
[From the transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists of 1892, London, Volume I, pp. 425 ff.]

A manuscript of a work entitled Dharmaparikṣā, by Amitagati, a Digambara Jaina and the author of the Subhāśītaratnasamādoha, which was written in Vikramasāhvat 1050, in the reign of Muṇja of Dhārā, has recently fallen into my hands. It was composed in 1070 Vikrama, as we are told in the following verses:

When a thousand and seventy years of King Vikrama had elapsed, this sāstra, full of the incomparable nature of the religion of the Jinendra, in which other creeds have been condemned, was finished.

Amitagati makes use of a story to convey his precepts, in the course of which the God Viśnu, and the several acts unworthy of him as the Supreme Being which he did while he lived in the world as Rāma and Krṣṇa, are spoken of. In connection with this I find the following verse:

A fish, a tortoise, a boar, a Man-lion, Vāmana (dwarf), Rāma, Rāma, Rāma, Buddha and Kalkin,—these are known as ten (forms of Viśnu).

There is a marginal note on Prthu in which the word is explained as meaning Sūkara or "boar." The three Rāmas are of course Pārśurāma, Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, and Balarāma.
or Kṛṣṇa. The last is spoken of independently in several places as an incarnation of Viṣṇu.

In another place, when the divine character of Viṣṇu is called in question, we have—

“Why did he, like an ordinary miserable living being, become a Fish, a Tortoise, a Boar, a Man-lion, Vāmana (dwarf), and Rāma thrice?”

Here we see that the idea of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu had become quite an ordinary article of belief in 1070 Vikrama or 1014 A.D., and Buddha had been received into the popular Brahmanic pantheon. In the latter verse the two last incarnations have been omitted, probably because the object was to represent the births of Viṣṇu in previous ages of the world; while the ninth belongs to the present, and the tenth to a future age.

A little farther on, a story is told of a recluse of the name of Maṇḍapaṇāusika. On one occasion he sat down to dinner along with other recluses. Seeing him sitting in their company, the other recluses rose up, afraid to touch him, as if he were a Cāṇḍāla. Maṇḍapaṇāusika asked them why they rose up as they should at the sight of a dog. They told him that he had become a recluse immediately after he had been a Brahmācārin, and without going through the intermediate order by marrying a wife and seeing the face of a son. A man without son does not go to heaven; nor are religious mortifications successful, if gone through by one in that condition. He then went away and asked men of his caste to give him a girl in marriage; but as he had become an old man, nobody would give his daughter to him. Thereupon he went back to the recluses and told them of this, when they advised him to marry a widow and assume the life of a householder. By doing so, no sin was incurred by either party, as stated in the scriptures of the recluses (tapāsāgame). For they said—
“In these five distressful conditions, viz., when the husband has renounced the world, is an eunuch, is not found, has fallen away from caste, or is dead, another husband is allowed to women.”

The text on the subject, occurring in the Smṛtis of Parāśara and Nārada, and also in that of Manu, according to a statement of Madhava contained in his commentary on Parāśara, though not found there now, is as follows:

The difference, we see, is little; the words are merely transposed in the first line, and we have प्रन्तेज्य for नष्टे. This transposition, however, allows of the proper locative पति being used, without the violation of the metre. It will thus appear that the text was known in 1014 A. D., and widow marriage was not a thing quite unheard of at that time.
THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE SŪTRAS OF ĀŚVĀLĀ-YANA AND ŚĀMKHĀYANA AND THE SĀKALA AND BĀSKALA ŚĀKHĀS OF THE RKSĀMHITA.

[From the Transaction of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, London, 1893, pp. 411 ff.]

A Manuscript of a work Anukramaṇikāḍhundhū was purchased by me for the Government collection about two years ago. It was bought by my agent from a Brahman of Śāmkhāyana school, living at a village called Brahmapol, about two miles from Jayapur, along with other Vedic works belonging to the school. It consists of the Sarvānukrama in a tabulated form. In each line we have first the number of the hymn, then the first pada of the first verse, and afterwards follow in order the numbers of the vargas and of the verses of which the hymn is composed, the name of the Rṣi, and the deity, and the metre. The next hymn is treated similarly in the next line. When the particulars referring to a hymn cannot be completely given in a single line, we have more than one, i.e., a paragraph. The Sāktas are numbered continuously from 1 to 1017, and the end of the Adhyāya is simply marked with the letters Adhya. The Vālakhilyas come between hymns 668 and 669, i.e., after viii, 48, and are numbered from 1 to 10. The manuscript was transcribed on Sunday the 7th of the dark fortnight of Bhādrapāda, in the Saṁvat year 1796, and is thus a hundred and fifty years old.

This tabulated Anukramaṇī agrees in all respects with the Sarvānukrama of Kātyāyana, as I have found from a comparison of parts here and there with the statements at the top of the hymns in Professor Max Müller's edition and with the original Sarvānukrama. The number of verses in vii, 21 is, however, given as nine, because it would appear, at first sight, the tenth is the same as the last verse of the previous hymn. In other places,
however, where the same verse occurs at the end of two successive hymns, it is not left out of account; so that there is probably a mistake here. The number of hymns, 1017, is the same as that given in the Anuvakanukramaṇi, indexed in the Sarvānu-
krama, and found in the Vulgate. But our Dhunḍhū differs from the last in omitting one of the eleven Valakhīlya hymns, viz., that beginning with \textit{yamṛtvijō} (viii. 58); but agrees with the Sarvān-
ukrama. For this also omits the hymn, and an anonymous commentary on the work, existing in one of my recent collections of manuscripts, agrees with the text, as it contains no reference to it.

The author of the Bhāṣya on the Caranaṇavyūha, often noticed by scholars, says that the omission of viii. 58 constitutes the distinction between the Śāmkhāyana and Āśvalāyana Śākhās. At the same time, he notices the insertion of two of the three verses composing the hymn into X, 88, but only as a khila, and, consequently, not to be counted. The work before me does not notice the insertion, probably just on this account, assigning to the hymn nineteen verses, which it has in the Vulgate. It will thus appear that the statement of the commentator as to the omission of viii. 58 in the Śāmkhāyana Samhitā is confirmed by my manuscript; and the Sarvānukrama, agreeing with both, seems to follow the text used by the school of Śāmkhāyana, rather than that used by the Āśvalāyana school.

But the statement of the commentator and this conclusion are contested by Prof. Oldenberg, and the grounds are these:—In the Upākarana ceremony, usually called Śrāvaṇi by us, after the name of the month in which it is performed, oblations are thrown into the fire after the repetition of the first and last verses of each Maṇḍala. In the Śāmkhāyana Grhya Sūtra the last verse that is directed to be repeated is \textit{"tac chaṁyor āvṛnimahe,"} etc., which, therefore, must have been the last verse of the tenth maṇḍala of the Samhitā followed by Śāmkhāyana. Similarly in another place in the Sūtra, the teacher having taught to the pupil the whole of the Veda ending with Śaṁyor Bārhaspatya, is

spoken of. Śaṁyor Bārhaspatya here means, according to Vīna-yaka, the commentator on the Sūtra, the second verse, "तत्तत्त्योरेता॒" etc. occurring at the end of the last hymn, and not that same verse occurring in the middle. Now, on the evidence of a Kārikā, quoted in a Prayoga or manual of domestic rites, noticed by Professor Weber in his first Berlin catalogue (p. 314), it is concluded that the Bāṣkala Saṁhitā of the Ṛgveda ended with the verse "तत्तत्त्योरेता॒" etc., and since Saṁkhāyana prescribes that verse for the last oblation, that this is the Saṁhitā that Saṁkhāyana followed, and that his Sūtra was written for those who accepted the Bāṣkala Saṁhitā.

To determine this point, it is necessary to trace the source of the information contained in the Kārikā noticed by the two scholars, and to bring together the statements of subsequent writers based on that source. The Kārikā occurs in the work entitled Āṣvalāyana-Grhya-Kārikā, attributed to Kumārila. Whether this writer is the same as Kumārila the great Mīmaṁsaka is a point which I, at least, do not consider to be settled. There is a copy of it in the Government collection of 1883-84 made by me, it bears the number 509. The collection A. of 1881-82, also made by me, contains two copies of a Bhāṣya on the Kārikās, Nos. 176 and 177. No. 176 is an excellent manuscript and contains the original as well as the commentary. The author of the latter does not give his name; and though the name Nārāyaṇa does occur in one place, still it is written in such a manner that it remains doubtful whether it is meant as the name of the commentator. In the introduction we are told, "First of all, Nārāyaṇa, the author of the Vṛtti, composed his work, as it was difficult for persons of little learning, who had simply a smattering of a part of the sacred lore, to perform the various ceremonies prescribed by Āṣvalāyana with the help of the Sūtra alone. Taking the Vṛtti as a basis, and considering the views of Jayanta and others which are in conformity with the Sūtra, the author of the Kārikā composed the Kārikā, setting forth the procedure in order. Still, some people neglecting this
Kārikā, though of use to carry one through the rites, on account of the difficulty arising from its brevity, and regarding a paddhati (manual) alone to be useful in this respect, perform the rites for themselves, and cause others to perform them (in accordance with it). Therefore, on account of the impossibility of removing doubts, by a mere Paddhati as to what is first and what is last, whether a thing exists or does not exist in the whole body of rites, prescribed in the Gṛhya Sūtras, some one, through the favour of the deity, presiding over the ceremonial having sat at the feet of a master, the like of whom is not to be found, of the name of Vuppadevabhaṭṭa, residing in the city of Kalamba, and belonging to the Āsvalāyana school of the Rgveda, for receiving instructions in the interpretation of the Kārikā, is now expounding the whole Kārikā, for removing doubts concerning the body of rites that are performed, making use of what was taught to him by his master.

From this it appears that the Kārikā was written in accordance with Nārāyaṇa’s Vṛtti, the views of Jayanta and others being also represented; and in the work itself the Bhagavadvṛtti-kṛt and Jayanta are frequently mentioned. Now, as regards the point in question, Naidhrucī-Nārāyaṇa’s Vṛtti on Āsv. Gr. iii. 5. 9, is: “It is well known to students that this itself (and no

---

1 त्राभिविभावस्तमदीनगुम्बस्तममृत्युपतिस्वतिमतामनादेखवस्यानि। तुकुलकृतमनिवाद्वितृतािक्तृतमतािक्तृतत्वमादेशस्यानि। तुकुलकृतमनिवाद्वितृतािक्तृतमतािक्तृतत्वमादेशस्यानि।
   तथाप्यस्य कृतमनिवाद्वितृतािक्तृतमतािक्तृतत्वमादेशस्यानि।

2 See also Dr. Buhler’s review of my Report for 1883-84, Indian Antiquary, Volume XVIII, p. 188a.
other) is the Sūtra and Grhya of the Śakala traditional text and the Bāskala text. For the Śakalas ‘Samāṇī va ākūtiḥ’ is the verse, because it is the final one of their Sāmhitā; while for the Bāskalas, ‘tac chaṁyor āvṛnimāhe’ is the one, being at the end of their Sāmhitā. Construing it thus is proper. The Kārikā based on this Vṛtti is that noticed by Professor Weber in the first Berlin Catalogue, and runs thus:—“The last oblation (āhuti thrown into the fire) of the Śakalas is after the repetition of the Rk. ‘samāṇī vah,’ and the last oblation of the Bāskalas, after (the repetition of) the Rk. ‘tac chaṁyor.’ The commentary on this is:—“In the province of Rgveda there are five different Śākhas, Āsvalayani, Śaṁkhāyanī, the Śakalas, Bāskalas and Māṇḍukas. Of these, the last oblation of the Śakalas is by repeating ‘samāṇi vah.’ and the last oblation of the Bāskalas is by repeating ‘tac chaṁyor.’ Everything else is the same. This same Āsvalayana Sūtra is of use for the performance of the rites to the followers of the Āsvalayana Śākha, and to the Śakalas and Bāskalas.” Jayanta in the Vimalodayamālā thus speaks about the point:—“Since this itself (and no other) is the Sūtra of Śakala and Bāskala, and this the Grhya of the two Sāmhitās, those who end their Sāmhitā by the verse, ‘Samāṇī va ākūtiḥ’ throw an oblation into the fire after repeating this verse and then offer to the Svistakṛty; while those who read ‘tac chaṁyor āvṛnimāhe’ at the end of their text throw an oblation on repeating that verse and then offer to the Svistakṛty and not on repeating

1 See p. 168, Bibl. Ind. Edn.

2 शाक्‍तानां समानी व इतृचालन्याहुतिभेदेत्।
शाक्तानां तु तत्तःश्रोतृचाचायाहुतिभेदेत्॥
—From MSS. No. 509 of 1883-84 and 176 of A. 1881-82.

3 अनेके पश्च शाश्वासनद्। आश्वासनयानी सार्वभावयानी (शाश्वासनी) शाक्तानां
शाक्तानां माणूकाभेदति। तेषां मध्ये शाक्तानां समानी व इतृचालन्याहुतिभेदति।
शाक्तानां तु तत्तःश्रोतृचाचायाहुतिभेदति। इत्रसबे समानम्। आश्वासनंशाश्वानां
नृत्तारिणां शाक्तचाष्टिकानां वदन्तमञ्चालायनमुचं कर्मनुदानंथयुपकरतात्।

From No. 176 of A. 1881-82,
"samāni va ākutih." This sense is obtained from the word 'eka,' which occurs in both the Sūtras.

It will thus be seen that the source of the information used by Professor Oldenberg is Naidhruvi-Nārāyana's statement in the vṛtti; and though Jayanta's direct connection with Nārāyana's work is not mentioned, still the passage from his work is so greatly like that occurring in the vṛtti, that there is hardly any reasonable doubt that it is based on the vṛtti, or both derived from a common source. If, then, the Bāskala Saṁhitā ended with "tac chaṁyor" etc., while the Śakaḷa with "Samāni va Ākūtih", the Śaṁkhāyaṇa Saṁhitā, which prescribes "tac chaṁyor" etc. as the verse for the last oblation in the Upakarana ceremony, must be a Śutra of the Bāskala Śaṁkha; and as according to Saunaka, the Saṁhitā of this school had eight hymns more than that of the Śakaḷas, and the arrangement of some of the smaller books composing the first Maṇḍala was different, it follows that the statement of the commentator on the Carana-vyūha that Śaṁkhāyaṇa Saṁhitā differed from Āśvalāyana's, which is the same as that of the Śakaḷas, only in excluding viii. 58, cannot be true, and there is no Saṁhitā exactly corresponding to the Sarvanukrama, which also excludes this hymn. At the same time, though my manuscript was in the possession of a Brahman of the Samkhyāyaṇa school, along with the other works decidedly belonging to that school, still it should be considered as not representing the Saṁhitā of that school. But, on the other hand, it must not be forgotten that those same writers who give us the information which leads to these conclusions tell us as a fact well known to students of Āśvalāyana's Śutra, that that was the Śutra and Gṛhya of Bāskalas as well as of the Śakaḷas. The same fact is stated by Gārgya-Nārāyana in his
comment on the first Śrauta Sūtra of Āśvalāyana. The expression ‘idam eva’ or ‘etad eva,’ used by them, would show that this same and no other was, according to the commentators, the Sūtra of the Bāskalas; and if the Śāmkhāyana Sūtra was peculiarly theirs and the Āśvalāyana that of the Śakalas, they were not aware of the fact. Again, if, following these commentators and looking to the present condition of the text, we exclude the hymn containing ‘tac charīyor’ etc. from the Śākala Śaṁhitā, and hold it to have at no time formed part of it, the traditional number of Rks in it, viz. 10580⅓, exceeds the real number by 15, which is exactly the number of Rks contained in that hymn. This in itself would show that the hymn formed part of that Śaṁhitā at some time, and if we interpret the Grhya Sūtras iii. 5, 8 and 9, independently of Naidhruvi-Nārāyana, and in accordance with Āśvalāyana’s usual style, we shall find that he supports our inference. And if this inference is correct, all the difficulties pointed out above will disappear, and Śāmkhāyana’s Sūtra as well as Āśvalāyana’s will have to be considered as a Sūtra for both the Śakalas and the Bāskalas.

According to Nārāyana, Āśvalāyana uses the word ekā in iii. 5. 8 to indicate that the verse “Samāni va ākūtiḥ” should be used to the exclusion of “tac charīyor āvrnimāhe”, which is prescribed in the next sūtra; and the word ekā in this last sūtra or iii. 5. 9 is used to indicate that ‘tac charīyor āvrnimāhe’ should be used to the exclusion of ‘Samāni va ākūtiḥ’. Thus the sense is, that or this verse should be used, and not both, i. e., vikalpa or option is here allowed; but it is a vyavasthitā vikalpa, i. e., one course is to be followed by one class of men and the other by another. Now, Āśvalāyana’s usual way of expressing a vikalpa is by the use of the word Vā, as in i. 10. 9; i. 11. 13; i. 14. 5; i. 15. 6; i. 19. 2; i. 20. 1 etc. etc. and we find the word used even a little before in the section under consideration in the Sūtra iii. 5. 3. Different courses for two classes of persons are prescribed by naming one of the classes, as in i. 7. 9 where Jamadagnas are mentioned, and i. 10. 9, where we have the
Explanation of 'eka'

Paṅcāvattis, or by using the word eke, i.e. "some", as in i. 4. 2; i. 13. 6, etc. So then, if he meant the verse mentioned in iii. 5. 8 for the Śakalas and that in iii. 5. 9 for the Bāśkalas, we should expect him to name the first school in the first Sūtra or the second in the second. At any rate, even if this mode of expression should be considered unnecessary, the word va is quite indispensable. Again, Nārāyaṇa interprets the word ekā in these two sūtras in quite a different manner from that in which he interpretes it in iii. 5. 6. In this last sūtra the word is used to prevent the repetition of the next verse in the text of the Samhita, while in the two, it is, he says, used to prevent the verse in the next or the preceding sūtra from being repeated in addition to the one occurring in the Sūtra itself. And Nārāyaṇa himself is by no means certain about the explanation he has given; for he winds it up by saying "ity evam niveśo yuktah," which means "This construction is reasonable," or rather according to the sense of the word niveśa as used by the grammarians, it means, "Āśvalāyana should properly have put in words to that effect."

The true explanation of the two sūtras seems to me to be this. Āśvalāyana evidently meant to prescribe the first and the last verse of each Maṇḍala. But since those for whom he wrote were supposed to know the whole Saṃhitā by heart continuously without proper divisions, or perhaps to possess a book in which the verses were written continuously without a break, he prescribes a pair of verses in each case, the first of which is the last of the previous Maṇḍala, and the second the first of the next Maṇḍala. This mode of expression can evidently not be used in prescribing the first verse of the first Maṇḍala, or the last verse of the last Maṇḍala; hence, they must be prescribed separately and singly. But to prevent the possibility of the learner connecting the word dvṛca, "pair of verses," with the first verse that has to be prescribed singly, and of his repeating the second verse also of the first Maṇḍala, the word 'ekā' is used in the Sūtra, iii. 5. 6, "Agnim īde purohitam ity ekā." But there is no such necessity in the sūtra which prescribes the
last verse of the tenth Maṇḍala, for even if the word “pair” were brought over to it, it could mean nothing, as nothing follows the last verse. If, notwithstanding this, the word eka is used in that sūtra also, the reason must be the same as that which holds in the case of the sūtra about the first verse of the first Maṇḍala, i.e., it is used to prevent the next verse for being repeated. The conclusion to be derived from this is that some verses followed the verse “samāṇī va ākūṭīḥ” in the text as it existed in Āśvalāyana’s time. And the last of these additional verses is also prescribed in iii. 5. 9 by Āśvalāyana; and there too, he uses the word eka. What could be the meaning of the word there? No more verses can be supposed to follow the last of the additional verses. We can understand the meaning of Āśvalāyana’s object in using the word only if we suppose that the additional verses which followed “samāṇī va ākūṭīḥ” constituted such a hymn as the samjñāna hymn with fifteen Ṛks, as given by the author of the commentary on the Carṇāvyaḥa, the fifth of which was “tac chaṇyor” etc., and the fifteenth or last also the same. If the word eka had not been used in the sūtra which prescribes “tac chaṇyor” etc., the learner, by connecting the word “pair” with it, might have used the first “tac chaṇyor” etc., i.e. the fifth verse of the hymn, and along with it the sixth also, “Nairhastyam” etc. But eka prevents the use of this, and the result is that the last verse only of samjñāna hymn is prescribed. But now the question arises, if another hymn followed “samāṇī va ākūṭīḥ,” why does Āśvalāyana not prescribe its last verse only, “tac chaṇyor” etc., as is done by Śaṁkhāyana, and why does he prescribe “Samāṇī va ākūṭīḥ” etc. also. The reason must, I think, be sought for in some such fact as this, that in his time the samjñāna hymn was considered as a necessary appendage of the Saṁhitā, though the text of the latter ended with “samāṇī va ākūṭīḥ,” or there was no general agreement that that hymn was not a part of the Saṁhitā; some included it, while others did not. To meet both these views, Āśvalāyana prescribed both the verses; so that it is not vikalpa or option that Āśvalāyana allows; an option to be construed as resulting in one verse being prescribed
for one of the two schools, and the other for the other; but twenty-one Rks are prescribed, and twenty-one āhūtis or oblations for the followers of Rgveda generally. And since the scholiasts we have consulted inform us of the tradition that Āśvalāyana sūtra was intended for the Śākals as well as the Bāṣkals, the twenty-one Rks and āhūtis must be understood as laid down for both.

If, for these reasons, we reject Nārāyana’s interpretation, and admit the supposition that Āśvalāyana prescribes the two verses either because the saṃjñāna hymn formed a necessary appendage of the Smāhītā, or its rejection was not accepted by all, Smāṅkhāyana must be understood to prescribe the last verse only of that hymn, not because he intended his Sūtra for the Bāṣkals only, but because he acknowledged the saṃjñāna hymn as decidedly the last hymn of the Smāhītā, and not a mere appendage; or the view of its being apocryphal was not started in his time, or he did not notice it. But that view, which is only indicated by Āśvalāyana, gained strength gradually, especially in the Śākala school, and about the time of the Anukramaṇis, the hymn was rejected by that school. But the Bāṣkals were more conservative, and retained it. And even the Śākals, though the hymn was thrown out, repeat at the present day the last verse or it, “tac chaṁyor” etc., in winding up the Smādhāvandaṇa and the Brahmayajña. It is repeated before the verse “namo brahmaṇe,” which is prescribed by Āśvalāyana in iii. 3. 4; and both are prescribed in the Grhya-pariṣīṭa (Ed. Bibl. Ind. p. 270, 1, 8). This circumstance might not improperly be taken to point to its ancient connection with Śākala smāhītā. By the way, it would appear, from what I have stated, that the Anukramaṇiś are chronologically subsequent to Āśvalāyana’s Grhya.

And now all the difficulties which I mentioned before have been cleared. What the commentator on the Caranavyūha says as to the difference between the Smāhītās of the Āśvalāyana and the Smāṅkhāyana schools is true, as the Smāhītā of the latter is not necessarily that of the Bāṣkals. These two Śakhas are only
two Sutra Śākhas like those of Āpastamba, Hiranyakeśin, and Baudhāyana, and do not point to a difference of the Sarvāhita text. If we believe the scholiasts, Āśvalāyana's Sutra was intended both for the Śākalas and the Bāṣkalas, and we may regard Śaṁkhāyana's also as intended for both. That the Śākhā of Āśvalāyana is a Sutra Śākhā only, and is not tied down to a particular Sarvāhita, is also indicated by the present practice of Brahmans of that school, who at the end of their Saṁdhya adorations, have to describe themselves individually as Ṛgvedāntārgatāśvalāyana-Śākala-śākhā-dhyāyin. The name of Śākala is added to show what Sarvāhita it is that he studies, as the name Āśvalāyana by itself does not do so. The Bāṣkala Śākhā seems to be extinct now; for the author of the commentary on the Caranāvyaḥa, after giving its peculiarities on the authority of a Vṛtti on the Auukramanī, says “evam adhyayanābhāvācchākha’bhāvah,” “such a text is not studied, therefore the Sākhā does not exist.” The only Sarvāhita, therefore, to which both Āśvalāyana and Śaṁkhāyana now refer is that of the Śākala school. And the text used by the two Sutra schools differs only in the omission of Ṛv. viii, 58, by the followers of Śaṁkhāyana. But in this respect they agree with the Sarvānuukrama; and it is the Āśvalāyanas who have admitted that hymn into their text, or allowed it to remain there in opposition to that work. My manuscript, also found with a Brahman of the Śaṁkhāyana school, really represents the text of his school, and of no other; and the traditional number of Rks in the Śākala Sarvāhita, 10580½, is now justified, since at one time the Saṁjñāna hymn formed a part of that Sarvāhita.

It may be remarked in conclusion that the Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śaṁkhāyana about the Upākaraṇa ceremony which we have been discussing are adduced by the commentator on the Caranāvyaḥa as authorities for including that hymn in the text of the Saṁvīta. One can understand how in his eyes the Sūtra of the latter is an authority, believing as he did that the Sarvāhita of Sarvākhaṇya was the same as that of the Śākala school. And probably he attaches the same significance to Āśva-
lâyana's prescribing the use of "tac chaîmyor" as to Saṁkhāyana's; but he has not explained why it is that the former prescribes the last verse of X. 191, "Sàmâni vah," etc. also. He, of course, does not adopt Nārâyana's interpretation. According to the commentator, the Saṁhitā of all the Rgveda schools is the same; which is true, as we have seen, in the case of the four that are extant. The fifth, the Maṉḍūki, has not yet been traced.

There are two copies, recently transcribed, of the commentary on the Caṅnavyūha in the Deccan College collections, No. 19 of 1871-72, and No. 5 of 1873-74. Neither of them contains the name of the author. But the work has been lithographed at Benares, and also printed in the Benares Sanskrit series, as an appendix of the edition of the Prātiśākhya of the White Yajurveda. In both, the name of the commentator is given as Mahidāsa, who wrote the work in the year (expired) tridaśāngadhārāmite, which in the edition in the Benares Sanskrit series is given as equivalent to 1613, but which really means 1633, tridaśa, meaning "gods", denotes 33, the traditional number of the gods. This Mahidāsa or Mahidāsa is probably the same as the author of the commentary on the Lilāvati, written in 1644, and noticed in my Report for 1883-84 under No. 205 (pp. 82 and 368). The dates refer to Saṁvat, i.e. the era of Vikrama, and thus correspond to 1577 and 1588 A.D.
YOUR EXCELLENCY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I sincerely thank you for having elected me President of this Conference. My only qualification for this post is that I am the oldest of you all, and if time allows, I intend to give you an illustration of my age by mentioning the several controversies which I have carried on since I began life as a scholar. I take it that our body here is composed of two classes of learned men, those educated as Pandits of the old school and those who have been studying the literature of the country and the inscriptions and the antiquities which are found scattered in the different provinces, by the application of the critical and comparative method. As to the former class, there are at present two Śastras mostly studied, namely Vyākaraṇa and Nyāya. In the former, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s Siddāntakaumudi and Manorāmā and portions of Nāgojiḥaṭṭa’s Śabdenduṣekhara and his Paribhaṣenduṣekhara, and the Navāhnikī and the Āṅgādhikāra from Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya are taught. My only suggestion with reference to this is, that the Mahābhāṣya is such an important and informing work that it should be the aim of the Vaiyākarana school to read the whole of it with its pupils. I had an occasion in connection with a controversy to give the correct sense of the passage of the
Mahābhāṣya under Pāṇini V, 3, 99 given in the footnote. My difficulty was great especially because Nāgojihāṭṭa in his Uddyota on the passage interprets Mauryas as manufacturers of idols. I consulted learned grammar-pandits, but they were not able to give me the correct sense off-hand, because this portion of the Mahābhāṣya does not come within the range of their studies. I then wrote a Sanskrit commentary on the passage, and they saw the propriety of taking Mauryas as a race of princes. My interpretation, that the Mauryas are spoken of in the passage as having used golden images for their purpose when they were in need of gold, was accepted by Prot. Kielhorn, who was opposed to me in that portion of the controversy, as he wrote to me in a private letter and did not contest my view again in the Indian Antiquary for 1887, in which the controversy was carried on.

The other school, that of the Nyāya, deals with what is called the Navya (or modern) Nyāya, based upon the Tatva-cintāmaṇi, composed by Gaṅgeśopādhyāya of Bengal, the many abstruse commentaries beginning with the Didhiti of Raghunāṭhabhaṭṭa Siromāṇi, and ending with the Jāgadīśī of Jagadisa Bhaṭṭācārya and the Gāḍādhari of Gāḍādhara Bhaṭṭācārya, are taught and studied in this school.

The whole learning has become extremely artificial and the student of this school acquires a certain intellectual acumen, which, however, is not of much use in ordinary matters. It is very unfortunate that this modern Nyāya should have driven out of the field the system of Logic and Didactics of Nyāya, founded by Gautama and elucidated by Vātsyāyana in his Nyāyabhāṣya, for about the time when this Bhāṣya was written, the Buddhist Mahāyāna school had acquired prominence and the two systems carried on controversies which are interesting to students of the progress of

1 अपणय इत्युप्ते तत्वेन्द्र न सिद्धाति । शिवः रक्षदी विशाख इति । कि कारणम् । मौलिकोप्यांशार्यतिष्ठन्ती । प्रकटिताः । मर्यादातुः न श्वातुः । यास्लेतः संबति पुजयात्साहु भविष्यति ।
thought. Vācaspati gives some valuable information about this point and I have given elsewhere a translation of his remark in the following words:—"The revered Aksapāda having composed the Śāstra calculated to lead to eternal bliss, and an exposition of it having been given by Paksīla-svāmin, 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 like Diinnāga 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 )." On this Uddyota there is a commentary by Vācaspati himself, entitled Vārtikatātparyatikā and on this again Udayana wrote the Tātparyapariśuddhi. These works represent the Brahmanic side of the argumentation with the Mahāyānists and a study of them would be both interesting and instructive. But this study has disappeared before the cumbrous subtleties of the modern Nyāya. Still, however, I hear that some of these works are read in the Mithilā country.

There are other schools also which might be styled (i) the literary, (ii) the medical, and (iii) the astronomical or astrological schools. In connection with the first, Kāvyas, dramatic plays and works on Poetics such as the Kuvalayananda, the Kāvyaparakāśa and the Rasagangādhara are generally taught and studied. The course of this school might be improved by including some of the works alluded to in the last two treatises. As to the other two schools I have nothing to say. I am not aware, whether in any of the indigenous establishments there exists a Mīmāṃsā school; but I think that there ought to be such a school in connection with Dharmasāstra in which the most important treatises on religious and civil law should be taught and the rules of interpretation given by the Mīmāṃsakas applied for the decision of legal points. I consider it advisable that in connection with this Dharmasāstra and Mīmāṃsā school
the oldest treatises, the Bhāṣya of Śabarasmātin and the Vārtikas of Kumārilabhaṭṭa, should be regularly studied.

As to the other class of our body here, viz. that composed of critical scholars, the first thing we have to bear in mind is that the study of the Indian literature, inscriptions and antiquity according to the critical and comparative method of inquiry, so as to trace the history and progress of Indian thought and civilization, is primarily a European study. Our aim, therefore, should be to closely observe the manner in which the study is carried on by European scholars and adopt such of their methods as recommend themselves to our awakened intellect. To an intelligent man this ought to be enough to qualify him for the pursuit of critical scholarship, and the Government of India seemed, at the Conference held at Simla in 1911, to favour the idea of opening Research Institutes at the Capital City and presidency-towns; but subsequent events led to the idea being set aside, and instead, the Government provisionally adopted the plan of sending qualified Indians to Europe and America to be trained under famous Western scholars. We have now among us several gentlemen, who have returned after serving out their period of apprenticeship. There are others among us, who have qualified themselves for the purpose by the method alluded to above by me.

Between the Western and Indian scholars a spirit of cooperation should prevail and not a spirit of depreciation of each other. We have but one common object, the discovery of the truth. Both, however, have prepossessions and even prejudices and the same evidence may lead to their arriving at different conclusions. Often, however, when controversies are carried on, the truth comes out prominently, and there is a general acquiescence when it does so. To express the same idea in other words, the angle of vision, if I may use an expression that has become hackneyed, may be and is different. The Indian's tendency may be towards rejecting foreign influence on the development of his country's civilization and to claim high
antiquity for some of the occurrences in its history. On the other hand the European scholar’s tendency is to trace Greek, Roman or Christian influence at work in the evolution of new points, and to modernize the Indian historical and literary events. It is on this account that there has been no consensus of opinion as to the approximate period when the most ancient portion of the hymns of the Rgveda was composed. Some refuse to assign it a higher antiquity than 15 centuries before Christ, while others carry it far to the beginning of Kaliyuga, i.e. to about 3101 B.C. A scholar may have conceived a prejudice against the Indian race and may look down upon the Vedic Rṣis. Thus, our critical method is unfortunately too often vitiated by extraneous influences. But this probably is due to human weakness. A critical scholar should consider his function to be just like that of a judge in a law-court; but even there human weakness operates, and renders a number of appeals necessary, so that one judge differs from another, and so does one critical scholar from another.

Now as to the subjects to which our critical studies are directed, the principal one is that of the interpretation of the Vedas. This has been the monopoly of the European scholars and we Indians have not taken any considerable part in it. But it is indispensably necessary that we should enter the field. A European scholar may give up the function of a judge which I have attributed to him, and assume that of a prosecuting counsel. A certain individual, looking to what are called the Dāna-stutis or praises of gifts, has given it as his general opinion that the old Rṣis or seers had no higher aim than the materialistic one—the acquisition of wealth. Thus he bases a universal judgment

1 Notable instances of the former are afforded by the persistent efforts made by some of us to prove that the twelve signs of the Zodiac are not adopted by the Hindus from the Greeks, though names of the signs are the translations of the Greek names, and even these last are given in a verse of Varāhamihira. Garga, as quoted by the latter states, 'The Yuvanas are the Mlecchas among whom this Śāstra (astronomy, and astrology) is well known; they even are worshipped like Rṣis.'
on what he finds in about 15 or 16 hymns out of 1017. In the same Vaśiṣṭha Maṇḍala in which he finds such a praise of gifts (hymn 18), there are the outpourings of a contrite heart afflicted with a deep sense of sinfulness, and humbly begging to be forgiven. But such points as this last do not attract the attention of the prosecuting counsel. Then again the same scholar asserts that ‘The hymns of the Rgveda are for the most part composed with the technical object of some ritual and this object stands quite near to the later ritual.’ This is perfectly wrong. The Rgveda collection has been treated, from the times of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa down to the present day, as a storehouse of sacred texts to be uttered and used whenever any new ceremony has to be sanctified. Thus the Brāhmaṇa again and again states ‘That contributes to the success of the sacrificial worship, which is possessed of an appropriate form, i.e., when the act performed is alluded to by the Rgveda.’ This rule has been followed by all writers on later ceremonies. The resemblance between the verse and the act may be simply verbal as in the prescription of ‘Śukraṁ te, etc.’ (Rgveda VI, 58, 1) in which there is mention of the bright form (Śukra) of Pūṣan, i.e., his form during the continuance of the day, to the invocation of Śukra or the planet Venus in the ceremony called the ‘Grahamakha.’ And this adaptation of different Rgveda verses for the performance of the Soma services also, such as a Śatra repeated by the Hotā, i.e., a priest, and for the choice of the Anuvākyā and Yājyā verses, is apparent from the services and the verses themselves, so that there is no question that the hymns of the Rgveda form the storehouse for the preparation of the services required for rites that came on in later times. (See my Report on the search for Sanskrit MSS. for 1883–8884, pages 32 ff.). Thus it will be seen that the Rgveda hymns were mostly composed for purposes other than those connected with the sacrificial ritual and there are a great many hymns which are to be recited in the morning on the first day of the Soma sacrifice (prātaranuvāka), which are addressed to Agni, Uṣas,
and the Aśvins. The commentator on the Aśv. Śr. Sutra (IV, 15, 11) states that Uśas has nothing to do with Soma sacrifice; still as the goddess is connected with the preceding Agni and the following Aśvins, hymns to her are intended in this list. Thus the theory that the hymns to the Vedic deities were inspired by the poetic inspiration of beauty holds its ground firmly, notwithstanding the assertions of the above-mentioned prosecuting counsel of a scholar. The three deities, Agni, Uśas and Aśvins, are represented as manifesting themselves in the morning. The old Āryans were accustomed to rise very early and enjoy the beauty of the Dawn and its thickening away into brighter light. It will be seen from all this that the cult followed the composition of hymns and did not precede it in a far outweighing measure.

Then again an attempt has been made to throw discredit on the ritual prescribed in the Gṛhyasūtras and the Śrautasūtras by tracing them to the practices of savages like the Red Indians of America; and even the Upanayana and the marriage ceremonies of the domestic rites and the Dikṣā ceremony are treated similarly. But the main points involved in these ceremonies are neglected. The priest in the case of Upanayana is the father of the boy himself and not a developed form of the "medicine man" of the barbarians. The boy is dedicated to the service of the God Savitar in the words "O God Savitar, this is thy Brahma-carin; preserve him, may he not die"; and the object of the ceremony is not to scare away the evil spirits of whom the Acārya or father is afraid. The putting on of the hide of an antelope in the Dikṣā and other ceremonies, the fasting which precedes them, and such other practices came down to the Hindus from their residence in the forest, where the antelope was a familiar figure, and from the necessity of preserving the body in an unencumbered condition before the performance of any rite. This is done even at the present day when the Brahmans have to perform holy functions such as meditation, celebration of the birth of such a god as Kṛṣṇa, the performance of the
Sraddha ceremony, etc., and these practices are certainly by no means to be traced to the weird performances of the medicine-man of the savages. The question of magic rites is an independent one and should not be confounded with the cults prescribed in the Sutras. As shown by an inscription, regarding a treaty between the king of the Hittites and the king of Mitani, found in Asia Minor, the Aryans who ultimately migrated to India were the neighbours of the Assyrians or Asuryas and must have learnt from their connection with these and the Babylonians the art of magic, and the subsequent composition of the Atharva-veda must have been greatly influenced by this circumstance. Therefore, whatever weird and magical practices are to be found in the Hinduism of the day, are not unlikely to be traced to this source.

Notwithstanding such aberrations of scholars as we have noticed, European scholarship deserves our highest respect, and the erring individuals are corrected by other scholars and on the whole no great harm is done. Still, we Indian scholars ought to devote ourselves strenuously to Vedic study. Yāska tells us that a science should not be taught or communicated to a fault-finding or prejudiced man and the mood to be observed in studying a subject is, according to the Bhagavadgītā, that of Śraddhā, i.e., a disposition to receive whatever strikes as reasonable or an attitude of open-mindedness. We are likely to be more actuated by this spirit in the study of our Vedas than any foreign nation. Still those of us who have not become critical scholars by closely observing the method of European scholars, or serving out a period of apprenticeship to them, exhibit a number of faults and weaknesses which entirely vitiate their reasoning. A young man, the editor of a good many Sanskrit works, asks me with a derisive smile what the necessity was of naming a MS., showing the country it came from and the age in which it was written, when the mere fact of its presenting a varied reading is enough for all purposes. He did not know that when a judge noted down the age or a wit-
ness appearing before him, the name of the caste or the community or the country to which he belonged, he got information from him which had a value in the estimate of the evidence. Similarly another young man, not fully acquainted with the critical method, said that Namadeva and Jñānadeva were contemporaries, but that the difference between their languages was due to the mistakes of successive scribes. He thus believed that the scribes could reconstitute the grammar and lexicon of a language, forgetting to ask himself why the marvels effected by the scribes in the case of Namadeva should not have been effected by them in the case of Jñānadeva himself, whose language they had not altered. I do not give these as solitary instances but as due to the working of a spirit which has rendered Jñāneśvara, the author of Jñāneśvari, which does not contain the name of God Vīthobā at all and whose Marathi is very archaic, to be the same individual as the author of the Haripātha, whose abhaṅgas teem with allusions to Vīthobā and Rakhumāi and whose language considerably approaches modern Marathi. The Marathi literature which has come down to us is full of such strange theories. It is a very disagreeable matter to dwell at this length on the faults of our Indian scholars, but it is an allegiance which I owe to truth.

The study of Vedantism among European scholars is dominated by the views of Prof. Deussen, who is a follower of Śaṅkaracārya’s system of world-illusion and the spiritual monism, but it is wonderful that nobody should have penetrated below the surface of the question and seen that it is not one system that the Upaniṣads teach, but several, inconsistent with each other and each supported by an Upaniṣad text (see the Introductory chapter of my Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism etc.). I have already alluded, in connection with the modern system of Nyāya, which forms the stock-learning of the existing Nyāya school, to the growth of a controversy between the Brahmans and the Mahāyāna Buddhists, the Brahmanic side of which is represented by Vātsyāyana, Bharadvāja, etc., and the Buddhistic side by
Diṇnāga and others. This controversy might well form the subject of close study among modern critical scholars and perhaps even a clue to Śaṅkaračārya’s theory of world-illusion might be found in the Nihilism of the Buddhist Mahāyāna school.

Another very important branch of our study is that of inscriptions, which are scattered over the whole country and are engraved on stones or on copper-plates. These last are mostly deeds of gifts of villages or of the revenues of villages to Brahmans or for the support of temples and other religious establishments. These deeds contain the pedigrees of the donating monarch, with notices of important points in the careers of his ancestors and in that of the reigning monarch himself. These notices have a historical value which must be judged of by our usual canons of criticism. We are thus enabled to reconstitute sketches of dynasties and of the principal points in the history of the provinces concerned. The inscriptions on stones contain records of specific events which enable us to find a clue to the progress of the occurrences described therein. We should be groping in the dark if there were no chronological light thrown on the events recorded in our reconstituted sketches. Such chronology we have for post-Christian occurrences. We have an era which originally dated from the coronation of a Śaka king and was called also the Era of Śaka kings. By a mistake in identification, such as those we have noticed in our vernacular literature, the name of the Śaka king was supplanted and that of the Śālivāhana or Sātavāhana Dynasty which followed those kings was substituted in its place. In the usual practice, the two names are put together and the era is called “Śālivāhana Śaka” which can denote the names borne by two dynasties. There is another era to which the name of Vikramāditya is attached. There is a third bearing the name of the Gupta princes, which has been in use for some centuries. Its initial date, as compared with the Śaka era, was given by the Arabic writer Alberuni as 242 Śaka, but unfortunately that writer stated it to be the era of the extinction of the
Gupta dynasty. It was however found to have been used by the Gupta princes themselves and hence scholars and antiquarians not only disbelieved *this fact*, but threw discredit on Alberuni's statement of the initial date of Gupta era. Long and pungent controversies followed on this matter, new initial dates for the Gupta era being proposed. I also took part in the controversy and my conclusion, recorded at the end of a note in the Appendix A to the second edition of my Early History of the Deccan, is as follows:—"Thus, then, the evidence in favour of Alberuni's initial date for the Gupta era appears to me to be simply overwhelming." Subsequently in an article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLII, pp. 199 etc., I had to consider the relation between the dates found in Mandasor inscriptions. These dates are given as the years that had elapsed after the constitution of the Mālavas as a Gana or a political unit. This Mālavagana came afterwards to be identified with the name of Vikramāditya, just as the Śaka era came to be associated with the name of Śālivāhana or Śātavāhana. The only Vikramāditya that became famous, after the institution of the era of the political unity of the Mālavas, was Candragupta III of the imperial Gupta dynasty, who came to the throne about A. D. 400, conquered Ujjain, made it one of his capital cities, drove out the Śakas and was consequently called Śakāri. These two ears then, that of the Śaka and that of Vikrama, have become our guides in determining the chronology of the post-Christian occurrences.

Another source of information is that which is afforded by comparison of the statements by foreign writers with those found in the indigenous records. Thus Megasthenes is mentioned by Greek writers as an ambassador sent by Selukos to the court of Sandracotta. Sandracotta is the same as Candagutta, the popular pronunciation of the Sanskrit Candragupta. Hence we gather the contemporaneity of Candragupta, the Maurya, with Selukos.

Similarly, in the inscriptions of Aśoka “Antiyoko nāma Yona Rāja” is mentioned as a friend of Aśoka, as also four
others associated with Antiochus. Thus the age of Candragupta is about 325-315 B.C. and that of Asoka's coronation is about 269 B.C. Similarly we gather chronological information through the comparison of Chinese literature with the Indian. The Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa on Śāmkhya philosophy and its commentary, for instance, was translated into Chinese between the years 557 A.D. and 569 A.D. Pulakeśin came to the throne in 610 A.D. and was the only southern monarch to conquer whom the efforts of Śilāditya or Hārśavardhana proved fruitless; he remained an independent sovereign. These facts are gathered from the writings of Hiuen Tsang and our copper-plate inscriptions, which tally with each other.

In this field of the study of inscriptions the most confusing points are those connected with the dynasty of Kanīśka. It is a great desideratum that all inscriptions and other scraps of information connected with the family should be brought together and attempts should be made to fix their dates. No such comprehensive attempt has, I believe, been yet made, and it is now left to those of us who have paid special attention to this branch of our study to make it. The Epigraphia Indica has been doing good service by the discovery and publication of new inscriptions and the whole department of Archaeology is devoted to making excavations and bringing to light new sources of information. Such a source is that of a Greek of the name Heliodora, having been discovered by means of an inscription at Besnagar as a Bhāgavata and a worshipper of Vāsudeva, the rise of this sect being shown as early as the 2nd Century before the Christian era (See my Vaiśṇavism etc. pp. 3-4). The field of research in this connection is extensive; to cultivate it and to bring out fruitful results it is necessary that more of us should devote themselves to the subject.

During the period that I have been working in this line, I have had to take part in several controversies. One of these I have already mentioned, and that is about the Gupta era.
I now close the address by briefly setting forth the points involved in one that is still agitating us, and that is about the genuineness of the Arthasastra attributed to Kautilya, which has been recently discovered. Prof. Jacobi believes that it is the production of Caṇākya or Viṣṇugupta, who overthrew the Nandas and raised Candragupta, the Maurya, to the throne. Prof. Hillebrandt, on the other hand, attributes the authorship to a member of the school of Kautilya and not to the great Caṇākya himself. The point I wish to make out is that it was not written so early as in the times of Candragupta, the Maurya, but later. The earliest notice of Kautilya's work is that contained in the Kāmasūtra of Vatsyāyana, in which occur a number of passages which are the same as in Kautilya. It is then mentioned by Kāmandaka in the third century, by Daṇḍin in the sixth century and by Bāṇa in the seventh century A.D. But its existence is noticed by no writer earlier than Vatsyāyana's Kāmasūtra. Patañjali, the author of Mahābhāṣya, throws side-glances on the things existing in or about his time. He mentions the Candragupta-Sabhā, the greed of the Mauryas for gold and their selling golden idols, and the beating and the sounding of the Mrdaṅga, Śankha and Paṇava in the temples of Kubera, Rāma and Keśava, the existence of a sect of Śivabhāgavatas holding an iron lance in their hands. In the extent of the literature written in the Sanskrit language, he enumerates a number of Vedic words with the Angas, Vākovākya (which is defined by Śaṅkarācārya and Raṅga-Rāmānuja as Tarka-śāstra), Itihasa, Purāṇa and Vaidyaka, but there is no room anywhere here for Kautilya or for his work the Arthasastra. Now as to the arguments that may be taken as pointing to an earlier date for the Arthasastra, the following may be mentioned:

(i) Ānvikṣiki as defined by Kautilya consists of Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata. This is the popular philosophy of the time of the Śvetāsvataropanisad and the Bhagavadgīta, while the Anvikṣiki of Vatsyāyana's Nyāyabhāṣya is the system of Gotama
himself. They should rather show a later date for Nyāya Philosophy than an earlier one for the Arthasastra.

(ii) Then again, Kautilya speaks of his writing a Bhāṣya on his own Sūtra and of apadesa, i.e. the statement of the views of others and lastly of the Siddhāntin. Now in the chapter on Tantrayuktis he mentions this last circumstance as the yukti or the device for the exposition of the system, so that it should not be necessarily understood that the views of the Siddhāntin or the last writer are given by himself. Similarly in the Vedāntasūtra, when the views of other authors are first given and that of Bādārāyana at the end, it ought by no means to be understood that Bādārāyana himself was the writer. Hence the occurrence of the name of Kauṭilya should not be taken as indicating his authorship of the whole statement.

Now as to the date of the Arthasastra itself, it depends on that of Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra. Vātsyāyana lived after Kuntala Śatakarani Sātavāhana, whom he mentions as having killed his queen Malayavati in an amorous sport by a pair of scissors. Kuntala must have flourished in the middle of the first century B. C. and consequently Vātsyāyana lived about a hundred years afterwards, so that he may be placed in the first century of the Christian era. Since these calculations are rough, we may assign him to the first or the second century A. D. This is the earliest date to which we can refer Kauṭilya. The last śloka of the chapter on Tantrayukti is:—

\[ येन शाश्वं च शक्तं च नन्दराजगम्या च सूः।
अमरनक्षुदतन्याया तेन शाश्वमिदं कृतम्। \]

the sense of which is “This Śāstra was composed by him who, unable to bear it, extricated this Śāstra, the insignia of authority and the country under the sway of Nandarāja.” The second word Śāstra which occurs in the last line refers to the book actually written, while the word occurring in the first line alludes to the conception and development of the idea of the Śāstra. This conception and the development were attributed
to Viṣṇugupta by tradition, as well as the removal of the insignia of authority and the overthrow of the sway of Nandas. The Arthaśāstra therefore was attributed to Kautilya, because traditionally he was the conceiver of it.

The study of the Avesta or the sacred literature of the Parsis has been associated with the study of our Sanskrit literature. There is a close resemblance between the languages of this literature and of the Vedic Sanskrit, so much so that, with but the slightest changes, certain passages from the one can be turned into the other. But a critical study of the Parsi Scriptures began with a French scholar named Anquetil Duperron, who came to this Presidency in the 18th century, discovered that literature and was struck with its importance. Critical studies were undertaken in Europe and several scholars such as Martin Haug, etc., devoted their lives to it. In India critical scholarship of the European type was introduced by the late Mr. K. R. Kama, in whose memory there exists an Institute erected by his friend Mr. Sukhadwala. Avestic studies were subsequently conducted by a number of Parsi scholars, prominent among whom is Dr. Jivanji Jamshetji Modi. It is very desirable that intelligent Parsis in greater numbers should enter into the field and conduct researches into their ancient religion and customs.

The Arabic and Persian literature also should prove a fruitful field of study. Early Arabic and Persian writers like Alberuni, have much to say about the contemporary history, religions, customs and manners of India. Their study is, therefore, bound to prove of great use. Again our modern vernaculars, especially the Aryan ones, have borrowed much from these sources and many points connected with their etymology cannot be satisfactorily solved, unless we seek help from the Persian and Arabic languages. I am glad to note that the attention of young scholars is drawn in this direction also. In this connection I have to note with satisfaction the useful work
that the Hyderabad Research Society is carrying on under the patronage of His Most Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government. I do hope that scholars will take greater interest in these subjects, as also in the Chinese and other literatures, without which Oriental studies are bound to remain incomplete and one-sided.

Now, gentlemen, I close. I am very glad to observe that critical scholarship has, notwithstanding the defects alluded to by me, been flourishing among us. Good books and lectures have recently been published, especially in connection with the Calcutta University. Our own University has not extended that support to original research that we might expect from it. Still, I close the active years of my life with an assured belief that sound critical scholarship has grown up among us, and that it will maintain its own against aspersions and attacks. I am very glad to observe that a large number of papers will be read at the session we begin to-day, a good many of which must be important, so that in every way we have reasons to congratulate ourselves; and this our Conference will, I trust, be a landmark in the progress of our studies.
MY VISIT TO THE VIENNA ORIENTAL CONGRESS

[From the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Volume XVII (1889) pp. 72ff].

BEING A PAPER READ BEFORE THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, ON FEBRUARY 11TH, 1887.

When my college friend and class-fellow, Mr. Javirilal Umashankar Yajnik, saw me a few hours after my return to Bombay from Europe, and proposed that I should give an account of my visit at a meeting of this Society, I had no hesitation in saying that that was the last place I should myself think of for such a purpose. My visit to Europe was of a very short duration, and though I could say something that might interest an ordinary native audience, I had very little to communicate that was worthy of being listened to by such a learned body as the Bombay Asiatic Society. Besides, even as regards a mixed native audience, so many natives of the country had visited Europe before me, and lived there for a number of years, and communicated their experiences to their countrymen after their return by publishing books and pamphlets and delivering lectures, that short as my visit was, I could have nothing new to tell even to such an audience. My scruples, it appears, were communicated to the respected President of the Society, who thereupon suggested that I should give principally an account of the Congress of Orientalists held at Vienna to which I had been deputed, and in connection with that, some of the impressions which what I saw in Europe had produced on my mind. To this I assented, and I thus appear before you to-day.

I arrived in London on Saturday, the 28th of August, and stayed there till Thursday, the 9th of September. On the afternoon of this day I left for Oxford, where I spent the next three days. On Monday I went thence to Birmingham, and returned to London on the following Wednesday. The next
four days I spent in London, and left England for France on Monday, the 30th. In London I saw St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, the House of Commons, India Office, the National Gallery, the Guildhall, the British Museum, the Tower of London, the Kew Gardens, Hampton Court, the Royal Exchange, the Bank of England, the Hyde Park, the Albert Memorial, the Albert Hall, and the Indian and Colonial Exhibition. I had unfortunately none to guide me in London, as I had in Oxford and Birmingham, and therefore I did not see as much or as well as I might have. I met our late Secretary, Dr. Codrington, in Vienna, and on my informing him that I had been to London, he told me he was in London during the time I was there, and had he known of my being there, he would have been glad to take me with him and show me all the sights. I was very sorry that I did not know Dr. Codrington was in London; but as it was, everybody was very busy and nobody could make it convenient to go with me. I cannot stop here to give the impression that each of the buildings and institutions I saw produced on my mind, and my general impression I will give further on.

I wore in Europe my usual Maratha costume, the turban, the long coat, and the white uparnem or scarf. In the streets of London and in the places I visited, therefore, I often met persons who stopped me with the words bahut garmi hoti hai, salam, &c. The conversation thus begun in Hindustani was continued in English, and I was asked to what part of India I belonged, and where I was going. These were Anglo-Indians; and they told me how long they were in India and in what part, and spoke of the days they spent in the country with agreeable feelings. I was once accosted in Marathi near the Royal Exchange with the words तुम्ही कोणां आला, "Whence do you come?" I said I was from Bombay, and asked the gentleman whether he was in the Maratha country, to which he replied in Gujarati, अमे काढवाळम हता, "I was in Kattiawar," आपण काम झाला होता. "What office did you hold there?" I asked.
"I was Political Agent," was the reply. Then I asked in Marathi, "Are you Anderson Saheb?" to which he replied, "Yes." Then we went on speaking in English together, and he was kind enough to go with me and show me the Office of the Oriental Bank to which I wanted to go.

The first person I saw in London was Dr. Rost, Librarian, India Office, who received me very kindly. I visited him several times, and on one occasion he remarked that my lectures on the Sanskrit and the derived languages, three of which the Society did me the honour of publishing in their journal last year, were very important, and wished me to complete them as soon as I could. The second time that I saw him in the India Office library, Dr. Eggeling, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Edinburgh, happened to be there, and I was introduced to him by Dr. Rost. Professor Eggeling has been compiling a descriptive catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the India Office library, on the model of Professor Aufrecht’s Oxford Catalogue, and he had come that day to London to examine some of the manuscripts carefully. I had an interesting conversation with him, and in his congenial company, and in that of Dr. Rhys Davids, the Pali scholar, to whom I was introduced by Professor Eggeling three or four days afterwards, I felt myself at home. I passed a very agreeable evening with them at the National Liberal Club, of which Dr. Rhys Davids is a member. We had a long conversation on a variety of topics, ranging from Buddhist metaphysics to English and Indian politics, including the annexation of Burma. Dr. Rhys Davids seemed to be full of admiration for the freedom, boldness, and truth of the religious and philosophic thought of ancient India about the time of Buddha, to which the modern world according to him presents no parallel. Professor Eggeling did not quite agree with him, taking into consideration the development of philosophic speculation since the time of Kant, and I was disposed to sympathize with him, though as regards religious ideas and theories I per-
fectly agreed with Dr. Rhys Davids. According to Dr. Rhys Davids, the Buddhistic ideal is the condition of an Arhat who enjoys profound internal peace undisturbed by passion. It is a condition of holiness, goodness, and wisdom. This seems in his opinion to be at the bottom of the religious aspirations of man, or probably the only thing that is valuable in those aspirations, and this alone Buddhism set up as an ideal to be striven for by the religious man, to the exclusion of the ideas of God, the human soul as one unchangeable substance, and eternal existence. Dr. Rhys Davids is an enthusiastic Pali scholar, and has succeeded in organizing the Pali Text Society, in connection with which, with the aid of other scholars, he has been publishing in annual instalments the sacred books of the Southern Buddhists. The service he has thus been rendering to the cause of scholarship and research is invaluable. But it is very much to be regretted that he cannot devote his whole time to his studies, and has to work for his bread at the bar. If he had been a German he would have got a Professorship somewhere. He is, however, Professor of Pali in the London University, but without pay and without pupils. He is a candidate for the vacant Secretaryship of the Royal Asiatic Society, which is a paid appointment; and I have no doubt, if elected, he will be of very great service to the Society; but it is by no means certain that he will get the appointment. I saw him on one occasion in his rooms in Brick Court, when he showed me some splendid Pali Manuscripts which had been presented to him, if I remember right, by the king of Siam.

Another gentleman with whom I came in contact in London and who was very kind to me was Colonel Henry Yule, Member of the India Council and President of the Royal Asiatic Society. Mr. Edward Thomas, a Bengal Civilian, who, after his retirement devoted himself to the study of Indian antiquities, and Dr. J. Fergusson, a zealous student of ancient Indian architecture and archaeology, both of whom were active members of the Royal Asiatic Society, are dead. The Society's Secretary,
Mr. Vaux, has also rather suddenly been removed by death at an early age and another not yet appointed; so that the Society is not in a very flourishing condition at present; and Colonel Yule observed to me how difficult it was for them to get enough matter for the Society's Journal. I also came in contact with Mr. J. S. Cotton, Editor of the Academy, who was once employed by the Secretary of State to examine the materials in the India Office, and digest them into a report on the advancement or condition of India; and he seemed to be very familiar with Indian matters.

At Oxford I was received with cordiality and almost enthusiastic kindness by my old master, Mr. Sidney Owen, who was Professor of History and Political Economy in the Elphinstone College, from January 1857 to April 1858, and his family. Here I had before me the charming and edifying spectacle of a well-regulated, high-toned, and happy English family. The one object of father, mother, sons, and daughters seemed to be to please me; and I felt I was in the midst of persons who had, as it were, found in me a long-lost son or brother. Oxford was at this time empty, the Colleges having vacation, and all I could see was the buildings. Mr. Owen showed me Magdalen, Christ Church, Worcester, Bailiol, and others. The quadrangles with the green grass nicely trimmed, the gardens and walks, and the canals give a rural, quiet, and pleasing appearance to the scene calculated to compose the mind and dispose it to contemplation, thought, and study. Within the premises of the same colleges there are often buildings in three different styles of architecture, the mediæval, that of the seventeenth century, and the modern. It was a curious sight of a nature to awaken historical associations rather than produce a sensation of harmony, the stone of the mediæval buildings in particular being in a crumbling condition. But even this characteristic is calculated, I suppose, to confirm the reflective mood. I also saw the Sheldonian Theatre where the commemoration is held, the Bodleian Library, the Martyr's Memorial, and others. I paid
a visit to Prof. Max Müller, who unfortunately was not in good spirits on account of the recent loss of a favourite daughter. He regretted very much that he should have been in that condition at the time of my visit. He wished to see more of me than he could under the circumstances. Still I had a pleasant and interesting conversation with him for an hour and a half. He told me he had quoted my lectures in a paper that he had been publishing in a German periodical, and read a passage from that paper in which he interprets the expression Bhasarthah, occurring in connection with certain roots in the Dhatupātha as meaning “roots the sense of which is to be known from the spoken language.” Though of course I am a strong advocate of the view that Sanskrit was the Vernacular of the Indian Aryans, and think I have proved the point in my last lecture, still I did not believe that the expression Bhasarthah meant what the Professor said, and was sorry not to be able to agree with him. Then he spoke to me about a letter he had received from the late Divan of Bhavnagar, Mr. Gauriśaṅkar, which was written on the occasion of his assuming the order of Saṁnyāsa, and about a copy of the new Saṁnyāsin’s work on the Vedānta, presented to him by the author. Professor Max Müller spoke approvingly of the doctrine of the Vedānta that the contemnability and misery of life come to an end when an individual soul knows himself to be the same with Brahman or the Supreme soul. As I am not an admirer of the doctrine in the form in which it is taught by Śaṁkarācārya and which alone is now the prevalent form in India, I observed that though according to his system a man must rise to the knowledge, “I am Brahma,” previous to his entering on the state of deliverance or eternal bliss, still it is essential that the feeling of me or egoism should be destroyed as a necessary condition of entrance into that state. The me is the first fruit of ignorance, and it must be destroyed in the liberated condition. A soul has no individual consciousness when he is delivered, and in that state he cannot have the knowledge, “I am Brahma.” The illustration often given of a
liberated soul that becomes one with Brahman is that of the space or ether that is enclosed in an earthen jar becoming one with the infinite outer space or ether when the jar is broken to pieces. In such an absorption into or identification with Brahman when there is no individual consciousness and no knowledge that "I am the Brahman," what happiness can there be? Besides, the proposition, "I am Brahman," does not according to Śaṅkarācārya's system mean I am one with the Supreme Soul, who is the author of the Universe and who dwells in the Universe, so full of beauty and grandeur. This, I believe, is the idea of the author of the Vedāntasūtra and of some of the Upaniṣads; but with Śaṅkarācārya, the Universe or Creation is an illusion like that perceived by a man who sees a rope in darkness and mistakes it for a serpent, and flies away from it through fear. Misery, worldly happiness, sinfulness, littleness, and indeed all finite thought and feeling, are illusions. When these are dispelled the soul is free and happy and without finiteness or limitations, so that the proposition, "I am Brahman," means "I am not the miserable, sinful, little soul, tied down to this or that mode of thought or feeling, that I appear to myself to be; but a free, blissful, unchanging and unconditioned soul." This is the real nature of the soul, and anything at variance with it that is felt is an illusion; so that Śaṅkarācārya's ideal is not to become one with another being who is the Supreme Ruler of all, but to see that oneself is really a blissful and unconditioned being. Though I might admire the doctrine about the first ideal, I do not think the latter to be very charming. This discussion we carried on for some time, and then we turned to other matters. Professor Max Müller made me a present of a copy of the four parts of the Anecdota Oxoniensia as a memento of our short meeting, and with a few complimentary remarks on my work in the field of scholarship, for which I feel very thankful to him, brought the conversation to a close.

On Sunday, the 12th, I was introduced by Mr. Owen to Professor Jowett. He received me very kindly, but nothing of importance was said in the short conversation that followed.
I went to Birmingham to have a glimpse of Industrial England. Fortunately I found an obliging friend in Colonel A. Phelps, late Commissary-General, Bombay. The British Association for the Advancement of Science recently held its meetings at the place, and an exhibition of the arts and industries of Birmingham had been got up for the occasion. Colonel Phelps took me twice to see the exhibition, and there I saw the products of an immense variety of industries with the latest improvements, from a new apparatus for electric lighting without the high tension so dangerous to life that is a drawback in the present mode, to a machine for washing clothes by means of steam, and school furniture so manufactured as to avoid the evils such as shortsightedness, which results from the use of the present kind of furniture. The kind Colonel also showed me the engine factory of Tangyes, Gillott's pen factory, and a pin factory. He then took me to the Birmingham Municipal Offices and Town Hall, both of which are splendid buildings, and in the afternoon to the Liberal Club, where I saw a great many members in the dining and the smoking-rooms. Mr. Chamberlain came in a short while after we entered, and I was introduced to him by the Colonel. A short but interesting conversation followed. Mr. Chamberlain endeavoured to excuse himself from attending to the affairs of India, while I strove hard to fix the ultimate responsibility of governing the country on the British Parliament and through it on each member, and especially on the leaders of parties.

After having seen so much of England I started from London for Vienna on the 20th. I went by way of Paris where I could spend only two days, during which, however, I saw so much as to make my head giddy. I saw the artificial lakes, the grand cascade, the race-course, the dismantled palace of St. Cloud, the palace, galleries, and park of Versailles, the Louvre, Luxembourg, Pantheon, the porcelain and tapestry manufactories which, I was told, are maintained at the expense of Government, and other places. Paris appeared to me to be a beautiful town, the
My visit to Vienna Oriental Congress

The palace at Versailles with the parks and avenue in front is superb, and the pictures at that palace and in the Louvre are innumerable and beautiful. The French appeared to me to be a nation of lovers of beauty and spared no expense, since the Government maintained even factories for painting pictures on porcelain and weaving them by means of coloured thread. But when certain places in the town called to my memory the frightful deeds of the people during the first revolution and of the Commune in 1871, the melancholy reflection forced itself on me that even an intense love of beauty, which I consider to be heavenly, is not necessarily associated in the human heart with a heavenly or angelic character, and that it is a mere passion in the human breast like rage and resentment. I was sorry not to have met any of the French Oriental scholars in Paris. I had very little time, and besides I was told that one of them, Monsieur Senart, was not in town, and I subsequently learned that even Monsieur Barth was absent. From Paris I went to Munich, where I stopped for a day. I found it to be a charming little town. There is an excellent museum, and a building in an elevated position called the Maximilian College, which commands a very fine view. I saw these and also a bronze colossus representing Bavaria, behind which there is a corridor in the shape of three sides of a rectangle with marble busts of the great men of the country placed in niches in the walls. The view from this point also is commanding, and in the light of the morning sun the place looked very charming and well suited for contemplation. From Munich I went on Saturday, the 25th, to Vienna, the place of my destination, which I reached at about 9 P.M.

The next morning Dr. Rost and Dr. Kielhorn came to see me at the Hotel de France, which is situated close to the University. We walked together for about an hour and returned by a tramcar to the University. The meetings of the Congress were held in this building, and the office of the managing committee was also located there. We stepped into the office and signed our names in the Register of members. In the even-
ing a conversazione was held at one of the hotels in order that the members of the Congress might make each other's acquaintance. The attendance was very large, and I was introduced to and exchanged cards with a great many scholars. There were two Egyptians with an ivory complexion and Turkish caps, a Chinaman, the Secretary of the Chinese legation in his national costume with the long pigtail, a Japanese in European costume, an Indian Mussulman, native of Aligarh and educated at Cambridge, similarly dressed, and myself with my turban and uparnem. The Chinaman's knowledge of French was greatly admired, and they said he spoke the language perfectly as well as a Parisian.

The next morning at ten o'clock the members of the Congress gathered together in the large hall of the University. Opposite to them on the other side of a large table sat the members of the Committee of Organization with the minister of Public Instruction and Archduke Rainer, who is a great patron of learning in Austria. The Archduke in a short speech declared the Congress open, after which the Minister of Public Instruction rose and welcomed the members of the Congress in the name of the Government. He was followed by the President, Baron Kremer, who delivered a long address in French. Then the leaders of the different deputations rose one after another and made a few observations, and those who had brought presents for the Congress laid them on the table. In the afternoon the different sections met in the rooms assigned to them, and after the election of the President and Vice-President, papers were read and discussed. As I belonged to the Aryan Section I witnessed the proceedings of its meetings only. I will therefore confine myself to an account of them. Our President was Prof. Roth of Tübingen and Vice-President, Prof. Weber. Among the members who attended were Dr. Rost of the India Office; Professors Bühler of Vienna, Kielhorn of Göttingen, Ludwig of Prague, Jacobi of Kiel, Leumann of Strasburg, Kühn of Munich, Jolly of Würzburg, and Windisch of Leipzig;
Drs. Hoernle of Calcutta, Cartellieri of Vienna, Macdonell of Oxford, and Stein of Buda-Pest; and Messrs. Bendall of the British Museum, Grierson, a Bengal Civilian, and McAuliffe, a Panjab Civilian, and Capt. Temple. Dr. Cust of the Royal Asiatic Society of London attended some of the meetings, and we had an American gentleman of the name of Leland, who has made the language of the Gipsies his special study. There were two French scholars of the names of Millouë and Guimet, and an Italian scholar named Lignana. There were other members whose names I do not remember. Our average attendance was about 45. Prof. Max Müller did not come on account of the unfortunate occurrence I have already mentioned, and the other scholars conspicuous by their absence to me, at least, were Professors Oldenberg of Vienna, Aufrecht of Bonn, Kern of Leyden, Eggeling of Edinburgh, and Dr. Böhtlingk of Jena. The Aryan section met also on the following days, the last sitting being held on Saturday. Englishmen and myself read papers in English, and the German scholars in German with the exception of Dr. Stein, the Hungarian, and Dr. Hoernle, who used English. One of the French scholars only read a paper, and this was in French; and the Italian read in the language of his country. These four languages only were recognised by the Congress. Mr. Bendall read a paper on the discovery in Nepal of a new alphabet with arrow-head characters. Specimens were exhibited on the occasion, but I felt convinced that the alphabet was only one of the many varieties of the Nāgari, and what looked like arrow-heads were only the short horizontal strokes which occur at the top of each Nāgari letter. They were thicker in this manuscript than usual and written in a manner to make one end narrower than the other. Mr. Grierson appeared before the section twice, to read a paper on some of the dialects of the Hindi, and at another time with observations on Tulasidāsa and other Hindi poets. This gentleman has been doing very useful work by studying the peculiarities of the Hindi, as spoken in the provinces of Behar and Mithilā, and publishing grammars
of the dialects prevalent there. The Aryan section adopted a resolution recommending to the Government of India the institution of a regular survey of the spoken dialects of India. I read at the first day's meeting, extracts from my Report on the search for Manuscripts which is now in the Press, and placed before the section an old Palm-leaf Manuscript of a Jaina work, hitherto unknown that had been discovered in the course of the search now conducted by Dr. Peterson and myself, and which would have been placed before the section by Dr. Peterson himself if he had been present. This excited a good deal of curiosity, and one of the scholars gave it as his opinion that the work belonged to that branch of the Jaina sacred literature which is known by the name of Pûrvas, and which is by some believed to be more ancient than the other branches, without, in my opinion, sufficient reason. At another meeting, Prof. Roth made a few observations on the peculiarities of Vedic grammar, dwelling principally on the fact that when a noun and an adjective are used together, the case termination is often found affixed to one of them only, as in the instances परमे व्योमन, महिना जनुषि, &c. Prof. Jacobi read a paper in which he endeavoured to show that the Brahmanic hero-god, Kṛṣṇa, was admitted by the Jainas very early, more than a century before the beginning of the Christian era, into the list of their holy personages. Prof. Kuhn appeared with a paper on the dialects of Kāsmir and the Hindu Kush. One of Dr. Bühler's pupils, a young man of the name of Dr. Cartellieri, showed, by comparing passages in Subandhu's Vasavadattā with similar ones occurring in Bāna's Kādambarī, that Bāna adopted, in a good many cases, Subandhu's images, and often his very words and expressions, so that the doubts thrown on Subandhu's priority to Bāna were groundless. Dr. Hoernle read a paper on an old Manuscript of a work on Arithmetic found at Bakkhālī in the north of Panjab in a ruined enclosure. It is written in a character which is a variety of the Kāsmir character known by the name of Sāradā; and Dr. Hoernle thought it was transcribed in the 8th or 9th century. The
character appeared to me not very different from, or very much more ancient than that in which Kasmir manuscripts about 100 or 150 years old are written. Dr. Hoernle had read a paper on the same manuscript about three years before at a meeting of the Bengal Asiatic Society. Mr. Leland read a paper on the Gipsy language, in which he traced the origin of the Gipsies to India; Captain Temple gave some account of the Dictionary of Hindustani Proverbs that he has been compiling; the Italian scholar read a few remarks on the words Navagva and Dasagva occurring in the Rgveda; and the French, an essay on the myth of Vrsabha, the first Tirthankara of the Jainas. A few other papers were also read.

At one of its meetings, the Section adopted a resolution asking the Government of India to restore the appointment of epigraphical surveyor, as the arrangements proposed by Dr. Burgess for getting translations of inscriptions done by different scholars willing and qualified to do them, were considered unsatisfactory, and to re-appoint Mr. Fleet to it. I must here observe that I did not quite approve of such a personal question being brought before that learned body.

One thing in connection with the work of the Semitic section that came to my notice must here be mentioned. Prof. Karabacek read a report on the paleographical results, furnished by some of the papyri or documents written on pieces of the papyrus which were found in Egypt. These were purchased by the Archduke Rainer, who paid more than 25,000 florins for them. I went to the place where they are kept and exhibited, and was told that some of them were more than two thousand years old. There is among them an original order issued by the Caliph Amru, which bears his own signature. The papyri were found rolled up, and it is a very difficult thing to unroll them in a manner not to break them into pieces. This however is done very carefully by Prof. Karabacek and his coadjutors; and there is a large photographic apparatus in the building, by means of
which the papyri are photographed, and copies of the size of the original printed off from the negative in the colour of the original.

On Monday, or the first day, an evening party was given by the Minister of Public Instruction. Besides the members of the Congress there were other distinguished guests, among whom was the British Ambassador, Sir Augustus Paget. On Wednesday, a sumptuous entertainment was given in the afternoon by the Burgomaster in the large banqueting hall of the Rathaus. The Rathaus or Townhall is an extensive and noble building round which the learned guests were taken, previous to their being led into the banqueting hall. Refreshments were laid on the table, and the best available music provided for the occasion. In the evening of the same day, there was a reception at the residence of Archduke Rainer. There was an unlimited supply of the best Viennese sweetmeats, and tea, coffee, and ices. A good many persons, including myself, were introduced to the Archduke and the Duchess, who spoke a few words to them in German, French, or English. On Thursday, a grand dinner was given in the evening by the Committee of organization, and there were toasts and post-prandial speeches as usual. In the afternoon of Friday, the members of the Congress were taken in river-steamboats by the Danube canal and by a special train up a hill in the vicinity called Kahlenburg, the view from which is splendid. The whole city of Vienna lay at our feet at a short distance, and with hills on the sides, the scene was charming. We spent about an hour at the place and returned home a little after sunset.

Dr. Bühler had told me a day or two before the dinner on Thursday to compose a few verses in Sanskrit and sing them in reply to one of the toasts. I said I would rather sing them at a meeting of the Aryan section, where I should have a select audience that would understand me. Accordingly I composed eight verses1 in different metres and sung them in the manner

---

1 Printed at the end of this article.
we usually do in India, at the final meeting of the Aryan section on Saturday morning. After that was over, I read some of the hymns in the Rgveda Samhita in the manner in which they are recited by Vaidika Brahmans here, as some of the German scholars were anxious to hear how the accents are indicated in pronunciation.

The sight of so many men from different parts of Germany and Europe who had chosen a life of study and thought, and who applied themselves with such devotion and zeal to the study of the sacred language of my country and its varied literature, was very gratifying to me. The spirit that actuated them appeared to be that of the old Rṣis of India, who cared little for worldly possessions, and devoted themselves to a life of study and meditation. In the ancient times in India, whenever any grand sacrifice was performed by a great king, Brahmans from all parts of the country assembled at the place and held debates and discussed abstruse points. One such congress of Rṣis is reported in the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad and the Vāyu-Purāṇa. Janaka, the king of Mithilā, performed a horse-sacrifice, and a great many learned Brahmans from the Kurupaṇcālas or the country about Thanesar, Mathura, Delhi, and Agra flocked to the place. Janaka wished to find out who among these was the most learned and knew the Brahma or the highest truth the best, and therefore brought forth a thousand cows and tied pieces of gold of the weight of ten tolas to the horns of each. Then he said to the Brahmans: "That one among you who knows the Brahma the best should take away these cows." None of the Brahmans dared to take them, when Yājñavalkya said to a pupil of his, "Young man, drive these cows home." The pupil began to do so, when all the other Brahmans got angry, saying, "What, does he think himself to be the one among us who knows the Brahma the best?" Janaka had a priest of the name of Aśvala, who said to him: "Well, Yājñavalkya, are you the one of us all who knows the Brahma the best." Yājñavalkya replied, "I am but an humble servant of
one who knows the Brahma the best; I only want the cows." Then the priest Aśvala put a question to Yājñavalkya, and he was followed by a great many others who put similar questions, requiring him to explain a large variety of points concerning the ritual, the gods, the soul, the supreme cause of the world and the soul of all, good deeds, bad deeds, &c. Among his interlocutors was a lady of the name of Gārgī Vācaknavī who, in her own words, "attacked him with two questions as a warrior of Kāśi or Videhas attacks an enemy with two arrows on his strung bow." Yājñavalkya answered satisfactorily the questions of all. This is a celebrated chapter in that Upaniṣad, and is very important for the history of ancient Indian thought. The idea I endeavoured to bring out in the verses sung by me at the Congress was that this body of holy and learned Rṣis, adored by gods and men, that had assembled at Mithila, the capital of the king of Videhas, on the occasion of the horse-sacrifice, had risen up again at Vienna, the capital of the Emperor of Austria, to dispel the darkness that had overspread the earth in this sinful age of Kali, out of pity for man. Aśvala, the priest of Janaka, had assumed the form of Bühler, Yājñavalkya appeared as Weber and Roth, and Śākala as Kielhorn. Kahoda manifested himself as Jolly; and the remaining Rṣis as Ludwig, Rost, Jacobi, and the rest. There was a Viennese lady who attended the meetings of our section, and who takes very great interest in Indian literature and has read nearly all that has been written about it, as well as translations of Sanskrit works. She was our Gārgī Vācaknavī.

Such a compliment, I thought, these European scholars, and especially the Germans, deserved. Ever since the discovery of Sanskrit, the Europeans have devoted themselves with their usual energy to the study of the language and its literature, and to the solution of the various problems suggested by it. They have successfully treated the affinity of the Sanskrit with the ancient languages of Europe, classified the languages of the civilized world on a scientific principle, and the races that speak
them, shown that the Aryans of India, composed of the three castes, Brahman, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya, belong to the same race as the ancient Greeks and Romans and the nations of modern Europe, except the Turks, the Hungarians, and the Fins, penetrated into the secret of the formation of human speech and the growth of myths, and constituted the science of language and comparative mythology. They have collected manuscripts from all parts of India, and from Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, and Siam; and the Government of India has been assisting their efforts by instituting an archaeological survey and search for Manuscripts. They have examined the Vedas carefully, and traced out a great many facts concerning the original history and condition of the Indian Aryans, and compiled dictionaries, concordances, and grammars. The Mahābhārata, Rāmāyana, some of the Purāṇas, and the law books, as well as the dramatical literature, have been subjected to a similar examination. Buddhism, the memory of which has faded away in India, has again been brought to our notice; and its sacred texts, Manuscripts of which are nowhere now found in India, have been rendered available to us.

In this work of study and research the Germans, of all the nations of Europe, have been the foremost. Most of the great achievements I have briefly indicated above are due to their patient industry and critical acumen. We have had one great French scholar, and there are now two or three. Englishmen first of all discovered Sanskrit, as was of course to be expected from the fact of India's having fallen into their hands, and we have had first-class English scholars, such as Colebrooke and Wilson. But somehow Sanskrit and philological studies have not found a congenial soil in the British isles. While there are at present twenty-five German scholars at least who have been working in the different branches of Sanskrit literature and have published something, we have not more than five among Englishmen. England employs Germans in connection with her philological work. The best Sanskrit scholar in the country is a German, and the Professor of Sanskrit at Edinburgh and the
Librarian of the India office are Germans. There is a German in charge of Manuscripts in the British Museum and the Assistant Librarian at the Bodleian is a Hungarian. The Germans are the Brahmans of Europe, the French the Kṣatriyas, and the English the Vaiśyas; though, as was the case in India, the Brahmans of Europe have now taken to a military occupation. The great excellence of German scholarship consists in the spirit of criticism and comparison that is brought to bear on the facts that come under observation, and in the endeavour made to trace the gradual development of thought and language and to determine the chronological relations of events.

So much for the bright side of the picture. But it has also a dark side, to shut our eyes to which will do no good to the cause or to anybody. The proper and fruitful exercise of the critical and comparative, or what might be called the historical spirit, depends upon innate ability and a naturally sound judgment. These are not to be found everywhere, and often we meet with instances in which very comprehensive conclusions are based upon the most slender evidence. Though it is true that a native does not easily look at the language, thought, and institutions of his country from the critical standpoint, while the first impulse of an intelligent foreigner is to do so, still there are some disadvantages under which the foreigner must labour. He has no full and familiar knowledge of what he subjects to a critical examination. In the case of European Sanskrit scholars there is besides always a very strong disinclination to admit the high antiquity of any book, thought, or institution, and a tendency to trace Greek influence everywhere in our literature; while not seldom the major premise in the reasoning is that the Indians cannot have any good in them, since several times in the course of their history, they allowed themselves to be conquered by foreigners. Oftentimes the belief that the Brahmans are a crafty race prevents a full perception of the truth. Of course, scholars of ability and sound judgment shake off such tendencies and prejudices; and among these I may
But independently of such defects in the exercise of the critical faculty, there are very important branches of Sanskrit literature which are not understood in Germany and Europe. I had a conversation with Dr. Kielhorn on this subject the day after I reached Vienna. I said it appeared to me that works in the narrative or Purānic style and the dramatic plays were alone properly understood in Europe, while those written in the style of discourse or works on philosophy and exegesis were not. He replied that even several of the dramatic plays and works on Poetics were not understood. Mistakes are constantly made when a scholar endeavours to interpret and criticise a work or passages in a work belonging to any of the Śāstras, as we call them; and often the sense of passages containing idiomatic expressions in other works also is not perceived. A scholar reads such a work or interprets such expressions and passages with the aid of a grammar and a dictionary; but a clear understanding of them requires an amount of previous knowledge which cannot be derived from either. As to positive command over Sanskrit, I had an illustration in the shape of a card which was given to me by a Professor at the Congress on which two verses in the easiest of Sanskrit metres, the Anuṣṭubh, composed by him, are printed. In three of the four lines the metre is violated, and there is a bad compound in the second verse. If the study of Greek was not successfully carried on in Western Europe before the fall of Constantinople drove many learned Greeks into that part of the continent, it is of course not reasonable to expect that Sanskrit literature should be properly understood in Europe without instruction from the old Pandits of India. This defect was first of all clearly perceived by those German scholars who spent a good many years in India; and now it has been acknowledged by others also, though there are still some whose reliance on a grammar and a dictionary continues unbounded. And the
Germans have already begun to remedy the defect. Dr. Garbe was sent more than a year ago to this country at the expense of the Prussian Government to study Indian philosophy. He lived at Benares for a year and read one or two works with some of the Pandits there, and has recently returned to his country. Dr. Kielhorn has undertaken to publish an edition of the Kāśika, an old commentary on Pāṇini’s Sūtras, containing copious notes and explanations of a nature to enable the European scholar to understand the intricacies of the style of grammatical exegesis. And on the last day of my stay at Vienna, Dr. Bühler told me that he had on that day called on the Minister of Public Instruction to represent to him the necessity of having an Assistant Professorship of Sanskrit in connection with the University of Vienna. This he means for Dr. Hultzsch; but his ultimate idea is that large Universities, such as those of Berlin and Vienna, should have an Assistant Professorship to be held by a Sanskrit Master of Arts of the Bombay University, and on Dr. Hultzsch being raised to the Professorship or provided for elsewhere, he will have an Indian in his place. This I believe is a good idea, in the interests of both European and Indian Sanskrit scholarship; but the principle involved in it, viz., a close intercourse between the scholars of the two countries, deserves to be carried out in other ways. This also has not escaped the attention of Dr. Bühler; for though he is not now in his bodily form present in India, he carries on an active correspondence with many persons here, and has recently issued a prospectus about a Vienna Oriental Journal which will contain several articles in English intended to be read by us here. I have no doubt that such a close intercourse will be productive of benefit to us here. New ideas and views about matters in Sanskrit literary history are constantly started in Germany, and these will stimulate thought and inquiry among us, and we shall be able to make use of our knowledge either to confirm or refute them, and put forth new ideas and views of our own. It is very much to be wished that more of us devoted ourselves to learning and research. Every year our University turns out a good many Sanskrit scholars, and but few
have hitherto made scholarship the occupation or pleasure of their lives. But physical wants claim attention first, and unless somebody in his liberality makes provision for them, there is little hope that we shall have many scholars among us. The necessity of endowing Professorships for the advancement of learning and science among us was recently urged with characteristic ability on the attention of his audience by the Vice-Chancellor of the University and our President; and I gave expression in my humble way to the same idea in my first Wilson Lecture and in my evidence before the Education Commission; but there is no hope of Government being able to do anything in the matter in the present state of circumstances, while as regards ourselves there is little public spirit among us, and the liberality of Khojas, Parsis, and Hindus flows in other channels, and no one has the power of diverting it into this.

Another feeling which the sittings of the Congress evoked in me and to which I gave expression in my verses was that of admiration for the respect for human nature and brotherly sympathy for mankind which, I thought, were evinced by the interest which so many people took in the condition, the thought, and languages of the people of Asia, Africa and Polynesia, so inferior to Europeans in all that constitutes civilization. I also thought that international congresses such as this were calculated to promote good feeling between the different nations of Europe, so as to render war impossible in the course of time. And from what I saw during my hasty visit it appeared to me that Europe was approaching towards a realization of this ideal. There is hardly so much difference as regards external appearance and manners between the different nations of Europe as there is between the different races of India, though their languages are more widely different than those of Northern India. Their dress, their modes of eating, their social manners, and their institutions are a good deal more alike than ours. Any invention or discovery made in one country finds its way easily into another. The railway trains of one country run in continuation of those
of another, and the postal and telegraphic arrangements are such as one might expect only in a country under one and the same Government. Travellers are always going from one country to another, and everywhere there are hotels where their comfort and convenience are carefully attended to. So that, to an external observer, Europe appears in times of peace to be one country. And I saw a pantomimic show in one of the theatres in Vienna which intensified my general impression. At first girls in European costume appeared dancing on the stage. Then was shown the digging of the Suez Canal and the plying of steam-boats in it. This was followed by a representation of the cutting of the Mount Cenis tunnel; and afterwards appeared men and women in the costumes of all countries, with some in our Indian costume, and a number of negro boys. And they all danced together in joy, the negro boys beating time. This idea of a universal brotherhood was, I thought, the most precious product of European civilization, more valuable by far than railways and electric telegraphs. And it was in such a mood of thought that I opened my versified Sanskrit address with the words, "Supreme over all is that brotherly feeling for mankind which prompts the constant endeavours of these men to study the languages, the sciences, and arts of Eastern races so utterly different from themselves;" and ended it by saying, "May Congresses such as this conduce to knit different countries together in friendship, to the cessation of war, and to the prosperity of mankind."

I was however not free from disturbing thoughts. Though all this Oriental learning had probably its origin in a respect for human nature, still a mere love of reputation and a desire to conform with the fashion of the day are the motive causes in most individual cases. Though the whole external look of Europe makes for peace, still ever since the idea expressed in the lines

46 [ B. G. Bhandarkar's Works, Vol I. ]
Till the war-drum throbbed no longer and the battle-flags were furled

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.*

was distinctly formulated, there have been many wars in Europe,
and many more times have the Europeans fought Asiatics and
Africans and crushed them. And I remember that the advance­
ment of oriental learning was looked forward to in some quarters
as one of the happy results of one of these latter wars; so that,
love of oriental learning is not necessarily associated with good­
will for the oriental races. A German Sanskrit Professor once
said to me that he liked social equality being given to the
natives of India, but not political equality, and that he considered
the Ilbert Bill to be mischievous. I told him that in Ceylon and
the presidency towns the native magistrates did actually exercise
the power of trying European offenders. He did not know that,
he said, but still proceeded to defend his position, and, bringing
his oriental learning to his aid, observed, “Oh, Buddhism has
softened the Ceylonese, so that they might exercise that power;
but the case is different in India.” I listened quietly, thanking
my country’s stars that she had not fallen into the hands of
Germans. And two of the most civilized nations in Europe have
for the last fifteen years been making preparations with their
usual energy for a grand human sacrifice, in which the blood of
about eight million human victims is to be poured on the altar
of the goddess of nationality.” Even the Oriental professors of
those two nations are full of warlike sentiments; and there is a
firm determination to destroy the hated enemy or die. So that,
the spirit of humanity, though evolved in the course of European
history, has been entirely driven out of the field of action by
the spirit of nationality. The very physical energy of the
European races and the importance attached to mere material
greatness are unfavourable to the further growth of that spirit.
And in this matter at least the prophecy of the old Locksley
Hall has not been fulfilled; and there is ground for the despo·

*Tennyson, Locksley Hall.
Energy of the European Races

dency expressed in the new. After the Congress was over I stayed for a week more in Vienna, and saw the museums, the picture galleries, and other sights. I left the place on Sunday, the 10th of October, for Venice, where I spent three days.

I have already taken up so much of your time, that I have little left for conveying to you some of my general impressions. I will, however, do so hastily. Everywhere the energy of the European races and the orderly shape that they give to everything made a deep impression on my mind. On my way from Brindisi to Calais, I observed on the sides of the railway in Italy vines and trees planted in straight lines at equal distances, and in Southern France, happy-looking villages with nice roads laid out, and grass so well trimmed as to give the fields and even the slopes of hills a smooth appearance. Everywhere the hand of man was to be seen. In London I was impressed with the immense wealth of the people, and their devotion to business. In private dwellings and in shops all things are nicely arranged. The shops are generally in substantial buildings, and the shopkeeper is always seen standing or sitting on a high stool, ready to attend to his customers. The affairs of every large establishment where a number of men are employed are conducted with the regularity of a machine. Wherever I went I could not avoid making comparisons between what I saw and what exists in India. I felt that with our fields neglected except for getting a harvest or two, our things lying about in a disorderly condition in our houses and our shops, and our shops constructed of wooden planks and our shopkeepers often dozing in their seats, we are considerably inferior in point of energy to the European races, and especially to the English. When I saw the exhibition at Birmingham and observed how some improvement or other is always made in machines, implements, and arts, and how new arts and industries spring up, I could not avoid remarking to my kind friend Colonel Phelps, “Your intellects are always awake, ours are dormant.” Indian implements and arts are now in that condition in which they were in the time of Manu.
The English people possess a vast power of organization. Those of them who hold the same view on any matter easily combine together to advance that view, and thus form clubs and associations. I was struck when I heard that the National Liberal Club in London had 5,000 members. In India hardly so many as five persons can be found to lay aside their jealousies and combine for the advancement of a cause. In every one of the towns I visited, there are one or more museums, and in most of them picture galleries. Both the Government and the people take pride in them and in other institutions of the kind, and are ready with their contributions of money for their improvement. We have no museum anywhere in India worthy of the name, and picture galleries are never dreamt of. I saw a splendid free library at Birmingham maintained by the Municipality, and in the Guildhall in London, and was told that all the municipalities in England had such free libraries. We never heard of anything of the kind in India. Even such a rich municipality as that of Bombay, with its surplus of five lacs, does not maintain an institution of the kind, and it is a matter of no little wonder that the idea should not have been put into the heads of the members of our Corporation by any European gentlemen or a native who has been to England. The means of communication throughout Europe are, as I have already stated, perfect, though the Customs Officers on the frontiers of a country give some trouble, and there are establishments in all places for the accommodation of travellers. Travelling, therefore, is so easy, that a timid Hindu like myself, who cannot speak French or German, could go from London to Vienna, and thence to Venice, alone, without the least difficulty. All that I saw in Europe deepened the impression that, as we are, we are an inferior race in point of energy. We are far behind Europe, and especially England, in all those matters that I have just noticed, and ours is what Principal Wordsworth calls a feeble civilization; though I believe the vigorous civilization of Europe is now on its trial, and the war between the French and the Germans which must come some
day, and the socialistic and nihilistic movements, if they make further progress, will determine whether it is not one-sided, and its ideals have not been chiefly, if not exclusively, material. And in this respect we should by no means be very anxious to realize it among ourselves.

One point more, and I have done. When I set my foot on the soil of Italy and saw the Italian Custom-house officers, policemen and others, exercising their authority, the thought entered my mind, "But a few years ago this country was cut up into a number of little states, most of them despotically governed, and now these people have become one nation and got representative institutions"; and I cast a wistful eye at their newly-acquired independence. While in London I once went to see the Tower with my friend Dr. Rhys Davids, and when I was shown the place where Anne Boleyn, Catherine Howard, and Lady Jane Grey were executed, and also the dungeon into which those persons who were obnoxious to the reigning prince or his courier were cast quietly and in a manner unknown to anybody, I observed to my friend, "You are a wonderful people; three centuries ago you were governed by monarchs nearly as absolute and despotic as any that reigned in India, and you have now gradually worked out your freedom without shedding much blood; while we have not succeeded in emancipating ourselves during the last twenty-five centuries." Notions such as these were present in my mind during the time I was in Europe; but after a while I asked myself, what it was that I wished? Should I like that the English had never conquered the country? I at once said, "No." For, as I had already observed to my friend we really were not free under the old native monarchs. Under them there was no possibility of our having any idea of that European civilization which I so much admire, there was hardly much security of life and property, and there was little possibility of a man travelling from one province to another without being looted. And we should in that case have had no post-office or roads or railways or electric telegraphs or printing presses; and
above all, that education which has now opened our eyes to our own defects, and given birth to new aspirations. And how was it possible that they should not subjugate the country when it was in the lowest state of political degradation, with selfishness reigning supreme, rival competitors for thrones or for power intriguing against each other and asking their aid, and the people at large maintaining their traditional indifference? Would I then wish that the English voluntarily retired from the country—for driving them away was out of the question—and left us to govern ourselves? Even here I had no hesitation in saying "No." If they should retire, we should immediately return to the old state of things. For though we talk about public spirit, public duty, nationality, and things of that sort, these ideas have not deeply sunk into our nature. Self-interest is as strong a motive with us as it ever was before. There is a lamentable want of serious thought amongst us. Childishness is rampant everywhere. We are divided into castes and communities that have not yet learnt to make common cause with each other. We still want that energy and those orderly modes of action, and that power of organization, which are necessary in order that we may progress in civilization; and we shall only lose the ground which we have gained under the British, and shall be unable to form a strong Government; and all the benefits of a higher civilization that we at present enjoy will be lost to us. I believe it to be an act of Divine Providence that the English alone of all the candidates who appeared about the same time for the empire of India should have succeeded. The Marathas, the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the French were all weighed in the balance and found wanting, and the empire was given to the English. For the Marathas possessed the usual vices of Indian rulers, the Portuguese were intolerant and forced their religion on the people, the Dutch have made the natives of the countries they conquered hewers of wood and drawers of water, and the French are volatile and have no settled principles. Of the other nations of Europe, the Germans and Austrians do not them
selves enjoy that freedom that we do under the British, and Russia is the most despotic of all European States, and is perhaps as barbarous as ourselves without our mildness. But England is a nation that has worked out its freedom. She gave liberty to the Negro slaves at a vast sacrifice of money; and it is the only country in Europe where the sentiment of humanity has made progress. It is impossible that such a country should treat us as slaves; or, like the Dutch, reduce us to the condition of mere artisans and labourers. Reflections such as these quieted me; and I was content that the English should rule over us, notwithstanding that there are very few Sanskrit scholars among them. In this frame of mind I got on board the steamer “Siam.” The next morning, a fellow-passenger of the name of Colonel Noble, Commissioner of Sahet Mahet in Oudh, came and sat near me. He asked me a variety of questions, one of which was, “How will you manage about caste after your return to your country.” I said: “When I go back I shall live with my family as a Hindu that I am, as if nothing extraordinary had happened, and will not invite caste opposition. If, notwithstanding, I find myself in difficulties, these must be put up with; for it is of the highest importance that we should visit Europe, if we would march on, side by side with our rulers, towards a higher goal.” “That word ‘rulers,’” says Col. Noble, “that you have used, I do not like. For, it is the feeling of a great many Englishmen, that we are but your brothers to direct and guide you towards a brighter future.” I was highly delighted, and thought that if all the statesmen and officers in whose hands the destinies of India were placed were actuated in all that they did by such a feeling as this, we should be the happiest people on earth; we should forget that we were governed by foreigners, and look upon the British Government as our own national government. There were a good many other passengers on board who were very courteous and kind to me, and with whom I had pleasant conversations. Among them were Mr. Sheppard, Revenue Commissioner, Northern Division, and a good many other civilians
belonging to Bombay, Madras, and the North Western Provinces. The charge of hauteur, usually brought against Anglo-Indians, I found to be false on board the steamer. The Siam dragged its slow length along the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean, and at last we found ourselves in the harbour of Bombay. In the bustle and commotion which followed in consequence of everybody's desire to go on shore at once, I made my way to the place where Colonel Noble was, and took his leave with the words, "Your sentiments with regard to my people are, no less than your name, Noble," and came away.
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पौरस्यानां जनानां निररितियमापि स्वामातो भेदभाजां
मायामयिकल्पसाधिन्मयियेपि संतंतं सम्पृक्तः।
येन्यायेण समेताः सात्मचितवच्चन्तोधन्येवेवेते
संतं सोदरिभाषो जगति विजयते मानुष्ट्वातुजनवः॥१॥

नानादिवेदेवार्थामथामथितुपुष्यजनानांगतात्वर्तिपुर्वयाः-
मायेयास्यमूलस्य नृपस्यकृतमर्य राज्याः समाक्षिः।
देवेह्स्याथ्मेवं पुरवर्मिनिहिताचारितं दुःष्ठसंघ
ब्राह्मानासुप्रीणां सकलाहरतेवेतिन्द्रानां समारभी॥२॥

अथवलो मयति बुद्धरूपः
याज्ञवल्क्य इत्र वेदव्रोहोः।
शाक्ति किं भवेकिल्लानाः
यः कहीर इति साध स योऽहि।॥२॥

गार्गी बाचक्कवेड़ा पुरंंहि विषभाषि मि।
ग्रन्थावलीक्रणं यस्य जीवावलिवार्य महत्।॥४॥

अर्यन्यमुद्विग्नहरंतयाकुबिन्दुलाभांमध्येऽतंततनुवंछ
सर्वं चतुर्वर्तः। अतिस्रुतिपरा ज्ञानिकचदनवृहतः।
चर्च नित्यप्रभावविविदं गाढं तमः सर्वतो
द्वीरेक्षरायाधितः सक्रुणः से यं धुमनिः गणः।॥५॥

समतत्वं वराकों गिरिवनयार्थपरंसमासमं प्रापः।
प्रेमं पार्श्ववं बरं च देशाब्रो नो भवेकिल्लिः।॥६॥

आयोऽवनिवासिन्दु तदविद्विषितवान्तारामवतः।
साहदा याचं विवृद्धरूपं तथा च मय्।॥७॥

राजस्या स्थेवाभाव विग्रहस्य शामाय च।
कल्यातीदृशो सन्मुखजनां च खुदते ||८॥

* See ante p. 345.

THE
CRITICAL, COMPARATIVE, AND HISTORICAL METHOD
OF
INQUIRY,
AS APPLIED TO SANSCRIT SCHOLARSHIP AND PHILOLOGY AND
INDIAN ARCHEOLOGY,

[Being a lecture read at the Public Meeting held under the auspices of the Free Church College Literary Society of Bombay on the 31st of March, 1888, originally published by the Author at Bombay, 1888].

A critical inquirer is one who does not accept an account of an occurrence just as it is presented to him, whether orally or in writing. He subjects it to certain tests calculated to prove its truth or otherwise. He takes care, for instance, to ascertain whether the person giving the account was an eye-witness to the occurrence, and if so, whether he was an unprejudiced and at the same time an intelligent observer. If his information is based on other sources, the critic endeavours to ascertain the credibility or otherwise of those sources. When it is a thing or a verified occurrence that he has to deal with, he does not satisfy himself with that view of its nature and relations that appears plausible at first sight. He seeks for extraneous assistance to enable himself to arrive at a correct view. One of the most efficacious means employed by him is comparison of like things or occurrences. This comparison enables him to separate the accidents of the thing or occurrence from its essential nature, and sometimes to arrive at a law which includes the thing or occurrence as a particular case and explains it. Though comparison may thus be considered one of the means of a critical examination, still its own proper results are so important that it deserves to be considered an independent method of inquiry. The history of a thing, i.e. a comparison of the various forms it presents at different well-ascertained periods, is also of the
greatest use for the determination of its real nature. Often, when no written history is available, the inquirer determines the historical or chronological relations between the several forms of a thing by referring them to an obvious standard, and arrives at some important conclusions based on such relations. Thus for instance, the Greek ἐσμὲς 'we are' is more ancient than the Sanskrit smas, for it retains the original a of the root as in the form of e which Sanskrit has lost; and the Sanskrit santi 'they are,' more ancient than the Greek 'enti' which has lost the whole root as. From an observation of many such forms the conclusion to be drawn is that Greek is not derived from Sanskrit, nor Sanskrit from Greek, but both from an older form of speech. The comparative and historical methods correspond to the inductive method used in the physical and experimental sciences. In those branches of knowledge in which you cannot from the nature of the case make experiments, you have recourse to comparison and historical observation. The inductive method began to be used in Europe about the end of the sixteenth century, and since that time very great progress has been made in the discovery of the laws of the physical world. The critical, comparative, and historical methods began to be well understood and employed about the end of the eighteenth century, and within a hundred years since that time, an equally amazing progress has been made in other departments of knowledge; and geology, paleontology, comparative philology or the science of language, comparative mythology, evolution and the origin of species, scientific history, comparative jurisprudence, archeology, sound scholarship, and even comparative religion are the grand results. Before the employment of the inductive and experimental method such theories as that nature abhors a vacuum passed current; and before the application of the comparative and historical method the beliefs that the world was created in six days and that the Hebrew was the primitive language of which all the rest were offshoots were equally prevalent. But just as an experiment with a tube longer than thirty-
three feet, in the case of water, was enough to explode that theory, so did the observation and comparison of the different strata of which the earth is composed and the discovery of Sanskrit and its comparison with Greek, Latin, and other languages dispel those beliefs. And this critical and comparative method is necessary not only for increasing our knowledge of the world and of historical man, but also for arriving at correct views of things in ordinary practical life. I must use criticism and comparison if I wish to have a true knowledge of the character of any man, public or private, or to understand any individual action of his correctly. Criticism and comparison are necessary for the politician, the legislator, the lawyer, the merchant, and, last but not least, the newspaper writer if he is to rise above the level of scurrilous journalism.

Criticism and comparison are of use not only in enabling us to arrive at a knowledge of what is true, but also of what is good and rational. A man born in a certain country with certain social and religious customs and institutions, and in a certain range of ideas, thinks those customs, institutions, and that range of ideas to be perfectly good and rational, and sees nothing objectionable in them, unless he is a man of genius. When, however, he comes to know of other customs, other institutions, and other ideas, and compares them with those to which he has become accustomed, he is able to find out any evil that there may be in the latter, and to see what is better and more rational. The comparison of the jurisprudence of different countries is calculated to afford valuable hints to the legislator for the improvement of the laws of his own country. Similarly, the critical observation and comparison of the social institutions of other countries and even of other religions will afford guidance to the social and religious reformer. Critical comparison is also of use in giving us juster notions of the beautiful. These general observations, applicable as they are to all the branches of knowledge I have indicated, I will expand and illustrate by taking instances from those subjects to which I have devoted some
attention, \textit{viz.} Sanskrit scholarship and philology, and Indian archeology.

Before admitting the narrative contained in an ancient work to be historical, one ought to ask oneself whether the object of the author was to please and instruct the reader and excite the feeling of wonder, or to record events as they occurred. If the former, the narrative cannot be accepted as historical, but legendary. Our obvious and almost axiomatic notions of ordinary probability should also be brought to bear on the question. If a king, for instance, in such a narrative is represented to have reigned a thousand, or even two or three hundred years, one ought to understand that the author wants to excite the feeling of wonder and admiration in his reader, and was in all likelihood under the influence of that feeling, himself. If we apply these tests to our existing Sanskrit literature, we must declare the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata, and the Purāṇas to be not historical works. Of course, it is possible that they may have a historical basis, and some of the persons mentioned in them may have really existed; but we cannot assert that they did exist, without corroborative evidence such as is to be derived from contemporary inscriptions and the historical writings of foreigners. Now, if the object of the author be the latter, and the narrative answers to our tests of ordinary probability, the work must be accepted as historical. But we have very few such works in Sanskrit literature now extant. Probably, there were many more, but they are lost to us. The Vikramāṇkacarita, the Harṣacarita, the Gauḍavadha, and the Rājatarāṇginī are works of this nature. I will also include deeds of grants inscribed on metallic plates, stone-inscriptions, and coins among the historical documents now available to us. It appears to have been the custom in ancient times, as it is even now, to preserve genealogies of royal families. We find some given in the Purāṇas. These have a historical value as they are confirmed by inscriptions. But as the readings have in the course of time become corrupt, and the genealogies of different royal families seem to have been confused together,
they are not to be relied on implicitly, without check and comparison. Now as to the contemporary caritras or the deeds of kings spoken of above, it ought to be remembered that the writers, being dependents or servants of the princes whose account is given therein, cannot be expected to be impartial historians of their patrons and masters; and must be regarded as open to the temptation of bestowing extravagant praise on them and their ancestors. Accordingly, the virtues that they ascribe to the princes in the most general terms cannot safely be accepted as historically true; but the specific statements such as those of their being at war with certain other princes or of their having constructed certain public works must be; and if corroborative evidence becomes available, we find them confirmed. Thus, all the copperplate grants of the successors of Pulakesi II of the Calukya dynasty of Mahârâṣṭra, who ascended the throne in the year 610 A. C., speak of his having defeated or remained unsubdued by Harśavardhana, the sovereign lord of the whole of Uttarāpatha or Northern India, and obtained in consequence the title of Parameśvara or sovereign lord. This is confirmed by what the Chinese pilgrim Hwhan Thsang, who travelled in India from 629 A. C. to 645 A. C., tells us about the prince. Śilāditya, as Harśavardhana is also named by him, invited the ablest generals, and sending a large army under them, and on one occasion taking the command himself, fought with the people of Mahârâṣṭra who were at that time ruled over by Pulakesi, but he was not able to conquer them. Now, the point to be considered with reference to such a book as the Rājatarāngini is that though the author is to be considered a contemporary historian so far as the period in which he lived is concerned, what were his authorities for the history of previous times? He does mention previous writers and speak of having consulted eight historical works. But he begins his history with Gonarda I, who was the contemporary of Yudhiṣṭhira, and gives three names after him. The next 35 princes are, he says, unknown by name; and then mentions 13 more. This is the period for which, he says, he did not find
full authorities, and mentions the books from which he got the 17 names given by him. The next period begins in 1184 B.C., when a prince of the name of Gonarda III ascended the throne. The history is then carried on by Kalhana without a break up to his own times. One of the princes, however, is represented by him to have reigned for 300 years; and the average duration of the reigns of the princes in the different groups is sometimes 48 years, sometimes 38. When it is remembered that this varies from 18 to 22 only, the chronology of Kalhana in the older portion of his history must be considered as not reliable. Though it appears very probable that he himself did not put on paper anything for which he found no authority, the works he consulted cannot be considered to be quite reliable themselves. And looking generally to the manner in which the text of old works gets corrupt in the course of time, this is perfectly intelligible. Still, since Kalhana mentions his having used inscriptions, and edicts or proclamations of kings, and states with what public works in Kashmir the names of some of the princes are connected and makes specific statements about them of another nature, the narrative portion of his history should, I think, be considered generally reliable, and also the chronology of the period nearer to his own time. But the older chronology and even to a smaller extent the latter require rectification, as we have seen from the internal evidence; and there is ample external evidence also. For Kalhana mentions three Turuska or Scythian kings who reigned before his historical period, i.e. before 1184 B.C. and whose names he gives as Huska, Juška, and Kaniška. There are coins of all these kings, and inscriptions also, from which it appears that the last was the founder of the dynasty. Kalhana mentions Buddhism as flourishing in Kashmir during the reigns of these monarchs, and represents them to have constructed monasteries in a country in the vicinity which appears to me to be Afghanistan. Now here, Buddhistic records and traditions, which represent Kaniška as a great patron of the religion, confirm Kalhana's account. But his chronology is entirely wrong.
For, from the evidence of the inscriptions, coins, and Buddhistic traditions, Kaniska has been placed about the end of the first century of the Christian era; and I have found reason to refer him to the middle of the second. Similarly, a comparison with Chinese chronology, which is believed to be very accurate, has led to a correction in the date of a later prince named Lalitāditya, who conquered Yaśovarman, the sovereign of Kanoj and the patron of Bhavabhūti and Vākpatirāja, the author of the Gaudāvadha, and who, according to Kalhana's chronology, reigned from 695 to 732 A.C. The Chinese account represents his brother who was king before him to have sent an embassy to China in 713 A.C.; while according to Kalhana that brother died in 691 A.C. But even supposing that the Chinese account is not correct, Prof. Jacobi has recently calculated the date of an annular eclipse of the sun which is represented in the Gaudāvadha to have occurred about the time Yaśovarman's position in his kingdom was shaken, apparently by a foreign invader whom that scholar understands to be Lalitāditya. The eclipse occurred on the 14th of August 733 A.C. and reached its middle at Kanoj at 40 minutes after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Now, if the danger to Yaśovarman's position that is spoken of was really that caused by Lalitāditya, which appears indeed very likely, Lalitāditya must have been living and in the height of his glory in 733 A.C., while the Rājatarāṅgini represents him to have died in 732 A.C.

Here I have given you a specimen of the sort of criticism to which books or documents of a professedly historical character ought to be subjected. As to the other class of works—the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, and all poems, plays, and religious books such as the Vedas,—though the narrative therein contained is not historical, still they are of great historical value in so far as they place before us the thoughts and feelings, the aims and aspirations, and the manners and customs of the people at or, possibly in some cases, before the time when they were written, and thus present to us a picture of the life and civilization of the
period. If, for instance, woven or sewn garments, ships, chariots, and weapons of war such as a sword and an axe, are incidentally mentioned in the Rgveda, it must be inferred that these were used at the time when the hymns, in which they are mentioned, were composed, and the arts of manufacturing them were known and practised. If the Atharvaveda tells us that "when a woman has had one husband before, and gets another, they shall not be separated if they offer the ajapañcaudana offering," we may safely infer that the practice of widow-marriages existed in those days. We may arrive at the same conclusion, and also infer the existence of polygamy in some cases at least and the absence of polyandry from the words of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa that "one [man] may have many wives; but one [woman] cannot have many husbands simultaneously." When we find that the Mantras or formulas contained in the Rgveda which the bridegroom addresses to the bride on the occasion of marriage contain allusions to the indissoluble character of the union into which they have entered and to their bringing up a family of children, it must be supposed that when these Mantras or formulas were composed, the two parties to the marriage were not children but capable of understanding and appreciating the sense of what one says to the other. When in the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata Kṣatriya girls are represented as calling a meeting of their possible lovers and choosing that one from among them that they liked, the custom must be considered as existing at or before the time when they were written. In Bāna's Kādambari the Queen Vilāsavati is spoken of as going to the temple of Mahākāla and hearing the Mahābhārata read. This shows that our present custom of reading that work and others of the kind in temples for the edification of visitors existed in the middle of the seventh century after Christ, when Bāna wrote; and his mentioning the Bhagavadgītā as a part of the Mahābhārata shows that the work is older than the seventh century and formed an episode of the epic then as it does now. From the fact that Rāma, the hero of that very
popular epic the Rāmāyāna, is represented as a rigid adherent of truth, regardless of the worldly sacrifices that such a course entails, as unswerving in his attachment and fidelity to his one wife, and as possessed of such equanimity and firmness of character that "when he was invited to his father's palace to be installed as Crown Prince, but was instead sent to live in a forest, divested of all worldly greatness and enjoyments, there was not the slightest change observable in his countenance," the conclusion is legitimate that the higher Hindu mind loved and admired these virtues. A wife's faithful devotion to her husband and her following him cheerfully through dire vicissitudes of fortune, with her love and respect for him unabated, were equally objects of admiration with Hindus, as is shown by the characters of Sītā, Damayanti and Tārā.

Perhaps the distinction between the ways in which the two classes of works are used for historical puroses, will be best illustrated by a specimen of the mistakes which writers in the vernacular papers make on the point. One such writer, waxing warm in the course of a dissertation against the Poona High School for Girls said, "What, had we not learned women in ancient times such as Gārgī, Sītā, and Tārā? But did they attend a High School? What then is the necessity of a High School in these days?" And on another occasion in that same paper, another or the same writer in giving advice to the women of these days said something to this effect, "You are ambitious of rivalling Gārgī, Sītā, and Tārā; but you should attend to your domestic duties first." I do not remember the exact words now, but this is certain that the writer made no distinction between Gārgī, and Sītā or Tārā as historical personages. Sītā and Tārā occur in poetical or legendary works; and though they may have existed, we have no grounds for believing that they did. They are not represented as possessed of learning, though they were educated women; but supposing they were, all that it would prove is that in those times it was possible for women to become learned, and that some did become so. But the existence of Gārgī
as a historical personage, as a woman of learning, and as a Vedic teacher, is not a matter of reasonable doubt. For a Rgvedin Brahman has, as a portion of his daily religious exercises, to recite portions of the Vedas and other sacred treatises, and pour water in the name of and, technically, for the satisfaction of three classes of beings, viz. deities, Rsis, and Ácāryas. This is prescribed in the Grhya Sūtra of Áśvalāyana, and the names are given there. The Rsis mentioned are the composers of the Rgveda hymns,—Grtsamada, Viśvāmitra, Vasistha &c.; and since these hymns exist, their authors also must have existed. The Ácāryas are the Vedic teachers, or writers as we should call them in these days, and in the list there are the names of authors of works called Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, some of which have come down to our times. Thus, Śākalya whose name occurs in the list was the author of the existing Pada text of the Rgveda; Pīṅgale wrote a treatise on the sacrificial rites which is mentioned by the grammarians; Áśvalāyana did the same and his work is now extant; Aitareya and Śāmkhyaṇa were the authors of Brāhmaṇas which are extant; Śaunaka wrote the Rgveda Prātiśākhya; and Bāskala and Śākala were the names of teachers of two different recensions of the Rgveda. All these being historical personages, the three women, Gārgi Vācaknavī, Sulabhā Maitreyi, and Vādava Prāṭitheyī, whose names occur in that same list of Ácāryas or teachers, must be so likewise, though their works have not come down to us.

Since then it is from our ancient literature that we have to find out the history of our people, it becomes a thing of the greatest importance to determine the form in which the works we are concerned with, were written by their authors. The readings of passages are not the same in different manuscripts of the same work. A variety of this nature we find to a pretty large extent even in ordinary works such as the poems and dramatic plays. Sometimes, numbers of the whole stanzas are to be found in certain manuscripts and not in others, as in the case of Kalidāsa’s Śākuntala. But in the Rāmāyāna and the
Mahābhārata, the two most important works of the non-Vedic period; the differences are bewildering. No two manuscripts, from different parts of the country agree. Often there are, in some, whole chapters which are omitted in others. Sometimes, new stories or legends are found. It is, therefore, the duty of the critical scholar to collect Manuscripts from different parts of the country and collate them, with a view to arrive at a correct text. In the performance of this task, which often is very laborious, he ought to be guided by definite principles. He should, in choosing or rejecting a certain reading or a certain passage, see whether it gives good sense, whether it agrees with the context, whether it is in keeping with the author's general way of thinking, whether it is found in the oldest manuscripts, whether the idea or mode of expression was current in the author's time, whether it involves redundancy or tautology, and so on. In some parts of India such as Bengal, people have been in the habit of taking very great liberties with the text of their author; and in Southern India they have been as a general rule very conservative. This fact I would take into account in determining the correct text of a work. When, however, the differences are very great, the best way is to treat the texts found in different provinces as independent editions or recensions. And this is what the old Indian Vedic scholars did. In the Vedic texts also different readings sprang up in the course of time; and one active cause of this was the fact that they were handed down orally. But when scholars like Śākalya, Śaunaka, Kātyāyana, and others arose and gave a definite form to the Vedic literature, they took into account these differences and established separate recensions or editions of the texts, known to us now by the name of Śākhās, which represent the forms of the text taught in different schools, such as those of Śakala, Bāskala, the Taittirīyas, the Maitrāyaniyas, the Kāṇvas, the Mādhyandinas &c. It is the business of a scholar of the present day to compare these several texts, as well as the several recensions of later works, determine the circumstances under which they arose and their mutual rela-
Now as to the mode of interpretation of the texts so settled. The first rule is that a word as occurring in a book must be interpreted in the sense which usage has given to it. Etymology may serve as a guide; but it ought never to be set above usage. Consequently, no word should be understood in an etymological sense only. Oftentimes it is difficult to find the correct etymology, and a man has recourse to one that is fanciful. An interpretation of a book based on such fanciful etymologies must be incorrect. Then again, the literature of a country is divisible into periods, and the usage of one period differs from that of another. A word, therefore, occurring in a certain book, should be understood in the sense which it has in the usage of the period in which the book was written. A better way still is to interpret it in the sense in which the author himself uses it in other parts of his work. Our oldest literary period is that of the Vedas, and this again is clearly divisible into the period of the hymns and the period of the Brähmanas. The language of the hymns is archaic and very different from the later Sanskrit; that of the Brähmanas is much nearer to the classical Sanskrit. The hymns contain a great many words which do not occur in later Sanskrit, and there are also a good many which have a different sense there from that which they have in the latter. Under these circumstances, the only proper way to understand the hymns is to bring together and compare the passages in which the same word occurs, taking etymology as a guide only where necessary. In the same manner, the ideas and modes of thinking which from our acquaintance with the period we have seen to be prevalent should be referred to for help in interpreting a passage. If, instead of resorting to these methods, we take an isolated passage and interpret it according to modern usage, modern ideas, and fanciful or even true etymology, we may make it mean anything; and we shall thus find in the Vedas not only pure theism,
but even railways and electric telegraphs. These observations are also applicable to works belonging to other periods.

Having disposed of books and other written documents, I will now endeavour to estimate the value of traditions. If we accept traditions as we find them, we shall often be deceived. There is a tradition among us, for instance, that Bhavabhūti and Kālidāsa were contemporaries; but we have now found that Bhavabhūti lived in the first quarter of the eighth century of the Christian Era, and Kālidāsa long before 634 A. C., since he is mentioned as a famous poet in an inscription bearing that date and also by Bāna who lived in the middle of the seventh century. Bhavabhūti, it has recently been discovered, was a pupil of Kumārilabhaṭṭa; and Kumārilabhaṭṭa quotes from Kālidāsa's Šākuntala. Similarly, the authors, Dhanvantarin, Kṣaṇaka, Amarasimha, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira, Vararuci, and others who formed the traditional nine gems, are said to have lived at the court of Vikramāditya the founder of the Saṃvat Era, the initial date of which is 57 B. C. But Varāhamihira, as stated by Āmarāja in his commentary on Brahmagupta's Khaṇḍakhaḍya, died in Śaka 509 or 587 A. C.; and the epoch year of his Paṇcasiddhāntikā is 427 Śaka corresponding to 505 A. C.; and the existence of Vikramāditya in 57 B. C. has not yet been traced. Alberuni, who accompanied Mahmud of Ghazni in his invasion of Gujarāt in the early part of the eleventh century, reports a tradition that the Gupta era dates from the extermination of the Gupta dynasty. But princes of the Gupta dynasty date their inscriptions in their era, which therefore, was in use before their extermination. Tradition makes Pāṇini a contemporary of Kātyāyana, and represents him as having been a blockhead who by austerities pleased Śiva and obtained a new grammar from him. Kātyāyana held a disputation with him for eighty days and, though Pāṇini proved a powerful antagonist, he was ultimately vanquished. The fact, however, as we know it, is that Kātyāyana is the writer of Vārtikas or comments on Pāṇini’s grammar, in which he explains, rectifies, and supplements Pāṇini’s rules. It was in consequence of his
having thus rectified and supplemented Pāṇini that the story of
his having vanquished him must have arisen,—and traditions often
have a basis of this nature and no better—but it is impossible that
he should have written those comments, a good many of which
are explanatory on the work of a contemporary. Besides, from
a comparison of the works of the two, it appears that the Sanskrit
language was in a somewhat more archaic condition in the time
of Pāṇini. Hence, therefore, the tradition cannot be true; and
there are also inherent improbabilities in it. Sometimes the
tradition of one sect contradicts that of another. The Śvetāmbara
Jainas, for instance, claim to represent the original Jainism and
speak of the Digambara sect as having been founded by one
Śivahūti in 83 a. c.; and give childish explanations of the origin
of the two peculiar doctrines of that sect, vīrt. nudity and denial
of absolution to women. The Digambaras, on the other hand,
represent themselves to be the original Jainas, and state that a
sect of the name of Ardhaphālaka separated from them about 272
b. c., and out of that arose after a long time the Śvetāmbara sect.
Still, however, traditions are not to be entirely rejected. An
endeavour should be made to ascertain their antiquity, as
their credibility must be considered to be proportionate
to it; and if they are in themselves probable and
stand all critical tests, they may be provisionally accepted.
Thus, the tradition about the nine gems has been traced
up to the year 1,005 Saṁvat or 948 A. D. In an inscription
bearing that date, found at Buddha Gayā, it is stated that Vikramā-
ditya was a renowned monarch in whose court there were nine
learned men celebrated under the epithet of the Nava-ratnāni or
nine jewels of whom Amaradeva was one. That portion of the
tradition which refers to Vikramāditya’s being a great patron of
learning ascends still higher into antiquity. In the introduction to
Vasavadatta, a work mentioned by Bāna in his Harshacarita and
consequently written before the middle of the seventh century,
its author Subandhu, who also is mentioned by name as a
previous poet in the Gaṇḍavadha by Vākpatirāja,—who lived in
the middle of the eighth century,—speaks regretfully of the sweet or tasteful poesy of the time of Vikramāditya, having, when he lived, dried up like the waters of a lake which once was full. And the manner of his regret, looks like that of one who lived near to the times of Vikramāditya. But nothing has yet been found to confirm the date; and it occurs only in the Jyotirvidabharana, the author of which pretends to be the great Kālidāsa, but which has been satisfactorily proved to be but a recent forgery by all scholars who have noticed it. Since the tradition is thus confirmed, it may be accepted as correct; but the date of the nine jewels and of their patron Vikramāditya should be taken to be that which we have got for Varāhamihira on unimpeachable evidence. And a great king of the name of Harṣa Vikramāditya is mentioned by Kalhana in the Rājatarāṅgini as a paramount sovereign ruling at Ujjayini. He drove away Śakas and all Mlecchas from the country, and was a great patron of learning. According to Kalhana's chronology which in this place is, as I have already observed, very faulty, this Vikramāditya lived in the first half of the second century of the Christian era. But description of the king suits so well the patron of the nine gems, that we may correct the date assigned by Kalhana in the light of that of Varāhamihira, and suppose Harṣa Vikramāditya to have reigned at Ujjayini in the middle of the sixth century and patronized Kālidāsa, Amarasīthha, Varāhamihira, and the rest. And nothing that has yet been discovered goes against the contemporaneity of those three; so that the tradition, when corrected as regards the date of Vikramāditya, agrees with everything that is known and seems highly probable. It may incidentally be observed here that Subandhu appears thus to have lived after Vikramāditya and before Bāna, that is between 550 and 650 A. C. And this is in keeping with his regretful mode of expression noticed above; and both together lend strong support to another tradition that he was the son of a sister of Vararuci, one of the nine gems of Vikramāditya's Court. But the chief use of a tradition is to confirm, corroborate, and strengthen other evidence; and it should
not be put in the place of such evidence. This will be illustrated further on.

I will now proceed to give instances of our method from philology and point out the errors due to superficial analogies. People seem to think that mere external similarity between a word in one language and another in another language is enough to enable us to decide that the two are one and the same word. Thus I have heard the word Dutch, (Germ.) Deutsch, traced to the Sanskrit word Dāitya, which means 'a demon' or 'an enemy of the gods', Taittiriya identified with Tartar, Caspian with Kāśyapa, and Chitpāvān or Chiptē with Copt or Gypt. It is melancholy to see such etymologies and a great many others of the same nature put forth without the slightest evidence, and against all the rules of philological comparison. Now there are languages which bear a close affinity to each other, and there are others which do not. Words in a language belonging to the former group observe certain laws in assuming the forms which they possess in another belonging to the same group. Thus the High German in which we have the word Deut, sch being an adjectival termination, is related to Sanskrit. But Sanskrit consonantal sounds assume certain forms in German. And there is a law with reference to that point known by the name of Grimm's law. The German d corresponds to th in the Gothic, with which also low German or Anglo-saxon, i.e., the modern English agrees, and to t in Sanskrit. Thus German drei is English three, and Sanskrit त्रि; Germ. dass, Eng. that, Skr. तद्; Germ. du, Eng. thou, Skr. त्रें in त्रें; Germ. durch, Eng. through, Skr. तिरमस्; Germ. durst, Eng. thirst, Skr. त्रें, i.e., तब &c. Similarly, Germ. t is Eng. d. and Skr. ध; as in the instances, Germ. mit, old H. G. mitte, Eng. mid, A. S. midde, Skr. मध्य; Germ. tag. Eng. day, Skr. some such word as धक्त्र. You will thus see that there is a law which determines the forms that Sanskrit words should assume in German, and that law ought to give to daitya some such form as teuth; so that we should not allow ourselves to be deceived by the mere similarity of dāitya and deut. Besides, from all the
observation that the great founders of comparative philology have made, they have come to the conclusion that the affinity between the Sanskrit and the European languages dates from prehistoric times, i. e., is due to the fact that the ancestors of us all spoke one and the same language before they separated and formed distinct nationalities. This was long before the time when the Vedas were composed. Now the word *daitya* does not occur in the Vedas and was formed later. How could such a word be found in the German, not having existed in the Sanskrit itself a long time after the Aryan-separation? There are, indeed, instances in historical times of independent Aryan communities having again been brought into connection with each other and exchanged a few later words. Thus our astronomical works, and especially those of Varāhamihira, contain several Greek terms, as will be hereafter noticed. If we suppose the word *daitya* to have been communicated to the Germans by us in historic times, is there any record anywhere of our having gone into the forests of Germany and established a kingdom there, as we have of the Bactrian Greeks having established one in the Panjab? And are there more such instances? None has been pointed out. The other etymologies must also be similarly condemned. Are we to suppose that the students of the Taittiriya recension of the Yajurveda came from Tartary, and our Chitpāvan Brahmans from Egypt, and that these foreigners were admitted into our exclusive Hindu community and assigned the highest place? Is there a tittle of evidence to show that? The Jews came to our country in very early times, and the Parsis later; but have they become incorporated with our community, taken our Gotras, and become students of our Vedas?

There are many instances of false and unscientific Marathi etymologies in our books. Unless you resort to comparison and historic observation and discover laws which explain the particular case before you, your etymology must be empiric. Thus our ordinary root बस ‘to sit’ has been traced to Skr. बस ‘to dwell’. Of course च and व constantly interchange places in our languages
and there is no difficulty on that point. The sense, however, of बल्स is not appropriate; but even that is no great objection. Still, if we have recourse to observation and comparison, we shall find that this etymology is wrong. बल्स has another form बल्स, and since the tendency of languages is always to drop an element and not add, बल्स is an older form of the root; and that it is a form of that same root and not an independent root is shown by such contractions as र्स र्स ‘a she-buffalo’ for ग्स, ज्ञस ‘as’ for ज्ञस, त्स ‘so’ for त्स &c. Again, the analogy of the cognate languages also shows that बल्स is the real form of the root; for the Gujarati has बल्स, and the Hindi बल्स, though बल्स is more common. Now Marathi, Hindi and Gujarati have descended from the old Prakrits; and र्स in the first two and र्स in the last is a combination of the vowels अ and इ, brought together by the dropping away of uninitial consonants, which forms a characteristic of the Prakrits, as will be seen from the following instances:

Skr. सदिर ‘a certain tree’, Pr. सदर | M. H. P. ल्यर | G. ल्यर.
— बल्स ‘a bullock’, | बल्स — बल्स — बल्स.
— तादा ‘like that’, | तादि, दिः, तद् — तेसा —
— माहिसी ‘a she-buffalo’, | माहिसी M. प्लेस, H. प्लेस — भेस.
— भागिनी ‘a sister’, | भागिनी, M. dial. भेन, H. बेन — बेन.

So that बल्स or बल्स must be बल्स in Prakrit or बल्स, since र्स and र्स are always interchangeable. Now, we know that Skr. उपविष्ट र्स which means ‘to sit’ appears in the Prakrit in the form of उपविष्ट, प‘being changed to ब as a general rule of which there are many instances, and र्स being dropped as in क्य for क्य, र्स for र्स &c. Then the initial vowel र्स is dropped since it is unaccented, as it is in the following cases:

— अर्च्चर ‘a water-wheel’, | H. रहट, M. रहट.

Another instance of the necessity of a close observation and comparison of facts is afforded by the derivation of masculine nouns ending in आ in Marathi and Hindi. It is supposed that the आ of these is a remnant of the ओ of masculine nouns in Prakrit, such as हथो, गो &c. But the question is, by what rules of transformation does ओ become आ, and why is it that a great many nouns such as हात ‘hand’, पाय ‘feet’, कान ‘ear’, and others are without it? Besides, in such a language as the Sindhi, those nouns which end in अ in Hindi and Marathi end in short त, while those ending in आ have ओ for their final; as हस्त, कठ for हाथ, कान &c. and चोडी ‘a horse,’ for घोड़ा, मंजी ‘a bed-stead’ for माध्या, मथ ‘head’, ‘top’ for माध्या &c. The correct way of finding the origin of these forms in आ appears to me to be the following:—

In modern vernacular pronunciation there is a law of accentuation which has produced important results. The penultimate syllable of a word is in all our dialects pronounced with a stress the tendency of which is to lengthen that syllable and drop the final vowel, and in most of them this tendency has worked itself out. The preceding vowel, however, is not always written long, but still the long or at least the emphasized pronunciation does exist. Thus गुर ‘virtue’ is pronounced by us as गृह in M., गुर in H., कृत ‘a flower’ as कृत्य, बल ‘strength’ as बल (baal), मदन ‘god of love’ as मदन (madaan), &c. In these instances, though we write the penultimate vowel short, it is really long. The final इ or उ of Sanskrit words recently imported into the languages have been dropped in virtue of this law of accentuation. Thus:
M. H. P. G. B. रीत ‘manner’, Skr. रीति.
M. H. P. G. रास ‘a heap’, Skr. राशि.
M. G. वस्त ‘a thing’, Skr. वस्तु.
H. P. साध ‘a good man’, Skr. साध.
M. G. H. P. मध ‘honey’, Skr. मधु.

Not only does this law characterise the vernacular speech of the day, but it must have been in operation for centuries, since the old Prakrit words, which like the above have not recently been imported but have descended to the modern languages from the spoken dialects of ancient times, have also been similarly changed. Thus:—

H. P. सेतु, M. G. हेज, S. सेज हेजा, ‘a bed’, Pr. सेज, Skr. झाया.
M. भीक, H. G. प्रीक, P. भिक्स or प्रीक, B. O. भिक, ‘alms’, Pr. भिक्स, Skr. भिक्स.
M. नीक, H. P. नांद, S. निंड, ‘sleep’, Pr. निंड, Skr. निंडा.
H. S. साथ, R. साद or साठ, O. साथ, ‘wish’, ‘longing’, Pr. साथ, Skr.
M. G. ध्रुव, H. ध्रु, S. धार्य, B. O. ध्रुव, P. धर, 'dust', Pr. धृत, Skr. धुःत.

M. बहिष्णु or धेन, H. धेन, बहिष्णु or धेन, G. धेन, B. धेन, 'sister', Pr. द्वितीय, Skr. द्वितीय.

M. हेस, H. हेस, G. हेस, P. हेस or हेस, 'a she-buffalo', Pr. महिसी, Skr. महिसी.

H. P. कोष, G. कुश, M. कृष, 'a side of the abdomen', Pr. क्रिक, Skr. क्रिक.

M. सत्य, H. सत्य, 'a fellow wife', Pr. सत्यी, Skr. सत्यी.

M. स्त्र, H. श्र, 'a mine', Pr. श्र, Skr. श्र.

H. सास, P. सास, M. G. सास, 'mother-in-law', Pr. सास, Skr. सास.

M. G. वीज, P. विज्य, 'lightning', Pr. विज्य, Skr. विज्य.

M. ऊस, H. ऊस or ऊस, P. ऊस, Pr. ऊस, Skr. ऊस.

H. G. आश, P. अश, B. O. आशि, 'the eye', Pr. अशि, Skr. अशि.

M. G. B. O. हाड, H. हाड, हड or हड़ी, P. हड or हड़ी, Pr. अथै, Skr. अथै.

In this manner the final आ, ह, व and उ of Sanskrit and Prakrit nouns have, in almost all cases, been dropped in the vernaculars or changed to a silent अ. Final ओ is similarly treated. Even in the Apabhraṃśa period this rule of accentuation must have prevailed, since the ending vowels are similarly shortened in a good many cases. The Prakrit ओ of the nominative singular of masculine nouns is mostly shortened to उ in that dialect, and sometimes altogether dropped. The modern vernaculars have thus got a great many masculine nouns ending in the silent अ, such as हात or हाथ 'hand', कान 'ear', दात 'tooth', शोट 'bold', बड़ 'the Banyan tree'. When the final vowel is preceded by another, and not by a consonant as in these words and the others given in the above lists, that other vowel, being accented by our rule, shows a tendency to become long; and the original final being dropped, the accented vowel becomes final. Thus:—
Thus then, the Sanskrit and Prakrit penultimate vowels become final in the vernaculars and, being originally accented in consequence of the law we have been considering, retain that accent in most cases, and are thus lengthened. When the penultimate happens to be अ it is lengthened to आ, as in
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It may be urged that in modern pronunciation when the penultimate अ is accented, it does not become आ, even though pronounced long, as observed before. How is it then that it becomes आ here? In modern times several new modes of pronunciation have arisen, but as regards the matter in hand, to lengthen अ into आ was the old process. And often when the old processes have disappeared from what is considered as the standard form of a language, they are found preserved in some dialect of that language. Thus, while in the standard Marathi the penultimate अ is simply pronounced long, it becomes आ in the Goanese and Malvani dialects.
Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. M.</th>
<th>Māl. Goan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पाळ्ढ ‘a garment’.</td>
<td>पाळ्ढ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कापड ‘cloth’.</td>
<td>कापड.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वतन ‘hereditary property’.</td>
<td>वतन.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जतन ‘careful preservation’.</td>
<td>जतन.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घोटर ‘a garment’.</td>
<td>घोटर.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>खडप ‘a rock’.</td>
<td>खडप.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this manner, then, the penultimate अ became आ in consequence of the accent and, the final vowel being dropped, itself became the final, and has preserved its accent. Thus the nouns ending in आ in Marathi and Hindi are derived from Sanskrit nouns with the penultimate and final syllables ending in अ. The consonant of the final syllable is dropped in the Prakrits, and the vowel अ is together with the nominative termination changed to ओ. This ओ, being unaccented, is first shortened to ई in the Apabhramṣa dialect, and afterwards entirely dropped; while the accented आ of the penultimate syllable is lengthened to आ and becomes the final.

In most cases the final syllable is क applied in Sanskrit to modify the original sense in some way. Instances of those nouns which are seen to have क as the ending syllable in Sanskrit have been given above, together with their Marathi and Hindi forms in आ. And in those cases in which the Sanskrit forms of other Marathi and Hindi words in आ are not seen with a final क, it must have been applied to them in the spoken language, since Pāṇini gives a very general rule as to the addition of क to all nouns, and we actually find its remnant अ in a great many words, including past and present participles in the Prakrits. I have spent so much time on this instance in order to give you an idea of the extent to which it is sometimes necessary to make close observation, discover analogies, and trace the operation of laws, to enable us to arrive at correct etymologies. A mere hap-hazard assertion without any proof is unscientific and will not do in philology any more than in other subjects.

In connection with this matter of insufficient or superficial analogies, I may mention that those who are engaged in the studies I have been speaking about are peculiarly open to their influence, especially when they lead to or support a theory which is striking. Thus, the Rāmāyaṇa is supposed by some to represent the struggles between the Brāhmaṇas of India and the Buddhists of Ceylon; that the Rākṣasas that disturb the rites of the Brāhmaṇas in the Daṇḍakāranyā are Buddhists; that the red clothes worn by the priests at the magic rites of Indrajit are the brown garments of Buddhist mendicants &c. Again, Sītā's ravishment is the same incident as the ravishment of Helen, and Śiva's bow which Rāma bent is the bow of Ulysses. Therefore, Vālmiki must have been influenced by Homeric ideas, and the poem written after the Hindus came in contact with the Greeks.

I cannot stop to give you a detailed account of this controversy; but will observe that if such analogies are to be used as arguments in favour of a certain theory, an antiquarian in the remote future may declare that the Maratha Hindus had no family names before the British conquered India; but that they learned to use them, having seen the British doing so. Hence some of their family names are but mere translations of British names; thus Gore or Dhaavale is a translation of White; Kale, of Black; Landge, of Wolf; Kolhe of Fox; Parvate or Dongre, of Hill; Barve, of Wells; Gole, of Ball; Ghate of Bell, &c. But as we now know that we had these names before we heard of the British, the theory cannot be advocated at the present day.

And to my mind the analogies about the ravishment of the wife of another and the bending of a heavy bow are more natural and less due to intercommunication than this close correspondence of family names. For, what incident is more common in an early condition of society than for one powerful man to take away forcibly the wife of another? Even in a highly civilized condition of society the incident is not uncommon, though the forces used are of a more delicate nature. The same remark applies to a heavy bow. And the state of society pictured in the
Ramayana is very archaic; the whole Maratha country was a forest infested by Rakṣasas or savages, the ancestors of our Bhils and Gonds; and the gender races of the South were so uncultivated that they were compared to monkeys. Valmiki does not mention a single Maratha town, while in the Mahābhārata the names of Karhad and Supara occur. He has heard a few names of places in Southern India, but does not seem to be familiar with the geography of the country; while, in the third and second centuries before the Christian era, the Aryas became more familiar with the South, as we see from the inscriptions of Asoka, Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, and Buddhistic tradition. And to this must be added the weight of the tradition which represents Valmiki as the first or earliest poet of the non-Vedic Sanskrit. Similarly resemblances have been traced between the ideas expressed in the Bhagavadgītā and those expressed in the New Testament, and a Christian influence detected in that work. But a good many of these resemblances are more apparent than real, the whole tone and manner of the Gītā are different from those of the New Testament, and most of the notions suspected to be borrowed from the Bible are found expressed in the Upaniṣads and such older works, as has been shown by the late Dr. Muir. Scholars seem sometimes, when they have to advocate a theory, to forget our common humanity to which a great deal that is common in our notions must be attributed.

On the other hand, when the evidence is irrefragable it is unscholarlike to deny foreign influence. For instance, the Indian astronomical works written during the first five centuries contain several Greek terms. The names of the twelve signs of the Zodiac are translations of the Greek names; and the original Greek names even are given by Varahamihira in the following Arya quoted by Bhau Daji:

क्रियतुरुचितस्यक्रियत篡मकृत्ति।
तैशक्षिक आचार्यकेसो हंसस्फोटयत:।
क्रमश:।

Where we have Kriya i.e. Krios, Tavuru i.e. Taurus, Jituma i.e. Didymos, Leya i.e. Leon, Parthona i.e. Parthenos, Juka
Some of the other terms are Hēlios, Kōna; i.e. Kronos, Kendra; i.e. Kétron; Jāmitra; i.e. Diâmētron &c. Altogether there are 36 such terms. These are not Sanskrit words; and to endeavour to give them an unnatural Sanskrit etymology is vain and unscholarlike. We have the clearest evidence of the close connection between Hindus and Greeks from about the third century before Christ to the first after Christ, in the inscriptions of Asoka and others, in coins which bear the names of Bactrian Greek monarchs, in Greek as well as Indian characters, and in Buddhistic literature. Garga as quoted by Varāhamihira says:—"The Yavanas are Mlecchas among whom this Sāstra (i.e. astronomy and astrology) is well known; they even are worshipped like Rṣis". The Greeks were at that time called Yavanas; for in an inscription of Asoka, Antiochus king of Syria is called a Yonarāja. So also Milinda who reigned at Śākala in the Panjab and who has been identified with the Bactro-Greek monarch Menandros is called a Yōna king in Pali books. The Hindus had their own astronomy before they came in contact with the Greeks; but they borrowed from the latter what was necessary for their own further progress. Prof. Weber thus expresses himself on the point:—"Although most of these names denote astrological relations, still, on the other hand, in the division of the heavens into Zodiacal signs, decani, and degrees, they comprise all that the Hindus lacked, and that was necessary to enable them to cultivate astronomy in a scientific spirit. And accordingly we find that they turned these Greek aids to good account; rectifying, in the first place, the order of their lunar asterisms, which was no longer in accordance with reality, so that the two which came last in the old order occupy the two first places in the new; and even, it would seem, in some points independently advancing astronomical science further than the Greeks themselves did,"
I will now give a specific instance to show how previous history enables us to understand the nature of a thing, though what I have hitherto said in connection with other points contains a good deal calculated to illustrate this also. At present we use an era which is called Śālivāhana Śaka; and ordinarily we understand the word Śaka in the sense of 'an era,' and believe that the era was founded by a king of the name of Śālivāhana. But the word Śaka has not the sense of an era in the Sanskrit language; and the expression Śālivāhana Śaka has been in use for about three or four hundred years only. Before that, and even in some books of the subsequent period, the expression used is Śakakāla. Varāhamihira calls it Śakendrakāla or Śakabhūpakāla, i.e. the era of the Śaka king. In an inscription dated 500 Śaka, it is called the era of the coronation of the Śaka king; and in another dated 556 Śaka, the era of Śaka kings. In all old copperplate grants the expression used is Śakanrakāla or Śakakāla i.e. the era of the Śaka king or Śaka. Thus, then, this is an era founded by a great king of the Śaka or Scythian race. And that India was exposed to the inroads of the Scythians and that they established a kingdom in the country, is proved by many an inscription and coin. There was a dynasty of kings who called themselves Satraps and ruled over Ujjayini, Kathiawar, and Gujarat. In the beginning at least they were in all likelihood the viceroys of the Śaka kings.

Śālivāhana or Śātavāhana was the name of a royal family which ruled over Daksināpatha or Southern India. The principal branch reigned at Dhanakataka in Telingana, and the younger princes of the family, or a subordinate branch, ruled over Paithana. The Śātavāhanas came in contact with the conquering Śakas, who established their power also over a part of the country ruled over by the Śātavāhanas. But after a short interval of time, one of the princes of this family succeeded in driving away the foreigners and regaining the lost provinces. The Śakas and the Śātavāhanas were by these events associated together in the popular memory; and it must have been on this account that the names of the two families came to be connected
in after times with the era, which thereafter was called the Śalivāhana Śaka. More information, however, is wanted to enable us to understand satisfactorily how the name Śalivāhana came to be connected with the era; but at present we do not possess it.

Thus, then, the great lesson we have to learn is that if we wish to know and understand the truth about a point, whether in science or practical life, we should seek analogies, find out, if we can, the history, and criticise, not foolishly and ignorantly as we often do, but according to well defined and rational principles.

And now, gentlemen, and my Hindu friends in particular, a word as to my object in taking up this subject for to-night's discourse. It is no use ignoring the fact that Europe is far ahead of us in all that constitutes civilization. And knowledge is one of the elements of civilization. Experimental sciences and the sciences that depend on the critical, comparative, and historical method have made very great progress in Europe, and what deserves our earnest attention is that they are every day making further and further progress. The Europeans have derived much greater advantage from our connection with them than we have from their connection with us. They have turned to account their acquaintance with the sacred language of our country, and have added the sciences of comparative philology and comparative mythology to their existing store of knowledge. The old principle of the classification of races has been given up, and a new one based on the affinity of languages adopted. Civilized mankind has in the first place been divided into three races,—the Aryan, the Semitic, and the Turanian. The first has again been subdivided into the Hindus, the Hellenes, the Italians, the Slavs and Lithuanians, the Kelts, the Teutons including the Scandinavians and the Germans, &c. So strongly and universally has the fact that affinity of language points to a community of descent and consequently to a common nationality been grasped in Europe.
that "to it," as Sir Sumner Maine remarks, "we owe, at all events in part, the vast development of German nationality; and we certainly owe to it the pretensions of the Russian Empire to at least a presidency over all the Slavonic communities."—So that, it may be remarked by the way, the many wars that have been fought in Europe since 1855, and are likely to be fought during the next twenty years, have or will have for one of their causes the discovery of Sanskrit. Though in itself this is by no means a very gratifying result, still I allude to it simply to show how deeply the Europeans have been influenced by the new ideas. Similarly, I think the liberality that is now observable in the religious thought of Europe is due to the study of Sanskrit and Pali literature. All this will show the activity of the European intellect, and convince us that the principle of progress is very strong in their civilization. But what advantages have we derived from them? A great deal of what they have got from us has but very indirectly been given to them by us; while they have placed before us a whole civilization, which undoubtedly is far superior to ours in a great many points. The impulse to be communicated to us by it ought to be a hundred-fold stronger than that which we have communicated to them. Just as they have used the critical and comparative faculty with energy and produced the results I have just noted, we should use it and direct it not only to find what is true in science, but what is good and rational in social and religious institutions. But have we received the impulse, have we been using the faculty? Who can say we have, while our new literature is scanty and barren of any original idea and we are still quarreling about female education, caste, and religion? Why should we not move on, side by side with Europeans, in the great fields of thought? Why should discoveries be made in France, Germany and England, and not in India? If you say that in most of the branches there are facilities in Europe for making fresh additions to the existing stock of knowledge, while we have none in India, surely no costly laboratories are required to enable us to study the ancient literature of our country and its architectural remains and inscrip-
tions, and to throw light on its political and literary history and its philology. This is a field in which we may successfully compete with Europeans, and in which we enjoy certain peculiar advantages. But these advantages can be turned to account only if we follow their critical, comparative, and historical method. My object, therefore, has been to call your attention to the nature and requisites of this method, in order that by its successful application to the branch of study I am speaking of, we may take our legitimate place among the investigators of the political, literary, and religious history of our country, and not allow the Germans, the French, and the English to monopolize the field. And here I feel myself in duty bound, even at the risk of displeasing some of you, to make a passing allusion to the most uncritical spirit that has come over us of praising ourselves and our ancestors indiscriminately, seeing nothing but good in our institutions and in our ancient literature, asserting that the ancient Hindus had made very great progress in all the sciences, physical, moral, and social, and the arts,—greater even by far than Europe has made hitherto—and denying even the most obvious deficiencies in our literature, such as the absence of satisfactory historical records, and our most obvious defects. As long as this spirit exists in us, we can never hope to be able to throw light on our ancient history, and on the excellencies and defects of our race, and never hope to rise. While, if we shake ourselves free of such a bias, and critically and impartially examine our old records and institutions, we shall do very great service to our country; we shall be able to check the conclusions of some European scholars who are swayed by an opposite bias; and at the same time that by a clear perception of our great national defects we prepare the ground for healthy progress in the future, we shall, I promise you, find a great deal in the past of which we may honestly be proud.

But an honest and discerning pride in the achievements of our ancestors entails a heavy responsibility and duty. We should render ourselves the worthy sons of the fathers whom we respect.
A son that is no better than the father or is worse certainly dishonours him. Have we then not been dishonoring our ancestors, of whom we profess to be so proud, by going backwards and thus becoming worse than they, or, at the best, standing where they left us? For, if you examine your history you will find that your philology is where Pāṇini and Kātyāyana left it, and your philosophy and literature where Kapila, Kanāda, Gotama, Vālmiki, Vyāsa and others left them; and your social institutions are actually far more irrational than theirs were in the very olden age. Let us therefore do honour to them by showing that we have their capacities and can use our rare opportunities. We have just seen how fifteen hundred years ago, the Hindus availed themselves of the astronomical knowledge of the Greeks; they ‘worshipped’ the Greek astronomers, in the words of Garga, ‘as Rṣis’, and finally, according to Prof. Weber, who is by no means fond of praising us, advanced astronomical science further than they did. Let us act likewise, and, sitting at the feet of the English, French, and German Rṣis, imbibe the knowledge that they have to give, and at least keep pace with them, if not go beyond them. Let us learn, let us reform. If we do not do so, fifteen centuries hence, the antiquarian of the period will, unlike Weber, say, “the English placed before the Indian Aryas the highest civilization which Europe had reached by the end of the nineteenth century; but in the hot plains of India, the Indian Aryas had grown so degenerate, that it produced no influence whatever on them, and their degeneracy deepening, they eventually became hewers of wood and drawers of water, or were swept off the face of the earth by the inexorable law of the survival of the fittest.”

LINES FOR FRESH RESEARCH IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE AND INDIAN ANTIQUITIES

[From the Sanskrit Research, Bangaloro, 1915, Vol. 1, pp. 51ff, being a lecture originally delivered under the auspices of the Free Church College Literary Society of Bombay in 1905.]

It gives me very great pleasure to find that a school of critical scholarship is growing up amongst us. The young men who were sent to Europe and America by Government to work under European and American scholars for two or three years, or who went there on their own account, have been endeavouring, with the assistance of an energetic young gentleman, who is both a scholar of the old and new school, to organise, in connection with an institute at Bangalore, a series of lectures on subjects connected with Sanskrit literature and Indian Archaeology, treated on the principles, accepted and approved by critical enquirers, and also to issue a periodical magazine.

In 1888, just 27 years ago, I delivered a lecture on "the critical, comparative and historical method of inquiry" in connection with the Free Church Literary Society, Bombay, and published it in the form of a pamphlet. It does not appear to have attracted the notice of our Sanskrit students, and there has been very little work done by Indians in the field of critical research. I therefore call the attention of students again to the lecture. Seventeen years later, i.e., about ten years ago, I delivered another lecture in the same institution. Therein I suggested or pointed out fresh fields for research in the various branches of Sanskrit literature and Indian antiquities. This lecture has remained unpublished to this day, and I deem the present one to be a fit occasion, when we have so many young men prepared to work in connection with original research, to

1 Printed in this Volume, ante, pp. 362 ff.
publish it. This I do in the following pages, omitting only a few introductory sentences.

Before I proceed, allow me, gentlemen, to state that whatever is done must be done strictly in accordance with the critical method. There is nothing mysterious about this method. It is the same method as that pursued by a judge in coming to a decision in the civil and criminal cases that come up before him. But I must lay special stress on one or two points in connection with our province of enquiry. We must discard certain suppositions which, as natives of this country, have taken a firm possession of our minds. The Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata should not be regarded as books of sober and authentic history. Vyāsa should not be believed as the author of all the Purāṇas in face of the facts that their contents are not only inconsistent with each other, but positively betray hostility towards the views and creeds of each other. Nor should all the Purāṇas be regarded as ancient because they pretend to be so. Some of them are very modern. Several other such suppositions might be mentioned. I would recommend you, for the practical understanding of the method, to read carefully the works of European and American scholars.

The most ancient Sanskrit work is the Rgveda Samhitā. European scholars have been working at it for the last fifty years and have published editions of the original and Sāyana's commentary on it, dictionaries giving references to all the passages in which a certain word occurs, grammars, translations, innumerable essays discussing particular points, books containing descriptions of the deities and the genesis of the conceptions involved. But the language of the Rgveda is very old; a great many of the words, grammatical forms and idioms are unintelligible. The question therefore is what are the helps to the study of the Rgveda-Samhitā. There is a long commentary on it by Sāyana. But the interpretations given by him sometimes appear unnatural and far-fetched; in some cases the same word is ex-
plained differently in different places and the same verse is interpreted differently in different Vedas. Sayana, therefore, had no traditional interpretation of the Veda to guide him. Some European scholars, headed by Roth, therefore set him aside entirely and, regarding the Rgveda as an Indo-Germanic work, i.e., a work containing the thoughts of the early ancestors of the whole stock rather than a work belonging to the Indian branch of the race, interpret it by means of etymology, grammar, comparison of all the passages in which a word occurs and by one's own idea of what is appropriate in the case of primitive thought. Other scholars have recently contested the truth of this view and laid down that the Rgveda is essentially a Hindu work; that though Sayana interprets the same words and passages in different places in different ways, still one of the ways at least is often found correct and therefore he was in possession of some tradition; that the same holds good of Yaska, who, though he interprets words by means of etymology, often-times mentions the Aitihāsikas (or knowers of legends) and Sampradāyavids (or persons acquainted with the tradition); that the Nighantus, though they contain but a few words and only give their general sense, must be considered as based on tradition; that there is no wide and impassable clift between the Rgveda and the later literature and that therefore all the help we can derive from this last we must avail ourselves of; that we should seek Hindu ideas (or at least the primitive forms of Hindu ideas) in the Rgveda rather than Indo-Germanic ideas. The necessity of comparing parallel passages and even the aid of etymology are not dispensed with by this school. Pischel and Geldner are the scholars who have put forth this view, and I believe it is correct. Though there is a break in the tradition and a great many changes and revolutions took place in later times, still we cannot say that between the Vedic and later Indians there is that difference which exists between two entirely different nations. I will give an instance of persistent continuity. Caraṇas or bards in Gujarat and Rajputana narrate stories the verses in which have been composed by others; but
the link between them is supplied by the Caranas orally in prose, so that if the tradition of the stories is lost and only the verses, as having a permanent form impressed on them, are preserved, these verses become unintelligible without the oral prose link supplied by the living bard. Now the practice of telling such stories existed in Buddhistic times and in those represented by Brähmana literature, and there are hymns in the Rgveda also which are called Ākhyāna hymns and which contain verses only. The connection between them was once orally supplied but has now to be guessed to render the verses intelligible. Here then we have a continuous literary practice from Vedic times to this day. And in these days we are as anxious about prajā (progeny), paśu (cattle or wealth), and daksinā as the old Vedic bards were. The Rgveda has been translated from Roth's point of view by Grassmann and to a certain extent by Ludwig also. But if any one of you are disposed to work in this direction, I would recommend its being translated in accordance with Pischel and Geldner's idea. But rather than undertake such a laborious work at once it would be well for you to confine yourself to parts or to the elucidation of certain words and expressions by means of the processes above mentioned. A student of the Rgveda will have to read it many times from different points of view. Even the grammar has not been fully investigated, especially the syntax. Roth has noticed a curious phenomenon in the omission of the termination of a case after some nouns when it is used after others in a sentence. In the case of the omission the termination is to be brought over to the noun from another noun after which it is used. Thus in viii. 11.1 we have तयाम्यः ब्रह्मतं अमि देव आ मरतेन्या । "Thou O Agni, art the protector of the law among gods and mortals." The sense does require our understanding देव आ देवेऽ, the ७ being brought over from मरतेन्य। So also तथा रक्ष ओष्ठीहु नूतीव नू. vi. 3. 7. "The fire roars in trees and bushes", रक्ष having ७ supplied to it from ओष्ठीहु. Similarly तत्तत्त्वहािष्टापिन्दमें घवामधे (i. 81. 1). "We invoke him (Indra) in fights large and small," Evidently अर्थ is here con-
trasted with महत् and should therefore be अभेदः. Several more such cases have been adduced by Roth.

The text of Ṛgveda, there is reason to suppose, is not quite the same as it was originally. Some Sūktas and Ṛks are found in the other Vedas, and there the readings in some cases are different. What the original readings were will have to be determined, if at all possible, by comparing the variation and taking a good many other facts into consideration. The way has been shown by Oldenberg, and it is quite open to any of us to follow it.

Another question that will have to be considered is whether the sacrificial ritual that prevailed in the times of the Ṛgveda was as elaborate as that detailed in the Brāhmanas; and if not, to determine its nature and compare it with that which came in later. The supposition that the Brāhmaṇa ritual was elaborated in later times is supported by the fact that the Mantras used in some of the ceremonies are not to be found in the same place in the Śamhitā, i.e., are chosen from different parts of it, and the principle laid down in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is that that Ṛk should be used which has some reference to the ceremony that is performed. So then here we find the practice of attaching Ṛk verses to every new ceremony to confer sanctity on it in its initial stage. In later times the connection between the Ṛk used and the ceremony did not go beyond the sameness of sound, howsoever entirely different and inapplicable the sense of the verse was.

There are several questions to be considered in connection with the Upaniṣads. As to the text, the following facts should be borne in mind. Sometimes the same verse occurs in more Upaniṣads than one, sometimes a whole passage or story found in one is repeated in another, and sometimes in the same Upaniṣad. These phenomena appear in an exaggerated form in the Mahābhārata. A number of verses in the same are to be found in the Manusāṁhitā and certain stories or discourses
occurring in one book are repeated in another (or the same), sometimes in an expanded form. The occurrence of the same verse or verses in different works I have in other place accounted for by the theory that since writing was in ancient India introduced at a late period and was not generally in use even after its introduction, verses containing a moral or religious idea were composed and handed down orally and, after a time, the name of the author was forgotten. Then when books came to be composed they were appropriated by different authors. The same is the case with regard to long passages containing stories or discussions. They were, so to say, in a floating condition, i.e. in the mouths of people, and were afterwards incorporated in books. As to the same discourse (such as that addressed by Yājñavalkya to Maitreyī in the Brhadāranyakopanisad) being repeated in another part of the work, this circumstance is, I think, to be accounted for by the supposition that the works in which such repetitions occur were made up by collecting matter from different places. The book is really a collection, and not one composed by one and the same author. Hence different versions of the same discourse, found in different quarters, were incorporated in the same book. The repeated discourse often-times contains additions, omissions or variations of reading and thus, though in substance it agreed with a preceding one, it was retained on account of its peculiarities. From this reasoning as well as from the fact that different doctrines are sometimes inculcated in the same Upaniṣad, it would appear that these works are generally collections of the observations or discourses of different Rṣis.

One thing I would recommend in connection with the Upaniṣads is the study of the growth and development of philosophic and religious ideas from the philosophic hymns of the Rgveda to the Upaniṣads. It should be determined what it was that communicated an impetus to the thought of a Rṣi; why it was that the Kṣatriyas are mentioned as particularly active in such speculation; whether one same doctrine is taught in all the
Upaniṣads; whether, if Pantheism is taught, it is of the nature that all reality consists of one soul, eternal, pure, and knowing, and every thing else is an illusion, or that God by means of self-determination assumes the form of the whole external world; and whether there are not purely theistic principles. If there are such, it should be found out what attributes are assigned to the supreme soul, what is represented as the relation between it and the individual soul, and what is aimed at as the *summum bonum*. All other doctrines, if there are any, should be traced.

I have mentioned in a paper I published about five years ago an allusion to the doctrine that the soul is not a permanent substance, and what remains of a man after death is his *karma*—a doctrine that in later times was adopted by Buddhism. An attempt should also be made to trace the influence of the Upaniṣad ideas on the later development of Hindu religion and philosophy. For the purposes of such an essay as this the Upaniṣads must be interpreted philologically, i.e., according to grammar, usage, context, comparison of parallel passages, and any historical information that is available, and not according to the commentary of any particular school, though all the existing commentaries belonging to the different systems should be read in order that the varying interpretations may serve as guides.

We will now turn to Vyākaraṇa or Grammar. The knowledge of the Grammar of Sanskrit must have been fully attained before the time of Pāṇini and from the very arrangement of his rules Pāṇini’s object seems to be to reduce the whole to the shortest possible compass and give it a systematic form. But the question is what is the language taught by Pāṇini. It is not that of the Vedas, since its grammatical peculiarities are specially noticed by him, nor of the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata, for there are a good many forms in them which violate Pāṇini’s rules. The later literature was not popular literature and the author specially learned Pāṇini’s grammar and wrote in con-

1 *A Peep into the Early History of India,* ante. pp. 7 ff.
formity with it. Some European scholars, and especially the American Sanskritist Whitney, have expressed their utter want of confidence in the grammarians and consider the language taught by them as fanciful or existing only in their imagination. A love of an artificial system is attributed to Indians generally, and if some matters cannot be brought into harmony with a preconceived system, they are made to be so. Thus, the Śūktas in the Vedas have each an author mentioned in connection with them. In some cases the author’s name is unknown; but to carry out the system thoroughly, a word from the hymns is taken out and understood and mentioned as the name of the author. Whitney, therefore, does not believe in the reality of the forms taught by the grammarians unless they are found actually used in the language. And first about the Dhātupāṭha it is stated that only about 850 roots out of about 1700 given in it can be traced in the language. The rest, therefore, are invented by the grammarians. Now, as to the lists given by Pāṇini they do not afford a fair ground for judging of his accuracy. For, there is every probability that there are interpolations in them and if there are more roots given in the Dhātupāṭha than are found in the literature the fault may be of later writers or readers. Still, though not found in the existing Sanskrit literature, some roots are found in the Pali stories called Jātakas, as has been pointed out by Dr. Bühler, and some in our present-day Vernaculars. No instance of the use of the root दुष्ट to touch has been given in the Petersberg Dictionary; but in the form of [हरिज] Hindi and [विष] Marathi it does exist in our languages. Similarly, in the case of forms the change of च्वे to हुवे in the perfect, as in चहुड़वे prescribed by the grammarians, he asserts, is due to “down-right unintelligent blundering”, because there is nothing here which might be expected to change the dental to a cerebral. Why not? There is the same thing here as in the case of अच्चाद्यम and अस्तौद्द्यम, which forms Whitney gives in his grammar as correct. He does not find चहुड़वे in the literature, but he does not find चहुड़वे either; then why condemn

the former in such violent terms? It is only a person who does not understand Pāṇini and is prejudiced against Indian writers generally that can use such expressions in speaking of him. Whitney's attacks go much further and he even condemns the logic of his system. But the German scholars, the venerable Hofrat Dr. Böhtlingk and Dr. Keilhorn's pupils have defended him. Now, to be able to say that the grammarians are untrustworthy because the forms and phrases they teach are not found in the existing literature, it is necessary that one should have before one a vast literature composed of works of all sorts, works containing discourses, narrations, and lively conversations. But all styles are not fully represented in the existing Sanskrit literature. Here, as in the case of roots, our Vernaculars may sometimes assist the inquirer in finding out whether the grammarians have taught the language correctly. Thus expressions like याहि याहीति यति “goes again and again,” or न संभावयामि स महानहरं निदिष्टपति “I do not think it probable that his honour will abuse Hari” as applicable even to a past time in which he is asserted to have abused him, are not found in the old literature; but still our Marathi has the phrases, as in जा जा जातो और मला बाटन नाही को तो हरीभी निदा करील said in reply to one who has reported, स्वाभाविक निदा केली. It would certainly not do here to say that in teaching these phrases Pāṇini drew on his imagination.—If then some of Pāṇini's forms and phrases are not found in the existing literature, but his grammar does teach a real language, what was that language? About thirty-seven years ago I showed, in the Preface to my Second Book of Sanskrit, that the several past tenses are used in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa exactly in the senses attached to them by Pāṇini. Dr. Keilhorn's pupils have carried on the examination further and the conclusion follows that the Bhasa or spoken language of which Pāṇini teaches the grammar was akin to that of the Aitareya and other Brāhmaṇas. A question connected with this is whether Sanskrit was ever a spoken language. Curious views are held with reference to this by European scholars, some of whom do not seem to be
acted quite by an impartial spirit. These I have considered in my Seventh Wilson Philological Lecture published in the Bombay Asiatic Society's Journal, and arrived at the conclusion that the Sanskrit was the language of educated people and the Prakrit of the lower strata of society, and the area over which the former was spoken gradually became narrower and the Prakrits went on developing until they have become the modern Vernaculars. Dr. Franke has written on the subject and arrived at similar results, and recently a paper followed by a debate was read at a meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society. No two scholars approach the subject from the same point of view, the question often becomes confused and it is very difficult sometimes to apprehend precisely the difference between two writers and speakers. Still the whole question is worthy of reconsideration; and I would recommend to your attention Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, which is a great work well worthy of close study. The style is pure, sometimes lovely, the argumentation is close and subtle, and it is real pleasure to read and understand the book. But often it is difficult to apprehend the connection between the several sentences. The instances given and the observations frequently made are full of information, but these have already been collected by Weber. Still a careful reader will glean much more than Weber has done. It is worth the while of a critical student to devote close attention to the work.

I will now turn to the Mahābhārata. European scholars have but recently begun to study this epic and grapple with the innumerable questions connected with it. One of the main points is whether the Mahābhārata is a Smṛti, i.e. a didactic work, or an Epic. If the former, the principal object must be considered to be to teach morality, the main story and other smaller ones being narrated to illustrate and support the doctrines inculcated. On this theory the whole book, it is said, will have to be considered as having from the beginning existed in the form in which we find it to-day. But I have already, in going over the Upaniṣads, given a reason why the Mahābhārata must
be considered as a collection of heterogeneous matter and not as one whole. Again, southern Mss. of the Epic are different from those in the North. A copy of Aśvamedha Parvan in Telugu characters was once examined by me; and I found it contained stories and other matter which the Bombay edition did not contain. Again, Patañjali mentions the names of Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma, Arjuna etc., and the family name Pāṇḍava, and tells us that the Kurus fought in accordance with the law, i. e. theirs was a fair fight in which no undue advantage was taken and that Yudhiṣṭhira and Arjuna were well-known. Taking these facts into consideration and the circumstance that the name Mahābhārata is mentioned by Āśvalāyana and Pāṇini, I arrive at the conclusion that a Mahābhārata existed in Patañjali’s time. Still, under Pāṇini iv. 2. 60, he tells us that Yāvakritika is one who reads and knows the Ākhyāna of Yava­krita and Yayātika one who reads or knows the Ākhyāna of Yayāti. Here these Ākhyānas are evidently spoken of as having a separate existence. But at present we have them in the Mahābhārata alone. And since we have supposed that a Mahābhārata existed in the time of Patañjali, these stories did not form parts of it. Even if they did, and the stories existed separately also, the circumstance would show that the Mahābhārata was made up by collecting matter from different quarters.—

Again, the different parts of the Epic are unequal and written in different styles. I have elsewhere given a reason why I consider the chapter in the Ānuśāsanika Parvan in which the relations between the Śakas and Yavanas on the one hand and Brahmans on the other are represented to have been written after those races had lost their predominance in the country, i. e. about the end of the fourth century. In the epic itself it is represented as having been edited at different times, the editions differing from each other in extent. From all these reasons it appears that even in the beginning, when the first shape was given to it, it was a work of the nature of a collection like the Upaniṣads; but unlike these, additions were made to it later from time to time.
But a didactic character it seems in some way to have borne from the beginning. Patañjali, as already noticed, reports the tradition which exists at the present day that the Kurus fought in conformity with the law (Dharma), i. e. the moral law. If the war was so regarded, the idea of making it serve a moral purpose must have existed in very early times; and if it did, it is easy to understand how the Epic should attract material of a didactic nature from different quarters. It is by no means necessary to suppose that the existence of that idea must necessarily have led to the Epic being at once cast into the form in which it now exists. The idea was there and it served as an attracting centre. The Mahābhārata, as I have elsewhere stated, is mentioned in inscriptions dated A. D. 492-3 and 495-6, and as a Śatasahasri or composed of a lakh of ślokas as it now is in one of the year A. D. 532-3. The Bhagavadgītā formed an episode of the work in the time of Bāṇa, i. e. middle of the seventh century, and the Narāyanīya which we have at the end of the Śāntiparvan, in the time of Śāmkarācārya in the beginning of the ninth century. Looking to the fact that what we at present consider the regular metres mostly prevail in the Mahābhārata and to the frequency with which the irregular ones occur in the Upaniṣads, the work must be supposed to have been composed after them and about the same time as the metrical works in Pali, i. e. about the fourth century before Christ.

These questions of the nature, composition and state of the Mahābhārata deserve your attention. But the Mahābhārata is a mine of information about the literature and philosophy, aims and ideals, manners and customs, and social and moral condition of the periods to which its different parts refer. It deserves study from this point of view, and as it is a huge work certain points or portions only might engage the attention of one scholar. Before however setting to work one must read what the European and American scholars have written about it. We have in German the volumes published by A. Holtzmann, Father Dahlman, and Jacobi, and in English that published by
Professor Hopkins as also an article on the "ruling caste" in the Journal of the American Oriental Society.

The Rāmāyaṇa also deserves our attention. Mss. of the poem differ widely from each other. One often-times contains verses and passages which are paraphrases of the corresponding ones in another. A chapter in one is sometimes longer than that which answers to it in another, or has a portion of the text in the later incorporated in it. This has been accounted for by the supposition that the poem was learnt by heart by rhapsodists, who went from place to place and recited it for the delectation of their hearers, and when it was committed to writing by different persons from the mouths of different rhapsodists, the Mss. came to be in the condition in which we find them. The last or Uttarākāṇḍa and also the first or Bālakāṇḍa were added in later times; and the story really begins with the exile of Rāma, Sītā and Laksmaṇa to a forest. These points you will have to consider if you mean to devote yourselves to the study of the Rāmāyaṇa. The condition of the country South and North as depicted in the poem will also be an interesting study as well as the manners, customs, aims and ideals of the people, as in the case of the Mahābhārata. You will also have to consider why it is that the characters in the Rāmāyaṇa are not mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya as those in the Mahābhārata are, and why even Amara gives the name of Kṛṣṇa among the synonyms of Viṣṇu, but not of Rāma. It will also be useful to compare the story with that in the Daśaratha Jātaka, which represents Rāma, called Rāmapaṇḍita, Laksmaṇa and Sītā, the children of the eldest wife of Daśaratha, to have been banished to a forest for twelve years, because the wife that had succeeded the mother of Rāma wanted Daśaratha again and again to assign the kingdom to her son Bharata; and Daśaratha feared that she might even take away the life of Rāma and the other two. But nine years after, Daśaratha died and Bharata instead of ascending the throne went to Rāma and endeavoured to persuade him to return and assume the sovereignty. But since he had been banished for twelve
years and there still remained three, Rāma would not return. At the end of the three years he came back and took possession of the throne. Curiously enough, Sitā though represented as Rāma's sister, was raised to the dignity of the Chief Queen.

I may here mention that the large number of Jātaka stories in Pali, which have now all been printed and some of which have been translated, deserve careful study. As already stated, Dr. Bühler made use of them to point out to Professor Whitney that some of the roots in the Dhatupāṭha, the existence of which he attributed to the inventive faculty of the Indian grammarians, were in vernacular use. Another scholar has written a book based on them on the "social divisions in Eastern India at the time of Buddha". The stories are interesting in more ways than one and the information to be gleaned from them as to the manners and ways of thinking of all sorts of men from the king to the common labourer in the street and the condition of Indian Society generally is very valuable. They vividly represent the virtues and vices of the times to which they refer.

Purāṇas (and usually the Purāṇa) are mentioned in some of the Brahmāṇas and Sūtras. The contents of a Purāṇa are fivefold: 1. creation, 2. resolution or dissolution, 3. family or geneology, 4. the Manus or certain periods, and 5. the doings of persons belonging to certain families. The idea has been started by Mr. Jackson that originally there was only one Purāṇa as in speaking of it the singular (Purāṇa) only is used. But that is not the invariable practice; the plural also is used. But while comparing the Vāyu, the Mārkaṇḍeya, and Liṅga Purāṇas it appeared to me that the sections on creation agree in substance as well as words in those Purāṇas as if they were derived from a common source; while the Viṣṇu has an abridged form of them. It appears that the Purāṇas were written to extol particular deities such as Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā, etc. and

1 Since the above was written all have been translated.
advance their worship, to sanctify customs that had come into use and lay down certain religious duties and prohibit others which had become obsolete. The earliest of them mentions Gupta princes and consequently must have been written, as I have elsewhere stated, in the last quarter of the fourth century. They are of use for tracing the growth of the religion that took the place of the old Vedic fire-worship. Most of the facts and observances of the religion of the day have their authority in one or other Purāṇa.

As to the Hindu Law which we study it is based on certain metrical works which are ordinarily called Smṛtis. There are older works which are called Dharma Sūtras. Patanjali seems to know of those only and not of the Smṛtis. Some Dharma Sūtras, such as those of Apastamba, Gotama, Vāsiṣṭha etc., are extant. Each of these belonged to a certain Vedic school or Carāṇa, and thus religious and civil law grew up within the limits of that body. A demand for a law binding on all was not, it appears, felt for a long time; but it came to be felt eventually, and the metrical Smṛtis began to be written for general use. Some of these, there is reason to suppose, were based on the Dharma-Sūtras; and as I have stated elsewhere, the Vināyaka-Śānti in the Yājñavalkya Smṛti agrees almost word for word with the Sūtras of the Kaṭha school on the subject. The doctrines laid down by the Smṛtis have been expounded by the authors of the Commentaries or Nibandhas, such as Medhatithi, Viśāneśvara, Aparārka and Nilakaṇṭha. It would be worth the while of a Sanskrit scholar who is at the same time a lawyer to trace the history of Hindu Law, both religious and civil, from its beginning in our oldest literature through the Dharma-Sūtras and the Smṛtis, to the Nibandhas or Commentaries; and if this is a wide subject, any portion of it only might be taken up for such a treatment. The Tagore Law-lecturers at Calcutta, including Professor Jolly, have done good work in connection with the subject. The introduction to the translation of law books published by Dr. Bühler and Jolly in the series of the
Sacred Books of the East will give the readers a good knowledge of the development of Hindu Law up to the rise of the Smṛtis. An easier work, though laborious, would be to trace the quotations from Smṛtis given in the Nibandhas to their source to enable one to find out whether the Smṛtis before their authors were exactly those which we have at present under the same names.

European scholars have not yet done much to elucidate Indian philosophy. I have considered the first portion of the subject already in going over the Upaniṣads. The notions put forth in those works were worked out in the older times by authors whose names are like those of the Rṣis, such as Auḍuloma, Āśmarathya, Bādari etc., but all we know of their work are the extremely short notices contained in Bādarāyaṇa's Śārīraka Śūtras. This latter work, as the principal work of the Vedānta, has been commented on by the founders of the various Vedantic schools of modern times. Most of them twist the sense of the Śūtras whenever they have to interpret them in accordance with their own doctrines; but it is a useful task to find out what Bādarāyaṇa's own system was. Dr. G. Thibaut has already done this to a large extent. But there is room for more work in connection with it. The author of the Śūtras does not support the doctrine of Maya; and it would be worth the while of a scholar to trace the history of the doctrine through all the available works, including Buddhistic works of the Mādhya-mika and Yogācāra schools, the Yoga-Vāśṭṭha and the system of the Kashmir Śaivas. A similar treatment should be accorded to Rāmānuja's doctrine of the reality of God, the individual soul and the inanimate world as three distinct substances, the last two being under the perfect control of the first, who is their internal soul and whose bodies they constitute. A work comparing the doctrines of the various Vedantic systems that prevail, viz. those of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vallabha, Nimbārka and others together with an account of their attitude towards the prevailing religion of ceremonials is very desirable.
There is a great deal of work to be done in connection with the system of philosophy not proposing to be based on the Upaniṣads. What the Sāṁkhya system is, I believe, not yet clearly understood. Hitherto it has been usual to translate the Prakṛti of this school by Nature which, of course, is inanimate nature. But the first product of Prakṛti is Buddhi or definite conception (अध्यवसाय) and through it is produced Ahamkāra or consciousness of self. How this can be a product of Nature in its ordinary sense is more than I can understand. The Sāṁkhya philosophy is the earliest. The words Sāṁkhya and Yoga as well as some of the peculiar terms of the system (Mahat, Āvyakta, Pradhāna, Puruṣa or Kṣetrajña) occur in the Upaniṣada. In the Bhagavad-gītā and other parts of the Mahābhārata also there are some of these terms; and the Pūrāṇas explain the genesis of the world by speaking of the production of the Sāṁkhya principles from the Āvyakta or Pradhāna put into motion by God. The chief authority for the system is Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s Kārikā. The so-called Sāṁkhya Sūtra I consider to be spurious. The doctrines are atheistic. But the Sāṁkhya alluded to in some of the works mentioned above is theistic, and probably the words Sāṁkhya and Yoga are not used in their technical sense. I would propose that somebody should take up this subject, collect the passages in which these words and some technical terms of the system occur, determine the sense of the words and decide whether the references are to Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s atheistic Sāṁkhya or to any other system. Of course the interpretation must be philological; it would not do to accept the views of the sectarians, who interpret the word Āvyakta in the Kathopaniṣad to mean “the body.”

The Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems should be studied with a view to ascertain their origin. Are there any germs in the previous literature which developed into those systems? An endeavour should be made to ascertain this. The great commentaries on the Sūtras of the two schools should be carefully studied to ascertain the points in dispute between the Buddhists and those schools, and the manner in which they argue with each
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other. For, in the celebrated passage in Vācaspati’s commentary on the Uddyota, the former tells us that the doctrines laid down by Vātsyāyana in his explanation of Gotama’s Sūtras were refuted by the Baudhā Diinnāga, and Bhāradvāja wrote his Uddyota to answer his objections and set Vātsyāyana right. If possible, any Buddhītic work on Dialectics that may be available should be read for the purpose of comparison. The Nyāya system of Dialectics is very interesting, and probably controversies such as those regulated by it must often have taken place in the olden days.

Lastly, I would suggest that the history of the manner in which the descendants of the old fire-worshipping Rṣis have become devotees of Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā and a host of other deities, and built temples instead of yajña-mandaṇapas and worshipped idols instead of invisible deities by throwing oblations into the fire in their names should be investigated. The innumerable animals that were slaughtered in the Yajñas or sacrifices produced feelings of revulsion; wordly life was found to be miserable and there were dreams of a happy condition in another world. The Upaniṣad Rṣis, therefore, resorted to the contemplation of the Supreme Soul that pervades the beautiful Universe, and aimed at the closest possible approach to him or union with him as the means of the highest bliss. The Buddhas and Jainas found a way in righteous and benevolent conduct, and others derived comfort from adoring Vāsudeva regarded as the Supreme Being and sought for their highest bliss in love for him and faith in him. This school was known afterwards by the name of Bhāgavata and Pāñcarātra. The Vāsudeva of this school and of the Bhagavadgitā were afterwards identified with Viṣṇu and Nārāyana, who had already been objects of worship before, and thus arose modern Vaiṣṇavism. But India has ever been exposed to the inroads of foreigners and the settlement of these in the country has led to the multiplication of races. These races had their own gods; some of them, who had preceded the Aryas in their occupation of the country, worshipped their god by means of the
phallus, and his worship must have been so general that he was taken over by the Aryas and identified with their Vedic Rudra. Other races worshipped other deities and these also were adopted into the pantheon, and Purāṇas were written to exalt their glories. Buddhism and Jainism being religions founded by men who came to be considered as perfect beings, naturally there was a desire to worship their relics and pay homage to their statues. The worship of these became general and spread over the Indian world and hence idols of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Nārāyana, Lākṣmi, Śiva and Pārvatī were prepared and established in public places for worship. But whatever may be the mode of accounting for the religious revolution that took place in the country, the question itself deserves careful study, and one who desires to take it up will have to read the Purāṇas, the Pāñcarātra-Āgamas, the Śaiva-Āgamas, the later literature of the several sects, and some portion of the Buddhistic and Jaina literatures.

I will devote the remaining portion of the lecture to the consideration of the study of Indian antiquities or of Indian history by means of coins and inscriptions and by the help of such incidental notices in Sanskrit literature as may be available. If you wish to take up the subject, you will have to cast a glance over the volumes of the Indian Antiquary, the Epigraphia Indica, the Journals of the Royal Asiatic Society, of its Bombay Branch and of the Bengal Asiatic Society, as well as the separate volumes of inscriptions that are published, and the Archaeological Reports, and read such portions of these as refer to the line you may have chosen. As to the inscriptions of Aśoka and those in the cave temples the last thing has not been said about them yet. They deserve a fresh study. The University has been offering a prize for transcripts and translations of the Karla inscriptions but no candidate has yet appeared. Then we have to consider the inroads of the Greco-Bactrian princes into India and the establishment of a kingdom by them in the Punjab with Śākala for their capital. One of these princes named Milinda is noticed in a Buddhistic work as holding a controversy with a Buddhistic saint.
named Nagasena. Milinda has been identified with Menander. The Bactrians were followed by the Sakas, who ruled over Kathiawar and Malva for more than 200 years, but were soon followed in Northern India by the Kushanas. There appeared to have been two families of these, the later having Kaniska for its founder. The name of this prince is famous in the literature of the Mahayana Buddhism. He is generally placed in the first century of the Christian Era, but I have on a careful consideration assigned him to the first quarter of the third century. There are dates in his inscriptions, but they run on from the unit figures (5, 6, etc.) and I have supposed that the hundreds in those numbers have been omitted in accordance with a practice prevalent in Kashmir in later times. But I am now of opinion that the existence of that practice in the early centuries cannot be proved; there is an inscription of the third Kushana prince in eastern Malva which is dated in the same way as the others belonging to the dynasty, and the practice of omitting hundreds does not seem to have ever existed in Malva. I would, therefore, now put forward the supposition that Kaniska founded an era of his own, but that its initial date must be about A.D. 200. The whole evidence I have brought forward is consistent with only such a late date and not with the first century. No scholar has answered my arguments, but they are sceptical as to the truth of my conclusion, and some wish me to read the notices occurring in a Chinese book about the Kushanas, and reconcile them with it. I have yet found no time for it. But this question of Kaniska’s date is important and is worthy of being taken up by any one of you. Then followed the dynasty of the Guptas and the Kushanas, and the Sakas of the Kathiawar and Malva were deprived of their power. But foreigners continued to pour into the country. There were Abhiras who penetrated into the country in such large numbers that after they became Hindus.

1 Since the above was written, several other inscriptions containing the name of Kaniska have been discovered and the whole evidence requires a thorough sifting.
they formed subdivisions of some of our castes and we have now
Aher sónars and ordinary sónars, Aher sutars and ordinary sutars
and Aher gaulis and ordinary gaulis, and several more of such
divisions. A dynasty of Abhiras seems to have reigned some­
where in the Maratha country, probably in Khandesh, since an
inscription of one of the princes exists at Nasik. Again we had an
inroad of another foreign race called the Gürjaras. The Gürjaras,
who came by way of the Punjab and gave their name to a part of it
which is called Gujarat to this day, settled in Rajputana and
founded a kingdom, thence extended their power to Kanauj,
which became their capital, and afterwards an offshoot of the
race established a kingdom at Anāhilapattana and gave the name
Gujarat to the province of Lāta. This race has also given rise to
a special division of castes like the Abhiras. The history of these
races which have settled in the country and become Hindus
deserves to be carefully studied; all the information that can be
obtained must be secured, and that which is now available to us must
be weighed critically. I am of opinion that some at least of the
Rajput families of the present day are of a foreign origin. In­
scriptions of some of the dynasties that ruled over Northern
India, have been published, but the information available from
them has not been collected and put into shape, as that referring
to the Maratha and Canarese dynasties has been. A family of
the name of Kalacūrī reigned in Cedi or the country about Chattis­
garh, and a good deal of information is available about it and it
can be put into shape. The subject was proposed for a university
essay several times, but it was not taken up by any body.
A dynasty that ruled over some part of Gujarat and even
Mahārāṣṭra, in the fourth century and is known by the name of
Teukūtakas used the same era as that used by the princes of Cedi.
The question to be considered is whether it belonged to the same
race as those princes. The history of the Paramāras of Ujjayinī

This year (1915), however, an essay on this subject has been
received by the University.
and Dhārādeśa has also to be written. We possess a good deal of information about them.

You will thus see how many questions there are in Sanskrit literature and Indian Antiquities which require to be taken up. If we natives of the country study them strickly according to the critical method, we are likely to throw more light on them in some respects than European and American scholars. But what is the reason of the fact that though we have been teaching Sanskrit in the University for the last forty years, we have turned out but few critical scholars? The reason probably is that a man must first devote himself to something that enables him to earn his livelihood; and most of his time being spent in that pursuit, very little is left for anything else. And scholarship is not something that you can acquire at odd moments. I have, therefore, been for several years urging the endowment of permanent fellowships in connection with the Colleges or Universities, and even proposed that the Dakṣinā fund, which in my opinion is now wasted on what are called Dakṣinā fellowships tenable for a year or two only, should be used for endowing permanent fellowships. Lord Harris took up the question at my suggestion, but in the face of the opposition of the Department, which is jealous of any suggestion from without, he had to give it up. And endowing fellowships from some other source is something that Government have not yet considered to be necessary for the advancement of original research among us and no patriotic Indian has turned his attention to it.
INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Delivered on the 15th of December 1918, at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute on the occasion of the Opening of a Series of Lectures arranged by the Institute.

[FROM THE ANNALS OF THE BHANDARKAR INSTITUTE, VOLUME I, (1919-20), pp. 1 ff.].

The object of this Institute is to promote among its members a spirit of inquiry into the history of our country—literary, social and political—and also to afford facilities to outsiders engaged in the same pursuit. The idea is to get scholars to deliver lectures and read papers before the members of the Institute and to publish these in the form of a journal. The work undertaken is indeed arduous; and it may well be questioned whether we Indians are sufficiently advanced to undertake unaided such a task with confidence and execute it in a manner so as to bring about fruitful and uncontestable results. To secure such results some familiarity with the critical and comparative method of inquiry is necessary. Institutions similar to this, e.g., the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, have been in existence for a long time among us, and several Indians have distinguished themselves by their work in connection with them. Our University has sent out into the world a large number of students of Sanskrit and the vernacular languages of India; but the number of inquirers has been very small and almost insignificant. Besides, much of the work done by Indian scholars is considered by the leading scholars of Europe as possessing little worth. We may easily retort to this charge and show their incompetence in dealing with Sanskrit matters; nevertheless we ought to ascertain whether this charge brought against us is based on truth, and, if so, we should set about mending our ways.

I have already tried to impress on our students the importance of the pursuit of a critical and comparative method of
inquiry, and indicated the lines of research that should be followed. But these lectures of mine do not seem to have produced a very wide effect; though, of course, I am much gratified to find that a small body of critical scholars has now grown up and is still growing up amongst us, and naturally they are among the members of this institution. Still, I must once hastily go over what I may call the temptations of an Indian scholar. He is prone to see good in everything old. If he does it without any evidence, he makes himself ridiculous and unworthy of attention; and sometimes even when there is evidence he is prone to take that view of it which reflects most credit on his ancestors. For instance, in a paper entitled ' International Law in Ancient India ' a scholar from Madras states that injury to the cultivators, their implements and crops by the enemy was against our international law. If this is to be quoted in our favour as against the practice of European combatants, the fact that European fights are between nations, while Indian fights have been between princes or chiefs, the great body of their subjects remaining unaffected, should not be lost sight of; so that if the enemy did not lay waste the land of the cultivators or do them any other injury, it may possibly have been due to the fact that in the case of success the cultivators and their lands belonged as much to the invading enemy as to the original chief. But this is not an instance of extravagant admiration for ancient Hindus, and it is taken from a paper which is thoughtful and written on critical lines.

But the tendency towards such admiration is very strong in the generally uncultured mind. Several years ago a young enthusiast came to me and wanted to know if in the course of my search for manuscripts I had come across a copy of the Maya-

1 In a lecture delivered in 1888 under the auspices of the Free Church Literary Society, Bombay, and published Ante, pp. 362 ff.
2 In a lecture delivered in 1905 in the same institution and published Ante, pp. 394 ff.
Samhitā which, he said, contained instructions for the accomplishment of wonderful feats. On my replying in the negative, he said that Europeans must have found a copy of the Samhitā; for otherwise how could they have possibly made the discoveries and inventions such as those of the telegraph, the telephone and others? Again there are persons who find in the Rgveda an allusion to the X-rays, railways and what not! I hope you will not consider my having brought forward these cases an insult to you, implying a comparison of your work with theirs. But what I have called the peculiar temptations of an Indian scholar do, in a large number of cases, influence our judgment.

For instance, reverence for the name of Vyāsa is early instilled into our minds. Consequently we are apt to feel shocked if anybody were to tell us that Vyāsa is only a mythical figure without any historical counterpart. Yet the chief circumstances we know about him are so incongruous and conflicting with each other that they unmistakably point to that conclusion. Vyāsa is said to be the grandfather (by means of Niyoga) of both the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, and yet he lived long enough to watch their deeds and write about them after the time of their death or ascension to heaven, and thus compose a voluminous work beyond the working capacities of an old man. Again, it is said of him in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa that there was only one Veda in the beginning and that Vyāsa divided it into four and taught it to four pupils: the Atharvaveda he taught to Sumantu, the Sāmaveda to Jaimini, the Yajurveda to Vaiśampāyana, and the the Rgveda to Paila. Āśvalāyana in his Grhya-Sūtra gives a list of the Rṣis or Vedic teachers in whose name oblations of water have to be made on certain occasions. Among these Rṣis are the authors of the several Maṇḍalas of the Rksamhitā, and the writers of the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, such as Kauṣitaka, Sāmkhāyana, Āitareya, etc., whose works have come down to us. This, therefore, is a list of actually living Vedic teachers. In this list occur the names Sumantu, Jaimini, Vaiśarpāyana, and Paila, spoken of as the pupils of Vyāsa in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, to whom he taught the
four Vedas. If the names of the alleged pupils of Vyāsa do occur in this list of teachers, why not that of Vyāsa himself if he was a historical personage and a teacher of these four? Again the Brahma-Sūtras are attributed to Bādarāyaṇa, which is regarded as another name of Vyāsa. So that our Vyāsa is to be the author of the Brahma-Sūtras also. Even such a great writer as Rāmacūṇa subscribes to this opinion and considers this Vyāsa to be the same as the author of the Mahābhārata. But in the Sūtras themselves occur names of ancient authors with an indication of their views which are often contrasted with each other. With the views of Jaimini, a name specially connected with the karmamārga or the road to final bliss by means of deeds such as sacrificial ceremonies, are contrasted those of Bādarāyaṇa which have a reference to the jñānamārga or the way of knowledge. One would here expect the name of Vyāsa, if that was the name of the author of the Brahma-Sūtras; but we have that of Bādarāyaṇa only. Vyāsa is also considered as the author of all the Purāṇas. But these contain conflicting views, and the same author cannot be considered as speaking highly of the gods Śiva and Viṣṇu in one place and making contemptuous observations about them in another. So that here too Vyāsa is a mythical personage. The word vyāsa has the sense of expansion or analysis, as opposed to samāsa which means contraction or synthesis. As observed before, the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa reports that all the four Vedas form one whole. This whole was expanded or analysed into four distinct substances. The Brhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad has in two places an enumeration of the then existing lore, in which Itihāsah and Purāṇam are put in the singular number, showing that each of these formed an independent whole. These afterwards were analysed, or divided, or expanded into the many stories contained in the Mahābhārata and into the large number of Purāṇas that we possess. Thus there was a vyāsa in each of the three cases and its importance led to the identification of the action with the actor: the analysis came to denote the analyser.
Similarly, we have been since our childhood so familiar with the stories contained in the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa that we should at once condemn the critic who spoke of the stories as constituting merely legendary poems, i.e., works of imagination, having perhaps historical basis of which one cannot be certain. The poems are very valuable from the historical point of view, because one can gather from them information as to what men and women did or thought in those days, i.e., as to the stage of civilization at which they had arrived when the poems were composed. But the occurrences reported in them cannot be regarded as strictly historical. In a prize-essay that I had to examine in connection with our University, the writer—who, I believe, was an M. A.—stated that the Mahābhārata was in every sense such a historical work as that of Thucydides. But it did not occur to him that before making such a statement it was necessary for him to settle whether the poem had one author or more, whether these authors were contemporary witnesses of the events they reported and whether the stories told by them were in themselves credible.

As to the authors of the metrical treatises on Law they mostly bear the names of old Rṣis of the Upaniṣad or Sūtra period. But it ought not to be supposed that the laws and usages mentioned in the Smṛtis of Yājñavalkya and Āśvalayana belonged to the period of Yājñavalkya of the Brhad-Aranyaka and the Āśvalayana of the Śrauta and Grhya Sūtras. It had become the custom or a matter of style to use the names of older sages in composing the Smṛtis and Purāṇas of the period of what I have elsewhere called the Brahmanic revival.

I have here briefly sketched the natural failings of Indian scholars. The fact is that the literature and the antiquities we examine are our own, and naturally we look more to the contents of a literary work than to its historical relations, which require the exercise of the critical faculty. It is questionable whether

1 In the "Peep into the Early History of India," Ante pp. 7 ff.
a European Scholar reads Sanskrit works to be amused or instructed by them; his point of view is historical and critical. On one occasion I happened to say to the late Dr. Bühler that the Third Act of the Uttararāmacarita drew tears from my eyes whenever I read it. He seemed to be surprised. This constitutes the difference in the points of view of the Indian and the European scholar. We must not on that account cease to read our Sanskrit and vernacular works for the pleasure and instruction which they afford to us. Only we must take care that our partiality for them in this respect does not obscure our judgment when we have to examine them critically in order to find out their historical relations. We may feel deeply moved by the Third Act of the Uttararāmacarita; but when the question of historical truth comes up for consideration, we must be prepared to accept, if our evidence leads to it, that Rāma and Sītā are mythical personages and that they did not really exist.

I have here touched only the fringe of the subject; the critical method to be pursued I have indicated in the two lectures alluded to above. Our critical studies must be conducted conjointly with European scholars. We should read their works and take hints from the observations contained in them, both as regards the subjects to be investigated and the methods to be followed. Our research work will assuredly bear fruit if it is thus conducted.

In conclusion I am happy to say that, notwithstanding the disadvantages under which we labour, critical scholarship has been steadily advancing among us. In recent years I have had several papers from the Madras Presidency the writers of which show considerable critical acumen and skill and I have full hope that our work here and in the Madras Presidency will put an end to the disparaging tone in which the European scholars speak of us, and compel their approval and even their admiration.
The Mahābhārata is a work which is essentially connected with a stage of civilization which the Indian Aryans had attained, and without which that stage would be unintelligible. The traditions which have been embodied in it have their roots in the most early times. The name Bhārata, which indicates the races which fought against each other, occurs in the 3rd Maṇḍala of the Rgveda Saṁhitā, where it is stated that the Brahman or religious worship instituted by Viśvāmitra protects the Bhārata people. On the other hand, in a hymn of the seventh or Vāsiṣṭha Maṇḍala it is stated that the Bharatas were like sticks used in driving the cattle with—torn into shreds, and were feeble; when Vasiṣṭha became their leader, the people of the Trtsu race spread over a wide extent. Similarly a prince of the name of Sudās crossed a certain river safely as Indra was pleased with the ministrations of the Kauśikas, i.e., Viśvāmitra and his kinsmen. On the other hand, in the fight between the ten kings Indra protected Sudās through the religious service performed by the Vāsiṣṭhas. Thus it appears that these two Rṣis were at times the religious leaders of the Bhārata tribe and Purohitas of Sudās, but which of them supplanted the other is not easy to determine. This is the origin of the famous enmity of the two sages, elaborated and even grotesque stories of which are narrated in later works inclusive of the Mahābhārata. The enmity of Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, which is an article of ordinary Hindu belief, has thus come down to us from early Vedic times, and thus also the name of the fighting race, mentioned in the work which we propose to edit, is as old as the Rgveda. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa Dirghatamas Māmateya is represented as having crowned Bharata, the son of Duṣyanta, by the use of the ceremonies contained in the ritual of the Indra coronation, and it is
also stated that Bharata was enabled by it to conquer the whole world, whereupon he performed the horse-sacrifice indicative of his supreme sovereignty. Similarly the name of Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣit, is mentioned there as having been thus crowned and having performed a horse-sacrifice.

The Mahābhārata is mentioned by Pāṇini, and the Bhārata and Mahābhārata by Āśvalāyana. One way of determining the position of a work in Sanskrit literature which we resort to is to determine the literary stratum to which it belongs. The Rk-saṃhitā forms the oldest stratum (or strata), the Brāhmaṇas form the next, though considerable chronological distance separates the two; then we have the the stratum represented by Yāska and Pāṇini. The question now is what position to assign to the Mahābhārata. If we judge form the language, we shall find that it is not in strict conformity with the rules of Pāṇini, as shown by Prof. Rajwade in the case of the Bhagavad-gitā. This is a stage in the growth of the Sanskrit language at which Pāṇini’s idiom was not strictly cared for, and a great deal of freedom, which we even in Marathi resort to, was used. But the sounds of the language at that stage had not become corrupt by passing through the mouths of foreign races, i.e. had not acquired the form of Pali. In other words, the language of the Mahābhārata represents the speech of the Indian Aryans, though strictly grammatical forms had gone out of use. Thus this stage in the growth of the language belongs to a period later than Yāska and Pāṇini. The Mahābhārata, therefore, is a work in popular use, and gives us knowledge of the ideas, conceptions, institutions, manners and customs of the Indian Aryans. And thus we find in it the philosophy and the morality which found their proper exposition in the Upaniṣads and Dharmasūtras, such as those of Gautama, Vasiṣṭha and Manu. The object of the writers of the Mahābhārata seems to be to include in it in a popular form all the stories and moral and philosophical conceptions that had developed from the remotest times to the period when its composition was conceived of. Thus it forms a sort
of encyclopaedia of the knowledge possessed by the Aryans. This object seems to have been never lost sight of during the course of the development of the work and thus we have had interpolations from time to time. For historical purposes it is necessary to ascertain what matter was interpolated at what time. There are differences of reading in individual cases, but they are not so great as in the case of the Rāmāyana, for instance. The theory is that the Rāmāyana was committed to memory and there were rhapsodists who sang it on different occasions. When the poem came to be written out, the reading of the different rhapsodists were used by different writers, and thus we come to have recensions in which the stanzas give the general sense but differ as to the particular words used. Such differences do not seem to exist in the case of the Mahābhārata MSS. Its recensions seem to be due to the interpolations introduced from time to time. There are, of course, as noticed above, varieties of reading in the portions of the recension which agree with each other. Our determination of the text should proceed mainly on these two lines. The Mahābhārata Prospectus, which has been prepared carefully by Mr. Utgikar, explains all matters connected with our work. When the text is prepared and established in accordance with the principles explained therein, then will be the time to inquire into and consider various questions concerning the Epic, such as the following. Whether the purpose of the work is to narrate the heroic deeds of the principal characters and the episodes introduced to set off or illustrate the exploits of the heroes, or whether the main purpose of the work is moral or didactic and the epic portions are introduced to illustrate the didactic purpose; whether the poem originally intended to represent the final victory of the Kauravas and was afterwards recast in order to represent their defeat and the success of the Pāṇḍavas, or whether the poem was gradually altered to give it a Vaiśṇava character which it had not in the beginning; whether Kṛṣṇa's early life was spent in the Gokula or cowherd-settlement, or whether it was totally unconnected
with his career as a member of the Sātvata branch of the race of Yadu and was introduced into the story in later times.

This work we propose to inaugurate on this auspicious New Year's day of our Hindu calendar. The conception of the undertaking is entirely due to the enlightened views of Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, from whom we have received and are to receive, munificent financial help but that alone will not suffice, and we have to request other chiefs and persons possessing the means to contribute towards the successful execution of the plan. For it should never be forgotten that this is a patriotic work. The Mahābhārata is essentially connected with our intellectual life. There is almost no Hindu who has no knowledge of one or more of the heroes whose exploits have been sung in the Epic. Our attitude towards the best of them is respectful and reverential. The late Mr. E. I. Howard, one of our earliest Directors of Public Instruction, often said to me in the olden days that we Hindus should be proud of our Mahābhārata heroes, and entertain feelings of admiration and respect for them. That such a work as the Mahābhārata should still remain a confused mass scarcely does any credit to us, whose attitude towards the heroes should be of such a nature.

And now a word as to the spirit in which the work should confidently be conducted by us. It should be thoroughly impartial. Our aim should be to find out the truth, whether it is flattering to our racial pride or otherwise. Scholars of the leading European nations have been for a long time engaged in making researches into our literature and ancient history. They have got their own critical methods. New ideas and issues strike them more easily than they do us. On the other hand, there are proper Hindu feelings and ideas which they do not
perfectly understand and make mistakes about. Science is not racial or national. European scholars and ourselves should devote respectful attention to what we have got to say to each other. We should learn from them and strictly use their critical methods, and they should not treat our suggestions with contempt, thus alone with the common efforts of both historical and literary research will advance and throw light upon our past, which must remain dark without such research.
CONVOCATION ADDRESS

[Delivered by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vice-Chancellor, at the University of Bombay, 1894. Originally published in 1894 by the author.]

Gentlemen of the Senate, Ladies and Gentlemen.—His Excellency the Chancellor has assigned to me the onerous task of addressing you to-day, and it will not, I expect, surprise you if I feel extremely diffident as regards my ability to execute the function which on other occasions was performed by Chancellors, such as His Excellency himself, Lord Reay, Sir James Fergusson, and Sir Seymour Fitzgerald, and by Vice-Chancellors such as Sir Raymond West, Dr. Mackichan, and the Hon. Mr. Birdwood. If I can at all hope to attract your attention, it can only be on the ground of the novelty of a native of this country addressing you from this chair. But even when you look at the fact from that point of view, a feeling of bitter disappointment is sure to arise in your minds. For you have, through a mournful occurrence, lost an opportunity of listening to a more distinguished and abler native of the country, whose public utterances were, as Sir Raymond West in the best notice of Mr. Telang's life hitherto published happily expresses it, characterised by "a sweet persuasive reasonableness, illumined by a diffused radiance of feeling," and whose inner nature was, as he truly says, "in a great degree that of a meditative Saint, enamoured of purity and holiness, and filled with longing aspirations for the progress of mankind; but especially of the Hindus, towards perfection in knowledge, wisdom, and purpose." A sadder occurrence than the death, at an early age, of your late Vice-Chancellor I do not remember. When his faculties had reached their fullest development and his thoughts on all subjects had become mature, when, by his intellectual and moral excellence, he had but just risen to a position of high honour and influence, and a wide sphere of
usefulness had opened itself before him, and the highest expecta­
tions were everywhere formed of the good he would be able to
do, he was snatched away from us by the hands of death. He
was not only the brightest, or one of the brightest alumni of our
University, but as a Fellow and Syndic always exerted himself to
promote its interests and raise the quality of its tests. In his
hands the interests of higher education, so far as the University
was concerned, were safe. Mr. Telang’s untimely death revived
with very great force the controversy which the occurrence of
the death of a graduate always gives rise to. His death was
followed by that of another gifted graduate who was an M. A.
and M. D.—Mr. Vithal Vishnu Gokhale. He was one of six
brothers, all of whom, with the exception of the last, who is still
young, achieved great distinction at the University, but three of
whom had died before him. Another very promising young
man, Mr. L. R. Vaidya, who had gone through all the Arts exa­
minations up to the M. A. very successfully, passed the LL. B.
and the Advocate’s examination, compiled a very useful Sanskrit
dictionary, and edited a Sanskrit poem, similarly died a very pre­
mature death. And there have been a good many more such
instances. The responsibility for the deaths of these young men
is, by a large number of persons, brought to the door of the
University. The courses laid down are, they say, very difficult,
the rules are stringent, a candidate who has failed in one subject
is made to go through the whole course again instead of being
examined in that one subject only and the examinations are stiff.
In the first place, before the charge can be truly made out against
the University, it is necessary that an equal number of young
men not belonging to the University should be taken, and the
percentage of deaths among them shown to be lower. But this
has not been done by anybody. In the next place, many of the
young men whose deaths we deplore died not immediately after
finishing their course, but a good many years after; so that the
heavy strain to which the avocation they had chosen subjected
them must at least have as much to do with their premature
death as the University course. Still, I am not prepared to
deny that the long course of study that a student has to go through before he becomes an M. A., LL. B., or even a B. A. does impose a heavy strain on the intellects of our young men. The education of a Hindu of the upper classes belonging to a generation immediately preceding ours consisted simply of reading and copying letters and a little mental arithmetic, while we have had to go through a course of training lasting for at least ten years in two or three languages, the literature of those languages, mathematics, history, philosophy, physics, &c. The only sort of indigenous education that can at all be compared with that which we receive is that which was given to those who became Śāstrins or Pandits. But in their case they took their own time to finish a book, and the number of such Śāstrins or Pandits was insignificantly small, there being hardly two or three to each district. If, then, while our fathers, grandfathers and so on were almost entirely free from any mental strain, we are subjected to it for at least ten years, it is not, I think, unreasonable to assume that somehow or other it must tell on our health. What then? Shall we ask that our colleges and high schools should be shut up? No, we are so jealous of this free gift of higher education by a civilised Government that whenever there is a report of the abolition of any of these institutions or a Government Resolution having a remote tendency to discourage higher education appears, we are all up in arms,—metaphorically of course. Shall we then render our degree course easy and direct the examiners to put easy questions? If we think over the matter, we shall see that this demand really means that we want the degree or certificate of higher education, the semblance of it, not the reality. But in practical life semblance will not help us; we must have the reality. And let us see whether while we have the reality of higher education we cannot prevent this heavy mortality amongst our graduates. If we examine the matter more carefully, we shall, I think, find out in what direction the remedy lies. I have been at some pains to ascertain how many men from our M. A. and B. A. lists have died from 1862, the year in which the first B. A. examination was held, to
the year 1880. In this portion of the M. A. list there are the names of 25 Maratha Hindu Graduates, of whom 11, or 44 per cent., have died, and there are 18 Parsis, of whom only 3, or 16.6 per cent., have died. There are three Gujarathi, one Mussulman, and two Europeans or Eurasians; but I do not take these into consideration, since the operation of any law in such matters does not become manifest when the area of observation is very limited. In the B. A. list between those years we have 193 names of Maratha Hindu Graduates, of whom 40 or 20.7 per cent. have died. The number of Gujarathi Hindu Graduates is 40, of whom 9 or 22.5 per cent. have died. The number of Parsis is 63, of whom only 6, i.e., 9.5 per cent., have died. The oldest graduate in this portion of the list is of 32 years' standing, and the youngest of 14 years. Amongst graduates, therefore, of between 32 and 14 years' standing, 44 per cent. Hindu M. A.s have died, while of the Parsis only 16.6 per cent.; and 20.7 per cent. Maratha Hindu B. A.s have died, 22.5 per cent. Gujarathi Hindu B. A.s, and 9.5 per cent. only Parsi B. A.s. Now what is the cause of this disparity? It cannot be said that the Parsis are less studious than the Hindus, for they have obtained equally high University honours; neither can it be said that after graduation they lead a less busy life than the Hindus. The cause, therefore, must lie in certain circumstances, the existence of which makes the Parsis go on and the absence of which leads to the early breakdown or death of the Hindus. A Parsi enjoys life much better than a Hindu, uses nourishing food, goes through a greater amount of physical exercise, and does not, as a general rule, marry very early. Neither does a Parsi girl enter upon the married condition until she is mature. It must then be that, because these conditions are wanting in the case of the Hindus, so many of them comparatively are unable to bear the strain which higher education and subsequent active life impose upon them and die off. The food used by most of our Hindus, if not all, is hardly nourishing, they have no liking for physical exercise, do not know how to enjoy life, and marry very early and the health of their wives is in a shattered condi-
tion on account of early maternity. Reform in this direction is, therefore, the only way to avert the evil. And this is not the only sphere in which we find the strain upon us to be heavy. We have now come in contact with an energetic race, able to sustain a great deal of continuous and hard exertion, and possessed of habits of punctuality and regularity, which enable a man to go through a large amount of work with the same efforts. We have not yet acquired those habits, and our indigenous modes of work are more leisurely. We have to stand side by side with Englishmen or act under their direction in the work of administration, and compete with them and other European races in matters of trade, commerce, and manufacture. Every one of us who enters the Public Service has to work continuously from 10 o'clock to 5 o'clock, sometimes much later. A man engaged in trade and commerce has always to be on the alert and watchful of his opportunity, and even the labourer in a manufacturing establishment has to work continuously from six in the morning till six in the evening. Thus, under the new conditions of life, we have to bear a heavy strain in almost all spheres of activity. If, then, we will not sink and fall back in the race or die off under the tension, we must turn our attention to reform in the direction indicated by the statistics we have examined. Early marriage, both of boys and girls, must be put a stop to, physical exercise must be regularly resorted to by young as well as old, and our diet must be more nourishing. But I have heard people complain of poverty, and say that they cannot afford to use nourishing food. But complaints of poverty are heard only in connection with education. When a Hindu has to get his boy married he does so, howsoever poor he may be, and borrows, pledges, or pawns, if he has no money. But he will do nothing of the kind for the education of his son. Still, he sees that education will enable him to earn a livelihood and sends him to a school, but he will spend as little as possible on the object. Thus, then, to render ourselves fit for the new conditions of life, all our ideas on social matters must undergo a thorough change.
In previous Convocation speeches the change recently introduced into the Arts course has been noticed. As I myself took very great interest in the question and often discussed the new scheme with my lamented friend, Mr. Telang, and as objections are still raised against it in one shape or another, I hope you will allow me to say a few words on it. If one surveys the history of higher education in this Presidency, one will find that a contention between two ideas or sets of views has been going on all along. Some educationists would comprehend or include a great many subjects in a course of general education, while there are others who would put in as few as possible and begin special education early. The necessity of a general education and also of special education has not been denied by either party though in the beginning that for the latter was not practically acknowledged. But there is very great difference as to what subjects a general education and special education should embrace. Higher education began in this Presidency with the establishment of the Elphinstone College about the year 1836. From that time up to the establishment of the University every student of the College had to go through a course of mathematics, beginning with spherical trigonometry and ending with the differential calculus, history, political economy, logic, mental and moral philosophy, and English literature. Even for the B.A. examination, history, and logic and moral philosophy formed part of the necessary course in 1862, the first year in which it was held. In 1863, however, logic and moral philosophy were taken out of the necessary course and put into the special or optional course. A further change in the same direction was made in 1865, when history also was removed from the necessary course, so that a few books in two languages and a short course in mathematics only formed the necessary course. Thus the specialists fully succeeded. Now, gentlemen, the object in laying down a number of optional subjects is to enable the student to apply himself exclusively to that subject in which he takes interest and thus to acquire a special proficiency in it, which he would not acquire if others repulsive to him were forced upon him. But from the manner in
which the subjects out of the optional list were chosen; it would appear that our students had either a varied taste or no taste at all, and were guided by other considerations than the interesting nature of particular subjects. Thus in a large number of cases they did not choose exclusively mathematical subjects or literary subjects or scientific subjects, but took up one or two from one branch and the rest from the others. Thus dynamics and hydrostatics and analytical geometry were chosen with political economy, or logic and moral philosophy; or chemistry, dynamics and hydrostatics, with political economy. The object of the advocates of special education was in this manner defeated by the students. To prevent a fanciful choice of this kind kindred subjects were in 1879 grouped together and a candidate was required to choose one of these groups. But even in the choice of a group the students were very often guided, as I know from experience, not by their tastes but by the probability of an easy or a difficult examination in them. When, from the known characteristics of certain persons, generally appointed examiners, a student saw that an examination in a certain subject would be easy, he took up that subject; and when that in another subject was similarly expected to be difficult, he rejected that subject or group. Thus it often happened that a young man got his B. A. degree after having gone through about seven poetical and prose books or parts of books in each of two languages and a course in mathematics or science not very comprehensive. During the three or four years that he spent at college he did not imbibe any sound principles in spheres of thoughts with which he necessarily came in contact after he went into the world. In practical life there are always political, moral, social, and economic questions coming up, and every graduate has to form some opinion about them and advocate it in the press or on the platform. But for this a great many were hardly qualified, not knowing anything about history, political economy, and philosophy. Ignorance of sound thought on those subjects and the absence of the mental discipline which a course of study
in them imparts is one of the many causes of the wild talk and writing that we find about us. Thus a young man goes out into the world and finds the English constitution spoken of. He sees how the people themselves govern the country and their wishes triumph over those of the men above them in the social scale, and conceives a liking for it, aspires after it, and wishes for its introduction into his own country. But he little knows that such a constitution as that implies masses of men being inspired with certain ideas and moving towards their realization, and to work it certain mental and moral habits are required which it takes hundreds of years to acquire, and certain social arrangements which are the growth of centuries. The English constitution of the present day would not have suited the English of the times of the Wars of the Roses. It did not spring up then. It is, therefore, not possible that it will suit India, which in its social arrangements and in its political, economic, and other ideas greatly resembles Europe in or about the end of the "Middle Ages." It is by an intelligent study of the history of England alone that a student can know what social changes must take place, what a transformation of ideas and sentiments there must be, what trials and sufferings must be gone through and how a nation's character should be formed under those trials and sufferings, before it becomes fit for such political institutions as those which prevail at present. The study of moral philosophy is similarly of use in my opinion. If nothing else is effected by it, the student's mind will at least be directed to the awful nature of the distinction between right and wrong, as to which the followers of all schools are agreed, though they explain the origin of the distinction differently. This cannot fail to be of use to a student when he goes out into the world, and the knowledge that he will acquire by the study of this subject will enable him to form for himself a practical theory for his guidance in life. It was for these reasons that, in common with my friend the late Vice-Chancellor, I sought the re-introduction of history, political economy, and moral philosophy into the general course. But there was such a strong opposition against the inclusion of
moral philosophy that it had to be given up. History we did succeed in getting in, but now and again there are complaints from specialists against it. I do not understand why there should be such a strong objection to the re-introduction of these subjects. Nor do I understand what marvellous virtue there is in six or seven prose or poetic books or parts of books in two languages and in a short course in mathematics which those subjects have not and which renders it necessary that every student should go through them. Why should we not have special education from the beginning? Why is a second language, which is often a dead language, necessary? But the specialist is not prepared to go so far, though if he is consistent, I think, he should. We have seen that very often we do not, by having a great many optional groups, encourage special talent, and the effect is that students go into the world with a sort of education which has not fitted them for grappling with certain problems that come up before them and which notwithstanding they have to grapple with. I do not mean to say that the mere inclusion of these subjects into the necessary course will effect the object I aim at. Nearly everything depends upon the sort of teachers we have in those subjects and of examiners. The teacher should accustom his pupils to think and trace effects to their causes, and it is the duty of an examiner to find out whether they have been so taught. But I cannot say that in both these respects things are in a satisfactory condition. Great is the responsibility of those who make appointments to professorships and to examiner-ships, but with reference to the latter, on behalf of the University, I can only regret that there is such a narrow and unpromising field for selection.

Another point on which, with your permission, I wish to make a few remarks this evening is that concerning the course of general education that is necessary for a candidate for a professional degree. The idea of those who gave shape to our University appears clearly to have been that a general education up to the B. A. standard was wanted. Hence they laid down
the rule that a candidate for LL. B. and M. C. E. should be a Bachelor of Arts. But in the early days of the University the number of B. A.s was very small and even that of those who passed the Matriculation examination, and the course of medical education extended over five years and that of civil engineering over three. They, therefore, conceived the idea of granting a sort of license to those students of medicine and civil engineering who were qualified for their particular profession, but were not qualified for a degree. As, however, they considered it inconsistent with the dignity of a University to issue licenses, they gave the name of degrees to the licenses they issued in medicine and civil engineering, and thus we came to have the degrees of Licentiates of Medicine and of Civil Engineering. In law, however, such a necessity was not felt, and and the B. A. qualification was adhered to. But since the time when the rules were promulgated the number of successful candidates at the several examinations in Arts have vastly increased, and while we had 39 candidates who passed the Matriculation in 1862, we have now about 800 or 900 passing every year. In 1862 there were only four B. A.s; we have now between 100 and 150, and at the Previous Examination we have between 160 and 240 successful candidates; and at the 1st B. A. more then 150. The time, therefore, for carrying out the idea of the founders of our University, in a modified shape at least, has long since arrived; and the engineering faculty has raised the standard of qualification from the Matriculation to the Previous examination. But the medical faculty has been discussing the question for nine years without coming to any conclusion. It was even proposed or resolved that, instead of the Licentiate of Medicine, we should have the more dignified degree of Bachelor of Medicine, and for this at least it was hoped that all medical members of the Senate would agree in requiring a higher standard of general education; but even for that the majority in the Senate would have nothing more than the Matriculation. The sister Universities of Calcutta and Madras have raised their preliminary requirement to the First Examination in Arts; but we will have nothing of the
It stands to reason that if a medical man has had a good general education, he is likely to be of greater use; but we do not want him to be a man of general education. This you will admit is a very unsatisfactory condition of things and is unintelligible to my mind. A dead-lock such as this cannot but be a matter of great concern to one who wishes to see self-government flourish in this country, and augurs ill for our future prospects. I earnestly hope, therefore, that wiser counsels will come to prevail, and our medical faculty and the Senate will decide the question in a satisfactory manner. I would propose for their consideration, as a sort of compromise, whether, if they must have the Matriculation for the degree of Licentiate, it would not be advisable to have the Intermediate as a preliminary qualification for the higher degree of M. B. We shall thus have three medical degrees corresponding with three stages in general education, that of Licentiate with the Matriculation, the M. B. with the Intermediate, and the M. D. with B. A. The field of choice will thus be comprehensive, and the candidate may choose one of the three according to his own capacities and means.

The character of our Senate and the debates carried on by it have a good deal changed since I first became acquainted with the body. In those days a very small number of Fellows attended the meetings, but they were men who took very great interest in educational matters and were alive to the responsibility of their position. There were only, if I remember right, about twelve fellows present when such an important question as the introduction of Persian as a second language at the higher examination in Arts was discussed and that language added to the list from which it had before been excluded on account of its being a vernacular. Now we have a larger number of fellows on the roll, and a larger number take interest in University matters. This is as it should be. If, however, instead of being guided by cold reason and acting with a sense of responsibility, the Senate becomes a democratic assembly, carried away by
emotion and impulse; the change must certainly be a matter for regret.

Our University is but an examining body, and its function, like that of a mint, is confined to assaying the silver, perhaps the gold, of the intellectual acquisitions of our young men, according to certain standards, and stamping it with the letters B. A., M. A., M. D., &c. Such an idea of a University is no doubt in keeping with the spirit of the age in which machinery has received such a high development. But this is neither the primary, nor a dignified, nor a fruitful idea of a University. A University, in my opinion, ought to be a body of men devoted to learning, engaged in the pursuit of truth, carrying on researches and investigations, and communicating their knowledge to others by educating young men and by the publication of books and papers. Such a body should have a healthy public opinion of its own, the influence of which every one of its members, whether a teacher or an examiner, should feel, and which should compel him to do his duty faithfully and conscientiously. Looking to the manner in which the work in the departments both of instruction and examination has been done for a great many years, I have long felt the necessity of such a public opinion as the only remedy for the many defects that are observable. But it is a question whether we shall ever be able to realise this idea in India. In the first place our colleges are scattered over the whole Presidency and cannot on this account influence each other. The learning and the knowledge that we aim at are, and must necessarily be, what might be called European learning and European knowledge, and the methods of investigation, research, and education are European. Consequently, Europeans must form a very large and predominant element of such an institution. But the European professors and teachers that come out feel themselves as exiles in this country and have got no permanent stake in it. They can hardly, therefore, be expected to take pride in such an institution as I have been thinking of and contribute to its formation. Hence it is that, though we have had European professors and teachers here
now for more than half a century, not a single work of a nature to make its mark in the world has been published by any one of them, except the German professors of Oriental Languages. And as to the natives of the country, they, too, have shown no zeal or ardour in the pursuit of knowledge. Our graduates after leaving the University often forget all about the subjects to which they were introduced while at college; and if in any case they continue to take interest in them, it is but of a languid nature. It must be said, however, on their behalf that the first thing they must think of is getting on in the world, and perhaps the avocation which they have to follow with that view allows them little time for pursuit of knowledge. What is necessary then is that in connection with the University we should have some endowments in the nature of fellowships or professorships to be held by the natives. Germany is the country in Europe which is known to be foremost in carrying on original research in all branches of knowledge, and this has been attributed to the fact that it was cut up into a great many little states, and continues in a great measure to be so cut up. Each of the states made it a point to have a University of its own with its usual complement of professors and the country has thus come to have many such Universities, and a great many men devoted enthusiastically to study and research. But what is the possibility of our having such professorships, fellowships, or studentships? There are many and important calls on the public exchequer on account of which it does not appear likely that Government will institute them, though it behoves a paternal Government to direct its attention to this branch of educational work also. But Government have at their disposal a fund which might be used for this purpose. The late Mr. E. I. Howard, Director of Public Instruction, who has left his permanent stamp on the Department of Public Instruction, saw the necessity of such professorships or studentships and got the Government to put into his hands the Dāksīnā Fund. He thereupon created certain appointments, which he called fellowships—a name which shows what his idea was; and he often expressed that idea by saying that his object...
was to encourage the pursuit of learning among the natives of this country. He, therefore, did not lay down a certain period for which a fellowship was tenable, and our early Dakṣiṇā fellows held their appointments for five or six years and might have held them longer if they had wished. But since his time the idea has been lost sight of, and the Dakṣiṇā fellowships have been, to all intents and purposes, converted into scholarships, tenable for a year or two, ostensibly to enable the Bachelors of Arts to study for the M. A. degree, which, however, they are not compelled to do. But there is nothing to prevent us from retracing our steps and the Dakṣiṇā Fund might still be used for the institution of fellowships or studentships in connection with the University with a monthly allowance varying from Rs. 150 to Rs. 250. I am sure we shall then have a few men at least determined to devote their life to study and research. But the Dakṣiṇā Fund can go but a little way; and the means that are wanted for this purpose must principally come from our rich citizens themselves. Scholarships and prizes we have got in abundance. What is now wanted is studentships or fellowships of the kind I mention; and the merchant princes of Bombay will truly immortalise themselves and entitle themselves to the permanent gratitude of their countrymen if they endow them. Five or six thousand rupees are sufficient for a scholarship, wherefore the credit derived from such a gift is but little. But a fellowship, from the very fact that a large amount is required and that it alone will be the means of promoting the growth of knowledge in the country, will remain a standing monument of the generosity and public spirit of the citizen who endows it.

But such as our University is, it has been the means of promoting education in the Presidency and, through it, of doing a great deal of good generally. Had it not been for such a central establishment as ours that lays down what boys and young men shall be taught, sees that they have been taught it, and issues certificates to that effect, education would not have received the expansion it has. At the same time it is quite clear
that such an expansion would not have been possible had there been no openings for our graduates in the public service and the professions. In 1862 there were only 4 B. A.s. Now the number on the M. A. list is 106, and that on the B. A. list is 1,339; and if we add the 183 that have passed this year, the total number of graduates in Arts is 1,628. Besides we have 35 Bachelors of Science, which brings it up to 1663. Of these 378, inclusive of the 31 who have passed this year, are Bachelors of Law. They are either employed in the Judicial Service of Government or are pleaders. In both capacities they have greatly contributed to raise the tone of the administration of justice. I remember in my younger days to have, in my native district, constantly heard murmurs against the conduct of the munsiffs or subordinate judges of those days; but they have all ceased now. A few graduates have got entrance into the Revenue Service, and from all the information I have I am in a position to state that there also their work is satisfactory. Nearly the whole of the higher branch of the Educational Department is conducted by graduates. The greater the number of educated men that find entrance into the services, the better will it be in the interests of good government. It is not enough that the statesmen at the helm of affairs and the great officers immediately under them should be disinterested persons desirous of nothing but the good of the people. The agency they employ for carrying out their orders and for the performance of the details of the administration must be as good as it can be made. Our immediate governors, with whom it rests to make our life miserable or happy, are the Patils, the Kulkarnis, the Talatis, the Mahalkaris, the Mamlatdars and their Karkuns, the Police Chief Constables and Inspectors, the petty Magistrates and the Subordinate Judges. For the purposes of good government in a country where the masses are uneducated and ignorant it is, in my humble opinion, of the highest importance that these should, as far as possible, be men of education and principle. On the list of medical graduates we have five Doctors of Medicine and 438 Licentiates of Medicine, inclusive of the men who have passed this
year; in all 443. Some of these are employed in the service of Government, and a few in Native States; but a good many are engaged in private practice. It is only in Bombay and some of the larger towns in the districts that our medical graduates find private practice; but in Bombay the field is now overcrowded. European medicine has not yet found favour with the masses, and the condition of our medical graduates is anything but satisfactory. On the list of the graduates in Civil Engineering we have one Master and 311 Licentiates inclusive of this year’s men. Most of those are employed in the Public Works Department, on the railways, and in Native States. A few are engaged in private practice; but there is no extensive field for it.

On our list all the literary classes or castes of Hindus are represented; and there are a few from what are called the backward classes. The Parsis have, as may be expected from their usual energy, taken the fullest advantage of the benefits of the University, considering that they form such a small part of the population of the Presidency. The only important community that still remains backward is that of the Mahomedans. There are not more than about 20 on the list of graduates in Arts. Up to this time we have had one Mahomedan M. A. only, and it is a gratifying circumstance that we have got another this year. In Bombay we have a large and influential Mahomedan community, but its members are engaged in trade and commerce; and, as a rule, Indians, whether Hindus or Mahomedans, who have an opening in this sphere for their sons do not care to give them higher education. The Deccan Mahomedans, like the Deccani Hindus, have no genius for trade or commerce, but somehow they do not come forward as their Hindu brethren do. In my opinion it behoves the leading and influential members of the Mahomedan community here and in the mofussil to make strenuous endeavours to bring up their co-religionists. The assistance of other communities might be asked and will, I suppose, be given. A large number of scholarships, not less than 100, to be held by Mahomedans in High Schools and
Colleges should be instituted. If it will take a long time to raise a sufficient fund to be invested for the purpose, a beginning should be made by making annual contributions. Let us show that we possess public spirit and will help ourselves. If we bring forward Mahomedans in this way, they will be represented on our University lists in due proportion and will take their places side by side with the Hindus in the public service and in the professions in a corresponding proportion.

But, gentlemen, though our University has thus been successfully discharging its duty, there are certain points which it is urgently necessary that our graduates should carefully bear in mind in order that they may be as useful as they might be to the Government of the country, promote the general interests of the community, and contribute towards the regeneration of India. And to these, with your permission, I will now devote a few minutes, addressing my remarks to my brother graduates. An undergraduate of the University, after he has finished his course and taken his degree, claims to be called an educated man. The Sanskrit word that corresponds to the word educated is "śīṣṭa," and according to the old Hindu idea a "śīṣṭa" is, in the words of the great grammarian Patañjali, a man who does not store up wealth (literally one who keeps so much grain only as is contained in a jar), who is not greedy, and who disinterestedly, without any further object, acquires perfect proficiency in some branch of learning. The idea, therefore, is that he who devotes himself to the pursuit of knowledge or truth for its own sake and disdains mere worldly prosperity is a man of education or culture. To deserve this title, therefore, it will not do for undergraduates to study their books and subjects only with a view to the degree examinations and in a manner to achieve success. It will not do for them to choose their optional subjects only because the examination in them is likely to be easy. They should take a real and lively interest in the books they read and the subjects they study, and choose their optional course only because they have a predilection for it.
With a sincere and humble desire to know and to improve, they should endeavour to find and appreciate the good that their books place before them, appropriate it, and make it a part of their own nature. Mere success at an examination and the acquisition of a degree, and through its means the improvement of one's worldly prospects, are not very high motives, and are certainly unworthy of any thoughtful man, and especially of the descendants of those who disdained riches to be able to devote themselves single-heartedly to knowledge and truth. At the same time to deserve this title of sīsta or educated it will not do for one who has got his degree to think that his work is accomplished and that he has nothing more to do with books or knowledge. An educated native should continue through his life to take interest in the great subjects of knowledge which occupy the attention of men, and should go on closely watching the progress of ideas in Europe, where, of course, there is greater movement of thought than in our country. He will forfeit his claim to be considered a man of culture, if he chooses to be ignorant of what the progressive nations of the West are thinking, doing and admiring. But in the course of our progress in this lifelong education we are likely, in consequence of our previous antecedents, to misunderstand and misapply European ideas. Against such misunderstanding and misapplication we have to guard ourselves. For instance, the idea of self-respect, personal independence, national independence, liberty of speech, and patriotism are constantly brought to our notice, and there is evidence that a good many of our men do not understand their proper limitations. Self-respect and personal independence often degenerate into disrespect for others, and want of reverence for those who, by their position, knowledge or even age, deserve it from us. Such a degeneration can only have the effect of degrading a man's character. Self-respect ought to come into operation only then, when a low worldly motive is about to lead you to do a mean or an unrighteous act, and prevent you from doing it. Personal independence ought to be exhibited only then, when the importunity of others or
the fear of displeasing them prevents you from saying and doing what, after a careful inquiry, you have come to believe to be undoubtedly true, and lead you to say it or do it. National independence you can have only when there is a nation and it has the capacity of governing itself. But when the inhabitants of a country are divided into a number of separate communities or castes hostile to each other, national independence can only mean the possession by one community or one caste of power over others which it must, of course, use for its own benefit and to the detriment of others. And when the country has never had in the course of its history a training in free or representative institutions or never been animated with a desire for them or had even a conception of them, national independence must mean the tyranny of one man over all others. In the same manner liberty of speech and all kinds of liberty have their limits, which it is of great importance always to bear in mind. You cannot speak what you like or act as you like simply because you are free or possess liberty. Liberty of speech means that one should not be prevented from speaking what, after a careful examination, one has found to be unmistakably true and which it is good in the interest of the community that one should speak. If, however, you say something against an individual or a body of individuals because they are obnoxious to you, without any inquiry and without even a decent knowledge of the matter with reference to which you are criticizing him or them, it is an absolute misuse of the liberty of speech which cannot but promote ill-feeling, foment quarrels, and eventually bring on ruin. Similarly, liberty of action implies that one should not be prevented from doing what one's conscience approves or imposes on him as a duty. If, however, conscience or sense of duty is set aside and a man, under the influence of any of his lower passions, acts in a manner to do harm or injustice to others, he is not a man who is free, but is a slave of his passions, and will have to be prevented in certain cases from being so by the laws of the community.
The idea of patriotism, which is constantly brought up before our minds by English literature and history, is in the same manner liable to be very greatly misunderstood and misapplied. One may think patriotism requires him to hate foreigners because they are foreigners, to run down their manners, customs, and institutions, to attribute vices to them which they do not possess, and deny their most manifest virtues and all the good that they actually do. On the other hand it may be considered to consist in praising one's ancestors and one's own people, admiring their manners, customs and institutions, and denying their manifest failings and the patent defects of their character. This is the patriotism of feeble minds incapable of thought and action. And eventually it resolves itself into a confirmed enmity for one's own people. For if people do not see the good that there is in foreigners, they are incapable of learning; if they do not see their own serious faults and defects and the evil that there is in their manners, customs, and institutions, there can be no improvement, no progress; and the nation must lag behind while others are going on, and must suffer. He only is a true patriot who, with an unprejudiced mind and with the light that God has vouchsafed to him, examines the manners, customs, and institutions of his country and the character of his people, fearlessly exposes the abuses or evils he may find therein, and earnestly calls upon them to reform and improve even at the risk of offending them and being stoned by them. Again, one ought to be a patriot in reality and not in name merely; for if he is a true patriot, he must be prepared to sacrifice his time, money, convenience, interests and even reputation for the good of his country. But if he is good only for talking and slowly retires when called upon to undergo self-sacrifice, when he will work only in matters where he is praised by his countrymen and will stand at a convenient distance from others, which, howsoever beneficial to them, offend their prejudices, he is but a self-seeking patriot. Again, in politics patriotism generally aims at national independence. But I have already pointed out what national
independence can only mean in the case of a country divided into communities and castes in chronic hostility with each other and unused to, or unacquainted with, free institutions. An Indian patriot must recognize the great forces in operation in the world. Asia is being divided among themselves by three great European Powers, and in the contest, from the character and peculiar civilization of its people, Asia is nowhere. We ought to consider ourselves peculiarly fortunate in having fallen into the hands of a nation that has a conscience. England would be ashamed of herself if she held India solely for the purpose of her own aggrandizement. She has consciously undertaken the function of civilizing India, and of this our University is one of the many evidences available. She has given an orderly and stable government to the country; destroyed the Thugs, Pindaries, and Dacoits; allowed to every man the right to live and enjoy his earnings, which no one, howsoever high his position, can transgress; and given us the benefits of the inventions of the nineteenth century,—railways, telegraphs, a highly organized post office, and so on. The material or mechanical resources of England are vast. The intellect of a European, especially of Western Europe, is ever wakeful, ever active. Every new idea is grasped, examined from all points of view, and it fructifies. Improvements in the processes of manufacture of all kinds, from that of fire matches to that of guns, ships of war, and spinning and weaving machinery, are constantly going on. And above all, the Englishman possesses immense powers of organization; he is ever diligent and watchful; his work is always methodical and systematic; he is animated by an over-powering sense of national duty; and he maintains perfect discipline in everything. I say “above all,” for it was by these qualities that he succeeded in establishing an empire in India, before he had steamships, railways, electric telegraphs, and powerful guns and other arms of precision. A wise Indian patriot, therefore, will take pride in the fact that this country forms a very important member of the Empire over which the sun never sets, and that India is one of the brightest jewels, if not the brightest, in the British Crown.
The glories of that Empire he should regard as his glories and its misfortunes to be his misfortunes. We are the inhabitants of Greater Britain, i.e. of the larger section of Britain, the smaller section of which is situated in North-Western Europe; and our political patriotism should centre itself round that name. Therein lies our salvation. The world is moving towards higher political unities. And a higher unity has been formed in the shape of the British Empire; and there can be no disruption of that unity as long as Englishmen are what they are, nor can there be the remotest desire for it so long as Indians are thoughtful and wise. There may be some points in the policy pursued in the government of the country and some acts which are conceived more in the interests of England than of India. There may be grievances and individual cases of oppression. But we have got the right of petition and the liberty of speech. This right and this liberty should, however, be used in the manner I have already indicated. Care should be taken to study the particular question and ascertain the truth about it, to say nothing that is not true, and to ascribe no evil motive; and general denunciations, of which unfortunately we find so many, ought strictly to be avoided. We may even ask for powers and privileges. But before we do so we should take care to qualify ourselves for their exercise. We should learn to use them in the interests of the community at large, and rise superior to all considerations about self, caste, or clique. Nothing but a sense of duty to the general public should actuate us in the exercise of the powers and privileges that may be granted to us. At the same time we should endeavour to form habits of working in an orderly and methodical manner. If those powers and privileges have, in the first instance, to be exercised by the masses of the people, they ought to be made to understand what they mean; they ought to be taught that they have certain interests as a community which it is their duty to promote by a just and faithful exercise of those powers and privileges, and educated into a desire for them. If we bestow no thought upon such matters and go on asking, we shall simply be wasting breath. And as to the
powers and privileges already granted to us, if we use them for advancing our private interests or those of our clique or caste and will not do the work they entail regularly, we shall make ourselves the enemies of our country instead of patriots. For there will thus be misgovernment, and the British authorities will take away what they have granted, or at least cease to grant more, and our future prospects will be destroyed. Whenever a native misuses a privilege or a power, there ought, therefore, to be a strong public opinion among us which will condemn him and prevent further misuse.

I have thus briefly discussed the manner in which some of the ideas to which we are introduced are, or may be, misunderstood and abused. We should guard ourselves against such a misunderstanding and such an abuse, and treasure up in our hearts the words of the great sage of Chelsea, addressed to the students of the Edinburgh University, on the true objects of education. "You are ever to bear in mind," says he, "that there lies behind that (mere positive and technical knowledge) the acquisition of what may be called wisdom—namely, sound appreciation and just decision as to all the objects that come round you, and the habit of behaving with justice, candour, clear insight, and loyal adherence to fact. Great is wisdom; infinite is the value of wisdom. It cannot be exaggerated, it is the highest achievement of man. 'Blessed is he that getteth understanding.' And that, I believe, on occasion may be missed very easily: never more easily than now, I sometimes think. If that is a failure, all is failure!" Let us then endeavour to acquire this highest achievement of man, this wisdom, by means of the education we receive, by what European literature and history teach us. If we do not do so, rest assured all will be failure, as the prophet tells us.

One of the ideas which is calculated to lead us to wisdom, and which, in recent times, has been exercising such a powerful influence over the European mind and leading Europeans to
study with a sympathetic spirit the literature, the history, and the religion of our country and the other countries in the world, even the thoughts and ideas of savages, is the unity of the human race. We should learn to sympathize with the joys and griefs of men of all races, study watchfully the conflict and progress of ideas among them and their gradual advance from barbarism to the height of civilization, and from the elevated standpoint thus gained, and with our national prejudices thus cleared off, look back upon the history of our race, trace with an unbiassed mind its progress towards civilization and observe the phenomenon of its stagnancy, or, more truly, its decline and degradation. It will then be our duty strenuously to endeavour to eradicate the causes of that decline and that degradation. My friends, we are living in a momentous period in the history of India. Upon our conduct at this period depends the future of our country. The Indian intellect has been dormant for centuries. Original thought disappeared with the old Rṣis; the fermentation of religious and philosophic ideas ceased with the decline of Buddhism; philosophy became verbose and wasted itself in trifling subtleties; poetry assumed an artificial character; religion degenerated into forms, ceremonies, and superstitions; and custom became a hideous tyrant and brought in female infanticide, the burning alive of widows, the marriage of a hundred or a hundred and fifty girls to one man, the degradation of womankind, hook-swinging, &c., &c.; and there was no moral force in the land to do battle with these evils. It was reserved for the foreigner to put some of them down with the strong arm of the law; but in the cases in which the foreigner will not interfere they still flourish. The intellect and the moral sense of the country must now wake up under the influence of European civilization, and the task and heavy responsibility of regenerating her has devolved upon ourselves, who have felt the influence. Thought on every subject of interest to humanity must be stimulated, literature and philosophy have a fresh start, our vernaculars be improved, and a desire for knowledge be propagated. The great iniquities and falsehoods of our social
institutions and customs must be corrected; the standard of practical morality raised, tastes improved, higher ideals placed before the people, and religion purified and reformed. If we have truly assimilated the idea of patriotism, if the feeling has really sprung up in our hearts, here is a legitimate field for its exercise. But if we neglect it entirely, or are very lukewarm about it, and confine our activity to the political sphere, the least that can be said about the matter is that our patriotism is not the genuine but a counterfeit article. And we shall cut the ground from under our feet; for, from what I have already said, you will see that there can be no political advancement without social and moral advancement. In this process of regeneration the ideas or principles, which alone will guide us safely, are sense of duty, love of truth, and love of justice. The education we receive will have to be considered merely superficial if it does not enable us to grasp these principles. These, therefore, I earnestly implore you to learn thoroughly and incorporate with your internal spirit. Not only will they elevate the individual character, but they alone will ensure the future happiness of our race. For, social arrangements, manners, and customs then only conduce to the happiness and prosperity of a nation; when they are based upon truth and justice. One of the greatest historians of England, who denies that history is a science which will enable us to predict the results of particular deeds, as the astronomer predicts an eclipse, still acknowledges that "one lesson and only one history may be said to repeat with distinctness; that the world is built somehow on moral foundations; that in the long run, it is well with the good; in the long run, it is ill with the wicked." And further on he says more forcibly and eloquently, "First, it (history) is a voice for ever sounding across the centuries the laws of right and wrong. Opinions alter,
manners change, creeds rise and fall, but the moral law is written on the tablets of eternity. For every false word or unrighteous deed, for cruelty and oppression, for lust or vanity, the price has to be paid at last, not always by the chief offenders, but paid by some one. Justice and truth alone endure and live. Injustice and falsehood may be long-lived, but doomsday comes at last to them, in French revolutions and other terrible ways.

There, gentlemen, must all discussion and dispute end, and there will I end.
REJOINDER TO MR. JUSTICE RĀNADE

[ FROM THE BOMBAY GAZETTE, BOMBAY, APRIL, 1894 ]

The late Mr. Justice Ranade criticised in an address delivered at the Eighth Annual General Meeting of the Bombay Graduates' Association some of the conclusions arrived at in the Convocation Address. The following is the reply of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, dated Lonavala, 24th April 1894.

Sir,—The position and influence of the Honourable Mr. Justice Ranade render it necessary that against my usual practice I should notice his criticism on my Convocation address. Mr. Ranade discovers an undertone of pessimism in what I said. In private conversation also he has again and again denounced me as a pessimist. But I am unable to find the reason. What I have been doing during the last seven or eight years is to call attention to the defects and shortcomings of my countrymen and the erroneous notions prevailing among them, imploring them to endeavour to get over them as a necessary preliminary to all progress and tell them that without the acquisition of certain virtues and without a reform of our social Institutions real political advance is impossible. Beyond this I can find no justification of Mr. Ranade's use of that epithet in my case. But there is no reason why I should complain. On the contrary, I should feel myself highly honoured by Mr. Ranade's speaking of me as a pessimist. For in the course of a lecture delivered by him in connection with the anniversary of the Prarthana Samaj, about a fortnight ago, Mr. Ranade told his audience that Carlyle and Ruskin were pessimists. A pessimist then is one who hates cant and convention, and preaches sincerity, fidelity to truth, and action as opposed to talk; for that is what Carlyle and Ruskin do. But Mr. Justice Ranade warned his hearers against Carlyle and Ruskin as unsuited to our weak constitution, however suited they might be to the sturdier races that inhabit the British Isles. This I am unable to understand,
Such a scientist as Tyndall acknowledges with gratitude the healthy moral influence exercised over him by Carlyle, saying it was his teaching that roused him to action. Principal Selby observed in the course of a lecture that he delivered to his pupils the other day that Carlyle, Ruskin, and Wordsworth were his favourite authors, meaning thereby to recommend them to their attention.

Perhaps Mr. Justice Ranade does not like my plain-speaking, for he is reported to have said at the lecture alluded to above that "a wise doctor never revealed to his patient the danger of illness he suffered from; though some thought that truth was truth and must always be told." This constitutes the radical difference between us. But what surprises me greatly is that Mr. Ranade should see that his doctrine is based on the most hopeless pessimism. For the comparison implies that India is suffering from a dangerous disease that must terminate fatally. But if she is suffering from a disease which is curable, but may become dangerous if she does not carefully attend to the directions of the doctor, can the doctor be called wise who will not warn her and impress upon her the paramount necessity of carefully observing his directions, if she wishes to live but will go on telling her that she is in sound health, equal to any kind of exertion and may conduct her as she wishes? If I believed that India was suffering from a disease of the former kind, I would pass my days in the saddest silence. But I believe she is suffering from a disease of the latter kind; and hence my efforts to warn her and to point out the remedies. This is what I have done in my Convocation address; and the directions there given might be shortly summed up in the words: "Follow Carlyle and Ruskin, and you will be saved."

I will now proceed to the main points discussed by Mr. Ranade. He says I did not attribute the disproportionately large mortality among the Hindus to "the strain of studies in the University curriculum." This is not correct. I did attri-
bute. Again, he says, I was "of opinion that they (the evil results) were not due to any overstrain of studies and examinations". I was not and did not say I was. On the contrary, I endeavoured to make out that the education we received did impose a heavy strain upon us, from which our fathers and grand-fathers were free. And I said that the strain in the ordinary walks of life was also heavy in consequence of our having come in contact with a more energetic race. I admitted the strain, but, unlike Mr. Ranade and others, I did not propose the reduction of the standards, as that would mean the giving of degrees to men with only a semblance of education; but, finding from a comparison of the mortality among the different classes of graduates that the Parsees stood the strain very well, I advised the Hindus to live like the Parsees, and affirmed that a thorough change in their social ideas and customs would alone enable the Hindus to bear the strain. And I do not know how men who advocate a reduction in the standards can with consistency ask Government to hold the Civil Service Examination in India. The course of study for that examination is certainly more difficult than that for the B. A. degree, and is as hard as, if not harder than, that for the M. A. examination. Our best B. A.s have, when they happen to go England, to place themselves for one or two years under a professional crammer and even then get a low place in the pass list. Our only way, therefore, is to fit ourselves for the strain which the higher education imposes, and not ask that the strain be reduced. If Mr. Ranade thinks that the real evil lies in the University curriculum, he ought to have faced that vital question, and given us his solution of it instead of contenting himself with a general allusion to the pass degree of the English Universities. He has not made any specific proposals as to how the standard should be reduced. The only definite thing that he and persons who think with him have got to say is that candidates who fail in certain subjects should be examined in the following year in those subjects only. But if we examine our death list we shall, I think, find that a
great many on that list were not plucked at all at any examination; so that, supposing the change were not objectionable in other respects, it would by no means operate as a far-reaching remedy.

Since the lowest percentage of deaths among the Parsee graduates is the point on which my argument for social change hinges, Mr. Justice Ranade's great effort is directed towards making out that the Parsees have no advantage over the Hindus in this respect, and these do not die in larger numbers. But since Mr. Ranade has also been an advocate of social reform, he endeavours to clear himself from a possible misunderstanding as regards his attitude towards that question, and asserts that if he is going to prove that the Parsees have no superiority over the Hindus, it is only because "no useful purpose is served by imperfect generalizations". He also thinks it unfortunate that I should have confined my inquiries to the first eighteen years of the existence of the University. But let us look into the question more closely in order to find out whether Mr. Ranade's generalizations or mine have a sounder basis, and whether the principle of confining one's inquiry to a certain number of years is not the only true principle in the case. Mr. Ranade himself says that some only of our graduates died immediately after taking their degree, but the majority lived till they were about thirty-five, that being their average age at the time of death. They thus lived for about ten years after they took their degree. In so taking the matter, Mr. Ranade supposes them to have left the University at the age of twenty-five. But B. A.s leave when they are about twenty or twenty-one; though M. A.s stay till they are about twenty-five. We will take twelve or thirteen as the number of years for which they lived after taking their degree. This means that the University poison, to adopt a medical phrase, takes about 12 years to operate after it has been introduced into the system. If so, in order to estimate the percentage of deaths caused by it, we should take into consideration only the number of graduates on whom it has been operating for more than twelve years, and leave out the rest. For in
the case of these latter the poison has not had its assigned time in which to operate. Mr. Ranade's procedure, therefore, of taking all graduates up to the last year must lead to fallacious results. I have excluded graduates of the last thirteen years, and therefore mine must be the correct principle. Of course, since all these calculations are more or less rough, I must have excluded those of the last twelve, eleven or even ten years, instead of those of thirteen years; but the result would not have been materially different. Then again the other principle introduced by Mr. Ranade is equally based on a radical error. He states that the general health statistics give the rate of mortality to be thirty per thousand between the age limits of twenty and forty, and since the University rate exceeds this, it is unquestionable that the University kills men. Now, the University rate cannot at all be compared with the general outside rate. For this latter is arrived at by taking a certain number of men at the age of twenty, observing them till they (the same men) become forty years old, and finding how many of them have died during the time. But in arriving at the University rate Mr. Ranade has not observed the same men from the age limit of twenty to that of forty; some of his men are forty years of age, others thirty-nine, thirty-eight etc., down to twenty. To be able to compare the two rates, Mr. Ranade ought to have taken the graduates of a certain year and observe them till they became forty years old, and not taken different graduates of different ages. In the case of the general outside rate, you have the same men at different ages, while in the case of the University rate you have different men at different ages. Thus then, though of course we believe that the strain of University studies does injure men's health, the matter has not at all been proved by Mr. Justice Ranade.

But though the statistical results arrived at by Mr. Ranade are vitiated by the radical error shown above, they point in the same direction as mine. The death-rate among Parsee B. A's is three per cent., among Gujarathis five, and Marathas 9.2,
while the rate among graduates generally is four, five and ten respectively. Mr. Ranade shirks from the obvious inference that arises. He dwells for some time on the apparent advantages which the Gujarathis enjoy as regards some of the courses in some of the faculties, and which are principally due to their smaller numbers, where, as I have observed, the operation of a law does not become manifest, quietly neglecting the fact that they are two-thirds worse than the Parsees in the B. A. list (the percentages being five and three), while in any more limited B. A. list, they are a little more than once worse; asserts that the general rates, 4, 5 and 10 are reproduced in the B. A. rates, though these are 3, 5 and 9.2, i.e. that there is no difference between the three of the Parsees here and four there; and observes in explanation of the more favourable rate in the case of the Parsees: "The general rate for the Parsees is lowered by the very large number of Parsee Graduates". What Mr. Justice Ranade means by this it is difficult to understand. Is it an arithmetical law that he wishes here to enunciate, viz., the larger the divisor, the smaller the quotient that we get? If so, what can be the use of such a statement here? He should give a social, economic, sanitary, or educational reason for it; but instead of that he gives an arithmetical reason. All this shows that the spirit in which Mr. Ranade approaches the question is anything but scientific; similarly, he says with reference to the Maratha graduate that "if these specially unfortunate deaths (60 out of 102) are excluded, the mortality rate among the Marathas would be as favourable as the Gujarathi graduates show", that is to say, if these sixty Marathas had not died, the death-rate among the Maratha Graduates would have been the same as among the Gujarathis, and if the divisor in the case of the Parsees had not been large, the Gujarathis would have been equally well off with the Parsees. This simply shows Mr. Ranade's desire to arrive at the conclusion that the Parsees were not better off than the Marathas and Gujarathis, and thus to show the groundlessness of my reasoning about the necessity
of Social reform, but it also shows that he has failed in the attempt, the facts being inexorable. And this is the case, notwithstanding that he included all the younger graduates upon whom the strain had not yet produced its effects.

The rest of Mr. Justice Ranade's address is similarly made up. He misunderstands me, makes me say what I did not mean to say, and then refutes me. For instance, while speaking on the question of the University becoming a body of men devoted to learning and carrying on original investigations and researches I said that the European Professors had not contributed to the formation of such a body, nor the Native graduates, who, if they continue to take interest in certain subjects, did it in a languid manner. Against this Mr. Ranade brings ten per cent of graduates, most of whom have confined their literary efforts to the translation of a play or two from Shakespeare, or another small English work or a Sanskrit work and to the publication of stray articles or essays in a magazine or newspaper. Can all this be by any stretch of sense called carrying on investigations and researches? Is the interest taken not languid even on Mr. Ranade's showing? I have even excused this want of devotion to learning by saying that the avocation which graduates must follow leaves them little time for literary pursuits, and proposed the institution of Fellowships. From Mr. Ranade's way of meeting the point, it would appear that Fellowships are unnecessary, since ten per cent of our graduates have already devoted themselves to learning and original research and made our Universities a body of learned men. Similarly, with reference to my remarks on the poverty of students Mr. Justice Ranade says I have evaded the difficulty. He, however, does not appear to have met it or suggested any remedies. He has only dwelt longer on the subject, and said some fine things about it. But I proceed to tell the parents that they should care more for the education of their sons than for their marriage and spend what they have got or what they borrow on the former rather than the latter. And no one will deny that the average
Hindu parent attaches far greater importance to the marriage of his son than to his education and makes greater sacrifices for it than for the other.

In the paragraph in which Mr. Justice Ranade brings together the lessons to be derived from his discourse he puts down enforced bachelorship up to the completion of studies as the highest remedy, and uses language a great deal similar to that which I have used. This is very surprrzing after the long and elaborate effort made to prove that University strain and poverty alone kill our graduates, in the course of which not the remotest allusion is made to bad social arrangements as even a partial source of the evil, or better social arrangements as calculated to avert it. There are a good many other points worthy of notice, such as the University extension question, and the proposal about a sort of an acadamy, both of which I consider thoroughly impracticable; but the letter has already grown long and I must stop.
THE ENDS AND AIMS OF COLLEGE EDUCATION

Being the substance of an Address delivered on the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the Removal of the Deccan College, Poona, to its present building. Originally published by the Cheap Literature Committee of the Theistic Association of Bombay,—1893.

On the 23rd of March 1868 the old Poona College was removed to this very commodious and beautiful building and called the Deccan College. This event you have recently conceived the idea of commemorating and I think very properly. For by being removed to this building, the old Poona College was put into a condition to realise, in a more efficient manner, the object of its existence. We should remember this event with joy, but it is not proper that the occasion should be wasted in mere froth and merriment. We should devote a portion of our time to looking back at the way we, as members of the Institution, have traversed in order to find out whether it is the right way, and if we perceive that we have gone astray, we should endeavour to place ourselves on the right way. In other words, this is an occasion when we should seriously consider whether the College has been realising the objects of its existence and if not, think how it may be made to do so better. From his superior ability and the position he occupies I believe the Principal to be the fit and proper person to address you on a matter connected with this subject today, but since the time is nigh when my connection with this College and with education generally shall cease, he has asked me to discharge the duty instead. And though I clearly feel myself to be incompetent for the task, I think I must obey.

The object of the Deccan College and similar institutions is to educate the youths of India. Various views have been expressed as to what education consists in, but I think those which I wish to place before you will not be considered unique. The etymological sense of the word, which is "to lead out,"
will guide us towards the formation of a correct idea. To evoke
the faculties of the mind, which, but for the education that is
given in such institutions, would lie dormant and to direct their
exercise so that they may efficiently serve their purpose, is thus
the object of education. In Sanskrit we have the word Vinaya
which has the same etymological sense and expresses the training
of the feelings and faculties and also the result of the process,
viz. a well-ordered or disciplined mind, good manners and
humility. There is another word Sāṁskāra which means the
communication of a certain shape or form to the mind like the
shape which an artist gives to the material he employs in order
to produce a beautiful object; or that which a mechanic gives to
the quantity of matter so as to make it subserve a useful purpose.
Training the mind in this way or giving it such a shape or form
is the object of education. Young men have to be taught here
to have clear ideas before them, to see the connection between
them, and to proceed from one connection of ideas to another,
that is, to proceed from one proposition to another. They have
thus to be taught to reason. We know how confused the ideas
of an uneducated man are, what mistakes he makes as to their
connection and how incompetent he is to arrive at a correct
conclusion from a certain proposition.

But this is not the only object of mental education. You
may be able to form clear ideas, see their connection correctly
and reason in a faultless manner, but the ideas themselves may
be mistaken. The premises you start from may be wrong, and
may thus render all your reasoning worthless. Another object
of education, therefore, is to teach you to observe correctly,
compare and criticise, and arrive at correct premises or notions.

Another object or a kindred object is to liberalise the mind;
to free it from the narrowness which the antecedents of a man
induce into it. Thus, for instance, a bigoted Christian thinks
that there can be nothing really good in Non-Christians, and a
bigoted Hindu thinks a Christian to be unclean whom it is
defilement to touch. But if by education the mind is raised above the narrow sphere of thought in which it moves, the Christian will see that the Heathen too has got a great deal of good in him and the Hindu, that it is not simply fickle fortune that has raised the European, but that he possesses virtues that deserve his admiration. To place the mind, therefore, on a high platform from which it can look at things as they are, and not with the coloured eyes of pre-possession or prejudice, is an important end to be attained by means of education.

But this does not exhaust all that is sought to be attained by the education of the mind. A young man is introduced to a variety of subjects that are likely to interest him, and these are taught to him in a manner to enable him to make one or more of these the study of his after-life, so that they may be the source of pure pleasure or profit to himself and to the community to which he belongs. Thus then the acquisition of clear ideas, and of the power of observation, comparison and criticism, the freeing of the mind from the narrowness consequent on prepossession or prejudice, and a positive knowledge of certain subjects constitute, I believe, the aim of mental education.

But after all the mind or intellect is but an instrument, and even when the instrument is good, it does not necessarily follow that he who wields it—the inner man—is himself good. The inner man is composed of a variety of feelings and desires which sway the will and from which proceeds action. We are so constituted as to perceive a graduation of worthiness among these various springs of action. The desire, for instance, of pleasure ought not to be allowed to determine a man's will in preference to truth or justice. Selfishness ought not to make us neglect the claims of compassion. A training and a discipline that will make all the springs of action fall into the relative positions assigned to them by the conscience, or the faculty of moral judgment, is the most important of the ends to be attained by education. A man has no right to be called an educated man.
if he has not acquired the habit of controlling himself, and shaping his action in accordance with truth and justice, or the dictates of an enlightened or cultured conscience.

Now what are the means at the disposal of Colleges such as this of attaining these ends? You are taught Logic here, which will help you to render your ideas clear and to reason correctly. But dry logic alone is insufficient, and therefore treatises on a variety of subjects, the matter contained in which is well reasoned out, are placed in your hands. Even poetry and fiction are calculated to contribute to the same end, since there also you have to observe the connection between one thought and another. You are also taught several subjects calculated to train your mind to observe, compare, and criticise; and there are books which, if you study them carefully, ought to raise your mind above all narrowness. Moreover the subjects themselves, if you approach them with an open mind, cannot fail to be interesting. The efforts recently made with partial success to introduce History, Philosophy, and Physics into your necessary B. A. course had for their object the liberalisation of the mind. As to that other end of education, which I consider by far the most important, viz. the training of the feelings and the desires, that also the course of study through which you are carried is, I believe, calculated to realise. If you study properly the literature that is placed before you of the two languages you have to take up, the end cannot but be accomplished to a certain extent at least. If the feelings of the human heart portrayed by a good poet are really appreciated by you, there cannot but spring up a desire in you to endeavour to realise those feelings in yourselves; and those works of imagination, whether novels or dramatic plays, which represent the struggle of good with evil, virtue with vice, cannot, if read and studied as they ought to be, but enlist your sympathies on the side of what is good. But more than all this, there are to guide you the living examples of some at least of your teachers who possess a high character.
There are, however, it must be confessed, the adverse influences of the society in which we live and move. And to remove you as far as possible from these the idea of having residences for you within the College premises, and more recently for the Professors also, has been carried out. If by such means as this you come into closer contact with your professors and there springs up in your hearts as unfeigned admiration and reverence for them and their character, it cannot fail to produce a very healthy influence on your own character.

And there is another object of education which, though incidental, is by no means less important than those to which I have called your attention. In the College we are introduced to a civilisation and a system of thought which are greatly different from our own. When two varieties of a type present themselves to our observation, they cannot fail to evoke the spirit of comparison and criticism so as to enable us to find out what is essential to the type and what is bad. It is said that a man cannot know his own language well unless he knows another. In the same manner you cannot understand your own civilisation, cannot distinguish its good elements from its bad elements, unless you are acquainted with another. When you are acquainted only with your own manners and customs and your ways of thinking, it is but rarely that a doubt crosses your mind that there may be evil in them. Though, for instance, in the course of time institutions such as child marriage and caste have grown up among us to such an extent that their evil consequences cannot fail to strike an unprepossessed mind, they did not strike us before we became acquainted with a condition of society in which these institutions do not prevail. The effect of such education, therefore, as is given to Young Indians in Colleges such as this ought to be to enable them to compare the manners, the customs, the ideas and the institutions of the flourishing communities of Europe with our own; and to find out the evil that there may be in the latter; and to create in us a desire to eradicate it. Though incidental, I consider this to be

a very important effect of the education we receive. For, unless
the evil that there is in our society is in the first place perceived
and then removed, there can be no hope that we shall ever rise.
In connection with this matter, however, I may note that there
are two extremes into which a man may easily fall. He may
come to think that every thing in the new civilisation he is
introduced to is better and so proceed to adopt it. Such a
wholesale adoption, even of manners which are trifling and have
no particular significance, argues a shallowness of mind. But on
the other hand, not to be awakened to the evil at all argues
stupidity or the absence of intellect; while to suppose and
declare, out of a mistaken pride, that everything we have is good
is pernicious and augurs evil for the future of our community.
If a man honestly compares the condition of our society with
that of any European nation such as the English, he cannot fail
to realise the fact that there is much evil in it from which the
other is free. And to declare, notwithstanding, that it is in
every way good and requires no change is to cut off all hope of
rise. It is a mistaken notion to suppose that there can be a race
which will evolve all its civilisation out of its own consciousness.
Just as one man learns from another, the history of the world
tells us that one race learns from another. The Greeks adopted
something from the Phoenicians and Egyptians, and the Romans
from the Greeks; while in the civilisation of modern Europe
four distinct elements are observable, the Greek, the Roman, the
German and the Jewish. And we are no exception to the rule.
We too in the olden times adopted a good deal from the
Dravidian races, later on from the Greeks and still later from the
Arabs. The very dress we wear at the present day is un-Hindu,
the two dhotars only being original with us.

Now the question is whether the education we have been
receiving in this and other Colleges has been successful and has
produced these several effects. That it has produced some good
effects, cannot be denied. Our educated men are in many cases
able to reason well. They know a great many things of which
their fathers were ignorant. And when placed in positions of power and influence they do credit to themselves. That by the employment of graduates in the Judicial Department the service has improved is an undoubted fact. But often times a doubt crosses my mind and I am reminded of the lesson that the Great Sepoy Revolt of 1857 taught us. On that occasion about 50,000 native soldiers revolted against the British Government and threw off the authority of their commanding officers. These soldiers were disciplined by the British. When they were led against powerful native Princes and chiefs, they achieved invariable success. Even if they had been led against a European foe it is not impossible that they would have been similarly successful. But all this they did, disciplined as they were, only when commanded by British Officers. As soon as they freed themselves from their authority, their discipline stood them in no stead, they became a mob, and were cut to pieces by a handful of British soldiers and in some cases even by civilians. The only small victory that the mutineers achieved was that over General Windham at Kalpee. My doubt therefore is this. May not the good qualities we educated people show when in position of power and trust be due to our continuing to be under British influence as much as to our education? And this doubt is strengthened by the manner in which these same educated natives often conduct themselves when employed in native states. And generally, whether a love of truth and probity, a sense of duty and fearless independence, are in many cases the prominent characteristics of our educated mind, is too more than questionable.

Even as regards mental education I have perceived from a perusal of several University essays and of the articles that appear in the Native press that, although we have acquired the power of correct reasoning, still the critical and comparative power which enables us to test our premises, and breadth or comprehensiveness of view are wanting. There are B. A.s and M. A.s who think the Ramayana to be a thoroughly historical work;
who, though reasoning correctly on points of English law, are
not, when asked to write an essay on the development of Hindu
Law, able to distinguish between the several stages that it
presents, and consider e. g. the Smṛti of Yajñavalkya to be a
work of the same author that promulgated the several books
of Śukla Yajurveda. The difference in language does not strike
them; and the fact that the law books in Sūtras are prior to
those composed in Anuṣṭubh Ślokas they have no conception of.

As to the last effect of education that I have noticed, the
fact that there has been very little of conscious improvement
in Hindu society indicates that that too is by no means very
perceptible. If any effect has been produced in this respect,
it does not go far beyond talk, while within the last 10 years
or so even the talk has been of the opposite kind, and educated
men are very little disposed to acknowledge the evil that per­
meates their society. Moreover, the fact that we have not yet
acquired the courage of our convictions argues that those con­
victions are very weak indeed. And the half-hearted and
lethargic manner in which all our movements, political, social,
religious and economical or industrial, are conducted and the
fact that we do not find a succession of resolute or zealous
workers in connection with them show that the new civilization
with which we have come in contact has not, except in very
rare cases, produced more than a skin-deep improvement in us.

If then our education has not been so effective in all these
respects, the next question is what are the causes and the
remedies? As to this matter I shall place myself under the
guidance of a very old Sanskrit author four of whose verses are
quoted by Yaska, the author of the Nirukta, himself a very
ancient author. The language and the irregularity of the metre
of the Ślokas indicate that they belong to the period in which
the Upaniṣads were written, i. e. to about the sixth or seventh
century at least before Christ. Two of them are as follows:—

विष्णु ह वे ब्राह्मणमाजगामः गोपाय या श्रेष्ठपितेःसन्नभिः
असुस्यकायान्तरनव्यताय न मा भ्रम बीर्यवतैः तथा स्थासुः
Knowledge went up to a learned Brahman and said, "I am your treasure, therefore take care of me, i.e. do not waste me, do not communicate me to a scoffer who is disposed to find fault with me or you, who is not honest or sincere towards me, and who is not well-conducted. Thus alone shall I have power, i.e. be useful. Communicate me only to him whom you may know to be innocent or unsullied, to be not conceited, to be endowed with good parts, chaste, unmarried or devoted to me only, and whom you may know to be faithful or loyal to you. He alone will protect the treasure.

Before proceeding further let me remark that the poverty of results we have been complaining of is due to other causes than such as refer to yourselves. To a certain extent the University examiners and even the teachers are responsible for it. The existing condition of the Hindu Society, its thoughts and aspirations, such as they are, operate in a manner to concentrate the influence of the education we receive. Our history of the last twenty centuries, which has induced certain mental and moral characteristics in us, has also a great deal ultimately to do with the unsatisfactory nature of the result. But as I am not discussing the question in a general manner today but simply addressing you, I will mention only those shortcomings in students to which this condition of things is in a great measure to be traced. Yāska, or the author quoted by him, says that knowledge has power (ज्ञानाधि) but only when communicated to one whose attitude towards it is that of honesty or sincerity (कृत्य). That is to say, the student must be a bona fide student, seek knowledge for its own sake and appreciate it for itself; and should not resort to it simply as a means to an entirely different end. Now can we assert that this is the attitude of most of our students? Do they not, when they read the books placed in their hands, think very much more of the examination that they have to pass and the degree they have to gain than of the
knowledge itself? When you choose your optional subjects can you all say that you choose them because you like them, and not because the University examination in them is likely to be easier, or those who are appointed examiners in them are not men of rigidity and are liberal in assigning marks? Here then is an instance of what Yāska called Anṛjutva or want of sincerity. When our students read the best specimens of English poetry, do they endeavour to realize the sentiment and appreciate it, and are they charmed by it? Do they not care for the syntactical collocation of the words, and for the merely dry and mechanical contents of the book, in order to be able to paraphrase any passage that may be set by the examiner and to answer questions as regards the contents? In studying history, do they care to realize the manner in which a race has progressed from barbarism to civilization, and do they study the arts and institutions of that race with any degree of sympathy? Is philosophy studied with a keen interest in the problems, concerning human nature and the principles which are in operation in human society, which it grapples with? I am afraid the examination papers in the University Calendar are more assiduously studied than the subjects themselves. If then a University degree and the worldly prospects it opens to us are all that we thinks of in reading our books, it is a wonder that our Vidyā or education or knowledge has no Virya or power as Yāska calls it? But on reflection you will find that if you study English poetry and fiction, history and philosophy in an appreciative manner, feel really interested in them, realise the ideas that they place before you, and learn to admire those ideas, you will do greater good to yourselves than that which a University degree will do for you. You will be a better man; life will have greater and more elevated pleasures for you; and you will be a more useful member of society. And do not for a moment suppose that by constantly placing before your mind's eye the requirements of the examinations you are the better able to pass them. He who studies a subject for itself because he is interested in it and wants to know as much of it as he can is
better able to stand the chances of an examination than one who studies it merely for the examination. So that a bona fide or sincere study of a subject is twice blessed. It improves your mind and heart, and enables you to pass your examination.

There is another circumstance which contributes towards this attitude of insincerity or this imperviousness to the influence of what you learn. Somehow or other, in Bengal and in our part of the country, a false race-pride has sprung up and dominates the minds of a great many persons, old as well as young. Whenever one is introduced to a good idea in European literature or philosophy there is always a desire in many young men to be able to say that the idea is not foreign to our literature and philosophy and that it dawned upon our ancestors centuries ago. People want to believe that Europe has got little or nothing which our ancestors had not. When the mind is thus prepossessed, it is of course not possible for it to place itself on a high platform and examine the literature, the history and the progress of different races with impartiality and critical fairness. Hence comes it that in handling Sanskrit literary problems our students show little critical powers and are guided by the same principles and beliefs that dominate the mind of a bigoted Pandit. The assertions of a graduate that the Rāmāyāna contains nothing that is not historical, or that of another that all people were perfectly virtuous and happy in the time of Rāma, without ever asking himself whether there was ever such a historical person as Rāma, and that of a third that the religion which enjoins animal sacrifices (कर्ममाण) and that which includes the findings of God in the whole universe as a means to eternal bliss (आत्माण) were promulgated at one and the same time as simply two alternative methods of arriving at eternal bliss, suited to the tastes of two sorts of people, and that the Upaniṣads, the hymns of the Rgveda, and the Brāhmaṇas were written at one and the same time, notwithstanding that the difference as regards language and ideas is so great that to a mind not so prepossessed they cannot but appear as representing different stages in the
progress of Indian thought, show that all the European education they had received was wasted on them and that it possessed no Virya or power in their case. I ask you to reflect whether this assumption that all that is ours is good and that our ancestors were omniscient can be beneficial to us in any way. That it is perfectly untrue is plain even to a child if its mind is not enslaved. And if we obstinately stick to this belief, the result must be that the thought or civilisation of Europe will exercise no influence upon us and that we shall be what we have been,—a dormant or dead community. A student therefore should endeavour to divest himself of this false belief and keep his mind open to the influence which European thought cannot but exercise in the natural course of things.

Another qualification of a student is Apramattatva, i.e. the absence of conceit. If a student already believes that he knows much, he cannot learn much. In order that learning may be possible, it is necessary that he should know how ignorant he is. A great many students think themselves qualified to pronounce a decided opinion on any question, educational, moral or historical, as against even their teachers and men of greater experience. It will be seen that Yāska requires a student to be loyal and faithful to his teacher and to regard him as his father and mother (य आतुरणविचित्रेण करारिष्ठं संसारसस्ते संसार-jêtā । ते सम्येत पितांन ज तस्मे न मुद्रेक्तमतमय्यनाह ।).

If such a relation springs up between the teacher and the taught, the latter cannot fail to be immeasurably benefited by it. If he sincerely reveres his teacher, the high character of the teacher will serve as a living example for him to copy. But if he is Asūyaka, to use Yāska's expression, i.e. disposed to find fault with him or to believe any evil about him upon the most slender evidence, the influence of that living example will be entirely lost. If any feature in the character of Indian students has from the remotest times been most plainly visible, it is this reverence for a teacher. But somehow under the system
of education organised by our Government that reverence seems to have almost entirely disappeared, and a teacher's own pupils are not seldom his hostile critics in debate and in newspapers. I believe this is partly at least due to the non-appreciation by the pupil of the knowledge communicated to him by the teacher. But whatever the reason may be, the absence of reverence is in a great many cases a fact, and a fact to be deeply deplored. You will see that Yaska places the teacher on the same level with the father and mother. The feeling of reverence for these naturally springs up in the mind of a man. A feeling of reverence is one of the most ennobling features of human nature. If it is not developed in those cases where it should first develop, it will in all likelihood not be developed at all, and a reverence for truth, for moral good, and for the author of the grand and beautiful cosmos of the universe will not spring up. And what is a man who has not reverence for these? You should therefore guard yourselves very much against conceit, against the readiness to teach before you learn, and against an irreverent spirit.

Again, we see that Yaska considers that a man's education will be fruitful when he has good natural parts. This no doubt is true, but it is a gift of nature or of God and we can devise no remedy if one does not possess it. Still, if the other requisites mentioned by him are realised, they can to a large extent make up for the absence of good natural parts. He says that a man should observe strict Brahmacarya during the time he is student, and should be Yata, i. e. 'well-behaved'. Brahmacarya by usage means 'celibacy', but etymologically it means the vow of devotion to Brahman, which might be rendered here as 'what is good and true'. This requisite therefore comes to this, that a man should devote himself entirely to knowledge during the time he is a student, should not think of enjoying pleasures and should not have a wife or the cares of the family. This last requisite is wanting in a good many cases in which our students have to look to their family and
their application to their studies is lessened. Here, again, we can see how much we have fallen away from our old ideal, the ideal of our ancestors. In olden times when a boy was sent to a Guru or teacher, he had to remain with him for twelve or twenty-four years and think of nothing but his studies during that time. And it was after he had thus completed his studies that he was allowed to marry. At the present day we go through the ceremonies of being sent to a Guru and of returning after the completion of studies. But this last, which was performed at the end of a period of twelve or twenty-four years, is now performed on the fourth day and we have now a farce in the place of an old reality. It must not be denied that there is a tendency in our society towards improvement in this respect, and the marriage of boys is often delayed till they are twenty or twenty-one. As to close application and devotion to your books with a singleness of purpose, you can realise them if you are so minded.

Thus then, if the education you receive here is to have Virya or power, i.e., is to be fruitful in the manner described in the beginning of this address, you should endeavour to realise in yourselves these requisites mentioned by an author who flourished about 25 centuries ago. Your attitude towards knowledge should be that of sincerity, i.e. you should be a bona fide student and seek knowledge for its own sake, because it is interesting to you, not because you are to derive any incidental benefits from it, such as a degree and good prospects in life, though of course these will be added and your single-minded devotion will be rewarded in that manner also. You should disabuse your mind of that sentiment of false patriotism with which the atmosphere of Bengal and of this side of the country is surcharged. You should keep your mind open to the influence which what is true, good and beautiful, whether it comes from a foreigner or from a native, cannot fail to exercise. You should not assume to yourselves a knowledge and experience you do not possess, and should wait until you come
to have them, and so become qualified to teach other people. Your attitude towards your teachers, as towards your father and mother, should be that of complete reverence; and that attitude will breed in you a reverence for what is true and good. Lastly, your application towards your studies should be close; nothing ought to draw your mind away from them; no pleasures ought to attract you. It is thus alone that the education given to you will develop your mental faculties, establish a moral order amongst the feelings of your heart, and elevate your character. And it is thus that you will be able to derive advantage from the dispensation of Providence in virtue of which we have been brought into connection with one of the foremost races of Europe, and improve your moral, social, economic and political condition. In this way alone will you be able to raise your fallen country, and enable it to take its place in the community of nations.
THE IDEAL OF AN INDIAN SCHOLAR

FROM THE TIMES OF INDIA, BOMBAY, WEDNESDAY, 19th JULY 1893

[At a private and informal meeting held on Sunday afternoon in honour of Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, M.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., the learned Sanskritist sketched the following ideal of what an Indian Scholar ought to be. In the course of his remarks he said:]

Many years ago when I first entered the Educational Department it was because I felt that the highest duty of man consisted in trying to secure the love and approbation of his fellowmen and that the teacher's calling afforded excellent opportunities for the purpose; I soon discovered, however, that it was not given to all, even of those who assiduously served their fellowmen, to secure their love and approbation, and all I aimed at instead was the satisfaction of my own conscience and the service of the Universal Lord in Whom we live, and move and have our being. When, later on, I had the good fortune to be appointed Professor of Oriental Languages, I felt I would hardly be equal to the discharge of the many and important duties which in my opinion are expected of the occupant of such a chair in India. A Professor's duty is not simply to teach, but also to learn. And a Professor of Sanskrit has an extensive field before him, the whole of which any one individual can hardly be expected to cover. In the first place, he has to be conversant with the history of Indian languages. The language of the Vedas differs from the language of the Brāhmaṇas, which in its turn is not the language for which Pāṇini legislated. It is generally believed that Pāṇini's Grammar formulated a system from which later Sanskrit literature has not diverged. But it is not so. The language of the Epics is not indeed so unlike the language of Pāṇini's Grammar as that of the Vedas is; still the points of dissimilarity between the two are neither few nor trivial, and European scholars who, till lately, had almost exclusively confined themselves to the Vedas are now beginning to bring their comparative, elabo-
rate and scientific methods of study to bear on the later Sanskrit literature, and to discover that in it also, as in the earlier field which they have made peculiarly their own, there are stages of growth and periods of change to record and understand. But this is not all. The Pali and kindred dialects also claim the professor's attention; these have developed literatures of their own, were derived at different stages of Sanskrit from the mixture of Sanskrit, the language of the Aryan conquerors, with the tongue of the barbarians, autochthonous or not, with whom they came in contact and whom they subdued and Aryanised; and they have given birth in turn to the Gujarati, Marathi and other languages of Modern India. The professor has thus to study the various literatures, with special reference to the history of language, the broad landmarks of which have thus been sketched too hurriedly. But this is only one branch of study he professes— and hardly the most important branch. These literatures embody many stages of religious belief and ceremonial practice, each of which grew out of the one preceding it. The Vedic hymns embody a religion which is not that embodied in the mass of literature styled as Brāhmaṇas. Again there is Buddhism, especially northern Buddhism; and the religious belief and the code of morals embodied in the Mahābhārata, which to all careful and unprejudiced students show strong mutual affinities. Lastly, there are Jainism and other modifications of Buddhism as well as Brahmanism, which slowly approximated one faith to the other, until there emerged as a substitute for both and as a result of compromising and accommodating tendency, extending over centuries, Purānic Brahmanism. Thirdly, the professor has to study the history of early Indian thought as a branch of inquiry distinct from the two, roughly delineated above. This, also, begins with some of the hymns of the Rgveda. The body of literature known as the Upaniṣads furnished the material for its second stage; and last come the different schools of formulated and systematised philosophies and the controversies that raged for long periods between them. The very materials for a study of this period of philosophical
controversies have yet to be discovered, collected and arranged. Lastly, the professor has to turn his attention to the political history of the country, and by deciphering and interpreting inscriptions, which is almost the only material he has got for the purpose, to try his best to get as many events, persons and works dated as possible. All this it is clearly impossible for any one man to study with equal attention and fullness at all points. Even the laborious Professor Weber has not been able to do so; and some scholars have, *nolens volens*, to work as pioneers examining, classifying and tabulating manuscripts; preparing lists of authors and the works, mentioned or referred to in any one manuscript or author, and in a variety of ways clear the road by preparing and digesting material in order that their successors may use it with greater ease and turn it to better account. Moreover, Indian professors have to do more teaching work than their German brethren. And being Indian born, they have a personal interest in the religious and social institutions that now prevail in the country, their past history, and the efforts that are now made to modify and reform them. As a reformer I belong to the most advanced section of the religious and social reformers of India. But my fellow-workers and fellow-thinkers of that section consider me as one of the most conservative of their number. The explanation is this. In Indian society, the centrifugal tendency is, in my opinion, far too strong. The slightest divergence of ritual, manner of life, or mode of thinking is sufficient to constitute a new caste-group which falls away from the older castes and begins life by itself; and there is hardly any way in which these atoms can be crystallised into a new and larger whole. This conviction and the strong sense of the need of preserving historic continuity have often held me back. It is not enough that any particular reform that may be suggested is good in itself. The question that is of vital importance is, whether it can be engrafted on the existing organism of Hindu Society, whose roots go back into the prehistoric times and which contains vestiges of all that it has at any period of its life assimilated or had to struggle against.
I am aware that this line of thought is capable of being construed to support the most uncompromising hostility to every kind of change. But I have always held that it is necessary to act as well as to deliberate and discuss and preach and enlighten, excite and exhort in all varieties of tone and manner. And whenever my lights have enabled me to recognize a clear case for action, I for one have not hesitated. If my conduct on such occasions has dissatisfied any, I ask only to be judged according to my lights. I have always an explanation to offer as regards my attitude towards present political movements. It is not that we Indians are devoid of sympathy for our fellow-creatures. Our benevolence is active where particular individuals have to be helped. Our feelings are stirred at the sight of individual human beings in distress. But we are devoid of the sense of public duty. Our sense of wrong at public grievance is fitful and transitory. We cannot yet work with perseverance for objects that are to benefit not certain specific individuals, but the body public. The public, the body public, the country, is to us an abstraction with whose wrongs and needs we have not sufficient sympathy, whose claims on our efforts we do not adequately recognize, and whose good is not the good of any individuals in particular with whom we can speak and talk, whose gratitude we can enjoy as our reward. We are unselfish enough where help is claimed by individual distress; but, being devoid of the sort of corporate consciousness thus described, our actions in political matters are guided on the whole by selfish and individual interests. When this is the case, it is inevitable that there should be factions instead of parties, and that personal preferences and animosities should assert themselves and public interests be lost sight of. As long as such a state of things lasts, representative government would be an evil and not a boon. And I conclude by advising you that before asking for any political privileges, you should impartially examine whether you are fit for it, whether, in fact, there is any probability of your using it to the lasting benefit of your country.
A REVIEW OF MARTIN HAUG'S AITAREYA-BRĀHMAṆA


It is satisfactory to know that while Europeans have got so many things which excite our admiration and which we are tempted to adopt we possess one at least which seems to be very attractive to them in India and which they have consequently adopted here, and that is,—our love of ease and pleasure. It is indeed wonderful that while so many good and valuable periodicals are conducted in England and so many books of real work published every week, the English men and other Europeans in this Presidency should not be able to manage a single periodical or write one book at least in a decade of years. The late Rev. Philip Anderson of Colaba was a remarkable exception. He wrote a good history of the English in Western India, and his connection with the late Bombay Quarterly Review is well known. The Review, like its projector, died an untimely death for want of contributors. Perhaps, the reason may be that Englishmen here have too much to do to be able to devote their attention to literature; but the number of really hard working men like Mr. Ellis is infinitesimal; and even in their

1 The Aitareya Brāhmaṇam of the Rgveda, containing the earliest speculations of the Brāhṇas on the meaning of the sacrificial prayers and on the origin, performance, and sense of the rites of the Vedic Religion; edited, translated and explained by Martin Haug, Ph. D., Superintendent of Sanskrit Studies in the Poona College, etc., etc., Volume I. Pp. IX, 80. 215, VI; Sanskrit Text with Preface, introductory Essay, and the map of the Sacrificial Compound at the Soma Sacrifice; and Volume II. Pp. VII, 535; Translation with Notes. Published by the Director of Public Instruction in behalf of Government, Bombay, Govt. Central Book Depot; London, Trübner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row, 1863.
Haug's first-hand knowledge of sacrificial ritual case the examples of Sir George Cornwall Lewis and Mr. Gladstone forbid us to make any great allowance. But the Professors of our Colleges can by no means plead this excuse; for the greatest amount of work they have is about two hours a day and vacations extend over about four months in the year. On this account, and on account of the circumstance that their profession is literary, the public has a right to expect good books from them. But they also have disappointed us. The only exception amongst them is Dr. Haug. His essays on the Parsi Religion have now been for about two years before the public, and this Edition and Translation of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is his second work.

The style of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is generally simple. But it can by no means be concluded that a translation of it is therefore an easy matter. There is indeed a very great difficulty, and such a difficulty as European scholars in Europe cannot master. To understand the Brāhmaṇa, a general knowledge of the complicated sacrificial ritual of the Brahmans is necessary. A large number of sacrificial terms occur in the book which, without such a knowledge, are liable to be totally misunderstood. There is, no doubt, Sayana's excellent commentary, in which most of these terms are explained and several of the sacrificial processes minutely described; but the great scholiast presupposes some knowledge of the ritual in his reader, and thus even with the help of his valuable work a great deal in the original remains indistinct and obscure. Dr. Haug's residence in India, therefore, gave him great advantage in this respect. He had recourse to one or two Śrōtriyas who had officiated as priests at some of the sacrifices which some times, though now very rarely, take place on the banks of the Kṛṣṇā. They gave him a good deal of original information; and one of them performed a model sacrifice in his presence in a secluded part of his bungalow. We congratulate the Doctor on the success which thus attended his endeavours. It is indeed very difficult for a European to procure information on this most holy art. A Brahman breaking its

secret to a Mleccha commits a horrible and inexpiable offence against religion. But the greediness of the Deccani Brahmans is more than a match for their bigotry and superstition, and the offers of Dr. Haug were probably too tempting to be resisted.

With the information thus obtained and with Sāyana's Commentary, the sacrificial sūtras and the prayogas or manuals of priests, the translation of the Brāhmaṇa was a matter of comparative ease. Dr. Haug, however, must have worked very hard before he was able to perform the task he had undertaken. The translation upon the whole is well executed, as might be expected. Copious notes illustrative of the text are given. They are chiefly based upon oral information and the prayogas, and now and then upon the Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Hiranyakeshin, and the Kauśitaki and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇas. No ordinary degree of perseverance must have been required to collect and bring together this mass of information. The Germans are known to be patient scholars, and Dr. Haug seems to be a favourable specimen of their class.

A knowledge of sacrifices and of the technical terms of the art is essential for the correct interpretation of a large number of hymns in the Rgveda, and of nearly the whole of the Yajus Samhita. It is indispensable for the accurate understanding of the work of the Mimāṃsā divines, and useful to a student of several schools of Philosophy. Dr. Haug, therefore, has rendered material service to the students of Sanskrit literature, especially in Europe, and is therefore entitled to their thanks.

But great as are the merits of this book, it has many blemishes. These we should gladly pass over, were it not a duty we owe to the public and to the cause of Sanskrit learning to point them out. The edition of the Sanskrit text seems to have been hastily gone through. The punctuation is in many places wrong and calculated more to bewilder than help a reader. The editor in the corrigenda states that the first 60 pages were reprinted, and that the stopping from page 61 to 96 is not quite
correct. But even in the reprinted pages and those which follow p. 96, the punctuation in a number of places is wrong; though such errors are fewer in the former portion than in the latter. We will give a few instances:

Page 50 line 20: kim sa yajamāṇasya pāpabhadrāṃdriyeta· teti ha smāha. yo 'sya hotā syāditi. Properly, the full stop ought to be placed after this last iti, and even if it cannot be marked there on account of the sandhi of the i of the a of the following atra, there ought not be a full point after smāha. For the meaning is, "what, can he who is Hotar do any good or evil to him? So they (he) ask." It is clear that the relative yāḥ is connected with the correlative saḥ. By placing a full stop after smāha, the relative clause is separated from the correlative, which ought not to be. On referring to the translation, we find that Dr. Haug has constructed the passage as he has pointed it. But the particle iti in Sanskrit cuts off the connection of the clause at the end of which it is placed with what follows. The clause yo 'sya hotā syād iti, therefore, has no connection with the following but with the preceding. Besides, it will be necessary to understand the correlative saḥ in the next sentence, while if it be taken with the preceding there is no such need. And Sāyana understands the passage as we take it. His words are: asya yajamāṇasya yo hotā syāt sa tāstya pāpabhadrāṃ kim ādriyeta. And there is no doubt that that is the sense of the passage.

Then follows in the text: atraivainam yathā kāmayeta, tathā kuryadyam kāmayeta. prāṇenainam vyārdhayāniti etc. Both these full points are wrongly placed. The first ought to come after kuryād, and, if it cannot be printed, omitted altogether; and the second ought to be totally dropped. The translation, however, in this case is correct, but the text, being badly pointed, is apt to confuse a learner.

Page 97, line 9. atha yāḥ samāpayisyāmah. saṁvatsara- mityāsaṭa etc. A full point is here placed between the verb
samāpayisyāmaḥ and its accusative samvatsaram, which, of course, is wrong.

Page 107, line 11. tad yadiheha vo manasā bandhutā nara ityārbbhavam. prathame 'hani śaṁsati etc. Here it is clear that ārbbhavam is the accusative governed by the verb śaṁsati; there ought not to be a full point therefore after ārbbhavam.

Page 106, line 3, agnir vai devata; prathamamaharvahati; —a semicolon separating the verb from its Nominative! — There are several such errors, but in the thirty-six pages between 61 and 96 the stopping is positively bad.

Then there are errors of another sort, which are also calculated to mislead a reader. The Sanskrit Mss., our readers know, are written without leaving a space between two successive words. This, no doubt, renders their understanding difficult to a beginner. Dr. Haug has, in his edition, separated the words, but in several places the division is wrong and therefore apt to bewilder a reader. Some of these errors are corrected in the corrigenda, but there are others which are not noticed. We will cite a few instances.

Page 31, last line (and p. 32 first line). sa medhena naḥ paśuṇeṣṭam asat kevalena naḥ paśuṇeṣṭamasaditi. Here the first word ought to be: samedhena, that is, with the medha or sacrificial quality. For the story there mentioned is that the sacrificial quality fled from animals and took refuge in the earth. Consequently, the things produced from the earth such as rice are offered in the form of purodāsa along with the animal, in order that the deficiency of the animal in the sacrificial quality may be made up.

Page 61, line 9. sastvā 'caturakṣareṇa. It ought to be: sastvā caturakṣareṇa.

Page 62, line 19. yajñāyajñiya, being the name of asāman, the first part ought not to be separated from the second.
Page 66, line 15. saṣomapithān karoti. It ought to be: saṣomapithān karoti.

Page 68, line 4. te na prati ca na samāvadata. It ought to be: te na prati ca na samāvadata.

Page 118, line 9. tad yathā yathamṛtvija ṛtvajān yajanti. The first yatha ought to be joined to the other.

Errors of this kind considerably impair the value of the edition before us. The third and a part of the fourth Pañcikā abound with them.

We will now proceed to examine the translation. We are sorry our limits do not allow of a full discussion of its merits; though it is, on the whole, well executed, there are unfortunately too many inaccuracies and errors to render it trustworthy throughout. We can give but a few examples.

Page 57, line 23 (Text). asau vāv vāvṛtavah śaḥ etam eva tad rūṣvādadhātyṛtuṣu pratiṣṭhāpayati. Dr. Haug’s translation of this passage is as follows:

Page 168, line 6-10 (Translation). The part vau of the formula vauṣat means the six seasons. By repeating vāṣṭkāra, the Hotar places the sacrificer in the seasons, gives him a footing in them.

This makes no sense. ‘Because the part vau means the seasons, therefore he places the sacrificer in the seasons’ is no good reasoning even according to the standard of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Besides, a little above, it is said that the part śat means the seasons, and the reason is that the seasons are six and śat in common language means six. Vau, therefore, cannot mean the seasons here. And immediately after this the author of the Brāhmaṇa says: ‘As he does to the Gods so the Gods do to him.’ There must be something then in what precedes which is construed by the author as being done by him (the Hotar) to the Gods; otherwise, that observation would be out
of place. The true sense is: asau i.e. that, meaning the sun, is vau and rtus (seasons) are sat; therefore (by joining the two in the word vauṣat) he places the sun in the seasons, gives him a firm footing in them. The connection of the observation which follows with this is clear. He (Hotar) gives the god Sun a firm footing among the seasons; therefore the god Sun will do a similar thing to him; i.e. give him a firm footing here in this world throughout the seasons. In Dr. Haug's translation the word asau is left out altogether, sat he takes to be the word in common language which means six, while it is here meant to be the latter part of vauṣat, and makes it an adjective of rtavaḥ. Sayana takes the passage as we do, and since the translator makes no mention of his dissenting from the commentator in this case, he must have been under the impression that Sayana and he agreed. But the commentator explains it differently, whence it is clear that the Doctor did not read Sayana's explanation carefully. It is thus: tanmantrapāthenaītameva vauṣabdābhidheyamādityam satābhdābhidheyesvṛtusvādadhāti, i.e. by repeating that mantra (vauṣat) he places that, i.e. sun who is meant by vau, in the seasons which are meant by sat. That the word asau or esa, that, refers very frequently to the sun is clear from several passages of the Brāhmaṇa itself (see particularly 3, 44 and 1, 30).

In the translation of the tale about the bringing of Soma from the heavenly world by gāyatrī, a formula is given which ought to be repeated by one who wishes safe passage to a friend going on a journey. That formula, according to Dr. Haug is pra cā cā. The original (page 69, line 21, 22, Text) is: tam devāḥ sarvena svastiyayenenaṃvamantrayanta preti ceti ceti. etad vai sarvam svastiyayanam yat preti ceti ceti. Dr. Haug's statement is in the last degree unsatisfactory. Sayana's explanation is decidedly better and very probably true. He says: ko 'sau mantra iti. prāśabda eko mantra aśabdo dvitīyo mantraḥ. tadubhayadarṣa-nārthamitiśabdadvayam. ubhayasamuccayārtham cakāradvayam. kṣemenā somam prāṇuhi punarapi kṣemenā 'gaccheti.
Nothing can be clearer than this. The word prā is one
mantra (formula) and the word ā another. The different
words which are joined together by the rules of samādhi in the
expression preti ceti ceti are, prā iti ca ā iti ca iti. The word iti
is twice used as a demonstrative and ca, being a copulative
particle, is put in twice to join prā and ā. The last iti points
out the whole expression and is connected with the principal
word in the sentence. The particle prā means forth and ā hither.
The sense of the formula prā and ā is forth (safely) and hither
(wards safely), i.e. go and return safely. Dr. Haug makes it
prā cā ā which means nothing.

Page 197, lines 12-16.

tadu punah paricaksate yadasarvena vaco'bhiṣikto bhavati-
cvaro ha tu purāyuṣaḥ praitoriti ha smaha Satyakāmo Jābālo
yametābhir vyāhrtibhir nabhīṣiṇcatisvaro ha sarvamāyuraitoh.
sarvamāpnod vijayenetyu ha småhoddālaka Āruṇir yametābhir
vyāhrtibhir abhiṣiṇcatisiti.

The full points are Dr. Haug's. The first is misplaced as
we shall show. The translation (page 506, lines 9-16) is as
follows:

They, again, are of opinion that the Kṣatriya when sprinkled
not under the recital of the whole mantra (i.e. with the omis-
sion of the sacred words) has power only over his former life.

Satyakāma, the son of Jabala, said, "If they do not sprinkle
him under the recital of these sacred words (in addition to the
mantra), then he is able to go through his whole life (as much
as is apportioned to him)." But Uddālaka Āruṇi said "He
who is sprinkled under the recital of these sacred words obtains
everything by conquest".

Before examining this, we must premise that the author
of the Brāhmaṇa in describing the power, whether for good or
evil, of a mantra or a sacrificial rite always points out an ana-
alogy between the good or evil which is to result and the mantra or rite. In the first and second sentences of the above passage as translated by Dr. Haug, having power over his former life and being able to go through his whole life are mentioned as the effects of sprinkling a Kṣatriya (at the time of coronation) with water under the recital of an incomplete mantra, i.e. mantra to which the sacred words bṛuḥ bhuvaḥ svāḥ are not added. There is, however, no analogy between the cause and its effects. It would make good sense if, on the contrary, it were said that when he is sprinkled under the recital of an incomplete mantra, he enjoys an incomplete life; i.e. as some words are clipped off from the mantra, so are some years clipped off from the life originally assigned to him; and that when he is sprinkled under the recital of a full mantra, i.e. the mantra with the sacred words, he enjoys his full life. And such is really the sense of the Sanskrit passage above quoted. Dr. Haug has translated it as if the first sentence ended with praītoḥ and the second, with āyu-raiitoḥ, the remaining words forming a third. But this is objectionable, because, as above observed, the sense is not good; and because, if the first sentence ended with praītoḥ, the second would begin with iti or at least with smāḥa, which is never the case in Sanskrit. Again, the translator has misunderstood the sense of purā 'yuṣaḥ, which according to him means 'former life,' while in reality it means 'before life' (purā before and āyuṣaḥ genitive sing. of āyuṣaḥ life) and he has not translated the word praītoḥ, which etymologically means to go forth, and usually, to die. Tadu punaḥ paricāksate may be taken to be the first sentence; the second ends with the words abhiṣiṇcatiti; and the remaining words of the passage as quoted above make up a third. If we construe the passage thus, the sense which as we said appears to be proper naturally follows. The translation then ought to be:

Then, again, they refute. Satyakama, the son of Jabalā, said that he who is not sprinkled under the recitation of the
sacred words (vyāhṛtis, bhūr etc.) is apt to die before the term of his natural life in consequence of his being sprinkled with a part only of a speech (i.e. mantra). And Uddālaka Arunī said that he who is sprinkled under the recital of the sacred words (vyāhṛtis) is able to live all his life and, having conquered his enemy, gains everything. Sāyana perfectly agrees with us. We refer the reader to his explanation, it being too long to be here quoted.

We will give a few examples of another class of errors and conclude.

Transl. Page 84, lines 2-5. When the fire is carried round (the animal), the adhvaryu says to the hotar: repeat (thy mantras). The hotar then repeats etc.

Page 93, line 29. The adhvaryu now says (to the hotar): recite the verses for Manotā.

Page 95, Note 32, line 5 to 7. The Adhvaryu puts the plant on the juhū . . . . and says to the hotar: address vanaspati. He then first repeats an anuvākyā.

Page 99, lines 1 to 2. The adhvaryu orders the hotar to recite the mantra appropriate to the drop (falling down).

This is all wrong. It is not the hotar but the maitrāvaruṇa that repeats all these mantras and the anuvākyās. The hotar recites the yājyaś only at the animal sacrifice. This will be evident from the following quotations from Āśvalāyana, and the Sāprta-hautra-prayoga. In the Sanskrit text of the Brāhmaṇa the name of the hotar is not at all mentioned on these occasions.

Dakṣiṇo hotṛśadanāt prahvo’vasthāya vedyām dandaṃ avaṣṭabhya bruyāt praiṣāmś cadeśām (Āśv. Śr. Su. 3. 1). On this, Nārāyaṇa, the commentator says; etad uktam bhavati; praiṣām-nāyaparipāthitaṁ sarvān praiṣāṁ maitrāvaruṇa eva preṣitah-preṣito ‘nubrūyad iti-arthāḥ caśabdō maitrāvaruṇānukarṣanārthāḥ. From this it is clear that the nominative to brūyat in the above sūtra

and consequently in those that follow, in virtue of the rule of anvṛtti, is maitrāvaruṇah. The word occurs in a previous sūtra from which it is brought on here, says the commentator, by the copulative particle ca.

The next two sūtras are:

Anuvākyaṁ ca sampraśe pūrvāṁ praiśat, i.e. before giving the praiśa or order to the hotar, he should repeat the anuvākya if he has got an order (praiśa from the adhvaryu). It is clear from this that the maitrāvaruṇa and not the hotar repeats the anuvākyas at the animal sacrifice for which Āśvalāyana is here giving rules.

Paryagni-stoka-manoto-ṇṇiyamānasūktāṇi ca i.e. he should repeat the verses for carrying fire round (the animal), for the drops and for manotā. The commentator says: evambhūtamaitrāvaruṇānukarṣaṇārthaḥ caṣabhdah, i.e. the particle ca is used in the sūtra to drag on the word maitrāvaruṇa (from a preceding sūtra given above). From this we see that all these mantras are repeated by the Maitrāvaruṇa.

Āśv. Śrau. Sūtra 3, 2 āsaṣūktesu preśito maitrāvaruṇo 'agnir hota na iti tṛcaṃ paryagnaye 'nvāha, i.e. after the ten (āpri verses) are repeated the Maitrāvaruṇa, when ordered, recites the triplet Agnir hota nāḥ etc. for carrying fire round (the sacrificial animal).

Sapta-Hautra: prayagnaye kriyamāṇāya 'nubrūhity ukte tiṣṭhann eva maitrāvaruṇaḥ agnir hota etc., i.e. after being told, “Repeat (mantras) for carrying fire round (the animal)”, the Maitrāvaruṇa, standing, (says) Agnir hota etc.

Stokebhyo 'nubrūhity ukte tiṣṭhann eva maitrāvaruṇaḥ, i.e. after being told “Repeat (mantras) for drops” the Maitrāvaruṇa, standing, says jusasva etc.

Atha manotāyai preśito maitrāvaruṇa āha. Maitrāvaruṇa being-ordered (to repeat mantras) for Manotā repeats; (tvam etc.).
After this it is needless to quote Sañyana who also says that these verses (given by Dr. Haug to the Hotar) are repeated by the Maitrāvaruṇa.

The 22nd khaṇḍa of the 2nd pañcikā is thus headed in the translation (see page 120): "The Hotar has no share in the Bahiś-pavamāna meal. The soma libation for Mitrā-Varuṇa to be mixed with milk." We think, there can be little doubt that Dr. Haug has misunderstood the general bearing of this khaṇḍa. For there is no such thing as a Bahiś-pavamāna meal, nor is the soma-libation for Mitrā-Varuṇa mixed with milk. We find no indications of them in Āśvalāyana, Sāñyana, or Sapta-Hautra. As to the first, all Āśvalāyana has got to say on it is this:

Adhvaryumukhāh samanvārabdhāh sarpaṇti ā tirthadesāt tat stotrayopaviśaṇty udgātaram abhimukhāh tān hotā 'numantrayaṭe 'traivāsino yo devānām etc.; i. e. "They headed by the Adhvaryu proceed up to the tirtha and there sit down for the stotra (Bahiś-pavamāṇa) facing the Udgātā. The Hotar sitting here only (i. e. where he was sitting before) consecrates them (their act) by reciting a mantra, Yo devānām etc."

Here we do not find any mention made of the meal, where it might be expected if the meal were an enjoined rite at all; nor do we find it before, nor after this. This mistake has arisen from a misapprehension of the sense of these words in the original: ubhayeśāṁ vā eṣā devamanusyaṇāṁ bhakṣo yad bahiśpavamāṇaḥ. The Doctor translates them thus: "this meal in honour of the Bahiś-pavamāna-Stotra (which is about to be performed by the Sāma-Singers) is enjoyed equally by both Gods and men." We do not know how the words in the original can bear this interpretation. We will give the meaning of each of them in order: ubhayeśāṁ, of both, vai, a particle very frequently used but having no definite sense, eṣāḥ that, devamanusyaṇāṁ, or gods and men, bhakṣaḥ meal or something eatable, yad which, bahiśpavamāṇaḥ, name of a stotra (performance of the Sāma-singers). The whole is this: "Of both
gods and men is that which is Bahisparvamana a meal”; i.e. the Bahisparvamana stotra is as it were the meal both of gods and men. The word bhaksha or meal is used here figuratively. The Bahisparvamana is compared to a meal, for it gives pleasure or satisfaction to both gods and men as a meal does. Sayana perfectly agrees with us, as is clear from the following quotation: yo bahis-pavamana esa eva devanam manusyaanam cobyheesam bhaksa, tena hi te sarve tripyanti; i.e. that which is Bahisparvamana is itself the meal or eatable thing of both gods and men, for all of them are pleased, or satisfied by its means. Sayana makes no mention of the “meal in honour of Bahisparvamana,” nor does Apastamba as quoted by him. Notwithstanding all this, the assurance with which note 12 ( page 120 ) is written is surprising. Dr. Haug says there that the text which he has misconstrued “refers to the eating of caru or boiled rice by the Sama-singers before they chant”.

With regard to the second error, the milk or curd, spoken of in the text as belonging to Maithra-varuna, forms one of the purodasas offered to some deities before the stotras commence. It is not mixed with Soma as Dr. Haug says in the heading and in note 16, page 122. This will be clear from the following observation of Sayana in his comment on the passage in the text: atha savaniyapurodasesu yeyam maithra-varunin payasya-sti tatsadbhava Apastambena darsita; i.e. “Among the purodasas at the savana is milk (or curd) dedicated to Maithra-varuna.” Apastamba has mentioned its existence amongst them. Then follows the quotation from Apastamba a part of which we give here: indraya harivate dhanaj indraya pusanvate karambham sarasvatyai bharyayai parivapam indraya purodhasam maithra-varunabhyam payasyam iti, i.e. dhana for Indra with Haris (horses), Karambha for Indra with Pusan and payasya i.e., curds or milk to Maithra-varuna. This is also clear from the Praisa and yayya given in the Sapta-Hautra, in which, along with the names of the other purodasas, payasya (curds) belonging to Maithra-varuna is mentioned. The story of Khanda 22 is related to account for this.
payasya given to Mitravaruna along with the other purodāsas and not for its mixture with soma.

Dr. Haug's account of Svāhākṛtis at page 100 seems to be confused and inaccurate. We had a mind to discuss their nature fully; but as we have, we are afraid, already wearied our reader with long Sanskrit quotations we forbear. We will only remark that the word Svāhākṛti (in the plural) ought not to be translated here by "the call Svāhā" as the Doctor does (see Trans.); for all the three Sanskrit authors we have consulted agree in stating that the Svāhākṛtis are the deities of the 11th prayāja, to whom an offering is given, not with the other ten prayāja deities but after the verses for the drops falling from yapā are repeated. The eleventh Āप्रि verse is used as their yājya.

Such is a specimen of the inaccuracies and errors to be found in the Edition and Translation before us. It appears clearly that Dr. Haug has not read Śāyaṇa, Āśvalāyana or the Sāpta-Hautra-prayoga carefully. And yet he says in the preface:

"My notes are, therefore, for the most part, independent of Śāyaṇa, for I had almost as good sources as he himself had."

But the great difference, even supposing that the materials were equally good in both cases, is that Śāyaṇa seems to have an intimate knowledge of them, while Dr. Haug has at the best only a superficial and general acquaintance, as we hope we have shown. And further:

"He (Śāyaṇa), however, does not appear to have troubled himself much with a minute study of the actual operations of the sacrificial priests, but derived all his knowledge almost entirely from sūtras only."

How he does not thus appear, we are at a loss to see. If Dr. Haug himself notwithstanding the immense help he must have derived from Śāyaṇa, and, notwithstanding that he possessed as good a source as Śāyaṇa himself, was unable to understand the
text of the Aitareya Brâhmaṇa correctly, without seeing some of the operations performed in his presence, how could it have been possible for Śāyāna to write such a voluminous and lucid commentary, without seeing the sacrificial rites performed and performing them himself. We believe such a minute and accurate description of several of the ceremonies as is given by him cannot be accounted for under any other supposition. He never, we apprehend, betokens an ignorance of even the details of the ritual. If Dr. Haug is led to this conclusion by Śāyāna's always quoting from Sūtra works and never advancing anything on verbal authority such as that of priests, as he himself does, it is because it is always a sound canon of criticism in expounding a book, to produce on matters of fact the authority of standard authors on the subject. Every reader is able to estimate for himself the value of such authority; but when what is referred to is a verbal statement which for aught one knows may be false or may have been misunderstood by the person who uses it, he is left helpless and has no choice but to place implicit confidence in it. Besides, a European, for whom the sacrificial ritual of the Brahmans can have no more than a passing interest, may be satisfied with the verbal statements of a priest and believe in them. But a person like Śāyāna, who was himself a Brahman and believed in the efficacy of the rites and held that the slightest deviation from the processes enjoined in the Sūtras was fraught with evil consequences, would place no confidence in mere verbal statements, but would consult the chief authorities on the subject and acquaint himself with the actual practice as it had descended from times immemorial. Moreover, if it were necessary, we might mention that there are extant several sacrificial manuals or prayogas written by Śāyāna himself. We have ourselves seen one of the Caturmāsya and another, of the Agniṣṭoma Audgātra. No doubt, Śāyāna may be wrong in the philological interpretation of particular passages of the Brāhmaṇa, but that he betrays any ignorance of the ritual or even shows but a poor acquaintance with it, we do not believe,
CONCLUSION

We beg that the point of our criticism may not be misunderstood. It is almost an intuitive belief in modern times that free discussion is indispensable for the advancement of Truth. "Truth, like a torch, the more it's shook, it shines". Anybody who is able in howsoever small a measure to help men in separating the grain of truth from the rubbish of falsehood and does not do so is guilty of an offence against Truth itself and against mankind in general. It is with such feelings as these that we entered upon this discussion. Our object is to enable our readers, so far as we can, to form a correct estimate of the volumes before us. Very little was known about sacrifices before in Europe and also in India except to a small minority of Bhattas and Srotiyas. Dr. Haug worked hard for some years and having obtained a considerable knowledge of the ritual has translated the Aitareya Brähmana. The work will afford great help for the understanding of other Brähmapas and of some hymns in the Samhita. The Doctor has thus rendered good service to the cause of Sanskrit learning. But it is certainly to be desired that the book were freer from inaccuracies than it is and bore fewer marks of haste. If Dr. Haug studied Ásvalāyana and Sāyaṇa more carefully and gave us another edition of his work, free from such faults as we have pointed out, it would no doubt be a valuable and permanent addition to our existing resources for the study of ancient Sanskrit literature and Indian antiquities.

Having thus given our estimate of the merits and faults of the edition and translation, we will, in the next notice give some account of the contents of the Aitareya Brähmana and discuss some of the questions to which they give rise.

[This intention, Sir Ramakrishna Bhandarkar said, was not realised.—N. B. U. J]
A REVIEW OF DR. GOLDSTÜCKER’S “PĂṆINI” AND HIS THEORY ABOUT PĂṆINI’S TECHNICAL TERMS.

[From the Indian Antiquary, Volume 6 (1877), pp. 107 ff.]

The following article on Goldstücker’s Pāṇini was published in two issues of Native Opinion, 21st and 28th August 1864. Appearing in a mere newspaper, it probably did not then attract the notice of scholars generally, and is now inaccessible. I am encouraged to reprint it in the Indian Antiquary by the suggestion by Prof. F. Keilhorn in a note to his article on the Mahābhāṣya (Indian Antiquity Volume V, p. 251). I have given it as it was, save misprints, and a remark of a personal nature omitted from the last paragraph.

Dr. Burnell, in his recent work, The Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians, has adopted Prof. Goldstücker’s theory about Pāṇini’s technical terms, which, as was shown by me twelve years ago is based on a misapprehension of the sense of certain passages in the Mahābhāṣya and Kaiyata, and, like him, is led to awkward conclusions. He gives some technical terms used by the older grammarians, which, he says, Pāṇini does not define in accordance with the theory. Of these, however, ṇakavacana, dvivacana and bahuvacana are defined in I. 4. 103. Upasarga, nipāta, dhātu and pratyaya Pāṇini defines likewise, but, as observed by me in the following paper, he defines them by enumeration, or by unfolding the denotation, of the term

1 Pāṇini, His Place in Sanskrit Literature, an Investigation of some Literary and Chronological Questions which may be settled by a study of his works,—by Theodor Goldstücker; London, Trübner & Co.

2 This and the following para. were added when the Review was reprinted in the Indian Antiquary.—N. B. U.
instead of the connotation and in the case of dhātu in the latter way also. All Indian grammarians so understand him, and Patañjali himself does so. Dhātu is defined in I. 3. 1. This sūtra is interpreted in several ways. First, that bhū and others are dhātus, i.e. the name dhātu is given to bhū and others. The effect of this, we are told in the Mahābhāṣya, is that these get the name from the fact of their being put in that list. Secondly, bhū and others which are of the nature of vā, i.e. which show action are roots; and thirdly vā and others which are of the nature of bhū, i.e. signify being, are roots. What is to be gathered from the last two is that words which show action or being are roots. This is a connotative definition. After finishing his explanation in this way, Patañjali says, "Well, then, if we have got a connotative definition now, the enumeration should not be made," which means that the purpose of a connotative definition and enumeration is the same, viz. the explanation of a term. In the same manner the word nipāta is explained in I. 4. 56. This is an adhikāra, wherefore the term is to be repeated in each of the sūtras that follow up to I. 4. 9; and the sense is that all the particles contained in these sūtras are nipātas. Upsarga is defined, i.e. explained by enumeration, in I. 4. 59. As to pratyaya, it is defined in III. 1. 1. This also is an adhikāra, and by this adhikāra we are told that a name is given to certain things which are set forth in the following sūtras, to which the adhikāra extends. Bhaviṣyat and Vartamāna are no sanjñās, or technical terms of Panini,—they are no more so than the words bhūta, adyantana and parokṣa, which are also used. The same remark applies to anta, pradhāna and prayatna. Anusvāra, like visarga, is merely the name of a sound, and is not a sanjñā, the object of which in Panini's grammar is abbreviation, or to be able to state much in a short compass.

1 पटेन धातुस्वित्येनीपाइत्व्यश्च भवति I p. 229a.
2 सबी ताहि लक्षणं धृष्टं नेवाद्वारं पाट: करत्वः I
3 प्रत्ययः अधिकारिण्यं परयवशीश्च करिते I
Then follow terms which, according to the theory, Pāṇini should not define, but as a matter of fact he does. Dr. Burnell gives reasons why he does, the chief of which is that Pāṇini's new anubandhas and the pratyāhāra sūtras rendered the definition of these terms necessary. Prof. Goldstücker's theory is that Pāṇini does not define those terms which admit of an etymology and which are "known and settled otherwise." Now these terms have an etymology, were settled by the previous grammarians, were known before Pāṇini, Pāṇini uses them in the same sense, and there is no difference whatever; why, then, should he define them if the theory be true? What difference does his new system of anubandhas and the pratyāhāra-sūtras make? He would be justified in defining them only if he used them in a different sense. But this is not the case. And if his new anubandhas make any difference, why should he not define the names of cases, prathama, dvitiyā etc. where also he has got new anubandhas? There are also some terms with the definition of which his innovations have nothing to do, but still he defines them notwithstanding they were used by writers who are believed to have preceded him. Pāṇini defines śāmhitā as paraḥ saṃnikārṣaḥ (I. 4. 109), and these are exactly the words in which Yāska explains the terms. Yāska uses the terms abhyāsa and abhyāsta also, and in Pāṇini's definition of them there are no anubandhas or pratyāhāras. The first of these observations will also stand against the reason advanced by Dr. Burnell for defining anunāsika. Pāṇini's definition of āmantrita he considers to be no definition. I do not see why. It is as good a definition as that of guṇa or vṛddhi. The sense of the sūtra (II. 3. 48) is, "the first case as used in addressing is called āmantrita." In the definition of upadha Dr. Burnell thinks that the reason given in the Mahābhāṣya for the use of alaḥ is to avoid making it apply to the indicatory letters. I do

1 P. 38, l. 2, Rothe's edition.
2 P. 40. l. 2 from bottom; p. 41, l. 8; p. 74, l. 2; p. 83, l. 2 from bottom; p. 94, l. 8.
not find this reason in that work. The quotation given in the footnote to support the statement means quite another thing. Its purport is this:—A question is raised whether the "alah is to be taken as an adjective to antya." The answer is "yes, it deserves to be so taken." What follows is a vārtika setting forth an objection against this construction. The objection is "If alah is to be taken as an adjective to antya, there should be a prohibition against [the application of the term to] a collection of letters," i.e. in this construction, the sense of the sūtra is "what precedes the last letter (lit. the end in the shape of a letter) is upadha" in which case the term would apply to the two letters ṣa of the root ṣas. A long discussion follows, with which we have nothing to do at present. I need say nothing more.

* * * * * * *

Dr. Goldstücker is undoubtedly one of the most learned, laborious, and accurate European Sanskrit scholars we have known, and the wide, and in many cases, precise knowledge he has shown of Indian grammatical literature is particularly striking to a Hindu, especially when we call to mind that he has not had the advantage of oral instruction, which is available only in India. Of course a minute knowledge of the complicated and subtle speculations of Indian grammarians can only be acquired after a hard study of at least five years and from a Pandit teacher. But much of what they have written is barren and useless, and no European Sanskritist, or Indian scholar of the new stamp, would consider it worth his while to study it. The Doctor's critical acumen, the skill with which he has brought together stray facts to illustrate and prove his point, and the success with which he has combated the opinions of several scholars command our admiration, though we are rather inclined to think he has handled some of his German friends somewhat roughly. His book is, however, not without its weak points, and there are three or four places where it appears to us to be particularly so. It is not our intention at present
to write an elaborate review of it, but we will notice one point which bears materially on his theory about Paṇini, the Indian grammatical legislator.

At page 166, Dr. Goldstücker lays down the following four propositions:

1. That his (Paṇini's) Grammar does not treat of those saṁjñās or conventional names which are known and settled otherwise.

2. That this term saṁjñā must be understood in our rule to concern only such conventional names as have an etymology.

3. That it applies also to grammatical terms which admit of an etymology, but not to those which are merely grammatical symbols.

4. That such terms as ī, ghu and bha were known and settled before Paṇini's Grammar, but that nevertheless they are defined by Paṇini because they are not etymological terms.

These four statements contain, according to Dr. Goldstücker, the principles which guided Paṇini in the composition of the work and are deduced as conclusions from one of his Sūtras, Patāñjali's Bhāṣya on it, and Kaiyāta's gloss on the latter. Leaving these points for fuller examination at the end, let us in the first place consider if these principles are worthy of being made the basis of a stupendous grammatical superstructure, and bear an air of truthfulness about them, or if there is any external evidence to support them.

According to the first two statements, Paṇini does not propose to teach saṁjñās and such saṁjñās only as have an etymology. Does he then propose to teach saṁjñās which are without an etymology? The "only" would show that he does propose this. What, then, is meant by saṁjñās without etymology? Are such saṁjñās as Paṅcālāḥ, Varanāḥ, Aṅgāḥ, which are given by the commentators as instances of this sūtra and the previous one to which it refers, and which, therefore, are the
sāṁjñās Pāṇini, according to them, does not propose to teach,—are these sāṁjñās, we ask, without etymology? If they are, according to Dr. Goldstücker, Pāṇini should teach them. If they are not, no instance can be given: of a word, existing in the language, which is a sāṁjñā without etymology. If we bear in mind that two schools of etymology existed in India, viz. Vyūtpatti-pakṣa, according to which all words have an etymology and A vyūtpatti-pakṣa, according to which some have it, and some have it not, and that Pāṇini belonged to the latter, as is asserted and believed by all śāstrins, such words as Pañčalāh and aṅgāḥ are sāṁjñās without etymology. And if this be joined with Dr. Goldstücker's statement, it will follow that Pāṇini should teach them. But as a fact he does not, if we believe the commentators. Now with regard to the Vyūtpatti-pakṣa, we see that the rule in question contradicts its doctrine, for according to that pakṣa all words, sāṁjñās included, have etymology, while the rule makes a distinction between words with and without etymology. If we suppose, then, that Pāṇini belonged to this pakṣa, and at the same time that he observed the rule given by Goldstücker, we must either suppose him to have possessed an extremely illogical mind or not to have proposed such a rule for his guidance. Upon either view of etymology, therefore, we maintain that the rule laid down in statement Nos. 1 and 2 could not have been followed by Pāṇini. We perfectly agree with statement No. 1, if it be separated from No. 2, and not interpreted according to the sense of the word sāṁjñā given in the latter.

In the next two statements this rule is applied to grammatical sāṁjñās. Such as are settled are not to be defined, but an exception is to be made in favour of such as have no etymology, e. g. ti, ghu, bha &c. We see no reason why Pāṇini should select for definition, out of settled sāṁjñās, such as have no etymology. For, both those with and those without etymology are settled, i. e. have a fixed meaning. The mere circumstance of some sāṁjñās having etymology, which may be considered as
the reason why they are not to be defined, is immaterial, as the presence of etymology in the one case is nearly the same thing as its absence in the other. The etymology of a technical term is not sufficient to explain its sense, and in some cases it affords no clue to it whatever. How can the etymology of the terms bahuvrihi, prataya, &c. enable one to understand their grammatical signification? In so far, then, as words with etymology are used in philosophical treatises in a sense different from the etymological, or from that they have in common language, they are in the same predicament as unmeaning words, such as ti, ghu &c. We see, therefore, no reason why Pāṇini should have selected the latter for definition, and not the former.

Having laid down this theory about Pāṇini's technical terms, Goldstücker proceeds to test its accuracy with reference to several sāṁjñās which he knows were settled before Pāṇini's time such as pratayā, prathamā, dvitiyā, tatpuruṣa &c., and finds that he has not defined them as they have an etymology. He then mentions other sāṁjñās, such as karmadhārāya, anunāśika, hrasva, dirgha, udātta, anudātta &c., and since they are defined and possess etymology, he concludes that they must have been first used by Pāṇini himself. We cannot help thinking that there is here an instance of the fallacy of reasoning in a circle, or of the Anyonyāśraya of Hindu logicians. In order that Dr. Goldstücker's theory may be true, it is necessary that these defined sāṁjñās possessing etymology should be inventions of Pāṇini and they are inventions of Pāṇini because the theory is true. Or in plainer terms, the theory is true because these defined sāṁjñās are Pāṇini's inventions, and they are Pāṇini's inventions because the theory is true. These defined sāṁjñās may have been settled before Pāṇini's time, in which case the doctor's theory would be false. And in fact we have reason to believe that such sāṁjñās as hrasva, dirgha, pluta, udātta, anudātta &c. were invented before Pāṇini. We are sorry we have not got any treatise on śikṣā to refer to just now, but considering that the names for accents and for long and short
vowels must have been very early invented by grammarians, as they are the most elementary distinctions and likely to strike a lingual philosopher before many others, and bearing also in mind that, if different terms for these had existed before Pāṇini, they would not have been altogether lost and we should have known them, we are inclined to believe that the names in question were settled before his time. Dr. Goldstücker himself mentions one such word (ढन्न ), and is not inclined to disbelieve that there may be many more. But the supposition he makes to save his theory that Pāṇini used them in a sense somewhat different from that in which they were before used has, in our opinion, no basis.

We have all along used the word definition in Dr. Goldstücker’s sense. He seems to understand by the term definition such a definition as is commonly given in European books, viz. that which unfolds the connotation or comprehension of a term. But the principal object of a definition is to point out or distinguish certain things (definitum) from the rest, and this may be done in other ways than by unfolding the connotation. Unfolding the extension or denotation is often an easier process and may in several cases be resorted to. Even European logicians call this latter a definition, no less than the former. Sanskrit writers do not confine themselves to the former, but frequently use the latter and several other kinds. For instance, in Viśvanātha Pañcānana’s Muktāvali (p. 71, Asiatic Society’s edition) the fallacy anaikāntika is defined as that which is any one of sadhāraṇa &c., i.e. anaikāntika is either Sadhāraṇa, Asadharāṇa or Anupasamārhārin. The fallacy is thus defined by enumerating its several kinds. We need not stop here to quote other instances. Any one who takes the trouble will find many in any Sanskrit philosophical treatise. What we maintain, then, is that, so far as this view of definition is concerned (and we are convinced that that is the Hindu view), Pāṇini has defined the terms pratyaya, tatpurusa, bahuvrihi &c., which Dr. Goldstücker says he has not; but he has defined them by enume-
rating the several kinds or individuals contained under them. To Hindu writers such a definition is as good as the other, especially when the latter is difficult to give. We think Panini in defining terms by enumeration was not guided by any such rule as the learned Doctor lays down, but simply consulted his own convenience. When he found it difficult to give a connotative definition, he gave a denotative one. How difficult would it have been to give a connotative definition of *bahu-vr̥ihi,* for instance, containing as it does such compounds as *uttara-, tuc-, dvara-, dhradhirād,* so different from such a one as *kamalāyan!*

We now proceed to examine the principal evidence upon which Dr. Goldstucker's theory is based. As we said before, he quotes a sūtra of Panini, the bhāṣya on it and Kaiyata’s gloss on the latter, and deduces his theory from these. When we read this portion of the book for the first time, we were surprised to find that the Doctor has not understood one of the passages correctly. The sūtra referred to is *tadśiṣयं संज्ञाप्रमाणवत्.* Dr. Goldstucker’s translation:—“Such matter will not be taught by me for it falls under the category of conventional terms which are settled (and therefore do not require any rule of mine; literally ‘for it has the authority of a sāmijnā or conventional term’).”

This translation is generally correct. We would, however, translate it more closely, thus:—“About that no rule ought to be made or that should not be taught; for (the knowledge derived from) the meaning of conventional terms in common usage is an authority in itself.” The word संज्ञा is explained by Patañjali as संज्ञान, which again Kaiyata interprets by संभ्रमयः, अवमाः, i.e. knowledge obtained (from usage). In a note on that portion of the Siddhānta-Kaumudi (Cowell’s edition) where this sūtra is explained, we find the following:—संज्ञानो लोक सङ्क्यः हराणमिच्छति प्रमाणवतः, “samijñās—that is, usages—are here an authority or evidence.”

The bhāṣya on this sūtra is as follows:—कित या एताः कृतिमा दिशुधादिसंज्ञासंस्त्रास्त्रमाण्यावधीष्यम् नैत्याह। संज्ञानं संज्ञा।
Dr. Goldstücker's translation:—"When Pāṇini speaks of conventional terms which he will not teach because they are settled, does he mean by this expression such technical terms as \( ti, \ ghu, \ bha \) and the like? No; for sāṁjñā is here the same as sāṁjñāna understanding (i.e., a name which has a real meaning that may be traced etymologically)."

We do not see whence he gets the first portion up to "settled". If by implication, we do not think it necessary to understand anything. There is nothing even in the śūtra which has the sense of the words "which he will not teach because they are settled." For, what Pāṇini says he will not teach is that something which he has alluded to in the last śūtra but one, and which we shall explain hereafter. We do not deny that this sense may be inferred from what Pāṇini actually says. We have, however, a particular objection to the expression "are settled" if it is to be made applicable to the terms \( ti, \ ghu, \ bha, \) &c., and understood to mean "settled before Pāṇini's time". There is nothing in the original corresponding to the words enclosed in brackets in the above extract, nor is the sense deducible from any word occurring in the Śāṃskṛt passage. There is, no doubt, the word sāṁjñānam, but we do not know upon what authority Dr. Goldstücker renders it by "a name which has a real meaning that may be traced etymologically". Kaiyata explains it by अवगम, संप्रवर्थ, as noticed above, which means 'knowing, comprehending,' as is evident from his use of the word अवगम (differing from अवगम only in the form and not in the sense of the termination) in the sentence which follows. It is this:—

\[
\text{तत्र यथायो दृष्टा सिक्तात् वर्षा इत्युक्ते तिः संशयविशेषावगमतिः सः सांज्ञानं स्मरणेऽव पाठाः वर्णणं इत्यादिपि:}—
\]

"As when one pronounces the words \( अगम; \, दृष्टा; \, सिक्तात्; \, वर्षा; \) the अवगम (knowledge or comprehension) of a particular number and gender which is produced is authority, so is it in the case of पाठाः, वर्णणः", &c. Our translation of the passage in question is as follows:—"Is it on account of the authority of (or evidence afforded by) such artificial sāṁjñās as \( ti, \ ghu, \ bha, \) &c. that that thing mentioned
in a previous *sūtra* alluded to before) should not be taught."

"No," says he (Gonardiya—Patañjali). "Samjñā is knowing, comprehending." Upon the whole, Dr. Goldstücker’s translation of these two passages is not very objectionable, but they do not afford any basis for his theory, except for that portion of it which is comprehended in the first statement. But the quotation from Kaiyāṭa is altogether misunderstood. It runs thus:

&f%<m

And Dr. Goldstücker’s translation of this is as follows:

"The question of Patañjali is suggested by the rule of analogy. His answer is in the negative because the context itself has greater weight than (mere) analogy. Now, though such terms as ti, ghu, bha, and the like are settled terms, this circumstance would not have been a sufficient reason in an etymological work (like that of Panini) for leaving them untaught; for they have no etymology. ‘Understanding (as Patañjali paraphrases samjñā) means mentally entering into, understanding the component parts of a word [or it means the words which admit of this mental process]."

In the first sentence of this, the word *analogy* is not, we think, a correct translation of *pratyāśānti*, though it will do. "Proximity" is the word that is equivalent to it, and it ought to have been used here, for a reason which we shall presently explain. But it is the third sentence that is the most objectionable of all. We have no hesitation in saying that the translation here is totally wrong, and it is upon this misapprehension of the sense of the original that the Doctor’s peculiar theory is based. We hope our readers will excuse us for the assurance with which we speak; for we feel that no native scholar acquainted with grammatical phraseology would ever think of translating or interpreting the passage thus. As Dr. Goldstücker translates it, he appears to connect the nouns *pramanābhāṣa* and *ahāśūhāsṇa* with the
genitive दिष्वाभिसंज्ञानां, and renders the former by "being settled". But अधिभाष्यसे ought really to be taken with the genitive यत्कथायायाः and then the translation would be "for learning यत्कथायायाः, untaught," instead of "for leaving them (i.e. ti, ghu, bha, &c.) untaught," as the doctor translates it. यत्कथायायाः is rendered "an etymological work," which, if one remembers what the sūtra is about, he will at once see is altogether wrong. The word can by no stretch of sense mean that. शास्त्र means here 'a rule,' as it frequently and primarily does, and not 'a work.' Various instances may be quoted in support of this, the last पदा of the verse about Upādi, एतच्छायासहस्राणिद्व, being one. संवसनामभावात is rendered as "having no etymology," for which, however, there is not the slightest authority. संवसन never means etymology; it means connection. Besides, from the context it is clear that the sentence cannot have the sense Dr. Goldstüker attaches to it. For, the whole subject here discussed by these several writers is this:—The last but one sūtra of Pāṇini is तुपि यत्कथायायायाः (I. 2. 51), which is thus explained in the Siddhānta-kaumudi:—तुपि सिद्ध 'प्रत्ययविक्रयायाः स्त:। पश्चातानां निवासो जनपदः पश्चातः। कुरः। अक्षः। &c, meaning that when an elision called हर्ष takes place, the gender and number (of the noun) are like those of the base; पश्चातः &c. are instances. This requires some explanation. In virtue of the sūtra तस्य निवासः (IV. 2. 69) the termination अकृ should be added to the noun पश्चातः; for instance, when we have to form a derivative signifying "the place of residence or the country of the Pañcālas", a race of Kṣatriyas (hence the above example from the Kaumudi is worded पश्चातानां निवासो जनपदः). Now this termination is elided in virtue of the sūtra जनपदे हर्ष, IV. 2. 81. If the termination were not dropped, the word expressing 'the country of the Pañcālas' would be पश्चातः. Then the question is, when it is dropped, what should...
be the gender and number of the noun signifying the country? Should it be masculine and singular, as the word जनपद 'country' is? If so, the derived word would be देशस्याशिक्षा. But "No," says पाणिनि (in the सूत्र लूपिन पुक्त शत &c.); "the gender and number should be like those of the original base," which is प्राच्य, and consequently masculine and plural. Hence the noun signifying the residence or country of the Pancaias is प्राच्य. "Now," says पाणिनि (in the सूत्र तद्विश्वयं संज्ञापमाण्वित I. 2. 53), "what is the use of teaching by a rule the number and gender of these?", though he himself, in conformity with the practice of former writers, has done so. "They are to be learnt from usage, which has itself an authority, just as the gender and number of आप: and दास: are, and the authority of a grammarian is not required. For प्राच्य: in the plural are actually the names of certain countries, and, as such, ought to be used in the plural in deference to the existing usage and there is no necessity of a grammarians's teaching it."

Upon this पताल्न्तोली raises the question, "Pāṇini speaks of the authority (of usage in matters) of names. Are they such names as ति, ग्वु, भा, &c. which have an authority" (as used by पाणिनि, not necessarily by any other writer)? "No," says he. Kaiyata explains why पताल्न्तोली put to himself such a question? "He was led," he says, "to it by the proximity of these artificial grammatical sāmijnās, or that he wanted to determine which were the sāmijnās meant by पाणिनि; because if he did not do so, a reader might, on reading the sūtra in question, be led to think first of them (the grammatical names) rather than of any other, on account of their proximity to or connection with, the science he is studying. In order, therefore, to avoid all such confusion he proposes the question, and answers it by saying "No". "Why not?"

"(हि) Because," says Kaiyata "(दितिवर्दिनिद्वारा प्रामाण्यम्) the authority of the grammatical sāmijnās, ति, ग्वु, भा, &c. (न हेमस्य-प्रसुत) is no reason (as the authority of sāmijnās in common language such as Pancaias, अंग, &c. is). Why युक्तिस्त्रावशालयम् | a sūtra or rule expounding that when a termination is elided by
Another Misinterpretation

- the use of the term ल्रप्र, the gender and number are like those of the base | (अशिष्यन्ते ) should not be taught? And why is it no reason? "(संबन्धभावधात ) Because there is no connection ( i. e. no connection between such saṁjñās as ti, ghu, &c. and युक्तव्यायान )". This is the whole sense of the three quotations. युक्तव्याय, i. e. like the base, is the word used by Pāṇini in the last but one śūtra ( तिपु युक्तव्याय ), &c.; and Kaiyata first adds the word मव to it, when the whole means "the being like the base", and then the word शास्त्रम a rule, and thus the expression युक्तव्याय-शास्त्रम signifies literally "the rule about the being like the base," and not an etymological word, as Dr. Goldstücker understands.

It will thus be apparent that Dr. Goldstücker's theory is based upon a misapprehension of a passage in Kaiyata; and, now that we have explained its true sense, and have also shown that the theory is not supported by any external evidence, it must, we think, be given up. The first of the Doctor's four propositions, if separated from the second, we agree with, as we have already intimated. Dr. Goldstücker's opinion, that the saṁjñās ti, ghu and bha were known before Pāṇini's time, may be true for aught we know, but it does not at all follow from anything in the passages commented on. He was, no doubt, led to it by the expression टित्तमादि-संभाषणगि प्रमाणवत्य, which he renders by "such terms as ti, ghu, bha are settled terms." We would translate it as "the authority of such saṁjñās or terms as ti, ghu, bha, &c." and this authority they derive from their having been used and defined by Pāṇini. The whole grammatical literature based on his work does not admit the authority of any other person except him, his continuator and critic Kātyāyana and his bhasyakāra. And even if we take Dr. Goldstücker's translation, the expression "are settled terms" does not necessarily mean "settled before Pāṇini's time, or by any other person than Pāṇini himself".

Dr. Goldstücker has also misunderstood the sense of the śūtra प्रधानग्रहायाध्यायचन्द्रस्यान्यप्रमाणवत ( I. 2. 56 ), which is thus
explained in the Siddhānta-Kaumudi: प्राप्यायमः प्रधानमित्र्येवं वचनायसिद्धिः। कुतः। अर्थश्च लोकत एव सिद्धे:। i. e. "the saying that the sense of a termination is the principal sense of a word (and that that of the base is attributively joined to it) should not be taught. Why? Because the sense [of a word] is to be gathered from or is established by usage.". We do not know whence Dr. Goldstücker brings in the idea of a compound and its "principal part" in his translation. We do not think it necessary to enter at greater length into the explanation of the sutra in this place.

We must here close our remarks; our space does not admit of a more lengthened notice, at least for the present. We hope our observations will be calmly and patiently attended to by European Sanskritists. In several cases, though not in all, native students of Sanskrit have a greater right to be listened to than Europeans. We are also desirous that these few remarks should not give pain to Dr. Goldstücker, who, especially by his articles on our religious difficulties published in the Westminster Review, has shown himself to be our decided friend who sympathizes with our fallen condition and is ready to help us by his friendly advice in our race towards a brighter future.
India has from time immemorial been cut up into a number of independent states, so that the expression "Political History of India" can only mean the political history of the states which composed it. But again from remote times the king of one or other of these states is represented to have conquered the "whole world" and performed the horse sacrifice, indicative of his supreme or paramount power. Such an old work as the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa mentions a good many such kings. These paramount sovereigns held power for a few generations, sometimes for only one. The history of these paramount sovereignties can more appropriately be called the History of India. Such paramount sovereignties, however, did not exist at all times. The religious and literary History of India is, however, an appropriate expression at all times. For any religious literary movement started in one state extended itself immediately to the neighbouring ones, and thence to remoter provinces, and eventually spread over the whole country. Mr. Smith does not propose to give the religious or literary history of the country; but only the political.

But what are the authorities for the political history of India? There are genealogies in the Purāṇas of royal dynasties that held power up to about the end of the third century of the Christian era. Then we have stray notices of some princes in the literature and whole biographies of a few. There is a chronicle of one province, Kashmir, which contains reliable history, though there is a good deal in the beginning which is mythical. Sanskrit literature does not contain history as a branch of study
and inquiry. The Purāṇas and Itihāsas cannot be relied upon as works of history, though there may be a historic basis or root, which, however, it is difficult to extricate from the mass of legend with which it is enveloped. The principal sources of history which are reliable are inscriptions on stone and copper, coins, architectural remains, and the accounts written by foreign writers, especially Greek, Chinese and Arabian, of the state of the country when they visited it. The information gathered from some of these sources is extremely meagre, and a special acuteness is wanted in the writer of the early history of India to piece together the different scraps of information and form a consistent whole. This, however, it is not every writer who possesses; and oftentimes wild statements are made, supported by very little or no evidence or unaccompanied by a statement of the evidence. The lay reader should guard himself against such writers.

Mr. Smith gives the histories of the paramount sovereigns that reigned from the third century before Christ to about the end of the seventh century after, and such history of independent provinces as has been worked out by scholars from the available materials. His account of Candragupta, who founded the Maurya dynasty about 322 B. C., and of his grandson, Aśoka, is very good and instructive, since the materials are ample, and a good many scholars have been working over them for a number of years. It may, however, be stated that I do not quite agree with Mr. Smith as to the extent of Aśoka's empire that he gives. He makes it extend over the whole of India, with the exception of the extreme south, up to Mangalore, where he places the independent country of the Satiyaputas. In my "Peep into the Early History of India" I have made his empire extend along the line connecting his inscriptions and made it include the whole of the northern India up to Kathiawad in the west and Ganjam in the east and also the portion of the table-land of the Deccan up to Mysore. I have excluded both the eastern and the western coasts, because there is no relic of the empire there
and also for another reason which may here be given. That reason is that the independent country of the Satiyaputas must be placed, not where Mr. Smith does, but a good deal further to the north; for, we have along the westernmost portion of the Deccan table-land in the Poona district Maratha, Prabhu and Brahman families bearing the name Satpute, which corresponds remarkably with the Satiyaputas of the inscriptions. The independent state, therefore, of Satiyaputa very likely was situated along the Western Ghats and the Konkan coast below. Upon the whole, the sections on Asoka in Mr. Vincent Smith's book are satisfactory.

There is also very little to remark as regards anything in the sections on the Śunaga and Kānvāyana dynasties, except this, that I still adhere to the view that to make the Puranic chronology agree with that derived from Nahapāna's date and the information available in Ptolemy's Geography it is necessary to regard the forty-five years assigned to the Kānvāyanas to be comprised in the 112 assigned to the Śunagas, notwithstanding the statement that Devabhūti was killed by Vāsudeva; and this supposition I still regard as fully supported by the statement in the Purāṇas that the Kānvāyanas were the servants of the Śunagas as the Peshwas were of the Rajas of Satara. If the Śunagas were entirely put an end to by the first of the Kānvas, his three successors can in no sense be called "servants of the Śunagas." The Śunagas, therefore, must have been reigning while the Kānvāyanas were ruling just as the Rajas of Satara reigned while the Peshwas held the true power.

Mr. Smith next proceeds to notice the Andhrabhrtya dynasty. The family is known by the name of Sātavāhana, he says, which is correct; but it is also known, he observes, by the name of Satakarni, which occurs frequently in the genealogy. The frequency of its occurrence is by no means a reason for its being regarded as a family name any more than Henry which occurs eight times and Edward which occurs seven times is the
name of the dynasty that has been ruling over England since 1066. Śatakarni is the proper name of the king who bore it. It was sometimes associated with another name but there is no indication anywhere of its having been the name of the family. A long inscription in one of the caves at Nasik on the Western Ghats contains the name of Gotamiputra Śatakarni who is represented to have conquered a very large extent of territory, to have restored the "glory of Satavahana race", to have destroyed Sakas and Pahlavas and to have left no trace of the line of Khakhārāta. This Khakhārāta was Kṣaharāta Nahapāna, whose coins are extant and whose son-in-law Uṣavādata, the husband of his daughter Daksamitrā, caused caves to be excavated at Nasik and founded a good many other charities. Nahapāna is called in the legends on his coins and in the inscriptions a Kṣatrapa or Mahākṣatrapa and a Rājā. Gotamiputra Śatakarni's son was Puḷumāyi, in the 19th year of whose reign the inscription describing the exploits of Gotamiputra is dated. The names of Simuka, Kṛṣṇa and Śatakarni, the first three princes of the dynasty, also occur in the Western Inscriptions. Similarly, princes, later than Puḷumāyi, of the names of Yajña-Srī-Śatakarni, and Māḍhariputra Sakasena are mentioned. No princes of the Satavahana dynasty are mentioned between the first Śatakarni and Gotamiputra Śatakarni, wherefore the inference is that foreigners, whose leader was Nahapāna, occupied Western Deccan in the intervening period before Gotamiputra vanquished them. In the legends of copper coins found at Kolhapur occur these words: Vāsithiputasa Vilivāyakuras, Gotamiputasa Vilivāyakuras and Māḍhariputasa Sevalakuras. Another Kṣatrapa king named Caṣṭana is mentioned in coins and inscriptions found in Kathiawad and Malwa, and he was followed by a long series of successors. The grandson of Caṣṭana was Rudradāman, whose exploits are described in his inscription dated 72, found at Junagad. Therein he speaks of twice having subdued Śatakarni, the lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha, but. not having destroyed him on account of the connection with him not being remote. In an
inscription at Kanheri which is much mutilated, the wife of Vasiṣṭhiputra Śātakarni is represented as the daughter of a Mahākṣatrapa.

These are the facts. Let us see how Mr. Smith has concatenated them. He says the first Śatavāhana prince Simuka, who has been variously named as Sindhuka, Sipraka, &c., in the Purāṇas, could not have been the one who uprooted the Kāṇvās, though the Purāṇas expressly state it. He gives no reason for the supposition. He then takes Gotamiputra Viḷīvāyakura to be the same king as Gotamiputra Śātakarni, who was the destroyer of the race of Nahapāna Kṣaharāta and the father of Puḷumāyi. This Puḷumāyi, he says, was the son-in-law of Rudradāman of the Junagad inscription and was twice subdued by him. The name of the daughter of Rudradāman married to Puḷumāyi, he says, was Daksamitrā. All this is opposed to the clearest evidence available to us. The identification of Viḷīvāyakura with Ptolemy's Baleocuros was first made by me, and it has been accepted by others and even by Mr. Vincent Smith himself. Ptolemy mentions him as ruling in Hippocura and Sirī Polemeos, i.e. Puḷumāyi, at Paithan, while Tiastenes or Caśtana ruled at Ujjayini. These, therefore, since they are so mentioned by Ptolemy, must be considered as contemporaries. But Mr. Smith makes Baleocuros the father of the Puḷumāyi and Puḷumāyi as the contemporary of Rudradāman, the grandson of Caśtana, and not Caśtana himself. If Baleocuros was the father of Puḷumāyi, the father reigned at Hippocura and the son at Paithan and neither had anything to do with the capital of the dynasty on the lower Godavari. This is certainly, to say the least of it, curious, and it is clear that Mr. Vincent Smith has in determining the relations of these princes entirely set aside the information derived from Ptolemy. At the same time, Puḷumāyi cannot have been the prince subdued by Rudradāman, because the name of the prince subdued by him is expressly given as Śātakarni and Puḷumāyi was never called Śātakarni. The daughter of a Mahākṣatrapa, represented in the Kanheri inscription as the queen of Vasiṣṭhiputra Śātakarni, cannot
have been the wife of Puḷumāyi; for he was not called a Śātakarnī, but of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Catarapana Śātakarnī, whose name occurs, according to Bhagwanlal Indraji, in a Nanaghat inscription. Her name is lost in the Kanheri inscription, and Dakṣamitra, which is given as her name by Mr. Vincent Smith, was the name of the daughter of Nahapāna married to Uśavadāta. And it must not be forgotten that Puḷumāyi could not have been Rudradāman’s son-in-law and could not have fought with him, as he (Puḷumāyi) was not his contemporary but of his grandfather Caṇṭana. Thus then, in connecting together the different pieces of information concerning these princes, Mr. Vincent Smith goes quite against the most unimpeachable evidence. Who then must have been Vilivāyakura? That name does not occur in the whole list given in the Purāṇas, and cannot have been borne by an Andhrabhṛtya prince. The great Gotamiputra who conquered Nahapāna and re-established the power of his family could not have been Vilivāyakura, the ruler of Hippocura. For his name is expressly stated in the long inscription at Nasik as Śātakarnī, and the whole information therein given is remarkably confirmed by the hoard of about fourteen thousand coins of Nahapāna, recently found in the Nasik district, more than nine thousand of which are counter-stamped with the words “Raṇño Gotamiputasa Siri Śātakanisa,” which shows that the conqueror used the money of the vanquished monarch, but re-stamped it with his own name, Gotamiputra Śātakarnī. The only way of making the whole account consistent is to take Vilivāyakura as viceroy, first of Vāsiṣṭhiputra and then of Gotamiputra, as I have done in my “Early History of the Deccan.” In the legends on coins it was usual to associate the name of the supreme sovereign with that of the viceroy of the particular province, as Catarapana’s name is with that of Yajña Śri Śātakarnī in the Sopara coin and in a great many coins of the Śaka princes of Arachosia and the Punjab. Thus then, the Vāsiṣṭhiputra of the Kolhapur coins must have been Puḷumāyi, and Gotamiputra, Yajña Śri. Or, if one per-
sists in taking Vilivayakura as in apposition to Gotamiputra and Vasiṣṭhiputra, they may be regarded as princes independent of the Andhrabhṛtya princes bearing those metronymics. But this supposition is highly improbable, since the metronymics Vasiṣṭhiputra, Gotamiputra and Māḍhariputra occur in the inscriptions in the Poona, Thana and Nasik districts and the same three metronymics are found on the coins at Kolhapur, a place only about 130 miles from Poona. There could not have been two dynasties having the same three metronymics at places so near each other and at about the same time. Ptolemy locates Puḷumāyi at Paithan, and the many traditions about Śālivāhana or Śatavāhana current in Mahārāṣṭra place him at the same place. There were, therefore, two viceroyalties at least of the Andhrabhṛtyas, one at Paithan and the other at Hippocura. To the former the younger princes must have been appointed, as Aśoka and Agnimitra were to the viceroyalties of Takṣaśilā and Vidiśā during the life-time of their fathers. This inference is very reasonable, and yet Mr. Smith rejects it. Again, the Śatakarni whom Rudradāman is represented to have twice subdued must be Yajña-Śri-Śatakarni. This way of taking the whole matter is consistent throughout, and does not go against any portion of the available evidence. Mr. Vincent Smith also says that “after the destruction of Nahapāṇa, the Local Government of the West was entrusted to one Caṭṭana, who seems to have been a Śaka, and to have acted as Viceroy under the Andhra conqueror.” What this Local Government of the West may have been it is impossible to say. For the Poona, Thana and Nasik districts were, after the destruction of Nahapāṇa, governed by Śatavāhana princes and Caṭṭana, according to Ptolemy, ruled at Ujjayini, far away in Malwa, and his being a Śaka was exactly a reason why he should not have been appointed a viceroy by the victorious Gotamiputra, who took pride in destroying Sakas. This statement is repeated by Mr. Smith later on. He appears to have had too much faith in H. Oldenberg, who started the theory. I will add one other point. Gotamiputra’s mother iṣ
called Balaśrī by Mr. Vincent Smith following Dr. Bühler. I have taken her name to be Gotami, and Balaśrī as a compound word qualifying Gotami and characterising her as the prosperous goddess of power. Balaśrī is not to be found in the whole range of the Sanskrit literature as the name of a person, and Gotami is not a Gotra-name here as Dr. Bühler takes it, for it is difficult to believe that such old Gotras as those of Gotama and Vasīṣṭha were in common use in the caste to which the Śatavāhanas belonged. Besides if Balaśrī had been the proper name of the lady, her son would have been called Balaśrīputra and not Gotamiputra, as Gotami was her general name according to Dr. Bühler’s supposition and not her proper name.

Though the Purāṇas represent the Āndhrabhṛtyas to have succeeded the Kāñvāyanas and the Śungas, they do not appear to have held power for any length of time in Northern India or even in the country of Magadha. Shortly after the foundation of the dynasty in about 73 B.C. northern India was disturbed by the incursions of the foreign hordes, some of which obtained a permanent footing in the country. Of these the Śakas were the most enterprising. They established themselves along the western side of the country from Takṣaśilā or Taxila to Kathiawad, inclusive of Mathura and Ujjayinī. They extended their power even to the Deccan, disposessing the Śatavāhanas of the country, but did not enjoy it for a long time. For Gotamiputra conquered Nahapāṇa or perhaps his immediate successor, whose name, however, is not known. The eastern side of India was probably in its normal condition, that is, cut up into small states and held by many native princes.

Mr. Vincent Smith proceeds to give the history of the incursions of these foreigners and the establishment of their power in the country; but there are a few points in which I cannot agree with him. The princes who are generally represented as forming a Śaka dynasty, notwithstanding some affinity with the Parthian race, are included by him in the
Kṣatrapas and Imperial Saka Race Racially Identical

Parthian dynasty. I have shown in my "Peep" that the rule of succession among these princes, viz., Vonones, Spalirises and others was that the younger brother succeeded to the throne in preference to the son of the first occupant, and, after all the brothers had enjoyed sovereignty, it descended to the son of the eldest brother, and so on. This was the rule of succession among the Kathiawar and Ujjayini Kṣatrapas, who belonged to the Śaka race; and Dr. Bühler has pointed out that that rule prevailed among the Northern Kṣatrapas also. This confirms the general view that Vonones and others were also Śakas. Another reason for the supposition of the racial identity of the Kṣatrapas and the line of Vonones is, as pointed out by Prof. Rapson, afforded by the term dāman, which forms either the prefix or the suffix of Kṣatrapa names and which we find in such names of the princes of the latter line as Sphalgadames. Mr. Vincent Smith regards the southern and northern Kṣatrapas as independent hordes of Śakas; but certainly a question ought to arise in one's mind as to why they should have assumed such an inferior title as Kṣatrapa corresponding to the Persian Satrap. And the question can be answered only by regarding them as having been in the beginning viceroys of some paramount sovereigns. Such paramount sovereigns were Vonones and others. On their coins appears the title "King of Kings" in Greek as well as Pali language. Why should not one then regard the Kṣatrapas as the viceroys of those imperial sovereigns? But to the imperial Śakas European scholars have been in the habit of assigning a very early date, which cannot be harmonized with the Śaka dates of the Indian Kṣatrapas. I see no reason why one should adhere to the early date and have regarded one of the imperial Śakas as the founder of the Śaka Era.

Mr. Vincent Smith then passes on to give the history of the Kuṣanás. He regards Kaniṣka as the immediate successor of Kadphises II., usually called Wema or Hima Kadphises. But the great difference in the legends and emblems on the coins of Kaniṣka and Wema Kadphises prevents the supposition that the
former was the immediate successor of the latter. Kaniska and his successors appear to me to have formed a distinct family from that of the two Kadphises. The Kuśana dynasty became extinct or sank into unimportance, according to the prevailing belief among scholars, a hundred or a hundred and fifty years before the rise of the Guptas in about 350 A.D. There is thus a gap of so many years between the two dynasties. But I have brought forward a number of reasons for believing that there was no such gap between the two dynasties and that the successors of Kaniska were in possession of North-western India up to Mathura till the Gupta prince Candragupta II. dispossessed them of it. I have thus regarded Kaniska to have begun to reign about 278 A.D., and thus shocked all European scholars. I expressed the opinion that the figures representing hundreds were omitted in the dates occurring in the inscriptions of Kaniska and his successor. But perhaps the existence of such a practice at such an early period cannot be regarded as substantiated by any positive indication. I may, therefore, modify my opinion, and say that Kaniska used an era of his own, but its initial date must be such as will make the last of his successors contemporaneous with Candragupta II., who overthrew him; that is to say, that the initial date should be about 260 A.D. The question is still open and cannot be regarded as settled until some fresh discovery gives us certain information as to Kaniska's date.

The foreign domination and the rule of native princes were put an end to when the Imperial dynasty of the Guptas rose in the first half of the fourth century. The first prince of the family who made glorious conquests and extended his dominions over a wide extent of the country was Samudragupta. He was followed by Candragupta II., who was called Vikramāditya. He put an end to the Śaka dynasty ruling over Ujjayini and also, in my opinion, to the Kuśana dynasty. The famous Vikramāditya, the patron of learned men, who was called "Śakāri" or "enemy of the Śakas," was in all probability Candragupta II., whose reign began.
Before 388 A.D. and ended about 412 A.D. Mr. Vincent Smith's account of the Gupta dynasty is, on the whole, very satisfactory, and I need go no further into it.

About the end of the fifth century the Gupta family broke up and after some time became extinct. About that time the Huns established themselves in the country and gave it two sovereigns, Toramana and Mihirakula. Their power also soon came to an end. For about a hundred years we had no imperial sovereign, but in the first half of the seventh century we have Harṣavardhana, who exercised paramount power over the whole of Northern India, but was checked effectually, when he attempted to extend it to the South of the Narmada, by Pulakesi II. of Mahārāṣṭra. The itinerary of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsang and Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita are the chief authorities for the history of this emperor. They give us a far fuller account than such authorities as coins and short inscriptions, with which we have had to satisfy ourselves hitherto, can give. Mr. Smith’s account of this emperor may also be regarded as satisfactory. He then proceeds to give a short account of some of the minor kingdoms of the subsequent centuries. In the following chapters he gives similar accounts of the kingdoms of the Deccan and of those in the extreme south. Having already exceeded my limits I will not go into them.

The history of the Kalacuri dynasty ought, in my opinion, to have been given in greater detail, since there were materials for it. That dynasty possessed an era the initial date of which is 249 A.D. and which was current in Gujarāt and some parts of Mahārāṣṭra also. There are some inscriptions which tend to show that that dynasty ruled over Western Deccan and a part of Gujarāt after the extinction of the Śatavāhanas. But it was dispossessed of these provinces and driven into the interior by somebody and occupied the country of Cedi near the modern Chattisgarh. They often came into close relations with the Rāṣtrakūtas of the Deccan, but nobody has yet collected all the information and written a book on the dynasty.
I will now close this criticism with the observation that the circumstances of the case require that the writer of a history of India for the use of ordinary lay-people should give the broad, salient facts which have now been placed beyond the possibility of doubt, and, if he enters into details, they must be such as have been accepted by all scholars or are supported by unimpeachable evidence. If there are conflicting or inconsistent views about a certain matter, all these should be given, and, if they cannot be given, that matter should be entirely omitted. All the available evidence should be carefully gone into, and the facts ascertained should not be combined and connected in a manner to conflict with other equally well-known facts. No statement should be made for which there is no authority, and in all cases references should be given in the footnotes. A book written on such principles may then be recommended as a safe guide to lay-readers. It is not meant to say that Mr. Vincent Smith has set aside these principles—and parts of his book are unexceptionably good—but it is impossible to refrain from expressing a desire that it should be thoroughly revised in strict accordance with those principles in order that it may become a safe and useful guide to ordinary readers.
THE LATE PROFESSOR PETER PETERSON


The following is the tribute paid by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar on the occasion of a meeting called in memory of the late Professor Peterson by the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society on Thursday, the 7th of September 1899, under the presidency of the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Candy.

[The Chairman said that they had met together to place on record the Society’s sense of the loss they had incurred in the death of their President, the late Dr. P. Peterson, M.A., D.Sc. On behalf of the committee of the Society he asked Dr. Bhandarkar to move the resolution.

Dr. Bhandarkar then moved the following resolution:—

“That the Society place on record its sense of loss it has sustained by the death of its president, Dr. Peterson, and its testimony to his abilities, to the interest he took in its affairs, and to his great services in connection with Sanskrit literature. That a letter enclosing a copy of the Society’s resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Peterson, with an expression of sympathy with her and her family.”

Referring to Dr. Peterson he said: ] Dr. Peterson was brought out in January 1873, to supersede me. I had been acting as Professor of Oriental Languages in the Elphinstone College for four years, from the beginning of 1867 to the end or 1872. Dr. Peterson was a young man of twenty-five and was junior to me by ten years. For fifteen years before this I had been learning and teaching Sanskrit, while Dr. Peterson could have been studying it only for about five years before. Under the ordinary operation of our sinful nature, one would expect that distrust, suspicion and jealousy would have sprung
up between us. But such feelings never for a moment took possession of his heart nor of mine, and a cordial friendship grew up between us, which was continued during the varied occurrences of the last twenty-six years, and has now terminated only by his death, which occurred a few days ago. This goodness was entirely due to the innate nobility of Dr. Peterson's nature and to the culture which his mind had undergone, as well as his desire to please and to be agreeable. He never gave himself an air of superiority, as is too often done by inferior natures. At a later period we happened to be engaged in a spirited controversy on a literary question. Such controversies between scholars often embitter their feelings against each other, and they are sometimes found not to be willing even to shake hands with each other when they chance to meet. But this was not the result of our controversy, and we were as good friends after it as before. Dr. Peterson was Professor and I his assistant and we worked harmoniously together. In September 1874, he went on a year's sick leave to Europe and, after his return, was appointed to the Deccan College as Professor for another year. In November 1876, he came back to the Elphinston College. There was a turning point in Dr. Peterson's career about the end of 1881. A Sanskrit professor is considered unworthy of his post if he does not carry on original research in Indian antiquities and Indian languages and literature in addition to his teaching work. The other professors in a college are at liberty to do or not to do anything they like, but this additional duty is imposed on Sanskrit professors. I do not complain of this, and even in these days, when there is a greater readiness to give professorships to natives, the authorities, I think, should insist that the Sanskrit professor should devote his leisure to this work. Since 1873 I had been doing work of this nature, but Dr. Kielhorn of Poona was about to retire on that occasion, and the idea had been conceived of getting out a new man from Germany to succeed him there; but since it was considered unfair that I should be passed over another time, especially after the literary
work that I had done, it was arranged that I should be made professor of Oriental Languages in the Elphinstone College and Dr. Peterson appointed professor of English literature. Had this plan succeeded, the world would not have heard of Dr. Peterson as a great scholar. But, having deliberately chosen Sanskrit studies as the work of his life, this proposal was not liked by him. He saw the members of Government and personally protested against it in a strong manner, and the result was that the orders for a new professor from Germany were countermanded by a special telegram, and I was appointed to the Deccan College and Dr. Peterson remained professor of Sanskrit in the Elphinstone College.

The Government of Bombay had for several years before been conducting a search for Sanskrit manuscripts and this work had been entrusted to Dr. Bühler, and after his departure to Dr. Keilhorn mainly and to me partially. After Dr. Keilhorn's departure Dr. Peterson claimed to be allowed a portion of it, and it was divided equally between him and me. In connection with this he went on tour several times to Gujarat and Rajputana and examined a good many of the Jain libraries in those provinces. He issued four reports as extra numbers of the Journal of this society. Two more were printed at the Government Central Press. He contributed a good many articles to the Journal of this Society, and published at various times editions of the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyāṇa, of Hitopadeśa, of Kādambari, of Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣītāvali and of Sārṅgadhara's Paddhati. In his introduction to Vallabhadeva's work, he gave an alphabetical index of all the poets whose names were found alluded to in the Sanskrit literature, together with all the information that had till then been obtained about them. This work he did in conjunction with the late Pandit Durgaprasad of Jaipur. An analysis of Sārṅgadhara's Paddhati had before been given by Professor Aufrecht, but that had only rendered the demand for the work itself keener. Sārṅgadhara's
date is known and from that the inference is easy that poets from whose works he gives elegant extracts flourished before him. This desideratum Dr. Peterson supplied by his edition. He also published annotated editions of the Rgveda Hymns laid down for the M. A. Examination, and a handbook for the students of Veda. He edited a Buddhistic work entitled Nyāya-biñḍūṭikā in connection with the Bibliotheca Indica of Calcutta, and an edition of a Jain work in connection with the same collection is in the press. The first two fasciculi were presented to me by him only a few days before his death. You will thus see that the original work done by Dr. Peterson since the end of 1881 has been considerable. His examination of Jaina libraries in particular has been productive of important results. His works are referred to and quoted from by all European scholars who have occasion to write on subjects touched on by him, and he is highly spoken of by them all. Professor Ernest Leumaun of Strassburg, in the notice of Dr. Bühler's life published in the recent number of the Indian Antiquary, says with reference to Dr. Peterson: "Bühler imparted his desire of discovering or uncovering all that is hidden or unknown in Jain literature to Peterson, his successor in Bombay, who has been so fortunate as to be able to enter sanctified temple libraries, which in spite of all exertions were closed to Bühler. Peterson has indeed been continuing Bühler's work in the search for manuscripts very much to his credit." Dr. Peterson has thus been able to secure for himself a very high place among European scholars. Whenever he came across a fine sentiment in a Sanskrit author he did not fail to appreciate it and often times translated it into English verse and compared it with similar sentiment an English authors or in the Christian Bible. As he appreciated all the good he found in Sanskrit literature, he appreciated also whatever good he found in Indians. He was thus a kind and sympathetic friend of us all. About six week ago he wrote to me, telling me that he was a candidate for the Boden Professorship at Oxford, and asked me
His Death an irreparable Loss

to give him a testimonial, as I had done on a former occasion when he applied for the Assistant Professorship. I intended to see him personally and speak about it and discuss his prospects at Oxford generally; but this was not to be. After my arrival here I heard of his serious illness on Saturday and heard of his death on the following Monday, after his mortal remains had been consigned to the grave. I had thus not even the satisfaction of having followed them to their last resting-place.

Dr. Peterson was our Secretary for several years, and I remember that after he assumed office he changed the appearance of these rooms and rendered them more attractive. He was also our President for three years. As he was the only scholar in Bombay who carried on original research the loss occasioned by his death cannot at least at present be made up, and not only on account of these special relations of the society to Dr. Peterson, but on account of the simple fact that he was a man who contributed to the advance of Sanskrit studies, it is but proper and fitting that this Society, the object of which is to promote such studies, should place on record its sense of the loss it has sustained by his premature death.
THE LATE MR. A. M. T. JACKSON, I. C. S.

[FROM THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY, VOL. XL, 1911, P. 1]

The diabolical murder of Mr. A. M. T. Jackson, just as he was about to take up the joint Editorship of this Journal, sent a thrill of horror into the hearts of members of both the European and Indian communities throughout India. He was by nature a kind-hearted and sympathetic man, and these traits of character were observable in everything that he did both in his official and private capacity. His charities to poor Brahmans, both of Ratnagiri and Nasik, who needed help were unstinted. I know of one such Ratnagiri Brahman, who was given some nominal work in the library of the Bombay Asiatic Society and was paid regularly a monthly allowance from his private resources. He never spoke an angry or unkind word to anybody, and his general character and conduct were saintly. He was an accurate and enthusiastic Sanskrit scholar, and his critical judgment was sound. He made original researches into the ancient history of India, and the introductory volume of the Bombay Gazetteer and his other papers and occasional notes contain the results of these researches. He successfully identified the cities and towns in India mentioned by Greek and Roman authors. He pointed out that the Turkomans of Central Asia settled in the western part of India and adopted Hindu civilization. He also threw very great light on the origin of the Gujars. He showed that they were a foreign race that had established a powerful kingdom over the whole of Rajputana and further to the north-east up to Kanauj. The Gujars were in power from the first quarter of the seventh to about the end of the tenth century and were constantly at war with the princes of the Cālukya and Rāstrakūṭa races that ruled over the Maratha and Kanarese countries. Mr. Jackson put forth a very original and correct idea as regards the nature of the Purāṇas, which awaited further development at his hands. His
paper on this subject has appeared in the centenary volume of
the Bombay Asiatic Society, and will well repay perusal. He has
also contributed several papers to the ordinary volumes of that
*Journal*. His essay on ‘Method in the Study of Indian Anti-
quities’ shows a very wide knowledge, not only of epigraphy and
numismatics, but also of a number of other lines of research.
This is calculated to be of great use to Indian students; and he
also projected for their use a handbook to the study of Sanskrit
literature and Indian Antiquities. To sound scholarship
Mr. Jackson added modesty and sobriety of thought and
expression,—a combination rarely met with amongst scholars.
He freely and fully acknowledged all the good that he found in
the writings of native Indian scholars. He often complained
that his official duties left him little time for his favourite studies,
and I had great hopes that after his retirement from service he
would be able to apply himself to them with zeal and ardour
and to throw light upon many a knotty point in Sanskrit litera-
ture and Indian Antiquities. The loss that the horrid deed of a
fiendish young man inflicted on the cause of Indian research is
incalculable.
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| Abdagases nephew of Gondaphares (Indo-Parthian), p. 31. |
| Abhidhamma, work of Kāśyapa, p. 76. |
| Abhidhāna-Cintāmaṇi of Hemacandra, p. 188. |
| Abhijana, p. 151. |
| Abhimanyu, pp. 165-167; A. father of Parikṣit, ref. to, in Bānaś Khādambari, pp. 86-87. |
| Abhimanyu, king reigned after Kaniṣka, pp. 116-117; Kalhaṇa's statement about, p. 184; revival of study of Mahābhāṣya in reign of A., acc. to Kalhaṇa, p. 185. |
| Abhiras, pp. 39, 413; A. Kings, p. i283; dynasty of A. probably reigning in Khandesh; inscription of one of the A. princes exists at Nasik, p. 414. |
| Abhyantara Karanaṇa, p. 71. |
| Abhyasa, p. 498. |
| Abhyasta, p. 498. |
| Absolute, p. 77. |
| Acaryabhimanayoga (Upaṣya), pp. 285, 286. |
| Accents, ways of, at the time of repetition of Veda, differs in all Śākhās of Vedas, p. 228. |
| Acchoda, name of a lake, in Bāna's Kādambari compared to Bhārata, p. 86. |
| Acyutanandin, p. 39. |
| Adharma, p. 67. |
| Ādhibhaṭṭika evils, p. 66. |
| Ādhibhaṭṭika evils, p. 66. |
| Adhikāra, pp. 145, 497. |
| Adhvaryu, pp. 489-491. |
| Ādhyātmika sufferings, p. 65. |
| Āditya (Sun), temple of, p. 44. |
| Advaśita Vedaṇṭa, p. 291. |
| Adyatana, p. 497. |
| Afghanistan, pp. 11, 18, 19, 37, 367; Asoka Inscriptions at Shahbazgarhi in, p. 10; ancient geography of A.; p. 103. |
| Agathocles (descendant of Demetrius) p. 19. |
| Agni, p. 7; A. called Asura-han, p. 94; Rg. hymns addressed to, pp. 321, 322. |
| Agni Purāṇa, p. 62 fn3; prophecy in A. re. White Yajurveda as a triumphant one, p. 222. |
| Agnihotri, or keeper of the sacred fires, pp. 16, 230. |
| Agnistoma Audgātra prayoga by Sāyaṇa p. 494. |
| Agnisvāmin, (name on charters), Bhaṣyakāra on Lāṭyāyana Sūtra, p. 55. |
| Agra, p. 346. |
| Ahura (in Avesta) name of Supreme Lord Ahuramazdā, p. 97. |
Aburas (or Asuras) represented as fiends by Indians, p. 97.

Ahuramazdā (Supreme Lord), pp. 97, 98.

Ābutis, p. 313.

Aigókerós (Gr.) i.e. Ākokera, name of a Zodiatic sign, p. 388.

Airy, Prof., calculations made by, re. eclipse of the sun, p. 79; his calculations about grant wrong, p. 92.


Aitareya, pp. 371, 418.

Aitareya Āraṇyaka, pp. 224 & fn1, 226.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, pp. 81fn1, 95 fn1, 224 fn1, 226, 321, 369, 398, 403, 480fn1, 494, 495.; A. B., Jana-mejaya and Bharata, mentioned in, p. 81; A. B., Pāṇini's rules scrupulously observed in, p. 161; A. B., mention of Dirghatamas Māmateya in, p. 422; A. B. edited and translated by Martin Haug, reviewed by the author, pp. 480-495; A. B., some errors re. faulty punctuation etc. pointed out in the edition of, by Haug, pp. 483-485; A. B., translation of, examined; some inaccuracies and errors pointed out, pp. 485-493; A. B., many Kings referred to in, p. 511.

Aitihāsikas (knowers of legends), p. 396.

Ājapañcādauna offering referred to in Ātharvaveda, p. 369.

Ājātaśatru, King of Kāśi in Kauśīta-kībrāhmaṇopaniṣad p. 292.

Ājīva sect of recluses, p. 15.

Ājīvaka monks, p. 17.

Ājīvakas, p. 17.

Ājāna, p. 67.

Ākāśa (ether), pp. 7, 67.

Ākhyaṇa hymns in Rgveda, p. 397.

Ākhyaṇas in Mahābhārata have separate existence, p. 404.

Ākokera i.e. Aigókerós (Gr.) name of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.

Ākṛti-Gaṇas, p. 102.

Akrūra plays prominent part in Kṛṣṇa Story, p. 212.
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ANDHA, PRAKRITI IS SAID TO BE, P. 67.

ANDHAKAS (YADAVA TRIBE), P. 292.

ANDHRA OR TAILANGA, P. 277.

ANDHRAS, P. 12; NAME DASYUS APPLIED TO A.S., P. 95 FN. 1.


ANDHRABHRTYAS (SATAVAHANA MENTIONED UNDER THIS NAME IN PURANAS), P. 30, 181FN1, 265, 516-518.
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ANGADHIKARA FROM MAHABHASYA OF PATANJALI, P. 316.

ANGUH, P. 500, 501, 508.

ANIRUDDHA SPRANG FROM PRADYUMNA, P. 285, 288.

ANKĀNĀM VĀMATO GATIHI, A RULE, P. 230.

ANNE BOLYN, P. 357.

ANQUETIL DUPERROD, A FRENCH SCHOLAR, P. 330.

ANJUTVA (WANT OF SINCERITY), P. 470.

ANTARYĀMIN (MANIFESTATION OF GOD), P. 285.

ANTARYĀMIN (MANIFESTATION OF GOD), P. 285.

ANUSASANA, BOOK OF MAHABHARATA, P. 9, 53 F, 91FN 4.

ANUSASANIKAPRAVAN, P. 404.

ANUSĀRA (BOOKS WRITTEN IN), P. 53, 212, 468.

ANUVAKYA VERSES, P. 321, 489, 490.

ANUVĀKANUKRAMAN I, P. 305.

ANUVĀKANUKRAMAN I, P. 305.

ANUVAŚASANIKAPRAVAN, P. 404.

ANUŚĀSA, BOOK OF MAHĀBHĀRATA, P. 9, 53 F, 91FN 4.

ANUŚĀSA, BOOK OF MAHĀBHĀRATA, P. 9, 53 F, 91FN 4.
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ANDHRAS, P. 12; NAME DASYUS APPLIED TO A.S., P. 95 FN. 1.


ANDHRABHRTYAS (SATAVAHANA MENTIONED UNDER THIS NAME IN PURANAS), P. 30, 181FN1, 265, 516-518.

ANCECDOCA OXONIENSIA, A COPY OF FOUR PARTS OF, PRESENTED TO AUTHOR BY MAX MÜLLER, P. 338.

ANGADHIKARA FROM MAHABHASYA OF PATANJALI, P. 316.

ANGUH, P. 500, 501, 508.

ANIRUDDHA SPRANG FROM PRADYUMNA, P. 285, 288.

ANKĀNĀM VĀMATO GATIHI, A RULE, P. 230.

ANNE BOLYN, P. 357.

ANQUETIL DUPERROD, A FRENCH SCHOLAR, P. 330.

ANJUTVA (WANT OF SINCERITY), P. 470.

ANTARYĀMIN (MANIFESTATION OF GOD), P. 285.

ANTARYĀMIN (MANIFESTATION OF GOD), P. 285.

ANUSASANA, BOOK OF MAHABHARATA, P. 9, 53 F, 91FN 4.
Apastamba, p. 492; his Dharma and Grhya Sutras, pp. 53, 408; A Śākā, p. 314. A. Sūtra of Black Yajurveda, p. 223.

Apollodotos (Yavana prince referred to in Arunād Yavanā Sāketam), pp. 18, 20.

Appājī, minister of Kṛṣṇa Rāya, same as Janamejaya of copper-grant acc. to Col. Ellis, p. 80.

Apramattatva (absence of Conceit), p. 472.

Apratihata (high sounding epithet on ooins), p. 32.

Aprī verse, p. 493.

Aptoryāma, p. 230.

Arabs, p. 466.

Arachosia, Śaka princes of, p. 516. Ārṇyakas, pp. 228, 287, 288.

Arasakes (Indo-Parthian king,) p. 31.


Archduke Rainer, a great patron of learning in Austria, pp. 341, 344, 345.

Archbeius, pp. 19, 20.

Archosia (Arkhōj or Rokhoj) derived from the name of mountain Riksoda, p. 104; A. name of kingdom, called Arkhoj or Rokhoj by Arab Geographers, ibid.

Archotis river i.e. Zend Haraqaiti i.e. Skr. Sarasvatī, p. 104.

Arda, p. 184.

Arjasāntī, Mahābhāṣya called so, by Bhaṭṭṛhari, pp. 184, 207.

Artaṃbha, the son of Jaraṅkāru, pp. 7, 8.

Arthā Purusārtha, p. 286.

Arthapaṇoaka, work summarising the doctrines of Rāmānuja school, p. 284; A. (Jīvas, Īśvara, Upāyas, Phala, and Virodhinā), p. 287.

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, genuineness of, p. 338; A. not mentioned in Mahābhāṣya, ibid.; A., authorship of, attributed to school of Kauṭilya and not to Cāṇakya himself by Prof. Hillebrandt; Jacob however attributes it to Cāṇakya or Viṣṇugupta who overthrew Nandas and raised Candragupta Maurya to the throne ibid.; A., p. 399; A. tribut ed to Kauṭilya as he was traditionally conceiver of it, p. 330.

Arurād Yavanā Sāketam, (use of Imperfect) under Panini III. 2, 111, pp. 17, 18.

Āryā metre, Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa written in, p. 60.

Āryabṛata, astronomer, p. 58; A., Āryā metre used by, p. 60.

Āryas, Indian, pp. 6, 387.

Āryan race, p. 390.

Āryaṇas, pp. 96, 97, 99, 100, 422, 424; A.s, progress of, contested both by Dasyus of India and Asuras of Assyria, p. 97; A.s divided into number of tribes, p. 100.

Āryāśaṅgga, or Aśaṅga brother of Vasubandhu founder of Yogācāra School, p. 58.

Āryasaṅgga, p. 46.

Āryāvarta, pp. 18, 39.

Asaṅha, p. 503.

Asaṅga (or Āryaśaṅga) brother of Vasubandhu founder of Yogācāra School, p. 58.

Asita Dāhava, name of a King, p. 98.

Āśmarthya Rśi, p. 409.

Āśoka Emperor, pp. 4, 9, 15, 17, 19, 387, 517, A.'s Edicts, their location, p. 10 f; his inscriptions, pp. 10, 11, 39, 162, 278, 325, 388, 413; A., Arha, p. 184.
son of Candragupta, his close connection with Buddhism, p. 5; extent of his empire, date of his coronation, p. 11 f; A. distinguishes between Hida and Antesu, p. 12 fn 1; A. crowned about, 271 B.C. p. 13; A. an Upasaka ibid; A. a Buddhist but tolerant and liberal, ibid, p. 14; his faith in Buddhist Triad of Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha, p. 14; his aims and objects and the means he employed, ibid; his work, p. 15; A., religion preached by, p. 16; A. visiting Buddha's birth-place ibid; his successors ibid; A. calls Antiochus, King of Syria, a Yona-raja, p. 178; A. king of Kashmir during his father's life time, p. 276; his coronation about 269 B.C. p. 327; A. grandson of Candragupta, p. 512; A.'s empire extended almost over whole of India acc. to Vincent Smith, p. 512; A., sections on, in Smith's History, satisfactory, p. 513.

Āsoka-Avadāna, p. 113 fn 1.
Āśīrīhitī, p. 257.
Āssur, p. 97.
Āssur-bani-pal, p. 97.
Āssur-Nazir-pal, p. 97.
Āssuryans (i.e. Assyrians), p. 97.
Āssurya (Āssuryāḥ) derived from Āssur, pp. 97, 100.
Assyrians (or Assurryans or Asuras), same as Mlechos, pp. 97, 98, 99, 323.
Āstādrāyī of Pāṇini, pp. 164, 226.
Āṣṭaputre Kaśīnāthaśāstri, p. 299.
Astrology and Astronomy, Śāstra of, well known among Greeks (i.e. Yavanas or Mlechos), p. 388.
Astronomy p. 57 f; A. and Astrology, Śāstra of, well known among Greeks (i.e. Yavanas or Mlechos), p. 388.
Asura, its meaning, p. 94; A. (i.e. living vigorous, powerful hostile or inimical to gods) ibid; A. foreign un-Brahmanic race, p. 96; A. (i) living spirit, (ii) human being hostile to wandering Āryas (iii) race of mythical beings hostile to gods (iv) a Mlecha or a foreigner of that name, p. 98.
Asuras men like Dasyus (or Assyrians), pp. 94, 95, 323; A. aborigines of some country, p. 95; A.s like Dasyus as enemies of Āryan wanderers, ibid; A. and Gods compared, p. 96; A.s dwellers of earth ibid; A.s (or Ahuras) represented as friends by Indians, p. 97; A.s mythical same as those of Assyria, pp. 98, 100.
Āsura-Māyā, p. 98.
Āsurī Vidyā (Veda of Asuras) magical skill and knowledge, p. 98.
Āsurya-Loka, p. 100.
Āsuryā speech, p. 96.
Āsuryāḥ (= Asurrya) applied to Lokāḥ in Īśa Upaniṣad, country of Asuras, p. 97.
Āsūyaka, p. 472.
Āśvaghoṣa, author of Buddhacarita (contemporary of Kaniṣka), p. 60.
Āśvala, name of Janaka's priest, Bühler compared to, in author's Verses sung at Vienna Congress, pp. 346, 347.
Āśvalāyana, pp. 92, 225, 306, 311, 314, 418, 420, 489, 490, 491, 493, 495; Ā, Brahmayajña for Rgvedins enjoined by, p. 224 fn 1; Ā., Mahābhārata mentioned by, pp. 404, 423; his Dharma and Grhya Sūtras, p. 53; Ā. Sūtra, pp. 55, 308, 309, 310, 313, 314, 482; Ā., Grhya Sūtra, name of Mbh. occurring in, p. 81. Ā. Grhya Sūtra p. 82 and fn 1 & 2, 371; Ā. G. Sūtra iii. 5. 9, p. 307; Ā., G. Sūtras iii. 5, 8, 9, p. 310; Ā. G. Sūtras i. 7. 9; i. 10. 9; i. 11. 13; i. 14. 5; i. 15. 6; i. 19. 2; i. 20. 1; iii. 5–3. p. 310. Ā. G. Sūtras i. 4. 2; i. 13. 6; iii. 5. 6; iii. 5. 8; iii. 5, 9; p. 311; Ā. G. Sūtra iii–5. 9; p. 312; iii–3. 4, p. 313. Ā. Kalpa Sūtra p. 324; and fn 1; Ā. Śrauta Sūtra
INDEX I

Asvalāyana Samhitā, pp. 309, 313.

Asvamedha, allusion to, in Mālavikāgnimitra, performed by Puṣyamitra, p. 17; A. performed by Saṃudragupta, p. 43; A. solemnised by Puṣyamitra, p. 111 fn. 3; A. performed by Puṃsmitra of Patañjali, pp. 182, 183.

Asvamedha-Mahendra legend on coins, p. 43.

Asvamedhaparākrama, title of Saṃudragupta, p. 43.

Asvamedhaparvā, p. 91 fn 4; A. in Telugu characters, p. 404.

Asvamedhikā Parvā, Arjuna killed by his son Baḥbruvaḥana referred to in, p. 86.

Asvaṭapi, King of Kekaya country (Chāndogya Upāniṣad, V. 11), p. 292.

Atman, pp. 287, 290.

Atmanepada, distinction between, and Pasamaipada, pp. 296, 297.

Atta, p. 105.

"Auṣṭyālakāra of Kṣemendra" article on, read by Peterson, p. 157 fn 1; A., p. 186 fn 1.

Aurâvelt, Prof., his Oxford Catalogue quoted, pp. 87 fn 3 and 4, 90 fn 1, 91 fn 4, 334; A., p. 164; A., Prof., of Bonn not present at Vienna Congress, p. 342; A., analysis of Sārṅgadhara's Paddhati by, p. 525.

Aulika, family epithet, p. 42.

Aupaniṣada, or Vedānta system, p. 294.

Avagraha, p. 228.

Avairāga, p. 67.

Avatāras of Viṣṇu, ten, p. 301.

Avesta, p. 97.

Avestio people, p. 330.

Avidyā, p. 78.

Aṣṭākta, p. 410.

Aṣṭyyutpattipākṣa, p. 501.

Aya, termination called Nie, p. 209.

Ayama, minister of Nahapāna, p. 31.

Aṣṭīdhya (Sāketa) province of Guptas, p. 51.

Āzes I, p. 21; A. II; ibid; A. dependent on Vōonones and Spalirises, p. 28.

Āṣṭīlijes, p. 21.

Babruvaḥana, son of Ulupī and Arjuna ref. to in Kādambarī, p. 86.

Bactria, p. 19; B., Menandros king of, p. 108.

Bactrian Greeks or Yavanas, p. 17.

Bactrian kings, their coins, p. 18 f.

Bactrians, p. 58; B.s followed by Sakas, p. 413.

Bactro-Indian princes, their coins, p. 18.

Bāḍāmi, a cave temple of Viṣṇu at, p. 45.

Bāḍarāyaṇa (Vyāsa) pp. 76, 224 and fn 1.

Bāḥrubāṣṭra, p. 419.

Bahis-pavamāna-stotra, pp. 491, 492.

Bahis-pavamāna meal, pp. 491, 492.


Bahuvacana, under Pāṇini, I. A. 103, p. 496.
Bahurvari Compound (Pañjini II. 2. 23) p. 212; B., pp. 502-504.
Baiji set at naught work of Patanjali acc. to Bhatrhari, p. 184.
Bairat, p. 11; edict of B., p. 13.
Baka, ref. to in Vāsavadattā, p. 87.
Bakhali, (North of Panjab) a paper on an old Ms. written in Sāradā character of a work on Arithmetic found at, read by Dr. Hoernle at Vienna Congress, p. 343.
Bala, pp. 285, 288.
Balakanda of Rāmāyaṇa, pp. 217, 406; B. edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 526.
Bālākī the Gārgya (Kauśitakibrahmanopanisad), p. 308.
Balāṣrī, as the name of a person not to be found in Skr. literature, p. 518.
Balāṣrī, epithet of Gotāmi, mother of Gotamiputra, (acc. to author) p. 518; B. mother of Gotamiputra acc. to Smith following Dr. Bühler, ibid.
Balavarman, p. 39.
Baleoouro-s as father of Pulumayi acc. to "Vincent Smith, p. 515.
Bali, pp. 209, 211.
Balibandha, p. 209.
Ballantine, p. 133 fn 1.
Ballantyne, his edition of Mahābhāṣya, pp. 124 fn 1; 127 and fn 3.
Bāṇa, author of Hārṣacarita, pp. 2, 521, B., p. 59, 85, 85, 289, 343, 369, 374, 376, 405; B., ref. by, in Hārṣacarita to Vāsavadattā of Subandhu, p. 87; B., mention of Kautilya’s work by, p. 329.
Bānīśa river, p. 264.
Banavasi, p. 38.
Bandha or Saṅga, p. 70.
Bannu, name given to Vaneh or Wanneh, province of Afghanistan, by General Cunningham, p. 104.
Bapat, Rao Saheb Narayan Vishnu, Mss. from Benares belonging to, p. 189.
Barābar near Gaya, three small tablet inscriptions in Caves at, pp. 11, 15, 17.
Baranas or Varanas, name of a place on the right bank of the Indus, p. 105.
Baron Kremer, President of Oriental Congress held at Vienna in September 1886, p. 341.
Barth Monsieur, p. 340.
Barygaza (Broach) p. 18.
Bāsileus Basileon (i. e. Māhārājasa Rājarājasa) Kings of Kings, p. 21.
Bāsileus Basileon Kanhekkoy (Greek legend on Kaniška coins), p. 34.
Bāsileus Basileon Megalou Gundopherrnou, (Greek legend) on some coins of Gondophares, p. 32.
Bāsileus Basileon Megas Wema Kadphises (Greek legend on the coins) p. 34.
Bāsileus Dikaioy HeloiKleous, (i. e. of HelioKles, the righteous king) the legend on the obverse of coins p. 18 f.
Bāṣkala, teacher of one of the two different recensions of Rgveda, pp. 308, 371.
Bāṣkalas pp. 308-311, 313, 314.
Bassein, inscriptions at, p. 30.
Bauddhas, pp. 51, 55, 293.
Bauddhāyaṇa, his Dharma and Ṣūtras p. 53; B., p. 55.
Bauddhāyaṇa Sākhā p. 314.
Bazdeo (or Vāsudeva), p. 29.
Behar, Hindi spoken in, p. 342.
Belvalkar S. K., Dr., paper on ‘Devas and Asuras’ read by, p. 101 fn 1.
Benares, pp. 133, 315; B., study of Veda in, p. 223; B. Sanskrit College, chair for Saṃkhya Philo¬sophy in, p. 63.
Bendall Mr., of British Museum, present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.
B, a paper on discovery in Nepal of a new alphabet with arrow-head characters read by, at Vienna Congress ibid.
Berlin, p. 351.
Besnagar, inscription found at, p. 327.
Bha (term), pp. 500, 501, 505, 506, 508, 509.
Bhadrapada, p. 304.
Bhadrasara, successor of Chandragupta acc. to one Purāṇa, p. 6.
Bhadrayana school, p. 275.
Bhagavadvyākhyāta, p. 307.
Bhagavanas Indraji, Dr. Puṣpamitra (another) acc. to, lived in reign of Somadatta, p. 180; B., 181 and fn1; B., name of Vāsiṣṭhiiputra Catara-pana Śatakarni occurs in a Nana Ghat inscription acc. to, p. 516.
Bhagavat Vāsudeva, pp. 43, 291; B. or Viṣṇu, temple of, p. 44; B., both Vāsudeva and Buddha called as, p. 292.
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, pp. 62 fn3, 69 fn2; B., IX. 9. 49, XI. 21. 1, p. 291 and fn 4; B., ref. to Puṣpamitra as name of individual in, p. 111 fn3.
Bhāgavata school, p. 411; B., or Pāṇi-carāṭa system, Rāmānuja’s same as, pp. 289, 290.
Bhāgavatas, pp. 287-289, 292, 294.
Bhāgēlkhanda, p. 11.
Bhākṣa (meal), p. 492.
Bhāktiyoga (Uपāya), pp. 285, 286.
Bhāmaṭi, p. 299.
Bhandarkar Devadatta R., Dr. pp. 21 fn1, 23 fn 1, 36 fn 2, 49 fn 3.
Bhandarkar R. G., Prof. (author) Peterson’s Reply to, p. 186 fn 1; B., quotations from Peterson’s reply to, pp. 188, 198; B., pp. 199 205.

Bhāradvāja, author of Uddyota, pp. 59, 324, 411.
Bharata, his departure to his maternal uncle, pp. 217, 218; B., p. 406.
Bharata or Sarvadamana son of Dusyanta and Sakuntala, p. 79; B. mentioned in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, p. 81; B., son of Dusyanta and Sakuntala, p. 120; B. son of Dusyanta crowned by Dirghatamas Māmāteya, p. 422 f.
Bhrārata, Achoda lake in Bāṇās Kādambari, compared to, p. 86.
Bhrārata, this name indicating races occurs in Rg. III, p. 422.
Bhrātṛtirtha, his Pañcadaśi, p. 77 fn1.
Bharaut, Buddhistic Stūpa as, pp. 17, 37.
Bhrāravi his Kārītārjuniya based on Mbh. story, p. 89; B., p. 90 fn 1.
Bhartṛdāman son of Rudrasena (Kṣatrara) pp. 26, 29.
Bhartṛhari, author of Čā. on Mahābhāṣya, p. 158; B. lived before 650 A. D., p. 164; his Vākyāpadiya pp. 166, 167; B. calls Pratīṣṭhāla Tirthadarśin (seer of saving truth and Mahābhāṣya on Arṣagrantha, p. 184; B., p. 185.
Bhartṛmēntha (or Meṇṭha), a poet, pp. 50, 60.
Bharukacōha (i.e. modern Broach) p. 254.
Bhāṣārthāḥ, p. 337.
Bhāsarpājñā, author of Nyāyasāra, p. 299.
Bhāṣya on Pāṇini VIII. 1, 15, p. 189; B. of Saharasvāmi, p. 58; B. of Saṅkara on Vedaṅga Sūtras, p. 62 fn 2; Mbh. and Gītā quoted in B., p. 88.
Bhāṣyas, pp. 52, 54, 55.
Bhaṭṭa, dynasty of, p. 103.
Bhaṭṭa, p. 495.
Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīta, author of Siddhānta-kaumudi, p. 316.
GENERAL INDEX 539

Bhau Daji, Dr., pp. 85 fn3, 90 fn1, 180, 181; B. thinks Puḍumāyi as father of Gotamiputra, p. 275; B., Ārya from Varāhamihira giving twelve names of Zodiac signs quoted by, p. 387.

Bhavabhūti, pp. 165, 217, 368, 374; B., verses in Uttara Rāma Carita taken by, from last chapter of Bālakāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa, p. 217; B. pupil of Kumārīlabaṭṭa, p. 374.

Bhavāvāmin, Bhāṣyakāra on Baudhāyana Śūtra, p. 55; B. (name on charters) ibid.

Bhaviṣya, p. 497.

Bhawanagar Collection of Inscriptions, p. 25 fn 1 & 3.

Bhikṣū (his name Budhamitra), p. 46.

Bhiksukas, division of Brāhmaṇas, pp. 223, 225.

Bhils, p. 387.

Bhilsa, p. 40.

Bhīma, ref. to, in Vāsavadattā, p. 87; B. mentioned by Patajñali, p. 404.

Bhūmasena, referred to, by Patajñali, p. 83; B., p., 85.

Bīṣma, p. 54.

Bīṣmaparva, Bhagavadgītā a part of, p. 90.

Bhiṭṭi, inscription at, p. 41; B., seal discovered at, p. 42; B., p. 43; B. Lāṭ Inscription on it, pp. 180, 181 fn1, 183, 208.

Bhogya, what is to be enjoyed or suffered, p. 287.

Bhoja of Dhara pp. 12, 89, 299; B. refers to works of Rājaśekhara, in his Sarasvatikanṭhābharana, p. 87.

Bhoṅkṛ (enjoyer or sufferer), p. 287.

Bhū, pp. 234, 497.

Bhūmavidyā (Chāndogya Upaniṣad VII. 1), p. 290.

Bhūṣaṇa, pp. 220, 221.

Bhūta, p. 497.

Bhūtāpāla, a Seth of Vaijayanti, p. 38.

Bible, p. 387.

Bihār, inscription at, pp. 41, 43.

Bilhaṇa, author of Vikramādikadeva-carita, p. 2.

Bilsad, inscription at, pp. 41, 43.

Bindusāra, successor of Candragupta, acc. to one Purṇa, p. 6.

Birdwood, Hon. Mr., Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University, p. 427.

Birmingham, p. 332.

Bizago i.e. Viśākha (Greek name on coins), p. 34.

Boar (Varāha) incarnation of Viṣṇu, p. 42.

Boddo=Buddho (Greek name on coins), p. 34.

Bodhi tree, p. 36.

Bodhisatto, pp. 295, 296.

Bodleian Library, p. 336.

Bohtlingk, Dr., pp. 155, 156, 169, 188, 402; his Edition of Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad IV. 4. 14, p. 100 fn2; IV. 4. 11, ibid fn 3; B., one of the two authors of Sanskrit Dictionary, p. 130; B. of Jena not present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.


Bradke, Von, quoted, p. 53 fn1.

Brahmā (Rajas), p. 69.

Brahmacārin, p. 302; B. dedicated by his father to service of God Savitṛ, p. 322.

Brahmacarīya (Celiaca), p. 473.

Brahmadatta, p. 295.

Brahmagupta, author of Khaṇḍakāhādyya, Com. on it by Āmarāja, p. 374.


Brahmans, pp. 15, 16, 38, 39, 44, 45, 47–49, 51–54, 56, 58, 59, 109, 292, 293, 404; B.s divided into Graha­sthas and Bhikṣu­kas, p. 223; B.s as learners and Kṣatriyas as teachers, p. 292.

Brahmanas (work), pp. 96, 225, 228, 229, 371, 373, 386, 402, 418, 423, 471, 476, 477, 480 fn1, 495; B.s preceded Śūtras, pp. 81; B.s, meaning of the word Asura in, p. 94; B.s, ritual of, elaborated later, p. 398; B.s, mention of Purṇa­nas in some of the, p. 407.
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Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, p. 113 fn3.
Brahmanic deities, p. 49; B. learning, p. 61; B. pantheon, emblems of deities from the, on coins, pp. 34, 44; B. revival (under Samudragupta), p. 43; B. r., pp. 45, 47, 49, 60.

Brahmanism pp. 17, 38, 52, 61, 477; B. and Buddhism, p. 10; B. decline of, p. 60; B. revival of, pp. 46, 48.

Brahmapol, a village two miles from Jayapur, p. 304.

Brahmasūtras, p. 419.

Brahmāvarta, p. 97.

Brahmayajña, pp. 224 fn1, 313; B. for Rgvedins enjoined by Āśvālāyana, p. 224 and fn1; B. of followers of other Vedas, p. 225.

Brāhmī Character of Asoka Inscriptions at Girnar, Khalsi, Dhauli, Jaugad, p. 11; B. (i.e. Old Devanāgari), p. 24; legend in B. Character (or ancient Nāgari) on coins, p. 19; B., pp. 22, 23.

Brett, Lieutenant, his copies consulted by author while translating Nasik Cave Inscriptions, p. 231; B., pp. 240, 241, 245, 246, 248, 271.

Brhadāraṇyaka Upanisad. pp. 7, 292, 399, 419, 420; its Madhyamādina Recension and Kāṇva one, p. 100; B., IV. 4. 14. ibid fn2; IV. 4. 11, ibid fn3; Celebrated Chapter in Br. U. containing story of Yājñavalkya and 1000 cows of Janaka referred to, pp. 346, 347.

Brhadatta, last Maurya King, Puspadmitra being his Commander-in-Chief, p. 112.

Bṛhaspati, ref. to Rg-cfr in, p. 252.

Bṛhatkathā, p. 45.

Bṛhat-Samhita edited by Dr. Kern, p. 119.

Broach (Barygaza), p. 18.

Brunnhofer, theory of, (all Veda hymns not composed in Panjab), p. 99; B. origin of Rgveda (hymnal literature) 2500 B. C. acc. to, p. 100.

Buddha pp. 10, 14, 47, 49, 73, 301, 302; B. Blessed, p. 46; his divine nature, p. 9; his discourses, p. 10; B., figures of, on coins, pp. 34, 35; B., images of, p. 46; B. Jīva, p. 284; B. a Kṣatrima of Sākya clan (founder of atheistic system), p. 292; B. a relic of, p. 36; B. religion of, p. 36; site of his birthplace, p. 13.

Buddhas, p. 411.

Buddhacarita work of Āśvaghoṣa, p. 60.

Buddhayā, image of Buddha at, p. 46.

Buddhi (Mahat-tattva), pp. 66-69, 71, 72, 75, 77; B. (definite conception i.e. Āryavarta) first product of Prakṛti, p. 410.

Buddhism pp. 3, 8, 74, 292, 477 B., rise of, its doctrines and aims, p. 5 ff; B., metaphysical doctrines of, p. 9; B. not a social revolution, pp. 9, 10; B. a revolt against the sacrificial system, p. 10; B. and Brahmanism ibid; its propagation ibid; B. veering towards Mahāyāna, p. 35; B., decline of, pp. 45ff, 46, 47; B., ascendancy of early, p. 60; B., popularity of early, p. 61; B., rise of, in 6th Cen. B. C., p. 99; B. flourishing in Kaśmir in the reigns of Huṣka, Juṣka and Kainṣka (Turuṣka or Scythian Kings) p. 367.

Buddhist doctrines, p. 59; B. mendicants, p. 46; B. preachers, p. 9; B. Triad of Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha, p. 14.

Buddhists, pp. 8, 16, 38, 51, 59, 73, 74, 293; B.s preceded by Saṁkhyas, p. 76.

Buddhistic Accounts, p. 16f; B. gospel, p. 9; B. Schools, pp. 73, 75, 131; B. Stūpa at Bharaut, p. 17; B. system, pp. 74, 76; B. Vihāras, p. 2; B. works, p. 9; Buddho=Boddo (Greek name on coins), p. 34.

Buddhagupta, pp. 41, 42, 44.

Budhamitra (Bhikṣu), p. 46.

Bühler, Dr., pp. 12fn1. 27, 61, 307, fn2, 343, 345, 351, 401, 407, 408, 421, 519, 525; B. of Vienna present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; B,
compared to Āśvala Janaka's priest in author's verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347; B., Balāṣrī as mother of Gotamiputra acc. to, (Smith follows him), p. 518; B., Leumann's remark about the work of, p. 526.

Bukka, king of Vijayanagara, p. 90.

Bulandshahr district, p. 41.

Bunyin Nanjio quoted, p. 51 fn2.

Burgess, Mr., Copperplate Grant possessed by, p. 88; B., p. 344.

Burnell, Dr., author of the Aindra Sohool of Sanskrit Grammarians, p. 496; B., p. 498.

Burnouf, M., Buddhistic account given by, p. 111 fn3; B., p. 113 fn1.

Caityas (or Stūpas), pp. 36, 37.

Caius, pp. 130, 175.

Cakora, p. 233.

Cakrabhṛt (Viṣṇu) temple of (on inscription), p. 44.

Cakrapālita, son of Parnadatta, p. 44.

Cālīph Amru, p. 344.

Cālukya Copper plate translated by Prof. Dowson, p. 85; C. dynasty, pp. 55, 366, 528.

Cālukyas, p. 45.

Cambridge, p. 341.

Cāpanāya, assistant to Candragupta, alluded to in a dramatic play etc., p. 5; C. or Viṣṇugupta, author of Arthasastra acc. to Jacobi, Nandas overthrown by, and Candragupta Maurya raised to throne by, p. 328.

Cāṇḍāla, p. 302.

Caṇḍī, goddess (on inscriptions), p. 43.


Caṇḍracūḍa, author of manual for Āpastambas, p. 225.

Candragupta, pp. 43, 46, 111, 119, 182, 206; his Capital Pāṭali-putra, p. 5; C. founder of Maurya dynasty ibid, his date of accession 322 B. C. ibid; his successor Bindusāra acc. to one Purāṇa, and Bhadrasāra acc. to another ibid; his son Aśoka closely connected with Buddhism, p. 6; C. son of Ghaṭotkaca, p. 39; C. first of ten Maurya kings, p. 113; C. founded Maurya dynasty about 320 B. C., pp. 173, 183, 512; C., ref. to, in Mahābhāṣya, p. 185; C., Mayura, date of, 315 B. C., p. 280; C., age of about, 325-315 B. C., p. 327; C. Maurya, raised to the throne by Cāṇḍāya or Viṣṇugupta who overthrew Nandas, p. 328.

Candragupta II, called Vikramāditya Śakārī pp. 40, 41, 43, 49, 50, 520.

Candragupta III, p. 326.

Candraguptasabha, in Patañjali, pp. 5, 328; C. (I. 1.68, Pāṇini), pp. 182, 188.

Candragupta-Vikramāditya, pp. 51, 52, 56, 61.

Candravarman, p. 39.

Candy, Hon'ble Mr. Justice, author's tribute to Prof. Peter Peterson, under the presidentship of, p. 523.

Cāraṇa or Vedic School, Dharma Sūtras belonged to a certain, pp. 256, 408.

Cāraṇas (bards) pp. 396, 397.

Cāraṇasyāya, pp. 305, 309, 312, 313-315.

Carlye, referred to as pessimist by Justice Ranade, pp. 453, 454.

Cartellieri, Dr., of Vienna present at Vienna Congress, p. 342; C., Bühler's pupil, paper on Bāṇa and Subandhu read by, at Vienna Congress, p. 343.

Caspian Sea, p. 99.

Caspian same as Kaśyapā (wrongly traced), p. 377.

Caṣṭana, pp. 25, 27, 31, 516, 517; C., son of Ghasamotika, first prince of this dynasty, p. 24; C. (same as Tiastenes acc. to Ptolemy) a prince at Ozene or Ujjayinī ibid; C. (a Kṣatrara and Mahākṣatrara),
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 Codrington, Dr., p. 333.
 Cohan Prince, named Hammūra, p. 91.
 Colebrooke, pp. 69, 348; C., notice of an inscription by, p. 79; C., Gowja Agrahāra grant translated by, p. 120.
 Comorin, cape, p. 60.
 Congress of orientalists held at Vienna, visit to, by the author (Monday 27th September 1886, ), p. 332.
 Cosmos, p. 7.
 Cotton, Mr. J. S., Editor of the Academy, (Royal Asiatic Society's Journal), p. 336.
 Cowell, his edition of Siddhāntakaumudi, pp. 504, 507 fn1.
 Creation (in Vāyu, Liṅga and Markandeya Purāṇas), p. 56.
 Cunningham Sir A., pp. 16, fn1, 17, fn1, 23 fn1 and 3, 28, 34 fn1, 51, 113 fn4, 157 fn2, 180, 181, and in 1,277 fn1; C. General, Vanee or Wanneh province of Aghanistan called Bannu by, p. 104; C., Aerons hill fort derived from Rājāvara acc. to, p. 105; C., Sambracē or Sabracē same as Skr. Saṁvāgrī acc. to, p. 106; C. transcribes Pa-la-fa-to as Sorvata and not Parvata after M. Julien ibid; C. derives Gonda from Gauda, p. 123; C. identifies Kukura with Gurjjara, p. 237; C. identifies Dhanakaṭaka with ancient Dharānikot, p. 276.
 Cūrpi, p. 158.
 Cust, Dr., of the Royal Asiatic Society of London present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.
 Cyrene, p. 12.

 Dahanūkā river in Thana Dist., p. 254.
 Dahlman, p. 405.
 Daitya, (Dutch, Germ. Deutsch), (wrongly traced) p. 377; D. (some such form as teudh) ibid; D. (this word not found in Vedas) p. 378.

 pp, 25, 28; C. a Kṣatrapa King mentioned in coins and inscriptions, p. 514.
 Catarapana, p. 516.
 Catherine Horward, p. 357.
 Cāturṃśya prayoga by Śāyāna, p. 494.
 Catusparṇa, p. 31.
 Catusparṇa Sātakarṇi, p. 30.
 Cayana, p. 230.
 Cecika, p. 264.
 Cedi (country near modern Chattisgarh), Kalacūri family reigned in, pp. 414, 521.
 Ceylon, Buddhists of, p. 386.
 Chamberlain, Mr., author introduced to, by Colonel A. Phelps in Birmingham p. 339.
 Chandas, pp. 224 and fn1, 226.
 Chāndasa i. e. obsolete language, p. 160.
 Chāndogya Upāṇiṣad, pp. 7, 292; C. VII. 1, Bhūmavidiśī in, p. 290.
 Chera country, King Tiru Vikrama of, converted by Saṁkaračārya from Jainism to Saivā faith, p. 88.
 Chera Kingdom, essay on, by Prof. Dowson, p. 88 fn4.
 China, pp. 3, 368.
 Chinese, Kārikās of Isvarakṛṣṇa and their com. translated into, p. 59.
 Chinese Chronology, p. 368.
 Chinese pilgrims in India, p. 3.
 Chips of Prof. Max Muller, p. 74.
 Chattisgarh (in Cedi), Kalacūri family reigned at, p. 414; C. ancient Cedi country near, p.521.
 Cīdaēdvīśištādvaitam, p. 287.
 Cikhalapādra, p. 262.
 Cia-Satīaj side of India, p. 43.
 Cītpāvana Brāhmaṇas equally divided between Rgveda and Black Yajurveda, pp. 222, 378.
 Cītpāvan or Ciptē same as Copt or Gýpt (wrongly traced), p. 377.
 Cīvārakās, p. 258.
 Coḍa, p. 12.
 Coḍas, p. 11.
Daityas, p. 216.
Daivaputra Śāhi Śāhanusāhi, p. 40.
Daśāmitrā wife of Uśavatāta and daughter of Ksabatāra Nahapāna, pp. 514, 516; D. daughter of Rudra-dāman married to Pulumāyi acc. to Smith, p. 515.
Daśi, Pāṇini son of, acc. to Aufrecht, p. 164.
Daśśīṇā fund, wasted on Daśśīṇā fellowships, be used for endowing permanent fellowships, pp. 415, 439, 440.
Daśśīṇāpatra, p. 39; D. (i. e. Southern India), p. 389.
Dāmaṃsada, son of Rudradāman (Mahākṣatrāpa and Kṣatrāpa), pp. 25, 27.
Damaṇā a river in Thana Dst. p. 254.
Dāmasena son of Rudrasimha (Mk.) pp. 26, 27.
Dāmakhaṇḍa, a section of Hemaḍrī's work, p. 90.
Dānasūtis (praises of gifts), p. 320.
Dānḍakāraṇya, p. 386.
Dānḍin, mention of Kauṭilya's work by, p. 328.
Dānube river, p. 345.
Dāsāgava, see under Nāvagava below, p. 344.
Dāsāpura in Gujarat, or Maratha country bordering on Gujarat, p. 254.
Dāsāratha, name of grandson of Aśoka acc. to Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, p. 16.
Dāsāratha Jātaka, Rāmapañḍita (Rāma), Lakṣmāṇa, Śītā, three children of Daśāratha's first wife in, p. 406.
Daśārūpa -mentions Mrochakatīka, p. 87; D. of Dhanāṇjaya, Com. by Dhanika on, p. 89.
asvya, pp. 94, 95, 100; Ds Asuras men like, p. 95; D.s enemies of Aryan wanderers, ibid; D.s in the sense of aboriginal races applied to Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras, Pulindas and Mutibas in Ait. Brāh., VII. 18, p. 95 fn1; D.s aborigines of India, p. 97.
Daśṭāmitrā (may be Demetria) under Pāṇini IV. 3. 76, pp. 272, 273.
Dāvaka, p. 39.
Davida, Rhys Dr., Pali Scholar, Professor of Pali in London University, p. 334; D., pp. 335, 357.
Dayā, p. 69.
Deccan, pp. 11, 24, 30, 45; D. ruled by Sakas for about one generation only, p. 30.
Deccan College or the old Poona College, pp. 461 f, 524, 525.
Dehli, pp. 11, 346.
Demetrios, son of Euthydemus, p. 19; D. Indo-Bactrian prince, p. 177.
Deorīya, image of Buddha at, p. 46.
Deśasthas are Vājasaneyins (followers of White Yajurveda) and R̥gvedins, p. 222.
Desīkas, (teachers), p. 287.
Desire, first germ of the mind, (i. e. Māra the Buddhistic Prince of Darkness or Kāma), p. 6.
Deussen, Prof., follower of Śāmkarācārya's system, p. 324.
Devās, worshipped by Brāhmaṇas, stigmatised by Iranians, p. 97.
Devabhūti killed by Vāsudeva, p. 513.
Devadatta, pp. 174, 175, 179.
Devagiri, a Yādava King of, p. 90.
Devanāgari, its earliest form being Brāhmī, pp. 11, 24.
Devasvāmin, Bhāṣyakāra on Áśvalāyana Sūtra, p. 55; D. Name on charters, ibid.
Devaviṣṭu, endowment of (on inscription) p. 42.
Dharakerataka, or Kāśaka, seat of Sātavāhana family, p. 30; D. or Gautamiputra, lord of, pp. 276, 277; D. in Tailāṅgaṇa, p. 389.
Dhanāṇjaya, author of Daśārūpa patronised by Muṇja, p. 89; D. brother of Dhanika, ibid.
Dhanika, brother of Dhanamjaya; date 10th cen. acc. to Dr. Hall, p. 89; his com. on Daśarūpa of Dhanamjaya, ibid.

Dhanvantarin, p. 374.


Dhanya-Visnū, brother of Matr-Visnū; pp. 42, 44.

Dharadesa, p. 415.

Dharanikot on the Kṛṣṇa (Dhānakataka acc. to Cunningham), pp. 276, 277.

Dharasena IV, Copperplate grant of, p. 103.

Dharma or righteousness, pp. 9, 10, 14, 47, 66, 69; D. or Righteousness explained by Asoke in edicts, p. 14; D., invocation to (on inscriptions) p. 38; D. (Purusartha) p. 286; D. (moral law), p. 405.

Dharmācakra (wheel of righteousness), p. 36.

Dharmamahāmātrā, or overseers', pp. 12 fn1, 15.

Dharmaparīkṣā of Amitagati a Digambara Jain, p. 301.

Dharmāśāstra school, p. 318.

Dharmasūtras, pp. 53, 423; D. of Apastamba, Gotama, Vāsiṣṭha etc. belonged to a certain Vedic School or Carana, p. 408.

Dharmika (or Dhārmika) high-sounding epithet on coins, p. 32.

Dharvar district, pp. 50, 85.

Dhāstu, p. 496; D. defined under Pāṇini I. 3.1, p. 497.

Dhātu-pañtha, pp. 337, 401, 407.

Dhauḷi in Katak, Asoka Inscriptions at, pp. 10, 11.

Dhṛtarāṣṭra, pp. 84, 86, 89.

Dhruvā Sarman (Pratoli built by), p. 43.

Dhūtavāmin, Bāhyakāra on Āpastamba Sūtra, p. 55.

Duvaṣṭambha (or flagstaff), pp. 42, 44.

Diametron (Gr.), i.e. Jāmitra, p. 388.

Dīdhiti of Raghunāthabhaṭṭa Sīromaṇī, p. 317.

Dīdymos (Gr.), i.e. Jituma name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Digambara Jainas, sect of, founded by Śivabhūti, p. 375; these represent themselves to be original Jainas, ibid.

Dīkṣā ceremony, p. 322.

Dinajapur district, Note on Ghaṭā written by the author at the request of an officer of, p. 219.

Dīnakā (coin), p. 46.

Diūnāga, opponent of Kālidāsa, a Buddhist logician, a pupil of Vāsunandhu, pp. 51, 52, 59, 318, 325, 411.

Dīnāgacārya, p. 58.

Dīodotus, founder of Greco-Bactrian monarchy, p. 19.

Diomedes, p. 20.

Dionysius, p. 20.

Dīrgha, p. 502.

Dīrghatamas Māmateya, mention of, in Aṅkureya Brāhmaṇa, p. 422.

Dowson, Prof., Calukya Copper plate translated by, p. 85; D. on Ms. in Mackenzie collection, p. 88; his essay on Chera Kingdom, ibid fn4.

Drāvidas, Indian tribes, p. 53.

Drāvidian races, p. 466.

Draupadi, ref. to, in Mṛcchakatika p. 88.

Duṣṭha (misery), first of four noble truths of Buddhism, p. 6.

Duṣṭāśana referred to by Patañjali, p. 83; D., ref. to in, Vāsavādattā, p. 87; D., p. 88.

Durgā, pp. 56, 407, 411.

Durgaprasad, Pandit of Jaipur, Co-worker of Peterson in preparing an alphabetical index of poets in Skr. literature, p. 525.

Duryodhana, referred to, by Patañjali, p. 83.

Duṣyanta, pp. 80, 81, 120.
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Dutch (Germ.) Deutsch wrongly traced to Skr. Daitya, p. 377.
Dvandva, pp. 18, 83, 169, 189.
Dvitiya (case), pp. 498, 502.
Dvivacana, under Panini, I. 4.103, p. 496.
Dvyanuka, p. 69.
Dyaus, Asura epithet applied to, p. 94.

Eggeling, Prof., his translation of SatapathaBrähmana, (S. B. E.) p. 96 fn1; E., p. 334; E. Prof. of Sanskrit in University of Edinburgh not present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.
Ego, pp. 70–74.
Egypt, pp. 12, 378.
Egyptians, p. 466.
Ekavacana, under Panini I. 4. 103, p. 496.
Elements, subtle five, gross five, pp. 67, 68, 70.
Eliot, Sir Walter, quoted, p. 90.
Ellis, Col., pp. 92, 480; his correspondence, re. Mbh. date, p. 79; E. Copper-plate grant of Janamejaya genuine acc. to, ibid; E., identifies Anagundi with Hastināpur, p. 80; his view criticised, p. 81; E. on Gowja Agrahāra grant, p. 119.
Elphinstone College established in 1836, pp. 432, 523–525.
England, p. 132.
English as Vaiśyas, p. 349.
Epics, language of, p. 476.
Eraṇ, inscription at, pp. 40, 41.
Erān, p. 44.
Eranoboas, the same as Hiranyabāhā (another name of the Soṇa), p. 5.
Eṣā, p. 41.
Etad, pp. 149, 154.
Euratides, rival of Demetrius, p. 19.
Euripides, p. 97.
European scholars on Mbh. date, p. 80.
Euthydemia, Indo-Bactrian King rebuilt Sākala, old city, p. 162.
Euthydemus, successor of Diodotus, p. 19; E. II, (probably son of Demetrius) belonged to the line of Demetrius, ibid.

Faculties, internal (Buddhi, Ahāmkāra, Manas) external (organs of sense and action), p. 68.
Fa-Hian, a Chinese pilgrim, p. 3.
Fa-la-nu, province of Afghanistan.
Fergusson, Dr. J., pp. 280–282; F. a zealous student of ancient Indian architecture and archaeology, p.335.
Fergusson, Sir James, Chancellor of Bombay University and Governor of Bombay, p. 427.
Fichte, German philosopher, his Idealism, pp. 70, 71, 74.
Firozeshah, Emperor, p. 11.
Fitzgerald, Sir Seymour, Chancellor of Bombay University and Governor of Bombay, p. 427.
Fleet, Dr., pp. 40 fn. 1–5, 41 fn. 1–2, 42 fn2–4, 44 fn2–9, 46 fn1–5, 47 fn1, 49 fn. 1, 50 fn. 2, 54 fn. 3, 55 fn1–3, 184 fn. 1, 344; inscriptions collected by, p. 45; F., Epigraphical Surveyor to Government of India, p. 181 fn. 1.
Frank Dr., p. 403.
French as Kṣatriyas, p. 349.

Gadadhara Bhaṭṭācārya, author of Gadādharī, p. 317.
Gadādharī of Gadadhara Bhaṭṭācārya, p. 317.
Gadhwa, inscription at, pp. 40, 41.
Gaikavād prince, liberal patron of Veda-reciters, p. 229.
Gam with ā, (root), p. 120.
Gaṇa-Pāṭha, appendix to Pāṇini’s work, p. 102.
Gaṇapatinīga, p. 39.
Gandhāra, name of country (Pāṇini iv. 2, 133 and iv. 1, 169), p. 104.
Gandhāras, p. 12.
Gaṇḍiva, bow of Arjuna, p. 86.
Gaṅgā, pp. 42, 56.
Gaṅges, p. 5; G., classical Hastināputra on the, p. 92.
Gaṅgēśa, his son Vardhamāna, p. 399.
Gaṅgēśopādhyaśya of Bengal, Nyāya Nyāya composed by, p. 317.
Ganjam, pp. 10, 11.
Garbe, Dr., p. 351.
Garbhādhāna rite, p. 10.
Garpa, pp. 320 fn 1, 393; G. quoted by Varāhamihira, p. 388.
Gārgi Saṁhitā calls Yavanaś as astronomers, p. 178.
Gārgi Vacanavī, pp. 370, 371; G., a Viennese lady present at Vienna Congress compared to, in author’s verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.
Gārgya-Nārāyana, p. 309.
Garuḍa, p. 284.
Gāthās, p. 82.
Gaṇḍa country, p. 63.
Gaṇḍas of North, White Yajurveda among, p. 222.
Gaṇḍapāḍāśayya, his com. on Saṁkhya-Kārikās, p. 59.
Gaṇḍapati, p. 221.
Gaṇḍavadhā, work of Vākpatirāja, pp. 365, 368, 375.
Gaṇḍirāja, tradition about, current in Nasik and Khandesh, Dst.s p. 283.
Gaurishankara, Mr., sometime Divan of Bhavanagar, his letter to Max Müller, p. 337.
Gautama, founder of Nyāya system, pp. 317, 423.
Gautamī, mother of Sātakarnī Gautampūtra, pp. 239, 275.
Gautampūtra, pp. 278-281; G. spoken as lord of Dhanakaṭa or Kaṭaka pp. 244, 276; G., Khaṣgarāṭa race, exterminated by, p. 280; date of his accession, as 319 A. D., p. 280 his death or end of his reign in 340 A. D., ibid; G. protector of Brāhmaṇas, p. 282.
Gaya, (Buddha) pp. 11, 16, 46; inscriptions found at G., p. 375.
Gāyatrī Mantra (Tatsavitūḥ etc.) pp. 223, 486.
Genesis, Book of, p. 175.
Geldner, pp. 395, 397.
Germans as Brāhmaṇas, p. 349; G.s; p. 390.
Ghaṭa, pp. 69, 152.
Ghaṭā (array) pp. 219-221; G. equivalent to three-fold, acc. to Rajendralal Mitra, p. 219.
Ghaṭotkacca, son of Gupta, p. 39.
Ghazipur, coins of Wemakadphises, a Kuṣana prince, even found at, p. 33; G. dat., p. 41.
Ghramotika, father of Caṇṭana, first King of this (?) dynasty (both these names foreign, not Indian), p. 24.
Ghu (term), pp. 500, 501, 505, 506, 508, 509.
Gibbon, pp. 130, 176, 179.
Gibbons, Rev. G. B., calculations made by, re. eclipse of the sun, p. 79.
Gilliot, his pen factory at Birmingham visited to by the author, p. 339.
Gipsies, languages of, made as special study by Leland, an American, p. 342.
Gipsy language, paper on, read by Leland at Vienna Congress, p. 344.
Girnar, in Kathiavad, pp. 10, 11; Asoka Inscriptions at G., p. 61.
Gitā, pp. 63 fn 3, 397.
Gladstone M., p. 481.
Goanese dialect, p. 384.
God, p. 9; G., denial of, p. 75; G. as creator of the world, p. 76.
Godāvari, Paithan on the bank of the, p. 515.
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Gokhale V. V., M.A., M.D., his untimely death referred to, p. 428.

Gokula, Kṛṣṇa's early life spent in, p. 424.

Golapa in Khokan, some sacrifice, held, at in 1868, p. 230.

Goldstucker, Dr., pp. 18, 114, 118, 126, 128, 131, 141, 150, 157–160, 162, 168, 173, 177, 178, 186, 199, 203, 350; G., date of Patañjali, 2nd century B.C. acc. to, pp. 81, 113; G., date of Patanjali, 2nd century B.C., acc. to, pp. 81, 113; G., Critique by Weber, on Panini of, pp. 115, 125; G., passage 'Iha Puṣpamitrām Yājyāmaḥ' not noticed by, p. 116; G., name Mādhyamika misunderstood by, p. 119; G., Kātyāyana as an eastern grammarian acc. to, p. 123; review of his Pāṇini and His theory about Pāṇini's Technical Terms, pp. 496–510 and 496 fn1; his passage on Bhasya on Pāṇini III. 2, 111, p. 212; appreciation about his precise knowledge of Indian grammatical literature, p. 499; his articles on religious difficulties of Hindus in Westminster Review, p. 510.

Gonāḍḍa (Gonarda, Gonda), p. 123.

Gonāḍḍa (Gonarda, Gonda) native place of Patañjali, pp. 122, 123; G. exact position of, unknown to North or North-west of Oudh, ibid; G. same as modern Gonda 20 miles from Oudh, ibid.


Gonardiya (Patañjali), p. 506.

Gonda, (Gonāḍḍa, Gonarda) town 20 miles from Oudh, p. 123.

Gonds, p. 387.

Gondophares (Indo-Parthian king.) p. 31; G.(155 A. D.) his coins found at Seistan, Khandahar and the Western Punjab, p. 32.

Gopasvāmin (name on charters), p. 55.

Gorakhpur, coins of Wema-kadphises a Kusana prince even found at, p. 33; G. lst., pp. 41, 46.


Gotama, Ānvikṣikī of Vātsyāyana's Nyāyabhāṣya, is system of, p. 328; G., p. 393; G. Dharma Sūtras, pp. 408, 411.

Gotami, mother of Gotamiputra Sāta-karṇi grand-mother of Pulumāyi, p. 38; G., a Gotra name acc. to Dr. Bühler, p. 518; G. as mother of Gotamiputra & Bālsāri epithet of her (acc. to author), ibid.

Gotamiputra Sātākarṇi, pp. 38, 516–518; Ujjayinī invaded by, p. 29; G., Śākas Yavanas and Palhavas beaten by, p. 30; G. destroyed lineal successor of Nahapāna, p. 30; G. referred to in Nasik Inscriptions, p. 84; G. compared to ancient kings, p. 233; G. referred to in one of Nasik cave Inscriptions p. 514; G. Vīlavāyaka same as G. Sātākarṇi acc. to Smith, p. 515; G. great Nahapāna conquered by, p. 516.

Gotamiputasa, pp. 277 and fn1.

Gotras, p. 378.

Govardhana as Capital of Sātāvahana race, pp. 38, 278.

Govinda, engraver of inscriptions at Gwalior and Mandasor, p. 42.

Govindānanda quoted, p. 75 fn.1.

Govindāsvāmin, (name on Charters) p. 55.

Gowja Agrahāra grant translated by Colebrooke, Colonel Ellis on, p. 119 f.

Grahamakha, p. 321.

Ghapatis, pp. 37, 38.

Grahasthas, division of Brahmanas pp. 223, 225, 229.

Grapthas, division of Brahmanas pp. 223, 225, 229.

Grassmann, Rgveda translated by, from Roth's point of view, 397.

Greco-Bactrian monarchy, Diodotus founder of, p. 19.

Greco-Indian Kings, p. 20.

Greco-Indians, p. 21.

Greek astronomy, p. 58; G. Charaeters, pp. 27, 28; G. deities, p. 48; G. Geographers, p. 103; G. Kings of
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Bactria, pp. 116, 117; G. legends, pp. 23, 28, 33, 34; G. letters, one legend in, on the obverse of coins, p. 21; G. pantheon, emblems are figures of deities from the, on coins, p. 34; G. princes, p. 12.

Greeks, pp. 3, 22, 31, 49, 466; Gs called Yavanas by Indians for three centuries before Christian era, p. 178.

Grhya-Parisiṣṭa, p. 313.


Grierson, Dr., ref. to Kielhorn's note by, pp. 214, 215; G., paper on some dialects of Hindi read by, and observations on Tulasidāsa made by, at Vienna Congress, p. 342.

Grimm's Law, p. 377.

Grtsamada, p. 371.

Guimet, a French scholar present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.

Gujarat, pp. 63, 279, 521; Chronicles of Kings of G., p. 1; G., one Sākhā Maitrāyaniya of Black Yajurveda in, p. 222.

Guna, pp. 143, 498.


Guntur d.s.t., ba ot Kṛṣṇā in, p. 277.

Gupta, name of a prince, p. 39; G., controversy re. the initial dates of, pp. 325, 326.

Guptas succeeding Kuśanās, pp. 29, 35, 39, 40, 42, 49-51, 55, 282, 520.

Gupta dynasty, pp. 61, 111, 326, 374, 413, 521; G. era, pp. 40, 157, 325, 327, 374; G. inscriptions, pp. 48, 181 fn 1; G. period, p. 61; G. princes, pp. 183, 408; G., Valabhi Era, ( 326=645 A. D.) p. 163.

Gurjaras came from Punjab, p. 414; G., Jackson on the origin of, p. 528.

Gurjara copper plate translated by the author, p. 85; G., Kukura identified with, by G. Cunningham, p. 237 f.


Guttal, Guttas (Guptas) of, p. 50.

Guttas (Guptas) of Guttal, p. 50.

Gwalior, inscription at, p. 42.

Hagāna (Kaśtrapa), p. 23.

Haṃśa (Kaśtrapa), p. 23.

Hāli, his Saptāśati, pp. 45, 165.

Hall, Dr., pp. 47 fn3, 60, and fn.1, 87 fn1, 113 fn3, 299; H., Vijñāna Bhikṣu praised by, p. 65, his edition of Vāsavadattā, p. 85 fn4, 87 fn5, 91 fn6; H., Copperplate grant mentioned by, Dhanika's date 10th cen. acc. to, p. 89; his edition of Daśarupa, pp. 89; fn1, 2, fn3; his "Index to the Bibliography of Indian Philosophical systems," pp. 298, 299 fn2.

Hamīra, a Cohan Prince, p. 91.


Hanuṣman, ref. to, in Mrchakatikā, p. 88.

Hardy, p. 259 fn1.

Harida, Harihara at the junction of H. and Tuṅgabhadrā, p. 93.

Harihara, at the junction of Tuṅgabhadrā and Harida, p. 93.

Haripūthā of Jāneśvara, p. 324.

Hariśvāmini, wife of Sanaśiddha, p. 46.

Hārtiputra Sātakaṟṇi, inscriptions of, p. 38.

Harivarmā, p. 213.

Harris Lord, p. 415.

Harsacarita of Bāṇa, pp. 183, 289, 365, 375, 521; H., mention of Kālidāsa in, p. 85; H., Vāsavadattā of Subandhu mentioned in, p. 87.

Hārsavardhanā, patron of Bāṇa, pp. 85 fn5; H. or Silāditya, pp. 327, 521; H. sovereign lord of Uttarāpatha or Northern India, p. 366.

Hārsā Vikramādiyā mentioned in Rājatarangini as sovereign ruling at Ujjayinī, p. 376.

Haryakṣa set at naught work of Patañjali acc. to Bhāṛṭhari, p. 184.

Hasināpur, identified with Anagundī by Col. Ellis, pp. 80, 120; H., Maṭha
of Maṇḍana Miśra, a few miles from, *ibid*, & 93; H., classical, far to the North, on the Ganges, p. 92.


Haviṣka (*Kuṣana* prince), p. 33.

Heaven, p. 66.

Helen, her ravishment same as that of Sītā, (*wrong analogy*), p. 386.

Heli (the sun) Helios, (Gr.) p. 388.


Heliokles, a Bactro-Indian prince, p. 18ff.

Helenes, p. 390.

Hemacandra, his *Abhidhana-Cintāmaṇi*, p. 188; H. gives ज्ञ, ज्ञ, and ज्ञ for Skr. ज्ञ, p. 246.

Hemādri, minister of Mahādeva, a Yādava king of Devagiri, p. 90; H. (*Dāna-Khaṇḍa*), p. 252; H., his *Vedāntakhaṇḍa*, p. 298.

Heraklio (Greek name on coins) p. 34.

Hélios, (Greek name on coins) p. 34.

Hélios (Gr.) *i.e.*, Hélios (*the sun*) p. 388.

Hellenes, p. 390.

Hemacandra, his *Abhidhana-Cintāmaṇi*, p. 188; H. gives ज्ञ, ज्ञ, and ज्ञ for Skr. ज्ञ, p. 246.

Heti, (reason), p. 197.

Heya, (what is to be shunned), p. 287.

Hida, *i.e.* here in the inscriptions, p. 12 fn1.

Hīdarāja, (*i.e.*, Kings about here), p. 12; H. a proper name, *ibid* fn1.

Hillebrandt, Prof., *authorship of Arthaśāstra* attributed to school of Kautiśya and not to Oṣaka by, p. 328.

Himālaya, pp. 10, 80; H., Bodhisatvo lived on the slopes of, p. 295.


Hindu Kush, paper on dialects in, read by Prof. Kuhn at Vienna Congress, p. 343.

Hindu law, p. 53.

Hindu States, p. 80.

Hindus, pp. 9, 19, 63.

Hippocura, Balecourus reigning at pp. 515, 516; H., vicereignty of Anhurabhyas at, p. 517.

Hippostratus, p. 20.

Hiranyakāśi *Yajurvedins*, p. 225.

Hiranyakāśi śākha, p. 314.

Hiranyakāśi Sūtras, p. 482.

Hitopadeśa, edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 525.

Hitties, King of, treaty between, and King of Mitani pp. 94, 323; H. in an inscription found in Asia Minor, p. 323.

Hiuen-tsang, Chinese pilgrim, pp. 3, 52 fn1, 164, 276, 327, 521; Pāṇini mentioned by H., p. 163.

Hoernle, Dr., of Calcutta present at Vienna Congress, p. 342; H. read his paper in English at Vienna Congress, *ibid*; H. paper on an old Ms. (*written in Śāradā character*) of a work on Arithmetic found at Bakkhala, North of Panjab, read by, at Vienna Congress, pp. 343, 344.

Holtzmann, A., p. 405.

Hopkins, Prof., p. 406.

Howard, Mr. E. I., one of the earliest of Directors of Public Instructions, his views of Mahābhārata, pp. 425, 439.


Hrasva, p. 592.

Hydroga *i.e.*, Hydrochóos (Gr.) name of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.

Hṛṣikeśa, p. 285.

Hultsch, Dr., p. 351.

Hūṇa race, p. 42.

Hūṇas or Huns, pp. 41, 42, 178, 183.

Huns or Hūṇas, pp. 41, 178, 183, 521.
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Huska, Turuska or Indo-Scythian prince, pp. 165, 367.
Hydraotes or Ravi, crossed by Alexander, p. 105.
Hydrochoos-(Gr.) Hrdroga, Dame of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.
Iba river, p. 255.
Ichthy’s (Gr.) i.e. Itthasi, name of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.
Idam, pp. 149, 154.
Idealism, position of, p. 69; I. of Fichte, German Philosopher, compared with system of Kapila, p. 70; I., subjective, of Fichte, p. 71.
Ilbert Bill, p. 354.
India, pp. 3, 4, 6, 18, 20, 28, 36, 43, 63, 64, 81, 99, 166, 278, 282; I. Northern, pp. 31, 167, 223; I. Southern, unknown to Aryas of North in Pāṇini’s time, p. 162; I. followers of Black Yajurveda in, p. 222.
Indian Aryans, p. 62; I. astronomers, p. 58.
Indo-Bactrian dynasty, 177.
Indo-Bactrian princes, pp. 177, 182.
Indo-Parthians or Pahlavas, succeed ed Šakas and Ksatrapas, pp. 31, 35.
Indo-Parthian or Pahlava dynasty, p. 33.
Indor in Bulandshahr district, inscription at, pp. 41, 44.
Indo-Scythian or Turuska princes, Kaniska, Huska and Suska, p. 167; I. called Sakas in Rājataraṅgiṇī, p. 178.

Indra, invocation to (on inscriptions), p. 38; I. Asura epithet applied to, p. 94; I., called Asura-han ibid. I., invoked by King of Mitani, ibid; I., p. 93.
Indrajit, p. 386.
Indus or Sindhu, p. 20; I. Baranas or Varanas, name of a place on right bank of, p. 105.
Inscriptions of some Ābhirā prince at Nasik, p. 414; I. of Gotamiputra Nos. 25 and 26, p. 231; I. of G., Uṣavadāta and private individuals ibid; I. of G. No. 26, pp. 231-232; its Sanskrit rendering, pp. 234, 235; its English translation, pp. 235-237; Notes on it, pp. 237-239; No. 26 A, pp. 239-240; its Sanskrit rendering, p. 242; its English translation, pp. 242-243; Notes on it, pp. 243-244; No. 25, pp. 244-245; its Sanskrit rendering, pp. 249-250; its translation, pp. 250-251; Notes on it, pp. 252-253; I. of private individuals, Nos. 6, 3, 27, 4, 15, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 24, pp. 265-275; I. of Uṣavadāta, Nos. 17, 19, 18, 16, 14, p. 231; No. 17, p. 253; its English translation, pp. 253-254; Notes on it, pp. 254-256; No. 19, p. 253; its English translation, p. 257; Notes on it, p. 257; No. 18, pp. 252-253; its Sanskrit rendering, p. 260; its translation ibid; Notes on it, p. 261; No. 16, p. 261; its Sanskrit rendering, p. 262; its English translation ibid; Notes on it, p. 263; No. 14, pp. 263, 264; its translation p. 264; Notes on it, ibid.
Iran North, p. 99.
Iranians, Devas stigmatised by, p. 97.
Iśa Upaniṣad (3), Asuryah in, p. 97; I., 100 fn1.
Iśi (Ṛṣi), p. 295.
Iṣṭi, p. 194.
Iṣṭiś (supplementary rules), p. 141.
Iśvara (or God), pp. 216, 284; his manifestations Para, Vyuḥa, Vīb-
hava, Antaryāmin and Ācē, pp. 284, 285.

Īśvaradatta, p. 29.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa, author of Kārikās on Sāṁkhya Philosophy, pp. 59, 60, 65, 327, 410.

Italians, p. 390.

I., p. 237.

Ithāsā, p. 328.

Ithāśaṣ (Br Up.), p. 419.

Iṣṭhāsāṣa, made use of, by Antiquarians, p. 102; I., p. 512.

I-ṣing, a Chinese pilgrim, pp. 3, 167; I., p. 37; his statement viz. Mahābhāṣya is a com. on Kāśikā is absurd, p. 157 f; his confusion of Vārtika Sūtras and Kāśikā, p. 158.

Ithāsāvimāna, i.e. Ithāśaṣa, name of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.

Iwullee, inscription in a temple at, pp. 85, 90 fn1.

Jabbalpore, pp. 17, 34, 37.

Jackson Mr., A. M. T., I. C. S., p. 407; J., obituary notice of; his literary work, pp. 528, 529; his correct idea about the nature of Purāṇas, p. 528; his essay on method in the study of Indian Antiquities, p. 529; appreciation of his literary work, his modest and sober nature, ibid.

Jacobi, Prof., pp. 368, 408; J., Arthaśāstra production of Ācārya or Viṣṇugupta acc. to, p. 328; J. of Kiel, present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; J. paper on Jainism read by, at Vienna Congress, p. 343; J., Ludwig, Rost assembled at Vienna, compared to Rāṣṭra assembled at Janaka’s Mithilā in author’s Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.

Jagaddhara, his com. on Mālatī-Mādhava, p. 74 fn2, 238.

Jāgadīśa, Bhaṭṭācārya, author of Jāgadīśa com., p. 317.


Jaimini, pp. 58, 91, 224 & fn1, 418, 419.

Jaina inscriptions, p. 47; J. objects of worship, p. 35.

Jainas, pp. 25, 59, 293, 411.

Jainism, p. 88, 292, 477.

Jains, chronicles written by, p. 1.

Jaitra, his sons Kṛṣṇa and Mahādeva, p. 298.

Jaitrapāla, p. 298.

Jāmadagnas, p. 310.


Jāmbuwaṭijaya, Pāṇini spoken of as author of, in a verse of Rājaśekhara; this tradition, author of J. and Aṣṭādhyāyī are same, to be rejected, p. 164.

Jāmitra i. e. Diāmetron, p. 388.


Jānaka, King of Mithilā, pp. 346, 347.

Jānamejaya, son of Parikṣit, Sarpasatra instituted by, pp. 79, 120, 423; his grant of land on Copper-plates, p. 79; J., Aśvamedha ‘Jagg’ (Horse-sacrifice) held by, p. 80; J. mentioned in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, pp. 81, 85; J. mentioned in Jñānæśvarī, p. 90; J. referred to in grant, p. 92.

Jānārdana (god Kṛṣṇa) pp. 42, 44, 212.

Jane, p. 176.

Jane Grey, lady, p. 357.

Jāratkāru, his son Artabhāga, p. 7.

Jāsavantrao Gopalrao of Patan, six Pāñcaratā-Saṁhitās exist in the library of, p. 290.

Jāsdan in Kathiawād, p. 25.

Jātājī, illustratet, pp. 225, 226; J. defini­ned, pp. 227, 228.

Jātaka, pp. 37, 296, 297.


Jātakas, Pali stories called, p. 401.

Jaungad in Ganjam, Aśoka Inscriptions at, pp. 10, 11.

Jāyādīśa (son of Čaṭṭana, a Kṣatripa), pp. 24, 25, 28.

Jāyādharasā (i.e. Nikēphorou) middle word in coins, p. 20.
Jayaditya, author of Kasika (or Vṛtti-Sūtra) a.o. to I-tsing, p. 158.

Jayadratha, killed by Arjuna, ref. to, in Kādambari, p. 86.

Jayanta, pp. 306-309.

Jayāpiḍa, ref. to, in Rājatarangini, pp. 166, 167.

Jayapur, p. 304.

Jews, p. 378.

Jinendra, p. 301.

Jitumā i. e. Didymos name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Jiva, five kinds of, nitya, mukta, kāvāla, mumukṣu baddha, p. 284; J. (animal spirit), ibid.; J. p., 288.

Jīva, five kinds of, nitya, mukta, kāvāla, mumukṣu baddha, p. 284; J. (animal spirit), ibid.; J. p., 288.


Jānadeva, p. 324.

Jānamārga, pp. 293, 419.


Jāneśvara, author of Jāneśvarī, Marathi com. on Bhagavadgītā, pp. 90, 324.

Jāneśvarī, work of Jāneśvara, Marathi com. on Bhagavadgītā, pp. 90, 324.

Jānātkas, Mahāvīra of the race of, p. 292.

John, pp. 175, 176, 179.

Johnson, edited Rambler, p. 130.

Jolly, Prof., of Wurzburg present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; J. compared to Kahoda in author's Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347; J., a Tagore Law-Lecturer, p. 408.

Jowett, Prof., author introduced to, by Prof. S. Owen, author's master, p. 388.

Jūka i. e. Zygōn (Gr.) name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Julien M., Pa-la-fa-to, transcribed as Parvata by, p. 106.

Jumna (Yamuna), pp. 10, 11, 18, 20, 177.


Junnar, inscription at, pp. 30, 31.

Juška, Turuska or Indo-Scythian prince, pp. 165, 367.

Jyotiśi, pp. 224 and fn 1, 1, 226.

Ka (Prajāpati), p. 215.

Kabul, valley, copper coins found in, p. 33; K. remarkable for fine grapes p. 104; K. river, Suvastu or Swat, branch of, p. 104.

Kacchhādi group, (Pāṇini IV. 2.133); p. 104.

Kādambari, pp. 150, 343, 369; K. of Bāna, referring to Mbh. and several characters in Mbh., p. 86.

Kāpila, edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, pp. 183, 525.

Kāḍḍhāse, p. 49.

Kabāum, inscription at, pp. 41, 47.

Kählenburg hill near Vienna, p. 345.

Kahoda, Jolly compared to, in author'sVerses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.

Kaiûkārya (attendance), p. 284.


Kākakharaparikas, tribes, p. 39.

Kalecūri, family of this name reigned in Cedi (country about Chattisgarh) p. 414; K. dynasty, p. 521.

Kalamba, a city p. 307.

Kalānta, chronicler of Kaśmir, pp. 165, 166, 167, 367, 368, 376.

Kalīdāsa, pp. 20, 51, 52, 61, 165, 182, 238, 371, 374, 376; his Mālavikāgnimitra; Agnimitra son of Pusyamitra, its hero, p. 17; K. said to have composed Kārikās in the name of Īśavṛkṛṣṇa, p. 60; K. mentioned in Harṣaśāstra of Bāna, p. 85; K. mentioned in the Inscription at Iwullee, ibid.; his Meghadūta p. 86; his Mālavikāgnimitra
refers to Puṣpamitra, p. 111 fn3; K. placed in 1st. cen. acc. to some traditions, p. 164.

Kaliyuga, White Yajurveda, (Vājasa-neya) alone in latter part of, acc. to Agni Purāṇa, p. 222; K., Period of Rgveda as early as beginning of, (3101 B.C.) p. 320; K., p. 347.

Kalki, king who will overthrew Mlecchhas, pp. 222 & fn2, 301.

Kalpa, p. 15.

Kalpa Sūtras, pp. 228, 230; K., of Āśvalāyana, p. 226.

Kalpataru, same as Vedāntakalpataru, pp. 298-300.

Kalpēe, victory over General Windham by mutineers at, p. 467.

Kāma, (or desire) Māra is spoken as, p. 6; K. invoked in Av. IX. 2. 17, 18, p. 95; K. (Puruṣārtha), p. 286.

Kama, K. R., Institute, erected in his name by Sukhadwala, his friend, p. 330.

Kāmāndaka, mention of Kauṭiliya’s work by, p. 328.

Kāmarūpa, p. 39.

Kāmasūtra of Vatsyayana, earliest notice of Kautilya’s work in, p. 328; K. of Vatsyayana later than Kuntala Śatākarna Śatavāhana p. 329.

Kamboja, p. 12.

Kambojas, pp. 54, 134.

Kānḍa, p. 209.

Kānḍā, his Śūtras, pp. 224 & fn1, 393.

Kāṇḍibhi, p. 38.

Kandali, of śrīdhara, p. 299.

Kanheri, inscriptions at, pp. 38, 515, 516.

Kānīśka, inscriptions at, pp. 38, 515, 516.

Kānīśka, pp. 34, 47, 118, 368, 413, & fn1, 520; K., the first prince of Kuśana family, pp. 29, 33; K., coins of, p. 35; K. patron of Northern Buddhists, ibid; K. later than 1st century, ibid; K., Āsāvinīa contemporay of, p. 60; K. Indo-Scythic king, pp. 116, 117; K. called Turuška in Rājarataśīp, p. 178; his date about 200 A.D., p. 413; Turuška or Indo-Scythian prince considered by some as founder of Saka era, pp. 165, 167, 367; K. as the immediate successor of Kadphises II (called Wema or Hima Kadphises) acc. to Smith, p. 519.

Kaniśka dynasty, p. 327.

Kanjoj, (Kanauj) Yāśovarman, sovereign of, conquered by Lalitāditya, p. 368; K., capital of Gūrjas, p. 414.

Kant, his philosophy, pp. 74, 334.

Kānva recension of Bhādarānyaka-pānīṣad, p. 100.

Kāνuvas, pp. 119, 228, 515; K. Sākha of, p. 372.

Kānāyana dynasty, p. 513.

Kānāyana, following Śūṅgas, p. 17; Śatavāhana dynasty succeeded K.s, acc. to Purāṇas, p. 31; K., p. 518.

Kāśī, name of Sīva, p. 45.

Kāpila, pp. 65, 71, 289, 393; K. sons of Sāgara burnt by, p. 64; K. of Viśṇu (Gītā I. 3; II. 7) ibid; K. author of Śāmkhya system ibid; K., Śāmkhya Pravacana (collection of Sūtras) ascribed to; his philosophy, p. 65 f; his system compared with Idealism of Fichte, pp. 69, 70; his idealism, p. 73; K., metaphysics of Buddhism derived from, pp. 72, 74.

Kāpiśayani, name of wine derived from Kāpiśi (same as Kapisena) in Pāṇini, IV. 2, 99, p. 104.

Kapisena, kingdom of Afghanistan known as, by Greek and Roman geographers, p. 103; K. acc. to Hwan Thang Kia-pi-she, ibid.

Kāpiśi (same as Kapisena) in Pāṇini IV 2, 99, p. 104.

Karađa, Pro., read a report on paleographical results etc. at Vienna Congress, p. 344.

Karambha, p. 492.

Karbhad, ref. to, in Mahābhārata, p. 387.
Karikās of Śrīvarakṛṣṇa on Sāṁkhya Philosophy in Āryā metre, pp. 60, 65, 327, 410.

Karkasvāmin, name of a Bhāṣyakāra on Śūtras, p. 55.

Karla, cave temple at, p. 38; K. caves, inscriptions at, p. 30; K. inscriptions at, p. 412.

Karma (deeds), pp. 7, 8, 287.

Karmadharaya, pp. 502.

Karla, oave temple at, p. 38; K. oaves, inscriptions at, p. 30; K. inscriptions at, p. 412.

Karma (deeds), pp. 7, 8, 287.

Karmadharaya, pp. 502.

Karmakāṇḍa i.e. Vedic religion (effectual blow to, at the hands of Buddhists generally but of Āśoka particularly), p. 16.

Kāmania, pp. 293, 419.


Kārmikas, p. 37.


Karttrpura, p. 39.

Kāśi, Ajātāsatru, king of, (Kauṣīta-kibrāhmaṇopanisad, p. 292.

Kāṣṭā, image of Buddha at, p. 46.

Kāśika Vṛtti, pp. 158, 182 fn 1, 189, 192, 215; K., an old com. on Pāṇini's Śūtras, p. 351.

Kāśmir, Mārgupta, king of, p. 50; K., pp. 166, 167; K., paper on dialects of, and Hindu Kush, read by Prof. Kuhn, at Vienna Congress, p. 343.

Kāśyapa, pupil of Buddha, author of Abhidhamma, p. 76; K. same as Caspian, (wrongly traced), p. 377.

Kātha, p. 152.

Kata, pp. 10, 11.

Kātha, his Dharma & Gṛhya Śūtras, p. 53.

Kātha school, Vināyaka Śānti in Yājñavalkya Smṛti agrees with Śūtras of, p. 408.


Kathavate, Abaji Vishnu, the Sanskrit Scholar, friend of author, p. 231.

Kathiwāḍ, pp. 11, 22, 25, 27, 41, 48, 103; K. Girnar in Āśoka Inscriptions at, p. 10; K. (or Surāṣṭra), p. 23; K. inscription in, p. 39; K. coins and Inscriptions found in, p. 514.

Kathiwāḍ Mālāvi, p. 22, 28.


Kauravas, pp. 418, 424.

Kauraḍu i.e. Scorpios (Gr.) name of a Zodiace sign, p. 388.

Kauśikas, kinsmen of Viśvāmitra, p. 422.

Kauśitaka, p. 418.

Kauśitaki Brāhmaṇa, p. 482.

Kauśitakibrāhmaṇopanisad, p. 292.

Kauṭiṣṭya, mention of his work first in Kāmaśāstra of Viṣṇyāyana, then by Kāmandaṇa, Daṇḍin, and Bāṇa in their works, p. 328. genuineness of K.'s Arthasastra, ibid; K., p. 329.

Kāvyapārakāśa, quotations from, in Sarvarāṇasanaśāgraha p. 91; K., p. 318.

Kelts, p. 390.

Kendra i.e. Kētron (Gr.), p. 388.

Kētron (Gr.) i.e. Kendra, p. 388.

Keraḥ, p. 39.

Keralapuṭa or Ketalapuṭa, p. 11.

Kern, Dr., on Yavanas, p. 116 K. on Mādhayamika, in his preface to Brhat-Saṃhitā edited by, p. 119; K., p. 131; his edition of Varāhamihira, p. 177 fn 2; K. of Leyden not present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.

Kesava, pp. 85, 328.

Kesavasvāmin name of Bhāṣyakāra on Śūtras, p. 55.

Ketalapuṭa, or Keralapuṭa, p. 11.

Kevala, p. 286.

Kevula Jiva, p. 284.
Kevalis (i.e. perfect individuals acc. to Jainas), p. 25.

Khagāra, p. 278; K. race exterminated by Gautamiputra, pp. 280, 281.

Khaharāta, race of, no remnant left of, by Gotamiputra Sātakaṇḍi, p. 30; K., same as Kṣaharāta Nāhāpāna, p. 514.

Khalsi, near the sources of the Jumna, Asoka Inscriptions at, pp. 10, 11.

Khandahār, coins of Gondophares found at, p. 32; Copper Coins found at K., p. 33.

Khandaḥādāya work of Brahmagupta, comm. of Amaraja on it, p. 374.

Khāṇḍava forest, p. 98.

Kharā, p. 25.


Khaṛoṣṭha, p. 27.

Kharoṣṭhī, pp. 22, 32; K. Character of Asoka Inscriptions at Shahbāzgarhi and Manseohabra, p. 11. K. of some coins, pp. 18, 19; K., one legend in, on the reverse of coins, p. 21; K., pp. 23, 27.

Kharoṣṭhī legend, pp. 28, 34.

Khshathrapa (Persian for Ksatrapa) ordinarily Satrap, p. 22.

Ki-a-pi-she i.e. Kapisene acc. to Hwan Thsang, p. 104.

Kiacas, officers of King Virāṭa, ref. to, in Vāsavadattā p. 87.


Kimdama Muni, death of Pāndu, caused by the curse of, p. 86.

Kirāṇḍvali of Udayana, p. 299.


Kolhapur, inscriptions found at, p. 30; K. coins found at, pp. 516, 517.

Komaro, (Greek name on coins) p. 34.

Koṇa, i.e. Kronos, (Gr.) p. 388.

Konga–Deśa–Carita, a Tamil Chronicle in the Mackenzie Collection Samkara referred to in, p. 88.

Kongāṇi Mahādhīrāja tenth King after Tīrū Vikrama I and third before Tīrū Vikrama II, p. 88.

Kosala, p. 39.

Kotah, inscription from, p. 186 fn.

Krama, illustrated, pp. 225, 226; K. defined, p. 227; K., p. 228.

Kriōs (Gr.) i.e. Kriya name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Kriya i.e. Kriōs (Gr.) name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Kronos (Gr.), i.e. Koṇa, p. 388.

Krṣṇa, Bhaṇḍārikot situated on, in Guntur dist., p. 277; K., sacrifices on the banks of river, p. 481.


Krṣṇa, earliest prince of Śātavāhana dynasty, p. 30; K. of Andhrabhṛtya dynasty, p. 514.

Krṣṇa Dvaipāyana ref. to, in Veni- saṃhāra, p. 89.

Krṣṇa Rāya, a king of Vijayānagara about 1521, p. 80.

Krṣṇarāja, pp. 278, 279, 281; K. of Sātavāhana race, p. 277; date of his accession, 2 A. D., p. 280; Mahādeva, his brother: both, sons of Jaitra, p. 298.
Kṣaharata Nahapāna called Kṣatrap or Satrap, p. 278.


Kṣapaṇaka, p. 374.

Kṣatrap (Satrap) same as Kṣaharata Nahapāna, p. 278.

Kṣatrapa or Mahākṣatrapa (title) pp. 21, 24, 514; K. an inferior title to Mahākṣatrapa (a superior title), p. 24; a list of K. princes occurring on the coins and in inscriptions, p. 25 f.; K., p. 30.

Kṣatrapa family, fortunes of, p. 28.

Kṣatrapas, pp. 23, 27, 28, 41, 519; K.s belonging to Saka race, p. 22. K.s (Northern) as Viceroys of the Saka kings in the beginning, ibid; K.s of Kāthiawāḍ, Māliwā, p. 23; K.s northern and southern, as independent hordes of Sakas, acc. to Smith, p. 519.

Kṣatriya girls, p. 369.

Kṣatriyas, pp. 53, 292, 399; K.s as original possessors of knowledge, and Brahmas as learners, p. 292.


Kṣemendra, Aucityālaṁkāra of, p. 186 fn. 1.

Kṣetrajña, p. 410.

Kṣudrakas (i.e. Oxydrakæ) tribe of Punjab, p. 106.

Kubera, p. 328.

Kühl Prof., of Munich present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; K., paper on dialects of Kasmir and Hindu-Kush read by, at Vienna Congress, p. 343.

Kujala-kapsa or kasa name on the reverse of coins of Kujala-kadphises (a Kusana prince), p. 33.

Kujala-Kadphises (Kusana prince), p. 33.

Kukura, called Kiuohelo by Huien Thsang, identified with Gurijara by Gen. Cunningham, p. 237f.


Kulira (कुलिर) one of the names of twelve Zodiac signs: its Greek equivalent not given by the author through oversight, p. 387.


Kumārila, (or "bhaṭṭa") a great Mīmāṃsaka writer of Vārtika on Bhāṣya of Śabaravāmin, pp. 58, 293; K., Aśvalāyana-Grhya-Kārika, attributed to, p. 306; his Vārtikas; p. 319; K., Bhavabhūti pupil of, p. 374.

Kuṇḍa, construction of, p. 230.

Kuṇḍāmadā, p. 219, 220.

Kuntala, p. 165; K. Śatakarni Śātvāhana, Vātsyāyana later than, his date lat, B. C., p. 329.

Kurus, pp. 291, 405; story of K.s, p. 82; K.s referred to, by Patañjali, pp. 84, 404.

Kurukṣetra mentioned in Meghadūta, p. 86.

Kuruṇpastālas (i.e. country about Thanesar, Mathura, Delhi and Agra), p. 346.

Kuṣana, name of a family, p. 29; K. dynasty after Indo-Parthian or Pahlava dynasty, p. 33.

Kuṣanā—Gupta period, Smṛtis referred to, p. 53.

Kuṣana dates, p. 60; K. dynasty, p. 520; K. princes, p. 36; K. successors of Wema-Kadphises, p. 49.

Kuṣanās, pp. 29, 34, 35, 39, 40, 49, 413 519.

Kushana prince III, p. 413.

Kusulaka (surname borne by Liaka and Patika), p. 22.

Kusumpura or Pāṭaliputra, p. 178.

Kuvalayānanda, p. 318.


Lakṣmī, p. 412.

Lakṣmī Sauhītā (Pānaorātra S.) p. 290.

Laliṭāditya, Yaśovarman, Sovereign of Kanoj conquered by, p. 368.

Lāṅkā, p. 239.
Lassen, Prof., pp. 19 fn1, 20 fn1; L., Menandros became king about 144 B.C. acc. to, p. 108; his wrong view about Puspamitra, 111 fn3; L. on date of Menandros, p. 113 and fn1; L. on date of Patañjali, p. 113 fn4; his chronology, p. 114; L., Indo-Bactrian dynasty became extinct in B.C. 85, acc. to, p. 177.


Lāṭa, name of Gujrat given to the province of, p. 414.

Law-books, metrical, or Smr̥tis, p. 53.

Lekhakas (professional writers), p. 37.

Leland, Mr., an American gentleman present at Vienna Congress; languages of Gipsies as his special study, p. 342; L., paper on Gipsy language read by, at Vienna Congress, p. 344.

Leon (Gr.) i.e. Leya, name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Leumann, Prof., Ernest of Strassburg, present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; his appreciation of Dr. Peterson's work in Jain literature, p. 525; his remarks on the work of Dr. Bühler, p. 526.

Lewis, Sir George Cornwall, p. 481.

Leya i.e. Leon (Gr.), name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Liaka, p. 22.

Lignana, an Italian scholar, present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.

Lilā, p. 234.

Lilavati, p. 315.

Līṅgānuśāsana, p. 221.

Līṅga Purāṇa, creation referred to, in, pp. 56, 407.

Lion Pillar at Mathurā, p. 23.

Lokāśāstrī, temple of, p. 46.

Lokāyata, p. 328.


Louvre, pp. 339, 340.

Ludwig of Prague, present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; L. Rost, Jacob assembled at Vienna compared to R̥ṣis assembled at Janaka's Mithilā in author's Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347; L., R̥gveda translated by, from Roth's point of view to a certain extent, p. 397.

Lumbini grove, visited by Aśoka, Sākyamuni born in, p. 13.

Ludwilians, p. 390.

Lydia, p. 19.

Macdonell, Dr., of Oxford, present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.

Macedonia, p. 12.

Macedonian (yoke), p. 5.

Mackenzie Collection, Saṅkara mentioned in Konga-Deśa-Carita, a Tamil Chronicle in the, p. 88.

Mackichan, Dr., Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University, p. 427.

Madjariputra Saṅkasaṇa, p. 30; M., later than Pujumāyi, p. 514; M., p. 517.

Mādhava, pp. 65, 76; M., author of Sarvadarāṣṭha Saṅgraha, p. 64; M., author of Saṅkara-Vijaya, p. 92 & fn2; his com. on Parasara, p. 303.

Mādhva, p. 409.

Mādhva, p. 293.

Mādhyamikā (yoke), p. 18, 182, 184.

Mādhyamika school, p. 58; M., Budhistic works of, p. 409.

Mādhyamikas, pp. 73, 74, 76, & fn1, 108, 116, 117; M.s, name misunderstood by Weber and Goldstücker, p. 119.

Mādhyandina Recension of Bhādāranyakopāniṣad, p. 100; M. Sākhā, pp. 233, 372.

Mādhyandinas, pp. 228, 372.

Mādhrakas, tribes, p. 39.

Madras, capital of, p. 106.

Mādras Presidency, p. 277.

Magadha, pp. 42, 56, 518; M., Patañjali putra capital of, p. 111.

Māgadhā Churh, p. 14; M. Saṅgha, a tablet inscription addressed to, p. 11.

Magas of Cyrene, (Maka), died 258 B.C., p. 12 f.

Māgha, his Śiṣupālavadha, based on Mbh, story, p. 89.
Mahābhārata, pp. 48, 57, 63, & fn 3, 64, 105, 224 & fn1, 291, 292, 348, 365, 368, 369, 372, 395, 398, 400, 403, 405, 406, 410, 419, 420; M. ( Anusasana ) p. 54; M., Sānti and Anuśāsanika, books of, p. 9; M. Sānti Parva, pp. 69 fn2, 237; M., date of, pp. 79-93, 119; M., serpent sacrifice held by Janamejaya described in, p. 79; oldness of this epic, accord. to Hindu belief p. 80; M. written after 1521 A.D. accord. to grant, p. 80; specific proofs re. its antiquity, p. 81; name of, occurs in Āśvālāyana Gṛhya Sūtra III. 4.4., p. 82; M., ref. to, in Bānas Kādambari, p. 86; story of, complete in Bānas time, p. 87; M., many allusions to, in Subandhu's Vāsavadattā, ibid; M. misquoted in Mrochakatika, p. 88; M., story of, base of Vēṇisāṃbhāra, p. 89; M. praised in Jñāneśvarī, p. 90; M. quoted often in Dānakhaṇḍa of Hemādrī's work, ibid; M., ref. to, in Sarvadarśanasāṃghera, p. 91; M., quoted in com. on Parāśara by Sāyana, ibid; M., quoted in Paddhati of Sārvigadharā, p. 92; M. quoted in works of Pāṇini, etc. of 5th cen. B. C. down to Sārvigadharā of 14th cen. A. D. ibid; its antiquity established, ibid; M., mention of Sākala as capital of Madras in, p. 165; M., names of Karad & Supara, Maratha towns, occur in, p. 387; M., mentioned by Āśvālāyana and Pāṇini; existed in Patañjali's time, p. 404; M., Vyāṣa author of, p. 419; M., language, period, grammar, contents, etc. of, pp. 422-426; M., mention of, by Pāṇini and by Āśvālāyana, p. 423; M. represents speech of Indian Aryans ( period later than Pāṇini & Yāṣka ), ibid; M. Prospectus prepared by Mr. Utgīkar, p. 424; M. code of morals embodied in, p. 477.


Mahābhōjas, p. 37.

Mahādeva, a Yādava king of Devagiri, p. 90; M., brother of Rāja Kṛṣṇa, both, sons of Jaitra, p. 298.

Māhākāla, temple of (Śiva) in Ujjayini, mentioned in Bāna's Kādambarī, pp. 6, 369.

Māhākāṇṭāra, p. 39.

Māhākṣatrāpa, a superior title to Kṣatrāpa ( an inferior one ), pp. 21, 22, 24, 515.

Māhākṣatrāpa dynasty, exterminated by Guptas in 310 or 311 Saka, p. 29.

Māhākṣatrāpas, pp. 27-29.

Māhāmātras or Governors, p. 14.

Māhānāman, Buddha image set up by, p. 46.

Māhārāja or Great King, Vonones represented as, p. 28; M., title of Gupta and his son Ghaṭotkacā, p. 39.

Māhārājābhṛtā, ( King's brother ) Spalīrīses was called as, p. 28.

Māhārājādhirāja, title of Candragupta I, p. 39.

Māhārāṣṭrā, pp. 30, 36, 521; M., cave temples in, p. 37; M., Traikūṭakas dynasty ruled in, & Gujrat, p. 414.

Māhāṛathīs, pp. 37, 38.

Māhārājās Apachehatas Philasinas, p. 20.

Māhārājasa Dharmikasesa Helyakreysa ( i.e. Māhārājasa Dhārmikasya Helyakreyasya ), legend on the reverse of the coins, p. 19.

Māhārājasa Dharmikasesa Jayadharas Arkehyiyasa, p. 20.

Māhārājasa Jayadharas Antialkiasa, p. 20.
Maharajasa rajadhikarajasa Sarvaloga-

Maharajasa rajadhikarajasa Devaratasa Gudapharasa (in Kharoṣṭhī) on some coins of Gondophares, p. 32.

Maharajasa Tradarasa Menamdrasa, p. 20.

Mahāsenā, worship of, p. 45.

Mahāseno (Greek name on coins), p. 34.

Mahat (or Buddha), pp. 69, 71, 410.

Mahata (high-sounding epithet on coins), p. 32.

Mahatasa (i.e. Greek Megalou), p. 21.

Mahātyas, p. 56.

Mahat-tattva (i.e. Greek Megalou), pp. 67, 69.

Mahāta (i.e. Greek Megalou), p. 21.

Mahatmyas, p. 56.

Mahāvira of the race of Jītakas (founder of atheistic system), p. 292.

Mahāyāna, later form of Buddhism, p. 47; M. school of Buddhism, p. 317; M., clue to Śaṅkara's theory of world illusion be found in Nihilism of Buddhism, p. 325; M. Buddhists, p. 324; M. Buddhism, p. 413.

Mahāyānism, rise of, p. 45 f.; M., p. 47.

Mahendra, king of Kosala, p. 39; M., title of Kumāragupta, p. 43.

Mahēśvara (Śiva), temple of, p. 45, M., p. 48.

Mahēśvaras (Kuṣāna kings called M.), devotees of Śiva, p. 34.

Mahēśvarabhaṭṭa, author Mahēśvarabhaṭṭa (for Hiranyakesīs), p. 225.

Mahēśvarabhaṭṭa (Mahēśvarabhaṭṭa), used by Hiranyakesīs Yajurvedins, p. 225.

Mahīdāsa, com. of Pratiśākhyas of White Yajurveda, p. 315.

Mahīṃsata, on Narmadā, Manḍana Mīśra lived in, p. 92; M., p. 210; M., capital of Anūpa on Narmadā, p. 238.

Mahmud of Ghazni, p. 374.

Mahomedans, ruling over India, p. 80.

Mahuli, in Satara dist., Atharvavedins found in, p. 228.

Maine, Sir Sumner quoted, p. 391.

Maitrīvaruṇa, pp. 489, 490, 492.

Maitreyāṇīya Uttarāṇad, p. 62 fn 1; M. Śākha of Black Yajurveda in Gujar, pp. 222, 372.

Maitreya, p. 399.

Maka, a king (Magas of Cyrene) died 258 B. C., p. 12 f.

Mālāṭi-Mādhava, com. on, quoted, p. 74 fn 2; M., Act VI, p. 238.

Mālava era, p. 42.

Mālavas, tribes, pp. 39, 106, 326; M.s, i.e. Malii, p. 106; M.s, as a Gaṇa or a political unit; Mālavagaṇa indentified with name of Vikramādiya, as Śaṅka era with that of Śālavahana or Śātavahana, p. 326.

Mālavikāgnimitra, drama of Kālidāsa, its hero Agnimitra, son of Pusyamitra, p. 17; M., pp. 20, 182; M., ref. to Pusyamitra in, p. 111 fn 3.


Mālayavati, queen of Kuntala Śatarkāri Śātavahana, p. 329.

Mali, tribe met with by Alexander, p. 106.

Mallinātha, p. 51.

Malva, pp. 413.

Malvani dialect, p. 384.

Mālāv, pp. 17, 22, 23, 29, 31, 38, 40, 41, 48, 49, 52, 56; M., coins & inscriptions found in, pp. 33, 514.

Mālāv Māhāksatrapa, p. 27.


Mānasasagara, son of Praṇāthaka and grandson of Khara, 'a Sāttra constructed by, p. 25.

Māṇḍalas, I & X of Rgveda, p. 312; M.s, p. 418.

Māṇḍana Kauṣikī, p. 302.

Māṇḍana Miśra, a great Mīmāṃsaka lived in Māhīṃsata, p. 92; his Māṭha, few miles from Hastināpur, pp. 92, 293.

Mandasar, inscription at, pp. 41, 42, 44, 385.
Māṇḍukī Sākhā (fifth) not traced, pp. 308, 315.
Manes, p. 21.
Māṅgalīśa, cave temple dedicated to Viṣṇu by, p. 45.
Māṇkuwār, inscription at, pp. 41, 46.
Manoramā, p. 316.
Mānsesahra (Manshera), p. 11.
Manshera in Panjab, Aśoka Inscriptions at, p. 10.
Mantra-Jāgara explained, p. 229.
Mantras, pp. 290, 369, 398, 489.
Mantraraja, King of Kerala, p. 39.
Manu, pp. 48, 355, 423.
Manusamhitā, p. 398.
Manu Smṛti, pp. 53, 54, 57, 303.
Manvantaras, p. 55.
Māra, (the Buddhistic Prince of Darkness) i.e. Kāma or Desire, p. 6.
Maratha Country, pp. 22, 63; Study of Veda in M., p. 223.
Marathī, p. 385.
Mārga, p. 74.
Mārkandeya Purāṇa, pp. 62 fn3, 407; M., creation referred to, in, p. 56; M., ref. to Mauryas (as demons) in, p. 172.
Mathi, p. 11.
Mathurā, pp. 3, 18, 21–23, 35, 43, 47, 49, 56, 128, 131, 132, 174, 518, 520; M., Lion Pillar found at, p. 23; M., inscription found at, pp. 35, 40; M., image of Buddha at, p. 46; M., conquered by Yavanas acc. to Gārgī Samhitā, p. 178.
Matila, a king ruling in Āryāvarta, p. 39.
Mātrīcetā, temple of the sun erected by, p. 42.
Māatrīgupta, King of Kāśmir, pp. 50, 51.
Mātr-Viṣṇu, a Brahman Mahārāja of the name of, pp. 42, 44.
Matsya Purāṇa, pp. 62 fn3, 63 fn3, 69, 113 fn3; M., ref. to Gonarda native place of Patañjali in, p. 123; M., ref. to निमिन् in, p. 252.
Maurya, i.e. guild or caste of idol-makers, acc. to Nāgojibhaṭṭa, p. 168.
Maurya, name of a dynasty, pp. 5, 167, 183; M. dynasty founded by Candragupta about 320–22 B.C., pp. 173, 512; M. family extinct 35 years before Patañjali, p. 150.
Mauryas pp. 4, 17, 111, 113, 119, 125, 126, 151, 153–156 168–172, 184, 185, 191–196, 198, 200–206, 317; M.s, alluded to, by Patañjali, p. 5; M.s, idols were sold by, p. 155; M.s, images such as Siva, Skandah Viṣṇukhaṇḍa were sold by, p. 170; their greed for gold, referred to, in Mahābāḥṣya, p. 328.
Max Müller, pp. 51, 60, 75, 157, 158, 160, 304; M., Chips of, p. 74; his Note on Renaissance, p. 157 fn. 3; M. visited by the author, p. 336 f.; M., author's discussion with, about the central idea of Saṁkṣāra's philosophy, p. 338; M., not present at Vienna Congress because of his daughter's death, p. 342.
Māyā (illusion), pp. 73, 77, 78, 294; M. (magical power), p. 98; M. (Prakṛti), p. 291; M. doctrine not supported by Sūtras, p. 409.
Maya-Asura, located in Khāṇḍa forest, p. 98; M., audience hall constructed by, for Pāṇḍavas, ibid; M., saved by Arjuna, ibid; M. (Assyrian or Asura) proficient in architecture, ibid.
Mayasamhitā containing instructions for the accomplishment of wonderful feats, pp. 417 f.
Mazdaemono-Mazlohanō (Greek name on coins), p. 34.
Mazlohanō–Mazdaemono (Greek name on Coins), p. 34.
McAuliffe, a Punjab Civilian, present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.
Me-, pp. 70, 71, 73.
Medhātithi, p. 408.
Meerut, p. 11.
Megasandos, an ambassador sent by Selukos to the Court of Sandracottā (i.e. Candagutta or Candragupta) acc. to Greek writers, pp. 3, 5, 326.
Meghadūta of Kālidāsa, p. 51; M., ref. to Kurukṣetra in, p. 86.

Menander, pp. 20, 177, 178; M. (or Milinda), p. 178; M., of Sākala, same as Milinda, the Greek King, p. 8; M., acc. to Goldstucker same as Yavana prince referred to in Arunāḍa Yavanaḥ, Sāketaṁ, p. 18; M., same as Milinda of Pali work Milinda-Pāṇīho, ibid.; M. or Milinda reigning at Sāgala, p. 162; M., Indo-Bactrian prince, p. 177; M. is Yavana (in Arunāḍa Yavanaḥ Sāketaṁ) spoken by Patañjali, p. 388.

Menandros (Yavana King), pp. 113, and fn 4, 114; M. became King about 144 B.C. acc. to Prof. Lassen, p. 108; M., King of Bactria, same as the Yavana in Paṁini acc. to Prof. Goldstucker, ibid.; M., a Bactro-Greek monarch identified with Milinda reigning at Sākala in Punjab called Yoṇa King in Pali, p. 388.

Meṣṭha or Bhartrmeṣṭha, a poet, pp. 50, 51.

Mesapotamia, North, pp. 99, 100.

Mihira = Miiro (Greek name on Coins), p. 34.


Miirño = Mihira (Greek name on coins) p. 34.

Milinda, Indianised form of Menander, pp. 19, 20, 178, 413; dialogue between M. and Nāgāsenā, a Buddhist saint, pp. 8, 412, 413; M., a Yoṇa King, p. 178; M. reigning at Sākala (Sāgala) in Punjab identified with Bactro-Greek Monarch Menandros called Yoṇa King in Pali, pp. 162, 388.

Milindapaṇīho, a Pali Work, pp. 18, 20, 178; M. refers to Sāgala (Sākala), p. 162.

Milloué, a French Scholar present at Vienna Congress, p. 342.
Murundra tribes, p. 40.
Mutibas, name Dasyus applied to, p. 95 fn.1.
Mysore, p. 11; M. dst., p. 85.

Nabhapanti, p. 12.
Nabhāta, p. 12.
Nāgadatta, p. 39.
Nāgāri, (ancient) i.e. Brāhmi charac-
ter, p. 19.
Nāgārjuna, contemporary of Kanisika,
Nāgārjuni hills near Gayā, p. 16.
Nāgasena, Buddhist saint, dialogue be-
 tween him and the Greek King Milinda, pp. 8, 413: N., pp. 18, 2, 178.
Nāgojibhaṭṭa, pp. 126, 128, 133, 136, 138, 139 fn.1, 171, 172, 176, 177, 187, 190, 192-199, 202-205, 216 fn.1, 317; N., Maurya means guild or caste of idol-makers acc. to, p. 168; N., Tatrabhavatāḥ (=Īśvara or God) acc. to, p. 216; N., author of Sabenduse-
khara and Paribhāṣendusekhara, p. 316.
Nahapāna, pp. 38, 278, 279, 281, 513, 516-518; N., ruler of Mahāraṣṭra, p. 30; N., named as Kṣaṇarāṭa (another form of Khakharāṭa), ibid, & 515; his son-in law, Uṣavadāta, p. 31; N., both a K. & Mk., ibid; N., founder of Śaka era, in 78 A. D., p. 280.
Naidhrui-Nārāyaṇa, his Vṛtti on Śrīvalyana Grhya, III. 5.9; p. 307; N., pp. 309, 310.
Nakula, referred to, by Patañjali, p. 83.
Nalodaya, tradition that N. and Śakuntala belong to the same author, be rejected, p. 164.
Nāmadeva, p. 324.
Nānāghāṭ, mutilated inscription at, pp. 38, 39, 516.

Nandas, their family uprooted by Čaṇakya or Viṣṇugupta, pp. 5, 328, 330.
Nandarāja, p. 329.
Nandin, emblem of, on the reverse of coins, of Kuṣana princes, pp. 34, 48.
Nārada, p. 290.
Nāradapancarātra, p. 290.
Nārada Sṛṃti, p. 303.
Nārāśāṃśa, p. 82.
Narasimha, p. 288.
Narasimmiyengar, Mr., quoted, p. 120.
Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, his Veṇīsaṁhāra based on Mbh. Story, p. 88.
Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, his work Nārāyaṇa-
bhaṭṭi, p. 225.
Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭi of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, for Ṛgvedins, p. 225.
Nārāyaṇiya section of Moksadharma-
parvan (Śantiparvan of Mbh.), p. 237; N., older than Rāmānuja and Śaṅkarācārya, p. 288; N., pp. 291, 293, 405.
Narmadā, Māhiṣmati on, p. 92; N., Anūpa on, p. 238; N., p. 521.
Nāsadāṣina sadāṣīt, (Ṛg. X. 129 ), p. 6.
Nāsāṭyas, invoked by king of Mitn, p. 94.
Nasik, pp. 281, 528; N., cave temples at, p. 38; N., cave inscriptions at, pp. 30, 38, 84, 514, 516, 517.
Nāsika, as capital of Śātavāhana race, p. 278.
Nātive Opinion, p. 131.
Navagva and Daśagva occurring in Ṛgveda, remarks on these made by Italian scholar at Vienna Con-
gress, p. 344.
Navāniki, p. 316.
Navanara, capital of Puḍumayi, p. 243.
Nava-ṛatnāni (nine gems) at the court of Vikramāditya, p. 375.

Navya Nyāya, composed by Gaṅgaśo-pāḍhyāya of Bengal, p. 317.

Nepāla, p. 39; N. Terai, pp. 11, 13.

Newton, Justice, pp. 280, 281.

Nibandha defined, p. 253; N.s or commentaries, pp. 408, 409.

Nic (Āya) termination, p. 209.

Niecea, a prince, p. 20.

Nīghaṇṭu, pp. 224 and fn, 226, 396.

Nīlīva, p. 11; N., Nepal Inscription found at, p. 13.

Nīgrahaṇḍam, p. 152.

Nihiliṣam, pp. 73, 74; N. of Buddhist Mahāyāna school, a clue to theory of Saṃkarṣaṇa's world-illusion be found in, p. 325.

Nīlakaṇṭha, p. 408.

Nimbārka, p. 409.

Nipāta, p. 498; N., under Pāṇini 1. 4. 56, p. 497.

Nirodha, p. 74.

Nirukta, pp. 161, 224 & fn, 226.

Nirāṇa of Buddha, pp. 73, 76, 163, 164.


Nītya Jīva, p. 284.

Nīvatana defined, p. 252.

Nīvāsā, p. 151.


Nīyam ( ruler ), p. 287.

Niyoga, p. 418.

Noble, Colonel, Commissioner of Sahet Mahet in Oudh, in the Steamer Siam by which the author returned from Vienna to India, pp. 359, 360.

Non-ego, p. 70.

North-Western provinces, pp. 40, 41.

Nyāya, Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya on, p. 65; N. Philosophy, p. 329; N. Śāstra, p. 316; N. school, p. 317; N. system, pp. 324, 410; N. of Dialectics p. 411.

Nyāyabhāṣya, Vātsyāyana, author of, pp. 317, 328.

Nyāyabinduṭīkā, a Budhistic work, edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 526.

Nyāyasāra of Bhāsarvajña, p. 299.

Objects of the senses, five, p. 67.

Oldenberg, Prof., pp. 305, 309, 517; O. Prof. of Vienna not present at Vienna Congress, p. 349; his method of interpreting Ṛgveda, p. 398.

Organs of action, five, p. 67.

Orthagōnes (Indo-Parthian king), p. 31.

OrtospaD, same as modern Kabul, derived from Urddhasthana ascribed to Prof. Wilson, p. 105.

Oudh, pp. 133, 134.

Owen, Mr., Sydney, sometime Professor of History and Political Economy in the Elphinstone College, author's master; author well received by him in London, p. 336; O., p. 338.


Oxydrakæ nearer to Kṣudrakas than to Śudrakas, p. 106; O. tribe met with by Alexander, identified with Śūdrakas of Puranas by Prof. Wilson, ibid.

Ozene or Ujjayinī, p. 24.

Pada illustrated, pp. 225, 226; P. defined, pp. 227, 228.

Paddhati (or anthology) of Sāṅgāyana, p. 91; P. Venīśamhāra Kārttārjunīya, Śīśūlālavadha, Bhagavadgītā and other parts of Mbh. quoted in, p. 92; P., edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 525.


Paderia in Nepal Terai, pp. 11, 13.


Pagenst, Sir Augustus, British Ambassador at Vienna, p. 345.

Pahlava, p. 24; P. or Indo-Parthian dynasty, p. 33; P. race, p. 293; P. tribes, p. 183.
Pahlavas, pp. 48, 53, 54, 514; P.s beaten by Gotamiputra Satakarni, p. 30; P.s, Persians or Parthians known as, p. 178.
Pahlavi, p. 11.
Paila, p. 418.
Paithana, pp. 389, 518; P., capital of the Deccan, p. 30; P., Sircu Pollemyos or Pulumai ruling at, acc. to Ptolemy, pp. 31, 515; P., viceroyalty of Andhrabhṛtyas at, p. 517.
Pakores (Indo-Parthian king), p. 31.
Pakṣīlāsvaṁī or Vṛtiṣyāṇa, pp. 59, 318.
Pa-la-fa-to, (transcribed as Parvata by M. Julien), central province of Panjab called so, by Hwan Thsang, p. 106.
Pali, pp. 18, 39, 45, 297, 423; P., Buddhist works in, p. 57.
Panava, p. 328.
Paṅcadaśi of Bhāratīrtha, p. 77 fn1.
Paṅcājana, p. 300.
Paṅcāla, conquered by Yavanas, acc. to Gārgī Śāṅhītā, p. 178.
Paṅcilā, p. 500, 501.
Paṅcilas, pp. 507, 508.
Paṅcarātras, pp. 287-289, 291, 294, 411; P.-Āgamas, p. 412; P.-Śāṁhitās, p. 290; P. system, pp. 288, 289, 294; P. or Bhāgavata system, Rāmānuja's same as, p. 290; P. a distinct system independent of Vedas and Upaniṣads, p. 293.
Paṅcasiddhāntikā of Varāhamihira, pp. 50, 374.
Paṅcāvatī, p. 311.
Paṅcikārana, p. 77.
Paṇḍava, family name mentioned by Patañjali, p. 404.
Paṇḍavas, pp. 291, 418, 424; their race, p. 79; P.s, story of (i.e. Mbh.), as ancient, in Patañjali’s time, p. 81; P.s, skill of, in gambling, ref. to, in Vāsavadattā, p. 87; P.s, audience hall constructed for, by Maya-Āsurā, p. 98.
Paṇḍu, pp. 84, 86, 89.
Paṇḍya, p. 12.
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Panjab, pp. 11, 18-23; P., Candragupta being present in, at the time of Alexander’s invasion, p. 5; P., Manshera in, Āśoka Inscriptions at, p. 10; P., Western, coins of Gondophares found in, p. 32; P., Copper Coins found in, p. 33; P., Aryans settled in, pp. 99, 100; P., ancient geography of, p. 103.

Pantaleon (descendant of Demetrius), p. 19.

Pantheism, p. 400.

Pantheon, Brahmanic, p. 44.

Pañya (vendible), pp. 155, 156, 190, 192-195, 197, 204.


Pārāśāra, Mbh. quoted in com. on, by Śāyaṇa, p. 91.

Parāśāra Sūtrā. p. 301.

Parasvarūpa Virodhin, p. 286.

Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nagojibhaṭṭa, p. 316.

Parīkṣit, father of Janamejaya, p. 79; P., son of Abhimanyu restored to life by Kṛṣṇa, ref. to, in Kādambari p. 86.

Parināmavāda, theory of, p. 77 fn 2.


Parīṣads, p. 256.

Parivṛṣṭaka Mahārajas, Copper Charters issued by, p. 55.

Parṇadatta, Skandagupta’s governor of Surṣṭra, p. 44.

Parokṣa, p. 497.

Paropamisūs, p. 20.

Parśis, pp. 330, 378.


Parthēnos (Gr.), i.e. Pārthēna name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Parthian dynasty, Śaka princes included in, by Smith, p. 519.

Parthians, p. 49; P.s, or Persians spoken of as Pahlavas, p. 178.

Pārthēna i.e. Pārthēnos (Gr.), name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.
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Parvata, name of country acc. to Pāṇini IV. 2.143 and IV. 3.93, p. 106; P., Candrācārya obtained tradition from, p. 184.

Parvata, Pa-la-fa-to, transcribed as, by M. Julien, p. 106.

Pārvatī, p. 412.

Paśu (cattle or wealth), p. 397.

Pāśupata, p. 287.

Pāśupatās, p. 294.

Pāṭālāvijaya, p. 206.

Pāṭāl (for Ujjainl), p. 50.

Pāṭaliputra, pp. 12, 40, 50, 111 fn3, 114, 122, 123, 131, 132, 167, 206, 276 277; P., capital of Sandrakottos, p. 3; P., capital of Candragupta situated at the confluence of the Ganges and the Erannobas, p. 5; P., capital of Magadha, often referred to, by Patañjali, p. 111; P., acc. to Patañjali situated on the Soṇa, pp. 5, 111 fn2; P., Patañjali flourished in the reign of king of, p. 108; P., author of Mahābhāṣya lived to the east of, acc. to Weber, really to north-west of Saketa, p. 128; P., or Kusumpura, p. 178.

Patañjali, pp. 18, 20, 54, 83, 84, 92, 95, 96, 98, 109 fn1, 111, 113 fn4, 142-136, 128, 129, 131-134, 137, 138 fn1, 139 and fn 1, 140, 141 and fn 1, 142-147, 149-152, 155-158, 160, 162, 164, 165, 168-185, 186 fn 1, 187, 189-192, 194, 195, 197, 198, 201, 202, 204, 205, 209-211, 213-215, 216 and fn 1, 291, 296, 297, 316, 328, 387, 403-405, 408, 443, 497, 500, 504, 508; P. speaks of Pāṭaliputra situated on the Soṇa, p. 5; P., alluding to the Mauryas, and speaking of Candraguptasabhā, ibid; his date about 142 B. C., pp. 17, 81, 119, 131; P., refers to Yavanas (arunad Yavanah Sāke- tam; arunad Yavanah Madyamikām) under Pāṇini III. 2. 111, p. 17 f; P. refers to Pusyamitra in Mahābhāṣya, ibid; his bhāṣya on Vyākaraṇa, p. 65; P., author of com. on Pāṇini's work, p. 102; his Mahābhāṣya i. e, com. on Pāṇini, p. 108; P., com. by, on the Sūtra Sāmavedavānavāya etc. of Pāṇini, p. 82; P., main story of Mbh. current long before the time of, pp. 83, 84; P., Panjab called as Bāhlika by, under Pāṇini IV. 2. 117 and V. 3. 114; p. 105; P. lived in the reign of Pusyamitra (178 B. C. to 142 B. C.), pp. 114, 116, 122, 130, 185; P., Weber's remarks on date of, p. 115; P., ref. to Pusyamitra-Sabhā in, ibid; P., brought to 25 after Christ by Weber, p. 116; his Bhāṣya introduced in Kashmir by Candrācārya, p. 118; P., on Pāṇini, III. 1.26, p. 121 and fn1; P., on sacrifices of Pusyamitra, p. 122; his native place Gonarda, ibid; his native place to north-west by west of Oudh, p. 123; P., Comments on Vārtikas; agrees with Kātyāyana, refutes him, races Pāṇini's Sūtras, discusses and explains even in the absence of a Vārtika, gives supplementary rules (Īstī) p. 147; his work is Com. on edition of Kātyāyana etc., ibid; P., flourished short time after Mauryas, p. 156; P., called Tirthadārśin (seer of saving truth) by Bhartrhari, p. 184; P., arguments for date (150 B. C.) of, summed up, pp. 184-185; Path, (Eight-fold) viz. right views, r. resolve, r. speech, r. action, r. living, r. effort, r. self-knowledge, r. contemplation, misery destroyed by, p. 9.

Pāṭika, p. 22; P., mentions Moga (i.e. Saka Emperor Maues), p. 23; P., of Takṣaśilā, ibid.

Pāṭnā, p. 123.

Paul, St., his Cathedral, p. 333.

Pauliśa (Siddhānta), p. 57.

Puṣkala, derived from Puṣkala of Pāṇini, ancient capital of Gāndhāra, p. 106.

Puṣkara (Pāṇcarātra Samhītā), p. 290.

Puṣkarasamhītā, p. 289.
Pāyasyā (curds or milk), p. 492.
Percy Gardner, pp. 19 fn1, 22 fn2, 28 fn1, 34 fn1.
Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, author of this work unknown, p. 3; P., p. 18.
Persian pantheon, emblems of deities from the, on Coins, p. 34.
Pershins or Parthians spoken of as Pahlavas, p. 178.
Peshwas, servants of Raja of Satara, p. 513.
Peshāwar, p. 31.
Pet-enikas, p. 12.
Petersberg (St.) Lexicon, pp. 169, 187, 188, 401.
Petersson, Dr. Peter, pp. 158, 164-170, 173, 175-178, 180-183, 185, 186 and fn1, 187-207, 343; P. on date of Paṭaṭjali, p. 156; P. refers Paṭaṭjali to time of Skandagupta of Gupta Dynasty, p. 157; P., obituary notice of, pp. 523-527; P., editor of Bālakāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa, Hitopadesa, Kādamba, Subhāśītavali, Śāṅgadharapaddhati, p. 525; his alphabetical index of all the poets in Sanskrit literature in his introduction to Subhāśītavali of Vallabhadeva, ibid; P., editor of Nyāyabindutikā, a Buddhistic work, ibid; his work on Jain literature, ibid; P., editor of some Rgveda Hymns, p. 526; P., author's appreciation about the original research work of, p. 527.
Peukalas derived from Puṣkala of Pāṇini, p. 106.
Phala or Puruṣārtha (end of life), p. 284.
Phala (fruits or objects of life), p. 287.
Philoxenus, p. 19.
Phoenicians, p. 466.
Pinagala, p. 371.
Pippala tree, p. 36.
Pipru, name of Āsura, p. 94.
Pischel, p. 396.
Piṭṭapuri, temple of, p. 44.
Pitinkika, p. 12.
Piyadasi, Inscriptions of, p. 12 fn1.
P. Inscriptions by Senart, p. 13 fn1.
Pluta (long vowel), pp. 96, 502.
Poona, Soma Sacrifice held at, in 1873, p. 230; P. dist., inscriptions in, p. 517.
Prabhākara, founder of atheistic Mīmāṃsā school, p. 58.
Prabhāśa, near Paṭṭaṇ Somnāth or Somnath acc. to Dr. Stevenson, p. 254.
Prācyas, p. 134.
Pradhāna (or Prākṛti) first principle, pp. 66, 68, 71, 73, 74, 410, 497;
Prādīpa, p. 189.
Pradīpoddypota, p. 189.
Pradyumna, p. 285; P. sprang from Śaṅkaraṇa, p. 288.
Prāṣa (order), pp. 490, 492.
Prājā (progeny), p. 397.
Prājāpati, p. 96; P. (all) as material cause p. 214; P., p. 215.
Prakalpitaḥ, p. 151.
Prakāśārthā, work, p. 300.
Prakrit, pp. 24, 32, 39, 45, 60, 61, 385.
Prakrit language, p. 18; P., one legend in, on the the reverse of the Coins, p. 21.
Prakrit legend, p. 19.
Prākṛtaprakāśa of Vararuci, p. 123 fn1.
Prākṛti, pp. 69, 75; P. (or Pradhāna) first principle, pp. 66, 68, 73; P., as material cause of things acc. to Prof. Wilson, p. 69; P. (Māyā) p. 291; P., (nature) of Śāṅkhyā school, p. 410.
Prājāthaka, p. 25.
Prapatti, p. 286.
Prāptivirodhin, p. 287.
Prāptī (he who attains it), p. 287.
Prāpya (what is to be attained), p. 287.
Prājūnas, tribes, p. 39.
Prarthana Samaja, Justice Ranade's lecture at, p. 453.
Prāśāda (temple), p. 46; P., p. 221.
Prāsāsti, p. 206.
Prāsāstis, historical accounts of princes, p. 4.
Prātaranuvāka, p. 321.
Prathamā (case), pp. 498, 502.
Prātika, p. 203.
Prātiṣākhya of White Yajurveda, p. 315.
Pratoli i.e. gallery, (on inscription), p. 43.
Pratyāhāra Sūtras, pp. 127, 139, 498.
Pratyākhya (speaking against), pp. 140, 143.
Pratyāyaya, p. 496; under III. 1. 1, pp. 497, 502, 503.
Pratyudhāraṇas (counter-examples) p. 212.
Prayāga, pp. 42, 56.
Prayatna, p. 497.
Prayoga, p. 306.
Prayogas (manuals), pp. 230, 482, 494.
Prayoga-Darpaṇa used by Mādhyamādinas, p. 225.
Present, Progressive, p. 175.
Prīncep, his Chronological Tables, p. 90 fn6.
Principles of Sāṁkhya system 25, viz. Prakṛti or Pradhāna, Mahattattva (or Buddhi), Aharikhāra, five senses, five organs of action, Manas, five subtle elements, five objects of the senses or (gross elements) and Puruṣa, pp. 66, 67.
Prithā, wife of Pāṇḍu, ref. to, in Kādambāri, p. 86.
Prithu, p. 301.
Prithvi, p. 67.
Pulumāyi, son of Gotamīputra, Vāsiṣṭhīputra or Vāsiṣṭhīputra, pp. 275, 276.
Pulinda, p. 12.
Pulindas, p. 12; P.s, name Dasyus applied to, p. 95 fn1.
Pulumāyi, pp. 30, 31, 38, 515-517; P., Ujjayinī invaded by, p. 29; P., ruling at Paithana acc. to Ptolomy, p. 31; P., son of Gotamīputra Śatākṛpi, p. 514; P., son-in-law of Rudradāman acc. to Smith, p. 515; P., as contemporary of Rudradāman acc. to Smith, ibid; P., same as Vāsiṣṭhīputra of Kolhapur Coins, p. 516.
Pundarika sacrifice, p. 44.
Pundraś, name Dasyus applied to, p. 95 fn1.
Pundrakas, Indian tribes, p. 53.
Purākāla, p. 150.
Purāṇam, Indian tributes, p. 53.
Purāṇam, ref. to, in Brhadāraṇya Upaniṣad; p. 419.
Pūrṇāṣ, pp. 2, 16-18, 30, 52, 56, 57, 62, 68, 213, 276, 278, 280, 282, 348, 365, 395, 408, 410, 412, 420, 512, 516, 518; P.s giving list of Kings, p. 4f; P.s, Vāyu, Viṣṇu, p. 42; P.s, date of, p. 55; P.s, read in temples (very old system even in Bāṇa's time), p. 86; P.s, made use of by Antiquarians, p. 102; P.s, reference to Puṣpamitra in, p. 111; P.s, mentioned in some of the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, p. 407; P.s, Contents of, are: 1 creation, 2 dissolution, 3 genealogy, 4 Manus or certain periods, 5 doings of persons belonging to certain families, ibid; P.s, written to extol particular deities such as Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā, etc., ibid;
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Purodāsa, pp. 484, 493.
Purohita (or priest of Kalki), p. 222.
Puruṣa, pp. 68, 75, 410; P., referred to in Puruṣāsūkta (Rgveda X. 90), p. 6; his state described after death, p. 7; P., last principle, p. 67; P. and Pra-kṛti distinguished, ibid; P., (absolute ego), p. 70.
Puruṣārtha or Phala (end of life), p. 284.
Puruṣārthas are Dharma, Artha, Kāma, Kaivalya and Mokṣa, p. 286.
Puruṣārthavirodhin, p. 286.
Puruṣāsūkta (Rgveda X. 90), p. 6.
Puruṣottama, p. 285.
Purvapaksin (opponent of Siddhāntin), pp. 172, 193, 194.
Pūṣan, Sukra (bright from) in Rgveda, VI. 58.1, p. 321.
Puṣkala (Pāṇini IV. 2. 75.), p. 106.
Puṣpamitra, pp. 20, 110, 113 fn4, 114, 115, 179, 180, 183, 185, 206, 276; P., or Puṣyamitra, founder of Śunga dynasty, pp. 17, 81; P., founder of Śunga dynasty, ref. to, in Puruṣās, p. 111; P., (Pāṇini III. 2. 123), p. 108; P., under Pāṇini, p. 121 and fn1; P., Patañjali lived in the reign of, pp. 109, 111, 116, 122, 130; P., acc. to Viśu and Vāyu Puruṣās, name of dynasty, acc. to former a Bālhika dynasty, p. 111 fn3; P., ref. to, in Bāhavastu as name of individual, ibid; P., wrong view of Prof. Lassen about, ibid; P., ref. to, in Mālavikāgnikāmitra, ibid; P., Commander-in-Chief of Bṛhadatta, last Maurya king, p. 124; P., king about 178 B. C. to 142 B. C, p. 113; P., supposed, one of 4th or 5th cen. p. 182; P., father of Agnimitra and grandfather of Vasumitra, p. 182; P. reigned in 2nd cen. B.C. ibid; P., conquered by Skanda-gupta, p. 184.
Puṣpamitra-sabhā (Pāṇini I. I. 68.), p. 182.
Puṣyadharman, as successor of Bṛhadatta, acc. to Buddhist Aśoka Avadāna, p. 113 fn1.

Puṣyamitra, pp. 115, 180, 181 and fn1, 182, 205, 206; P., or Puṣpamitra, p. 17; P., represented by Buddhists as their persecutor, his son Agnimitra, ibid.
Puṣyamitras, name of a tribe, p. 41; P., a name of a tribe mentioned in Puruṣās, p. 181 fn1.
Puṣumavisa, p. 277.

Radha, p. 11.
Rāghava, grandfather of Sārūga-dhara, author of Paddhāti, p. 91.
Rāghavabhāṭṭa, his Com. on Nyāya-sāra of Bhāsarvājña, p. 299.
Raghu, p. 221.
Raghunātha-bhāṭṭa Śiromaṇi, author of Didhāti, p. 317.
Raghuvarṇa, work of Kālidāsa, p. 60; R., IV. 52, 53, 58, p. 238.
Rājaliṅkikāras (royal scribes), p. 37.
Rajas, pp. 66, 69.
Rājaśekhara, Subandhu mentioned in a Sloka attributed to, p. 87; R., Pāṇini spoken of as author of Jámbuvaritjaya, in a verse of, p. 164.
Rājatarangini, pp. 116, 118, 134, 136, 138 and fn1, 166 and fn1, 365, 366, 368, 376; R., Kaniṣṭha, Haviṣka, and Vāsudeva or Vāsuṣka, belonging to Turuṣka race, noticed in, p. 33; R., reference to Vikramāditya Śakāri in, p. 50; R., ref. to Nāgarjuna in, p. 117; R., calls Kaniṣṭha etc. as Turuṣkas, p. 178; Rajvade, Prof., his paper on Bhagarvadgītā, p. 423.
Rajavārttika, p. 299.
Rajputana, Chronicles of Kings of, pp. 1, 11, 23.
Rājub (v) ula, p. 22.
Rājuvula, his coins, p. 23.
Rakhumai, alluded to, often, in Hari-pātha of Jnānesvara, p. 324.
Rākṣasas (Buddhists troubling Brahmānas in Daṇḍakāranya), p. 386; R.s, p. 387.


Rāmānanda, author of Ratnaprabhā, p. 300.

Rāmānuja, p. 77 fn2, 287, 289, 291, 293, 294, 409, 419; doctrines of his school summarised in a work entitled Arthapaṇcakas, p. 284; R., Nārāyaṇiya section older than, p. 288; his system is the same as the Pāṇcarātra or Bhāgavata, p. 290; his doctrine of the reality of God, p. 409.

Rāmapāṇḍita, Rāma called so, in Daśaratha Jātaka, p. 406.

Rāmatīrtha, place near Sopara, p. 255.

Rāmāyana, pp. 217, 348, 365, 368-371, 395, 400, 406, 420, 424, 471; R., ref. to, in Bāṇa's Kadambarī, p. 86; R., supposed by some to represent struggles between Brahmānas of India, and Buddhists of Ceylon, p. 386; R., state of society pictured in, is archaic, p. 387; R., no mention of Maratha town in, ibid.; R., characters in, not mentioned in Mahābhāṣya, p. 406; R., a thorough historical work, p. 467; R., Bāla-kāṇḍa of, edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 525.

Rambler, edited by Johnson, p. 130.

Rāmān, P. 11.

Rādnade, Justice, M. G., rejoinder to, pp. 453ff.

Rāṅgā-Rāmānuja, p. 328.

Rapson, Prof., p. 519.

Rasagahādharā, p. 318.

Rāṣṭikas, p. 12.

Rāṣṭrakūṭa race, p. 528.

Rāṣṭrakūṭas, p. 521.

Rathhaus or Townhall in Vienna, p. 345.

Ratnāgiri, pp. 230, 528.

Ratnaprabhā of Rāmānanda, p. 300.

Raukuta, Tsaukuta same as, acc. to Hwān Thsang, p. 104.

Rāvi or Hydractes crossed by Alexander, p. 105; R., Sāṅgala to the east of, and Sākala to the West of, p. 162.

Reay, Lord, Chancellor of Bombay University and Governor of Bombay, p. 427.

Revakānta, Atharvavedins found in, p. 229.


Ṛgvedi, Vaidika, p. 225.

Ṛgvedins, pp. 224, 228, 229.

Ṛksoda, name of mountain, Archosia, Arkhoj or Rokhoj derived from the name of, p. 104.

Ṛks, p. 313; Ṛs in Ṛgveda, some, found in other Vedas, p. 398.

Ṛksaṁhitā, pp. 6, 94, 423; Ṛs, meaning of the word in, p. 94.

Ṛk-verse, p. 227.
Rock Edicts, their contents, p. 15.
Rokhaj (or Arkhoj) Archoisia called as, by Arab Geographers, p. 104.
Rokhoj (Archoisia, Arkhoj) derived from the name of mountain Rikšoda, p. 104.
Romaka (siddhānta), p. 57.
Roman Geographers, p. 103.
Romans, p. 466.
Rost, Dr., sometime Librarian, India Office, p. 334; R., p. 340; R. of India Office, present at Vienna Congress, p. 341; R., Ludwig, Jacobi assembled at Vienna compared to Ṛṣis assembled at Janaka’s Mithilā, in author’s Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.
Rotb, Dr., pp. 169, 188, 343, 397; R., one of the two authors of Sanskrit Dictionary, p. 130; R. of Tübingen, President of Aryan Section at Vienna Congress attended by author, p. 341; R. and Weber, compared to Yājñavalkya in author’s Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347; R., Rgyveda regarded as Indo-Germanic work by him and other European scholars, p. 396; his curious phenomenon in the omission of termination of a case, pp. 397, 398; his edition of Nirukta, p. 498fn1.
Ṛṣis, pp. 7, 55, 287, 304, 320, 346, 347, 371, 399, 409, 411, 418, 420; R.s, assembled at Janaka’s Mithilā, Rost Ludwig, Jacobi, assembled at Vienna, compared to, in author’s Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.
Ṛṭavaḥ, p. 486.
Rudra (Tamas), p. 69.
Rudra god, pp. 38, 412.
Rudrabhūti, p. 24.
Rudradāman, pp. 25, 27, 29, 516; R. (a Mahākṣatrapa), p. 24; R. at war with Śatakarnī (the lord of the Deccan), ibid; his minister Suvīśkha, ibid; R. son of Jayadāman (Mk.), p. 25; his Sanskrit inscription at Girnar, p. 61; R. grandson of Čaṭana, p. 514; R. father-in-law of Puḷumūṣya, acc. to Smith, p. 515; R. Śatakarnī (or Yajña Śri Śatakarnī) subdued by, p. 517.
Rudrdeva, p. 39.
Rudrasena (Mk. and K.) pp. 25, 27; R. (Mk. and K.) son of Rudrasiṃha, grandson of Rudradāman, grandson of the son of Jayadāman, and great-grandson of the son of Čaṭana, p. 25; his genealogy, ibid; R., son, of Viṛdāman (Mk.), p. 26.
Ṛṣa, one of the five Skandhas, p. 8 fn1.
Ṛṇāṇa, p. 11; Ṛ., edict of, p. 13.
Ruskin, referred to, as pessimist by Justice Ranade, p. 453; R. p. 454.
Śaba Virasena, Minister of Candra-gupta II, and native of Pātaliputra, p. 40.
Sabarasvāmin, a great Mīmāṁsaka, author of Mīmāṁsābhāṣya, pp. 58, 65, 293, 319.
Śabaras, name Dasyus applied to, p. 95 fn1.
Śabdānusāsanaśāstra, p. 140.
Śabdavidyā, p. 163.
Sabdentukhara of Nāgojibhatta, p. 316.
Sabrae or Sambrae tribe, met with, by Alexandar, same as Skr. Samvāgri, acc. to General Cunningham, p. 106; S., probably Śaubhreyas, p. 107.
Śādhāraṇa, p. 503.
Sāgala, (Śākala) in Milindapañho, a Pali Buddhist work, p. 162.
Sagala, mentioned by Ptolemy (i.e. Śākala and not Śānkala), p. 162.
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Sāgar dst., inscription in, pp. 40, 41.
Sagara, his sons burnt by Kapila, p. 64.
Sāh coins, p. 279; S., or Satrap dynasty, p. 280.
Sāhs, overthrown by Gautamiputra, p. 279; S.s., final date of, 250 (i.e. Śaka 328), p. 281; S.s, p. 282.
Sahadeva, referred to, by Patañjali, p. 83.
Sahasaram, edict of, p. 13.
Sahasrām, p. 11.
Sainhhalakas, p. 40.
Śaiva-Āgamas, p. 412; Ś. faith, p. 88.
Śaivas, system of Kaśmir, p. 409.
Śaka Mana Boddo—Śākyya Muni Buddha (Greek name on Coins), p. 34.
Śaka, Candragupta, the Maurya referred to, in an inscription in the year 72 (i.e. A. D. 150) of Ś. era, p. 5; Ś., p. 29; Ś. coinage, an imitation of Greco-Bactrian or Greco-Indian coinage, p. 20; Ś. dynasty, p. 520; Ś. era, pp. 22, 31, 32, 36, 40, 85, 89, 282, 325, 326; Ś., Kaniska believed to be founder of, pp. 35, 167; Ś. in A. D. 78, p. 280; Ś., founded by great King of Śaka or Scythian race, p. 389; Ś. Kings, pp. 21, 516; Ś. power, foundation of, in 1st century B.C., p. 22; Ś. race, pp. 293; Ś or Scythian race, p. 389; Ś. tribes, p. 183.
Śakas, pp. 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 27, 28, 32, 33, 38, 48, 50, 53, 54, 55, 376, 404, 413, 514, 517, 518; Ś.s, imperial, p. 28; Ś.s beaten by Gotamiputra Śtakarni, p. 30; Ś.s or Satraps driven from Mahārāṣṭra, between 134 and 132 A. D., p. 31; Ś.s, (i.e. Satraps of Mālwā), p. 49; Ś.s, Indo-Scythians were called as, in Rājasthānī, p. 178.
Śakabūpakāla, p. 389.
Śakakāla, p. 389.
Śākala, Menander of, (M. same as Milinda, the Greek king), p. 8; Ś., in Panjab, capital of Yavana king, Menander, p. 18; Ś., p. 20; Ś. (i.e. Śāngala) name of town captured by Alexander, p. 105; Ś. and Śāngala as different places, ibid; Ś., capital of Madras, p. 105f; Ś. to the west of Rāvi, p. 162; Ś., capital of Madras acc. to Mahābāhrata, ibid; Ś., old city rebuilt by Euthydemia of Indo-Bactrian king, ibid; Ś., in Punjab, Milinda king ruling at, p. 388.
Śākala, pp. 308, 314, 312, S., Kielhorn compared to, in author's Verses sung at Vienna congress, p. 347; Ś., teacher of one of the two different recensions of Śṛgveda, p. 371.
Śākala Śākhā, pp. 308, 313, 314, 372; Ś. Sāhhitā, pp. 309, 310, 313, 314.
Śākulas, pp. 308, 309, 311, 313, 314.
Śākalya, author of Pada text of Śṛgveda, pp. 371, 372.
Śantrāpakāla, p. 359.
Śakārī (enemy of Śakas), i.e., Vikramāditya (Candragupta II, 400 A.D.), pp. 49, 60, 326, 520.
Śakasena, p. 31.
Śākayavanam, an instance of aggregate Dvandva, p. 18.
Śakendrapākāla, p. 389.
Śākṣeta or Ayodhya, pp. 18, 42, 52, 56, 108, 114, 116–118, 122, 123, 131, 174, 177, 178, 182, 184; Ś. (Śrāvaṇī) or Ayodhya, province of Gupās, p. 51; Ś., Patañjali lived to north-west of, p. 128; Śākṣeta, siege of, by Yavana, before 85 B. C., pp. 173, 178; Ś., conquered by Yavana, acc. to Gārgī Sāhhitā, ibid.
Śākṣī of Veda, p. 223.
Śākhās (schools) of Brahmans, pp 53, 54, 372.
Śakti, pp. 285, 288.
Śakuntalā, pp. 80, 120, 164, 371, 374.
Śākya clan, Buddha, a Ksatriya of, p. 292.
Śākyamuni, born in Lumbini grove, p. 13; his relics, p. 23; Ś., p. 36.
Salātura, Pāṇini referred to, as native of, in copperplate grant of Dharasena IV, p. 103; hence P., called Salaturiya, p. 163.

Sālaturiya (native of Salātura), Pāṇini referred to as, in copperplate grant of Dharasena IV, p. 103; S. (Pāṇini) a native of Salātura, p. 163.

Salece (Greek name on Coins), p. 34.

Salivāhana, pp. 165, 389, 390; S. Saka known up to 13th century as ‘the era of the Saka King of Kings’ and ‘the era of the coronation of the Saka King’ p. 21; S. or Sātavāhana dynasty followed Saka Kings, p. 325; S. Saka (two names of the dynasties combined), ibid; S., pp. 389, 390.

Salva, p. 390.

Sāmānīya, pp. 152, 153.

Samata, p. 39.

Sama-Samhitā, p. 224 and fn 1.

Śāmaveda, pp. 229, 418.

Śāmavedis, p. 229.

Śāmas, p. 229.

Sambandha (relation), p. 287.

Śāmbhu, dedication of a cave to, (on inscription), p. 43.

Śambodhi, i.e. Perfect Knowledge, Aśoka set out for, p. 13.

Śambraçae or Sābraçae tribe met with by Alexander, same as Skr. Samvāgrī, acc. to General Cunningham, p. 106.

Śaṁḍhī rules, p. 227.

Śaṁḍhyā, p. 314.

Śaṁḍhyā-Vandana, time of, pp. 223, 224; S., p. 313.

Śaṁgha (Assembly), pp. 10, 14.

Śaṁghadānam, son of Rudrasirha (Mk.), p. 26.

Śaṁhitā, pp. 225, 228, 308, 398, 495; S., defined, p. 227; S., defined by Pāṇini, as paraḥ saṁnikarṣah (I. 4. 109), p. 498.

Śaṁhitās, p. 225.

Śaṁjñā, one of the five Skandhas, p. 8 fn 1; S., p. 214; S., (technical term), pp. 497, 501.


Śaṁjñāna (i.e. Śaṁjñā), p. 505.

Śaṁjñāna hymn of Rgveda, pp. 312–314.

Śaṁkaraśārya (or Śaṁkara), pp. 59, 63 fn 3, 64, 65 fn 1, 77, 289, 293, 294, 328, 337, 338, 405, 409; his Vedānta Bhāṣya, pp. 62, 65, 73 fn 1, 75 fn 1, 150, 300; Ś., date of, 9th century, pp. 88, 89; S., Nārāyanīya section older than, p. 288; his Bhāṣya (Vāyu Purāṇa quoted in), p. 56; his com. on Bhagavadgītā (episode of Mbb.), p. 88; Ś., mentioned in Koṅgā-Deśa-Carita, a Tamil Chronicle in the Mackenzie Collection, ibid; his system followed by Prof. Deussen, p. 324; Ś., clue to his theory of world-illusion be found in Nihilism of Buddhist Mahāyāna school, p. 325.

Śaṁkara-Vijaya of Mādhava, p. 92.


Śāṁkhyas, pp. 62, 64, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 77; S.s, Buddhists preceded by, p. 76.

Śāṁkhyā-Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, p. 59.

Śāṁkhyā Pravacana, (a collection of Śūtras) ascribed to Kapila, p. 64;
S., Vijñāna Bhikṣu's bhāṣya on, p. 65.
Sāṅkhya Sāra quoted, pp. 68 fn1, 299 fn3.
Sāṅkhya-tattvakaumudi, p. 299.
Sāṅkhya-yoga, p. 287.
Sāmpadāyavīdics (persons acquainted with tradition), p. 396.
Sampatī (present time), pp. 150, 156.
Saṃsāra (succession of lives and deaths), p. 284.
Saṃskāra, one of the five Skandhas, pp. 8 fn1, 462.
Samudragupta, pp. 43, 49, 206, 520; S., son of Cangragupta I, p. 39; S., great grandfather of Skanda-gupta, p. 183.
Sānavāgri, Sambrācā or Sabracā same as, acc. to General Cunningham, p. 106.
Sāvat Era (57 B.C.), Vikramāditya founder of, p. 374.
Sanabares (Indo-Parthian king), p. 31.
Sanakānīkas, tribes, p. 39.
Sanasiddhā, his wife Harisvāminī, p. 46.
Sānci, pp. 35, 46; S., inscription at, pp. 29, 40; S., remains of Śūpas at, p. 37.
Sāndilya, pp. 289, 290.
Sandracottas, same as Candragupta (Candagutta), ambassador Megasthenes sent to the court of, by Salukos, acc. to Greek writers, p. 326.
Sandrakottas, a King of Pātaliputra, p. 3.
Sandrakotus, i.e. Candragupta, p. 206.
Saṅgā or Bandha, p. 70.
Saṅgala (Skr. Sāṅkala) name of town captured by Alexander, p. 105; S. and Sāṅkala as different places, ibid; S. i.e. Saṅkala (Pāṇini, IV. 2. 75), p. 106; S., p. 163.
Saṅgāla, identified with Sāṅkala of Pāṇini, IV. 2. 75, destroyed by Alexander the Great, p. 162; S., to the east of Ṛavī, ibid.
Saṅgha, p. 47.

Sāṅkala, and Saṅgala identified, p. 162.
Sāṅkalādi group, Pāṇini IV. 2.75, p. 106.
Sāṅkha, p. 328.
Sanskrit, as Vernacular of Indian Aryans (author's view), p. 337.
Sanskrit passages quoted from Bene- res edition of Mahābhāṣya, pp. 136, 137; Skr. p. Ṛnom Kātyāyana quoted, p. 211 fn1; Skr. p.s from Patañjali and Kātyāta quoted, p. 216 fn1; Skr. p.s from Āśvalā- yana etc. quoted, p. 224 fn1.
Śānti (or "parvan") book of Mahā- bāhārata, pp. 9, 63, 69 fn2, 72 fn2, 287; S., Nārāyaṇiya section at the end of, p. 405.
Sarpa-hautra, pp. 490-492.
Sarpa-hautra prayoga, pp. 489, 493.
Saptāsāti, by Hāla, p. 45.
Sapta Sindhava i.e. seven rivers of the Vedas, p. 104.
Sarasvatī (same as Zend Haraqaiti i.e. Archotis river) one of the Sapta Sindhus, p. 104; S., p. 133.
Sarasvatīkāṭhībārāṇa, a Work of Bhoja on Rhetorics, Rājaśekha- ra's Works quoted in, p. 87; S., p. 90.
Sāriraka Śūtras of Bādarāyana, principal work of Vedānta, p. 409.
Sāṅgadharas, pp. 87, fn2, 92; S., his Padhhati; S., grandson of Rāghava, p. 91; his Padhhati edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 525.
Sārūgin. image of (on inscription), p. 45.
Sarpasatra or serpent-sacrifice, performed by Janamejaya at Harihara at the junction of Tuhgabhadrā and Harīḍā, p. 92f; S., p. 120.
Sarvaḍamanā or Bharata, son of Dus[y]anta and Sakuntalā, p. 79.
Sarvarāšana Saṅgregha, work of Mādhava, pp. 64, 73 fn1-3, 74 fn3, 76 fn1, 91 fn1-2; S., ref. to Mahābāhārata in, pp. 90, 91.
Sarvānukrama of Kātyāyana, pp. 304, 305, 309, 314.
Selby, Principal, of the Deccan College, p. 454.
Selukos, General of Alexander the Great. p. 3; S., p. 5; S., ambassador Magasthenes sent by, to the Court of Sandracotta (Candagutta i.e. Candragupta Maurya), p. 326.

Semitic race, p. 390.
Senart, Monsieur, pp. 12, fn1, 13 fn1, 2, 340.

Senses, five, viz, seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and hearing, p. 67.
Seña, pp. 152, 153.
Setthis or Seths p. 37.

Shahbazgarhi in Afghanistan, Aśoka Inscriptions at, p. 10; S., p. 11.
Shakespeare, p. 459.

Shaonano Shaho Kanheski Kushano Shaonano Shao Havishki Kushano (Turkish), p. 34.
Sheldonian Theatre, p. 336.
Sheppard, Mr., Revenue Commissioner, Northern Division in the steamer Si am by which author returned from Vienna to India, p. 359.

Simla, Conference at, in 1911, to favour the idea of opening Research Institutes at presidency-towns, p. 319.
Simuka, the founder of Śātavāhana family, p. 30. S., of Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty, p. 514; S., (Sindhuka, Sipraka etc.) a Śātavāhana prince, p. 515.
Sindhu or Indus, pp. 20, 182.
Sindhuka (Simuka, Sipraka etc.) p. 515.
Sīṅghapā, p. 298.
Sipraka (Simuka, Sindhuka etc.) p. 515.

Siri Polemeos i.e. Połumāyi, p. 515.
Sīṣṭa, (educated man), pp. 443, 444.

Śīṣupālavadha of Māgha based on Mbh. story, p. 89; S., quoted in Paddhati of Sāṅgavāhana, p. 92.
Sītā, pp. 370, 406, 421; her ravishment same as that of Helen (wrong analogy), p. 386; S. represented as sister of Rāma (Rāmapadīta) and Laksmana in Daśaratha Jātaka; still she is represented as Chief Queen, pp. 406, 407.
Śīva, pp. 34, 38, 56, 190, 191, 194–196, 198, 374, 407, 411, 412, 419; S. (Maheśvara) temple of, p. 45; S., worship of, ibid; S., figure of, on coins p. 48; his bow same as that of Ulysses (wrong analogy), p. 386.
Śivāha, pp. 125, 126, 154–156, 170–172, 193, 198, 204.
Śivabhāga, a sect of, p. 328.
Śivabhūti (83 A.C.) founder of Digambara sect of Saivas, p. 375.
Śivakaḥ, pp. 170, 171.

Śivakandavarman, inscriptions of, a ruler of Kāśi, p. 38.
Śiwalk, p. 11.

Skandab, pp. 125, 126, 154–156, 170–172, 193, 198, 204.
Skandakaḥ, pp. 170, 171.

Skandhas, five, viz, Rūpa, Vijñāna, Vedanā, Saṁjñā, Saṁśkāra, (these constitute human being), p. 8 fn1.

Skando (Greek name on coins), p. 34.
Ślokāvārtika of Kumārtīla, p. 58 fn2.
Smith, Ptolemy's information set aside by, 515.
General Index

Smṛti, remembrance, of what a man's true condition is, p. 9, fn.1.

Smṛtis (or Metrical Law Books) pp. 52, 53, 303, 403, 409, 420; S.s, some of, based on Dharma Śūtras, p. 408.

Śrīvibhrama or Śrīvibhrāṃśa (Bhagavadgītā ii. 63, XV. 15, and XVIII. 73), p. 9 fnl.

Śoḍāsa, son of Rajub(v)ula, p. 22; his āte is 72 (i.e. 150 A.D.), p. 23; Ś., 27.


Śoṇa, another name of Hiranyabāḥa (i.e. the Erannoboas), p. 5; Ś., Paṭāliputra situated on the banks of, acc. to Patañjali, ibid.; p. 111 fn2.

Śorparaga i.e. Supara near Bassein p. 254.

Śorvata, Pa-le-fa-to transcribed as, by General Cunningham, p. 106.

Spalahores, pp. 21, 27; S., brother of Vonones, p. 28.

Spalgadames, son of Spalahores, pp. 21, 27, 519; S., subordinate to Vonones and Spalirises, p. 28.

Spalirises, pp. 21, 519; S., successor and brother of Vonones, p. 28.

Spence Hardy, p. 259.

Spooner, Dr., Archaeological Superintendent, Bengal Circle, p. 98.

Śraddha, p. 323.

Śrāddha Ceremony, p. 323.

Śramaṇas, p. 10; S.s or holy reclusees, p. 15; S.s or ascetics of all sorts, p. 16.

Śrānta Śūtras, pp. 322, 420; S.s Purāṇas referred to in, p. 55; S.s written before Pāṇini, p. 81.

Śrāvaṇi Ceremony (i.e. Upākaraṇa), p. 305.

Śrāvasti (or Sāketa), pp. 51, 52.

Śri, p. 249.

Śrīhara, p. 63 fn3; his Kandali, p. 299.

Śrī-Harṣa, patron of Bāṇa, pp. 2, 55.

Śrī-Saila on Kṛṣṇa, p. 233.

Śrūtriyas (Srautūs), pp. 230, 495.

Śruṭi, pp. 66, 76, 287, 289; Ś., no basis of, for Śāṅkhyā philosophy acc. to Śāṅkaraśārya, p. 64.

Stein, Dr., of Buda-Pest, present at Vienna Congress, p. 342; S., the Hungarian, read his paper in English at Vienna Congress, ibid.

Stevenson, Dr., pp. 239, 252, 254, 256, 257, 261, 263, 265, 267, 272, 273; S., copies of Lt. Brett used by, for his translation of Nasik Cave Inscriptions, p. 231.

Strabo, p. 18; S., Greek historian, p. 177.

Strato, p. 20.


Śūpas (hemispherical structures), p. 36; (or Caityas), ibid.; S.s, p. 37.

Subandhu, pp. 58, 59; S., author of Vāsavatāt, pp. 47, 343, 375; S., mentioned in a Śloka attributed to Rājaśekhara, p. 87; his work Vāsavatāt mentioned in Harṣacarita ibid; S. (between 550 and 650 A.C.), p. 376.

Subhadrā, ref. to, in Mṛcchkaṭākī, p. 88.

Subhāṣitaratnasāmōdoha, work of Amita-gati, a Digambara Jaina, p. 301.

Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhadeva, edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 525.

Sudarṣana lake, pp. 24, 41.

Sūdās prince, p. 422.

Sūdras, pp. 18, 53, 54.

Sūdrakas, of Pūrāṇas, Oxydrakse tribe identified with, by Prof. Wilson, p. 106.

Sūdrāṇām etc., śūtra of Patañjali, under Pāṇini, II. 4.10, p. 18.

Suez Canal, p. 353.

Sūkara (boar), p. 301.

Sukhadwala, Mr., Institute erected by, in memory of K.R. Kama, p. 330.

Sukra of Pūṣan in Rgveda, VI. 58.1, p. 321.
Sūksma Sarīra formed by Buddhī, Ahaṁkāra, Manas, organs of sense and action, and five subtle elements (in all 18), p. 68.

Sūktas of Rgveda (1-1017), p. 304; S.s, of Rgveda, some, found in other Vedas, p. 398; S.s in Vedas, p. 401.

Sulabha Maitreyi, p. 371, Sumantu, p. 418.

Sun, worship of, p. 45; S., called Asura-han, p. 94.

Sung-yun, a Chinese pilgrim, p. 3.

Sūngā dynasty, pp. 51, 119, 182, 206, 513; S., following Mauryas, p. 111.

Sūngas, pp. 17, 518.

Supara, ref. to, in Mahābhārata, p. 387.

Sūrāṣṭra, pp. 24, 31, 38, 134; S., (same as Kathāwād) p. 23; S., Parṇa-datta, governor of, p. 44; S., Valabhi dynasty in, p. 111 fn 3.

Sūrēśvara, pupil of Sarhkaracarya, p. 59.

Śūris, p. 287.


Sutlej, p. 104.

Sūtraś (prose aphorisms), p. 52; S.s, pp. 53, 54, 323, 371, 409, 410, 418, 419, 420, 494; S.s of Kaṇāḍa, p. 224 and fn1; S.s, mention of Purāṇas in some of the, p. 407.

Suvarṇakārās, p. 37.

Suvāṣṭu, name of river (modern Swat), branch of Kabul river (Pāṇini IV. 2.77), p. 104.

Suvīṣākhā, a Pahlava, son of Kulaipā, minister to Rudradāman, p. 24.

Śvāhā, p. 493.

Śvāhākṛti, p. 493.

Śvāmin, title of a Bhāṣyakāra, p. 55.

Śvāmi-Mahāśaṇa, temple of, p. 43.

Śvāmi-(Rudra?) sena, son of Śvāmi-Sīhāsena (Mk.), p. 26.

Śvāmi Rudra Sāh, pp. 280, 281.


Śvāmi-Sinhasena, sister's son of Śvāmi-Rudrasena (Mk.), p. 26.


Śvasvarūpa-virodhin p. 286.

Śvetāmbara Jainas, claim to represent the original Jainism, p. 375.

Śvetāvatara Upaniṣad, pp. 62 fn1, 64 fn1, 328; S., Kapila referred to, in, p. 64.

Śviṣṭakṛt, p. 308.

Swaṭ, same as Suvāṣṭu river of Pāṇini IV. 2.77, branch of Kabul river, p. 104.

Śyāma, Antiochus, king of, called Yoṇarāja, by Asoka, pp. 178, 388.

Tad, pp. 149, 155.

Taddhita affixes, p. 124.

Tagore Law Lecturers, p. 408.

Tailang Vaidika praising princes of Gaikwad and Travancore, p. 230.

Tailāṅga Brāhmaṇa wandering for Dakṣiṇā, p. 223.

Tailāṅgaṇa, study of Veda in, p. 223.

Taittirīya identified with Tartar (wrongly traced), p. 337.

Taittirīya Prātiśākhyā, p. 228.

Taittirīya Śākha, p. 378.

Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Mbh. quoted in, by Śāyaṇa, p. 90.

Taittirīyas, p. 228; T.s, Śākhā of, p. 372.

Takh-i-Bahi, to the North-east of Peshwar, inscription of Gondophares discovered at, p. 31; T., p. 32.

Takkhubalī, p. 295.

Takṣaśālī, pp. 23, 517; T., or Taxila, p. 518.

Takṣaśālīdī group, (Pāṇini IV. 3.93), p. 106.

Tamās, pp. 66, 67, 69.

Tambapanī, pp. 11, 12.

Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, p. 482.
Tangyes, his engine factory at Birmingham, visited by the author, p. 339.

Tantryuktis, p. 329.

Tapi, river, p. 254.

Tara, p. 370.

Tārāpiḍā, King of Ujjayinī, (character in Kādambīrī of Bāṇa), p. 86.

Tattar identified with Tattirīya (wrongly traced), p. 377.

Tartary, p. 378.

Tattva, (one entity), p. 287.

Tattvas or principles of Sāṁkhya system 25 in number viz. Prakṛti or Pradāhāna, Mahat-tattva (or Buddhi), Ahamkāra, five senses, five organs of action, Manas, five subtle elements, five objects of the senses (or gross elements) and Puruṣa, pp. 66, 67.

Tejas, pp. 67, 285, 288.

Temple, Captain, p. 342; T., account of Dictionaries of Hindustani Proverbs given by, at Vienna Congress, p. 344.

Tennyson, two lines from his poem Locksley Hall, quoted, p. 354.


Teutons, p. 390.

Thana dist., inscriptions in, p. 517.

Theophillus, p. 19.

Thibaut, Dr., quoted, p. 57 and fn1; 409.

Thomas, St., is said to have visited Gondophonea, p. 32.

Thomas, Mr., Edward, a Bengal civilian devoted to study of Indian antiquities, p. 335.

Thucydides, p. 420.

Tī (term), pp. 500, 501, 505, 506, 508, 509.

Tiastenes, same as Caṣṭana, acc. to Ptolemy, p. 24; T., ruling at Ujjayinī, p. 515.

Tiglath-pileser, p. 97.

Tigris, p. 97.

Timira, disease, p. 73.

Tirthadāsin, seer of saving truth, Patañjali called, so by Bhartrihari, p. 184.

Tiru Vikrama, king of Chera Country converted by Saṅkarācārya from Jainism to Śaiva faith, p. 88; T. I, II, pp. 88, 89.

Tod, Col., date of Hammira acc. to, p. 91.

Tom, p. 176.

Tonakiatsekia, mentioned by Hiuen Thsang as name of a country, Chinese equivalent of Dhana-katka, p. 276.

Toramāṇa, prince (of Hūpa race), pp. 42, 521.

Toxōtēs (Gr.) i.e. Taurōs (Gr.) name of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.

Taurōs (Gr.) i.e. Tāvuru name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Tāvuru i.e. Taurōs (Gr.) name of a Zodiac sign, p. 387.

Tāvura, pp. 21–23; T. or Takṣaśilā, p. 518.

Tējamasā (i.e. Greek Epiphanous) Tāḍāraṣa (tejamasā i.e., brilliant), p. 20.

Tējas, pp. 67, 285, 288.

Tangyes, his engine factory at Birmingham, visited by the author, p. 339.
Traikūṭakas, dynasty of, ruled in Mahārāṣṭra and Gujrat, p. 414.

Trasarenu, p. 69.

Travancore, Rāja of, liberal patron of Veda-reciters, p. 230.

Trinity, Purāṇic, p. 69.

Trirāṣmī (name of a hill), pp. 252 f., 272, 273, 282.

Tṛṣūtu race, p. 422.

Tsaukuta, same as Raukuta, acc. to Hwan Thsang, p. 104.

Tulsidas, observations made by Grierson at Vienna Congress on, p. 342.

Tuṅgabhadra, Harihara at the junction of, and Harida, p. 93.


Turanian race, p. 389.

Turks, p. 33.

Turkish Kings, p. 35.

Turkish language of some coins, p. 34.

Turkomans of Central Asia settled in Western part of India, acc. to Jackson, p. 528.

Turuṣka race, Kaniṣka, Haviṣka and Vāsuveda or Vasuṣka of Kuśana dynasty belonging to, acc. to Rājatarāṅgini, p. 33; T., generic name for Indo-Scythic Kings, ref. to, in Viśvakarma, p. 118; T. or Indo-Scythian princes, Kaniska, Huska and Juśka, p. 167.

Turuṣka or Scythian kings, p. 367.

Turuskas, p. 178.

Tyndall, a scientist, influenced by Carlyle, p. 454.

Udāṭta, p. 502.

Udayagiri, inscription at, pp. 40, 43, 47.

Udayana, his Kiraṇāvali, p. 299; his com. Tātparyaparipūrṇa on Uḍḍyota, p. 318.

Udayanācārya, p. 10.

Uḍḍāḷaka Āruṇī, pp. 487, 489.

Uḍḍyota, work of Bhaṭṭadvāja, p. 59; U., comp. of Vācaspati on, p. 411; U., of Nāgōjībhāṣṭa, pp. 317, 318.

Udgītar, p. 491.

Ujjain, p. 326.


Ujjayinī Mahākṣatrapas, p. 41.

Ujjayinīpuravarāhāvara title, p. 50.

Ulupī, wife of Arjuna, ref. to, in Kādambarī, p. 86.

Ulysses, his bow, same as that of Siva, (wrong analogy), p. 386.

Umākhelā, queen, p. 239.

Upādi, pp. 146, 507.

Universe, p. 64.

University, the idea of, p. 438.

Unsubstantial, world wrapped up in the, p. 6.

Upādeya (what is to be sought and secured), p. 287.

Upadhā, pp. 498, 499.

Upākaraṇa ceremony, (i.e. Srāvaṇi) pp. 305, 309, 314.

Upanayana, p. 322.

Upanisads, pp. 6, 8, 64, 229, 287, 292, 293, 324, 338, 387, 398-400, 403-405, 409, 410, 420, 423, 471, 477; U.s, Purāṇas referred to in, p. 55; U.s., Sāmkhyya terms in, p. 62; U.s., date of, 6th or 7th century B.C., p. 468.

Upapada compound, p. 231.

Uparkot, p. 23.


Upasarga, p. 496; U. under Pānini I. 4. 59, p. 497.

Upasargas, p. 140.

Upāya (way to God), pp. 284, 287.

Upāyas (ways to God) are Karmayoga, Jñānayoga, Bhaktiyoga, Prapatityoga and Ācāryābhīmānyayoga, p. 285.

Upāyavirodhin, p. 286.

Upendravajra metre, p. 212.

Urdhāsthāna, OrtoSPAN (modern Kabul) derived from, acc. to Prof. Wilson, p. 105.
Usas, Rg. hymns addressed to, pp. 321, 322.
Utgitar, Mr., Mahābhārata Prospects prepared by, p. 424.
Utpati, p. 151.
Uttarā, wife of Abhimanyu ref. to, in Kādambarī, p. 86.
Uttarapatha or Northern India, p. 366.
Uttara Rāma Carita, p. 150; U., p. 217; U., III act of, is pathetic, p. 421.
Uttarārāha, p. 257.
Vācaspati author of Vārtikatātparyājīka, pp. 59, 299, 318, 411.
Vācaspatimīśra, p. 299.
Vajāvā Prāśītheyi, p. 371.
Vadha, p. 209.
Vaidika, a living Vedic Library, p. 226.
Vaidika Brahmanas, p. 346.
Vaidikas, important class of Bhāskaras called, pp. 223, 228–230.
Vaidyaka, p. 328.
Vaijayantī, Bhūtapala, a Seth of, p. 38.
Vairāghya, p. 66.
Vāśampāyana, p. 418.
Vaiśeṣika system, p. 410.
Vaiśeṣikas, p. 69.
Vaiṣṇava character of Mahābhārata, p. 424.
Vaiṣṇavism, rise of, pp. 293, 411.
Vaiśvānara, body of God called, p. 77.
Vaiṣyakaraṇa school, p. 316.
Vaiṣṇaveyaka, will be the only Veda in latter part of Kaliyuga, acc. to Agni Purāṇa, p. 223 and fn1.
Vaijī, p. 12.
Vākovākya, defined as Tarkaśāstra by Saṅkarācārya and Raṅga-Rāmānuja, p. 323.
Vakpatirāja, author of Gaudāvadhā, pp. 368, 375.
Vākypadīya of Bharṭṛhari, pp. 118, 134, 136, 141, 166.
Valabhi, in Kathiawād, under Pāṇini IV. 2.82, p. 103; V., p. 281.
Valabhi dynasty, pp. 111 fn3; V., Copper-plate Grant of, dated, 326, p. 163.
Vālkhiyas, pp. 304, 305.
Vallabha, pp. 77 fn2, 409.
Vallabhadeva his Subhāṣītāvalī, edited by Dr. Peter Peterson, p. 525.
Vālmiki, pp. 387, 393; V. influenced by Homeric ideas (wrong analogy), p. 386.
Vāmana, p. 301.
Vāṃśastra metre, p. 84.
Vanaparva, p. 88.
Vaneh or Wanneh province of Afghanistan (same as Fa-la-nu, acc. to Hwan Thsang and Bamu, acc. to General Cunningham), p. 104.
Vāṇija (Vāṇika), p. 37.
Vāṇika (Vāṇija), p. 37.
Vāpā, p. 493.
Varāha (Boar) incarnation of Viṣṇu, p. 42; V., p. 288.
Varāhamihira (astronomer), pp. 50, 57, 58, 233, 374, 376, 378, 387, 389; V., edition of, by Kern, p. 177; his verse giving Zodiac signs from Greeks, p. 320 fn1; V., Ārya giving twelve names of Zodiac signs given by, p. 387; V., Garga quoted by, p. 388.
Vāraṇā (Pāṇini. IV. 2.82) perhaps Aornos same as, p. 105; V., name of city as well as its people, ibid.
Vāraṇādi group (Pāṇini. IV 2.82), p. 103.
Vāraṇā, p. 500.
Varanas or Baranas the name of a place on right bank of Indus, p. 105.
Vararuci, pp. 374, 376; his Prakṛtaprakāśa, p. 123 fn1.
Vearin, name of Asura, p. 94.
Varhikas (carpenters), p. 37.
Varhamāna, son of Gangeśa, p. 299.
Varṇu (Pāṇini IV. 2.103, IV. 3.93) probably same as Fa-la-nu (province of Afghanistan) of Hwan Thsang, p. 104.
Varṣa, p. 219.
Vartamaṇa, p. 497.
Vārāṭika on Bhāṣya of Śabarasthāmin, p. 58.
Vārīkatāṭparyāṭikā, compiled by Vācaspati, pp. 59, 299, 318.
Varuṇa, Asura epithet applied to, p. 94.
Varuṇa-tree, amulet of, p. 95.
Vāsāna (habit), p. 73.
Vāṣaṭṭikāra, p. 485.
Vāsavadattā, work of Subandhu, pp. 47, 434; V., Tathāgata or Buddha doctrine referred to, in, p. 58; V., edition of, by Dr. Hall, p. 85 fn4; V., a work of Subandhu mentioned in Harṣacarita of Bāṇa, pp. 87, 375; V., of Subandhu, many allusions to Mahābh., in, p. 87.
Vāṣṭī, p. 371, 423.
Vāṣṭīṣṭha Dharma Sutras, p. 408.
Vāṣṭīṣṭha Mahādharma, Dānastuti, hymn 18 of, p. 321; V., p. 422.
Vāṣṭīṣṭhas, p. 422.
Vāṣṭīṣṭhi, pp. 275, 276.
Vāṣṭīṣṭhiputra Sātakarni, his wife represented as daughter of a Mahākṣatrapa in a mutilated inscription at Kanheri, p. 515; V., Catarapāṇa Sātakarni, this name occurs in a Nanaghāt inscription acc. to Bhagwanal Indrajāi, p. 516; V., of Kolhapur coins same as Puḷumāyi ibid; V., p. 517.
Vasubandhu, pp. 52, 58; V., Buddhist patriarch, his pupil Diṇṇāga, p. 51.
Vāsudeva Bhagavat (Kṛṣṇa), pp. 43, 174, 175, 177, 210–214, 285, 289–291, 293, 327, 411; V., (as god) referred to, by Pāṇini in IV. 3.98, p. 82; V., should be first in speaking of V. and Arjuna, p. 213; V., to be taken in his Divine capacity and not a mere Kṛṣṇa, ibid; tendency towards calling V., as ordinary man, acc. to Kielhorn, p. 214; V., passage, IV. III. 98, p. 215; V., spoken of as divine being both by Pāṇini and Patañjali, p. 216; V., founder of theistic system ibid. V., called Sāvata-puṁgava, p. 292.
Vāsudeva, first of Kāṁvāyanas, p. 17; V., (or Bazdeo), p. 29; V., or Vāsuṣka (Kuṣana prince), p. 33; V., name of a king at Sānci, p. 35; V., invocation to, (on inscriptions), p. 38; V., Devabhūti killed by, p. 513.
Vasumitra, grandson of Puṣpamitra, p. 182.
Vāsuṣka p. 29; V., or Vāsudeva (Kuṣana prince), p. 33.
Vasu Uparicara, follower of Śāvatā religion, p. 291.
Vāṭśyāyana, pp. 324, 411; V., or (Pakṣilasvāmin), p. 59; his bhāṣya on Nyāya, pp. 65, 317, 328; V., earliest notice of Kuṭila’s work in Kāmaśāstra of, p. 328; his Kāmandaśāstra; his date 1st A. D., p. 329.
Vaux, Mr., sometime Secretary of Royal Asiatic Society, London, p. 336.
Vāyu (or wind), p. 67.
Vāyu-puṁgava, pp. 42, 283, 346, 407; V., (creation referred to, in), p. 56; V., a ref. to Puṣpamitra as name of some dynasty in, p. 111 fn3.
Veda, pp. 47, 139, 223; V. of Asuras (Asuri Vidya), p. 98.
Veda-reioters, patronised by native princes, p. 229.
their authority denied by Buddhism, p. 10; V.s preceded Sutras, p. 81; V.s, all four, form one whole acc.
to Viṣṇupurāṇa, p. 419.
Vedamūlaka, based on Vedas, p. 184.
Vedanā, one of the five Skandhas, p. 8 fnl.
Vedāṅgas pp. 225, 238.
Vedāntabhāṣya of Rāmānuja, p. 288.
Vedāntakalpataru of Amalānanda pp. 298, 300.
Vedāntakaṇḍa of Hemādri, p. 298.
Vedānta Sūtra, quoted, p. 77 fnl.
Vedāntasāstra, p. 329.
Vedāntasūtra bhāṣya of Śaṅkara-cārya II. 1. 1., 2, 42, p. 288; V. on, I. 4.11, p. 300.
Vedāntasūtras, pp. 289, 338; V., Mbh. and Gītā quoted in Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on, p. 88; V. or an Aupaniṣāda system, pp. 62, 294.
Vedic Āryans, neighbours of Assyrians acc. to Inscription, p. 99; V. culture, p. 99; V. hymns, p. 477; V. Library, a Vaidika is a living, p. 226; V. people, p. 97; V. or Sacrifical religion (Karma-kāṇḍa effectual blow to, at the hands of Aśoka) pp. 16, 49; V. rites, p. 10; V. ritual, p. 10; V. Rēśī, p. 99.
Venice, author's stay at, for three days in October 1886, p. 355.
Venīsamhāra, drama by Bhāṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, based on Mbh. story, p. 89; V., quoted by Kāvyaprakāśa, p. 91; V. quoted in Paddhati of Śrīgadha, p. 92.
Venus, the planet Śukra, p. 321.
Vernacular dialects, p. 45.

Vernaculars, p. 61.
Versailles, p. 339.
Veṣṭāna, p. 227.
Vibhavas, p. 293.
Videhas, Mithilā, Capital of, p. 347.
Vidīśa, pp. 17, 111 fn3, 276, 517.
Vidyā (education), p. 470.
Vienna, pp. 339, 340, 345, 350, 351, 353, 355, 356; V. Congress of Orientalists held at, 1886, p. 332; V., English, German, French and Italian languages only recognised by, p. 342; comparison between Vienna Congress and assemblage of Rēśī at Janaka's Capital Mithilā drawn by author in his Verses sung, at Aryan section of Vienna Congress, p. 347.
Viennese lady, present at Vienna Congress compared to Gārgī Vaca- knāvi in author's Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.
Vihāras, p. 37.
Vijayāditya, p. 85 fn5.
Vijayanagara or Anagundi, p. 80; V., Bukka king of, p. 90.
Vijñāṇa, one of the five Skandhas, p. 8 fnl.
Vijñāṇa Bhikṣu, his bhāṣya on Śaṅkhyā Pravacana, pp. 65, 68.
Vijñāneshvara, p. 408.
Vikalpa (option), p. 310.
Vikalpa (option), p. 310.
Vikrama era, pp. 32, 280-282.
Vikrama King, p. 301.
Vikramāṇikacarita, p. 365.
Vikramāṇikavedacarita, written by Bilhana, its hero ruled over Southern India in 11th and 12th centuries, p. 2.
Vikramādiya, pp. 50, 52, 375, 376; V., Sakārī (enemy of Śakas tradition about, applicable to Candragupta II, p. 49; V., King of Śrīvasti (Sākṣēla) acc. to Chinese authorities p. 51; V., era, p. 325; V., Mālavā-
gaṇa identified with the name of, as Śaka era with that of Śālīva-
vāhana or Śālavāhana, p. 326; V., founder of Śālavat Era, p. 374; V., Candragupta II called so, p. 520.

Vīlāśavatī, Queen of Tarāpāda (Characters in Bāna’s Kādambari), pp. 86, 369.

Vīlāvāyakura, same as Baleucuros of Ptolemy, p. 515; V., Viceroy first of Vāsishthiputra and then of Gotāmi-

Vimalodaysālī, p. 308.

Vinaya, its etymological sense, p. 462.

Vināyaka, Com. of Śāṅkhāyana Ghṛhya Śūtra, p. 306.

Vināyakāsānti, Śūtras on, in Kaṭha Śūtra, p. 53; V., in Yājñavalkya Smṛti, agrees with Śūtras of Kaṭha School, p. 408.

Vincent Smith, his Early History of India (from 3rd Cent. B.C. to 7th Cent. A.D.) reviewed, pp. 511-522.

Viracarita II, p. 150.

Virasena, Commander-in-Chief of Agnimitra, p. 111 fn3; V., (called Ābhira or cowherd), p. 282.

Virātā, ref. to, in Vāsavadattā, p. 87.

Virodhins are Śvasvarūpā, Parasvarūpā, Upāya, Puruṣārthā, and Prāpti, pp. 286, 287.


Visa, p. 12.

Visākha i.e. Bizago (Greek name on coins), p. 34.

Visākha, pp. 188-191, 194, 196, 198.

Visākhabh, pp. 125, 126, 154-156, 170-172, 193, 198, 304.

Visarga, p. 497.

Visēṣa, pp. 152, 153.

Visṇu (god), Bhagavat, pp. 44, 56, 69, 285, 293, 301, 302, 407, 411, 419; his Varāha (Boar) incarnation, p. 43; V., god (on inscriptions), p. 43; V., worship of, p. 45; V., cave temple to, p. 45; his ten forms, p. 301; V., among synonyms of, Kṛṣṇa is mentioned but not Rāma by Amara, p. 406; V., Vāsudeva of Bhāgavata school and of Bhagavadgītā afterwards identified with, p. 411.

Visṇugupta or Cāṇakya, author of Arthaśāstra, acc. to Jacob: Nandas overthrown by, and Candragupta Maurya raised to the throne by, pp. 328, 330.

Visṇu Purāṇa, pp. 16, 42, 56, 407, 419; V. later than Vāyu P., p. 56; V., ref. to Puṣpadama as name of Bāhlika dynasty in, p. 111 fn3; V., edition of Wilson p. 233; (Ch. XXIV) p. 278 fn1; (Ch. XXV), p. 280 fn1; V., ref. to Vyāsa in, p. 418.

Visṇuvardhana, predecessor of Yaśodharman, p. 42.

Visvagūḍarāśa, ref. to Turugka in, p. 118.

Visvamitra p. 371; V., and Vasiṣṭha leaders of Bhārata race and Puro-
hitas of Sudās, p. 422.

Visvakṣena, p. 284.

Visvaṁśa, author of Pañcarāṇa, author of Muktavāli, p. 503.


Visvaṁśha, son of Rudrasena (K and Mk.) p. 26.

Visvāvasu, ref. to, in Mṛcchakaṭika, p. 88.

Vīṭhobā often alluded to, in Haripāthā of Jñāṇesvara, p. 324; V. God, no mention of, in Jñāṇesvari, ibid.

Vonones, pp. 21, 519; V., p. 21; V., coins of, p. 27; V., the first sup-
reme sovereign represented as Mahārāja, p. 28.

Vṛddhabrahma Śaṁhitā, (Pañcarātra-

Vṛddhi, p. 498.

Vṛṣaṇa, first Tirthaṅkara of Jainas, essay on the myth of, by the French Scholar at Vienna Congress, p. 344.

Vṛṣṇis (Yadava tribe), p. 292.

Vun (i.e. Aka) termination (IV. 3,98) pp. 212, 213.
Vuppadevabhaṭṭa, p. 307.
Vyāghrāja, King of Mahākāntara, p. 39.
Vyāhṛtis, p. 489.
Vyākaraṇa, p. 400.
Vyākaraṇa, Patañjali’s bhaṣya on, p. 65.
Vyākaraṇa Sāstrā, p. 316.
Vyākhyāna of Patañjali, p. 141.
Vyākhyāna (speaking about), pp. 140, 141.
Vyāpadesā, pp. 152, 153.
Vyāsā, pp. 85, 393, 395, 418, 419; V., as grandfather, by Niyoja, of Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, p. 418; V., taught Rgveda to Paila, Yajurveda to Vaiśāṃpāyana, Sāmaveda to Jaimini, and Atharvaveda to Sumantu acc. to Viṣṇupurāṇa, ibid; V., in his manifold capacities, pp. 418, 419; V., author of all Purāṇas also, p. 419; V. i.e. expansion or analysis as opposed to Samāsa, i.e., contraction or synthesis, ibid; V., author of Mahābhārata, ibid; V., identification of action (expansion) with the actor: analysis denoting analyser, ibid; Vyāha (manifestation of God), p. 285, V., pp. 286, 289, Vyūhās (forms), p. 288. Vyuptyāṭt-pakṣa, p. 501.

Walter Elliot, p. 277.
Wanne or Vaneh, province of Afghanistan, (same as Fa-la-nu, acc. to Hwan Thsang and Bannu, acc. to General Cunningham), p. 104.
Wassiljew, quoted, pp. 47 fn4, 51 fn3, 52 fn1, 58 fn3.
Weber, Prof., pp. 118, 120, 126, 131–136, 162, 173, 306, 308, 393, 403, 478; his remarks on date of Patañjali, p. 115; W., passage ‘Iha Puspamitram Yajayāmāḥ’ not noticed by, pp. 115, 116; W., name Mādhyanikā misunderstood by, p. 119; W., on date of Patañjali, p. 122; W., Patañjali lived to east of Pātali-putra acc. to, p. 123; W., Kātyāyana as eastern grammarian acc. to, ibid; his letter, p. 123 fn2; his Critique on Dr. Goldstücker, p. 125; W. on Vārtika 2 on III. 2, 111, p. 128; W. on Puspamitra, p. 130; his essay on Rāmāyana, translated by Rev. Boyd, p. 217; W., Vice-President of Aryan Section at Vienna Congress attended by author p. 341; W. and Roth compared to Yājñavalkya in author’s Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347; W. on Zodiac signs, p. 388.
Wema-Kadhphises (Kušāna prince), pp. 33–35, 38, 48, 49 52, 56.
Wema or Hima Kadphises same as Kadphises II, p. 519.
West, Mr., pp. 239–241, 245, 246, 259 fn2, 271, 275; his excellent lithographs followed by author in translating Nasik Cave Inscriptions, pp. 231, 232.
West, Sir Raymond, Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University, p. 427.
Western Mālā, p. 42.
Westminster Abbey, p. 333.
Widow remarriage, p. 303.
Williams, Monier, p. 169; his Dictionary, pp. 187, 188.
Wilson, Professor, Prāktī acc. to him, is material cause of things, p. 69; W., Aornos hill-fort derived from Āvaraṇa (enclosure) acc. to, p. 104; his Ariana Antiqua, p. 104fn1; W., Ortospan (modern Kabul) derived from Urdhasthana acc. to, p. 105; W., Oxydrake tribe identified with Śūdrakas of Purāṇas by, p. 106; his Viṣṇu Purāṇa, pp. 111 fn3, 115 fn2, 3, 233; his Viṣṇupurāṇa, Ch. XXIV, p. 278 fn1; Ch.XXIV, p. 280 fn1; W., p. 348.
Windham, General, victory over, by mutineers at Kalpee, p. 467.
Windsch of Leipzig, present at Vienna Congress, p. 341.
Wordsworth (Poet) quoted, pp. 72, fn1, p. 454.
Wordsworth, Prin., p. 356.

X-rays, allusion to, in the Rgveda, acc. to some, p. 418.

Yad, pp. 148, 154.
Yadu, Sātvat, name of a descendant of, p. 291.
Yadu race, p. 425.
Yajñā, p. 411.
Yajñā-manḍapas, p. 411.
Yajñāśri Sātakarni, pp. 30, 31; Y. later than Puḷumāyi, p. 514; Y., in Sopāra Coin, p. 516; Y., same as Sātakarni subdued by Rudrādāman, p. 517.
Yājñāvalkya, pp. 7, 8, 346, 347, 399, 420; Y., will be Purohitā of Kalki King, p. 222 and fn2; Y., first teacher or founder of White Yajurveda, p. ibid; Y., Weber and Roth compared to, in author's Verses sung at Vienna Congress, p. 347.
Yājñāvalkya Śmrti, pp. 53, 224, and fn1, p. 468; Y., Vināyaka Śānti in, agrees with Sūtras of Kātha School, p. 408.
Yajnik, Javirilal Uniahsankar, p. 332.
Yājñiikas, some of Bhikṣukas called, p. 225.
Yajurveda, pp. 378, 418; Y., Black, pp. 223, 228; Y., followers of, in South India, pp. 222; Y., Citpāvana Brahmaṇas have, as well as Rgveda, ibid; Y., White, predominant in Northern India, p. 223, Y., p. 468; Y., Prātiśākhyas have, as well as Rgveda, ibid; Y.,...
doctrines of, p. 73; Y., Buddhistic works of, p. 409.
Yogåsåras, p. 74.
Yogå King named Antiyoko, pp. 11, 12; Y., in Pali i.e. Milinda reigning at Såkala in Panjab identified with Bactro-Greek monarch Monandros, p. 388.
Yoparåja, Antiochus, King of Syria, called so, by Aåoka, pp. 178, 388.
Yudhiåthiråjñunau, this compound occurring in Patañjali's work in several places, p. 83.

Yule, Colonel Henry, sometime member of India Council and President of the Royal Asiatic Society, p. 335; Y., p. 336.
Yåpa (on inscription), p. 43.
Zeionises (name of Northern Kåtrapa), his coins, pp. 22, 23.
Zend Haraqaiti (i.e. Archotes river) i.e. Skr. Sarasvatå, p. 104.
Zodiac signs, not adopted from Greeks by Hindus acc. to some, p. 320 fn1; Z., twelve signs of, are translation of Greek names, p. 387.
Zoilus, p. 20.
Zoroastrians, p. 49.
Zygåñ (Gr.) i.e. Jåka, name of a Zodiac sign, p. 388.
INDEX II*
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अक्क p. 234.
अक्क P., p. 382.
अक्क Fr., p. 382.
अक्कतच p. 242.
अलिस Skr. आंश H. G. अक्क P. आलि
B. O. अक्क Fr., p. 382.
अनियतफप p. 271.
अक्ष्य p. 256 fn 1.
अन्त p. 144.
अन्त P.: p. 508.
अजकार्थकीय (अवकालकीय, ओकालक्ष्य) p. 246.
अवस्था p. 144.
अवस्था Pr., p. 382.
अव p. 507.
अतो होप:, p. 145.
अन्तय यज्ञदीर्घ, on Pāṇini VIII.
1.15, p. 83 fn 5.
अन्तयसमवद्भत p. 44 fn 1.
अन p. 144, 145.
अन पठठते: नम्नब्र, Sāmkhyasa, p. 68 fn 1.
अन्तनrat p. 144.
अन्तायिक्ष: p. 224 fn 1.
अन सतवेवत:...प्रलात p. 88 fn 3.
अ (आ) आपवार्यतेक (आदिकालकार्थक or
वासानक) p. 246.
अनिवार्यतम (अनिवार्यतम) p. 242
अच्छ: नासित, p. 86 fn 2.
अन्तयसाय p. 410.
अधिव प. 146.
अनामसं (अनामसं) p. 246.
अनिति p. 146.
अनितित p. 145.
अधातप p. 145.
अनुनासिक p. 144.

अनुपात पाराशिष्टयम्, p. 5 fn 1.
अनुपात p. 234.
अन्ततस्यां p. 145.
अन्तर्वचन च...संरणात, Vedānta Bhāṣya
II. 1, 1, p. 64 fn 5.
अपणं...असिष्टत, p. 168 fn 2.
अपणं pp. 191, 194, 195.
अपणय p. 168.
अपरद्विष (अपरद्विषय) p. 246.
अपरस्त p. 234.
अपरिज प. 274.
अपरिच p. 246.
अपरिच (अपरिवर्ध) p. 246.
अपरिथनन Skr. भीजना H. भिजनं M.
रिव्रु G., p. 380.
अपरत्तर Skr. भीतर M.द्वित M., p.379.
अपराध p. 234.
अस्थािा Arp., p. 384.
अस्थािा H., p. 384.
अस्थािा Pr., p. 384.
अस्थािा (अस्थािा) p. 234.
अस्थािा M., p. 146.
अस्थािा Skr. रहस्त H. रहस्त M., p. 379.
अस्थािानिनियम (अस्थािानिनियम, सूति)
निनियम ) p. 246.
अस्तवनवन: साक्तेम, pp. 173, 175.
अस्तवनवन pp. 213 fn 1, 234.
अस्तवनवन p. 238.
अस्तवनवन p. 505.
अस्तवनवन: pp. 504, 505.
अस्तपती p. 234.
अस्तपती p. 234.
अस्तपती p. 75 fn 1.
अस्तपती pp. 506, 507, 509,
अस्तपती p. 234.
अस्तपती p. 361.
अस्तमः p. 361.
अस्तमः (अस्तमः) p. 248.
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अधिक p. 234.
असिन्द्र p. 144.
असिन्द्रवद p. 144.
असि Skr. हाद म. G. B. O. हाद; हाद or हाद H. हाद or हाद P. अटो
Pr., p. 382.

आंबल M., p. 383.
आकोंक: p. 387.
आंस H. G., p. 382.
आंखि B. O., p. 382.
आणितन (आईसेन) p. 247.
आप, p. 146.
आय: pp. 505, 508.
आयादिफ़ क: p. 144
आयालो Pr., p. 383.
आयालक: Skr. आयालो Pr. आयालक.
आयाल H. P. B., p. 383.
आयि p. 144.
आयाल M., p. 384.
आया: Pr., p. 383.
आयालयनशाला p. 307 fn 1.
आयालयनीशाला p. 308 fn 3.

इ p. 146.
इस्स Pr., p. 382.
इस्स Skr. उष्म म. उष्म or उष्म H.
इस्स P. उष्म Pr., p. 382.
इस्स p. 146.
इंदिरास p. 224 fn 1.
इनास: p. 387.
इनस p. 146.
इनानीतन p. 177.
इनानीतनप्रयोक्त: p. 177.
इनानीत्व p. 144.
इनानीत्व p. 272.

इच्छा p. 153.
इछु p. 274.
इच्छा p. 170.
इंस or उष्म H., p. 382.
इंस्तरकणनाम्ना ....कालिकः: p. 60
fn 1.

उच्छन्नेत (उष्म्क्ष) p. 266.
उच्छु Pr., p. 382.
उच्छपन्नी pp. 211 fn 1, 263.
उच्छपन्नो p. 504.
उच्छिस (उच्छिस) p. 270.
उच्छक p. 196.
उच्छेद p. 136.
उच्छैर Skr. उच्छैर M., p. 380.
उच्छिता Skr. उच्छिता Pr., p. 379.
उच्छितार p. 196.
उच्छितप्र: p. 214.
उच्छितप्रा माध्या म. पचे p., p.380.
उच्छितप्रांत, pp. 253, 257, 260, 261, 265.

उ म., p. 383.
उष्म or उष्म H., p. 382.
उतरास (उतरास ) p. 272.
उष्म M., p. 382.

काव्ये पन्नाशा: आम्बलायनी, सांख्या-(शाला) पनी शाकला, बाणकला,
मण्डलका, p. 308 fn 3.

उष्म: p. 224 fn 1.
उष्म p. 469.

इच्छु p. 146.

एकरथ Skr. कठो H., p. 380.
एकरथम्यागादिद्व, p. 507
एता: p. 170.
एतास: p. 170.
एता: p. 170.

एतास pp. 174, 211 fn 1.
एतास: p. 302.
क्रीड़ा (क्रिया) p. 241.
कर्क p. 174.
करटक: Skr. करटक Pr. कर्तका M. (Goan, Mal, and Chit.), p. 384.
कर्ता H., p. 380.
कर्तक Pr., p. 384.
कर्ता M. (Goan, Mal, and Chit.), p. 384.
कर्मद भ. p. 384.
कर्मदों Pr., p. 384.
कर्म (मात्र) p. 265.
कर्ममति p. 274.
कर्मप्रण pp. 258, 260.
कर्म H. कान p. 380
कर्मों सूप, pp. 168, 170.
कर्मणक p. 271.
कर्मधारा p. 261.
कर्मसंय स p. 504.
कर्मसंय स p. 253.
कर्मसंय स p. 268.
कर्मसंय स p. 471.
कर्मसंय स p. 307 fn 1.
कर्मकी p. 301.
कर्म p. 224 fn 1.
कर्म (कर्म Pr.), p. 379.
कर्मविद्वानिशार ऐस अभिप्रदाधिकार कर्मविद्वानिश -
दखौनामिन, p. 47 fn 3.
कर्मकोः p. 361.
कर्ममा or नामा p. 255.
कर्मड St. M. कार्मड Mal. Goan., p. 385
कार्मड Mal. Goan., p. 385.
काम p. 238.
कार्मप्रण pp. 268, 273.
किय या: इयथ, p. 506.
किय: सज्जा, p. 504.
किय म., p. 384.
कीर्तन Pr., p. 384.
कीर्तन H. P., B., p. 384.
कीर्तन H. G. P., p. 381.
कीर्तन M. H., p. 381.
कीर्ति Skr. कीर्ति M. H. कीर्ति H. G. P., p. 381.
कीर्ति p. 234.
कीर्तिस Pr., p. 382.
कीर्तिस Skr. कीर्तिस H. P. कृष्ण G. कृष्ण M.
कीर्तिस Pr., p. 382.
कृष्ण G., p. 382.
कृष्ण p. 221.
कृष्ण: प्राचार्य, पाराभाजा IV 1. 4, p. 83 fn 2.
कर्मी (कर्मी) p. 268
कर्मी p. 387.
कर्मीन p. 387.
कर्मीन p. 271.
कर्मण pp. 258, 259.
कर्मी (कर or कर्मी) p. 271.
कर्मम p. 301.
कर्म म., p. 382.
कर्मण p. 211 fn 1.
कर्मण मात्र, p. 298.
कर्मणमिति p. 234.
कर्मणार p. 265.
कृष्ण p. 169.
के कार्मप p. 263.
के विद्वानि: प्राचार्य, p. 58 fn 1.
के दाब p. 234.
के शि p. 266.
कीर्ति H. P., p. 382.
कीर्ति p. 181.
कीर्ति p. 387.
किय p. 387.
कियताहु: कर्मणम, p. 387.
कोः p. 303.
क्षणकाल क्षणकाल p. 253.
क्षण Pr. p. 379.
क्षण p. 234.
क्षण (क्ष) p. 233.
इंडेक्स II

जाति M. H. G. P. B., p. 381.
जाति Skr. जाति M. H. G. P. B., p. 381.
जितुम p. 387.
जितवायय...समा, Patañjali, p. 111 fn1.
जिन p. 242.
जिल्ला p. 301.
जिमा Pr., p. 381.
जिम B. O. S., p. 381.
जिमा Skr. जीम M. H. G. P. B., जिम्ब B. O., जिम्ब S. जिम्बा Pr., p. 381.
जी H., p. 383.
जीओ Pr., p. 383.
जीम M. H. P. G., p. 381.
जीम: Skr. जीम जी, जीउ जी जी H., p. 383.
जीविकारं p. 170.
खुदिया Pr., p. 383.
खुदी or जाइ M. H. G., p. 383.
ज्ञ H. P. G., p. 383.
ज्ञक p. 387.
ज्ञपं Pr., p. 383.
ज्ञानमार्ग p. 471.
ज्ञण p. 145.
दिवुभासिंहजानां, p. 507.
दिवुभासिंहजानां प्रामाण्यताम, pp. 508, 509.
द्राह H., p. 381.
प्रेमिन्द्र p. 146.
ताहितेत अप., p. 379.
ताहितिक p. 271.
ताहितिकय = त(भ)ताहितिकय, p. 271.
तत्र...ताहिति p. 505.
ताहितिकय: p. 215.
तदशिक्षा संतस्रात्राणामानां, I. 2. 53, pp. 504, 508.
तदुभनिरोध...खूफ़्र, p. 76 fn 1.
तस्तातसा, p. 379.
तस्त तिरस्त: IV. 2. 69, p. 507.
कृष्ण p. 146.
ताहितेस Pr., p. 379.
ताहितया Skr. ताहितया ताहि...
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दिया ब., p. 384.
दिया म., p. 384.
दीनक pp. 253, 261.
दीया म. दीया P. दीया H., p. 384.
दीया Pr., p. 384.
दीया P., p. 384.
देवदात्त: p. 174.
देवदात्त p. 179.
इन्द्र pp. 169, 503.

पनकट p. 242.
पनकटसामाय pp. 242, 249.
पानम p. 265.
पार्श p. 238.
पार्शेव p. 272.
पार्शनाथी p. 274.
पार्शरक्षित p. 272.
पारस्पर p. 253.
पहडी S., p. 382.
पहूँ P., p. 382.
पहुँ म. G., p. 382.
पहुँ H., p. 382.
पहुँ B. O., p. 382.
पहुँ Pr., p. 382.
पहुँ Skr. पहुँ म. G. पहुँ H. पहुँ S.,
पहुँ B. O. पहुँ Pr., p. 382.
पोता St. म. पोता Mal. Goan.,
p. 385.
पोतार Mal. Goan., p. 385.

न केबलानि ... भवति, p. 141 fn 2.
नह ( नह ) p. 242.
नन्दनाज: p. 329.
नन्दनी: p. 274.
नन्दनिकामा p. 270.
नन्दना p. 234.
नन्दकर्म p. 302.
नन्दन p. 242.
नन्दनरसामी p. 242.
न श्रुति...व्यतात्, p. 77 fn 3.
भोक O., p. 381.
चर्चाशास्त्र p. 145.
ातुस्व तानो, on पाणिनी II. 2. 34, p. 83 fn 4

मगहरो=मागहरो pp. 253, 256.
माधव आप., p. 384.
माधवा प्र., p. 384.
माधवः Skr. माधवों प्र., माधव आप.
माधो M., p. 384.
माधो H. माधा p. 380.
माधुआ प्र., p. 383.
माधु H., p. 383.
माधुआ प्र., p. 383.
माधव आप., p. 384.
माधुओ प्र., p. 384.
माधुओ प्र., p. 384.
माध्या P., p. 384.
माध्या p. 302.
माधुरी p. 174.
माधो H. माधा p. 380.
माधव ( माधू) p. 380.
माध ( माधू) p. 14 fn 3.
माध M. G. H. P., p. 381.
माध स्क्र. मध म. G. H. P., p. 381.
माध p. 270.
माध p. 234.
माधुरक स्क्र. मधुयं प्र. मधुयों M.(Goan. Mal. and Chit.) मधुओ प्र. आप.
माधव आप. माध्या M. H. B. माध्या P., p. 384.
माधीव p. 298.
माधीवी p. 233.
महाभाषा | कुशालेन, p. 86 fn 3.
महात्मापिव ( महात्मापिव), p. 247.
महिना जयिव, p. 343.
महिस Skr. महिसी प्र. महिस M. भेस H. P., भेस G., p. 379.
महिसी Skr. महिसी प्र. महिस M. भेस H. P., भेस G., p. 379.
महिसी Pr., pp. 379, 382.
महिसे p. 234.
माधोय... याः, p. 87 fn 2.
माधो M., p. 384.

माण्डलाशाखा p. 308 fn 3.
माती M., p. 383.
मातृ p. 233.
माध्या M. H. B., p. 384.
माध्या M. ( Goan. Mal. and Chit.), p. 384.
मातृ p. 253.
माधुस्ती p. 211 fn 1.
मिठुआ प्र., p. 383.
मिथ पर p. 181.
मिथिला p. 361.
मीन: p. 301.
महावरो=महावरो pp. 253, 256.
महावर p. 274.
महंत p. 234.
महत: p. 303.
महत्तिका p. 200.
महत्तिका Skr. महित्रा, मद्धित्रा, मिठुइआ माती M. मद्धु H., p. 383.
मेष p. 234.
मोती G. P. H., p. 383.
मोती M., p. 383.
मोतिं Pr., p. 383.
मेष or भेस P., p. 382.
मौर्यः: pp. 169, 170.
मोतिंक Skr. मोतिंग्य Pr. मोती M. मोती G. P. H., p. 383.
मौस, मौस p. 379.
मौस M. pp. 379, 382.
महाउनि.....जनमेजया, p. 90 fn 5.

य p. 146.
य... माह, from Nirukta, p. 472.
वक्ताः p. 234.
वन्नि p. 224 fn 1.
वज्जादितु...... p. 121 fn 1.
वज्जादितु...... यस्तः; कात्यायन, p. 121 fn 1.
वज्जादितकणि p. 266.
वदितहि..... p. 497 fn 2.
यनन p. 266.
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सुभल रिमा...ब्रजानु from निर्वक, p. 469.
व्यास: pp. 173, 175, 234.
व्यासित p. 234.
व्यासक p. 272.
वस्तित्सान का (स्तानस्तान्तक) pp. 253.
256.
यस्य हृद, p. 146.
यानन्दक p. 179.
याज्ञवल्क्य p. 361.
छाक...p. 507.
छुक्त p. 509.
छुक्तद्वार p. 509.
छुक्तवदासाध्य pp. 508, 509.
छुक्तका, लुपा Pr. जु ह. P. G. ऊ, M., p. 383.
छुक्तका Skr. जुहुआ Pr. जुहु or जुङ M. H. G., p. 383.

रबिय ( लई Pr. p. 9.
राह ह., p. 379.
राह p. 271.
राह म., p. 379.
रामा: p. 234.
रामस्थान: p. 182 fn 1.
रामायण का (रामायण = राजायण) p. 247.
रामिका: शालय...स्थाली p. 221.
रामि Skr. राम म. H. P. G., p. 381.
राम p. 234.
राम ( रामस्थान: पश्चास्म: ) pp. 301, 302.
रामाक p. 273.
रामादन p. 253.
रास M. H. P. G., p. 381.
राति M. H. P. G., p. 381.
राति Skr. रात म. H. P. G. B., p. 381.
रेशम गणपक p. 268.
रक्षणपतिप्रदेशक p. 146.
रक्ष्यप म. p. 146.
रक्षषपंच p. 146.
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संकार (संग्रह) p. 233.
संग्रह p. 234.
संख्या (Number) here 25 principles of Sāmkhyas, p. 63 fn 3.
संघ p. 273.
संघ (संग्रह) p. 14 fn 3.
संञ्जय pp. 215, 504.
संञ्जयन p. 504
संञ्जयनां.... p. 504.
साधय (साध्य) pp. 253, 256.
साधरी p. 258.
संक्षेपयाय....कृत्यa, p. 49 fn 2.
सत्तात्विकामात्माभिषेकायथ, p. 77 fn 3.
साक्ष... Pr., p. 381.
सन: सिद्धि, p. 145.

सांप (स्वप्न) p. 242.
सांपत्ति Skr. सांपति M. तात H. सांपति Pr., p. 382.
सांपय p. 504.
सांपन (अभ्यास) p. 265.
सांप जा p. 233.
सांपलद्वे (0 पदल or 0 वहद्वे) p. 241.
सांपना (अंधकार) p. 145.
सांप...इत्यादि, Av. X. 3. 11., p. 95.
संभाषित p. 170.
संम्पादनांत्यार्थं: pp. 170, 171.
संम्प्रय pp. 504, 505.
संबल्य p. 507.
संबन्धपायामात्र pp. 507, 509.
संस्कारमौलिक: p. 9 fn 1.
संस्कारसंग्रह: p. 9 fn 1.
संस्कारसमाधि: p. 9 fn 1.
संस्कारस्थिरति: p. 9 fn 1.
संस्काराभाव: p. 9 fn 1.
संस्कारवाचः p. 9 fn 1.
संस्कारायाम: p. 9 fn 1.
संस्कार (सिद्धिः or सिद्धिः = सिद्धिः) p.242.
संस्कार प्राप्तिः: p. 214.
संस्कारकेतन: p. 242.
संस्कार M., p. 382.
संस्कार Pr., p. 382.
संस्काराचार...भाविष्यसमाहेवः: p. 69 fn 1.
संस्कार P., p. 382.
संस्कार Pr., p. 382.
संस्कार p. 234.
संस्कारपर्वम pp. 173, 175.
संस्कार... derived from संख्या (number) (संप्रक्षे स्पर्शा) true knowledge, p. 63 fn 3.
संस्कार...रुचिः in Matsya, p. 63 fn 3.
संस्कारानन्दण...परिप्रेक्ष्याय, in Mahābhārata, p. 63 fn 3.
संस्कार (शास्त्राः)भौनी शास्त्रा, p. 308 fn 3.
सांहिका Pr., p. 383.
सांहि M. G. H., p. 383.
साद or साध B., p. 381.
साध H. P., p. 381.
साध O., p. 381.
साध or साध B., p. 381
साध H. S., p. 381
साध Skr. H. S. साध O साध B. साध O, सद्ध Pr., p. 381
साध (साधु) ) p. 14 fn 3
साधु Skr. साध H. P., p. 381
समान p. 224 fn 1
साठड़ A., p. 384
साठड़ो Pr., p. 384.
साठा M. H., p. 384.
साठा H., p. 384
साठ H., p. 382.
साठ M. G., p. 382.
सिकत्र p. 505.
सिवा  p. 234.
सिविटन (सुनितन) p. 233.
सिवितनिका an enclosure or railing made of stone, p. 13 fn 3.
झंड P., p. 381.
झंडनार p. 242.
झंडगुप p. 234.
झंडगुप p. 234.
झंडगुप p. 253.
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