, and Viśakhah, the correctness of which is in question] which (अ:.) are at the present day used for worship (संप्रति प्रजापाः) the
rule is applicable to them (ताहि भविष्यति)." That is, the termination Ka should be dropped in their case and the forms whose correctness was questioned are correct.

The forms are correct, because they signify images of gods which are now worshipped and are not vendible. They were thought to come under the class of vendible objects because such images were used by the Mauryas for raising money; but the vendibility of some does not make those that are worshipped vendible, and consequently, the names of those images do come under Pāṇini's rule and drop Ka. In understanding the passage thus I have set aside Nāgojibhaṭṭa's comment which I think can be shown to be wrong. He appears to me to say that the words, Śivah, Skandah and Viśakhah, express images sold by the Mauryas, and as such they are vendible objects and consequently should have the termination Ka, i.e. the forms should be Śivakah, &c., and not Śivah, &c., as given in the Mahābhāṣya which are incorrect, while those, which, in conformity with Pāṇini's Sūtra drop Ka, are such as express images, intended for that sort of worship which immediately after their manufacture brings in gains and enables a man to earn his livelihood. Now this makes no difference as to the province or operation of Pāṇini's rule; but that the passage itself has been misunderstood by Nāgojibhaṭṭa appears to me clear. He interprets कपित पुजाय्याः as "bringing in gains immediately after manufacture," which interpretation is far-fetched, as are those of all commentators when they do not understand the point and still wish to explain a passage somehow. He also neglects the word एताः. But the great mistake he makes is his forgetting that when Patañjali supposes an opponent and makes him raise an objection by the expression न विचारति, "this is not justifiable by that rule," he very generally makes him object to the rule by bringing forward correct forms which that rule does not explain. Eventually, he interprets the rule in such a manner that those forms also are explained by it. In accordance with my interpretation this is exactly what is done
hence by Patañjali. If the passage were put in the form of a dialogue between the Doctor (Siddhântin) and his opponent (Pûrvapakṣin), it would stand thus:—

Op. Pāṇini inserts the condition that the image should not be vendible. Then, the forms Śivah, Skandah, Viśākhah, are not correct according to his rule. [These forms express images of those gods, and should have the suffix Ka].

Doc. Why?

Op. Because the Mauryas, desirous of raising money, used as means the images of gods, [i.e. they bartered them; and these are such images, and consequently belong to the class of vendible objects].

Doc. Those images may not come under the rule, [because they bartered them, and consequently they may not drop Ka]. But these, [viz., those in question] which at the present day are used for worship, come under the operation of the rule [and consequently the Ka is dropped].

Does this passage contain history? The past tense in the third speech itself shows that whoever the Mauryas were, they existed at a time which preceded the present time expressed in the last sentence of the fourth speech. And the present time must clearly be the time when Patañjali wrote. The Mauryas could not have been idol-makers, for, if they were, there was no necessity for referring them to past time. Nâgojibhâṭṭa, no doubt, says they were idol-makers. But Nâgojibhâṭṭa was a Śâstri or Paṇḍita, who lived about a hundred and fifty years ago, and though a man of very great learning and acuteness, did not care at all for history or had no conception of it, and as I have already observed, like other commentators, he often cuts the gordian knot of a difficulty instead of untying it. And what authority is there in the whole range of Sanskrit literature for taking the word in that sense? It is used in the Mârkaṇḍeya Purâṇa to express a certain class of demons. But these demons can have nothing to do here. The word therefore must be understood in the only other known
sense, and that is, that it was the name of a royal dynasty founded by Candragupta about 320 B.C. And Patanjali’s expression Hiranyārthibhih does certainly not discountenance the hypothesis, as I have already observed; for he has used the same expression in an uncompound condition in speaking of kings generally. What is this fact that the author of the Mahābhāṣya mentions regarding the Mauryas? It may be, as Professor Weber has stated, that the Mauryas coined money by stamping the images of gods on the pieces; or it may be anything else.

Professor Peterson next proceeds to consider the historical value of the passages pointed out by Professor Goldstücker and myself, the events mentioned in which we regard as contemporaneous with Patanjali. In Goldstücker’s passage, Patanjali gives अरुणाहत्तमः साकेतम्, “The Yavana besieged Saketa,” as an instance of Kātyāyana’s rule that the Imperfect should be used to express an event, (1) known generally to people, and (2) not witnessed by the speaker, but (3) capable of being witnessed by him. The event mentioned in the instance must be understood as having these three attributes. The Yavana’s siege of Saketa was known to all, and could be actually witnessed by the speaker if he wished, but was not, as a matter of fact; that is to say, the event took place during the lifetime of the speaker. But who is the speaker? Is he necessarily to be supposed to be contemporaneous with Patanjali or Patanjali himself; or is his time an irrelevant matter? Professor Peterson thinks it is irrelevant, and the speaker may be supposed to have lived any number of years before Patanjali. Then how is it to be made out by Patanjali’s pupil, for whose edification he gives the example, that the verb Arunad here expresses an action that could be witnessed by the speaker? What Professor Peterson says amounts to this, that the pupil should know, as we now know it, that the verb expresses such an action, from the fact that this is an example of the rule that the Imperfect is used to denote an action that could be witnessed by the speaker. Then what was the necessity of a historical example? Patanjali might have
given such an instance as this:—ैवददात समुदायमन्तव, "Devadatta went to Mathura." That this was a fact well known, not witnessed by the speaker, but capable of being witnessed by him, his pupils should have gathered from the fact that it was an example of the rule. And what is the point of the counter-examples that he gives? He puts the question, "Why does the Vārtikakāra say, 'the event must not be witnessed by the speaker'? [परोक्ष श्रृंग तिमर्यम्]?

The answer is, "In such instances as 'The sun has risen' [उदाधवातिवः], the Imperfect is not to be used but the Aorist", for this fact is known to people generally and is capable of being witnessed by the speaker; but it is not such as is not witnessed by the speaker. Again, "Why does he say the event must be known to people generally [होकविववात श्रृंग तिमर्यम्]?" "Because, in such instances as 'Devadatta made a mat' (वकार कटे देवदत्तः), the Perfect must be used and not the Imperfect"; for this event is not witnessed by the speaker and is capable of being witnessed by him, but it is not a thing that is known to people generally. And lastly, "Why does he say it must be capable of being witnessed by the speaker [प्रयोक्तर्देशेननिष्प: श्रृंग तिमर्यम्]?" "Because in such instances as 'Vasudeva killed Karīśa' (नानां क्षेणं किल वासुदेवः), the Perfect should be used, and not the Imperfect"; for the event is generally known to people, and is not witnessed by the speaker; but it is not capable of being witnessed by the speaker, as it took place a long time ago. It will thus be seen that these counter-examples are such that their possessing two of the three conditions, and not possessing one, is a fact that is known to the persons whom Patañjali is addressing, and is not to be made out by them simply because he says so. Similarly, the fact that the example, "the Yavana besieged Sāketa", possesses the three necessary conditions, must be known to the pupils independently of the rule, and then only can they see that the Imperfect is properly used. If the existence of the three conditions in the example were a thing to be made out from the wording of the rule only, अहंकार्णं किल वासुदेवः would also serve as
an example of the rule instead of अरूणाध्वन: साक्षितम् for we might suppose the speaker to be contemporaneous with Vasudeva, since the rule requires it to be so. The counter-examples would be pointless if there were no way of knowing, independently of the rule, that one of the conditions was absent. And we shall see, if we compare these examples, that the means of judging whether the conditions of a rule are realized in an example are supplied by the pupil's acquaintance with the world, and with history and mythology. When the conditions are verbal, it is the eye and the ear that discover whether they are fulfilled. This is what Patanjali supposes, and not a previous acquaintance with the language, as Professor Peterson thinks. Even in the English example he has given, "In six days God made heaven and earth", we know that this use of the past tense is proper, because we know from the Book of Genesis and not from the rule about that tense, that God did create heaven and earth in six days, i.e. it is a past action.

I will here endeavour to state clearly the relation between the rules and examples given by a grammarian. Every rule lays down a certain condition, and prescribes what should be done when the condition is satisfied. An example intended to illustrate such a rule can serve its purpose only then when the pupil or reader sees, independently of the rule, from his knowledge of the world, including that of history, that the condition mentioned in the rule is satisfied and what is prescribed is done. In those examples in which the names of possible individuals such as John, and Caius, and Devadatta are used, the condition can only be satisfied by the possible and not actual existence of its requirements. "John is writing a book" is an appropriate example of the use of the Present Progressive, because the condition that the action of writing should be of a nature to be progressive and present is satisfied in so far as it is possible for the action to have both characteristics in this case. But this possibility is independent of the rule, and is to be made out by the
reader or pupil through his knowledge of the world. For if, instead of this example, we have "John is loving Jane and hating Tom", we see it is not appropriate, though the rule is the same. The reason is that the condition is not satisfied, as the actions of loving and hating are not of a nature to admit of progressiveness, and this we know independently of the rule. In the same way the example, "Gibbon is writing the history of the Decline and Fall" would be inappropriate as given by grammarians of the present day, because the condition that the action should be present cannot be satisfied, for Gibbon is not living now. But as given by a grammarian living while Gibbon was writing his work, it would be appropriate; for that condition would then be satisfied. A grammarian of the present day can use the fact only for illustrating the use of the Past tense and say, "Gibbon wrote the History of the Decline and Fall." It will, therefore, be seen, that when examples containing the names of actual or historical and not possible individuals are used, the condition of the rule can only be satisfied by its requirements having an actual or historical, and not possible, existence.

Thus, then, in the case before us, in which we have a historical example, the requirements of the condition must have an actual or historical existence, and Patañjali's pupils must see from their acquaintance with the world, and not from the rule of Kātyāyana, that the siege by the Yavana was known to people generally, that it was not witnessed by the speaker, but that it was capable of being witnessed by him. Now if the speaker was an indefinite person who lived nobody knew when, it was not possible that the pupils should be able to find out whether the condition that the siege should be capable of being witnessed by him was satisfied in the example, and therefore he must be supposed to be contemporaneous with them and with Patañjali, or Patañjali himself. Professor Peterson thinks Nāgojibhāṭṭa supports his view. But Nāgojibhāṭṭa puts himself in the position of a modern reader, and not in the position of Patañjali's pupils; and infers from the Vārtika and the example that the speaker
belongs to the same time as that when the siege took place. We
know nothing of this siege and when it was undertaken: and
have consequently to infer from the passage the chronological
relation between it and the speaker. But Nāgojibhatta does not
say that the contemporaneity of the siege and the speaker is the
only inference that is valid, and that the “user” is not necessari­
ly Patañjali or contemporaneous with him. On the other hand,
he remarks:— “The killing of Kamsa is not even capable of being
witnessed by a speaker living in these days (इद्यानांतनमयोऽक्षुः),
while in the example Arunād etc.,' the speaker is contempora­
ous with the action.” The word इद्यानांतत ‘living in these days’
which he has used in connection with the speaker in the coun­
ter-example, “Vāsudeva killed Kamsa,” is to be understood as
applicable to the प्रवक्ता or speaker in the example also; so that
Nāgojibhatta must be taken to mean that the speaker of these
days is contemporaneous with the action. “These days” are
of course the days when Patañjali wrote.

Again, even if the contemporaneity of the siege of Saketa by
the Yavana and of Patañjali be admitted, it proves nothing, ac­
cording to Professor Peterson, as regards the age of Patañjali.
“There is nothing to show that the Yavanas besieged Saketa in
the time of Menander, or that they did not besiege that city more
than once in the centuries that followed.” But the question has
certainly advanced a stage and it were very much to be wished
that the Professor had taken it up there. Of the Indo-Bactrian
princes Demetrius and Menander have been represented by the
Greek historians to have made the largest conquests. The
former is said to have reigned between 205 and 165 B. C.2
According to Strabo, as Goldstücker has stated, Menander pushed
his conquests up to the Jumna (Yamunā) river. The Indo-Bac­
trian dynasty became extinct in B. C. 85, according to Lassen.

1. माध्ये जजानालि । कंसच्यो हि नेद्यानांतनमयोक्षुः । अर्जुनादः
सुदाहण तु तुर्मकालेः प्रवक्तिः पाध्यमू । From a MS. in my possession.


In the Gārgi Sarīhitā, the Yavanas are mentioned as having conquered Sāketa, Pañcāla, and Mathurā, and penetrated even to Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra. Of the Indo-Bactrian kings, Menander was the one who seems to have come in close contact with the Indians. There is a work in Pāli entitled Milindapaṇhā which gives an account of a religious conversation between a Yoṇa king of the name of Milinda and a Buddhist sage of the name of Nāgasena. Milinda has been identified with Menander. There is, therefore, every probability that it was Menander that laid the siege to Sāketa alluded to by Patañjali. But if Professor Peterson is not satisfied, no Greek invasion of India could have taken place after 85 B.C.; so that the "centuries that followed" during which the Yavanas could, according to him, have besieged the city are reduced to about 60 years. That the Indians called the Greeks only Yavanas during the three centuries preceding the Christian era and about as many after, is a fact. Aśoka calls Antiochus, king of Syria, a Yoṇa-rāja. Milinda or Menander is so styled in the Milindapaṇhā, and in the Gārgi Sarīhitā the Yavanas are spoken of as good astronomers; wherefore the Greeks must have been meant. Kaniśka and his successors are called Tūruṣkas in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, and the Indo-Scythians, who overran a large part of the country, were called Śakas. Persians or Parthians are spoken of as Pahlavas; and the Huns, who poured into the country later, are styled Hūnas. So that during this early period, each of these foreign races was called by a distinctive name and there was no confusion. By the name Yavana, Patañjali therefore could not have meant a prince of any other than the Greek race. Hence the siege of Sāketa by a Yavana could by no possibility have taken place after 85 B.C.; and for the reasons above stated and also because the Indo-Bactrian kings could not have invaded the country during the years of their decline, it was Menander in all likelihood that is spoken of as the Yavana by our great Grammarian.

As with the example pointed out by Goldstücker, so with mine. Katyāyana's Vārtika is: "the Bhavanti or forms of the Present
Tense should be prescribed for use to express an action which has begun but not ceased, "for, though at a particular time during the interval that action may not be going on, still if it has not ceased, it should be expressed even at that time, by means of the Present tense. “Here we sacrifices for Puṣpa­mitra” (हेष एपामिवं राज्यम्) is one of the three instances by which Patañjali illustrates the rule. It is a historical instance, and consequently on the principles laid down before, the re­quirement of the condition mentioned in the rule must have an actual or historical existence. If Puṣpamitra had flourished long before Patañjali, it would not have done for him to illustrate an action that had begun but not ended by speaking of his sacrifice, in the same manner as it would not do for us in these days, to illustrate such an action by “God is making heaven and earth” or “Gibbon is writing the History of the Decline and Fall.” And as we must have recourse in these days to an event that is going on at present, if we wish to give a historical illustration, and say such a thing as “Kielhorn is editing the Mahābhaṭṣya,” so when Patañjali wanted to give a historical illustration of the rule, and said, “Here we sacrifice for Puṣpamitra,” it must have been an occurrence actually then going on that he had recourse to. In other words, Patañjali’s pupils must be able to see that in this example, the condition laid down in the rule that “an action must have begun but not ended” is fulfilled. This would, of course, be impossible for them to find out if Puṣpamitra flourished long before them. If instead of this historical fact, Patañjali had instanced a possible fact and said, “Here we sacrifice for Devadatta” (हेष देवदत्तं राज्यम्), all that would have been necessary is that the action of sacrificing (यज्ञनिक्रिया) should be of a nature to have a possible present existence and to extend over many days and admit of intervals during which it is not actually going on; and then his example would have resembled such a modern example as “John is writing a book.” But Puṣpamitra, being a historical personage, the action affirmed with reference to him must have an actual present existence at the time. When, therefore Patañjali wrote this, the sacrifice of Puṣpamitra had begun, but not ended.
Professor Peterson, however, considers it “more probable than not” from the whole context of the passage, and not from the illustration, that “Patañjali lived at the time, and perhaps at the court, of Puṣpamitra.” The historical import of the illustration I have explained, and nothing more remains to be said on this point, except that instead of saying the “whole context of the passage,” if the Professor had said “from this passage, and another in which Puṣpamitra’s sacrifice is spoken of and he is represented as giving the money required, and from a third in which he is meant to be spoken of as a particular king (राजविभाग:) and as holding his courts”, it would have answered his purpose better. But though Professor Peterson admits that Patañjali very probably lived in the time of Puṣpamitra, still he thinks that there is no ground for believing that he was the Puṣpamitra who reigned in the second century before Christ; and has got Dr. Bhagvanlal Indraji to unearth for him another Puṣpamitra, who lived about the time of Skandagupta. But this process has certainly not succeeded. For, in the first place, General Cunningham, writing in 1861-62, says with regard to the Bhitari Lāṭ and the Inscription on it: “Unfortunately, this face is much weather-worn, and the stone has also peeled off in several places, so that the Inscription is now in even a worse condition than when I first saw it in January 1836.” Then, the line read समुदितवलकोषमपमयमिभवे यहितवा by Dr. Bhau Daji, and समुदितवलकोषपमयमिभवे च नित्वा by Dr. Bhagvanlal (both reading from the same transcript), reads in General Cunningham’s copy दर्पच्छयमकोष वाक्यमिभवे गदात्वा, where we see Puṣyamitra is transformed into Vakyamitra. This shows unmistakably in what condition the Inscription is. In the impression or facsimile given by Dr. Bhau Daji, I can read समुदितवलकोष *** चित्त्र यहित्त्वा. The चित्त्र of Bhagvanlal’s नित्वा does not at all appear there, and the word looks certainly far more like यहित्त्वा than च नित्त्वा, and General Cunningham’s गदात्त्वा agrees better with the former than with the

2. Ibid, plate XXX.
The two letters between कोष and दिर्व are illegible, and the second certainly looks much more like General Cunningham's श्य than श्य and may be श्य, and it was on this account that Bhau Daji himself must have enclosed "Pusya" within brackets in his translation. It cannot be a printer's error, as Professor Peterson supposes; and the reason why पुष्य is not bracketed in the Nagari Transcript must have been that Bhau Daji himself did not read a proof of it, but left it to his Śāstris. There is then no authority for reading the word as "Pusyamitra" in the published copies of the Inscription. So that until Professor Peterson gets Dr. Bhagvanlal to publish a more legible facsimile, I must refuse to believe in his Pusyamitra's having been a man of flesh and bones and in his having been conquered by Skandagupta.1

But supposing that there was a prince of that name in Skandagupta's time, is it possible he could have been Patanjali's Puspamitra? Decidedly not. Let us determine the environments of Patanjali's Puspamitra as they are to be gathered from the Mahā-

1. After the above was written I saw Mr. Fleet in Poona. As Epigraphical Surveyor to the Government of India he has taken fresh impressions of the Gupta Inscriptions. He was good enough to show that of the Inscription on the Bhitari Lāṭ to me. He agrees with General Cunningham in stating that the inscription is much worn and illegible, and says it is the worst of the Gupta inscriptions. He reads पुष्यमित्र but instead of च जिन्ना there is in his copy मूढ़ीत्वा distinctly. But he says the whole line is quite capable of being read समुद्दितवल्कोषापुष्यमित्रादगृहीत्वा; and this, I believe, is a much better reading than Bhagvanlal's समुद्दितवल्कोषापुष्यमित्रान्त. For, the ablative कोषां as taken to express the means by which Skandagupta is represented to have conquered Pusyamitra is unquestionably ungrammatical. The accusative, therefore, is correct, and thus पुष्यमित्र for पुष्यमित्र is also correct. If then this is the true reading, पुष्यमित्र becomes the name, not of an individual, but of a tribe, and a tribe of that name is mentioned in the Purāṇas as having held power over some part of the country during the period of confusion that followed the overthrow of the Andhribhrtyas.
bhāṣya, and then examine whether they are to be found in the first prince of the Śuṅga dynasty who reigned in the second century before Christ, or in Skandagupta's supposed Pusyaimitra. 1. Patañjali's Puspamitra performed, as we have seen, a sacrifice which must have been the Aṣvamedha sacrifice performed by paramount sovereigns. 2. He must have lived at a time when the country was exposed to the inroads of Yavanas. For, though Professor Peterson has denied the contemporaneity of Patañjali and the sieges of Śaketa and Madhyamika he cannot deny that such events must have taken place at a time sufficiently near to that of Patañjali in order that he might know of them, think of them, and speak of them. 3. Patañjali's Puspamitra lived at a time when the memory of another great king of the name of Candragupta had not died away. For under Pāṇini I. 1. 68 Patañjali gives as instance of compounds of the names of particular kings with the word sahā, Candragupta-sahā and Pus­pamitra-sahā. Now these environments are found in the case of the Puspmamitra who reigned in the second century before Christ. For Kalidāsa tells us in his Malavikagnimitra that Senāpati Pus­pamitra, the father of Agnimitra and the grandfather of Vasumitra, and consequently the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty, performed an Aṣvamedha sacrifice. He also tells us that the horse which had been let loose previous to the sacrifice and was under the protection of Vasumitra was captured by the cavalry of the Yavanas on the southern bank of the Sindhu. Greek writers also inform us, as we have seen, that the Indo- Bactrian kings several times invaded India in the second century. Now, these two circumstances cannot be true in the case of the supposed Puspmamitra of the fourth or fifth century. For he was a minor

1. Dr. Kielhorn omits this in his Edition, but it occurs in four of his MSS. and also in the Kāśikā. Besides it will be seen that two instances of compounds of the synonyms of राजवृत्त are given, wherefore one might expect two of Rājaviśeṣas or particular kings. The reading चन्द्रगुप्तसभा, therefore, must be correct. [Kielhorn's Second edition of the Mahābhāṣya (1892) restores the reading चन्द्रगुप्तसभा, p.177, lines 10-11. - N.B..U.]
prince, and not lord paramount, since he was conquered by Skandagupta and since paramount sovereignty was enjoyed, as we know, by the Gupta princes. He could not, therefore, have performed an Aśvamedha sacrifice. And in the Inscription on the Bhitari Lāt we are told that the Aśvamedha sacrifice had long fallen into disuse, no doubt, because for the first three centuries of the Christian era the country was in the hands of foreigners of the Śaka, Palhava, and other tribes, and Buddhism rather than Brahmanism was in favour with these foreigners. It was Samuḍragupta, the greatest of the Gupta princes and great-grandfather of Skandagupta that revived the rite. Again, it was not the Yavanas that harassed the country in the time of Skandagupta, but the Hūṇas or Huns, as we know from the last part of this same Inscription and from foreign writers. Their inroads continued till the sixth century, as we learn from the Harṣacarita of which Professor Peterson has given such an excellent abstract in the Preface to his edition of Kādambari. As to the third circumstance, it is applicable to Puṣpamitra the Śunga; for Candragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty, flourished only a little more than a hundred years before, and being one of the greatest princes of the family, perhaps the greatest, was of course not forgotten. In the case of the supposed Puṣpamitra, his being associated with Candragupta is no doubt explicable; for there were two Candraguptas in the Gupta family. But neither of these two was the greatest prince of his family, and there is no reason why either should be mentioned in preference to Samuḍragupta. Since, however, this is the only circumstance out of those found alluded to in the Mahābhāṣya, which might be considered applicable to the latter Puṣpamitra, little weight can be attached to it as against the earlier Puṣpamitra, while the existing evidence in favour of the latter being Patañjali’s Puṣpamitra is greatly strengthened and corroborated by that circumstance being applicable in his case.

And if there was such a Puṣpamitra in the time of Skandagupta and Patañjali lived in his reign, between Patañjali and Bhartrihari a period of only about 150 years intervened according
to the true date of Skandagupta, but of about 275 or 300 years, according to those assumed by certain archaeologists. Is this period enough to account for the manner in which Bhartrhari speaks of the Mahābhāṣya in that celebrated passage which has been so often quoted and translated, and for the eventful history of the work which he there gives? Bhartrhari calls Patañjali a Tirthadarśin, i.e., "the seer of the saving truth," and the Mahābhāṣya an Ārṣa-granṭha, or a work composed by one who had such a keen perceptive faculty as the Rṣis of old possessed, and consequently as authoritative as those composed by the Rṣis. Can such a thing be said by one of a work written only 150 years before him or even 300 years? A book can become Ārṣa, as a custom can become law, or in the language of Indian writers, Vedamulaka, i.e., based on the Vedas, only when its origin is forgotten. Then, Bhartrhari tells us "Baiji, Śaubhava, and Haryakṣa set at nought the work of Patañjali, following their own conjectures and guesses." "And the tradition of grammar which had fallen away from the pupils of Patañjali was in the course of time preserved only in books among the people of the South. Then Candrācārya and others obtained the tradition from Parvata, and following the principles laid down in the Bhasya made it branch off into many schools". And it was after all this had taken place that Bhartrhari's master flourished. I do not think a period of 150 or 300 years can account for all this; and consequently the Puṣpamitra conquered by Skandagupta, even if he really existed, cannot be Patañjali's Puṣpamitra; while, if we take the passages about the Mauryas and the Yavanas in the manner in which they must be understood, and place reliance on Kalhana's statement about Abhimanyu, he has no chance whatever. I will now pass under review the whole evidence as regards the date of Patañjali:—

a. The passage about Yavana shows that Patañjali lived about the time when a Yavana besieged Sāketa and Madhyamikā.

1. Mr. Fleet has recently found a date of one of the Guptas which confirms my interpretation of the dates of the dynasty.
This leads us to about the middle of the second century before Christ.

b. The passage in which the name of Puṣpamitra occurs shows that Patañjali lived during the reign of Puṣpamitra. Two other passages in which the name of that monarch is mentioned corroborate this view and leave no reasonable doubt about the matter. This also leads us to about the middle of the second century before Christ.

The date so arrived at is consistent—

c. With the mention of the name of Candragupta in the Mahābhāṣya.

d. With the mention of the Mauryas as having flourished before Patañjali’s time.

And c. and d. together show that he lived at a time sufficiently close to the Mauryas in order that they might become the subject of his thought.

e. With Kalhana’s statement about the revival of the study of the Mahābhāṣya in the reign of Abhimanyu.

f. With the eventful account given by Bhartrhari who lived in the first half of the seventh century, and with the reverent manner in which he speaks of Patañjali’s work.

No later date can be assumed without doing violence to one or more of these passages and statements; that is, without saying that a passage does not mean what it naturally means, or that the statement is unfounded, incredible, or false. And all of them harmonize so thoroughly with my hypothesis and, taken collectively, form such a conclusive body of evidence, that I feel myself fully justified in concluding this rather long reply to Professor Peterson with those words of mine with which he began his attack, “Patañjali’s date, B. C. 150, may now be relied on.”

DATE OF PATAÑJALI No. II: BEING A SECOND REPLY TO PROFESSOR PETERSON.

[Originally published by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar himself and printed at Education Society's Press, Byculla, Bombay, 1885.]

Dr. Peterson drew me into a controversy by publishing a Note on the Date of Patañjali, in which he discussed Professor Goldstücker's views and mine, and asking me how, in my opinion, the matter stood in the light of what he had written. I had no option but to take up the challenge. I also thought this was a good opportunity to discuss fully the historical significance of the important passages pointed out by Goldstücker and myself, and to bring together all the available evidence for the date of Patañjali and also of Panini. I therefore wrote a long and, as Dr. Peterson himself styles one part of it,—whatever may be the sense intended by him,—an "elaborate" reply. After waiting for about three months, Dr. Peterson has now published a reply to me. In this, however, he discusses the sense of the least important of the passages, in his translation of which I pointed out some faults; and unceremoniously dismisses the main question and disposes of all I have said on it with the remark, "I think the whole argument a most unsafe one," without giving himself the trouble of entering at all into the merits of that argument. This is indeed a very easy way of disposing of great literary questions; but it is not one to which the scholar, born to a hard and a plodding lot, can afford to resort. The controversy has thus assumed a shape in which no good can be expected to come out

1. This reply is contained in the "Prefatory" Remarks to the separate reprint of Prof. Peterson's Papers on the Aucityālamkāra of Kṣemendra, the Date of Patañjali, and An Inscription from Kotah, printed at Bombay, 1885. Prof. Peterson's "Preface in Reply to Professor Bhandarkar" in this booklet is dated 25th August 1885, and extends to eighteen pages. [N. B. U.]
of it; and I should have said nothing with reference to Peterson's reply, had he not in his desire to take 'sweet revenge' yielded to the temptation of discovering "a capital error" in one of my former publications on the subject, and of accusing me of having mis-apprehended Nāgojibhaṭṭa's meaning. As it is unquestionable that this discovery and this accusation are the result of Peterson's own palpable mis-apprehension of Nāgojibhaṭṭa's meaning and his failure, as I now see it, to catch the main point of the passage in Patañjali, the sense of which he has been discussing with me, I must once more argue the matter with him. I will begin by putting before the reader for reference the passage from Patañjali and the comments on it:

Pāṇini—पाणिनि विशाल इति।

Patañjali—पाणिनि इति। तत्वों न सिद्ध्यति तिच्छ : सकन्दो विशाल इति।

Kaiyata—कायता इति। या: परियुत्त्र युहाँहुमदित्तिन तासियत्यः। योतु मिक्रसोंते तासु न भवति कित सीवकान्तिकारिणीत इति।

Nagojibhāṭṭa—नागोजिब्हाठ्ठ विक्रेतां प्रतिमातिक्यत्वम्। तैरच्छ: प्रकल्पिता:। विक्रेताः दृष्टिः। अनसब्धां पण्डितानां प्रत्ययुवर्णपसङ्ख्य इति भावः। तत् प्रत्यय। प्राणिक्षेत्रेन दवस्तुष्णयोद्वाहरम् दुर्शारिति प्रवेदियादि पास्वेता इति न। संप्रअति पुजार्यो:। संप्रति स्थिरमार्मणसमकालेस्वर फलजनिका या पुजा जीविकाप्रदत्त्वेन तदेऽथ इत्यः। तदाह या: परियुक्ति।

The first thing to be discussed is Dr. Peterson's translation of सकन्दो विशाल: Dr. Peterson's words in his Note or first paper are:— "But a reference to any dictionary will show that such a meaning is one of the best authenticated senses of the word विशाल: सकन्दो विशाल: means 'A Skanda in act to shoot.'" I looked into the St. Petersburg Lexicon and Monier Williams' Dictionary for the word विशाल as directed, and found what I have stated. It certainly is no fault of mine, if I find in the Dictionaries "a certain explanation of the word with a second-hand quotation," &c.
Böhtlingk and Roth, as well as Monier Williams, give "a certain attitude in shooting" as the sense of the word विशाल; and I told Peterson that विशाल with this sense could not be taken as an adjective to स्कन्द, as certainly it cannot. He however now directs me to look out the word बैशाल; and under that word I do find the two passages mentioned by him, as well as the explanation that बैशाल also means "a certain attitude in shooting;" and the passages show nothing more than that. But does this serve as a warrant to take बैशाल as an adjective meaning "one in that particular attitude?" बैशाल is a derivative from बिषा and means "belonging to or relating to Visākha," that is, the word means that particular attitude in shooting which was attributed to the god Visākha. The word बैशाल occurs in Hemacandra’s Abhidhāna-Cintāmanī, and this is the derivation given by him in his explanation of that word in his commentary on the work—विषालस्य स्कन्द्येद्य बैशाल. Hemacandra, of course, identifies the god स्कन्द with विशाल, the two having in later times come to be considered as the names of the same god.—Hemacandra’s Thesaurus is referred to by Böhtlingk and Roth, though not the Commentary. Thus, though बैशाल means "an attitude in shooting," there is no possibility of बिषाल meaning "one in that attitude," i.e. of being used as an adjective in view of the explanation of बिषाल contained in the Commentary on Amara referred to in the St. Petersburg Lexicon, and of the derivation of बैशाल given by Hemacandra.

Then Dr. Peterson goes on:—"On another small point too here Bhandarkar does me some wrong. He does not understand why I reject the reading विशाल before स्कन्द: 'unless the reason be that it goes against the translation which' I have 'worked myself into believing to be correct.' It would be a legitimate retort to say that Bhandarkar reads Candragupta-sabha against Kielhorn, in the note on Panini I. 1. 68, because the omission of that word might be fatal to the edifice Bhandarkar has raised on it." The retort is by no means legitimate, though of course I do not grudge Dr. Peterson the pleasure he evidently
feels in making it. There is very little or no resemblance between the two cases. Dr. Peterson's evidence for the omission of श्रेण: when he first wrote, was, according to his statement, one Manuscript out of the eight collated by Dr. Kielhorn and the India Office Photozincograph of Kaiyata. But Peterson made a mistake when he considered these as two different Manuscripts; for they are really one. He did not see that that manuscript collated by Dr. Kielhorn, which does not contain रा:ः, is called by him 'g.' And from the Preface to the First Volume of his edition we see that 'g' is the India Office Photozincograph of Kaiyata. Thus then Peterson had only one Manuscript against seven to support his reading, while my reading चन्द्रयासंभा was supported by four MSS. out of six collated by Dr. Kielhorn; and the evidence of the Kaśīkā and the fact of Patañjali's giving two instances of a correlative case were decidedly in its favour. Peterson also conjectured Kaiyata did not read रा:ः, but he gave no reason whatever. On the other hand, it would appear that his example श्रेणकान्नक्रीणिेति was framed with the particular object of distinguishing that form from the श्रेण: occurring in Patañjali. As to the two new Manuscripts Peterson speaks of, I have got against them two which read श्रेण:, viz. one from Benares belonging to Rao Saheb Narayan Vishnu Bapat and generously presented by him to me. It contains the Bhāṣya, Pradīpa, and Pradīpoddyota. The other, which also contains the three works, is Numbers 330-332 of Collection A of 1881-82, deposited in the Deccan College.

In all this defence of the "shooting Skanda," Dr. Peterson quietly leaves out of sight the phrase श्रेणविशालो pointed out by me as occurring in the Bhāṣya on VIII. 1. 15, from which it is unquestionable that Patañjali himself understood by the word विशाल 'a god of that name.' If another passage is wanted in which also Patañjali renders it plain that the word is the name of a god, it will be found under Panini, VI. 3. 26. Here too we have श्रेणविशालो which is a Dvandva compound meaning 'the two gods Skanda and Viśākha.' To persist in interpreting a word in Patañjali as meaning something totally different from
what Patañjali himself says it means is a feat requiring courage and boldness, which Peterson has shown himself to possess.

Before proceeding further, I must state that I did not fully understand Dr. Peterson's translation of the passage under discussion on the last occasion. Though, of course, there were some mistakes, still I thought he had understood the argument generally according to Nāgojibhatta's view of it. But I now see that this is not the case. Though I do not agree with Nāgojibhatta on one point, still, a great grammarian as he was and familiar with his subject, it is impossible that he should not see the main point of Patañjali's argument. But Peterson has totally mis-apprehended it. His view is so much out of the way that without more explanation than was contained in his first paper, it was not possible for me to understand it. And even on the present occasion it has cost me a good deal of trouble to ascertain it clearly. Dr. Peterson does understand 'Skandah' to be an image brought forward to show that Panini's rule is violated in that instance. But it is violated according to him because the image "may or may not be for sale." From what follows and precedes, Peterson seems to mean by this expression that images have in them the possibility of being sold. The phrase श्रवं, बिद्याम: contains, according to him, not according to me, as he supposes, "instances or an instance, of a form which, as denoting an image, is prima facie incorrect under the rule." "It is notorious that images are vendible things." Thus Peterson means, what he afterwards says in express words, that "all idols are in their nature vendible"; and, therefore, we at once see that Śivaḥ, Skandah and Viśākhaḥ violate Panini's rule. This is the germ of the whole mistake. Then, says he, "such names of idols then as Śiva, Skanda, Viśākha are for the matter in hand colourless. They do not of themselves tell us whether the objects of which they are the names—that is idols in general—are Panya or Apanya, vendible or not vendible. What then is it that raises the presumption, which it is necessary to notice, that all idols are in their nature vendible? The answer to this query lies in the
phrase नैन्दिरणार्थिः: &c. So that, according to Peterson, Pa­tañjali’s query is “To what is it due, why is it that ‘idols in general, ’ i. e., ‘all idols are in their nature vendible’?” And the answer is, “because it is for gain that the Mauryas make images.” And herein lies Peterson’s radical error. In the next sentence Patanjali means to say, according to Peterson, that “vendible images made by the Mauryas are as a class ” excluded from the operation of the “general rule which enjoins the omission of affix Ka”; that is, their names must all have the termination Ka. But such of the vendible images as “are from the beginning intended for worship and not for sale” come under the rule and have not the affix. This is the sense of the last sentence.

(i) Now, if images are notoriously vendible things, if “they may or may not be for sale,” if Śivah, Skandah and Viṣākhah are primā facie incorrect under Pāṇini’s rule, why is it that Patanjali asks कि कारणस्य न निधिपति, i. e. “why are the forms Śivah, Skandah, Viṣākhah, incorrect under the rule?” But Peterson thinks that the meaning of this query is, “why is it that all idols are in their nature vendible?” What have you got to do with all idols? Whence do you get them? How does any question arise about them? Do Patanjali’s words, which are perfectly plain, mean that? The question is only about three idols and not all. And what is the necessity of accounting for the fact that all idols are in their nature vendible? The question does not hang at all on the reason of the fact, but on the fact itself. We have nothing whatever to do with the reason. The whole point is, the use of the word अपण्य in the Sūtra makes the forms शिव: स्कन्दे विषाखः: incorrect. How they became incorrect under the rule in consequence of the use of that word is what is required to be shown, i. e. it should be shown that while the operation prescribed in the sūtra, viz. the dropping of Ka, is done here, one of the conditions of the operation, viz. अपण्य or invendibility, is absent; i. e. that the images expressed by those forms are Panya or vendible. And it is also necessary to decide whether the forms are really incorrect. This is the meaning of the word
and no other meaning is possible. Now Peterson would object, saying, 'What is the necessity of showing the images to be vendible and the forms to be incorrect? It is notorious that images are vendible things and the forms are therefore, of course, incorrect.' My first emphatic reply is, I am under no obligation to tell you why it is necessary to show this; but there can be no doubt that Patañjali himself does admit the necessity and asks why they are incorrect. His words mean that, and can mean nothing else. My next reply is, you mis-understand the word Panya when you say that the vendibility of images is such a notorious and plain matter that it does not require to be shown. When you say, ‘idols have been sold from the beginning and are sold now: and the supply will doubtless continue so long as the demand shall last,’ all you mean is that images possess the possibility of being sold. Panya does not mean a thing which possesses the possibility of being sold. If that is what you mean by Panya and the English word ‘vendible,’ the very clothes that you or I have now on our bodies are Panya; for clothes have been sold from the beginning and are sold now, &c. But I should consider it an insult if anybody so characterized my clothes. The sense of the word Panya, therefore, is a thing that is intended to be sold, that is for sale. The definition in the Kaśīka is: विक्रयिते वस्त्रस्यपप्पम्. The clothes I wear were Panya before I got them from a shop, are not panya now, and would be Panya again if I were reduced to destitution, which God forbid, and should be obliged to sell them. Just then, as you cannot say, when a shirt is spoken of, that it is panya or vendible in this sense, i.e. ‘exposed for sale,’ so when certain images are named, it does not necessarily follow that they are panya. Hence the necessity of showing that they are so; and hence the question किं कारणम्. The answer is and must be contained in the next clause; मौर्यंहिरण्यायिकामिन्यां: प्रकलिता:. That answer, according to Nāgojībhaṭṭa, is that they are Panya because these are images exposed by the Mauryas for sale; and according to my independent translation, they are Panya because images like them were sold or exposed for sale by the Mauryas
who wanted to raise money. "It is for gain that the Mauryas make images," which is Peterson's translation, cannot possibly be the answer to the query.

The difference between Nagojibhatta and myself here is that according to himself the Siddhāntin who asks the question किं कारणः and the Pūrvapakṣin who answers it by saying मौर्येन्दिर० &c., both understand the word पान्या in its correct or proper sense, viz., 'something exposed for sale' (विक्रीयते यत्तत्त्वयमः); while according to my view, the Siddhāntin takes it in its correct sense, and the Pūrvapakṣin resorts to the incorrect sense which Peterson seeks to attach to it, viz., 'the possibility of being sold,' which a thing comes to have on account of other things of the class being 'exposed for sale,' and thus wrongly brings पान्यत्वय or vendibility on the three images. The Pūrvapakṣin is in the remainder of the passage told by the Siddhāntin that because certain things are 'sold' or 'exposed for sale,' that is, are Pānya,' it does not follow that those of the class that are under actual worship are Pānya, i.e. pānya does not mean 'the possibility of being sold.' You (the Pūrvapakṣin) attach that sense to the word and say that Śivah, Skandah, Visakhaḥ are Pānya because the Mauryas sold such images, and consequently the forms should have the affix Ka. The images sold by the Mauryas being Pānya in the correct sense, their names may have the affix (योगायतुं न स्यात्); but that does not make these Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha, which are under actual worship, Pānya; i.e. again, Pānya does not mean 'the possibility of being sold,' and consequently Pāṇini's rule must apply, and no affix is wanted for these forms, and they are correct (यास्त्रेता: समति पुजार्थास्त्तात् मविख्याति). It will be seen from this why it is that the Pūrvapakṣin resorts to the Maurya kings to bring Pānaya in the sense of 'possibility of being sold,' on Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha, and to any ordinary image-seller. Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha were images under actual worship, and no ordinary image-seller sells them. The Maurya kings must have sold images under actual worship, and hence they are spoken of. This independent interpretation of mine I have put into

Sanskrit in the shape of a commentary on the passage in Patañjali under discussion, and I give it at the end [as an Appendix].

Nagojibhāṭṭa, on the other hand, regarding the Pūrvaṇakṣin’s and Siddhāntin’s sense of the word Panya to be the same, viz., the correct sense ‘exposed for sale,’ makes the Pūrvaṇakṣin say that those particular images are Panya because they are images exposed for sale by the Mauryas, who were certain images-makers (मौर्याः...सूचः). This the Siddhāntin admits, and therefore agrees with the Pūrvaṇakṣin that Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha should have the affix Ka (अत्ततास्य...स्वरूपः). And the Siddhāntin goes on to say that the images dedicated for such worship immediately after manufacture as brings in grains are the examples of the rule; i. e. their names drop the termination Ka.

(2) The true sense of the word Panya being that given above the query, ‘Why is it “that all idols are in their nature vendible”? which Peterson puts into the mouth of Patañjali is absurd. All idols are not vendible, i. e. ‘exposed for sale.’

(3) If according to Peterson’s translation of भवेताय न स्वाद, Panini’s rule does not apply to vendible images as a class, i. e. to all images, and consequently their names should take the termination Ka, upon what authority is it that such of these images as are intended for worship from the beginning are brought under the rule, as Peterson does by his translation of यास्वेता?: &c.? Peterson does admit that these images form a part of the class of vendible images. The possibility of being sold attaches to them also. Peterson’s argument, “Idols have been sold from the beginning, and are sold now,” &c., applies to them equally with the images शिवः स्तन्द्रो विशालः. And if it does not, why should it apply to शिवः स्तन्द्रो विशालः? If these are Panya or vendible primâ facie, they also must be in accordance with Peterson’s sense of the word. Panini’s Sutra about dropping of Ka cannot therefore apply to them. The word अपण्य in the Sutra must prevent its application to them. We have no Vārtika or Īṣṭi here, adding to or amending Panini’s rule and directing us to drop the

1. N. B. U.
though the images intended for worship are vendible. We have simply a Vyākhyaṇa of Pāṇini’s Sūtra. And thus the result according to Peterson’s interpretation will be that Pāṇini’s Sūtra has no instance and is vain. According to Nāgojibhaṭṭa’s and my way of taking it, the images being under worship are not Pāṇya or ‘for sale,’ and hence Pāṇini’s Sūtra applies and the Ka is dropped.

(4) Again, if images are notoriously vendible and consequently it is not necessary to show that they are vendible, is it not equally notorious that the manufacturers of idols make the idols with a view to gain, and not from disinterested motives? What then is the necessity of telling us, according to Peterson’s way of taking it, that “all images are vendible, because it is for gain that the Mauryas make images”?

(5) The whole point of the passage in Patañjali, according to Dr. Peterson, must be this. Images being in their nature vendible, such forms as Śivah, Skandah, &c., are incorrect, i. e., they should have the suffix ka. But though all images are vendible, such of them as are from the beginning intended for worship, should be brought under Pāṇini’s rule, and Ka should not be added to their names. Now, the sense of the first of these two sentences is according to Peterson brought out by the clause अपणण इत्युच्चते तत्रदं न शिष्यति. शिष्यः सक्षवो विषाळक इति and of the second by यात्रवेता: सम्बन्ध सुपौगीता स्त्रांस्तांस्ताक सहिष्यति. What then is the necessity for the matter in hand of the intervening clauses? The first of these means, according to him, “It is for gain that the Mauryas make images.” What has this got to do with the matter? The second (भेततास्त न स्पात्) means, Pāṇini’s rule does not apply to images which are, all of them, in their nature vendible, and thus they should take Ka. Do we not know this already, according to Peterson, and has he not assumed this in interpreting the first clause? Why then are we told this again?

(6) Peterson admits that we have first a doubt thrown on the correctness of the forms शिष्यः सक्षवो विषाळक:. This doubt must be
cleared and it should be decided whether the forms are correct or incorrect. If that is not done the result will be that the question is about one thing and the decision about quite another, i.e. the उपक्रम and उपसंहार will be inconsistent. In Peterson's translation this decision of the original question nowhere appears, one thing is said first, and quite another afterwards. It will thus be seen that Peterson's interpretation of the query, the answer, and what follows, i.e. of the whole passage, is entirely wrong. He does not understand the argument.

I have already given the general sense of Nāgojibhaṭṭa's comment, but since, according to Peterson, in giving its substance in 1873 I committed "a capital error," and since, from a "misapprehension" of its sense I have not, according to the same authority, "yet shaken myself free," it is necessary that I should discuss it more particularly. The reader will kindly look at the passage given before. Dr. Peterson's explanation is:—"We must, says Nāgojibhaṭṭa, understand the word विक्रेत्तम after प्रकालित्तम."

Good. But you should understand that here ends Nāgojibhaṭṭa's explanation of नीर्गीतिः—स्तित्त: and that his explanation of the passage is that these images, Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha, were exposed for sale by the Mauryas and not that "images are made by the Mauryas for gain," as you take it. "The images referred to are therefore vendible, and the occasion for the suffix Ka presents itself." This is a translation of अतस्तसां पप्पत्तनानां प्रत्यप-अवणालसः इति भाव: :. The translation is correct so far as the words go, except that 'vendible' means 'for sale,' of which, however, Peterson has no conception. But what are "the images referred to" which is your translation of तस्ताम्? Are they "the images in general" made by the Mauryas for gain which you have supposed or दिश: सकले विशाल: ? They cannot be images in general, for there is no question here, as I have already explained about "images in general" or "all images." And images in general or all images cannot be vendible or 'exposed for sale,' while those referred to by Nāgojibhaṭṭa are spoken of by him as
PETERSON'S INTERPRETATION CRITICISED

Panya. The question is about the correctness of the forms विवाचः and it is their पण्यवत्त that is required to be shown in order to make good the position that they are incorrect. By अततासां पण्यवताः, therefore, Nagojibhatta means to say that (अत:) for this reason, viz. that given in Patanjali's statement पौराणिकाः प्रकृतिः explained by Nagoji, (तासा) their, i.e. of विशिष्ट, विशिष्ट, विशिष्ट (पण्यवताः) Panyatva is established. Now अत: referring to the whole statement मौनेव....त: and that statement containing the Hetu or reason, the तेः of तासां whose Panyatva is established by that reason cannot be referred to anything contained in that statement which is the hetu or reason. Hence also तासां must refer to विवाचः. It will be seen that Nagojibhatta speaks here of vendibility being established or proved, while according to Peterson it does not require to be proved. Peterson therefore sets Nagoji at defiance.

Peterson then goes on with the explanation of Nagojibhatta. “In the two clauses that follow, beginning respectively with भवेत् and यास्वेतः: Patanjali first (भवेत् तासा न स्वाद्;) accepts the preposition that the occasion for the suffix has presented itself, and, secondly, (यास्वेतः: संपत्ति पुनरायाः: तासा भविष्यति) shows how nevertheless his rule is not of none effect.” This is a translation or explanation of प्रत्ययभवनिर्ववेतिः वदन्तुज्ञायोवाहरणं द्वितियतिः भवेदिवथिदि यास्वेतः इति च. Now this translation is open to the same objection as Peterson's translation of Patanjali's original, viz. if there is an occasion for the suffix, there is nothing that can prevent it, and the rule is of none effect. There is also a special objection. In the last sentence Peterson has translated प्रत्ययभवनिर्ववेतिः: by “the occasion for the suffix Ka has presented itself”; and in this sentence प्रत्ययभवनिर्ववेतिः also he translates in just the same words. Is there no difference between प्रत्ययभवनिर्ववेतिः and इद्देवत: ? There is very great difference. प्रत्ययभवनिर्ववेतिः shows ‘the occasion for a thing,’ and इद्देवत: the ‘things becoming an actual fact.’ The proper translation is, “Patanjali says (िं भवेत् तासा न स्वाद्;) that the termination is of course wanted or should be used there and (िं यास्वेतः:) he points out the examples of Panini's rule.” The termination is, of course, wanted...
or should be used there. Where? There, where in the last sentence he speaks of an occasion for it, consequent on Panayatva or vendibility. Whose panayatva? तात्त्व, that is of the images. What images? Śivah, Skandah, Viśākah, which are the subject of the discussion and the Panayatva of which is established in the last sentence. The actual use of the termination cannot be spoken of as इत्येव or "of course wanted" in the case of the merely hypothetical images or images in general understood by Peterson; and that we have nothing to do with images in general I have said several times. The termination is therefore of course wanted, or should be used in these cases; that is, the correct forms are भिषक्; स्कन्दक्; विशालक्; and therefore भिषव: स्कन्दो विशाल: which were brought forward as in use, and which were the names of images exposed for sale by the Mauryas, as stated before, are incorrect, i.e. Pāṇini's rule is set aside in their case. Thus is the original question decided; and this is plainly what Nāgojibhaṭṭa makes Patañjali say; there can be no question whatever about it, and this is exactly what I stated in 1873. Yet Dr. Peterson says:—"In 1873 Bhandarkar took Patañjali to mean that Pāṇini's rule is arbitrarily set aside in the case of images sold by the Mauryas, so that forms not valid are nevertheless in use. What Patañjali means to say is that the termination Ka should be applied to the names of the images sold by the Mauryas, according to Pāṇini's rule; but the rule is set aside in this case, and the wrong forms Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha are used'. This is a capital error, as Bhandarkar now sees. That it is in accordance with the native commentators is a view of it due, I believe, to a misapprehension of Nāgojibhaṭṭa's meaning, from which Bhandarkar has not yet shaken himself free." Is it not perfectly clear that Peterson himself, when he says this, has no conception whatever of the matter? He has totally misunderstood the point in Patañjali's passage, and interprets Kaiyāṭa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa in accordance with that misconception; and thus

1. This is a quotation from Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's paper of 1873.
confidently pronounces my former translation of Nagojibhatta, which is unquestionably correct, to be "a capital error." And yet with a charming simplicity and an unsuspecting belief in his own powers, Peterson takes credit to himself for having given me hints in my independent translation of the passage. For says he:—"In other respects, however, Bhandarkar's version of 1873 is very defective, a fact which in fairness should not be lost sight of when comparing my version with that with which Bhandarkar has now followed it." Dr. Peterson evidently means that his version has suggested improvements to me in my former version. I repudiate the insinuation entirely. It was impossible to derive any hints from a version in which I pointed out several mistakes and which, on the last occasion, I took as agreeing as regards the main point with Nagojibhatta, because the connection between the different sentences was not distinctly given, and which, now that Dr. Peterson has given more explanation, I see to be entirely away from the point and wrong from top to bottom. My readers will have seen and will see if they have the patience to go to the end of this paper, how little ground there is for Peterson's taking credit to himself for having corrected Goldstucker, and given me hints. I must not omit to add that Dr. Peterson need not have searched the volumes of the Indian Antiquary for my explanation of Nagojibhatta's view. That explanation is given in my last Reply to him and it occurs even in the passage which he has quoted in his Paper under review.

I will now notice Peterson's defence of the remaining grammatical and other errors pointed out by me in his translation on the last occasion. When I called attention in my last article to Peterson's having translated the past passive participle एकलिनता: by the present tense "make," I, of course, did not mean he committed a schoolboy error; but that the past tense of एकलिनता: was an important point in the argument and consequently should be prominently noticed. But let us hear the defence. "There is no restriction to time present, past or future in my
English sentence, any more than there is in the Sanskrit so-called ‘past passive participle,’ प्रकटित:.’ I admit there is no restriction to time present, past or future in the English sentence “The Mauryas make images;” but that is because it contains a general truth; and general truths are always represented by the present tense, and never by the past. You must always say “Elephants have trunks,” but never “had trunks.” The Sanskrit प्रकटिता: is a past passive participle, and as indicating past time it can never be used to express a general truth, and can apply only to a particular time and that particular time a past time. Therefore what is only true at a particular time cannot be a general truth. This is the difference between the present and past time in his English “Mauryas make images” and the Sanskrit प्रकटिता:. Peterson tries to get rid of the distinction by the contention that “for gain” is the predicate in his sentence “It is for gain that the Mauryas make images” and “make images” forms part of the clause which is used as the subject. But the subject clause “the Mauryas make images” is nevertheless a general proposition, and the distinction cannot be got rid of. But, says he, there is no restriction to a particular time in the Sanskrit “so-called past passive participle प्रकटिता:”. Why? Is it not a past participle and does it not express past time? If it does not, I must say Peterson follows a Sanskrit grammar and literature unknown to me and, I have no hesitation in saying, to all Sanskrit Scholars. But, says Dr. Peterson, he would “prefer now to translate ‘images are made by the Mauryas for gain, ’” and is “confident that the so-called past passive participle in Sanskrit is the proper translation of ‘made’ here.” Again he says his first translation “‘Mauryas make images for gain’ is only a more idiomatic rendering of the same thing as ‘images are made by the Mauryas for gain.’” What is all this? ‘Pots are made of earth.’ The Sanskrit past passive participle is the proper translation of ‘made’ here. Therefore शूलिकायचत: हन्त: is the proper translation of that sentence. But that sentence is the same as ‘They make pots of earth”; therefore
that is the Sanskrit translation of this sentence. Similarly the proper translation of ‘Hornd animals ruminate’ is शूष्कित्य रोमन्धायित्वं अर रोमन्ध्या: कुत्; of ‘man sees colour by the eye’, सपावश्यक चक्षुष तृष्णा तुष्ण और of ‘water removes thirst’, उद्येक तुषपनीता. That is to say, Peterson is confident that we should teach our pupils that general truths might be translated into Sanskrit by the past passive participle which implies “no restriction to time past, present or future”!

And notwithstanding all this Peterson immediately afterwards states that “प्रकरणत: denotes no more than that the action of making is to be conceived as completed.” Is the action of making to be conceived as completed in the English phrase “the Mauryas make images?” Certainly not. If so, your translation of अवबाहः प्रकरणत: by “make images” must be wrong. Now if the action is represented as completed in the phrase मैथिया……प्रकरणत: was it not completed before Patañjali wrote or spoke those words? It must be. Then was it not past with reference to the time when he wrote, and may it not have been past with reference to that time by any number of years, say two or three centuries? The answer must be “yes.” If so, this is all that I contended for; and your “traversing directly my contention” means nothing. Contrasted with the word सम्पत्ति as it is, प्रकरणत: must show a past action that took place a long time before Patañjali. And having been represented as completed with reference to the time when Patañjali wrote, has the action not been referred to a particular time? If so, what is the meaning of your first statement that the Sanskrit so-called “past passive participle प्रकरणत: ” involves “no restriction to time present, past, or future”? One who endeavours to defend the indefensible must fall into such contradictions.

To my contention that एता: in प्रकरणत: cannot mean “whichever of these;” for it is either the genitive or locative that has that sense and not the nominative, Peterson’s reply is, he will “substitute for एता: its antecedent अच्छा:” and then the meaning
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will be "whichever images." But this is simply grammatical jugglery, and will deceive nobody who is not a simpleton. Why do you substitute it? Patanjali's word is एतः and you must interpret that and nothing else. And do you really think you have given us all we had before, when you give us only the antecedent अच्छोः? Does not एतः mean 'these,' i.e., such as are 'nearer to the speaker than others.' Do you give us that sense when you substitute अच्छोः? You surely cannot say you do. And what is it that you get after all this operation? 'The Mauryas make images for gain. To those the rule does not apply and Ka must be appended. But whichever images are intended for worship come under the rule,' &c. If this is the construction, one would naturally take 'whichever images' in the last sentence to be different images from those made by the Mauryas, as Nagojibhaṭṭa and I take them; especially because the assertion with reference to the images in the last sentence is directly the opposite of that in this. But this would cut off the ground from below Peterson's feet. For his idea is that these last images are to be included among those made by the Mauryas. This sense you have no chance of securing unless you allow the demonstrative to stand and at the same time mistranslate it as "of these." Thus this grammatical jugglery, like other species of it, recoils on the person practising it.

I will ask my reader to be good enough to consider this point. Patanjali uses the word तस्मां and in the same breath the word एतः: (भेत्तनरु न स्वाद यास्मेतः &c.). तस्माः is the remote demonstrative, and means 'that,' while एतः is the near demonstrative and means 'this.' Is it possible that by these two inconsistent pronouns he should demonstrate or point out the same preceding thing, especially when the assertions, as I have stated, are contradictory of each other? "Mauryas make images. To those the rule does not apply. But of these whichever are intended &c., to them the rule does apply." Can those and these here both refer to "images" in the first sentence? For this reason, and also because without the genitive or locative you cannot have the sense
Peterson requires, the एता: cannot refer to the images made by
the Mauryas. Dr. Peterson says:—"He is fully supported by
Kaiyata and Nāgojibhaṭṭa" in his construction of एता; but in the
note immediately below, this expression is softened into "I be-
lieve that Kaiyata construes यास्वेता: as I do." Connecting एता:
with the images sold by the Mauryas would have the effect, as I
have already explained, of making the images used for worship
vendible images' at the same time, and of rendering Pāṇini's
Sūtra inapplicable to them, and consequently vain and useless.
This is a mistake that no native grammarian will make, much
less men like Kaiyata and Nāgojibhaṭṭa. And the reason for
Peterson's belief is his own utterly groundless conjecture that
मैया: is meant as the nominative to अद्वतित by Kaiyata. But No !
Peterson does give evidence. "I can only note here that in the
India Office MS. Nāgojibhaṭṭa seems actually to read ते ( i. e. the
Mauryas ) after या: परियुद्ध in Kaiyata." Excellent! What we
have got in the India Office MS., the photozincograph of which
I have referred to, is तदः या: परियुद्धते. Commentators put at the
beginning of their comment on a passage of the original the
opening words of that passage with हतित after them. This is
called a Pratika. Now the Pratika from Kaiyata given by Nā-
gojibhaṭṭa in the present case is या: परियुद्धति. This the copyist
of the Manuscript through stupidity or mistake has written as
या: परियुद्धते, and this evident mistake of the man Peterson relies
on and uses as evidence to prove that Kaiyata meant मैया: to be
the nominative of अद्वतित. If या: परियुद्ध ते had been meant by Nā-
gojibhaṭṭa as Kaiyata's reading, हतित would have been put after ते,
and we should have had या: परियुद्ध त हति. But we have not got
it. The Pratika does occur in the form of या: परियुद्धति in the
manuscript consulted by Goldstücker and in the two mentioned
by me before. This speaks for itself.

Kaiyata's note on the passage beginning with यास्वेता:, on the
contrary, is that "एता: signifies the images which are taken from
door to door"; and they are thus distinguished from those with
which the Mauryas are connected in the preceding sentence.
Nāgojībhāṭṭa too disposes of the merchandise of the Mauryas by saying तत्र प्रव्ययवणिमित्तमेवति वदनूः and speaks of other distinct images by सूखस्सोदाहरणं दश्यति. Peterson’s misapprehension of the main point in Patañjali’s passage vitiates his interpretation of Nāgojībhāṭṭa throughout. Then again, I am told that neither of the two takes एततः as I do. No one can be sure of this as regards Kaiyātā; for he does not say that the images taken from door to door for worship were not the Śivaḥ, Skandaḥ, and Viṣākhaḥ with which the argument began. Kaiyātā not only may have meant them to be the same, but his counter-example शिवकान्ति-क्रीणिः affords strong evidence that the instance of an image under worship meant by him was the शिवः occurring above. And as to Nāgojībhāṭṭa, Peterson tells me nothing new, for I have said in giving my independent translation that I disagree with Nāgojībhāṭṭa, and that he has assigned no definite sense to the word एततः i.e. refers it to nothing, neither to the images of the Mauryas, nor to Śivaḥ, Skandaḥ and Viṣākhaḥ. Nāgojībhāṭṭa and I agree as to the main point, viz. that Śivaḥ, Skandaḥ and Viṣākhaḥ are in the beginning spoken of as incorrect according to Panini’s rule, in consequence of a certain action of the Mauryas which made the images Panya. We also agree that the question about the correctness of these forms has to be decided somehow. Nāgojībhāṭṭa thinks the Panyatā attaches to the images and cannot be removed; therefore the forms ought to have Ka. I say that the Panyatā is conferred on them only in an incorrect sense, and is removed by the Siddhāntin. The other points of difference I have given before. This difference between Nāgojībhāṭṭa and me arises from my assigning to ताह and एततः the sense that they have, viz. ‘those’ or remote from the speaker, and ‘these’ or near to the speaker. Nāgojībhāṭṭa has not attached to एततः this its definite sense. I also take संपत्ति in its usual sense of ‘now,’ ‘in these days,’ and contrast it with the past प्रकलिततः; while Nāgojībhāṭṭa explains it as ‘immediately after their manufacture,’ which sense the word cannot bear, and does not see the contrast. The other reason that I have
given in my last Paper is that when Patanjali raises any question about a rule, he does so by bringing forward correct forms which apparently go against the rule. When in rare cases incorrect forms are brought forward, he tells us at the end of the discussion that they are incorrect by using such an expression as अनमितानात्.

Dr. Peterson again says: "I feel sure that it (एता:) would have been made to stand before, and not after the adversative particle तु if it had the meaning Bhandarkar now ascribes to it." Why he feels sure he does not tell us. But या एतास्तु, which I suppose he would have, is unidiomatic. The Sanskrit idiom requires तु and such particles to be put immediately after the forms of यद्. Innumerable instances might be given, but I will here quote a few from the Mahābhāṣya itself. यस्य प्रक्कृतं कुशलो विषेषे Mahābhāṣya, Edition of Kielhorn, Vol. I. p. 2; यस्य सङ्केतमयं Ibid. p. 20; यस्य तु विषेषिष्ठिन्द्रमेव Ibid. Vol. II. p. 332.

In criticizing my translation of 1873 Peterson say:—"I should be more than human if I refrained from adding that in 1873 Bhandarkar gave to the phrase ताक्ते न स्वताः precisely that reference which he now seeks to give to the admittedly converse phrase पाल्चेता:" Now that I have explained the correct sense of Nāgojibhaṭṭa, Peterson will see that this is in accordance with his comment. Again, "एता: he naturally then took in the sense he refuses to admit for it now." I did not attach to एता: its definite sense of these, following Nāgojibhaṭṭa; but certainly I did not give to it Peterson’s meaning of these and refer it to the images made by the Mauryas, if that is what he means by the word "naturally."

As to the main question of Patanjali’s date, I have already stated that Peterson attaches no value to what I have set forth in my last papers and re-asserts most emphatically his own view, and makes other vague and general statements. I am therefore not called upon to say anything about them. I must however not omit to notice one point. Peterson says that as for Pusya,
mitra and Candragupta, "he has pointed out that the existence of two princes of these names, reigning at about the same time, is better guaranteed for the fourth century after Christ than for the third before Christ." So then, according to this authority, the Bhitari Lāṭ Inscription, which is in such a dilapidated condition that no perfectly satisfactory copy has yet been or can be published, possesses a far higher historical value than the works of the Greek historians of Alexander the great and his successors, who speak of Sandracottus or Candragupta as having established a powerful monarchy at Pāṭaliputra about 320 B. C., and the Inscription in which his name occurs, as well as all the Buddhist, Jaina, and Brahmanic books which mention both him and Puṣpa-mitra the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty that succeeded the Mauryas. Perhaps Dr. Peterson considers all this literature and the Inscription to be fabricated, or assigns them to the period between 600 and 1000 A. D., or it is quite possible he never heard about them. Peterson's last paper did not show any appreciation of the value of the name of Candragupta for the determination of the question under discussion. It was Puṣpa-mitra alone he spoke of and the name Candragupta simply occurred in the translation of a passage from that priceless Inscription, that on the Bhitari Lāṭ along with Kumāragupta, Samudragupta, and others. His coupling the two names together in the present paper is therefore an afterthought, and the statement that it has been done in the first paper is not accurate.

How many of this long list of errors of all sorts are "capital errors" or very serious errors I leave it to my readers to judge.

Lastly, I am much obliged to my friend Peterson for his promise to make over the Pāṭalavijaya to me if it falls into his hands "in view of the effect the Praśasti, " which he is sure it will contain, "may have upon me." But I would advise my friend to give up the "[con-] quest of the Dark Regions" that he has been prosecuting so vigorously of late, and assure him that any number of such books dealing with "the Dark
Regions "are but trash in comparison with that "Arśa-grantha" or "Book of Light," the Mahābhāṣya. I shall, therefore, have undoubtedly a stronger claim to Peterson's gratitude than he will have to mine, if I ask my friend Kielhorn to send him a copy of his edition of the Mahābhāṣya with the following note on the title-page in capital letters—

"THIS IS NOT AN ANTHOLOGY. "
APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.
A Vārtika on Panini, III. 1. 26 teaches that the termination Aya, technically called Nic, should be appended to a verbal noun expressive of an event, in the sense of narrating the event. The derivative suffix is to be dropped, and the noun reduced to the form of the original root from which it was derived, and it is to this root that the termination Aya is to be applied. If there is any other noun depending on the verbal noun, it should be put in the accusative or other appropriate case, and governed by the verb in Aya. The example given by Patanjali to illustrate this is: Karṣavādamācaṣṭē—Karṣam ghatayati; i.e., the expression Karṣam ghatayati means “He narrates the story of Karṣa’s being killed.”—Now Ghatayati in this instance is, according to the theory of the author of the Vārtika, got by dropping the suffix of Vadha, reducing it to its original form of Han (to kill), appending the termination Aya and making the changes necessary in the case of Han. Another instance given in the Bhāṣya is: Balibandhamācaṣṭē—Baliṃ bandhayati.—Now Patanjali asks if this rule is applicable only to the settled names of stories, or to all nouns expressive of an event. His answer is to the latter effect, and, thus, one may use the expression Rājanam āgamayati in the sense of “he announces the coming of the king.”—This shows that Karṣavādha and Balibandha were the settled names of certain current stories. Now in this Vārtika, Kātyāyana notices a usage in Sanskrit common to it with several other languages, in virtue of which the causal form of a root may be used to denote the narration or announcement of an event expressed by the root. The expressions “He causes Karṣa to be killed, Bali to be put under restraint, and the king to come,” mean “He narrates Karṣa’s being killed” and “Bali’s being put under restraint,” and “announces the coming of the king.” But though the forms,
Ghatayati, Bandhayati, and Agamayati, are causals of the roots Han, Bandh and Gam with A, the author of the Vārtika does not here call them so, and hence the necessity of the new rule he has made. But Patañjali, and perhaps Katyayana also eventually, looks upon them as causal forms, and decides that the rule is not required, and that the forms can be arrived at by Pāṇini’s general sūtra about the causals: Hetumati ca III. 1. 26. But there is some difficulty as to the Present Tense. In such instances as “Having started from Ujjayinī, he makes the sun rise (Sūryam udgamayati) at Māhiṣmati (i.e., reaches Māhiṣmati at sunrise),” the Present Tense is appropriate, since at the time he is in Māhiṣmati, the sun actually does rise. But its propriety is not so clear in such expressions as “He causes Kaṁsa to be killed,” and “He causes Bali to be put under restraint,” for it is a long time since Kaṁsa was killed, or Bali restrained. Even here, says Patañjali, the Present Tense is appropriate. For the narration or annountemement of a story or an event may be made in one of three ways:—1st, by representing the story on the stage; 2ndly, by representing it by means of pictures; and 3rdly, by narrating it by word of mouth:—In the first case, the leader or manager of a dramatic corps does actually cause a person who calls himself Kaṁsa to be killed, and a person who calls himself Bali to be put under restraint. Hence the Present Tense is appropriate. In the second case, the blows of Kaṁsa and Kṛṣṇa are actually seen at the time in the pictures as aimed or received by the two combatants. In the third case the narrators give expression to what they know about them (Kaṁsa and Kṛṣṇa) from their birth to their death, and thus externally manifest what at the time exists internally. And that the things do exist internally or in the mind is shown in this way. They (the narrators) are of various kinds, some are adherents or devotees of Kaṁsa and some of Vāsudeva. Their countenances assume different colours; the faces of some (whose favourite hero is defeated) become dark, the faces of others, red. And in such cases all the three tenses are used by people. For example, they say “Go, Kaṁsa is being killed;” “Go, Kaṁsa is to be killed;” “What is the use of going? Kaṁsa is killed.”
This remarkable passage then shows:

1st—That the stories of the death of Karhsa and the subjugation of Bali were popular and current in Patanjali's time.

2nd—That Kṛṣṇa or Vasudeva was mentioned in the story as having killed Karhsa.

3rd—That such stories formed the subjects of dramatic representations, as Purānic stories are still popularly represented on the Hindu stage.

4th—That the event of Karhṣa's death at the hands of Kṛṣṇa was in Patanjali's time believed to have occurred at a very remote time.
I now proceed to other passages. One of the Pratyudāhāranaṇas or counter-examples of the rule in Dr. Goldstücker's passage (Bhāṣya on Pāṇini III. 2. 111) is: Jaghāṇa Kaṁsaṁ kila Vāsudēvaḥ: "Vāsudeva verily killed Kaṁsa." From the context it is clear that this is given as an example, the occurrence mentioned in which is popularly known, but which was not, and could not have been, witnessed by the speaker, i. e., the story was ancient and popular.

Again, we are told by the author of the Mahābhāṣya, under a Vārttika on Pāṇini II. 3. 36, that Kṛṣṇa was not well disposed, or friendly to his uncle: Asādhuḥ mātule Kṛṣṇah. In the dissertation on Bahūvṛiḥi compounds, Pāṇini II. 2. 23, the following occurs in the Mahābhāṣya: Saṁkarṣaṇadvitiyasya balaṁ Kṛṣṇasya vardhatāṁ, "May the power of Kṛṣṇa, assisted by Saṁkarṣaṇa, increase." From this we gather that Saṁkarṣaṇa was his constant companion and assistant, as might have been expected from their relationship. In the Vārtikas that follow Pāṇini, IV. 2. 104, Patañjali gives as instances of IV. 3. 64, Akrūravargyau, Akrūravargiṇāh (i. e. a follower of Akrūra), Vāsudevavargyau, Vāsudevavargiṇāh (a follower of Vāsudeva). Akrūra plays a conspicuous part in the story of Kṛṣṇa. Under VI. 3. 6 Patañjali quotes Janārdana tvātmacaturtha eva ("Janārdana with himself as the fourth," i. e., with three companions) as an apparent exception to the rule. Janārdana is another name of Kṛṣṇa. This and the second passage from the Mahābhāṣya form regular lines in the Upendravajra metre, while the third and fourth form one-quarter and one-half respectively, of an Anuṣṭubh stanza, from which it would appear that these are lines quoted from an existing poem on Kṛṣṇa.

Not only was the story of Kṛṣṇa and Kaṁsa current and popular in Patañjali's time, but it appears clearly that the former was worshiped as a god. Pāṇini, in IV. 3. 98, teaches us to append the termination Vun, i. e., Aka, to Vāsudeva and Arjuna to form nouns expressive of the adorer, adherent, or worshipper of
those persons. There is another more general rule (IV. 3. 99) which teaches us to form such derivatives from names of Kṣatriyas. Vasudeva, being the name of a Kṣatriya, comes under that rule, and the form, made up according to it, is the same as that made up in conformity with this rule. "Why, then," Patañjali asks, "are we told in this Sūtra to apply Vun or Aka to Vasudeva?"

One reason may be, he says, that the word is put in here in order to indicate that in speaking of Vasudeva and Arjuna together the name of Vasudeva should always be used first. Or, he goes on, this word Vasudeva is the name of the Divine Being and not of a Kṣatriya; i.e., Vasudeva is to be taken here, in his capacity as a god, and not in his capacity as a mere Kṣatriya; for in this latter capacity, the name comes under the other rule.

I have thus brought together seven passages, from a work written in the middle of the second century before Christ, which show that the stories about Kṛṣṇa and his worship as a god are not so recent as European scholars would make them. And to these I ask the attention of those who find in Christ a prototype of Kṛṣṇa, and in the Bible, the original of the Bhagavadgītā, and who believe our Puranic literature to be merely a later growth. If the stories of Kṛṣṇa and Bali, and others which I shall notice hereafter, were current and popular in the second century before Christ, some such works as the Harivarṇaṇa and the Purāṇas must have existed then.

---

1. वासुदेवाजुनाभ्य युन्। किंतर्थ वासुदेवशब्दाध्वीभीत्ते। न गोपश्श्रीवक्षोभोषी बहुते वृंदवन्य सिद्धात्। न हरिन्ति क्रोधो वासुदेवशब्दाह्जो वा बुनो वा।......हि ताहि पयोज्यं वासुदेवशब्दस्य पृथविनिपातं वश्यामलि। अथवा नैष।श्रीवाल्ल्या सिद्धे तुष्ट-भगवतः।
VAŚUDEVA OF PANINI IV. III. 98.


In Part IV of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London, for 1909 (p. 1122) Dr. Grierson, referring to a previous note of Professor Kielhorn (Part II of JRAS for 1908, pp. 502 ff.), states the Professor’s view to be “that Patañjali therefore implies that here the word ‘Vaśudeva’ is merely an ordinary proper name, and is not the name of a god”. This does not appear to me to be quite what Professor Kielhorn says. For his words are “the word indeed conveys an honorific sense, but would be equally applicable to a human being.” Professor Kielhorn, here, does not deny its applicability to a divine being; but it must be confessed that the trend of his argument is towards making out Vaśudeva to be an ordinary individual. For he says:—(Vaśudeva) “is the proper name of an individual called Vaśudeva...” In either case the word, ‘Tatrabhavataḥ,’ by which ‘Saṁjñaiśa’ is followed, does not in the least suggest that the personage denoted by the proper name is a divine being.” Neither does it, I assert, suggest that he was not a divine being; and this is plain from Dr. Kielhorn’s own statement that the word is equally applicable to a human being. “Equally” with whom? It must be “equally” with divine beings. And certainly the word “Tatrabhavat” means “respected,” “revered,” “worshipful,” and may be applied to men as well as gods. And in the very passage in Patañjali, with which Professor Kielhorn compares the Vaśudeva passage, “Tatrabhavataḥ” is used of Prajāpati, who is called “Sarva”, i.e., “all.” Prajāpati can be “all” only in the sense that he is the material cause (उपादान) of all that exists. This sense is assigned to Patañjali’s words “सर्वश्रेष्ठ प्रजापति:” by Kaiyata. Prajāpati therefore is the creator, and to him is applied the epithet “Tatrabhavataḥ.” Why not, then, may the same expression be understood to imply that Vaśudeva was a god or a divine being?
I do agree with Professor Kielhorn in thinking that the correct reading is "Tatrabhavatah," and not "Tatrabhagavatah," which I accepted on a former occasion on the evidence of the Benares edition. But "Tatrabhavat" is applicable equally to gods and men, Patanjali himself having used it in the case of the god Prajāpati.

In all the passages, containing forms of the word 'tatrabhavat' referred to by Professor Kielhorn, except three, the grammatical connexion gives the substantives which are qualified by the epithet "tatrabhavat". In two of these three, the wording of both of which is संज्ञा तत्रभवतः, the grammatical connexion does not bring out the substantive qualified by the epithet, and the sense is: "This is the name of the worshipful." Thus stated, the word "worshipful" indicates one who is pre-eminently worshipful, i.e., a god. In the passage under P. IV. II. 25, Prajāpati is mentioned as equivalent to Ka; but in connexion with another argument, and not with that which ends with संज्ञा तत्रभवतः. And this mention enables us to determine in the manner indicated above who it is that is meant by the epithet "worshipful" not followed by any substantive. If the general epithet "worshipful" thus indicates a god in this passage, there is every reason for understanding that that expression indicates a god in the Vasudeva passage (IV. III. 98).

Vāsudeva is here associated with Arjuna, and in the whole literature in which they are so associated, Vāsudeva is the name of a divine being. And the traditional interpretation of Patanjali's passage is that by "Tatrabhavatah" is meant such a being. The instance from the Kāśīka, which I found out for myself when Professor Kielhorn's Note first appeared, has already been given by Dr. Grierson. Kāyāta's explanation is: "नित्य: परमात्मेतत्तिष्ठेष इस वासुदेवेश्च श्रद्धाल हि: " i.e., the sense is, Vāsudeva is to be understood as a certain eternal deity which is the supreme soul. The "Tatrabhavatah" occurring in the third passage is taken by Professor Kielhorn as used in an ironical sense. But even here,
since it is used without a substantive, "Tatrabhavatah" is understood by Nāgojībhattā in his explanation of Kaiyāṭa's comment on Paraṇjali's text as equivalent to Īśvara or god. Īśvara is supposed to have taken upon himself the rôle of an opponent of the Vedas to delude the Daityas, and to have uttered the verse quoted by Paraṇjali. Thus in all the three passages in which "Tatrabhavatah" is not followed by a substantive, i.e., is itself used substantively, the sense is "of God, or a God", on the evidence of Paraṇjali himself, Kaiyāṭa and Nāgojībhattā.

Paraṇjali, for these reasons, and on his evidence Paraṇjali also, may be safely taken to speak of Vasudeva as a divine being. I understood them in this sense in an article I wrote formerly; and propose so to understand them in writing a work for the Grundriss, which I intend doing if my eyesight is restored.
BHAVABHÜTTI'S QUOTATION FROM THE RĀMĀYĀNA.

[FROM THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY VOLUME II, 1873, P. 123]

Prof. Weber's Essay on "The Rāmāyāna" was translated by Rev. Boyd and published serially in the Indian Antiquary, Volume I, 1872, pp. 120 ff, 172 ff, 239 ff. This translation was also published separately, and the verses under reference are quoted and discussed on pp. 88 ff. of this separate translation = p. 246 b, f., of the Indian Antiquary.—[N. B. U.]

In his Essay on the Rāmāyāna, Prof. Weber gives the verses quoted by Bhavabhūti in his Uttara-Rāma-Carita from the last chapter of the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyāna, and points out corresponding verses in Schlegel's and the Bombay and Serampore Editions, which resemble Bhavabhūti's only in substance. In Gorresio, he says, there is nothing corresponding to them. But about the end of the chapter, immediately previous to the one, to which Prof. Weber refers us, there are these same verses in Gorresio, identical in all respects with those quoted by Bhavabhūti, except apparently in two small words, which are Eva (in the last line of the first verse) and Tu (in the last line of the second verse) in Bhavabhūti and Adhi and Hi in Gorresio. But the difference in the case of the first word at least is rather a difference between Gorresio and the Calcutta Edition of the Uttara-Rāma-Carita, and not between Gorresio and Bhavabhūti; for in an old MS of the play existing in the Elphinstone College Library I find Adhi instead of Eva.

But while Gorresio's Edition agrees almost throughout with Bhavabhūti in this point, there is a material difference in another. Bhavabhūti quotes the verses from the last chapter of the Bālakāṇḍa, in Gorresio they occur in the last but two, while in Schlegel and the Bombay Edition the corresponding verses, though considerably differing in language, occur in the last. On comparing the several editions, one finds that Bharata's departure to the country of his maternal uncle, which is despat-

ched in five verses in the other Editions, in Gorresio is expanded into almost a chapter of which it forms the first 44 verses. The remaining four verses of this chapter occur in the other Editions after the five verses about Bharata.—The last chapter, again, in Gorresio, which describes Bharata's doings in the country of his uncle, and his sending a message to his father, is wanting in Schlegel and the Bombay Editions. And since these additional chapters contain no new incident except the sending of the messenger (which has very little to do with the story), they are probably interpolations.
A NOTE ON MEANING OF GHAṬĀ

(I)

From the Indian Antiquary, Volume I, 1872, p. 128.

The following Note on Ghata was written in response to the request of an officer of the Dinajapur District, who wanted historical information about that District, and in connection therewith had quoted Babu Rajendralal Mitra’s translation of a verse in an Inscription containing the word Ghata, this word being translated by Rajendralal as “three-fold” or “plural”. (Indian Antiquary, Volume I, 1872 p. 127) —[N. B. U.]

Babu Rajendralal gives no authority for taking Ghata as equivalent to three-fold; and supposing that were its meaning, “threefold eight” would be 24. But the instrumental Varṣena is a serious objection, I think, to his interpretation of Kuṇjaraghata-Varṣena, for if the last word of the compound meant the “year”, and the other two 888, Varṣa ought to be in the locative case. When a noun denoting time is in the instrumental case it indicates the period occupied in doing a thing (Panini II. 3. 6), and thus the sense of the above expression, if it referred to time, would be ‘the temple was constructed in 888 years,’ or at least that it took the 888th year to be constructed. But the construction is awkward, and if it represented a date the compound would be difficult to separate grammatically. I think the expression means “he who pours forth an array of elephants”, or, if the Va is to be taken as Dha, which is not unlikely, ‘the defier of the ranks of elephants.’ Varṣa-māṇo does not agree with the metre and is consequently inadmissible; besides the compound would be ungrammatical. The word has two forms Varṣa and Varṣa; if the former be taken, the final word of the nominative singular of the compound would be Varṣa-mo, if the latter, Varṣa, but in neither case Varṣa-māṇa; but even were it not so the meaning would be “a temple in which there are bodies or carcases of many elephants.” The idiom of the language does not admit of such a word as “carved” being understood, except when a double sense is intended.
A NOTE ON MEANING OF GHAṬĀ

To this Note Babu Rājendralāl replied at Indian Antiquary, Volume I, 1872, pp. 195 f. The following (Second) note is a rejoinder to Rājendralāl's observations contained there. Both letters are by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar himself.—[N. B. U.]

(II)

[FROM THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY, VOLUME I, 1872, P. 227].

In reply to Babu Rajendralal, I must point out that he has given no authority for taking ghaṭā to mean three; or if he did so, for taking the expression three eights to represent 888, and not 8 + 8 + 8 or even 8 x 8 x 8. He says he thinks his interpretation is 'not forced'; but is the word Ghaṭā, which is very indefinite, ever used to signify figures in this way? If the writer meant to express three, could he not have used one of the many symbolical expressions for it, instead of a word which simply means 'a collection'? And according to the usual way of expressing numbers in this symbolic way, and to the rule: Ankānāṁ vāmato gatih' if Ghaṭā meant three, would not the expression Kuṇijara-Ghaṭā mean 38? And what is the necessity of restricting the 'collection' to three? It may mean any number, even 9, in which case, though a row of nine nines, according to Babu Rājendralāl's way of taking it, may not refer to any era, still the expression may mean 98. Altogether the supposition that the expression represents the date appears to be extremely improbable. The grammatical difficulty the Babu thinks I have myself solved, when I admit the alternative interpretation that "the temple took the 888th year to be constructed." But what one would naturally expect to find in an Inscription is that such and such a building was constructed in such and such a year, and not that it took such and such a year to be constructed. And the phrase that temple took the twentieth or any such year to be constructed is not Sanskrit as it is not English. I admitted the interpretation only so far as the grammar was concerned. The writer has not sinned against grammar in using Bhuṣaṇa as masculine, for abstract verbal nouns ending in Ana only are necessarily neuter but others, signifying the instrument or place of an action, generally take
the gender of the noun qualified. This is clear from the Liṅga-
uśāsana (Siddhānta-Kaumudi, Calcutta Edition, Volume II, last
page). This appears to be more especially the case when the verbal
noun has what may be called an Upapada or another noun
depending on it. In the Siddhānta-Kaumudi, under Pāṇini III.
3-113 and 117 the instances given are राजमीजना: जालयः। ह्वम-
प्रवथनः कुड़ारः। गोदोहणी स्थाली। in which nouns in Ana take the
gender of the nouns they qualify. Bhūṣaṇa as an abstract noun
is neuter, but in the sense of Bhūṣyate Anena it may take any
gender. Many verbal nouns in Ana are used by Sanskrit
authors in this way. In the present case Bhubhūṣaṇa qualifies
Prāṣada, and hence it is masculine.

Babu Rājendralāl supposes a double entendre on the ex-
pression in question, but such a double entendre appears to be
purposeless. For the syntactical connection of a word on which
such a play is intended is generally the same in both senses,
but here in the one sense the compound becomes an epithet of
Gauḍapatinā, and in the other, it stands independently.

Babu Rājendralāl calls the compound awkward when inter-
preted in the way I have done, but he takes it to be a Bahuvrihi,
which it is not. It is what may be called an Upapada compound;
and is to be dissolved thus:—Kuṅjarāṇām Ghaṭā = Kuṅjara-
Ghaṭa; Kuṅjara-Ghaṭām Varṣatiti,=Kuṅjara-Ghaṭāvarṣāh: Pāṇini,
III. 2. 1. Neither is it farther from the noun qualified than
such epithets are even in such a simple Kāvya as Raghu.
It is worth noticing that the followers of the Black Yajur-veda are almost confined to Southern India, while the predominant or only Veda among the Gaudas of the North is the White Yajur. The Gujarat people have got a trace of one Śākhā only of the former—the Maitrāyaṇīya. Among the Marathas, the Citpāvana Brahmans are nearly equally divided between the Rgveda and the Black Yajur-veda; while the Deśasthas are Vājasaneyins (followers of the White) and Rgvedins. Whether this is to be accounted for by a revolution or some such event, enabling the followers of the White Veda to drive their rivals to the South, or by the supposition of that part of India being the country of the origin of the Black Yajur-veda is not determined. But there is a prophecy in the Agni Purāṇa which represents the White Yajur-veda as a conquering or triumphant Veda, saying that the only Veda that will prevail in the latter part of the Kaliyuga will be the Vājasetraya; all others being lost, and the Purohita or priest of Kalki, the king that will overthrow the Mlechchhas, who will have overspread the earth, will be Yājñavalkya. This latter part of the prophecy occurs in other Purāṇas also. Yājñavalkya is the founder or first teacher of the White Yajur-veda.

Why should not a Census be taken of the several Vedas and Śākhas, and of the most important sects of Theosophy or religious philosophy?

1. Dasyavāḥ śilahinascav edo Vājasaneyakaḥ
2. Kalki Viṣṇuyassah-putro Yājñavalkya-purohitāḥ
THE VEDA IN INDIA.

[From the Indian Antiquary, Volume III, 1874, pp.132 ff.]

Every Brahmanic family is devoted to the study of a particular Veda, or a particular Śākha of a Veda; and the domestic rites of the family are performed according to the ritual prescribed in the Sūtra connected with that Veda. The study consists in getting by heart the books forming the particular Veda. In Northern India, where the predominant Veda is the White Yajur, and the Śākha Madhyandina, this study has almost died out, except at Banares, where Brahmanic families from all parts of India are settled. It prevails to some extent in Gujarat, but to a much greater extent in the Maratha Country, and in Tailanga there is a large number of Brahmans who still devote their life to this study. Numbers of these go about to all parts of the country in search of Daksīṇā, and all well-to-do natives patronize them according to their means, by getting them to repeat portions of their Veda, which is mostly the Black Yajur, with Āpastamba for their Sūtra. Hardly a week passes here in Bombay in which no Tailanga Brahman comes to me to ask for Daksīṇā. On each occasion I get the men to repeat what they have learnt, and compare it with the printed texts in my possession. With reference to their occupation, Brahmanas of each Veda are generally divided into two classes, Grhastrhas and Bhikṣukas. The former devote themselves to a worldly avocation, while the latter spend their time in the study of their sacred books and the practice of their religious rites. Both these classes have to repeat the Saṃdhīyā-Vandana or twilight prayers, the forms of which are somewhat different for the different Vedas. But the repetition of the Gāyatri-mantra Tat-Savitur varenyam, &c., five, ten, twenty-eight, or a hundred and eight times, which forms the principal portion of the ceremony, is

1. Compare the Note on the White and Black Yajurvedas on the last page in this Volume.—[N. B. U.]
common to all. The Sarhdyā-Vandana is performed early in the morning and at sunset by a few pious Brahmans, but the rest do it a little before the morning and evening meals, i.e., from 10 A.M. to 12 noon, and at about 8 P.M. Besides this, a great many perform daily what is called Brahmayajña, which is incumbent on all on certain occasions. This for the Rgvedis, consists of the first hymn of the first Mandala, and the opening sentences of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, the five parts of the Aitareya Āranyayaka, the Yajus-Sāmhitā, the Sāma-Sāmhitā, the Atharva-Sāmhitā, Āśvalāyana Kalpa-Sūtra, Nirukta, Chandas, Nighantu, Yjotiś, Sīkṣā, Pāṇini's Grammar, Yājñavalkya Smṛti, Mahābhārata, and the Sūtras of Kaṇāda, Jainini, and Bādarāyana.

1. Āśvalāyana enjoins the Brahmayajña in the following Sūtra:—

1. Asvalayana enjoins the Brahmayajña in the following Sūtra:—

Upon this is based the following, as repeated by the Rgvedi Brahmans in these days:—

1. Āśvalāyana enjoins the Brahmayajña in the following Sūtra:—

1. Asvalayana enjoins the Brahmayajña in the following Sūtra:—

Such Bhiksukas as have studied the whole Veda, repeat more of the first hymn, and a Khaṇḍa or more of the Brāhmaṇa, thus following the precept of Āśvalāyana: Sa yāvan manyeta tāvadādhiya, “having recited so much as he wishes.” The Brahmanyaṇa of the followers of the other Vedas consists of the first sections of their Sarḥhitās and Brāhmaṇas, and the opening sentences or verses of the other Vedas. The Vedāṅgas and the other works are dispensed with.

The Vedic learning of the Grhasthas extends generally thus far only, but that of the Bhiksukas goes further. Some of these latter are what are called Yājnikas. They follow a priestly occupation, and are skilled in the performance of the sacred rites. They study the manuals of domestic rites based on the several Grhya Sūtras. The manual used by and for the Rgvedi followers of Āśvalāyana is one composed by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and known by the name of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭi. The Hīranyakesī Yajurvedis use the Mahēśvara-bhaṭṭi, composed by Mahēśvarabhaṭṭa, and the manual followed by the Āpastambas is the work of one Candracuḍa, while a book of the name of Prayoga-Darpana is used by the Mādhyanandas. There are a few other works of this nature which are occasionally referred to, but the usual practice of the rites is based on these. But a more important class of Bhiksukas are Vaidikas, some of whom are Yājnikas as well. Learning the Vedas by heart and repeating them in a manner never to make a single mistake, even in the accents, is the occupation of their life. The best Rgvedi Vaidika knows by heart the Sarḥhitā, Pada, Krama, Jata, and Ghana of the hymns or Mantra corresponds, to his ॐ, Nos. 2-7 to भाष्ण्ड, No. 8 to यज्ञ, No. 9 to सांस्कृत, No. 10 to अभ्यास, No. 11, and perhaps the Vedāṅgas from 12 to 17, to गाथा नातात्साहितिद्विण्ठु, and the rest to ॐ. Of these latter the quotation from the Mahābhārata No. 19 corresponds remarkably to Āśvalāyana’s इतिहास, and there is no reason to think this did not form part of the Brahma-yajña repeated in his time.

portion of the Veda, and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and Āranyaka; the Kalpa and Gṛhya Sūtra of Āśvalāyana, the Nighantu, Nirukta, Chandas, Jyotis and Śikṣa, and Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī on Grammar. A Vaidika is thus a living Vedic Library. The Samhita and Pada our readers will understand; Krama, Jata and Ghana are different arrangements of the words in the Mantras. All these I show below by an example:

Samhita

\[
\text{हुं विष्णुविष्णुकर्मे नेष्या निदे धे पदम् समूल्लमस्य पासरे} \]

Padas

\[
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
\]

Krama

\[
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11
\]

Jata

\[
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
\]

Ghana

\[
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
\]
Padas are the different words of a Mantra repeated separately. Saṃhitā consists in putting them together according to the Saṁdhi rules and using the Saṁdhi accents. In Krama the first word is repeated along with the second, the second with the third, the third with the fourth, and so on, as shown in the above scheme. The last word of a Mantra or a half of a Rik-verse, is simply repeated with the word Iti placed between. This repetition is called Veṣṭana. In the Jātā arrangement, the first word and the second, the second and the first, and the first and the second again, are repeated together, joined by the Saṁdhi rules and having Saṁdhi accents. In the same manner, the second and the third, the third and the second, and the second and the third are put together, and thus it goes on, each word in succession beginning a new Jātā arrangement, up to the end of a half-Rik or of a mantra, when the last word is simply repeated, as in the Krama. In the Ghana there is first a Jātā arrangement of two successive words, and then the third is added on, then the three are put together in the reverse order, and again in the converse. A Ghana is thus composed of the first and the second; the second and the first; the first and the second again, then the third; the third, the second, and the first; and the first, the second, and the third. The second word begins the next Ghana, and we have the second, third; third, second; second, third, fourth; fourth, third, second; second, third, and fourth put together. In this manner it goes on to the last word, which cannot begin a new Ghana, and is therefore simply
repeated, as in the other cases. Whenever there is a compound, there is in addition what is called an Avagraha, i.e., a dissolution of it into its parts, in all these schemes, as in the case of Samhãlam in the above. It ought by no means to be supposed that to one who has got up the Padas these other arrangements are easy, since the Sarhdhi changes and accents are different in each scheme; and in reciting, the horizontal and vertical (Anudãta and svarita) accents, as also the one compounded of these two, are distinctly shown by certain modulations of the voice. The Rgvedis do this in a way different from that followed by the Taittiriyas, or followers of the Black Yaju, while the Madhyandinás indicate the accents by means of certain movements of the right hand. The Kãnvás, however, differ from these latter, and follow the Rgvedis, as do the Atharvavedis also.

In this manner the Vaidikas learn to recite the Mantra portions of their Veda. The Brãhmañs and other works are learnt and repeated simply as we find them in Manuscripts, i.e., in the Saṁhitā way. The quantity that the Rgvedis have to get up is so large that a person who has carried his studies up to Ghana is very rarely to be met with, and generally the Vaidikas of that Veda get up only the Saṁhitā, Pada, and Krama of the Mantra portion, in addition to the Brãhmañ and the other works enumerated above. Amongst the Taittiriyas, however, a great many Vaidikas go up to the Ghana of the Mantra portion of their Veda, since they have to get up only their Brãhmañ and Âranyaka in addition. Some learn the Taittiriya Pratîsākhya also; but the Vedângas, including the Kalpa and Grhya Sutras, are not attended to by that class, nor indeed by any except the Rgvedis. The Madhyandinás get up the Saṁhitā, Pada, Krama, Jâta and Ghana of their Mantra portion; but their studies generally stop there; and there is hardly one to be found who knows the whole Śatapatha Brâhmañ by heart, though several get up portions of it. There are very few Atharvavedis in the Bombay Presidency, a few families residing at Mâhuli, near Satara,
and some more in Revakāntā (See Indian Antiquary Volume, I. p. 129). Last year, two Vaidikas of this Veda, very probably from the latter district, came up to me for Dakṣiṇā. I took a copy of the German Edition in my hand and examined them, but they did not seem to know their Saṁhitā well. The triumph of a Vai-diika consists in repeating his Veda fluently, in all the ways above detailed, without a single mistake in the letters or accents. The students of the Sāmaveda have their own innumerable modes of singing the Sāmas. These are now being published in the Bibliotheca Indica. The Sāmavedis get up their Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads also.

The Vaidikas support themselves generally on the gifts or Dakṣiṇās of those of their countrymen who are charitably disposed. Often recital-meetings, known by the name of Mantra-Jāgaras, are held by rich Grhasthas in their houses, at which the principal Vaidikas in the town or village are invited. The reciters of each Veda are divided into two parties, one of which repeats a portion of a Mantra in one or more of the several schemes, and the other party takes up the next; and is then followed by the first again. Each of them is silent while the other is repeating. In this manner, they go on till the time for breaking up arrives. The reciters are provided with milk and other refreshments, and at the end a money-Daksīna is given to them by the host, according to his means. It is always a point of honour, at these meetings, who should recite first. By general consent, however, the first place is given to the Rgvedis; and after they have repeated their Mantras, the Yajurvedis begin. But, since there are two classes of Yajurvedis, the followers of Black Veda and of the White, this second place is the subject of contention between them. And sometimes the quarrel waxes so warm that it is often considered the safest course for the convener of the meeting, in order that his house may not be a scene of tumult, to invite members of only one of these. The third place is assigned to the Sāmavedis.

The Veda-reciters are patronized by native princes also; and the most liberal of these are the Gaikavāḍ and the Rāja of
Travancore, whose praises are sung by the wandering Tailanga Vaidika. The former has got a regular board of examiners, by whom every candidate that comes up from any part of India is examined and recommended for Dakṣiṇā according to his deserts. But, with all these sources of income, the Vaidika is hardly in easy circumstances. Hence the class is gradually dying out, and the sons of the best Vaidikas in Poona or the Koṅkan, now attend Government English Schools—a result not to be much deplored.

Though the time and energy wasted in transmitting the Vedas in this manner, from the times of Kātyāyana and other ancient editors of the Vedas, has been immense, we should not forget that this class of Vaidikas has rendered one important service to Philology. I think the purity of our Vedic texts is to be wholly attributed to this system of getting them up by heart, and to the great importance attached by the reciters to perfect accuracy, even to a syllable or an accent.

There is another class of Vedic students called Śrotriyas, or popularly Śrautis, which must not be omitted here. These are acquainted with the art of performing the great sacrifices. They are generally good Vaidikas, and in addition, study the Kalpa-Sūtra and the Prayogas or manuals. Their number is very limited. Here and there one meets with Agnihotris, who maintain the three sacrificial fires and perform the fortnightly Iṣṭis (sacrifices) and the Cāturmāyas (particular kinds of sacrifice). The grander Soma sacrifices are now and then brought forward, but they are as a matter of course very unfrequent. There was one in the Koṅkan at a village called Golapa, near Ratnāgiri, in May 1868, at which I was present, and another at Poona last year. The young Chief of Colaba has made preparations to institute at Ālibāg, at the end of this month (April), a sacrifice which is to be a compound of the species called Aptoryāma and of a ceremony known by the name of Cayana; that is, the ceremony of constructing the Kunda of altar in a peculiar shape. This will occupy the first twelve days, and the whole will last for about twenty days.
In the following Translations of the Nasik Cave Inscriptions, I have mainly followed Mr. West's excellent lithographs, given in Volume VII of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society's Journal. Lieutenant Brett's copies, from which Dr. Stevenson translated them, were also consulted. But finding that neither Collection was satisfactory in every respect, I visited the caves myself about three weeks ago, and compared the copies with the originals. I found a difference in several cases. These have been indicated in their proper places. I was accompanied by my friend Mr. Ābāji Viṣṇu Kāthavaṭe, himself a Sanskrit scholar, who was of much assistance to me. I have translated all the Inscriptions with the exception of No 23, which consists of a few small and incomplete lines. The numbers used are those of Mr. West's copies. The order in which I have arranged my Translations is as follows:—

1. Gautamiputra's Inscriptions, Nos. 26 and 25.
2. Uṣavadāta's Inscriptions, Nos. 17, 19, 18, 16, and 14.
3. Inscriptions of private individuals containing the names of kings.
4. The rest.

No. 26

1. सिद्ध रणो वासिष्ठपुत्र सिरिपुरुषायिस समच्छे एकुणविसे १९ मिन्धणपुरे विनोहे २ दिवसे तरसे १३ राजरणो गोतमीपुत्र हिमवतमेह—
2. मंदारपवतसमसास असिक-असकमुकसठुकुकुकुकपतअनुपविद्मआकरावति-राजस विक्ष्यातपरिचालनसखकेदिगिरिमचिरितनमलयमहिंद—
3. नातिन्निधिकामशतिसवदनस सक्राराजोकमंडल गतिगतिसासनस दिवसस्कर- कर्पियोज्यकमलविमलसदिसदनस निमितुनोपायरावहनस पहिपुरुषमंडलसिरिसैक—
Though covered over with a black oily paint, this Inscription, with the exception of a few letters at the end, could be easily read. It is intelligible throughout, though not without a few difficulties; and the words can be readily traced to their Sanskrit originals. The letters, not occurring in Mr. West's lithograph, and such as are different there from what I found them to be in the original, are underlined here, as in other Inscriptions.
Lines 2, 3. Some of the names cannot be identified. लिप्तम is perhaps भ्रितम in Sanskrit. May this be Śri Śaila on the Krṣṇa?—चक्र is very likely the Cakora mentioned in some of the Purāṇas. For the rest see Wilson’s Viṣṇu-Purāṇa and Varāha-Mihira, Chap. XIV.

L. 6. स्वारात or स्वारात. The right-hand stroke indicative of आ is distinct in the original.

L. 8 दुर्लक्षपदः makes no sense. व must very likely be read before it, though it does not occur; and then the word would correspond to दुर्लक्षपदः. सकर must have been intended for समर. Engravers not seldom make such mistakes. सकर can have nothing to do here; Gautamiputra is compared to ancient kings, and not to gods, in the compound. Dr. Stevenson’s शकारि will not do; for what is wanted here is an old Purānic king.

L. 9. वितिरण offers some difficulty. If taken as corresponding to वितीरण, there is nothing in the following words which it may with propriety be made to qualify. वितीरण: समर: would hardly be good sense; for the fight is with mortal enemies, and not with the wind, Garuḍa, etc. Nor would the compound ending with the word look well as an adverb. The letter representing Ca may not unlikelihood have been engraved for Dha, which it greatly resembles; and with a small stroke to the right, Na would be Na, and the whole word would be वितिरण. This yields pretty good sense; for what seems to be intended is that he propitiated the wind, Garuḍa and the rest by some processes, and then obtained an easy victory over his enemies. मातुः, महादेवी, etc., stand for मातुः, महादेवी, etc. instrumantal singulars in Prakrit.

L. 10. तिरण्ट or more properly तिरण्ट (see No. 25, l. 8), corresponds to तिरण्ट (See No. 17, middle of l. 3, and No. 15, l. 7), and was the name of the hill on which these Cave-Temples are excavated. It occurs in No. 9, No. 11, l. 2, No. 25, about the end of l. 9, and also in l. 11 of this. Dr. Stevenson makes “Kanha mountain” of it in one place (p. 43), “the rays of the setting sun” in another (p. 50), and “wilderness” in a 30 [R. G. Bhandarkar’s works, Vol. I.]
third\(^1\). भद्रानीयान्त ought to be भद्रानीयान्त (See ta. ll. and 13 below) =भद्रानीयान्त which was the name of a Buddhistic sect.\(^2\)

L. 11. चितवन = देशानिधित्वम् is the reading of both Lieut. Brett and Mr. West; but I could distinctly see स instead of श and देश, the genitive, is wanted here. चितवन =नैवायायात्. अयक्ष =अयक्षः
gen. “of the venerable lady”. पितामहदर is unintelligible.

Sanskrit of No. 26.

1 सिद्धम् राहो वांशिकिणुस्वर्य श्रीपुढुमयोऽसंवतः एकोनविते १९ श्रीमद्वे
   द्वितीये २ द्विसेत्र श्रीवदे १३ राजसायस्य गौतमीपुढुमय्यः हिकवमेद—

2 भद्रायानीयान्तसायस्यकारम् कुलकपिकुम्बल्लकपारतनापातूप्रिविद्वाराजनी
   राजस्य विनयात्याहयास्यसस्यप्रिविद्वाथश्रिश्चित्तनमात्यमेदहे—

3 भद्रमितिरिच्चकोरपरितपते सर्वाराजलक्षकामगीप्रान्तिशासनस्य दिसक्करविवे
   मितकराविनिमिततासाधवयस्य विसमुद्रणपीयवाहस्य परिपूणाद्वेद्वराजश्रीक—

4 पियुदस्सायस्य वर्तारणीवकपमाणिक्यस्य भुजगवतिकोणिस्वरुपाचितृपदीम्
   सुन्दरमुजस्याभयुपोढङकानियाकार्यस्यार्पित्यप्रमाणत्वशुभरक्षस्य सुविमाकाविमाविसा
   कालस्य

5 पौरजानिविनिष्प्रसससम्भुवंत्वस्य नात्र यज्ञीयपद्मानामद्वेद्यस्य शक्यवाचकनविश्वीकृत्यः
   श्रमेष्टिरित्तकः विनययोगकरस्य रतापरोपि श्रुतिनेत्रमाणियसीतहेचोढ़निवर्तकुहकुराविवध—

6 नयो यमागाराजसायनिराशवेशकरस्य शातावलकृपयायास्यतिपाणकरस्य सर्वे
   मणिलामियाददित्वयानस्य विनिर्विहृत्तातुवंशसंस्कर्णस्यमार्गितायणियाज्ञानविवत्कुलकुडा
   मधुकुलावणी—

7 पुत्रस्य कुलकुपरांगातविपुरांगाजातिवायास्यावमानाः निलवस्य सतुभागणामा,
   अयस्य यिणोविनृश्चास्योपाचारणाः प्रस्यस्यकुकुस् \( \text{\$} \) \( \text{\$} \)प्रयोगुन्यार्थस्यकुर्म्यस्यकायकृत्य
   धातोऽस्य राम—

8 केर्कावाजुवामेज्यनुस्तप्तवर्तकम् दृष्टिक्षणानिोखस्वामाजारकस्य नम्नगंग्नुष्पतेनात्र
   जामेज्यनायस्यालातिरियामायायस्यमस्तेनसि अयमिततमसन्यातिविन्नुष्टते \( \text{\$} \)वनमहाकार्य्य
   क्षराधामिदारागमध्यस्चाराह—

This Cave-temple, a benefaction, the greatness of which is not excelled by the best (1) of Vimānas (celestial cars), is caused to be constructed on the snmmit of Trirasmi, which is like the summit of—, on the 13th thirteenth day, in the 2nd second fortnight of Grismā (2), in the year 19 nineteen, of the King Śrī Pūḍumayi, the son of Vāśiṣṭha, by the Great Queen Gautami, the presiding genius of power, taking delight in veracity, charity, forbearance, and abstinence from killing, devoted to religious austerities, self-restraint, vows and fasts, and acting (3) in every way as befits the title of “daughter (4) of royal sages,” and the mother of Śatakarni, Gautamiputra [the son of Gautami], the King of Kings, whose might [firmness] is-equal to that of the mountains Himālaya, Meru, and Mandāra; who is king of Asika, Asmaka, Mudhaka, Surāṣṭra, Kukura (5), Aparānta, Anūpa, Vidarbha, Akara, and Avanti, and lord of the mountains Vindhyāvat, Pāriyātra, Sahya, Kṛṣṇa-giri, Malaya, Mahendra, Śreṣṭha-giri and Cakora; whose orders are obeyed by the circle of all kings, whose pure face resembles the lotus blown open by the rays of the sun, whose beasts of burden have drunk(6) the waters of the three seas, whose look is as graceful and lovely as the full disk of the moon, whose gait is as-
pleasing as that of an excellent elephant, whose arm is as stout, rounded, massive, long, and beautiful as the body of the lord of serpents, whose fearless hand is wetted by the water poured in granting (7) asylums, who serves his living (lit. not dead) mother, who has well arranged the times and places proper for [the pursuit of] the triad (8), whose happiness and misery are the same as, and not different from, those of his citizens, who has quelled the boast and pride of Kṣatriyas, who is the destroyer of the Śakas, Yavanas, and Palhavas, who spends the [revenue got from] taxes levied only according to the law, who does not like to destroy life even in the case of enemies who have given offence, who has increased (9) the families of the best of Brahmans, who exterminated [lit. left no remnants of] the race of Khagārāta, who has established the glory of the family of Śatavahana, whose feet are adored by the whole circle of kings, who has stemmed [the progress of] the confusion of the four castes, who has conquered the host of his enemies in innumerable battles, whose great capital is unapproachable to his enemies and has its victorious flag unconquered, to whom the great title of king has descended from a series of ancestors [lit. men of his family], who is the abode of learning, the support of good men, the home of glory, the source of good manners, the only skilful person, the only archer, the only brave man, the only supporter of Brahmans, whose exploits rival those of Rāma, Keśava, Arjuna, and Bhimasena; who holds festive meetings on the occasion of the summer solstice, whose prowess is equal to that of Nabhāga, Nahuṣa, Janamejaya, Sagara, Yayāti, Rāma, and Aṁbariṣa; who conquered the host of his enemies in the brunt of battle in a curious and wonderful manner in virtue of his innumerable worships and observances, and by means of rites concerning the wind, Garuda, Siddhas, Yaksas, Rakṣasas, Vidyādharas, ghosts, Gandhārvas, Caranas, the moon, the sun, the constellations and planets; who erects his neck high in the sky like (10) mountains and trees [lit. who goes or makes towards the sky], and who has brought prosperity to his race,
The Great Queen, the mother of the Great King, and the grandmother of the Great King, gives this cave to the Congregation, the host of mendicants of the Bhadrāyaniya School. The Lord of — patha, desirous to please and to serve the venerable lady, the Great Queen, grants a village on the south-western side of the Triraśmi mount for the sake of the Caityas (images) in the cave-temple, in order thus to prepare a bridge for the fame and religious desert of her father and husband.

NOTES.

The syntactical connection of the sentence ending with बंपनम in the tenth line is शातकृणोमित्रा गोतम्या त्रिनामिस्तिसव इव्वं बंपनं कारितम्. The words from राजराजस्य in the first line to—श्रीकर्ष्ण in the ninth, are epithets of शातकृणि; and from महादेव्या to —विघीरभावनाय of गोतमी.

(1) My friend remarked, when we came to this part of the Inscription, that below the plinth of the verandah of the Cave, were carved figures of men with poles on their shoulders, giving to them the appearance of Vimāna-bearers, like the modern Palki—bearers, and to the Cave that of a Vimāna.

(2) It appears to have been the custom in some parts of the country in those days to mark the Ṛtu or season instead of the month. Each season is composed of two months, and consequently of four Pakṣas or fortnights. Grīṣma comprehends Jyeṣṭha and Āṣāḍha.

(3) अधिविधीयमान्य is in form passive, while the active sense is required. It may have been a mistake of the engraver,

(4) Daughter or daughter-in-law.

(5) A portion of modern Rajaputana appears to have been known by the name of Kukura; for it is called Kiuchelo by Huien Thsang, which General Cunningham identifies with Gurjjara.¹ But Gurjjara is nowhere mentioned as the name

¹ Ancient Geography of India, p. 312.
of a country; and supposing that there was a country of that name, its position ought to be farther to the South. The Gurjara dynasty which the General connects with that country reigned at Broach\(^1\) (See Journal B. B. R. A. S. Vol. X). Kukura answers to Kiuchelo better than Gurjara. Aparânta must be the Western coast below the Sahyâdri; for Kâlidâsa represents Raghu, in the fourth canto of the Râghuvâmaśa (Śloka 52, 53, and 58), to have crossed the Sahya to conquer that country, and to have, by means of his immense army, made the sea to appear "as if it touched the Sahya mountain." Anûpa was a country on the Upper Narmadâ, with Mâhiśmati for its capital.\(^2\)

(6) According to the usual Sanskrit idiom (Pâñini II. 2. 36) ought to be placed before विसमुद्वतोय. But there are exceptions, as noticed in Pâñini II. 2. 37. Such expressions as माहव-सिरिबो (Mâlati-Mâdhava, Act VI.) are not uncommon. Jagaddhara’s remark in this case is माधवशिष्य इत्यद्य प्राक्ते पुनर्विपातात्तत्त्वात् (Mâlati-Mâdhava, Act VI.) According to him, therefore, adjectives may be placed after the noun in Prakrit where this cannot be done in Sanskrit.

(7) Properly the phrase ought to be translated thus, "Whose fearless hand is wetted by giving the water of asylum or safety." But there is no object or propriety in comparing safety to water. The expression ought to be अभयानारोदक. The compound, however, may be dissolved as अभयानोदकम् दानम्, but this is hardly good.

(8) The triad: is धâma “religious merit or desert”, अर्थ “wealth, possessions, or worldly interests,” and काम, “desires or pleasures.”

(9) To put a Brahman in a condition in which he may "increase and multiply" his race has always been considered an act of virtue. Usavadâta is praised in Inscription No. 17 for

---

1 Journal of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, Volume X.
2 Râghuvâmaśa, VI. 37-43.
"having given eight wives to Brahmans," i.e. given them the means of marrying.

(10) The termination प्र showing "manner" or "variety," which in Sanskrit is applied only to numerals, seems to be appended here to common nouns. Hence नम्ब्रसङ्ग्रहा means "in the manner of mountains and trees."

By far the greater part of Dr. Stevenson's translation of this Inscription is wrong, and wide away from the true sense. His "Varāja, lord of the circle of Laṅkā"); "Sūrya going to the region of the lotuses at the suggestion of chāyā"); "the spotless sister," "Kṣatriya flaming like the god of love," "the four institutes, one for the sick and infirm," "Umākhelā, the queen, etc. etc., have all disappeared in my Translation. I need not criticize it further. Any one who will compare both with the original will perceive the truth of my remark.

It will be seen that the cave was caused to be constructed and assigned to the mendicants by Gautami, the mother of Śatakarni Gautamiputra, and not by his wife or widow, as supposed by Dr. Stevenson and all subsequent writers.

Below this Inscription there is another composed of about three lines in smaller characters, which is difficult to read. The time at my command was so short that I had to come away without comparing Mr. West's transcript with it. But I do not think such a comparison would have been of much use. The engraver was evidently in haste, and wanted to compress much matter within the short space at his disposal, in consequence of which the letters are badly formed. The difficulty is increased by a portion in the middle of each line being destroyed. The context is thus cut off. I have, however, been able, by comparing the two copies, to make out the following:—

No. 26 A.

11 नवमस्वामी वासिठेन्द्रो सिथीषुरुमवि आणपति गोवथे अमधे

12 सवस्वाल्ल अमेण सवः 19 मित्र पव 13 धनकट्यामानिनि

13 एथ पलेततर cut away. न एतस तस लेनल पदस्थरणे अस्विन्यतु एथ गोवथनुहे
THE NASIK CAVE INSCRIPTIONS

When a reading not noticed below is not found in one of the copies, it should be looked for in the other.

L. 12. अबेंॅ looks like अबेन, but what is required is a Prakrit word having the sense of अस्माक्. —सामिनाङ्गि is the instrumental plural occurring again in No.25, l. 5. The न of the singular seems to have the plural termination attached to it in this case, as in the Marathi plural राज्यानी (=नहीं), the singular being राज्यने. The verb or participle of which सामिनाङ्गि is the agent in the instrumental case is wanting, probably lost in the portion of the Inscription destroyed. It should be some word signifying "given". —प्रतस. The त seems to have been badly cut in the rock or compounded by the copyists with व. —परसंधरण ⟹ शतांतरण ⟹ शतांतरण ⟹ शतांतरण. अभावनन्दवहे may also be read as गोवर्धनावरे ="district of Govardhana." —तथापि is somewhat difficult Mr. West has भिलेण. I prefer the former, and refer it to the Sanskrit तत्त्वान or विश्वान. —अद्यनेऽन्ति. The व books like न, but there can be little doubt that व is the correct reading, since the word occurs near the end of l. 10 and in the middle of l. 13. In the latter place it is distinct in Lieut. Brett's copy. —पतिलान. The first letter is न in Lieut. Brett's, and unreadable in Mr. West's.
It must be ष, for the word is repeated in the next line, where the ष is distinct. In the latter place the letter that looks like ष must be corrected to ष, as we have got it here. —खदस्तनिहि.
The vowel of the last letter is not distinct. The vowel occurs in the last line about the end. —ब्र. The vowel of the first letter is wanting in Mr. West's, but some mark denoting it is to be seen in Lieut. Brett's, though on the left side of the letter. Mr. West suspects the existence of ष after ष, but that letter is not required here unless we read the whole word as पघम.

L. 13 गासे. This is nominative singular, but the sense requires the accusative. —ददिम appears to be the first person plural of the perfect. In Sanskrit, however, the root द्र first class takes the Ātmanepada terminations. Or if one ष is considered redundant, and consequently to have crept in by mistake, the form is of the root ष. But the Prakrits generally have not preserved the Ātmanepada. —अहरकान = आयकानाम. The dots representing ष sometimes stand for ज as in l. 5 of No 12, in which case the word is अहरकान. The plural is used as expressive of respect. —समलपद्य मight be taken as corresponding to सममपद्य or समलपन्य. पय or पह means a "road" or "path", but मह does not yield an appropriate sense. The letter, however, which looks like म may also be read as वि, in which case the expression is समलपन्य "together with the ditches (such as wells) and roads." The expression occurs further on in this line and in the next. —उपणय. The isosceles triangle which represents ष has in several cases in this inscription lost one of its sides. Taking the first letter, therefore, as ष, the word nearest to उपणय which makes sense is विदापियो or विदापिति "abandoned". —देवानकणकज is somewhat unintelligible. The first word is very likely देवानांदेवानाम्, the second must be one having the sense of "a mendicant" or "beggar," and third कले कारि; so that the whole expression appears to mean "for the sake of gods and beggars and mendicants." Generally these are the objects of charity. (See बनक-बेवसेय below.) The first letter is not distinct, as it looks like ष.

The prosperous Puḍumayi, the lord of Navanara (1), commands Sarvākṣadalana, the Royal Officer in Govardhana:—The village in the Govardhana district, in the southern division which (was granted) on the thirteenth day of the second fort...
night of Grīṣma, in the year nineteen of our (reign), by the Lord of Dhanakāṭa, as a permanent provision for the keeping up of this said cave-temple, was disapproved by the mendicants of the place, the Bhadrāyaniyas in congregation, residing in the Queen’s cave-temple, and given (back). In its place we granted, by (issuing) mandates, another village of the same area as the former, along with the wells and roads, as a permanent provision for the keeping up of the cave-temple of the great venerable lady (or grand-mother) which is the bridge of religious desert to the donor; and the management of the village, which was disapproved by the Bhadrāyaniyas in congregation, was placed in the hands of the body of the protectors of the mendicants, (and of?) the body of the recluses (2), for purposes concerning gods and beggars (generally). We (now) grant the village to Buddha, the best of Jinas, the destroyer of the ignorance (lit. sleep) of the crowd of mortals, by (issuing) commands to the prosperous Viśṇupāla, the Royal Officer residing in Gona-bana. It is not to be entered on or interfered with by others, not to include what has been granted (before) or may be dug out, and not to be subject to the rules (in matters of revenue) applicable to (other parts of) the country, and to include all that may grow on it. (We grant) with these restrictions this village, along with the wells, roads, and appurtenances. This charter (composition) is engraved here by the general, the talented Aksatasattva at the command (3) of the very respectful composers of all mandates (or charters).

NOTES.

(1) I translate नवनरस्त्रामी as “the Lord of Navanara,” upon the analogy of the expression पनक्षरस्त्रामी. Navanara must have been the name of Puḍumayi’s capital. But it may be translated as “the new lord of men.” रस्त्रामी, however, in the sense of a King, is hardly to be met with, and the epithet नव or “new,” as applied to the King, can have so significance, since about the time that it was used in this Inscription he must have been more than nineteen years on the throne,
(2) A distinction seems to be intended here between a विष्णु and a प्रभु। The former term signifies a regular Buddhist mendicant, and the latter, any one who has abandoned the world and devoted himself to the life of a recluse.

(3) Command, i. e. the respected person composed the charter, and it was engraved as composed. The word आज्ञा may here be translated "at the dictation of."

The Lord of Dhanakaṭa spoken of in this Inscription was Gautamiputra; for the title occurs before his name in No. 25, l.1. He appears to be represented here to have granted a village on the thirteenth day of the second fortnight, etc., which is the date of No. 26. This, therefore, must be the same grant as that mentioned in l. 11 of that Inscription. From No. 26 A we see that the Bhadrāyaniyas disapproved of the village granted to them by Gautamiputra, whereupon Puḍumayi gave them another in its place, and the old one, which for some time had been devoted to charitable purposes generally, was assigned to the Buddhists by this charter.

Govardhana appears from this Inscription, and from No. 25, to have been the capital of the province during the reign of these princes. There is a village of that name at present about three or four miles from the hill where these caves are constructed.

No. 25.

१ सिंघ सेनानी विजयति याँ विजयितिववाचा[डे] गोवङ्गनस व[ढ]नैकड़ु स्वामी गोतमपुले विशिष्ट्यकरणि

२ आन्द्रयति गोवङ्गने अपरविज्ञुपालित काल अपरकालित् ये खेंत अपर-कालियिय उससदति[ले]एन अति नवत[न]—

३ सताति वे २०० एत्थ अत्य खेंत [नि]वतनसताति वे २०० इवैसे पवित्रियापुर तेंकरसिंहन् [हरिसान्] विताम एतस च [त]वेंत खेलस परिवारि

५ विताम अपरसिंह अनामस अदाण्यव्रो[तर]कं अरदविनियंक सव-जानपरिवारिक च एताहि परिष्ठोरैि परिखोरैि.
This Inscription is faintly cut, and the surface of the rock is so uneven that the natural indentations appear like letters or parts of letters. Hence neither of the published copies is satisfactory. Though Mr. West's is superior as a whole to Lieut. Brett's, the latter is in several places better than the former. With the assistance of these two I was able to make out a good deal, but there are several difficulties which cannot be satisfactorily cleared up.

Line 1. सनानी. What is marked as ज़ in Mr. West's copy, has the mark of the vowel ए above it, and looks so much like the letter which he has taken to be ज़ = ए, that I have put down both as नानी. —वैज्ञानिक. The sense requires that Mr. West's ज़ should be taken as ज़. —विज्ञ. १० looks distinctly like
The Nasik Cave Inscriptions

Lo = तिप. तिथवारा should be तिथवारी which represents the Sanskrit तिथवारी. Hemacandra gives वार, दार and द्वार as the Prakrit forms of द्वारस्य.¹ (क्रियापदार्थण् - द्वार वार दार). The vowel marks are not distinct here. It is दार in Mr. West's, but वार in Lieut. Brett's. It must very likely be वार. -वनकटका. The first letter should be read घ (See No. 26 A: l. 12). The dot on न and the right hand stroke of क must be mistakes. There appears to be a letter like घ=म after this word, but nothing satisfactory can be made out of it. -स्वामिः. घ when looked at from a certain position looks like घ=स्वामिः; and it must be so, for if it were simply म, the nether loop would not be so much below the level of that of the next म. The loop, therefore, must be another letter, i.e., घ.

-Line 2. आनपयिः. The first two letters are: आन; तु must be तु. -अपरत्निरंग. The sense of this cannot be determined with perfect certainty, but it must refer to the direction in which the field lay. In No. 26, l. 11, the word अपरत्निरंग meaning "southwest" occurs, and उत्तरायण in No. 19. The expression may therefore have been intended for अपरत्निरंग -अत्यक्षरियः probably corresponds to अत्यक्षरिय (अत्यक्षरिय). -नियत. तु and तु have been put together by Mr. West, but they appear separate in Lieut. Brett's copy.

-Line 3. The mark for a hundred has a side stroke, though the copies do not give it. तु therefore signifies two hundred. -नियत. The first letter is omitted in Mr. West's copy, but there is a perpendicular stroke to represent it in Lieut. Brett's. The context requires the निः. -तेक्षरियः must very likely be पुरिसानं=पुरि-

-Line 4. अपोविं अनामसं अदुपायआदकं अर्धद्विनिरिक्षः. Mr. West's copy is not faithful to the original here. The third word is not distinct even in the original; but it must be as I have put it, for

¹ क्रियापदार्थण् - द्वार वार दार.
NOTES ON INSCRIPTION NO. 25

these expressions occur in l. 10 below, and in the last line of No. 26 A. In this Inscription, however, we have अरुिस्रमाकर्मक or अरुि-सबीनवीकङ्क for the fourth expression. These phrases correspond to आयाधपवेश्यम or समस्तराजक्याियानमवेश्यम, इत्यं पदेवमन्द्रायवज्ञन्यम or सर्वदानसंग्राहक, etc., occurring in copperplates of a later date. अध्वेशय is to be traced, I think, to अयाधपवेश्यम, अनासांस to अनासाद्य, अदाधाभाऊक or आदाधाभाऊक, as it may be read, to आदनसातोक or आदनसातोक, and the last probably to अरुिस्रविनयिकङ्क, or more in conformity with Sanskrit usage, to अरुिस्रविनयिकङ्क, i. e. “not to be controlled or dealt with in point of revenue in the same manner as other parts of the country,” i. e. “not to be subjected to taxes.”

—एतत्विहृ. The न appears to form part of the termination, the usual portion of the अि of the instrumental plural being written separately.

Line 5. एत च सिःतत is the reading of Lieut. Brett’s copy. It should be एतैं च सिःतत. —I found यिशवार instead of यिशवार. —एष्ण मित्र is the reading of the original, as of Lieut. Brett’s copy. यिशवार ought to be यिशवार, the word occurring in the same circumstances in No. 26 A l. 14. सुविशेषण = सुविशेषेषण “a learned man.” Compare संस्कृतदशैनाण विनियमचक्र: in No. 26 A. l. 14. These charters were written by learned men for those officers. —आण्वन ought either to be आण्वन = आण्वन or should be taken as forming a compound with the following word.—अस्थेषय, Mr. West’s copy is inaccurate here; the other is better. छठो represent the Sanskrit किथो, or if there is a छ in the blank, दिशो “placed,” i. e. “engraved.”—महासामिच्छिह must be महासामिच्छिह. (See No.26A, l. 12, and the note). —अपर. The perpendicular stroke to the right hand is wanting in the case of अ.

Line 6. पविक्ष or पवाक्ष is very likely दुबक्ष = दुबैक्ष “the preceding” or former”. —ताप्ताछ्य. The mark of आ in ता is distinct in the original and in Mr. Brett’s copy. राजनिताय may have been intended for राजाणित्त = राजाणित्त.

Line 7 झाणि. I do not know what to make of this. If झि were to be taken as the copulative particle, झि alone would no signify anything, and the context seems to require that the sense should be "the Queen of Satakarni Gautamiputra," and not "Satakarni Gautamiputra, and the Queen" because in line 9 we have the word एवति "got from the father," i.e. patrimony, which expression would not suit in the case of the King. Perhaps it may be भजा=भार्यि or वजा=वार्षि. It may notwithstanding झाणि झार्थि; the झि may have existed, though it is not now seen, or it may be चस or वस, equivalent to वार्षि, a term of honour used before the names of women, as it is in inscription No. 24.

—झाणि. I distinctly saw the word, though in the copies it is found in a mutilated form. The झि for झि may be a mistake of the engraver or owing to a defect in the rock. —असभि. There must have been अस in the blank before झि; for the following name is the same as in I. 6, and it is preceded by असभि there.

—झाणि. I saw this word distinctly. —झाणि. What seems like तन्मेविषि may be गोविषि, and the first three letters countenance this supposition. It is difficult to say what the next four letters stand for. Perhaps the word is बाँधविषि=वास्तवि or चिन्तांतिषि=तिन्ति meaning "situated".

Line 8. असभि. The झि is not unlikely झि, and I saw something like झि below it. The expression, then, is असभि=असभि. —झाणि. The copies are defective here, but I could discern these words in the original. —असभि. Lieut. Brett's copy is accurate here and in the case of the next word, where, however, the झि ought to have the mark of झि, as it has in the original. गावि रसविषि. Here, again, I found Lieut. Brett's copy to be correct.

Line 9. बन्तलिति. The older copy is better here also. —झाणि. The first two letters are very illegible in the original; the second looks like झि; but it appears likely that the two stand for एक; for it is in this way that the sentence yields any sense. Had the word गावि in the last line been गावि, and had there been जि after झि, I should have taken these two letters to represent नव, and their appearance would support this reading; for the
sense in that case would be:—"Formerly a village and a field were granted to the mendicants. The field is one hundred (nivartanas), and the village nine. At the place where there is the grant of nine hundred is crownland on the boundary of the town, etc." द्वानि must be द्वानि. —नगरसीमे is a locative, for Sanskrit nouns ending in च व निवर्तनासिद्धान्तम् become masculine nouns ending in अ.
—पेतकः. So I read it. In Mr. West's copy it looks somewhat like सत्क, but in Lieut. Brett's, decidedly more like पेतक, and this gives the good sense.

Line 10. The words in this line have been remarked on before.

Line 11. ठिर्पं छाविणेन. See notes on l. 5 above. What looks like ठठ must be ठिर्प। —परिधिरक्षितं परिधिरक्षितं. We see from l. 4 that these should be the words here but the original is so bad that Mr. West has got some characters which look like the usual marks for the figure 10. Lieut. Brett's copy is better. —पञ्चेसरक्षण। Perhaps the name of the engraver—प्रतिभारक्षितं like परिधिरक्षितं occurring in Inscription No. 11. —लाजयमा तो=राजयमात्वो, the य being probably a mistake for अ.

Line 12. प्रजितितम is not unlikely प्रजितानाम।

A good many of the anusvāras in the foregoing transcript do not occur in the two copies of the inscription referred to. Some of these I found in the original myself, and others have been put in only when the context undoubtedly required them.

Sanskrit of No. 25.

1 सिद्धम्। सनातनीविज्ञानि यो विज्ञानियोद्वोर गोवर्षेनस्य। धनकटकस्यामी गोतमीपुजो श्रीशाताकर्षण।
2 राजस्यपयामि गोवर्षेनेवमात्रं विद्युपालितम्। शास्त्रस्मिन्निमीयं यत्केत्रमयंकर-सिद्धसत्तमाद्वान [वृषभदसेन] मुख्य निवर्तन—
3 शस्त्राय हृ २०० एतद्वयं केत्रं निवर्तनसवत्ताने हृ २०० अर्थं प्रद्वितानव [स्त्रेया] मुख्य पश्चय वितराय एतस्य तस्य केत्रस्य परिवारं

1. Vararuci, Prakṛta-Prakāśa, IV. 18.
To the Perfect One. Victorious in Senāni (leader of the army of the gods), who is on the gate of the Vijayatirtha (1) in Govardhana. The prosperous Śatakarni Gautamiputra, the Lord of Dhanakataka, commands Viṣṇupālita, the Royal officer in Govardhana: We grant to the men in the village (2) who have renounced the world, the field in the Village (measuring) two hundred 200 Nivartanas (3) which is to the south-west, and is at present enjoyed by Usabhadasa. We grant the appurtenances also of this said field. It (4) is not to be entered on or interfer-
ed with by others, not to include what has been granted (before) or may be dug out, and not to be subject to the rules (in matters of revenue) applicable to (other parts of) the country, and to include all (5) that may grow on it. [We grant] with these restrictions (various conditions) this said field and these appurtenances. This charter (lit. composition) is engraved by the Royal officer Śivagupta, at the dictation of a learned man. The great lord gave another field in the previous year, 19, on the day of the 4th fortnight of Varṣā, for the sake of the ascetics.

To the Perfect one. This is a Royal command to be issued to Śramaka, the Royal officer in Govardhana. Śramaka, the Royal officer in Govardhana, should be given this command at the orders of King Śātakarni Gautamiputra, and of the Great Queen (6) the honoured Vāsiṣṭhi, the mother of the King. Formerly a field was granted in the south-westerly direction in the village to mendicants who had renounced the world, living in the cave-temple, which is our benefaction, on Mount Trirāśmi, the haunt (of ascetics) situated in Govardhana. That field measures one hundred, and the village, nine hundred. On the boundary of the town, at the place where the field measuring one hundred lies, there is a field belonging to the Crown which is our patrimony. Out of this field we grant one hundred nivarānas lying in the openings of Trirāśmi (7) and the appurtenances of the plot. It is not to be entered on or interfered with by others, not to include what has been granted or may be dug out, and not to be subject to the rules applicable to (the other parts of) the country, and to include all that may grow on it. [We grant] with these restrictions (various conditions), this said field and its appurtenances. Pratibhāraśīta, the Royal officer, engraved this charter here at the dictation of a learned man. In the year 24, 4th fortnight of Varṣā, on the 5th day. For the sake of the worshipful (persons) this charter (8) was written (composed) on the 10th of the fourth (?) fortnight of Grīṣma in the year 24.
It will thus be seen that this Inscription consists of two charters containing grants of land to the mendicant priests and recluses. The first was issued by Śatakarni Gautamiputra, and the second by Vāsiṣṭhi his Queen. Dr. Stevenson thinks it to be a deed of sale executed by the proprietor of Govardhana, as he calls him, conveying the field over which this cave is constructed to Gautamiputra’s ageni, and thinks the second part to be merely a repetition of the first. The cave is excavated out of the rock, and there could be no field there to convey. His translation therefore is wrong in many places.

1. गोवर्धनस्य cannot be connected with स्वामी, since this latter forms the second part of a compound word. It must, therefore, be taken with the preceding. Vijayatirtha must have been the name of a shrine or sacred place in Govardhana, and an image of Senāni must have been placed or carved out on its gate, as is not unusual in Hindu houses or temples.

2. अस्य for इहेस seems to refer to the village spoken of in l. 2. The village must be one near Govardhana and Trirāśmi.

3. Nivartana is thus defined:—ढासाहस्यद ढासने विज्ञायणदा निवर्तनम्, Brhaspati; ससाहस्यद ढासने विज्ञायणदा निवर्तनम्, Matsya Purāṇa, both quoted by Hemādri (Dānakhaṇḍa ed. Bib. Ind. p. 505).

4. The epithets, अप्रावेश्यस्य etc., qualify कृत्यम् in l. 3.

5. परिचारम् l. 5 is in the accusative, wherefore वितराम् is to be understood, or the accusative may be connected with the वितराम् occurring in l. 3.

6. If the expression चष्ट्र were taken as equivalent to भायां, वयां or some such word, the sense would be: “At the orders of the Great Queen of king Śatakarni Gautamiputra, the honoured Vāsiṣṭhi.”

7. Trirāśmi is used in the plural in Inscription No. 17. The name probably derived its origin from the fact that there are
three hills in one line, detached from the adjoining ranges, on one of which the caves exist. Between these hills there are plains or valleys; and the field conveyed by Vāsiṣṭhi was perhaps in one of these.

(8). निबन्धः: This word originally signifies any piece of composition. It is then applied to the piece of composition issuing from a king. Hence the legal word निबन्ध, which signifies any hereditary office conveyed by a royal charter. The word is used in Inscription No. 18, l. 4.

No. 17.

1. सित्सुः। राज्यः क्ष्यरास्य भक्तरस्य नहुष्यास्य जामात्रा दीपीपुष्पिण उष्वदा-तेन निगीतसत्सरवेण न्यायानो वागानसाया सुरगेत्तसत्वारा क्रयोपसर्व देवताम्यः ब्राह्मणस्वर बोद्धापारादेश सर्वत्सरवत्सरात्मही सोजायित्रा

2. प्राणस्ते पृथ्वीपर्षया ब्राह्मणेयः सहस्रमस्त्रोक्तेषु दसरुपे गोत्वपमेश्वरेषु श्रवेश्ते च चतुर्यात्मकवित्राय अयमादेश आरामवत्ताय उद्यानक्रये द्वापारादा दमरकायी-कर्मेणाधितृतनाः। नावा पृथ्वत्तकर्ये एतार्य च नदीनां महतायथातृतरं समा—

3. प्रपाकरणे पृंडितकाव्यः गोवध्वे वृपणमुक्तेश्वरेषु श्रवेश्ते च रामायणे चरकः। प्राप्तेश्रुती नानंगोले दुविन्द्राय नार्यरूपमविश्रावस्त्र गोवध्वे निग्रामाणे वरदेवतेषु हस्तीक्षणा संदे चेष्ट बारथित एसा च पृंडितमेश्वरे शार्तर्वा आपातीया च गवासिस्वर्णशिरां चालेये...हिबयं उत्तममहे भोचायितुः

4. ते च मात्रा व्रान्दनेषव अपराया उत्तममुद्रकाव्यं च शान्तिमाव सेव परिधानं कुत पलतायम हृतो पोदराणि तत्र च मयं अनिष्टकः। कुतो विष्णु च गीतहुर्वाश्च दत्तानि प्राचां च...

No. 19.

दत्र बालनेष्वराय ब्राह्मणस्त्रोक्तेषु वराहुपृषपुष्पिण अश्मित्तिः हृद्रोगीतं मृदेशन कान्हायण-वहेडः [1] चतुर्दशी 4000 [1] संप्रितकत्वनगरस्तीमाय उत्तममुद्रय दिस्य एतों मम तेने बस्तानां चालुदित्तस्म कृषिलामस सुखदारो भविष्यति।

TRANSLATION.

To the Perfect one. This Cave and these small tanks were caused to be constructed on the Mounts Triraśmi (1) in Govardhana, by the benevolent Uṣavadāta, the son-in-law- of
King Kṣaharāta Satrapa Nahapāna (2), son of Dinīka, who gave three hundred thousand cows, presented gold, and constructed flights of steps on the river Bārṇāśā, gave sixteen villages to gods and Brahmans, fed a hundred thousand Brahmans every year, provided (the means of marrying) eight wives for Brahmans at Prabhāsa (3), the holy place, constructed quadrangles (4), houses and halting-places at Bharukaccha, Daśapura, Govardhana and Śorparaga, made gardens, tanks and wells, charitably enabled men to cross Ibā, Pārāda, Damaṇa, Tāpi, Karabanā and Dahanukā by placing boats (5) on them; constructed Dharmasālavas and endowed places for the distribution of water, and gave capital worth a thousand for thirty-two Naḍhigēras (6) for the Carānas (7) and Pariṣads in Pīnditakāvāda, Govardhana, Suvārnāmukha, Śorparaga, Rāmatīrtha and in the village of Nānagola. By the command of the Lord I went in the rainy (8) season to Mālaya to release Hirudha the Uttambhadra (9). The Mālayas fled away at the sound of our war music, and were all made subjects of the Kṣatriyas, the Uttambhadras. Thence I went to Pūkṣaraṇī and there performed ablutions, and gave three thousand cows and a village.

NOTES.

The first part of this inscription is in Sanskrit. The latter part contains a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit.

(1). For Triraśmi see note No. 26, l. 10 and No. 25, l. 9.

(2). I think upon the whole that this way of interpreting the expression is more in consonance with known facts than making Nahapāna satrap of a king named Kṣaharāta.

(3). Prabhāsa, as Dr. stevenson says, is a place near Pāṭṭan Somnāth or Somnath itself. Bharukaccha is now known to be Broach. Daśapura must be some place in Gujarāt or in the Maratha country bordering on Gujarāt. It occurs in Inscription No. 1. Śorparaga is Supara near Bassein. The Damaṇa and Dahanukā must be rivers flowing into the sea at those places in the Thana District. Tāpi is well-known. The others I am
notable to identify. Ramatirtha is, I am told, a small place near Sopara. Uṣavadāta’s charities do not seem to have gone further to the north than Gujarat, or further to the south than the northern district of the Poona District. The expedition to the south described in the Inscription was occasional, the object being to assist a friendly race of Kṣatriyas.

(4) चतुःशाला is a house with an open quadrangle in the middle and halls on four sides. It has an entrance in each of the four directions: चतुःशाला चतुर्द्वाराकल्याणे: सबौतेषुकथा नामता तत्तत्तेर्मण्डुं दृष्टुपालये (Matsya Putra). प्रतिष्ठा is what is in these days called an असलन, a place where travellers put up and are fed without charge.

(5) शाहुषकाकानावापूणयत्तर्केन. द्राहस्थ or द्राहूठका may be taken as one name, and कानावा or नावा another and the words पूणयत्तर्केन as forming one compound with them and the rest. But the word नावा is here in such a position that one cannot but think it was intended to signify a “boat”. Then नावा would be instrumental singular, and would stand at the end of the long compound. But the several rivers could not have but one boat; and if the word नी formed part of the compound, the sense would not be appropriate, for it would appear as if what Uṣavadāta did was to render the “passage across” possible by means of the boats of Iba, Pārāda, etc. But the sense required is not the boats of Iba, Pārāda etc., but the passage of Iba, Pārāda etc. by means of a boat. Hence I think there ought to have been one नी more, with a dot above it, so as to make it शाहुषकाकानावा नावा पूणयत्तर्केन and probably that letter must have been omitted by the engraver through mistake, as writers often do when they have two or more similar letters to write in succession.

(6) द्वारिष्काशाहूठगिर्यस्तरहः. I have translated the expression as in the text, since there is a similar expression in No. 16 (वायुविकक्षणम्), and in No. 18, in the last line, which must be so translated. I do not know what sense to attach to नासिर or नासिनिर as it is written in No. 16. Since even in this Sanskrit
inscription the word stands thus, it must signify something which
was usually called by this name alone, and not by its Sanskrit
analogue, supposing it had any. Perhaps it may be traced to
नान्दीयुक्त, a place where anything religiously auspicious was per­
formed, since the gift is to Caranas and Pariṣads. Dr. Stevenson's
supposition that it signifies some currency will not do at all.

(7). I think we must read here चरण instead of चरक.
(8). वर्षारुत्तु is intended in this Sanskrit-Prakrit inscription for
वर्षाक्रृत or वर्षातः.
(9). This was the name of the Kṣatriya race whom Uṣava­
data went to assist.

Dr. Stevenson's translation of this is correct except in three
or four places.

No. 19.

This forms portion of No. 17, and is mostly a mixture of
Prakrit and Sanskrit, like the latter part of No. 17.

अधिकृताः हर्षे = अधिकृताचेहते "in the hands of Aśribhūti".
This expression occurs in No. 12, l. 5, and No. 26A, l. 13. Since
the body of mendicants was itinerant, it was necessary to entrust
the benefactions to some persons. --यस्यपितसत्तक. This expression
seems to correspond to यस्यसत्तक, and must be taken to qualify
कृतम्. The meaning would then be, "which field measuring
seven hundred " ( probably Nivartanas ). The usual Prakrit
representative of सत्त is सत, but मभित is not unlike the character
of this inscription, which is rather corrupt Sanskrit than Prakrit.
Or, सत्तकसत्तकार्ज may be taken as one noun forming the name of
a place. I was told at Nasik that there is a place of the name of
सत्तक = सत्तक in the vicinity. वस्तान्तं मिषुस्तुंभस = वस्तातं मिषुस्तुंभस ;
not good grammar. शस्याहरे, I saw a faint perpendicular stroke
below, representing the vowel उ. The expression seems to
signify "the chief sustenance." It may be taken as corres­
pending to शस्याहरे. Or if the stroke is not real, the expression
is मगाहरे = मगाहरे " provision for journey ". But beggars can

1. Compare the use of अम्र in अभ्रास्वार.
hardly be under the necessity of taking provisions with them while on a journey, for they go begging.

The Sanskrit of the inscription is therefore as follows:

दत्तं चालेन लेणं बाह्रणस्याशिरिमति। कीतं मूलेन कापशपणसहस्रभुमिः

**TRANSLATION.**

He, Usavadata, has also given a field in the possession [lit. in the hands] of Asribhuti, the son of a Brahman (named) Vararha. It was bought for the sum of four thousand Kārṣapānas, measures seven hundred, and is in the north-westerly direction from the boundary of the town. This shall be the chief support of mendicant priests from the four quarters residing in my cave.

**NOTES.**

Dr. Stevenson’s translation of this is altogether wrong. The grantor, according to him, was a person whose father was from the city of Sataka, and mother of the province of Uttarārha. He seems to have divided the words beginning with व thus:—

**NOTES.**

No. 18.

उषवदाता संघस चालुदिसस दत्तं लेणं नियासिं दत्तं चालेन अक्षय निषि

2 एते च कापशणां प्रशुत। गोवधवादवासु श्रेणिसु कोषिकन्तिकाये २००० वर्षे

**33** ([B. G. Bhandarkar’s Works, Vol. I.])
3 ऐतो मम हेरे कल्याणं मिलनूं गीतिः प्रेमक्ष चित्तिके वासके चे
सहीं सुन्दर पाणुनपडिके(क)हृते अतो कुशाण

4 शालिन्य लिगोमनभय निविध [वी] च फटकारे चतुरी [ती] तोति मूनेने
दूसरे २१ कानिकाणे पनसे पुत्रकसे २०

5 पनसे लियुने भगवती [ती] देखाने बालाणां च करीणसहस्रं सदरि २०००
शालिन्य शकसुवर्णकतादिन सुवर्णसहलाण(ग) सुके

Line. i. दत्ता. This looks likes दृष्टि in the original, but there is little doubt that it must be दृष्टि. —अक्षय निविध, or properly नीविध is "permanent capital". —कालापणसहस्र. Though there is no mark of the obliteration of any letters after this, still there is no doubt some are wanted at the end of the first and second lines and perhaps of the third. Probably at some later time some body must have smoothed off that part of the rock. At the end of this first line what is wanted is the number of the sahasras or thousands bestowed and also the termination नि(धि) after सहस्र.

Line. 2. प्रकट = प्रकुट "Laid out at interest, invested.", —वांढवाएः = वांढवाऐः. —हस्ति = हस्त्रि "interest". —प्रकट = प्रक्रि "what is worth a Kārṣāpana ". After निविध, ये and words expressive of the amount deposited or invested, together perhaps with that of the interest, are required.

Line. 3. वसवाणां. This is to be traced to वर्षावस्तुनाम. The word वसवाणां occurs in Inscription No. 12. Buddhistic mendicants generally wandered about during fair weather, and resided in one place during the four rainy months; and then they held what was called their vassa, corresponding to वर्षा, and read what was called bana. वीसिय = विश्लेष्य. For it is clear (see translation) that he left two thousand Kārṣāpanas for providing civarikas. The donor in Inscription No. 12 leaves a hundred Kārṣāpanas

1 See Vārtika on Panini V. 1. 25.
2 See Hardy, Eastern Monachism, chapter XIX.
and directs that the one mendicant residing in his cave should be provided with a civarika; so that if one hundred suffices for one, two thousand ought to suffice for twenty. And the cave in which this inscription occurs has accommodation for so many, for there are sixteen cells in the interior, and two larger ones at the two ends, each of them sufficient for two.

—विवरिक, or properly चीवरिक, is the garment worn by Buddhistic mendicants.

वारसक = वार्षिक, meaning “belonging to or given in the rains ” or “annual”. The robing month among the Buddhistic mendicants was the third of the rainy season, when laymen presented garments to them. That was a regular ceremony; hence these gifts. Endowments of this nature are recorded in Inscriptions No. 12 and 21, and in Nos. 16, 17, 18, 24, 39, 44, at Kanheri, in which latter the words अवस्तवणी, पदेक, वस्तवणास, चीवरिक, and वारसक occur. In the first of these (No. 16) we have distinctly the words एतो च वस्तवणी बिशिंनो विवरिक =एतस्मात् वर्षोऽस्तो वस्तवणी चिस्तुकस्य चीवरिकस्.

—पादुक. I take this to be equal to पादोन “less by a quarter”. The interest of two thousand was one hundred; of this capital “a quarter less,” i.e. seventy-five.

—कुशण. I have not been able to determine the sense of this word; but probably it means something connected with the Buddhistic rite of Kasina (Spence Hardy's East. Mon. Chap. XXI).

Line 4. निगमसम्भव. Instr. sing. = “by the assembly or corporation of the town”, or “by the townspeople generally”. It may be taken as Gen. or Loc. sing. also. — For निवाये see note, Inscription No. 25. —फलकवारेऽ, वार means “a door” (see note, Inscription No. 25), and फलक “a slab,” “the door of a slab of stone”. It should rather be वारस्तकेऽ= “on the slab of the door” (see note 6, Inscrip. No. 26). —तौति = तौति. After the figure for 40 there is a vertical stroke, which does not seem to signify anything; or if it does, it perhaps shows that there is no odd number after 40.

1 See Hardy, l.c. Chapter XII.
2 See Mr. West's copies. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Volume VI.
This cave has been dedicated by Uṣavadāta to the (mendicant) priesthood of four quarters. He has also given a permanent capital of [3000 three (1)] thousand Kārṣāpanas. The Kārṣāpanas are deposited with the guilds residing in Govardhana, with the body of weavers 2000, interest a hundred Kārṣāpanas, with the other body of weavers [1000 a thousand]. From this interest, should be given] a garment in the rainy season to each of the twenty mendicants residing during the rains in my cave. From the 1000 (2) laid out at an interest of three-quarters of a hundred Kārṣāpanas, Kuṇaṇa [should be provided]. This good deed has been published in the assembly of the town (or amongst the towns-people), and this inscription on the slab-door praises it, Moreover, in the year 41, on the fifteenth of the bright half of Kārtika, and in the previous year 40, on the fifteenth, he gave 4000 four thousand Kārṣāpanas and a capital of thousands of Suvarṇas for [the acquisition of] thirty-five golden Katādis, to the worshipful gods and Brahmans.
NOTES ON INSCRIPTION No. 18

Notes.

(1). I gather that the sum he deposited was three-thousand from Inscription No. 16, which also mentions this endowment.

(2). This must have been the thousand deposited with the other body of weavers.

Dr. Stevenson’s translation of this is wrong, with the exception of that of the first line. He did not understand जीवरिकृत, बारसक, दुध, भेणी, and such other words.

No. 16.

1 सिंधे रण्णो श्रहातस क्षत्रपस नाहपानस दीड़ि—

2 तु दीनीकपुनस उषबद्वातः कुटबिनीय दसामालय देखसंसं उवरको

3 सिंधे वसे ४२ वेसाखमथे रण्णो क्षहातस क्षत्रपस नाहपानस जानाल्,

dीनीकपुनः

4 वि तिणां २००० संथस चानुदिसस व इमसभ लेणेक वसातानं भविसति चिचु.

रिकुशणमुलं च—

5 वे २००० वधि पायुनपादिकांत एते च काङ्ग्णा अपिजिदातवा स्विरीका$

[भा]ज्ञा एतो विविक कर्त्तानि वे २००० वे पालके[क]सते[त].

6 मुळे काङ्ग्णारे च गामे चिसखमधृ दत्तानि नाडिगळे[१] मुखसंभानि अट


The first two lines of the above form an independent inscription, which is the same as No. 20.

उवरको from अपवरकम् “an inner apartment.” From the same word comes आवरी f., a provincial Marathi word having the same sense.

Translation of No. 16, Lines 1, 2.

To the Perfect one. This appartment is the benefaction of Dakhamitrā, the daughter of King Kshaharāta Satrap Nahapāna and wife of Usavadāta, son of Dīnika.
THE NASIK CAVE INSCRIPTIONS

Line 4. नितिणि. Two or more letters which are required before the first नि must have dropped. There is, however, no indication of the existence of any in the original. दुता at least is wanted so as to make the first word दुताति. —वाक्य-नामा. This may be the genitive of the present participle स्व. स्व. प्र., or may be equivalent to वग्य-नामा: “living during the rains.”

Line 5. वधिभेजा or वधिभाजा = वधिभाजा: “bearing interest”.

As to the rest, see notes on No. 18.

SANSKRIT OF NO. 16, Lines 3-6.

3 सिद्धस्य। वर्षं ४२ वेशासास्से राज्य। लाहरात्मको राज्य पर्वतस्थ नामानुस्मार्को दृश्यकपेन

4 [दुता] निरीक्षितो ३००० संगस्यस्य[घाय] चतुर्दीस्यनि योगनिकायने सतात [or वग्य-नामाने] भविष्यति चीवकिरक्षानमूलम्। च—

5 ये १००० वृद्धि: पादियङ्गयक्षात्मय। एतदेच कार्यकर्मणा अपस्करितत्वाय वृद्धि-भाजः। एतस्मातीविनियमसहस्ये हे २००० ये तत्कथात—

6 मूलम्। कादुपराहो च वाम चिस्तायाभ्रद्व दृष्टानि निन्दितेनारावस्मु मूल्यसहिष्णुष ४०००। एतद वाम फलीधारे चरित्र स्वाति।

Translation of No. 16, Lines 3-6.

To the Perfect One. In the year 42, in the month of Vaisākha, the son of Dinika, and son-in-law of King Kshaharata Satrap Nahapâna, gave three thousand 3000 to the priesthood from the four quarters residing (1) in this cave during the rains, as capital for [providing] garments and Kuśana. Out of this sum, on 1000 the interest is three quarters of a hundred [i.e., 75] Kārsāpanas (2). These Kārsāpanas, bearing interest, are not to be repaid. Out of this [sum] two thousand, which is the capital bearing an interest of one hundred Kārsāpanas, is for garments (3). A capital of 8000 for Nādigeras was given in Kapurāhāra, and the village of Cikhalapādra. All this [inscription] on the slab-door praises the good deeds.
Notes on Inscription No. 16

Notes.

(1). The syntactical connexion, when बल्कता is the reading, is "अर्थित्वञ्जने बल्कता वः संपन्ने माहिष्येन तस्मै संयम्य दनानि. With वर्णरथानः there is no difficulty.

(2). Out of this interest Kuśana was to be provided (see No. 18 and below).

(3). Lit. "Two are Civārika-thousands, those that are the capital bearing an interest of 100 Padikas." Civārikāya सहनं छीन- शिक्षितं दे.

From this and No. 18 it appears clear that Uṣavadāta gave three thousand Kārṣāpaṇas; — two deposited with one body of weavers, bearing an interest of 100 Padikas or Kārṣāpaṇas, from which Civārikas or garments were to be provided, and one with another body of weavers, bearing an interest of 75 Padikas, out of which Kuśana was to be given. Lines 4 and 5 of this and 3 of No. 18 are thus consistent with each other.

We see from the above that the cave was dedicated to the use of mendicants in the year 42, and from No. 28 that Uṣavadāta bestowed other charities in the years 41 and 40. What era these are to be referred to will be considered in the remarks.

Nearly the whole of Dr. Stevenson’s translation of this is wrong.

—

No. 14,

1 तस क्रांत्य नहपानस जामा
2 शासक उपवदानस नेत्यकेशु
3 भेषिके दाहनुकामिं जेकाकापे
4 भेषे अनुमागिभे उज्जिये छीससस
5 गवालो ब्राह्मणाभुजुसो सत्याभ
6 गवालो ब्राह्मणं जेनं सत्यस
These lines are complete on the right-hand side, but incomplete on the left, the rock having broken off on that side. There is, therefore, not one sentence complete. Still the general sense is clear, as will be seen from the following.

Translation of No. 14.

1 Son-in-law of Satrap Nahapāna
2 Usual deeds of Ushavadāta, the Śaka ( 1 )
3 In Cecika, city of Dāhanukā, Kekāpura
4 In each village, in Ujjayinī ( 2 ), Sikhā
5 [ Feeding ] a hundred thousand worshipful Brahmans
6 [ Giving ] a hundred ( thousand ) cows to the worshipful Brahmans
7 Given to gods and Brahmans
8 On ( 3 ) the fifteenth of the bright half of Caitra, Kṣaharā
9 Uṣa(vadāta ) who gave a hundred thousand cows
10 On the river Banāsā
11 Second of bright half

The Inscription thus appears to be of the nature of No. 17, recording nearly the same charities.

Notes

( 1 ) This has been usually taken to be Śaka, as if there were no doubt about it, but it is not quite safe to do so in the mutilated state of the Inscription.

( 2 ) This is not without doubt.

( 3 ) Another inscription seems to begin here, since Kṣaharāta appears again.
INSCRIPTION Nos. 6, 3 & 27

No. 6.

Sanskrit.

1. This inscription was caused to be constructed by the Śramaṇa officer of Kṛṣṇarāja of the Śatavahana race, residing in Nāsika.

Kṛṣṇa is well known to be the Prakrit form of Kṛṣṇa, belonging to or inhabitant of Nāsika. The termination -śrī is added upon the analogy of the words embraced in Pan. IV. 2. 121-130. This inscription is not translated by Dr. Stevenson.

This Kṛṣṇarāja was the second king of the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty of the Purāṇas, as will be shown in the remarks.

No. 3.

1. To the Perfect One. In the year 2 of the King, the Lord, the prosperous Puṇumai, the son of Vāsiṣṭhi, in the 4th fortnight of Hemanta, on—day. Before this, by the householder or husbandman Dhanama.

No. 27.

1. To the Perfect One. In the sixth year of the King, the prosperous Paḍumaya, the son of Vāsiṣṭhi, in the fifth day of Grīṣma, on the fifth day.

1 Vararuci-Prakṛta-Prakāśa III. 33.

No. 4

1. लिंधे रणो गोतमिपुत्रस् [सामितरिक्षणसंवर्तः] संवर्ते सामने ॥ द्वेषपदवे

2. द्विसे पच्चमे केशिकस् महासेनाधिपतिः च(श)गोपस्य भरिजय महासेना-

3. बोपकियतिस्य जमानिः[मन 1]स पवयिते[1] सम्मे बहुकानि वरिष्णु उक्ते

4. ससर्मरसद्रा आ(अ)बेने दूलिनि.

Line 2. जसु प्रया. बसु or बसु may be the name of the lady or a term of honour used in her case, as चस or बस in the case of those spoken of in Inscription No. 24. Probably the अच्छ of dramatical language is the same as this.

Line 3. बोपकियतिस्य जमानिः बोपकियतेम्मनस्य. Or if the अ, which with the vertical stroke looks like अ, is to be so नम, बोपकियती अजमानिः बोपकियति आयप्रमाणेयः. This will not necessitate महे being considered a mistake for मन. उक्ते—उत्क्रम. उत्तरेये is the word we should expect to find in such a case; but क्रम has the sense of “cutting,” and with उत्तर, of “cutting out,” which would do very well in the present case. ने in उक्ते is the representative of तित = न.

SANSKRIT of No. 4.

1. सिद्धस्य । राजा गोतमीपुत्र स्वामित्रीमायंवातञ्जरः संवसारे सामने ॥ हेमस्त-

2. द्विसे पच्चमे केशिकस्य महासेनाधिपतेम्मनस्य भार्याया महासेनाधिपत्यः

3. बोपकियतेम्मनस्य पवयिते श्रमे बहुकानि वपाषायुक्तय पर्वशानां नीते

4. शस्त्रय च भिन्नार्यस्याचे दूलमिति.
TRANSLATION of No. 4.

To the Perfect One. On the fifth day, in the 3rd third fortnight of Hemanta, in the 7th seventh year of the King, the Lord, the prosperous Yajña Śatakarni, Gautamiputra, (1) the Cave of Vastu, Lady Senāpati, the wife of Bhavagopa, the Senāpati (commander-in-chief), inhabitant of Keśi was, the Śramana (2) having died, carried to completion, after having been under excavation for many years, for (or by) Yamana (3), the ascetic of Bopaki (or for the ascetic of Bopaki honoured by good men), and given for the use (lit. protection) of mendicant priests from the four quarters.

NOTES.

1. She is called चनापती, not because she commanded any army, but because she was the wife of the सनापति or commander of the army. The only way I can think of, of conveying this sense when another expression महोपपत्य भार्या has also to be translated, is that adopted in the text.

2. The Śramana must have been the husband of the lady.

3. I am not quite satisfied with this. I was attempting so to construe the expression चोपकिंगयति जस्मनेस as to yield the sense “having done so-and-so or while this was doing, the Śramana died;” but have not succeeded. So the best way is to take the genitive and interpret it by the prepositions “for” or “by”. And there is Hemacandra’s authority for it. तात्त्वत्त्व विहितस्य देवादुप्वेक्षविचनस्य स्थाने घरी भवति। किचिदाहितीयवे। राजाने घरी भवति

Dr. Stevenson’s translation of this is mistaken in many places. He takes the third line to consist of names only.

Who is the Gautamiputra here spoken of? Dr. Stevenson translates descendant of “King Gotamiputra”. But there is no word here which means “descendant”. And this king Yajña is called Gautamiputra in the other inscriptions in which
he is named. It appears to have been a custom in the case of these kings to apply to them an epithet expressive of their being the sons of certain mothers. The Great Gautamiputra was so called because he was the son of Gautami, though his real name was Satakarni. Pudumayi was called Vasisthiputra because he was the son of Vasishthi. In the same manner, Yajna Satakarni must have been called Gautamiputra because his mother also was named Gautami.

No. 15

The language of this inscription is Sanskrit, with the exception of but a few words. It is considerably mutilated towards the end. Even in the first part the letters are not fully formed, and have to be determined by the sense and context. In most cases, however, my readings are obvious, and can admit of little doubt.

1 सिंधुः  राज्यो दमोभ्रत्राय शिवद्वाराध्यमदुरस्य
2 आमोद्य देवज्ञाध्य सवद्वत्र नवने गि—
3 हे पत्रो चोरे 4 दिसे नयोदशे 13
4 यातुर्वासवसकन्हां: उदिन्त: गामक—
5 नेननसवृध्यां नर्य्यम्याय गणपवर्नवें विनमरभर्स
6 भवातर्कनन्यायः उपसिक्रुणम विण्डुरदुया दवंसतिवदि—
7 तस्तुवार्त विरामपण्तविधिरवालस्वत्त्वस्य चालुक्याः—
8 भिन्नस्पृष्टाः—नेसलामस्वक्ष्यन्नीकी महुः विकिंच्छत [ि]सङ्केताः—
9 भवञ्चु भवतनांनतामु ब्रह्माणि ग्य तः क्षेत्रिक्षेत्राय इस्ते कार्यः
10 सहस्त ऊ०००—याप्तिक्षेत्राय सहस्त्वाणि [खेक] द्व २ ... य यविव...
11 यद्यम शतानि पंच ५०० तिरितियप्रक्षेत्राय शतात ... य विव...
12 एते च कार्यपाणि चताभार पदात । ... य विव...
13 ...तस्वम भस्वदिकं सवर्तारिविद...
Translation of Inscription No. 17

Notes

1. शिव is doubtful.

4. गुणवत्ता is unintelligible. कणिका may be काणिका, in which case the name is कणिकान्त and the k the last syllable of the preceding word.

6. कानिका is very likely कन्यकम. The first two letters are unintelligible, but they may have been intended for त्रात or त्र, so that the whole compound is त्रातलन्यकम or कन्यकम.

8. The three letters after संवार are unintelligible. They may have been intended for दिस्मुदास or वसन्य. --नपा. One or two letters are lost here. Probably the word was गोवर्षेन.

9. कुलरिक was probably intended for कौलिक.

10. The first two letters before पानिक are unintelligible. They may have been intended for ब्रह्म। This and the succeeding lines have lost a good many letters.

Translation.

To the Perfect One. On the 13th day of the fourth fortnight of ग्रिस्मा in the 9th year of the king वीरसेन, the अभिरा, the son of शिवदत्तभिरा and of दमारि, a permanent capital was deposited as follows with the guilds residing now or in future in गोवर्धन (?) by the worshipper विष्णुदत्ता, the daughter of कर्णवर्मन, wife of रेभिला गणोपाक (the leader of a host), and niece (or adopted daughter) of विश्ववर्मन गणोपाक (the leading host), for the benefit and good of all creatures, and for providing medicine to the body of the mendicant priests residing in the caves on mount त्रिरास्मि:—

A thousand कर्षापान with the guild of the weavers, two thousand with the guild of — engineers, five hundred with the guild of — and — hundred with the guild of the grinders of sesamum (oilmen). These कर्षापान together with interest —

This is a new Inscription, and was not translated before.

No. 1.

सिंच शुक्ल दामनिकल लेखक बुधिकल
To the Perfect One. [This] cave and [these] two tanks are [the benefaction] of the Śaka Dāmacika, writer [or engraver] and usurer [or carpenter], son of Viśudatta and inhabitant of Dasapura. One of these tanks...is intended for (the spiritual good of) my father and mother.

Notes.

बुधिकस = बुधकस् probably "a usurer", or = वर्षक "a carpenter". वाण्यस = वास्तवस्य. उदिर्द = उदिशय.

No. 2.

1 सिरं सक्ष दामचिकस
2 लेखकस बुधिकस पोदि

To the Perfect One. Tank of Dāmacika, the Śaka, writer [or engraver] and usurer [or carpenter].

No. 5.

1 देयघुनय[1] उपासि–
2 काया मम्मोया लयने
This cave is the benefaction of Marmā, a worshipper.

No. 8.

1 नाणिकनघननिकामस दान[1]

Benefaction of Nandabhikagama, inhabitant of Nāsika.

Nos. 9 and 10.

These two are parts of one inscription, both together forming but one sentence. No. 10 is the first and No. 9 the second part.
Inscription Nos. 9 & 10

1. The first letter does not occur in Mr. West's copy. Lieut. Brett's has it. The initial letter of the second word, read as अ, may have been intended for त, in which case we have the genitive रायबाबस. —In रहल्यस the ह may have been intended for ह, in which case the expression would mean "native of रहल.” In such inscriptions it is usual to mention the native places of the persons named. —पक्त. This syllable occurs at the end of each of the three names of men. Very likely it is an honorific termination corresponding to our modern Marathi नाक appended to the names of Mahārs, and traced to the Sanskrit नाक्ष. —कसीय. This may be कासीय or केसीय.

L. 2. तंतपालिकाय = तंतपालिकिया or भतपालिकिया. The first means “protectress of a fortress” and the second “of soldiers”, but भतपालिकिया is an unusual expression. Perhaps it is तंतपालिकिय, used as an attribute of the following noun, and meaning “native of” or “residing in तंतपालिक”. तटाकाराकियस = “native of तटाकारक” perhaps, but it would not do to take it so if the word तटपालिक य were to be interpreted as proposed last. This word, however, may be read as भटाकारकियस = भटाकारकियस, “one whose look and deeds are commendable”. In this inscription no difference is perceptible between the letters त and भ.

Ll. 3, 4. Some vowel-marks, which undoubtedly are required, are wanting. I have not attempted to reduce the proper names to their corresponding Sanskrit forms.

Sanskrit.

1. राजामात्यस रहित्यस्य विलिसिन्यकस्य दुहित्रा महानैःक्ष्या
2. तंतपालिकियराजामात्यस्यागितत्वकस्य महाकारकियः
3. यथ रायत्या कल्पनकमात्रा चेत्वगुणह प्रके
4. बिरस्यी निश्चापितत्या.
This Caitya-temple was established on the mountain Tri-rasmi by the worthy Kusi, the daughter of Baliśitapaka, the king's officer, residing in Rahala, the wife of Agiyatanaka, the king's officer residing in Tatapalika, whose look and deeds are commendable, and the mother of Kapapanaka.

Dr. Stevenson treated these as two separate inscriptions. I need not make any remark on his translation of them.

No. 11.

1. This is the cave of the charitable Indragñidatta, the son of Dharmadeva, a Northerner, a Yavana, native of Dattamiti, excavated on Mount Tri-rasmi. The interior of this cave is a shrine for a Caitya, and there are terraces also. It was caused to be constructed with a view to the spiritual good of the mother and father, and is dedicated to the mendicant priesthood of the four quarters, for the worship of all Buddhas, by Dharmarāśita and his son.

Notes.

अतिव = अस्त्रव "belonging to or inhabitant of the North".

Dattamiti was the name of a town in Sauvira in the vicinity of Sind. In the Siddhantakafuras, this is given as an instance of a Sauvira town under Vainava IV. 3. 76. Dr. Stevenson's translation of this contains several mistakes. He makes the father of the donor "prince regnant under Dattamiti."
This Inscription shows how wide the fame of our Trirāśmi was spread. It also points to the settlement of the Greeks near Sind and to their adoption of Buddhism. द्वारामित्री may be Demetria.

---

**No. 12.**

1 वेक्तिहर्दपुत्तस नेमसस रामणकस
2 छाकलयकियस केःं देवधंम चातुर्दि—
3 सस मिश्रसंघस नियातिं दत[ो] च[षा]—
4 नेम अद्यनिव दक्षापनसत १००
5 संसास हृं एतो वसववहस पवश्रस चिवरि—
6 कं दातवं बारसक

This cave is the benefaction of Ramanaka, a merchant, native of Chākalapaka. It is dedicated to the mendicant priesthood of the four quarters. He has also given a permanent capital of a hundred Kārsapanas into the hands of the towns-people. From that a garment should be given in the rainy season to the ascetic living here during the rains.

नेमक is very likely नेमस "a merchant".

संस in the fifth line may mean "the congregation of the mendicant priests". For the rest see notes to Inscription No. 18.

Dr. Stevenson’s translation differs a good deal from this.

---

**No. 13.**

1 शिंचं शिवापितेश्रकपुत्तस
2 रामणकस लेःं देवधंम

To the Perfect One. [This] cave is the benefaction of Rāmanaka, the son of Śivamitra, the writer.

35 [ E. G. Bhandarkar’s Works, Vol. I. ]
No. 21.

1. 腹蒂薩 普拉契瓦拉 博格薩 資賜 萬拉
2. 腹普拉契瓦拉 普拉契瓦拉 資賜

This cave is the benefaction of the worshipper Mugudāsa, a Khātika (a butcher) (1) and his family. Dharmanandi, the son of the worshipper Bodhigupta, has given a field in the Western (2) Kanhahini for this cave. From this field a garment [to] an ascetic.

(1) खातिक may have been the name of a tribe. It may also correspond to कौटिक “a butcher”. The vernacular word for a butcher, खातिक or खातक, is very near to this.

(2) अपरिलय—पशु is a termination applied to nouns in the sense of “belonging to,” “existing in”. दिडप्पुहो अवे। अभें नामूं परो पशु उत्त इत्यती दिती प्रत्ययौ भवतु। ............. प्रिंदं ............. परिंदु—Hemacandra. The same termination in the form of पशु exists in Marathi. अपरिलय therefore seems to mean “Western”. कण्धहिनी must have been the name of something.

No. 22.

1. बाणकस् मुगुदसल सपारिकार क्षेल देयचंम.

This cave is the benefaction of Mugudāsa, a fisherman, and his family.

No. 24.

1. सिंचं बसाइक्ष् [१] तिस नेगारस क्षेत्
2. देयचंम कुंक्तेलिय बसानंदसिरिय क्षेत्रको बुद्धु—
3. य चस्पेरिसदातक बसाको प्रेमं बैं बौद्ध—
4. मित्रते बिहुण्डस चाण्डुतिस गियापिंत
To the Perfect One. [This] cave is the benefaction of the merchant Varagahapati, [one] apartment, of his wife the worthy Nandaśri, [another] apartment, of his daughter the worthy Puruṣadattā. The cave thus composed of four parts is dedicated to the mendicant priesthood of the four quarters.

Line 2. जस may perhaps be traced to झस्या, or if read as वस, to बालु.

Line 3. चावुन्तनिहत. गस probably from गस "a hollow", "a cave".

REMARKS.

As I have observed before, the cave numbered 26 by Mr. West was constructed and assigned to Buddhist mendicants of the Bhadrāyāniya school by Gautāmī, who is distinctly mentioned as the mother of the king Gautamiputra Śatakarni, whose exploits are described in the inscription. Gautamiputra therefore was so called because he was the son of Gautami, while his own proper name was Śatakarni. Pudumāyi is called Vasiṣṭhiputra or Vasiṣṭhiputra for the same reason. Vasiṣṭhi, as I have pointed out, granted the field conveyed in the second charter in Inscription No. 25. She is there spoken of as the Queen of Gautamiputra, if we accept the interpretation given in the note, and even if we follow that adopted in the text, and understand them as issuing orders conjointly, there could be no reason why their names should be so coupled together unless that relation existed between them. Pudumāyi therefore was the son of Gautamiputra, and not his father, as the late Dr. Bhau Daji thought.

Gautāmī is described as the mother of a king and grandmother of a king, while Vasiṣṭhi is mentioned simply as the mother of a king. Gautāmī therefore appears to be the

more elderly of the two, which she could not be if her son were the son of Puḍumāyi, whose mother was Vāsiśthi.

No. 26 is dated in the year 19 of Puḍumāyi, when Gautami, who is spoken of as dedicating the cave in the present tense, must have been alive. Her son Gautamiputra Śatakarni issued the charter No. 25 (first part) the next year, and is represented in No. 26 and No. 26A as having granted a village in the same year for the support of the inmates of the cave-monastery of his mother, though his name does not expressly occur. He must, therefore, have been alive when the cave was dedicated. As noticed above, Gautami is spoken of as the mother of the Great King and the grandmother of the Great King. There is no object in such a statement unless the son and grandson were kings at the time when the statement was made. How could Puḍumāyi then come to be king during Gautamiputra’s life-time? Instances are not wanting in Indian history of sovereigns appointing their sons as governors or kings of distant provinces. Aśoka was king of Kashmir during the life-time of his father, and Agnimitra, of Vidiśā, while Puṣpamitra reigned at Pātaliputra. In the same manner, Puḍumāyi seems to have ruled over this side of the country, since the inscriptions containing dates at Nasik and Karla are dated from the commencement of his reign, while his father Gautamiputra Śatakarni reigned at his own capital. Gautamiputra Śri Yajña Śatakarni was one of their successors, whose name occurs in these inscriptions. The elder Gautamiputra is mentioned in No. 26 as having “established the glory of the Śatavahan race”; whence it appears that the dynasty called Andhrabhṛtya in the Purāṇas was known by the name of Śatavahana.

Gautamiputra is spoken of in Nos. 25 and 26A as “the Lord of Dhanakaṭa or Dhanakaṭaka”. Huien Thsang mentions a country of the name of Tonakiatsekia, which name is properly considered as the Chinese representative of Dhanakaṭaka. This General Cunningham identifies with the ancient Dharanikot.
situated on the river Kṛṣṇa, in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency. From the bearings given by the Chinese traveller, it does appear that Dhanakaṭaka is to be looked for somewhere in that part of the country. That Gautamiputra’s Dhanakaṭaka was the same as or situated near Dharnikot is confirmed by the fact that coins of the Śatavahana dynasty are found in that district. These being leaden coins, the place where they are found may very reasonably be regarded as that of their original circulation. Some of these are figured by Sir Walter Elliot in Plate XI attached to his article in the Madras Literary Journal, Vol. iii, New series. Of these, one (No. 96) has for its legend ‘Sata-kanisa rāmio’, another (No. 101) has ‘Gotamiputasa’, and a third (No. 105) ‘Ranno Gotamiputasa sariyanna-satakaniṣa’. The legend on a fourth (No. 100) may be read Puṭumavisa, though I am somewhat doubtful. The Purānic name of the dynasty also indicates that its original seat, or the province over which its kings immediately ruled, must have been somewhere in the Andhra or Tailanga country. At first, the princes of the family must have been subject to the paramount sovereigns of Pātaliputra, and were hence called bṛtyas or servants of those sovereigns; and afterwards they raised themselves to supreme power.

The three princes named above are not the only ones of this dynasty that are named in the inscriptions. There is another of the name of Kṛṣnarāja, spoken of in No. 6 as belonging to the race of Śatavahana. The characters in this inscription are far older than those in Nos. 25 and 26. The Va, consisting of a circle with a vertical stroke above, is very much unlike the isosceles triangle of these latter, and this letter and the Da, made up of a small rectangle with the left hand side wanting

1 General Cunningham reads this as Rajuya Gotamiputa Satakaniṣa, but I observe the letters Sari after Gotamiputasa distinctly, and others further on which look like Yanna. He reads the legend on No. 100 as Pudumāvisa, and does not give that on No. 101, but I have little doubt it is Gotamiputasa. (See Ano. Geogr. of India, p. 541.)
and with two vertical strokes upwards and downwards, as well as the general style, look more like those of Asoka inscriptions than those of these later ones do. This in itself shows that a considerable interval of time must have elapsed between Krṣṇarāja and Gautamiputra. And this is confirmed by the Purāṇas, which, though there is not so much agreement amongst them as might be desirable, in the case of this dynasty, place about nineteen kings between Krṣṇarāja, who stands second in the list, and Gautamiputra.1 There are two other circumstances that deserve remark. In the time of Krṣṇarāja, the capital of the province seems to have been Nasik (Nāsika), for his officer or general resided there, as we gather from No. 6, while in Gautamiputra’s time it was Govardhana. There is still a village near Nasik of the name of Govardhana, as I have observed before. The other circumstance is that while out of the five kings, beginning with Gautamiputra, the names of three occur in the cave inscriptions on this side of India, not one out of the nineteen successors of Krṣṇarāja is mentioned. This would tend to show that the Śatavāhanas possessed these provinces in the time of Krṣṇarāja, but that some time after him they were deprived of them by another race of kings, who must have held them till Gautamiputra regained them and re-established the power of his dynasty. And in No. 26 he is mentioned as having exterminated the race of Khagarāta and “established the glory” of his race. The dynasty of Khagarāta therefore must have ruled over these provinces during the interval. But what other indications have we of the existence of this dynasty? In the first place we have the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta, which mention a king of the name of Kṣaharāta Nahapāna, who is also called Kṣatrīpa or Satrap. Kṣaharāta looks very much like Khagarāta and the characters in these inscriptions occupy a middling position between those of No. 6 and No. 26. Kṣaharāta Nahapāna therefore may well have been the founder of the dynasty which displaced the Śatavāhanas

1 See Wilson’s Viṣṇupurāṇa, Chapter XXIV, Book IV.
some time after Kṛṣṇapāja. And coins of a race of kings calling
themselves kings and Kṣatrapas or Satraps have been found in
Gujarat and elsewhere, and amongst them one of Nāhapaṇa
himself. There are two inscriptions also in Gujarat, which
mention some of these kings. Very likely therefore it was this
dynasty that Gāutamiputra displaced.

A passing examination of the coins of the Śātavāhana
dynasty mentioned above points to the same conclusion. If we
look at the figures of the coins bearing the devices of a horse,
four wheels, and a pyramid composed of arcs of circles with a
wavy line below and a crescent on the top, we shall find that
these are alternative emblems. Some of the coins have the first
and the second, others the first and the third, and the rest the
second and the third. The first two occur on No. 96 and No.
92, the former of which bears the legend Satakanisa Ranno.
This was the name of one of the earlier kings of the dynasty.
Of the coins which bear the third emblem, those which have a
legend at all contain the names of Gāutamiputra and his suc­
cessor. Now this third device is universally seen on the reverse
of Śāh coins; it does not occur on a Śātavāhana coin of a king
earlier than Gāutamiputra, while it does occur on his and on
those of his successors. This would show that the device was
borrowed from the Śāhs, and was perhaps used by the Śātavā­
hanas to indicate their conquest of them. And since it occurs
first on Gāutamiputra’s coin, it must have been he who over­
threw them. An examination of more coins of this dynasty, if
available, would throw further light on this subject. But so far
as my present information goes, the fact tends to confirm
what we have gathered from other sources, viz. that Gāutami­
putra put an end to the Śāh dynasty.

These inferences would be rendered highly probable, or
almost certain, if what is known or believed with regard to the
dates of these kings were made to harmonise with the similar
information we have with regard to the dates of Kṛṣṇapāja and
Gautamiputra. The coins of the Satrap or Sah dynasty bear dates, but it is not known to what era they are to be referred. For the dates of the Satavahana kings the only authorities are the Puranas. Though there is no very satisfactory agreement amongst them as to the names and number of the individuals composing the dynasty, the period of its total duration, given by all, nearly corresponds. Starting from the date of Chandragupta Maurya, which is generally believed to be 315 B.C., and deducting 294, the number of years for which the intervening dynasties reigned, we have 21 B.C. as the date of the foundation of the Andhrabhryta dynasty; and going on further in the same way, we have 2 A.D. for Krsnaraja’s accession; and 319 A.D. for that of Gautamiputra. Now if we take Nahapana to be the founder of the Sakka era, and refer all the Sah dates to that era, the information got from the caves and the inferences based on it are perfectly consistent with these dates. Nahapana’s career of conquest must have ended in A.D. 78, when the era began; and this agrees with what we have stated above that the Satavahanas were deprived of the province of Nasik some time after Krsnaraja. In the same manner, if the statement that Gautamiputra exterminated the race of Khagārata is true, the last of the Sah dates must come up near enough to 340 A.D., that being the date of Gautamiputra’s death, or of the end of his reign. This last date, if the era is Sakka, is, according to Mr. Fergusson, 376 A.D., in which case it would not agree with the other, but there is a mistake here. Mr. Justice Newton, whom he follows, assigns 235 A.D. to Svāmi Rudra Sah, the 25th in his list, on the supposition that the era is Vikrama’s, whence it appears that he reads the figure on the coin of that monarch as 291. But if we turn to the copies of the figures given by him at page 28, Vol. VII, Journ., BBRAS. we shall

1 Wilson, Viṣṇupuruṣa, Chapter XXIV, book IV.
find that there must be some mistake as to the right-hand stroke on the mark for a hundred in the last of the three dates given under Svâmi Rudra Sâh. For the first of these is 224, the middle figure being the mark for 20, since the circle has one diameter; and the second 192, the mark for a hundred having no side stroke. It is impossible then that the king, whose date is 192, should be reigning in 291. It is extremely probable that this king, No. 18 in Mr. Newton's first list (Journ. BBRAS. Vol. VII.) or No. 25 in his second (Vol. IX.), whose date appears thus to have been misread, or improperly engraved, is the same person as No. 12 in the former or No. 19 in the latter. For the name of the individual and of the father is the same in both cases. There is only the prefix Svâmi, "Lord," in the former, which make no difference, and the date 192 in the one case and 197 in the other. The final date of the Sâhs therefore is that of No. 17 (p. 28, Vol. VII. BBRAS.), which is 250, for the figure resembling the letter 6 sa stands really for 50, as I have shown in my paper on the Valabhi dates.

This date in the era of the Saka Kings is 328. About that time then, i.e. about nine years after his accession, the Sâhs must have been conquered by Gautamiputra. If, on the contrary, we should take the era to be Vikrama's, Nahapâna's date would be about 60 B. C., i.e. he reigned 62 years before Krşnarâja, which, it will be seen, does not agree with the evidence of the caves, the Sâtavâhana dynasty having been in possession of Nasik in A. D. 2. In the same manner, the final date, which, according to Mr. Newton and Mr. Fergusson, is 235 A. D. on the hypothesis that the era is Vikrama's, but which really should be 196 A. D. in conformity with my reading of the dates, is so remote from Gautamiputra's 319 A. D., that he can in no sense be said to have exterminated the "race of Khagarâta." The

---

2 Ibid, p. 72.
Vikrama era will therefore not do. The objection brought by Mr. Fergusson against the Śaka is that if the dates were referred to it, the Sāhs would overlap the Guptas by a considerable period. But this period has now been reduced to about ten years, the Guptas being supposed to have come into power in 319 A. D. And a difference of 10 years in the uncertain condition of our chronology is almost nothing. Besides, there is nothing to show that the Guptas obtained possession of the countries over which the Sāhs ruled in 319, or immediately after. Thus the date 319-340 A. D. for Gautamiputra, and the Śaka era for the Sāh dates, alone appear to be consistent with what we find in the cave inscriptions about that monarch and the Śatavahana dynasty. The dates in Uṣavādāta’s inscriptions, therefore, viz. 42, 41 and 40, would be 120, 119 and 118 A. D. respectively.

The other inscriptions show that in the early centuries of the Christian era Buddhism was flourishing in this part of India. Mendicant priests from all quarters assembled at Trīrāśmi during the rains, and held what is called their vassa; and laymen made presents to them, especially of garments, during the robing month. For this purpose it was usual for persons who possessed the means, to deposit sums of money out of the interest of which the garments were given. The followers of Buddhism appear to have belonged principally to the artisan and labouring classes. Brahmanism was not in a condition of decline. Uṣavādāta made as many presents to Brahmans as to the Buddhists; and in these Buddhistic cave inscriptions they are spoken of with reverence. Gautamiputra also takes pride in calling himself the protector of Brahmans, and credit is given to him for averting the confusion of castes, i.e. destroying the effects of foreign inroads on Brahmanism and the system of castes and re-establishing them.

Inscription No. 15 is dated in the ninth year of a king named Virasena, who is called an Ābhīra or cowherd. The Purāṇas place a dynasty of that name after the Āndhrabhṛtyas,
and it was one of the many that ruled over the country, contemporaneously it would appear. They must have come into power after 416 A. D., and, according to the Vāyu-Purāṇa, ruled for 67 years. The Abhīras do not seem to have been very powerful kings, and possessed only this part of the country. The traditions about a Gaulirājya current in the Nasik and Khandesha districts not unlikely refer to them.
A work entitled Arthapañcaka that has recently fallen under my observation gives a summary of the doctrines of the school of Rāmānuja. The whole subject is treated of under five heads viz. (i) jīva, i. e., animal spirit or dependent spirit; (ii) iśvāra, i. e., God; (iii) upāya, i. e., the way to God; (iv) phala or puruṣārtha, i. e., the end of life; and (v) virodhinah, i. e., obstructions to the attainment of God.

I. — Jīvas are of five kinds, viz. (1) nitya, i. e., those who never entered on saṁsāra or the succession of lives and deaths at all, such as Garuḍa, Viśvaksena, and others; (2) mukta, i. e., those, who have shaken off the fetters of life and whose sole purpose and joy is attendance (Kairhkarya) on God; (3) Kevala, i. e., those, whose hearts being purified, are fixed on the highest truth and who are thus free from the succession of births and deaths; (4) mumukṣu, i. e., those, who having experienced the misery of life, are averse to its enjoyments and have fixed their desire only on the highest end, viz., the attainment of the condition of an attendant on God; and (5) baddha, i. e., those who devoting themselves to life, whether of a God, man, or brute, that their previous merits or demerits (karman) have assigned to them, seek only the enjoyments of such a life and are averse to the joys of Brahman.

II. The manifestations of Īśvara or God are five; viz.,

(1) Para, i. e., he who lives in Vaikuṇṭha and whose presence is enjoyed by the Nitya and Mukta spirits who dwell near him, who is unbeginning and endless, who wears celestial ornaments, celestial garments, and celestial weapons, who possesses celestial beauty and an endless number of holy attributes, and who is accompanied by Śri, Bhū, and Lilā;
(2) Vyūha, i. e., the forms of Saṁkarṣaṇa, Praduymna, and Aniruddha, assumed for the creation, protection, and dissolution of the world;

(3) Vibhava, i. e., incarnations such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa for the establishment of Truth, the protection of the good and the destruction of the wicked;

(4) Antaryāmin, who has two forms in one of which he dwells in everything and rules over all, is bodiless, all-pervading, and the store of all good attributes and is called Viṣṇu, Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva, etc., and in the other he possesses a body bearing celestial weapons such as a couch-shell and a discus, and celestial ornaments, dwells in the heart of man, is the store of all good attributes, and is known by the names of Hṛṣīkeśa, Puruṣottama, Vāsudeva, etc.;

(5) Arcā, i. e., idols of stone, metal, etc., in which he dwells and allows himself to be worshipped by his devotees. In the Yatindramatadipikā, to be noticed below, and in other places, the Vyūhas are given as four, Vāsudeva possessed of the six great attributes being the first, Saṁkarṣaṇa, possessed of two, viz. Jñāna and Bala, being the second, Pradyumna having Āisvarya and Virya, the third, and Aniruddha possessed of Śakti and Tejas, the fourth. The first Vyūha is assumed in order that it may serve as an object of devotion, and the other three for creation etc. of the world. In the present work, the Vāsudeva Vyūha is put down as the second form of the Antaryāmin.

III. The Upāyas or ways to God are five, viz. (1) Karma-yoga, (2) Jñānayoga, (3) Bhaktiyoga, (4) Prapattiyoga, and (5) Ācāryābhīmānayoga. Under the first comes the whole Vedic sacrificial ritual and the Smārta or domestic ceremonies along with the fasts and observances by going through which the person is purified. Then by means of Yama, Niyama, etc., mentioned in the Yogasāstra, one should concentrate one's mind upon oneself. This concentration leads to Jñānayoga which consists in fixing the mind on Nārāyaṇa or Vāsudeva, described
in the Vasudeva Vyūha, as the person on whom one's own self on which the mental powers have already been concentrated depends. Thus the devotee arrives at God through himself. The jñānayoga leads to Bhaktiyoga, which consists in continuously seeing nothing but God. Prapatti is resorted to by those who cannot avail themselves of or are not equal to the first three methods. It consists in throwing one's self entirely on the mercy of God. There are many details given which need not be reproduced here. The last method, Ācāryābhimānayoga, is for one who is unable to follow any of the others, and consists in surrendering oneself to an Ācārya or preceptor and being guided by him in everything. The preceptor goes through all that is necessary to effect his pupil's deliverance, as a mother takes medicine herself to cure an infant.

IV. The Purusarthas are five, viz., (1) Dharma, (2) Artha, (3) Kāma, (4) Kaivalya, and (5) Mokṣa. The first three do not differ from those ordinarily called by those names, and the last two are the conditions attained by the Kevala and Mukta spirit (I. 3 and 2 above).

V. The Virodhins are five, viz.,

(1) Svasvarūpavirodhin, i.e., that which prevents one's own real or spiritual nature from being seen, such as the belief that the body is the soul;

(2) Parasvarūpavirodhin or that which prevents one's approach to the true God, such as devotion to another or false deity or belief in God's incarnation being but a human being etc.;

(3) Upāyavirodhin or that which prevents the true ways from being resorted to, as the belief in ways other than those mentioned above being more efficacious or in the latter being inadequate;

(4) Puruṣārthavirodhin, or attachment to other than the true or highest object of life;
Praptivirodhin, i.e., the being connected with a body that one’s own Karman has entailed or with other spirits who are so embodied.

At the end of another work, viz. the Yatindramatadrīpikā, the author gives a variety of views entertained by different classes of writers belonging to this school. The Śūris admit only one entity (Tattva); the Rṣis divide it into two, Ātman and Anātman; and the Ācāryas professing to follow the Śruti, propound three Tattvas or entities, viz., (1) Bhogya or what is to be enjoyed or suffered; (2) Bhoktṛ, the enjoyer or sufferer; (3) Niyanṭṛ or the ruler and controller. Some Ācāryas teach the system under the four heads of (1) Heya, or what is to be shunned, (2) the means of keeping it off, (3) Upādea or what is to be sought and secured, and (4) its means. Other teachers (Desikas) divide the subject into five parts, viz., (1) what is to be attained or got at (Prāpya), (2) he who attains it (Prāptṛ), (3) the means of attainment (Upāya), (4) the fruits or objects of life (Phala), and (5) obstructions or impediments. These are the five topics or the Arthapañcaka described above. Some teachers add one more topic which is called Sambandha (relation), and thus expound six. There is no real difference according to our author between these several views, since the variety is due to the adoption of a different principle of division by each teacher. The true substance of the Vedānta or Upaniṣads is that there is only one Brahman with the animal spirits and the dead world as its attributes (Cidacidviśiṣṭādvaitam).

The doctrines of Rāmānuja’s school here given are the same as the doctrines of an older school, that of the Pāncarātras or Bhāgavatas, reduced to a systematic form. In the Nārāyaṇiya section of the Mokṣadharma-parvan which forms part of the twelfth or the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata, there occurs a text in which the Śāmkhyayoga, Pāncarātra, Vedas or Āranyakas, and Pāṣupata are mentioned as five distinct systems of religious truth.¹

¹ Chapter 349, Bombay Edition.
The Vedas or Āranyakas here spoken of are the system afterwards known by the names of Aupaniṣada and Vedānta. The doctrines of the Pāñcarātra system are explained in Chapter 339 of the same book. Vāsudeva is the supreme, unborn, eternal and all-pervading soul, the cause of all. From him sprang Saṁkarṣaṇa, or the soul that animates all bodies, regarded as one, from him Pradyumna, the sum total of all intelligence (Manas), and from him, Aniruddha who represents Ahamkāra or egoism, and who created all objects. Varāha, Narasimha, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and others are represented as subsequent incarnations of the Supreme Vāsudeva. Bhakti or love and faith is the way of reaching God. The Nārāyaṇiya section is older than Rāmānuja, since he refers to it in a passage in his Vedāntabhāṣya, to be noticed below, and older also than Saṁkaracārya, who quotes in his Bhāṣya under II, 1, 1. from Chapters 334 and 339,1 and 350 and 351.2 In his Vedāntasūtrabhāṣya Saṁkaracārya gives under II. 2, 42 these same doctrines as maintained by the Bhāgavatas, and refutes them on the ground that if Jiva, or the animating soul, is to be considered as created by Vāsudeva, it must be capable of destruction, and hence there can be no such thing as eternal happiness. Then under Sūtra 44 he gives the same doctrines in a modified form. Saṁkarṣaṇa and others are not the animating soul, intelligence, and egoism, independant of Vāsudeva, but they are different Vyūhas or forms of the same Vāsudeva, regarded as possessing certain attributes, viz. jñāna and aśvārya, sakti and bala, and virya and tejas, respectively. This too is refuted by Saṁkaracārya. In connection with this modified doctrine, the name Pāñcarātra is used as of those who advocated it.

Rāmānuja in his Vedāntasūtrabhāṣya introduces his comments on these Sūtras by the observation, 'Raising an objection against the authoritativeness or truth of the Pāñcarātra dispensation which was revealed by Bhagavat and which shows the way to the highest bliss, from its being a (separate) system like those

1 Page 409, Vol. I (Bibl. Ind. Edn.).
2 Page 413, ibid.
of Kapila and others (which have been refuted), he refutes it. The objection that is raised is this. The Bhāgavatas maintain that Saṁkarṣaṇa, the animating soul, and others were created; but the Śrutis lay down that souls are not created. Then under Sūtra 44 which, however, is 41 in his Bhāṣya, Rāmānuja says that this objection is based on a misconception of the doctrine of the Bhāgavatas. The correct doctrine is that Vāsudeva, the supreme soul, assumes these four forms out of love for those who depend upon him, in order that they may resort to him under those forms. In support of this he quotes a text from the Pauṣkārasamhitā; and another from the Śātvataśāṁhitā is quoted to show that the worship of these four forms is really the worship of the supreme Vāsudeva. The supreme Vāsudeva is attained by his devotees when they worship him according to their abilities in his Vibhava and Vyūha manifestations or in his original subtle form. By worshipping the Vibhavas, they reach the Vyūhas and through the Vyūhas they reach the subtle form. The incarnations Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, and others are Vibhavas, the Vyūhas are those mentioned above, and the subtle form is the supreme Brahma(n) called Vāsudeva, possessed only of the six attributes, Jñāna, Aīśvarya etc.

According to Rāmānuja, therefore, the Bhāgavata doctrine, when properly understood, is not opposed to the Śruti and it is therefore not reputed by the author of the Vedāntasūtras but pronounced as correct. It will thus appear that the system was known by two names, Pañcarātra and Bhāgavata, though Bāna in his Harṣacarita speaks of these as two different schools. If they were different, the distinction between them was probably due to one having adopted one form of the doctrine explained above and the other, the other. Under Sūtra 45, Saṁkaracārya accuses the Pañcarātras of treating the Vedas with contempt, since it is stated in one of their books that Śāndilya, not having found the way to the highest good in the four Vedas, had recourse to this Śāstra. Rāmānuja answers this accusation by
saying that a similar statement occurs in the Bhūmavidyā (Chāndogya Up. VII. 1.). Nārada is represented there as saying that he has studied all the Vedas and other branches of learning and still he only knows the Mantras and not the Atman. This does not involve the contempt of the Vedas, but the object of the statement is simply to extol the Bhūmavidyā or the philosophy of the highest object that is explained further on. Or the sense is that Nārada studied all the Vedas but was not keen enough to comprehend the nature of the Atman, though set forth in those works. Precisely the same interpretation should be laid on this statement of Śaṅḍilya's not having found the way to the highest good in the four Vedas, and it should not be construed as involving contempt for the Vedas.

Rāmānuja’s system is thus the same as the Pāñcarātra or Bhāgavata. The sacred books of this latter are the Pāñcarātra-Saṁhitās, three of which, the Pauṣkara, Sātvata, and Parama, are quoted by Rāmānuja in the passage referred to above. The following exist in the library of Jasvantrao Gopalrao of Patañ:

a Lakṣmi-Saṁhitā, Gr. S. 3,350.
b Jñānāmṛtasāra-Saṁhitā, Gr. S. 1,450.
c Paramāgamacakūḍāmaṇi-Saṁhitā, Gr. S. 12,500.
d Pauṣkara-Saṁhitā, Gr. S. 6,350.
e Padma-Saṁhitā, Gr. S. 9,000.
f Vṛddhabrahma-Saṁhitā, Gr. S. 4,533.

The book printed as Nāradapañcarātra in the Bibliotheca Indica is only one of these that are marked b. A copy of c was purchased by me for the Government of Bombay two years ago. Whatever may be the time when these and other Saṁhitās were written and the religion received a definite shape, the root of the Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra system is to be traced to very remote times. Its distinguishing features are, as we have seen, the worship of Vasudeva as the supreme Brahma and the doctrine of Bhakti or faith and Love as the way to salvation. It does not trace all our finite thought and feeling to a principle
Worship of Vasudeva older than Panini

alien to the soul such as Prakrti or Mâyâ, as the Sârkhya or Advaita Vedânta does, and look upon freedom from that sort of thought and feeling as Mokša or deliverance. It is a system of popular religion and has not such a metaphysical basis as either of those two has. Vasudeva was recognised as the supreme deity even in the time of Patañjali, for under Panini IV, 3, 98, the author of the Mahâbhâsya states that the Vasudeva occurring in the Sûtra is not the name of a Ksatriya, but of Tatrabhagavat, which term is explained by Kaiyata, as signifying a certain [form of the] Supreme Deity. And since Panini himself directs us in that Sûtra to append the termination aka to Vasudeva in the sense of ‘one whose Bhakti or object of devotion is Vasudeva’ the worship of Vasudeva is older than that grammarian also. In forming some conception of the origin of this cultus, other circumstances than those hitherto mentioned must be taken into consideration. In the Nârâyaniya section of the Mahabhârata, the Pâñcarâtra is represented as an independent religion professed by the Sâtvatas and is also called the Sâtvata religion1; and Vasu Uparicara, who was follower of that religion, is spoken of as worshipping the Supreme God according to the Sâtvata manner (vidhi) which was revealed in the beginning by the Sun.2 The religion is stated to be the same as that taught to Arjuna by Bhagavat himself when the armies of the Pândavas and the Kurus were drawn up in battle-array and Arjuna’s heart misgave him.3 Thus the Bhagavadgîtâ belongs to the literature of Vasudeva worship. In the Bhâgavata-Pûrâna, the Sâtvatas are represented as calling the highest Brahma (n), Bhagavat and Vasudeva, and as worshipping and adoring Krsna in a peculiar way.4 Râmânuja too refers, as we have seen, to the Sâtvatârûta. Satvat was the name of a descendent of Yadu as we learn from the Purânic genealogies, and his race was the race or clan of the Sâtvatas. The Sâtvatas are mentioned in the

1 Chapter 348, verses 34, 55, 84,
2 Chapter 335, verses 19, 24.
3 Chapter 348, verses 8; chapter 346, verses 11.
4 Bhâgavata Pûrâna, IX. 9. 49; XI. 21. 1,
The Bhagavata along with the Andhakas and Vṛṣṇis, which were two of the Yādava tribes. Vasudeva himself was a prince of that race, being called Sātvatapurūṅgava. About the time when Panini flourished or when the Upanisads were written, and even later when Buddhism and Jainism arose, the energies of the Indian mind were directed to religious speculation, and we find a variety of systems coming into vogue. In this intellectual race, the Kṣattriyas took a much more active part than the Brahmans. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, a prince of the name of Pravāhana, the son of Jaibala and Aśvapati, King of the Kekaya country, appear as teachers of religious truth and Brahmans as learners; and in the former passage it is even stated that the Kṣatriyas were the original possessors of that knowledge. Similarly, in the Kauśītakibrāhmaṇopaniṣad, we find Ajātaśatru, king of Kāsi, explaining the true Brahma(n) to Bālāki the Gargya, who had only pretended to teach it to the king, but did not know it really. The same story is told in the Brhadāraṇyaka. Buddha was a Kṣattriya and belonged to the Śakya clan; so was Mahāvīra, who belonged to the race of the Jñātrkas. Since then the Kṣatriyas were so active at the time in propounding religious doctrines and founding sects and schools, we may very well suppose that a Kṣattriya of the name of Vasudeva, belonging to the Yādava, Vṛṣṇi, or Sātvata race, founded a theistic system as Siddhartha of the Śakya race and Mahāvīra of the Jñātrka race founded atheistic systems. And just as Buddha under the title of 'Bhagavat' is introduced as the teacher in Buddhistic works, so is Vasudeva as Bhagavat introduced in the Bhagavadgītā and some other parts of the Mahābhārata. That must have been one of his most prominent names, since his followers were in later times called Bhagavatas. Or perhaps, it is possible that Vasudeva was a famous prince of the Sātvata race and on his death was deified

1 Bhagavata Purāṇa, i. 14, 25; iii. 1, 22.
2 Ibid, xi. 27, 1; i. 2. 32.
3 V. 3.
4 V. 11.
and worshipped by his clan; and a body of doctrines grew up in connection with that worship, and the religion spread from that clan to other classes of the Indian people. In the course of time other elements got mixed with it. We have seen that Rāmānuja considers Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and others to be only Vibhavas or incarnations of Vāsudeva and they are so represented in the Nārāyaṇiya also. This means that the legends and worship of those deified heroes became identified with Vāsudeva; and the traditions about the Vedic Viṣṇu and the Purānic Nārāyaṇa, who drew out the submerged earth were also in subsequent times referred to him, and thus the various forms of modern Vaiṣṇavism arose.

It is therefore clear that the Pāñcarātra was a distinct system independent of the Vedas and Upaniṣads. But during the early centuries of the Christian era, while the country was under the domination of foreigners of the Śaka, Pahlava, and Yavana races, the Buddhists had grown powerful. With the restoration of the native dynasties in the fourth century, the influence of Brahmans increased, and they then began a fierce conflict with all heretics. These were cried down as scoffers, atheists, nihilists (Vaināśikas), etc. The great Mimāṁsakas—Śabaravāmin, Maṇḍanamiśra, Kumārila, and others, flourished during this period of conflict. They ran down even the Aupaniṣadas or the holders of the Jñāna-mārga, i.e., the religion of the Upaniṣads, as against the Karma-mārga or the sacrificial religion. The Bauddhas and Jainas who had no regard for the Vedas whatever met them on independent or rationalistic grounds. But the Aupaniṣadas fought them on the field of the Vedic orthodoxy and succeeded in maintaining their position. There were unquestionably in ancient times several Aupaniṣada systems; but it was the doctrine of the unreality of the world and the unity of spirit with which the name of Śaṅkarācārya is connected and which has been characterized by the Mādhvas as but Buddhistic nihilism in disguise, that succeeded on the present occasion. And that doctrine was by others considered as subversive of religion and certainty.
Sāṅkarācārya and his followers did not treat tenderly the religious systems that had become popular, such as that of the Bhāgavatas or Pāṇcarātras and of the Pāśupatas. It was, therefore, Rāmānuja’s endeavour to put down the pernicious doctrine of Māyā or unreality, and seek a Vedantic and philosophic basis for the religion of Bhakti or Love and Faith that had existed from times immemorial; and thus the Pāṇcarātra system, which was independent of the Vedas before, became in his hands a system of the Vedānta or an Aupaniṣada system.
A BUDDHIST JATAKA STORY IN PATANJALI.

[From the Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, London, 1892, Volume, pp. 421 ff.]

The Ādīccupatthānajātaka, No. 175 of Fausbøll's edition (vol. II, p. 72), is to the following effect:—In former times, while Brahmadatta was reigning at Benares, the Bodhisatto was born in the family of a Brāhmaṇa, and after finishing his education at Takkhasila, became an Isi hermit (Ṛṣi), and lived on the slopes of the Himalaya together with a crowd of followers or disciples. After having spent a long time there, he came down from the heights, and lived together with his followers in a hut made of leaves in the confines of a village in the vicinity. When the hermits went into the village for alms, a monkey used to get into the hut of leaves, spill the water, break the pots, and clear his bowels in the fire-sanctuary. After the hermits had lived for a year in the village, they made up their minds to return to the slopes of the Himalaya, as the heights had at that time become charming by means of flowers and fruits; and begged leave of the villagers. The villagers expressed their intention to give a feast to the hermits at their hut before their departure and the next day brought a great many nice eatables to the hermitage. The monkey, thinking of inducing the villagers to feed him also, assumed the appearance of one practising religious austerities and of a pious being, and stood adoring the sun. The villagers seeing him in that attitude, and observing that those who lived in the vicinity of good men became good themselves, said—

"Among beings of all species, there are (some) who are ennobled by their virtue; see, a vile monkey adores the son."

1 This and the following two articles appear as "Miscellaneous Notes" in the Transactions of the Congress [N. B. U.].
Bodhisatto, finding that the men were praising the monkey in this manner, and observing that they were pleased with an undeserving creature, said—

$n\text{तोत्स लौं विजयाय अवज्ञाय भरसंस्थ}$

अंगुष्ठत्व उठति तेन भिष्या कम्पित्व ॥ तित$\text{।}$

"You do not know his conduct; you praise him without knowing; he cleared his bowels in the fire-sanctuary, and broke pots."

Thereupon, knowing the hypocrisy of the monkey, they struck him with sticks and fed the hermits.

Under Pāṇini I. 3. 25, Patanjali gives as an instance of the first Vārttika आदिकृत्यपितुत्ते, "he adores the sun" and quotes the following verses :-

बहुनामप्यचित्तानामेको भवति चित्त्राय ।

पद्य वानसपाल्यसिन्यदर्किसपित्त ॥

मैयं मस्त्यं संविचारवमेष्यपि हि यथा वयस्म ।

एतद्वस्य कौशिपं वदर्किसपित्त ॥

"Among many unintelligent beings there is (possibly one) who is intelligent, seeing that in this crowd (army) of monkeys, one adores the sun.

"Do not think he is intelligent and is as we are; even this is his monkeyism, that he adores (apes the adoration of the) Sun."

Here the story is not given; but there can be no question that whatever it may have been, a monkey is seen putting himself into an attitude of adoring the Sun, and in this respect it resembles the Buddhists Jātaka. In both, the two verses are spoken by two different persons. The speaker of the first verse supposes that the attitude the monkey assumes is out of real devotion for the sun, wherein we have another point of resemblance. But in the Mahābhāṣya the adoration is regarded as indicating such an intelligence in a monkey as men possess; while in the Jātaka story it is attributed to piety. The same word, sthā with upa, is used in both; but the verse in Patañjali being in Sanskrit, where the distinction between the Atmane-
pada and Parasmaipada is to be carefully observed, the Atmanepada is used, as real adoration of the sun is meant; in the Pali the distinction between the voices is lost. The impression of the first speaker is corrected in both by the second, wherein we have a fifth point of agreement. But intelligence is denied by the second speaker in the one case, and piety in the other, which difference depends upon the original difference pointed out above. In the Mahābhāṣya story, a crowd of monkeys is seen before him by the first speaker; while in the Jātaka there is only one monkey. In the second verse in Patanjali, the Parasmaipada is used, as reality is denied to the adoration, and it is in consequence no adoration. Whatever, therefore, may have been the story from which these two verses have been extracted in the Mahābhāṣya, the resemblance between it and the Jātaka story is so great as to warrant us in attributing a common origin to them, and regarding them as different versions of the same story, though we have no grounds for holding them as identical.
In noticing the Vedantakalpataru of Amalananda, Dr. Hall, in his "Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical systems", says:—"It was written in the days of one Raja Kṛṣṇa, who had a brother Mahādeva."

A more definite statement was not possible at the time when Dr. Hall wrote. But since that time we have made greater progress in the knowledge of Indian antiquities, and can now with ease determine who this Raja Kṛṣṇa was who had a brother of the name Mahādeva. The verse occurring in the Kalpataru is as follows:

"I begin the Kalpadruma (wish-fulfilling tree), calculated to adorn the garden of Vedānta, while the King Kṛṣṇa, the son of Jaitra, is protecting the earth in a manner to exalt the Yādava race by his fame, along with his brother Mahādeva; and the Lord of the serpents is resting himself after the long-continued exertion consequent upon (bearing) the burden of the earth."

These princes, Kṛṣṇa and Mahādeva, who were sons of Jaitra, and belonged to the Yādava race, were the princes of those names of the Yādava dynasty of Devagiri. The introduction to Hemādri's Vedānta-khaṇḍa and the inscriptions speak of them as the sons of Jaitrapāla, and we are told that they succeeded their grand-father Singhaṇa. During Kṛṣṇa's lifetime Mahādeva only assisted him in the government, and became sole king himself after Kṛṣṇa's death. Kṛṣṇa reigned from 1247
DATES OF VĀCASPATI AND UDAYANA

A. D. TO 1260 A. D. 1 The Kalpataru was therefore written in the interval between these two dates, i.e. about the middle of the thirteenth century. Vācaspatimisra, on whose work, the Bhāmati, the Kalpataru is a commentary, lived sufficiently long before this date to acquire reputation as an important author.

Another latest limit to Vācaspati’s date is Śaka 1174 or 1252 A. D., in which year a commentary on Bhāsarvajña’s Nyāyasāra was written by Rāghavabhaṭṭa, who mentions or quotes from Vācaspati and Udayana. 2 Dr. Hall gives the time of Bhoja of Dhāra as the earliest limit; for, Vācaspati, he says, quotes Bhoja. 3 Unfortunately he has not stated where Bhoja is quoted by him; but if it is the passage from Rājavārttika quoted at the end of the Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi that he means, the Rājavārttika has not yet been discovered, and we do not know for certain who its author is. The statement made by Dr. Hall that it was composed by Bhoja is based simply on the information given by Kaśīnāthaśāstrī Aṣṭaputre, which is more than questionable. 4

But if the supposition that the Rājavārttika was written by Bhoja is correct, the earliest limit for Vācaspati’s date is the period between 996 A. D. and 1051 A. D. Vācaspati thus flourished between about 1050 and 1250 A. D. But in this period we have also to place Udayana, and assign to him a date later than Vācaspati, for Udayana has commented on the Vārttīkatātparyāṭikā of Vācaspati. Another earliest limit to the date of Udayana is śaka 913 or 991 A. D., in which year Śrīdharma’s Kandali was written. In his commentary on Udayana’s Kiraṇāvali, Vardhamāna, the son of Gaṅgeśa, says in his explanation of one passage that therein Udayana sets forth the view of the Kandali.

1 See my Early History of the Deccan, p. 86.
2 Dr. Hall’s Bibliography, p. 26.
The Kalpataru is mentioned by Rāmānanda in his comment on Śaṅkarācārya's Bhāṣya on the Vedāntasūtra I. 4.11. He states that the explanation given by the author of the Prakāṭartha about the accent in the word Pañcājana has been refuted by the author of Kalpataru. Thus we have the author of the Prakāṭartha first, then Amalananda, the author of the Vedāntakalpataru, about 1250 A.D.; and after him Rāmānanda, the author of the Ratnaprabhā, published in the Bibliotheca Indica.