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THE DATES OF THE SMṚTI-CHAPTERS OF THE
MATSYA-PURĀṆA.

BY

RAJENDRA CHANDRA HAZRA, M. A.

Department of Sanskrit, Dacca University.

The determination of the date of composition of the Matsya-
Purāṇa, as we have it now, is rather difficult. No one date is sufficient for it, because it has suffered through repeated additions and losses. Hence, for the date of this Purāṇa in its earlier form, we shall have to look to the chapters dealing with the genealogies of kings of the Solar and Lunar dynasties, for, these chapters are undoubtedly the oldest parts in the present Matsya. These chapters, again, should be divided into two groups, viz. (1) chapters 11–12, 23–24 and 43–46, which have not yet been traced anywhere else, and (2) chapters 47–50 and 271–273, which greatly resemble chapters 96 (verses 192ff.), 97–98 and 99 (especially, except verses 367–391) of the Vāyu-Purāṇa. Besides these, there are also other chapters which are common to the Matsya and the Vāyu-Purāṇa, viz. Matsya-Purāṇa chapters 51, 114, 124–128 and 141–145 and Vāyu-Purāṇa chapters 29, 45 (verses 69 to end), 46 (verses 1 to end, except some verses), 50 (verses 56 to end), 51, 52 (verses 1 to 71a), 52 (71b to end) and 53. We shall first turn our attention to the chapters of the second group, and especially to chapters 50 (verses 72ff.) and 271–273.
dealing with the future dynasties, because their date will help us to ascertain the date of the present Matsya-Purāṇa.

The striking agreement between the chapters common to the Matsya and the Vāyu-Purāṇa naturally raises in our mind the question as to whether these two Purāṇas borrowed their accounts from the same original source or one of them copied from the other. As a solution Mr. Pargiter has put forth the theory that about the last quarter of the 3rd century A.D. the Matsya borrowed from the Bhavisya the shorter account (of the future dynasties) which ended with the downfall of the Andhras and the local kingdoms that survived them a while. The Bhavisya account was then extended down to the time when the Gupta kingdom had acquired the territories assigned to it, and its language was revised; that would be (say) about 320-325 A.D. The Vāyu copied that extended and revised account from the Bhavisya almost immediately, and that is the version found in eVāyu (i.e. a Ms of the Vāyu-P. preserved in the India Office Library and called eVāyu by Mr. Pargiter for differentiation). Afterwards, the language of the Bhavisya version was revised again...... ...........about 330-335.................This second revision was soon adopted by the Vāyu and is the version found now in Vāyu Mss generally.' 1 This theory, with all its attractiveness and reasonings, is not free from defects. The way, in which the Matsya and the Vāyu refer to the 'Bhavisya,' 2 shows clearly that their versions were not copied verbatim from the original source, for in the 'Bhavisya' itself such references would be absurd and meaningless. If so, why, then, do the two versions agree almost literally not only in the genealogies but also in the stories of kings, sages and demons; viz. Matsya 47 = Vāyu 96 (verses 192ff)—98 (on Viṣṇu's different incarnations and the war between the gods and the demons); Matsya 48, 30—89 = Vāyu 99, 35—98 (containing the story of the birth of Dirghatamas, his practice of go-dharma and his begetting of five sons on the maid-


2. Viz: in 'tān sarvān kīrtayasyāmi Bhavīṣya kathitān nṛpān'—Matsya 50, 75 = Vāyu 99, 267; the Vāyu reads 'paṭhitān' for 'kathitān'; 'tasyānvāvāye vakṣyāmi Bhavīṣya kathitān nṛpān'—Matsya 50, 77 = Vāyu 99, 270; the Vāyu reads 'tāvate' for 'kathitān'. And 'Bhavīṣya te prasāmkhyātāh purāṇajñātāh śrutāsibhih'—Matsya 273, 37 = Vāyu 99, 417; the latter reads bhavīṣyais-tatra śaṁkhyātāh' for 'Bhavīṣye etc'.

---

*Note: The text contains references to Sanskrit passages and numbers that have been replaced with their modern equivalents for clarity.*
servant and the wife of Vali); \textit{Matsya} 49, 15–34 = \textit{Vāyu} 99, 139–158 (story of the birth of Bharadvāja); and so on. The genealogies of kings are given in some other Purāṇas also and there are, of course, certain verses which are found common to two or more of them, but the striking agreement which is found between the \textit{Matsya} and the \textit{Vāyu} is to be met with nowhere else. So the mutually agreeing \textit{Matsya} and \textit{Vāyu} versions, which are not copies made from the original source, could not be based independently upon this source—because in that case they could never agree so literally—but one of them must have drawn upon the other.

The expressions ‘...Bhaviśye kathitān nṛpān,’ ‘Bhaviśye te prasamkhyaṭāḥ......’ etc. occurring both in the \textit{Vāyu} and the \textit{Matsya}, should not be taken to be due to the independent use of the same original (be it the Bhaviśya-Purāṇa or anything else) by these two Purāṇas. But the reason is that, as we shall see below, the version of the \textit{Vāyu} was based on some original to which it refers as ‘Bhaviśya’ and the \textit{Matsya} version is only a copy of the \textit{Vāyu} version. So the references also have been retained in the \textit{Matsya}.

It may be questioned, ‘If one of the \textit{Matsya} and the \textit{Vāyu} used the other as the source, then how are we to explain the differences between the two Purāṇas in readings and additional verses?’ The answer is that such differences are to be ascribed to the later additions, alterations, losses and mistakes made by the scribes. Even the different Mss of a particular Purāṇa are always found to differ not slightly in readings and numbers of verses, but inspite of such differences the work is originally the same. So, the \textit{Matsya} and \textit{Vāyu} versions should not be taken to be distinct from, and independent of, each other merely on account of such differences. On the other hand, a comparison of readings and verses given from different Mss in the AnŚŚ editi-ions of the \textit{Vāyu} and the \textit{Matsya} lessens such variations to a very great extent. It should be remembered that no one Ms of a Purāṇa is reliable for such comparison, for it is not seldom found that while one Ms preserves a correct reading in a place another makes a mistake and the verses omitted by one Ms in a place are found in another. For example, \textit{Vāyu} 99, 15 (= Brahmāṇḍa III, 74, 14 = \textit{Matsya} 48, 11\textsuperscript{b}–12\textsuperscript{a}; the \textit{Matsya} reads ‘Kolāhalasya’ for ‘Kālānalasya’ of the \textit{Vāyu} and the Brahmāṇḍa) was not
found in the Ms C of the *Vāyu* (vide *Vāyu*-P., p. 370, foot-note); *Vāyu* 99, 17a (= *Brahmāṇḍa* III, 74, 16a = *Matsya* 48, 14b; readings differ) was not found in the Ms B of the same Purāṇa; and so on. Similarly, *Matsya* 49, 52b–59 (= *Vayu* 99, 175–182; readings differ) were not found in the Ms C (vide *Matsya*-P., AnSS ed. p. 102, foot note); and so on. On the other hand *Mat.* 49, 61–69, which are not found in the *Vayu*-P., were also not found in the Ms D and E of the *Matsya* (vide *Matsya*-P., AnSS ed., p. 102, foot note); *Mat.* 50, 41b, not occurring in the *Vayu* did not also occur in the Ms A and B (vide *Matsya*-P., AnSS ed., p. 105, foot note); and so on. As regards the readings also a good number of such examples may be given.

As to the inter-relation among the *Vayu, Brahmāṇḍa,* and *Matsya,* it may be said that the *Vayu* and *Brahmāṇḍa,* though originally one, were separated long ago. Since separation they have been subjected, separately and independently, to additions, alterations, losses and mistakes made by the scribes. As the same additions, alterations etc. were not, and could not possibly be, made in these two separate works by different hands belonging to different climes and ages, where one is found to preserve the original text and reading, the other makes a mistake. It is only for this reason that, "where the *Vayu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* differ, one of them not seldom agrees with the *Matsya* " which also has not escaped additions, alterations etc.; that "single Ms of them sometimes vary so as to agree with the reading of the *Matsya;" and that "one Purāṇa occasionally omits a verse which appears in one or both of the two others, yet a single Ms (or a very few Ms) of it has at times preserved that verse......" ¹.

From all that has been said above it follows that the *Matsya* and *Vāyu* versions were not based independently on the same original source nor were they copied verbatim from it, but that either the *Matsya* version was copied from that of the *Vāyu* or vice versa. We shall now try to see which one is the borrower. In *Matsya* 142 (= *Vāyu* 57, 1–85) the genealogies of the sages are referred to as narrated before but there is no

¹ *Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali age,* Introduction, p. vi.
² Cf. kramāgatam mayāpy-stat tadbhavyaṃ naktam yuga-dvayaṃ, ṛṣi-vamśa-prasāṅgana vyākulaśā tathātmanaḥ — *Matsya* 142, 39 = *Vāyu* 57, 38. The latter reads ‘hi’ for ‘api,’ ‘proktam’ for ‘noktaṃ’ and ‘tathātmaḥ’ for ‘tathātmanaḥ.’
chapter in the *Matsya* dealing with these and preceding chapter 142, whereas in the *Vāyu* there is a chapter (viz. 28) which deals with ṛṣi-vamśa. In the *Matsya* the genealogies of sages are given as late as in chapters 195–202 which, on account of their position and elaborate character, seem to be later additions. Moreover, the opening verses contain Manu’s mention of Śiva’s curse on the sage—a curse which has really not been referred to by the Fish anywhere in the *Matsya-P.* These chapters (195–202), which practically treat of the gotras and pravaras, may have been based on the works on pravaras ascribed to Baudhāyana, Kātyāyana, Viśvāmitra, Garga and others (‘pravara-gotrayoh samānatvāsamānāvate Baudhāyana—Kātyāyana—Viśvāmitra—Gargādi-pranīteṣu pravara-granthesu prasiddhe’—Vide *Parāśura-bhāṣya* of Mādhavaçārya, Vol. I, part ii. p. 72). Again, in *Matsya* 50, 68-71 (= *Vāyu* 99, 260–263; the *Vāyu* differs in readings in several places) the sages, wishing to hear of the future, put to Sūta several questions about (1) the future kings—their names and the periods of their reigns, and (2) the future ages—their characteristic signs, their merits and defects, and the happiness and miseries of the people during these ages. Consequently, Sūta, promising to narrate to them the future Kali age, the future manvantaras and the future kingships¹, begins with the future kings and answers all the questions in *Matsya* 50 (verses 77 to end = *Vāyu* 99, 270–280) and 271-273 (= *Vāyu* 99, 281 to end). About the future manvantaras, which Sūta himself wants to narrate, nothing is said in the *Matsya-P.*, whereas in the *Vāyu* these are dealt with in the following chapter (viz. chapter 100). From these disagreements between the two Purāṇas it follows that the *Matsya-P.* borrowed only those chapters from the *Vāyu*, which it found necessary, without caring for the lines containing references to other chapters of the *Vāyu*. So, we may hold that the *Matsya* borrowed the chapters common to itself and the *Vāyu* from the latter and not from the *Bhavisya*. And this priority of the *Vāyu* account explains why “the *Vāyu* has Prakritisms sometimes where the *Matsya* has correct Sanskrit.”²

¹ Cf. *Matsya* 50, 72-76 = *Vāyu* 99, 264–269; the readings differ in a few cases.

The above view is supported further by the \textit{Vāyu} Mss themselves. One \textit{Vāyu} Ms (referred to as \textit{eVāyu} by Mr. Pargiter and belonging to the India Office Library) is described as follows: "Very valuable because it has readings different from the printed editions and some verses not contained therein; and where it differs therefrom, it often agrees with the \textit{Matsya} ...... ........."

Moreover, in that portion of the account, which deals with the evils of the Kali age and a chronological-astronomical summary of the age, "the account in \textit{eVāyu} has the full description with the exception of a few verses." From these it follows that the agreement between the \textit{Vāyu} and \textit{Matsya} versions was once much greater than it is now and that the text of the \textit{Vāyu} has been much tampered with, with the result that it has suffered, not without occasional gain, through additions, losses and mistakes. It should be noted here that the \textit{Vāyu} Ms referred to can not be proved to have preserved the original readings of the \textit{Vāyu} and that there might have been other Mss containing better readings.

Before finishing this topic we are confronted with another problem, viz, why \textit{Vāyu} 99, 365-391, which carry the narrative down to the rise of the Guptas, do not occur in the \textit{Matsya-P.}, though the latter drew upon the former. The explanation is that the \textit{Vāyu} version of the dynasties of the Kali age must have had two stages of termination. In its earlier stage it ended with the downfall of the Andhras and the local kingdoms that survived them a while, and it was in this stage that the \textit{Matsya} copied the \textit{Vāyu} version. In the second stage the \textit{Vāyu} account was extended to the rise of the Guptas by the addition of verses 365-391 of \textit{Vāyu} 99. There being no mention of Samudragupta’s conquests in this later addition, Mr. Pargiter thinks, and not unreasonably, that this addition was made not later than 335 A. D. Hence the date of the \textit{Vāyu} version in its earlier stage should be placed not earlier than the middle of the 3rd century A. D. when the Andhra kingdom fell and not later than 335 A. D., and most probably about the last quarter of the third century

1 Ibid., Introduction p. xxxiii.
2 Ibid., Introduction, p. xiii.
So, the date of the Matsya version also falls either in the last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A. D. The occasional crude style of the Matsya version and the agreement between the Vāyu and Brahmana as regards the extended portion of the dynastic account need not go against the priority of the shorter account of the Vāyu. We have seen that the text of the Vāyu was revised and emended more than once. Hence it is not at all improbable that the crude portions also should have been rewritten. Further, the Vāyu and Brahmana were separated undoubtedly after the Vāyu account had been extended to the rise of the Guptas and also even after the text of the Vāyu had begun to be tampered with, for the Brahmana not only contains the extended portion of the dynastic account of the Vāyu but agrees more closely with the printed text of the Vāyu than with the Ms (eVāyu of the India Office Library) referred to.

The view of Mr. Pargiter that the Bhavisya was subjected to two revisions in the early centuries of the Christian era is purely an assumption without any evidence in its support. The accounts in the three Purānas Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmana also do not seem to have been compared at times, because in that case the readings of the Matsya, while agreeing more with those of the Ms eVāyu would not have differed so much from those of the printed editions of the Vāyu, and the Brahmana and there would have been every possibility of extending the Matsya account to the rise of the Guptas.

We have seen above that the chapters of the second group in the Matsya i-P. (i.e. those chapters on genealogies of kings in the Matsya which are common to itself and the Vāyu) were borrowed from the Vāyu about the last quarter of the 3rd century A. D. Now, the chapters of the first group (i.e. chapters 11-12, 23-24 and 43-46) may either be contemporaneous with those of the second or they may hail from different ages. The close relation of contents of the chapters of the two groups, however, tends to point to the former alternative. In the first group, chapter 11 opens with a request to Sūta to describe the Solar and Lunar dynasties, and chapter 12 accordingly

1 Ibid., Introduction, p. xiii.
2 Ibid., Introduction, p. xiii.
names the descendants of Ikṣvāku of the Solar dynasty. Next, the Lunar dynasty is taken up. Accordingly, in chapters 23-24 the story of the birth of Budha is narrated and his descendants down to Yadu, Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu and Puru are named; and chapters 43-46 name the descendants of Yadu and give accounts of some of them. Let us now pass on to the second group, in which chapter 47 narrates the stories of the Yādavas, of Kṛṣṇa, of the wars between gods and demons, etc; chapter 48 names the descendants of Turvasu, Druhyu and Anu with their accounts; chapters 49-50 (verses 1-67) name the descendants of Puru down to Adhiśomakṛṣṇa; chapter 50 (verses 68-end) names the future kings from Adhiśomakṛṣṇa to Kṣemaka; and chapters 271-3 further continue the names and accounts of the future kings and races.

The above contents will show how closely the chapters of the two groups are related. Without the chapters of the second group, the accounts given by those of the first are incomplete, for the descendants of Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu and Puru are no less important than those of Yadu but are equally required for the fullness of the account. It is, therefore, highly probable that the original author, or rather compiler, of the present Matsya-P. wrote, or borrowed from some unknown source, the chapters of the first group and supplemented them with those of the second. Consequently, the date of the earlier form of the present Matsya-P. seems to be the same as that of Māṭṣya's borrowing the chapters of the second group from the Vāyu i.e. about the last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A.D.

Let us now pass on to the Smṛti-chapters, which form the major portion of the present Matsya-P. In this Purāṇa śrāddha is dealt with in chapters 16-22; vrata in chapters 7, 54-57, 60-66, 69-81 and 95-101; dāna in chapters 53, 82-92, 205-206 and 274-289; tīrtha in chapters 13 (verses 10-end), 22, 103-112 (on Prayāga-māhātya), 180-185 (on Avimuktakṣetra-māhātya), and 186-194 (on Narmadā-māhātya); āśrama-dharma in chapter 40; snāna in chapters 67, 68 and 102; pratiṣṭhā in chapters 58-59 and 264-270; stridharma in chapter 7 (verses 37-49); naraka in chapter 39; grahayajña and sānti in chapters 93, 94 and 228-239; rāja-dharma in chapters 215-243; vyavahāra in chapter 227;
utsarga in chapter 207; yuga-dharma in chapters 142, 144, 145 and 165; prāyaścitta in chapter 237 (verses 34ff); and vāstu in chapters 252–257 and 268–270.

Before proceeding to discuss the dates of these chapters we should turn our attention to the chapters common to the *Matsya* and the *Padma-P* (srṣṭi-khaṇḍa) in order to see whether the former borrowed these chapters from the latter or vice versa. The chapters common to the two Purāṇas are the following:

| Mat. 5–6 = | Pad. 6 |
| Mat. 7–9 = | 7 |
| Mat. 10–12 = | 8 |
| Mat. 13 (verses 1–9) and 14–17 = | 9 |
| Mat. 18–21 = Pad. 10 (except verses 5–20a) |

Mat. 22 (except verses 1a and 2–10a) Pad. = 11 (ex. verses 2–3 and 10–11a)

Mat. 23 and 24 (verses 1–54) = Pad. 12 (verses 1–96)
Mat. 43 (ex. verses 1–4) = Pad. 12 (verses 97–end)
Mat. 44 (ex. verses 1–14a), 45–46, 47 (verses 1–181 ex. 9b and 10b–11a) = Pad. 13 (verses 1–279)
Mat. 100, 101 (ex. verses 70 and 73b–74a), and 102 (ex. verses 27b–30a) = Pad. 20 (ex. verses 1–3, 129, 136–9 and 171–2)
Mat. 81, 82 (ex. verses 23a–and 24), 83–92, 74–75, 76 (ex. verse 13) and 77–80 Pad. = 21
Mat. 61–64, and 66 = Pad. 22 (ex. verses 63 and 165–175)
Mat. 69–70 = Pad. 23
Mat. 71–72 = Pad. 24
Mat. 55 = Pad. 25 (ex. verses 34–37)
Mat. 57–58 = Pad. 26–27
Mat. 59 = Pad. 28 (ex. verses 23–end)
Mat. 60 = Pad. 29
Mat. 164 (ex. verse 3), and 165–178 = Pad. 39–41
Mat. 146 (verses 41–end) = Pad. 42 (verses 5–40)
Mat. 147 (ex. verses 5b, 6b–9, 10b, 11b–14a and 15–16) = Pad. 42 (verses 41–59)

[Annals, B. O. R. I.]
Mat. 148 (ex. verses 1b, 4-6a, 8-10, 12-19, 22a, 25-37, 39b-41a, 44-50 53, 57-58a, 66-72, 85b-97) = Pad. 42 (verses 66-104, ex. 64, 68b-69, 74-75 and 87).

Mat. 153 (verses 222-228a) = Pad. 42 (verses 105-end, ex. 109b-110).

Mat. 154 (ex. verses 25-26, 29-31a, 51, 82, 127b, 173-174, 180b-181a, 196a, 200, 201b, 216, and so on) = Pad. 43 (ex. verses 5b, 10b, 16a, 17b, 30a, 226 and so on).

Mat. 155-160 (ex. verse 32) = Pad. 44 (ex. verse 125)

Mat. 161 (ex. verses 70b, 72b-73a, 78a and 87), 162 (ex. verses 35-38) and 163 (ex. verses 1-25a) = Pad. 45

Mat. 179 (verses 1-13a) = Pad. 46 (verses 1-4 and 73-81)

The multifarious subjects and stories dealt with in these chapters prove that they could not be based independently on tradition but one of them must have drawn upon the other. A comparison between the two Purāṇas, however, shows that the Padma (srṣṭi) is the borrower. In those chapters which are common to the Vāyu, Mātśya and Padma (srṣṭi)¹, the Padma follows more the Mātśya than the Vāyu. We have seen above that the Mātśya drew upon the Vāyu. So it stands that the Mātśya first borrowed these common chapters from the Vāyu and the Padma (srṣṭi) next took them from the Mātśya. A comparison of chapters common to the Harivaṃśa, Mātśya and Padma (srṣṭi)² also shows that the Padma resembles more the Mātśya than the Harivaṃśa. The reading “Purānaṁ paus-kare caiva mayā Dvapāyanāc-chṛutam” of Hv. III, 14 66³ need not mislead us to hold that the Hv. was based on the Padma (srṣṭi), for both the Mātśya and the Padma (srṣṭi); read “Purānaṁ puruṣaḥ-caiva mayā (Padma reads māyām) Viṣṇur-Hariḥ prabhuḥ” in the corresponding passages. Besides the above evidences there are also others to show that the Padma (srṣṭi) is the borrower. Both in Vāyu 9 (verses 9, 12, 15, 19 and 31) and Mātśya 47 (verses 174, 179, 182, 186 and 197) Sukra, the preceptor of the Asuras, is said to have lived invisibly with Jayantī for ten years, whereas in Padma (srṣṭi) 13

¹ Vāyu 73 and 96-98, Mātśya 14-15 and 47 and Padma (srṣṭi) 9 (verses 11-71) and 13 (verses 135-279)
² Hv. III, 41-47 and 7-14, Mātśya 161-171 and Padma (srṣṭi) chapters 45, 39 and 40.
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(verses 274, 277 and 283) the period is lengthened to one hundred years. The occurrence of the words ‘śata-varṣāṇi’ and ‘varṣa-śatam’ in three places in the Padma (sṛṣṭi) shows that it is not due to the mistake of the scribes but is to be ascribed to the spirit of exaggeration of the people of later ages. Further, in some of the chapters of the Padma (sṛṣṭi) which are traceable in the Matsya and the Viṣṇu-P., the names of Viṣṇu have been changed for those of Brahmā, while in others the names or glorifications of Viṣṇu have been left unchanged. Even in those chapters wherein such changes have been made, there are marks left to testify to their originally Vaiṣṇava character (cf. Padma, sṛṣṭi, 7, 115—‘Brahma Viṣṇu-sayujyam tato yāsyanti vai nrpa; 9, 109; etc.). Such Vaiṣṇava character of these chapters shows that they did not belong to the Padma (sṛṣṭi), which, we shall see afterwards, was originally meant for the revival of the Brahmā-worship. That the Padma (sṛṣṭi) borrowed the common chapters from the Matsya does not seem to have been unknown to the early Shrauti-writers. For example, Anirudhabhaṭṭa, who lived about 1150 A.D., quotes Padma (sṛṣṭi) 10, 13b and refers to Padma (sṛṣṭi) 10, 15–20a saying “yat-tu Padma-Puraṇe—‘sampūjya dvija-dāmpatyam nānabharaṇa-bhūṣitaṁ’ ity-evam-antam Matsya-Puraṇa—tulyam-abhidhāy-ādhikam sayyā-dānavidhānam-uktam tat pārvatīyānāṁ eva Kāmarūpādi—vāsināṁ Brāhmaṇādīnāṁ-avaśyānuṣṭheyam-iti tatraivoktam” (Hara-latā, p. 199). The evidences adduced above are perhaps sufficient to prove that the Padma (sṛṣṭi) is the borrower. It is probably due to this plagiarism of this Purāṇa that it has been rarely drawn upon by the early Nibandha-writers.

Let us now proceed to discuss the dates of the Shrauti-chapters. We shall first take up the chapters (16–22) on śrāddha. These chapters were written by a Vaiṣṇava¹ and introduced into the Matsya-P. in connection with the Pitṛvamsa (the genealogy of the Pitṛs) given in chapters 13–15. The spurious character of all these chapters from 13–22 seems to be proved by their very position. At the outset of chapter 11 Śūta is requested to

¹ Cf. ‘varjayed krodhapparatam smaran-Nārāyaṇam Hariṁ”—16, 45b; atāh-paraṁ pravaksyaṁ Viṣṇunā yad-udiritaṁ—17, 1b; ityāha Keśavaḥ—17, 30b; and so on.
narrate the Solar and Lunar dynasties. Chapter 12, accordingly dealing with the Solar race, ends thus "iti...Sūrya-vamśānukṛtanaṁ nāma dvādaśo'dhyāyah". But the Lunar race is taken up as late as in chapter 23. Hence the intervening chapters 13-22 seem to have been interpolated later on. The spurious character of these chapters is further proved by the fact that they are wholly unconnected and are introduced all on a sudden without any hint being given beforehand. So, their date is to be placed later than the first quarter of the 4th century A.D. Again, chapters 16-22 (dealing with śrāddha) and chapters 13-15 (on Pitr-vamśa) do not appear to have hailed from the same date. At the beginning of chapter 13 Manu requests the Matsya to tell him about the Pitr-vamśa and the śrāddha-devatva of the Sun and the Moon. The latter accordingly narrates the Pitr-vamśa in chapters 13-15, refers to the Sun and the Moon in the course of chapter 15 (viz: in 15, 43a and 32a) and finishes saying:

"havismatāmādhipatye śrāddha-devah smṛto raviḥ,
etad-vah sarvam-ākhyātam Pitr-vamśānukṛtanaṁ,
punyam pavitrāṃ-āuyasyaṃ kṛtāntyam sadā nrbhiḥ." (15, 43).

As in chapters 13-15 there is no reference to the chapters on śrāddha, as the Pitr-vamśa is complete in chapters 13-15, and as there is no second reference to the śrāddha-devatva of the Sun and the Moon anywhere in chap. 16-22, we may hold that chap. 13-15 formed a distinct unit by themselves and were originally not followed by any chapter or chapters on śrāddha. It is, therefore, probable that chap. 16-22 on śrāddha were interpolated later than chap. 13-15. If periods of at least 50 years each be allowed between the chapters on the genealogies of kings and chap. 13-15 and between the latter and chap. 16-22, then these chapters on śrāddha can not possibly be earlier than the beginning of the 5th century A.D. Now, Devanabhāṭṭa quotes numerous verses from Matsya-P. chapters 15-19 and 22 in his Smṛti-candrikā I and IV, Jmūtavāhana from chapters 17 and 22 in his Kālo-viveka, Aniruddha from chap. 18 in his Hāralatā, Ballāslasa from chap. 22 in his Dūna-sūgarā, Aparārka from chap. 15-18 and 22 in his commentary on the Yājñavalkya-smṛti, Haradatta from chap. 18 in his commentary on the Gautama-dharma-sūtra, Kullūkabhaṭṭa
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from chap. 17 and 18 in his commentary on the Manu-smṛti, Mādhavacārya from chap. 16, 17 and 18 in his Parāśarabhāsya, Madanapāla from chap. 16 and 17 in his Madana-pārijāta, Śrīdatta Upādhyāya from chap. 16 in his Kṛtyacāra, Candaśvara from chap. 17 in his Kṛtya-ratnākara, Nṛsīṃha Vājapeyin from chap. 18 in his Nityācāra-pradīpa, and Govindānanda from chapters 15, 16, 18 and 22 in his Dāna-kṛiyā-kaumudi and Śraddha-kṛiyā-kaumudi. These quotations made by the Nibandha-writers from different parts of India, show that chap. 16-22 must be dated not later than 1000 A. D. Again, chap. 16-22 are among those which are found common to the Matsya and the Pudma (srṣṭī). The quotations made by the early Nibandha-writers like Aniruddha-bhatta, Aparārka, Ballālasena, Devanabhatta and Śrīdatta Upādhyāya, from the common chapters of the Padma (srṣṭī) show that the Padma (srṣṭī) borrowed these chapters so early that this Purāṇa, with its new additions, had sufficient time not only for circulation in all parts of India but also for replacing the earlier form of the Purāṇa. If at least a century and a half be allowed for such effective circulation, then the lower limit of the date of borrowing is to be placed not later than about 950 A. D. Consequently, the common chapters of the Matsya are to be dated earlier still. As chap. 16-22 betray Vaiṣṇava authorship it is probable that they come from the same date as the chapters on vows and gifts.

We shall now take up the chapters on vows, gifts, bath, etc. The position of chapters 51-270 between the chapters 43-50 on the one hand and chapters 271-273 on the other appears to prove their spurious character, for the latter two groups of chapters are inti-

1 If the word ‘Brahmaṇya’ used along with the words ‘Śiva-bhakta’, ‘Sūrya-bhakta’ and ‘Vaiṣṇava’ in Matsya 16, 9-10 is taken to mean ‘the worshipper of Brahmā’, then we must admit that the worship of Brahmā was still prevalent, otherwise his worshippers would not have been classed with the ‘pañkti-pāvanas.’ Hence Matsya 16-22 could not be later than 650 A. D. Though the Padma-P. (srṣṭī) reads ‘Brahmaṇa’ in the corresponding line (cf. Pad srṣṭī, 9, 87b) the reading ‘Brahmaṇya of the Matsya is the correct one, for this latter reading is supported by Devanabhaṭṭa (Smṛti-candrika IV, p. 156), Aparārka (p. 443) and Govindānanda (Śraddha-Kṛiyā-kaumudi, p. 35). The change from ‘Brahmaṇya’ to ‘Brahmaṇa’ made by the Padma (srṣṭī) is most probably due to the fact that in the just preceding line it changes ‘Śiva-bhakta’ to ‘Brahma-bhakta’.
mately connected with each other. The Lunar dynasty is taken up in chap. 23 and is described in chap. 23-24 and 43-50. In Matsya 50, 68-71 the sages request Sūta to tell them about the future kings and ages. In compliance with this request Sūta undertakes, in Matsya 50, 72-76, to speak on the future Kali-yuga and the manvantaras and also to give accounts not only of the future kings in the families of Ila, Ikṣvāku and Puru but also of the Andhras, Sakas, Yavanas, Pulindas, Kaivartas, Ābhīras and others, who attained regal power. He then gives the list of the future kings of only the line of Puru in Matsya 50, 77 to end, the chapter ending thus:

" ityēṣa Pauravo vamśo yathāvad-īha kirtitah,
dhīmatah Pāṇdu-putrasya Arjunasya mahātmamanah "

At the beginning of chapter 271 the sages say to Sūta:

" Puror-vamśas-tvayā Sūta sa-bhaviṣyo niveditah,
Sūrya-vamśe nrṇa ye tu bhaviṣyanti hi tān vada "

and the latter continues to give lists and accounts of the other future kings and the future ages in accordance with the promise he makes in 50, 72-76. From all this it is quite evident that chapters 271-3 have been separated from chap. 50. Of course, this separation might be due to the misplacement of chap. 271-3 which is not quite unlikely. We should, therefore, turn our attention to other things. The internal evidences show that at least a good number of the chapter on dāna, vrata, snāna etc. were inserted into Matsya-P. at the same time. In Matsya 53, 1 the sages ask Sūta not only to enumerate the Purāṇas but also to "deal exhaustively with the piety of making gifts " ( dāna-dharmam aśeṣam tu ). Consequently, in chap. 53, 3ff Sūta speaks of the Purāṇas and Upa-Purāṇas and the gifts of these on particular occasions. Next, proceeding to speak on the gifts connected with vows and fasting in chapters 54ff, he begins saying:

" atahparam pravakṣyāmi dāna-dharmān-aśeṣatah |
vratopavāśa-samyuktān yathā Matsyoditān-īha |
Mahādevasya saṁvāde Nāradasya ca dhīmatāh \""

The expression 'pravakṣyāmi dāna-dharmān-aśeṣatah ' is certainly used by Sūta in compliance with the request made by the sages in 53, 1. It, therefore, shows that chap. 53 and those chapters ( viz : 54-57, 61, 68 and 83-92 ) on vrataś and dānas ( because the making of ceremonial gifts also is to be accompanied with
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Fasting) in which Mahādeva and Nārada are the interlocutors are contemporaneous. The genuineness of these latter chapters need not be doubted, for, the request made by Nārada to Śiva in 54, 4 to tell him how the Śiva and Viṣṇu-worshippers could attain health, beauty etc., shows that the chapters in which Mahādeva and Nārada are to be the interlocutors should be Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava; and in fact they are so with the only exception of chap. 61 (dealing with Agastya-pūjā). Chapters 83-92 were all inserted at the same time in a group, for they are all enumerated by Śiva at the very beginning of these chapters (viz: in 83, 4–6). All these contemporaneous chapters (viz. 54–57, 61, 68 and 83-92) are interspersed by many others (viz. 58–60, 62–65, 66–67, 69–80 and 81–82) on vrata, pratiṣṭhā, snāna and dāna in which the interlocutors differ 1. The unconnected position of these chapters and the breaches they create in the dialogue between Mahādeva and Nārada prove their comparatively late dates. In these comparatively late chapters, again, there are some which seem to date still later. These are chapters 65, 73 and 76. The list of contents of the Matsya given in chapter 291 does not mention the Aksaya-tṛtiyā-vrata (chap. 65). Guru-Śukra-pūjā-vidhi (chap. 73) and Viṣṇu-vrata (chap. 99). Therefore, these seem to be later additions. This doubt is further strengthened by their absence from the Padma-P. (srṣṭi-kh.). The late age of chap. 76 (dealing with the Phala-saptami-vrata) is evidenced by the non-mention of this vrata in Matsya 74, 2–3 wherein Śiva names the Saura vrata as he afterwards speaks of in chap. 74–5 and 77–80.

Thus we get three groups of chapters which are arranged in order of priority:

1. Chap. 54-57 are told by Mahādeva to Nārada.
   58-60 " " Matsya to Manu.
   61 " " Mahādeva to Nārada.
   62-65 " " Mahādeva (Īśvara) to Umā.
   66-67 " " Matsya to Manu.
   68 " " Mahādeva to Nārada.
   69-80 " " Śiva to Brahmā.
   81-82 " " Matsya to Manu.
   83-92 " " Mahādeva to Nārada.
   93 " " Vaiśampāyana to Saunaka.
   94 " " Śiva to (?).
   95-112 " " Nandikesvara to Nārada.
Now, Nrsimha Vajapeyin of Orissa quotes one verse from chap. 53 in his Nityacara-pradipa; Govidananda quotes a number of verses from chapters 53 and 58 in his Dāna-kriyā-kānumudi; Candēśvāra quotes the entire chapters 56 and 63 and also some verses from chapters 53, 61 and 70 in his Kṛtya-ratnakara; Madanapāla quotes verses from chapter 53 in his Mudana-pārijāta; Ballālasena quotes entire chapters 82-92 and also verses from chap. 53 in his Dāna-sāgara; Aparārka quotes almost the entire chapters 53, 58-59 and 82-92 in his commentary on the Vaiśnavalkya-smṛti; and Jñūta-vāhana quotes a verse from chap. 53 in his Kālaviveka. These quotations made by the Nibandha-writers hailing from different parts of India, show that the chapters of at least the first two groups were inserted into the Matsya-P. much earlier than their times. Otherwise, such wide spread circulation of the Purāna would have been impossible. So these chapters must be dated not later than 950 A.D. Again, many of the chapters of the first and second groups and chap. 76 of the third group have been borrowed by the Padma-P. (srṣṭi) from the Matsya. We have said that this borrowing took place not later than about 950 A.D. Hence the date of the chapters of the Matsya, including chap. 76, are to be placed earlier still and most probably not later than at least 900 A.D. We have said above that chap. 76 (on Phala-saptami-vrata) was added later than chap. 74-5 and 77-80 which belong to the second group. Hence the date of at least these chapters of the second group and consequently also of those of the first, is to be placed further up. The acala-dānas (gifts of hillocks, chap. 83-92) require the images of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva which are to be placed on the artificial hillocks to be given away (cf. 83, 15 and 91, 5) and in 58, 24 Brahmā is found to be worshipped equally with the other two gods of the triad. These evidences show that the worship of Brahmā did not die out at the time of insertion of these chapters. Varaha-mihira's mention of only the most
prominent sects of his time shows that the Brahmā-worship was still popular. If, as scholars hold, this god was thrown into the back ground about the beginning of the 7th century A.D., then the date of chap. 58 and the chapters on açaladāna can not be placed later than 650 A.D. Thus we get the lower limit.

The mention of the names of the week-days in connection with the vrata etc. (cf. 55, 4; 57, 4; 64, 5; 70, 33; etc.) shows that these were well-known when these chapters were added. The earliest dated mention of a week-day being traced in the Eran inscription of 484 A.D. these chapters should not be placed very much earlier than this date. Matsya 53, 46-7 describe the Kūrma-P in its Vaiṣṇava form. As we have shown that the Vaiṣṇava Kūrma-P was written between 550 and 650 A.D. this chapter can not be earlier than 550 A.D. The mention of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu during the worship of the Naksatra-puruṣa in Matsya 54 (dealing with the Naksatra-puruṣa-vrata) and their total absence in Brhat-samhitā, chap. 105 (dealing with the same vrata) prove the later date of the former. The Brhat-samhitā was written about 550 A.D. Therefore, the date of Matsya 54 is later than 550 A.D. The inclusion of Buddha, in Matsya 54 (on Naksatra-puruṣa-vrata), among the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu also shows that this chapter could not have been written earlier than 550 A.D. The Mahābhārata does not mention the Buddha incarnation though it mentions Kalki in one of the spurious verses in XII, 141. Mārkandeya-Purāṇa chap. 4 names a few incarnations beginning with Varāha and ending with Māthura (i.e. Kṛṣṇa), there being no mention of Buddha. The Viṣṇu-P.

---

1 Viṣṇor-Bhāgavatān Magāṁś-ca Savitūḥ Sambhoḥ sa-bhasma-dvijān
Mātrprām-api Mātr-maṇḍala-vido viprān vidur-Brahmanah ||
Śākyān sarvahitasya śānta-manaso Nagnān Jinaṁ vidur
ye yaṁ devam-upāśritah sva-vidhinā tais-tasya kāryā kriyā ||

Brhat-samhitā 60, 19.

The mention of only the Bhāgavatas, and not the Pāñcarātras, among the worshippers of Viṣṇu shows that Varāha-mihira mentions only the most powerful sects of his time. We know that the Bhāgavatas grew in power under the Gupta emperors who called themselves ‘parama-bhāgavata’.

2 This essay on the Kūrma-P. has been published in the June issue of the Indian Historical Quarterly, 1935.

3 [ Annals, B. O. R. L ]
(about 300 A. D.) mentions Kalki but not Buddha. The Hari-vamsa (about 400 A. D.) also does not mention Buddha though it mentions Kalki. The lists of incarnations, or rather manifestations, of the Brahma-P. are the same as those in the Markanḍeya-P. and the Hari-vamsa. The Jayākhyā-samhitā (about 450 A. D.) of the Pāñcarātras does not name Buddha. The Ahirbudhnya-samhitā which is certainly later than the Jayākhyā, mentions 39 Vibhavas in which Kalki is one but the name of Buddha is wanting. Thus the Buddha incarnation seems to have been unknown to the beginning of the sixth century A. D. Matsya 47, 247, which mentions Buddha, is undoubtedly a later interpolation, for there is no mention of Buddha in the corresponding verse of the Vāyu. Now, the mention of the Buddha incarnation in the Gītāgovinda of Jayadeva (about the end of the 12th century), the Daśāvatāra-carita of Kṣemendra (11th century A. D.), a hymn by Nammalvar (alias Saint Śatagopa, 9th century), the Viṣṇupura cards (end of the 7th and beginning of the 8th century), a Pallava inscription of about the latter half of the 7th century A. D. 1 and the Bhāgavata-P. shows that this incarnation attained popularity by the beginning of the 7th century A. D. It is highly probable, therefore, that Buddha began to be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu from about 550 A. D. That during this time the founders of the heretical religions came to be identified with Viṣṇu is shown by the Brhat-samhitā (58, 45) according to which the image of the god of the Arhats (Arhatām devah) is to be marked with the Śrī-vatsa.

From what has been said above it appears that the chapters of the first two groups were written not earlier than 550 and not later than 650 A. D.

Of the chapters of the third group, chap. 76 is, as we have seen, later than the chapters (74-5 and 77-80) of the second group. As it is found in the Padma-P. (sṛṣṭi), it is earlier than 950 A. D. The other two chapters (viz. 65 and 73) are neither mentioned in the list of contents of the Matsya given in chap. 291

1 H. Krishna Shastri, the Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India Vol. 26, p. 5.
nor in the Padma-P. (srṣṭi). They are also not drawn by any Nibandha-writer. Therefore, they may be taken to be very late additions.

_Matsya_ chap. 7, verses 6-30 deal with the Madanadvādaśī-vrata observed by Diti for getting a son capable of killing the enemies of the Daityas. As in none of the other Purāṇas Diti is found to observe this vow, this portion of _Matsya_ 7 seems to have been interpolated later on. This interpolation was most probably made not later than 900 A. D., for these verses also occur in the Padma-P. (srṣṭi).

_Matsya_ 95-101 deal with vrataš-Śaiva, Saura and Vaiṣṇava. All of these chapters do not seem to have come from the same date. In _Matsya_ 95 Śiva, the speaker in the earlier chapters on vrata and dāna, refers Nārada to Nandikesvara, who is to speak on the 'Māheśvara-dharma'. Consequently, Nārada asks Nandikesvara to tell him about 'Māheśvara-vrata,' and the latter describes the 'Śiva-caturdāsi-vrata' (chap. 95) and the 'Sarva-phala-tyāga-vrata' (chap. 96) both of which are Śaiva. But in chap. 97-112, which also are ascribed to Nandikesvara the Saura and Vaiṣṇava vratas and Prayāga-māhātmya are treated of. Hence these chapters (97-112) must have been added by the non-Śaivas later than chap. 95-96. The strictly Śaiva character of chapters 95-96, as contrasted with those chapters on vrata and dāna in which Śiva and Nārada are the interlocutors, and the fact that Nandikesvara, the narrator in chap. 95-96, is introduced to Nārada by Śiva, show that chap. 95-96 were added by a Śaiva later than those chapters in which Śiva and Nārada are the interlocutors. Therefore, these two chapters (95-96) cannot be dated earlier than 600 A. D. Now, Caṇḍeśvara quotes a few verses from chap. 95 and 101 in his Kṛtya-ratnākara, Madanapāla from chap. 101 in his Madana-pāryāśa, and Devanabhāṭṭa from chap. 101 in his Smṛti-candrikā II. These quotations show that chap. 95 and 101 are to be dated earlier than 1100 A. D. Chap. 100 and 101 have been borrowed by the Padma-P. (srṣṭi). Therefore, these two chapters should not be placed later than about 900 A. D. The Bhavisya-P. also has borrowed chap. 95-100. Hence the dates of _Matsya_ chapters 95-101 fall between 600 and 900 A. D. Chap. 95-96 being earlier than chapters 97-101, the
former should be dated in the former part and the latter in the latter part of this period.

Matsya chapters 205--206 on gifts and chap. 207 on the dedication of bulls (vṛṣotsarga) seem to have been misplaced. Chapter 115 opens thus:

Manur-uvāca
caritam Budha-putrasya Janārdana maṇḍaḥ śrutam | śrutah śraddha-vidhiḥ puṇyaḥ sarva-pāpa-praṇāsanaḥ || dhenvāḥ prasūyamānāyaḥ phalām dānasya maḥ śrutam | kṛṣṇajīna-pradānam-ca vṛṣotsargas-tathāiva ca || śrutvā rūpam narendrasya Budha-putrasya Keśava | kautūhalam samutpannam tan-mamācakṣya prcchataḥ || etc. etc.

This opening shows that this chapter was immediately preceded by the story of Pururavas (the son of Budha) in which he was praised for his physical beauty, and also by chapters on śraddha, prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna, kṛṣṇajīna-dāna and vṛṣotsarga. Now, the story of Pururavas is found in chap. 24 (verses 11-32), śraddha in chap. 16-22, prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna in chap. 205, Kṛṣṇajīna-dāna in chap. 206 and vṛṣa-laksana in chap. 207. That Matsya 24 (11-32), dealing with the story of Pururavas, is aimed at by the expression 'caritam Budha-putrasya...... etc.' is shown by the fact that it is in this portion (viz. 24, 12) that Pururavas is called very beautiful so much so that Urvasī, the divine nymph, falls in love with him. There are also other evidences to show that chap. 205-207 immediately followed the chapters (16-23) on śraddha. Matsya 204, in which the Pitr-gāthās only are laid down but which ends with the verse "etavad-uktam tava bhūmi-pāla śraddhasya kalpaṃ muni-sampradīषṭam etc" points to chap. 16-22 termed 'śraddha-kalpa' and is, therefore, a continuation of these chapters. The mention of the prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna, kṛṣṇajīna-dāna and vṛṣotsarga in this chapter (i.e. chap. 204) shows that it preceded chap. 205-207 dealing with these topics. Hence the real order of these misplaced chapters seems to have been as follows:

Chap. 16-22, chap. 204-207, chap. 24 and chap. 115-120. This order is supported by the Vīṣṇu-dharmottara which borrows,
among others, the chapters 207 (24b-end) and 115-120 from the Matsya and in which the story of Pururavas is immediately preceded by viṣṇotsarga. 1

We have seen above that chap. 205-207 stand in close connection with the chap. (16-32) on śrāddha. This connection shows that the former could by no means be earlier than the latter, and it is highly probable that these two groups of chapters come from the same date. That chap. 205-207 were inserted into the Matsya earlier than 1100 A.D. is doubtless, for Govindānanda quotes verses from chapters 205-207 in his Dāna-kriyā-kaumudi and Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudi, Śālapāṇi quotes two lines from chap. 206 in his Prāyaścitta-viveka, Ballālasena quotes the entire chapters 205 (except verse 1) and 206 (except the last verse) and three verses from chap. 207 in his Dāna-sāgara, and Aparārka quotes chap. 205 (ex. verse 1) and 206 (except the first and last verses) in his commentary on Yāj.

Matsya 274-289 deal with the sixteen mahādānas (great gifts) which, requiring the worship of Viṣṇu, are certainly Vaiśṇava in character. The mention of these 16 mahādānas in chap. 274 (4-10) shows that all of the chapters 274-289 come from the same date. These chapters are frequently drawn upon by the Nibandha-writers early and late. Govindānanda quotes verses from Matsya 274 in his Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudi, Ballālasena gives the entire chapters 274-289 in his Dāna-sāgara, and Aparārka quotes chapters 274 (ex. verses 3a, 13b and 28b), 275 (ex. the last verse), 277 (ex. the last verse), 278 (ex. the last verse), 279, 280 (ex. the last verse) and 281-289 in his commentary. These quotations show that these chapters must be dated not later than 1050 A.D. The Liṅga-Purāṇa deals with the mahādānas in II,

1 Vide Viṣṇu-dharmottara I, 146, 41b-end and I, 148-154 (verse: 1-7) which are the same as Matsya 207 (24b-end) and 115-120 respectively.

The Viṣṇu-dharmottara is suspected to be the borrower for the following reasons:

(1) In the Viṣṇu-dh. the story of Pururavas is further continued to chap. 156.

(2) Though the opening verses of Viṣṇu-dh. I, 148 are the same as those of Matsya 115, in the former there is no chapter on prasūyamāna-dhenu-dāna or krṣṇājina-dāna preceding chap. 148.

(3) In the Viṣṇu-dh. the chapters on viṣṇotsarga and the story of Pururavas are introduced almost abruptly.
28ff. Ballalasena says that the mahādānas dealt with in the Liṅga were based on those of the Mātsyā. As in the Liṅga the mahādānas were inserted before the time of Ballalasena the chapters (274–289) of the Mātsyā should be dated earlier still and reasonably not later than 1000 A.D. The references to the worship of the images of Brahmā during the different mahādānas prove that the worship of the god was still popular. So these chapters (274–289) can not be dated later than 650 A.D. The references to the worship of the Images of Brahma during the different mahādānas prove that the worship of the god was still popular. So these chapters (274–289) can not be dated later than 650 A.D. Therefore, their date falls between 550 and 650 A.D.

Let us now take up the chapters on tīrtha. Mātsyā 13, verses 10–end describe, quite incoherently, the story of the self-immolation of Sati, the daughter of Dakṣa, in which she is appeased to name the numerous holy places sacred to herself. The position of these verses in chapters 13 (dealing with the Pitṛs) and their obvious Śākta character testify to their late date. Their late age is further proved by their mention of Rādhā in 13, 38 (Rādhā Brndāvane vane) and their position in the Padma-P. (srṣṭi). Though chap. 9 of this Purāṇa is the same as Mātsyā 13 (verses 1–9) and 14–17, these verses which are included in Mātsyā 13, are found in the Padma-P. (srṣṭi) as late as in 17, 182–216a. Hence we may be sure that these verses were taken by the Śāktas from a common source and interpolated independently in those parts of these two Purāṇas which the interpolators thought suited for them.

Chapters 103–112 (on Prayāga-māhātya) of the Mātsyā are later than Kurma-P. I, 35–38 which again, can not be dated earlier than 750, or rather 800 A.D. Hence the chapters of the

---

1 "ḥpad-apī Liṅga-Purāṇam Mātsyā-Purāṇoditair-mahādānaiḥ.....etc. Dānasāgara, fol. 3b.
2 Brahmā, Śiva and Viṣṇu are to be worshipped on the altar constructed during the tulk-puruṣa-mahādāna, etc. (Mātsyā 274, 30); in the kalpa-padvapa-mahādāna, the kalpa-padvapa is to be placed on a heap of coarse sugar (gūḍa) with Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya (Mātsyā 277, 6); the images of Brahmā and Anantaśakti are to be placed on a heap of salt in hema-kalpa-latā-dāna (Mātsyā 386, 6); and the golden image of Brahmā is to be placed on salt during the sapta-śāgara-dāna (Mātsyā 287, 7).
Matsya should be dated not earlier than 850 A.D. As most of these chapters are profusely drawn upon by Vācaspatimiśra and Caṇḍeśvara they are certainly not later than 1250 A.D.

The chapters on Prayāga-māhātmya (told by Mārkandeya to Yudhiṣṭhira) are not free from interpolations, for there are evidences which go against the authenticity of at least verses 1-17 of chap. 112. Though up to Matsya 112, 17 the sage Mārkandeya is nowhere said to have parted with Yudhiṣṭhira, in Matsya 112, 4 the former is said to have come to the latter, blessed him and then repa'red to his hermitage. This is quite contradictory. Again in Matsya 112, 18 Nandikesvara says "ityuktva sa mahābhāgo Mārkandeyo mahātapah,

Yudhiṣṭhirasya nrpates-tatraivāntar-adhiyata." The word 'ity-uktva' would have been meaningless if the preceding verses were not spurious, for they are spoken by Vāsudeva. Hence it follows that Matsya 112, 1-17 are interpolated.

Matsya 180-185 (on Avimuktaksetra or Benares) come from a fairly early date. A comparison between these chapters and Kūrma-P. I, 30-34 (on Benares) shows that the former are earlier than the latter. Though in both the Purāṇas (Matsya 181, 6-7 and Kūrma I, 30, 16) the Avimuktakṣetra-māhātmya is said to have been told by Śiva to Umā on the mount Meru, the chapters of the latter consist of the glorification of some Śiva-liṅgas, viz. Oṁkāra, Kṛttivāseśvara, Madhyameśvara, etc., at Benares. They also contain some fanciful stories about the origin or power of these liṅgas. Besides these, there is a story glorifying the Piśāca-mośana-kūṇḍa lying near the Kapardīśvara liṅga. These names and stories, which are undoubtedly of later origin, are not found in the Matsya. Now, Kūrma I, 30-34 are dated not later than the middle of the 13th century A.D. Therefore, chapters 180-185 of the Matsya should not be placed later than 1200 A.D. As Govindananda quotes verses from chap. 184 in his Śrāddha-kriyā-kaumudi, Vācaspatimiśra from chap. 180-184 in his Tīrtha-cintāmanī, Maḍanapāla from chap. 184 in his Madana-pāryjāta, Mādhavācārya from the same chap. in his Parāśara-bhāṣya and Aparārka from chap. 184 in his commentary on Yaj., we may be sure that chapters 180-185 were inserted into the Matsya not later than at least 1075 A.D. The
strictly Śaiva character of these chapters tends to show that they were added later than 700 A.D.

**Matsya** 186-194, on Narmadā-māhātya, must have been composed by a Śaiva living somewhere about the northern bank of the Narmadā. These chapters must have been interpolated at a very late date. They seem to be later than *Kūrma*-P. II, 33-39, which, again, are later than 800 A.D. Their late date seems further to be proved by the fact that no Nibandha-writer has been found to draw upon them.

**Matsya** 39 and 40, treating respectively of naraka and āśrama-dharma, are included in the story of Yayāti extending over chap. 25-43. This story seems to have been interpolated later on, because the *Padma*-P. (srṣṭi) in which *Matsya* chapters 5-24 and 44ff are found borrowed in the same order, omits this story. As no Nibandha-writer has been found to quote from these chapters, we are not sure about the lower limit of their date.

Snāna is dealt with in *Matsya* chapters 67-68 and 102. Of these, chapters 67 and 68 have already been dated between 550 and 650 A.D. Chap. 102, being drawn upon by Govindānanda in his *Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudi* and by Devnabhaṭṭa in his *Śrīti-candrikā* II, can not be dated later than 1100 A.D. As this chapter has been borrowed by the *Padma* (srṣṭi), it should not be placed later than 950 A.D. It has been shown above that chap. 97-112 are later than chap. 95-96 which, again, are later than 600 A.D. Therefore, chap. 102 cannot possibly be earlier than 650 A.D. Thus the date of this chapter falls between 650 and 950 A.D.

Pratiṣṭhā (consecration) is the subject matter of *Matsya* 58-59 and 264-270. Of these the former two have been dated between 550 and 650 A.D. The latter two chapters, dealing with the consecration of the images of gods, are certainly contemporaneous with chap. 258-263 in which the characteristics of the different images of gods have been laid down. A comparison between *Bṛha*-samhitā chap. 58 (dealing with pratimā-lakṣaṇa) and *Matsya* 1

---

Cf. chap. 186, verses 8a, 10, and 11 in which the Narmadā is glorified even over the Ganges, Yamūṣa and Sarasvatī. Also cf. 186, 52a; 190, 1f etc. wherein the northern bank of the Narmadā is said to be equal to the Rudra-loka. The Śaiva character of these chapters is quite obvious.
258-270 show that the former must be earlier than the latter. The Brhat-samhita names the following gods with their respective characteristics.

(1) Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, (2) Bali, the son of Virocana, (3) Baladeva, the carrier of the plough, (4) Devī (i.e. Lakṣmī), (5) Śamba, (6) Pradyumna, (7) the two wives of Śamba and Pradyumna, (8) Brahmā, (9) Skanda, (10) Mahendra, (11) Śambhu, (12) Buddha (for the Buddhists), and (13) the god of the Arhats (for the Jains).

The Matsya-P. omits (3), (6), (7), (12) and (13) but adds the following: Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nṛsiṃha, Vāmana, Rudra, Ardha-nārīśvara, Umā-Maheśvara, Śiva-Nārāyaṇa, Vināyaka, Kātyāyani, Agni, Yama, Nārāyaṇa. Vāyu, Kuvera, Gadādhara, the Mātrīs (viz: Brahmāṇī, Mahēśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhi, Indrāṇī, Yogeśvarī, Cāmunda, and Kālikā) and Kusumāyudha. The innovations made in the chapters of the Matsya prove that they can not be earlier than 550 A.D. As Aparārka quotes verses from chap. 265 and 267, they can not be later than 1100 A.D. The retention of Brahmā by the Matsya inspite of its additions and alterations in the list of gods given by the Brhat-samhita, shows that the Brahmā-worship did not die out. Moreover, according to the Matsya, the priest is required to be ‘Brahm-opendra-Hara-priya’ (Matsya 265, 7); the Brahma mantras are to be used in consecrating the image of Brahmā (Matsya 267, 39); and the gods, who are to be summoned at the time of consecrating the image of any god, include Brahmā (Matsya 267, 42). All these references prove the popularity of the Brahmā-worship at the time when Matsya 258-270 were written. Hence these chapters are to be dated earlier than about 650 A.D., and thus their date falls between 550 and 650 A.D.

Matsya chapter 7, verses 37-49 lay down the duties of pregnant women. These verses, being vitally connected with the story of the birth of the Maruts, appear to come from the date when the extant Matsya-P. was first written or compiled. That they are not later than 1100 A.D. and most probably also than 950 A.D. is shown by the quotations made from them by Devanābhaṭṭa in his Smṛti-candrīkā I and by the occurrence of these verses in the Padma (स्मृति).
Matsya 215–243 and 252–257, treating of raja-dharma, graha-yajña, adbhuta-sānti, yātrā-kāla-vidhāna, subhāsubha-nirūpāṇa, vāstu and vyavahāra, must have come from the same date, because all these are meant for the king. The determination of even their approximate date is rather difficult. That they are not later than 1000 A.D. is sure, for Bhavadeva quotes verses from chap. 237 in his Prāyaścitta-prakaraṇa, Aparārka from chap. 253 in his commentary on Yāj., Devaṇabhaṭṭa from chap. 227 in his Smṛti-candrika I, and Ballālasena from chap. 228–238 in his Adbhuta-sāgara. The reference to the unpopularity of the worship of Brahmā in Matsya 225, 12–14, wherein it is said that the people worshipped the fierce (daṇḍināḥ-punishing) gods Rudra, Agni, Sūrya, Viṣṇu and others instead of the mild (prāśānta-serene) Brahmā, Pūṣan and Aryaman, shows that Matsya 215–243 and 252–257 can not possibly be dated earlier than 600, or rather 650, A.D.

Matsya 93 and 94 deal with graha-sānti and graharūpākhyāna respectively. These chapters are certainly not later than 1000 A.D., because Śūlapāṇi quotes two lines from chap. 93 in his Vṛata-kāla-viveka, Devaṇabhaṭṭa quotes a verse from chap. 93 in his Smṛti-candrika II, Aparārka quotes the entire chap. 94 and a good number of verses from chap. 93 in his commentary, the Trikāṇḍa-mañḍana has one verse from chap. 93, and Vijñāneśvara quotes the entire chap. 94 in his Mīlākṣarā (under Yāj. I, 297–298a). The interlocutors (viz. Vaiśampāyana and Śaunaka in chap. 93 and Śiva alone in chap. 94), who appear abruptly without any introduction but who are not found in the chapters preceding or following chap. 93 and 94, prove that these two chapters are later than at least those chapters on vṛata and dāna in which Śiva and Nārada are the interlocutors. These latter chapters we assigned to 550–650 A.D. Therefore, chap. 93–94 can not be earlier than about 650 A.D. Thus their date falls between 650 and 1000 A.D.

Yuga-dharma is dealt with in chapters 142, 144, 145 and 165. Of these, the former three are the same as Vaiṣṇa 57 (verses 1–85), 58 and 59 respectively. They most probably come from the time when the extant Matsya-P. borrowed some of its chapters from the Vaiṣṇa. Their position between Matsya 50 and 271–3 (on the future dynasties and ages) must be due to misplacement. Matsya 165,
which has been borrowed by the Padma (srṣṭī), should be dated not later than about 950 A.D.

In the foregoing pages we have tried to determine the dates of the different Smṛti-chapters of the Matsya-P. The results of our investigation are given below in a tabular form:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Periods of insertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-22</td>
<td>400-950 A.D. Probably between 550 and 650 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 54-57, 61, 68 and 83-92</td>
<td>550-650 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>650-950 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and 73</td>
<td>Uncertain. Surely much later. Most probably not later than 900 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (verses 6-30)</td>
<td>600-900 A.D. The former two chaps. are earlier than the latter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-96 and 97-101</td>
<td>Not earlier than 400 A.D. and not later than 1100 A.D. Probably between 550 and 650 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-207</td>
<td>550-650 A.D. Late interpolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274-289</td>
<td>850-1250 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (verses 10-end)</td>
<td>700-1075 A.D. Very late (later than 800 A.D.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-112</td>
<td>Late but uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-185</td>
<td>650-950 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186-194</td>
<td>550-650 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-40</td>
<td>Not later than 950 A.D. Most probably as old as the date of composition of the extant Matsya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>650-1000 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258-270</td>
<td>650-1000 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (verses 37-49)</td>
<td>650-1000 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215-243 and 252-257</td>
<td>650-1000 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>650-1000 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In connection with the Smṛti-chapters we should like to say a few words on the date and authenticity of some of the remaining chapters. Matsya 52, dealing with karma-yoga, recommends the worship of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya, who are to be considered as not different from one another (Matsya 52, 23f.). The author of this chapter seems to be a Viṣṇu-worshipper, for he defines Vāsudeva as 'atīndriya,' 'śānta,' 'sūkṣma,' 'avyakta,' 'sanātana' and 'jagan-mūrti' and calls Brahmā, Śiva, Sūrya and others his 'vibhūti.' Therefore, the date of this chap. can not possibly be later than 650 A. D. The story of Pururavas in chap. 115-120 is of comparatively late origin. It says how Pururavas, the son of Budha, attained extraordinary physical beauty by fasting on every dvādaśī tithi and by worshipping Viṣṇu in the Himalayas respectively in two of his previous births. Ballāla-sena's quotation of Matsya 115, 14 in his Dāna-sagara (fol. 23a), however, shows that chap. 115-120 are at least not later than 1100 A. D. The story of Sāvitrī in chap. 208-214, on account of its innovations befitting later taste, can be taken to be a late interpolation. It says that Aśvapati, king of Madra, worshipped the goddess Sāvitrī and was gifted with a daughter who was consequently named after the goddess, and that four days before the death of Satyavān, Sāvitrī fasted for three days and observed the Sāvitrī-vrata. Besides these there are also other innovations.

From what has been said above about the dates of the different chapters of the Matsya-P. it appears that this Purāṇa was subjected to additions, and also perhaps to alterations, more than once. That some of its chapters have been lost is shown by the quotations made by Devanabhāṭṭa and Aparārka on dāna and ekādaśī-upavāsa. In the extant Matsya there is no chapter treating of these topics.
The extant Matsya-\textit{P.} seems to have been written, or rather complied, originally by the Vaiṣṇavas. At least this impression is created by the earlier portions that have been retained. In \textit{Matsya} 1, 23–25 the supernatural power which the Fish displays in rapid growth and huge size is said to be possible only with Vāsudeva, for, Manu says, ‘none other than he can be such’; \textit{Matsya} 9, 39 says that at the end of each thousand years the Manus perish and Brahmā and other gods (Brahmādyāḥ) attain the proximity of Viṣṇu; in \textit{Matsya} 23, 17 Nārāyaṇa is called ‘Paramātman’; in \textit{Matsya} 24 (verses 11, 36 etc.) many ancient kings, viz. Purūravas, Raṇi and others, are said to have practised austerity for the favour of Viṣṇu; and so on. In the verses referred to above Viṣṇu has been assigned the highest position, and these seem to be the traces of the original Vaiṣṇava character of the \textit{Matsya}.

On the strength of the great prominence given to the region about the Godāvari in \textit{Matsya} 114, 37–39 (on geography) it has been suggested that the place of composition of the \textit{Matsya-\textit{P.}} was Nasik ¹. This suggestion seems to have a very weak basis, for these verses of the \textit{Matsya} tally with \textit{Vāyu} 45, 112–114, and we have seen that the \textit{Matsya} borrowed some chapters from the \textit{Vāyu}. The close agreement between the majority of the geographical chapters in the two Purāṇas seems to confirm the indebtedness of the \textit{Matsya} to the \textit{Vāyu}. Hence to find out the place of origin of the present \textit{Matsya} we shall have to look to those of its original chapters which have not been found to be borrowed from any other work. Such a one is chap. 2. In it the river Narmadā, and not the famous Ganges, is said to remain even after the destruction of the world (\textit{Matsya} 2, 13). Elsewhere, in chap. 15 (which most probably comes from a little later date) this river “which flows through the Deccan” is called the ‘mānasi kanyā’ of the Somapa Pitṛs living in the Mānasa loka (\textit{Matsya} 15, 25–28). These passages tend to show that the \textit{Matsya-\textit{P.}} was composed and circulated by some Vaiṣṇava living somewhere about the river Narmadā.

We give below a list of those verses quoted by the comparatively early Nibandha-writers from the 'Matsya-Purāṇa' which we have been able to trace in the Vaṅgavāsi edition of the same Purāṇa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Smṛti-candrika</th>
<th>Matsya-P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 46</td>
<td>7, 37&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;; 40&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, 44&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-45&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;; 46-47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>17, 6-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>18, 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>102, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>101, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>93, 111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>102, 2-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>102, 9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-10&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>102, 14-21 &amp; 23&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 481</td>
<td>227, 146&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (the other line differs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IV                 |           |
| 28                 | 17, 4-5<sup>a</sup>. |
| 29                 | 17, 6-8.  |
| 53, 72, 76. 77-78—On ekādaśi | |
| 82                 | 22, 84.  |
| 83 (twice)         | 16, 21; 22, 85 |
| 84 (twice)         | 22, 83 and 88 |
| 121                | 22, 88.  |
| 156 (twice)        | 16, 8<sup>b</sup>-10<sup>a</sup>; (other quotation is not found) |
| 191                | 16, 19<sup>a</sup>. |
| 194-195            | 16, 19<sup>b</sup>-20 |
| 215                | 15, 39<sup>a</sup> (the first line is not found) |
| 255                | 17, 30.  |
| 265                | 15, 37<sup>b</sup>-38<sup>a</sup>. |
| 270-271            | 16, 27<sup>b</sup>-28<sup>a</sup>. |
| 271                | 16, 28<sup>b</sup>-29<sup>a</sup>. |
| 272                | 19, 4<sup>a</sup>. |
| 290-291            | 17, 14<sup>b</sup>-15<sup>a</sup>. |

| (2) Prīyaścitta-prakarana |
| (of Bhavadeva) |
| p. 5 = 227, 118<sup>b</sup>-120<sup>a</sup>. |

| (3) Kāla-viveka |
| (of Jīmūta-vāhana) |
| p. 101 = 17, 9 |
| 292 = 61, 49<sup>a</sup> (the other line is not found) |

| 304 = (this is same as Brahma-P. 220, 14) |
| 321 = 274, 19<sup>b</sup>-23<sup>a</sup>. |
| 369 = 22, 83. |
| 370 = 22, 88. |
| 391 = (the same as Brahma-P. 220, 57<sup>b</sup>-54) |
| 400 = 17, 4<sup>a</sup> (the other line is not found) |
| 418 = 17, 9. |
| 520 = 17, 5<sup>b</sup>-8. |
### Dates of the Smṛti—Chapters of the Matsya-Purāṇa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4) Hāralalā</th>
<th>Matsya P-</th>
<th>Dīna-Sāgara</th>
<th>Matsya-P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(of Aniruddha)</td>
<td>p. 98 = 18, 30</td>
<td>fol. 90(^a)–90(^b) = chap. 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162 = 18, 5-7</td>
<td>&quot; 91(^a)–91(^b) = &quot; chap. 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 = 18, 12(^b)–14(^a)</td>
<td>&quot; 92(^a)–92(^b) = &quot; chap. 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Mitākṣarā</td>
<td>Matsya-P.</td>
<td>&quot; 93(^a)–93(^b) = &quot; chap. 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of Vijñānāśvara)</td>
<td>under Yāj. I, 297–298(^a) = Chap. 94</td>
<td>(ex. verses 17–33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Dīna-sāgara</td>
<td>&quot; 94(^a)–95(^a) = &quot; chap. 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of Ballalasena)</td>
<td>folio 6(^a) = 274, 1</td>
<td>(ex. verses 1, 20(^a), 23(^a), 24 &amp; 26–31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 15(^b)–16(^a) = 22, 27(^b)–28, 30(^b)–36, 49–55(^a), 57–59, 68, 73(^b)–75(^a), 71(^a)</td>
<td>&quot; 115(^a)–115(^b) = &quot; chap. 205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18(^a) = 206, 23(^b)–24(^a)</td>
<td>&quot; 117(^a)–117(^b) = &quot; chap. 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23(^a) = 115, 14</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27(^a)–31(^b) = Chap. 274</td>
<td>&quot; 191(^b)–193(^b) = &quot; chap. 290, 2–19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39(^b)–41(^a) = Chap. 275</td>
<td>3–4 and 11–56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 42(^b)–44(^a) = &quot; chap. 280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 45(^b)–46(^b) = &quot; chap. 280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 48(^b)–50(^a) = &quot; chap. 281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 52(^a)–53(^a) = &quot; chap. 281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 54(^a)–55(^a) = &quot; chap. 282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 56(^a)–57(^a) = &quot; chap. 282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 58(^a)–59(^a) = &quot; chap. 283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 61(^a)–62(^a) = &quot; chap. 283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 63(^b)–64(^b) = &quot; chap. 284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 66(^a)–67(^b) = &quot; chap. 284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 69(^a)–70(^a) = &quot; chap. 285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 71(^a)–72(^a) = &quot; chap. 286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 73(^a)–74(^a) = &quot; chap. 287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 77(^a)–77(^b) = &quot; chap. 288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 79(^a)–81(^b) = &quot; chap. 289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 87(^b)–87(^b) = &quot; chap. 291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 88(^a) = &quot; chap. 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 88(^a)–89(^a) = &quot; chap. 293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 89(^a)–89(^b) = &quot; chap. 294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>, 89(^b)–90(^a) = &quot; chap. 295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(except the first line)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Commentary Matsya-P.</td>
<td>on the Manu-Smṛti</td>
<td>(by Kullukabhaṭṭa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Manu III, 265 = 17, 61</td>
<td>&quot; V, 60 = 18, 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Commentary Matsya-P.</td>
<td>on the Yājñavalkya-smṛti</td>
<td>(by Aparārka)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 16 = 265, 1(^b)–5</td>
<td>139—(This quotation tallies with Viṣṇu-P. III, 11, 32–35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 = 16, 5</td>
<td>201 (twice), 207 (twice) and 209 (twice)—On ekādaśi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three of the lines quoted on p. 207 are found quoted in the Smṛti-candrika IV, 61 as from the Brahmā-ṇḍa-P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Com. on Yājñavalkya- Matsya-P. Smṛti

295-296, 370, 380-382 and 427—On gifts of cows, land, house etc.

301 = chap. 205 (except verse 1).

303-305 = 82, 2-25, (except verses 12 and 24)

313-319 = chap. 274 (except verses 3a, 13b and 28b)

320-323 = chap. 275 (ex. the last verse) and chap. 276 (except the last verse; one of the quoted verses is not found)

324-326 = chap. 277 (ex. the last verse)

328-354 = chap. 278, (ex. the last verse), 279, 280 (ex. the last verse)

354-356 = chap. 206 (ex. the first and last verses)

382-383 = 253, 19b-32

392-396 = chap. 53 (ex. verses 1, 2, 5-10, 21, 25b-26a and 56b to the end)

403-404 = chap. 290 (ex. verses 1, 13-17 and 20 to the end)

409-413 = chap. 58 (ex. verses 1-3)

Com. on Yājñavalkya- Matsya-P. Smṛti

414-415 = chap. 59 (ex. verses 1 and 19)

441 = 16, 11b-12a (the other verse is not found)

443 = 16, 8b-10a

456 = 16, 19-20

466-467 = 22, 88

475 (twice) = 15, 34a and 35b-36a: 16, 26-29 (ex. 26b)

485 = 17, 26-27a

491 = 15, 32b-33a

507 = 18, 30

512 = 17, 0-61

514 = 16, 56-57a

515 = 17, 65b-66

523 = 18, 8-9a

550 (twice) = 16, 52b-54a (the first quoted passage is not found)

554 = 17, 36

557-558—One line coincides with 17, 4a; the substance of another quoted verse is found in 17, 2a

564 = 267, 12b-13

569 = chap. 94, (the quoted passage has two verses more than chap. 94)

572 = 93, 7b-9a and 11-12

575 = 93, 59-63a

600 = 227, 6

835 = 227, 8

856 = 227, 120b-121a, and 126b-127a

889 = 18, 5-6

890 = 18, 7

954 = 184, 21b-23a

1043 = 227, 118b-120a
(9) **Trikāṇḍa-maṇḍana Matsya-P.**  
(of Trikāṇḍa-maṇḍana  
Bhaṣkara Miśra)  
p. 238 = 93, 111

(10) **Haradatta’s Matsya-P.**  
commentary on the  
Gautama-dharma-sūtra  
under Gautama II, 5, 12 = 18, 30

(11) **Kṛtyācāra Matsya-P.**  
(of Sridatta Upādhyāya)  
fol. 66\(^b\) = 16, 5\(^b\)

(12) **Kṛtya-ratnakara Matsya-P.**  
(of Caṇḍēśvara)  
fol. (?) = 61, 43ff.  
fol. (?) = 58, 28–29  
fol. 139\(^b\) = 53, 23–24

| Reference to 82, 18\(^ff\) in which tila-dhenu-dāna is dealt with | 161\(^b\)–162\(^a\) = 56, 1 to end  
| | 169\(^a\)–170\(^b\) = 95 1 to end  
| | 176\(^b\) = 53, 31–32\(^b\)  
| | 177\(^a\)–(the verse 'sītāśīte etc.' is not found); 101, 36  
| | 161\(^a\) = 101, 53\(^a\)–b  
| | 181\(^a\)–182\(^a\) = 63, 1 to end (ex. verse 29)  
| | 187\(^a\) = 53, 33–35  
| | 193\(^a\) = 101, 79  
| | 193\(^a\)–b = 53, 36–37  
| | 197\(^b\) = 17, 6–8  
| | 220\(^b\) \(ff\) = 70, 32–44f.

(5) **Parāśara-bhāṣya Matsya-P.**  
(of Mādhavācārya)  
Vol. I, part ii.  
p. 58 = 18, 30  
182 = 184, 21\(^b\)–23\(^a\)  
222 = 18, 30  
310 = 17, 4–5  
311 = 17, 6–8  
361 = 16, 19\(^a\) and 19\(^b\)–20  
371 = 17, 30  
398 = 16, 28\(^b\)–29\(^a\)  
396 = 16, 27\(^b\)–28\(^a\)  
405 = 17, 23 and 14\(^b\)–15\(^a\)  
418 = 17, 28\(^a\)  
433 = 17, 36  
434 = 17, 49\(^b\); 16, 47; 17, 53–55  
438 = 16, 54\(^a\)  
440 = 16, 55  
443 = 16, 56–57\(^a\)

(13) **Madana-panjata Matsya-P.**  
(of Madanapāla)  
p. 13 = 53, 5\(^b\)–13\(^a\) (ex. 12\(^b\)). One line ‘tṛptim karoti etc.’ is not found  
264 = 101, 37  
375 = 184, 21\(^b\)–23\(^a\)  
540 (twice)—(Brahma-P. 220, 53\(^b\)–55).  
17, 6–8  
558 = 16, 11\(^b\)–12\(^a\)  
568 = 16, 27\(^b\)–28\(^a\)  
575 = 17, 23  
631 = 17, 65\(^b\)–66

(15)  
(a) **Vrata-kāla- Matsya-P.**  
viveka (of Śūlapāṇi)  
fol. 2\(^b\) = 93, 140\(^b\)–141\(^a\)

(b) **Sambandha-viveka**  
fol 1\(^b\) = 18, 30
(c) Prāyaścitā-viveka Matsya-P.
p. 416 = 206, 23^b-24^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>108, 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>108, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>110, 1-11^a (the verse 'tathā drṣṭvā etc.' is not found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>104, 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>106, 27-28, 30^b-33 and 46-48; 107, 20-21; 108, 15 and 25-26^a. (Three verses are not found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>107, 8 (the other quoted verses are not found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>104, 5-6^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>106, 34-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>106, 40-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>106, 44-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>107, 4-6 (ex. 5c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>107, 9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>107, 17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-43</td>
<td>105, 13^b-14^a and 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>205, 4^b-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>18, 12^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 (thrice)</td>
<td>53, 51 53, 17^a-b, 22a-b, and 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>206 (ex. verses 1, 3-4^a, 9^a, 10-19, 20^b-22, 23^b-28^a, and 30-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>206, 23^b-24^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>18, 12^b-14^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 (twice)</td>
<td>207, 18-19^a; 207, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>18, 16^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>58, 55-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>58, 18^-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>58, 42_^b-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>17, 65^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>58, 43^b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Śuddhi-kriyā-kaumudi (of Govinda-nanda)
p. 49 = 18, 30 |
| 74 | 18, 12^b |
| 139 | 18, 7^a |
| 163 | 18, 12^-b-14^a |
| 165 | 207, 38-41 |
| 169 | 207, 18-19^a |
| 177 | 17, 70 |
| 178 | 18, 26 |
| 182 | 18, 16^-a and 22^b-23^a |
## Dates of the Smrīti-Chapters of the Matsya-Purāṇa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suddhi-kiṃyā-kaumudi</th>
<th>Matsya-P.</th>
<th>Śrāddha-kiṃyā-kaumudi</th>
<th>Matsya-P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>183 = 18, 22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>192 = 16, 39&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 = 18, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>194 = 16, 38&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 = 22, 82-84&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>196 = 17, 47&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; and 49&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 = 274, 6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>207 = 17, 52&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-55&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 = 102, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>208 = 17, 55&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212 = 17, 52&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; and 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214 = 17, 59-60&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>252 = 16, 57&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-58&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>259 of 17, 63&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300 = 18, 22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306 = 22, 82-85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312-313 = 22, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319 = 18, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326 = 16, 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>336 = 18, 8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337 = 18, 22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>345-346 = 18, 22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>357 = 18, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>362 = 18, 16&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389 = 17, 27&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>398 = 18, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425 = 18, 19&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>433-434 = 18, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>435 = 18, 28-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>436 = 18, 20&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; and 21&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>471 = 16, 58&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>474 = 18, 23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>488 = 17, 65&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557 = 16, 5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19) Nityācāra-pradīpa Matsya-P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(of Nṛsimha Vājapeyīn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 18 = 53, 59&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104 = 18, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209 = 93, 83&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-84&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(c) Śrāddha-kiṃyā-kaumudi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17, 30-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>17, 63-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>17, 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>17, 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>16, 8-12</td>
<td>(six lines, 'sad-angavit etc.' are not found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16, 14 and 15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-16, (the line 'parapūrva-patiḥ etc.' and the verse, 'Karṇatāś-ca etc.' are not found)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>17, 14&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>16, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>16, 19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; and 29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-30&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>16, 56-57&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>184, 33&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; ; 17, 11&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-12&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;; 16, 27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-29&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>17, 16&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>17, 19&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>17, 14&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>17, 14&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; and 17&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>17, 26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-27&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>15, 37&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>15; 32&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;-33&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>17, 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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मत्तकारणिव एवं सिहिसरपासु दंसि जद तनाणो
प्रयासम सत्तारीण संकरो होइ बहुरवा II ३ II
आसायुदारणानि ग्न्हान्तराणस्यायानि II २७ II २८ II पत्रपद्यःप्रकरणः-
अथ पद्पदी—
दसान्त्तरसानि वा इह वारसान्त्तरसानि अहवाः
अन्धेयारसानि व दसान्त्तरसानि वाविः II २९ II
वारसान्त्तरसानि वारविवारसानि य कहाँः
तिरुतिरु पप्पि कमसी दश्मुप्पले बहुविहा घटा II ३० II
पत्रा कडकवयनिःष्णु छड़णिया इत्यः पद्मबिहुत्याः
तंत्रयात्राः चउत्थर्यस्यमाणाः च अणुपासी II ३१ II
[ क्षायःतायाद्वारसानि इह क्षायःकालयाद्वारसानि यथा
क्षायःकालयाद्वारायाणि दुसान्त्तरकाव्याभिवापि II ३२ II
dसान्त्तरकृद्वारसानि रविपुराविभिवापि कलासिः
तिरुतिरु पप्पि कमसो दश्मुप्पि बहुविहा घटा II ३३ II
eषा कडकवकविःष्णु छड़णिकाग्र ध्रुवगत्विभियोः
तृतीयकृद्वाृत्तथपःप्रस्यमोऽवानुमात् II ३४ II
[ इत्यती असिद्धस्ववसिः क्षायःकालयाद्वाराकाण्डलः यथासंस्थान्त्तरसानिभिपि
पटितार्थेमुखी बहुविहा घटायानाम पद्पदी। क्षायःकालस्य संघःमुखि कदवकसश्च तवः
ध्रुवविषयः कायेव। ध्रुवमध्रुवकसिः संहारस्यापि एषा कडवकान्ते प्रकाश्त्वार्थः
भ्रायःन्त्वाणि भविष्याधेभिः कालककेति तृतीयमापि। इत्यती अस्यां घटायां प्रथमेऽ
क्षायःकालयाद्वारःध्रवकियस्यध्रुवपःसमयः पद्योपसन्तुमाः II ३५ II
उदात—सांस्कृतिकस्मुख्याः। बप्पुःकरकाथा (सुक्स्य) । जे जिलिन्द तुह नहु गाविय ।
दुहसंचारियाः। कुपस्य-भावियाः। ने तर लिब पांच चिरु भामि II ४६ II
[ मनसि मानससुखः। मूर्ति वराकः। ये जिलिन्द त्वा न पणाता।
दुहसंचारिताः। कुपस्यभाविता:। ने तरः खलु बने चिरः
आतमाः। II ४६ II ]
संचारःविवाच्य सामाये वेति दिन्याय। बप्पुःस्वि हीपुराख्या।ध्रुव्य स्य बप्पुः।
निश्चिति निश्चित्यार्थायुक्तस्य II ४६ II
उदात—जय जिलिन्दाससान्तनसानुपथः। बप्पुःस्वि ध्रुवः। निम्मकःसचंद्रध्रुवमातुः।
हुःकुःकालयाद्वारः। मुःसायायारः। तिलघुसःतें गण्डरतिल्हुः।II ४७ II
साहित्यसरसाः। श्रीमन्तेसाः। जुः वाजिय जयजज्ञः।
तुः सिंहवगः। महाभर्यमः। हियदः पाडः भस्यः। II ४८ II
भवः अश्वारिः। इष्क्यारिः। सभरि सर्यारिहाः।
घणणकदुःसालः। कुद्मर्यः। तिफि साणि भगः बिलाउः। II ४९ II
Both 50 and 51 are fine examples of ការបង្កាប់ ពាក្យ. 

*Both 50 and 51 are fine examples of ប្រៀបធៀប*.
तथान्तरसमार्थसमा संकीर्णा सर्वसमा जेति चतुर्था चतुःपदं । यच्छन्दःकन्यकी—
अह चउर्ध्वः चउर्धा हर्वति अन्तरसमा तह्वसमा ।
संक्रिता सत्समा य तातु तार्तरसमाओऽय ॥ १ ॥
विसने सेगा सेगा सताध शोध जाव पनेय ।
अढ्याई जा सतसर सेगा सेगा सम मचा ॥ २ ॥
चंपङ्गकुकुतस्रामायामियाओ जाइँ वहति वणपञ्चा ।
दितीश्रमणहुवर्षरससरसायरसिंहिनयणचन्द्रभेदाः ॥ ३ ॥
प्रयात्मचिय सुमणोरमायनामाओ वच्चर मुणह ।
परावर्णार्तर्षर्षर चाम्प्रा अंतरसमाओऽय ॥ ४ ॥
अंतरसमाचिय दुहुयवर्षहर्ष विभिन्नयामि कप
अंबसमा य दृष्टवर्षसञ्चा तेहिं नामेहि ॥ ५ ॥
दुहितिश्रिहुजाहिष्विविससिलपाएहि विमिसियाउँ संक्रिता ।
सत्तवसमाओऽ पुण सर्चएहि सत्तवेहि पाएहि ॥ ६ ॥

कुकुतस्राया तु चतुःपदिता द्विपदि । तथोऽऽ पञ्चानन्दःशिरमःहुमार्तक-
वृहकापद्वृहकाया: करिकिश्रिहुर्तरसमार्चुपचुपदवियः कुकुतस्रायाः
करिकिश्रिहुपदेवः: भृशक्ता एव्य पञ्चानन्दःशिरमः च बहुशः: संतिसुमुखः प्रयुक्तः हस्यते ॥ २९ ॥
३० ॥ ३१ ॥

पपका टुंमण पप्पा करमण मुहण्डन्दःदपणपतिेसू ।
कितिश्रवल्लल दृष्टजुमे पढऺतयाजामणपुप्पासि ॥ ३२ ॥
[ पपकाटुमण पप्पा करमण मुहण्डन्दःदपणपतिेके ]
कितिश्रवल्लल दृष्टजुमे पढऺतयाजामणपुप्पास: ॥ ३२ ॥

खच्छव्यायचन्द्रस्य प्रमाचू वर्णेत्य तद्वलसम । तब त्रिधा । अष्टपाद
प्रवाशःश्चाराण । यदाह—

खच्छव्यायेः मुहरेचा वासितबजः जन तेन सो धवलो ।
धवलोवि होष तिविहो अहुपछायु चुरुपाओऽ ॥

तमात्पदश्रीपल्लववर्षव्या वश्यति । पद्वर्ष पञ्च यथा । कमान्नुवर्षके
प्रथमेश्वरी हृ पण्मात्रावै द्वितीयावै द्वितीयावै तृतीयावै तु हृ पण्मात्रावै
द्वितीयावै द्रुतावै द्वितीयावै द्रुतावै द्रुतावै द्रुतावै द्रुतावै द्रुतावै
द्रुतावै प्रथमेश्वरी हृ प्रथमेश्वरी हृ प्रथमेश्वरी हृ प्रथमेश्वरी हृ प्रथमेश्वरी हृ

उपाः—देशणमुण्डाचिवि हिषंज्व । मण्डल नाणिहि । पवल्वायवह्दवाहिहि

मण्डलः ।

परिकितिधत्वियसयधरै । जजःहसमुरी । तुहसमवढ न छहाहि
किचि गणधर ॥ ५२ ॥
[ देवानामुळें गाजित: ] मतो ज्ञानेन। प्रवृत्तवादलवादिमत्वको ल।
परिकीतैपिनिकृतसंकल्परो। यशोघोषसौ। त्वस्मि न भव्यते
कौषिक मण्डरः। ५२।
समवदाति समस्ततांबिकस्तः। संसिद्धार्थः। चतुर्पद्वः। गुणवर्धादिः। स च
महायनेभ्यः। वधोपस्तुक्षाणामंगलार्थसंबंधैन्युन्धो मंगलाः। यदाहुः
उत्साहेक्षातुपद्वादितार्थस्वतीत समक्षवाच्च किंचितै।
तद्धूःधान्तो अभिधानपूर्व्यैं च छन्दोबन्धुः। समक्षामाननिति। ॥ ॥
तथा—तैरेव धर्मव्याजातपुरुषः। लघुत्यते यदा।
तद्देव तदुपनिको धर्मोपयोगेऽन्निते। ॥ ॥

कौषिकः। चेन्नाक्तांहारादिन वधसुचवछरमाणामां कृते तद्वामाये मंगलपवलः।
तथाहि। उत्साहमक्ष्णस्म। शेषामक्ष्णस्म। वदनमक्ष्णस्म। आहिष्ठामक्ष्णस्म। आदि
शब्दातु रासायनवस्तुकृं दृष्टमक्ष्णादि च। हैयस। एवम्। उत्साहव्याजयै।
वाच्यः। किंच चेन्नाक्तांहारादिने देवां गीते तद्धूःकृमस। तथा चतुर्मात्रत्रिक्त
सेको द्विदार्शो यज्ञात्मितित्युः। यस्य कर्मचिद्धाते श्वस्तकृमस।

वन्धवनः: कठर्थः।

उत्साहव्याजातहारादिनेष्वतः। विस्तार पुरिं।
जेश्विनी धर्मस्थिरं तत्रामुच्यते। पवलः। ॥ ॥
इप्संगताविन तत्रामसुचच्। मंगलस्तयसबृद्धः।
फुलदर्च तुर्णि ज्ञावं ज्ञातं तन्त्रका। गाणे। ॥ ॥
वन्धववर्णाना वद्धार्दंधृतं छष्ठयं दृश्यं।
कथवं वा। अद म्चा। वद्धार्दंगण्यं फुल। ॥ ॥

[ वन्धववनादिन कुडङ्गसंतुः। पदपः नर्षस्मातः।
काय्यि। वा। अब मात्रा। वद्धार्दसंगता। फुल। ॥ ॥

वन्धववनादिनेष्वतः। रासायनवस्तुकृं। कन्दुवंशः। समृद्धस्व। तदूः।
ठकनेन कठुमकेन। कपूरणे। च। संदूः। नृपदाह्यं। सार्थस्मानुः। संतुः। काय्यं।
वा। हैयस। यदाहुः।

ज्ञाव। वन्धवानि। हिंदु। वन्धारा छुर्दयुः। किम्यं।
विवश्चछुर्दयुः। कार्यः ताइ। दुर्बलः। ॥ ॥

उद्वार—प्रवश्च। प्रोपोस्ता। समगरप्रहियार्थयमः।
गाविर्यक्षमुवस्तुस्तोयोऽखण्डवस्माय।
तत्त्वत्तपभूपभिनिम्नमस्मिनिविदृष्ट।
उद्वारमपत्तमातिबनिसयरेव।
संसयं सुकारसिद्धसिद्धस्पदासंडरसदृष्ट।
पस्य गृहस्थ तरुत्तारचिनवः। नस्सकम। चुडः। केषुमगम। ॥ ॥
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रासावल्यः करपूरण यथा—

परशुरंपरः साधनासम्बन्ध संख्य स किर तिथि भवन न किंचि मुख्य कल्यङ्कनिग्रिः
चंद्रु न दिखाण संक्रान्त जै सा सर्वाश्रयः
दृष्याणि सुह न पृथक्कादि तिथि भवन मयायणः
चब्रिद साणि सर्वाणि कुसमसरू लगिनानि सा बहु उत्तरसः ।
अचारिन्द रुवानिन्द कुसमसरू तुह दुसंदु ज अहिलसः ॥ ४९ ॥
वदनावदनकरासावलथसंकीर्षण रुक्मेन यथा:—
पंडितां जाग्मुण्यपरप्रमुणकमकरुः
कंचि बालबाठाविलासवहालिस्मणनायरुः
इविदिविचिंचयपरिपलयलनसः
कुतलिकुत्नलिपकरणककरुः ॥
सरहंहिलानिद्रागवलथविविलङ्कसः ॥
कसु करिः न माणि हलङ्गतुर लध्यानिन्तु शुहङ्गु ॥ ५० ॥

कपूरैण यथा—
अबिन्द अवस्थापपसुखगुणमौदितनिन्दरुः
एयारिण हलङ्गु गलङ्गु पिम्यु सर्विंगलसङ्गकलसः ॥
माणसमधप तुह न जसु उचमभाणि
तिभाणि वादङ्गु वारवार वाराणभाणि ॥
अह करिः कलङ्गु वलङ्गु सः इभिः स इभिः पण्यसः ॥
माणिणि साणसिणि करिःदलः हिण्डु सिभिङ्गाण्डु तुहः ॥ ५१ ॥

रासावलथवस्तुवदनकसंकीर्षण कुक्मेन यथा
सविन्निनन्तिहरियहसंकुंडलजुः
शूलामस्यनाराविधिमौदितनिसः ॥
सायामपरपारण बहसासिङ्गंदरपुङ्जः
वल्हुवहङ्गिवधायहुक्षुन्तकुः ॥
तो पयाद्वर्धसंस्कारणविबद्धाविदमभारायिः
अहिसरङ्घ चंदुसुबरानिसिणः पां पियाम्प अहिसारि ॥ ५२ ॥

कपूरैण यथा—
तस्विनिङ्गाणि भंडपपहुङ्गिश्चातिशिरिमसः
उक्कुलुकावल्हु दुसंदु मा कलः सति ॥
सविन्निनन्ति मन्यनाणि धुणियकपूरकवणिः(कः)वणः
संग्ध्विनियमणागेगुः सः मा दहुः तुहः तणः ॥
तणां प्रणिः म पद्धारङ्गु पडळः तुहुः मन्यनाणावेणकतः ॥
चय माणुः माणिचहङ्गु सः चृडः म जीयसांसतुः ॥ ५३ ॥

वदननक्त्व कुक्मेन यथा—
जह तुहुः महुः करपलः दम्मोडिविः
विचित्रीय चीरिण्डः अच्छौऽपिविः ॥
कथ्ये यथा——

कि न कुदूँ पाठ्य पररमित
महन्नेष कि न माहवि अविरत ।
नवमाचिय कि न धृष्ट पाहिण्य
कि न उत्थरह कुसूमभार माहिय

विद्यतभायसायित्वविहारिं हि कि न पसाहि पत्रकोण फुडङ्ग ।
तुवि जाह जायसुण्यसंखरणुणाँ वि भस्स हु मणि खुडङ्ग ॥ ५५ ॥

उवा।० —विद्यमानवविवशवविवशववर्दास । रसु साहिह दुःखरिषु ।
हणिह असुर वशहु भयेकरु ॥

उपकपासिनवविहित्सम । वातिरज्ञ पाठिर निरंबरु ॥
पुण्यकपालविनविधुववसुरकित्तन्तारिय ।

रामपाणदवभरपाररियंद । गणसुररिह्तिः जन्तु । पुग्नायु पाठिकवाज्ज्द कृरिहि ।
विज्ञातंतह निजयणह । जाकर हरित पाठिविहि भूरिहि ॥
मुग्नात कुदूँ पां पाँ कृमाँ तिणु जिनु तिहुण्यपाठसु ।
उपकपालविह उनिन जन मुग्नाहि, तिणि कुमरेन्स चरित तुय ॥ ५६ ॥

[ ॥ ॥ ]

रामपाणदवभरपाररियंद । नहःप्रसुक्ष्रेण— । पुग्नायु प्रतिपत्य कृरिहि ॥
विज्ञातंतह निजयणह । यविकुह हत्त पाठिविहि भूरिहि ॥
मुग्नात तलयुक्तं 'स्वयं भ्रामोत' भणितथा तृणितम्ब त्रिभुक्तपाठसु ।
उपकपालविह उनिन कि न जानानि जनस्तेन कुमरेन्स चरित्रं तव ॥ ५६ ॥ ]

पाठविज्ञाति प्रतिपत्य । मुग्नाहि कृतस्तथम । भणितिः भणितथा । 'क्त्वा—ह—
इत्य—हति अवय' ( हे। ८४५४४१२९ ) इति व्याख्याने हः । एवं रंगभेद्युद़दायर्थम् ।
स्तरेर्मकरणः।
अथाप्रवण—

विषमेवु दतिगंभरं समेधु ददुभे छादुसु सिरिषभरं।
विषमसमयाप्रणासं, अह तरंग दोहसंदोहा॥ ३४॥

[ विषमेवु दतिक्रेमः समेठु दद्विकृतं छादुसु श्रीपदकाम।
विषमसमयाप्रणासं; अह तरंग दोहसंदोहि॥ ३४॥ ]

विषमेवु छादुसु पादेवु विभिन्नतुस्तिर्यकेन द्विमात्रेण समेठु छादुसु पादेवु द्वायः।
चतुर्मात्रा क्रमेण श्रीपदकाम छन्दो विषमसमयाप्रणासं प्रथमस्थापितेद्विमात्रेण नानाविनिर्मिता नृत्यस्य दुर्गं सत्यस्मय पद्येन सत्यस्मयाप्रणासं इत्यर्थः। अथ दोहसंदोही सिरिषिं तरंग छन्दः।

दोहसंदोही दोहकाव्यातित्रिकेष्ठे तस्यो दोहकाव्याधिकोपस्यो-
हकन्तुधाकाः सहस्राः। यमनोरऽः—

“ जह स्नबाहण हिंदे स्नासं संदोहां हः (?) रसोः।
ता ते सवेद छंदोभि तरस्नामभि नायवि। १। ॥”

उदाहरण—स्निरसूचिणिः छादुग्धज्ञाहि। कुवल्य कुसुमहि।
काटिक्रिय सुरसिन्धुज्ञाहि। महासहुधु हरिण॥
करार्यसिः सरसिउ खु फिरि। सों अंजणगिरि।
इह तुह जससिरेपिलिङहु छहु। कह रंगउ न छहु। ५४॥

सिरिपत्रज्ञ हेमसुलस्य।
प्रणु ज्ञवाणु शीविवउ सजः। चंद्रचु जिम्बा करिक्रु।
स्वाग प्रणी कररत्थि नीह जिम्बा। श्रवश्र रथायश्रु॥
अवरात्म अविरलविजुन्युवलयः। विलिसिंयतयत्नु पयाङ्।
इह छो भमत्सुवासादिश्चलम्। जन अष्ट्रु वीरस्य। ५४॥

[ श्रीसमुद्रेन छादुग्धज्ञाहि। कुवल्यानि कुसुमः॥
काटिक्रिय सुरसिन्धुज्ञाहि। महाशाम्भो हरेन॥
क्रियासन सत्युः खरु क्रुः। तोसांगिरि।॥
इह तव याज्ञाविबिचित्रं प्रभो। कह पाप्पुरं न खरु। ५४॥

भण् यविनं जीवितं सकरं। चक्त्यं यथा करिक्रणः॥
क्षणे क्षणे करत्ते नीर्म यथा। गाढति लघावव्ययः॥
अपरमापि अविरलविज्ञुवलयः। विलिःतितरकः पद्मः॥
ततोपि सुधौ प्रसंवायस्चिनिर्मितमः। जनः भवति विश्वस्य। ५८॥

बहुतिः श्रीधार्यी सुदृढ़या नाळियवाहारी। ( हे। ८-४-४२३।)
वस्तुच्छ दोहा दोहय वस्तुच्छ तहय दुबिगहः॥
हुंक दुहायी नासा वस्तु दोहा दुहायिः॥ ५५॥

[ वस्तु च दोहा; दोहा च वस्तुच्छ दुहायिः; तथा च द्विपदीक्रोऽप्रो।
बहुति द्विपदीक्रोऽप्रो; वस्तु दोहादितिकामाः॥ ५५॥ ]
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उदा०—अरिरि मयण रहववणकमधवस्य रचना वर्नह
अरिरि कालपरिवारसिद्धवस्य प्राण सज्जह।
अरिरि वीररिणाक्षुडळां नर संघवह
अरिरि हिण उल्लितति जंतु मह वही लघवह॥
इम्ब बुङ्ती राहसम | सामिय बहुसोहाग |
अंभुजलुक्तयोलोणिय | तह किम्ब चित्ति न ठगम ॥ ५९ ॥

दुहांगिया सरन्यपुरस्स।
मई मिलिहें जन जाह तुह। केन वसंतप्रेमस।
चूड न बाहच उत्थारित। विरहिणिमारणसेस।
विरहिणिमारणसेसं मुंदिसवाहु सुङ्खु चारि।
किंत बाहच उत्थारित चूड अविरहुङ्खदवर।
केन वसंतप्रेमस विरहुङ्खदवरस्त वहिहु॥
अहह म जाह अनाहसीदुमम मह मिलिहें ॥ ६० ॥

[ अरिरे सदन रतिवद्वनकमल्दरिन्य स्मण वर्जय
अरिरे कालपरिवारसिद्धवस्यं धनु: सज्ज।
अरिरे वीररिणाक्षुडळां चूडालोणं शारं संधेिह।
अरिरे हेठनोज्जयन्त गच्छन्त नम वहिहम रुङ्ख।
हिः बदस्ती राजीमाति: स्वासिनु्त बहुसीभाग।
अपृजलाईलोचनी। तव किं तिते न भुरा ॥ ५९ ॥

[ मां त्यक्तम्या मा यासीस्वम् कान्त वसंतप्रेमरते।
चतो न बाहुसिरास्तीयों। विरहिणिमारणार्थम् ?।।
विरहिणिमारणार्थ महरसिद्धव सुङ्खु कुङ्ख।
किं न बाहुसिरास्तीयङ्खुवोङ्खविरहुङ्खदवरमेरे॥
कान्त वसंतप्रेमरते विरहुङ्खवस्यं सिष्थ्व।
अहह मा याहि अनाहसीदुमसि मां त्यक्तमा ॥ ६० ॥

गुंदिच्च माजीरी। चंबलिनवं श्रीभागी ठगटकस्त्य पंघह। अनजनमायः।

दोमकपुराणी प्रतिहार वस्तुवदुकप्रेमद्वारत्नीयाणि।

उदा०—परिघर पेसुङ्खवहह्म्रम्यविळेकज्ञोरहुं भुमम्।
ब्रह्मणवेयमवण्ड्यज्ञणं कंड्र जयज्ञष्टु भुमम्।
तकरिणी कृष्ण कहरी निहााङ्खु कामवं ज्ञणविव वज्ञम्।
पाराैवानं जिज्ञु नारीवणी आविरधुच साण्डु वज्ञप॥
सा वहठकमठपरिमठममिरणठरोठरोठरमणीया।
मंगलभन्नवावदंज दिष्मुहसंजा नरिषं तुहं होत॥ ५१॥

[ गुष्मेेमहे एनुषदवधिधिमण्डविमठठरणोकोशो सूक्तपति
व्यासवानवेद्यपादिकृमिनविल्लीयो जयजयश्रव्यः श्रमणे।
तन्त्राणु मुक्त: कथापि तिर्थान्न: कामुकदनोपि वैपतः
धारणिवने व्य नारीजननावरसं सक्तम्युः॥
सा वहठकमठपरिमठममिरणठरोठरमणीया।
मंकुटानिवावनथा विनुमसंथथा नरेन्द्र तवासु॥ ५२॥

रोठमरोठाति अभञर्वः।
तथा चति चक्रार्दम्यरपि छन्दोभिर्बिर्मङ्गि-द्विभुवि स्वात्।
यथा माथाया मक्क्रियां—
केषक्बंभा रूप नाही बावी मुणादीया बाहा।
नरणांं कुववनां दसणा उण कुरुक्क्किल्याऑ॥
छण सतिमंडत्मणणं पाणीपाया य तुज्ज पउमाई॥
सिखिरबवासरस्यासि कि तहाबि दिवाणिसं दूहसि दूहप॥ ५६॥

[ कुकलीस्माभारूः; नाभिर्पी; मुणाळिके बाहु।
नरणे दुर्गवने; दुस्रां: पुनः कुरुक्क्किल्या॥
श्यासिद्धक्षणसमपाणणं पाणी पादों च तव पदवानि।
शिरीशर्वचारसम्यासि कि तथापि दिवाणिसं दूहसि दूहित।॥ ५६॥]

अष्टपदीमकरणः। अथ नवपृडः।
दोहकायुता मात्राजातिवंतसुसंहा।
रशुत्वन्ये। आदिभ्रात्रवद्वैहकोपदोहकपरिश्रर॥।

उदाहरणमणि—
पुनांकवर्याद्भिषक्ष्यं। तसकुतजपंचमसुह।
रणितमणि—
माणिक्यद्विपुर॥

नाकमठक्षकरकसु। अमशकसुं जगद्विहंसपु।
संडक्षजातलयङ्क्रसु। कंदुपन्तमक्षु॥
सयत्वस्यान्यथत्कन्तः। तो उमिङ्गां चंदु॥ ५२॥

[ पूर्वपूर्वस्त्राजासिद्धिच्छन्त। तस:कुअररपअसुः।
रणितमणि—
माणिक्यद्विपुर॥

नाभकमठक्षकरकसु। अस्मतकङ्गो जगद्विहशकः॥
शंभुजातलत्कङ्गसु। कंदुपन्तमक्षु॥
सकशवस्वस्यासिद्धकः। तत उमिङ्गां चंदु॥ ५२॥

ठयाणिचर छत। एवमवद्वोक्षपदोहक्योक्षद्वाहारम्यु।
नवपदीमकरणसृ।
अथ वृद्धापृडः।
दोहे चतुचू मुलित: अतुलुक्तसंजुंय वस्त्र।
होळ तिब्बती: अब संदर्भुध्वगोळी डुबडबेंड। ३६॥
[ दोहा जल चतु दिब्बली: अरूढळाठळसंजुंय वस्त्र।
भवती त्रिभुजी: अय खण्डघे गुरुळिक द्रिपदीवेक्षण। ३६॥]
ढंपकाव्याण्येन चाणायतिरंगमाप दिब्बली।
उठा—को नेवाह सन्देशट। सहि देशान्ति बूरि॥
बंदिमुखि पठां संधिविर। गुरु सूरपपत्तरी॥
इत्यु गुरुचित्व। गुरु उकांठिय। आविर रहसुचाव।
युखू रंगिणि। नवनवधंगिणि। माण(व)देसीचां। ६३॥
ढंगाळी तिन्यासूरिष्य।
[ को नेवाहि सदेशित। सहि देशान्ति बूरि॥
* * * गुरु: सूरपम्पत्तरी॥
इति कौशिकिविविचत:। मुक्तकणित। ६३॥
* * * ६३॥]
ढंगाळी तिंतकपुरुष॥
व्यापदीकरणस। अर्थका बुकशन्तस। अथोष्ठालकायां संयुता वन्यायी वस्तु
जातिक्षेत्रिणी भवति। यथो भुक्तव्यचनाचयरूप अस्फां सा त्रिभुजी।
उठा—गणित जलहसुरर बज्वाति। चणु नाचाहि विजुक्षितः।
महुर सोर गायाति सुसर।
ढुररवचत्तरिय। रणधुरुणि वणघोंसनिभर॥
वणपीहाबंदिनीवर। ठड़वमर रसांः।
जालपारोपणिमित्त। वायण पयाण पमांति॥
इति निवर्स हुढ़द धर्मत्तस सच्चेवतयावणु॥
सहसिसांगमिनन्दगच्चरिव । आहिणु पांसापिक्षण। ६४॥
[ मम्बीरा जलधरसुरजा वायाने। बुढ़ बूत्याति विवुढ़।
महुर्ल मूर्ति गायाति सुक्वरस॥
ढुरवचर्चरिकां। रणधुरुणि वणघोंसनिर्माणा॥
चातकवन्दुनामुप स्वरा। ठड़वमर रसांः॥
जालपारोपणिमित्त। वायणानि प्रकटं पतां॥
इति निर्भरं वर्तं धराववये सकललोक सस्त्रस। ६४॥]
एकादशपदीकरणस। अथ द्वाराधारी। खण्डघुणाशत् मोति: सामायने
त्रिभुजी विशेषण द्रिपदीवेक्षण।
उदा ।—कृतुमाउष्ठृपियुदृक्षयः। मुद्राबिंतो चूथर्यः।
सिद्धिष्ठियमाणमहान्तः। बायाः द्वाधित्रिष्यव्रुणाः।
वियाध्यथाउपारः। इच्छित्यवियथसंसैदः।
पदिबान्धनअससमथः। तममः दुव्रवस्थः।
इति पदमः महामासो जनस्स हिययाधः कुणाः मदयाः। ॥ ६५ ॥
पश्चा विनंधः सरणोऽछाण्यसः। कुसुमजाणोऽहः।
पवःः। दुव्रवस्थः। सिद्धिष्ठियसारः।
[ कृतुमाउष्ठृपियुदृक्षयः। मुद्राबिंतो चूथर्यः।
सिद्धिष्ठियमाणमहान्तः। बायाः द्वाधित्रिष्यव्रुणाः।
वियाध्यथाउपारः। इच्छित्यवियथसंसैदः।
पदिबान्धनअससमथः। तममः दुव्रवस्थः।
इति पदमः महामासो जनस्स हिययाधः कुणाः मदयाः। ॥ ६५ ॥
पश्चा विनंधः सरणोऽछाण्यसः। कुसुमजाणोऽहः।
पवःः। दुव्रवस्थः। सिद्धिष्ठियसारः।
]

उदा ।—किणि अवरिष्ठि बुज्ञकः। सुग्राहु बुज्ञकः। वारिष्ट जूदृविवः
वेयविवः।
क्षेत्रमज्ञेसः। महुरामासः। नाउविव मूलः निर्हिवः।
सरणभयसीः। सचाः स्यायः। वाज्ञाविव अभयपदः।
रे रायतः रहस्विनः। सहुः कुमारसिनः। तुडिकारं किम सहिपदः। ॥ ६६ ॥
[ कैरपेशु भूम्भते। भूतस्वतु मिन्ततः। वारिष्ट चुतमापि वैतीसुतः।
कृत्तथभृः। मार्दिनांसः। नामापि मृष्टोत नरिरिहितः।
सरणभयसीः। सवधः सवधः। वारिष्टोभयपदः। ॥ ॥
रे राजानः रवसेनः। चर्य तुसारसिनः। तोषमानः चिन न परि-
प्रस्यः। ॥ ६६ ॥

रे शङ्खः (व्यः) ( हे ८-२-२०२१) संभाणो। तुडिकि संर्थे। प्राप्तः द्रिपकः ननः
क्षणार्ति सूचना।(व)वधमक्षस्तत्ते मीतिरिमापि त्रिपकः।

उदा ।—विरुविझहिष्ठियथपोरज्ञासिनिविदक् योस्मिथवः
पत्नसः। मणिरब्यासस्यपः। कोडः। ॥

7 [ Annals, B. O. R. L ]
इतिहासी द्वारा विद्वानों का समन्वय स्थापित किया गया है। उन्हें इसके प्रभाव के लिए सम्मानित किया गया था। उन्होंने इसके लिए बहुत से अत्यधिक प्रयास और निश्चलता किया था।

इसके लिए उन्हें सम्मानित किया गया था। उन्हें इसके प्रभाव के लिए सम्मानित किया गया था। उन्होंने इसके लिए बहुत से अत्यधिक प्रयास और निश्चलता किया था।
অন বোঝাপড়ি। পড়ালিকাবিদ্যাসংস্থি চত্বারি কষ্টকমৃ। আদিশৃষ্ণাদন্তে। নান্দিনরেখা। তথায় চ কষ্টকানাং গণে। সংসর্গঃ।

উদ্দানে পুষ্পজম্বলতি অহসমদ্বঃ। অণাহিন্দনব নামিনায় পলিনবার।

তাহি সিতিচাওক্কড়ম্বসংজায়। ভগরায়পুস্ত হুম বহুয়রায়।

আহ কাঠকম্যন রাঙমমাঝু। রিউরায়চকিপিনাঝু।

চালুক্য্যাপঞ্চকম্বসাধু। তথ্যাৎ নামাধু কুমারাধু।

বহুবিবিধ বহুপারিহরিসাধু। তিথি সমুদ পারিচিন্তু ধৰ্মসাধু।

জিনাসাংসু বহুগুণ ভাণী পবনু। ন বিবেয়বিধ তুব সম্বু।

নান্দম্যস্বাভাবিজ্ঞানরিণবেস। মণ্ডর অতেস্ত তিথি চিহ্নিত দেস।

তত্ত্ব সরিত্র নরেশর মণ্ডলদৌ। ন তু হুমদ ন হোৎসহ নাথি।

কোই। ৬৮।

[পুরুষোক্তমণ্ডে অহিতসমুদ্র। নগরমাণাহিনান্নাং প্রতিহ্রস।

তন্ত্র শ্রীবাপোঁদকবংশজাতঃ। বনরাজসুখা জাতা বহুনুয়া।

অথ কাঠকম্যন রাঙমাঝু। রিউরায়চকিপিনাঝু।

চালুক্য্যাপঞ্চকম্বসাধু। তন্ত্রাচারাধিপি কুমারাধু।

বহুবিবিধাদ্বীপারিহরিসাধু। তেন সম্প্রতিরাখ্যেন ধৰ্মমাণ।

জিনাসাংসু বহুগুণ ভাণী পবনু। ন বিবেয়বিধ তোয়েদু সুদিত।

ন মেঢ শ্রীশায়ীজ্ঞানগুণহিনীবেশ। মনোমোগায়েন বিহিতো দেষ।

তত্ত্ব সদ্যো ন্যমূঢাং মণ্ডলাহোক। ন তু হুমু ন অহিত্যাতি নাসিক।

কোই। ৬৮।

স্তস্ত। সন্ত্যাগর্ভণ প্রত্যেক। বোঝাপড়িম্বরমণ।

ইতি কবিতরপ্রণবুচ্ছ তিদীযোদেশ। গাথা ৩৭ মুহোদাগর্ভণী।

দিকোদাগর্ভণানি ৫৭।

শৈং। তৃতীয়োদেশঃ।

অথ বাংটুন্নাং।

ইতি বংশু সম্বাচ্ছ ছাড়বর্ধ সংক্ষেপক্ষণয়।

বহুচূম্বে বিস্তর অহিতফিনজু; ত পুপো তিবিহ্রস। ১।

[ইতি বংশয় সম্বাচ্ছ ছাড়বর্ধ সংক্ষেপক্ষণক্ষম।

বাংটুন্নাং বৃত্তমমধিক্রিয়ে তপুনিধিবিধ্রস। ২।

ইতি মাত্রাশন্তেনোনেতে সর্বসাপি বাংটুন্নাং উম্ভয়চূম্বন্দু সংক্ষেপক্ষণকে।

বংশয়। তদেবোদাগর্ভণ তদেব সূত্রনিধিব্যর্থ।। চক্ষণকমিতি স্ত্রায়ে কে। কিমেী রীতিব্লু ইত্যাদি ছাড়বর্ধ:। দেবিরাধ্যে হি প্রথমোর স্বাভাব।। মাত্রাশন্তেন দৃষ্টিয়া:।
उत्तराधुनिक स्थापना पहले सूचना ले।

उन्होंने अपने जीवन में महत्वपूर्ण योगदान किया?

उनका जीवन निवास क्षेत्र क्या?

उनके लिए महत्वपूर्ण कितने लोगों का श्रेष्ठ सहयोग मिला?

उनके लिए कितने पत्रिकाएं तथा समाचारपत्र शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने पुस्तकालय शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने विश्वकर्मा शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने पत्रिकाएं तथा समाचारपत्र शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने पुस्तकालय शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने विश्वकर्माएं शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने पत्रिकाएं तथा समाचारपत्र शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने पुस्तकालय शर्मा?

उनके लिए कितने विश्वकर्माएं शर्मा?
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In this chapter, Sanskrit rendering of the text is not given as it is quite unnecessary. It has been dropped even where it is given in the commentary.
The text in the image is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a page from a book or a document, but the content is not clear.
तोभो वसंतातिल्या जडुँगे गुरू दो। १६२॥ जाठिनपरम्जुगुमुस्वाचिन्तसू। १६३॥
बाणोऽहो मो तो नस्सदुःगुरु अस्वेधा। १६४॥ इसहिर ननस्मा छाया अवराया। १६५॥
पर्णाकाण्ठेया ननस्सहुगुरू। १६६॥

ढीका:—तरुतस्यपरं गुरुर्ध्रिकमुपचिन्तन। १६४॥ पश्चाभियत:। १६५॥ सम-भियति:। १६६॥ शक्वबरी। १६७॥

बाणा मा जसिते ते कामकाण्ड नाम नायनां। १६७॥ चुडस्सहुगुरूसवरुण सातिकाठा। १६८॥ रोजराज गणा जहीं तस्मिन तोणयं। १६९॥ हबहि समयसं ननजहा तहेः सो। १७०॥ आसेहि धंधुखाभांडे मरा मो चयौं यो। १७१॥ ननस्समयकाण्डवा मालिणी पंजोहि। १७२॥ यहा चिन्ता कुन्ता जीये तिच्छे मा सिंह देया। १७३॥

ढीका:—यस्मिन्नमास्तकामनक्रीडा नाम धात्वस्य। १७४॥ १७५॥ १७६॥ १७७॥ समथियति:। १७८॥ अदाशियति:। १७९॥ पश्चाभियति:। १८०॥ अदाशिवरी। १८१॥

स पंचाचारोऽहो धुगुरू निवास कमा। १७१॥ तोणयसं अंतपर कपुरण गेण चिन्तमुरुः। १७५॥ आसमाि उत्त पंचुहि मेंहि तहा गुहुणा। १७६॥ परिमहिया न जा भजरणा य वाणितप्पे। १७७॥ नदरभा गुरु जहीं सा माणकपथया। १७८॥ भगुणवसुहुमचलदिविशिष्ट। १७९॥

ढीका:—तत्र धुगुरुः कपस्राण्डी पोड़ा। १७५॥ पूर्वाकितस्य तोणकक्रय। पश्चात्वस्य: समनृरितस्य:। १७५॥ १७६॥ १७७॥ १७८॥ द्विगुणवसावः। बोड़शतच्छवो यथा। १७९॥ अधि:। १८०॥

लोण्डकंता चढ़हि रिहिर्न मेधानतोतगाजो। १८०॥ रितहि चढ़हि नीरोऽमोरी:-सल्ल हरिणी गुरु। १८१॥ रसेहि निथुड़ा यमनमभङ्गामो तिज्ञेणि। १८२॥ बसुहि पुढ़हि जसाजस्थयः तहें गुरु। १८३॥ पूंतिहि वंशपत्तिपर्यं भरतभनभगमा। १८४॥

ढीका:—तथुमिष: पद्मिष्ठव यति। १८४॥ पद्मिष्ठकुम्भिष्ठ यति। १८५॥ पद-भियति:। १८६॥ अदाशितिः। १८७॥ दशाभियति:। १८८॥ अवज्ञे:। १८९॥

जजुगरहरुचउकानिखात्रिया वस्थिना तारया। १८५॥ ओमननानसा नवहि निसु-णाप भस्तवं। १८६॥

ढीका:—। १८७॥ नवभियति। १८८॥ धुति:। १८९॥

tतत्त्वीवयणिरुलिमं कहिः समणा छ तहा मो। १८१॥ सोसोभो सत्तम मुरू य रविः स्नुङ्गक्षिपिर्यं। १८०॥

ढीका:—। १८१॥ द्वादशाभियति:। १८२॥ अदाशितिः। १८३॥

माठू हिरंतरा जहीं तु बीस तं सु जान तिन नाम। १८४॥ कुता सत्तमोऽन भरस्मयफ्फा गंगा सुवर्णाः। १८५॥

ढीका:—खरु निःश्चयात। १८६॥ समसि: समथियति:। १८७॥ कृति:। १८८॥
बुधयणसम्या नजमशा जडत्तां साणो य सिद्धिया। १९।। आसेहि सुधरेहि सरमहवयां नद्वि नाम नेवा। २०।।

टीका:— १९।। अनौपूर्व्यवर्त्यति: सतमिः साधिरिथ्यर्थः। २१।। प्रकृतिः।

२२।।

सतमहनिम्मिरिमतपदिः पहारसुरी र त्याकुसमः। २२।। मद्यसुहवंति विदुः भराजनराहणगः य दसहि। २३।।

टीका:— २२।। दुसाधिरिभिः। २४।। आसिकाति। २५।।

रो नराजनराहडवुः तहा जहि तस्मिः बिंति विजन्यः। २६।। मङ्किता मोसोतनो सिद्धिपरः पद्मसुहि। २७।।

टीका:— २७।। शिलिनरी त्रिन्यः मङ्किताभिभिः पद्मभियोति। २८।।

विकृतिः। २८।।

नामानुसारः नवणारस्त्रकर्तं सहेजशति चतुः परव्यंति द्वंदनयुः। २९।। बिंति सुधिद्वानः

मयूरधि सहेजप्रेमं बहा किर अकहि। ३०।। प्रकृतिः। ३१।।

कुंजय भोसोततः नामानुसारः गुरुः त्याः बसुहिः। ३२।। सा हृदशय जीप दसहि तयाभिहितानुभिष्यस्तम्रः। ३३।।

टीका:— पद्मभिरायत्यर्थः। ३४।। दुसाधिरिभिः। ३५।।

सो मो तो नो मो नो रो सो लहूरुवसुपुतविहः सुविनायत्यस्यविः। ३६।।

मो ना छाच्छिय जहि नवछाछिय समानंदगुणः सहायमः। ३७।। सा हृदशय जीप दसहि

तयाभिहितानुभिष्यस्तम्रः। ३८।।

उत्तितः। ३९।। उक्तादिकप्रकरणः। हेपेतः। ४०।।

माताविर्ध सेचिमात्र भोसोततः नामानुसारः यथीनिः संकेतेरिः। ४१।।

टीका:— अमार्कादिकभिः। ४२।। नवभिः। पद्मभियोति। ४३।।

उत्तितः। ४४।। उक्तादिकप्रकरणः। हेपेतः। ४५।।

प्रभावित्व संसृताहि भोसोततः नामानुसारः यथीनिः संकेतेरिः। ४६।।

टीका:— अमार्कादिकभिः। ४७।।

प्रभावित्व संसृताहि भोसोततः नामानुसारः यथीनिः संकेतेरिः। ४८।।

एवं प्रभावित्व संसृताहि नवछाछिय सहायमः। हेपेतः। ४९।।

लत्तितिः। ५०।। उक्तादिकप्रकरणः। हेपेतः। ५१।।

छापविभास्वराहिः दीपाः जनकितु सवर्यं चांदेः। ५२।।

तैं दंतर्यमिति स्पर्शायः मिनुसुः। ५३।।

ननुरगणस्तयं जन्य सो दंतेऽनुपि चांदुः स्त्रिहिण्यायाँ यथा विचारोऽः। ५४।।

जहकम ससिरेहिण्याः अनुजवचालसुस्वरीयाः। ५५।।

पचियामि नजुमास्वृतः याः सवेधं निव्यतिः सतहुः कपहः। ५६।।

जाहिंच्छय लहूरुः निरितः बिंति जन्य दंते औरो अवमतिः। ५७।।

वेण्यमश्च एवेनेव तेहेतिकानुविभिः मेवः। ५८।।

टीका:— चांदुविभास्वराहिः। ५९।।
चण्डौऽक्ष्यानन्देश्वर द्वारा -

साहित्यिक प्रयासोऽपभाषणाद्वारे यथासमग्रमार्थवा दुःख-का: स्वः। एवं नमगणां परंतुभागणांशः। नवासिरण्योऽह दुःशिवरयोऽह पकादुः-

भिज्ञसुतो द्वाराशिवर्णोऽहसंधिनान्यस्मार्थाद्विनाशः। शक्रः। आदिशारापच्छस्मार्थाद्विनाशः। शुभः। पद्मसखर्णज्ञः इत्यं साधनाद्वारे यथेकुटनामानो यावेकोनसहायां आकाशः॥ १०६॥

इत्यलोकमेण नगरांमण्यज्ञकं यथाप्रसिद्धनिर्णयेऽवर्णमण्यं। समसूच्यं तदानि निर्णयतं प्रचारितकं नाम दुःखः। ॥ अत्रापि समाना यणणं दीनामणे सङ्कीर्णं सिद्धशास्त्राः। अवधीः कृ स्वे धीर्षकः अललक्षिणं सात्थितति दुःखक्रमां। ॥१०८॥ सामग्रुःत्वमकरिणः। अथान्यसंसाहनायाः।
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टीका:—अथ विषमबुधचान्याह। अनुसूचि अषाधकाराया जाती पादस्याधा-
dकारार्थमे नगरान्तरावज्जे सर्वं भढणि गणण: स्युनोत्तरादुसरारात्परी यङण: पादस्याधा-
dवर्तमन्मुत्त्रत्वार्थमा स्थानांक्लास्मात्तिः ह्रास्य। आयाद्वसराराथ्यां ग्राह्याविद्वीश वेदोः;
हि तिथिमे संवर्णिाःक्षेत्रमाः संदृश् । तूर्तिं च एकः । तुर्यं ग्राह्याविद्वीश । अन्यायार-
भ्यासे चतुर्विद्धाति: । प्रत्येकमा चतुर्विद्धातेऽथवादन्यन्यां तिथिमे हक्षा एकस्वस-
tसक्रमः सं सिद्धानि प्रदस्माति: । एवेनेनां हस्तिः विपुजाभेदेनापि ॥ ११८॥
समपाद्योत्तर्य्वसरारायणायां जयग्राह्यतथावक्रमेष्व पादस्याधक्रमः । विष-
मयोत्तर्य्वसराराजज्ञण: समयोर्यण: हेयं तथेऽव वक्त्रवचयत तद्विपरीताति विपरीत-
प्रथावक्रमः ॥ ११९॥ तदेव च प्रथमप्रथावक्रमेष्व प्रथाक्रमायां नमोन चप्पडक्रमः । विष-
मयोत्तर्य्वसरारायणार: समयोस्तु यङण: इत्यर्थः। समयोऽस्तु: सममो भुपक्ष्यां किर्तिे सा विपुजावक्रमः। न चेष्व पश्चाय गतार्थः। विपुजावक्रमेः
dानिमारसिम्मत्वां बिना सत्याधिकरणे: समपाद्योऽस्तु: सत्मधुपुताराचरणम् भाव्यम्।
विषमयोस्तु मानिद्रसिम्यमन्यापवार्तवादक्रमः। पश्चायाम मु यङण: प्रवचारकिष्ठते ॥ १२०॥
सत्याधिकरणे: चतुर्थ: पादस्तु सममो भुपक्ष्यामन्यापवार्तक्रमः॥ १२१॥ ओजयोद्वयाव-
क्रारायणार: बाधिता मणः; समयोस्तु सममो भुपः स्थित एव चेन्मविपुलः।
ओज इति जातिप्रक्षे हृदयोपप्ने पादयोर्यणः। व्यक्तिपक्षे पुनर्वेष्केस्य प्रथमस्य
दूसीयस्य वा। पुर्व वक्त्रमार्याविपुजास्चापि। तथा च महावक्विन्म प्रयोगः।

सर्वार्थमेपिन्त थावण्ये विप्रस्ती चाराविधम: ॥
ब्यापृक्षृणुती: सा नूत्ने न समान्यस्य वेधसः ॥ २ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—

गत: स कारो यन्त्रासिन्योत्कताना जन्म × × × ॥
वर्तने × × × सतासां सामप्रत्य हक्तस्यस्युता: ॥ २ ॥

तथा:—

व्याकारे कीठोराणी सुवांसे खुसुमादापि ॥
कोकोट्राणां चेतासि कोहि निर्ज्ञानुमाति ॥ ३ ॥ १२२॥

तथे विषमार्थशुद्धर्य्वसरायणायांहथुविपुर्योऽः जातिपिते यथा:—

द्रश्य दुर्गम सनातिं जीवयानि द्रीशीव या: ॥
विरुपाक्षेप सधिनिशाना: सुवे वामलोचना: ॥ २ ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—

प्रीताणा दीपवनन हृदयाना सांख्योचन: ॥
पुर: सक्कीजनस्या: प्रार्थिब्रज्ञमिच्याम्बवृद्ध: ॥ २ ॥

तथा:—

अन्यदाया भूर्मण पुत्राः सानो हृदेव योचितः ॥
पराक्रम: परिभेद बैयाख्य मुल्लिश्वरं ॥ २ ॥ १२३॥
नथेय अश्वेयज्ञविपुः। जातिपक्षे यथा:—
इत्य संख्यरूपी सिद्धज्ञानज्ञविवेकानन्दनः।
स्वाधीनरूपी हृदयदीपित तथापि मे। १। ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—
मूर्तिपुष्पं पृथिवीं चिन्ताविलक्षिण गुणधारणः।
वृक्षः कुलबिंदुः यथा जानाति सेवितनुषाः। २। ॥

तथा:—
बालरूपज्ञानानाय किन्तु न बिनाशितः।
बालरूपस्यापि कृतं सुष्ठाः पापानि कृत्वा। ३। १२४। ॥

तथेऽव रगणेश्वरेऽपि तु हेया। जातिपक्षे यथा:—
काश्यपवर्ज्ञमहिमिः नान्तरस्य।
काश्यपेऽपि नान्तरस्य च ज्ञाति स्म॥ ४। ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—
महामर्गम बालिदानां वन्दे बालदेवतां श्रुतः।
यज्ञानि विवेकमात्र दुर्प्रक्षतिबिस्वबद्रः। २। ॥

तथा:—
काश्यपाः स्वंसंग: किथते पवित्रतिपरः।
यद्व न स्वाद्राधिवृद्धचक्रयः हस्तजीवितमः। ३। १२५। ॥

तथेऽव यत्र समग्नः सा साविपुः। जातिपक्षे यथा:—
श्रुतिपुष्पेऽपिनि ठोके का चिन्ता मरणः।
कोहि मनः सहस्रेऽम्भृत बहु हारयेत्। ५। ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—
श्रुतिः सति न सुप्रस्वर्ण सति नेष्टे न परभ्यति।
वक्ते सत्यापि न बक्ति पार्थिवस्तेन पार्थिवः। २। ॥

तथा:—
कीर्तिपुष्पवर्जः पापास्य बदकचतयः।
सुवृण्यो वर्जप्रत्ययः। वृण्यन्ते स्वमेवाहिः। ३। १२६। ॥

तथेऽव तगणश्रेष्ठापि अस्त्र्याता। जातिपक्षे यथा:—
श्रुति हस्ता पादेन सा जातिलुभ्येऽन्ति मालिक।
अद्वितियः वैवाहिः बदर्शी सुदुर्भा। १। ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—
बन्दे कविः श्रीभारविं चाकसंतरतः।
दिबा दीपा द्वाराभानि यस्माभ्रोपि कवयः। परेः। २। ॥

व्यक्तिपक्षे यथा:—
बन्दे कविः श्रीभारविं चाकसंतरतः।
दिबा दीपा द्वाराभानि यस्माभ्रोपि कवयः। परेः। २। ॥
संकीर्णश्च विपुलामकारा दृश्यन्ते। यथा:—
कविविकालं प्रसरता कविविद्वार्थविनिधता (?)।
गुणव सारासुकुलं त्यस्य मिच्रं द्वियां बलम्।
तत्थ्योपरं सवर्मान्तरोमतमते चिरं यत्।
हिमायुमाश्च रसते तन्मूदिन्द्रः सुषुवं फलम्।

tयादायतल्ले स्वतंद्राभ्युदयः। सवर्स्यां च विपुलानां चतुर्यों वर्णः प्रायेन
गुरुभवतीत्याङ्कः। १२७। वक्त्रायातिपकरणसृजनो।

पद्मामि अठवजा।
istleमिदुवांत्स निर्मीताति।
तद्भि सोचस चउष्ठप क्रिस्त जत्थे पाप।

ते पत्रादुस्तानयं पर्यन्तित विसमच्चन्द्रं। १२८।

स्पष्टाः। पद्मसुन्तवर्मेयः न्यायेन्द्राच्चविद्वार्तियः। स्थापना:— पद्मसुन्तवर्मेयं
पद्मसुन्तवर्मकरणमुप्रकथ्यं थाः। पद्मसुन्तवर्मेवृविद्वार्तियमार्गदादीं हिमायुक्तं ततः
सर्वनग्न्यां यथा प्रतिपादिकार्यावन्ते च हिमायुक्तं शोषकसस्वद्धयुक्तं सा आपीङ्। आपीङ्
एवाध्यात्रीहिर्जितीयाश्च्चित्रिणां यत्रये कलिका। तुतीयेन ठवली। तुतियांमृत-
पारा। १२८। पद्मसुन्तवर्मकरणाः।

सन्तता ठहुः पद्मामि। कसतदुर्गोदुद्धजपं।
हुंति भनजयदुर्ग ठहपं। तुरिप नजसजयदुर्ग य उगया। १२९।

स्पष्टा। उद्वसया उद्वतापकरणसंश्रोत्त होयं। था। उद्वसया तृतीयायाङ्गी
रत्नदातो वेदा। नंतरसन्त। य महसश्च। १२९। उद्वतापकरणाः।

आहेखे मसजा भगायुक्तं आहवां। सन्ता रक्षा तहिमां ननासो।
नरितमन तुरिःपं। इय मुंगः पटुरीयमुवा० पुवां। १३०।

स्पष्टाः। उपायितमन्त्रितं तत्त्यकरण स्वरितसृजनो। था। इदमेव तृतीयायाङ्गी नने-
नतन्त्रत्सदेहद्विषेड्यां। इदमेव तृतीयायाङ्गी तत्त्यकरण स्वद्विषेड्यां। उप-
रितमन्त्रितमकरणाः। पूर्वां। छोडः युवः उत्तराणैः द्वारिन्णां चासप्य।
पूर्वां। द्वारिन्प्रत्यक्षव: उत्तराणैः छोडः युवाः यस्योऽयोति। विसमकरणाः। १३०।

तत्त्य कविद्वर्ध्यृवी चतुर्यों ठिग्रेशः।

(To be continued)
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE FIGURES OF SPEECH IN THE RGVEDA *

BY

ABEL BERGAIGNE

(Translated into English by A. Venkatasubbiah)

[1] This article will have only an indirect relation to the ordinary labours of the Société de Linguistique. I do not however undertake in it, as the title may lead one to imagine, a purely literary study, at finding which in our Memoirs, one may justly feel astonished. The facts to which I am going to draw attention concern philology, and particularly Vedic lexicography.

The rhetoric of the Vedas is in reality a bizarre one which seems to shock even to this day the most authoritative interpreters of the Rgveda. Rather than be consistent in their translations, they have, in order to avoid the strangeness of the figures, and chiefly the cacophony of the discordant metaphors, had recourse to a certain extent to all kinds of means. When the obliteration of the figures, or even the wholesale substitution of plain words for figurative ones, has seemed insufficient in their eyes, they have at no time shrunk from doing the utmost violence to the lexicography.

However, I concede readily that the two scholars who have given us recently complete translations of the Rgveda have not yielded in the same degree to the repugnance which the rhetoric in question must engender in all persons with our modern taste. In many of the cases where Grassmann has retreated before the boldness or incoherence of Vedic figures, Ludwig has held his

* The original article, entitled "Quelques observations sur les figures de rhéorique dans le Rgveda" was published in Memoires de la Societe de Linguistique, Tome IV, fascicule 2, pp. 1-42.

1 The translation of Ludwig is, on the whole, a very estimable work, very superior in regard to accuracy to that of Grassmann; but it will become perfectly intelligible only with the help of the commentary which is to follow it. As regards Grassmann, he has assuredly, by the publication of his dictionary, rendered signal service to Vedic philologists. But he has aggravated in his translation the defects of interpretation that are already perceptible in his former work.
ground. Still he too has been lacking in courage on more than one occasion.

[2] I have already referred to them at length.¹ My translations have appeared so crabbed to a serious critic² as to force from him this singular opinion: "On the whole I avow that I would rather be in the wrong with Roth and Grassmann than understand the Veda rightly with Bergaigne." I shall be still more bold on this occasion. I shall not be content with holding my ground before the monster on all the occasions when it presents itself before me in connection with a verse; but I am going to give chase to it throughout the collection of hymns. I hope to show that this "extreme harshness of expression"³ on which my interpretations often border is not only tolerated, but is actually recommended, by Vedic rhetoric, that in other words, the authors of the hymns are never more satisfied with themselves than when they have put together words which "scream with fright at seeing themselves joined together."

**BOLDNESS OF THE SIMILES**

The boldness of Vedic similes is well-known. None of the processes of interpretation that I am going to criticise here has been able to efface totally this characteristic trait of the poetry of the rṣis. Even the most obliterated translation, the interpretation that is the most intentionally colourless, that of Grassmann for instance, teems still in strange figures. A small number of examples will suffice.

Here is one whose strangeness has at least a certain poetic flavour. The horses of Indra are compared to wings that carry an eagle,⁴ VIII, 34, 9. The team of the Aśvins being often composed of birds, it is, by a figure perhaps still more singular, these birds that become their wings while they themselves are compared to eagles, V, 74, 9. Why then should Grassmann who has translated these formulae pretty faithfully, obliterate the same

---

¹ La Religion Vedique d'après les hymnes du Rigveda, Vol. 1.
² Pischel, Göttingische Anzeigen, 1879, p. 170.
³ Ibid.
⁴ The Maruts on their chariot drawn by horses are also compared to eagles, VIII, 20, 10.
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figure in verse VI, 47, 31 in his translation which is more in conformity with our own taste than with the text which he interprets? This text in fact, does not say merely that 'the warriors fly on their horses,' but that they take 'their horses' for 'wings.'

In the verse X, 180, 2, Indra is compared to a terrible animal. At the same time, there presents itself before the poet the image of a chariot with a sharp wheel which grinds the enemies, and the sharp wheel of the hero becomes the jaw of the animal: "Like the terrible animal dwelling in the mountain which glides slowly, thou hast come from the most distant region; [3] sharpening like a jaw, ' the sharp felly of the wheel, O Indra, grind the enemies, chase the malefactors."

The following comparisons are still more bizarre. The poet with his hymn turns Indra (in order to make him roll towards himself) as the carpenter turns a wheel, VII, 32, 20. The singers place their desire on Indra like a foot in a chariot (in order that it may take them to the goal), VII, 32, 2. The prayer is compared to a girth which grips Indra and Soma like two horses, VII, 104, 6. Indra is filled with chants as a stable with cows, VIII, 24, 6. We shall have to revert more than once to the assimilation of the chants with cows. The whole world knows, moreover, what an important role the cow plays in Vedic phraseology. The beneficent deity par excellence, Indra, is compared to a cow that allows herself to be milked, VIII, 82, 3; Vāl. 4, 4. The god who unites in himself the principle attributes of Providence, and who, in particular, observes the most secret faults, Varuṇa, protects the thoughts of men, like cows, VIII, 41, 1.

I could continue thus for a long time. The juices of Soma, when they have been ingurgitated, fight in the heart, like drunken men, VIII, 2, 12. When Indra soaks himself with them, the author of the hymn X, 43 compares them not only to rivers that

1 शुक This meaning seems to me justified by the analogy of srkva, srkvaṇ, 'corner of the mouth' (in classical Sanskrit), and by the comparison of verse I, 32, 12, in which शुक is used a second time with the verse IV, 18,
9 in which the word हुन is used.

2 The second simile contained in this verse is very obscure.
fill a pool (verse 7), but to birds that are going to perch upon a thick tree (verse 4). The simples that heal a sick person are compared to victorious mares that break through the malady X, 97, 3.

But, more curious, sometimes, than the strangeness of the text itself are the expedients to which the interpreters have recourse in order to escape it. Indra 'carries his puissance like a hook', X, 134, 6, without doubt in order to draw to himself the branch of the celestial tree, *ibid.* Who could have expected to see Ludwig and Grassmann have recourse to a word *sakti*, 'lance', of which there is no trace in the Vedic texts, 1 in order to end in the idea, which is moreover no less bizarre, of a god carrying his lance like a hook?

**VERSE COMPARISONS**

There is more than one simile whose words occupy a place which is inverse to that which, in our eyes, appertains to them. Thus the comparison of rivers to horses that run, does not astonish us. The comparison of horses however, [64] with rivers, VI, 46, 14, appears to be very strange. It is nevertheless capable of explanation. The rivers, like the waters in general, play such a great role in Vedic phraseology.

The sound of the pressing-stone is often compared to the chant of the priest. Inversely, we read in the verse V, 36, 4, that the 'singer' raises the voice 'like the stone'.

The comparison of prayers to teams is very frequent: the prayers thus become in a way the type of teams, and a poet compares the teams of the gods to prayers: "When willst thou yoke thy team like prayers?", VI, 35, 3. The position of the particle of comparison, na, does not allow of any other interpretation. This however does not prevent Grassmann from translating, "When willst thou yoke the prayers like horses?"

The sacred speech is all powerful in the sky. It is therefore comprehensible why its power is compared to that of the gods. None but a Vedic poet however would think of saying of a god, of Indra, that he is 'powerful like the speech', VIII, 46, 14. This, however, is no reason why the translators of this verse dis-

---

1 In the verse II, 39, 7, Ludwig gives the correct interpretation.
figure an expression that is perfectly clear by interpretations that are as far removed from each other as from the text which they claim to explain.  

In the verse I, 124, 4, we read that the Dawn ‘has caused to appear like Nodhas, all that men desire’. This passage has put all the interpreters to torture; or rather, it is the name, in itself quite inoffensive, of Nodhas, that these same have tortured in order to extort from it a meaning which they suppose to be hidden in it. Let the reader however reassure himself: I shall cite here the conjectures of the three principal interpreters only. The word signifies according to Roth ‘merchants’, and according to Grassmann, ‘young girl’. Ludwig, finally, sees in it two different words and extracts from them a meaning that is as strange as any that can be proposed. It would be very much more simple to take the word for what it is, that is to say, as the name, known from other passages, of an ancient sacrificer. The priests procure wealth to those that employ them. They can therefore be compared to the Dawn who brings to mortals the treasure of light. The poet has only reversed the comparison here.

**DOUBLE COMPARISONS**

[5] Sometimes also the Vedic poets, in their comparisons, kill, as we say, two birds with one stone. Two ideas, each of which is often compared with a third, are compared with each other through the medium of a metaphor which replaces the two former similes. The latter, thus, in a way, serve as premises for a conclusion which is the new comparison.

This will be made more clear by examples. Here are two which I have already mentioned together elsewhere. The prayers

---

1 Grassmann: “Im wahren Sinne des Wortes, kräftigen.” Ludwig: “wie (meine) Rede (es vermag).” Does not Ludwig himself interpret a similar formula in the verse X, 50, 4 in the sense that Indra is ‘the prayer par excellence’, being thus more correct on this occasion than Grassmann?

2 Siebenzig Lieder des Rgveda, übersetzt von Geldner und Kaegi, pp. 35 and 37, note 2.

3 "Nicht wie ein Euter ließ sie (doch) Liebes sehen."

4 Religion Vedique, I, pp. vii and note, and previous to it, Revue Critique, 1875, II, p. 373, note 3.

9 [ Annais, R. O. R. I. 1]
of different men are the branches of the same tree. The favours which the god distributes among men are also branches of the same trunk. Hence this third comparison which comprises the two former. "The favours of Indra ramify like prayers," VI, 44, 6. Again, the prayers are teams that bring the gods to the sacrifice or that carry the man to the goal which he pursues. But the riches that one appropriates are also teams that can be guided according to one's will. This is the origin of the formula, "I yoke the riches of men like my prayers." VIII, 19, 33. In these two passages, Grassmann has, without any reason, abandoned the true meaning of the word vip 'prayer.' Ludwig seems to have understood both formulae; only, he has committed the mistake of obliterating the metaphor in the second and has thus made it difficult to comprehend the comparison.

Here is another example of the same type. The diffusion of light is often compared to the effusion of a liquid. The composition of the hymn is assimilated to the clarification of the sacred beverage. The two comparisons are combined into one in the following formula which seems at first sight to be devoid of meaning: "Agni, whose flames are clarified like sounds," X, 3, 5. I refer to the translation of Ludwig, and especially to that of Grassmann, the reader who is curious to learn to how many improbable hypotheses about the meanings of words that are most clear, the strangeness of various figures of speech can lead the most competent interpreters.

A double comparison seems likewise to be implied by the bizarre metaphor which makes butter the tongue of the gods, IV, 58, 1. The tongue of the gods is, ordinarily, Agni as [6] it is by means of the sacrificial fire that the gods consume the offering. Now the butter can be compared to the fire in so far as all the offerings have to be preceded and followed by an offering of butter which seems therefore to envelope the principal offering and thus becomes a new intermediary between this offering and the deity for whom it is destined.

1 Grassmann translates correctly without giving any explanation. Ludwig seems, as if he would avoid, by means of a forced construction, the application of this formula to the butter.
BOLDNESS OF METAPHORS

We have pointed out the boldness of the Vedic similes. When these become implicit and are reduced to mere metaphors, the strangeness can more easily conduce to obscurity. The rays of the sun are compared to horses. It is necessary to have this idea present in the mind in order to comprehend the formula: "The rays of the sun draw him," I, 50, 1. The Maruts, when shaking the sky, make brilliant figs fall down from it, V, 54, 12. This is because the sky is sometimes conceived as a tree, whose fruits are the celestial treasures, rain or light.

It is said of the dead burnt on the funeral pyre that they are 'cooked'.' Again, the sun is a strainer with brilliant filaments who filters the light as the sacrificial strainer the Soma juice. 2 The reader to whom these ideas are unfamiliar can hardly understand that in the verse IX, 83, 12, the 'cooked ones' that alone can reach 'the strainer with brilliant filaments' at which the 'raw ones' do not arrive, represent the dead going to inhabit the sun.

To pardon sins, is in the Vedic language as in ours, to 'deliver' one from them. But the risis do not content themselves with this metaphor. They compare the sinner to a calf or a cow that is 'tied', IV, 12, 6. It is this which explains the following prayer: "Release us, O Agni, from the stable of the gods and from that of the mortals," IV, 12, 5. The allusion seems to have escaped Grassmann and Ludwig who arbitrarily assign to the word अङ्ग्रेज़ी stable,' 3 the meaning of 'prison'.

It is certainly a gracious figure that makes of the lightning a smile of the sky. It is again necessary to know that this figure is familiar to the Vedic poets in order to understand the comparison of Agni, the celestial fire, to the sky 'smiling across the

---

1 Religions Vedique, I, pp. 79 and 80.
2 Ibid., p. 201.
3 See, regarding other, most curious, uses of this word, pp. 11 and 18. It is no longer necessary to change its meaning in the verses III, 1, 14; IV, 50, 2 (where however Ludwig retains the meaning of stable abandoned by Grassmann), nor in the verse II, 13, 7, nor in VII, 76, 5, where the fathers are represented as 'united with the Dawns in their stable.'
cloud,' II, 4, 6, [7] and specially the allusion1 contained in this formula: "Agni, who makes the smile of all sacrifices," IV, 7, 3. The 'smile' of the sacrifice is the lightning itself in the verse VIII, 78, 6, the sacrifice in question being the celestial sacrifice: "When thou art born, O Indra, then are born the sacrifice, the hymn and the smile."

Indra, when he becomes intoxicated with the sacred beverage in the company of Visnus, receives with this god, the to our eyes, very irreverent appellation of 'jug of Soma', VI, 69, 2 and 6. An allusion to the same figure seems to be contained in this formula which is still more bold: "To milk the Soma into the stomach of Indra", IX, 72, 2. Here Grassmann translates correctly and it is Ludwig who weakens the figure by substituting the natural expression 'to cause to run' for the figurative expression 'to milk'.

We have already seen that the sound of the pressing stones is considered to be like a prayer. Hence the stones that speak, V, 31, 12.3 The hymn X, 94, dedicated to the pressing-stones, begins thus: "May they speak, may we also speak. Speak to the stones that speak". By adding to this figure a metonymy, that is by understanding the stone as the sound which it makes, we arrive at the bizarre formula of the verses X, 64, 15 and X, 100, 8: "The stone has said'.3

The assimilation of the prayer to an offering 'is the key to the understanding of expressions like 'pouring out the hymn', VIII, 52, 4. It is the more astonishing that this formula should have brought Grassmann5 to a standstill since this scholar correctly translates the verse VIII, 39, 3: "O Agni, I throw these prayers, like butter, into thy mouth", and the verse II, 27, 1: "I pour out with the spoon in honour of the Adityas these chants dripping with butter".6

1 It has escaped Grassmann.
2 And passim. See Religion Vedic, I, p. 281.
3 Grassmann acquits himself of the affair, as he frequently does, by substituting for the figurative expression the word 'resounds.' Ludwig has recourse to a construction which seems to be very forced.
4 Religion Vedic, I, p. 283.
5 He translates 'Sängers Ruf'.
6 Cf. I, 61, 5.
The Vedic poets are not content with comparing the recitation of the hymns to the throwing of the offering in the fire; they compare the composition with the preparation of the Soma offering.\(^1\) As the prayer, moreover, procures all riches, it can be said of Agni, the poet par excellence, that he ‘clarifies a very nourishing hymn’, VII, 9, 2. Ludwig and Grassmann escape very cheaply from the difficulty presented by this passage \[^8\] by giving to the substantive\(^2\) a meaning which it does not have in the Vedic hymns, and to the verb,\(^3\) a meaning that exists in mere fancy.

It is said further of the same Agni that he has clarified the hymn\(^4\) through three strainers, III, 26, 8. When this god is conceived, not as the author, but merely as the inspirer of the prayer, the poets become the strainers through which he clarifies his thought,\(^5\) III, 1, 5. The prayers\(^6\) themselves distil a sweet liquor when passing through the poets as through strainers, III, 31, 16. It is also said that the sages clarify speech through an extended strainer through which pass thousands of drops, IX, 73, 7. To

\(^1\) *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 283.

\(^2\) 'sun'; see *Religion Vedique*, I, p. 279 and note.

\(^3\) *Panā*: Grassmann, ‘flammend aufthat’; Ludwig: ‘rein darstellend.’

\(^4\) Again *Agni* which Ludwig continues to translate as ‘sun.’ He will explain later on the ‘three purifications of the sun.’ Grassmann disposes of the matter at once by giving to the word *prābhā* ‘strainer,’ the meaning of ‘entflammen’ (*sic*).

\(^5\) Ludwig’s translation, ‘heilig darstellend seine geistige Kraft durch die Reinigungsmittel der göttlichen Weisen’ is not very clear. Grassmann has not hesitated to make a mere adjective of *kāvibhi:*, Ludwig too does so, moreover, in the verses III, 31, 16. See the next note.

\(^6\) Denoted by the word *prābhā*: which occurs again only once, in IX, 93, 1 and as an epithet of the prayers. *śtuḥ*: is a partitive genitive used here with *prābhā*: as it frequently is with the verb *pā* ‘to drink’. It is the prayers which cause the waters to move (*hinvanti* can have only a transitive meaning). Grassmann and Ludwig have not troubled themselves about making the translation of this passage accord with that of the preceding one.
learn the verses which celebrate Soma Pavamāna\(^1\) is to learn 'the juice prepared by the ṛṣis', IX, 67, 31. Finally, the tongue distils the sweet liquor of the sacrifice,\(^2\) IX, 75, 2, and at its extremity is a strainer, IX, 73, 9. We shall meet below\(^3\) with this last idea in combination with a different figure.

"To weave the work of the singers", X, 53, 6, is another metaphor which recalls by way of allusion the comparison of the prayer with a textile, with a garment, which the singers weave for the gods.

The prayer is also conceived as a weapon, whence the metaphor, to 'whet the prayer', VIII, 42, 3. The weapon of the prayer is employed by the gods themselves. If this idea had been present in their minds, Grassmann and Ludwig, would have, in spite of the example of Roth, understood that there is no occasion to abandon\(^4\) [9] the meaning of prayer, which is the only justifiable\(^5\) meaning, in order to explain the formula: "Trita struck the boar with a prayer which had a point of iron", X, 99, 6. The prayer with the iron point recalls moreover the hymns\(^6\) which 'glow like the fire' X, 68, 6.

It is said to Indra: "Do not stay in the evening away from us like a bad son-in-law", VIII, 2, 20. This is a comparison which is not more unusual than many others. One does not, however, understand it fully, if one fails to see in it an allusion to the

---

\(^1\) And not the prayers 'that clarify themselves' as I have said elsewhere (Religion Vedic, I, p. 283) through a lapsus, confusing the derivative प्रावणमि with the present participle of the verb pu.

\(^2\) Or, more correctly, 'of the law.' I do not believe that the genitive ऋतुष्य should be construed with निद्र, as Grassmann and Ludwig have done, and still less, that the tongue in question can be Soma. Such a figure can be explained by no analogy. On the other hand, it is clearly Soma who is the 'lord' or 'spouse' of the prayer, and who moreover, himself also speaks.

\(^3\) Pp. 26–27.

\(^4\) Grassmann: 'Pfeil.' Ludwig: 'Schleuder'.

\(^5\) See above, p. 5, note 1.

\(^6\) Again अर्क, Grassmann: 'Glute,' Ludwig: 'Blitz.' See p. 8, notes 1 and 3.
idea that the prayer is the spouse, the young wife, *ibid.* 19, of the god. In this way is also explained the presence, in a hymn addressed to Indra, of a formula like that of the verse V, 37, 3: "This woman goes searching for a husband that will espouse her". In the same way also when the Vedic poets show us Agni VII, 10, 1, or Soma, VI, 47, 3, *awakening* the prayer which readily awakes, it requires on the part of the reader some familiarity with the conceptions which are peculiar to them to see there an allusion to the spouse or the lover (female) awakened by the husband or the lover.\(^2\)

The prayer is, again, a chariot that brings the gods to the sacrifice. The Vedic rśis therefore *carpenter* prayers, VI, 32, 1.\(^3\) The poet, fearing that other sacrificers may compete with him and invoke the god at the same time as he, addresses himself in these words to Indra: 'Let our hymn be the one that *conveys* thee the best,' VI, 45, 30. From this translation to that of Ludwig and from Ludwig's to Grassmann's, there can be observed a gradual effacement of the figure. Ludwig says, "Let this be the one that *draws* thee the best," and Grassmann: "Let this be the one that *charms* thee the most." We may also cite in this connection the formula: "Let us make for Indra a pleasing chariot," III, 53, 3. Grassmann gives to the word वाहिस् व indirectly the meaning 'praise': in doing so, he is only following the *Nirukta*. The hymn of praise may be thus named because it brings the god; but there is here one of the numerous cases where the question of rhetoric is wrongly treated as a question of lexicography. The word वाहिस् *denotes* 'chariot' and *suggests* the idea of 'prayer.'\(^5\)

\(^1\) "Come towards us like the great man who has married a young wife," that is to say, like a powerful or rich son-in-law. The second पादā seems to be a sort of parenthesis. Ludwig, it seems to me, has totally misunderstood the meaning of this passage.

\(^2\) Compare, regarding उष्णि, X, 63, 1, and regarding अजीगर, I, 134, 3.

The allusion has, without doubt, escaped the two translators.

\(^3\) And passim.

\(^4\) Cf. the use of the word वाहि in the compounds स्तोम्बाहि, नम्बाहि, and सिंधुवाहि and likewise the parallel use of the adjective वाहिष्च, applied sometimes to the hymn, as above VI, 45, 30, sometimes to the rivers, VIII, 26, 18, and sometimes to the chariot, VII, 37, 1.

\(^5\) Ludwig substitutes, without any apparent reason, another metaphor, 'Hebe'. 
The assimilation of prayers to horses belongs to the same category of ideas. Of Agni the inspirer of hymns, it is said that he helps 'in yoking the prayers,' 1 I, 18, 7. Sometimes it is the god invoked who himself yokes the prayers, that is, who takes them for his team: "The men invoke Indra that he may yoke the prayers which he rescues," VII, 27, 1. Ludwig and Grassmann obliterate this metaphor in their translations. Both have totally mistranslated verse 13 of the hymn VIII, 5, addressed to the Aśvins, where the same idea is expressed as, 'yoke the prayer of men and come quick.' And yet, the verb used, ni yavītām, is precisely the one whose formation corresponds to that of the substantive niyut. Now this word is so often used to denote the prayers that Grassmann, substituting, as he frequently does, the suggested idea to the idea expressed, assigns directly to it the meaning 'prayer' in his lexicon, although in reality it has the meaning of 'team' only. The numerous uses of the same word in a metaphorical sense can, for the rest, furnish us with a whole series of allusions in addition to those that have just been mentioned. I shall content myself with citing one of them. We have seen Indra compared to a wheel that rolls towards the sacrificer. The author of the verse IV, 31, 4 reproduces this comparison, adding however that it is the teams of men that make him roll. These teams are evidently the prayers. Here the true meaning has escaped Ludwig; it has been grasped by Grassmann who however commits the mistake of substituting the idea of 'prayers' for 'teams'.

The figure that is perhaps the most used and whose applications are the most diverse in the Rgveda is that of the 'cow'. It denotes in particular the prayers, 2 and the metaphor is so well-known that a poet alludes to it in the following manner: "I have brought thee these hymns of praise like a cowherd", I, 14, 9. 3 Elsewhere, through a peculiarity similar to that which I have denoted by the name of 'Inverse Comparison,' it is the upameya which occurs in the simile: "I have somehow brought thee the cows; accept them, O night, daughter of the sky, like the praise

1 Ludwig and Grassmann have effaced the metaphor.
2 Religion Vedique, I, p. 309.
3 Cf. VI, 49, 12 below, p. 19.
which is addressed to the conqueror,” X, 127, 8. The translation which Ludwig gives of this verse is not very intelligible. Grassmann gets rid of the bizarreness by giving to the words their natural order; but in doing so, he has been obliged to reverse that in which it has pleased the poet to present them to us.

Indra’s appellation as the ‘bull of the prayers,’ VI, 17, 2, is to be explained in the same way. Similarly, it is possible that an allusion of the same kind [II] is contained in the invitation which is addressed to Indra in VIII, 88, 1 to ‘approach the stable.’ For the idea of ‘stable,’ Ludwig substitutes the vague one of ‘habitation.’ Grassmann translates ‘drinks,’ and in fact it is possible that by the word ‘stable’ the poet alludes to the offerings, which, like the prayers, are also represented as cows; but he should have, in any case, preserved the metaphor.

The substitution of ‘milk’ for ‘cow’ in representing the prayer leads naturally to the substitution of the idea of cow for that of ‘cowherd’ in representing the poet. It is thus that the author of the verse I, 186, 4 is able to compare himself to a ‘cow,’ a good milker, when he composes his ‘hymn’. Here it is the text which Grassmann has disturbed; he substitutes a dual for the singular in order to connect the qualification ‘cow’ with the ‘Night’ and the ‘Dawn’ to whom the verse is addressed.

Finally, one should bear well in mind that the cow is the type of all the gifts that man expects from the gods in order to understand this strange comparison: “Our desire is opened like a stable; fill it, O Indra, thou that art the lord of riches’”, III, 30, 19.

INCOHERENT COMBINATIONS OF FIGURATIVE AND UNFIGURATIVE WORDS

The obscurity of metaphors is lessened, when, by the side of the figurative word, there occurs, as is the case in a great number

1 Ludwig gets rid of this combination in a very artificial manner by understanding an idea which nothing suggests, ‘der Stier, (der Gegenstand) der Lieder.’ Grassmann translates more faithfully; but there is nothing to indicate that he has understood the allusion.
3 Ludwig translates correctly. Grassmann substitutes another metaphor ‘Meeresbecken’ for that of the text, Cf. p. 6, note 3.
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of the examples already cited, an unfigurative word which determines its application. But, in return, the bizarrerie is enhanced when this unfigurative word expresses a detail which is strange in connection with the idea represented by the figure, or even irreconcilable with it.

To kindle Agni is to awaken him: the metaphor is natural. It is less natural when Agni is ‘awakened’ with ‘a billet of wood,’ V, 1, 1. The fire devours: nothing more simple. But what formula is so bizarre as the following where it is a simile which suggests the metaphor while the principal sentence contains only the unfigurative word: “Thou burnest the wood, O Agni, like cattle in the pasturage,” V, 9, 4? Agni’s flame is a tongue. This tongue digests the offering. It is more strange that it breaks the stones, VIII, 61, 4. Similarly, one can understand the flames being called [12] spoons when they present the offering to the gods. But this figure is used in sentences where it cannot be explained, in VI, 66, 10, where the Maruts, impetuous like flames, are compared to the spoons of Agni.

The priest who has drunk the Soma juice and whose body has thus become the abode of a god, calls himself an ‘ornate mansion.’ This does not prevent him from representing himself at the same time as ‘going and carrying the offering to the gods,’ X, 119, 13. This figure has displeased Grassmann and Ludwig and they have sacrificed to their offended taste, one the lexicography, and the other, the grammar. The former gives to a word which denotes ‘house’ the meaning of ‘servant’; the latter translates a nominative as an accusative and another nominative as the genitive of a word whose accent does not permit it to be confounded with the word actually used.

---

1 Cf. VI, 2, 9.

2 जूड़ लुद्विग एण्ड ग्रासमान चेंज दी मीनिंग ऑफ द वर्ड एण्ड से,’ the tongues of Agni’; see below, p. 14, note 2.

3 Religion Vedic, I, p. 151.

4 गूढ़ी Does Ludwig believe, like Kaegi, Siebenzig Lieder, p. 83, note 4 that this form stands for गूढ़ी ज? In my view, the one is equivalent to the other.

5 अरंकलो and not अरंकलो.
Soma himself is a combatant: he fights the demons. But, as it is the arms of the priests which make the Soma juice run when pressing it with stones, Soma is 'a combatant who is made to move with the arms'\(^1\) V, 58, 4. In the verse IX, 96, 19, Soma is called at the same time a 'drop' that carries weapons and wins cows and an 'eagle' staying in the 'vat'. In another passage, X, 101, 10, where the epithet 'bay' and specially the figure of the ten straps (the ten fingers) which grip imply the assimilation of Soma to a horse, the poet says, without troubling himself about the incoherence\(^2\) of his language, 'Throw the bay into the vat,' and he adds, alluding to the sacrifice of the horse, 'fashion him with knives;' but these knives are 'made of stones,' because they are the pressing-stones. Again, it is Soma who is called in the verse V, 50, 4, the 'animal of the vat'. This combination of words has appeared too dry to Grassmann who replaces 'vat' by 'manger.'

When representing Soma as a bull, the poet has felt no scruple about making him liquid and has thus made a 'drop bull' of him, VI, 41, 3. Then, with the addition to the metaphor of a metonymy, it is said that the plant (for the Soma juice, that is extracted from it) [13] Iows, IX, 74, 5. This formula becomes, in the translation of Grassmann, 'the juice bubbles'.

Soma on the one hand is a calf; on the other, he comes out of a plant. He is therefore a calf whom Parjanya, his father, makes a 'foetus of the plants', III, 101, 1. Ludwig translates correctly this formula, the figure in which is obliterated by Grassmann.

To press out any juice is, in Vedic phraseology, to milk it out. Therefore the Soma is said to be milked; but he is 'milked' with 'stones', the pressing stones, I, 54, 9; VII, 38, 3; IX, 80, 5. Here it is Grassmann who has preserved the figure while Ludwig has effaced it.

The Soma in the sky is identified with the sun. He is therefore represented as 'looking down below', but the poet continues and calls him a 'liquor', IX, 38, 5.

---

\(^1\) बाहुच्छेत This epithet which is related to बाहुच्छेत and बाहुविज्ञात, does not permit of any doubt that it is Soma who is spoken of in this verse. Grassmann and Ludwig, without troubling themselves with these analogies, translate here, the former, 'armgewandt' and the latter, 'armkräftig.'

\(^2\) Regarding the incoherence of the figures, see the whole hymn and especially verses 2, 7, and 11.
On the other hand, the liquor which gives to Indra the strength that he requires for accomplishing his divine exploits can pass for the bolt of Indra. This is the 'intoxicating bolt' which has been given to him by Kāyya Usana, and which the new priest again forges for him, I, 121. Grassmann translates 'the joyful lightning' and Ludwig 'the bolt which is pleasing to him'. Neither the one nor the other seems to have comprehended that the bolt given to a god by a priest can only be a liturgical weapon.

But we have better than the 'intoxicating' bolt. It is the hammer explicitly called 'hammer of the pressed liquor', that Indra 'causes to flow into his stomach', X, 116, 4. We find again here the confusion of the idea of 'weapon' and that of 'drink'. Nothing however of all this in the translations of Grassmann and Ludwig.¹

Elsewhere, it is Indra himself who 'causes to flow' on the demon, by means of 'stones', a 'bolt' representing Soma, V, 48, 3. Grassmann translates correctly this passage; it is Ludwig who has effaced the figure.

Soma is also the prop of the sky. It would seem that the first quality required in a prop should be solidity. The author of the verse IX, 86, 46, says nevertheless: 'It has spread, the liquor that is the prop of the sky'.

It is Soma that attracts Indra, that makes him come down upon the altar. It can therefore be said that he yokes his horses. Everything goes well so long as Soma is represented with a human form. But, when the poet places him in the cup, or even substitutes by metonymy for the liquor the 'cup' which 'yokes the horses' hāriyojana, I, 82, 4 the combination of ideas becomes very [14] strange. Nevertheless it would be better to admit this than to essay the forced constructions to which Grassmann and Ludwig have recourse. The error of the latter is the more peculiar inasmuch as in a very analogous formula where it is merely the priests instead of the cup that yoke the horses of Indra, I, 61, 16, he does not hesitate, in order to bring out the meaning of the same word, harīyojana to make in the text a correction² which looks very

¹ The meaning of the root vrṣ in the middle with the prefix a, has not appeared sufficiently established to them to discourage them from searching for another.
² By rejecting firstly the reading of the Pada-pāṭha, and then changing the accentuation of the Samhitā.
seductive in my eyes, but which condemns his former interpretation.

These however are but some out of the thousands of examples of bizarreness that are furnished by the formulae relating to Soma. Book IX of the Rgveda, consisting solely of hymns addressed to Soma Pavamāna is wholly in this style.

I have already referred above to the assimilation of the prayer to the offering. When the offering is a prayer, the spoon is naturally the tongue of the poet. It is in this sense that the formula, "I eloquently invoke Agni with the spoon", II, 10, 6, should be understood. But interpreting is one thing, and translating, another; and Grassmann in his dictionary, and Ludwig in his translation, are wrong in substituting the idea of 'tongue' for that of 'spoon'.

In the hymn IV, 56 concerning the sacrificial butter, the drops of butter placed 'in the heart', 11, purified 'with the heart,' 6, coming out from 'the ocean of the heart,' 5, can be only the prayers. But it must in any case be admitted that the metaphor is harsh. The 'ocean of the heart' is not found either in Ludwig or in Grassmann. The former substitutes for it 'the inmost vessel' which has not much meaning. The latter is clear, but at what a price! The ocean becomes a 'pleasing' ocean, that of the atmosphere. Neither the one nor the other has taken any pains to make his translation of verse 5 accord with that of 6 and 11.

Conversely, the flowing of the deified waters is assimilated to a chant: "Sing us," they are addressed, "milk out of fat, sweet milk," X, 64, 9. Grassmann replaces here the idea of 'singing' with that of 'sending.'

The sacred speech is the first of all things. In particular, it is the mother of the different couples of gods, X, 125, 1. The author of the verse III, 39, 3 (cf. 1 and 2), while calling it 'the mother of twins,' has not hesitated to add that it is placed [15]

1 In his translation, he is far off from the true meaning. The article in the dictionary on the imaginary word तुष्क 'tongue' contains however a just observation on the confusion of the idea of spoon and that of 'tongue' applied to the flames of Agni. See above, p. 12, note 1.

2 On the meaning of the verb रे, see Religion Védique, I, p. 277.
'on the mobile extremity of the tongue.' Nothing of this however is found either in Grassmann or Ludwig.1

The invocation to Agni: "Give attention to every one that has a good chariot," III, 14, 7, evidently needs explanation. To say like Ludwig "Be the ally² of every one that has a good war-chariot" is to content oneself too easily, and not to interpret it. The possession of a good war chariot is not, obviously, a special title to the favour of the gods. The chariot in question is the prayer² that brings the gods to the sacrifice. I could have already cited this passage above; but the imperative bodhi 'pay attention' would very naturally require the complement 'to our prayer,' so that I thought that I should include the combination 'pay attention to him who has a good chariot' among those which present an incoherence between the figurative and unfigurative words.

There are however, belonging to the same category, many combinations that are strange. Ludwig has not shrunk from 'the eloquent chariot,' I, 112, 2, which has scared away Grassmann. The 'eloquent ship,' II, 16, 7, has, I do not know why, scared away not only Grassmann 3 but Ludwig also. The 'ship of prayers' is, nevertheless, a known figure, I, 46, 7.

1 The lexicography and the grammar (accentuation of पत्र ) have been equally maltreated in the translation of Ludwig: "Der Zunge Spitze senkte sich und hob sich ". Grassmann's only mistake is in giving to the two different propositions two different subjects both of which are drawn from his imagination. It is the same element of Vedic liturgy and mythology that is spoken of in verse 6 of the hymn VI, 59 addressed to a pair of deities, to Indra and Agni: "She who is without feet advances before those who have feet; she comes out from the head; with the tongue, she speaks, she walks, etc." Here the accent of बापद्वत may be explained as due to a sort of subordination of this verb to those that follow. The unexpected translations that Grassmann and Ludwig give of this new formula are as far removed from each other as each of them is from mine.

2 Ludwig is however obliged to understand the word 'ally' with bodhi, taken as the imperative of bhū. This form is here, as understood by Grassmann, the imperative of budh.

3 Or the sacrifice in general. It is thus that Grassmann, in his dictionary, seems to understand this passage. His translation, without explanation, is correct.

4 Only at the time of translation. In his dictionary, he gives the correct meaning.
The prayers are also horses. It is also said therefore that they 'caracole,' and that they caracole when coming out from 'the heart,' III, 39, 1.

We have seen the gods take for their team the prayers of men. But these teams of prayers go to meet them. The poet 'sends' to the gods a 'desire' well 'yoked', IV, 23, 5. All 'the teams pursue' the Aśvins, VII, 72, 1. The figurative and the unfigurative words are used together in this passage of a hymn to Indra: "Like water that follows its slope, the prayers, the teams, run towards thee," VI, 47, 14. Horses that themselves go seeking him whom they have to carry are, in the first place, rare horses. What can we say of those that call him? It has been seen above that Agni helps in yoking the prayers. Elsewhere, he is prayed to himself yoke, like a driver, 'the horses which best call the gods', VIII, 64, 1.

---

1. I, 142, 4; VI, 22, 5; X, 148, 5. This is the correct meaning of the root vānç. It explains particularly well the passages where this root is used to denote the flowing of the Soma who is so often compared to a horse. In his interpretations of the word वासन् Ludwig is not consistent. See VI, 22, 5 and I, 144, 6.

2. Cf. X, 47, 7. Grassmann is wrong in referring the form वचयमान to the root vac 'to speak'.

3. Here it is Grassmann who translates correctly. It is however possible that the verb signifies 'to weave' as understood by Ludwig. We would then have a combination of two incoherent metaphors. But Ludwig's translation: "festverbundene Liebe" seems to us to be pure fantasy.

4. Ludwig translates 'follow' in spite of the prefix अमि. Here it is Grassmann who seems to me to have understood the correct meaning.

5. Cf. VIII, 85, 10: "Send to Indra the hymn, the troops, the chants" and I, 145, 3: "Towards him (Agni) go the spoons, the mares." In the second passage which takes us back to the figure of teams, the mares are the prayers rather than the beverages as believed by Grassmann. As for Ludwig's translation, 'die Trefflichen,' it is as arbitrary as it is devoid of sense.

6. Ludwig, contrary to his habit, adds to the translation of the word निषुच an explanation in parenthesis. But this explanation, 'Aufträge,' is inadmissible.

7. This figure has quite disappeared in Grassmann's translation.
Indra mounts his chariot 'at the call' of his bay horses, III, 45, 2. Ludwig, it is true, interprets this call as a simple neighing; and, in fact, the two bay horses do constitute the celestial team of Indra. Still it is the more easy to admit here a confusion between this team and the liturgical team of prayers inasmuch as we read in the verse III, 50, 2: "I yoke for thee the two pious horses whose piety thou hast rewarded long ago.'

In the hymn II, 18, the horses that call Indra are in number successively 2, 4, 6, 10 (verse 4), 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 (verse 5), 80, 90, 100 (verse 6). Grassmann and Ludwig translate 'called with 2, 4, etc., horses.' They have not comprehended that all these horses, or rather, all these pairs of horses, are liturgical teams. And yet the chariot of verse 1 can represent only the sacrifice. It is said in verse 3 that the two bay horses of Indra are yoked by the prayer. Finally, verse 7 says quite categorically, "Come, O Indra, in the direction of my [17] prayers; yoke them all like the two bay horses to the yoke of the chariot." And why this ever increasing number of horses? The sequel of the same verse explains it to us: "For, thou mayest be invoked in many different places." The multiplication of the number of horses is like a higher bid by means of which the poet hopes to induce the god to resolve to listen to him in preference to other sacrificers.

But we have not yet arrived at the last limits of the bizarrerie. The horses that draw the gods, the chariot wheels that are turned for them, are well-known equivalents of the prayers, so that, instead of saying, as in the verse VI, 48, 16, 'to speak' to the ear of the god, the poet says, 'May the horses, O Indra and Kutsa, draw you at the ear' V, 31, 9 or 'The priests, while invoking the ram (Indra), draw a chariot-wheel at his ear,' VIII, 86, 12.

1 Grassmann's translation is totally different. But the meaning which he gives to अभिरविबन्धः 'behind,' is only a conjecture and is as venturesome as futile.

2 Note the parallelism of द्वियमानः and उद्वियमानः in verses 4 and 6.

3 It is not possible to connect विष्णु and दरी as Grassmann and Ludwig have done.

4 Grassmann and Ludwig seek naturally another meaning for अपि करणे, 'nah zur Stelle.' 'auf Hörweite'. 
On the Figures of Speech in the Rgveda

It will be observed, in connection with the assimilation of the prayers with horses that the priests also are horses that draw the sacrificial chariot. There are therefore horses that chant beautiful hymns, VII, 38, 7. The priests that are spoken of in this passage are however divine priests; and Grassmann and Ludwig remove the bizarriere from the expression, the first by giving to the word अर्क ‘hymn’ the meaning of ‘splendour,’ the second by omitting to translate the word बगिन् ‘horse.’

We have also seven ‘horses’ that ‘speak’ and that ‘say’ the truth only, that have only ‘thoughts’ conforming to the law; III, 4, 7. They are the seven mythical priests. The verse VII, 90, 5 also speaks of beings that ‘draw’ (a chariot) ‘yoked’ by their own will; and that have only ‘thoughts’ conforming to the truth.

Inversely, but chiefly by virtue of the same assimilation of the priests to horses, there are ‘priests’ that ‘caracole,’ III, 6 1. They are the ‘horses with seven tongues’ recalling the seven priests and the seven prayers, ibid, 2.

But let us turn back to the prayers. We know that they are also often compared to cows. Hence the ‘cows’ that approach; ‘praying’ to the lord of the cows, IX, 97; 34. The [18] formula that follows immediately in the same verse presents to us the same figure reversed: “The prayers go forward bellowing towards Soma.” The two explain each other. We may also cite the verse X; 104; 10: “The cow invokes him who is much invoked.” The author of the verse V, 18, 4 does not shrink from alluding to the assimilation of the prayers with cows even when placing the prayers in the mouth of the poets or singers: “The singers who guard the hymns in their mouth.”

The Maruts when making the rain fall are said to ‘milk’ the inexhaustible spring, VIII, 7, 16. This is because, in reality, like the prayers, and according to all seeming even before them, the celestial waters are cows.

1 See Religion Vedique, I, p. 279 and note.
2 Ludwig does not admit the meaning ‘horse’ given by Roth and Grassmann to the word बगिन्. This meaning however seems to me to be probable. In any case, the assimilation of the priests with horses is established by a good number of passages.
3 This figure seems to have completely escaped Ludwig.
4 See above, p. 15, note 5.
11 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]
The waters would be in place in a river and the cows in a stable; but the Vedic poets do not trouble themselves about analogy in the use which they make of sacred figures. Thus we meet in the verse IV, 19, 6 a 'river' containing all the 'cows.' From the river full of cows, by transferring the figure from the contained to the container, one arrives easily at this formula: "The rain coming from the troop," X, 23, 4. One thinks oneself dreaming when one reads the 'translation' that Grassmann gives of this expression. "The hero and all his troop (sic)."

The confusion between cows and celestial rivers also explains perfectly the formula: "The rivers fill the same stable," II, 35, 3, without any necessity of changing, as do Grassmann and Ludwig, the meaning of 'stable' into that of 'reservoir'.

The cow is also a commonplace symbol of the liberality of the god, and when the supplicant desires horses or even cows, it is this symbolical cow that he has to 'milk' in order to extract from it the 'cow' and the 'horse,' VIII, 14, 3.

**JUXTAPOSITION OF DISPARATE SIMILES**

Just as I said some words on the boldness of similes before speaking of the bizarrie of the metaphors, I believe that I should, before speaking of the incoherent combinations of diverse metaphors, give some examples of the diversity of the similes employed concerning the same object and their juxtaposition in the same formula. Here is one that is very curious: "Like the cows towards the village; like the combatant towards his horses; like the cow towards her calf, good and allowing herself to be sucked, like a husband towards his [19] wife, may he come towards us, he who sustains the sky; Savitṛ who gives all riches," X, 149, 4.

The litanies to Indra are similar to those to Savitṛ: "Call here thy friend like a cow that one is going to milk; 2 awaken, O singer, the lover Indra; like a vessel full of riches up to the brim, bring here the hero that he may make us presents," X, 42, 2.

---

1 Concerning the word घनि see below, p. 31, note 1.
2 जूति See above, p. 6, note 3.
3 This interpretation, which in any case, thrusts itself, so to say, upon one would be facilitated by the emendation दोहे न proposed by Roth.
To the well-known figure which makes the prayer a cow, may be added that which makes it a garment, a parure of the god, in the following passage: "Lead them to the hero as a cowherd leads his herd to the stable; may he clothe himself with the prayers of the priests as of the starry sky." VI, 49, 12. In the verse V, 29, 15, the poet compares the prayers which he addresses to Indra to garments and to a chariot. In another passage, I, 186. 7, the prayers have at the same time three different representations: "Our prayers, which serve him as horses, lick him as cows lick their new-born calf. Our chants caress, as wives the most lovable hero." The three figures likewise combined in the verse X, 101, 2 are those of the garment which adorns, the boat which sails and the weapon which brings victory over the enemies: all the three denote alike the prayer: "Perform the pleasant works; stretch (the warp of) the prayers (in order to weave them); make the boat which transports with the aid of oars; make ready your weapons, prepare everything; lead, make the sacrifice come forward, friends." The application of these metaphors, or at least of the last one, seems to have escaped Grassmann and Ludwig; for they substitute for the idea of 'weapons' that of 'utensils'.

When the prayer is considered as a chariot that brings the god, the poet can say that he makes a 'hymn' like a 'carpenter'. But the author of the verse III, 38, 1 does not stop here: he compares himself in addition to a horse yoked to the yoke.

The hymns to Soma of Book IX furnish us in abundance with a series of incongruous comparisons. We content ourselves with citing the verse IX, 82, 1. Soma is here called a horse that is 'pressed'; he is compared to a king when he neighs or bellows (just as one likes) after the cows and to an eagle when he passes through the strainer and stops in the vat.

[To be continued]

---

1 It is necessary however to cite the whole hymn. It is full of mystical incoherences.
2 The allusion seems however to have escaped Ludwig who gives to मनीष ण the meaning of 'Gedanke' and explains it in parenthesis by 'Plan'.
MISCELLANEA

METHODS ADOPTED BY JAINA WRITERS
FOR RECORDING THEIR OWN NAMES AND THOSE
OF THEIR GURUS IN THE WORKS COMPOSED
BY THEM

BY

Prof. H. R. KAPADIA, M. A.

Works can be classified in a number of ways. One of them is to divide them into two groups: (1) onymous and (2) anonymous. As regards the first group there are two alternatives, one wherein the author has himself mentioned his name and the other wherein the author's name is supplied later on by some one else. In the former case, it may be that the name is expressly mentioned by the author himself or that it may have been indirectly suggested by him. I intend to deal with, in this note mostly with the latter case. I shall begin with a Prakrit work viz. Viseshacunni of Nishhasutta composed by Jinadasa Gaṇi Mahattara. There he has said in the end:—

"ति-चउ-पण-अउसवग्म ति-पण-ति-तिमआक्षरा द ते तोर्सं।
पढम-ततिएहि ति-दुसरजुएहि नामं करयं जस्स॥
गुहदर्णं च गणितं, महचरं च नस्स तुवोहि॥
तेण कपसा चुणी, विसंसनामा गिःसीहस्स॥
"

The first of these verses gives us the name Jinadasa. For, अ, क, च, ट, त, ॠ, ण and श are the eight vargas. The 3rd, 5th, 3rd and 3rd letters of the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 8th vargas are respectively ज, ण, द, and ॠ. Out of them the first ज and the third द respectively combined with द and आ, the 3rd and the 2nd letters of the first varga give us the name Jinadasa.

Upadeśamālā known as Puṣpamālā, too, furnishes us with a similar example. The verse in question is as under:—

"हेममाणिचउदुपणगमुरिससिपढमवचनामेहि॥
सिरिअमयग्मसितिसेहि विरइयं पगरण इणस्मो॥ ५०१॥"

1 For some of the remarks regarding this work, see Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XVI, pts. III-IV; pp. 299-300.
By combining the first letter of each of the words हेम, मणि, चन्द्र, द्विया, चूर्णि and रिसी we get the author’s name Hemacanda Sūri.

In the two instances already noted, the clue to derive the name is given. Now, I shall refer to verses where such a clue does not seem to be specifically pointed out. Take the case of the following verse from Sanghapattaka\(^1\) of Jinavallabha Sūri.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"\textit{विभ्राजिष्ठमन्मगंधसमस्रासावः शुतोलुंचने}} \\
\text{\textit{सज्जानमुस्तिं जिनं वरवपःश्रीचन्द्रि:कामेश्वरसि}} \\
\text{\textit{वन्दे वृणमनंकपः सुररायः शक्ति चन्द्रिकःरं}} \\
\text{\textit{द्रमारिविदुषा तदा नुचचासानिन्यात्तरप्रद्यः}} \quad \text{॥ ३४ ॥} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This verse can be arranged as a \textit{cakrabandha}\(^2\) for which the reader is referred to the diagram facing this very page.

Somatilaka Sūri, too, has ingenuously suggested his name in the following verse:\(^3\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"\textit{यस्ताः श्रीजिनः हुदिवतोमदनस्योः प्रणीति अभन्}} \\
\text{\textit{जित्वा सोढ़रिष्ठकंशदने सोचिष्ठ्यंभुस्वन}} \\
\text{\textit{द्वारस्तेरिष्ठवरसंबंधुः पतन्त् कान्त: विशाङ् स्तवं}} \\
\text{\textit{वन्यान्यायं भवासः जिनं: प्रदुतास्वत्वंथि तर्मै शिवस्}} \quad \text{॥ १२ ॥} \\
\end{align*}
\]

By taking from each of the first these \textit{caranas} the 3rd, 17th, 6th and 14th letters respectively we get :

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"\textit{श्रीसमातिलकूसूरिविचिन्तत्"}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Sometimes an author introduces his name through a \textit{slesa}. For instance Dhanapāla\(^4\) (Pr. Dhanavāla) has done so in the last verse of \textit{Rṣabha-pañcāśiṅka}\(^5\) which runs as under :—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"\textit{प्रभुसमातिलकूसूरिविचिन्तत्"}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

1. This work is published in Gaekwad Oriental Series as No. XXXVII pp. 81-86. In the Govt. Mss. Library deposed at the Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, there are Mss. of this work and those for its commentary etc. All of them are described by me in “the Descriptive Catalogue of Jaina Mss.” Vol. XVIII about to be sent to the press.
2. This is here reproduced from my D. C. J. M.
3. As regards other peculiarities of this verse, the reader is referred to my Sanskrit bhūmi (p. 26) of Stuticaturvadhādikā of Sobhana Muni.
4. He is a brother of Sobhana Muni whose Stuticaturvadhādikā was commented upon by him. This is published by the Agamodaya Samiti as No. 52.
5. This work is edited by me with various commentaries etc., and is published in D. L. J. P. F. Series as No. 83 together with two other works of Dhanapāla.
Samayasundara Upādhyāya has mentioned his name in Kalpasūtra at the end of each of the 9 vyākhyanas. He has adopted the well-known method of splitting up the name into two parts and of suggesting their positions. This will be clear from the following verse:

"व्याख्यानं कल्पसूत्रं प्रथमं समगं स्फुटसः।
शिष्यार्थ पाठकास्वः। समयादिसन्तुरा:।।"

Now a word about a Jaina writer mentioning the name of his guru, when he perhaps wants to remain incognito.

The avacūrṇikāra of Jinaprabha Sūrya's Jina-gamastava has introduced the name of his guru as could be seen from taking the 4th and the 5th letters from each of the 4 carānas of the following verse:

"व्याख्यानं कल्पसूत्रं प्रथमं समगं स्फुटसः।
शिष्यार्थ पाठकास्वः। समयादिसन्तुरा:।।"

Avacūrṇikāra has himself said in the last verse that his guru's name is mentioned in a concealed form in the first verse. This last verse is as under:

"आदिगुमाभिधानसः गुरोः। पादप्रसादः।
पदविच्छेदस्येः विन्यते। स्फुटम्।।"

Vivekavilāsā is another work that may be referred to in this connection; for, from the first letter of each of the 4 carānas of the following verse we learn the name Jivādeva.

"जीवजन्तु प्रतिमा यस्य बचो मधुरमित्रित्वम्।
देहे गंगे श्रीयस्य स्वे बचै चूमिवं गुरुसः।।"

1 This is a Sanskrit commentary on Kalpasūtra attributed to Bhadrabhūṣṭrāmin. For a description of its Mss. see my D. C. J. M. Vol. XVII, pt. II; Nos. 520-522.
2 विशालराज्यं.
3 For this verse and the information connected with it, I am indebted to Munirāja Panyavijayājī.
REVIEWS


Kundakunda is unquestionably an authority on Jaina dogmatics; and his Pravacanasāra, despite its sectarian touches, especially certain leanings towards the so called Digambara persuasion, is a quintessential composition dealing with epistemological, ontological and monastic aspects of Jainism. On this Text there are Sanskrit commentaries of Amṛtacandra, Jayasena, Prabhācandra and Malliṣeṇa; and besides there are Kannāda and Hindi commentaries by Bālacandra and Hemarāja respectively (For a detailed information about them see my Introduction pp. 97 etc. to Pravacanasāra which is in the press being published by the Rāyachandra Jaina Śāstramāla, Bombay).* Of all the works of Kundakunda this work has attracted more attention of orientalists since its contents were summarised by R. G. Bhandarkar in his Report for 1884. The present publication is an English translation of ‘the Prakrit stanzas of Kundakunda together with the commentary of Amṛtacandra.’

The Editor has added an Introduction of about 14 pp. discussing some important topics about Kundakunda and his works. The editor, after surveying the views of Pt. Gajādharaśālā (who closely follows Pt. Premi Jaina Hitāishi Vol. X.) that Kundakunda belonged to c. 250 A. D., and those of K. B. Pathak that he belonged to the 6th century, comes to a possible conclusion that Kundakunda flourished in the 3rd or the 4th century of the Christian era especially in the light of the Jaina tradition, the general

* Since published.
tone of his works, the manner of his references to scriptures and the possibility that he was earlier than Umāsvāti.

The question of the date of Kundakunda is a most perplexing one. It is true that the Paṭṭāvalis are not reliable and the inscriptions not contemporary evidences; but if they agree on fundamental points and if there is no conflict from other sources, their information does deserve a judicious consideration in the light of other circumstantial evidence. The editor has not detected another weak point in Prof. Pathak’s uneven arguments, namely, the meaning of the word anvaya as taken by Pathak. It is accepted that the anvaya of Kundakunda existed as early as 6th or 7th century A. D.; but from this it does not follow that Kundakunda lived about 528 A. D., because, for instance, Padmanandi of the 15th century A. D. calls himself a Kundakundānvaya-dhurīṇa. Pathak’s evidences cannot supply any earlier limit. Pathak’s attempt to identify Śivakumāra with a contemporary king was only a probability, because it is Jayasena, who comes about one thousand years later, that tells us that Kundakunda wrote for one Śivakumāra Mahārāja. The argument cannot ‘disappear,’ but it has to be understood with certain reservations. To quote a parallel case, there are scholars who would take Kālidāsa and Dignāga as contemporaries on the authority of a dubious statement of Mallinātha. Further the editor remarks, ‘what is more decisive is that it (i.e. Śivakumāra) is known as the name of the hero of an old Jaina story which is alluded to by Kundakunda himself (Bhāvaprābhṛta v. 51): this must be the ultimate basis of the late commentator’s association of Kundakunda with a king of that name’. It cannot be decisive but only plausible, because Kundakunda refers not only to Śivakumāra but to many other persons: Bāhubali (Bhāvapāhūda v. 44) Madhupiṅga (v. 45), Vaśiṣṭha (v. 46), Bāhu (v. 49), Dipāyana (v. 50), Bhavyasena (v. 52), Śivabhūti (v. 53), Surattaputta (Silapāhūda v. 30) etc.; and there is no reason why Jayasena should specially select the name of Śivakumāra alone and take him to be a contemporary of Kundakunda. About the priority of Kundakunda over Umāsvāti there is not much doubt, and it can be shown that many sūtras of Umāsvāti closely follow certain gāthās from Kundakunda’s works. A close comparison of the Śvetāmbara
canon with the works of Kundakunda shows that they inherit much that is common, and, as I have said elsewhere, the works of Kundakunda are of a compilatory character, put together by way of memory notes at a time when Digambaras refused to accept the canon as shaped by the Pātaliputra council. That also explains why some of his works are called Sāras and Pāhuḍas. The editor rightly says that the references to non-Jaina schools do not help us to settle the date definitely. One is perfectly aware that the Prakrit dialect would yield 'no chronological certainties,' but this should not be an excuse, as it has been in the case of our editor, to neglect that aspect altogether. Savants like Pischel and Jacobi have often used the dialectal evidence in matters of relative chronology; and a moderate attempt, so far as Pravacanasāra is concerned, has been already made by me in this direction (See Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. II, part VI). Towards the problem of Kundakunda's date I might further add that the Merkara copper plates of 466 A. D. (looked upon as apocryphal by some) mention Kundakundānvaya, and Sarvārtha-sidahī (II, 10) of Pūjyapāda quotes some gāthās in the same order as found in Bārasa Anuvekkhā of Kundakunda. A close study of their works shows that the relative chronology should be like this: Kundakunda, Umāsvāti, Samantabhadra, Siddhasena and Pūjyapāda (c. 5th century A. D.). So it is more probable that Kundakunda flourished at the beginning of the Christian era, as I have shown in my Introduction. The editor has not taken into consideration Prof. Chakravarti's discussion about Kundakunda's date, though he mentions his edition of Pañcāstikāya.

The editor's discussion about Kundakunda's work is very poor. He gives merely the editions, and we do not get any information about the form and contents of various works of Kundakunda. The facts that some Mss. of Mūlācāra attribute its authorship to Kundakunda and that Prabhācandra attributes Prakrit Bhaktis to Kundakunda are not at all noticed by the editor. It appears that even some of the good editions of Kundakunda's works have not reached the hands of the editor; for instance, Sat-Prabhātādi-saṁgraha, Ed. Mānikachandra Jaina Granthamālā, Vol. 17, which contains the Sanskrit commentary of Śruta-sāgara etc. and the edition of Samuṣṭāra published by Rāyachandra Jaina Śāstramālā, Bombay, 1919.
The editor remarks that stanzas 24–34 of Chap. II (III?) seem out of place and have the air of an interpolation. It is a hasty pronouncement. I have studied the whole problem, and have come to the conclusion that these gāthās are not inconsistent with the utterances of Kundakunda in his other works; some of the gāthās so left by Amṛtacandra are very old ones, and some of them are already known to him (See the discussion in my introduction to Pravacanasāra pp. 50–54). Still the question remains why Amṛtacandra has not included them in his recension.

In one place the editor says: 'in the works attributed to Kundakunda there are no allusions to particular scriptures.' I may point out here that Kundakunda definitely refers to a Pratikramanā-sūtra in his Niyamasāra, gāthā 94 (Puḍikāmaṇa-nāmadheyo sutte jaha vannidam puḍikamanam).

There are certain errors of facts in the Introduction of the editor, and they require correction. There is no such work as Prabhṛtāsāra (p. xv) on which Bālacandra is said to have written a commentary: in fact he has commented on all the three works (Pañcāstikāya, Pravacanasāra and Samayasāra) of Kundakunda; it was an error first committed by K. B. Pathak, and that appears to be followed here. Vardhanadeva (p. xv) is not known from any references: the correct name is Śrīvardhadeva who is often identified with one Tumbūlurācārya and not Tumbūlācārya. Silapāhuḍa refers to Surattaputta and not to Rudra Sātyakiputra (p. xvi); the editor should have looked to the Prakrit gāthā and not easily be misled by the Sanskrit rendering Aṣṭaprābhṛta is not at all the name of a work with 'eight topics' (p. xix), but it is an editorial designation given to eight small treatises, each quite independent of the other, attributed to Kundakunda; it is an error similar to Chappāhuḍa which is a designation for six pāhuḍas (excepting Liṅga and Siṭa-pāhuḍa). Niyama in the title of Niyamasāra does not mean the 'rule of life,' but the text is so called because it discusses about three jewels which necessarily (niyamen) lead the soul to liberation. There is no edition of Niyamasāra by Gajādharalal; perhaps the editor means Samayaprābhṛtam. Samayasāra–kalāsa–nātaka is not at all an independent work of Amṛtacandra, but it is only a name given to a
compilation of all the verses from his commentary on Samayasāra. The name of Amṛtacandra's commentary on Samayasāra is not Tatparyavṛtti but Ṛmabhakhyāti.

The Prakrit gāthās are often cryptic. The style of Amṛtacandra's commentary is artificial, elaborate and heavy. It is a pleasure to read and enjoy the sound and sense of Amṛtacandra's utterances, but to translate the same with justice is a hard task. So turning to the translation one finds that the gāthās have been interpreted mainly according to Amṛtacandra's commentary. Differences in translation are possible in many places, and even mistakes can be pointed out here and there. A few typical errors might be noted: in gāthā I, 13 visayātīdaṃ = 'surpassing objects' is not correct; visaya undoubtedly refers to indriya-visaya. In gāthā I, 74 jīvāṇam devadāmānām = 'including those of gods'; the translation may be accepted, but the force of amtānām is missed; the gāthā has in view the enumeration of four kinds of mundane beings in which the gods come last. The rendering of pōggalajīvappagassa (II, 37) as 'which has souls and matter for self' is a good illustration how the translator is guided by the Dictionary even at the cost of the sense. The gāthās especially could have been translated more literally in many places: for instance dhoda-ghādi-kamma-malam = 'free from the stain of destructive Karmas'; the exact significance of dhoda is missed. The long sentence parama-Bhattachāraka etc. is rendered as 'prostrate myself before the holy Vardhamāna the mention of whose name is auspicious and is worthy of being praised by the most excellent Masters (bhattachārakas), Great Gods, Tutelary deities and Supreme Lords (parmesvaras)' (p. 3). Any one acquainted with the usual epithets of a Tirthamkara added by commentators will immediately see that Paramabhaṭṭāraka etc. are the adjectives of Vardhamāna; and this way of rendering upsets the various notions of Jaina pantheon. There are many such errors here and there. When Amṛtacandra writes in an involved style the translation also becomes tiresome. When Amṛtacandra's sentences are short, the translation is lucid and refreshing (I, 44). Some of the footnotes are important and informative. These differences and errors detected should not mean in any way the disparagement of performance. The translator has taken great
pains, and he has accomplished his task with an amount of success. The translator is not merely a cold academician, as can be seen from one of his remarks; ‘During these last years I have realised the joy of a deeper and better understanding of the Jaina religion.’

The translator should have outlined to us in the Introduction a general survey of the philosophical tenets of Jainism as given in Pravacanasūra in comparison with other leading systems of Indian philosophy, because every student cannot be expected to wade through the currents and cross-currents of a commentator's elaboration. The present publication is a good addition to our knowledge of Jainism; and it is hoped that the Boden Professor of Sanskrit would soon issue the various volumes of the ‘projected series’ of the Jaina Literature Society that the Jaina studies might go ahead to keep pace with Vedic and Buddhistic studies.

A. N. Upadhye
This work, meant, according to the learned author, for "the remaking of a lost world," gives, to what are hitherto considered as "absurdities and insoluble puzzles," in the Indo-Aryan literature, "their own natural place and position in the newly oriented world."

Although bound in one volume, the book contains two separate works: the first runs over a large extent, and deals with the history of the Vṛātyas of the East; while the second, which covers only the last (XIV) section, is devoted to culling the material out of the present Mahābhārata,—the materiel which alone, in the opinion of the learned author, formed the original "Draupadi-Sāgā," and was subsequently added to, and even altered, most mischievously by the wretched Brahman redactors.

It has been, hitherto, the fashion of the Western Scholars to take to task, off and on, the so called Brahman authors of old Indian literature, whenever these scholars found something unpalatable to their own taste, or to their peculiar mode of reasoning. The learned author of the work under review, while disagreeing with the scholars of the 19th century, on some vital points, has, most faithfully followed the fashion of putting the whole blame upon the Brahman class, for giving a form to the Indian literature, which, in his opinion, ought to have existed in some other form, originally. In fact, this tendency has, in the present work of Prof. Ghose, reached such a pitch, that even an indifferent reader would think it highly ridiculous.

One who is given to reading a literature somewhat intensive-ly, forms some ideas of his own; and once possessed by these ideas, he makes his own hypothesis, and works it out according to his own particular views, all the while, believing that he is doing something great. But the public, and especially the
keen-eyed critic, not being so biased, looks at the work from an impartial view-point, and it is thus that the real worth of an work is ultimately decided.

That the wholesale condemnation of the Brāhmans, as a class was so long done, and supported too, with some political motive is now generally known, and the work seems to have recently been given up as a task achieved. Prof. Ghose, in harping upon the same tune, seems to serve kicks to a dead body!—not a very brave feat, indeed!

Leaving this main item, there remains very little indeed, that can be looked at as research work! The thesis, laid down by the learned Professor, seems to have been constructed on the Vrātya literature, and, "remains," in the words of the author himself "a matter of purely personal conjecture, unrelated altogether to the data of demonstrable historicity."

Thus prepared, the reader may now look into the work itself: While the Aryan colonies were established in the Punjab, and the Western part of India, the East was populated by the Vrātyas, who had their own religion, and were ruled by their own kings. Some Brāhmans, being harassed by the oppression of Ksātriya rulers, left the Aryan colonies, and emigrated to the Vrātya country, in the East, where they Aryanised the whole population by certain Samskāras (ceremonials). This, in main, is the theory of the learned Professor, who has collected his material from the Atharva Veda, and some Brāhmaṇa works, as also from some of the Purāṇas. Prof. Ghose further holds that the Vedic literature was, as a whole, subsequently thoroughly revised by the priests who had managed to put down their oppressors by the help of the Vrātya Kings, and thus, with mutual borrowing, made the whole of the population equally Aryanised, with a newly cast Vedic literature to suit the needs of the aryansed Vrātyas; and the collection of hymns regarding these latter, mainly covers the Atharva Veda.

Then the author, in the last section of his works, turns towards the Mahābhārata, the great Indian Epic, and with certain convictions already settled in his mind, offers, to the reader, the material of the Draupadī Saga, upon which the present huge
Brahmanical structure of the Epic, subsequently came to be built. The author,—the seer of this original saga!—cuts away the brahmanical portions so as to make out a form of the Saga. Thus, "the Satyavatī Bhīṣma colloquy, and its uncomely issue,"—meaning the Niyoga episode,—is cut out as a Brahmanic elaboration. Pāṇḍu's Sons, too, are held to be his own work; Drona, his absurd son Aśvatthāman, and all about these, are held to be "a pure Brahmanic fabrication foisted on the original Saga." Without giving a complete list of the these "vile" fabrications, it would be well to reproduce here what, according to the author, is "an absolutely sure test" for finding out these mischiefs from the present bulky form of our ancient Indian literature: "when any part of the narrative is found to be totally lacking in verisimilitude, and is, at the same time, seen to imply extravagant glorification of the Brahman, specially if this be at the expense of some other class, and even more so if it involves the humiliation of that class, then we may have the rechauff patented as sixteen-annas Brahman-made." (p. 195).

S. N. Tadpatrikar
It is in the fitness of things that the life of a scholar should be crowned at a ripe old age with a volume of studies as a mark of respect from his fellow scholars, and we have been long accustomed to these Festschriften. But none deserves it more than this veteran scholar who for more than two decades has carried on the torch of the older generation of scholars. Winternitz’s name is familiar to all students of Sanskrit Literature and is one to conjure with in many of its departments.

The work is divided into the following sections: Language, Literature, Religion, Philosophy, Culture and History, to wit, the various fields in which the learned Professor has shown keen interest. In the first section Debrunner (joint author of Altindische Grammatik, III) has an interesting note on the type nesa and parsə of the Vedic imperative in -si; Renou gives an exhaustive list of words in -ima in Sanskrit and studies the derivation of this interesting suffix. Among other interesting articles on Linguistics may be mentioned Alsdorf’s observations on Pischel’s Materialen zur Kenntnis des Apabhramsa.

The literature section is enriched by Weller on the Text-Criticism of the Mahābhārata, Schrader on the Recensions of the Bhagavadgītā, Meyer on the Cultivation of Trees in the Agnipurāṇa. The following names will vouch for the all-round authority and interest of this section: Richard Schmidt, Gode, Sarup and Koerner.

In the section on Religion we have Shamasāstry on the Conception of Śīn in the Vedas, Mrs. Rhys Davids on a Vanished Sakyan window, E. J. Thomas on Pre-Pāli terms in the Pātimokkha, Sieg and Siegling on the Fragments of a Udāna-commentary in Toχkarian, Zachariæ on Jain authors of the 16th and 17th Centuries, Aiyangar on Pāñcarātra in classical Tamil literature, and De on Pre-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal.

The section on Philosophy contains useful contributions on various aspects from Strauss, Edgerton, Hiriyanna, Sharma, Coomaraswamy, Frauwallner, Tucci, Schayer and Tavadia, all of which are as interesting as they are brief.

In the final chapter we meet with such well-known scholars like Charpentier, Geiger, Norman Brown, Przyluski, etc. Each contribution is the fruit of deep thought in the particular field, and to give a detailed criticism of the more important studies would require a volume in itself, which, indeed, is the highest praise for a Commemoration Volume.

Finally Prof. Winternitz is to be congratulated on having established such a wide circle of admirers, friends and pupils among all generations of scholars, and the Volume under review which is as fitting a tribute to his genius as to that of the different authors, deserves to be in the bookshelf of every lover of India’s Culture and Scholarship.

S. M. Katre
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“VEDIC GODS: I-IV.”

BY

HIRALAL AMRITLAL SHAH, B. A., (Bombay, 2.)

SECTION—I: GODS "VARUṆA-MITRA-SŪRYA:

(1) God Varuṇa:— Fortunately for us, we possess a very distinctive description of the God Varuṇa in one of the hymns of Rgveda. It says that he knows the course of ships on the sea. This is how the verse reads:

“वेद्रा यो वीणां पद्मन्तरिक्षेण पततास्। वेद्र नाव: समुन्द्रियः॥” RV I. 25.7.

("Who knows the way of the birds that keep flying in the heaven (‘Antarikṣa’); who knows the course of ships on the sea.")

Herein, it seems, we get a clue as to the exact nature of this Vedic god. The course of navigation has ever been determined by the mariner’s compass which always shows the North, the needle pointing to the North Pole. It, therefore, suggests to me to take this particular description to refer to the Pole Star (a Ursae Minoris-Polaris) the well known Dhrūva star or to its regent god who knows the course of ships on sea. In RV. VII, 49. 3, we find that Varuṇa is associated with “waters” as their king. At this
stage, we will not discuss the nature of "Āpah (आपः)" in the RV. It is evident that Varuṇa is connected with "sea" in one way or the other.¹

(2) Varuṇa knows the ways of the birds that soar in Antarikṣa. The "bird" here does not seem to be an ordinary bird which flies. It seems to refer to stars which have their course in the sky. We find that the Sun is called a bird:

"In various passages Śūrya is conceived as a bird traversing space. He is a bird (X, 177, 1-2), or a ruddy bird (V, 47, 3), is represented as flying (I, 191, 9), is compared with a flying eagle (VII, 63, 5) and seems to be directly called an eagle (V, 45, 9)..........." (Mac. p. 31).

If flying 'birds' are in reality the stars, then the reference to the knowledge of Varuṇa in their connection seems to be the Polar Longitudes and the Polar' Latitudes which pass on, from Dhruva to all the stars and all the places. It is in this sense that (we think) the description of the god Varuṇa—the regent god of Dhruva as universal monarch, with spies and with a knowledge of all people, is appropriate. He is the only steady one in the changing and revolving universe. That way we prefer to interpret the verses in RV. I, 25, 10-13.

(3) It is significant that Varuṇa is associated with night. This fact would go to support his stellar nature and his visibility at night. We read that:

"In another passage (VIII, 41, 3) it is said that Varuṇa has embraced (pari śasvaje) the nights, and by his occult power has established the mornings or days (usraḥ).....In the later Vedic period of the Brāhmaṇas, Varuṇa comes to be specially connected with the nocturnal heaven. Thus Mitra is said to have produced the day and Varuṇa the night (TS. VI, 4, 8, 3); and the day is said to belong to Mitra and the night to Varuṇa (TS II, 1, 7, 4.)." (Mac. p 25).

(4) God Mitra:— Dhruva star is further associated (on earth) with the Gnomon (Śaṅku) which is inclined to its altitude: it fixes up the northern direction (one of the four cardinal points)

¹ Cf. para 65 "Sindhu" and note to Para 58 with reference to "Fish" and "sea" in connections with Canopus and Vasiṣṭha.
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just as, on sea, for the same purpose, it is helpful to the navigator through his compass. For an idea of the Śāṅku of this type we may well think of the one that is to be seen in the Indian astronomical observatories of Jai Simhā at Ujjain, Jaipur, Delhi and Benares and which is therein known as the “Samrāt-Yantra.” (Kaye p. 35ff., p. 41ff.) This type of Śāṅku is of prime importance for the measurement of time, with the help of the shadow the sun casts on it and on its equatorial side quadrants facing East and West (the two other cardinal points). It will be seen that the description of Varuṇa is “वेद भान धृतबन्ध स्राव ज्योति:।
वेदं यं उपजायते॥”

(“The righteous knows the twelve months with the family; he knows the offshoot that arises therefrom.” (RV. I, 25, 8.).

This description of Varuṇa brings us to the consideration of measurement of time which is done through Śāṅku.

(5) The associate god of Varuṇa is Mitra God in Vedas and therefore, we may as well take this Mitra God to be a personification or the regent god of Śāṅku, the Indian Gnomon (associated with Dhruva) and then reread the passage (quoted above) which says that the day belongs to Mitra. It is this character of Mitra, that his description of impelling men to action and helping them (or the agriculturists) acquires its proper sense:—

“मित्रो जनान्यायतनी तबाहो नित्रो द्वारं दृश्विकृत दयाः।
मित्र: कृष्टिर्निर्माणमेव च विद्वत्य इत्यं भूतवज्जुहोत॥”

1 We read in the “Pañcasiddhāntikā” Ch. XIII about the Gnomon as under:—

“The observer placing his eye at the base of the straight gnomon, is to incline it in such a way, that the top of the gnomon is in the straight line joining the eye and the Pole Star.” (31).

“At Lanka this observation is performed with a gnomon lying flat on the surface, on Sumeru with one standing upright, and in the intermediate regions with one inclined more or less.” (32).

“The people at Lanka see the Pole star in the horizon; those on the Meru in the Zenith; those dwelling between, see it between (the Horizon and the Zenith)” (28).

[From G. Thibaut’s translation (1889) reprinted by the Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Lahore, 1930 (p. 86).]

It should not be forgotten that the northern point of this Śāṅku is in the Pole Star in Dhruva Star and not in the Polar Point.

2 Thus the ‘Friendly’ function of the Mitra God arises co-ordinating the function of the two gods Varuṇa and Sun.
"It is the voice of Mitra that impels men:
Mitra sustains earth as also heaven; with a steady gaze,
Mitra watches the active folk (or agriculturists). Pour to
Mitra the luscious oblation." (RV. III, 59, 1).

(6) The function of Mitra and Varuṇa can now be followed
when it is said about it as under—

"In the AV. (IX, 3. 18) Mitra is asked to uncover in the
morning what has been covered up by Varuṇa." "In the AV.
(XIII, 3, 13) Mitra at sunrise is contrasted with Varuṇa in
the evening" (Mac. P. 29).

The antithesis between Mitra and Varuṇa is expressed as
under:—

"S. B. (XII, 9. 2, 12) asserts that this world is Mitra, that
the celestial world is Varuṇa." (Mac P. 25).

In company with Varuṇa:—

"By occult power Varuṇa, standing in the air, measures out
the earth with the sun as with a measure (V, 85, 5,) Varuṇa
and Mitra send the dawns (III, 61, 7), make the sun to cross
the sky and obscure it with cloud and rain, while the honeyed
drops fall (V, 63, 4); or (V, 63, 3 and 7) they cause heaven to
rain and they uphold the ordinances by the occult power of the
Asura (here-Dyaus or Parjanya)," (Mac. P. 24).

(7) Perhaps the golden shield (RV. I, 25, 13) or the cover-
ing which Varuṇa is said to be putting on before sending out
spies (spāsas) relate to his using the sun as a measure during day-
time. We will consider the "Dawns"-Ušas—later on.

MITRA-VARUṆA:— and SUN

(8) Both these gods Mitra and Varuṇa constitute an entity
as described above. Their eye is Sūrya, the sun (Mac. p. 30:—
"The eye of Sūrya is mentioned several times (V. 40, 8 etc.) but
he is himself equally often called the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa
(cf. Mac. p. 23) or of Agni as well (I, 115, 1.)."

It is natural that Mitra (Śaṅku) is closely associated with
the sun at day-time; accordingly it has led Vedic scholars to
take him for a Sun-God or a god of light specially connected
with the Sun:—

"The somewhat scanty evidence of the Veda showing that
Mitra is a solar deity, is corroborated by the Avesta and Persian
religion in general. Here Mithra is undoubtely a Sun-god or a god of light specially connected with the Sun.” (Mac. p 30).

(9) We may point out that the beneficent nature of Mitra of the Veda (and Mithra of the Avesta) consists in the essential need he fulfills by supplying the measurements of time, for proper action and for performance of rites or rituals. The ethical side of this god arises in that way. The measurement follows upon the linking of the North (with Varuna) and the East (with Sūrya) with the help of this god.

(10) It will now be interesting to note what is said about Varuna:—

“The hypothesis recently advanced by Oldenberg that Varuna primarily represented the moon, cannot be passed over here...... he believes that Varuna and Mitra were the moon and the sun..... This hypothesis does not seem to account at all well for the actual characteristics of Varuna in the Rgveda......It has already been mentioned that Varuna goes back to the Indo-Iranian period, for the Ahura Mazda of the Avesta agrees with him in character though not in name. The name of Varuna may even be Indo-European. At least, the long accepted identification of the word with the Greek “ouranos”, though presenting phonetic difficulties, has not been rejected by some recent authorities on comparative philology” (Mac. p. 28). (cf. para 69.)

DEVAS-STARS

(11) The difficulties that the scholars experienced in a proper understanding of the Vedic gods such as Varuna, Mitra etc. is quite natural. The impressions which work with them are that the Vedic seers merely sang the glories of a variety of natural phenomena. Hence the scholars naturally restrict their attention to some obvious happenings such as storm, wind, lightning, dawn, fire, rains; or to the course of sun and moon or at times to some tribal history. But the mention of them as shining ones, lustrous as conveyed by the sense of “div”—to shine—in the word “Deva” used for gods, would naturally invite our attention to the starry realm for a solution of the enigma. The foremost in such an astronomical realm is, as we suggest, Dhruva in the Varuna; and the second identity is of Mitra with the Šaṅku connected with Dhruva, as Mitra is connected with Varuna. Both are connected with the sun and moon as every other star
is connected with them. The connection of Mitra with Time (through Dhruva and Sun) necessarily leads us to a consideration of the Vedic calendar with its solstice and equinoctial points and without which, we will never be able to comprehend the nature of other Vedic creations, much less their grouping together on several occasions in several hymns. We have already covered some ground in our explanations of the grouping together of Mitra and Varuna.

(12) Before proceeding with the determination of the Vedic calendar, it will not be out of place to note that what applies to the Vedic texts does apply to the texts of other non-Indian religions where strong resemblances either to the Vedic conceptions, to Vedic narrations or to Vedic terminology are a marked characteristic. A better understanding of Varuna and Mitra will therefore naturally elucidate the basic conception of the greatest (Iranian) god Ahura Mazda and of god Mithra. Similarly, Vedic Vṛtra, Soma, Yama, Vivasvat, will naturally help us all to know the Iranian Verethraghna, Haoma, Yima and Vivanhvant better than before. Vedic Mātrarśvan will help us to see through the legend of Prometheus. Even this episode requires a clearer conception of the Vedic (stellar) calendar that the Vedic seers seem to have fixed up.

SECTION—II: OLD CALENDAR

(13) Vedic Calendar:— In order to understand other Vedic gods, it will be necessary for us to understand the nature of the Vedic months, Vedic Year, the Solstices and the Equinoctial points thereof and the system and division of constellations. We have practically no direct evidence which may be considered to be of the nature of a positive proof. We are left to gather and infer from many sources which differ widely and which do not reconcile with one another easily in their variances; and in the absence of one good reliable data, the choice of any particular one, or a suitable explanation of any growth that cannot be explained is difficult and the task becomes somewhat perilous. It can be easily seen that many hands must work at it and the limitations of a single individual applies very well to the humble but a bold attempt of the present writer. It has been found that many authors
must be kept out for our purposes of investigation; and so too, the many prevalent theories (ancient or modern) have to be laid aside in this matter. And above all, it has not been possible for the writer to go through several previous attempts that the learned (ancient and modern) scholars have made in this direction, because of the immensity of the controversial nature of the subject, and of the limited ability of the writer.

(14) As we quoted before, Varuṇa knows twelve months and the co-related matters with the offshoots. It does point to the adoption of a year of 12 luni-solar months and its adjustment to the solar year. It cannot be forgotten that in India, the very names of the months and their connection with the lunar mansions, bring to us the consideration of the system of Indian constellations which also has to be determined for the application to the Vedic conceptions. And herein we possess a great advantage in the present investigations because all the zodiacal constellations and many prominent stars and star-groups have their regent gods known to us. Since we find Varuṇa to be one of the starry realm, we can extend our scope in that direction to see if we get results which are better than what have been obtained hitherto without reference to stars or to the true old calendar.

(15) We refer to the works of Kālidāsa and of Kauṭilya for our purpose since they bear the impress of profound scholarship and of their inclination to the Vedic lore and because they are least modified or tampered with and therefore they can be relied upon as a safe guide.

(16) Pārvaṁānta months:— In “Meghadūta,” of Kālidāsa we read that the hero got the first glimpse of the approaching rainy season, on the last day of the Āsādha month, that then the following Srāvaṇa month was quite near to it and that since the day he saw the clouds, he had to spend four more months in exile, its termination being the 11th day in the bright fortnight of the month Kārttika, when Lord Viṣṇu wakes from his sleep. There is one variant reading in this text which would mean that it was the ‘first’ day of Āsādha rather than the last one when the clouds were visible. It has taxed the ingenuity of the commentators to square the latter variant reading with all that is related above in this connection. They ultimately leave the
text to itself stating that it is not to be literally interpreted. They are in such a fix because they understand the months to be of the Amānta type, starting with the moment of New moon. However, such is not the case. The months herein are Pūrṇi-mānta type, ending with the bright fortnight.

The portions of the text here referred to are as under:

"आपादस्य प्राधमविवादे नेवमानिष्टसायु।" (v. l. 'प्राधमविवाद')

MeghaDūta-2.

"प्रत्यास्से नवसिः दृष्टिजोशितालम्बनार्थः।"

"शापान्तो से श्रृणश्यनादुतिथिते शाद्वाणा

मासान्याः शमय चतुर्भो छोिचं मीठयथिल्ला।"

(v. l. 'शापान्यासाय')

[ "...(saw) on the last day of अश्वेत a cloud, resting on the top of the hill (2)."

"Desirous of sustaining the life of his beloved wife, the mon' of श्रवण being at hand (4); My curse will terminate when Lord Viṣṇu rises from his sleep resting till then on the serpent; pass the remaining four months with the eyes shut......"

(115).]

Since 30 Tithis (a tithi is one digit of moon in the luni-solar month of 30 tithis) would constitute 29½ solar days, four months (of 120 digits-luni solar tithis) would require 29½ × 4 = 118 solar days (according to the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya). Since 30½ solar days constitute a solar month 30½ × 4 = 122 solar days would make up four solar months; and since it is only 11th day (in the bright fortnight) when the curse is to terminate, four days of the fortnight (at the end the fourth month) are deducted from 122, which brings the total of day (of four months) to 118th day from the time the clouds first appeared. It will be seen that the months do end with bright half if the portions of the text stand co-related as they do. Srāvana would be near to अश्वेत only if it is ending in its full moon.

(17) Let us take up the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya, to determine the nature of the calendar in vogue in his days (B. C. 4th cent).

"विशालं भुजाध्वासाध्वाहोरात्रां भर्मंतवत्तरः। तमाशावधीपयवसानमूनः

पूणं वा द्वात। करणाविष्टितानीयिसमस्यकं क्षयत।" (Ch. II, 7, 25).

[ cf. 'Jain Text' — 'C' on p. 154 and note thereon ].

"The Civil Year will constitute 354 solar days. He should
pay him in that year more or less when it is completed on the full moon of the month Āśāḍha, (‘अशाढ’). He must provide for the extra month determined as per its procedure (Karana)."

We learn from Kauṭilya that the month Āśāḍha (which we saw, ended at full moon) constitutes the last month in the hot season, while the rainy season with Śrāvāṇa ushers the southern course of sun. The mid-day (at Ujjain as per Indain convention) in the month of Āśāḍha is the day when the shadow (cast on Sāṅku by the sun on its reaching the summer solstice point) disappears. The equinoctial days—a day of 15 mūhūrtas and the night of 15 mūhūrtas—occur in the months of Cāitra and Āsvayuja (solar month).

The text of the above-referred to passages is as under:—

"आवण: प्रोढ्द्वद्व वर्यो। आश्वयु: कादिक्रम शरत। मागष्ठिस्य: पौष्ठ हेमन्तः।
 साध: फांिुनश्व शिशिरः। चैत्रो वैशाखश्व वसन्त। ज्येष्ठामूलीय आशाध्व श्रीमः।

शिशिराविचारणाम्। वर्षाधि दक्षिणायनम्। द्वायनस्तरसः।"

"आषाढ़े साति नवश्चायो मच्छाब्लो भवति।"

"पृथविदशहृदृं दिवसौ राजाश् चैत्रे माष्काध्वुजेच माति भवति।"

(Ch. II, 20, 38.)

[ Cf. ‘Jaina Texts—’ C. E. L. on pp. 154-161 and notes thereon ]

(18) **Solstice points:**—There is thus no doubt that the system in vogue then points to the solstice points on the first day of the solar month Śrāvāṇa, when it is the dark half because the civil year ends with full moon of the month Āśāḍha (the difference between the two being adjusted by two extra luni-solar months in one cycle (yuga) of five solar years as shown in the concluding two verses of this chapter:—

"शिशिराविचारणाम्। वर्षाधि दक्षिणायनम्।
द्वायनस्तरसः। पश्चात्तरसः युगायति।
दिवसस्य हरत्यक्ष्णप्रवत्तिः तत्।
करोध्याध्वमहाथृद्व तथेऽवेकं च चन्द्रमः।"

2 [ Annals, B. O. R. I. ]
Afrimats of the JT!J WORTHS tJFsT
( Ch. II, 30, 38 ).

( Cf. ' Jains ' Texts ' -- H. I. pp. 157-158 ).

"Seasons from Sīśira and onwards constitute the Winter solstice and those from Vārṣā and onwards constitute the Summer solstice. Two solstices make up one year — five years making up a cycle (Yuga). The sun carries off (is in excess by) $1/60$th day of a (civil) day and thus 60 parts ($1/60 \times 60 = 1$ day) make a complete day in a season of two months. Likewise the moon is short by $1/60$th day in a day (civil) and is thus short by one complete day in a season of two months. In this way, when $2\frac{1}{2}$ years are completed (60 luni-solar months are completed) there is an extra luni-solar month. In the end, when five years are over another (extra month) is added, at the end, in Grīṣṇa season."

Since the luni-solar year ends in the full-moon of Āśāda (‘आषाढ़ पर्वतसार्न’) there can never be Grīṣṇa season at the end of $2\frac{1}{2}$ years. Hence the last line of the verse in the text is either faulty or of a clumsy construction. It must either read "nūnam" = definitely instead of "Pūrva"; or if "Pūrva" reading holds good, it must be construed with the previous line of the verse, while the word "Grīṣṇe" should be taken with the word "Pañcābdante".

(19) It appears then that the two solstice points, and therefore the two equinoctial points too are fixed in the solar year although, the digits of the moon at those particular four moments (of 2 solstices and of 2 equinoctials) naturally vary in a cycle of five solar years. But the point of interest lies in the fact we glean as to the exact place of the sun amongst stars at those four moments. That was just the reason (and not its day to day application) that we traced the nature of old calendar from the authentic source that is still available. It will be noticed that even these texts that we consulted are not left intact as we have noticed in the discussions (1) over a variant in the Meghadūta and (2) over the season of the first extra luni-solar
month at the end of 2½ years in the Arthasastra. A further notice of this calendar is material to our investigations.

(20) **The year: Luni-Solar:**— As 354 solar days comprised one civil year (Arthasastra-Ch. II, 7, 25) ending with the full moon or luni-solar month Āśādha, the counting of fortnights and months had to be adjusted, because 15 days made a fortnight and 30 days a (civil) month of two fortnights (ibid-Ch. II, 27, 38) "पञ्चदशाहीरात्रा: पक्षः । सोमायायनःशुकः । सोमावस्तुदनो बहुः: । इष्टपक्षः मातः । रविदशीरात्रः प्रकर्ममातः।" ["15 days and nights make one fortnight which is bright when the moon waxes and which is dark when the moon wanes. Two fortnights make a Civil month"] and since twelve such months would make 360 such days, adjustment in civil counting (360 days) to the luni-solar phenomena amounting to 354 days was brought about by non-counting of one day *every third and seventh fortnight in the season of four* (Cf. Ko IX, 1, 135–36 कङ् च तंतर्णिपर्वसानं etc.) months from Varṣā. Thus 6 days are not-counted days and the total stops at 354 days. Since the year begins in the dark half of Śrāvana (आषाढ्यपर्वसानं) one day of each of the dark fortnight of the months Bhādra, Kārttika, Pauṣa, Phālguna, Vaiśākha, and Āśādha will not be counted. To this effect is the text of the Arthasastra:—

"राजवर्ष मात: पक्षः दिवसः व्युद्वर्षहिमत्रिध्यमार्गाः तुरीयस्तत्ततः।
दिवसोऽनाः पक्षाद्विशः पूर्णः वृक्षगोधिमातक इति कालः। (Ch. II, 6, 24).

("The royal year, the month, the fortnight, the day the new year's day on Śrāvana (first day of the dark half of Śrāvana), the 3rd and 7th fortnight of three (six compressed into three) seasons—rainy, winter and summer season short by a day (3rd of 14 days; then 7th of 14 days—of each of the three seasons), the rest of the fortnights (of these three seasons)—intercalary month being separate—these are the divisions of time.") ¹

[ Cf. Jain Text "M" on p. 161.]

The system of calendar thus fixed up in the Arthasastra is a cycle of five solar years made up of 1830 (5 x 366) solar days; to the solar years are adjusted the luni-solar year (of 354 days - 13 months x 29½ days) by two extra luni-solar months within that cycle. Still, the adjustment is not complete because it comes to only 1829 days (62 months x 29½ days = 1829 days). This discrepancy of a day within five years would necessarily obtrude upon the reality in course of several years as well as any such that may be in the length of the year of 366 days instead of a year of 365 days and odd. (The civil adjustment to the luni-solar year i.e. 36 days minus 6 non-calculated days to equate with 354 days in the year just shown before is not in question here). Hence, it looks, that the final adjustment of calculations to the recurrence of natural phenomena such as the exact time of completion of luni-solar year and of the return of the sun to the fixed points of solstice or equinoctials has been devised in the provision of “Mala Māsa,” an expurgated month (of perhaps varying number of days) at some future period, the period being determined by the school according to its own adoption of a data of the length of a luni-solar month (Kauṭilya has 29½ days). The Jain system, the same as of Kauṭilya in most of the points, differs here, in as much as, the luni-solar month consists of 29½ days, 62 months making in all 1830 days, thus fully equating them with the cycle). We would interpret the text in the Arthasastra Ch. II, 20, 38, as under:

Translation:— "Thirty second (solar year perhaps) has a suppressed (solar) month [days not stated] - [according to the system of the Arthasastra as implied by denomination of 2 other schools in this Malamāsa section]. It is thirty fifth year according to the [school of] Aśvavāhās (theirs being horse's speed). It is 40th year according to Hastivāhās [school] (theirs being speed of an elephant)."
It is quite plain that the word "Malami-sa" means a suppressed month and that it is not an intercalary (अधिमास) month. The latter is invariably called "Adhimāsa" in the three passages that we have quoted hitherto. Since this is a chapter on the calendar, reference to any scale of payment to horse-breeders or to elephant-breeders would be out of place. There is another construction possible and that is that the first school (of Kautilya) went by Solstice point, the second by the Vernal equinox point (in Aśvini constellation) and the third was prominent either by its emphasis on the Hasta (Corvus) constellation or for the matter of fact by its preference for the Autumnal equinox (in Śvātī constellation). These suggestions are only hypothetical since we have no other evidence to check them; the only sure ground is that it is not 'अधिमास' (an intercalary, an added month) and that even solar year adjustments must have been found necessary at intervals. The bearing of this discussion is that the precession of equinoxes was an unknown thing and the system contained fixed points of two solstices or two equinoxes. This fact is very pertinent to our further consideration of the Vedic Gods when we are faced with a labyrinth of views as to the equinoxes, or as to the starting point in the month stated to be the first day of the bright half of Māgha; or views that the Vedas were composed or the materials for their composition arose in regions far away from India or that traces of polar life survive in some Vedic words or rituals or sacrifices. After getting a central view-point from the present investigations based upon authentic sources free from ceremonial bias and after its applications and the results obtained thereby, we shall be in a position to review all these views to enable us to trace their growth behind several hypothesis and to check them all, for ascertaining their proper value.

The Jain Calendar and the Arthasastra:— [Cf. Quotations under "Jain Texts" pp. 154-161 and notes thereon]. The Jain system of calendar is very conservative. Even the later works try to preserve the views that were held during the sixth century B.C. At times we find that there are modifications even in these books (see quotation 'M' on p. 161), since the later authors found a considerable change in the seasons with reference to lunar mansions and to the lunar months. In spite of such aberrations
in the texts or in their commentaries, they collectively serve as a guide for present investigations; and since the system propounded therein runs in a close parallel to the one propounded in the Arthasastra we may safely switch over from the Arthasastra to what is related therein when we find that some particulars are not given in the former. It permits us to take a consistent and harmonious view of the calendar from both the sources and accordingly, there is ample scope for these Jain data, in our investigations related to the nature of the Vedic Gods. Since this article does not mean to serve a compendium of the data in Jain works or to explain the variance in details, the reader will have to be content with the barest mention of only the required data collected therefrom. The known Jain works are (1) "Suryaprajñāpti," (2) "Candraprajñāpti," (3) "Jyotiṣkarandaśaka," (4) "Jambudvipaprajñāpti," (5) "Kālalokaprakāśa". There are several others also. Those who desire to refer to the original will get a great help in the Sanskrit commentaries on some of their Māgadhī texts.

(24) The Jain system has a cycle of five solar years of a total of 1830 solar days, five luni-solar years of 62 months (60 usual luni-solar months plus two extra luni-solar months, to equate the luni-solar year to the solar one and to the completed cycle). It starts with the moment of summer solstice in the dark half of the month Śrāvaṇa, on its first day in early morning, with the moon in the Abhijit constellation then, (We have not yet seen anything of a 'Malamāsa' therein).

(25) However we commend the system to the readers as supplementing that of the Arthaśāstra for the division of the ecliptic it gives, for the division spaces allotted to 28 constellations (the Abhijit constellation being there), and for the daily and yearly courses of the Sun and of the Moon amongst those allotted spaces and for its equinoctial and solstice points according to the data that it has adopted. We shall give here their data as briefly as possible for the facility of the readers and in a tabulated form after giving their brief description, correlated to the probably Vedic one as might be justified because of the same system of the Arthaśāstra (See pp. 154-172).

(26) **Ecliptic:** In the Jain system, the ecliptic is made up of two styles. One of 1830 spaces and the other of 3660 spaces.
The difference is not at all material since the former is as good as the latter and vice-versa. We will follow the division of 3660 spaces. The division of 360 degrees is entirely absent and it looks that the guiding consideration has been the year of 366 days and therefore, it looks, the space division has been fixed upon just to suit this number 366.

(27) The sun completes ten spaces within a solar day (of 30 Muhurtas); accordingly it takes him 366 days to cover 3660 spaces and to return to his old position. He completes 915 spaces in his course, from a solstice point to an equinoctial point and in the same way, further on (3660 ÷ 4 = 915). In one solar month, he covers therefore 305 spaces (3660 ÷ 12 = 305). The course of the ecliptic runs through 28 constellations amongst whom the spaces (3660) are distributed by four standards. First standard (see 'D' on p. 112) exclusively covers the constellation Abhijit to whom 42 spaces only are allotted. The second (see 'A' on p. 112) is a regular standard allotted to 15 constellations, each of which occupies 134 spaces (which the moon covers in a solar day) of the ecliptic. The third is an inferior standard (see 'B' on p. 112) assigned to six constellations, each of which occupies 67 spaces and the fourth standard is superior standard (see 'C' on p. 112) and it embraces the remaining six constellations measuring 201 spaces. The names of respective constellations and their spaces can be looked up in the table I on pp. 162-163.

(28) The moon traverses in one (solar) day (of 30 Muhurtas) 134 spaces which means that sidereal month consists of $27\frac{42}{134}$ days (3660 ÷ 134 = $27\frac{42}{134}$). This is in obvious contrast to the sidereal month of 27 days stated by Kautilya (Arthasastra Ch. II, 20, 38) "सत्तविशालिन्यस्वतसः:।" "The sidereal month is of 27 days"). It looks that the author has left out odd figures for a round number. Supposing that he takes the system of 27 constellations and omits Abhijit with its 42 spaces, giving to his ecliptic only 3618 spaces (366 - 42 = 3618 spaces), distributing 134 spaces to each constellation (134 x 27 = 3618), his other data will not work out. From one lunation to the other, the moon covers 29\frac{1}{2} days according to him; while according to him it takes only 27 days for the moon to complete the circle for herself. The extra distance represented by 2\frac{1}{2} days (29\frac{1}{2} - 27) i.e. by $2\frac{1}{2} x 134$ spaces, i.e.
by 335 space, is the distance that the sun covers between the two lunations in $29\frac{1}{2}$ days. With that speed he will take only 318$\frac{6}{2}$ days to complete the whole circle (3618 spaces) while actually he ought to take, according to him 366 days. This small discussion will point out the advisability of taking up the Jain data unhesitatingly with its system of 28 constellations, the constellation Abhijit being included. The Jain data gives the period of lunation to be $2\frac{3}{6}\frac{3}{2}$ days; deducting from it its sidereal period of moon of $27\frac{4}{13}\frac{4}{4}$ days, we get a period of $9\frac{1}{4}\frac{5}{4}$ days which the moon should traverse to complete the lunation. Multiplied by 134 spaces that the sun travels a day, we get the total amount of spaces which the sun really covers in $29\frac{3}{6}\frac{3}{2}$ days; and in that way, in 366 days, he covers exactly 3660 spaces. It must be noted that the Abhijit constellation is included in the system of 366 days and 3660 spaces and it is indispensable, and that the text of Kautilya cannot be reconciled with any other prevalent system to-day excepting the Jain one. We shall be therefore following a perfectly right course in applying the Jain data (which are in consonance with those in Arthasāstra) for a Vedic calendar because of their being in harmony with Arthasāstra of Vedic leaning.

(29) A—The 15 constellations each of which occupies 134 spaces of the ecliptic are:—

Āśvini, Kṛttikā, Mrṛgaśīrṣa, Puṣya, Maghā, Pūrvāṅgūṇi, Hasta, Citrā, Anurādhā, Mūla, Pūrvaśādhā, Śravaṇa, Dhaniśṭhā, Pūrvāḥādrapadā, and Revati—each of 134 spaces.

B—The 6 constellations each of which occupies 67 spaces are:—Bharanī, Ādrā, Āśleṣā, Svāti, Jyeṣṭhā and Śatabhisā—each of 67 spaces.

C—The 6 constellations each of which occupies 201 spaces are:—Rohini, PunarVasu, Uttarāṅgūṇi, Viśākhā, Uttarāśādhā and Uttarāḥādrapadā—each of 201 spaces.

D—The Abhijit constellation occupies 42 spaces.

(30) Fixed Points:—[Vide Tables III and IV (on pp. 169-172)] All constellations together make up an ecliptic of 3660 spaces. The points of equinoxes are stated to be as under (they are fixed points):—
Autumnal Equinox:— When the sun completes 23 spaces of the constellation Svātī (out of its 67 spaces).

Vernal Equinox:— When the sun completes 69 spaces of the constellation Āśvini (out of its 134 spaces).

The solstice points are removed from these two equinoctial points exactly by 915 spaces (a quadrant) and accordingly they are as follows:—

The Summer Solstice:— When the sun completes 46 spaces of constellation Puṣya (out of its 134 spaces).

The Winter Solstice:— When the sun completes all the 201 spaces of constellation Uttarāsāḍhā, at its ending moment and when the first space of constellation Abhijit begins.

The first year of the cycle (Yuga) begins when the sun enters the 47th space of constellation Puṣya and when the moon enters the first space of constellation Abhijit early morning at a particular moment (morning of the 1st day of the dark fortnight of the month Śrāvaṇa). The position of the moon (during the cycle) keeps changing thereafter at every equinoctial and solstice point while that of the sun repeats itself mathematically.

(31) Seasons:— [Vide Tables III and IV (on pp. 169-172)] The rainy season begins with the summer solstice (Dakṣināyana), and the two solar months herald each succeeding season. Thus the winter solstice marks the advent of the season Śiśira. The Autumnal equinox occurs in the midst of Sarad season and the Vernal equinox comes in the midst of season Vasanta.

The course of ages did not harmonize with these periods of year and the seasons and we notice the tendency (of later writers) to modify the earlier statements or to put a new interpretation or a new nomenclature on the original text on the part of some of the Jain commentators. It can be noticed in their observations on the scriptural texts we named before.

The accompanying quotations (with notes thereon on pp. 154-161) relating to the old Jain calendar will prove to be of great interest and the tabular form (on pp. 162-172) will elucidate the course of sun through the constellations and in various months.
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Regent Gods:-- Next in importance are the regent gods of these constellations. They are of great importance for our comprehension of the nature of the Vedic conceptions of gods. The names of the regents are nearly uniform in the Jain and in the Brahmanic texts. They stand on a common ground which is a great point as to the essential unity between them.

Re: Tables:-- The way to find out the position of moon at the moment of solstice or of equinox is shown at the end of the space table 1 (pp. 162-165).

Whether the Rāśis (signs—stellar) were known at all to the Vedic poets, or known in the nomenclature that is in vogue to-day cannot be settled now. It will be seen from the table that three constellations which encompass the stars in the sign Scorpi-Vrścika—can be never missed by any observer of heaven. We therefore give the names of the (stellar) signs also in the tables that we give.

In table II (pp. 166-168) we try to give the modern equivalents, in the current astronomic terminology to the stars of the 28 constellations with the names of their principal stars and some of their marked features and here we are much indebted to Pillai and Kaye. The shape and color of some stars of most of these constellations is given from the Jain texts and here too, we have to acknowledge our indebtedness to them. There is a good deal of variance in the number of constituent stars of some constellations. We try to give the variants although, it has to be noted that the discrepancies in these respects are a matter of individual observations and they make no material difference. (Vide table II).

In the unequal spaces of constellations and in the order of enumeration we strictly follow the Jain texts as also in the data with respect to the ecliptic to the fractional length of solar days, lunar digits, lunations, sidereal year, the cycle (Yuga), and with respect to the measure of course of sun and moon amongst the 28 constellations. (Vide table I).

Equal space—Ecliptic: Non—Jain: (Vide tables I and IV; I and III).
No. 8. Shows constellations from असिलिन to अभिनो (in 18 hours to 2) with हेमन, शिशि and वसन seasons.

Shows the constellations of the Divine Night and daybreak in आंविनी.
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There is a possibility of another type of space division of the total of 3660 of the ecliptic. That system is not mentioned by the Jain texts but still, the writer may make a note about it. It would seem to allot 42 spaces to Abhijit but then it would equally distribute the remaining 3618 spaces between the remaining 27 constellations, allotting 134 spaces to each one of them. In spite of this distribution, this system will have the same solstice and equinoctial points but in several other intermediate totals it would vary a little from the list we have given. The possible currency of such a method of counting with non-Jains has not to be lost sight of when we consider the constellations coupled with Vedic festival tithis. Since there is no deviation of any material character, we simply mention the same in the tables we give.

(38) These tables with star maps will be of great help in mapping out the constellations by actual observations—a much desired practice which has been lost since not only by centuries but even further. (It has been noted by Alberuni that the Hindu astronomers of his day cannot point out the constellations if asked to do so! What a sad picture when we contemplate that the Vedic gods are of stellar nature.) The tables will also help in the calculations of the position of moon stated in the observance of several auspicious days, or of worship of several gods and goddesses. There, it will have to be ascertained in advance, if any stated day represents either lunar digits of a luni-solar month or the number of solar days in one particular solar month or if it is a calculation of civil day coupled with the former or the latter or of equal or unequal space division. It is generally the first year of the cycle (Yuga) that is taken by convention. Herein, the starting point, in the first day of the dark half of Śrāvana will hold good as also the space divisions. The only other point that remains to be stated is that we shall have to see if, in the nomenclature, the month and fortnight are not the later

---


"The Hindus are very little informed regarding the fixed stars. I never came across any one of them who knew the single stars of the lunar stations from eyesight, and was able to point them out to me with his fingers."
modified ones in order to harmonize them with the changes that have come upon later on (through the fact of the precession of equinoxes), or that, in equating the old names with the modern ones, if the lunar digit has not interchanged for the solar day and vice versa. We now ask the reader to revert to the tables and to a citation of some of the important portions of the Jain texts, given in the appendix before he begins to read other sections.

(39) As regards constellations on a full moon night at full-moon: Some of the Jain texts observe that in the specified three months the constellations are different from that we would naturally understand from the name of the month. Thus on a particular full moon night, moon will be with Mūla in the (luni-solar) month Jyeṣṭha, with Dhanisthā in the month Śrāvaṇa, and with Ārdra in the month Mārgaśīrśa. In the rest of the months, moon will be approximately with the constellations implied by the names of the months. To-day, however, it is a matter of renewed observations.¹ (cf. 'Jain Text '- J ' on pp. 158 and note thereon).

Jain Text and Notes thereon: We cite (in appendix) some of the portions of the Jain texts which gave us the data. Since the Kālalokapratāśa text runs in easy Sanskrit verses, preserving the original material, in citing texts we prefer it to other works for the purposes of this article. Those who would like to know more of the old calendar and its system must gather for themselves from all the texts mentioned before (in para 23).

(40) Before we resume the main work—to continue (from section I) the thread of our investigations to find out the basic conceptions of Vedic gods,—it will be worth while to take stock of the ground that we have covered already.

(1) From the “Meghadūta,” we saw that the system of the months we should keep before us are of Pūrṇimānta type. We found it to be the case in the calendars of the Arthaśāstra and of the Jain texts.

(2) From the “Arthaśāstra,” we saw that the Yuga system had its solstice and equinoctial points expressed in terms of the solar months and further implied by seasons, coupled with

¹ Quotation from Jain Texts with Notes thereon and Tables I-IV, will be found at the end of this article as Appendix pp. 154 ff.
end of the year in a bright fortnight. This system ran in close parallel to the one of the Jain calendar and that the time division of Kauṭilya with reference to the course of moon, though varied slightly, yet materially tallied with the Jain system in its ways and methods.

(3) We found in the Jain calendar the exact position of the sun with reference to the two solstices and two equinoctial points and we got two complete systems of old division of ecliptic with reference to constellations and solar months.

(4) We then get at the Zodiacal constellations and their regent gods.

(41) Now we take a step further and see if some of the constellations and phenomena (that arose by course of sun traversing the same) enable us to understand and appreciate the Vedic singers better than before. It will be found that in one or another form, these constellations and the delineation of old equinoxes and solstices have been preserved for us; the writer has found that the drama of Vikramorvaṣṭya of Kalidāsa is such a work. The Śākuntala and Raghuvamśa too serve the same purpose. So too, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana. They are, in themselves relatively later growths consistent with the earlier Vedic one forming one unit as it were by continuity; but all of them enable us a better approach to the prime source—the Vedas. With these brief notices here, the writer passes on now to the consideration of the Vedic gods and goddesses. The writer has put on paper some of his researches with reference to the Dramas of Kalidāsa in his article.¹

SECTION—III: VERNAL EQUINOX: ĀŚVINS and UŚAS:

(42) Goddess Uṣas and the Āśvins:— We now refer to the goddess Uṣas, "the most graceful creation of Vedic poetry." (Mac. p. 46). She is the goddess of Dawn. "She removes the black robe of night (I. 113, 14,)" (Mac. p. 47). In her ordinary aspect, she heralds the physical day—but it is then the day of the mortals. There is a day of the immortals which too is ushered in by the Uṣas. The conception of the northern passage of sun

¹ "The Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kalidāsa." It will be published in the A. B. I., later on. He hopes to reduce other researches to writing in course of time. They are in progress.
(north of equator) connoting such a day of gods and his southern course their night is a familiar conception in the old literature. We read in the SūryaSiddhānta I. 13 and XII. 45 that from Aries up to Libra, it is the region of the gods, the rest being that of Asuras.

“मातृश्वल्विभिर्विंदिय ‘तदद्वृहस्यत्’ II १२ II
“मेषानां देवभागस्थं द्रवानां याति दर्शिनम् II
अनुरागानं तु विधाति तु सूर्यास्त्रागस्तेचः ” ४५ II

In the PañcaSiddhāntikā, (G. Thibaut's translation, p. 86) (see note to para 4 and quotations from this text) Ch. XIII, 27, we read:

“For those who dwell on the back of Meru the sun once risen remains visible for six months, while he moves in the six signs beginning with Aries; for the Asuras he is visible as long as he is in the latter (half of the ecliptic)". Manu I, 67 says that the (human) year is a night and day of the gods, the northern passage being day, the southern being night.

“देवेण राज्यहि वर्षः प्रतिभागस्तया: पुनः !
अहस्तरेवद्यायनं रात्रि: स्यादस्क्षिणायनम् ” II

The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (III, 9, 22) "एकं वा एतद्विवानाम: यत्संवत्सरः " II says that the one day of gods is the Samvatsara (Tilak, pp. 68-70). The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (II, 1, 3) prefers to take three seasons Vasanta, Grīma and Varsā to connote the northern passage of the sun and the rest of the three seasons to connote his southern course, the former associated with the gods and the latter with the Pītris "वर्षस्तो श्रीमो वर्षः। ते देवा सत्वः ज्योत्स्वंस्तो दिशितस्तो पितरो....स (सूर्य:) ज्योतिर्गार्भः। देवेनु ताहिं स्ववति....यत्र क्षिणावर्तेति पितुष्ठ ताहि भवति ” II

(Śatapatha Br. II, 13) (Dixit. p. 34.)

(43) For the gods thus as in human affairs, there is an intervening period between night and day with its goddess, when that long night of the gods terminates. That leads us to the equinoctial points (with northern course of sun on equator), to the mid-point of the two solstices, since the year commences with a solstice point. We saw that the equinoctial points are in the constellations Aśvini
No. 5. Shows constellations from उत्तरा माद्रपदा to युध्य (in hours 24 to 8) with seasons वसन्त and शिवाल. Shows the Divine Day with the Usas and Asvins with मघ: the Divine Midday in the solstice point.

Shows stars Sirius (Rudra) with the Ganges and Canopus (अर्जुन).
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and Svāti and accordingly their regent gods have their rightful place with the goddess Uṣas in one form or another. We first dwell upon the Vernal Equinox, upon the two Āśvins who preside over this equinoctial constellation of Āśvinī, the half of which (vide tables III and IV) goes over the divine night (cf. "She removes the black robe of night.") and the other half over the divine day. "Yāska quotes a passage stating that 'one (of the two Āśvins) is called the son of night, the other the son of Dawn' [Nir. 12, 2.]. (Mac. p. 49). RV. cf. VII 16, 1. "The time of their appearance is often said to be the early dawn, when darkness still stands among the ruddy cows (X. 61, 4) and they yoke their car to descend to earth and receive the offerings of worshippers (I, 22, 2, etc.) Uṣas awakes them (VIII, 9, 17). They follow after Uṣas in their car (VIII, 5, 2). At the yoking of their car Uṣas is born (X, 39, 12.)" Mac. p. 50. What a splendid picture of the occurrence of Vernal Equinox when the nature shakes off its slumber—when it is rejuvenated!

"Uṣas is borne on a car which is shining (VII, 78, 1), brilliant (I, 23, 7)"..."She is drawn by steeds which are ruddy (VII, 75, 6)"..."She is also described as being drawn by ruddy kine or bulls ('go': I, 92, 2; I, 124, 11; V, 80, 3)—" Mac. p. 47. "Both the horses and the cows probably represent the ruddy rays of the morning light."—Mac. p. 47. "Her radiant beams appear like herds of cattle (IV, 52, 2-4)"..."She opens the doors of darkness as the cows their stall '(I, 92, 4.)" Mac. p. 47. "The gods are often described as 'waking with Uṣas (I, 14, 9 etc.)' Mac. p. 47. The divine day has commenced.

(44) It will be evident that the twins gods Āśvins, the regents of the constellation Āśvinī at the equinoctial point, are thought of by the Vedic poets in connection with the termination of the divine night and also in connection with the commencement of the divine day. *This is the divine character of the Uṣas which brings her*

---

1 The imagery after the cowstalls and after herds of cattle seems to have been furnished by the village life of India where cattle set out (cows after being milked early) of the village at daybreak for grazing. They return at dusk to their homes when the cows are milked again. Both the period of time of their outgoing and incoming, particularly the latter, is considered very auspicious time of "निःशृङ्ग: " the time of Dawn and Dusk, when clouds of dust rise out of the movement of the cows.
together with the Āśvins. It is not a phenomena of the northern or of the polar regions but a phenomena of return of Spring. In that way we see that the "Dawn herself is born of Night" (I, 123, 9) "Mac. p. 13. "...She removes the black robe of Night (I, 113, 14)" Mac. p. 47.

SECTION IV: From VERNAL to the AUTUMNAL EQUINOX; SEVERAL GODS and GODDESSES.

(45) Autumnal Equinox: It will be seen that the divine daybreak at the Vernal equinox explains the association of Usas with the twin gods Āśvins. At that time, nature herself has worked a change towards her own rejuvenation; there is little of human efforts or activities that counts then.

It is however different at the approach of the Autumnal equinox. The progress of the seasons, after the Vernal one, particularly from about the Summer solstice (rains) upto the Autumnal equinox is associated with human efforts in the form of agricultural operations and of a subsequent good harvest. Therein several natural forces are supposed to participate, advancing or aiding the human efforts or impeding their course. During the rainy season the earth gets flooded and the religious and other regulated activities (which proceed from the correct apprehension of the measurement of time made through Śāṅku and shadow) fall into abeyance. Days and nights are clouded and therefore the sunlight, the stellar movements, and the lunar progress generally get out of observation. These are the "impediments" of those days; while the beneficent influences are in the form of a good harvest and the resusciation of the vegetation on account of the profuse supply of water from sky. The Vedic songs seem to be an attempt to trace the forces that range behind these developments that are at work and which forces are behind the human attempts in reality; the songs reflect the glory of the divine grace that is instrumental in helping them and also in overpowering the manifold impediments that they are subject to, and what are human efforts without these divine graces? The utmost tribute that is paid to these gods is their celebration and the humble offerings (of the season) accompanied with their recognition and emulation, with prayers and devotion. It is natural that the poets—the Vedic seers—try to exhaust the enumeration of
all these forces. It is therefore impossible for them to detach or isolate any one agency from the rest that are at work. The principal god of this period is Indra and the main obstructive force is the serpent Ahi or Vṛtra. The serpentine constellation (Hydra Ahi: Vṛtra) near summer solstice ends just at the Autumnal equinox covering a fourth part of the Zodiac from Āśleṣā and of the southern sky near it from Pusya up to Svāti. Accordingly, most of the regent gods of these intervening constellations (Pusya to Svāti—Brhaspati to Vāyu) come into the fray and help Indra one way or another. There are other stars like Sirius and Canopus and star-groups like Ursa Majoris—the Saptarṣis which are also involved in this period; they too are brought in, in one form or another. From their occurrence as well as from their heliacal rise, the northern constellation Saptarṣi (Great Bear—Ursa Majoris) helps Indra as also the two southern stars Sirius Rudra—Śiva (A-Canis Majoris S. 16°34’) and the star Canopus (A-Argo Navis S. 52°39’) known as Agastya. If we leave out these stars and constellations associated with the seasons, associated with the resuscitation of nature and fruition of agriculture, we will not be able to understand the Vedic songs. There are many regent gods of constellations from the Summer solstice onwards. Brhaspati helps Indra. Then the Pitṛs—the Saptarṣis—combine in the image of Brhaspati and they take an active part. So does Aryaman; so do Savitṛ, Tvastr, Sarasvatī and gods Vāyu—who are also called the Maruts and the Mātariśvan. The last one forms a terminus to the Serpentine demon Hydra. They are spoken generally in plural. They are of greater importance than most of the others enumerated since their occurrence is associated with harvest and with the Autumnal equinox; and they form a terminus to the heliacal rise of the Saptarṣi also. The star Svāti, being in the north, rises earlier by about an hour just after the Hasta and earlier than the Citrā constellations which are in south and therefore the scope of Maruts gets more extended to the regions of Hasta and Citrā. The physical characteristics of Vāyu—wind—

---

1 This will explain the name “Guruvāyur” god of Malabar in South India at a celebrated place of pilgrimage and further, of the beneficent agency that is celebrated through this god.
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extend the scope even during the rainy season and therefore, of all the gods, they are the most associated with Indra. Since Agastya rises in autumn at different places on different days (being in the south) it also gets associated with the Autumnal equinox as it were, marking its complete rise through the association of early rising of the star Svāti. It is through the Agastya, that Brhaspati Viṣṇu and Agni enter into the fray against the serpent Vṛtra—the Hydra—to help and to associate with Indra. Soma too gets in, a being of important consideration, at the Autumnal equinox at Svāti.1 The following pages will unfold what is told herein.

(46) It is impossible therefore to keep a numerical sequence or to concentrate exclusively upon the characteristics of one single god in the subsequent paras without taking into account those of the others. It is impossible to proceed with the basic conception of the gods that we now describe, in the detached manner we could describe that of Varuṇa, or of Mitra, or of the Usas and the Aśvins. Varuṇa and Mitra are indispensable throughout the year where Light and Time are involved; therefore they find a place along with the one or the other god of this period particularly at the Autumnal equinox. After these preliminary observations, we proceed with further examination or explanation of the distinctive features of these gods, as best and as short as it can be possible.

(47) Vāyu.— This god is the regent of the Svāti constellation (Δ-Bōötes-Arcturus) at the Autumnal equinox as we saw from the calendar. "Vāta is spoken of as producing ruddy lights (X, 168, 1) and of making the Dawns shine (I, 134, 3)—Mac. p. 83. It is the evening of the Gods, as Aśvins marked their daybreak.

(48) The Svāti star is N. 19°/42' while Hasta (Corvus) stars are S. 16° to S. 24° and the Citrā star is S. 10°/38'. Vide table II for the modern equivalents. The phenomenon on the Indian horizon (it is not polar) is that the Svāti and Citrā stars make their appearance in the East soon after the Hasta group completes.

1 See illustration maps.
Thus the very early advent of Svāti is noted as its swift course. It is not unusual to call stars as ‘birds’ as we noticed before in the section on the God Varuṇa. Hence Svāti at times is depicted as a swift bird—swifter than any of its prototype. Accordingly, it earns the name of the swiftest bird which is the reputed *Eagle*. “Vāyu is fond of Soma, to which he is invited to come with his teams and the *first* draught of which he obtains as his share (also in company with Indra, I, 135, 4), for he is the swiftest of the gods (SB. XIII, 1, 2-7, etc.)” — Mac. p. 82. “Vāyu reached the goal first and Indra second in a race which the gods ran for the first draught of Soma (AB. II, 25) — Mac. p. 82. These statements point to early rise of Svāti over that of others. Unlike the Aśvins, they are associated with Indra as Maruts. They strike Vṛtra (Hydra—vide Vṛtra), the serpentine demon Ahi (Mac. p. 152), assisted by Indra (I, 23, 9) — Mac. p. 81;” and “with them, Indra gains light (VIII, 65, 4) and finds the cows (1, 6, 5)” — Mac. pp. 80 and 81. “And the Maruts sang a song and pressed Soma, for Indra when he slew the dragon (V, 29, 2; V 30, 6)” — Mac. p. 80. They are keepers of cow—stalls. “Indra produced cows for Trita (Gnomon—vide Trita) from the dragon and delivered the cow—stalls to Dadhyānc and Matarisvan (X, 48, 2)” — Mac. p. 71. The cows are light (vide cows) and at the Autumnal equinox, the cowstalls refer to

1 Owing to differences in magnitudes of these stars, to the variations in atmosphere at this period of the year, at various places in India, owing to the wide range of Indian latitud (N. 9° to N. 35°) as also to diversities in methods of computations of rise of stars, while there is no good reliable guide in these respects for calculating either heliacal rising or heliacal setting, and last but not the least, owing to the limited knowledge of the mathematical phase of astronomy on the part of the present writer,—for all these reasons combined—it is impossible to be exact in details or to be precise in particulars. That task devolves on more capable shoulders.

The present writer is however confident as to the truth of the generalities that he is able to present from his personal observations and from the data he is fortunate enough to collect and interpret from the literary classics and from the reliable authors. Even then, it is difficult for him to decide if the classical authorities adopted Kashmir (N. 34° 2") as their standard for their reference to the heliacal rise and setting of stars—such as Agastya—Canopus—or that they stuck to Ujjain, (N. 24°—Kayas) the standard Indian meridian, for this purpose. Kauṭilya’s measure for the longest day of year applies to the latitude of Kashmir which is therefore remarkable for our considerations.
The sixth star (Vasiṣṭha) of Saptarsi. The Dadhyaṇca is the Aśvini constellation—since to Dadhyaṇca the Aśvins gave the head of a horse (I, 117, 22)” (Mac. p. 141). Soma is light and its transformations (vide Soma). The connection of Agni with this god explains the myth of the eel bringing fire (vide Agni). The terrestrial Agni is lighted up at the daily dawn and at the dusk of the Autumnal equinox which is another celestial form of Agni (vide Agni). Svāti—the Maruts—are thus associated with Vṛtra, Indra, Trita, Cows, Dadhyaṇca, Soma, Agni and Saptarsi.

(49) The golden colour of the star Svāti (Arcturus) imparts a good deal to this imagery. The Maruts are “golden, of sun-like brightness, like blazing fires, of ruddy aspects (VI, 66, 2; VII, 59, 11; VIII, 7, 7)” —Mac. p. 78. Their mantles, ornaments, helmets, cars, wheels of their cars, are all golden: their coourses are all ruddy, tawny and golden footed—Mac. p. 79. This ruddy nature imparts to them as Mātariśvan much of the attributes of gold or fire: but really Mātariśvan is not Agni. As a star, it does partake of the nature of Agni (light)—but “when as Mātariśvan he was fashioned in his mother (ānimita Mātari: cp. I, 141, 5) he became the swift flight of wind (III, 29, 11) ” —Mac. p. 71. He is therefore a Wind god, regent of Svāti.

(50) Trita: Soma:— “Indra and Trita in three or four passages perform the same feat, that of slaying a demon.” ... “Trita is associated with the Maruts in the thunderstorm.—Moreover he finds Agni, kindles Agni in heaven, and takes up his abode in human dwellings, clearly as a form of Agni. His abode is remote and hidden, and Soma is there.” “In the Avesta he is once (Yasna IX, 10) described as the third man who prepared Haoma (Soma) for the corporeal world (Āthwya–Aptya being the second) and once (Vend. XX, 2) as the first healer who received from the Ahura Mazda ten thousand healing plants which grow round the white Haoma, the tree of immortality.” —Mac. p. 68. “Trita cherishes (him who is like) Varuṇa in the ocean (IX, 95, 4)” —Mac. p. 68. “Soma occupies the secret place near the two pressing stores of Trita (IX, 102, 2) and is besought to bring wealth in a stream on the sides (Prṣṭheṣu) of Trita—(IX, 102, 3). “Soma caused the sun along with the sisters to shine on the summit (sānu)
of Trita (IX, 37, 4)’’—Mac. p. 67/68. Such are the distinctive features of Trita.

(51) Who is this Trita? Connected with Varuṇa, with two stones of Trita, and the abode in human dwellings suggest to us the Śaṅku the Gnomon with its two side quadrants, with its central portion pointed to Varuṇa (the Ahuramazda). Naturally, as a means to the measurement of time he is, associated with the Maruts (the regent god of Śvāti) at the Autumnal Equinox and with Indra in the Viṭṭha-fight. Hence, what shines on his summit is the Light which alights there, for its conversion into Time (at Autumnal Equinox) and which is here described as “Soma” on the summit. The idea of fire being brought out of sky or the idea of Agni produced from rock, by the bird is very well known in the Mātariśvan myth. —(Mac. pp. 71–72). The summit known as ‘Śānu’ of the gnomon and the association of the Maruts would in themselves suggest the Autumnal equinox when the fire is lighted up. (Vide Agni). “Soma is purified by Trita” (IX, 34, 4)—Mac. p. 67, seems to refer to the (calendar or) Time checked at the Autumnal equinox, when the measurement of Time is checked by the Light (Prabhā—‘Palabha’) that is cast on the gnomon on the mid-day of the day of the Autumnal equinox. We may read again the description in para 50.

(52) “...In one passage, in the middle of a Varuṇa hymn, Trita is described as one in whom wisdom is centered, as the nave in the wheel, (VIII, 41, 6)”—Mac. p. 68. This seems to refer to the manifold beneficent activities which arise out of the Time measured out of the gnomon. (The conception of Manu is a parallel case in this respect). The plight of Trita in a well (Mac. p. 67) seems to be a picture of the gnomon in the rainy season when the earth gets flooded with water and the gnomon gets surrounded by water, rescued by Brhaspati (Mac. p. 67) (in Śarad) when ‘the seven rays’ (=Saptarṣi—) rise heliacally in Autumn.

(53) Soma:— What is Soma? It will be easy to follow the basic conception of this god if we refer to his Vedic colour. ¹

¹ In para 50/51, under “Trita” we read that the ‘Haoma’ is white in Avesta. If redness and whiteness mean little difference with reference to Light, then Vedic Soma would secondarily be the regent god of moon, of Light and Time in the Vedic Luni-solar calendar.
Soma is "brown, (babhru) or ruddy, aruna), but most frequently as tawny (hari). Thus Soma is a branch of a ruddy tree (I, 94, 3), it is a ruddy milked shoot (VI, 98, 1) etc." (Mac. p. 105), the part of Soma plant which is pressed is called Amśu (IX, 67, 28) - Mac. p. 104. So far the colour of Soma is concerned there is little doubt that the colour is that of Light. He is an embodiment of Light and in that way the following narration becomes significant. He caused the Sun to shine (IX, 28, 5; IX, 37, 4); caused the lights of the sky to shine (IX, 85, 9) and produced the sun in the waters (IX, 42, 1). He caused the sun to rise, impelled it, obtained it and bestowed it, and caused the Dawns to shine. (Mac. pp. 109-110). "He makes his worshippers participate in the sun (IX, 4, 5) and finds light for them (IX, 35, 1). He found the light (IX, 59, 4) and wins light and heaven (IX, 3, 2)"... "placing light in the sun (VI, 44, 23-24; VI, 47, 3-4)" - Mac. p. 110. The elements of the Dawns are two: its Time of occurrence (Equinoxes and the daily grandeur of light). The god Soma who makes Uṣas shine therefore constitutes "Soma" as the god of Light, the light which pervades in the stars too and in the universe. But at times, the light gets transformed when it reaches the terrestrial world and one such transformation (on Śaṅku) is "Time": and Soma becomes secondarily, a god of both Light and Time. In that way, we can understand the following passages. "The term Madhu, which in connection with the Ašvins means 'honey' or 'mead' (very suggestive of the Vernal season and of the bees which are then active), comes to be applied, in the general sense of 'sweet draught' not only to milk (payas) and ghee (ghṛta), but especially to the Soma juice (IV, 27, 5; VIII, 69, 6): Mythologically Madhu is the equivalent of Soma when the latter means the celestial Ambrosia (Amrta): Conversely, Amrta is frequently used as an equivalent of ordinary Soma (V, 2, 3; VI, 37, 3 etc.; VS. VI, 34; SB. IX, 5, 1, 8). King Soma when pressed is Amrta (VS. XIX, 72). Here we may remember the two pressing stones of Trita, the two quadrants on the sides of Śaṅku. Another expression is 'Somyam Madhu.' 'Soma Mead' (IV, 26, 5; VI, 20, 3)" - Mac. p. 105. The connection with Ašvins at the Vernal Equinox is expressed through Madhu while with Vāyu it is told that Soma the purified draught is offered exclusively to Vāyu and Indra.
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Thus Soma is connected with the two equinoctial points,—"the epithet Śucipa 'drinking clear (Soma)' being distinctive of Vāyu (cf. Mac. p. 82)."—Mac. p. 106. The connection of Soma with Vāyu makes it pre-eminently a god of the Autumnal equinox, Vāyu being regent god(s) of Svāti.

(54) It looks as if there are other forms of Soma. "Soma clothes himself in waters, that streams of water flow after him, when he desires to clothe himself in cows (in milk—IX, 2, 3-4)"—Mac. p. 106. It will be worth investigation how this transformation is alluded to in a variety of ways in the Vedic poetry. According to RV. VII, 47, 3 and VII, 49, 2-4, Āpah are brilliant. The waters seem to be regarded as a form of light and if that be really so, Varuṇa, who is the lord of Light, can well be said to be the lord of Waters or the 'Lord of ocean' (Mac. p. 25). Cf. "Varuṇa clothes himself in the waters. (IX, 90, 2; cp. VIII 69, 11-12.)"—Mac. p. 25. We may as well see the truth of Trita being styled "Āptya," because of the connection of Śaṅku (gnomon) Trita with Light (Āpah = waters = Light).

(55) In the above passages, it is significant that Soma desires to clothe himself in cows. It seems that "cow" is an expression which signifies light wherever the cows are ruddy or shining or in heavens. The cowstalls then would suggest beams or flood of light as we would notice in the Dawns or in the myriads of stars (of Bootes group).

(56) The Soma drink which makes the gods immortal and which is the Amṛta seems to be nothing but a figurative expression for the immortality where the Light and Time continue and which is the case with the gods—the stars—who are an embodiment of these elements. The life that the mortals get, it seems, is made up of restricted Light and Time and of what trickles down through the spaces from sky in the form of water, rain-drops and the ultimate juice that is created in the vegetable world and which fills the udders of the cows. The convention for a fixed standard of time for human or religious affairs seems to have selected the time of the Autumnal equinox when the living world enjoys once again the mercy of this god—the mercy of light and "water" in its abundance, at harvest time after a good rainy season, and at
the end of the Hydra constellation. Soma is therefore truly called "the milk (piyusa) of heaven (IX. 51, 2 etc.), is purified in heaven (IX. 83, 2; IX. 86, 22, etc.). He flows with his streams to the dear places of heaven (IX. 12, 8),...he occupies heaven (IX. 85, 9), he is in heaven (SB. III. 4, 3, 13) or is lord of heaven (IX. 86, 11-13)." —Mac. p. 111.

(57) Āpaḥ: — The nature of Āpaḥ being wholly or partly a nature of Soma—Light—various other references in connection with Āpaḥ can be easily followed. It is said that "they abide where the gods are and the seat of Mitra and Varuṇa is (X. 30, 1). They are beside the sun and the sun is with them" (I, 23, 17).” —Mac. p. 85. This is evidently a reference to Śāṅku, to light on it and to the time of Autumnal equinox. The gods are conceived as stars in heaven which is the ocean. ["The atmosphere is often called a sea (samudra) as the abode of the celestial waters..." —Mac. p. 10) the lord of all being Varuṇa. The Āpaḥ "are the goddesses who follow the path of the gods (VII, 47, 3)” —Mac. p. 85. The idea seems to develop in the Apsarasas, the divine (water) females; and along with the Soma, they are naturally associated with the Autumnal equinox: "The Apsaras of the sea are described as flowing to Soma (IX. 78, 3), with reference to the water that is mixed with the juice," —Mac. p. 134. The chapter on Āpaḥ has to be read in connection with that on the Apsarasas. Since Soma is preeminent ly placed with Vāyu, the Apsarasas are placed with Gandharvas, who seem to be none else than the Stars (Boötes) at the Autumnal equinox: — "In several passages Gandharva is closely connected with some form of celestial light. Thus he is brought into relation with the sun, 'the golden winged bird the messenger of Varuṇa' (X. 1:3, 6), with the sun bird (X. 177, 2), with the sun-steed (I. 163, 2), with Soma likened to the sun (IX. 85, 12)’ —Mac. p. 136. The golden winged bird mentioned here is not sun but the golden star Śvāti (Arcturus) at the Autumnal equinox; and from (from one equinox), the opposite point of the Vernal equinox steps in, in the imagery of the steeds. We read that "Gandharva is sometimes connected with the waters. "Gandharva in the waters’ and the ‘aqueous nymph’ are alluded to as the parents of Yama and Yami (X, 10, 4) —Mac. p. 137. The Yama seems to
be also a conception of Gnomon (Śaṅku) with reference to the mortals in connection with Time when memory of the dead is resolved into Time-oblivion. "He is associated with the departed fa'hr-ṣ, particularly with the Aṅgirases (Mac. p. 171)...His father is Vivasvat (X, 14, 5)" - Mac. p. 172. Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan are mentioned together as the names of the one being (I, 164, 46)" - Mac. p. 171. The Aṅgirases are Saptarṣis (vide Aṅgirasa), the Vivasvat is the Pole star-Dhruva (vide Vivasvat); and their close association with Mātariśvan is evident since the gnomon at the Autumnal equinox is just what is herein referred to. The two dogs of Yamī seem to be the two side quadrants of the gnomon which give morning and evening time, the sister Yamī being the light which alights on the Śaṅku itself at the Autumnal equinox as also on the side quadrants in that period. We will not dilate upon it. "Yama's foot-fetter (padbiṣa) is spoken of as parallel to the bond of Varuṇa (X, 97, 16)" - Mac. p. 172. The bonds of Varuṇa are the polar longitudes and latitudes. "In their dialogue, in the RV. (X, 10, 4) Yama and Yamī call themselves children of Gandharva and the water nymph (Apyā yoṣā)" - Mac. p. 172.

Thus the chapter of "waters"—Āpaḥ—leads us to a consideration of Soma, Light, Gandharvas, the Apsarases, the Yama and Yamī because light is associated with the gnomon, Varuṇa and with Time and thus with the mortals.

(58) Āpaḥ too are connected with the Agni as we saw just before. It is expressive in more than one way. "As mothers they produce Agni" (X, 91, 6) - Mac. p. 85. As waters, it seems that they refer to (here producing) the heliacal rise of the star Agastya,1 which comes at the end of the rainy season in sign

1 Cf. Raghu. IV, 21 "प्रसादीदायायम्: कुम्भेऽनमेम्होजस्: " Waters became clear on the (heliacal) rise of Canopus-born of Kumbha—of great effulgence. Mallinātha comments:—"अगस्य: कुम्भेऽनमेम्होजस्: । अगस्योद्घ्य: जात्तानि प्रसिद्धिं इत्यागमः: " From Dowson’s "Hindu Classical Dictionary" we learn under ‘Agastya’ that—"Agastya and Vasistha are said in Rigveda to be the offspring of Mitra and Varuṇa, whose seed fell from them at the sight of Urvāṣī and the commentator Śāyaṇa adds that Agastya was born in a water-jar ('Kumbha') as a "fish of great lusture," whence he was called 'Kalahasti,' 'KumbhaSambhava' and 'Ghaṭodhava’. From his parentage he was called ‘Maitrāvāruṇi’ and Aurvaeṣeya." (continued on next page)
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Virgo. The more of it can be discussed when we refer to Agni and the Apāmnāpāt god— the son of waters. Let us repeat that “sometimes at least the celestial waters were regarded as containing or identical with the heavenly Soma, the beverage of Indra”—Mac. p. 86. “The atmosphere is often called a sea (samudra) as the abode of the celestial waters.” (Mac. p. 10). The “heavenly ri<er Ganges” is a very familiar expression for the Milky Way (Via Lactea).

(59) Aditi: She is said to be the mother of the gods and accordingly her stellar nature is to be thought of first. “The

(continued from previous page)

From “Agastya in the Tamil Land,” by K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, B. A.-University of Madras—p. 2, we learn that:—“Agastya is known as ‘Kalasaja ‘KumbhaSambhava’... (the pot-born), from the fact that he was born from the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa had a sort of love contest in respect of the heavenly damsel Urvasī and that they could not do anything more than depositing their fertile seed, one in a pot and other in the sea. In time, Agastya was born from the pot and Vasiṣṭha, one of the reputed Saptarṣis (Zeta Ursae Majoris—Mizar) started his life from the sea.”

The above quotations show how the story develops round the word ‘Kumbha’.

It is apparent to the writer that the word ‘Kumbha’ is here misunderstood and so too the variants of that word. As in the ‘Hasta’ word (vide ‘kari’) which means hand as well as the trunk of an elephant, “Kumbha” is both ‘the pot’ as well as ‘the forehead of an elephant.’ We have to take here the latter sense of the word: meaning thereby, “the (heliacal) rise of the star Agastya when the constellation Hasta (Corvus) is not visible (in season Sarad—Autumn); when the sun covers those degrees wherein that portion of Hasta (Gamma, Epsilon and Alpha Corvus)—the forehead region of elephantine head—is heliacally set. Perhaps the same period should hold good for the heliacal rise of the star Mizar—Vasiṣṭha. Origin of both these stars is connected with Urvasi which is Celestial Equator and Equatorial shadow later on (cf. present writer’s paper “Astronomical Data in the Darmas of Kālīdāsa”) which would point to the circumstance of completion of their heliacal rise at all places in India when the sun is approaching the celestial equator with the approach to the equinoctial star Svāti which rises earlier with the Hasta constellation (vide paras 45 and 48).

It is to be noted that the star is styled a “fish” of great lustre. This way of calling the star a fish will help us in interpreting some of the miracles of the Gospels (Mt. XIV, 13—21: XV, 32—39) and other portions therein, where the disciples are called (Mt. IV, 19—20) ‘fishers’ and made ‘fishers of Men’ as well as the Flood or the Deluge stories wherein the ‘fish’ (Canopus—Agastya) plays a prominent part. (continued on the next page)
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Gods are said to have been born from Aditi, the Waters, and Earth (X, 63, 2)"—Mac. p. 121. Their daily course would naturally associate them with the earth and water. She is bright and luminous (I, 136, 3)"—Mac. p. 120 and hence, her stellar nature is definite. "She is **widely expanded**" (V, 46, 6)—Mac. p. 120 which is therefore a description of the Milky Way—Via Lactea the Heavenly Ganges. Aditi is the mother of Mitra and Varuṇa “(VIII, 25, 3; X, 36, 3; X, 132, 6)”—Mac. p. 120. It looks that the Vedic conception of the prime cause of light and stars has passed on even beyond from the Varuṇa—the Pole Star, to Aditi—the infinite cluster of the Stars. We can now easily understand the "Ādityas." "In X, 5, 7, it is stated that the existent and non-existent were in the womb of Aditi, in the birth-place of Dakṣa."—Mac. p. 46.

(60) C manus: We read that "the beams of Dawn are personified as cows, which draw her car (Mac. p. 47)"—Mac. p. 150. The Maruts, the regent god(s) of Svāti, are sons of cow: "the cow Pṛśni (V, 52, 16) or simply a cow is their mother (VIII, 83, 1) and they bear the epithet ‘Gomātarah’—‘having a cow for their mother’ (I, 85, 3; ep. VIII, 20, 8)"—Mac. p. 78. The opening of the cow—

(continued from previous page)

Because the fishes do not wink, the stars have been styled at times ‘fishes’ as may be seen from the lexicon of Amara, III, 218, “सूर्यस्यानामिनिः |” To the same effect we read in the drama ‘Vikramorvaśiśya of Kalidāsa after III, 17, “किं च ब त्वरं स्वनेवगुरु । न च अजयनं न च परिवेल । केचरवननित्व

The gliding through of these ‘fishes’ in the heavenly expanse might have given rise to the idea of the heavens as a vast “Sea,” the Pole Star Dhruva–Varuṇa being the suzerain, styled also as the Lord of the Sea.” Close association and the nature of Mitra and Varuṇa (in north) has been noted already; and Canopus in the south may well get in the picture. The seed of Varuṇa (in the northern quarter) may well be associated with the birth of Vasiṣṭha in the “sea” in North.

As noted before (in paras 45 and 48) the early appearance of the pearl-like star Citrā (Spica—Alpha Virgo) along with the rise of Hasta (Corvus) constellation may well have given rise to the conception of a popular myth expressed in “मातिर्कि न गज गजि” of valuable pearl to be found (in the ‘Kumbha’)—in the forehead of an elephant.

It will be realised how the words “Kumbha,” “Fish” and “Sea” are applicable in the old tales and stories. That is how the Elephant-head-ed classical god Gaṇeṣa comes into being, the heliacal rise of the Star Canopus–Agastya when the “Hasta” (Corvus—‘kari’) disappears heliacally.
stalls at the dawn may therefore refer to the equinoctial time when it is not a daily affair that is intended thereby. But for the Autumnal equinox, the Maruts would not be in the picture. The star group (representing the cows) which is connected with the Sváti (Arcturus = A-Böötes) star is the Böötes cluster of stars (N. 20° to N. 50°) which has at its other (northern) end the well known star Arundhati (Alcor) and the star Vasiṣṭha (Sixth of the Saptarsi—Zeta Ursae Majoris). It seems that the famous cow of plenty—'Nandini—Kāmadbeu'—Surabhi—Devaki—has some reference to this star group (including Sváti), if we remember that the Nandini—Kāmadadenu is in the keeping of Arundhati and Vasiṣṭha (Cf. Raghuvamśa, I, 56, 82; II, 25, 62ff.). The star group Böötes connected with Sváti and Alcor occupies nearly 20 degrees of (northern) passage of sun in heaven and the king Dilīpa took 21 days in attending her. He met the lion (red coloured Sváti) on the final day which perhaps means that the star Sváti—Arcturus was there after 21 days. We have therefore to consider this period and this constellation Böötes in our thoughts of opening of the cow-stalls at the autumnal dawn. For further reference to cow, see Appendix re "Aryaman and Bhaga" on pp. 151—153.

(61) Aṅgirases:—The fathers—or the Pitrē—are the regents of constellation Maghā (Alpha Leo—Regulus). It seems that they refer to the constellation Saptarsi (Ursae Majoris) of seven stars, the last of which occupies the space at the Autumnal equinox. Yama is associated with the departed fathers (Pitrē), particularly the Aṅgirases (X, 14, 3 and 5) Mac. p. 170, and 171. "Accompanied by them Indra pierces Vala (II, 11, 20)"—Mac. p. 142. "To them Indra disclosed the cows (VIII, 52, 3) for them he opened the stalls (I, 51, 3; I, 134, 4)"—Mac. p. 142. The action of killing the demon and opening of the cow-stall does connect them (through Hydra and Böötes) with the Autumnal equinox at Sváti. Hence it will be proper if we understand them as Saptarsi from this latter point and from the former point which refers to their regency of Maghā. We may read this chapter accordingly. "The Vasiṣṭhas claim to have first awakened Uṣas with their hymns (VII, 80, 1)"—Mac. p. 47. This seems to refer to the heliacal rise of Vasiṣṭha in the season autumn, with cessation of rain and approach of harvest season when sacrifices are resumed. cf. Rbhu
No. 1. Shows Sanku (Trisula).

No. 2. Shows old Sanku with Dhruva (N.) Agas and Sun (W.) also.

No. 3. Shows Sapta Rsis, Pole Star and Riotes up to Svati with reference to Hydra and constellations from Punarvasu to Svati.

No. 4. Shows Sivana (V.) also.
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(62) Vivasvat-Manu: "Soma dwells with Vivasvat (IX, 26, 4)" -Mac. p. 42., as well as Āpah (vide Soma and Āpah). This description points to the stellar nature of this God. "The gods are also once spoken of as the offspring (Janimā) of Vivasvat (X, 63, 1)" -Mac. p. 42. This does point to the preeminence of this god, which, in the stellar regions belongs to the Pole star - to Dhruva. "He is the father of Manu the ancestor of the human race" - (Mac. p. 42). The characteristic connection of Dhruva with the gnomon seems to have been referred to. "The Āsvins who dwell with Vivasvat are besought to come to the offering (I, 46, 13)" -Mac. p. 42. The Āsvins who dwell with the Vivasvat refer to their proximity at the Vernal equinox and the connection of Soma points to his proximity at the Autumnal equinox. "Some dwells with Vivasvat (IX, 26, 4) and is cleansed by the daughters (H.=longitudes) of Vivasvat (IX, 14, 5)" -Mac. p. 42. "The streams of Soma flow through the sieve having obtained (the blessing) of Vivasvat and producing the blessing (bhagam) of Dawn" (IX, 10, 5) Mac. p. 42, is quite natural.

(63) Sacrifices followed the measurement of Time from the gnomon (Śaṅku). We read that "Manu was the institutor of sacrifice. -For when he had kindled the fire, he presented the first offering with the seven priests to the gods" (X, 63, 7) -Mac. p. 139. The seven priests are the Saptarśis heliacally arrived, associated with the sacrifices which start at the end of the rainy season in autumn and with the suppression of Hydra. Yama too is the son of Vivasvat (Mac. p. 139) which is the same conception but from a different viewpoint from point of oblivion with reference to short human standard

(64) Tvāstr-Sarasvī: We apply the calendar to ascertain the position of sun when the worship in honour of the goddess Sarasvati commences. The days when this goddess is invoked are Āśvin, 7th to 9th tithis (digits), of the bright half, when the lunar mansion on its seventh tithi is Mūla constellation, and on the ninth the constellation is then Śrāvaṇa. The first day of the Śrāvaṇa month is of the dark half when the sun is in the 47th space of Puṣya and the moon is in the O (or first) space of the Abhijit constellation (Vide tables III-IV). From that day, 81
digits of the moon will complete the sixth tithi of the Āśvin month (its bright fortnight) which would mean in all 79 and 43/62 solar days from the summer solstice, or 796 and 58/62 sapces of the ecliptic. The sun would therefore be at the time in the Citrā constellation perhaps nearing the Citrā star longitude (A Virgo-Spica) completing its 38 spaces, the regent god being Tvastr. By that time, the moon will complete 2 circles and 3358 with 29/31 spaces (134 spaces = a solar day) from Abhijit, placing herself in the constellation Mūla according to the equal space system (vide table IV). Three digits more and she is in the Sūrānā constellation, in its 53rd space. Now we can understand the description of Sarasvatī and Tvastr with reference to Citrā (Spica) star.

(65) Sarasvatī is called “an ‘iron’ fort” —(Mac. p. 86) perhaps from the blue colour of the star Spica. She is called a stream (‘Sīndhu’) surpassing all other water (bright light) in greatness. The term ‘Sīndhu’ is remarkable in its reference to the star of the magnitude of Citrā (Spica-Virgo). It seems that great stars are considered to be oceans of (water) light. She has “seven sisters and is sevenfold (VI 61, 10-12)” —(Mac. p. 86) which evidently seem to refer to the (heliacal arrival of seven stars of the Saptarṣi constellation. “The goddess comes to the sacrifice on the same chariot as the Fathers¹ and seats herself on the sacrificial grass (X, 17, 8-9)” —Mac. p. 86. The reference to the arrival of the Pitra-fathers is a reference to (the heliacal) arrival of the Saptarṣis, perhaps completed at the same time. Her appearance at the harvest season has been an international symbol—a stalk is given in the hand of the Virgo: the Vedic poets see in her the motherly element and sings that “Her unfailing breast (cf. AB. IV, 1.) yields riches of every kind” (I, 164, 49)—Mac. p. 87, a beautiful picture of the splendid harvest. She is “a Vṛtra slayer (VI, 61, 3-7)” —Mac. p. 87; evidently, since her beneficent influence persists even when the Hydra has not yet terminated. The star Spica rises just after or along with the Hasta and Svāti and hence its description acquires much of the imagery that can be pictured from the proximity of the Hasta constellation. “She is particularly

¹ Her name Śīrūḍā retains the association of Autumn. So too the swan, lotus, flowers etc., emphasise this season in her picture, the peacock reflects the Saptarṣi—the fathers (vide para 75 for this peacock).
The imagery after this shape of an "axe" reappears later in a different form in our classical literature in the figure of Parāśurāma who holds an Axe. It is like Ganeśa and Kārttīkeya, the advent of Agastya-star Canopus—, the symbolical elephantine head being substituted by the axe-like shape of the Hasta (Corvus) constellation. Kārttīkeya gives another imagery after Agastya, the ride on peacock representing its heliacal arrival along with that of saptarṣi (vide para 75).
the month in all such cases. It seems that the system of equal spaces is agreed upon in the Vedic calendar in some quarters, in preference to the one of unequal spaces. That however does not alter the actual position of the stars though it alters, at times, the space value ascribed to them, in terms of the constellation.

(68) *Vītra:* This is preeminently the *Ahi* the serpent of the obstructive and of the ‘evil’ tendency (*Mac.* p. 152 and p. 158). “Hence he is without feet or hands (I, 32, 7; III, 30, 8)”–*Mac.* p. 158. There is little doubt that he has some connection with the rainy season. “He has thunder at his disposal (I, 80, 12) as well as lightning, mist and hail (I, 32, 13)”–*Mac.* p. 158. It is Maruts that help Indra to overcome him and his form of a serpent leads us to take him to represent the gigantic but zigzag constellation Hydra which ends in Svātī (regent god being Vāyu) and which begins at Āśleṣā constellation, whose regent god is *Surpa* the Serpent.

(69) He is overpowered in the Sarat season and it was then the fortieth day, fortieth perhaps from sometime to the heliacal rise of star Canopus on the Indian horizon (Cf. II, 12, 3 and 11). Indra released *seven* ‘*Sindhus*’ to follow their course is also told herein. It seems to refer to the free course of Saptarṣi along with Bōōtēs (the cow) after their heliacal rise. The release of the cows by Indra is accordingly quite natural, it being then the Autumnal equinox. The term ‘*Sindhu*’ applied to Cīrā is also applied to the seven stars of the Saptarṣi constellation. (Cf. II, 12, 12). The serpentine god was, of course, a *shining* god. It seems that “the seven rivers that flow in the jaws of Varuṇa as into a surging abyss (VIII, 58, 12)”–(*Mac.* p. 25) refer to the Saptarṣi and the Pole Star.

(70) In the fight with this Hydra group, Indra gets help from many other gods of whom, we have yet to consider the Bṛhaspati, Agni and Viṣṇu. For this purpose, we shall have to look to an additional factor—to the *Agastya star* in the south, (the cardinal point opposite to the North) which sets heliacally before the begin-

---

1 We read in Raghu. IV, 44 “अगस्त्य प्रभातादिवाहिन्यः......”. Mallinātha in his comments observes that “अगस्त्यो वृक्षाकृतिः बमसिंहाशिविंतः। ब्रह्मास्यात्मजः
योगिः विनिघातानिधिरः। हि तोऽहस्वरुपः॥”*. We find here the same idea of “the Son” and of the “Father in Heaven” put somewhat differently.
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ing of Hydra but which rises heliacally on the termination of the rainy season (Cf. Raghuvamśa IV, 21). It is then the time when Hasta-Corvus) is heliacally setting. Further, since the constellation Hasta is in the south, the other stars of the two succeeding constellations Citrā and Svāti set in soon after it. Hence the star Canopus is conceived to rise with the heliacal appearance of equinoctial star Svāti. This phenomena also has a parallel in the north with reference to the heliacal rise of the Saptarṣi constellation, because it marks approximately the same time. Hence, in the fight with Vṛtra, we come across a star, its star picture and the conception of Light as against the darkness (of the period of the rainy season).

(71) Evil: A few remarks on the evil serpentine god will not be out of place. The conception of evil as of a gliding, crooked serpentine form is international (as Dragon, Hydra, Satan etc.) but Hydra constellation has escaped the notice as well as the Northern star group of Saptarṣi and the Southern star Agastya, the two saving graces to this evil—all of them have been lost right off. At times the Draco constellation is mistakenly taken when the Hydra ought to figure in. The Biblical serpent who is tempting the Eve with the (golden?) fruit is this Hydra with the (golden) Svāti (Arcturus) at its end, the Eve being the Light associated with the gnomon (= Adam) [cf. quotation (K) from the Jain Text and notes thereon pp. 159-160.] The agon in most of the myths is Hydra. The several headed monster in the story of Hercules is none else than the Hydra constellation, the mouths representing the stars that may be associated with the Āśleṣi constellation, Hercules representing Canopus-Agastya.

(72) Bṛhaspati: The planet Jupiter is out of question here. Bṛhaspati is the regent god of the Pusya constellation at the summer solstice the cardinal northern point, and which is near the Hydra constellation. "He is seven mouthed and seven rayed" (IV, 50, 4-Mac. p. 101) which fact points to his connection with the Saptarṣi constellation; the end of the Saptarṣi furnishes another picture. "He also wields a golden hatchet (VII, 97, 7) and is armed with an iron axe, which Tvāstr sharps (X, 53, 9, "Mac. p. 101. The golden colour is an index of the Svāti star and the shape of axe to that of the Hasta star, the proximity of Citrā (of blue colour) bringing in the regent god.
Tvaṣṭṛ. He is said to be ‘blue-backed’ which cannot be explained by reference to Citrā star; but ‘he is golden-coloured and ruddy (V. 43, 12)’—Mac. p. 101. This it seems, is a northern imagery of the star Agastya—Canopus, which, when it rises heliacally is accompanied with the heliacal arrival of the Saptarṣi stars. The colour of Agastya is changing and variegated to-day but it was red if we follow the covert allusions to it 1 in the dramas of Kālidāsa ( Vide writer’s paper “Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa”).

(73) The epithet Āṅgirasa (son of Āṅgirasas) belongs to him exclusively (II, 23, 18)”—Mac. p. 102. This does emphasise his connection with the Saptarṣi. So too, in the description—“When Bṛhaspati with fiery gleams rent the defences of Vala, he revealed the treasures of the cows; as if splitting open eggs, he drove out the cows of the mountain; he beheld the honey enclosed by the stone; he brought it out, having cloven (Vala) with his roar; he smote forth as it were the marrow of the Vala (X. 68, 4-9)”—Mac. p. 102. This description points to the end of Saptarṣi constellation connected with the Bōōtes and the end of Hydra at the Autumnal equinox. The equinoctial place seems to have been called a mountain. It was on the mountain that the Ahi (= Vṛtra) was resting (Mac. p. 158). It was from the mountain that the bird (Śvāti) brought the fire (Mac. p. 71). The top of the gnomon is as it were a peak (Śānu) as we saw in the case of Trita (vide Trita). He drove out the cows and distributed them in heaven (II, 24, 14, 1)—Mac. p. 102. The cows so released are therefore not terrestrial. It will be perhaps evident. With Indra, he is Soma drinker (IV, 49, 3; IV 50, 10)’’ (Mac. p. 103) which is an index of his proximity to the Autumnal equinox. He is naturally associated with the Maruts (Mac. p, 103) which transfers to him the roar of the Maruts in the fight. And since he is associated with the Saptarṣis, he is associated with songs, with the wisdom of the priests as well as with their learning. Thus he is supreme in his beneficence because prosperity is the fruit at the Autumnal equinox. (vide Amara I 3, 24, 27 re. Āṅgirasa.)

1 The uniting red jewel in the Vikramorvaśiyā and the red-jewelled ring of the Śākuntala. Cf. also Vikram. IV, 34, 36; V, 2, 3, 4 etc. for their descriptions of deep red color.
(74) **Viṣṇu**: In the conception of this god we have another imagery drawn around the star Agastya the regent of the South. He rises daily for some hours and then sets. But his treadings are marked by important events in human life. In Viṣṇu, he is conceived as taking big strides—three strides—of which the third is beyond the ken of mortals. "Man glorifying Viṣṇu, tracks two steps of that heaven beholding (deity) but he apprehends not the third; nor can the soaring winged birds (pursue it)" (Wilson) RV I. 155, 5—Mac. p. 38." The same notion seems to be mystically expressed (I, 155, 3) when he is said to bear his third name *in the bright realm of heaven*. The highest place of Viṣṇu is regarded as identical with the highest place of Agni, for Viṣṇu guards the highest, the third place of Agni (X, 1,3) and Agni with the loftiest station of Viṣṇu guards the mysterious cows (V, 3, 3). The highest step of Viṣṇu is seen by the liberal like an eye fixed in heaven (I, 22, 23); it is his dear abode where pious men rejoice and where there is a well of honey (I, 154, 5), and where the gods rejoice (VIII, 29, 7). This highest step shines down brightly and is the dwelling of Indra and Viṣṇu, where are the many-horned swiftly moving cows ["यग्न गावः सूर्य-श्रुव्धा अयासः," ] and which the singer desires to attain (I, 154, 6)

−Mac. p. 38.

(75) It is told that the *three* steps exhaust all the 'Bhuvanas' (I, 154, 2). This expression, we suggest, should be taken to mean that the three strides cover all the changes in the year, of one complete revolution of sun whereafter the phenomena would repeat. Thus, we must measure the strides *along the ecliptic* in its 3660 spaces. The loftiest step is invisible and in the bright realm of heaven; therefore it represents the phenomena when the star Agastya has set heliacally. Since the final step contains 'flow of honey'—which is a reference to the rains and their results; and therein there are many horned cows' which is a reference to the Saptarśis with their forecrest (known thereby at times as 'Citraśikhandi'—a peacock with crest—Amara I, 3, 27); the final step must therefore be from the summer season to the autumn or to the Autumnal equinox. The third name may refer to Brhaspati but this is only a conjecture because we do not know the other names at present. Now, if we count the spaces onwards,
on the ecliptic from Abhijit, 1220 spaces would bring us to the constellation Kr̃ttikā (Pleiades) according to the equal space division. From thence, further 1220 spaces would bring us to the end of the constellation Uttarāphālguna the period of the invisibility of Agastya. The third 1220 spaces would take us back to Abhijit whose regent is Brahmā. The star Canopus sets heliacally just about the sun in Kr̃ttikā (vide table IV) and rises when the sun is covering up Hasta in his rays. This is just the step-th-fnal and the third (if the first begins with the heliacal rise of Agastya) where he is not seen it is really beyond the mortalken, only ‘the wise’ or liberal know it. It is remarkable that the regent god of the constellation Kr̃ttikā is Agni. (This may perhaps account for the list of constellations starting with Kr̃ttikī found in some works). “Viṣṇu is spoken of (I, 156, 5) as having three abodes (Trisadānastha) an epithet primarily appropriate to Agni.” Mac. p. 38. Shall we be justified to say that one of the two unknown names of Viṣṇu is Agni? Viṣṇu is considered the ‘ancient germ of order’ (Mac. p. 38) which seems to signify some basis of the Agni worship, connected with the cycle of seasons and Canopus.

(76) The cows in the sacrifice ‘Gātīn Agni’ seem to be of

1 The heliacal setting of Agastya–Canopus:– This happens in or about the beginning of sign Taurus when the sun is there (vide tables III and IV for the signs) and which circumstance is graphically narrated in the Gospels as the ‘betrayal’ of Christ by one of his twelve disciples (in one of the twelve signs of the ecliptic) for 30 pieces of silver (which is 30 degrees or perhaps 30 days in a sign). The heliacal rise of this star occurs when the sun is in the sign Virgo (vide tables III and IV for the sign) which makes it symbolically the ‘son of a Virgin’ as the Gospels would have it. From Taurus to Virgo, it is the third portion of the ecliptic—the one vast stride of Viṣṇu. “The Son of Man will come in clouds” is a natural imagery arising out of association of Canopus with the rainy season (the idea seems to have originated in the conception of the “Aṣāmnapāt god”). The heliacal rise of this star is associated with harvest—the Christ is styled the “Lord of Harvest.”

When this truth will be realized, it will be found that for want of proper elucidation of such symbolic accounts, the “betrayal” of Christ has been ascribed to an individual or to a tribe or to a race; and develop therefrom one of the most unfortunate piece of history—develop bitterness leading to hatred, vengeance and persecution; and that they follow on and persist through centuries for the ‘blood’ of Christ—for the yearly phenomena of the heliacal setting of Canopus in reality!!
Saptarṣis with their crest (=horns) in the forepart and hoofs in Boötes, the cows which reside in the final step of Viṣṇu, when during rains, for two months, the sacrifices get out of question.

(77) In the fight against Vṛtra, naturally Viṣṇu is associated with Indra. "Indra about to slay Vṛtra says, 'Friend Viṣṇu, stride out vastly' (IV, 18, 11)" Mac. p. 39. The one important function of Āgastya is suppression of Hydra, classically, of the King Bali.

(73) Indra: One of the central figures in the Vedic poetry is Indra. He nearly reflects the character of the most of gods we have described so far. We need not therefore repeat the descriptions. "All the gods are unable to frustrate his deeds and counsels (II, 32, 4) 'Even Varuṇa and Sūrya are subject to his command' (I, 101, 3 cp. II. 38, 9)" Mac. p 58. This description would not warrant his identity with the sun. Varuṇa is the god of Night and hence, in day time, the god who would command Sun is Indra. It looks therefore that the Indra god is the regent god of the Sun (East) as Varuṇa god is the regent god of the Star Dhruva (North). He is a fighting god and the fight with Vṛtra (cf. Mac. pp. 58 61 and the Maps) puts him at the summer solstice point and also at the Autumnal equinox. "His car is drawn by the two tawny steeds (hartī)" (Mac. p. 55). This description associates him with the Vernal Equinox, the two steeds seem to be the two Aśvin stars. His fondness for the drink of Soma associates him with Light and Time and since he is resplendent (in the sun) he is drinking it much more than any other god, the exception being made of the Vāyu god, the latter having the privilege of being stationary at the Autumnal equinox. This is sufficient to explain the Indra god over and above what has been explained in connection with the various other gods. cf. Note 'G' on p. 157.

(79) Agni:—After considering the several gods, we are in a position to understand the god Agni and Agni worship. The place of Agni is as central in the religious literature as it is in the home of the Vedic times. Agni is the Light that is on the earth but, in a representative capacity. He is "Purohita" (Mac. p. 96) "representative" on earth of the heavenly lights. When the star-lights are gone—invisible, when the sun is absent—not yet on the horizon—at Dawn, Agni the representative is lighted
up. He thus represents the star light that is not present. When in the evening, the (star) light again returns with the stars, his function of representation is superfluous—it terminates. It is not to be forgotten that the sun is not the predominant figure or an exclusive eminent god in the Vedic conceptions. Varuna has his own eminence. Of a subordinate nature is the eminence of Mitra. Of another eminence is the star Canopus-Agastya in various imageries of Vedic gods. Agni is therefore the representative of each and every one of them, at day time or when they are with the sun, set heliacally. Hence, till the time of the heliacal rise of this star Canopus, Agni represents him as Āpām-vatsa or rather as Āpāmnapit, as son of waters. “Waters”—because it is then the rainy season. (We may here recollect the imagery of the gospels that ‘the Son of Man will come on clouds’). Agni when born is Varuna"—(Mac. p. 29) is a perfect expression since Varuna is not visible at day and because Varuna is the pivot of the (Vedic) stellar gods, the sun being only one of the many such gods. It is thus that the sacred and godly character of Agni is bestowed on it by Varuna. “When kindled, he is Mitra (V 31, 1)” (Mac. p. 29) is also true. It is in the measurement of time (from morn) that the Mitra god stands associated with the Varuna. Agni in waters (Mac. p. 92) is a reference to the Agastya, when he is in waters in the rainy season. The autumn follows. It is told that Uṣas arrives with a bright child (Mac p. 48) she has been produced (prasūta) for the production (savāya) of Savitṛ and arrives with a bright child (1, 113, 1-2)". Savitṛ is the regent god of Hasta (Corvus) constellation. (Cf. Gospels “Before they came together she was found with child of the Holy ghost’” Matthew I, 18-19, and “Joseph knew her not till she had brought forth a son” — (I, 25). This is the case of the heliacal rise of star Agastya (in Autumn with Sun in Virgo) in the proximity of the Autumnal equinox through the early appearance of star Svāti where the equator and ecliptic unite. He is thus said “to have been born from the belly of Asura III 29, 4)” (Mac. p. 90) meaning thereby the heliacal rise of Agastya even while the (asura) Hydra was there. Thus the importance of the advent of Canopus is the importance of Agni. “In him are comprehended all the gods (V, 3, 1), whom
he surrounds as a felly the spokes (V, 13, 6) " (Mac. p. 95) is the correct description of Agni since the Vedic gods are stellar gods and the Vedic analysis of the prime force seems to be the Light that pervades everywhere in one form or another. Agni represents an unbroken human touch with the divine lights as their representative on the earth. Thus the sun enters Agni when it sets" (Mac. p. 93).

(80) As a representative of Light and of Time too, through the light, Agni is described as follows:- “Agni knows the sacrifice exactly (X, 110, 11) and knows all rites (X, 122, 2). Knowing the proper season he rectifies the mistakes which men commit through ignorance of the sacrificial ordinances of the gods (X, 2, 4-5)" Mac. p. 97. Thus he becomes a centre of knowledge, of prayers, of devotion, of offerings and of all the activities the knowledge may lead to. "The sacrificial fire seems to have been an Indo-European institution also, since the Italians and Greeks, as well as the Iranians and Indians had the custom of offering gifts to the gods in fire." Mac. p. 99.

(81) Great importance has been attached to the harvest season falling about the Autumnal equinox. The bird—or the star—Svāti thus fetching the fire, the Light, or kindling the fire has been an international story. The daughter of the sage Kanva protected by the bird (Svāti) earns a most graceful tribute: Śakuntalā is the good action incarnate” (शकुन्तला स्निमती च सद्यः “Śākuntalā śaṇrni-matiḥ ca sadāḥ” Śāk. V. 15). This is the true description of the resultant activities which started with the resumption of the worship of Light and Time-of Agni worship, pure in the basic conception at the Autumnal equinox period. It did degenerate

---

1 Here we can explain the Indian custom of Waving of Light performed before the images of gods at twilight, both at Dawn and at Dusk. When the stars begin to fade and disappear at Dawn, the temple doors are opened and the first ceremony performed before the deity is to wave the Light before the image, which is the representative of the (stellar) deity. The concluding ceremony at Dusk is identical in nature: since the stars begin to shine, the temple doors are closed after the Waving of Light. It is called "Ārātrika" ceremony implying its limitation to the time of night only. The human touch with gods—with the stellar gods remains uninterrupted after dusk to dawn, during night: but during day it is lost and accordingly, it is continued through the representative image, the representation with its resumption or its termination being carried through this symbolical act of "Waving of Light."
later on into bloody sacrifices when the stellar light value of the gods was lost in blood. Mac. pp. 29-30:— “The same contrast between Mitra as god of day and Varuṇa as god of night is implied in the ritual literature, when it is prescribed that Mitra should receive a white and Varuṇa a dark victim at the sacrificial post (TS. II, 1, 7, 4; II, 1, 9, 1; M.S. II, 5, 7)”. Stars were described at times as animals as it may be seen with reference to Viṣṇu who is described as “यूगः वृ भीमः कु चरोऽगिरिष्ठः” I, 154, 2. It may be easily realised how ‘sacrifices’ came to mean ‘killing the ‘animal,’ associated with gods or with godhood. The Goats are sacrificed to goddesses, the sign Aries (Ram) getting associated with the Vernal Equinox.

It is the stellar value that is preserved in the classical (stellar) figures of gods, in their images that were conceived therefrom, and which represent a step secondary to the Agni worship. The most prominent instance is that of the Gaṇeśa creation and his worship. (cf. foot-notes, pp. 129-135).

(82) It has not been yet possible for the writer to understand the several other Vedic gods. Perhaps they may have some connection with the lunar mansions and with full moon.

(83) Before concluding this article, we quote that “Soma is described in the RV. as pressed three times in the day. Thus the Rbhus are invited to the evening pressing, (IV, 33, 11 etc.), Indra to the mid-day pressing: (III, 32, 1-2; VIII 37, 1), which is his alone (IV, 36, 7), while the morning libation is his first drink (X, 112, 1) Mac. p. 107. The Rbhus are of the Saptarśi group whose heliacal rise is described in the passage we quote just below. If the Aśvins terminate the divine night, the opposite point would be the termination of the divine day, and the summer solstice would be the mid-day. Thus Indra has mid-day pressing while Rbhus (of the Saptarśi at the Autumnal equinox=the divine evening) have the evening pressing. And when Indra gets identified in the Sun, he gets the morning one too at the Vernal Equinox. Let us quote the condition described of the time when, at about Hasta constellation, (its regent god being Savitṛ) the Saptarśis rise heliacally and when Citrā, with its regent god Tvaṣṭṛ and the indication of
the Autumnal equinox Svāti (Vāyu) are manifest through early arrival of Svāti (Vāyu).

(84) “Another myth connects the Rbhus with Savitr. They are said to have been round the sky; wind-spēd, in swift course (IV, 33, 1; Cp. I, 161, 12). After much wandering, they came to the house of Savitr,1 who conferred immortality on them when they came to Agohya (I, 110, 2-3). When slumbering for twelve days, they had rejoiced in the hospitality of Agohya, they made fair fields and directed the streams, plants occupied the aried ground and water the lowlands (IV, 33, 7). By their skill they made grass on the heights and waters in the depths, when they slumbered in the house of Agohya (I, 161, 11). Having slept, they asked Agohya as to who had awakened them; in a year they looked around (I, 161, 13)” Mac. p. 133. There will be nothing that will remain concealed once we recognise the heliacal rise of Agastya, when Hasta stars set heliacally, when Saptarsis rise heliacally, in the name ‘Agohya’ and its (heliacal rise) period, before the Autumnal equinox, with the cessation of rain and with abundance of vegetation and harvest. The heliacal rise of the Saptarsis seems to be complete when Svāti sets heliacally—they are then ‘wind-spēd’ resuming, after Svāti their revolutions, their daily course of rising, culmination and setting. Their heliacal rise in Autumn is beautifully and vividly described coupled as it is with the heliacal rise of Canopus in that interval (—it is the very same picture in the Gospels wherein, the Magi, the Wise Men from the East, come to worship the Child who is then born to the ‘Virgin-Mt. II, 1-12’). The query—‘who awakened them?’ sounds mysteriously answered: in a year they get the answer when the heliacal rise is so repeated.

(85) The Rudras have not been referred to here but we may say in brief that they are the regents of Ārdra (Betelgeuse) and of Star Sirius (A—Canis Majoris), the latter occupies portion of hot season; rising in rainy season and the god thus partakes of two

1 Cf. note on pp. 129-131 relating to the connection of Vasiṣṭha star and Canopus in the history and interpretation of the word ‘Kumbhavoni.’ Savitr god is the regent god of the constellation Hasta (Corvus),—the note explains its bearing to ‘Kumbha’—, with which Citrā (Spica), Vasiṣṭha and Canopus stars are associated.

7 [Annals. B. O. R. I.]
sorts of temperament both convenient and inconvenient, beneficent and malevolent.\(^1\) Ardra being in hot season and heliacal rise of Sirius occurring in rainy season amidst torrential rains. [In the paper "*Vedic Gods—V—Rudra—Kali*" full consideration of Rudra is taken up along with the *Divine Female*, Vasu (s), of gods Pūṣan, Savitṛ, Hiranyagarbha and of Prajāpati with ‘Ajū’ in their connection. It was read before the Mysore Oriental Conference in Dec. 1935. It will be published in the A. B. I. in course of time.]

(86) **Resume**: In brief the results (in this article) are as under:

**The Calendar:**

The year—Primarily of 366 solar days, according to Kauṭilya, and Jain Texts controlled and corrected by Malamāsa etc.

The Ecliptic—3660 spaces, 23 constellations: two systems of equal (non-Jain) and unequal (Jain) distribution of spaces.

The months—Ending in full moon according to Kālidāsa, Kauṭilya and Jain Texts.

---

\(^1\) To-day star Sirius is blue in color but it seems to be changing color in olden times. "A learned discussion by Dr. T. J. J. See, moreover, enforces the belief that Sirius was absolutely red 1800 years ago. ‘Astronomy and Astrophysics,’ Vol. XI, p. 29." [from Clerk’s "Popular History of Astronomy during the Nineteenth Century" (1903), p. 375, footnote.]

It is remarkable that Kālidāsa refers to Śiva as ‘Nilas-Lohita’ (Sāk. VII, 34) which, with reference to star Sirius, would be blue-red i.e. purple color.

We add one more quotation on this subject from the "Star Lore of all Ages" by W. T. Olcott (G. P. Putnam's Sons, Newyork), 5th edition 1919 pp. 102-3, from its chapter on Canis Major—Sirius:

"The question whether Sirius has changed in color since early times has given rise to considerable controversy. Ptolemy called it fiery red, Seneca, claimed it was redder than Mars. Cicero also mentions its ruddy light and Tennyson wrote, ‘The fiery Sirius alters hue and bickers into red and emerald.’ Dr. See, the eminent astronomer of the present day, asserts that 1300 years ago, Sirius was red...... There is a reference in Fastus to the effect that the Roman farmers sacrificed ruddy or fawn colored dogs to save the fruits on account of the Dog star, and Dr. See, says there is no reason why the Romans should sacrifice red dogs except that Sirius was red, and dogs of the same color must be offered up to the "Dog" in the sky. There can be no doubt that many of the ancients looked upon red stars as angry deities.'

In the above description, we get another picture of how accidents of associations with Light degenerate into bloody sacrifices. The true perspective of stellar values gets obscured and lost; and thence arise consequent misdirected applications.
Equinoxes—In the midst of Āśvini and in Svāti constellations.
Solstices—In Puṣya and in Abhijit constellations.

_The Gods and Goddesses:_

Varuṇa—Regent god of Pole Star Dhruva.
Vivasvat—,, ,, ,, ,, ,, Mitra—,, ,, of Śāṅku the Gnomon (the Samrāṭ Yantra)

Dawn, Uṣas—With reference to Gods—Equinoctial points and with reference to Calendar, Equinoctial points and daily phenomena.

Āśvins—Twins—the Regent gods of Āśvini at the Vernal equinox.

Vāyu, Marut, Mātariśvan—The regent gods of Svāti (Arcturus) at the Autumnal equinox.
Bṛhaspati—The regent god of Puṣya at the summer solstice (an imaṇḍery of Saptarṣi after Agastya—Canopus.
Viṣṇu—Agastya (Canopus: A—Argo Navis).
Viṣṇu—Agastya (Canopus: A—Argo Navis).
Vṛtra—Ahi—Hydra—The regent of the Serpent god of Āślesā.
Ṛbhūs—of Saptarṣi group.
Sapta Sindhus—Seven stars of Saptarṣi.
Cows—Rays of star light (particularly at Autumnal equinox).
Soma—Regent god of Light and of Light combined with Time.
Āpaḥ—As divine—Light; as terrestrial, transformed into water, juice.
Sarasvatī—Regent goddess of Citrā (Spica—A Virgo).
Tvāṣṭr—Regent god of Citrā (Spica) constellation.
Manu, Yama—Śāṅku the Gnomon.
Yima—Shadow or Light that alights on Śāṅku.
Indra—Regent god of sun.
Agni—Representative of Stars on earth and of Principal stellar gods.

Trita—Śāṅku the Gnomon with its two quadrants on its sides. Apāṃnapāt—Agastya—Canopus during its heliacal rise and in the rainy season.
Apsarases—Lights—Shadows coming to Earth.
Gandharvas—Star groups at the Autumnal equinox, such as of Böötes.
Cowstalls—Star lights particularly of some of Böötes stars at the Autumnal equinox in Svāti.
Aditi—The milky way—the Heavenly Ganges—Via Lactea.
Kāmadhenu—Star group Böötes with Svāti.
Aṅgirases—Saptarṣi group (Ursa Majoris).
Rudras—Sirius (α-Canis Majoris).
Aryaman—Star Vasiṣṭha. (of Saptarṣis).
Bhaga—One of the Saptarṣi stars (α).

(87) For all purposes and information, "Vedic Mythology" of late Prof. Macdonell has been relied upon while, for facts from the Jain sacred texts, the text of Kālalokaprakāśa has been used.

**The Texts used are:**

1. "Vedic Mythology"—by A. A. Macdonell (Trübner Strassburg 1897).
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APPENDIX

ARYAMAN and BHAGA:—(Addenda to para 60).

The cow of Vasiṣṭha leads us to the identity of god Aryaman who is "so destitute of individual characteristics that in the Naighantuṣṭa he is passed over in the list of Gods" (Mac. p. 45). However, in RV. I, 139, 7, we find that Aryaman has a milk giving cow¹ (Gh. p. 66-67) which fact points to the connection of Aryaman to Vasiṣṭha (Zeta Ursa Major). The relation of both to the Autumn is significant in this respect. "The kings Mitra, Varuṇa and Aryaṇa are said to have disposed (created) the Autumn, the month, day and night (Mac. p. 25), sacrifice and ṛks" VII, 66, 11 (Gh. p. 66). That is just the function of Vasiṣṭhas who "claim to have first awakened Uṣas with their hymns (VII, 80, 1)" Mac. p. 47. The course of sacrifice resumes with the help of Aryaman-Vasiṣṭha. The prominence at the Autumnal equinox does permit the grouping of this star with Mitra and Varuṇa. "Together with Aryaman, Mitra and Varuṇa are called sun-eyed (VII, 66, 10)" Mac. p. 23 which means that none of the three can be identified with sun. When the (Hindu) longitude of this star is 162°-12', it is in agreement with Longitude 167°-57' of constellation Uttarārāphālgūṇi (its regent being Aryaman) whose yogatārā is Beta Leo (Kaye p. 93, 106). Both appear on the eastern horizon nearly the same time and the heliacal rise comes in later constellations. These points support the identity of the god proposed herein although it will be seen that it is not the only ground for the same. The emphasis on the meaning of the word "Su" to produce used in connection with god Savitṛ (regent of the asterism Hasta-Corvus) has been noticed (Mac. p. 34). This word "occurs in connection with (creation of) Uṣas (VII, 77, 1) with Varuṇa (I, 28, 9), with the Adityās (VIII, 18, 1) and with

¹ In respect to this addenda about Aryaman and Bhaga the writer had the benefit of consulting a new treatise "Studies on Rigvedic Deities Astronomical and Meteorological" by Sjt. Ekendranath Ghosh (referred to as Gh. herein). It is published in the Journal and Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, (New Series) Vol. XXVIII 1932, No. 1, published 5/9/33.

This treatise supplements in a way the data we get from the work of late Prof. MacDonell.
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Mitra, Aryaman coupled with Savitṛ. This employment being so frequent, Yāska (Nir. X, 31) defines Savitṛ as ‘Sarvasya prassavitā’—the stimulator of everything’—Mac. p. 34. It is thus evident that the heliacal rise of god Aryaman has something to do with Savitṛ. Indeed, such an eminent group of gods, and the heliacal rise of Ursa Major and that of Agastya at harvest time might have furnished an occasion for that famous Savitṛ hymn of the Veda (III, 62, 10) Mac. p. 33. Creation of Uṣas points in fact to the Autumnal equinox. “Soma has been compared with Aryaman and Mitra and Varuṇa” (Gh. p. 66).

Association of Aryaman (Zeta Ursa Major) with gods Mitra and Varuṇa may again be referred to. “Indra is, however in RV once coupled in the dual as an Āditya with Varuṇa as chief of Ādityas (VII, 85, 4)......when one god alone is mentioned as an Āditya, it is generally Varuṇa, their chief;......when two are mentioned, they are Varuṇa and Mitra, once Varuṇa and Indra;......when three, Varuṇa, Mitra and Aryaman;...when five, this is only once the case, the same three together with Savitṛ and bhaga.” (Mac. p. 44). This association does locate both the Aryaman and Bhaga to the period of these gods all grouped together, to the Autumnal equinox. Who the god Bhaga is cannot be so easily determined but we may take him to be some star near Vasiṣṭha, say the fifth of Saptarṣi-Epsilon Ursa Major—whose longitude is 154°-39', when that of the Pūrvāphālguṇī asterism, whose regent is Bhaga, is 157°-36' of its Yoṣatāra delta Leo (Kaye p. 98, 106). The asterism falls in the rainy season when the agriculture is in progress and when the heliacal rise of Canopus is approaching in the lower latitudes. It is a trait time that “the god Bhaga is asked to deepen the ploughing” (III, 12, 4) Gh. p. 75. In such case and when its heliacal rise is near or about the equinox, associating Bhaga too with all the benefits of nature at harvest, the word ‘bhaga’ acquires superb connotation. “Dawn is Bhaga’s sister (I, 123, 5), Bhaga’s eye is adorned with rays (I, 136, 2) and hyms rise upto Viṣṇu as on Bhaga’s path” (III, 54, 14) Mac. p. 45. The above description too puts the god near the Autumnal equinox since Viṣṇu’s strides are associated with this
period also (vide Viṣṇu). Anyhow, close association of Bhaga with Aryaman is unmistakable to support the proposed identification.

The pair Vasistha and Arundhati (Zeta Ursa Major and Alcor) has always been in India an emblem of matrimonial bliss and of purity in wedded life (their heliacal rise at about the equinox — union of ecliptic and equator — at a time when it is all rejoicings amidst good harvest and bright prospects in the new season does contribute to their glorification). "Aryaman has been praised for providing a new wife, once with Bhaga (X, 85, 23) and once with Bhaga and Savitṛ" (X, 85, 36) Gh. p. 66. Thus we cannot think of Bhaga without the gods Aryaman and Savitṛ. We may again revert to Aryaman.

"In Atharvaveda, Aryaman has been invoked for benefit in general, to prevent ill-luck in marriage ceremonies (XIV, i, 50; XIV, 2, 13), to provide a wife or husband (VI, 60, 1), to remove ill omens on the part of a woman (I, 18, 2) and in mantras for an easy delivery (I, 11, 1)"—Gh. p. 66–67. We may well refer all that to Aryaman-Vasiṣṭha and read the praises bestowed on the sage in Raghu I 58–74—"देशीनां मात्येजीर्णां च प्रतिहर्षी व्रम्प्रदातः".

"In Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (II, 3, 5, 4) Aryaman has been called the sacrificial fire (Yajña)"..."In Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (V, 5, 1, 12) we are told that the path of Aryaman is placed above the high direction (regions) of Brhaspati"—Gh. p. 67. The fire does refer to the Autumnal equinox and the path refers to the northern regions where Saptarṣis are. The description will be clear if the reader refers to sections relating to Agni and its cult, to Soma, Brhaspati and to appearance of stars at about the Autumnal equinox on the Indian horizon — to their daily rise as well as to their heliacal arrival.

Beyond these few notes about Aryaman and Bhaga, we are not yet in a position to say anything more definite.
JAIN TEXTS—QUOTATIONS with OBSERVATIONS.
From the "Kalalokaprakāsa": Ch. XXVIII—PP. 1-141

(A) The solar year of 366 days:

"—एकसिंहसिये तथास्थाय्यश्चितियां दिनां: ॥ 292
पद्मश्रयाणुरुक्कम: वैवस्थराजस्वत्त्रयाः ॥
सूर्यसंवत्सरं हि यथा विचित्रशान्धुनेन: ॥ 293 (p. 38).

(B) Yuga (cycle) of 5 solar years = 1830 solar days:—

"तथाहि-सूर्याण्यस्य सप्तप्रभाराजस्यास्याः।
पद्मनाथाद्यास्यास्यास्याः: स्युर्यांवसाः ॥" 300 (p. 39).

(C) Yuga begins on the 1st day (Morn) of dark half of Srāvana:—

"बादीं वर्षं सूर्यांदित्यासदस्यार्षम: हस्ते।
मासादिशित: पक्षस्यादिशिदिवसो भवेत् ॥ 461॥ (p. 59).

प्रदार्शार्यापौर्णिमाशिङ्ग: समानुतिर
प्रवर्तते सूर्यांदित्यादिर्भूतपतांक: ॥ 463॥ (p. 60).

	
tथोके जस्ये प्रमाणिनिसृष्टी —Q.—‘किमावि णं भेते संवर्च्छस्त्र, किमावि
अपाणा, किमावि उऊ, किमावि सासा, किमावि पखा, किमावि अहोर-रत्रा, किमावि मुहुता, किमावि करणा, किमावि नखता, ? ’—A.—
‘गोयाणम! हृदश्चत्रा, हृदियावी अपाणा, पाउरासुः उऊ, ताब्राणार्था सासा, बहुछाड़ावि पखा, दव्यासुः अहोरता, ऋषावि मुहूता, वालवाहा
र्षा करणा, अभियाविक नखता पखता; समाजाउसो’। (p. 60)

‘श्रावणस्यित्यस्य तिथि: प्रतिपदेष्टि च।
वास्तवस्य करणस्य ऋक्ष्यामिकाज्ञवस्य ॥ 467॥
प्रथमे सम्ये भोक्तः युगार्थममित्यद्वृधैरः।
भशतीर्थवत्महाविवेश्य सम्य जिने: ॥ 468॥ (p. 61).

"C" The answer to the disciple Gautama by Mahāvira makes it abundantly clear that the calendar consisted of elements which related to the beginning of the Yuga in the dark half of the month Śrāvana, when the season was rainy (Prāṛt) and the solstice point was the southern course of the sun and that the moon was then in the Abhijit constellation.

There were deviations later on in the months of the seasons which too were incorporated by the later commentators along with the original but evidently failing to match the two. It will therefore be no surprise if the students find a bit of confusion in this respect in these texts, in respect of the seasons related to months.
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(D) Ecliptic = 28 constellations = 3660 spaces [see also Sūrya-praṇāpti X, 22 62, and commentary on it:—
“...जातानि पद्मविशालं जलकनि पद्मविशिष्कानि 3660”... (p. 177)]

“भरणीशताराजस्मिन्नेवतिलिङ्गस्यभवन।
पतान्यपक्षशृष्टिनि नक्षत्राणि जगुलिनाः || 315 ||
पुनर्वतु विशाखा च रोहिणी चोतिराँचन।
साख्र्देशान्यसूर्याहुनक्षत्राणि जितेन्द्रर। || 316 ||
भानि पञ्चदशा स्नातानि तुल्यक्षेत्राणिथिभीतिः
पश्चयो विस्तृत्तः भागाक्षिन्धादर्शिष्य समझाती || 317 ||

[630:-15 = 42 of Abhijit. Multiple of 15 has been adopted to suit the lunar course with muhūrta. Thus 1005 = 67; 3015 = 201 and 2010 = 134 when divided by 15, the total of all being 3660.]

अर्द्धक्षेत्राणां च भानि श्रेष्ठशिष्कम् हृदिति:।
अन्तः: सहस्रं पञ्चाः प्रत्येकं तत्क्षेत्रविविधम् || 318 ||
साख्र्देशाणां सहस्त्राभ्या: पञ्चदशाधिकाः।
तुल्यक्षेत्राणां च भानि द्वे सहस्रे देशाधिके” || 319 ||(pp. 40-41)

Moon covers 134 (of 3660) spaces in a solar day of 30 muhūrtas.

(E) Solar position on equinoctial points in one Yuga of 5 solar years:—

“पञ्चदशाभुतावना रजनी विवशोधि च।
यत्र तुल्यादृशी स्यातं स काढो विषुवं स्वयं || 574
तथोक्तक्षित्तमित्तमश्चित्तमाणि—

“तुल्यनकांद्रिये काढो विषुवं विषुवं च तद।
“तत्त्व श्यामादिवसयो: पञ्चदशाभुतायोः।
प्रदोषकां विजेयं निम्ब्रायपेश्या बुधे।” || 575 ||
‘तत्त्वत्त्वयन्तमक्षेत्रं तत्त्वस्य युगो देश।
याम्यायनस्य पञ्चाजन्येयु स्वयमसि कालिके” || 577 ||

“D” The division of 3660 cannot but go along with 336 days of the year. In the same way, to complete 3660 spaces, 28 constellations are required and hence the constellation Abhijit cannot be left out in this scheme of the calendar.
Solstice points in a Yuga (here expressed in Muhūrta, 3 mūhūrta making one space, 30 mūhūrta making a solar day):--

"आँक्नी: आवेने पश्चायाबृहिय: कुरुते युगे।
पुष्यस्वयं वाहिःपचन्तु सत्यम-तरमण्डलात्॥ ५६८॥
अहंकारस्य वाहिःपचन्तुस्यमहोपात्रतुष्टः॥
पुष्यस्वयं मुख्यवाके: सवे आँक्नी: आवेने सूजेनुे॥ ५६९॥

[4 days + 18 mūhūrta = 46 spaces (of 3660 division) of Puṣya.]

अभयंतरं विश्रां वाहिःपचन्तु कुरुते राविः।
पश्चायाबृहिःपञ्चमितिर्मितमान्नन्दः॥ ५७०॥ (p. 74).

[It refers to the 0 space of Abhijit]

(G) PP. 75-6 (verses 579-591) give lunar position, digits (other works give months too) on the 10 Viśuvas ( = equinoxes) of the Yuga. They are as under:--

I रो०—को० ब० 3  II प००—ब०० ब० 9
III स्वा०—को० ब० 15  IV पुनो—ब०० छ० 6
V उ०धा०—को० छ० 12  VI अज०—ब०० ब० 3
VII सवा—को० ब० 9 VIII अस्वी—ब०० ब० 15
IX उ०सा०—को० छ० 6  X उ०सा०—ब०० छ० 12

"G" The first equinox in the first year of the Yuga occurs when the moon is in Rohiṇī constellation on the (completion of the) Kārttika Vadi 3. Since one solar month consists of 31 complete digits, three solar months (to arrive at the equinox from the solstice point) would require 93 completed digits and hence from the Śrāvaṇa first of its dark fortnight, it will be three digits of Kārttika completed.

(Continued on the next page)
Add 3 circles and 1381 spaces to O A.hhi jit” at Summer solstice = 1st जून। Then add double of it i.e. 6 circles and 2562 spaces for each successive position therefrom.

(H) Solar days of various type of months:

“साल्डॉरंशाद्होरात्रा मासमाने भवेदृ रके।”
कल्युसारण: पुनर्विशादहोरात्रांक: रकुरत्स: II 311 II
एकोविघात्ताचाहारिणयसङ्ग्मयये: II 312 II
द्विषिंड्र्ज्ञाहोरात्रांम्नद्विविशालधातिक्षे: III 313 II
नक्षत्रसागोःहोरात्रा: समविघात्तिरनित्या।
अहोरात्रांवैविध्यार्या सतसिंहं: III 314 II
एकोवियसद्होरात्रांविधविङ्घो शतं क्षता:।
चतुःबैशाशनिविचित्रा चाहोरात्रांस्यापितनिरोऽमिति।” II 314 II (p. 40)

Solar =30½; seasonal =30; Luni-solar =29²3²; Synodical =
27²1⁵; 1 month (of 13 month’s luni-solar year compressed into 12
months) =31½2⁴. 12 months =1 year (p. 40).

(I) The Luni-solar year (12 x 29³2) is short by several days
of a solar year (30½ x 12): hence by every 2½ luni-solar year, a
luni-solar month of 29³2 days is added:

(continued from previous page)

According to the writer of this article, the third act, of the drama Vikramorvâsîya of Kâlidâsa, is a description of such an Equinox with moon in Rohini. See his article on the “Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kâlidâsa.” (to be published.)

Can this be the three lakes that Indra drinks, the “lakes” being the digits of the moon? We read (Mac. p. 56). “For the slaughter of Vîtra he drank three lakes of Soma—V, 29, 7; op. VI, 17, 11.” That would further explain (Mac. ibid.) “and he is even said to have drunk at a single draught thirty lakes of the beverage (VIII, 66, 4).” The thirty lakes would be the thirty digits of a luni-solar month, from one lunation to the other. We can therefore explain the passage—“So essential is Soma to Indra that his mother gave it to him or he drank it on the very day of his birth (III, 48, 23; III, 32, 9-10; VI, 40, 2; VII, 98, 6)” —Mac. p. 56—to mean that (at the commencement of Yuga) the solar year was converted into luni-solar on the first digit which means then the first drink of Indra on the start.

Then the Sautrâmanî ceremony is referred to [X, 119]—Mac. p. 56] to cure Indra of the excessive indulgence in Soma drink. This excess must be then the excess of one or other in the daily value of the spaces of the sun or of the moon over the either. The ceremony goes on over three days which would perhaps point to the completion of three digits of Kârttika month when the Autumnal equinox is fixed up, when the “Jewel” is threaded—perhaps to the centre—when the “Sautrâmanî” is done.
This text ought to hold good for Kautilya II, 20, 38, last ve.

(J) P. 51 gives some of the lunar mansions on full-moon day:

"नक्षत्राणि यथायोगं स्वस्वमासातुसारतः।
भवानि यत्र राकायां कार्तिके कृतिका यथा। 393। तथोकसं
'जिठ्ठी वचचि सुरेण सावणो धिगवहि
अहासु अ मगासिरो रेसा नक्षत्रनामिया माता।'" (p. 51).

Months bear their names from the constellation in which the moon is full e.g. कृत्ति 15 then full moon in कृत्तिका and the month therefrom is styled कृत्तिका. Exception:

| ज्योति १५ | Full moon in मुला constellation. |
| आसि १५ | "", in धनिष्ठा "" |
| मार्गि १५ | "", in अड्रा "" |

"J" The constellations of full-moon nights did form a matter of observation as well as a matter of calculation; hence any variance in the latter can be checked by the former. If the exact length of the year is not exactly 366 days but less by about—say—\( \frac{3}{4} \) (or less) of a day it would mean that the sun will complete 3660 spaces in about 365 \( \frac{1}{4} \) days, the daily course would then be slightly over 10 spaces. That cannot be checked daily, from course of Sun easily in a short time but the opposite point to the sun—the moon on a full-moon night can be checked. If the sun is faster, the moon has to reach more spaces than average 134 for a solar day to complete the full-moon point. Hence, according to unequal or equal spaces, on मार्गसिर्षा full moon the moon covers ordinarily 1475 and 50/62 spaces but the sun being faster, the moon ought to cover about 8 spaces more every month from स्रावणa and thus would put herself to fullness in the constellation अड्रा in मार्गसिर्षा, in पुर्यa in पांशa, in मुलa in ज्येष्ठa and curiously, in सवातi in चात्रa, which last fact is slightly not in consonance with the statement of the text that the full-moon constellations generally synchronise with the names of the months with the only three stated exceptions. It seems therefore that 134 rate is an average one, the actual being more or less varying at different periods of the year, or of the month.

The discussion has another bearing. It is on the stated 366 days of the year which, being too much, would necessarily give rise to the procedure of "Mala Masa"—of dropping of a solar month of some days to harmonize the calendar ( mere reckoning ) with the true course of the sun. The reader should refer to the observations on it in the article.
Vedic Gods

(K) Śaṅku is styled "Puruṣa" hence "Pauruṣi" the shadow:—

"शाङ्कुः पुरुषशःद्वेण स्यादेहः पुरुषस्य वा।
लिङ्गवशा पुरुषात्मात्माहृदीत्यापि सिद्धवतः ॥ ९९२ ॥

(pp. 125-126).

"तथोत्कः नन्दिंचूणोः—"

1st "K" The quotation from the Genesis has very great significance in this connection. As observed in the text of the article, the conception of Manu, Yama, or of Adam—the "ancestor" of the human race—is to be referred to the Gnomon, the Śaṅku of the type of Samrātyantra of the observatories of Jai Sinha. So conception of "woman," of the first Śakti as well is to be referred to the Light which alights on it and on its sides, the left side of the Śaṅku facing the Eastern direction, where sun rises daily. The mid-day Light—"Prabhā" (or Shadow) tends to merge itself into Śaṅku and thus identify with it and with the Pole-star Dhruva and with its regent god Varuṇa. The evening shadow leaves the Śaṅku and as it were, dissolves into the vast stellar expanse of the light at night.

This identity of the woman with Light may have any significance of the accidental or of the natural fact of coincidence. The recognition of the either fact is sure to unravel the basic conceptions which in their turn will explain the developments of various beliefs, laws, and notions handed down to us in popular, secular or sacred literature with reference to woman or to Śakti and sacrifices in her honour (cf. para 81, 85). They will set right any injustice that may have been done unconsciously to either the man or the woman from magnifying the functions of either the Śaṅku or of the Light that gets associated with it—for sometime only as "shadow". We need not here pursue the matter except to point to the extreme significance of the growth of conceptions, with resultant practices.

2nd "K" The identity of Puruṣa with the Śaṅku has another important aspect. The Śaṅku is inclined to the pole-star always, head suppliant to Pole-star (and in which case, the left side would give out shadow cast by the sun in morning) and as such—I suggest—gives rise to the idea of continued devotion of Man to the regent god of the Pole-Star Dhruva—to a conception of Bhakti cult to that supreme deity.

The points of equinoxes then enter into this cult with the regent gods of the constellations at the Vernal and the Autumnal equinox in various ways. The sage Nārada preaching Bhakti is none else than the Svāti-Arcturus-star whose description in the Vikramorvaśīya (V. 19) of Kālidāsa is perfect even in point of time—of the moment of the Autumnal equinox. This is with reference to the Śaṅku and Dhruva, vide article—"The Astronomical Data in the Dramas of Kālidāsa " (to be published).

There is another point of association. The Śaṅku is associated with the Sun for the day time and thus he is a friend and ally of Indra in various battles that he fights—through the measurement of Time, represented in Sanskrit dramas as the hero mounting the chariot of Indra.

(continued on next page)
cf. Genesis II 3. "She shall be called 'Woman' because she was taken out of Man."

(L) Shadow on the solstice days:—

"पौरेण विततिल् चायाय यदि स्याह द्वादशाकु करता

तदा दिनस्य पूर्गीवः मासे मासे ततः पुनः ॥ 1085 ॥

द्वरेष्वार्जुनलुक्तोऽहारिन्भव्य ततः सारी।

मध्याह्ने स्याह तच्छाया खड़मेत्रीव मृत्तः ॥ 1086 ॥

यद्रापौरेण दिनार्जुनकु चायाय पट्तादा हृष्टे ततः ।

एक्कोहिवासि माति चाष्ट्रे नित्तिताकिष्ठि" ॥ 1087(p.p.136-7).

(M) Pp. 102/104, verses 801-818 give the digits (out of 360) that are omitted to adjust the civil luni-solar (354) days.

(continued from previous page)

Thus the "heroes" invariably bear the characteristics of the Śāṅku (where they are not of a stellar type); while the heroines are, the Light that alights and associates with it, in all early myths or religious literature or in classical literature based upon either of them.

3rd "K" On Agastyā:— The northern cardinal point is associated with the pole star whose regent god is Varuṇa. The eastern and western points are associated with Śan whose regent god is Indra. Thus the Śāṅku gets associated with all the cardinal points and their regent gods because the southern cardinal point is associated with Agastya who is (in old times) associated with the changes in seasons and with the Autumnal harvest. It is after rains in India.

Thus the calendar gets involved with considerations of lores that arise out of Varuṇa, Indra and out of Agastya. The first two of the three have been recognised as great gods. The last one is recognised also as a great god but connected with the northern god Varuṇa—as Viṣṇu in Vedic times and later on as an Avatāra, as Krṣṇa, and as Son of the Father in Heaven—as Christ—later on. It is not possible to dwell upon or to enlarge upon this aspect of religion in this paper but we may note that the revivification of earth at the Vernal equinox was associated with the Sun god; and the similar phenomena later at the Autumnal equinox (= harvest) came to be associated with Canopus—Agastya, giving rise to their deification and worship.

"L" This measurement of time (by the shadow the sun casts on the gnomon) makes it, in itself, exclusively a solar measure and a brake or a check upon the luni-solar calendar when discrepancies accumulate. The constellations are not visible at day-time, hence its importance.
"युगस्वामप्रतिपद्धःचतुःपर्व्यतित्रेमात्र ।
ठभतेवस्मारस्त्वमेक्षणेष्थुतमा तिथिः || 806 ||
आविनामप्रतिपद्धः क्रृष्णा सा श्रेयास्यां यज्ञविनयाद ।
तिथिविनित्यं सर्वाधिकप्रतिपद्धविनयमभागना || 807 ||
ज्योतिषकरणंकेन तु-तद्र्प्यमि ओपरतं कायकं सत्समं पक्षं ।
वासिसत्समणंकेष्ठं चौराध्यमा विधीयते" || 808 || इत्युक्तः

(p. 102)

This Prakrit text refers to equation of civil counting (360) to luni-solar counting (354).

"पयं च-आविनं मार्गेशिष्ठं मार्गशीत्रत्थथा परः ।
ज्येष्ठं: आवं च पुनरण्येत्त एव पद्ध । || 811 ||
पुनरण्याविनं मार्गं द्वितीयं: पौष एव च ।
युगायेण्य पश्चाद्वा मासा: सात्मर्च्छकं: " || 812 || etc.

This explains the text of Kautilya in II, 6, 24.

"वर्षाह्मेति मृदिष्ठाणां तृतीयसमं विवर्षोः: पक्षार्कोः: पुराणः:।

THE GREEK ALPHABET

For the Star Maps and for Table - II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α Alpha</td>
<td>i Iota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β Beta</td>
<td>κ Kappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ Gamma</td>
<td>λ Lambda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ Delta</td>
<td>μ Mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε Epsilon</td>
<td>ν Nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ Zeta</td>
<td>ξ Xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η Eta</td>
<td>ο Omicron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ Theta</td>
<td>π Pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ Rho</td>
<td>σ Sigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ Tau</td>
<td>υ Upsilon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ Phi</td>
<td>χ Chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ Psi</td>
<td>ω Omega</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 [ Annals, B. O. R. I. ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Names of Constellations</th>
<th>Spaces according to unequal space system (Jain)</th>
<th>(Non-Jain) acc. to Equal space system</th>
<th>Total of spaces completed. Unequal spaces (Jain)</th>
<th>Equal spaces (non-Jain) completed</th>
<th>Regent God of each constellation (Jain and non-Jain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abhijit</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0 - 42</td>
<td>0 - 42</td>
<td>Brahmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sravana</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>176 - 310</td>
<td>176 - 310</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dhanisṭhā (or Śraviṣṭhā)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>42 - 176</td>
<td>42 - 176</td>
<td>Vasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Śabhishā</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>310 - 377</td>
<td>310 - 444</td>
<td>Varuṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PūrvaBhādrapāda</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>377 - 511</td>
<td>444 - 578</td>
<td>AjaiKapāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UttarāBhādrapāda</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>511 - 712</td>
<td>578 - 712</td>
<td>AhirBuddhṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Revati</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>712 - 846</td>
<td>712 - 846</td>
<td>Pūṣan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aśvini</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>846 - 980</td>
<td>846 - 980</td>
<td>Aśvins (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bharani</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>980 - 1047</td>
<td></td>
<td>980 - 1114</td>
<td>Yama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kṛttikā</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1047 - 1181</td>
<td>1114 - 1248</td>
<td>Agni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rohini</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1181 - 1382</td>
<td>1248 - 1382</td>
<td>Prajāpati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mrgaśīrṣa (or Mrgaśīras)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1382 - 1516</td>
<td>1382 - 1516</td>
<td>Soma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ārdrā</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1516 - 1583</td>
<td>1516 - 1650</td>
<td>Rudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Punrvasu</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1583 - 1784</td>
<td>1650 - 1784</td>
<td>Aditi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pusya</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1784 - 1918</td>
<td>1784 - 1918</td>
<td>Brhaspati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Āślesā</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1918 - 1985</td>
<td>1918 - 2052</td>
<td>Sarpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Maghā</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1985 - 2119</td>
<td>2052 - 2186</td>
<td>Pītṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PurvaPhālguni</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2119 - 2253</td>
<td>2186 - 2320</td>
<td>Bhaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Names of Constellations.</td>
<td>Spaces according to equal space system.</td>
<td>(Non-Jain) acc. to Equal space system (Jain)</td>
<td>Total of spaces completed. Unequal spaces (Jain)</td>
<td>Equal spaces (non-Jain) completed</td>
<td>Regent God of each constellation (Jain and non-Jain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UttarāPhālguṇī</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2253 - 2454 2320 - 2454</td>
<td>Aryāmā</td>
<td>अयमा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hasta</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2454 - 2588 2454 - 2588</td>
<td>Savitṛ</td>
<td>सावित्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Citrā</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2588 - 2722 2588 - 2722</td>
<td>Tvastr</td>
<td>त्वस्त्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Svātī</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2722 - 2789 2722 - 2856</td>
<td>Vāyu</td>
<td>वायु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Viśākhā (or Rādhā)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2789 - 2990 2856 - 2990</td>
<td>Indrāgūn</td>
<td>इन्द्रागुं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Anurādhā</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2990 - 3124 2990 - 3124</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>मित्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jyesthā</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3124 - 3191 3124 - 3258</td>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>इन्द्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mūla</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3191 - 3325 3258 - 3392</td>
<td>Rāksasa</td>
<td>राक्षस</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Purvā Asādhā</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3325 - 3459 3392 - 3526</td>
<td>Āpaḥ</td>
<td>आपः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Uttarā Asādhā</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3459 - 3660 3526 - 3660</td>
<td>Viśve Devāḥ</td>
<td>विश्व देवा</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Then repeat Abhijit etc. etc.]

*Data—* (A) Cycle (Yuga), of 5 solar years, of 1830 solar days, of 1860 Digits (= 1860 Tithis), of 60 solar months, of 62 luni-solar months (= lunations), of 67 synodical (lunar completed circles). Ecliptic divided into 3660 spaces and into 28 constellations.

(B) Solar year of 366 solar days, the sun completing the spaces 3660.

(Continued on next page)
**Table I (contd.)**

(C) Luni-solar year of $354\frac{1}{2}$ days (solar), of 12 luni-solar months each of $29\frac{3}{2}$ solar days or 30 digits. (Its 3rd and 5th year has $383\frac{1}{2}$ days (solar) and 13 months.

(D) Solar day of 30 Muhūrtas.

(E) Starting point:— The Yuga, the first solar year and the first luni-solar year begin early morning, on the first day of the solar and luni-solar month Śrāvana in its dark fortnight, when the sun has completed 46 spaces of the constellation Puṣya, when the moon has completed 6 space of the constellation Abhijit, when the summer solstice begins and when the rainy season starts, the preceding fortnight being the light half of the month Āṣāḍha.

(F) Digit = Tithi is $\frac{61}{62}$ of a solar day, and the moon covers $131\frac{29}{31}$ i.e. $\left(\frac{61 \times 67}{31}\right) = \left(\frac{61 \times 134}{62}\right)$ spaces during one digit or one tithi, while the sun covers $9\frac{5}{6}$ spaces in a tithi. In a luni-solar month, in 30 digits, moon will cover $3955\frac{1}{6}$ spaces (or, 1 circle and $295\frac{1}{3}$ spaces) and sun would cover $295\frac{1}{3}$ spaces. Moon would return to its position—which means it would complete $27\frac{42}{134}$ (solar) days when it would cover 3660 spaces in $27\frac{41}{67}$ digits.

(G) Spaces:— The sun covers 10 spaces each solar day; the moon covers 134 spaces each solar day.

(H) Solstice points:— Sun begins summer solstice in the 47th space of Puṣya, and the winter solstice in the 0 space of Abhijit.

(I) Equinoctial points:— Sun is in the Autumnal equinox at the end of 23rd space of Svāti, and in the Vernal equinox at the end of 69th space of Aśvini.

(J) The sun covers 915 spaces from a solstice point to an equinox point or from an equinox point to the next solstice point. These points repeat five times in a Yuga.
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Table II For actual observations. See star maps.
(See Pillai and Kaye and other books of reference mentioned on pp. 148-49 also p. 161.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No. (names as per Table I)</th>
<th>Color of principal star</th>
<th>Probable no. of Stars</th>
<th>Description as to shape</th>
<th>Modern Astronomic equivalents</th>
<th>Probable YogaTārā or Principal Star</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 अभिजित</td>
<td>Bluish White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Horn or head of a cow.</td>
<td>Alpha, Beta, Gamma of Lyra</td>
<td>A-Lyra (Vega)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 यफ्त</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lake or Balanced suspender.</td>
<td>Alpha, Beta, Gamma of Aquila</td>
<td>A-Aquila (Altair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 चतुर्भुज</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (4?)</td>
<td>Cage of a bird</td>
<td>Alpha, Gamma, Delta, Beta, Epsilon of Delphin</td>
<td>Lambda Aquarius and-XXXX-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 शताब्दी</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (?)</td>
<td>Circle (?)</td>
<td>Alpha, Beta of Pegasus.</td>
<td>Lambda Aquarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 पूर्वाराधारपदत</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Giant Square)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha of Andromeda &amp; Gamma of Pegasus.</td>
<td>Alpha Pegasus (Markab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 उत्तराराधारपदत</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha Andromeda (Alpherat)</td>
<td>Zeta? or Mu? Pisces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 रात्ती</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Helm of a ship</td>
<td>51, 60, 62 Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, 88, Mu, 89 of Pisces, 35, 33, 26, 20, 13, 12 of Cetus; also 44, 75, 77, 80, D of Pisces and 42, 43, 34, 39, 25, 10 etc. of Cetus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 अभिनी</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 or 2</td>
<td>Neck or the head of a horse</td>
<td>Alpha, Beta, Gamma of Aries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No. (names as per Table I)</td>
<td>Color of principal star</td>
<td>Probable no. of Stars</td>
<td>Description as to shape.</td>
<td>Modern Astronomic equivalents.</td>
<td>Probable Yoga Tārā or Principal Star.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 भरणी</td>
<td>Diamond Stars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Measure Bowl Form of a (folded) razor. (Like letter 'ɔ')</td>
<td>35, 39, 41 of Aries. &quot;Pleiades&quot;</td>
<td>35 Aries. Eta Pleiades (Alcyone, ...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 कृतिका</td>
<td>Golden Yellow-red</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A toy-cart (Like &quot;V&quot;)</td>
<td>Alpha, Theta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon of Tauri.</td>
<td>A-Tauri (Aldebaran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 रोहिणी</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drop of Blood</td>
<td>Alpha Orionis</td>
<td>Lambda Orionis (Betelgeuse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 सुम्भीरिणी</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>4 or 2</td>
<td>(Resembling somewhat) a parallelogram.</td>
<td>Alpha, Beta of Gemini and Alpha, Beta of Canis Minoris</td>
<td>B-Geminorum (Pollux) or A-Canis Minoris (Procyon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 आर्क</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>An arrow.</td>
<td>Alpha, 54, Delta of Cancri</td>
<td>D-Cancris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 णुर्विष्कु</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hood of a Serpent</td>
<td>Eta, Sigma, Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, Omega &amp; Theta of Hydra.</td>
<td>Epsilon Hydra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 षुष्ण</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rampart of a fortress (sickle)</td>
<td>Alpha, Eta, Gamma, Zeta, Mu, Epsilon of Leo.</td>
<td>A-Leo (Regulus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 आक्षेस्वरा</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Like a Bedstead</td>
<td>Theta, Delta, of Leo</td>
<td>D-Leonis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 सचा</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>{</td>
<td>Theta, Delta, of Leo</td>
<td>B-Leonis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 पूर्वकाल्याणी</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Palm of hand with five fingers (or an axe)</td>
<td>Delta, Gamma, Epsilon, Alpha, Beta of Corvus.</td>
<td>Gamma Corvus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II (continued from the previous page.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No. (names as per Table I)</th>
<th>Color of principal star.</th>
<th>Probable no. of Stars.</th>
<th>Description as to shape.</th>
<th>Modern Astronomic equivalents.</th>
<th>Probable Yoga Tārā or Principal Star.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 वस्त्रा</td>
<td>Bluewhite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fine Pearl</td>
<td>Alpha Virgo</td>
<td>A-Virgo (Spica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 स्वाति</td>
<td>Bright reddish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coral like</td>
<td>Alpha Böötes</td>
<td>A-Böötes (Arcturus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 विझा</td>
<td>(golden) Yellow</td>
<td>4 (2?)</td>
<td>A wreath</td>
<td>(Alpha, Beta, Gamma and Iota of Libra</td>
<td>Iota of Libra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 अनुराधा</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Streak of water</td>
<td>Upsilon, Beta, Delta, Pi, of Scorpii</td>
<td>D-Scorpii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 जैष्ठा</td>
<td>Like a flower of Coral tree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Earwear 'Kundala'</td>
<td>Sigma, Alpha, Tau of scorpii</td>
<td>A-Scorpii (Antares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 मृझ</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tail of a Lion</td>
<td>Epsilon, Mu1-2, Zeta 1-2, Eta, Theta, Iota 1-2 Kappa, Lambda and Upsilon of Scorpii</td>
<td>Lambda Scorpii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 पृज्ञाहा</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>Like tusk of an Elephant</td>
<td>Gamma1-2, Beta, Epsilon, Delta of Sagittarius</td>
<td>D-Sagittarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 उत्तराधा</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Phi, Zeta, Tau, Sigma of Sagittarius</td>
<td>Phi of Sagittarius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: — Most of the description, colours and the number of stars are from the Jain texts which are at times supplemented from other observations. [See Kaye as also see Pillai (S. K.) "Indian Ephemerides" Vol. X (Introduction); and personal observations. See maps] The Modern equivalents will show very nearly these constellations. The Yogatāra are taken from several sources. They are not in the Jain texts as such.
### Table III

**Dviti**:—(A) The months here are solar months of $30\frac{1}{3}$ (civil) days

(B) Starting point of the first month is on the 1st day of *yuga* of the dark fortnight, of *Śrāvana*, early morning.

(C) See table I, for other data, 10 spaces mean one solar day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solar Month</th>
<th>Constellations. unequal spaces which the sun covers in one solar month (Completed spaces)</th>
<th>Total spaces</th>
<th>Season begins &amp; continues</th>
<th>Sign Stellar</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Summer solstice begins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-Śrāvana</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>305 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>पुष्य                                                                        67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>आष्ट्रीय                                                                       134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मध्य                                                                        16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>पुष्यāफाल्युणि                                                                  16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total                                                                       305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-Bhadrapada</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>610 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prośtha Pada)</td>
<td>पुष्यāफाल्युणि                                                                  187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भाद्रपद (or प्रोश्चपद)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total                                                                       305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-Āśvin</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Autumn.</td>
<td>Virgo.</td>
<td>915 Total</td>
<td>Autuminal equinox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Āsvayujah)</td>
<td>उत्तराफाल्युणि                                                                  134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आश्विन (or आश्वयुज:)</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>स्वाति                                                                       23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total                                                                       305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-Kārttika</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Libra</td>
<td>1220 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कार्तिक</td>
<td>स्वाति                                                                       201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>विशाख्य                                                                       60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total                                                                       305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-Mārgaśīra</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mid-Winter</td>
<td>Scorpio.</td>
<td>1525 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रावण</td>
<td>अनुराधा                                                                       67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मार्गशीर्ष</td>
<td>ज्येष्ठा                                                                       134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मुहुर्ता                                                                         30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मार्गशीर्ष</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total                                                                       305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Table III (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solar Month</th>
<th>Constellations.</th>
<th>Total spaces</th>
<th>Season begins &amp; continues</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI-Pausa</td>
<td>पूर्वपाः</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Mid-Winter</td>
<td>Sagittarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मौष</td>
<td>उत्तरपाः</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Winter Shishir</td>
<td>Capricorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII-Magha</td>
<td>अभिनित</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Aquarius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>माघ</td>
<td>आल्लन</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Shishir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चन्द्र</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vernal Equinox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII-Phalguna</td>
<td>चन्द्र</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vernal</td>
<td>Pisces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मास्त</td>
<td>शालिप्रति</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>बस्त</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चन्द्र</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX-Caitra</td>
<td>उत्तराभास्कर</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Taurus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चेत्र</td>
<td>रेवती</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>ग्रामः</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्मिति</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3355</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gemini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Vaisakha</td>
<td>अम्बिनि</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Then</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वैशाख</td>
<td>निर्मिति</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>राहिणि</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td></td>
<td>The summer Solstice begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI-Jyestha</td>
<td>राहिणि</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jyestha-</td>
<td>निर्मिति</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Rainy etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulya)</td>
<td>आद्या</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्येष्ठ</td>
<td>ग्रामः</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Asadha</td>
<td>अम्बिनि</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अष्ट्र</td>
<td>निर्मिति</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Rainy etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्मिति</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table continues with further columns and constellations, providing a detailed representation of the solar months and their corresponding observations.*
# Table IV: Data as of Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-Sravana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>Summer solstice begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>पुष्यः</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>आसंतेः</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मघा</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-Bhadra Pada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भाग्यपुष्कलपाद (or प्राशंकपुष्कलपाद)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मघा</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>पूववकालपुष्कली</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>उत्तराकालपुष्कली</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-Aśvin. (Aśvayujah)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virgo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or Aśvayujah)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>शत्रु</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आस्विन</td>
<td>उत्तराकालपुष्कली</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>हस्त</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>चिन्त्र</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>स्वाति</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autumnal equinox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-Kārttika.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कार्तिक</td>
<td>स्वाति</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>विशाखा</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अनुराधा</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-Mārgaśiṣṭa. Mānasīṣṭa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scorpio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अनुराधा</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid hemst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ज्येष्ठा</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मुहृद</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI-Paśa. पोष</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sagitarius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मुहृद</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Solstice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>पूववकाली</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>उत्तराकाली</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solar month</th>
<th>Non-Jainsystem Constellations which the sun covers in a solar month</th>
<th>Total spaces</th>
<th>Season begins &amp; continues</th>
<th>Sign Stellar</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII-Māgha</td>
<td>अभिजित श्रवण घनिष्ठा</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Winter शिशिर</td>
<td>Capricorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>माघ</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII-Phālguna</td>
<td>घनिष्ठा शतसिपा पुर्वाभागपद्र उत्तराभागपद्र</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aquarius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फाल्गुन</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX-Caitra.</td>
<td>उत्तराभागपद्र रेवती अश्विनी</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Vernal बसन्त</td>
<td>Pisces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चैत्र</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Vaiśākha.</td>
<td>अश्विनी मच्छी क्रतिका</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Aries.</td>
<td>Equinox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बार्षिक</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| XI-Jyeṣṭha | क्रतिका शेतिणी धुगकर्षि आद्री                                          | 28           | Hot श्रीध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्र�्रध्रধ्रध्रध्र�्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रধ्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्र�्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रধ्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रধ्रध्र�्रध्रध्रध्रধ्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्र�्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्र�्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्रध्र�्रध्रध�
ERRATA: STAR MAPS

Following errors which have crept in the star maps (in transcription for making blocks) need correction by the reader before the maps are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Site-hours</th>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>Correct as in map No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canopus Canopus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashvay Ashvay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sambhavathy Sambhavathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Star Pole Star</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecliptic Ecliptic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vasishth Vasishth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarpari Sarpari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mizar Mizar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corvus Corvus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Böötes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Bava)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arcturus*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4       | Above |        | Hasta | Put as in 3, to the five stars (above)
<p>|         | Dhanabhaga |        | | Dhanabhaga |
|         | the 5 stars |        | | |
|         | Ecliptic |        | Ecliptic | 4 |
|         | Böötes |        | | 7 |
|         | Sarihich |        | | 3 |
|         | Autumnal |        | | 3 |
| 5       | XXIV |        | [Ahirdasa] | 8 |
|         | Dhanabhaga |        | | |
|         | III |        | Put Divine Day | Dives |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map. No.</th>
<th>Site-hours</th>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>Correct as in map No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Jemitorum</td>
<td>Gemitorum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>सर्प</td>
<td>(सर्प)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>आद्वति</td>
<td>आद्वति</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>सचा</td>
<td>सचा</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
<td>(क्षेत्र)</td>
<td>(क्षेत्र)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>बुफेस</td>
<td>बोौटेस</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Corvis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corvus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVII/XVIII—Put *μ before *ν in Milky Way, in tail of Scorpio.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>आप</td>
<td>[आप:]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अमिजित</td>
<td>अमिजित [बाह्या]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>विषु</td>
<td>[विषु]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX/XXI Put *κ Delphin as in Map No. 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>*κ Vega</td>
<td>*κ Lyra</td>
<td>*κ Lyra Vega</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Lyra</td>
<td>*Lyra Vega</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Put a third *γ to 'अव्र' in Milky Way</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Andromeda</td>
<td>Andromeda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>*अभिजीत</td>
<td>*अभिजीत</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 8 star maps (with corrections of errors on pp. 173-4) will be found as follows: Nos. 1-4 p. 133, No. 5-p. 118, No. 6-p. 136, No. 7-p. 126 and No. 8-p. 144. For the Greek alphabet see p. 161.

These maps will help students of Vedic literature and of all other Indian and non-Indian religious or semi-religious literature to visualise the heaven with reference to various hymns and gods. They will bring out vividly the associations of seasons with (stellar) asterisms and their regent gods; their associations with seasons such as the Vernal and Autumn, with the Vernal equinox (maps nos. 8, 5), the Autumnal equinox (maps nos. 6, 7, 3, 4) and the Summer solstice (maps nos. 1, 2, 4, 6); their associations with the happenings in nature and in human life, with several phenomena of rainy season (map no. 6) and with the harvest (map no. 7), the sacrifices and other regulated activities of Autumn (maps nos. 7, 6). The old conceptions will be better understood with these associations.

Maps nos. 5-8 give the 28 Indian Zodiacal constellations and several other stars and star groups. Maps 3-4 give the Saptarṣis, no. 6 the Hydra; map no 3 the Pole Star, nos. 4-6 star Sirius, the Dog, and nos. 4-5 the star Agastya-Canopus-Argo Navis. The regent Gods are stated in brackets [ ] along with the asterisms.

The Hydra, the Vṛtra-Ahi—the international Dragon, the Biblical serpent, the Dānava, the Rākṣasa and the Evil genius in various names and under various imageries in all lores will be seen (map no. 6) with the Vedic 100 "forts"—the Hundred "brothers" of the Mahābhārata and as the Rāvaṇa of the Rāmāyaṇa, spreading itself from the Summer Solstice to the Autumnal equinox, from the asterism Āśleṣā (embracing the Equator) the classical Rāhu, to its terminator the Svāti—with the grouping of Hasta and Citrā asterisms in this connection—and Saptarṣi (map No 3) with Canopus (maps nos. 4, 5). The last one is one of the mighty
forces which suppress this Evil and it is variously represented as Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, as Kārttikeya and Gaṇeṣa, as Heracles, to name a few of the Divinities and heroes figuring out of the grace of this star Canopus–Agastya.

The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute is to be congratulated for extending to the readers the facility of these maps. Without such materials at the disposal of the public, the remarks of Alberuni (para 38) would still persist. The maps do admit of greater precision, refinement, improvements, coloring of some stars and various arrangements to help students for their astronomical studies. They have yet to be supplemented by authentic maps of the latitudes of Ujjain and Kashmir to show the position of heaven at the daily and at the heliacal rising and setting of several stars and star groups. For the present we have to fall back upon individual observations with all their shortcomings.

To convert the stellar value or better, the Light value into the Time value for human cravings and purposes, the Śaṅku—the Gnomon has to be looked to. Maps Nos. 1–2 will show it. For better illustrations see Kaye. More of this will be found in the “Vedic Gods: –V–RudraKālī” in the coming number(s) of the Annals. Rudra as Śaṅku (and Sirius) with the “Kālī” as the Light in its most prime and modern form is pointed out therein. The laws of Manu and of Moses and of Yājñavalkya have grown around this Śaṅku, evolved out of continuity of thoughts and practices around this central figure.
KAVIDARPANAM

[ A Prakrta Treatise on Metres ]

BY

PROF. H. D. VELANKAR, M. A.

पञ्चमोदेशः |

अनोभयचन्द्रः |

विषमे छक्राम समेव वसू। वैयालीयों रोङ्गमां तामां।
अद्भुता छलूर्ण्य निरस्तरा। दु००गच्छं कष्ट न समां पराशुर। || 1 ||
[ विषमे पट्रकथा: समेव वसवः। वैतालीयों रोङ्गमां तामां।
अद्भुता छलूर्ण्य निरस्तरा। दु००गच्छं कष्ट न समां पराशुर। || 1 ||

विषमयोः पाद्याः: प्रफ्रात्रा: सम्यवस्त्री इति मात्राचन्द्रः च। ततो द्वियापिर: रमणो ठुमुँगुर्णारिति वर्णचन्द्रः। इति द्वितालीयसु। अत्रप्राप्तः।
समाक्रिकरकदस्तरकी स्पर्श वर्णम। संस्तता न स्पर्श द्वियापिर: समो भण्व:। पर्यायः छलूर्ण सह गुरुन्स कार्य इति। इति। अत्रोजाक्रिकरकदस्तरका त्रस्तरे अन्योऽत क्वात्रस्ताक्षर्वोऽहास% ग्राम्य% यथा। स्थापना। || साकात्रु पक्ष यथा। स्थापना। || पराश्र्यसनकल्प% साकात्रु हरेर्नस्ताका इति भूम्याभय% युक्तादातात्त्त्रानाणु प्रस्तारे चतुर्बिन्दाजुद्दत्तेच्छेदसाता धोडः। धोडःभोपिण संतवचछांधवच्चयोपनीयी-पक्षे। ततो जाताङ्कयांदशा। तेत्र ग्राम्य% स्थापना। साकात्रु छलूर्ण। ते स्थायः। स्थापना।

ते चित्र रमणसांधिये ये। तमुवचछांदशाः वर्न्ति बुढा। || 2 ||
[ तदेव रमानांतसंस्थिते ये। तदु ओष्ठछण्डारूकं वदल्नि बुढा। || 2 ||

तदेव वैतालीयोऽमाजायोः। स्पर्शयो गुम्बोरस्तरम्। क्षात्रम्। परस्य रमण
स्थाने संस्थिते यमणे ओष्ठछण्डारूकं बुढा बदल्नि। || 2 ||

आपातकाल्या भमणेन। गुम्बुचुडवेण य आंतमैलम्। || 2 ||
[ आपातकाल्या भमणेन। गुम्बुचुडवेण चाँतमैलम्। || 2 ||]
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बेतालीयमेवालिकामुख्ये षडयंत्रकलाभ्यो भगवेन गुरुभाई चापाताळिका।

समयकलाधिकारितांतिमोऽ जइ गुरु उत्तर होइ पत्रिचित। ॥ ४ ॥

समयकलाधिकारितांतिमोऽ यदि गुरुः पुनर्भवचति प्राप्तिका। ॥ ४ ॥

समयप्रभावात्स्फार्मु तिसरणं कलाग्रंथामन्त्रगुरूः पुनःचब्रेष्टिन्योऽः

प्रागवचनेतस्तयात् प्राच्यनुबंधितसामाचारिवाचिका। सा जिथा बेतालीयमेवालिका

औषध्यन्दसापाताळिकाः आपातिकाप्राप्तिका। ॥ ६ ॥

उद्दित्विचया सा पुत्रचुपेः जाहि समेतमुखंतर्परो गुरुः। ॥ ४ ॥

[ कोनणिका सा प्रोचये। यत्र समयोऽ मुखंतर्परो गुरुः। ॥ ४ ॥ ]

यत्रोजाधिकारक्षस्यायात्त्वः परो गुरुः सा प्रोचये उद्दित्वत:।

प्राकृतिका। पृष्ठ प्राप्तिकारिविभा। ॥ ४ ॥

तत्रा दुष्ण पायसंकरी। पुर्वशंदायाणम पवतम्। ॥ ६ ॥

[ तथा हुयोः पादसंकरे। पूर्वशंदमच्छ प्रौतकरम्। ॥ ६ ॥ ]

तथाहृ: पूर्वशंदस्तोः प्राच्छिकोदीविक्षयोपरिवर्षसंकरे। प्रौतकं युजो-रूपान्तरपुयुजोस्तवावलोक्ष्यर्पिज्ञित्यः।

इदमपि प्राप्तिकारिविधा। ॥ ६ ॥

सच्चुमपत्यावरतिया। ॥ ७ ॥

[ सच्चुपत्यावरतिया अपरान्तिका। ॥ ७ ॥ ]

सर्वं बेतालीयोपसङ्कुर्दसापाताळिकामापापाताळिकाभेपन्द्रसं समपादेजिन्ति

अपरान्तिका। ॥ ७ ॥

अयुमजा चारुहासनिणी। ॥ ८ ॥

[ अयुमजा चारुहासनिणी। ॥ ८ ॥ ]

बेतालीयोपसङ्कुर्दसापाताळिकामापापाताळिकानां विषमाधिक्रिया चारुहास हिणी। ॥ ८ ॥

असेसपायसङ्कुर्दपरो। गुरुः जर्म सा दाहिन्णितिया। ॥ ९ ॥

[ असेसपायसङ्कुर्दिदातम्यरो। गुरुर्वम सा दाहिन्णितिका। ॥ ९ ॥ ]

असेसपायसङ्कुर्दपरो। गुरुः जर्म सा दाहिन्णितिका। ॥ ९ ॥

असेसपायसङ्कुर्दिदातम्यरो। गुरुर्वम सा दाहिन्णितिका। ॥ ९ ॥

असेसपायसङ्कुर्दपरो। गुरुः जर्म सा दाहिन्णितिका। ॥ ९ ॥

उद्दित्वचनेतस्तयात्। लिख्ये छेंद्रम्य ल्यम्यम स्वदेवाश्चरी ण भानियः।

तेन सबंपि नेष्य गाहाणेर विषमाधिक्रिया। ॥ १० ॥

[ वाच्यमक्षपरणं ऊनाधिकचरणं वा रूपकम्।]
कविदर्पणम

विविधे च्छन्दसिः असिद्धयदेववादरिहिं भणितसः।
तत्त्वर्मपिशैं गाथानाम विदुरवः॥ १०॥

शहुल्मात्रारुपस्मृतिकादिहिं वा रूपक मात्रार्णेनहयथैः (विविधे
इन्द्रयसिद्धयदेववादस्वेतंतर तत्त्वर्मपि गाथायूँ विदुरपेर्खः॥ १०॥

छन्दसां वर्णुखुसुखसंस्कृतयनन्तः करणमाहः

गुरुकृत्याहि अखिलसंस्करणुक्षिप्याहिः गुरसंकीर्णेहि।

d्रविगणितंगुरुरहिताभिढितः वसुखलकः हि।

[भुक्तविनितत्रसंस्करणुक्षिप्याहिः वर्णुक्षिप्याहिः भुक्तविनित"

d्रविगणितंगुरुरहिताभिढितः वसुखलकः हि।

रूपकस्य वसुध वस्त्रायिते छन्दसाः करणाः संस्कृतयते तत्त्वस्यस्यवेन रूपकः

गुरसः पात्रस्या चेदृणसंस्कृतः। वर्णाश्रेयुक्तहन्ते गुरसंस्कृतः। द्रविगणितः कुतर गुरवोऽ

पात्रनां चेदृणसंस्कृतः स्वातः। यथायासेव गाथायां सत्यां ज्ञानमात्राभ्यः

tदशयुक्तम्यस्य चतौराषिद्वादशः। वर्णात्येऽसामुद्यः गुरवः। द्रविगणितादिभु

त्रिशसांहेयः पातित्रेष्यायोधानिदित्वच इति।

इति काविदर्पणात्त्रती प्रकटसंदेशः॥

पदोद्वः॥

अह पत्थरो नान्दु उदितु प्रमाणंगकरिणाः।

संस्का तहद्वारोऽसदुक्तं छ पञ्जया प्रप॥ १॥

[अथ प्रस्तारो नदमुहिन्दमेकाविद्यम्बकरिणाः।

संस्का तथाच्यायोऽसदुक्तं प्रत्यया पुष्ट॥ १॥]

अधाजनतरं प्रस्तारं (इति) प्रस्तारं जातिव्याविल्पस्याः। नदस्

पत्तामेव्योजोइदुस्तस्य जातिव्याविल्पस्याः। नदस्। उदित्रस्य कारिः भो भेदः।

प्रस्तारेष्विति प्रश्नोपन्यस्तस्य जातिव्याविल्पस्याः। नदस्।

सवेजुनाः सवेजुऽगुरणेमकारिद्विगुरानां च जातिव्याविल्पस्याः। ज्ञानाय करणमेका

दिविद्विगुराकरिः। जातिव्याविल्पस्याः ब्रेद्धमण्यकारणार्णां संस्का। जातिव्याविल्पस्याः

मानसखेम्यः। छन्दसिः प्रदु प्रत्यया। प्रत्यांजननाद्वैते स्युः॥ १॥

तत्र जातिप्रस्तारां—

विश्वामाओ छहयावः समा गुरान्त्व उदाफः य छहाः।

उवारिवुरों पञ्ज्या पुढ़वाबे हुः जातिप्रस्ताराः॥ २॥
BRIEF NOTES

[ Hema. = Hemacandra’s Chandonūsāsana, N. S. P. edition, 1912. ]


मोक्षिकशाम is properly a Sanskrit metre with four lines, according to Hema. p. 7ᵇ/19-20.

II. 8. Com:—कमला ललिता etc. The same are quoted at Hema. p. 27ᵇ/15ff.

II. 9. Com:—एकैव भवति पञ्चया etc. These seem to be reproduced from Hema. p. 28ᵇ/1-3.

II. 20. Com:—द्रिजातिजा: विकल्प: etc. This is quoted from Hema. p. 26ᵃ/8.

II. 22. Com:—for हेला, अधिकासर, मम्मीरी and अराविन्द, cf. Hema. p. 32ᵃ/1; 33ᵃ/8; 32ᵃ/9; 3₂ᵇ/10

Obviously, Hemacandra does not consider these metres to be the 'derivatives' of पद्धिकाः; for the derivatives of लण्ड and मदनावतर, see Hema. p.31ᵇ/18-20 and 33ᵇ/2-14

II. 23. Com:—सत्वां वि जाइं ओ etc; cf. Hema. p. 35ᵇ/1-2.


II. 32. Com:—वचनामिहेणः The stanza is from Svayambhū (IV. 36); but Hema. also quotes it at p. 37ᵇ/4-5.

उत्साहेलाओ and तैलरो both quoted at Hema. p. 38ᵃ/7-8.


राजावलयस्य कृक्कुमेन यथा etc. All examples that follow are obviously reproduced from Hema. p. 34ᵇ/9ff. I have not been able to understand some of them correctly; hence I have not translated them. The variants offered by Hema. are not very helpful. Our readings often seem to be better.

II. 34. Com:—The example of अरिवल is quoted from Hema. p. 37ᵇ/7-8 by the author of Kavidarpana himself.

II. 35. Com:—केदिक्वेमा रू etc. quoted from Hema. p. 34ᵃ/2-3.

II. 37. Com:—उच्चड़तंतस्य etc. quoted from Hema. p. 34ᵇ/14-17.

IV. 40. :—ँखितिरिप्यमयोः, also quoted at Hema. p. 7ᵃ/18.

IV. 103. :—छल्लिसक्षं. This is =Svayambhū I. 140.


IV. 122. Com:—Many of these illustrations are also found in Hemacandra; cf. p. 22ᵃ, 22ᵇ.
Index of the Prākṛta and the Apabhraṃśa metres in the Kavidarpana, Ch. II.

APPENDIX

The following are the definitions of the various metres in Nandīśena's Ajitaśāntistava, given by Jinaprabhasūri in his commentary on it. See Intro., p. 5. According to him they are from Kavidarpana. See last stanza. The verses are also edited by W. Schubring in Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, 1923, p. 182 ff.
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"चौहामणौ श्रीहेमचन्द्रसुरिपादः": सुमो संगमसमपथम तदन्तदुम तोऽ-तचउऽ-त-ततमचलमुभृषो।
चलुटो चचउऽ-चटुंगम ततचातिणा टपगदसय गुरु बेहेदो।
भगितुंयो गुलमुरुणो टमगातिंगम गुलमुरुण य टमगातिंगम।

dुरुरङ्गी अंपथं रासािलुमुयं कंदं॥

"जोऽ तुरुम गुलमुरुणो टलकामुरुणसचलमुभृषो।
पटुमुरुण अचमत दुःसुभुमुट-चउऽ-सुभृषो।
टुमरुणयं टतिंगम दुःसुभृष अबरबेदों चंदं॥

टुमरुणमुरुण पड़ेम टुमरुणमुरुण पण तुरः॥

tुरुये टुमरे सुभुमु रासािलुमुश्यं कंदं॥

"तटतदुमरुणमुरुणमुरुणमुरुणमुरुणमुरुणमुरुण।

tुरुषेम टकतजुऽयं चमगमुरुण चित्ततेहुयं॥

"गुलमुरुणमुरुण चथंवामणो चवावामणो चवावामणो य।

dसचमगणा तह नमणो चमगणो गुरु दुभि नारायो॥

सर्वमुरुणमुरुणमुरुण पचात्र चमगणो ग्रादः।

"सविसमें कधाणः वकं समेसः अड़णः निरंतरे नहू तं।
Ath रमणो यमणो कुमुमलय्यामत्तौऽद्वेय॥

"तमणो टमणो गुलमुरुण पमणो टमणो य दुःसुभृष दुइः।

पविविय पच्छुऽ श्रुऽगपरिरितिणिं चंदं॥

"मरणमुरुणमुरुणमुरुण सच्चवपुरुः तहा। जाई दसमे।

सवांतक्षरज्ञमियं चंदं ख्यािथ्यनं संगम ॥
For the rest, see Peterson’s Report, III, p. 231.
EPIC STUDIES

BY

V. S. SUKTHANKAR

V. NOTES ON MAHĀBHĀRATA COMMENTATORS

§ 1. Chronological Notes.

A necessary complement to a critical study of the Mahābhārata is an intensive study of the commentaries of the Mahābhārata, of which there is quite a large number preserved still, mostly in manuscript form. Among the scholiasts who have written commentaries on the Mahābhārata—either on the whole, or only on selected parts of the Great Epic—are: (1) Anantabhaṭṭa, (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Ānanda, (4) Caturbhujamiśra, (5) Jagadīśa-cakravartin, (6) Devabodha, (7) Niḳakaṇṭha, (8) Mahānanda-pūrṇa, (9) Yajña-Nārāyana, (10) Ratnagarbha, (11) Rāmakīṁkara, (12) Rāmakṛṣṇa, (13) Rāmānuja, (14) Lakṣmaṇa, (15) Vrada, (16) Vādirāja, (17) Vidyāsāgara, (18) Vimalabodha, (19) Śrīkarācārya, (20) Śrīnivāsa, (21) Sarvajña-Nārāyana, and (22) Srṣṭidhara. Very little is at present known about these commentators: only very few of them have been, so far, published. The only collective study made of these commentaries is by Holtzmann in Das Mahābhārata, Vol. 3, pp. 67 ff., and that was in 1897, that is, nearly forty years ago. The material at his disposal was very scanty, and so are his notes.

But the study of these commentaries must be now taken up more seriously, not so much for the sake of the explanations contained in the commentaries—though even the glosses of a commentator like Devabodha are extremely important—as for the readings and pāṭhāntaras recorded in them; because, most of

---

1 For the first instalment of the series, cf. JBBRAS (NS). 4. 157ff.; the following three have appeared in these Annals, Vol. 11, pp. 165-191, 259-283; Vol. 16, pp. 90-114.—The substance of the present study (No. V.) was communicated to the International Congress of Orientalists at Leyden in 1931.
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the commentaries are older—some very much older—than our manuscripts; and therefore the documentation of these readings by the commentators takes us back a stage further in our investigation of the history of the epic.

The usefulness of these commentaries is, however, considerably diminished by the fact that we know next to nothing about these commentators themselves. In particular, we lack information about their dates, which are not easy to fix in Indian literature. Even if the dates cannot be determined, it would be a great help if we could fix their relative chronology. An attempt is made in the following pages to fix, to start with, the relative chronology of some of the more important Mahābhārata commentators.

A fixed point in the exegetical literature centering round the Mbh. is furnished by Nīlakanṭha, who until lately was considered, at least in India, as the most trustworthy guide for the exposition of the Great Epic, and about whose date there is not much doubt. The available personal data about him has been put together by Wilhelm Printz in the biographical note on Nīlakanṭha appended to his Berlin dissertation entitled Bhāṣā-wörter in Nīlakanṭha’s Bhāratabhāvadīpa und in anderen Sanskrit-kommentaren.1 Nīlakanṭha, according to his own statements, was a Mahārāṣṭra Brahmin of the Gautama Gotra, with the surname Caturdhara (modern Chaudhari), eldest son of Govinda Sūri and Phullāmbikā, residing at Kūrparagrāma (modern Kopargaon) on the Godāvari. Nīlakanṭha wrote his commentary on the Mbh. and on the Gaṇeśagītā (a section of the Gaṇeśapurāṇa) in Benares, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century,2 the latter (Gaṇeśagītā) being composed in A. D. 1694.3

In the beginning of his commentary on the Mbh., Nīlakanṭha tells us that before writing his commentary, the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, he had compared many (bahūn) copies of the Mbh., collect-

2 He was apparently a protégé of Anūpasiśāha, who was a contemporary of Shah Jahan.
3 The year of composition is given as Samvat 1750. The name of the commentary is Gaṇapatibhāvadīpikā. Cf. the name of his Mbh. commentary, Bhāratabhāvadīpa; see next note.
ed together from different parts of India (vibhinnadesyān) in order to ascertain the correct reading (paṭham agryam) and also consulted older commentaries. We accordingly find that he frequently mentions variant readings and “additional” passages found in the versions consulted by him, and he cites the explanations given by older scholiasts: information, scanty though it be, of immense interest and value for the history of the received text.

(i) Devabodha and Sarvajña–Nārāyaṇa.

In marked contrast to Nilakanṭha stands Devabodha, whom I regard as probably the oldest and therefore the most important commentator of the MBh. He is extremely reticent about himself and his predecessors, but is cited or mentioned by several commentators, who must therefore have lived after him. One of such successors of Devabodha was Sarvajña–Nārāyaṇa. Sarvajña’s Bharatārthaprakāśa has fortunately been preserved, though it is not definitely known whether his commentary on all the eighteen parvans of the MBh. is now available. His commentary on the Virata and the Udyoga has already been published by Mahadeva Shastri Bakre. The Bombay Government MSS. Collection (No. 180 of 1891–95) contains a fragment of his commentary on the Ādi, comprising merely the first adhyāya with the beginning of the second; while the Madras Government Collection (No. 2169) contains another fragment which lacks the beginning. In the colophon of the latter MS., Sarvajña is styled paramahamsa–parivrājakācārya; he was therefore a samnyāsin.

Now Sarvajña explicitly refers to Devabodha in the beginning of his commentary on the Udyoga:

उदयोगकारण वायुपदनाितिववधिय: ।
पिबल्कुः ज्ञानद्वारवृक्षानान्तरकमहार्णवस् ॥

1 ब्रह्मसमाहित्य सिद्धांताकारणवृक्षानान्तिववधित्य च पाठमयम् ।
पाचाः पुराणानुसार वायुपदनाितिववधित्य भारतभावदीयः ॥

2 Cf. my Ādiparvan (Poona 1933), Prolegomena, pp. Lxvff.

3 The Virataparvan was published in 1915, and the Udyogaparvan in 1920, by the Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay.

4 Read निवन्तजान° ?
This stanza is curiously enough not found in the commentary of Sarvajña as printed in the Gujarāṭi Press edition of the Udyoga, but occurs in both the MSS. of the work in the Bombay Government Collection (deposited at the Institute), bearing Nos. 33 of A 1879–80 and 168 of 1884–87 respectively. The priority of Devabodha is, however, independently established by another direct reference to Devabodha in the body of the published commentary itself, to which my attention was recently drawn by my friend and colleague Professor Sushil Kumar De of Dacca University, who is editing the Udyoga for the Institute. In Sarvajña’s comment on B. 5. 96. 41 (on p. 327 of the Gujarāṭi Printing Press edition), we find:

\[
\text{देववोधपादाल्लु} \\
\text{कामकौधी लोभमोहि मद्मानो तथेव च} \\
\text{मात्सयाइंकुली चैव कर्मान्ते उदाहरत:} \\
\text{इति। केवलः काकश्रीकः पुष्पिरे}...
\]

This quotation can unfortunately not be verified; for in the very old Bengal Asiatic Society’s palm-leaf MS. (No. 3399) of the unpublished commentary on the Udyoga by Devabodha the corresponding folio is missing! But there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

This establishes Devabodha’s priority to Sarvajña. We therefore get

**Series 1: Devabodha—Sarvajña**

Now this Sarvajña–Nārāyaṇa must be identical—as has indeed been assumed by Jolly, Bühler, Holtzmann, and others—with the Sarvajña–Nārāyaṇa (also called Nārāyaṇa–Sarvajña), the author of the Manvarthavṛtti or Manvarthanabandha, a

---

1 This important passage was verified by me in a MS. of Sarvajña’s commentary deposited at the Institute, namely, Bombay Government Collection No. 33 of A 1879–80 (fol. 194). .


well-known commentary on the Manusmṛti, published by V. N. Mandlik. The assumed identity of the two commentators at present rests, it is true, merely on the identity of the names, but can scarcely be regarded on that account as doubtful. It is hardly conceivable that there were two different Sarvajña-NDARAYANAS, both commentators of well-known works on Dharmaśāstra like the Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛti.

The date of Sarvajña has been fixed on the basis of certain quotations. Bühler cautiously remarks that Sarvajña-NDARAYANA "cannot have written later than in the last half of the fourteenth century," but the recent researches of Kane tend to show that Sarvajña flourished between A. D. 1100 and 1300.

(ii) Arjunamiśra.

Both Devabodha and Sarvajña are mentioned and cited several times by the Bengali commentator Arjunamiśra, the manner in which Arjunamiśra refers to Devabodha suggesting that in his time Devabodha's commentary possessed an established reputation. These references are as follows:

(a) In the foreword to his scholium (Bombay Govt. Coll. No. 30 of A 1879–80 = Da of the Critical Edition), Arjuna pays homage to his predecessors, citing by name several of them. Devabodha, he mentions with special reverence, whose commentary (among others) he had carefully studied before writing his own commentary on the Mbh.:


1. Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra, Bombay 1886.
5. See also my paper on Arjunamiśra in the Sir J. J. Modi Commemoration Volume, p. 565.
and Sarvajña have been recited in the correct order of precedence and chronology, a point to which we shall return in the sequel.

(b) Arjuna mentions the Acāryas again in the list of his (immediate and remote) “Gurus”, placing this time Devabodha at the head of the list, which ends with the name of his father, who (as we know from other sources) was a well-known reciter (pāṭhaka)\(^1\) of the Mbh.:

अदिविधोधविश्वास्यांभोजनमाण्डल्यामपवित्र।
नारायणां संवर्त: पिता च श्रव्यो सम।

(c) In the short introduction which prefaces his commentary on the Virātā,\(^2\) Arjuna twice mentions Devabodha, once to give expression to the high esteem in which Arjuna holds him and again to record his gratefulness to his illustrious predecessor:

वेदवाससहस्रास्मोजनगलितं वाडास्यात्मृतम।
संभोजयति भुवनं देववीर्यं भजामहे॥

... ... ... ... ... ...

अदिविधोधवादादितातोपदेशांतिविना।
क्रियते दृष्टामुखेण विराटपर्वांगिका॥

(d) Finally, while commenting on 1. 143. 34 (a difficult stanza, giving a fanciful derivation of the name Ghaṭotkaca), Arjuna mentions two readings, which had both won the approval of Devabodha:

श्लोकाबद्वम् देववीरशर्मिनि (sic) समतम।

These two readings are in fact mentioned by Devabodha: vide fol. 37\(^b\) of the Baroda MS. of Devabodha’s commentary on the Ādi. The above extracts taken together indisputably prove that Arjunamiśra was posterior to both Devabodha and Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa. Adding the name of Arjunamiśra to Series 1, we get

Series 2: Devabodha-Sarvajña-Arjunamiśra.

Some faint light on the question of the age of Arjunamiśra is thrown by a dated MS. of Arjuna’s commentary listed by the late MM. Haraprasada Sāstrī in his Notices of Sanskrit MSS., Second

---

\(^1\) See my “Arjunamiśra,” p. 566.


\(^3\) Read देववीरपार्श्वानि समायतः?

---
Epic Studies (V) Series, Vol. I (Calcutta 1900), p. 298 (MS. No. 295). The late Mahamahopadhyaya reported that it was a carefully written palm-leaf MS. of Arjuna’s commentary on the Mokṣadharma, called Mokṣadharmanṛṭhadīpikā, written in archaic Bengali characters and belonging, apparently, to Babu Saradaprasanna Ghose of Kelomal, Tamluk. The MS. gave the date of writing as Śaka 1456 (ca. A.D. 1534.)¹

I may here draw attention to some stanzas added by the copyist, which are to the effect that already at the time when the copy was made, correct MSS. of Arjuna’s commentary were a rarity even in Bengal, the home of the commentator, which can only be explained by assuming, as pointed out already by Mahadeva Shastri Bakre that there was a considerable interval of time between the two. The stanzas I am referring to are:

{quote p. 298}

The date Śaka 1456 (ca. A.D. 1534) is then the lower limit of the age of Arjuna, but the date of Arjuna, if we rely on the information vouchsafed by the copyist, must be long prior to A.D. 1534.

(iii) Nilakanṭha.

We return to Nilakanṭha, who is the next great Mbh. commentator, and who cites or mentions Devabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa and Arjunamisra, not indeed in the introduction to his commentary on the Mbh., where he mentions a number of his “Gurus”, but elsewhere in the course of his well-known scholiast. Here are the references.

(a) While commenting on 1. 158. 14, a stanza with numerous variants, Nilakanṭha cites an old variant of the entire stanza, mentioning Devabodha in that connection.

{quote p. 298}

It is worthy of note that Nilakantha regards the variant as ancient, owing to its having been explained by “Devabodha and others”. He must therefore consider Devabodha as an ancient authority.

What Nilakantha regards as ancient is of course a matter for speculation. Nevertheless I do not think that Nilakantha would have used the word prācīna in connection with Devabodha unless the interval between them was at least three or four centuries.

In passing it may be mentioned that this reference to Devabodha by Nilakantha is yet another instance of the practice of mentioning names of Ācāryas honoris causa (pujārtham), because the reading cited by Nilakantha is probably not that of Devabodha at all, who to judge by the lemmata in his commentary must have had before him a stanza differing from the corresponding stanza of the Critical Edition, merely in reading śakunāḥ for kunapāḥ of the Critical Edition (1.158.14). The third pāda of the stanza as cited by Nilakantha is certainly the reading of the T G version, found otherwise only in three conflated N MSS., and in a fourth one written in the margin; while the last pāda was found by me only in four MSS. (K2 B3 M3.5) of my critical apparatus, one of them (B3) having as a matter of fact the reading of our text in the margin! It is therefore most improbable that Devabodha had commented on the particular variant version cited by Nilakantha, and it is really doubtful to me whether Nilakantha had at all Devabodha’s commentary before him. Devabodha is referred to by Nilakantha merely as one of the ancient Ācāryas.

(b) While commenting on B. 7. 82. 2, Nilakantha notices a variant interpretation of madhuparkika given by Devabodha:

madhuparkika: madhuparkika samaye patnīta iti devaboddha:

(c) Nilakantha’s reference to Sarvajña will be found in his comment on B. 5. 40. 10 (Gujarati Printing Press ed., p. 131):

---

1 This passage was already cited by me in the Critical Edition of the Adiparvan, p. 666.
and again in the same adhyāya, a few stanzas further on (B. 5. 40. 26), we find:

A reference to Sarvajña’s commentary printed in the same work (p. 131 f.) will show that all these explanations do as a matter of fact occur in the commentary of Sarvajña, while they are not met with in any of the three other commentaries printed there.

(d) For Nilakantha’s mention of Arjunamīśra, I may draw attention to Nilakantha’s comment on B. 3. 291. 70, a stanza at the end of the Rāmopākhyāna, where he mentions various explanations of the word jārūthya, among them the one given by Arjunamīśra, whom he mentions by name:

These various extracts establish the posteriority of Nilakantha to Devabodha, Sarvajña—Nārāyaṇa and Arjunamīśra. Adding Nilakantha to Series 2, we get

Series 3: Devabodha—Sarvajña—Arjunamīśra—Nilakantha.

It will be remembered that as each member of this series of four names clearly cites one or more of his predecessors, this is a chronological sequence whose correctness is absolutely incontrovertible.

(iv) Vimalabodha.

There is moreover a subsidiary series connected with a Mbh. commentator called Vimalabodha,1 to which we shall now turn our attention.

It will be recalled that in the excerpts given above from the commentary of Arjunamīśra, the commentator twice mentions Vimalabodha in close proximity to Devabodha. Therefore it is evident that Arjunamīśra is posterior to Vimalabodha, whose commentary (ṭīkā) variously known as Durghatārthāprakāśinī

1 See Holtzmann, op. cit. vol. 3 p. 72.
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or Viṣamaśloki has fortunately been preserved. In the introduction to this unpublished commentary, a copy of which is to be found in the Bombay Government Collection (No. 84 of 1869-0), while speaking of his predecessors, Vimalabodha says (fol. 1):

निःप्रभुभाष्यायनिगमनित्याहि विशेषतः ।
वैशिष्ट्यात्तत्त्वाद्विस्मिस्मिर्तियति ।

वीक्ष्य व्यास्याविशिष्टमायुर्यायिनिनी ॥

Again while giving the etymologies of the name of the Sūta, Loma (or Roma) harsana, Vimalabodha observes (fol. 2):

पञ्चयतं मुनिनां अतिविस्मयमुप्यादितवावान हति लोमहर्षणामास्मादिति वैमालबोधा आहं ।

Undoubtedly the Devasvāmin mentioned in the first excerpt is the same as the Devabodha (who in the colophons of his commentary is styled paramahāmśa-parivrājakācārya) in the second. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the etymology of Loma (or Roma) harsana mentioned by Vimalabodha is actually to be found in Devabodha's scholium. In the Baroda MS. (11372) of the unpublished commentary of Devabodha, we read (fol. 3 h, line 1 f.):

पञ्चयतं इत्यादिनामालोकमयात सामाधृत्यादितिवादितिति तैमहर्षणानामायत ॥

which substantially agrees with the excerpt in the commentary of Vimalabodha.

Since Arjunamiśra mentions Vimalabodha, and Vimalabodha cites Devabodha, we get a subsidiary series, namely,

Series 4: Devabodha-Vimalabodha-Arjunamiśra.

Thus far we have been treading on solid ground and the correctness of Series 1-4 is, as far as I can judge, absolutely unimpeachable.

In trying to combine Series 3 and 4, however, there arises the difficulty that no cross reference has hitherto been found in the works of Vimalabodha on the one hand and Sarvajña-Nārāyana on the other. Their relative chronological position is, therefore, a matter for speculation. It is possible, however, to combine the two series tentatively, on the equivocal testimony of Arjunamiśra, which we shall proceed to examine more closely.
In one of the lists of the Ācāryas cited by Arjunamiśra, we have the sequence: Veda-Vyāsa, Vaiśampāyana, Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa, Śāndilya Mādhava. Here the first two pairs, as was pointed out above, have been named in the correct chronological order, the earlier author being placed first, in conformity with the rule governing the sequence of the members of a Dvandva compound (P. 2.2.34 Vā.) Devabodha is, as we have seen, prior to Vimalabodha as surely as Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Great Epic, is prior to Vaiśampāyana. Further in both lists the father of Arjunamiśra is mentioned last. These facts suggest the surmise that the whole series is arranged in the strict chronological sequence. If this surmise be correct, then Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa would be posterior to Vimalabodha, and we get, tentatively, the sequence: Vimalabodha-Sarvajña.

It may, however, be noted that such names are often found arranged on the diametrically opposite principle of uttarottara-gāriyastra, i.e., naming the more important persons later, which is however not admissible in the particular instance; or even arranged on no principle at all; or at least on some principle which it is difficult for us to comprehend. In fact a subsequent enumeration of these same Ācāryas by the same Arjunamiśra is in partial conflict with the earlier list! There the sequence (already given above) is Devabodha, Vimalabodha, Śāndilya Mādhava, Nārāyaṇa-Sarvajña. Here Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa has been placed after Śāndilya Mādhava, while in the former list he is placed before them! This irregularity apart, the lists tally with each other.

It is not, however, impossible to resolve this contradiction and harmonize the data. There is a notable difference between the two lists. The first one is in prose, the second is an anustubh stanza. I am disposed to attach more importance to the sequence of the prose enumeration, and to regard the change of sequence in the other as due to the exigencies of metre. The first again is a formal expression of homage (namaskriyā), where the principle of priority has been, it seems, rigidly observed; on the other hand, the second is merely a collective metrical list of the author's "Gurus," where the consideration of rank and precedence did
not perhaps prevail so much. I may also point out that the first list is in the form of a Dvandva compound, while in the second the persons have been all independently mentioned. If these considerations have any value, then we may postulate, at least tentatively, another series,

Series 6: Devabodha—Vimalabodha—
Sarvajña—Arjuna—Nilakantha,

where the relative position of Vimalabodha and Sarvajña alone is open to doubt.

Of these five commentators, as was mentioned above, Sarvajña could not have lived later than the latter half of the fourteenth century and flourished probably between A. D. 1100 and 1300; while Arjunamiśra lived some time prior to A. D. 1534. Moreover, if the position assigned in Series 5 to Sarvajña be correct, then both Devabodha and Vimalabodha must have lived long prior to A. D. 1300.  

* * *

§ 2. What was Devabodha’s version of the Mahābhārata like?

The only commentary of the Mahābhārata completely printed so far is the Bharatabhavadipa by Nilakantha. The Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay has done, however, inestimable service to the cause of Mahābhārata studies by publishing other commentaries at least on the Virāta and Udyoga, edited by Mahadeva Shastri.

1 Since the above was written, two efforts have been made to fix the date of Arjunamiśra. Mr. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh (Indian Culture, Vol. I, p. 706 ff.), working on the data supplied by certain ancient pedigrees preserved in Bengal, arrives at the date ca. A. D. 1300 for Arjunamiśra; but it may be pointed out that the method of fixing precise dates on the basis of pedigrees alone never gives entirely reliable results. On the other hand, Mr. P. K. Gode of the Bhandarkar Institute (Indian Culture, Vol. 2, p. 141 ff.), relying on his identification of the Satya-Khāṇa, who was a patron of Arjunamiśra (see Sir J. J. Modi Commemoration Volume, p. 566), argues for a date between A. D. 1450 and A. D. 1500. There is thus a difference of about 200 years between the two computations. But the matter is still sub judice, and more light on the question may be expected from further investigation of the question which is being carried on by these two scholars.

2 See further the Appendix at the end of this paper (below, p. 202).
Bakre. The Virāṭaparvan Volume (published in 1915) contains, besides (1) the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, the commentaries of (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Caturbhujā, (4) Vimalabhodha, (5) Rāmakṛṣṇa, (6) Sarvajñā–Nārayāṇa and (7) Vādirāja, as also a commentary called (8) the Viṣamapadavivarana of unknown authorship. The Udyogaparvan Volume (published in 1920) includes, on the other hand, besides (1) the Bhāratabhāvadīpa, the commentaries of (2) Arjunamiśra, (3) Vimalabhodha, (4) Sarvajñā–Nārayāṇa and (5) Vādirāja.¹ A commentary more important than any of these and one more neglected still is the Jānādipikā of Devabodha. Until recently nothing was in fact known about Devabodha or his commentary on the Mahābhārata save what is contained in perfunctory notices of Sankrit MSS., which has been summarized in Holtzmann's meritorious work Das Mahābhārata (Vol. 3, section 14, para 3, p. 70 f.). A selection of Devabodha's readings and glosses was for the first time published by me in the critical notes of the Ādiparvan Volume.²

I have shown in the previous section that Devabodha is indubitably earlier than Nilakanṭha, Arjunamiśra, Sarvajñā–Nārayāṇa or even Vimalabhodha, and is therefore in all probability the earliest commentator of the Mahābhārata hitherto known. It is therefore needless to add that the commentary is most valuable and its evidence, both positive and negative, of supreme importance for the constitution of the text.

The MS. of the commentary (which is unaccompanied by the epic text) utilized by me for the Adi belongs to the Baroda Central Library (Sanskrit Section) and was kindly placed at my disposal by Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya, Director of the Oriental Institute of Baroda, to whom my sincere thanks are due for the kind loan.³ This paper MS. which bears the identification No. 11372, contains the commentary on Adi only and is written in

---

¹ Vādirāja's commentary on the Sabhā has been published by Prof. P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri as an Appendix to his edition of the Sabhā according to the Southern recension (Madras 1932). For Vādirāja's date see further below (pp. 203–210) the note on the subject by Mr. P. K. Gode.
² See also my Prolegomena, p. LXX.
³ There is another MS. of the commentary in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, which was also consulted by me.
Devarāgāri characters of about the seventeenth century. The bulk of the MS. is in a fair state of preservation, though in many places the text is extremely corrupt. In our MS. the name of the commentary is given as Jñānādīpikā; but, according to Holtzmann (cp. cit. Vol. 3, p. 71), it is also known as Mahābhārata-tātparyaṭīkā or tātparyādīpikā. MSS. of this commentary are rare, and no complete copy has yet been found.

In the colophon the author is described as paramahamsa-privrājaka. He must therefore have belonged to an order of Sannyāsins. The name of his Guru is given as Satyabodha. This is all the personal data we have at present about Devabodha.

The Jñānādīpikā is a concise tīkā, that is, a running commentary paraphrasing the difficult words of the epic text and occasionally explaining the gist or purport (tātparya) of the original. The extent of the text of the commentary on the Ādi is given at the end of our MS. as 1400 granthas.

The homage which Arjuna pays to Devabodha in the Introduction to his scholium is by no means a matter of mere form. Arjuna appears to have made a very close study indeed of the scholium of Devabodha, and based his own commentary, on the Ādi at least, largely on that of his predecessor. He has copied very large portions of Devabodha’s commentary, sometimes verbatim, sometimes in extracts. Moreover, even when the commentators differ, the influence of Devabodha is plainly discernible. In fact, Arjuna’s Arthatīkā may be considered, as I have remarked elsewhere, as a revised and enlarged edition of Devabodha’s Jñānādīpikā. Unlike the commentary of Nīlakanṭha, that of Devabodha is unaccompanied by the epic text. The question, therefore, naturally arises what was Devabodha's text like?

When we read the commentary along with any of the old printed editions of the Mahābhārata, like the Calcutta or the Bombay or the Kumbhakonam editions, we are at once struck by the singular disparity between the text and the commentary. Not only does Devabodha’s commentary contain many words or expressions which do not occur at all in the Vulgate, but it also cites, at times, verses or stanzas which read differently in the

1 Ādiparvan, Prolegomena, p. LXX.
Vulgate. One also comes across passages and even adhyāyas of the Vulgate on which one expects some comment but which are left wholly uncommented by Devabodha.

The Southern recension may be categorically ignored in our search for the prototype of Devabodha’s commentary, as this commentator does not know even a single one of the many passages peculiar to the Southern recension. He further does not show the typical Southern transposition of the Śakuntalā and Yayāti episodes, nor the characteristic position of the prose genealogical adhyāya (called Pūruvaṁśānukirtana), after the chapter containing the eulogy of the epic (Bhārataprasāmsā).

The vulgate (with the Bengali) may likewise be excluded. It agrees with Devabodha’s text up to a certain point; but the divergences, which are numerous, remain inexplicable. There remain then only the Śāradā and the “K” versions. And with them, the version of Devabodha does, as a matter of fact, show very close affinity.

It is worthy of note that Devabodha has no commentary on any of the six adhyāyas of the Vulgate which are completely missing in the Śāradā and the K MSS. and which have also been completely omitted in the Critical Edition of the Ādi. They are the following adhyāyas of the Vulgate: (i) adhy. 22 (duplicate description of the ocean); (ii) adhy. 24 (Aruṇa is appointed charioteer of the Sun, an evident digression and interpolation); (iii) adhy. 116 (birth of Duḥśalā: a fairy tale of questionable authenticity); (iv) adhy. 139 (an absurd chapter describing further exploits of the Pāṇḍavas and containing a reference to Yavana kings); (v) adhy. 140 (Kaṇikaniti); and finally, (vi) adhy. 149 (Pāṇḍavas’ crossing of the Ganges, a passage of doubtful value).

But, on principle, we cannot attach very great importance to such omissions, as a commentator is apt to skip in the Mahābhārata any adhyāya which he thinks too simple to need any comment. This explanation will apply to most of the omissions mentioned above, but will not hold good in the case of the Kaṇikaniti, an adhy. of 140 stanzas, which has evoked lengthy comments from both Arjunamīśra and Nilkanṭha; we expect some comment on this adhyāya by a commentator like Devabodha.
Much more important from our point of view is an addition characteristic of the Kaśmirī version. This version adds at the very end of the Ādi a supplementary (and entirely superfluous) adhyāya, which contains merely a variant version of the well-known Puranic tale of Śvetaki’s sacrifice, occurring earlier in the course of this very parvan, and which was known to Kṣemendra. Curiously enough the king who is called Śvetaki in the first version is here called Śvetaketu! That the version of Devabodha contained this interpolated (supplementary) adhyāya is proved by the concluding remark of Devabodha on this adhyāya (fol. 48):

श्रेष्ठकिरेष्वि श्रेष्ठकेरतिरति नाम

This remark, as I have pointed out elsewhere, will not apply to any version which did not have the supplementary adhyāya containing the story of Śvetaketu, which in fact is peculiar to the Śāradā and the K versions. These facts demonstrate that the version of Devabodha agrees with the Śāradā and K versions with respect to both addition and omission of whole adhyāyas.

The conclusion regarding the affinity between the two versions is fortified by many minor agreements in point of shorter passages and even readings of individual stanzas.

For example, Devabodha has no comment on any portion of the Brahmā-Ganēśa episode (40 stanzas in the Vulgate), which is missing in its entirely only in the Kaśmirī and the Bengali versions. Again, for 1.105.4-7 of the Critical Edition the Vulgate substitutes a lengthy passage of 56 lines, which is entirely ignored in the commentary of Devabodha, who on the other hand cites 7\(^{ab}\) (a line not known to the Vulgate), in exact agreement with the Śāradā and K versions (besides the Southern recension), but in direct opposition to the Bengali and the Devanāgarī versions. In connection with the omission of adhy. 139-140 of the Vulgate mentioned above, the Śāradā and K versions omit the first 19 stanzas of the following adhyāya (namely, adhy. 141 of the Vulgate). In conformity with that, the first 19 stanzas of adhy. 141 are ignored completely in the scholium of Devabodha. It may be noted that the omission of adhy. 139-140 together with the first 19 stanzas of adhy. 141 of the Vulgate
makes an aggregate and continuous omission of 139 (=27 + 93 + 19) stanzas of the Vulgate, a not inconsiderable portion of the text. Likewise there is no commentary on nearly 70 stanzas of adhy. 128 and 129 of the Vulgate, which are omitted only in the Śāradā–K group and the Critical Edition.

This affinity is further borne out by agreements as regards minor readings too numerous to mention.

These considerations make it, in my opinion, perfectly clear that the version of Devabodha is closely allied to the Śāradā and the K versions.

Though the Śāradā version and what I have called the "K" version run for the most part parallel to each other, there are in fact minor discrepancies between the MSS. of these versions, which indicate different sources. But as, on the one hand, we have for the Ādi a solitary MS. (Śt.) of the genuine Śāradā (or Kaśmiri) version, and on the other hand we do not know the provenance of the Devanāgarī MSS. which I have denoted by the symbol "K" (on account of their affinity to the version of Kaśmir), it is at this stage not easy to explain these discrepancies between Śāradā and K. It would be also premature to say whether Devabodha's version was more akin to Śāradā or the K version.

I may, however, draw attention to one instance which suggests to my mind an affinity with K rather than with the Śāradā version. In I. 68. 72 the text reading is asatyavacana nāryah (nom. plu.), "women (are) perfidious," a general statement. Only K1.2 B1 (m as in text) have, on the other hand, asatyavacane nīrye (voc. sing.), "O thou perfidious (and) dishonourable (woman)!

Ko. 4 appear to have corrupt forms of the same. The vocative appears to be, therefore, peculiar to the K version, which differs here from the Śāradā, and which latter has the nom. plu. as in all other MSS. Now in agreement with K, Devabodha has anīrye=vakre! One instance of an agreement like this is, I will readily admit, wholly inadequate to prove the point. It can only give an indication and may perchance give wrong indication. The question may, therefore, be left over for future investigation.
APPENDIX.

List of five major Mahābhārata commentators arranged according to the probable chronological sequence, with the names of their commentaries, approximate date, and sundry data about them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Devabodha</td>
<td>Jñānadipikā, Mbh.-tātparyatīkā, Tātparyadipikā</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samnyāsin; pupil of Satyabodha, mentioned or cited by Vimala, Arj., Nīl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vimalabodha</td>
<td>Viṣamaśloka-tīkā, Durghatārthaprabhāśini, Durbodhapadabhañjini</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions Vaśam-pāyana's Tīkā and cites Devabodha (once as 'svāmin').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sarvajña Narāyaṇa</td>
<td>Bhāratārthaprabhāsa</td>
<td>Ante 1300</td>
<td>Mentions Dev. and is cited by Arj. and Nīl., as also by a lexicographer Rāyamukuti. (A.D. 1431).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For Arjunamiśra's date, see also Mr. J. C. Ghosh's recent paper in *Indian Culture*, vol. 2 (1936), pp. 585 ff.
Prof. P. P. S. SASTRI, AND
THE DATE OF VĀDIRĀJATĪRTHA
BY
P. K. GODE, M. A.

Prof. P. P. S. Sastri, in his Introduction to Vol. III. (Sabha-parvan) of the Southern Recension of the Mahābhārata, p. xi, makes the following remarks about the date of Vādirajatīrtha and his commentary on the Mahābhārata:—

“Reference has already been made to the Laksālamkāra of Vādirāja, the contemporary of Vāgīsatīrtha, one of the apostolic successors of Ānandatīrtha the great dualistic philosopher. Vādirāja died in *1261 Šaka or 1339 A. D. (Vide R. G. Bhandarkar’s Collected Works, Vol. II, p. 7 1.) The Laksālamkāra is very valuable as it may possibly turn out to be the earliest dated commentary on the Mahābhārata”.

* I owe this information to my revered guru and colleague Mahāmahopādhyāya S. Kuppuswami Sastrigal.

Being interested in the chronology of the commentaries on the Mahābhārata I felt much interested in the above remarks of Prof. Sastri about Vādirajatīrtha’s date and began to read some of the works of this erudite philosopher with a view to gather chronological data. To begin with I perused his Tīrthaprabandha-kāvyā from a Ms in the Govt. Mss. Library at the Bhandarkar Institute (No. 622 of 1882-83). This poem contains description of the places of pilgrimage and the deities presiding over them in different parts of India. In particular I was much impressed by Vādirāja’s description of (1) the

1 In Duff’s Chronology of India (1899) this date for Vādirāja has been incorporated as under on page 210:—

A. D. 1339—S. 1261—Death of Vādirāja, said to be same as Kavindra, 8th successor of Ānandatīrtha in the Madhya Sect.” (Bhandarkar’s Report 1882-83, pp. 8. 203).
Vithoba of Pandharpur \(^1\) (Sholapur District) and \(^2\) Mahalaksmi of Kolhapur. Further while describing the 
Pepala on the banks of the Tungabhadra river Vadiraja was found to refer to god 
Vitthal. This reference roused my curiosity still further as the verse containing this reference contains 
the tradition current in the Maratha country about the transfer of the image of Vithoba from Pandharpur to Vijayanagar

---

\(^1\) Verses 5 to 8 on folio 10a refer to God Vitthal of Pandharpur:

```
"श्री भीमरथयमलीनारसिंहस्वगः
निर्माणसागरराधूषरङ्गायतासम् ।
श्रीपांडुरंगङ्गसितं नारुपारंकीक- 
लेखनः पवित्रमहमन्नहारम्भितोःसिंहः ॥ ५॥

तीरः संसरितसंस्तवदनास्किन्तुवृक्षिकितिमयः
पारुझोजंडियः मदुकमलितः संविवादांहृः ।
पालाते कदिमातं एव भविता नांसारवांविन्तेचे -
केशारितिहि वृक्षयत्वनुदिनं स्वास्थ्याः विद्धः ॥ ६॥

पाणवली पाणपुष्पांगः
श्रीपाणपाणान्निवःन्याजः ।
गोपालवाहः रूपया सवरः ।
श्रीपांडुरंगेण सजवु प्रसादः ॥ ७॥

पाणपाणोदनपुष्पांिशुर्यभृत्रेः
पेयपाणाशुरूनदिकारांस्वः ।
तापत्रिव्यक्ते नन्दे तराकर्कवर्णः
गोपालवाचरणांवितः श्रीनागिहिः ॥ ८॥
```

\(^2\) The verse referring to the Mahalaksmi of Kolhapur reads as follows on folio 8:

```
"अमानमत्जनस्थायसोकठसंभवः
रमा कोल्हापुरक्षेण* बसनिति किमदुनम् ॥ ८५॥
```

\(^*\) In an inscription (dated 1st February 1147) of Silabhar Vijayaditya on a Jain Temple near Sukrawar Gate (Kolhapur) Kolhaw is recorded as another name for Kolhapur (Vide Ep. Ind. Vol. III, p. 209).

\(^3\) The description of Pepala and the reference to Vitthal will be found in the following verses on folios 15-16:

```
"सर्दरुदकङ्कुकः त्वमसि नूनसः
कर्माचारंपदोऽधले तमेव दुष्प्रयोगोऽचेतः ॥ १२॥
```

(Continued on the next page)
on the banks of the Tungabhadra. I found this tradition referred to in one of the Maratha Chronicles.

Malhar Ramrao Chitnis in his *Life of Shivarj* compiles in A.D. 1811 states that the image of Vithoba was transferred from Pandharpur to Vidyanagar as the Vijayanagar kings were great upholders of Hinduism and full of devotion to Gods and Brahmans. Later in the same context he mentions the names Jnanesvara and Bhunudasa without mentioning the re-transfer of the image back to Pandharpur.

Mr. K. N. Sane the editor of the above bakhar of Chitnis in his notes on the above mentioned passage of the Bakhar in question makes the following remarks:

"Rāmrāja of Vidyanagar transferred the Vithoba of Pandhari to Vijayanagar from whence he was brought back by sage Bhanudāsa of Paithana (see Mahipati’s *Bhaktivijaya* chapter 43) ...... It was possibly in the reign of Kṛṣṇadevarāya (1509–1530) that Vithoba was taken from Pandhari to Vidyanagar. It is likely

*In a Sanskrit inscription dated Śaka 1159 (= A.D. 1237) in Vithoba’s temple at Pandharpur the story of the boon to Pundalika is referred to with the only difference that pūndarik is there called a Sage or मुनि (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XX, p. 420) Vādirāja also refers to pūndarik as मुनि.

Compare also the following remarks of John Wilson in his article "Ancient Remains of Western India" (J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. III, Jan. 1850) p. 87—

"The celebrated temple of Vithoba near Pandharpur is supposed to be a Buddhist structural temple now appropriated by the Brahmans. It certainly has the appearance of great antiquity. The oversight of the distinction of caste among the natives who frequent this shrine, when in the presence of the idol would seem to indicate some compromise with the Buddhists. In villages near Pandharpur we have noted other ancient temples probably Buddhist which are entirely forsaken and which bear the marks of violence probably Brahmanical or Musalman."

1 Edited by Mr. K. N. Sane, Poona 1924, Pages 7–8.
2 Ibid, p. 38.
that the temple of Viṭṭhalasvāmi at Vijayanagar may have been commenced during his reign. The construction of this temple was completed about A.D. 1542 during the reign of Acyutarāya the brother of Kṛṣṇadevarāya (vide Sardesai's Musalmani Riyaset page 200, section 51). At that time Rāmarāya the son-in-law of Kṛṣṇadevarāya was the Prime Minister of the state and he continued in that capacity from 1542 to 1565 A.D. As he was practically in power he is called "Kirtī Rāmarāja" in the Chitnis Bakhar".

According to the tradition referred to in Mr. Sane's foregoing remarks the transfer of Viṭṭhobā to Vijayanagar took place in the middle of the 16th century while if the date of Vādirāja's death, as given by Prof. P. P. S. Sastri on the authority of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, the difference between the dates for this tradition being

---

1 Vijayanagar Third Dynasty by Prof. N. V. Ramanayya, Madras, 1935—व्यास नायक the greatest exponent of Madhvaism had much influence with Kṛṣṇadevarāya (p. 322). He set up the image of नरसिंहस्वामि in the courtyard of Viṭṭhala temple at Hampi (p. 323) and died a little later in A.D. 1532.

On p. 439 Prof. Ramanayya observes:—"He (i.e. Kṛṣṇarāya) must have undertaken to reconstruct the Viṭṭhalsvāmi temple during the last years of his reign which he was obliged to leave unfinished at the time of his death"......"The construction of the Viṭṭhalsvāmi's Temple is usually attributed to Kṛṣṇadevarāya but he could not have built that temple as it existed even in the time of Devarāya II. We learn from Haribhatta, who lived in the first quarter of the 16th century that Proluganti Tippana, one of Devarāya's officers built a bhogamantapa for Viṭṭhala" at Hampi.

Dr. B. A. Saletore in his Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire, Vol. II, (1934) p. 163 observes:—"Acyutarāya's gift of Suvarṇameru was commemorated in a Sanskrit verse composed by Vōduva Tirumalamma (A.D. 1533) and inscribed in the Viṭṭhla Temple at Hampi."

Mr. A. H. Longhurst in his Hampi Ruins (1917) p. 124 remarks:—"The temple was never finished nor consecrated. In all probability the work was stopped by the destruction of the city in 1565, but tradition gives another reason and says that it was built specially for the famous image of Viṭṭhobā at Pandharpur in Sholapur district of Bombay but that the god having come to look at it, refused to move, saying that it was too grand for him and that he preferred his own humbler home." (A fine photograph of Viṭṭhala Temple at Hampi appears on p.126 of Mr. Longhurst's book showing its architectural grandeur).

See also Epi. Carnatica Vol. XI, p. 137—Inscription dated 1533 A.D.—God Viṭṭhalesvara is referred to.
more than 200 years it could not but raise doubts in my mind about the date of Vādirāja as recorded in the Succession Lists of the High Priests of the Mādhva Sect,¹ as recorded by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar in his Report for 1882–83 (p. 203 onwards). I also reported this contradiction between the two dates to my friends Prof. S. V. Dandekar, M. A. of the S. P. College, Poona, who has made a special study of the literature about the Viṭhobā of Pandharpur as also Dr. B. A. Saletore, M. A. Ph., D. of the same College. The former told me that the tradition known to him pertained to the 16th century while the latter informed me that the date for Vādirāja in the lists published by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar was definitely wrong. I thereupon asked Dr. Saletore to state his evidence on the strength of which he considered Bhandarkar’s date A. D. 133¹ for Vādirāja’s death as definitely wrong. He was kind enough to send me a note recording epigraphic evidence in support of the date A. D. 1571 for Vādirājatīrtha and I have great pleasure in reproducing it here in extenso:—

"Vādirāja of Udipi —

Vādirāja Svāmī’s date can be determined from the following stone inscription found in the Kaṇṭanahalli grāma, Soraba Hobli in front of the Veṅkaṭarāmaṇa temple. It relates the following:

That when the Rāja-parameśvara Tirumala Rāya Mahārāya was on the throne in his residence at Penugonda, and Keladi Sadāśiva Rāya Nāyaka’s (Agent) Rāma Rāja Nāyaka (was over the Banavase Twelve Thousand), Rāma Rāja Nāyaka made to Kṛṣṇadeva of Udipi, to the paraṇa-haṁsa Vādirāja-tīrtha-śripāda and to Raghunidhi-tīrtha-śripāda, the grant of an arghāra with a stone

¹ The unreliability of these lists has been made clear by Prof. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma of Annamalai University in Nov. 1935 issue of the Anna Univ. Journal, pp. 96–118. According to him the dates of accession and demise of MadhvaŚrīrya and his first five successors are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śrī Madhvācārya</td>
<td>A. D. 1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Padmanābhatīrtha</td>
<td>1318 (accession)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nārāhara Tīrtha</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mādhava Tīrtha</td>
<td>1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aksobhya Tīrtha</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jayatīrtha</td>
<td>1365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The date works out to A.D. 1571, November the 1st Thursday when the nakṣatra was Bharaṇi and not Krṛttikā. This was a Paunrṇimā (Swamikannu, Indian Eph. V. p. 345.)

From other sources we know that Vādirāja’s favourite disciple was the well-known Kanaka Dāsa, the Non-Brahman (Bedar) devotee of Kṛṣṇa. Kanaka Dāsa’s dates are circa 1550-1570.

In addition to the above direct inscriptionsal evidence for Vādirāja we find two more inscriptions one of A.D. 1614 and the other A.D. 1613 in which Vādirāja and his pupil are mentioned. There are in all 40 inscriptions at Udipi, the seat of Madhva Matha. Two of these refer to Vādirāja and his pupil:

“No. 231—110 of 1901 (Kanarese) On another slab built into the same wall (i.e. North wall of the Kṛṣṇa Matha). A record of the Vijayanagar King Vīra Veṅkaṭa Patī (1) recording in śaka 1536 (=A.D. 1614) Pramādin the grant of the village of Huvinkere by Venkatappa Nayaka of Keladi while बेदःबलिपण्डित, pupil of वादिराजतिथ्य was the priest of the temple. See Nos. 234 and 235 below. वादिराज was a man of great erudition and wrote several works.”

“No. 235—114 of 1901 (Kanarese) On another slab built into the same wall. A record in śaka 1535 (=A.D. 1613) Pramādin mentioning वादिराजतिथ्य and his pupil and providing for offerings.”

In view of the foregoing epigraphic evidence it is difficult to believe in the accuracy of the Madhva Matha lists published by Sir R.G. Bhandarkar so far as exact chronology is concerned. If Vādirāja was living in A.D. 1571 as proved by the Soraba Hobli inscription mentioned above it is perfectly natural for-

---

2 There is a MS of a work called रन्नसम्ह by रघुनाथवाच्य in the India Office Library (No. 6051—Keith’s Catalogue Vol. II, p. 659). It is ‘an anthology of the views of Vādirāja” compiled by his pupil Raghunātha.
The Date of Vadirajatirtha

him to refer to the transfer of the image of Vithoba to Vijayanagar in the line: "तुंगातीरगतोऽसि चित्तुः" in the verse 13 of his तृणमोहनपुराण quoted above and hence there is no sort of contradiction or anachronism involved in the reference.

A question may be raised whether there was another वादिराजतीर्थ in the Madhva line of succession distinct and separate from the वादिराजतीर्थ referred to in the inscriptions mentioned above. The Madhva lists published by Sir. R. G. Bhandarkar already alluded to by me show only one वादिराजतीर्थ and it was this वादिराज- 

We may, therefore, safely conclude that there was only one Madhva philosopher of the name वादिराजतीर्थ and that he flourished about the 2nd half of the 16th century and that the date A. D. 1339 of his death recorded in the Madhva succession lists is definitely wrong.

Prof. P. P. S. Sastri on pp. XIV-XV of his Introduction to the Sabhāparvan (Vol. III) of the Southern Recension of the Mahābhārata states that the Ms of Vādirāja's commentary used by him records the following date when the copy was made by the scribe Narasimha:—

"तारण क्लेश चैव मध्ये छहे च पद्धमी।
बुधवारे नारासिंह इदे तिसिवत दस्तकम्।"

Prof. Sastri observes that "The earliest date for the above is 30-1-1465 A. D. and the latest date satisfying the other particulars is 25-1-1645 A. D."

As the date 30-1-1465 A. D. cannot satisfy all particulars mentioned by the scribe, we have to reject it and adopt the date
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25-1-1645 A. D. which as Prof. Sastri states satisfies all particulars. This later date is perfectly in harmony with our date for Vādirāja viz. 1571 A. D. If Vādirāja wrote about 1571 it is natural to have a copy of his work in A. D. 1645.

In view of the facts recorded in this note it is difficult to accept an early date for Vādirājaśirtha as Prof. P. P. S. Sastri has done in the extract from his Introduction to one of the Mahābhārata volumes quoted by us already. In case Prof. Sastri succeeds in establishing on incontrovertible grounds an earlier date for Vādirājatīrtha I shall be very glad to know the independent evidence, if any, on the strength of which his conclusion may be based. For the present at least the inscriptive evidence recorded by me in this note compels me to reject all conjectural and other data gathered on the question so far.
REVIEWS

THE GĪTĀ RAHASYA OR SCIENCE OF KARMAYOGA,
BY B. G. Tilak, (English translation) Vol. I by B. S.
Sukthankar, M. A., LL. B. Publishers—Tilak Bros, Poona
(India) pp. 618. Price Rs. 6.

The book under review is the first volume of the English
translation by Mr. B. S. Sukthankar, M. A., LL. B., of the Gītā
Rahasya, the Secret Doctrine of the Gītā or as the translator
puts it, the Science of Karmayoga, the magnum opus of the great
patriot genius, late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. Inspite of
its early date, the Gītā has not yet become a document of com-
pleted history. Its influence is not waning; it is on the increase.
In India countless millions derive from it comfort and joy. Even
in the West, inspite of prejudice and powerful organization, the
song of the lord is gaining admiration, reverence and even devot-
ion. Feeling the pulse of the nation, the late patriot concluded that
to rouse his countrymen from the slumber of inaction, it was
necessary to inject into their veins the spirit of activism which
he had extracted from the Gītā and which he had by personal
experience, found most enlivening. It is with this end in view
that late Mr. Tilak published his big Volume in 1915 in Marathi,
the dialect spoken by millions of his countrymen. What scholar-
ship, erudition, originality of thought and perseverence Mr. Tialk
possessed will flash on the mind of a reader even by a
cursory glance over the few pages of the book.

It is unnecessary to discuss in the present review the merits
and demerits of the original work. Suffice it to say that the Gītā
Rahasya has created for itself an immortal place in the hearts of
the Marathi speaking people. It can be safely said that it is one
of the few prose works in the Marathi language that will go down
to posterity.

Since its first publication in 1915 it has passed through four
editions, the first edition being sold within less than three months.
Its Hindi translation has gone through seven editions. It has
been translated in Gujarathi, Bengali, Kanarssee, Teligu and Tamil,
i.e. practically in all the major dialects of India.
It was necessary that a work of this type be translated into English, so that it might be placed in the market of the world to be judged and appreciated by world scholars. The late Mr. Tilak greatly desired and in his life time strove to get his work translated. But as fate would have it, he neither found time to do it himself nor found anyone who could undertake to do it. It was thus an onerous charge bequeathed by him to his sons. And the work, as we have it before us, is the fulfilment of the last will of his father by the only surviving son of the late author.

Mr. Sukthankar, the translator, has taken great pains to render into English the Ethico-philosophical ideas in the original work. But the translation form has certain special difficulties of its own. The best literature in any language can never be adequately rendered in another language. The intrinsic difficulties of this method have been, from our point of view, unnecessarily increased by certain self-imposed conditions of the translator. The translator says, “In translating I have attempted to be as faithful to text as possible, as I have thought that in the case of a philosophical and technical book written by a genius like the late Lokamanya, it would be extremely wrong to take any liberty whatever with the text. The late Lokamanya, besides being a great philosopher and a great statesman, was also a master of the Marathi language and even an apparently insignificant word used by him has an immense modifying or limiting value and the omission of even a small conjunction or the translation of an ‘and’ or an ‘or’ would considerably injure the sense intended to be conveyed by the author. I have therefore not changed the text at all, but only altered the garb, or the medium of expression; for a translation is no translation, if it is not faithful. I have not even broken up long and involved sentences.” We differ from the translator in this respect. A word for word translation may, to a casual reader, appear as a faithful translation. But there is every possibility that it may not be a faithful one in the true sense of the term, as it may not convey to a reader the spirit or the meaning which the original author wanted to express; thus it will frustrate the very wish of the author to be truly reproduced. The spirit is the soul of the work, the words are only the body. And we therefore believe that it is necessary to pay more attention to the spirit than to the body in the mode of its expression.
The Gītā Rahasya, as has been said above, started a new era in the Marathi branch of the history of the Gītā. Moreover, the work bristles with abstract conceptions and naughty philosophical terms. As such we believe that utmost care should have been taken to see that the translation reproduced the exact spirit of the original. But in this translation, it appears that the choice of words has been frequently unhappy. And it is possible to point out better and more appropriate English words for corresponding Marathi and Sanskrit terms. for instance has been translated as 'conscious ego'. It could have been better translated as finite or individual self. The word सच्च can certainly be translated with 'released'. But we believe it will be inappropriate to use word 'released', when by the word सच्च (Page 19) the absolute freedom of the "Parabrahma" is to be denoted. The word स्वत on page 269 has been translated as Owner of the Body. We think Dr. Besant's translation ' knower of the field ' is certainly better. The words तथ and अभ्य on page 274 have been translated as 'matter and spirit.' We wish the author had stuck to one rendering 'mutable and immutable'.

In a translation method we think it is desirable to allow the translation to lie on the table for some days and then to revise it twice or thrice. That gives a sufficient time for the mind to dig into itself and get the most exact word. But apparently the present translator found no time to do this and hence the hasty choice.

We take this opportunity to suggest that an appendix at the end of the Vol. II be given where the technical terms and newly coined words should be explained. That will help to avoid a possible misunderstanding. For instance, Mr. Tilak translates the word Pravṛtī Mārga with 'Energisim.' Perhaps the author used it in a sense approaching the Aristotelian. But as used in these days it means a theory similar to the one advocated by Von Driesch and others. And until the reader comes to that page where the technical sense is explained, he is likely to be greatly misled by the associations the term energism has gathered round itself and which he must be carrying in his head. Such an appendix is absolutely necessary as the translation is meant for a reader who knows not Marathi.
Such defects are however bound to remain in a volume of over 600 pages finished within a span of hardly six months. Even as it is, we welcome the volume, as it opens a new era in the history of the work that has captured the minds of the Maharashtrians. The publishers have taken all the pains that they could to make the work as attractive as possible, by giving several opinions of great men like Babu Aravind Ghosh, Mahatma Gandhi and others about the author and the work. In a translation meant for an alien reader, the information regarding the family history of Mr. Tilak's dead son could have been safely omitted; for it in no way helps a better understanding of the translation, though perhaps it may show why the sons could not publish the work earlier, a fact not very important to a foreigner.

The front piece is very well chosen as it is expressive of the variations in the interpretations of the Gītā and of the place the Gītā Rahasya occupies in these interpretations.

We await with keenness the second Volume of the translation.

S. V. Dandekar
THE TRADITIONAL CHRONOLOGY OF THE JAINAS
(An outline of the Political Development of India from 543 B.C. to 78 A.D.) by Shantilal Shah (Verlag von W. Kohlhammer Stuttgart 1935)

This small book covering 109 (XII + 97) pages and having a very nice get-up forms the 9th number (Heft) of the Series "Bonner Orientalistische Studien" herausgegeben von P. Kahle und W. Kirfel. As stated by Mr. Shah in his preface, his aim in writing this book is "not alone to fix the death-year of Buddha or Mahāvīra or the coronation-dates of Candragupta and Aśoka, nor to authenticate the Jaina traditional account, but also to reconstruct the chronology of the whole history of Northern India from Ajātaśatru to Kaniska".

This aim is certainly ambitious and laudable as well, but its achievement is by no means an easy task as it requires collecting, reshuffling and evaluating in a dispassionate way, various data pertaining to legendary accounts and anecdotes, coins and inscriptions as well as traditions and several historical records. Mr. Shah has no doubt taken much trouble to fulfil the aim; but, as all the materials sufficient for the reconstruction of the chronology of the entire History of Northern India are not still available, it should not be a matter of surprise to him, if his attempt, however praiseworthy it may be is not looked upon as final. Moreover, there is always room for honest difference of opinion in the field of true research and sound scholarship.

An ardent student of history cannot afford to belittle, much less to entirely ignore, the value of a genuine study of the legendary accounts. So it is quite consistent when we find Mr. Shah making full use of the Jaina traditional account which being resourceful can lend a helping hand in solving some of the vexed questions of Indian History. It is in the fitness of things that he has devoted one whole chapter out of four, to the history of the Jaina church of ancient days.

His zest for investigation goes so far as to make him criticize the views and writings of various veteran scholars. For instance,
while agreeing with Prof. Jacobi regarding the identification of Kalāśoka and Kākavarna, he differs from him when the latter doubts the authenticity of some of the Jaina chronological gāthās, and that he boldly points out Prof. Jacobi's mistake regarding the meaning of the word "Yugapradhāna". He has not even spared an ancient Sūri and a polygrapher like Hemacandra. For, he observes that there are many inconsistencies in the whole account given by him in the 8th and 9th cantos of his work Pariśistaparvan. Of course, he remarks in the course of his criticism that Hemacandra alone is not responsible for this, and that "he has been merely a prey of the popular stories current in his times".

On the whole Mr. Shah's book provides ample material for further study in the field of Indian chronology in general and Jaina chronology in particular. I may en passant note below one or two mistakes—discrepancies that I have noticed during a cursory perusal of this book, with the hope that they may be removed in the subsequent edition of this book and thus enhance the value that can be attached to it owing to its exhaustive contents, index and lucid treatment.

It is a sad mistake to attribute the authorship of Prabhāvakacaritra to Pradyumna Sūri who has corrected it, when the real author is Prabhācandra Sūri. As regards the Index an entry about Pradyumna Sūri is at present wanting, and one more reference to Prabhāvakacariia on p. 73 is left out.

In the end, while congratulating the publishers for this handy work they have thus provided to an ordinary reader, I may draw Mr. Shah's attention and that of the reader, too, to the following contributions connected with the chronology and some other problems pertaining to Maurya dynasty:


H. R. Kapadia.

1 See Descriptive Catalogue of Jain Manuscripts Vol. XIX.
All Orientalists and Indologists are familiar with Dr. Aufrecht's monumental work—The Catalogus Catalogorum—as an indispensable piece of apparatus for Oriental research. Since 1903, thirty-two years ago, when Dr. Aufrecht completed his Catalogus Catalogorum, many important collections of Sanskrit manuscripts within and outside India have come to the notice of scholars and several volumes of catalogues, giving reliable information regarding some thousands of Sanskrit manuscripts, have become available in Madras, Bengal, Lahore, Bombay, Baroda, Dacca, Benares, Travancore, Central Provinces and Berar, Mysore and other centres. Highly valuable as are the materials contained in Dr. Aufrecht's great work it is now found to be defective and incomplete, chiefly in view of the vast accession to the stock of knowledge about the literary treasures in Sanskrit, that has been made available within the last thirty-two years subsequent to the completion of Dr. Aufrecht's work. The need for supplementing Dr. Aufrecht's work was recently brought to the notice of the Madras University, which in view of the large number of Sanskrit manuscripts in South India, has decided to undertake the preparation and publication of a complete up-to-date Catalogus Catalogorum of Sanskrit Manuscripts, utilising the invaluable work already done by Dr. Aufrecht as the basis and containing references to all known Sanskrit manuscripts. The main lines on which this work is proposed to be carried on are indicated below:

1. Checking and verification of the entries in the Catalogus Catalogorum of Dr. Aufrecht.

2. Introduction of fresh entries in the case of important manuscripts.

3. Dealing with the additional manuscripts collected within and outside India within the last thirty-two years.

4. Entering the dates of works and authors, as far as possible.

5. Incorporation of works known through citations alone, with appropriate references as far as possible.
The University has entrusted the work to an Editorial Committee constituted as follows:—

1. Mahamahopadhyaya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M. A., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Presidency College, Madras (on leave), and Curator, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras—(Editor-in-Chief).

2. Professor P. P. S. Sastri, M. A. (Oxon), Officiating Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Presidency College, Madras.

3. Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, B. A. (Hons.), D. Phil. (Oxon), Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras.

Since the success of the undertaking is largely dependent upon the co-operation and help of scholars interested in Sanskrit, the Madras University would earnestly request scholars and Heads of institutions interested in Sanskrit and Indology to assist it by furnishing information on any or all of the following points:—

1. Places where manuscripts are available, with particulars regarding owners and authors.

2. Lists of manuscripts.

3. Other suggestions for the preparation of the proposed new Catalogus Catalogorum.

It is requested that all communications regarding this matter may be addressed to "The Editor-in-Chief, Catalogus Catalogorum, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Museum Buildings, Pantheon Road, Egmore, Madras."

S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI
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COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA
( Epic and Pauranic Sources )

BY

Dr. BIMALA CHURN LAW, M. A., B. L., Ph. D.

BHÄRATAVARŚA AND ITS VARIOUS DIVISIONS

The Jambudvipa, according to Puranic authors, was originally divided into seven varṣas, namely Ilavṛta or Meru-varṣa, Ramyaka or Ramaṇaka (Matsya, 113, 61; Mbh. VI, 8. 2.) or Nila-varṣa (Brahmāṇḍa, 34, 46), Hrīṇāmaya or Śvetavarṣa Brahmāṇḍa, 34, 46; Agni 107. 7), Uttarakuru or Śṛṅgavat-(Brāha, 34, 47) or Airavata-varṣa (Mbh. VI, 6. 37), Bhārata or Himāva (Brāha, 84, 44, 53) or Haimavata (Brāha, 35, 30, Matsya, 113, 28) or Ajanābha (Ind. Ant. 1899. p. 1), Kimpuruṣa or Hemakūṭa-varṣa (Brāha, 34, 44) or Haimavata-varṣa (Mbh. VI, 6. 7.) or Kimnarakhaṇḍa (Ain-i-Akbari, III, pp. 30. 31), and Harivarṣa or Nisadhavarṣa (Brāha, 34, 45). Two other varṣas, namely, Bhadrāśva or Mālyavad-varṣa and Ketumāla or Gandhmādana-varṣa (Brāha, 34, 47, 48), were later on added to the original seven, thus bringing the total number of varṣas to nine (for sapta-varṣāṇi, see Matsya, 113-14; Brāha, 35, 24; ibid, 28, Mbh. VI. 6. 53; for navavarṣāṇi, see, Matsya, 114, 85; Brāha, 34, 48; ibid, 35, 7; Nilakantha’s Com. on Mbh. VI. 6. 37). Of these varṣas Bhāratavarṣa lay most to the South. It was separated from the Kimpuruṣa by the Himavat.
and had the shape of a bow (Matsya, 113-32; Brda, 35, 3; Mbh. VI. 6. 38). It lay between the Himavat to the north and the sea to the south (Vayu, 45. 75-76; Vishnu, II. 3. 1.)

The name Bharatavarṣa is said to have been derived from King Bharata, a descendant of Priyavrata, son of Manu Svayambhava.

Bharatavarṣa, according to Puranic Cosmology, was divided into nava khaṇḍas or nine divisions. According to Mārkandeya Purāṇa they are:

Indradvīpaḥ Kaśerumānas-Tāmraparno Gabhastimān
Nāgadvīpastathā Saumyo Gāndharvvo Vārunastathā
Ayaṁ tu navamastēsāṁ dvīpaḥ sāgarasamvṛtaḥ
Yojanānāṁ sahasram vai dvīpo yam daksiṇottarāt
Brāhmaṇāḥ Kṣatriyāḥ Vaiśyāḥ Śūdrāscāntahsthitā dvija

These nine 'bhedas' or 'khaṇḍas' of Bharatavarṣa are mentioned also in the famous astronomical work, the Siddhānta Śīromaṇi (III. 41) of the celebrated astronomer Bhāskaracārya, as well as in the majority of the Purāṇas. The Vāmana and the Garuḍa Purāṇas however replace Saumya and Gāndharva by Katāha and Simhala. The ninth dvīpa which is described as 'encircled by seas, extending over thousand yojanas from north to south, with Kīrātas at the eastern extreme and Yavanas at the western and Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras residing between', is not mentioned by name in the majority of the Purāṇas. The name is supplied by the Vāmana Purāṇa as Kumāra (XIII. ii) and by the Kumārika Khanda of the Skanda Purāṇa

---

1 For the historical value and otherwise of the different Pauranic Varṣas, see, Ray Chaudhuri, Studies in Indian Antiquities, pp. 61-80.
2 Brda, 34. 55; Bhāga, XI, 2. 15 ff.
3 The Nāgarasamvṛtaḥ of Alberuni is obviously a copyist's mistake (Indica; I, 295).
4 Mārk. P. 57.
5 According to the Skanda Purāṇa, Kumārika Khanda extended from only the Mahendra mountain to the Pāriyātra (Kumārika Khanda, 39. 113); according to the Garuḍa Purāṇa, however, it was bounded on the east by the Kīrātas, on the west by the Yavanas, on the south by the Āndhras and on the north by the Turuṣkas (55. 6).
as Kumārika (39.69). The Kāvyamīmāṁsā of Rājaśekhara also gives the name of the ninth dvipa as Kumārī (Deśa-vibhāga, p. 93). The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa along with other Purāṇas describes the nine dvipas as 'separated by seas and as being mutually inaccessible' (Samudrāntarita jñeyāste tvagamyah parasparam, Mār. 575). But Bhāratavarṣa, as we now know it, is not separated by seas within itself, nor are its component parts "mutually inaccessible"; Bhāratavarṣa is not thus our India of present geographical area. That Bhāratavarṣa connoted a much larger area than India proper will be evident from the fact that only one of its islands, the ninth, stands for India proper. The 'ninth dvipa', i.e., the Kumārī or Kumārika dvipa is described to be surrounded by sea and to have been inhabited by the Kirātas and the eastern extreme and Yavanas at the western with Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras thrown within. The Kumārī dvipa thus seems to be identical with India proper; and in its account the Pauranic authors seem to describe a condition of India as in about the first century A. D., when Ptolemy locates the Kirrhadia, doubtless identical with the Kirātas, in the eastern region (Cf. Majumdar's edition of Ptolemy, p. 219) and the inscriptions of Aśoka place the Yonas or Yavanas along with the Kambojas and Gāndhāras. Bhāratavarṣa thus denoted a much larger area than India proper.2

As to the identifications of eight other dvipas there is much scope for speculation, and hence a great deal of disagreement among scholars. Thus Alberuni identifies Indradvīpa with Madhyadeśa, i.e., the middle country (Indica I. p. 296) while Abul Fazl in his Aīn-i-Akbarī places it between Laūkā and Mahendra hills (III, p. 31) which somewhat agrees with the location of the dvipa as described in Skandapurāṇa.

1 Cf. also the Mahāvaṁsa, Geiger's trans. p. 85, p. 194, n; Cf. also the invasion of the Indo-Greeks in the time of the Suṅgas, and later of the Bactrian Greeks.

2 Pargiter rightly observes that the description of Kumārī dvipa does not fully accord with the geographical position of India, for India proper "is not surrounded by the sea, but bounded by it only on the east, south and west, and only partially so on the east and west for verse 8 places the Kirātas and Yavanas respectively." Mār. p. 284 n.
Surendranath Majumdar Sastri identifies it with Burma. The next dvipa, Kaserumat, is placed by Alberuni to the east of Madhyadeśa, and between Mahendra and Sukti hills by Abul Fazl. Majumdar identifies it with the Malay Peninsula. The third dvipa, Tāmravarṇa or (Tāmrarṇa or Tāmrāparṇī) is placed in the south-east by Alberuni and between Sukti and Malaya by Abul Fazl. It is probably identifiable with the region drained by the river Tāmrāparṇī in the extreme South. The dvipa is also identifiable with Ceylon which the Greek Geographers knew as Tāprobane, and is referred to in the inscriptions of Asoka as Tam-bapanī. Gabhastimat, according to Abul Fazl, lay between the Rksa and the Malaya, and according to Alberuni, to the south of the Madhyadeśa. According to Smith Nāgadvipa seems to be identical with the Jaffna Peninsula of Ceylon (Early History of India, 4th Edn. p. 491) Saumya has not been identified, but Katāha which is the substitute reading in the Vāmana Purāṇa has been rightly identified with Kedah in the Malaya Peninsula. Gandharvā is placed by Alberuni to the north-west of the Madhyadeśa; it is doubtless identical with the well-known and very ancient region of Gandhāra. Garuḍa Purāṇa reads Simpala instead which is Ceylon. Varuṇa, the eighth dvipa, is placed by Abul Fazl between the Sahya and the Vindhya.

Perhaps older and certainly more accurate than the tradition of the Pauranic-Navakhanda is the division of Bhāratavarṣa into nine bhedas by the celebrated astronomers Parāśara and Varāhamihira.1 These astronomers and astrologers conceived the shape of India as that of a tortoise (kūrma) lying outspread; they therefore describe the country as Kūrma-cakra. Each of the nine bhedas is called a varga by Varāha; Bhāratavarṣa is thus divided into nine parts conforming to the nine of the ten points of the compass, e. g., the central, eastern, southern, western, northern, south-eastern or Āgneya, south-western or Nairṭa north-western of Vāyava and north-eastern Aīśāna. Paṅcāla was the main district in the central division, Magadha in the eastern, Kulinda in the north-eastern, Madra in the northern,

---

1 Varāhamihira is supposed to have adopted the tradition earlier recorded by Parāśara in his Parāśaratana. See Kern's edn. of Brhatsahhita of Varāha, p. 32.
Harahaura (or Hara Huṇa) in the north-western, Sindhu in the western, Anarta in the south-western, Avanta in the southern, and Kaliṅga in the south-eastern (Brhat Saṃhitā, Ch. XIV. 32, 33). But when Varāha comes to his details, he assigns Sindhu and Sauvira in the south-western division (Nairṭa) along with Pahlava and Kamboja and evidently Anarta also (Ibid, XIV. 17). "This mistake is certainly as old as the eleventh century, as Abu Rihān has preserved the names of Varāha's abstract in the same order as they now stand in the Brhat Saṃhitā (Reinaud, Mèmoire sur l'Inde, pp. 116, 117 cf. no. II, map, fig. 3). These details are also supported by the Mārkaṇḍeeya Purāṇa, which assigns both Sindhu-Sauvira and Anarta to the south-west."

But the most accurate from the geographical point of view is the description of our country divided into five and seven regions as given in the Purāṇa and the Mahābhārata. The division of India into five regions is however as old as the Atharvaveda (XIX. 17. 1-9) and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VIII. 14), and was adopted by later Brahmanical and Buddhist authorities. Thus Śmṛti writers like Baudhāyana seem to suggest a five-fold division while Rājaśekhara in his Kāvyamīmāṃsā actually adopts it. Buddhist writers like Yuan Chwang and authors of earlier texts also follow the same division. The Mahābhārata also describes five divisions in detail, the central or Madhyadeśa, the eastern, southern, western and northern and at least three, the Matsya, Vāyu and Viṣṇu purāṇas, agree with it. According to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Madhyaadeśa was occupied by the Kurus and Pāṇcālas, the east by the people of Kāmarūpa, the south by the Pundras, Kaliṅgas and Magadhas, the west by the Sauṛastraṇas, Śūras, Abhīras, Arbudas, Kārūsas, Mālavas, Sāuviras and Saindhavas, and the north (?) by the Huṇas, Śālvas, the people of Sākala, Ambaśṭhas, Pārasikas, Rāmas etc. (Wilson's Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Vol. II. Bk. II. 3 p. 132; there is, however no mention of the northern division in the text but it is nevertheless evident). The Viṣṇu Purāṇa list of countries is very meagre; the Mahābhārata has a much longer catalogue, but it is without any arrangement; so also in the Padmapurāṇa.

1 Cunningham's Geography, Majumdar's Edn., p. 7 and note.
2 See, Law, Geography of Early Buddhism, Intro. p. xixff.
The longest list of countries and peoples of India is however, contained in the Mārkaṇḍeya, the Brahmāṇḍa and the Vāyu. Both the Mārkaṇḍeya and the Brahmāṇḍa refer to the territorial divisions of India (Kumāridvīpa) as numbering seven, the latter expressly stating that in ancient times Bhāratavarṣa was divided into seven regions (Sapta Khaṇḍaṇa). But this division into seven regions is not anything fundamentally different from the division into five which is adopted by the majority of the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata. This will be evident from the list of the divisions which are as follows: the Madhyadeśa, the Udīcyā or north, the Prācyā or east, Daksināpatha or south, the Apaṛānta or west, the Vindhyaṇ region and the Himalayan region (Parvataśreyśiṇa).

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa has also a second classification, apart from this seven, into nine, adopted certainly from the astronomical and astrological work of Varahamihira and Parāśara. There India is described as resting on Viṣṇu in the form of a tortoise looking eastward; the various countries and peoples of Bhāratavarṣa are distributed accordingly over the several parts of his body, together with corresponding lunar constellations. The majority of the names of countries and peoples is very much the same as we find in the Nadyādivarṇanā section of the same purāṇa, but there is also quite a good lot of names that are entirely new and original.

It has already been pointed out that geographically speaking the division of our country into seven regions is more accurate and more in accord with reality. We, therefore, propose to follow the account as given in the nadyādi varṇanā section (Ch. 57) and supplement it by names of peoples and countries as mentioned in the astronomical section (Ch. 58). The Brahmāṇḍa and the Vāyu Purāṇas, and as a matter of fact other Purāṇas also, give us nothing more than what is there in these two sections of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.

**SHAPE OF INDIA**

It has already been pointed out that according to the Kurmaniveśa section (i.e., astronomical) of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa as

1 Brahmaṇḍa, 36, 64.
well as the works of our early astronomical authors the shape of
India was like that of a tortoise "lying outspread and facing
eastwards." This conception ignores the extreme southern re-
gion of the country. From the geographical standpoint, a sober
account is given in a number of Purāṇas as well as in the Mahā-
bhārata which describe India as having the shape of a bow
(Matsya, 113. 32; Brāha, 35. 33, Mbh. VI, 6. 38). Nilakanṭha, the
celebrated Commentator of the Mahābhārata, confirms the bow-
like description of the country (Commy. on the Mbh. VI, 6. 3-5 ),
but he also speaks of Bhāratavarṣa as being triangular in shape
(Ibid. VI, 6. 3-5) which is certainly a better description. The
most accurate description, however, seems to be the one as given
in the nadyādi varṇanā section of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. India
according to this conception, is "constituted with a four-fold
conformation. On its south and west and east is the great ocean;
the Himavat range stretches along on its north, like the string
of a bow."

MADHYA-DEŚA OR CENTRAL REGION

Matsyaśvakūṭā Kulyāśca Kuntalāh Kāśi Kośalāh
Atharvāśca Kaliṅgāśca Malakāśca Vṛkaiḥ saha
Madhyadeśyā Janapadāḥ prāyaśco'm prakṛtītāh
Sahyasya c'ottare yāstu yatra Godāvari nadi
Prthivyāmapi Kṛtsnayāṁ sa pradeśo manoramaḥ
Govardhanāṁ purāṁ ramyaṁ Bhārgavasya mahātmanāḥ

(Mārk. P. 57. 32-35).

Matsya—According to the Mahābhārata (Sabha P. XXX,
1105-6) the Matsya country of the Matsya people was situated
south or south-west of Indraprastha, and west of Sūrasena (Virāṭa
P. V, 141-45). According to Manu it was within the limits of

1 Mārk. P. 57. 59 Pargiter's Tr. p. 347. According to Cunningham, the
Mahābhārata has another description of the shape of the country, that
of an equilateral triangle "which was divided into four smaller equal
triangles. The apex of the triangle is Cape Comorin, and the base is formed
by the line of the Himalaya mountains." Anc. Geo. of India, Majumdar’s
Edn. p. 5.

For other descriptions of the shape of India, see, ibid, pp. 1-13; Camb.
Hist. of India, I, pp. 400-402; Ray Chaudhuri, Studies in Indian Antiquities,
pp. 84-86; Law, Geography of Early Buddhism, Intro., p. xixff.

2 For the boundaries of Madhyadeśa see Law, Ibid, pp. 1-2.
Brahmārsidēśa (Manu, II, 19). The Mahābhārata mentions (Śalya P. XXXVI, 1973–76) Upaplavya or Upaplava, a city situated at a distance of two days’ journey by chariot from Hastināpura, as its capital (Udyoga P. LXXXIII 3910–17; LXXXV, 3040). It is difficult to ascertain if Upaplavya was the same as Vairāṭa or Virāṭanagara which is also said to have been the capital city of the Matsya. Virāṭanagara was so called because it was the capital of Virāṭa, king of the Matsyas. According to Buddhist tradition it was one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas. The Matsya country comprised the modern territory of Jaipur including the whole of the present territory of Alwar with a portion of Bharatpur.

The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Vatsas instead of Matsyas (XLV, 110). The kingdom of the Vatsas or Vatsas is mentioned in Buddhist texts as one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas. According to the Mahābhārata Vatsa or Vatsya kingdom was situated to the east of Indraprastha (Sabhā P. XXIX. 1084); its king Vatsa was a grandson of king Divodāsa of Benares (Hari V. XXIX. 1587, 1597). The capital of the Vatsa country was Kausāmbī identical with modern Kosam near Allahabad.

Aśvakūṭas—Such a tribe or country is unknown; it is obviously a misreading, for the Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kisaśitas, Kisaśitas or Kisadyas instead (XLV, 110), and the Matsya reads Kirātas (CXIII 35). But we have otherwise no information of the location of the Kirātas in the Madhyadeśa; epic and pauranic tradition places them in the eastern region as we shall see later on; evidently the Kirātas are out of place here.

Kulyas—No such tribe or country is known; but it may be possible that they were the same people as the Kulutās, a republican community, who are mentioned in inscriptions of about the 1st century A.D. The Kulutas dwelt in the Punjab along with such tribes as the Mālavas, Yaudheyas, Ārjunīyanas, Udumbaras, Kunindas etc.

Kuntalas—The Bhīṣma Parva (IX, 347, 359, and 367) of the Mahābhārata has some references to this tribe. The tribe referred to in verse 347 of the Bhīṣma Parva is probably the

1 Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 16–17.
one referred to here in the Markandeya Purāṇa. The Kuntala, evidently occupied a country contiguous to Kāśi and Kosala where Cunningham found a region called Kuntila near Chunar. The tribe mentioned in verse 359 seems to have been a western people as they are mentioned along with peoples residing in the western region. The third tribe mentioned in verse 367 was the well-known Kuntala people of the South who played an important role in the history of the Deccan.

Kāśi—Celebrated as one of the oldest janapadas Kāśi finds mention in each and every ancient work of importance, Brahmanical or Buddhist. It is the ancient Vārāṇasī. According to the Rāmāyaṇa (Ādi. K. XII. 20) Kāśi was a kingdom while Prayāga and the regions around it were still a forest (Cf. Kalakāvana). The Harivamśa refers to its early vicissitudes (XXIX and XXXII) while the Udyoga Parva of the Mahābhārata alludes to Krṣṇa's repeated burning of city. (XLVII. 1883).

Kośala—Evidently Uttara Kośala or northern Kośala is meant for another Kośala which was called Dakśiṇa Kośala or Mahā-Kośala is mentioned later on in verse 54 of Chap. 57 of the Markandeya Purāṇa. According to epic tradition, Ayodhyā on the Sarayū seems to have been the earliest capital, but later on, in Buddhist times Ayodhyā sank to the level of an unimportant city but Sāketa and Sāvatthī were two of the six important cities of India.¹

Atharvās and Arkaliṅgas—These two names are evidently misreadings, and it is difficult to find out what the correct form had been. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads atha pārśve tilaṅgāśca instead of Atharvāśca Kaliṅgāśca, while the Matsya reads Atharvāśca Kaliṅgāśca. All these readings are improbable. Tilaṅgas are well-known as a southern people, identical with the Trikaliṅgas, and mentioned in Chap. 58 verse 28 of the Markandeya Purāṇa in connection with the southern people. Avantas and Kaliṅgas are also well-known peoples but they are not known to have been located in the Madhyadeśa. In fact the Markandeya Purāṇa refers to the Avantas as a Vindhyan tribe (ch. 57; verses 52 and 55)

¹ Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 4-6.

² [Annals, B. O. R. I.]
and to the Kalingas once as a northern (Ibid; V. 37) and at another time as a southern tribe (Ibid, V. 46). The reference to the Kalingas as a northern tribe is certainly erroneous.

Malakas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Magadhas instead and the Matsya reads Mūkas. Both are misreadings, for the Magadhas are mentioned as an eastern people in verse 44 of Chap. 57 of the Mārkaṇḍeeya Purāṇa. Pargiter suggests (Mārk. P. p. 309) that the reading should be Malajas. The Malajas "are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma Parva, IX, 357) and Rāmāyaṇa (Ādi K. XXVII, 16-23) and from the course described in the latter poem as taken by Viśvāmitra and Rāma, it appears they were neighbours of the Kārūsas and occupied the district of Shahabad, west of the Sone.......(ibid, 8-16).

Vṛkṣas—This tribe is similarly referred to in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. LI. 2106); but the Matsya Purāṇa reads Andhakas instead. The Andhakas, were very intimately associated with the Yādavas, and are often referred to in the Mahābhārata (Udyoga P. LXXXV, 304; Harivamśa, XXXV. 1907-8; ibid, XXXIX, 3041 etc.) but they are known to have been located in western India or Aparānta. A more correct reading appears to be Vṛṣṇikas.

The Mārkaṇḍeeya list of peoples and countries of Madhyadeśa does not seem to be complete; for, the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas enumerate few countries more (Vāyu, XLV. 109-110; Matsya, CXIII. 35, 36), and the Mahābhārata seems to confirm it (Bhīṣma P. IX. 346-7). These countries and peoples are as follows: the Kurus, Paṇcālas, Śālvas, Jāṅgalas, Śūrasenas, Bhadrakas, Boddhas and the lords of Śatapatha. The Matsya Purāṇa, however, gives the last two names as Bāhyas and Paṭaccaras.

Kurus—The land of the Kurus was well-known as one of the sixteen mahājanapadas in the days of the Buddha; many a Buddhist legend is associated with the Kurus and their country.¹ They are also very intimately connected with epic tradition; indeed the Mahābhārata grew up with the Kuru people and their country as its background. The ancient Kuru country may be said to have comprised the Kurukṣetra or Thānesvar. The region included Sonapat, Amin, Karnal and Pānipat, and was

¹ Law, Geo, E. B., pp. 17-18.
situated between the Sarasvati on the north and Drṣadvatī on the south.

According to Pargiter the Kurus occupied the country "from the Sivas and sub-Himalayan tribes on the north to Matsya, Sarasena and South Pañcāla, on the South, and between north Pañcāla on the east and Marubhūmi (the Rajputana desert) on the west. Their territory appears to have been divided into three parts, Kurukṣetra, the Kurus and the Kurujāngala (Adi P. CIX. 4337–40). Kurukṣetra, 'the cultivated land of the Kurus' comprised the whole tract on the west of the Jumna and included the sacred region between the Sarasvati and Drṣadvatī (Vana P. LXXXIII. 5071–78 and 7073–76; Rāmāyana, Ayodhyā K. LXX. 12; Megha D. I. 49–50). Kurujāngala, 'the waste land of the Kurus' was the eastern part of their territory and appears to have comprised the tract between the Ganges and North Pañcāla (Rām. Ayodhyā K. LXXII; Mbh. Sabhā P. XIX. 793–94). The middle region between the Ganges and Jumna seems to have been called simply the Kuru's country. The capital was Gajapur Hastināpura; and Khāṇḍavapraṣṭha or Indrapraṣṭha, the modern Delhi, was a second capital founded by the Pāṇḍavas (Adi P., CCVII, 7568–94)" 1

Pañcālas -- According to Buddhist tradition Pañcāla had two divisions: Uttara Pañcāla and Dakśiṇa Pañcāla. Mahābhārata also refers to these two divisions of the country the capital of Uttara Pañcāla was Ahicchatra or Chaṭravati (identical with modern Ramnagar in the Bareilly district), while southern Pañcāla had its capital at Kāmpilya (Mbh. 138. 73–74), identical with modern Kāmpil in the Farokhabad district. According to Buddhist tradition as contained in the Divyāvadāna, the capital of Uttara Pañcāla was Hastināpura while according to the Jātakas Kapillanagara was the capital. 2

Pañcāla was originally the country north and west of Delhi from the foot of the Himalayas to the river Chambal, but it was

---

2 Law, Geo. E. B., pp. 18–19.
divided into north and south Pañcāla, separated by the Ganges. It roughly corresponds to modern Budāon, Furrukhābad and the adjoining districts of the U. P.

Śālvās -- The Śālvās as a people are often mentioned in the Mahābhārata; in the Vanaparva they are also mentioned as Śālveyas (CCLXII, 15576–82). They lived not very far from the Kurus and Trigarttas (Virāṭa P. I, 11–12; ibid, XXX). Satyavān was a Śālva prince (Vana P. CXCII); the story of Kṛṣṇa’s conquest of the Śālva country points to the fact that they were located somewhere contiguously with the Yādavas (Vana p. XIV–XXII; Udyoga p. XLVII. 1886; Drona p. XI. 395). Pargiter therefore thinks that the Śālva country was situated along the western side of the Aravalli hills."

Jāṅgalas -- Pargiter’s suggestion that the Jāṅgalas are the same as the people of Kurujāṅgalas is evidently correct, since they are mentioned along with the Kurus and contiguous tribes (see above), and there are no other people of this name mentioned in ancient texts or inscriptions.

Sūrasenas -- Sūrasena lay not far from the country of the Kurus and the Matsyas. In fact, it was located immediately to the south of the Kuru country and to the east of the Matsya country. Sūrasena became famous in epic and paurnic literature because of its connection with Kṛṣṇa and the Yādava tribe. The country had its capital at Mathurā which stood on the Jamuna. The epic and paurnic story of Kaṁsa’s attempt to make himself a tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and his consequent death at the hands of Kṛṣṇa is not only referred to by Patañjali but also by the Jātakas. The early Greek writers knew Sūrasena as Sōurasendi. Presumably the Sūrasenas belonged to the Yādava tribe, for Mathurā, the capital of the Sūrasenas, is specially called the capital of the Yādavas and the kings ruling at Mathurā also belong to that tribe (Harivamśa, LVII, 3180–83; LXXIX. 4124–34, etc.).

Bhadrankaras -- The location of the Bhadrankaras is difficult to determine as well as their identity; doubtless they are the same

1 See Geo. E. B. by Law, pp. 20–21.
as the Bhadrakāras (Sabhā P. XIII, 590) and the Bhadras (Vana P. CCLIII, 15256) of the Mahābhārata. The people may be said to have had their habitat near about the Kurus, the Matsyas and the Sūrasenas. It is not improbable that the Uttamabhādras known in historical times as a republican tribe were a section of the epic and pauranic Bhadrakas or Bhadras.

*Bodhas*—The Bodhas are mentioned also in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XIII.590; Bhīṣma P. IX, 347), and perhaps also in the Rāmāyaṇa as Bodhis (Ayodhya K. LXX. 15). These people were probably located somewhere in the eastern districts of the Punjab.

The reading Bāhyas of the Matsya purāṇa seems to be erroneous, since the name is not met with elsewhere, if of course, they are not equated with the Bāhikas.

*Sātāpatha*—This is unintelligible, and obviously erroneous. Paṭacccara is indeed a better reading, for a people of this name is also mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XIII, 590-91; XXX, 1108; Virāṭa P. I, 11-12, etc.).

After the catalogue of countries and peoples in the Madhyadesa the Mārkandeya Purāṇa has the following passage:

Sahyasya c'ottare yāstu yatra Godāvari nadi
Pṛthivyāmapi Kṛṣṇāyāṁ sa pradeśo manoramah
Govardhanam puram ramyaṁ Bhārgavasya mahātmanaḥ

The Vāyu purāṇa, however, reads Sahyasya c'ottarārddhe tu instead of Sahyasya c'ottare yāstu; the former indeed makes a better reading, for any people who are said to have been located just to the northern of the Sahya mountains cannot be said to be within Madhyadesa. According to the reading as given in the Vāyu and also in the Matsya (Sahyasyānantare c'aite) the people mentioned in this passage, i. e. the Bhārgavas, were located along the (northern half of the) Sahya mountains and the region in which the Godāvari flows. "This region and the country west of it on the other side of these mountains and the tract northwards to the Narmadā", Pargiter points out, "are connected in many a story with Bhrigu, his son Cyavana and his descendants (Mbh. Adi P. CLXXVIII, 6802-10; Vana P. CXXI, CXXII, LXXXIX. 8364-65, C XV. 10150-2, etc.). The Bhārgavas were
however, a numerous race and spread into other regions: they are also mentioned as one of the eastern peoples” (Märkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Ch. LVII, 43). The Bhārgavas were probably identical with the Bhaggas of the Buddhist texts who were located at Sūmśumāragiri in the Majjhimaṭṭhā.¹

APARANTA & UDICYA or NORTHWESTERN AND THE NORTHERN COUNTRIES

Vāhlikā Vāṭadhānāśca Ābhīrāḥ Kālato yakāḥ ||
Aparāntaśca Śudrāśca Pallavāśca Carmakhaṇḍikāḥ ||
Gāndhārā Yavanāścaiva Sindhu-Sauvīra-Mad rakāḥ ||
Śatadrūyāḥ Kālingāśca Pāradā Hārabhūṣikāḥ ||
Māṭharā Bahubhadrāśca Kaikeya Daśamālikāḥ ||
Kṣatriyopanivesāśca Vaiśya-Śudrakulāni ca ||
Kāmboja Daradāścaiva Barbarā Harśavardhanāḥ ||
Cināścaiva tu Khārāśca bahulā Bāhyato narāḥ ||
Ātreyāśca Bharadvājāḥ Puśkalāśca Kaśerukāḥ ||
Lampākāḥ Śūlakarāśca Culikā Jāgudaḥ Saha ||
Aupadhāścānimadrāśca Kirāṭanāīca Jātayāḥ ||
Tāmasā Hamsamārgāśca Kāśmīrastuṅganāstathā ||
Śūlikāḥ Kuhakāścaiva Urṇā darvāstathāiva ca ||
Ete deśā hyudīcyāstu..............................

(Märkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, ch. 57. 35-42).

The northern peoples are the Vāhlikas, Vāṭadhānas, the Ābhīras, the Kālato yakas, the Aparāntas, the Śudras, the Pallavas, the Carmakhaṇḍikas, the Gāndhāras, the Yavanas, the Sindhus Sauvīras, the Madrakas, the Śatadrūjās, the Kālingas, the Pāradas, the Hārabhūṣikas, the Māṭharas, the Bahubhadras, the Kaikeyas, the Daśamālikas, the settlements of the Kṣatriyas, the families of the Vaiśyas and Śudras, the Kambojas, the Daradas, the Barbaras, the Harśavardhanas, the Cinas, the Kharas, and the various peoples who live outside, the Ātreyas, the Bharadvājas, the Puśkalas, the Kaśerukas, the Lampākas, the Śūlakārās, the Culikas, the Jāgudas, the Aupadhas, the Animadras, the Kirātas, the Tāmasas, the Hamsamārgas, the Kāśmīras, the Tuṅganas, the Śūlikas, the Kuhakas, the Urnas and the Darvas.

¹ Law. Geo. E. B., pp. 33, 43.
Vāhlikas—They are the same people as the Vāhlikas or Vāhlikas. For a detailed account of this tribe readers are referred to my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 58–60.

Vātadhānas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Vātadhānas which is evidently a mistake, for the people referred to are mentioned several times in the Mahābhārata under the name Vātadhānas (Sabhā P. I, 1826; Udyoga P. III, 85; Bhīṣma P. IX, 354; Droṇa P. XI, 398). The Mahābhārata includes the name of their king Vātadhāna under the Krodha-vasa group (Ādi Parva, LXVII. 2695–9) to which also belonged the eponymous kings of the Vāhlikas, Madras and Sauvīras. Evidently the Vātadhānas were connected with these peoples and were located contiguously to these tribes. The Vātadhānas were also among the peoples that assembled on the side of the Kauravas, and from the reference as given in the Udyoga Parva (XVIII, 596–601) and Sabhā Parva (XXXI. 1190–91) it appears that the tribe was located somewhere on the eastern side of the Sutlej. According to Manu (X. 21) a Vātadhāna was the off-spring of an outcaste brahman and a brahman woman; “but”, says Pargiter, “that is no doubt an expression of the same arrogance which in later times stigmatised all the Punjab races as outcastes....”

Abhiras—According to the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P., XXXI, 1192) the Abhiras were classed into three divisions. One dwelt along the Sarasvatī, one lived by fishing and may perhaps be interpreted as having their location along the sea-coast and the third dwelling on the mountains. Mahābhārata mentions them several times, and the Rāmāyaṇa at least twice in the Kīśkindhyā Kanda (XLIII. 5 and 19). For a detailed account of the tribe readers are referred to my *Ancient Indian Tribes*, Vol. II, pp. 51–54.

Kālabōdayakas—The Mahābhārata reads Kālabōdayakas instead (Bhīṣma P. IX, 354); but neither the Kālabōdayakas nor the Kālabōdayakas are indentifiable.

Aparāntas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Aparītas and Matsyā Purandharas instead; both are evidently erroneous. The Bhīṣma Parva list agrees with that of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, and mention is often made of the tribe in the Mahābhārata as Aparānta
or Aparantas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 355; Vana P. CCXVII, 7885-56; Śānti P. XLIX, 1780-82). Generally the term is applied to all the tribes living in the western region of India, but the Mārkaṇḍeya and the Bhīṣma Parva list must also be taken to signify a particular tribe. According to the astronomical list of the Mārkaṇḍeya (Chap. 58) the tribe seems to have been located north of the Sindhu-Sauvīra country.

Śūdras—In the Mahābhārata the Śūdras are almost invariable associated with the Ābhīras (Sabhā P. XXXI. 1192; Bhīṣma IX, 375; Droṇa P. XX. 798; Śalya P. XXXVIII, 2119-20); and were considered to be outside the pale of Aryanism. The Rāmāyaṇa (Kiṣ. K. XLIII, 19) and some of the Purāṇas read Śūras instead which certainly is erroneous. A definite location of the tribe is provided by a sloka in the Mahābhārata which places them in western Rajputana where the Sarasvatī disappears (Śūdrābhīrān prati dveśād yatro naṣṭa Sarasvatī, Mbh. IX, 37.1).

The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali to which we can assign a definite date is perhaps the earliest authority that introduces the Śūdras in Indian history (Patañjali, I, 2. 3). There the tribe is associated with the Ābhīras, a tradition which as we have seen is upheld by the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas as well (e.g., vide Viśṇu P. by Wilson Bk. II, Chap. 3, p. 133). The Śūdras were evidently identical with the Sodrai ( setDate) of Greek historians of Alexander's time who place them in the western region of the Punjab.

Pallavas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Pahlavas (XLV. 115) which obviously is the correct reading, for the Pallavas were admittedly a southern people. The Pahlavas are generally identified with the Pehlavis or ancient Persians. The Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata mentions two tribes of this name (IX, 355 and 375), "but there appear to be no data to make a distinction as the allusions to the Pahlavas are generally vague, unless it be supposed there was a Pahlava colony in the Punjab; and this supposition would suit this verse, for the Persians were altogether outside India. The Harivamśa says king Sagara defeated a great confederation of Pahlavas and other people, abro-
gated their laws, degraded them and made them wear beards (XIII, 763-64; XIV, 775-783); but this seems to be a late fable.........”

Carmakhāndikas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Āta-khaṇḍikas, or Cāṭta-khaṇḍikas, and the Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata (IX, 355) Carmamandalas instead. These names are not identifiable; but Pargiter’s suggestion of its identification with Samarkand is interesting and ingenuous.

Gāndhāras—A great and famous people known from very ancient times. They practically occupied the whole lower basin of the Kabul river. Some passages of the Mahābhārata seem to suggest that the Gāndhāras were an impure people (Śānti Parva, LXV, 2429-31: CCVII. 7550-1; Karna P. XLIV, 2070; vide my “Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India,” chap. IX).

Gabalas—The Vāyu and the Matsya Purāṇa read Yavanas instead which undoubtedly is the correct reading. The Yavanas may be identified with the Indo-Greeks and Greco-Bactrians who held sway over portions of the north-western frontier regions and the Punjab before and after the Christian era, though it seems that the people were known in India even before Alexander’s time.

Sindhus and Sauvīras—The Mahābhārata refers frequently to the Sindhus; they are mentioned twice in the Bhīṣma Parva list, once in connection with the Pulindas and another time with the Sauvīras (IX. 348 and 361). The Kurma Purāṇa (XLVII. 40) mentions the Hūṇas, the Mālyas (doubtless misreading for Śālyas or Śālvas) and the Bālyas (not identifiable) along with the Sindhus and Sauvīras.

For a detailed account of these two tribes, see my “Ancient Indian Tribes”, Vol. II, pp. 20-22.

Madarakas—They are the same people as the Madras or Mādras from which tribe came Mādrī, the second queen of Pāṇḍu. According to epic tradition they were closely related to the Sauvīras and Vāhlikas (Ādi. P., LXVII, 2695-96). The capital of the Madra country was Śākala (Mbh., Saṅhā P., XXXI. 1197) or modern Sialkot; and the river Irāvatī flowed through
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the country (Matsya P. CXIV. 7 and 15-18). Later epic tradition brands the Madras as base and impure (Śānti P., CCVII, 7559-61; Harivamśa, XIV. 784).

Śatadrūjas—They are the people who dwelt along the river Sutlej; but the Vāyu Purāṇa reads Śakas and Hradas (XLV, 116), the Matsya, Śakas and Druhyas instead. The Śakas were a well-known people who left their traces on Indian history. They were first a northern and north-western people but gradually spread themselves towards the east and south and founded royal families as far east as Mathura and as far south as Surāśṭra. The Hradas cannot be identified. The Druhyas were an ancient people, mentioned as early as the Rgveda along with the Anus.

Kaliṅgas (Kulindas or Pulindas)—It is doubtless a抄isten's error, for in no circumstance and never in history the Kaliṅgas were located in the northern or northwestern country, though the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 376) repeats the same mistake. The correct reading is perhaps Kulindas as given by the Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 116) or Pulindas as in the Matsya Purāṇa (CXIII. 41). The Vana Parva of the Mahābhārata speaks of "all the countries of Kulinda" (CLXXVII. 12350) which seems to suggest that the Kulindas were distributed over different countries or a composite people consisting of different tribes. Passages in the Sabha Parva seem to indicate that the Kulindas occupied the territory along the southern slopes of the Himalayas from the Punjab to Nepal (Sabha P. XXV. 996; LI. 1858-59). The Pulindas were a hill tribe inhabiting the Himalayan region and were closely associated with the Kirātas (Vana p. CXL. 10863-65, Drona P. CXXI. 4846-47). Evidently they were aboriginal tribes and were considered as impure. The Rāmaciyaṇa associates them with the Śabaras and seems to locate them somewhere in central India; this location is also upheld by some passages of the Mahābhārata (e. g. Sabha P. XXVIII. 1068, XXX. 1120; Śānti P. CCVII. 7559).

Pāradas—Like the Kulindas the Pāradas was also a hill tribe and were considered mlecchas dwelling on the slopes of the Himalayas (Cf. Sabha P. L. 1832; LI. 1869; LI. 1858-9; Drona
Hara-b'ūṣikas — The variant readings are Hāra-pūrīkas (Vāyu., XLV., 116) and Hāra-mūrtikas (Matsya, CXIII. 41). None of these names is identifiable. Pargiter suggests Hāra-hūṇakas who are mentioned in the Mahābhārata as a people outside India on the west (Sabhā P., XXXI, 1194; L. 1844; Vana P. LI, 1991).

Mātharas — The reading is evidently erroneous; the Matsya Purāṇa (CXIII. 43) reads Rāmathas instead. There is a mention of the same people in the Mahābhārata which locates them in the west (Sabhā P., XXXI, 1195; Vana P. LI, 1991, Śānti P. LXV. 2430). The name of the people is also given as Ramaṭas or Ramathas, as in the Vāyu purāṇa (XLV. 117) and also in the Mahābhārata. There is however no clue to their identification.

Bahu-bhadras — The variants are Bāhu-bādhas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 362) and Bālabhadras (Karṇa P. VI. 153) in the Mahābhārata, and Kaṭṭakāras and Raddha-Kaṭakas in the Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇa (CXIII. 42 and XLV. 117) respectively.

Kaikayas — They are the same people as the Kekayas or Kaikayas, famous in the Mahābhārata as a powerful nation (Sabhā P. IV. 126; Vana P. CCLXVII 15654). It was from this tribe that came Kaikeyi, the second wife of Daśaratha. The Mahābhārata seems to associate the tribe with the Madras (Sabhā P. LI, 1870; Droṇa P.XX 799), it seems, therefore, that the tribe was settled in the Punjab. The Rāmāyaṇa mentions their capital Rājagrha or Girivraja (Adi K. LXXIX. 35-44) which, however, must not be confounded with the city of the same name famous in the time of the Buddha and in the early Buddhist texts. Cunningham identifies the Rājagrha or Girivraja of the Rāmāyaṇa with Girjāk, the ancient name of Jalalpur, on the river Jhelum (Arch. Sur. Rep., II, 14).

Daśamāṇikas — The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Daśamāṇikas (XLV. 117) while the Matsya reads Daśanāmakas (CXIII. 42). The Bhīṣma parva list, however agrees with the Markaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Bhīṣma P. IX. 374) but it is difficult to identify or locate the people.
The Markandeya now proceeds to give a list of people dwelling evidently (Vāhyatonarāh) the borders of India. They were the Kambojas, the Daradas, the Barbaras, the Harṣavardhanas, the Cinas and the Tukhāras.

Kāmbojas—The Kambojas were a famous people dwelling in the extreme north of the Punjab beyond the Indus. According to epic and later Indian tradition, the country of the Kambojas was noted for a particular breed of horses; indeed references to Kamboja horses are numerous in both the epics. The Mahābhārata associates them with the Cinas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 373), the Yavanas and Śakas (Udyoga P., XVIII., 590) and the Daradas (Sabhā P., XVI., 1031). According to the same tradition they were considered to be outside the pale of Aryanism (Vana P., CLXXXVIII, 12338-40; Śānti P. CCVII. 7560-61. Vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India", Chapter VIII.).

Daradas—They were a hill tribe associated in epic tradition with the Kāśmiras (Mbh. Drona P. LXX. 2435); the Kambojas and the Cinas (See ante) and the Tuṣāras (probably Tukhāras; Vana P. CLXXVII. 12350). They were also considered as mlecchas. Vide Indian Culture, Jany 1935, p. 388.

Barbaras—Epic tradition connects the Barbaras with the Śakas and Yavanas (Mbh., Sabhā P.; XXXI. 1199; Vana P., CCLIII. 15254; Śānti P., CCVII, 7560-61); evidently they were neighbours of these tribes and were inhabitants of the northwestern region. The country of the Barbaras seems to have extended to the Arabian Sea. Their port was called Barbarika which was probably identical with Barbaricum of the Greek geographers (Cunningham's A. G. I., Majumdar's Edn., pp. 693-95). Vide Indian Culture, Jany 1935, p. 388.

Harṣavardhanas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Priya-lauckikas instead, but these names are not identifiable.

Cinas—Evidently they were the people of China, but here Cinas certainly do not refer to their original country. Presumably they were those Chinese people who had settled down along the Indian side of the Himalayas from the northwest to the extreme east. Thus in one place in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. IX. 373) they are associated with the Kambojas which seem to
indicate that they were settled in the northwest while in another (Udyoga P. XVIII. 584-85) they are noticed among the soldiers who followed Bhagadatta, king of Prāgjyotīśa, i.e., roughly modern Assam. Still there are other references which seem to indicate that they were settled not very far from the sources of the Ganges (Vana P. CLXXVII. 12350; Śānti P. CCCXXVII. 12226-29). They seem to have been a respectable and well-known people (Udyoga P. XVIII. 584-85). Their country was famous for a particular breed of horses (Udyoga P. LXXXV. 3049).

A people called the Apara-Cīnas (Western Činas) is mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa (Kiṣ. K. XLIV. 15).

Tukhāras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Tuṣāras instead (XLV. 118). Both forms are admissible, and the Mahābhārata refers to the people in both the names (Sabhā P. L. 1850; Vana P. LI. 1991; Śānti P., LXV., 2429.). The Rāmāyaṇa also mentions the Tukhāras (Kiṣ. K. XLIV. 15). Epic tradition connects them with the Śakas, Daradas, Pahlavas, etc. They were considered to have been outside the pale of Aryanism.

The Mārkaṇḍeya then proceeds to give the names of a few more tribes and countries of the north: they were the Ātreyas, Bharadvājas, Puṣkalas, Kaserurakas, Lampākas, Śūlakāras, Čulikas, Jāguḍas, Aupadhas, Animadras, Kirātas, Tāmasas, Hāṁsamārgas, Kāśmiras, Tuṅgas, Śūlikas and the Kuhakas, Urṇas and Darvas.

Most of these tribes cannot be satisfactorily identified, for example, the Kaserukas, the Śūlakāras, the Aupadhas, the Animadras, the Tāmasas, the Hāṁsamārgas and the Kuhakas. Some of these names again are names more of families than of tribes, e.g., the Ātreyas, the Bharadvājas, etc.

Ātreyas—In the Mahābhārata the Ātreyas are said to have been residents of Dvaita-vana (Mbh. Vana P. XXVI. 971), a forest and lake near the Sarasvatī (Ibid, CLXXVII. 12354-62). The Harivamśa details the story of their origin from Rṣi Prabhākara of Atri's race (XXXI. 1660-68). The tribe is also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 376) of the Mahābhārata.
Bharadvājas—They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 376) along with the Ātreyas. References in the Great Epic (Ādi P. CXXX. 5102-6; CLXVI. 6328-32; Vana P. CXXXV, 10700-728, etc.) to Rṣi Bharadvāja seem to locate the tribe, who evidently were descended from the Rṣi Bharadvāja, not far from the upper regions of the Ganges near the hills.

Puṣkalas—The name of the tribe seems to connect them with Puṣkalāvati or Puṣkarāvati (Rām. Kiś. K. XLIII. 23), the old capital of Gandhāra. The Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas read Prasthalas. The Prasthalas were evidently people of Prasthala (Vīrāṭa P. XXX. 971; Bhīṣma P. LXXV. 3296; Droṇa P. XVII. 691), closely connected with Trigarta and therefore located probably in the Punjab.

Kusērukas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kaśerukas and Matsya Daserakas instead, but none of them can satisfactorily be identified. Daserakas are however also mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. L. 2080; CXVIII. 5483; Droṇa P. XI. 397; XX. 798) as joining in the Kurukṣetra war.

Lampākas—The Lampākas are described in the Mahābhārata as a mountain tribe (Droṇa, P. CXXI. 4846-7). They are identified by Cunningham with the people of Lamghān situated to the north-east of Kabul (Anc. Geo. India, Majumder’s Edn. pp. 49-50).

Śūlakaras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Stanapās instead, but the name is not identifiable.

Culikas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Sainikas, and the Vāyu Purāṇa reads Pidikas instead.

Jāguḍas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Juguḍas, the Matsya Jāṅgalaś. In another place, however, the Matsya Purāṇa “mentions the Jāguḍas as a people through whose country the Indus flows(CXX. 46-48)”. But this indication is a bit too vague to admit of any definite identification. The Jāguḍas are also mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Vana P. LI. 1991).

Aupadhas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Apagas instead (XLV.120). No identification is possible.

Animadras—The variant is Cānimadras or Cālimadras, as in the Vāyu Purāṇa.


Tāmasas—The variant is Tomaras, as in the Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 120) and in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. IX. 377).

Hamsamārgas—They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata. According to the Matsya Purāṇa, the river Pāosni flowed through the countries inhabited by Tamaras and Hamsamārgas. The description of the Matsya Purāṇa seems to locate the two tribes in the region east of Tibet.

Kāśmiras—They are undoubtedly the people of Kāśmir. They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 361 and 375).

Tuṅganas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Taṅgaṇas (XLV. 120) and more than once in the Mahābhārata, as Taṅgaṇas and Para-taṅgaṇas, (Sabhā P. LI. 1859; Bhīṣma P. IX. 372). According to the epic description they were allied with the Kirātas and Pulindas and lived in the kingdom (Vana P. CXL. 10863-5; Sabhā P. LI. 1858-59). They seem to have been a rude tribe, as their main fighting weapon was stone (Droṇa P. CXXI. 4835-47).

Śūlikas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Cūlikas which are mentioned as a separate tribe in the Mārkaṇḍeya. According to the Matsya Purāṇa the river Caksu flowed through the country of the Śūlikas (CXX. 45, 46). In the Brhat Samhitā mention is made of a tribe called Šaulikas (XLIV. 8), but there the Šaulikas are associated with Vidarbha. The Harāhā inscription of the Maukharis makes a reference to the Śūlikas who are identified by some scholars with the Cālukyas; but that does not agree with the Paurānic description.

Kuhakas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Āhukas or Ahukas instead. They may be the same as the Kuru of the Matsya Purāṇa who are said to have dwelt on the Indus. (CXX. 46-48).

Uṛnas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Uṛṇas but none is identifiable except if we find in the Uṛṇas a people inhabiting the Uṛṇadesa which Lassen places on the Sutlej near Garhwal. (Ind. Alt. map.).

Darvas—The Mahābhārata associates them with the Trigartas, the Daradas and other northern tribes to the north of the Panjab.  

1 See also Pargiter, Märk. P. p. 324 notes.
PRACYA OR EASTERN COUNTRY

"Pracyän deśān nivodha me ī
Adhrārakā Mudakarā Antar-girīyā Vahir-girāh ī
Yathā Prabaṅgā Raṅgeyā Mānāda Mānavartikāh ī
Brahmottarāh Pravijayā Bhārgavā Jāeya mallākah ī
Prāgjiyotisāśca Madrāśca Videhāstāmraliptakah ī
Mallā Magadha-Gomantāh Prācyā janapadāh Smṛtāh ī
(Mār. P. 57. 42-44).

"Hear from me the peoples who inhabit the Eastern countries. The Adhrārakas, the Mudakaras, the Antargiriyas, the Vahirgiras, and the Pravaṅgas also; the Raṅgeyas, the Mānadas, the Mānavartikas, the Brahottaras, the Pravijayas, the Bhārgavas, the Jāeynamallakas, the Prāgjiyotisās, and the Madras and the Videhas, and the Tāmraliptakas, the Mallas, the Magadhās, the Gomantas, are known as the peoples of the East."

Adhrārakas—It is difficult to restore the correct reading. The Vāyu Purāṇa has (XLV. 122) Andhravākas.

Mudakaras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Sujarakas and not Matsya Madgurakas instead. None of these names is identifiable, but one may guess that here is a name which is a corrupt rendering of Mudgagiri or Modagiri, mentioned in literature and inscription and identifiable with the hills of Monghyr in Bihar. Monghyr was anciently known also as Mudgala-puri, Mudgala-āśrama, etc. The Mudgalas or the people of Monghyr are also referred to in the Mahābhārata (Drona P. XI. 397).

Antargiriyas—These people must be those dwelling in the hilly stretch of the Rajmahal ranges of the Santhal Parganas. They are mentioned in the Bhīṣma Parva list of the Mahābhārata.

Bahirgiras—They must also be said to have been associated with the hilly tracts of Bihar and from their mention along with the Antargiras it seems that the people meant were dwellers on the outskirts of the hills of Bhagalpur and Monghyr regions.

Pravaṅgas—The Pravaṅgas probably stand for those people who dwelt just in front of the Vaṅgas (Pravaṅga), and they may be Aṅgas.

Raṅgeyas—This is evidently a copyist’s mistake for Vaṅgeyas which is the reading of the Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 122). The Matsya Purāṇa however reads only Vaṅgas. They are undoubtedly the people of ancient Vaṅga or Bengal. For a detailed account of the tribe see my 'Ancient Indian Tribes’, Vol. II, p. 1.
Mānadas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Māladas (XLV. 122). It is a shrewd guess of Pargiter that here we have a reference to the people of modern Maldah in which are situated the old cities of Gaur and Pandua. The Māladas are also mentioned as an eastern people in the Mahābhārata (Sabha P. XXIX. 1081–82; Droṇa P. VII. 183).

Māna-vārtikas—The variants are Mālavartinah (Vāyu P. XLV. 122) and Mānavarjakas (Mbh. Bhīṣma P. IX. 357); but none of these names are satisfactorily identifiable.

Brahmottaras—Pargiter suggests the reading Suhmottkalas 1 which is neither intended nor necessary, for evidently a better suggestion is that of the Matsya which reads Suhmottaras meaning the people who dwelt north of the Suhma country.

Pravijayas—The Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 358) of the Mahābhārata seems to read Pravrṣeyas; but none of the names is identifiable.

Bhārgavas—The Bhīṣma Parva list mentions the same people as Bhargas; it is permissible to conjecture that they had been intimately associated with the prince Bhārga or Bhārgava who is referred to in the Harivamśa as having founded Bhṛgubhūmi or Bhārgabhūmi (XXIX. 1587 and 1597; XXXII. 1753). They were perhaps an eastern branch of the Bhaggas or Bhargas of Sūmumāragirī.

Jneyamallakas—The variants Geyamarthakas (Vāyu P. XLV. 123) and Gayamālavas (Matsya P. CXIII. 44), but none of these names is identifiable.

Prāgjyotiṣas—The Prāgjyotiṣas were a well-known people in both the epics; their country was a famous kingdom, evidently outside the pale of Aryandom. The Mahābhārata frankly refers to it as a mleccha kingdom which was ruled over by king Bhaga-datta (Sabha P. XXV. 1000–1; L. 1834; Udyoga P. CLXVI. 5804; Karṇa P. V. 104–5); in the same epic it is referred to also as an asura kingdom ruled over by the asuras Naraka and Muru (Vana P. XII. 488; Udyoga P. XLVII. 1887–92). It seems to have bordered on the realm of Kirātas and Cīnas (Sabha P. XXV. 1002; Udyoga P. XVIII. 584–5). According to the Raghuvamśa the Prāgjyotiṣa country lay evidently to the north of the Brahm-

1 Märk. Purāṇa, p. 327 note.

4 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]
It therefore seems that the kingdom included not only the Kamarūpa country but also a considerable portion of north Bengal and perhaps also of north Bihar.

**Madras**—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Muṇḍas instead (XLV. 123) which is certainly the more plausible reading, for the Madras cannot in any way be placed in the Eastern region. The Muṇḍas are a well-known pre-Aryan tribe, and are mentioned as such in Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. LVI. 2410). The Matsya Purāṇa reads Pundras instead which is certainly the best reading possible here. For a detailed account of the Pundras see my "Ancient Indian Tribes," Vol. II. p. 15.

**Videhas**—Videha was a famous country from very early times; in very early texts the country is designated as Videgha (e.g. in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa) as well. The country, according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (I. IV. 1) was separated from Kosala by the Sadānirā. The capital of the Videha country was Mithilā ruled over by a king named Janaka, and celebrated in both the epics especially in the Rāmāyaṇa. Mithilā is identified by Cunningham with a small town called Janakpur not far from the Nepalese border where the two districts Darbhanga and Muzaffarpur meet (Arch. Sur. Rep. XVI. 34 and map.). The Videha country is thus identical with the northern districts of North Bihar. (Vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India," Chap. III.)

**Tāmraliptakas**—A variant is Tāmraliptikas. The people and the country are well-known in the Mahābhārata (Adi P. CLXXXVI. 6993; Sabhā P. XXIX. 1098 Dronā P. LXX. 2436). Other forms of the name are Tāmalipta or Tāmaliptaka (Vāyu P. XLV. 123) and even Dāma-lipta (Daśakumārācaritam). The country has left its trace in the modern Tamluk in Midnapur.

**Mallas**—The Vāyu-Purāṇa reads Mālas while the Matsya reads Śālvas, certainly erroneously. The people may be the same as the Māls or Mālas, an indigenous tribe now spread all over Bengal. (Vide my "Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India", Chap. IV.)

**Magadhhas**—They were the people of the region now represented by the modern districts of Patua and Gaya. For an account of the Magadhhas see my "Ancient Indian Tribes" (pp. 93-175).

**Gomanthas**—The variant readings are Govindas (Vāyu Purāṇa XLV. 123), Gonarddhas (Matsya, CXIII. 45) but none of these names is identifiable.

(To be continued)
THE POET BHĀNUKAṆARA

BY

DR. HAR DUTT SHARMA, M. A., Ph. D.

Aufrecht mentions BhānukaṆara (C. C. I, 405) as quoted in the प्रतास-तातिक by भास्कर, son of आपातकिम. According to Bhandarkar (Collected Works, II, 324, no. 376)1, भास्कर, the author of the anthology, belonged to an अन्या-ट्रॉन family and wrote a commentary on इत्यादाहार in 1676 A.D. But our poet BhānukaṆara enjoyed much more popularity as his verses are quoted in the following anthologies also.

I. पन्थेवी by वेनावल, grandson दौलकण्ठ and belonging to a यातिक family (Collected Works, II, 322, no. 375). He is the author of दाबुदेरकथा or चरित, a poem in 7 cantos (C. C. III, 130) and of पञ्चतत्त्रप्रकाश, a glossary which he composed in 1644 A. D. (C. C. I, 304 and 603).

II. सभ्याठकरण by मोविन्दजी or मोविन्द्रजीत (Collected Works, II, 325, no. 417).

III. भमावित्तारासंद्र by श्रीहासेनवि (Peterson, Second Report, pp. 57-64 and no. 92; Poona, xviii A, 92 of 1883-4).

IV. रसिकलचन्द्र by गदाधरभुद्ध of the 17th century A. D. 2 (C. C. I, 497; II, 116).

V. भवराचना by ठाकुरभुद्ध अहोराठकर (Kāvyamālā, 89).

VI. चतुर्कंठ by सुब्रदेव (Dr. Bhaudaji’s Collection. Ms. no. 1237 B. B. R. A. S. The Ms. is written in देवनागरी. Old paper, 18 leaves. The name of the scribe is दामोदर and the date of the copy is शक 1632 [1680 A. D.]. It belongs to रामचन्द्र हुळल. It quotes verses from 31 authors and gives their names.)3

VII. सारसमझ by इश्कुत्रास (Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. Asiatic Society, Bengal. By the late M. M. Haraprasāda Śāstri, Vol. VII. no. of Ms. 5443).

3 See my article Sūktisundara of Sundaradeva (Calutta Oriental Journal, Feb. 1936, pp. 133-44). Sundaradeva flourished in the last quarter of the 17th century A. D. See also Mr. Gode’s Notes on Indian Chronology, III (Poona Orientalist, July 1936, p. 55).
This evidence is enough to prove the importance and popularity of our poet. But as yet his identity has not at all been established. In spite of the fact that Mr. Kane mentions भानुकर or भानुद्वन in his Index of Works¹ (no. 507), and a भानुद्वतामिर (nos. 508, 581 and 598—about 1300 A.C.), he has not been able to throw any light on the personality of भानुकर. According to Mr. Kane भानुद्वतामिर is the author of रसमजज्री and रसतरामङ्क्षी and lived at about 1300 A.D. To भानुकर or भानुद्वन Mr. Kane ascribes the authorship of अनंकारातिलक in five chapters.²

On भानुद्वन Dr. De remarks³ — “The form Bhānukara of this name is given by Śeṣa Cintāmanī’s Parijñāla, Gopāla’s Vikāsa and Rangaśāyin’s ‘Amodā commentaries. The title misra is also appended sometimes to this name.” I was able to examine a Ms. of शेष चिन्तामणि’s रसमजज्रीपारमिल (जेन भण्डर, उज्रमबाई की धर्माण्ला, अहमदाबाद, डावडो २६, नं. १) and found the following introduction:—

हे सह सकलकविकुलकुक्तमणिरिविमली प्रतीत तत्ततिन्यायिको इतरकारणमिरचण परायणात्करण: श्रीभानुकरकामाराथि: etc. The Ms. bears the date वि. सं. १६८३ = 1627 A.D.

According to Aufrecht (C.C.I, 405 and III, 88) भानुद्वन is from मिलिन्दा and he is the son of गणपति and grandson of महादेव. He is the author of अनंकारातिलक, रसमजज्री, रसतरामङ्क्षी, शृंगारधारिक, गोत्मरास्क्ष or गोत्मोरास्क्ष and कुमारभागवीय. Of these works only रसमजज्री, गोत्मरास्क्ष and रसतरामङ्क्षी are printed⁴. Dr. De has been able to prove successfully that all these three works are by one and the same writer. The date of the author, according to him, is earlier than the 14th century A.D. and later than the 12th century A.D.⁵ According to Mr. Kane,⁶ भानुद्वन’s father गणेश्वर is very likely गणेश्वरचतरि, brother of वर्षिक, whose son चण्डेश्वर composed विषाण—रसङ्कर and weighed himself in gold in 1315 A.D. “Therefore,

² Ibid. p. CLXI. No. 40.
³ Sanskrit Poetics I. 245, In.
⁴ For editions, see Sanskrit Poetics I, pp. 245-54.
⁵ Sanskrit Poetics, I. p. 249.
⁶ Sāhityadarpana, Introduction, p. CXVIII
Bhānudatta flourished probably towards the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century.¹

But how is it that our poet is not at all quoted in the Śākţaparājapāti which was composed about 1363 A. D.²? There are several verses ascribed to a certain Bhānudatta but none of them is found in any work of our Bhānudatta. Bhānudatta, as well as the īsavānus of Sadhuīkarna, are quite different from our Bhānudatta. If we accept the date of Bhānudatta to be earlier than the 14th century or even the beginning of the 14th century, then he must have been known to the compiler of Śākţaparājapāti. Bhānudatta is a pet of the anthologists. पवरचना quotes so many as 180 verses of his; रसिकजीवन has not less than 104 and भावारितहारारवली can boast of at least 11. Under these circumstances, Bhānudatta’s verses must have found a place in Śākţaparājapāti if he had been living in the 14th century.

The error about his date seems to have started with Burnell’s description of Bhānudatta as a native of मिळिला. The fact that he wrote गोलाबीपति in imitation of गोलाबीविन्द of the great मिळिला poet जयदेव lent further support to Burnell’s conjecture. And once this hypothesis was taken for granted, it was not difficult to identify his father गणपति or गणेश्वर with गणेश्वरमान्वि of मिळिला, brother of बिरिझ्बार, whose son चाहेड्स्वर composed विवाचतरनाकर and weighed himself against gold in 1315 A. D. Another fact which lent a support to the theory of the 14th century is that a Ms. of the रसमजरबिकास by गोपाल (alias गोपेन्द्र), son of चुसिंह is expressly dated in 1428 A. D. But the doubtfulness or rather the error about this date has already been pointed out by the late Śridhara R. Bhandarkar. The date of the Ms. of the commentary was read as 1484 and the era was taken to stand for the विक्रम संवत. But the late S. R. Bhandarkar observed (Report of the Second Tour 1904-6, p. 36) that the date was 1494 and not 1484 as given by Stein (extr., p. 273) and that it indicated the Śaka era. Therefore, it stood for 1572 A. D.³. As it will be proved later on, the observation of S. R. Bhandarkar is supported by other facts also.

¹ Sāhityadarpana, Int., p. CXVIII.
² Sanskrit Poetics, I, p. 249.
³ Sanskrit Poetics, I, pp. 251—2. I am very glad to find that my view is further supported by Mr. P. K. Gode in his Notes on Indian Chronology, XXX—“The Terminus ad quern for the date of Bhānudatta, the author of Rasamaññāri (Annals of the B. O. R. I., XVI, pp. 145-7).
Now if we compare the list of commentaries on भादुद्ध्त's works given by Dr. De in his Bibliography ¹, we shall observe two facts. Of the commentaries whose dates are known none is earlier than 1553 A.D., and except for one, all the other commentaries seem to have been composed by writers bearing दास्तिक्यात्त्व names. The exception is रक्षिकरज्ञनी by वेणीद्ध्च तत्कलागीरा महाचार्य, son of वीरेश्वर and grandson of दुर्गमण. It seems strange that out of 19 commentators none bears a मैथिल name. The theory that भादुद्ध्त is a native of म्युथ्यु was somewhat thrown into doubt by the term विनिधाः found in some of the Mss. of रसमथ्य. But as other Mss. had विनेश्वस, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar fixed विनेश्वस as भादुद्ध्त's native place, as the poet “represents the river of the gods or the Ganges as flowing through his country; while the country of the Vidarbhās, which corresponds to the modern Berars, is situated to the south of the Narmāda.” ².

But in the above-mentioned Ms. of रसमथ्यारितमित श्लोपाविज्ञान by देशाविज्ञानात्त्व भादुद्ध्त is described as ब्राह्मणविनिधाः. This seems to be equivalent to श्रीनुरविनिधाः = Benares. His authorship of गीतगांगीपार, a poem in praise of रशिव, also supports this view. There is another possibility. From the following verse one might suspect him to be a resident of Allahabad.

क्षेणिन्द्रस्वरभं श्रावण विहितं वादाय विविधाजीता
मानंभवेसनहेतवे परिचितितस्ते ते भराघोवरा: ।
विशेषाय सरोजसुन्दरप्रशामायं कुतं इदं: ।
कुज्यानिन मया प्रयागसमरे नारायणं नारायण: ॥

रसतराङ्गिणी, p. 35.

This can also explain the fact of his having so many दास्तिक्यात्त्व commentators. For, it is a well-known fact that many families of महाराष्ट्र ब्राह्मणs have long since been established at Benares and Allahabad. Again, if भादुद्ध्त were a मैथिल and the son of गणेशरमन्त्रिक, one of whose relations weighed himself against gold, then he must have been living in affluent condition. But as it is evident from the verse quoted above and as it will be shown later on, he was wandering from place to place, seeking

¹ Sanskrit Poetics, I, pp. 251-4.
² Collected Works, II, p. 12.
The Poet Bhanukara

... patronage of various rulers. However, nothing can be said definitely about his native place and the problem raised by the two readings विद्यक्तः and विद्वेश्य: yet remains to be solved.

Now I give the evidences which once for all settle the question of identity of भानुकर and भानुद्वत. Following verses which are found in रसमंजरी, रसतरकङ्किणी and गीतगौरीपति are ascribed to भानुकर in the various anthologies noted against them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>भानुद्वत</th>
<th>भानुकर</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>विना सायं कोईं सहस्रयाति, etc. रसतरकङ्किणी (Benarcs edn.) p. 14.</td>
<td>सुभाषितारावली 81 (8) रसिकजीवन fol.63a,62. पवरचना 33. 25. पवरचना 72. 21. पवरचना 21. 32. सूरथसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिकों fol. 66 a, 98. खः हाराबली 34 (70). पवरचना 84. 7. पवरचना 86. 19. पवरचना 2. 10. खः हाराबली 6 (43). रसिकों fol. 9, 93. पवरचना 87. 26. पवरचना 72. 3. पवरचना 53. 5. पवरचना 46. 4. पवरचना 50. 23. पवरचना 50. 24. रसिकों fol. 72 a, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रितो पितो प्रतिफलगतं, etc. रसतो p. 42.</td>
<td>रसिकजीवन fol.63a,62. पवरचना 33. 25. पवरचना 72. 21. पवरचना 21. 32. सूरथसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिकों fol. 66 a, 98. खः हाराबली 34 (70). पवरचना 84. 7. पवरचना 86. 19. पवरचना 2. 10. खः हाराबली 6 (43). रसिकों fol. 9, 93. पवरचना 87. 26. पवरचना 72. 3. पवरचना 53. 5. पवरचना 46. 4. पवरचना 50. 23. पवरचना 50. 24. रसिकों fol. 72 a, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नियति कलशोद्वेन जलथी, etc. रसतो p. 45 a.</td>
<td>रसिकजीवन fol.63a,62. पवरचना 33. 25. पवरचना 72. 21. पवरचना 21. 32. सूरथसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिकों fol. 66 a, 98. खः हाराबली 34 (70). पवरचना 84. 7. पवरचना 86. 19. पवरचना 2. 10. खः हाराबली 6 (43). रसिकों fol. 9, 93. पवरचना 87. 26. पवरचना 72. 3. पवरचना 53. 5. पवरचना 46. 4. पवरचना 50. 23. पवरचना 50. 24. रसिकों fol. 72 a, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सौदर्यस्य मनोभेजन गणना, etc. रसतो p. 53.</td>
<td>रसिकजीवन fol.63a,62. पवरचना 33. 25. पवरचना 72. 21. पवरचना 21. 32. सूरथसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिकों fol. 66 a, 98. खः हाराबली 34 (70). पवरचना 84. 7. पवरचना 86. 19. पवरचना 2. 10. खः हाराबली 6 (43). रसिकों fol. 9, 93. पवरचना 87. 26. पवरचना 72. 3. पवरचना 53. 5. पवरचना 46. 4. पवरचना 50. 23. पवरचना 50. 24. रसिकों fol. 72 a, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गीतगौरीपति साक्षी, etc. रसतो p. 72.</td>
<td>रसिकजीवन fol.63a,62. पवरचना 33. 25. पवरचना 72. 21. पवरचना 21. 32. सूरथसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिकों fol. 66 a, 98. खः हाराबली 34 (70). पवरचना 84. 7. पवरचना 86. 19. पवरचना 2. 10. खः हाराबली 6 (43). रसिकों fol. 9, 93. पवरचना 87. 26. पवरचना 72. 3. पवरचना 53. 5. पवरचना 46. 4. पवरचना 50. 23. पवरचना 50. 24. रसिकों fol. 72 a, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विद्यहरेष्वस्कुपूर्वे, etc. रसतो p. 81 a.</td>
<td>रसिकजीवन fol.63a,62. पवरचना 33. 25. पवरचना 72. 21. पवरचना 21. 32. सूरथसुन्दर 13 a, 3. रसिकों fol. 66 a, 98. खः हाराबली 34 (70). पवरचना 84. 7. पवरचना 86. 19. पवरचना 2. 10. खः हाराबली 6 (43). रसिकों fol. 9, 93. पवरचना 87. 26. पवरचना 72. 3. पवरचना 53. 5. पवरचना 46. 4. पवरचना 50. 23. पवरचना 50. 24. रसिकों fol. 72 a, 14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think that this evidence is enough to establish the identity of मातुकर with मातुड़ा. In my article, “The Subḥāṣīṭahāraṇa of Śrī Hari Kavi and some poets enjoying the patronage of Muslim Rulers” (Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. X, 1934, pp. 478-485), I have proved that मातुकर flourished in the middle of the 16th century A.D. I am now inclined to put him in the early part of the 16th century A.D. The पत्रिचना throws much light on मातुकर’s age. Even at the risk of repeating some of the arguments already advanced by me in my article referred to above, I give below the details by which I fix his age. In पत्रिचना and other anthologies we find 2 verses of मातुकर in king रूढ़ा’s honour, 3 in वीरमादु’s, 1 in Sher Shah’s and 9 in Nizam’s. They are as follows:
Although the name of Bhānukara is not given in the description of Sarasāṅgrah, but as it follows one of Bhānukara's verses and is in praise of Bhānukara I am convinced that its author is Bhānukara himself. Mr. Gode quotes this verse in his article on Bhānukara.

5 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]
श्रोकार्यों वा तद्वृत्ते यहि हि विनिहित दृष्टां दुःखसे।
किन निन्द्विः तदा स्यादृ कविकुलानि काव्यकोटिज्ञरानाम।
वाहाःत्रे गन्धवाकाहादिकुञ्जमगर्य। पद्यशता: काण्डक्षता:
का हानि: सेन्साह्कारसरकुलमणोर्नवकोटिज्ञरस्य।
सु॰ हाराचर्यी fol. 42, 273.

निजामशाह—

बिन्दुगोद्विविषिः प्रतिभटलमन श्रीनिजाम प्रतीमः
कृत्वा त्वर्कीर्निमाथः वहाति गणकपार्थि पद्योपनि: काठिन्या।
वका तेहः शृणुमानुसकरकाण्डक्षांहुमद्विमारालः
शुच्या तेन छद्मो विसुध्धानन्नान्तिरहार्तिः।

पाठरचना 10, 8; रासिकेऽ 15, 45.

श्रोणीकाम निजामशाह भवति। प्रौढः प्रतापाण्डे-
ज्ञानेव इति रूपतः तस्मात प्रभुप्रसन्नकरानोधः।
भज्याणाधामधान्द्वरिणि सुहुमण्डलवर्णहारामणि
त्रस्यकाम्यिनि निपपत्तुनितः भेरो। समुमीर्थयः।

पाठरचना 13, 24; रासिकेऽ fol. 13, 23.

द्वाने द्वार्षायासि कपटः स्वस्तान्तिन्यः काठिन्या-
------------------ तव कुंतवता ........... गारभिति।
नापि प्रापि काविदुपि ...........श्रीनिजामद्वितीयी-
स्तेनाकारि श्रेष्ठितमनसा वेधसा विन्दुरिन्दुः।

पाठरचना 14, 32.

श्रोणीकाम निजामशाह बिन्दसत्सत्युकुण्डन्त्रश्च ज्ञात
षष्ठा त्वबरण विघाय निद्रे वैरित्रियो मुर्घही।
सीमान्तम चकार्ति कापि सरणकस्योऽविरेणाद्यः
सिन्दूरः कणा जयानि किरणः कुन्दानि मन्ये नवः।

पाठरचना 16, 4.

अर्थ कामो निजामो वा त्यथा किमेन्दरारितः।
इति वृत्तिरिव प्रयुः श्रीति अध्याति सुक्ष्माः।

पाठरचना 17, 6.

वाहन्युक्षुच्चर्कत्त्र वसुमनी संवीक्षय शुचार्वः
नेरीमृकुकतिवचछलेन पयसा वारान्तिः सिद्धः।
दिग्राढः तजुते निजामवन्दिरवाने पताकांशुक्तः
पूण्याभूमिरिव रक्षितमिव प्रहु दिवो धावाणि।

पाठरचना 18, 14.
Fortunately it is easy to identify रूपण and Sher Shah. The former stands for रूपणदेवराय, king of विजयनगर (1509–1530 A.D.). Sher Shah’s time is 1540–1545 A.D. The only difficulty which stood in the way of identifying बीरभाद्र has been now overcome by the publication of M.M. Haraprasada Sastri’s Catalogue of Sanskrit Ms.s, Vol. VII. Herein we find a Ms. of तोमदेव’s कथासतिस्तागिरिण which was copied by रूपण, a poet at the court of भावसिंह of Rewah State. The scribe रूपण gives a genealogy of his patron who is 23rd in the line of Vagbha rulers of Rewah. Tracing their descent from कण्ठदेव of Gujarat, the poet describes the various rulers and at the end mentions some of his contemporaries at the court. Following is the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 कण्ठदेव</th>
<th>9 वरियार</th>
<th>17 बीरभाद्र married to खुकीरावदेवी</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 ढाणदेव</td>
<td>10 शेठारदेव</td>
<td>18 रामचन्द्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 सावंग</td>
<td>11 सिंहदेव</td>
<td>19 बीरभाद्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 वीसरामदेव</td>
<td>12 वीरस</td>
<td>20 विक्रमादित्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 भीमभाद्र</td>
<td>13 तरहरि</td>
<td>21 अमरस</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 राजनीकृतदेव</td>
<td>14 शेख [र]देव</td>
<td>22 अनुवसिंह married to कमला</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 बलतन</td>
<td>15 शाहिबाहन</td>
<td>23 भावसिंह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 तलके</td>
<td>16 बाबरसिंह</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This account is corroborated by the account of Rewah State given in the Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. XXI, pp. 279 ff. I quote a few relevant passages below—

"Chiefs of Rewah are Baghel Rajputs, descended from the Solanki clan which ruled over Gujarāt from the 10th to the 13th Century. Vyāghradeo, brother of the ruler of Gujarāt is said to have made his way into North India, about the middle of the 13th century and obtained the fort of Marpha, 18 miles north-east of Kālanjar. His son Karan Deo, married a Kalacuri (Haihaya) princess of Māndla and received in dowry the fort of Bāndhorgarh, which until its destruction by Akbar in 1597 was the capital of Baghel possessions......... In 1298 Karan Deo, the last Baghel ruler of Gujarāt was driven from his country by Ulughkhan, acting under the orders of the Emperor Alā-uddin. In 1494 Sikandar Lodi advanced against Rājā Bhairā or Bhira of Panna........... In 1498-9, Sikandar Lodi attacked Bhira's son and successor, Śālivāhana, for refusing to grant him his daughter in marriage." The son of Śālivāhana was Bīra Singh Deo (वीरभास्वस् of our ms.), founder of Bīra Singhpur in Panna state. “He was followed by his son Bīra Bhān who had lived for sometime at Sikandar’s court. The next chief was Rāma chandra (1555-92), the contemporary of Akbar.”

From this it is clear that वीरभास्वस, being a contemporary of Sikandar Lodi must have come to throne in the beginning of the 16th century. Sikandar Lodi died in 1517, so it must have been at the close of his reign that वीरभास्वस lived at his court. For, we know that वीरभास्वस's son and successor रामचन्द्र ascended his throne in 1555 A. D. 1.

1 Mr. P. K. Gode, in his article "Some data for the identification of Vīrabhāsū, the patron of the poet Bānukara" (Calcutta Oriental Journal, 1934, p. 197ff.), has found out some epigraphical records mentioning वीरभास्वस. He arrives at the conclusion that this वीरभास्वस is identical with "a Hindu King called Bānū, who was the grandfather of the brothers Mādhavāsīmha and Mānasīmha, the favourites of Emperor Akbar (A. D. 1556-1605), and father of Bhagavantadāsa. This information is recorded in the Rāgamanjari of Pūḍarīka Viṣṇhala in the following verse—श्रीमल्लकचछिपयवस्तीपकमहाराजाविजयाचरणात्रेव— नेत्रपशुपतमनातपनिकोभावःसिन्हा:राजनः।तर्कससीद्रवन्तनातसनमोभीरसचीराभिविभाभःश्रीणिमङ्कलमञ्चने: निजये:भूमंदावलंकरः॥” (continued on next page)
Now, our poet being patronised by वीरभान ठु should be placed in the beginning of the 16th century A.D. So far only 3 verses of our poet in honour of वीरभान ठु have been found. But we find 9 verses in honour of निजाम. This shows that our poet spent more time at the court of निजाम than at the court of वीरभान. This is

Although, chronologically speaking, this King भा of कच्चवंश might
coincide with our वीरभान, still I am inclined to think that both are different.
Our वीरभान belongs to वाबलंका. In the first place we find that our poet's
court is वीरभान or वीरभान, which is the name of the Rewah ruler also. The
king of कच्च family is simply भान. Secondly, our poet sings the praises of
वीरभान and निजामशाह (Sikandar Lodi). It has been shown that वीरभान and
Sikandar Lodi (निजामशाह) were closely associated with each other. Hence
there is stronger reason to identify our poet's patron with वाबलंका than
with the कच्चवंशीय भान.

\[ N. B.- Mr. Gode writes to me in a letter dated Poona, 13th March, 1935—\]
\"Since writing my note in the Calcutta Journal I have come across some
further data about a King Virabhāna whose grandson Virabhāda wrote a
work in A.D. 1577. This King belongs to the Vāghela dynasty. As the grand-
son of Virabhāna wrote in A.D. 1577, Virabhāna must have flourished between
1500 and 1550 A.D. In this hypothesis two points of identification are useful,
viz., (1) the name Virabhāna and (2) the date of Virabhāna's grandson
which is A.D. 1577.\"

We find another mention of वीरभान of वाबलंका in प्रोतभारायण's commentary
शास्त्रगम on चन्द्रङ्क (Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 75. 1929).

Here the editor gives the following footnote—वर्षभंनतन्त्रतिश्चान्तरमेघनोत्तत्रवन्ती—
प्रकाशितसन्ध्यानावात पवित्रवंद्यन्त्योमेये....‘रामचंद्र’ नामकनुवणकपारसके पवित्रपक्षिते माति।
The colophon at the end of the commentary is—इति श्रीभानकाधिविद्यनिषेठरामचंद्र
देवानतुतुसबालायित्समीरतममन्दवभ्रमकर्मकदाकार्यार्थवृद्धिप्रोततन्त्रपारमसिद्धिचित्रं
चन्द्रलोककारोशारागमंदृत्यमुखमितासमापः।। Now, this confuses our position of
वीरभान, who is here made the son of वीरभान and grandson of रामचंद्र. According
to the genealogy given in the Ms. of कपालसिंहताग, वीरभान is the father of
रामचंद्र. The grandson of रामचंद्र and the son of वीरभान bears the name of
विक्षणविलिक्ष्य। I am inclined to think that वीरभान is a mistake here for विक्षणविलिक्ष्य.
further supported by निजाम’s date. In my article referred to above I identified this निजाम with Nizam Shah Boorhan Shah I (1510–1553 A. D.) of the Nizamshahi dynasty. But now I think that निजाम stands for Nizam khan, son of Bahlol Lodi. This Nizam khan later on assumed the title of Sikandar Lodi (See—Smith : India in the Muhammadan Period, 1923, p. 254). Therefore, we can draw the conclusion that our poet भानुकर spent major part of his life at Sikandar Lodi’s Court (the time of Sikandar’s reign is 1489–1517) and must have met बीरभानू there. At the death of Sikandar he seems to have gone to the court of बीरभानू. After a short stay there he seems to have migrated towards the south and enjoyed the patronage of रक्षणारायण of विजयनगर. But his wandering nature or the death of रक्षणारायण in 1529 prompted our poet once more to move towards the North where he visited the court of Sher Shah. That he had a chequered life is evident from his wanderings, and that he was respected and deserved respect at all places is evident from the works he composed and the verses which have replenished so many anthologies.

His father गणपति also must have been a poet of high order. Not only does भानुकर speak highly of him in—

तत्त निर्याचति गणपति नाकमवापि तस्या
वाचा देवदास्यजति दिनिवधिरं कक्षन्न नॅव दृष्टोऽ।
अवारावर्मवति कुच्योन्नापि पाटोरपह्नो
नेते निर्याचसि न पुनः कक्षन्न स्वर्यस्मिति॥

रसतो p. 23.

but verses of गणपति are quoted in रसिकजीवन, पदवेणी, पदार्थसरस्यजी, संपार्थकरण and पदरचना. There is no doubt that he is different from the गणपति mentioned by राजजेश्वर in जह्नु’s सुधिकुलकावली, and his namesake whose verses are quoted in सुधिकुलकावली.

In the ms. of कुमारभर्तवैय Dr. De has found the pedigree of भानुकर as follows: रतनेश्वर—सुरेश्वर (author of शासनकभाष्यवाचक) प्रियश्वराय—रविनाथ—भवनाथ—महाद्वार—गणपति—भानुकर. ¹

¹ Sanskrit Poetics I. p. 250. I cannot agree with Dr. De when he identifies सुरेश्वर with सुरेश्वरचार्य or महेन्द्रसिंह, the author of शासनकभाष्यवाचक, for the latter was a contemporary of शंकराचार्य (8th century A. D.) and it is impossible that the 5 ancestors of भानुकर intervening between सुरेश्वर and himself could have lived away 700 years between themselves, unless we suppose that भानुकर has dropped the names of some of his unimportant ancestors.
Our poet must have visited the court of king कृष्णदेवराय of बिहार for a short time and probably in the latter part of his career. It is here or at the court of वीरभाद्र that he sang—

ययनीन्धनास्थपोरशिरोरिणाअमपातया तापविभिः।
मकृत्तुमसेक्मचारन्त्द्वृत्तक्कं प्रणमाशि नित्विकल्मस।

रसिकः fol. 10, 106.

It is most probable that he wrote his गीतगोरीपति, रत्नमणी, अगुणकारिता, गृहरारदीपिका and कुमारभारतीय in the prime of his life and रस-सतरामिणी was his last work as is evident from the verse श्रीपिष्टां तत्त्वाय विहितम्, etc., quoted above.

As already pointed out amongst his works गीतगोरीपति, रत्नमणी and रसतरामिणी have been published, but others are still in ms. form. That our poet is the author of कुमारभारतीय is inferred from the following verses which are apparently quoted from that work in पद्यरचना—

रामे बाझ्रणवेषपारिणः प्रजुर्वतय करामभोधेः।
संज्ञ्यायास्तिकाख्मराचार्यं तैत्तिकसामाध्यतिः।
तत ताहि गुत प्रयाहि दयिते नियाहि सीपाहि—
बारं वारमयं पुराणकपुरक्षीमः: श्वायास्तु वः।

पद्यरचना 3, 14.

मृदों मनस्थ्वासितंबंधादितं कृपाश्रयास्यं वांदरे।
वक्रेण बाझ्रणपारि पारि: कण्ठोदः तिष्ठतिः।
शोष्यं वीक्ष्यं विकोषप्रज्ञानयं भवाधरोपितिः।
ज्ञातन्त्रकरताक्षिक किन्तुस्मां बालो विज्ञानो दुःखं।

पद्यरचना 6, 32.

शुद्वे शिरोपसां ब्रजे प्रलं व्रज्ज्वासि।
विन्यस्य प्रतिभवन्त भर्गवृं भारमयामास।

पद्यरचना 6, 33.

As regards अठारहरितदेवक और गृहरारदीपिका, it is very difficult to pronounce any judgment before their Mss. are thoroughly examined.
In the end I am tempted to give those verses of भावकर which are nowhere printed but found only in the Mss.

रे रे कोकिल सा भज तौरी किंचिदृढ़वय पञ्चमरागः।
नो चेत्तामिष को जानिते काककदम्भ[ मैंः ]पिंहिते तृतः॥
रसिकोऽ फल. 34, 152.
संकेतकेतिमुहम्मत्य निरीक्ष्य शून्यमेणीहीनो निश्चि[ त ] निःश्रसितात्।
अपरीक्षर वचनमर्थविकाशि नेत्र तामुृ॥ मर्थकशिहृऽ मतवेदेष तस्यो॥

ibid fol. 76, 59.

सुरुरसामिज्जमहम्मतुपुराणैँ किसलयकोमठकान्तः पदेन ।
अत कथय कथय सहेट गम्यं यदि न निःशासु मनोरथो रथः स्वादः॥

ibid fol. 77, 62.

बदुयाति हउँ यस्य नैव ठज्जा न च कच्चा न च कोपि भैतिेशः।
बंकुलसुकुलकोशकोमठायं [भा्] पुनरापि तस्य करे न पापवेदः॥

ibid fol. 77, 84.

कान्ते कनककम्रीरं करे किमपि कुर्वेदः।
आगारात्त्विते भानी बिन्दुमिन्दुमुखी दूधी॥

ibid fol. 79, 87.

सा चन्द्यमिन्दुमुखी स च नन्दसुकुलकोशकोमठायं सुमुपाजगः।
अतन्ति सहचरसतारं कठोरे पानीयपानकपेटेन सरः पतेशं॥

ibid fol. 80, 96.

ईष्टकामपाथोरं गुणकाटिमुहम्मताराजुते
स्ववझालमकनेकहासससरे सारमंनदभयसः।
वारं वास्मुः प्रहासानुभंगे [ सं ] दृष्टमानाधरं
किंचिद्वृत्तिनासितमददानवरं धन्यो रतं सेवते॥

ibid, fol. 101, 95.

पाथोदजाति [ ज ? ]तिरु…………………हरवकाशः।
अम्बरं धारवामास चान्तिकाचरशारिभि।॥

ibid, fol. 115, 97.
The Poet Bhanukara

अद्वितीयक्रामरूपस्मार्ति नृत्यमुखोऽगु
सम्राप्यन्ति चकोरार्किनी न छत्र्युक्तियं ज्ञाते॥

ibid, fol. 135, 104.

dुःखं दृष्टितरं वहस्त्यापि सर्वसाध्यं नै भास्ते
शीवळेः सयने सृजन्यापि पुनः शीतिन वा छज्जया॥
कं त्रे गहनवचमाश्रयं दृष्टादेशः न ब्राप्तोऽद
संतापं सहते यद्युज्जमस्य तद्युद्चेतोभवः॥

अुर्य हारावली ३४° ( ६२ )
पायाहुः बुन्द्रवः स यत्र सहसा व्याघायत्यक्तमादनोकरणं भयातुर्तं चाहिं तेस्रं बिन्दुः बिहायं कासितं॥
ओकरः करपदुः पुरामेवं भेजे विशृंहस्त्थानाः
बिन्दुःत्मकमशीते कैभज्जत्स्तस्य कराम्भोरहे॥
दतं सया पदमितं नवापुक्तनाय तव सत्वरं क्रमं ईश्वर साप्ते ति।
क्रमस्य इस्ताद्यिद्विताक्षरसमाधिकेव रोमावठी विजयते जठज्जे
क्षणायाः॥

रसिकः फूल, ६५, ९३।

हर्षं सुष्टं चर्चलकन्तकलितं पद्धः ( ज ) छ्रवा
मिष्का समवशालकोरसमसमरणादनुसारितवसम्।
अक्षसमाखोमाखोमुघुपपटसक्तिस्कुरे यत्रु
ततं शश्चे पुष्पोऽदसमसमसमायातमधुना॥

ibid, fol. ६६°, ९५।

रचयति दुनवेतःअक्षोपश्चिमवर्धविधः नवजद्धवरेकोरोमराजचिन्तने।
वदुद्वयति कठाप्रक्रियं तदं चः सतनवसमयोऽदशामावरस्ति
तितिविषः॥

ibid, fol. ६६°, ९७।

पद्ध्वयं मुक्कास्तरलभणे: संयोगाः छोचनार्कृं
धीमाहस्यजन्ति नंतरं सेर्वे मध्यमाहः।।
पदेष्च चन्द्रः कः कचासचिवतामाचादीयमावस्यः
नामार्कृं गुणाविनिमयः कल्पितं पौनेन॥

ibid, fol. ७९°, १४२।
Dr. S. K. De has appended in this very number of the *Annals* a note on my article. Therein he contests my evidence for proving the identity of भावनिद्रा with भावनुकर. According to him the evidence supplied by anthologies should be taken very cautiously. But the external evidence of so many as eight anthologies and the internal evidence of both भावनुकर and भावनुकर referring to one निशाचविद्यापाल or निशादकाशि, cannot be easily dismissed on the slender ground of unreliability of anthologies, unless some positive evidence to the contrary is forthcoming. भावनुकर belongs to the middle of the 16th century and amongst the anthologies that quote him पवेन्द्रि belongs to the middle of the 17th century खंडनकपर to the last quarter of the 17th century and रासिकसिद्धिन to the 17th century. So, even if we do not known the date of पवेन्द्रि for certain, the above-named three anthologies, which were composed within about a hundreded years of भावनुकर's date, could not have committed one and the same mistake of confusing भावनुकर with भावनुकर.
The first verse of the hymn to Savitri, X, 149, begins thus: "Savitri has restrained the earth with the reins; Savitri has sustained the sky in the space without support". Up to this point, the verse speaks only of cosmogonic marvels with a very harsh allusion to the bizarre representation of the worlds in the form of mares brought to a stop by the god who has organised the universe. Now the atmosphere is, like the earth, compared to a horse. It is also compared to an ocean or to a cow. As horse, it is capable of being fastened; as cow, it is capable of being milked; but what a strange combination of these diverse figures is presented by the second half of our verse: "He has milked the atmosphere like a trembling horse, the ocean fastened in an inaccessible place."

The conception of a god 'propping up' the sky and the earth is one very familiar to the Vedic poets. The author of the verse I, 62, 7 keeps all this when comparing the sky and the earth to two 'women'.

The separation of the two worlds is compared to that of two skins. But what makes the formula of the verse VI, 8, 3 bizarre is that the two worlds receive in it at the same time the name of 'couples': "Agni has separated the two couples like two skins". This figure of the 'couples', which suits well only the conception of the two worlds as the two recipients of the


1 Ludwig rejects the meaning given to the word विषण्ण by Roth. This meaning however seems to be the one which explains best the different uses of the word. Grassmann admits it, but he replaces here the figurative word by the unfigurative expression 'the worlds'.
waters or of the Soma, produces a no less singular effect in the verse I, 160, 1 which shows us the sun 'pursuing his way' between the two couples, and adds that these two couples are 'well-born'. The same figure denotes also the three worlds in a passage where they ought to be represented rather as three cows, since it speaks of three bulls that fecundate them: "The three bulls, brilliant and separate, fecundaters of the three couples", 1 V, 69, 2.

The Dawns are sometimes cows and sometimes warrior virgins. In the verse I, 92, 1, they are at the same time called cows and compared to warriors who make ready their weapons.

They are also compared, however strange the idea may seem to us, to the sacrificial posts, IV, 57, 2. It is more easy to understand why they are compared to birds, and particularly, [21] in case the word हस can be taken in its classical sense and interpreted as swans, that is to say, as birds with red wings. Hence without doubt the strange formula: "The brilliant posts have come towards us like swans that rush in flocks", III, 8, 9.

The Dawn is also at the same time a 'marej' and the mother of 'cows', IV, 52, 2. We have already mentioned the bizarre combination that makes of the celestial ocean an ocean of 'cows'. By the addition of another figure which assimilates the diffusion of light to the effusion of the waters, one arrives at the 'splendour of the Dawn containing an ocean of cows', II, 34, 12. Grassmann suppresses here the idea of 'ocean': Ludwig replaces the idea of 'cow' with that of 'milk' 2. The mountain is the mythological figure of the cloud and the sky; the horse is that of the lightning or the sun. By combining them,

1 Unlike Ludwig, Grassmann avoids connecting the genitive जिष्यांनां with रेतोऽघाः. But the combination of ideas that I have dwelt upon is the more easy to admit inasmuch as it occurs again in a well-known myth. See VII, 33, 11 and 33.

2 See below, p. 30 ff. The formula however appears to be capable of being also explained in the sense that the Dawn gives an ocean of cows, and it is, without doubt, in this way that we should understand in the the verse X, 76, 3 the juxtaposition of the epithets 'that has an ocean of cows' and 'that has a garment of horses'. Regarding the metaphor of the garment, see below, p. 36.
one thus gets the explanation of the idea that the lightning or the sun delays in appearing: "The mountain does not give the horse", V, 54, 5. Grassmann, who has indicated in his dictionary the correct meaning of the word अन्नदा has then given to it an interpretation which must without doubt be regarded as a lapsus. Ludwig proposes two meanings, one of which is the correct one; but he seems to find it unintelligible.

The lightning is a fire that may be considered as sustained, like the terrestrial fire, by fuel. This fire dwells in the waters of the sky, which, on their part, are called cows. Thus it comes about that there are 'cows' containing 'fuel', II, 34, 5.

'Cooked in the raw ones' is a well-known expression for the 'milk in the cows.' Although this formula can have a meaning when applied to natural cows and although in fact milk is called the offering 'cooked in the udder'; it nevertheless seems to me certain that it is also applied and principally, like that of 'the milk, white, brilliant, [22] in the black cows and the red cows', to the raw cows, that is to say, to the frigid ones of the sky. Nights, Dawns and clouds, whence issues the brilliant splendour of the sun or the lightning.

Now if the clouds are cows, they are also fortresses that retain the waters as prisoners. The words for 'cow' and 'fortress' play

---

1 "Den kein Ross erreicht".
2 The other implies the existence of a word नास्वा=नास्वरा.
3 इष्थन्यन्य . Cf. the classical indhanvant. The translation of Ludwig, 'flammend', and even that of Grassmann, 'flammenreich' are only approximate.
4 The idea of milk is actually expressed in the verses I, 62, 9; 180, 3; that of cows in the verses I, 180, 3; II, 40, 2; III, 30, 14; IV, 3, 9; VI, 17, 6; 44, 24; 72, 4; cf. VIII, 32, 25. The enigma is complete in the verse VIII, 78, 7 only.
5 This explanation, which is so simple, has escaped Grassmann who assigns arbitrarily to the word उधार the meaning of 'vessel'.
6 I, 62, 9; III, 3, 9. Cf. VI, 72, 4; VIII, 82, 13.
7 Not to speak of the use of the word उष्णिण्य I, 180, 3; II, 40, 2; VI, 17, 6, which contains at least an allusion to the Dawn-cows (Religion Vedique, I, p. 316), it will be observed that not only do all our formulae celebrate the work of a god putting the cooked milk into the raw cows,
thus the role of verifiable equivalents that may replace each other
in the mythical formulae, in the same way as the chemical equi-
valents replace each other in combinations of matter. We have
a very curious example of this equivalence in the formula ‘raw
fortresses’, II, 35, 6, which at the same time confirms the appli-
cation of the formula ‘raw cows’ to the celestial cows, and
specially to the clouds. These fortresses are the abode of Apâm
Napât, the son of the waters, that is to say, of the celestial fire
who takes the place here of the cooked milk contained in the
raw cows. But what is no less curious than the expression itself,
is, on the one hand, the manner in which it has been interpreted
by Ludwig, and on the other, the manner in which Grassmann
has effaced the figure. The former supposes that the ‘raw fort-
resses’ are fortresses ‘built with raw bricks’. The latter trans-
lates ‘the sombre fortresses’ (sic). He has however, according
to an indication given in his dictionary, recognised that the
epithet ‘raw’ of the ‘fortress-clouds’ is here given to them
through apposition to the fire which is born in them. But he
does not seem to have understood the relation of this expression
with the formula of ‘raw cows’. In any case, he has not merely,
according to the process of translation which is familiar to him,
replaced the idea expressed by the idea suggested: he has replac-
ed it by an idea that is quite strange to the text. 1 [23]

but that almost all either reveal plainly by some term (पृथ्वी I, 180, 3, जार्म-
वेण IV, 3, 9) their mythical character or depict clearly at the same time
other works accomplished by the gods in the sky, VIII, 32, 25. Thus such
are, in the verse VI, 17, 6 the opening of the doors ‘of the sky’; in verse
II, 40, 2, the dispersion of darkness; in verse VIII, 78, 7, the rising of the
sun. In the verse III, 30, 4, the ‘cooked thing’ which the ‘raw’ cow carries
is called ‘a great light, placed in the entrails’. It may also be observed
that the ‘cooked thing’ placed in the cows receives in verse X, 106, 11
the name of मधु (cf.IV, 3, 9), denoting apparently the same liquor to
which the verse III, 39, 6 assigns feet and hoofs, that is to say, the Soma.
But there is still better to come. In the verse X, 99, 10, it is under his own
name that the Soma is placed in the entrails and in the udder of the cows.
Finally, in verse X, 45, 3, we see Agni ‘kindled in the udder’ of the sky.
Cf. below, p. 29.

1 Similar, too, is the procedure of Ludwig; in the formula of ‘raw cows’,
he replaces the idea of ‘raw’ by that of ‘living’, I, 180, 3; III, 30, 14;
cf. IV, 3, 9.
The Maruts are, on the one hand, stags, and on the other, priests. They are therefore the stags\(^1\) that 'sing';\(^2\) I, 165, 1.

Like the Maruts, the companions of Brhaspati are celestial priests. The warm rain of the summer is their sweat. But this rain is also the milk of the sky, and it is a warm milk.\(^3\) It can therefore be said that they have 'warm milk as their sweat', X, 67, 7. Those who, in order to avoid this bizarre combination, would uphold the interpretation, which however is uninteresting, of Grassmann and Ludwig, 'perspiring on account of the heat', should first bring this translation into accord with that which the same scholars have given of the verse VII, 103, 8 (cf. 9).

Agni the fire, who is sometimes a sage and sometimes a horse, becomes in verse I, 149, 3 a 'sage horse'. The same Agni is not only the horse that carries to the gods the sacrifice in general and the prayer in particular, he is also the driver who yokes and guides the prayer. The two ideas are combined in the verse I, 65, 1: "(Agni) who yokes the obeisance and who draws the obeisance". Here Grassmann gives the correct meaning, and Ludwig rejects it.

The priests lead by the bridle the horse Agni, IV, 11, 9. But, on the other hand, it is he who impels them, who 'awakens' them. It is therefore said, by mixing up the two figures and by adding to them a metonymy, that he 'awakens the bridle of the troop (of the priests)', V, 1, 3. The translations which Grassmann and Ludwig give of this passage differ as much from each other as they do from mine.\(^4\)

Agni and Soma are both assimilated sometimes to a calf and sometimes to a priest. It is one of these two gods of the sacrifice who is called in the verse VIII, 61, 5 a 'calf' that 'praises' its mother.

---

\(^1\) In spite of Grassmann and Ludwig and the Pada-p\-\-tha even, the word एत in a hymn to the Maruts, can only have the meaning of 'stag' or 'antelope'.

\(^2\) On the meaning attributed to the root र\- by Grassmann, see Religion Vedic, I, p. 277.

\(^3\) Cf. VII, 103, 8 and 9, and Religion Vedic, I, p. 292.

\(^4\) The most improbable one is indisputably that of Ludwig: "Die Kette der lebenden Schaar".
Soma, like Agni, is a horse. To make him flow is to guide a yoked horse. This is the function of the pressing stones that are, however, themselves called males (horses or bulls), either because of their strength, or by way of allusion to the celestial bulls and horses that shed the rain. Soma is therefore a horse yoked by horses (or by bulls). IX, 97, 28.

Soma is also an eagle. The vat into which he flows is his garment [24] or his armour. Thus then we have an eagle that is covered with armour, IX, 67, 14.

We have seen above the sun assimilated with a strainer through which is filtered a Soma who is no other than the light itself of that heavenly body. Elsewhere the rays of the sun become the fingers that filter this same Soma. Now they are also represented under the name of द्वितृत्ति as mares. There are thus 'ten harits' which 'filter Soma' and make him bright, IX, 38, 3.

The rays of the sun are also arrows. This explains the formula 'Soma filtered by the arrow of the sun', IX, 76, 4. Grassmann has understood this passage whose meaning seems to have totally escaped Ludwig. But he has not perceived some corollaries that can be drawn from it, particularly in the explanation of the metaphor शर्य 'arrow', applied to the fingers that express the sacred beverage, and in that of the word क्षिप which is translated as 'finger', but whose real meaning seems likewise to be arrow. There are here, it seems to me, allusions to the fingers that press the solar Soma, that is to say, to the sun's rays assimilated at the same time with arrows. They give rise to a new series of combinations whose strange-ness is not surpassed by that of the multitude of formulae that we have already studied.

1 Grassmann and Ludwig avoid the paradox, the former by giving to ब्रह्म, contrary to all probability, the meaning of 'Mann', the latter by employing the preposition 'mit' instead of 'von' in translating the instrumental, which gives a formula without any definite meaning. Add in the same category of ideas the formulae of the verses IX, 64, 15 and 96, 2, where the horses that 'guide' Soma and the 'bays' that 'curry' the 'bay' are, without doubt, the priests themselves or their fingers.
2 Grassmann and Ludwig weaken the expression.
3 See Religion Vedique, I, pp. 201-204 and 206-207.
The pressing stones are represented as ‘carrying the Soma on their back’, VIII, 52, 2. But the Soma himself is represented as a horse. Hence ‘the stone that carries the horse on its back’, VIII, 26, 24. The two formulae are mixed up by Grassmann in the same translation, ‘the stone that carries the Soma’. The second formula thus loses all its force; it is explained but not translated. But this explanation is at least correct. What however can we say of the interpretation that Roth gives in his dictionary of the word अत्यन्त, ‘stone carried on the back of a horse’ and of that of Ludwig ‘(stone) large like the back of a horse’?

The celestial treasures, the waters for instance, are represented sometimes as cows and sometimes as the fruits of a tree. Combining these figures, a poet says to Indra: “Make cows fail for us by shaking (the tree of the sky)”, I, 10, 8. On the other hand, the falling of the rain is considered as a sowing of the field which it fertilises; and it is said of the Maruts that they [25] sow the cloud, VIII, 7, 4. But the waters of the clouds are at the same time cows, and the clouds themselves are mountains. We therefore see Brhaspati, after his victory over the demons, drawing out the ‘cows’ from the ‘mountain’ in order to ‘sow’ them like the corn which is taken from bushels of corn, X, 68, 3.

The making of Soma by pressing has been assimilated to the churning of butter and to the operation, denoted by the same root manth ‘to churn’, of kindling the fire by rubbing. On the other hand, it is, according to a well-known myth, by an

---

1 Cf. III, 45, 4. Ludwig’s translation: “Raffe uns in Sturm zusammen die Rinder” does not present any definite image. As for Grassmann, he replaces ‘shaking’ by ‘throwing’ and ‘cows’ by ‘milk’. On this last point, see below, p. 30ff.

2 Here it is Ludwig who removes the metaphor while Grassmann retains it.

3 The meaning of the word स्थिनिः is doubtful; but the interpretation of Grassmann, ‘Aehre’, and that of Ludwig, ‘Worfel’, are mere conjectures like that of Roth which I have adopted. The latter has at least the advantage of completing a definite, and if I do not err, very satisfying, meaning.

4 See in the verse I, 28, 4, the use of अर्थ (instrument of churning) in the pressing of the Soma.
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eagle that Soma has been carried from the sky. Finally, the sky
or the cloud, whence the Soma can likewise be taken away, is
a mountain. Hence the formula: "The eagle has churned (taken
away by churning) the Soma from the sky", IX, 77, 2 or "from the
mountain", I, 93, 6. When the Soma is considered as held (i.e.,
confined) by the demon Namuci 'Who-does-not-give-up' in
the most remote portion of the sky which is therefore called
the 'head of Namuci', Indra makes him come out of this
'head' by 'churning', in the same way as 'the eagle' has
'churned' for him the intoxicating plant², VI, 20, 6.

Regarding the compound दुर्बार्जिन 'that churns'² the offering,'
VII, 104, 21, we can replace it by दुर्बार्जिन applied to Dadhikravan
in the verse IV, 38, 5, where this mythical horse is compared at
the same time to an 'eagle' and a 'thief' who 'churns a gar-
ment'. The thief is not different from the eagle, and the latter
is the carrier of the celestial Soma; it churns for this Soma the
celestial butter, that is to say, the waters of the sky, that be-
come his garment. It is thus that the water mixed with Soma in
the preparation of the sacred beverage serves him as a garment,
according to a metaphor that has become commonplace in the
hymns of Book IX. The allusion to the robbing of the Soma by
the eagle appears to have totally escaped Grassmann and also
Ludwig.

Finally, a third compound, उर्मार्जिन 'that churns the sheep,'
is in verse VIII, 55, 8, the epithet of the wolf 'that observes the
rites [26] of Indra'. This sheep and this wolf can be no other
than the Soma and the pressing stone⁴. It is the sacrificer him-
self who is compared with the wolf in a verse of the Aṣṭar-

1 On the Vedic uses of the root manth and on the possibility of bringing
all these uses under the meaning of 'to churn', see Religion Véduque, III,
p. 7 and note 3.

2 I do not know through what construction Grassmann could have arriv-
ed at the translation that he gives of this passage. Ludwig translates
correctly, but he has committed the mistake of abandoning, as does Grass-
mann, the radical meaning of the root manth.

3 This meaning is placed beyond doubt by the parallel epithet
आविळमात्र. The Yātus there are the enemy sacrificers.

⁴ Regarding the role of the wolf in the Soma myths, see Religion
Védique, III, pp. 7–10 and note 3.
vaveda, V, 8, 4, where the priest, when praying to the gods to spare the life of his client, seeks, like the author of the verse II, 28, 5 of the Rgveda, to interest them by means of the consideration of the sacrifices which a living man could offer to them: "May he, living, churn the sheep like a wolf". In the verse VIII, 2, 2, the formula concerning Soma, which is translated as 'pressed by the stones', signifies perhaps literally 'pressed by the wolves'. In fact, the word अग्नि to which Grassmann and Ludwig, following Roth, give in this passage alone the meaning of 'stone', signifies etymologically 'devouring', and is elsewhere used as an epithet of a demoniacal animal.

If now, we bear in mind that the falling of the rain is considered as the sowing of a field which it fertilises, and if we consider, on the one hand, that the rain which falls from the sky contains the celestial Soma whose direct action on the crops¹, is, however, also established by many texts, we shall understand that the 'wolf' representing the celestial pressing may become the instrument by means of which the Aśvins 'sow', I, 117, 21, or according to another expression, 'plough' ² VIII, 22, 6, the field of corn. Thus becomes futile a hypothesis which is however very ancient since it goes back to the Nirukta, according to which, in these two passages ³, the word व्रक 'wolf' signifies 'plough'.

Like the prayer in general, the hymns, the verses, are cows. The verses have feet, but these feet are eight in number. Hence the cows with eight feet, II, 7. 5. For Ludwig, the cows with eight feet are the pregnant cows; but is not the epithet अष्टापदरी (having eight feet) in the verse VIII, 65, 12, expressly given to speech itself? Grassmann interprets the words as I do, but translates differently by understanding the word 'verse'.

¹ Religion Védique, III, p. 9, note 1.
² Cf. I, 23, 15: Pūsan, with the drops of Soma, has 'realised' six yoked (oxen) and has 'ploughed, as it were, the field of corn' with these oxen.
³ In these two passages only! In passages which evidently speak of a mythical ploughing and sowing, since the ploughers and sowers are the Aśvins! For a more complete argumentation of this point, see Religion Védique, III, p. 9, note 1.
We have seen that the composition of the hymns is compared to the purification of the Soma. By combining this figure with that which assimilates the sacrifice to a textile woven by the priests \[27\) on a warp, we obtain the formula: "The warp of the sacrifice is stretched on a strainer at the point of the tongue by Varuṇa's puissance", IX, 73, 9. It is in fact Varuṇa who confers wisdom and eloquence, I, 105, 15. The words वरुणस्य मायया form a well-known phrase and one should not therefore detach, as does Ludwig, the genitive वरुणस्य from it and attach it to जिह्याया. As for the translation of Grassmann: 'at the commencement of the sacrifice', it is futile to discuss it.

The prayer is the wife of Indra. But it is also a lowing cow. Indra has therefore a 'wife' that 'lows' after him, IV, 24, 8. The commentary which Grassmann gives to his translation of this passage proves that he has not understood its real meaning.

The prayers are weapons, arrows. The priests are bulls. Hence the 'bulls' yoked to the yoke of the sacrifice who have 'arrows' in the 'mouth' and who hit the 'heart', I, 84, 16. Ludwig has understood that this expression denotes the priests. Why then has he not seen that in the verse, II, 24, 8, the 'arrows' discharged from the bow of Brahmanaspati, who has the sacrifice\(^1\) 'for his string', these arrows that have 'the ear for womb'\(^2\), are the prayers?

The prayer is not only the weapon of the gods; it is also, according to a figure no less familiar to the Vedic ṛṣis, a garment which is put on them. It is the combination of these two figures that explains the following formula addressed to Indra: "Thou hast hit the enemies with beautiful garments", VI, 33, 3. Despite the manuscripts of the Nighantus which give अत्क (instead of अन्ध्र which however has the meaning of hymn only) among

\(^1\) Neither Grassmann nor Ludwig has understood the word स्रक्तर्थ.

\(^2\) And not, 'that are brought back in the rear up to the ear' as understood by Grassmann, and without doubt by Ludwig also. The poet indicates thus the provenance of the prayers that are collected by oral tradition.
the names of the lightning, I venture to maintain against Grassmann and Ludwig that this word can have no other meaning but 'garment'.

Every danger is a river or a sea to be crossed over and the instrument of salvation is the ship. This metaphor is so commonly used that a poet in begging Agni for the salvation of his chariot (in the war) and of his house (during peace) implores him for a 'ship for his chariot and for his house', and in order that this ship may more quickly transport his house and his chariot over the ocean of danger, he wishes that it may have 'feet', 1,140,12. Grassmann and Ludwig weaken this last trait in a translation that is however accurate as regards the rest and, in consequence, already noticeably strange. The scruple has here taken hold of them somewhat late.

The god himself, the saviour god Indra, is a 'ship' that [28] the priests make use of by yoking (like a horse) 'to the yoke' of their 'hymn', I, 131, 2. Ludwig obliterates all the force of this formula. Grassmann gives, like him, to the word शास 'hymn' the meaning 'force'; but he goes further by making a pile (sic) of the 'yoke', dhur.

TRIPLE AND QUADRUPLE GALIMATIAS.

I do not believe that I can characterise better than by this title the formulae similar to those that follow.

Indra is the son of the sky and of the earth. But Indra is a bull, the sky and the earth are two couples, and in the mythical language of the Rgveda all generation is readily compared to the work of Tvaśṭr 'the carpenter'. It is said therefore that "the two couples have carpentered the bull", VIII, 50, 2. Grassmann who substitutes for the three figures the ideas which they represent, translates, if it can be called translation, as "the worlds have engendered the strong one".

The prayer is of celestial origin; it is the sister of the gods, VII, 23, 2; VIII, 12, 31. But it is also a weapon, either in the

1 Ludwig does not admit the meaning 'couple' for सिष्णु; see p. 20, note 1.
hands of men or in those of the gods. This latter idea is one of those most familiar to the Vedic poets. Combining this with the preceding one and using a word recalling the natural meaning one arrives at the formula 'saying of sister-weapons', which is met with in the verses VIII, 6, 3 and X, 8, 7. The greatest mistake of Grassmann and specially of Ludwig in their translations of these two passages has been their neglect or misunderstanding of the complete comparison.

Nor, moreover, have they seen their connection with another formula, 1 'he has caused the brother bow to glow', VIII, 61, 4, where the prayer-weapon is more implicitly compared to the fire. The addition of this new image can be explained the better inasmuch as the god referred to here is Agni.

The celestial Soma comes out of the cloud. The cloud is a cow. Soma is a hero or a horse; or rather Soma is a 'liquor' that has 'feet', that has 'hoofs', and that Indra finds in the 'cow', III, 39, 6. The waters of the sky are sometimes the milk of a celestial cow [29] and sometimes are themselves cows. Hence the 'cows' that come out of an 'udder', and what is stranger, from the 'udder of a male', as a consequence of the confusion of the figures which make the cloud sometimes a male and sometimes a female: "He (Agni) knew how to find, 3 when being born, the udder 4 of his father; he made streams to run from it, the cows 5", III, 1, 9.

1 Ludwig gives to this formula too a translation that is quite fantastic: "Die Doppelsflache hat er in Brand gesetzt".

2 The words गुहा हितं etc., that follow in the verse seem to indicate plainly that there is only one thing spoken of here, only one object, denoted by the substantive मुद्र and by the adjective पुद्वर्त and शाखत. In any case, Ludwig's translation 'durch die Fuss (spuren)', etc., is hardly admissible.

3 Doubtless, it is through inadvertence that Ludwig confounds vīveda with veda.

4 Grassmann seems as if he would conceal the paradox by the equivocal word 'Busen'; Ludwig translates very well as 'Euter'.

5 Regarding धेनं (Grassmann, 'Trank', Ludwig, 'Stimme'), see below, p. 31, notes 1 and 2.
This formula, moreover, is not an isolated one. In the verse IV, 22, 6, are again spoken of the 'cows' which come from the 'udder' of the 'male'. In this passage, Ludwig, overcome by a scruple which did not make him halt in the preceding one, replaces the expression 'udder of the male' by 'the udder that rains.' Grassmann retains the expression 'udder of the male', but transforms the 'cows' into 'milk'.

The mixing up of the cows and of milk is implicit in many other formulae beginning with this: "To milk the cows out of obscurity", I, 33, 10, for 'make them come out'. But this observation can be generalised. This is what I am going to do in the next paragraph after citing an example of what I call 'quadruple galimatias'.

The celestial fire, sun or lightning, or the Soma who is identical with the fire in these forms, is sometimes the 'calf' and sometimes the 'cooked' and resplendent milk of the 'raw' celestial cow. It is also a 'sluggard' when it lingers in an abode that is more or less confounded with the cow itself and is also called, in allusion to the malevolent forces which retain the celestial treasures, the abode of 'deceit'. These different figures are combined in verse 3 of a hymn, X, 79, which however almost exclusively contains enigmas. The verse concerns the action exercised on the celestial fire or Soma by the terrestrial fire 'seeking the hidden retreat of its mother', and says: "He found like a sluggard the brilliant cooked one sucking in the lap of deceit".

**METAPHORICAL USES OF THE WORD गो 'COW'**

The word गो whose usual meaning is 'cow' has, according to the majority of interpreters, गोटि become in current usage

1 Grassmann and Ludwig suppose, contrary to all probability and particularly to the interpretation adopted by Ludwig for the first hemistich, that the subject of the verb avidat is the 'mother'. Regarding the meaning of the word rip, cf. रिप and see Religion Vedique, III, p. 179. Ludwig makes रिप an accusative plural without taking into account similar formulae where this word figures always as a genitive singular. Grassmann gives to it the meaning 'earth' which nothing justifies. Concerning the meaning that I assign to the word सत्स, see the myth of the slumber of the Rbhus in Savitri's abode, that is to say, in the invisible world.
by a sort of metonymy the name of different products like the milk of the cow or the butter made from this milk, the skin made from the hide of the same animal, and the straps or the bow-string made of this skin. It is indisputable in fact that the same word which in certain passages denotes either real cows or mythical cows—Dawns, waters, prayers, offerings, serves also to denote the cowhide on which the Soma juice is extracted, the straps of the chariot, the string of the bow, and above all the butter sacrificed in the fire or the milk mixed with the sacred beverage. But it denotes these different objects like offerings of all sorts, prayers, waters and the Dawns, only because they are, in the phraseology of the hymns, either regularly or accidentally assimilated to cows. The figure is less a metonymy than a metaphor. It is also very probable that it is a purely mythical and liturgical figure and not a popular one. Finally, and this point is the most important, it is always a figure that is felt as such and has not become a current appellation. Neither the archers nor the drivers, nor the women that milked, of the Vedic period gave, I believe, to the strings of their bows, to the straps of their chariots or to their milk, the name of 'cow'.

And in any case to substitute according to the occasion the words 'milk', 'straps', 'strings' for 'cows' as the lexicographers and translators have done is to interpret the text rather than to translate it; it is to interpret the text so as to remove from it the mythical colour which ought to form the principal interest for us.

They retain nevertheless this colour in more than one passage. Grassmann in his Woerterbuch has remarked that the word go, in the plural, often denotes the drops of milk conceived as the cows towards which rushes the bull Soma. He and Ludwig translate correctly many formulae, like that in the verse IX, 97, 13 for instance, where Soma is represented as a bull bellowing after the cows. There is in it an allusion to the union of the celestial Soma with the Dawns or the waters of the sky, those other cows1 whose milk is one of those represented in the operations of the cult. This allusion is the raison d'etre of the metaphor; and it would furnish the justification in a multitude of passages in which Grassmann and Ludwig have

1 Cf. IX, 96, 7.
felt that they ought to replace the figurative word by the unfigurative one.

It is necessary however, even in the formulae whose details are in accord with the metaphor, that the translators should at all times be consistent with themselves. Grassmann, on the other hand, in the verse IX, 96, 14, shows us Soma 'united with the milk' although [31] the epithet 'bellowing' given to the male beverage should have induced him to keep the name 'cow' for the female beverage. This is what Ludwig has done in this passage. On the other hand, in another, still more decisive passage, in which Grassmann translates correctly as 'like a man who goes to meet a woman at the rendezvous, he unites himself with the cows in the vat', IX, 93, 2, Ludwig has deemed it proper to translate 'he has united himself with the milk'.

Nor is this all. In these two passages, the word which expresses the idea of 'cow' and suggests the idea of 'milk', is not go' but उष्मिया. Now it would in the first place be difficult to admit, in the formulae in which it is the word go' that denotes the milk, a complete forgetfulness of the original signification that is still so vividly felt in other similar formulae, and to the allusion to which the metaphor, in my opinion, owes its origin. But it is still more difficult to conceive of a similar effacement of the meaning in many synonyms at the same time. I say 'many', and in fact, to the words go' and उष्मिया Grassmann and Ludwig add the word तेनु and the former the word तेना 1 also as the names of the cow that have parallely become capable of denoting 'milk' without any figure.

1 Ludwig gives to this word the meaning 'voice, hymn', and the Nighantus do in fact include it among the synonyms of vāc. The truth is, however, that it can have, like तेनु only the meaning 'cow' which is sufficiently established for it by its etymology, and by a formula like that of the verse V, 62, 2, 'the cows of the stable', but that, like the other names of the cow, it can denote and does in fact sometimes denote, the prayers. Thus in the verse X, 104, 10, the 'cow' that 'implores' Indra is certainly the prayer; cf. VII, 94, 4 and X, 104, 3. But elsewhere, the word तेना denotes other forms of the mythical or liturgical cow, for instance, the celestial waters; see below.
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Of the different instances of a similar use of the word गोत्र which are found cited in Grassmann's Woerterbuch, two only deserve to be mentioned, and have, in fact, been already mentioned above. In one, the 'river' that contains all the 'cows', IV, 19, 6, is, we have seen, the river that contains all the waters. In the other, III, 1, 9, the reader who can willingly accept Ludwig's 'udder of the father', will not, I hope, make too much difficulty in admitting, with me, that this 'udder' from which Agni comes is not that of the milk but of the 'cows'.

In a formula almost identical with the verse IV, 22, 6, the 'cows' that 'flow out' from the 'udder of the male' are denoted by the word गोत्र and here Ludwig bravely keeps the word 'cows', for which Grassmann substitutes 'milk'. Elsewhere it is on the contrary Ludwig who substitutes for the figurative word the unfigurative one, while Grassmann, at least in his translation, reverts to the meaning 'cows' in the case of the word गोत्र. This passage which speaks of the 'foregathering' of Soma with the 'cows' represented as beautiful women, IX, 61, 21, brings us to the formulae concerning the sacred beverage.

In the verse IX, 72, 1, the word गोत्र denotes again the 'cows' with which Soma is anointed in the vat. The same formula is many times repeated with the word go'. This combination has displeased Grassmann and Ludwig who have everywhere substituted the word 'milk' for 'cows'. This is the case with the passages where the vat is explicitly mentioned, IX, 85, 5; 86, 47; 96, 22. But in others, IX, 45, 3; 50, 5; 103, 2; 107, 22, there is room for doubt if the 'unguent' in question is that of the

---

1 Regarding VII, 94, 4, and X, 104, 3, see the preceding note. It is possible that in the verse VII, 24, 2, the word गोत्र likewise denotes the prayers. It certainly denotes in the verse 11th 58, 6, the prayers assimilated with the offerings of butter (see above, p. 14). In the verses VIII, 32, 22 and X, 43, 6, the context is not such as to enable us to determine the meaning.

2 P. 18. This is, for the rest, the interpretation of Grassmann in his translation: only, he has suppressed the figure.

3 P. 29.

4 It is said of the vat itself that it is, 'anointed with the cows', IV, 27, 5; IX, 74, 8.

5 See particularly IX, 50, 5.
milk or of 'the prayers'. For, the Vedic priests 'anoint', for instance, Indra and Viṣṇu with the 'unguent of prayers', VI, 69, 3, as they 'anoint' Mitra and Varuṇa with 'cows', I, 151, 8. On the other hand, the prayer of the Sobharis is 'anointed with cows' by the Maruts, VIII, 20, 8, that is to say, without doubt rewarded with cows. In brief this metaphor of the 'unguent' is commonplace in the hymns for expressing an enhancement of splendour. The gods take on a new splendour through the prayers, the prayers through the cows that are their reward, and the Soma likewise through the cows, which may represent the hymns chanted in his honour or the milk with which he is mixed. In the verse IX, 10, 5, the comparison 'the Somas are anointed with cows as kings with praises' suggests rather the identification of the cows with the prayers. But even in those places where milk is spoken of, the milk is denoted only by a figurative expression whose plain meaning is 'cow', and the unguent of cows should arrest the attention of the reader if only because of the bizarre combinations of words with which he is already familiar. The prayers however and even the milk are no more a real unguent than the cows, and if my translation of the verse IX, 32, 3: "He is anointed with cows like a horse" is paradoxical, that of Grassmann "He is anointed with milk like a horse" is unmeaning.

One might think that it is the butter that serves as unguent. None the less, I translate the second pāda of the verse V, 1, 3, which can [33] in fact be applied to the sacrificial butter, on the analogy of the formulae already cited, as 'Agni, brilliant, is anointed with brilliant cows'. And I have the less scruple in doing so inasmuch as the verse begins with another bizarre formula already cited above, "He has awakened the bridle of the troop", and ends in the same paradoxical style.

Moreover according to an observation that has also been made above, the mere fact of the change in the terms गो and येनु in the formula 'to anoint with the cows' should be a reason to keep this word 'cows' for which Grassmann and Ludwig have...
substituted the word 'milk'. The same argument could be applied in the case of the formula 'cooked by the cows' where too these two interpreters have made the same substitution. But here it is sufficient to oppose them to themselves and to point out the inconsistency which they commit in translating in certain passages, VIII, 2, 3; IX, 46, 4; IX, 107, 2; 109, 15 and 17, as 'cooked with milk' a formula which in other passages, where the idea of 'milk' is expressed at the same time as that of 'cows', VIII, 58, 3; IX, 84, 5, they have themselves been obliged to translate as 'cooked by the cows'.

Further though it is shown by these passages and others also where the formula is in fact 'cooked with milk' or 'cooked with curdled milk', VIII, 2, 9; IX, 11, 6, that the cows that cook the Soma can represent the milk with which he is mixed, it does not necessarily follow that these cows represent the milk only. And in fact, we read in the verse IX, 84, 5 that the cows cook the Soma with their milk 'and with their prayers'.

That is, 'to cook the Soma' does not mean to cook him materially as believed by Grassmann who understands this formula as referring to 'hot' milk. The cows that represent the milk or the prayers can be considered as 'cooking' the Soma.

1 The word वेन्धु is used in the verses I, 84; 11; IX, 1, 9; 86, 17.

2 In his translation Grassmann says simply 'mixed with the milk', as if he had abandoned the meaning which he had adopted in his Woerterbuch for the root śri and reverted to that of Roth. Elsewhere however, he keeps to this meaning, or rather, only modifies it into that of 'heat', 'to heat', VIII, 58, 3; IX, 86, 17, cf. 84, 5. Finally it will be seen below that the verse IX, 93, 3 suggests to him the meaning of 'covering up the hot milk'. In the verse IX, 71, 4, he prefers the meaning 'to anoint'. This is really too much to pass by without comment. For the rest, he has already in his Woerterbuch translated the compound गोश्रीत as 'mixed with milk'. I translate it as 'cooked with cows', as I do गवाशिर as a possessive compound whose second word आशिर whether used by itself or in other compounds, should signify 'that which serves for cooking', that is to say, for making perfect the offering.

3 Ludwig translates thus the verses IX, 71, 4 and 93, 3 also, and Grassmann, the verse IX, 86, 17, with the exception that he attenuates the meaning of 'to cook' into that of 'to make hot'. In this verse Ludwig connects the verb aśiśrayukh with the root śri 'to go towards'.
because they complete the preparation in the same way as a real cooking [34] completes the preparation of the other offerings. But this expression contains chiefly an allusion to the celestial Soma, to the sun or to the lightning 'cooked' in the 'raw' cows, that is, in the Nights, Dawns or clouds. This is so much the case that in the verse I, 84, 11, the cows that cook¹ the Soma receive not only the name द्वन्द्व: but also दृष्ट्व: which moreover is alone used to denote them in the verse VIII, 58, 3 and evokes already by itself the idea of the clouds that is symbolised by the well-known Praśni, although the passages in question do not, as we shall see, lay stress on the idea of the celestial cows. In the first place, these cows are called the cows of Indra that accompany him and drink the liquor (of the offering), ibid. 10. I translate the second thus: "For him (Indra), at his birth, the cows that give sweet milk, the races of the god cook the Soma in the three brilliant spaces of the sky".² We read also in the verse IX, 71, 4, that the cows which 'eat the offering' cook the Soma 'in their udder', and 'at the head', that is to say, in the most elevated portion, of the sky.³ In the verse IX, 93, 3, the 'head' is the Soma himself of this supreme world, although the cows that cook him are 'in the vats'.⁴ It is without doubt the action of the terrestrial sacrifice on the celestial Soma that is spoken of here.

The Soma 'cooked by the cows' is at the same time considered

¹ Grassmann writes 'mixed with Soma'.

² My construction is the same as that of Ludwig. That of Grassmann seems certainly to be unnatural. The meaning which he extracts from the passage is moreover without any interest.

³ Grassmann interprets, without however explaining the meaning further, 'an dem Euter rechte Opfer nehmend', and replaces without any ado the idea of 'to cook' with that of 'to anoint' at the head. It is the word उधर् which Ludwig attacks. He changes the meaning of 'udder' into that of 'reservoir'. But he too does not tell us what he understands by the cows that cook the Soma 'on their head'.

⁴ Ludwig translates correctly but without determining the application of the word 'head'. Grassmann substitutes the idea of 'covering' (sic) to that of 'cooking'.

---

¹ Grassmann writes 'mixed with Soma'.

² My construction is the same as that of Ludwig. That of Grassmann seems certainly to be unnatural. The meaning which he extracts from the passage is moreover without any interest.

³ Grassmann interprets, without however explaining the meaning further, 'an dem Euter rechte Opfer nehmend', and replaces without any ado the idea of 'to cook' with that of 'to anoint' at the head. It is the word उधर् which Ludwig attacks. He changes the meaning of 'udder' into that of 'reservoir'. But he too does not tell us what he understands by the cows that cook the Soma 'on their head'.

⁴ Ludwig translates correctly but without determining the application of the word 'head'. Grassmann substitutes the idea of 'covering' (sic) to that of 'cooking'.
as the calf of the same cows. It is therefore said: “The cows cook this Soma who is their young one”, IX, 1, 9.

The ‘purification’ of the Soma by the ‘cows’ is certainly no more strange than the ‘cooking’ which they perform in respect of the sacred beverage. In the verse IX, 43, 1 however the Soma purified by the cows is compared to a horse. Now it is probable that the grooms of the Vedic period made use neither of milk nor of cows when currying their horses. The parallelism of the words अहिं and गोविन्द: in the verse IX, 68, 9 is no reason to translate ‘purified with the waters and with milk’. We have mentioned above 2 examples of such parallel construction of the figurative and unfigurative words, and there are many others. To the same two words the verse IX, 91, 2 adds also अविभिः; and here again, the bringing together of the two figurative words is one more reason for translating ‘purified by the cows’ at the same time as ‘purified by the sheep’. The sheep represent, as we know, the strainer of wool.

I do not lay equal stress on all the formulae where the figurative word ‘cows’ has been abandoned by the interpreters and replaced by the plain ‘milk’. In some, 3 it would be difficult to

1 Ludwig searches for a too subtle explanation of the word शिंशु which denotes, according to him, the Soma newly prepared. As for Grassmann, he replaces the idea of ‘cooking’ with that of ‘mixing with hot milk’ in this translation which is moreover quite as bizarre as the correct one: “The cows mix the hot milk with the calf”.

2 P. 16 and note 3.

3 See regarding the word घेरि, I, 125, 4; VIII, 2, 6; IX, 66, 6, and regarding the word गो, I, 134, 2; III, 35, 8; IX, 64, 13. Add the following compounds, namely, गृविघु, which in the verse X, 76, 7 refers to Soma himself rather than to the prayers; गॊपारिणस, VIII, 45, 24; गोपिश, which in the verse I, 19, 1 can very well signify ‘protection’ as in the other verses in which it is employed; गोरम्बस, I, 121, 8; गोविन्द, IX, 96, 19, and the derivative गोमल in the expression सुस्तुण्य गोमलत:; VIII, 3, 1 ; 13, 14; 71, 6; 81, 13; 83, 6. Regarding the compound गॊविन्दिष्टः, IX, 66, 15, and the derivatives गॊयुव’, IX, 97, 15 and गो’मुत in
discover any particular reason which could have led them to the decision to make such a substitution. In others, I, 95, 8; IX, 97, 45 and 24, 2, the observation made just now about the parallelism of the figurative and the unfigurative words or the one that was made at the commencement of this article on 'inverse' comparisons is sufficient to explain the use of the word 'cows'. The expression 'adorned with cows', IX, 61, 13, is but an attenuation of the expression 'anointed with cows'. Finally, there are cases where substitution of the word 'milk' is doubly defective. Thus, although it can be said of milk, as also of cows, that it is 'milked', it is quite evident that the application of this epithet to a word whose original meaning is in any case 'cow', does not allow of its being translated, in the verse IX, 107, 9, by the word 'milk', as has been done by Grassmann. The translation which the same scholar gives of the verse IX, 84, 3 disconcerts the reader who has the text before his eyes. Being unable to say that the Soma flows 'into' the plants 'with the milk', he says that he 'comes out of it', translating without any adverb a locative like an ablative. In reality, the verse speaks of the celestial Soma entering into the plants with the 'cows' that are here the waters of the sky. In the verse IX, 6, 6, the epithet 'male' given to the Soma juice has led Grassmann to the decision (36) to leave the name 'cows' to the milk with which Soma is mixed. But Ludwig, on the contrary, substitutes, very inappropriately, the plain word for the figurative one. Finally, it is difficult to

the expressions बाजन गोमन्तर, IX, 33, 2; 63, 14, cf. Vūl. 1, 9, and गोमन्तरिः: I, 98, 15; V, 79, 8; VIII, 5, 9; VIII, 23, 29; IX, 62, 24 (cf. चेनुमत्यः देवे I, 120, 9), it is sufficient for me to oppose Ludwig to Grassmann, and regarding the compound गोन्येऽवसु, IX, 97, 10 Grassmann (translation) to Ludwig. There are some compounds that are difficult to explain. Regarding गोवर्णिः 'that has an ocean of cows', see above p. 21 and note 1. As for गोकृष्णिक, I have translated it as 'having the cow for arrow', Religion Vedique, I, p. 206

1 See Religion Vedique, I, p. 172.

2 Only he commits the mistake of covering up the boldness of the metaphor by introducing a particle of comparison to which there is nothing corresponding in the text.
understand why Grassmann and Ludwig have both preferred to
give Soma for 'friend' the 'milk' rather than the 'cow',
V, 37, 4.

I hasten now to take up a new series of formulae whose examination will be successful, I hope, in proving that the word go' never denotes 'milk' directly, and without figure. It is often said that Soma 'puts on, as if it were, something', IX, 14, 5; 107, 26, or without any attenuating particle, that he 'puts on a garment of cows', IX, 86, 26; 95, 1; that he 'attires himself', II, 36, 1; IX, 2, 4; 14, 3; 42, 1; 66, 13; 107, 18, and that 'he is attired' in cows IX, 8, 5, that his 'colour' ¹ is attired with cows, IX, 104, 4, that he is 'enveloped with cows', IX, 86, 27. Grassmann turns the dress of 'cows' into one of 'milk'. This too is a costume that is very unusual; but one can only do what one can, and Vedic thought, in spite of it, refuses to allow itself to be dressed wholly according to the mode of the day.

Ludwig proceeds most frequently like Grassmann. However, in the verses IX, 107, 26 and 86, 26, his translation shows us Soma taking, as in the text, the 'cows' for garment, or according to the expression that he substitutes for the latter in the verse IX, 86, 26, for 'covering'. It seems thus as if it is less through repugnance than through indifference for the Vedic figure that he substitutes 'milk' for 'cows' in the majority of passages. In reality, the toilets of Soma are as bizarre as they are varied, and form the strangest masquerade.² His 'white', IX, 107, 13, or 'bright', IX, 69, 4, garments can, without doubt, represent the milk, and the Vedic poets give his other liquid costumes also, melted butter, IX, 82, 2, and the waters, II, 36, 1; IX, 2, 3; 42, 1; 70, 2; 96, 13; 107, 4 and 18; 109, 21. But in addition he attires himself with the wool-strainer through which he is filtered, IX, 101, 15, or, according to the expression of the verse I, 98, 2, with the armour of the sheep, and with the vats into which he flows,

¹ In the verse IX, 105, 4, it is conversely said: "I have stretched thy brilliant colour on the cows". Cf. also the use of the derivative राज्ग 'belonging to the cow' in the similar expressions of VIII, 1, 17 and IX, 8, 6.

² The metaphor of 'garment' has like that of 'unction' other applications also. It is said of Indra rewarding the hymn that he 'attires' it with riches, VI, 35, 1, etc.
On the Figures of Speech in the Rgveda 281
IX, 90, 2, with the fingers that express him, IX, 97, 12, and the laws, ibid., that is to say, with the rites according to which he is prepared. He is also dressed with 'chants', IX, 35, 5, cf. IX, 71, 1, [37] and 99, 1; and this naturally is the occasion to repeat in connection with the figure of 'attiring' what we have already said in connection with 'anointing' and 'cooking': in this new series of formulae, as in the preceding ones, the cows can often represent the prayers that accompany the preparation of the sacred beverage as also the milk with which it is mixed.

The figure of 'cooking' is however combined with that of 'attiring' in the verse IX, 75, 5 which represents Soma as attired in the आरिर, that is to say, in that which 'cooks' him. I do not lay stress on other combinations like 'he attires himself in rivers' as 'king', IX, 89, 2, etc. It is known that such incoherences abound in the Vedic hymns and particularly in the hymns to Soma. They are also met with therefore naturally in many of the formulae in which blooms already this singular flower of rhetoric, the 'garment of cows'. Soma attired in cows is, in the verse IX, 86, 26, called a sage, and compared to a horse, when he flows through the wool (of the strainer). In the verse II, 36, 1, he is 'milked' with the 'stones' and the 'sheep', these sheep, which represent the strainer, appear again in the verse IX, 8, 5: "When he passes through the sheep, we attire him in cows".

But we have not finished our survey of Soma's wardrobe. He has a triple garment, IX, 108, 12, in the same way as he has three forms corresponding to the three worlds. Not only has he a garment that touches the sky, IX, 86, 14, but he takes for garment the sky itself, IX, 69, 5 or the four cardinal points, IX, 70, 1, and the cloud, IX, 83, 5, cf. 71, 1.

The reader sees now what should be thought of this translation of the verse IX, 86, 27: "The fingers purify him covered with milk, on the third summit, in the brilliant space of the sky." The repugnance of Grassmann and the indifference of Ludwig to the figure in whose favour I have undertaken this long pleading make their eyes blind here to the evidence. In fact, it is patently clear that the cows with which Soma is covered in the
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sky, when he is there purified by the fingers of a divine sacrificer, represent the celestial waters.

But this is not all: this formula concerning the celestial Soma gives us the key to the similar formulae employed in connection with the beverage of the terrestrial sacrifice. The cows, milk or prayers, with which Soma is there attired, represent the waters of the cloud which he himself puts on in his superior forms. It is also said [38] that Soma clothes himself with the vats as Varuna with rivers, IX, 90, 2.

If the reader can still have any doubts about the meaning of the figure and also about the necessity of keeping it always intact in the translations, I hope that they will be removed by a last quotation. The bull with three horns that is spoken of in the verse V, 43, 13 is either identical with Soma, considered in the unity of his triple form, or in any case, is represented as could be Soma himself, called in the verse IX, 56, 32, the husband of the women, going to the rendezvous. Now this bull ‘attires himself with women’ as Soma attires himself with cows. The women and the cows play therefore in the figure of the ‘garment’ the role of those mythical equivalents that replace each other, as we have already seen more than once, in the manner of chemical equivalents. Now the word ‘women’ can on occasion denote the sacrificial milk, but it does so evidently because the latter represents the divine women, that is to say, the celestial waters. Does the reader now want to know how Grassmann and Ludwig have acquitted themselves in the matter of verse V, 43, 13? In the formula ‘attired with cows’, they substitute the idea of ‘milk’ for that of ‘cows’. Being unable to have recourse to the same substitution in the case of the new formula, it is the idea ‘garment’ which they attack, by translating ‘surrounded by women’ or ‘dwelling with the women’. To point out such expedients is to pass judgment on them.

It now remains for us to examine the passages where the inter-

---

1 Similarly, in the ceremony of the burning of the corpse, the butter, denoted by the word ‘cows’, which covers the dead man and is to protect him from the heat of the fire, X, 16, 7, represents without doubt the waters of the sky where he has to take on a new life.
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interpreters have substituted for the word 'cows', not 'milk', but the words 'cow-hide', 'straps' or 'bow-strings'.

We read in the verse X, 94, 9 that the pressing stones are placed 'on the cow', and in the verse X, 116, 4 that the beverage has been pressed 'in the cow'. Inconsistent with themselves, Ludwig and Grassmann, the latter changing the idea not only from one passage to another but from his Woerterbuch to his translation, have translated in turns, the former 'cowhide' and 'milk', and the latter, 'cowhide', 'cow', and 'leather bottle'. I translate 'cow'¹ and I intend 'cowhide'. The cowhide on which the Soma juice is expressed² should, like the milk with which it is mixed, represent the celestial cow, that is to say, the cloud which envelopes him in the sky, or, in a sphere of ideas less directly naturalistic, the mysterious abode of the cow, पुदे गो:, that is also called the abode of the bird (Agni or Soma), पुदे वे:.

[39] It is this same abode or the cloud that is alluded to in the verse I, 121, 9, according to which, Indra, in the opinion of Roth, Grassmann and Ludwig who are all in agreement here, 'hurled' the bolt with a 'sling'. The text signifies in reality that he has 'caused to come back', that is to say, that he has withdrawn, his bolt, 'from the cow'.

From the imaginary sling, we pass on now to the straps of the chariot. The author of the verse VIII, 48, 5, wishing to express the salutary and vivifying effect of the sacred beverage, says that the Somas that he has drunk have 'bound' him in his joints, as the 'cows' bind a 'chariot'. It seems evident that here, the word 'cows' denotes in fact the straps of the chariot. But is it necessary to translate 'straps', as Grassmann and Ludwig do, or should one translate 'cows' as I propose?

The hymn VI, 47 will furnish us with the answer to this question. We see there invoked in the verses 26-28 a chariot, which may be, if one so likes, a real one, but which represents in any case the celestial chariot or lightning, since in the verses 27 and 28 it receives the name 'Indra's bolt'. The qualification

¹ This word is not the most bizarre expression of the verse X, 116, 4. See above, p. 13.
² Cf. IX, 70, 7.
which is applied to it in verse 26 and which Grassmann and Ludwig translate as 'bound with straps' would already be one reason for us to keep the word 'cows', as the cows are capable of representing the waters in which the lightning is enveloped in the sky. But what is decisive is that in verse 27 the same chariot is in fact represented by a slight modification of the formula as 'enveloped' in the cows. This is exactly the qualification that we have seen applied above to the celestial Soma. At the same time, moreover, when our chariot receives in this verse the name 'Indra's bolt', it is also called 'the strength of the waters'. It seems as if the poet has foreseen the embarrassment that he would cause to his interpreters and has therefore accumulated hints calculated to extricate them. They have not sufficed for the interpreters: I hope they will be sufficient for the reader.

Thus the straps of the chariot are called cows because they allude to the cows, that is to say, to the waters that envelope the lightning, the war-chariot that on the earth overcomes the enemy representing the lightning that overcomes the demons in the sky. The bizarrerie however of the metaphor which seems to be at its height in the formula 'bound with cows', is found weakened in another metaphor denoting the chariot itself. This latter receives the name 'tree', in such a way that the complete expression suggests the idea of a tree to which cows are fastened.

The same idea is met with in a verse of the Atharva-veda, [40] I, 2, 3, where the 'cows' denote, not the straps of the chariot, but bowstrings. The poet however says in it of the 'cows' fastened to the 'tree' that they 'sing' the 'arrow' when shooting it. The reference here is to the incantations of the enemy whose effect Indra is begged to avert. The idea of magical formulae and the figures of the cow and the arrow that are so often applied to hymns are in this verse combined in the most bizarre manner.

In the verse X. 27, 22 of the Rgveda, we read: "The cow fastened to different trees has lowed; it is from it that fly away the

---

1 Grassmann continues to translate 'enveloped in straps'. Ludwig does better: he translates as Grassmann proposed to do in his Woerterbuch: 'enveloped in milk' (sic). He does not however seem to apply this expression to the chariot. His translation is not very intelligible.
birds that devour men". Here the cow is perhaps the cloud from which proceed the lightnings. The ideas of the bow, the string, and the arrows are however suggested less by the text itself than by the comparison with the passage previously cited and with another where the arrows are similarly represented as birds. I refer to the verse VI, 46, 14 already cited above, in which we have seen the horses compared to rivers. The same horses are there compared also to birds, held 'with the arms' on the 'bow', and hurling themselves 'on the flesh'. These birds are evidently the arrows that proceed from the bow-string that is called a cow because it represents the cow-cloud, whence proceeds the arrow-bird-lightning.

But the most curious passage, that which definitely condemns the substitution of the unfigurative for the figurative word while at the same time it confirms the idea of an allusion in the figurative word to a celestial phenomenon considered as the type of the object denoted by the figure, is the verse VI, 75, 11 which Grassmann and Ludwig translate almost alike as, "It (the arrow) puts on the garment of an eagle; its tooth is a savage beast; placed on the string, it flies when it is hurled". The first trait only is weakened: the exact translation should be, "It attires itself with the bird". The reference here, it is quite agreed, is to the feathers that trim the arrows. The formula recalls that of 'attired with cows' that has been studied above and confirms the interpretation which we have given to it. The word 'cow', it is certain, signifies 'milk' no more than the word 'bird'.

1 See Religion Vedique, I, p. 278 and note.
2 The use of the root sphur with the prefix anu in the verse VI, 67, 11 can lead to the belief that the 'cows' which are spoken of here are also the prayers assimilated at the same time with bow-strings.
3 Pp. 3-4.
4 Grassmann and Ludwig connect the participle मुर्जीताः with horses, and take the 'cow' for a 'bridle'. But the comparison with the verse X, 27, 22 which I have cited in the text appears to me to be decidedly in favour of my interpretation.
5 Ludwig translates, 'Mit Riemensammengebunden'. I do not know what image he has in mind,
does 'feather'. But let us pass on. I understand the second trait in the sense that the point of the arrow is made of the horn of some antelope, सूग.

The rest is not of much importance; what is certain is that the two parts of the arrow, the feathers and the point, are denoted, one by the name 'bird', and the other by the name of some animal. Now I ask, when to these two formulae there succeeds a third containing likewise the name of an animal, the cow, is it really translating the text when one simply substitutes the idea of string for that of the cow? The third combination of the words 'bound to the cows' is no more strange than the first 'it attires itself with the bird', or the second, 'its tooth is an animal'.

The use of the words 'bird', 'animal (antelope)', 'cow' does not however constitute simple metonymy; there are metaphors also, metaphors whose meaning is explained by verse 15 of the same hymn, where the arrow is invoked by the epithet देवी 'divine', and पुजन्यरेतस् 'produced by the semen of Parjanya'. The allusion to the lightning is evident, and it is this allusion that explains the metaphors of verse 11. The lightning in fact is a bird. It could also in the eyes of the र्‍यस take on the form of an antelope, as the mounts of the Maruts. Finally and chiefly it is 'bound to the cows', that is to say, is enveloped by the waters of the sky. This is exactly the same expression which we have seen applied to the war-chariot which likewise represents the lightning. Beside the warrior himself, the warrior attired in armour, it is in the first verse of the same hymn VI, 75, compared to a cloud.

As for the epithet गोव्रेप्श VI, 53, 9 which Grassmann translates 'provided with straps' and Ludwig as 'having a cow's tail',

1 Cf. verse 15 of the same hymn. Grassmann translates 'Löwe'!
2 Or of the strap. See p. 40, note 5.
3 Here therefore the expression 'attires himself' would be equivalent to 'takes the form of', at least in so far as in the myth of the descent of Soma the bird cannot be distinguished from the arrow in its character of the 'carrier' of Soma-lightning.
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it does not contain merely an allusion to the celestial cows. For, the 'goad' which receives this qualification is in the hands of a god, of Pūṣan. The word ओप्स has probably, as believed by Roth and Grassmann himself, the meaning 'hair' or 'tuft of hair'. Whatever it may be, when Indra is seen carrying the sky like an ओप्स, I, 173, 6, cf. VIII, 14, 5, and Soma taking the cloud for ओप्स, IX, 71, 1, it is not difficult to understand what is represented by the 'cows' that serve likewise as ओप्स to the goad of Pūṣan.

I have said at the beginning that these observations on the figures of speech in the Rgveda ought not, in my opinion, [42] to be without interest for the lexicography. It has in fact been seen that in many cases they allow us to explain the text of the hymns without doing to the meaning: all the kinds of violence which they have been subjected to at the hands of the interpreters who have been too much preoccupied with the exigencies of our modern taste. But this work has, if I am not mistaken, another object also. I have been reproached1 for having 'taken for ready money the bold metaphors of the ancient ṛṣis' and for assigning to these metaphors a mythological value. I have more than one reply to this criticism. And the best would be to finish the work at which the criticism was directed, that is to say, the complete reconstitution of a system where the formulae that are the subjects of the controversy are grouped up too well to allow of their being reduced in value to mere poetical figures, born of individual fancies. But at present I shall content myself with the argument which has been furnished to me by the observations that have gone above, and particularly the last ones on the uses of the word गो: 'cow'. It has been seen in fact that what explains the most bizarre of these uses is precisely the allusion which they contain to certain religious conceptions and above all to the correspondence of the rites of the cult to celestial phenomena or even to the correspondence of the engines of war on the earth and in the sky. To unite Soma with the liturgical cows is to reproduce here below the union which he himself contracts with the

1 Pischel, Göttinigische Anzeigen, 1879, p. 168.
celestial cows. To hurl against the enemy the arrow or the war-chariot 'bound to cows', is to imitate Indra hurling against the demon the lightning which is enveloped in the celestial cows. And, this is very important, the rite which reproduces the phenomenon, the formula which assimilates the terrestrial weapon to the celestial one are like talismans which assure success to everyone who employs them. Now, in the domain of the supernatural, the expressions that are most strange are found to be, because of the strangeness itself; the most appropriate for the ideas which they express or suggest. This is in my view the true explanation of the taste of the ṛṣis for incongruous figures. The enigmas and the paradoxes that are the results of the incoherence of the metaphors are, for the rest, but one form of the Vedic enigma and paradox which have many forms and which occasionally assume that of the popular riddle containing, totally concealed, a mystical meaning. There is here the subject for a new work which I intend to publish shortly and which will be closely related to this.
A NOTE ON KṣA AND JṆA

BY

Prof. H. R. KAPADIA, M. A.

It appears that even in remote times keen desire was felt by mankind to give an outward manifestation to emotions and inward conceptions. For this purpose different methods seem to have been adopted by different persons at different times. One of them was to resort to writing. I do not intend to discuss here the evolution of the primitive scripts or the origin of alphabet regarding which several theories have been propounded by previous scholars. I shall therefore confine myself to say a few words about some of the features pertaining to kṣa and jña written in Devanāgarī characters.

Broadly speaking we have two types of Devanāgarī characters: (1) Jaina and (2) non-Jaina. In both these cases we find that out of the various conjunct consonants kṣ and jñ have each of them a special form wherein one cannot easily notice any trace of

---

1 Out of these may be mentioned Mr. C. J. Gadd's theory, the opposite view expressed by Sir Flinders Petrie and Dr. Prāṇānātha's article viz. "How the alphabet began," published in the "Illustrated Weekly of the Times of India," vol. LVI, No. 36 and the following dated 8-9-35 etc.

Mr. Gadd has said in his "Sumerian Reading Book" that the evolution of primitive scripts points out two stages: (i) pictorial and (ii) the one which subsequently developed from it into hieroglyphic signs.

Sir Flinders says that signs rather than pictures are the primitive systems; for, simplicity leads to complexity.

2 See Appendix I (pp. 1-3) of "Descriptive Catalogue of Jaina Manuscripts" vol. XVII, pt. II.

| Jaina Devanāgarī | ृ | ढ |
| Non-Jaina Devanāgarī | ञ | ण |

4 When the form resulting from the combination of two conjunct consonants leaves no trace of its constituents, it at times presents a very great difficulty in deciphering it. Some of the forms of conjunct consonants occurring in Kāroṣṭhī līpi bear testimony to this. Vide p. 35 of "The Palæography of India," alias "Bharatiya Prācīna Lipimālā", a work in Hindi by Pandit Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha.
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the consonants of which they are composed.\textsuperscript{1} क and श put together in various\textsuperscript{2} ways does not give rise to a form identified as क्ष.\textsuperscript{3} In the case of the Jaina Devanāgarī characters, both the parts are fairly noticeable in क्ष. The upper portion of this shows that there is the form of ka occurring in the Jaina forms for क and क्ष,\textsuperscript{4} and that the lower portion of क्ष shows श without its slant stroke.\textsuperscript{5}

As regards ज्ञा, the presence of ज (ञ) can be seen in क्ष and क्ष, both the types\textsuperscript{6} of Devanāgarī characters\textsuperscript{7}; but there remains a

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Canarese & क & ष & श \\
Non-Jaina Devanāgarī & क & ष & श \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{1} Since there is thus very little chance left of suspecting that क्षa and ज्ञा are ligatures, they are mentioned under the head “मुलांक्षराः” in a “Desi Hisāb”. Furthermore we learn from “The Palæography of India” (p. 47) that क्षa and ज्ञा are each assigned a place in नागरी varṇamālā, as the original forms of their constituents are not maintained in the ligatures. Even त्रa is included in this varṇamālā, though the sign for ट, one of its constituents is visible in त्रa.

\textsuperscript{2} Taking the Devanāgarī characters into account, क placed to the left of क्ष and ष placed below क्ष are the ways expected in a normal course. Both these processes have been utilized in some of the southern characters. For instance, in Malayālam, Tāmil and Grantha characters we find the first method is adopted, whereas in Canarese and Telugu characters, the second method is adopted. Owing to want of suitable types I can illustrate as under:

\textsuperscript{3} In the form for क्षa in the Brāhmī script both the constituents क and ष seem to be present, and the ligature appears to have been formed by placing the latter below the former. See plate LXXXII given in “Palæography of India”. In the script used in plate XVIII, the constituents for क्षa and ज्ञा are both distinct.

\textsuperscript{4} See Appendix II (p. 4) of D. C. J. M. vol. XVII, pp. II.

\textsuperscript{5} The latter remark is applicable to श, too.

\textsuperscript{6} It appears that the former type is derived from the latter, the similar remark holding good for क्षa, too.

\textsuperscript{7} This remark is applicable to the Brāhmī character, too.
difficulty of tracing ः, though it may be guessed that the portion remaining after j is taken off from jña, resembles some part of it. This will show that in the Devanāgarī form for jña, ञ is assigned a place below j. Thus this method agrees with the way of writing jña in Canarese ¹ and Telugu characters, whereas it differs from the way in which jña is written in Malayālam, Tamil and Grantha characters; for, in these three characters jña is written by the side of j and to its left.

In this connection I may draw the attention of the learned reader to the plate ² facing this page and especially to the third line from the bottom of a portion of the leaf 145ᵃ which may be represented in non-Jaina characters without प्रमाणाः ³ as under:—

“कुञ्जनरूपं। मातित्वानदिकवस्थानं। तं तत्र लाभ—”

There are some persons who believe in Mātrka theory. They opine that every letter and every symbol have something to do with a god or a goddess ⁴, and that they quote a typical line viz. “aksaraṁ paramaṁ brahma”. Will any one of them point out as to what god or goddess is associated with kṣa and jña as well?

Leaving aside for a moment the tradition that every letter is a mantrākṣara ⁵, I would like to know if kṣa or jña has been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canarese</th>
<th>ढ</th>
<th>ङ</th>
<th>ङ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jaina Devanāgarī</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ज</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Cf.

² A portion of this plate given below to the left and containing the date Saṁvat 1179, is in continuation with the bigger portion containing the circular diagram. This when placed to the right of this bigger portion with a marginal space between them forms leaf 145ᵇ of this Ms. of which this is a facsimile. A portion marked as leaf 145ᵃ forms a part of the same leaf of which it is the reverse. For further description of this Ms. see “D. C. J. M.” Vol. XVIII.

³ This is commonly known as paḍimātrā and it is connected by some with pratimātrā (Skr.).

⁴ Dr. Prāñānātha has observed in his article referred to on p. 289 that the Tantrabidhāna, Bijanighantu, Mudranighantu and Ekārthakośa throw light on this question.

⁵ Cf—

“अस्मत्रमवारं नास्ति नास्ति गुल्मप्रविष्टम।
अन्यं गुल्लकी नास्ति संयोगः। वष्ट्य दुःस्मितम्॥”

This is quoted by Subhatilaka. See my edition of Anekartharatnamanahjūga (p. 82)
given in any work on mantras, as much importance as praṇava, a mantrika symbol. If there is no such evidence coming forth, will one be justified in saying that the Jaina and non-Jaina ways of writing kṣa and jña have nothing to do with the mysticism associated with mantrākṣaras?

I do not remember to have read anywhere the exact period whence kṣa and jña have been each given a special form as we now find in both the types of Devanāgarī characters. Under these circumstances, I am tempted to deal with this question here.

That in Devanāgarī characters k and s together make up ks is a well-known fact; but it remains to be ascertained whence this rule came into existence. So far as I know, it is not mentioned in Āstādhyāyī, Mahābhāsyā, Vārtika and Siddhāntakaumudi. All the same this rule is found in Candraprabhā (p. 48) as under:

- कष्योण्ये क्ष:।

An earlier reference to this is met with in Rūpmālā (p. 49), a commentary on Kātantra as below:

- कष्योण्ये क्ष:। ॥ २८५ ॥

As regards the form for jña, Siddhāntakaumudi (p. 82) on Āstādhyāyī (VIII–2–8) states that “जञोर्जः। राजः। राज्ञा।”. In a foot-note (the third) on it we have:

- जञोर्जः इति-नेन्द्रमुद्दश्वविषयं सूचभाष्यवातिक्ष्यपविद्वात, किंतु अभिदुर्कवचनं।

From this it follows that out of Pāṇini, Patañjali and Kātyāyana none has stated that in Devanāgarī or any other script

---

1 This is written in two ways: (i) ओ and (ii) ओ. The first of them belongs to the Jaina script and the other to the non-Jaina one. The former way of writing om is what one can naturally expect; for, it is derived by writing ओ (i.e. o in the Jaina script) with an anusvāra (nasal) on it. The latter way seems to be rather peculiar, for, in ओ, a layman cannot trace ओ. A paleoepigraphist like Pandit Ojha has suggested that ओ is a modification of older o occurring in plates Nos. XVIII, XIX, XXI and XXXV. Moreover, he says (on p. 136) that it follows from the 25th plate.

From Dr. R. Shamsastra’s learned article published in “Indian Antiquary” Vol. XXXV, pp. 253–267, 270–290 and 311–324 we learn that from the latter half of the 11th century A.D. the older form of au became current for o.

2 Incidentally I would like to know exactly from what period and for what reason, special forms for and, et cetera, dollar and pound (20 shillings) are being represented as औ, औि, $ and £.
the forms for $j$ and $\tilde{n}a$ when combined give rise to a special form $j\tilde{n}a$.

In the Candraprabhā above referred to, we have on p. 57:—

"जनोऽः"

At first thought it struck me that the special forms for $k\tilde{a}$ and $j\tilde{n}a$ might have originated in a land where people had to write $k\tilde{a}$ and $j\tilde{n}a$ many a time and who, whereupon wanted to save time and trouble. But I am not prepared to take a serious note of it, unless and until I can substantiate it by some other valid evidences and convincing arguments. It is, however, true that we come across passages and verses where $k\tilde{a}$ occur several times. For instance, in Jambū kavi's Jinaśataka one can trace many instances of this kind. As a typical example, may be quoted the following verse from this Jaina hymn:—

"क्ष्याग्य रूपश्चिमन: श्चिमक्रियकृताक्षुरस्तस्ताश्रयः
मृगकेर्मिकृतादिम: क्षापितमुक्ताक्षुरमयर्क्षपििदस्ताः।
अश्रयः क्ष्याग्यक्षरप्रतिवंतना भिक्षुप्रो सहिष्ठवल्लभीं
सायानं विनाय किरिन्ति क्षपतु स जिन: क्ष्यपक्षे यद्यक्षः॥ १ ॥"

The first hemistich of the following verse occurring in the tīppāna of Sayaga and in the tīppānaka of Pavaṇaṇāsaṛuddhāra, each composed by Udayaprābhā Sūri may be also noted:—

"सपाल्क्षरक्रीयाधस्तस्ताश्रयः स्तंबद्वर्तिनाम्।
श्रीधरयोगरस्तरिणो पुल्लक्ष्यारकारकः॥ १ ॥"

As a fairly parallel example from a non-Jaina source, I may mention the first hemistich of the following verse given on p. 72 of Vidyānanda's Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣana:—

"क्ष्याग्यक्रियकृतादिम: क्षापितमुक्ताक्षुरस्तस्ताश्रयः
क्ष्याग्यक्रियकृतादिम: क्षापितमुक्ताक्षुरस्तस्ताश्रयः।
उदामोन्नमस्तंबद्वर्तिनां युगवर्तिनां ऊगवर्तिनां
मोदितंबल्लक्ष्यारकारकः द्विवद्वर्तिनां केलयः॥" (प्रतापक्रीया—कायमकरण)

The 3rd varṇa of the verse beginning with नव्य वेणोक्तम्य: and occurring in Nīśatāka also furnishes us with an example of anuprāṣa of $k\tilde{a}$ to some extent.

1 $j\tilde{n}a$ and $k\tilde{a}$ occur a number of times in plate X given in "The Palæography of India ".

2 This is published in Kāvyamālā as No. 7 by the Nirṇayāsāgara Press in A. D. 1907.
The second carana of the following verse from Gaṅgālahari can be also referred to in this connection:—

“उद्ययमय्रमस्वम्भरकर्मद्विन्यमणोष्णिः
कल्याणोपरमस्यप्रसन्नताःसाम्यस्मृतिवसः
भवन्तु वंगमनो इररिकाः गम्यात्तुर्वया—
सदर्भः प्रातिः हर्षार्ययम भवताः॥ २ ॥”

Bāṇa’s Hārṣacarita, too, has several passages where three or four kṣas can be noticed.

As in the case of kṣa, it is desirable that I should cite passages and verses which may furnish us with examples of anuṃraṣa of jña. But I am sorry to note that I do not remember to have come across any which can be assigned a place equal to verses quoted for kṣa. Will any scholar therefore kindly supply me with the pertinent instances? In the meanwhile, I may en passant refer to the following verse occurring in Nitiśataka:—

“अन्तः सुखमार्गवते सुखतमार्गवते विशेषज्ञः
ज्ञानलङ्कविशेषवेद्य वद्विनांपि नरेन रश्यति ॥”

I may note as an additional example, the last carana of the following verse from the Naiṣadhiya carita (canto III, v. 64):—

“ईश्वरिस्मश्चविभर्तामणे
लोकानांकोणां शायतोकमणे ।
तिर्य्कपथ्यं सुपाणामित्वं
रसिन्द्रोपतज्ञसमव्यमानं ॥ ६ ॥”

The ligatures kṣa and jña are not to be met with in every īpi. For instance, in the 46 letters which make up the Brāhmī īpi according to the 46th samavāya of Samavāya, the 4th aṅga of the Jaina canonical treatises, there is no mention of jña. Even the occurrence of kṣa is not a matter of certainty. For, Abhayadeva Sūri, while commenting upon Samavāya (XLVI) says that kṣa may have been included in the 46 letters of the Brāhmī script.

---

1 See pp. 16, 61, 130 and 170 of the Bombay Sanskrit Series No. LXVI.
2 Some of the details about this īpi are dealt with by me in a separate article “Some Palaeographical data from the Jaina sources” to be published in the Annals of B. O. R. Institute hereafter.
3 “The Palæography of India” (p. 47) throws light in this connection; for, there it is said that after a special form took place for the combination of k and s, the Bauddhas included kṣ in the list of the varṇas—mātrkas-siddha-mātrkās. In the täntrika works, kṣa and jña are each styled as a varṇa i.e. a mātrkā.
Prof. Johann Georg Bühler denies its existence as can be seen from the following observation made by him in his "Indian Palæography" (p. 2):

"While the mātrakās R, R̄, ḍ, ḍ̄ and the ligature kṣa, which in later times was often erroneously considered a mātra were excluded."

Pandit G. H. Ojha, in "The Palæography of India" (p. 46) introduces kṣa in an optional manner for ś.

Now a word about the presence or absence of kṣa and jñā in languages. The Sanskrit 1 language and the Vernaculars where-in tātsama words are used, contain words having kṣ 2 and jñ. But such is not case with the Prākrit languages. These ligatures are absent there. Even the n, a constituent of jñā has no room for it there, as can be seen from the following verse which is quoted by Malayagiri Śūrī in his commentary (p. 3) to Brhat-kalpsūtra:

"य-ओकारपरां हंकारपरं च पापेन नामिन ।
ब-सनामविज्ञमाणि य क-चवग-तवगविज्ञायां इ।"

As kṣ and jñ are absent in Prakrit, I may say a few words regarding their substitutes.

The conjunct consonant kṣ is reduced to kkh and cch. The grammarians of the eastern school assert that kkh is a feature of Sauraseni, and cch, that of Māhārāṣṭri. Such a distinction is not as yet noticed to exist in the western school. In Aśva-ghoṣa and Bhāṣa we have a number of cases where kṣ is replaced by kkh. Kṣ occurring in some of the Sanskrit words is even now reduced to kkh in Gujarāti and Marāṭhī as well.

The treatment in the case of jñ differs at different hands.3 On the one hand Hemacandra Śūrī, the well-known polygrapher reduces jñ, ny and ny to jñ, as is the case in

---

1 This is mentioned after Sanskrit in Thāṇa (II) of the third aṅga.
2 Even in Vaidikā Sanskrit we have words containing kṣ. Vide Rg-Veḍa (II. I. 10; etc.).
3 This topic is treated by my friend Prof. A. M. Ghatage, M. A., in his splendid article "Sauraseni Prakrit" (Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. III, Pt. IV, pp. 55 and 56).
the Māhārāṣṭrī. It seems that most of the modern scholars follow in his foot-steps (Schmidt 6-7). Vararuci mentions an option of substituting Ṉj instead of Ḍn in the case of words like vijña (12, 7), but only ṇn in the case of injītajña and sarvajña (12, 8). Kramadīśvara substitutes Ṉj for Ḍn occurring in adhijña, pratijnā, yajña and vijña (5, 76). Dr. Pischel opines that both these rules are rather doubtful; for, no other grammarian has mentioned them, and that this is probably due to an error on the part of scribes who copied Mss.

Markandeya gives both jñ and ṇn for Ḍn (9, 46). Āsvaghoṣa replaces Ḍn by ṇn, whereas Bhāsa substitutes both ṇn and ṇñ almost with equal frequency.

I may conclude this note by referring to the pronunciation of jñā. I have heard it being pronounced in various ways⁴ such as dnya, d̐na, gña, ṇnya, gya etc, even when it is admitted by the speakers that j and ṇa combined together make up jñā. Thus it appears that its pronunciation has something to do with provincialism.

In “The Palæography of India” (p. 47) it is said that the Deccanies pronounce jñā as dña² some persons in the north of India as gya and a few Sanskritists, something like gnya.

---

⁴ This is likely to remind one about the differences in the pronunciation of the liquid letters viz. ṛ and ṭ. In this connection it has been remarked in “The Palæography of India” (p. 44) that many a person pronounce ṛ̐ and ṭ̐ as ṛ and ṭ; some of the people of the Deccan as ṛ and ṭ̐ and some of the Northern India as the Vaidika ṛ and ṭ̐. But none of these ways is correct.

² Vide the English title of ज्ञानप्रकाश. Is this due to the mode of writing jñā in Modi as d plus na?
MISCELLANEA

BHĀNUDATTA AND BHĀNUKARA

BY

DR. S. K. DEI, M. A., D. Litt.

In his very interesting article on the poet Bhānukara Dr. Haradatta Sarma has referred to the question of the date of Bhānudatta, with whom he proposes to identify Bhānukara. He has criticised the date 1428 A.D. given by me (Sanskrit Poetics I, p. 248) as the terminus ad quem of Bhānudatta's date; but he appears to have overlooked my note (at p. 252 of the same work) where I had indicated that this date was not beyond doubt. His attention may be drawn in this connexion to my subsequent article on Bhānudatta’s date (which also he seems to have overlooked) placed before the Fourth All-Indian Oriental Conference and published in its Summaries of Papers (Allahabad 1926, pp. 40-43). In this article I have definitely rejected the date 1428 A. D. for 1572 A. D., which Dr. Sarma, agreeing with Mr. Gode, now proposes; and I have, on independent grounds, attempted a closer approximation of Bhānudatta’s date to the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century. This dating will dispose of Dr. Sarma’s surprise that Bhānudatta is not at all quoted in the Saruṅgadhārā-paddhāti, which was compiled much earlier at about 1363 A. D.

The fact of Bhānudatta’s having more Southern commentators than Northern does not finally settle the question as to whether Bhānudatta belonged to Videha or Vidarbha. It is possible, as Dr. Sarma suggests, that he wandered from place to place; but this does not prove the question either way.

There are two minor points in Dr. Sarma’s statements which require modification. It is hardly correct to state that Jayadeva, the author of the Gītā-govinda, was a Maithila poet; he belonged to Bengal. In his footnote 1, p. 254, Dr. Sarma appears to think that I have identified Suresvara, the ancestor of Bhānudatta, with the Suresvara, who was a contemporary of the great Śaṅkara. But I have not done so. Probably Dr. Sarma was misled by the description that Bhānudatta’s ancestor Suresvara was the author of
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Sārīrakabhaṣya-vārttika; but this description is given in Bhānu-
datta's Kumāra-bhārgaviya itself. On the other hand referring to
this question, I have already remarked in my article referred to
above (p. 43): "In the genealogy of the Kumāra-bhārgaviya men-
tion is made of one Suresvara, son of Ratnesvara, who was an
ancestor of Bhānudatta, separated by six generations from himself,
and who wrote a Sārīrakabhaṣya-vārttika. We need not identify,
with Eggeling, this Suresvara with the famous Suresvara who was
a disciple of Śaṁkarācārya; for otherwise the date of our Bhānu-
datta would have to be unwarrantably pushed back to a time
which would be inconsistent with other date furnished by his
text."

The main argument on which Dr. Sarma relies for the identity
of the poet Bhānukara and Bhānudatta is that a large number of
Bhānudatta's verses are assigned to Bhānukara in some very late
anthologies. It is true that Bhānudatta himself was not a very
early writer, and we cannot expect to find his verses quoted in
early anthologies; but one should take very cautiously the
evidence supplied by anthological compilations. By far the
largest number of Bhānudatta's verses in question are found
assigned to Bhānukara in compilation, entitled Padya-racana by
Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa Ankolakara; but for this work its editors them-
selves (ed. Kāvyamālā 86) would not venture to claim a higher
antiquity than even a hundred years. Of the other anthologies
mentioned, the Rasika-jīvana belongs to the 17th century, and the
Subhāṣita-harāvali, as Mr. P. K. Gode has shown, to the end of the
17th century. The attributions in anthologies are notoriously care-
less and confused, and one would require a more substantial and
independent evidence of identity than such attributions occurring
in comparatively modern compilations of doubtful value. I may,
however, add that since both Bhānudatta and Bhānukara refer to
one Nījāma-dharaṇīpāla or Nījāma Shāha, whom I have proposed
to identify with Ahmad Nīzām Shah who obtained possession of
Daulatābād some time between 1499 and 1507 A. D. and founded
the Nīzām Shah dynasty of Dekkan, it is quite possible that they
might have been contemporaries, but this alone does not identify
the two writers.
This is a very instructive and thought-provoking work. The subject is treated with great sympathy for the aspirations of India throughout the ages and understanding of the problems that confronted the Indians of all times. The aim of the work, as stated in the preface (XII), is 'to inquire into the nature of Dharma—the fundamental motive force in the life of man as a social being—in connection with a comparative study of the theory and ideal of varna (natural class) and the phenomena of caste in India and incidentally of class in the west'. The purpose of the work is not to test the Hindu theories philosophically or morally, but to show that the fundamental nature of dharma (and of related conceptions) is a mystic one (p. XIII). It is impossible to convey, in a brief review such as the present, even a vague idea of the contents of this work. The work is divided into two parts. The first part deals with dharma as conceived by the ancient Hindus, the various meanings that were attributed to dharma, the various distinctions of dharma according to subject (viz. svadharma, varṇadharma, jātidharma, deṣadharama, gaṇadharma &c.), the four ends of life (puruṣārtha) and their relation to varṇas and āśramas, characteristics of dharma (dhamma) as conceived by the Buddhists, conceptions akin to dharma among other ancient peoples, distinction between varṇa and caste, the five conceptions about varṇa (racial, cultural, professional, symbolical and occult); the meaning and conception of Ārya characteristics, origin and function of jātis (castes), the āśramas. Out of the two parts, the second is the more important. The author tries to establish that varṇa theory in its wider sense was a theory not applying to Hindu society exclusively, but to human society generally, in other words 'varṇa' contains a universal element and is a theory of natural class, and that there
was a tendency to uphold it as an international ideal (p. 79) in consequence of which even foreigners were in ancient times adopted into the social system of India. The author points out how in the ancient Iranian and other cultures there were four classes corresponding to the four varnas of ancient India. The learned author distinguishes between two aspects of dharma, the one corresponding more or less to varna and the other to caste, he endeavours to demonstrate at great length that in alternate periods (called by him 'periods of life' and 'periods of form') the corresponding aspect of dharma predominated, that in different periods of form various 'social evils' were evolved and that as a reaction to the tendency towards social crystallization and caste separatism we find again and again in Indian history the promulgation of dharma in its first aspect by great teachers who heralded 'periods of life' (p. 87). As examples of the latter he refers to the Upaniṣads (which marked a 'period of life' against the formalism of the ritual end dogmas of the Brāhmaṇa Literature), the preaching of dharma by Buddha whose influence was directly social by propagating the spiritual equality of man, by opening up the spiritual path to all, irrespective of caste or sex (p. 95). The author however points out (p. 96) that there was a biologically unsocial element in Buddha's teaching withdrawing the noblest elements of humanity from the married state to monkhood and that the army of idle monks and nuns was one of the causes of the disappearance of Buddhism from India. Then Śaṅkarācārya inaugurated a new period of life by establishing the one Godhead and truth as against the doctrines of the many sects that existed and by making the Vedānta philosophy the basis of all the nobler movements of Hinduism. Then came the Vaiṣṇava Reformation of which Rāmānuja may be called a fore-runner (p. 98). The author refers to the work of the Ārya-Samāj, of Vivekananda, of poet Tagore and Mahātma Gandhi as heralding the birth of a new 'period of life'. In contrast to the foregoing periods of life, the author instances as periods of form the complicated Vedic ritual (in the Brāhmaṇas), the systematized and dogmatized dharma contained in the dharmaśāstras such as those of Manu (chapter III about food proper for śrāddha, chap. IV about rules for householders). As social evils of the
periods of form he instances the practice of Sati (p. 104), the prohibition of the remarriage of widows (p. 105), the gradual lowering of the status of women from Vedic times downwards (pp. 111-112), child marriage (pp. 110), untouchability (pp. 111-112).

The author summarises his estimate of the Brāhmaṇas in these words (p. 113) 'Hinduism owes to true Brahmans the blessings of the theory and ideal of Varṇa, and to the Brahmans as caste-upholders many of the diseases of caste.' He does not subscribe to the view of some that the complicated caste system was an invention of the Brāhmaṇas, but he appears to think that if the Brāhmaṇas had lived up to the Varṇa standard, had worked for the realization of Varṇa in the social mind and had maintained a healthy self-criticism, caste would never have come into existence (p. 116).

The author tries to show that not only in India but everywhere in the world cyclic processes of sleep and renascence have gone on from remote times (pp. 121-126) and that man's task has been from the beginning to learn to use his hands as his soul inspiring practical brotherhood, directs i.e. that part of the population which corresponds to the three lower varṇas must be guided by the highest varṇa.

In contrasting the theory of varṇa with caste the author remarks 'In the theory of varṇa we find the social duty of the individual always on the foreground and never his personal rights and in accordance with this it contains the principle that the higher the varṇa, the more exacting the duties and the stricter education. This principle was lost sight of to some extent in caste when the tendency appeared to lay more stress on privilege than on duty' (p. 127).

The author says 'there were originally only two varṇas, a fair and a dark one. But soon the conception of three higher varṇas must have developed from the classes into which the fair coloured people became divided. But when classes began to develop into castes and sub-castes varṇa became theory and ideal. Yet for a long time it remained possible for people of
lower classes to pass into higher classes (pp. 136–137). The author relies for this last proposition on the stories of Janaka, Satyakama Jābāla, Kavaśa Ailūsa and others.

The author wisely remarks 'in the West the social mind is obsessed by the idea of economical power, in India by the idea of caste power. A reviving sense of varṇa may free the social mind of its obsession, then the natural hierarchy must again emerge out of the social unconscious into the light of recognition and in proportion to this the tyranny of power will be weakened' (p. 145).

The author's thesis is that in the natural hierarchy there cannot be one moral standard for all, that the normal standard of one high up in the natural hierarchy will be the ideal for a person lower in the scale and will be entirely unintelligible to a person at the bottom, that it is illogical to require and expect the same conduct from these three people and to put before them the same ideal (p. 146). He thinks that the Christian church has tended to do this, with the positing of the 'Christian duty', that the Church pointed to the goal, but did not show the steps and that it failed to show sense of reality and a sense of proportion (p. 147). He is of opinion that when the śāstras speak of the eight forms of marriage they have in mind this principle of natural hierarchy. The author finds fault with westerners for turning up their noses against Indians for their caste system when 'Europe has developed separative nation–castes which for the moment tend to grow away more and more from the organic basis' (p. 150). Internationalism is nothing but the sense of social unity plus the urge of the expression of unity (speaking mystically) or the sense of sociality plus the urge towards integration (speaking sociologically).

The author acutely points out that though the theory of varṇa implicates the social inequality of man (which is the vertical view of society), it does not contain any principle of spiritual inequality, which is the horizontal view of society (p. 153). This he supports by reference to the fact that the main schools of Hindu philosophy hold that Brahman is the origin of all things, of all beings and that Brahman is the goal and that into which all will eventually dissolve.
The author deals with the topic of varṇa-saṃkara (which has two aspects viz., mixture of castes and also mixture of Varṇa). For the latter he refers to Bhagavadgītā 18-45 and 47.

The author winds up by saying that 'no serious student of caste will propagate the abolishment of the caste system' (p. 192), but he also seems to hold (relying on a statement of Dr. Ghurye in his work 'Caste and Race in India' that some efforts made during the last few years in that direction failed) that to propose to abolish caste by slow consolidation of the small groups is to miss the real problem. His own view seems to be that the theory and ideal of 'cāturvarṇā' will have to come forward again in the consciousness of the people not as the model on which to remould the caste system by legislation but as the fundamental theory of the composition of society, public opinion will do the rest and the problems of caste will solve themselves and new classes will emerge from the crumbling remains of the old castes. This is rather very vague and one wonders how long it will take before this prophecy materializes even partially and what efforts ordinary individuals and institutions are to make before the ferment of ideas throws up a personality like Buddha or Śaṅkarācārya.

From the fact that the author quotes well-known authors, Vedic texts and works like Āpastamba and the Mahābhārata from text-books on caste (e.g. pp. 107n, 118n, 1 and 2. 139n 2, where all the quotations are acknowledged to have been taken from N. K. Dutt's 'Origin and growth of caste in India') it is reasonable to infer that the author has not made any first hand study of the original Sanskrit texts. In spite of this the author displays great insight into the working of ancient Indian society. One can well express substantial agreement with most of the main conclusions which the learned author has drawn. The author relies too much on works of other writers on caste and does not explore for himself the vast material on Varṇa in the original texts. He quotes profusely from the Manusmṛti, the Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata and other purāṇas, but Vedic material is conspicuous by its paucity. There are however several minor matters where one differs from the learned author. On pp. 33 and 88 he still clings to the theory of the late Dr. Bühler that the present code
of Manu is a recast of the ancient Mānavadharmasūtra. On p. 190 he puts the extant Mahābhārata several centuries earlier than Aśoka. On p. 92 he appears to state a sweeping generalisation that the Upaniṣads were composed by non-Brāhmaṇas. Although the printing and general get-up are excellent, there are several misprints not noticed even in the errata (vide pp. 271.3, 151 l. 19, p. 106n. 5 Vasiṣṭha XV, 73–78 should be XVII. 73–78), several lapses in transliteration (p. 28 śamā for śama, p. 114n Brahmā for Brahma) and the inaccurate ascription (on p. 54n. 1) of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa to the Black Yajurveda.

P. V. Kane
This bulky volume of about 450 pages is a welcome addition to the Anthological literature in Sanskrit. The text of the book is based on sixteen mss. and two printed editions. The task of collation is indeed laborious and Dr. De is to be congratulated on his brilliant performance. The lengthy introduction is an important contribution to the History of Vaisnavism and the Bhakti movement in Bengal (a problem which Dr. De defers for another work which is forthcoming). The editor gives here a very lucid exposition of Bhakti as a Rasa, its comparison and contrast with the Rasa of the orthodox school of Sanskrit Poetics (p.lxxxix). He has also made a clear distinction between the old type of Bhakti as found in the Bhagavadgītā and other works, and the erotic mysticism in the language of earthly passion, a special characteristic of the Caitanya school. There is no doubt that this sort of mental attitude has in some cases led to a sort of degeneration from the high plane of religious mysticism to the low depths of earthly passion. And it may be argued that there is always a danger of this type of poetry leading to sensualism. But in order to appreciate it we must adopt the right type of mental attitude. In any case “however gross or crude their cry of natural passion may sometime appear to modern taste, it is impossible to underrate its reality and frankness, the sweet, tender and familiar force of its palpitating humanity.” (p. cv). In other words it is the cry of the individual soul desirous of communion with the Universal Soul.

It is interesting to note that the Subhāṣita-Ḥāravallī of Śrī Hari Kavi (Peterson: Second Report of the Search of Sanskrit Mss; pp. 57-64 and No. 92; Poona, xviii A, 92 of 1883-4) which was composed in the middle of the 17th century A. D. (See my Article: The Subhāṣita-Ḥāravallī of Śrī Hari Kavi and some
Poets enjoying the Patronage of Muslim Rulers. Indian Historical Quarterly, X. 1934, pp. 478-485) has drawn upon this Padyāvali. For, herein the verses of Rūpa Gosvāmin himself are not ascribed to his name but to samāhārtuḥ as in the Padyā. S. Hār. borrows as many as 36 verses from the Padyā. The importance of the S. Hār. lies in the fact that many of the readings found in it are not met with in any of the mss. used in the text of the Padyā. Again, some new verses from the authors quoted in the Padyā are found here. It quotes 3 verses of Gopinātha Paṇḍita who as far as I can judge from the contents of the verses, must be identical with Gopinātha Acārya of Navadvīpa at whose house Īśvarapuri composed his Śrī Kṛṣṇa-līlāmṛta (p. xiii). The verses are as follows.

Following is the list of verses common to Padyā and S. Hār. with different readings according to the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of verse in the Printed Text</th>
<th>No. and the readings acc. to S. Hār.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) tvamhasām; b) mukti-stri (śri) yah; lines c and d reversed. c) śca-ryāmasāvikṣate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Śrimadbhagavad-Vyāsapādānām.</td>
<td>do. do. d) harsāśrupulakodgamaḥ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of verse in the Printed Text</td>
<td>No. and the readings acc. to S.Här.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>B 19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>do. d) -dapavargam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. kasyacit.</td>
<td>do. Samāhartuḥ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>B 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>do. a) -karmapaṇka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>B 20a. 70. a) -dārīpratyagṛa-; b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nandamayam; d) kṛṣṇatī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>B 20, 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>&quot; 72. d) -lātābandhe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>B 21a. 78. b) devāḥ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>B22a, 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>&quot; 94. a) svargārthādyā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>&quot; 95. b) nirbharamam; d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grāmasāyāmala-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>B 22, 96. a) sambhṛtabhrami-;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) diptenādyā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; 97. c) aśarāṇajana-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>B 22, 98. c) bhaktavatsala iti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>&quot; 99.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>B 23, 8. d) he kārunyanidhe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>&quot; 9. a) kaśābhīrāhataḥ; b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>indriyakānanaṁśtare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Śrī Bhagavatāḥ.</td>
<td>&quot; 10. Anon. a) bahutātmav poisoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>B 24a, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>&quot; 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>&quot; 14. &quot; d) kārnadhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bhagavan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Śrī Gopālabhatṭānaṁ.</td>
<td>&quot; 15. Anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Sarva-Vidyāvinodānam.</td>
<td>&quot; 17. &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are the new verses of Kaviratna, Vaiṅvilāsa and Hariharabhaṭṭa.
By the middle of the 17th century, that is, about one hundred years after its composition, the Padyā, seems to have acquired wide fame and its Ms. or Mss. must have travelled far south. For Hari Kavi seems to have been a southerner as is evident from the following verse.

By the middle of the 17th century, that is, about one hundred years after its composition, the Padyā, seems to have acquired wide fame and its Ms. or Mss. must have travelled far south. For Hari Kavi seems to have been a southerner as is evident from the following verse.

The verse "uddhuyeta tanūlatetī", etc., ascribed to Ānanda in the Padyā. (358) is ascribed to Jayadeva in the Padyaracana 40.6 (Kāvyamālā No. 89). The verse "citrotkāraṇādapi", etc., anonymous in the Padyā, is signed as (kasyāpi) [Hariharasya] in the Padyaracana, 67. 54.

Dr. De. has collected a great deal of historical material on the contemporaries of Caitanya and the other six Gosvāmins. In the elaborate Notes appended to the volume he has thrown new light on many of the poets quoted in the Padyā. The different Indices enhance the value of the edition and make the task of the workers in the same field much lighter.

Har Dutt Sharma
The new viewpoint presented by Prof. Hauer in this book is that Gitā teaches Action or performance of one’s duties, however adverse the circumstances may be. And this peculiar attitude of fight has been the special characteristic of the life of those people who have Aryan blood flowing in their veins. Prof. Hauer’s main purpose of writing this volume is to present this new interpretation to German people who are today engaged in shaping the destiny of their nation. He rightly remarks in the introduction that scholars (we should say specially in Europe) had till now been more concerned about the exterior of the book, its passages, the different interpretations, etc. On the contrary in India the metaphysical problem of the Gitā has been the main viewpoint from which it is mostly studied. From many, one may quote the instance of Gitārahasya (The Secret of Gitā) of the late B. G. Tilak. And what is more astonishing is that Tilak’s work anticipates much of what is found in this book under review.

The book is divided into six chapters and Prof. Hauer has grasped the essence of the Gitā with remarkable insight. He gently leads the reader from topic to topic till he shows him the final goal of human effort. Every thinking human being is faced with a conflict of duties at times in his life. Even against his will he has to perform several actions. And actions bind him by their result. This life is but a fight. It is a tragedy. It was realised by Arjuna as well as Kṛṣṇa. But the latter would not allow him to give up the fight, however tragic the result might be. Kṛṣṇa teaches him that we cannot give up actions. We should not, nay we cannot acquire “akarmanyatā” (Nichttätigkeits). The best way is to act with a detached mind which will lead us to freedom from actions “Naiṣkarmya” (Freiheit von Werkverhaftung). This freedom from actions is attained by a person if he leaves the fruits of actions and considers himself as only a tool in the cosmic order (prakṛti) of God. We should develop the idea of sacrifice which is complete self-surrender in
action. In this way we can become free from the responsibility or consequence of our action. We become a part of the cosmic order (the prakṛti, which word, Prof. Hauer rightly remarks, should be translated as Urnatur and not Materie) of God. Our aim should be to realise this and establish union with Godhead.

Prof. Hauer has avoided all philological and critical discussions about the text and has presented his theme in simple language and very clearly. The notes which he has added are also not copious. Specially interesting is his comparison of the view of the Gītā with Kant (p. 45). He quotes Kant at length in his note II on pp. 72–4. This point has been discussed briefly in the Gītārāhasya, pp. 216–7 (Hindi Trans. Poona, 1917). Prof. Hauer discusses in note 15, pp. 74–5 the translation of the first line of Gītā XVIII 47 and III, 35, viz,

Śreyān svadharma viguṇaḥ paradharmāt svanuṣṭhitāt.

He points out that svanuṣṭhitāt should be translated as “gut zu erfüllen”, “leicht erfüllt”, i.e., good to perform or easily performed. He rejects “gut erfüllt” “recht ausgeübt”, i.e., well done or correctly performed. Similarly, according to him viguṇa means opposed bringing or creating some opposition, etc., and not incomplete, bad or unvirtuous. No doubt the meaning rejected by Prof. Hauer is that by Śaṅkarācārya, but the meaning adopted by Prof. Hauer is what has already been given by the late B. G. Tilak in his Gītārāhasya.

There can be no two opinions about the goodness of the book and the brilliance and deep insight of writer. We can safely say that this is one of the most sympathetic studies ever written by a European Scholar.

Har Dutt Sharma

This translation of Kundamalä is a valuable addition to Indology, coming as it does from the pen of an eminent Indologist of Dr. Woolner’s repute. There are some printing mistakes, the fewness of which is but a compliment to the renowned Oxford University Press and to the still more renowned scholar Dr. Woolner.

But the most serious mistake committed is on p. 12, foot-note 1, where we read: — "Kausalyā was the wife of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the mother of Rāma."

The name Diinnāga has led to much controversy among the scholars. [See: The Date of the Kundamalä by A. C. Woolner (Annals of the B. O. R. I., Vol. XV, 1933-34, pp. 236-239). On Kundamalä by S. K. De (Annals of the B. O. R. I. Vol. XVI, 1934-1935, p. 158). Kundamalä and the Uttararāmacarita by K. A. Subramania Iyer (Proceedings of the 7th Oriental Conference, Baroda, pp. 91-97)]. One of the reasons for giving the name Diinnāga to the author of Kundamalä is that the first editors of this work (in the Dakṣinābharati—granthamālā, no 2, intro. p. iii) state that in a manuscript copy of Vallabhadeva’s Subhāṣitāvalī, the second verse of the First Act of Kundamalā is ascribed to Diinnāga. Dr. Woolner very pertinently remarks in the Introduction of his translation ‘but we are not told the date of this Ms., which differs from the printed edition’ (p. vi, fn. 1). Now, the following statement of Veda Vyasa and Bhanot in the Introduction to their edition is very misleading:—‘the second verse of our drama is quoted under Diinnāga in Vallabhdeva’s Subhāṣitāvalī, etc.’ (p. IV). This statement has led Mr. Subramania Iyer to the error of supposing that the second
editors refer to the printed edition of Subhāṣītāvalli (see Proceedings of the Baroda Oriental Conference).

An uncritical statement of Messrs Veda Vyasa and Bhanot is quoted by Dr. Woolner also in his introduction (p. v, fn. 2):—

"A Dhiranāga, styled Bhavanta (obviously a misprint for Bhadanta) is mentioned in the Sūktimuktāvalli (Veda Vyasa and Bhanot)!" (The italics are mine). Dr. Woolner should have examined the veracity or otherwise of this statement by referring to the very detailed description of the Ms. of Jahlapa's Sūktimuktāvalli given by the late Sir R. G. Bhandakar in his Reports on the Search of Sanskrit Mss., 1887–91 (now published in the Collected works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. II, pp. 349-412). Sir Bhandakar has not only given a historical account of the work but has preserved for us the pratīkās of the verses together with the names of the authors. Here we find no mention of Diinnāga or Bhadanta Dhiranāga.

Now this much discussed verse Jvālevordhvavisarpīṇī, etc., (Kundamālā, I. 2), is found quoted in the Saduktikarpāmṛta (=Skm.) I. 12. 1, of Śrīdharādāsa (Saduktikarpāmṛta of Śrīdhara-dāsa, edited by the late P. Rāmāvatāra Šarmā Pāṇdea, with a critical Introduction by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma. Published by Motilal Banarsi Dass. Saidmimtha Bazar, Lahore, 1930) This verse is attributed to Rāvināga there. Now, if we take into consideration the evidence of Nātyadarpāṇa (Gaekwad Oriental Series, No. XLVII). viz., Vīrāṇāga-nibaddhāyām Ku-r.damālayām, etc., (p. 48), then we can say that most probably Vīrāṇāga is the name of the author and that Vīra has become Rāvi in the Skm. through the vagaries of some scribe or scribes. Had Dr. Woolner consulted Skm. then he would have been able to find out a better reading and also an improved translation of the verse referred to above. In Kundamālā the last two lines of this verse read:

\[
\text{samāhyevārdramṝṇālakomalatanorindoh sarāsthāyini}
\]
\[
Pāyāḍ vastarunārunāḥsukālipā Śambhorojaśaśantatiḥ.
\]

In place of the underlined portions Skm. reads sarāsthāyini and jaṭāsaṃhātiḥ Dr. Woolner translates these lines as 'like twilight eternal or the crescent moon delicate as fresh lotus stem'. Dr. Woolner must have felt the difficulty of construing sarāsthāyini
which he joins with saṁdhya. But it is difficult to understand as to how and with what does he construe the genitive case in ārdramṇālakomalatanorindoḥ. On the other hand, if we adopt the reading of Skm. the construction would be simple.

ārdramṇālakomalatanorindoḥ indoh sahaṣṭhāyini (accompanying the moon, etc.) saṁdhya iva. Similarly, jaṭāsamahatiḥ of Skm. is certainly a better reading than jaṭāsamhatiḥ.

The translation is mostly very free, although at one or two places it becomes too literal to be correct as (on p. 31, fn. 1) when the word siniddha = snigdha is translated as 'sticky'.

The following points in translation deserve special mention.

P. 3, line 20. It would be better to say 'assisting me by summoning' instead of 'assiting me in summoning', as the text is: āryāsamāhvānena sahaṣṭayina me sampādayati.

P. 4, line 6. It is difficult to agree with the translator when he translates the word amandram as 'softly'. It should be translated as 'loudly' mandra meas gabhira, deep.

P. 5, line 18. Dr. Woolner translates the word paricchada as 'blessing'. But the word means 'attendants', which, no doubt, may be included, but along with many other things, under 'blessings'.

P. 6, last line. After Sītā, the stage direction lajjām nāṭayati of the text ought to have been translated and not altogether left out.

P. 7, lines 16-17. Dr. Woolner following Jayacandra translates yahi taha annāsattā paṇo itthiājanassa dukkam uppādedi jaha annāsatto 'for a wife devoted to another does not pain her husband as a faithless husband pains a wife.' But, really speaking, a wife devoted to another person causing less pain to her husband is entirely against Indian genius. The passage can be construed in a better way and give appropriate meaning: yahi taha paṇo sattā annā itthiā janassa dukkam uppādedi jaha annāsatto. Taking the word paṇo (genitive) in the sense of locative, the meaning of the passage will be: --'a woman devoted to husband (i.e., a sapati) does not cause so much pain to a wife as the husband devoted to another woman.'

P. 7, line 29 and P. 10, line 32. Dr. woolner translates the term varṇāśrama as 'caste and hermitage' which is wrong. The word
āśrama here stands for 'a stage of life' as Dr. Woolner himself translates it further on P. 37, line 18.

P. 9, line 10. The translation of Sītā's words kudo me tādio bā-

hādhea, viz., 'How did I get such luck' is not correct. Veda

Vyasa and Bhanot are right when they translate 'Whence can

there be such a good fortune for me?'. The idea latent in the

mind of Sītā is that how can I get such a good luck as still to be
called the wife of Rāma. Being exiled Sītā deplores her bad luck of having lost the position of grhīnitva.

P. 9, line 16. Laksmanā begins his speech which continues till the 36th line. Then why does Dr. Woolner repeat the name of Laksmanā in the 25th line in margin, as if before it some one else was speaking? Such repetitions are to be met with again on P. 11 (of Sītā) and P. 16 (of Laksmanā).

P. 22, lines 14–15. It is wrong to translate ārya-Hasitena sarav-
mākarnitam by 'he must have heard, etc.' It should be 'he heard'.

In the edition of Veda Vyasa and Bhanot (P. 129, fn. 2) we
read that the editors have left out the following passages found
in the original edition on the ground of their being meaning-
less:

Vi—He Rāma, piavayassa, Rāmattī khane alamahurehīm vahe

him āulayasī.

Rā—Kīm Tilottamā?

Dr. Woolner has also left out these passages but he ought to
have given a note on this.

P. 30, line 23. The word savanā is translated by Dr. Woolner
as 'evening rites', which is hardly correct. The word
savanā means 'sacrificial rites' quite alright, but it has no conne-
ction with 'evening'. Moreover, as the context itself shows, it
is the description of morning:—savanam:avasitām hutaṁ krśānā-
udayagatāh samupāsito vivasvān. The rites here are those of the
morning and not of the evening.

P. 30, line 32. 'Pale rounded cheeks' is the translation of
pāndurapīnagandam in the text. Here not only Jayacandra but
even Dr. Woolner, has been led into an error. Their justification of
ptnatva in separation is far from convincing. The text is: lambān-
If pändurapīna-gandām prasūdaranyām vadanāṁ vahattī. The
meaning will become quite clear if we construe pändūḥ (=pale
Sits) lambālakāṁ apīnagandāṁ (with emaciated cheeks) prasūda-
ramyāṁ vadanāṁ vahattī, etc.

P. 32, line 17. Dr. Woolner translates tusārabindu as 'snow fla-
kes' and gives "or 'dew drops'" in the foot note.

P. 37, lines 11–12. Dr. Woolner says, 'tell me, do you both
dwell together in the same place' while translating kim bhavad-
bhīyāṁ avyavahiti bhūmiradhyāsyate. In this Dr. Woolner has
followed the explanations of Jayacandra and his co-editors again.
But the sense is 'What! are you sitting on the bare ground?'
Rāma had asked Kuṣā and Lava to get down hastily from the
throne. They sat down on the ground as is evident from the stage
direction ubhāvatīrya bhūmāvapariśatalḥ, and not on any seat. At
that moment Rāma was very anxious to know if they were unhurt.
After satisfying his mind on this point he suddenly observes that
the boys (of brāhmaṇa sages, as Rāma thought up till now) were seated on the bare ground. To this Kuṣā and Lava reply:—Mahārāja, prathamparīṇī (na) to yamarthāḥ. "That, your
Majesty, was settled (ordained?) from the first". This, of course
refers to the previous speech of Vidiṣāka (p. 148 of the text in
Veda Vyasa edition) where the boys use the word bhūṣṭhānam.

P. 46, foot note 4. It is not necessary to change the reading
girayo for sarīlo, for it refers to the shaking or moving of moun-
tains, which makes enough sense.

Dr. Woolner does not mention the text he follows in his tra-
slation. On the whole his efforts are laudable but unless a
critical edition of the drama gives us a reliable text it is diffi-
cult to judge the merits of the poet as well as those of the trans-
lator.

Har Dutt Sharma

[This review was received in this office on Dec. 25, 1935, when
Dr. Woolner was alive. We regret that Dr. Woolner is no more
to reply to the points raised in the review. — Editor.]
Travel undertaken for travel’s sake has a charm of its own, especially when such travel is properly planned out by men of means and enjoyed with an appetising relish and care-free mind. The volume under review is a record of such travel carried out by Shrimant Rajesaheb of Bhor between 20th February and 18th April 1909 and is well illustrated containing not less than 20 beautiful pictures of important and historical places and architectural buildings visited during the travel. The book is mainly descriptive and as such would prove useful to educated persons feeling any zest for long-distance travel. For those, however, who cannot afford to undertake such a travel the book can provide much entertaining reading matter if they bring some imagination to bear on their reading of the book and put themselves in the position of the author-traveller.

It is difficult to find in modern travel books that free criticism of men and things characteristic of the travel books written by old travellers like Marco Polo or Manucci because it results from a natural self-abandon and complete identity of the observer and the observed, we mean the panorama of life through which he is dragged by the insatiable zest for travel. In the case of persons of rank the difficulty is greater still as admitted by Raje Saheb in his introductory remarks.

Every attempt has been made to make the present volume as neat and attractive as possible in point of printing and get-up. As an earnest of the future volumes in the series promised by Raje Saheb the present volume is an admirable token of the cultured taste of the author. We would, however, like to make one suggestion with regard to the illustrations to be included in the future volumes in the proposed series. Reproductions from standardised pictures if included in a book of travel divest it of
novelty and charm which generally attend a picture produced for the first time. Such reproductions, howsoever beautiful in themselves take away from a publication that touch of individuality which is rightly considered to be the very soul of an artistic publication. Even the beauty of the present volume would have been much heightened by a few out-of-the-way snaps of the varied life met with by the author during the course of his travel. We await with eagerness the publication of the future volumes in the Series as early as possible.

P. K. Gode.
TRAVANCORE A Guide book for the visitors, By Emily Gilchrist Hatch

The present guide is just what a book of this kind should be—short, pleasant, racy and intelligently instructive. Travancore is indeed a marvellous and progressive state in Western India and the present guide book holds a mirror into its glorious past and picturesque present. This guide produces in the mind of the reader a very keen desire to visit Travancore. The Oxford University Press deserves our congratulations for such an excellent production—well-planned, well-written and well-illustrated.

D. V. Potdar
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
POONA 4 (INDIA)
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The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute at Poona is well-known for its researches in Indian antiquities and its reputation in this line is established beyond question. As a recognition of this the Government of Bombay has made over its collection of manuscripts, numbering no less than 20,000, to the Institute and has also provided for grants to help its work. The authorities of the Institute have taken great pains in classifying this huge collection and are now engaged in bringing out descriptive catalogues of each class.
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The method adopted in describing the manuscripts in these catalogues is as follows:

Title of the manuscript, its measure, number of pages, number of lines and letters in each page, condition, age, author, subject-matter, commencement, conclusion, approximate date of composition and its reference in other places. One can form an idea about the manuscripts by studying their descriptions in these catalogues.

The importance and usefulness of the publication of these catalogues cannot be over-estimated. If similar catalogues are prepared of the collections of manuscripts in other parts of India that would give us an idea of the total amount of this national wealth. In this matter the example set by the Bombay government should be followed in other provinces as well. Moreover the authorities in charge of the orthodox old seats of learning in India should also join in this endeavour.

Those who want to carry on researches in Indian antiquities and old Sanskrit literature should consider such catalogues as boons. A previous study of them is sure to give the research workers a correct guidance as to the line they should take, the materials they would require as well as where those materials would be available."
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Early History of Kausambi

Glosh wi an Introduction

[ft reviewed by I
COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA*

(Epic and Pauranic Sources)

BY

Dr. Bimala Churn Law, M. A., B. L., Ph. D.

DAKŚIṆĀPATHA OR SOUTHERN REGION

Athāpāre janapāḍā Dakśiṇāpathavāsīnāḥ
Puṇḍrāśca Keralāścaiva Go-lāṅgulāstathaiva ca
Śailūṣā Müśikāścaiva kusumā nāma vāṣakāḥ
Mahārāṣṭrā Maḥiśakā Kaliṅgāścaiva sarvvaśaḥ
Abhīrāḥ Sahavaiśikyā Ādḥakyā Śabarāśca ye
Pulinda Vindhyaśauleya Vaidarbha Daṇḍakālaḥ Saha
Paurikā Maulikāścaiva Āsmaka Bhogabhārthaḥ
Naiṣikāḥ Kuntalā Andhrā Udbhīḍa Vanaḍarakaḥ

(Mark. P. 57. 45-48).

"Now the other peoples who dwell in the Southern Region
are the Puṇḍras, the Keralas, the Golāṅgulas, also the Sailūṣas,
and Müśikas, the Kusumas, the Nāmavāsakas, the Mahārāṣtras,
the Maḥiśakas, and Kaliṅgas on all sides, Abhīras and Vaiśikyas,
the Ādḥakyas, and the Śabaras, the Pulindas, the Vindhyaśauleyas,
the people of Vidarbha, and the Daṇḍakas, the Paurikas,
and the Maulikas, the Amakas, the Bhogavardhanas, the Naiṣi-

* Continued from Vol. XVII part iii pp. 917-243.
kas, the Kuntalas, the Andhras, the Udbhidas, the Vanadārkas, these are the peoples of the countries of the Southern region."

Punḍras—It is curious that the Punḍras are mentioned as a people of the South, for, they are in fact an eastern people and have been already referred to as such. Both the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas (XLV. 124 and CXIII. 46 respectively) read Pāṇḍyas which is undoubtedly the correct reading. The Pāṇḍyas were a well-known Southern people with their capital at (Dakṣīṇa) Mathurā or modern Madurā. The country of the Pāṇḍyas comprised the modern districts of Madurā and Tinnevelly. The Pāṇḍyas are often mentioned in the Mahābhārata, and sometimes in the Rāmāyaṇa as well, e. g., in the Kiṣkindhā Kanda (XLI. 15 and 25) Vide my "Ancient India Tribes," vol. II., Chap. IV.

Kevalas—Evidently this is a mistake for Keralas which is the reading of the Vāyu (XLV. 124) and Matsya (CXIII. 46) Purāṇas as well as of the Bhīṣma Parva of the Mahābhārata (IX. 352 and 365). According to the Mahābhārata the Keralas seem to have been a forest tribe (Sabha P. XXX 1174-75). In historical times they are often associated with the Colas and Pāṇḍyas, e. g., as early as in the records of Aśoka. This is upheld by the Hari-vamśa as well (XXXII. 1836).

Go-lāngulas—No people of this name are known. The Matsya Purāṇa reads Colas and Kulyas (CXIII. 43), and the Vāyu Caulyas and Kulyas instead (XLV. 124). The Colas (Caulyas) were a well-known people and were famous from very early times, being mentioned as early as in the inscriptions of Aśoka, as one of the four tribes of the far south. The Kulyas are not met with anywhere; but undoubtedly they are the same people as the Kolas mentioned more than once in the Mahābhārata (Sabha P. XXX. 1171; Aśvamedha P. LXXXIII. 2476-7). But the people cannot satisfactorily be identified.

Śailūṣas—The Vāyu (XLV. 125) and the Matsya (CXIII. 47) Purāṇas read Setukas instead; but none of the names can be identified. But Pargiter’s suggestion that they might mean the people who lived near the Setu of Rāma is ingenious and may not altogether be improbable, specially in view of

1 Märk. P. 332, note.
the fact that they are mentioned in connection with people of the far south.

Musikas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Sūtikas instead (CXIII. 47). The Bhīṣma Parva list reads just as in the Mārkandeya Purāṇa, but elsewhere it mentions another Southern people called Müśikas. It is difficult to identify them.

Kusumas—The variants are Kumanas (Vāyu, XLV. 125), and Kupathas (Matsya, CXIII. 47). Pargiter suggests an identification with the Kurubas or Kurumbas who were the same as the Pallavas, an important tribe of the Deccan.

Nama-Vāsakas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads (XLV. 125) Vanavāsikas, and the Bhīṣma Parva list Vanavāsakas (IX. 366) which is undoubtedly the correct reading. Doubtless they refer to the people of the kingdom of Vanavāṣī, a well-known region of the South in historical times, and not unknown to the author of the Harivaṃśa (XCV. 5213 and 5231-3). The Matsya Purāṇa reads Vāji-Vāsikas (CXIII. 47) which is apparently incorrect.

Mahārāṣtras—The well-known people of Mahārāṣtra country, identical with the Rathikas and Mahārathis of early inscriptions. In the 7th century A. D. the celebrated Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang visited the Mahārāṣtra country. The Matsya Purāṇa reads Nava-rāstras (CXIII. 47), a people located by the Mahābāhārata near the land of the Kuruś (Sabṭa P. XXX. 1110; Virāta P. I, 11-12).

Mahiśakas—or the Mahiśikas (Matsya P. CXIII. 47). Doubtless they are identical with the Mahiśmakas of the Mahābhārata (Aśvamedha P. LXXXII. 2475-7), the people of Mahiśmati or Māndhātā, identical with modern Maheśvara or the Narmadā. Mahiśmati was an ancient and famous city (Mbh. Sabṭa P. XXX. 1125-63), and was the border city whence began the western country (Mahiśmatyā pārtaḥ paścūdddeśa). In the Sutta-Nipāta commentary Mahiśmati is mentioned as an important city (Vol. II, p. 583).

Kaliṅgas—The Kaliṅgas in ancient historical tradition in the Purāṇas as well as in the epics are always associated with the

1 Ibid. P. 332, note.
Anāgas and Vaṅgas. According to the Harivamśa the Kaliṅgas along with the Anāgas, Vaṅgas, Suhmas and Pundras are said to have been descended from five eponymous brothers (Mbh. Adi. P. CIV. 4217-21; Hariv. XXXI. 1684-93). The Mahābhārata tells us that the river Vaitaraṇi flowed through the country (Adi. P. CCXV. 7820-24) and the Mahendra mountains were within its southern limits (Raghu V. IV. 38). Kaliṅga thus seems to have been conterminous with modern Orissa within the district of Ganjam.

Abhiras—The Abhiras of the Deccan must be a branch of the northern tribe of the same name. (For the migration of the tribe to different regions in the north and south see my Ancient Indian Tribes Vol. II, pp. 51-54.) The Matsya Purāṇa reads Kāruṇas instead, the same as Karuṇas (For Kāruṇas or Karuṇas see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 31-33).

Vaiśikyas—The variants are Eṣikas (Vāyu P. XLV. 126) and Aiṣikas (Matsya P. CXIII. 48); but it is difficult to identify them.

Āḍhakyas—The Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas (XLV. 126 and CXIII. 48 respectively) read Āṭavyas which is no doubt the correct reading. Āṭavi as a city of the Deccan is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXX. 1176). The Āṭavyas were certainly the same as the Āṭavikas of the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta, who were perhaps aboriginal tribes dwelling in the jungle tracts of Central India.

Śabaras—Admittedly they were an aboriginal tribe mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa (Adi K. I, 59; Aranya K. LXXVII. 6-32) as well as in the Mahābhārata (Śanti P. LXV. 2429; CLXVIII. 6294-6303; CLXXXIII. 6445) as living in the forest regions of Central India and the Deccan. The Śabaras can still be found in the interiors of Orissa, as well as in those of Central India and the Deccan under the names of Sabar, Saur, etc. (For references to the tribe see Indian Culture, Vol. I, no. 2, p. 305). They are almost always associated with such rude non-Aryan tribes as the Pulindas, Mutibas, Abhiras, Pukkusas etc.

Pulindas—The Pulindas are referred to in the Purāṇas as dwelling in the northern and western regions as well. Apparently
they were a rude non-Aryan tribe scattered in different parts of India. The Pulindas of the Dakṣiṇāpatha were probably an offshoot of the northern Pulindas. (For a detailed account of the tribe see Indian Culture, Vol. I, no. 3, pp. 383-4). For an origin of the Pulindas, Vide Mahāvaṁśa (P. T. S.) p. 69.

Vindhyā-mauleyas—The Matsya Purāṇa erroneously reads Vindhyā-puṣikas (CXIII. 48), but the Vāyu reads Vindhyā-mūlikas (XLV. 126). No particular people of the name are known, but the name may mean the "people who live at the foot of the Vindhya.

Vidarbhās—The Vidarbhas were a famous people and known from very early times; their country was one of the most renowned kingdoms in the Deccan. In the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII. 34), Bhīma was the king of Vidarbha. The country is also mentioned in the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa (II, 440; Ved. Ind. II, 297) as also in a number of Jātakas. It seems to have been one of the earliest Aryan kingdoms in the Deccan. According to the Paurānic account of the Yādavas, Vidarbha, the eponymous leader of the Vidarbhas was a Yādava (Matsya, XLIV. 36; Vāyu, 95. 35-36). According to the Mahābhārata (III. 73. 1-2) as well as the Harivamśa (Viṣṇu Parva, 60) Kuṇḍīṇa, represented by the modern town of Kuṇḍin-yapura in Amarāoti, on the banks of the Vardhā, was the capital of the Vidarbha country. Its most famous king, according to epic tradition (Mbh. Vana P. CXVII. 6590-1) was Bhīṣmaka.

Dandakas—They are undoubtedly the people dwelling in the Daṇḍaka forests, made famous in the Rāmāyaṇa in connection with the story of Rāmā's exile. According to the description as given in the Rāmāyaṇa, the forest seems to have covered almost the whole of Central India from the Bundelkhand region to the Godāvari (J. R. A. S., 1894 p. 241; cf. Fausboll Jātaka, Vol. V. p. 29), but the Mahābhārata seems to limit the Daṇḍaka forest to the source of the Godāvari (Sabhā P. XXX. 1169; Vana P. LXXXV. 8183-4).

Paurikas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Paunikas instead (XLV. 127), perhaps erroneously. According to the Harivamśa, Purikā was a city in the Mahismatī kingdom (XCV. 5220-8). It is not improbable that Purikā was the city of the Paurikas.
Maulikas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Maunikas (XLV. 127) instead; the Sabhā Parva of the Mahābhārata refers to a people named Mauleyas. The Maulikas were evidently the people of Mūlaka mentioned in the Parāyaṇavagga of the Sutta Nipāta. (For an account of the Mūlakas see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, p. 26).

Aśmakas—They are a famous ancient Indian tribe referred to in ancient Greek accounts and Sanskrit and Pāli literature. (For a full account of the tribe, see my Ancient Indian Tribes, p. 86).

Bhogavardhanas—The tribe cannot satisfactorily be identified. Bhogavadham occurs in the Barhut Inscriptions (Vide Barua and Sinha, Barhut Inscriptions, p. 15).

Naiśikas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Nairnikas (XLV. 127) but none of these names can be identified. Pargiter suggests an identification with the Nāsikyas or the people of Nasik, mentioned in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (LVIII. 24).

Kuntalas—The Kuntalas were a well-known people of the South, mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma P. IX. 367, Kṛṣṇa P. XX, 779) as well as in inscriptions. They occupied a region almost conterminous with the Kanarese districts.

Andhras—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Andhras instead (XLV. 127) which is undoubtedly the correct reading. They were a famous and well-known people who founded a kingdom in the third century A. D. In very early times they seem to have been rude people (Sabhā P. IV. 119; XXX. 1175; Vana P. LI. 1988), and were probably non-Aryans, for they are always mentioned with such tribes as the Pulindas, Šabaras, Kirātas, Ābhiras, etc.

Udbhidas—The tribe cannot be identified.

Vana-dārakas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Nala-Kālikas (XLV. 127). The tribe cannot be identified.
Hear from me the names of the Western peoples: the Sūryarakas, the Kalivalas and the Durgas, and the Anikatas, and the Pulindas, and the Suminas, the Rūpapas, and the Svāpadas, and the Kuruminas, and all the Kāthākṣararas, and the others who are called Nāsikyavas and the others who live on the north bank of the Narmadā the Bhirukacchas, and the Maheyas, and the Sārasvatatas also and the Kāsmiras, and the Surfāstras, and the Āvantyas and the Arbudas also. These are the western people."

[Sūryarakas—Doubtless this is a misreading for Šūrpārakas. The Šūrpāraka country was known from very early times, and is celebrated in the Mahābhārata in connection with the legend of Rāma Jāmadagnya (Vana P. LXXXV. 8185). There it is located in the western region, but some passages seem to locate it in the south as well (Sabha P. XXX. 1169, Vana P. LXXXVIII. 8337). This does not mean that there were two Šūrpārakas; the fact is that the situation of Šūrpāraka has been interpreted in some passages as west and in other passages as south, because it was near the southern sea in the western region. According to the same tradition the country was situated on the sea near Prabhāśa (Vana P. CXVIII. 10221-7) identical with modern Somanath in Kathiawar. The city of Šūrpāraka, identical with the modern town of Sopārā near Bassein, is said to have been founded by Rāma Jāmadagnya (Hariv. XCVI. 5300).

Kalivalas—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kolavanas (XLV. 128), but none of the names is identifiable.
Durga— The Bhīṣma Parva list (IX, 359) of the Mahābhārata gives a similar name, Durgalas, but the names are not identifiable.

Anikalas— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kolavanas (XLV. 128) but the names are not identifiable.

Pulindas— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Puleyas (XLV. 129 and Matsya Kuliyas (CXIII. 49). These names are not identifiable. For the Pulindas, however, see note on the tribe above.

Sumīnas— The Vāyu Purāṇa (XLV. 129) reads Surālas and the Matsya Sirālas (CXIII. 49). None of these names are identifiable.

Rūpapas— The variants are Rūpasas (Vāyu, XLV. 129; Matsya, CXIII. 49) and Rupavāhikas (Bhīṣma P. IX. 351). They are not identifiable.

Śvāpadas— The Vāyu and Matsya read Tāpasas (XLV. 129; CXIII. 49 respectively). They are not identifiable.

Kurumins— The variants are Turasitas (Vāyu, XLV. 129), Taittirikas (Matsya, CXIII. 49) which is almost similar to Tittiras (Bhīṣma P. L. 2084). They cannot be identified.

Nāsikyavas— The Nāsikyas are certainly the people of Nāsik. The Matsya Purāṇa reads Vāsikas which is evidently a mistake.

Kathākṣaras— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Pārakṣaras (XLV. 129) and the Matsya Kāraṇkaras (CXIII. 49). They are not identifiable.

Bhirukacchas— The Matsya Purāṇa reads Bhārukacchas (CXIII. 50) who are the same people, namely the Bhṛgukacchas of Sanskrit literature. Bhṛgukaccha, Bharukaccha, Bhirukaccha are all identifiable with the modern Broach or Bharuch which is the Barygaza of early Greek geographers.

Māheyas— They must have been the people dwelling along the banks of the Māhi. The Māheyas are the same as the Māhikas of the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 354).

Sārasvatas— The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Sahasas and Sāsvatas instead (XLV. 130); but these names are not identifiable. The Sārasvatas are of course the people dwelling along the Sarasvatī, the river that flows into the sea past Prabhāsa, i. e. modern Somnath (Vana P. LXXXII. 5002–4; Salya P. XXXVI. 2048–51).

Kāśmīras— Evidently it is a misreading, for the Kāśmīras
can in no way be located in the western region. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kacchvīyas (XLV. 131) and the Matsya Kacchikas (CXIII. 51); these are undoubtedly the correct readings and mean the people of Kaccha or Cutch.

Surāśtras—The Surāśtras are frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata, and were a famous people. (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II. pp. 23 ff.).

Avantyas—They are undoubtedly the people of Avanti (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, Vol. I. pp. 139-155). But the reading as given in the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas (XLV. 131 and CXIII. 51 respectively) is perhaps better. They read Ānarta whose capital was Dwārakā or Dwāravati, the modern Dwarka on the sea-shore. (Śānti P. CCCXLIII. 12955; Hariv. CXIII. 6265-6).

Arbudas—They must have been the people dwelling on the mount Arbuda which is the ancient name for Mount Abu.

PEOPLES AND COUNTRIES OF THE VINDHYAN REGION

.............Śrṇu Vindhyanivāsīnāh ॥
Sarajāśca Karūṣaśca Keralāścokalaiḥ saha ॥
Uttamarṇā Daśārnāśca Bhojyaḥ Kiśkindhakaiḥ saha ॥
Tosalaiḥ Kośalāścaiva Traipura Vādīśastathā ॥
Tumburāstumbulāściva Paṭavo Naśadhaiḥ saha ॥
Annajāstustūṭikāraśca Virahotrāhyavantayah ॥
Ete janapadāḥ Sarve Vindhyapṛśṭhanivāsīnāh ॥
(Mārkandeya Purāṇa, 57. 52-55).

"Hear the inhabitants of the Vindhya Mountains. The Sarajas, and Karūsas, and the Keralas, and Utkalas, the Uttamarṇas, and the Daśārṇas, the Bhojyas, and the Kiśkindhakas, the Toṣalas, and the Kośaias, the Traipuras and the Vādīśas, the Tumburas, and the Tumbulas, the Paṭus and the Naśadhas, Annajas, and the Tuṣṭikāras, the Virahotras and the Avantis. All these people dwell on the slopes of the Vindyha Mountains."

Sarajas—The Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇa read Mālavas (XLV. 132 and CXIII. 52 respectively), which no doubt is the correct reading. The Mālavas, it is well-known, had settlements in 2 [AnnaH, B. O. R. I.]}
different parts of India (For an account of the tribe see my
Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 37 ff.); the tribe referred to
here may probably mean that branch of the Mālavas which settled
in and around that portion of Malwa which borders on the Vin-
dhyas. The Mālavas are again and again mentioned in the Mahā-
bhārata (Sabhā P. XXXIII. 1270, LI. 1871; Vana P. CCLIII.
15256, etc.).

Karūṣas—They are the same as the Kārūṣas, and Kāruṣakas
(For an account of the tribe, see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol.
II. pp. 31-33).

Keralas—This is undoubtedly wrong, for the Keralas cannot
in any way be placed on the slopes of the Vindhyas, they being
a people of the far South. The Vāyu (XLV. 132) and the Matsya
Purāṇas (CXIII 52) read Mekalas which seems to be the cor-
rect reading. The Mekalas are those people who dwelt on the
Mekala hills and the country around. They are coupled in early
Indian literature and inscriptions either with the Ambaṅṭhas or
with the Utkalas. (Bhīṣma P. IX. 348; Drona P. IV. 122 etc.).
(For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol.
II, p. 28).

Utkalas—They were a well-known people in ancient India
though they are not often mentioned in the epics. According
to the Raghuvamśa (IV. 38), their territory bordered in the
east on the river Kapiṣā, probably the modern Kasai in Midnapur.
Utkala seems to have comprised the southern portion of Chotanag-
pur and almost the whole of the modern province of Orissa except
Puri and Cuttack.

Uttamarṇas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Auṇḍramāṇas (CXIII.
52) but none of these names are identifiable. The Uttamaṅgas
are however presumably the Uttamas of Bhīṣma Parva list
(IX. 348) of the Mahābhārata.

Daśārṇas—They are evidently the people of the country water-
ed by the river of the same name identified with the modern
Dasan, a tributary of the Jumna. The capital of the country
was Vidiśā, situated on the river Vetravatī, the modern Betwa.
The people and their kingdom are referred to frequently in the
Mahābhārata (Ādi. P. CXIII. 4449; Vana P. LXIX. 2707-8;
Udyoga P. CXC-CXCIII; Bhīṣma P. IX. 348, 350, 363; Vide
also my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 29-30).
Bhoijas—The Vāyu (XLV. 132) and Matsya Purāṇas (CXIII 52) read Bhojas which is undoubtedly a better and more probable reading. It is well-known that the Bhojas who are frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Vana P. XIV. 629, XX. 791, CXVI. 10172–6, CCLIII. 15245; Mausala P. VII. 244-45; Hariv. XXXVII. 1980–87, etc.) were a Yādava tribe and dwelt in north-eastern Gujrat. The Bhojas referred to here may have been a branch of the main tribe inhabiting the western slopes of the Vindhayas. (For further details regarding the tribe see my “Some Ancient Indian Tribes,” Indian Culture, Vol. I, No. 3, pp. 384-86).

Kiskindhakas—It is doubtful that they are identical with the people of Kiskindhyā mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, for Kiskindhyā of Rāmāyaṇa was situated far below in the South. In the circumstances it is not easy to identify the tribe.

Tosalas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Stosalas (CXIII. 53) evidently erroneously, for Tosalas is correct reading meaning the people of Tosali or Tosala and the adjoining region. Tosali or Tosala was name of a country as well as of a city. The city of Tosali was the seat of the provincial government of Kaliṅga in the days of Aśoka; while the country or janapada of “Amita-Tosala” is referred to in the Gaṇḍavyūha¹ along with its city Tosala. In Pauranic literature, Tosala is always associated with Daksīṇa Kosalas, and distinguished from Kaliṅga. Tosala in mediaeval times seems to have been divided into two parts: Daksīṇa Tosala and Uttara Tosala (Ep. Ind. IX. 286; XV. 3). The city of Tosala seems to have been the same as Tosalei of Ptolemy.

Kosalas—These are undoubtedly the people of Mahā-Kosala or Daksīṇa-Kosala, well-known in early literature and inscriptions. Vide my Ancient Indian Tribes, pp. 34-85.

Traipuras—They are the people of Tripūrī or Tripura which was both a city and a country. The city of Tripūrī was the capital of the Cedi kingdom. It was a well-known city that derived its name from three cities or tri-pura once in possession of the asuras (Sabha P. XXX. 1164; Vana P. CCLIII. 15246; Karna P. XXXIII

In the time of the Guptas Tripuri-visaya was formed into a province under a viceroy; it roughly corresponded to the modern Jubbulpur region which was the ancient Cedi country.

Vaidiṣās—These are undoubtedly the people of Vaidiṣā, a famous city of early times, the capital of the Daśāṇa country, both immortalised by Kālidāsa in his Meghadūtam. Vaidiṣā is probably the modern Bes-nagar, close to Bhilsa; it was situated on the river Vetravati, modern Betwa.

Tumburās and Tumbulas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads Tumburās (CXIII. 53) and the Bhīṣma Parva gives (L. 2084) Tumbumas. Closely allied to them were probably the Tumbulas where the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas read Tumuras and Tumbaras respectively. These names cannot be identified.

Pātus—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Śatsuras (XLV. 133) and Matsya Padgamas (CXIII. 53). None of these names are identifiable.

Naisadhas—or Nisadhas, the people of Niṣadha. (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II. pp. 63ff.).

Annapas—Evidently this, and the Matsya Purāṇa reading of Arūpas (CXIII. 54), are erroneous. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Anūpas (XLV. 134) which undoubtedly is correct. The country of the Anūpas must have been situated somewhere on the sea. King Kārttavirya (Vana P. CXVI. 16189-90) as well as king Nala lorded over the Anūpa country (Bhīṣma P. XCV. 4210) which is probably to be sought for somewhere near Surāśtra and Ānarta with which the Harivamśa associates Anūpa (XXXIV. 5142-80). Evidently the country was included within the sphere of the Māhismatl.

Tuṣṭikārās—Doubtless it is a misreading. The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Tuṇḍikeras (XLV. 134) which is supported by the Mahābhārata (Drona P. XVII. 691; Karna P. V. 138) and the Harivamśa (XXXIV. 1895). According to the Harivamśa, they belonged to the Haihaya race (ibid.). The tribe seems to have left their trace in the little town of Tendukhera, a little to the
The Matsya Purāṇa reading of Sauḍikeras is incorrect.

**Virahotras**—The Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas read Vitihotras (XLV. 134; CXIII. 54) which is undoubtedly correct. Presumably they were descended from king Vitihotra and were a branch of the Haihaya race (Hariv. XXXIV. 1895). A variant of their name is given in the Droṇa Parva of the Mahābhārata (LXX. 2436). The name Virahotra or Varahatra is met with in the Sānci Inscriptions of the 2nd century B.C.

**Avantis**—They were an important tribe in ancient India who had their capital at Ujjain. (For a fuller account of the tribe see my Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, Vol. I., pp. 139-155).

PARVATĀŚRAYIN OR THE PEOPLE OF THE MOUNTAIN (OR HIMALAYAN) REGION

Ato désān pravakṣyāmi parvvatāśrayiṇaśca ye I
Nihārā Hamsamārgaśca Kuravo gurgaṇah Khasāḥ II
Kunta-Pravaraṇaścaiva Uṛṇā Dārvvā Sakṛtrakāḥ I
Trigartta Mālavāścaiva Kirātāstāmasaiḥ saha II

(Mārk. P. Chap. 57. 56-57).

"Next I will tell you also the names of the countries which rest against the Mountains (i.e., the countries of the Himalayan region). The Nihāras, and the Hamsamārgas, the Kuras, the Gurguṇas, the Khasas, and the Kunta-pravaraṇas, the Uṛṇas, the Dārvās, the Sakṛtrakas, the Trigarttas, the Gālavas, the Kirātas and the Tāmasas."


**Nihāras**—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Nigarharas (XLV. 135) and the Matsya Nirāḥāras (CXIII. 55). None of these names are identifiable; but Nihāras may generally mean those people dwelling on the snowy (nihāra) slopes of the Himalayas.

**Hamsamārgas**—They cannot satisfactorily be identified.

**Kurus**—These must be the Uttara Kuras, a semi-mythical country referred to frequently in both the epics as well as in early Pāli literature. Their country cannot definitely be identi-
fied, but presumably it was somewhere beyond Kasmir on the other side of the Himalayas.

Gurganas—The Matsya Purāṇa reads A-pathas (CXIII. 55). But none of them can be identified.

Khasas—The Khasas presumably a non-Aryan tribe, and foreign as well. In the epic tradition the Khasas are associated with the Sakas, Daradas etc. (Sabhā. P. LI. 1859; Drona P. XI. 399; and CXXI. 4846-47), and were considered mlechhas (Hariv. XCV. 6440-41. XIV. 784).

Kunja-prāvarana—The Vāyu Purāṇa reads Kuṣa-prāvaranaś (XLV. 136). The Mahābhārata often (e.g., Sabhā P. LI. 1875; Bhīṣma P. LI. 2103) speaks of a people called Karna-prāvaranās who probably are meant. But they cannot definitely be identified.

Urnas—They have already been mentioned as a northern people.

Dārvas—The have also been mentioned as a northern people.

Sakrtrakas—Perhaps the Śakridgrahas of the Bhīṣma Parva list (IX. 373) are meant. They were a rude non-Aryan tribe, but they cannot definitely be identified.

Trigarttas—For a full account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 55 ff.

Gālavas—They were probably those people who claimed their descent from sage Gālava, but they cannot be definitely identified.

Kirālas—They were a rude non-Aryan tribe distributed in different regions of India. (For a full account of the tribe see Indian Culture, Vol. I, on. 3. pp. 381-82 my article on “Some Ancient Indian Tribes”).

Tāmasas—They have already been mentioned as a northern people, but cannot satisfactorily be identified.

COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THE POSITION OF THE KŪRMA

Here we practically come to an end of the geographical (i.e. Navakhandā) canto (i.e. Chap. 57) of the Mārkandeya Purāṇa,
which in fact contains the strictly geographical information of other major Purānas. But the Mārkaṇḍeya has also another section (Chap. 58, i. e., the Kūrmavibhāga or the Kūrma nivāsa) containing a list of countries and peoples of India arranged according to the position of the country conceived as a tortoise as it lies on the water resting upon Viṣṇu and looking Eastwards. This arrangement is based, on earlier astronomical works like those of Parāśara and Varāhamihira. This chapter though not strictly geographical contains valuable topographical information. Most of these countries and peoples have already been mentioned in the Navakhaṇḍa section but there are good many names which are new, though quite a number of them cannot be satisfactorily identified. Here I propose to deal with only the additional names of peoples and countries mentioned in the Kūrma Vibhāga.

(a) In the middle of the tortoise

The Vedamantras and the Vimāṇḍavyas cannot satisfactorily be identified.

Śālvas, Śālyas and Śālveyas are one and the same people, and are frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata, where their location is suggested to have been near the Kurus and Trigarttas (Virāṇa P. I. 11–12; XXX). The story of Satyavān, a Śālya (or Śālva) prince and Śāvitri, a Madra princess, is quite well-known. In the time of the Kurukṣetra war the Śālva king was an important personage, a brother of King Śīśupāla of Cedi (Hariv. CVIII. 6029, Vana P. XIV. 620–7). The Śālvas seem to have occupied some region west of the Aravalli hills and not very far from Kṛṣṇa's country, for, in the Harivaṁśa the Śālva king is said to have once attacked Dvārāvatī, but was killed by Kṛṣṇa in retaliation (Drona P. XI. 395).

It is difficult to say where the Nīpas had their habitat; but one can gather that they descended from king Nīpa, a Paurava, who had his capital in Kāmpilya, modern Kampil on the Ganges (Mbh. Ādi. P. CXXXVIII. 5512–13; Matsya P. XLIX. 52 and 53; Hariv. XX. 1060–73). Later, they came to be regarded as degraded (Sabhā. P. XLIX. 1804; L. 1844).

The Śakas were a well-known foreign tribe, classed with the
Yavanas, Kambojas, Pahlavas, Tukhāras, Khasas, etc., and considered mlecchas in Indian historical tradition as contained in the Epics and Purāṇas.

Ujjīhānas are difficult to be identified; but Pargiter suggests their probable association with Urjīhāna, a town situated south-east of Hastināpur, identical probably with Ujhānī about 11 miles south-west of Budaon.

The Ghoṣa-Sāṃkhyas cannot be identified.

Dharmāranya is to be identified with a forest near Gayā (Vana P. LXXXIV. 8063-4; Anuśāsana P. XXV. 1744; CLXV. 7655; Vana P. LXXXVII. 8304-8).

The Jyotiśikas and the Gauragṛivas cannot be satisfactorily identified, nor can we identify definitely the Saṅketas, the Kaṅkas the Mārutas, the Kāla-Koṭiṣas, the Pāṣaṇḍas, and the Kapiṅgalas.

The Kuruvāhyas must necessarily include the Kurus, but it is difficult to say who are the other races meant.

The Udumbaras are certainly the Audumbaras of the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. LI. 1869). Lassen identifies Udumbara country with Cutch (Ind. Att. map.); but this is doubtful, for, here they are placed in the Madhyadeśa. There was a river Udumbarāvatī in the South (Hariv. CLXVIII. 9511).

The Gajāhvayas are the same as the people of Hastināpura which is also known as Gajapura, Gajāhvaya, Gajasāhvaya, Nāgapura, Nāgasāhvaya, Vāraṇāsāhvaya and Vāraṇa-sāhvaya, in the Mahābhārata. All the names are coined by playing on the meaning of the word ‘hasti’, i.e. elephant.

(b) In the face of the Tortoise

The Vadana-danthuras, the Candreśvaras, the cannibals dwelling on the seacoast, and the Ekapāḍaparas cannot be identified.

The Subhras were the same people as the Suhmas.

The mention of the Khaśas as situated in different parts of the Tortoise’s body suggests that the tribe, a mleccha one, was distributed over different localities of India; so with the Abhiras and similar tribes.

The Lauhityas are certainly those people dwelling along the
The Lauhitya river, i.e. the Brahmaputra. This is further supported by the fact that they are mentioned just after the Prāgjyotisās. The Kasāyas probably mean the people of Kāśi, if so they are certainly misplaced here.

The Mekhalāmuṣtas is a curious reading; almost certainly it stands for the Mekalas and the Ambaṣṭhas, mixed up by the copyist in a curious compound. For an account of the two tribes see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 28 and 34-36.

The Vardhamānas are certainly the people who lived in the ancient viṣaya or bhūkta of Vardhamāna identical with modern Burdwan.

(c) In the Tortoise's fore-foot

The Jātharas, the Mrṣikas, the Īrdhva-Karnas, the Nārikelas, the Dharmadvīpas, the Elikas, the Vyāghragrīvas, the Mahā-grīvas, the Haimakūtas (the Himalayas cannot be meant here) and the Kākulālakas cannot be identified; some of these names are indeed fanciful.

The Kaṭakasthalas are indeed the people of Kaṭaka (modern Cuttack).

The naked Hārikas may mean the Hādis of modern times, an aboriginal tribe, now found scattered all over western Bengal and Orissa.

The Niṣādas were an aboriginal race dwelling generally in forest tracts. (For an account of the tribe see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 63-64).

The Parna-śavaras were evidently a branch of the Savaras who lived on leaves or who wore leaves.

(d) In the Tortoise's right flank

Laṅkā is Ceylon.

The Kālājinās, the Śailikas, the Nikatās, the Sarvas, the Akanin people, the Gonarddhas, the Kolagirās, those who inhabit Carmapatṭa, the Ganavāhyas, the Paras, the Vāricaras, those who have their dwelling in Kṛṣṇadvīpa, the peoples who live by the Sūrya hill and the Kumuda hill, the Aukhāvanas, the Plśikas, the Karma-nāyakas, the Tapaśāgramas, and the people who dwell in Kuṇijara-dari.  

9 [ Annals, B. Q. B. I. ]
The Dāsapurās are the people of Daśapura or Mandasor, the capital of king Ranti-deva (Megha D. I, 46–48).

The Citrakūṭas are the people living on the mountain Citrakūṭa, still known by the same name.

The Southern Kaurūṣas were a branch of the Karuṣa or Karuṣa race already discussed.

The Rṣabhas are the people dwelling on the Rṣabha parvata identified with the southern portion of the Eastern Ghats.

Kānci is modern Conjeeveram.

Tilāṅgas should properly be read as Tailāṅgas or Tri-liṅgas, people of Telīṅga or the modern Telugu country.

Kaccha, the same as Kochchi, the modern Cochin in Trivandrum.

Tāmraparṇī is the land perhaps on both sides of the river of the same name in the extreme south. There is also a town of the same name in Ceylon which itself is also sometimes known as Tāmraparṇī.

(e) In the Outer foot

The Vadava-mukhas, the Vanitā-mukhas, the Drāvaṇas, the Sārgigas, the Karṇa-prādheyas, the Pāraśavas (perhaps those who claimed descent from Paraśurāma), the Kalas, the Dhūrtakas, the Haimagirikas, the Sindhukalakavairatas and the Mahārṇavas cannot be satisfactorily identified.

(f) In the Tortoise's tail

The Śāntikas, the Viprasastakas, the Kokaṅkaṇas, the Paṅcadakas, the Vamanas, the Avaras, the Tārakṣuras, the Aṅgatakas, the Šarkaras, the Śālma-vesmakas, the Guru-svaras (evidently a branch of the Savaras), the Phalgunakas, the Ghoras, the Guruhhas, the Kalas, the Ekekṣaṇas, the Vāji-keṣas, the Dirgha-grīvas and the Aśva-keṣas cannot be satisfactorily identified.

(g) In the Tortoise's left hind foot

The Māṇḍavyas (probably those who claimed descent from sage Māṇḍavya), the Caṅdakhāras, the Aśvakalantakas, the Kunyatāladahas, the Strivāhyas, the Bālikas, the Nṛṣimhas, the people who dwell in Valāva, the Dharmabaddhas, the Alūkas (probably the Ulūkas), and the people who occupy Urukarma cannot be satisfactorily identified.

The Bālikas are evidently the Bāhlikas.
(h) In the Tortoise's left flank

The Krauñcas, the Vakas, the Kṣudravīnas, the Rasālayas, the Bhogaprasthas (perhaps Bhojaprastha = Bhojanagara, the capital of king Uśinara), the Agūjyas, the Sārdana peoples, the Aśvamukhas, the Prāptas, the Cividas, the Dāserakas, the Adhama-Kairātas, the Ambālas, the Veṇukas, the Vādantikas, the Piṅgalas, the Mānakalahas, the Kohalakas, the Bhūti-yuvakas, the Śātakas, the Hema-tārakas, the Yaśomatyas, the Kharasāgara-rāsis, the Dāsameyas, the Rājanyas, the Śyāmakas, and the Kṣemadhūrtas cannot be satisfactorily identified.

Yāmunas—They are the people who dwelt along the Jamuna.

Antar-dvīpa is the same as the Antar-vedi, the land between the Ganges and the Jamuna.

For an account of the Yaudheyas see my Ancient Indian Tribes, Vol. II, pp. 43-44.

(i) In the Tortoise's north-east foot

The Yenas, the Kīmnaras, the country Praśupāla, the country Kicaka, the Davadas, the Vana-rāstrakas, the Sairisthas, the Brahma purakas, the Vana-vāhyakas, the Kauśikas, the Ānandas, the Lolanas, the Dārvādas, the Marakas, the Kurutās, the Anna-dārakas, the Eka-pādas, the Ghoṣas, the Svarga-bhaumāna-vadyakas, the Hiṅgas, the Ciraprāvaraṇas and the Trinetras cannot satisfactorily be identified.

The Abhisāras are the people of the Abhisāra country, the Abhisaras of early Greek geographers, a people of the Punjab. Their capital Abhisāri is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Sabhā P. XXV f. 1097 Bhīṣma P. IX. 361).

The Kulaśtas are evidently the Kuluṭas, presumably the people of the Kulu valley.

The Pauravas are evidently those who claimed descent from Puru, a son of Yayāti. The Pauravas had different settlements (Cf. Mbh. Sabhā P. XXVI. 1022-25; Śānti P. XLIX. 1790-92; Adi. P. CLXXXVI. 6995).

APPENDIX

Full list of countries and peoples of India mentioned in the Kurmvibhāga.

(a) In the middle of the tortoise are placed the following countries and peoples:
The Vedamantras, Vīmāṇḍavayas, Śālvas, Nīpas, Śakas, Ujjihānas, Ghoṣa-sāṅkhayas, Khaṇas, Sārasvatas, Mātysas, Śūrasenas, people of Mathurā, Dharmāraṇyas, Jyotiṣikas, Gauragrīvas, Guḍas, Aśmakas, Vaidehkās, Pāncalas, Saṅketas, Kaṅkas, Mārutas, Kālakoṭīsas, Pāṣaṇḍas, inhabitants of the Pāripātra mountains, Kāpiṅgalas, Kuruvaḥyas Uḍumbaras and the Gajāhvayas.

(b) In the face of the tortoise are situated the following countries and peoples:

The people of Mithilā, the Subhras, Vadanadántaras, Candrasekaras, Khaṇas, Magadhas, Prāgjyotisas, and the Laihityas, the Cannibals who dwell on the sea-coast, Kaṣayás, Mekhalāmuṣtas, Tamraliptas, Ekapādapas, Vairamānas, and the Kośalas.

(c) The following countries and peoples are situated in the Tortoise’s right fore-foot:

The Kaliṅgas, Vaṅgas, Jatharas, Kośalas, Mrṣikas, Cedas, Īrdukāraṇas, Mātysas, others who dwell on the Vindhyā mountains, Vidarbhas, Nārikelas, Dharmāvīpas, Elikas, Vyāghra-grīvas, Mahāgrīvas, the bearded Traipuras, Kaśīkindhyas, Haimakūṭas, Niśadhas, Kaṭakaṭhalas, Daśāṛnas, the naked Hārikas, Niśadas Kākulālakas and the Parnaśavaras.

(d) The following countries and peoples are placed on the right flank of the tortoise:

Laṅkā, the Kālājina, Sailikas, Nikaṭas, those who dwell on the Mahendra and Malaya mountains and the Durdura hill, those who dwell in the Karkotaka forest, Bhṛgukacchas, Koṅkanas, Sarvas, Abhiras, those who dwell on the river Veṇvā, Avantis, Dāsapuras, the Ākəpin people, Mahā-rastras, Kaṃpadas, Gona-rddhas, Citrakūṭakas, Colas, Kolagiras, the people who wear matted hair (Jāṭādharas) in Krauṇcatvāpa, the people who dwell on the Kāveri and on mount Rṣyamukha, those who are called Nāsikyas, those who wander by the borders of the Śaṅkha and Śukti and other hills and Vaidūrya mountains, Vāricaras, Kolas those who inhabit the Cardmapatta, the Gaṇavāhyas, Paras, those who dwell in Kṛṣṇadvīpa, the peoples who dwell near the Sūrya hill and the Kumuda hill, Aukhāvanas, Pišikas, Karmānāyakas, southern Karūṣas, Rṣikas, Tāpasārāma, Rṣabhās, Simhalas, those who inhabit Kānci, Tilaṅgas, those inhabit Kuṇjaradari and Kaccha and Tāmraparṇi.
The countries and peoples located in the right hand foot are the following:


The countries and peoples situated on the tortoise’s tail are the following:

The Aparāntikas, Haihayas, Śāntikas, Vipraśastakas, Kokaṇkanas, Paṇcadakas, Vamanas, Avaras, Tārakśuras, Angatakas, Śālama-veśmakas, Gurusvaras, Phalgunakas, the people who dwell by the river Veṇumati, Phalguṇakas, Ghoras, Gruhās, Kālas, Ekekeśanas, Vājikeśas, Dīrghagрīvas, Cūlikas, Aśvakeśas.

The countries and peoples situated in the left hind foot of the tortoise are the following:


The following countries and peoples are placed on the Tortoise’s left flank:


The following countries and peoples are situated on the Tortoise’s north-east foot:

Yenas, Kimnaras, the countries of Praśupāla, Kīcaka Kāśmīra, the people of Abhisāra, Davadas, Tvaṅganas, Kulaṭas, Vanarāṣṭrakas, Sairiṣṭhas, Brahmapūrakas, Vanā-vāhyakas, Kirātas, Kauśikas, Anandhas, Pahlavas, Lolas, Dārvādas, Marakas, Kurutās, Anna-dārakas, Ekapādas, Khaṇas, Ghoṣas, Svarga-bhaumānavadyakas, Hīṅgas, Yavanas, Ciraprāvaranās, Trinetras, Pauravas and the Gandharvas.
The two canons, of the Buddhists in Pāli and of the Jains in Ardha-Māgadhī, present us with a few interesting parallels worth consideration. The study of such parallels is interesting both for its own sake and for the light it throws on the problem of the relation in which these two religions stand with each other. The real explanation of the similarity found therein, whether it is a case of borrowing or one of common inheritance or even one of accidental coincidence, is to be decided in each particular case by considerations of its individual peculiarities. And as such their examination will help us in forming an idea about the exact relation in which these religions stand, particularly in their literary traditions.

Both the religions, Buddhism and Jainism, arose in the same country of Magadha and at about the same time. As such they partook of the same surroundings which goes a long way in determining many of their common features. But besides this general similarity of spirit and form which can be explained as due to the influence of the time-spirit we find something more to think of in the present case. The canons of both these religions show similarity not only in the general moral and disciplinary tone due mainly to the fact that they embody the same general principles of ethics which are common to both these religions which is in its turn due to the circumstance of their birth and early growth, but also in matters of composition and wording which requires something more to explain them. They raise the important question of borrowings and the authentic nature of one tradition as against the other and the question of their respective age.

Even though it is now admitted on all hands that Jainism as a religion arose a few decades earlier than Buddhism, or even
A Few Parallels in Jain and Buddhist works

a few centuries before it, if we accept the view that not only Pārśva was a historical person but that the traditional date of his birth and death is equally trustworthy, a fact not beyond reasonable doubt; the question of the formation of the two canons of these two religions stands on a very different footing, and is in no way connected with it. It is yet very difficult to believe that the present Ardha-Māgadhī canon, which tradition itself admits to have suffered much recasting and reduction, and which has the still greater disadvantage of being repudiated by the whole of the Digambara community of the Jains, can be reasonably attributed to a period to which the Pāli canon of the Buddhist is attributed at the latest. It is true that the Pāli tradition also shows us the Buddhist canon as going through the similar stages of redactions at various stages of its history, but their last council falls in the reign of king Aśoka in the third century B.C. while the last council of the Jains comes in the fifth century A.D. in the days of the kings of Valabhi. So if we are to believe in these traditions alone it is clear that the Pāli canon will have to be put much earlier than the Ardha-Māgadhī one.

This problem of the relative priority of the two canons is further rendered more difficult and complicated by the supposition of an Ardha-Māgadhī canon earlier than the present one, and a similar canon of the Buddhist which again according to Lüders will have to be supposed to be written in old Ardha-Māgadhī. All such speculations have no doubt some indications in the present canons themselves and can on that account be said to rest on facts. In the case of the Jain canon we even possess an outline of the older canon preserved to us with more or less accuracy, while it will be very unwise to put down the whole of the Pāli canon at the time of Aśoka. But it is equally true that it is not possible now to separate them from their later
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1 Keith, Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon. Ch. i, pp. 15–24.
3 Charpentier, Introduction to his edition of the Uttarādhyayana, pp.15–16.
4 Bruchstucke Buddhistischen Dramen, Einleitung.
additions with anything like certainty. For the present purpose then of comparing a few parallel passages from the two canons it is better to set them aside and to start without the supposition of earlier works not to be found to day, even though the parallels themselves are adduced to prove their existence.

To begin with, we have a number of stories common to the two canons which we take for consideration. Of all the works of the Jain canon the Uttarādhyayana is the most important as it preserves many interesting stories and parables which are also to be met with in various works of the Buddhist. Here we meet the story of the two persons called Citra and Sambhūta who were fast friends at the beginning and wandered a series of lives together but at the end suffered very different fates because of their characters. This story is also found in the Jātaka collections in the Citta-Sambhūta-Jātaka. As pointed out by Dr. J. Carpentier the two chapters show similarity not only in the general outline of the story and its main incidents but even in the verses found in them which are common to both the books. The story in the Uttarādhyayana is in verses only while the one found in the Jātaka books is in mixed verse and prose as usual. This fact along with the fact that the Gāthās of the Jātaka are decidedly older than the prose which is very late as can be seen both on linguistic and logical grounds would lead us to suppose that the story as preserved in the Uttarādhyayana is the older of the two. But the Jain version says nothing of the earlier lives of these two friends which are however referred to in their conversation. The Jātaka gives us all the details about this earlier part of the story which cannot be regarded as a later modification of it or an addition to it. So also we have a few cases in which the order of the verses in the Jātaka books appears more in accord with the general trend of the story than the one found in the Jain version. This is to be explained on the supposition that the Jain version has suffered in its arrangement while the Jātaka books were more fortunate in having a commentary which numbered its verses very early and arranged them rigidly which has saved it from
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1 Ch. XIII, pp. 115-119.
2 No. 498, Fausbühl, Vo. IV, pp. 390-400.
3 Ch.:XIII, Vs. 5-7.
any further change. On the other hand the Jain version also lost the earlier part of the story which is preserved to us in the prose of the Jātakas even though it is put down much later than the writing of the chapter in the Uttarādhyayana.

Another story common to these two works is that of Isukāra in the Uttarādhyayana and the Hatthipālaḥjātaka in the Jātaka books. The story relates that a king and his preceptor had no son, but with the help of a tree-spirit the Purohita was able to obtain four sons who were all religious-minded. To test their zeal in the matters of religion and to know for certain whether they will live in the worldly life or not both the king and the Purohita approached them in the garbs of monks and found that all of them turned out monks. This led the wife of the Purohita and himself to take up to asceticism and consequently the king and the queen also do the same thing. In this case it will be seen that the story of the Jātaka books is fuller and gives many details about the birth of the four sons of the Purohita which are wanting in the chapter of the Jain work. There the story begins abruptly with the statement that all the characters in the story were born in the same town descending from their heavenly abode.

Another difference between the two versions is about the number of the sons the Purohita had, they are four in the Jātaka while only two in the Uttarādhyayana chapter. This fact again is made use of in the Jātaka books to give rise to four different occasions for the renouncing of this world by the four sons and taking to ascetic life, which is occasioned by seeing the king and the Purohita in the garbs of a monk, and the repetition of the same situation for four times. In the story as preserved in the Uttarādhyayana there appears to exist no relation between the Purohita and the king, while in the Jātaka they are represented as consulting each other and plotting together to test the sons of the Purohita as to their intention of becoming monk. In the version of the Jains it appears that when all the members of the family of the Purohita took to monkhood, the king came in the possession of their property according to the rule of the Dharmāśāstras. This occasioned a complete change in the mind of the queen who turns her mind to nunhood and also advises the king to the same
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1 Ch. XIV, pp. 119-125.
2 No. 509, pp. 473-490. Vol. IV.
3 Annals, B. O. R. L.
effect. This fact appears to be more natural and appropriate than the one found in the Jātaka books. Considering further, facts like the story of the four sons acting exactly like each other, their long-drawn moralising, the improbable story of the spirit in the tree in the beginning which is pleased to give four sons to the Purohita alone and not a single one to the king who was in greater need of an heir, and the curious relation between the king and the Purohita, it is clear that the Jain version is not only earlier but is better preserved and the more interesting of the two.

The story of a low-caste man attaining to a high position and showing the ill-founded faith of the Brahmans in their idea of greatness in birth is found in the Hariśijjam \(^1\) of the Uttarādhyayana and the Mātaṅgajātaka \(^2\) of the Buddhists. The two stories shew a good deal of divergence in all matters except the central idea of the approach of the Cāndāla to the feast of the Brahmans the wrong treatment given to him by the priest in one case and by his own son in the other, the sound beating they receive at the hands of the demi-gods who attend on the Mātaṅga, the approach of the woman the daughter of the king of Pāñcāla in case of the Jain version and of a merchant in case of the Buddhist version, her revealing the greatness of the Mātaṅga, and the recovery of the Brahmans from the illness. And it is interesting to note that this part of the story is to be found in the verses which are common to both the versions to a great extent. The Jain version adds little to the body of the text but the commentator \(^3\) gives us the back-ground of the whole story. He relates how the daughter of the king of the country of Pāñcāla went to a temple and saw there the Cāndāla whom she abhorred. But a spirit possessed her and to get her out of its clutches the king became ready to give her to the same low-caste man. But the sage refused to marry as its being against his monkhood. Now once he goes to the sacrificial ground of the Purohita of the king where he is refused food. And there the story begins in the Uttarādhyayana. The story in the Jātaka is much more complicated and expanded. There also the daughter of a rich merchant

\(^1\) Ch. XII, pp. 109-115.
\(^3\) Cp. the commentaries of Śāntyācārya and Devendra.
meets a Matanga and feels disgusted at his sight. The man is beaten by her servants. But he goes to the house of the merchant and lies at the door until he is given the same daughter in marriage which is done at his persistence. A son is born to them, but in the mean time he becomes a sage and to confer prosperity on his wife makes the people believe that she is the wife of the great Brahma. While the son grows old and is worshipped by all the people, the main incidents of the story happen. From this the Jataka proceeds to give another story of the same Matanga only because it also deals with the same theme. Otherwise it has no connection with the main story. A comparison of the two versions will make it clear that the Buddhist story is much more elaborate and of mixed motifs. The Jain version, on the other hand is much more simple and to the point. But there is one consideration which should lead us to think that the Jain version is the older of the two. On a careful reading of the Buddhist story it is seen that the attitude behind it is much more haughty and full of bitter feelings than the one which accentuated the writer of the Jain version. This can be seen in the facts like the plain deception of the Brahmins and the administration of the food as a cure for the beating. This must have also led the writer to include the other story in the same Jataka. And such an attitude must have arisen in later times as the effect of sectarian bias. The original motive of writing such stories appears to be to show the hollow foundation of the greatness claimed by the Brahmins on account of birth alone. And this is clearly seen in the Jain version and in a much more humane and sympathetic form.

Another book of stories in the Jain canon is the sixth Anga called the Jñātādhamakathā. Here also we meet with a few parallels in the Buddhist works. The illustration of the tortoise in it has a clear parallel in the Samyutta-Nikāya II which by the nature of the case appears to be a very ancient simile developed into an illustration and used by both the religions for the specific purpose of moralising on the control of the senses. The story of the two brothers going on a voyage and suffering

1 Ch. 4th.
3 Jñātādhamakathā, Ch. 9th.
a good deal at the hands of the deity on the Ratnad vipa who killed so many ship-wrecked people and the winged horse who helped them in flying from that island, and the fall of one of the two brothers because of the temptations of that Yakṣīṇī has a parallel in Valāhassa-Jātaka where the part of the winged horse is played by the compassionate Bodhisatta.

Of greater importance is the story in the chapter of this book called the Amarakaṅkā which related the Jain version of the Brahmanic epic of the Kuru family considerably changed and modified to suit the Jain religion. In tracing the early life of Drāupadī we find a very curious story of a girl called Sukumāra which has a very distinct parallel in the story of Isidāṣī in the Therī-Gāthā. The story tells of a girl who sinned in giving bad food to a monk, and as a result of which she was born in her next birth with an unpleasant touch of her body. She was married to a son of a merchant but in the very next day of their marriage he ran off to avoid her unpleasant touch. She returned back to her father's house where her father married her a second time with a monk who had come to his house to beg food. He also ran off the next day and the girl disgusted at her life took to the life of a nun. The Buddhist story of the unhappy girl is materially the same. The form in which the story is found in the Jain version is fragmentary and incomplete and is relegated to the back-ground, showing great inferiority to the other version in the Therī-Gāthā which is more complete and better told. But against the natural supposition of regarding the Buddhist version as earlier on account of its artistic superiority we have many textual indications in the Pāli version itself which go to prove a very different result. As remarked by Mrs. Rhys Davids the whole spirit of the poem is non-Buddhistic and shows many traces of Jain tendency of valuing mortification and penance as more important. To add to this, we find such a technical term as Nirjarā used in the poem, and the

---

2. Jāā. Ch. 16th.
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name of the teacher of the unhappy girl is given as Jinadatta, not without significance. So it is more than probable that the writer of the Pali poem had before him some Jain version of the story even though it may not be identical with the very meagre survival of it in the sixth Anga of the Ardha-Magadhi canon. The Pali tradition itself admits that the present poem in the Theri-Gatha is much later than the bulk of the work and was introduced into the collection by the Sangitikaras.

Two other stories in the Jantadhammakatha have parallels in the anecdotes told by Buddhagosa in his Visuddhi-Magga. Considering the nature of his work and his usual method of relating stories from earlier literature we can fairly suppose that the present two stories are also drawn by him from the canon or possibly from the older Atthakathas in Ceylon. This is more probable as he omits all details and satisfies himself with a bare reference which shows that the stories were very famous and already known to his readers. The story of the merchant becoming a frog because of his falling away from the right path to which he was first introduced and his consequent liberation is told in the Visuddhi-Magga without the previous life of the merchant, while the cause of his death is different in the two versions. In the Jain version the frog is trampled down by the hoof of Srenika's horse, while in the Buddhist story a cowherd kills the frog with a stick. The second parallel is not so marked as Buddhagosa only gives a passing remark about the central idea of the story without adding details. But the idea and the statement is so queer and out of the way that we are forced to think that there must be a story behind it. The Jain work relates the story in full. It tells us that a merchant was pursuing a thief who had carried away his daughter. But before he was able to catch hold of him the thief killed the girl and escaped. Now the father and his sons who were pursuing him found themselves in a thick forest without food. So to save themselves they ate

1 V. 427.
3 Jain. Ch. 13th.
5 Jain, Ch. 18th.
the flesh of the girl and in this manner came safe to their own town. Buddhagosa makes the father to eat the flesh of the son instead of the daughter.

Besides these parallels in story and fable, we find similarities in the two canons about some important philosophical discussions. The most important among them is dialogue in the Rayapaseñiyam¹ and the Pāyāsi Suttanta² in the Digha-Nikāyā. Similarities in wording and similes and expressions leave no doubt as regards their mutual relation. Either both must have followed very closely a common source or one must have made a considerable use of the other. The Jain version as found in the second Upāṅga forms the central theme of the work. It turns on the point of the existence of the soul independent of the body in which it is embodied. Kesi the follower of Lord Pārśva tries to prove the soul as existing and refutes the arguments of king Paēsi who is a follower of the heretical teacher Ajita Kesakambal. The Pāli version makes the king bear the name Pāyāsi who holds conversation with Kumāra Kassapa who is also shown triumphant in refuting the arguments of the king. Some scholars are inclined to think that the Jain version is the later of the two, but without sufficient reasons.³ On the contrary there are a few facts which point unmistakably to the conclusion that the Jain version is the older of the two. The vehement denial of the soul which is the main function of this story is a little inconsistent with the general spirit of Buddhism. Herein Buddhism agrees more with the views of the king than his opponent who is shown as successful in both the versions. According to the Buddhist tradition itself the present Sutta is not of equal age with the others of the same collection. It is even admitted that the real name of the king was Paēsi and not Pāyāsi which is an unmistakable sign of the authentic nature of the Jain tradition as against the Buddhist version. On the other hand the Jain version is shown to be contemporaneous with Mahāvīra as Kesi the disciple of Pārśva is shown in other works ⁴ to hold conversation with

¹ Ed. by Dr. Vaidya, Poona, 1934.
Gotama the chief disciple of Lord Mahāvīra. So here also we will have to admit that the Jain version of the dialogue is of better authenticity and we can go so far as to assert that it was the Jains who first tried to refute this doctrine of Ajita as being the exact contradictory position of their own theory of the existence of the soul. The Buddhist took this refutation bodily from them even though a little inconsistent with their own vehement denial of a soul.

Another philosophical discussion common to the two literatures is that about the refutation of the philosophy of Gosāla. In the Jain works we find it stated in the Upāsagadasāṇo and the Bhagavatī while in the Sāmāñaphalasutta of the Dīgha-Nikāya is found a summary of his views. The life story of Gosāla as found in the Bhagavatī Sūtra is not to be met with in the Buddhist works. But the statement of his doctrines is common to both of them in a very similar phraseology. It is just possible that both of them were copying from the works of that sect. But the other alternative is more probable. It can very easily be seen that Gosāla was more intimately connected with Jainism than with Buddhism, even though it is very difficult to decide the exact relation in which he stood. But in view of the fact that his doctrines are taken by him from the Pūrvas and his claim to be the last prophet of Jainism it appears that he represented another line of the school of Pārśva while Mahāvīra succeeded in asserting himself as the true continuer of the orthodox line. So it is more probable that the Jain version had better chances of giving the views of the school of Gosāla in a more authentic form than its rival religion Buddhism.

Apart from these similarities extending over a long incident we have a good many verses in common in the works of
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1 Ed. by Dr. Vaidya, Poona, 1930. Chs, 6 and 7.
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these two religions. Particularly the Uttarādhyayana and the Sūtrakṛtāṅga show many verses in common with the various books of the Pāli canon like the Dhammapada the Thera and Therī-Gāthās the Suttanipāta and stray verses from the Nikāyas. Dr. Winternitz has suggested the solution of such similar verses in the supposition that there existed before both these canons a floating mass of poetry dealing with ascetic life and ideals which was incorporated in the works of both these religions.


1 Hist. Ind. Lit. Vol. II, P. 121, p. 125 etc.
The disappearance of Uṣas from the Vedic pantheon is as mysterious as her presence interesting. It is all the more inexplicable as we remember the amount of poetic wealth spent on the enchanting Daughter of Heaven by the Vedic Rṣis who handle the theme of her rise and duration with a reverence and love that belong only to the earliest poets, or rather prophets, of mankind. But though the final exit of the charming goddess is generally regretted, its cause is, as yet, scarcely properly investigated. The universal law of Change, it is true, is the general answer to the too inquisitive questioner in all matters relating to antiquity, but still a momentous change is always worthy of our investigation. For the loss of an old order or thing, if viewed in the scientific perspective, is brought about in two ways: either by metamorphosis, in which the old disappears only to emerge as new; or by supersession, in which the old is pushed aside by a stronger new rival. The object of the present article is to prove that Uṣas has changed in the former sense, though the evolution is not even so much as suspected, first, because of the dimness of the intermediate stages, and secondly by reason of the great development in her new character. When, however, the progressive stages which transformed the Vedic Uṣas into Lakṣmī of later mythology become luminous, it will be easily conceded that Theology also presents instances of metamorphosis as strange or remarkable as Zoology, and as attractive as any that either Ovid or Dante depicts in poetry.

It never seems to have struck any writer on Indian mythology that though the goddess Śrī (the goddess of splendour and wealth) is the same as Lakṣmī according to all later accounts, yet in her earlier phase she possesses certain attributes which clearly argue a period of transition. Some of them disclose her identity with Uṣas, while others are of a novel type. This is, of course, the intermediate stage wherein the old traits appear oddly blended with the
new, quite in conformity with the change of time. For the period which marked the close of the Rgvedic epoch was a period of transition in many respects. The old gods, severing their connection with the phenomena of Nature, were assuming a more and more anthropomorphic shape, and also a more exalted character as becomes the epic gods. The Rgvedic words, at first so strikingly cognate to the root-meaning in their import, now become gradually settled in their conventional senses. And the school of the 'Aitihāsikas' — the gleaners of old legends and myths — was busy weaving them into wondrous poetic tales. But in spite of this general change in theology, Indra, Varuṇa and the other gods have not lost their old appellations which are the most unmistakable signs of recognition. Such is not, however, the case with Uṣas. The Dawn, the natural phenomenon, slowly lost her divinity, but her radiance which is the very essence of her life and form came to be deified and venerated as Śrī. Why this latter goddess is not even mentioned in the Rgveda, it is now easy to understand. It is in the famous 'Śrī-Śūkta', which is a 'Khila Śūkta' of that Veda, and undoubtedly the oldest of that class, that we see her for the first time. In this early conception of the new deity we perceive a good many attributes that usually characterise the luster of the dawn. And that settles the question of identity notwithstanding the metonymic change. Thus, if the rays of Uṣas are said to be 'Candra' (delightful) in the R.V., 1 Śrī herself is described as 'Candrā' in the Śrī-Śūkta. 2 Both are golden in complexion, and both shower the same gifts on the suppliant devotees, namely, cows, chariots, horses, heroic sons etc. 2 The epithet 'Piṅgalā' (the Rosy) as applied to Śrī in the Śūkta, is intelligible only when we view her in the light of this identification. Similarly, why Śrī or Lakṣmī is described as clad in milk-white garments, and fond of white flowers and decoration, will be clear if we remember that the original Vedic goddess is said to be...

1 Cf. उप आ माहि मानुना चन्द्रेण दुहितार्दृष्टि | R. V. I. 48-9
2 चन्द्राः हिंशमिः लक्ष्मिः जातवेदी ममावह | Śrī-Śūkta 1
3 Compare R. V. I. 48, 12-16; also VII, 75, 8 with चर्चाः हिंशमिः विन्दैः गामच्छे पुरुषानामहस् | Śrī Śūkta
4 Cf. सरस्विनिमिहि सरोजहस्ते धवलगंधकपश्चात्मलयशोभि |
The Metamorphosis of Usas

'Śubhā' or 'Arjunī' (the white), and also as 'dressed resplendent white'. Still more important is the epithet 'Āṛdrā' (the wet) belonging to Śrī, since it is only a paraphrase of Uṣās' corresponding epithet 'Odatī' (the moist). It is necessary to remark in this connection that in later times Lakṣmī has not retained any such clear mark of wetness after she landed on the dry ground leaving her watery home. Next, the fact that 'Jātaavedas' or Agni is implored in the Śrī-Sūkta to bring in Lakṣmī, furnishes the most unequivocal clue to regard Śrī as identical with Uṣās. For the close relation of the two divinities in the Rgveda is a patent fact, while in the Sūkta it is only a sort of reminiscence. Again, the sisterhood between 'A-Lakṣmī' (Poverty, Distress), and Lakṣmī may fairly be traced back to the times when the dark night was sincerely looked upon as the elder sister of the bright Dawn. Lastly, the epithet 'gandha-dvārā' (unfolder of fragrance), as belonging to Śrī suggests the aromatic dawn, while her association with the day-lotuses (padmas) which bloom at day-break confirms it.

All this is again highly corroborated by the history of the evolution, which, when properly traced, is as interesting as the result, and makes certain moot points in the life of the Vedic goddess very luminous. It is expressly stated in the Viṣṇu and other Purāṇas that the churning of the Ocean was occasioned by the disappearance of Śrī into it owing to the curse of Durvāsas, and that she was known to be the daughter of Bhṛgu in her previous existence. Now, who is Bhṛgu? The Bhṛgas, indeed, figure in the Rgveda as a clan of mighty ṛṣis, like the Aṅgirasas and the Atharvans, but none of them individually receives the distinction of special mention. It is only in the Taittirīya-Upaniṣad

1 उष: युक्तके शोभिना। R. V. I. 48, 14, श्वाद्रा श्रीवती शुकमस्तैत्। VII. 77, 2।
2 युक्तके युक्तके युक्तके etc. Śrī-Sūkta।
3 परं न च स्वस्योक्तः। R. V. I. 48-6।
4 श्वाद्रा श्रीवती श्रसा। R. V. III: 55, 11।
that we meet with a mythological personality of that name for the first time. But then, it should be observed, he is there said to be the son of Varuṇa and none of the members of the Rṣi-clan. When we remember that ‘Bṛghu’, even in Classical Sanskrit, means a ‘precipice’, the mystery surrounding the mythical being is at once unravelled. He is either the rising mountain, or the ‘Lokāloka’—the chain of mountain that seems to encircle the earth. Viewed in this light, his paternal relation to Varuṇa (the Lord of the sky) becomes manifest. Again, Venus, the planet, is also called Bṛghu’s son (Bhārgava), as we may now believe, because of his keeping close to the horizon throughout. Thus proximity or close succession was sufficient for the Vedic or post-Vedic poets to establish some kind of family connection between a pair of natural objects or phenomena. Śrī, the daughter of Bṛghu (Bhārgavi) and the sister of the Morning star, can, therefore, be none other than Uśas who invariably clings to the rising mountain, like a young maiden to her father’s side.

How she disappeared into the ocean has been already referred to above. But the legend preserved in the Viṣṇu and some other Purāṇas seems to be the poetic version of an old Uśas myth which may be traced in the Rgveda. The reader of Uśas hymns is startled, indeed, when he sees the mighty god Indra chastising the terrified celestial maiden—smashing her car in splinters, and chasing her to a great distance through the aerial space. And yet, the enormity of the crime for which she is so mercilessly dealt with is scarcely proclaimed. We are simply told that the offending goddess was a ‘durhanāyu’ i.e. a goer on the wrong track (if ‘han’ means to ‘go’ according to the Grammarians’ maxim वे हिमवर्षितं गत्यर्थं:); or, ‘desirous of killing Indra’ (if ‘han’ means to ‘kill’). All Vedic scholars, so far as I know, have been at a loss to understand the exact motive or magnitude of Uśas’ guilt. Even the great scholiast, Sāyaṇa, contents himself only with the paraphrase of the words, where we want an explanation of the myth. Now as a natural phenomenon this is intelli-

1 Tait. U. III. 2.
2 भृगोः: स्माल्यं सुधपन्ना श्री: पूर्वेणुद्वधे: पुनः:।
   देववन्यवलोक प्रदुःखास्मृतमथवः॥ V. P. I. 9, 38.
3 R. V. IV. 30, 8-11
The Metamorphosis of Usas

gible enough: Indra, the sun-god viewed as the dispeller of clouds and darkness, scares away the mild Usas by his superior effulgence. Her crime is, probably, nothing more than lingering a little longer even after sunrise on a cloudy day. But however we may explain the phenomenon, its mythological importance can never be overrated. For this is the very myth which is referred to, though in a slightly altered form, in the Rāmāyana, and which later on developed into the grand puranic legend of the Churning of the Ocean. The reference in the Rāmāyana is clearly to the earlier version of the exploit of the Vedic war-god against the gentle Usas. When young Rāma, in obedience to the dictates of conscience and the universal law of chivalry, hesitated to kill the wicked Tādakā at the bidding of Viśvāmitra, the latter justifies the killing of a woman, provided it is beneficial to mankind; and as an instance he cites god Viṣṇu's killing Bṛṛgu's wife, who thought of ridding the world of Īndra. Here we find Viṣṇu, the guardian of the world, taking the place of Indra and shielding him from all intrigues and mishaps, while the intriguer is the wife of Bhṛgu. Thus it is evident that Vālmiki had the legend from some older source—perhaps an old Brāhmaṇa or gatha now lost—or, perhaps, from some other source than that of the Purāṇas, wherein Usas figured as the wife of Bṛṛgu instead of his daughter. But the difference is trivial when we remember that the change in the import of the word 'patni' which, in early Vedic times meant simply a 'protectress' or 'governess' is of subsequent date, and that a corresponding change in mythological outlook was but a foregone conclusion. The legend in the Rāmāyana, therefore, proves, first, that the wife of Bṛṛgu is none other than Usas; and, secondly, that, notwithstanding certain minor differences, the various versions about the disappearance of that goddess are based on the same Vedic myth.

And lastly, we behold her once more, rising from the Ocean when it was churned by the gods and demons. The episode of the 'Churning of the Ocean' is not only the oldest legend in the epics and the Purāṇas, but also the grandest and boldest that could be conceived by a poet's fancy. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa unquestionably presents the older version of the story when it says that the divine

---

1 विष्णुपराणिः वृद्धमादि वस्तु विष्णु मन्यते ||
अतिक्रमेऽपि ट्रिन नारदि ।
राम. I. 25, 22
enterprise was for the recovery of the lost Śrī. The epics, on the other hand, unanimously declare that the chief aim of the gods and demons in that undertaking—perilous even for them—was the acquisition of the Immortal Drink (Amṛta). And though they describe the appearance of Śrī or Lākṣmī in glowing words, they do not connect the event with anything like her past history. According to the Puranic account, the reappearance of Śrī is an event of far greater moment for the gods than the gain of the ‘Amṛta’ as their hearty reception of the goddess followed by an outburst of spontaneous hymn clearly testifies. But this reincarnation of the goddess, and indeed the whole story of the churning of the Ocean becomes intelligible enough, when we remember that the grand conception underlying it originated with the change in the import of the word ‘Samudra’ at the close of the Vedic period, and that the post-Vedic poet or poets were capable of preserving the old myths by giving them a new lease of life. It is clear to anyone tolerably acquainted with the Rgveda that the word ‘Samudra’ denotes there the mid-air-region (antarikṣa) as well as the terrestrial sea. However, in course of time, like many other Rgvedic words, it became restricted in its import, and stood for one object only. If, therefore, the daughter of Bhrigu, who, as we have already seen, is none other than Uṣas, vanishes into, and emerges again from, the ‘Samudra’, it is a change in the theological outlook rather than in the natural phenomenon—a change in the import of word and not in fact. It is not necessary for our purpose to trace here the previous history of the other ‘gems’, though, on a closer examination, that also may be found, at least in part, to conform to the same mode of explanation as above. 2 The whole episode of ‘Samudra-Mani—

1 Compare, for instance, एकः सुपण्यः स समुद्रनाविषेष etc. R. v. X, 114, 4 also X, 123, 2; where Śāyaṇa remarks समुद्रक ब्यस्नादाप: सति समुद्रोक्तविशेषः।

2 Thus it is clear why the moon is reckoned among the fourteen ‘gems’, if only we remember the change in the meaning of the word ‘Samudra’. And the desire-yielding cows (गावः कामदुधः) who rose up from the ocean at the same time can be no other than the वाङ्गिका वाङ्गः whose abode is ‘antarikṣa’, and who manifests herself in the sweet and pure utterances of the wise. That sweet words serve the purpose of man in the highest degree was admitted in early Vedic times and hence ‘speech’, was said to be a bounteous cow; Compare. चेरुवाणस्नापस्मुपुष्टेः। Again, Airāvata, Indra’s elephant, is none other than the white cloud that floats in the Antarikṣa. Cf. प्राचृत्यपयं पयोवाहि वियदेशवतावव | Raghū I. 36.
thana’, is, indeed, a legend which proves that while Brahmanic ritualism was fast developing in the post-Vedic period, the Brahmanic Muse also was keeping pace along with it. And our only misfortune is that the names of those gifted sons of the Muse who left a rich and considerable heritage to the authors of the Epic and the present Purāṇas should have been so easily consigned to oblivion.

And, lastly, Lākṣmī’s union with Viṣṇu amply bears out her Vedic origin and character as traced above by us. That Viṣṇu is the sun at the meridian is a conclusion of Yāska who identifies all the Ādityas with the solar deity. When, therefore, we behold the goddess taking refuge with Viṣṇu, the most high and popular of later mythology, we but realise what is anticipated in the Rgveda, where the morning sun is described as chasing Uṣas—the rosy dawn—like a man who pursues a youthful maiden. As the worthy consort of the chief of the Hindu Trinity, Lākṣmī has equally risen in dignity and divinity, and now exercises a far greater influence on modern Hindu society than she did in the times of the Vedic Rṣis. For there are few high-class Hindu house-holds now-a-days where at least one female—wife or daughter—is not christened with one of her names. Immortal Dawn, in the words of a Vedic poet, disappears only to rise again.
SAMARĀNGANAŚŪTRADHĀRA AND
YUKTIKALPATARU.

Whether these works are productions of one and the same
king Bhoja of Dhārā Nagari.

BY

P. A. Mankad

( N. B. समराङ्गणो and युक्ति are abbreviations for समराङ्गसूत्रधार
and युक्तिकल्पतत्त्व. )

1 In the foreword to युक्तिकल्पतत्त्व, Mr. Narendranath Law
writes—“The evidence brought together by the learned Editor
( Pandita Ishvara Chandra Sastri ) in the preface, points to the
11th century A. D. as the probable and generally accepted time
of its composition, and to its reputed author, King Bhoja, to be no
other than the Bhoja Parmāra of Dhārā. ” Mahāmahopādhyāya
Ganapati Sastri, in his preface to समराङ्गसूत्रधार ख Part I, says that
the author of the work as mentioned in it is Mahārājādhirāja
Sri Bhoja Deva who is probably the same Bhoja of Dhārā who
ruled over Malwa in the 1st part of the 11th century, A. D. and to
whom many important works are ascribed, such as श्रृङ्गारप्रकाश,
सरस्वतीकण्ठरथभरण etc.

In the preface of the same work, Part II, he says “The Subject
matter being दृष्टिलेख, the work need not possess the characteristics
of a literary work. Nevertheless, it is remarkable for its sweet
and simple Kāvya style. It is for this reason, that I said in the
1st volume that the author of the work is the same King Bhoja
of Dhārā who wrote श्रृङ्गारप्रकाश and other works, and to whom
is ascribed a high place in the domain of साहित्य. ”

2 It would, thus, appear that both the editors are unanimous
as regards the fixing of authorship on one and the same individ-
ual, viz. King Bhoja of Dhārā Nagari. The former adduces
exhaustive evidence from extraneous materials, while the latter
is content only with the solitary internal factor—sweet and simple
kāvya style, and colophons, besides, perhaps.
3 Now, युक्ति° is composed by भोजराज, while समराङ्गन° is the product of महाराजाधिराजश्रीद्वेष. युक्ति° has references, in the body of the work to भोज and भोजेश्वर, as is clear from various extracts interspersed in the book itself. This very fact shows that some other भोज and भोजेश्वर were authors of works treating of subjects dealt with in युक्ति°. (It may be pointed out, by the bye, that none of the extracts of भोज and भोजेश्वर in युक्ति° has been found in समराङ्गन°. ) Further, one comes across a writer by name मांजराज vide Pages 78, 178, 199 of the 3rd part (क्रियापद) of ईशान्तिक्षितगुरुदेव-पद्धत, of the Travancore Sanskrit Series; Dr. Rajendralal Mitter, moreover, in his "Antiquities of Orissa" mentions as many as a dozen or more Bhojas who have flourished from the Vedic times downwards to the 12th century A.D. The majority of them, if not all, were reported to be not only patrons of literature, but to be, themselves, endowed with literary abilities of a very high order. This problem of authorship, when viewed from the point of so many Bhojas assumes a complicated aspect.

4. Unless the learned editors have been in possession of materials to definitely lead them to the conclusion that the same King Bhoja was the author of the works, I venture to hold that mere mention of the name Bhoja or of works युक्ति° and समराङ्गन°, in works of other writers, could not be the conclusive warrant for the statement advanced by the editors. I regret, I am not in possession of the reasons which have prompted them to reach the conclusions they have arrived at. I, for my part, have tried to study comparatively the works under reference from the internal evidence alone and have mainly confined myself to the position which bears on चार्चु and शिल्प more than anything else.

5 a To start with, let the benedic.ory stanzas speak for themselves—

कंसान्नद्वसुक्तवारण: कंसान्नद्वू करोति यः
ते देवदशेराम्भमनारामायमहे मये ॥ २ ॥ in युक्ति° and
dेयः स पातु मुनत्रयसूचिपारस्त्रा बालचन्द्र कथिकान्त्वंजटकोटि: etc. in समराङ्गन° इति.

These, by themselves, tend, though to a very slight degree, to justify the position I have undertaken to emphasize, in as

6 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]
much as the author in the one (स्मरण) distinctly displays a leaning towards ड़ण्ड (विषय) while that in the other (समराज्ञि) towards सिि.

b Colophons——शाकि has, at the end of every शाकि, "इति भोज-राजीय शाकिकल्पतरी नगरी शाकि:", and, at the close of the book, the colophon runs as "इति श्रीमहाराजाधिकाराजाधिकारिचिती शाखिकल्पतरि समाषां". The colophon in समराज्ञि at the end of every ओँथाव runs as "इति श्रीमहाराजाधिकाराजश्रीमोजेिविचिति समराज्ञि etc." These colophons, too, are suggestive. The author of शाकि is only a महाराजमोजेि, while that of समराज्ञि is a personality with higher attributes, महाराजाधिकाराजमोजेिदेव. If these colophons, were really meant to signify what they actually connote, the only feasible inference would be that भोजराज when merely a महाराजा composed शाकि while समराज्ञि came to be composed later on, in the height of his glory, when he had become महाराजाधिकाराजमोजेिदेव. In these days, we are quite familiar with instances of assumption of successive appellations such as महाराजा, महाराजाधिकाराज, राजा, देव, देवि, देवता etc. by individuals in their different stages of life and thus महाराजमोजेि and महाराजाधिकाराजमोजेिदेव, may, for aught one can say, apply to one and the same person, as one advances in material and intellectual prosperity; and on this very account, I will dismiss these colophons, too. The author of शाकि makes a direct mention of the names, both of himself and his work (the benedictory verses on the 1st page are closely followed by a verse तनुि भोजुधिकल्पतरि छदे), while the author of समराज्ञि is very modest in as much as he remains quite silent in this respect.

c The treatment of subjects in समराज्ञि follows the Pauranik method, in as much as the subject matter is dealt with in the form of a dialogue between विषयकर्मच (the first and foremost exponent of Architecture, especially of the नामाग school) and his disciples. The manner of treatment in शाकि is not so.

d Further, शाकि and समराज्ञि, both, have प्रभु देव generally; only the closing verses which sum up the contents, of every ओँथाव in the latter are mostly composed of समरण 8 syllables in a पाद while शाकि on the contrary, is interspersed in the body of शाकिँs throughout, with longer verses.
6. The benedictory stanzas, colophons, mention or absence of names of authors and works, after the opening verses, as also the justification or otherwise of the names assigned to the works—these, in combination, if not singly, may assist one in the work of differentiation of authorship to a certain extent, though not so much as the substantial internal evidence which follows and which, I presume, will lead one to the irresistible conclusion as regards the non-identity of authorship of these two works. For a positive assertion that the one or the other was the King Bhoja of धारानगरी, internal evidence is totally wanting in both. All the same, there is no doubt that समराज्ञान is the product of the King Bhoja of धारानगरी.

7 Writings of authors belonging to any department of knowledge are generally characterized by their individual or personal stamp. Turn to any domain of knowledge, say Poetry, Literature, Science etc. and one is sure to be impressed by this personal stamp. This is, moreover, prominently brought out in works, especially when they have emanated from one and the same author. Plays of Shakespeare, novels of Walter Scott, writings of कालिदास etc. will bear out, on comparative study, the above statement in a marked manner. Such a characteristic feature is manifested in a variety of ways—common words and set phrases, similarity of ideas, the diction etc. It is only when one fails to recognize any of these common traits of language and ideas, in works which are ordinarily ascribed to the same author, that one has, perforce, to set about thinking as to the real authorship of these works. When the above test is applied to समराज्ञान
and युक्ति°, the conclusions are in favour of the contention that these productions cannot be of one and the same individual—King Bhoja of Dhārā.

a Single words.—युक्ति° displays an unusual though distinct terminology of technical words which has no place in समराज्य°. I append them in parallel columns for easy verification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>युक्ति°</th>
<th>समराज्य°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>हस्त्र (a fortress)</td>
<td>भुगोल (a fortress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पाण्ड्या (an enclosure)</td>
<td>दित्तो (an enclosure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रस्थ (broad)</td>
<td>विस्तृत (broad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रस्त (breath)</td>
<td>विस्तार (breath)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आचार (an objectionable combination)</td>
<td>बेबध (an objectionable combination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जानी (a plan)</td>
<td>बास्तु (a plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बड़ा (a bedstead)</td>
<td>शास्त्र (a bedstead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व्युचान (a head piece of a bedstead)</td>
<td>इश्वा (a head piece of a bedstead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्मा (a foot piece of a bedstead)</td>
<td>उद्यम (a foot piece of a bedstead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आचार (a side piece of a bedstead)</td>
<td>पाद् (a side piece of a bedstead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बचना</td>
<td>पाद्धर (a room near the gate of a palace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मकोद (a room inside the gate of a palace)</td>
<td>(V. 410)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures of length

Names of 16 kinds of नगरी
Names of 8 kinds of वास्तु
Names of 18 kinds of बादी
a kind of वहस्तक (कल्याण, कल्याण, सचेतीय, कल्याण and डूब्ढ)
Names of 12 kinds of TWZS Not to be found

While the above words are profusely used in युक्तिः, most of them, if not all, are conspicuous by their total absence in समराक्षणं. Moreover, one whole chapter is devoted, in the latter, to an exposition of definitions of technical words and yet it is surprising to note that the definitions of प्राची, राजस्थ, राजछात्र, राजदृष्ट, राजकंड, राजपुर, राजधारणी, राजक्षेत्र, राजमार, अपदार, यमदार, विषद, तुपूतत, नित्यक, आतिक, उपरस, भूफार, चफक, राजपाठ, राजभूत, यान, ( चतुष्पद, दिनद, विपद, बहुप्रद, विनाम ), आसन ( 86. 87-88 ), घट ( 447 ) तनु, सुच, युण, भाष, राहिम, रज्जु ( 450-451 ) कौशिक P. 81 V. 19 etc. etc. which are given in युक्तिः are absolutely wanting therein. युक्तिः has पराधात, पराधवत etc. whereas समराक्षणं has द्विमेघ, माभव etc. Similarly महाराजः, पुकूरम, पर्यातिययुर, वनदुर, अद्वृखं of the latter are replaced by जलदन्त, पवतद्वं, नवदिन्यं, वनदन्त, वनदुर, मनुष्यदन्त etc. in युक्तिः.

b Set phrases.— To illustrate, the expressions which are very current in युक्तिः are rarely met with in समराक्षणं; I append parallel phrases— the most common combination for length and breadth.

उपरस has आयाम-परिणाम
दैर्घ्य-प्रसर
दैर्घ्य-प्रस्थ

While समराक्षणं has आयाम-विसार
दैर्घ्य-प्रयुक्त
आयाम-प्रयुक्त

Turn to any description where length and breadth are concerned and you will find that युक्तिः will invariably show आयाम-परिणाम, while for the same meaning, समराक्षणं has different expressions.

उपरस has hardly 350 verses bearing on गरि and वास्तु in comparison with समराक्षणं which is several times bigger than युक्तिः in this respect, and yet, even in that small compass, the ordinary combination for length and breadth—आयाम-परिणाम occurs as many as 14 times. दैर्घ्य-प्रसर and दैर्घ्य-प्रस्थ as many as 12 times and आयाम-प्रसर twice in युक्तिः, whereas the same combination
scarcely finds a place in; ig used only 3 times and that, too, in a sense rather different from the one pointed out above, while प्रस्तर and प्रस्थ are never used in such a combination at all, in समराज्ञेय°.

c. Similarity or otherwise of ideas.—समराज्ञेय° treats of वास्तु for the ordinary run of the populace as well as for higher personages, culminating in the residential seats etc. for divinities. It includes principles of design and many cognate subjects at great length. It is as exhaustive in the treatment of the subject matter वास्तु in its various aspects, as it is logical in its method of handling it. As such, it deserves rightly to be styled a standard work in the नागर school of Indian Architecture. दुकिं° in comparison with the above, is merely a specialized epitome of a certain section of वास्तु. It, all the same, covers an extra ground in that it includes in its treatment, all the paraphernalia of royalty, such as the appendages of a King (दूर्ग, चामर, अम्बुपात्र, etc. सिंहासन, छत्र), his ornaments (various kinds of रत्न) शाख, अच्छ, horses, elephants, bulls, animals of draught and conveyances, ships etc. etc. दुकिं° is thus, restricted in its treatment of the principles of वास्तु; and yet, withal, it is, as its name implies, really एक्लपत्र so far as its दुकिंs go. Each page bristles with some unusual or original conception, not commonly met with in समराज्ञेय° an exhaustive and all embracing work on वास्तु.

I append hereunder a number of these ideas—

c 1 Various are the considerations that go to guide the selection of a site for buildings, townships etc. ; one of them is प्रव, declination or “lie of the ground site”. This प्रव, it may be stated, may be in one direction, or it may be concurrent in two or more directions. The form which the consideration of this problem assumes, becomes the more complex, the more directions are involved in it. One generalization, however, emerges from these considerations re. प्रव and it is—that a direction ranging anywhere between North and East is acceptable for the selection of a site for buildings. समराज्ञेय° equally with many other works on वास्तु mentions this aspect of प्रव in a more or less detailed manner. The only correspondence that has been established in that work has reference to the slope of the site, and the direction
in general (without any reference to an extra element) in which it runs. वर्गिति, on the other hand, introduces a third and unique element in this consideration. This third element is जन्मसंज्ञाविन्द्र over and above the slope and general direction of run of the site. The introduction of this extra element is a deviation from the general rule so far as वास्तव of राजस्थान is concerned. All the same, the absence of this phase of प्रवक्त in an exhaustive treatise like समराज्ञ्ञ, wherein, by the bye, two exclusive chapters dealing with Royal Palaces, over and above general specifications scattered in several chapters in the body of the book have been introduced, cannot but be striking and thought provoking.

c 2 Books on वास्तव in their earlier portions begin with a description of units of measurements which vary with the nature of the वास्तव. Measures of all kinds required for the smallest वास्तव e.g. bedsteads, सिंहासन mouldings, ornaments etc., to the largest e.g. streets, townships, highways across the country etc. are prescribed at great length in समराज्ञ्ञ°. These measures start from the lowest basic unit i.e. a very minute particle of dust floating in the air, and rise, in gradational series, eventually to the highest योजन etc. Such an all embracing nature of these tables notwithstanding, it is really surprising to notice that a kind of measurement used in the design of several Royal Appendages, and defined in युक्ति° has not even been hinted at in समराज्ञ्ञ°. This system of measurement is allied to the decimal system used for Scientific purposes, as each succeeding measure in this system forms a multiple of ten with regard to the one preceding it. This table of measures is appended hereunder for facility of reference.

10 हस्तs of a king make one राजहस्त
10 राजहस्तs , , one राजदण्ड
10 राजदण्डs , , one राजकाण्ड
10 राजकाण्डs , , one राजपुरुष
10 राजपुरुषs , , one राजप्रधानी
10 राजप्रधानीs , , one राजस्त्र.
Similarly, there is another table of measures where 9 takes the place of 10 as under—

- 9 तन्त्रस makes one खग
- 9 सुखस = one गुण
- 9 मुणस = one पाष
- 9 पाषस = one रादिस
- 9 रादिस = one राष्ट्र.

It would be tiresome if I were to jot down in details all the uncommon ideas. I shall, therefore, content myself with a bare enumeration of some of them.

c 4 Division of नगरी into 16 kinds with its terminology in accordance with their dimensions measured by राजकृष्ण.

c 5 Determination of the dimensions of a पद्धनस from the जनमङ्गल of a King.

c 6 Specification for a locality fit for वास्तुकर्म and the exceptions thereto in the case of यहङ्ग्रक.

c 7 Determination of 8 kinds of वास्तु when measured by राजकृष्ण.

c 8 Division of वाढी (वास्तु) into 18 kinds as derived from a formula length × breadth, including their effects on occupants.

c 9 Correspondence between लिंधि and the fixation of cardinal points of a यह.

c 10 Functions of three doorways राजढ़, वमढ़, and अपढ़ in a राजयह and the varying distances of परीचीर in the case of each.

c 11 12 Kinds of राजयह determined from भेंपादशन at the times of birth of kings, their names, dimensions, अधिदशता, (शह) the number of doorways with varying colours of आहितानि, and houses covered by पद्धस of different colours, suitable for every one of them.

c 12 Disposition of minerals on the top of houses to ward off evil influences, even death.

c 13 Adjustments of measurements for 8 pieces of timber in खदा of 8 kinds from सभोदकिका to सभंत्रिसातिका, including their names.

c 14 जारी—its numbers in राजयह and dimensions.
8 The non-existence of ideas expressed above could not be made to construe that the author of समराङ्गनः was not aware at least of some, if not all. Verses 9 and 10, page 62, Part I अनया युक्या कल्पतरक्

The author may have ignored them or rather thought it insignificant, on account of rare usage etc, for incorporation of them in a standard work. The author of युक्तिः, on the other hand, has made the most of them, as he includes them in the युक्तिः which form the products of a कल्पतरु.

It stands to reason to assume that one or two view points could be left out of consideration from a standard treatise as समराङ्गनः is. When, however, a host of views on diverse matters is conspicuous by its absence, the question of penmanship assumes an unusual character.

9 Now, the last and at the same time, the most unrefutable factor in deciding the authorship—The Contrast in Specifications—

a युक्तिः sanctions वैशाखः, आषाढः, आषाढः, मागः, कालिकः and कालिकः months as acceptable for starting the construction of houses. vide. V. 212.

वैशाखः आषाढः मागः कालिकः गुहाकारभेते पत्तिप्रत्येकादिवः $\|

समराङ्गनः on the other hand, lays down that in this respect, आषाढः and कालिकः bring down destruction of beasts and servants respectively to occupants of such houses. Vide verses 6 and 7, page 246, Part I.

b Certain kinds of trees are considered as objectionable in the vicinity of Royal Palaces, temples, and dwelling houses in townships. The following verses describe them and it will be found that दार्ड़िकी is included in the list of trees as being not acceptable in समराङ्गनः. Verses 130-131, page 255, Part I.

$\text{ कटुकःकिंकिणीविभज्ञानाकारूणाः सुमाति।}
$\text{ न भारयेत् समूपस्वामनां पुरातात्ववेशनाः।}$ र० २० $\|
$\text{ बवरी गदली चौवं ह्यासी बीज्यारिका।}$ $\|
$\text{ प्ररोहि मुहूः यत्र। तदू मुहूः न प्ररोहित।}$ र० २१ $\|

7 [ Annals, B. O. R. L ]
\( \text{त} \) अन्तः वन्दित हृदा, विन्दुवालिकोक्तः। \( \text{क} \)
पान्ता नारिकेराष्ट्र गुणं कुर्वान्ति निर्क्षयं।
निर्ज्ञा नीली पठाष्ट्र चिन्ना वेदपराणिता।

\( 324 \)

(c) धम्मान् Part I, page 67 Verses 19-20-21.
कर्मिकारपवन्नव्यक्तिपत्विषविषम्भद्वा।
शिरीषोऽवर्षवत्वोण्डशोलवयोऽप्रस्थम्भकः।
निम्नत्रेकोविदुरारक्तवत्वान्यानात्मश गाहिता।

\( 20 \)

\( 19 \)

\( 21 \)

Again—Ibid. page 154 Verse, 5.

समराज्ञ, it will be clear from the above, specifies certain trees as unfit for building materials, (गुहकम्यनि नेतःशते). Further, while specifying the usefulness or otherwise of different kinds of timber for शयन (bedstead), आसन (seat) etc, the author of समराज्ञ adds that whatever timber is undesirable as a building material is equally so, so far as those articles of furniture are concerned. निम्ब is one of the trees included in the above list as unsuitable for building purposes. Evidently, therefore, it cannot be accepted as a useful material for the articles of furniture mentioned above. Moreover, the use of निम्ब tree which is unsuitable for ordinary आसन even, should be absolutely prohibited according to समराज्ञ in the construction of सिंहासन, as the latter forms a specialized kind of आसन. ठुकि, on the contrary, prescribes this very (गद्ध) objectionable material for use in one of the 8 kinds of सिंहासन, and attributes to that timber, besides, the property of bestowing on the user, Prosperity, Victory, Wealth and Health. Verses 372 to 374, page 53 ठुकि are quoted as under,

\( 374 \)

\( 373 \)

\( 372 \)

\( 368 \) Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Not only is युक्ति° thus very positive (Verses 377 and 378) in specifications but, also, it does not brook any the slightest deviation whatsoever from its prescriptions except on penalty of death.

In the design of वास्तु, its dimensions—viz, length, breadth and height or thickness, are arrived at after due adjustments made in accordance with certain principles laid down for it. These principles are embodied in the form of certain relations or formulas which constitute the अंकs of a वास्तु. In this connection, be it noted that the choice of dimensions is deemed most happy when it (वास्तु) secures the greatest satisfaction of these relations. The greater the agreement of these relations it secures, the closer it approximates to an ideal stage dimensionally. These अंकs are आय, व्यय, नक्षत्र, अंशक, तारा etc. Their number varies with different writers, the maximum reaching as high as 27. It is not the purpose here to enter into the details of these formulas and the rules to be observed thereunder, except for a certain arithmetical technicality in their derivations.

आयs are 8 in number, determined by remainders in the division of length × breadth

\[ \frac{\text{length} \times \text{breadth}}{8} \]

Similarly, व्ययs are also 8 obtained by remainders of the division of नक्षत्र

\[ \frac{\text{nakṣaṭra}}{8} \]

नक्षत्रs are 27 determined in the same way, from remainders in length × breadth × 8

\[ \frac{\text{length} \times \text{breadth} \times 8}{27} \]

Remainders in व्यय + अन्तरफल + मूहनामाकारणि give 3 अंशक: and so forth, for 9 तारा where the divisor is 9.

It may be pointed out that in a division, the remainders can never equal, but should invariably be less by one than the divisor. Thus the आयs, व्ययs, नक्षत्रs, अंशकs and तारा could never be 8, 8, 27, 3 and 9 (equal to the divisors in each case) but should be one less viz. 7, 7, 26, 2 and 8, though really they are not so. An anomaly such as this is common not only to समाराज्य° but many other books on वास्तु also. It is, strange, however, that युक्ति° is free from this anomaly, e.g. 18 kinds of बाठी in that work are derived from 18 remainders left out of \( \frac{\text{length} \times \text{breadth}}{19} \)

divisor being one more than the kinds of बाठी.
Divergence in specifications as to the number of doorways in राजयुष्म is so wide that there could be no reconciliation in the view points of both युक्ति and समराज्ञि. युक्ति page 38 lays down,

९का द्वार वासुखण्ड न चतुर्दशरमार्गः।
पंक्तिर दुःसारण, चतुर्दशर दुरार्पहः॥ ३२॥
विधार्शेव चुपतेवोस्तुकम प्रशस्यते।
हृद सुख्ये तत्र चान्यस्यासुस्यासित्य निर्मौः॥ ३२॥

समराज्ञि, on the other hand, in अध्याय ३०लिया which treats of राजयुष्म in details, prescribes ४ doorways in various palaces described therein. e. g,

पुष्पवीणय-Verse ६ द्वाराणि चास्य चत्वारि etc.
मुलक्षण-Verse ४२ पुष्पवीणयद्वारि शेषसिद्धानित्वते।
सर्वतेभ्रम-Verse ५७ डृष्ट सर्वसार्वं प्राकम निर्धरितवेयव्यवहः॥
श्रोणिद्रव्यण-Verse ९८ चतुर्दशमिर्द्र कार्य यतः श्रीकाँविवर्णमच॥
लक्ष्मीविलास-Verse ११७ चतुर्दशर भवदेशदिविद्यया क्षणमध्यगुः।

d्वारसम्भवं विभावतवर्य स्यपैं स्यायं चुड़ासित्य॥

10 The above illustrations of divergent specifications, it is believed, are sufficient to show the non-identity of authors. If the authors of युक्ति and समराज्ञि were one and the same individual, it would be wellnigh impossible to reconcile such diametrically opposite prescriptions. It is as plain as anything that one and the same person would never dictate in one and the same breadth, specifications conflicting one with the other in such a marked manner. Under the circumstances, no room is left but to accept the contention of different Bhojas as authors of युक्ति and समराज्ञि.

11 To sum up, the opening verses, colophons, manner and method of treatment, dissimilarity in language as revealed by non-existence of several words and set phrases, and in ideas, by the total absence of certain conceptions, in some places, and complete divergence in others—all these peculiarities both in the subject matter and method of treatment—go to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the works have emanated from different individuals and that if one of these is the product of King Bhoja of धारानगरी, the other can never be his.
In a paper of mine read before the XVII International Congress of Orientalists held at Oxford, I have given mileage of the distance between Citrakūṭa and Kiśkindā as 98.

Thus four Yojanas as stated in Aranyakāṇḍa (3) Sarga 11 Ślokas 38 and 39 were interlocated by me as 32 miles, and three Krosas in Aranyakāṇḍa Sarga 5 śloka 69 as 6 miles. I did so in other places too.

The above mileage can be tested from the distance between two known places viz. the Gaṅgā at its junction with Yamunā at Allahabad and the Citrakūṭa Mountain situated in the Banda District of the United Provinces in the North-west or West of Allahabad.

In Ayodhyākāṇḍa (2) Sarga 54 and Ślokas 28 and 29 Bhāradvāja whose hermitage was on the junction on the Gaṅgā and Yamunā informs Rāma that 10 Krośas from there was situated the mountain Citrakūṭa where he should stay. Thus:

द्रम्भकोश इतस्तताः गिरियस्मिनिजित्वात् ।

... ... ...

चित्रकूट इति स्थातो......

In the next Sarga in Ślokas 4 to 6 he gives further directions for reaching the place. He says that from the junction of the two Rivers, the Ganges and Yamunā, they should follow the latter upwards from its mouth and having reached an old landing place they should cross it by making a boat and reach a big Nyagrodha tree which has big leafy branches and after having gone only a Kṛośa further, they will see a blue forest. Thus:
The Muni Bharadvaja also adds in the Sloka 9 that he has been often over this road to Citrakūṭa. Thus:

स पद्यांभित्रकूटस्य गतं: पुजवहुःसया ||

Accordingly Rāma made a boat and having put Sītā on it first, crossed the river (Ślokas 18 and 19). Thus:

पुवः... ... ...रामबचके सहाययः: ||
आरोप्य प्रथम सीताः... ... ... ||
तत् प्रतर्युर्यक्ती मीतो द्वारारथात्मजी ||

Having done so they went a distance of one Kroṣa, they wandered in the forest of Yamunā, evidently this being the same place which is mentioned in Śloka 8 (supra) and Śloka 33. Thus:

... ...क्रोशार्य ततो गतवा भातरी रामच्छम्यो ||
बह्नु मेघायु मृगाण हुवा चेर्युर्यमुनावने

Later when Bharata came with his army in the wake of Rāma to the hermitage of Bhāradvāja and asked for the whereabouts of the former, he pointed out that three and half Yojanas from there was the Citrakūṭa Mountain where Rāma was staying. As Bharata was accompanied by a big retinue Bhāradvāja pointed out to him another route but the distance although mentioned in two different methods of calculating it, viz. Kroṣas and Yojanas, 10 Kroṣas (i.e. 20 miles) are almost equal to 3½ Yojanas (i.e. about 9 Kroṣas), having regard to perhaps different places for crossing the river (Yamunā) as the route pointed out is to the South or South-west (Sarga 92, Ślokas 10, 11, 13, and 14). Thus:
Having followed this direction Bharata came to the vicinity of Citrakūṭa and said to his chief adviser that the place pointed out by Bhāradvāja had been reached (Sarga 93, and Ślokas 6 and 8). Thus:

... ... ...अवाच भरतः श्रीमातः वशिष्ठ मन्त्रिणाः वरसः || 6 ||
... ... ...यथक भासा: ससि ते देशं भारद्वाजो यमक्षेत || 7 ||
अर्यं गिरिभिष्टकृत्तं इयं मन्त्राकिनं नदी ।
एतत्प्रावश्यते दुराभीष्टमेघायुेकं वनसः || 5 ||

The description of the bluish forest has reference to what was stated in Sarga 55, Śloka 8 supra. Now the shortest distance between the bank of the Yamunā and Citrakūṭa is between 20 and 30 miles, although it is 80 miles by rail from the junctions of the two rivers.

This test should leave no doubt as regards the distance between Citrakūṭa and Kiśkindhā as calculated by me in my last paper.

II

In the 32nd Sarga of Aranyakānda (4) it is stated that when Śūrpanākhā saw Trisiras, Khara and Dūṣana with their army killed by Rāma singly, filled with grief she went to Laṅkā, protected by Rāvana, from Daṇḍakāraṇya, (Śloka 3). Thus:

जगाम परमोदिता छट्टी रांगणावलितांम् || 3 ||

Then Rāvana went to the stables, asked his charioteer to yoke the mules who did it in a moment and in his golden chariot came to the ocean. (Sarga 35, Ślokas 4, 5, 6 and 7). Thus:

यानशाशां ततो गतवा धृतराष्ट्रां राजसाविषयः
पूर्ते संघोद्यामास रथः संपीष्यतामिति || 7 ||
He then crossed the sea and in a lovely and beautiful place in the forest saw the Rākṣasa named Mārica ( Sarga Ibid Ślokas 37 and 38 ). Thus:

तेन तु गत्वा परं पारं समुद्रस्य नदीपतेऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽऽঃ।

Rāvana induced Mārica to accompany him on his chariot to the place where Rāma was staying to decoy Sītā ( Sarga 42, Ślokas 7, 8, 9 and 11 ). Thus:

आर्यासामयं शीर्षं खंगो रत्नाविसृष्टं।
मल्लोकायत्वा वेढोऽं यथेष्टं मन्तमहसी।
ततो रावणार्थे विमानांमि तेन रथमु।
आर्याय यथूः शीर्षं तस्मात्रायमणमण्डलात।
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In Kīṣkiṇḍhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 6, Ślokas 9, 10 and 11 Sugrīva says that he saw Sītā being dragged by Rāvana when seeing him and his followers she threw down on the peak her covering garment and some ornaments. It is however not clear from this nor from a similar description of the manner of her being taken away by Sāmpāti in Sarga 58 and Śloka 15 whether she was being dragged on earth or by air. Thus:

हियमाणा मया दृष्टा रक्षस शूरकर्मणा ॥ १ ॥

उत्सर्रीयं तया र्यकं ... ॥ १ ॥

हियमाणा मया दृष्टा राज्येन दुराधमना ॥ १ ॥

It will be evident from the above narrative that neither in the journey of Rāvana, with Mārica, to Janasthāna, where Rāma was staying, nor on his return journey with Sītā, is there any mention of the formidable obstruction of the ocean. On the contrary he seems to have crossed it easily. It clearly appears that he had to use two chariots one to the sea from Lāṅkā and other from the hermitage of Mārica, which was near to the sea. Arāṇyakāṇḍa (3) Sarga 35, Ślokas 37 and 10. Thus:

तै तु गत्वा पर्य पार्य समुद्रस्य नदीपते ।

दुधर्मार्घस्यमेकान्ते रस्ये गुण्ये वनान्ते ॥ ३ ॥

कामगे रथसायाय शुद्धेऽः राजसंवरः ॥ १ ॥

III

Now those who maintain that the sea or the ocean which surrounded the island of Lāṅkā was in the South of India base their argument on the mention of the names of Mountains Sahya, Malaya and Mahendra, which are well known mountains at the extreme end of the Southern peninsula of India. ( Yuddhakāṇḍa (6), Sarga 4 Ślokas 73, 74, 95, 96 and 97 ). Thus:

सह्यपर्वतसेवदुर्गलयं च महीभर ।...

पह्यशभिययो रामं: सह्यस्य महङ्यस्य च ।...

ततः: शिखरसार्हक्क्को रामो दुर्शात्मजः ॥ ९ ॥

कूर्मादिसमाकार्यमपवस्तुचिह्वारसु... ॥ १७ ॥

8 [ Annals, B. O. R. I. ]
But apart from the fact that this lengthy Sarga appears to be later interpolation, there is evidence to show that the Malaya and Mahendra were the names of forts or peaks near Kiskindhā.

In Aranyakānda (3) Sarga 72, Śloka 12, it is stated that Sugrīva had to live on the mountain Rṣyamūka which spread up to Pampā, which was a lake (Aranyakānda Sarga 73, Śloka 11). Thus:

ऋष्यमूके गिरिवरे पप्पापर्यन्तशोभिते।

and

ततः पुष्करिणीं वीरी पम्पां नाम गमिष्यथ।

In Kiskindhākānda (4) Sarga 2 it is stated that seeing Rāma in the neighbourhood of Rṣyamūka (Sarga 1, Śloka 129) Sugrīva and his followers became terrified (Sarga 2, Śloka 1) fearing that Vāli had sent them (Śloka 13). Then Hanumān assured them that the place where they were standing i.e. the hill named Malaya, on which was situated Rṣyamūka, was beyond the pale of Vāli (Śloka 14). Thus:

तारुष्यमूकस्य समीपचारी चरत्र । ...

...


नतस्तं भक्षसंविंशं वालिकिलिबिष्यशाल्लितः।

उवाच हनुमानं वाक्यं सुग्रीवं वाक्यकोविदः।

संभवस्त्र्यात्मसिंह सर्वं वापृष्ठकृंभन्ति महानू।

मलयावर्ग गिरिवरो भयं नेहास्ति वालिमः।

That the place mentioned above was in the neighbourhood of Rṣyamūka is seen from Sarga 3 Ślokas 1, 2 and 21 to 23. Thus:

वच्चो विज्ञाय हनुमानु तुष्टिवस्य महात्मन।

पर्वताख्यान्त सुपुष्पावेः यज्ञ रापती।

...

...

पापीस्ये प्रेमितस्य सुभर्बिषं महात्मन।

राजा वानरसुख्यान। हनुमाणानाम वानरः।

...

...

तस्य मां सचिवं चिरं वानरं पवनात्मण ...।

...

ऋष्यमूकादिछ प्रामं। ... ...।

...

...
Then Hanumāṇ went to Rṣyamūka itself which was the abode of Sugrīva (Araṇyakāṇḍa (3) sarga 72 Śloka 12 supra), to Malaṛyaṅgiri from where they had seen Rāma and his brother wandering near Rṣyamūka (Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4), Sarga 5, Śloka 1).

Thus:

अङ्ग्यसूकाङ्क हर्माचार गतवा तं समय गिरिजः।
आचार्यां तदा बीरी कपिराजाय राजवी ||

Vāli, the opponent of Sugrīva, lived at Kiṣkindhā (Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa (4) Sarga 11, Śloka 21). Thus:

वाली नाम महाप्रजाः शकुन्त्यपराक्रमः।
अध्यास्ते वानर: श्रीमान किष्किन्धामतुष्टिमालः॥२१॥

This place was at a distance of one Yojana (4 miles) from the hermitage of Mataṅgā (Sarga 11, Ślokas 46, 47 and 48). Thus:

पपात च महाकाल: क्षितो पञ्चचतवागतः।
तं तोऽनयित्वा वाहुः गतसच्चमचेतनसु।॥४६॥
चिक्षेप बलवान्व वाली वेगेनकेन योजनसु।...॥४७॥
प्रेतेनसहतोक्षितसा मत्त्वस्यात्रेः प्राधः।...॥४८॥

This hermitage of Mataṅgā was at a distance of 12 miles from Janasthāna, where Rāma had lost his wife (Araṇyakāṇḍa (3) Sarga 69, Ślokas 5 and 8). Thus:

तत:परं जनरथानान्तति गम्य राजवी।
कौश्यार्यं विविष्कर्षणं ती महीजसी।॥५॥
...
...
...
...
तत: दुःखेन तित गतवा त्रिकोषों भारी तदा।
कौश्यर्यमतिक्षयं मत्त्वस्यात्रमात्रं॥८॥

From Rṣyamūka Sugrīva was asked to immediately proceed to Kiṣkindhā (Sarga 12, Ślokas 12 and 14). Thus:

अस्मत्त्रेच एव किष्किन्धाम स्वियं गच्छ खम्बतः।...॥१२॥
सवे ते त्यारितं गतवा किष्किन्धाम बाधिन: पुरीमः।...॥१४॥

Sugrīva was hotly pursued by Vāli upto Malaya forest (Ślokas 22 and 23). Thus:

...
...
...
...
...
...
...स निबुद्धो महासुगः॥२२॥
...
तं प्रविष्टं वर्ष द्वृच्छ बाधी शापण्यार्थं:।
...
...
...
...
...
...
...स निबुद्धो महासुगः॥२ः॥
Rāma accompanied by Laksmana and Sugriva went to Kiśkindhā from Rṣyamūka. In the way they met a broken grove named Sapta Janasthāna. From here they saw Kiśkindhā (Sarga 13, Ślokas 1, 13, 29 and Sarga 14. Śloka 1). Thus:

अष्टमूकात्त सर्मात्मा किष्किन्यां छक्ष्मणाणाः

daham sah muṣṭikō wāḍaṇaṭkarmapāḍitaṁ

... ... ... ...

तेषां तु गन्धेर्तं तत्र ल्वरितं रघुनन्दनः ... ...

ते गम्भास दूरमद्वां तत्तमालस्वाभायमाणः।

दूरुमस्तन्त दुरार्धि किष्किन्यां बाळिश्पालिष्टाः

... ... ... ...

सवं ते ल्वरितं गम्भास किष्किन्यां बाळिश्पालिष्टाः। ...॥ ॥

All this description shows that there was not much distance between Rṣyamūka and Kiśkindhā. The latter was in a valley (Sarga 27, Śloka 1 and Sarga 26, Śloka 7). Thus:

अभिविष्णुे तु मुष्ट्वं प्रविशं चालने यहां। ...॥ ॥

... ... ... ...

इत्य्य गिरिमुहा रसपायनमन्त्रिन्तिः। इत्यतः ...॥ ॥

This is made clear in Sarga 31 Śloka 16, Thus:

तासपत्यदुर्दर्कर्णिः हरिराज महापुरीम्।

दुर्मालिष्क्कुशास्त्रीत्र: किष्किन्यां गिरिस्कुण्टे। ...॥ ॥

and Rāma with his brother went to live on the Prasravana Mountain (Sarga 27, Śloka 1). Thus:

... ... आजगाम सह भान्त्रा रामः ग्रहणान्य गिरिम्। ...॥ ॥

In the neighbourhood also were in the North a peak and in the South a peak named Kailāsa and on the East a river flowing by a peak known as Trikūṭa (Sarga 27, Ślokas 14, 15, 16, 26 and 27). Thus:

गिरिश्वेवुकं तात प्रश्व चोर्चरत् ज्युष्मन्। ...॥ ॥

द्विक्षण्यास्यपि दिशिः स्थितं झेतामिनांत्यतः।

केताससिरिष्कर्मवं ... ... ...॥ ॥

प्राचीनवाहिनिः चैव नदी ... ... ...॥ ॥

गुहाया: पूर्वः प्रश्य त्रिकुटे। ... ... ...॥ ॥

... ... ... ... ...

इत्यद्व नातिसुृव ता किष्किन्याः। ... ... ...॥ ॥

धुरीवंश गुरूरि स्याय अविष्ट्यानि। ... ... ...॥ ॥
Besides Kiskindhā there were other forts on the mountain (Sarga 19, Slokas 14 and 15). Thus:

... ... ... ...

Besides Kiskindhā there were other forts on the mountain (Sarga 19, Slokas 14 and 15). Thus:

Besides Kiskindhā there were other forts on the mountain (Sarga 19, Slokas 14 and 15). Thus:

During this time Rāma lived on a peak of Prasravāna mountain which was known as Mālyavat (Sarga 27, Slokas 1 and 29 and Sarga 28, Sloka 1). Thus:

During this time Rāma lived on a peak of Prasravāna mountain which was known as Mālyavat (Sarga 27, Slokas 1 and 29 and Sarga 28, Sloka 1). Thus:

In Kiskindhākānda (4) Sarga 2 Sloka 14, this Mālyavat is called Malaya. Thus:

In Kiskindhākānda (4) Sarga 2 Sloka 14, this Mālyavat is called Malaya. Thus:

That this Prasravāna Mountain otherwise known as Malaya, was in sight of Vindhyā at the foot of which was the sea, which divided Lanka from the Vindhyā range in a valley of which was Kiskindhā is borne out by Sarga 53, Slokas 12 and 16 Sarga 60 Sloka 6 and Sarga 58, Sloka 34 and Sarga 64, Sloka 2. Thus:

That this Prasravāna Mountain otherwise known as Malaya, was in sight of Vindhyā at the foot of which was the sea, which divided Lanka from the Vindhyā range in a valley of which was Kiskindhā is borne out by Sarga 53, Slokas 12 and 16 Sarga 60 Sloka 6 and Sarga 58, Sloka 34 and Sarga 64, Sloka 2. Thus:
So when Hanumān, who was among the above army made his mind to cross the ocean, he observed that the ground below his feet being soft will not be able to bear the repurcursion of his leap (Kiśkindhākānda (4) Sarga 67, Śloka 37). Thus:—

नें नम सही वेम खड़गने धारिष्यति । ...॥ ३७॥

So he pointed out to the peaks of Mahendra Mountain as firm enough to bear his burden and ascended one of them (Sarga 67, Ślokas 38 and 41). Thus:—

शिखराणि महेन्द्रस्य स्थिराणि च महान्ति च।
पूष वेम करिष्यासि महेन्द्रशिखरेणवहस् ॥ ३८॥

... ... ... ...
आश्रयाद नामस्यं महेन्द्रमनिर्वर्तनः । ...॥ ४२॥

This Mahendra was a peak of Vindhyā is shown by the narrative in Sarga 63, Śloka 14 and Sarga 64 Ślokas 1 and 2 according to which Sampāti, who was on a peak of the Vindhyās flew away from it followed by Hanumān and others to the banks of the sea. Thus:—

उत्यापत जिरेः ढक्काद् । ... ...॥ ४४॥

... ... ... ...
आश्रयाद गुप्तराजेन समुदपत्य पठवेंगमाः । ...॥ १॥

... ... ... ...
हस्ता सागरमात्रं: सीताद्विनकाभिनः: ॥ २॥

Here as seen later (infra) Rāma ascended the Mahendra.

On his return from Laṅkā Hanumān and others ascended the peak of Mahendra and leaving it ran to where Rāma was. Sundarakānda (Sarga 60, Śloka 13, and Sarga 61 Śloka 2). Thus:—

तस्माहक्रस्म वे सर्वेऽयत्र रामः सद्हस्यः । ...॥ १३॥

... ... ... ...
महेन्द्राः परित्याज्य पुष्टवु: पठवेंगम्भाः: ॥ २॥

Here also came Rāma (Yuddhakānda (6), Sarga 4, Śloka 95 and 96). Thus:—

... ... ... ...
महेन्द्रस्य सम्पाण् रामो राजीवहाचनः ॥ ९५॥
अभ्यारोह्न्महावातः शिखरं हुम्भूषिलम् । ...॥ ९६॥
He came here from Prasravana Mountain where Hanumān had reported his success to him (Sundarakāṇḍa (5) Sarga 65, Sloka 1). Thus:

ततः प्रसरवणं शीतं ते गत्वा चित्रकाननम्।
प्रणवमिश्रितं सरसं त्वक्षमणं च महावलस्य॥ १॥

But in this lengthy chapter 4 of Yuddhakāṇḍa in which Rāma’s journey to the sea and his ascending of Mahendra is described, there appear to have crept in some interpolations, such as in 73, 74, 97 and 98, the meaning of which is also obscure. Ślokas 73 and 74 say that Rāma reached the Sahya and Malaya Mountains, and a river which is full of water or the name of which was Prasravana. Thus:

सद्यपर्वतमयेंदरंततं च महाघरयं।
कातनानिशिष्टघणि नदीप्रसरवणानि च॥ ३॥
पश्यचाभियों रामः सद्यस्य महास्य च । । । । । ॥ ७४॥

If the latter interpretation is correct then the river might have been named after the mountain on which Rāma was living near Kīşkindhā, as it might have had its source there. Then Sahya and Malaya appear to be synonyms and Malaya was another name for Prasravana as seen above.

But Ślokas 96 to 100 are not clear. They appear to mean that Rāma had ascended the peak of Mahendra, he saw the sea at a distance but in between were Sahya and Malaya, and having ascended from the peak he crossed a beautiful forest reaching upto the sea coast and said to Sugriva that they had reached the sea. Thus:

... ... ततः शिखरमासूह्य रामो द्वाराधावतःम्॥ ९६॥

... ... ... ... ... ...

ते सहं समतिक्रमः मलयं च महागिरिम्॥ ९७॥
आसेदुरानुवंशर्येण समुद्रं भौमिनित्वनम् ... ... ॥
अवश्यं जगामाहु बेलावननुस्तनम्॥ ९८॥

... ... ... ... ... ...
बेलामासायं विपुलं रामो वचनमविवे।
एते इयमनुष्यानः सुश्रीवस्य वर्णालंकयः॥ १००॥
But the above does not mean that Rāma crossed the mountain ranges named Sahya and Malaya.

Reference has been made to the existence of a mountain known as Trikūta with a river flowing by to the East of the cave in which Rāma had taken his abode. ( Kiskindhākānda (4). Sarga 27, Ślokas 16 and 4 ). Thus:—

This Trikūta which was observed to the East of Malaya, or Prasravāna, with a river between, was in the vicinity of Lāṅkā ( Yuddhākānda (7). Sarga 11, Ślokas 22, 24 and 49 and Sarga 40, Ślokas 2 and 3 ). Thus:—

That the distance between the North bank and the South bank of the sea dividing the Continent from the Island of Lāṅkā was not great is evident from Yuddhākānda (6). Sarga 17, Ślokas 1, 9, 10 and Sarga 19 Ślokas 1 and 2 ). Disregarded by his brother, Rāvaṇa, Bibhīṣaṇa came to the Northern Coast of the Sea, when Rāma had reached the Southern Coast. There he stood on a high ground (“गणनस्य” and स्वस्य एव व्यतिक्रमत ) and loudly spoke (उवाच स्वेरण महता ). Thus:—
At his instance was built the Setu for crossing the (Sarga 19, Ślokas 32, 33, 39 and 40). Thus:

... ... ... ... विभीषणनन्तः राश्रेण विपश्यिता॥ २२॥
... ... ... ... तत्तथारक्तभुस्मवर्ष्यमे विभीषणवचः हुमासू॥ २४॥
... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... किमथर्थं नौ नरव्यायं न रोपित्यायं राखवः।
विभीषणेण योगकमासिनः काले सुखावहम्॥ २९॥
अबुद्धा सारे संस्तं घोररसिनाहं वर्णणात्ले।
छंदा नासारिनु शाख्या सेन्त्रे: अपि सुरासुः॥ ४०॥

The above shows that the distance between the two coasts although difficult to be crossed by an army without a bridge, loud conversation between the two could be heard. Moreover, a small party could cross it as Bibhīṣaṇa did (Sarga 19, Ślokas 2 and 3). Thus:

खाल्पवातावरः हुनो भक्तिनर्वर्णनः।
स तु रामस्य धर्मांक्ष निपात विभीषणः॥ २॥
पादवोः जराणार्चेयी... ... ... ...॥ ३॥

When visiting Mārica Rāvāṇa too had crossed it. (Aranyaka-kaṇḍa (3). Sarga 35, Śloka 37). Thus:

तं तु गत्वा परं पारं समुद्रस्य नदीपते:।
ददद्वारामस्मेकान्ते रश्ये पुण्ये वनान्ते॥ ३७॥

Moreover, the bed of the river (exaggerated by poetic imagination into a sea) was mainly without mud (Kiṣkindhākaṇḍa (4). Sarga 27, Śloka 16). Thus:

प्राचीनवासिनीं चं व नन्द्रं श्रीमक्कड़मां॥ ...॥ १६॥
SUMMARY

In my paper on 'Rāvana's Lanka discovered' read before the XVII International Congress of Orientalists I had located Lanka in the Vindhya Mountain on the description of the route of Rāma to Lanka, as given in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa. In the present paper I locate it at the same place on the basis of Rāvana's route to Pañcavaṭi and his subsequent movements.

It is noteworthy that in the Ayodhyākāṇḍa Vālmiki gives the distance between Ayodhyā and Citrakūṭa, both in Kṛṣṇas and Yojanas, and it tallies exactly with the present location of these two places. It is also noteworthy that against the popular belief that Vālmiki lays stress on the vicinity of Malaya and Sahya to the north bank of the sea which divides Lanka from India, these, as a matter of fact, are only mentioned once in a long Adhyāya in Sundarakāṇḍa, which there is reason to suppose, contains many interpolations. On the other hand, Malaya is the name of a fort on a peak of the Vindhya Mountain near Kiśkindhā. As a matter of fact, Vālmiki in many places insists on the vicinity of Vindhya to Lanka. All these facts and the fact that Rāvana easily came to Pañcavaṭi and Bibhiṣāṇa spoke to the followers of Rāma from the other side of the sea, dividing India and Lanka, lead to the same conclusion as I have arrived in my previous paper. 1

1 N. B. (1) Important references in Sanskrit quotations have been printed in black type.

The traditions of the Gauda Brahmanas point to Gauda, in Bengal, as their original home. They are divided into two main sections, viz., the Adi-Gauda, i. e. those who were first to migrate from Gauda, and the Sri-Gauda. In speaking of the origin of the last-named of Gujarāt, the Brāhmaṇoppati-mārtanda writes,

Purā Gauḍa-Brāhmaṇās-ca Kāsmīra-desā-vāsinah || 41 ||
Apratigrāhīnaḥ sarve Lakṣmī-sāpena bhikṣukāḥ ||
Jitāḥ Śrīhāṭṭa-nagarāṇ-nirg utāḥ-ca diśo-dāsa || 42 ||
Mālavā ca gatāḥ kecin-Maruḍhanve tothā'parā ||
Śrī-gauḍa iti yan-nām-i-grāma-Śrī-kāra-yogatāh || 43 ||

( pp. 133-134 ).

i. e. "In ancient time the Gauda Brāhmaṇas were the residents of the country of Kāsmīra. They were all non-acceptors of gift and were turned to beggars, through the curse of the goddess of fortune. Born in the city of Śrīhaṭṭa, went forth to ten directions, some to Mālava and others to Marudhanva ( Raiputānā ). They are called Śrī-Gauda by the addition of 'Śrī' of their village name ( i. e. Śrīhaṭṭa ) ".

Śrīhaṭṭa has been called 'nagara' i. e. city in the third line and again as 'grāma' i. e. village, in the last line of the above extract. This leads us to suspect, whether Śrīhaṭṭa-nagara' is the correct reading. We think that the correct word is Śrīhaṭṭa-Nāgara'. This slight change makes the sense clear, without spoiling the metre.

Let us see if our surmise can be supported by facts. In this connection, the word Bhikṣukāḥ first attracts our attention. It

1 Sup. to Gloss of Ind. Terms, by Sir H. M. Elliot, pp. 417-20.
reminds us of the Bhikṣu or Bhiksuka section of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt. These Brāhmaṇas are principally divided into two sections, viz. Bhikṣu, i.e. the priestly class, which lives on charities (pratigraha), and Grhastha who follow all sorts of professions, including government service.

Again the tradition says that these Brāhmaṇas were formerly the residents of Kāśmīra. This does not seem to be a pure myth. This is capable of proof, if our surmise is accepted. Six years ago, we hinted that the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Śrīhaṭṭa might have come from the north-western border of Kāśmīr. Prof. Bhandarkar has since substantiated this by positive evidence. He has shown that a place named Nāgarakhaṇḍa, in Kāśmīr, is mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgīnī (VII. 194). This, no doubt, proves the existence of the Nāgaras in Kāśmīr. He identifies this place with the second of the two chiefships denoted by Hunza-Nāgara, to the extreme north-west of Kāśmīr. He, further, says that the Nāgaras migrated from their original home in Hāṭaka, near Mānasa lake, westward to Kāśmīr. This is also proved by the existence of the Nāgarī class of Brāhmaṇas in Kāśmīr.

Now we shall try to see where this Śrīhaṭṭa was or is. The compiler of the Brāhamaṇotpatti-mārtanda in his bhāṣā-tīkā has located it in Kāśmīr. He has not given any evidence in support of his assertion, nor have we been able to find any. On the other hand the Bombay Gazetteer (Vol. IX., Pt. I., p. ix & n.)

---

1 The Nāgaras of Gujarāt attribute the origin of the name of ‘Bhikṣuka’ to the curse of Indra, and not of Lakṣmī. The origin of the tradition is based on the following verse of the Śkandapurāṇa, Nāgarakhaṇḍa ch. 206, which says:

"Mama Vākyād- api prāpya ete Lakṣmīṁ dvijottamāh \nNirdhanāḥ samāhavisyanti nīvā yad-duvārato’khilam\ 163"

2 As regards vocations and religious customs, these Grhașthas have got striking similarities with the Kāyașṭhas of Bengal, who according to Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, were originally Nāgara Brāhmaṇas. Sherring, speaking of the Mehtās says:—The Mehtās, moreover, are spoken of as writers, and apparently hold the position of the Kāyașṭha, or writer caste, in northern India. (Hindu Tribes and Castes, Vol I, p. 100). It is very curious indeed that of the different meanings of the word ‘kāya’, ‘grha’ is one. Thus the words Kāyașṭha and Grhaștha etymologically mean the same thing.

3 Nāgarotpatti by G. S. Pancoli, pp. 60-61.


5 Ind. Ant, 1932, pp. 68-69.
Among the later arrivals of Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas in Gujarāt are the Śrī-Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas from Gauḍa or Bengal by way of Mālava and Dohad. So according to this evidence Śrīhāṭṭa must have to be looked for in Bengal. In fact there is an ancient place named Śrīhāṭṭa, in Assam, on the eastern border of Bengal. It is the head-quarters of the district of the same name. Not only Śrīhāṭṭa, but there was also a small kingdom named Gauḍa in this district. The king had his capital at the modern town of Śrīhāṭṭa (Sylhet). This kingdom was conquered by the Muhammudans in the fourteenth century A. D. **We** have already shown that there has been a settlement of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas in this Śrīhāṭṭa, since about the fifth century A. D.

In enumerating the different kinds of silver, Kautilya, in his **Arthaśāstra**, speaks of a variety named ‘Gaudikam’ or Gaulikam. Bhaṭṭasvāmi, the commentator, interprets this term as ‘Kamarū-pajam’ Kauṭīlya’s Gauḍa is, no doubt, the Gauḍa in Bengal, which is much older than the other Gauḍa in Śrīhāṭṭa. We do not know what was the extent of Gauḍa in Kauṭīlya’s time, nor whether Gauḍa produced any silver. A commodity is known by the name of the country of its production, or by that of its market. We do not know again, if the name of Kāmarūpa is so old

---

1 Although Sylhet is now politically under Assam, from the linguistic and ethnological points of view, it still forms a part of Bengal. As far as is known in the latter part of the fifth century, Śrīhāṭṭa was under the kingdom of Kāmarūpa. It is not known how long it remained so. Most probably with the decline of the Kāmarūpa kingdom, there grew up several independent and semi-independent chiefs, who were conquered by the Muhammudans in the fourteenth century. With this conquest it came under Bengal, and remained so till 1874 A. D., when it was transferred to Assam.

2 It is interesting to note here that besides Gauḍa, there were two other petty kingdoms, named Magada and Lāḍa. Magada is, no doubt, named after the well-known kingdom of Magadha, by the people migrating from there. Similarly the other two countries, viz., Gauḍa and Lāḍa (Rāḍha = Lāḍha = Lāḍa) were named by the people coming from Gauḍa and Rāḍha of Bengal. This, no doubt, accounts for their linguistic and ethnological affinity with Bengal. An aboriginal tribe called Rāḍha is found in Mayūrabhaṇḍa, on the borders of Rāḍha, and also in the Sylhet district. They are, no doubt, original inhabitants of Rāḍha. Lāḍa or Lāḍha of Gujarāt might have some connection with Rāḍha or Lāḍha of Bengal. We hope some students of ethnology will take up this interesting study.

3 *J. A. S. B.* — 1823, p. 413.

as the fourth century B.C. It may be that Kāmarūpa produced silver, which came to be known to the outside provinces through its market, which was Gauḍa in Bengal. Or it may be that in Bhaṭṭasvāmi's time Gauḍa of Bengal was under Kāmarūpa kings, which was about the latter half of the seventh and first quarter of the eighth century A.D. If he is of still later date he might have in view the Gauḍa in Sylhet.

Yaśodhara, the author of the Jayamaṅgolā commentary on Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra, flourished about the middle of thirteenth century. He appears to have known both the Gauḍas. He interprets, 'Gauḍā' as Kāmarūpakāh, and again writes:—'Kaliṅga-Gauḍa-viṣayād-dakṣinena'. It should be noticed here that he makes a distinction between Gauḍa and Gauḍa-viṣaya. The first is, no doubt, Gauḍa in Sylhet, which was probably under the Kāmarūpa kings, in the thirteenth century. Gauḍa-viṣaya, to the south of which has been placed Kaliṅga, can not but be the Gauḍa of Bengal. In the Jitopadeśa, which is considered not later than the twelfth century has 'asti Gauḍa-viṣaye Kauśāmbī-nāma-nagarī' Kauśāmbi occurs in the Velābo plate of Bhojavarman,¹ and also in Saṁdhyākara's Rāmacaritā of about the twelfth century. It has been identified with the village of Kauśāmbi, with considerable ancient remains, in the Rajshahi district, in Bengal.

The Śrīhaṭṭa-Nāgaras, whom we have identified with the present day Sāmpradāyika or Vaidika Brāhmanas of Sylhet, know nothing about their coming from Kāśmir.² On the other hand, some of them claim that their forefathers came from Kanauj, while others say that they came from Mithilā. We find no improbability in either of the two assertions, as both the provinces have got Nāgar settlements. It is not necessary that they should come direct from Kāśmir. They might have come via either or both of the countries.

According to the Nāgara-puspānjali (Vol. I. p. 2). 'Kanaujiā' is the name of a section of the Kapola-Nāgara division of the Nāgaras. This is supported by epigraphic evidence also. An inscription, in the script of the seventh century, found in the ruins

¹ E.J. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 42.
² Ind., Hist. Qly., Vol. VI, p. 68.
of Kudarkot, Gavidhmat, Itāwā district, U P., records gift of houses to some Brāhmaṇas, with the surnames of Soma, Kirti, Sārmā and Svāmī, like those of the Brāhmaṇas, mentioned in the Nidhanpur grant of Bhāskararavarma, found in the district of Sylhet. Again Risely says that 'Nāgara' is a hypergamous group of the Matūhil Brāhmaṇas. It is, therefore, very probable that the Śrīhaṭṭa–Nāgaras came to Sylhet from Kāśmīr, via Kanauj and Mithilā.

As we find both Śrīhaṭṭa and Gauḍa in the same locality, that is in the district of Sylhet, we feel no hesitation in identifying this Śrīhaṭṭa with the Śrīhaṭṭa of the traditional account of the Śrī-Gauḍa Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt, whence they are said to have migrated to Mālava and other provinces. By going from Gauḍa in Śrīhaṭṭa, they probably came to be known as Śrīhaṭṭa-Gauḍa, in contradistinction to the 'Ādi-Gauḍas,' who had already been there. Śrī-Gauḍa seems to be nothing but the shortened form of 'Śrīhaṭṭa-Gauḍa'.

Now let us see if we can find out the time, when these Brāhmaṇas migrated to Mālava. The Brāhmaṇapattimārtaṇḍa (p. 433) gives the date of their migration to Gujarāt as 'the Nande Rudra-varṣe,' i. e. in the year 1190. Taking this to be in Vikrama era, it comes to 1137 A.D. So their migration from Bengal to Mālava must have taken place in the tenth or eleventh century at the latest. Epigraphic evidence also goes to support this story of migration of Bengal Brāhmaṇas to Mālava, in the latter part of the tenth century onwards. Mr. K. N. Dikshit exhibited at the 150th Anniversary of Foundation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, held before year last, certain copper plates found at Gaonry in Narwhal Estate near Ujjain. One set of these copper plates was issued by the Paramāra king Vākpati-Muṇja on the 10th of the bright half of the 2nd Āsāḍha of V. S. 1038 (= 982 A.D.). Some of the donees, says Mr. Dikshit, migrated from 'Kanopā in Magadhā, Madhyadeśa, Bilvasavasa in Dakṣīṇa Rādha (south-west Bengal) Nandipur (modern Nandur) in south Gujrat, Paundarika in the Uttarākula country which may mean the northern bank of the

---

2 Ibid, Vols XII, p. 65 and XIX, pp. 118 and 246.
3 Castes and Tribes of Bengal, Vol. II, p. 121.
Ganges, Kauśāmbī, Śāvathika which is apparently the same as Śrāvasti and Kolāṇca in Bogra district of North Bengal.' Several other inscriptions also testify to the fact of migration of Bengal Brāhmaṇas to Mālava.

HINDU ALCHEMY AND MODERN CHEMISTRY
(The Origin of gold from Mercury)

BY

J. C. GHOSH

The Alchemists of old claimed the knowledge of transmuting baser metals into gold. But the science of modern chemistry, which is a biproduct of the ancient Alchemy, has so long poohpoohed the idea, and called it a dream. Now the Chemists are constrained to admit that this dream of the Alchemists is on the verge of fulfilment. Recently Rao Bhadur Prof. B. Venkatesachar, in the course of his lecture on "The Structure of the Nucleus and the transmutation of Elements", in the Senate House of the Calcutta University, says:—

"The dream of the alchemists was to change baser metal into gold. If we can knock out one proton from the nucleus of the mercury atom we will get the nucleus of gold". (Statesman, Saturday, January 5, 1935, p. 5).

1 Printed List of Exhibits at the 150th Anniversary of ASB. We are not in agreement with Mr. Diksit, in some of his identifications of the villages. As it appears that most of the donees migrated from Eastern India, their former residences must have to be looked for there. If we fail in that, we should try elsewhere. Madhyadeśa is, in all probability, Madhyadeśa in the Midnapur district. The Brāhmaṇas of this locality are called Madhyāśreṣṭi Brāhmaṇas even today (Midnapur District Gazetteer). There is a village named Nandipur, under police station Chintāmon in Dinajpur (Village Directory, Dinajpur). Pundari and Pundri are the two villages in the same district (Ibid). We know of a village named Pundari in the Rajshahi district, from where some ancient remains have been collected in the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi.

The knowledge of the Hindus in Alchemy has been traced as early as the Rgveda (Hist. of Hindu Chemistry, Vol. I, Intro. p. ii). The use of gold was also known at the period. In the Atharva-veda, gold is spoken of as born of fire (Ibid, p. VI). Kanada, the author of the Vaiśeṣika system of Philosophy, denies that gold is a substance, although the Mimāṃsakas affirm this to be a peculiar substance. He calls it a mineral light and says that 'some maintain that gold is solid light; or, at least the chief ingredient is light, which is rendered solid by mixture with some particles of earth. He again says that gold is affected by the quality of gravity, by reason of earth contained in it' (Ibid, pp. 5 and 7).

Mercury does not appear to have been known so early. Pārada,¹ a name of quick silver, occurs in the Suśrula, but Sir P. C. Ray thinks this reference of Mercury, in that work, rather vague (Ibid, p. 26). Indubious mention of it is found in the Vāgbhata (Ibid, p. 31). Regular treatment of mercury is found in works of 800 A. D. and later. From this time it came to be studied extensively. It acquired so much importance that the word rasa, inspite of its earlier well-known meaning came to be identified with mercury. Rasaśiddhi meant 'The knowledge of Alchemy, the possession of peculiar familiarity with mercury obtained by performance of chemical operations, conjoined with certain mystical and magical rites and the securing thence to the adept of happiness, health and wealth, the power of transmuting metals and the art of prolonging life'. (Wilson).

The word Rasāyana,² which is now the Sanskrit word for chemistry, used to signify as the science of mercury (Ibid, pp. 43-44) at that period. Not only this, from the Sārvadarśana-saṅgraha we come to learn that a system of Philosophy named Rasētvaradarśana grew round it. Mercury was considered as the energy of Śiva or the creative conjunction of Hara and Gauri (Ibid, pp. xlii+43).

We have so long seen what the Hindus thought of or did with gold and mercury. We shall now see what some of our scriptures say about them.

¹ Dārda, which is another name of Pārada, occurs in the Mahābhārata.
² Alberūṇī connects Patañjali, the author of the Yoga system, with Rasāyana (Alberūṇī's India—I. p. 80).

10 [ Annals, B. O. R. I. ]
The Rāmāyāna says that the Ākāśa-Gaṅgā (the celestial Ganges) received the semen of Śiva from Agni and conceived thereby. But as she was unable to bear it, under instructions of Agni, threw it on the side of the Hīmālayas. This womb coming in contact with the different substances of the earth was turned into gold, silver, copper and iron and its impurities into tin and lead (Ādikāṇḍa, Ch. XXXVII).

Again in the Bhāgavata, we read, that the river Hātaki was formed by the semen of Bhava and Bhavāni (Śiva and his consort) in the Viśala. Once upon a time Śiva, finding that Agni (fire), strengthened by Vāyu (air) was drinking this semen, turned it into gold named Hātaka by phūkāra i.e. the blowing of his mouth (Skandha V, Ch. XXIV, 13-18).

Are all these creations of pure imagination or have they got facts at the base? It is well-worth comparing these with the modern theory of the origin of metals. The account given in the Bhāgavata seems to be an allegorical expression describing how gold used to be extracted from some compound of mercury by blasting process.

It has been stated above that pārada (mercury) does not occur in the extant Hindu medical books before the Suśruta. This does not prove that mercury was not known to the Indians before that. Varāhamihira (587 A. D.) knew this to be an aphrodisiac (Bṛhat-Saṁhitā, Ch. 76). The Amarakoṣa (c. 400 A. D.) mentions pārada as a synonym for mercury. We have seen that mercury occurs in the Ādikāṇḍa or the first book of the Rāmāyana, which according to Jacobi is a later addition. Macdonell considers these recent portions to be added not till the 2nd century B. C. and later (Hist. of Sanskrit Literature, p. 309). Mercury is chiefly found connected with the Saiva and Tāntrik cults, which are much older than the second century B. C. So it may not be improbable that the knowledge of mercury in India is as old as those cults.
Some scholars have held that these two princes are identical, but we have already expressed our disagreement with this view. (J. B. O. R. S., Vol. XX. Pt. I. p. 43). There are, no doubt, some points of resemblance between the two, which mark them off as belonging to the same dynasty. But there are sufficient dissimilarities which stand against their identity. They are:—

1. The charters of the Maharaja Ranabhanja begin with 'Om (expressed by a symbol) siddhi', whereas those of the Rāṇaka commence with 'Om (also expressed by a symbol) śvasti'.

2. The Maharaja was a 'Paramamāheśvara', while the Rāṇaka, a 'Paramavaiṣṇava'.

3. The Maharaja was the son of Gandhata, while the Rāṇaka was the son of Satrubhaṇja and the grandson of Silābhhaṇja.

The Maharaja Raṇabhaṇja ruled in Khiṇjali maṇḍala only whereas the Rāṇaka Raṇabhaṇja and his father Satrubhaṇja were the lords of Udbhaya-Khiṇjali maṇḍala.

Of these four points of objection, point (3) presents greatest difficulty in identifying the two as one person. In lines 5-6 of the Baud grant of Maharaja Raṇabhaṇja of the 54th year, we have: — 'Śrī - Ganaḥaṭu[h]prakaṭa-pauruṣa-raśmi - cakranirdārit āra-hṛdayo-sya pitā vrpaṣya 3'. Late R. D. Banerji at first interpreted it as that a king named Gandhaṭa was the king's father. (E. I. Vol. XII., pp. 322-23). But subsequently, with a view to identify the Maharaja with the Rāṇaka, he explained the passage by saying that the Maharaja Raṇabhaṇja was born in the lineage of Gandhaṭa, (J. B. O. R. S., Vol. XIV., Pt. I. p. 120). If this interpretation is accepted as correct, then the similar expression in line 8 of the Patna Museum grant of Rāṇaka Raṇabhaṇja (E. I. Vol. XX. pp. 100 ff.) shall have to be explained in a similar
manner. In that case Satrubhāṇja, the father of Rāṇaka Rāṇabhaṇja, was not the son of Silābhāṇja, but was only born in his line. But as far as we know, nobody has given this interpretation of the line referred to above. We do not, therefore, see our way to agree with Banerji in his subsequent explanation.

Further, if the two princes are identical, we do not know what satisfactory explanation there can be, for Rāṇaka Rāṇabhaṇja to make the following changes, as soon as he assumed the title of Mahārāja:

(1) to begin his charter with 'Om siddhi' and discard 'Om svasti', which he had been so long using.

(2) to change his religion from Vaiṣṇavism to Śaivism.

(3) to cease to name his father and grand father and mention in their places the name of a distant forefather, Gandhāṭa.

(4) to rule over only one Khiṇjali ṁandala, although as a Rāṇaka he was the lord of Ubhaya-khiṇjali ṁandala.

Beside the above, we find that their scribes and engravers were also different. Points (1) and (2) may be explained away, but not (3) and (4). When we notice the consistency with which these differences occur, we cannot brush away lightly their cumulative effect. For these reasons, we are of opinion that they were two different persons. Of the two, we think Mahārāja Rāṇabhaṇja was the earlier.
NOTES ON INDIAN CHRONOLOGY

BY

P. K. GODE, M. A.

XXXIV

DATE OF VIMALABODHA'S COMMENTARY ON THE MAHĀBHĀRATA CALLED THE VIṢAMAŚLOKĪ—after 1150 A. D.

Dr. V. S. Sukthankar in his recent article on the commentators of the Mahābhārata states that Arjunamīśra mentions Vimalabodha and Vimalabodha cites Devabodha and hence we get the series: Devabodha—Vimalabodha—Arjunamīśra  As the date of Vimalabodha's commentary has not yet been fixed by scholars I propose in this note to analyse a Ms of his commentary called the Viṣamaśloki viz. No. 84 of 1869–70 in the Govt. Mss Library at the B. O. R. Institute, Poona, referred to by Dr. Sukthankar in his article mentioned above. This Ms consists of about 38 folios and bears the date Śaka 1724 ( = A. D. 1802 ). It was copied at Poona by one Kṛṣṇabhat Śivarāma Śivaṇekar from some original, which he complains ( in the colophon ) was extremely incorrect. Vimalabodha refers to the following authors and works in his commentary:

(1) "निचंटभाष्यनिरूपकानि"—fol. 1, 85.
(2) बैलानपायवनीकां—fol. 1.
(3) देवस्वामिसत—fol. 1, 12, 15, 23, 24, 31, 54, 59.
(4) द्वाराधारानि:—fol. 2.
(5) मेघातिथि:—fol. 2.
(6) निचंट—fol. 2, 43. निचंट—fol. 12.
(7) विमलबोधषाठाया—fol. 2.
(8) वासहुराण—fol. 2.
(9) अविभै—fol. 3.
(10) आयम्सि—fol. 3.
(11) बहार्धि—fol. 4.
(12) भुजनमेलवाघार्य—fol. 12, 70.
(13) बद्रविचंत—fol. 12.
(14) बहार्धि—fol. 13, 81.
(15) दुष्कारः—fol. 22.
(16) स्पर्खाक्षर:—fol. 23, 25.
(17) अर्धर्षाः—fol. 25.
(18) पहदयोग—fol. 25, 81.
(20) मेलुकोपास्यानि—fol. 27.

1 Annals, Vol. XVII, p. 194.
In the above references the colophon on fol. 65 quoted by me does not appear to have formed part of Vimalabodha’s commentary and this conclusion is proved by its absence in another Ms of Vimalabodha’s commentary viz. No. 167 of 1887-91 of the Govt. Mss Library, where on folio 49 we have the following brief colophon “पढ़े देवराय स्वायम् समसाम श्रीकान्त देव:”-fol. 65. Evidently the colophon on folio 65 of Ms No. 84 of 1869-70, which ascribes definitely the authorship of “स्वायम् समसाम श्रीकान्त देव” to one विविधक्रम (styled as “स्वायम् समसाम स्वायतेन सिद्धिमुक्तिकारकाः ज्ञातिः”) is wrongly inserted in the present Ms. Aufrecht in his Catalogus Catalogorum does not mention any commentator
of the name विभिक्षम as the author of a commentary described in the above-mentioned colophon. In the list of 22 commentators on the महाभारतम् given by Dr. Sukthankar in his Epic Studies 1 no commentator of the name विभिक्षम has been recorded 2.

We now come to the question of the chronological limits for Vimalabodha’s commentary. Dr. Sukthankar has already given us the Series “ Devabodha-Vimalabodha-Arjunamisra ” which states the relative chronological position of the three commentators. In the list of references recorded above, the references to “धरारे” on folio 64, to “संजराज” and his “व्यवहारमझुरी” on folio 63 and to “सरस्वतीकण्ठासरण” on folio 74 enable us to fix one terminus to the date of Vimalabodha’s commentary. As king Bhoja of Dhārā is assigned to a period—1010 A. D. and 1055 A. D. 3 and as A. D. 1062 is considered as a limit for his date 4 we may not be wrong in fixing about 1150 A. D. as one terminus for the date of Vimalabodha’s commentary on the महाभारतम्.

XXXV

DATE OF KEDĀRABHATTĀ’S VRṬTARATNĀKARA

—before A. D. 1000.

In my note on the Date of Kedarabhattā’s Vṛttaratnākara, 5 a popular work on Sanskrit Prosody, I tried to prove that the work was composed before A. D. 1250 in view of its being mentioned in Caṇḍūpandita’s commentary on the Naiṣadha-carita (A. D. 1297). Subsequent to the publication of my note I have come across the following quotations from the work in Aruṇadatta’s commentary called Sarvāṅgasundarā 6 on the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya of Vāgbhata II:—

1 Annals, Vol. XVII, p. 185.
2 Whether विभिक्षम was another name of Vimalabodha in the ग्रहastha-krama (householder’s life) is a matter for investigation. We may cite as an analogy the name जनाईन, which was the name of Ānandajāna, the author of the Tarka-şāstra (G. O. Series Baroda) in the grhastha-krama.
4 Keith: History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 153, foot-note 2—“Bhoja was alive later than 1060; so also Kālhaṇa vii, 259 treats him as alive in 1062,”
5 Annals, Vol. XVI, pp. 143-144.
6 Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya with the commentaries of Aruṇadatta and Hemādri, ed. by Paradkar Shastri of Akola, N. S. Press, Bombay (forms kindly supplied by the Editor)—pages 235, 236.
If the identification of these references as given by the learned shastri is correct we can push back the date of Kedārabhaṭṭa’s Vṛttaratnākara to 1200 A. D. if not earlier.

According to Dr. Hoernle 2 Aruṇadatta flourished about 1220 A. D. and if we presume his reference to the Vṛttaratnākara as identified by the editor of the Sarvāṅgasundarā commentary as correct we may safely conclude that this work on prosody was composed earlier than 1150 A. D. Prof. Keith 4 states that the Vṛttaratnākara of Kedārabhaṭṭa was composed before 15th century, while according to the evidence recorded in the present and earlier notes of mine it appears that the work must have been composed before 12th century, if not earlier. This work deals with 136 metres and is commented on by not less than 20 commentators as pointed out by me in my previous note on the subject.

Further evidence on the date of the Vṛttaratnākara is furnished by the commentary of Somacandra which was composed in Samvat 1329 (= A. D. 1273) 5 as recorded by the author in a verse at the close of his commentary. The Govt. Mss Library at B. O. R. Institute, Poona possesses a Ms of this commentary (No. 349 of 1884–86) but it does not contain the date of composition found recorded in the Ulwar Ms described by Peterson.

The bracketed variant is found in the Calcutta edition (1915) of the Vṛttaratnākara, p. 8.

1 The bracketed variant is found in the Calcutta edition (1915) of the Vṛttaratnākara, p. 8.
2 Ibid, p. 14—line 6 is exactly identical with the line quoted by Aruṇadatta.
3 Hoernle : Osteology, p. 17 of Introduction—The dates of Aruṇadatta and two of his successors as fixed by Dr. Hoernle are:—
   (1) Aruṇadatta — about 1220 A. D.
   (2) Vijayarākṣita—'', 1240 A. D.
   (3) Vācaspāti —'', 1260 A. D.
5 Vide Extract 245 in Peterson's Catalogue of Ulwar Mss p. 89. Somacandra records the date of his work in the following verse:— "अत्तिक्रममुपकृति
नवकारकवातिनीतरमस्य संवतः १२२९ समाप्तिरत्नास्तवदिने वृत्तिःमुपकृतिकृती II ॥ II ॥"

The above date of Somacandra’s commentary on the Vṛttaratnākara has been included in the Chronology of Indian Authors by Nilamani Chakravarti published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. III (1907), pp. 204–220. This is a supplement to M. Duff’s Chronology of India and will be found very useful to students interested in Indian Chronology.
Somacandra mentions Hemacandra on folio 17 of the B. O. R. I. Ms referred to above:— "श्लिष्टिसुखस्वदियमपि नभवति

निजकारुपार्थवत्तिसति मयावि सज्जा।

श्री हेमस्त्रयस्विविंद्र छंदोऽधिय पाद्यविवलकलंकित बहवति। यथा प्रमुखमिरियतिवालितिसिर

लिखितमयुमाधियुगीणि...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...सिद्धान्तहासिति विचारमयुमाधियुगीणि।...

It appears from the above extract that Hemasuri or Hemacandra has in one of his works dealt with the two lines of the Vṛttaratnakara viz. "श्लिष्टिसुख etc." and "निजाष्टि etc." as stated by Somacandra. If this statement proves true on identification we may be in a position to push back the date of the Vṛttaratnakara before 1000 A. D., for the reason that Hemacandra \(^1\) flourished between 1088–1172 A. D.

Later references to the Vṛttaratnakara especially in works, the chronology of which has been settled, will be found useful as they will show the authoritative character of the work. Hemāḍri, the author of a commentary on the Raghuvamśa, who is different from his namesake the author of Āyurvedarasāyana and Caturvṛtgarcintāmani quotes, the Vṛttaratnakara \(^2\) while commenting upon Raghuvamśa VI, 6. I have proved elsewhere \(^3\) that Hemāḍri the author of the Raghuvamśadarpūṇa flourished in the 1st half of the 15th century. Mr. Nilamāṇi Chakravartī in this *Chronology of Indian Authors* \(^4\) records the following information about Rāmacandra Bhārati’s commentary on the Vṛttaratnakara composed in A. D. 1455:—

“A. D. 1455—One thousand ninehundred and ninetynine years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha (according to Ceylonese calculation) Rāmacandra Bhārati composed a commentary on the Vṛttaratnakara. The author who was a Bengal Brahmana, went to Ceylon; converted by Parākrama Vāhu VI (A. D. 1410–1462) and was surnamed Baudhāgama Cakravartī. He was an adept to the Mahāyāna School, a form of Buddhism, says Prof. Bendal, almost unknown in Ceylon, B. M. C. No. 429.”

---


\[11 \text{ [ Annals, B. O. R. I. ] }\]
REVIEWS


The work under review is a commentary on the Bhāṭṭadipikā of Khaḍḍadeva. This commentary should be distinguished from other commentaries of the same name on the Mīmāṁsā Sūtra viz. (1) by Gaṅgādharabhaṭṭa and (2) by Viśveśvara-bhaṭṭa.¹ Aufrecht does not record any Ms of the Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi the work under review, composed by Vānccheśvara, though he refers to the other works of this author viz. (1) Śrauta Sūtra commentary² (Hiranyakesīsūtravākhyā) which he says was “composed about 1800”. Another commentary on the Bhāṭṭadipikā of Khaḍḍadeva was written in 1708 by Śambhubhaṭṭa, a pupil of Khaḍḍadeva³ himself. Khaḍḍadeva also called Śridharendra, was the son of Rudradeva. Besides Śambhubhaṭṭa he had another pupil viz. the renowned Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja⁴. In addition to Bhāṭṭadipikā two other works are also ascribed to him viz. (1) Bhāṭṭarahasya and (2) Mīmāṁsākaustubha. Khaḍḍadeva died at Benares in A. D. 1665.

There is another published commentary on the Bhāṭṭadipikā called Bhāṭṭacandrikā written by Bhāskararāya. The present commentary by Vānccheśvarayajvan though it follows the Bhāṭṭacandrikā of Bhāskararāya in certain respects has still its special features and peculiarities. These have been dealt with by Āryasvāmi in his able Sanskrit Introduction to the work under review (pp. 1–2). Though Vānccheśvara’s commentary is comparatively modern it serves a very useful purpose by its lucid exposition and vindication of the ancient Mīmāṁsā doctrines. The language of the commentary is as simple as could be used

consistently with the demands made on the commentator by the abstract nature of the Mīmāṃsā doctrines and their critical exposition.

The edition of the present commentary was first projected in 1927 and commenced by Mahāmahopādhyāya Venkata Subrahmanya Shastri of Madras. He was eminently fitted for this task by his deep erudition and ability. He had also in his possession the only Ms of the present commentary on which the edition under review is based. Another fortunate circumstance was his ancestral relation to our commentator, he being the son of the daughter of Vāṅccheśvara, the author of the Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇī (vide Genealogy on p. 20 of Introduction). A work so well-circumstanced and enthusiastically projected has had, however, many mishaps. M. M. Venkatasubba Shastri unfortunately died in 1928 and the work of publication came to a stand-still. After sometime His Holiness Śrī Śaṅkarācārya of the Kāmakotipīṭha came to the rescue of this work and appointed Mr. Venkatarama Shastri, the son of the late M. M. Venkatasubba Shastri to see the work through the press. He too unfortunately died after sometime and Messrs Subrahmanya Shastri and Balasubrahmanya Shastri were appointed in his place to carry the work of publication to completion. Naturally, therefore, the printed volume of the present edition though elegant in all other respects contains numerous printing mistakes and an attempt has been made to rectify them in an Errata of 32 pp. annexed to the volume. Another difficulty of the Editor was his necessary reliance on a single Ms of this valuable commentary.

Inspite of these blemishes the work has been on the whole carefully done by the Editors and the main credit of bringing to light this elaborate unpublished commentary on Khaṇḍadeva’s Bhāṭṭadīpikā must be given to H. H. Śrī Jagadguru Śaṅkarācārya of the Kāmakotipīṭha, but for whose sponsorship of this laborious and costly undertaking this commentary would have remained unknown as hitherto.

The Sanskrit Introduction by Āryasvāmī to the present edition is sufficiently critical and historical. Aufrecht states as we have stated above that Vāṅccheśvara wrote his Hiranyakṣiṣṭa-vyākhyā about 1800 A. D. On page 331 of the present edition
Vānččēśvara states— “एवं छेन्द्रोगनां स्वयंद्रसत्त्वात् अनुवादनमित्यादिकं हिरण्य- 
केशिङ्गव्यायामार्गानि प्रतिपादितंस्मादिः” This reference by our author 
to his commentary on the Hiranyakesisūtra in the Bhāṭṭacintāmani 
proves, if Aufrecht’s statement referred to above is correct, that the 
Bhāṭṭacintāmani may have been composed after A.D. 1800 or so. 
The author of the Introduction states (p. 18) that Vānččēśvara 
wrote other works\(^1\) previous to his writing the Bhāṭṭacintāmani 
in his old age and that he flourished between A.D. 1780 and A.D. 
1850 (p. 2). The Genealogy (on p. 20) shows that our author 
was descended from Govinda Dīkṣita, the well-known minister 
of Acyutadevarāya (1529-1542 A.D.).

Vānččēśvara travelled far and wide from Benares to Rameshvaram. 
This fact is vouched by the following passports in the 
possession of his descendants and now published after the Intro-
duction in the volume under review.

**Appendix I**— Passport No. 292 dated 26th Nov. 1816 signed by 
M. Elphinstone, Resident at Poona.

**Appendix II**— Passport dated 8th October 1818 signed by W. 
M. Chaplain, Katoral Palace Agent, Subha Dharwar etc.

**Appendix III**— Passport dated Poona, 25th Sept, 1822, signed 
W. M. Chaplain.

**Appendix IV**— Passport in Kanarese dated 24th January 
1824 signed by Krishnarāya Wodiarāvaru of Mysore.

**Appendix V**— Passport in Persian language, modi Script and 
Kanarese signature, dated 31st Jan. 1824 written by Bukh Row 
Munshi, Huzur Darbar, Camp Ramanathapura.

**Appendix VI**— Letter dated 11th Feb. 1828 to Vedamurty 
Kutti Sastry by Shri Krishnaraja Wodaiyar.

\(^1\) In the Introductory verses to the Bhāṭṭacintāmani Vānččēśvara states 
that he composed the following works—

(1) माहिषमत्तपमाव्यासं ; (2) हिरण्यकेशिङ्गव्यायमार्गत ; (3) उजचिन्तामाणि ; (4) आद-
चिन्तामाणि ; (5) अहर्षस्वर्यचिन्तामाणि ; (6) काकनतीयव्यासं.

The writer of the Introduction adds the following works to the above list 
of Vānččēśvara’s works—

(7) हिरण्यकेशिङ्गव्यायमार्गत ; (8) धूमचिन्तामिर्क ; (9) शेखरचिन्तामिर्क and (10) 
नरेष्वरचिन्तामिर्क.
All the above documents refer to Vānčchesvara’s pilgrimage to Rameśvaram and the facilities offered to him by the then authorities for a safe and comfortable journey. The name Kutty Shastry referred to in the above permits was the popular name of Vānčchesvara.

The present edition contains (1) an elaborate table of contents; (2) an alphabetical index of adhikaranaṇaś dealt with in the Bhāṭṭa-
dīpikā; (3) an alphabetical index of the sūtras; (4) an alphabetical index of nyāya-adhikaranaṇaś and (5) a dictionary of quotations occurring in the Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi indicating in some cases their identified sources. All these are useful features of the edition. But for a student of the history of Sanskrit literature not only quotations but even the mere names of authors and works mentioned in this bulky text of 482 pages are important. I have tried to make up this deficiency partially by preparing and appending to this review a list of such references which caught my eye during a cursory perusal of this valuable commentary which I trust would be a rough guide to the historical student.

APPENDIX

Works and Authors mentioned by Vānčchesvara
in his Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/Author</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अश्विनपुराण</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अमर</td>
<td>99, 103, 57, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अष्टकमस्याचिकम</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अहोवभ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मचर</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आचाय</td>
<td>8, 175, 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आयस्तम्ब</td>
<td>69, 208, 328, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आयस्तम्बवचन</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आयस्तम्बव्यक्तिविषयसूत्रतिस्म</td>
<td>196, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आयस्तम्ब</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आयस्तम्बवनसूत्र</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आयस्तम्बवनसूत्रसूत्र</td>
<td>331, 185, 327, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपवर्ष</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कणाद</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कमलकर्ण</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कर्कभाष</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काकतात्त्विवादार्थ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काकतात्त्विवादार्थ (असस्मक)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काठकारिष्यमध्य</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काठकारिष्यमध्य</td>
<td>95, 97, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काठकारिष्यमध्य</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कूचविपचन</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कैस्यन</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कोश</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कोशसमुद्र</td>
<td>114, 351, 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कोशसमुद्र</td>
<td>63, 71, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कौषिनकसमुद्र</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कौषिनकसमुद्र</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakrit</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वर्दःराज-127</td>
<td>हाशदीपिकाया (अनुसंधानकरण) - 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वाक्यपरिवारिका-97</td>
<td>शिक्षावचन-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वांतिक-285, 399, 406, 414, 425, 436, 439</td>
<td>आधुनिकतामार्ग-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वांतिककार-84, 94, 99, 109, 144, 374, 376, 386</td>
<td>आचरणवास्तव-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वांतिकन्यायसंहा-75</td>
<td>आत्मतुल्यकार (त्त्वत्त्व) - 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वांतिकिकसराण-29, 39, 45</td>
<td>संकर्षभाष्य-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वांतिकक्रम-372</td>
<td>संकर्षभाषे (पितृव्यज्ञातिकरण)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवारणश्रीमरणा: (ब्रह्मचर्य)</td>
<td>सामान्यवेद अनुभुविक-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब्रह्मचर्य-49, 136, 300, 394</td>
<td>सामान्यविदेशार्थनये-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रेशमब्रह्म-73</td>
<td>सांख्यस्त्रिक-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रेखवा ब्रह्मसराणे-413</td>
<td>सूत्कार-90, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रेखेक्षीकल्लू-437</td>
<td>सूत्माध्य-394, 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रुतमाध्यस्त-68</td>
<td>सूत्माध्यस्तवांतिकवेदमध्यर्ग्यिय-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रुतमाध्यस्त-2</td>
<td>सौचमाध्य-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सप्तान्त्रे-2</td>
<td>हरि-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हरिणा-82, 95</td>
<td>हरिणा-82, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हरिश्चन्द्रोपाध्यायनार्दीनां क्षेमेन्द्रादिनीविवंता-ख्याविकानां-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हलायुध-189</td>
<td>हिरणेकशिस्तहकालधक-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हिरणेकशिस्तहकालधकते अस्यांभे-13, 37, 76, 138, 196, 228, 331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. K. Gode.
In order to justify his own remarks, it is now the unfortunate task of the reviewer to lay before the readers, at least a brief outline of the work he reviews. Of course, if it is a really sweet work the reviewer is blessed by the reader for supplying the contents, but the present is a different case, and hence this apology:

'The Great Epic' in the opinion of the learned author, 'is not a mere story of great deeds of mythological heroes and gods, but a wonderful explanation of all systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion, written in a story form which, when examined in the light of ancient method of Letter-analysis, reveals the great secret of its real meaning and mystery'.

This idea of Letter-analysis has been most patiently worked out in all the five Volumes before us. The First Volume shows how the Sacred Books of the Hindus, from the Vedas to the Epics, deal with the science and philosophy of life-evolving from the organic Cell into Brahmāṇḍa or the whole Universe—and concludes with an explanation of the Hymns and Gods of the Vedas in this light.

Second Volume examines the great systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion, and shows how they are all based on the Vedas, and connected with one another.

In the Third Volume we have a detailed account of the story of the Epic, divided into 372 sections and a brief explanation of the essential idea of the whole as a picture of all the systems. The Fourth and Fifth Volumes contain a detailed explanation of the whole story of the Great Epic, and show that it is a picture of the contest between the different Systems of Philosophy, in the light of the ancient method(?) of Letter-analysis.

The reader is, all through the extensive work, faced with the mystery of this so called ancient method of Letter-analysis. It would have been well if the author had quoted the original source of this method; but such being not the case, the mere perusal of the table at p. 323ff of Vol. III is not at all convincing and satisfactory. The learned author has also, at the beginning of the Fourth Volume, given a long list of the characters in the Epic with the corresponding ideas which, in the opinion of the author, they personify.
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Going a little further, into the heart of this laborious work, we have, at Vol. III, p. 316: "The whole story of the Mahā-bhārata is but an account of the connection and conflict between the different systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion." So that really speaking, there is no history, no war and no death! What is war is only a debate where each side starting from some common point of agreement, marshalls its array of arguments. "Of these," to quote the author again, "the most interesting as well as the most comprehensive conflict is between principal Vedānta and principal Śāmkhya or Vaiśnavism on the one hand, and Buddhism and Jainism on the other—and that is the subject matter of the great "battle" of Kurukṣetra!"

Now, we shall quote a few stray instances, picked up at random, to show how Prof. Thadani, explains the story in his own way.

"The word for Gambling in the text is Dyūta (d, y, u, ta,) meaning, (d) giving, (y) Buddhi, (u) woven with (u) the senses of knowledge, and (ta) the senses of Action." The Gambling match is thus a discussion between Buddhi on the one hand (Yudhiṣṭhira), and the senses of knowledge and Action, the basis of Jainism (Śakuni) on the other".

In Vol. III of the work, we have an English translation, in verse, of all the eighteen chapters of the Lord's Song, Bhagavad-gītā; while the situation is explained, in Vol. IV. (pp. 463ff.), as follows. "The Battle of Kurukṣetra is a "conflict" of systems of thought. Man is first represented as unable to accept the the Yoga system of thought, where Yoga is identified for practical purposes with Vedānta, as Buddhi, the basis of Yoga, is identified with the soul, the basis of Vedānta. This gives us Yoga-Vedānta, Viṣistadvaita, or qualified Monism, the creed of the Man, while his opponents are wedded to Buddhism and Jainism."

"The Nature of the combat we have explained that the general "combat" between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas is between Vaiśnavism (Vedānta-Yoga-Vaiśesika) on the one hand and Buddhism and Jainism (Śāmkhya-Nyāya-Vaiśesika) on the other. The two sides meet, however nominally on the common ground
of Vaiśeṣika based on the character of the Mind, holding that Puruṣa and Prakṛti are joint and equal or almost equal partners in the creation of life. Starting from this, the Pāṇḍavas have to prove that it is god alone who creates, and Prakṛti, if it is a separate entity is but a spectator of this work."

It is really wonderful. Prof. Thadani has, with exceptional patience, worked out even all the minor details of his theory, although, in the elaborate Volumes, one often comes across tedious repetitions, the only point—and this is really the important point at issue—is how far the reader can be convinced by all his laboursious argument in favour of the allegorical nature of the Great Epic.

That the Mahābhārata is an 'Itihāsa'—of course Prof. Thadani's Letter—analysis is sure to interpret this word in quite another way. But, as it is at present understood, by all—a 'history' and not a myth or allegory, is recorded in the very text of the Epic, in numerous places: 'Itihāsottamād asmāt'; 'jayo nāmethā-so yam', etc. etc. That the Pāṇḍavas, Kauravas, Kṛṣṇa, in fact, all the characters connected with the story were living persons; they moved, they fought, and they died, is the idea which holds us to the end, as we read the Great Epic; and we exult, cry, and weep with them, owing to the deep interest that is aroused in our heart.

And now comes Prof. Thadani with his thesis and asks us to consider the whole as nothing more than a deliberate attempt to put the contest of all the systems of thought into an allegorical form! And judging from our ideas which have been deep rooted in our heart, for centuries, we would not be surprised if this learned author, after all his labours, finds them wasted for want of any followers.

And still, one cannot but admire the Professor's enthusiasm, which carried him to the end of his self-imposed task!

S. N. Tadpatrikar.
This Commemoration Volume prepared in honour of and dedicated to Mm. Pandit Gauri Shankar Ojha, the Veteran Indian Scholar, on the attainment of his 71st year, contains, as usual, numerous articles from the pen of scholars of repute, and deals with different topics of Ancient Indian interest. The fact that many ruling princes of Northern India, have made liberal donations to cover the cost of printing the Volume, shows the great respect that this venerable scholar commands even among the aristocratic circle.

A special feature of this Volume is that, excepting those in English, all the articles written in the different vernaculars of India, are printed in Devanāgarī type; while to each article is attached a short Summary in Hindi.

The Volume has been divided into 10 different sections, and the list of scholars who have written articles for this Volume covers not only the whole of India, but also includes some European scholars of high reputation. Among latter, to mention only a few, are Prof. A. B. Keith, Otto Strauss, Przluski, Konow, Glassennop, Norman Brown etc.

Looking closely into this vast field, we have before us, a rich harvest of the different important crops, in different places. It is not, however, possible to take a complete survey of all the articles in this large volume. With apologies therefore, to the learned writers, whose writings have not been noticed here, the following is a running summary of some of the articles that would interest even a general reader.—

Prof. Keith has, in his article on the Indus valley civilization arrived at the negative conclusion that it is not that of the Rgveda; while in his Hindi article, Prof. S. K. Chatterji. has taken a review of the Ancient Indian Culture, and having mentioned the different influences to which it was subjected, has, turn-
ing to the Epics, finally remarked that the Great Epic Mahābhārata in its present encyclopaedic form, was established some time about the beginning of the Christian era.

Prof. Sten Konow’s notes on Takṣaśila, as well as Mr. Jayaswal’s article on Āryamaṇjuśrīmūla Kalpa are also of considerable interest, the latter especially so, as the writer has culled out a history of the Mauryan period from this Bhuddhistic work.

Prof. Altekar has thrown some new light on the Rāstrakūtas of Gujarath, while the articles on Poet Dhoyi, author of Pavanadūta, Karna, Solanki king, the Jain king Kumārapāla have a historical interest. Mr. Bahadurchandra Sastri of Leiden university, gives an account of the Hindu literature in Java; Mr. Acharya of Mayurbhanj writes about some rulers of Orissa in the Mediaeval Period.

Turning to the period of Modern History, Mr. Bendre of Poona in his Marathi article, describes the last battle of Vijaynagar. Then we have some side light on the history of the Maratha movements in Rajaputana, where the writer Mr. Bhalerao, pleads for more research work in the line. A military History of India from Ancient times is given in a brief outline by general Shinde of Baroda; here we see how the art of warfare developed among the Indians.

Diwanbahadur Sarda gives in an interesting article, a brief history of the research work mainly bearing on Rajaputana done by scholars of the 19th century.

Passing over some articles of Epigraphic interests, we come to Indian Art, where Mr. Ramachandran gives us some interesting details of Pallava Paintings.

An English article treating of some Tibetan customs, by the late Sir J. J. Modi of Bombay, takes us to another, treating of ‘Kṣatriyas in Greater India’ where Dr. V. Chatterji, gives us a peep into the history of Indian exploits in the Far East. Rai-bahadur Hiralal brings us back to Central India and C. P., and shows how Rajputs settled in this part, are connected with their original clans.
It is interesting to note that Sjt. Rameshvarji son of Pandit Ojha, contributes an article on the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu. The article gives a comparative study of all the Pauranic sources and it is illustrated by Photos of some of the old images of the Varāha. And speaking of the Puraṇas, we have another interesting article from the pen of Mr. Jayachandra Vidyalamkāra, one of editors of this Volume. This article deals with the Rājasūya expedition of the Pāṇḍavas, and throws important historical light on some of the places into the west enumerated in Nakula's expedition as described in the Sabhāparva of the Mahābhārata. Mr. Narang has, here, suggested some intelligent emendations and also shown his critical views regarding the identification of these places.

In the end, we wish long life to Pandit Ojha, who commands such high respect among all Sanskritists, and with repeated apologies to the scholars, whose names and writings, have through oversight, been omitted in this short review, we conclude.

S. N. Tadpatrikar.
It is well-known that the late Sir Ashutosh Mukarjee had been an exemplar to the Vice-Chancellors of the other Indian Universities by founding the Research Department of the Calcutta University. It is not however equally known that he had also been an exemplar to the well-to-do from amongst the living fathers of children by founding in 1924 a lecturership at the Calcutta University in loving memory of his beloved daughter Kamalā, for an annual delivery of a course of three lectures in English or Bengali on some aspect of Indian life and thought to be treated from a comparative standpoint and by providing the University with the wherewithals to remunerate the lecturer liberally and publish the lectures, by handing over G. P. Notes of a fairly large amount. The choice of the Senate of that University having once fallen on Sir S. P. Sivaswami Aiyer and he having been left free to select any subject falling within the terms of the endowment, selected the subject which forms the title of the book under review.

The learned author has made it clear in the preface that the said subject had suggested itself to him by the recent organized attempts of orthodox Hindus to oppose the introduction of social reform in Hindu Society by legislative enactments and that his object was to convince the educated Indians that the ethical ideals of the Hindus have not remained the same since the earliest time of which we have a literary record but have continued to undergo changes from time to time according to the requirements of each age and that therefore it would be no sacrilege to mould our ethical ideals so as to suit the modern conditions. With that end in view he has examined the views of the Hindu law-givers on several topics of ethical interest such as woman, slavery, caste, law and justice &c. and appraised them in the light of the modern notions on those topics, in the first nine chapters following the Introductory. While doing so he has
given comparative notes based on the works of European writers on morals such as Leckey, author of the History of European Morals, Westermarck, author of the Origin and Development of the Moral Ideals, Hobhouse, author of Morals in Evolution and others, with a view to enable the readers to take into consideration the ideas and customs of other nations on the same topic before passing judgments on those of the Hindus.

His other declared object in selecting this subject was to consider the validity or otherwise of the criticisms of the principles of the Hindu religion made by some Christian missionaries in order to show to the world how ill-informed, unfair and biased they were. This he has done in Chapter XI of the work. He has also considered therein the question whether the influence of the Hindu religious principles has been deleterious to the ethical and social progress of Hindu India.

Chapter XII has been devoted to an investigation of the question whether the changes that have already taken place in the ethical conception of the educated Hindus of both the sexes are desirable or undesirable. In the thirteenth and the last chapter the author has expressed his views as to the trend of modern thought on ethical subjects and considered how far the unhealthy tendencies that have crept in are capable of being checked and ought to be checked in order that the foundations of Hindu society may not be shaken and uprooted though its structure may be re-modelled and re-constructed so as to suit the changed outlook on life brought on by the spread of Western education and culture and by an increase in the intensity of the struggle for existence.

This book thus serves a triple purpose, (1) that of trying to persuade the orthodox Hindus to agree to the introduction of certain reforms which the spirit of the present age have made inevitable and which are not inconsistent with the Scriptures; (2) that of defending the fundamental principles of the Hindu religion against the attacks of prejudiced and interested critics and (3) that of warning the radical reformers of both the sexes against the danger of blindly following the Western nations wherever they go and of impressing upon them the necessity of drawing a line up to which it would be safe to go if the integrity of the Hindu
character of our society is to be preserved. His criticism is well-founded and sympathetic, his defence well-documented and vigorous and his warning well-thought out and friendly. There is no invective in his criticism, no partiality in his defence and no imperiousness in his warning.

There are however two drawbacks therein which I cannot refrain from taking a note of. The first is that no attempt has been made by the learned author to determine what is the scope of the science of ethics, whether morality is an end in itself or a means to an end, what are virtues and what are vices, whether there is anything like an absolute moral standard by which the actions of everybody, whether in private or public life, should be judged and if so, what it is and if not, what should be the standards by which private conduct and public conduct ought to be judged. If the examination of the ethical notions of the Hindus had been commenced after doing that, I believe the work would have proved more useful. Another drawback that I have noticed in this work is the lack of any scientific arrangement of the different topics of ethical interest with reference to which the evolution of the Hindu ideals have been traced. The learned author has admitted in the preface that he has not attempted any classification of the topics and his excuse for not doing so is that whatever principle of classification is adopted, the classes would be found to be overlapping. In my view that excuse is not convincing.

Yet so far as it goes, the work is sure to commend itself to the educated Indians for whose edification it has been written and to prove an eye-opener to them with respect to several topics of interest about which they carry wrong notions imbibed in the college class-rooms and on playgrounds. For those who wish to study the subject seriously the author has taken pains to prepare and append an exhaustive index. The printing and get up of the work are also such as to attract readers towards it.

P. C. Divanji.

This book is a praiseworthy attempt to collect in a single volume all known information about the city of Kausambī before the Mughal period. The author is a typical exponent of that renascent enthusiasm for antiquity which has found an important practical outlet in the activities of the Allahabad Archaeological Society, of which the author is (according to the title-page) an Hony. Life Member.

The book opens with a discussion of the oldest known references to the city of Kausambī, of which that in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa seems more valuable than any in the Purānic tradition. But these, after all, are vague. The fullest body of evidence adduced belongs to the Buddhistic period and to the days of Mauryan rule. At this stage, something more is known of the people associated with the city than mere names, and the author closes the Early History proper at the reign of Udayana. The rest of the book consists of three appendices, rather curiously divided. The most important single report is that in Appendix II, on an image of Buddha of the second year of Kaniska’s rule. Appendix I is a reasonably full and critical account of the date available to the author from Udayana to Bhasasatimita. The book is decently printed, and supplied with some moderately good plates as well as a very convenient Index.

With all due praise for a first attempt, it must be confessed that the work in question leaves a great deal to be desired. The striking part about the whole discussion is the paucity of material to which any credence can be given by the historian. From the pioneer viewpoint of a Vincent Smith, in the much larger framework of a general history of India, even fabulous references have some worth. But the evidence of a book like the Kathasarit-sagara, mentioned in the introduction as well as the text, has about as much value as that of the Arabian Nights for a critical
history of the caliphate of Harounal Rashid. The Jataka stories are not much better, and an Atthakathā written eight centuries after the period by a monk in Ceylon who shows no acquaintance with northern India can, at best, be mentioned in passing. For all this, it might be possible to excuse the author and the learned prefator; but both have neglected the most important new source available to them, the Jain tradition. The sole religious building of any importance that survives on the ruins of a far vaster edifice at Kosam is Jain, the temples at Pabhosā are Jain; the images, which lay scattered in 1930 on the path from the Aśoka pillar to the riverside—perhaps a by-product of Dayaram Sahni’s work in excavating the base and restoring the pillar—and which (according to pages 110-111) now grace the Allahabad Museum are mostly Jain. But to one who relies on the present work alone for his knowledge, there is not even a suspicion of the existence of a large ardhamāgadhī tradition in which many interesting details about the venerable city could be found.

The book and, for that matter, all the activities of the Society call for a word of warning. No history of Kauśāmbi is possible without excavation. And as yet, not even the surface has been scratched. The ruins have raised the ground level for about three square miles to very nearly the height of the pillar there, but the indigent farmer still ploughs over the mixture of dust and brick-bats in the hope of a precarious crop. The legend that an unexpectedly classical if unerudite tenant relates even now of a spot where the relics of Janamejaya’s (sic) yajña may be found indicates some holocaust from which that portion of the ancient city never recovered. The dry water-courses which lead to the river are undoubtedly old streets, as seen from the remains of brick walls down to the very bottom. When the Allahabad amateurs begin to drive their trenches across these gigantic ruins, let them not, in the excitement of a first discovery, obscure or damage evidence that will be of great value to the expert. That they themselves, even with the very best of intentions, still lack something of the expert touch is evidenced by the publication of the present book which, however, is quite suitable for newspaper articles. The present reviewer photographed (in situ) the companion inscription to that referred to on p. 110, but
six years have elapsed without the Allahabad people reaching anything like a satisfactory reading, or even one which scholars who have seen the photographs think plausible. Again, the large bricks referred to on p. 103 as presumably ancient are either paving bricks, or bond bricks used, even after the Guptas, for the string courses necessary in buildings erected without good foundation in alluvial soil. The conjecture on p. 106 about the Aśoka pillar is incomprehensible, and could be decided at once by a word from Dayaram Sahni as to the precise extent of his spade-work.

Kauśāmbī has yet to find its Gregorovius and its Giacomo Boni.
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