




00042290

42290

NOT TO BE ISSUED OUT
WITHOUT PERMISSION.



THE JOURNAL
OF
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

1906

1906

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

FOR

1906



A.D. MDCCCXXIII. INST.



~~186-68~~ 889

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY,
22, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

MDCCCVI.

42290

STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LIMITED,



PRINTERS, HERTFORD.



00042290

CONTENTS FOR 1906.

ARTICLES.

	PAGE
I.—The Metre of the Bṛhaddevatā. By A. B. KEITH	1
II.—Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán, by Mírzá Muḥammad b. 'Abdu'l-Wahháb of Qazwín. Translated by E. G. BROWNE	11
III.—The Pahlavi Texts of Yasna LVII-LXI (Sp.; in S.B.E. xxxi, LVIII-LXII), for the first time critically translated. By Professor LAWRENCE MILLS	53
IV.—The Haydarābād Codex of the Bābar-nāma or Wāqī'at-i-bābarī of Ṣahīru-d-dīn Muḥammad Bābar, Barlās Turk. By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE	79
V.—Yuan Chwang's Mo-la-p'o. By G. A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt.	95
VI.—Siam and the Malay Peninsula. By C. O. BLAGDEN, S.S.C.S. (retd.)	107
VII.—Notes on some Maldivian Talismans, as interpreted by the Shemitic Doctrine of Correspondence. By the Rev. S. STEWART STITT	121
VIII.—The Inscription on the Piprāwā Vase. By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E.	149
IX.—Sakastana. By F. W. THOMAS	181
X.—Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE	283
XI.—A Historical Enquiry concerning the Origin and Development of Ṣūfism, with a list of Definitions of the terms 'Ṣūfī' and 'Taṣawwuf,' arranged chronologically. By REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON	303
XII.—Aurangzeb's Revenues. By H. BEVERIDGE	349

CONTENTS.

vii

	PAGE
XXX.—Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine. II. On some obscure Anatomical Terms. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE	915
XXXI.—Studies in Buddhist Dogma: The Three Bodies of a Buddha (<i>Trikāya</i>). By L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN	943

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rock Dwellings at Rench. By E. CRAWSHAY-WILLIAMS	217
'Mo-la-p'o. By JAMES BURGESS	220
Suśruta on Mosquitoes. By J. JOLLY	222
Mahābhārata (Ādiparva, ch. 94). By B. C. MAZUMDAR	225
The Bṛhaddēvatā and the Sanskrit Epic. By GEORGE A. GRIERSON	441
Gauḍa Deśa. By B. C. MAZUMDAR	442
Pali and Sanskrit. By LOUIS DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN ..	443
The Inscription on the Piprāwā Vase. By F. W. THOMAS	452
The Sakyas and Kapilavastu. By W. HOEY	453
The Orientation of Mosques. By JAMES BURGESS	454
The name Gujarāt. By J. F. FLEET	458
Sakastana. By F. W. THOMAS	460
Om Maṇi padme hūṃ. By F. W. THOMAS	464
Erratum	464
The Study of Sanskrit as an Imperial Question. By A. A. MACDONELL	673
Bṛhat Kathā. By S. KRISHNASVĀMI AIYANGĀR	689
Dallana and Bhoja. By G. A. GRIERSON	692
Aḍhakōśikya. By G. A. GRIERSON	693
The use of the Gerund as Passive in Sanskrit. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH ...	693
Ancient Manuscripts from Khotan. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE	695
The Commentaries on Suśruta. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE	699
Bijoli Rock Inscription: The Uttama-śikhara-purāṇa. By F. KIELHORN	700
Notes on the Poem ascribed to Al-Samau'al. By HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD	701
Derivation of the words Bargī and Sabaio. By H. BEVERIDGE	704

	PAGE
The Date in the Takht-i-Bahi Inscription. By J. F. FLEET	706
The Inscription on the Peshāwar Vase. By J. F. FLEET.....	711
Vedic Metre. By E. VERNON ARNOLD and A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	716
The negative <i>a</i> with finite verbs in Sanskrit. By L. D. BARNETT and A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	722
A remarkable Vedic Theory about Sunrise and Sunset. By J. S. SPEYER	723
The Date of the Poet Magha	728
The Traditional Date of Kanishka. By J. F. FLEET ..	979
The use of the Passive Gerund in Sanskrit. By W. H. D. ROUSE	992
The Peshawar Vase. By W. H. D. ROUSE	992
The Inscription on the Peshawar Vase. By G. A. GRIERSON	993
The negative <i>a</i> with a finite verb in Sanskrit. By TH. AUFRECHT	993
The Origin of 'Sabaio.' By DONALD FERGUSON	993
Vedic Metre. By E. VERNON ARNOLD	997
A Saying of Ma'rūf al-Karkhī. By R. A. NICHOLSON ..	999
Alexander's Altars. By W. HOEY.....	1000
Additional Note on the Poem attributed to Al-Samau'al. By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH	1001
Notes on Dr. Fleet's Article on the Corporeal Relics of Buddha. By G. A. GRIERSON.....	1002
The alleged use of the Vikrama Era in the Panjāb in 45 A.D. By VINCENT A. SMITH.....	1003
Wrongly Calculated Dates, and some Dates of the Lakshmaṇasēna Era. By F. KIELHORN	1009
The Yōjana and the Li. By J. F. FLEET	1011

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

J. CHOTZNER. Hebrew Humour, and other Essays. Reviewed by M. G.	227
E. N. ADLER. About Hebrew Manuscripts. By M. G.	228
D. COMPARETTI e G. VITELLI. Papiri Greco-Egizii : Vol. I. By M. G.	228

	PAGE
JOH. FLEMMING and H. LIETZMANN. Apollinaristische Schriften Syrisch	229
FRIEDRICH SCHULTHESS. Christlich-Palaestinische Frag- mente aus der Omajjaden-Moschee zu Damaskus. By J. P. MARGOLIOUTH	230
S. C. HILL. Bengal in 1756-57. By H. BEVERIDGE ..	231
KATHLEEN BLECHYNDEN. Calcutta, Past and Present. By H. BEVERIDGE	236
ARNOLD C. TAYLOR. Paṭisambhidāmagga: Vol. I. By C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS	238
ALBERT J. EDMUNDS. Buddhist and Christian Gospels. By J. TAKAKUSU	243
The Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai. By F. P. Père ANTOINE RABBATH, S.J. Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du Christianisme en Orient. By J. KENNEDY	249
A. A. BEVAN. The <i>Nakā'id</i> of Jarīr and al-Farazdaq. By C. J. LYALL	256
ARTHUR WILLIAM RYDER. The Little Clay Cart (<i>Mṛcchakatikā</i>). By GEORGE A. GRIERSON	258
JULIUS JAMES COTTON. Indian Monumental Inscrip- tions. Vol. III: Madras: List of Inscriptions on Tombs or Monuments in Madras. By WILLIAM IRVINE	260
THOMAS BOWREY. A Geographical Account of Countries round the Bay of Bengal. By DONALD FERGUSON	465
IBN ḤAṬĪB AL-DAḤṢĀ. Tuḥfa Dawī-l-Arab über Namen und Nisben bei Boharī, Muslim, Mālik. By H. F. A.	473
DECORSE and M. GAUDEFRY-DEMOMBYNES. Rabah et les Arabes du Chari	475
L. A. WADDELL. Lhasa and its Mysteries. By S. W. B.	476
FRIEDRICH HIRTH. Scraps from a Collector's Note Book. By S. W. B.	479
MAX LÖHR. Der vulgärarabische Dialekt von Jerusalem nebst Texten und Wörterverzeichnis dargestellt. By H. HIRSCHFELD	481
S. A. HIRSCH. A Commentary on the Book of Job from a Hebrew MS. By H. HIRSCHFELD	482
E. V. ARNOLD. Vedic Metre. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	484
PAUL DEUSSEN. The Philosophy of the Upanishads. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	490

	PAGE
L. D. BARNETT. Some Sayings of the Upanishads. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	495
SYAMSUNDAR DAS. Annual Report on the Search for Hindi Manuscripts. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE ..	497
G. E. GERINI, Colonel. Historical Retrospect of Junkceylon Island. By R. C. TEMPLE	503
PAUL DAHLKE. Aufsätze zum Verständnis des Buddhismus. By C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS	505
ALLOTTE DE LA FUYE. Monnaies de l'Elymaïde. By O. C.	507
ARTHUR CHRISTENSEN. Recherches sur les Rubaiyat de 'Omar Hayyâm. By F. J. G.	508
MARGARET A. MURRAY. Elementary Egyptian Grammar. By F. L.	509
PERCY E. NEWBERRY. Scarabs. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings. By F. L.	511
HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD. Judah Halevi's Kitab Al-Khazari. By M. G.	513
WILLIAM HUNTER WORKMAN and FANNY BULLOCK WORKMAN. Through Town and Jungle. By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS	515
Major-General J. G. R. FORLONG. The Faiths of Man. By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS	729
E. A. GAIT. A History of Assam. By VINCENT A. SMITH	733
M. A. STEIN, Ph.D. Report of Archæological Survey Work in the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. By VINCENT A. SMITH	737
E. H. C. WALSH. A Vocabulary of the Tromowa Dialect of Tibetan spoken in the Chumbi Valley. By C. M. RIDDING	740
GRAHAM SANDBERG. Tibet and the Tibetans. By C. M. RIDDING	742
JAMES HENRY BREASTED. A History of Egypt, from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. By F. L.	744
E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. The Egyptian Heaven and Hell. By F. L.	746
ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE. The Bábar-náma, being the Autobiography of the Emperor Bábar. By E. BLOCHET	1015
Very Rev. A. E. MEDLYCOTT. India and the Apostle Thomas. By J. KENNEDY	1020

CONTENTS.

xi

PAGE

R. J. WILKINSON. The Peninsular Malays. I. Malay Beliefs. By C. O. BLAGDEN	1029
B. LEWIS RICE. Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. IX: Inscriptions in the Bangalore District. By J. F. FLEET	1033

NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

General Meetings of the Royal Asiatic Society	265, 523, 751
Anniversary Meeting	751
Presentation of Medals	769
Principal Contents of Oriental Journals.....	266, 524, 790

OBITUARY NOTICES.

Rev. JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D. By S. W. BUSHELL	269
Professor JULIUS OPPERT. By G. O.	272
CECIL BENDALL. By E. J. RAPSON	527
FRIEDRICH VON SPIEGEL. By L. C. CASARTELLI	1035

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY	279, 535, 793, 1041
--------------------------------	---------------------

TESTIMONIAL TO PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS	519
--------------------------------------------	-----

INDEX FOR 1905.

INDEX FOR 1906	1045
----------------------	------

LIST OF MEMBERS	1-32
-----------------------	------

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE FIRST HALF-YEAR.

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR SECOND HALF-YEAR.

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE YEAR.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS FOR THE YEAR.

1906.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS.

	PAGE
AMEDROZ. An Unidentified MS. by Ibn al-Jauzi, in the Library of the British Museum, Add. 7,320	851
BAYNES. The History of the Logos	373
BEVERIDGE (Annette S.). The Haydarābād Codex of the Bābar-nāma or Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī of Ṣahīru-d-dīn Muḥammad Bābar, Barlās Turk	79
BEVERIDGE (H.). Aurangzeb's Revenues	349
BLAGDEN. Siam and the Malay Peninsula	107
BROWNE. Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān, by Mīrzā Muḥammad b. 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb of Qazwīn	11
BURN. Some Coins of the Maukharis, and of the Thanesar Line	843
FLEET. The Inscription on the Piprāwā Vase	149
—— The Meaning of Aḡhakōsikya in the Seventh Pillar- Edict of Aśōka	401
—— The Tradition about the Corporeal Relics of Buddha,	655, 881
GRIERSON. Yuan Chwang's Mo-la-p'o	95
GUEST. Notice of some Arabic Inscriptions on Textiles at the South Kensington Museum	387
HOERNLE. Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine.....	283, 915
HOPKINS. Modifications of the Karma Doctrine	581
KEITH. The Metre of the Br̥haddevatā	1
MARGOLIOUTH. A Poem attributed to Al-Samau'al	363
MAZUMDAR. Durgā: Her Origin and History	355
MILLS. The Pahlavi Texts of Yasna LVII-LXI (Sp.; in S.B.E. xxxi, LVIII-LXII), for the first time critically translated	53
—— The Pahlavi Text of Yasna LXV (so in S.B.E. xxxi, otherwise LXIV), for the first time critically translated	825

LIST OF AUTHORS.

	PAGE
NICHOLSON. A Historical Enquiry concerning the Origin and Development of Šúfism, with a list of Definitions of the terms 'Šúfí' and 'Tašawwuf,' arranged chronologically.....	303
—— The Lives of 'Umar Ibnu'l-Fárid and Muhiyyu'ddín Ibnu'l-'Arabí, extracted from the <i>Shadharátu'l-Dhahab</i>	797
POUSSIN. Studies in Buddhist Dogma: The Three Bodies of a Buddha (<i>Trikāya</i>)	943
SAYCE. The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van: Part VII....	611
SEWELL. Antiquarian Notes in Java	419
STITT. Notes on some Maldivian Talismans, as interpreted by the Shemitic Doctrine of Correspondence	121
THOMAS. Sakastana	181
VOGEL. The Sanskrit <i>pratolī</i> and its New-Indian Derivates .	539
VOST. Identifications in the Region of Kapilavastu.....	553
WEIR. The Persian and Turkish Manuscripts in the Hunterian Library of the University of Glasgow	595

JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

I.

THE METRE OF THE BRHADDEVATA.

By A. B. KEITH, M.R.A.S.

IT is perhaps difficult to exaggerate the importance from the point of view of the literary history of India of the Brhaddevatā attributed to Śaunaka. That this has not hitherto received full recognition is due in part to the fact that it has been held, for example even by Dr. E. Sieg,¹ that the Brhaddevatā is later in date than the Mahābhārata. This is, however, certainly not the case, as Professor A. A. Macdonell has shown conclusively in his edition² of the former work. About 300 ślokas of the work are devoted to legends, and this must, it seems, be regarded as a conclusive proof that at the date of its composition there existed, in Sanskrit an ākhyāna or itihāsa literature. Now the date of the Brhaddevatā is fixed by Professor Macdonell,³ on grounds which appear to me unassailable, at about 400 B.C., perhaps earlier. It follows, therefore, that a Sanskrit itihāsa literature can be proved to have existed in the fifth century B.C.

¹ *Die Sagenstoffe des Rigveda*, pp. 126, 127.

² *Brhaddevatā*, vol. i, p. xxix.

³ *Op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. xxii, xxiii. Cf. Victor Henry, *Revue Critique*.

This appears to me a most important result in view of the controversy over the date of the epics. Two competing opinions on this point are held at the present time. The one, represented by such scholars as Professor Jacobi, Professor Macdonell, Professor Rapson,¹ and Mr. Thomas, ascribes the epics to an early date, say the sixth to the fourth century B.C., and considers that at the time of composition they were written for and were intelligible to a comparatively wide circle of the people; the other, which counts among its supporters in various degrees M. Barth, Professors Bergaigne, Lüders, and Rhys Davids, Dr. Senart, and Dr. Grierson, considers that the epics are comparatively late work, the result of the gradual growth of the influence of the literary language of the Brāhmaṇic schools, which still show in many traces evidence of their being translations or adaptations of Pāli or Prākṛit originals. The question is of course intimately connected with the kindred question of the extent to which Sanskrit was ever a spoken language. It is not, I understand, ever now held that Sanskrit—in the sense of the language which was known as a *bhāṣā* to Pāṇini—was a vernacular of all the people in any part of India, but it obviously makes a great difference in the view taken of the nature of Sanskrit whether we are to regard it as a mere priestly language applied in late times to secular purposes, or are to hold that there was a time when a heroic epic was written in a language approximating to that of the Kṣatriya class, and one which could be understood without great difficulty by the mass of the people. We cannot believe, I venture to think, that the early audiences to whom the epics were recited were satisfied to listen to what they did not pretend to understand. No doubt, as Dr. Grierson² says, the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata are nowadays recited to villagers who know nothing of Sanskrit, but that is the result (a) of the sacred character now attaching to the works as the result of centuries of fame, and (b) of

¹ Cf. the discussions in *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, pp. 435–487.

² *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, p. 475.

the fact that the outlines of the story are familiar through vernacular translations and imitations. Neither of these features could be found in the primitive ākhyānas out of which the epic developed. It is really inconceivable that a man should compose works to appeal to the people—as the epics were beyond question intended to do—in a language unintelligible to them, whereas there is no difficulty in understanding how the epics soon became less and less generally understood, and yet retained their hold on the populace.

Taken in this connection the Br̥haddevatā appears to me to be decisive for the early date of the Sanskrit epic poetry, and against the theory of translation from Pāli or Prākṛit. If there were Sanskrit epic legends in the fifth century B.C., it is unreasonable to look for the composition of the great epics in the first or second century A.D.

Since the Br̥haddevatā has the great merit of being preserved in a text which is in all probability free from serious interpolation or corruption, as is proved by the quotations in the Sarvānukramaṇī, I have thought it may be of interest to examine the metres of this early piece of quasi-epic literature. In the present state of the text of the two great epics no useful comparison of metre can be made, but it is not improbable that such a comparison may in course of time be rendered possible when critical text studies of the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa have proceeded further and some better criteria of old and new strata of text have come to light.

The following remarks are based entirely on the text as constituted by Professor Macdonell, Rājendralāla Mitra's edition being quite useless from this as from every other point of view. I use a comma to denote the cæsura, or rather diæresis, whenever it can be determined with fair certainty. It is assumed that for the purpose of the diæresis a prefix like *saṃ* in *saṃbhūtaḥ* counts as a separate word; this could easily be proved if necessary. I have omitted the references to save space, and there are very possibly some errors in the enunciation, but the main results

will not be affected by such errors. In any case the numbers would be altered if readings other than those adopted by Professor Macdonell were accepted. *Cha* has, of course, been regarded as always making position.

The anuṣṭubh in the Bṛhaddevatā is essentially of a later form than the anuṣṭubh, even in the latest portions, of the Ṛgveda. This is shown especially by the fact that the second pāda of each half-verse ends always¹ in $\cup - \cup \asymp$. In the first pāda the second half is $\cup - - \asymp$ in 2,002 cases out of a possible 2,382.² On the other hand, the remaining 380 half-verses show a much greater variety of form than is allowed in the kāvya śloka, and it seems fair to regard the śloka here as exhibiting a transition stage to the śloka of the later literature.

Of the variant forms five half-lines have nine syllables in the first pāda, which begins with $\cup \cup$ save in one case (IV, 102a). In 182 cases the first pāda ends in $- - - \asymp$. Two forms only of the first four syllables occur frequently, viz., $- - \cup - -$, $- - \asymp$ in 86 cases, and $\cup - \cup - -$, $- - \asymp$ in 73 cases. In VIII, 79a occurs $\cup - \cup - - -$, $- \asymp$, but the reading may be incorrect for *yathā ca gharmaḥ sambhūtaḥ*. The other instances are distributed as follows:—

$- - - - -$, $- - \asymp$	4
	+ 2 with caesura after the 4th syllable.
$\cup - - - -$, $- - \asymp$	5
	+ 2 with caesura after the 4th syllable.
$- \cup - - -$, $- - \asymp$	2
$- - - \cup -$, $- - \asymp$	2
$- - \cup \cup -$, $- - \asymp$	2
$- \cup - \cup -$, $- - \asymp$	1
$\cup \cup - \cup - -$, $- \asymp$	1
$\cup \cup -$, $- - - - \asymp$	1

¹ For an apparent exception see Macdonell, p. xxvi, n. 2.

² In the first four syllables $\cup \cup \cup -$ and $- \cup \cup -$ occur twice each, $\cup \cup \cup \cup$ and $- \cup \cup \cup$ once each only. The other possible forms are all frequent.

In 68 cases is found — ◡ ◡ ≡ as the end of the first pāda. As before only two forms occur frequently, viz., — — ◡ — —, ◡ ◡ ≡ in 16 cases + 3 with cæsura after the fourth syllable, and ◡ — ◡ — —, ◡ ◡ ≡ in 34 cases + 1 with cæsura after the fourth syllable.

There are ten other forms, as follows:—

— — — — —, ◡ ◡ ≡	3
◡ — — — —, ◡ ◡ ≡	1
— ◡ — — —, — ◡ ◡ ≡	2
— — — ◡ —, ◡ ◡ ≡	1
— — ◡ ◡ —, ◡ ◡ ≡	1
◡ — ◡ ◡ —, ◡ ◡ ≡	1
◡ ◡ — ◡ —, ◡ ◡ ≡	1
— ◡ ◡ —, — ◡ ◡ ≡	1
◡ ◡ — — —, — ◡ ◡ ≡	2
◡ ◡ ◡ — —, ◡ ◡ ≡	1

In 52 cases the first pāda ends in — ◡ — ≡. There are seven forms, of which four are fairly common:—

— — — — —, — ◡ — ≡	16	+ 2 with cæsura after the fifth syllable. + 1 with cæsura after the sixth syllable.
◡ — — — —, — ◡ — ≡	7	
— ◡ — — —, — ◡ — ≡	3	+ 1 with cæsura after the sixth syllable.
— — ◡ — —, — ◡ — ≡	9	+ 1 with cæsura after the sixth syllable.
◡ — ◡ — —, — ◡ — ≡	9	+ 1 with cæsura after the sixth syllable.
— ◡ ◡ — —, — ◡ — ≡	1	
◡ — — ◡ —, — ◡ — ≡	1	

In 43 cases the first pāda ends in ◡ ◡ ◡ ≡. There are seven forms distributed as follows:—

— — — — —	⌣, ⌣ ⌣ ⌣	≍ 9	
		+ 2 with cæsura after the fourth syllable.	
⌣ — — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣	≍ 8	
		+ 3 with cæsura after the fifth syllable.	
		+ 2 with cæsura after the sixth syllable.	
— ⌣ — — —	⌣, ⌣ ⌣	≍ 3	
— — — — —	⌣, ⌣ ⌣ ⌣	≍ 6	
		+ 2 with cæsura after the fourth syllable.	
— ⌣ — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ ⌣	≍ 1	
⌣ — — — —	⌣, ⌣ ⌣	≍ 5	
⌣ ⌣ — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ ⌣	≍ 1	
		+ 1 with cæsura after the fifth syllable.	

In 15 cases the first pāda ends in ⌣ — ⌣ ≍. These cases are of special interest, as the later form avoids carefully the iambic ending. There are six forms:—

— — — — —	⌣, — ⌣	≍ 1	
— ⌣ — — —	, ⌣ — ⌣	≍ 2	
— — — — —	⌣, — ⌣	≍ 4	
		+ 1 with cæsura after the fourth syllable.	
— ⌣ — — —	, ⌣ — ⌣	≍ 1	
⌣ — — — —	, ⌣ — ⌣	≍ 4	
		a very remarkable form.	
⌣ — — — —	⌣, — ⌣	≍ 1	
		+ 1 with cæsura after the sixth syllable.	

In 12 cases the first pāda ends in ⌣ ⌣ — ≍. There are eight forms, but all the occurrences are sporadic:—

— — — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ —	≍ 2	
⌣ — — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ —	≍ 1	
— — — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ —	≍ 3	
⌣ — — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ —	≍ 2	
— — — — —	⌣, ⌣ —	≍ 1	
⌣ — — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ —	≍ 1	
⌣ — — — —	⌣, —	≍ 1	
⌣ ⌣ — — —	, ⌣ ⌣ —	≍ 1	

There remain 3 cases of endings in — — ∪ ≍, viz. :—

— — ∪ ∪ —, — ∪ ≍	1
∪ — ∪ —, — — ∪ ≍	1
— — ∪ — —, — ∪ ≍	1

This large variety of forms appears consistent with and to support the date assigned on other grounds to the work by Professor Macdonell. It was most probably written at a time when the śloka had not yet received its final form, and when the verses which are irregular according to the later metre were still felt to be correct. It may, of course, be argued that some of the forms are the result of the introduction of quotations from the R̥gveda, but, even allowing this to be the case in some instances, the explanation cannot be applied in the majority of cases, and it would doubtless have been easy for the author to put them in another form, had they seemed to him unmetrical.

Consistent also with the antiquity of the verse is the fact of the separation of the pādas. Hiatus is quite freely allowed between pādas in the same half-verse. There are, according to my reckoning, about 112 cases of such hiatus. It is true that hiatus occurs also elsewhere, but these cases can nearly all be reduced to (1) Vedic quotations, e.g., *te astu*, I, 54a; *ko adya*, I, 57a; or (2) *a* or *ā* + *r*, or *i* + *r*, or *u* + *r*—all special cases.¹ Other exceptions are extremely rare (e.g. I, 111a). Between pādas, however, all sorts of hiatus occur freely.

On the other hand, there are not lacking signs that the connection of the pādas was becoming closer than in the period of the Saṃhitās. The instances are of three kinds. (1) The break at the end of the first pāda occurs in the middle of a compound, or after a prefix to a verb, e.g., *prātaḥ* | *savanam*, I, 115a, or *ābhi* | *dīyate*, I, 30a. There

¹ Śākalya, it may be noted, is cited in Pāṇini, VI, i, 127, as permitting the absence of sandhi in the case of *i*, *u*, and *r* followed by a dissimilar vowel, and Śaunaka is associated with Śākalya. The absence of sandhi between *a* or *ā* and *r* is permitted by Pāṇini, VI, i, 128, also on the authority of Śākalya, according to the Kāśikā Vṛtti.

are seven other instances (II, 98*a*, 103*a*; III, 86*b*; IV, 82*b*; V, 58*c*, 175*b*; VI, 88*b*). (2) There is elision at the end of the first pāda; the elision is almost always of *i* becoming *y*; of which there are eleven instances (II, 127*b*, where the verse should probably be divided after the 'py; III, 69*b*, 135*a*; IV, 144*b*; V, 81*b*; VI, 63*b*, 68*b*; VII, 83*a*, 105*b*; VIII, 14*b*, 94*b*). There are three instances of the elision of initial *a* (I, 54*b*; IV, 139*a*; VI, 156*a*); and one instance of *u* becoming *v* (II, 115*b*). (3) Finally, in six cases the verse runs on irregularly: they are III, 83*a*, *āṅgīrasasyāsan*; 134*b*, *varuṇasyāryamaṇaḥ*; 9*a*, *naktānakti*; II, 141*a*, *hīttham*; IV, 116*b*, *āṅgānyanaḍuḥaḥ*; VIII, 57*a*, *tvantyaṅyāḥ*.

The examples of hiatus taken together with these signs of the tendency to regard the pādas as united seem to be conclusive evidence of the transitional character of the verse. The same view follows from the treatment of the triṣṭubh. There are some 42 verses in this metre in the Brhaddevatā, and the details given below seem conclusively to show that the metre was still in an experimental stage. No one after the later metres had definitely formed themselves would have composed these curious forms, which, however, find a natural explanation as transitional forms from the free triṣṭubh of the Samhitās, where the last four syllables are alone of importance, to the later verses, where all syllables are determined.

Only one verse occurs where all the pādas are alike in metre, the indravajrā, IV, 2. Verses with mixed pādas of indravajrā and upendravajrā occur in I, 44 (*u. + i. + u. + i.*), 45 (*u. + u. + i. + i.*); IV, 1 (*u. + u. + i. + i.*). In III, 154, the first, second, and fourth pādas are indravajrā, the third is śālinī. In 155 the first two pādas are śālinī, the third and the fourth irregular. In IV, 95, the first and third pādas are upendravajrā and the second indravajrā, the fourth is irregular. In 96 the last two pādas are indravajrā, the first two are irregular. The second and third pādas of V, 8, are identical (◡ — — — ◡ — — ◡ — ≡), and so in V, 46, and VIII, 127 (◡ — ◡ —, — ◡ — — ◡ — ≡), the first and fourth being irregular. In

V, 113, the first two pādas are upendravajrā, the last two $\cup - \cup - , - \cup - - \cup - \cup$. In VIII, 101, the first two are indravajrā, the last irregular. In 125 the second and fourth are $\cup - - - , \cup \cup - - \cup - \cup$, the others irregular. In IV, 99, the second and third are śālinī, the rest irregular. In all, 15 verses have two or more pādas alike.

On the other hand, there are no less than 7 verses with four pādas of 11 syllables all dissimilar (III, 156; IV, 5, 6, 7; V, 114; VIII, 128, 129); and 19 verses contain pādas of differing numbers of syllables. In five cases only is there any correspondence of pādas: in IV, 10, the verse consists of $12 + 11 + 11 + 11$, the last two being $- - - - \cup \cup - \cup - \cup$; in IV, 4, of $11 + 11 + 12 + 11$, the second and fourth being $- - - \cup \cup \cup - - \cup - \cup$; in V, 7, of $11 + 12 + 11 + 12$, the second and fourth being $\cup - - - \cup \cup - - \cup - \cup \cup$; IV, 3, consists of an indravajrā + upendravajrā + indravajrā + 12; and V, 11, consists of two śālinī pādas + 12 + 11. The other verses show different variations of pādas of 10, 11, and 12 syllables as follows:—

IV, 97: $10 + 11 + 11 + 11$.

V, 112: $10 + 11 + 12 + 12$ (the first pāda may be read as 11 with *vyūha*).

V, 10: $11 + 11 + 10 + 10$.

III, 126, 127 } $11 + 12 + 11 + 11$.
VIII, 99, 100 }

III, 128; V, 9: $11 + 11 + 11 + 12$.

IV, 8: $12 + 11 + 11 + 11$.

IV, 9: $12 + 11 + 12 + 11$.

III, 129: $12 + 12 + 11 + 11$.

III, 130: $12 + 11 + 12 + 12$.

IV, 98: $11 + 11 + 12 + 12$.

There remains VIII, 130, which has 6 pādas of 11 syllables, the fourth and fifth being upendravajrā, and the first and sixth indravajrā.

Of the 24 jagatī pādas only 12 have the characteristic jagatī ending of $\cup - \cup \asymp$; 10 end in $- \cup - \asymp$; 2 in $\cup \cup - -$ and $- - \cup -$ respectively. On the other hand, of the triṣṭubh pādas 2 end with the jagatī ending $\cup - \cup \asymp$, and 1 with $\cup \cup - -$.

In four cases hiatus is permitted between the pādas of the half-verses, while in one case *tu* becomes *tv*.

Confirmation of the view here taken that the metre of the Brhaddevatā represents a genuine stage of the historical development of the śloka may be derived from an examination of the 58 half-verses in the epic narrative in adhyāya 33 of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which must date about 200 or 300 years before the Brhaddevatā. In 14 cases the first pāda ends in $\cup - - \asymp$; in 13 in $- - - \asymp$; making 27 cases with the long syllable in the sixth and seventh places, the characteristic of the classic śloka. Of the rest there are 8 cases of $\cup - \cup -$; 6 of $- \cup - \asymp$; 5 of $\cup \cup \cup \asymp$; 5 of $- \cup \cup \asymp$; 4 of $- - \cup \asymp$; and 3 of $\cup \cup - \asymp$. In three cases the second pāda has not an iambic ending. The verse is undoubtedly of an older type than that of the Brhaddevatā, but the line on which it will develop is clearly one which will naturally lead to the later metre, while its own history can be traced in the different strata of the R̥gveda.

II.

MAS'UD-I-SA'D-I-SALMAN

BY MÍRZÁ MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABDU'L-WAHHÁB OF QAZWÍN.

Translated by E. G. BROWNE.

*(Continued from p. 740, October, 1905.)**Mas'úd's Second Imprisonment.*

AFTER Abú Naṣr-i-Fársí had incurred the displeasure of Sultán Mas'úd, his *protégés* were also arrested, dismissed or cast into prison, and amongst them Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán, who was interned in the Castle of Maranj,¹ where he remained a long time in confinement. During this period also he composed in praise of Sultán Mas'úd and his advisers and courtiers poems so touching and full of pathos that, in the words of Nidhámí-i-'Arúdí of Samarqand, to read them "causes the hair to stand on end and tears to well from the eyes." Yet these availed him nothing, until, after eight years, according to the most probable conjecture, the efforts of Thiqatu'l-Mulk Ṭáhir b. 'Alí effected his release. I shall now cite verses in proof of the facts summarised above.

A certain Muḥammad Khaṭībí, one of the friends of Mas'úd-i-Sa'd (perhaps also one of the *protégés* of Abú Naṣr-i-Fársí), was commissioner of Quzdár² in Sístán while Mas'úd was governor of Chálandar. Both were subsequently dismissed and cast into prison. Mas'úd, in a *qaṣida* in praise

¹ *Maranj* or *Marang* is the name of a castle in India, according to the *Burhán-i-Qdī*, but I have been unable to find any mention of it elsewhere.

² [Or Quzdár. See Le Strange's *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp. 331-3.—E. G. B.]

of *Thiqatu'l-Mulk Tāhir* b. 'Alī,¹ one of *Sultān Mas'ūd's* ministers, endeavours to console him, and it appears from

¹ *Thiqatu'l-Mulk Tāhir* b. 'Alī b. Mushkān was the *Wazīr* of *Sultān Mas'ūd* b. *Ibrāhīm*. 'Awfī in his account of *Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān* (*Lubābu'l-Albāb*, ed. Browne, vol. ii, p. 246) says: "Of *Thiqatu'l-Mulk* he writes as follows, at the time when the chief seat of the Ministerial Office was filled with so much distinction by him"; and most of the *qaṣīdas* composed in his praise by *Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd* also contain a panegyric on *Sultān Mas'ūd*. Of these I will only cite the following couplet:—

نه چون ثقة الملک بود مُلک فروزی

نه نیز چو مسعود بود مُلک ستانی

"Neither is there such an ornament of the Empire as *Thiqatu'l-Mulk*,
Nor such an Empire-maker as [*Sultān*] *Mas'ūd*!"

Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rūnī has also written *qaṣīdas* in his praise. In one of these he says:—

تقة الملک خاص و خازن شاه خواجه طاهر علیه عین الله

"*Thiqatu'l-Mulk*, the King's treasurer and confidential adviser, *Khwdja Tāhir*—
may God's Eye watch over him!"

From this couplet it appears that he held the rank of "*Khāṣṣ*" (confidential adviser, or Privy Councillor) before that of *Wazīr* (Premier). *Sanā'ī* also has composed poems in his praise, and in his *Kār-nāma*, after praising *Sultān Mas'ūd*, he says:—

تقة الملک طاهر بن علی پادشه چون نبی و او چو ولی

تا ترا کرد آسمان ظاهر یک زمین است و طاهر و طاهر

"*Thiqatu'l-Mulk Tāhir* b. 'Alī: the King is as the Prophet and he as the Saint.
Since Heaven made thee manifest there is [but] one Earth and [one] *Tāhir*,
[one] *Tāhir*."

He was also praised by *Mukhtārī* of *Ghazna*, by whom this quatrain was written:—

طاهر ثقة الملک سرداد گران

آید بخطِ امرِ تو سرهای سران

چون شد بجهان دلش برحمت نگران

پاینده شمر عمر و جهان میگذران

"*Tāhir Thiqatu'l-Mulk*, great Chief-Justice! The heads of chiefs bow to thy
written edict!

Since his heart regards mercy in the world, reckon life abiding and pass by the
world!"

His biography is wanting in the *Athārū'l-Wuzarā* ("Traits of the Wazirs") composed by *Sayfu'd-Din Ḥājji* b. *Nidhāmu'l-Faqlī* (Or. 1920 of the British

certain expressions which the poet employs that the cause of his imprisonment was connected with the government of Chálandar.

محمد ای بجهان عین فضل و ذاتِ هنر
 تویی اگر بود از فضل در جهان پیکر
 ترا خطیبی خوانند و شاید و زیبد
 که تو فصیح خطیبی بنظم و نثر اندر
 ز حسبِ حال چو زهر تو زهره ام خون شد
 که نظم کرده آنرا بگفته چو شکر
 چو بنگریم همیدون پس از قضای خدای
 بلای ما همه قزدار بود و چالندر
 دواهلِ فضل و دو آزاده و دو مُساکَنیم
 دو خیره رای و دو خیره سر و دو خیره بصر
 مرا اگر پس ازین دوستی دهد یاری
 من و ثنای خداوند و خامه و دفتر
 بمدحتِ ثقه الملک ازین چه دریا دل
 بغوص طبع بر آرم طویل‌های گهر

Museum) and the *Dastūru'l-Wuzarā* ("Manual of Ministers") of Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Khwāndamīr (Or. 234 of the British Museum). In the poems of the poets his name and title appear as above, "Thiqatu'l-Mulk Tāhir b. 'Alī." The only authority for the statement that his father 'Alī was the son of Mushkán is the statement of Nidhāmi-i-'Arūdi of Samarqand (*Chahār Maqāla*, Browne's translation, p. 74). This Mushkán was the father of Abū Naṣr Maṣnūr b. Mushkán, who died in A.H. 431 (= A.D. 1039-1040), who was secretary to Sulṭān Maḥmūd and his son Mas'ūd, author of the *Maqāmāt* of Bū Naṣr Mushkán, and teacher of Abū'l-Faḍl Bayhaqī, author of the "History of Mas'ūd" (*Ta'rikh-i-Mas'ūdi*). For the biography of Abū Naṣr Mushkán, see Ṣalāhu'd-Dīn Ṣafadi's *Wafāi bi'l-Wafayāt* (Add. 23,359 of the British Museum, f. 15), Ibnū'l-Athīr's Chronicle under the events of the year A.H. 431, and the History of Abū'l-Faḍl Bayhaqī *passim*. It would therefore appear that Thiqatu'l-Mulk Tāhir b. 'Alī b. Mushkán was the nephew of Abū Naṣr Mushkán. I have not been able to ascertain the date of his death, which, however, appears to have taken place after A.H. 500 (= A.D. 1106-7) and before A.H. 510 (= A.D. 1116-17).

"O Muḥammad, if there be in the world a monument of talent it is thou, O Essence of Talent and Incarnation of Genius!

Men call thee Khatībī, which is but right and proper, for thou art a most eloquent orator (khatīb) both in verse and prose.

When I read the statement of thy case, every corner of my gall-bladder was choked with blood, for thou didst state thy case in verses sweet as sugar.

Even so, when we well consider the matter, all our misfortune arose (after God's predestination) from Quzdār and Chālandar.

We are two scholars, two noblemen, two men well proved, yet withal ill-advised, wrong-headed, and far from clear-sighted.

Hereafter, should Fortune befriend me, my part shall be the praise of my lord and master with pen and paper;

In praise of Thiqatū'l-Mulk (how ocean-hearted a benefactor!) the diver of my genius shall bring up treasure-houses of pearls."

It was about the same period, namely, at the beginning of his second imprisonment, that he composed his celebrated *M-gaṣida*, which is so touching and full of pathos, and which begins:—

از کرده خویشان پشیمانم ' جز توبه ره دگر نمیدانم
 کارم همه بخت بد بیچاند ' در کام زبان همی به پیچانم
 این چرخ بکام من نمی گردد ' بر خیره سخن همی چه گردانم

"I am sorry for what I have done: I know no other way save repentance:

Ill fortune tangles all my affairs; I twist my tongue in my mouth.

This sphere turns not according to my desire; why should I turn wild words?"

A few verses further on he says :—

تا زاده ام ای شگفت محبوسم ' تا مرگ مگر که وقف زندانم
 یکچند کشیده داشت بخت بد ' در محنت و در بلای الوانم
 چون پیرهن عمل بپوشیدم ' بگرفت قضای بد گریانم
 بر بیخده باز مبتلی گشتم ' آورد قضا بسمج ویرانم
 بر مغز من ای سپهر ساعت ' چندین چه زنی که من نه سندانم
 در خون چه کشی تنم نه زوپینم ' در تف چه بری دلم نه پیکانم
 حمله چه کنی که کند شمشیرم ' پویه چه دهی که تنگ میدانم
 رو رو که بایستاد شدیزم ' بس بس که فروگسست خفانم
 سبحان الله مرا نگویید کس ' تا من چه سزای بند سلطانم
 والله که چو گرگ یوسفم والله ' بر خیره همی نهند بُهتانم
 گر هرگز نذره کثری باشد ' در من نه ز پشت سعد سلمانم

“ O wonder, since I was born I am in bonds : am I then assigned
 to prison until death ?

For some while evil Fortune kept me racked by all kinds of
 sorrow and affliction.

When I put on the raiment of office, evil Fate seized my collar.
 Again without cause am I afflicted : Fate has brought me
 to a desolate cell.

Wherefore, O Heaven, dost thou thus each moment inflict
 such blows on my head ? I am not an anvil !

Wherefore dost thou trail my body in blood ? I am not
 a pole-axe ! Wherefore dost thou put my heart in
 a furnace ? I am not an arrow-head !

Wherefore dost thou attack, for my sword is blunt ? Wherefore
 dost thou pursue, for my field is narrow ?

Avaunt, avaunt ! for my steed halts ! Enough, enough !
 for my buckler is broken !

*Great Heavens! Will no one tell me why I have deserved the
King's bonds!*

*By God, I am [innocent] as the 'Wolf of Joseph': by God,
they do falsely accuse me!*

*If there be ever an atom of guile in me, I am no son of Sa'd-
i-Salmán!"*

And in conclusion he says:—

پیوسته چو ابر و شمع میگیریم ' وین بیت چو حرز و مدح میخوانم
فریاد رسیدم ای مسلمانان ' از بهر خدای اگر مسلمانم

*"I continually weep like the cloud or the candle, while I recite
this verse like some charm or psalm:*

*'O Musulmáns, for God's sake come to my aid, if I be
a Musulmán!"*

All the verses of this *qaṣida* are in this vein; and though the lines cited above are foreign to our present purpose, which is to adduce evidence connected with Mas'úd's biography, they are given as a specimen of his prison-poems.

In another *qaṣida* in praise of Thiqat'u'l-Mulk Ṭáhir b. 'Alí he says that in the preceding year he was one of the notables and officials of the State, and that every *dirham* of public money for which he was responsible could be accounted for; yet, notwithstanding this, he had been imprisoned for a year in the utmost destitution and misery in the fortress of Maranj. This *qaṣida* he composed in the first year of his [second] captivity, and after the customary laudation he says:—

دشمن و دوست دیده بود که من ' پار بودم ز جمله اعیان
اسب بسیار و بنده بی حد ' مال انواع و نعمت الوان
من چو مستان همی دوانیدم ' از چپ و راست برگشاده دهان
بر همه اعتماد آنکه مرا ' نتواند که کس نهد بپشتان

کرده‌ام شغل و کرده‌ام مدحت ' که ندید است کس چنین و چنان '
 از عمل نیست یکم درم باقی ' بر من از هیچ وجه در دیوان '
 هستم اینک درین حصارِ مَرَنج ' گنگده و سوخته نه خان و نه مان '
 شکم و پُشت من درین یکسال ' والله اریافته است جامه و نان '

" *Friend and foe have seen that only a year ago I was one of the nobles.*

[*I had*] *many horses and countless servants, all sorts of property and all kinds of luxuries.*

Like those who are drunk [with success], at the mere opening of my mouth I made [my subordinates] run right and left.

I relied on all, thinking that none would venture to traduce me. Such work have I wrought and such panegyrics have I composed that none have seen the like of either.

Not one dirham remains against me in my official capacity on any score in any Government office.

[*Yet*] *behold, I am in this Fortress of Maranj, plucked and singed, with neither house nor home !*

[*I swear*] *by God that during this year neither back nor belly have received clothing or bread !*"

From another *qasida* in praise of the same person it appears that at the time of its composition he had been imprisoned two years in the fortress of Maranj. After the panegyric he says :—

رنج و تیمار در حصارِ مَرَنج ' جان من رنجه کرد و طبع فکار '
 طبع و جان مرا برحمت و فضل ' بخر از رنج و برکش از تیمار '
 تو خود از خویشتن روا داری ' در چنین سمج اگر بمیرم زار '
 چون زامسال و پاریاد کنم ' زار گیرم ز حسرتِ پیرار '

" *Grief and detention in the fortress of Maranj have vexed my soul and wounded my spirit ;*

*By thy mercy and beneficence redeem my spirit from grief
and raise up my soul from care !*

*Wouldst thou really on thine own part be content if I should
die miserably in such a prison-cell ?*

*When I remember [the sufferings of] this year and last year,
bitterly do I weep in regret for the year before last !”*

Finally, in addressing a certain minister whose name is not mentioned, though it is almost certain that the above-mentioned Thiqat'u'l-Mulk is intended, the poet clearly and explicitly defines the periods of his imprisonment in different places. This *qasida* he composed in the third year of his imprisonment at Maranj :—

‘ من درین حبس چند خواهم بود ’ مانده بندی چنین گران بر پای

‘ هفت سالم بکوفت سو و دهک ’ پس از آنم سه سال قلعه نای

‘ در مرجم کنون سه سال و بود ’ که به بندم درین چودوزخ جای

“ *How long shall I remain in this imprisonment with fetters
so grievous on my feet ?*

*Sú and Dahak crushed me for seven years, and thereafter for
three years the castle of Náy.*

*Now I have been for three years in Maranj, and it is actually
the case that I continue to abide in this hellish place.”*

In connection with Maranj, no mention is made in his poems of any longer period than this, that is, three years. In another *qasida* in praise of Sultán Mas'úd b. Ibráhím, which appears to have been written shortly after his release from prison, when he had been pardoned and received into favour by that monarch, and which begins—

شاهان پیش را که نکردند جز ستم

‘ شاه زمانه کرد به تیغ و بخشت کم

“ *Former kings, who wrought naught by injustice, the King of
the Age hath done away with sword and spear,”*

he says, after the panegyric :—

هرگز بحرمیت حرم ای شاه مر مرا
 نامد بدل که گردم ازینگونه محترم
 نه نه چه مدحت افسر حشمت بود نزد
 گر مدح گوی تو شود از خلق محتشم
 ارجو که ضعف تن نکند خاطر مرا
 در مدح تو بعجز و بتقصیر متهم
 کز رنج تن بر ایندل من دست یافت یاس
 وز درد دل برین تن من چیره شد سقم
 کافستاده بود ازین پیش ای چرخ شیرزخم
 با جان و مال و جاهم چون گرگ در غنم
 در بندگیت ازین پس چون کلک و چون دوات
 بندم میان بجان و گشایم بمدح نم

“By my veneration for the Sanctuary [of Mecca, I swear],
 O King, that it never entered my heart that I should
 become so honoured !

Nay, nay : since to praise thee is the crown of honour, it is
 but right if he who praises thee be honoured amongst
 mankind !

I trust that bodily weakness may not cause my mind to be
 suspected of failure or shortcoming in thy praise ;

For, through bodily suffering, Despair hath laid hands on my
 heart, while, through mental anxiety, Sickness has over-
 come my body ;

And erstwhile Fate, which wounds like a lion, hath fallen on
 my life, property and rank like a wolf on a flock of
 sheep.

Henceforth in thy service, like the pen and like the pen-case,
 I will eagerly gird up my loins and open my mouth
 in praise.”

Again, in another *qasida* in praise of the same ruler, he says:—

انعام شاهرا كه مرا داد خانمان
 بسيار شد بشكر چگونه ادا كنم
 گر روز من ثنا كنمش بر ملا بنظم

در شب همى بنشردعا برخلا كنم

"How can I adequately express my gratitude for the favours of the King, which gave me [or restored me to] house and home?

If by day I publicly praise him in verse, at night I privately pray for him in prose."

On Thiqatu'l-Mulk Ṭāhir b. 'Alī, who effected his release from prison, he composed the two following quatrains, which confirm the truth of Nidhāmī-i-'Arūdī's statement that this minister was instrumental in effecting his deliverance:—

چرخم چو بخواست گشت بى هيچ گمان
 جاه تو بزندگانيم كرد ضمان
 گويم همه شب ز شام تا صبحدمان

اى دولت طاهرِ على باقى مان

"When Fate, without doubt, designed to slay me, thy position guaranteed my life.

All night, from evening until dawn, I cry: 'O Fortune of Ṭāhir son of 'Alī, long endure!'"

در خدمت طاهرِ على يارم جان
 كز خدمت طاهرِ على دارم جان
 هر صبحدمى روان نهم بر كف دست
 در خدمت طاهرِ على آرم جان

“ In the service of Tāhīr son of ‘Alī I risk my life, since I owe my life to the services of Tāhīr son of ‘Alī :

Every morning I take my soul in the palm of my hand, and bring my life to the service of Tāhīr son of ‘Alī.”

There is some difficulty in determining the exact duration of the period of his imprisonment in the fortress of Maranj. On the one hand it appears, from the two verses beginning *“ Sū and Dahak crushed me for seven years ”* (see p. 18 *supra*), that the whole period of his imprisonment was thirteen years, namely, ten years in the reign of Sultān Ibrāhīm and three years in the reign of Sultān Mas'ūd. And although it does not necessarily follow from the verses in question that the period of his imprisonment in Maranj did not exceed three years, since his captivity there may have been prolonged for some time after he composed these verses, yet in another passage he explicitly mentions this period of thirteen years, to wit, in a *qaṣīda* which he composed in praise of Malik Arslān b. Mas'ūd. In this poem Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd craves the favour and good-will of this Prince; describes his former life and the misfortunes which he has suffered at Fortune's hands, and adds that he had been imprisoned for thirteen years, a statement which exactly tallies with the two verses to which reference is made above. This *qaṣīda* begins:—

با روی تازه و لبِ پُر خنده نو بهار
آمد بخدمتِ ملک و شاه کامکار
سلطان ابو الملوک ملک ارسلان که ملک
ذات عزیز اورا پرورد در کنار

“ With fresh face and smiling lips Spring came to wait on the victorious King and monarch.

Sultān Abu'l-Mulūk Malik Arslān, whose precious person Empire hath nursed on her bosom.”

After the panegyric he continues:—

' در انتظارِ رحمت و فضل تو مانده ام
 ای کرده روزگارِ تو را دولت انتظار
 من بنده سال سیزده محبوس مانده ام
 جان کنده ام ز محنت در حبس و در حصار
 در سمجهای تنگ و خشن مانده مستمند
 در بندهای سخت تبر مانده استوار
 دارم هزار دشمن و یک جان و بیم تن
 لیکن گذشته وام من از هشتصد هزار
 بی برگ و بی نوا شده و جمع گیرِ من
 عورات بی نهایت و اطفال بی شمار
 بسیار امیدوار ز تو یافته نصیب
 من بی نصیب گشته و مانده امیدوار
 پیر و ضعیف عالم و درویش و عاجزم
 بر پیری و ضعیفی من بنده رحمت آر
 گیرم گناهگارم و اله که نیستم
 نه عفو کرده گنه هر گناهگار
 تا شاید بگذرانم ارم روزگار هست
 در مدح و در ثنای تو این مانده روزگار

*"I continue in expectation of thy clemency and favour, O thou
 whose time Fortune hath so long awaited !*

*I thy servant have remained imprisoned for thirteen years,
 and have suffered agonies of sorrow in prison and in
 fortress,*

Lying in want in hard and narrow cells, fast bound in heavy bonds.

*I have a thousand foes, and but one life, and go in bodily fear,
but my debts exceed eight hundred thousand :*

*I am without resources or means, while round me are gathered
countless women and innumerable children.*

*Many a hoper hath received from thee a portion ; I am
portionless, yet continue to hope.*

*I am old, weak, poor and helpless : show mercy to the age and
weakness of this thy sercant !*

*Granted that I am a transgressor (though by God I am not
so), hast not thou pardoned every transgressor's trespass ?*

*So that, if time be vouchsafed me, I may happily pass such
time as still remains to me in praise and glorification
of thee."*

On the other hand, in the *Haft Iqlim* (Or. 203, f. 309b) and the *Majma'u'l-Fusahá*, as well as in the printed edition of the *Diván*, a fragment is ascribed to Mas'úd-i-Sa'd wherein he addresses Abu'l-Faraj.¹ Some of the verses in this fragment run as follows:—

¹ It is not clear who this Abu'l-Faraj was, but apparently he cannot be identified with Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rúní, as the authors of many *Tadhkiras* have supposed. For Mas'úd-i-Sa'd certainly did not compose this fragment during his first imprisonment, the entire duration of which did not exceed ten years, for how then could he say "*for nineteen years I have been a captive*" ? And during his second imprisonment he remained on the very best of terms with Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rúní ; for in a *qasida* which he addressed to him from prison and which begins—

ای خواجه بو الفرج نکنی یاد من ' تا شاد گردد این دل ناشای من

"O Master 'Bu'l-Faraj, thou dost not remember me, so that this sad heart of mine
may be gladdened !"

it is clear beyond all doubt that it is Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rúní to whom he is speaking, since in the course of the poem he addresses him as "O Rúní." Nor can Abu'l-Faraj Nasr b. Rustam, the governor of Lahore, be intended, as is stated in the printed edition of the *Diván*, for he was the subject of Mas'úd-i-Sa'd's praises in many *qasidas* dedicated by the poet to him. Mas'úd also composed an elegy on his death, from which it appears that he died in the reign of Sultán Ibráhím. How, then, could Sa'd-i-Salmán say that he had been a prisoner for nineteen years, seeing that the whole period of his imprisonment during the reign of Sultán Ibráhím was only ten years ? Therefore the Abu'l-Faraj to whom allusion is here made cannot be either of these two.

بو الفرج شرم نایدت که بجهد ' بچنین حبس و بندم افکندی
 تا من اکنون ز غم همی گریم ' تو بشادی ز دور می خندی
 شد فراموش کنز برای تو باز ' من چه کردم ز نیک پیوندی
 مر ترا هیچ باک نامد از آنک ' نوزده سال بوده ام بندی

"O 'Bu'l-Faraj, art thou not ashamed to have cast me into imprisonment and bonds by thine endeavours?"

So that now I weep in sorrow, whilst thou in happiness laughest afar off?

What I did for thee through good fellowship hath been forgotten.

Does it cause thee no compunction that I have been a captive for nineteen years?"

This fragment implies that he had already been imprisoned for nineteen years, and that he had again been cast into prison at the time when he composed it. There is no doubt that one of these two passages contains an error; i.e., either the word "nineteen" in the sentence "*I have been a captive for nineteen years,*" or the word "thirteen" in "*Thy servant hath remained in prison for thirteen years,*" is a mistake, and that we should read either "thirteen" or "nineteen" in both places. From the hint given by Nidhámí-i-'Arúdí, who states that Mas'úd-i-Sa'd was imprisoned for eight years in the reign of Sultán Mas'úd, I feel pretty sure that the word "thirteen" in the *qaṣida* of Malik Arslán is a mistake, and that it should be "nineteen" or "eighteen." We should then arrive at the result that the total period of Mas'úd's imprisonment was nineteen or eighteen years, so that, deducting his ten years' captivity during the reign of Ibráhím, the duration of his imprisonment in Maranj during the reign of Sultán Mas'úd would be eight or nine years, which agrees with the statement of Nidhámí-i-'Arúdí.¹

¹ There still remains one difficulty which has not been solved, namely, the period at which Mas'úd-i-Sa'd composed this *qit'a* which he addressed to Abu'l-Faraj. For its implication is that he had been imprisoned for nineteen years,

To conclude the matter, we must assume that 'Alí-qulí Khán "Wálih" of Daghistán, the author of the *Riyādu'sh-Shu'arā* ("Gardens of the Poets," Add. 16,729, f. 407^b), Mr. Bland in his article in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1853 (ser. v, vol. ii, pp. 356 *et seqq.*), and the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahā* have misread the word هشت, "eight," as بیست, "twenty," in the expression of Nidhāmí-i-'Arúdí of Samarqand "the period of his imprisonment in the time of Sultán Mas'úd was eight years"; and that, having done this, they added on their own authority the summarized statement that "Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán was imprisoned for twelve years in the reign of Sultán Ibráhím and twenty years in the reign of Sultán Mas'úd, or, in all, thirty-two years," not reflecting, apparently, that the whole period of Sultán Mas'úd's reign did not exceed seventeen years, and that therefore Mas'úd-i-Sa'd could not possibly have been imprisoned for twenty years in his reign. In both manuscripts of the *Chahár Maqāla* in the British Museum, as well as in the Tíhrán lithographed edition, the numeral "eight" (هشت) is perfectly clear.

(c) *Third Period: Period of Happiness at the close of Mas'úd's Life, from about A.H. 500 (= A.D. 1106-7) until A.H. 515 (= A.D. 1121-2), which last is the correct date of his Death.*

This period extends over the last half of the reign of Mas'úd, the whole of the reigns of Shír-zád and Malik Arslán, and part of the earlier period of the reign of Bahrámsháh. All the *qaṣidas* which he devotes to the praise of these monarchs belong to this period, and since during it Mas'úd-i-Sa'd did not again suffer imprisonment, it may be called, relatively speaking, the "period of happiness," although

and had again been cast into prison at the time when he composed it. Now if we suppose that he composed the fragment in question at the beginning of his second imprisonment, what is meant by his having been a prisoner for nineteen years? While if we suppose that he composed it after his second imprisonment, then it would appear that he was imprisoned three times, for which supposition we have no warrant, since nowhere in his poems does he allude to a third imprisonment.

during the reign of Malik Arslán he still enjoyed no great favour, since his release from prison was still comparatively recent, and some prejudice still existed against him in consequence of the suspicions cast upon him by his enemies. But in the reign of Sultán Yamínu'd-Dawla Bahrámsháh his affairs prospered greatly, and he became one of the most favoured intimates of this monarch's court. It appears that Bahrámsháh was a patron of letters and a friend of learning,¹ and fully recognised the merits of this great poet, who was at this time in extreme old age and well stricken in years, so that he showed him special favour, increased his salary and allowances, and did not suffer the remainder of his life, which was but a very little period, to be vexed by the spite of prejudiced foes or the slanders of malevolent detractors. So poor Mas'úd-i-Sa'd, who had passed the greater portion of his life in prison and in bonds, enjoyed for the brief remainder of his days a short period of tranquillity and happiness under the protecting ægis of that great and royal patron, and left behind him as a memorial several splendid *qasidas* in praise of Bahrámsháh.

In one of these *qasidas* he hints that previously to the year in which it was written he did not even feel secure of his life, but that now he was the object of the king's gracious and kindly solicitude. In this *qasida*, which would therefore appear to have been written in the first year of the reign of Bahrámsháh, he says, after the customary laudation :—

پیرار و پاربنده ز جان نا امید بود
 و امسال حال بنده چو پیرار و پار نیست
 کس را چنانکه امروز این بنده تراست
 جاه و محل و مرتبت و کار و بار نیست

¹ This appears from the number of great poets who assembled at his court, such as Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán, Mukhtári of Ghazna, Saná'í of Ghazna, Sayyid Hasan of Ghazna, 'Abdu'l-Wási' Jabalí, and others mentioned in the *Lubábu'l-Albáb*; as well as from the books composed for and dedicated to him, such as the *Kalila and Dimna* [translated from the Arabic of Ibnu'l-Muqaffa' into Persian prose] by Naşru'lláh b. 'Abdu'l-Hamid, the *Hadiqatu'l-Haqiqat* of Saná'í, and the *Bazm-ardá-yi Fakhri* by al-'Utbi. (See vol. ii of the *Lubábu'l-Albáb*, p. 287.)

هر مجلسی ز رأی تو اورا کرامتی است
 هر هفته از تو بی صلت صد هزار نیست

"Last year and the year before last I thy servant despaired of my life, but this year my state is not as it was last year and the year before.

No one has such rank, position or degree, or affairs so flourishing, as I thy servant have to-day.

At every reception some honour accrues to him from thy thoughtfulness; not a week passes but a gift of a hundred thousand [dirhams] is bestowed by thee!"

In another *qasida* in praise of the same monarch he says:—

آن ثنا گستر منم کاندر همه گیتی بحق
 عز و ناز از مدحهای شاه حق گستر گرفت
 من بگیتی اختیار شاهم اندر هر هنر
 با من اندر هر هنر خصمی که یارد در گرفت
 طبعم اندر مدح گفتنهای بس بیحد نمود
 دستم از جودش غنیمتهای بس بی مرگرفت

"I am that celebrator of praises who [alone] in the whole world rightfully received honour and favour for my praises of that right-recompensing King.

I am the King's choice in the world for every accomplishment: what foe would dare to vie with me in any one of these accomplishments?

In panegyric my genius made many and countless utterances, while my hand received from his generosity innumerable benefits."

In another *qasida* in praise of Bahrámsháh he alludes to that monarch's recognition of talent in his own case, and declares that in consequence of old age and weakness he can

no longer continue in attendance on the King's court. In this, which must have been composed at the very end of the poet's life, he says, after the customary laudation :—

بنده را چون دید مدحی بس بلند
 از شرف برگنبد اخضر کشید
 صد نظر در حال بنده پیش کرد
 تا ز خاک او را برین منظر کشید
 مدح او از آسمان برتر شناخت
 قدر او از آسمان برتر کشید
 بنده را چون تشنه کرد آرزو نیاز
 جودش اندر چشمه کوثر کشید
 لیکن از خدمت فرو ماند است از آنک
 رنج بیماریش بر بستر کشید
 پای نتواند همی نیکو نهاد
 دست نتواند همی ساغر کشید

“ Since he perceived in me his servant very high merit, he raised me up in honour over the Green Vault [of Heaven].

He cast more than a hundred regards on his servant's state until [at length] he raised him up from earth to this high belvidere.

He recognized his merits as transcending Heaven, and so exalted him in honour above the sky.

Since craving and need had made me thirsty, his generosity drew me to the celestial fountain of Kawthar.

But your servant falls short in service, because pain and sickness have stretched him on his couch.

He cannot set down his foot firmly, nor can his hand bear the goblet.”

There also exists a fragment in which he describes his former days and the time of his youth, alluding to his long imprisonments and the grievous hardships which he has suffered at Fortune's hands. It is possible that he composed this fragment at the end of his life, when he was no longer able to attend at the court of Bahrámsháh on account of advancing years and increasing weakness. It is, however, also possible that he may have composed it after his release from his last imprisonment, and before the reign of Bahrámsháh; and this supposition is in some ways more probable. He says :—

دریغا جوانی و آن روزگار ، که از رنجِ پیری تن آگه نبود ،
 نشاطِ من از عیش کمتر نشد ، امیدِ من از عمر کوتاه نبود ،
 ز سُستی مرا آن پدید آمدست ، درین مه که هرگز در آن مه نبود ،
 در آن چاهم افکند گردونِ دون ، که از زرفِ آن چاه را ته نبود ،
 بسا شب که در حبس بر من گذشت ، که بینای آن شب جز آنکه نبود ،
 سیاهی سیاه و درازی دراز ، که آن را امید سحرگه نبود ،
 یکی بودم و داند ایزد همی ، که بر من موکل کم از ده نبود ،
 گرم نعمتی بود کاکنون نماند ، کنون دانشی هبست کانگه نبود ،
 تنم شد مُرقه ز رنجِ عمل ، که آنکه ز دشمن مُرقه نبود ،
 جدا گشتم از درگه پادشاه ، بدان درگهم بیش ازین ره نبود ،
 گرفتم کنون درگه ایزدی ، کزین به مرا هیچ درگه نبود ،

*"Alas for youth and for that time when the body knew naught
 of the suffering of age !*

*My joy in pleasure hath not become less, my hope of life hath
 not been shortened.*

*In this month a weakness hath accrued to me which never
 weighed on me last month.*

*Vile Fortune hath cast me into a pit so profound that it has
no bottom.*

*Many a night hath passed over me in prison so dark that the
most clear-sighted was in that night not other than
one blind from birth.*

*Black as black and long as long could be, such that it held
no hope of dawn.*

*I was one man, yet God knows that not less than ten warders
were set over me.*

*If I possessed then any blessing which now remains not, I have
now knowledge which I had not then.*

*My body hath been eased of the burden of office, when at that
time it was not eased of the foe.*

*I have been parted from the King's court; to that court I had
no longer means to go.*

*Now I have attached myself to the Court of God, than which
no court better suited me."*¹

Having now completed the biography of Mas'úd-i-Sa'd in such wise and so far as we have been able to deduce it from his own poems, it seems appropriate to conclude this sketch with an account of the great poets who were his contemporaries.

¹ In the *Memoirs* of Dawlatsháh (ed. Browne, p. 47, l. 24 — p. 48, l. 9), as well as in the lithographed edition of the *Diván* of Mas'úd (of which the editor, no doubt, in the biographical portion used Dawlatsháh as his source), a fragment is ascribed to our poet which implies that at the close of his life he became a hermit and an anchorite, and adopted a mode of life similar to that of the Šúfis and Gnostics. This fragment begins:—

چون بدیدم بدیدهٔ تحقیق ' که جهان منزل فناست کنون

"When now I perceived with the eye of certainty that the World is the Abode
of Decay"

The style of this fragment, however, presents an obvious dissimilarity to that which prevails in Mas'úd-i-Sa'd's poems, which, moreover, give not the faintest hint that he at any time adopted the life or practices of the Šúfí mystics. It is also implied in two verses of the fragment in question (*Dawlatsháh*, ed. Browne, p. 48, ll. 5-6) that the writer, abandoning the praise of kings, had devoted his talents to the praise and glorification of God and to the celebration of the virtues of the Prophet and his family; whereas no such poems are to be found in the actually existing manuscripts of Mas'úd's *Diván*. In all probability this fragment is really by Saná'í, whose poems it greatly resembles in style.

Poets contemporary with Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán.

A great number of poets were contemporary with Mas'ud-i-Sa'd. We have no intention of enumerating all of these, but only such as are alluded to in his poems, or who in their poems make mention of him, so that we may obtain a general idea of that group of poets who indulged in dialogue or mutual eulogies, and also show how most of the poets of that period acknowledged the pre-eminence of Mas'ud-i-Sa'd and recognized him as their master.

1. *Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rûnî.*

Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán explicitly recognizes this poet as his master in a fragment to which allusion has already been made (p. 23 *supra*, n. 1 *ad calc.*), and in which he says:—

ای خواجه بو الفرج نکنی یاد من ' تا شاد گردد این دلِ ناشاد من
 نیازم بدانکه هستم شاگرد تو ' شادم بدانکه هستی استاد من
 ای رونی ای که طرفه بغداد ' دارم نشستگاه تو بغداد من

"O Master 'Bu'l-Faraj, thou rememberest me not, that this sorrowful heart of mine may be gladdened.

I glory in this, that I am thy pupil: I rejoice in this, that thou art my master.

O Rûnî¹

Mas'ud has also another "Prison-poem" in which he expresses his regret for and longing to see Abu'l-Faraj. Here are some verses from it:—

بو الفرج ای خواجه آزاد مرد ' هجر وصال تو مرا خیره کرد
 دید ز سختی تن و جان آنچه دید، خورد ز تلخی دل و جان آنچه خورد
 ای ببلندی سخن شاعران ' هرگز مانند تو نادیده مرد
 روی توام از همه چیز آرزوست ' خسته همی جوید در میان درد

¹ The last verse appears to be corrupt, and is, at any rate to me, unintelligible.

" O 'Bu'l-Faraj, O noble lord, separation from thy society has confounded me.

My body and soul have experienced such hardships as they have experienced; my heart and spirit have drunk such bitterness as they have drunk.

O thou whose like in loftiness of song the poets have never seen! Of all things I most desire thy countenance: the sick man seeks the cure for his ailment!"

Once Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán had built a lofty palace, and Abu'l-Faraj sent him a fragment of which some of the component verses are as follows:—

بو الفرچ را درین بنا که در آن ' اختلاف سخن فراوان گشت
 سخنی چند معجب است که عقل ' برو قوفش رسید و حیران گشت
 گوید این در بهشت یک چندی ' روضه دلگشای رضوان گشت
 چون بآدم سپرد رضوانش ' منزل آدم اندران آن گشت
 بزمین آمد از بهشت آدم ' غربت او بکام شیطان گشت
 خانه ز آن شخص باز ماند و لیک ' مدتی غوطه خورد و پنهان گشت
 اندرین عصر چون پدید آمد ' قصر مسعود سعد سلمان گشت

" On this building, about which so many different things have been said, 'Bu'l-Faraj

Has a few wondrous words to say, at which Reason was amazed when it became cognizant of them.

He says: 'For some while this [building] was the charming bower of Ridwán¹ in Paradise.

When Ridwán made it [i.e. Paradise] over to Adam, it became Adam's abode therein.

Adam descended from Paradise to earth: his exile therefrom took place according to Satan's wish.

¹ [Ridwán is the name of the guardian of Paradise.—E. G. B.]

The mansion [in question] was vacated by him, but it disappeared and was hidden for some time.

When it reappeared in this age, it became the Palace of Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán."

In answer to this fragment, Mas'ud-i-Sa'd sent a fragment to Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rúní, of which some of the verses are as follows:—

خاطر خواجه بو الفرج بِدُرُست ' گوهر نظم و نشر را کان گشت
رونق و زیب شعر عالی او ' حسن اسلام و نور ایمان گشت
راه تاریک مانده روشن شد ' کار دشوار بوده آسان گشت
معجز خامه اش چو پیدا شد ' جادوئیهای خلق پنهان گشت
خاطر من چو گفته او دید ' از همه گفتهها پشیمان گشت
من چگویم که آنچه او گفتست ' شرف سعد و فخر سلمان گشت

"In truth the mind of Master 'Bu'l-Faraj hath become a mine for the gems of prose and verse.

The splendour and beauty of his lofty poetry hath become the ornament of Islám and the Light of Faith.

The road which was dark hath become bright: the matter which was hard hath become easy.

When the miracle of his pen became apparent the sorceries of men disappeared.

When my heart saw his words, it repented of all that it had uttered.

What shall I say? For that which he has said is the glory of Sa'd and the pride of Salmán!"

Mas'ud-i-Sa'd has written "parallels" to many of Abu'l-Faraj's *qasidas*, as appears from an examination of the two *Diváns*.

2. *Rashîdî of Samarqand.*

This poet had several "poetical duels" (*mushá'arát*) with Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán. On one occasion Mas'úd, while imprisoned by Sultán Ibráhím,¹ sent him a *qaşıda* in reply ("parallel") to one which Rashîdî had written in his honour, beginning:—

شبِ سیاه چو برچید از هوا دامن، ز دوده گشت زمین را ز مهر پیراهن
*"When black night gathered up her skirts from the air, and
 the shirt of earth was blanched by the sun,"*

and in the course of it he says:—

همی بر رمز چگویم قصیده دیدم،
 چو از زمانه بهار و چو از بهار چمن،
 حقیقتم شد چون گرد من هوا و زمین،
 ز لفظ و معنی آن شد معطر و روشن،
 که هست شعر رشیدی حکیم بی همتا،
 به تیغ تیز قلم شاعری بلند سخن،
 بوهم شعرش بشناختم ز دور آری،
 ز دور بوی خیر گویدت ز مشگ ختن،

*"Why should I speak in riddles? I have seen a qaşıda [fair]
 as the season of Spring and [fresh] as the Spring in
 the meadows!*

*I was sure, when round about me earth and air became
 fragrant and bright with its words and ideas,*

*That it was the work of Rashîdî, that peerless philosopher,
 that poet so lofty in speech with the sharp sword of
 the pen.*

¹ For in this *qaşıda* is also contained praise of Sultán Ibráhím.

*I recognized his verse by intuition from afar; yea, from afar
doth its fragrance give thee tidings of the musk of
Khutan!"*

Further on he says, apologizing for making payment in kind (that is, for sending only a poem in return for the one which he has received):—

مرا جز این رخ زرین ز دستگاه نماند
و گرنه شعر نبودى ز منت پاداش
بشعر تنها بپذیر عذر من کامروز
زمانه سخت حرون است و بخت بس تونس
ز پیش بودم بیم و امید دشمن و دوست
برنج دوستم اکنون و کامه دشمن
نه دشمن آید زى من نه من روم بر دوست
که ازدهائی دارم نهفته در دامن
دوسر مراورا برهرسرى دهانی باز
گرفته هر سر یکساق پای من بدهن
بخویشتن بر چون پیچد و دهن گیرد
چنان به پیچم کو¹ پر شود دو رخ ز شکن

*"Naught is left me of my [former] estate save this gold-hued
[i.e. sallow] cheek, else would my reward to thee be
something more than verse.*

*Accept my excuses for [sending] verse unaccompanied by
anything else, for to-day Fortune is very recalcitrant
and Luck very restive!*

¹ The lithographed *Diwân* reads کر, and Taqí Káshí for کو.

*Formerly I had fear and hope of foe and friend : now I am
in such plight as grieves my friends and delights my foes.
Neither doth my foe come to me, nor can I go to my friend,
for I have a dragon concealed beneath my skirt.
It has two heads, and in each head there gapes a mouth, and
each head holds in its mouth one of my feet.
When it twists itself, so that the mouth grips, I writhe in such
fashion that my two cheeks are filled with wrinkles !”*

Further on he says :—

من این قصیده همی گفتم و همی گفتم
‘ چگونه هدیه فرستم ببوستان راسن
که اوستاد رشیدی نه زان حکیمان است
‘ که کرده بودی تقدیر و برده بودی ظن
ز بس که گفتم اشعار و پس فرستادی
‘ بضاعتی ز سمرقند به زدر عدن
شگفتم آمد کان آتش است خاطر تو
‘ سخن چگونه تواندش گشت پیرامن

“ *I kept saying, as I composed this qaṣīda, ‘How can I send
dock-leaves as a gift to the garden ?’
For Master Rashīdī is not one of those philosophers who
would have ‘conjectured’ or ‘suspected.’
So many poems did he write and afterwards send from
Samarqand—stuff more precious than pearls of Aden—
That I was astonished, seeing that thy genius is a flaming fire,
how verse could approach it !”*

In answer to this qaṣīda, Rashīdī sent another beginning :—

رسید شعر تو ای تاجِ شاعران بر من

چو نو شگفته گل اندر بهار گرد چمن¹

"Thy poem, O Crown of the Poets, reached me like roses fresh-blossoming in Spring around the parterre."

3. Rāshidī.

No account whatever of this poet is to be found in any of the *Tadhkiras*, and in the *Chahār Maqāla* only (p. 46 of Browne's translation) is the barest mention made of his name in the enumeration of poets of the House of Subuktigīn (or Ghazna). His poems seem to have entirely disappeared, but it may be inferred from certain poems of Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd that he was one of the court-poets of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, and that he had composed a *qaṣida* beginning :—

رونده شخصی قلعه گشا و صفدر¹ پناه عسکر و آرایش عسکر

"One ever on the move, a reducer of castles and a render of ranks,

The refuge of the army, and the ornament of the camp."

Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd composed a *qaṣida* in praise of Sayfu'd-Dawla, in reply (or "parallel") to the *qaṣida* of Rāshidī, some of the verses of which, containing eulogies of Rāshidī and some biographical data, are as follows :—

¹ For the remainder of this *qaṣida*, see the *Lubābu'l-Albāb*, vol. ii, pp. 177-9. There is in that text a lacuna which would lead one to suppose that the *qaṣida* in question is by Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd, whereas it was really composed by Rashidī in reply to Mas'ūd. Moreover, in two passages in Rashidī's poems in praise of Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd the word "*Wazīr*" is incidentally mentioned amongst his titles. This is certainly incorrect, and there must be some mistake in the expression, for at no time did Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd hold such rank, though there is a faint possibility that during the period when he was in the service of Sayfu'd-Dawla Maḥmūd this ruler conferred on him the title of Deputy-Wazīr. Finally, to remove possible confusion, we may observe that one of Mas'ūd's *qaṣidas* in praise of Abu'r-Rushd Rashid-i-"Khāss" (in praise of whom he has composed many other poems) is, in consequence of the similarity of name, erroneously attributed by the author of the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣah* to Rashidī of Samarqand.

تمام کرد یکی مدحتی چو بُستان،
 ز وزن و معنی لاله ز لفظ عبهر،
 چنانکه راشدی استاد این صنعت،
 کند فضایل آن پیش شه مقرر،
 بدیهه گفتست اندر کتابخانه،
 بفر دولت شاهنشاه مظهر،
 بر آن طریق بنا کرد آن که گوید،
 حکیم راشدی آن فاضل سخنور،
 ”رونده شخصی قلعه گشا و صفدر،
 پناه عسکرو آرایش معسکر،“
 مفاعیلن فعلا تین مفاعیلن فع،
 ز وزن محبت باشد دو حرف کمتر،
 خدایگانا امروز راشدی را،
 بفر دولت سلطان ابوالمظفر،
 رسید شعر بشعری و شد بگیتی،
 چو جود کف تو اشعار او مشهر،
 ر شعر اوست همه شعرهای عالم،
 چنانکه هست همه حرفها ز مصدر،
 چو نشتر او نبود نشتر پر معانی،
 چو نظم او نبود نظم روح پرور،
 اگر نباشد پیششت رهی مصدق،
 و گردن داری مر بنده را تو باور،

حدیث کردن بسی حشو او ننگه کن
 بدین قصیده که امروز خوانده بنگر
 دهند بسی شک افاضل بر آن گواهی
 اگر بگاه فضیلت سازد رهیت محضر

"He [thy servant, i.e. the poet himself] completed a panegyric [fair] as a garden, in metre and sense a tulip, in phraseology a narcissus,

Such that Ráshidí, the master of this art, will declare the virtues thereof before the King.

He composed it *ex tempore* in the library, by the glorious fortune of the victorious monarch.

He constructed it in that same way that *Hakim Ráshidí*, the eminent poet, sings :—

'One ever on the move, a reducer of castles and a render of ranks,

The refuge of the army and the ornament of the camp.'

Mafá'ilun, fa'ilátun, mafá'ilun, fa'—two letters short of the *Mujtathth* metre !

O Sire, to-day, by the glorious fortune of *Sullán Abu'l-Mudhaffar*,

Ráshidí's verse hath soared to *Sirius* in the sky: his poems are famed as the bounty of thy hand.

All the poems of the world are [derived] from his poetry, as all derivatives are formed from the infinitive !

No prose is so full of ideas as his prose ; no verse so life-giving as his verse !

If thy servant be not credited before thee, and if thou dost not believe thy slave,

See how he narrates without wordy padding ; look at this *qaşıda* which he has recited !

Without doubt men of talent will bear witness to it, if thy servant should make such declaration in scholarly circles !"

In another *qaşıda*, also in praise of *Sayfu'd-Dawla Maḥmúd*, he again alludes to *Ráshidí* in such terms as to

make it appear that these two poets were violently opposed to one another.

خدایگانا دانی که بندهٔ تو چه کرد
 بشهر غزنین با شاعران چیره زبان
 هر آن قصیده که گفتیش راشدی یکماه
 جواب گفتم به زان بدیهه هم بزمان
 اگر نه بیم تو بودی شها بحق خدای
 که راشدی را بفکندمی ز نام و ز نان

"O Sire, thou knowest what thy servant did with the glib-tongued poets in the city of Ghaznīn!
 To every qaṣida which it had taken Rāshidi a month to compose,
 I at once replied *ex tempore* with one better.
 But for my fear of thee, O King, by God's Truth, I would have deprived Rāshidi both of fame and bread!"

4. Sayyid Muḥammad b. Nāṣir-i-'Alawī of Ghazna.

He was the elder brother of Sayyid Ḥasan b. Nāṣir-i-'Alawī of Ghazna, and both brothers were amongst the most eminent poets. Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd says in praise of him in one of his fragments:—

شعر سید محمد ناصر دل من شاد کرد و خرم کرد
 بردل من نشاط ورامش یافت در تن من روان و جان پرورد
 هیچ فاضل بگرزد او نرسد گشته هر فاضلی بیادش¹ گرد
 در هنر فرد و یک جهان است او یک جهان را چگونه خوانم فرد

"The verse of Sayyid Muḥammad Nāṣir made my heart glad and cheerful;

¹ MS. بیادش.

It produced in my heart delight and tranquillity; it strengthened the soul and spirit in my body.

No man of letters can approach him [lit. can reach the trail of dust he leaves behind him in his course], nay, every man of letters is as dust in his whirlwind!

He is a world in himself and solitary in talent: how can I call a world solitary?"

In an elegy on his death he says:—

بروفات محمدِ علوی ' خواستم زد بشعریکدو نفس
باز گفتم که در جهان پس ازین ' زشت باشد که شعر گوید کس

"I desired to breathe a few sighs in verse over the death of Muhammad-i-'Alawi;

*But again I said, 'Henceforth it would be an ill thing that anyone should utter poetry!' "*¹

Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán, Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rúní, and Sayyid Muḥammad Násir have each a *qaṣida* with the refrain "*átash u áb*" ("fire and water") and the letter *râ* with a preceding *fatha* ("-ar") as the rhyme. The *qaṣida* of Abu'l-Faraj is in praise of Abú Naṣr-i-Fársí, and it begins:—

قبول یافت زهر هفت اختر آتش و آب
وحید گشت بهر هفت کشور آتش و آب

*"Fire and water have found acceptance from the Seven Stars;
Fire and water have become unique in all the Seven Climes."*

The *qaṣidas* of Mas'ud-i-Sa'd and Sayyid Muḥammad Násir are both in praise of Sultán 'Alá'u'd-Dawla Mas'ud b. Ibráhím, nor is it clear which of these two poets preceded the other in making use of this rhyme and refrain, which was afterwards imitated by the others. (See, for the text

¹ [Meaning, of course, that the Art of Poetry, as it were, had died with the subject of the elegy.—E. G. B.]

of these three *qaṣidas*, the *Diwāns* of Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd and Abu'l-Faraj-i-Rūnī, and 'Awfī's *Lubābu'l-Albāb*, vol. ii, pp. 267-9.)¹

5. *Akhtari*.

No mention is made in any *tadhkira* of this poet, nor is anything known of his circumstances, save that he was a contemporary of Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān and addressed to him a *qaṣida* to which Mas'ūd replied in a *qaṣida* beginning:—

ای اخترى نه تو مگر اختر ' گردونِ فضل گشته بتو انور
اندر بروج مدح و ثنا شعرت ' سایر چو اختر است بهر کشور
مسعود گشت اختر بخت من ' زین نظم نورمند فلک پیکر

"O *Akhtari*, thou art naught else than a star (*akhtar*), by whom the firmament of Talent has been rendered most luminous;

Through the zodiacal signs of panegyric and praise thy verse moves like a star through every clime.

The star of my fortune hath become fortunate (mas'ūd) by this luminous, heaven-faced verse."

6. *Abu'l-'Alā 'Aṭā b. Ya'qūb*, known as *Nāḳūk*.

A biographical notice of this poet is contained in 'Awfī's *Lubābu'l-Albāb*, vol. i, pp. 72-75. Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd praises him in several passages, amongst others in the following:—

¹ *A propos* of Sayyid Muḥammad Nāṣir, attention must be called to the fact that there is in the *Diwān* of Mas'ūd an elegy on the death of a certain "Sayyid Hasan." Both the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣah* and the Tih-rān lithographed edition of the *Diwān*, misled by similarity of names, have mistaken him for Sayyid Hasan-i-'Alawī of Ghazna, the well-known poet and the brother of this same Sayyid Muḥammad Nāṣir. In order to remove this misconception, we may remark that Sayyid Hasan of Ghazna survived until the reign of Khusrāwshāh b. Bahrāmshāh (A.H. 552-9 = A.D. 1157-1164, according to the best authorities), whose praises are celebrated in his *Diwān*, and that this poet's death is recorded as having taken place in A.H. 565 (= A.D. 1169-1170), that is to say, nearly fifty years after the death of Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd, who therefore cannot have written an elegy on his death.

عطاء یعقوب ای روشن از تو عالم علم
 تو آفتابی و ما ذره را همی مانیم
 کنون که دوریم از نور روی و رای تو ما
 چو ذره بی مهر از چشم عدل ینہانیم
 سخن بر تو فرستم از آنکہ تو دانسی
 کہ ما بدانش نہ چون فلان و بہمانیم
 بشعرداد بدادیم داد ما تو بدہ
 کہ ما چو داد بدادیم داد بستانیم

"O 'Atā-i-Ya'qūb, by whom the world of learning is illuminated,
 thou art a Sun, while we are like motes ;
 Now that we are far from the light of thy face and thy counsel,
 and, like motes deprived of the Sun, are hidden from
 the eye of Justice,
 I send thee my verse, for thou knowest that in learning we are
 not like Such-and-such and So-and-so.
 We have done justice to [thee in] poetry ; do thou give us
 justice ; for when we have given justice, we take justice."

He also says in an elegy on his death, which took place,
 according to 'Awfī (*Lubāb*, vol. i, p. 73), in A.H. 491
 (= A.D. 1098) :—

عطاء یعقوب از مرگ تو ہراسیدم
 شدت و پیش نبودم ز مرگ هیچ ہراس
 در بخت لفظی بر ہر نمط ہمہ گوہر
 در بخت طبعی بر ہر گہر ہمہ الماس

"O 'Atā Ya'qūb, I shudder at thy death ; thou hast departed,
 and hitherto I had no fear of death ;
 Alas for that speech whereof every modulation was all pearls !
 Alas for that genius whereof every facet was all
 diamonds !"

Again he says :—

از وفاتِ عطاء بن یعقوب ، تازۀ تر شد وقاحتِ عالم
 در سر آوردش آخرای عجبی ، پویۀ اشهب و تگِ ادهم
 بر سخن بود نیک چیره سوار ، وز هنر بود بس بلندِ عَلم
 خشک شد خشک مرغزار ادب ، تیره شد تیره جویبارِ حَلم

“ By the death of ‘Atá ibn Ya‘qúb the insolence of the World hath been renewed.

At length, O wonder ! the running of the white and the racing of the black [coursers of Day and Night] have put an end to him.

Very masterly was his control of words ; very high flew his standard in talent !

Dried, dried up is the glade of Culture ; darkened, darkened is the stream of Wisdom ! ”

7. ‘Uthmán Mukhtári of Ghazna.

This poet has many fine *qaṣidas* in praise of Mas‘úd-i-Sa‘d-i-Salmán, in some of which he importunes him for a gift of money. This alone is sufficient to show that Mas‘úd-i-Sa‘d is to be reckoned amongst the leading public men of his time, for a great poet like Mukhtári, to whom Saná‘í addressed so eloquent a panegyric,¹ would not condescend to beg a gift of any ordinary person. Here are some verses from one of these *qaṣidas* of Mukhtári :—

بر اهل سخن تنگ ماند میدان ، وز جای بشد پای هر سخندان
 هر طبع که بر سخن بود قادر ، از عجز چو مسکور گشت حیران

¹ Saná‘í’s *qaṣida* in praise of Mukhtári is well known, and occurs in all copies of Saná‘í’s *Diwán*. It begins :—

نشود پیش دو خورشید و دو مه تاری و تیر ،
 گر برد لمعۀ از خاطر مختاری تیر

خاطر نبرد پی همی به معنی ' فکرت بکشد سر همی ز فرمان '
 چون جزو بکُل باز شد معانی ' زی خاطر مسعود سعد سلمان '
 مخدوم سخن پروران مجلس ' سر دفتر خوان گستران میدان '
 طبعش بسخن ده هزار دریا ' دستش بسخا صد هزار چندان '
 ابرهنش نا پدید گوشه ' بحر سخنش نا پدید پایان '
 ای گنج ایادی بهشت کردی ' بزم امل از تحفای احسان '
 گم کرد عطای تو نام حاتم ' برگشتد لقای تو بیخ حرمان '
 هربیت کم اندیشه تر ز شعرت ' شد نادره تر تحفه خراسان '
 اشعار ترا در جهان گرفتسن ' باشد اثر خاتم سلیمان '
 گرز تو گشت درعا ز مغفر ' تیغ تو برد فرقا ز خفتان '
 خورشیدی و ماهی بصدور مجلس ' بهرامی و تیری بزم و دیوان '
 هم صاحب عبّاد روزگاری ' هم رستم زال زری بدستان '

" *The field was narrowed to the poets ; the foot of every eloquent singer slipped :*

Each genius which had wielded magical powers through helplessness became amazed like one bewitched.

The mind cannot find its way to the meaning ; thought withdraws its head from the command.

[*But*] *ideas are disclosed, as is the part to the whole, to the mind of Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salman,*

The lord of those who cultivate verse in Courts, the chief of those who spread the [hospitable] table in public places.

His genius in verse is ten thousand oceans ; his hand in generosity is a hundred thousand times as much.

The edges of his cloud of talent are invisible ; the bottom of his ocean of verse is not to be found.

O Treasure of Benefits, thou hast turned to Paradise the banquet of hope by the gifts of [thy] generosity !

Thy bounty hath caused the name of Hátim [of Tayy] to be forgotten ; thy presence hath uprooted disappointment ! Every verse of thy poetry, even that least meditated, is the rarest gift of Khurásán.

To take thy verses in the world is like the effect of Solomon's seal. Thy mace rends the chain-mail from the helmet ; thy sword severs the joints of the cuirass.

Thou art a Sun and a Moon in the chief seat of the assembly ; thou art a Mars and a Mercury in the battle and the Council-chamber.

Thou art at once the Šāhib [Isma'il]-i-'Abbád of the age, and the Rustam-i-Zál-i-Zar¹ of legend."

His request for a gift runs as follows :—

بیرون نتوان شد ز حدّ قسمت
 شوگرد فضولی مگرد عشمان
 بسیار غم دل مگوی و شერთ
 بنویس و ببر پیش خواجه برخوان
 دل در صفت با جلال او ده
 وزوی صالت با کمال بستان

"One cannot go beyond the limits of the [predestined] portion : Go, have no dealings with officiousness, O 'Uthmán ! Talk not over-much of thy heart's grief ; write, and take it and recite it to the Master. Set thy heart on [the delineation of] his glorious qualities, and receive from him a rich reward."

8. *Saná'i of Ghazna.*

This poet at one time made a collection of the poems of Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán, which he arranged in the form of

¹ According to the *Burhán-i-Qāfi*, *zar*, besides its ordinary sense of 'gold,' has the meaning of 'albino.'

a *Diwán*. It happened that by mistake he incorporated amongst them certain verses by other poets. Thiqatu'l-Mulk Táhir b. 'Alí called Saná'í's attention to this inadvertence, and Saná'í made his apologies to Mas'úd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán in the following very distinguished *qiṭ'a*, in which, after the customary laudation, he says (*Or.* 3302, *f.* 210*) :—

چون بدید این رهی که گفته تو،
 کافران را همی مسلمان کرد،
 کرد شعر جمیل تو جمله،
 چون نُبی را گزیده آنسان کرد،
 چون ولوع جهان بشعر تو دید،
 عقل او گرد طبع جولان کرد،
 شعرهارا بجمله در دیوان،
 چون فراهم نهاد دیوان کرد،
 تا چو دریای موج زن سخنت،
 در جهان دُر و گوهر ارزان کرد،
 چون یکی دُر ج ساخت پرگوهر،
 عجز دزدان برو نگهبان کرد،
 طاهر این حال پیش خواجه بگفت،
 خواجه یک نکته گفت و برهان کرد،
 گفت آری سنائی از سر جهل،
 با نُبی جمع ژاژ طیان کرد،
 دُر و خرمهره در یکی رشته،
 جمع کرد آنگهی پریشان کرد،
 خواجه طاهر چو این یگفت رهیت،
 خجلی شد که وصف نتوان کرد،

لیکٹ معذور دار از آنکہ مرا
 معجزِ شعرہات حیران کرد
 زآنکہ بہر جواز شعر ترا
 شعر ہر شاعری کہ داستان کرد
 بہر عشق پدید کردن خویش
 خویشتن در میانہ پنهان کرد
 من چہ دانم کہ از برای فروخت
 آنکہ خود را نظیر حسان کرد
 پس چو شعری بگفت و نیک آمد
 داغ مسعود سعد سلمان کرد
 شعر چون دُر تو حسود ترا
 جگر و دل چو اسفل و مرجان کرد
 سخن عذب سہل ممتنع
 بر ہمہ شعر خواندن آسان کرد
 چہ دعا گویمت کہ خود هنرت
 سر ترا پیشوای دو جہان کرد

“ When this thy servant saw that thy verse converted infidels
 into true believers,

He collected thy beautiful verse, compiling it as [the Companions
 of the Prophet compiled] the Qur'án.

Seeing in thy poetry the advancement of the world, his
 intelligence circled round [i.e. allied itself with] his
 inclination.

When he had collected together all these poems in an *Anthology*,
 he made it a *Diwán*,

So that thy verse, like a tossing sea, made pearls and jewels
 cheap in the world.

When he had made a casket full of pearls, he made the impotence of the thieves its guardian.

Tāhir told this matter to the Master; the Master uttered one observation and made it a proof:

He said: 'Yes, Saḍ'ī in ignorance has associated the Qur'ān with the filthy rubbish of Tāyyān.¹

He hath strung together on one thread pearls and cowries, and then hath scattered them.'

When Master Tāhir had spoken thus, thy servant was overcome by shame which cannot be described:

Yet do thou pardon me; for the miracle of thy verse confounded me,

Because, in order to reward thy poetry, the verse of every poet who has sung

In order to display its admiration, concealed itself in the midst.

How do I know whether, to secure a sale, he who made himself like unto Ḥassān [b. Thābit]

When he produced a verse, and it was good, ascribed it to Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān?

Thy pearl-like poetry made the heart and liver of him who envied thee like rubies and coral.

Thy sweet simple-seeming verse made it easy to all to recite poetry.

What prayer shall I offer for thee, for indeed thine own genius hath made thee the leader of the two worlds!"

9. Mu'izzī.

Taqiyyu'd-Dīn Kāshī cites these verses of his in praise of Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān²:—

شریف خاطر مسعود سعد سلمان را
مستخر است سخن چون پری سلیمان را

¹ I.e. Tāyyān of Bam in the province of Kirmān, known as "Zhdzh-Khā" ("the dirt-eater"), an opprobrious term which Ridā-qulī Khān (*Majma'ul-Fuṣahā*, vol. i, p. 328) confesses himself unable to explain satisfactorily.

² I have not looked for them in the *Diwān* of Mu'izzī.

نسیمِ وحده که نو حله دهد هر روز
 ز کارگاه سخن بارگاه سلطان را
 حکایتِ خردش روشنی دهد دل را
 روایتِ سخنش تازگی دهد جان را
 ز شادی ادب و عقل او بدارِ سلام
 همه سلامت و سعد است سعد و سلمان را
 اگر دلیل بزرگی است فضل پس نه عجب
 که او دلیل بزرگی است فضل یزدان را

*"Verse is in subjection to the noble mind of Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán as were the fairies to Solomon,
 That incomparable tissue which, from the workshop of speech,
 daily gives new adornment to the Sultan's court.
 The utterances of his wisdom give brightness to the heart :
 the narratives of his verse give refreshment to the soul.
 Through joy at his culture and intelligence in the Abode of
 Peace (i.e. Paradise) all peace and happiness accrues
 to Sa'd and to Salmán (the poet's father and grand-
 father).
 If merit be a proof of greatness, then it is no wonder that he
 is the proof of the greatness of God's Bounty."*

In another passage he says, praising him :—

تا هست تیغِ گلها در برق و رعدِ نیسان
 تا هست سوزِ دلها در زلف و جعدِ جانان
 تا با فساد باشد همواره کونِ عالم
 تا با وعید باشد پیوسته وعدِ یزدان
 در مجلسِ بزرگان خالی مباد هرگز
 پیرایهٔ بزرگی مسعودِ سعدِ سلمان

آن شاعرِ سخنور کز نظمِ او نکوتر
 کس در جهان کلامی نشنید بعد قرآن

"So long as the budding¹ of the roses is in the thunder and lightning of April,

So long as heartburnings are in the curls and tresses of the Beloved,

So long as the order of the world is associated with decay, so long as the promises of God are conjoined with threats,

So long in the assembly of the great may there never be wanting that ornament of greatness, Mas'ud-i-Sa'd-i-Salmán!

That eloquent poet, than whose verse none hath heard words more beautiful since the Qur'án."

In conclusion, I desire to express my hearty thanks to Professor Browne, who is so deeply interested in all matters connected with Persian and Arabic literature, for the warm encouragement which prompted me to compile this article, as well as for the trouble he has taken in translating it into English.

MIRZÁ MUHAMMAD.

London.

Safar, 1323 (November, 1905).

¹ This meaning of تیغ (in the sense of "arising," "growing up," "sprouting from the earth") is embodied in the compound verb تیغِ زدن.

III.

THE PAHLAVI TEXTS OF YASNA LVII-LXI
(Sp.; IN S.B.E. xxxi, LVIII-LXII),

FOR THE FIRST TIME CRITICALLY TRANSLATED.¹

By PROFESSOR LAWRENCE MILLS.

YASNA LVII (Sp.).

THE FŠŪŠA MANØRA.

THE TAT SOKIDIŠ CHAPTER: THE BEGINNING.

INTRODUCTION, 1-9.

The Holy Service and the Cattle-culture Benefit.

TO that Beneficial Farming result (literally 'to that cattle-culture profit'), (and) to the Praise (i.e. to the Celebrated Service), do I devote my desire² (i.e. do I turn my prayers). Which is (i.e. the above means): toward the Praise of the good seed (having the prospect of future beneficial results in cattle-breeding and harvest in view, do I turn my prayers). [It is (above all and as including the above) quite necessary to turn (our desiring prayers) toward the Dēn (possibly meaning 'in accordance with the Dēn'), and toward the profitable (result).³ From that on they

¹ The texts from which these translations are made are expected to appear in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* during the course of 1906. Translations into Sanskrit, Parsi-Persian, and Gujrati, made upon texts not collated and otherwise of an uncritical character, have alone preceded this. The [] contain the glosses, () my own explanations.

² So, in great error. 'Desire' was seen in ver; cf. vereθrem.

³ There is some question as to whether actual 'agricultural profit' was not meant; but in course of time this harvest Hymn lost some of its healthful point.

should make it their own (or meaning 'do it (?) of themselves')],¹ (2) [even toward it (the beneficial result; see above), let us devote our desiring prayers] with the concurrence of Aši (as the Consideration of Recompense,² and as the representation of wealth for the reward) [of themselves it is necessary so to act (or 'it is necessary to make that their own'), when they would accomplish the Priestly course of Studies prescribed by Aši (as the Venerating Recognition of the Recompense)²; also to it, the Profit and the Service, they should offer their desiring prayers] with the concurrence of Perfect Thinking³ (i.e. with Perfect Reflection and Investigation the above indicated course of action is to be pursued) [when (meaning 'in case that') they should completely carry out a course of Priestly Studies (in reference to the duties of the Sanctuary, and to Agriculture as sanctified by the Religion of the State)].

(3) The Seed (meaning 'the cattle-breed,' or 'the effective grain seed' as a figure of speech);—the seed of which Service (meaning 'its effective generative result') is 'from'; (that is to say, 'it is derived from') the good Thought, the good Word, and the 'good Deed' (as exercised in the labour involved in the occupations named); [and so it is offered; that is to say, the seed is derived from that place where 'good thought' is at home.⁴] (Of course, 'man' must be construed as = *yēuhyā*, which agrees with *nemañhō*, but the Commentator looks back to the *sōiḍiš*; hence this *čiθrem* = *tōχm* as 'profit' in the sense of *fšūs*, 'cattle-profit'); (4) and that Praise of ours (the Universal Public Religious

¹ So, better in the concrete, of the actually attending congregations. Can it mean that here the congregations are to carry on the celebration 'of themselves'?

² That Aši means 'justice in the light of acquisition,' as 'reward,' or as 'result' in the original at times, is quite sure, and the moral idea was even sometimes quite lost in the idea of the 'result' as reward. It even seems at times to mean 'property' or 'wealth.'

³ Notice that *ār(a)maiti* is not here 'the earth,' as we might more naturally expect in this Harvest Mantra.

⁴ This Mantra's original looked toward the harvest as its objective. A later glossist brings in the interior virtues.

Service) shall¹ save us from the hostility of the Demons, and from that of [evil] men.

(5) To that Praise (i.e. to the established Celebration of Public Worship) do I deliver an inviting² announcement, and to it do I deliver also the settlements and (our) persons for³ (so = *barā*) protection and for direction ('chieftainship') and for careful observation (literally for 'oversight').

(6) I desire this praise (the Celebration of the Sacrifice, etc.), O Aūharmazd [from (the consecrated) persons]; for (their) praise (there is a desire) even to me; that is to say, (to me⁴ there will be) satisfaction [which (shall be realised) in that time when they shall fulfil duty and good works].

(7) And (this) Service (the Established Religion) would I accept for myself; and I would (therefore, indeed and again) announce the Service (with invitation); (8) and I would consign (or announce) the Settlements (and) our person(s) (to it) for⁴ protection, and for direction, and for further chieftainship, and for (close guardian) observation.

(9) Yea, to the Service⁵ (do we thus declare, and to it do we confide ourselves and our interests), when so it is a Service offered on to You.

¹ The imperative in -ātū must have been seen; from this the '*barā*' = 'shall' rather than 'will' (save us).

² Is there no trace of the meaning 'invitation' here; see the verbal form in the original rendered by *yehabūnam*.

³ '*Barā*' must be used in this sense here; the oblique case was seen, and recognised as dative.

⁴ *Barā* in this sense.

⁵ In order to acquire the interior meaning here we should do our best to grasp both original and Pahlavi in the concrete. 'Praise' seems to be the theme of the introduction, but it would be a great dereliction as to duty if we rendered the word in that flat manner only. 'Praise' of course means here attendance upon (or 'attention to') the Celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, as a good Churchman might say. Worship was regarded in the most concrete sense of personal action with interior sincerity, but solemnly celebrated in fullest ritual. The interest held in view was no improper one, when we at the same time describe it as a 'rational Priestcraft.' If the Priesthood could not sustain the services of the Sacrifice, of course the national Faith would dissolve.

THE MANŌRA.

The Cattle Chief.

(9) The Cattle Owner (as represented by the Chief of the local Cattle-Culture) is even the Saint (meaning the 'typical excellent Citizen'); and he is successful (lit. 'victorious,' successful as the One who is predominant), and the best¹ (possible)—even the cattle-thrift Maker (is) a benefit to (all of) us.

The Herd's Father..

(10) He (it is) who (is) the Father of the Herds [that is to say, he² produced them]; and Aša Vahišta increased [the Profit³], and also (established = increased) the Saints (see the original; that is to say, his influence formed their character); and the other ['Yazats' (work with him)]⁴; and the desire⁵ of Aša is strong⁶ (within him, or 'in his favour'). (So is he the Father) of the creation (see the original stoīs) [of the entire creation (gen. by position) (he was the Father) when it desired Aša, (or 'when Aša desired it'; and then) their Father he (the Cattle Chieftain is); (see Y. XXIX, 2)]. (The reading aōjist (for aōjišt), so C.; the Parsi-Pers., translating 'buland,' would relieve the intricacy, though A., B. otherwise and also the original require a 'stī'; zag

¹ See the original.

² This looks as if Ahura were meant; but see below.

³ B. (D., Pt. 4) reads Artavavahišt, as a mere gloss to Aharāyih, which would leave -ñhačā unrendered; 'increased the profit' looks clumsy enough; but see Profit as the theme throughout; va hūtvaxšt, 'beneficently produced,' is also awkward. One might think of 'hamtvaxšt.' If we read va sūtvaxšt the question arises, 'What does it translate?' I can only suggest, as often, that -ñhačā must have once stood in an Avesta-Pahlavi character, which being so indefinite as to 'n' and 'v,' the word may have looked like vaxšt as 'h' was expressed by the same signs as *kh*, *χ*. Or hač = 'to accompany in a friendly manner,' might have been tentatively rendered 'prosper,' 'increase.'

⁴ Hardly 'he produced the other Yazats.'

⁵ A curious mistake which occurs elsewhere, -vairī, the feminine possessive suffix, was seen as a form of var = 'to choose,' 'to desire.' Have we here another double translation? Whence comes 'other'? Was -apara also seen in -avairya- owing to the original early character? Or did hā(čā) suggest hā(n)?

⁶ Aōj- was, as elsewhere (?), suggested by the external form of -aōscā; ō would be rendered by the same sign as 'j,' but what suggested hamāk?

hamāk stī looks also the more like gloss, as the first stī ends the original. I put the stī in the gen. by position, as the original so indicates. With the reading ān ič stī we can only render 'and the desire of Aša is even for the world.')

(11) Manifestly (i.e. publicly) is he (the thrifty Chief, the ideal Husbandman¹) the (public) Benefactor² for whom (so better, see the original) Ye³ are the producer(s) of greatness (i.e. of 'predominance'), O Ye August Immortals, and of goodness (meaning 'of happiness'), of a benefit (meaning 'of general prosperity').

(12) And (may) that Chief Yeoman also (be) our Chieftain as to the spiritual⁴ interest; (may he be) also a watchman over us [for earthly things] in view of the continued existence (sic, haḍa-dahešn = hadā) of the sacrifice to Aša, and of the work and agriculture⁵ [of the 'others'] (not of the 'duty and good works' with some MSS.; see the original) and of forth-flowing bountifulness (lavish generosity) and of partition⁶ and genial character (lit. 'hate-absence') as regards also to (or 'by means of') the (Holy) Fire created by Aūharmazd.

¹ The leading Yeoman Chief representative of the agricultural interest was always held in view. Cf. Y. XXIX, 2; Gāθas, pp. 22, 412.

² B. (D., Pt. 4) has daχšak = 'sign' possibly in view of āškarak, but erroneous for dehāk = dehak; see the original.

³ See the Amešaspend below. This havēt which I put in the 2nd pl. with kartār for kartārān with kartārīh: 'Yours is the production . . .'; hardly 'Ye are the production . . .'; see the Amešas below, is in any way a mistake. Was the 2nd person, though in the plural, suggested by the -ahi of -mahī, so mistaken for a 2nd singular, as elsewhere?

⁴ Was this mēnavadih suggested by the terminations -ratū of nišanharatū, etc.

⁵ The Cattle-breeder with the Agriculturalist held a position analogous to the great grain or cotton Leaders of other lands and of other days. Cattle-culture was the all-in-all of the national resources, and Political Economy was of the most rudimental type, but for that very reason it was all the more vital to the national existence, enabling it to maintain itself upon its original basis as a law-abiding community. Aside from agriculture 'freebooting' was the usual resource, and freebooting was Aēšma. Cf. Y. XXIX, 1.

⁶ Meaning 'sharing with the poor.'

Appeals for Protection.

(13) As we have been created by [You], O Ye Amešas-pentas, so do Ye grant us saving protection.¹ (14) Do Ye grant us protection, O Ye Good ones, Ye Males² (so, referring to the non-feminine names; hardly 'to us men'): do Ye grant us protection, O Ye Female Ones² (with names in the feminine), Ye Amešas-pentas who rule aright; (i.e. 'who rule justly over us'), Ye who are well-giving ('who give generously').

(15) Not one other than You [and (Omni)scient³ Ye are; —not a person (other)] do I know [from whom benefits (so come) as from You], (and as) a revering recognition⁴ (= ašā (so), or 'reward' (sic)) [which I would fully make effective, i.e. 'realise']; so do Ye afford us protection.

(16) And (continuously) on do we offer Herd and Man to the August Spirit⁵ with our thoughts (i.e. intentions), with our words and deeds, which Herd [is Aūharmazd's⁶].

Health from Ahura.

(17) The Herds and Settlements of Aūharmazd are healthy [that is to say, from Him is the thoroughly healthy (element)], the healthy flock, the healthy man;—all are (healthy as) the manifestation (meaning 'the result' or 'the creation') of Aša (as the holy Spirit of the regulating Law⁷).

¹ From the raids of Aēšma; see the Gāthas.

² Males with the neuter names Aša, Vohuman, and Kh.; females with the names in the feminine, Aramaiti, Haurvatāt, and Ameretatāt.

³ The 'Intelligent, the knowing One,' as applied to Aūharmazd, meant, of course, the 'superlatively intelligent One'; the grammatical form mistaken. 'None other than You' is a Gāthic expression.

⁴ It would be a pity to abandon altogether the idea of 'fearing consideration' for tarsakās in B., which word, however, tarsakās, elsewhere renders aši where it, 'aši,' occurs almost fully in the sense of 'wealth' as a reward. C., the Pers., often renders bandagī.

⁵ So with the better texts, A., B.; see the original; but Sp. has spendarmad.

⁶ Was this suggested by the outward shape of haurva-?

⁷ The grammatical form is not reproduced.

Illumination for those having the Gift of it by Right.

(18) The gift of the Creator is the illumination¹ for those having a right to gifts. [The meaning is that what it is possible or proper to give to him (the one having (the right to) gifts) he gives it to that one (the gift-having one) to whom it is quite proper to give it], and within it (the illumination) let me see² (it) together with (i.e. 'let me² see it circumstantially together with'³) what (is the illumination, or 'the gift') of Aūharmazd.

To the Fire⁴ (an animating insertion).

(19) Praise to Thee, O Fire⁴ of the Lord, who wilt come at the greatest matter [at the resurrection (so the Pers., lit. 'at the advanced completion') the future body].

(20) For the help of the great (matter), for the joy of the great (cause) let there (be a) giving (infin. for imperv.; see dāidi) of Haurvatat,⁵ healthful weal,⁵ and of Ameretatat Deathless-long-life.

(An Interpolation.)

(21) I sacrifice to the complete⁶ set of the Staota Yasnya⁷ (so meaning, the complete arrangement and delivery in the sense of practical edition; i.e. furnishing complete for the service).

¹ The grammatical form is not reproduced.

² The erroneous -ānd (?) should of course be read -ānī; see the original; elsewhere in glosses this is justified; but I believe that the correct -ānī is seldom, or never (?), written, not even in the Pers. With the impossible -ānd, 'let them see what are the characteristics of Ahura'; or 'let them look upon me who am Ahura'; but see the original. ī is understood; see the original.

³ So, 'with which,' as recognising the influence of 'hām,' or possibly the instrumental of raočēbiš was expressed.

⁴ We must not forget that the sacred Fire upon the Parsi Altars was, and perhaps is still by some, supposed to have come down from Ahura in Heaven, and most appropriately represents the most searching form of purity. As the Manōra was doubtless chanted in presence of the Fire, these frequent choruses to it are natural.

⁵ Hardly here 'water and fuel,' as the first does not agree 'with fire.'

⁶ Hān of the original is absorbed (so to speak) in hamāk.

⁷ Those parts of the Yasna which are of the nature of Yasts; so I conjecture. The interpolation seems awkward; it was probably meant to stir up the chanters and the Priests in the course of the celebration.

*The Fire again, as Ahura's Body.*¹

(22) Beautiful (so better than 'good' here) is this Thy body,¹ [and also to Your] bodies² (see the original) do I offer a proclaiming-invitation,³ O Aūharmazd [that is to say, within the world will I proclaim that this Thy body is the most beautiful (lit. 'better')].

Spiritual Approach.

(23) To this illumination [that is to say, to this illumination (of the heavenly bodies as if in view)]; to the highest of the high let me come on [that is to say, to that called the Sun-track; that is, may our Soul come on to the beyond (so 'may it arrive even there')].

To the Antiquity of the Holy Lore.

(24) I sacrifice to the Staota Yasnya⁴ which are the product of the primeval world [that is to say, that which first was, through it (or 'in it') existed the Gāthīc law]. [(Rubric.) At this place, i.e. at this point in the Yasna, the Zōt places his hand upon the holy water receptacle and pours water into it.⁵]

¹ Referring to the brilliant flame. Recall Heraclitus. The first three words of (22) are not translated.

² The Stars are elsewhere His body. A curious expression this plural 'bodies'; it has reference to the plural 'stars' here understood.

³ I cannot shake off my recognition of 'invitation' as part of the idea here and elsewhere present; and this in spite of the glosses which persistently render merely 'proclaim.'

⁴ That portion of the Yasts which is introduced into the Yasna Service; so I conjecture.

⁵ This last translation (of 24) needs technical corroboration on the part of those familiar with the details of the sacrifice.

YASNA LVIII (Sp.).¹

To Victory (i.e. to Success), and to the Princely Saviour ('the One about to Benefit').

(3) I sacrifice to Victory, the Aūharmazd-made One, and I sacrifice to the Saošyañt, the Beneficent, the Victorious. [(Rubric.) At this point the Barsom is to be taken up from the Māhrū according to regulation. Also the persons celebrating the Sacrifice at the same time with (or 'at') this point are themselves to advance the frāgam (sic, the forefoot of the Barsom even with the lower end of it (the Māhrū); also when this is done the Māhrū is to be set again in its place).]

(The translation of this rubric is again conjectural, and the items of the ceremonial may indeed have changed with time.)

To the Barsom.

(4) I sacrifice to this Barsom, together with the Zaoθra, with its (the Barsom's) girdle-band, spread out with aša (the sacred-regularity); (5) and I sacrifice to his² (my client's) own soul and to his (my client's) own² fravaši.

To all the Yazats.

(6) And I sacrifice to all the holy Yazats, even to all the Ratu (-chiefs) of Aša (as the Holy Law), [and to every holy Yazat] (7) at the (appointed) ratu (the ritual-time-and-service) of Hāvanī, at the time and service of Sāvaŋhī and at the ritual time of Visya, and to all the greatest Chiefs at their ritual-times-and-places (in the service).

¹ For the text of Y. LVIII, 1 (Sp.), see Y. XVII, 56-69, and for the text of 2 Y. XXVI, 1-33 (Sp.). For my text of Y. XVII see J.A.O.S., July, 1905; for my Y. XXVI see a possible future contribution.

² The word 'own,' as elsewhere in similar places, is here intended to be really indefinite. It refers to the 'soul' of the party in whose interest the sacrifice was being celebrated; here, I think, the idea is associated with the Zaoθar likewise.

An Antiphonal (here introduced to solemnise the Celebration).

The Rasvīg (Ratu) addresses the Zōt (Zaotar). [(The Rasvīg is to say the following standing ¹ at the place of the Frabaretar.)]

(8) Good art thou (perhaps meaning 'fortunate,' 'beatified'; and for the sake of Thee (meaning merely 'for thee') may that happen to thee which is better than the good,² (9) to (thee) thyself may that happen of which thou, O Zōt, art worthy, (10) for thou art on thine (own) account worthy of that reward, (thou) who art a deserving Zaotar (11) advanced in good thoughts, abundant in good words, and advanced in good deeds

The Zaotar reciprocates in response.

(12) May that come to you (likewise) which is better than the good [that is to say, (may) 'sanctity' (be thine) (in the way of ritual rank and merit)].

Deprecation.

May that not happen to you which is worse than the evil [(this last is repeated in some MSS. The Ahuna-vairya follows): As is the will of the Lord . . . the Benefit of Aša is the best . . . (this Ašem Vōhu) is to be said twice to its end)].

(13) I sacrifice to the Ahunaver, and to Aša Vahišta the Beneficent,³ the Immortal and the August, do I sacrifice.

¹ One might think that the following was rather the meaning: The Ratu is to say (the following) from the beginning (from the foot) in place of the F.; but 'bun' is used for 'beginning.' Upon these technical rubrics referring to particulars in the movements of the Priests in the sacrifice, of course, only the Local Priests have full information.

² Y. XLIII, 2. Organic embodiment of ideas; not mere external citation.

³ So for A., sraēsta-, which we should more naturally render 'the beautiful,' referring to the Fire which Aša later represented.

And I sacrifice to the Fšūš-Manθra, the Hadōxt, and to the Entire Collection of the Stōt Yašt which the primeval world produced. [(The Yeñhyā Hātām here recurs.)]

The Antiphonal resumed.

The Zōt (Zaotar): As is the will of the Lord, [as is the will of Aūharmazd], (as a) Zōt speak forth to me.

The Ratu, responding.

As is the will of the Lord, [and as is the will of Aūharmazd], thou who art the Zōt speak forth to me.

The Zōt (Zaotar) rejoins.

As is according to the ritual regulation, and as using a Destoor's authority from Aša [in every way], I declare the sacred duties and doctrines with intelligence [that is to say: with full learning I declare that all duty and good works are to be done according to the Destoor's authority as Aūharmazd wishes].

YASNA LIX (Sp.).

Blessings upon the Home.

A Household Priestly Visitation and Service at Domicil.

(2)¹ May those propitiations come to this House which are those of the Saints; and may the venerating rewards (gained for good works) come also here, and the giving away² and the free-acceptations,³ may those come up now to this Vis (this Hamlet); and (may) Aša (also come) and the Sovereign Authority and the Solid Gain and Glory and Splendour (or 'ideal comfort'),

¹ For the text of 1 see Y. XLIII, 3, Gāθas, pp. 158, 511; šaēte = ketrūnēt suggested 'Home.'

² Dab = 'to deceive,' not being seen; the letter z was read as y; not so in Y. LIII, 1.

³ Mutual approaches of the worshipper and the object of his devotions.

(3) and what is the long advanced [Authority, the Vanguarding of it] which exists through this Dēn, the Religion of Aūharmazd and of Zartūšt.

[(As to the word) pēš, (it refers to leading authority in a household); for (it is) clear that the household authority of the householders¹ in a house should not be enforced by all (meaning 'both') (the man and wife); (this in case) that within (this House) offspring should be born which shall name (or 'bear' the name of) the one whose is the household authority in accordance with (the station of) the householders² (i.e. 'of the Father').]

Deprecations.

(4) May wasting now (at once)² be absent from the cattle of this Vis [that is, the herd of the cattle should not waste].

[In advance (this for pēš); for it is evident that from an entire race (or family) a Mobadship of the Mobads should not be (derived); therefore, within this (Priestly?) House³ let there be a progeny which may present its name as a Mobadship of the Mobads (with especial claims to the Sacred Office).]

(5) May not Aša be a wasting (here), nor may there be a wasting of the force of the strength of saintly men, (6) nor a wasting of the legal Lore of Aūharmazd [(either of) the plaintiff's case or of the defence. Some said ' . . . not a wasting of the legal Lore of Aūharmazd, (adding 'not of') the making of a Lore of (legal) distinctions and of the administering of legal justice'].

The Fravaši prayed for to the House.

(7) Let the Fravašis of the Saints come here, the good, the heroic, the august.

¹ So with the more natural reading mānpatān mānpatih. With magōpatān magōpatih we have a less pointed sense.

² I would now correct my translation in S.B.E. xxxi, in this sense for asištō, asištem, etc., waste, absence, not 'swiftest.'

³ The frāztum patih may have suggested the High-priestly Residence as the scene of this blessing. It was a Holy Office in the Official Home.

Aharišvang's Healing Power.

And may the healing power of Aharišvang be (here) with them (those Fravašis), [and that capacity which is derived from correctness¹], earth-wide and river-long, the sun-track-high. [And may that (further) benefit which is from Aharišvang (here meaning 'wealth') come on.]

(May they, the Healings of the Ameša, come on) and may they (such influences) be as the confirmer(s) of the good (or 'benefit') (curiously seeing a form of stā in išti, so rendering astētār = 'confirmer'), [that is, may they keep them to themselves (compactly)] and be keepers-back of the wicked; may this (influence continuously) increase the splendour and glory of Aūharmazd [as His activity and as His powerful energy]. (Naturally the exact syntax does not here fully correspond with the original.)

Indiscipline deprecated from the House and Order prayed for.

(8) May Asrōš (as Disobedience) be conquered by Srōš (Obedience²) (as driven) from this House; may tumult (i.e. 'non-peace') be conquered by Peace, niggardliness by generosity, impudence by respect,³ lying by truthful speech (the Druj by Aša).

*The Yasna of the Amešas, male and female, within the House :
it should be closely read with private offerings.*

(9) When also within (this house) [they may perform] the Yasna of the Amešaspends and the Praise of Srōš by

¹ These words do not strictly correspond to hačimnāo, the first syllable of which, hač-, is, as elsewhere, rendered by levatā = 'with.' Could a form of 'man' = 'to think' have been seen in -mnāo, so suggesting 'thoughtful regulation' and so 'correctness' with vohu manah also in mind?

² While we should, of course, endeavour to understand these expressions in the sense most egoistic to the Householder, it is clearly impossible to exclude the finer sense.

³ This is a valuable passage to prove the depth of the moral idea in the later Avesta. Here ār(a)maiti, with tarō-maiti, cannot possibly mean the 'earth'; nor can the 'truthful speech' refer only to 'exactness in reciting the ritual,' nor can Aša mean simply the 'ritual law,' nor can sraoša mean anything less than a moral obedience.

the Destoor (so mistaking the paiti of paitišān for paiti = 'master'), (10) [let them perform¹] too the good sacrifice and praise [of the male² Yazats on behalf³ of the men³] and an effective sacrifice and praise of the female² Yazats [on behalf³ of the women³].

Their Offering.

(11) With a good offering (that is to say, with a well-meant and well-appointed offering (let them celebrate this sacrifice)), and with a benefit-offering (that is, with one which seeks to secure and does secure a highly beneficial result), and with an offering of (i.e. motivated by) friendship (that is, with an impulse of affection).

(Response of the Worshippers, or a Prayer of the Officiating Priest for himself.)

The Reward.

(12) A bearer myself may I be of the long [reward]⁴ (which is my own) [may I be].

The Glory, or 'Ideal Comfort' (the Priest speaks).

(13) Let (then) the illustrious Glory never waste away from this House; (14) let not illustrious riches, nor an illustrious original⁵ (and not adoptive offspring).

¹ It is not impossible that we have here another case of double 'translation. γal vebedūnānd or -yēn might be meant to render paitišān, though dātōbar (dāt'bar) renders paiti- with curious error. This, as often, was the translator's mode of giving an alternative translation.

² Male Yazats having names not in the feminine. Female Yazats having names in the feminine.

³ This is the most natural rendering of the words, but it is a little suspiciously intelligent; the glosses may possibly mean 'in special reference to these male (Yazats),' and so of the females.

⁴ 'May I myself be a . . . ' Or 'may we be ourselves bearers.' The 'long' reward recalls Y. XXX, 11, the word naśā rendering the χvā- of χvābairyāt refers rather to the 'self' as 'bringing' than to the person's 'own' reward.

⁵ So, perhaps better than 'legitimate' as I held formerly.

The Householder (?) responds.

(15) My (supreme) comfort (so, better here than 'glory') is observed (carefully watched) [for the beyond] (and so) also [may] Aharišvang [be] on continuously for long (time) a companion with me.

Ahura's Rule.

(16) At thy will, O Aūharmazd, do Thou rule for our prosperity over (Thine) own creatures [that is, do Thou provide Thy creatures with that blessing which is good government]¹

The Wished-for Joy.

(17) In order that (or 'as') we may be rejoiced-in-mind and possessing our souls' desire² (-ištō of vahištō (so) rendered) (here upon the earth; see 'tamā' above) (18) (. . . a gap in the translation) let one give us (the anticipation of) the Better World (i.e. of Heaven. So, missing the case only of vahištō).

The Approach toward Heaven.

(19) Openly even (let me³) come on to Aūharmazd and to (we are hardly at liberty to write 'and with'), and to Aša Vahišta, even to Aša, the Beneficent (we can hardly say the 'beautiful' with the original).

The Beatific Vision.

Let me⁴ therefore see Thee⁵ and come on to Thee, and altogether⁶ (attain) to companionship to Thee.

¹ Here follows from Yasna VIII, 5-7 (or 10-16, to be treated later).

² So following B. (2), Pt. 4; vahištō is not otherwise expressed.

³ Was the 1st personal form used in yehemtūnam from a curious mistake as to the terminal 'ām' of jaseñtām? The 1st personal is in 20.

⁴ Reading -āni see the original and the Pers.

⁵ Recall kat θvā dar(e)sāni; Y. XXVIII, 5.

⁶ Ham (= hamem) + av-, not amān (same characters = 'ours'); not 'ours (be) Thou in companionship.'

LX (Sp.).

The Holy Formulas Apostrophised (pealed forth to Earth and Heaven ; with their Effect).

(1) I proclaim the Ahunaver [that is to say, I declare this thing to the fore (before other things)] between Earth and Heaven.

(2) I proclaim the Ašem Vahištem (the Ašem Vohū) I declare this matter to the fore between Earth and Heaven.

(3) I proclaim the Yeñhyā Hātām (as) the Guest¹ with a worthy (lit. 'good') celebration of the Yasna [this thing I declare to the fore] between Earth and Heaven ; (4) and I proclaim also the Āfrīn Blessing of the pious (saintly) man (the typically correct orthodox citizen), [and the Āfrīn Blessing of the pious of the good men (in general) ; I declare this thing to the fore] between Earth and Heaven,

(The Withstanding and Dislodgment of Angra Mainyu, with his Crew.)

(5) for the withstanding and removal of Ganrāk (read 'Angrāk') Mēnavad (Angra Mainyu) of the evil creation, full-of-death.

The Kaḥereḍas and their Evil Glory.

(6) for the withstanding and removal of the Glory of the Kāstārs² (why not Kaḥastārs? so reading) (of the Kaḥereḍas) men and of the Kāstārs (Kaḥastārs (sic?)) women (Kaḥereḍis),

(7) for the withstanding and removal [of the Glory] of the Kāstār-(Kaḥastār-)party, that of the men, and [of the Glory] of the Kāstār-(Kaḥastār-)party, that of the women,

The Kayaḍas to be Withstood

(8) for the withstanding and removal of the Glory of the Kāstārs (Kayaḍārs) [the men] and of the Glory of the

¹ Aša and Vohū Manah are elsewhere and more than once spoken of as 'lodged' in the body.

² 'Kāstārs' is less rational, or Kaḥadārs (so reading) is nearer Kaḥereḍas.

Kāstārs (Kayaḍārs¹) [the women], (9) for the withstanding and removal of the Kāstār-(Kayaḍār-)party [of the men] and of the Kāstār-(Kayaḍār-)party [of the women],

Thieves and Robbers

(10) for the withstanding and removal of the Thieves and Robbers (or the Tyrants) . . . ,

The Zandas and the Sorcerers

(11) for the withstanding and removal of the Zandas² and the Sorcerers . . . [the meaning of 'Zanda' is that emissaries of the Sorcerers are said to act (i.e. effect their purposes) through the Zanda and the Sorcerer],

Against Contract-breakers

(12) for the withstanding and removal of the contract-breakers and of those who falsify the contracts,

The Persecutors

(13) for the withstanding and removal of the Murderers of Saints and of the Tormentors of the Saints (the Persecuting Opposition),

(Irresponsibles)

(14) for the withstanding and removal of the Law-violators,³ the unholy, and of the tyrants full of death (who execute many of their subjects),

(15) for the withstanding and removal of whatever injurious evil of whatever faithless persons of unholy mind, of unholy speech, and of unholy deed, O Spitama Zartušt.

¹ As the sign for 's' may be read 'y' + 'd' when more loosely written, I should say that we ought to write Kayada = Kayaḍa of the original; or at least Kayastār, as 'd' sometimes goes over to the sibilant.

² Zanda here must mean the use of spurious commentaries perverting the sense of original texts to purposes of evil magic or sorcery.

³ Of those who fatally or seriously injure the Orthodox.

The Expulsant Saviour.

(16) How shall they, the Saošyants, with a thorough expulsion drive out¹ the Drūj from hence [from this settlement], even the Drūj of tyranny, with a thorough expulsion, they, the Princely Leaders (Saošyants, as they are) ?

How do they smite her with (as being of) this nature² (i.e. with her inverted religious custom?) with this Dēn. (How do they drive them hence with (their) Sovereign Authority all those who lack it (who usurp all rightful claims to it), out from all the Kešvars which are Seven ?)

Expulsions continued

(17) for the withstanding and removal of all which is of the creation of the Evil Ones through³ the Praise of Aša (in the Celebration of the legally Established Worship) [and through the sacrifice of Him] who is the Omniscient [Aūharmazd], whose⁴ they are⁵ [that is to say, His Own they are, the Sacrifice, the Zaoθra, and the Yašt-Praise].

Ahura's Will the Law.

As is also the will of the Lord, [as is the will of Aūharmazd], so according to the ritual, [so according to correct practice], from (that is to say, in accordance with) Aša duty [and good works] of every kind (are to be) correctly (done), and duty and good works (are thus practised) correctly as is the will of Aūharmazd.

¹ See Y. XLIV, 13, 14. Gāθas 203, 205, 532.

² This is, of course, erroneous as a translation. The original word is hīm, mistaken here for a Pahlavi χīm, which shows in passing how often Avesta characters were read as Pahlavi, and *vice versa*.

³ 'Through the Praise of A.' is not improper as an explanation of the present participle, if this was seen.

⁴ Aēy represents yōi either by mistake or with freedom.

⁵ Yōi heñti = ye santi is characteristic in Vedic, and does not elsewhere necessarily refer to the elements of worship. 'Yōi heñti' does, however, here refer to the Sacrifice, etc., as indicated in the gloss.

YASNA LXI (Sp.).

(A rubric.) [(The barsom is (here) to be lifted up from the barsom-dān, and praise is to be offered to the Fire, and the Yasna up to its end is to be sung standing (?).)]¹

The Chief Yasna Hymn to the Holy Fire, accompanied with Offerings.

With the Āfrīn-blessing I offer sacrifice and praise to thee, O Fire, Aūharmazd Son, with a favoured offering,² with an offering securing a benefit,³ with an offering for (or of) friendship⁴ and accompanied with a Yašt praise.

[The matter (or business) of the certain (that is, 'of the fixed and firmly regulated') sacrifice, and of the austāfrit of praise and of the effective offering are (now) given (or 'carried out' at this present moment), and the offering of benefit (or 'for happiness'), and the effecting of the increased population of the country and of its protection is to be furthered thereby, and the offering of (or 'for') friendly (help), the effecting of friendly help and of mediation is to be furthered in every way.]

The Fire's Worth and Claims.

(2) Worthy of sacrifice art thou, and worthy of (Yašt) praise, worthy of sacrifice and worthy of praise within (this) house of (our) men (art) thou. [The One (of these two considerations, this fitness for sacrifice on the one hand) makes for thy praise, and the other (this fitness for praise makes) for the āfrīn offering (as most of all an offering due to thee).]

¹ To be said standing. Or 'to the end from the beginning'; as 'sar' = head is used for 'end,' so ragelā = 'foot' may (?) be used for the beginning; but bun' is almost universally used for 'beginning.' I repeat my remark that upon these rubrics I do not possess that experience of ritual details which should make my opinions ultimate; and in fact such usages must have changed with time.

² Hū = 'good,' 'effective.'

³ An 'uštā' or 'benefit-offering.'

⁴ 'Friendship' for vaŋta-beretīm, 'securing friendships.'

Beatitude to him who Offers to the Fire.

(3) Happy be that man, even happy be he who sacrifices continuously on to thee (4) with wood in hand, barsom in hand, and flesh in hand [even meat.¹ Some say (that the last word means) 'which are tied together' (referring to the barsom)], and with a mortar- (or 'hāvanī-') offering in hand (the Benefaction of the Priests).

Expressions of Good Will to it in Sacrifice.

(5) According to regulation wood provided be thou ; according to regulation be thou provided with the perfume,² and so as to regulation provided also with the fat ; according to regulation provided with the (u) pāsai- (not pasin ?) . . . andirons² (?).

Mature and Flaming.

(6) Be of full age³ a chieftain(-guard) ; be of the age for ritual,⁴ a chieftain(-guard), O Fire, Aūharmazd's son !

(7) Be (all) aflame within this house ; be aflame always within this house ; be light-giving within this house ; be on thine increase (as prosperity-bestower) within this house⁵

('till Frašakart)

(8) until the long time to the heroic Frašakart, even till the good Frašakart (the Perfection of all Progress).⁶

¹ As distinguished from 'milk,' sometimes named by the same name.

² C., the Pers., had sitār-i-nimšab, 'the star of midnight.' Possible (?) reference to some extra midnight offering coinciding with the luminous appearance of some star at a midnight ; possibly 'pasin' = 'late' was read ; from this 'the star of (late) midnight.' Other Pers. and Sansk. 'laying on fuel.'

³ The Pers. does not translate.

⁴ Be pious, i.e. 'religious chieftain-guard,' one fitted for the official liturgy of sacrifice.

⁵ Be 'on thy growth' ; 'let there be more fire used.'

⁶ As we should 'till millennium,' or 'till Paradise.'

Rewards for this Devotion sought.

(9) Give me, O Fire, Aūharmazd's Son, (10) speedy glory (or 'ideal' comfort), speedy nurture¹ (*θrāitīm*), quick-begetting (of my family, so for *jītīm*) and abundant glory (or 'great comfort'), abundant nurture, and abundant birth (begetting and child-bearing), [so (to the degree) that there may be no dying-out of life for us. Give us quick (O Fire of Aūharmazd), and give us much]. (11) (Give) learned-understanding² [(so for *mastīm*) that is to say, that I may understand the conclusion of the duty and religious distinctions], and give increasing-abundance (so for *spānō*). [That is, may I understand a matter from (the standpoint of) a thing which is extensive (i.e. from abundant and imposing considerations)], (give me) nimbleness of tongue [that is to say, in order that our tongue may be nimble in the matter of duty and of religion] (and as to) soul [that is, grant that our soul may be holy] (and as to) enlightenment (*uški*) [that is, may that our knowledge be ready (lit. 'in place')]; and (may it the Fire give us) an after-sagacity [(so) I call (it; may it be first (?))] the great [(and then) the ear-heard (knowledge). (Two are) spoken of; (the one, the ear-heard one,³ referred to is the sagacity of the man) who has not (so, *barā* (?)) in the negative sense of 'exclusion') completed priestly studies, and does not understand (how) to utter words of wisdom. (Was 'aērpaistan' suggested by the external form of *apairi āθrem* ?) Some say the meaning is this: the person by whom things are not done radically (in an interior manner it, this sagacity) is not in him.] (One would say that either *masita* or *mazāōntem* was left untranslated here.) (Grant us, O Fire) the intelligence (?), *vīr* (?), (so misunderstanding the *nair-* of 'nairyam' at this place; the 'n' of early Av. had the same shape as 'v');

¹ Possibly 'deliverance.'

² So for *mastīm*.

³ A well-known Zoroastrian distinction between the knowledge which comes instinctively and that which is acquired from without, and yet, notwithstanding this, the higher instinctive wisdom of conscience is here conceived as being imparted by priestly instruction.

but see below; [this (intelligence, *vir*) is that through which they would effect (a purpose practically). (Or was *nar* = 'man' properly seen here, '(grant us) the man through whom they would effect (a purpose)'); and the information (*hūš*, or 'enlightenment' (recurring to the above)) is that through which they would consider (or 'maintain' an opinion); and the sagacity (*χrat'*; see also above) is that through which they would maintain (an opinion) to its effective completion (hardly merely 'for duty.' The *pasçaeta* after *nairyām* is not translated here)]. And (give me, O Fire) that also which is the philanthropic desire¹ [and the power (capacity)] of men [in the matter of duty and religious opinion],

(12) and a standing-on-foot (we must, however, render 'give me a standing on foot'); (and give me, O Fire) an (offspring; so it should be; see the original) [that is, may it be possible to me (so missing the point of the original, which refers to offspring) to do good service on foot (that is, requiring energy and movement from place to place)] and sleeplessness [that is, so that (or 'while') I may not sleep on (aside) from the religiously appointed time], that is, three times day and night, [and more may one not sleep]; (an offspring) 'quick from the couch' [that is, may it be possible to me to be quick (free) from *Bušāsp'* (quick to shake off untimely sleep)]; and give strength (-having-) alertness,² watchfulness [as to what it is needful to do by hand].

Distinguished Offspring asked for of the Fire.

(13) And a name-bearing offspring do thou bestow on me (so, with error, seeing *sruš* = 'to hear' in *tuθruš-*), an offspring original ('mine own, i.e. not adopted'), and one order-giving [to the country (or 'world')³ region

¹ So for 'ham-mart-azūkih.' The cause of this egregious blunder was that 'var' was read as 'nar' = 'mart.' Var probably stood in a quasi-original Av. Pahl. character, in which 'var' and 'nar' would be spelt with the same signs. Then a later hand added as alternative var as *azūkih* = 'var' = 'to desire.'

² The *hervandī* of C., the Pers., seems to be a variant of the *ērvandih* to *aurvant*. *χvāš* *arvandih* would be 'spontaneous alertness.'

³ C., the Pers., has only *šahr*.

(i.e. used to command)] a man of meetings (or 'assemblies'; one whose presence draws and regulates multitudes; *ārāstar yatnī zēb dehendah*)¹ (14) well-grown, well-escaped² from distress [i.e. from Hell], having many men (the head of a clan, or, on the contrary, having 'much intelligence')³ [that is to say, desirous of full knowledge as to what is later (as to what may be indispensable to do later, so, probably taking *hūvīrām* as having reference to 'vīr' in the sense of 'intelligence')],

(15) who enlarges my house and hamlet and district and province, and rustic fields (open country; so here?).⁴ (Or is *sastīm* in *dañhyu sastīmčā* translated *dādistāk* (so C.?) in the sense of 'authority'? I think not; it is *va rōstāk* in C. = *mulχ*.)

Preparation and Heaven.

(16) Give me, O Fire, Aūharmazd's Son, that which may be⁵ a completing preparation⁶ (a soul's *Hāvanī*) even now and till the Eternal Future (lit. 'advance') and the Best World of the Saints, (Heaven,) the shining, the all-glorious.⁷

The Reward and the Činvat.

(17) A seizer⁸ of the reward, may I be [that is to say, may I⁸ make it my own] of the good reward (the effectual

¹ A man with a name to conjure with.

² Hardly 'gaining much booty,' the 'r' is to be read as if a' in a *hū-āp'*, not 'hū-āpar'; the Pers. has curiously 'as having handsome eyebrows'; 'par' suggesting 'ūru,' same signs. *Hū-āp'* = 'well reached.'

³ So the Pers. In the original we should rather defer to *vīr* = 'man'; see the following text, not gloss. The Pers. has *hamrōstar* (sic) = *ham sūrat*, *χādar* = *bar dāst kunandah*, *min tangi* = *az duzaχ*. The above section is one of the most difficult in the Pahlavi Avesta.

⁴ The *-sastī* does not seem to be translated—unless a '*rōd-sastāk*' is to be read for the '*rōd-satāk*' of B. (D., Pt. 4). C., the Pers., trl. *mulk* = *rōstāk*.

⁵ *Havēt* (so), not *āmūχt*, is to be read; so the Parsi-Pers. An *āmūχt* might indicate a glance toward *sah* (*sañh*).

⁶ Erroneously seeing '*sāz*' in *afrašaonghāo*.

⁷ Between the meanings 'comfort' and 'glory' there might be some mediation, if we understand extreme 'comfort' as 'beatification.'

⁸ *Zazē buvē*.

reward) [which is beyond] and of the good renown¹ here (on the earth may I be too a seizer), and of what is the long good² preparation (possibly 'Hāvanī' (?)) for the soul [and of the vision which is upon the Činvat Bridge.]

The Fire Speaks (personified as Haoma was).

(18) The speech-word for³ all, the Fire, Aūharmazd's Son, declares⁴ (to all) (19) for whom they cook the sacred⁵ (meal⁵) and the feast⁶ [that Fire (the one) who sits in the house (declares it); his (is the) assembly (of the congregation to hear his speech; he need not go forth to gain a hearing)].

Its Desire.

(20) The Fire's desire from all (of every kind) is a good offering (one which offers a real value), and an offering bringing especial prosperity (an ušta-offering) and an offering of friendly devotion (spontaneous and delighted, so for vañta) [and on to such offerers, name by name,⁷ will he (the Fire) speak in order that (so for vad) within this offering of a benefit there may be a production (kartan) of a circuit (sic (?)) that

¹ See Y. XXXII; the 'good renown' there mentioned seems to be referred to Heaven.

² The 'long preparation of the soul,' so S.B.E. xxxi, seems to me now to be suspiciously intelligent; perhaps the idea is a long hāvanī-service referring to the first sacrifice of the day at sunrise, when the H(a)oma-mortal (hāvana) was first used. The 'long hāvanī' would be the continuous religious service looked forward to in Heaven, and to the vision (so it seems dōisarih); but C., the Parsi-Pers., seems to read 'vindsari' (sic (?)), 'the overmastership and the gaining of headship,' and it translates with what seems meant for nazūl = 'hospitality,' 'alighting,' 'the hospitality beyond (or 'at') the Činvat Bridge.'

³ Gen. by position for dative.

⁴ E. has a 2nd sing. B. has yedrūnyēn, as 2nd sing. imper.; but we are obliged to follow A.'s burad with the original.

⁵ Why was the evening meal called dahn = 'pious,' or merely 'good'; so the Pers. nek? Possibly because it was the substantial meal of the day, and so entailed more ceremonies.

⁶ Sūr would more naturally mean 'feast' than xurad = 'eats'; so C., the Pers. But in the original it seems from antithesis with the 'evening' to mean the 'morning meal.' Possibly the spit 'sūiri' on which meat was roasted gave the name.

⁷ Or does 'name-by-name' refer to the several objects upon which the Fire speaks?

‘of general priestly defusion,’ or ‘of the bow of Heaven’ (?), that is, ‘of a heavenly state’ (?), and in this offering of friendship (spontaneous and delighted devotion) may there be, O Spitāmān, the making of mediation (between the Saints in conflict or between them and their God)].

The Fire is keen; it searches close the hands of those who come to it for offerings.

(21) To the hand of all the passing men the Fire (keenly) looks,

(22) saying this: What will the comrade bring to the comrade, the friend to the friend, the man going out (among the people) to him even who is (at home) alone [the Fire];

(A gloss to offset the Isolation of the Fire.)

[There a place (in a text) which says thus of the Fire, ‘the charioteer.’ (He is not always sitting and at home.)]

(23) (That passage is): I sacrifice to the August Fire who is doughty, who (is) the charioteer [so it says (i.e. so it reads); its body is lonely (an hermit body; so its character is) the ‘spirit charioteer’].

If Satisfied, it Blesses.

(24) And if he (the sacrificer) brings wood even as they would bring according to Aša (the exact ritual measure due), and the barsom (too) spread forth, with ritual (measure), and the Haḍānaepata plant (25) him afterwards the Fire of Aūharmazd blesses (26) when contented not offended, and (so) satisfied,

Terms of its Benediction

(27) (saying) thus: May a herd of cattle come to thee, and a full advance¹ (great initiative) of men [and a man (-throng) which is young].

¹ So tās seems to have suggested the form rōvešnih. A. has ‘a full-bearing,’ ‘pūr-baresnih.’ It seems as if the idea of ‘motion’ was recognised in -tās = tāts; so elsewhere; ‘tač’ was hardly seen. It looks as if the long ā were read in its Pahlavi value as āi, suggesting a form from i, aē = ‘to go.’

(28) On to thee may follow¹ (as inciting) a desire in accordance with intellect, and a desire in accordance with the soul² [that is to say, with the desired object, which concerns intellect, let that which concerns the soul be right]. (Which would seem to mean 'that the desires excited by perception should be accordant with those excited by conscience.')

(29) With joyful-minded soul live³ in (thy) life during the nights which thou livest³ [this way do thou live⁴]. This is the Fire's Āfrīn-blessing, [and this do thou continually fulfil].

(30) (This is the Fire's blessing for him) who brings it wood dried and looked after⁵ for shining (flame) with respectful longing for Aša, [(with) a religious desire which is for the sake of the duty and good works] of the purifier,⁶ [that is to say, of the just].

(I have met with no passages in the Pahlavi Yasna so difficult as the above; and scholars who have not made close studies in these texts, the crux of the Avesta, might differ from my conclusions much.)

¹ So D. hačāt; C. hātād (? sic) translates kāmah = 'desire,' a mistake.

² The Pers. trl. has dil = 'heart.'

³ Notice the 2nd sing. indic. used as so often as imperv., and then just after in its usual sense.

⁴ Or 'that is' (expressed as often by aē = 'this') 'live according to the (sacred) custom.' But is not this a mere grammatical note? This (zīvih, in form a 2nd sing. indicative, is) a fashion for ziv', the literal 2nd sing. imperv.

⁵ 'Sought out'; iš = 'to wish for' seen.

⁶ As if yaozdatām were seen as the (?) pl. of the participle.

IV.

THE HAYDARABAD CODEX OF THE BABAR-NAMA OR
WAQI'AT-I-BABARI OF ZAHIRU-D-DIN MUHAMMAD
BABAR, BARLAS TURK;

KING OF FARGHĀNA 1494-1502 (899-908 H.); KING OF
KĀBUL 1504-1530 (910-937 H.); FIRST TĪMŪRID EMPEROR
OF HINDŪSTĀN 1526-1530 (932-937 H.).

By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.

(Concluded from p. 762, October, 1905.)

No. IV. *The Bukhārā MS.*

THE opinion that a *Bābar-nāma* exists in Bukhārā rests upon inference and rumour only. It is on record that a copy of the book was made in Bukhārā in 1709 (p. 81), and that in 1824 this copy belonged to a Bukhāriot merchant, named Nazar Bāy *Turkistānī*.

In 1813 it was known in India that there was a *Bābar-nāma* in Bukhārā, since Mr. Elphinstone then sent there for a copy of it for Mr. Erskine.¹

All I have learned about the manuscript of date later than 1813, is in shape of a rumour kindly communicated to me in 1900 by Professor C. Salemann, from friends of his own in Turkistān, that there is a *Bābar-nāma* in Bukhārā, owned by a member of the Amīr's family and highly prized.

¹ What was written by Mr. Elphinstone in 1813 about the Bukhārā MS. may be quoted for the sake of exact information:—

"November 10, 1813.—I did not delay writing to Mīr 'Izzatu'l-lāh at Bukhārā for the Turkish of Bābar."

"POONA, February 14, 1814.—In hunting for the Persian translation of Bābar to compare with yours, I stumbled on the original Turkish, which I have been writing to Bukhārā for and which all the time has been among my books. The Turkish copy derives great consequence from its being the one used by Leyden."

This conjectured manuscript was clearly out of consideration as a rival to the Haydarābād Codex for reproduction. Even if it had been accessible, its minor mutilations, identical in all its descendants, would have made it impossible to photograph successfully and to reproduce without critical work.

It is not easy to estimate the age of the Bukhārā MS. (or manuscripts); according to the most authoritative information I possess, one was copied in 1709 (1121 H.). This information is second-hand only, being derived through Mr. Senkovski. Dr. Kehr assigns a date for his source which two readers—Dr. Ilminsky and Professor Smirnow—have read as 1126 H. (1714). The St. Petersburg University MS. however, has the given date of its source blurred slightly in the hundreds' place, and it may be read as 1026 H. (1617), or, with Kehr, as 1126 H. (1714). There is much to lead to the opinion that Dr. Kehr's copy is the direct archetype of the University Codex, and in the matter of this date, they show a coincidence of unusual position: in both it stands before the end of the short record of 936 H., and in the margin at the end of 935 H. Which is the true date (1026 H. or 1126 H.) cannot be ascertained until the Bukhārā Codex is seen. Dr. Kehr may have miscopied, and the earlier date may be correct.

Great interest attaches to the Bukhārā MS. It may be a really good example, with minor mutilations only; with it may be the "Fragments" (p. 85), in their true place and not amongst the *lūlīs*; and it may reveal authoritative sign of their authorship.

No. V. *The British Museum MS.*

This is a collection of fragments, the last one of which has a tailpiece bearing date just one hundred years after Bābar's death. It is a valuable relic both by its age and by the excellence of its scribe's handwriting. It has been severely criticised in a letter (unpublished) from M. Quatremère to Mr. Erskine, on the ground of its paucity of diacritical points.

The volume was given to Mr. Erskine by Major Yule in 1836, and therefore, was not used for the Memoirs. On a fly-leaf of it stands the note which locates the Elphinstone Codex (*q.v.*) in Edinburgh in 1848; it has the interest, also, of having been lent to M. Quatremère when he was preparing his *Chrestomathie Turque*. From it he copied, perhaps the whole, but his published *Chrestomathie* stopped short and does not include the *Bābar-nāma*.

No. VI. *Nazar Bāy Turkistānī's MS.*

Of the continued existence of this transcript I have no information; what is known is, that it was copied in Bukhārā by Mullā 'Abdu'l-wahhāb *akhūnd Ghajdewānī*, and was finished on Tuesday, Rajab 5, 1121 H. (1709); also that it was the archetype of the Senkovski MS. in 1824. Whether it is a complete copy, or whether, like its descendant, it ends with 913 H., cannot be said. It is identical in defect with what is stated by Ilminsky of Kehr's transcript, and with what stands in the University MS.

No. VII. *The St. Petersburg Foreign Office MS.* (*Dr. Kehr's Transcript*).

The copy of the *Bābar-nāma* which was made by Dr. George Jacob Kehr in 1737 and is preserved in the St. Petersburg Foreign Office, is of great and varied interest. It is a monument of the patient labour of its scribe and of human fidelity to a task assumed, for, in Dr. Ilminsky's well-informed opinion, Dr. Kehr was not expert in Turkī and often worked mechanically. Though his copy cannot have critical value, it has played a part in the history of the *Bābar-nāma* which evokes gratitude.

Dr. Kehr's work only is the Turkī basis of Dr. Ilminsky's imprint; it has had, as sequels, the French translation of M. Pavet de Courteille and Dr. Teufel's discussion of the "Fragments" which it brought to light. With minor omissions, it is complete, and its defects notwithstanding, has done real service to literature.

That it is unfit for photographic reproduction is clear from its western origin, the defects of its archetype, and the inexperience of its scribe.

.As has been said when speaking of the Bukhārā Codex, Dr. Kehr's transcript descends from that MS., but whether directly or not, I am not able at present to judge. Dr. Ilminsky says in the preface to his *Bābar-nāma* imprint that he had no knowledge of Dr. Kehr's source; if he had seen the Senkovski, he would have inferred the Bukhārā Codex. It is remarkable that Dr. Kehr should not have given any information beyond the statement of its date, about the MS. from which he copied, because he has made various annotations in the progress of his transcription.

Dr. Ilminsky had much work to do in the preparation of his imprint; what that work was can be judged best by collation of the imprint with manuscripts and from his own preface. That his work was necessary justifies the supersession of the imprint—now, moreover, a rare book—by the photograph of the Haydarābād Codex. Neither Dr. Kehr's copy nor the imprint amended from it can claim, and Dr. Ilminsky disclaims it for them, to be true in detail to Bābar.

To dwell on the point of the critical inadequacy of the imprint of the *Bābar-nāma* is useful, because it enables justice to be done to Kehr, Ilminsky, and Pavet de Courteille. One has but to look into the gulf which would yawn in *Bābariāna* if unfilled by their work, to be grateful for all. But truth obliges the remembrance that the whole mass, and also Dr. Teufel's discussion of a section of it, must be seen for what it is—a great thing, but collateral only to critical work on the *Bābar-nāma*.

The drawbacks from excellence of the French translation have been pointed out by M. C. Defrémery in a passage which I quote to show the view taken by a fellow-countryman of the difficulties that beset M. Pavet de Courteille's work, and in further testimony of the usefulness of the reproduction of the Haydarābād Codex :—

“ Dans les observations qui précèdent je n’ai eu nullement en vue de diminuer, à peine ai-je besoin de le dire, l’estime et la reconnaissance qui doivent s’attacher au travail de M. Pavet de Courteille. Si quelques erreurs de détail sont bien excusables, c’est lorsqu’elles se rencontrent dans un ouvrage tel que celui que nous examinons en ce moment. Outre que les *Mémoires de Baber* traitent des sujets les plus variés et parfois les moins familiers, même à la plupart des lecteurs instruits, il ne faut pas oublier que M. Pavet de Courteille travaillait sur un texte souvent incorrect, rédigé dans une langue encore mal connue, et qu’il n’a eu à sa disposition que des secours fort insuffisants. On doit donc lui tenir grand compte de la persévérance qu’il a montrée en menant à bonne fin une tâche aussi longue et aussi ardue. Il serait injuste, d’ailleurs, d’oublier que son travail a été achevé et livré à l’impression au milieu des pénibles épreuves que la France et sa capitale ont traversées, pendant les cinq derniers mois de 1870 et les cinq premiers de 1871, épreuves auxquelles sont venues, par surcroît, s’en ajouter d’autres, particulières au traducteur. Cette considération doit aussi nous rendre plus indulgents pour quelques négligences de style ou pour les fautes typographiques, assez nombreuses, qui déparent ces deux volumes, imprimés d’ailleurs avec beaucoup d’élégance et de netteté.”¹

No. VIII. *The John Rylands Library MS.* (Bib. Lindesiana).

The manuscript which now belongs to the John Rylands Library in Manchester, goes only as far as f. 71b of the Haydarābād Codex. It was bought by the late Lord Crawford in Paris in 1865, at the sale of the books of M. Alix Désgranges. It has no colophon nor is it dated, but in the lower margin of the last page there is a confused entry, of which so much is clear, *Dast-khatt-i-Nūr Muḥammad*
. . . . *Abū’l-fazl.*

¹ *Journal des Savants*, 1873.

Nūr Muḥammad is well known by his writings and as the editor of Shaykh Faizī's letters in 1035 H. (1625); he was a nephew of Abū'l-faẓl.

Nos. IX and X. *The Asiatic Society of Bengal and the India Office MSS.*

The manuscripts which belong to the Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Indian Office are closely related and may be described together. From their common errors, from the location of the first in Calcutta in 1800 and onwards, and from the copying of the second in Calcutta for Dr. Leyden not later than 1811, it is tolerably safe to assume that the second was copied from the first. It is a degenerate copy, however, and seems to be the work of a scribe who knew of what he was doing, only the Arabic character. Both manuscripts are modern and without distinction, both defective, and in both are long omissions.

The A.S.B. manuscript once belonged to the College of Fort William; it agrees in style and size of volume with what is set down by Stewart, in his Catalogue of the Mysore MSS., of Tipū Ṣaḥib's *Bābar-nāma*. It has the words *Tūzak-i-bābarī* on a fly-leaf, and bears a tailpiece of no informing value, but of the slight interest that it occurs also on the St. Petersburg University MS.

The India Office copy was made for Dr. Leyden; its date is approximately fixed by the water-marking of its fly-leaves, "S. Patch, 1805," and by the date of Dr. Leyden's death, 1811. It is the only Turkī example owned by the India Office, a disappointing fact, since several circumstances lead to the hope of a better possession there.

No. XI. *The Senkovski MS. (St. Petersburg Asiatic Museum).*

The Senkovski transcript of the *Bābar-nāma* contains the record of the years down to 914 H. It was made from Nazar Bāy's manuscript by Professor Joseph Ivanovitch Senkovski when 24 years old.

Its copyist had the happy thought of copying the colophon of his archetype (p. 81), and he made, too, the following valuable note: "N.B. J'ai achevé cette copie le 4me Mai, 1824, à St. Pétersbourg; elle a été faite d'après un exemplaire appartenant à Naẓar Bāy *Turkistānī*, négociant Boukharī, qui était venu cette année à St. Pétersbourg. J. Senkovski."

Even in the partial transcript made by Professor Senkovski, there are features common to it, the Kazan imprint, and the University MS. which allow all to be referred to a common source. Such are—

(a) All contain a brief account of the battlefield of the Chīrr, which is not in the Haydarābād Codex or in the Persian translations (Haydarābād text f. 8).

(b) All have an erroneous statement which is suggestive of a scribe's mistake, i.e. that Yūnas Khān had two sons, named Apāq and Bābā (text f. 9b).

(c) All have a blank which Ilminsky says is filled by Kehr with a marginal Persian passage (N.B. This is taken from the 'Abdu'r-raḥīm translation). The blank occurs in the Senkovski MS., but without the Persian supplement, and in the University MS., with the Persian in the margin.

(d) All have the same long defective passage which Ilminsky says he made good from other sources (text 204f).

No. XII. *The St. Petersburg University MS.*

The St. Petersburg University MS. was purchased in 1871 from the library of Mīrzā Kāzim Beg. It is modern and bears date 1839. Its relation to the other Bukhārā and Russian transcripts has been mentioned already, and also that it appears to be a direct copy from Dr. Kehr's. Its defects would forbid its reproduction by photography; it not only shares those due to mutilation in its archetype (direct or indirect), but has one important lacuna of its own, i.e. from text f. 284b (*chirūnjī* fruit) to f. 294 (Dihlī and Āgra).

The most interesting thing about the University MS. is that it reproduces the "Fragments" and enables us to know

how they appear in Dr. Kehr's volume, a matter not quite clear from Dr. Ilminsky's preface.

Perhaps a few words of direct statement about these attachments to the recognised text of the *Bābar-nāma* will be useful. They have been referred to already several times, and are of great interest.

Dr. Ilminsky found them in Dr. Kehr's volume and first brought them to public knowledge in his imprint. He has placed them all where their contents require that some of them should stand, i.e. at the end of his volume. This, as he says, was not where he found them. In the University MS. they are interpolated, *en bloc* and without preface or tailpiece, in the middle of an account of the *lūlis* of Hindūstān which occurs at Haydarābād text f. 353.

They consist, first, of a translation from the *Akbar-nāma*, which opens abruptly after the fashion of a fragmentary survival, within 933 H., and runs on through Abū'l-faẓl's account of the battle of Kānwāha. This is what Dr. Ilminsky mistook appropriately for the plain tale of that battle, as told by Bābar and as displaced in his book by Shaykh Zain's Persian description.

Secondly, there is an account of Humāyūn's illness in 937 H., of Bābar's self-devotion to save him, and of Bābar's last illness, death, family, and Court. The whole of this is taken from the *Akbar-nāma*.

These first and second chapters partly supplement Bābar's narrative, the first with a completion of the Turkī text where only Persian stood, the second with information which is not or could not be given by Bābar. All is what it might well occur to a man who was content with his knowledge of Turkī and ambitious of perfecting a great ancestor's record, to add to that record. In this lies circumstantial evidence that the "Fragments" are Jahāngīr's (J.R.A.S. 1905, p. 756).

Thirdly, there is a set of biographies of certain Chīngīz Khānids and Timūrids.

Fourthly, there is a copy made from a much mutilated original, of part of the record of Ṣafar, 932 H. This has only

the interest of exciting wonder as to why it is here. Neither it nor the set of biographies is copied by Ilminsky.

The "Fragments" have been elaborately discussed by Dr. Teufel. He made careful comparison in order to show that the Turkī style of such of them as might be Bābar's, varies from that of the *Bābar-nāma*. This variation might well occur if Jahāngīr had written, or rather translated, these; but it must be said that the last word about the "Fragments" cannot have been spoken by Dr. Teufel, because his sole basis for opinion was Dr. Ilminsky's amended imprint from Dr. Kehr's defective transcript. Discussion on the "Fragments" will hardly be profitable until the Bukhārā MS. has been seen. It testifies to their interest, while it awakens regret, that Dr. Teufel should have spent so much acumen upon a tottering basis of evidence. Neither he nor Dr. Ilminsky nor M. Pavet de Courteille ever used an authoritative text. But his work has great collateral value notwithstanding, and it is a witness to his pertinacity and dogged grip of details.

No. XIII. *The Haydarābād MS.*

The Haydarābād Codex has been photographed and published as the first volume issued under a Trust created by the late Mrs. Jane Gibb in memory of her son, Elias John Wilkinson Gibb. Its unique position amongst *Bābar-nāma* transcripts is shown by the Table of these in J.R.A.S. 1905, p. 752. Its history, so far as it can be traced, is, that it has been owned by four generations of the family of its present owner, who is Mīr Abū'l-qāsim, Yūsuf 'Alī Khān, son of Mīr La'īq 'Alī Khān, son of Sir Sālār Jang, son of the Mūnirū'l-mulk whose seal with date 1206 H. (1791) is twice impressed within the volume.

The Codex is not signed; its nameless scribe could little guess the honour to which his careful work would bring him. Nor is it dated, and no merely inferred date would give clear knowledge of its rank. As an ancient codex,

however, could be copied accurately to-day, and the scribe of the Haydarābād transcript was careful, the point of real importance to us is the date of its archetype.

It must be borne in mind that few copies of the *Babar-nāma* appear ever to have been made.

The Haydarābād Codex contains indications that it was copied from Bābar's own manuscript. The first class of testimony to this opinion is negative, and is conveyed by the fact that it has no marginal notes. If it bore even one of those made upon the Elphinstone Codex, i.e. the one of earliest date, that made by the Emperor Humāyūn in 959 H. (1551-2), the opinion would seem tolerably safe that it is a copy of that "old and valuable" manuscript which I surmise to be either Bābar's own or one made in the year of his death, 937 H. (1530), (J.R.A.S. 1905, pp. 755 and 761).

The Haydarābād Codex, of course, might have been copied from the transcript of 937 H. before Humāyūn's note of 939 H. was made, but it is doubtful if this suggestion could be supported by the testimony of the paper on which it is written. Moreover, another obstacle will be seen after considering the second class of the testimony that Bābar's autograph text was its archetype.

This second witness is borne by certain blanks which have been left here and there in the text, and so left, it can hardly be doubted, because they were under the scribe's eye. All are of one class; all wait for information. In other transcripts, some of these blanks have been ignored and some filled in.

Of the blanks there are—

(1) On folio 27, one that waits for the names of two princesses, which could almost certainly have been supplied by some kinsman who was with Bābar in Hindūstān.

(2) On folio 211b a single name fails, which Bābar might reasonably have expected to learn from some of his many followers connected with Harāt, notably from Khwānd Amīr.

(3) On folio 288 two highly significant blanks can be considered. The first waits for the names of Signs of the Zodiac to be entered as corresponding to those of Hindī

months; the second for Hindī names of the days of the week. These blanks occur in the record of Bābar's first year of residence in Hindūstān, when what was needed to fill them might well be unfamiliar to him.

Further evidence of the value of the archetype of the Haydarābād Codex may be held supplied by the doubled statement of Bābar's departure from Farghāna which has been described J.R.A.S. 1905, p. 749.

All these specialities of the Codex indicate a careful scribe who set down what was before him. It would be much to assume them copied from a manuscript intermediate between Bābar's own and the Haydarābād Codex; since this would demand two successive faithful copyists.

The Haydarābād manuscript contains the maximum of the known contents of the *Bābar-nāma*. It has few omissions; the longest equals one page of the Memoirs (p. 406, l. 13, 'boat,' to p. 407, l. 9, 'river.' Text f. 363b).

Amongst lesser details of the manuscript that the photograph does not reproduce there is a somewhat surprising entry in what looks like an English hand, on a fly-leaf, of a price. The photograph shows a price in *Raqam*; the manuscript has also SRs. 35. One would not expect this, but it may be of recent date.

The manuscript may now be left to speak for itself in the Gibb Memorial volume. It is pleasant that, vagrant dots excepted, it can be accepted as faithful, and that scholars have now this mine for work without the lurking doubt which must beset a transcript made by man.

THE WORK DONE UPON THE TURKĪ MANUSCRIPTS.

The earliest worker upon the *Bābar-nāma* was Shaykh Zain, who paraphrased or translated the diary of eleven months of 932 H. (1525-6). To this he added the Persian *farmāns* which concern the battle of Kānwāha and stand in the Turkī text in their Persian form.

Next came a translation which was begun at the instance of a private individual, by Mirzā Pāyanda Ḥasan *Mughūl Ghaznavī* and finished by Muḥammad Qulī *Mughūl Hīṣārī* in 994 H. (1586). Of this the copies in the Bodleian and India Office Libraries are very incomplete; I have not seen one that contains the whole book. The translation may always have been fragmentary, and this the cause of its non-acceptance, supersession under Akbar, and omission from the book-records of historians.

Thirdly, there is the standard Persian translation of which it is historically recorded that it was commanded by Akbar from 'Abdu'r-raḥīm Mirzā *Bahār-lū Turkmān* and was presented to the Emperor in 998 H. (1590). Derived from this is a modern lithographed *Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī* published in Bombay by Muḥammad *Shīrāzī*.

Next in time, and after an interval of over 200 years, is the translation made of a part of the Elphinstone Manuscript by Dr. John Leyden. This remains in manuscript in the British Museum, ends with f. 180b of the Haydarābād Codex, and was taken into Mr. Erskine's translation of the Persian. Its latest assignable date is 1811, and presumably it went no further because of the death then of Dr. Leyden.

The Memoirs follow, which Mr. Erskine finished in 1816 and published in 1826. They were translated first from the Persian, but in 1813 Dr. Leyden's executors sent to Mr. Erskine Leyden's translation from the Turkī, and this, as far as it went, Erskine worked into his then supposedly finished book. The difficulties of such piecing can be guessed. After this was completed, Mr. Elphinstone sent his *Bābar-nāma*, and the undaunted Erskine once more went through his translation and collated it with the original text. He had with him for at least a part of the time, the Persian Turk who had helped Dr. Leyden.

Next in order of time comes the Russian work and its sequels, the *Bābar-nāma* imprint of Dr. N. I. Ilminsky, which was published in Kazan in 1857, its translation into French by M. Pavet de Courteille (Paris, 1871) and the discussion of the Fragments by Dr. Teufel (1883).

Lastly, there is the reproduction and Index of the Haydarābād MS. already named as published (1905) by the Gibb Trustees.¹

FUTURE WORK UPON THE BĀBAR-NĀMA.

With the Turkī manuscripts now at command, no new text can be created of higher critical value than that of the Haydarābād photograph. All that can be done for the revival of the original book would seem effected by this reproduction.²

What should be done and what is now practicable is so to revise the Memoirs that it would become in contents a critical English text. There can be no question of a new translation; the *Bābar-nāma* has been translated once for all

¹ Two books have been based upon the Memoirs and may be mentioned here. First, *Denkwürdigkeiten des Zehir-eddin Muh. Bābar*, A. Kaiser (Leipzig, 1828). This is a reproduction of the Memoirs. Secondly, an abridgment of the Memoirs, by R. M. Caldecott (London, 1844).

Other items of *Bābariānu* are:—

“Life of Bābar.” William Erskine. 2 vols. (Longmans, London, 1854.)

“Bābar.” Rulers of India Series; Stanley Lane-Poole. (Oxford, 1899.)

“Bābar Pādshāh *Ghāzī*.” Henry Beveridge. (*Calcutta Review*, July 1897.)

“Bābar’s Diamond: Was it the Koh-i-nūr?” H. Beveridge. (*Asiatic Quarterly Review*, April 1899.)

“Was ‘Abdu’r-raḥīm the translator of Bābar’s Memoirs?” H. Beveridge. (*Asiatic Quarterly Review*, July 1900, and October 1900.)

“Notes on the Turkī Text of the *Bābar-nāma*.” A. S. Beveridge. (July 1900, July 1902, October 1905, January 1906.)

A notice of Bābar, with translation of extracts, in Elliott & Dowson’s “History of India,” vol. iv.

The *Wāqī‘āt-i-bābarī* (*Bābar-nāma*) has been written of and quoted from in Turki, in Davids’ Turkī Grammar and in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1842.

² The impression has been made upon me, which is set down merely as a result of work, that the *Bābar-nāma* offers its own difficulty in the way of creating a new Turkī text. It appears to me to demand for this a more than usually broad basis of old and authentic manuscripts; for a Turkī scholar working for the purification of his text from all extraneous to Turki might make his text other than Bābar left it. Bābar’s own manuscript only or a careful and faithful copy could make it sure whether a lapse from Turki form or wording was his or a scribe’s. As his variations have interest; they may sometimes be a collateral outcome (on which the Turkī scholar would enjoy speculation) of the genius of his mother-tongue. Care would be needed not to destroy his own work.

into English by Dr. Leyden and Mr. Erskine. No one could translate again without incorporating what they have done; all future English work cannot but remain loyally under their names.

To revise the Memoirs would be to carry on their work; its revision is needed. It is now a rare book. It was produced under circumstances of difficulty and with poor textual basis. It could be pressed back now throughout its length upon a Turkī mould; it could be compared with good Persian manuscripts for an early reading of the Turkī; into it could be gathered what it lacks, a not inconsiderable amount; it could be checked and guided by all that the past century has added to our knowledge of Bābar's period, scenes, and peoples. Its supplements could be improved from Mr. Erskine's own later and better-based work in his "Life of Bābar." Another book which he did not know, the *Ḥabību's-siyār*, Mr. Beveridge judges would give useful help by details which it has in curiously close agreement with the *Bābar-nāma*, and by supplementing the material used by Mr. Erskine for lacuna A.

Revision would imply less verbal change than might be anticipated from the fact that Mr. Erskine translated from the Persian and collated, and this partially only, with the Turkī. He, who best knew the matter, has set it down that "the style of the Persian translation is frequently not Persian, and a native of Persia would find it difficult to assign any sense to some of the expressions" (Preface, ix). Some change to simpler wording might suggest itself during revision, but this touches the plastic art of translation and the issue is with the worker.

To revise the Memoirs must be a difficult and lengthy task; it demands one special effort towards making it less bewildering to readers. Even those who know it and its period well, must admit that it requires to be led up to by convergent reading, and that the crowd of actors with unfamiliar names and of shadowy personality, oppose a good deal to ease of perusal. Some of the opposition is formal and unreal, I think, and would yield to the free hand of

a faithful reviser, obeying for rule of change, "What was clear to the writer should be clear to the reader."

Leyden and Erskine produced a great book. It remains now for this to take a step forward, and to become greater by the growth of opportunity yielded by the century through which it has lived.

V.

YUAN CHWANG'S MO-LA-P'O.

By G. A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., PH.D., D.LITT.

[After I had completed the draft of this paper, Monsieur Sylvain Lévi very kindly sent me a copy of his article which appeared on pp. 534 ff. of the number of the *Journal des Savants* for October. On pp. 544 ff. he has discussed the question of Mo-la-p'o mainly from the Chinese side, and has come to the same conclusion as that arrived at by me in the following pages. As I have treated the subject from a different point of view, I offer the paper to the Society without making any alteration in the light of his remarks, save for a few footnotes to draw attention to details in which his knowledge of Chinese enabled him to give information which was beyond my reach.—G. A. G.]

YUAN CHWANG describes a country which he calls Mo-la-p'o, immediately after his account of the kingdom of Broach in the modern Bombay Presidency. Up to lately, this name has (with some hesitation) been considered as equivalent to Mālava, the modern Mālwa. Mr. Vincent Smith, on pp. 279, 280 of his *Early History of India*, and at greater length in vol. lviii of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, has attacked this interpretation, and, with a confidence somewhat strongly contrasted with the diffident opinions of his predecessors, maintains that "the learned authors who identify Mo-la-p'o with Mālava, meaning by the latter term the kingdom of Ujjayinī, are demonstrably mistaken." He insists that Yuan Chwang's Mo-la-p'o "clearly corresponds with the modern Bombay districts of Kaira and Ahmadabad, together with parts of Baroda and some adjoining territory." In other words, it roughly corresponds with a portion of what is now called North Gujarāt.

When dealing with Yuan Chwang, it appears to be the usual course to say that he makes mistakes when his evidence is not in accord with what a modern writer wishes to prove. It is very easy to say that Yuan Chwang meant 'east' when

he wrote 'west,' or that instead of a 'thousand' he meant a 'hundred.' Archæologists have been doing this kind of thing since the days of General Sir Alexander Cunningham, and the process seems to have a sort of fascinating comfort; for, once we feel at liberty to alter what Yuan Chwang says, it is only natural to alter it to agree with our theories. Mr. Vincent Smith follows the path laid down for him by his learned predecessors. I am no archæologist, but I do take an interest in Yuan Chwang's reputation for accuracy, and I must confess that some of Mr. Smith's improvements on his text have rather startled me. He alters Yuan Chwang's distance of 2,000 *li* (say 350 miles) to 200 *li* (say 35 miles), and his 2,800 *li* (or 525 miles) to about half. He also altogether ignores the pilgrim's account of the size of Mo-la-p'o. His conclusions have found acceptance; for instance, from Mr. Burn in the last number of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1905, p. 837 f.). And, as none of the scholars whose opinions he attacks have as yet made any reply, I venture to put forward the following reasons for considering that the matter is not so finally settled as he appears to think.

There can be no doubt that, to most people, especially those who do not care to alter the pilgrim's text, the account of Mo-la-p'o has its difficulties, the chief of which is that countries have changed their names and their political connection. Let us first consider this. Modern Gujarāt forms part of the Bombay Presidency. That is a political accident due to British rule. It is divided into North Gujarāt and South Gujarāt by the river Mahī. In Yuan Chwang's time, South Gujarāt was not known by that name. It was called Lāṭa, and his scholiast quite properly alludes to it under that designation. The name Gujarāt was extended to it in modern times. North Gujarāt, or Gujarāt proper, did not get its name, meaning 'the kingdom of the Gurjaras,' till the time of the Cāwada dynasty, which did not commence to reign till a century after his time. Mr. Vincent Smith has quite correctly pointed out that, at the period in which Yuan Chwang wrote, the Gurjaras

were far to the north, in central (or rather west-central) and northern Rājputāna. This altogether tallies with the information given by the pilgrim. So far as I can ascertain, at that time Northern Gujarāt, as a tract by itself, had no separate name. Geographically, it was included in Rājputāna. Politically, it was not connected with Lāṭa (the modern South Gujarāt) to its south, and even in Albērūnī's time (1030 A.D.), although it had then acquired its modern name, it was still looked upon as a part of Rājputāna.

The language spoken to-day in West and South Rājputāna (including Mālwa) is called Rājasthānī. That spoken in modern Gujarāt is Gujarātī. The two languages are very closely connected. In Northern Gujarāt the dialect is still nearer the adjoining Rājasthānī dialects (Mārwārī and Mālvi) —so near, indeed, that the three could be classed together as mutual dialects of a common language. In one part of North Gujarāt the Gujarātīs actually call the local dialect 'Mārwārī,' while the people of Mārwār in Rājputāna call it 'Gujarātī.'

In Yuan Chwang's time, what is now North Gujarāt had Surāṣṭra (the modern Kāthiāwād) to its west, and the ancient Mālava, also called Avanti, to its east. It was wedged in between the two, and in ancient times must have belonged to one or other of them, for the Mahābhārata (e.g. iv, 1, 12) couples the two countries just named in one compound word (*surāṣṭrāvantayāḥ*, the people of Surāṣṭra and Avanti), which it would not do if there were independent territory between them. At the time when this was written, the country was not known by the name of Mālava. As a *local* name, that did not come into use until the Mālava tribe settled in Central India in the first century after Christ (Bhagvanlal Indraji, in *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. i, p. 28). In later times we find both Avanti and Mālava used as almost synonymous; but there is a tendency (as in Albērūnī) to look upon Avanti, with its capital of Ujjain, as distinct from Mālava, with its capital of Dhārā. No doubt, at various epochs these neighbouring states sometimes formed one geographical expression and sometimes two. A glance at the map will

show that the separate Mālava would lie to the west of the separate Avanti. Similarly, in the Purāṇas we more than once find Surāṣṭra, Mālava, and Avanti grouped together as neighbouring countries, with no mention of any intervening tracts, except, perhaps, the Bhil country (including Mount Ābū), in the hills of Central India. Thus (*Bhāgavata*, xii, 1, 36) we have, catalogued together, the inhabitants of Surāṣṭra and Avanti, the Ābhīras (the tribe), the Śūdras (doubtful reading), the Arbudas (of Mount Ābū), and the Mālavas, while the older *Mārkaṇḍēya-Purāṇa* (lvii, 52), a Central-Indian work, only mentions together the people of Surāṣṭra and of Avanti, and the Arbudas. There is no mention in either of these of any tract between Surāṣṭra and Avanti or Mālava.

There is no reason for assuming that this state of affairs cannot have existed in Yuan Chwang's time too. He mentions Surāṣṭra as an independent kingdom. But, if Mo-la-p'ō is not Mālava, he never alludes to either of the two famous names Mālava and Avanti at all.

Having attempted to sketch as nearly as we can the actual state of affairs, let us see how Yuan Chwang describes the country of Mo-la-p'ō, and compare his statements with the conclusions of Mr. Vincent Smith.

(1) Yuan Chwang says, "going north-west (from Broach) for about 2,000 *li* (say 350 miles) we come to the country of Mo-la-p'ō" (Beal, ii, 260).

The exact meaning of this is not clear. But, to use Mr. Vincent Smith's language in regard to Gurjara, we may say, *mutatis mutandis*: "The exact points from and to which the distance is reckoned are not known. The distance is equivalent to 350 English miles or a little more, and a point some 350 miles to the north-west either of the town of Broach or of the approximate frontier of the Broach State falls within the limits of the Mo-la-p'ō kingdom." There is nothing in this to prevent other parts of Mo-la-p'ō lying far to the south of this point, so long as we do not have to go through them going north-west from Broach. The pilgrim describes a route taken by him—not the shortest

direct line to the nearest point in Mo-la-p'o's territory. It is evident that he means that he went north-west for 350 miles and then found himself in Mo-la-p'o, which in the very next sentence he describes as a very large country. I therefore quite freely admit—indeed, I think it certain—that other parts of Mo-la-p'o coincided with the east of North Gujarāt, say Ahmadābād and Mahī-Kāṇṭhā, but hardly with Kaira, which is too far to the west. The line north-west from Broach would take the pilgrim across the neck of Kāṭhiāwād, and along the east coast of the Ranns of Cutch.

Mr. Vincent Smith says: "The alleged distance of 2,000 *li* is absurd Evidently there is a clerical error in the figure, which may be conjecturally amended to 200." The use of the words "clerical error" seems to suggest that Mr. Vincent Smith assumed that Yuan Chwang employed the Arabic system of writing numbers, and wrote a cypher too many. Even if he was so far in advance of other Chinese writers, the fact is not very important. Whether it is an error of any kind or not, there is nothing inherently absurd in the pilgrim's 2,000 *li* except that they do not tally with Mr. Smith's conclusions. Assuming that there is no error, the distance would bring us to somewhere about the west of Mārṣār, near the northern boundary of Mallānī. There cannot have been *much* westing, or we should have to cross the Gulf of Cambay and the Ranns of Cutch.

(2) "It is about 6,000 *li* (say 1,100 miles) in circuit" (Beal, ii, 260).

Mr. Vincent Smith does not refer to this statement. The "country of Mo-la-p'o" must have been a large one. A boundary of 1,100 miles indicates an area of from 65,000 to 75,000, or say roughly about 70,000 square miles.¹

¹ The area, of course, depends on the shape of the country. An exact square would give something over 75,000 square miles. A tract twice as long as it is broad would give about 67,000 square miles, and the smaller the area, the longer two of its sides would be. As a *reductio ad absurdum*, a tract 548 miles long and one mile wide would reach half across India, and would have an area of only 548 square miles. Under no conceivable circumstances can a country with boundaries totalling 1,100 miles be got to fit into North Gujarāt.

(3) The capital (name not given) was "defended (or supported) by the river Mo-ho (said to be the Mahī) on the south and east (or on the south-east.)"¹

Mr. Smith urges this to show that the *country*, not the capital, consisted *only* of North Gujarāt. What capital is referred to is doubtful. I purposely abstain from making guesses. I only mention that Mr. Beal's suggestion of Dōngarpur is not impossible. I may also remind the reader that Dhārā, which has been suggested by other scholars, is not once mentioned elsewhere by Yuan Chwang.

(4) "To the north-west of the capital about 200 *li* (say 35 miles), we come to the town of the Brāhmaṇs (or Brāhmaṇapura)" (Beal, ii, 262).

At present we do not know where this was, so that the clue is of little use; but it is worth nothing for future consideration. Mr. Smith does not refer to it.

(5) The country of K'ie-ch'a is 300 *li*, or three days' journey (say 55 miles), to the north-west of the country of Mo-la-p'o, of which it is an appanage (Beal, ii, 265).

So Mr. Smith. If his identification of K'ie-ch'a with Cutch is correct (a point on which Julien was doubtful), we may so far agree that the portion of Mo-la-p'o from which the bearing of north-west and the distance of 55 miles were taken, must have been somewhere in modern North Gujarāt. If it were to the north-west of the entire country of Mo-la-p'o, K'ie-ch'a cannot have been Cutch, but must have been somewhere in eastern Sindh, north-west of Mallānī, which does not seem probable. On the other hand, if K'ie-ch'a is Khēṭa, and if that is the modern Kaira, as suggested by General Cunningham, the point from which the measurement was taken must have been some place in the modern Rēwā-Kāṇṭhā, so that part of Mo-la-p'o must

¹ Since writing the above, I see that Monsieur Sylvain Lévi (*Journal des Savants*, October, 1905, p. 546) interprets the passage as meaning that the capital lay to the south-east of the Mahī. Dhārā complies with this condition, but is a long way from the river. That 'Mahī-Kāṇṭhā' means 'bank of the Mahī' is probably only a coincidence with Yuan Chwang's expression.

have been in the east of Lāṭa.¹ The greater part of Lāṭa must have belonged to Broach, which was a fairly large state, 2,400 *li*, say 450 miles, in circuit.

(6) The country of 'O-nan-tō-pu-lo was an appanage of Mo-la-p'o. This country was 2,000 *li* (say 375 miles) in circuit, and therefore had an area of something about 9,000 square miles. It is no doubt identified correctly with Ānandapura (the modern Vāḍnagar in North Gujarāt), and a kingdom of that size would leave very little for Mo-la-p'o, if Mo-la-p'o was confined to that part of the country. If, however, Mo-la-p'o reached as far north as Mallānī, 'O-nan-to-pu-lo would be a semi-independent state, bounded by it on the north and east. If K'ie-ch'a was Khēṭa,² and = Kaira, then it lay directly to the south of 'O-nan-to-pu-lo, and the two semi-independent states together occupied between them all the western part of North Gujarāt.

(7) Mr. Vincent Smith quotes with approval the remark of a Chinese scholiast³ that Mo-la-p'o is the same as the Southern Lo-lo (Lāṭa) country. This cannot be true if Mo-la-p'o is Northern Gujarāt. It may well be true if K'ie-ch'a is Khēṭa (Kaira), not Cutch. In that case, the east and south-east of Lāṭa (Rēwā-Kāṇṭhā and the Dāṅgs) could well form a part of the large kingdom of Mo-la-p'o.

In all this there are two facts, which, if we refrain from altering Yuan Chwang's text, are fairly certain. One point in Mo-la-p'o was near Mallānī, 350 miles north-west of Broach, and the area of Mo-la-p'o must have been something like 70,000 square miles. We may also assume with some confidence that another point in it lay in the east of the Lāṭa country, in South Gujarāt, i.e. to the east of Broach. Combining

¹ Since this was written, I see that Monsieur Sylvain Lévi, in his article in the *Journal des Savants* already referred to, p. 546, shows that the phonetic equivalent of K'ie-ch'a is Khēṭa.

² See note above.

³ Beal, ii, 260, note 57. The Northern Lo-lo country was, according to a similar authority, Valabhī (*ib.* 266-71). But this would imply that Valabhī lay south of the Mahī, which does not seem to have been likely in Yuan Chwang's time.

these data, and using a pair of compasses, a measure, and a map, we find that such a tract would cover not only the east of modern North Gujarāt, but also South-West Rājputāna, the east of Lāṭa, or modern South Gujarāt, and the modern West Mālwa. The approximate eastern boundary would coincide with the present railway-line running from Indore to Ajmere, but it would not run so far north as the latter town. If we add to this territory of Mo-la-p'o the independent country of Surāṣṭra (including Valabhī), we get almost exactly the tract inhabited by the Surāṣṭras, Avantis, Ābhīras, Śūdras, Arbudas, and Mālavas, of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa.

Finally, in this connection, we can consider Yuan Chwang's account of the kingdom of Ujjain. It is, he says, 6,000 *li* (say 1,100 miles) in circuit, i.e. its size was the same as that of Mo-la-p'o. If Mo-la-p'o = Mālava, then the country of Ujjain, or Avanti, was in his time considered to be distinct from Mālava, as was also the opinion of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa and other Sanskrit works quoted above. It would therefore correspond to Eastern Mālwa and that part of Rājputāna which lies south of Bundēlkhaṇḍ and Gwālīor, a tract otherwise left unprovided for by Yuan Chwang. This extension to the east will account for the distance given by the pilgrim from the Gurjara country (2,800 *li*, Beal, ii, 270), which Mr. Vincent Smith reduces by one half. Yuan Chwang does not talk of the *city* but of the *country* of Ujjain, i.e. of Avanti.

Mr. Vincent Smith would confine Mo-la-p'o to Northern Gujarāt alone. He defines it as the modern Bombay districts of Kaira (Khēḍā, i.e. Khēṭa) and Ahmadābād, together with parts of Baroda and some adjoining territory. Unfortunately, the greater part of this area is already (according to Yuan Chwang as explained by Mr. Smith) occupied by Ānandapura. The area of Kaira is 1,600 and of Ahmadābād 3,854 square miles. Add to this, as a very liberal allowance, 3,500 square miles for "parts of Baroda and some adjoining territory," and we get a total of 8,954, or say 9,000, square miles. Deduct from this 9,000 square

miles for Ānandapura (not to speak of the area of Kaira, if that is what is meant by K'ie-ch'a), and poor Mo-la-p'o, this rich, prosperous, and intelligent country, with two important towns thirty-five miles apart, is left with no area at all.

On the other hand, if we accept Yuan Chwang's own indications, the area of Mo-la-p'o was about 70,000 square miles, which even if we deduct 9,000 square miles for Ānandapura and 7,000 for Khēṭa from the entire area of North Gujarāt—a process which is not strictly required—leaves an ample area for the inclusion of the various tracts mentioned by me above.

As for the Sanskrit equivalent of Mo-la-p'o, I believe that I am right in saying that, phonetically, it *can* be 'Mālava.' It is also difficult to see what name could have been given to the whole of Mo-la-p'o other than the Mālava country, with which, if we accept Yuan Chwang's figures, it closely coincided. Mālava was a large and powerful kingdom, not elsewhere mentioned by the pilgrim, and we should expect him to mention it. The portion of that kingdom which adjoined Valabhī and Surāṣṭra had no separate name in the age of Sanskrit literature, and was part of the Mālava or Avanti country then, as it was in Yuan Chwang's time. The east of North Gujarāt was a part of Mālava, and was as naturally called by that name as the East End, or any other part of the Metropolis, is called London.

I have deliberately refrained, in the course of the above remarks, from discussing two points. One is the question of the identity of the king Śilāditya,¹ regarding whose recognition by Dr. Hoernle and Dr. Stein Mr. Vincent Smith has made such severe remarks. These gentlemen are perfectly well able to take care of themselves, and, as I have already stated, I am no archæologist. My object has been to ascertain what Yuan Chwang could have meant by his geographical information, which was of some importance to

¹ See, however, M. Lévi's remarks on pp. 546-8 of his article.

me while dealing with the Gujarātī language in the Linguistic Survey of India. The pilgrim may have been right, or may have been wrong, in this information. Dr. Stein and Dr. Hoernle or Mr. Vincent Smith may have been right, or may have been wrong, in what they say about Śilāditya. But, for my immediate purpose, that is not of interest to me. All that I wish to ascertain is what, without starting with any preconceived opinions, Yuan Chwang wished, right or wrong, to convey to his readers. I hope that I have succeeded in doing so.

I had another object, and that is one over which I have ruminated ever since, some twenty years ago, I followed on the spot Yuan Chwang's footsteps at Bōdh-Gayā and Rājagṛha, and compared his account with the distortion of it put forward by General Cunningham. That object was to seize the first opportunity that presented itself of protesting against the treatment of the great pilgrim as a person to be followed when fancy dictates, and to be abandoned when fancy dictates. Only the extremest necessity and the most positive proof should allow us to 'correct' his information so as to make it agree with other views on the same subject. To my mind it is absolutely inadmissible to alter his 'east' to 'west' or his '2,000' to '200,' and *then* to found a theory upon the altered text. To do this is to throw back truth into the region of the imagination. It is to act like the old equity-draftsman in *Iolanthe*, who found it difficult to repeal a law, but easy to read and interpret it as if the word 'not' had been inserted in each section.

The other point which I have refrained from considering is the position of Yuan Chwang's 'Fa-la-pi,' usually restored as 'Valabhī.' If, as Mr. Vincent Smith maintains, 'K'ie-ch'a' represents 'Cutch,' it appears to me that this question is infinitely more difficult than he seems to think. Assuming, as I believe to be the fact, that Fa-la-pi does represent Valabhī, there are, in that case, not one but several difficulties to be dealt with, which no one has as yet attempted to explain. As these have nothing to do with the position of Mo-la-p'o, I leave them untouched. It is

sufficient to mention that I think that, if we identify K'ie-ch'a with Khēṭa, Khēḍā, Kaira, all these difficulties, except that due to the Chinese scholiast mentioned above, will be found to disappear.

One word more. If I have assumed the honour of breaking a friendly lance with Mr. Vincent Smith on a question of detail, it should be understood that I in no way claim the right or the learning to criticise his *History* as a whole. As for that, a humble pedestrian amidst the tangled undergrowth of roots and words may claim permission to admire from below its Olympian heights, and to congratulate him upon the success which it has achieved.

VI.

SIAM AND THE MALAY PENINSULA.

By C. O. BLAGDEN, S.S.C.S. (RETD.), M.R.A.S.

IN his interesting paper on "The Nāgarakrētāgama List of Countries on the Indo-Chinese Mainland,"¹ Colonel Gerini objects, reasonably enough, to the claim set up by the Javanese author of the Nāgara Krētāgama that the states of Kēdah, Kēlantān, Trēngganu, and Pahang in the Malay Peninsula and the island of Singapore at the south of it were dependencies of the Javanese empire of Majapahit. This alleged Javanese supremacy over the Peninsula cannot, in view of the known facts of Malay history, have been much more than a mere pretension, never substantiated by any real effective occupation. The claim was, no doubt made under the influence of the stirring events which in or about the year 1377 A.D. culminated in a great, though transient, expansion of the Javanese sway. Palembang, Jambi, Pasei, and Samudra (in Sumatra), Ujong Tanah (the "Land's End" of the Malay Peninsula, now known as Johor), Bangka, Bēlitung, Riau, Lingga, Bentan, and a number of other small islands in this region, as well as certain points on the coast of Borneo and other places to the eastward, are in the Pasei Chronicle recorded as having been conquered by Majapahit at this period or as being tributary to it about this time.

There is little doubt that this was the conquest recorded in the Malay Annals (the Sējarah Malayu), which expelled the ruling Malay dynasty from Singapore and led to the foundation of the new settlement of Malacca. The Javanese do not appear to have kept Singapore, for we hear of no

¹ J.R.A.S., July, 1905.

Javanese settlement being made there; the place simply lapses into insignificance as an unimportant dependency of Malacca.

But so far as the Peninsula itself is concerned, there is no evidence that there was ever any real conquest by the Javanese or any lasting relation of subjection to Majapahit.

In place of this Javanese claim, Colonel Gerini would set up a Siamese occupation of the Peninsula, asserting that "all that territory then belonged unquestionably to Siam, and continued to do so until the advent of the Portuguese at Malacca." Similarly, in his very interesting article on Siamese Proverbs in the Journal of the Siam Society for 1904, he says¹ that "the whole of the Malay Peninsula was under Siamese sway for the two hundred and fifty years comprised between the middle of the thirteenth and the end of the fifteenth century A.D., during which period many Siamese customs, institutions, etc., were introduced to the Malay people."

Malay history is an obscure subject and hardly, perhaps, of very general interest, but in view of Colonel Gerini's recognized position as an authority on matters relating to the history of South-Eastern Asia, it is impossible to pass over in silence assertions such as these, which are contrary to ascertained facts and in the highest degree misleading.² This is the more necessary as Colonel Gerini is not altogether alone in making such assertions. For some centuries past the Siamese have exercised a somewhat ill-defined suzerainty over certain of the northern states of the Peninsula; and in support of this traditional suzerainty (which they often tried to convert into something more substantial) they sometimes roundly claimed that the Peninsula belonged *de jure* to them. But they never, so far as I am aware, adduced any evidence of such an actual occupation as Colonel Gerini asserts; nor does the latter

¹ p. 27 (p. 17 of the article).

² I need hardly say that I do not for a moment impute to Colonel Gerini any intention to mislead; but he appears to be so much influenced by the Siamese point of view that he sees Malay history through a distorting medium.

bring forward any evidence that is conclusive on the point. While he denies the supremacy claimed for Majapahit (wherein he has the facts of history on his side), and will not even admit so much as an ephemeral conquest of these territories by the Javanese (which indeed, except as to Singapore and its immediate neighbourhood, is unlikely), he attempts to base his assertion of a Siamese occupation of the Peninsula on certain warlike expeditions, beginning about A.D. 1279-80, of the Sukothai king Ruang, who is said to have conquered the Peninsula at that remote period.

I propose to consider this alleged Siamese occupation of the Peninsula in the light of Malay history. But first of all, in order to avoid ambiguity, I would say that when I speak of the Malay Peninsula I do not (like some other writers, including Colonel Gerini) include in the term the whole territory which lies between Tenasserim and Singapore. As a matter of physical geography, the Peninsula begins about lat. $7^{\circ} 30'$, where it joins the long isthmus which connects it with the mainland of Indo-China. But that is a mere matter of technical terminology, whereas the distinction I wish to draw is of substantial importance.

The Malay Peninsula, in the sense in which I use the expression here, comprises that part only of this long tongue of land where for centuries past the bulk of the settled population has been of Malay race and speech and of the Muhammadan religion. In that sense the Malay Peninsula begins about lat. 7° .¹ A few generations ago the ethnical frontier was on the whole somewhat to the north of that parallel,² but during the last two centuries it has shifted slowly southward. It is said that Sënggora (lat. $7^{\circ} 12'$) was once a Malay town; if that was so, it must have been a very long time ago, for now the place is mainly Siamese, in so far as it is not Chinese.³ Even to the south of lat. 7°

¹ Apparently rather to the north of this parallel on the west coast of the Peninsula, and to the south of it in the districts further east.

² See Newbold, "Straits of Malacca," vol. ii, pp. 2, 67.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 71-3; Annandale & Robinson, Fasciculi Malayenses, Supplement, p. xii.

there are at the present day a few small patches where Siamese constitute the bulk of the settled population, but, roughly speaking, the ethnical boundary may be taken to be about lat. 7°. Here Siamese territory, in the true sense of the word, borders on two historic Malay states: Kēdah, which still survives as a tributary state, and Patani, which, like Kēdah, was ravaged by the Siamese some seventy years ago, and, less fortunate than its neighbour, has been broken up by the invaders into a number of small fragments, over most of which weak Malay rulers are allowed to exercise a nominal sway under the suzerainty of the Siamese King and the supervision of a Siamese High Commissioner. But broken or whole, with diminished boundaries and in a position of dependence though they may be, Kēdah and Patani have for centuries been essentially Malay states, the circumstance of their being officially styled Siamese provinces and having strange Siamese names conferred upon them notwithstanding. They have their place in Malay history, and by their speech, race, and faith they are unmistakably alien to the Siamese. There are relatively few Siamese elements in their population,¹ and those have probably only come in during the last few generations. Further to the south, in the remaining states of the Peninsula such as Kēlantan, Trēngganu, Perak, and Pahang (to say nothing of Sēlangor, the Nēgri Sēmbilan, and Johor), there are no Siamese worth mentioning, and there is no evidence that there ever were any.

To return to the alleged Siamese sway over the Peninsula from *circa* A.D. 1250 to 1511, I would observe that it is in terms contradicted by some of Colonel Gerini's own authorities, viz., the Chinese works known as the Ying-yai Shēng-lan (of 1416), the Hai-yü (of 1537), and the History of the Ming Dynasty (1368-1643), Book 325.² These authorities expressly state that in the year 1403 the Chinese

¹ See Fasciculi Malayenses, Supplement, p. xxii, for the census figures showing the Malay preponderance in the Patani states. (No figures are given for Kēdah, which is even more Malay.) In Ligor, Patalung, and Sēnggora, on the other hand, the Siamese preponderance is marked.

² Groeneveldt in "Miscellaneous Papers relating to Indo-China," 2nd series, vol. i, pp. 243 *et seq.*

emperor sent an embassy to Malacca; that Malacca returned the compliment in 1405, on which occasion the Chinese emperor invested the local chief with regalia and appointed him king of the country; likewise that in 1409 another Chinese embassy again recognized the independent status of Malacca.¹ In 1419, and again in 1431, Malacca complained to the Court of China that Siam was planning an attack against her, and the Emperor forbade the Siamese King from carrying out his supposed intention, and on the second occasion issued a decree that he should live in harmony with his neighbours and refrain from acting against the orders of the Imperial Court. So say the Chinese records; but it is to be feared that these paternal admonitions had little effect on the Siamese, who repeatedly made war on Malacca in spite of the Emperor's orders.

Now of course it is open to argument whether the Emperor of China had any sort of jurisdiction or *locus standi* to interfere between Siam and Malacca at all, even if Siam stood (as it is generally believed to have done) in some sort of dependent relation towards the Celestial throne. But it is surely perfectly obvious that China could not have solemnly recognized the independence of Malacca and invested its ruler as king, if the place had been at that time actually in Siamese occupation. Thus these Chinese authorities, which, it must be remembered, are matter of fact documents, some of them official records and contemporary with the events they relate, suffice to knock rather more than a century off the alleged two and a half centuries of Siamese sway over the Peninsula.

It is true that these same records state that "formerly" Malacca was not a kingdom, but was a mere chieftainship tributary to Siam, the Hai-yü adding that the chief who was in charge of the country had revolted against his master and

¹ This independence is of course considered by the Chinese chroniclers as being subject to the general overriding suzerainty then claimed by China over the whole of Eastern Asia. It is really comical to read of Java, Siam, and China all almost at the same time claiming supremacy over the Peninsula, while in fact none of them had any actual footing there. These rival claims (even if we did not know their hollowness *abundē*) are enough to destroy one another.

made himself independent at some period which could not (in 1537) be ascertained.¹ I will return to that point hereafter; but in the meantime I would emphasize the fact that during the whole of the fifteenth century Malacca, the leading state of the Peninsula, was an independent Malay kingdom, recognized as such by the Chinese Imperial authorities, and was often at war with Siam, but in no sense under Siamese sway. The King and people were Muhammadans; they had their own laws,² their own administrative system, their own language and customs; in fact, with the exception of that tincture of Indian civilization which is shared by most of the civilized races of Further India, they had nothing whatever in common with Siam. During the whole of this period they maintained, at frequent intervals, diplomatic relations with China by the sending and receiving of embassies, which were openly accorded official recognition. It is quite certain that from the year 1405, when China, then beyond all question the leading power in Eastern Asia, recognized the claims of Malacca, its independence was *de facto* maintained till 1511, when the place fell into the hands of the Portuguese.

This state of things is in all essentials confirmed by the evidence of the Commentaries of Alboquerque³ and by the Malay Annals (the *Sĕjarah Malayu*).⁴ The former work no doubt merely embodies the oral traditions current about the time of the Portuguese conquest; the latter, though probably based in part on earlier written sources, was not itself

¹ The account in the History of the Ming Dynasty might be taken to mean that Malacca was tributary to Siam up to the year 1403, and renounced its allegiance at the suggestion of the Chinese envoy. But this hardly seems consistent with the conservative tendencies of Chinese policy, and is therefore improbable. If it was, however, the fact, it goes to show that the Siamese supremacy was of a very nominal character, seeing that it could be thrown off so easily. There can have been no real sway, no actual Siamese occupation, but a mere paper suzerainty at the most.

² A translation of the laws of Malacca will be found in Newbold, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 231 *et seq.*

³ Translated by W. de G. Birch in the Hakluyt Society's publications. See especially vol. iii, pp. 71-84.

⁴ Partly translated by John Leyden under the title "Malay Annals." The best edition in Malay is that of Singapore (1896, ed. Shellabear).

composed till A.D. 1612. Both are therefore inferior as authorities to the earlier Chinese records. But where they agree with these records, their value as independent corroborative evidence is not to be denied. It is pretty clear from a comparison of these sources, as I tried to show some years ago,¹ that the usually received Malay chronology is incorrect and must be cut down considerably. But it is also evident that some five or six of the Malay *rajas* of Malacca, whose conquests and other exploits are related in the *Sĕjarah Malayu*, are perfectly historical personages, even though their Malay chronicler has woven some legendary lore into his history of their lives. They really lived and reigned in the fifteenth century. They conquered neighbouring states, such as Pahang, Siak, Kampar, and Indragiri (these last three in Sumatra), squabbled with Palembang (another Sumatran state),² were in diplomatic relations with Majapahit and China, and were several times at open feud with Siam. They came near to welding the whole Peninsula, as far as Kĕdah and Patani inclusive, into a Malay empire, and but for their conquest by the Portuguese it is possible that they might have succeeded in doing so. Anyhow, a few years before the Portuguese conquest, they defeated a Siamese fleet which had been sent to attack them.

One may well ask, what is there, so far as the fifteenth century is concerned, to show for the alleged Siamese sway over the Peninsula, seeing that its leading state at this time enjoyed such a perfectly autonomous position?

Perhaps, however, it may be suggested that even if Malacca was independent from 1405 onwards, it may have been in Siamese hands some twenty-five years earlier, at the time when the *Nāgara Krĕtāgama* was written. If that be so, I should like to have it explained how, in such a short space of time, the Siamese so completely lost their hold over

¹ Actes du Onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes, ii, pp. 239-253.

² See Groeneveldt, *op. cit.*, p. 163. At some time between 1408 and 1415 the King of Malacca appears to have raised a claim to sovereignty over Palembang, which place seems to have been still under Javanese supremacy, and there was a suggestion that this claim was put forward with the sanction of China; but this was formally repudiated by the Chinese emperor.

this region. But what evidence is there that it was really Siamese in 1380, any more than in 1405 or 1500 ? According to the *Sĕjarah Malayu*, Malacca was founded in consequence of and soon after the destruction of Singapore by the forces of Majapahit. This event, I believe, I was the first to date at about the year 1377,¹ and I am glad to observe that Colonel Gerini agrees with me : it avoids the necessity of restating here the grounds which led me to that conclusion. I suppose, therefore, that I shall not be far wrong in assuming the foundation of Malacca to have been approximately synchronous with the writing of the *Nāgara Krĕtāgama*, which apparently contains no mention of the new settlement. The Malay chronicler tells us nothing very definite as to the condition of the Peninsula at the time of its foundation, except that Muhammadanism had not yet become the established religion of the country. The conversion of the ruling dynasty to Islam must, however, have happened a few years later, as the Chinese embassy of 1409 found that religion established.

According to Colonel Gerini's contention, we are to believe, it seems, that in 1380 or thereabouts the Peninsula was held by the Siamese, who were good enough to acquiesce in the establishment of a new Malay state in their midst, and who in the space of a single generation had so completely effaced themselves that not a trace of them remained. This strikes me as being in the highest degree improbable.

My data do not enable me to pursue the alleged Siamese occupation of the Peninsula further back into the dim past ; but I have not the slightest hesitation in asserting that if the conquest of the Peninsula in 1279-80 by King Ruang really took place—if, that is to say, that warlike monarch or his army ever got further south than Ligor or Sĕnggora—the exploit was a mere episode which left no permanent traces. What, in fact, are the Siamese customs, institutions, etc., that during this supposed period of Siamese occupation

¹ Actes du Onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes, ii, pp. 250-1.

were introduced among the Malays? I know of no single specifically Tai (or Thai) characteristic among the Malays or any of the other indigenous inhabitants of the Peninsula, as defined above. This is the more remarkable as there is plenty of evidence in the Peninsula of a former Indo-Chinese domination, as I shall state presently, but it is not Siamese at all. One would, however, like to have fuller and better particulars as to the expeditions of King Ruang, and I trust that Colonel Gerini will be good enough to supply them.

It will be objected to my arguments that the authorities I have referred to expressly state that Siam "formerly" owned the Peninsula, and that local legends and traditions ascribe to the Siamese a number of ancient forts, mines, and other striking landmarks, the real origin of which is lost in antiquity. Further, it may be pointed out that the Siamese suzerainty over the northern states of the Peninsula has been acknowledged for several centuries by the Malay rulers sending periodical tribute in the form of 'golden flowers' (*bunga emas*) to the Court of Siam.

I will deal with this last point first. It seems to me entirely irrelevant to the issue here raised. The northern states of the Peninsula have for centuries past had good and sufficient reasons for desiring to propitiate their powerful neighbour. To them the King of Siam and his viceroy of Ligor were ever a dangerous menace, and it needs no hypothesis of conquest or occupation to explain the attitude which the Malay *rajas* adopted. During the early part of the last century gallons of ink were spilt in learned dissertations as to the precise rights of the King of Siam over these Malay feudatories, vassals, or subordinate allies of his. I do not propose to revive these extinct controversies, for they can have no bearing on the purely historical question of the relation of Siam to the Malay Peninsula in medieval times. I would only observe that, until a comparatively recent period, the Siamese overlordship (whatever its theoretical rights may have been) remained in fact a purely external suzerainty: these Malay states were left to enjoy autonomy so long as they sent their periodical tribute of golden flowers

with reasonable punctuality. Such as it was, this homage was confined to the four northern states of the Peninsula, Kědah, Patani, Kělantān, and Trěngganu; the others, which are now under British protection or suzerainty, had, as a rule, no dealings with Siam at all.

The other argument at first sight seems much stronger: we have all the authorities, Chinese, Portuguese, Malay (and, I suppose, Siamese), alleging or admitting that in some far distant past Siam had held the Peninsula. Well, is it quite certain that 'Siam' and 'the Siamese' are, in this instance, convertible terms? The people we call Siamese do not apply that name to themselves, but call themselves Thai, and are a branch of the Tai race. Long before they came down from their original seats in Southern China, the country which they were eventually to occupy already bore the name of Siam. This country, the valley of the Me-nam, had (as Colonel Gerini has shown us elsewhere¹) a long history prior to its conquest by the Tai race. For the first ten centuries or more of our era it was inhabited by a race allied to the Mon people of Pegu and the Khmer people of Camboja. Now of the influence of this race there are in the Malay Peninsula abundant traces. The dialects of the remnants of the wild aboriginal tribes that have escaped absorption by the more civilized Malay population are not merely distantly related to the languages of the Peguans and Cambojans, but also in certain parts of the Peninsula exhibit traces of direct contact with some such Indo-Chinese race. Thus in certain portions of the Peninsula² the numerals used by these rude tribes are nearly identical with the Mon numerals. Now it is quite certain that there has been no possibility of recent contact between the Mons and these wild tribes; since the time when the Malays colonized the Peninsula and the Siamese occupied the isthmus leading to it, these tribes have been completely cut off from all relations

¹ See his contributions to the *Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review* in the years 1900-1902.

² Southern Sělangor, North-Eastern Pahang, the Nēgri Sěmbilan, and Northern Johor.

with the Mon and Khmer peoples. But, on the other hand, their numerals have diverged so slightly from the Mon type that there must have been direct contact at a period which in the history of human development cannot be styled remote.¹ I think one would not be far wrong in suggesting that it was something less than a thousand years ago.

Here, then, we have real evidence of the former presence of a strong Indo-Chinese element in the Peninsula; but it is not Siamese in our sense of the word at all, that is to say, it is not Thai or Tai. It is Siamese in the old sense, viz., that it probably proceeded from the country which bears that name; but of Thai (or Tai) influence there is not a trace to be found.

These are some of the grounds on which, until better evidence is adduced, I venture to doubt the reality of any such early Siamese occupation of the Peninsula as Colonel Gerini alleges. The early history of this region is somewhat of a mystery, but it would appear that, before the Malays colonized it, it was in part occupied by a Mon-Khmer race, who probably held a few points on the coast. Then, somewhere about the eleventh or twelfth century perhaps, these remote possessions were given up, probably because the home country of these Indo-Chinese settlers was in the throes of war and in course of being conquered by the invading Thai race. When, after a prolonged series of struggles, the latter had made themselves masters of Siam, it is quite possible that they took stock of what they had conquered, and endeavoured to claim for themselves all the territories that had formerly been occupied by the race they had overcome: it is a familiar principle, applied a few years ago against Siam

¹ Compare the forms of these numerals:—

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Southern Sakai (Malay Peninsula) }	mui	'mbār	'mpe'	ěmpun	masokn	pě'rū'	tempo
Mon (written) ...	mwai	mbā	pi	pan	māsun	tārau	thāpah
Mon (spoken) ...	müā	mbā	{pī or {pāi	{pān or {pon	{m'sōn or {p'sōn	{t'rau or {k'rau	{th'pāh or {kh'pāh.

It is obvious that in some cases the modern forms in the aboriginal dialects of the Peninsula are more archaic than the modern Mon speech itself.

by the French, when they claimed all the tributary states over which the empire of Annam had formerly exercised suzerainty. But in the meantime the Peninsula had been colonized by the Malays from Sumatra, and Siam did not succeed in wresting it from its new rulers. That is my reading of the history of this region: a hollow claim to supremacy by the Siamese, founded not on their own conquests or actual occupation, but on the earlier settlements of the Mon-Khmer race whose country they had taken; a failure to make good these pretensions; and a series of raids and aggressions on the small Malayan states: that is a brief summary of the relations of Siam to the Peninsula in medieval times; and that, I take it, is why the Peninsula is rightly called the Malay Peninsula, although at the present day Siam is politically suzerain over the northern third of it.¹

For the rest, though venturing to differ entirely from Colonel Gerini's interpretation of history, I may perhaps be allowed to add that his identification of the Nāgara Krētāgama names of countries appears to me to be unimpeachable. With regard to the doubt which he throws on the antiquity of the name of Kēdah, I would observe that this state is mentioned under that name in the Sējarah Malayu as obtaining regalia by investiture from the King of Malacca.² That is not, of course, very conclusive, as this event is related of a period just preceding the Portuguese conquest, but, after all, Kēdah may very well be the old native name of the country and Langkasuka its literary name. Many places in Further India and the islands bear two names: thus, Pegu was styled Hamsāwatī, Tumasik was called Singapura; similarly Siak (in Sumatra) is known

¹ The rest is under British overlordship. The Peninsula, having never achieved political unity, suffers from the want of a convenient proper name. "Golden Chersonesus" and "Malay Peninsula" are clumsy descriptions. "Malacca" was (and to some extent still is) used by Continental authorities as a name for the Peninsula, but has not found favour with English writers, and sounds rather absurd locally because the town to which the name really belongs has lost all its old political and commercial importance.

² Leyden's "Malay Annals," pp. 321-3; "Sējarah Malayu" (ed. 1896), pp. ८८१, ८८२.

as Sēri Indrapura, and many other such instances could be given. All this merely illustrates the varnish of Indian culture which spread over these regions during the first dozen centuries or so of our era. Sometimes the native name alone has survived, sometimes the Indian one, occasionally both.¹

I do not propose in this place to criticize in detail the etymologies which Colonel Gerini suggests for some of the older local names: some of them seem to me of a rather speculative character. But it is worth mention that Langka-suka still lives in the memory of the local Malays. It has developed into a myth, being evidently the 'spirit-land' referred to as Lakān Suka ('Lakawn Suka') by the peasantry of the Patani states and the realm of Alang-ka-suka, interpreted by a curious folk-etymology as the 'country of what you will,'² a sort of fairy-land where the Kēdah Malays locate the fairy princess Sadong, who rules over the Little People and the wild goats of the limestone hills, and persistently refuses all suitors, be they never so high-born or otherwise eligible.³

I trust that these observations, made in no spirit of carping criticism, but with the genuine desire that the history of the Malay Peninsula may be set in a true light, may lead the able author from whom I have ventured on some points to differ, to contribute additional evidence in support of his own point of view, and thus further elucidate the obscure past of this somewhat neglected region.

¹ Little weight can be attached to the statement in the Marong Mahawangsa on which Colonel Gerini relies. That work is one of the least satisfactory of Malay chronicles, being indeed little more than a collection of fairy tales.

² As my friend Mr. R. J. Wilkinson has pointed out to me, the name should, if it is to fit this fictitious etymology, be pronounced Alang-kah-suka.

³ See Fasciculi Malayenses, pt. ii (a), pp. 25-6; and Skeat, "Fables and Folk Tales from an Eastern Forest," pp. 49-51, 81.

VII.

NOTES ON SOME MALDIVIAN TALISMANS,

AS INTERPRETED BY THE SHEMITIC DOCTRINE OF
CORRESPONDENCE.

These Talismans were brought from the Maldiv Islands by Mr. J. Stanley Gardiner, M.A., F.R.G.S., etc., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and are the subject of the following paper read to the Royal Asiatic Society by the Rev. S. STEWART SMITH, M.A., formerly Scholar of Pembroke College, and late Chaplain of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

INTRODUCTION.

THESE talismans represent the later and more elaborate magic which can be traced to the influence of the Cabala, a theosophical work embodying the Gnostic traditions of past ages. The ideas contained in them are chiefly to be found in the "Sepher Yetzirah," or "Book of Formation," which is held by some authorities to be the oldest philosophical treatise to be found in the Hebrew language. The same authority tells us it is referred to by both the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds, and therefore this work or a similar predecessor is at least as old as A.D. 200.

The SEIPHER YETZIRAH (in contradistinction to the ZOHAR, or "Book of Splendour," which mainly deals with the essential dignities of the Godhead, and with the emanations that have sprung therefrom, with the doctrine of the Sephiroth and the ideals of Macroprosopus and Microprosopus) is mainly concerned with our universe and with the microcosm.¹

We shall now proceed to examine how the teaching contained therein was applied to the making of talismans and working of spells, or practical Cabala.

¹ Cf. Jewish Encyclopædia, vol. iii, article "Cabala," p. 463.

The remarkable and well-known symbol which consists of the interlaced triangles within a circle, commonly called the Seal of Solomon or the Shield of David, and which appears in every religious system that came under Semitic influence, was used by the Cabalists to illustrate their doctrine of Perfect Correspondence or Synthesis. For the purposes of this paper it will suffice to say that with the Sun in the centre of the circle, and the other six planets placed in a particular order on the points of the triangles, it was meant to signify the Solar System. Each of the seven planets represented not only certain sounds, numbers, colours, moral qualities, and metals, but also the different features of the countenance of the one Ruler of that system, while the signs of the Zodiac belonging to each, in their turn represented the various organs of the body.




FIG. 1.

This doctrine of Harmony or Correspondence went so far as to lead the magicians to make their charms only at the proper hour, of the proper materials, accompanied by the proper invocations and fumigations, and clad in the proper colours applicable to the purposes they were meant to achieve. For their motto was that *the microcosm should be as the macrocosm*, just as every dewdrop contains the moon; and their object, therefore, was to make the creature reflect his Creator.

Numbers play a large part in this system (in fact, they come first), for each number denoted at least a sound, an idea, a colour, a metal, a force, and these six things were summed up under a seventh, which we may call a planetary influence, of which there were seven.

These numbers, again, were divided into various classes. For the purposes of this paper it is only necessary to consider one, namely, the primary numbers or digits, which were believed to represent *the Divine Will in Act*, and thus were the ordinary ones used in a certain class of talisman or amulet, which represented the concrete expression of prayer to the Almighty for some marks of His protection or favour. These digits were nine in number, for in the number 10 unity returns to infinity, and so closes the first series. Therefore in this connection a method was devised to reduce all numbers to digits by dividing them by 9. This has been called *theosophical reduction*, or 'the proof by 9.' That is, however many digits appear in the numerical expression of sacred sentences or in magical formulæ, their significance can only be understood by adding them up and dividing by 9, the true number concealed being the last remainder. Should the figures be exactly divisible by 9, leaving no remainder, then 9 is the number required. For instance,

4578 would = $24 \div 9$ with remainder 6.

369 would = $18 \div 9$ with no remainder, therefore the number is 9.

We now must enquire how these numbers were severally

allocated to the different planets, sounds, etc.; and before doing so it is necessary to remark that in no magical work is this system clearly stated. Each author lays down various axioms, but expects the reader to draw his own deductions. It is therefore only possible to test one's deductions by experiment, and the results of one experiment are now being presented before you in this paper on Maldivian talismans, which is an attempt to demonstrate experimentally certain deductions based on axioms laid down in the "Sepher Yetzirah," and works like those of Kircher, Cornelius Agrippa, Trithemius, Joannes Baptista Porta, and others.

It is well to take as a starting-point some fact upon which most of the old alchemists and astrologers agree, viz. in their allotment of certain *metals* to certain planets.

We have nine numbers to deal with, which fall into three triads, or groups of three each, thus :

1	4	7
2	5	8
3	6	9

The first triad consists of the first three digits, 1, 2, 3, the *Primary* metals. These are *gold, silver, tin*, and they are severally allotted to Sun ☉, Moon ☾, and Jupiter ♃. So here the number of the Sun is 1, of the Moon 2, and of Jupiter 3.

The second triad deals with the next three digits, 4, 5, 6, and the *Solar* metals. These are *gold, mercury, copper*, and they are severally allotted to Sun ☉, Mercury ☿, and Venus ♀. So we have another number for the Sun, namely 4, the number for Mercury is 5, and of Venus 6.

The third triad deals with the next three digits, 7, 8, 9, and the *Lunar* metals. These are *silver, lead, iron*, and they are in their turn severally allotted to Moon ☾, Saturn ♄, and Mars ♂. Thus Moon also has another number, namely 7, the number for Saturn is 8, and that of Mars 9.

This arrangement of numbers, metals, and planets as Primary, Solar, and Lunar applies also to sound and colour and moral qualities, but it does not come within the scope

of this paper to discuss the Shemitic doctrine of Correspondence fully, but only to use it so far as it applies to the elucidation of the accompanying talismans.

The following table will serve to sum up the conclusions at which we have arrived :—

PLANETS.	NUMBER.	HEBREW NAME.	ARABIC NAME.	CHARACTER.	
				(a) Positive.	(β) Negative.
Sun	1, 4	Shemesh	Ash-Shamsu	Power	Slavery.
Moon	2, 7	Lavanah	Al-Qamaru	Fertility	Barrenness.
Mars	9	Madim	Al-Mirrikhu	War	Peace.
Mercury...	5	Kokab	Al-'Utâridu	Wisdom	Folly.
Jupiter ...	3	Tzedeq	Al-Mushtari	Wealth	Poverty.
Venus.....	6	Nogah	Az-Zuhratu	Love	Hate.
Saturn ...	8	Shabbathai	Az-Zuhalu	Life	Death.

Athanasius Kircher, in his great work *Œdipus Ægyptiacus* (vol. ii, p. 232), tells us how the ancient astrologers arrived at the order of the days of the week as being Sun's day, Moon's day, Mar's day, etc. They started with the assumption that each of the twenty-four hours of the day was ruled over by one of the seven planets. The planet that ruled the first hour gave its name to that day of the week.


The planets were arranged in the following order: the sun in the centre, with the negative or feminine planets on the left, and the positive or masculine planets on the right, thus :—

♀ ♀ ☾ ☉ ♂ ♀ ♀
Negative. Positive.

Each of these planets was supposed to rule and preside over the several hours of the day in *retrograde* order. For instance, if Saturn ruled over the first hour of the day, Jupiter would rule over the second, Mars the third, Sun the fourth, Venus the fifth, Mercury the sixth, Moon the seventh, while Saturn

again would govern the eighth hour, the fifteenth, and the twenty-second in the course of a day of twenty-four hours. Jupiter then would govern the last hour but one, and Mars the twenty-fourth hour; the ruler of the twenty-fifth hour would then be Sun, and as the twenty-fifth hour is the first hour of the ensuing day it would take its name from that of the ruler of the first hour and would thus be Sun's day. Similarly, the last hour of the day on which the Sun would rule on his day would be the twenty-second, and so the third planet in order from the Sun, i.e. Moon, would rule over the ensuing or Moon's day.

The following figure was employed to illustrate this arrangement:—



Planetary Hours of the Day.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
☉ Dies Solis	☉	☿	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂
♂ Dies Martis	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂
♂ Dies Iovis	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂
♂ Dies Saturni	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂
♂ Dies Venus	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂
♂ Dies Mercurii	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂
♂ Dies Lunae	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂	♂

FIG. 2.—THE ORDER OF THE HOURS AND OF THE DAYS OF THE WEEK.

The explanation of the circular figure is as follows:— If a line be drawn between ☉ and ♃, ♀ and ♄ are found on the arc of the circle thus formed. If we now turn to the table beneath we see the last two hours of the *Dies Solis* are ruled over by these two planets. In like manner, if a line be drawn from ♃ to ♀, on the arc thus described are ♅ and ♆, which are the planets ruling the last two hours of the *Dies Lunæ*. Lines drawn from

♂	to	♀
♀	to	♆
♆	to	♀
♀	to	♅

will also show on the respective arcs thus described the planets ruling the last two hours of their respective days. It has been said that children's games and toys often refer to the magic of the past. In this case the arrangement of the planetary hours of the day remind us of the old-fashioned country dance called Sir Roger de Coverley.

THE MALDIVIAN TALISMANS.




FIG. 3.—A TALISMAN FOR WISDOM.

The first two talismans in this collection are simple personal amulets. They were apparently written at a certain period in a particular hour of a particular day, probably, as the moon is so strong in them, at the first period of the first hour of Monday, which is the Moon's day. They were then carefully folded, so that they could easily be carried on the person of him whom they were meant to help. He, on his part, was never to open them, or their efficacy would

cease. They both consist of three lines of letters and numbers each, over a line ending in the letters of Ya Allah, with the pentacle or sign of luck in the corner.

The first reads thus :—

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 6 & 6 & 5 & 5 & 9 & 9 = 56 = 11 = 2 = \text{D} - \\ & & 5 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 6 & 1 & 3 & 5 = 32 = 5 = & \text{♀} \\ & & 4 & 1 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 3 & 6 & 8 & 6 = 52 = 7 = & \text{D} + \end{array}$$

It then, is a concrete prayer that its wearer should be endowed with the influence of Mercury (عطارد, 'utârid) or Wisdom, both for this world and the next. The positive number of the Moon applies to this life, the negative number refers to the side or face of the Moon, or the unveiling of Isis, which can never be seen in this life. We are here reminded of the mystical meaning of the words in Exodus xxxiii, 20 and 23 : "Thou canst not see My face : for there shall no man see Me, and live. . . . Thou shalt see My back parts : but My face shall not be seen."

It may be only a remarkable coincidence, but it is certainly worth mentioning that the sum of the numbers of the letters of both of the Christian names of the person for whom these amulets were made, come by the Cabalistic method of counting to one of the numbers of the Moon.




FIG. 4.—A TALISMAN FOR RICHES.

The second amulet reads thus :—

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & 6 & 6 & 9 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 = 47 = 11 = 2 = \text{D} - \\ & 6 & 5 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 7 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 4 & 5 & 2 & 6 = 66 = 12 = 3 = 7 \\ 5 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 = 43 = 7 = \text{D} + \end{array}$$

This is a concrete prayer that the possessor of this amulet should have not only earthly but heavenly riches, for Jupiter (مشري, *mushtarî*) is the Divine attribute of grace or riches. In this charm we see the letters of Ya Allah more distinctly than in the former.




FIG. 5a.—A TALISMAN FOR GOOD LUCK.

Fig. 5. This talisman is remarkable for the form it assumes. It is in the form of a pyramid, an ancient way of describing the solar system, as will be seen in Fig. 5b. Its meaning appears to be that the sum of the signs of the Zodiac on the right, or the positive houses of the planets, is 6, or Taurus, the house of Venus, and the exaltation of

Moon. This balances the sum of the signs on the left, or negative houses of the planets, which comes to 9, the number of Scorpio, the negative house of Mars. So we have Venus (Love) and Moon (Health or Fertility), both at their strongest, combined to bind Mars with his destructive influence, when




FIG. 5b.

in his weak house. To use astrological terms, it is Venus and Moon in good aspect, afflicting Mars. This probably was not only an indication of the time when this charm was

made, but was also meant to perpetuate the results of this favourable direction of these three planets for the purposes of this talisman.

If we now examine the centre of the figure we shall see a curious magical table of Arabic numbers, which by the method of calculation referred to above may be read as—

9	1	2	7	5
2	7	5	9	1
5	9	1	2	7
1	2	7	5	9
7	5	9	1	2

If we add these figures up horizontally and vertically, we find the total of each line is 24, or 6—the number of Venus, ♀. Again, if we add the sum of these totals taken vertically and horizontally, we again get as a last remainder 6, or ♀. Once more, if we add these figures up crosswise, from left to right and from right to left, we get the same total, i.e. 6, or ♀.

Lastly, when we add up all possible last remainders of this square we get twice 6 = 12 = 3 = ♃, Jupiter or Wealth. The numbers round the square come to 96 = 15 = 6 = ♀.

The outer ring of figures—

$$(\alpha) \text{ on the top} \quad = 3000 = 3 = \text{♃, Jupiter.}$$

$$(\beta) \text{ on the bottom} = 3900 = 39 = 3 = \text{♃, Jupiter.}$$

$$\text{Total} \quad \dots \quad 6 = \text{♀, Venus.}$$

According to the archetype referred to above, Jupiter and Venus are interchangeable, i.e. are as positive and negative, husband and wife, so this talisman is evidently meant to be a powerful prayer for what is now called *good luck*, i.e., a combination of perfect love and perfect wealth, or rather perfect power of loving.




FIG. 6a.—A TALISMAN TO PROTECT A MAID'S VIRGINITY.

Fig. 6a contains, inside a square protected by emblems to which we will refer later—

$$24 \text{ small triangles} = 6 = \text{♀}$$

$$4 \text{ large triangles} = 4 = \odot$$

$$4 \text{ large squares} = 4 = \odot$$

$$4 \text{ smaller squares} = 4 = \odot$$

$$\text{Total} \quad \dots \quad 18 = 9 = \text{♂}.$$

The sum of benefic planets making up the number of Mars is called *the binding of Mars*, and occurs several times in this collection. By the binding of Mars is meant the utilising the force of the influence of that planet and robbing it of any baleful power. For while Mars in its positive sense signifies *War*, in its negative or bound sense it denotes *Peace*.




FIG. 6b.

When we severally add up the digits and emblems (female or negative) in the larger squares we get the following results :—

digits, 32 = 5	digits, 28 = 10 = 1
emblems, 21 = 3	emblems, 21 = 3
digits, 34 = 7	digits, 29 = 11 = 2
emblems, 26 = 8	emblems, 28 = 10 = 1

Hence the sum of the digits in the larger squares

$$= 123 = 6 = \text{Venus.}$$

$$,, \quad ,, \quad \text{emblems} \quad ,, \quad ,, \quad = 96 = 6 = \text{Venus.}$$

If we perform the same operation on the smaller squares we get—

digits, 19 = 10 = 1	
emblems, 14 = 5	
digits, 7	digits, 7
emblems, 11 = 2	emblems, 16 = 7
digits, 27 = 9	
emblems, 13 = 4	

Hence the sum of the digits in the smaller squares

$$= 24 = 6 = \text{Venus.}$$

$$,, \quad ,, \quad \text{emblems} \quad ,, \quad ,, \quad = 18 = 9 = \text{Mars.}$$

Again, by adding up the digits and emblems in the four large triangles, we obtain the following result :—

digits 38 = 11 = 2
30 = 3
34 = 7
17 = 8

$$20 = 2 = \text{J} - , \text{Moon.}$$

$$\text{emblems } 29 = 11 = 2$$

$$26 = 8 = 8$$

$$13 = 4$$

$$28 = 10 = 1$$

$$15 = 6 = \text{♀}, \text{Venus.}$$

So far, then, these results show the victory of Venus over Mars, or Purity protected and aided by the heavenly influence of the Moon.

We now turn to the top of the figure and observe 8 positive or male emblems, the number of Saturn (♄), the cherubim's sword, which turned every way to protect the Garden of Eden or Paradise, with 6 axes, the number of Venus (♀), and male and female emblems = 2 or ♀, Moon, or the axes and emblems added together may signify Saturn in wrath. If we add together the whole we get twice $8 = 16 = 7$, the other number of the Moon, or Isis or Diana, protecting her devotee.

Below are 19 male or positive emblems = 1, or Sun, ☉.

The emblems above and below, then, point to the powerful aid of the Heavenly Powers, the evil fate of the seducer, and the reward of the virtuous.

The points of flame and the scallop, or *Mons Veneris*, when added up = $15 = 6 = \text{Venus}, \text{♀}$.

Fig. 7a. This was a concrete prayer for a blessing on crops at the time of sowing—in fact, a practical Rogation-tide Litany. The first thing to notice in this figure is the Arabic ك ح ك ح, Kaf Hā, Kaf, Hā, at the top of the figure in the centre. The numerical value of these letters is $20 + 8 + 20 + 8 = 56 = 11 = 2$; 2 is, as we have seen, the number of the Moon, the type of Fertility.

The square on the right consists of numbers. Their total taken vertically is $3445 = 16 = 7$, while if we take them horizontally we get the same result— $3445 = 16 = 7$; 7 is the other number of the Moon.




FIG. 7a.—A TALISMAN FOR GOOD HARVEST.

The square on the left consists of letters. Adding up their numerical value in the same way, we get in each case $2602 = 10 = 1$, the number of the Sun.

We thus have ☉ and ♃, 'the eyes of God.' When combined, they make this figure (Fig. 7b, A), which has been described as Horus in his boat, Noah in the Ark, the Sacred Fish, the All-seeing Eye.

Fig. 7b. This figure consists of the same number of squares and triangles as the former, with probably the same meaning, which appears to be emphasised from the fact that whereas the sum of all the numbers in the centres of the triangles, etc., amounts to 9, or the number of Mars (♂), they in every case but one, i.e. when the figure 54 or 9 occurs, represent benefic planetary influences, and in the case of the number 54 occurring it is always guarded by the Sun and Jupiter.




FIG. 7b.

Taking digits, decads, and hundreds of the larger squares by themselves, and the thousands by themselves, we get the following result:—

digits, etc., 7 2 9 = 18 = 9	digits, etc., 7 2 9 = 18 = 9
thousands, 1 1 5 5 4 = 16 = 7	thousands, 1 1 5 5 4 = 16 = 7
digits, etc., 7 2 9 = 18 = 9	digits, etc., 7 2 9 = 18 = 9
thousands, 1 1 5 5 4 = 16 = 7	thousands, 1 1 5 5 4 = 16 = 7

The sum of the digits is 36 = 9 = Mars, ♂.

„ thousands is 28 = 10 = 1 = Sun, ☉.

Doing the same with the smaller squares we get—

digits, etc., 61 = 7	
thousands, 5169 = 27 = 9	
digits, etc., 612 = 9 thousands, 8672 = 23 = 5	digits, etc., 612 = 9 thousands, 5776 = 25 = 7
digits, etc., 668 = 20 = 2 thousands, 5785 = 25 = 7	

The sum of the digits is $27 = 9 = \text{Mars, } \♂$.

„ thousands is $28 = 10 = 1 = \text{Sun, } \odot$.

Again, if we do the same with the large triangles we get—

digits, etc., 178 = 16 = 7 thousands, 11555 = 17 = 8	
digits, 779 = 23 = 5 thousands, 17330 = 14 = 5	digits 1174 = 13 = 4 thousands, 5776 = 25 = 7
digits, 785 = 20 = 2 thousands, 11555 = 17 = 8	

The sum of the digits, etc., = $18 = 9 = \text{Mars, } \♂$.

„ . „ thousands = $28 = 10 = 1 = \text{Sun, } \odot$.

The probable meaning of the figure is that the evil influence of Mars should not only be bound by the power of the Sun, but that its force should be controlled and directed for good by that great luminary, for Mars, though a bad master, is, like fire, a good servant.

The points of flame round the square are $16 = 7 = \text{J}$, and the Moon is the type of Fertility. The number 7 is also

the number of the sign Aries, the favourite house of Mars. When the Sun enters Aries the vernal equinox is reached, and his influence renders Mars strong for good.

There is in this picture, in the third line from the top and third square from the left, an obvious mistake in copying from some older pattern. It might have been done inadvertently, or (as so often happens) on purpose to confuse the enquirer and to render the charm inoperative.





FIG. 8a.—AN AMULET TO KEEP OFF ASTHMA.

Fig. 8a. In this figure the astrological intention is more obvious than in some others we have seen. It is evidently a representation of Taurus, the sign which rules over the throat. The circle which seems to stand for the head (Fig. 8b) contains

would not be unduly pressing the point to state that it, as in a former talisman, refers to the beneficent power of Horus in his boat, or the All-seeing Eye. The throat of the figure has the Arabic numeral 4 representing the Sun over the astronomical sign of Taurus. The shoulders of the figure have the following numbers, viz., $5380 = 16 = 7 = \text{D}$. The chest of the figure has on the left the Arabic numeral 2 or D , and on the right the numeral 4 or Sun. In the two middle divisions we have *maḥar*, which we render 'Go away,' or *Retro, Satanas*. We observe the same characters written on the bisecting line. On the extremities of this line, we see on the left the Arabic *waw* or 6, the number of Venus, Lord of the Sign; on the right we have what appears to be two *elifs*, or 2, the number of the moon, which is in exaltation in Taurus. The characters at the tips of the line are probably those of Ya Allah. In the next line we have $1444 = 13 = 4 = \odot$. Below this we have two Arabic 5's, which may either be meant to be taken singly, from their extra size, and would refer to the medical character of the amulet. Or, if added together, they make 10 or 1, the positive number of the Sun.



Kassodine
to be affixed on the door. When you will be free
from poverty

FIG. 9a.—THIS TALISMAN IS TO BE FASTENED IN FRONT OF THE DOOR, AS A PROTECTION AGAINST POVERTY.

the Sun. Added together, the sum is 12 or 3, the number of Jupiter, which signifies wealth. The two rows of letters over the top triangle have their numerical values worked out on the accompanying figure (Fig. 9*b*). Their sum is 20, or 2, the number of the Moon, the type of Health and Fertility. In the sack-shaped figure in the middle, we have in Arabic, on the right, the names of Archangels, or positive agencies, over the name Ya Allah or Justice; on the left the names of negative influences, over the name Ya Rahim or Merciful; in the centre we have the names of the first four Caliphs after the Prophet, over seven lines of Arabic characters; which when added up come to the several numbers of the planets, whose total again comes to 7, the number of the Moon. The mystical meaning of this is probably a reference to Wisdom or Creator, attended by Justice and Mercy.

::	::	::	::	::	::	::	::	::
::	ف	ق	س	ن	ع	ج	س	::
::	ق	س	ن	ع	ج	س	ف	::
::	س	ن	ع	ج	س	ف	ق	::
::	ن	ع	ج	س	ف	ق	س	::
::	ع	ج	س	ف	ق	س	ن	::
::	ج	س	ف	ق	س	ن	ع	::
::	س	ف	ق	س	ن	ع	ج	::
::	::	::	::	::	::	::	::	::

FIG. 10.—THE DESCRIPTION OF THIS TALISMAN IS AS FOLLOWS: "PLACED IN THE ROOF OF THE HOUSE TO PREVENT SATAN FROM ENTERING."

Fig. 10. This is an *abracadabra* sign. Read from the left-hand top corner, in our numerals it would be as follows:—

80	8
800 800	7
60 60 60	9
50 50 50 50	2
600 600 600 600 600	3
3 3 3 3 3 3	9
60 60 60 60 60 60 60	6
80 80 80 80 80 80	3
800 800 800 800 800	4
60 60 60 60	6
50 50 50	6
600 600	3
3	3

$$69 = 15 = 6$$

$$= ♀ = \text{Venus.}$$

By adding up each line, by the method we have already used, we get a total of $69 = 15 = 6$, or the number of Venus. In this figure we see the same numbers are repeated every seventh line.

80	800	60	50	600	3	60	$= 1653 = 15 = 6 = ♀$
800	60	50	600	3	60	80	
60	50	600	3	60	80	800	
50	600	3	60	80	800	60	
600	3	60	80	800	60	50	
3	60	80	800	60	50	600	
60	80	800	60	50	600	3	

1653

15

6

♀

Again, if we add the figures up as they stand, both horizontally and vertically, we get in each column 6 as the last remainder. Adding the totals horizontally and vertically, we again get in each case 6 as a last remainder. While, if we add the last totals of the figure taken horizontally, vertically, and crosswise, from right to left and from left to right, we again obtain as last remainder the number 6. Evidently the original framer of this talisman was convinced that Love was greater than Hate, and that "a soft answer turneth away wrath."




FIG. 11a.—A TALISMAN AGAINST CONVULSIONS.

Fig. 11a. This amulet is designed to keep off convulsions, and is in the familiar form of the interlaced triangles, which, when described within a circle, is *the talisman of talismans*.

On the other affected side we have two sets of figures, one being inverted. Their several sums amount to 4, the number of the Sun, and 2, the number of the Moon; their conjoint signification, as we have seen before, represents the All-seeing Eye, and the sum of 4 and 2 is 6, the number of Venus, or Love. The top left-hand line contains, over the word *Alh*, letters and figures, whose conjoint sum is again 1 or the number of the Sun. On the other lines are figures, each designed to denote favourable planetary directions, or, shall we say, to invoke the powerful aid of the various attributes of the Most High?

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- A treatise on Zodiacal Physiognomy. By John Varley.
 Book of the Sacred Magic. By S. Liddell MacGregor Mathers.
 Clavicula Solomonis. By H. Gollancz.
 Cornelii Agrippæ Opera.
 Custom and Myth. By A. Lang.
 De Intelligentiis. By Trithemius.
 De Occultis. By Joan. Baptista Porta.
 Demonology among the Hebrews. By Witton Davies.
 Dictionary of Christian Biography. Art. "Cabala."
 Dictionary of Islam.
 Doctrine and Literature of the Kabalah. By A. G. Waite.
 Egyptian Magic. By J. Wallis Budge.
 Gaffere's Curiosities.
 Gipsy Sorcery. By Leland.
 Gnostics and their Remains. By King.
 History of the Devil. By Carus.
 Jewish Encyclopædia. Articles: Abraham, Apocalypse of—Abraham,
 Testament of—Adam Kadmon—Ascension—Azilut—Cabala—
 Creation—Gnosticism.
 Kabalah Unveiled. By S. Liddell MacGregor Mathers.
 Key of Solomon the King. By S. Liddell MacGregor Mathers.
 Magical Ritual. By Dr. Wynne Westcott.
 Medical Symbolism. By Thomas S. Sozinsky.
 Migration of Symbols. By D'Alviella.
 Mysteries of Magic.
 Mysteries of the Cabiri. By Faber.
 Mystery of Sound and Number. By Sheikh Habeeb Ahmad.

- Ædipus Ægyptiacus. By Athanasius Kircher.
Phallicism. By Hargreave Jennings.
Primitive Culture. By Tylor.
Religion of the Ancient Egyptians. By Wiedemann.
Ritual de la Haute Magie. By Eliphaz Levi.
Sepher Yetzirah. Translated by Dr. Wynne Westcott.
Sword of Moses. By M. Gaster.
Tarot of the Bohemians. By Papus.
Testament of Solomon. Translated by F. C. Conybeare. (Jewish
Quarterly Review, vol. xi, pt. 1.)

VIII.

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE PIPRAWA VASE.

By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

SOME remarks made in the *Journal des Savants*, 1905. 540 ff., by our valued friend and collaborator M. Sylvain Lévi, have given me a clue which enables me to now carry to a final result that which I have to say about the inscription on the steatite or soap-stone Piprāwā relic-vase,— the oldest known Indian record. He has drawn attention to a statement by Hiuen Tsiang (see page 166 below), overlooked by me, which has led me to weigh the wording of the inscription in such a manner that no doubt whatsoever remains as to the real meaning of it, and as to the circumstances connected with it.

Also, through the kindness of Mr. Hoey, I have before me a very excellent plaster cast of the inscribed part of the vase, which shews the whole inscription quite plainly. The engraving is so very thin and shallow that it is doubtful whether a satisfactory facsimile can be produced; at any rate until a much better light is available than can be obtained at this time of the year. But I can say this much: that the whole record was engraved on the original in the most complete manner; that every stroke of it is distinctly legible in the cast; and that not the slightest doubt attends any part of the decipherment of it.

* * * * *

The text of the record stands precisely as already given by me, except in two details. We certainly have *sabhaginikanam*, with the lingual *ṇ* in the fourth syllable; not *sabhaginikanam*.¹

¹ The lingual *ṇ* may or may not be correct; and it may or may not have been intended. But it is certainly presented by the original.

I have no object in differing from Dr. Bloch, who considered (see this Journal, 1899. 426) that the appearance of *ṇ* is due to a small piece of the stone having

And the word *sakiyanam* is not to be marked by a capital *s*, as if it were a proper name. I repeat the text here, with these two alterations, for convenient reference:—

Text.

Sukiti-bhatinam sa-bhaginikanam sa-puta-dalanam iyam salila-nidhanē Budhasa bhagavatē sakiyanam.

On this occasion, however, I render the meaning of the inscription as follows; adhering again, as closely as is possible, to the order of the words in the original:—

Translation.

Of the brethren of the Well-famed One, together with (*their*) little sisters¹ (*and*) together with (*their*) children and wives, this (*is*) a deposit of relics;² (*namely*) of the kinsmen of Buddha, the Blessed One.

* * * * *

The record in fact commemorates, as I will prove in detail below, an enshrining of relics, not of Buddha himself as has

peeled off when the engraver was forming the vowel *i* as attached to a dental *n*. And I accepted his view of the matter in the reading which I gave on the previous occasion (this Journal, 1905. 680).

The cast, however, points plainly to a different conclusion. It shews distinctly a completely incised top stroke, which makes the difference between *n* and *ṇ*. At the same time, it does shew that a small piece of stone peeled off along the top of that stroke. So we may perhaps hold that the engraver's hand slipped, and his tool went further than was intended, and he formed *ṇi* instead of *ni* by accident.

¹ That is, their orphan unmarried sisters. As the base of *sa-bhaginikanam*, we might take *sa-bhaginī*, with the suffix *ka*. I prefer, however, to take *sa-bhaginika*, from *sa + bhaginikā*. The St. Petersburg Dictionary gives *bhaginikā*, as a diminutive of *bhaginī*. And that word, with that meaning, is a very suitable one, in this record at any rate. The grown-up sisters were, of course, all married; and they are covered by the word "wives" in the next adjective. The unmarried sisters who were not orphans are covered by the word "children."

² It may be noted that, whereas the word *salilam*, = *śarīram*, in the singular, means 'a body,' the plural *salilāni*, *śarīrāni*, means 'bones,' and so, secondarily, 'relics.' The base in composition here represents, of course, the plural.

The difference is well marked in the Mahāparinibbānasutta. It was *śarīram*, the body, the corpse, of Buddha, that was cremated so that the skin, the hide, the flesh, the tendons, and the lubricating fluid of the joints were all consumed, leaving neither ashes nor soot (text, ed. Childers, JRAS, 1876. 258). It was *śarīrāni*, his bones, which alone remained unconsumed (*ibid.*). And it was *śarīrāni*, his bones, his relics, which were claimed by various claimants, and were apportioned amongst them, and over which Stūpas were built (258-260).

hitherto been believed, but of his kinsmen, with their wives and children and unmarried sisters. And now we see the meaning of the curious nature of the articles, numbering more than seven hundred, which were found in the Stūpa along with the inscribed vase.

Lists and representations of the details of the find have been given in this Journal, 1898. 574, 585 and plate, 869, and in *Antiquities in the Tarai*, 43, and plates 13, 28.

First of all, about ten feet below the existing summit of the ruined Stūpa, there was found a broken steatite vase "full of clay, in which were embedded some beads, crystals, gold ornaments, cut stars, &c."

Then, "after cutting down through 18 feet of solid brick-work, set in clay," there was found a large stone box or coffer, measuring 4' 4" \times 2' 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " \times 2' 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ ".

The inscribed vase was found inside this stone box or coffer. With it there were found, uninscribed, two other steatite vases, a steatite casket, and a crystal jar the top of which was fitted with a fish-shaped handle which rather curiously resembles a child's feeding-bottle.

The only human remains that were obtained, were some pieces of bone which were found in the "relic-urns" (see this Journal, 1898. 576); that is, I presume, in the three steatite vases and in the steatite casket.

The other articles obtained in the box, vases, casket, and jar, include such items as the following. Two small human figures in gold leaf. Two birds, of cornelian and metal. A lion, stamped on gold leaf; also, an elephant. A coil of fine wire, apparently silver; evidently, a bracelet. The *triratna* and *svastika* emblems. Various jewels, and articles, including beads and leaves, made from them; amethyst, cornelian, topaz, garnet, and lapis lazuli. Pieces of metal. Crystal beads, and pieces of crystal. Coral beads and cups; and other cups, pink and white. Beads of other makes. Lotus seed-pods. Blue and white pyramids. A bottle containing gold and silver leaf stars. A box containing pieces of wood and part of a silver vessel. Rolls of gold leaf. And a box containing some sort of salt.

In this list we find many a thing unnecessary, if not actually unsuitable, in connection with any enshrining of the relics of a teacher or a saint. But the details are all most appropriate and thoroughly intelligible in connection with what, we now know, was the real object of the deposit; namely, to preserve some of the remains, of all kinds, of a people who had been ruthlessly slaughtered, men, women and children.

We shall understand the circumstances fully further on. We will establish first the real purport of the record.

* * * * *

In respect of my interpretation of the record, I must first make the following observations.

M. Sylvain Lévi, working on the basis of the words *iyani salila-nidhanē* as the commencement of the text, has observed that the long string of six genitives, which we have from that point of view, results in an ambiguity which is well illustrated by turning the record into Latin:—“*Illud corporis depositum Buddhae sancti sakiyorum sukiti-fratrum cum sororibus cum filiis uxoribus.*”

He has then remarked that, while the currently admitted interpretation resolves that ambiguity by recognising in these relics that portion of the relics of Buddha which was allotted to his brethren of the clan of the Śākya, the text permits equally well of a translation which marks them as relics of the Śākya themselves:—“*C’est ici les reliques des Çākya, frères bienheureux du saint Bouddha, avec leurs sœurs, leurs fils et leurs femmes.*”

And he has added:—‘We know in fact, from the evidence of Hiuen-tsang, that the remains of the Śākya, collected after the general massacre ordered by the impious Virūdhaka, were deposited under Stūpas.’

There, however, M. Sylvain Lévi has left the matter. It is the reminder, given by him, of the statement made by Hiuen Tsiang, that has furnished the clue which I have found so invaluable.

* * * * *

I have already shewn (see this Journal, 1905. 680)¹ that the opening word of the record is, not *iyam* as had always been previously supposed, but *sukiti-bhatinam*.

This rearrangement of the text transfers the words *iyam sakila-nidhanē* to a position in which, as we shall see when we come to examine the construction of the record, they grammatically and lucidly divide the long string of genitives, and preclude any possibility of ambiguity.

* * * * *

In considering certain other details which must be examined, we will take first the opening word itself, *sukiti-bhatinam*.

The last member of this compound, *bhatinam*, stands for *bhātīnam*, the genitive plural of *bhāti*, more usually *bhātu*,² = Sanskrit *bhrātri*, 'a brother.' We have the same form of the genitive plural in line 16 of the Kālsī version of the edicts of Aśoka (EI, 2. 454), and in line 25 of the Dhauli version (ASSI, 1. 118).³

As regards the first member of the compound, *sukiti*, I cannot agree with the view that it is equivalent to the Sanskrit *sukṛitin*, 'one who has done good actions,' and so that, like *punyavat* and *dhanya*, it means, secondarily, 'heureux, bienheureux.' The word, in that case, would have been *sukati*; on the analogy of *sukataṃ*, 'a good deed,' in line 3 of the fifth edict at Girnār (EI, 2. 453). Or else it

¹ I find that, in the references to previous treatments of this record which I gave in the same place, I omitted to mention the edition of it, with a lithograph, given by M. Barth in the Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1898. 147, 231, which was published at just about the same time with Dr. Bühler's version. The two versions agree in all substantial points.

² Childers, in his Pali Dictionary, has given *bhāti* as an optional base, as a first member of compounds. He has also given *bhatitō* — (? a misprint for *bhātītō*) — as a second form of the ablative singular.

It seems plain that there were two optional bases, *bhātu* and *bhāti*, for some declensional purposes, at any rate in the epigraphic dialect, and that the same was the case with the Pāli forms of *pitṛi* and *mātṛi*.

³ The published texts of the edicts, indeed, present in both cases *bhātīnam*, with the short *i*. But the long *ī*, which gives the correct form, is quite distinct in the lithograph of the Kālsī version, and is, in my opinion, clearly recognisable in also the lithograph of the Dhauli version.

would have been *sukaṭi*, with the lingual *t*; on the analogy of *sukaṭaṇ*, in the corresponding passage in line 14 of the Kālsī version (*ibid.* 454).

The word *sukiti* stands for either *sukīti* or *sukitti*, = Sanskrit *sukīrti*, 'of good fame.' For the alternative that it stands for *sukīti*,—or, indeed, even for a view, which might be held, that it is correct as it stands, with the short *i* and the single *t*,—compare *yaśo va kīti va*, "either glory or fame," in line 1, and *yaśo va kīti va* in line 2, of the tenth edict at Girnār (EI, 2. 459), and *yashō vā kīti vā*, and also *yaśo vā kīti vā*, with the short *i* in both places, in line 27 of the Kālsī version (*ibid.*). For the alternative that it stands for *sukitti*, compare *yaśo kitti cha*, "glory and fame, honour and renown," in the Suttanipāta, verse 817 (ed. Fausböll, 154), and *kathaṃ su kittiṃ pappōti*, "how does one obtain fame?," in verse 185 (*op. cit.*, 33).¹

Now, to translate *sukiti-bhatināṃ* by "of well-famed brothers," would hardly give any sense here. We should require some separate word to shew who the person was, whose brothers are referred to. There is no separate word to indicate him. We must, therefore, find his name or some appellation of him in the word *sukiti* itself; on the view, which thus becomes obvious, that *sukiti* is not an adjective which qualifies *bhatināṃ*, but is a personal designation, of some kind or another, which is dependent on *bhatināṃ*. I do not trace any such name in Pāli literature. And so, looking to the mention of Buddha further on in the record, I take the word *sukiti* as, plainly, a special appellation of Buddha, used here in a more or less sentimental or poetical fashion just as the word *vicutha*, *vyutha*, *vyūtha*, "the Wanderer," was used to denote him in another ancient record (see this Journal, 1904. 25, 26).

¹ *Su* is here taken as the interrogative particle, which often accompanies *kathaṃ*, on the analogy of the preceding two lines, *kathaṃ su labhatē paññāṃ* *kathaṃ su vindatē dhanāṃ*.

But, having regard to the next line, *kathaṃ mittāni ganthati*, and to the last, *kathaṃ pechcha na sōchati*, we might just as readily read *kathaṃ sukittiṃ pappōti*, and find here the word *sukitti* itself.

We thus fix "of the brethren of the Well-famed One," as the translation of *sukiti-bhatinam*.

* * * * *

We will consider next the construction of the record. We can do this best by comparing another record of the same class. We have several such, expressed in somewhat laconic terms. And amongst them there is fortunately one which exactly serves our purpose. It is the inscription on a relic-vase from the Andhēr Stūpa No. 2, which was brought to notice by General Sir Alexander Cunningham in his *Bhilsa Topes*, 347, and plate 29, figs. 8, 9. The text of it runs thus:—

Sapurisasa Mōgalīputasa Gōtiputasa a[m̐]tēvāsinō.¹

Here we have nothing but a string of four genitives, without any word to govern them or the principal one of them. The record, however, is one amongst various homogeneous records. From the fact that they are all found on unmistakable relic-boxes, we know exactly what was intended; namely, that we should supply some word or words meaning "relics" or "a deposit of relics."

For the rest, it does not for a moment occur to us to translate this Andhēr record as meaning:— "(*Relics*) of the sainted Mōgalīputa; (*a donation*) of a pupil of Gōtiputa." We see at once that *am̐tēvāsinō* is in apposition with, and qualifies, *Mōgalīputasa*. And we naturally and unhesitatingly translate the record thus; and we could not reasonably translate it otherwise:—

(*Relics*) of the sainted Mōgalīputa, a pupil of Gōtiputa.

¹ I have to observe that, both in his transcription on page 347, and in his representation of the original in plate 29, fig. 9, Sir A. Cunningham has given *Gōtiputa*, as if a compound had been intended; *Gōtiputa-am̐tēvāsinō*, for *Gōtiput-am̐tēvāsinō*. Fortunately, he has also shewn part of the record, in fig. 8, as it actually lies on the rim of the vase. And there we have distinctly the genitive *Gōtiputasa*.

The Anusvāra of *am̐tēvāsinō* may or may not stand in the original; compare a remark in this Journal, 1905. 688. I supply it because, in merely using the record for comparative purposes, it is more natural to write it.

Now, let us exclude from the Andhēr inscription the word *sapurisasa*, an appositional genitive of *Mōgalīputasa*, which embellishes the sense of the record, but is not in any way essential to the construction of it. And let us insert, in the position which is grammatical as well as artistic, the words *idam sarīra-nidhānam* which are understood.

The text of the Andhēr record thus becomes :—

Mōgalīputasa idam sarīra - nidhānam Gōtīputasa antē-
vāsinō.

We still see that the word which is governed by *idam sarīra-nidhānam* is *Mōgalīputasa*; that *Gōtīputasa* is governed by *antēvāsinō*; and that *antēvāsinō* qualifies *Mōgalīputasa*. And, completing the resemblance of the two inscriptions by translating the metronymic *Mōgalīputa*, we render this text thus :—

This (*is*) a deposit of relics of the son of Mōgalī, a pupil of Gōtīputa.

Let us now treat the Piprāwā inscription in the same way, by excluding from it all the words, the appositional genitives of *sukiti-bhatinam* and *Budhasa*, which embellish the sense of it, but are not in any way necessary to the construction of it. The record then reduces itself to :—

Text.

Sukiti-bhatinam iyam salila-nidhanē Budhasa sakiyanam.

We have here *sukiti-bhatinam* answering to the *Mōgalīputasa* of the Andhēr record. We see at once that it is the word which is governed by *iyam salila-nidhanē*; that *Budhasa* can only be dependent on *sakiyanam*; and that *sakiyanam* is in apposition with, and qualifies and states something further about, *sukiti-bhatinam*. We postpone for the present the attachment of any particular meaning to *sakiyanam*. To bring out fully the exact resemblance of the two records, we leave the personal appellation *sukiti*

untranslated. And we see that the following is the unmistakable meaning of the record:—

Translation.

This (*is*) a deposit of relics of the brethren of Sukiti, the *sakiyā* of Buddha.

The matter may perhaps be made even clearer still, if that is possible, in the following manner:—

While striking out the simply embellishing genitive *sapuriśasa* from the Andhēr record, let us refrain from inserting the words *idaṁ sarīra-nidhānaṁ*. That record thus becomes:—

Mōgaliputasa Gōtiputasa amṭēvāsinō.

(*Relics*) of the son of Mōgali, a pupil of Gōtiputa.

Let us now reduce the Piprāwā inscription to its mere essential skeleton, by excluding the words *iyam salīla-nidhanē* in addition to the simply embellishing genitives. The record thus becomes:—

Text.

Sukiti-bhatinaṁ Budhasa sakiyanam.

No one, familiar with the inscriptions on other relic-receptacles, could think of interpreting such words as these, inscribed on a relic-vase, except as follows:—

Translation.

(*Relics*) of the brethren of Sukiti, the *sakiyā* of Buddha.

* * * * *

We come now to the word *sakiyanam*, the meaning of which still remains to be determined.

From the translation at which we have arrived so far, it becomes obvious that *sakiya*, the base of which we have the genitive plural, cannot be a proper name. It might be such if, in connection with it, we had, instead of *Budhasa*,

any such word as *Kapilanagalasa*. "Of the Sakiyas of Kapilanagara" would be appropriate enough. But any such expression as "of the Sakiyas of Buddha" is inept. And but little if any more appropriate, in reality, is the rendering which I proposed on the previous occasion; namely, to take *sakiya* as used in a double sense, and to translate "of the own Sakiyas of Buddha," that is, of the members of that particular line of the Sakiyas to which Buddha himself belonged.

It becomes obvious, in fact, that *sakiya* can only be a noun or adjective expressing some relationship or connection of that sort. And, discarding the suggestion which I made on the previous occasion, I find the natural meaning of the word *sakiya*, as used here, in one of the ordinary meanings which belong to it as the Pāli form¹ of the Sanskrit *svakīya*, 'own, belonging to oneself.'

The word *svakīya* is of exactly the same purport with *svaka*, *svīya*, *sva*. The four words are interchangeable, just as metrical necessity, fancy, or any other cause may dictate. And, as regards one of the meanings of *sva*, we are told in the Amarakōśa, 2. 6, 34:—*Sagōtra-bāndhava-jñāti-bandhu-sva-svajanaṇ samāḥ*; "the words *sagōtra*, 'of the same clan,' *bāndhava*, 'a relation,' *jñāti*, 'a kinsman,' *bandhu*, 'a relative,' *sva*, 'one's own man,' and *svajana*, 'a man of one's own people,' are equal, identical, synonymous."

This use of *sva*, and, through it, of *svakīya*, in the sense (to select a particular one of the above synonyms) of *jñāti*, 'a kinsman,' is no late one. Pāṇini has a special rule regarding the form of the nominative plural of *sva* when it is not used in the sense of *jñāti*, 'a kinsman,' or *dhana*, 'wealth, property'; *svam=a-jñāti-dhan-ākhyāyām* (1. 1, 35). And we have a most apposite instance, both of the interchangeability of *sva* and *svakīya*, and of the use of them in the sense of *jñāti*, in the Mahābhārata, 7 (Drōṇaparvan).

¹ We might perhaps expect the Pāli form of *svakīya* to be *sakiya*, with the long *i*. Childers, however, has in his dictionary remarked that the short *i* is correct, as also in *parakīya*, 'belonging to another,' *duṭṭiya*, 'second,' *gahita*, = *grīhita*, 'taken,' and other words.

7608. The verse occurs at the end of a passage describing a confused nocturnal fight, in which people could hardly recognise even their own identity, and father by mistake slew son, and son slew father, friend slew friend, connection slew connection, and maternal uncle slew sister's son. And it runs:—

Svē svān-parē svakiyāṁś=cha nijaghnus=tatra Bhārata |
nirmarṣādāṁ=abhūd-rājan=rātrau yuddham bhayānakam ||

“There, O Bhārata!, (*our*) own people slew their kinsmen, and (*our*) foes slew theirs; that terrible battle in the night, O king!, was one in which no distinctions could be observed.”

A good Pāli dictionary would probably give us some precisely similar instances of the use, in that language, of *sa*, *saka*, *sakiya*.

But, however that may be, the natural translation of the words *Budhasa bhagavatē sakiyanam* is “of the kinsmen of Buddha, the Blessed One.”

* * * * *

The record, then, commemorates an enshrining of relics, not of Buddha himself, but of his kinsmen, and of their wives and children and unmarried sisters.

Who the kinsmen of Buddha were, we know well enough. They were the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu, known in later times, in Sanskrit works, as the Śākyas of Kapilavastu. The point is made clear in various passages; amongst others, in the concluding part of the story, given further on, of the occurrences which ended in a great massacre of the residents of Kapilavatthu.

But most plainly, perhaps, is it exhibited in the Mahā-parinibbānasutta, which tells us (ed. Childers, JRAS, 1876. 258) that the Sakyas¹ of Kapilavatthu claimed a portion of the relics of Buddha, on the ground that:—Bhagavā amhākaṁ nāti-seṭṭhō; “the Blessed One was our chief

¹ The original text (pages 258, 260) has *Sakyā*; not *Sākiyā*, as we are led to suppose by Professor Rhys Davids' translation (SBE, 11. 131 f.).

kinsman.” And the same work further tells us (text, 260) that the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu duly carried out their promise, and built a Stūpa at Kapilavatthu, and held a feast, for the portion of the relics which was assigned to them.¹

* * * * *

I have thus determined the meaning of the record, and shewn who the people were to whom it refers. We

¹ Somehow or other, the learned translator omitted to reproduce this second passage in his translation (page 134).

It must also be observed that he has considerably misunderstood the nature of the relic that was assigned to the Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa, who collected and apportioned the remains of Buddha.

The corpse of Buddha was cremated in *ayasā tēla-dōṇi*, ‘an iron trough for holding oil,’ which was covered by *aññā ayasā dōṇi*, ‘another iron trough’ (text, 256).

The translation says (135):—“And Dōṇa the Brāhmaṇ made a mound over “the vessel in which the body had been burnt, and held a feast.”

The original text, however, does not say anything of the kind. It says (260):—*Dōṇō pi brāhmaṇō kumbhassa thūpañcha mahañcha akāsi*; “and the Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa made a Stūpa and a feast for the *kumbha*.”

A *kumbha* is not a *dōṇi*; much less is it an iron *dōṇi*. A *kumbha* is ‘an earthenware pot.’ The St. Petersburg Dictionary gives, as one of its special meanings, ‘a pitcher or urn in which the bones of a dead person are collected.’ It refers to, amongst other passages, the *Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, 13. 8, 3, 4; for which see Dr. Eggeling’s translation, SBE, 44. 434, and compare 433, note 2, and 117, note 3, and Muir’s *Sanskrit Texts*, 5. 316. From all of this, we learn that the loss of any of a dead man’s bones was regarded by his friends as disgraceful, and that there was a regular custom, after the cremation of a corpse, of collecting the bones with a view to placing them in an earthen vessel and burying them. And I may add that an allusion to the collection of the bones in a *kumbha* or in several *kumbhas*, after cremation, of king Prabhākaravardhana, is found in the *Harshacharita*, Kashmir text 370, line 1, trans. 159, and note 6.

It was, thus, not over the iron trough in which Buddha had been cremated, but over the earthen vessel in which his bones were collected and from which they were distributed to the various people who received them, that the Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa built his Stūpa.

A note may be added, on the story given in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*, in respect of the statement that, before the cremation, which took place at Kusinārā, the city of a branch of the Malla tribe, the corpse of Buddha was carried in procession (text, 255) to:—*Makutabandhanam nāma Mallānam chētiyam*; “the shrine of the Mallas which was named *Makutabandhana*.”

The *Makutabandhanachētiya* of the Mallas was their “coronation-temple,” in which would be performed the ceremony of the binding on of the tiara of chieftainship. We know that from what we have learnt about *Paṭṭadkal*, the ancient *Paṭṭada-Kisuvōjal*, the “*Kisuvōjal* of the fillet of sovereignty,” which was the coronation-town of the Chalukya kings, and about the Jain temple at *Saundattī*, named *Rattara Paṭṭa-Jinālaya*, which was the coronation-temple of the *Rattas*; see *IA*, 30, 1901. 263, and note 34.

This shrine of the Mallas is mentioned again, and in very unmistakable terms, in the *Divyāvadāna* (ed. Cowell and Neil, 201):—*Ramanīyānanda Vaiśālī Vrijbhūmiś dhurā-nikshēpanam Mallānam Makutabandhanam chaityam*; “charming, O *Ānanda*!, is *Vaiśālī*, and the land of *Vrijji*,, and the *Makutabandhanachaitya* of the Mallas, where the yoke (of chieftainship) is fastened on to them.”

are coming shortly to the circumstances in which it was framed. It will be convenient to say here something that I have to say regarding the origin, development, and use of the tribal name,— or rather names; for there were, in reality, two names, resembling each other in appearance, but not actually connected. For some references for these names, in epigraphic records, both of the Pāli and of the mixed-dialect type, and in Prākṛit and Sanskrit, see my remarks in this Journal, 1905. 645 ff.

In the expression presented in the Piprāvā inscription, *Buddhassa sakiyā*, “the kinsmen of Buddha,”— an expression which assuredly was not invented for the occasion, but must have been an habitual one,— I find the older form of the tribal name. The *sakiyā*, the kinsmen, of Buddha, became known as the Sakiyas; after, no doubt, the time when he had passed away.

From the name Sakiya, thus devised and established, there came, by contraction, Sakya. And there was then devised and established that appellation of Buddha, Sakya-muni, “the Sakya saint,” which we find first, so far as definite dates go, in the Rummindēi inscription of Aśoka.

Then, from that form Sakya there came, by assimilation of the semivowel, the form which appears in Pāli literature as Sakka, in Prākṛit passages as Sakka, Śakka, and in epigraphic records as Saka, Śaka.

That name of the tribe, in those different actual forms, thus had a substantial basis in fact. And it only remains to add that, while it still survived, but when the true origin of it had been forgotten, there was a plain tendency to account for it, in a fantastic way, by connecting it with *sakya*, *sakka*, as the Pāli forms of the Sanskrit *śakya*, with the meaning of *śakta*, ‘able, capable.’ This is illustrated by a play on the word *sakya*, presented to us in connection with the story of the banished sons of the third Okkāka king (see page 163 below), as follows:—

When they had founded the city Kapilavatthu, the banished princes could not find any Khatṭiya (Kshatriya) damsels, of equal birth with themselves, whom they might

wed, nor any Khattiya youths to whom they might marry their sisters. And they were not willing to sully the purity of their race, by making unequal alliances, with the result of issue which would be impure on either the mother's or the father's side. So, avoiding a certain stain upon their caste, they installed their eldest sister in the position of their mother, and married their other sisters. When it was made known to their father that they had thus been able (*sakyā*) to ensure the continuance of their race without rendering it impure, he exclaimed :— *Sakyā vata bhō kumārā parama-sakyā vata bhō kumārā* ; “ Aha ! smart men indeed, Sakyas indeed, are the princes ; very smart men indeed, most excellent Sakyas indeed, are they ! ”¹ And so, from that time, the princes and their descendants were known as the Sakyas.²

On the other hand, to a totally different source, in folklore, I trace another name of the tribe, similar in appearance only, which became ultimately fixed in Sanskrit as Śākya. It was invented at a time when, not only the true origin of the real name of the tribe had been lost, but also that name itself was falling into disuse.

This form Śākya was obtained, by contraction, from the Sākiya of Pāli books, the Sākiya and Śākiya of verses in mixed dialect in the Lalitavistara.

The forms Sākiya, Śākiya, are Pāli and mixed-dialect forms of a Sanskrit form *Śākiya.³ For the shortening of

¹ The Kōliyas, however, the cousins of the Sākiyas, took a different view of the matter when it suited them. In a quarrel which they had with the Sākiyas about the use of the river Rōhiṇī for irrigational purposes, they reviled the Sākiyas as being descended from people who “ cohabited with their own sisters, just like dogs, jackals, and other animals ” (see the commentary on the Dhammapada, p. 351).

² For this matter, see the Dīghanikāya, 3. 1, 16 (ed. Davids and Carpenter, 92), and, more fully, Buddhaghōṣa's comments on that passage in his Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (ed. D. and C., part 1. 258 ff.).

³ I mark this form Śākiya with an asterisk, because, though it is given in the St. Petersburg Dictionary, I cannot at present cite any passage in which it actually occurs.

It seems that the word Śākya does not actually occur either in Pāṇini, or in the Mahābhāṣya, or in the Kāśikā. But, by means of Pāṇini's rules and the *gaṇas* established in connection with them, it might be derived in the following ways :—

(1) Under Pāṇini, 4. 1, 105, from Śaka ; with the meaning ‘ offspring of the

the *i*, compare the cases of *svakiya*, *sakiya*, and other words (see note on page 158 above).

And **Śākiya* is a derivative, in accordance with Pāṇini, 4. 2, 90, from *śāka* with the suffix *īya* in any or all of certain four meanings, defined in sūtras 67 to 70; from which we select that of sūtra 67, *tad=asminn=asti*, "such and such a thing is there." Just as, with a different suffix, from the word *udumbara*, the tree *Ficus Glomerata*, we have *Audumbara* as the name of a country abounding in *udumbara*-trees, and of the people of that country, so from *śāka*, with the suffix *īya*, we have **Śākiya* as the name of a country abounding in *śāka*, and of its people.

The form *Śākya* was reached, not directly from **Śākiya*, but through the intermediate Pāli and mixed-dialect forms *Sākiya*, *Śākiya*.

To the word *śāka* which was thus the ultimate source of *Śākya*, we might perhaps assign either of two meanings. For understanding it in the sense of 'a potherb,' some basis might be found in the allusion to potherbs in the story given further on (see page 173 below). But it seems plain that tradition took this name of the tribe from *śāka* in the sense of 'a teak-tree.' We gather that from the story told in the books (page 162 above, note 2) about the origin of the *Sakyas*:—

The banished sons of the third *Okkāka* (*Ikshvāku*) king, went away towards the *Himālaya* mountains, taking with them their five sisters, four of whom they ultimately married (see page 162 above). And there they founded the city *Kapilavatthu* (*Kapilavastu*), on a site (*vatthu*, *vastu*) occupied and assigned to them by the *Brāhmaṇ* saint

Śāka clan.' But, whereas the *gaṇa* *Gargādi* under this sūtra includes the word *Śāka* as it is given in Böhrtlingk's Pāṇini, 2. 92, the *gaṇa* as given in the Benares edition of the *Kāśikā* does not include it.

(2) Under Pāṇini, 4. 1, 151, from *Śāka*; with the meaning of 'offspring of a man named *Śāka*.'

(3) Under Pāṇini, 4. 3, 92, from *Śāka*; with the meaning 'the *Śāka* territory was his original place of abode, his ancestral home.'

But these would be academical explanations, to which we need not attach importance in the face of what I shew above.

Kapila, a previous incarnation of Buddha, whom they found dwelling in a hut of leaves, on the bank of a tank on a slope of the Himālayas, in *sākasaṇḍa*, *sākavanasaṇḍa*, 'a grove of teak-trees.' Building the city on that site, they erected their palace on the spot actually occupied by Kapila's hut; making for Kapila another hut of leaves beside it.

Such is the story given in the books. Looking to the end of it, to the exclamation attributed to the Okkāka king when his sons' proceedings were reported to him (see page 162 above), we find only a fanciful desire to account for the name Sakya by identifying it with the word *sakya*, *śakya*, in the sense of 'able, capable, smart.' But, looking below the surface, we find in the allusion to *sākasaṇḍa*, *sākavanasaṇḍa*, the grove of teak-trees, the real origin of the other name, *Sākiya*, *Śākiya*, *Śākya*.

In respect of the three Pāli forms, *Sakya*, *Sakka*, *Sākiya*, presented in literature, it may be observed that a manner in which they are sometimes all found in one and the same passage, is well illustrated by the story given on page 167 ff. below. And the mixture of them in that way seems to suggest that the following distinctions may have been aimed at in the Pāli works:—The form *Sakya* was to be used to denote the religious kinsmen of Buddha, all the members of the Buddhist order; both those who were of the same tribe with him, and those who were not. The form *Sakka* was to be used to denote the members of the family of the princes of the tribe, who were kinsmen of Buddha by actual birth. The form *Sākiya* was to be used to denote the people at large, who were in a general way kinsmen of Buddha, as belonging to the same tribe. And, in fact, I can at present detect only one point opposed, if it really is opposed, to such a conclusion; namely, that I cannot find the form *Sākiya* used to denote the country. The form used for that is always *Sakka*; in such expressions as that in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, ed. Oldenberg, 2. 253:—*Tēna samayēna Buddhō bhagavā Sakkēsu viharati Kapilavatthusmiṃ Nigrōdhārāmē*; "at that time Buddha, the Blessed One, was sojourning in the *Sakka* country, in the *Nigrōdha* monastery at *Kapilavatthu*."

A more practical purpose, however, to which it should be possible to turn these Pāli forms hereafter, may be indicated. They should be of use towards establishing the relative ages, and approximately perhaps the actual ages, and the sources, of certain works and passages. For instance, an argument against the view, which has been advanced, that the text of the Milindapañha may be based on a Sanskrit original, may be found in the fact that it gives only the forms Sakya (ed. Trenckner, 108, 115, 203, 209, 259) and Sakka (101, 289, 350). The form Sākya, which would suggest the Sanskrit Śākya, does not occur, though from the translation we should infer that it does.¹ I mention this in illustration of the point that, for critical details of this kind, we cannot always trust translations; we must go back to the original texts.

* * * * *

I have referred, on page 159 f. above, to a passage in the Mahāparinibbānasutta, which recites the allotment of a portion of the relics of Buddha to the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu, and the building of a Stūpa by them, at that place, over that portion. It was, of course, that passage which led, when the Piprāwā inscription was first handled in this Journal (1898. 387), to the idea that the record could only commemorate an enshrining of relics of Buddha, and to the resulting misinterpretation of it:—"This relic-shrine of "divine Buddha (*is the donation*) of the Śākya Sukiti- "brothers (*i.e.* either 'of Sukiti's brothers' or 'of Sukiti "and his brothers'), associated with their sisters, sons, and "wives."² And it is the influence of that rendering, which has kept us for so long a time from recognising the real meaning.

¹ The translator, Professor Rhys Davids, has once correctly reproduced the form Sakya (SBE, 36. 85). He has twice substituted Sakya for Sakka (*ibid.* 143, 249). In the remaining five instances, he has substituted the imaginative form Sākya for Sakya (SBE, 35. 163, 173, 290, 301) and for Sakka (*ibid.* 153).

² So, also, as regards the essential purport, runs the version published independently at the same time elsewhere (see note 1 on page 153 above). But the author of it did not concur in connecting the record with the enshrining of the relics of Buddha immediately after the cremation.

We have now, by a thorough examination of the record, established the true purport of it. And it only remains to complete the matter, by shewing why we should find, thus enshrined, relics of the Sakya people, the kinsmen of Buddha.

It is in this part of the matter that I am so greatly indebted to M. Sylvain Lévi, in consequence of his having drawn attention to a statement of Hiuen Tsiang which I had completely overlooked. The statement is found in Hiuen Tsiang's account of his visit to Kie-pi-lo-fa-su-tu, Kapilavastu. And, as translated from M. Stanislas Julien's *Mémoires*, I. 316, it runs thus:¹—

“On the north-west of the capital, we count the Stūpas by hundreds and thousands. It is in that place that the race of the Śākya was massacred. When king Pi-lou-tse-kia (Virūdhaka)² had conquered the Śākya, he led them away as prisoners, to the number of 99,900,000, and caused them all to be massacred. Their corpses were piled up like heaps of straw; and their blood, which had poured out in torrents, formed a large lake. Secretly prompted by the gods, men collected their bones, and gave them burial. To the south-west of the place where the Śākya were massacred, there are four small Stūpas. It was there that four Śākya withstood an entire army.”

So also, it is to be added, Fa-hian, without going into details, tells us as follows (Legge, *Travels of Fā-hien*, 65):—“The places (were also pointed out) and (where) king Vaidūrya³ slew the seed of Śākya, and they all in dying became Śrōtāpannas. A tope was erected at this last place, which is still existing.”

¹ Compare, Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, 2. 20.

² The Pāli books give the name as Viḍḍabha (see page 169 ff. below; also the *Jātaka*, ed. Fausbøll, I. 133).

The name figures as Virūdhaka in Sanskrit in the version of the story which is given in the *Avadānakalpalatā*, pallava 11 (ed. Vidyabhushana). This form of the name would appear to be due to some confusion with the name of a supernatural being, Virūdhaka, the regent of the south, and the chief of the Kumbhāṇḍas, who is mentioned in, for instance, the *Lalitavistara*, chap. 15 (ed. Mitra, 266; Lefmann, 217).

³ Regarding Vaidūrya as another variant of the name of Viḍḍabha, see Watters in this *Journal*, 1898. 556. He has there said that the form Viṭaṭubha occurs in Pāli, as well as Viḍḍabha; and also a form Viḍḍha, which, he considered, “perhaps gave the Chinese Liu-li as if for Vaidūrya.”

Hiuen Tsiang goes on to give, in very few words, a not very accurate account of the occurrence which led up to the massacre of the Sakyas. And, in respect of the four Sakya husbandmen who at first repulsed the army of 'Virūḍhaka,' he tells us that their tribesmen punished them by banishment; because they had disgraced their family, in that they, descendants of a Chakravartin and heirs of the King of the Law, had dared to commit cruel actions, and to apply themselves in cold blood to manslaughter! That seems rather a curious recognition of a signal act of bravery. The reason for it, however, is found in a trait in the behaviour of the Sakyas, as Buddhists, which is mentioned in the story that I give below (see page 172):—*Sammāsambudhassa pana nātakā asattughātakā nāma attanā marantā pi parē jīvitā na vōrōpēnti*; "the kinsmen of Him who completely attained true knowledge were people who did not kill their enemies; they would die, rather than deprive their foes of life." And, after all, the banished men did not remain unrewarded. Going away into the snowy mountains, one of them became king of Udyāna; another, of Bamian; the third, of Himatala; and the fourth, of Shang-mi.

Now, in order to understand several things rightly, we need a fuller account than Hiuen Tsiang has given us of the massacre of the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu. The whole story is found in the introduction to the *Bhaddasāla-jātaka*, No. 465 (the *Jātaka*, ed. Fausböll, 4. 144; trans. Rouse, 91), and in almost identical terms in Buddhaghōsha's commentary on the *Dhammapada* (ed. Fausböll, 216); such differences as there are seem unimportant, except in connection with the dénouement. I put together an abstract of the story, from these two sources, as follows:—

In the days of Pasēnadi, king of Kōsala or Mahā-Kōsala, whose capital was Sāvattihī, the Buddhist monks would go, to eat, only to the houses of trusted friends in whom they had full confidence. There was always a liberal supply of food for them in the king's palace, as also elsewhere. But, having no trusted friend in the palace, they would not go there to eat it. They took it away to eat it in the houses

of Anāthapiṇḍika, of Visākhā, and of other persons on whom they could rely.

This came one day to the notice of king Pasēnadi, who thereupon went to consult Buddha. He asked:—"What is the best kind of food?" Buddha replied:—"The food of confidence, the food that can be trusted; even sour rice-gruel becomes agreeable when given by a trusted friend." "Then," said the king, "in whom do the monks place confidence?" Buddha replied:—"Either in their own kinsmen, or in those who belong to the Sākya families."¹

King Pasēnadi then determined to gain the confidence of the monks by taking a daughter of the Sakyas, and making her his chief queen, and so becoming a kinsman (*ñātika*) of the monks; or, as Buddhaghōsha puts it, by taking into his household a daughter of some kinsman (*ñāti*) of Buddha. And he sent messengers to Kapilavatthu,² to ask the Sākiyas to give him one of their daughters; bidding the messengers to be careful,—Buddhaghōsha adds,—to ascertain the status of the Sakka whose daughter should be given.

Now, the demand placed the Sākiyas in a dilemma. On the one hand, they held the king of Kōsala to be inferior to them in point of birth; and they thought it derogatory, to give a wife to even him. On the other hand, they knew, their territory being a part of his realm, that the orders of the king of Kōsala ran in their country; his authority was supreme and undeniable; even his polite requests had to be complied with; and a refusal might mean their destruction.

In this position, the Sakka Mahānāma,³ a paternal uncle of Buddha, came to the rescue. He had a very beautiful and charming daughter, sixteen years old, named Vāsabha-

¹ I am giving only an abstract, not a translation. But I follow the different forms of the tribal name presented in the originals, uniformly in both as far as the two versions agree. This sentence, however, stands only in the Jātaka; it is not in Buddhaghōsha's commentary. Compare some remarks on page 164 above.

² Buddhaghōsha says here "to the Sākiyas," without mentioning the city in this place.

³ The Jātaka calls him, mostly, simply "Mahānāma." Buddhaghōsha styles him "Mahānāma, the Sakka," almost throughout.

khattiyā, born to him from a slave-girl named Nāgamuṇḍā. A certain ruse was adopted, which had the effect of making the king's messengers believe that they saw Vāsabhakhattiyā eating along with Mahānāma; a thing which could not have been permitted unless she was of full Khattiya birth on both sides. Both the king and his messengers, being apprehensive of some fraud, had in fact demanded that very test. By means of a deception that was practised, their suspicions were allayed. Vāsabhakhattiyā was accepted, and was led away to Sāvattthī, and was placed at the head of the five hundred ladies of the harem of king Pasēnadi, and was anointed as his chief queen. And after no long time she bore to the king a boy, upon whom there was conferred the name Viḍūḍabha.

When he was sixteen years old, Viḍūḍabha obtained his mother's consent, with some difficulty, and then his father's permission, to go and make the acquaintance of his maternal relations, the Sākya princes. And he set out, attended by a great retinue.

Vāsabhakhattiyā took the precaution of warning her relatives privily of the impending visit, by a letter in which she said:—"I am dwelling here in happiness; let not my lords shew him the secret of the matter!" So the Sākiyas, knowing that they could not receive Viḍūḍabha with the customary respectful salutations, sent away into the country all their boys who were younger than him.

On reaching Kapilavatthu,¹ Viḍūḍabha was received by the Sākiyas in their town-hall, and was presented to his maternal grandfather, his maternal uncle, and so on. He did obeisance to all of them, until even his back ached. But he found none to return the compliment to himself. And he asked the reason thereof. The Sākiyas explained that all their boys, younger than him, were absent in the country. And, soothing him by that statement, in other respects they entertained him right royally.

¹ So in the Jātaka; Buddhaghōṣa here has Kapilapura. Further on, where the city is mentioned again (page 171 below), both versions have Kapilavatthu.

After staying there a few days, Viḍḍabha set out to return home. Shortly after he had started, a slave-girl came to purify, by washing it with milk-water, the bench on which he had sat. She happened to exclaim aloud, in doing so:—"This is the bench on which there sat the son of the slave-girl Vāsabhakhattiyā!" This, unfortunately, was overheard by one of the king's armed men, who had returned for his weapon which he had left behind. An explanation ensued; that Vāsabhakhattiyā had been born to Mahānāma, the Sakka, from a slave-girl. On rejoining his comrades, the soldier made the matter known to them. And a great uproar arose, the troops all shouting:—"They say that Vāsabhakhattiyā is the daughter of a slave-girl!"

Viḍḍabha heard the matter. And he registered a vow:—"So!; they are washing with milk-water the bench on which I sat!; well!; let them do so!; when I am king, I will wash it with the blood from their throats!"

When the matter was made known to king Pasēnadi, he was enraged with the Sākiyas for giving him the daughter of a slave-girl to be his wife. And, depriving Vāsabhakhattiyā and her son of all the honours that had been accorded to them, he caused them to be treated just like slaves.

A few days later, however, the Teacher, Buddha, came to the palace. On the circumstances being detailed to him, he agreed that the Sākiyas had behaved improperly; if they gave a wife at all, they should have given one of equal birth. "But," he explained, "Vāsabhakhattiyā is the daughter of a prince; she has been anointed in the house of a Khattiya king; and Viḍḍabha is the son of such a king. Wise men of old have said:—'What matters the family of a mother? the father's family decides the rank.'¹

¹ While awaiting the first proofs of my article, I have happened to read the Tauchnitz translation of Ebers' *Egyptian Princess*, which, though it is a romance, is based on history and on real manners and customs. I find there the following statements placed in the mouth of Rhodopis (l. 163), in respect of her granddaughter Sappho being sought in marriage by Bartja, brother of the Persian king Cambyzes:—

"Her father was free and of noble birth, and I have heard that, by Persian

There was once a poor woman, who supported herself by picking up sticks for firewood; they raised her to the position of chief queen; and from her there was born a boy who attained the sovereignty of Bārāṇasi, and became known as king Kaṭṭhavāhana, the Wood-carrier." And he recited to the king the ancient story of that previous birth, in which he himself, Buddha, had been king Kaṭṭhavāhana.

So king Pasēnadi was appeased. And he restored to Vāsabhakhattiyā and Viḍūḍabha all the honours of which they had been deprived.

Eventually, by the help of a commander-in-chief named Dīgha-Kārāyana, Viḍūḍabha usurped the sovereignty. And, as soon as he was firmly established as king, he remembered that grudge of his against the Sākiyas, and he set out with a great army to destroy them.

Buddha, however, surveying the world, saw the impending destruction that threatened his kinsmen (*ñāti-saṅgha*). And, travelling through the air in order to protect them, he sat down, close to Kapilavatthu, under a tree that gave but scanty shade. Not far from that spot, within the boundary of the dominions of Viḍūḍabha, there was a great banyan-tree, giving dense shade. Viḍūḍabha, seeing the Teacher, approached and saluted him; inquired the reason why, in such heat, he was sitting under a tree giving such poor shade; and asked him to take his seat under the banyan-tree. "Let it be, O king!", said Buddha; "the shade of my kinsmen (*ñātaka*) keeps me cool!" So Viḍūḍabha, recognising that the Teacher had come to protect his kinsmen (*ñātaka*), saluted him, and went back, and returned to Sāvattthī. And Buddha went away through the air to the Jētavana monastery.

"law, the descent of a child is determined by the rank of the father only. In "Egypt too the descendants of a female slave enjoy the same rights as those of a princess, if they owe their existence to the same father" (211).

And, in the course of his reply, Croesus is made to say (l. 164):—"The history of Iran too offers a sufficient number of examples in which even slaves "became the mothers of kings" (212).

The notes refer us:— 211, to Diod. 1. 81; and 212, to Firdusi, Book of the Kings, Sons of Feridun.

This happened a second time, and a third. And, so far, the Jātaka and Buddhaghōṣha's account are in agreement. From this point they differ.

The version given in the Jātaka says that, on the fourth occasion, Buddha, having regard to the acts of the Sākiyas in a former state of existence, and especially to an unattonable sin that they had committed by poisoning a river, went not again to their assistance. And so, king Viḍūḍabha then slew all the Sākiyas, beginning with the babes at the breast; and with the blood from their throats he washed the bench on which he had sat.

Now, even without the evidence of the Piprāwā inscription, it would be difficult to dismiss this story altogether, as simply an invention of later days. At the same time, it must be observed that that version of it would be somewhat injurious to the credibility of the Mahāparinibbānasutta, which, without even hinting at any such occurrences, treats the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu as being in the full possession of life and prosperity after the death of Buddha.

Buddhaghōṣha, however, has given a different account of the ending of the matter. Stating, like the Jātaka, that on the fourth occasion Buddha did not go to preserve his kinsmen, and assigning the same reason for his abstaining from doing so, he continues as follows :—

When, for the fourth time, Viḍūḍabha came to slay the Sākiyas, they went out to meet him in battle. They, however, the kinsmen (*ñātaka*) of Buddha, were people (see page 167 above) who did not kill their enemies; they would die, rather than deprive their foes of life. So, exercising their great skill in archery, and seeking only to frighten their foes and put them to flight by means of it, they shot their arrows in between the shields and the openings of the ears of their assailants and so on, without harming any of them. Viḍūḍabha, however, even when he found, by counting, that none of his men were slain, was only partially appeased and diverted from his purpose. But he relented so far as to give orders that only those who confessed themselves to be Sākiyas should be slain; and also that the

immediate followers of his maternal grandfather, Mahānāma the Sakka, should be spared.

Now, the Sākiyas were people in respect of whom it was said:— *Tē marantā pi musāvādaṃ na bhaṇanti*; “they would die, rather than utter a falsehood,” or at any rate tell a deliberate lie. But they were not all prepared to die on that occasion. So, not seeing any other course open to them, again they resorted to a ruse. Some of them began to bite grass; others snatched up reeds.¹ When they were asked:— “Are ye Sākiyas, or not?,” each of the former replied:— *Nō sākō tiṇaṃ*; “it is not a potherb that I am biting; it is grass!;” mumbling his words, of course, so that they sounded as if he said, though he would not really say:— *Nō Sākiyō*; “I am not a Sākiya!” And each of the others mumbled:— *Nō sākō naḷō*; “it is not a potherb that I hold; it is a reed!” Thus each of them conveyed the meaning:—“I am not a Sākiya; I surrender and ask for quarter.”

So there were saved alive, not only the immediate followers of Mahānāma, but also others, who therefrom came to be known as *Tiṇa-Sākiyas*, “grass Sākiyas,” and *Naḷa-Sākiyas*, “reed Sākiyas.”

But all the rest of them, including even the little babes at the breast, *Viḍḍabha* slew. And, making a veritable river of blood to flow,² with the blood from their throats

¹ The biting of grass was a Hindū token of submission to an enemy, with a request for quarter. And it is to be inferred that holding a reed in the hand had the same meaning.

To this meaning of the biting of grass, there are frequent allusions. For instance, a passage in an inscription of the twelfth century says (IA, 19. 218):— “Tears, forsooth, are in the eyes of thy enemy’s consort; blades of grass are perceived between thy adversary’s teeth;; desolate are the minds of thy foes, when the jubilee of thy onward march has come, O illustrious lord *Vigraharāja*!” And in the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* we have (*trans.* Tawney, 55):—“Since even enemies are let off, when near death, if they take grass in their mouths, how can you slay these harmless beasts who always feed on grass?” And again (*ibid.* 189):—“Grass is now worshipped in Paramardin’s city, because, when taken in the mouth, it preserved our lord Paramardin from *Prithvirāja*, the king of men.”

On the other hand, the throwing of grass and water was a challenge (*see ibid.* 97, 172). We may perhaps infer, from *Buddhaghōsha*’s text, that biting potherbs, or holding them in the hands, was also a challenge.

² The text has *lōhita-nadinī pavattītvā*. As, in Sanskrit at any rate, we have the two forms *lōhita* and *rōhita* in similar meanings, we may perhaps find

he washed the bench on which he had sat. Thus he cut off the Sākiya race.

We need mention only briefly the subsequent fortunes of Mahānāma and Viḍūḍabha, as reported by Buddhaghōsha. In order to avoid having to eat a meal in the company of Viḍūḍabha, Mahānāma loosed his long hair, tied it into a knot in front, fastened it to his great-toes, and plunged into a lake, intending to drown himself; but he was rescued by a Nāga king, in whose palace he remained for twelve years. While Viḍūḍabha and his retinue, journeying on, and encamping on the bank of the Achiravatī, were there caught by a great flood, and, being eventually washed out to sea, became the food of tortoises and fishes.

* * * * *

Here, in this story, we find the explanation of the matter, and learn why we have in the Piprāwā Stūpa a memorial, not of Buddha, but of the kinsmen of Buddha. The remains and relics found in the Stūpa are remains and relics of the slaughtered residents of Kapilavatthu, massacred in the circumstances detailed above.

As regards, indeed, the effect of the story on the credibility of the Mahāparinibbānasutta, we have to remark that, like the Jātaka, Buddhaghōsha, also, distinctly places the massacre in the lifetime of Buddha; he goes on to say that, on a remonstrance being addressed to the Teacher, Buddha, to the effect that the slaughter of the Sākiyas was an improper deed, the Teacher explained to the monks that, though such a fate had not been deserved by anything done by them in their latest stage of existence, it was merited by the sin committed by them, in poisoning the water of a river, in a previous birth; and the Teacher made the fate of also Viḍūḍabha the subject of a sermon. But we have also to note that Buddhaghōsha represents some at least of the people as having survived the massacre; and

here the origin of the name of the river, the Rōhiṇī, which flowed between the territories of the Sākiyas and their cousins the Kōliyas; see, *e.g.*, the Jātaka, 5. 412, and the commentary on the Dhammapada, 351. To the Chinese, the name was evidently given either as Rōhitanadī or as Lōhitanadī; see *Watters in this Journal*, 1898. 547.

that neither does he, nor does the account given in the Jātaka, assert or hint that the city Kapilavatthu was razed to the ground, or even was laid waste.

So, accepting the version which reached Buddhaghōṣha, we need find no difficulty in believing that, on the death of Buddha, there were still left, at Kapilavatthu itself, some of the kinsmen of Buddha, in sufficiently prosperous circumstances to receive a portion of his relics, and to build there a Stūpa over them, as is related in the Mahāparinibbānasutta.¹ We may find such survivors in the Tīṇa-Sākiyas, the Naḷa-Sākiyas, and the other Sākiyas who were spared because they were the immediate followers of Mahānāma. And we may also find amongst them, or amongst their descendants, the man or men who,—prompted by the gods, says Hiuen Tsiang,—collected the bones and other relics of the slaughtered people, and buried them, and left us the record which has at length, after so many centuries, come to light.

* * * * *

I am afraid that this my article, unravelling the true meaning of an ancient record which some unknown friend of a long since dead and vanished Hindū tribe bequeathed to foreign epigraphists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is somewhat iconoclastic. But, though the sentimental value of the record, and of the remains found with it, so far as it has rested upon the belief that the Piprāwā Stūpa has yielded veritable relics of Buddha himself, has disappeared, we gain new points of interest in what we now have before us.

¹ It need hardly be observed that there were, of course, others of the tribe, besides the inhabitants of Kapilavatthu. For instance, the Saṅguttanikāya (ed. Feer, part 1) mentions a town of the Sakyas named Khōmadussa, in the Sakka country (7. 2, 12), and also a place named Silāvati in the Sakka country (4. 3, 1, 2). The Milindapañña mentions Sakyas of Chātumā (ed. Trenckner, 209). Buddhaghōṣha (*op. cit.* 222) and the Jātaka (4. 151) mention a town of the Sakyas named Uḷumpa. And a Chinese work appears to locate at only three *yōjanas* from Srāvastī a village of the tribe which it calls Lu-t'ang, "the deer-hall" (Watters, On Yuan Chwang, 1. 401).

There is no indication of Viḍḍabha having slaughtered any of the Sakyas beyond those of Kapilavatthu. And some of the Sakyas of such other towns may have helped to repopulate Kapilavatthu.

The record gives us, as I have shewn, the origin of the earlier name of the tribe to which Buddha belonged. The kinsmen of Buddha, *Buddhassa sakiyā*, became first the Sakiyas, and then the Sakyas. And from that there came the appellation of Buddha as Sakyamuni, "the Sakya saint."

And, though the full story of the massacre by Viḍūḍabha is first found in only the comparatively late works from which I have taken it,—one of them, at least, composed some nine centuries after the event,—we can hardly fail to see in the inscriptional record, and in the nature of the articles found with it, an appreciable though silent corroboration of the narrative, and reasonable grounds for believing that that narrative has an historical basis in fact.

But also, the value of the record in another direction, recognised from the time when it first came to notice,—namely, in localising Kapilavatthu, Kapilavastu, the city of the Sakya, Śākya, prince Śuddhōdana, the father of Buddha,—remains, in my opinion, unimpaired.

In describing the auspicious omens that heralded the birth of Buddha, the Lalitavistara tells us (ed. Mitra, 87; ed. Lefmann, 76) that Kapilavastu was near enough to the slopes of the Himālaya mountains for the young lions to come prowling down around it, and to stand at its gates, hailing with their roars the impending event. To this indication of the position of Kapilavastu there answers well the position of Piprāwā, in the north-east corner of the Bastī district, on the frontier of Nēpāl. And to somewhere in that neighbourhood we are clearly led by the descriptions of their travels given by Fa-hian and Hiuen Tsiang, both of whom visited the site of the ancient city, which, however, already in the time of Fa-hian was in ruins, and was nothing but mounds and jungle and desolation.

But, further, there is another guide which leads us to the exact locality of Piprāwā itself. The Suttanipāta tells us (ed. Fausböll, verse 683) that Buddha was born:—*Sakyāna gāmē janapadē Lumbinēyyē*; "in a village of the Sakyas, in the Lumbinī country." The Lalitavistara, specifying more closely the actual site of his birth, tells us (ed. Mitra,

94, 104, 110; ed. Lefmann, 82, 91, 96) that it was a garden known as the Lumbinīvana. The Nidānakathā tells us (see the Jātaka, ed. Fausböll, 1. 52) that the garden was situated between Kapilavatthu and the neighbouring town Dēvadaha,— which we know, from other sources,¹ was the city of the Kōliyas, the cousins of the Sakyas, and was also called Kōlanagara and Vyagghapajja. And both to Fa-hian, and to Hiuen Tsiang, there was shewn the Lumbinīvana garden, which their statements place, roughly, some six to ten miles towards the east from the place shewn to them as Kapilavastu.

The Lumbinīvana garden is located for us by the Rummindēi pillar inscription of Aśōka (EI, 5. 4), which was found close to a mound of ruins, known by the name Rummindēi, in the Nepalese Tarai, about eight miles towards the east-north-east from Piprāwā. This record marks the locality by the ancient name Lumminigāma, the village Lummini. And it tells us that Aśōka did the place the honour of visiting it in person; that it was shewn to him as the scene of the birth of Buddha, the Sakya saint; and that he set up a stone column there,— namely, the column the extant part of which bears the inscription.

There is no reason for supposing that the place where the inscribed portion of the column was found, standing and partly buried, is not the place where the column was originally set up. In the first part of the name Rummindēi, we recognise at once a survival of the ancient name Lummini, Lumbinī. The Lumbinīvana garden is thus located for us. And this identification distinctly takes us to the neighbourhood of Piprāwā for the position of the city Kapilavatthu, Kapilavastu.

Now, as is seen at once from the plaster cast, the characters of the Piprāwā record resemble very nearly those of the Aśōka edicts; favouring most closely, perhaps, those of the Delhi-Siwālik pillar. But we are not by any means

¹ See, for instance, Buddhaghōsha's Sumaṅgalavilāsini, ed. Davids and Carpenter, p. 262.

thereby reduced to placing in the time of Aśoka the composition and engraving of the record, and the erection of the Stūpa in which it was deposited. Palæographic grounds, alone, can rarely, if ever, enable us to fix within at least a century or so the time of an undated record which does not present the name of a well-known king, or some other specific guide.¹

In this case we have the point that time must have elapsed before, from the expression *Buddhassa sakiyā*, "the kinsmen of Buddha," there was evolved the name Sakiya as the appellation of the tribe to which Buddha belonged, and from that, again, the form Sakya, which first appears, so far as definite dates go, in the Rummindēi inscription of Aśoka.

And another clear indication that the Piprāwā inscription is considerably older than the records of Aśoka is found in the complete absence of the long *ā* from it; in *nidhanē* for *nidhānē*, and in the penultimate syllable of the genitives *sabhaginikanaṃ*, *saputadalananaṃ*, *sakiyanaṃ*. We find, indeed, a partial absence of the long *ā* in the Rummindēi and Niglīva inscriptions of Aśoka (EI, 5. 4, 5); in the words *Piyadasina* for *Piyadassinā*, *lājina* for *lājīnā*, *atana* for *attanā*, *kālāpita* for *kālāpitā*, and *usapāpitē* for *ussāpāpitē*. But the long *ā* is otherwise duly shewn in those two records. Except in any cases of purely accidental omission, it is always found throughout the Brāhmī versions of the edicts of Aśoka. And the complete absence of it from the Piprāwā inscription is a decisive indication of very considerable antiquity.²

¹ Of this, there is on record a case in point which may appositely be cited. It has been said, and not unjustifiably (this *Journal*, 1903. 293), that the characters on a certain coin may be, perhaps, of the ninth or tenth century; leaving us to infer that the coin itself might be allotted to that time. But, from the words of the legend, "the glorious Rāyamurāri," we know that the coin is one of the Kalachurya king Rāyamurāri-Sōvidēva-Sōmēśvara of Kalyāṇi, who reigned A.D. 1167-1177.

² Except in one word, in the last line, the same absence of the long *ā* appears to run through the record, in Brāhmī characters, on the Sōhgaurā plate (*Proc. JASB*, 1894. 84, plate; *IA*, 25. 261), which would thus seem to come rather near to the Piprāwā inscription in point of age.

On the other hand, the long *ā* is shewn in the legend, in Brāhmī characters, on

We may confidently, for these two reasons, place this record not later than a full century before the time of Aśoka. We may, in my opinion, place it even much nearer still to the date of the death of Buddha in B.C. 482. We may, in any case, unhesitatingly stamp it as the oldest known Indian record. And we may safely believe that it was written, engraved, and buried at a time when, even if the city Kapilavatthu, Kapilavastu, had then been deserted and had become waste, the position of the city was still well known.

The mound, the ruined Stūpa, in which the record and the relics were found, may or may not mark the actual scene of the massacre of the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu. As regards Hiuen Tsiang's statement,—the north-west corner of the city would be the place at which an army coming from Sāvattī would most naturally approach it. But we can hardly believe that each of some "hundreds and thousands" of Stūpas had a separate record of its own. It would be a remarkable coincidence if, amongst very many monuments of an identical nature, there has survived the only one actually containing a record. Fa-hian's statement mentions only one memorial of the massacre, and distinctly suggests that it stood, not amongst a vast number of other Stūpas, but in a somewhat isolated position such as that occupied by the Piprāwā mound. And it seems not impossible that what was shewn to Hiuen Tsiang was, in reality, the general cemetery of Kapilavatthu; a cemetery similar to, but on a larger scale than, that which has been found at Lauriya in the Champāran district.¹

the Ēraṇ coin of Dhamapāla (C.CAI, plate 11, No. 18; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, plate 4, No. 7), which is allotted (see Bühler's *Indische Palaeographie*, § 3) "if not to B.C. 400, at least to the middle of the fourth century;" that is, to about a century before the time of Aśoka. So far, however, as this attribution is based on the view that the legend on the coin was written in reversed style, from right to left, see remarks in my introductory note to the English version of Dr. Bühler's work (*Indian Antiquary*, vol. 33, 1904, appendix).

¹ See Dr. Bloch's Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey, Bengal Circle, 1904-1905. 11.

A Buddhist cemetery (*susāna*) is mentioned in one of the Bharaut inscriptions (IA, 21. 228, No. 9):—"The woman Asaḍa, who has observed the jackals in the cemetery." The representation of the scene, however (*Stupa of Bharhut*, plate 47, bottom, right) does not shew any mounds.

But, however that may be, the only appropriate place for depositing such a record and the relics that were enshrined with it, would be in or close to the city of the people to whom it referred and they belonged. That was, surely, recognised by the unknown friend who so piously collected some of the bones of the slaughtered people, and entombed them along with the trinkets and household treasures of the women and the playthings of the children. And, though the mound in which the record and the relics were found may possibly not indicate the north-west corner of the city Kapilavatthu, we need not question the point that it marks some portion of the site of the city, or at least some spot in the immediate outskirts of the city which may have been more convenient for erecting the memorial.

IX.

SAKASTANA.

BY F. W. THOMAS.

1. WHERE DWELT THE ŚAKAS NAMED BY DARIUS AND
HERODOTUS ?

THE earliest references to the Śakas have been so often discussed that it would seem scarcely worth while to seek for further information in them (*see* Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1880, iv, pp. 200 sqq.). But the passages in Herodotus and the inscriptions of Darius have suggested to me a doubt which I should like to submit for consideration.

The notices contained in the history of Herodotus are as follows :—

(1) In book i, c. 153, we are told that Cyrus was prevented from giving his full attention to the subjugation of the Greeks by being called away elsewhere—*ἥ τε γὰρ Βαβυλῶν οἱ ἦν ἐμπόδιος, καὶ τὸ Βάκτριον ἔθνος, καὶ Σάκαι τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι· ἐπ' οὓς ἐπέιχεε στρατηλατέειν αὐτὸς*: "For he was preoccupied with Babylon and the Baktrian nation, and the Sakai and Egyptians, against whom he proposed himself to take the command."

(2) In book iii, cc. 90–3, we have an enumeration of the twenty *νόμοι* into which Darius divided the Persian Empire of his day. Fourteen of these I may leave out of question. The remaining six, which comprise the eastern portion of the empire, are as follows :—

No. 7. *Σατταγύδαι, Γανδάριοι, Δαδίκαι, Ἀπαρύται.*

No. 10. *Βακτριανοὶ μέχρι Αἰγλῶν.*

No. 14. *Τα Σαγάρτιοι, Σαραγγαί, Θαμάναιοι, Οὔτιοι, Μύκοι, and the inhabitants of the islands in the Indian Ocean.*

No. 15. The *Σάκαι* and *Κάσπιοι*.

No. 16. The *Πάρθοι*, *Χοράσμιοι*, *Σογδοί*, and *Ἀρειοι*.

No. 17. The *Παρικάνιοι* and *Αἰθίοπες οἱ ἐξ Ἀσίας*.

(3) In book vii, c. 64, we learn that the Sakai were under the same command with the Baktrioi in the army of Xerxes, that their dress consisted of pointed headgear and *ἀναξυρίδες* and their weapons were *ἀξίλαι σαγάρεις*, and that the *Σκύθαι Ἀμύργιοι* were by the Persians called *Σάκαι*, a name which they gave to all *Σκύθαι*. The *Ἴνδοί* are next mentioned. Cf. *Μήδους τε καὶ Σάκας καὶ Βακτρίους τε καὶ Ἰνδούς*, viii, 113.

(4) In book ix, c. 71, we find that the *Σάκαι* formed the best cavalry in the army of Xerxes.

(5) In book ix, c. 113, the *Βάκτριοι* and *Σάκαι* are clearly neighbours.

In these passages Herodotus, whose information in regard to Persia is not at first hand, seems to use the term *Σάκαι* in more than one application. The *Σάκαι* of No. (4) are the same who appear in Persian armies on other occasions as *ἵπποτοξόται*, 'horse-bowmen,' e.g. at Arbela (Arrian's *Anabasis*, iii, c. 8). Their armature was the same as that of the Scythians beyond the Jaxartes who fought against Alexander and that which later was perfected by the Parthians (Justin, xli, 2). They are therefore to be distinguished from the *Σάκαι Ἀμύργιοι* of No. (3). As regards the *Σάκαι* of No. (5) it is impossible to say whether they are the eastern neighbours of the Bactrians, i.e. the wood-and-cave-inhabiting nomads of the Alexandrine geographers (see Ptolemy, vi, c. xiii), or the Scythian Massagetæ on the north-west frontier of Bactria. The events connected with Spitamenes and Dataphernes in the course of Alexander's wars (Arrian's *Anabasis*, iv, cc. 16 sqq.) are perhaps in favour of the latter supposition. The *Σάκαι* associated with the *Κάσπιοι* in No. (2) have been identified with the former and with the *Σάκαι Ἀμύργιοι*, and a place has been found in the mountains east of Bactria for two peoples, *Σάκαι Ἀμύργιοι* and *Κάσπιοι*, neither of which can otherwise be traced there. The *Κάσπιοι* known to us

are situated on the west of the Caspian Sea. But the *Κάσπιοι* of this passage must be the same people which is mentioned in Herod. vii, c. 67, in the account of the army of Xerxes. There, as in the list of *νόμοι*, they are enumerated between the Parthian group (*Πάρθοι καὶ Χοράσμιοι καὶ Σογδοὶ τε καὶ Γανδάριοι καὶ Λαδίκαι*) and the southern group (*Σαραγγαί, Πάκτες, Οὔτιοι καὶ Μύκοι τε καὶ Παρικάνιοι*), and their armature is the same as that of the *Πάκτες*, while their leader is brother to the leader of the *Γανδάριοι καὶ Λαδίκαι*. It is therefore unlikely that the *Σάκαι* joined with them are identical with the *Σάκαι* of the Alexandrines, who would, moreover, probably be included in the Bactrian *νόμος* (No. 10).

If now we turn to our second authority of the first order, we are presented with the following facts:—

(1) On p. 5 of the second edition of Spiegel¹ we find an enumeration of the provinces subdued by Darius, namely, Persia, Susiana, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Sparda (i.e. Lydia), Ionia, Media, Armenia, Kappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Khorasmia, Baktria, Sogdiana, Gandhara, the Sakas, Thatagush, Arakhosia, and the Makas. (*Behistūn*, i, § 6.)

(2) On p. 13 Darius enumerates as the provinces which revolted from him Persia, Media, Assyria, Armenia, Parthia, Margiana, the Thatagush, and Sakas. (*Behistūn*, ii, § 2.)

(3) On pp. 49–51 the tributary provinces are named as Susiana, Media, Babylonia, Arabia, Assyria, Egypt, Armenia, Kappadocia, Sparda, the Greeks of the mainland and the islands, and in the East the following: the Sagartians, Parthians, Zrankas, Aria, Baktria, Sogdiana, Khorasmia, the Thatagush, Arakhosia, India, Gandhara, the Sakas, and the Makas. (*Persepolis*, i.)

(4) On p. 55 we find another list: Media, Susiana, Parthia, Aria, Baktria, Sogdiana, Khorasmia, Zranka, Arakhosia,

¹ In regard to the points discussed in this paper, neither the new edition of the Old Persian inscriptions nor the edition of the so-called Scythian nor that of the Babylonian version (all included in the *Assyriologische Bibliothek*) supplies any divergent information.

the Thatagush, Gandhara, India, the Sakā Humavarkā (Haumavarkā) and Tigrakhaudā, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Kappadocia, Sparda, Ionia, the *Sakā Taradarya* or Scythians beyond the sea, the Skudra, Ionians who wear crowns, the Putiyas, Kushiya, Maciyas, Karkas. (*Naksh-i-Rustam*, a, § 3.)

In the *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, ii, p. 388, Professor Geiger has arranged these and other references of Darius, which are unmistakably grouped on a geographical principle (Justi, *Grundriss*, ii, p. 454), in a table which we may now in part reproduce :—

DARIUS.	HERODOTUS.	STRABO.	ISIDORE OF CHARAX.	AMMIANUS.	AVESTA.	MODERN.
1. Parsa ...	Persis.	Persis. Paraitakene. Karmania.		Persis, 4. Carmania Maior, 6		Farsistān. Kermān.
4. Parthava ...	Parthians, Sogdians, Khorasmians, and	Hurkania. Parthuaia.	Khoarene, 9. Komisene, 10. Hurkania, 11. Astabene, 12. Parthuene, 13. Apauartikene, 14	Hyrcania, 7. Parthia, 5.	Varena, 14. Vehrkāna, 9. Cakhra, 13.	Khurāsān.
5. Haraiva ...	Arians, 16.	Aria.	Aria, 16.	Aria, 14.	Haraēva, 6.	
6. Bakhtri ...	Baktria.	Margiane. Baktriane.	Margiane, 15.	Margiana, 8. Bactriana, 9.	Mouru, 3. Nisaya, 5. Bakhdhi, 4.	Merv. Balkh.
7. Suguda ...	With the Parthians, <i>v. supra.</i>	Sogdiane.		Sogdiana, 10.	Sughdha, 2 (Gava).	Sogdiana.
8. Uvārazmī ...		Khorasmioi.			(Hwairizem.)	Khiva.
9. Zaranka ...	Serangians, Sagartians, Outians, Mukians, 14.	Drangiane.	Anabon, 17. Drangiane, 18. Sakastene, 19.	Drangiana, 16.	Haetumant, 12.	Sistān (Hēlmund).
10. Haraувati		Arakhosia.	Arakhosia, 20.	Arachosia, 17.	Harahvaiti, 11.	Kandahār.
11. Thatagu ...	Sattagudes, Gandarii, Dadikai, Aparutsi.	Paropamisadai.		Paropamisadae, 14.	Vaākereta, 7.	Kabul.
(12. Gandāra)		Gedrosia. Oritai.		Gedrosia, 18.	Urva, 8 (Pisina).	Ghazna, Balū- cistān.

The situations of most of the peoples named in these lists are sufficiently known. The Sagartians are fixed by the fact that Arbela was in their country; the name of the Makas, the Mukoi of Herodotus, recurs in the modern Mekran; the Outioi of Herodotus are the Yutiya of Darius, and belong to Persia proper; the Aparutai occupied a country in Southern Drangiana towards Karmania, which also shares with other districts elsewhere the name Paraitakene. The question of the Sakas is one of extreme difficulty. The statement of Herodotus that the Persians gave the name Saka to all Scythians seems to be confirmed by the usage of Darius, who applies it both to European Scythians (the *Sakā Taradarya*, 'Sakas beyond the sea') and to his eastern subjects the *Sakā Tigrakhaudā* ('Sakas with pointed caps') and *Sakā Haumavarkā*. The conquest of the latter, with the death of one king and the capture and execution of Skunka, the other, is related in an unfortunately mutilated passage of the old Persian inscriptions, which is not represented in the 'Scythian' and Babylonian versions. Here the words *ashiyavām abiy Sakām*, 'I went against Sake,' *abiy darayam aram*, 'to that sea,' and *viyatarayam*, 'I crossed,' can be clearly read, and, as the European Scythians are out of the question, we must find some 'sea' which fits in with the circumstances.

From the united testimony of the Greek and Latin writers we know that there were Asiatic Scythians dwelling (1) in the country north of Parthia and between the Caspian and the Aral Sea. Here were the Parni (the Varena of the Avesta?), the Dahæ, and from here probably came the Saraucæ or Sacaraucae.¹ (2) In the country north of the Jaxartes, where dwelt, for instance, the Scythians ruled by Satrakes, who fought against Alexander. (3) In the mountainous country about the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes. It is only in the last case that the name Σάκαι is fully attested.² Megasthenes tells us (McCrindle, p. 30)

¹ See the map in Tomaschek's *Centralasiatische Studien*, i, and Ptolemy's *Geographia*, vi, xiv, 13.

² Cf. Strabo, xi, c. viii, 2: οἱ μὲν δὴ πλείους τῶν Σκυθῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Κασπίας.

that the Hemodos divides India from the part of Scythia inhabited by the Scythians called Σάκαι. Ptolemy enumerates (McCrindle, pp. 283-5) as their tribes the Karatai, Komaroi, Komedai (the Chinese Kiu-mi-tho), Massagetai, Grunaioi Skuthai, Toornai, and Bultai (Baltistan). With these passages we may associate the expression in Strabo: ἀπὸ τῆς περαιᾶς τοῦ Ἰαξάρτου τῆς κατὰ Σάκας καὶ Σογδιανούς, ἣν κατεῖχον Σάκαι, although it involves some illegitimate extension northwards and westwards; for, according to the geography of Ptolemy, the Tokharoi and other tribes who invaded Sogdiana and Bactria would be Σκύθαι and not Σάκαι, as also are, according to Arrian, the tribes beyond the Jaxartes who fought against Alexander. Here, therefore, the Amurgian Sakai are usually placed.¹

But how are we to reconcile such a situation with the mention of the sea by Darius? A solution of this difficulty is proposed by Justi, who writes (*Grundriss d. Iranischen Philologie*, ii, p. 445):—

“By reason of the ‘sea’ the reference has been
 “conjectured to be to the European Scythians, who
 “are in fact called *Sakā tyaiy taradaraya*, but are,
 “however, in the inscription of Naksh-i-Rustam, care-
 “fully distinguished from the *Sakā Haumavargā* and
 “*Tigrakhaudā*. The word *drayah* (sea) will have been
 “here used like the modern Persian *daryā* of a great
 “river, as in fact of the Jaxartes, now *Sir Daryā*:
 “*daryā-i-Gang*, Firdausi 709, 494, and of the Oxus or
 “*Jaihun*.” He then quotes further instances.

I do not think it possible to subscribe to this argument. The word *zrayah* (Zend) or *drayah* (old Persian), originally,

θαλάττης ἀρξάμενοι Δάαι προσαγορεύονται. τοὺς δὲ προσεφούς τούτων μᾶλλον Μασσαγέτας, καὶ Σάκας ὀνομάζουσι. τοὺς δ' ἄλλους κοινῶς μὲν Σκύθας ὀνομάζουσιν, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ὡς ἐκάστους.

¹ There seems to be no real proof that the *Sse* of the Chinese, though the original pronunciation was *Sek* or *Sok* (see M. Lévi's very interesting note, *Journal Asiatique*, sér. ix, vol. ix, 1897, pp. 10, 11), were our *Sakas*. The Tibetan *Sog* means Mongol.

no doubt, meaning 'wide space' (cf. Sanskrit *jrayas*), is used by Darius himself more than once in the sense of 'sea,' and in the Avesta it is applied only to certain definite stretches of water, namely, (a) the world ocean (*vouru-kaša*), (b) with *pūitika*, a mythical lake, (c) with *kaṁsaoya*, the Hāmūn lake.¹ In the face of this, of what value is the occasional idiomatic use of *daryā* first traced in Firdausi, 1,500 years later than Darius? We may add that the well-known citation from Hellanicus' *Scythica* (Ἀμύργιον πεδίου Σακῶν), though it might suit the plains east of the Caspian or north of the Jaxartes, would not be applicable to the mountains of the Caucasus inhabited by Ptolemy's Sakai.

No one has suggested that it was the Caspian Sea which Darius crossed to attack the Sakas, nor is this a probable hypothesis.² Against tribes dwelling to the east of that sea, he would no doubt have despatched his satraps in Hyrcania, Parthia, or Bactria, just as the rebellions in Parthia, Hyrcania, and Margiana were suppressed by governors of Parthia and Bactria, Hystaspes (father of Darius), and Dādaršiš.³

Is there any fatal objection to an identification of the sea in question with the Hāmūn lake itself, which even in modern times bears the name Zarrah and in the time of Darius gave the name Drangiana to the surrounding country?⁴ We may note in passing that with reference to this region Darius always uses the form with *z*, Zrañka, also represented by the Σαργγαί of Herodotus, and that this proves the name to have been current in the country itself, since the Persian form of the word would be Drañka.⁵

It may be said that the settlement of Sakas in this region, afterwards known as Sakastāna, now Sistān, is an event which may be assigned to a definite date, namely, the end of the

¹ Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *zrayah*-.

² According to Strabo, xi, c. vii, 2, the Caspian was ἀπλούς τε καὶ ἀργός, 'unsailed and idle.'

³ *Behistun Inscr.*, ii, § 35 (xvi) - iii, 38 (iii).

⁴ Drangiana = 'Seelandschaft' (Geiger, *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, ii, p. 393, doubted by Foy, *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, xxxv, p. 22).

⁵ This remark is also made by Foy, *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, xxxvii, p. 536.

second century B.C.,¹ and that with this date well accords the fact that the name Sakastāna is first recorded by Isidor of Charax² in the time of Augustus, being unknown before. The first part of this objection seems, however, to be baseless. Testimony of such an immigration of Sakas into south-eastern Persia is, so far as I have ascertained, to be *entirely wanting*: what we have is a conjecture based upon the Chinese accounts of the movements of the Yue-tchi, which accounts in themselves contain no such statement.³ As for the name Sakastāna, it may be due as well to the rise of Sakas, already in the country, to a consolidated power as to their first appearance there,⁴ and such an event may very well have taken place during the decay of the Greek rulers of Bactria, who, though at one time possessed of Kandahar and Sindh, later “per varia bella iactati non regnum tantum, “verum etiam libertatem amiserunt, siquidem Sogdianorum “et *Arachotorum* et *Drangianorum* et *Arcorum* bellis fatigati “ad postremum ab invalidioribus Parthis velut exsanguis “oppressi sunt” (Justin, xli, c. 6).

Secondly, it may be objected that when we have taken account of the Drangians, Thatagush, Arachosians, Gandharians, and Makas, who are all separately mentioned by Darius, we have no room in south-eastern Persia, Afghanistan, and Baluchistan for the insertion of the Sakas. This leads me to make the following observations.

The country lying between India and Persia, to which Strabo assigns the collective name of Ariana, includes on the

¹ Geiger, *Grundriss*, ii, p. 393; Justi, *ibid.*, p. 489.

² *Stathmoi Parthikoi*, § 18.

³ See Mr. Vincent Smith's article, J.R.A.S., 1903, pp. 1-64, esp. pp. 18-24 and reff.

[I find that the above statement requires modification. Ma-twan-lin's work (thirteenth century) does, in the account of Ki-pin, affirm that when the Yue-tchi moved west “the king of the Saï went to the south to dwell in Ki-pin. The “tribes of the Saï divided and dispersed so as to form here and there different “kingdoms. From Sou-le on the north-west, all the dependencies of Hieu-Siun “and Siun-tu (Sind) are inhabited by former Saï tribes” (Rémusat, *Nouveaux Mélanges*, i, pp. 205-6). Whether this account goes back to an earlier source I am not in a position to say. Sakastāna, though not mentioned, might be held to be included. But the whole story seems to me incorrect.]

⁴ The ‘German Empire’ and ‘Hindustan’ are rather later than the Germans and Hindus!

north the regions of (1) Aria (Herat), (2) the Paropamisadæ (Western Afghanistan, etc.), and (3) Gandhara, immediately south of which lie (4) Drangiana, and (5) Arachosia (the Helmund valley and the district between that river and the Indus), while the whole space between the two latter and the ocean is included under the term (6) Gedrosia. By these six territories the whole of Ariana, as is shown by the statements concerning their boundaries, is marked out with no gap. The Ikhthuophagoi with their rather more inland neighbours, the Mukoi, occupy the western part of Gedrosia, where it borders upon Karmania.¹

The names of these six districts, among which, however, Gedrosia or Gadrosia is not etymologically certain,² are all territorial, not ethnological, and they accordingly tell us nothing concerning the inhabitants.

With one exception these divisions are known to both Darius and Herodotus. We may note the following details:—Herodotus does not mention the Paropamisadæ; but there can be no reasonable doubt, in view of the geographical conditions, that the territory afterwards so named was occupied by his *Sattagudai*, the Thatagush of Darius. The latter has the word *Paruparaesana*, *Paruparanisanna*, in the 'Scythian' and Babylonian versions of his inscriptions, in place, however, not of the Thatagush, who are there mentioned, but of Gandhara. This substitution is so surprising that we must suspect an error in the drawing up of the text in question; but if that is not the case, the most likely supposition is that the name was applied to any part of the Hindu Kush and the mountains of Afghanistan which was not preoccupied by other terms. In any case the matter can cause no difficulty. Concerning the Dadikai, whom Herodotus twice mentions in connection with the Gandarioi, we need say nothing; whether they are the Dards or not, they do not come into the question. Similarly, it is of no importance whether the Aparutai (Zend

¹ Other Ikhthuophagoi and a people named Makai are placed by Ptolemy (vi, c. vii, 14) on the Arabian side of the Gulf of Oman.

² Cf. Zend *kadrva* = Skt. *kadrū*, 'brown,' *kadrvaspa*, 'a certain mountain,' acc. to Brunnhofer, *Iran u. Turan*, pp. 109, 168.

Pouruta) were really inhabitants of the *Σακαστανή Σακῶν Σκυθῶν ἢ καὶ Παρατακηνή* of Isidor of Charax. As regards the *Πάκτες* of Herodotus, who are twice associated with the city of Kaspatures, and from whose name is supposed to come the term Pashto, they also, being on the immediate confines of India, do not affect the problem.

The region not mentioned by Darius or Herodotus is Gedrosia, which, as we learn from Strabo and Ptolemy, adjoined Drangiana and Arachosia on the north, and stretched south as far as the ocean. That the land was in the possession of Darius cannot be doubted. His Arachosian Satrap Vivāna fought two battles, at Kāpisakānish¹ and Gandumava, with an army sent against him by the rebel Vahyazdata from Persis (*Behistūn*, iii, §§ 44–5), which army would no doubt pass through Gedrosia. Here also we find in Herodotus the tributary *Αἰθίοπες οἱ ἐξ Ἀσπης*, long identified with the Dravidian Brahui of the hills. Whether the *Παρκάνιοι*, whose name is exactly reproduced in the modern Farghūnah,² and the *Θαμνάριοι*, who may have been connected with the Arachosian city of Dammana (Ptolemy, vi, c. xx, 5), are to be placed here or further west, say in Karmania, it is impossible to say. But this much is certain, that by Darius, whose authority is far superior to any other in these matters, either this country, except the part occupied by the Makas, is not named at all, or it is included in Drangiana or Arachosia, or finally it is

¹ The second part of *Kāpisakānish*, 'a fort in Arachosia,' is supposed by Justi (*Grundriss*, ii, p. 430) to correspond to modern Persian *khāni*, 'spring' (= Sanskrit *khāni*, 'mine'), or *khandah*, 'ditch of a fort.' But, whether it is to be explained so or as a fusion of the two common suffixes *ka* and *āna*, at any rate it occurs in several names of towns noted by Ptolemy in this region and in Persia, e.g., *Artakāna* (Persis), *Sourogāna*, *Astakāna* (Bactria), *Sarmagāna*, *Zamoukhāna*, *Ortikāna* (Herat), *Davakāna*, *Turbakāna* (Paropamisadæ).

Kāpisakānish is therefore the Kāpisa in Ghorband, which was destroyed by Cyrus (Cunningham, *Numismatic Chronicle*, xiii (1893), pp. 97 and 99; Justi, *Grundriss*, ii, p. 420), although Cunningham seems to distinguish the two. The identity of *Kavisiye nagara* with *Kāpisa*, suggested by Marquardt (*Ērānshahr*, p. 280), is now vindicated by Professor Rapson (J.R.A.S., 1905, pp. 733–4). The Arachosian *Kāpisa* of Ptolemy should surely (though I do not find it suggested) be the same, and perhaps the (*Σάκαι καὶ*) *Κάσιοι* of Herodotus are really *Kāpisoι*.

² Mentioned with ref. by Tomaschek, *Zur Historischen Topographie von Persien*, p. 183.

included in the country which he designates by the term *Sakā*. I will now indicate more precisely the reasons which incline me towards the last alternative.

(1) The *Σακαστανή Σακῶν Σκυθῶν* of Isidor of Charax comes between *Δραγγιανή* and *Ἀραχωσία*. It therefore occupies exactly the position of the Sagistān and Sijistān of Sassanian and Muhammadan times. Thus the Bundahish¹ states (xiii, 16) that "of the small seas, that which was most "wholesome was the sea Kyānsih (i.e. the Kāmsava or "Zarrah), such as is in Sagastān," which at one (mythical) period was free from salt and again "when the renovation of "the Universe occurs" will be so, and (xx, 5) "Lake Frazdān "is in Sagastān," a lake identified by Justi with the Āb-Istādah, south of Ghazna. Sagastān therefore stretched away from the Hāmūn lake eastward in the direction of Ghazna, just as in Muhammadan times we find it stated² that "Sistān . . . is the lowland country lying round, "and to the eastward of, the Zarah lake, which more "especially includes the deltas of the Helmund and other "rivers which drain into the inland sea," while from the maps accompanying these statements a part of the (Gedrosian) desert to the south of this region appears to be reckoned in.

(2) When, therefore, in a grouping evidently geographical (see above, p. 184), Darius couples the Sakas and the Makas, it is as if in later times occurred a mention of Sistān and Makrān (see Mr. Le Strange's map No. 1). When he speaks of crossing the sea, and finds it necessary to add *that* sea (*darayam avam*), we can understand that he was referring to what was indeed one of the *darayas*, namely, the Hāmūn lake, but being one of the "small seas" needed to be clearly indicated.

(3) An irruption of Sakas in the second century B.C. into the country called Sakastān is not stated by any ancient authority, and is in fact improbable. Its improbability is evident from the following considerations.

¹ Trans. West, *Sacred Books of the East*, v.

² Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 334.

In order to reach Sistān it would have been necessary for the Sakas to pass through one or other of the two great states, the Parthian and the Greco-Bactrian, which together covered the whole frontier of north-eastern Iran.

The Bactrian kingdom, as is well established, extended southward until at the time of its greatest power it included a territory embracing Arachosia (where Demetrius founded a city named after him), and even Broach and Surat. What part of it was taken away by the Scythians, and when? The two often quoted passages from Trogus and Strabo leave no doubt upon this point:—

“In Bactrianis autem rebus ut a Diodoto rege constitutum est : deinde quo regnante Scythicae gentes Saraucae et Asiani Bactra occupavere et Sogdianos, Indicæ quoque res additæ, gestæ per Apollodotum et Menandrum, reges eorum.” (Trogus, 41.)

μάλιστα δὲ γνώριμοι γεγονῶσι τῶν νομάδων οἱ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀφελόμενοι τὴν Βακτριανήν, Ἀσιοὶ καὶ Πασιανοὶ καὶ Τόχαροι καὶ Σακάραυλοι, καὶ ὁρμηθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς περαιῆς τοῦ Ἰαξάρτου τῆς κατὰ Σάκας, ἣν κατεῖχον Σάκαι. (Strabo, xi, c. viii, 2.)

It was therefore Sogdiana and Bactria from which the Greeks were driven by the Scythians, and this event took place rather early in the history of their kingdom. If the Scythians had penetrated further, we should most certainly have learned the fact from Strabo on this occasion; and we should have heard nothing further of any Greek kingdoms beyond the confines of India. But we must suppose the Greeks to have occupied a part of Ariana long after this, for their final overthrow was the work, not, as is sometimes stated, of their Scythian, but of their Parthian enemies.

“Eodem ferme tempore, sicut in Parthis Mithridates, ita in Bactris Eucratidas, magni uterque viri, regna ineunt. Sed Parthorum fortuna felicior ad summum hoc duce imperi fastigium eos perduxit; Bactriani autem per varia bella iactati non regnum tantum,

“verum etiam libertatem amiserunt, siquidem Sogdianorum et Arachotorum et Drangarum et Areorum bellis fatigati ad postremum ab invalidioribus Parthis velut exsangues oppressi sunt.”¹

After the Kushan occupation of Afghanistan there could have been no Greek power in touch with the Parthians, so as to be overthrown by them. And, in fact, the survival of a Greek kingdom in Kabul long after Eucratidas is generally assumed (*Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, ii, p. 489).

Was it, then, through the Parthian kingdom that Scythians penetrated into Sīstān in the second century B.C.? This was the period of that great extension of the Parthian dominion which Strabo has described in terms significant for our purpose (xi, c. ix, 2):—

ἔπειθ' οὕτως ἴσχυσαν ἀφαιρούμενοι τὴν πλῆσιον αἰὲν διὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις κατορθώσεις, ὥστε τελευτῶντες ἀπάσης τῆς ἐντὸς Εὐφράτου κύριοι κατέστησαν. Ἀφείλοντο δὲ καὶ τῆς Βακτριανῆς μέρος βιασάμενοι τοὺς Σκύθας, καὶ ἔτι πρότερον τοὺς περὶ Εὐκρατίδαν. καὶ νῦν ἐπάρχουσι τοσαύτης γῆς καὶ τοσούτων ἔθνων ὥστε ἀντίπαλοι τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις τρόπον τινα γέγονασι, κατὰ μέγεθος τῆς ἀρχῆς.

¹ Professor Rapson (*Indian Coins*, pp. 7, 16) and Mr. Vincent Smith, whom I name *honoris causa*, are therefore in contradiction with this, the latter very sharply: “The flood of barbarian invasion . . . finally extinguishing the “Hellenistic monarchy, which must have been weakened already by the growth of “the Parthian or Persian power” (*Early History*, p. 201). What Mr. Vincent Smith ascribes to the Sakas, Professor Rapson attributes to the Kushans. This latter view seems to me incorrect, though only slightly. I conceive that the Kushans conquered the Kabul valley not from the Greeks, but from the Parthians, who had themselves taken it from the Greeks. Nor is this a mere inference or conjecture. The Chinese History of the Second Hans (25–220 A.D.) states in a passage cited by M. Specht (*Études sur l'Asie Centrale*, i, p. 10) as follows:—“They” (the people of Kabul) “have been successively under the dominion “of the Thien-tchou (Hindus), of Ki-pin, and of the A-si (Parthians). These “three realms at the time of their greatness had conquered this country, and “they lost it at the moment of their decay. The book of the Han (Han-chou) “is therefore mistaken in counting Kao-fou among the five principalities of the “Yué-tchi. It had never belonged to these last, since it was at that time under “the dominion of the A-si. But when the Yué-tchi attacked the A-si, they “became in that way possessors of Kao-fou.” From the circumstances it is clear that the people of Ki-pin to whom reference is made in this extract must be the Greeks.

“Afterwards they grew so powerful, continually encroaching upon the neighbouring territory by reason of their successes in war, that finally they established themselves as masters of all within the Euphrates. They appropriated further a portion of Bactria by bringing force to bear upon the Scythians, and even before that upon Eucratides and his.¹ And now they rule over so much territory and so many nations, that they are become a match almost for the Romans in extent of dominion.”

We know that this power lasted in eastern Persia until the rise of the Sassanians, and even the Indo-Scythian kingdom about the lower Indus was, as we learn from the author of the “Periplus,” under Parthian rulers. During the last two centuries B.C. these were at various times in collision with the Scythians. Phraates was defeated and killed by the Tokharoi (B.C. 127), and his uncle Artabanus II met with the same fate (B.C. 124; Justin, xlii).² The son of the latter, Mithridates II, was more successful.

“Sed et cum Scythis prospere aliquotiens dimicavit ultorque iniuriæ parentum fuit” (Justin, xlii).

But these and other events took place on the northern and eastern frontier, where Ptolemy's *Geographia* still finds the Tokharoi, and we hear nothing of such an occurrence as the penetration of a horde into the south-eastern portion of their dominion. For this reason, as well as for every other, the Kushans too must have reached India over the Hindu-Kush.

It remains to add a word as to (1) special indications of the presence of a Saka population in Sīstān in early times and (2) the general probabilities of the case.

Among the former I think we may include the citation

¹ From another passage (xi, 2) we learn that it was two satrapies (τὴν τε Ἀσπιδίου καὶ τὴν Τουριόταν) that they took from Eucratidas.

² *Grundriss*, ii, pp. 488-9. It is at this period that von Gutschmid considers that the Scythians “must have” occupied Sakastan, although the “too favourable” accounts of the dealings of the Parthians with their disloyal Scythian allies do not mention the fact. (Encycl. Brit., 9th ed., vol. xviii, p. 5946.)

from Hecataeus (fragment 179) of *Κασπάτινος πόλις Γανδαρική, Σκυθῶν ἀκτὴ*, and the statements concerning the Ariaspi. The former, the city in the country of the Paktues from which Darius despatched Skulax on his voyage down the Indus and then westward to Egypt (Herodotus, iv, c. 44), was also known as that from the neighbourhood of which started the Indians who made expeditions into the desert in search of gold (iii, c. 102). But its exact situation remains after much discussion still undecided.¹ Not only the Indus, but several rivers of Afghanistan also, are gold-bearing, and gold has also been found in the neighbourhood of Kandahār.

The facts concerning the Ariaspi are known to us from the narratives of Alexander's expedition, in the course of which he passed through the country of Drangiana, then that of this people, continuing his march by way of Arakhosia and Kabul into Bactria. The Ariaspi therefore occupied exactly the region of the modern Sīstān, and it is here that we must locate the city Ariaspe mentioned by Ptolemy. That the name stands for *Ayriaspi* (with the Iranian spirant *γ*) we may be certain by reason of the variant form of the name *Agriaspi*, and because the epithet *ayriya*, 'best,' is applied to horses in the Avesta.² The name therefore means 'having excellent horses.' But for help rendered to Cyrus in the course of his Scythian expedition the people had received a new designation, which the Greeks render by *Euergetai* or 'benefactors,' the Persian equivalent of which we know from Herodotus to be *Orosangai*, perhaps a form corresponding to the Zend *ver^{ezy}-aṇhvā*, 'energetic.' Arrian informs us (iii, c. 27) that they enjoyed a government unlike that of the other barbarians in that part of the world, and laid claim to justice equal with the best of the Greeks. From the time of Homer onwards the attribute of justice, based probably upon some social feature, was a commonplace in relation to Scythians,³ so that Herodotus,

¹ Megasthenes (ap. Strabo, xv, 44) places the scene among the *Δέρδαι* (Dards).

² See Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wörterbuch*, s.v. *ayriya*.

³ See Smith's *Dictionary of Ancient Geography*, s.v.

for instance, speaking of the Issedones (iv, 26), can say, though justice has not been mentioned,

ἄλλως δὲ δίκαιοι καὶ οὗτοι λέγονται εἶναι ἰσοκρατές δὲ ὁμοίως αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖσι ἀνδράσι.

"For the rest these also are said to be just: and the
"women enjoy rights equally with the men."

We may therefore reasonably understand the statements concerning the alien population named Ariaspi to point to a Scythian origin. The form in which the name appears in Diodorus, namely Arimaspi, may most probably be ascribed to a confusion with the story of the one-eyed Scythians of that name, dwelling beyond the Issedones, who carried off gold from the γρύπες. But may he not have stumbled upon a truth? The Indians near the city of Kaspatyros who fetched gold from the deserts infested by giant μύρμηκες, and the Arimaspi who snatched gold from the γρύπες, may not they represent two different versions of an account of the Ariaspi? Gold is mentioned as one of the products of Balūchistan.¹ History, as distinct from legend, knows nothing of a people named Arimaspi in Central Asia, and the distance of the Ariaspi from Farghāna, the seat of the Issedones, and its direction are not insuperable difficulties in view of the error of the early Greek geographers in regarding Central Asia as lying to the north of Europe.

As regards general probabilities, there can be, I imagine, no difficulty in the supposition that Scythians from Central Asia had penetrated in prehistoric times, by way of Herat and Drangiana, or by another route, into south-eastern Persia and Balūchistan. We know that Persia, like India, has always been exposed to irruptions from that quarter. The fact that Herodotus and the historians of Alexander's expedition make no explicit mention of Scythians in the region under consideration, is balanced by the other fact that Strabo and Ptolemy² maintain the same silence at a time when we know that the Scythians were already there.

¹ *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, ii, p. 383.

² Unless Ptolemy's Τατακηνή in Drangiana is really Σακαστηνή.

But may we not make a more extended observation? What objection can we urge against the supposition that in ancient times the whole population of the mountainous country from the Σάκαι of the Greek narratives to Sakastāna was in fact 'Scythian'? No one any longer doubts that the Scythians of Europe and Asia were merely the outer, uncivilized belt of the Iranian family, and, though the observations of Hippocrates¹ may point to an ethnological difference, the close relation of the Scythian dialects to the Zend and Persian is beyond dispute. Justi regards the speech of the European Scythians as having been most nearly related to Ossetic.² Whether the peculiarities of the Pamir dialects and the Pashto and Balūchī are consistent with a Scythian origin, and whether the early names of places recorded in these regions are consistent with a Scythic extraction of the peoples, the Iranian scholars will perhaps decide. The feature by which the Greeks, and no doubt the Persians also, distinguished tribes as Scythian or Saka was their manner of living as nomads, and this may have been the peculiarity in virtue of which Darius applies the name Saka, if we have rendered it probable that he did so, to the neighbours of the Makas.³

The points in favour of our hypothesis, which is made with great deference, may therefore be summed up as follows:—

(1) First, and most important, the clearly geographical enumerations of Darius.

(2) The *daraya* = the Hāmūn lake or Zarrah.

(3) The very brief narrative of the campaign against the Sakas, which is inconsistent with a distant expedition beyond the Jaxartes, more especially as the rebellions in Arachosia and Hyrcania were repressed, not by Darius himself, who does not seem to have personally conducted campaigns in

¹ Regarding the European Scythians.

² *Grundriss*, ii, p. 400.

³ We may perhaps hope to learn something bearing on the subject of this paragraph from Dr. Grierson's forthcoming work on the Paisācī dialect.

the far east and north of his dominions, but by his lieutenants.

(4) The Ἀμύργιον πεδῖον Σακῶν might well represent the Gedrosian desert or part of the Persian desert, and the name *Haumavarka*, which Justi interprets 'cooking the leaves (*varka*) of the Hauma plant,' and for which Bartholomae¹ suggests as an alternative that *varka* is the Persian form of *vehrka*, 'wolf,' seen in Darius' *Varkāna*, 'Hyrcania,' 'country of the Varkas,' may really mean 'the Hauma (using) Varka'; cf. the Βόργιοι, whom Ptolemy records as neighbours of the Αἰτύμανδροι, 'Helmund people,' in the country of Herat. We may add—

(5) That while, in spite of Kureschata in Sogdiana, it remains wholly uncertain to what people belongs the distinction of the defeat and death of Cyrus (Justi, *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, ii, p. 421: "More probable than this "legend sounds the statement of Ktesias, *Persica*, 6-8, that "Cyrus fell in a battle against the Derbiker, a people "bordering on India"²), it is difficult to see how the Ariasprians of Sīstān can have "assisted Cyrus, son of "Cambyses, in his invasion of Scythia" beyond Bactria or the Jaxartes (Arrian, iii, 26).

Probably we may not use as an argument the fact that the legend of Zal and Rustam belongs certainly to Sīstān and Arachosia, and represents perhaps an Arsacid sub-dynasty in that region (Nöldeke, *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, ii, pp. 138-40), since this is no doubt consistent with a Scythian settlement of the later date. But against the current hypothesis we may certainly urge the silence of the classical writers. In the geography of Ptolemy we still find the Sakai with their tribes (named above, p. 187) in the mountains east of Bactria and Sogdiana, where Alexander fought with

¹ *Altiran. Wörterbuch*, s.v. *Haumavarka*. The old Persian form of the name need not, however, be more correct than the Ἀμύργιοι and the *Umurj Umavarga* (i.e. *Umavarga*) of the Greeks and of the Babylonian and Scythian versions of Darius' inscriptions. It may be due to popular etymology. What if the original form of the word was *Hāmavarka*, i.e. the *Varka* of the *Hāmūn*?

² In Badakshān acc. to Justi, but in Margiana acc. to Ptolemy (vi, c. x, 2).

them. To the presence of Scythian tribes in Bactria, Ptolemy may be held to testify by his mention of the Khomaroi, Komoi, and Tokharoi. But, except for the Indo-Scythians, the classical writers supply no evidence of Scythian tribes south of the desert of Margiana.

It may be pointed out that the theory here sketched is not, except in its method and point of view, exactly a new one. An early presence of Sakas in Sakastān is explicitly included among the Indo-Iranic speculations of Brunnhofer,¹ and would no doubt harmonize with the theories of Hillebrandt concerning a knowledge of Arachosia and Drangiana by Indians of the Vedic age.² Cuno (*Die Skythen*, pp. 76-7) quotes the passage from Hecataeus concerning Kaspatyrus and the Scyths which we have noted above.

But even if the supposition is not new or were not true, it may not be useless to lay before students of Indian history a statement of the facts from a point of view outside the north-west frontier. For Indian history the importance of the question under discussion lies in the fact that an early presence of Sakas in Sistān or Balūchistān renders the chronology of the Indian Sakas entirely independent of the question of the Kushans, as indeed must be the case if Maues is to be placed in the second century B.C. It also has a bearing on the illuminating suggestion of Dr. Fleet, that the Saka rule belonged properly to Western India, and not at all to Hindustan (*v. infra*, p. 216).

2. ISSEDONES, KUSHANS, PASIANOI, THE RIVER SILA.

Concerning the position of the country of the Issedones the statements of the ancient geographers are sufficiently clear, and modern writers are agreed in placing them in

¹ *Aral bis zur Gāṅgā*, p. 120. "So müssen die Čaka schon einmal in der Urzeit, nicht erst im zweiten Jahrhundert vor Christus, die mittelliranische Tiefebene besetzt haben."

² *Vedische Mythologie*, i, pp. 101 sqq., questioned by Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 145, n. 1, and Foy, *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, xxxv, p. 51.

Farghāna. They came early to the knowledge of the Greeks.

Ἰσσηδῶνες, ἔθνος Σκυθικόν, Ἑκαταῖος Ἀσία. Ἀλκμὰν δὲ μόνος Ἑσσηδῶνας αὐτοὺς φησιν. εὕρίσκεται δὲ ἡ δευτέρα παρ' ἄλλοις δια τοῦ εἰ. λέγονται καὶ Ἰσσηδοὶ τρισυλλάβως. ἔστι καὶ Ἰσσηδῶν πόλις. (Stephanus of Byzantium.)

"Issedones, a Scythian tribe—Hecataeus in his 'Asia.'
 "Alcman is alone in calling them Hessedones. The
 "second syllable is found with *ei*. They are also
 "called Issedoi, in three syllables. There is further
 "a city Issedon."

No one seems to have connected the name with the statement of Albīrūnī¹ that the rulers of Farghāna were called *Ikhšīdh*, while those of Srughna were *Afšīn*. Ṭabarī mentions a king *Ikhšād* of Farghāna, son of *Afšīn*, and for further evidence we may refer to Justi's *Iranisches Namenbuch*, s.vv. *Ikhšēdh* and *Pisina*. *Ikhšēdh* is the Avestan *khšaeta*, 'brilliant,' and a later form is *šedah*; for the origin of *Pisina* we may refer to Bartholomae's *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. Is it not a plausible suggestion that the Issedones were really named after an Iranian *Ikhšēdh* dynasty in Farghāna? The representation of Iranian *khš* by Greek *σσ* can cause no difficulty.² As regards the meaning of the name, if that should be considered, it is noticeable that the antithesis of white and black in proper names, whether referring to a difference of costume or to some religious or social feature, is found over the whole Iranian area. We need refer here only to the *Syāmak*, *Spitāma* of the Persian legend, and the name 'White India' applied to Ariana.³

It is noticeable that the same dynasty in Farghāna seems to be named by the Chinese in the form *Ali-thsi*,⁴ which

¹ *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, trans. Sachau, p. 109.

² Cf. *σατράπης* (*ξαστράπης*, *ἐξαστράπης*), the initial vowel in *Ἰσσηδῶνες* being, no doubt, prothetic, whence its variation.

³ See also below.

⁴ Rémusat, *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques*, i, p. 203.

suggests an Arabic source. Another point common to Albīrūnī¹ and the Chinese accounts² of Farghāna is the longevity ascribed to its inhabitants. This must be an ancient feature of Central Asian legend,³ since it stands in evident connection with the fable of the Uttara Kurus, 'Οτροποκόρραι, located by Ptolemy, VI, c. xvi, 5.

Another ancient fable⁴ belonging to the same region is that of the river Silias, on which nothing would float. Brunnhofer⁵ found the name of it in the modern Syr Daryā or Jaxartes, and the Iranian *Grundriss* (ii, 392) agrees. But by Ktesias the river is named Side⁶ and placed in the country of the Uttara Kurus. This is a very interesting fact: for not only is the legend seen to be based on a popular etymology of the name (Sanskrit *śīdati*, 'sink'), but the change of earlier *d* to later *l* (and *r*) is common to the Pamir and Afghan dialects and in part to the Pahlavī. *Side*, *Silis*, and *Syr Daryā* form an interesting parallel to *Haetumant* (*Haedumant*), *Helmund*, *Hirmand*.

In the Persian legend Pisina and Waeška, the two sons of Zaeška, are the progenitors of the dynasties of Turān.⁷ The family of Kavi Pisina (Kai Fāshīn) ruled in Bactria. The Pisīn or Pashang gave their name to the valley of Kabul, and the Pahlavī Pēšyānsai belong to the same quarter.⁸ When, therefore, history also supplies through Albīrūnī an Afšīn dynasty in Srughna, we must recognize a family or dynastic name having a very long history. Under these circumstances it seems difficult to follow Marquardt in his interpretation of the passage in Trogus—

¹ Op. cit., p. 94.

² Op. cit., i, p. 203.

³ Cf. Lucian, *Macrobioi*, § 5. His Omanoi, § 17, will be the *Yamāma* of Albīrūnī, loc. cit.

⁴ Ancient enough to be disputed by Democritus (Strabo, xv, 38). For the Chinese account of the 'weak water' see Rémusat, op. cit., i, pp. 216-17.

⁵ *Iran u. Turān*, p. 139. For the Chinese version see Rémusat, op. cit.

⁶ Megasthenes, xxi-xxiii (trs. McCrindle), has *Silas*.

⁷ For the genealogy see Justi, *Iran. Namenbuch*, p. 394.

⁸ *Zendavesta*, trans. Darmesteter, ii, p. 62 and note; *Bundahiš*, trans. West, xxix, p. 5, note.

"Illi successit Prates, qui et cum Antonio [Mark Antony] bellum habuit et cum Tiridate. Additæ his res Scythicæ. Reges Thogarorum Asiani, interitusque "Saraucarum"—

and of the "Ἀσιοὶ καὶ Πασσιανοὶ καὶ Τόχαροι καὶ Σακάρανλοι of Strabo. He suggests that "Ἀσιοὶ (or "Ἀσιανοὶ) and Πασσιανοὶ both represent a Γασσιανοί, which is to be identified with the Kushan. I think that, whether with Cunningham we regard the Tokharoi as the Kushans or with Marquardt (*Ērānšahr*, p. 204) as the Ta-hia subdued by these, we shall be far more inclined to find a connection between the Πασσιανοί and the Pisina, Pashang, Fāshīn, Pēšyān(sai), and Afshīn of the Iranian legend and history. Perhaps the progress of Iranian studies will some day show us historical descendants of Waeška or Wisēh also.

This brings us naturally to the Kushans and the Chinese accounts of them, with which, however, we do not propose now to deal. It has been pointed out that long after the overthrow of the Kushans proper the name continued to be applied by the Persians to the barbarians, Huns and Turks, who threatened their north-eastern frontier.¹ But in no case can we expect that geography will ever point to a people of this name, since this also seems to have been a family or dynastic title. Otherwise we should not have an Indian inscription describing Kaniška as *Guṣaṇavamśa-samvārdhaka*, 'propagator of the Kushan stock'—for this rendering, suggested as an alternative by M. Senart,² will be generally approved by scholars.

¹ See Stein, *White Huns and Kindred Tribes*, etc., *Indian Antiquary*, vol. clixviii, 1905, pp. 73.sqq.

² *Journal Asiatique*, sér. ix, vol. vii, p. 12. 'Ephthalite' also is stated by M. Specht (*Études sur l'Asie Centrale*, i, p. 33) to be properly a family name.

3. ETYMOLOGY OF 'INDO-PARTHIAN' AND 'INDO-SCYTHIAN' NAMES.

If we disregard the evidence of coins, with which I am incompetent to deal and which is set forth with such admirable clearness in Professor Rapson's work on "Indian Coins," we learn from the Indian side astonishingly little concerning the Śakas and other 'Scythian' invaders. From the fact that Śakas and Tukhāras, Tuḥkhāras, or Tuṣāras are frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata and other early works, we may infer that the peoples bearing these names were somewhat familiarly known. The Harivaṃśa informs us that the Śakas shaved one-half of their heads (*see* Böhtlingk and Roth *s.v.* Śaka), and the Jaina work *Kālakācārya-Kathānuka*, edited by Professor Jacobi in the *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft* for 1880 (vol. xxxiv, pp. 254-5)¹ states that their kings were called Śāhi. The Pahlavī title is in harmony with the constant association of Śakas and Pahlavas, and with the statement of the author of the "Periplus" (McCrindle, p. 108) that the capital of the Scythian kingdom on the Indus, Minnagar, was governed by Parthian princes. A relation between Śakas and Greeks is implied in the dvanda compound Śaka-Yavana recorded by Patañjali. The Turuṣkas seem to be mentioned first in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and *Rājatarāṅginī*, nor should we expect early references to a people who first acquired importance (and perhaps a common designation?) not earlier than the sixth century A.D.² Hence we must put aside the Kashmirian belief³ that Kanīṣka, Huṣka and Juṣka were Turuṣkas, as this is precluded by dates, and we shall also regard with suspicion the statement⁴

¹ Cited by M. Boyer, *Journal Asiatique*, sér. rx, vol. x, p. 150, and used by Cunningham. Cf. M. Lévi's note mentioned above, p. 187.

² We may refer to M. Chavannes' very valuable work, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue*, St. Petersburg, 1903.

³ *Rājatarāṅginī*, i, pp. 168-70, see Dr. Stein's observations in his translation, i, p. 31, and *Introd.*, p. 76. Dr. Stein, however, seems to hold that the Kushans were *by race* Turuṣka: see his paper on the 'White Huns' (*Ind. Antiquary*, 1905).

⁴ *Rājatarāṅginī*, iv, p. 179.

that the Turuṣkas shaved one-half of their heads, since this attribute may have been wrongly transferred from the Śakas.

In inscriptions there are, of course, passages where the Śakas are mentioned by the Guptas, and there are at least two references to them in the earlier records of Western India. Whether the *sakastana* of the Mathurā Lion Capital relates to Sīstān we may be permitted with Dr. Fleet¹ to doubt.

On the other hand, we have on coins considered to be of Śaka, or Pahlava, or Kuṣaṇa origin, and also in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, a number of proper names from which something may be learnt. Steps in this direction have been taken by M. Senart, who has some remarks upon the matter in his article on the Māṇikiālā Vase inscription,² and by M. Boyer, who in the name *Miraboyana* of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription (*Journal Asiatique*, sér. x, vol. iii, p. 458) recognizes a Persian *Mithrabouzanēs*, the *y* (for *j*) representing a Persian *z*.³ We may add that this *boyana* or *bojana*, which is the Zend *baōśnah*, 'freeing,' 'salvation' (cf. *pouru-baukhśna*), occurs in the name *Āthiyābauśna* of a cuneiform inscription. Two names inscribed on the Mathurā Lion Pillar, *Śaudāsa* and *Hayuāra*, have been supposed by Professor Rapson⁴ to correspond to the Persian *Zodas* and *Hayour*.

Considering the linguistic affinities of the Śakas and our ignorance of the chronology and range of 'Middle Persian'

¹ *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. xxxvi, 1904, pp. 703 sqq., v. *infra*, p. 216.

² *Journal Asiatique*, sér. ix, vol. vii, pp. 12 sqq. Among other points he suggests that *Spala* in *Spalahora* is a Scythian word denoting 'victory.' Some etymologies are proposed by Cuno, *Die Skythen* (1871), p. 211.

³ The confusion of *y* and *j* between vowels is in the inscriptions of Aśoka rare and almost confined to the words *rājā*, *pūjā*, and *mayūra*. We have to distinguish between *y* for *j* as in *rājā* and *pūjā*, and *j* for *y* as in *majūla*. It is not likely that both changes took place in the same dialect at the same time, but the occurrence of either might lead to confusion in writing. For the early period the matter still needs investigation. But as regards the time and place of the Śaka, Pahlava, Kushan dynasties, I am inclined to believe that the choice between *j* and *y* is not quite haphazard, and that the *y* properly represents the intermediate sound *z* = French *j*.

⁴ *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, n.s., xxvi, 1894, p. 549.

(Pahlavī) sound changes, it must obviously be difficult to distinguish between names belonging to them and those which are pan-Iranian or proper to other Iranian tribes. For instance, we cannot easily establish with certainty whether Maues is really a Śaka name or, let us say, Old Afghan or Balūchī. It is well known that the old Persian and its descendant, the Pahlavī,¹ differ from the Eastern Iranian dialects in substituting *d* and *th* for the *z* and *s* (Indo-European *ǵ*, *ǵh*, and *k*) of this group, while the Pahlavī and modern Persian also fail to distinguish earlier *z* and *j*. Perhaps the latter feature is found also in European Scythian, where we find Spargapeithes corresponding to Asiatic Spargapises. So far as can be seen, the ancient trans-Oxian dialects in this respect agreed, as do the Pamir dialects and those of Afghanistan and Baluchistan, with the Avestan.² On the other hand, we may perhaps trace in this sphere a tendency towards two special sound changes. The one is the substitution of tenues for mediæ at the beginning of words. This seems to be exhibited in the name, Parni, of a tribe in Margiana,³ probably like its neighbours, the Massagetæ, originally from beyond the Oxus; for the name seems to recur in the Bactrian Varni. The Paskai, who dwelt in the Oxian mountains⁴ in Sogdiana, would very likely be Vākṣai, i.e. people of the Oxus (Vakṣu). Compare also the Bactrian town-name, Kouriandra, with the Gouriane in Margiana. The other change, aspiration of initial tenues, may be traced in Trogus' Thogari (for Tokhari), and the Bactrian Khomari, doubtless related to the Komari on the Jaxartes.⁵ This change, which characterizes also the modern Pamir dialects,⁶ is also to be traced in the Scythic *foṭ* or *pot* (*Spargaphotos*, etc.) = *pati* and *phurtos* = *puthra*,

¹ Which was, of course, not the native, even if an official, language of the Parthians themselves.

² Geiger, *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, i, pp. 205, 236, 300-1.

³ Ptolemy (McCrindle), pp. 263 and 269. Cf. Avestan *Varena*?

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 35 and 268.

⁶ Geiger, *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie*, i, p. 299, § 19.

though in the latter example the neighbourhood of *r* may have co-operated, as in Persian. Further, some terminations, such as *-ūs* (*-ūt*), and some individual words, such as *avadi* or *odi*, 'intelligence,' are said to be specially Scythic. With the help of such indications and the actually recorded facts, we may perhaps in some cases be able to distinguish the provenance of the names, as is done in the following table, which contains (1) names occurring on coins, (2) names occurring on the Mathurā Lion Capital, (3) some names occurring in other inscriptions. Names familiarly known to be Parthian or Persian, as *Vonones*, *Gondophares*, are of course excluded.

I. NAMES OCCURRING ON COINS.

NAME.	ETYMOLOGY.	LANGUAGE. ¹	REMARKS.
1. Maues } Moga }	Scythic.	An Asiatic Saka ruler is named by Arrian <i>Mauches</i> , <i>Meuakos</i> and <i>Moephernes</i> are names of European Scythians, and <i>Maogetes</i> was a Phrygian tyrant: cf. <i>Mevaka</i> on the Mathurā Lion Capital. In all Iranian languages <i>ka</i> is a common <i>kose</i> -suffix, and in the Scythic names it is especially frequent in the form <i>ga</i> . No doubt <i>Moga</i> = <i>Mataka</i> .
2. Azes ...	Short form of <i>Azilises</i> , q.v.	...	This is the view of Justi, I.N., s.v., and is in agreement with the general system of Indo-European nomenclature (see Fick's <i>Griechische Personennamen</i> , 2nd ed., pp. 15 sqq.).
3. Azilises ...	= (a) <i>Aza</i> occurs in <i>Azos</i> , <i>Azaios</i> , <i>Azias</i> , names of European Scythians, and also in <i>Azilos</i> , an Indo-Parthian king. It is therefore probably ... (b) <i>lises</i> is a form of <i>risēs</i> , found in <i>Spalirises</i> . It is connected with Zend <i>raēš</i> , <i>riš</i> , 'injure,' Sk. <i>riś</i> , 'tear,' <i>lēśa</i> , 'fraction.' Pahlavi <i>reš</i> is <i>Sataresu</i> , etc.	Scythic. Pan-Iranic.	The form <i>āza</i> , 'impelling,' is found in Zend, also compounded with <i>ham</i> in <i>hamāza</i> = Sk. <i>saṃjā</i> . The Sanskrit <i>ājñ</i> suggests that the meaning is 'warrior' or 'battle,' so that <i>Azilises</i> = 'wounding, or urging, in battle.' The <i>l</i> in <i>lises</i> may be either Scythic or Iranian (Pahlavi, etc.). As to <i>y</i> in <i>Ayritisa</i> , see p. 205, n. 4. On the whole the name is probably Scythic.

¹ Statements in this column are intended as purely positive. A name *found* in Old Persian only *may* have occurred also in the Avestan or the East Iranian area, and be therefore 'Iranic,' which term we also employ in cases of doubt in the sense of 'Old Persian' or Avestan, and an 'Iranic' name *may* have occurred in the Scythic dialects, and *vice versa*.

4. Spalirisos ...	= (a) <i>Spala</i> might be a Pahlavi form of Pan-Iranic <i>spāda</i> , 'army' (= Pers. <i>spāh</i>), in <i>Spādepatī</i> , etc., Scythic <i>Spādakes</i> , etc., etc. But more probably, in connection with <i>risos</i> , it is = <i>spāra</i> , 'shield,' in Persian <i>Sparamēizos</i> , Scyth. <i>Sparē-thra</i> , <i>Sparophotos</i> (i.e. <i>Spārapatī</i>), etc., Persian <i>sipar</i> . (b) <i>risos</i> : see <i>Azilises</i> .	Pan-Iranic.	The Sanskrit <i>sphāra</i> also has the meaning 'a hump on a shield.' It would no doubt be possible to regard <i>spala</i> as a form of <i>psala</i> (Scythic = Sk. <i>psaras</i>) with the sense of 'success,' 'victory': cf. Bartholomae s.v. <i>Spāradāsta</i> .
5. Spalahora ...	= (a) <i>Spala</i> in <i>Spalirisos</i> . (b) <i>hora</i> = <i>Ahura</i> .	Pan-Iranic.	The meaning would be 'having Ahura for shield.' This name would seem to be non-Scythic.
6. Spaluris ...	= <i>Spala</i> + Pan-Iranian termination <i>-ura</i> in <i>Spityura Tomuris</i> , etc.	Pan-Iranic.	
7. Spalagadama ...	= (a) <i>sparga</i> , 'scion' (Zend <i>spareya</i>) in <i>Spargapises</i> , etc. (b) Pahl. <i>tam</i> , 'strong' (Zend-Pers. <i>taxma</i> in <i>taxmō-spāda</i> , etc.), or -δημη in Περγोधμη?	Pan-Iranic.	
8. Zeionises ...	= (a) Zend <i>zaya</i> , 'weapon,' cf. <i>zaena</i> , and <i>zayotēna</i> , 'having the best weapon' or = Iranian <i>jaya</i> , 'victory' (Sk. <i>jaya</i>). (b) Zend <i>naeza</i> , 'point,' Pers. <i>nezh</i> , 'spear,' in <i>Bivises</i> , name of a Persian noble.	Zend. Zend-Persian.	The long <i>o</i> in <i>Zeionises</i> , <i>Jihōnisa</i> is in favour of regarding this name as Persian rather than Scythic, and the occurrence of <i>Bivises</i> tends in the same direction.

NAMES OCCURRING ON COINS (*continued*).

NAME.	ETYMOLOGY.	LANGUAGE.	REMARKS.
9. Manigula } Mannigios }	= (a) <i>Māna</i> , 'moon.' (b) <i>kula</i> or <i>gula</i> in <i>Mihirakula</i> 'gula.	...	This interpretation is supported by the parallelism of 'moon' and 'sun' in <i>Manigula</i> and <i>Mihirakula</i> . The latter name seems to be identical in sense with Georgian <i>Mirangul</i> , in which <i>gul</i> is regarded by Justi as the Persian word meaning 'rose' (cf. <i>Vologases</i> , etc.) and not = Turkish <i>guli</i> , 'servant.'
10. Sanabares ...	= (a) <i>Zend saena</i> (Pers. <i>sān</i>), 'war equipment,' in Parth. <i>Sanatrūk</i> , etc. (b) <i>bara</i> , 'bearing.'	Pan-Iranic.	So Justi.
11. Sapateizes ...	= (a) <i>aspa</i> , 'horse.' (b) <i>ises</i> , as above.	"	
12. Sapadbizēs ...	= (a) <i>spāda</i> , as above. (b) <i>pises</i> in <i>Spargapises</i> , etc. = <i>Zend patesa</i> , <i>pisa</i> , Sk. <i>pesa</i> , etc.	"	
13. Hyrkodes ...	= (a) <i>Vērka</i> , 'wolf.' (b) <i>avadi</i> , <i>odi</i> , 'mind.'	Iranic. Scythic.	
14. Rañjubula } Rājubula } Rājula } Razu }	= (a) <i>Zend ragu</i> (<i>venjsta</i>), Sk. <i>raghu</i> , <i>laghu</i> . (b) Scythic <i>bala</i> (Sk. <i>bala</i>) in <i>Ovapßalos</i> , <i>Dekabalos</i> , etc.	Pan-Iranic. Scythic?	This name may be Scythic, as <i>Parγωδῆμα</i> , wife of <i>Σμαρδάρις</i> (Cunningham, <i>Nimisnatic Chronicle</i> , ix, 1889, p. 305), seems to be a Scythian princess.

15. Śodāsa } Śaudāsa } Śodisa }	...	<p>= (a) Zend <i>syāva</i>, 'black' (Sk. <i>śyāva</i>), in <i>Syāwārān</i>, <i>Syāwāspa</i>, Scyth. <i>Satalkes</i>, <i>Seutalkes</i>.</p> <p>(b) Zend <i>dāsa</i> (Sk. <i>dāsa</i>), 'sign,' Pahl. and Persian <i>dās</i>, 'form,' etc., or Pahl. <i>dāsa</i>, 'doctrine.'</p>	Pan-Iranic	Probably non-Scythic. If the second member is <i>dāsa</i> , we may compare * <i>Syāwāsa</i> , 'black doctrine,' with Pers. <i>Sādō</i> , 'white doctrine.' This antithesis of black and white recurs in European <i>Seutalkes</i> and <i>Satalkes</i> . Mr. V. Smith has already commented on its occurrence in the Scythian sphere.
16. Cashtana	...	<p>= (a) ?</p> <p>(b) <i>stana</i> in <i>Bagistanes</i>, <i>Ustānos</i>, etc.</p>	Iranic.	Or should this name be <i>Cishtana</i> ?
17. Nahapana	...	<p>= (a) <i>naha</i>, 'people' (Zend <i>Snaoñā</i>) in <i>Nabedes</i>, <i>Nahapēt</i>, <i>Nahanarzan</i>.</p> <p>(b) <i>pāna</i>, 'protecting,' or <i>panāh</i>, 'protection,' in <i>Artabanos</i>, etc., or <i>Dārāpanāh</i>, etc.</p>	Iranic and Armenian. Iranic.	
18. Ghsamotika	...	<p>= (a) Zend <i>khšayama</i>, 'mighty,' Scythic <i>Ξαυ(φάνακος)</i>?</p> <p>(b) <i>avadi</i>, <i>odi</i>, as above.</p>	... Scythic.	No doubt a Scythic name.

II. NAMES OCCURRING ON THE MATHURA LION CAPITAL.

NAME.	ETYMOLOGY.	LANGUAGE.	REMARKS.
19. Kharasta ...	= (a) Zend <i>khathra</i> , 'sovereignty,' or <i>havāra</i> (with uncertain meaning). (b) Zend <i>ušta</i> , 'blessing,' in <i>Artostes, Argoste</i> .	Iranic.	Probably non-Scythic.
20. Abuhola ...	= (a) Cf. <i>Abouites</i> ? (b) <i>hora</i> in <i>Spatahora</i> , etc., above.	Iranic. ...	Female relative of Kharasta.
21. Ayasi Komusa	= (a) <i>Āya</i> (i.e. <i>Āza</i> , as in <i>Azes</i> , etc.) + f. suffix - <i>sī</i> in <i>Zairīcī</i> , etc. (b) <i>Komūs</i> + f. suffix <i>ā</i> .	Scythic. Scythic.	<i>Komūs</i> is no doubt a Scythic name in - <i>ūs</i> , cf. <i>Sāmūs</i> , <i>Kosūs</i> , etc., perhaps from the stem of <i>koma</i> (Persian = Sk. <i>kāma</i> ? Justi in <i>Abrokomas</i> , etc.). For the <i>y</i> in <i>Āya</i> see p. 205, n. 4. Ayasi Komusa is a female relative of Kharasta.
22. Ayimisa ...	= (a) <i>Āya</i> , as above. (b) Scythic <i>maza</i> , 'greatness,' in <i>Arīamazes</i> , etc., or Old Pers. <i>mēzōs</i> in <i>Sparamēzōs</i> , or Old Pers. <i>Mithra</i> .	Scythic?	Ayimisa is mentioned without particulars.
23. Hana ...	?		
24. Hayuara ...	= (a) <i>Āza</i> , as above? (b) <i>wār</i> or <i>bāra</i> .		
25. Kalui ...	= Scythic <i>Kadoutias</i> , Pers. <i>Qadūgeh</i> .	Pan-Iranic.	<i>l</i> for <i>d</i> and the termination in the form <i>āi, oe</i> , seem to be Pahlavi.

26. Kamuio	...	= <i>Kāma</i> in <i>Kamōpat</i> , <i>Kamōs</i> , etc. + termination as in the preceding.	...	The reading is doubtful.
27. Konina	...	?	...	Khalama is a princely person, and the name probably non-Scythic.
28. Khalama	...	= <i>Kharva</i> , as above? + suffix <i>ma</i> , short for <i>manis</i> as in <i>Sptāma</i> , etc.	...	Possibly Scythic <i>Sabōdakos</i> , <i>Sambion</i> , and <i>Sambos</i> are related.
29. Khalasamuša	...	= (a) <i>Khala</i> , as above? (b) Scythic <i>samuš</i> .	Scythic.	The reading is not quite certain.
30. Khardaa	...	?	...	
31. Maya	...	Perhaps for <i>Maza</i> in <i>Mazaios</i> , <i>Mazēnēs</i>	
32. Mevaki Miyika	...	= (a) <i>Meuakes</i> , etc., as supra. (b) Scythic <i>Mīdakhos</i> , i.e. <i>Madhyaka</i> or <i>Mazdaka</i> , <i>Mazakes</i> .	Scythic.	Regarding the <i>y</i> in <i>Miyika</i> see p. 205, n. 4, or cf. Pahlavi <i>mēyān</i> ?
33. Nandasi	...	= <i>Nanda</i> in Persian <i>Nandakhya</i> + f. suffix <i>-si</i> .	Scythic.	
34. Nauluda	...	= (a) <i>nava</i> , 'new.' (b) Pahlavi <i>rōd</i> , 'growth,' in <i>Hurodes</i> , <i>Marod</i> , <i>Wandarūd</i> , etc.	Iranic.	
35. Kusulaa Padika	...	= (a) <i>Kusūlaka</i> ? (b) Pahlavi <i>Pātak</i> , Pers. <i>Pādēh</i> , 'shepherd.'	Iranic.	<i>Wāpa</i> (Sk. <i>viśva</i>) is a short form of some compound, e.g. <i>Wispānfrīyā</i> .
36. Pispasi	...	= <i>Wīspa</i> + <i>si</i> f. suffix.	Iranic.	The reading is not quite certain.
37. Pulīṣṭa	...	?	...	
38. Tachila	...	= <i>Tacila</i> or Indian <i>Tariles</i> .	Iranic?	

III. SOME NAMES OCCURRING IN OTHER INSCRIPTIONS.

NAME.	ETYMOLOGY.	LANGUAGE.	REMARKS.
<i>Manikiāla</i> ... <i>Inscription.</i>	See M. Senart's edition, <i>Journal Asiatique</i> , sér. ix, vol. vii, pp. 1-25.
39. Vespasī ...	= (a) <i>Vīspa</i> , 'all.' (b) <i>zā</i> , 'conquering.'	} Iranic.	Name of a satrap.
40. Horamurta ...	= (a) <i>ahura</i> . (b) <i>burz</i> , 'high' (Zend <i>berez</i>), in <i>Vahūburz</i> , etc. or <i>marā</i> in <i>Siāmard</i> , etc.	Iranic. Pahlavi, Pers. " " " " } Pahlavi.	So M. Senart, loc. cit. For <i>m</i> in place of <i>b</i> cf. <i>Mēra</i> = <i>Bara</i> , etc.; and (<i>vr</i>) for <i>rz</i> will not cause a difficulty in Pahlavi, where both ultimately became <i>l</i> .
41. Khudacia ...	= (a) <i>Khudā</i> , 'god.' (b) Suffix <i>ca</i> , <i>ci</i> in <i>Manec</i> , <i>Zairici</i>	See M. Boyer's edition, <i>Journal Asiatique</i> , sér. x, vol. iii, pp. 457-65.
<i>Takht-i-Bahi</i>	So M. Boyer.
42. Miraboyana	= <i>Μιροβοϋάνας</i> .	Old Persian.	Name of a king: the reading is doubtful.
43. Ejšuna ...	= <i>śaśan</i> , 'pious' ?	Zend.	
<i>Wardak</i> ...			
44. Bagamarega ...	= (a) <i>Bara</i> , 'god.' (b) <i>bara</i> in <i>Senabares</i> , etc.	Pan-Iranic. "	See Justi s.v. <i>Bagabara</i> .
45. Haštunamarega	= (a) <i>Histanes</i> , <i>Bisthanes</i> . (b) <i>bara</i> , as above.	Pan-Iranic ?	

It must be admitted that these etymologies are by no means all of equal certainty. We have to allow for the inaccuracy of ancient, as of modern, Indians in the representation of foreign names. But, on the other hand, the Iranian origin of practically all the names seems clear. To discriminate generally, however, between those which are Scythic and those which belong to the Zend-Persian group is hardly possible. Some, such as *Nahapana*, *Zeionises*, *Kalui*, certainly bear the latter character, and others, e.g., *Maues*, *Hyrkodes*, *Ghsamotika*, decidedly associate themselves with the former: probably the elements *Sparga-* and *Spala-* are rather Scythic than Persic. Considering that such a name as *Spalahora* is probably of mixed origin, and considering that in several instances (e.g., *Vonones* and his relatives *Spalahora*, *Spaluris*, *Spalagadama*, and *Kharaosta*, *Rañjubula*, *Śoḍāsa*) there appear to be names from both sources belonging to members of the same family, we must admit that it is hopeless to base any distinction of nationality upon such nomenclature. In fact, the evidence of these names, so far as it goes, is in agreement with the close association of Śāka and Pahlavas, which seems to be indicated by the Indian references, and with the statement quoted above (p. 195) from the *Periplus*. It would seem probable that the tribes from eastern Iran who invaded India included diverse elements mingled indistinguishably together, so that it is not possible to assert that one dynasty is definitely Parthian while another is Śāka. A regular invasion by the Parthian empire seems to be not recorded and *a priori* highly improbable. We must think rather of inroads by adventurers of various origin, among whom from time to time one or another, as Maues, was able to assert a temporary supremacy.

A special interest attaches to the Lion Capital of Mathurā, where only we find the names in question forming a fairly numerous group. It is to be expected, indeed, that some of them, e.g. *Kalui*, will hereafter be found of interest for the linguistic chronology of Persia. As regards the historical questions involved, whatever we may think of

the word *sakastana* occurring among the inscriptions,¹ it is certain that the names are in some instances of Scythian, in others of Persian, origin. Considering that Maues is also a specifically Scythic name, it is impossible to maintain literally the contention of Dr. Fleet (op. cit., pp. 643-5) that Sakas are not found at all in Hindustan. In essence, however, this contention seems to me to contain a valuable and indeed illuminating truth, namely, that, whatever Pahlava or Saka dynasties may have existed in the Punjab or India—for their coins are not found in Afghanistan²—reached India neither through Afghanistan nor through Kashmir, but, as Cunningham contended,³ by way of Sind and the valley of the Indus. For Mathurā, the Lion Capital itself seems to proclaim this fact aloud. For that it was really a capital may be seen from the plates in Mr. Vincent Smith's work on Mathurā⁴; but the manner in which it fitted into the building of which it formed a part, and the Persian character of that edifice, can be properly estimated only by a comparison with the originals in the tomb of Darius at Naksh-i-Rustam and other buildings of the Achæmenids.⁵

¹ For a discussion of the matter see Dr. Fleet's articles in this Journal, 1904, pp. 703 sqq.; 1905, pp. 643 sqq.

² Professor Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 8, § 29.

³ For ref. see Professor Rapson, loc. cit.

⁴ *Archæological Survey of India*, New Imperial Series, vol. xx, pls. xliii-1.

⁵ See figures, pp. 48, 49, 68, 124, 134, of *Inscriptiones Palæo-Persicæ Achæmenidarum* by Dr. Cajetanus Kossowicz (St. Petersburg, 1872).

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE ROCK DWELLINGS AT RENEH.

A short time ago I wrote a brief letter asking for any information concerning some rock dwellings at Reneh, in the Elburz Mountains, and now, since after the insertion of my letter in the Royal Asiatic Society's Journal no further light has been shed upon the subject, I venture to give a more detailed description.

The rock dwellings are near Reneh, perhaps a mile away down the Barferush road, just opposite the place where the track to Dehat ascends the opposite side of the ravine. The cliff in which they occur faces south, up the ravine, and its rather soft conglomerate face has been hollowed into more than fifty rooms of various shapes and kinds, the form of the chambers being rectangular, and that of the openings generally square or oblong.

From the path which descends opposite them they are seen to excellent advantage, and in a proper light—midday would be best—an excellent photograph could be obtained. Unfortunately I came to the dwellings in the early morning, and being unable to wait was forced to take my photographs under unfavourable conditions.

To a height of perhaps 60 feet, and for a space of about 50 yards, the cliff has been literally honeycombed with these holes, the entrance to all but the lowest being practically

impossible without a rope or ladder. On the morning I came across them, after the mules had gone on, I crossed a stony moraine to the north-western end of the series of dwellings, where, indeed, they are not so accessible as further to the south-east, but I wished if possible to climb to some of the less easily entered chambers, as obviously those most easy of access would have been entered and possibly lived in by Persians.

The entrance to the first I attempted, I gained after a moderate scramble, it being about 10 feet from the ground with an almost precipitous ascent. I found the remains, apparently, of a double doorway, two sets of door posts a couple of feet apart, as in the 'Fire-temple' at Naksh-i-Rustam, and, inside, a plain oblong room about 7 feet high, 15 feet long, and 8 wide, hewn out of the solid rock. The marks of the chisel were plainly visible on the walls: there were rude niches in places, but no traces of an inscription anywhere. The floor was covered to the depth of about 6 inches with filth, and in the centre was an irregular hole leading to a sort of cellar which I could not enter. At the top of the before-mentioned moraine there was a room on the ground-level in an angle of the cliff, and, entering, I found a perfectly bare apartment leading by a step into another higher room. Here there was a plain floor with, unlike the first room, no hole leading to a lower cellar. In neither of these two last rooms was there anything of interest, and, leaving them, I made an effort to reach another doorway about 15 feet up the cliff, a little to the south-east of the angle. I succeeded without much difficulty, only to find a similar room to the first I entered, and then tried the next entrance to the north-west, which gave promise of leading to a suite of rooms, but which appeared very inaccessible, and was about 20 feet up the rock.

After several unsuccessful and painful failures to scale the cliff directly from beneath, I endeavoured to scramble across the face of the rock from the previous entrance, and after being nearly precipitated to the bottom more than once, I managed to gain the opening, and was rewarded

by finding myself in a sort of passage. It was only a few feet in length, and about four in width, with its floor shelving steeply upwards owing to an accumulation of débris. From the inner or upper end rose a sort of shaft, say 15 feet in height and 4 feet square, there being a 'landing' 7 feet up with on one side a passage now open to the air, but once, evidently, entirely walled round by the rock, and on the adjacent or inmost side the entrance to a room.

The means of ascending the shaft were obvious, for in the wall, at convenient intervals on the adjacent sides leading to the passage and the room, were niches, now worn very smooth. I had to use both sets of niches to get up, and when on the landing had some difficulty in getting across the passage to the rooms beyond, as the outer wall and part of the flooring were gone.

Once across, I saw there were two lower rooms and one upper, leading one out of the other, the upper being nearest the passage. I went first to the upper room, a plain empty chamber like the former ones, save that the filth on the floor, untouched for ages, had formed in places a hard crust. Then I passed on to the lower ones, having to creep. Creeping in, I saw, by the light entering through a window on my left, what was evidently an ancient refuse heap. I sat down and inspected it. Bones in plenty—large ones—and fragments of pottery, etc., all piled up together with other refuse.

The pottery was of various shapes and thicknesses, some coarse pieces of what had been evidently bowls with a rough zigzag pattern round them, some thin pieces of jugs, and one fragment with the handle complete.

I fancy that both the remaining portions of this and the various parts of other vessels could be found and pieced together. I had not the time, nor could I carry anything away with me, so I left all as I found it. The only remarkable thing in the inmost room was a large pit about 2 feet square and $6\frac{1}{2}$ deep, with nothing in it, not quite in the centre of the floor. There was a smaller and shallower

one in the room above, and also one in the 'rubbish-room.' Returning by an oblique jump across the shaft, I gained the isolated room on the other side, which, but for its slightly different shape, needs no comment. A difficult jump back, and a scramble down, brought my investigations to a close, as I had to hurry on after my mules, already far ahead.

I much regretted having to make only so cursory an examination of these dwellings, which would possibly repay closer investigation, especially if the upper and at present inaccessible suites of rooms were reached by a ladder or rope. I am entirely ignorant of their history, and I could find out nothing from the natives of the district except that they were "very old." As my appeal for any other available information in a former number of the *Journal* was unsuccessful, I am giving this short account of my experiences in the hope that it may prove of interest, and elicit opinions as to the age and history of these rock dwellings.

E. CRAWSHAY-WILLIAMS.

Hallo 'th' Hill, Adlington, Chorley.

MO-LA-P'O, 摩臘婆.

To Mr. V. A. Smith's argument against the identification of Hiuen-Tsang's Mo-la-p'o with Mālava, stated in his *Early History of India* (pp. 279-80) and expanded in his paper in the *Zeitsch. d. Deut. Morgenl. Gesellschaft* (Bd. lviii, Ss. 787-96), I had drafted a reply. But my attention has just been directed to a review in the *Journal des Savants* (October, 1905, pp. 534-548) by M. Sylvain Lévi, in which the question is discussed in a way that leaves not much more to be said.

The general regularity with which the same Chinese characters are employed to transcribe Sanskrit *aksharas*, renders it next to impossible to transliterate the three

symbols for *Mo-la-p'o* into any form materially different from *Mālava*. And we know of no district in Gujarāt proper that ever bore a name at all resembling this. As M. Lévi remarks, "it is absolutely impossible to place Mo-la-p'o, as Mr. Vincent Smith does, in the isthmus to the peninsula of Kattiawar, between Cambay and the Rann of Kachh."

From the Chinese texts, M. Lévi supplies us further with some important corrections of the translations that have perplexed editors. Thus, Julien (ii, 160), with a defective text, was led into a mistake, the correct version being: "En partant de ce royaume [de Mālava] au Sud-Ouest, on entre dans la mer. Il [Hiuen-Tsang] marcha au Nord-Ouest deux mille quatre à cinq cents li, et parvint au royaume de O-tch'a-li." And at the close of the next paragraph the reading should be, as in the *Life*: "On leaving the kingdom of Mo-la-p'o, by *three days* march to the north-west, he arrived at the kingdom of K'ie-ch'a."

Julien doubted the identification of this last with Kachh, as the Chinese characters (契吒) transcribe into Khētā, and General Cunningham proposed Khēḍā (*hodie* Kaira); but Mr. Beal did not accept this. M. Lévi agrees with Cunningham and the proper transcription. Thus, in Hiuen-Tsang's time, Khēḍā and Ānandapura were both included in Mālava, which then "extended to the sea on the south-west." But a century before, and again in 765, these provinces belonged to Valabhī. And, till the time of Akbar, we know that Gujarāt and Mālwa were constantly encroaching on one another; and at this day Western Mālwa still marches for 150 miles along the eastern borders of Gujarāt.

For the Mahī river, Julien's text seems to have given *Mo-ho* (莫訶) (ii, 515), but M. Lévi informs us that the correct reading is *Mo-hi*, and that "the capital was situated to the south-east of the river"—whether in its upper or lower course is not indicated.

A very important correction is that on Julien, ii, 163 (Beal, ii, 267), where we should read: "At present the king

(of Valabhī) is a Kshatriya by birth; *he is* the son of the brother of the former Śilāditya, king of Mālava, and son-in-law of the son of the present Śilāditya, king of Kanyākubja: his name is Dhruvabhāṭa.” Śilāditya-Dharmāditya of Valabhī, then, was Hiuen-Tsang’s “Śilāditya of Mālava,” and M. Lévi does not trouble “to collect all the data that permit us to follow the destinies of Mālava, conquered by Śilāditya, who annexed it to Valabhī, invaded by Harsha, and lost by Dhruvasena II, who retreated to Bharōch.”

These details may be welcome to readers who may not see the *Journal des Savants*.

Mr. Smith tells us in his *History* (p. 280, n.), and repeats it in the *Z.D.M.G.* (p. 788, n.), that Max Müller “was led astray by Mr. Beal’s blunder” respecting Śilāditya of Mālwa. But, on behalf of the dead, it may be pointed out that Max Müller’s *India* was published more than a year *before* the late Mr. Beal’s translation was printed in 1884; and so the latter could not have misled the professor, whether he blundered or not.

JAS. BURGESS.

Edinburgh.

Nov. 4th, 1905.

SUŚRUTA ON MOSQUITOES.

His Excellency Sir Henry A. Blake, Governor of Ceylon, having most kindly favoured me with a copy of his paper on “Ancient Theories of Causation of Fever by Mosquitoes,”¹ I have once more examined all the principal medical Sanskrit texts likely to throw light on this point. The two texts of Suśruta on which the five distinguished Ceylon scholars referred to by Sir Henry Blake have rested their opinion that the medical writers of ancient India were acquainted with the connection existing between malaria and mosquitoes,

¹ Read before the Ceylon Branch of the B.M. Association, on the 15th April, 1905.

were also quoted in my previous communication to this Journal (July, 1905), which was written about the same time as Sir H. Blake's paper. Now it is quite true that the two texts, the only ones in Suśruta which bear on the point, may convey the impression that he was actually aware of the fatal consequences attending the bites of certain mosquitoes, of the kind called Pārvatīya (mountainous), which are, he says, as dangerous as 'life-taking' or destructive insects. The 'life-taking' insects, according to Suśruta, are of twelve kinds, Tuṅgīnasa, etc. (not identified), and they cause the person bitten to undergo the same (seven consecutive stages of) symptoms as in the case of snake-bites, as well as the painful sensations (of pricking pain, heat, itching, and so on, Comm.) and dangerous diseases, the bite, as if burnt with caustic or fire, being red, yellow, white, or brown. The further symptoms which are mentioned in the following verses, such as fever, pain in the limbs, etc., are, however, common to all the four principal kinds of insect bites; they are not meant to be specially characteristic of the bites of 'life-taking' insects.¹ Nor is the fever (*jvara*), of which Suśruta speaks in this place, likely to be true malarial fever. The term rather denotes the wound-fever, which is constantly mentioned by Suśruta as arising from the bites of insects, such as Viśvambharas and Kaṇḍūmakas (Kalpasth. viii, 15), of various poisonous spiders (viii, 51-54), of scorpions (viii, 35), of certain serpents (iv, 24), of rats or mice (vi, 11, 16), or from the wound caused by a poisoned arrow (v, 24).

If the chief causes of malarial fever are "impure air and water and the existence of mosquitoes, according to ancient authorities on Āyurvedic medicine," we should be led to expect some statements to that effect in Suśruta's chapter on fever, the king of diseases (*rogāṇīkarāt*), where he goes very thoroughly into the causes of fever, such as derangement of the humours by some disturbing cause, as fighting with

¹ This does not come out in the English translation proposed by the five Sanskrit scholars. It appears from the Sanskrit Commentary of Dallana.

a strong man, anger, or sleeping in the daytime, by improper application of medicines, by external injuries caused by a weapon or other instrument, by some disease, by fatigue or exhaustion, by indigestion, by poison, etc. Poison (*viṣam*) is the only term in this list which could be supposed to have any reference to mosquito-bites; but the symptoms attributed to the fever caused by poison, such as diarrhœa, prove that vegetable poison must be meant, and this is expressly stated in a Sanskrit Commentary. Suśruta does not refer to mosquito-bites anywhere else than in the book on Poisons (*Kalpasthānam*), where he notices them very briefly, together with the stings of other insects. Poisonous spiders, e.g., are far more copiously discussed by Suśruta than mosquitoes, and he attributes to them the causation of dangerous diseases, as well as of fever and other complications. Suśruta's general notions of the nature of poisonous substances, including the nails and teeth of cats, dogs, monkeys, alligators, etc., are very crude, and his statements regarding animal poison in particular seem to be based, in a great measure, on an observation of the effects of snake-bites. Thus he supposes insects (*kīṭa*) and scorpions to be generated in the putrid carcases, excrements, and eggs of snakes; and he places the bites of dangerous animals of this kind on a par with snake-bites as to their consequences and as to their medical treatment. It does not seem advisable, therefore, to compare Suśruta's remark on the fatal nature of the bites of a certain Maśaka occurring in mountainous regions with modern theories of the origin of malaria, especially as Maśaka is a very wide term, which may include any fly or insect that bites, besides ordinary mosquitoes, as in a well-known text of the Code of Manu (I, 40) on the creation of 'all stinging and biting insects' (*sarvaṃ ca daṃśamaśakam*). The other Sanskrit authorities agree with Suśruta.

J. JOLLY.

Würzburg.

November 21st, 1905.

MAHĀBHĀRATA (Ādiparva, ch. 94).

There are references of the Kuru-Pāṇchāla war in the later Vedic and Sutra literature. But that the Pāṇdu story of the Mahābhārata Samhita, which gives the account of the two rival families of the Kauravas, could not in any way be called Kuru-Pāṇchāla story, is beyond all doubt.

As there is also mention in the later Vedic literature of the names of Dhritarāstra, Parikshit, and Janamejaya, it is still supposed by some that the Pāṇdu story, if not the same or a part of the Kuru-Pāṇchāla story, may be of equal antiquity. But I think it can be with some certainty shown from the Mahābhārata itself that there was an old legend of a war between the Kurus and the Pāṇchālas which had no relation whatever with the Pāṇdu story.

I refer the readers to the 94th chapter of the Ādiparva, giving the history of the Puruvamsa from the remotest antiquity. It has been distinctly stated (slokas 34 to 50) that Raja Sambarana (who was a Bhārata), being defeated by the Pāṇchālas, had to live with his whole family in the mountainous regions of the Panjab for a long time. This Sambarana is said to be the father of Raja Kuru. With the help of the Rishi Vasistha, the Raja got back the lost kingdom, and could make all other Rajas (Pāṇchālas not excepted) pay tribute to him. Kuru, son of Sambarana, founded Kurujāngala, famous since then as Kurukshetra.

We get also Janamejaya, Parikshit, and Dhritarāstra as some subsequent Rajas in the same family (slokas 51-56), who are far removed from the Rajas of the same name mentioned in the Pāṇdu story. Sāntanu himself is a successor of theirs; and this Sāntanu has been made in the Mahābhārata Samhita, the grandfather of the later Dhritarāstra and Pāṇdu. Thus we can easily explain how the names Janamejaya, Parikshit, and Dhritarāstra could be mentioned in very old literature, even though no Pāṇdu story existed.

I suspect that Dhritarāstra and Pāṇdu of the Mahābhārata were affiliated to the old renowned family for conferring dignity upon the heroes of the new story, and that the

author of the Mahābhārata Samhita grafted his new story upon the Old Kuru Pāṇchāla or Bhārati Kathā. There are passages in the Mahābhārata which show that facts which with propriety could only be mentioned in connection with the Kurus of old, have been with great inconsistency stated with reference to the modern Pāṇdavas. The Dhārtarāstras and Pāṇdavas were contending for supremacy over countries near about the Jamunā and the Gangā; and they had no manner of right over the portion of the Panjab which is watered by the Five Rivers, and had other kings for rulers. Yet, very curiously enough, it was agreed that the Dhārtarāstras would lose the kingdom of "Panchanādyah" if the Pāṇdavas could not be traced by them during the stay of the Pāṇdavas for twelve years in the forests (Vana Parva, 34th chapter, 11th sloka). The passage looks like a quotation in the mouth of Yudhisthira, and can be suspected to be the remnant of a portion of the old Kuru-Pāṇchāla story.

I need not multiply examples here, since I wanted in this paper merely to show that the legend about a war between the Kurus and Pāṇchālas existed in olden days, and that legend had nothing to do with the Pāṇdu story of the Mahābhārata.

B. C. MAZUMDAR.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

HEBREW HUMOUR, AND OTHER ESSAYS. By J. CHOTZNER,
Ph.D. (London: Luzac & Co., 1905.)

Dr. Chotzner publishes under the title of *Hebrew Humour* a collection of essays read before various literary Societies, and some of which have appeared in various periodicals.

The book consists of sixteen essays, and we are introduced to some of the most appreciated Hebrew poets of the Middle Ages: very few of these had hitherto been introduced to the English reading public. It is a great merit of Dr. Chotzner's volume that he not only gives life sketches of men like Bedaresi, of Emanuel of Rome, the reputed friend of Dante, and a close imitator of his immortal poem in his own *Mehhaberot*, or *Kalonymos*, a thirteenth century satirist, or of *ibn Hisdai*, the Hebrew translator of the famous legend of Barlaam and Josafat, but he also, in a felicitous manner, translates some of their poems, and thus makes it possible for the otherwise uninitiated reader to get a glimpse of a rich and varied literature which flourished in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

It must be noted that each one of these authors handled the language of the Bible in a manner unsurpassed, and it requires a profound knowledge of the Bible fully to appreciate the poetical power of their compositions.

Dr. Chotzner has also given us biographies of some noted modern Hebrew scholars, and one essay is devoted to show the influence of Hebrew literature on Heine, the great German poet.

A good index completes this collection, which can be warmly recommended to all lovers of mediæval poetry.

M. G.

ABOUT HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS. By E. N. ADLER.
(London: Henry Frowde, 1905.)

Mr. E. N. Adler, an indefatigable traveller in the East, has lost no opportunity in his journeys to enquire after and to acquire literary treasures, and he has thus amassed a unique collection, undoubtedly the largest in a private position of Hebrew manuscripts and incunabula. He has almost rediscovered a rich Hebrew Persian literature, i.e. Persian poetry and Persian prose translations of the Bible, commentaries and other literary compositions in the Persian language, but written with Hebrew characters.

A few stray specimens of that literature were known from the manuscripts in the British Museum, and from the old translation of the Pentateuch by Tawuz. But no one had dreamed of so large a store of literary productions in Persia. He also acquired fragments from the Genizah, and among them he was lucky enough to find some missing chapters of the Hebrew version of the Ecclesiastics of Ben-Sira; this he has published with facsimiles in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*; and he has often discoursed pleasantly and instructively on his travels, on his finds of old books and manuscripts, and on the romance that surrounds them.

Most of these articles and papers appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*; but instead of becoming lost, scattered as they were among various periodicals, they have now been united into a handsome volume full of instruction from beginning to end, and enriched, moreover, by a few more facsimiles and by suggestive remarks of Professor Bacher. A copious and carefully compiled index still more enhances the value of this book.

M. G.

PAPIRI GRECO-EGIZII. By D. COMPARETTI e G. VITELLI.
Vol. I. (Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1905.)

The Academia dei Lincei, at the request of its president, Professor Villari, has sanctioned a separate publication of

Greek-Egyptian papyri collected from Egypt and scattered now in various libraries in Italy, as a supplement to their *Monumenti Antichi*, entrusting the care of this publication to Professors Comparetti and Vitelli.

The first fascicle has now appeared, containing thirty-five Greek papyri from Florence, transcribed and commented upon by the learned editor, and accompanied by a number of facsimiles admirably executed. The contents of the papyri are very varied; they are mostly of a legal and domestic character, and the editors as well as the *Academia* are heartily to be congratulated on this publication, which will throw light also on the early Christian and Byzantine period in Egypt.

M. G.

APOLLINARISTISCHE SCHRIFTEN SYRISCH. Edited by Dr. Joh. FLEMMING and Hr. H. LIETZMANN. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch - Historische Klasse.* (Berlin, 1904.)

This is a particularly careful and thorough piece of editing. Hn. Flemming and Lietzmann have not been content with bringing together hitherto published treatises and allowing due honour to those who have already edited them, but they have carefully collated these with photographs of any portions of the same quoted in other Brit. Mus. and Vatican MSS., and have been able to add some hitherto unpublished texts from the former collection; the whole number now being printed in a most convenient form, with the Greek on the same page as the Syriac. Further, a very full list of Greek words with their Syriac equivalents occupies 19 pages at the end of the pamphlet, and facilitates to the utmost references to and study of important passages. We must add that the Syriac is remarkably free from typographical errors.

Although the title of this pamphlet is non-committal, yet in the introduction old ascriptions as to the authorship of

the various pieces are continued, probably for convenience of reference, and only passing allusion is made to Caspari's learned and convincing researches, resulting in the attribution of most of these writings to Apollinaris the Younger. Hr. Lietzmann, however, refers his readers for discussions of questions of authorship and of textual criticism to an earlier volume of these transactions which we have not seen.

CHRISTLICH-PALAESTINISCHE FRAGMENTE AUS DER OMAJJADEN-MOSCHEE ZU DAMASKUS. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH SCHULTHESS. Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse. (Berlin, 1905.)

The long-hoarded MSS. of the Omayyad Mosque at Damascus were at last—in 1900—brought out of their seclusion by the efforts, exerted through the channels of diplomacy, of Baron Dr. von Soden, his success being doubtless due in great part to the favour with which the German Emperor, alone of the Christian Powers, is regarded by the Sultan. The state in which these anxiously hoped-for treasures were found is vividly described by Dr. Bruno Violet, who, owing to the want of such facilities as are usual in civilised lands, had to spend many weary months in hunting through the dirty tattered MSS., which were stuffed by ignorant labourers into sacks and lumped down before him for his selection. For the *Kubbet-el-Chazne*, Treasure Cupola, of the Mosque is dark and only accessible by a ladder, and the jealous care with which it has been guarded (from the researches of scholars) is merely due to the superstition of ignorance. On Dr. Violet's return to Germany he handed over his finds, chiefly palimpsests, and further obscured by dirt and neglect, to Dr. Schulthess for decipherment; partly from stress of other work, chiefly from his confidence in Dr. Schulthess's experience in Palestinian Syriac. Both Dr. Violet's and Dr. Schulthess's descriptions of the state of these fragments make us wonder at the patient industry,

practised eye, and keen insight which have deduced so much from them. With regard to the Biblical portions, of course comparison with other texts is of avail, as also in the case of hymns where identification with Greek originals has proved possible; Dr. Schulthess hopes that these learned researches may be carried further by other scholars. He judges from the script that most of the fragments are of the ninth century or somewhat earlier. They comprise scattered passages of the Old and New Testaments, those from St. John's Gospel, Romans, Philippians, and Hebrews being the most continuous; some leaves from Apocryphal Gospels and Acts of Saints, and three longish hymns in fair preservation. Except in the case of the Biblical fragments the Greek, where known, is given, and elsewhere a German translation; and careful notes have been added throughout.

J. P. MARGOLIOUTH.

BENGAL IN 1756-57. A selection of papers dealing with Bengal during the reign (?) of Siraj-Uddaula. Edited by S. C. HILL. 3 vols., 8vo. Indian Records Series. (John Murray, 1905.)

This is a work of much research, and which does great credit to the industry and ability of Mr. Hill. He is already favourably known by his life of Claude Martin and his account of three French officers in Bengal, and this book is a further instance of his talent for investigation. In preparing it he has examined the records in Calcutta, London, Paris, and The Hague, and he has also perused the Clive papers in the possession of the Earl of Powis and the contemporary magazines and newspapers of Europe, etc., etc. He acknowledges that the idea of including extracts from newspapers, etc., was suggested to him by the discovery by that veteran antiquarian, Mr. T. R. Munro, of some lists of the victims of the Black Hole in the *Scots Magazine*.

The work is an account of the revolution whereby Bengal was transferred from the Muhammedans to the English in

1757. The period covered by it is about thirteen months, namely, from the beginning of June, 1756, when Cossimbazaar surrendered to Siraj-Uddaula, to 23rd June, 1757, the date of the victory of Plassey. These months were epoch-making, and so the space allotted to them is not excessive. Mr. Hill's historical introduction occupies little more than two hundred pages, and the rest of the three big octavoes is taken up with copies of letters and minutes, and extracts from contemporary narratives. Many of them appear for the first time, and others, such as Holwell's account of the Black Hole tragedy, well deserve reprinting.

It must be confessed that much of the three volumes is melancholy reading. They form a record abounding in instances of cowardice, incapacity, and duplicity. In the first volume there is little that is cheerful reading. The second and third are better, for in them we have the account of the recovery of Calcutta and of the taking of Chander-nagore. After wading through that Slough of Despond—the dreary detail of disaster and incompetence—it is pleasant to meet with the account of the squadron which sailed from Madras and ascended the Hooghly. The log-books of the men-of-war, the description of Admiral Watson's making himself a better target for the French gunner, of his brother-admiral, Pocock, rowing up in his barge from Hidjeelee to share in the fun, and arriving in time to get wounded, and the pathetic story of Captain Speke and his son Billy—best told in the pleasant pages of Dr. Ives—come upon one like a whiff of sea-air from the Sandheads, such as Zephaniah Holwell must have rejoiced in when he sat down in the “Syren” sloop in February, 1757, to describe the horrors of the previous June.

There is something humorous as well as sad in finding that it was the presence of a woman—the redoubtable Begam Johnson—in Cossimbazaar Fort, that was the proximate cause of its surrender, and of the Black Hole and other disasters. She was the Eve who tempted her foolish Adam to interview the Nawab, and so made him and his countrymen lose Bengal, that “Paradise of Countries.” Mrs. Johnson

was at this time the wife of Watts, the chief of the Cossimbazaar Factory. He was her third husband, and she afterwards accompanied him to England. She must have been as vigorous as the Wife of Bath, for she outlived three husbands and got rid of her fourth by pensioning him off and deporting him to Europe, dying herself in Calcutta in 1812, at the age of 87, and being honoured by a public funeral, attended by the Governor-General in his coach and six ! One would have thought that so masterful a dame would rather have animated her husband to resistance than have implored him to surrender. But perhaps her anxiety for her children, born and unborn, depressed her spirit on this occasion. At any rate, her husband must share the blame with her, for in his tenderness for her he forsook his duty to his country. Watts' surrender was another instance of the fatal habit of trusting to Orientals, of which Indian history gives us so many examples. It was similar in its folly and disastrous results to the surrenders at Manjhi, Cawnpore, and Munipore. One is inclined to wonder how the actors in such scenes forgot their classical education, and did not remember the Anabasis and the story of the surrender of the Greek generals to the Persians. The only redeeming feature in the sordid story of Cossimbazaar is the conduct of Elliott, the officer in command of the fort, who blew out his brains while smarting under the disgrace of his chief's behaviour. Perhaps things would have happened very differently if Warren Hastings had been in the fort. He was but a young man then, and in an inferior position, but it is not likely that he would have capitulated. He was attached to the Cossimbazaar Factory at the time, but he was absent at one of the out-factories or *aurangs* and did not know what was going on. Holwell, in writing on the subject to the Court of Directors, used strong language, but not, I think, more than was justifiable. He said :—

“The reasons which swayed Mr. Watts to quit his government at such a juncture as that, and trust himself in the hands of the Suba (on whose character or principles no reasonable faith could

be had) without any proper security, hostage, or safeguard for his person; or those which urged Mr. Collet to follow his example, when he knew his chief was made a prisoner, and that consequently the trust, command, and government of the factory, fort, and garrison devolved upon himself; or why this your Settlement was thus given up without a single stroke being struck for it, I am totally a stranger to, and can only hope for their sakes and the honour of their country, they have, or will justify their conduct to you in those particulars. I will not subscribe to the opinion of our five Captains,¹ as already recited, and say their force was sufficient to resist and defend the place for any long time against the Suba's army; but had it been defended at all, he could not have attacked and taken it without the loss of time and many of his people, and probably some of his principal officers . . . A defence of only twenty-four hours would, in its consequences, have retarded in all probability his march to Calcutta for many days . . . A detention of his army before Cossimbazaar for two or three days would have brought on dirty, rainy weather in his march towards us, and incommoded him greatly, as well in the passage of his troops and cannon as in the attack of our Settlement; whereas, by the easy possession he acquired of Cossimbazaar, he was enabled to march against us without loss of time or obstruction from the weather, which afforded not a drop of rain during his march and attack of Calcutta; but on the 21st, at night, whilst I was prisoner in the camp, it rained heavily, and dirty weather succeeded for many days after, during which his musketry, being all matchlocks, would have been rendered in a manner useless." (Letter, vol. ii, pp. 12 and 13.)

Holwell might have added to this that the surrender of Cossimbazaar at once put Siraj-Uddaula in possession of guns and ammunition which, as Mr. Hills says (i, p. lxii), he needed for the attack of Calcutta, his own being worthless. The explanation or apology which Holwell hoped for was given by Watts and Collet in a letter to the Council at Madras dated 2nd July, 1756 (i, 45), but in it they almost gave

¹ Watts admits (iii, 333) that the five captains made this report, though he says they were greatly mistaken. Captain Grant, who was at Cossimbazaar in October, 1755, says (i, 74) that the guns were in pretty good order, and that there were also eight Cohorn mortars 4 and 5 inches, with a store of shells and grenades. Apparently also there were forty guns of 9 and 6 pounds and a saluting battery of twenty-four guns of from 2 to 4 pounds.

away their case, for they said (*id.*, p. 47), "We might possibly have held out three or four days." Afterwards Watts submitted a separate explanation to the Court of Directors, dated 30th January, 1757 (*iii*, 331), in which he endeavoured to traverse Holwell's allegations. But it is a very poor performance, and shows that Watts was either disingenuous or stupid, or both. He wrote:—

"Mr. Holwell endeavours to arraign my conduct by artfully endeavouring to prove that one day's defence of Cossimbazaar might have saved Calcutta, and in order to do this he calls the heavens to his assistance and makes it rainy, dirty weather for several days after the taking of the place; to this I answer, and appeal to every inhabitant of Calcutta for the truth of what I assert, that except one shower on the second night after the place was taken, it was in general clear and dry weather for many days, I think to the beginning of July."

But if Watts had been honest or had read Holwell's letter with due attention, he would have seen that Holwell says nothing about there being any rain shortly after the surrender. On the contrary, he says that there was not a drop of rain during Siraj - Uddaula's march to Calcutta or during his attack on the place. Holwell's point is that if Siraj - Uddaula had been detained for three or four days before Cossimbazaar (three or four days, of course, being a loose expression which might cover a week) he could not have marched till the 9th or 10th June, instead of, as he did, on the 5th. Consequently he would not have arrived at Calcutta on the 16th or have taken the fort on the 20th. At the earliest he would have arrived there by the 20th or 21st, and so would have come in for the bad weather which set in on the night of the 21st. It seems to me, therefore, that Mr. Hills disposes of Holwell's remarks in a rather cavalier fashion when he calls his assertion "one of those hypothetical arguments which does not admit of answer, and is hardly worth discussion" (*i*, p. lxi).

I have not space to dwell upon other points in Mr. Hill's excellent Introduction and notes. I would only observe that in one or two places he seems to have been misled by

a too exclusive reliance on European authorities. For instance, it is surely misleading to describe Murshid Quli as a *convert* to Muhammedanism. Was he not, though by birth a Hindu, bought by a Muhammedan while in his infancy and brought up as a Musalman?¹ Then, again, we are told by him that Clive recommended Omichand to visit a sacred shrine in Maldah. Omichand, whose real name is said to have been Amir Chand, was apparently an up-country man and a Sikh or a Jain, and I am not aware of there being any sacred Hindu shrine at Maldah. Perhaps Maldah is a mistake for Malwa, and the place he was recommended to visit was Ujjain. Finally, if Mr. Hill had referred to the *Riyāzu-s-salāṭīn*, of which the Asiatic Society has published a translation, he would not have written (i, p. ccvi) that Siraj-Uddaula was arrested close to Rajmahal. In fact, the faquir who betrayed him lived on the other side of the Ganges, and it was there that he was arrested. Siraj-Uddaula knew too well that Mir Jaffar's brother was Governor of Rajmahal to trust himself on that side of the river.

H. BEVERIDGE.

NOTE.—I may note here that there is an appropriateness in Mr. Hill's having been selected as the author to deal with a period when the district of Murshidabad was so much in evidence, for his honoured father was a missionary there for many years, and there is a tablet to his memory in the Berhampore School. A word of praise should be given to the very interesting plans and portraits which adorn the volumes.

CALCUTTA, PAST AND PRESENT. By KATHLEEN BLECHYNDEN.
(Thacker & Co., 2, Creed Lane, E.C., and Calcutta, 1905.)

This is a pleasant and interesting book, and is a worthy addition to the writings of Padre Long, Busteed, and Wilson. Miss Blechynden is a lady who is well known for the interest

¹ It is also incorrect to say that he destroyed all the Hindu temples within four miles of Murshidabad. There is a famous temple nearer the city than that which dates from before his time.

she takes in Calcutta and Alipore, and she has been able to give some new information from old family diaries. One charm of the book is the evident love that the authoress has for the Queen of the Ganges. Calcutta is too often regarded by the English as a place of exile and as barren of delight, and is sometimes spoken of by them as Smelfungus spoke of Rome. Miss Blechynden, however, speaks of it with the affection of a veritable Ditcher. And in truth Calcutta has many charms. Its Maidan is delightful, and its riverside has not lost all its beauty, in spite of the disappearance of the "winged chariots of sailors" and the presence of a railway-line. One charm of Calcutta to the pedestrian is that, thanks to its lofty houses, it is possible to walk in the streets at the hottest time of the day, a thing which one can rarely do in the Mofussil. Jahangir's famous avenue from Agra to Lahore was often spoken of by seventeenth century travellers, but I am afraid it is now, and always has been, something of a myth. Guidebooks to Italy used to tell of the picturesqueness and variety of the fish-market in Venice, but in truth that in Calcutta beats it hollow for strange forms, while the fragrance of the fruit and flower departments of the same market exceeds that of the covered walk in Covent Garden.

The first chapter of the book contains an account of the Charnock Mausoleum, together with an illustration of it, and at p. 22 we have an account of the Hamilton tablet with a translation of the Persian inscription. The translation, which is similar to that given in Talboys-Wheeler's book and in Dr. Wilson's "Inscriptions of Bengal," adds an unnecessary hyperbole to the original. In the English, the inscription is rendered as saying that Hamilton made his name famous in the four quarters of the earth. But the original is *chahar dāng*, "four dāngs," and this is a common expression for Hindustan, in accordance with the old saying quoted by Akbar's mother to the king of Persia's sister that India was four dāngs of the world and Persia the other two.

At p. 50 Miss Blechynden notices Mr. Hyde's discovery that the first Mrs. Hastings was married to Captain Buchanan,

who perished in the Black Hole. But may not the tradition that she was the wife of Captain Dugald Campbell, who fell at Budge-Budge, be also true? May she not have married Campbell at Fulta? Ladies remarried quickly in those days. Witness Mrs. Johnson, who married her second husband nine months after the death of her first, and her third a twelvemonth after the death of her second. Miss Blechynden speaks of Mrs. Buchanan escaping to Fulta with her baby-girl. Possibly this is the daughter who died at Berhampore, and she only bore Hastings a son. The latter, poor boy, went home to England with Colonel Sykes, and was received into the house of Jane Austen's father.

Our space will not allow us to dwell longer on Miss Blechynden's pleasant pages. We recommend our readers to procure the book for themselves. They will find in it, among other things, the thrilling story of the wreck of the "Grosvenor," and several very pretty illustrations.

H. BEVERIDGE.

PAṬISAMBHIDĀMAGGA. Vol. I. Edited by ARNOLD C. TAYLOR, M.A. (Pali Text Society, 1905.)

This—the first half of the first European edition of the Paṭisambhidāmagga—forms with another issue of the Journal the Pali Text Society's publications for 1905. The completion of the edition in one more volume is being proceeded with, and its appearance will leave, of the whole of the great Sutta Piṭaka, only three volumes yet unedited—Dīgha Nikāya III, now in process of making by Mr. J. Estlin Carpenter; the Niddesa, long promised by Professor Lanman; and the Apadāna. The Society is to be congratulated, not only on another step towards the completion of its work, but also on the reappearance in Pali scholarship of the editor of the Kathā Vatthu. For ten years closed in upon by professional labours, he has yet, without abatement of these, so prevailed—like the moon in the verses quoted in his text, "*abbhā mutto va candimā*"—as to accomplish this disinterested and,

in one way, most ungrateful labour of love. And the edition shows practically no sign of how it has been the thief of scanty leisure. The slips of the groping typographer which have eluded or resisted correction are astonishingly few, and the text is so presented as to help the reader in several ways. He needs help, for the work, if simple in argument, teems with difficulties of phrase and diction.

That argument, so far as this first volume takes us, shows a Mahāvagga of three Discourses. The first expounds seventy-three items of knowledge (*ñāṇa*) equated, so to speak, in terms of '*paññā*.' The second distinguishes various forms of 'views' (*diṭṭhi*), adducing some of their conditions and characteristics. The third gives a somewhat more detailed account than is yielded by other canonical books of that regulation of the flow of consciousness in connection with regulation of respiration, known as *Ānāpāna-sati*.

Into these contents this is not the place to enter at any length. But one or two brief comments on points that seem to me noteworthy may not be amiss.

As we read we are often tempted to think that the Paṭisambhidāmagga has strayed from what should be its proper collection, the Abhidhamma-piṭaka. There is no narrative or personal element whatever. Direct address is limited to three quoted passages (p. 161) which I have not yet been able to identify. The form is catechetical throughout, a persistency peculiar to Abhidhamma books. There is an interwoven exegetical Atthakathā, as in the Vibhaṅga, and a Mātikā for the longer discourse, as in the latter work and the Dhammasaṅgaṇī. Once more, the book is of a kind for advanced students. There is here no milk for babes, no talk of *puñña* and naughtiness, heaven and hell for such simple bhikshus as are, in the text, called hoi-polloi-good fellows, *puṭhujjanakalyāṇakā*—"l'homme sage moyen," to adapt a French phrase. The questions for the most part turn on subtle intricacies of that cultivation in introspective analysis to which Buddhist philosophy has ever been addicted. This, it is true, might well be expected from the title of the book, "The Way of Analysis." But then

a book so termed is precisely what might be looked for in the Abhidhamma. And as a fact, the so-called Four Paṭisambhidās are treated of more at length in the Abhidhamma (in the Vibhaṅga) than anywhere else, including even the present volume, where they are only brought in incidentally.

It will, however, be time, when the edition is complete, to test the style and diction of the Pali with a view to determining the date of the book relative to the rest of the Canon. With reference to the interwoven Atthakathā, I will only reply so far to the editor's query, whether Buddhaghosa makes use of it, as to point out that he does so in commenting on the Cūḷa-Vedalla-Sutta (Papañca-Sūdanī *ap.* M. i, p. 300), quoting the metaphors illustrating forms of soul-heresy given in pp. 143 ff. of the present volume.¹

To dwell a moment longer on the Atthakathā, it is, like its fellows, mainly descriptive and exegetical, explaining (?) rather by way of extension than of intension. A curious instance is where the word 'as,' in the gāthā *yathā Buddhena desitā*, provokes the comment:—There are ten meanings of *yathā* (more justly, ten things which *yathā* may here imply), viz., self-taming, self-quieting, etc., taught by the Buddha. One wonders if any mnemonic purpose was served by the rattling rhythm: *attadamathaṭṭho yathattho*, *attasamathaṭṭho yathattho*, etc. But a more interesting point is that, where the commentary becomes etymological, a quaint instance occurs such as we have hitherto associated with the days of Buddhaghosa:—'Ken' *atṭhena nīvaraṇā?* *Niyy-ānā-varaṇa-tṭhena nīvaraṇā?* Whereupon the catechism digresses on the term *niyyānam*. In a passage from Suidas, attempting to explain the meaning of the festival, Diasia² — *διαφύγειν* . . . *τὰς ἄσας*—I see the same

¹ When writing on the Vedalla Sutta (J.R.A.S., 1894, pp. 321 ff.) I was not aware that the metaphors were not the commentator's own. I note too that my transcriber unwittingly misled me by writing *jāyā* for *chāyā*, shadow—a confusion only too easy in Sinhalese.

² Quoted in Miss J. Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 22.

usage observed in the West at a date nearer to that of Buddhaghosa.

Like the Abhidhamma books which it resembles, the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* contributes practically nothing new to positive doctrine. But it contains many interesting side-lights on that doctrine. Confining my remaining space to the *Ñānakathā*, I may point out, firstly, that of the last six bodies of knowledge, reserved for the intellect of a Buddha, one is that known as the *yamakapāṭihīre ñāṇaṃ*, or knowledge in paired miracle. I believe that the description given on pp. 125, 126 is the first yet met with. Another deals with that common plane of Buddhism and Christianity, world-compassion. The section (pp. 126–31) is an exhaustive collection of all the grounds and metaphors for the action of Saviours as such, and is termed Knowledge of the Tathāgata's attainment of the Great Pity. Its refrain—"so seeing, great pity for creatures descends into the Buddhas, the Blessed Ones!"—has the effect of a litany, or a "Benedicite, omnia opera." "On fire are the habitations of the world! so seeing, etc. . . . fallen into an evil way . . . without shelter . . . without refuge . . . inflated, unsoothed . . . pierced is the world with many darts, and there is none to draw them out but I . . . flung into a cage of corruption enwrapped by the gloom of ignorance, and there is none can make it see light but I . . . none to put out (*nibbāpetā*) the fires of lust . . . and misery but I . . . I have crossed over, I can make them cross, free, I can set free . . ." Curious in the above is the old-world word-play *uddhato* (inflated) and *uddhatā* (drawer-out).

Of *ñāṇāni* or 'knowledges' (once I believe good academic Scottish) within the reach of the *sāvaka*, those so often named in Buddhist books as Purity of Hearing and the Spiritual Eye are here shown as evolved by practice; the former through extreme discriminative alertness (*vitakkavipphārasena*) to all physical sounds; the latter, by so fixing the consciousness on light or radiance that, in time, day becomes as night and night as day, the vision transcending the immediate

environment and attaining a purview of the passing and pageant of human lives (pp. 112 ff.).

These and the rest of *sāvaka*-knowledge (saving only the four Truths and four *Paṭisambhidās*) are, as I have said, equated with as many kinds of *paññā*, e.g., “*Paññā* in discerning, by way of radiance, the diversity and similarity in visual presentations = (copula suppressed) knowledge in spiritual vision.” And this formula, with its varying content, seems to differentiate *paññā*, as intellectual procedure in order to acquire, from *ñāṇa* as the acquired, realized and registered product. In the little simile of the well, used of himself by *Saviṭṭha* (S. ii, 118), the man reaches the well and sees water. So *Saviṭṭha* has reached ‘by right *paññā*’ to a *ñāṇa* of what constitutes *Nirvāṇa*. But there is neither pail nor rope. He cannot attain *nirvāṇa* (though, for that matter, its attainment is often described as an uprising of *ñāṇa*, S. iv, 8 ff.). Now our word, knowledge, answers well enough for *ñāṇa*, which is used for all sorts of having-come-to-know:—that ‘water is there,’ or that one is an *Arahat*. But what we still need, in this our language, is an adequate word for *paññā*. Wanted also, out of the relative poverty of our intellectual nomenclature, are distinctive terms for *abhiññā* and *pariññā* (pp. 5–26). If we conclude, after comparing these pages with the use of the terms in the *Saṅyutta Nikāya*, that *abhiññā* refers to intellectual acts of intuition, without conscious steps of reasoning, and *pariññā* to discursive reasoning and judgment (*tīraṇa*), in other passages we seem to see merely equivalents used much like the pairs and triplets in lawyers’ phraseology.

Finally, it may prove suggestive to note the frequent occurrence in this volume of the word *ekattaṃ*—oneness, as opposed to *nānattaṃ*, plurality or diversity. The Buddhist was bidden to be alert and open to all channels of impressions for the purpose of self-guarding by self-knowledge, but to cultivate only *ekattaṃ*. What is precisely to be understood by this? Was it concentrative discipline (the word occurs oftenest in the discourse on Breathing), for the better co-ordination of mind and body? And is this, too, meant

by the phrase 'single taste (or essence) of faculties' (*indriyānaṃ ekaraso*)? Or was it a feeling after the value, as an intellectual instrument, of the development of generalizing, of grouping particulars on a ground of partial similarity or, virtually speaking, *identity*? The age of the Piṭakas appears to have had no logic ready made for this purpose. And one of the 'equations' in the *Nāṇakathā* points to a quite conscious effort at obtaining certain aspects of highest generalization. I refer to § 32, on "*paññā* relating to the discernment of the diversity and identity of all phenomena taken together as one," and that under twelve of such takings together, or aspects, viz. 'thus-ness,' soullessness, truth, elements, etc. On these passages it is not impossible that Buddhaghosa's Commentary, taken in conjunction with what he may say on M. i, 364, may throw some light of tradition. So far as a superficial reference to a palm-leaf MS. of the former work enables me to judge, *ekatta* is more than once described in terms of the former alternative. For instance, "*ekatta* is the having the nature of *eka* from steadfastness, non-diffusiveness." Again: *ekatte santitṭhatīti*, "*ekatta* through the absence of the distraction of various objects of thought." But the term may not be inseparably wedded to this ethico-intellectual import.

Meanwhile we wish ourselves soon to be yet further in debt to Mr. Arnold Taylor, by the timely appearance of the second and concluding volume of his notable contribution to Anglo-Buddhist literature.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

BUDDHIST AND CHRISTIAN GOSPELS, NOW FIRST COMPARED FROM THE ORIGINALS. By ALBERT J. EDMUNDS. Edited with parallels and notes from the Chinese Buddhist Tripiṭaka. (Yūkōkwan, Tokyo, 1905; London, Trübner.)

The present work is, according to Mr. Edmunds himself, part of his larger work which will be called "*Cyclopædia Evangelica*; an English Documentary Introduction to the

Four Gospels." In this the author treats systematically of the parallel ideas and passages of the two Gospels, drawing his materials chiefly from original sources, and arranging them under six heads. These are:—Infancy legends; Initiation and Commencement; Ministry and Ethics; the Lord; Closing Scenes, the Future of the Church, Eschatology; Appendix (uncanonical parallels).

Prefixed to these there is an historical introduction, which is exceedingly interesting to students of religion. His careful summary of historical relations between the East and the West, and minute analysis of the original texts, tend to prove successfully the possibility of connection between Christianity and Buddhism.

This book, brought out under the able editorship of Professor Anesaki, is further enhanced by parallels, hitherto mostly unidentified, from Chinese Buddhist works, which are very welcome to those who read Chinese.

Parallels or points of resemblance in ideas and their expressions, set side by side, may sometimes mislead uninitiated readers. Professor Anesaki, our editor, evidently holding similar ideas to those of Mr. Edmunds, our author, wrote in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1905, pointing out the close resemblance between the very sayings of Buddha and Christ, alleging, of course, no borrowing on either side. The Rev. C. Voysey, speaking at the Theistic Church, argues that Buddhism preceded Christianity by about six hundred years, so that there could be no possibility of anyone asserting that Buddha imitated Christ, while it is plain enough that, if the New Testament can be trusted, Christ imitated Buddha.

This will in no way be proved to be Mr. Anesaki's opinion, nor is it Mr. Edmunds'. The latter especially is exceedingly careful about this point, laying down the principle that no borrowing is to be alleged except in cases of identity of text, or sequence of narrative, accompanied with demonstrable intercourse (p. 47). Even if, therefore, intercourse is proved to be historical, e.g. in the case of the Greeks and the Hindus, between whom there was intercourse, as Mr. Edmunds

successfully shows—religious, philosophic, literary, artistic, and commercial—all the time from Megasthenes to Hippolytus (p. 43), and further, even if this intercourse were at its height at the time of Christ, as seems to have been the case, it would by no means follow that Christ imitated Buddha. No religion can claim, as Mr. Anesaki says, an absolute unity and homogeneity. This truth is more observable in the case of Buddhism than in the case of Christianity, for no one can state definitely how much of Buddhism and its legend can be traced to the time of its founder. The legends of Buddha and Christ may, as our author says, have caught a tinge from Zoroaster, and Christ from the earlier Buddha; while the later Buddha legends may have been influenced by rising Christianity. Thus a historical connection may be true, yet the question of borrowing on the part of the one or the other remains still to be solved. Besides, the parallels are, in many cases, accidental or of independent origin, except such as the narrative, in Luke, of Christ's nativity, missionary charge, etc., which are minutely discussed by our author (p. 48).

If the readers will clearly understand the author's position, this work will be most helpful, and it is certainly the best textbook for the advancement of religious knowledge. There will be a time, we may hope, when every missionary training college will use this as a standard work for the study of relative positions of the two great missionary religions. It is, at any rate, indispensable for those who go to Japan as missionaries, where the two religions are brought face to face in their activity.

It is significant that this lifework of Mr. Edmunds should be published in Japan, for, as he says:—

“Dramatic in the highest is the course of the two great world-faiths: Buddhism has rolled from the Ganges to the Pacific, and Christianity from the Jordan, in the reverse direction, again to the Pacific, until in Japan and the United States, after their age-long and planetary march, they stand looking at each other across that ocean—once a Spanish, but now an American lake. . . .

“The two world-forces, which first met when the Spaniards landed in the sixteenth century, have now, at the dawn of the twentieth, begun a new act in the drama, which only time can unroll.”

Japan will be grateful to our author for the boon of this excellent work, which will, I hope, eventually help to bring about a solution of the religious problem of Japan.

J. TAKAKUSU.

THE PRIVATE DIARY OF ANANDA RANGA PILLAI.

This is a book to welcome, not effusively perhaps, but with a quiet gratitude; for it throws not unimportant sidelights upon the history of the period with which it deals. The diarist's father traded in Madras under the protection of the Fort St. George Government. When the diarist himself was seven years old his father migrated with his family to Pondicherry, and traded henceforth under the protection of the French Company. Like his father, he became a rich and successful trader, enjoying the confidence of the French Government, and becoming under Dupleix not only the chief native agent for the promotion of the Company's trade, but also the chief adviser of his illustrious master in all matters relating to native concerns.

He commenced his diary in 1736, ten years before he attained by his shrewdness, good sense, and sound judgment to this high position.

Ananda Ranga Pillai gives some interesting personal reminiscences of the happy understanding between the French and English Companies and their agents on the coast before the war of 1744. He records the close friendship between Governors Benoir and G. M. Pitt, the French marks of respect for the memory of Deputy-Governor Hubbard, who died at Fort St. David in 1741, and the official welcome given by Governor Dumas to his successor, when he passed through Pondicherry to occupy the vacant chair.

Of very special interest are his comments on the political movements of the time. The English Company tried to keep aloof from all entanglements with the native powers, and made presents to all indiscriminately who were strong enough to inspire respect. The French Company consistently courted the friendship of the recognized rulers, the Nizam and his lieutenant, the Nawab of Arcot.

The French understood the political situation better than the English, and were probably better served by their native advisers than the English merchants allowed themselves to be. The result was that the French often received presents of honour not only from the Nawab and his subordinate officers, but also from the Nizam and from the Emperor of Delhi himself. There was probably a further reason for this in the method of receiving the presents. Ranga Pillai describes in detail the ceremonious honour which was paid to the envoys of the country powers when presents were brought. They were met at a distance from the fort by representatives of the French Governor and personally conducted to his presence. In the diary are described their retinue, their dress, their palankeens, their roundels, their elephants, and the number of salutes which gave distinction to the effort; the French gunners were not spared on these occasions. All this was as greatly appreciated by the native powers as by Ananda Ranga Pillai himself, and it helps us to understand why, when war broke out in 1744 between the English and the French, the Nizam and the Nawab seemed more inclined to side with and protect the French than the English.

Ranga Pillai had trade agents at all the ports of importance on the coast. His agent at Fort St. George informed him of the military preparations there, and he passed the news on to Dupleix. This suggested to Dupleix the probability that news of French preparations were similarly passed on to Fort St. George, which turned out to be the case, and the result was the imprisonment of the Fort St. David agent in Pondicherry dungeon.

The diarist had the most complete confidence in Dupleix

as a man of resource, decision, and courage. He regarded him as a tower of strength to the French cause. On the other hand, he regarded Governor Morse as "a person without worth, a man devoid of wisdom," by which he probably meant a man devoid of political sagacity, incapable of conducting any except commercial affairs.

The chief value of the diary consists in the opportunity it gives a European to look at historical events through the spectacles of a shrewd native. He relates the circumstances of the purchase of Karical from the Rajah of Tanjore; he tells the story of a caste reform effort in one of the Pondicherry churches, and how it came to a ridiculous end; he records scraps of news from Fort St. George, and thus enables us to learn that when Nawab Sudder Ali Khan was murdered at Arcot, the flag at the fort was flown half-mast, sixty minute guns were fired, a special church service was attended by the English officials and residents, and a mourning visit was paid by the wife of the Governor to the widow, who was then living in the fort; he tells of a confidential interview in 1746 between Dupleix and the Deputy-Governor of Tranquebar, whose personal appearance he quaintly describes; and that shortly afterwards a French sloop sailed for Manilla under Danish colours and with Danish officers. But quite the most remarkable revelation is that Ananda Ranga Pillai had knowledge of what took place in the Council Chamber; and that on one occasion he knew the contents of dispatches from France before the Governor communicated them to his colleagues.

The book is printed on good paper, and there are few mistakes. It is only necessary to point out that on page 142 the capture of Porto Novo is referred to, not Negapatam; on page 251 (note) the word semi-hemispherical occurs; on page vii of the General Introduction Perambur is spoken of as a suburb of Madras (at the time mentioned it was a village four miles from Fort St. George belonging to the Nawab of Arcot); and that on page 299 the translation 'worthless fellow' is probably not strictly correct in the light of modern meanings. There is a nominal index; the

convenience of historical students should have been met by a subject index also.

F. P.

DOCUMENTS INÉDITS POUR SERVIR À L'HISTOIRE DU
CHRISTIANISME EN ORIENT, publiés par le Père
ANTOINE RABBATH, S.J. Tome premier. (London :
Luzac & Co.) Prix 6 frs.

This is the first instalment of a collection of documents which Father Rabbath, of Beyrout, has been making for the last sixteen years. The documents range in point of time from 1578 to 1773; and although they chiefly refer to Syria, there are some which come from Egypt, Persia, and Abyssinia. They consist of official reports, papers in the *chancellerie* of the French Ambassador at Constantinople, memoirs, and private letters; all relate directly or indirectly to the Jesuit missions in the East, and all throw some light on the progress of these missions, the character of the Jesuits, or the state of the country. The author has divided them into two groups according to the language of the document: the first group is French; the second and much the smaller one is in Latin, Italian, Portuguese, and Arabic. Within these limits the arrangement is chronological, so far as the continuity of the narrative will admit.

The papers are for the most part excellent reading, and we have only two criticisms to offer. The first relates to the title. It is far too general, and awakens expectations regarding the history of the Eastern Churches with which the book has practically nothing to do. By Christianity the author means Latin Christianity, and the progress of Christianity is for him little more than a synonym for the history of the Jesuit missions. He passes over in silence the labours of the Capucins, Carmelites, and other orders; and what older and sometimes contemporary writers have put down to them is apparently set down to the credit of the Jesuits. A second defect is the absence of any historical sketch. A brief resumé of the history of the

Jesuit missions in Syria at least would have been useful, and any reader unacquainted with the subject will find such subjects as the history of the Romanising Syrian Patriarch, Peter Ignatius, not a little puzzling. The documents do not sufficiently explain themselves without the historical context, which is not supplied. Moreover, an index is imperatively required if the series is to be continued. On another point opinions will differ. The author, speaking of the documents in his possession, says: "*Les publierons-nous tous? Il semblerait difficile. Car outre que certains documents sont d'une nature tout intime, d'autres apprécient avec une franchise déconcertante, les personnes et les choses, et même après des siècles, toutes les vérités, en orient plus que partout ailleurs, ne sont pas toujours bonnes à dire.*" How far this reserve is wise only the holder of the documents can say. But, generally speaking, the suppression of documents creates an air of suspicion more injurious than open scandal.

The most important parts of the work are those which relate to Syria; more especially the papers relating to the Maronite Mission in 1578-1580, and Father Poirresson's report on the Syrian Jesuit Missions in 1652. The latter was written at a time when little was known in Europe of the country. Few Europeans found their way into the interior of Syria before the sixteenth century. It first became accessible to the West through the philo-Turkish policy of Francis I on the one side, and the Portuguese occupation of Ormuz and command of the Persian Gulf on the other. The earliest travellers were merchants, a few Englishmen among the number. John Eldred had made three journeys from Baghdad to Aleppo before the Armada had sailed from Spain to conquer England. Under the capitulations the Turks allowed Romish priests to reside in the ports and other towns frequented by the European merchants and sailors, and these formed the proper charge of the missionaries. They also did their best to look after and ransom the European captives, all or almost all of them Poles. The French Consuls at Aleppo and Cairo were their protectors; indeed, no other European Consuls existed inland.

although the united states of Holland, Venice, and Ragusa had consuls in Alexandria and one or two other ports. But the missionaries were not content with their proper charge. They had come to proselytise, and they proceeded to proselytise among the native Christians, whether Greek, Armenian, Syrian, or Chaldean. No other proselytism was possible, for the conversion of a Moslem meant the certain death of the convert by fire or by impalement, and the destruction of the mission in an outbreak of popular fury—*une avanie*, the French missionaries called it. The suspicions of the authorities and of the populace were always awake, and very much less was sufficient to produce one of those outrages from which the missionaries repeatedly suffered. In India and in Persia the priests while mastering the language used to employ themselves in secretly baptising children *in articulo mortis*, sometimes three or four a day; but even this does not seem to have been attempted in Syria. We do not find among all these documents the record of a single Mahommedan's conversion. The Jews were for other reasons as inaccessible as the Turks; and thus the missionaries were obliged perforce to turn to the native Christians. With the Maronites they were completely successful. The Maronites were a simple-minded folk—"gente semplice e idiota" Cardinal Caraffa calls them; and, secure in their mountain fastnesses, they owned only a nominal allegiance to the Porte. No political complications intervened in their case, and the Maronites readily acknowledged themselves true children of the Roman Catholic Church. But with the other Christian communities the case was different. Although extremely ignorant of the creed—many of the Christians, we are told, knew nothing except to sign themselves with the cross, to fast, and to repeat the words "Kyrie Eleison"—yet they were extremely tenacious of their faith, and regarded apostates with abhorrence. They were despised and oppressed, and almost all were miserably poor, especially the Syrian Jacobites, who were artizans and day labourers, except in Aleppo, while the Armenians were the best off and in the greatest esteem.

In one respect they were united, for if any suffered for his faith the brethren of his sect made it up to him. But even among these Christians the work of the Roman Catholic missionaries was difficult and sometimes dangerous. For the Turks had two general rules of policy. The first was to foment dissensions among the native Christians, since these dissensions had proved so profitable to themselves in time past. Any attempt at union must be suppressed. The other rule was to prevent any Europeanising of their Christian subjects. To become a Frank was a capital offence, and this was a charge which could always be trumped up against the converts of the missionaries. Two cases which had a fatal ending, the one of a Syrian patriarch, the other of an Armenian priest, are narrated at length in this volume. If we add that every pretext was seized for extorting a bribe, that the French Consul himself was not secure against the caprice of the local governor, and that the missionaries lived in a constant state of insecurity, sometimes forbidden to enter the native Christian quarters, sometimes thrown into jail or driven out of the place on the trumped up charge that they were trying to build a church or through some popular outbreak, we can realize the difficulties and hopelessness of the mission and the perseverance with which it was carried on.

The Jesuits were late comers in this field, and they were never numerous, probably never more than twelve all told during the seventeenth century, and generally much less. In some respects they were as credulous as their flock, and believed much in portents and omens and miracles. We have a story of a Mahomedan who dug out the eyes of an image of St. Theodosius and whom invisible hands thereupon suspended by his neck to a tree. One at least of the Jesuits dabbled in astrology; and a rebel Pasha tried to make another foretell his fortune. But the Jesuits were scholars and linguists; some of them were accomplished mathematicians and botanists; and the much-loved Father Aimé Chezaud translated numerous works from French into Arabic, composed an Arabic grammar, and compiled a Persian

dictionary. He was an eminent scholar, and underwent the tortures of a Turkish prison. The Jesuits had one great advantage over others ; they were trained observers ; and we get a better knowledge of the state of the country from their reports than we do from the travels of most other Europeans. Neither the European merchants nor the missionaries wandered far from the main commercial routes, and much of Coclo-Syria remained unknown. The magnificent ruins of Baalbec are not far distant from the highway that leads across the Libanus and Anti-Libanus from Beyrout to Damascus, but they remained unknown until the latter part of the seventeenth century. We have, however, full accounts of Aleppo and Damascus, the two great commercial emporia of the interior, as well as of Alexandretta, Tripoli, Beyrout, Saida, and other seaports frequented by Europeans. The missionaries also found their way into the recesses of the Lebanon, where the Maronites lived. The country, the people, and the Government were very much then what they are now, only the people were poorer, more ignorant, and more oppressed, and the Government more tyrannical, anarchic, and barbarous. Nationality and religion were synonymous, and the sects were sharply divided. Father Poirresson counts sixteen sects in Aleppo, including four divisions of Mahommedans, as well as some Hindu traders from the dominions of the Great Moghul. With the exception of Aleppo and Damascus there were scarcely any towns, the country was desolate, and villages were rare. In a three days' journey from Alexandretta to Aleppo, Father Poirresson saw only three. The interior of the country was destitute of trees, and cultivation was confined to the neighbourhood of the villages, cotton and tobacco being the principal crops. The sea-coast alone was populous and fertile. It suffered from marshes and malarial fever, but immediately behind there arose the terraced heights of the Lebanon, rich in mulberries, vineyards, and fruit-trees. It was here that the manufacture of silk was carried on, and that the Christian population was most dense. The country grew an insufficient supply of food, and imported large

quantities of rice from Egypt. The population everywhere was profoundly ignorant, and anyone who could read or write was a learned man. A little logic and rhetoric was taught at Aleppo, but there was no other seat of learning in the country, and as there were no printing-presses, and printed books were regarded with suspicion, everything had to be circulated in manuscript. The fortifications of the towns were antiquated and ruinous; the first discharge of cannon would level them with the ground. The town of Aleppo, which was as large as Lyons, had not even an enclosing wall, and a rebel Pasha had occupied it without resistance, the garrison retiring into the citadel, an antiquated oval keep with towers, but without bastions. The walls of Damascus were then what they are now, wanting in places and elsewhere crumbling away. The plague had broken out in Damascus in 1651, and carried off a quarter of the population. The throne of S. John of Damascus was built into a mosque at Aleppo, but his church had been turned into a latrine. The churches built by the Crusaders were some of them mosques and some of them stables. The Maronite churches were little better than caves, dark caverns without ornament or light.

As for the Government, it was tyrannical and anarchic. The Maronites and Druses were only nominal subjects of the Porte; a rebel Pasha ruled in Aleppo, and a tyrant in Saida. Justice could scarcely be said to exist. Everything was a matter of bribery, and every pretext was seized on for extortion. To visit the jails was to raise the ransom demanded of the prisoners, and the punishments were barbarous. Life and property were always insecure; the poor were always oppressed; and the highest natives and foreigners were liable to be imprisoned and bastinadoed. Horrible executions by impalement are described at length. The governing class had two characteristics, an appetite for money and for lust.

Such is the picture of Syria presented by Father Poirresson. His account of the Mahommedan religion, which he did not take the trouble to understand, is highly amusing. If

religion, he says, consists in contortions and grimaces, God must be pleased with the Turks. Their gestures and prostrations in their mosques are so violent that women and children cannot take part in them, and men are able to do so only after a full meal. His account, however, of their dervishes and his conversations with individuals on religious subjects are in a more sympathetic spirit. Throughout his report and the other papers in this volume there are scattered many picturesque descriptions of scenes taken from the life; for instance, the appearance of the bazaars, the interior of the prisons in Cairo, and the rising of the Nile. One of the most interesting papers gives an account of the death and funeral of Father Aimé Chezaud at Julfa, the Armenian suburb of Isfahan, in 1664. The whole Christian community and some of the Mahommedans came to visit the body. As the procession left the church it was joined by all the Europeans on horseback, including the English, the Dutch, and the Huguenots. Conspicuous among them was the Muscovite ambassador with his suite in magnificent attire. The Russians took possession of the corpse, kissed the bier, and prostrated themselves before it, driving away the hired carriers and candle-bearers. The Armenian clergy had offered their services, but the Jesuit Father in charge, not wishing to refuse them on the ground that they were heretics, declared that the time was insufficient. However, to his great disgust, they met the cavalcade and accompanied it, reciting their office loudly in opposition to the chanting of the Roman monks. An Armenian offered the use of his newly-constructed family sepulchre, but the Jesuits preferred to bury Father Aimé among his own brethren. As the party returned from the grave, they had repeatedly to halt and partake of the fruit and wine offered them along the route. How well do the pictures of the time and the accounts of European travellers in India enable us to see it all. Then follows an amusing account of how the Shah treated the Frenchmen in his service, common men whom he dressed as French cavaliers, and made them dance and fence and feast before him,

putting morsels with his own hands into their mouths. But it is time to come to an end with a book which we have thoroughly enjoyed.

J. KENNEDY.

THE *Naḡā'id* OF JARĪR AND AL-FARAZDAK. Edited by A. A. BEVAN. Vol. I, Part 1: pp. i-xxiii and 1-156. (Leiden : Brill.)

It had been the late Professor William Wright's intention to edit this celebrated collection of poetical invectives, and the text which forms the basis of the work, the Bodleian MS. (Pococke, No. 390), as well as the shorter MS. of Strassburg (Spitta Collection, No. 36), was copied by him for that purpose. On his death in 1889 his MSS. passed into the hands of Professor Bevan, and the present edition represents the result of many years of labour on the text, aided by the collation of a third ancient MS. (Or. 3,758 and 4,018) now in the British Museum. The first instalment, now before us, is stated to be a sixth part of the whole, which will form two volumes, to be followed by a third containing the indices and a glossary.

Both Jarīr and al-Farazdak belonged to the great tribe of Tamīm, which, in the Ignorance and during the first century of Islam, produced more poets than any other of the Arab stocks. Jarīr was of the sept of Kulaib, son of Yarbū', son of Ḥanḍalah, son of Mālīk, son of Zaid-Manāt, son of Tamīm, while al-Farazdak belonged to the branch of Dārim, son of Mālīk, son of Ḥanḍalah, called after Mujāshī', from whom he was seventh in descent. The original occasion of the quarrel which led to the interchange of satire between these two poets was an assault committed by a man of Salīḡ (son of al-Ḥārith, son of Yarbū') called Tamīm, son of 'Ulāthah, upon his wife Bakrah, who belonged to Jarīr's family, the Kulaib. A brother of Bakrah's remonstrated with her husband, and got his head broken for his pains. This quarrel, though appeased by the payment of a fine of 33½ camels by a peacemaker of the sept of Kulaib on behalf

of the guilty person, left its rancour behind; and shortly afterwards a branch of Salīṭ and the house of Kulaib called Banu-l-Khaṭafā fell out again over a watering-place. Thereupon the two families began to compose verses against each other, and Jarīr, then a boy tending the herds of his father 'Aṭiyah, entered the fray as a champion of Kulaib with, it is said, the first of his utterances in song. The other side brought one poet after another to answer him, all of whom he met with lampoons in the best style of Arabian invective, until, in engaging an antagonist named al-Ba'īth, he attacked the honour of the women of Mujāshi', and thus brought al-Farazdak on the scene. This must have been many years after the original quarrel, for both Jarīr and al-Farazdak (who were nearly equals in age) must have been between 40 and 45 when they began to attack one another. The contest seems to have begun shortly after A.H. 64, and the last note of time which appears in the series is subsequent to A.H. 105; the interchange of invective thus covers a period of at least forty years.

Hijā', or satire, as understood by the Arabs, consists in heaping insults of the grossest kind on one's adversary and exalting one's own family and self with the most extravagant praise. The *'ird* or *ḥasab*—personal honour or family reputation—is the object of attack and vindication, and the aim of the satirist is to scar it with a wound which will never be effaced. Every mean action, every shameful flight or niggardly breach of hospitality, that can be remembered, personal disfigurements, dishonour to women—these are his stock-in-trade; and he exults savagely over the terrible gashes he inflicts. Thus al-Farazdak, in the first of the pieces with which he lashes Jarīr, says of the wound which his verses cause—

*Idhā naḍhara-l-āsūna fīhā, taḳallabat ḥamālīkūhum min hawli
anyābiha-th-thu'ā!*

“When the surgeons look into it, the whites of their eyes turn up in horror at its yawning rows of ragged teeth!” (31, 18).

The effectiveness of such compositions is testified by many anecdotes, and is easy to understand. They are not a class of literature which now gives us much pleasure, though we may admire the address of the combatants and the varied resources of their invective. But the poems constituting the *Nakā'id*, which bring forward on both sides everything that could be said to the discredit of the adversary in the past and the present, teem with allusions to bygone scandals, and are rich in references to the Days or encounters of old Arabia. They abound also in strange and difficult words and expressions. These two features gave the collection, originally put together by the famous gatherer of Arab legend Abū 'Ubaidah Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā († 207), its importance in the eyes of scholars, and it has been enriched with most copious commentaries by a succession of learned men. These scholia, which are given in full in the edition before us, besides their linguistic importance yield invaluable material for reconstructing the life of the Arabs before Islamic times. They also contain (though sparingly) allusions to contemporary history, and are therefore welcome contributions to the record of the obscurest period of Islam, the reigns of the Caliphs of the House of Umayyah.

Of the care and learning bestowed by Professor Bevan on the work it is superfluous to speak. The text (which has been read while printing by Professor de Goeje) appears to be as nearly perfect as such things can be made. The printing is also much to be commended, the only defect being an occasional indistinctness in the diacritical points and the vocalization in the larger Arabic type used for the verses.

C. J. LYALL.

THE LITTLE CLAY CART (*Mṛcchakatikā*). A Hindu Drama attributed to King Shūdraka. Translated by ARTHUR WILLIAM RYDER, Ph.D. Harvard Oriental Series. (Cambridge, Mass., 1905. 1 \$ 50 c.)

Considerations of space allow me to give only a brief general account of this version of an excellent comedy.

I need not dwell on the charms of the *Mr̥cchakatikā*. It is familiar to, and beloved by, every student of Sanskrit. While Dr. Ryder has well kept the spirit of the original, his book reads as little like a translation as is possible. The champagne has been decanted, and yet retains the aureola of its effervescence. The verve, the slang, the humour, even the puns, of the royal author are reproduced with great fidelity, and, though the whole is thoroughly Anglo-Saxon in language and idiom, it has all the merits (without the demerits) of a literal translation. As an example of this neat literalness I may quote the name, "The Little Clay Cart." This is verbally more near to *Mr̥cchakatikā* than Wilson's "Toy Cart," and, to one acquainted with the plot of the play, seems, once it is suggested, to be the inevitable representation of the idea which Śūdraka wished to convey. To me, and to others, "The Toy Cart" has always suggested something Chinese or Japanese. I may plead my Irish nationality as an excuse for saying that it reminded me of San Toy thirty years before that musical absurdity came into its joyful existence.

Dr. Ryder, without saying it, has grasped the fact, which most learned scholars ignore, that a Sanskrit play resembles an English ballad opera far more than any other form of European drama; and, if this is the case, surely the *Mr̥cchakatikā* is the prototype of that merry stream of paradox that rippled across the stage of the Savoy. There is the same delicate fancy, the same graceful poetry, the same riotous fun, the same series of characters—impossibly virtuous heroes, and impossibly moral unmoralities—in both. Even the Sanisthānaka perpetually boasting

"I am a wonder, I'm a wondrous thing,
And the husband of my shister is the king,"

is balanced by Katisha, "the daughter-in-law elect" of the Mikado.

Dr. Ryder has fully entered into this spirit, and the rhymed verses, which represent the songs of the original, are as true to the characters into whose mouths they are

put, and often as quaintly perverse, as the lines written by the creator of Major-General Stanley, of the Lord High-Executioner, and of the Lord High-Everything-Else.

The astonishing variety of Prakrit dialects in the *Mṛcchakatikā* cannot be represented in a translation. Dr. Ryder has, however, reproduced the Śākārī palatalization of *s* in the speeches of the Saṁsthānaka, and he might perhaps have done the same (for his experiment is, so far as it goes, very successful) in the case of the other forms of Māgadhi which abound in the play.

I have checked the translation here and there, and, as I have said, have been struck by its fidelity. In one or two passages I should myself have given another version, but that is possibly accounted for by differences of reading. Dr. Ryder's translation is based on Parab's text, which I have not seen.

The keynote of the whole book is that it is intended to be read by non-Sanskritists. For such it is a clever and pleasing introduction to one of the most successful branches of Indian literature. To Sanskritists it revives many agreeable memories, and is also useful as a work of reference.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

INDIAN MONUMENTAL INSCRIPTIONS. Vol. III. Madras :

"List of Inscriptions on Tombs or Monuments in Madras." By JULIAN JAMES COTTON, C.S. (Madras, Government Press, 1905.)

Mr. Cotton's volume is a worthy successor to that of the late Mr. C. R. Wilson for Bengal; and the Government in India may be congratulated on finding an officer to undertake with disinterested zeal such as Mr. Cotton's, a task from which little, if any, official reward is likely to be obtained. In fact, Mr. Cotton has far outstripped his predecessor in the extent of his researches and the copiousness of his information. It is no light task to gather together 2,308 inscriptions scattered over a whole Presidency

in some 232 sites. Much of the preliminary work, a very laborious and troublesome one no doubt, must have been done locally; but there are abundant indications that the editor has visited a great many of the places himself.

With such a wealth of material to choose from, I find it would occupy beyond all possible limits of space if I were once to begin any reproduction of the varied points of interest presented by these records. I find there are at least twenty-five entries to which I should have liked to call particular attention. Mr. Cotton is especially strong on that very interesting line of inquiry, the unravelling of the great cousinhood formed by the early Anglo-Indian Services. Madras seems to have been a favourite field for them; and I must confess that they make a brave show, these Birds, Cherrys, Conollys, Cottons, Haringtons, Harrises, Lushingtons, even unto the third and fourth generation. It is remarkable that, contrary to popular belief, there were very few Scotchmen in the Indian Services until late in the eighteenth century; perhaps they were too cautious to venture until they found out what a good thing it was they were neglecting. It will be more profitable, however, if I use the page or two at my disposal in giving a few additional facts and venturing on a correction or two. As for the rest, I can only recommend everyone to get the book itself and read it.


Anyone looking through the book must be struck with the fact that the Dutch paid much more attention to the worthy commemoration of their notable dead than any other of the European communities. In regard to their practice of inscribing verses on their tombs, I may call attention to a very interesting Dutch book which has lately come into my possession: "*Op en Ondergang van Coromandel*," by Daniel Havart, Med. Doet., 4to, Amsterdam, 1693. Mr. Cotton is possibly aware of it already, but I was surprised to find that some sixteen of his poetical inscriptions are set forth in this book, along with twenty more not given by Mr. Cotton. Other persons are mentioned both in Havart and in Cotton, but without poetical epitaphs. The readings vary slightly both in spelling and wording, but

not enough to make any great difference in the sense. The Dutch author in nearly every case prefixes to the Dutch lines a Latin motto from Seneca, Horace, or Juvenal. As Mr. Cotton omits these, I presume they were either not inscribed, have become obliterated, or have been overlooked by the transcribers. Of Pulicat (Cotton, p. 185) there is a plate in Havart which shows "Casteel Geldria" (the official designation) as an enclosure with moat in the centre of the Pulicat factory; the verses on p. 191 are said by the Dutch writer to be by Bruno Caulier, son of the deceased. On p. 153 (part i) Havart calls Jacob Dedel, No. 1,318, "Heer Admiraal," and states that he was buried in the "Logie" (factory) at Masulipatam "under the great warehouse." Braun, No. 1,333, is Braim in Havart, ii, 167, and No. 2,113, F. Bolwerk, has eight lines of verse (D.H., iii, 82).

A few miscellaneous notes may be added before I conclude. Henry Greenhill (No. 2) must have been at Madras as early as 1642, for his name appears as one of the three signatories to the order appointing Father Ephraim of Nevers, Capuchin, to be R.C. Chaplain (le Père Norbert "*Mémoires utiles et nécessaires*" (Lucca, 1742), p. 95). As the remarks about Manucci under Thomas Clarke (No. 8) are, as I understand, traceable finally to me, I must correct myself by later researches. Manucci's wife died in 1706 and he himself c. 1717 (N. Foscarini, "*Della Litteratura Veneziana*," 1742), most probably at Pondicherry, to which place he had removed between 1706 and 1712. The lady's name was Elizabeth, daughter of Christopher Hartley, of Masulipatam; and Aguida Pereyra, his wife. The Rev. Mr. Penny informs me that the north-west gate of the fort at Madras was long known as "Tom Clarke's Gate," and I have seen the name in a document of 1712.

On p. 25, note to No. 129, the date, 1760, for Henry Vansittart's death must be wrong; the title-page of the work published by him in 1766 claims to be a history of his government from 1760 to 1764. Perhaps 1760 is a misprint for 1766. The word "at tamgat" in the note to No. 538.

should read *āl-taghmah*, "red-seal," this being a specially binding form of grant. On p. 236, in the note to No. 1,317, there is a slip; for "Mr. Thomas Pitt, 'Pyrott Pitt,'" read "Mr. Consul (John) Pitt." Thomas Pitt was Governor at Madras at the time referred to; see his biography in Yule's "Hedges Diary," vol. iii, pp. i-clxvi. John Pitt died the 8th May, 1703, at Daurum Par, near Masulipatam, *ib.*, iii, 81. It is curious that there was another distinguished dynasty of Pits, but they were Dutchmen and in the Dutch Company's service. Havart mentions at least three:



Covelong (p. 184) was also called Ja'farpatnam; see M. Huisman's "La Compagnie d'Ostende," p. 132, who spells *Cabelon* or *Coblon*. As for M. J. Walhouse, mentioned in the note to No. 1,653, he is still to the fore, a much-respected member of our Society and other learned bodies, and may be seen most days of the week at No. 16, St. James's Square.

Mr. Cotton will find, I think, some information about the trust-money of the Armenian Petrus Usca, No. 527, in the "Madras Catholic Directory" for 1867, an article of which the author, as Mr. W. R. Philipps informs me, was presumably Bishop John Fennelly, No. 604. There is a great deal about Father Ephraim and the other Capuchins in the works of the Père Norbert of Lorraine, a copious controversialist of the eighteenth century, who was for a time in Pondicherry. One of the later volumes of Manucci's "Storia do Mogor," which I am now translating and editing for the "Indian Text Series," will contain a very curious narrative by Father Ephraim himself of his trial by the Inquisition at Goa in 1649.

Before closing this notice I must, in allusion to No. 526A, add my tribute of affectionate remembrance to the memory of A. T. Pringle, whose tomb bears the words "Beloved by all who knew him." I came to know him, alas! only during the last years of his too brief life; but I knew him long enough for me to bear testimony to his unrivalled knowledge of his subject and his ungrudging liberality in imparting what he knew. A long letter to me, full of hope, was found in his desk when he died.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

Notices of the following works will appear next quarter:—

Lhasa and its Mysteries, by Colonel Waddell; Scraps from a Collector's Notebook, by F. Hirth; The Jātaka, vol. v, by H. T. Francis; A Geographical Account of Countries round the Bay of Bengal, by Thomas Bowrey, edited by Sir R. C. Temple; Rituale Armenorum, by F. C. Conybeare and the Rev. J. A. Maclean; Scarabs, by Percy E. Newberry; Egyptian Grammar, by Margaret A. Murray; Burma, by R. Talbot Kenny; India, by Mortimer Menpes; L'Agniṣṭoma, by W. Caland and V. Henry; Judah Hallevis's Kitab al Khazari, by H. Hirschfeld.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

(October, November, December, 1905.)

I. GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

November 14th, 1905.—Sir Charles Lyall, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Society :—

Sir Charles Eliot, Vice-Chancellor of the University
of Sheffield,

Mr. H. A. Rose, I.C.S.,

Dr. E. M. Modi,

Mr. E. Edwards,

Mr. Ganga Prasad Gupta,

Babu Jogendranath Dutt,

Dr. Friedrich Otto Schrader,

Mr. Syed Asghar Husein.

A paper by Mr. R. Sewell on “Antiquarian Notes in Ceylon, Burma, and Java” was read. A discussion followed, in which Dr. Hoey, General Gossett, Mr. Sturdy, Mr. Thomas, and Dr. Grierson took part.

Special General Meeting.

November 14th, 1905.—Sir Charles Lyall, Vice-President, in the Chair.

It was resolved that the following Rule be added to the Rules of the Society, viz. :—

28a. The Society may, at a Special General Meeting or Anniversary Meeting, elect any Member who has filled the office of Vice-President, Hon. Secretary, Hon. Treasurer, or Hon. Librarian, or who has, as a Member of the Council for not less than three years, rendered special service to the Society or the cause of

Oriental Research, to be an Honorary Vice-President. The nomination of a Member for this distinction shall be made by the President and Council.

An Honorary Vice-President shall not have a seat on the Council, but an Honorary Vice-President may be subsequently re-elected a Member of Council, thereby ceasing to be an Honorary Vice-President.

December 12th, 1905.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. R. R. Bugtani,
Sheikh Abul Fazl,
Mr. Muhamed Badr,
Mr. Mir Musharaf ul Huk.

Mr. Herbert Baynes read a paper on "The History of the Logos." A discussion followed, in which Sir Robert Douglas, Professor Margoliouth, Dr. Pinches, Mr. Whinfield, and Mr. Hagopian took part.

Special General Meeting.

December 12th, 1905.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The President proposed, and Sir Charles Lyall seconded, the appointment of the Right Hon. Sir M. E. Grant Duff and Major-General Sir Frederick Goldsmid as Honorary Vice-Presidents, and the proposal was carried unanimously.

II. PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS.

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Band lix, Heft 3. 1905.

Baudissin (W. W. G.). Der phönizische Gott Esmun.
Schmidt (R.) and Hertel (J.). Amitagati's Subhāṣita-saṃdoha.

Hell (J.). Al-Farazdaq's Lieder auf die Muhallabiten.

Barth (J.). Ursemit *e* zum Demonstrativ *d*, *tī* und Verwandtes.

II. VIENNA ORIENTAL JOURNAL. Vol. xix, No. 3. 1905.

Müller (D. H.). Der Prophet Ezechiel entlehnt eine Stelle des Propheten Zephanja und glossiert sie.

III. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Série x, Tome vi, No. 2. 1905.

Ferrand (G.). Un Chapitre d'astrologie arabico-malgache.

Revillout (E.). Le papyrus moral de Leide.

Saïd Boulifa. Manuscrits berbères du Maroc.

IV. JOURNAL OF THE CHINA BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
Vol. xxxvi. 1905.

Carey (F.). From Szemao to Rangoon.

Watson (W. C. Haines). Journey to Sungp'an.

Leavenworth (C. S.). History of the Loochoo Islands.

Box (Rev. E.). Shanghai Folk-Lore.

V. JOURNAL OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL. N.S. Vol. i,
Nos. 1, 3, 4. 1905.

Laskar (G. M.). Four new Copper-plate Charters of the Somavamsī Kings of Kōśāla.

Sastree (Y. C.). Note on Halāyudha, the author of Brāhmanasarvasva.

Chakravarti (Monmohun). Pavana dūtām or Wind Messenger by Dhoyika.

Vidyabhusana (Satis Chandra). Anuruddha Thera.

Das (Sarat Chandra). Monasteries of Tibet.

Numismatic Supplement.

VI. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

Howorth (Sir H.). Some Unconventional Views of the Text of the Bible.

Petrie (Professor F.). The Early Monarchy of Egypt.

Johns (Rev. C. H. W.). Chronology of Ašurbānīpal's Reign.

Legge (F.). The Magic Ivories of the Middle Temple.

VII. BUDDHISM. Vol. ii, No. 1.

Duroiselle (C.). The Commentary on the Dhammapada.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

REV. JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D.

THE loss of Dr. Edkins makes another gap in our list of Honorary Members. He died in Shanghai last Easter Sunday at the ripe age of 81, having spent fifty-seven years of an active life in the service of China and the Chinese.

Joseph Edkins was born at Nailsworth, in Gloucestershire, on December 19th, 1823. He was a son of the Manse, his father being a Congregational minister, in charge also of a private school, where his son received his earliest education. The district is one of the most beautiful in England, the famous "Golden Valley," lying in the lap of the Cotswold Hills. It was here, in a village near Dr. Edkins' birthplace, that Dinah Mulock (Mrs. Craik), who was three years his junior, wrote "John Halifax, Gentleman," and her book gives a graphic picture of the scenes and influences under which the young boy must have grown up. He afterwards entered Coward College for his theological training, graduated in Arts at the University of London, and went to China as a missionary in 1848, under the auspices of the London Missionary Society. His first colleagues in the mission at Shanghai included the well-known names of Medhurst, Lockhart, and Wylie. In the year 1860 Dr. Edkins made several adventurous visits to the Taiping rebel chieftains who had captured Soochow and Nanking, and who loudly professed a kind of Christianity; but he came to the conclusion that no support ought to be given to a movement disfigured by such enormous crimes and atrocities. Next he went on to Peking, which had always been the goal of his ambition, and remained there nearly thirty years, until he

returned once more to Shanghai, where he spent the last fifteen years of his life. In 1880 Dr. Edkins left the London Mission in consequence of some difference of opinion with his colleagues as to methods of work, and came under the ægis of the Inspector-General of Imperial Maritime Customs, for whom he edited a useful series of science textbooks in Chinese, and wrote a number of pamphlets on opium, silk, currency, banknotes, prices in China, and the like, which are mostly enshrined in the yellow books of the Customs Service. Yet his missionary enthusiasm never flagged, and his habit was to rise at daybreak to work at Bible revision before office hours, to attend meetings in the evening, and to preach regularly every Sunday.

Dr. Edkins was one of the founders of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1857. To the first volume of the *Journal* he contributed "A Buddhist Shastra, translated from the Chinese," to the second number a paper on the "Writings of Meh Tsi," and to the next a sketch of "Taoist Mythology in its modern form"—forerunners of a long succession of later articles on the three religions of China. In our own *Journal* he published, among other interesting articles, "The Yih-king as a Book of Divination" and "The Nirvana of the Northern Buddhists." His best book, perhaps, is "Chinese Buddhism," published in 1880 as one of the volumes of *Trübner's Oriental Series*, of which a second edition appeared in 1893. An earlier book, "The Religious Condition of the Chinese" (London, 1859), was enlarged in 1877 under the title of "Religion in China, a brief account of the three religions of the Chinese," to form vol. viii of the *English and Foreign Philosophical Library*. This last has been translated into French by L. de Milloué (*Annales du Musée Guimet*, tom. iv, 1882).

But there is no space for a complete bibliography of Dr. Edkins' work. A few titles may serve to give some idea of the wide scope of his researches:—

The Jews at K'ae Fung Foo. 1851. 8vo.

Chinese and Foreign Concord Almanack. 1852. 8vo.

Grammar of the Shanghai Dialect. 1853. 8vo. 2nd ed. 1868.

- Grammar of the Mandarin Dialect. 1857. 8vo. 2nd ed. 1863.
Progressive Lessons in the Chinese Spoken Language. 1862. 8vo.
4th ed. 1881. Translated into German by J. Haas.
Narrative of a Visit to Nanking. 1863. 8vo.
Description of Peking. Supplement to Dr. Williamson's Travels in
North China and Manchuria.
The Miao-tsi Tribes. Foochow, 1870. 8vo.
China's Place in Philology: an attempt to show that the languages
of Europe and Asia have a common origin. 1871. 8vo.
Introduction to the Study of the Chinese Characters. 1876. 8vo.
Catalogue of Chinese Works in the Bodleian Library. 1876. 4to.
The Evolution of the Chinese Language, as exemplifying the origin
and growth of human speech. 1888. 8vo.
The Evolution of the Hebrew Language. 1889. 8vo.
Studies in Genesis. (In the press.)

Of the above works the Mandarin Grammar is certainly one of the best grammars of the Chinese language that has ever been compiled. "China's Place in Philology" was probably the book nearest to the author's heart, but the general consensus of opinion is that it hardly suffices to prove his somewhat daring thesis of the common origin of the languages of Europe and Asia. Dr. Edkins was always original. His reading of Chinese literature was most extensive, and the words of the other languages cited in the text were actually taken down from the mouths of Tibetans, Koreans, Manchus, and Mongols, yet the theme was almost too discursive even for his power of concentration. But who will decide such a question? Or that of the origin of human speech by a study of the evolution of the Hebrew and Chinese languages?

A close friendship of some thirty years' standing entitles me to add a word as to the personal charm of Dr. Edkins' manner and character. He was thoroughly simple and earnest, as well as intellectually vigorous to the last. His literary correspondence was worldwide, and his loss will be deeply felt by Sinologues of every country.

S. W. BUSHELL.

PROFESSOR JULIUS OPPERT.

PROFESSOR JULIUS (JULES) OPPERT, the Nestor of Assyriology, died an octogenarian at Paris on the 21st of August, the last of the scholars of the old school.

He was born in Hamburg on the 9th of July, 1825, the eldest of twelve children, eight boys and four girls. Both his parents came from a long line of scholars and financiers. His father was the sixth in descent from Samuel Oppenheimer, the court factor of the German Emperor Leopold I, who provided the latter with the means of conducting the wars against Turkey, and of undertaking the war of the Spanish Succession. He was a friend of Prince Eugene, and got with his assistance a large number of most valuable Hebrew manuscripts from Turkey. These, with a considerable collection of printed books, he bequeathed to his nephew David of Nikolsburg, afterwards Landesrabbiner of Bohemia. The latter spared no pains and expense to increase the library, which eventually was transferred to Hamburg, and in 1829 sold to the Bodleian Library in Oxford. By a curious coincidence a younger brother of Julius, Gustav (afterwards for some time assistant in the Queen's Library at Windsor Castle and Sanskrit Professor at the Madras Presidency College), was in 1866, at the instigation of the late Professor Max Müller, engaged in arranging the library of his ancestor. His mother, a sister of the well-known Berlin law professor, Eduard Gans, was descended from the historian and astronomer David Gans, a friend and collaborator of Tycho de Brahe in Prague, and also from Isaac Abarbanel, the great statesman and counsellor of the kings of Portugal, Castile, and Naples, and learned commentator of the Bible.

Julius received his preliminary instruction in the educational establishments of Messieurs Gebaner and Brandtmann and at the College of his native town, the Johanneum, so named after its founder, Johannes Bugenhagen, the energetic Reformer and zealous friend of Luther. Already at that period Julius distinguished himself by his great application

and predilection for literature and mathematics, and was chosen on leaving the Johanneum for the University to deliver in 1844 the farewell address of the students. At Heidelberg he devoted himself mainly to the study of law, but in Bonn he returned to his linguistic studies, and attended the lectures of Welcker on archæology, of Freytag on Arabic, and Lassen on Sanskrit, and afterwards in Berlin those on Greek of Boeckh and on Sanskrit of Bopp. In the Spring of 1847 he took his degree at Kiel with a dissertation on the Criminal Law of the Indians ("De jure Indorum criminali").

He now concentrated his attention on the study of Zend, and published in the same year his excellent essay on the vocal system of Old Persian ("Das Lautsystem des Altpersischen"), which created quite a sensation. However, as in consequence of his firm adherence to the belief of his ancestors he could not obtain a professorship at a German University, he left his fatherland at the end of 1847 and went to Paris, provided with introductions to such eminent scholars as Eugène Burnouf, Letronne, Mohl, de Saulcy, and Longpérier. In order to secure a fixed livelihood, he submitted to the necessary preliminary examination or concours, which on passing procured him a German professorship, first at Laval (1848) and afterwards at Rheims (1850). He owed his first appointment to Laval to a confusion of his name with that of M. Adolph Oppert (not Oppert) of Blowitz, well known later as correspondent to the London *Times*, M. Oppert obtaining the appointment of Oppert, and the latter *vice versa* that of the former, both names, Oppert and Oppert, sounding alike in French. In his new career Oppert, however, found the necessary leisure to devote himself to his favourite pursuits, and he availed himself thoroughly of this opportunity for studying the Cuneiform inscriptions of Darius, king of Persia. These inscriptions, in three different modes of writing, represented three different languages: Persian, the mother tongue of Cyrus; Scythian, the Turanian dialect of Media; and Assyrian, the Semitic language of Nineveh and Babylon.

The learned traveller Carsten Niebuhr had towards the end of the eighteenth century copied some of the inscribed monuments of Persepolis, but it was reserved to the ingenious Hanoverian Georg Friedrich Grotefend to discover the purport of the Old Persian inscriptions and to commence their decipherment. He read his memoir on this subject on the 4th September, 1802, at the meeting of the Society of Göttingen. A few years later J. Rich, resident of the East India Company at Bagdad, had recognized in the ruins situated near the banks of the Tigris in the neighbourhood of Mosul the remains of Nineveh, and collected a considerable number of monuments, which were afterwards (1811) deposited in the British Museum. This discovery attracted the attention of Orientalists to Mesopotamia, and in consequence, Julius Mohl, of Paris, instigated Paul Émile Botta, at that time French consular agent, to examine the environs of Mosul, and, after some unsuccessful attempts, he discovered in 1843 the palace of King Sargon III in the present Chorsabad. The sculptures found by him and by his successor, M. Place, were in their turn transmitted to the Louvre. Two years later Henry Austen Layard commenced his excavations near the Birs Nimrood and unearthed the three palaces of Asurnazirpal, Tiglath Pileser III, and Asarhaddon, while he discovered at Kuyunjik the palace of Sanherib, together with a large library consisting of Cuneiform tablets. Major Henry C. Rawlinson, from 1844 British Consul and afterwards (1851) Consul-General at Bagdad, had meanwhile at the peril of his life copied the Cuneiform inscription engraved on the rock at Behistun, and independently of the decipherings of Burnouf and Lassen succeeded in defining the vocal value of the Persian cuneiform characters and in reading the Assyrio-Babylonian inscriptions of Nineveh and Babylon. While the Old Persian signs represented merely letters, the identical signs denoted elsewhere ideograms and syllables, a feature which aggravated the difficulty of reading.

Oppert had meanwhile, during his stay in Laval and Rheims, pursued his researches, and by his publications on the

language and proper nouns of the ancient Persians and on the Achæmenid inscriptions (1850) established his reputation as a distinguished scholar. Therefore, when the French Assemblée Nationale granted in 1851 a sum of 70,000 francs for an expedition to examine on the spot the Babylonian antiquities, of which the late French consular agent, M. Fulgence Fresnel, was appointed chief, with M. Felix Thomas as architect, Oppert joined it as the linguistic member. Leaving France before the Coup d'état, the expedition spent three years in Mesopotamia and returned to Europe in 1854. Meanwhile Oppert had established his position as one of the leading Assyriologists. His considerable knowledge of Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian, joined to a thorough acquaintance with classical literature, enabled him to fulfil the expectations he had aroused and, though the archæological monuments found on the spot were unfortunately submerged in the floods of the Tigris, to secure the success of the expedition.

In the two volumes of his "Expédition en Mésopotamie" (1857-63) he gave an account of his journey and its scientific results, having fortunately taken accurate drawings and copies of the inscriptions previous to their being lost in the Tigris. Next to philological and historical inquiries, the topography of ancient Babylon engrossed his attention. The trigonometrical survey which his considerable mathematical acquirements enabled him to make, and the plan he drew of the enormous city, were founded on his intimate acquaintance with the descriptions and allusions contained in the works of classical authors like Herodotus, Aristotle, Strabo, and others, a knowledge despised by most modern Assyriologists because they do not possess it. In the late controversy about Babel and Bibel, Oppert repeatedly raised his powerful voice against this ignorance.

On his return to France, Oppert received as a reward letters of *grande naturalisation* as a Frenchman, and on the completion of his "Expédition en Mésopotamie" he obtained in 1863 the great biennial prize of the Institute. Some years previously (1857) he had been appointed Professor

of Sanskrit at the Imperial Library in Paris; in 1869 a temporary Chair of Assyriology was created for him at the Collège de France, which in 1874 was transformed into a permanent Professorship. It was in 1857, when the Royal Asiatic Society, in order to test the scientific value of the various systems of deciphering Assyrian, propounded a cylinder inscription of Tiglath Pileser for translation to Assyriologists, that the versions of Sir Henry Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks, and Oppert, when unsealed, proved to be on the whole identical. This fact secured at once the scientific position of Assyriology. In 1881 he was elected a member of the Institute in the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, and in course of time he became a member of most of the learned Academies in Europe, as well as honorary member of the Royal Asiatic Society, the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, etc.

After his arrival in Paris he became a permanent contributor to the *Journal Asiatique*; in 1881 he founded the *Revue d'Assyriologie* and became co-editor of the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*. The publications of Oppert are very numerous; the list compiled of them at his election to the Institute amounted already to eighty, and since then (1881) it has been so greatly increased that it would take too much space to enumerate them.

Though his researches were principally directed to Assyriology and Scripture History, yet they extended over the various fields of philology (including Semitic, Aryan, and Turanian languages, as proved by his Sanskrit grammar and his Sumerian essays), history, chronology, and ethnology. He excelled as a philologist, historian, and jurist. His mathematical attainments qualified him eminently as a chronologist, enabling him to calculate and to determine the lunar and solar eclipses down to the remotest times of antiquity, and to convert the oldest dates of the various eras into modern calendar days and *vice versa*; as a metrologist see his "*Étalons des mesures assyriennes*," and for his legal knowledge as a writer on Assyrian law see his "*Documents juridiques de l'Assyrie*," etc. In all

his writings and conversations he was aided by a most marvellous memory always at his command.

In religious matters, being proud of his descent, he adhered to the ancient unitarian belief of his ancestors, not so much from bigotry as from contempt of those who forsook it moved by worldly interests or cowardice.

In private life Oppert was of amiable disposition and fond of fun. His fiery temperament was easily aroused, but as easily appeased. Though ready at repartee and often vehement in discussion, he never became personal nor did he long harbour a grudge. He excelled as a conversationalist, and liked to move and to shine in society. He was a favoured guest in the Tuileries and in Compiègne at the Court of the Emperor Napoleon III and in the circle of Princess Mathilde.

He married somewhat late in life, and has left a widow and a son, who is *interne* in a Parisian hospital. He liked travelling and was always on the move, sharing the fondness for travel peculiar to his family, for of the five brothers who grew with him to manhood four undertook long voyages to India and China.

Oppert was active nearly up to the last. On the 11th August, while attending the meeting of the Institute, he fainted. It was his last appearance in public. From that time he hardly recovered consciousness, and breathed his last in the night of the 21st August. He was buried in the cemetery of Mont Parnasse on the 23rd August. Thus ended the honourable career of the principal founder and Nestor of Assyriology.

G. O.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY.

Presented by the Government of India.

Hill (S. C.). Bengal in 1756-57. Indian Records Series.
3 vols. 8vo. London, 1905.

The Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai from 1736-
1746. Edited by Sir J. F. Price and K. Rangachari.
Vol. i. 8vo. Madras, 1904.

Madras District Gazetteers :

Coimbatore, Statistical Appendix. 8vo. Madras, 1905.

Nilgiri " " 8vo. Madras, 1905.

South Arcot " " 8vo. Madras, 1905.

Trichinopoly " " 8vo. Madras, 1905.

Hahn, (Rev. F.). Kurukh Folklore in the Original. 4to.
Calcutta, 1905.

Sastri (M. S.) and Rangacharya (M.). Catalogue of
Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental MSS.
Library, Madras. 8vo. Madras, 1905.

Presented by the Government of Germany.

Rose (Valentin). Verzeichniss der Lateinischen Hand-
schriften. Band ii, Abteilung 3. 4to. Berlin, 1905.

Presented by the Gibb Memorial Trustees.

The Bābar-Nāma (facsimile). Edited by Mrs. A. S.
Beveridge. 8vo. London, 1905.

Presented by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Geography of Africa in the Mombasa Swahili Language.
8vo. London, 1905.

- Book of Common Prayer, in Luganda. 8vo. *London*, 1905.
 „ „ „ Portions of, in Malagasy. 8vo.
London, 1904.
 Mitchell (J. M.). Evidences of Christian Religion, in
 Swahili. *London*, 1905.
 Norris (J. P.). Manual of the Prayer Book, in Luganda.
 8vo. *London*, 1904.
 Robertson (J. C.). Sketches of Church History, in
 Luganda. 8vo. *London*, 1904.
 Wordsworth (Bp. J.). Teaching of the Church of England
 on some Points of Religion. Arabic-English edition.
 8vo. *London*, 1904.

Presented by R. N. Cust, Esq., LL.D.

- Sastri (M. S.) and Rangacharya (M.). Catalogue of
 Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental MSS.
 Library, Madras. Vol. i, part 3. 8vo. *Madras*, 1905.

Presented by the Authors.

- Munro (N. G.). Coins of Japan. 8vo. *Yokohama*, 1904.
 Dalgado (S. R.). Dicionario Portuguez-Komkanî. 8vo.
Lisboa, 1905.
 Mitra (S. M.). Naiti Prabandha. 8vo. 1905.
 Glaser (E.). Suwâ' und al-'Uzzâ, etc.
 Hirschfeld (H.). The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah
 at Cambridge. (Reprinted from the *Jewish Quarterly*
Review, April, 1905.)
 ———— Judah Hallevis's Kitab al-Khazari.
 Vaux (Bn. Carra de). Etrusca. Parts iv and v. 8vo.
Paris, 1905.
 Lepasqueur (Parfait-Charles). La France et le Siam.
 8vo. *Paris*, 1897.
 Hirth (Prof. F.). Scraps from a Collector's Note Book.
 8vo. *Leiden*, 1905.

Presented by the Publishers.

- Jarir and al-Farazdaq, The Naḳā'id of. Edited by
A. A. Bevan. Vol. i, part 1. 4to. *Leiden*, 1905.
Bibliotheca Abessinica, Parts i and ii:
Littmann (Dr. E.). The Legend of Queen Sheba. 8vo.
Leiden, 1904.
Boyd (Dr. J. O.). The Text of the Ethiopic version of
the Octateuch. 8vo. *Leiden*, 1905.
Documents inédits pour servir a l'Histoire du Christianisme
en Orient. Publiées par le Père Antoine Rabbath.
8vo. *London*, 1905.
Littmann (Dr. E.). Semitic Inscriptions. 4to.
New York, 1905.
Kelly (R. Talbot). Burma. 4to. *London*, 1905.
Belloni-Filippi (F.). La Kāthaka-Upanishad. 8vo.
Pisa, 1905.
Blechynden (Kathleen). Calcutta, Past and Present. 8vo.
London, 1905.
Chapman (Major F. R. H.). Urdu Reader for Beginners.
8vo. *London*, 1905.
Löhr (Max). Der Vulgararabische Dialekt von Jerusalem.
8vo. *Gieszen*, 1905.
Newberry (Percy E.). Scarabs. 8vo. *London*, 1906.
Menpes (M.) and Steele (F. A.). India. 4to.
London, 1905.
Caland (W.) and Henry (V.). L'Agniṣṭoma, description
complète de la forme normale du Sacrifice de Soma dans
le culte Védique. 8vo. *Paris*, 1906.

Presented by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press.

- Pope (G. U.). A Catechism of Tamil Grammar. 8vo.
Oxford, 1905.

Presented by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.

- Francis (H. T.). The Jataka translated. Vol. v. 8vo.
Cambridge, 1905.

Presented by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Ryder (A. W.). The Little Clay Cart (*Mṛcchakatikā*):
a Hindu Drama translated. Harvard Oriental Series,
vol. ix. 8vo. Camb., Mass., 1905.

Purchased.

Malleson (Colonel G. B.). The Decisive Battles of India
from 1746-1849. 8vo. London, 1885.

——— Final French Struggles in India. 8vo.
London, 1878.

. ——— History of the French in India, 1674-1761.
8vo. London, 1893.

——— Ta Tung chi nien. (Chinese.) Five vols. 1905.

Buckland (C. C.). Dictionary of Indian Biography. 8vo.
London, 1906.

JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

X.

STUDIES IN ANCIENT INDIAN MEDICINE.

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

I. THE COMMENTARIES ON SUŚRUTA.

ON Suśruta's great textbook on General Medicine (*Āyurveda Samhitā*) we possess at present only one complete commentary. This is Dallana's *Nibandha Saṁgraha*. It was printed by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara in Calcutta in 1891, and in the following pages the references are to that edition. Dallana's date is somewhere between 1060 and 1260 A.D. The earlier year, as Dr. Cordier has pointed out (*Journal Asiatique*, 1901, *Note Bibliographique*, p. 10), is the date of Cakrapāṇidatta, whom Dallana quotes (p. 1245), while he himself is cited by Hemādri at the latter date. Cakrapāṇidatta is known to have written a commentary on Suśruta's textbook, which bears the name of *Bhānumatī*; but only a small portion of it has survived, viz. that on the first Section, or *Sūtra Sthāna*. There is a manuscript of this Section in the India Office Library, No. 908 (Cat., No. 2647, p. 928). Nearly the whole of it, also, has been printed in Calcutta by Kavirāj Gangā Prasāda Sen in his edition of "Suśruta's Samhitā with Commentaries" (cited hereafter).

Suśruta's textbook consists of six Sections (*sthāna*), filling 915 pages in Jivānanda's print (1889, cited hereafter). The

Sūtra Sthāna takes up 242 pages, or about one-fourth of the whole work. There is, however, evidence proving that Cakrapāṇi's commentary extended to the whole of the textbook. Thus Dallana quotes (p. 1245) a remark of Cakrapāṇi on a word (*pañcamūli*) occurring in verse 16 of chapter 49 of the last Section (*Uttara-tantra*) of the textbook (p. 847). The same quotation is found also in the commentary of Śrīkaṇṭhadatta (c. 1280 A.D.) on the *Siddhayoga* (p. 170 of the Poona print, 1894, cited hereafter). The latter, moreover, quotes several other glosses of Cakrapāṇi on words occurring in the fourth Section (*Cikitsita Sthāna*); e.g., pp. 197 (*Cik.*, ch. iv, 12, 13, p. 400), 410 (*Cik.*, ch. xx, 60, 61, p. 489), 534 (*Cik.*, ch. xxxi, 41, p. 541). In his commentary on Mādhava's *Nidāna* (Jīvānanda's Calcutta print, 1901, cited hereafter), p. 277, Śrīkaṇṭha also quotes a gloss of Cakrapāṇi on the second Section (*Nidāna Sthāna*, ch. xiii, 12, p. 287). According to Dr. Cordier (*Récents Découvertes de MSS. Médicaux Sanscrits dans l'Inde*, p. 12) there occur numerous quotations from Cakrapāṇi's commentary in the *Ratnaprabhā*, a work by Nīśalākara, "which refer themselves to all the Sections" of Suśruta's textbook, but as that work is not accessible to me I am not able to verify the quotations. Lastly, a complete copy of the *Bhānumatī* is said (*ibid.*, p. 12) to exist in a certain library in Benares. If this copy could be procured, all doubt would be set at rest regarding the completeness of Cakrapāṇi's commentary.

Dallana calls his commentary a Summary of Compilations (*Nibandha Saṁgraha*) on the Textbook of Suśruta. The meaning of the term *nibandha* is shown by a remark of his (p. 183) that a certain reading (*pāṭha*) is found in numerous manuscripts (*pustaka*) of the text, but not in any of the commentaries (*nibandha*). Moreover, he claims to give a summary of *all* commentaries on Suśruta; for, as he explains in the colophon (p. 1377, also pp. 455, 614, 866), his work is intended to afford information (*jñāpaka*) on the interpretations of all (*samasta*) the commentaries (*nibandha*). That word 'all' (*samasta*) must be noted: it

is not an otiose addition. Ḍallana expressly states in one place (p. 1104) that "after having mastered all commentaries he has adopted a particular reading on the authority of the *Pañjikāra*," probably Gayadāsa (*sarva-nibandh-opajivinā mayā pañjikāra-paṭhitatvāt paṭhitah*). Similarly, to the 62nd chapter of the last Section (*Uttara-tantra*) he appends the remark (p. 1343) that he has explained that Section "after having examined the whole of the commentaries" (*nibandhān nikhilān dṛṣṭvā*). There can be, then, no doubt as to Ḍallana's claim; but, of course, it may not be pressed so as to include all existing commentaries: what Ḍallana claims is that his own commentary is based on all the other commentaries known to him, or, at least, accessible to him.

In the introduction to his commentary (p. 1) Ḍallana enumerates the works (*nibandha*) which he includes in the term 'all.' They are the following five:—

1. The commentary (*ṭīkā*) of Jaijjaṭa.
- 2, 3. The annotations (*pañjikā*) of Gayadāsa and Bhāskara.
- 4, 5. The glossaries (*tippana*) of Śrī-Mādhava and Brahmadeva.

To the last item (Nos. 4 and 5) he appends the phrase 'etcetera' (*ādī*). We are to conclude, therefore, that other gloss-writers were consulted by him besides the two he names. One could wish that he had not contented himself with the vague *etcetera*; but probably we are justified in concluding that the five works which he mentions were his main sources, if not, indeed, practically his only sources. We may obtain some light on this point by observing the names which Ḍallana quotes in the course of his commentary. They are the following:—

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Caraka, named about 24 times. | 9. Videha, about 8 times. |
| 2. Hārīta, twice. | 10. Hariścandra, twice. |
| 3. Jatukarṇa, once. | 11. Bhoja, about 14 times. |
| 4. Kāśyapa, once. | 12. Kārttikakuṇḍa, about 15 times. |
| 5. Kṛṣṇātreyā, once. | 13. Jaijjaṭa, about 73 times. |
| 6. Madaśaunaka, once. | 14. Gayadāsa, about 153 times. |
| 7. Nāgārjuna, twice. | 15. Brahmadeva, about 10 times. |
| 8. Vāgbhaṭa (both), about 25 times. | |

The first nine names are those of writers of textbooks (*saṃhitā* or *tantra*) of their own, not of writers of commentaries on Suśruta's textbook. In the present connection they may be set aside, for, as we have seen, Ḍallana's claim is to give a summary of what he calls *nibandha* or explanatory writings on Suśruta.

No. 10, Hariścandra, may also be set aside. He is known as a writer of a commentary on Caraka's textbook (*saṃhitā*), and is expressly referred to as such by Ḍallana (p. 204).

No. 11, Bhoja, is frequently quoted, in connection with Suśruta's views, by Ḍallana as well as by Gayadāsa, and by Cakrapāṇidatta (about twenty-one times in the *Bhānumatī*). His work has not survived, but it does not appear to have been a commentary on Suśruta, but rather an independent textbook, for Ḍallana once (p. 238) describes it as a *saṃhitā*, and similarly Gayī once (fol. 52a, l. 8) as a *tantra*. As Bhoja is quoted by Cakrapāṇi, he cannot be later than 1060 A.D. He may, provisionally, be placed about 1030 A.D., and may very well have been the famous king Bhoja of Dharā.

Nos. 13, 14, and 15, Jaijṇa, Gayadāsa, and Brahmadeva, whom Ḍallana quotes most frequently, are precisely three of the five sources which he specifies.

Two of Ḍallana's five sources, Bhāskara and Śrī-Mādhava, do not appear in the list. On the other hand, there appears in it No. 12, Kārtikakuṇḍa, who is rather frequently quoted by Ḍallana. I would suggest that he is identical with Bhāskara, who is not once quoted by Ḍallana. It would be strange if a writer who is expressly named by Ḍallana as one of his main sources should never be quoted by him. I may add that the two well-known commentators of Mādhava's textbooks, Vijayarakṣita and Śrīkanṭhadatta, likewise frequently quote Kārtikakuṇḍa in connection with Suśruta, but never mention Bhāskara, whose name one would expect to appear if he, as a commentator on Suśruta, were really a separate entity. I would also suggest that Bhāskara may be identical with the Bhāskara-bhaṭṭa of whom it is said, in the Pāṭṇa Inscription (*Epigr. Ind.*, i, 340, 345), that "King Bhoja conferred on him the title of *Vidyāpati*," or

Master of Science. In that case Bhāskara might be a younger contemporary of Cakrapāṇidatta (c. 1060 A.D.), which would explain why neither Bhāskara nor Kārtika-kuṇḍa is (so far as I know) ever named by that commentator. The suggested identification and date of Kārtika is supported by the fact that he is very frequently quoted, especially by Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, in close connection with Gayadāsa, who often quotes Bhoja. There is probably no long interval in time between Kārtika and Gadādhara, the father of Vangaśena. For Śrīkaṇṭha, commenting on a formula of Suśruta (p. 697) quoted by Vṛinda Mādhava in the *Siddhayoga* (p. 477), mentions a different reading of it, common to both Kārtika and Gadādhara. In the same *Siddhayoga* (p. 162) there is quoted another formula of Suśruta (p. 853), to which Vṛinda Mādhava appends a gloss (*tippani*) noticing the view of another medical writer (*anyato drṣṭa*). Commenting on this gloss, Śrīkaṇṭha says that the view referred to is that of Kārtika. This remark must not be taken to convey any chronological implication, as if Kārtika were earlier in date than Vṛinda; we shall presently see that Vṛinda is probably identical with Mādhava, and is a comparatively early writer. As a fact, Śrīkaṇṭha explains immediately afterwards that Kārtika only adopted the view of a very early writer, Kāśyapa the Elder (*vrddha Kāśyapa*). Chronologically, therefore, the case stands thus: Quoting the formula in question from Suśruta, Vṛinda adds a gloss noticing the rival view of another ancient writer, Kāśyapa; and Kārtika, commenting on Suśruta, appears (*teste* Śrīkaṇṭha) to have preferred Kāśyapa's view mentioned in Vṛinda's gloss. That, chronologically, this was really Śrīkaṇṭha's opinion, appears from another remark in the *Siddhayoga* (p. 440), where he says that Kārtika adopted a certain view on the authority of old medical writers (*vrddha vaidya*); he cannot, therefore, have looked upon Kārtika as being himself an old medical writer.

In this connection it may be useful to observe that the distinction between a *ṭīkākara*, or commentator, and a *pañjikākara*, or annotator, must not be urged too far.

Dallana, in the list of his sources, describes Jaijṛaṭa as a commentator, but Gayadāsa and Bhāskara (=Kārtikakuṇḍa) as annotators. But in another place (p. 909) he calls Gayadāsa a commentator; and Śrīkaṇṭha (on *Siddhayoga*, p. 310) applies the term commentator also to Kārtikakuṇḍa (=Bhāskara).

But to return to our list of names quoted by Dallana, besides Bhāskara the name of Śrī-Mādhava likewise does not occur in it. In the list of his sources Dallana describes the latter as a *ṭippanīkāra*, or gloss-writer. Under that designation he is probably mentioned by Dallana (p. 74) as the authority for a certain interpretation (*vivaraṇa-prasaraṇa*). But who is this Śrī-Mādhava, the glossator? The only Śrī-Mādhava who is known to us as a medical writer is the author of a work on *Nidāna*, or Pathology, called *Rug-viniścaya* or *Roga-viniścaya*, i.e. Diagnosis of Diseases. It is called so by the author himself in *Nidāna*, i, 2 (Jivānanda's edition, 1901, always cited hereafter). He is also known as Mādhavakara, or Mādhavācārya, or simply Mādhava. There can be no reasonable doubt that Dallana's reference is to him; and from this reference we learn that he was also a gloss-writer. At this point we receive some useful guidance from Śrīkaṇṭhadatta in his commentary on the *Siddhayoga*, a work on *Cikitsā*, or Therapeutics. The author of that work calls himself Vṛinda, and says that in compiling it he followed the order of diseases adopted in the *Gada-viniścaya* (syn. *Roga-viniścaya*), or Diagnosis of Diseases. The obvious conclusion from that remark is that the author wishes to say that having written the Pathology, he now writes the Therapeutics, following therein the same order of the diseases. He would hardly have expressed himself in that way if he had meant to say that he followed the order of someone else's work; he would at least have named the author. Now Śrīkaṇṭha, in the colophon of his commentary (p. 665), states that the *Siddhayoga* has also "another name," *Vṛinda-Mādhava* (*Vṛinda-mādhav-āpara-nāma-Siddhayoga*). Similarly, Śrīmādhava's Pathology is also

known as the *Mādhava-nidāna*. The author of the *Siddhayoga*, in his own colophon (ch. lxxxi, verse 21, p. 665), explains that he wrote that work under the name of Vṛinda (*vṛnda-nāmnā*). Here it may be well to point out that the author of the *Nidāna* or *Roga-viniścaya* nowhere names himself in that work, either at the beginning or the end. He receives the name *Mādhava* only in the introduction of the commentary of Vijayarakṣita (verse 5, p. 1). As that commentary is called *Madhukoṣa*, or "Store of Honey," it suggests itself that the author of the *Nidāna* is poetically described as *Mādhava-kara* (syn. *Mādhu-kara*), lit. Maker of honey, or the Bee of the honey collected in the commentary, and *Mādhava* is only an abbreviation of *Mādhavakara*, just as Cakrapāṇi of Cakrapāṇidatta and Śrīkaṇṭha of Śrīkaṇṭhadatta. It seems quite clear, therefore, that the *Roga-viniścaya* was only the first part of a larger work, the second part of which is the *Siddhayoga*; and it is quite natural, therefore, that the author only names himself at the conclusion of the entire work, where he discloses his name to be Vṛinda.¹ The conclusion, therefore, is that both the *Roga-viniścaya* and the *Siddhayoga* were written by the same person called Vṛinda, who, however, subsequently (perhaps for the reason above suggested) became known as Śrīmādhava, and the two parts of his great work came to be known as the *Mādhava Nidāna* and the *Vṛnda Mādhava Siddhayoga*. In the same direction points a remark of Śrīkaṇṭhadatta (p. 325). With regard to a diagnostic statement on hydrocele (*vṛddhi*, *Siddhayoga*, xl, 20), he observes that properly it should have been made in the *Rug-viniścaya*, or Diagnostic of Diseases, but having been omitted there it is now given in the *Siddhayoga* or Therapeutics.

The *Siddhayoga* contains numerous formulæ excerpted from Suśruta's textbook, to which occasionally Vṛinda adds glosses of his own. Śrīkaṇṭha, in his commentary, points out these glosses and calls them *ṭippaṇi* or *ṭippaṇa*. Thus *Siddhayoga*, xxii, verses 7 and 8 (p. 196), gives a formula on

¹ See an opinion to the same effect by Professor Jolly in the Transactions of the Thirteenth International Congress of Orientalists.

rheumatics quoted from Suśruta, *Cik.*, iv, 12, 13 (p. 400), to which is appended a long explanatory gloss (verses 9 and 10); and Śrīkaṇṭha observes that this is a gloss (*ṭippaṇa*) of Vṛinda himself. Another short gloss (*ṭippaṇikā*) of Vṛinda is noticed by Śrīkaṇṭha on p. 316. It refers to a formula adapted from Suśruta, *Cik.*, xxiii, § 13 (p. 499), as well as Caraka, *Cik.*, xvii, 38, 39 (p. 633). As another example may be mentioned a gloss appended to a formula (*Siddhayoga*, xii, 22, 23, p. 162) quoted from Suśruta, *Ut.*, li, 16a-18a (p. 853), and based on a dictum of Kāśyapa the Elder. Evidently, it was this gloss-making practice of Vṛinda which earned him the epithet of *ṭippaṇakāra*, or glossator. To my mind there can be little doubt that by "Śrīmādhava the glossator" Dallana intended to indicate the *Siddhayoga* as one of his sources.

So far, then, it appears possible to identify all the main sources of Dallana's commentary. There remains one puzzle: Dallana's relation to Cakrapāṇidatta. The latter is very considerably earlier than Dallana, and was the writer of an important commentary on Suśruta (*Bhānumatī*). Nevertheless, seeing that Dallana does not name him among his sources, the presumption is that he did not know Cakrapāṇi's commentary, or at least that it was not accessible to him. It must be remembered that Cakrapāṇi was a native of Eastern India (Bihar, or Bengal), while Dallana had his home in the North-west. That presumption, I believe, can be sustained, with some probability, by a comparison of the commentaries of the two men. For example, discussing the term *dravottara* occurring in Suśruta, *Sū.*, xix, 30 (p. 76), Dallana says (p. 177) that the meaning 'chief of fluids' (*drava-pradhāna*) given to it by some (*kecit*) interpreters is rejected by Gayadāsa, on the authority of Bhoja. Precisely the same reason for the rejection, practically in the same words, is given by Cakrapāṇi in his *Bhānumatī* (p. 343) without any mention of Gayadāsa, and the impression left on the mind of the reader certainly is that he puts forward the argument as his own. Still, it is possible

that both Cakrapāṇi and Gayadāsa, who probably were contemporaries, were using the same source. But, in any case, Ḍallana does not seem to be aware of the fact of Cakrapāṇi using the same argument as Gayadāsa. Again, speaking of verse 14 in Suśruta, *Sū.*, ch. xx (p. 80), Ḍallana says (p. 186) that that verse is rejected by Jaijṇaṭa as spurious (*anārṣa*, lit. not old, i.e. a later interpolation), but admitted by Gayadāsa, and that he himself also admits it on the latter's authority. Cakrapāṇi, discussing the same point (*Bhānumatī*, p. 356), states that the verse is rejected by some (*kecit*) for a certain reason which he explains. If Ḍallana had known Cakrapāṇi's comment it seems probable that he would also have given the reason why Jaijṇaṭa rejected the verse. Again, commenting on Suśruta, *Sū.*, vi, § 9 (p. 20), Ḍallana says (p. 58) that others (*anye*) adopt the order of the seasons as held to the south of the Ganges, and adds that Gayadāsa refutes this opinion. Cakrapāṇi (p. 119) refers to a statement of Kāśyapa in explanation of that opinion. It does not seem probable that Ḍallana would have omitted this explanation, if he had known Cakrapāṇi's observations. Again, with reference to Suśruta, *Sū.*, i, § 6 (p. 2), Ḍallana says that some (*kecit*) read *ātisāra-jvara* (the reading of the Vulgate), diarrhoea and fever, instead of *jvar-ātisāra*, fever and diarrhoea, but that he adopts the latter reading on the authority of the *Pañjikā* (of Gayadāsa). Cakrapāṇi (p. 20) mentions the same difference, but adds the reason for the two readings. One expects that Ḍallana would have mentioned this reason if he had known Cakrapāṇi's comment. Such instances might be indefinitely multiplied. None of them is absolutely conclusive, but the impression created by their accumulation is that Ḍallana was not acquainted with Cakrapāṇi's commentary.

The general conclusion, then, which is reached is that, whatever the exact significance of the phrase 'etcetera' (*ādī*) in Ḍallana's statement of his sources may be, the enumeration in that statement is practically exhaustive. His work is really a summary (*saṁgraha*) of the three commentaries (*tīkā*

or *pañjikā*) of Jaijñata, Gayadāsa, and Bhāskara (= Kārtika-kunḍa), and of the occasional glosses (*tippani*) occurring in such works as those of Śrīmādhava (*Siddhayoga*) and Brahmadeva.

Regarding the last-mentioned, Brahmadeva, there is a noteworthy remark in Ḍallana's commentary, which may have a chronological value. He states (p. 170) with regard to a certain reading that Gayadāsa declares it to be spurious (*anārṣa*), and that therein he is followed by Brahmadeva (*tan-mat-ānusāriṇā*). On the face of it, this statement suggests that Brahmadeva's date is posterior to Gayadāsa. Provisionally, this inference may be accepted, though it must be remembered, of course, that the intention of such statements is not consciously chronological, but doctrinal. There is an instructive parallel case in Vijayarakṣita's commentary on the *Mādhava-Nidāna*, xxii, 5 (p. 147). He makes a remark which suggests the inference that Mādhava was posterior to Dṛḍhabala. There exists sufficient evidence, in my opinion,¹ to prove that, as a fact, Dṛḍhabala was posterior to Mādhava.

The most important of Ḍallana's sources, both by reason of age and, to judge from quotations, of fulness of treatment, is the commentary (*ṭikā*) of Jaijñata. The earliest author (known to me) who quotes it is Vṛinda, in the *Siddhayoga*, chap. xlix, verse 30 (p. 320). This would refer Jaijñata to the seventh century A.D. at the latest. Unfortunately no copy of the commentary has, as yet, come to light. In the India Office Catalogue, p. 928, it is suggested that the marginal notes found in MS. 1842, which contains a copy of Candrata's revision of Suśruta's textbook, might be taken from Jaijñata's commentary, which Candrata professes to have used in preparing his revised text.² This suggestion is not sustainable; for a cursory examination shows that the notes are, in all probability, extracts from Ḍallana's

¹ This is not the place to set out the evidence, for which I hope shortly to find another opportunity.

² The earliest mention of Candrata occurs in Śrīkaṇṭha's commentary on the *Siddhayoga*, p. 552.

commentary, with which they verbally agree. Thus on fol. 25*a* there is a long extract from Ḍallana, p. 579; on fol. 35*a* from Ḍallana, p. 590; on fols. 41–43 from Ḍallana, pp. 595, 596. These examples have been selected because they contain references to Gayadāsa, and thus prove that whoever the author of the notes may have been, he certainly cannot have been Jaijjāta, who lived considerably earlier than Gayadāsa and is probably quoted by him (see below). There are some curious points about Candrāṭa's revised text, which show that it deserves a much more searching examination than I have as yet been able to give to it. For example, Ḍallana says that after Suśruta, *Ut.*, xlv, 18*a* (p. 825), Kārtikakuṇḍa reads an additional verse (not found in the Vulgate version) which he quotes in his commentary (p. 1207). This verse is found in Candrāṭa's text, fol. 162*a*. Again, on fol. 205*a* of that text there is an additional verse (not in the Vulgate) after Suśruta, *Ut.*, lvii, 4*a* (p. 878), which Ḍallana (p. 1304) declares to be spurious (*anārṣa*). There would thus appear to be some kind of connection between Candrāṭa's revised text and Kārtikakuṇḍa (Bhāskara), who, as seems probable, was one of Ḍallana's sources.

Next to Jaijjāta's commentary, the most interesting, in several ways, of Ḍallana's sources is the commentary (*pañjikā*) of Gayadāsa or (as he is also not unfrequently called) Gayī. As the numerous quotations from him, in the commentaries of Ḍallana, Vijayarakṣita, and Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, show, his commentary, called *Nyāya Candrikā*, extended over the whole of the textbook of Suśruta. Only two portions of it, however, have up to now been discovered. These are the comments on the second and third Sections, treating of Pathology (*Nidāna Sthāna*) and Anatomy (*Śārīra Sthāna*). The former has been announced by Dr. P. Cordier in his *Récents Découvertes*, p. 13. The latter, which has been described by Professor J. Jolly in a paper contributed to the *Journal G.O.S.*, vol. lviii, pp. 114–116, is the unique manuscript Add. 2491, belonging to the Cambridge University Library. Having, through the kindness of the University, been given the opportunity of thoroughly examining the

manuscript, I am now able to contribute some further information concerning it.¹

Gayadāsa is quoted by Dallana 3 times and Gayī 49 times, altogether 52 times (not 51, as Jolly, p. 114). The quotation in adhy. 9, which Professor Jolly failed to discover (p. 115), occurs in the MS. fol. 68*a*, ll. 7 ff. I have succeeded in verifying every one of the quotations, except those few which stood in the missing leaves of the manuscript.

The MS. consists now of 66 leaves; but the first and the two last leaves, as well as leaves 4 to 14 (both inclusive), are missing. The MS., when complete, must have comprised 80 leaves. The numbers of the leaves 3, 68, 71, 75, 76, 77, 78 are missing, and those of fols. 51, 69, 70, 73, 74 are mutilated; but the identity of the leaves can be easily verified from the context.

The introduction is lost, but nothing of the commentary proper; for the obverse of fol. 2 begins with the comment on the first phrase of Suśruta (p. 103), *sarva-bhūtānām*. Only a small portion is lost at the end, namely, the comments on the five last passages (60–64) of Suśruta (p. 370); for the comments on the immediately preceding verses (52–59) are found on fol. 77*a*.

Fol. 3*b* carries the comments as far as *tal-lakṣaṇāny=eva* (p. 302, l. 14), and fol. 15*a* begins with *vāta-varṇa* (p. 306, l. 17). The lost fols. 4–14, therefore, comprised the commentary on nearly the whole of the first chapter, as well as on the introductory phrases of the second chapter.

In addition to this loss there is another, which, however, is not indicated in the manuscript. The whole of the comments from *hṛdayāmāśayayoh* (p. 334, l. 16) to *tāny=etāni* (p. 337, l. 24) is missing; that is, the end of chapter 5 and the beginning of chapter 6. It is a large portion (three pages of print, 335–337) which would have stood on fol. 50*b*, where, however, no indication whatever is given, the writing

¹ It may be useful to note here a few misprints in Professor Jolly's article. On p. 115, l. 21, for 37*a* read 36*b*; l. 28, for 591 read 590; l. 30, for 54*b* read 54*a*; l. 38, for 62*a* read 62*b*; l. 44, for 77*b* read 75*b*.

proceeding uninterruptedly as if nothing were missing. A similar, but smaller, unindicated lacuna occurs on fol. 74b; the comments from *ato bhūyīṣṭhaiś=ca* (p. 363, l. 22) down to *ath=āsyāḥ* (p. 364, l. 18) are missing.

On account of these losses nine of Ḍallana's references to Gayī cannot be traced. But all the other quotations can be verified. Professor Jolly has already noticed some of these in his article (*l.c.*, p. 115). I shall notice some others in the sequel.

The most interesting point in Gayadāsa's commentary is the evidence it affords that he often read a text different from the now accepted Vulgate, printed by Jivānanda. Some of these variations are large and important, while others are trivial. To the latter category belong the following :—

Jiv., p. 309, l. 4, has *śuddha-snātam*, but Gayī, fol. 18a, l. 6, reads *śuci-snātam*, and adds that *śuddha* is in another textbook (*tantrāntare*).

Jiv., p. 310, l. 20, has *ghṛta-piṇḍo*, but Gayī, fol. 20a, l. 10, reads *ghṛta-kumbho*.

Jiv., p. 312, l. 15, has *sātva-bhūyīṣṭhāḥ*, but Gayī, fol. 24b, l. 7, reads *sātva-bahulāḥ*.

Jiv., p. 313, l. 9, has *śukra-bāhulyāt*, but Gayī, fol. 28a, l. 5, reads *śukrāmśa-bāhulyāt*.

Jiv., p. 326, l. 4, has *balavān*, and l. 9 *mānayitrā*, but Gayī, fol. 44a, ll. 6, 10, reads *dhanavān* and *pūjayitrā*. These two differences, however, may be due to mere misreadings of the copyist.

Jiv., p. 339, l. 8, has *māns-ādīnām*, and l. 14 *caturvidhā yās*, but Gayī, fol. 51a, l. 10, reads *marmm-ādīnām*, and fol. 51b, l. 4, *caturvidho yas*.

Jiv., p. 342, l. 6, has *jaghana-bāhir-bhāge*, and l. 15 *bāhu-mūrdha*, but Gayī, fol. 53a, l. 6, reads *jaghana-bhāge*, and fol. 53b, l. 2, *bāhu-śirṣo*. The former difference is noticed by Ḍallana (p. 588), who says that Gayī took *bhāga* to mean *adho-bhāga*.

Jiv., p. 344, l. 13, has *śalya-viṣay-ārddham*, but Gayī, fol. 55b, l. 3, reads *°ārtham*.

Jīv., p. 345, l. 21, has *yābhir*, but Gayī, fol. 56a, l. 10, reads *tābhir*.

Jīv., p. 349, l. 15, has *abhito deham*, but Gayī, fol. 59b, l. 5, reads *akhilam deham*.

Jīv., p. 352, l. 4, has *raktam sa-śeṣa-doṣam*, and l. 24 *trika-saṁdhi*, but Gayī, fol. 62a, l. 1, reads *sa-śeṣa-dosam rudhiram*, and fol. 63b, l. 7, *marmma-trika-saṁdhi*.

Jīv., p. 353, l. 2, has *saṁdhi-madhya*, and l. 13 *tāsan=tu*, but Gayī, fol. 64a, l. 1, reads *saṁdhi-saṁipa-madhya*, and fol. 67b, l. 5, *tāsam khalu*.

Jīv., p. 356, l. 24, has *yaiḥ svedam=abhivahanti*, but Gayī, fol. 70a, l. 4, reads *taiḥ svedaḥ śravati*.

Jīv., p. 358, l. 17, has *prathama-divasāt*, but Gayī, fol. 72a, l. 1, reads *prathama-māsāt*.

Jīv., p. 359, l. 5, has *āprasavāt*, but Gayī, fol. 72b, l. 3, reads *āprasava-kālāt*.

Jīv., p. 360, l. 18, has *ath-āsyāḥ*, but Gayī, fol. 75a, l. 1, reads *ataḥ tasyāḥ*.

Jīv., p. 367, l. 1, has *ṣaṇ-māsam*, but Gayī, fol. 75b, l. 6, reads *ṣaṇ-māsāt*. This difference is noticed by Ḍallana (p. 619), as noticed by Professor Jolly (p. 115).

Jīv., p. 367, l. 12, has *ath=āsmāi*, but Gayī, fol. 76a, l. 3, reads *tath=āsmāi*.

Jīv., p. 368, l. 1, has *sa-dāha*, and l. 2 *upakrāmati*, but Gayī, fol. 76b, l. 2, reads *vāta*, and l. 3 *apakrāmati*.

Much more important are the following differences, some of which are not noticed by Ḍallana.

Jīv., p. 309, l. 20, has § 27 of chapter ii. This paragraph is read by Gayī, fol. 28b, l. 2, as a portion of § 3 of chapter iii, immediately before *ṛtus=tu* (Jīv., p. 313, l. 10). Ḍallana notices this difference (p. 546).

Jīv., p. 321, l. 2, has *udare pacyamānānām*. Here Ḍallana (p. 563) notices a variant, *hṛdaye pacyamānānām*, which he ascribes to Gayī; but, as a matter of fact, Gayī, fol. 38a, ll. 6, 7, ascribes it to others (*anye*).

Jīv., pp. 323, 324, reads seven verses (49–55) on the symptoms of *klama* and *ālasya*, but Gayī, fol. 42a, l. 5, omits them. This is noticed by Ḍallana (p. 567).

Jiv., p. 324, l. 22, has *sapta-prakṛtayāḥ*, but Gayī, fol. 42b, l. 6, reads *tisraḥ prakṛtayāḥ*. Dāllana does not notice this difference, which is probably an error of the copyist of the Gayī MS.

Jiv., p. 326, l. 4, has *darśano madhura-priyāḥ*, but Gayī, fol. 44a, l. 3, reads *amadhura-priyāḥ* in full. This difference is probably due to a mere misprint, Jivānanda having omitted to insert the *avagraha* or mark of elision of *a*.

Jiv., p. 327, l. 20, has *audārikam*, but Gayī, fol. 45a, l. 9, reads *auśadhikam*, as noticed by Dāllana (p. 571; see Jolly, p. 115).

Jiv., p. 334, l. 6, has *ṣaṭ-ṣaṣṭiḥ*, sixty-six, and *catus-trimśat*, thirty-four; but according to Dāllana (p. 578) Gayī read *ṣaṣṭiḥ*, sixty, and *catvāriṃśat*, forty. This is not found in the MS. of Gayī, fol. 50b, ll. 7, 8, but the MS. in this place seems to be corrupt; for that, as a fact, Gayī's text read, as stated by Dāllana, is proved by the circumstance that the details as given by Dāllana (p. 578) are really found in Gayī, fol. 50b, ll. 3 ff.; e.g., Jiv., p. 334, l. 13, has *pañc=odare*, and l. 16 *dve hrdayāmaśayayoh*, while Gayī, fol. 50b, l. 4, reads *sapt=odare*, and l. 7 *dve hr̥di āmāśaye ekā*, exactly as stated by Dāllana, p. 578, ll. 12, 15. Dāllana's statement about *grīvā* and the rest (p. 578, ll. 17 ff.) is also not found in the Gayī MS.; but the fact is that the MS. at this point is defective, though there is no indication in it of any lacuna. But, as already stated, nearly the whole of Gayī's comment on Suśruta's text, Jiv., pp. 334–337, is missing.

For the same reason, Dāllana's statement (p. 579) that Gayī omits verse 38 (Jiv., p. 335) cannot be verified. But it is worth noting that Dāllana himself mentions that that verse is taken from another textbook (*tantrāntariya-śloka*), and therefore a spurious interpolation. Unfortunately Dāllana does not name the author of the textbook; but it is not Caraka, in whose textbook it is not found. Dāllana further states that Gayī rejected the verse on the authority of Bhoja, with whom he held that "Suśruta's doctrine that the muscles numbered 500 only applied to the male, but that the muscles of the female were short of that number

by three," and accordingly numbered only 497. The case would seem to stand thus: Caraka (p. 353, in Jiv., ed. 1896) teaches that there are 500 muscles (*pañca peśi-śatāni*), irrespective of sex, of which he takes no notice. Suśruta adopted this doctrine (Jiv., p. 334, l. 5, *pañca peśi-śatāni bhavanti*, i.e. there are 500 muscles), but added a full enumeration of them, including three muscles for the generative organs outwardly visible in the male (Jiv., p. 334, § 34). Naturally the query suggested itself: How about woman? Hence Suśruta added (Jiv., p. 334, § 36) that "women have twenty extra muscles," viz. ten in the two breasts and ten in the genitals. Here Suśruta left the case. The difficulty now arose as to the real total number of the muscles in the case of the woman. Did Suśruta mean to say that she had a total of 520 (i.e. $500 + 20$) muscles, or did he mean that in her case, of course, the distinctive muscles of the male were to be discounted; in other words, that her twenty extra muscles took the place of the three extra muscles of the male, and that, therefore, her total was 517 (i.e. $497 + 20$)? Bhoja clearly took the latter view, and Gayī agreed with him. Others, however (i.e. Dallana's *tantrāntara*, the other textbook), upheld the former view, maintaining that the three male muscles were also present in the female; only they were invisible, because they lay concealed within her genitals. There can be no doubt that verse 38, which sets forth this view, is not a genuine portion of Suśruta's textbook.

Jiv., p. 345, has a verse 46, which, according to Dallana (p. 591), is omitted by Gayī. This is borne out by the MS. fol. 56a, where Gayī, after commenting on verse 45, at once proceeds to comment on verse 47.

Jiv., p. 346, l. 18, has *caturdaśa grīvāyām*, i.e. there are fourteen (*sirā* or blood-vessels) in the neck. Gayī, fol. 57a, reads only *aṣṭau*, or eight. Dallana takes no notice of this difference.

Jiv., p. 349, l. 1, has *ṣaṭ-trimśaj-jihvāyām*, i.e. there are 36 *sirā* in the tongue; but Gayī, fol. 59a, l. 1, reads *aṣṭāvimśati*, or 28. Dallana notices this difference (p. 595,

l. 21); but Gayī adds that others (*anye*) read 36, and again others (*apare*) 34. It is the reading of Gayī's *anye* which has been adopted into the Vulgate text. It would be interesting to know who the *anye* are to whom we owe that text.

Jiv., p. 349, l. 2, has *dvir=dvādaśa nāsāyām, tāsām=aupanāsikyaś=catasraḥ pariharet*, i.e. there are twice twelve (i.e. 24) *sirā* in the nose; of these one should avoid those four which are near the root of the nose. On this Dāllana remarks (p. 596, l. 24) that Gayī reads *ṣoḍaśa nāsāyām, tāsu pañca aryaḍdhyāḥ*, i.e. there are sixteen *sirā* in the nose, among these five should not be cut. The MS. (fol. 59a, l. 1) reads *tāsām upanāśyaś* (sic) *catasraḥ pariharet*. This reading is clearly corrupt: the first part of the clause has dropped out; but what remains agrees with the Vulgate, and does not bear out Dāllana's statement. There must be some error here in Dāllana's text as printed by Jivānanda, though the marginal note in the India Office MS. No. 1842, fol. 42a, agrees with that text (*ante*, pp. 292, 293). Two lines lower down (Jiv., p. 349, l. 4) we have *aṣṭa-triṃśad=ubhayor=netrayoḥ*, i.e. there are 38 *sirā* in the two eyes; and this reading is repeated in Dāllana (p. 595, l. 25). But the true reading here should be *ṣaṭ-triṃśat*, 36, as, in fact, the India Office MS. 72b (Cat., No. 2645, fol. 26b, l. 8) of Suśruta correctly reads. This is proved by Dāllana himself. On p. 596, l. 3, explaining the number 60 of the *sirā* in the forehead (*lalāṭa*), he says that it is obtained by adding the 24 *sirā* of the nose and the 36 *sirā* of the two eyes. This explanation of Dāllana, moreover, suggests that the true reading of his comment on Gayī should be *ṣaṭ-triṃśat*, 36, instead of *ṣoḍaśa*, 16; for, according to him, Gayī read 24 *sirā* in the eyes (p. 595, l. 25) and 60 in the forehead (p. 596, l. 7). The fact is that there were clearly two theories on the subject, one of Gayī (and probably Bhoja), the other of the Vulgate, which latter is followed by Dāllana; namely, Gayī counts 24 in the eyes, 36 in the nose, total 60 in the forehead; Vulgate, 36 in the eyes, 24 in the nose, total 60 in the forehead. It would be interesting to discover who the author of the Vulgate version of Suśruta's textbook is.

Jīv., p. 349, l. 6, has *karnayor=daśa*, i.e. ten *sirā* in the two ears, and l. 10 *śaṁkhayor=daśa*, ten *sirā* in the two temples. But Gayī reads, fol. 59a, l. 9, *karnayoḥ pañca pañca*, i.e. five in either of the two ears (i.e. ten altogether), and fol. 59b, l. 1, *aṣṭau śaṁkhayoḥ*, i.e. eight in the two temples, though in the latter case he is aware of the other (anye) reading *daśa*. Ḍallana notices both variants, though he reads *ṣoḍaśa*, sixteen, instead of *pañca pañca*.

Jīv., p. 357, verse 9, is placed differently by Gayī, fol. 68a, l. 6, just before verse 4 in Jīv., p. 356, l. 3.

Jīv., p. 358, l. 13, has a verse 12, *mūlād*, etc.; but Gayī, fol. 71a, l. 10, apparently rejects that verse, which, he says, is only read by some (*kecī*), i.e. by the Vulgate version.

Jīv., p. 360, l. 13, has *prahāśva tato*; but Gayī, fol. 73a, l. 4, inserts and explains between those two words a clause, of which he quotes only the two initial words, *śāstram kuṣṣau*. The Vulgate text misses out that clause, nor does Ḍallana (p. 613) comment on it.

Jīv., p. 365, has the verses 27–32, of which Gayī, fol. 75a, l. 7, appears to have rejected the verses 27, 28, 29a, for his comment begins with verse 29b. Ḍallana does not notice this difference, which, however, may be due to a defect of the Gayī MS.

Jīv., p. 369, has the verses 52–59, but Gayī, fol. 77a, places these verses much earlier, immediately after § 50, in Jīv., p. 368. This difference from the Vulgate text is expressly noticed by Ḍallana (p. 622, l. 25).

A few other points are worth noting. Ḍallana (p. 545) gives a very long passage (17 lines in print) as quoted from Gayadāsa. This quotation is found in the Gayī MS., fol. 18a, but there it is referred to Caraka, where, as a fact, it occurs on p. 357, ll. 1–18 (Jīv., ed. 1896). Moreover, Gayī does not quote the passage in full, as Ḍallana does, but only the initial words with *ityādi*, “and so forth.” Ḍallana (p. 572, l. 20 ff.) quotes another long passage (four lines in print) from Gayī, but without acknowledgment. This passage is found in the Gayī MS., fol. 46a, l. 8 ff. A more searching examination might disclose some more quotations of this kind.

Ḍallana (p. 622, l. 7) states that Gayī explains the drug *payasvā* to be the same as *kṣīravidārī*, while he himself identifies it with *arkapuṣpī*. Gayī's identification occurs in the MS., fol. 77a, l. 5.

Ḍallana (p. 549) discusses the meaning of the phrase *dharm-etara*. He himself adopts the interpretation *dharm-ādharma*, "both right and wrong," while he ascribes to Gayī the interpretation *adharma* simply. This is found in the Gayī MS., fol. 20b, where Gayī discusses the point, and says that *dharm-etara* must mean "other than right conduct," that is to say, *adharma* or 'sin' simply, because both *Śruti* and *Smṛti* (i.e. revelation and tradition) ascribe the birth of twins to sinful conduct on the part of the parents, and prescribe expiation. Hence it cannot mean "both *dharm* and *adharma*," i.e. making twin-birth consequent on both right and wrong. This argument of Gayī's seems obviously correct, and that Ḍallana nevertheless preferred the rival interpretation can only be due to his considering that it enjoyed greater authority. Ḍallana does not mention this authority, but Gayī discloses it, for he says (fol. 20b, l. 5) that it is the interpretation of Jaḍa. Now this is a most interesting statement. Jaḍa must have been one of the sources on which Ḍallana based his commentary, and seeing that among his sources (*ante*, p. 285) Jaijjāta is the only one that bears any resemblance to Jaḍa, the suggestion made by Professor Jolly (l.c., p. 116) is strongly confirmed that Jaḍa and Jaijjāta are the same person. But if this is so, Jaijjāta must have been also the author of a textbook; for Gayī, fol. 52a, l. 8, ascribes to him also a *tantra*. The form Jaijjāta never occurs in the Cambridge Gayī MS.; on the other hand, the form Jaḍa occurs five times (fol. 20b, l. 5; fol. 26b, l. 6; fol. 52a, ll. 8, 10; fol. 54b, l. 3). It does not seem probable, therefore, that it is a textual corruption of Jaijjāta.

As to Gayī's date, he must, of course, as Professor Jolly points out (p. 116), be older than Ḍallana, who so frequently quotes him. In addition, I suspect that he must have been a contemporary of Cakrapāṇidatta, for both these authors

not unfrequently quote Bhoja, but neither of them ever quotes the other. Provisionally, therefore, Gayadāsa's date may be taken to be about 1050 A.D.

To Professor Jolly's list of names (p. 116), quoted by Gayadāsa, the following should be added :—

Cakṣuṣya, fol. 28 <i>a</i> , l. 7 (= Videha).	Kumāra-tantra, fol. 31 <i>b</i> , l. 4; fol. 75 <i>b</i> , l. 10.
Dhanvantari, fol. 2 <i>a</i> , l. 2.	Śālākya-tantra, fol. 58 <i>b</i> , l. 5; fol. 59 <i>a</i> , l. 1; fol. 59 <i>b</i> , l. 1.
Gotama, fol. 29 <i>b</i> , l. 6.	Śalya-siddhānta, fol. 63 <i>b</i> , l. 8; fol. 70 <i>b</i> , l. 7.
Manu, fol. 28 <i>b</i> , l. 7.	Yoga-prayoga, fol. 65 <i>a</i> , l. 2.
Puṣkalāvata, fol. 50 <i>b</i> , l. 6.	
Videha, fol. 29 <i>a</i> , l. 10.	

XI.

A HISTORICAL ENQUIRY CONCERNING THE ORIGIN
AND DEVELOPMENT OF SUFIISM,WITH A LIST OF DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS 'ŞÚFÍ' AND
'TAŞAWWUF,' ARRANGED CHRONOLOGICALLY.

By REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON.

I.

THE nucleus of the present article was meant in the first instance to be added as a note to a chronological list of definitions of the terms 'Şúfí' and 'Taşawwuf' chiefly compiled from the *Risála* of Qushayrî (Cairo, 1287 A.H.), the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* of Faridu'ddín 'Aţţár (cited as T.A.),¹ and the *Nafahátu'l-Uns* of Jámí (Calcutta, 1859). These works contain about a hundred definitions of 'Şúfí' and 'Taşawwuf,' none of which exceeds a few lines in length. I thought that it might be interesting, and possibly instructive, to arrange the most important in their chronological sequence, so far as that can be determined, since only in this way are they capable of throwing any light upon the historical development of Şúfiism. The result, however, was somewhat meagre. Taken as a whole, those brief sentences which often represent merely a single aspect of the thing defined, a characteristic point of view, or perhaps a momentarily dominant mood, do undoubtedly exhibit the gradual progress of mystical thought in Islam from the beginning of the third to the end of the fourth century after the Hijra, but the evidence which they supply

¹ The references are to my edition, of which pt. i was recently published as the third volume of Professor Browne's Persian Historical Texts.

is limited to a vague outline. Accordingly, I resolved to undertake a chronological examination of the doctrine taught by the authors of these definitions and by other distinguished Šúfis, and I have here set down the conclusions to which I have come. I do not claim to have exhausted all the available material. There are two works of great importance which I have not yet found an opportunity to examine at leisure, namely, the *Hilyatu'l-Awliyá* of Abú Nu'aym al-Išfahání († 430 A.H.) and the *Kashfú'l-Mahjúb* by 'Alí b. 'Uthmán al-Jullábí al-Hujvírí, who wrote in the latter half of the fifth century. Nevertheless, the evidence at my disposal seemed to me sufficient to form the basis of a preliminary investigation such as I have attempted. The subject is too large to be treated adequately in a few pages, and too obscure to admit of a complete and final solution at present, so that the following sketch must be regarded as more or less tentative, although I venture to think that its main features, at any rate, will be confirmed by future research. I shall not discuss the principles of Šúfism, which are well known, but rather try to show whence they were derived and how they grew into a system.

The seeds of Šúfism are to be found in the powerful and widely-spread ascetic tendencies which arose within Islam during the first century A.H. As Goldziher has remarked, the chief factors in this early asceticism are (1) an exaggerated consciousness of sin, and (2) an overwhelming dread of divine retribution.¹ The movement proceeded on orthodox lines, but it was inevitable that the extraordinary value attached to certain points in Muḥammad's teaching and practice² should produce a corresponding neglect of other matters which good Moslems might think equally essential. Asceticism easily passes into mysticism. Ḥasan of Baṣra, the most famous representative of the ascetic movement, is reckoned by the Šúfis as one of themselves,

¹ *Materialien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Šúfismus* (Vienna Oriental Journal, vol. xiii, No. 1, p. 35 sqq.).

² E.g. ذكر and توكل

and with justice in so far as he strove for spiritual righteousness and was not satisfied with formal acts of devotion. "A grain of genuine piety," he declared, "is better than a thousandfold weight of fasting and prayer."¹ "Cleanse ye these hearts (by meditation and remembrance of God), for they are quick to rust; and restrain ye these souls, for they desire eagerly, and if ye restrain them not they will drag you to an evil end."² Still, these ascetics were only the forerunners of *Ṣūfism*. According to Qushayrī, the term '*Ṣūfī*' came into common use before the end of the second century A.H.=815 A.D. It is probable enough that this epithet, which refers to the woollen garment adopted (as Ibn Khaldūn says) by Muḥammadan ascetics in order to distinguish themselves from those who affected a more luxurious fashion of dress, really marks a definite rift between asceticism and orthodoxy, and that it was first applied to Abū Hāshim of Kúfa († 150 A.H.), of whom Jámí says (*Nafahāt*, 34, 11):—"Before him there were men eminent for asceticism and piety and well-doing in the path of trust (توکل) and in the path of love, but he was the first that was called *Ṣūfī*." Perhaps we may also connect with this Abū Hāshim the fact mentioned by Jámí immediately after the passage which I have just quoted, that the first convent (*khánaqáh*) for *Ṣūfīs* was founded at Ramla in Palestine by a Christian Amír. While recognising, however, that Christian influence had some part in shaping the early development of *Ṣūfism*, I am inclined to believe that *Ṣūfism* of the ascetic and quietistic type, such as we find, e.g., in the sayings of Ibrāhīm b. Adham († 161 A.H.), Dá'ūd al-Ṭá'ī († 165 A.H.), Fuḍayl b. 'Iyād († 187 A.H.), and Shaqīq of Balkh († 194 A.H.), owes comparatively little either to Christianity or to any foreign source. In other words, it seems to me that this type of mysticism was—or at least might have been—the native product of Islam itself, and that it was an almost necessary consequence of

¹ Qushayrī, 63, last line.

² *Kámīl* of al-Mubarrad, 120, 4.

the Muḥammadan conception of Allah, a conception which could not possibly satisfy the spiritually-minded Moslem. Although the Ṣúfís mentioned above carried asceticism and quietism to extreme lengths, their mysticism was very moderate. The raptures and transports of later Ṣúfism were as unknown to them as were its daring speculations.¹ They loved God, but they feared Him more, and the end of their love was apathetic submission to His will, not perfect knowledge of His being. They stand midway between asceticism (*zuhd*) and theosophy or gnosis (*ma'rifat*). The word that best describes their attitude is quietism (*riḍā*).

In the third century Ṣúfism assumes an entirely new character, which cannot be explained as the further development of spiritual forces within Islam. It is significant that the earliest definition of Ṣúfism occurs in the sayings of Ma'rúf al-Karkhí († 200 A.H.), whose parents were Christians or Mandæans in religion and, to judge by the name of his father, Fírúz or Fírúzán, of Persian nationality.² Ma'rúf, it is said, was a client (*mawlā*) of the Imám 'Alí b. Músá al-Riḍá, and accepted Islam at his hands. He lived in Baghdád—no doubt in the Karkh quarter, whence he is generally called Ma'rúf of Karkh—during the reign of Hárún al-Rashíd, and his tomb, which still exists in that city, has always been an object of profound veneration. He associated with Dá'úd al-Ṭá'í († 165 A.H.), but we learn from the *Fihrist* (183, 16) that his master in Ṣúfism was a certain Farqad al-Sanjí,³ who derived from Ḥasan of Baṣra, who derived from Málík b. Anas. Such *isnáds* designed to show the orthodoxy of Ṣúfism are of small account. Ma'rúf is described in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* as a man filled with longing for God. His pupil, the celebrated Sarí al-Saqatí, relates as follows:—

¹ There is one conspicuous exception, namely, Rábi'a al-'Adawiyya († 135, 180, or 185, according to different authorities). In her sayings the doctrine of mystical love appears almost fully developed, but it is probable that many of them are spurious.

² Ma'rúf belonged to the district of Wasit (see *infra*).

³ The vocalisation of this word is uncertain. It may refer to any one of several places named Sanj, Sinj, or Sunj.

"I dreamed that I saw Ma'rúf al-Karkhí beneath the throne of God, and God was saying to His angels, 'Who is this?' They answered, 'Thou knowest best, O Lord.' Then God said, 'This is Ma'rúf al-Karkhí, who was intoxicated with love of Me, and will not recover his senses except by meeting Me face to face.'"¹ In the sayings of Ma'rúf we discern for the first time unmistakable traces of those new ideas which remain to this day the essential and most characteristic element in Šúfism. Here are some examples:—

"Love is not to be learned from men: it is one of God's gifts and comes of His grace."²

"The saints of God are known by three signs: their thought is of God, their dwelling is with God, and their business is in God.³ If the gnostic ('*árif*') has no bliss, he himself is in every bliss."⁴

One day Ma'rúf said to his pupil, Sarí al-Saqatí: "When you desire anything of God, swear to Him by me"
(فَأَقْسِمَ عَلَيْهِ بِي).⁵

Anyone who has perused the sayings of Ibráhím b. Adham and the group of Šúfís mentioned above in connection with him will readily perceive that these utterances of Ma'rúf al-Karkhí belong to a quite different order of ideas. Their Tašawwuf had a practical end, the attainment of salvation, but his was primarily a theosophy; it consisted, as we see from his definition, in "the apprehension of Divine realities" (الْأَخْذُ بِالْحَقَائِقِ). Before considering the origin of this conception, let us follow its historical development a little further.

¹ Qushayrî, 11, 7 sqq.

² T.A. i, 272, 12.

³ T.A. i, 271, 18.

⁴ T.A. i, 272, 13. Compare this with Ibráhím b. Adham's definition (T.A. i, 93, 24): "This is the sign of the gnostic, that his thoughts are mostly engaged in meditation, and his words are mostly praise and glorification of God, and his deeds are mostly devotion, and his eye is mostly fixed on the subtleties of Divine action and power."

⁵ Qushayrî, 11, 1.

Abú Sulaymán al-Dárání († 215 A.H.), a native of Wásit, emigrated to Syria and settled in the village of Dárayá, west of Damascus. Many of his sayings are purely mystical in spirit and expression, thus :—

“None refrains from the lusts of this world save him in whose heart there is a light that keeps him always busied with the next world.”¹

“It may be that while the gnostic sleeps on his bed, God will reveal to him the mystery and will make luminous that which He never will reveal to one standing in prayer.² When the gnostic’s spiritual eye is opened, his bodily eye is shut : they see nothing but Him.”³

“If Gnosis (معرفة) were to take visible form, all that looked thereon would die at the sight of its beauty and loveliness and goodness and grace, and every brightness would become dark beside the splendour thereof.”⁴

“Gnosis is nearer to silence than to speech.”⁵

“When the heart weeps because it has lost, the spirit laughs because it has found.”⁶

The following passage may be quoted in full, inasmuch as it is one of the earliest specimens of the erotic symbolism which afterwards became so prominent in the religious language of the Súfis :—

Aḥmad b. Abi’l-Ḥawarí⁷ said : One day I came to Abú Sulaymán (al-Dárání) and found him weeping. I said, “What makes you weep?” He answered : “O Aḥmad, why should I not weep? for, when night falls, and eyes are closed in slumber, and every lover is alone with his beloved, and the people of love keep vigil,⁸ and tears stream

¹ T.A. i, 232, 12.

² T.A. i, 234, 21.

³ T.A. i, 234, 23.

⁴ T.A. i, 235, 3.

⁵ T.A. i, 235, 5.

⁶ *Nafahātu’l-Uns*, 44, 3.

⁷ T.A. i, 286 sqq.

⁸ Literally, “make their feet a bed, rest on their feet” (افترش اهل).
(المحبة أقدامهم).

over their cheeks and bedew their oratories, then God Almighty looks from on high and cries aloud—‘O Gabriel, dear in my sight are they who take pleasure in My Word and find peace in praising My name. Verily, I am regarding them in their loneliness, I hear their lamentation and I see their weeping. Wherefore, O Gabriel, dost thou not cry aloud amongst them—“What is this weeping?” Did ye ever see a beloved that chastised his lovers? Or how would it beseem Me to punish folk who, when night covers them, manifest fond affection towards Me (تملقوا لى) ? By Myself I swear that when they shall come down to the Resurrection I will surely unveil to them My glorious face, in order that they may behold Me and I may behold them.’”¹

Passing over Bishru'l-Ḥáfí (the barefooted), who died in 227 A.H., and who described the gnostics (‘*arífán*) as the peculiar favourites of God,² we come to Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrî († 245 A.H.),³ the man who, more than any other, deserves to be entitled the founder of theosophical Ṣúfism. His right to this honour is acknowledged by Oriental biographers and historians. Jámí says (*Nafahát*, 36, 2 sqq.) :—“He is the head of this sect; they all descend from, and are related to, him. There were Shaykhs before him, but he was the first that explained the Ṣúfí symbolism (اشارات با عبارت آورد) and spoke concerning this ‘path.’” According to Abu'l-Mahásin (i, 753), Dhu'l-Nún “was the first that spoke in Egypt concerning the system of ‘states’ (الاحوال) and ‘stages of the saints’ ” (مقامات اهل الولاية). These assertions, though not literally exact, are amply borne out, on the whole, by the sayings of Dhu'l-Nún which are preserved in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* and in other works. Space does not permit me to analyse the copious and interesting collection of mystical doctrines attached to his

¹ Qushayrî, 18, 5 sqq.

² T.A. i, 112, 13.

³ He was called Dhu'l-Nún (He of the Fish) on account of a miracle which is related in the T.A. i, 116, 18 sqq.

name. It may be remarked, however, that the definitions of 'gnostic' (*ʿarif*) and 'gnosis' (*maʿrifat*) alone occupy about two pages in my edition of the T.A. (see especially i, 126-128). Dhu'l-Nún distinguishes three kinds of knowledge, of which one is common to all Moslems, another is that of philosophers and divines, while the third sort, viz., the knowledge of the attributes of unity, is peculiar to the saints "who see God with their hearts" (T.A. i, 127, 3 sqq.). When Dhu'l-Nún was asked how he knew God he replied, "I know Him by Himself"¹; yet he confessed that the highest knowledge is bewilderment (أَعْرَفَ النَّاسِ).² Similarly, he taught that true praise of God involves absorption of the worshipper in the object of worship.³ He said: "One that veils himself from mankind by means of solitude is not as one that veils himself by means of God" (Qushayrī, 60, 1). His Deity is a Being that can be described only by negatives: "Whatever you imagine, God is the opposite of that."⁴ The idea that Sūfism is an esoteric religion for the elect finds frequent expression. Thus, تَوْبَةُ الْعَوَامِّ is a different thing from تَوْبَةُ الْخَوَاصِّ (Qushayrī, 10, 16), and Divine love is regarded as a mystery which must not be spoken about, lest it come to the ears of the profane (ibid., 172, 21). Dhu'l-Nún mentions "the cup of love" handed to the lover of God (T.A. i, 126, 13)—one of the earliest instances of the Bacchanalian symbolism in which Sūfī poets delight. He is the author of the first definitions of *waqīd* and *samāʿ* (T.A. i, 129, 13; Qushayrī, 180, 8), and *taḥhīd* (Qushayrī, 5, 8).

¹ عَرَفْتُ رَبِّي بِرَبِّي (Qushayrī, 167, 7).

² Ibid., 166, 23.

³ غَيْبَةُ الْذَاكَرِ عَنِ الْذَاكَرِ (ibid., 120, 7; cf. 119, 2).

⁴ كُلُّ مَا تُصَوِّرُ فِي وَهْمِكَ فَالَلَهُ بِخِلَافِ ذَلِكَ (ibid., 5, 10).

Enough, I think, has been said to show that it was unquestionably Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrī (and not, as Mr. Whinfield has suggested, Báyzid al-Biṣṭāmī) "who above all others gave to Ṣúfī doctrine its permanent shape."¹ Let us now see whether the facts recorded by his biographers afford any clue as to the origin of this doctrine.

According to Ibn Khallikán (No. 128; De Slane's translation, vol. i, p. 291) and Jámī (*Nafahát*, p. 35) the name of Dhu'l-Nún was Abu'l-Fayḍ Thawbán b. Ibráhīm, or al-Fayḍ b. Ibráhīm. His father, a native of Nubia or of Ikhmím in Upper Egypt, was a slave enfranchised and adopted by the tribe of Quraysh. Dhu'l-Nún probably passed some time in the Ḥijáz, for it is said that he was a pupil of the Imám Málík b. Anas († 179 A.H.) and taught the *Muwatta'* from his dictation. His master in Ṣúfiism was Shuqrán al-'Abid (Ibn Khallikán) or a Maghribite named Isráfíl (Jámī). Ibn Khallikán tells us that Dhu'l-Nún was "the nonpareil of his age" for learning, devotion, communion with the divinity (*ḥál*), and acquaintance with literature (*adab*); also that he was a philosopher (*ḥakím*) and spoke Arabic with elegance. He was a Malámatí, i.e., he concealed his piety under a pretended contempt for the law, and most of the Egyptians regarded him as a *zindiq* (freethinker), but after his death he was canonised (T.A. i, 114, 15 sqq.). Several anecdotes in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* represent Dhu'l-Nún as turning pebbles and the like into precious stones, and in the *Fihrist* (353, 28) his name occurs among "the philosophers who discoursed on alchemy," while a few pages further on we find him mentioned as the author of two alchemical works (*ibid.*, 358, 3).² His true character appears distinctly in the account given by Ibnu'l-Qiftí in the

¹ *Masnavi-i Ma'navi*, translated and abridged by E. H. Whinfield (2nd edition), p. xvii of the Introduction. It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Whinfield, whose writings have done so much to promote the study of Sufism, and I am glad to find myself in general agreement with his views as to the origin of the doctrine.

² He also dabbled in medicine. See Wuestenfeld, *Gesch. der Arab. Aerzte*, p. 24. Three works attributed to him are extant (Brockelmann, *Gesch. der Arab. Litt.*, i, 199).

Tārikhu'l-Hukamā (ed. by Lippert, p. 185):—"Dhu'l-Nún b. Ibrāhīm al-Ikhnīmī al-Miṣrī professed the art of alchemy, and belongs to the same class as Jābir b. Ḥayyān. He devoted himself to the science of esoterics (*'ilmu'l-bāṭin*) and became proficient in many branches of philosophy. He used to frequent the ruined temple (*barbā*) in the town of Ikhnīm, which temple is one of the ancient 'Houses of Wisdom' (*بيوت الحكمة*), containing marvellous figures and strange images that increase the believer's faith and the infidel's transgression. And it is said that knowledge of the mysteries therein was revealed to him by the way of saintship (*بطريق الولاية*); and he wrought miracles."

Mas'ūdī, who died exactly a century after Dhu'l-Nún and is the first authority to mention him, derived his information from the inhabitants of Ikhnīm on the occasion of a visit which he made to that place. He relates the local tradition as follows:—"Abu'l-Fayḍ Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrī al-Ikhnīmī, the ascetic, was a philosopher who trod a particular path (*طريقة*) and pursued a course of his own in religion. He was one of those who elucidate the history of these temple-ruins (*barābi*). He roamed among them and examined a great quantity of figures and inscriptions." Mas'ūdī gives translations of some of the latter, which Dhu'l-Nún claimed to have deciphered and read (*Murāju'l-Dhahab*, ed. by Barbier de Meynard, ii, 401 seq.).

The statement that Dhu'l-Nún assiduously studied the inscriptions in the *barābi* or ancient Egyptian temples requires some explanation. Egypt was regarded by Muḥammadans as the home of alchemy, magic, and the occult sciences. The first who discoursed on alchemý was Hermes the Babylonian (*Fihrist*, 351, 20), who afterwards became king of Egypt and was buried under one of the Pyramids. Others relate that Hermes was one of the seven priests in charge of the temples of the seven Planets. The Moslems identify this Hermes with the Prophet Idrís (Enoch), and ascribe to him the origin of Egyptian art, science, and religion. "He built the Pyramids and the temples (*barābi*) in Upper Egypt, and figured thereon all the arts and

scientific instruments (الصناعات والآلات), and engraved thereon descriptions of the sciences, because he desired to preserve them for posterity, and feared lest they should disappear from the world and leave no vestige behind.”¹ We see from this passage that the hieroglyphics on the Egyptian monuments were believed to hold the secret of those ancient and mysterious sciences first practised, as was thought, by the people of Babylon, viz., alchemy, astrology, and magic. This was the view taken by the most enlightened of Moslem historians, Ibn Khaldún, who not only asserts the reality of magic, but affirms that the *barábi* in Upper Egypt still show traces of the art and furnish abundant proofs of its existence.² We read in the *Fihrist* (353, 3 sqq.) :—“In Egypt are buildings, called *barábi*, composed of great stones enormous in size. They are houses of diverse shape, which contain places for crushing and pounding and dissolving and compacting and distilling, whence it may be inferred that they were made for the practice of alchemy. And in these buildings are figures and inscriptions in Chaldean and Egyptian, of which the nature is unknown. Subterranean treasuries have been discovered, where these sciences are written on bast (*falján*) made of thin bark and on membrane of the white poplar (*túz*) which bowmen employ and on sheets of gold and copper and on stones.”

It is now clear that Dhu'l-Nún was an alchemist and magician, but we must remember that at this time magic and alchemy (which latter was regarded as a branch of magic) had long been associated with theurgy and theosophy. This connection is very marked in the later Neo-Platonists, like Iamblichus and Proclus, and it pervades the whole history of Gnosticism, which Irenæus appropriately derives from Simon Magus, as well as of Šábianism. In Šúfism, on the other hand, it is more or less disguised; the great Šúfis of the third century are theosophists rather than theurgists. Magic, which is condemned by the Koran, could

¹ *Tárikhu'l-Ḥukamá*, 348, last line et seqq.

² *Prolegomena*, translated by De Slane, iii, 176 seq.

have no recognised place in their system. The miracles which they wrought were Divine gifts (كرامات) and came to them unsolicited, by virtue of their holiness and sincere faith in God.¹ It would be easy to show, however, that the old theurgic ideas exercised a powerful influence on Ṣúfism. Ja'far al-Ṣádiq († 148 A.H.), whose life is given in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá*, is said to have written a treatise on alchemy, augury, and omens. His pupil, Jábir b. Ḥayyán, the celebrated alchemist known to Europeans by the name of Geber, was called "Jábir the Ṣúfí," and, like Dhu'l-Nún, he studied the science of esoterics (علم الباطن), which, according to Ibnu'l-Qiftí, is identical with Ṣúfism.² More important evidence is afforded by the biographies of the Ṣúfí saints. It is related that Ibráhím b. Adham, while travelling in the desert, met a man who taught him the greatest name of God (اسم الله الأعظم), and as soon as he pronounced it he saw the Prophet Khidr (Qushayrí, 9, 12). Dhu'l-Nún is represented as knowing the greatest name. One of his pupils, Yúsuf b. al-Ḥusayn († 304 A.H.), desired to learn it, but failed to pass a simple preliminary test³ which Dhu'l-Nún imposed on him (T.A. i, 316, 10 sqq.). The magical efficacy of certain names and formulas is a commonplace of theurgy. A Coptic work on Gnosticism mentions "the mystery of the great name," which enabled the disciples to dispense with all other mysteries.⁴ Dhu'l-Nún seems to have used invocations and incense; at least, we are told by one who visited him that he saw a golden bowl in front of the holy man, while around him rose the fumes of aloes-wood and ambergris. "Art thou," he cried

¹ Cf. Ibn Khaldún, *Prolegomena*, trans. by De Slane, iii, 184.

² *Tárikhu'l-Hukamá*, 160. This combination of natural science and religion is exemplified in the history of mediæval mysticism in Europe. Jábir b. Ḥayyán and Dhu'l-Nún anticipate Cornelius Agrippa and Paracelsus.

³ This is the قصة الفاقة to which Ibnu'l-Athír alludes (vol. vii, p. 79, l. 7, in Tornberg's edition).

⁴ Carl Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in Koptischer Sprache*, p. 197.

to the intruder, "one of those who enter into the presence of kings in their hour of 'expansion'?" (فى حال بسطهم).¹

An ascetic, philosopher, and theurgist, living in the ninth century among the Christian Copts, himself of Coptic or Nubian parentage—such was Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrī, from whom, as his extant sayings bear witness, and as Jámí, moreover, expressly states, the Ṣúfī theosophy is mainly derived. The origin of this doctrine has often been discussed, and various theories are still current; a result which is not surprising, inasmuch as hardly anyone has hitherto taken due account of the historical and chronological factors in the problem.² To ignore these factors, and to argue from general considerations alone, is, in my opinion, a perfectly futile proceeding, which can lead to no safe or solid conclusion. It is obvious that the principles of Ṣúfism resemble those of the Vedānta, but the question whether Ṣúfism is derived from the Vedānta cannot be settled except on historical grounds, i.e., (1) by an examination of the influence which was being exerted by Indian upon Muḥammadan thought at the time when Ṣúfism arose; and (2) by considering how far the ascertained facts relating to the evolution of Ṣúfism accord with the hypothesis of its Indian origin. Similarly, with regard to the alternative form of the 'Aryan reaction' theory, namely, that Ṣúfism is essentially a product of the Persian mind, it must be shown, in the first place, that the men who introduced the characteristic Ṣúfī doctrines were of Persian nationality. As we have seen, however—and I do not think that my conclusions will be disputed by anyone who studies the evidence chronologically—this was by no means the case. Ma'rúf al-Karkhī came of Persian stock, but the characteristic

¹ Qushayrī, 193, 9 sqq. T.A. i, 121, 14. For the use of incense by the 'Ṣābians' of Egypt, who were probably Copts or Nubians, cf. Chwolson, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, vol. i, p. 493 seq.

² One of the first to do so was Dr. A. Merx, who in his *Idee und Grundlinien einer allgemeinen Geschichte der Mystik* (Heidelberg, 1893) traced the progress of mystical ideas in Islam down to the time of Abú Sulaymán al-Dārání, and argued that they must have been derived from Greek philosophy. Before seeing his book, I had approached the question independently, and, working on the same lines, had come to a similar conclusion.

theosophical mysticism of the Şúfís was first formulated by his successors, Abú Sulaymán al-Dárání and Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrî, men who passed their lives in Syria and Egypt, and who probably had not a drop of Persian blood in their veins.

The remarkably close correspondence between Neo-Platonism and Şúfism—a correspondence which is far more striking than that between Şúfism and the Vedanta system—would not in itself justify us in deriving the one doctrine from the other. Nevertheless, I am convinced that they are historically connected, and I will now state some of the considerations which have led me to this belief.

Starting with the proposition, which I have deduced from an examination of the materials contained in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* and other works, that theosophical, as contrasted with quietistic and devotional Şúfism, arose and reached a high degree of development in the half-century which, broadly speaking, covers the reigns of Ma'mún, Mu'taṣim, Wáthiq, and Mutawakkil, that is, between 198 and 247 A.H. = 813–861 A.D., we must see in the first instance what sort of influence was exerted in Western Asia during this period by Greek thought in general and by Neo-Platonism in particular.

Little need be said regarding the diffusion of Hellenic culture among the Moslems at this time. Every student of their literary history knows how the tide of Greek learning, then at its height, streamed into 'Irâq from three quarters: from the Christian monasteries of Syria, from the Persian Academy of Jundéshápúr in Khúzistán, and from the Syrian heathens, or Şábians, of Harrán in Mesopotamia. Innumerable works of Greek philosophers, physicians, and scientists were translated into Arabic, were eagerly studied, and formed a basis for new researches. In short, Muḥammadan science and philosophy are founded, almost exclusively, on the wisdom of the Greeks.

Aristotle, not Plato, is the dominant figure in Moslem philosophy. But the Arabs gained their first knowledge of Aristotle through Neo-Platonist commentators, and the system with which they became imbued was that of Plotinus,

Porphyry, and Proclus. Thus the so-called "Theology of Aristotle," which, according to Dieterici, was translated into Arabic about 840 A.D., is in reality a manual of Neo-Platonism. The main point, however, is that Neo-Platonist ideas were widely circulated, and were easily accessible to educated Moslems in the first half of the ninth century of our era. This was especially the case in Syria and Egypt, which for many hundreds of years had been the two great centres of mysticism and pantheism, where Neo-Platonists, Gnostics, and Christian heretics were equally at home. About the beginning of the sixth century "there suddenly appeared a body of writings purporting to be by Dionysios the Areopagite, the convert of Saint Paul. It has been for some time generally recognised that they were the work of this period, and, in all probability, written by some follower of Proclus, who may have been a Syrian monk; a theory supported by the fact that, although eagerly received and studied by the whole East, these writings were brought forward and most powerfully supported by the Syrians."¹ The pseudo-Dionysios names as his teacher a certain Hierotheos, whom Frothingham has shown to be identical with Stephen bar Sudaili, a prominent mystic of the East Syrian school and a contemporary of Jacob of Sarúj (451-521 A.D.). Fragments of two works by this Stephen, viz. the *Erotic Hymns* and the *Elements of Theology*, are preserved by Dionysios; and a complete work, the *Book of Hierotheos on the hidden Mysteries of the Divinity*, has come down to us in a unique MS. of the British Museum. Here, then, is the true source of the pseudo-Dionysian writings, which, as is well known, were turned into Latin by John Scotus Erigena, and founded mediæval mysticism in the West. Their influence in the Eastern world was no less far-reaching. They were translated into Syriac almost immediately on their appearance, and their doctrine was vigorously propagated, as the numerous commentaries by Syrian writers attest. These studies must have flourished particularly in the ninth

¹ Frothingham, *Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian Mystic* (Leyden, 1886), p. 2.

century, since from that time date the splendid MSS. which were sent from Scythopolis in Palestine to Edessa. "About 850 Dionysios was known from the Tigris to the Atlantic."¹

But it was not through literature alone that the Moslems were made familiar with Neo-Platonistic doctrine. The city of Harrán in Mesopotamia has been already mentioned as one of the principal avenues by which Greek culture poured into Islam. It was inhabited by a people who were really Syrian heathens, but who towards the beginning of the ninth century assumed the name of Šábians, in order to protect themselves from the persecution with which they were threatened by the Caliph Ma'mún. At this time, indeed, many of them accepted Islam or Christianity, but the majority clung to their old pagan beliefs, while the educated class continued to profess a religious philosophy which, as it is described by Shahrastání and other Muḥammadan writers, is simply the Neo-Platonism of Proclus and Iamblichus. Although the Šábian colony in Baghdád, which produced a brilliant succession of scholars, philosophers, and men of science, was not established until near the end of the ninth century, we may be sure that long before that epoch there was an active interchange of ideas between Šábian and Muḥammadan thinkers. I need not pursue this topic further. It is not too much to say that the Moslems found Neo-Platonism in the air wherever they came in contact with Greek civilisation.

Now the lands of Greek civilisation were pre-eminently Syria and Egypt, the very countries in which, as we have seen, the Šúfí theosophy was first developed. The man who bore the chief part in its development is described as a philosopher and an alchemist: in other words, he was a student of Greek wisdom. When it is added that the ideas which he enunciated are essentially the same as those which appear, for example, in the works of Dionysios, does not the whole argument point with overwhelming force to the conclusion that there is an historical connection between

¹ Merx, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

Neo-Platonism and Súfism? Is any other theory of the origin of theosophical Súfism conceivable in view of the facts which I have stated? I am not prepared to go so far as Merx, who traces the Súfí doctrine back to the writings of Dionysios, but my researches have brought me to a result which is virtually the same: that *Súfism on its theosophical side is mainly a product of Greek speculation*. That it was not, even at this early stage, a purely Greek system, goes without saying. Neo-Platonism itself had absorbed many foreign elements in the course of six centuries. I will not attempt just now to distinguish the Greek from the non-Greek element in the Súfí mysticism of the period which we have been considering, i.e. before 860 A.D. It may be observed, however, that Ma'rúf al-Karkhí, whose parents, according to Abu'l-Mahásin, were "Šábians belonging to the dependencies of Wásit" (كان أبواؤه من أعمال واسط من الصابئة), was probably a Mandæan. These Mandæans (the Šábians of the Koran) were called by the Muḥammadans المغتسلات on account of their frequent ceremonial ablutions. They dwelt in the swamp-land between Basra and Wásit. Their founder is said to have been Elkhasai (الحسيح, 'Ηλχασαί), and, as their name denotes, they were the remnant of an ancient Gnostical sect.¹ If Ma'rúf was not himself a Mandæan, he must at all events have been acquainted with the doctrine of these صابة البطائح. It is curious that among the sayings attributed to him we find (T.A. i, 272, 7): "Close your eyes, if all is (derived) from a male and female," which seems to refer to the doctrine of the Mandæans or Elkhasaites (Fihrist, 340, 27).² Abú Sulaymán

¹ Mandâ and Mandâyâ answer to the Greek expressions γνῶσις and γνωστικός (Brandt, *Die Mandäische Religion*, p. 167).

² Ma'rúf, as I understand him, means to say that, if the phenomenal universe is dualistic, we should close our eyes to it and regard only the Absolute Unity. The words نرى و ماده appear to be connected with the fact that in the

al-Daránī was also a native of Wásit (Abu'l-Mahásin, i, 591), and we have seen that Dhu'l-Nún attached great importance to the theory of معرفت (*γνῶσις*). The six passes (عُقَبَات) which, according to Ibráhīm b. Adham, a man must traverse in order to attain the rank of the pious,¹ recall the seven gates, each guarded by its peculiar Archon, which the soul encounters on "the holy way" to salvation, and which are opened only to those who possess the *γνῶσις* or mysterious knowledge. Later on, these Archons were allegorised into evil passions—lust, envy, and the like.² I have no doubt that Gnosticism, as modified by Jewish-Christian ideas and by Greek speculation, contributed a good deal to Šúfism, and that the two systems offer many striking analogies. The subject is one that would repay investigation. In the meantime this much is certain, that having regard to the historical environment in which the Šúfī theosophy sprang up, we cannot refer its origin either to India or to Persia, but must recognise it to be a product of the union between Greek thought and Oriental religion, and in particular of Neo-Platonism, Christianity, and Gnosticism. It is possible that two at least of these systems may have been influenced by Persian and Indian ideas, but this is a large question which has not yet been, and perhaps never can be, definitely settled. The direct influence of Indian ideas on Šúfism, though undeniably great, was posterior and secondary to the influence exerted by Greek and Syrian speculation.

The principal Šúfī Shaykhs who died between 250 and 300 A.H. are Sarī al-Saqatī († 253), Yaḥyá b. Mu'ádh al-Rázī († 258), Abú Yazíd (Báyazíd) al-Bisṭámī († 261), Abú Ḥafṣ al-Ḥaddád († *circa* 265), Ḥamdún al-Qaṣṣár († 271), Abú Sa'íd al-Kharráz († 277 or 286), Abú Ḥamza al-Baghdádī († 289), Sahl b. 'Abdullah al-Tustarī († 273,

Babylonian religion, which is probably the parent of Gnosticism, each god has his feminine complement, e.g. Anu and Anatu. This is a constant feature in Gnostical systems of emanation. Similarly, the *Βυθός* is often described as ἀρρενόθηλος, 'masculo-feminine.'

¹ Qushayrī, 9, 21 ; T.A. 100, 16.

² W. Auz, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, p. 17.

283, or 293), Abu'l-Ḥusayn al-Núrí († 295), Junayd of Baghdad († 297), 'Amr b. 'Uthmán al-Makkí († 291, 297, or 301), Abú 'Uthmán al-Ḥirí († 298), and Mīmshád al-Dínawarí († 299). To examine in detail the doctrine taught by each of them would carry me far beyond the limits of a brief sketch. I will therefore conclude this paper with some account of the general development of Sufism down to the end of the third century A.H., confining my attention, as before, to the features which stand out in prominent relief.

This development took place in two ways :—

- (1) Existing doctrine was amplified, elaborated, and systematised.
- (2) New doctrines and practices were introduced.

1. Sufism, which was at first a form of religion adopted by individuals, and only communicated to a comparatively small circle of companions (*aṣḥáb*), gradually became an organised system, a school for saints, with rules of discipline and devotion which the novice (*muríd*) learned from his spiritual director (*pír*, *ustádh*), to whose guidance he submitted himself absolutely. Already in the third century it is increasingly evident that the typical Sufi adept of the future will no longer be a solitary ascetic, shunning the sight of men, but a great Shaykh and divinely inspired teacher, who appears on ceremonial occasions attended by a numerous train of admiring disciples. The notion expressed in Báyzíd's saying, "If a man has no teacher (*ustádh*), his Iḥám is Satan" (Qushayrí, 213, 10), is probably connected with the well-known Shí'ite theory first enunciated by 'Abdullah b. Sabá; and Wellhausen's remark, "die Gottesverehrung der Schiiten war Menschenverehrung," may be applied with equal justice to the Persian Sufis of a later age (cf., for example, the attitude of Jalálu'ddín Rúmi towards Shams-i Tabrizí). Divine favour and authority were claimed by the Sufi theosophists from the very beginning. "Swear to God by me," said Ma'rúf al-Karkhí; and Dhu'l-

Nún declared that the true disciple should be more obedient to his master than to God Himself (T.A. i, 131, 7).

In the sayings of the Shaykhs of this period the tendency to codify and systematise is everywhere apparent. The 'Path' of the novice was marked out into a series of stages (T.A. i, 261, 9 sqq.), and different 'paths' were distinguished. Yahyá b. Mu'ádh al-Rázi († 258 A.H.) said: "When you see that a man inculcates good works, know that his path is piety; and when you see that he points to the Divine signs (*áyát*), know that his path is that of the *Abdál*¹; and when you see that he points to the bounties of God, know that his path is that of the lovers; and when you see that he is attached to praise of God (*dhikr*), know that his path is that of the gnostics."² Ḥamdún al-Qaṣṣár († 271 A.H.) founded in Nishápúr the sect of the Malámatís or Qaṣṣáris, who proved their sincerity and devotion to God by cloaking it under an affected libertinism.³

Sarí al-Saqatí († 253 A.H.) is said to have been the first who spoke in Baghdád concerning Divine realities (*haqá'iq*) and Unification (*tawhíd*).⁴ The first to lecture on Šúfism in public (بر منبر) was Yahyá b. Mu'ádh al-Rázi († 258 A.H.),⁵ and his example was followed in Baghdád by Abú Ḥamza al-Baghdadí († 289 A.H.).⁶ According to Jámí (*Nafahát*, 36, 4) the theory of Šúfism was formulated and explained in writing by Junayd († 297 A.H.), who taught it only in private houses and in subterranean chambers (سردابها), whereas Shibli († 334 A.H.) made it the subject of public discourse. From this we may conclude that the orthodox party, whom the accession of Mutawakkil (232 A.H.)

¹ The *Abdál* (Substitutes) form a particular class in the mysterious Šúfi hierarchy, at the head of which stands the Qutb. According to Ibn Khaldún, they were derived from, and correspond to, the Nuqabá of the Shí'ites.

² T.A. i, 305, 21.

³ See *Nafahatu'l-Uns*, 8, 16; T.A. i, 319, 22 sqq., 333, 7 and 23. Other Šúfi sects are the Tayfúriyán, the Kharráziyán, and the Núriyán, who followed Báyazid, Abú Sa'id al-Kharraz, and Abu'l-Ḥusayn al-Núrí respectively.

⁴ T.A. i, 274, 9.

⁵ T.A. i, 299, 6.

⁶ Abu'l-Mahásin, ii, 47, 6 sqq.

re-established in power, treated the Šúfí mysticism with less intolerance than they displayed towards the liberal opinions of the Mu'tazilites. Dhu'l-Nún, however, was denounced as a *zindiq*, and was summoned to the presence of Mutawakkil, but a pious exhortation which he addressed to the Caliph secured his honourable dismissal.¹ Junayd himself was more than once accused of being a freethinker, and mention is made of an inquisition directed against the Šúfis (*mihnatí Šúfiyán*) in Baghdád, in consequence of which Abú Sa'id al-Kharráz († 286 A.H.) fled to Egypt.²

The Šúfis of the third and fourth centuries worked out a complete theory and practice of mystical religion, but they were not philosophers, and they took little interest in metaphysical problems, so that the philosophical terminology which later Šúfism borrowed, through Fárábí, Avicenna, and Ghazzálí, from the Neo-Platonists, does not concern us here. A few words may be said, however, regarding the symbolical language of the Šúfis.³ Traces of this appear very early. It is told of Dá'úd al-Tá'í († 165 A.H.) that a dervish saw him smiling, and asked, "Whence this cheerfulness, O Abú Sulaymán?" Dá'úd answered: "At dawn they gave me a wine which is called the wine of intimacy (*sharáb-i uns*); to-day I have made festival, and have abandoned myself to rejoicing."⁴ Love symbolism occurs in the sayings ascribed to Rábi'a († 135, 180, or 185 A.H.), in a passage already quoted from Abú Sulaymán al-Daránī († 215 A.H.), and thenceforward with increasing frequency. Hátim b. al-Ašamm († 237 A.H.) speaks of the four deaths of the Šúfí: white death = hunger, black death = endurance of injuries, red death = sincere self-mortification, green death = wearing a garment to which patches are always

¹ Ibn Khallikán, trans. by De Slane, vol. ii, p. 291.

² *Nafahátu'l-Uns*, 81, 16.

³ Ibn 'Atá († 309 A.H.) was asked why the Šúfis used strange and unusual expressions. He replied: "Forasmuch as this practice (i.e. Šúfism) is honoured by us, we were unwilling that any except Šúfis should be acquainted with it, and we did not wish to employ ordinary language. Therefore we invented a particular language" (T.A.).

⁴ T.A. i, 222, 2.

being added.¹ But the peculiar poetic imagery, which was afterwards developed by the famous Šúfī of Khurásán, Abú Sa'íd b. Abi'l-Khayr († 440 A.H.), is first found full-blown in the sayings of Báýazíd of Bistám († 261 A.H.). Yahyá b. Mu'ádh al-Rází wrote to Báýazíd: "I am intoxicated through having drunk deeply of the cup of His love," and Báýazíd replied: "Another has drunk the seas of heaven and earth, and is not yet satisfied, but his tongue comes forth and says, 'Is there no more?'"² Here are some striking examples of the same kind:—

"I went forth to the fields. Love had rained, and the earth was wet. My foot was sinking into Love, even as a man's foot sinks in clay."³

One day he was speaking of the Truth, and was sucking his lip and saying: "I am the wine-drinker and the wine and the cup-bearer."⁴

"Dost thou hear how there comes a voice from the brooks of running water? But when they reach the sea they are quiet, and the sea is neither augmented by their in-coming nor diminished by their out-going."⁵

"Desire is the capital of the Lovers' kingdom. In that capital there is set a throne of the torment of parting, and there is drawn a sword of the terror of separation, and there is laid on the hand of hope a branch of the narcissus of union; and every moment a thousand heads fall by that sword. And seven thousand years (said he) have passed, and that narcissus is still fresh and blooming: never has the hand of any hope attained thereto."⁶

2. As has been said, the germ, at any rate, of nearly all the characteristic Šúfī doctrines may be traced back to Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrī and his immediate predecessors. The idea of

¹ Qushayrī, 18, 8 from foot.

² Qushayrī, 171, 4 from foot.

³ T.A. i, 155, 9.

⁴ T.A. i, 159, 2.

⁵ T.A. i, 163, 7.

⁶ T.A. i, 166, 17.

ecstasy and self-annihilation was no doubt familiar to these early theosophists, but the doctrine, which became of vital importance in the subsequent history of Šúfism, is nowhere clearly stated by them. It was a Persian, the celebrated Báyzíd of Bistám, that first used the word *faná* denoting self-annihilation, and he may probably be regarded as the author of this doctrine.¹ Abú Yazíd Ṭayfúr b. 'Isá b. Ádam b. Surúshán² was born at Bistám, a town in the province of Qúmís situated near the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea. His grandfather was a Zoroastrian, and his master (*ustádh*) in Šúfism a Kurd.³ Báyzíd at first held the opinions of the *ašhábu'l-ra'y*, "but a saintship was revealed to him in which no positive religion (*madhhab*) appeared."⁴ If we can assume the genuineness of the sayings attributed to Báyzíd by Faridu'ddín 'Aṭṭár in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* (i, 134-179), he was not only an antinomian pantheist of the most extravagant type—a precursor of Ḥusayn b. Manšúr al-Ḥalláj—but also a singularly imaginative and profound thinker, not unworthy to be compared with men like 'Aṭṭár and Jalálu'ddín Rúmí. It is hard to say what proportion of the utterances collected by his biographers is fact and how much is fiction. 'Abdullah al-Anṣári of Herát († 481 A.H.) asserts that many falsehoods have been fathered on Báyzíd, e.g. his alleged saying, "I went into Heaven and pitched my tent opposite the Throne of God."⁵ Out of this grew the story of his ascension (*Mi'ráj*), which is told at great length by 'Aṭṭár (T.A. i, 172-176). Ibn Khallikán describes him as an ascetic pure and simple, but the

¹ According to Jámí (*Nafahát*, 81, 4 from foot) Abú Sa'íd al-Kharráz († 286 A.H.) was the first that spoke concerning the theory of *faná u baqá*, i.e. death to self and life in God.

² So Ibn Khallikán, Qushayrī, and Jámí. Yáqút (sub voc. Bistám) names him Abú Yazíd Ṭayfúr b. 'Isá b. Sharwasán, and says that he must not be confused with Abú Yazíd Ṭayfúr b. 'Isá b. Ádam, who is known as al-Bistámí al-ašghar.

³ The text of the *Nafahát* (62, penult. line) has گردی, but گردی is the correct reading.

⁴ *Nafahát*, 63, 1.

⁵ *Nafahátu'l-Uns*, 63, 1.

account of him given by Qushayrî, 'Aṭṭâr, and Jâmi is confirmed by what we know of his race and Magian ancestry. Bâyezîd, unless I am mistaken, became the legendary hero of Persian Sûfism just because he was in reality a thorough Persian and true representative of the religious aspirations of his countrymen. He it was who brought into Sûfism the extreme pantheistic ideas which even in Sâsânian times were widely prevalent in Persia.¹ This pantheistic (Perso-Indian) element is as distinctively Oriental as the older theosophical tendency is distinctively Greek.²

I shall now translate some of the most characteristic sayings ascribed to Bâyezîd, which illustrate (a) the doctrine of *fanâ*, (b) his uncompromising pantheism, (c) the poetical and imaginative colour of his thought.

(a) Creatures are subject to 'states' (*aḥwâl*), but the gnostic has no 'state,' because his vestiges are effaced and his essence is annihilated by the essence of another, and his traces are lost in another's traces.³

I went from God to God, until they cried from me in me, "O Thou I!"—i.e., I attained the stage of annihilation in God.⁴

Thirty years the high God was my mirror, now I am my own mirror—i.e., that which I was I am no more, for 'I' and 'God' is a denial of the Unity of God. Since I am no more, the high God is His own mirror. Lo, I say that God is the mirror of myself, for He speaks with my tongue and I have vanished.⁵

“

¹ Justi, *Gesch. des alten Persiens*, pp. 184 sqq. and 204 sqq.

² The monastic system of the Sûfis was, no doubt, formed to some extent on Buddhist models. In an interesting passage of the *Kitâb ul-Ḥayawân*, Jâhîz († 255 A.H.) speaks of the *رهبان الزنادقة*, "monks of the zindiqs," who travel in pairs, never passing two nights in the same place, and observing vows of holiness, chastity, truth, and poverty; and he tells an anecdote concerning two of them who entered *Aḥwâz* (Baron V. Rosen in *Zapiski*, vi, 337).

³ Qushayrî, 166, 1.

⁴ T.A. i, 160, 13.

⁵ T.A. i, 160, 16.

Nothing is better for Man than to be without aught, having no asceticism, no theory, no practice. When he is without all, he is with all.¹

They asked, "When does a man know that he has attained real gnosis?" He said: "At the time when he becomes annihilated under the knowledge of God, and is made everlasting on the carpet of God, without self and without creature."²

- (b) Verily, I am God, there is no God except me, so worship me!³ Glory to me! how great is my majesty!⁴

I came forth from Báyazíd-ness as a snake from its skin. Then I looked. I saw that lover, beloved, and love are one, for in the world of unification all can be one.⁵ He was asked, "What is the '*arsh*'?" He said, "I am it." "What is the '*kursi*'?" "I am it." "What is the Tablet and the Pen?" "I am they."⁶

- (c) It is related that he was asked, "How didst thou gain this rank, and by what means didst thou win unto this station?" He answered: "One night in my boyhood I came forth from Bistám. The moon was shining, and everything was still. I saw a Presence beside which the eighteen thousand worlds appeared as an atom. Agitation fell upon me, and a mighty emotion overwhelmed me. I cried, 'O Lord! a court of this grandeur, and so empty! Works of this sublimity, and such loneliness!' Then a voice came from heaven, saying, 'The court is empty, not because none comes, but because We do not will; since it is not everyone with face unwashed that is worthy to enter this court.'"⁷

For twelve years I was the smith of my soul. I put it in the furnace of austerity and burned it in the fire of combat and laid it on the anvil of reproach and

¹ T.A. i, 162, 21.

² T.A. i, 168, 24.

³ T.A. i, 137, 6.

⁴ T.A. i, 140, 14.

⁵ T.A. i, 160, 11.

⁶ T.A. i, 171, 18.

⁷ T.A. i, 155, 20.

smote upon it with the hammer of blame, until I made of my soul a mirror. Five years I was the mirror of myself, and was ever polishing that mirror with divers sorts of worship and piety. Then, for a year, I gazed in contemplation. On my waist I saw a girdle¹ of pride and vanity and self-conceit, and reliance on devotion, and approbation of my works. I laboured for five years more, until that girdle became cut and I professed Islam anew. I looked and saw that all created things were dead. I pronounced four *takbirs* over them and returned from the funeral of them all, and without intrusion of creature, through God's help alone, I attained unto God.²

With the exception of Báyazíd and Abú Sa'íd al-Kharráz, the Šúfis of the third century keep the doctrine of *faná* in the background and seldom use the language of unguarded pantheism. They are anxious to harmonise Šúfism with Islam, to hold an even balance between the Law and the Truth. Of course they do not succeed in this, but the necessity is felt of maintaining a certain reserve. While Báyazíd and his followers, called Tayfúris (طيفوريان), spoke and acted as God-intoxicated men, the great majority of Šúfis at this time agreed with Junayd in preferring "the path of sobriety." The Koran and the Sunna were proclaimed to be the standard to which, not speculation only, but also spiritual feelings and states

¹ The girdle (*zunmár*) is the symbol of Zoroastrianism, i.e. of duality.

² T.A. i, 139, 5. It is instructive to compare this poetical description of the mystic's ascent with the Arabic version (Qushayrî, 56, penultimate line):

قال ابو يزيد كُنْتُ ثِنْتَيْ عَشْرَةَ سَنَةً حَدَادَ نَفْسِي وَخَمْسَ سَنِينَ
 كُنْتُ مَرَأَةً قَلْبِي وَسَنَةً أَنْظُرُ فِيمَا بَيْنَهُمَا فَاذَا فِي وَسْطِي زُنَّارٌ ظَاهِرٌ
 فَعَمَلْتُ فِي قِطْعِهِ ثِنْتَيْ عَشْرَةَ سَنَةً ثُمَّ نَظَرْتُ فَاذَا فِي بَاطِنِي زُنَّارٌ
 فَعَمَلْتُ فِي قِطْعِهِ خَمْسَ سَنِينَ أَنْظُرُ كَيْفَ أَقْطَعُهُ فَكُشِفَ لِي فَنَظَرْتُ
 إِلَى الْخَلْقِ فَرَأَيْتَهُمْ مَوْتَى فَكَبَّرْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَرْبَعَ تَكْبِيرَاتٍ

must conform.¹ Great stress was laid on the ascetic, moral, and devotional aspects of Šúfiism. "Our principles," said Sahl b. 'Abdullah al-Tustarí, "are six: to hold fast by the Book of God, to model ourselves upon the Apostle (may God bless him and his family and grant them peace!), to eat only what is lawful, to refrain from hurting people even though they hurt us, to avoid forbidden things, and to fulfil obligations without delay."² "We derived Šúfiism," said Junayd, "not from disputation, but from hunger and abandonment of the world and the breaking of familiar ties and the renunciation of what men account good."³ On the other hand, it was recognised that when the Šúfí, after painfully mounting the steps of the mystic ladder, at last reached the summit of Divine knowledge, all his words and actions were holy and in harmony with the spirit of the Divine law, however they might seem to conflict with its letter. Hence "the hypocrisy of gnostics is better than the sincerity of neophytes."⁴

To recapitulate the main points which I have endeavoured to bring out—

- (1) Šúfiism, in the sense of 'mysticism' and 'quietism,' was a natural development of the ascetic tendencies which manifested themselves within Islam during the Umayyad period.
- (2) This asceticism was not independent of Christian influence, but on the whole it may be called a Muḥammadan product, and the Šúfiism which grew out of it is also essentially Muḥammadan.
- (3) Towards the end of the second century A.H. a new current of ideas began to flow into Šúfiism. These ideas, which are non-Islamic and theosophical in character, are discernible in the sayings of Ma'rúf al-Karkhí († 200 A.H.).

¹ See, for example, Qushayrî, 17, 4 from foot = *Nafahât*, 43, 3 from foot; T.A. 329, 2; Qushayrî, 22, 10 sqq.

² T.A. i, 261, 4.

³ Qushayrî, 21, penultimate line.

⁴ Qushayrî, 112, 18.

- (4) During the first half of the third century A.H. the new ideas were greatly developed and became the dominating element in Šúfiism.
- (5) The man who above all others gave to the Šúfi doctrine its permanent shape was Dhu'l-Nún al-Miṣrī († 245 A.H.).
- (6) The historical environment in which this doctrine arose points clearly to Greek philosophy as the source from which it was derived.
- (7) Its origin must be sought in Neo-Platonism and Gnosticism.
- (8) As the theosophical element in Šúfiism is Greek, so the extreme pantheistic ideas, which were first introduced by Abú Yazíd (Báyazíd) al-Bisṭámí († 261 A.H.), are Persian or Indian. The doctrine of *faná* (self-annihilation) is probably derived from the Buddhistic Nirvana.
- (9) During the latter part of the third century A.H. Šúfiism became an organised system, with teachers, pupils, and rules of discipline; and continual efforts were made to show that it was based on the Koran and the Traditions of the Prophet.

II.

The following list of definitions, which occur in the *Risála* of Qushayrī, the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá* of Farídu'ddín 'Aṭṭár, and the *Nafahátu'l-Uns* of Jámí, is tolerably complete, but I have omitted a few of comparatively modern date and minor interest, as well as several anonymous definitions to which no date can be assigned. It will be seen that from the first definition, by Ma'rúf al-Karkhí († 200 A.H.), to the last, by Abú Sa'id b. Abi'l-Khayr († 440 A.H.), a period of almost two and a half centuries comes into reckoning. The definitions are of all sorts—theosophical, pantheistic, ethical, epigrammatic, etymological. No one nowadays is likely to dispute the derivation of 'Šúfí' from *šúf* (wool), but these

definitions show very plainly that such was not the view taken by the Šúfis themselves, for against a single case in which the word is connected with *šúf* there are twelve which allude to its supposed derivation from *ṣafá* (purity). Some definitions occur only in Arabic, others only in Persian, and a large number in both languages. I have always given the Arabic version whenever I found it in Qushayrī's *Risāla* or in the *Nafahātu'l-Uns*. Doubtless it would be possible to discover an Arabic original for most of the Persian definitions preserved in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá*, if similar works in Arabic were thoroughly searched.

1. Ma'rúf al-Karkhí († 200 A.H.) :

التصوّف الأخذ بالحقائق واليأس ممّا في أيدي الخلائق

Taṣawwuf is: to grasp the verities and to renounce that which is in the hands of men. (Qushayrī, 149, 1; T.A. i, 272, 4.)

2. Abú Sulaymán al-Dárání († 215 A.H.) :

تصوّف آنست که بروی افعال می رود که جز خدای نداند
و پیوسته با خدای بون جنانک جز خدای نداند

Taṣawwuf is this: that actions should be passing over the Šúfī (i.e. being done upon him) which are known to God only, and that he should always be with God in a way that is known to God only. (T.A. i, 233, 19.)

3. Bishr al-Ḥáfí († 227 A.H.) :

صوف آنست که دل صافی دارن با خدای

The Šúfī is he that keeps a pure heart towards God. (T.A. i, 112, 13.)

4. Dhu'l-Nún († 245 A.H.) :

سئل ذو النون عن التصوّف فقال هم قوم آثروا الله عز وجل على كل شيء فآثرهم الله عز وجل على كل شيء *

He was asked concerning Taṣawwuf, and he said: "They (the Šúfis) are folk who have preferred God to everything, so that God has preferred them to everything." (Qushayrī, 149, 20; T.A. i, 133, 10.)

5. Dhu'l-Nún :

صوف آن بون که جون بگویند نطقش حقائق حال وی بون یعنی
جیزی نگویند که او آن نباشد و جون خاموش باشد معاملتش معبر
حال وی بون و بقطع علایق حال وی ناطق بون

The Ṣūfī is such that, when he speaks, his language is the essence of his state, that is, he speaks no thing without being that thing; and when he is silent his behaviour interprets his state and is eloquent of the detachedness of his state. (T.A. i, 126, 13.)

6. Abú Turáb al-Nakhshabí († 245 A.H.) :

الصوف لا يكدّرهُ شىءٌ ويصفو به كلُّ شىءٍ

The Ṣūfī is not defiled by anything, and everything is purified by him. (Qushayrī, 149, 19.)

7. Sarī al-Saqaṭī († 257 A.H.) :

التصوّف اسمٌ لثلاث معاني وهو الذى لا يُطفى نور معرفته نور ورعه
ولا يتكلّم بباطنٍ فى علمٍ يَنْقُصُهُ عليه ظاهر الكتاب او السنّة ولا تحمله
الكرامات على هتك استار محارم الله

Taṣawwuf is a name including three ideas. The Ṣūfī is he whose light of divine knowledge (gnosis) does not extinguish the light of his piety; he does not utter esoteric doctrine which is contradicted by the exterior sense of the Koran and the Sunna; and the miracles vouchsafed to him do not cause him to violate the holy ordinances of God. (Qushayrī, 12, 1; T.A. i, 282, 20.)

8. Abú Ḥafṣ al-Ḥaddād († *circa* 265 A.H.) :

تصوّف همه ادب است

Taṣawwuf is wholly discipline. (T.A. i, 331, 6.)

9. Sahl b. 'Abdullah al-Tustarī († 283 A.H.) :

الصوفى من يرى دمه هذرا وملكه مباحا

The Ṣūfī is he that regards his blood as shed with impunity and his property as lawful prey. (Qushayrī, 149, 9.)

10. Sahl b. 'Abdullah al-Tustarī:

صوفی آن بون که صافی شود از کدر و بُر شود از فِگرو در قرب
خدای منقطع شود از بشر و یکسان شود در چشم او خاک و زر

The Ṣūfī is he that is purged of defilement and is filled with meditations, and in the vicinity of God is cut off from mankind; and earth and gold are equal in his eyes. (T.A. i, 264, 1.)¹

11. Sahl b. 'Abdullah al-Tustarī:

تصوّف اندک خوردن است و با خدای آرام گرفتن و از خلق
گریختن

Taṣawwuf is: to eat little, and to take rest with God, and to flee from men. (T.A. i, 264, 3.)

12. Abú Sa'íd al-Kharraz († 286 A.H.):

برسیدند از تصوّف گفت آنست که صاف بون از خداوند خویش
و بُر بون از انوار و در عین لذّت بون از ذکر

They asked concerning Taṣawwuf. He said: "The Ṣūfī is made pure by his Lord, and is filled with splendours, and is in the quintessence of delight from praise of God." (T.A.)

13. Sumnún al-Muhibb († before 297 A.H.):²

سئل سمنون عن التصوّف فقال أن لا تملك شيئاً ولا يملكك شيءٌ

¹ The Arabic original is given by Suhrawardī in the *'Awārif* 'l-*Ma'ārif*:
الصوفى من صفا من الكدر وامتلا من الفكر وانقطع الى الله من
البشر واستوى عنده الذهب والمدر

² According to Zakariyyā al-Anṣarī († 926 A.H.), who wrote a commentary on Qushayrī's *Risāla*, سمنون is generally pronounced Sumnún. This saying is attributed to Ruwaym in the *Nafahāt*, p. 105, last line.

Sumnún was asked concerning Taṣawwuf. He answered:

“It is this, that thou shouldst possess nothing and that nothing should possess thee.” (Qushayrī, 148, 6 from foot.)

14. ‘Amr b. ‘Uthmán al-Makkí († 291 A.H.):

سئل عمرو بن عثمان المكي عن التصوف فقال أن يكون العبد في كل وقت مشغولاً بما هو أولى به في الوقت

‘Amr b. ‘Uthmán al-Makkí was asked concerning Taṣawwuf. He said: “A man should always be occupied with that which is most suitable to him at the time.” (Qushayrī, 148, 8 from foot.)¹

15. Abu’l-Husayn al-Núrí († 295 A.H.):

نعت الصوفي السكون عند العدم والايثار عند الوجود

It is the attribute of the Ṣúfī to be at rest when he has nothing, and unselfish when he finds anything. (Qushayrī, 149, 9.)²

16. Abu’l-Husayn al-Núrí:

صوفیان آن قوم اند که جان ایشان از کدورت بشریت آزاد گشته است و از آفت نفس صافی شده و از هوا خلاص یافته تا در صف اول و درجه اعلی با حق بیارامیده اند و از غیر او رمیده نه مالک بودند و نه مملوک

يقولون الصوفي ابن وقته يريدون بذلك أنه

¹ Cf. Qushayrī, 36, 21: “مشتغل بما هو أولى به في الحال” They say, ‘The Ṣúfī is the son of his time,’ meaning thereby that he occupies himself with what is most suitable to him at the moment.” In other words, he must let himself be a passive instrument of the Divine energy.

² Or, “to be at rest when he is non-existent, and to prefer (non-existence) when he is existent.” Probably عدم and وجود are not used here solely in their philosophical sense.

The Súfis are they whose souls have become free from the defilement of humanity and pure from the taint of self, and have obtained release from lust, so that they are at rest with God in the first rank and in the highest degree, and having fled from all besides Him they are neither masters nor slaves. (T.A.)

17. Abu'l-Husayn al-Núrí :

صوفی آن بوند که هیچیز در بند او نبوند و او در بند هیچیز نشوند

The Súfi is he to whom nothing is attached, and who does not become attached to anything. (T.A.)

18. Abu'l-Husayn al-Núrí :

تصوّف نه رسوم است و نه علوم لیکن اخلاقی است یعنی اگر رسم بوندی بمجاهده بدست آمدی و اگر علم بوندی بتعلیم حاصل شدی بلک اخلاقی است که تخلقوا بأخلاق الله و بخلق خدای بیرون آمدن نه برسوم دست دهد و نه بعلوم

Taşawwuf is not a system composed of rules or sciences, but it is morals: i.e., if it were a rule it could be made one's own by strenuous exertion, and if it were a science it could be acquired by instruction; but, on the contrary, it is morals—*form yourselves on the moral nature of God*; and it is impossible to come forth to the moral nature of God either by means of rules or by means of sciences. (T.A.)

19. Abu'l-Husayn al-Núrí :

تصوّف آزادی است و جوانمردی و ترک تکلف و سخاوت

Taşawwuf is freedom, and generosity, and absence of self-constraint, and liberality. (T.A.)

20. Abu'l-Husayn al-Núrí :

تصوّف ترک جملة نصیبهاء نفس است برای نصیب حق

Taşawwuf is, to renounce all selfish gains in order to gain the Truth. (T.A.)

21. Abu'l-Ḥusayn al-Nūrī:

تصوّف دشمنی دنیا است و دوستی مولی

Taṣawwuf is hatred of the world and love of the Lord.
(T.A.)

22. Junayd al-Baghdādī († 297 A.H.):

هو أن يميتك الحق عنك ويحييك به

It (Taṣawwuf) is this: that the Truth (i.e. God) should make thee die from thyself and should make thee live in Him. (Qushayrī, 148, 19.)

23. Junayd:

هو أن تكون مع الله بلا علاقة

It is this: to be with God without attachment (to aught else). (Qushayrī, 148, 4 from foot.)

24. Junayd:

التصوّف عنوة لا صلح فيها

Taṣawwuf is violence: there is no peace in it.
(Qushayrī, 149, 5.)¹

25. Junayd:

هم أهل بيت واحد لا يدخل فيهم غيرهم

They (the Ṣūfīs) are one family: no stranger enters among them. (Qushayrī, 149, 5.)

26. Junayd:

التصوّف ذكر مع اجتماع ووجد مع استماع وعمل مع اتباع

Taṣawwuf is praise of God with concentration (of thought), and ecstasy connected with hearing (of

¹ Cf. Ruwaym's saying: (read تناقروا) ما تزال الصوفيّة بخير ما تناقروا (Qushayrī, 149, 17), the meaning of which is explained by 'Abdullah al-Anṣārī in the *Nafaḥāt*, 84, 5 sqq.

the Koran, Traditions, or the like), and practice accompanied with conformity (to the Koran and the Sunna). (Qushayrî, 149, 6.)

27. Junayd :

الصوفى كالارض يطرح عليها كل قبيح ولا يخرج منها الا كل مليم

The Şúfî is like the earth, on which every foul thing is thrown and from which only fair things come forth. (Qushayrî, 149, 6.)

28. Junayd :

انه كالارض يطؤها البتر والفاجر والسحاب يظل كل شىء وكالقطر يسقى كل شىء

Verily, he (the Şúfî) is like the earth which is trodden by the pious and the wicked, and like the clouds which cast a shadow over everything, and like the rain which waters everything. (Qushayrî, 149, 7.)

29. Junayd :

تصوّف اصطفا است هرکه گزیده شد از ما سوى الله او صوفى است

Taşawwuf is : to be chosen for purity. Whoever is thus chosen (and made pure) from all except God is a Şúfî. (T.A.)

30. Junayd :

صوفى آنست كسى دل او جون دل ابراهيم سلامت يافته بون از دنيا وبجای آرندۀ فرمان خدای بون و تسليم او تسليم اسمعيل و اندوه او اندوه داود و فقر او فقر عيسى و صبر او صبر ايوب و شوق او شوق موسى در وقت مناجات و اخلاص او اخلاص محمد صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وسلم

The Şúfî is he whose heart, like the heart of Abraham, has found salvation from the world and is fulfilling

God's commandment; his resignation is the resignation of Ishmael; his sorrow is the sorrow of David; his poverty is the poverty of Jesus; his longing is the longing of Moses in the hour of communion; and his sincerity is the sincerity of Muḥammad—God bless him and his family and grant them peace! (T.A.)

31. Junayd :

تصوّف نعتی است که اقامت بنده در آنست گفتند نعت
حق است یا نعت خلق گفت حقیقتش نعت حق است
ورسمش نعت خلق

"Taṣawwuf is an attribute wherein man abides." They said, "Is it an attribute of God or of His creatures?" He answered: "Its essence is an attribute of God and its system is an attribute of mankind." (T.A.)

32. Junayd :

برسیدند از ذات تصوّف گفت بر تو بماند که ظاهرش بگیری و از
ذاتش نبرسی که ستم کردن بروی بود

They asked about the essence of Taṣawwuf. He said: "Do thou lay hold of its exterior and ask not concerning its essence, for that were to do violence to it." (T.A.)

33. Junayd :

صوفیان آنند که قیام ایشان بخداوند است از آنجا که نداند الا او

The Ṣūfīs are they who subsist by God in such sort that none knoweth but only He. (T.A.)

34. Junayd :

تصوّف صافی کردن دلست از مراجعت خلقت و مفارقت از
اخلاق طبیعت و فرو میرانیدن صفات بشریّت و دور بودن از
دوای نفسانی و فرون آمدن بر صفات روحانی و بلند شدن بعلم

حقیقی و بکار داشتن آنچه اولیترست إلی الابد و نصیحت کردن
جمله امت و وفا بجای آوردن بر حقیقت و متابعت بیغمبر کردن
در شریعت

Taşawwuf is : to purify the heart from the recurrence of inborn weakness, and to take leave of one's natural characteristics, and to extinguish the attributes of humanity, and to hold aloof from sensual temptations, and to dwell with the spiritual attributes, and to mount aloft by means of the Divine sciences, and to practise that which is eternally the best, and to bestow sincere counsel on the whole people, and faithfully to observe the Truth, and to follow the Prophet in respect of the Law.¹ (T.A.)

35. *Mimshád al-Dínawarí* († 299 A.H.) :

تصوّف صفای اسرار است و عمل کردن بذآنچه رضای جبار است
و صحبت داشتن با خلق بی اختیار است

Taşawwuf is purity of heart, and to do what is pleasing to God Almighty, and to have no personal volition although you mix with men. (T.A.)

36. *Mimshád al-Dínawarí* :

تصوّف توانگری نمودنست و مجهولی گزیدن که خلقت ندانند
و دست برداشتن از چیزی که بکار نیاید

Taşawwuf is : to make a show of wealth,² and to prefer being unknown, that people may not recognise thee, and to abstain from everything useless. (T.A.)

37. *Abú Muḥammad Ruwaym* († 303 A.H.) :

سئل رُوَيْمٌ عَنِ التَّصَوُّفِ فَقَالَ اسْتِرْسَالُ النَّفْسِ مَعَ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى عَلَى
مَا يَرِيدُ

¹ This definition is ascribed by Sha'rání (*Lawdqih*, p. 160) to Abú 'Abdullah b. Khafif.

² I.e. for fear of becoming known as a dervish. It is told of Ruwaym that "towards the end of his life he hid himself among the rich, but thereby he was not veiled from God."

Ruwaym was asked concerning Taṣawwuf. He replied :
 "It is the self-abandonment of the soul with God according to His will." (Qushayrī, 148, fifth line from foot.)

38. Ruwaym :

التَّصَوُّفُ مَبْنِيٌّ عَلَى ثَلَاثِ خِصَالٍ التَّمَسُّكُ بِالْفَقْرِ وَالْإِفْتِقَارِ وَالتَّحَقُّقُ
 بِالْبَذْلِ وَالْإِثَارِ وَتَرْكُ التَّعَرُّضِ وَالْإِخْتِيَارِ

Taṣawwuf is based on three qualities : a tenacious attachment to poverty and indigence ; a profound sense of sacrifice and renunciation ; and absence of self-obtrusion and personal volition. (Qushayrī, 148, last line.)

39. 'Alī b. Sahl al-Iṣfahānī († 307 A.H.) :

التَّصَوُّفُ التَّبَرُّى عَمَّنْ دُونَهُ وَالتَّخَلُّى عَمَّنْ سِوَاهُ

Taṣawwuf is : to become quit of all persons save Him, and to make one's self clear of others except Him. (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 116, 1.)

40. Ḥusayn b. Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj († 309 A.H.) :

سُئِلَ عَنِ الصُّوفِيِّ فَقَالَ وَحْدَانِيَّ الذَّاتِ لَا يَقْبَلُهُ أَحَدٌ وَلَا يَقْبَلُ أَحَدًا

He was asked concerning the Ṣūfī, and he answered :
 "One essentially unique ; none turns towards him, nor does he turn towards anyone." (Qushayrī, 148, 21.)

41. Abū Muḥammad al-Jurayrī († 311 A.H.) :

سُئِلَ أَبُو مُحَمَّدٍ الْجُرَيْرِيُّ عَنِ التَّصَوُّفِ فَقَالَ الدَّخُولُ فِي كُلِّ خُلُقٍ
 سِنِّيَّ وَالْخُرُوجُ مِنْ كُلِّ خُلُقٍ دِنِّيَّ

Abū Muḥammad al-Jurayrī was asked concerning Taṣawwuf. He said : "It is to enter into every lofty disposition and to go forth from every low disposition." (Qushayrī, 148, 16.)

42. Abú Muḥammad al-Jurayrí :

التصوّف مراقبة الاحوال ولزوم الأدب

Taşawwuf is : to be observant (of God) in all circumstances and to be constant in self - discipline. (Qushayrî, 149, 18.)

43. Abú 'Amr al-Dimashqî († 320 A.H.) :

التصوّف رؤية الكون بعين النقص بل غصّ الطرف عن كلّ ناقص
بمشاهدة من هو منزّه عن كلّ نقص

Taşawwuf is : to behold the imperfection of the phenomenal world, nay, to close the eye to everything imperfect in contemplation of Him who is remote from all imperfection. (*Nafahātu'l - Uns*, 175, 14.)

44. Abú Bakr al-Kattání († 322 A.H.) :

التصوّف خُلُقٌ فمن زاد عليك في الخُلُقِ فقد زاد عليك في الصفاء

Taşawwuf is a good disposition : he that exceeds thee in goodness of disposition has exceeded thee in purity of heart. (Qushayrî, 149, 10.)¹

45. Abú Bakr al-Kattání :

تصوّف صفوة است و مشاهدة

Taşawwuf is purity and spiritual vision. (T.A.)

46. Abú Bakr al-Kattání :

صوفي کسی است که طاعت او نزدیک او جنایت بود که از آن
استغفار باید کرد

The Ṣufî is he that regards his devotion as a crime for which it behoves him to ask pardon of God. (T.A.)

¹ In the T.A. this definition is rendered : تصوّف همه خُلُق است
هرکرا خُلُق بیشتر تصوّف بیشتر

47. Abú 'Alí al-Rúdhbá'í († 322 A.H.):

التَّصَوُّفُ الْإِنَاخَةُ عَلَى بَابِ الْحَبِيبِ وَإِنْ طُرِدَ عَنْهُ

Taşawwuf is: to alight and abide at the Beloved's door, even though one is driven away therefrom. (Qushayrî, 149, 11.)

48. Abú 'Alí al-Rúdhbá'í:

وَقَالَ أَيْضًا صَفْوَةُ الْقُرْبِ بَعْدَ كَدُورَةِ الْبُعْدِ

And he said also: "It is the purity of nearness (to God) after the defilement of farness." (Qushayrî, 149, 12.)

49. Abú 'Alí al-Rúdhbá'í:—

صُوفِي أَنْسَتْ كَهْ صُوفٍ بَوْشَذْ بَصْفًا وَبَجْشَانْذْ نَفْسًا رَا طَعْمَ جَفَا
وَبِينْدَارْذْ دَنِيَارًا اَزْ بَسْ قَفَا وَسَلُوكَ كَنْدِ طَرِيقِ مُصْطَفَا

The Şúfî is he that wears wool with purity of heart, and makes his 'self' taste the food of maltreatment, and casts the world behind his back, and travels in the path of Muṣṭafá.¹ (T.A.)

50. 'Abdullah b. Muḥammad al-Murta'ish († 328 A.H.).

اَزْ وَیْ بَرَسِیدَنْدْ كَهْ تَصَوُّفْ چِیْسْتْ گُفْتْ اِشْكَالْ وَ تَلْبِیْسْ وَ كَنْمَانْ

They asked him, "What is Taşawwuf?" He replied, "It is ambiguity and deception and concealment." (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 230, last line.)

51. 'Abdullah b. Muḥammad al-Murta'ish:

صُوفِي أَنْسَتْ كَى صَافٍ شَوْنْ اَزْ جَمَلَهٗ بَلَاهَا وَ غَايِبْ گُردَنْ اَزْ جَمَلَهٗ
عَطَاها

The Şúfî is he that becomes pure from all tribulations and absent (in spirit) from all gifts. (T.A.)

¹ Muṣṭafá, i.e. the Chosen One = the Prophet Muḥammad. This saying, as quoted here, occurs in the Supplement to the T.A. It is also found (with omission of the final clause) in the body of that work, where it is ascribed to Abú 'Abdullah b. Khafîf († 331 A.H.).

52. Abu'l-Hasan al-Muzayyin († 328 A.H.):

التصوّف الانتیاد للحق

Taşawwuf is, to let one's self be led to the Truth.
(Qushayrî, 149, 18.)

53. Abú 'Abdullah b. Khafîf († 331 A.H.¹):

تصوّف صبرست در سخت مجاری اقدار و فرا گرفتن از دست
جبار و قطع کردن بیابان و کوهسار

Taşawwuf is patience under the events of destiny, and
acceptance from the hand of Almighty God, and
travelling over desert and highland. (T.A.)

54. Abú Bakr al-Wásitî († after 320 A.H.):

صوف آنست که سخن از اعتبار گوید و ستر او منور شده باشد بفکرت

The Şúfî is he that speaks from consideration, and
whose inmost heart has become illuminated by
reflection. (T.A.)

55. Abú Bakr al-Shiblî († 334 A.H.):

التصوّف الجلوس مع الله بلا هم

Taşawwuf is, to sit with God without care.² (Qushayrî,
149, 13.)

56. Abú Bakr al-Shiblî:

الصوفى منقطع عن الخلق متصل بالحق كقوله تعالى وَأَصْطَفَيْنَكَ
لِنَفْسِي قطعهُ عن كلّ غير ثم قال لَنْ تَرَانِي

The Şúfî is separated from mankind and united with
God, as God hath said, "*And I chose thee for myself*,"³
i.e. He separated him from all others; then he said,
"*Thou shalt not see Me*."⁴ (Qushayrî, 149, 15.)

¹ So Jámî. Qushayrî gives the date of his death as 391 A.H.

² In the *Nafahát*, 90, 4 from foot, this definition is attributed to Junayd.

³ Koran, xx, 43.

⁴ Koran, vii, 139.

57. Abú Bakr al-Shiblí :

التصوّف بركة مُحَرَّقة

Taşawwuf is a burning flash of lightning. (Qushayrî, 149, 16.)

58. Abú Bakr al-Shiblí :

الصوفيّة اطفالٌ في حجر الحقّ

The Şúfis are children in the bosom of God. (Qushayrî, 149, 16.)

59. Abú Bakr al-Shiblí :

هو عِصْمَةٌ عن رؤية الكون

It (Taşawwuf) is, to be guarded from seeing the phenomenal world. (Qushayrî, 149, 16.)

60. Abú Bakr al-Shiblí :

تصوّف آنست که جنان باشد که آن زمان که بوجود نیامده بود.

Taşawwuf is this: that the Şúfî should be even as he was before he came into existence. (T.A.)

61. Abú Bakr al-Shiblí :

تصوّف ضبط قوئى است و مراعات انفس

Taşawwuf is control of the faculties and observance of the breaths.¹ (T.A.)

62. Abú Bakr al-Shiblí :

صوفى وقتى صوفى باشد که جمله خلایق را عیال خود بیند

The Şúfî is a true Şúfî only when he regards all mankind as his own family. (T.A.)

¹ The practice of holding the breath, like that of carrying rosaries (Qushayrî, 22, 19), seems to be of Indian origin (cf. Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge*, p. 48 sqq.). Among the sayings of Báyazîd al-Bistāmî we find, "For gnostics, worship is observance of the breaths" (T.A. i, 162, 10).

63. Abú Sa'id Ibnu'l-A'rabi († 340 A.H.):

التصوّف كُله ترك الفُصول

The whole of the Taṣawwuf consists in abandonment of superfluities. (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 248, 2.)

64. Abu'l-Hasan al-Búshanjī († 347 A.H.):

برسیدند از تصوّف گفت کوتاهی امل است و مداومت بر عمل

They asked concerning Taṣawwuf. He answered:
"Deficiency of hope and incessant devotion to work." (T.A.)

65. Ja'far al-Khuldī († 348 A.H.):

تصوّف طرح نفس است در عبودیّت و بیرون آمدن از بشریّت
و نظر کردن بخدای بکلیّت

Taṣawwuf is, to throw one's self into servility and to come forth from humanity, and to look towards God with entirety. (T.A.)

66. Abú 'Amr b. al-Najid († 366 A.H.):

تصوّف صبر کردنست در تحت امر و نهی

Taṣawwuf is to be patient under commandment and prohibition. (T.A.)

67. Abú 'Abdullah al-Rúdhbárá († 369 A.H.):

التصوّف ترك التكلّف واستعمال التظرف وحذف التشرف

Taṣawwuf is, to renounce ceremony, and to use an affected elegance,¹ and to discard vainglory. (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 300, 11.)

68. Abú Muhammad al-Rásibí († 367 A.H.):

لا يكون الصوفى صوفياً حتى لا يُقِلَّه أرض ولا يُظِلَّه سماء ولا يكون
له قبول عند الخلق ويكون مرجعه في كل الأحوال الى الحق تعالى

¹ Elegance was a characteristic of the *zindiqs*. Some Sufis, e.g. the Malámatís, pretended to be *zindiqs* in order to escape the reputation of holiness.

The Ṣúfí is not a Ṣúfí until no earth supports him, and no heaven shadows him; until he finds no favour with mankind; and until his resort in all circumstances is to the most high God. (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 304, 8.)

69. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Ḥuṣrî († 371 A.H.):

[خلیفه] گفت تصوّف چه باشد گفت آنکه از جهان بدون حق بهیچ چیز آرام نگیرد و نیاساید و آنکه کار خود با او گذارد که خداوندست و او خود بقضای خویش توّل میکند فما ذا بعد الحقّ الا الضلال چون خداوند را یافت بهیچ چیز دیگر باز ننگرد

The Caliph said, "What is Taṣawwuf?" He answered: "It is this, that the Ṣúfí does not take rest or comfort in anything in the world except God, and that he commits his affairs to Him who is the Lord and who Himself oversees that which He has predestined. What remains after God unless error? When he has found the Lord, he does not again regard any other thing." (T.A.)

70. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Ḥuṣrî:

صوفی آنست که چون از آفات فانی گشت با سرّ آن نشود و چون روی فرا حق کرد از آن نَبِیّتند و حوادث روزگار را درو اثر نباشد

The Ṣúfí is he that, having once become dead to (worldly) taints, does not go back thereto, and having once turned his face Godward, does not relapse therefrom; and passing events in no wise affect him. (T.A.)

71. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Ḥuṣrî:

صوفی آنست که وجد او وجود او است و صفات او حجاب اوست یعنی من عرف نفسه فقد عرف ربه

The Ṣúfí is he whose ecstasy is his (real) existence, and whose attributes are his veil, i.e., if a man knows himself, he knows his Lord. (T.A.)

72. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Ḥuṣrī :

صوفی آنست که اورا موجود نیابند بعد از وجود خویش

The Ṣūfī is he whom they do not find existent after their own existence.¹ (T.A.)

73. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Ḥuṣrī :

تصوّف صفای دلست از کدورت مخالقات

Taṣawwuf is, to have a heart pure from the defilement of oppositions. (T.A.)

74. Abú 'Uthmán al-Maghribí († 373 A.H.) :

تصوّف قطع علائق است ورفض خلائق و اتصال حقایق

Taṣawwuf is severance of ties and rejection of created things and union with the (Divine) realities. (T.A.)

75. Abū'l-'Abbás al-Naháwandí († about 400 A.H.) :

تصوّف پنهان داشتن حالست و جاه بذل کردن بر برادران

Taṣawwuf is, to keep one's state hidden and to bestow honour on one's brethren. (T.A.)

76. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Khurqání († 425 A.H.) :

صوفی بمرقع و سجاده صوفی نبود و صوفی برسوم و عادات صوفی نبود

صوفی آن بود که نبود

The Ṣūfī is not a Ṣūfī in virtue of patched cloak and prayer-carpet, and the Ṣūfī is not a Ṣūfī by rules and customs; the true Ṣūfī is he that is nothing. (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 337, 6.)

77. Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Khurqání :

صوفی روزی بود که بآفتابش حاجت نبود و شبی که بماه

و ستاره اش حاجت نبود و نیستی است که بهستیش حاجت نبود

¹ I.e. he only exists in God.

The Šúfí is a day that needs no sun, and a night that needs no moon or star, and a not-being that needs no being. (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 337, 7.)

78. Abú Sa'íd b. Abi'l-Khayr († 440 A.H.):

شیخ را پرسیدند که تصوّف چیست گفت آنچه در سر داری
بنهی و آنچه در کف داری بدهی و آنچه بر تو آید نبهی

They asked the Shaykh, "What is Taṣawwuf?" He said: "To lay aside what thou hast in thy head, to give what thou hast in thy hand, and not to recoil from whatsoever befalls thee." (*Nafahātu'l-Uns*, 345, 12.)

XII.

AURANGZEB'S REVENUES.

By H. BEVERIDGE.

THE late Mr. Edward Thomas made an examination of the revenues of the Moghal Empire, and, among other things, gave tables for Aurangzeb's revenues for the years 1654-5, 1663-4 (?), 1697, and 1707. But he omitted to notice the statistics given in the *Mirātu-l-'Aālam*, and which relate, apparently, to the year 1078 A.H. or 1668 A.D. They are very full, and appear to have been carefully compiled. The author, whether he was *Bakhtāwar Khān* or, as is more likely, Muhammad Baqā, was in Aurangzeb's service and had good opportunities of acquiring information. The paragraphs have been translated by Sir Henry Elliot, and appear in his *History*, vol. vii, pp. 162 et seq., but his manuscript was probably not perfect, and the translation is not quite correct. Lately I have been reading the paragraphs in the copy of the *Mirāt* belonging to our Society and described by Mr. Morley, and I have also consulted the MSS. in the British Museum. The account begins in what the writer calls the Third *Numāyish* of the Seventh *Ārāyish*, and at p. 252*b* of the R.A.S. copy. First, the length and breadth of the empire are given both in royal (*bādshāhī*) *kos* and in ordinary (*rasmī*) *kos*, that is, *kos* commonly used in most parts of India; the writer stating that the royal *kos* is one of 5,000 cubits (*zarā'*) of the dimension of 42 finger-breadths, and that 2 such *kos* are equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ ordinary *kos*. Here it may be parenthetically remarked that Oriental writers commonly call the distance from west to east length, and that from north to south breadth, a mode of speaking which seems to agree with the etymology of the words

longitude and latitude. According to the *Mirāt*, then, the length of the empire from *Lāharī Bandar* in Scinde to *Bandāsāl thāna* in Bengal was 994 royal kos or 1,740 common ones, and the breadth from the Tibet frontier and Cashmere to the fort of *Sholāpūr* was 672 royal kos or 1,176 common ones. As regards the first of these starting-points, *Lāharī Bandar* was a port, now deserted, at an old mouth of the Indus, for an account of which see Elliot, i, Appendix, p. 374, but *Bindāsāl*, or *Bandāsāl*, I have not been able to identify. In *Tiefenthaler*, vol. i, pp. 19 and 20, it appears as *Bandanil*, and is described as 30 kos from *Sylhet*, and as on the frontiers of *Cachar*. In the *Mirāt* it is also described as 30 kos from *Sylhet*, and I presume this means in an easterly direction. I think that the proper spelling must be *Bandāsāl*, and not *Bindāsāl* as in Elliot, and that the word may be compared with the names *Bhītarband* and *Bāhirband* given to two tracts in the *Rungpore* district. Possibly the true spelling should be *Bandāṣāl*, and the meaning is *Terminus* or the *True Boundary*. The 30 kos from *Sylhet* are royal kos, and an idea of the distance may be obtained from the statement that *Jahangirnagar*, "commonly called *Dhāka*," is described as 87 kos distant from *Sylhet*. Taking 12 common kos as the length of a day's journey, it would require 145 stages, or 4 months 27 days, to travel from west to east of the empire, and 98 stages, or 3 months 10 (?) days, to travel from north to south of it. The above estimate of distance is more moderate than 'Abdu-l-Ḥāmid's in the *Bādshāhnāma*, for he makes the length from *Lāharī Bandar* to *Sylhet* about 2,000 royal kos, and the breadth from the fort of *Bast* (in *Afghanistan*) to the fort of *Ausā* (the *Owsa* of the maps, in the *Hyderabad* territory, and not *Orissa*, as *Thomas* has it) about 1,500 (royal?) kos. See the *Bib. Ind.*, 2nd ed., p. 709.

In *Shah Jahan's* time the number of provinces or *Subahs* was twenty-two, and to these 'Abdu-l-Ḥāmid adds the *Vilāyat* of *Baglāna*, and the total revenue was 8 *arbs* and 80 *krors* of *dāms*, or £22,000,000. In *Aurangzeb's* reign,

though the empire was enlarged towards the south, it was diminished towards the north, and so there were only 19 Subahs instead of 22 or 23, but the number of parganas or districts was greater, being 4,440 as against 4,350. The last four entries in 'Abdu-l-Ḥāmid's list (*vide* Thomas, p. 28) disappear in the *Mirāt*, for Balkh and Badakhshān had been surrendered to the Uzbegs, Qandahār had been taken by Persia, and Baglāna had been absorbed in Khandesh. Instead, too, of Daulatabad and Telingāna we have Aurangābād and Zafarabād, i.e. Bīdar. The total revenue shown in the *Mirāt* is higher than 'Abdu-l-Ḥāmid's, being 9 arbs 24 krors 17 lacs 16,082 dāms, or upwards of £23,000,000. It is added in Elliot's translation that out of the 9 arbs odd, 1 arb and 72 krors odd were *khālīṣa*, that is, were paid to the royal treasury, and that the assignments of the *jāgīrdārs* or the remainder was 7 arbs 51 krors odd. But this does not appear to be a correct translation. The *Mirāt* does not mean, I think, that Aurangzeb's revenue was only 1 arb 72 krors odd dāms, i.e. about £4,500,000, and that the remainder, amounting to £18,500,000, went as *tankhwāh* or assignments to the *jāgīrdārs*. The word which Elliot has translated 'remainder' is the technical term *paibāqī*, which according to Wilson means lands set apart for *jagīr* grants if required and the revenue from lands so reserved and not yet alienated. And it is significant that the expression in the original is *ū paibāqī*, "and the *paibāqī*," not "or the remainder" as in Elliot. Evidently what is meant here by the word *khālīṣa* is the revenue of the Crown lands, and not the total amount of land revenue received by the emperor. A similar division of the revenue is made by 'Abdu-l-Ḥāmid (*id.*, p. 713), and he adds, "Formerly there was not so much *khālīṣa*; during this reign it has come to this amount on account of the extension of the empire." He too makes the *khālīṣa* revenue a very small portion of the whole, viz. 1 arb and 20 krors out of 8 arbs and 80 krors. The detailed account of the revenue from each province given in the *Mirāt* differs from the total stated there, for the aggregate of the figures comes

to about 9 arbs and 48 krors, or 24 krors' more than the total. But such discrepancies are of common occurrence in Oriental writers. It may be noted that by some mistake of the copyist the revenue of Akbarabad, that is, Agra, is understated in the R.A.S. copy and made the same as that of Aḥmadābad, that is, Gujrat, and that in Elliot, id., p. 164, the number of the *mahals* in the Tatta, i.e. the Scinde, province has been wrongly included in the revenue. The correct figures are 57 mahāls and 74,986,900 dāms. The figures given in the *Mirātu-l-'Aālam* are interesting, as they substantially agree with the official return of Aurangzeb's revenues for 1654-5 (Thomas, p. 35), and also with Bernier's figures (id., p. 37). Thomas remarks that Bernier is "a witness for whom the greatest reliance might have been claimed had he expressed more confidence in his own returns." Some people may think that this diffidence is an additional guarantee of good faith, and that Bernier's remark "*Suivant ce mémoire que je ne crois pas trop exact ni véritable*" does not detract from the value of his figures.

I observe that both Thomas and Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole quote Dr. Gemelli Careri as a good authority for Aurangzeb's reign. They apparently, then, do not consider that there is any foundation for the remark of Anquetil du Perron that Gemelli Careri was a Neapolitan who amused himself during a long illness with writing a book of travels round the world without ever quitting his chamber. Du Perron supports his remark, which is made in Tiefertalier, vol. ii, pp. 488-9, by a reference to a work by Sir James Porter, who was ambassador at Constantinople in the eighteenth century. My friend Mr. Irvine has been good enough to look into the subject of Gemelli Careri's credibility, and the result seems to be that Careri really travelled, but that he inserted many things in his book which were not the fruit of his own observations. Thomas makes use of Careri in rather a singular way. He quotes him as saying that the Moghal receives from only his hereditary countries, that is, exclusive of the conquests in the Deccan, £80,000,000, and makes the comment that this statement is highly interesting

on account of its close approach to that given from the independent testimony of Manucci. Now Manucci's figures are £39,000,000, and Thomas assimilates them to Careri's monstrous total by doubling them, on the ground that Manucci, or at least Catrou, says that Aurangzeb's miscellaneous revenue, "*le casuel de l'empire*," equals or exceeds his land revenue. This seems to me highly improbable. Moreover, Manucci's £39,000,000 includes the revenues of the conquests in the Deccan, which Careri expressly excludes.

XIII.

DURGA: HER ORIGIN AND HISTORY.

By B. C. MAZUMDAR, M.R.A.S.

DURGĀ is a mighty Paurāṇic goddess; and of all the forms of Śiva's wife or Śakti she is the most popular and greatly honoured in the province of Bengal. It is in the province of Bengal only that her Pūjā (worship) is celebrated with great pomp and idol-exhibition. By 'Pūjā' the Anglo-Indian means now the Durgā-Pūjā festival of Bengal, during which all Government offices remain closed for one month. A new clay image of the goddess is made for the occasion, and it is *enthroned* on the sixth day of the light fortnight of the month Āśvina. She is worshipped during the three days next following, and is then immersed in water on the Daśamī day. These are all very widely known facts, but I mention them with a distinct purpose in view, as will be shown later on.

I.

I need hardly point out that neither the Vedas nor the old Vedic literature knew the name of this mighty goddess. Dr. A. A. Macdonell has shown in his excellent edition of the Bṛhaddevatā that one solitary, meaningless mention of her name in that book (ii, 77) is an interpolation.¹ Leaving aside the Mahābhārata Saṃhitā, we do not find any trace of her in any literature or epigraphic writings down to at least the fifth century A.D. It is necessary, therefore, to examine critically the chapters of the Mahābhārata where Durgā appears.

¹ The name Durgā does not seem to be mentioned either in the Rāmāyaṇa or in Manu.

There are two chapters in the Bombay edition of the *Mahābhārata Saṃhitā* containing prayers to the goddess *Durgā*;¹ they are the sixth of the *Virāṭa Parvan* and the twenty-third of the *Bhīṣma Parvan*. The Bardwan Rāj family *Mahābhārata* does not contain any chapter in the *Virāṭa Parvan* devoted to a prayer to *Durgā*; a very careful Bengali translation of this *Mahābhārata* has been published by the proprietor of a journal named *Vaṅgavāsī*. It is to be noted that excepting these chapters there is no mention even of her name elsewhere in the *Saṃhitā*. The goddess, whose mythology is not given at all in the *Mahābhārata*, either independently or in connection with the worship of *Śiva* or *Skanda*, is made the recipient of two stray prayers very loosely connected with the preceding and subsequent chapters. This circumstance is alone sufficient to throw doubt on the genuineness of these prayer chapters. But I have better proofs to offer to show that they are very late interpolations.

Referring first to the *Durgā-stotra* in the *Virāṭa Parvan*, we find the goddess described as daughter of *Yaśodā*, the wife of *Nanda* of the Cowherd tribe (iv, 6, 2), sister of *Vāsudeva* (iv, 6, 4), living permanently on the *Vindhya* hills (iv, 6, 17), and wearing a peacock's tail for her armlet (iv, 6, 8). She is very dark in colour (iv, 6, 9), and possesses four heads and four arms (iv, 6, 8). She is a maiden, or *Kumārī Brahmācārīṇī* (iv, 6, 7), and sways the worlds by remaining a maiden for ever (iv, 6, 14). It is also stated that it was she who killed the demon *Mahiṣāsura* (iv, 6, 15), and that, as *Kālī*, is fond of wine, flesh, and animals. She dwells on the *Vindhya* mountain (iv, 6, 17).

Now, first of all, she is not described as *Pārvatī*, wife of *Mahādeva*, in this chapter. To make her a wife of any god would also have been inconsistent with her character as *Kumārī* for ever. In the eighth sloka she is compared to 'Padmā, wife of *Nārāyaṇa*,' but her own condition is given

¹ See Fausböll, "Indian Mythology," p. 159.

as that of a Kumārī. This shows clearly that Durgā had not become Pārvatī when this chapter was composed. There is no hint thrown out that she had any relationship with the Himālaya, but, on the other hand, her origin is distinctly given as from the family of the Cowherds, and the Vindhya is described as her place of abode. She is associated here with the worship of Kṛṣṇa, and is shown rather to be the tribal goddess of the Gopas or Ābhiras.

The goddess Durgā of the Purāṇas is 'tapta-kāñcana varṇābhā' Gaurī, and not dark in colour, and she has ten arms and not four. Neither Durgā nor any other form of Śiva's Śakti carries four heads on the shoulder. It is also to be noted that Durgā is not included in the Daśa Mahāvidyās or the ten glorious forms of the Śakti. The assertion in the stotra that Durgā killed Mahiṣāsura is false according to the Mahābhārata mythology, for it is distinctly mentioned in the Vana Parvan that Skanda, son of Agni, whom Mahādeva and Umā worshipped for nascent glory, distinguished himself specially by having killed the demon Mahiṣāsura (iii, 230).

Now I shall consider another important character of Durgā, that she is Vindhyavāsini Kālī and is very fond of wine and blood. During the early years of the seventh century A.D. we find it often mentioned by Bāṇabhaṭṭa and others that the non-Aryans worshipped horrible goddesses in the Vindhya region by offerings of wine and blood. Till then, it seems, the Vindhyavāsini had not obtained admission into the temples of the Hindus. Either towards the end of the seventh or by the beginning of the eighth century A.D. the poet Vākpati composed his Gaṇḍavaho kāvya. In this book the goddess Vindhyavāsini appears in double character; she is called in clear terms non-Aryan Kālī, and at the same time declared to be a form of Pārvatī herself.¹ Her worshippers till then are the Koli women and the Śavaras wearing turmeric leaves for their garment. Offerings made

¹ In the Kādambarī she is mentioned as the wife of Śiva, see Miss Ridding's translation, pp. 49-50.

to her are wine and human blood (*vide* slokas 270 to 338 in the Bombay Sanskrit Series edition).

This gives us some idea as to the time when, as a hymn in honour of Durgā as Vindhyavāsini, the sixth chapter of the Virāṭa Parvan was composed. The twenty-third chapter of the Bhīṣma Parvan is hopelessly confused. All that has been said of Durgā in the sixth chapter of the Virāṭa Parvan is fully repeated here, and still she is called the mother of Skanda (vi, 23, 11), which is inconsistent with her character as Kumārī (vi, 23, 4). Though in the seventh śloka she is said to have her origin in the family of Nanda Gopa, yet Kāuśikī, or born in the family of Kuśika, is another adjective given her in the eighth śloka.

It appears that when Durgā was merely a non-Aryan tribal goddess her non-Sanskritic name was also either Durgā or something which had a similar sound. The reason for this supposition is that for want of some orthodox grammatical derivation of the word a new and defective grammatical explanation had to be thought out. Derivation of the name has been given in the following words: "Durgāt tarayase Durge tat tvam Durgā smṛtā janaiḥ" (iv, 6, 20).

Whether Durgā had an independent existence as a tribal goddess and only later became one and the same with Vindhyavāsini, or whether the goddess Vindhyavāsini in the process of evolution at the fusion of tribes became Durgā, is not easy to ascertain.¹ But that there was once a Kumārī Durgā, not belonging to the household of Śiva, is borne out by the interpolated stotras in the Mahābhārata.

II.

I shall now give some account of a hitherto unnoticed Kumārī worship prevalent amongst the non-Aryan Śūdra castes in the Oriya-speaking hill tracts in the District of

¹ See Bengal Census Report, 1901, vol. i, pp. 181-2.

Sambalpur, lying on the south-western border of Bengal. In this out-of-the-way place, only recently opened out by a railway line, all the different tribes retain to this day their old manners and customs, unaffected by Brāhmaṇic influence. The place is extremely interesting on that account for ethnographic researches.

Kultā, Dumāl, and Śūd are the Śūdra castes of Sambalpur that celebrate the festival of Kumārī-Osā in the lunar month Āśvina, from the eighth day of its dark fortnight to the ninth day of the light fortnight. Though the Brahman priests officiate in all the religious and domestic ceremonies of these people, the worship of the goddess Kumārī during this festival is wholly and solely performed by the unmarried girls of these Śūdra people. It is a festival of the maidens for a maiden goddess. The word Osā seems to be a contraction of the Oriya term Upās (Sanskrit Upavāsa). On the Kṛṣṇa Aṣṭamī day the maidens, singing special songs, go out in large companies from the villages in quest of good clay for making an image of the goddess Kumārī. They themselves fashion the idol in a rude form and besmear it with vermillion. They sing and dance every day in honour of the goddess, and that is the only thing they do to worship her.

In some villages, owing very likely to the Brāhmaṇic influence, the figures of Hara-Pārvatī and Lakṣmī are painted by the girls on the walls, in addition to the figure of Kumārī. But this shows more unmistakably that this Kumārī is separate from, and has no connection with, the renowned consort of Mahādeva.

Some of the songs chanted for worshipping the goddess are interesting as giving some clue to the history of the festival. I notice here particularly two lines of one song; they are—

“Āśvine Kumārī janam
Gopinī-kule pūjan.”

It was in the month Āśvina that the goddess Kumārī was born, and in this month she is worshipped by the females

of the tribe of the Cowherds. Is not, then, this Kumārī the same whom we meet with in the interpolated chapters of the Mahābhārata as 'Nanda-gopa-kule jātā'?

Śukla Aṣṭamī is the principal day of the whole festival; and the maidens sing and dance that day almost unceasingly, on the village green, till late at night. It is worth noting that that is the very day regarded as very important and holy in Bengal during the Durgā-Pūjā; and special fasting is observed by the Bengali Hindus on that day called Mahā-Aṣṭamī (great Aṣṭamī). I should further notice that it is even now a custom in many villages in the District of 24 Parganas in Bengal, that on this Mahā-Aṣṭamī day a Brahman maiden is to be worshipped by other maidens by offering her new cloth, vermilion, and flowers.

Again, on the day next following, that is, on the Navamī day, the non-Aryan maidens of Sambalpur sing some hardly decent songs in honour of their maiden goddess. For this reason the songs of the girls in general during the Kumārī-Osā (called Dāḷkhāi songs by many people) are unfortunately believed by outsiders to be wholly indecent. I may draw the attention of readers to the fact that the custom of singing obscene songs on the Navamī day during the Durgā-Pūjā in Bengal was very widely prevalent throughout the lower province of Bengal some twenty years ago, and even now this custom is in full force in many villages far away from civilised centres. The Bengali phrase "Navamir Kheidi" (obscene songs of Navamī day) is well known throughout Bengal proper.

After the completion of worship on the Śukla Navamī day the non-Aryan maidens of Sambalpur throw the Kumārī idol into water, singing songs meanwhile. I have stated already that the goddess Durgā is also immersed in water on the Daśamī day (called Vijayā Daśamī) in Bengal.

As the Brahmans and other high-caste Hindus of Sambalpur do not take any part in the Kumārī-Osā of the Śūdras, and as the Durgā-Pūjā in Bengal style is wholly unknown to the people of Sambalpur, no one will venture to

say that the lower-caste Śūdras in those inaccessible hilly tracts imitated the Durgā-Pūjā of Bengal. Since the Durgā-Pūjā is celebrated in Bengal alone in a form and style which strongly resemble the Kumārī-Osā of Sambalpur in many very important particulars, I may venture to think that it was from some non-Aryan tribes of Bengal (who were once akin to the Śūdras of Sambalpur and had great influence all over the province of lower Bengal) that the Durgā-Pūjā was borrowed by the Hindus.

The influence of Brāhmaṇism is nowadays so very supreme in the province of Bengal that even those low-caste people who allow widows to remarry, eat fowls, and drink wine, elsewhere consider those acts as degrading and defiling. Consequently it is impossible now to get any evidence in this direction from the customs of any lower-class people in Bengal proper.

I mention another fact in connection with the Durgā-Pūjā rituals in Bengal. A plantain-tree is covered with a piece of cloth and is posted on the right side of the idol Durgā. This plantain-tree is regarded as the goddess Vana Durgā (Durgā who resides in forests), and she is worshipped duly and carefully along with Durgā and other deities associated with her and represented there in the idol exhibition. As to whence this Vana Durgā came the Purāṇas are silent, and the priests offer no satisfactory explanation. That this Vana Durgā was a goddess of some wild tribes seems pretty certain in the light of the facts already detailed. That in addition to the image of Durgā a Vana Durgā has to be set up and propitiated, shows that there was something in the origin of the Pūjā which recognised a goddess other than the consort of Śiva.

The reward for which the non-Aryan maidens of Sambalpur hope by worshipping their Kumārī goddess is that their brothers may obtain a long life. Hence Kumārī-Osā is known by another name, called Bhāi-Jīūtīā. Bhāi means brother, and Jīūtīā means that which gives long life. There is also a ceremony called Bhāi-Dvitīā in Bengal, which is performed by sisters for the longevity of their brothers, nearly

twenty days after the Durgā-Pūjā. I strongly suspect that it is the Bhāi-Jītiā which has been transformed into Bhāi-Dvitiā in Bengal, since the latter as a Hindu ceremony is unknown in any other province of India.

As the Kumārī-Pūjā of the Tāntric cult is a medley of many things and requires a separate critical study, I have

XIV.

A POEM ATTRIBUTED TO AL-SAMAU'AL.

By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

IN the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April, 1905, Dr. Hirschfeld published a poem discovered by him in the Cambridge Genizah Collection, attributed to Samau'al, and in Hebrew characters. This Samau'al is naturally identified by him with the Jewish hero of Taimā, whose name is commemorated in an Arabic proverb, and to whom certain poems preserved in the *Aṣma'iyyāt* and the *Ḥamāsah* are ascribed. An account of him was given by Nöldeke in his *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber*, 1864, pp. 57-64. Verses would naturally be ascribed to such a person, as it is the habit of the Arabs to attribute at least a few to almost every famous man; thus they can recite to us the ode in which Adam bewailed Abel. Samau'al being a person on the confines of myth and history, the supposition that any verses ascribed to him were really by him is extremely hazardous.

The noble poem in the *Ḥamāsah* beginning "If a man's honour be not stained, any garment he wears befits him," has other claimants besides Samau'al; Ibn Kṭaibah, ed. de Goeje, p. 388, ascribes it to Dukain; the mention of "a secure fortress" in it is what has caused it to be attributed to Samau'al (Nöldeke, l.c., p. 64). Besides this there are eleven verses collected by Nöldeke, and seventeen published in Ahlwardt's *Aṣma'iyyāt*, rhyming in *itu* or *aitu*, of which, however, the first are in the *wāfir* and the second in the *khafif* metre, while a line closely resembling the second of these poems is quoted by Jāḥiẓ (Bayān, ii, 86) in the *kāmil* metre. Two of the verses (with, as usual, some variants) are quoted in the *khafif* metre by the author of

Alif-Bā (i, 158) on the authority of Tha'lab, on whose authority the same two with a third are produced in the *Lisān al-ʿArab*, ii, 381. Of neither poem is the genuineness particularly probable. The first is partly autobiographical, the author stating that he was faithful in the matter of the Kindite's cuirasses, whereas other people were apt to be unfaithful; and that ʿĀdiyā, his father according to most authorities, or his grandfather according to Ibn Duraid, had built him a fortress, with a supply of water, and warned him not to destroy it. Anyone to whom the story of Samau'al was known could have composed the lines without difficulty; and the remainder, which are commonplaces about wine and women, are still cheaper.

The poem in the *Aṣmaʿiyyāt* is religious in character, and contains a confession of faith in the resurrection, with an account of the origin of man, similar to many passages of the Koran. It is of interest that the language contains some slight Judaisms, i.e. words which should end in *th* are made to rhyme with words ending in *t*; this is noticed in the *Nawādir* of Abū Zaid (p. 104) as a Judaism. The words in which it occurs are *حَبِيبٌ* and *مَبْعُوثٌ*, rhyming with *دُعِيبٌ*, etc. Abū Zaid quotes them as Samau'al's. In L.A., ii, 332, the mispronunciation is said to be a sign of the dialect of Khaibar, and the author is called the Jew of *Khaibar*, and therefore a different person from Samau'al, who was an inhabitant of Taimā. However, on p. 333 two more verses are cited and ascribed to Samau'al, as usual. The chief importance of the poem to the Moslems lay in its throwing light on an obscure phrase in the Koran (iv, 87)—*mukhīt*. Tabarī (Comm., v, 111) cites the verse in which this word occurs as 'the Jew's'; Zamakhsharī as Samau'al's. Probably, then, the verses were originally ascribed to 'a Jew,' and afterwards this poet was identified with Samau'al.

Of the poem discovered by Dr. Hirschfeld there appears to be no trace in the Mohammedan records. That it was composed by a Jew is certain; but it contains no archaisms, nor indeed any peculiarity that would cause us to assign it

an early date. So far as it has any metre, it favours the *ṭawīl* and *kāmil* rhythms about equally: some verses and half-verses belong to one or other of these 'seas' decidedly; in a few cases it is uncertain which is intended; and some cannot be got into either. One would imagine that the author was very imperfectly acquainted with the laws of Arabic versification. For there is little or no reason for supposing that the chief metrical irregularities are due to corruption of the text. That anyone should venture to write Arabic verses without knowledge of the metrical laws is surprising, but it would not be difficult to find parallels to such hardihood.

The genus of the poem is, as Hirschfeld rightly says, *fakhr* or *mufākharah*, 'boasting,' in reply to someone who had depreciated the Jewish race; we should gather that this person was a Mohammedan, since the reply is mainly based on statements of the Old Testament which are confirmed by the Koran; and the Koranic or Moslem titles for the Hebrew heroes are ostentatiously employed: *kalīm* for Moses, *khaṭīl* for Abraham, *dhabīḥ* for Isaac. Koranic usage is also to be found in the word used for the dividing of the Red Sea (فرق, *Sūrah* ii, 47), and there is apparently a misreading of the Koran (*ibid.*), which states that we "drowned (الفرعون) Pharaoh's folk," for which the poet has آل فرعون, as though آل were the article, which is not used with this proper name. The phraseology of *Sūrah* vii, 160, where the miracles of the wells according to the number of the tribes and the manna and quails are described, agrees closely with verses 19 and 20 of the ode. One or two details certainly are not confirmed by the Koran, but probably the poet felt he would satisfy his audience if the bulk of his statements were corroborated by that paramount authority.

The other possibility—that we have here a pre-Koranic ode and one which may have been utilized by the Prophet—does not seem to commend itself. The epithets applied to the Hebrew heroes (quoted above) are Arabic words, in two out of the three cases derivatives of purely Arabic roots,

likely enough to have been invented in a Mohammedan community, but by no means likely to have originated in a Jewish community, which would employ either Hebrew words or Arabized forms of them. Moreover, the employment of the phrase *العاجل والأجل* for 'this world and the next' implies a more decided theological terminology than we should credit the 'people of the Ignorance' with possessing; the bulk of the Arabs would have known of no *'ājil*. Jews or Christians would have had their own words for it.

Pre-Koranic origin being excluded, it is difficult to offer any conjecture as to the date of the composition. Attacks on the Jews appear to have been common in all ages of Islam, and to the attacks naturally there were rejoinders. These rejoinders, if they were to be of any effect, had to be based on the Koran; and those members of tolerated sects who intended to enter the lists as controversialists, or indeed aspired to any considerable government employment, had to study the literature of the Mohammedans. Pious grammarians refused to teach unbelievers the grammar of Sibawaihi (and probably other works on the same subject), because it contained texts of the Koran; but the ordinary teacher, who lived by giving lessons, could not afford to be so particular.

The practice of composing speeches or verses and ascribing them to some ancient hero was so common in Mohammedan antiquity as scarcely to need illustration. The choice of Samau'al as the ideal apologist of the Jews in verse was both natural and felicitous. His name was held in high honour among Moslems, and verses containing a confession of faith closely agreeing with Islam were ascribed to him by the Moslem tradition. An apology put in his mouth, and couched in the language of the Koran, with special reference to the Biblical history recorded in that book, might well be received with favour and provoke little opposition. The author ruined his fair chance of success by forgetting to acquire a tolerable knowledge of Arabic metre, whence his

performance became ridiculous. Somewhat similarly those forgers of charters given to Jews and Christians by the Prophet ordinarily forgot to ascertain the death-dates and conversion-dates of the witnesses whose names they appended to the deeds, which in consequence were shown by simple inspection to be fabrications. Since no one would accuse the famous Samau'al of Taimā of inability to distinguish between the kāmīl and the ṭawīl metres, this apology never obtained the popularity which its author probably hoped, and hence it has only been preserved in a collection of waste-paper.

The following is the text (reprinted with Dr. Hirschfeld's permission) with translation ¹:—

(1) الا ايها الصف² الذى³ عاب سادتي

اسمع جوابي لست عنك بغافل

O thou party that hast found fault with my masters, I will make my reply be heard, I am not negligent of thee.

The last phrase is Koranic.

(2) واحصى مناقب قومة اختارهم رحمانهم بشواهد ودلائل

And I will recount the exploits of persons chosen by their Rāḥmān with evidences and proofs.

This verse is both metrically and grammatically faulty. قومة seems intended for قوم. By omitting the initial و we should get a kāmīl verse, but the *elif* of اختارهم ought not to be fixed. مناقب is technical in this sense. احصى reads like a translation of אספּר.

(3) اختارهم عقما عواقر⁴ للذي اختصهم ربى لصفو التناسل⁵

He chose them barren and sterile for the sake of the purity of strain wherewith my God had privileged them.

¹ Hirschfeld's emendations are indicated by the letter H.

² MS. אלצפי.

³ MS. אלתי (H.).

⁴ MS. טואמר (H.).

⁵ MS. אלתלאסל.

The Samau'al of the *Hamāsah* answers the charge of paucity of numbers. The syntax of the second half-verse is faulty.

- (4) من النار والقربان والمحن التي¹ لها استسلموا حب الآله الكامل
*Of the fire and the sacrifice and the trials whereunto they
 surrendered themselves and of love for the Perfect God.*

These words explain the 'exploits' of v. 2. The rhythm is *ṭawil*, but the second half is defective. The epithet 'perfect' is probably due to metrical necessity.

- (5) فهذا خليل صير النار حوله رياحين جنات الغصون الذوابل
*This one was the Friend of God round whom He turned the
 fire into fragrant herbs as of gardens with quivering
 branches.*

Baidāwī, on *Sūrah xxi*, 29, says Nimrod's furnace was turned into a روضة, 'garden.'

- (6) وهذا ذبيح فداه بكبشة براه بديا لا نتاج الشياثل
*And this was a victim, whom He redeemed by a ram whom He
 created anew, no dropping of the antelopes.*

The verse is defective, and the form كبشة is doubtful. Baidāwī, on *Sūrah xxxvii*, 107: "Some say it was a ram from Paradise, others an antelope from Thabir."

- (7) وهذا رئيس اصطفاه وخصه واسماه اسرائيل بكر الاوائل
*And this was a Prince, whom He chose and on whom He
 bestowed privileges, and named Israel, first-born of the
 ancients.*

The verse is defective.

- (8) فالله شرفهم كما لم يولهم لمكبر في العاجل والآجل
*And God made them honourable in this world and the next,
 even as He did not make them subject to any tyrant (?).*

¹ MS. ٨٧٩ (H.).

The verse is defective. متكبر appears to stand for مكبر. The employment of آجل and عاجل for the two worlds is probably post-Koranic; in the Koran عاجلة is found for 'the present world,' and آجلة is likely to have been invented to give it a jingling antithesis like صالح and طالح, قدح and مدح, etc.

(9) لا لعقبهم¹ الذين هداهم وحباهم بغضائل ونوائل

Did He not favour their posterity whom He guided, and bestow on them excellencies and gifts?

The first half is unmetrical and defective in sense.

(10) انصت لفخر يترك القلب مولها²

ويشب³ ناراً في الصلوع الدواخل

Listen to a boast that will leave the heart dazed and kindle fire in the inmost ribs.

(11) ويلهم وسواساً ويلقح⁴ حيرة ويوقع في الاحشاء مثل البلال

And inspire bewilderment and give birth to wonder, and throw as it were confusion in the entrails.

(12) السنا بنى⁵ مصر المنكلة التي⁶ لنا ضربت مصر بعشر مناكل

Are we not children of Egypt the plagued, for whom Egypt was struck with ten plagues?

This seems to be the sense; it would, however, require الذين 'لنا ضربت مصر'.

¹ MS. لعلك بهدم.

² MS. ملها.

³ MS. وينشب.

⁴ MS. ويلقح.

⁵ MS. بنو (H.).

⁶ MS. الممصر الممنكل.

(13) السنا بنى¹ البحر المفرق والتي لنا غرق الفرعون يوم التحامل

Are we not the children of the split sea, and those for whom the Pharaoh was drowned on the day of the charge?

'Pharaoh' ought not to have the article. See above.

(14) واخرجه الباري الى الشعب كى يرى

اعاجيبه مع جوده² المتواصل

And the Creator brought him out to the nation that He might show His signs with His continuous goodness.

جودو is the vulgar pronunciation of جوده.

(15) وكىما يفوزوا بالغنيمة اهلها من الذهب فوق الحمائل

And that its people might secure the plunder, even the gold above the sword-belts.

The verse is defective. Perhaps الذهب الابرينز.

(16) السنا بنى³ القدس الذى نصبت لهم

غمامة تظل لهم طول المراحل

Are we not children of the Sanctuary for whom there was set up a cloud to give them shade throughout their journeys?

The verse is ungrammatical and unmetrical.

(17) من الشمس والامطار كانت صيانة

تجير عساكرهم من الهوف العائل

It was a protection from sun and rains, keeping their hosts safe from the fierce hot wind.

(18) كشبه الضلائل

Most of the verse is lost. Probably the words are intended for كشبه الظلائل, meaning 'like harbours.'

¹ MS. بنى.

² MS. جودو.

³ MS. بنى (H.).

(19) السنا بنى¹ السلوي مع المن والذى لنا فجر² الصوان عذب المناهل

*Are we not the children of the quails and manna, and them
for whom the rock poured forth sweet waters ?*

(20) على عدد الاسباط تجري عيونها فراتا زلالا طعمه غير حائل

*Whose fountains flowed according to the number of the tribes,
sweet and limpid water whose taste changed not.*

(21) وقد مكثوا في البر عمرا مجددا يغذيهم الباري بخير المأكّل

*And they abode in the desert a whole generation, being fed by
their Creator with the best of foods.*

(22) فلم يبيل ثوب من لباس عليهمو ولم يحوجوا للنعل طرا النقال

*Neither did any garment upon them wear out, nor did they
require fresh patches for their shoes.*

(23) وانصب نورا كالعمود امامهم ينير الرجا كالصبح غير مزائل

*And He set up a light like a pillar before them, flashing hope
like dawn unceasing.*

(24) السنا بني³ الطور المقدس والذى تدخدخ للجبّار يوم الزلازل

*Are we not sons of the Holy Mountain and of that which
humiliated itself before God on the day of the earthquakes ?*

جبار is a Moslem name for God (Sūrah xix, 23).

(25) اليس تطاطا بالجليل تذّلّا فشفرفه الباري على كل طائل

*Did it not bow down its head (?) humbly, and was it not
exalted by the Creator over all that is high ?*

جليل sometimes means 'thatch.' Here it appears to stand
for the 'roof,' or 'top' of a mountain.

(26) وناجا عليه عبده وكليمه

And thereon He spoke to His servant and Interlocutor.

¹ MS. بنو (H.).

² MS. فطر.

³ MS. بنو (H.).

XV.

THE HISTORY OF THE LOGOS.

BY HERBERT BAYNES, M.R.A.S.

THE DIVINE WORD.

“IN the beginning was the Word” is a truth the sublimity of which grows upon us the more we ponder it. And, indeed, the common consciousness of mankind has ascribed to the Logos the supreme act of Creation. Alike in India, China, Egypt, and Mesopotamia, the world is said to exist as the audible thought of the Deity. Moreover, the creative power of the divine Voice is intimately associated with the possession of the sacred Name. In the very interesting papyrus at Turin we find the following remarkable passages concerning the god Ra:—

“I am the great one, the son of a great one: my father meditated upon my name. My father and my mother pronounced my name; it was hidden in the body of my begetter.”



“I am He whose name is more hidden than that of the gods, God only, living in truth, Framers of that which is, Fashioner of beings!”

Again, in the Papyrus of Nesi-Amsu, the god Kepera says: “I uttered my own name as a word of power from my own mouth, and forthwith I created myself!”

To what extent the Hebrews were intellectually indebted to the Egyptians we are hardly yet in a position to say, but the Semite is full of the thought so nobly expressed by the Psalmist (xxxiii, 6):—

בְּדִבַּר יְהוָה שָׁמַיִם נִעֲשׂוּ

“By the Word of the Eternal were the heavens made.”

And in that majestic story of Creation in the book Genesis (i, 3):—

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהי אֹר. וַיְהי-אֹר

“And God *said*: Let there be light! and there was light!”

Now this דִּבָּר, by which the heavens were made, is the principle of Law and Order, the union of תְּקֵנָה and בִּינָה, theoretical and practical Reason, for the root-meaning of the word is ‘arranging,’ ‘combining.’ According to the metaphysical system known as Kabbalah the Deity is אֵין סוּף, pure Being, the Absolute, the Infinite, above space and time sublime, the Unconditioned, neither caused nor defined by aught else. The question then arises: How did the Absolute become manifest? To this the answer is: By Self-modification (*simsum*), whereby the one, indivisible, unchangeable Deity reflected upon Himself as plurality, just as the sun, though remaining one, reveals itself in beams and gleams. Not that the world of phenomena is the direct result of any shrinking or separation of the Self, but is due rather to a series of reflexions nearly as pure and perfect as the Infinite itself. This is the doctrine of the *Sephiroth* (σφαῖρα), the ten archetypal creative ideas, corresponding to the ten spheres of the Ptolemaic system and to the ten numbers of the book of Jezirah. They are sometimes called Maamrim Creation-words, because it is said in the Talmud that the world was created with ten expressions. From these metaphysical elementary forces, which come between the Deity and the world, others are given off, until we at last come to the elements of surrounding

nature. This theory of Emanation is a doctrine of philosophic energy, of metaphysical dynamics, in which the Noumenon is also actus purus, highest energy. One may conceive the process as one of progressive externalisation of the central primal Power. Every less perfect emanation is thus the 'husk' or 'shell' (*kelippah*) of the one before; the last and uttermost emanations forming the material world are therefore the 'shells' of the whole, the *kelippôth* (κατ' ἐξοχήν).

The kabbalist arranges the sephirôth in three groups, and in each of these groups we have a positive, a negative, and a synthetical principle, so that the emanation-series may be represented either as rays of the Absolute, star-fashion, or in the form of a tree. But the important and interesting point for us is the fact that the first emanation is *Reason*, the second and third being the inner and outer aspects of the Logos.

That other members of the Semitic family were conscious of the supreme significance of the divine Word is evidenced by the reference in the *Qurân* to the religion of Abraham as מלך, verbum.

Nor is this all. The Kabbalah has a good deal to say about the sacred Name. As the name of a thing is said to express its nature, so the name of God is the expression, the revelation of His essence, of His character. And since the essence of the Deity is omnipotence the application of the name must be an apprehension of His nature, and, as far as possible, an assimilation of His power. Nay, more. It is even held that the single letters of the sacred names are at once parts of the essence, i.e. of the energy of God. The knowledge of their several groupings according to definite rules is thus acquaintance with the production of definite effects for definite purposes. By uttering the S'êm hamphoras', the holy Tetragrammaton, many mighty marvels are said to take place, and the man who fully knows the Name can understand not only the various idioms of mankind, but also the dialogues of angels, the speech of

the brutes, the language of trees and of flowers, and the very thoughts of his neighbour.

Again, in the great Chaldean epic of the Kosmos, recently brought to light in the Seven Tablets of Creation now in the British Museum, we find that it is the Word, the introduction of law and order, or "the way of the gods," which turns Chaos into Kosmos. As has been well said:—

"With the Babylonians truth or law was the essential attribute of all the great divinities, as with the Egyptians, and in each case the highest manifestation of this law was found in the Sun-god. The Egyptian hymns to Ra say, 'Men love thee because of thy beautiful law of day'; so the Babylonians say of S'amas, 'Thou comest each day as by law'; hence the older god is replaced by the Sun, the lord of light, as well as by order personified by Merodach, who wars against Tiamat, the brooding chaotic sea and darkness. The old Ea myth contains a doctrine closely approaching that of the Logos or Divine Wisdom, by whom all things were made. He is knowledge, for Ea knows all things and defeats the powers of Chaos; his knowledge guides and controls the work of Creation, even when actually performed by his son Merodach. The functions of Ea in this phase of the Chaldean poem have a curious resemblance to those of the Iranian Ahura-Masda, while Merodach has all the attributes of Mithra as well as his heroic rôle. The transition of the nature myth to the ethic poem is clearly to be traced in these tablets, and perhaps they form the best material for the study of this most important subject. Tiamat, the old chaotic sea, becomes the embodiment of evil or storm and wrath and black magic and ill (like the Iranian Ahriman), to whom is opposed Merodach, the lord of light and purity, law and order, of prayer and pure incantation, of mercy and justice."

In the first tablet we have the remarkable words—

Enuwa elis la nabu s'amamu s'ap'o ammatum s'uma la šikrat.

"When on high the heavens were unnamed, below on the earth a name was not recorded."

And in the hymn to Sin, the chief god of Ur, the work of creation is said to begin when "Thy Word is declared": *Ammat issakar*.

At first sight one would hardly expect to find any doctrine of the Word in India, and yet there is a whole hymn in the R̥gvêda addressed and devoted to वाच्, whilst in the Jôga-sûtras we even have such an expression as शब्दब्रह्म, the Word of Brahma. Nor is this all. In the Śânti-parvan of the Mahâ-B'ârata (8. 533) there is the following remarkable utterance:—

अनादिनिधना नित्या वाग् उत्सृष्टा स्वयम्भुवा ॥

Anâdinid'ana nitjâ Vâg utsr's'tâ Svajamb'uvâ.

"The Eternal Word, without beginning, without end, was uttered by the Self-Existent!"

Very striking, too, is the fact that Vâsudêva or Nârâjana is referred to in the Nârada Pankarâtra as *pûrvvaja* and *agrêjâta*, the first-born.

According to the Vêdânta-Sûtras the Word is the *sp'ôta* or basis of evolution, by which creation is preceded. And this is implied in the ancient Sûkta (R̥gv. x, 125) to which we have already referred. Vâk is there described as the daughter of the vasty deep, whose power stretches from the watery waste beneath to the highest heaven above, whose spirit, blowing whithersoever it listeth, gently calls to light and life!

अहं राष्ठी संऽगमनी वसूनां

चिकितुषी प्रथमा यज्ञियानां ।

तां मा देवाः वि अदधुः पुरुऽत्रा

भूरिऽस्थात्रां भूरि आऽवेशयंतो ॥

अहं एव वातःऽह्वा प्र वामि

आऽरभमाणा भुवनानि विश्वा ।

परः दिवा परः एना पृथिव्या


एतावती महिना सं बभूव ॥

*Ahañ rās'trī sañ-gamanī vasúnāñ
 Kikitus'ti prat'amā jagijānāñ |
 Tām mā dévāh vi adad uh puru-trā
 b'ūri-st'ātrām b'ūri ā-vēsajantīm ||*

*Ahañ ēva vātah-iva prā vāmi
 ā-rab'amāñā b'ucanāni viścā |
 Parah divā para ēnā pr'tiējā
 Etāvatī mahinā sañ bab'ūva ||*

“I am Collector of the things that hide,
 And first to understand the blessed gods,
 Who sent me forth to wander far and wide,
 To penetrate to earth's remotest clods!

“From me, like summer-breeze, a breath goes forth
 Wherewith I touch all things both great and small;
 Far down to South and upwards to the North
 The world of life will answer to my call!”

Even more interesting and important is the doctrine of the Word in the Avesta. According to the ancient Masdayasnic faith  is the holy soul of Ahura, the Supreme Law by which the prophet smites the forces of evil, the armies of Angra Mainju. It is both a weapon and a revelation. By chanting the great Ahuna Vairja, the “Thus saith the Lord,” Šarat'ustra repels the assaults and withstands the temptations of the Evil One. Thus in the 19th Fargard of the Vendidad we read:—

“From the region of the North rushed Angra Mainju, the deadly, the Daēva of the Daēvas. And thus spake the guileful one, he the evildoer, Angra Mainju, the deadly: ‘Drug, rush down upon him! destroy the holy Šarat'ustra!’ The drug came rushing along, the demon Būiti, the unseen death, the hell-born.

“Then Šarat'ustra chanted aloud the Ahuna Vairja: ‘The will of the Lord is the law of holiness; the riches of Pure

Thought shall be given to him who works in this world for Maşda, and wields according to the will of Ahura the power he gave him to relieve the poor.'

“ The Drug, dismayed, rushed away, the demon Bûiti, the unseen death, the hell-born, and said unto Angra Mainju: ‘O baneful Angra Mainju! I see no way to kill him, so great is the glory of the holy Sarat’ustra.’ ”

၁။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၂။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၃။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၄။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၅။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၆။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၇။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၈။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၉။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .
 ၁၀။ နေရာ . နေရာ . နေရာ .

Jat'â ahû Vairjô :—

At'â ratus as'âdk'id hak'â

Vagheus dasdâ Managhô

Skjaot nanām aqheus Masdâi

K'sat'remkâ Ahurâi â

Jim dregubjô dad'ad vâstârem.

Such was the power of this pure and mighty Speech, which was uttered by the Self-Existent before the world began! And it is said to have been given to the prophet by the Holy Spirit in the boundless Time. When asked how to free the world from all the ill wrought by the Evil Spirit, the great Ahura answers (Ven. xix, 14) :—

“Invoke, O Šaratuštra, my Fravaši, who am Ahura Mašda, the greatest, the best, the fairest of all beings, the most solid, the most intelligent, the best shapen, the highest in holiness, and whose soul is the holy Word!”

Again, *Sraos'a*, the personification of obedience and piety, is said to be the incarnate Word (Ven. xviii, 14); nay, the *Māfra Spenta*, holy Word, is the mighty Law which binds together all the dwellers in Irân. It is the *Dâtem-vidævô-dâtem*. "As high as the heaven is above the earth that it compasses around, so high above all other utterances is this law, this fiend-destroying law of Maşda!" (Ven. v, 25).

Turning now to the Far East, we find in China and Japan the far-reaching doctrine of *Tao*, the Divine Word, the supreme principle of Eternal Reason. It is quite true that this word is generally translated 'Way,' and no doubt rightly so, especially in such a work as the Sacred Edict. But in the greatest philosophical work which China has produced we cannot get a better equivalent than *Λόγος*. Whatever view we may take of the renowned Lao-zö, his book is one of perennial interest, and cannot fail to appeal to the student of philosophy.

Now, the *Tao-tê-kin*, or Classic of Reason and Virtue, begins in the following very remarkable way:—

非	道	<i>Tao</i>	<i>fê</i>
常	可	<i>k'o</i>	<i>k'an</i>
道	道	<i>Tao</i>	<i>Tao!</i>

which has been translated in many ways by different scholars. For instance, "Via (quæ) potest frequentari, non eterna-et-immutabilis rationalis Via" (Pauthier); "La voie droite qui peut être suivie dans les actions de la vie n'est pas le Principe éternel, immuable, de la Raison suprême" (Julien); "Die Bahn der Bahnen ist nicht die Alltagsbahn" (Ular).

Excepting perhaps the last, each of these versions is a possible translation, for the radical of the character representing the great concept with which we have to deal is the 162nd. But the opening sentence can only be fully understood and appreciated by a reference to the context. If we translate "The Way which can be trodden is not the path for every day," or "The way of ways is not the

everlasting Path," we shall certainly fail to understand the 34th chapter, where we read—

"O Tao ! infinite and omnipresent !
 The world is from Thee, through Thee, in Thee !
 Activity almighty and Mother of the All !
 Thou seemest small, thou seemest great,
 O source of nature's constant ebb and flow !"

It is quite evident that what is here predicated of the Tao cannot apply to a Path or Way, but would be very appropriate in respect of the Λόγος or Divine Word. In fact, we have in this passage the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, whilst in the 42nd chapter we find both the λόγος προφορικός and the λόγος γενικώτατος :—

"Tao brought forth One ;
 One produced Two ;
 Two gave rise to Three ;
 Three produced all things."

Again, in the 25th chapter :—

"There is a framing first Force,
 Cause of all becoming,
 Changeless and formless,
 Self-raised and self-possessed,
 The origin of life.

Tao is the final greatness,
 Heaven, Earth, and the Framer.
 Man has Earth for his basis,
 And the Earth has Heaven.
 Heaven has for basis the Tao,
 Which is its own source and sustenance !"

Further on in this most ancient and curious work it is stated of the Tao: "It produces, furthers, develops, nourishes, preserves, and guides all things !"

From these and similar passages we have come to the conclusion that the opening sentence is best interpreted as follows :—

“Reason which can be embodied in speech is not the eternal Reason.”

That this is the real meaning seems all the more likely by reason of what immediately follows :—

名可名非常名, *Mĩn k'ó Mĩn jé k'án Mĩn !*

“The word which can be named is not the eternal Word!”

Nor is such an oracular opening confined to the Tao-tê-Kĩn. In another philosophical work of almost equal merit, the *T'ai-kih-T'u* of K'ao-zö, the opening sentence is very similar, namely :—

無極而太極, *Wu Kih, öl Tai Kih !*

“Without basis is the primal principle,” or “the First Cause is causeless.”

And here we find that the two thinkers have a great deal in common. The Chinese mind is first of all conscious of dualism alike in the soul within and in the world without. Indeed, it cannot be otherwise, owing to the relativity of consciousness. The world arises as thesis and antithesis, and long before he has learned to speak of quantity man knows both great and small, much and little; and ere he has grasped the thought of temperature he is well aware of heat and cold.

Now, in the Middle Kingdom this primitive dualism was represented by—

<i>T'jän</i>	<i>T'u</i>	Heaven	Earth
<i>Jen</i>	<i>Jan</i>	Rest	Motion
<i>K'jan</i>	<i>K'un</i>	Male	Female

and the question before the philosopher was and ever must be: Is there perhaps some subsumptive principle which would be a synthesis of the two extremes? In other words,

have we no reconciliation of contradictions? Both Lao-zö and Kao-zö answer the question in the affirmative. To the one the solution is found in the doctrine of the Word, to the other in the thought of the ultimate or supreme Principle. And the choice of the concepts in question is significant. As already observed, 道 is first of all 'the Way,' from the radical 去, 'to go,' and at the hands of an ethical teacher like Confucius was applied to the Way of the Heart or Conscience. Such at least is the interpretation we venture to put upon such a passage as the following:—

"If a man hear the Tao in the morning he may die at night without regret." (Lun Jü, iv, 8.)

From his metaphysical standpoint Lao-zö added to the extension of the concept so as to include the Way of the Head or the immanence of Mind.

To the later sage, Kao-zö, the origin of all things is T'ai Kih, τὸ τέλος. At first sight this expression is a little puzzling, as the radical and the word itself refer to nature, viz. wood or a tree (No. 75). 極 in its original meaning is the gable of a house, and because this is the uppermost part of the building, it is further used as an expression for the highest and outermost points. Hence the philosophical sense of 'turning-point' and 'goal,' the word 太, when prefixed, giving the whole expression the meaning of 'highest goal,' 'ultimate principle,' 'First Cause.'

Thus we have China's best thinkers agreeing to ascribe all things to right Reason or the Word made manifest. "Nothing happens," says Kao-zö, "against the Tao of Jen and Jan, which is based upon the T'ai Kih."

If now we return to the Hebrews before dealing with the specific doctrine of Philo we find, both in the canonical Book of Proverbs and to a great extent in the Apocrypha, the idea of Wisdom, חכמה, σοφία, taking the place of the Word. And here it is quite possible that both Egyptian and Greek influences were at work. Both priests of the

Nile and Orphic theologians may have contributed something to Jewish thought at Alexandria. But, however this may be, it is quite certain that alike in the books Baruch, Jesus Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon this idea plays a great part. Of *Wisdom* we read first of all in the Proverbs (viii, 22, 23) :—

“The Eternal created me as the beginning of His way, the first of His works from the commencement.

“From eternity was I appointed chief, from the beginning, from the earliest times of the earth.”

In the Wisdom of Solomon we have the following beautiful passage :—

*Μία δὲ οὖσα πάντα δύναται,
Καὶ μένουσα ἐν ἑαυτῇ πάντα καινίζει,
Καὶ κατὰ γενεὰς εἰς ψυχὰς ὁσίας μεταβαίνουσα,
Φίλους Θεοῦ καὶ προφήτας κατασκευάζει. (Κεφ. ζ', 27.)*

That Wisdom and the Word are one is further shown by two mystical and exalted verses in Sirach (xxiv, 3 and 4) :—

*Ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος ὑψίστου ἐξηλθον,
Καὶ ὡς ὀμίχλη κατεκάλυψα γῆν.
Ἐγὼ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατεσκήνωσα,
Καὶ ὁ θρόνος μου ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης.*

The feminine form of the expression of this great thought of pre-Christian Judaism, namely *σοφία*, did not seem to the mightiest metaphysician of Alexandria by any means the most fitting. Whilst admitting and accepting all that is said of Wisdom in Proverbs and the Apocrypha, Philo looks upon *Λόγος* as a far more appropriate term for the everlasting Yea, the eternal Reason of the Godhead. To him it is the immanence of Spirit, the principle of the religious life, for it is the first emanation from the Absolute (τὸ ὄν). And from the Word comes the world, as the realised thought of God.

“The world were an empty tablet but that Thou hast written thereon Thy eternal thought. Of Thy divine poem

the first word is Reason, and the last is Man. And whoso shall trace the words from first to last shall find them the unbroken series of Thy favours, the varied names of Thy love."

No wonder that St. John adopted and adapted so grand a thought, as we have it in that glorious exordium to his Gospel:—

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word And the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us, and we beheld His glory, as of the one-born of the Father, full of grace and truth."

XVI.

**NOTICE OF SOME ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS ON TEXTILES
AT THE SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.**

By A. R. GUEST.

THAT the collection of textile fabrics at the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, is not generally so well known as it deserves to be, is doubtless due largely to the unfavourable conditions under which, owing to want of space, it has now to be exhibited. It is satisfactory to think that this will before long be remedied, for the collection is a remarkably good one. Taken all round, it is probably not surpassed by any other of the kind.

The collection is particularly distinguished by early examples of woven stuffs, and among these there is a considerable number of fragments dating from the seventh to the fourteenth century of our era and bearing Arabic inscriptions. Specimens of Eastern textiles of this period have more than a local interest. During part of the time Europe was learning much from the East, and in no branch of artistic manufacture more, perhaps, than in that to which they belong. The progress of the transmission of this knowledge is an interesting subject, still somewhat obscure, and anything that aids towards its elucidation cannot be neglected. Definite determinations of date of specimens compared are evidently of importance for its study, as well as for that of the history of design from a more special point of view, and no more reliable testimony can be hoped for than what is recorded on objects themselves.

The whole of this part of the collection has been examined for such evidence, and all the inscriptions which it has been found possible to decipher have been read. The specimens

of the most interesting class are nearly all fragments ; some of them are small and do not contain enough writing to convey any meaning, in others the characters are defaced by damage. Of the inscriptions of the latter sort which remain unread, there are some which may yield to further investigation, but the number is not great. With regard to the rest, a large proportion of the inscriptions are purely general, consisting usually of short pious formulas or auspicious mottoes, such as "Victory comes from God," "Perfect blessing," "Excellent fortune." From these, of course, no evidence of date is obtainable, excluding that to be derived from the character employed. It is to be regretted that the whole of the inscriptions on the stuffs classed as Hispano-Moresque are of this type, for these stuffs are numerous and nearly all in good condition. The majority appear, however, to belong to a somewhat late period.

There remain out of the whole collection only eleven pieces of so-called Saracenic fabrics with writing that either dates them definitely or gives a fairly close approximation to their date. Two of these, Nos. 8288-63 and 8639-63, are brocades of the twelfth century, the work of the same craftsman, whose name is recorded on each. They are said to have been manufactured in Sicily, and as they have been sufficiently described elsewhere, further allusion to them would be superfluous. The other nine are described below. The description of the material in each case has been supplied by Mr. A. Kendrick, of the Museum. The inscriptions are transcribed in full so far as has been found practicable, for it has not always been possible to trace the whole, but in many cases only a part has been reproduced in the photographs. In only one instance, and that one of the least interesting, is a date definitely expressed. Elsewhere the date has had to be deduced, usually from the name of a monarch, and the manner in which the determination is arrived at is shown, where necessary, in the remark.

The remaining seven descriptions relate to fragments which do not afford any definite indication of date. The

first two are remarkable pieces in themselves, and advantage is taken of the opportunity of bringing them to notice. The next four form a series illustrating the transformation undergone by a simple formula at the hands of the weaver. By steps it becomes a meaningless collection of symbols, the origin of which is, however, quite clear when the process of alteration can be followed. It may be useful to record one of the results of experience with the Museum collection. No simulated Arabic inscriptions have been found on any piece of stuff which there is reason to believe is of Eastern manufacture and in the least early in date. There are many debased inscriptions, but every one almost certainly traces back to a significant original. As far as can be judged from a limited number of cases, simulation seems to be a sure sign of European or late Oriental manufacture.

It will be noticed that with one exception (No. 7) all the fragments are known to come from Egypt. It is thought likely that No. 7 did not come from that country, but no positive information can be obtained. This piece differs from the rest in not having been buried: all the Egyptian fragments appear to have been underground, and most of them are from garments or wrappings in which the dead were enveloped at the time of burial. That there are so many from Upper Egypt, and that none, so far as is known, come from the Delta, is doubtless due to the superior dryness of the former, perhaps also to the chances of exploration. It has, at any rate, no connection with places of manufacture. As is very well known, many towns in the north of Egypt were quite as celebrated for weaving as any in the south, and in some cases the former had the higher reputation.

Mr. Kendrick remarks on the material:—"An interesting point is the use of silk, which is general throughout the Arab period, and appears in every fragment here illustrated. The cultivation of silk was but a century old at the time of the Arab conquest, and this precious material had been sparingly used when the whole supply had to be imported."

In the dated pieces up to the Fatimite period, 969-1171 A.D., where there are patterns, the 'Roman Copt' character

of the ornament is evident at a glance. It is to be regretted that the collection does not contain specimens enough to enable an opinion to be formed as to the nature of the transition to the style of a late date. Judging from analogy, one may suspect that the alteration was comparatively rapid. From the scanty evidence which is available, it looks as if the downfall of the Fatimites had been quickly followed by far-reaching changes in Egyptian art. It would be interesting to know whether this is substantiated in the case of textiles, but at present there seems to be hardly enough material to allow a conclusive judgement to be formed.

No. 1. MUSEUM NUMBER, 1314-1888.

Description. Silk fabric, woven in colours on a red ground. The inscription is embroidered in yellow silk. From a cemetery at Akhmîm. This fabric bears a close resemblance in the scheme of colour and manner of weaving to several Byzantine silk fabrics in the Museum collection which are considered to date from the seventh to the ninth century (e.g. Nos. 558-1893, 264-1900).

Inscription. الله مرون امير المو

Translation. God, M r w n, Commander of the . .

Date. 64-132 A.H. = 684-750 A.D.

Remark. There seems to be no doubt that the name is Marwân; being followed by Amîr el Mu[’minîn] it appears equally sure that it is the name of a Khalif. This brings the period within Umayyad times, in the reign of either the father of the celebrated ‘Abd el Malik or that of the last Khalif of the Umayyad race, excluding the Cordovan sovereigns, with whom the stuff is obviously not connected. Both Marwâns were connected with Egypt.

It is to be remarked that the absence of the ‘alif,’ which in modern script would follow the ‘waw’ in Marwân, is in accordance with the usage of the

seventh and eighth centuries. The 'allâh' before Marwân is probably part of 'Abdullah, used here, not as a name, but in its literal signification of Servant of God, a style adopted by the earlier Khalifs.

No. 2. MUSEUM NUMBER, 257-1889.

Description. Fragment of linen material, the inscription embroidered in red silk. From a cemetery at Akhmîm. The surface of the linen is glazed with a vegetable wax.

Inscription. الله ابا العباس المعتضد بالله امير المومنين المجزة
الله ما امر بفصل سنة اثنين ثمانين وميتين

Translation. . . allah, Abû el 'Abbâs (acc.) El Mu'tadîd billâh, Commander of the faithful. God fulfil for him that which he commands. In the season of the year 282.

Date. 282 A.H. = 895 A.D.

Remark. El Mu'tadîd was Khalif from 279 A.H. to 289 A.H. = 892-902 A.D. The chief interest of this inscription lies in its early date, on account of which the absence of the usual 'waw el 'aṭf' between the numbers and the spelling 'mi'tain' deserve attention.

It is also to be observed that the year mentioned is that of the reconciliation of Khumârawaih, prince of Egypt, with his suzerain El Mu'tadîd, after the house of Tûlûn, to which the former belonged, had withheld allegiance from the Abbasides for some twenty-five years.

No. 3. MUSEUM NUMBER, 133-1896.

Description. Fragment of loosely-woven blue linen, with inlet tapestry ornament in coloured silks. From a cemetery in Egypt. This fragment should be compared with the 'Izâr' or Veil of Hishâm II, exhibited by the Royal Academy of History at the Madrid Exhibition in 1892-3.

Inscription. [أمير المؤمنين بن العزيز بالله صلوات]

Translation. Commander of the faithful, son of El 'Az[iz] billāh, prayer . . .

Date. 386-411 A.H. = 996-1021 A.D.

Remark. El Hâkim, Fatimite Khalif, reigned between these two dates. The position of the words 'Amir el Mu'minin' before 'El 'Aziz' seems to be sufficient to show that the inscription recorded the name of El Hâkim and not that of a later Khalif. This is supported by some other fragments, not reproduced, belonging to the same piece of stuff, where part of the names El Hâkim and Mansûr appear to be discernible. Mansûr was El Hâkim's name, the latter appellation, by which he is better known, being actually a title. El 'Aziz was El Hâkim's father and immediate predecessor.

NO. 4. MUSEUM NUMBER, 2104-1900.

Description. Fragment of a garment of linen, with bands of tapestry, woven in coloured silks and linen thread on the warp threads of the linen, the weft thread having been withdrawn. From a cemetery at Erment. Cf. No. 134-1896.

Inscription. The following is quite clear, the rest has not been read. على ولي الله صلى الله عليه


Translation. . . . 'Alî is the 'vicar' of God, prayers be on them both.

Date. Fatimite period, 357-567 A.H. = 969-1171 A.D.


Remark. The above is a part of the well-known 'Alîite creed, and fixes the date, as the object comes from Egypt, in the Fatimite period.

NO. 5. MUSEUM NUMBER, 1381-1888.

Description. Fragment of a garment of fine linen, with bands of tapestry, woven in coloured silks and linen thread on the warp threads of the linen, the weft



2



4.

Textiles at South Kensington Museum.

(No. 1, $\frac{3}{4}$ size; Nos. 2, 3, 4, full size.)

threads having been withdrawn. From a cemetery at Erment. Cf. No. 134-1896.

Inscription. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم لا اله الا الله محمد رسول
الله على ولي الله صل المستنصر بالله امير
المؤمنين صلوات الله عليه وعلى ابائه [الاكرمين] الطاهرين
وابنائهم المنتظرين

Translation. (The Bismillah.) There is no god but God, Muhammad is the prophet of God, 'Alī the vicar of God, prayer el Mustanṣir billāh, Commander of the faithful; blessing of God be on his [noble] and pure ancestors and his descendants to come

Date. 427-487 A.H. = 1036-1095 A.D.

Remark. El Mustanṣir, Fatimite Khalif, reigned between these two dates. What follows his name is a well-known Fatimite formula, which is found on several existing monuments.

No. 6. MUSEUM NUMBER, 134-1896.¹

Description. Fragment of a garment of fine linen, with bands of tapestry, woven in coloured silks and linen thread on the warp threads of the linen, the weft threads having been withdrawn. From a cemetery at Erment. Cf. Nos. 1381-1888 and 2104-1900.

Inscription. عبد الله ووليه معذ بنو من الامام
المستنصر بالله امير المؤمنين صلوات الله عليه وعلى
ابائه لا الطاهرين وابنائهم

¹ Compare with No. 6 the following specimen in the collection:—Fragment of linen with two narrow bands of tapestry, woven in blue silk and linen thread on the warp threads of the linen, the weft threads having been withdrawn. From a tomb in Egypt. Given by Robert Taylor, Esq. Museum number, 2172-1900. This fragment also bears the names Ma'add, Abū Tāmim, El Mustanṣir billāh (A.D. 1036-95). Attention was drawn to it too late for it to be included in the series.

Translation. The servant of God and his vicar [? Ma'add]
 . . . el Imâm el Mustanşir billâh, Commander
 of the faithful, blessing of God be on his pure [and
 noble] ancestors and his descendants . . .

Date. 427-487 A.H.=1036-1095 A.D.

Remark. The Khalif is the same as in No. 5. The words before El Imâm are much defaced, and no restoration can be suggested. The inscription affords a remarkable instance of the curtailment of the letters 'lâm' and 'alif.'

No. 7. MUSEUM NUMBER, 8560-1863.

Description. Fabric, entirely of silk, woven with a small diaper pattern in black, and an inscription in brownish-yellow. This fabric was acquired by the Museum forty years ago from the Boch Collection. It is probably not from Egypt.

Inscription. السيد الاجل يمن الدولة ابو يمن ا طال الله بقاءه
 (The above is repeated and reversed.)

Translation. The most glorious lord, Yumn ed Daulah, Abû Yumn, may God prolong his existence. Nâşir ed Daulah, Abû Naşr, instead of Yumn ed Daulah, etc., is a possible reading.

Date. Eleventh or twelfth century.

Remark. This is dated on the strength of the title Es Saiyid el Ajall, the most glorious lord, as it has been translated here, and of the character of the Kufic lettering. The title was in vogue in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In Egypt, where it was introduced about 1070 A.D., it was the style of the viziers, who had then assumed very extensive power. Before the date mentioned it had been adopted by the Governors of Damascus.

No. 8. MUSEUM NUMBER, 2101-1900.

Description. Fragment of a garment, of loosely-woven linen, with a narrow band of tapestry, woven in dark



5



6



7



8

Textiles at South Kensington Museum.

(No. 5, $\frac{3}{4}$ size; Nos. 6, 7, 8, full size.)

blue silk and linen thread on the warp threads of the linen, the weft threads having been withdrawn. From a tomb in Egypt.

Inscription. بنصر الله أمير المؤمنين بن الاممن * الظافر بامر
الله أمير المؤمنين صلوات . . .

Translation. The above are titles of El Fâ'iz bi Naṣr illâh, and his father Ez Zâfir bi 'amr illâh.

Date. 544-549 A.H. = 1149-1154 A.D.

Remark. El Fâ'iz, Fatimite Khalif, reigned between these two dates. This inscription shows signs of debasement; it will be noticed that the alif of 'Amîr' has become reduced in length to a degree which does not differentiate it from letters of the form of medial nûn. It has not been found possible to decipher the word marked *; the only solutions that suggest themselves are that it is a corruption of El Imâm or a contraction of Amîr + Imâm: the former requires the rejection of two redundant letters, and is only offered as a bare possibility, not as a probable explanation. The word standing for 'Ez Zâfir,' if seen alone, would be taken for En Nâsir, but altogether the reading does not seem doubtful.

NO. 9. MUSEUM NUMBER, 769-1898.

Description. Green silk damask, woven with pear-shaped devices springing from scrolled stems. From a cemetery at El 'Azîm, near Asyût.

Inscription. ناصر الدنيا والدين محمد بن قلاون

Translation. Nâsir ed Dunyâ wa ed Dîn (temporal and spiritual conqueror) Muḥammad ibn Qalâ'ûn.

Date. 693-741 A.H. = 1293-1341 A.D.

Remark. The long and twice interrupted reign of the most famous of the Mamlûk Sultans of Egypt, Muḥammad ibn Qalâ'ûn, extended between these

dates. There are one or two other specimens in the Museum collection somewhat similar to this, which bear the title 'El Ashraf.' So many of the Mamlûk Sultans used this title that the only information to be derived from it is that it relates to the Mamlûk period, and to a time not earlier than 1290 A.D.

UNDATED FRAGMENTS.

No. 10. MUSEUM NUMBER, 2081-1901.

Description. Portion of a band of tapestry, woven in coloured silks and linen thread on the warp threads of a linen garment, a fragment of which remains. From a tomb in Egypt.

This piece is of considerable interest as forming a link between the Coptic and Arab stuffs. It has several points of similarity to those Coptic examples having Christian subjects mingled with rude survivals of Roman patterns. The string of circular medallions enclosing debased animals and joined together by straight bands is seen in the Coptic example No. 57-1897, and two others (Nos. 866-1886 and 212-1891) have the same border as this Arab piece.

Inscription. الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلوات . . . الرحمن
الرحيم الملك الحق . . . لاشريك

Translation. Praise be to God, Lord of the worlds, and prayers . . . the Merciful and Compassionate. The King, the Truth, . . . no partner.

Remark. That this piece is very early there can be little doubt; the appearance of the inscription, as far as its letters are concerned, supports the evidence of the typical Roman pattern. The inscription, however, gives no other evidence.



(a) Decoration of porch,
Chandi Sewu, Java.



(b) A Chaitya (Boro Búdúr sculptures)
showing porch pillars with lion supports.



(c) General view of Boro Búdúr, Java.



old supporting wall, afterwards hidden by the new 50-foot terrace, has only recently been discovered; and it is not yet known whether the whole or only a portion of the wall was sculptured. The sculptures found thereon at the recent excavations have been photographed. It is probable that this terrace was constructed in later years in order to form a support to the main structure, which has been sadly shaken and disintegrated by earthquakes.

Thus the main design of the building may be described as a temple in archaic South Indian form, but considerably flattened, and solid throughout, having four terraces; surmounted by a half-stupa, and capped by a dagoba with its appurtenances; the whole strengthened by a wide terrace constructed for support in later years, which terrace clasped and concealed the ground member of the original structure.

The decorations of this immense building, the sculptures on which are so numerous that it has been calculated that if placed end to end they would cover a distance of three miles, are with very few exceptions of Indian origin,¹ and bear little trace of Cambodian or Siamese, still less of Chinese, influence. The whole of them form parts of one grand design, which was to establish once for all a visible representation in stone of the entire scheme of Mahāyānist doctrine. Seen by the worshipper from the moment of his approach, in all his ritualistic circumambulations (*pradakshina*) of the shrine from below upwards till he reached the holy dagoba on the extreme summit, sacred especially to Buddha himself as supreme over all, the sculptures taught him what Buddhism meant, how the virtuous Buddhist could attain to salvation, and what awaited him in the future if he led a virtuous life.²

Before ascending to the first terrace the eye is caught by the rows of life-size Buddhas that adorn the retaining walls of the several terraces and the cage-like shrines above on the circular platforms.

¹ Rocks and deserts are represented in Javanese style, in a form which was evidently stereotyped and conventional. This style is not of Indian origin.

² Cf. Dr. Gronemann's pamphlet. The interpretation of the meaning of the *mudras* is Dr. Brandes's.

All the great figures on the east side represent Akshobhya, the Dhyāni Buddha of the East. His right hand is in the *bhūmiśparśa mudrā*, touching the earth in front of the right knee—"I swear by the earth."

All the statues on the south are of Ratnasambhava, in the *varada mudrā*, the right hand displayed, palm upwards—"I give you all."

The statues on the west side represent Amitābha, in the *dhyāna* or *padmāsana mudrā*, the right hand resting palm upwards on the left, both being on the lap—the attitude of contemplation or meditation.

The statues on the north side are of Amoghasiddhi, in the *abhaya mudrā*, the right hand being raised and displayed palm outwards—"Fear not. All is well."

These are the Dhyāni Buddhas of the four quarters, each governing his own direction of the whole universe to its furthest bounds, including the heavens and hells.

The similar Buddhas on the lower circular platform, these platforms being circular as representing the universality of the Law, and therefore applicable to all the four quarters, represent the fifth Dhyāni Buddha, Vairocana¹; who is also the Buddha of the zenith or centre, including the universe on high. These have the right hand in the *dharma-chakra mudrā*, the attitude of teaching, the hand being raised and held palm outwards with the first finger turned down—"I have learned all. Now I tell you all."

The upper circular platforms have the Buddhas with the hands in a different, a sixth, *mudrā*; equally one of teaching, but with a deeper esoteric meaning.² The third finger of the right hand touches the point of the third finger of the left, the first finger and thumb of the left hand forms a circle, and in some cases the right also—figuring the *Dharmachakra*—and the hands are turned till, with the elbows squared, the right hand is perpendicular above the left.³

¹ Vairocana is the thinker as well as the teacher, and is therefore appropriately placed in the centre, apart from the four quarters. As such he is often reckoned as the first of the Dhyāni Buddhas, but not so at Boro-Būdūr.

² What this meaning is I did not gather.

³ See Waddell's *Lāmāism*, pp. 350-1. A Table showing the celestial Buddhas, their attributes, etc.

The worshipper now prepares to ascend, and first passes round the basement. What the designs on the entablature represented is not known, but no doubt they were intended to inculcate some lesson and prepare the mind for what was to follow. Judging by the teaching conveyed by paintings and sculptures in other places, it would be natural to suppose that the first thing taught would be the terrors of punishment for sin and disobedience of the Law. We should expect to see representations of the tortures that await the evildoer in the several hells, and the sufferings consequent on being reborn after death in the lower planes, a condition that in the Buddhist scheme of existence inevitably awaits him who in this life is guilty of actions forbidden by the Law of Gautama. Future excavations will show us whether this was so or not.

On the inner wall of the first terrace two sets of sculptures are seen. Above are depicted scenes in the earthly life of Gautama Buddha, beginning, on the centre of the east face at the head of the stairs, with his conception and birth. Fergusson in his *Indian and Eastern Architecture* has stated that the birth is not represented, but here he is mistaken. The Nirvāṇa, however, is curiously absent. The lower sculptures on this wall represent scenes from the Jātakas or former lives of the Buddha.

Having completed the study of this terrace, the worshipper ascended to the second gallery, and here was taught that the gods of the Brahmanical Pantheon — Brahma, Śiva, and Viṣṇu—were but Bōdhisattvas (or Buddhas “*in potentiā*,” as defined by Professor Kern), and that similarly all great and powerful gods and holy men were the same. The Mahāyānists recognized a plurality of Buddhas and Bōdhisattvas innumerable. They taught that all the Vedic and Brahmanical deities were only deities temporarily, being subject, as are mortal men, to change and rebirth. According to the Jātakas, Buddha had himself been born as Śakra or Indra twenty different times, as Brahma four times, and he was a Tree-Deva forty-three times. And so they accepted the whole Brahmanical Pantheon in this sense, and honoured

the Devas and Devatas as Bōdhisattvas and Tārās equally with the more purely Buddhist Dhyāni Buddhas, Pratyēka Buddhas, and the rest. All of these were but Buddhas in earlier births, or great celestial beings carrying out the one eternal law of the universe.

This is clearly shown on the second terrace, where these beings are represented as enthroned on high, each with his nimbus or corona, and surrounded by adoring worshippers. We see Brahma, Viṣṇu, and Śiva, four-armed in Indian fashion, seated in glory, as well as Arhats, Tārās, hermits, and others similarly honoured.

On the two upper terraces Buddhism is represented as a religion, and a crowd of Bōdhisattvas on thrones are shown, teaching the believer the rewards that await him in the future, and the glory that will surround him in his rebirths.

From the fourth terrace the devout Buddhist emerged on to the circular platforms, and learned the Law as delivered to all the world through the scriptures.

Finally, he arrived at the summit of all, fitted by his previous preparation to perform *pradakshina* round the dagoba which enshrined the relic of the Buddha of this age.

Not far from Boro-Būdūr are the temples known as Chandi¹ Mendūt and Chandi Pāvon. Both have been carefully restored by the Archæological Survey.

The Mendūt temple was the immediate successor of Boro-Būdūr. It was originally a brick temple on a large brick basement, with a projection on each face. Afterwards the brick superstructure was removed, and on the old basement was constructed a temple in stone. This having become weak, a new stone skin was built round the former core, the basement also being surrounded by an outer layer of stone. It was handsomely sculptured, and Fergusson writes that this sculpture was "as refined and elegant as anything in the best ages of Indian architecture." Dr. Brandes is of the opinion that not more than a century elapsed from the

¹ Chandi, or Tjandi, means 'temple.'

date of the first brick basement to that of the completion of the outer skin of stone with all its decorations. The statues were of Buddha, Vishṇu, and Śiva. Lakshmī is seen on one of the sides.

Chandi Pāvon is a small, but elegant shrine. It was certainly later than Boro-Būdūr.¹ Its design is similar to the general type noted above, having basement, chaitya, and dagoba. There is here, however, only one principal figure, which has entirely disappeared, with a single flight of steps giving access to it. The sculptures on the walls are remarkably beautiful, the figures being more true to life than most of those at Boro-Būdūr. A female figure in a panel on the south side is exceedingly graceful. The central panel on each side of the chaitya represents the sacred Bo-tree hung with garlands, and shaded by an umbrella, having attendant *Kinnaras* at the sides. The figure of Buddha has a third eye in the centre of the forehead.

The great group of temples at Brambanan, or Parambanan, is easily reached by train from the native capital of Jokyakarta. Dr. Groneman's pamphlet is useful here. The ruins are very extensive, and evidence a perfect rage for temple-building. They are of an altogether later date than Boro-Būdūr, and show symptoms of decadence from the classic period. In a large square courtyard over 150 smaller temples surround six of great size and of somewhat pyramidal appearance. A line of three on the east faces a line of three on the west, with two smaller ones in the middle of the north and south faces. The central one in each row of three is dedicated to Śiva, that on the north to Vishṇu, that on the south to Brahma; but to each as a Bōdhisattva.

The basements are very fine and bold. They are manifestly of Indian origin, and seem to belong to the later Chālukyan period. The sculpture is exceedingly rich, especially on the stairways and terrace-walls. Above the basement in each case is a series of terraces, each on a smaller base than

¹ Dr. Brandes was a little doubtful as to its date.

the one below. The terrace-walls are sculptured, and, in the case of the western Śiva-temple, show a series of scenes from the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The divinities represented in the detached sculptures are, in the case of the Śiva-temple, surrounded by sitting worshippers; in the Viṣṇu-temple by standing women, probably Lakṣmī and Bhūmidevi; in the Brahma-temple by gurus or hermits.

The principal image of Śiva, with the diaper pattern of Buddhist *triśūlas* on the wall behind it, is shown in Plate I (c); and another in Chinese form is given in Plate I (b). In the headdress of the former is a skull; but this is the only terrifying attribute about the figure, the God being represented as in his most benevolent aspect. One hand holds a *chauri*; one a chaplet; the left hand seems to hold some object; the right is raised to the breast, palm inwards. The Javanese form of the cobra-head supporting the right side of the base is noticeable. The *nāga* on the libation-vase of the former is of Siamese or Cambodian character. The *nandi* is shown in Plate II (b).

Half a mile northwards from this group is the large ruined lava-built Chandi Būbrah (*būbrah* = 'ruined'), and finally the immense and important group known as Chandi Sēwu, or the "Thousand Temples." There were actually 238 temples surrounding the great central one. These lie in four squares, the two outer lines being divided from the two inner by a space, in which were other larger temples now completely ruined. Each of the small temples contained its own statue or object of worship, and the entrances were manifestly arranged so that each was visited in turn, in the course of *pradakṣiṇa*, before the central building was reached. In one of these small shrines on the south side is a design manifestly connected with the worship of the Hindu Ādinārāyaṇa. It is executed in bold bas-relief, and represents the springing of the three gods Brahma, Viṣṇu, and Śiva from the primordial Deity who rests on the serpent. It is true that in this case the creative Deity is absent, but the three shrines, resting on lotus-buds, whose stalks emanate from a single point below, leave no

doubt as to the intention of the sculptor, though the figures have disappeared. It is very similar to the design on a slab at Thatōn in Burma shown by Sir Richard Temple in *Ind. Ant.*, xxii, 359, and plates xiv and xiv a.

Guarding the approach to the great courtyard on the south side are two enormous granite Rākshasas¹ acting as dvārapālas. One of these is shown in Plate II (d).

The chief temple is of great size and is built in the form of a square, with projecting members on each side, all similar. These have ascending stairways with porches and small halls, and the central feature on each side was a lofty vaulted hall of no great depth, on the back wall of which was the figure of the Deity who was the principal object of worship. These may have been the four Dhyāni Buddhas of the quarters, but more probably were figures of Viṣṇu. The figures are not to be found, but certainly that on the west side must have been Viṣṇu, for its base, which still remains, is ornamented with a *chank*-shell resting on a tripod.

The upper portion of the building has been destroyed, but it probably consisted of a dagoba as in other cases.

Panataram, near Blitar in East Java, consists of a group of stone temples and other buildings on elevated ground, the principal ones being the larger of the shrines and a magnificently decorated basement constructed for the support of some structure which has disappeared. On the left of the approach is a small temple in Hindu shape with a heavy overhanging cornice, and, like so many others in the island, though it is evidently Hindu, it is Hindu with a difference. There are *yāli*, or *sardūla*, heads over the

¹ Dr. Groneman has expressed the opinion that these figures should not be called Rākshasas (*Hindu Ruins in the Plain of Parambanan*, p. 68), but as they are certainly demon-guards I hardly know by what other name to describe them. The great tusks classify them at once as dangerous beings, and they were placed to terrify the unworthy. The lesson they teach is that he who approaches should do so in devout spirit, as otherwise he will fall into the clutches of the enemy of all good and suffer endless tortures in hell. This is the same lesson that is taught in other places of Buddhist worship, e.g. the Temple of the Tooth at Kandy in Ceylon, where the first gallery on the approach contains a series of pictures representing the sinful being tortured in the infernal regions. Mediæval Christianity taught the same lesson in its churches, showing the wicked descending into Hell while the good rise to Heaven.

doors, but they are exaggerated from the Indian type, the eyes being enormous and protruding. On each side are represented the animal's paws, the claws being crooked and displayed in threatening attitude.

The great detached basement is covered with magnificent carvings. The main design evidently depicts the several scenes of some legend or poem. There are many inscriptions, but all short ones, which Dr. Brandes conjectures to be names of the metres in which the poem was composed. Copies and translations into Dutch are to be found in the *Rapporten* for 1901 (published by the Batavian Society). The angles consist of great twisted serpents, the length of whose bodies runs all along the sides above and below the carved friezes. The building was probably the *pāśāla* of the monastery.

Two immense *dvārapāla* figures guard the approach to the main temple. This is built in curious fashion with two staircases, having heavy retaining walls, leading up to a platform, from which another staircase leads to an upper terrace. The whole has been restored, but the entire top of the structure has disappeared. The peculiarity of this very interesting shrine lies not only in its general design but in its sculptures. Rich friezes run round the walls, covered with figures and scenes deeply and boldly carved; and the style of the figures differs altogether from those of Borobūdūr. Fergusson, describing them, writes that they are "more spirited and better executed than any similar figures are in any examples of Hindu Art I am acquainted with."¹

The human figures on the basement are peculiarly clumsy and short, very straight up and down, and wanting in gracefulness. The headgear of the males is enormous, and covered with plumes and heavy ornaments. The Rākshasa figures are coarse and sexual. The friezes represent generally scenes from the *Rāmāyaṇa* mixed with local East Javanese legends. On the east side is Rāma's march to Lanka, his standards being the Vaishṇava *chaṅk* and *chakra*.

¹ *Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 654.

One of the most beautiful and artistic sculptures in the East, perhaps in the world, is that on the robes of the free-standing monsters that guard each side of each stairway. One of these is figured in plate 31 of the *Rapporten van de Commissie in Nederlandsch-Indië (Java en Madoera)* for 1903. It consists of a mass of most graceful scrollwork interspersed with birds and animals very realistically rendered. A blood-sucker lizard is shown, forcing his way in amongst the twisted ornament, in a way that adds immensely to the general effect by suggesting lightness to masses that might otherwise have appeared heavy. The gracefulness of the lotus-stalks and leaves growing from a pot at the side is also very remarkable. I wrote to Dr. Brandes about these statues, expressing my surprise and admiration, and at the same time saying that they seemed to me to be more Chinese or Japanese in conception than Indian. He replied: "That wonderful vegetation is not only quite Japanese, but the whole conception of the statues is Chinese; though they are pure-Javanese at the same time."

Over most of the sculptured friezes runs a long wavy line like the long roll supported by *ganas* which forms the upper member of the outer rail at Amarāvati. In the line of decoration at foot the 'lucky line' alternates with the *triśūla*.

The sculptures on the (present) top of the building are strikingly bold and uncommon. There are monsters with immense wings, the feather-work splendidly executed, and having heads, sometimes of *yāli* pattern, sometimes of serpents. Their arms are raised as if they were in the midst of a wild and furious combat, and were in act to strike, the attitudes being full of life and energy.

The principal temple at Singosāri has not yet been taken in hand by the Archæological Department, and is covered with vegetation. To the west of the present main shrine are two enormous granite *dvārapālas*, something like that shown in Plate II (*d*) but much larger, which probably (foundations of walls are visible) guarded the entrance of a temple. The *dvārapāla* figures are too far from the

present main shrine to have been solely intended to guard its approach, and they do not face outwards from it, but in a different direction. The inference would be that they marked the entrance to a site not yet fully explored.

At the temple is a fine statue of Śiva, moved to its present site from a spot in the neighbourhood. It does not therefore belong to the only temple now standing at Singosāri.

The temple is small but lofty. There is some fine carving above. The *yāli* heads over the doorways are very large, but not very well designed.

From Malang a light tram-railway on the main road leads to Tumpang, and here the temple, otherwise called Chandi Jāgō, is exceedingly interesting.

It has been much injured and broken down, but apparently was of the Panataram type. The great *sardūla*, or *yāli*, heads over doorways are similar to those at Panataram, and here, as there, is a large double stairway leading to the chaitya platform, with retaining walls finished on the outside in similar fashion. The temple has four bands of rich and elaborate sculpture, on the base and on the sides of the three platforms. The costumes and style of treatment of the squat and awkward figures are also like those at Panataram, the men as well as women wearing enormous headdresses, helmets, and plumes. The subject of this series of friezes I could not ascertain, but there are kings on thrones, ladies, dwarfs, elephants, supernatural beings, including tree-bogies (a favourite theme in Java). Numbers of buildings, such as palaces, temples, courtyards, walls, are shown; also lakes, gardens, and forests. In one place is represented a Chinese or Burmese pagoda with seven separate roofs, the ends sweeping upwards in Far-Eastern fashion, each roof surmounting a storey with windows. The topmost platform is approached by a little double stairway square with the façade; and here the frieze exhibits a number of monstrous and grotesque Rākshasa figures, treated in a gross fashion never to be seen in buildings of the more classic period.

Though very fine in many respects, Chandi Tumpang belongs to the age of decadence.

Near the temple stands a fine statue, six-armed, of Padmapāni Lōkēśvara, or Āvalōkitēśvara, one of the Bōdhi-sattvas of the Mahāyānists. It is in the *amōghapāśa* form, holding in one hand the noose. Graceful lotus-leaves with long pliant stalks are carved by the side of the figure in the manner common in East Java.

An inscription is cut in the field on each side of the head, which has been broken away. This is in Deva-nāgarī characters, and reads—

Bharāla Āryāmōghapāśa Lōkēśvara.

Above the head is—

Bharāla Amitābha (as I read it).

It was apparently intended to represent, or was afterwards taken as representing indifferently, either Amitābha or Āvalōkitēśvara. *Bharāla* = 'image' (see above).

A very curious form of building is represented on the Tumpang frieze, a form of which there are many specimens on different temples, and on detached slabs at the Museum at Weltevreden, Batavia. It depicts a tall temple split down the centre from top to bottom and having a flight of steps running up into the hollow so made. No satisfactory account of the origin of this apparent vagary can be given. The appearance is as if some holy temple had been split by an earthquake,¹ leaving an aperture to which access was afterwards gained by the construction of a staircase.

Near by is Chandi Kidal, shown in Plate I (*a*). It is described by the French traveller Dr. Parmentier as an "elegant and well-preserved" temple of the most modern period of Javanese art. It is, however, too tall for its base, and somewhat out of proportion in that respect. The upper, or dagoba, portion seems unduly heavy for the underlying

¹ See *Tjandi Djago*, published in 1904, for description of this temple.

chaitya. The basement is not so striking as in many others. The angles have statues of monsters, demon-shape, in a style purely Javanese (or perhaps Cambodian); but they are depicted as too quiescent to strike the beholder as threatening or dangerous.

Near Bangil on the east coast is Gunong Gangsir, a temple of brick and sandstone. This is in appearance something of the shape of Chandi Kidal; but the basement is here so lofty that it includes the chaitya as part of itself, in contradistinction to the usual form where the chaitya and dagoba above are the principal members, and the basement is merely built for their support. In this case the basement is half the total height of the structure, and the chamber which contained the principal image is high up on a portion of the basement itself. There are some fine decorations in panels, made of terra cotta; but the temple is so covered with vegetation, ferns, and growth of all kinds that much of it is hidden.

A number of sculptured and terra-cotta figures have been collected and placed on the platform that surrounds the temple. One seems to be Vishṇu seated on a flying garuḍa, but it is much mutilated. There is the ornamental top of a votive chaitya, a garuḍa, an elephant, a wreath of flower-work belonging to a cornice, a Chinese dragon-head, an urn with flowers of the Indian Buddhist type, and other figures, and heads of small statues.

The upper line of decoration of the basement consists of urns and niches (the former being in terra cotta) under a band which, like that noticed above at Panataram, represents a long wavy roll as in the upper portion of the outer rail at Amarāvati. The band below has a number of designs called by Dr. Brandes the 'lucky line.' They are very frequent in Javanese sculpture. The corners of the cornice have two little buildings shown side by side, representing possibly a chaitya and a vihāra, the latter resembling the waggon-roof *ratha* at Mahāvālipura. Here and there on the walls are more niches and a few figures seemingly of Vaiṣṇava deities.

The principal chamber of this temple is a square vaulted hall, in the centre of which (for what reason is not apparent) is a deep and perfectly square hole about 7 feet each way, which takes up almost the whole floor. It does not seem to have been excavated in more recent times, but to have been part of the original design. There is no sign in this hall of any base for an image, nor indeed of any place where an image could worthily stand. That this hollow chamber could not have been constructed, as Fergusson thinks the similar hollow in the Panataram temple was, for the reception of a Bo-tree, is apparent from the fact that the entire chamber is only a room in the building, roofed in and having the lofty dagoba and superstructure above it.

Fergusson treats of these deep 'well-holes' at some length (*Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 656), and writes: "Neither here [Panataram] nor elsewhere does there seem anything to controvert the theory that these wells were always open to the upper air," i.e. never had any pavilion or structure or roof above them, and he argues that they were 'tree-temples,' the sacred tree being planted in the well-hole.

Here, however, at Gunong-Gangsir, is most certainly such a hole in the principal chamber of the temple, and above is perhaps fifty feet of solid superstructure. The hole is a hole in the floor of the inner chamber of the shrine. There are no signs of any steps down or any means of ascent or descent, and the walls of the hole are smooth and vertical.

The bricks here are very large, some of them being four inches thick, and measuring 15 inches by 12 inches. Outside the chamber the flanking walls are decorated with niches representing a four-pillared *mandapa* with a heavy roof.

The temple of Chandi Jāvī, near the village of Pandehan, appears to be of late date. Only the basement portion of this remains. The *yālī* heads here are made in the usual East Javanese fashion with huge goggle eyes and wide cheeks. The pupil of the eye is made by cutting a spiral in the stone instead of (as constantly done) by concentric circles. The hair is dealt with in purely conventional manner,

no attempt being made to represent nature. It consists of a mass of floriated ornament and scrollwork.

The panels of the basement bas-reliefs are richly carved in a continuous series of scenes, the figures being often graceful and in good proportion. But I could not make out what legend or poem they were intended to depict. Many houses are seen, temples, enclosures with walls, hermit huts, etc., and always as they would appear to an observer standing at an angle of about 45° on the left side of the object; also gardens and forests. Elephants with howdahs appear also, the design here being evidently Indian as there are no elephants in Java. In one case there is a walled enclosure with gardens. On the left are three small buildings, each of one storey, with pointed roofs in Javanese style, while on the right stands a stupa of Indian design, dome-form, on basement, surmounted by three umbrella-like roofs one above the other, and topped by a *śikhara*. This evidently represents a monastery. Below the nearest of the three detached houses is a building with a roof singularly like the waggon-roof *dharmasāla* at Mahāvalipura.

The overhanging cornice is enormously heavy, as if the architect were determined at all hazards to preserve the sculptures below as long as possible. Above and below the line of bas-reliefs runs a series of projecting bands, one more forward than the other, the corner points of the most prominent having peculiar projecting ornaments. Some of the bands are richly carved.

From the masses of broken brick that lie about, it is evident that the superstructure was built of that material.

Near at hand is Chandi Pārī, a building of a totally different class to those described above. Dr. Parmentier remarks that it is very like the Cham temples. It is a solid square, or it may be, oblong structure on a basement with a raised platform round it. In front steps lead up from the platform to the principal chamber, over the entrance of which is a high peaked roof, its point being considerably higher than the edge of the main cornice. On each side of this the wall-face is decorated with panel-work.

The main side-wall is almost plain, the only ornament being a false door or niche with a high-peaked roof or series of roofs. The band above the wall is decorated with rosette-like knobs.

The building is built of very hard and durable bricks, and is well preserved. Near it was found an inscription bearing date corresponding to A.D. 1371.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

THE BRĤADDĒVATĀ AND THE SANSKRIT EPIC.

On p. 2 of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1906, Mr. Keith has honoured me by mentioning me as one of those who consider the Sanskrit epics to be "comparatively late work, the result of the gradual growth of the influence of the literary language of the Brāhmaṇic schools, which still show in many traces evidence of their being translations or adaptations of Pāli or Prākṛit originals." He points out that there are examples of *ākhyāna* literature in the *BrĥaddĒvatā* (written B.C. 400, or perhaps earlier), and argues that this fact is "decisive for the early date of the Sanskrit epic poetry, and against the theory of translation from Pāli or Prākṛit."

I am in no way concerned to defend here, on general grounds, the theory with which Mr. Keith has associated my name; but I venture to point out that, whether that theory is right or wrong, his argument is not so decisive as he thinks. Granted all his facts—what then? The *BrĥaddĒvatā* was a Sanskrit work composed for the use of school-Brāhmaṇs who were Vedic students. It was therefore naturally written in Sanskrit. That in no way proves that what was in those days intended for the edification of people who were not school-Brāhmaṇs, and who were not Vedic students, was also composed in Sanskrit. I am not going to discuss here in what language such works were composed. All I want to show is that, admitting for the sake of

argument all Mr. Keith's premises, his conclusion (which may in itself be right or wrong) does not follow from them.

I may perhaps take this opportunity of pointing out that scholars in Europe, who know much more Sanskrit than I can pretend to, sometimes find a needless difficulty in grasping the fact that there is nothing at all out of the way in two languages being current (amongst different castes or for different uses) side by side in the same locality in India. I know of a tract in Bengal in which three distinct languages are current at the present day in nearly every village; and over a great part of northern India the language of literature actually belongs to a group of Indo-Aryan vernaculars different from that in which the home-speech of the writers of that literature must be classed.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

Rathfarnham, Camberley.

January 22nd, 1906.

GAUḌA DEŚA.

In support of the proposition that Gauḍa was not formerly the Vaṅga Deśa (p. 163 of the January number of the Journal, 1905), I cite a text from Matsya Purāṇa :—

“Nīrmitā yena Śrāvastī Gauḍadeśe dvijottamaḥ.”

(12th ch., 30, Cal. ed.)

This has been said of Raja Śrāvasta, son of Raja Yuvānāśva, of the Īkṣvāku family. For the well-known town Śrāvastī to have been founded by the Raja in the Gauḍadeśa, Gauḍa must have been lying to the north of Kośala and to the north-west of Mithilā.

B. C. MAZUMDAR.

PALI AND SANSKRIT.

LES GURUDHARMAS.

Les fragments de Vinaya de langue sanscrite ne sont pas tellement nombreux qu'on puisse dédaigner les plus petits morceaux, et j'espère qu'on fera bon accueil au paragraphe des *gurudharmas* inséré par l'auteur de l'*Abhidharma-kośavyākhyā* dans la longue et ténébreuse dissertation sur l'*aviññapti* [Soc. As., fol. 290 b 8]. La comparaison avec Cullavagga x. 1. 4 est intéressante.¹

À ces petites trouvailles, la lexicographie sanscrite ne gagne pas seulement quelques mots curieux, par exemple *upasampad* (Böhtlingk ne donne qu'*upasampadā*, avec une référence (Kār. vyūha, 90. 24) qui, naturellement, est fausse²), elle s'assure aussi le droit de considérer comme siens presque tous les termes techniques du Bouddhisme pāli. La prudence est néanmoins de mise : j'observe, par exemple, que l'*Abhidh. k.v.*, en reproduisant, sur les cinq classes d'*Anāgāmin*, des explications analogues à celles de l'*Anguttara* (iv, 70-74), s'abstient régulièrement de donner à l'*Ūrdhvamsrotas* la qualification d'*Akanisṭhagāmin*.

Gurudharmābhyupagameneti . aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ . bhikṣor antikād bhikṣuṇīnām upasaṃpat, bhikṣuṇībhāvaḥ . anvar-dhamāsam³ avavādo⁴ grāhyo bhikṣor antikāt . abhikṣuka āvāse varṣā nopagantavyā . pravāraṇāyām⁵ ubhayasaṃghas tribhiḥ sthānaiḥ pravārayitavyaḥ⁶ . na codayitavyo bhikṣur

¹ Voir l'Index du Culla et Vinaya Texts, i. p. 35, note.

M. Cecil Bendall a eu la bonté de collationner ma copie avec le MS. de Cambridge, et j'ai aussi profité de plusieurs observations dues à l'obligeance de M. A. Barth.

² Lire 96. 7 ; voir Mahāvastu, i. 368, etc.

³ MS. *aṃtardāham*°.

⁴ *avadhādo*.

⁵ *pradhā*°.

⁶ *ṭavyāḥ*.

āpattim āpannaḥ, nākroṣṭavyaḥ . gurudharmāpattau mānāpyam¹ ardhamaśaṁ caritavyam . varṣaśatopasaṁpannayāpi bhikṣuṇyā² tatkṣaṇopasaṁpanno bhikṣur vandyāḥ . na ca bhikṣuṇyā kva cid bhikṣuś codayitavyaḥ . ity evamādayaḥ . eṣāṁ abhyupagamena tasyā upasampat.

PĀCITTIYA 68.

Abhidharmakośav. (Soc. As., fol. 329 b 1 ; Cambridge, 229 a 4) : Arbudāt pūrvam iti . doṣo 'rbudam . dṛṣṭyārbudam śīlārbudam vā, 'tra dṛṣṭyārbudam . dvidhārbudam dvitrārbudam vā . yathoktam : *yathāhaṁ bhagavato bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi ya ime bhagavatā 'ntarāyikā dharmā ākhyātās te pratiṣevyamāṇā nālaṁ antarā[yā]yeti tathā tadaiva cittam saṁdhāvati saṁsaratīty ādi . śīlārbudam dauḥśilyam.*

Comparer Pāc. 68 ; Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, p. 22.

C'est un des *vaiśāradyas* de Bhagavat d'expliquer convenablement les *antarāyikadharmas* (Mahāvvyutpatti, § 8. 4).

UN NOUVEAU FRAGMENT DU BRAHMAJĀLA CITÉ DANS L'ABHIDHARMAKOŚAVYĀKHYĀ.

L'intérêt de la comparaison entre les documents pāli et sanscrit réside surtout dans ce fait que l'Abhidh. k.v.,—lequel, ainsi que nous l'avons remarqué naguère,³ cite le Brahmajāla en l'appelant par son nom,—nous fournit ici, comme extrait de la *Śīlaskandhikā* un fragment de sūtra très voisin du *Majjhima Śīla* du Brahmajālasutta. Ceci donne à penser que les §§ relatifs aux Śīlas ne faisaient pas partie du Brahmajāla septentrional.⁴ Le Brahmajāla est le filet de

¹ Sic. "Pointing to a Prākṛit original answering to a Skr. mānātmya. The word is obscure; in Pāli it is commented by mānanabhāva" (Kern, Man. 87, n. 5); défendu par M. Vyutpatti, 265. 14-17 (*mūla*°, *mūlāpakarṣa*°, *cirna*°). Pāli mānattam (*ttacārini*). L'explication de Childers (*māna-tva*) paraît bien faible.

² °*nyāt* || *kṣaṇ*°.

³ J.R.A.S. 1903, p. 359. Je crois avoir déjà observé que le Nanjio 554, que j'indiquais à tort à propos du 'Sūtra du Filet de Brāhmā,' traduit par M. de Groot, n'a rien à faire avec ce sūtra. C'est la traduction d'un texte correspondant au Suttānta.

⁴ Voir Rhys Davids, Dialogues, p. 3, note.

dr̥ṣṭi dans lequel Brahmā s'enveloppe; par extension, il est traité des autres *dr̥ṣṭis* dans le sūtra de ce nom; mais les 'Śīlaskandhikās' n'y sont pas très bien à leur place.

Je me borne, après cette rapide constatation, à présenter le texte sanscrit (MS. de la Société Asiatique, fol. 324 *a-b* = Cambridge, Add. 1041, fol. 224 *b* 4), avec un très sobre commentaire. Par endroits, les leçons des MSS. laisseront le lecteur perplexe.

Vividhadr̥ṣṭineti . kautukamaṅgalatithimuhūrtanakṣatrā-didr̥ṣṭinā . pareṣv āyattavṛttineti . kāyasthitihetavaś cīvara-piṇḍapātaśayanādayo bhikṣoḥ parapratiḥbaddhāḥ, piṇḍapātām niśrityeti vacanāt . tasya parādhinavṛtter mithyājīvā bhaveyuh¹ kuhanā lapanā naimittikatā naiṣpeṣitā² lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā³ ca te duḥśodhā bhavanti . ājīva-yoga iti . Śīlaskandhikāyām iti . Śīlaskandhikā nāma nipātaḥ.

Tatroktam⁴: yathā Tridaṇḍin⁵ eke śramaṇabrāhmaṇāḥ śraddhādeyaṁ paribhujya⁶ vividhadarśanasamārambhānu-yogam⁷ anuyuktā viharanti . tadyathā hastiyuddhe śvayuddhe rathayuddhe pattiyuddhe yaṣṭiyuddhe muṣṭiyuddhe sārāsāyuddhe vṛṣabhayuddhe mahiṣayuddhe ajayuddhe meṣayuddhe⁸ kukkuṭayuddhe vartakayuddhe lābakayuddhe

¹ Cf. Dīgha, i, 1. 20 ad finem.

² Pāli *kuhanā, lapanā, naimittikā, naiṣpeṣikā*. Cf. Çikṣās. 268. 5: *Kuhanā-lapanā-lābhāpagato bhavati . pe . na bodhisatto dānapatini vā dr̥ṣṭvā nimittān karoti* . . . ; M. Vyut. 127, 52 et suiv. *Kuhanā, lapanā, naimittikatvam,*

naiṣpeṣikatvam (= བཞིན་[ས.]་སྤྱོད་ = mendier avec importunité et violence).

Pour le dernier mot, Dialogues, p. 16, n. 2. On peut penser au sanscrit *niṣpeṣa[na]*.—Les lexiques fournissent les synonymes *mardana, pīḍana, kleśa, unmāda*; Pān. v, i, 101, *naiṣpeṣika*, qui est capable de produire *niṣpeṣa*; *niṣpiṣ* = écraser, anéantir.—Visuddhimagga, J.P.T.S. 1891, p. 80; Rāṣṭrapālap. 15. 10.

³ *lābhena lābhanijigimsitāro*—*cikīrṣ* = "das Verlangen nach."—M. Vyut. 127. 15, *lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā*; 56, *lābhena lābhaniṣpādanam*.

⁴ Cf. Dīgha, i, 13.

⁵ Dans le Dīgha le discours est adressé aux Bhikṣus. Tridaṇḍin manque, ici, dans Cambr.; mais il est donné ci-dessous. (Voir Dialogues, p. 220; M. Vyut. 178. 26.)

⁶ *saddhādeyāni bhojanāni bhuñjivā*.

⁷ *viśukadassanam anuyuttā*. Voir Dialogues, p. 7, note 2.

⁸ *meṇḍakayuddham*. Le Dīgha n'énumère pas tous les *yuddhas* et fait précéder ceux qu'il nomme par les diverses musiques qu'on va trouver ci-dessous, p. 446, l. 8.

striyuddhe puruṣayuddhe kumārayuddhe kumārikāyuddhe udgālavaṣe¹ utsatikāyāṃ² dhvajāgre balāgre senāvīyūhe anikasamādarśane . mahāsamājāṃ vānubhavānty eke . ity evamrūpāc chramaṇo vividhadarśanasamārambhānuyogāt prativirato bhavati.

Yathāpi Tridaṇḍinn eke śramaṇabrāhmanāḥ śraddhādeyam paribhujya vividhaśabdaśravaṇasamārambhānuyogayuktā viharanti . rathaśabde pattiśabde śaṅkhaśabde bheriśabde ādambaraśabde³ nṛtaśabde⁴ gītaśabde śamyāśabde⁵ acchaṭaśabde pāṇisvane kumbhatūṇire⁶ kacito⁷ citrākṣare citrapadavyaṇjane lokāyatapratisaṃyukte . ākhyāyikā vā śrotum icchanty eke . ity apy evamrūpāc chramaṇo vividhaśabdaśravaṇasamārambhānuyogāt prativirato bhavati ity evamādimitthyāviṣayaparibhogād asamyagviṣayaparibhogāt.

LES CINQ ESPÈCES D'ANĀGĀMIN.

Āṅuttaranikāya, vii, 52 (t. iv, p. 70. 4) et *Abhidharma-kośavyākhyā*, chap. iii, Soc. As. 213 b = Camb. 145 b.

I.

Au cours de la discussion sur l'*Antarābhava*, l'auteur de la Vyākhyā, Yaśomitra, fait appel à l'autorité de l'Écriture. Il cite le sūtra qu'on va lire et dont les rapports avec l'*Āṅuttara* méritent d'être étudiés.

Sūtraṃ cātra paṭhyate.

Śrāvastyāṃ nidānam . tatra bhagavān bhikṣūṃ āmantrayate sma. Sapta vo 'haṃ bhikṣavaḥ satpuruṣagatir deśayīṣyāmy

¹ Camb. *ingā°*; Paris *udgā°*. Voir *udgūraṇa*, M. Vyut. 261. 53; *udgoraṇa*, *udgūra*, Böhtl. ii, Suppl.—Voir aussi *udgāra*, Jātakamālā, iii, 8.

² Sic MSS.—La valeur du terme est indiquée par le pāli *nibuddhaṃ uyyodhikāṃ balaggaṃ senāvīyūhaṃ* . . . Cf. Pācittiya, 50.—La Mahāvīyutpatti donne *udiyūthikāgamanam* (§ 261, 51).

³ Les cinq *śabdas* manquent dans le pāli.

⁴ *Naccaṃ gītaṃ vāditaṃ pekkhaṃ akkhānaṃ paṇissaraṃ vetūlaṃ kumbhatūṇaṃ* . . .

⁵ MSS. *śamyā°*; cf. M. Vyut. 218, 11.

⁶ Voir Mahāvastu, *°tūṇi*, *°tūṇika*, *°thūṇika*, iii, p. 472: "Nos MSS. sont si conséquents dans l'orthographe *tūṇika* que je regrette de ne pas l'avoir maintenue partout."

⁷ Sic MSS.—Peut-être *°tūṇirake*, *citrācitra°*.

anupādāya ca parinirvāṇam . tac chṛṇu[ta] ca sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuruta, bhāṣiṣye¹ . sapta satpuruṣagatayaḥ katamā?

1. iha bhikṣur evaṃ pratipanno bhavati : no ca syāṃ, no ca me syāt, na bhaviṣyāmi,² na me bhavisyati . yad asti yad³ bhūtaṃ tat prajāhāṃīty upekṣāṃ pratilabhate . sa bhave 'smin⁴ na sajyate,⁵ athottaraṃ padaṃ sāntaṃ prajāyā pratividhyati.⁶ tac⁷ cānena padaṃ kāyena [na]sākṣāt-kṛtaṃ bhavati . “ evaṃ pratipannasya bhikṣoḥ kā gatiḥ syāt kopapattiḥ ko 'bhisamparāya ” iti syuḥ praṣṭāras.⁸ tadyathā bhikṣavaḥ parittaḥ śakalikāgnir⁹ abhinirvartamāna eva¹⁰ nirvāyād, evam eva tasya tāvan mānāvaseṣam¹¹ aprahīṇaṃ bhavaty aparijñātam . tasya tāvan mānāvaseṣasyāprahāṇād aparijñānāt, pañcānāṃ avarabhāgiyānāṃ samyojanānāṃ prahāṇād antarāparinirvāyī bhavatiyaṃ prathamā satpuruṣa-gatir ākhyatā.¹²

2. ¹³ Punar aparaṃ bhikṣur evaṃ pratipanno bhavati : no ca

¹ Pāli ajoute la réponse des Bhikṣus : “ ‘Oui, Seigneur,’ répondirent les Bhikkhus. Le Seigneur dit :”

² Pāli na bhavissati (?).

³ MSS. tad.

⁴ Asmin manque dans Pāli.

⁵ Paris, sakṣyate ; Pāli ajoute saṃbhave na rajjati.

⁶ Sammappaññāya passati.

⁷ Tañ ca khv assa padaṃ na sabbena sabbam sacchikataṃ hoti, tassa na sabbena sabbam mānānusayo pahīno hoti, na sabbena sabbam bhavarāgānusayo pahīno hoti, na sabbena sabbam avijjānusayo pahīno hoti. So pañcannam orambhāgiyānāṃ samyojanānāṃ parikkhayaṃ antarāparinibbāyī hoti. Seyyathā pi, bhikkhave, divasasantatte ayokapāle haññamāne, papaṭikā nibbattitvā nibbāyeyya, evam eva kho, bhikkhane, bhikkhu evaṃ patipanno hoti : no ca syāṃ (comme ci-dessus jusque antarāparinibbāyī hoti). Pour le sanscrit kāyena sākṣātkṛta, cf. kāyasākṣin, M. Vyut. 46. 12 ; Puggalapaññatti, i, 31 et suiv (p. 14), Dh. 259, etc.

⁸ MSS. praṣṭāras, ci-dessous prāptārah et praṣṭārah.

⁹ Le mot śakalikā, autant que je sache, n'est connu que par Mahāvvyutpatti, § 245, qui vise notre sūtra ou un sūtra analogue : śakalikā (299), parittasakalikāgniḥ (300), utplutya (301), sañjñāgataḥ (302), nāmnāyate (303).—Cf. la forme correcte śakalika.

Remarquer l'emploi du mot abhinirvartamāna. Le feu n'a pas encore pris qu'il est éteint. (Comparer le nibbattitvā nibbāyeyya.)

¹⁰ MSS. evaṃ.

¹¹ En fait d'anūsaya notre texte ne laisse à l'antarāparinirvāyīn qu'un reste de māna. Le Pāli ajoute bhavarāga et avidyā.

¹² La finale 'iyam . . . ' manque dans le Pāli.

¹³ Pāli comme dans la section précédente, sauf papaṭikā nibbattitvā uppatitvā nibbāyeyya.

syām iti . pūrvavat . yāvat syuḥ praṣṭāra¹ iti tadyathā 'yogu-
dānām vā 'yasphālānām² vā pradīptāgnisamprataptānām
ayoghanena hanyamānānām ayasprapāṭikā³ utpatanty eva
nirvāyād evam eva tasya pūrvavat . yāvat pañcānām avara-
bhāgiyānām samyojanānām prahāṇād antarāparinirvāyī
bhavatiyaṁ dvitīyā satpuruṣagatiḥ.

3. Punar aparaṁ bhikṣur evaṁ pratipanno bhavati [iti]
pūrvavad yāvad ayasprapāṭikā⁴ utplutyāpatitvaiva⁵ prṭhi-
vyāṁ nirvāyād evam eva tasya pūrvavad yāvad antarāpari-
nirvāyī bhavati . iyaṁ tṛtīyā satpuruṣagatiḥ.

4. Punar aparaṁ bhikṣur evaṁ pratipanno bhavati
pūrvavat . yāvad ayasprapāṭikā utplutya patitamātraiva
prṭhivyāṁ nirvāyād⁶ evam eva tasya pūrvavad yāvat
pañcānām avarabhāgiyānām samyojanānām prahāṇād
upapadya⁷ parinirvāyī bhavatiyaṁ caturthī satpuruṣagatiḥ.

5. Punar aparaṁ bhikṣur evaṁ pratipanna iti pūrvavad
yāvad ayasprapāṭikā utplutya parितte tṛṇakāṣṭhe⁸ nipatet . sā
tatra dhūmam api kuryāt ; arcir api samjanayet . sā tatra
dhūmam api kṛtvā , 'rcir api samjanayya , tad eva⁹ parittam
tṛṇakāṣṭham dagdhvā paryādāya nirupādānā¹⁰ nirvāyād,
evam eva tasya pūrvavad yāvat pañcānām avarabhāgiyānām

¹ MSS. *prāptāra*.

² "Pelle en fer."

³ MSS. *ayatpr*^o ; M. Vyut. 245, 608, *ayasprapāṭikā* (°ṭikā).

⁴ MSS. ici et ci-dessous *ayaṁ pra*^o.

⁵ MSS. °*tya patitvaiva* ; Pāli, *nibbattitvā*, *uppatitvā*, *anupahacca talaṁ nibbāyeyya*. (Je ne vois pas pourquoi l'éditeur écrit *anupaccatalam* en un mot.)

⁶ Pāli *nibbattitvā*, *uppatitvā*, *upahacca talaṁ nibbāyeyya*.

⁷ Pāli *upahaccaparinibbāyī*. Le sanscrit signifie "qui obtiendra le nirvāṇa après une nouvelle naissance" (dans un monde supérieur, bien entendu ; si non, nous aurions affaire à un *sakṛdāgāmin*) ; le pāli, d'après Childers, "who ceases to exist after half the time is expired he should have lived in the Atappa heaven," id est, "having reduced [*upahacca*] the ordinary term of Atappa-life." Cette explication est modifiée dans le détail par Pugg. Paññ. i, 43.—Voir Minayeff, Grammaire palie, p. xxxix, Kathāv. a., iv, 2.

⁸ MSS. *kā*^o et *koṣṭham*.—Pāli *nibbattitvā*, *uppatitvā*, *parittē tinapuñje vā kaṭṭhapuñje vā nipateyya* ; sā tatha aggim pi janeyya, dhūmam pi janeyya, aggim pi janetvā, dhūmam pi janetvā, tam eva parittam tinapuñjaṁ vā, kaṭṭhapuñjaṁ vā pariyaḍiyyitvā anāhārā nibbāyeyya. . . .

⁹ MS. *evam*.

¹⁰ MSS. *nirupādā* et ci-dessous *nirupādāyā*, °*dānā* ; = *anāhārā* du Pāli. La leçon *nirupādā* serait trop belle !—*upādāna*, aliment du feu, est fréquent ; cf. *anupādāna*, Madhyamakavṛtti, Bibl. Buddh. 285. 7, 295. 4.

samyojanānāṃ prahāṇād anabhisamkāraparinirvāyī¹ bhavati . iyaṃ pañcamī satpuruṣagatiḥ.

6. ² Punar aparaṃ bhikṣur evaṃ pratipanna iti pūrvavad yāvad ayasprapāṭikā utplutya mahati vipule tṛṇakāṣṭhe nipatet . sā tatra dhūmam api kuryād arcir api samjanayet ; sā tatra dhūmam api kṛtvā 'rcir api samjanayya tad eva³ mahadvipulam tṛṇakāṣṭham dagdhvā paryādāya nirupādānā parinirvāyāt⁴ ; evam eva tasya pūrvavad yāvat pañcānām avarabhāgiyānāṃ samyojanānāṃ prahāṇāt sabbhisamkāraparinirvāyī⁵ bhavati . iyaṃ ṣaṣṭhī satpuruṣagatiḥ.

7. Punar aparaṃ bhikṣur evaṃ pratipanna iti pūrvavad yāvad ayasprapāṭikā utplutya mahati vipule⁶ tṛṇakāṣṭhe nipatet . sā tatra dhūmam api kuryād arcir api samjanayet ; sā tatra dhūmam api kṛtvā, 'rcir api samjanayya tad eva mahadvipulam tṛṇakāṣṭham⁷ dagdhvā grāmam api dahed, grāmapradeśam api, nagaram api, nagarapradeśam api, janapadam api, janapadapradeśam api, kakṣam api, dāvam api, dvīpam⁸ api, khaṇḍam⁹ api dahed ; grāmam api dagdhvā yāvat khaṇḍam⁹ api dagdhvā, mārgam¹⁰ hy āgamyā udakāntam vānyaharitaṃ¹¹ vā pṛthivipradeśam āgamyā paryādāya nirupādānā¹² nirvāyāt ; evam eva tasya yāvat

¹ Pāli *asamkhāraparinibbāyī*.—La version tibétaine (voir Śārad Candrar Das, Tib. Dict. *sub voce* gañ-zag = puḍgala, p. 210) confirme la lecture de nos MSS.—M. Vyut. 46, 8 et 9.

² Pāli comme ci-dessus en substituant *vipula* à *paritta*. Le sanscrit porte *mahati* vipule, *mahadvipule*, dans 6 comme dans 7.

³ MS. *evam*.

⁴ MSS. *parinirvāyāt*, mais comparer les passages parallèles.

⁵ Pāli *sasamkhāraparinibbāyī*.

⁶ Le pāli porte *mahante* au lieu du *vipule* du § 6. Le texte sanscrit additionne les deux qualificatifs.

⁷ Pāli **kaṭṭhapuññaṃ vā pariyaḍḍiyitvā gaccham pi daheyya dāyam pi daheyya, gaccham pi dahitvā, dāyam pi dahitvā haritaṃ tam vā patthan taṃ vā selan taṃ vā udakan taṃ vā ramaniyaṃ vā bhūmibhāgaṃ āganna anāhārā nibbāyeyya*

Trois MSS. donnent, au lieu de *gaccha* (shrub), *kaccha*, qui correspond au sanscrit *kakṣa*.—*dāyo* = *dāvo* = *dāva*.—Je crois qu'il faut lire *haritantam* *udakantam*.

⁸ Cette lecture est bien étrange.

⁹ MSS. *ṣaṇḍa*. Voir Mahāvīyutpatti, § 196, 20, *vanakhaṇḍa*.

¹⁰ Lecture douteuse. Le feu s'arrête quand il rencontre un chemin, de l'eau, un endroit 'vert,' où il ne trouve pas d'aliment.—Cf. Lalitav. 392. 12.

¹¹ Lecture plus que douteuse. MSS. *vā || nyaharitaṃ*. (Cf. le *saharitaṃ* de Mahāvīyutpatti, § 263. 105.)

¹² MSS. *nirupādāyā* ; il faut °*dāya* ou °*dānā*.

pañcānām avarabhāgiyānām saṃyojanānām prahāṇād ūrdhvaṃsrotā¹ bhavatiyaṃ saptamī satpuruṣagatir ākhyātā.

Anupādāya parinirvāṇaṃ katamad ? iha bhikṣur evaṃ pratipanna itī pūrvavad² yāvat syuḥ praṣṭāra³ itī . tasyaivaṃ pratipannasya bhikṣor na pūrvasyāṃ diśi gatim vadāmi, na dakṣiṇasyāṃ, na paścimāyāṃ, nottarasyāṃ, nordhvaṃ, nādho, nānuvidikṣu, nānyatra ; drṣṭa eva dharme niśchāyaṃ⁴ parinirvṛtaṃ śītībhūtaṃ⁵ brahmībhūtaṃ itī . idam ucyate anupādāya parinirvāṇam.

II.

Les textes que nous venons de confronter présentent notamment deux divergences dignes de remarque. 1° La substitution du *śakalikāgni*, comme exemple du premier paragraphe, à la *ayasprapātikā* seule mentionnée dans le pāli. Je suis porté à croire que la version sanscrite, sur ce point, a été retouchée. 2° L'omission dans le § 7 de l'épithète *Akaṇiṣṭhagāmin* régulièrement accolée, dans tous les documents pālis, au terme *Ūrdhvaṃsrotas*. Il faut noter que la glose de Śarad Candra Dās, Tib. Dict. p. 210,⁶ établit suffisamment l'existence dans la littérature sanscrite de cette épithète : *Akaṇiṣṭhaga* est, dans le *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, un des noms du Buddha. Mais il se peut que la source de l'*Abhidharmakośa* soit, en l'omettant, plus archaïque :

¹ Pāli *uddhamsoto hoti akaṇiṣṭhagāmi*.

² Le texte pāli, avec raison, établit une différence avec les cas précédents. Le candidat à l'*anupādā parinibbāna* est naturellement entièrement dépouillé de tout *māna*, *bhavarāga*, ou *avijjānusaya* ; il réalise (*sacchikaroti*) complètement le *santa pada*. *So āsavānaṃ khayā . . . pe . . . sacchikatvā upasampajja viharati*. *Idam vuccati bhikkhave anupādā parinibbānam*. Le sanscrit semble donc parfaitement indépendant de la source de l'*Anguttara*.—Pour la comparaison du feu qui s'éteint faute d'aliments, voir Majjh. i. 487, etc.

³ MSS. *praṣṭāra*.

⁴ MS. *niśchāyam* ; voir *niśchāya*, 'Schattenlos,' Deśin. i, 164 ; Mahāvvyutpatti, § 223. 180, *chayikam* (?) *api na praññāyate*.

⁵ Mahāvvyutpatti, § 129. 6, *śītībhāvah*.

⁶ " Ūrdhvaṃsrotas, ཡོད་རྩ་འཕྲོ་བ་, he will in his spiritual progress reach up to the Akaṇiṣṭha heavens."—C'est sans doute pour cela que l'*Āḍibuddha* est logé dans le ciel *Akaṇiṣṭha*.

Akanitthagāmin appartient peut-être en propre à la définition scolastique de l'Uddhamsota.

Le pāli parle de "l'étincelle qui se détache, quand on le frappe, d'un vase de fer chauffé par le soleil"; le sanscrit, de "l'étincelle qui se détache d'une cruche ou d'une pelle en fer, chauffée à feu vif, et frappée d'un marteau de fer."

Je n'ai pas l'intention d'examiner les problèmes relatifs à la définition des trois sortes d'Antarāparinirvāyin, à la distinction de l'Antarāparinirvāyin et de l'Upapadya (upahacca) parinirvāyin. Le lecteur se documentera sur ce point en lisant la Puggalapaññatti, i, 41-46, le Nettipakaraṇa et son Commentaire, p. 189.¹ Il suffira de noter pour l'instant que l'Abhidharmakośavyākhyā (chap. iii), après avoir rappelé des explications analogues à celles des Abhidhammas pālis, mais plus nettes, les écarte pour adopter l'explication, *antarāparinirvāyin* = "être destiné à obtenir le nirvāṇa au cours de la période intermédiaire" (*antarābhava*): de même, sans doute, les hérétiques confondus par Tissa dans le Kathāvatthu, viii, 2. La question est d'ailleurs reprise dans le chap. vi, qui traite du 'chemin' et des *pudgalas*.²

LOUIS DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN.

¹ Il est intéressant de comparer Aṅguttara, iii, 86. 3, ix, 12. 5 et vi, 52, d'une part; d'autre part, le Saṃgītisuttanta, qui ignore les trois espèces d'Antarāparinibbāyin, et les livres d'Abhidharma nommés à l'instant. Il est certain que la scolastique eut grand peine à hiérarchiser les sept *satpuruṣagatis*, les neuf *sattvāvāsas*, les sept *vijñānasthitis*, et à les mettre en relation d'une part avec les dieux mythologiques, d'autre part avec les dieux dogmatiques (*ākāśānantyāyatana*, etc.); les dhyānas et les samāpattis entrecroisant leurs efficacités, on arrive à des conceptions extrêmement embrouillées et variables desquelles on ne peut s'occuper avec succès que dans un travail d'ensemble.

² L'auteur de l'Abhidh. k.v. désigne, en passant, le chapitre vi comme le *pudgalanirdeśakośasthāna*; mais la version tibétaine des Kārikās porte ལམ་རྟོག་པར་ལྟོག་པར་ལྟོག་པར་ = *mārga-pudgala-nirdeśa*, et la Vyākhyā du chapitre vi débute par la discussion des ākāras de la vérité de la douleur. Voir le remarquable article de M. Takakusu sur les Abhidharmas des Sarvāstivādins (J.P.T.S., 1905), p. 133, n. 5.

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE PIPRĀWĀ VASE.

The Piprāwā inscription, so ably treated by Dr. Fleet in the January number (pp. 149 sqq.), exhibits one rather interesting feature, which seems to have hitherto escaped observation, namely, that it is composed in metre, forming a somewhat irregular rhyming Āryā verse.¹

īyām sā|lilānī|dhānē || būdhās|a bhāgāvā|tē sā|kiyā|na(m) |
sūkīti|bhātī|nā(m) sābhāgi|nikā|nā(m) sāpū|tā|dālā|na(m) ||

Both lines have an unusual amphibrachys in the first foot, and the second by its imperfect cæsure seems to deserve the title *Vipulā*. It may be noted that the metre is almost decisive in favour of the reading *sābhaginikāna(m)*, with the second *i* long. The fact that the inscription is in metre may affect the consideration of interpretations based on order, and as regards the meaning of *sūkīti* I am inclined to ask whether Bühler's original understanding of it as an ordinary proper name has been justifiably abandoned in favour of the application to Buddha, which seems to lack testimony. The name *Sukīrti* occurs in the *Mahāvastu*, vol. i., p. 136, l. 14.

However, Professor Pischel's *Sukitī* in the sense of 'pious foundation' (*Zeitschrift d. deutschmorgenländ. Gesellschaft*, 1902, pp. 157-8) would be from the point of view of metre equally acceptable.

The irregularities in the scansion of the verse will not prove too much for the credence of those who will consult the Āryā verses occurring in the *Therāgāthā*, pp. 162, sqq. (Pali Text Society, 1883). In these, first noted by Professor Jacobi, as I learn from Professor Pischel, who has edited the text strictly in accordance with the MSS., we find exemplified not only -ām, -ē, and -ō, but also amphibrachys in the first and third foot, etc.

¹ The marks of quantity relate to the syllable, not to the vowel. *tē sā|kiyā|na(m)* is a suggestion of Professor Rapson.

[Dr. Fleet points out that the verse may preferably be regarded as an *Upagiti*, in which case I am inclined to agree with him that the first word of the inscription is *Sukitī*—

Sūkīṭī|bhātī|nā(m) sābhāgī|nikā|nā(m) sāpū|tā|dālā|na(m) |
iyāṃ sā|lilānī|dhānē || būdhā|sā bhāgāvā|tē | sākiyā|na(m) ||

Possibly the last word might be scanned *sākyā|na(m)*.

I have previously (in this Journal, 1903, pp. 831–3) pointed to some apparent verses in the inscriptions of Aśoka, and suggested that others would hereafter be discovered. The following inscription now seems to me to be metrical:—

Gihīlōnā | Sihārā|khītēnā cā || bhātārē|hī Tākhāsī|lāē |
āyāṃ thū|vō prātī|thāvītō || sārāvū|dhānā pū|yāē ||

(Peshawar Vase.)

Here we seem to have a rhyming verse consisting of five feet of five *mātrās* with a concluding spondee; but I am not acquainted with the metre elsewhere.

F. W. THOMAS.

THE SAKYAS AND KAPILAVASTU.

I venture to call attention to two points in Mr. Fleet's paper on the inscription on the Piprāwā vase.

In tracing the origin of the tribal name Śākya through the forms Śākiya, Sākiya, *sākiya*, to the word *śāka*, he has taken this last word in the sense of 'a teak-tree' (p. 163 above); and that is in accordance with the dictionaries.

But the application of the word *śāka* in Northern India is to the *sāl*-tree (*Shorea robusta*); and the teak-tree is called *sāguān*. It may be that the latter word has led the interpreters astray. Anyhow, the *sāl*-tree is also called *sāku* throughout the districts and provinces bordering on Nepal, and a tract of *sāl*-forest is called *sākuwan* or *sakuwan*. As *sāl* represents *śāla*, *sāku*, *saku*, will represent *śāku*. The teak is not indigenous to the Nepal Terai forests. They are essentially *sāl*-forests, and Śākya obviously means 'the people of the *sāl*-forest tracts.'

Mr. Fleet relies on the Piprāwā Stūpa as clearly marking a portion of the site of Kapilavatthu, Kapilavastu, or some spot in the immediate outskirts of the city (page 180). I do not think that this conclusion is justified by the data.

Exactly $4\frac{3}{4}$ miles due south of the point where the Bāngaṅgā enters the Basti district there is a vast mound, surmounted by the ruins of a small shrine, called in the map Grankul, but incorrectly so, for the people call it Kraṅkul, with a very faint nasal sound. The houses of villagers stand on the skirts of this mound. North-east of this, less than a mile off, is Nibī. Chāṇḍapār lies between the two places. Fa Hian states that he came south-east from Śrāvastī to Na-pi-ka (Nibī), and there he found the birthplace of Krakucchanda. He also states that there was a tower erected over the spot where the interview took place between father and son (when the latter returned, as did Gautama-Buddha also, after Enlightenment, to his home). Yuan Chwang also places the town of Krakucchanda south of Kapilavastu, and mentions the Stūpa of the Return. Two and a half miles west by south of Nibī is Parigawan, and here is a Stūpa. This I take to be the Memorial of the Return. I speak of what I have seen for myself, and I can have no doubt that we here have the identical places seen by both Fa Hian and Yuan Chwang, and by them referred to as the birthplace and the place of the return of Krakucchanda.

Mr. Smith seems to have been mistaken in claiming (*Antiquities in the Tarai*, prefatory note, p. 16) that "the Asoka pillar of Krakuchandra's town is probably that which is now worshipped as a Mahādeo at Paltā Devī"; and, when he admits that the two pilgrims must have seen the same towns of Krakucchanda and Kanakamuni, his theory that they saw two different Kapilavastus is thin.

W. HOEY.

THE ORIENTATION OF MOSQUES.

Considerable attention is paid to the proper orientation of Christian cathedrals and churches, and Muhammadans are equally zealous about their masjids. With the first, all

that is required is that the axis of the building should be due east and west. With the Muhammadans, the ritual requires that in facing the *mihrābs* they are assured that they are looking in the direction of their real *qibla*—the Ka'aba in Makka. This implies a different orientation for mosques all over the world, and to conform to their ritual, when away from a mosque, they use a compass (*qibla numā*) to show the direction of Makka. They have also tables (*tahwīl al qibla*) computed to guide them as to the precise direction.

It would be interesting to know more than we do of such tables, and they would be well worth publishing as an illustration of a branch of Oriental science. The mediæval Arabs and Persians were highly versed in astronomy, and were quite able to tabulate, according to available information, the direction of Makka from any known place, however distant. Their knowledge of the precise geographical positions may not have been quite mathematically accurate; still, the results would differ but slightly from those obtained from the employment of the more accurate latitudes and longitudes now in use. For example, Makka is placed by the Arabs about a third of a degree north of what we hold as its true position; and so is Lahor—Lahāwar as they call it—which is also fixed relatively almost two degrees more to the west than ought to be the case. Now, if we use the Muhammadan data, we find that a mosque at Lahor ought to have its west wall facing $11^{\circ} 25'$ to the south of due west, and if we use the European positions of the two places, we find the inclination to be $10^{\circ} 6'$ to the south. Such divergences, however, are trifling, and the ritual is practically as correctly conformed to as is needed. It would be interesting to determine what the actual deviation of the axis of Wazīr Khān's masjid at Lahor, from the direct east and west direction, really is and whether it agrees with calculation.

It will be readily seen that, since Makka is more than 21° north of the equator and the meridians converge to the poles, a line in India on which Makka should be due west from all places upon it, must run from the west gradually

tending slightly to the north-east. This line would cut the 70th meridian in latitude $24^{\circ} 16' N.$; the 80th in $27^{\circ} 0' N.$; and the 90th in $31^{\circ} 14' N.$ It is evident also that at all places to the north of this line the east and west sides of the mosque must be turned to the west of north; and at all places south of the same line, they must incline less or more to the east of their meridians.

A table might be calculated showing the points where each meridian would be cut by circles on which the face of all masjids would vary by fixed angles from the meridian. Lines drawn through these points would converge towards Makka, and it would be easy to interpolate the angles for intervening positions. The following table will illustrate this, giving the latitudes at which the inclination of the east and west axis of a mosque should vary from the cardinal direction—south or north by 5° , 10° , 15° , etc., at the longitudes respectively of 65° , 70° , 75° , etc., east from Greenwich:—

INCLINATION N. OR S. OF WEST.	EAST LONGITUDES.					
	65°	70°	75°	80°	85°	90°
	N. LATITUDES.					
25° S.	34° 49'	38° 23'	OUTSIDE INDIA.			
20°	32° 13'	35° 15'	38° 42'			
15°	29° 52'	32° 20'	35° 10'	38° 29'		
10°	27° 37'	29° 34'	31° 51'	34° 38'	37° 43'	
5°	25° 27'	26° 54'	28° 38'	30° 44'	33° 15'	36° 19'
Due W.	23° 19'	24° 16'	25° 29'	27° 0'	28° 53'	31° 14'
5° N.	21° 11'	21° 39'	22° 20'	23° 16'	24° 31'	26° 9'
10°	19° 1'	18° 59'	19° 7'	19° 35'	20° 3'	20° 57'
15°		16° 14'	15° 48'	15° 31'	15° 24'	
20°			12° 16'	11° 18'		
25°			8° 27'	6° 43'		

This table covers all India down to Ceylon.

To ascertain the actual orientation of a given mosque is not at all difficult for a surveyor, as it requires only the observation of the sun's altitude, with the angle between the line of the walls and the sun's centre for a given time. And it would be interesting to examine this question for a few of the more notable mosques in different parts of India, especially where the angle with the meridian is considerable.

PLACE.	LAT. N.	LONG. E.	ANGLE OF AXIS N. OR S. OF WEST.
Peshāwar.....	34° 2'	71° 37'	16° 33' S.
Lahor	31° 34'	74° 21'	10° 6' S.
Multān	30° 12'	71° 31'	10° 1' S.
Amritsar	31° 37'	74° 55'	9° 43' S.
Dehli	28° 39'	77° 17'	3° 44' S.
Agrā.....	27° 10'	78° 5'	1° 10' S.
Lucknow	26° 55'	80° 59'	0° 31' N.
Allahābād	25° 28'	81° 54'	2° 32' N.
Ahmadābād	23° 2'	72° 38'	3° 9' N.
Benares	25° 19'	83° 3'	3° 22' N.
Māndu	22° 21'	75° 26'	3° 23' N.
Cambay	22° 19'	72° 38'	4° 23' N.
Surat	21° 12'	72° 52'	6° 19' N.
Calcutta	22° 34'	88° 24'	8° 2' N.
Bombay	18° 55'	72° 54'	10° 11' N.
Golkondā	17° 23'	78° 27'	12° 36' N.
Haidarābād	17° 22'	78° 32'	12° 29' N.
Bijāpur	16° 50'	75° 47'	13° 24' N.
Madras.....	13° 4'	80° 15'	17° 53' N.

The angle for Lahor has been given above; but, for the convenience of anyone who may be interested in the question, the angles—north or south of due west—of the axes of mosques, for some of the principal places in India are given in the second table, with the latitudes and longitudes used in the computation. The position of Makka is taken as $21^{\circ} 21'$ N. and $40^{\circ} 10'$ E.

It is not to be supposed, however, that the mosques of India will be found to agree very closely with these angles. For Lahor it has been shown that the geographical positions given by Nasir al-din Tusi and Ulagh Beg yield an inclination of $1^{\circ} 19'$ less than the actual; and the same authors give the latitudes of Multān and Benares as $29^{\circ} 40'$ and $26^{\circ} 15'$ respectively, and the differences of longitude from Makka as $30^{\circ} 35'$ and $40^{\circ} 20'$. Now these give the inclinations for Multān and for Benares both less than the true positions afford.

The subject has never been investigated scientifically by anyone in India, and the above remarks and computations may help to direct attention to it, and possibly also to the *Tahwil al qibla* mentioned above.

JAS. BURGESS.

Edinburgh.

February 17th, 1906.

THE NAME GUJARĀT.

My attention has just been drawn to the question of the derivation of the name Gujarāt; by an expression of concurrence in the view, which has been asserted in print,¹ that the name has come through a Prākṛit form Gujjararatta from the Sanskrit Gurjararāshṭra, "the country of the Gurjaras." That, however, is not the real explanation of the matter.

The origin of the modern name, as far as we can trace it at present, is the form Gurjaratrā. We have this form in

¹ See, for instance, the Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, vol. i, part 1, p. 2.

ulatpurā plate of A.D. 844 (EI, 5. 211), in which it is made of Gurjaratrā-bhūmi, "the land Gurjaratrā." We have it again in an undated inscription, of about the 10th century, at Kālāñjar (ibid. note 3), in which mention is made of Gurjaratrā-maṇḍala, "the province or territory of Gurjaratrā." And, for a later time, we have a closely similar form in line 35 of the Verāwal or Sōmnāthpāṭaṇ inscription of A.D. 1216 (EI, 2. 439). Here, the published text presents the form Gūrjarātrā. There is nothing peculiar in the long *ū* in the first syllable; the tribal name was often, and not usually, written Gūrjara in the epigraphic records, other than those of the Gurjara princes of Western India of the seventh and eighth centuries. The penultimate long *ā*, however, seems somewhat questionable; the original record, or an ink-impression, should be examined, to decide whether we have here Gūrjarātrā or Gūrjaratrā.

The intermediate Prākṛit form Gujjarattā is found in line 14 of the Ghaṭayāla inscription of A.D. 863, written in Mahārāshṭrī-Prākṛit (this Journal, 1895. 516).

The modern form Gujarāt comes, of course, directly from this last-mentioned form Gujjarattā; by elision of the final *ā*, with dissolution of the nexus *tt* into the *t*, accompanied by compensatory lengthening of the preceding short *a*. In respect of the last two syllables, we have another instance in place-names, the ancient name Lattalūra, Lattanūr, through which we pass into the modern Lātūr (EI, 7. 226).

The modern name Gujarāt is carried over by Alberūnī, whose *India* presents the form *Gujarat* (Alberūnī, whose *India* presents the form *Gujarat*, Hau's text, p. 99, line 4).

On the other hand, the form *Gujarat* is first recorded after A.D. 900, and is represented the

Gujarāt, "just like *Suratrāṇa* out of *Sultan* and *Ga*
 "out of *Ghaznav*," and that "*Gujarāt* itself is pro
 "a hybrid formation, the Arabic collective affix *āt*,
 "added to the name of the Gurjara or Gujar clan."
 fact, however, that the form *Gurjaratrā* is carried back
 A.D. 844, seems to dispose of any such theory as that.
 it appears to me that we must in some way connect the
 with the adverbial suffix of position, *tra* (Vēdic *trā*), which
 we have in *atra*, 'here,' *tatra*, 'there,' and other words
 and notably in the term *Kuru-Pañchāla-trā*, "amongst the
 Kurus and Pañchālas" (*Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, 3. 2, 3, 15).
 Perhaps some reader of this note may be able to throw
 a light on this point, and to produce some other territorial
 appellations formed in the same way.

I notice that Molesworth and Candy's *Marāṭhī Dictionary*
 gives an optional form *Gujarāth*, and presents "*Gujarāth*,
 relating to *Gujarāt*." What is the authority for this?

J. F. FLEET.

14th, 1906.

SAKASTANA.

or two slight notes correcting or supplementing
 on "Sakastana" in the last number of
 (216)? For some not very important
 iteration I may no doubt hope, in
 to receive absolution.
 connection of the *Kāpisakānisha*
 mentioned by Greek writers
 noticed by Edward Thom
 7. But up to the
 the

In this connection there can be no doubt that the reference is to the city or district *Kāpiśi*: for *Bālhi* is Balkh and *Pardi* is perhaps the country of the Pāradas; *Urđi* appears not to be known.¹ The examples cited by the Kāśikā, namely, *kāpiśāyanam madhu* | *kāpiśāyanī drākṣā*, have a considerable interest; for the Sanskrit lexicographers give *kapiśā*, *kapiśikā*, *kāpiśam*, *kāpiśāyanam* as a kind of intoxicating spirit, and the grapes and wine of Cabul are now, and have always been, famous.

It is of interest in connection with Dr. Grierson's theory concerning the Paisāca dialects (J.R.A.S., 1904, pp. 725 sqq.) to note that *Kapiśā* is the name of the mother of the Piśācas, who are called *Kapiśāputra* and *Kāpiśeya*.

I am not within reach of a copy of the Buddhist *Kapiśāvadāna*, so as to gather the information which may be contained in that text.

p. 194, l. 16. For τοῦς read τοῖς.

p. 197, n. 2. The suggestion that Ptolemy's *Τατακηνή* is an error for *Σακαστηνή* is due to Dr. Marquart (*Ērānšahr*, p. 36). It is noticeable that between this district and Arachosia Ptolemy places a people named *Βάκτριοι*. If we combine these facts with the proximity of the *Παρικάνιοι* (*Farghūnah*, see p. 191 *supra*), whose name is identical with the original of *Farghāna*, we have an additional argument for an early southern settlement—the *Παρικάνιοι* being mentioned by Herodotus—from beyond the Hindu-Kush.

I note that Dr. Marquart, in his *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, pp. 514–15, n. 136 (cf. *Ērānšahr*, p. 220), proposes to find a third *Farghāna*, denoted by the *Βαρκάνιοι* of Ktesias, in “one of the valleys between Baghlān and Iškamyš.” At the same time he cites from a fragment of Hekataios (No. 180) the reference to a *Παρακάνη, πόλις Περσική*. He distinguishes the forms in

¹ I think, however, that I can make a suggestion which under the circumstances has considerable probability. The Buddhist Sanskrit form of the name *Udyāna* is *Uddiyāna* or *Oddiyāna*, and the presence of an *r*, or at least a cerebral, seems to be attested by the Tibetan *U. rgyān*. *Udyāna* is therefore a popular corruption. If *Urđi* denotes this country, it would be appropriately mentioned in conjunction with *Kapiśa*, Balkh, and the Pāradas.

situation and etymology from the *Παρκάνιοι* of Herodotus. Also he gives the authority of Ptolemy, VI, c. 17, § 7, for a city *Παρακανάκη* in Herat.

But is it quite clear that the *Βαρκάνιοι* of Ktesias are not precisely the *Παρκάνιοι* of Herodotus? Ktesias mentions this people three times, in his *Persica*, cc. 5 and 8, and in his *Assyriaca*, fragment 1. The first passage relates that Astyages was to be fetched from the Barkanioi, over whom, as we learn from another reference (*op. Tzetzes*, i, 1, 87, see Baehr, *Ktesias*, p. 106), Cyrus had made him ruler. In the second passage it is said that on the death of Cyrus, Tanuoxarkes (Smerdis) became master of Bactria, Khorasmia, Parthia, and Karmania, Spitades satrap over the Derbikes, Megabernes over the Barkanioi. The third passage tells us that the Assyrian king Ninus "was lord of the country of "the Kadousioi and Tapouroi; further, of the Hurkanioi "and Drangians: in addition to these, of the Derbikes "and Karmanioi and Chorasmioi; moreover, of the "Borkanioi and Parthuaioi" (Diodorus, ii, 43). Stephanus of Byzantium describes the Barkanioi as a race having a common frontier with the Hurkanioi (Baehr, *op. cit.*, p. 106). They supplied 12,000 combatants against Alexander (Curtius, iii, c. 2).

Although these statements may not be sufficiently definite or reliable to enable us to fix exactly the position of the Barkanioi, they are certainly not in favour of a too remote situation for a people bordering on Hyrcania. Would not Dr. Marquart's Farghāna be also too small to suit the requirements of the second passage from Ktesias and that from Curtius, and would it not be included in the dominion of the ruler of Bactria?

p. 199, l. 18. For 'Derbiker' read 'Derbikes.' According to Strabo (xi, cc. ix and x), this people was separated from Hyrcania only by the Tapouroi (Tabaristan), while Pliny (vi, 16) places them on both sides of the Oxus. They must have been a powerful people, as they supplied to the army of Darius 2,000 horse and 40,000 infantry to fight against Alexander (Curtius, iii, c. 2).

These statements seem sufficient to establish the position and importance of the people in question. No doubt identical with them are the Derbikes who fought against Cyrus (Ktesias, cc. 6-7), who cannot be placed very far from India, as Indian allies with elephants took part in the battle. The Sakai, who came to the help of Cyrus on this occasion, were commanded by a prince whose name Amorges certainly reminds us of the Amurgioi—his wife's name was Sparethra (c. 3). The leader of the Derbikes was called Amorrhaïos.

In any case, Amorges and his Sakas are clearly the Euergetai = Ariaspi of Arrian (*supra*, p. 196), and therefore the Saka nationality of this people is established by testimony as well as by inference.

p. 202, ll. 7 sqq. It is to be observed that Pliny definitely states (vi, c. 16) that the Scythians gave the name *Silys* to the Jaxartes. If the oldest form of the name is preserved in the Sanskrit *Sitā*, the similarity with the case of the Helmand is still more complete.

p. 205, n. 3. The instances of confusion of *y* and *j* in the edicts of Asoka are, according to the citations in M. Senart's *Inscriptions de Piyadasi*, confined to the following:—

- (1) *j* for *y*—*majura*, Shahbazgarhi, i, 3;
majula, Khalsi, i, 4;
ja, Shahbazgarhi, v, 11;
anajijasa, Shahbazgarhi, vi, 16.

(The last two disappear in Bühler's text, *Epigraphia Indica*, ii, pp. 447 sqq.)

- (2) *y* for *j*—*ṛaya*, Shahbazgarhi, i, 1; v, 11; ix, 18; x, 22;
kamboya, Shahbazgarhi, v, 12; xiii, 9;
samāya, Shahbazgarhi, i, 1 (by the side of *samāja*).

p. 206, l. 11. For 'latter' read 'former.'

p. 206, ll. 19 sqq. I may hope not to be accused of supposing that the difference between *p* in *Parni*, etc., and the *v* in *Varni*, etc., is solely one of tenuis and media.

p. 216, ll. 14 sqq. For the influence of Persian architecture on that of the early Buddhists I may refer to Grünwedel, *Buddhistische Kunst in Indien* (1900), pp. 16–18.

An interesting similarity may be traced between the *tout ensemble* of the building represented in the Sānchī stūpa, which is reproduced in a plate accompanying Dr. Burgess' article in this Journal for 1902 (facing p. 44), and the buildings of the Achæmenids to which I have referred. This edifice also has 'Lion Capitals.'

F. W. THOMAS.

OM MAṆI PADME HŪM.

The Tibetans, who have so much to say concerning the mystic import of this famous formula (Rockhill, *Land of the Lāmas*, pp. 326 sqq.), do not appear to throw light upon its grammatical form. Nor does Koeppen's *Religion des Buddha* (ii, pp. 59 sqq.) deal with this side of the matter.

I can see no reason whatever for departing from the view of Hodgson (*J.A.S.B.*, 1835, p. 196) that the formula relates to [Avalokiteśvara] Padmapāṇi or from that of Mill (*ibid.*, p. 198) that *Maṇipadme* is one word. I should not, however, follow Wilson (*Essays* ii, pp. 334 and 356) in regarding *Maṇipadma* as a simple alias of *Padmapāṇi*. On the analogy of other Dhāraṇīs such as *Oṃ Vajragandhe hūṃ*, *Oṃ Vajrāloke hūṃ*, *Oṃ Vajrapuspe hūṃ*, would it not be more probable that *maṇipadme* is a vocative referring to a feminine counterpart of that Bodhisattva, i.e. Tārā?

F. W. THOMAS.

ERRATUM.

In the R.A.S. Journal (January), 1906, p. 220, l. 21, the Chinese characters for Mo-la-p'o should have been

摩臘婆.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A GEOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF COUNTRIES ROUND THE BAY OF BENGAL, 1669 TO 1679. By THOMAS BOWREY. Edited by Lieut.-Col. Sir RICHARD C. TEMPLE, Bart., C.I.E. (Hakluyt Society, 1905.)

Professor E. B. Tylor having drawn the attention of Sir Richard C. Temple to a MS. in the possession of Mr. Eliot Howard, Sir Richard, on examining it, at once recognized its value, obtained leave to copy it, and, with characteristic energy, spent two years in the endeavour to discover the identity of the writer, who concealed his name under the initials T. B. After long and fruitless efforts, a series of happy coincidences revealed beyond a doubt that T. B. was Thomas Bowrey, a sailing master, who went out to Madras in 1668 or 1669, and remained in the East until October, 1688, when he sailed for England. During the nineteen years that he spent in the East, Bowrey visited various parts of India, Persia, Arabia, the Malay Peninsula, Pegu, Achin, etc.; and a portion of his experiences is set forth in the MS. here printed. Unfortunately this work is incomplete, and ends abruptly in the middle of a sentence. It is possible that Bowrey may have written a fuller narrative; but, if so, it appears to have disappeared. The only other extant works of Bowrey's are a number of charts, at present in the British Museum, and a "Dictionary English and Malayo, Malayo and English," which was published in 1701. These facts and others relating to Bowrey's life have been unearthed after infinite trouble by Sir R. C. Temple, and are set forth in his excellent Introduction.

The MS. here printed is headed "Asia, Wherein is contained the scituation, comerse, cus[toms], etc., Of many

Provinces, Isles, etc., in India, Persi[a], Arabia, and the South Seas, Experienced by me T. B., in the forementioned Indie[s], Vizt., from Anno MDCLXIX to MDCLXXIX." It is evident from this heading that Bowrey intended to narrate his experiences in all the parts of Asia that he had visited; but, as a fact, the only parts here described are the Coromandel coast, Golconda, the coast of 'Gingalee,' Orissa (a fragment), Bengal, Junkceylon, Queda, and Achin (incomplete); there being headings only for Arakan, Pegu, and Tenasserim. The dates at the end of the title are accepted by the learned editor without question; but to me the second is inexplicable. Why Bowrey should have confined the narrative of his experiences to the first half of his sojourn in the East is incomprehensible, and I cannot but suspect an error. Again, since he sailed for England in October, 1688, and, according to his own statement in the preface to his Dictionary, had "nineteen years continuance in East-India," he probably arrived at Madras in the latter part of 1669. Surely, then, he must have left England at the beginning of the same year, and not in 1668, as Sir Richard Temple thinks. At any rate, Bowrey nowhere tells us the exact dates of his departure from England and arrival in India, the earliest date given in this MS. in connection with his movements being 1672, and the latest 1677.

Though incomplete, and written in a style that smacks more of the seaman than of the penman, Bowrey's narrative is of much value as the work of a shrewd observer, and many of the incidents recorded by him are not to be found elsewhere. The illustrations with which he embellished his manuscript, and which are here reproduced, are more curious than accurate,¹ except those of boats. (A facsimile is also

¹ I am suspicious regarding the originality of these drawings, especially of those of trees and plants. As regards one drawing, however, there can be no manner of doubt, viz. that of "An Achin cripple" (plate xviii, fig. 3), which is simply copied from plate iii ("Atteekeninge van de grouwelijcke Institie in Achin"), at p. 14 of the account of the voyage of Wybrandt van Waerwijck and Sebaldt de Weert to the East in 1602, printed in deel 1 of *Begin ende Voortgangh*, etc. (1644). A simple comparison of the two proves this at a glance.

given of Bowrey's chart of the Hugli river, drawn in 1687, and described by Yule in his *Hedges' Diary*.) But, valuable as is the narrative intrinsically, its value has been enormously increased by the wealth of footnotes added by the editor, embodying as they do a large number of extracts from contemporary records in the India Office, as well as from the accounts of seventeenth century travellers. A list of the works quoted or referred to is given at the end; and full as it is, we notice two rather strange omissions—one, that of Baldæus's *Malabar en Choromandel* (1672), a faulty translation of which was printed in Churchill's collection of voyages and travels; and the other, that of Havart's *Op- en Ondergang van Cormandel* (1693), a valuable work, containing a mass of information regarding the Dutch settlements on the Cōromandel coast, especially during the writer's residence there, 1671–1685, almost the same period over which Bowrey's travels extended. From one Dutch writer, Wouter Schouten, Sir Richard Temple quotes very copiously; and it is, therefore, all the more to be regretted that he has drawn his extracts from the very inaccurate French translation, in which (an important point) the spelling of names of places, etc., has been mostly altered. Another work which is also freely cited is, on the authority of the India Office Library catalogue, credited to "Delestre." (That the British Museum Library catalogue should father the book on "Dalencé" is one of those things that "no fellow can understand.") The writer was actually François Lestra or l'Estra (see Prévost's *Hist. Gén. des Voyages*, ix, 14–29; *Nouv. Bibl. Gén.*, xxx, col. 983).

The editor has rightly printed the MS. practically *literatim*; and consequently we have here some curious forms of Indian words and names. The most extraordinary of these is "Jno. Gernaet" for Jagannāth (both the god and the place). I am not sure, however, that the entire credit of evolving such a fine specimen of 'Hobson-Jobson' is due to Bowrey; for in the map of "Bengale" in Valentyn's *Oud en Nieuw Oost-Indien*, deel v, the place is entered as "sJan Gernaet," and as that map was compiled between 1658

and 1664 it is probable that Bowrey got the name from a copy of it, only turning 'Jan' into 'Jno.' (for 'John'). In passing, I may mention that Bowrey's map of Ceylon, drawn in 1681 (the year in which Knox's *Historical Relation* appeared, with its infinitely superior map), contains a fine example of 'Hobson-Jobson,' which deserves a place in the next edition of Yule's monumental work, viz. "Barbarian Island," as a name for Berberyn or Bêruwala. In describing the various races on the Coromandel coast, Bowrey says:—"The Poore Sort of Inhabitants, vizt. the Gentues, Mallabars, etc., Smoke their tobacco After a Very meane, but I Judge Original manner, Onely the leafe rowled up, and light one end, and holdinge the Other betweene their lips, and Smoke untill it is soe farre Consumed as to warme theire lips, and then heave the end away; this is called a bunko, and by the Portugals a Cheroota." Regarding this "meane, but Original, manner" of smoking tobacco, I may point out that Christoph Schweitzer, who was in Ceylon from 1676 to 1682, says of the natives (I quote the English translation of 1700, chap iv): "They Smoak Tobacco too, not out of Pipes, but wound up in a dry Leaf." (On the other hand, Albrecht Herport, who was in the island in 1663-65, depicts a Sinhalese smoking a pipe.) In footnotes to the above passage from Bowrey, the editor states that these are the earliest quoted instances of the words *bunkus* and *cheroot* (see *Hobson-Jobson* under these words). As regards *cheroot*, I know of no earlier mention; but I can cite an earlier instance of *buncus* from the *Diarium* (published 1668) of Johann von der Behr, who served as a soldier under the Dutch in the East Indies from 1644 to 1650. Describing Batavia and its inhabitants, he says (p. 23):—"In using tobacco they have no pipes, but only a thin leaf, which they call a *punchs*, in which they are accustomed to roll as much as they wish, and then put in their mouth and light." Christoph Langhanss also, who was in the East Indies from 1694 to 1696, in his *Neue Ost-Indische Reise* (1705) says (p. 233): "In the whole of India they [plantain leaves] are also used for making *puncas*, namely, one takes a bit of such

a leaf dried, and lays some of the green Malay tobacco therein, then one rolls it up, and thus smokes both tobacco and pipe together." On p. 307 Bowrey speaks of "makeing a sumbra," i.e. a reverential salutation. The *r* here seems to have got in by inadvertence; for in his Dictionary he gives the Malay word as *soomba*. Baldæus, Valentyn, and other Dutch writers use the forms *sambaja*, *sombayen*, and the Portuguese dictionaries enter the word as *zumbaya*. The origin is apparently Skt. *sambhāvana*, 'worship, honour.' The word *braces*, applied by Bowrey and other contemporary writers to the shoals at the mouth of the Hugli, must surely be a corruption of the Portuguese *baixos*. The word *spulshore*, which the editor has been unable to identify, is evidently a nautical term, and I would suggest as its origin the Dutch *spil* (pin, bar, or capstan) and *schoor* (prop, beam), though I do not find the combination *spilschoor* in the Dutch dictionaries.

I have said above that Bowrey records interesting facts not found elsewhere. As an instance, I may refer to the details he gives (pp. 182-190) of the attempts of the Danes in 1674-76 to conclude peace with Malik Qāsim, governor of Hugli, and form a trading settlement in Bengal, which, taken with the statement in the Batavia *Dagh-Register* for 1676 (p. 289), confirm the supposition that it was in 1676 that the Danes first settled at Serampore (see J.R.A.S. for 1898, pp. 628-9).

Speaking of the 'Resbutes' (military retinue) of the native governor of Masulipatam, and of their inferiority to Europeans, Bowrey says (p. 84):—"And a more memorable fight Sir Edward Winter had with above 300 of them horse and foot upon Guddorah bridge, when he and his Trumpeter cleared the way and drove Severall of them Over the bridge to the great Astonishment of all the Natives and Fame of that Worthy Knight." In a footnote to this the editor confesses that he has been unable to find in the records of the time an actual account of this fight, though he gives an extract referring to it from a letter from Sir Edward to Sir Thomas Chamberlin, deputy-governor in London, and

also (through Mr. Wm. Foster's kindness) some lines from Sir Edward's monument in the Battersea Parish Church, the last three of which run :—

“Thrice twenty mounted Moors he overthrew
Singly on foot, some wounded, some he slew;
Dispers'd the rest: what more cou'd Sampson do?”

Sir Richard Temple surmises that these lines refer to the skirmish spoken of by Bowrey. His surmise is correct, and so is the number of the “Moors” given in the lines, Bowrey's “300” being a gross exaggeration. A description of the affair, which occurred on 22nd October, 1662 (new style), is given in the *Batavia Dagb-Register* for 1663, pp. 116–17, from which it appears that disputes had arisen between William Jearsey, the acting-agent, and the governor “Pattulabeek,” who, after Winter's arrival as agent, finding the grievances increase, resolved to rid himself of his two enemies at one stroke, and so organized an attack on Winter as he was returning in his palankin from the garden outside the town. Winter protected himself with the cushions, while his native *schermmeester* (either fencing master or roundelier) and trumpeter defended him from the attack of the “50 or 60 horsemen,” until, getting his sword in his hand, he leapt out of the palankin and—hid himself! So says the Dutch diarist, who mentions nothing of Winter's alleged prowess, though he adds that the trumpeter died of his wounds three days later, and that the agent himself received five or six wounds, one of them in the face. Naturally this affair led to an open rupture between Winter and the governor, references to which occur on pp. 374 and 455 of the same *Dagb-Register*. How the matter was ultimately settled, I do not know.

On pp. 64–70 Bowrey gives a summary account of the doings of the French fleet under Admiral La Haye in 1672–73 on the Coromandel coast, which the editor has supplemented by copious extracts from contemporary writers. It is curious, however, that Bowrey is silent regarding

the sea-fight between the English and Dutch off the Masulipatam-Nursapore coast (see Hunter's *Hist. of Brit. India*, ii, 199), of which Havart (*op. cit.*, i, 163-6) gives a graphic account. Bowrey states on p. 70 that "The French Chiefe resident in Matchlipatam was killed by the Moors." Of this tragedy Sir Richard Temple has been unable to discover an account. Havart, however, gives the following details (*op. cit.*, i, 223):—"The last [French] chief, who was there in my time, was one Michiel Malafosse, who *anno* 1673 was villanously murdered and run through with pikes by the Moors, although he defended himself stoutly like a brave warrior, and sold his life dearly enough, but 'many dogs are the death of the hare.'"

The latest portion of Bowrey's narrative is of peculiar interest, giving, as it does, his personal experiences in Junkceylon, Kedah, and Achin, the first of these three being of special value in its description of a place regarding the history of which in the seventeenth century we know practically nothing. Unfortunately the writer's statements and dates cannot be absolutely depended on. For example, he says (p. 311): "Anno Domini 1675 the Old Queen of Achin died"; whereas, according to Valentyn (*Sumatra*, 9, 41), this queen reigned from 1641 to 1688, when she died, and was succeeded by another queen. (Two of the four queens mentioned in the editor's footnote appear to be mythical.) Other instances of erroneous dates are (p. 67) 1672 for 1673, and (p. 147) 1678 for 1677.

I have spoken of the mass of valuable information contained in Sir Richard Temple's footnotes, and with one or two of the points discussed in these I have already dealt. I can now only run through the book and make a comment or correction here and there. Negapatam was taken by the Dutch in 1658, and not in 1660 (p. 2). The word 'boars' in the note on p. 6 should surely be 'bears' (see p. 17). In note 4 on p. 42 'p. 44' should be 'p. 104.' In note 1 on p. 55 the word 'Sangaries' should have a reference to *Hobson-Jobson* s.v. 'Jangar.' (Is 'Gun boates' in the extract correct?) The suggestion from *Hobson-Jobson* in

note 2 on the same page, that '*long-cloth*' may be a corruption of *lungi* is shown to be erroneous by the *New Eng. Dict.* In the continuation of the same note on p. 56 'a/c' is evidently an error for '@.' In note 2 on p. 57 read '*Persia Merchant.*' In note 2 on p. 65, for 'October, 1671,' read '1 September, 1671.' In note 3 on p. 69 'Bellefort' should be 'Bellesort.' The word 'Coreas' in the extract quoted in note 1 on p. 75 is strange to me. The correct name of the "antient Portugees" spoken of in the same note was, of course, Oliveira. (I may mention that in Ceylon this name has undergone a similar corruption, and now figures as 'Livera' or 'De Livera.') In note 4 on p. 78, and in other places, Dr. Watt is called 'Watts.' In the two extracts in the note on p. 118 'Cogee' and 'Cozzee' surely represent the same word. In connection with note 1 on p. 169 I may point out that Valentyn (*Choromandel*, 162) gives a plan of the Dutch factory at Hugli. In the last line of this note (on p. 170), for 'foild' read 'feild.' In note 1 on p. 200 the explanation of 'fanoux' by *fulūs* is, I think, incorrect; a fanam is probably meant, *fanoux* representing the Portuguese plural *fanões*. In note 2 on p. 209 the date '(1660)' after '*Valentyn*' is incomprehensible, '152 ff.' should be '153,' and 'Gala' should be 'Gale.' I may add to the information given in note 1 on p. 251 regarding Wm. Jearsey, that his wife's name was Catharina Hemsink, and that he carried her off before her parents' eyes from a meal to which he had been invited at Palicol (see Havart, *op. cit.*, iii, 31). In connection with note 6 on p. 257, I may mention that the Batavia *Dagh-Registers* between 1625 and 1663 give the following variants of the name Pondicherry: Poulecera, Poelocera, Poulocera, Pouleceer, Polocera, Poulechere (1643), Poulechera, Poeleceere, Poelesere, Poelesera, Poulesere. These are all earlier than Bowrey's 'Pullicherrie.' Near the top of p. 268, and in note 2 on p. 308, the same extract is given from the India Office O.C., but in one the place spoken of is said to be Kedah, in the other Achin. In note 1 on p. 323 '*nephaliūm*' should be '*nephelium*,' and the rambutan is certainly *not* the same as the leechee.

In conclusion, I must accord a word of praise to the index, which appears to be exhaustive, and is altogether admirable.

DONALD FERGUSON.

TUHFA DAWÎ-L-ARAB ÜBER NAMEN UND NISBEN BEI BOHARÎ, MUSLIM, MÂLIK. By IBN HATÎB AL-DAHŞA. Edited by Dr. TRAUGOTT MANN. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1905.)

This edition, prepared from the MS. of the work in the British Museum, Add. 7351 (Cat. Dxli²)—of which the Berlin MS. Ahlwardt, No. 1663, appears to be a copy—may be expected to justify its editor's anticipation by proving of service to students. It consists of vocalized alphabetical lists of names, and (p. 135) of nisbas, limited to such as occur in the works mentioned in the sub-title. There follow (pp. 196–205) lists compiled by the editor of other names and nisbas occurring either in these works, or in the "Tuhfa" outside its lists. These include some unusual names for which references to the passages where they occur would have been acceptable. In other cases the vocalization seems scarcely to admit of doubt, or is left doubtful, e.g. ابن خَلِكان and القرصى, where the absence of the 'teshdid' in the former may be of no greater significance than its obvious presence in the latter, where the more material 'fathas' are omitted. In truth the vocalization in printed texts is as often as not the work of editor, or even of printer. There exists, as yet, no definite practice restricting the vowel-marks in print to those occurring in the manuscript original, nor might such a practice find general acceptance. Failing this, the authority of such vocalization must be small.

Dr. Mann has diligently brought together, on pp. 2–7, various notices of the author. The fullest of these, that by Ibn Hajar (p. 3), is to be found in nearly identical language, but with some added particulars, in الضر اللامع, a collection of biographies of the ninth century, by

al-Sakhâwî (Brock., ii, 34). This notice, after stating the author's birth, continues:

يعرف أبوه بآبن ظهير ثم هو بآبن خطيب الدهشة تحوّل أبوه من
القيوم الى حماة فاستوطنها ووّلّى خطابة الدهشة بها وصنّف المصباح
المنير في غريب الشرح الكبير مجلد وشرح عروض آبن الحاجب
وديوآن خطب وغيرها

Then resuming, as in Ibn Hajar, it says of the author:

وصرف (صدف) بالزّين آبن الخرزى (الجزرى) فلزم منزله
مستصديًا بالاقراء والافتاء والتصنيف وانتفع به عامّة المحميين واشتهر
بذكره وعظم قدره وصنّف الكثير

viz, the works given by Ibn Hajar, with لباب القوت as an alternative title for شرح المحتاج الى شرح المحتاج, adding also, an abridgment of the Tahdhîb of Ibn Qurqûl by the title of التقريب (which is the MS. at Cairo, cat. i, 286, and No. 3. in Brockelmann's list of his works), and another work called اليواقيت المضىة فى المواقيت الشرعية. It goes on to give, on the authority of Taqî al-Dîn ibn Qâdi Shuhba, who was a contemporary of Ibn Khatîb al-Dahsha, the matter given on p. 5 from the Dhail al-Sakhâwî (where استخصار should be استحضار), and adds:

قال ولكن كانت فيه غفلة وعنده تساهل فيما ينقله ويقوله وكذا
أثنى عليه آبن خطيب المنصورية وغيره¹

¹ These extracts are from a transcript, in private ownership, of the MS. of al-Dau' al-Lâmi' in the public library at Damascus. The statement from Ibn Qâdi Shuhba occurs verbatim in that writer's notice of Ibn Khatîb al-Dahsha in his Tabaqât al-Fuqahâ—autogr. B.M. Add. 7,356, 151^a margin, and Or. 3,039, 331^b margin—where the father is mentioned as the author of the Mişbâh, and the son's birth is put in 760 A.H. (in Brock. 750 A.H.).

Dr. Mann points out (p. 3, n. 1) that Brockelmann, in his notice of the author (ii, 66), credits him in error with the next mentioned author as his son. On the other hand, by the omission of his first patronymic "Aḥmad," Brockelmann has deprived him of his sonship to the above-mentioned Ibn Zahr, whom he had already noticed (ii, 25), and whose Miṣbāḥ is quoted by his son in the "Tuḥfa"—see p. 11, n. 4.

The introductory part of the volume is followed by sixteen pages of notes and corrections (printed on one side only so as to allow of insertion in the text), which give evidence of much research. One of these, on p. 33, seems to enable the identification of a MS. as one of the works of that voluminous author, Ibn al-Jauzi. In the passage of the text there referred to—at p. 11r, line 7—a 'Muḥtasib' by this author is quoted. On this the note refers to a MS. by Ibn al-Jauzi, Pet. i, 359, i.e. Ahlwardt, 10,163, which is mentioned by Brockelmann (i, 503) as No. 27 in the list of his works, and as unidentified. The MS. B.M. Add. 23,279—(Cat. mcccxxvii)—an abridgment of the Mir'ât al-Zamân of the Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi, gives a full obituary notice of Ibn al-Jauzi, and among his works, under the heading of "Ilm al-Ḥadīth," fol. 103b ult., *المحتسب في النسب جزآن*. The MS. Ahlwardt 10,163 must be this work.

H. F. A.

RABAH ET LES ARABES DU CHARI. By DECORSE and M. GAUDEFROY-DEMOMBYNES. (Paris: E. Guilmoto.)

Three documents relating to Râbah, a follower of Zubair Pacha of slave-trade notoriety, who conquered the sovereignty of Bornu, a territory lying south-west of Lake Chad—"where three empires meet," viz., Nigeria, the German Kameruns, and the French Protectorate—and ruled there with Dikoa as his capital for seven years, until he and his son Faḍl Allah were suppressed by the French in 1900-1. The documents were procured by Dr. Decorse, who was attached to the French expedition. The first, which is in

debased Arabic, was drawn up for the Doctor by a secretary of Râbah. It is a bare and jejune record of his movements, and of his son's after him, until their deaths. The second and third, which narrate a success on Râbah's part, and his murder of M. de Béhagle, who had come to negotiate with him, were told orally to the Doctor by a son of Râbah when a prisoner of the French, and were taken down by him in a transliterated form. All three documents are accompanied by translations, and by full notes on the names and places, and the verbal idioms. There follows a French-Arab vocabulary of the terms found current by Dr. Decorse among the inhabitants of the Lower Shari River, with grammatical observations thereon, the origin of the more debased terms being indicated in notes.

The work is a useful addition to Maghrabi literature.

LHASA AND ITS MYSTERIES, WITH A RECORD OF THE EXPEDITION OF 1903-1904. By L. A. WADDELL, LL.D., C.B., C.I.E., F.L.S., F.A.I., Lieut.-Colonel, Indian Medical Service, author of "The Buddhism of Tibet," etc. With 200 illustrations and maps. (London: John Murray, 1905.)

This remarkable volume is a worthy record of the achievements of the recent British mission to the mysterious city of Lhasa by the Principal Medical Officer of the expedition. To adopt the words of the preface, it is, so far as it goes, an intelligible and authentic account of Central Tibet, its capital, its Grand Lama hierarchy, and its dreamy hermit people, as they appeared to one who had had exceptional advantages for making their acquaintance. Its merits have been already acknowledged in many a review, and need not be further insisted on here.

The author gives some prominence to the mystic side of the story, alluding to "the theosophist belief that somewhere beyond the mighty Kanchenjunga there would be found a key which should unlock the mysteries of the old world

that was lost by the sinking of the Atlantis continent in the Western Ocean, about the time when Tibet was being upheaved by the still rising Himalayas." He is amazed by the way the astrologers of Tibet were able to predict the distressful storm which was in store for their country, and gives, in chapter i, the original text of their prophecy, copied by himself from the "Almanac for the Wood-Dragon Year (1904 A.D.)." But diligent inquiries at Lhasa only met with disenchantment, even when Ti Rimpoché, the Regent of Tibet, an excellent portrait of whom faces p. 208, was specially interviewed on such questions:—"Regarding the so-called 'Mahatmas,' it was important to elicit the fact that this Cardinal, one of the most learned and profound scholars in Tibet, was, like the other learned Lamas I have interrogated on the subject, entirely ignorant of any such beings. Nor had he ever heard of any secrets of the ancient world having been preserved in Tibet: the Lamas are only interested in 'The Word of Buddha,' and place no value whatever on ancient history."

The last sentence is the explanation of the fact that we owe to Chinese sources all the exact knowledge we possess of the early history and chronology of Tibet. The dates of Srong-tsan's first mission to the Chinese imperial court in A.D. 634, of his marriage to the Chinese Princess Wên-Ch'êng in 641, of the Tibetan marriage of the second Chinese Princess of Chin-Ch'êng in 710, and of the erection of the famous bilingual treaty monument at Lhasa in 822, are certain fixed points which there is no gainsaying. Colonel Waddell refers to this last monument as a pillar still standing in front of the Jo-k'ang, the great cathedral of Lhasa. It is a pity that no photographs or rubbings of the inscriptions upon it appear to have been taken. Two facsimiles have been already published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (October, 1880), but there is a third side said to contain the names of the Chinese high ministers of state of the period and of those officials who made the sworn treaty, which is still unknown. The author gives a photograph (p. 340) of a neighbouring stone monument

(*doring*), and tells us to note the 'cup-markings' on it, but this is a nineteenth century production of the reign of Chia Ch'ing inscribed with a Chinese edict on smallpox, of much less interest.

Colonel Waddell also refers to the Chinese consort of the celebrated king Srong-tsan, but he strangely makes her start (p. 369) from Peking. She really set out from Ch'ang-an (now Si-an-fu in Shánsi province), which was the capital of China during the T'ang dynasty, and the cavalcade was painted on a scroll-picture at the time by Yen Li-pên, a well-known artist of the first rank. There are one or two other slips which may be noticed for correction in the next edition. The Mongolian city of Urga is nowhere "near the great Lob Nor lake" (p. 27), nor is it to be found marked in the map on p. 41 to which we are referred. Kublai Khan, the founder of the Mongolian dynasty in China, was not "the son of the famous Genghis Khan," as we are told on p. 26, but the grandson, being the son of Tuli, who was the fourth son of Genghis.

The impression of the seal of the Dalai Lama, pronounced to be "in square Indian characters," is printed on its left side on p. 448, as if it were to be read horizontally. The inscription seems to be rather an archaic form of the Tibetan script, and is to be read in vertical columns, passing from left to right, like the Bashpa script of the thirteenth century. It corresponds to the modern formula ཨ། ༥ ལའི་བླ་མའི་ བམ་ཀ་རྒྱལ་བ་ i.e. Talai bLamai . . . Thamka rgyalva, "The royal seal (generally written *thamga*) of the Dalai Lama." The character at the bottom of the middle of the three columns has not been deciphered.

The book is enriched with several useful appendices on the scientific results of the expedition. Among the fauna of Central Tibet are described three new birds, and a new species of carp was found in the Yamdok lake, which has been named *Gymnocypris waddelli*. The illustrations are mostly of exceeding beauty and interest, notably the Palace of the Dalai Lama on Potala at Lhasa and the Painted

Rock Sculptures at Lhasa, both of which have been reproduced from 'colour photographs' taken from nature by the author.

S. W. B.

SCRAPS FROM A COLLECTOR'S NOTE BOOK, being notes on SOME CHINESE PAINTERS OF THE PRESENT DYNASTY. With appendices on some Old Masters and Art Historians. By FRIEDRICH HIRTH, Professor of Chinese, Columbia University, in the City of New York. (Leiden, Leipzig, and New York, 1905.)

A new interest in Chinese pictorial art is shown by a number of recent publications on the subject, several of which we owe to the pen of Professor Hirth, one of its most appreciative and luminous exponents. He is a collector of pictures as well as a diligent student of the history of Chinese art, and the "scraps now offered are," he says, "in the shape of desultory notes, dotted down by their author a dozen years ago for purposes of reference when forming a collection of scrolls and sketches in the old art city of Yangchou on the Grand Canal near Chinkiang." The collection is now installed in the Royal Museum at Dresden, where a catalogue of the Hirth Collection of *Chinesische Malereien auf Papier und Seide* was issued in February, 1897.

The chief value of the present work is that it is mainly devoted to painters of the present Manchu dynasty, who are generally passed by as hardly worthy of notice. The period is confessedly one of rapid decadence, but as it includes some nine out of every ten scrolls which come into our hands it cannot be entirely neglected. The book becomes thus a most useful supplement to Professor Giles's learned "History of Chinese Pictorial Art," which ends with the close of the Ming dynasty in 1643. Professor Hirth, by the way, discusses at some length (p. 67) the famous wood-cut of a cake of ink labelled "Three in One," which Professor Giles takes to represent an early picture of Christ

accompanied by two Nestorian priests; and he argues pretty conclusively that the three figures in question are really intended to represent Confucius, Laotzŭ, and Buddha, as the founders of the three great religions of China, a not uncommon subject for Chinese painters.

In addition to the notes on sixty-seven painters of the reigning dynasty, Professor Hirth gives a series of biographical notes of forty-five of the older Chinese painters, about whom he has always something new to say. Then follow a number of interesting and instructive "Notes on some old Art Historians and Publishers"; several complete indexes of names and of titles of books, all with Chinese characters attached; and, finally, an annotated list of the twenty-one illustrations which add so materially to the charm of the book. With a wonderful command of colloquial English, the author occasionally surprises us with an unfamiliar word, as in the title of the sixteenth illustration, "Snooping Boys," borrowed from the New York vernacular to translate *Fruchtnäscher*.

Professor Hirth does not despise "modern copyists and imitators as a makeshift," but he constantly insists on the importance of original materials for the proper study of pictorial art. Some signal additions to European collections have been made since the siege of the Legations at Peking. The Louvre, for example, is indebted to M. Pelliot for a collection made at Peking in 1900, which has been appreciatively noticed by Professor Chavannes in the *T'oung-tao*, 1904. The British Museum has also lately secured some remarkable pictures of ancient date, notably the celebrated silk scroll painted by Ku K'ai-chih which has been so fully described by Mr. Laurence Binyon in the Burlington Magazine (June, 1904), under the heading of "A Chinese Painting of the Fourth Century." This production has every intrinsic mark of authenticity, and it is guaranteed moreover by seals of famous critics and emperors back to the eleventh century. Professor Hirth somewhat slightly remarks: "I have not seen the painting, probably a copy, ascribed to him (Ku K'ai-chih), which found its way into the British

Museum." Perhaps an actual inspection may induce the critic to modify some day such a conclusion as too hasty. Doubt may be the first principle of scientific criticism, but its expression in such intangible fashion is to be deprecated in a work of light and authority, which will be in the hands of all interested in Chinese art.

S. W. B.

DER VULGARARABISCHE DIALEKT VON JERUSALEM NEBST
TEXTEN UND WÖRTERVERZEICHNIS DARGESTELLT, VON
D. DR. MAX LÖHR. pp. viii and 144. (Giessen :
Täpelmann, 1905.)

It is quite a pleasure to open a new book on modern Arabic and to find that it does not serve "practical, conversational, and commercial" purposes, but is principally devoted to linguistic research. It is natural that, Arabic being a living language, the study of the same should be promoted also for other than literary purposes, but there is, particularly in this country, the danger of allowing the practical side to preponderate over the theoretical one. Arabic is, after all, the key to Semitic philology, and no academic study of the North Semitic dialects is complete if Arabic be omitted. This applies to modern Arabic not less than to the classical language.

Dr. Löhr's book is a welcome addition to the existing works on the living Arabic dialects in Asia and Africa, and its linguistic value is all the greater in that it confines itself to the narrow circle of Southern Palestine and Jerusalem in particular. The difficulties with which the author had to grapple should not be overlooked, in spite of the various excellent models at his disposal. Taking down the manifold characteristics of popular speech is no easy matter, as the elasticity of rules is a great impediment in the clear classification of forms. As an instance may serve the short, unaccentuated vowel in open syllable, which has a tendency to disappear entirely, as in *wazze* (for *iwazze*), 'goose.' Professor Löhr's spelling *ikhtiyār* (old people) for *ikhtyār*

is therefore a slight inconsistency (see also Guthe in *Z.D.M.G.*, vol. xxxix, p. 133). The omission of this short vowel also affects the treatment of the article, resulting in forms like *ezbīb* (raisin) or *esmīn* (fat). A similar phenomenon is observable in the Maghribine dialect. It is curious that Professor Löhr has expressed no opinion on this point, but these and similar pronunciations are given in a little primer compiled by J. M. Salaman (Jerusalem, 1878), written in Arabic, but containing a transcription of the alphabet and the whole vocabulary in Hebrew characters, with full vocalization. However small the scientific pretensions of the little book, it is of some value, and its vocabulary contains a number of words not recorded by Professor Löhr. The latter was well advised to give all his Arabic material in transcription, following a strict system which faithfully renders all shades of pronunciation. Of special interest are the texts annexed to the work. The pieces of popular poetry, as well as the collection of proverbs, riddles, and phrases, have a more than purely linguistic interest, and allow one to peep into the very soul of the people. The book signifies not only another step forward in Arabic dialectology, but also contains a certain amount of Oriental *Culturgeschichte*.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF JOB FROM A HEBREW MS. IN THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, CAMBRIDGE. Edited by WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT. Translated by S. A. HIRSCH, Ph.D. pp. viii, 130 and 264. Text and Translation Society (Williams & Norgate), London, 1905.

It is just thirty years since the late Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, in his Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. of the Cambridge University Library, called attention to the above-mentioned work, which is written round the margins of a Hebrew copy of the Book of Job. He was also able to announce at the same time that the present editor was preparing

a publication of this commentary. Professor Wright is to be congratulated on having accomplished the work, and having placed before the student a strikingly handsome and interesting volume. One can only agree with him that the attempts to establish the commentator's identity have thus far proved unsuccessful, except in so far that we now know that his name was Berakhyāh, and that he lived in France. There is not sufficient evidence to identify him with Berakhyāh han-Nakdān. On the contrary, the lack of originality in the writings of the latter speaks against it. Our author was not only an independent critic, but a well-read scholar, and appears to have had a knowledge of Arabic. I feel inclined to seek his home in Provence. To judge from occasional vowel-points employed, the copyist of the MS. must have been a 'Spanish' Jew with only a moderate knowledge of grām̄mar, as he frequently takes *pataḥ* for *qāmeṣ* and *sēgōl* for *ṣērē*. The number of Spanish authorities quoted in the work points in the same direction. As regards these authorities, Professor Wright contents himself with merely reproducing Schiller-Szinessy's list. The omission by the latter of Simon b. Jochai, the "Tikkun Sopherim," and the "Massecheth Sopherim" was quite justified. It is different with the "other R. Simeon," whom Professor Wright rightly introduces. The name is only given in abbreviated form (שמע), and I believe it should be read Shema'yāh. It is, of course, possible that the author consulted the Hebrew versions of Ibn Ḥayyūj's and Ibn Janāḥ's writings, but this was not the case with Sa'adyāh's commentary on Job, nor with Ibn Ghayāth's translation of Ecclesiastes. The last-named, indeed, inserts the word 'except' into his paraphrase of Eccl. ii, 24 (see J. Lövy's edition, p. 5). The English translator of our work (p. 78) took the abbreviation 'ע for עַל, but it should be read עֵי, 'read.' One would like to know a little more about the other authorities consulted by the author, notably Samuel and Jacob. The former is certainly not Samuel b. Nissim of Aleppo, who lived in the twelfth century and composed

a commentary on Job (ed. Buber, 1889), but it might be the famous Samuel b. Nagdila. With regard to Jacob, we are in a more favourable position, because our author (p. 86) mentions his name in connection with one of his writings, viz., his notes on Dūnāsh b. Labrat's criticism of Menahem b. Sarūq's dictionary. Now this annotator was Jacob Tām (twelfth century), a man of great fame in Rabbinic literature, and his notes have been edited, together with Dūnāsh's criticism, by Filipowski (London and Edinburgh, 1855). The note in question is to be found on p. 85.

The style of our anonymous author is anything but easy, and great thanks are due to Dr. Hirsch for the admirable manner in which he has accomplished the arduous task of translating so broken a text into fluent English. He has also added a number of critical as well as literary notes, and suggested corrections of corrupt passages with tact and skill. A pleasing feature of the book is the addition of the French glosses, to which Professor Brandin lent his assistance. The book can be recommended for academic readings as a fine example of a mediæval Jewish Bible commentator. To the *littérateur* it offers interesting problems for further research.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

VEDIC METRE. By Dr. E. V. ARNOLD. (Cambridge, 1905.)

In this work Dr. Arnold has summed up the results of long-continued and minute research into the metres and history of the *R̥gveda*. His views have for some time been familiar to scholars from several articles in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* and the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, and every student of Vedic chronology owes a great debt to the labour expended by Dr. Arnold on the collection of materials to determine the chronological sequence of the several parts of the *R̥gveda*.

By the examination of metre, language, and ideas, Dr. Arnold concludes that five great periods can be

distinguished in the Ṛgveda—the archaic, the strophic, the normal, the cretic, and the popular. While, however, we should be glad to be able to accept the results at which he has arrived, it appears necessary to lay stress on the very different values of the evidence adduced.

Much of the argument rests on the view that the elaborate and irregular lyric metres, including the Uṣṇih, Kakubh-Satobṛhatī, Bṛhatī-Satobṛhatī, and Atyaṣṭi hymns, are of the earliest periods. It seems impossible to accept this view. It is quite true that the Ṛgveda is not primitive poetry, but the fact that lyric metres are practically unknown in later literature (p. 9) merely proves that lyric metres are not characteristic of the latest strata of the Ṛgveda. Probability points to their being placed somewhere intermediate between the earliest and latest stages, not to their being very early. On the other hand, it is not probable that Dr. Arnold (p. 171) is right in maintaining that gāyatrī is a later metre than anuṣṭubh. It is much less unnatural to assume that gāyatrī is earlier than anuṣṭubh, and that anterior to either were double and single verses.

Again, Dr. Arnold (p. 52) considers that catalectic and heptasyllabic verses are characteristic of early date. But, as he points out (p. 19), the Vedic metre is no remote descendant of a metre which was determined only by number of syllables. It is therefore extremely improbable that early Vedic metre should be characterised by irregularity in this respect, while such irregularities are natural at a time when the verse had a characteristic rhythm which rendered it more independent of an exact number of syllables.

The history of the anuṣṭubh as traced by Dr. Arnold appears to be somewhat as follows. It starts from a type which may be denoted $\asymp - \asymp - | \cup - \cup -$. The oldest stages are marked by slightly less distinct iambic metre in the 'cadence' or second half. A later stage, characteristic of gāyatrī verse, is seen in the comparatively frequent use of a 'syncopated opening,' viz. $\asymp \cup - -$, while the latest stage is seen in a verse approximating to the epic śloka. As a matter of fact, there is no evidence

that in a pre-Vedic period the anuṣṭubh had any special rhythmical form. The earliest stage in the R̥gveda would seem to be one in which all syllables were indifferent; the next stage would be one in which the latter half became defined either as iambic or as trochaic, there being no reason to ascribe an earlier date to either variation; the last stage one in which the single verses are no longer independent in metre, but are gathered together in pairs and differentiated so as to form the epic śloka $\cong \cong \cong \cong | \cup - - \cong | \cong \cong \cong \cong | \cup - \cup \cong |$. This sequence is a reasonable one and *a priori* probable, but it does not seem possible to find any place in it for a stage of 'syncopation,' though Dr. Arnold considers this a characteristic of the gāyatrī as a later form than the anuṣṭubh.

The history of the triṣṭubh is traced to a dominant form of pre-Vedic trimeter (p. 226) in the shape $\cong \cong \cong \cong, \cup \cup - -, \cup - \cong$, where a comma denotes the cæsure. On the cæsure Dr. Arnold lays great stress. He considers that originally it was at the fourth syllable, though later it was frequently at the fifth, and that there was another cæsure at the eighth syllable. The cæsure was prior to any differentiation of quantity, and it is thought that the $\cup \cup$ after the first cæsure was due to the natural pause there for taking breath, and that from this beginning a preference for long and short syllables spread in both directions on the principle of alternation. We are doubtful of the importance of the cæsure; the nature of Sanskrit renders it extremely natural that at the fourth or fifth syllable there should be a cæsure, and there seems no conclusive evidence that the poets felt themselves bound to have a cæsure. Certainly on Dr. Arnold's theory it is remarkable that (p. 191) the archaic period should be characterised by a weak cæsure, i.e. a cæsure after the third syllable or in the middle of a compound, and that it is not until the strophic period (p. 217) that secondary cæsure becomes common. We are unable to reconcile these statements with the theory propounded of the origin of the verse.

In dealing with the history of the triṣṭubh it will be

convenient to follow for the moment Dr. Arnold's division of it into opening (first four syllables), break (syllables five to seven), and cadence. In the strophic and normal periods he finds the opening $\cong - \cup - -$ common, in the cretic and popular periods $\cong \cup - -$. But there is certainly nothing in these forms to suggest sequence in time. In the break he assigns to the archaic period the so-called iambic form $\cup - \cup$, to the cretic period the cretic break $- \cup \cup$, but here again it seems impossible to admit any validity to the attempt to assign differences in time. There remains the cadence, in which alone can we find any real basis for a history of metre. As with the anuṣṭubh verse, we assume an original triṣṭubh of eleven syllables whose length was indifferent, of which the R̥gveda contains many examples. This leads to a verse where the last syllables receive more definition, usually the last four being trochaic. Probably of much the same date are iambic endings, including the verses described as catalectic jagatī by Dr. Arnold (p. 207). The more regular the trochaic ending the later probably the verse, but further there is little evidence to carry us, save that we may suspect verses with the ending $- \cup \cup - \cup - \cong$, especially if repeated more than once in a stanza, to denote a late origin, since that is the metre of the latter part of the great triṣṭubh metre of later days, the indravajrā or upendravajrā. But it is significant of the slow development of the triṣṭubh that the R̥gveda shows no signs of the systematic assimilation of two or more of the four verses of the stanza.

The theory of distinct parts of the verse on which Dr. Arnold bases many of his conclusions appears to us unsupported by any evidence. In the anuṣṭubh verse there is no break in sense or cæsure to lead us to believe that the poets felt the division of the eight syllables into two sets of four. In the triṣṭubh the division into sets of four, three, and four syllables is peculiarly artificial, as in very many instances the cæsure falls after the fifth syllable, and there is no cæsure or break in sense after the seventh syllable, though there sometimes is a cæsure after the eighth. This

being so, it is surely useless to base arguments on the forms assumed by the three sets taken separately. If anything is certain about Vedic metre it is that the poets composed in lines, usually of eight or eleven syllables, and that their smallest unit was the line, as Dr. Arnold himself appears (p. 226) to admit. We must therefore consider the whole line in laying down any arguments as to relative dates. It is clear that the development of the internal rhythm commenced at the end of the verse, doubtless because it was felt requisite to mark off clearly the conclusion of the one verse from the beginning of the next. In both anuṣṭubh and triṣṭubh verses it was felt to be sufficient to define the last four syllables, and the really important criteria of age are to be derived from the form of these four syllables in the verses alone, and also in the four verses of the stanza taken together. A triṣṭubh stanza with four verses all ending in trochees would undoubtedly be rightly assigned to a late period, but unfortunately Dr. Arnold's collections do not directly throw light on this last point. Similarly, his collections of 'openings' and 'breaks' are not sufficient to serve as guides, unless in each case it is shown what the form of the last four syllables is. No useful comparison can be made between, e.g., the rhythms $\underline{\quad} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$ and $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---}$.

Of the other metres it must suffice to say that we doubt the derivation of the decasyllabic metre from the triṣṭubh, which seems forced and unnecessary, as a ten-syllable verse is common in many languages and is in itself natural. As in the case of the anuṣṭubh and triṣṭubh, the last four syllables gradually become defined and serve as marks of date.

In support of the division of the R̥gveda on metrical grounds, Dr. Arnold refers to linguistic evidence, which he thinks confirms his results (pp. 257 sq.). Now, even after making allowance for certain cases in which we cannot accept these tests, there remain certain phenomena characteristic of early date which appear with considerable frequency in the parts held early by Dr. Arnold. This, however, is by no means surprising. As will have been seen above, we

accept part of the metrical tests and accordingly part of the results. Indeed, we consider that the only method of securing more certain results is to apply the simpler metrical tests together with certain linguistic tests of admitted value. But the application of tests so doubtful as many of the metrical and some of the linguistic tests used in this case leads us to results of an impossible nature.

This receives striking proof when we consider the development of ideas which is considered (pp. 260 sq.) to run parallel with the development of language and metre. Dr. Arnold considers that the ritual practices which are fundamental to the R̥gveda are essentially older than beliefs in gods, and that these practices themselves were originally acts of sympathetic magic. The view which regards religion as posterior to magic is hardly satisfactory, but if we accept it, it becomes very difficult to assign to the normal and cretic periods the Soma Pavamāna hymns, as Dr. Arnold (p. 266) now does. The metrical tests which give to these hymns a late date are open to grave suspicion. Similarly, we find it hard to believe that it is in the later periods that Uṣas and Dyāvā-Pr̥thivī become prominent. Dr. Arnold also inverts the relation of Indra and Varuṇa. Indra, who is with him the warrior-god of the invasion of India, is prominent in the older R̥gveda, and is the representation of a time of conquest and hatred of the dark-skinned races. Varuṇa, a Chaldæan deity, represents the settlement in India and the unification under a rule of justice of white and dark alike. To reconcile this with the actual representations of the R̥gveda seems hopeless, and it may be well to point out that on the ingenious theory of Professor Hopkins,¹ accepted by Professor Macdonell,² the Uṣas and Varuṇa hymns must be older than the Indra hymns, because in the Panjāb alone are to be found the wonderful phenomena of dawn described by the poets, and for the phenomena of the strife of the elements, in which

¹ *Journal of American Oriental Society*, 1898, p. 19.

² *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 145.

the Vedic Indians saw Indra, you must go to the Sarasvatī country south of Ambāla.

So with individual hymns. Dr. Arnold holds that the Vimada hymns, X, 20-26, belong to the very oldest in the R̥gveda, and that e.g. X, 20 is much older than I, 1. We confess that we prefer the ordinary view that the Vimada hymns, instead of being early, are badly written and late imitations in elaborate metres much beyond the powers of the poet. The first line of X, 20, 2, which is unmetrical (*agnim īle bhujām yāviṣṭham*), is surely deliberately put at the head of the collection (for v. 1 is merely a fragment of a refrain) in imitation of the famous *agnim īle* of I, 1, 1, and shows that the Vimada hymns are later than even that not very early hymn and the collection associated with it. What may be marks of antiquity may equally well in some cases, as in this, be signs of the incompetence of the poet.

The doubts we feel about Dr. Arnold's results apply mainly to his treatment of the first four of the periods into which he divides the hymns, and he has rendered a valuable service by the careful examination and determination of the features characteristic of the 'popular' R̥gveda.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS. By PAUL DEUSSEN.

Translated by Rev. A. S. GEDEN. (Edinburgh, 1906.)

Mr. Geden has rendered a valuable service to students of Indian Philosophy by this translation of the second part of vol. i of Professor Deussen's General History of Philosophy, which originally appeared in 1899. Professor Deussen's work has long been recognised as the most important treatise on the Upanishads; it has proved a great stimulus to their study, and has raised in a new form the old controversy as to the meaning of these treatises.

Professor Deussen is a follower of Kant and Schopenhauer, and, like the latter, regards the Upanishads as containing one of the great philosophies of the world. With a vastly

wider philosophic knowledge, he supports the interpretation of the Upanishads assigned by Gaudapāda and Śaṅkara, and endeavours to trace through them the development of subsequent Indian philosophy. His view may perhaps be summed up in the following propositions:—(1) *Upaniṣad* originally meant a secret word such as a name of the ātman like *tajjalān* or *tadvanam*. (2) These names were the expressions of a doctrine of the ātman as first principle of the universe, which, though possibly originating in Brāhmaṇic circles, was developed by the Kṣatriyas in opposition to the principles of the Brāhmaṇic ritual. (3) The Brāhmaṇic śākhās soon took up these ideas and developed them, bringing them into accord with the ritual tradition by interpreting the latter in the spirit of the ātman doctrine, as in the Āraṇyakas. Later arose the Upanishads, which represent the final results of much enquiry. (4) The oldest and most fundamental doctrine of the Upanishads is that of Yājñavalkya in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, which asserts (1) that the ātman is the knowing subject, (2) and as such unknowable, (3) and is the sole reality, all else being illusion (though the word *māyā* does not occur before the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*), (4) that on attaining true knowledge the individual is brahma, whereas other persons go through successive transmigrations. (5) This doctrine, which he styles 'Idealism,' is easily changed into Pantheism by regarding the universe as real, though identical with the ātman. This is a view found in even the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* itself, and is a concession to the empirical belief in the reality of the universe. By regarding the relation of the universe to the ātman as causal is obtained the cosmogonic point of view found in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and later. This develops into Theism, when in the *Kāthaka* and *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads* the ātman enters into the created universe as an individual soul. The next step leads to the Sāṅkhya doctrine, when the universal soul is dispensed with and *prakṛti* evolves itself unassisted by a deity for the individual *puruṣas*, now regarded as unlimited in number.

Attractive as the development is, it is open to some

criticism. The derivation of *upaniṣad* as meaning a secret word seems too restricted, and it appears better to adhere to the more general meaning of secret doctrine or secret explanation,¹ especially as the explanation of such secret words is not relatively a great part of the Upanishads. Nor can it be regarded as very probable that Kṣatriyas especially developed the doctrine. The instances of kings instructing Brāhmaṇas (pp. 17 sq.) do show that, as indeed we would expect, at the date of the composition of the Upanishads the severance of priest and warrior had not gone to extreme lengths, but we must also remember that priests were human and flattered princes generous givers of cows. There seems no satisfactory ground for doubt that the development of the ātman doctrine was a continuous one and conducted by the Brāhmaṇas.

More important is the question of the historical relations of Idealism and Pantheism, and the relative importance of either in the Upanishads. Professor Deussen's theory regards Idealism as expounded by Yājñavalkya as the fundamental doctrine, which merges into Pantheism and later into 'Cosmogony.' This view is natural, if it be accepted that the Yājñavalkya sections of the *Brhadāranyaka Upanishad* are the oldest representatives of the Upanishads extant. As a matter of fact, they are undoubtedly older than the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (cf pp. 105, 205, 233), the *Taittirīya*, and the *Kauṣītaki*. But it may seriously be doubted whether there is not an older stage of doctrine to be found in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*. That work contains three Upanishads, corresponding to *Āraṇyaka* ii, 1-3, ii, 4-6, and iii respectively. Of these, ii, 1-3, and ii, 4-6 are probably anterior to the *Brhadāranyaka*, and ii, 1-3 is the older. This seems to follow from the facts which we will now enumerate:—(1) The doctrine of the *Āraṇyaka* is mainly an allegorical account of the *Uktha*, and it fits itself very closely on to the Brāhmaṇa. The philosophical context is not large and is obscurely expressed. On the whole, it

¹ Max Müller, S.B.E., I, lxxxiii.

is therefore more probably ancient than so definitely philosophical discussions as those of Yājñavalkya. (2) The doctrine of both Upanishads is purely pantheistic or cosmogonic (it is not possible, we consider, to separate these ideas in these early Upanishads). The latter (ii, 4-6) shows a certain development as compared with the former. It adopts the term *ātman* as against *puruṣa-prāṇa*, and recognizes the nature of the *ātman* as *prajñā*, an idea not so clearly expressed in the former (see, however, ii, 3, 2). But though the author of ii, 4-6 agrees with Yājñavalkya in recognizing the *ātman* as thought, he does not show any knowledge of the more special doctrines which constitute the characteristic signs of Yājñavalkya's Idealism. Thus (a) he does not assert that the knower cannot be known. This idea occurs only in the later Upanishad, *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* iii, 2, 4, 19. (b) He does not regard the *ātman* as alone real, the rest being truly unreal. It is indeed doubtful how far Yājñavalkya himself held this view, but it is a logical result of his thought, and the *Chāndogya Upanishad*, vi, 1, 3, already has the phrase *vācārambhaṇam* of plurality. The *Aitareya* is consistently pantheistic or cosmogonic. The *ātman* is the world or produces it, but its reality is not impugned. The point is an important one, because on it depends the question of the validity of interests in the world. To a Pantheist the world is the revelation of the divinity, to the Idealist it is the cloud which hides it. Indian philosophy is not absolutely dominated by Idealism. There is always a strong school of Pantheists, who regard the world as no mere illusion, but a living truth. Dr. Thibaut has recently shown that this is the point of view in all probability of Bādarāyaṇa; it is that of Rāmānuja and of Rāmānanda, and the space allotted to it in the *Sarvadarśana-Saṃgraha* demonstrates its real importance. It assumes, indeed, in these writers a theistic tinge, and is inferior in philosophic value to the system of Śaṅkara, but from the practical point of view it is undoubtedly superior. It may be interesting to note that Viśveśvaratīrtha and Āṇandatīrtha have commented in a Vaiṣṇava sense on the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* ii, iii. It

naturally follows that (c) the result of knowledge in the individual is not emancipation. The man who knows the various doctrines of ii, 4-6 becomes immortal. Sāyaṇa, following Śaṅkara, interprets this, of course, as referring to *mukti*, but this is merely scholastic. There is not a trace of evidence that the authors of the Upanishads in the Āraṇyaka understood the doctrine of *mukti*. Further (d), there is no clear trace of the doctrine of transmigration, even in the form in which it appears in *Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad* iv, 4, 5. What happens to the unenlightened man is not specified, possibly it was thought of as in the Brāhmaṇas (Deussen, p. 327) as recurrent death. There is indeed an apparent reference to transmigration proper in *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* ii, 3, 2, 5, in the words *yathāprajñam hi sambhavāḥ*, which Max Müller renders "for they are born according to their knowledge in a former life," as it was taken by Sāyaṇa. This meaning does not particularly well fit the context, and the words should probably be translated "for their experiences are according to their measure of intelligence."

There are other points in which the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* ii is older than the *Brhadāraṇyaka*, but the evidence seems clearly to show that we have in the *Āraṇyaka* a pantheistic view older than the idealistic, and if we accept this result we will be inclined to interpret the Upanishads generally either pantheistically or idealistically, as may best suit each passage. Indeed, probably the idealistic view is the rarer, as it is the more subtle, and able as are Śaṅkara's efforts to explain away discrepancies, we must be prepared to admit that the two lines of thought are not capable of ultimate agreement.

Among the many other interesting questions raised by Professor Deussen, we must be content with referring to his theory of the origin of the Sāṅkhya doctrine (ch. x). He accounts for the curious position of *prakṛti* by the theory that Sāṅkhya is a Theism with the deity omitted, *prakṛti* being permitted to evolve itself. Perhaps the theory of the Sāṅkhya system is deeper; puruṣa seems to be the absolute subject—the transcendental unity of apprehension—made

into a self-existing entity and opposed to the object as *prakṛti*. The system would thus, however illogical, be one of pure Idealism and in full sympathy with the Vedānta.

We must add that Mr. Geden's translation is accurate and readable. We do not, however, know why Yājñavalkya is throughout spelled Yājñavalkhya.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

SOME SAYINGS FROM THE UPANISHADS.

By Dr. L. D. BARNETT.

In this little book Dr. Barnett has made accessible to English readers the most important passages of the Upanishads—the teaching of Uddālaka from the *Chândogya Upanishad*, of Yājñavalkya from the *Bṛhadāranyaka Upanishad*, and the legend of Naciketas from the *Kātha Upanishad*. He has accompanied his renderings with analyses of the parts translated, which will be of considerable assistance to the reader in grasping the thought of the Upanishads, and his presentation of the subject will undoubtedly convey an attractive impression of the philosophic value of these old enquiries.

One or two points on which Dr. Barnett takes views other than those usual seem to call for remark. He considers (p. 47) that the expression *aṇimā* in the *Chândogya* shows that the absolute was conceived as essentially material substance, though without any attributes of materiality, and that being, thought, and matter were ultimately one to the author. This seems to press unduly the literal meaning of *aṇimā*, and, though the idea of thought which does not think is a strange one to us, yet it seems plain that this was the conception of being present to the mind of the author, whereas matter is a product of being, with which, however, it is not identical. Again (p. 58), it is suggested to take *aśukad* in *Kātha Upanishad*, vi, 4, as the negative *a* combined with

the subjunctive *śakad*, as otherwise the meaning is wrong. But even assuming that Pāṇini, ii, 2, 6, authorises such a compound, which is open to grave doubt,¹ until some clear Vedic cases are found, we cannot accept so hybrid a formation as possible in an Upanishad. It is true that the aposiopesis theory of the commentators is impossible, but surely the next verse makes it clear that the reference is to one who is not completely enlightened but is progressively attaining that end (cf. the later *kramamukti*). There is a very similar passage in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad*, iv, 4, 5, where the soul which has negatively cleared itself progresses through lives in higher spheres such as those of the fathers, Gandharvas, and Brahman.

The reference suspected in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad*, iv, 4, 24, to the legend of Suvarṇaṣṭhīvin seems unnecessary, and as Uddālaka was son of Aruṇa, the father of Naciketas, Auddālaki Āruṇi, must have been son of Uddālaka and grandson of Aruṇa, and not grandson of Uddālaka, as stated on p. 56. Or if he was grandson of Uddālaka, he must have been great-grandson of Aruṇa. It is clear, however, that the legends had preserved little but names vaguely remembered.

There are one or two misprints, e.g. *Īsā* for *Īsā* on p. 53, and in a later edition it might be well to discard a few of the more awkward of the archaic words and forms, such as 'understanded,' 'wotteth,' 'rede.' After all, the style of the Upanishads is, for the time of the probable composition, remarkably modern, as was to be expected from the fact that they are the textbooks of a new faith.

A. BÉRIEDALE KEITH.

¹ Probably the use is later than Pāṇini, and based on a misunderstanding or illegitimate extension of the rule.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE SEARCH FOR HINDI MANUSCRIPTS.

Four volumes, for the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903.

By SYAMSUNDAR DAS, B.A., Honorary Secretary, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Benares; Member, Asiatic Society of Bengal; Second Master, Central Hindu Collegiate School, Benares; etc., etc. Published under the authority of the Government of the United Provinces. (Allahabad: United Provinces Government Press.)

As is well-known, an active search for Sanskrit manuscripts under the authority and at the cost of the Government of India has been carried on for very many years throughout the various provinces of India. It has led to most valuable results, and has shed a flood of light on the still existing manuscript treasures of the vast Sanskrit literature of India. A similar search was instituted, at least in the Province of Bengal, for Arabic and Persian manuscripts. But it lacked the needful enterprise, and never came to much. It may be hoped that now, under the direction of Dr. Denison Ross, the present energetic Principal of the Calcutta Madrasah, it may begin to rival in usefulness the Sanskrit branch of the search.

All this time the vernaculars of India were left out in the cold. Probably it was thought that in respect of them there was little or nothing to search for. The conviction that this was a great error has gradually forced itself on all who have sympathised with the newly awakened interest in the Indian vernaculars. In Bengal a commendable effort has begun to be made in connection with the search for Sanskrit manuscripts, by its present able Director, Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasada Shastri, the learned Principal of the Sanskrit College in Calcutta, who is devoting a portion of his attention to the collection of Bengali manuscripts. But it is the Hindi vernacular which has been the first to secure for itself the advantage of a distinct organization for the search of its manuscripts. The credit of this achievement, as we learn from the introduction to the First Annual Report (1900),

is due to an entirely native Indian agency, the Nagari Pracharini Sabha of Benares. After an abortive attempt to interest the Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Government of India in its scheme of collecting Hindi manuscripts, it met with well-deserved success in its appeal to the Government of the United Provinces of the North-West and Oudh. That Government sanctioned an annual subsidy of Rs. 400 to the Sabha, and also undertook to publish the Annual Reports of its search. This was in 1899, and since then four Reports have been published by Mr. Syamsundar Das, the able Secretary of the Sabha. The choice of this scholar for the direction of the search is a very happy one. Mr. Syamsundar Das is an excellent Hindi scholar, who has already made himself favourably known by several welcome editions of important Hindi works. Among these may be mentioned Lāl Kavi's Chhatra Prakāś, a Bundelkhand historical poem dealing with the life of Chhatrasāl Bundelā. This edition Mr. Syamsundar Das has provided with an excellent introduction, in connection with which, as well as with the "Hindi Notes" in the Reports, the only regret one cannot help feeling is that its author should not have seen his way to discard the artificial Hindi loaded with Sanskrit Tatsamas which is still so dear to the literati of India, and which, in No. 34 of the Report for 1901, Lallū-jī Lāla is said to have 'invented' in 1800. The Sabha, and its able Secretary, might add to their laurels by taking the initiative, for which they are so well fitted, in raising up a true literary Hindi, presenting in a polished form the living language of the people, such a language as would be both intelligible and enjoyable by the people at large, and not be merely the jargon of a literary class. The literary Hindi which we should like to see created would be on the pattern of the language of what Mr. Syamsundar Das calls the Augustan period of Hindi literature, and of which the famous Rāmāyan of Tulsī Dās is one of the best representatives.

The case of this beautiful poem well illustrates the usefulness of a search for Hindi manuscripts. That search has

brought to light several extremely old manuscripts of the poem, among them one (No. 22 of 1901) discovered in Ajodhyā, the first canto of which was written in 1604 A.D., that is, 19 years prior to the death of Tulsī Dās. The poet lived for many years in Ajodhyā, where he began the composition of his epic in 1574 A.D. It is therefore quite possible that this canto may be in the actual handwriting of Tulsī Dās himself. It is said that Tulsī Dās made two copies of his Rāmāyan, one of which he took to Rājāpur in Banda. The Rājāpur MS. is described as No. 28 in the Report for 1901. It does not appear to bear any date, and contains no more than the second canto (*Ajodhyā Kaṇḍ*). But for some watermarks, it is in fairly good condition. There is a story that it "was once stolen, but the thief, when pursued, threw the entire bundle into the Jamna, whence only one book, the Ajodhyā Kaṇḍa, could be rescued" (Report, 1900, p. 3)—a story which the condition of the manuscript fragment would seem to corroborate. Mr. Syamsundar Das, who has compared the two very old manuscripts, considers that they are both in the same handwriting, and were written by Tulsī Dās himself. But by adding two reduced facsimile pages of each of the two manuscripts to his Report for 1901, he has made it possible for anyone to judge for himself. If his opinion should prove to be correct, we should be in possession of portions of both the traditional autographs of Tulsī Dās; and it would follow that the Malihābād copy, which is also claimed by its owner to be in his handwriting, cannot be genuine. And this, indeed, would seem to be the truth, if the report that it contains many *kṣepaka*, or interpolations, should be true (see Report, 1900, p. 3; 1901, p. 2). In this connection, however, one point may be worth noting. In the Rājāpur MS., व and य, when they signify *va* and *ya* (as distinguished from *ba* and *ja*), are invariably marked by a subscribed dot; thus on the upper page, 2nd line नयन *nayana*, 5th line भयेउ *bhayeu*, and 2nd line अवधि *avadhi*; on the lower page, 1st and 3rd lines प्रिय *priya*, and 7th line अवनि *avani*. In

the Ajodhya MS., it is only *va* which is so marked; e.g., upper page, 3rd line जीवन् *jīvana*, 6th line गाव्हाँ *gāṇhā*, 9th line संवत् *saṁvat*, but 2nd line भयेउ *bhayeu* without a dot. It would be desirable to have larger portions of the two manuscripts in facsimile to compare.

With reference to another celebrated Hindi work, the search has proved of much usefulness. This is the Prithirāj Rāsau, the so-called epic or ballad chronicle of Prithirāj Chauhān by Chand Bardāi, composed towards the end of the twelfth century, the oldest work written in Hindī, or indeed in any of the modern North Indian vernaculars. The search brought to light in Mathurā a very old manuscript, dated 1590 A.D. (No. 63 of 1900), and on the basis of it, as well as three other, already known, good manuscripts, the Nagari Pracharini Sabha has commenced to publish a trustworthy edition of the hitherto much disputed text, the preparation of which is in the experienced hands of Mr. Syamsundar Das, Pandit Mohanlal Vishnulal Pandya, and Babu Radha Krishna Das. This is a much needed work, which, in spite of its lengthiness, it may be hoped will be carried to a successful conclusion. The genuineness of the chronicle, once unhesitatingly accepted, was first denied by Kavirāj Syamal Das in 1886 in an article contributed to the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and has since remained greatly suspect, on the ground mainly of the incorrectness of its dates. In his Report for 1900 Mr. Syamsundar Das has made an attempt, as it appears successfully, to rehabilitate the ancient chronicle. The clue to it, discovered by Pandit Mohanlal Vishnulal Pandya, is furnished by the chronicle itself. In his first canto, Chand Bardāi explains that his dates are not stated in the ordinary Vikrama era, but in a modification of it adopted by Prithirāj, and called the Ananda Vikrama era. Several explanations are suggested of this name, none of which is quite satisfactory; but what appears to be certainly true is that, as Mr. Syamsundar Das shows, all the dates given in the Rāsau work out correctly if the

Ananda Vikrama era is taken to commence 90-91 years later than the ordinary Vikrama era, called by way of distinction the Sānanda Vikrama (e.g., in No. 41, of 1900, p. 40). It follows, therefore, that any year in the former era may be converted into the corresponding year of the Christian era by adding 33. At the same time, it is not denied that the text has suffered by occasional interpolations of incidents as well as by modernisation of the language. The object of the edition which the Sabha has undertaken is precisely to furnish scholars with the means of settling the exact literary and historical value of the epic.

The term *Hindī*, as employed in the name of the Search for Hindi Manuscripts, is used in its old sense, in which it embraces the languages of the whole of the central portion of Northern India. The search, therefore, includes manuscripts written in Bihārī, Rājputānī, and Mārwarī; and it is apparently intended to include even Panjābī. From the point of view of practical utility, seeing that it secures a wide sweep of the search, one cannot help condoning the abuse of the term.

Altogether 761 separate works, or books, appear to be noticed in the four Annual Reports. The numeration, however, is not quite clearly stated. The number of separate "Notices" is certainly smaller. Moreover, the search has produced a considerable number of manuscripts which have not been "noticed" at all, as being "of no historical or literary value."

The search has already produced some very valuable results, both from the literary and antiquarian points of view. Some great literary finds have been already mentioned: manuscripts of Tulsī Dās Rāmāyan and Chand's Prithirāj Rāsau. To these may be added two old and important manuscripts of the Padmāvatī by Malik Muhammad (c. 1540 A.D.) and of the Sat'sai by Bihārī Lāl Chaube (c. 1650 A.D.), dated respectively 1690 and 1718 A.D.

The oldest manuscript brought to light by the search is a manuscript of the Prithirāj Rāsau (No. 63 of 1900), which is dated in 1590 A.D. It appears to be the only manuscript

of the sixteenth century as yet discovered by the search. The next oldest is dated in 1604 A.D., and is a manuscript of the Tulsī Dās Rāmāyan (No. 22 of 1900). There appear to be 32 other manuscripts of the seventeenth century. They belong to the years 1612 (7 MSS.), 1614, 1635, 1647, 1649 (14 MSS.), 1651, 1673, 1683 (3 MSS.), 1686, 1688, 1690.

The date of a manuscript is one of the most important points to note. The passage or colophon which gives it should always be transcribed; and it is convenient always to quote it also in the English portion of the "notice." In this respect the first Report of 1900 was often wanting, but in the succeeding volumes the defect has been almost entirely removed; though not altogether, as e.g. in Nos. 24 and 112 of 1901. In respect of the dates mentioned in the Notice No. 63 of 1900, there is much confusion. On p. 58 the manuscript (one of the Prithirāj Rāsau) is said to be dated Samvat 1640, or 1583 A.D.; but on p. 57, in Notice No. 62, A.D. 1584 is given as the date of the same manuscript. Unfortunately the passage containing the date has not been reproduced. But in point of fact, as Mr. Syamsundar Das some time ago informed me privately, the date is Samvat 1647, that is, 1590 A.D. The passage runs as follows:—

रासा री पोथी रा रूपक संख्या १०७०९ वत्तिस आबर मिलने
 झोक ग्रंथ जुदौ है । ए पोथी श्री दीवाणा जी रै थी उत्तरी है ।
 लिषतं गणि ज्ञान विजये ॥ श्री बड़ा नलाष मध्ये लिषतं । संवत्
 १६४७ वर्षे आश्विन मासे ॥

The dates are not always correctly given; e.g., No. 41 of 1900 is not dated Samvat 1942, but 1944. The date is expressed thus: *juga śruti nidhi mahi*, that is, 4, 4, 9, 1; *juga* refers to the well-known four ages. It also means a pair; but I do not recollect ever having met with it as symbolic of two, but always of four. Again, the date of No. 134 of 1900 is given, in the English note on p. 106, as "Samvat 1825 (1768 A.D.);" but in the Hindi note on p. 107 as "Samvat 1827," which would be 1770 A.D. Again, under No. 143 of 1900 (p. 113), the date in the

transcript of the "End" is given as "Samvat 1896," but in the English and Hindi notes it is stated to be "Samvat 1889 (1832 A.D.)." The former date would be 1839 A.D.

Some additional errata, not noted in the list prefixed to the Report for 1900, are the following:—On p. 77, l. 36, read Orissa for Orrissa; p. 78, l. 30, read Vindhya for Vindya; p. 107, l. 3, read ऋषभो for कृषभो. In the Report for 1900, p. 110, in the English note on No. 139, read 1851 A.D. for 1817 A.D.; also in the Report for 1901, p. 39, in the English note on No. 36, read 1837 A.D. for 1817 A.D. Both dates are given correctly in the Hindi Abstract list (*Samkṣep Sūci*).

Most of these blemishes, it must be acknowledged, occur in the first, and necessarily experimental, Report: the succeeding ones are nearly all that one can desire. On the whole, the Reports reflect great credit on their compiler, and on the Nagari Pracharini Sabha to whose public-spirited enterprise we owe them.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

HISTORICAL RETROSPECT OF JUNKCEYLON ISLAND. By
Colonel G. E. GERINI, M.R.A.S., M.S.S., etc., etc.
(From the Journal of the Siam Society, 1905.)

A careful and scholarly account of this little known island. The early notices are especially valuable. The author cites the remarks of fifteen travellers between 1200 and 1700 (pp. 7–19). He gives a clear and interesting account of French influence in the seventeenth century, but touches very lightly on attempted Dutch aggression during that period. For the eighteenth century, he quotes Hamilton, Koenig, and Forrest. On the last-named traveller he bestows a just encomium, and compares his careful and accurate work with that of later writers, greatly to their disadvantage. The Burmese invasions of Junkceylon are carefully dealt with, and the writer carries the history of the island down to the middle of the nineteenth century.

Colonel Gerini's remarks on the derivation of the name of the island and of other places on the coast and mainland are of exceptional interest. With regard to the name Junkceylon (pp. 2-7), he agrees that the generally accepted meaning (Ujung Salang) Salang Head is correct, and utterly discredits the ingenious derivation given by Skeat in the second edition of *Hobson-Jobson*. At the same time, he maintains that "C'halāng, the correct name (of which Salāng is the Malay form)," is neither Siamese nor Malay. He leaves it an open question whether the name was bestowed by the early Moñ settlers, or by the southern Indian traders, or whether it is a "loan word from the speech of the aboriginal Negrito tribes originally inhabiting the country." He discredits the Malay derivation, *bukit*, a hill, for P'hūket (Bhūkech, Puket), but suggests no alternative.

Among numerous valuable notes on words used by travellers, the following are especially interesting. The author derives Forrest's 'poot' from "probably *pūk*, a lump," but adds, "it may, however, be meant for the Chinese *puat*, a lump." In the *Geographical Account of Countries round the Bay of Bengal*, by Thomas Bowrey, Hakluyt Society's edition, p. 241, the word is derived from the Malay *patah*, 'a fragment,' which, in view of Bowrey's spelling (*putta*) of the word, seems to me the more likely derivation.

Again, the author's remarks on the vexed question of the origin of 'Talapoin' are of great value, though on some points open to objection. He contends, pp. 55.n. and 139, that the derivations collected in the 2nd ed. of *Hobson-Jobson* fall wide of the mark, and that the term in its various forms is from a Moñ original *tala-pói*, meaning 'my Lord.' This view has much to recommend it.

It is a pity that the index to this important work should be so inadequate.

R. C. TEMPLE.

AUFSÄTZE ZUM VERSTÄNDNIS DES BUDDHISMUS. VON PAUL DAHLKE. I^{ter} und II^{er} Teil. pp. 157, 137. (Berlin: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1903.)

These twenty brief essays are profoundly interesting. Not of the class of work usually termed scholarly, and professedly appealing only to the general cultured reader, they may be nevertheless commended to the perusal of all scholars to whom the historical phenomenon of Buddhist thought is at least not less important than ancillary questions of Pali philology. The author is convinced that the gospel of Buddhist nirvana is the view of things which all who reject any form of faith, of revealed religion, must inevitably stumble over, even if they do not take it up and make it their own. It lies across their way—is their way, even if they know it not. How this is demonstrated scarcely belongs to a review in these pages. But in spite of much repetition and other weaknesses, the logically strong, incisive, and uncompromising exposition constitutes a positive contribution to modern Buddhist literature.

To some extent this trenchant certainty of tone is due to the restricted and simplified field of Mr. Dahlke's data. He comments pleasantly on the 'doing everything' of Western secular life, on the 'doing nothing' of intellectual and moral sloth, and on the 'not doing' of the selective ideal of life. But that he should carry out the last ideal by remaining ignorant of his literary material in the original is absolutely unpardonable. He is justly complacent respecting the fact that his limited 'Bücherstudien' have been complemented by visits to the homes of surviving Buddhism. We could wish he had enlarged more on the living and thinking of brethren and religious laymen in those countries. Sympathetic information such as he could have given, from a non-Christian standpoint, is much asked for by Western inquirers. But his book-material is drawn almost wholly, and wholly uncritically, from Dr. Neumann's *Anthologie* and *Majjhima* translations. As a result his strong and his weak points are but repetitions of corresponding

features in those notable but prismatic works. We find the (to us) elusive Pali terms gripped by ill-fitting Schopenhauerisms, and all the fine ethic of will-culture informing Buddhist doctrine wilting under the illusion that insight means killing out of will and desire. And this because terms of volitional import are foisted on to Pali terms which do not fit. Of this we have spoken elsewhere. But this belief in will-paralysis, in place of synergy diverted, directed, concentrated, and intensified by intellectual culture, tends to distort the author's view of Buddhism. Where he leaves German for English translations he falls into the error of calling suicide a 'deadly sin' in Buddhist law. Only incitement to suicide was denounced, and he might, from the instances of Channa and Godhika, have seen saintly suicides pronounced void of offence by the Buddha. It is unsatisfactory, too, that one who so ardently assimilates the philosophy of Buddhism should be content to repeat, at second-hand, in a footnote, the exploded error of referring to the Abhidhamma as the 'philosophical books' of Buddhism.

But we trust that, since the publication of his essays, Mr. Dahlke has been both willing and doing with respect to the study of Pali. And for the rest we can always be grateful that his past absorption into the spirit of Sutta literature has resulted in his charming contribution to Buddhist similes. His figures of the rainbow, the swimmer, the lightning flash, the veil of the gods, the sieve of criticism, the radius of cognition, the spectrum, the lonely traveller, and many others are worthy of his interesting and beautiful models. And it is pleasant to think of him sitting in the moonlit Gosinga-grove, exchanging *seyyathāpīs* with the saintly theras of old, the barriers of East and West replaced by the bond of the great Dhamma.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

MONNAIES DE L'ELYMAIDE. Par ALLOTTE DE LA FUYE.
(Chartres, 1905.)

Probably no Asiatic coins present greater difficulties than the sub-Parthian, and certainly none have been studied by abler numismatists than they have.

In 1852 Bartholomei published a coin bearing the name Kamniskires, which he attributed to the king of an unidentified small state in Asia. In 1853 Longperier described two coins with figures and names of King Kamniskires and his queen Anzaze, which he attributed to a king of a later date than that of Bartholomei. In 1856 Vaux located the kingdom of the Kamniskires in Susiana (Elymais, Elam). In 1877 Gardner described a tetradrachm of Kamniskires and Anzaze bearing the date 234 of the Seleucid era. Besides these we have had the researches of Mordtmann, Thomas, Markoff, and Allotte de la Fuye upon these and other coins from the same region, of a Parthian type, some bearing the names of Orodes or Phraates in Aramaic as well as in Greek.

In the book now under notice Colonel Allotte de la Fuye very ably sums up these researches, and describes in great detail the hundreds of coins which he has been able to examine, and gives figures of 185 of them in four large quarto heliotype plates. He discusses the types, the symbols, and the attributions, and the readings of the Greek and Aramaic legends, with careful facsimiles of the latter. He says that the Kamniskires dynasty was probably as follows:

Kamniskires Nicephore, *circa* B.C. 163.

Kamniskires II the Great.

Kamniskires III and Anzaze, B.C. 82.

Kamniskires IV, son of Kamniskires II, B.C. 72.

He attributes the majority of the Kamniskires coins to the last of these.

With regard to the coins having the name Orodes or Phraates on them, it is debated whether they were struck

by the Arsacid rulers of those names or by their satraps or governors in Elymais; or whether there was a line of Elymaid kings descended from Orodes I; or whether the coins should be attributed to a line of kings of a later period near to that of the last Arsacid or early Sassanian kings. The author is inclined to agree to the second of these propositions, and suggests that the Orodes of Elymais was the son of the great Parthian Orodes I (B.C. 55), and that he was followed by Phraates, Orodes III, and Orodes IV.

The book is an excellent piece of numismatic work on a difficult subject, and without accepting as proven all that the author propounds as to the order of the two dynasties, we congratulate him on the way in which he has done it. The Dujardin heliotype plates are also admirable.

O. C.

RECHERCHES SUR LES RUBAIYAT DE 'OMAR ḤAYYĀM, par
ARTHUR CHRISTENSEN, docteur ès lettres de l'Université
de Copenhague. (Heidelberg, 1905.)

This work—one of the series purporting to supply material to the history of the languages and literature of the Further East—deserves a fuller review than we are able to find space for here. The following extract from the concluding lines of Dr. Christensen's long and elaborate essay will give some idea of his method of treating his subject. He speaks of it as the remarkable work which we "call the Rubā'iyāt of Omar Ḥayyām." We have it in French, the language he has himself chosen for expression of his sentiments:—

"Mélange curieux de pensées les plus hétérogènes, les plus contraires, renfermant le matérialisme le plus brutale et le spiritualisme le plus sublime, poésie tantôt légère, tantôt profonde, tantôt quelquefois avec enjouement, mais le plus souvent avec une ironie amère ou un désespoir plus ou moins accentué ce qui contribue à rendre ce mélange plus confus, c'est les quatrains ont été arrangés selon le hasard de la rime.

Pourtant il ne faut pas aller jusqu'à prétendre que toutes ces idées incongrues n'aient pu exister ensemble dans un même cerveau persan. N'avons-nous pas eu nous autres nations européennes qui nous vantons de penser logiquement, des poètes qui ont traité des idées presque aussi hétérogènes ? Comment un tel phénomène ne serait-il pas possible chez ces Persans doués de plus d'imagination que de logique ? Dans la poésie de Nasir Husrau nous trouvons également une bonne part de ce déchirement, de ce débordement de sentiments momentanés bien que chez lui ces sentiments soient contenus par une forte tendance. Au point de vue de la psychologie, je ne trouve pas impossible qu'Omar Hayyām ait pu composer les Rubā'iyāt essentiellement telle qu'elles nous sont représentées dans les meilleurs textes. Mais, encore une fois même les meilleurs textes sont fortement altérés, à quel point c'est ce que nous ne savons pas. Nous n'avons pas des moyens pour décider si tel, ou tel quatrain est composé par lui même ou non.

Mais la valeur de l'œuvre reste indépendamment de l'auteur. Dans les Rubā'iyāt, les courants d'esprit qui ont traversé, durant les siècles, le monde persan, se rencontrent et se réfractent. Les Rubā'iyāt sont une encyclopédie poétique de la vie intellectuelle des Persans, et à ce point de vue le plus elles sont incontestablement une des œuvres les plus remarquables qu'a produite la littérature persane.

F. J. G.

ELEMENTARY EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR. By MARGARET A. MURRAY. (Quaritch, 1905.)

Miss Murray has for some years acted as instructress in Egyptian to the beginners' class among Professor Petrie's pupils at University College, London, and has thereby acquired an insight into the first difficulties attending the study of hieroglyphs such as has been attained by few. Her Elementary Grammar thus tells us all those things which a beginner in Egyptian wants to know, and which

he will be able to find in no grammar hitherto published. As an instance may be taken the simple forms of signs given on pages 8 and 9, which teach the student to reduce the printed hieroglyphs to their simplest expression, and thus to reproduce them currently without previous study of the graphic arts. Until now these could only be found after long search in the expensive and scarce Dictionary of Brugsch, and their possession alone will amply repay the reader the few shillings that Miss Murray's book will cost him. For the rest, it is founded on Erman's *Ägyptische Grammatik*, which is to say that it is based throughout on the theory of the Berlin school of Egyptologists that the ancient Egyptian was in effect a Semitic language. This Pan-Semitic view of the case is not held by all scholars, and it will seem to many that a work like M. Victor Loret's *Manuel de la Langue Egyptienne*, if brought up to date, would be better fitted to beginners than all the paraphernalia of vowelless words, pseudo-participles, and the purely hypothetical paradigms of verbs with which Erman's grammar and, to a certain extent, the present volume are garnished. Miss Murray does indeed spare us the awkward and pedantic transliteration of the Berlin school, which she rightly pronounces to be "often a great stumbling-block to beginners." For this we are grateful, but it looks as if she might have also warned them that the older system of Lepsius was still in force, and was exclusively used by nearly all French and many English Egyptologists. By so doing she would have followed the courteous precedent set by the greatest living Egyptologist, M. Maspero, who in his public lectures has never given a reading of a text which differs from that of Berlin without at the same time reading the German version and allowing his hearers to see which corresponds most closely to the original. With this exception, Miss Murray's grammar seems entirely adequate to the needs of the class for whom it is written, and really brings the power of reading cartouches and other simple inscriptions within the reach of anybody with a little leisure.

F. L.

SCARABS. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. (Constable, 1906.)

This handsome book gives us reproductions of some twelve hundred scarabs, which have been chosen from the different museums and private collections of Europe, Egypt, and America as good specimens of their different types. Hence the reader is confronted, on first opening the book, with a duly arranged set of examples which should enable him to identify at a glance any particular variety. After a very short study of them there is no reason why the characteristics of each type should not be as easily remembered as the marks on porcelain; and with this equipment the most unlearned traveller in Egypt can be secure against having a late Ramesside scarab palmed off on him as a Mentuhotep, or a *porte-bonheur* seal as a cylinder of the Thinite dynasties. All others apart, for such uses Mr. Newberry's book is invaluable.

In his Introduction, too, Mr. Newberry, speaking with the authority to which his long experience in Egyptology entitles him, has much to say that will be useful to the tourist and to the student alike. Forged scarabs are, he tells us, so rare as to be negligible, but the Egyptians themselves thought nothing of antedating their work by several dynasties, so that it is quite possible to come across scarabs purporting to be made for a king of the Sixth or some earlier dynasty which were not made until the Twelfth. Hence the value of the scarab as historical evidence is small, and, with the exception of a few well-known ones, more properly to be called medals, commemorating some event like the marriage of Amenhotep III with the famous queen Thyi, or the same king's slaughter of an incredible number of 'lions,' no great reliance can be placed in their inscriptions. On the other hand, scarabs are most valuable as a means of determining the family history, the relationships, and the official appointments of individuals. For the scarab was

the personal seal or signet of the wearer, with which he was accustomed to authenticate documents, execute deeds, and do all the other things that in our civilization demand a signature, as well as to seal up doors, cupboards, and other things now kept under lock and key. This fact, which in the earlier days of Egyptology was often denied, is clearly proved by the arguments in the present book, even without the study which Professor Spiegelberg has lately devoted to the subject. That it was thus the lineal descendant and supplanter of the cylinder or barrel-seal which the first conquerors of Egypt introduced, probably from Babylonia, is as clear as daylight, and all fanciful theories that the scarab was ever used as money and the like may fairly be laid aside.

I will not quarrel with Mr. Newberry for assuming, as he does, on p. 107, that the Aha whose cylinder-seals—or, more correctly, their impressions—have been found at Abydos, was really Menes, the founder of the Egyptian monarchy, though I think he might have warned his readers that many Egyptologists hold a different opinion. I will go instead to what appears to me the only serious omission from the book, which is the absence of any attempt to explain why the later Egyptians chose the beetle as the invariable type of their seals. The *Ateuchus sacer*, or beetle who lays its eggs in dung, and is often seen in Egypt rolling before her the little ball containing them, was, of course, looked upon as a type of the sun-god, who in the same manner was considered to push the orb of the sun across the sky. There is also some reason for supposing, as does Dr. Budge in his “*Gods of the Egyptians*” (vol. i, p. 356), that this *Ateuchus* was worshipped on its own account in the Nile Valley from very early times, its identification with the later sun-god being merely a piece of priestcraft. Nor can there be any doubt that the scarab-form was looked upon as in some way representing the heart of man, there being many directions in the *Book of the Dead* for providing the corpse with a green-stone cut into beetle-shape in the place of that organ. But what had any of

these ideas to do with the choice of the beetle as the conventional form of a seal? Mr. Newberry does not tell us; and, as what he does not know about scarabs is not likely to be knowledge, we may conclude that here is but one more of those mysteries which Ancient Egypt still keeps in store for us.

F. L.

JUDAH HALEVI'S KITAB AL-KHAZARI, translated from the Arabic with an introduction. By HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD, Ph.D. (London and New York: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1905.)

The middle of the eleventh century finds the Muhamedan philosophical world in a state of great ferment. The philosophy of Al-Ashari, and, above all, that of Gazali, showed a decided reaction against the advance of the Aristotelian philosophy of Avicenna. This great spiritual excitement communicated itself also to the Jews, who were affected to a great extent by the doctrines of their Muhamedan contemporaries. Karaism assailed, moreover, the authority of the Oral tradition. It is then at that juncture that Judah Halevi undertook the defence of Judaism from a philosophical point of view, following in the main the lines of Gazali, yet sufficiently independent to give to his book the great merit of being one of the finest apologetic writings, strengthened by philosophical arguments, that has hitherto been written. In contradistinction to the prevailing tendency of starting with metaphysical problems, he bases his creed on the traditional accuracy of the various revelations which make the existence of God a necessary postulate.

The book bears the name of Al-Khazari, for Judah Halevi, true to his poetical genius, could not present a philosophical treatise in a dry manner as other writers on philosophy had done, as a chain of theorems and arguments. He needs must clothe it in a poetic garb, and he takes as

background the history of the conversion to Judaism of the king and the people of the Khazars, who lived in what is now called South Russia. The correspondence between the King Bulan and the Jewish Vizier, Hisdai b. Cheprut, at the court of the Muhamedan ruler in Spain, must have been known to Judah Halevi. He uses this historical event as a framework for his philosophical treatise, representing the king as the enquirer, who puts questions to Muhamedan, to Christian, and lastly to Jewish sages, and who tries to elicit the truth by constant questioning and argumentation. Thus in the form of a lively dialogue the whole philosophical theory of Judah Halevi is expounded.

This book was originally written in Arabic, but was translated at an early period into Hebrew. It shared the fate of other philosophical works written in Arabic; the original was almost lost and forgotten until in modern times scholars began to turn their attention to the Arabic text. It fell to Dr. Hirschfeld to be the first editor of the Arabic text, preserved in a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library. He accompanied that edition with the corrected and emendated Hebrew translation of Ibn Tibbon, and he then published a German translation of the book of Judah Halevi, based on the Arabic original.

Dr. Hirschfeld has now turned to his old study of predilection, and no one was more fitted than himself to undertake the English translation of this classical book of Jewish philosophy, and he has accomplished his task in a thoroughly efficient and scholarly manner. The text reads very smoothly, and the literary and critical notes at the end of the volume, together with an elaborate and yet not discursive introduction, give all the bibliographical and historical information required for a fuller understanding of the "Khazari" of Judah Halevi.

M. G.

THROUGH TOWN AND JUNGLE. By WILLIAM HUNTER WORKMAN and FANNY BULLOCK WORKMAN. With map and 202 illustrations. Large 8vo; pp. xxiv and 380. (London: Unwins, 1904.)

This handsome volume is the record of a really remarkable achievement. Mr. and Mrs. Workman bicycled some fourteen thousand miles through the length and breadth of India, from Tuticorin to the Himalayas, and from the Panjab to Bengal, turning aside often to unfrequented places where interesting remains could be seen, and only occasionally using the railways as a help. Those who know how little prepared is India for such a method of travel, how meagre and uncomfortable, when indeed any can be found at all, is the accommodation provided for non-official travellers, will appreciate the difficulties of this undertaking, and the courage and persistence necessary to carry it out through three successive cold seasons. More especially for a lady travelling under these self-imposed conditions the discomforts, the strain, and even the danger (for little or no help would be available in case of illness, or accident, or breakdown), were immense. It would be impossible to speak too highly of the pluck and perseverance of the authors of this book, though it was only what one might expect from such distinguished travellers and mountaineers.

The objection may here be raised that these columns are scarcely the most appropriate place in which to notice a book on travels, however arduous and meritorious they may have been. The objection would be valid were there nothing of historical interest in the volume. But for that reason it does not apply to the present case. The journey was undertaken chiefly to study the remains of Indian architecture in its several styles. The course of the routes followed was determined by this consideration; and it was in gathering the information of most historical value that the travellers had to endure most hardship.

One result of the constant wars of religion and robbery which devastated India for so many generations from the

time of Mahmud of Ghazni onwards was the impoverishment of the people; another was the neglect of intellectual pursuits, and the general lowering of the intellectual level; another was the destruction or serious injury, sometimes wanton, sometimes unintentional, of the architectural monuments of the country; and another was the removal of the centres of population from the older sites to the new capitals. Very few of the most distinctively Indian—that is to say, the Jain, Buddhist, and Hindu—monuments are now in or near the most populous places. Temples and palaces, left unfinished in consequence of the wars, are hidden in the jungles or on the hills in out-of-the-way spots, often exposed to utter destruction from natural causes. The advent of the ‘Pax Britannica’ has tended slowly, but surely, to the removal of some of the evil. But a few generations have not sufficed, could not be expected to suffice, for the removal of the disasters resulting from centuries of constant warfare; and the preservation of the national monuments of India is only now beginning to be taken seriously in hand.

Under these circumstances we may congratulate ourselves that Americans interested in Indian art should, in so efficient a way, and at the cost of so much hardship, have succeeded in placing on record, both by description and by illustration, the present state and appearance of a large number of buildings, some of them hitherto not described at all, some of them not nearly so well described elsewhere. It is an excellent work they have done; and though the descriptions given are not, and could not have been, accompanied by plans, or by the details of architectural measurements, they remain as most welcome information about buildings some of which may very likely have fallen into heaps of jungle-covered stones before the meagre staff of the Government Archæological Survey shall have been able to treat of them in the full manner they deserve.

An unfortunate accident, due to a flood, at Sri Nagar in Kashmir, led to the destruction or injury of many of the photographs that the authors had taken. They have been compelled to undertake another journey to repair in part

this serious loss, and to use some of the injured photographs it was impossible to replace. They have acted wisely in giving to the world, in spite of this mishap, the result of their labours; and we thank them most heartily for a most interesting volume of great beauty and of permanent interest and value.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

TESTIMONIAL

TO

PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS.

At the conclusion of the General Meeting on Dec. 12th, 1905, Lord Reay, the President, presented to Professor Rhys Davids, the late Secretary of the Society, a testimonial consisting of a portrait of himself, a cheque, and an address, to which was appended the following names :—

REAY.	W. IRVINE.
STANMORE.	G. A. JACOB.
W. M. ADERS.	J. JAGO-TRELAWNY.
J. B. ANDREWS.	A. B. KEITH.
C. BENDALL.	A. KEMBALL.
A. S. BEVERIDGE.	J. KENNEDY.
H. BEVERIDGE.	F. W. LAWRENCE.
E. L. BEVIR.	H. P. P. LEIGH.
SYED ALI BILGRAMI.	A. S. LEWIS.
C. OTTO BLAGDEN.	C. J. LYALL.
J. F. BLUMHARDT.	L. H. MILLS.
L. B. BOWRING.	C. MONTEFIORE.
E. L. BRANDRETH.	C. OLDHAM.
E. G. BROWNE.	T. G. PINCHES.
S. W. BUSHELL.	ST. GEORGE LANG-FOX PITT.
J. E. CARPENTER.	B. PLIMMER.
L. C. CASARTELLI.	E. J. RAPSON.
R. CHALMERS.	C. M. RICKMERS.
O. CODDRINGTON.	C. M. RIDDING.
R. N. CUST.	A. ROGERS.
M. L. DAMES.	R. SEWELL.
R. K. DOUGLAS.	V. A. SMITH.
A. G. ELLIS.	E. T. STURDY.
H. C. FANSHAWE.	C. H. TAWNEY.
J. F. FLEET.	A. C. TAYLOR.
R. W. FRAZER.	R. C. TEMPLE.
M. GASTER.	F. W. THOMAS.
G. E. GERINI.	T. H. THORNTON.
F. J. GOLDSMID.	F. W. VERNEY.
M. W. E. GOSSET.	L. A. WADDELL.
G. A. GRIERSON.	E. H. WHINFIELD.
H. HERTZ.	A. N. WOLLASTON.
J. F. HEWITT.	F. BULLOCK WORKMAN.
H. HIRSCHFELD.	R. A. YERBURGH.
C. HUGHES.	

LORD REAY, in presenting the testimonial, said : It is my pleasant duty to offer in your name to our late Secretary, Professor Rhys Davids, the testimonial, a portrait of himself

painted by Mr. Ivor Gatty, and an address to which the names of 69 subscribers are attached—a large number, considering that we have only about 100 members resident in Great Britain—in token of our appreciation of his services for many years, and of our regret that his connection with the Society has been severed. We know that his interest in the Society will remain what it has ever been, and we hope that although no longer editor of our Journal, he will often enrich it with contributions from his pen. We are aware that while he was the Editor he made it a recognised organ of Oriental learning in Great Britain. It is a cause of regret that Professor Rhys Davids could not remain in London; and it is not to our credit that a man of Professor Rhys Davids' reputation should be unable to remain in the Metropolis, as would be the case were he at Paris, Vienna, or Berlin. Had he been a Professor at a University in one or other of these capitals, he would not have felt obliged to accept an appointment at another University. London's loss is Manchester's gain. We are grateful for all the work that he has done on our behalf for so many years, and we wish to assure him and Mrs. Rhys Davids that not only we, but all the members of this Society, wish them many years of happiness in their new home. We may well envy this young University of Manchester the privilege of having such an eminent Orientalist on its teaching staff, and we trust that his scholarly attainments may be duly recognised by successive generations of students.

PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS, in reply, said: My Lord, ladies, and gentlemen,—I feel so very unworthy of all the kind things that Lord Reay has been kind enough to say of me that it makes it more difficult for me to express my gratitude for the appreciation shown by the kindly words (inscribed in this address) and by this beautiful present. It is refreshing to find that in a world said to be so full of hatred and malice there should, in fact, be so much friendly feeling. But, believe me, I harbour no illusions. I know quite well that I am not in the least indispensable. The work of the Society is in very safe hands under my able successor, and

all that I can hope is that the work I have been able to do, the projects I have succeeded in setting on foot, may still have some influence in advancing the cause which we all have so much at heart. I shall soon pass away, and be forgotten ; but the cause will live. If those present in this room were to submit to be examined in the list of my distinguished predecessors in the office of Secretary, many of them would, I am afraid, be hopelessly ploughed. But their work, their Karma, survives. There is a portrait in the next room of the very distinguished founder of this Society, Horace Hayman Wilson. The Sanskrit Dictionary which, with the help of the Bengal pandits, he was able to finish, is now seldom referred to. But anyone who takes the trouble to compare it with the dictionaries now always used in its place would be struck by the very large number of cases in which the existing works have availed themselves of the very expressions that he used.

In one of Olive Schreiner's beautiful dreams there is a description of the crown of Light and Truth she was shown, I think, in heaven. The workers who gathered the stones of which it was made never kept them for themselves; they handed them on from one to another to be placed in the crown. And when she suggested to her guide that the new stones would overlay, and hide, the older ones, she was told that the new ones actually shone so brightly by the aid of the light that came through them from the stones that lay hidden beneath. In that way, and in that way only, we can all hope that the result of our work will shine through in the work of the future. Whatever work I have been able to accomplish on the history of thought in India, or towards the publication and elucidation of the historically important literature of the early Buddhists, will, I hope, soon be superseded by better work done partly on the basis of those labours. And the greater my success in inducing other scholars to devote their attention to those matters, the sooner will that desirable end be reached.

So also with the schemes with which the usefulness and credit of the Society is so intimately bound up — the

Translation Series and the Monograph Series—they, having been nursed with much care and trouble through a frail and ailing infancy (for which the annual reports of the Society afford abundant evidence)—are at last standing on their feet. They may be expected (and in this connexion I should not omit my pet baby, the Indian Texts Series) to grow continually.

For the stones in the dream grew. These were alive with brightness and beauty. So it is with the work of our Society. Our stones are the ideas which humanity has created. Just as at the time of the great intellectual movement of the Renaissance, though the European nations did not adopt pagan beliefs, yet the recovery of the ancient literatures of Greece and Rome was a potent factor in the movement; so now, although we do not desire that the West should in any way adopt the ideas of the East, yet a knowledge of what those ideas, through the centuries, have been, will very probably be a potent factor in the intellectual movements of the twentieth century.

However that may be, we shall continue to work for the truth for its own sake. And we shall not be in the least dismayed because our studies are, at the present juncture, the reverse of popular. The study of nature looms so much more largely in the public eye than the study of man, that our own pursuits—and especially the history of philosophy, literature, and religion, of economics and social institutions, in the East—seem to be left out in the cold. We have no quarrel with science—quite the contrary. But we have a reasonable hope that the contempt in which Orientalism is now regarded is but a passing phase; and that our work is really helpful, in a modest way, to that increase of knowledge, that broadening out of ideas, which is the main basis of the welfare and progress of mankind.

I can only say, in conclusion, that we are deeply grateful for all your kindness, and that the memory of to-day will go with us to our new home in the North; and that I cannot thank you enough for the manner in which, in all your kind wishes, you have associated my dear wife with me.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

(January, February, March, 1906.)

I. GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

January 9th, 1906.—Sir Raymond West, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Society :—

Dr. J. W. Lowber,
Mr. C. G. Idichandy,
Mr. Moungh Moungh.

Mr. Fleet read a paper on “The Inscription on the Piprāwā Relic Vase,” the oldest known Indian record. A discussion followed, in which Dr. Grierson, Dr. Hoey, Professor Rapson, and Mr. Thomas took part.

February 13th, 1906.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Society :—

Captain John Stevenson, I.M.S.,
Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar,
Mr. W. Edgar Geil,
Mr. Gulab Shankar Dev Sharman.

The President paid a tribute to the memory of the late Sir M. E. Grant Duff, an eminent member and Honorary Vice-President of the Society.

Professor Macdonell read a paper on “The Importance of Sanskrit as an Imperial Question.” A discussion followed, in which Dr. Hoey, Mr. Rogers, Mr. V. A. Smith, Mr. Fleet, and Dr. Grierson took part.

March 13th, 1906.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

Mr. H. G. Stokes was elected a member of the Society.

Mr. W. Hoey read a paper on "Sarmad and Aurangzeb." A discussion followed, in which Mr. Irvine, Dr. Gaster, Sir Charles Lyall, and Mr. Fleet took part.

II. PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS.

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Band lix, Heft 4. 1905.

Jahn (G.). Die Mesha-Inschrift und ihr neuester Vertheidiger.

König (Ed.). Mesa-Inschrift, Sprachgeschichte, und Textkritik.

Nöldeke (Th.). Zu Kalila wa Dimna.

II. VIENNA ORIENTAL JOURNAL. Vol. xix, No. 4.

Geiger (B.). Die Mu'allāqa der Ṭarafa.

Müller (D. H.). Hammurabi-Kritiken.

——— Zur Terminologie im Eherecht bei Hammurabi.

——— Zum Erbrecht der Töchter.

III. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Série x, Tome vi, No. 3.

Henry (V.). Physique védique.

Marchand (G.). Conte en dialecte marocain.

Revillout (E.). Nouvelle étude juridique économique sur les inscriptions d'Amten et les origines du droit égyptien.

Mallon (A.). Ibn Al 'Arsāl.

IV. JOURNAL OF THE SIAM SOCIETY. Vol. ii, Part 2.

Gerini (G. E.). Historical Retrospect of Junkceylon Island. (A review of this will be found amongst the Notices of Books.)

V. T'OUNG PAO. Série ii, Vol. vi, No. 5.

Chavannes (E.). Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei lio.
T'ang Tsai-fou. Le mariage chez une tribu aborigène
du Sud-Est du Yun-nan.

VI. JAPAN SOCIETY OF LONDON. Vol. vi, Part 3.

Dickins (F. V.). The Mangwa of Hokusai.

Scidmore (E. R.). The Japanese Yano he.

VII. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.
Vol. xxviii, Part 2.

Ricci (Seymour de). The Zouche Sahidic Exodus Fragment.

Newberry (Percy E.). To what race did the founders of
Sais belong?

Thompson (R. Campbell). The Folklore of Mossoul.

VIII. NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE. Part iv. 1905.

Amedroz (H. F.). The Assumption of the Title Shāhanshāh
by Buwayhid Rulers.

IX. JOURNAL OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC
SOCIETY. Vol. xxii, No. 60. 1905.

Pathak (K. B.). On the Age of the Sanskrit Poet
Kavirāja.

Natu (V. R.). History of Bijapur by Rafiuddin Shiraji.

Karkaria (R. P.). Manuscript Studies of Lieut.-Colonel
Thomas Best Jervis on the Maratha People.

Bodas (M. R.). A Brief Survey of the Upanishads.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

CECIL BENDALL.

WHEN I was asked to write for the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* some account of the life of Professor Bendall, my first teacher in Sanskrit and my friend for twenty-five years, I felt that, well as I knew him during that period, I could not unaided deal with the other twenty-five years of his life—his boyhood and his brilliant career as a student at school and at the University. Through the kindness of Mrs. Bendall, of his sister, Mrs. de Sélincourt, and of his school and college friends, W. Marsh, M. F. Webster, and F. J. Allen, the required aid has been supplied. To all of them I desire to express my best thanks for the help without which this notice must have been very imperfect.

Cecil Bendall was born in London on July 1st, 1856. His father, who died when he was 7 years old, was a man of very wide reading; and his mother, who lived to rejoice in her son's success, was a woman of rare intellectual gifts and a strong, vigorous personality. From her especially he inherited the musical tastes which were so essentially a part of his nature. He was the youngest of six brothers, all of whom were more than usually gifted. His sister describes him as a singularly clever child, who could read fluently at an age when most children can hardly speak plainly.

He entered the City of London School in 1869, when H. H. Asquith, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, was captain of the school. He was in the Sixth Form from 1870 to 1875, and gained the Carpenter Scholarship in 1871. At the City of London School it is customary on Speech

Day for the first five boys to pronounce 'declamations' in praise of the Founder (John Carpenter) in the various languages taught in the school; and the programmes show that Bendall was chosen to declaim on no less than five occasions and in all the five languages—French in 1871, German in 1872, Greek in 1873, English in 1874, and Latin in 1875. My college tutor, Dr. J. E. Sandys, who examined the school in 1873, told me many years ago that he remembers that Bendall in his Greek declamation referred to the Sanskrit studies which were even then his chief love, in a passage beginning with the words "Συγγνώμη μοι ἔστω σανσκριτιζοῦντι," and that the Lord Mayor, who presided, evidently regarding Sanskrit as a living tongue, expressed the hope that the promising young student might find it useful when he went out to India.

At school Bendall owed much to the teaching and to the influence of Dr. E. A. Abbott, who was headmaster during his time, and for whom he retained through life the warmest affection and admiration. To Dr. Abbott, no doubt, may be traced his early appreciation of English literature, which went far beyond the limits within which a schoolboy's English studies are generally confined; and Mrs. de Sélincourt speaks of the pride with which he told her that Dr. Abbott had first confided to him the secret, until that time carefully kept, that he was the author of *Philochristus*.

As a schoolboy, Bendall showed a singularly ripe, perhaps precocious, intellect. His school friend, W. Marsh, says of him that "at fifteen he talked like a man of forty. His interest in ecclesiastical architecture, and in archæology generally, was in those days as keen, and his knowledge almost as great, as in later times. But music was his *Lieblings-studium*. His taste was mature and catholic, except that he could not away with anything 'banal.'" Handel and Bach, and the old English and foreign church composers, were his chief delight; and we hear of him, in those early days, haunting St. Anne's, Soho, to listen to Bach's Passion Music, or attending a performance of the Mass in *B minor* at St. James's Hall.

This devotion to what he called "the music of the best period" (from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century) was the characteristic by which he was best known to his intimate friends all through his life. Of late years, so long as he remained a member of the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society and was able to come to London for the meetings, he and I used regularly to go together in the evening to a motet party, which was arranged for the same day, the second Tuesday in the month, at the city offices of his brother Robert. In the extent of his knowledge of the church music of the sixteenth century, the music of Palestrina, Croce, and Vittoria, which was chiefly performed at these meetings, he was probably unrivalled. It was noticed among his fellow-members in this little society, as a melancholy coincidence, that the day of his death was the anniversary of his last attendance.

The manner of Bendall's first introduction to the study of Sanskrit, in which he was to win the highest distinction, may best be related in the words of his school and college friend, M. F. Webster, who says: "In September, 1872, Mr. (afterwards Professor) Nicholl came to Dr. Abbott and offered to teach Sanskrit to a few boys to be picked out by him as promising pupils. He chose five, all near the top of the form in classics, Farnell,¹ Bendall, Stevenson,² and two others; and later on I joined the class. From the first, Bendall took the lead, the difficulties of the language seeming to spur him on. With his love of fitting in things, so as not to waste a moment's time, he used to copy long paradigms of verbs and rules of *Sandhi*, whilst his indulgent aunt read Dickens to him. He was easily first in the school Sanskrit examinations in 1873-5. He won the Broderers Company's scholarship in 1875, and went up to Cambridge in October, 1875, winning soon afterwards a Sanskrit exhibition at Trinity College."

It is therefore, in the first instance, to the zeal of the late Professor Nicholl, Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic at

¹ Now tutor and dean of Exeter College, Oxford.

² Now an Irish Land Commissioner.

Oxford, that the world owed this distinguished Sanskrit scholar. The tradition of teaching Sanskrit, thus started by Professor Nicholl, was maintained in the City of London School by Mr. Rushbrooke; and it cannot but be regarded as a grave misfortune to the cause of learning that it is now abandoned. We have recently had some discussion in the Royal Asiatic Society as to the best means of encouraging the study of Sanskrit in this country. Surely, no better beginning could be made than by restoring the teaching of Sanskrit in the City of London School, where it has been so fruitful of results in the past.¹

In 1877 Bendall migrated to Caius College, where he was elected to a classical scholarship, and afterwards, in 1879, to a fellowship, having taken his degree as fifth in the First Class of the Classical Tripos. In 1879 also he spent the summer months with his friends Marsh and Webster at Göttingen, where Webster and he attended the lectures of Professor Benfey on the Veda and on Zend. Two years later he gained a First Class in the Indian Languages Tripos.

If Bendall had been asked what he considered to be the determining factor in his career at Cambridge, he would have answered, as every Cambridge Sanskritist of his time would answer, that it was undoubtedly the teaching and example of Professor Cowell, with whom he read continuously during the seven years of his first period of residence at the University, and under whose guidance he completed his first important work, the *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. in the University Library of Cambridge*, which was published in 1883.

In the October term of 1881 he instituted at Caius College a course of lectures in elementary Sanskrit for classical students who were taking Section E (Comparative Philology) in the Tripos, and for selected candidates for the Indian Civil Service. Of this class I was a member, and I feel that I cannot too gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to his

¹ We need only here refer to a few names of well-known scholars who have profited by the Sanskrit teaching in the school—Mr. Webster, Mr. Chalmers, Professor T. W. Arnold, and Professor Conway.

help and encouragement, which led me to persevere in a study which too many young students abandon on account of its initial difficulties.

In 1882 he succeeded Dr. Haas in the care of the Oriental printed books in the British Museum. His supplementary *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Pali Books in the British Museum* appeared in 1893, and his *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the British Museum* in 1902, after his retirement, in 1898, on account of ill-health caused by the deep-seated disease which eventually proved fatal.

In 1885 he was elected to the Professorship of Sanskrit at University College, London, a post which he held till 1903, when he succeeded Professor Cowell at Cambridge, having held the subordinate post of University Lecturer in Sanskrit since the death of Mr. R. A. Neil in 1900.

On two occasions he made "cold weather" tours in Nepal and other parts of India, chiefly in the interests of the University Library, Cambridge. The first of these, in 1884-5, resulted in the acquisition of about 500 Sanskrit MSS. Of this tour he published an extended report in his *Journey of Literary and Archæological Research in Nepal and Northern India* (1886). One of the nine Sanskrit inscriptions which he discovered on this occasion was of special importance, since it supplied the clue to the early chronology of Nepal and to the determination of the Gupta era.¹

From his second journey, in 1898-9, he brought back to Cambridge some 90 MSS. An account of some of the other results then obtained—his discovery of MSS. in very early characters and of inscriptions—is given in his report to the Vice-Chancellor, which was published in the Cambridge University Reporter for 23rd November, 1899, and reprinted in our Journal for 1900, p. 162.

In 1902 appeared the last fasciculus which completed his edition with critical notes of the Sanskrit text of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, published in the Bibliotheca Buddhica under the auspices of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at

¹ Fleet, *Inscriptions of the Gupta Dynasty*, p. 184 (cf. pp. 96, 177).

St. Petersburg. He was engaged in collaboration with Dr. Rouse on a translation of this important compendium of Buddhist doctrine at the time of his death. In 1903 he published an annotated text of the *Subhāṣita-saṃgraha*, and in 1905, in association with his friend Louis de la Vallée Poussin, he submitted to the Oriental Congress at Algiers the first part of a summary of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, a textbook of the Yogācāra school. The three works last mentioned represent the branch of study—the Sanskrit Buddhist literature of the Mahāyāna—which he had specially made his own, and for which such abundant materials, collected in no small degree by himself, exist in the University Library at Cambridge.

Married in 1898 to a lady who was able to take an interest in his studies and to share the intellectual pleasures which appealed most strongly to his nature, and succeeding at a comparatively early age to the Professorship at Cambridge and to an Honorary Fellowship at his college, he might have looked forward to a life of happiness and useful scholarly work; but these hopes were destined to be realised only for a brief period. During a great part of the three years for which he held the Professorship, he had to struggle with ill-health and often to carry on his work while racked with pain. When at last it was decided by his medical advisers that an operation of the gravest character was necessary, he accepted the terrible ordeal with a quiet fortitude which, I think, cannot be better illustrated than by the last communication which I received from him—a postcard dated 29th November, 1905: "To-morrow I am off to the surgeon in Liverpool, I fear for many weeks—if not for good. But it is no use 'θρηνεῖν ἐπὶ δάς πρὸς τομῶντι πῆματι.'—Ever yours, C. B."

For three and a half months he lay at Liverpool, tended with unceasing care by Mrs. Bendall; but no means could stay the increasing weakness, and he passed away on Wednesday, 14th March, 1906.

Bendall's chief characteristics as a scholar were the catholicity of his tastes, the wide extent of his knowledge,

and his sympathy with students of every kind who were trying to do good conscientious work. It may be that, until towards the end of his life, his many interests prevented him in some degree from concentrating his great powers on any one special subject ; but it is certain that, at all times, they made his advice especially valuable, for they enabled him to see things in their true perspective, and to consider the various branches of learning in their relation to the great field of human knowledge. Many indeed are the students both in this country and abroad who stand indebted to his sympathy and good counsel. His unaffected modesty, and the affectionate esteem in which he was held among his friends, are well shown in a sentence of a letter from Mrs. Ealand, who knew him from his boyhood, to her brother, Mr. W. Marsh. Referring to a visit which he paid to Bath, she says : " It was so delightful to have him here last year, and to find how absolutely unaltered he was—the same faithful friend, interested and interesting in so many ways, and so singularly retiring about his own position and his own knowledge. I do indeed owe him a debt of gratitude, and I only wish it was possible for my children to find such a comrade."

E. J. RAPSON.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY.

AITAREYA SANHITA of the Black Yajur Veda. 1905. 8vo.
(*Anandasrama Sanskrit Series*, vol. xlii, 8.)

Purchased.

Arden, A. H. A Progressive Grammar of the Telugu Language.
2nd edition. Madras, 1905.

From the Publishers.

Barnett, L. D. Some Sayings from the Upanishads. London,
1905. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Bell, C. A. Manual of Colloquial Tibetan. Calcutta, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the India Office.

Bliss, F. J., and Macalister, R. A. S. Excavations in Palestine,
1898-1900. London, 1902. 4to.

(*Palestine Exploration Fund.*)

Purchased.

Blumhardt, Professor J. F. Catalogue of the Library of the India
Office. Vol. ii, pt. 4. Bengali, Oriya, and Assamese Books.
London, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the India Office.

Brandes, Dr. J. A. L. Beschrijving van de ruïne bij de desa
Tsempang genaamd Tjandi Djago, in de Residentie Pasoeroean.
's-Gravenhage and Batavia, 1904. 4to.

Archaeologisch Onderzoek op Java en Madura, No. 1.

Pres. by the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

Bridge, J. E. Burmese Manual. Rangoon, N.D. 8vo.

Purchased.

Browne, Professor E. G. Hand-list of Turkish Books presented by Mrs. E. J. W. Gibb to the Cambridge University Library. *Cambridge*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Bühler, J. G. Indian Paleography (English translation). Edited by J. F. Fleet as an appendix to the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxxiii, 1904.

Presented by the Editor.

Butterworth, A., and Chetty, V. V. A Collection of the Inscriptions on Copper-plates and Stones in the Nellore District. 3 vols. *Madras*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the India Office.

Caland, W., and Henry, V. L'Agnistoma, Description Complète de la Forme Normale du Sacrifice de Soma dans le Culte Védique. Vol. i. *Paris*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Chavannes, Édouard. Fables et Contes de l'Inde, extraits du Tripitaka chinois. *Paris*, 1905. Pamphlet, 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

al-Dahša, ibn Ḥaṭib. Tuḥfa Dawi-l-Arab; über Namen und Nisben bei Boḥāri, Muslim, Mālik. *Leiden*, 1905. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Darian, Yusuf. Kitab al-itqan fi Saraf Lughat al-Siryan. 1905. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Decorse, Dr., and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Professor. Rabah et les Arabes du Chari. *Paris*, N.D. (1905). 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Deussen, Professor P. The Philosophy of the Upanishads, translated by Rev. A. S. Geden. *Edinburgh*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Distant, W. L. Rhynchota, vol. iii. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

(*Fauna of British India.*)

Presented by the India Office.

Douglas, Sir R. K. Catalogue of Japanese Printed Books and MSS. in the British Museum acquired during 1899-1903. London, 1904. 4to.

Presented by the Trustees of the British Museum.

Fuye, Allotte de la. Monnaies de l'Elymaïde. 2 vols. Chartres, 1905. Large 4to.

Presented by the Author.

Geil, William Edgar. A Yankee on the Yangtze. London, 1904. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Gerini, Colonel G. E. Historical Retrospect of Junkceylon Island From *Journal Siam Society*, 1905.

Presented by the Author.

GRUNDRISSE DER IRANISCHEN PHILOGIE. Edited by W. Geiger and E. Kuhn. Vol. i (two parts) and Supplement, and vol. ii. Strassburg, 1901-3. 8vo.

Purchased.

Hoernle, A. F. R., and Stark, H. A. History of India. New edition. Cuttack, 1905. Small 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Margoliouth, G. Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum. Part 2. London, 1905. 4to.

Presented by the Trustees of the British Museum.

Peters, J. P., and Thiersch, H. Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa. Edited by Stanley A. Cook. London, 1905. 4to. (*Palestine Exploration Fund.*)

Purchased.

Pope, Rev. G. U. A Catechism of Tamil Grammar. No. 2. Oxford, 1905. Post 8vo.

Presented by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

— Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language. Part 5 of "A Tamil Prose Reader." 7th edition. Oxford, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

Prain, Colonel D. Hamilton (once Buchanan), Francis, A sketch of the Life of. *Calcutta*, 1905. 4to.

Presented by the Author.

Pullé, Francesco L. La Cartographia Antica dell' India. 2 vols. with maps. *Firenze*, 1901-5. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Ranking, Colonel G. S. A. An English-Hindustani Dictionary. *Calcutta*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

RECUEIL DE MÉMOIRES ORIENTAUX. Series v, vol. v. *Paris*, 1905. Roy. 8vo.

L'École Spéciale des Langues Orientales Vivantes.

From the Publishers.

Sastri, M. H. P. Catalogue of Palm Leaf and Selected Paper MSS. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal. *Calcutta*, 1905. 8vo.

(*Notices of Sanskrit MSS.: Extra No.*)

Presented by Dr. Cust.

Sastri, M. S., and Rangacharya, M. Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental MSS. Library, Madras. Vol. i, part 3. *Madras*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by Dr. Cust.

Verbeek, Dr. R. D. M. Description Géologique de l'Île d'Ambon. With atlas. *Batavia*, 1905. 8vo.

Pres. by the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

Spiers, R. Phené. Architecture East and West. *London*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Wilkinson, R. J. Malay Beliefs. *Leiden*, 1906. 8vo.

Purchased.

Winternitz, M., and Keith, A. B. Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bodleian Library. Vol. xi. *Oxford*, 1905. 4to.

From the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

XIX.

THE SANSKRIT PRATOLI AND ITS NEW-INDIAN DERIVATES.

By J. PH. VOGEL, Litt.D.

SOME three years ago, I published a note on the above-mentioned subject.¹ Since then, I have been able to collect such additional material as to afford conclusive proof of what at first could only be advanced as a hypothesis. In laying my conclusions before the readers of this Journal, I may be excused for first summarizing the contents of my previous paper, which appeared in a publication and in a language accessible only to a limited number of students.

After stating that the traditional meaning assigned to the Sanskrit word *pratolī* in the *kośas* and *ṭikās*, and also adopted by Böhtlingk in the St. Petersburg Dictionary, is that of 'a broad way, high-street,'² I pointed out that this sense

¹ *Album-Kern* (Leiden, 1903), p. 235 ff. My attention was first drawn to the problem by Dr. J. K. de Cock's remark in his dissertation *Eene Oud-Indische stad volgens het epos* (Groningen, 1899), p. 55 ff., regarding the occurrence of *pratolī* in the two great epics.

² *Pratolī rathyā visikkhā*, *A.K.* 2, 2, 2, and *Halāy.* 2, 134; *abhyantaramārga*, *Ś.K.Dr.*; *pratolī rathyā*, *Nilak.*; *rathyāpratolīvisikkhāḥ samāh*, *Hemac.* 4, 981. On the other hand, *durganagaradvāre iti kecit*, *Ś.K.Dr.*, and *Bharata* at *Rām.* 2, 80, 18.

cannot well be applied to any of the places, known to me, where the word occurs in either the epic or the classical literature. There it is mostly mentioned in connection with the fortifications of a city, and must have indicated some lofty and solid building. This is confirmed by the *Mṛcchakatikā*, where we find the word repeatedly in its Prākṛit form *padolī*. My investigation led me to the conclusion that the real meaning of *pratolī*, *padolī*, is 'a gateway, especially that of a fortress or fortified city,' which meaning is still preserved in its modern derivative Hindī *pol*. Finally, I suggested that *pratolī* is possibly a Māgadhism, containing the same root which is found in the Sanskrit *torana* and is represented in most other Indo-Teutonic languages.

Here, I wish only to draw attention to a few passages from Sanskrit literature which seem to me the most convincing.¹ In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, ed. von Schlegel, 5, 3, 17, we find *Laṅkā* described as *pāṇḍurābhīḥ pratolībhīḥ uccābhīḥ abhisamvṛtām*, which I propose to render 'surrounded (or guarded) by white, lofty gateways.' Here the meaning 'street' is clearly inadmissible, on account of *abhisamvṛtām* and of the accompanying adjectives.

In the same book, 5, 51, 36, *Hanumān* winds up *Rāma*'s message to *Rāvaṇa* with these threatening words:—

34. Yā Sītetyabhijānāsi yeyam tiṣṭhati te grhe
Kālārātrīti tām viddhi sarva-Laṅkā-vināśinīm.
35. Tad alam Kālapāśena Sītā-vigraha-rūpiṇā²
svayam skandhāvasaktena kṣemam ātmani cintyatām.
36. Sītāyās tejasā dagdhām Rāma-kopa-pradīpitām
dahyamānām imām paśya purīm sāṭṭa-pratolikām.

"Learn that she whom thou knowest as *Sītā*, even she who dwelleth in thine house, is no other than the

¹ The following are the places, known to me, where *pratolī* occurs: *Rām.* 1, 5, 10 (v. Schlegel); 2, 80, 17 (87, 20, Gorresio); 5, 3, 17 (v. Schlegel); 5, 51, 36, and 6, 75, 6; *Mah.* 3, 15, 6; 12, 69, 55, and 14, 85, 12; *Vāyu-P.* 1, 14, 52; *Kathās.* 42, 124, and 43, 8; *Sisup.* 3, 64; *Prabhāvakacarita*, 4, 72; *Bīlśar* inscr., l. 10. Prākṛit, *padolī*: *Mṛcch.* (ed. Stenzler), pp. 99, 132, 162, and 164.

² Read *Sītā-nigraha-rūpiṇā*.

Angel of Death who will destroy the whole of Lāṅkā. Therefore, have done with that sling of Death which took shape in Sītā's imprisonment, and which thou thyself hast slung round thy shoulders. Oh think of thine own safety. Behold, kindled by Sītā's radiance, inflamed by Rāma's wrath, this town burning with tower and gate."

It will be seen that in this case also the meaning 'high-road' cannot be right; whereas that of 'gate' yields an excellent sense. The same applies to Mahābhārata, 12, 69, 55, where Bhīṣma, stretched on his bed of arrows, instructs Yudhiṣṭhira on the duties of a king :—

54. Bhāṇḍāgārāyudhāgārān yodhāgārāṁśca sarvaśaḥ
aśvāgārān gajāgārān balādhikaraṇāni ca.
55. parikhāś caiva Kauravya pratolir niṣkuṭāni ca
na jātv anyah prapaśyeta guhyam etad Yudhiṣṭhira.

"Let no outsider see the arsenals and armouries anywhere, the horse-stables and elephant-stables and whatever relates to the army, nor the ditches, O son of Kuru, or the gates and bastions (?). [All] this is secret, O Yudhiṣṭhira."

Here, again, the commentator explains *pratolī* as synonymous with *rathyā*, but fails to add in what manner a king could possibly keep the high-roads secret. I may note in passing that his explanation of *niṣkuṭāni* as *grhārāmāḥ* is hardly more satisfactory. That gates as part of the fortifications should not be shown to outsiders is a principle still adhered to, I believe, by military authorities.

To the places quoted in my previous paper, I can add one from the Jaina text *Prabhāvakacarita*, 4, 72, an edition of which is being prepared by Paṇḍit Hirananda of the Archæological Survey Department. There it is related how a certain king, Gardabhilla by name, relying on his supernatural powers, neglects all ordinary means of defence when the enemy is threatening his capital :—

32. Na vā bhāṭa-kapātāni pūḥ-pratoliṣv asaṅjayat
Iti cārāḥ pariṇāya suhṛd bhūpañ jagau guruḥ.
33. Anāvṛtam samikṣyedan durgam.

“Neither did he (Gardabhilla) place soldiers and doors in the city-gates. When he had learnt this through spies, the friendly *guru* (Kālakasūri) went to the king, as he had seen the fortress unclosed.”

The *kapāṭa* is the door (Latin *janua*) of wood or metal, whereas *pratolī* indicates the whole structure (Latin *porta*) built of stone or brick. In the word *dvār(a)* we find both meanings combined, as in the French *porte*. The adjective *ḍṛḍhadvārapratolīkā* (metrical for *-pratolīkā*; Rām., ed. von Schlegel, 1, 5, 10) can, therefore, be rendered by ‘having gates provided with strong doors,’ taking *ḍṛḍhadvāra* as a *bahuvrīhi* in itself. The whole compound is synonymous with the immediately preceding expression *kapātatorāṇavatī*.

Another possessive compound, *sopaśalyapratolīkā* (Mah. 3, 15, 6), I feel inclined to explain as ‘having gates provided with spikes,’ the latter serving the purpose of protecting the gate against attacks of mounted elephants, by preventing the latter from ramming the gates with their heads.

It is possible that in the same way *sāttapratolīkā* really means ‘having gates provided with turrets’ (*aṭṭa*) and not ‘having gates and towers.’ Both interpretations are grammatically possible.

In the Kathāsaritsāgara, 42, 124, we meet with the compound *pratolīdvār*, which, in view of the above considerations, is to be rendered as ‘door of the gate’ :—

123. Gatvā ca dūram sa prāpad ekam puravaram mahat
kurvaṇam Meruśikharabhrāntim hemamayair gṛhaiḥ.
124. Tatra raudram dadarśaikam pratolīdvārī rākṣasam
papraccha tañ ca viro sya purasyākhyām patiñ ca saḥ.
125. Idam Śailapuram nāma nagaram rakṣasādhipaḥ
adhyāste Yamadamṣṭrākhyāḥ svāmīnaḥ śatrumardanaḥ.

126. Ity ukte rakṣasā tena Yamadaṁṣṭra-jighāmsayā
tatrendīvaraseno tha sa praveṣṭum pravṛttavān.

“And after going some distance he (prince Indīvarasena) reached a large and excellent town which by its golden houses gave the impression of the top of Meru. There the hero saw at the gate-door a terrible giant (*rākṣasa*), and asked him the name of the town and its ruler. ‘This is the city Rock-town by name; our master, the foe-smashing giant king Death-tusk, rules it.’ When this was spoken by the giant, Indīvarasena, longing to kill Death-tusk, set about entering [the town].”

The passages in the *Mṛcchakatikā*, where the word *pratoli* is found in its Prākṛit form *padoli*, deserve special notice. Those acquainted with that most interesting of Old-Indian plays will remember that in the eighth act the wicked Samsthānaka, the king’s brother-in-law, after suing in vain for the favour of the courtesan Vasantasenā, strangles her in a fit of rage—only seemingly, as appears afterwards. One of the witnesses of his crime is his servant Sthāvaraka (lit. Constantius). The murderer, in order to secure his silence, sends him away with the following words:—

Tā gaccha edāim goṇāim geṇhia mama kelakāe pāsāda-
bālaggapadolikāe ciṣṭa jāva haḡge āacchāmi.

“Go then with these bullocks and wait in the gate of my palace¹ till I come.”

After Sthāvaraka’s departure he remarks:—

Attapalittāṇe bhāve gade adamaṣaṇaṁ ceḍe bi pāsāda-
bālaggapadoliāe ṇialapūlidam kadua thābaissam.
Evvaṁ mante lakkhide bhodi.

¹ The second member of the compound I have left untranslated, as its sense is uncertain. The literal meaning of *bālagga* (Skr. *vāṭagra*) is hair-point.

“For his own safety His Honour (the parasite) has disappeared, and the slave (Sthāvaraka) I shall place in the palace-gate, loaded with chains. Thus the secret will be kept.”

In the last act we find the slave imprisoned in the palace, whence he sees that Cārudatta, falsely accused of Vasantasenā's murder, is being led away by two Cāṇḍālas to be impaled. Wishing to rescue the victim, he tries in vain to attract the attention of the crowd. Then he resolves to throw himself down at the risk of his life :—

Jadi evvaṃ kalemi tadā ajja-Cāludatte na vābādiadi.
Bhodu imādo pāsādabālaggapadolikādo eḍiṇā jīṇṇa-
gavakkheṇa attāṇaam nikkhāmi.

“If I do so, then the honourable Cārudatta will not be put to death. Come, I will throw myself down from this palace-gate through this broken window.”

A moment later Samsthānaka appears on the scene, and, in order to witness the death of his enemy, ascends the palace-gate :—

Śampadam attanakelikāe pāsādabālaggapadolikāe ahiluhia
attaṇo pallakkamaṃ pekkhāmi.

“Now let me ascend my palace-gate and watch my exploit.”

But in the meanwhile the death-procession has been stopped by Sthāvaraka :—

Adha kiṇṇimittam mama kelikāe pāsādabālaggapadolikāe
śamibe ghoṣaṇā ṇiḇaḍidā ṇivālidā a.

“But why near my palace-gate has the proclamation ceased and been stopped?”

At the same moment he realizes that the slave has escaped.

It is obvious that here also the word *padoli* cannot possibly be rendered by ‘high-road.’ Böhtlingk, in his excellent

translation of the *Mṛcchakatikā*, has rendered *pāśādabālaggapadolīā* by "im Taubenhäuschen auf der Zinne meines Palastes," but it is not clear on what grounds the meaning 'pigeon-house' can be applied to the last member of the compound. It is true that pigeon-houses are sometimes placed on the top of large buildings in India, but they are hardly a suitable place to be used as a prison; nor are they, as a rule, provided with windows (*gāvākṣa*). I presume that the analogy of the compound *pāśādabālaggakabodabālīā*, which occurs elsewhere in the *Mṛcchakatikā*, towards the end of the first act (ed. Stenzler, p. 21, l. 21), has led the distinguished German scholar to the above rendering. I should feel more inclined to adopt the opposite course, and explain the latter compound by means of the former.

The difficulty is that both expressions are used by the half-mad Śākāra. But though his talk betrays madness, still there is a method in it. In some of the impossible expressions which he uses, it is evident that the author makes him convert or change syllables of the word which he intended to use, in order to produce a comical effect.¹ Thus I presume that, where he speaks of 'the pigeon-house on his palace' (*pāśādabālaggakabodabālīā*), he really meant 'the gate of his palace' (*pāśādabālaggapadolīā*).

The word *padolī* occurs once more in the compound *padolīduāraa*, in the sixth act of the *Mṛcchakatikā*, where Viraka, the superintendent of police, orders his constables to station themselves at the doors of the four city-gates of Ujjayinī in order to prevent the escape of the pretender Āryaka.

To the above instances from Old-Indian literature, I can now add the evidence of an inscriptional record which at first had escaped my notice. In the inscription on the Bilsar pillar (F.G.I, 42),² erected in the ninety-sixth year of the

¹ In the same manner I believe that, when the Śākāra addresses the Vidūṣaka as *kākapadamastāśīśaka*, the expression which he intended to use was *kākapakkhamasta*. It would be the same as if in German one spoke of 'Krähenkopf' instead of 'Krauskopf.'

² Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, Corpus Inscr. Indic., vol. iii, p. 42 ff.

Gupta era (A.D. 415-16) and in the reign of Kumāragupta, we read (l. 10) :—

Kṛtvā [— — ā]bhirāmām muni-vasati [— —] svargga-
sopāna-r[ū]pām |
kauberacchanda bimbām sphaṭika-maṇi-dal-ābhāsa-gaurām
pratolīm |
prāsādāgrābhirūpaṁ guṇavarabhavanam [dharmma-sa]tt-
ram yathāvat |
punyeṣv evābhirāmām vrajati śubha-matis tātaśarmmā
dhruvo stu ||

This passage has been rendered by Dr. Fleet as follows:—

“Having made a gateway, charming, (and)
the abode of saints (and) having the form of a staircase
leading to heaven, (and) resembling a (pearl)-necklace
of the kind called *kaubēracchanda*, (and) white with
the radiance of pieces of crystalline gems;—(and
having made), in a very proper manner, a [religious]
almshouse (?), the abode of those who are eminent
in respect of virtuous qualities; resembling in form
the top part of a temple;—he, the virtuous-minded
one, roams in a charming manner among the items
of religious merit (that he has thus accumulated);
may the venerable Śarman endure for a long time!”

It will be noticed that Dr. Fleet, also, for reasons stated in a footnote (*loc. cit.*, 43) has taken *pratolī* in the sense of ‘a gateway (with a flight of steps).’ We see, moreover, that in this instance it is not a city-gate, but a gate of an apparently ornamental character giving access to the enclosure within which some monument (in this case, a pillar) stands. The well-known *torāṇas* of Sāñchi may be quoted as a parallel example. It is hoped that, within the near future, a careful excavation of the site of Bilsar will enable us to reconstruct the *pratolī* mentioned in the inscription.

As to the *pratolī* as a city-gate, literary evidence, however abundant, is insufficient to convey an exact idea of its

architectural peculiarities. Nor would it be possible to decide whether and in what respects it differed from a *torana* and a *gopura*. That these words, though synonyms, do not convey exactly the same meaning, may be inferred from the circumstance that in the epics they are mentioned side by side. Evidently, the *pratoli* was a strongly-built gateway of considerable height, sometimes plastered or whitewashed, provided with spiked (?) doors and perhaps with flanking bastions or towers (*aṭṭa*). In the *Mṛcchakatikā*, we see it contained a room, evidently raised at some distance above the ground-level, which could be used as a prison and was provided with windows (*gavākṣa*, lit. *ceiling-bæuf*). It is a curious circumstance that *Sthāvaraka* could only escape through a broken window; from which we may infer that those windows were closed, either with iron bars or more probably with perforated screens of stone or brick such as are still commonly found in Indian monuments.

We may assume that, apart from the influence of Muhammadan architecture, the gates of ancient Hindū towns and forts do not essentially differ from the *pratoli* of Sanskrit literature. So much is certain, that in *Rājputānā* city-gates very often bear names ending in *pol*, which, as we shall presently see, is the Hindī derivate of the Sanskrit *pratoli*. Instances are: *Cānd Pol* (Jaipur); *Sūraj Pol* (Udaipur); *Bhairō*, *Hanumān*, *Gaṇeś*, *Lakṣmaṇ*, and *Rām Pol* (Citaur); all in *Rājputānā*. The word *pól* as a generic name occurs in *Gujarātī* also, whereas in Hindī we have an equivalent in *paur* or *pauri*. In *Urdū* it has been replaced by the Persian *darwāza*, which is now regularly found in the names of city-gates in Northern India. There is, however, one curious exception. In the famous Mughal forts of *Dehli*, *Fatehpur-Sikri*, and *Lāhōr*, we find one gate designated *Hatiyā-paul*, i.e. *Hāthiyā-pol*, or the Elephant Gate. These gates were at *Dehli* and *Fatehpur-Sikri* flanked by large-sized statues of elephants, which account for the name. At the latter place those figures are still *in situ*, though in a very mutilated state. At *Dehli* the two elephant-statues, which *Bernier* saw at the entrance of

the Dehli Gate of the fort in the beginning of 'Alamgir's reign, were removed by order of that emperor owing to religious scruples. Shortly after the Mutiny, when the greater portion of Shāh-Jahān's palace was being demolished, some fragments of the elephant-statues were discovered inside the fort, hardly enough to make up one elephant. The revived animal, after many peregrinations, has, at the instance of Lord Curzon, been lately replaced on its original site outside the Dehli Gate of the Dehli Fort.¹ The Hatiyā-paul of the Lāhor Fort does not seem ever to have been provided with elephant-statues. But here the name either is a survival, or possibly relates to the tile-decoration on the adjoining wall, in which we find many representations of elephant-fights. The use of the term Hatiyā-paul for gates flanked by elephants is of archæological interest, as it indicates that not only the name, but also the thing itself, was borrowed by the Mughals from the Hindūs.² This accounts perhaps for the popular tradition preserved by Bernier, that the figures on the Dehli elephants represented Jaimall and Fataḥ Singh, who defended Citaur against Akbar.

The word *pol* is also found in the compound *tirpoliyā*, meaning 'a gate with three passages or gateways.' Gates known by that name exist at Dehli, Jaipur, and Udaipur.

It now remains to consider whether the derivation of the Hindī *pol* from the Sanskrit *pratoli* is linguistically possible. In deciding this question, I wish thankfully to acknowledge the assistance received from so good an authority in the Indian vernaculars as Dr. Grierson. That scholar is of opinion that the form of the modern word proves my derivation to be correct. The lingual *l* in Rājasthānī presupposes a Prākṛit *l*, whereas a dental *l* always represents a double *l* in Prākṛit.

¹ For the curious history of the Dehli elephant cf. Bernier, *Voyages* (Amsterdam, 1699), vol. ii, p. 33; Franklin, *As. Res.*, vol. iv, p. 446; Cunningham, *A.S.B.*, vol. i, p. 225 ff., and *J.A.S.B.*, vol. xxxii, 296; Abbot, *J.A.S.B.*, vol. xxxii, p. 375, and Sayyid Ahmad, *Āthār-u-ṣ-Ṣanādīd*, ii, 5.

² In the famous Hindū fort of Gōāliyar (*vulgo* Gwalior), in Central India, there is a Hāthiyā-paul, which once had the figure of an elephant, as mentioned by Bābar and Abu-l-fazl.

The vowel of the Gujarātī *pól*, which has the sound of the English *aw* in 'law,' is generally derived from an older *a + u* or *a + o*, so that *pol* postulates an older *paola*, and we are thence easily referred to the Prākṛit *padoli* and the Sanskrit *pratoli*. It should be observed that, besides *pól*, the form ending in *ī* also occurs, corresponding to the ordinary Hindī *paurī*.

"In mediæval Hindī literature," Dr. Grierson remarks, "the word is quite common in the form of *paurī*, meaning 'the gateway of a castle or of a town.' The oldest form 'in Hindī which I have noticed is *pavāri* in the Padumāvati 'of Malik Muḥammad (c. 1540 A.D.)' which is written in 'Eastern Hindī. It occurs frequently in that work, e.g., 'in line 2 of caupāi 36 of the Bibliotheca Indica edition.' The nasal in the Eastern Hindī form is evidently inorganic.

It is interesting that some of the Hill dialects of the Western Himālayas possess also a derivative of the Sanskrit *pratoli* in the word *pról* or *prōlī*, meaning 'the main gate of a castle, palace, temple, or any other large building.' I have found it used in that sense in Kāngṛā, Kuḷlū, and Cambā (*vulgo* Chamba), i.e. in the valleys of the Byās and the Rāwī. An instance is afforded by a popular rhyme current in Kāngṛā:—*Koṭocām dī pról ghālkar kō āṭā khuṣāmatī kō cōl*; "In the gate of the Kaṭoces, the helper (?) gets flour and the flatterer rice."¹

In Kuḷlū, the word occurs also as a geographical name, applied to one of the ancient administrative divisions called *wazirī* into which that former principality is subdivided. Wazirī Pról (*vulgo* Parol) is the uppermost portion of the Byās valley, narrowing towards the Rotang Pass whence that river takes its rise. Thus the designation 'gate' may easily be accounted for from the physical features of that tract. There is, however, a popular explanation, according to which the name *pról* was, in the first instance, applied to the palace of the Rājās of Kuḷlū which originally stood at

¹ G. C. Barnes and J. B. Lyall, *Settlement Report of the Kangra District*, Lahore, 1889, App., p. xxii. The Kaṭoces are the leading Rājput clan of the district, who claim descent from the ancient rulers of Trigarta.

Jagatsukh, the ancient capital, and was then extended to the tract in which this place is situated. That the word is in reality used as a *pars pro toto* for the whole building to which the gateway belongs, is proved by the rhyme above quoted.

In Cambā, the petty hill-state on the upper Rāvī, the word *pról* occurs also both as a generic name and in proper names. Thus, one of the less frequented passes between Cambā and Kāngrā is known by the name of Prōlī-rā-gaḷā, literally 'gate-neck.' The passage enclosed by rocks on both sides is said to present the appearance of a gateway. Here we meet the word in its older form ending in *ī*.

A detached gateway through which the road from Cambā town approaches the village of Chatrārhi is known as Chatrārhi-rī-pról. I quote this instance in order to show that the word is feminine in its shorter form also.¹ The pronunciation of the vowel is exactly the same as in the Hindi *pól*, and the final consonant is always pronounced as a lingual.

In connection with the fact that the *r* of *pratolī* has been preserved in these hill dialects, it is interesting to note that a non-assimilation of post-consonantic *r* was one of the features of the Prākritis of the North-West.² This is first attested for the time of Aśoka by the two rock inscriptions of Shāhbāzgarhī and Mansehra.³ Here the king calls himself *Devānaṁ priyo Priyadraśi*, whereas in the other inscriptions we find *Devānaṁ piye Piyadasi*. Of later epigraphs I quote that on the well-known Taxila vase, now in the Lāhor Museum⁴ :—

Sihileṇa Siharachiteṇa ca bhratarehi Takhaṣilae aya[m]
thuv[o] pratithavito sava-Budhana[m] puyae.

¹ In the Cambiyālī dialect the genitive ending is *-rā*, fem. *-rī*, plur. *-re*, whereas in Pañjābī we have *-dā*, *-dī*, *-de*, and in Hindi *-kā*, *-kī*, *-ke*.

² H. Kern, *Jaartelling der zuidelijke Buddhisten* (Amsterdam, 1873), p. 45.

³ G. Bühler, *Aśoka's Rock Edicts, Epigr. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 447 ff.

⁴ A. Cunningham, *A.S.R.*, vol. ii, p. 125. The inscription being in Kharoṣṭhī, the length of the vowels is not indicated.

“The brothers Sihila (Skr. Simhala) and Siharachita (Skr. Simharakṣita) have erected this *stūpa* at Takkhasilā (i.e. Taxila) for the worship of all Buddhas.”

Finally, I wish to offer a few remarks on the origin of the Sanskrit *pratolī*. The etymology proposed in the *Śabdakalpādruma*, which connects the word with the root *tul* (*pratulyate parimīyate*, etc.), is far from convincing. We have noticed an Old-Hindī form *paūrī*, which Dr. Grierson takes to be the same word as *pól(ī)*, and are therefore justified in assuming an Old-Indian **pratorī*, which, though not found in Sanskrit literature, must have existed side by side with *pratolī*. This would lead us to the conclusion that the latter form is to be regarded as a Māgadhism.¹ Assuming **pratorī* to be the more correct form, it will be possible to connect the word, with also its synonym *torana*, with the Greek *τύρρις* and Latin *turris*, from which the Italian *torre*, French *tour*, English *tower*, and perhaps German *turm*, are derived.²


¹ ‘Māgadhism’ is perhaps an anachronism. What I mean is that the form **pratorī* would have been ‘lautgesetzlich,’ and *pratolī* due to ‘Dialectmischung.’

² C. C. Uhlenbeck, *Kurzgefasstes Etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache* (Amsterdam, 1898), p. 117, i.v. *toranam*; and F. Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* (Strassburg, 1894), p. 384, i.v. *Turm*.

SKETCH MAP
OF THE
REGION OF KAPILAVASTU.

After Mukherji.

Nyāghavā pillar



W. FOST. DEL.

XX.

IDENTIFICATIONS IN THE REGION OF KAPILAVASTU.

(WITH A MAP.)

BY MAJOR W. VOST, I.M.S.

Introductory.

DO the Chinese pilgrims know two cities named Kapilavastu?

Certain discords and bearings in the itineraries of the pilgrims are discussed in the Prefatory Note to *Antiquities in the Tarai, Nepal*,¹ and from them it is inferred there were two cities named Kapilavastu; one the city visited by Fa-hsien, now represented by the ruins at Piprāhavā; the other that described by Yuan Chwang, of which the "royal precincts" are found in Tilaurā Koṭ, some ten miles to the north-west of Piprāhavā. Paltā Devī is held to mark the site of the town either of the Buddha Krakucandra or of the Buddha Koṇāgamana;² or Sisaniā Pāṇde may represent the town of Koṇāgamana.³ Guṭihavā is believed to represent the site of the famous Nyagrodha grove.⁴

Elsewhere it is observed that the old Kapilavastu was probably at Tilaurā Koṭ, but the Piprāhavā stūpa may be on the site of a new Kapilavastu, built after the earlier city at Tilaurā was destroyed by Viḍūḍabha.⁵

From the discussion of the bearings and distances, and the positions of certain remains, I attempt in this article to prove that the pilgrims knew but one city of Kapilavastu,

¹ Arch. Survey India, 1901, vol. xxvi.

² Prefatory Note (=P.N.), pp. 10, 13, 16.

³ P.N., pp. 10, 11, 13.

⁴ P.N., pp. 12, 16.

⁵ Buddhist India, p. 18, note.

comprising Tilaurā Koṭ and ruins to the south of it; that Krakucandra's town corresponds to the remains at Sisanihavā (Sisaniā Pāṇḍe), and Koṇāgamana's town to those at Guṭihavā (Guṭivā); that the Banyan grove adjoined the south side of the city Nyagrodhika, the Piprāhavā remains, and that the Arrow-well was situated near Birdpur in the Basti district.

In attempting to fix precisely the positions of Kapilavastu and the towns of the two Buddhas there are difficulties: the values of the yojanas of the pilgrims are disputed; it is not easy to decide offhand whether 'city' or 'capital' in the texts refers to the "royal precincts" of Kapilavastu, to the capital Kapilavastu, to Koṇā, to Krakucandra's town, or to the city in the Nyagrodha grove; and consequently when we find 'capital' or 'city' it requires very careful study to determine where certain distances begin or end. By 'capital' it is generally assumed that a reference is made to the capital Kapilavastu, but I am convinced this assumption is very frequently not correct.

If we con their accounts in the belief that the Kapilavastu and the three other towns are in each instance identical, considerable help is obtained in fixing at each town the position of the monuments. The description of one pilgrim may be fuller, more exact, or perhaps vary a little, yet not infrequently the two narratives are required for a clearer comprehension.

Southwards to Krakucandra's town Yuan Chwang gives 50 li, reckoned from the "royal precincts" which he calls 'city,' meaning the "palace city" of Kapilavastu. Another distance, 40 li, is given, which fixes the approximate spot where Śuddhodana met Gautama Buddha on his first return to his father's district. The "30 li north-east" from Krakucandra's to Koṇāgamana's town I consider an error for 30 li north-west.

I calculate Yuan Chwang's yojana at 5·288, and Fa-hsien's at 7·05 English miles.¹ Round Kapilavastu Yuan Chwang's

¹ J.R.A.S., 1903, pp. 80, 91.

distances are after all recorded in the one measure he always employs, and not as I suspected formerly in the earlier *vojana* adopted by Fa-hsien.¹

"The country shown in Mr. Mukherji's map² is for the most part open . . . and the positions of all ancient remains on the surface of any importance are known."³

Tilaurā Kot.

Here were situated the "royal precincts" (1), whose walls, 14 or 15 li in circuit (= 1.9 miles), were as stated by Yuan Chwang "all built of brick." At the spots examined Mukherji found brick walls on all four sides of Tilaurā Kot. The walls are from 10'-12' thick, and the bricks measure $12\frac{1}{4}" \times 8" \times 2"$. The excavations so far undertaken are insufficient for us to fix the sites of all the buildings enumerated by the pilgrims. The fort is only "about a mile in circuit," but "a triangular patch of ruins exists to the north outside the walls which is not included in Mr. Mukherji's measurements, and would add considerably to the circuit if included." With the unmeasured patch "the circuit measures little under two miles";⁴ another estimate also makes the circuit "to be about two miles."⁵ "The brick fort was protected by a deep ditch on all sides, as also by a second mud wall and a second but wider ditch."⁶

The relative positions and distances from one another of the places which I identify with Kapilavastu, Koṇā, and the town of Krakucandra, and the bearings to certain other remains, lead me to agree with the statement respecting Tilaurā Kot "that there is no other place in the whole

¹ J.R.A.S., 1903, pp. 102, 103.

² *Antiquities*, p. 1.

³ P.N., p. 10.

⁴ *Pioneer*, February 1st, 1904. The *Pioneer* (Allahabad newspaper) of 1st, 6th, and 19th February, 1904, contains three articles contributed by Prince Khadga Samser, of Nepal, on the Kapilavastu and other Tarāi remains.

⁵ P.N., p. 12.

⁶ *Antiquities*, pp. 19, 22.

region which can possibly be identified with the 'royal precincts.'"¹

The site of the sleeping palace of Mahāmāyā in Yuan Chwang's description is apparently the same as the site of the palace of Śuddhodana in Fa-hsien's. The two palaces of Yuan Chwang's account were probably contained in one building (2).

Yuan Chwang informs us that a stūpa (3) commemorated the spot where Asita (Kāladevala) cast the horoscope of prince Gautama. It is not perfectly clear whether the stūpa was inside or outside the palace gate. It was situated "to the north-east of the palace of the spiritual conception," and Yuan Chwang adds Asita "came and stood before the door." In the *Lalitā Vistara* Asita is admitted within the gate.² Fa-hsien, however, does not allude to Asita until he speaks of the monuments outside the gates of the capital. From this we should possibly infer that Asita was shown the child outside a gateway in a wall around the palace site. Legge notes that only the spot was shown to Fa-hsien, but Beal, Giles, and Laidlay make out from their texts that a stūpa existed. The place was shown to Aśoka.

Outside the walls of Tilaurā Kot Yuan Chwang saw (4) two Deva temples and a monastery; the latter is noted by Fa-hsien as "congregation of priests." If these monuments formed one group a probable position is the three mounds, one semicircular, lying together outside the upper gate in the west wall of the fort.³ There are also two "stupa-like" mounds and a tank in Dervā village, and farther north another mound 650' from the fort. These three mounds are near the south-west corner of Tilaurā Kot.⁴

At the south-west corner of the fort, between the two moats in front of the gate in the west wall, there is a mound (5) which Mukherji marks, in his plate ii, but does not describe. This mound may be the stūpa which indicates the spot where

¹ P.N., p. 12.

² Biblio. Indica, Calcutta trans., p. 140.

³ Antiquities, p. 22.

⁴ Antiquities, pp. 22, 53, pl. ii.

the elephant blocked the "south gate of the city" or citadel,¹ and Nanda drew the elephant on one side or "carried it seven paces."² Gautama afterwards tossed the elephant with his foot, and it fell on the other side of the "city moat."³ Yuan Chwang has nothing about the elephant being tossed over a wall, far less seven walls and seven ditches of some accounts. Fa-hsien was shown this spot, but has neither walls nor moats. The elephant fell "two miles away in the outskirts,"⁴ that is, on reckoning the finger-breadth by Yuan Chwang's scale, half a yojana from the spot where it was killed, or 2.65 English miles from the gate of the citadel. This is very little short of the distance from the south-west gate of Tilaurā Kot to the tank at Lahari Kudān.

Lahari Kudān.

Yuan Chwang notes that a stūpa—this was built by believing brāhmaṇs and householders, and was revered by bhikṣus⁵—and three temples stood within, while a fourth temple, this containing a representation of one of the four signs, it seems that of a sick man, stood without the south gate of the capital.

The four signs are accounted for in this way. The brāhmaṇs predicted that Gautama would see four signs or visions which would cause him to become an ascetic.⁶ The visions appeared while he was going his rounds outside Kapilavastu,⁷ and again while he was on his way to the Nyagrodha grove,⁸ or in it.⁹ At the east gate of the capital Kapilavastu he saw the form of an old man, at the south gate

¹ Beal, ii, p. 16.

² Rockhill: *Life of the Buddha*, p. 19.

³ Beal, ii, p. 17.

⁴ *Lalita Vistara*, pp. 204, 208.

⁵ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁶ Hardy: *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 154.

⁷ Beal, ii, p. 18.

⁸ Dīgha; Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 157; Bigandet, *Life of Gautama*, 1866 ed., p. 49; *Lalita Vistara*, p. 257.

⁹ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

of a sick man, at the west gate of a dead man, at the north gate of a mendicant.¹ Yuan Chwang notes the signs in this order,² but he does not explain at which gate each of the forms appeared. Fa-hsien says there were (?) stūpas to mark the sites, one apparently at the east, south, and north gates.³

Yuan Chwang does not give the relative positions of the different monuments at the south gate, but he notices the stūpa first and the temple outside the gate last. It is likely from this that the three temples in the capital lay between the stūpa and the temple outside the south gate. If so the stūpa would occupy the northernmost and the fourth temple the southernmost place in the series.

Ranged north to south on the east side of Lahari Kudān village are four mounds,⁴ which I think represent the sites of the stūpa and the four temples. Three of the mounds lie on the west, and the fourth on the south side of a tank which I identify with the hastigarta.

(1) The northernmost mound (6), says Mukherji, appears "to be a stupa of solid brick-work, still about 30' high, of which the superficies was covered with plasters, and concrete, as is still visible on the top." From three sides bricks have been removed. This surely must be the stūpa near the spot where "the elephant falling on the ground caused a deep and wide ditch."⁵

(2) The mound about 40' high, situated just south of the stūpa, is the site of a building with "two divisions," around which there was formerly a brick wall on the four sides.⁶ On the summit of the mound and again at 20' from the ground level there are traces of more brick walls. Here we had I believe the (7, 8) two temples which Yuan Chwang places by the side of the hastigarta (9). That next the stūpa

¹ Laidlay's Fahian, p. 196.

² Also Bigandet, op. cit., p. 44; Rockhill, op. cit., p. 22.

³ Beal, i, p. xlix; in Laidlay's version at the east and south gates; in Legge's only at the east gate, 'on seeing the sick man,' perhaps when Gautama was driving towards the Nyagrodha grove.

⁴ Antiquities, pp. 32, 53; *Pioneer*, Feb. 6th, 1904.

⁵ Antiquities, p. 32; Beal, ii, p. 17.

⁶ Antiquities, p. 32; *Pioneer*, Feb. 6th, 1904.

contained a representation of Prince Gautama, and the other a likeness of Yaśodharā and Rāhula.¹ This temple perhaps was built on the site of one of Śuddhodana's three palaces, Ramma, Suramma, and Subha.² Gautama's palace was surrounded by high walls and a moat.³ From an arched doorway in the palace a stairway led down to the courtyard where Gautama mounted Kanthaka that night he left Yaśodharā and Rāhula, and abandoned his home.⁴

(3) A small mound "only 4 feet high," other dimensions not given, lies 250' south of the palace mound just described. Probably this (10) was the site of the schoolroom which was also shown to Aśoka. "The walls of a room are traceable."⁵ The tank by the side of the stūpa and the two mounds is probably the hastigarta.

(4) The southernmost mound "nearly 11 feet high," distance south of the four foot high mound is not given, "appears to be a structure of solid brick-work." It has a line of ancient platform on its south side. This mound (11), on which stands a modern octagonal temple sacred to Nāgeśvara Mahādeva, probably conceals the remains of the temple which lay without the south gate, and contained a representation of a sick man. Fa-hsien means, I think, by "where *Nan tho* and others struck the elephant" (Laidlay) that he saw a stūpa at the south gate of the citadel, Tilaurā Kot, and, according to the other texts where there are the additional words, "tossed it," "hurled it," or "threw it," that he saw another at the hastigarta, and, see Laidlay's and Giles' translations, that there was a temple outside the south gate of the capital at Lahari Kudān.

¹ Beal, ii, p. 17.

² Beal, ii, p. 17; Bigandet, op. cit., pp. 47, 50; Hardy, op. cit., p. 154.

³ Lalita Vistara, p. 260.

⁴ Bigandet, op. cit., p. 56; Hardy, op. cit., p. 162.

⁵ Antiquities, p. 33.

South-East Angle and East Gate of Kapilavastu.

From the outer moat at the south-east corner of Tilaurā Kot a division, which Mukherji suggests is the Rohiṇī stream, is shown on his map to extend southwards to a point almost midway between Taulihavā and Bardeva, a village half a mile south-west of Taulihavā. South of Taulihavā its course is not outlined, but it "joins a river in British territory."¹ This moat probably defined the eastern side of the capital.

From a spot one-half to one mile to the south-east of Bardeva—at this distance south-east because the remains at Bardeva must be included in the capital—the Tilaurā Kot-Bardeva moat probably gave off a side branch which led westward to the south gate of the capital at Lahari Kudān to supply the hastigarta and the moat round the palace in which Gautama lived by the side of the hastigarta.

Inasmuch as Taulihavā is to the east side of the Tilaurā-Bardeva moat, the ancient mound in Taulihavā village lies outside, or just on the eastern boundary of Kapilavastu, probably a little to the eastward of the spot where the east, the principal gate, was situated. Bardeva village, situated as it is in the angle formed by the Tilaurā-Bardeva moat and the suggested course of the Lahari Kudān-Bardeva moat, must stand in what was the south-east quarter or angle of the capital. There are no ruins to the immediate south of the line Lahari Kudān-Bardeva.

"In the south-east angle of the city"²—here 'city' does not seem to be Gautama's palace enclosure—there was a temple (12) containing an equestrian representation of Prince Gautama, to mark where he left the city "by the eastern gate."³ A small mound, apparently without others near it, is situated about a furlong south of Bardeva.⁴ This

¹ Antiquities, p. 22.

² Beal, ii, p. 18; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, ii, p. 2.

³ Beal, i, p. xlix.

⁴ Antiquities, p. 33.

mound, which contains the ruins of a temple, is perhaps the site.

Ancient remains extend from Taulihavā northwards to Samai Māyi, and south-west to Bardeva. The ancient mound of bricks in Taulihavā village, that on which is the temple of Taulisvara Mahādeva, built about twenty years ago, is, I suspect, the ruins of the temple of the old man (13) which the pilgrims saw outside the east gate. Here there are pieces of ancient sculpture, the carved jambs of a door, dressed stones, and much brick rubble.

Neither Fa-hsien nor Yuan Chwang notices the Shrine of Kanthaka's Staying. It was apparently in this locality, but perhaps a good way east of the temple outside the east gate.

Krakucandra's Town (14).

The bearings and distances given by Yuan Chwang appear to me to make it impossible to identify this town with any other than the remains at Sisanihavā.¹

After describing what he saw at the "palace city" of Kapilavastu and at the south and east gates in the capital adjoining its south side, Yuan Chwang, without giving the distance from the south gate of Kapilavastu at Lahari Kudān, then takes us outside the Kapilavastu capital to Krakucandra's town or Sisanihavā, and from this position gives us a summary description of what he found in the immediate outskirts of Kapilavastu, and of the memorials which interested him. His account, apparently not free from error as we have it, is somewhat meagre in detail and not lucid.

The distance, he says, to this "old town" or "old city," Krakucandra's, is 50 li or so, an approximate estimate, south of the 'city,' that is, I consider, of the "palace city," the royal precincts of Kapilavastu. Some may be inclined to

¹ Dr. Hoey (J.R.A.S., 1906, p. 454) proposes to identify Krakucandra's town (Na-pi-ka of Fa-hsien) with remains near Nibi, about four miles south of the point where the Bāngangā enters the Basti district. The places on the way to Rummindei are not indicated.

believe that the 50 li and 40 li¹ are both reckoned from the south side of the capital Kapilavastu to Krakucandra's town. Such an interpretation involves, it will be found, our changing south, in "50 li south," to south-east. This change, I think, is quite unnecessary; and not likely to be right. But let us inquire if this be possible.

On measuring 50 li, 6·6 miles, in a southerly direction from Lahari Kudān, from Bardeva, or from Taulihavā, no mounds are known, whereas at 40 li, 5·28 miles, south-east from Lahari Kudān, and also at this distance nearly south-east from Taulihavā and Bardeva, we find the village Sisanihavā, where there are extensive remains of an ancient town, comprising on the north side of Sisanihavā a long mound resembling that lying just south of Rummindeī, and also remains which extend half a mile south of Sisanihavā.² The bearing to Sisanihavā, as shown on Mukherji's map, from the south-east quarter of Kapilavastu at Bardeva is a little east of south.³ But Bardeva or Taulihavā can scarcely be the point from which Yuan Chwang reckons his 40 li, for neither is quite on the southern limit of Kapilavastu. In this respect Lahari Kudān would be a preferable starting-point for the 40 li. The objection to reckoning the 40 li from the south side of Kapilavastu to Sisanihavā is that the subsequent bearings and distances to Rummindeī do not suit. They do, however, if the 40 li are reckoned from Sisanihavā.

In Yuan Chwang's account of Krakucandra's town three stūpas are mentioned; one, probably inside the city of Krakucandra, to commemorate Krakucandra's birth (15); a second, to the south of this 'city' at the spot where this

¹ Beal, ii, p. 22. The map (P.N., p. 10) showing Yuan Chwang's route from Kapilavastu to Rummindeī is unsatisfactory in that no notice is taken of this distance.

² *Pioneer*, Feb. 6th, 1904; *Antiquities*, pp. 33, 50, 56.

³ The position of 'Sisania' on Mukherji's map requires to be altered a little to the west, and perhaps also a little to the north, that is, it lies about a mile, or perhaps more, to the north-west of the spot shown. I suppose I am right in saying so, because it is remarked (P.N., p. 10) Sisanihavā is "some four or five miles in a north-westerly direction" from Piprahavā, and (*Pioneer*, February 6th, 1904) the distance is a little above 3 miles E.S.E. from Guṭihavā to Kuvā, a village 1½ miles north of Sisanihavā (Sisaniā).

Buddha met his father (16); a third, to the south-east of this 'city,' Krakucandra's relic stūpa, and near it an inscribed Aśoka pillar (17). Fa-hsien notices two of the three stūpas and makes it clear they were to be seen at this town. The birthplace stūpa was perhaps not pointed out to Fa-hsien.

The mounds on the south side of Sisanihavā village have not been minutely examined. It is therefore impossible to tell where to look for the stūpas and Aśoka pillar, to which Yuan Chwang does not give the distance from the city. The stūpa and pillar beside it may have been some miles distant. There is a stūpa at Bharaulia,¹ but this seems to be too far away, and it probably commemorates another event.

Fa-hsien places Koṇā to the westward of Kapilavastu. Krakucandra's town could not well be to the south-west of Koṇā (Yuan Chwang gives north-east to Koṇā from Krakucandra's town), for then Krakucandra's town would not be situated, if this were so, to the 'south' of Kapilavastu, and it would be impossible with the distances and bearings given by Yuan Chwang to span the distance from Krakucandra's town to Rummindei.

Kanakamuni's or Koṇāgamana's Town, or Koṇā (18).

Yuan Chwang calls Koṇā "an old capital (*or* great city)," 'city,' and 'town.' Fa-hsien has 'city.' They agree in placing Koṇā to the northward of Krakucandra's town. According to Fa-hsien, Koṇā lay to the westward of Kapilavastu, for he proceeded eastward² from Koṇā to the "city of Kapilavastu," by which we must understand, as I contend, to the "royal precincts" of Yuan Chwang's description. If we trust one statement alone of Yuan Chwang—he has two which appear to contradict it—Koṇā was distant about 30 li "to the north-east of the town of

¹ J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 578.

² 'Eastward' in Beal; 'east' or 'easterly' in the other translations. That these bearings probably correspond to north-east see J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 100, and arguments in this article.

Krakuchehhanda Buddha,"¹ which was situated 50 li to the 'south' of the 'city,' that is, of the royal precincts of Kapilavastu, and south of the capital. Koṇā thus lay, according to this account, at an unrecorded distance to the south-east of Kapilavastu.

It follows from what the pilgrims say that Fa-hsien places Koṇā to the north-west (he says 'north'), whereas Yuan Chwang places it to the north-east of Krakucandra's town. Which pilgrim are we to follow? When all the bearings, distances, and remarks of the pilgrims have been critically examined we must decide in favour of Fa-hsien that Koṇā lay to the westward of Kapilavastu.

Mukherji marched with his camp twice from Piprāhavā to Tilaurā, and once from Tilaurā to Rummindei,² and passed three times near to, or at the most not more than one and a half to two and a quarter miles from, the position where Koṇā should be found if it was situated just under four miles, 30 li, north-east of Sisanihavā, but he did not see, at least does not describe, remains of any kind. If Sisanihavā represents Krakucandra's town I presume there are no remains of adequate importance north-east of Sisanihavā which could possibly be identified with Koṇā. Were there any near the distance I give Mukherji was likely to have heard of them. And Prince Khadga Samser does not mention any. Are we then to conclude that the entire record "30 li north-east" is a blunder? It is possible that the 30 li north-east should be changed to 30 li north-west, or that no change is required, for "30 li north-east" has possibly by an oversight been given as the distance from Krakucandra's town to Koṇā instead of from Koṇā to the "royal precincts." Each of these theories is capable of support.

It is certain 40 li³ in a southerly direction is the distance from some 'city,' probably from its south gate, but which

¹ Beal, ii, p. 19.

² Antiquities, p. 1.

³ Beal, ii, p. 22.

city is meant is not made clear by the pilgrim. With the exception of Lahari Kudān any spot on the line Lahari Kudān—Bardeva is less than 40 li, 5.28 miles, from Sisanihavā. Now, if we allow that Lahari Kudān, on account of its remains, is the south gate of the capital Kapilavastu, and that Sisanihavā, as the distance from Lahari Kudān to it is exactly 40 li, about 5.25 miles, is Krakucandra's town, then 50 li, 6.6 miles, the other distance 'south' of the 'city' Kapilavastu to Krakucandra's town (Sisanihavā), cannot be reckoned from any point on the outskirts of Kapilavastu between Lahari Kudān and Bardeva. The 50 li would have to be calculated from a spot well to the north of Bardeva, whereas Yuan Chwang usually gives the distance from one town to the next between the nearest points. If calculated from the south side of Kapilavastu the 50 li must necessarily begin from some point to the west of the south gate of the capital, and 50 li 'south' would then be meant for 50 li south-east. But it will be remembered by those who have studied the pilgrim's account he does not place any memorials from which he could have reckoned the 50 li in a position to the westward of the south gate of the capital Kapilavastu. In 50 li south, say for south-east, we may have the distance from some city, perhaps from Koṇā, as Fa-hsien places Koṇā to the westward, to Krakucandra's town (Sisanihavā). The 50 li 'south,' perhaps south-east, and 40 li, also perhaps south-east, just discussed with Sisanihavā as the southern terminus of the two distances, make it possible that '50 li' to Sisanihavā was reckoned from the neighbourhood of Guṭihavā, where there are a pillar, stūpa, and other remains. But if so it is to be observed that 'south' would have to be altered to south-east. This is not desirable.

I shall now assume that the "30 li north-east" is correct, and is somehow connected with Koṇā, but is misplaced in the text. As Fa-hsien places Koṇā to the westward of Kapilavastu, is "30 li north-east," if interpreted as the distance from Koṇā to the "royal precincts," in harmony with the pilgrims' accounts?

Yuan Chwang records "40 li north-east" from the north

side of Koṇā to the ploughing stūpa (19).¹ To my thinking there is no ambiguity as to the 'city' from which the pilgrim reckons the 40 li. It is Koṇā. The deductions from this distance, and particularly from this bearing, require notice. Fa-hsien writes: "A few li to the north-east of the city is the royal field where the prince, sitting under a tree, watched a ploughing match."² His nurses took the infant Gautama not far I think from the "royal precincts" of Kapilavastu—corresponding to the "inner city" or "palace city" in Yuan Chwang's description of Kuśāgārapura³—or 'city' in this part of Fa-hsien's account of Kapilavastu. Indeed, I believe they took the child no more than 10 li or so from the palace, or 40 li north-east from Koṇā to the "royal field" less "30 li north-east," the latter the distance, if this is misplaced in the text, from Koṇā to the palace. Now 10 li is equivalent to 7.5 li of Fa-hsien's measure, and represents the "a few li" which he gives from the 'city' to the "royal field." If we have to reckon the 40 li (this would be 30 li in Fa-hsien's scale) from Śuddhodana's palace in Tilaurā Kot, it is improbable Fa-hsien would have expressed this by "a few li." He expresses a distance of about 30 li in other words, "less than one yōjana."

Because the bearing to the "royal field" or ploughing stūpa is north-east—north-east of the palace city of Kapilavastu according to Fa-hsien, and north-east the whole way from Koṇā to the stūpa according to Yuan Chwang—Yuan Chwang when recording the 40 li north-east from Koṇā must have had clearly in his mind that Koṇā lay to the south-west of the "royal precincts" of Kapilavastu, and to

¹ Beal, ii, p. 19.

² Beal, i, p. xlix. This quotation is taken from that part of Fa-hsien's narrative which treats, as we know from Yuan Chwang, of the monuments in the Nyagrodha grove. In using it here in my argument I may be wrong. But I have some justification, for Fa-hsien's reference to Asita does not occur until he leaves the palace city of Kapilavastu and describes the monuments a long way to the south in the capital, or town to the south of the palace city. Gautama was taken when five months of age to the 'field' (twice mentioned in Hardy, *Manu Buddha*, p. 153). This apparently is the same as the "royal field" in Fa-hsien. Gautama also when a young man watched men ploughing (Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 22).

³ Beal, ii, p. 150.

the westward of Kapilavastu, where Fa-hsien places Koṇā. It now seems tolerably certain that Yuan Chwang's 'north-east' from the town of Krakucandra to Koṇā is either a mistake for north-west, or "30 li north-east" is misplaced in the text and records the distance from Koṇā to the "royal precincts." If the latter supposition be correct, Yuan Chwang has not given the distance from Krakucandra's town to Koṇā, or, if the former be correct, that from Koṇā to the "royal precincts."

Again, according to Beal's translation, the stūpas of the slaughtered Sakyas (20) were seen to the north-west of Koṇā.¹ But Watter's has 'north-east.'² If this bearing is not a misprint, Koṇā of course lay at an unrecorded distance to the south-west and to the west side of Kapilavastu. Yuan Chwang's reference seems most likely to be to the Sāgarahavā stūpas on the sides of the Sāgarahavā tank two miles north of Tilaurā Koṭ.

Sāgarahavā with its tank and stūpas is perhaps the site of the 'Sows tank' and the Udambara ārama of the Parivrājakās where Viḍūḍabha had his captives trampled by elephants and mangled by harrows, and afterwards thrown into a pit. The place was visited by Ānanda the day after Viḍūḍabha left for Śrāvastī.³

Now, as "40 li north-east" to the ploughing stūpa is to a spot "a few li" north-east of the palace in Tilaurā Koṭ, the distance from Koṇā to the palace must be somewhat short of 40 li, that is, of one yojana of Yuan Chwang. This agrees with Fa-hsien's "less than one yōjana" eastward or north-east from Koṇā to the "city of Kapilavastu," or the palace. South-west exactly four miles (30 li Yuan Chwang north-east = 3·9 miles) we find Guṭihavā. Mukherji says the distance from Guṭihavā to Tilaurā Koṭ is "about

¹ Beal, ii, p. 20.

² Op. cit., ii, p. 8.

³ Rockhill, op. cit., p. 120; J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 558. Yuan Chwang says that Viḍūḍabha, after his subjugation of the Sakyas, took 500 of their maidens for his harem. They also were mutilated and cast into a pit near Śrāvastī city (Beal, ii, p. 11).

4 miles.”¹ If, therefore, Guṭihavā can otherwise be identified as a part of Koṇā, Yuan Chwang’s 30 li north-east, if misplaced, should no doubt be calculated from near Guṭihavā to the “royal precincts.” A place must be found for the 30 li north-east, if the bearing must not be altered, and no other than the line from Guṭihavā to Tilaurā Koṭ suits so well. In addition to there being no remains, it would seem 30 li north-east of Sisanihavā, to correspond to the site of Koṇā, and as Fa-hsien certainly, and Yuan Chwang too, as we have learned from two possibly of his statements, places Koṇā to the westward of Kapilavastu, we have two distances which give support to the probability that Koṇā stood near Guṭihavā, namely 30 li north-east, if misplaced in the text, 4 miles, from Guṭihavā to Tilaurā, and also 50 li, 6·6 miles, ‘south,’ possibly intended for south-east, if the 50 li are calculated from the southernmost limit of the capital Kapilavastu, which is the distance from Guṭihavā, the approximate position of Koṇā, to Sisanihavā.

Gautama watched ploughers at work at Karṣaka (= ploughing), a town in which for a time he was chief magistrate.² This may be the place referred to by the pilgrims. There are ruins “about two furlongs west of Ahirauli,”³ a village one and a half miles north-east of Tilaurā Koṭ (40 li north-east less 30 li north-east = 10 li = 1·32 miles). Except at Sāgarahavā, Bikulī, and Ahiraulī, “no ruins have been found in any other villages” in this region.⁴ Bikulī is out of the question; it is “three miles east and a little north” of Sāgarahavā. Sāgarahavā seems to be too far from Tilaurā Koṭ, and is not in the right direction; Sāgarahavā is “about 2 miles north,”⁵ whereas the stūpa apparently stood about one and a half miles north-east of Tilaurā Koṭ. The ruins near Ahiraulī very probably include the stūpa; this position agrees best with the bearing,

¹ Antiquities, p. 49.

² J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 549.

³ Antiquities, p. 28.

⁴ Antiquities, p. 28.

⁵ Antiquities, p. 25.

and with what the distance to it from Tilaurā Koṭ seems to be. We should note that Fa-hsien is unwontedly particular in giving the exact bearing north-east to the "royal field," as if he were cautioning us against mistaking the Sāgarahavā stūpas for the site. Aśoka was shown the place.

The conclusion I come to from the previous discussion of the bearings and distances is that it is safest to take the 50 li 'south' to Krakucandra's town as the distance to some spot between south-south-west and south-south-east of Kapilavastu. If we go beyond these limits to search for Krakucandra's town and suppose 'south' is here south-west, so that the 'north-east' to Koṇā may remain unaltered, we find ourselves in difficulties: if Krakucandra's town be supposed to lie somewhere to the south-west of the Koṇā of Fa-hsien it becomes necessary to change 'south' in Yuan Chwang to south-west, with the result that the subsequent distances and bearings given by Yuan Chwang do not suffice to cover the ground from Krakucandra's town to Rummindeī, whereas with the bearing 'south' Sisanihavā corresponds admirably in position with Krakucandra's town. The distance from Koṇā to the "royal precincts" was no doubt about 30 li of Yuan Chwang's reckoning, the same as the 30 li north-west (north-east in the texts) from Krakucandra's town to Koṇā, probably to its south-east corner. Fa-hsien makes the corresponding distances each "less than one yojana." Yuan Chwang certainly appears to contradict himself with regard to the position of Koṇā, which Fa-hsien places to the westward of Kapilavastu. Although 40 li from the 'city' to the Nyagrodha grove agrees with the distance from Lahari Kudān to Sisanihavā, I am convinced this distance must be reckoned from Sisanihavā (Krakucandra's town) and not from the south gate of the capital Kapilavastu at Lahari Kudān. As the subsequent distances and bearings to Rummindeī prove, the Nyagrodha grove, to which the 40 li is the distance, was situated a long way from Krakucandra's town. The remains near Ahiraulī probably include the ploughing stūpa which was distant "a few li" to the north-east of Tilaurā Koṭ and 40 li to

the north-east of the north side of Koṇā. The stūpas near Sāgarahavā, two miles north of Tilaurā Kot, are very probably the stūpas of the slaughtered Sakyas spoken of by Yuan Chwang, who gives the bearing to them without any distance as 'north-east' (so in Watters), which in some texts is 'north-west.'

Yuan Chwang notices three Aśoka pillars in the Kapilavastu district—at Lumbinī, at Krakucandra's town, and at Koṇā. The Lumbinī pillar has been discovered at Rummindeī; the upper inscribed portion of another, evidently from Koṇā, exists at Niglihavā; and in Guṭihavā village there is an uninscribed lower part of a pillar which stands on its original foundation. It is tempting to regard the Guṭihavā and Niglihavā pillars as one, but that this is so is not certain. The Niglihavā pillar if joined to the Guṭihavā pillar and to the three pieces in this village would form a pillar over 28' 9½" high.¹ The Guṭihavā pillar stands south-west of the stūpa, whereas the Koṇā pillar was 20' high and stood "in front" (? east side) of the stūpa, and the inscription on the Niglihavā pillar does not bear out what Yuan Chwang says of the Koṇā pillar. The colour and stone of the Guṭihavā, Niglihavā, and Rummindeī pillars do not appear to differ.²

Perhaps Yuan Chwang was misinformed of the purport of the inscription on the Koṇā pillar, and 20' high may be a mistake for 30', the height of the pillar at Krakucandra's town, which was probably ordered by Aśoka at the same time on one of his visits.

Not far to the north-east of Koṇā stood the stūpa where Koṇāgamana met his father (21), and "farther north" than this was the relic stūpa of Koṇāgamana, with the Aśoka pillar we have been discussing in front of it (22). To the north of the Guṭihavā pillar and stūpa there is a mound

¹ The height (*Pioneer*, Feb. 6th, 1904) of the Guṭihavā pillar is 10' 2" and of the pieces 2' 3" and (*Antiquities*, p. 32) 1' 7" high. Total, 14'. The measurement of one piece is not given. The Niglihavā pillar is about 14' 9½" long (*Antiquities*, p. 30).

² *Antiquities*, pp. 31, 34.

which Mukherji describes :—"On the north of the village [Guṭihavā] is an ancient ditch, and about 200 feet south of the Stupa is an ancient tank. About two furlongs north ['north-east'] of Gutivā is a ['very'] large mound, on the east and south of which are two tanks."¹ Mukherji searched at Guṭihavā for stūpas to the 'north-west' of the pillar in this village, but could not find another.²

It is thus seen that there is a mound which may be the remains of a large stūpa "farther north" than the stūpa in Guṭihavā. Yuan Chwang has, I suspect, in his description put the pillar in front of the wrong stūpa. The Guṭihavā stūpa and the mound northwards of it appear to be the two stūpas of which he speaks, and if so the city of Koṇā was situated to the south-west side of the village Guṭihavā. To the southwards of Guṭihavā, so far as I know, there is no trace of the stūpa where Koṇāgamana was born (23), or of the "new preaching hall," Santhāgāra (24), which stood to the south of Koṇā city. According to Yuan Chwang it was at this 'hall' Viḍḍabha was slighted by the Sakyas, which occasioned his attacking the city of Koṇā when he came to the throne. As I understand it the fighting occurred round the hall; he "occupied this place" and the fields close by.³ The four stūpas of the champions (25) who scattered Viḍḍabha's army lay to the south-west of the "place of massacre," the battlefield. Probably they lay somewhere to the southwards of Koṇā. They were not found at Sāgarahavā,⁴ which is far to the northward of the supposed position of Koṇā, whereas the four champions opposed Viḍḍabha, as I understand Yuan Chwang, to the southwards of Koṇā.

¹ Antiquities, pp. 32, 55.

² Antiquities, p. 55.

³ Beal, ii, p. 21.

⁴ Antiquities, p. 55.

The City in the Nyagrodha Grove.

When Gautama, after becoming Buddha, was approaching the kingdom of Kapilavastu, Śuddhodana "proceeded 40 li beyond the city, and there drew up his chariot to await his arrival."¹ Here "the city" should, I think, be "this city," the town of Krakucandra, where Yuan Chwang is describing the surroundings of Kapilavastu, and is meaning to give the distance from Krakucandra's town to the stūpa which commemorated the spot in the Nyagrodha grove where they met for the first time. The grove lay 2 or 3 li to the south of a city of which Yuan Chwang has not given the name, but which we recognize corresponds to the ruins of the city at Piprāhavā. Yuan Chwang does not mention the distance from this city to the stūpa.

There are several accounts of the meeting.² Yuan Chwang's is to this effect:—The king and ministers, having revered him (Gautama Buddha), again returned to the kingdom (? city), and they (Gautama and disciples) located themselves in this Nyagrodha grove by the side of the saṃghārāma. And not far from it (monastery) is a stūpa; this is the stūpa where Tathāgata sat beneath a great tree with his face to the east, and received from his aunt (Prajāpatī) a golden-tissued garment. A little farther on is another stūpa; this is the place where Tathāgata converted eight king's (? kings') sons and 500 Sakyas.

Fa-hsien adds some monuments which are not noticed by the later pilgrim.

'Kingdom' is a slip for 'city.' The grove was formed by Nigrodha, a Sakka.³ It was prepared for the Buddha's reception by Śuddhodana,³ who presented it to him along with the Nyagrodha monastery, which was built after the plan of the Jetavana monastery at Śrāvastī. The presentation

¹ Beal, ii, p. 22.

² Hardy, op. cit., p. 205; Bigandet, op. cit., p. 162; Rockhill, op. cit., p. 52.

³ Hardy, op. cit., p. 205.

was made the day after the Buddha arrived and took up his abode with his disciples in the grove by the side of the city and the Rohiṇī (Rohitā) river,¹ which separated the kingdom of Kapilavastu from that of the Kolis.²

The city in the grove had gates, walls, monuments, watch-towers, a palace, several monasteries, and a festival hall or pavilion.³ It appears to have been called Nyagrodhika.⁴ We hear of the Buddha begging in the streets of this city, "where he was accustomed to ride in his chariot,"⁵ and of the conversion here of eight kings' sons,⁶ the names of whom vary,⁷ and do not always include the Buddha's own son Rāhula, who was of the number.⁸ The majority of these conversions are said to have occurred at Anūpiya, a village in the country of the Mallas on the road to Pāṭaliputra.

When "a battle was about to take place"⁹ between the Kapilavastu and Koli people respecting irrigation from the Rohiṇī river, the Buddha settled the dispute and afterwards admitted to his Order the 500 Sakyas, 250 men from each tribe.¹⁰ Fa-hsien also refers to this incident, and adds "while the earth shook and moved in six different ways."¹¹ The words within inverted commas explain each other; the Buddhists attribute earthquakes to many causes, one when a great war is imminent.¹²

Prajāpati on three different occasions headed a deputation of 500 Sakya women, the wives of the 500 Sakyas just mentioned, to the Buddha while in the grove, to seek

¹ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-53.

² Theragāthā, quoted Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 412.

³ Hardy, *op. cit.*, pp. 156, 207, 208, 210.

⁴ Divyāvadāna, p. 67; J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 549.

⁵ Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

⁶ Beal, ii, p. 22.

⁷ Hardy, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-212; Bigandet, *op. cit.*, pp. 170, 171; Rockhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-57; Watters, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁸ Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

⁹ Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

¹⁰ Bigandet, *op. cit.*, p. 194; Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

¹¹ Legge's Fā-hien, p. 66.

¹² Laidlay's translation, p. 207, 8th cause. For other causes see Bigandet, *op. cit.*, p. 282. There should therefore be one stūpa for this incident, not two as in all the translations but Legge's.

admission to the Order, but their request was denied.¹ It was probably at one of these times that Prajāpati presented the monk's robe.

There were two, if not three, monasteries in or near the city of Nyagrodhika; one built by Śuddhodana,² another by those converted to Buddhism,³ and perhaps a third situated close to the banks of the Rohiṇī.⁴ Perhaps these accounts refer to one monastery.

The monuments enumerated by Yuan Chwang in the grove to the south of this city are:—

1. Stūpa where Gautama Buddha met Śuddhodana (26).
2. Stūpa where Gautama contended in archery (27).
3. Stūpa where Prajāpati presented robe (28).
4. Stūpa of 500 Sakyas converted (29).
5. Nyagrodha monastery (30). To the list Fa-hsien adds,
6. Hall where the Buddha preached to the Devas (31).⁵

Fa-hsien mentions the first four. These I take to be the mounds shown in *Antiquities*, pl. xxvii, fig. 4, and described at p. 46, and noticed J.R.A.S., 1898, pp. 578, 581.

No. 1 is, I think, the stūpa in Ganvariā village (p. 43), from which the distance to Sisanihavā (Krakucandra's town) is given by Yuan Chwang as 40 li; No. 2, the circular mound at the south-west corner of fig. 4, if a stūpa may be that from which the distance to the 'arrow-well' is 30 li south-east; Nos. 3, 4, and perhaps 2 also, may have stood on the ground south of the south-east corner of fig. 4, which is described (p. 46) as covered with "scattered rubbles and bricks" for 300 feet; No. 5 may be the cells at the north-east corner of fig. 4, or possibly the same as the site of Nos. 3 and 4. The central mound in fig. 4 is possibly the hall, noticed alone by Fa-hsien of the two pilgrims,

¹ Hardy, *op. cit.*, pp. 320, 321.

² J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 542.

³ Watters, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 12.

⁴ Bigandet, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

⁵ See also Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

where the Buddha preached to the Devas, and the 'pavilion' where young Gautama was examined in the arts and sciences by his relatives.¹

Inside the east gate of the city, on the left of the road, there was a stūpa, its site in the Piprāhavā ruins has not been discovered as yet, to indicate where Gautama practised archery and other accomplishments (32). The site was apparently pointed out to Aśoka as that where Gautama was taught riding, driving, and as that of his gymnasium. Outside this gate stood the temple of Īśvara Deva (33), perhaps the temple whose foundations are seen 80' north of the (34) Piprāhavā stūpa.² Śuddhodana, following a custom of his tribe,³ presented Gautama, then two days of age, to the deity in the temple. The temple was named Sakya-vardhana, and its guardian deity, a yakṣa, bore the same name. Afterwards, it would appear, the image of this yakṣa was replaced by one of Īśvara Deva. The temple was pointed out to Aśoka. To the east of this, and 88' from the Piprāhavā stūpa, are the ruins of a monastery, the name of which is not known.

The Piprāhavā vase inscription, as interpreted by Dr. Fleet,⁴ convinces me that the Piprāhavā stūpa (34) must be the stūpa noticed by Fa-hsien alone, "where King Vaidūrya [Viḍūḍabha] slew the seed of Śākya, and they all in dying became Śrotāpannas." The story is told that one day Viḍūḍabha entered the Nyagrodha grove, and the people of Nyagrodhika came out to drive him away. Viḍūḍabha vowed vengeance, and declared: "My first act will be to put these Čakyas to death."⁵ He fulfilled his threat with cruel tortures. There is a stūpa (35) at Bharaulia⁶ which may mark the tree under which the Buddha sat when Viḍūḍabha was approaching the city in the grove, and

¹ Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

² *Antiquities*, p. 44, pl. xxvii, fig. 1.

³ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁴ J.R.A.S., 1906, p. 149.

⁵ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-79, 116-120.

⁶ J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 578.

where for a while the Buddha diverted him from his purpose to attack the city.¹

It is from the Piprāhavā stūpa, I think, that Fa-hsien calculates his 50 li, 8·8 miles, to Rummindeī. If we follow the sequence in Fa-hsien's narrative, it is impossible that the "50 li" was calculated from any site at the capital Kapilavastu. The distance from Taulihavā to Rummindeī direct is 13½ miles, whereas the distance from the Piprāhavā stūpa to Rummindeī on Mukherji's map is 8½ miles. It is just possible that there was a ploughing stūpa "several le" (Fa-hsien) to the north-east of the Piprāhavā stūpa, to indicate where Gautama when a young man, according to some accounts, watched ploughers at work,² and that the 50 li should be calculated from it. But I think Fa-hsien's ploughing stūpa, the reference to which is delayed, as is his reference to Asita, is the one noticed by Yuan Chwang. But if this is unlikely, I would point out that there is a mound north-east of the Piprāhavā stūpa, on the west side of the Sisvā reservoir, and another on the east side of the reservoir.³

The two Rivers Rohiṇī.

The Lesser Rohiṇī, *alias* Rohitā or Rohitakā. It is likely the Rohiṇī is represented in part of its course by the Sisvā (36), which flows southwards between Rummindeī and Tilaurā Kot, and passes half a mile or so to the east side of Piprāhavā. The Lesser Rohiṇī must have been a narrow and shallow stream. It is repeatedly described as small.⁴ In Chinese texts, the names Luhitā or Luhitakā, for Rohitā and Rohitakā, and in the Tibetan accounts Rohitā, correspond to the Rohiṇī,⁵ which flowed between the city of Kapilavastu

¹ J.R.A.S., 1906, p. 171; Avadāna Kalpalatā, J. Bud. Text Soc., 1896, p. 5. A similar place was shown to Yuan Chwang 4 li S.E. from Śrāvastī, where Viṇḍabha "on seeing Buddha dispersed his soldiers" (Beal, ii, p. 11). A stūpa marked the spot when Fa-hsien visited it (Beal, i, p. xlviii).

² Rockhill, op. cit., p. 22.

³ Antiquities, pp. 43, 46; J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 581.

⁴ Bigandet, op. cit., pp. 11, 193.

⁵ J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 547; Rockhill, op. cit., p. 20.

and the city of Koli,¹ which it was the custom of the inhabitants of both cities to dam to irrigate their fields, which contained little water in times of drought,² and which could have all its water diverted by a large tree falling across it.³ The Nyagrodha monastery was close to or actually on its bank,⁴ and at this river Śuddhodana waited for Gautama Buddha's return from Magadha.

The Greater Rohiṇī, which joins the Rāptī at the west end of the city of Gorakhpur, is sometimes mistaken for the Rohiṇī just described,⁵ but this is a broad and deep river, "not fordable even in summer for 25 miles above Gorakhpur," and "in the north its banks are steep and well marked."⁶ It is scarcely conceivable that it could ever have been diverted by a fallen tree, or that its water fed by melted snow in Summer could run short and lead to dispute.

Arrow Well.

The arrow-well (37) was distant 30 li of Yuan Chwang, 4 miles, south-east of the stūpa on the left of the road outside the south gate of the city in the Nyagrodha grove. Fa-hsien makes the distance to it 30 li south-east, about 5.28 miles; Yuan Chwang gives 80 to 90 li north-east, from 10.6 to 11.9 miles, by road from the well to Rummindeī. The direct distance from Birdpur to Rummindeī (38) is about 12 miles. The well, I think, perhaps lies somewhere near Rasulpur, which is 2½ miles north-east by east from Birdpur. I do not know if there are ruins near Rasulpur. There are several mounds to the south-east of Piprāhavā, in the Dulhā Grant.⁷ The distance is not given. They are

¹ Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 412 (quoting Theragāthā); Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 317; Bigandet, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

² Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

³ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 20; J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 548.

⁴ Bigandet, *op. cit.*, p. 230; J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 548.

⁵ Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 96; Hardy, *op. cit.*, p. 318; P.N., p. 18.

⁶ Gazetteer, N.W.P., vol. vi, 1881, pp. 294, 295.

⁷ P.N., p. 18.

probably too near Piprāhavā to be identified with the site of the arrow-well, at which we are told the small stūpa was built by brāhmaṇs and householders.¹

The *Lalitā Vistara*² gives 10 krośa (=2½ yojanas of Yuan Chwang=13·2 miles) from a palace in Kapilavastu, probably Gautama's at Lahari Kudān, to the well.

The City of Devadaha or Koli.

The founding of the city of Devadaha is described in the Burmese legend.³ The city was situated in the vicinity of a "sheet of water," and became the capital of the Kolis. The Buddha's maternal grandfather resided in it, and hither Māyā repaired when about to be delivered of Gautama. It is probable the village of Lummini of which Aśoka remitted the land tax on account of it being the birth-place of the Buddha is the same city. In one romance we hear of the "city of Devadaha and Lumbini," apparently as names of one city.⁴ Devadaha was not far from Kapilavastu, for the ladies of Devadaha used to present flowers to the Buddha in the Nyagrodha grove, and we have seen that it was close to the Rohiṇī, now the Sisvā, or more probably, one of the former beds of this river.

"About a mile north of Paṇḍiā village is a very high ground extending east to west for about two furlongs and about a furlong north to south. It represents undoubtedly the site of an ancient town."⁵ This (39) I propose to identify with Devadaha and the village of Lummini of the Rummindeī pillar inscription of Aśoka. On the north side of the ruins of the ancient city there is a "long tank, now dry," which I think was the sheet of water by the side of which the city was built. The sacred site of Rummindeī lies on the north side of this dry tank.

¹ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

² p. 203.

³ Bigandet, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁴ Beal, *Romantic Legend*, p.

⁵ *Antiquities*, p. 34.

The capital of the Koliyas of Rāmagrāma, where a stūpa of the Buddha relics existed, was apparently known to some by the name Koli;¹ and here also was a tank.² The Chinese pilgrims place this other city some miles from Rummindeī.

Conclusion.

There is one stūpa (40) of which we might have expected the pilgrims to tell us something. It stands 600' south-east of the east gate of Tilaurā Koṭ. From its size, and the number of times it has been repaired, it must have commemorated an important event. Unfortunately it has been rifled ages ago.³ Possibly this was the stūpa erected at Kapilavastu to receive the share of the Buddha's relics.

MAP INDEX.

KAPILAVASTU.

1. "Royal precincts," citadel, of Kapilavastu.
2. Palaces of Śuddhodana and Mahāmāyā.
3. Asita stūpa.
4. Monastery and two Deva temples, by the side of "royal precincts."
5. Stūpa where elephant blocked south gate of citadel.
6. Stūpa where elephant fell in capital.
- 7, 8. Two temples on site of Gautama's palace.
9. Hastigarta, or fallen elephant ditch.
10. Site of schoolroom of Prince Gautama.
11. Temple of 'sick man' outside south gate of capital.
12. Temple of representation of Gautama on white horse.
13. Temple of 'old man' outside east gate of capital.

KRĀKUCANDRA'S TOWN.

14. Krakucandra's Town.
15. Stūpa of Krakucandra's birth.
16. Stūpa where Krakucandra met his father.
17. Aśoka pillar and Krakucandra's relic stūpa.

¹ J.R.A.S., 1898, p. 566.

² Beal, ii, p. 26.

³ Antiquities, pp. 21, 22, pls. ii, iv.

KOṆĀGAMANA'S TOWN.

18. Koṇāgamana's Town.
19. Ploughing stūpa, at Karsaka, 40 li north-east.
20. Sāgarahavā tank and stūpas of slaughtered Sakyas.
21. Stūpa where Koṇāgamana met his father.
22. Aśoka pillar and relic stūpa of Koṇāgamana.
23. Stūpa where Koṇāgamana was born.
24. New preaching hall.
25. Four stūpas of champions.

CITY IN NYAGRODHA GROVE (NIGRODHĪKA).

26. Stūpa, where Gautama Buddha met Śuddhodana, in Ganvariā village.
27. Stūpa where Gautama contended in archery.
28. Stūpa where Prajāpatī presented robe.
29. Stūpa of 500 Sakyas converted.
30. Nyagrodha monastery.
31. Hall where Gautama Buddha preached to Devas.
32. Stūpa where Gautama practised archery.
33. Temple of Īśvara Deva.
34. Piprāhavā vase stūpa, where Vaidūrya slew the Sakyas.
35. Bharaulia stūpa, ? where Gautama Buddha sat under a tree.
36. Sisvā river, the Rohiṇī or Rohitakā of Buddhist books.
37. Arrow-well, approximate position.

RUMMINDEĪ.

38. Aśoka pillar at Rummindeī.
 39. Site of city of Devadaha, Koḷi, or Lummini village.
 40. ? Kanilavastu stūpa of the Buddha's relics.
-

XXI.

MODIFICATIONS OF THE KARMA DOCTRINE

By E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

THE Karma doctrine in its Brahmanistic form teaches that every individual in successive existences reaps the fruit of ignorance and desire as these were expressed in action performed in antecedent existences. As a man himself sows, so he himself reaps; no man inherits the good or evil act of another man: *nā 'yam parasya sukṛtāṃ duṣkṛtāṃ cā 'pi sevate* (Mbh. xii, 291, 22). The fruit is of the same quality with the action, and good or bad there is no destruction of the action: *na tu nāśo śya vidyate*. The result is exactly as when just retribution follows a wrong; there can be no cessation till the account is squared: *ubhayaṃ tat samābhūtam*. Whether "with eye or thought or voice or deed, whatever kind of act one performs, one receives that kind of act in return": *kurute* (v.l. *karoti*) *yādṛśaṃ karma tādṛśam pratipadyate* (ib. 16, 22; cf. 139, 24).

We may here ignore the metaphysical subtlety of the self as conceived by Buddhism, observing only that despite all efforts to conceive of an individuality which inherits Karma without being the self of the antecedent action, the fact that the Buddhist can remember previous existences shows that the new ego is practically, if not essentially, one with the previous ego, and may be regarded not only as a collective, but as a recollective entity—and how such a self-entity differs from a soul, *ātman*, probably none save a metaphysician could ever have explained. Not all Buddhists, however, were metaphysicians. Though they were not supposed to believe in metempsychosis or even in transmigration, the many actually believed that the self of to-day

atoned for the selfishness of the self of a previous birth, that the penalty was paid by the very individual who had done the wrong—an individual identical with that self in memory and hence, in mental personality, equivalent to the self or soul of Brahmanic, as of all popular theologies.

Thus logically the doer of the deed suffers, and not some other person. And most logically the doer suffers at the hands of the injured. He who has wronged another in one life is punished for it by that other in the next life: the *māmsa* law, “me eat will he whose meat I eat.” Or there is a slighter logical connection, as when the thief of grain is reborn as a mouse, because ‘mouse’ means ‘thief.’ So too he who starves others will himself be starved. According as the act is mental or bodily, and according to the mental disposition, *bhāva*, with which one performs an act, one reaps its fruit hereafter in a body similarly endowed (Mbh. xv, 34, 18; Manu, xii, 62 and 81). But analogy often fails, and a low birth of any kind, without further logical connection, rewards a low act. Thus the fruit of foolishness is simply rebirth “in this or a lower world”: *imaṃ lokam hīnataram cā ’viśanti* (Muṇḍ. Up., i, 2, 7-10). Or hell-torture, which antedates the systematic Karma doctrine,¹ may be adjuvant to the mechanical fruit of evil. Hell even in the Brahmanic system may take the place of metempsychosis altogether, as in Manu, xii, 18 and 22, which only a theological necessity can couple with the doctrine of Karma as a retributive power. Here, and elsewhere in many places, the only retribution is hell-torture, after which the soul receives a new body, but not a body conditioned by the acts already atoned for in hell. That the same lecture of Manu’s code recognizes the full Karma doctrine does not make any difference. The view that hell alone punishes the guilty is older than the view that the individual is a self-adjusting moral mechanism such as

¹ The doctrine of metempsychosis, without ethical bearing, has no necessary connection with ante-natal action, and this, transmigration pure and simple, was an older belief than that in hell. Karma itself merely implies the fruit of action, and that fruit may be in terms of metempsychosis or in terms of hell or of both. Compare the Aṅguttara Nik., iii, 99, on hell or rebirth, as alternatives.

is usually found in the Buddhistic interpretation. When hell and Karma both punish a sinner, he is sent to hell first and is then handed over to the working of Karma. A balance is struck between evil and good. Or the individual who, it is recognized, is never absolutely bad or absolutely good, may take his reward of joy and punishment in slices, first being rewarded for having been good and then being punished for having been bad. One canny hero, on being given this choice, said he would take his punishment first, and his reason was the one given by Dante—"nessun maggiore dolore che ricordarsi nel tempo felice," etc.

But there are various other theories which cross the theory of Karma, and if logically set beside it they must have annoyed not a little the religious consciousness of the Brahmins and Buddhists. Fortunately for man's peace of mind his theology may be illogical without upsetting his religion, and in India old and new beliefs seem to have met in a blend which, however incongruous, was accepted as the faith of the fathers, and hence was considered good enough for the sons. Just how far these incongruities were common to Brahmanism and Buddhism it is difficult to say. In some cases they appear in both systems; but on the whole Buddhism is the more decided opponent of doctrines subversive of the Karma theory. Yet when we say Buddhism we must make an exception in the case of Lamaism and perhaps other exponents of the Mahāyāna, where, as in Brahmanism, the Karma doctrine was modified in many ways.

In Brahmanism itself Karma struck hard against the old belief in sacrifice, penance, and repentance as destroyers of sin. It is in the code of practical life, as well as in the esoteric teaching, that sacrifice, reading the Vedas, knowledge of God, destroy all sin; austerity destroys all sin; penance destroys almost every sin; penance and repentance (i.e. public confession of sin and a promise not to sin in the same way again) at least mitigate, if they do not destroy, every sin; while later, as is well known, in all the popular teaching, gifts made to the priests remove sins, just as do visits made to holy places (Manu, xi, 146, 228, 240-247). The older

theologians indeed raised a question as to penance. Unintentional sin may be destroyed by penance; but how about intentional sin? Some said yes, even intentional sin; but others said no, for "The deed does not die": *na hi karma kṣīyate* (Manu, xi, 46; Vas. xxii, 2-5; Gāut. xix, 5, etc.). The incongruity was recognized; but orthodoxy prevailed and continued to preach both Karma and its logical antidote. Of all these factors, knowledge alone in the primitive Buddhistic belief can destroy the effect of Karma.

That the prayers for the dead, admitted into the Lamaistic service, presuppose the power to change the effect of Karma, goes without saying. The ritual employed to "elevate the fathers" is a parallel in Brahmanism. Whether, however, a curse, or its practical equivalent in *kṛtyā*, witchcraft, may be construed in the same way, is doubtful. Imprecations and magic existed before Karma was thought of. The only question is whether, when an innocent person was entrapped by *kṛtyā*, or a slight offence was punished out of all proportion by a curse, the resulting unhappiness was construed as being independent of Karma or as the real result of prenatal acts, the curse or act of sorcery being merely the means to the fulfilment of Karma's law. As to the effect of a curse, it is regarded either as the punishment of an act done in the present body or, when argued from a present state of being, as resulting from a curse uttered in a previous existence.¹

Another theory of man's lot also existed before Karma was known. In its simplest form it is the theory that man owes what he gets, not to his anterior self, but to the gods. What the gods arrange is, in any case, whether good or bad, the appointed lot; the arrangement, *viddhi*, is fate. If the gods bestow a share, *bhaga*, of good upon a man, that is his *bhāgya*, luck, divinely appointed, *diṣṭa*. As divine, the cause is *dāiva*, which later becomes fate, and is then looked upon

¹ That is, a curse may take effect at once, an injury be thus punished in the present existence; but (usually) a curse changes the next state of existence, as when Sāudāsa, King of Kosala, is changed into a cannibal monster at the curse of a great seer (Mbh. xiii, 6, 32).

as a blind power, necessity, chance, *haṭha*. So radical a blow at Karma as is given by this theory is formally repudiated in the words *bhāgyam Karma*, "luck is Karma," or some equivalent denial. It is *dāiva*, fate, which according to Manu, xi, 47, causes a man to sin, for he is represented as performing penance on account either of an act committed before birth or 'by fate,' that is, as the commentators say, by chance (carelessness) in this life. But *dāiva* elsewhere is a mere synonym of Karma, as in *dāivamānuṣe* (Manu, vii, 205), and is expressly explained to be such in the later code of Yājñavalkya, i, 348: *tatra dāivam abhivyaktam pāuruṣam pāurcadāihikam*, "Fate is (the result of) a man's acts performed in a previous body." Nevertheless, although the Brahman here, as in the Hitopadeśa and other works, expressly declares that what is called *diṣṭa*, 'decreed,' or fate, and is said to be insuperable when writ upon the forehead, *likhitam api lalāṭe*, results really from man's own act, whether in the present or the past, yet the original notion of God's favour persists, until it leads in its logical conclusion to that complete abrogation of the Karma doctrine which is found in the fundamental teaching of the Bhagavad Gītā in its present form. This fundamental teaching (not historically but essentially) inculcates the view that the favour of God, here called *prasāda*, 'grace,' combined with the necessarily antecedent 'loving faith' of the worshipper, surpasses all effects of antenatal error. Thus, though starting with Karma, the Gītā, like all later sectarian works, finally annuls the doctrine, exactly as in Japan one sect of Buddhists finds that an expression of faith in Amitabha Bhutsi transcends all other acts and secures salvation. This virtually does away altogether with the logic of Karma. In the same way Kṛṣṇā in the Mahābhārata, iv, 20, 7-29, is not led to believe that her present misfortunes are the result of acts in a previous existence, but that they are due to the Creator, Dhartar; "through whose grace, *prasāda*, I have obtained this misfortune," she says, owing to a "fault against the gods," *devānām kilbiṣam*, committed not in a prenatal state, but when she was a foolish young girl, *bālā*, in

her present life. It is the will of the god which is identified with *dāiva* (*nā 'daivikam*, she says of her condition). Yet the formal denial of any cause save Karma is as vigorously made in the epic as elsewhere. "Not without seed is anything produced; not without the act does one receive the reward. I recognize no Fate. One's own nature pre-determines one's condition; it is Karma that decides": *dāivam tāta na paśyāmi*, opposed to *svabhāva* and Karma (xii, 291, 12-14). On the other hand, the fatalistic belief, despite this objection, is constantly cropping up. The length of a man's life is "determined at the beginning" (as is that of all creatures) by fate, under the form of Time, *kāla*, *āyur agre 'vatiṣṭhate* (Mbh. xii, 153, 56); through *Kāla* alone comes death (ib. xiii, 1, 50). There is a long discussion in xiii, 6, 3 ff., of the relative importance of action in the present life and that action (or effort) in a preceding life which is virtually fate, and the conclusion here reached is that it is activity in this life which determines every man's lot, for "there is no determining power in fate": *nā 'sti dāive prabhutvam* (ib. 47). This is the manly view. The weaker sex adopts the opposite opinion (*Śak.*, p. 68). The theory of chance and accident is clearly expressed in Buddhism. According to the *Milinda*, it is an erroneous extension of the true belief when the ignorant (Brahmans and Buddhists) declare that "every pain is the fruit of Karma" (136 and 138).

The individual, besides having his Karma abrogated by divine grace, may secure a remittance of part of his evil Karma involuntarily. The Karma doctrine demands that every individual shall reap what he has sown. But when the farmer, in the most literal sense, reaps the harvest he has sown, it is due not to his own Karma, but to the virtue of the king, and conversely, when, owing to the neglect or oppression of the king, the farmer does not reap his crop, then the blame attaches to the king. Thus, if his wife dies of hunger, he ought logically to say that it is due to his wife's or his own previous Karma. Instead of this, it is the fault of the king, and the king will reap hereafter

the fruit of the sin. The king alone determines the character of the age, *rājāi 'va yugam ucyate* (Mbh. xii, 91, 6), and "drought, flood, and plague" are solely the fault, *doṣa*, of the king (ib. 90, 36). The same theory holds in Buddhism (Jātaka 194). The share of religious merit accruing to or abstracted from the king's account in accordance with this theory is mathematically fixed.

The relation of husband and wife, touched upon in the last paragraph, also interferes with Karma. In the unmodified theory, a wife is exalted only in this life by her husband; her position in the next life depends upon her own acts. If she steals grain she becomes a female mouse, etc. (Manu, xii, 69). But elsewhere in the code (v, 166; ix, 29) and in the epic, a woman's future fate is that of her husband if she is true to him. Faithfulness might logically be reckoned as her own act; but the reward is in fact set in opposition to the operation of Karma, as is clearly seen in the words of Sītā in Rām. ii, 27, 4-5. Here the heroine says: "Father, mother, brother, son, and daughter-in-law reap each the fruit of individual acts¹; but the wife alone enjoys the lot of her husband . . . in this world and after death." It is evident that the words *svāni punyāni bhuñjānāḥ svam svam bhāgyam upāsate*, which express the Karma doctrine as operative in the case of others, are here placed in antithesis to the wife's reward, which is to share the fruit of her husband's acts. The faithful wife absorbs her husband's qualities, *guṇas*, but if unfaithful is reborn as a jackal (Manu, ix, 22, 30; v, 164).

To return to transferred Karma. A voluntary transfer occurs only in the case of good Karma. But transfer of evil Karma is found in still other cases than that mentioned above. For not only are a subject's sins transferred to a bad king (Manu, viii, 304, 308), but the priestly guest who is not properly honoured transfers his evil deeds to the

¹ The commentator understands *karmaphalam*, 'the fruit of acts,' to be meant, and this is supported by the varied reading: *bhāryāi 'kā patibhāgyāni bhuñkte patiparāyanā pretya cāi 've 'ha*, "here and hereafter the faithful wife enjoys her husband's lot."

inhospitable host, and all the good Karma of the householder is transferred to the guest (Manu, iii, 100, etc.). Further, a perjurer's good Karma goes over to the person injured by the perjury (Yāj. ii, 75), or, according to Manu, viii, 90, "goes to the dogs," *śuno gacchet*; but the latter expression merely means "is lost" (Viṣṇu, viii, 26). 'Brahman glory' can perhaps be interpreted as Karma-fruit. If so, it goes to the benefit of the gods when its possessor sins (Manu, xi, 122).

A voluntary transfer of good Karma is recognized, for example, in the epic tale of the saint who, having merited and obtained "a good world," offers to hand it over to a friend who has not earned it. It is hinted in this case that though acquired merit in the objective shape of a heavenly residence may be bestowed upon another, the gift ought not to be accepted (Mbh. i, 92, 11 f.). Strangely enough, the idea that good Karma is transferable is also common in Buddhism. Thus there is the Stūpa formula, *sapuyā matu pitu puyā*, (erected) "for (the builder's) own religious merit and for the religious merit of his mother and father," and also the formula¹ in the ordination service: "Let the merit that I have gained be shared by my lord. It is fitting to give me to share in the merit gained by my lord. It is good, it is good. I share in it." We may compare also the *pattidāna* formula: *aham te ito pattim dammi*, "I give thee my merit."

Most of these modifications of Karma are to be explained by the impact of divergent beliefs, which, older than Karma, survived in one form or another, interposing themselves between the believer's mind and his newer belief. Such also is that which accomplishes the most important modification in the whole series, namely, the belief in hereditary sin.

The belief that a man may inherit sin rises naturally when disease is regarded as the objective proof of sin. As disease is palpably inherited, so, since disease is the reward of sin, the inheritor of disease is the inheritor of sin. At the time

¹ Warren, "Buddhism in Translations," p. 396 f.

of the Rig Veda we find the doctrine of inherited sin already set forth. The poet in RV. vii, 86, 5 first inquires why the god is angry, what sin, *āgas*, has been committed, and then continues in supplication: "Loose from us paternal sins and loose what we in person have committed" (*āva drugdhāni pitryā sṛjā nō 'va yā vayān cakrma tanūbhiḥ*). The collocation and parallel passages show that what is here called *drugdhā* is identical with the preceding *āgas* (*ēnas*) and with *ānhas*, found elsewhere, RV. ii, 28, 6, in the same connection; it is the oppressive sin-disease (either inherited or peculiar to the patient), which may be removed by the god, who has inflicted it as a sign of anger, and whose mercy, *mṛtikā*, is sought in visible form, *abhi khyam*.

Obviously such a view as this is inconsistent with the doctrine of Karma. If a man's sin is inherited it cannot be the fruit of his own actions. Individual responsibility ceases, or at least is divided, and we approach the modern view that a man's ancestors are as guilty as himself when he has yielded to temptation. Not the self, in the orthodox view, or the confection that replaces soul (self) in the heterodox (Buddhistic) view, but some other self or confection reaps the fruit. This view has indeed been imputed to Buddhism, but it was in an endeavour to make it appear that Buddhism anticipates the general modern view of heredity and is therefore a 'scientific' religion. No examples, however, were proffered in support of this contention, and there was apparently a confusion in the mind of the writer between self-heredity (Karma) and heredity from one's parents. The fact that in Buddhism one inherits one's own sin in the form of fruit does not make it scientific in the modern sense of heredity. To find an analogue to the thought of to-day we must turn to Brahmanism.

For although it would seem that after the pure Karma doctrine was once fully accepted such a view as that of inherited sin could find no place in either Buddhism or Brahmanism, yet as little as the Hindu was troubled with the intrusion upon that doctrine of the counter-doctrine of God's sufficient grace, was he troubled with the logical

muddle into which he fell by admitting this modification and restriction of the working of Karma. He admits it, not as an opposed theory, but as a modification. Thus in the Great Epic, i, 80, 2 f. : " When wrong is done, it does not bear fruit at once, but gradually destroys. . . . If the fruit (of Karma) does not appear in one's self, it is sure to come out in one's sons or descendants " :

*nā 'dharmaś carito, rājan, sadyaḥ phalati, gaur iva,
śanāir āvartyamāno hi kartur mūlāni kṛntati,
putreṣu vā naptrṣu vā, na ced ātmani paśyati,
phalaty eva dhruvam pāpam, gurubhuktam ivo 'dare.*

Almost the same words are used in xii, 139, 22 : " When, O King, any evil is done, if it does not appear in (the person of) this man (who commits the deed, it appears) in (the person of) his sons, his grandsons, or his other descendants " :

*pāpam karma kṛtam kimcid, yadi tasmin na dṛśyate,
nrpate, tasya putreṣu pautreṣu api ca naptrṣu.*

Strange as this doctrine appears in contrast with the Karma theory (" no one reaps the fruit of another's good or evil deeds," cited above), it can, perhaps, be explained as an unconscious adaptation from the visible consequences of evil. Thus, when the god Justice, otherwise personified Punishment, judges a king, he decrees that if a king is unjust that " king together with his kin " is destroyed (Manu, vii, 28). But this is a natural, obvious result, as it is said further " if the king through folly rashly harasses his kingdom, he, with his kin, soon loses his kingdom and life " (ib. 111, *sabāndhavaḥ*). It is such wrong that is particularly alluded to in one of the texts above,¹ but here the further step has been taken of incorporating the notion of divided punishment into the Karma system with its special terminology, so that it now appears as a modification

¹ Compare, in the continuation of the first selection, the seer's words, which express the punishment to be meted out to the king in this particular instance : *tyakṣyāmi tvām sabāndhavam* (i, 80, 5).

of that system, whereby (divided punishment implying inherited sin) the sons and grandsons reap the Karma of another. It is improbable that the author of Manu, iv, 172-174, had any such notion. He simply states the observed fact that when a *king* is destroyed his relatives (i.e. his whole family) suffer also. But the later writer begins a fatal process of logical analysis. If the king's sons or grandsons suffer for ancestral sins, then clearly Karma works from father to son. In the second example¹ the generalization is complete; if the fruits of sin do not appear in the person of any sinner, such fruits may be looked for in the person of his descendants, even to the third generation. This forms a sharp contrast to the teaching of xii, 153, 38: *na karmanā pituḥ putraḥ pitā vā putrakarmanā, mārgenā 'nyena gacchanti, baddhāḥ sukṛtaduḥkṛtāḥ*, "neither the son by the Karma of his father nor the father by the Karma of his son go, bound by good and evil deeds, upon another course," for "what one does, that the doer alone enjoys": *yat karoti tat kartāi 'va samaśnāti* (Mbh. xii, 153, 41). It agrees logically with that later explanation of the fate of Yayāti which sees in this seer's rehabilitation in heaven, not a purchase, or a gift accepted, but a "reward for the virtue of his grandchildren," for in one case a man's sins are paid for by his descendants and in the other the descendants' virtue affects the fate of the (still living) grandsire.²

It is due to the doctrine of inheritance that we find another suggestion made in Manu and the Great Epic. The child's disposition, one would think, must be his own, but when the subject of impure (mixed) birth is discussed we get a very clear intimation that the child inherits (from father or

¹ This case is as follows: a bird revenges itself on a prince who has killed its young by picking out the prince's eyes, remarking that an instantaneous punishment comes to evil-doers in the shape of revenge, but that this revenge squares the account. If unavenged at once, the evil fruit will appear in a subsequent generation.

² In the first passage cited above the sage receives a good world as a gift, or if ashamed to do this may "buy it for a straw," but in xiii, 6, 30, it is said, "Of old, Yayāti, fallen to earth, ascended to heaven again by virtue of his descendants' good works" (*punar āropitāḥ svargam dāruhitṛāḥ puṇyakarmabhiḥ*).

mother, or from both) his mental disposition, *bhāva*, just as, to use the epic's own simile, a tiger shows in his (outer) form the ancestral stripes. Interchanging with *bhāva* in the epic discussion is *śīla*, character, which is inherited. So Manu, x, 59-60, says that the parents' character, *śīla*, is inherited by the son. The epic has (Mbh. xiii, 48, 42):

*pitryaṃ vā bhajate śīlam mātṛjaṃ vā, tatho 'bhayaṃ,
na katham cana saṃkīrṇaḥ prakṛtiṃ svāṃ niyacchati,*

(43) *yathāi 'va sadṛśo rūpe mātāpitror hi jāyate
vyāghraś citrāis, tathā yonim puruṣaḥ svāṃ niyacchati :*

“A man shares his father's or his mother's character, or that of both. One of impure birth can never conceal his nature. As a tiger with his stripes is born like in form to its mother and father, so (little) can a man conceal his origin.” It is clear from the *nānābhāva*, ‘varied disposition,’ which opens the discussion, and from *śīla*, ‘character,’ as used in the cases here cited, that character as well as outer appearance is here regarded as inherited. Not only, then, may a man's sinful act be operative in his bodily descendant without that descendant being an earner of his own Karma, but the descendant's evil disposition (the seed of the active Karma) may be the result, not of his own prenatal disposition, but of his bodily ancestors and their disposition. With this admission there is nothing left for the Karma doctrine to stand upon.

In conclusion, a refinement of the Karma theory leads to the view that the fruit of an act will appear at the corresponding period of life hereafter: “What good or evil one does as a child, a youth, or an old man, in that same stage (of life hereafter) one receives the fruit thereof”:

*bālo yuvā ca vṛddhaś ca¹ yat karoti śubhāśubham
tasyām tasyām avasthāyām tatphalam pratipadyate,*

as given in Mbh. xii, 181, 15, which is repeated in xii, 323,

¹ Or, v.l., *vā*.

14, with a change at the end, *bhunkte janmani janmani*, "birth by birth one reaps the fruit." A third version (xiii, 7, 4) combines these: "In whatsoever stage of life one does good or evil, in just that stage, birth by birth, one reaps the fruit":

*yasyām yasyām avasthāyām yat karoti śubhāśubham
tasyām tasyām avasthāyām bhunkte janmani janmani.*

That this is an after-thought is pretty certain.¹ The earlier expositions know nothing of such a restriction. It accounts for a man's misfortunes as being the fruit of acts committed at the same age in a precedent existence. But it is difficult to understand how it would cover the case of a child born blind, which the Karma doctrine, untouched by this refinement, easily explains as the penalty of sin committed at any stage of a former life. Perhaps such infant misfortunes led in part to the conservation of the older theory of parental guilt, inherited and reaped in misfortune by the offspring. The same query arose elsewhere—"Was it this man's sin or his parents' that he was born blind?"²

¹ There are other forms of this stanza with slight variations. It occurs several times in the pseudo-epic besides the places here cited.

² As a kind of modification may also be regarded the *quasi* personification of Karma, as if it were a shadowy person pursuing a man. In Brahmanism this conception is common. In Buddhism an illustration will be found in the introduction to the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka, No. 522, where the lurking Deed waits long to catch a man, and finally, in his last birth, "seizes its opportunity," *okāsam labhi* (or *labhati*), and deprives him of magical power. On the barter of Karma as a price, in poetical metaphor, see Professor Rhys Davids on the *Questions of Milinda*, v, 6. Poetic fancy also suggests that even a manufactured article may suffer because of its demerit (*Sak.*, p. 84).

XXII.

THE PERSIAN AND TURKISH MANUSCRIPTS

IN THE HUNTERIAN LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
GLASGOW.

By T. H. WEIR.

IN the *Journal* for October, 1899, there was published a hand-list of the Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac manuscripts in Dr. Hunter's collection. The following pages contain a list of the Persian and Turkish manuscripts. The late Mr. E. J. W. Gibb visited the library and examined the Turkish manuscripts, leaving in each of them, with the exception of one or two which escaped notice at the time, a slip, with his initials, describing its contents. These slips have been copied down here verbatim, and one or two remarks have been added. A detailed catalogue of the whole of the European manuscripts by the Rev. Patrick H. Aitken, B.D., is now in the press, and will be published by the Messrs. MacLehose in due course. I have to thank Professor Browne for kindly reading the proof of this paper.

PERSIAN.

1.

U. 8. 19.

A Risālah containing explanatory notes upon the twelfth Surah of the Koran, written in small Nestalik. No title nor author's name. The cover bears the date 1070 A.H., and the flyleaf the owner's name, محمد بن عبد الرحمن.

Begins : قوله تعالى نحن نقص عليك احسن القصص

تمت هذا [sic] الرسالة في شهر صفر بالخير والظفر

2.

V. 8. 17.

The Commentary of Muḥammad Ja'far Ja'farī upon the Aurād or Litanies of 'Alī Hamadānī, written in Naskhī. No date.

Beg. : همی کوید ساکن زاویه حیرانی

Brit. Mus. Suppl. Cat. 20.

3.

T. 5. 5.

The زرتشت نامه of Zartusht i Bahrām, written in Nestalik, and dated 30th Ardībihisht, 1046 A.Y., in the ḡashbah of Nausārī.

Beg. : سخن را بنام خدای جهان
بیاراید از آشکار و نهان

Copyist : خورشید ولد اسفندیار

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 46b.

4.

S. 4.

The روضة الشهداء of Husain ibn 'Alī al-Kāshifī, known as Al-Vā'iz al-Baihaḡī, written in Naskhī. No date.

Beg. : کتاب روضت الشهداء باب اول در بیان ابتلای حضرت
آدم علیه السلام

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 152b.

5.

V. 4. 13.

The تذکرة السلاطین جغتای of Muḥammad Hādī, known as Kāmvar Khān, written in Nestalik. This copy was made for a Mr. Mitchell, an Englishman, by Nāhir Singh, son of Risk La'l, and finished on the 18th Ṣafar in the tenth year of Muḥammad Shāh (1140 A.H.).

Beg. : چون صفحه کاغذ بیاراستم وخامه دوزبان برداشتم

Brit. Mus. Cat., pp. 274b, 924a.

6.

T. 2. 9.

An anonymous History of the Mahrattas down to the battle of Pánipat, written in large Nestalik.

Beg. : ويسوجي پڻته كه جد سيوم بالاجي راؤ پيشوا بود نوكر
ياقوت خان حبشی صاحب راجپوری بود

A note at the end states that this is "the original manuscript from which Mr. Kerr [Captain James Kerr] made his Translation of *A short Historical Narrative of the Mahrattah State*. Printed in 8vo, London, 1782." It was presented to the writer by Mr. White, Professor of Arabic in Oxford.

The History is preceded by a list of the Mogul Emperors and their sons, and by four folios containing an account of Ghāzī ud-Dīn Khān, the wazīr of Aḥmad Shāh and 'Ālamgīr II.

7.

T. 8. 6.

The كتاب أشجار وأثمار, a general treatise on the science of astronomy by 'Alī Shāh ibn Kāsim al-Khwārazmī, generally known as Bukhārī, written in Nestalik. Dated 2nd Jumādā II, 955 A.H.

Beg. : حمد وثنا افريد كاري را كه افلاك دو آير و نجوم سواير ساخت
وشكر و سپاس واجب الوجودى را

Copyist : فریدون بن قباد طالش

Pertsch, Berlin Catalogue, No. 342.

8.

V. 8. 19.

Written in Nestalik and dated 1040 A.H.

I. A treatise on precious stones and minerals written for Hūlāgū by Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūṣī, mentioning the properties, tests, and value of each. It is an epitome of the second and third Maḳālahs of the Tansūḳ Nāmāh.

Beg. : اما بعد این کتابیست که استاد جهان
خواجه نصیر الدین طوسی نوشته است در معرفت جواهر
ومعادن و خاصیت و قیمت هریک بموجب اشاره خاقان
عالم هلاکو

Cf. Brit. Mus. Suppl. Cat., No. 157.

II. A practical treatise in fifteen *bābs* on Archery.

Beg. : الحمد لله رب العالمین والعاقبة للمتقين
اما بدانکه [sic] طالبان علم را بعد از علم شریعت رغبت
می افتند بعلم سلاح

9.

T. 7. 5.

The کتاب وسیلة المقاصد الى احسن المراد the Persian-Turkish dictionary of Maulavī Rustem, written in Naskhī. No date.

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 515 ; Vienna Cat., vol. i, p. 197.

10.

S. 2. 4.

A Persian glossary, written in Nestalik. It is complete, but without title, author's name, or date.

Beg. : باب الالف آب معروف رواج و رونق و جاه

It is written in double columns, and space has been left between them and in the margin for a commentary.

11.

S. 7.

The الانشا [بدائع] of Maulānā Ḥakīm Yūsufī, written in Nestalik and dated 5th Sha'bān, 119 [1190] A.H.

Beg. : زینت عنوان هر نامه نامی و زیور دیباجه

Brit. Mus. Cat., 529a.

12.

S. 7.

The شرفنامه or second part of the Iskandar Nāmah of Nizāmī, written in Nestalik and dated 1102 A.H.

Beg. : خرد هر کجا کنجی آرد پدید
بنام خدا سازد آنرا کلید

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 569*a*.

13.

V. 8. 21.

The کتاب الانتخاب, a volume of selections from the Khamsah of Nizāmī, written in Nestalik.

14.

T. 5. 20.

The بند نامه of Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār, written in Nestalik, and dated 9th Jumādā I, 1100 A.H.

Beg. : حمد بی حد آن خدای پاک را
آنکه ایمان داد مشتی خاک را

Copyist : عبد الصمد محمد بن احمد الحلیمي

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 579*b*.

15.

S. 7.

The same work, written in Nestalik. No date.

16.

V. 5. 18.

The لطائف اللغات, a glossary to the Maṣnavī of Jelāl al-Dīn Rūmī by 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-'Abbāsī and generally called Farhang i Maṣnavī, written in Nestalik. No date.

Beg. : این فرهنگى است مشتمل بر حلّ لغات غربیه عربیه
والفاظ عجیبه مشنوی مولوی

Brit. Mus. Cat., 590*b*.

17.

T. 7. 13.

The Gulistān of Sa'dī, written in small Naskhī with interlinear Turkish translation. The last folio bears the date 1136 A.H.

Beg. : منت خدایرا عزوجلّ که طاعتش موجب

Translation beg. : منت الهیچونددر که اکا مطع (sic) اولمق

18.

U. 1. 4.

The *Gulistān* of Sa'dī, written in *Naskhī* with brief interlinear and marginal notes.

Beg. : مَسْتِ مرخدای را عزوجل که طاعتش

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 597*a*.

19.

T. 5. 4.

The *Bustān* of Sa'dī, written in *Nestalik* and dated 8th *Jumādā* I, 1084 A.H.

Beg. : بنام جهاندار جان آفرین

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 597*b*.

20.

U. 5. 16.

The *Dīvān* of *Hāfiẓ*, written in *Nestalik*, and with Chinese pictures inserted between the gatherings.

Beg. : الا ايها الساقى

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 627 ff.

21.

U. 6. 7.

The *Wazīẖa* of *Jāmī*, written in *Nestalik*. No date.

Beg. : الهی غنچه امید بکشای

کلی از روضه جاوید بنمای

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 645*a*.

22.

U. 5. 7.

The *Dīvān* of *Lisānī*, written in *Nestalik*.

Beg. : زهی عشقت بباد بی نیازی داده خرمنها

خم فتراک شوق سرکشان را طوق کردنها

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 656*b*.

23.

T. 5. 7.

انتخاب دیوان شوکت, selections from the *dīvān* of *Shaukat-i-Bukhārī*, written in Indian hand.

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 698*a*.

24.

U. 8. 21.

A volume of Ghazals and Rubā'īs selected from the divāns of Aṣar, Kalim, Mirza Šā'ib, Ḥasan Dihlavī, Abū Sa'īd ibn Abu'l Khair, ʿĀshik, Muḥammad Jān Kudsī, Zulālī Khwānsārī, Shāh Shujā', Mir Muḥammad Kāzīm Karīm, Khākānī, Sa'dī, and other poets. The lines are arranged to form geometrical designs upon the page.

25.

S. 7.

The کتاب کلیله و دمنه, written in Nestalik in the year 1192 A.H. Folios 137-144 are wanting.

Beg. : سپاس از دل و ابد خداوندی را

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 745a; Vienna Cat., vol. iii, p. 286.

26.

T. 7. 24.

A جنگی or album of extracts, consisting of traditions, tales, etc. The lines are generally written diagonally across the upper and lower halves of the page. Written in Indian hand. No date.

27.

S. 7.

The کتاب معجزات of Hairatī, written in Nestalik. The text is written round the margin as well as in the field of the page.

Beg. : الهی از دل من بند بردار
مرا در بند چون و چند مکرار

Folio 1a bears the title بجۃ المباهج : cf. Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 758b.

Brit. Mus. Suppl. Cat., No. 303.

28.

S. 7.

The رقعات or familiar letters of the Shāikh Abu'l Fazl, written in Nestalik. No date.

Beg. : بعد از انشائی حمد و ثنائی حضرت خداوند

Brit. Mus. Cat., 838b.

29.

V. 8. 20.

A small volume written partly in Nestalik, partly in Naskhī, and dated 960 A.H., containing three treatises on the subject of *bāh*.

I. Beg. : اما بعد چنین گوید مکرر این اوراق اضعف عباد الله

اسماعيل بن مولانا شهاب الدين العرب دمشقى

که مختصرى در باب اسرار توالد و تناسل بنو شتم

II. Beg. : الحمد لله رب العالمين والعاقبة للمتقين

وبعد چنین گوید ابو المظفر بن هبة الله بن محمد بن

اردوشير من اول (sic) جرجاس بن جاماس حکيم که چون

خدمت خدايگان عالم سلطان المشارق والمغرب معز

الدنيا والدين ظل الله ابو الحارث سجر ابن ملکشاه ابن

الب ارسلان

The date of Abū'l Hārith Sinjar is 1117-57 A.H.

Pertsch, Berlin Cat., No. 627.

III. Beg. : فصل بعضی از جهال گویند که هرگز مجامعت

نباید کردن

TURKISH.

1.

U. 8. 20.

Doctrina Christiana. The Catechism of the Church of England in Turkish and Latīn, by Albert Bobovius, Constantinople, 1654.

2.

U. 3. 13.

A universal history by Hūsain Efendi, generally known as Hazārfan, written in 1081-3 A.H. Dated Constantinople, 15th Rejeb, 1089 A.H. = 3rd Sept., 1678 A.D.

Beg. : حمد و صد حمد اول حضرت نى جلال

The colophon begins :

وقع الفراغ من تحرير هذه النسخة المبرورة المسماة بتنقيح
تواريخ الملوك تاليف افضل الفضلا حسين افندى الشهير
بهارفن تحريرا في ملحقات دار السلطنة العثمانية قسطنطينية
المحمية بخارج غلط في سراى فرانساه عن يد اضعف العباد الفقير
الحقير الى عفو الملك القدير فرانسيس الشهير بالضليبي
الترجمان في خدمة السلطنة العلية والدولة البهية الفراساوية قد
مالكها السلطان ابن السلطان سلطان لوزير الملقب بالغرهام
خلد الله ملكه.

3.

T. 7. 26.

A narrative of events under the Safavid Shahs of Persia about the year 1138 A.H. by an author called Josephو يوژفو.

Beg. : اصفهانندن كلن يوژفو نام كمسنه سكرسنه اصفهانده مكث
ايدوب

4.

U. 6. 24.

A History of Sultan Suleymán I.

E. J. W. G.

Beg. : بر پادشاه عالى جاء دركه رعايت

5.

V. 6. 20 II.

A Turkish translation of a charter permitting Christians to occupy Mount Sinai, dated Sha'bán, 1048 A.H.¹

Beg. : صورة نقلت عن اصلها بمعرفة افقر الورى عبد الله المولى
خلافة بديوان مصر غفر له الامر في الحقيقة كما في حق هذه
الوثيقة نمقه اضعف عباد الله الرحمن الفقير الشريف نعمة
الله بن عثمان القاضى بندرسويس وطور المعروفة سبب
تحرير قلم فصيح اللسان وموجب تقرير رقم صحيح البيان

¹ The contents of Nos. 3 and 5 were kindly indicated by Mr. A. G. Ellis, M.A., of the British Museum.

6.

U. 5. 1.

A collection of official documents, chiefly letters between the Porte and European Powers, more especially France. No date.

E. J. W. G.

Beg. : سلطان سليم خانك عهد نامه سيدر

7.

T. 8. 14.

Inshá انشا. Models of letters, some of them by historical personages.

E. J. W. G.

8.

U. 7. 20.

Inshá انشا. Models of letters by Oqji-zâde Nishânji Mehemed Efendi محمد افندی زاده نشانجی, in dîwânî hand.

E. J. W. G.

Cf. Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 97a.

9.

V. 7. 13.

Two treatises on Inshá انشا, epistolary style, the first by Oqji-zâde, no author for the second. Undated.

E. J. W. G.

I. A duplicate copy of the last work.

II. Beg. : دولتلو وسعادتلو ومرحمتلو سلطانم

10.

T. 7. 17.

Inshá انشا, a collection of epistolary formulæ : at the end are various arithmetical notations, the multiplication table, etc.

E. J. W. G.

11.

T. 7. 8.

A book on Inshá انشا, epistolary style : a page or two missing at the beginning : composed about 938 A.H. In dîwânî hand.

E. J. W. G.

Beg. : ذكر الله اعلى و بالتقديم اولى حمد بيقياس و ثنائى با

سپاس

12.

V. 8. 5.

Forms of Address for the Sultan and other great personages.
No author's name or date. E. J. W. G.

I. Heading : بهجت سلاطين العظام

Beg. : جناب ملك آراى ممالك كشای

II. Heading : صورت برات قضاة

Beg. : سبب تحریر مثال بيمثال واجب الادعاء (sic) والامثال

13.

T. 7. 12.

A treatise on the organization, etc., of the Corps of Jannisaries ; the author says he is a member of the corps, but does not mention his name ; he compiled the treatise during the reign of Sultan Ahmed, son of Sultan Mehemmed. There does not appear to be any title mentioned in the text ; but the words كتاب قانون نامه , Kitáb-i Qánún-Náme, 'the Book of the Canon (Code),' are written over the first page. Transcribed 9th Rebí-ul-Akhir, 1087.

E. J. W. G.

Beg. : الحمد لله رب العالمين اما بعد سلطان

البرتين والبحرين خادما الحرمين الشريفين سلطان احمد خان

ابن سلطان محمد خان

Copyist : على بن محمد

Cf. Vienna Cat., iii, 252f.

14.

T. 6. 6. II.

A note on the rations provided at certain 'imárets in Constantinople, drawn up by Mehemed bin Husain for the Sultan (Mehemed III), written by Mehemed bin Husain, 952. Autograph of author ? E. J. W. G.

Beg. : حمد نا محدود وثناءنا محدود اول خاتى بى مشال ورازق

بى زوال

15.

T. 6. 7.

روضة الازهار ولذايد الاثمار Rawzat-ul-Ezhár ve Lezá'iz-ul-Esmár by 'Abd-ul-Mejíd of Siwás, a work on Ethics, transcribed by Ibráhím ibn Jihángír, 1045. E. J. W. G.

Beg.:

شكر اول الله اولسون كه شمع جانندن چراغ قلبي يافردى

16.

T. 3. 5.

Almanack for the year A.H. 1008.

E. J. W. G.

Heading: جدول معرفت احكام طالع سال عالم بطريق
الاجمال

17.

T. 3. 17.

Almanack for A.H. 1066.

E. J. W. G.

Beg.: جدول احكام كلية طالع سال منارات على سبيل الاجمال

18.

T. 5. 11.

A medical work, apparently without title (although يادگار ابن شريف is written on the flyleaf), by Sheref ud-Dín ibn 'Alí el-Mutatayyib مستطيب, who was in charge of the hospital at Amasiya when Prince Báyezíd (afterwards Sultan Báyezíd II) was governor there. This is a translation of a work written for Khwárazm Sháh خوارزم شاه. Copied by Mustafa ibn Shír Merd, and dated 3rd Muharram, 961. E. J. W. G.

Beg.: حمد بى حد و ثناء بى عد اول خالق

Cf. Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 124a.

19.

T. 8. 15.

Qaws-Náme قوس نامه, a treatise on Archery. There are many lacunæ in this volume, and some of the pages have been bound out of their place. The Qaws-Náme is followed by some prayers. E. J. W. G.

Beg.: بسم الله . . . الحمد لله رب العالمين هزاران

هزاران بار ممت

20.

T. 8. 3.

Turkish-French Vocabulary. No author's name or date.

E. J. W. G.

21.

T. 6. 4.

Lughat-i Ni'met-ulláh, a well-known Persian-Turkish Dictionary by Ni'met-ulláh. No date. E. J. W. G.

حمد بی قیاس و شکر با سپاس ان مالک بی همتارا :

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 142b.

22.

T. 7. 10.

Turkish commentary on the Pend-Name *پند نامه* of the Persian poet 'Attár *عطار* by Shem'í. Dated 1030. E. J. W. G.

The name of the commentary is *سعادت نامه*.

Beg. : شکر و سپاس بی قیاس شول قادر قیومه :

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 154b.

23.

T. 6. 5.

Díwán-i Nejátí, the poems of Nejátí (flourished in the 15th century).

E. J. W. G.

The Preface to the Divan begins :

كلكنز اوللم كه و بىكاه

ذاكر لا اله الا الله

The Divan begins :

شوسوز كيم اوله مثال كلام اهل كمال

سلاستنده خجل اوله سلسبيل زلال

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 171a.

24.

V. 8. 22.

Genjine-i Ráz *گنجینه راز*, poem by Yahya Bey *یحیی بک*.
Dated 13th Jumádá-ul-Akhir, 991. E. J. W. G.

Beg. : جان و دلدن دیهلم بسم الله
اچلم سوزله سوز کنجنه راه

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 181*b*.

25.

V. 7. 15.

Leylá and Mejnún, poem by Fuzúlî فضولی, transcribed 28th
Muharram, 1084. E. J. W. G.

Heading : دیباچه کتاب لیلی مجنون مولانا فضولی علیه الرحمه
Beginning of Preface :

ای نشاء حسنی عشقه تاثیر قیلن
عشقیله بنای کونکلی تعمیر قیلن

Poem begins : الحمد لواهب المکارم
والشکر لصاحب المراحم

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 206*b*.

26.

T. 6. 8.

Sheref-ul-Insán شرف الانسان by Lámi'î لامعی (It is an
adaptation from the treatise on the Dispute between Man and the
Animals in the رسائل اخوان الصفا Undated. E. J. W. G.)

Beg. : بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
فاتحه كنج كلام قديم
هذا كتابنا ينطق عليكم بالحق

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 226*b*.

27.

T. 7. 15.

Ibret-Numá عبرت نما by Lámi'î لامعی, transcribed 29th
Sha'bán, 1121. E. J. W. G.

Beg. : حمد بی حد وثناء لا یوعد اول حکیم پر حکمت و علیم
پر موهبت

Vienna Cat., iii, p. 301*f*.

28.

T. 7. 19.

“The Golden and Open Door of Tongues—Turkish and Frankish,” a series of chapters on various subjects, with Latin translations of most.

E. J. W. G.

Beg. : اولكى باب مدخلة . سلام عليك قرائتى دوستم

29.

U. 7. 21.

A vocabulary explaining in Turkish certain Arabic and Persian words that occur in official documents. It is entitled :

مشكلات انشايات و برات وحكم شريف و دفتر

The vocabulary is followed by a table showing the numerals according to the notation called سيات siyâq. No author's name or date.

E. J. W. G.

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 252b.

30.

T. 6. 9.

A dictionary explaining in Ottoman Turkish the Jaghatay or Eastern Turkish words that occur in the works of Mîr 'Alî Shîr Newâyî . No title, author's name, or date.

E. J. W. G.

Beg. : يوز حمد انكا كيم وصفى دا دور ايل تيلي لال

كرچه تيل آرا اندين ايرور سوزكا مجال

This is the work called the Abushka.

Brit. Mus. Cat., p. 263a.

31.

V. 7. 16.

Dictionary of Jaghatay or Eastern Turkish explained in Ottoman Turkish. No author's name. Copied by Ahmed bin 'Abdallâh, 994.

E. J. W. G.

The same work as the last, but wanting the prologue.

Beg. : الحمد لله الالف المفتوحة آبوشقه

XXIII.

THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS OF VAN.

PART VII.

By PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE.

IN the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, October, 1894, I showed that the Kelishin inscription (No. lvi) was a bilingual, the Assyrian transcript of it having been discovered by M. de Morgan, and I was thereby enabled to confirm some of my interpretations of Vannic words and grammatical forms and to correct others. My conclusion was disputed by Drs. Belck, Lehmann, and Scheil, but the question has now been decided in my favour. Dr. Leopold Messerschmidt, together with Dr. Belck, has made a careful examination of a cast of M. de Morgan's squeeze in the light of the fresh materials obtained by Drs. Belck and Lehmann in their scientific mission to Armenia, and the result is to prove that the Vannic and Assyrian texts are close representatives one of the other. The revised texts have been published by Drs. Belck and Messerschmidt in *Anatole I* (1904), and Dr. Lehmann has written upon them in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, lvi, 4 (1904), pp. 825-829.

The revision has introduced so many corrections and new readings into the published copies as to necessitate a fresh transliteration and translation of the inscription. This, accordingly, I proceed to give.

ASSYRIAN TEXT.

- (1) [Ki-i ina pan] AN Khal-di-e ana ALU Mu-za-zir
 [When before] Khaldis to Muzazir
 [il-lik-u-ni]
 [had gone]
- (2) [Y Is-pu-u-]i-ni MAR Y AN RI-dur SAR rab-u
 [Ispu]inis son of Sar-duris, the great king,
 SAR [dannu SAR kissati]
 the [powerful] king, [the king of multitudes,]
- (3) [SAR MAT] Na-i-ri sa ALU Dhu-us-pa-an alu [û]
 [the king] of Nairi, of Dhuspan the city, [and]
- (4) [Y Me-]nu-a TUR Y Is-pu-u-i-ni mas-k[a-bi sa]
 [Me]nuas the son of Ispuinis, a rest-house [of]
- (5) [abni us-]dhu-bu ana AN Khal-di-e ina eli
 [stone they] made good; for Khaldis upon
 [sadi?]
 [the mountains?]
- (6) [a-ni-]i-nu nistak-an dup-pu ina pan mas-ka-[bi]
 we set up; a tablet before the rest-house
- (7) [Y Is-]pu-u-i-ni MAR Y AN RI-[dur]
 [Is]puinis son of Sar-[duris]
- (8) [na-si] til-li damqute bi-bu damqu na-si
 [has raised]; shields beautiful, a door beautiful he has raised;
- (9) . . [rab?]u-MES-ni sa eri na-si ummar eri
 great (?) . . . of bronze he has brought; a bowl of bronze
 na-si . . .
 he has brought; . . .
- (10) . . bi-bu ma-h-du-tu tu-ru istakan ina mas-
 . . doors numerous (and) strong he has set up in the
 ka-[bi]
 rest-house;
- (11) [babâni]-MES sa AN Khal-di-e i-nam-din ana
 [the gate]s of of Khaldis he gives to
 AN Khal-di-[e]
 Khaldis;

- (12) [a-na ni-ís]bu-ut TI-LA-su na-si MCXII
 [for the satis]faction of his life he has brought 1112
 GUD-MES
oxen,
- (13) [IXM]CXX (sic) LU-BIR-a-MES immeru-MES
 [9]120 sucklings (and) lambs
 pa-as-ru XMIICIVCX
yearlings (and) 12490
- (14) [LU-]BIR-GAL-MES e-qu-te ki-i ina pan AN
sheep sacred when before
 Khal-di-[e]
Khaldis
- (15) [ana] ALU Mu-za-zir allik-an-ni † Is-pu-i-ni MAR
 [to] Muzazir I had gone, (I)Ispuinis son
 † AN RI-[dur]
of Sar[duris]
- (16) [SAR rab-]u SAR dan-nu SAR kissâti
the [great king], the powerful king, the king of multitudes,
 SAR MAT Na-i-ri sa ALU Dhu-us-pa-[an alu]
the king of Nairi, of of Dhuspa [the city],
- (17) [ana pa ?-]ni-pa (?) -ni AN Khal-di-e an-ni-u . . .
 [for the] mercy-seat (?) of Khaldis this [chapel]
- (18) [ilâni ? û] an-na-te MA-KA-MES ina eli
 [of the gods? and] these . . . s upon
 GIR (?) . .
the pass (?)
- (19) [ina pa-]an babâni sa AN Khal-di-e tam-[sil]
 [bef]ore the gates of of Khaldis like
- (20) [an-]na-te ina ALU Mu-za-zir istu lib-bi babâni
those in Muzazir from within the gates
- (21) [sa] AN Khal-di-e bi-bu ki-i pa-as-ri ILI-u (?)
 [of] Khaldis a door like a yearling I lifted up.
- (22) [masmas ?]-si i-du-nu KA-MES ki-i ina pa-an
The augurs (?) uttered words, when before
 AN Khal-di-[e]
Khaldis

- (23) [ana] ALU Mu-za-zir il-lik-u-ni [a-khu-mes]
[to] Muzazir had gone [together]
- (24) [I] Is-pu-u-i-ni MAR I AN RI-[dur]
Ispuinis son of Sar-[duris]
- (25) [I] Me-nu-a TUR I Is-pu-u-[i-ni]
[and] Menuas son of Ispuinis;
- (26) [a-]na e-qu-te yu-sa-li-ku bi-bu sa AN
for consecration they set apart the doors of
Khal-[di-e]
Khaldis;
- (27) [iq-]bi-u ma-a sa bi-bu istu lib-bi babâ[ni]
[they] said thus: Whoever the door from within the gate[s]
- (28) [sa] AN Khal-di-e ILI-u [sa]
[of] Khaldis shall take away, [whoever]
- (29) [a-na] qi-li-li tsi-h-su iddin sum
[to] the frieze (?) of its frame (?) shall give the name
me-ni-me-ni
of another,
- (30) [u iq-]ta-pi ki-i ILI-u [bi-bu]
[and shall] assert that he has raised [the door];
- (31) [zik-ri-ya?] yu-pa-za-ar ina abni li-te-[e-su]
[my name?] shall hide, on the stone [his own] deeds
- (32) [i-nam-]di-nu sa ina lib-bi ali ALU Mu-za-zir
[shall] set; whoever within the city, the city of Muzazir,
- (33) [yu-se-]i-si-me ki-i bi-[bu]
shall cause to hear that the door
- (34) [ul-tu] lib-bi babâni sa AN Khal-di-[e]
[from] within the gates of Khaldis
- (35) [is-da-a?-]ni-is ILI-ni SUM-MU
[from the foundations(?)] he has erected, the gift
.
.
.
[of sacrifices to]
- (36) [AN Khal-]di-e MU-su ina eli ki-lu-di yu-[kin]
Khaldis as his own gift upon the altar shall [place];
- (37) [sa dup-pu] an-ni-tu i-da-h-ib u-[lu-u]
[whoever] this [tablet] shall appropriate or

- (38) [sa ina] lib-bi mas-ka-bi an-ni-[u]
 [what (is)] within this rest-house
- (39) [i-kha-ab-]bu-u-ni sa a-na me-ni-me-ni i-qa-[ab-bi]
 shall conceal; whoever to another shall say :
- (40) [an-na-]a tas-kin AN Khal-di-e AN [IM]
 [this] you have made; Khaldis, Teisbas
- (41) [AN UT] AN-MES-ni sa ALU Mu-za-[zir]
 [and the Sun-god], the gods of Muzazir
- (42) [niqê?-su] ina eli ki-ri(?) -e(?) la yu-[ki-nu]
 [his sacrifices] upon the altar(?) shall not set.

VANNIC TEXT.

- (1) [I-u] AN Al-di-ka-i [ALU Ar-di-ni-di]
 [When] before Khaldis [to the city of Ardinis]
- (2) [nu-na-li(?) † Is]-pu-u-i-ni-ni † AN RI-[du-ri-e-khe]
 [had gone Is]puinis son of Sar-[duris]
- (3) [erila taraie erila] MAT Su-ra-a-u-e erila
 [the powerful king, the king] of the world, the king
 MAT Bi-a-i-[na-u-e]
 of Biai[nas],
- (4) [a-lu-]ši ALU Dhu-us-pa-a ALU † Me-nu-[u-a-ni]
 [dwelling] in Dhuspas the city, (and) Menuas
- (5) [† Is-pu-]u-i-ni-khe ya-ra-ni ABNI-di is-[ti-i-tu]
 son of Ispuinis, a rest-house of stone they [marked out]
- (6) [AN Al-]di-e tar(?) -a-i nu-u-a-di
 [for Khal]dis the powerful(?) on the mountain(?)
 te-ru-[u-tu?]
 [they(?) set up ;
- (7) [duppa ya-ra-]ka-a-i † Is-pu-u-i-ni-[e-s]
 [a tablet] before [the rest-place] Ispuini[s]
- (8) [† AN RI-]dur-khi-ni-s na-khu-ni u-ri-is(?) . . .
 [son of Sar]-duris has taken; shields
- (9) [ga]-zu-li ni-ri-bi ga-zu-li na-khu-[ni-e]
 beautiful (and) a door beautiful [he has] taken

- (10) . . . -u-MES ERU na-khu-ni sa-ni
 . . . of bronze he has taken; .. a bowl
 ERU na-khu-ni du . .
 of bronze he has taken; . . .
- (11) [. . -]ni ni-[ri-]bi tar-a-a-e a-da-a (?) -ni (?)
 . . . doors strong (and) numerous
- (12) [te-]ru-ni AN Al-di-na BAB a-ru-ni AN Al-[di-e]
 he has set up; the gate of Khaldi's he gives to Khal[dis];
- (13) [e-u-]ri-i BAB ul-gu-si-a-ni e-[di-ni]
 [to the] lord of the gate [for the] sake of (his) life
- (14) [na-khu-]ni MCXII GUD-MES IXMXX
 he [has brought] 1112 oxen, 9020
 LU-BIR-li-[ni-MES]
 sucklings
- (15) [LU-]ARDU-MES e-gu-ru-khe XMIIMIVCXC
 (and) lambs yearlings, . (and) 12490
- (16) [LU-]BIR-GAL-MES at-qa-na-ni i-u
 sheep sacred. When
 AN Al-di-ka-[a-i]
 before Khaldi's
- (17) [ALU] Ar-di-ni-di nu-na-bi ¶ Is-pu-u-i-ni-ni
 to the city of Ardinis I went belonging to Ispuinis
- (18) [¶ AN RI-]du-ri-e-khe erila DAN-NU erila
 son of [Sar-]duris, the powerful king, the king
 MAT Su-ra-a-u-[e]
 of the world,
- (19) [erila MAT] Bi-a-i-na-u-e a-lu-ši
 [the king of] Biainas, dwelling in
 ALU Dhu-us-pa-a ALU
 Dhuspas the city,
- (20) [AN Al-]di-ni-ni us-gi-ni i-na-ni bur-ga-na-ni
 of Khaldi's for the mercy-seat (?) this chapel
- (21) i-na-ni-i us-la-a-ni zu-u-si-ni-li
 (and) these . . . belonging to the temple,
- (22) [a ?-]ri-e-di AN Al-di-na BAB te-ra-a-i-ni-li (?)
 in the pass (?) the Khaldi's-gate having been set up

- (23) . . . -i ALU Ar-di-ni AN Al-di-na-ni [BAB-MES]
[like] of Ardinis the Khaldis [gates],
- (24) [ni-]ri-bi e-gu-ru-khu kha-i-ni kha-u-[bi]
the door with a yearling's taking [I] took.
- (25) [MAS? a-]li i-u i-u AN Khal-di-ka-[a-i]
[The augur? sp]oke thus, when before Khaldis
- (26) [ALU Ar-]di-ni-di nu-na-a-li ¶ Is-pu-u-i-[ni]
to [Ar]dinis had gone Ispuinis
- (27) [¶ AN RI-]dur-e-khe ¶ Me-nu-a ¶ Is-pu-u-i-ni-[e-khe]
son of [Sar-]duris (and) Menuas [son] of Ispuinis;
- (28) . . -di-tu AN Khal-di-e ni-ri-bi ti-ya-i-tu
they [consecrated] of Khaldis the door; they said:
a-[lu-s]
Who[ever]
- (29) ni-ri-be AN Khal-di-na-ni BAB kha-u-li-i-e
the door of the Khaldis gate shall take,
[the frieze]
- (30) . . -li-ni a-lu-s a-i-ni-e i-u-li
[of its frame] whoever for another shall claim (saying):
[i-ni-li?]
[This?]
- (31) [AN Khal-]di-is e-ya-me du-li-e [a-lu-s]
[Khal]dis to himself gives; [whoever]
- (32) . . . -li-i-ni a-lu-si i-na-a-ni . . .
dwelling in the city
- (33) . . . -ta-ni ALU Ar-di-ni ALU kha-su-li-[i-e]
the city of Ardinis shall cause to hear
- (34) [ni-ri-bi] AN Khal-di-ni BAB a-i-se-e-i
(that) [the door] of the gate of Khaldis to the foundations
kha-[u-li]
he has taken;
- (35) [a-lu-s] du-li-e me ku-u-i AN Khal-[di-e]
[whoever] shall assign to his own account Khaldis's
- (36) [zi-il-]bi qi-u-ra-a-e-di ku-lu-di-i-[e]
[sacrifice]s on the platform of the altar;

- (37) [a-lu-]s DUP-TE-i-ni su-u-i-du-li-i-e . . .
 [whoev]er the tablet shall appropriate; [what is]
- (38) . . . -ni a-lu-s ip-khu-li-i-e a-lu-s
 [in this rest-place] whoever shall conceal; whoever
 a-[i-ni-e]
 to a[nother]
- (39) [i-ni-]li du-li-i-e ti-i-u-li-i-e u-[li-e]
 [it] shall assign(and) shall pretend(it belongs) to an[other]
- (40) [tu-u-]ri-i AN Khal-di-is AN IM-s AN UT-s
 [per]son; Khaldis, Teisbas (and) Ardinis,
 AN-MES-s
 the gods
- (41) [ALU] Ar-di-ni-ni na MU zi-il-bi qi-ra-e-di
 of Ardinis shall not grant sacrifices on the platform
 ku-lu-di-[e]
 of the altar.

ASSYRIAN TEXT.

- (4) The final syllable of *maskabi* is preserved in l. 38. The root is שֹׁכֵב. A rest-house on the pass seems to be meant, similar to the posting inns established by the Egyptian king Thothmes III in the Lebanon.
- (5) The Vannic equivalent of . -*dhu-bu* signifies 'to delimitate'; perhaps [su-]*dhu-bu* would be the better reading here.
- (8) *Til-lu* sometimes has the determinative of 'leather' before it. In a letter quoted by Delitzsch horses are also described with *tilli* of silver. The word was used ideographically in Vannic (Sayce, lviii, 5, where we should read LU AN *Khaldinaue* BAB LU AN *Khaldinaue* TIL-LI-MES, 'a sheep for the Khaldis gate, a sheep for the Khaldis shields'). We know from Sargon's picture of the temple of Khaldis at Muzazir that shields were hung up on either side of the entrance to a Vannic sanctuary, and some of

the sacred bronze shields dedicated by Rúsas to the temple at Toprak Kaleh are now in the British Museum.

- (8, 9) *Nasu*, with its ideograph **ILI**, means 'to lift,' 'remove,' 'take,' 'bring,' 'dedicate.' The Vannic equivalents are *nakhu* and *khau*, which in the historical inscriptions are used in the sense of 'bringing away' and 'conquering,' i.e. 'taking.' Cf. the double sense of the English 'lift.'
- (10) The *bibu* was 'the small door' or 'wicket' in the larger gate, such as is still usual in the East and in the Oxford and Cambridge colleges. *Biba* in the Tel el-Amarna tablets is not a mistake as I supposed in 1894.
- (13) *Pasru* signifies 'scattered grain' (Sum. *se-burra*) and comes from *pasâru*, 'to loosen.' Hence *immeru pasru* will be a lamb that is no longer a suckling and can run loose.
- (14) Since the Vannic equivalent of *eguté* is *atqana-ni*, which has the same origin as *atqana-duni*, 'he consecrated,' and *atqanê-si*, 'priests,' the Assyrian word must signify 'sacred' or 'consecrated.'
- (17) I would identify *panipani* with *pa-an-pa-an* (= *parakku*, 'mercy-seat,' W.A.I., ii, 35. 15). Cf. *meni-meni*, l. 39 below.
- (18) **MA-KA-MES** is composed of the two ideographs **MA**, 'dwelling,' and **KA**, 'word,' so it might mean 'prayer-chambers.' **GIR** is *padânu* and *urkhu*, 'a road.'
- (19) Messerschmidt and Belck give *mat* instead of *tam*, which is the more probable reading.
- (21) What is meant by the final words of this line I fail to see. *Nasû* cannot signify 'to dedicate,' since the Vannic equivalent is *khau*. See note on the Vannic version.
- (22) The traces of the first character in the line seem to be those of *mas-mas*. *Idunu* is for the usual *idduni* from *nadû*.

- (26) As *equté* is literally 'sacred things,' *bibu* is probably intended to be plural.
Yusaliku is for *yustaliqu*. *Salâqu* is literally 'to cut off.'
- (29) *Qilili* is the *kilili* of Nebuchadrezzar, which Delitzsch renders 'band' or 'frieze.' The word signifies a border running round the outside of a building.
Tsih corresponds with the Heb. תִּיחַ, 2 Kings xxiii, 17; Ezek. xxxix, 15.
- (30) *Iqtapi* for *iqtabi*.
- (33) *Yuseisime* for *yusesime*.
- (36) *Kiludi*, 'altar,' is either borrowed from the Vannic *kuludi* (elsewhere written *quldi*), or *kuludi* is borrowed from it. For the interpretation of the line see note on the Vannic text.
- (37) I made *idahib* 'he destroyed'; Professor Lehmann would translate it 'he carried away'; but the Vannic equivalent shows that the word really means 'to appropriate,' 'capture.'
- (39) *Meni-meni*, usually written *memmeni*, is the fuller form, like *pani-pani*, l. 17 above.
- (40) *Taskin* ought to be *taskun*. The text is throughout in the Assyrian of a foreigner.
- (42) *Kiru* is 'garden' in Assyrian; what is needed here is a word signifying 'altar.' We should probably read *ki-lu-di*.

VANNIC TEXT.

By the help of the Assyrian transcript I have already, in 1894, indicated the significations of the Vannic *iu*, *nuna-li*, *gazuli*, and the grammatical suffix *-kai*, and in 1901 (J.R.A.S., p. 655) I have pointed out that *niribi*, 'entrance,' 'door,' is a loan-word from Assyrian.

The sense of the passage is: When Ispuinis and Menuas were on the march to Muzazir, they built a rest-house for travellers on the summit of the Kelishin pass, erecting a stela in front of it. On

a subsequent occasion, when Ispuinis alone was campaigning in the district, he consecrated the rest-house, hanging shields on the walls, dragging doors up from the valley, and furnishing the shrine with a bronze bowl. Perhaps *nuna-li* in line 2 should be *nuna-tu*.

- (3) *Suras*, 'the world, is derived, not from *su*, 'to make,' but from *su*, 'many,' 'much,' which we have in *ebani-di suyai-di*, 'in many lands' (Sayce, lxxiii, 10), and *su-khe*, which signifies 'many,' not 'artificial.' *Suras* thus corresponds exactly with the Assyrian *kissati*.¹
- (4) *Alu-si* is here and in l. 19 the equivalent of the Assyrian *sa*, 'of'; in l. 32 of *ina libbi*, 'within.' It means 'a citizen,' and is, I believe, a derivative in *-si* from the borrowed Assyrian *alu*.
- (5) Professor Lehmann has shown that besides the pronominal *isti-ni*, *isti-di*, there was a verb *isti* signifying 'to mark out,' 'delimitate.' It appears to have been an abbreviated form of *aisti*, which is found in the inscription of Sigdeh (Lehmann, Z.D.M.G., lviii, p. 818).

Dr. Belck has given a list of examples of a 3rd person plural termination of the verb in *-tu*, which he and Professor Lehmann have discovered in the inscriptions. This explains the variant *te-ir-tu*, i.e. *ter-tu*, for *teru-ni* in Sayce, v, 34, 'they set up,' the nominative being

¹ *Su-i-ni* in lxxix, 16, is the 3rd pers. of the verb *su*, 'to make,' and has nothing to do with *su*, 'many.' In this passage the squeeze shows that the word following the determinative of 'bronze' is really *du-di-e*, which must therefore be the Vannic name of that metal. The word preceding the determinative is *di-ri*, the derivative of which, *diri-nis*, denotes a class of workmen ('smiths'?) in the Toprak Kaleh tablet (l. 8). The whole passage, consequently, may be: D.P. TUR-MES-*ni-s a-lu-[s ?]* *u-ru-li-ni su-i-ni* D.P. TUR-*se [i ?]-bi-ra di-ri ERU du-di-e te-ra-gi*, 'some of the citizens (?) have made the seed-plot for the citizens with picks of copper, iron, (and) bronze.' In this case *diri* will be 'iron.' I think that *teragi* signifies 'with picks' or 'chisels.' In l. 31 the sense may be 'making a way for the water with picks.' The passage translated above might conceivably be rendered: 'Who of posterity will make a (similar) seed-plot for posterity,' etc., but the use of the ideographic 'sons' in l. 11 of the inscription seems to oblige us to refer the expression to 'the sons of Tosp.'

'Ispuinis and Menuas.' It is possible that we have another instance of the termination in *khai-tû*, xxxii, 4, 'the soldiers having collected [their arms?] overmastered (?) the city of Surisilis.'

- (8) Since *nakhu* in the historical inscriptions means 'to take,' the verb here probably refers to carrying the stela up from the valley.

Initial *kh* is dropped in this inscription (in *Khaldis* and *khatqanani*); it is therefore possible that *uris* . . . 'shields,' is the *khuris* . . . of Sayce, lxxix, 22.

- (12) The bilingual shows that *aru* signifies 'to give,' not 'to bring.'

- (13) The signification of *ulgusiani* has at last been cleared up by this bilingual as well as by the bilingual inscription of Topzawa. Hence in Sayce, lxxx, 4-7, we should translate: *ma-ni-ni AN Khaldi-ni bêdi-ni Menua Ispuine-khi-nê Inuspûa Menua-khi-nê ulgus pîtsûs alûisê*, 'from all their Khaldis-gods to Menuas, son of I., and Inuspûas, son of M., life, joy, strength!' *Alûisê* is plural, and the meaning of *pîtsus* is given in the Topzawa bilingual.

- (14) It is difficult to believe that the animals were driven up to the summit of the pass. It is more probable that they were given to the mother sanctuary in Muzazir. *Aldina BAB* is literally 'gate of the land of Khaldis,' and consequently must be a term metaphorically applied to the pass itself.

- (17) The form *Ispuini-ni* explains the forms in *-ni* after the 1st person of the verb in the historical inscriptions. While the nominative in *-s* preceded the verb, it was changed into the objective case in *-ni* (probably pronounced *-n*) when it followed the verb.

- (20, 21) *Usgi-ni* corresponds with *panipani*, and *uslâ-ni* with *MA-KA-MES*. *Inani* here is evidently the equivalent of *anniu* and *annâtê*, and is a lengthened form of the demonstrative *ini*, and therefore unconnected with *inani*, 'city,' which we find in l. 32. Apparently the difference between the two was that in the pronoun

the second syllable was short, in the word for 'city' it was long. There is no longer any difficulty, accordingly, in the translation of the formula in the historical inscriptions of Argistis: *Khaldia istiné inani-li arniusini-li sušini salé zadubi*, 'for the people of Khaldis that is here these achievements in one year I performed.'

Zūsini-li, the translation of which is given in the bilingual inscription of Topzawa, is the *šusi* of Sayce, lviii, 2. Perhaps the Vannic word for 'god' was *zu*, *zu-si* or *šu-si* signifying 'divine.' The word is found in lxxix, 23, where the reading is: [*i-*]*ši-i zu-u-se*, 'with the gods' (?).

- (24) All the sense I can extract out of this line is that the king took the door and carried it up the mountain as easily as he would have carried a lamb. *Khai-ni*, however, may not be from *khau*, 'to take,' 'carry captive,' but be connected with *khai-tû*, xxxii, 4, for which see note on line 5 above.
- (26, 27) We should notice that the objective case of *Ispuinis* and *Menuas* is not used here; hence it is probable that in line 1 *nuna-tu* should be read; see note on line 17.
- (28) *Ti-yai*, lengthened form of *ti*, as *su-yai* is of *su* in lxiii, 10.
- (29) The meaning of *ainei* is settled by the Assyrian *meni-meni*. *Ti* has probably been omitted by the engraver before *iu-li*.
- (31) In *eya-me*, *me* is the dative of the 3rd pers. pron., and *eya* is the *ea-i*, 'whether—or,' of lxxxvi, 40, 41; hence the word seems to signify 'to himself.'
- (34) An inscription discovered by Professor Lehmann (Z.D.M.G., lviii, p. 841) makes it clear that *aisei* must mean 'foundations.' Here we have *i-nu-ki-e* E-GAL-*a e-ha* ALU-MES *a-li-li i-nu-ki-e* . . . *i-nu-ki-e* E-GAL *a-bi-li-du-u-bi-e me-i a-i-se-e-i*, 'utterly the palaces as well as all the cities, utterly the . . . , utterly the palace I burned to its foundations.'

(35, 36) In the Topzawa bilingual (l. 30) *ziel-dubi* must signify either 'I prayed' or 'I sacrificed.' The Assyrian equivalent is [*l*]u^sik, that is, *lu-išik* or *lu-ešik*, from the root of which comes *nišakku*, 'a sacrifice' (see Delitzsch), and perhaps also *ušukku*, 'sanctuary.' From *ziel*, by means of the locative suffix, is formed *ziel-di*, which we have in Sayce, lix, 11, [*Khal*]di-ni-ni *ziel-die* D.P. *tisnu*, 'flesh for the sacrificial altar of the Khaldises,' as well as in *barzani zieldi*, 'a chapel-altar.' In *zil-bi*, *bi* is the plural suffix, so that the word signifies 'sacrifices.' The object 'upon' which sacrifices are placed must be an altar. This fixes the meaning of *kiludi* and *kuludē*. Elsewhere where the phrase occurs *kuludi* is written *gul-di*; *qūra gul-di* (Sayce, lix, 6), *qūra-ni gul-di-ni* (lxxvii, 6). *Quldi* is found alone in lxxix, 6, *quldi[-ni]* [*i*]nu D.P. *Biaina-se palla eha AN-MES-se gūni sulimanu*, 'the area of an altar, for a . . . to the Biainians and for (daily) sacrifices to the gods'; lxxix, 14, *gūni quldi-[di?]* *sulimanu*, 'sacrifices on the altar.' *Qūra-ni* also occurs alone (lxxxvi, 7), and in lxxxvi, 46, we have *mei zil-bi qūrai-di*, 'his sacrifices on the (altar-)platform.' I render *qūra* by 'platform,' since it corresponds with the Assyrian *eli*, 'upon,' and must therefore be either part of the altar or the ground on which the altar stood. It cannot be the first as it is used alone, and it will therefore be the *kisallu* or 'altar-platform' of the Assyrians, as opposed to the *kigallu* or 'temple-platform.' *Qiu-ra* is a derivative in *-ra* (like *su-ras*) from the preposition *qiu* (lx, 5, *tsūnē-li meie-li qiu*, which I would now translate 'on the bank of a canal').

Kui is found in the compound *ku-su-ni*, 'he caused to be built' or 'erected' (lxv, 6).

- (41) *Na* would therefore appear to be the Vannic negative. 'Prayers' instead of 'sacrifices' would seem more natural here, at least to the modern mind.

In 1894 I pointed out that Ardinis, 'the city of the Sun-god,' is the Vannic name of the city which was called Muza-zir, 'the place whence the serpent issues,' by the Assyrians. The inscription fixes the position of the city, now Shkenna near the Topzawa-Chai.

THE BILINGUAL INSCRIPTION OF TOPZAWA.

This was discovered by Dr. Belck and Professor Leh_____, and copied and re-copied by them in 1899. It is engraved on a stela near Sidikan. Professor Lehmann has published ll. 9-28 of the Assyrian text and ll. 9-32 of the Vannic text in the *Zeitschrift d. Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, lviii, pp. 834-5. Of this I offer the following translation:—

ASSYRIAN TEXT.

- (9) . . . -e-qi (?) lu u ta (?) . . . an a yu-bi-lu-u-ni
. they had brought ;
- (10) te-ir-du [tsab-]MES ana [ALU] Mu-za-[zir] . . .
marched the troops to the city of Musazir . . .
- (11) † Ur-za-na SAR pukh-ru ina bit-ili ina
Ur-za-na king of multitudes into the temple into
pani-ya e-li-[ma]
my presence came, [and]
- (12) [a-]di MAT As-sur tsab-MES AN Khal-di-a
[as] far as Assyria the soldiers Khaldi
bil IK-MES su-til LU-t[u]
the lord of existences (?) caused to ascend ; they took
- (13) [kurun-]ni-MES ina lib-[bi-]su DU-[ku]
the wine there. Had gone
† Ur-za-na-a zu-qu-ti
Urzana (and) the infantry
- (14) e-mu-qi † Ur-za-na-a ana se-qi ka-ya-na-a
the forces of Urzana to render homage
- (15) i-na bi-it AN Khal-di-a ana-ku † Ru-ša-se
in the temple of Khaldi. I Rušas

- (16) a-di sa-di-e MAT As-sur-KI . . . a-ta-la-ka
as far as the mountains of Assyria . . . marched.
- (17) [di-]ik-tam [KAK] † Ur-za-na-a ina qa-ti LU
 [A sla]ughter [I made]. Urzana by the hand I took ;
- (18) [al-]ti-h-su ina mas-ka-ni û ana
 [I] took charge of him in (his) place and to
 sarru-ti astak-an
 the sovereignty raised (him).
- (19) [XV] yû-me-MES ina lib-bi ALU Mu-za-zir
 [15] days within Muzazir
 a-tu-[sub]
 I remained ;
- (20) niqê-MES pa-ni tap-pu-tu ALU Mu-za-zir
 sacrifices before the community of Muzazir
 a-ti-di-[in]
 I offered ;
- (21) [ana] D.P. nisi-MES ina libbi ALU Mu-za-zir
 [to] the men within Muzazir
 a-di [tsab-MES ? aq-bi]
 together with [the soldiers ? I proclaimed]
- (22) [ba-]a-na ina yu-me a-na nap-tan e-ru-bu
 a festival ; daily to the feast they went.
 ana-ku † Ru-[ša-se]
 I Rušas
- (23) [ina] pani sa AN Khal-di-a D.P. rêu
 [in] the sight of Khaldi a shepherd
 ki-e-nu [sa nisi-MES]
 faithful [of mankind]
- (24) ana-ku AN Khal-di-a bit qa-as-ši-pu
 (am) I ; may Khaldi, the temple making holy,
 lut-ma-a-[an-ni]
 decree [to me]
- (25) [tu-]qu-un-tu AN Khal-di-a li-tu da-[na-nu]
 victory ; may Khaldi strength po[wer]

- (26) [mil-]ka-tu liddin-na ina lib-bi sanati-ya
 (and) [king]ship give. In the midst of my years
 [ana] MAT Urdhu ir-ti-[di]
 [to] Ararat I marched,
- (27) [lu-]u-si-ik ilani liddin-nu-ni yume sa
 [then] I sacrificed. May the gods grant days of
 khiduti
 joy
- (28) [ana bit]-ili eli yûme sa kha-du-ti
 [to the tem]ple more than (former) days of rejoicing!

VANNIC TEXT.


- (9) ši (?) -e-i-si ALU Ar-di-ni-di kha-ba-la-a . . .
 . . . in Ardinis . . .
- (10) [AN Khal-]di-s ti-a-khi-i-e-s su-si-ni-e ša-li-[e]
 [Khal]dis . . -ing one year
- (11) . . . -a-se NISU-[MES]-s(e) ALU Ar-di-ni
 . . . (for ?) the men, of Ardinis
- (12) [u-]la-di te-ru-ni DU † Ur-za-na-s
 [in the] midst, set up. Came Urzanas
 BIT-PARA-[di]
 [into] the shrine
- (13) [ka-]u-ki ma-a NISU TSAB GIS-BAN
 [be]fore me; the archer(s)
 MAT AS-SUR-ni-e-di AN Khal-di-s
 in Assyria Khaldis .
- (14) . . . -me (?) -e a-ru-ni a-sa-di KURUN-tsi
 to my (?) . . . gave; there wine
 za-du-u-[ni]
 [they] were making.
- (15) [us-]ta-di MAT AS-SUR-ni-e-di AMIL a-si-MES
 On (my) march to Assyria the infantry,
 a-li-e
 who

- (16) za (?) sag (?) ru a ri [na-]ku-ri gu-nu-si-ni-[ni]
[did not render] the homage of servants
- (17) [AN Khal-]di-ni-ni zu-u-si-i-ni u-la-a-di-[e]
of the [Khal]dians' temple in the midst
- (18) [ku-]ri-e-da za-as-gu-u-bi † Ur-za-na-ni
(and) tribute, I slew. Urzanas
- (19) [pa-ri] ALU Ar-di-ni-i pa-ru-u-bi a-u-du-i-[e?]
[out of] Ardinis I took with the hand.
- (20) [ma-ni] ha-al-du-bi te-ru-u-bi ma-ni-ni e-si-[ni]
[Him] I brought back; I set up his rule
- (21) [i?-]na (?)-ni XV YŪ-ME ALU Ar-di-ni
over the city (?); 15 days of Ardinis
 ma-nu-di a-li-e
in the community sacrifice
- (22) [i-u] za-du-u-bi KAL ALU Ar-di-ni-e
[when] I had performed the whole to Ardinis
 a-ru-u-[bi]
I gave;
- (23) [ALU Ar-di-ni-e-]di-e YŪ-ME su-i-ni-ni a-si-khi-ni
in [Ardinis] many days a feast
 as-du-[bi]
[I] celebrated
- (24) . . . AMIL-[se]-e is-te-di † Ru-sa-ni
[for] the men in that place belonging to Rušas.
 AN Khal-di-e-[i]
of the Khaldian
- (25) [MAT-]na AMIL si-e mu-tsi AMIL UN-MES-u-e
land the shepherd faithful of mankind.
 AN Khal-di-[e]
To Khaldis
- (26) [zu-]u-si-ni a-se-e gu-nu-s(e) u-i gu-nu-u-[sa]
for the temple house conquest and pow[er]
- (27) . . . -[di?]-ra-si ya-bi a-ru-me-e AN Khal-di-i-s.
. . . I prayed: may Khaldis give
- (28) [a-]se-e ar-di-s(e) pi-tsu-u-s(e) su-si-na MU me- . .
to the house gifts of joy. One year af[ter]

- (29) [MU]-e i-ni-li nu-ul-du-u-li MAT Lu-lu-i-ni-[di]
that [year] on returning [to] Lulus
- (30) zi-el-du-bi ar-tu-me AN-MES-s pi-tsu-u-[se]
I sacrificed: may the gods give joy
- (31) [a-]si-li YŪ-ME-MES-di pi-tsu-si-ni e-ti-bi
to the house among days of joy more than
 is-tu-[bi-ni]
the preceding
- (32) [ha ?]-a-li e-di-ni sal-mat-khi-ni kha-ra-ni
for the sake of the sacrifices (?). The frontier road (?)
 te-ra-gi
with picks (?).

ASSYRIAN TEXT.

The two versions do not agree so closely together as in the case of the Kelishin inscription, and their author had less knowledge of Assyrian than the earlier scribe.

- (10) *Terdu* would signify 'they marched down' if it is Assyrian. But in view of the Vannic text it is very possibly the Vannic *ter-tu*, 'they set up,' which is found in Sayce, v, 34, where the variant text has *teru-ni*.
- (12) *Su-til* is a more probable transliteration than *su-ziz*, 'settled.' The last character but one in the line in Professor Lehmann's copy looks more like *ku* than *lu*, but *ku* would give no sense. As the ideograph in the next line denotes 'vines' (*karani*) as well as 'wine,' we should expect a verb like 'they planted.'
- (17) The soldiers were slain who, instead of rendering homage with Urzana and their comrades, had fled to Assyria, and there, apparently, were massacred while drunk with wine.
- (19) According to Professor Lehmann the inscription has the character *suk*, which he thinks may be used for *sub*: it is more probably either an engraver's error or a mistake in the reading for .

- (22) Similarly we find *yuma banâ* for 'holiday' in the Tel el-Amarna tablets.
- (24) *Qassîpu* for *kasîpu* from *kašapu*, which has nothing to do with 'a funeral feast.' In the Gilgames Epic *ikšupu kušapa* is 'they made holiday,' i.e. rested.

VANNIC TEXT.

- (12) The signification of *ula-di* is given by its Assyrian equivalent in line 17.
- (13) For *ka(i)uki* see J.R.A.S., October, 1894, p. 703. That *mâ* is the oblique case of *ies*, 'I,' is new. The oblique case of the possessive is found in a tablet discovered by the German excavators at Toprak Kaleh and published by Professor Lehmann, which begins: *akuki-mu*, 'to my lord.'¹ The Vannic equivalent of *Assur*, 'Assyria,' must have ended in *-n*.
- (14) The root of *asa-di* is probably the same as that of *asi-s*, 'house.' The Vannic word for wine was *metši*: see J.R.A.S., xx, p. 9.
- (15) *Asi* turns out to mean 'infantry,' not 'cavalry,' as I had rendered it. Hence *sur-khani* in xxxix, 49, will be 'cavalry,' and its synonym *sisu-khani* must be compounded with the Ass. *sisu*, 'horse.' *Alê* must signify 'who' here, and so have the same origin as *alus*.

¹ According to Professor Lehmann's copy the first paragraph is—(1) *a-ku-ki-mu* † *Ru-ša-a-u* † *Ar-gis-te-khi* (2) † *Sa-ga-as* † *Târ-a-nis* † *Is-qu-gu-ul-khi-e* (3) *u-la-qu* MAT *Ma-na-i-di* † *A-ta-h-a* (4) *e-ši-i-a* MAT SARRI-ni AN *Khal-di-ni a-su-me* (5) † *Ru-ša-a-khi-na* MAT *Qi-el-ba-ni-ta* (?) (6) BIT-PARA-ni IB-NI; i.e., 'To my lord Rušas son of Argistis (says) Sagas of Taras (elsewhere called Tarius); from the midst of Isqigulus in the land of the Minni for the royal land of Khaldis I have sent the men of the place of Atahas: in Qielbanis in the province of Rušas one is building a sanctuary.' *Asu-me* seems to represent the ordinary 1st person of the verb rather than the precativè, and in *Ruša-u* the final vowel must be *û*. So *ula-qu* for *ula-ki*. A list of the workmen follows; the second in the list are the *di-ri-ni-e-i* from *di-ri*, which we find in Sayce, lxxix, 17.

(16) *Ari* may be 'gift.' Perhaps instead of *za* we should read *na*.

(18) The signification of *zasgubi* is settled by this passage. For the preceding word cf. *kure-da*, 'tributes,' xxx, 14.

(20) *Mani-ni* is formed by the relational suffix *-ni* from *mani*, and hence is not a plural.

I have been converted by Prof. Lehmann's arguments to his view that *ési* means 'place.' In this passage, therefore, a more literal translation would be 'post.'

(21) The difficult word *manu* is at last explained. It must mean 'in common,' 'all together.' Hence *atsus manus* (v, 2) is 'all the months together'; *sulê-manu* (lxxix, 8, 15; lxxxvi, 7) is 'in common to many,' i.e. 'public'; *ali-manu*, 'common to all.' In lxxxvi, 8, *giei manu-ri*, or 'public temple,' is opposed to *gi sidagu-ri* in lxxvii, 7, which will therefore signify 'a separate' or 'private chapel.'

Aliê must be the *halie*, 'sacrifices,' of Sayce, v.

(23) For *sui-ni-ni* see note on lvi, 3, above.

Asikhi-ni has the same root as *askhu-me*, 'may she banquet,' Sayce, xxiv, 6; *askhu-li-ni*, xix, 12; *askhas* and *askhas-tes*, x, 2, 5 (to which I assigned the signification of 'food' in my first memoir).

Since *d* becomes *t* after *s*, *asta* in Sayce, lxviii, 6, 10, 11, may be the noun corresponding to *asdu-bi*.

(25) In *eba-na šie mutsi* the last two words are new.

(26) The Assyrian text shows that my original translation of *gunuse* and *gunusa* was nearer the truth than Dr. Scheil's correction of it.

(27) In *ya-bi* we probably have the root of *ya-ra-ni*, 'a rest-house': cf. also *ti-yai-tu*, 'they said.'

The Assyrian text shows that I was right in the explanation I put forward of the verbal suffix *-mê* in my first memoir.

(28) It is unfortunate that the character which followed *me* is lost. Like other prepositions it would have terminated in *-u*, and may have been *su*; cf. *mesu-li*, 'on the left hand (?),' v, 30.

- (29) *Nuldu*, 'to descend,' 'return,' is probably a compound of *du*; cf. *nula-li*, lxviii, 6, 10, 11.
- (30) 'I prayed' would seem a more natural signification of *zieldu-bi* here than 'I sacrificed.'
- Ar-tu-me* is the 3rd pers. pl. of *aru* with the precativ suffix *me*.
- (31) *Etibi* is clearly related to *atibi*, 'myriads.'
- (32) For *teragi* see xxxvii, 2; lxxix, 17, 31.

LXXXVII.

Two years ago Dr. Rendell Harris sent me a photograph of an inscription which had been dug up in the courtyard of a house near the church of Haykavank at Van, and had long been used as a pavement stone with its face downwards. Professor Lehmann has since published it in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, lviii, pp. 815-23, but as he has not attempted to give a translation of it I reproduce it here with the provisional number lxxxvii in continuation of my previous notation.

- (1) [Y Ar-gis-ti-]s
[*Argisti*]s
- (2) Y Ru-sa-khi-ni-s
son of Ruśas
- (3) [GIS-]KAK ti-ma ku-lu-[ni?]
a building has defined(?) for a sanctuary,
- (4) i-nu-ka-a-ni
the area
- (5) e-si-ni-ni
of the place (extending to)
- (6) Y Gi-lu-ra-a-ni-e
before Gilura's
- (7) GIS-TIR-ni-ka-i
garden
- (8) pa-ri Y Is-pi-li-ni
from that of Ispilis

- (9) 𐎶 Ba-tu-khi-ni-ni
the son of Batus
 (10) GIS-NU-KHIR-ni-di
the gardener
 (11) IXCL 𐎶 U
 950 *cubits.*

- (1) Professor Lehmann is doubtless right in restoring the name of [Argistis].
 (3) GIS-KAK was *kamnis*, pl. *kamna*, in Vannic.
Ti-ma must be a verb here. I suppose the root to be *ti* with suffix *-ma*; cf. the precative *-me*.
 (4) *Inu* is 'extent,' 'length'; *inu-ka*, 'before-the-length,' 'area'; *inu-ki*, 'to its full extent,' 'in its entirety.'
 (10) The order of the ideographs ought to be NU-GIS-KHIP

LXXXVIII.

I also received from Dr. Rendell Harris a copy of an inscription on the two sides of a stone built into the walls of the church of Surb Sargis at Melazgherd, which was found in 1903.

FACE A.

- (1) AN Khal-di-ni-ni
To the Khaldises
 (2) al-šu-si-ni 𐎶 Me-nu-a-ni
the great ones belonging to Menuas
 (3) 𐎶 Is-pu-u-i-ni-khi
son of Ispuinis
 (4) SAR DAN-NU SAR al-šu-ni
the powerful king, the great king

FACE B.

- (1) . . . [du-li-]i-e
 . . . shall [set],

- (2) a-lu-s a-i-ni-e
 whoever *to a second,*
 (3) a-lu-s u-li-[e]
 whoever *to another*

.

Face B is at the back of Face A.

LXXXIX.

I copied the following inscription, which was found at Berggri, in the Museum of Constantinople, where it is numbered 1112. It is, I believe, the same as Professor Lehmann's "MENUAS 32." The first line of the text is lost.

- (2) [Y Me-nu-u-a-s Y Is-pu-]u-i-ni-khi-ni-[s a-li]
 [Menuas] son of [Isp]uinis [says]:
 (3) [AN] Khal-di-ni-e ba-du-ši-e DUP-[TE-ni]
 Of Khaldis *a destroyed* *tablet*
 (4) [te-ru-]u-bi a-li ALU Ar-tsu-ni-u-i-[ni]
 I [set up]; *and* *of the city of Artsunius*
 (5) [DUP-]TE te-ru-u-bi a-li i-na-a-[ni-i]
 a [tab]let *I set up;* *and* *of the city*
 (6) [a-]lu-ši-i-na-a DUP-TE te-ru-u-bi
 inhabitants *a tablet* *I set up.*
 (7) [a-]lu-us ni tu-li-e a-lu-s pi-tu-li-e
 Whoever *them* *carries away,* *whoever* *obliterates,*
 (8) [a-]lu-s te-ir-du-li-e a-lu-s
 whoever *transplants (?),* *whoever*
 (9) u-li-e i-ni-li du-li-e AN Khal-di-s
 to another *it (them)* *assigns,* *Khaldis*
 (10) [AN IM-]s AN UT-s qi-is (?) -mu (?) -ši-a-s
 [Teisba]s (and) *Ardinis,* *the . . .*
 AN-MES-s
 gods,

- (11) [paʔ-]ru-[u-]ni-e-ni . ma-a-ni e-ha [me-i]
will remove (?) him as well as [his]
- (12) [zi-]li-bi-[i qi-i-]u-ra-a-ni e-di-ni-[e]
[sac]rifices for the [altar]-platform.

(5) 'The city' denotes Dhuspas or Van as opposed to the older capital Artsunius.

(7) The spelling *a-lu-us* is interesting, as it proves that I am right in holding that the suffix of the nominative was -s, not -se. The Vannic script was practically alphabetic, the vowels being written wherever there was room for them. Where they are not written, the presumption always is that they were not pronounced. As there is no certain example of a vowel being attached to the accusative suffix, I believe it was pronounced -n, not -ni.

Ni in this line must be an accusative of the 3rd personal pronoun. Perhaps it is the origin of the accusative suffix.

(8) *Teirdu* appears to be a compound of *ter(u)* and *du*, and is found in Sayce, xxi, 5, where it must be used in much the same sense as *teru*. See also lxviii, 7. Perhaps it means 'gives to be set up,' or better, 'to give away,' 'dispose of.'

(10) I was unable to make out the characters, or character, following *qi*.

(11, 12) The second -ni of the verb is difficult to explain. If the verb is *paru* it ought to be followed by *pari*, not *edini*, which in *ulgusiyani edini* signifies 'for the sake (of).' But since three characters seem to be lost after *bi*, we could, of course, read [pa-ri qi-], '[from] what is for the sake of the altar-platform.' I believe, however, that *giurani edini* should be construed with *zilibi*, 'sacrifices on account of the altar.'

XC.

I copied another inscription at Constantinople on a double step cut out of black basalt. Apparently it was a single block of a broad staircase; not only the commencement and end of the inscription are wanting, but also the beginnings and ends of the lines.

A (on the top step).

- (1) khi-ni-s a-li-i
son of . . . says :
- (2) ša e lu u a
. . . .
- (3) a-ru-li AN Khal-[di]
given (?) to Khal[dis]
- (4) IMVIICXXX (?)III
 173 (?)3
- (5) [ALU Dhu-]us-pa-a ALU u-la-[di]
[Dhu]spas the city within
- (6) ni u . . . ni ka (?) -i
before (?) . . .

B (on the side of the upper step and top of the lower step).

- (1) [Is-pu ?-]u-i-ni-e
of [Ispu]inis (?)
- (2) i-u-ni-ni
. . .
- (3) la (?) -la-a-ni
. . .
- (4) a-gu-u-bi
I brought
- (5) i (?) as (?) ALU Dhu-u-[us-pa-a]
. . . Dhu[spas]
- (6) a-se di-ru

C (on the side of the lower step).

(1) Is-pu-[u-i-ni-s]

Ispui[nis]

(2) u se

. . .

(3) ar su

. . .

(4) e-ri[-la ?]

king (?)

(5) ša a

. . .

(6) li-i

. . .

It is possible that we should substitute Ispuinikhinis, 'son of Ispuinis,' i.e. Menuas, for Ispuinis.

Pili, 'water.'

Professor Lehmann does not seem to have seen my last article on the Vannic inscriptions (J.R.A.S., October, 1901), as he still adheres to his old error of translating *pili* by 'canal.' But in lxxxvi, 17, 22, the word interchanges with the ideographic A-MES, 'water,' thus settling its meaning. Hence in the Artamid inscriptions *ini pili aguni* is simply 'this water he brought,' which explains the use with *pili* of the verb *agu*, 'to bring.'¹ As my attempt at the translation of lxxxvi needs correction in several points, and Professor Lehmann has made it probable that *umesi-ni* is borrowed from the Assyrian *umasu*, 'enclosure,' 'basin,' I here give again ll. 14-25:—

(14) pi-li	NAHR	Il-da-ru-ni-a-ni
<i>the water</i>	<i>of the river</i>	<i>Ildarunias</i>

¹ In Sayce, lxiv, 7, 8, 18, Sarduris prays for YUME-MES *gazuli pili šiprugi-ni*, 'prosperous days (and) pure (?) water.' *Pili*, 'water,' has, of course, no connection with *pi*, acc. *pi-ni*, 'name,' which we find e.g. in xxxiv, 13-15: *ha-al-du-bi ALU Lu-nu-u-ni-ni me-e-si-ni pi-i* D.P. *Me-nu-u-a-li-e a-tsi-li-ni*, 'I changed its name of Lununis to Town (?) of Menuas.'

- (15) a-gu-u-bi u-me-si-ni ti-ni
I brought; what 'the enclosure' was called
- (16) i-nu-ka-khi-ni-e ¶ Ru-ša-i-ni-e
the whole area as belonging to Rušas
- (17) khu-bi gi a-se pi-li
I took; for (or of) the temple-house with the water
 ni-ki-du-li
making libations,
- (18) LU-BIRU-TUR AN Khal-di-e
a lamb to Khaldis
- (19) ni-ip-si-du-li-ni LU AN Khal-di-e
of the north (?) (and) a sheep to Khaldis
- (20) SUM LU AN IM-a LU AN UT-ni-e
I sacrificed; a sheep to Teisbas, a sheep to Ardinis,
- (21) se-kha-di-e AN A-ni-qu-gi-e
a goat (?) to Aniqugis:
- (22) a-se A-MES e-si-a-tsi-u-li
for (or of) the temple with the water offering libations (?)
- (23) [LU]-BIRU-TUR AN Khal-di-e ni-ip-si-du-li
a lamb to Khaldis of the north (?)
- (24) LU AN Khal-di-e SUM LU AN IM-a
(and) a sheep to Khaldis I sacrificed; a sheep to Teisbas,
- (25) LU AN UT-ni-e se-kha-di AN A-ni-qu-gi
a sheep to Ardinis, a goat (?) to Aniqugis.

I pointed out that *niki-du-li* is compounded with the borrowed Assyrian *nigé*, 'libations,' *niki-du* being literally 'to make libations' (with the change of *q* to *k* cf. *quldi*, *kuludi*, *kiludé*). Now SUM not only means 'to sacrifice,' but also represents *naqú*, 'to offer libations,' and in lix, 8, we find SUM-*tsi*, which could be transcribed *esia-tsi*. From this *esiatsi-u-li* would be formed, as *tiu-li* from *ti*. Hence in *niki-du* and *esia-tsiu* we may see the imported and native terms for the same idea.

The Vannic language is related to that of Mitanni, though the Mitannian is far more complex and has a far greater power than Vannic of adding one suffix to the other. Moreover, the ordinary 3rd personal pronoun in Mitannian is *sa, si, se*, as in the Hittite language of Arzawa. But otherwise there is a close similarity between the grammar, vocabulary, structure, and syntax of Vannic and Mitannian. In grammar the nominative sing. ends in *-s*, the accusative in *-n(i)*, and the oblique case in a vowel, as is also the case in Arzawan; much use is made of the suffix *-li* (Vannic), *-lla* and *-lli* (Mit.); and the plural acc. and nom. often terminate in *-(a)s* (so too in Arzawan). A common plural suffix in Mitannian is *-êna*, corresponding with what Professor Lehmann has shown to be a Vannic plural in *-aini* (e.g. *ulgusiy-aini*). Frequently the singular and plural have the same form. Of adjectival suffixes the commonest in both languages is *-ni*; other nominal suffixes are *-si, -li, -ki (-ku), -ra, -ta (-dä), -khi*, Mit. *-khe*, and *-ue*, Mit. *-pi*. There are no genders, and the position of the adjective and the genitive is the same in both languages. The Vannic *mâ*, 'me,' and *mu*, 'mine,' correspond with Mit. *mâ-na, manni*, and *na* and *ni* are used for 'him,' 'it,' 'them,' in Mitannian, like the Vannic *ni*. We have the same stem as that of *iu* in Mit. *iu-mmi-mma-man* and *iu-ta-lla-man*; as that of *eya* in *iâ-menin*; of *ainei* perhaps in *ai-lan* and *ai-tan*; and of *ini* in *inû-menin*. The pronominal root *i* is found in the Mit. *i-êna-manin*. *Ulis* is 'another' in both languages. The 1st person of the verb terminates in *-bi* in Vannic, in *-pi* and *-u* in Mitannian, and in the latter language *-n* denotes the 3rd pers. sing. and plural of the precativè, while *-ta* (Vannic *-tu*) frequently represents the 3rd pers. sing. and plural. In both languages the same form often serves for both numbers. If *ti-ma* (lcccvi, 3) is a verbal form we could compare the Mit. suffix of the 3rd pers. pluperfect *-ma*. Finally, the gerundival *-li* of Vannic reappears in Mitannian with the same gerundival sense.

In the vocabulary we have Vannic *agu*, 'to bring,' Mit. *aku, aru*, 'to give,' Mit. *aru, euris*, 'lord,' Mit. *ipris, ebani*,

'country,' Mit. *uwini*, *gazuli*, 'delightful,' Mit. *kaśsa*, *khasu*, 'to hear,' Mit. *khasu*, *śila*, 'daughter,' Mit. *sāla*, *zari*, 'plantation,' Mit. *śarve*, *su*, 'many,' Mit. *su*, *ti*, *tiu*, 'speak,' Mit. *tiwi*, Teisbas, 'the Air-god,' Mit. Tessupas, which, however, may be a loan-word.

For the Mitannian see my memoir on the *Language of Mitanni* in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, June, 1900, and Dr. Leopold Messerschmidt's *Mitanni-Studien* in the *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1899, 4.

VOCABULARY.

VANNIC.¹

A.

- A-da-a (?) -ni (?). 'Numerous' (Ass. *mahdutu*). lvi, 11.
 A-gu-u-bi. 'I brought.' lxxxvi, 15; xc, 4b.
 A-gu-u-ni. 'He brought,' 'conducted.'
 A-i-ne-i. 'To another' (Ass. *menimeni*). lvi, 30, 38;
 lxxxviii, 2b.
 A-i-se-e-i. 'To the foundations.' lvi, 34.
 A-ku-ki. 'Lord.' T-K. 1.
 Al-di-e. 'For Khaldi.' lvi, 6, 12.
 Al-di-ka-i. 'Before Kh.' lvi, 1, 16.*
 Al-di-ni-ni. lvi, 20.
 Al-di-na. 'Land of Kh.' lvi, 22.
 Al-di-na-ni. lvi, 23.
 A-li. 'He says,' 'speaks.' lvi, 25; lxxxix, 1.
 A-li-i. xc, 1a.
 A-li. 'And.' lxxxix, 4, 5.

¹ T. denotes the Topzawa inscription; T-K. the Toprak Kaleh tablet.

- A-li-e. 'Who.' T. 15.
 A-li-e, *for* halie. 'Sacrifices.' T. 21, 32.
 A-li-ma-nu. 'Common to all,' 'public.'
 Al-su-ni. 'Great.' lxxxviii, 4a.
 Al-su-si-ni. 'Great ones.' lxxxviii, 2a.
 A-lu-us. 'Whoever.' lxxxix, 7.
 A-lu-s. lvi, 28, 30, 31, 35, 37, 38; lxxxviii, 2b, 3b;
 lxxxix, 8.
 A-lu-si. 'Inhabitant.' lvi, 4, 19, 32. Probably from
 borrowed Ass. *alu*.
 A-lu-si-i-na-a. lxxxix, 6.
 A-ni-qu-gi-e. 'A deity.' lxxxvi, 21, 25.
 Ar-di-ni. 'City of Muzazir.' lvi, 23; T. 11, 21.
 Ar-di-ni-e. T. 22.
 Ar-di-ni-i. T. 19.
 Ar-di-ni-di. lvi, 1, 17, 26; T. 9.
 Ar-di-ni-e-di-e. T. 23.
 Ar-di-ni-ni. lvi, 41.
 Ar-di-se. 'Offerings.' T. 28.
 [Ar-gis-ti?]-s. lxxxvii, 1.
 Ar-gis-te-khi. T-K. 1.
 Ar-tsu-ni-u-i-ni. 'City of Artsunius.' lxxxix, 4.
 A-ru-u-bi. 'I gave' (Ass. *atidin*). T. 22.
 A-ru-ni (Ass. *inamdin*). 'He gives.' lvi, 12; T. 14.
 A-ru-me-e (Ass. *liddinna*). 'May he give.' T. 27.
 Ar-tu-me (Ass. *liddinnu*). 'May they give.' T. 30.
 A-ru-li. xc, 3a.
 A-ri. 'Gift' (?). T. 16.
 [A?-]ri-e-di. 'In the pass' (?). lvi, 22.
 A-sa-di. 'There' (Ass. *ina libbi-su*). T. 14.
 As-du-bi. 'I celebrated.' T. 23.
 A-se. 'House,' 'temple.' lxxxvi, 17, 22.
 A-se-e. T. 26, 28.
 A-si-li. T. 31.
 A-si-khi-ni. 'Feast' (Ass. *naptan*). T. 23.
 A-si-MES. 'Infantry' (Ass. *zuquti*). T. 15.
 As-sur-ni-e-di. 'Into Assyria.' T. 13, 15.
 A-su-me. 'I (?) sent.' T-K. 4.

A-ta-h-a, Atahas. T-K. 3.

At-qa-na-ni. 'Consecrated' (Ass. *equtē*). lvi, 16.

A-u-du-i-[e]. 'With the hand' (Ass. *ina qati*). T. 19.

B.

Ba-du-si-e. 'Decayed.' lxxxix, 2.

Ba-tu-khi-ni-ni. 'Of the son of Batus.' lxxxvii, 9.

Bi-a-i-na-u-e. 'Of the Biainians.' lvi, 3, 19.

Bur-ga-na-ni. 'Chapel.' lvi, 20.

D.

Di-ri. 'Iron' (?). lxxix, 17.

Di-ri-ni-e-i. 'Smiths' (?). T-K. 8.

Di-ru . . . xc, 6b.

Du-di-e. 'Bronze.' lxxix, 17.

Du-li-e. 'Sets,' 'assigns.' lvi, 31, 35, 39; lxxxviii, 1b;
lxxxix, 9.

DH.

Dhu-us-pa-a (patari). '(City) of Tosp.' lvi, 4, 19;
xc, 5a, 5b.

E.

E-di-ni. 'For the sake of.' lvi, 13; T. 32; lxxxix, 12.

E-gu-ru-khu. 'A yearling' (Ass. *pasri*). lvi, 24.

E-gu-ru-khe. 'Yearlings.' lvi, 15.

E-ha. 'As well as.' lxxxix, 11.

Erila. 'King.' lvi, 3, 18.

E-si-a-tsi-u-li. 'Pouring libations.' lxxxvi, 22.

E-si-ni. 'Place.' T. 20.

E-si-ni-ni. lxxxvii, 5.

E-si-i-a. 'People of the place.' T-K. 4.

E-ti-bi. 'More than' (Ass. *eli*). T. 31.

E-u-ri-i. 'Lord.' lvi, 13.

E-ya-me. 'To himself.' lvi, 31.

G.

- Ga-zu-li. 'Fine,' 'prosperous' (Ass. *damqu*). lvi, 9;
 lxiv, 7, 18.
 Gi. 'Temple.' lxxxvi, 17.
 Gi-lu-ra-a-ni-e. 'Of Giluras.' lxxxvii, 6.
 Gu-nu-u-sa. 'Power' (Ass. *dananu*). T. 26.
 Gu-nu-s(e). 'Strength' (Ass. *litu*). T. 26.
 Gu-nu-si-ni-ni. 'Slaves,' 'captives.' T. 16.

H.

- Ha-al-du-bi. 'I brought back,' 'changed.' T. 20.

I.

- [I ?]-bi-ra. See [za ?]-bi-ra.
 I-na-ni. 'This' (Ass. *anniu*). lvi, 20.
 I-na-ni-i. 'These' (Ass. *annâte*). lvi, 21.
 I-na-a-ni. 'City' (Ass. *ali*). lvi, 32; T. 21 (?); lxxxix, 5.
 I-ni-li. 'It.' lvi, 39; T. 29; lxxxix, 9.
 Inu. 'Length.'
 Inuki. 'In its entirety.'
 I-nu-ka-a-ni. 'Area.' lxxxvii, 4.
 I-nu-ka-khi-ni-e. lxxxvi, 16.
 Ip-khu-li-i-e. 'Conceal' (Ass. *ikhabbu*). lvi, 38.
 Is-pi-li-ni. lxxxvii, 8.
 Is-pu-u-i-ni-e-s. lvi, 7.
 Is-pu-u-i-ni. lvi, 26; xc, 1b, 1c.
 Is-pu-u-i-ni-ni. lvi, 2, 17.
 Is-pu-u-i-ni-khe. lvi, 5, 27.
 Is-pu-u-i-ni-khi. lxxxviii, 3.
 Is-pu-u-i-ni-khi-ni-s. lxxxix, 1.
 Is-qu-gu-ul-khi-e. T-K. 2.
 Is-te-di. 'In that place.' T. 24.
 Is-tu-[bi-ni]. 'Former.' T. 31.
 Is-ti-i-tu. 'They marked out.' lvi, 5.
 I-u. 'When,' 'that' (Ass. *ki*). lvi, 1, 16, 25; T. 22.
 I-u. 'Thus.' lvi, 25.
 I-u-li. Probably for *tiuli*. lvi, 30.

K.

Ka-u-ki. 'In front of,' 'against.' T. 13. From *ka*,
'the face.'

Ku-u-i. 'Account.' lvi, 35.

Ku-lu-di-i-e. 'Altar' (Ass. *kiludê*). lvi, 36, 41.

Ku-lu-[ni?]. lxxxvii, 3.

[Ku-]ri-e-da. 'Tributes.' T. 18.

KH.

Kha-ba-la-a-[ni?]. T. 9.

Kha-i-ni. 'Taking.' lvi, 24. Cf. *kha-u-bi*.

Khal-di-is. lvi, 31, 40.

Khal-di-s. T. 10; lxxxix, 9.

Khal-di-i-s. T. 27.

Khal-di-e. lvi, 28; T. 24, 25; xc, 3a.

Khal-di-ka-a-i. lvi, 25.

Khal-di-ni. lvi, 34; T-K. 4.

Khal-di-ni-e. lxxxix, 3.

Khal-di-ni-ni. T. 17; lxxxviii, 1.

Khal-di-na-ni. lvi, 29.

Kha-ra-ni. T. 32. Perhaps Ass. *kharranu*, 'road.'

Kha-su-li. 'Hear.' lvi, 33. A different word from the
compound *kha-su*, 'capture.'

Kha-u-bi. 'I took.' lvi, 24.

Kha-u-li-i-e. lvi, 29, 34.

Khu-bi. 'I took.' lxxxvi, 17.

Q.

Qi-el-ba-ni-ta (?). T-K. 5.

Qi-is (?)-mu (?)-si-a-s. lxxxix, 10.

Qi-i-u-ra-a-ni. 'Altar-platform.' lxxxix, 12.

Qi-u-ra-a-e-di. lvi, 36.

Qi-ra-e-di. lvi, 41.

L.

Lu-lu-i-ni-di. 'In Ararat.' T. 29.

M.

- Ma-a. 'Me.' T. 13.
 Mu. 'Mine.' T-K. 1.
 Ma-ni. See *me*.
 Ma-na-i-di. 'In Minni.' T-K. 3.
 Ma-nu-di. 'In the community' (Ass. *tapputu*). T. 21.
 Ma-nu-ri. 'Public.' See *ali-manu* and *sulê-manu*.
 Me. 'Of him.' lvi, 35.
 Me-i. lxxxix, 11.
 Ma-ni. 'Him.' T. 20.
 Ma-a-ni. lxxxix, 11.
 Ma-ni-ni. 'His.' T. 20.
 Me-nu-u-a-s. lxxxix, 1.
 Me-nu-a. lvi, 27.
 Me-nu-u-a-ni. lvi, 4; lxxxviii, 2.
 Me-[su?]. 'After.' T. 28.
 Mu-tsi. 'Faithful' (Ass. *kênu*). T. 25.

N.

- Na. 'Not.' lvi, 41.
 [Na-]ku-ri. 'Homage.' T. 16.
 Na-khu-ni. 'Take.' lvi, 8, 9, 10, 14.
 Ni. 'It,' 'them.' lxxxix, 7.
 Ni-ki-du-li. 'Making libations.' lxxxvi, 17.
 Ni-ip-si-du-li-ni. 'Of the north' (?). lxxxvi, 19, 23.
 Ni-ri-be. 'Door.' lvi, 29. Borrowed from Assyrian.
 Ni-ri-bi. lvi, 9, 11, 24, 28, 34.
 Nu-u-a-di. 'On the mountain' (?). lvi, 6.
 Nu-ul-du-u-li. 'Descending,' 'returning' (Ass. *irtidi*). T. 29.
 Nu-na-bi. 'I went' (Ass. *allik*). lvi, 17.
 Nu-na-[li?]. lvi, 2.
 Nu-na-a-li. lvi, 26.

P.

- Pa-ri. 'Out of.' T. 19; lxxxvii, 8.
 Pa-ru-u-bi. 'I took.' T. 19.
 [Pa?-]ru-u-ni-e-ni. lxxxix, 11.

Pi-li. 'Water' (Ass. A-MES). lxiv, 7, 8, 18; lxxxvi, 14, 17, 22.

Pi-tsu-u-s. 'Joy' (Ass. *khaduti*). T. 28, 30.

Pi-tsu-si-ni. T. 31.

Pi-tu-li-e. 'Obliterate.' lxxxix, 7.

R.

Ru-ša-a-u. 'To Rušas.' T-K. 1.

Ru-ša-ni. T. 24.

Ru-ša-i-ni-e. lxxxvi, 16.

Ru-ša-khi-ni-s. lxxxvii, 2.

Ru-ša-a-khi-na. T-K. 5.

S.

Sa-ga-as. T-K. 2.

Sal-mat-khi-ni. 'Frontier.' T. 32.

Sa-ni. 'Bowl' (Ass. *ummaru*). lvi, 10.

Se-kha-di-e. 'Goat' (?). lxxxvi, 21, 25.

Si-da-gu-ri. 'Separate,' 'private.' lxxvii, 7.

Sisu-khani. 'Cavalry.'

Su-i-ni. 'They made.' lxxix, 16.

Su-i-ni-ni. 'Many.' T. 23.

Sulê-manu. 'Public.'

Su-ra-a-u-e. 'The world.' lvi, 3, 18.

Sur-khani. 'Cavalry.'

Su-ši-ni-e. 'One.' T. 10.

Su-ši-na. T. 28.

Š.

Ša-li-e. 'Year.' T. 10.

Šari-du-ri-e-khe. lvi, 2, 18.

Šari-dur-e-khe. lvi, 27.

Šari-dur-khi-ni-s. lvi, 8.

Ši-e. 'Shepherd' (Ass. *rêu*). T. 25.

Ši(?) -e-i-ši. T. 9.

Ši-ip-ru-gi-ni. 'Pure' (?). lxiv, 8, 18.

Šu-u-i-du-li-i-e. 'Appropriate.' lvi, 37. See *šu-u-i-du-tu*, 'they have appropriated,' xxxi, 10.

T.

- Tar-a-a-e. 'Strong' (Ass. *туру*). lvi, 11.
 Tar (?) -a-i. lvi, 6.
 Tar-a-nis. 'Of Taras.' T-K. 2.
 Te-ru-u-bi. 'I set up.' T. 20; lxxxix, 4, 5, 6.
 Te-ru-ni. 'He sets up.' lvi, 12; T. 12.
 Te-ru-u-tu. 'They set up.' lvi, 6.
 Te-ra-a-i-ni-li (?). lvi, 22.
 Te-ir-du-li-e. lxxxix, 8.
 Te-ra-gi. 'Picks.' T. 32; xxxvii, 2; lxxix, 17, 31.
 Ti-a-khi-i-e-s. T. 10.
 Ti-ma. 'He has defined' (?). lxxxvii, 3.
 Ti-ni. 'Named.' lxxxvi, 15.
 Ti-i-u-li-i-e. 'Pretends.' lvi, 39.
 Ti-ya-i-tu. 'They declared' (Ass. *iqbiu*). lvi, 28.
 Tu-u-ri-i. 'Person.' lvi, 40.

U. •

- U-i. 'With.' T. 26.
 U-la-di. 'Within' (Ass. *ina libbi*). T. 12; xc, 5a.
 U-la-a-di-e. T. 17.
 U-la-qu. T-K. 3. For the usual *ulaki*.
 U-li-e. 'Another.' lvi, 39; lxxxviii, 3b; lxxxix, 9.
 Ul-gu-si-a-ni. 'Life' (Ass. *baladhi*). lvi, 13.
 U-me-si-ni. 'Enclosure' (?). lxxxvi, 15. Probably Ass. *umasu*.
 U-ri-is (?). . . . 'Shields' (Ass. *tilli*). lvi, 8.
 Ur-za-na-s. T. 12.
 Ur-za-na-ni. T. 18.
 Us-gi-ni. 'Mercy-seat' (?) (Ass. *panipani*). lvi, 20.
 Us-la-a-ni. (Ass. MA-KA-MES.) lvi, 21.
 Us-ta-di. 'On approaching.' T. 15.

Y.

- Ya-bi. 'I prayed.' T. 27.
 Ya-ra-ni. 'Prayer-house,' 'rest-house' (Ass. *maskabi*). lvi, 5.
 Ya-ra-ka-a-i. lvi, 7.

Z.

[Za ?-]bi-ra. 'Copper' (?). lxxix, 17. Cf. Sumerian *zabar*.

More probably [i-]bi-ra; see xix, 11; xxx, 18.

Za-du-u-bi. 'I made.' T. 22.

Za-du-u-ni. T. 14.

Za-as-gu-u-bi. 'I slaughtered' (Ass. *diktam astakan*). T. 18.

Zi-li-bi-[i]. 'Sacrifices.' lxxxix, 12.

Zi-il-bi. lvi, 36, 41.

Zi-el-du-bi. 'I sacrificed' (Ass. *lušik*). T. 30.

Zu-u-si-ni. 'Temple' (Ass. *bit-ili*). T. 26.

Zu-u-si-i-ni. T. 17.

Zu-u-si-ni-li. lvi, 21.

ASSYRIAN.

A.

Ana-ku. T. 15, 22, 24.

A-di. T. 12, 16, 21.

[A-ni-]i-nu. 'We.' lvi, 6.

An-ni-u. lvi, 17, 38.

[An-na-]a. lvi, 40.

An-ni-tu. lvi, 37.

An-na-te. lvi, 18, 20.

Ir-ti-di. 'I descended.' T. 26.

As-sur. T. 12, 16.

A-ta-la-ka. 'I went.' T. 16.

A-tu-[sub]. 'I stayed.' T. 19.

B.

Babâni. lvi, 11, 19, 20, 27, 34.

[Ba-]a-na. 'Feast.' T. 22.

Bibu. 'Wicket-gate.' lvi, 8, 10, 21, 26, 27, 33.

Yu-bi-lu-u-ni. T. 9.

Bit-ili. T. 11, 28.

D.

- Damqu. lvi, 8.
 Da-na-nu. 'Power.' T. 25.
 I-da-h-ib. 'Appropriate.' lvi, 37.
 Di-ik-tam. T. 17.

DH.

- Dhâbu. lvi, 5.
 Dhu-us-pa-an. lvi, 3, 16.

E.

- Eli. 'Ascend.' T. 11.
 Su-til. T. 12.
 Eli. 'More than.' T. 28.
 E-mu-qi. 'Forces.' T. 14.
 Se-qi. 'Render.' T. 14.
 E-qu-te. 'Sacred.' lvi, 14, 26.
 Eri. 'Bronze.' lvi, 9.
 E-ru-bu. T. 22.

I.

- Is-pu-u-i-ni. lvi, 2, 4, etc.

K.

- Ka-ya-na-a. 'Homage.' T. 14.
 Ki-i. 'When.' lvi, 1, 14.
 Ki-e-nu. T. 23.
 Ki-lu-di. 'Altar.' lvi, 36.
 Kurun-ni. T. 13.

KH.

- I-kha-ab-bu-u-ni. 'Conceal.' lvi, 39.
 Kha-du-ti. 'Joy.' T. 28.
 Khi-du-ti. T. 27.
 Khal-di-a. T. 12, 15, 23, 24, 25.
 Khal-di-e. lvi, 1, 5, 11, 14, etc.

Q.

Aq-bi. T. 21.

Iq-bi-u. lvi, 27.

I-qa-ab-bi. lvi, 39.

Iq-ta-pi. lvi, 30.

Qa-as-sa-pu. 'Making holy.' T. 24.

Qa-ti. T. 17.

Qi-li-li. 'Frieze' (?). lvi, 29.

L.

Li-te-e. 'Strength.' lvi, 31.

Li-tu. T. 25.

M.

Ma-a. 'Thus.' lvi, 27.

Ma-h-du-tu. lvi, 10.

Mas-ka-bi. 'Rest-house.' lvi, 4, 6, 10, 38.

Mas-ka-ni. 'Place.' T. 18.

[Masmas ?]-si. 'Augurs' (?). lvi, 22.

Me-ni-me-ni. 'Another.' lvi, 29, 39.

Me-nu-a. lvi, 4, 25.

[Mil ?]-ka-tu. T. 26.

Mu-za-zir. lvi, 1, 15, 20, 32, 41 ; T. 10, 19, 20, 21.

N.

A-ti-di-in. T. 20.

Liddin-na. T. 26.

Liddin-nu-ni. T. 27.

I-du-nu. lvi, 22. From *nadû*.

Na-i-ri. lvi, 3, 16.

Nap-tan. 'Feast.' T. 22.

Na-si. lvi, 8, 9, 12. See III.

Niqê. T. 20.

P.

- [Pa ?-]ni-pa (?) -ni. 'Mercy-seat.' lvi, 17.
 Pa-as-ru. 'Yearling.' lvi, 13, 21.
 Yu-pa-za-ar. 'Conceal.' lvi, 31.
 Pukh-ru. 'Assembly.' T. 11.

R.

- Rêu. T. 23.
 Ru-ša-se. T. 15, 22.

S.

- Sa-di-e. T. 16.
 [Al-]ti-h. 'I sought.' T. 18.
 Yu-se-i-ši-me. 'Made hear.' lvi, 33.
 Sar-dur. lvi, 2, etc.

Š.

- Yu-ša-li-ku. 'Set apart.' lvi, 26.
 [Lu-]u-ši-ik. 'Sacrifice.' T. 27.

TS.

- Tsabi. T. 10, 12, 21.
 Tsi-h. 'Frame' (?). lvi, 29.

T.

- Tam-[sil]. lvi, 19.
 Tap-pu-tu. 'Community.' T. 20.
 Lut-ma-a. 'May he decree.' T. 24.
 Te-ir-du. 'Descended' (?). T. 10.
 Til-li. 'Shields.' lvi, 8.
 Tu-qu-un-tu. T. 25.
 Tu-ru. 'Strong.' lvi, 10.

U.

- U-[lu-u]. 'Or.' lvi, 37.
 Ummar. 'Bowl.' lvi, 9.
 Urdhu. 'Armenia.' T. 26.
 Ur-za-na-a. T. 11, 13, 14, 17.

Z.

- Zu-qu-ti. 'Infantry.' T. 13.

IDEOGRAPHS.

- ABNI-di. 'Stone.' lvi, 5.
 A-MES. 'Water.' lxxxvi, 22.
 AMIL-[se-]e. 'Men.' T. 24.
 AMIL-UN-MES-u-e. 'Mankind.' T. 25.
 AN-MES-s. 'The gods.' T. 30 ; lxxxix, 10.
 AN IM-s. 'Air-god.' lxxxix, 10.
 AN IM-a. lxxxvi, 20, 24.
 AN UT-s. 'Sun-god.' lxxxix, 10.
 AN UT-ni-e. lxxxvi, 20, 25.
 BAB. 'Gate.' lvi, 12, 22, 23, 29, 34.
 BIT-PARA. 'Mercy-seat.' T. 12 ; T-K. 6.
 DUP-TE. 'Tablet.' lxxxix, 3, 5, 6.
 DUP-TE-i-ni. lvi, 37 (*armani-ni*).
 ERU. 'Bronze.' lvi, 10.
 GIS-KAK. 'Building.' lxxxvii, 3 (*kamni*).
 GIS-NU-KHIR-ni-di. 'Gardener.' lxxxvii, 10.
 GIS-TIR-ni-ka-i. 'Before the garden.' lxxxvii, 7 (*sari-ni-kai*).
 GUD-MES. 'Oxen.' lvi, 14.
 IK-MES. 'Existencies' (?). T. 12 (Ass.).
 IB-NI. 'He built.' T-K. 6.
 ILL-u (for *nasu*). lvi, 28, 30 (Ass.).
 ILL-ni. lvi, 35 (Ass.).

- KAL. 'All.' T. 22.
 KURUN-tsi. 'Wine.' T. 14.
 LU. 'Seize.' T. 17 (Ass.).
 LU (?) -tu (?). T. 12 (Ass.).
 LU. 'Sheep.' lxxxvi, 19, 20, 24, 25.
 LU-ARDU-MES. 'Lambs.' lvi, 15.
 LU-BIRU-TUR. 'Suckling.' lxxxvi, 18, 23.
 LU-BIRU-li-ni-MES. lvi, 14.
 LU-BIRU-GAL-MES. 'Yearlings.' lvi, 16.
 MA-KA-MES. lvi, 18 (Ass.).
 MAT-na. 'Land.' T. 25.
 MU. 'Year.' T. 28, 29.
 MU. 'Give.' lvi, 41.
 NISU-MES-se. 'Men.' T. 11.
 SUM. 'Sacrifice.' lxxxvi, 20, 24.
 SUM-MU. 'Gift.' lvi, 35 (Ass.).
 U. 'Cubit.' lxxxvii, 11.
 UT-ME. 'Days.' T. 21, 23.
 UT-ME-MES-di. T. 31.
 (D.P.) ZAB-GIS-BAN. 'Archer.' T. 13.

XXIV.

THE TRADITION ABOUT THE CORPOREAL RELICS
OF BUDDHA.

By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

I.

BY way of a preliminary to some further remarks on the inscription on the Piprāhavā relic-vase,¹ which I shall present when a facsimile of the record can be given with them, I offer a study of an interesting side-issue, the tradition regarding the corporeal relics of Buddha.

The subject has been touched by another writer in this Journal, 1901. 397 ff. And I am indebted to his article for (in addition to some minor references) guidance to the story told in Buddhaghōṣha's *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, which otherwise might have remained unknown to me. For the rest, however, that treatment of the subject was biassed by starting with the postulate that the Piprāhavā record could only register an enshrining of relics of Buddha by the Sakyas at Kapilavastu. It was, consequently, entirely directed to throwing discredit on the tradition about the eventual fate of the relics. Also, it has by no means told us, or even indicated, all that there is to be learnt; and it is not exactly accurate even as far as it goes.

I take the matter from the opposite point of view; namely

¹ I have been using hitherto the form *Piprāvā*, which I took over from another writer. But it appears, from Major Vost's article on *Kapilavastu* (page 553 ff. above), that the correct form of the name is that which I now adopt.

(see page 149 ff. above), that the inscription registers an enshrining of relics, not of Buddha, but of his slaughtered kinsmen, the Sakyas themselves. And my object is to exhibit the details of the tradition about the relics of Buddha more clearly; to add various items which have been overlooked; and to examine the matter carefully, in the light of the tradition having quite possibly a basis in fact.

And there is a difference between the two cases. To support the previous interpretation of the Piprāhavā record, it was vitally important to invalidate the tradition about the eventual fate of the corporeal relics of Buddha; for, if, some centuries ago, the memorial mound raised at Kapilavastu by the Sakyas over their share of those relics was opened, and the relics were abstracted from it, how could that monument be found in 1898, externally indeed in a state of ruin, but internally unviolated, with the relics, and a record proclaiming the nature of them, still inside it? For my case, however, the truth or otherwise of the tradition is of no leading importance at all, and might almost be a matter of indifference, except for the intrinsic interest attaching to the tradition itself: the tradition might be shewn to be false, but that would not affect my interpretation of the record; we could still look to find corporeal relics of Buddha in some other memorial in the same neighbourhood. At the same time, while my case is not in any way dependent upon proving the tradition to be true, it is capable of receiving support from a substantiation of the tradition.

However, the question of the merits of the tradition cannot be decided either way, until we have the traditional statements fully before us, in a plain and convenient form. So, I confine myself first to exhibiting those statements just as they are found; starting the matter, in this note, with the tradition about the original division and enshrining of the relics, and going on afterwards to the tradition about the subsequent fate of them. I will review the whole tradition, and consider it in connexion with certain instructive facts, in my following article on the inscription.

Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta.

In tracing the history of the corporeal relics of Buddha, we naturally commence with the narrative, presented in the ancient Pāli work entitled *Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta*, and possibly dating back to B.C. 375 (see page 670 below), of the circumstances that attended the distribution of them and the building of Stūpas or memorial mounds over them. And I prefix to that the account, given in the same work, of the cremation of the corpse of Buddha; because it includes several features of interest which may suitably be brought into relief, with some comments, from the artistic setting in which they stand in the original text.

The narrative runs as follows; see the text edited by Childers in this Journal, 1876. 250 ff., and by Davids and Carpenter in the *Dīgha-Nikāya*, part 2. 154 ff., and the translation by Davids in SBE, 11. 112 ff.:¹—

The Bhagavat, “the Blessed One,” Buddha, died,² at the

¹ Using Childers’ text, which is divided into rather long paragraphs, I found the translation very useful in leading me quickly to the points to be noted. The translation, however, cannot be followed as an infallible guide; and I have had to take my own line in interpreting the text at various places.

While revising these proofs, I have seen for the first time Turnour’s article in JASB, 7, 1838. 991 ff., where he gave a translation of the sixth chapter (the one in which we are interested) of this Sutta, and an abstract of the preceding ones. By the later translator, Turnour’s work has been dismissed with the observation (SBE, 11. introd., 31) that, “though a most valuable contribution for the time, now more than half a century ago,” it “has not been of much service for the present purpose.” Nevertheless, there are several details in which it contrasts very favourably with the later translation.

² In this Sutta, Buddha is most usually designated as the Bhagavat. But other appellations of him used in it are the Tathāgata, the Sugata, the Sambuddha, and the Samaṇa Gōtama. The appellation Buddha occurs in the expression:—*ambhakaṃ Buddhō ahu khantivāḍo*; “our Buddha was one who used to preach forbearance” (text, 259/166), in the speech of the Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa, when he was asking the claimants not to quarrel over the division of the relics.

The word used for “he died” is *parinibbāyi* (text, 252/156). From that point, the text constantly presents *parinibbūta* to describe him as “dead;” and it several times, both here and in previous passages, presents *parinibbāna* to denote his “death.” And, just after the statement that he died, it places in the mouth of the venerable Anuruddha a *gāthā* of which the last line runs:—*Pajjotassēva nibbānaṃ vimōkhō chētasō ahū*; “just like the extinction of a lamp, there was a deliverance (of him) from consciousness, conscious existence.”

The text thus establishes *nibbūta* (Sanskrit, *nirvṛita*) as the exact equivalent of *parinibbūta* (Skt., *parinirvṛita*) in the sense of ‘dead.’ And it establishes *nibbāna* (Skt., *nirvāṇa*), and any such Sanskrit terms as *vimōksha*, *mōksha*,

good old age of fourscore years,¹ at Kusinārā, the city of a branch of a tribe known as the Mallas. And we may note that, though Kusinārā is several times mentioned in the Sutta as a *nagara*, 'a city,' still it is distinctly marked as quite a small place. We are expressly told (text, 245/146; trans., 99) that it was not a *mahānagara*, a great city, like Champā, Rājagaha, Sāvattī, Sāketa, Kōsambī, and Bārāṇasī, full of warriors and Brāhmaṇs and householders all devoted to Buddha, but was merely:—*kuḍḍa-nagaraka*, *ujjaṅgala-nagaraka*, *sākhā-nagaraka*; "a little town of plaster walls, a little town in a clearing of the jungle, a mere branch town;" and that Buddha accepted it for the closing scene of his life because of its pristine greatness, under the name *Kusāvati*, as the royal city of the righteous monarch *Mahā-Sudassana*.

At this little place, then, Buddha died. And he breathed his last breath, in the last watch of the night, on a couch, with its head laid to the north, between a twin pair of Sāla-trees which were masses of fruiting flowers from blossoms

mukti, etc., as the exact equivalent of *parinibbāna* (Skt., *parinirvāṇa*) in the sense of 'death.'

I mention this because a view has been expressed that, in addition to a reckoning running from the *parinirvāṇa*, the death, of Buddha, there was also a reckoning running from his *nirvāṇa* as denoting some other occurrence in his career.

¹ For this detail, see text, 73/100; trans., 37. And compare text, 249/151; trans., 108; where we are told that, seeking after merit, at the age of twenty-nine he went forth as a wandering ascetic, and that he wandered:—*vassāni paññāsa samādhikāni*; "for fifty years and somewhat more."

With this last expression, compare the same phrase, but in another connexion, in the Jātaka, ed. Fausböll, 2. 383. There, the commentary (after perhaps suggesting, according to one manuscript, *sama*, for *samā*, + *adhikāni*) distinctly explains the expression by *atireka-paññāsa-vassāni*. From that we can see that *samādhika*, in both places, is not *samā* + *adhika*, 'increased by a year,'—(giving "fifty years and one year more"),—but is *samādhika*, 'possessed of something more,' with the short *a* of the antepenultimate syllable lengthened for the sake of the metre. And, in fact, in the passage in the Jātaka we have the various reading *samādhikāni*.

The long life thus attributed to Buddha is somewhat remarkable in the case of a Hindū. But, if it were an imaginative detail, the figure would almost certainly have been fixed at eighty-four or eighty-two, on the analogy of something referred to further on, under the *Divyāvadāna*.

The actual cause of the death of Buddha was, coupled with extreme old age, an attack of dysentery induced by a meal of *sūkara-maddava* (text, 231/127). This has been rendered by "dried boar's flesh" (trans., 71), and elsewhere, not very kindly, by "pork." Having regard to *mridu*, 'soft, delicate, tender,' as the origin of *mārdava*, *maddava*, I would suggest "the succulent parts, titbits, of a young wild boar."

out of season,¹— (the text goes on to emphasize the condition of the flowers by saying that they were constantly dropping off and falling onto the body of Buddha),— in the Sāla-grove of the Mallas which was an *upavattana*, an adjacent part (outskirt or suburb), of the city, on the bank of the Hiraññavatī, on the further side from the town Pāvā.

¹ The words (text, 239/137) are:— *Tēna khō pana samayēna yamaka-sālā sabba-phāliphullā honti akāla-pupphēhi.*

The month is not specified. And there were two views on this point. Buddhaghōsha says, in the introduction to his *Samantapāsādikā* (Vinayapīṭaka, ed. Oldenberg, 3, 283), that Buddha became *parinibbūta*, i.e. died, on the full-moon day of the month *Visākha*, = *Vaiśākha*. Hiuen Tsiang has said (Julien, *Mémoires*, 1, 334; Beal, *Records*, 2, 33; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2, 28) that, according to the ancient historical documents, Buddha entered into *nirvāṇa*, at the age of eighty, on the fifteenth day of the second half— [meaning apparently the full-moon day]— of the month *Vaiśākha*, but that, according to the school of the Sārvāstivādins, he entered into *nirvāṇa* on the eighth day of the second half of *Kārttika*.

We need not speculate about the rival claims. But the following remarks may be made.

From Roxburgh's *Plants of the Coast of Coromandel* (1819), 3, 9, and plate 212, and Drury's *Useful Plants of India* (1858), 405, I gather the following information about the Sāla-tree. It has two botanical names, *Vatica robusta* and *Shorea robusta*; the latter having been given to it by Roxburgh in honour of Sir John Shore, Bart. (Lord Teignmouth), who was Governor-General of India, 1793-98. It is a native of the southern skirts of the Himalayas, and is a timber-tree which is second in value to only the teak. It grows with a straight majestic trunk, of great thickness, to a height of from 100 to 150 feet, and gives beams which are sometimes 2 feet square and 30 feet or more in length. And it yields also large quantities of resin, the best pieces of which are frequently used, instead of the common incense, in Indian temples. It flowers in the hot season (Roxburgh), in March-April (Drury), with numerous five-petalled pale yellow flowers about three-quarters of an inch in breadth. And the seed, which has a very strong but brief vitality, ripens (by the maturing of the fruit) about three months after the opening of the blossoms. The flowers, of course, begin to fall when the fruit is becoming set. Roxburgh's plate exhibits well both the flowers and the fruit.

Now, it is somewhat difficult to compare the Indian months, whether solar or lunar, with the English months: because (1), owing to the precession of the equinoxes being not taken into consideration in determining the calendar, the Indian months are always travelling slowly forward through the tropical year; and (2), owing to the system of intercalary months, the initial days of the Indian lunar months are always receding by about eleven days for one or two years, and then leaping forwards by about nineteen days. But, in the present time, the full-moon of *Vaiśākha* falls on any day ranging from about 27 April to 25 May, new style. In the time of Buddhaghōsha, it ranged from about 2 to 30 April, old style. At the time of the death of Buddha, it ranged from about 25 March to 22 April, old style. The specified day in the month *Kārttika* comes, of course, close upon six months later.

The tradition about the month *Vaiśākha* in connexion with the death of Buddha may thus be based on some exceptionally early season, when the Sāla-trees had burst into blossom an appreciable time before the commencement of the hot weather. On the other hand, it might quite possibly be founded on only some poetical description of the death of Buddha, containing a play on the word *visākha* in the two senses of 'branched, forked,' and of 'branchless' in the way of all the branches being hidden by masses of flowers.

The venerable Ānanda having notified the occurrence, early in the day, to the Mallas of Kusinārā (text, 253/158; trans., 121), the Mallas bade their servants collect perfumes and garlands and all the cymbals and similar musical instruments in Kusinārā. And, taking with them those appliances and five hundred pairs of woven cloths (*dussa*), they repaired to the place where the corpse (*sariraṇi*) of Buddha lay. They spent the whole of that day in doing homage to the corpse with dancing and songs and music, and with garlands and perfumes, and in making canopies of their garments (*chēla*), and in fashioning wreaths. And then, finding it too late to cremate the corpse, they determined to perform the cremation on the following day. In the same way, however, there passed away the second day, and the third, the fourth, the fifth, and even the sixth.¹

On the seventh day (text, 254/159; trans., 123), the Mallas proposed to carry the corpse by the south and outside the city to a spot outside the city on the south, and to cremate it there. And eight of their chief men, having washed their heads and clad themselves in new clothes (*ahatu vattha*), prepared to lift the corpse. But they could not raise it; for, as the venerable Anuruddha explained, such was not the purpose of the gods.

Accordingly (text, 255/160; trans., 124),—the intention of the gods having been fully made known to them,—still doing homage to the corpse with their own mortal dancing and songs and music and with garlands and perfumes, together with an accompaniment of divine dancing and songs and music and garlands and perfumes from the gods, they carried the corpse by the north to the north of the city. Then, entering by the northern gate, they carried it through

¹ Here the question arises: how was the corpse of Buddha preserved from hopeless decomposition during the time that elapsed?

I would suggest that the mention of the perfumes and the woven cloths (*dussa*, = Skt. *dūrśa*) may indicate that recourse was had to some process of embalming and swathing. And, in fact, (see trans., introd., 39 f.), Robert Knox, in his *Historical Relation of Ceylon*, part 3, chapter 11, in describing the arrangements for cremation, has expressly mentioned disembowelling and embalming in cases where the corpse of a person of quality is not cremated speedily.

the midst of the city into the midst thereof.¹ And then, going out by the eastern gate, they carried it to the shrine known as the Makuta-bandhanachētiya or coronation-temple² of the Mallas, which was on the east of the city. And there they laid it down.

There, under the directions of the venerable Ānanda (text, 255/161; trans., 125),³ the corpse was prepared for cremation, in all respects just as if it had been the corpse of a Chakkavatti or universal monarch. It was wrapped in a new cloth (*ahata vattha*), and then in flocks of cotton (*kappāsa*), alternately, until there were five hundred layers of each. It was then placed in an iron-coloured oil-trough, which was covered by another iron-coloured trough.⁴ And it was then placed on a funeral pile (*chitaka*) made of all sorts of odorous substances.

¹ A very special honour was conferred on the corpse of Buddha by this treatment; for (as the translator has indicated, 125, note), to carry into the city, in any ordinary case, the corpse of a person who had died outside it, would have polluted the city.

In a similar manner, the corpse of Mahinda was carried into the city Anurādhapura by the eastern gate, and through the midst of the city, and then out again on the south; see *Dīpavaṃsa*, 17. 102, 103.

² See note on page 160 above.

³ He was, in fact, repeating instructions which had been given to him by Buddha; see text, 242/141; trans., 92.

⁴ The text here is:—*ayasāya tēla-dōṇiyā pakkhipitvā aññissā ayasāya dōṇiyā paṭikujjivā*.

For following the translator in rendering the apparently somewhat rare word *paṭikujjivā*, *paṭikujjivā*—(it is not given in Childers' Pāli Dictionary; but the translator has given us, p. 93, note 1, two other references for it, in the *Jātaka*, 1. 50, 69)—by "having covered," I find another authority in the *Theragāthā*, verse 681:—"A puffed up, flighty friar, resorting to evil friends, sinks down with them in a great torrent,—*ummiyā paṭikujjitō*, covered, turned over, overwhelmed, by a wave." And it appears that we have in Sanskrit *nikubjana* in the sense of 'upsetting, turning over.' So also Childers has given us, in Pāli, *nikujjita*, with the variant *nikkujjita*, in the sense of 'overturned, upside down,' and *nikkujjana*, 'reversal, upsetting.'

As regards the word *ayasa*, I suppose that it does represent the Sanskrit *āyasa*, from *ayas*, 'iron;' in fact, it is difficult to see how it can be anything else. As to its meaning, Buddhaghōṣa's assertion (see trans., 92, note 4) that *āyasa* (as he has it) was here used in the sense of 'gold, golden,' can hardly be accepted; but his comment is of use in indicating that he was not quite satisfied that the troughs were made of iron: he may have thought that, whereas iron troughs could not be burnt up or even melted, golden troughs might at least be melted.

In following the understanding, when I previously had this passage under observation (note on page 160 above), that the troughs were made of iron, I felt the following difficulty:—The two iron troughs themselves cannot have

Four chief men of the Mallas (text, 257/163 ; trans., 128), who had washed their heads and clothed themselves in new clothes for the purpose, then sought to set the funeral pile on fire. But they could not do so ; because, as was explained to them by the venerable Anuruddha, the intention of the gods was otherwise : namely, that the pile should not catch fire until homage should have been done at the feet of Buddha by the venerable Mahā-Kassapa, who, travelling at that time from Pāvā to Kusinārā with a great company of five hundred Bhikkhus, friars, had heard on the way, from an Ājīvaka,¹ the news of the death of Buddha, and was pushing on to Kusinārā. In due course, Mahā-Kassapa and the five hundred Bhikkhus arrived. And, when they had done homage at the feet of Buddha, the funeral pile caught fire of its own accord.

The corpse (*sarīram*) of Buddha was then (text, 258/164 ; trans., 130) so thoroughly consumed, and, with it, every two cloths of the five hundred pairs of woven cloths (*dussa*)

been consumed ; and how could any fire from the outside reach what was inside them ? : and, even if the contents of the lower trough were set on fire before the covering trough was placed over it, still, how could they continue to burn without free access of air ? But I did not then see any way out of the difficulty. It has been since then suggested to me that perhaps the troughs were made red-hot, and the corpse of Buddha was baked, not burnt ; but there could hardly be accomplished in that way the complete destruction of everything except the bones.

If, however, it was really intended to mark the troughs as made of iron, why were two separate words used— (at any rate where *dōṇi* is not in composition with *tēla*),— instead of the compound *ayā-dōṇi*, just as we have in Sanskrit *ayā-drōṇi*, ‘an iron trough’ ? ; in such a trough, we are told (Divyāvadāna, 377), there was pounded to death, along with her child, a lady of the harem who had given offence to Aśoka. Further, *āyasa* is distinctly used to mean, not ‘made of iron,’ but ‘of the colour of iron,’ in the Mahābhārata, 5. 1709 ; there Sanatsujāta tells Dhritarāshtra that *brahman*, the self-existing impersonal spirit, may appear as either white, or red, or black, or iron-coloured (*āyasa*), or sun-coloured. And Robert Knox (loc. cit. ; see note on page 660 above) has mentioned a custom of placing the corpse of a person of quality, for cremation, inside a tree cut down and hollowed out like a hog-trough.

In these circumstances, I now take the text as indicating wooden troughs, which, naturally or as the result of being painted, were of the colour of iron ; adding that an oil-trough seems to have been used as the lower receptacle because, being saturated with oil, it would be very inflammable. But, to make sure of understanding the whole passage correctly, we require to find a detailed description of the cremation of the corpse of a Chakkavatti.

¹ A non-Buddhist religious mendicant ; probably a worshipper of Vishnu (see, e.g., IA, 20. 361 f.).

in which it had been swathed, that, just as when ghee¹ or oil is burnt, neither ashes nor soot could be detected, either of the cuticle, or of the skin, or of the flesh, or of the sinews, or of the lubricating fluid of the joints; only the bones (*sarīrāṇi*) were left.² Then streams of water fell down from the sky, and extinguished the pyre. So, also, from "the storehouse of waters (*beneath the earth*)" streams of water arose, and extinguished the pyre. And the Mallas of Kusinārā extinguished the pyre with water scented with perfumes of all kinds.³

Then, for seven days (text, 258/164; trans., 131), the Mallas of Kusinārā guarded the bones, the corporeal relics (*sarīrāṇi*), of Buddha in their *santhāgāra*, their townhall, within a cage of spears with a rampart of bows; doing homage to them with dancing and songs and music, and with garlands and perfumes.

Meanwhile, the news had spread abroad. So (text, 258/164; trans., 131), messengers arrived, from various people who claimed shares of the corporeal relics (*sarīrāṇi*), and promised to erect Thūpas (Stūpas, memorial mounds) and hold feasts in honour of them. Ajātasattu, king of Magadha, the Vēdēhiputta or son of a lady of the Vidēha people, sent a messenger, and claimed a share on the ground that both he and Buddha were Khattiyas, members of the warrior and regal caste.⁴ Shares were claimed on the same

¹ The word is *sappi*, 'ghee, clarified butter;' not anything meaning 'glue' as might be thought from the translation.

² It may be useful to remark here that the tradition seems to have been as follows:—The following bones remained uninjured; the four canine teeth, the two collar-bones, and the *uḥḥisa*, *uḥṇiṣa*, an excrescence from the cranium. The other bones were more or less injured by the fire, and were reduced to fragments, of which the smallest were of the size of a mustard-seed, the medium-sized were of the size of half a grain of rice, and the largest were of the size of half a *mugga* or kidney-bean.

I take this from Turnour, JASB, 7, 1838. 1013, note. He apparently took it from Buddhaghōṣa's commentary.

³ To this apparent act of supererogation, attention has been drawn by the translator (130, note). As, however, Buddha had died and was cremated in their village-domain, the Mallas were entitled to take a part in quenching the funeral fire.

⁴ Fourteen days elapsed, and apparently no more, from the death of Buddha to the distribution of his relics. The distances over which, during the interval,

ground, and in the same way, by the Lichchhavis of Vēsāli, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kōliyas of Rāmagāma, and the Mallas of Pāvā. A share was claimed by the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu, on the ground:—Bhagavā amhakam nāti-setthō; “the Blessed One was our chief kinsman.” And a share was claimed by a Brāhmaṇ (not named) of Vēṭha-dīpa, on the ground that, as a Brāhmaṇ, he was entitled to receive relics of a Khattiya.

At first (text, 259/166; trans., 133), the Mallas of Kusi-nārā, addressing the messengers company by company and troop by troop,¹ refused to part with any of the relics; because Buddha had died in their *gāma-kkhetta*, their village-domain. It was pointed out to them, however, by a Brāhmaṇ named Dōṇa, who addressed the parties company by company and troop by troop, that it was not seemly that any strife should arise over the relics, and that it was desirable that there should be Thūpas far and wide, in order that many people might become believers. So, with their consent, thus obtained, he divided the corporeal relics (*sarirāni*) into eight equal shares, fairly apportioned, and distributed them to the claimants. And he himself received the *kumbha*, the earthen jar in which the bones had been collected after the cremation.² And to the Mōriyas of Pippalivana,—who, also, had claimed a share on the ground that, like Buddha, they were Khattiyas, but whose messenger had arrived too late, after

the news had to travel and the claims to shares of the relics had to be transmitted in return, can hardly be estimated until we can arrive at some definite opinion as to the identification of Kusi-nārā.

¹ The text before this indicates only one messenger from each claimant. It here says:—Kōsinārakā Mallā tē saṅghē gaṇē etadāvōchun.

The translator has said:—“The Mallas of Kusi-nārā spoke to the assembled brethren.” But I do not find any reason for rendering the words *tē saṅghē gaṇē* by “the assembled brethren.”

We need not exactly go as far as Buddhaghōsha does, in asserting that each claimant took the precaution, in case of a refusal, of following his messenger in person, with an army. We may, however, surmise that each messenger was, not merely a runner bearing a verbal demand or a letter, but a duly accredited envoy, of some rank, provided with an armed escort.

² See note on page 160 above. One of the manuscripts used for the text in the Digha-Nikāya gives, instead of *kumbha*, both here and twice below, *tumbha*. This latter word is explained in Childers' Pāli Dictionary as meaning ‘a sort of water vessel with a spout.’

the division of the relics,— there were given the extinguished embers (*aṅgāra*) of the fire.

Thus, then (text, 260/166; trans., 134), Ajātasattu, king of Magadha, made a Thūpa over corporeal relics (*sarīrāni*) of Buddha, and held a feast, at Rājagaha. So did the Lichchhavis of Vēsālī, at Vēsālī. So did the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu, at Kapilavatthu. And so did the Bulis of Allakappa, at or in¹ Allakappa; the Kōliyas of Rāmagāma, at Rāmagāma; the Brāhmaṇ of Vēṭhadīpa, at or in Vēṭhadīpa; the Mallas of Pāvā, at Pāvā;² and the Mallas of Kusinārā, at Kusinārā. And, at some unspecified place, the Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa made a Thūpa over the *kumbha*, the earthen jar in which the bones had been collected after the cremation, and held a feast. And the Mōriyas of Pipphalivana made a Thūpa over the embers, and held a feast, at or in Pipphalivana.

Thus there were eight Thūpas for the corporeal relics (*aṭṭha sarīra-thūpā*), and a ninth for the *kumbha*, the earthen jar, and a tenth for the embers. “That is how it happened in former times!”³

Some verses standing at the end of the Sutta (text, 260/167; trans., 135) assert that the body (*sarīraṃ*) of

¹ Here, and in two other cases, I have not been able to determine whether mention is made of a place or of a territory.

² Both here, and in the passage about the messengers, the Mallas of Pāvā stand last among the seven outside claimants who obtained shares of the corporeal relics. Of course, someone or other was bound to be mentioned last. But Buddhaghōsha, taking things very literally, has made a comment to the following purport:— Considering that Pāvā was only three *gāvutas* from Kusinārā, and that Buddha had halted there on his way to Kusinārā, how was it that the Mallas of Pāvā did not arrive first of all? Because they were princes who went about with a great retinue, and the assembling of their retinue delayed them.

He has apparently not offered any explanation of a really practical point; namely, why the messenger of the Mōriyas of Pipphalivana did not arrive in time to obtain a share of the corporeal relics for them.

³ Buddhaghōsha says, in his commentary, that this sentence:— *Ēvaṃ ētaṃ bhūta-pubbaṃ*, was established by those people who made the third Saṃgīti (who held the third “Council”). Of course, from his point of view, which was that the Sutta was written at the time of the events narrated in it.

But the sentence is, in reality, the natural, artistic complement of the opening words of the Sutta:— *Ēvaṃ mā sutāṃ*; “thus have I heard!”

Buddha measured (*in relics*) eight measures of the kind called *dōṇa*; ¹ and they say that, of these, seven *dōṇas* receive honour in Jambudīpa, India, and one from the kings of the Nāgas, the serpent-demons, at Rāmagāma.² They further say that one tooth is worshipped in heaven, and one is honoured in the town of Gandhāra, and one in the dominions of the king of Kāliṅga, and one by the Nāga kings.³

Buddhaghōṣa says, in his commentary, that these verses were uttered by Thēras, Elders, of the island Tambapaṇṇi, Ceylon.⁴ And they seem to have been framed after the time when there had been devised the story (which we shall meet with further on, first under the Dipavaṃsa) to the effect that the god Indra, while retaining the right tooth of Buddha, gave up the right collar-bone to be enshrined in Ceylon. Otherwise, surely, the verses would have mentioned the right collar-bone, also, as being worshipped in heaven? On the other hand, they must have been

¹ The word *dōṇa*, *drōṇa*, has sometimes been translated by 'bushel.' But, even if there is an approximation between the two measures, there are difficulties in the way of employing European words as exact equivalents of Indian technical terms; see, for instance, a note on the rendering of one of Hiuen Tsiang's statements further on.

² This statement seems calculated to locate Rāmagāma outside the limits of Jambudīpa; unless we may place it, with the usual abodes of the Nāgas, below the earth.

³ For a statement of belief, apparently not very early, regarding the localities of deposit of various personal relics of Buddha, see the *Buddhavaṃsa*, ed. Morris, section 28.

According to that work, the alms-bowl, staff, and robe of Buddha were at Vajirā. And in this place we recognize the origin of the name of the Vājirīyā, the members of one of the schismatic Buddhist schools which arose after the second century after the death of Buddha; see the *Mahāvamsa*, Turnour, p. 21, as corrected by Wijesinha, p. 16.

Amongst the Jains, there was a sect the name of which we have, in epigraphic records, in the Prākṛit or mixed-dialect forms of Vairā Śākhā (EI, 1. 385, No. 7; 392, No. 22; 2. 204, No. 20; 321); Vērā or Vairā Śākhā (EI, 2. 203, No. 18); Vairī Śākhā (VOR, 1. 174); Ārya-Vērī Śākhā (EI, 2. 202, No. 15); and the Śākhā of the Ārya-Vērīyas (EI, 1. 386, No. 8): and, in literature, in the Prākṛit forms of Vairī or Vayarī, and Ajja-Vairā Śākhā (Kalpasūtra, ed. Jacobi, 82), with the concomitant mention, evidently as the alleged founder of it, of a teacher named Ajja-Vaira, Vayara, or Vēra (id., 78, 82). May we not find the origin of the name of this sect in the same place-name, rather than in a teacher Vajra, in connexion with whom the sect is mentioned, by a Sanskrit name, as the Vajra-śākhā (EI, 2. 51, verse 5)?

⁴ According to his text, as I have it, he does not say that they were "added by Theras in Ceylon" (trans., 135, note).

framed before the time when the tooth-relic was transferred from Kalinga to Ceylon; that was done, according to the Mahāvamsa (Turnour, 241; Wijesinha, 154), in the ninth year of king Siri-Mēghavanna of Ceylon.

They are, however, useful in helping to explain an expression, *drōṇa-stūpa*, a Stūpa containing a *drōṇa* of relics, which is applied, in the story which we shall take from the Divyāvadāna, to the Stūpa of Ajātasattu at Rājagriha. As has been remarked long ago, the idea that each of the eight original Stūpas contained a *dōṇa*, a *drōṇa*, of relics, of course had its origin in a dim reminiscence of the part played by the Brahman Dōṇa, Drōṇa; to whom, by the way, some of the later traditions, reported by Buddhaghōsha and Hiuen Tsiang, impute disreputable behaviour, with a view to securing some of the corporeal relics, in addition to the *kumbha*.

* * * * *

Some remarks must be made here regarding the probable date and the value of the preceding narrative.

Reasons have been advanced by the translator of the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta for holding (trans., introd., 13) that the work cannot well have been composed very much later than the fourth century B.C. And, in the other direction, he has claimed (this Journal, 1901. 397) that substantially, as to not only ideas but also words, it can be dated approximately in the fifth century. That would tend to place the composition of its narrative within eight decades after the death of Buddha, for which event B.C. 482 seems to me the most probable and satisfactory date that we are likely to obtain. In view, however, of a certain prophecy which is placed by the Sutta in the mouth of Buddha, it does not appear likely that the work can be referred to quite so early a time as that.

In the course of his last journey, Buddha came to the village Pāṭaligāma (text, 60/84; trans., 15). At that time, we know from the commencement of the work, there was war, or a prospect of war, between Ajātasattu, king of Magadha, and the Vajji people. And, when Buddha was

on this occasion at Pāṭaligāma, Sunīdha and Vassakāra, the Mahāmattas or high ministers for Magadha, were laying out a regular city (*nagara*) at Pāṭaligāma, in order to ward off the Vajjis (text, 62/86; trans., 18).¹ The place was haunted by many thousands of "fairies" (*dēvatā*), who inhabited the plots of ground there. And it was by that spiritual influence that Sunīdha and Vassakāra had been led to select the site for the foundation of a city; the text says (trans., 18):—"Wherever ground is so occupied by "powerful fairies, they bend the hearts of the most "powerful kings and ministers to build dwelling-places "there, and fairies of middling and inferior power bend in "a similar way the hearts of middling or inferior kings and "ministers." Buddha with his supernatural clear sight beheld the fairies. And, remarking to his companion, the venerable Ānanda, that Sunīdha and Vassakāra were acting just as if they had taken counsel with the Tāvatisa "angels" (*dēva*), he said (text, 63/87; trans., 18):—"Inasmuch, O Ānanda!, as it is an honourable place as well as a resort of merchants, this shall become a leading city (*agga-nagara*), Pāṭaliputta (*by name*), a (?) great trading centre (*putabhēdana*); but, O Ānanda!, (*one of*) three dangers will befall Pāṭaliputta, either from fire, or from water, or from dissension."²

Unless this passage is an interpolation, which does not seem probable, the work cannot have been composed until after the prophecy had been so far fulfilled that the village Pāṭaligrāma had become the leading city, the capital Pāṭaliputra.

Now, Hiuen Tsiang, in the account given by him under Rājagriha, has reported that a king Aśōka, who, so far, might or might not be the promulgator of the well-known edicts, transferred his court to Pāṭaliputra from

¹ Compare the story about the founding of Rājagriha which we shall meet with further on, under Hiuen Tsiang.

² From the use of the particle *va*, 'or,' three times, the meaning seems clearly to be that only one of the three dangers should actually happen to the city.

For the danger from fire, compare the story about Girivraja, under Hiuen Tsiang.

Rājagriha; that is, that he, for the first time, made Pāṭaliputra the capital. And, from the way in which mention is made of Pāṭaliputta in the Girnār version of the fifth rock-edict (EI, 2. 453, line 7), we know that Pāṭaliputra was certainly the capital of the promulgator of the edicts, Asōka the Maurya, who was anointed to the sovereignty in B.C. 264, when 218 years had elapsed after the death of Buddha.

But we know from Megasthenēs, through Strabo,¹ that Pāṭaliputra was the capital of also Chandragupta, the grandfather of the Asōka who promulgated the edicts. In his account of Pāṭaliputra itself, Hiuen Tsiang has said, more specifically,² that in the first century, or in the year 100, after the death of Buddha, there was a king Asōka (A-shu-ka), a great-grandson of Bimbisāra; and that he left Rājagriha, and transferred his court to Pāṭali(putra), and caused a second wall to be made round the ancient town. And the Dīpavaṃsa, in its first reference to Pāṭaliputta, mentions it (5. 25) as the capital of that Asōka, Kālāsōka,

¹ See McCrindle in IA, 6. 131, and *Ancient India*, 42 f.

² Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 414; Beal, *Records*, 2. 85; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 88.

As a matter of fact, not even Kālāsōka the Śāisunāga was a great-grandson of Bimbisāra. But this point is not a material one.

Except perhaps in the passage mentioned just above, from the account given by Hiuen Tsiang under Rājagriha, where Julien has left the point undetermined, and except in the present passage, Hiuen Tsiang has, in the passages which I am using on this occasion, denoted his Asōka by the Chinese translation of the name, meaning (like the Indian name itself) 'sorrowless,' which has been transcribed by Julien as Wou-yeou, by Beal as Wu-yau, and by Watters as A-yü. It was A-yü who visited Rāmagrāma, and who opened the Stūpas at Vaiśālī and Rājagriha and that in the Chan-chu kingdom over the earthen jar.

Here, however, Hiuen Tsiang has denoted his Asōka by the Chinese transliteration of the name, which has been transcribed by Julien as 'O-chou-kia, by Beal as 'O-shu-kia, and by Watters as A-shu-ka.

This detail is noteworthy: because Hiuen Tsiang has said in the immediately preceding sentence that it was A-yü who made the "hell" at Pāṭaliputra; and, even closely after introducing the name A-shu-ka here, he has reverted to the other, and has said again that A-yü made the "hell" (Julien, *ibid.*) and that A-yü destroyed it (418), and also that it was A-yü who built one, or the first, of the 84,000 Stūpas (417 f.).

For reasons, however, which may be stated on another occasion, it cannot be said for certain from this passage that the king Asōka who made Pāṭaliputra the capital was, at that place, expressly indicated to Hiuen Tsiang as being not the Asōka who made the hell, opened the original Stūpas, built 84,000 other ones, etc.

son of Susunāga, who began to reign ninety years after the death of Buddha; mentioning, on the other hand, (3. 52) Rājagaha (but ? rather Giribbaja) as the capital of Bōdhisa (for Bhātiya) the father of Bimbisāra.

Tradition thus seems to indicate, plainly enough, that it was by Kālāsōka, who reigned for twenty-eight years,¹ B.C. 392–365, that Pāṭaliputra was made the capital, and to make it practically certain that the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta cannot have been composed before about B.C. 375.

The Sutta may really have been written then. Or it may be of later origin; how much so, we cannot at present say.² But it is certainly a very ancient work. The narrative presented all through it is so simple and dignified, and for the most part so free from miraculous interventions—(these occur chiefly, and not unnaturally so, in connexion with the death and cremation of Buddha)—and from extravagances of myth and absurdities of doctrine and practice, that it commands respect and belief. And so, in spite of the way in which (we know) history in India was liable to be somewhat quickly overlaid with imaginative and mythical details, I see no reason for regarding as otherwise than authentic the main facts asserted in the Sutta, including those attending the original disposal of the corporeal relics of Buddha.

It follows that we may at least believe that, over the eight portions of the corporeal relics of Buddha, Stūpas were erected—

¹ So Buddhaghōsha, in the introduction to his *Samantapāsādikā*; see the *Vinayapitaka*, ed. Oldenberg, 3. 321. So also the *Mahāvamsa*, 15, line 7.

Buddhaghōsha has mentioned him as simply Asōka in that place, but as Kālāsōka in passages on pages 293, 320.

² The following suggests itself as a point that should be considered in any full inquiry.

Does the appellation of the work really mean, as has been understood, “the book of the great decease”? If so, when did the terms *mahābhikkhamana*, ‘the great going forth from worldly life,’ and *mahāparinibbāna*, ‘the great decease,’ applied to those events in the case of Buddha as against *nikkhamana* and *parinibbāna* in the case of ordinary people, first become established?

Or does the appellation indicate only “the great(er) book of the decease,” as contrasted with some earlier and smaller work of the same kind?

- (1) At Rājagriha, by Ajātasatru king of Magadha.
- (2) At Vaiśālī, by the Licchavis.
- (3) At Kapilavastu, by the Sakyas.
- (4) At or in Allakappa, by the Buli people.
- (5) At Rāmagrāma, by the Kōliyas.
- (6) At or in Vēṭhadīpa, by an unnamed Brāhmaṇ of that place or territory.
- (7) At Pāvā, by a branch of the Mallas.
- (8) At Kuśinagara, by another branch of the Mallas.

Further, there were erected Stūpas—

- (9) At some unstated place, by the Brāhmaṇ Drōṇa, over the *kumbha*, the earthen jar in which the bones of Buddha had been collected.
 - (10) At Pippalivana, by the Mauryas, over the extinguished embers of the funeral pile.
-

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT AS AN IMPERIAL QUESTION.

Probably very few people, even among those who have some knowledge of the East, fully realize how important a part the ancient classical language and literature of India have played, directly or indirectly, in the history of civilization. Sanskrit was the vehicle of that form of Buddhist doctrine which from India spread to Nepal, Thibet, China,¹ Corea, and Japan; while Pāli, the oldest daughter of Sanskrit, was the language which diffused the teachings of Buddha over Ceylon, Burma, Siam, and the adjoining countries of the Farther East. In this way the religion, and to some extent even the laws, customs, and art, of some 400,000,000 of the present inhabitants of the world beyond the confines of India have been influenced from the plains of Hindustan.² Within the peninsula itself the ancient Aryan civilization, which is embalmed in Sanskrit literature, had penetrated, long before the beginning of our era, from its starting-point in the north-west to the extreme south, including Ceylon, and had imposed on the whole country that distinctive type of speech, as well as social and religious order, which in its essential features survives in the India of to-day. The Sanskrit language and Sanskrit literature thus furnish the key to the tongues and institutions of nearly 300,000,000 of people in India itself. What may be

¹ Hundreds of Buddhist Sanskrit works were translated into Chinese from the first century A.D. onwards. Cf. my "History of Sanskrit Literature," p. 369.

² See Ernst Kuhn, "Der Einfluss des arischen Indiens auf die Nachbarländer im Süden und Osten" (Munich, 1903), pp. 28.

termed Sanskritic civilization has thus been instrumental in raising to a higher level the population of nearly one-half of the human race. It may, in fact, be said to have done for the East much the same as Greece and Rome did for the West. The culture which the ancient Indo-Aryan thus diffused was, it is true, less advanced, but it was distinguished by originality as well as by depth of thought and a high standard of morality. Its diffusion, moreover, was not effected by the sword, but was a conquest achieved solely by the influence of religion, letters, and art.

Sanskrit literature and science have to an appreciable extent affected even the West. A well-known literary instance is the migration, beginning in the sixth century A.D., of Indian fables and fairy tales to Europe by way of Persia. The introduction into the West, through the Arabs, of the Indian numerical figures, together with the decimal system, now employed by the whole world, has had an influence on civilization in general which it is hard to overestimate.¹ More recently the discovery of Sanskrit led, in the nineteenth century, to the foundation of the sciences of Comparative Philology, Comparative Mythology,² and Comparative Religion. Through the first of these sciences Sanskrit has even influenced the teaching of Latin and Greek in the schools of the West. Such considerations as these are sufficient to show the general importance of the study of the language and literature of ancient India.

My present intention, however, is to deal with the subject only in so far as it is related to the practical needs of the British Empire. Linguistically, Sanskrit is the fountain-head of the speech of modern India. Nine of the main languages of the country, spoken by about 220,000,000 of people, are directly descended from the earliest form of Sanskrit. Of these, the most widely diffused is Hindī, with sixty millions; then Bengālī, with forty-five; Bihārī,

¹ See my "History of Sanskrit Literature," chapter xvi ("Sanskrit Literature and the West"), and the appended bibliography.

² Cf. Ernst Windisch, "Ueber die Bedeutung des indischen Alterthums," Leipzig, 1895.

with thirty-seven; Marāṭhī, with eighteen; Panjābī, with seventeen; the group of which Sindhī is the principal dialect, with thirteen; and, finally, Oriyā, Rājasthānī, and Gujarātī, with about ten millions each.¹

By the side of these Sanskritic tongues the speech of the aborigines of India still survives in various forms. Spoken by about sixty millions, it is chiefly represented by the Dravidians in the south of the peninsula. The four Dravidian tongues are Telugu, with a population of twenty-one millions; Tamil, with sixteen and a half; Canarese, with over ten; and Malayālam, with six.² These languages are full of Sanskritic words borrowed at different periods, some at the time of early contact with Aryan civilization, others in the form they had assumed in the mediæval Aryan vernaculars; much in the same way as English has, at different stages, adopted Latin words, either directly or in a French garb.³ The general relation of these languages to Sanskrit is, in fact, somewhat like that of English to Latin; only the degree of dependence is much greater in the former case. Hence, without a knowledge of Sanskrit, the history even of these Dravidian tongues cannot be understood.

Thus Sanskrit is the key to practically all the literary Indian vernaculars of to-day. Similarly, Sanskrit literature is the key to the life and thought of the modern Hindu. Owing to the continuity—unique among the Aryan nations—of Indian civilization and the great antiquity of its literature, the religious and social institutions of the India of to-day can be traced back historically to the earliest sacred texts and lawbooks through a period of well over three thousand years. Nor can those institutions be properly comprehended except in the light of this ancient literary evidence.

It is, therefore, clear that a knowledge of the Sanskrit language and literature is in quite a special degree calculated to afford an insight into Hindu life and to enable those

¹ These statistics are taken in round numbers from Dr. Grierson's "The Languages of India" (pp. 51-93), Calcutta, 1903.

² Grierson, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

³ E.g. 'fragile' and 'frail'; cf. Grierson, pp. 40 and 60.

possessed of such knowledge to regard much that might otherwise appear absurd or ridiculous with sympathetic interest. The experience of a friend of mine may serve to illustrate this point. There is a well-known hymn of the Rigveda¹ (dating at the latest from about 1000 B.C.), in which the sound produced by pupils repeating their lessons is compared with that made by frogs during the rains :

“When one repeats the utterance of the other
Like those who learn the lessons of their teacher.”

Dr. Grierson was a few years ago asked to visit a school for native boys in the district of Bihar. As he entered the building the croaking of the frogs in a neighbouring water-course sounded loud in his ears. Making his way through various passages, he at last came to a long corridor where he was greatly surprised to hear the same sound with extraordinary distinctness. The door opened, and he stood face to face with a class of Hindu boys repeating their lesson in unison. What a vivid illustration of the truth to nature of a comparison made three thousand years ago, and of the unchanging character of Indian custom through so vast a period of time !

Some knowledge of Sanskrit would thus appear to be an essential element in the training of young men preparing to rule a Hindu population. And, as a matter of fact, the subject formed part of the curriculum at Haileybury till the East India College was closed in 1858 ; and it has continued, as an option under the competitive system, down to the present time. It used to be taken up by a large proportion of the probationers both in the Haileybury days and subsequently. Thanks to such preliminary training, several of these civilians afterwards became distinguished scholars. Among them I may here mention Dr. John Muir, whose “Original Sanskrit Texts” is still a standard work ; Dr. A. C. Burnell, eminent as a palæographer and editor

¹ The well-known Frog hymn, vii, 103, translated in my “History of Sanskrit Literature,” p. 121 f.

of early Sanskrit texts; Dr. Fleet, our leading Indian epigraphist; Dr. Grierson, director of the Indian Linguistic Survey; and Mr. Vincent Smith, well known as an authority on Indian archæology.¹

As an example of the number of probationers learning the language in comparatively recent years, I may mention that as many as eighteen began Sanskrit at Oxford in the year 1888, when probably not twenty-five altogether were in residence in the University.

In 1892-3 new regulations came into force, which, while raising the maximum age of candidates for the open competition to 23, reduced the probationary period from two years to one. The prizes which had till then been offered for proficiency in Sanskrit and other subjects were at the same time withdrawn. This change resulted in bringing down the average number of men taking Sanskrit to between four and five a year. In 1903 a further alteration was introduced, restricting the number of optional subjects allowed in the final examination to one instead of two. The effect of this additional change has been further to reduce those offering Sanskrit in that examination to one or two only, though the total number of men entering the Civil Service annually has considerably increased—the average since 1892 being fifty-five, as compared with forty-one for the ten previous years²; or an increase of 33 per cent., accompanied by a decrease of Sanskrit candidates to almost vanishing point. This is not all. Sanskrit is, indeed, one of the subjects allowed in the open competition also; but, owing to the highness of the standard, no English candidate finds it worth his while to offer the subject. For he would have to devote to it as many years as months to some other subjects in order to secure the same number of marks. Hence the only candidates during the last twelve or thirteen years who have succeeded in passing the open competition

¹ The greatest of English Sanskritists, H. T. Colebrooke, was an Indian civilian of the older period: he was in India from 1782 to 1814.

² These statistics are derived from information supplied to me by the Civil Service Commissioners.

with the aid of Sanskrit have been one or two natives of India annually. The net result, then, of the present regulations is that, of the fifty-three or fifty-four young Britons who leave England every year as future rulers of India, two at the most now go out equipped with even an elementary knowledge of the classical language of that country.

Can it be regarded as a satisfactory state of things that the subject which above all others furnishes the key to the civilization of a dependency should be virtually excluded from the preliminary training of its administrators? Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that Italy were a province of Germany and ruled by a staff of German Civil Servants educated for the purpose in their own country. Is it conceivable that these highly trained officials would be allowed to enter on their duties without knowing a word of Latin, the mother of Italian, and the language in which the ancient literature and laws of Italy are written? Is it likely that such a lack of educational principle would be tolerated in France or the United States, to say nothing of Germany?

But, it may be objected, your Indian civilian can very well learn his Sanskrit in India itself. The answer to this is that in the busy, practical life upon which the young civilian at once enters, there is no time or opportunity for him to begin a difficult dead language like Sanskrit. In any case, his knowledge, acquired with the assistance of an uncritical Pandit, would not be of much value. It would probably express itself in philological discoveries such as identifying the Sanskrit word *aśva*, 'horse,' with the English *ass*¹; or deriving the Sanskrit *vānara*, 'monkey,' from *vā nara*, 'or a man.'²

It may further be objected that we do not wish to turn our Indian civilians into Sanskrit scholars, since such men would be apt to neglect their official duties. Now the work of the modern civilian has become so much heavier than in the old days, that there is little risk of his becoming a mere

¹ An Indian civilian, who had evolved his own philology in the East, once actually mentioned this to me as an interesting linguistic equation.

² This is a native etymology of the word.

student; nor am I here advocating the study of Sanskrit except as an element in the educational equipment of the Indian civilian.

One occasionally, however, hears the somewhat Philistine remark that the study of a dead language like Sanskrit is absolutely useless to the civilian. Now even the comparatively small amount of Sanskrit that a man can learn in his probationary year is by no means 'useless.' It would be of some value if it did nothing else than prevent him from mauling in pronunciation, as the ordinary Anglo-Indian does, the many Sanskrit words which he will have to employ. The following example may serve as an illustration. Anglo-Indian society appears to be divided into two camps regarding the true pronunciation of the name of the great northern mountain range. The one party says Himālay-a; the second, with the consciousness of profounder knowledge, pronounces the name as Himālāh-ya. Our young civilian would know that these superior persons are quite as wrong as the ordinary herd, and that the only correct pronunciation is Himāh-laya.¹ Starting with the knowledge of Sanskrit he has brought with him, he can go on to take the High Proficiency prize, which represents quite a substantial reward in money value. Besides, a study which, even though incapable of being estimated in terms of cash, tends to inspire a man with sympathetic interest in his work, and thus increases his efficiency in the performance of that work, does after all 'pay.' A very distinguished member of the Indian Civil Service (not himself a Sanskrit scholar), in a letter written not long ago, said he considered it "desirable that he [the probationer] should make a beginning in this country [England] in the study of Sanskrit. The importance of such a study to his understanding of the Hindu mind is, I am convinced, immense. And the possession of a moderate knowledge of Sanskrit gives a man an influence in India, and an amount of respect among native scholars, which are of great value to him." A very small acquaintance with

¹ That is, 'Abode (*ālaya*) of snow (*hima*).'

Sanskrit will enable the young civilian to understand at once the meaning of a great many Indian geographical and personal names. It will give him a keen interest in his modern vernacular, the derivation of which from Sanskrit must constantly strike him. It will enable him to consult the Sanskrit legal works which are the sources of Hindu law, without having to rely on the uncritical interpretations of a possibly third-rate Pandit. If he has made some acquaintance with ancient Sanskrit literature, he cannot fail to be deeply interested in the life of the population around him, because he can then comprehend it historically. Otherwise he must for the most part find it dull and meaningless, much as the ordinary man neither observes nor understands the teeming insect life which reveals itself in woods and fields to the seeing eye of the trained naturalist. And how much more sympathetic must be his relations to the people among whom so many years of his life are passed? Would not such a mental attitude, if general, greatly strengthen the position of the British Rāj, the even-handed justice of which the native on the whole acknowledges, but which, he cannot help feeling, treats him with the cold indifference of an alien race? Surely, under these circumstances, a better regulation of the preliminary training which Indian civilians have to undergo must appear advisable. Thus Sanskrit might be made a compulsory subject, by the Civil Service Commissioners, for those probationers who are assigned to the Provinces of which the vernaculars are peculiarly Sanskritic, as Bombay and Lower Bengal; while those going to other Provinces might be encouraged to take Sanskrit as their optional subject either by attaching to it a higher scale of marks, or by offering a prize for proficiency in this language, as used to be the case before 1892.

Let us now turn to examine the condition of Sanskrit studies in India itself at the present day. Two ways of teaching Sanskrit exist there side by side: the method followed in the native schools and that prevailing in the Government colleges.

In the traditional learning of the Brahmans Sanskrit

still occupies a far more important position than Latin does in any European country. Though it ceased to be a living language, in the true sense, several centuries before the beginning of our era, it still survives as a spoken language among the learned classes, beside the vernaculars of which it is the parent. Thousands of Brahmans still speak it, and in some centres like Benares they wield it, in disputations lasting for hours, with a mastery which could hardly be surpassed in any living language. Sanskrit also continues to be largely used for literary purposes; for many books and journals written in it are still published in India. The copying of Sanskrit manuscripts goes on in hundreds of Indian libraries. The Vedas are even at the present day committed to memory in their entirety. Many a Pandit can repeat the exhaustive grammar of Pāṇini (written about 300 B.C.) without a mistake from beginning to end. The learning of the Brahmans is, however, a purely traditional affair, unprogressive and uncritical because the historical and comparative methods are completely beyond its ken. Its object is not, like that of European science, to enlarge the boundaries of knowledge, but simply to hand on the ancient learning unimpaired from one generation to another by means of oral teaching.

In Government schools and colleges, Sanskrit, as coming under the general system of education introduced into India from the West, is, of course, taught differently. It is, however, a most unfortunate thing that the excessive use of examinations prevalent in England, should have been adopted in a country where the memory has for ages been abnormally developed to the detriment of the reasoning powers. Memory continues to be the faculty mainly relied on by the Sanskrit student; but the redeeming feature of the native system, single-minded devotion to the subject for its own sake, is replaced by feverish eagerness for the attainment of a degree, through examinations which must be passed by hook or by crook. A certain number of prescribed books has to be got up in a mechanical way, often with the aid of very inadequate editions. A glance at the calendars of the Indian Universities

will suffice to show that the set books in Sanskrit are by no means always judiciously selected. A number of books may, for instance, be found prescribed from a single department of literature, in which the same kind of subject-matter is treated over and over again. In the regulations, books may be seen recommended which are quite out of date, and the use of which must therefore necessarily do more harm than good. This state of things is doubtless largely due to the fact that no Director of Public Instruction ever knows any Sanskrit nowadays, while the native professors, whose advice is accepted, are not qualified to construct a systemic and adequate curriculum based on broad principles. Such haphazard and one-sided schemes cannot possibly produce educationally satisfactory results. Matters are aggravated by the 'cram' character of the papers to which a native examiner is particularly prone. One can hardly help feeling that to such circumstances is partly due the amazing ingenuity which is often employed by Indian students in their endeavours to secure advance copies of examination papers, and which has rendered the printing of the latter in Europe an advisable precaution. A good many people have probably heard of the white-robed compositor of Calcutta who, having sat down, when no one was looking, on the type he had set up, sold the impression thus obtained to aspirants for University Honours.

There can be little doubt that, with the spread of the Western system of education, the native learning will die out, leaving behind a very inadequate substitute, as far as Sanskrit at least is concerned. Yet in Sanskrit the educationalist has ready to hand a subject which, if properly handled, would be at least equal to Latin or Greek as an agency for developing the mental faculties. The dominant position which, owing to its archaic character, its copious inflexional forms, and its transparent structure, Sanskrit occupies in Comparative Philology, is sufficient to prove its educative value from the *linguistic* point of view. The richness of its literature in many departments further makes it a suitable vehicle for mental training on the *literary* side.

Finally, the peculiarly close relation of this ancient literature to modern Hindu life supplies much material for the teaching of historical evolution, a notion hitherto so conspicuously unfamiliar to the Indian mind.

At present, however, there is less prospect than ever of improvement in the teaching of Sanskrit in India. At one time chairs of Sanskrit in India used to be filled by European scholars like Bühler and Kielhorn,¹ trained in strict critical methods of research. The labours of such men did an immense deal to stimulate and place on a scientific basis the study of Sanskrit grammar, palæography, epigraphy, and archæology in India. But for some time past the fatal policy has been pursued of appointing only natives to such posts. These are men who have grown up under the English educational system, and, without possessing the profound traditional learning of the genuine Pandit, have yet not acquired (with the extremely rare exceptions of men like R. G. Bhandarkar) any real grasp of scientific method. The following two examples may serve as illustrations of what such a man may do. A native scholar of some distinction wished to edit a certain text in a well-known Sanskrit series, one of the rules for which forbade the publication in it of any edition unless based on at least three independent MSS. The scholar in question possessed only *one* MS. of the work. This, however, proved no insuperable difficulty. He handed his solitary MS. to his copyists, "and then there were three." The resulting edition probably contained quite an array of various readings, supplied by the mistakes of the scribes, and doubtless presented a thoroughly critical appearance. More recently another native Sanskrit scholar has published a work in which he claims to have conclusively proved, on the strength of some vague astrological statements in the Mahābhārata, the exact date (October 31st, 1194 B.C.) when the great war described in that epic began! A Greek scholar fixing the first year of the Trojan war from the data of the Iliad would be performing an analogous feat.

¹ Besides many others, such as Fitzedward Hall, Cowell, Ballantyne, Griffith, Tawney, Gough, Peterson.

But if there is little hope of improvement in the methods of teaching Sanskrit in Indian colleges, there is still less in the matter of higher studies. Native scholars can no longer obtain any training in this direction. The lack of the knowledge of German, moreover, cuts them off from most of such guidance as can be derived from the private study of standard works of scholarship. And yet India, with its vast mass of traditional learning and its ancient civilization still surviving, is an ideal country for research. It is, besides, a country in which research in the domain of epigraphy and archæology should be specially encouraged and would be peculiarly fruitful. For, owing to the total absence of historical writings till after the Muhammadan conquest (about A.D. 1000), it is on such researches that we must largely rely for material throwing light on early Indian history. Hence there is some comfort to be derived from the fact that of the very few European Sanskrit scholars still left in India, as many as three¹ hold archæological appointments; but even these scholars have not always been able to devote themselves entirely to this important branch of research. At least Dr. Stein, whose published works have shown his eminent abilities as an archæologist, and whose explorations in Chinese Turkestan have proved his practical aptitude for such work, was for many years able to pursue his archæological studies in his holidays only. He has been obliged even latterly, I believe, to spend a large proportion of his time on routine educational duties, instead of being able to devote all his energies exclusively to the investigation of the antiquities of India. It is heartbreaking to think of the irreparable damage done in this field, partly by the neglect of Government, partly by the operations of amateur archæologists, in days gone by. All those who have the interests of Indian archæology at heart must therefore be truly grateful for the new era inaugurated by the late Viceroy. Soon after his arrival in India Lord Curzon publicly expressed his conviction that

¹ Dr. Th. Bloch in Bengal; Dr. Vogel in the Panjab and United Provinces; Dr. Stein in the Frontier Province.

the preservation of the relics of the past was a primary obligation of Government, a duty owed not only to India, but to the whole civilized world, and that the promotion of archæological study and the encouragement of research was a part of our imperial obligation to India. It is due to him that the archæological department in India has now, for the first time since it came into being more than forty years ago, been placed on a firm administrative basis, with a consistent policy, definite responsibilities, and a systematic programme. As evidence of the important work, chiefly in the direction of conservation, but also to some extent of exploration, which has been done under the new *régime*, the first Annual Report of the Archæological Survey (for the year 1902-3) has been published in a handsome volume, ably edited by Mr. Marshall, the Director-General of Archæology, in a form which should attract many readers. It is greatly to be hoped that the archæological department will henceforth remain on a permanent footing as now established, and that in appointing Europeans to posts in the five archæological circles into which India is divided, a knowledge of Sanskrit will be regarded as an essential qualification. It is also to be hoped that the Provincial Governments will be ready to make liberal grants for the regular and complete excavation of important buried sites, to be carried out by their trained experts. Enlightened native opinion should least of all object to the comparatively trifling expenditure involved. For the sole object of such work is to throw more light on the obscure periods of the history of their country, of the achievements of which in ancient times Indians have every reason to be proud. Learned societies cannot provide funds sufficient for such undertakings; and it is much better to "let sleeping gods lie" than to encourage the private efforts of uninformed amateur zeal.

The exclusion of European scholars from the chairs of Sanskrit in India is likely to react in a prejudicial way on Sanskrit studies in England also. Though the subject is of practical and imperial interest to us, and does not directly

concern any other Western nation, we have in Great Britain and Ireland only four endowed professorships of Sanskrit—at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, and Dublin; while Germany has about twenty-six: at least one in each of the Universities and two in some of them, to say nothing of the numerous *Privatdocenten* in the subject. The prospect of a career for English Sanskritists in India being practically closed, the professors in our Universities must naturally have some hesitation in encouraging students to become specialists in Sanskrit; for the openings for such scholars in this country itself are very rare. This will later on lead to restriction in the supply of adequately trained candidates for even the very few chairs of Sanskrit which exist in England. A depressing influence must thus make itself felt all round in the study of a subject which affects the interest of England and India alike.

How to remedy this unsatisfactory state of things is a question worthy of being seriously considered by the Indian Government. At present that Government has no body of experts on whose advice it could rely in initiating educational reforms such as that I have indicated. None of the Directors of Public Instruction know Sanskrit. There is no trained European Sanskritist either in the Bombay or the Madras Presidency holding an archæological, epigraphical, or educational post. Since the retirement of Mr. Justice Pargiter in the spring of this year, there is no European Sanskritist left in the whole of Bengal who could be consulted on educational questions connected with Sanskrit, excepting only Dr. Bloch, whose duties are not educational, but are confined to archæology. In the United Provinces, Dr. Thibaut retires in May from the Principalship of Muir Central College, Allahabad, and there will remain only Mr. Arthur Venis, who is chiefly interested in the traditional side of Indian philosophy, and Mr. H. C. Norman, a young Oxford graduate, who only went out to Benares a few months ago as a Professor of English Literature. In the Panjab there is, besides Dr. Vogel, only a young graduate of Oxford, Mr. Woolner, who went

out to Lahore only three years ago and most of whose time is taken up with the heavy routine duties of Registrar to the University. In the Frontier Province there will shortly be no one left, when Dr. Stein has started on his archæological expedition to Central Asia.¹ The net result, then, is that in the summer of the present year there will be only five or six² European Sanskrit scholars in India holding archæological or educational posts, none of them directly responsible for the advancement of Sanskrit studies or capable of speaking with authority on the subject from the educational point of view.

It is thus difficult to see what could be done without the aid of a small commission of experts appointed to investigate and report on the condition in India of Sanskrit studies as a whole. Such a commission might, as regards Sanskrit, lay down principles for guidance in teaching and examining, in arranging an adequate curriculum, and in providing for text-books suitable for that curriculum. It could, further, make recommendations as to the best means of securing a regular supply of teachers qualified for higher studies and capable of training others in methods of research. The ideal state of things would be to combine a trained European Sanskritist with a native scholar on the staff of each University; the latter having the advantage of familiarity with indigenous tradition, the former with critical method. But to appoint to such posts Englishmen possessing merely a tolerable linguistic knowledge of Sanskrit, without a systematic and scientific training in the subject as a whole, would do but little good. It would in my opinion be futile to create chairs of Sanskrit till thoroughly qualified scholars are known to be available. A supply of suitable men is, however, not likely to be forthcoming, unless vacancies can be counted upon to occur at definite periods. If the professors in our Universities could be informed of such appointments a sufficiently long time before, they could easily train an able

¹ A young American Sanskrit scholar has, I hear, just been appointed to take Dr. Stein's place.

² Only two of these are Englishmen by birth.

man for the particular post, supplementing, their own teaching by sending him to a German University for a time. These remarks apply not only to possible chairs of Sanskrit, but, in the Muhammadan parts of India, of Persian or Arabic also. A moderate knowledge of Sanskrit scholarship ought to be regarded as an essential qualification for men who are to teach history and philosophy to Hindu students. For without such knowledge a man cannot fully understand Hindu modes of thought, and consequently lacks the mental equipment necessary for teaching these two subjects satisfactorily in India. The position of Arabic and Persian in Muhammadan Colleges is similar. Moreover, a general knowledge of Sanskrit scholarship is essential in archæological appointments owing to the peculiar importance of archæology in Indian historical research. By this I do not by any means intend to say that every officer in the archæological department should be a Sanskritist; for a considerable part of the work requires only a practical knowledge of surveying, excavating, and architecture. What I mean is that there should be in every archæological circle at any rate one Sanskritist, and in the Muhammadan part of Northern India one trained European Persian and Arabic scholar. How else are the inscriptions to be deciphered, ancient sites to be identified, antiquities to be interpreted, history to be extracted from archæological finds, by men who have not learned Indian epigraphy, who have no first-hand knowledge of ancient Indian mythology, and to whom the various clues afforded by a direct acquaintance with the ancient literature are inaccessible? Would the archæology of Greece yield any valuable results if investigated by men who know no Greek?

There can be little doubt that, under a well thought-out system, the ancient classical language and literature of India could be made a potent agency in educating the Hindu mind. Applied thus, they could make the Indian people understand their own civilization historically, and acquire that enlightenment which will prove the surest means of delivering them from the bonds of superstition and caste that have

held them enthralled for more than two thousand years. If handled in the manner indicated, Sanskrit learning might contribute to render our rule in India sympathetic as well as just; and Sanskrit literature, the best inheritance of the Hindus, and, in its earliest phase, the oldest monument of the Aryan race, might be made the chief instrument in their intellectual and social regeneration. The realization of such an idea would show that Britons are indeed well fitted to maintain an empire which is unique in the history of the world.

A. A. MACDONELL.

BRHAT KATHĀ.

This great work, which is the source of all later romantic literature, has been known to us only through three Sanskrit versions,¹ viz., Kṣhēmēndra's Bṛhat Kathāmanjari and Sōmadēva's Kathāsaritsāgara. Older Sanskrit scholars have been of divided opinion as to the date of composition of the original work, Professor Weber ascribing it to the sixth century after Christ, as also Daṇḍin's Daśakumāra Caritam. But the latest opinion, that of Dr. Bühler, is that it must have been composed about the first or second century A.D.² That the Bṛhat Kathā was well known and highly regarded is evident from the quotations given in the introduction to the Nirṇayasāgara edition of Sōmadēva's Kathāsaritsāgara. As the Kathāpīḍa has it, the work is a faithful abridgment of the original in the Paisāci dialect, the only liberty that the author has taken, according to himself, being the change in language and the abridging.³ That Guṇāḍya flourished in the court of Sātavāhana at Pratiśtāna would refer him to the first two centuries of the Christian era. This particular Sātavāhana, whose minister Guṇāḍya is said to have been, was, according to the same authority, the son of

¹ The third is a comparatively new discovery, and was found among a collection of old Nepalese MSS. obtained by Pandit Hara Prasad Sastri, and described by him in J.A.S.B., vol. lxii, pt. 1 (1893), pp. 254-5.

² Macdonell's Sans. Lit., p. 376.

³ Śloka 10, Taranga i.

a *Dīpakarṇi*. In the *paurāṇic* lists of the *Sātavāhanas* there is no name *Dīpakarṇi* unless we identify the name with *Śātakarṇi*, in which latter case *Guṇādyā* will have to be referred to a time perhaps in the century preceding the advent of Christ. It is here that unexpected light is thrown on the question from classical Tamil literature. There is a work in Tamil variously referred to as *Udayaṇan Kadai*, *Kadai*, or *Peruṇḡadai*, the last of these being a literal translation of *Bṛhat Kathā*. A part of the manuscript copy of this Tamil work has been for some time in the possession of Pundit V. Svāminātha Iyer, of the Madras Presidency College, who kindly informs me that he is editing it to bring out as much of it as is available, though the manuscript is so disfigured as to make his task very difficult. Its publication would establish a much-needed link between the *Āryan* and *Draviḍian* literatures that is likely to be fruitful of consequences on the study of both. The available portion of this Tamil work is composed of five sections or books :—¹

1. *Unjaik Kāṇḍam* (*Ujjaini Kāṇḍa*), 58 subsections, of which 32 are lost.
2. *Ilāvāṇa Kāṇḍam* (*Lāvāṇa*), 20 subsections.
3. *Magadha Kāṇḍam*, 27 subsections.
4. *Vattava Kāṇḍam* (*Vatsa*), 17 subsections.
5. *Naravāṇa Kāṇḍam*, 9 subsections.

If an idea could be formed of this Tamil translation (or at the worst, adaptation) of the *Bṛhat Kathā*, this would help to ascertain the date of the original.

The existence of this work, according to the learned Pundit, has been brought to light by his examination of *Adiyārkkunallār's* Commentary on the *Śilappadhikāram*. This is an exceptionally good and accurate commentator, who acknowledges quotations from other works, unlike other commentators. Although there is evidence enough in his commentaries that he wrote a complete commentary upon the work, it is only a part that has survived so far.

¹ Pundit Svāminātha Iyer's edition of *Śilappadhikāram*, introd., p. 17.

In this portion he quotes from the Kalingattupparaṇi, by the side of one of which quotations he simply adds 'Kavichakravartī.'¹ Jayamkondān, the author of the Kalingattupparaṇi, was the Kavichakravartī of Kulōttunga Chōḷa I. If the title should clearly be understood by the readers of his commentary he could not have lived much later than Jayamkondān, as other Kavichakravartīs there were under Kulōttunga's son and grandson. Hence we might allocate Aḍiyārkkunallār to the early part of the twelfth century A.D.

This commentator, who came a little after the Kāsmirian translators of the Br̥hat Kathā, not only quotes from the Peruṅgadaḷ or Udayaṇaṅgadaḷ, but has the following to say of it in discussing whether the Kāvya Śilappadhikāram should be called a kāvya, which is not a Tamil designation, or a kathā, which, though Sanskrit, has been recognised as a class of composition by Tamil grammarians. Of course, he decides that it should be called a kāvya, the recognition of which by Tamil grammarians could be inferred if no explicit definition be given. Quoting a passage from the "Udayaṇan Kathai," where the expression "Kāpiya Araṣan" (Kāvya Rāja) occurs,² the commentator proceeds to say that the said kathā was written on a study of the published works of the middle Śāṅgam (college of poets and critics) at Kapādapuram. Hence we have to take the work to have been written prior to the great works of the third Śāṅgam that we have now. This is also borne out by the disappearance of a kind of musical instrument referred to in the kathā which is not at all referred to under identical circumstances in the later works, a smaller instrument having taken its place. Besides this, there is a general similarity of design observable between the great Tamil kāvyas as they are now and the Br̥hat Kathā. This could not have been quite accidental, as it works through details even. Hence the kathā—I am concerned with the translation

¹ Śilappadhikāram, S. Iyer's edition, p. 136.

² Śilappadhikāram, Pundit S. Iyer's edition, commentator's introd., p. 2.

only here—must have been composed prior to the third Tamil Śāṅgam, which could not be placed any later in point of time than the third century A.D.,¹ the period of decline of the Sātavāhana power. Hence the Bṛhat Kathā will have to be referred to the commencement of the Christian era, if not a little anterior to it, and I hope to study the question more closely, as soon as I am in a position to compare the kathā with kāvyas like the Chintāmaṇi and Maṇimekhalā. In the meantime I thought it would serve some useful purpose to indicate the line of enquiry suggested by the little that could be known of the work, as I casually took up the Kathāsaritsāgara in the course of my Sanskrit reading. Before closing I would invite attention to the following: (1) That the work Udayaṇa Kadai was based upon Guṇāḍya's Bṛhat Kathā; (2) that the translation or adaptation was made between the second and third Tamil Śāṅgams, probably nearer the latter than the former; (3) that the great kāvyas of Tamil so far available show considerable grounds for affiliation of a more or less intimate character with this work.

S. KRISHNASVĀMI AĪYANGĀR.

DALLANA AND BHOJA.

Dallana, the main subject of Dr. Hoernle's article on Indian medicine in the *Journal* for April, may have been the same as a Dallana who was, according to Bihār tradition, a contemporary of Bhoja. Every Maithil paṇḍit knows his name, and can tell half a dozen amusing stories about him. He is always described as *madhyama paṇḍita*, neither very learned nor altogether a fool. This evidently refers to his knowledge of *kārya*. He may have been a very good doctor. He is said to have been Bhoja's chief paṇḍit, and to have retained his post by managing to keep all better scholars away from court. Kālidāsa is said to have obtained

¹ See my article, "The Augustan Age of Tamil Literature," *Madras Review*, 1904.

an audience with the king by means of an ingenious stratagem, and thus to have ousted Dallana.

The author's name is spelt, in Bihār, in three different ways, either दल्लन or दल्लन or दल्लन. All three spellings are well-known to the local paṇḍits, and are said to refer to the same person. A legend about Dallana (दल्लन or दल्लन) will be found in JASB., xlviii (1879), Pt. I, pp. 36 ff.

In all the stories Dallana is represented as Kālidāsa's butt, and is the subject of what paṇḍits look upon as humour. I have some of these stories in MS., but the Indian idea of the *hāsya-rasa* differs so widely from that of educated Europeans that they are too coarse for publication.

G. A. GRIERSON.

ADHAKŌSIKYA.

Dr. Fleet's translation of *aḍha* by 'eight'¹ is borne out by the traditions of modern Magadha.

In Gayā, as elsewhere in Northern India, a halting-place for travellers is known as a *parāo* (पड़ाव).

During the past twenty years the British Government has erected inspection bungalows for the use of travelling officials at intervals of about eight miles along most of the main roads. These are generally in some shady spot, and are always provided with wells. The latter have made the nearest groves convenient halting-places (*parāo*) for native travellers.

This has often led to my being told by 'oldest inhabitants' that in former days there were *parāos* at every eight kōs (*āṭh āṭh kōs par*), but that the British Sarkār had now made them at every eight miles.

G. A. GRIERSON.

THE USE OF THE GERUND AS PASSIVE IN SANSKRIT.

In discussing the Madhuban plate of Harṣa, Professor Kielhorn, *Epigr. Ind.*, vii, 159, note 3, with reference to the

¹ J.R.A.S., April, 1906, pp. 401 ff.

sentence *rājāno yudhi duṣṭavājina iva śrīdevaguptādayaḥ kṛtvā yena kaśāprahāravimukhāḥ sarve samam saṃyatāḥ*, writes: "The Gerund *kṛtvā* of the original text is employed, in an unusual way, to convey a passive sense; 'like vicious horses (curbed) after they have been made to turn away from the lashes of the whip.' In Prākṛt we do find passive Gerunds; compare e.g. *bhajjīu janti* (= *bhañkṛvā yānti*), 'they run away after having been broken,' in Prof. Pischel's *Materialien zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṃśa*, p. 23. For Sanskrit I can only quote, from the *Daśakumāracarita*, *kim upakṛtya pratyupakṛtavatī bhaveyam*, where the Gerund *upakṛtya* must mean 'after having been favoured.'"

Though undoubtedly the meaning of these gerunds is practically what would be normally expressed by a past participle passive, it would appear undesirable to admit that they were so treated by the writers. It seems to me more probable that they were intended to be ordinary gerunds. Compare, for instance, such an example as the following from Manu (ix, 99): *yad anyasya pratijñāya punar anyasya dīyate*: the translation in English would be 'that, having been promised to one, the maiden is given to another.' But no one would hesitate to construe it strictly either as 'that she is given to another by some one who has promised her to one' or 'that, when some one has promised her to one, she is given to another,' the gerund being taken as absolute in the second case. Similarly, the passage from the *Daśakumāracarita* surely means 'How can I requite the person who has done me a favour?' or 'How, when some one has benefited me, can I repay?' The passage from the Madhuban plate on this view would mean literally 'by whose action Devagupta and all the other kings together were subdued, although like vicious horses they turned away from the lashes of his whip.' The exact idea would seem to be that the kings were kicking against the pricks, but had to give in, not that he made them give in like horses which had been made to turn away from his lashes.

I have not been able to find any passages in Sanskrit where a similar explanation is not possible and adequate.

The Prākṛt passage cited by Professor Kielhorn is clearly open to a similar interpretation (viz. 'they run away when one has broken them'), but I must leave it to those who have studied Prākṛt and Pāli more fully than I have done to say whether the gerund has developed, through instances such as these, a definitively passive meaning in these languages.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS FROM KHOTAN.

On the 18th April last I received another small consignment of ancient manuscript fragments from Khotan. It was forwarded to me by Mr. J. H. Marshall, Director-General of the Indian Archæological Department. Among other, smaller, fragments it contained four very large leaves in perfect preservation, measuring $22\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{8}$ inches (height of letter $\frac{1}{2}$ "), and numbered 253, 254, 259, 260 on the obverse left-hand margin. I noticed on one of the leaves the name of the Bodhisatva *Prajñākūṭa*; and this enabled me to identify the leaves as belonging to a manuscript of the *Saddharma Puṇḍarīka*. Fols. 253 and 254 give the end of chapter xi; and fols. 259, 260 are from chapter xii. Comparing the text with that of the manuscript of the Royal Asiatic Society, Cat. No. 6, fol. 253 begins with *sarve ca te Mañjuśrī*, corresponding to R.A.S., fol. 95a, l. 3. Fol. 254 ends with *na c-āśya maṇeḥ pratigra[hakah]*, corresponding to R.A.S., fol. 96b, l. 1. Fol. 259 begins with *prativitarkam*, of which *prati* is the last word on R.A.S., fol. 97b, and *vitarkam* commences R.A.S., fol. 98a. The two texts substantially agree; but there are numerous differences in detail. Thus a long passage, R.A.S., fol. 95a, l. 6, to fol. 96b, l. 4, is omitted on fol. 253. Another long passage, on fol. 259b, middle of line 3 to middle of line 6, is omitted in R.A.S., fol. 98a. Instead of the address (to the daughter of Sāgara, the Nāgarāja) *bhagini* in the R.A.S. manuscript,

our fragment has *kula-duhite* (*sic*; cf. Müller, Pali Grammar, p. 84, *dhīte*).

In another large consignment of manuscript fragments which I received in February, 1904, from the Under-Secretary of the Government of India, I discovered five bilingual fragments (Nos. 1-5), inscribed on one side with Chinese, and on the other with cursive Brāhmī letters. On closer examination it was discovered by me that they formed three pieces of manuscript; Nos. 1 and 2 forming a continuous piece; so also Nos. 3 and 4. The colour (reddish-brown) and texture of the paper show that Nos. 1-4 belong to the same sheet, or leaf, of which, thus, a fairly large portion is preserved. No. 5, a very small piece of a slightly lighter colour, may belong to another sheet. I transmitted the fragments to M. Chavannes, who very kindly had promised to examine them. I have just had a postcard (May 7th, 1906) from him to say that he has discovered the Chinese text of the fragment to belong to the *Mahāprajñā-pāramitā Sūtra*. The reverses of the fragments which show cursive Brāhmī characters, are inscribed in one of the two unknown (proto-Tibetan?) languages of Khotan. It is much to be hoped that the detailed account and reading of the Chinese text may eventually yield a clue to the long-sought identity of the unknown language.

In the same consignment of February, 1904, I discovered also some fragments of two manuscripts of the *Suvarṇa-bhāṣottama Sūtra*. There is one complete, though slightly damaged, leaf (No. 1), numbered 89, measuring $16\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ inches, with six lines on the page. Of another leaf (No. 2), apparently of the same manuscript, there is nearly the whole of the right-hand half; $7 \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ inches, with six lines on the page. A third leaf of the same work (No. 3) belongs to another manuscript. It consists of most of the left-hand half, and measures $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ inches, with nine lines on the page. It has a blank reverse, and appears to have been the final leaf of the manuscript. On the obverse there are remains of ten verses (*śloka*), numbered 3-13, in praise of the Sūtra. For example, on line 2, we read . . . *svaṇṇa*

bhāṣottamantidam | *gaṁbhīram śravaṇena* . . . (remainder lost), i.e. "this Suvarṇa - bhāṣottama, deep by the ear . . . "; and on line 7, . . . *śrotavyaṁ sūtram = uttamam* || 10 || *Ye śṛṇvanti idaṁ sūtram* . . . i.e. "this excellent Sūtra is to be listened to; who hear this Sūtra," etc. Line 9 has, . . . *tejasā c=āśya sūtrasya śamyante sarva-prāṇināṁ* || 12 || . . . i.e. "by the power of this Sūtra (the ill?) of all living creatures are relieved." These verses are not found in either of the two copies of the Sūtra accessible to me, viz. R.A.S. MS., No. 8 (Cat., p. 7), and Cambridge, Add. 875 (Cat., p. 13).

The complete leaf (No. 1) professes to give the conclusion of the 15th chapter (*parivartta*), called *Susambhava*, and the opening six verses (*śloka*) of the 16th chapter. The text corresponds to the Calcutta print (*Buddhist Texts*, of the Buddhist Text Society of India), fasc. i, from *yan=me śrutam*, on p. 69, down to (verse 7) *tatr=aiva bhūya madhye 'smin pa*, on p. 70, and to R.A.S. MS., No. 8, fol. 55a, l. 1, to fol. 55b, l. 4. In the print, however, as well as in the two manuscripts, mentioned above, the *Susambhava* is the 14th chapter. Though the text is substantially the same, there are numerous readings in the fragment differing from both the print and the R.A.S. manuscript. For example, instead of *bhūya madhye* of the print, both the fragment and the R.A.S. manuscript read *stūpa-madhye*.

The text of the half-leaf (No. 2) belongs to the beginning of the 6th chapter, and gives portions of verses 1-9. Here also there are numerous *variæ lectiones*; but the most important difference is that our fragment apparently inserts a chapter unknown to the print and the R.A.S. and Cambridge manuscripts. According to those authorities the 5th chapter is entitled *Kamalākara*; but in our fragment it is entitled *Hiraṇyāvatī dhāraṇī*. The fragment reads as follows :—

Obverse, line 1, . . . *ttamātaḥ sūtrendrarājñe hiraṇyāvatī dhāraṇī parivartto nā-*

line 2, [ma] . . . [gā]thā dhv=abhāṣīt || *Anyeṣu sūtreṣu acintikeṣu atici* (here begins line 3).

The insertion of this redundant chapter would seem to account for the discrepant numbering of chapter 15, instead of 14, which has been noticed above in the complete leaf.

I am hoping to publish in full these identified fragments at an early date. I may take this opportunity to explain that I have arranged with the Clarendon Press to publish, with the help of a liberal subvention from the Indian Government, a series of six volumes of facsimile reproductions of manuscript fragments from Khotan, together (so far as possible) with transliterations, translations, and every other useful information. The first volume, it is hoped, will appear early in 1907, and give specimens of every kind of manuscript discovered in Khotan. The following collections will contribute to the volumes :—

(1) The new collection, now accumulating in my hands. It contains (a) a very large number of manuscripts written in Brāhmī characters, either in Sanskrit or in an 'unknown' language; (b) manuscripts in Chinese, (c) in Arabic, (d) in Persian, (e) in Tibetan, (f) in Uigur, (g) bilinguals, (h) wooden wedges or splints inscribed with Kharoṣṭhī or Brāhmī characters, etc.

(2) The Weber MSS., Godfrey MSS., and Macartney MSS.

(3) The Brāhmī portion of the Stein MSS., under special arrangement with Dr. Stein and the India Office.

From a number of scholars I have received valuable promises of assistance. M. Chavannes will deal with the Chinese fragments, and Dr. Sten Konow with the Brāhmī fragments in the unknown (proto-Tibetan?) language. Professor Margoliouth will edit the Persian, Dr. Denison Ross the Arabic, and Dr. Barnett the 'Tibetan documents. The Sanskrit-Buddhist fragments, which are the most numerous, will be undertaken by Mr. Thomas, Professor Lüders, Dr. Barnett, and myself.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

Oxford, May 11th, 1906.

THE COMMENTARIES ON SUŚRUTA.

To my article on the Commentaries on Suśruta (*ante*, p. 283) I may add that Brahmadeva, whose name appears among the sources of Dallana's commentary, may perhaps be identified with Śrībrahma, whom Maheśvara, the author of the *Viśva-prakāśa*, a general vocabulary, and of the *Sahasanka Carita*, a biography of King Sahasanka, names as his father (see Zacharæ on the Indian Koṣas in the Encyclopædia of Indo-Aryan Research). Maheśvara wrote that biography in 1111 A.D. His father, Śrībrahma, accordingly must be referred to about 1080 A.D. This date suits Brahmadeva very well; for Dallana and Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, both in the thirteenth century, are the two earliest writers (known to me) who quote him.

Maheśvara claims to belong to an hereditary family of doctors. He names, as one of his earliest ancestors, Hari-chandra (or Hariśchandra), who lived at the court of Sahasanka, and wrote a commentary on the *Caraka Saṁhitā*, much quoted (also by Dallana). His father, therefore, must have been a medical man. He himself claims to be proficient both as a *kavi* and as a *kavirāja*, that is, as a man of letters as well as of medicine. His claim to be a *kavi* is proved by his authorship of the two works mentioned above. His claim to be a *kavirāja*, also, appears to have some support. For Herambasena, the author of the *Gūḍha-bodhaka Saṁgraha*, a treatise on pathology (Ind. Off. Cat., p. 937), claims to have based his work (among others) on that of a certain Maheśvara. The latter appears to be quoted also in a work on therapeutics, the *Prayoga Ratnākara* by Kavikaṇṭhahāra (*ibid.*, p. 942). If these two Maheśvaras may be identified with the son of Śrībrahma, he would seem to have been the author of treatises on pathology and therapeutics.

Dr. Grierson has kindly reminded me of an article published by him in JASB., xlviii (1879), which relates some amusing stories about a certain Dallana. It does not seem to me that this Dallana can be identified with the

commentator of that name. The Ḍallana of those stories is described as a *kavi* and a *paṇḍita*; and, indeed, the stories would lose their point if he were not a *kavi*, seeing that he is contrasted with the great *kavi* Kālidāsa. The stories never represent him as a *kavirāja*; nor is it usual in India to call a *kavirāj* by the title *paṇḍit*; nor does the historical Ḍallana, the scholiast, ever claim to be a *kavi*. Moreover, the historical Ḍallana was not a contemporary of King Bhoja of Dhārā, as little as Kālidāsa was. These folk stories are not concerned with historical truth; their authors only want names as pegs to hang their stories on. The famous name of Kālidāsa naturally suggested itself for a man of wit; any name—Ḍallana as well as any other—would do for the arrogant fool; and the court of Bhoja, the well-known patron of men of letters, was chosen as the obvious place for them to meet. But it would have been pointless to pit a *kavirāja* against a *kavi*.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

Oxford, May 11th, 1906.

BIJOLI ROCK INSCRIPTION: THE UTTAMA-SÍKHARA-PURĀṆA.

In the neighbourhood of Bijoli (Bijaoli, Bijolia, Bijholi), a town in the Udaipur State of Rājputāna, forty-eight miles north-east of Chitorgaḍh and thirty-two miles west of Kotah, there are two large Sanskrit rock-inscriptions. One of them, of the Vikrama year 1226 and the reign of the Chāhamāna Sōmēśvara, has been roughly edited in the *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. lv, part 1, p. 40 ff. (No. 154 of my *Northern List*). To the other (unpublished) inscription Colonel Tod, in his "Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan," vol. ii, p. 744, has given the title *Sankh Purāṇa*, at the same time informing us that it appertains to the Jaina creed, while according to the Progress Report of the Archæol. Survey of Western India for the year ending 30th June, 1905, p. 52, the inscription "is a Jaina poem entitled *Unnata śikhara Purāṇa*." Moreover, in the Annual Progress Report of the Archæol. Survey Circle, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, for the

year ending 30th June, 1893, p. 21, the same inscription has been called a *praśasti*, and stated to give "a long list of the spiritual heads of the *Kharatara gachchha*." All these statements are more or less incorrect.

The inscription (which consists of forty-two lines of writing, covering a space of about 15' 2" long by 4' 9½" high) is a *kathā* in verse, entitled *Uttama-śikhara-purāṇa*. This poem was composed by Siddhasūri, and consists of five *svargas* (!), with a total of 294 verses. It was engraved on the rock in the Vikrama year 1232. The title, everywhere clearly engraved and well preserved, occurs in the following five passages:—

Line 5, after verse 33: iti Siddhasūri-rachita Uttama-sikharapurāṇē prathamah svarggaḥ.

Line 10, after verse 74: iti Siddhasūri-virach[i]ta Uttama-sikharapurāṇē dvitīyah svarggaḥ.

Line 23, after verse 160: iti Siddhasūri-virachitah Uttama-sikharapurāṇē tṛtīya-s[v]arggaḥ.

Line 37, after verse 261: iti Siddhasūri-virachitah Uttama-sikharapurāṇē chaturthah svarggaḥ.

Line 42, after verse 294: iti Siddhasūri-virachita Uttama-sikharapurāṇē pañchama-svarggaḥ.

This *Uttama-śikhara-purāṇa* is sure to exist somewhere or other in manuscript, and I write this note to draw attention to the poem, and to urge scholars in India to search for it in Jaina libraries. To edit the text solely from the inscription would be a very troublesome task, because the writing on the rock in several places has been more or less effaced.

F. KIELHORN.

Göttingen.

NOTES ON THE POEM ASCRIBED TO AL-SAMAU'AL.

Professor D. S. Margoliouth has, in an interesting and scholarly manner, subjected the fragment of an Arabic poem, ascribed to Al-Samau'al and published by me last

year, to a searching criticism.¹ The result of his investigation is briefly that the poem is spurious, because (1) the author was but imperfectly acquainted with the laws of Arabic prosody, (2) a pre-Qoranic origin of the poem is impossible.

There is, however, something more to be said on the matter. First of all, I must repeat what I pointed out in the opening of my publication² (and what Prof. Margoliouth seems to have overlooked), that however uncritical it would be to treat the poem *prima facie* as genuine, it would be equally hasty to reject it without careful examination. He is, therefore, not justified in stating that the author of the poem is "naturally identified" by me with the poet of Teimā. I maintained the hypothetical character of the authorship of the poem throughout my article, beginning with a compilation of arguments which speak against its authenticity, and several of which were merely repeated by Margoliouth.

I must confess that his arguments fail to convince me. His theory that the poem shows traces of two different metres is unwarranted. A forger who has such mastery of the old Arabic language and all other technicalities of the Qasīda would certainly not be embarrassed by the lesser difficulty of the metre. As the large majority of verses shows correct versification, there is no reason to assume that this was originally not the case in the remaining hemistychs. Did it not strike Professor Margoliouth that the flaws in the metre might be due to corruptions and gaps in the text? The poem was probably penned for the first time many years after it had been composed. The writer of the fragment (which is evidently a copy, though of considerable age) neither understood its character nor was he completely master of its contents. This alone is an argument in favour of the great antiquity of the poem. Apart from writing it like a prose piece, he did not notice that of a whole line only two words were left and omitted to leave space for the

¹ April number of this Journal, p. 363 sqq.

² Ahlwardt, *Asmā'iyyāt*, No. xx.

missing ones. The metre may also have suffered, when first written down, by the substitution of synonyms for words which had been forgotten. The prosody of the doubtful hemistychs, therefore, remains a matter of conjecture, but this defect allows no conclusion either as regards the technical skill of the poet or the spuriousness of the poem.

As to the pre- or post-Qoranic age of the poem, Professor Margoliouth must admit that nothing definite can be said. His arguments to disprove the pre-Qoranic age are very weak. Those 'Qoranic' words which occur in the poem had been in common use among Arabian Jews and Christians before Mohammed. The existence of Jewish poets in Arabia prior to Islām is an historical fact. Why should they not have employed some of those specific words and phrases in their rejoinders to religious attacks? Margoliouth seems altogether inclined to doubt the historical existence of Al-Samau'al, and also to ascribe the poem given under his name in the *Asmā'iyyāt* to some other poet. He is, as far as I am aware, the only student who does so. The authenticity of this poem is questioned neither by the editor nor by Professor Goldziher, who discovered in the first line an element of the Jewish *Agādā* (*Z.D.M.G.*, lvii, 397, rem. 3).

In conclusion, I should like to mention a few corrections of doubtful passages suggested to me by Professor Goldziher.¹ Line 3 he reads التناسل, like Margoliouth; line 9, G. علق; line 10, G. and M. انصت, 'listen,' which would make good sense, but has the metre against it; perhaps the word was originally فأنصت (iv); *ibid.*, G. حرّك; line 14, G. الى الشعب, 'to the nations' (G. 'the nation'), which seems rather questionable for more than one reason; *ibid.*, G. and M., for جوده, which is likewise open to doubt; line 23, G. الدجا, 'darkness.'

If Margoliouth considers it improbable that the phrase

¹ On the poem itself he writes to me—"Das Gedicht erinnert an die dem Amīyah ben Abī al-Salt zugeschriebenen Dichtungen und repräsentiert eine bisher unbekannte jüdische Spielart dieses Genre" (May 23rd, 1905).

العاجل والآجل, 'in this world and the next,' was current among the "people of the Ignorance," he overlooks the fact that Al-Samau'al was not of their number. Jews and Christians in Arabia were well acquainted with the notion of the next world. A strong proof of this is given in the following verse from the Mu'allāqa of Zoheir (v. 27):—¹

يُؤَخَّرُ فَيُوضَعُ فِي كِتَابٍ فَيُدَّخَرُ لِيَوْمِ الْحِسَابِ أَوْ يَعْجَلُ فَيُنْتَقَمُ

"It might be delayed and kept back and reserved in a book for the day of reckoning, or punishment might be hastened."²

Zoheir is supposed to have been a Christian. It is, indeed, difficult to say whence the doctrine of future life came to Mohammed's knowledge if not from the Jews and Christians. There is not a line in the poem under consideration which could not have been expressed prior to Islām.

As the fragment comes from Egypt, the question arises whether it was not written by an Arabic-speaking Jew of that country. A *fakhr* poem after the expulsion of the Jews from Arabia would have had no *raison d'être*, but would, at all events, have contained bitter words against Islām, especially as it was, probably from the outset, written in Hebrew characters. In all the twenty-six lines of the fragment there is not the slightest allusion to Islām. This, indeed, renders the early age of the poem probable, and was probably also felt by Professor Vollers, who writes to me—"Aus späterer Zeit lässt es sich in Arabien kaum erklären."

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.

DERIVATION OF THE WORDS BARGĪ AND SABAIO.

Can any member explain the derivation of the word Bargī, which is commonly used in Bengal and elsewhere

¹ Ahlwardt, "The six ancient Arabic Poets," p. 95 (v. 27).

² The scholion in Arnold's edition of the Moallaqāt ends with the words
يريد انه لا مناص من عقاب الذنب آجلا او عاجلا.

to denote the Marhattas? Mr. Risley, I believe, connects it with *bārgīr*, a kind of trooper, but this seems very unlikely. It is a Deccani term, and seems originally to have meant a robber. *Bargigiri*, or the profession of a Bargī, is said by one native writer to be the Deccani for *qazzāqī* (from which our word Cossack comes), 'brigandage.' Perhaps *bargī* is an abbreviation of *bairāgī*, a beggar or ascetic, for the Maṣūr 'Aālām-gīrī, 320, speaks of Sambha the son of Sīvājī's being connected with the tribe of *bairāgīs*.

In connection with this mention of Sambha's name I may note that, according to Khāfī Khān, ii, 384, he called himself Sambha Siwāī. It has been generally supposed, I believe, that this name was first given to Jai Singh of Jaipur. Perhaps it is an old Rajput title, and was assumed by Sambha to support his claim to be of Rajput descent.

The etymology of the Portuguese term Sabaio is discussed by Sir Henry Yule in "Hobson-Jobson," and there is an interesting note in the second edition by Mr. Whiteway. He considers, on the authority of Couto, that the Portuguese Sabaio was a Hindu prince of Canara, and not Yūsuf 'Aādīl Shāh of Bijāpūr. But it appears to me that the Portuguese must have meant Yūsuf 'Aādīl Shāh or the Idalcan when they spoke of the Sabaio of Goa, for, according to Ferishta, Yūsuf 'Aādīl Shāh was alive when Albuquerque took Goa in March, 1510 (end of 915), and it was his governor who was dispossessed. When Yūsuf Shāh heard of the capture, says Ferishta, he made a rapid march with 2,000 men and recovered the city. This is the event which the Portuguese, apparently, represent as having occurred in the time of Yūsuf's son Ismāīl. But, according to Ferishta, Yūsuf did not die till 916 or 917 (1511). Mr. Whiteway refers to Briggs' translation of Ferishta, but Briggs has not translated all that Ferishta says about the etymology of Sāvai. What Ferishta says is that Yūsuf 'Aādīl Shāh got the name of Sāvai because he had been brought up in the Persian town of Sāvā, and that this name became changed on Indian lips to Siwai, because that means $1\frac{1}{4}$, and Yūsuf was $1\frac{1}{4}$ superior to the other rulers of the Deccan; but that in reality his

name was Sāvai. Ferishta is entitled to credit about Bijāpūr affairs, as he lived long at that court.

H. BEVERIDGE.

May 25th, 1906.

THE DATE IN THE TAKHT-I-BAHI INSCRIPTION.

I have given a general note on the Takht-i-Bahi inscription, in respect of its bearing on the tradition about St. Thomas and Gondophernēs, in this Journal, 1905. 223 ff. We are here concerned with only a feature in the framing of the record.

The record is dated first in the 26th year of the king Guduphara, = Gondophernēs, and then in the year 103 of an era not specified by name, and on a day in the Indian month Vaiśākha. And, with the year taken as the year 103 (current) of the Mālava or Vikrama era, the historical era of Northern India, commencing B.C. 58, the date of the record falls in A.D. 46, and the commencement of the reign of Guduphara-Gondophernēs falls in A.D. 20 or 21, at precisely the time which suits everything that we can ascertain about him.

Mr. Vincent Smith has an aversion to accepting the understanding that this year 103 is the year 103 of the Indian era of B.C. 58. Nevertheless, "to avoid the assumption of the existence of another unknown era," he has "provisionally" used that era to determine this date; and so he, also, has placed the record in A.D. 46, and the commencement of the reign of Guduphara-Gondophernēs in or about A.D. 21: see, for instance, this Journal, 1903. 41, 59, and *Early History of India*, 203.

He has now advanced the following proposition (ZDMG, 1906. 71):—"I doubt very much if the so-called Vikrama era was then in use, and think it quite possible that the inscription may be dated in the Caesarean era of Antioch, for instance, which ran from 49 or 48 B.C., or in some other foreign era." But even now, instead of carrying

his ideas to their logical conclusion, and placing the record in A.D. 54 or 55, and the commencement of the reign of Guduphara-Gondophernēs in A.D. 28 or 29, he considers (*ibid.*) that "the ordinary interpretation fits well, and we "are entitled to assume with some confidence that the reign "of Gondophares¹ began somewhere about 20 A.D."

To Mr. Vincent Smith's expression of doubt, not even supported by any indication of a reason, about the Indian era of B.C. 58 having been in use in the time of Gondophernēs, no importance attaches. It has its basis simply in an apprehension that an admission that the era was then in use might conflict with his theories about Indo-Grecian art, and also might be construed as a step towards admitting that the era was founded by Kanishka. With the questions of the founder of the era and of theories about art, we are not here concerned. But, for reasons which I have explained (*this Journal*, 1905. 232), there are not any grounds for believing otherwise than that the era was in current use from the very year in which we know its initial point fell. And, as in the case of also various other Indian eras, such use of it was, in fact, the cause of the existence of it.

For the rest, it is not easy to know what arguments can best be employed against so fantastic a treatment of an historical detail. But perhaps the following exposition of the matter may help to make things clear.

We are told (*ibid.*, 65) that the proper inference seems to be that Gondophernēs was a king of Taxila, who extended his sway over Sind and Arachosia by conquest. It is not quite evident why the matter has been put in that way:

¹ Quoting Mr. Vincent Smith's actual words, I of course concede to him the use of the form Gondophares, in connexion with which he has said (*loc. cit.*, 64, note 3) that my form Gondophernēs is "not supported by authority."

As regards authority,—he informs us that "the name obviously is a Persian one formed like Holophernes, Sitaphernes etc." My form of it is justified by those analogous names which he has quoted. And it is further expressly indicated by the Kharōshthī form Gudapharna, which he has mentioned on the same page.

The preference for continuing to use an imaginative form, "sanctioned by usage" which dates back to about 1841, is quite another matter. It may be classed along with the habitual use of the remarkable expression Kālī Yuga, Kāliyuga.

unless it is because other writers have rather suggested the contrary; namely, that Gondopernēs was a king of Arachosia who acquired Taxila by conquest. However, we may pass that point. In one way or the other, Gondopernēs possessed Taxila. And, though the Takht-i-Bahi hill, in the Yusufzai country, some fifty or sixty miles to the north-west from Taxila and on the other side of the Indus, was not necessarily in the province of Taxila, still, the record shews that the territory lying round the Takht-i-Bahi hill was subject to Gondopernēs.

Taxila was in India, on the east of the Indus. It is (see *Early History*, 54) "now represented by miles of ruins to the north-west of Rāwalpindī, and the south-east of Hasan Abdāl." Or, as other writers have decided, it may be closely located at the modern Shāh-Dhēri, which is in that locality.

Antioch (modern Antakieh), built by Seleucus Nicator about B.C. 300, was on the Orontēs (modern Asy), on the north of Palestine, about twenty miles from the Mediterranean Sea. The distance to it is more than 2,000 miles from Taxila, and some 1,600 miles from even the western boundary of Arachosia.

Antioch possessed three reckonings (see Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, 3. 365), running from B.C. 49–48, 31, and 7, and commemorating grants of autonomy to its inhabitants. Of the reckonings of B.C. 31 and 7, traces have been found on coins, and apparently nowhere else. Regarding the reckoning running from B.C. 49 or 48,¹ which commemorated the grant of autonomy by Julius Caesar, we are told by Clinton that it was in general use as a date in Evagrius and other writers, and subsisted to a late period; Evagrius himself (born about A.D. 536) being cited as mentioning the 641st year of it, = A.D. 592–93. And, as far as I can trace it out from other sources of information, it was perhaps taken up somewhat freely by Greek writers and in other

¹ From other sources it would appear that the event occurred, and the era was established, just after the battle of Pharsalia in August, B.C. 48; and that, while the Syrians computed the reckoning from the autumn of that year, the Greeks threw back the initial point to a time eleven months earlier, in B.C. 49.

western places besides Antioch itself, but the Syriac writers, instead of adopting it, continued the use of the Seleucidan era.

It will probably be conceded that the adoption of a foreign era in India could only be brought about by a royal decree, or by official usage sanctioned by royal authority. At any rate, it is difficult to picture to oneself the ordinary inhabitants of a remote inland Indian district suddenly realizing a need of an international chronological reckoning, and inviting tenders of eras from all parts of the world, as a preliminary to selecting a foreign article such as this era of Antioch.

It is quite possible that St. Thomas, visiting the court of Gondophernēs, may have taken with him, and may have made known there, along with all sorts of miscellaneous information, a knowledge of even all the three reckonings of Antioch; because, though they had nothing to do with Christianity, Antioch was one of the earliest strongholds of Christianity: it was, in fact, the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians, and where the first Gentile church was established. But, in the days of Gondophernēs, the ancient importance of Antioch as the capital of the Greek kingdom of Syria was a thing of the past. In his time, the city was only the chief city of a Roman province. Its importance as a great centre of Christianity, where various ecclesiastical Councils were held, was a matter of the future. Its era of B.C. 49-48 had no connexion with any Christian event, or with the foundation of an empire, the establishment of a line of kings, or any other political occurrence of international importance. In such circumstances, even if Gondophernēs was, as tradition says, converted to Christianity, and even if he heard of the era, from what possible point of view, unless he was inspired by a prophetic intuition, can he have taken an interest in such an era, dating from simply a grant of autonomy to a city of subordinate rank some 1,600 miles away from even the nearest point of his own dominions, such as to order it to be adopted as the standard reckoning in his realm?

especially, since there were two eras either of which he, an Indo-Parthian king, might most appropriately have chosen; the Seleucidan era of B.C. 312, which was actually in use in Parthia on the west of his own dominions, and the Parthian era of B.C. 248 or 247, which seems certainly to have existed though evidence of the actual use of it may not be very clear.

As a matter of fact, however, what evidence is there that Gondophernēs used any reckoning at all, except, like various other ancient kings, that of his own regnal years? His coins have not yet suggested the use of any era by him. And certainly the Takht-i-Bahi inscription does not prove that he used even the era used in it. The inscription is not a royal record, nor even an official record. It is the private record of a private donation. The donor, judged by his name, may have been not an Indian.¹ But his donation was made to some religious establishment situated in a locality which is shewn by the Indian dialect, used in the record, to have been an Indian district. A record of his benefaction was drawn up, as a notification to the public. And the writer of the record stated the date fully in two ways, both of them freely used in ancient times, though, unfortunately for us, not often both together; namely, by the regnal year of the reigning king, and by the corresponding year of, naturally, the local Indian era.

Mr. Vincent Smith is plainly not quite happy with even his "Caesarean era of Antioch." It will be interesting to learn what may be the "some other foreign era" which he may have in view. There is, I believe, a Spanish era of B.C. 38. But that would probably carry on the date of Gondophernēs so late as to interfere with theories about the Kadphisēs group of kings; and what is really wanted is an era commencing closely about B.C. 58. May it be held possible that Gondophernēs heard of the first invasion of Britain by Caesar in B.C. 55, and promptly emitted an edict establishing an era to eternalize that event?

But why look about for a foreign reckoning at all?

¹ See the latest treatment of the record, by M. Boyer, in *JA*, 1904, 1. 457 ff.

Why not take the natural solution in the thoroughly well established indigenous Indian era of B.C. 58, which admittedly meets all the requirements of the case? That could be done without any prejudice to the right to continue to deny that the era was founded by Kanishka.

J. F. FLEET.

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE PESHAWAR VASE.

We are greatly indebted to Mr. Thomas for detecting and announcing (page 452 above) the interesting fact, which had remained unrecognized, that the inscription on the Piprāhavā relic-vase is a verse. It may, indeed, perhaps be held open to argument, whether it is actually a verse or whether it is only metrical prose. But my opinion is that Mr. Thomas is quite right on this point, and that the record is actually a verse.

In his treatment of the verse, however, Mr. Thomas is wrong; owing, apparently, to a belief that, if the line commencing with *Budhasa* can be scanned so as to shew eighteen *mātrās* or short-syllable instants, that line must be the second line of the verse, and the verse must be an *Āryā* commencing with the word *īyaṇi*. But we have most clear proof (see this Journal, 1905. 680) that the record commences, not with *īyaṇi*, but with *Sukiti-bhatinani*. And the verse is either an *Upagīti* or an *Udgīti*, according as the line commencing with *Budhasa*, which is in reality the last line of it, is scanned so as to present fifteen or— (but not in the way in which Mr. Thomas has scanned it)—eighteen *mātrās*.

However, that matter may lie over for the present; and, with it, the point that the metrical nature of the inscription does not in any way militate against my interpretation of the meaning of the record: if anything, quite the reverse. We are interested here in something else.

As another instance of a metrical record of the same class, Mr. Thomas has adduced the inscription on the Peshāwar

vase. In this he has found a rhyming verse consisting of two lines each composed of five feet, each of five *mātrās*, followed by a spondee.

This is an illuminating suggestion which might lead to developments; for instance, in the direction of tracing the introduction into India of the five-time measure of oriental music to incursions, *viā* Kandahār, Kābul, and Peshāwar, of itinerant bands of Śaka minstrels from the land of Sēistān. As, however, Mr. Thomas has failed to discover such a metre elsewhere, the suggestion seems to somewhat lack testimony. And, in these circumstances, I venture to hope that I may receive absolution for taking another view of the matter. I do not, indeed, claim to propose a final settlement of it. I can only hope to shew that questions such as these cannot be disposed of in quite a cursory manner.

For handling the record on the Peshāwar vase, we are dependent upon two reproductions of it: one given by Professor Dowson in this Journal, 1863. 222, plate, fig. 2; the other given by General Sir Alexander Cunningham in ASI, 2. 125, plate 59.

From Sir A. Cunningham's reproduction, we have the following text:¹—

Sihilēna Siharachhitēna cha bhatarēhi Takhasīlāē aē
thuvō pratithavatō sava-Budhana puyāē.

Unfortunately, neither reproduction is an actual facsimile; they are both hand-drawn. Professor Dowson's differs in several details, including the opening word which it presents as *gihilēna*. Even in this detail, however, it seems preferable: for, as we shall see, the metre shews that in *siharachhitēna* the first component stands for *siha* = *sinha*: on the analogy of that, *sihilēna* should stand for *sihilēna* = *sinhalēna*, which, however, would not suit the metre either from Mr. Thomas'

¹ His original reading was given in JASB, 32, 1863. 151. He corrected *aśa-thuva* into *aya thuva*, with a suggestion that there might be *ayam*, in the same volume, p. 172. He afterwards adopted *ayam*; but his reproduction shews *aē*. He read *bhratarēhi* and *pratithavitō* in his later version (ASI, 2. 125); but his drawing shews *bhatarēhi* and *pratithavatō*.

point of view or from mine; whereas *gihilēna* = *grihalēna* scans quite correctly. And, in the other details in which it differs, Professor Dowson's reproduction answers more correctly to what we know about that which has come to be called the Paisāchī or Shāhbāzgarhī dialect.

Following, then, Professor Dowson's reproduction,¹ and his reading of the text (loc. cit., 241) except in not agreeing that *aya* is actually written with an Anusvāra and in not finding the lingual *th* in *thuvō* and *pratithavitō*, I take the record, as it actually stands, thus:—

Text.

Gihilēna Siharachhitēna cha bhratarēhi Takhasilāē aya
thuvō pratithavitō sava-Budhana puyaē.

Translation.

By Gihila and by Siharachhita, brothers, at or from Takhasilā, this Stūpa has been caused to be erected in honour of all Buddhas.

Mr. Thomas' method of shewing that this is a verse, by simply marking certain vowels as short and others as long without shewing why some of them become long, is not very lucid, and leaves too much to the imagination. And he has taken liberties with the text which are unjustifiable. It is true that in *siharachhitēna* the *rachhitēna* stands for an ultimate *rakshitēna*; but the actual text has *chhi*, and it is not permissible to alter that into *khi* for *kkhi* = *kshi*. It is not permissible to reject the *r* in the first syllable of *bhratarēhi* in order to prevent the *a* of the preceding *cha* from becoming long by position. And the actual reading in another word is *sava*, not *sarva*. Also, it is not apparent why he should supply an Anusvāra with *aya*, but not with *budhana*.

¹ Judged by his use of the form *gihilēna*, instead of *sihilēna*, Mr. Thomas did the same. But he made certain deviations from what the reproduction really shews.

The identification of such records with verses is effected by, and can be only understood from, a restoration of long vowels, Anusvāras, and double consonants, all of which features of course existed in the spoken language, though they were for the most part not represented in the Kharōshthī characters. It does not follow, however, that in popular records of this class we must always restore double consonants up to the full standard of literary productions. And, restoring the text as far as it seems proper to do so, I find here, not a verse in an otherwise unknown metre consisting of feet of five *mātrās*, but an ordinary verse in the well-known Upagīti metre, as follows:—

Gihlē|nā Sīhā|rachhitē|
 nā chā bhrā|tārēhi| Tā|khašilā|ē|
 āyān thū|vō prāti|thāvitō|
 sāvvā|-Buddhā|nām| pūyā|ē|

Mr. Thomas has referred us (page 452 above) to ancient Pāli verses in the Thērīgāthā, in the same class of metres, which amply justify the scanning of the *ō* of *pratithāvitō* as short, and the slurring of the Anusvāra so as not to lengthen the preceding *a* of *āyān* and *buddhānām*, and the use of an amphibrach in an odd foot, the fifth, in *tārēhi*.

Other peculiarities are these. (1) The absence of caesura at the end of the first Pāda, in *rachhitē||nā*. This is justified by absence of caesura at the end, sometimes of the first Pāda, sometimes of the third, in such cases as—

gō||tamēna, Thērīgāthā, verse 91; mā||lutēna, 104;
 pa||bbatēna, 115; sēnā||sanāni, 592;
 kuli||nāyō, Thērīgāthā, verse 400; sā||dhayāmi, 412.

(2) The scanning of the *a* of *cha* as short before the compound consonant in the first syllable of *bhrātarēhi*. Many instances may be found in Pāli verses of the Anushtubh class, in which a short vowel remains short before *br*. In Pāli verses of the Āryā class, I find an instance in—

sīlā|nī brāhma|chariyam|; Thērigāthā, verse 459.

And I find an instance in Buddhistic Sanskrit before *gr* in—

dīn-a|tūrā-grā|hakō ni|rāyā|saḥ|; Divyāvadāna, p. 395,
line 26.¹

(3) The scanning of the final *a* of *savva* as long. This may be justified by multitudinous instances in Pāli, in which *a*, *i*, and *u* are lengthened, just as wanted, for the sake of the metre. But, also, the expression *savva-Buddhā*, “all Buddhas,” was a standing expression in early inscriptions; and it is not unlikely that there was a special compound, either *savvā-Buddhā*, or *savvam-Buddhā*, which might be justified on the analogy of instances in Pāli given by Dr. Müller in his Grammar, pp. 18, 22.

It might perhaps be objected that I ought to double the consonant in *takḥaśīlāē*, and take *takkhaśīlāē*, in view of the original name being Takshaśīlā. There would not be induced any difficulty by doing that; the *a* of the first syllable might still be scanned short. We have, for instance,—

mātā|dūkkhītā|rōdati|; Thērigāthā, verse 461.

We have a still more pointed instance, three times out of four, in—

dāsa-kkhā|ttum sātā|-kkhattum|
dāsa-sātā|-kkhattum| satāni| cha sata|-kkhattum|
Thērigāthā, verse 519.

And I find something similar in Buddhistic Sanskrit, though in a metre, Pushpitāgrā, of another class, in—

Daśaba|lā-sūta| kshantum=a|rhas=īmaṇ|
Divyāvadāna, p. 380, line 2.²

¹ The verse, and another following it, stand in print as if they were prose.

² The verse stands in print as if it were prose. The editors, however, have marked it as a verse in a note on page 708. And they have there suggested that for *kshantum* there should be read *kḥantum*, for the sake of the metre. That, however, does not now seem necessary.

I am inclined, however, to find the origin of the name Takhasilā elsewhere than in a Sanskrit Takshasilā. But this, also, may wait over for another occasion.

J. F. FLEET.

VEDIC METRE.

May I ask for a small space in the Journal for comment upon the review of my book "Vedic Metre" by Mr. A. Berriedale Keith?

When I first noticed how numerous were the points on which your reviewer differed from me, it seemed to me that an examination of his criticisms in detail might be a valuable means of verifying the validity of my own conclusions. On further examination I have been obliged to abandon this view, and to recognise that the differences between Mr. Keith and myself are fundamental, and are concerned with methods rather than with results. It seems, however, to be incumbent on me to defend the methods I have endeavoured to follow, and which I believe to be essential to valid literary criticism in any subject.

Shortly stated, it appears to me that Mr. Keith judges all my arguments solely by their conclusions: if the results are acceptable to him, he is satisfied; if, however, they are strange or unpleasing to him, he rejects them offhand. He has many forerunners in this procedure. *Plerique homines ex eventu rem iudicant, quod iniquissimum est.* This, however, is a method which makes scientific progress impossible.

Thus Mr. Keith rejects altogether my chronological division of the main portion of the R̥igveda, because "the application of tests so doubtful as many of the metrical and some of the linguistic tests leads us to results of an impossible nature"; yet he writes, "he has rendered a valuable service by the careful examination and determination of the features characteristic of the 'popular' R̥igveda." Now, as my methods and tests are the same in both parts of the subject, they must be either of value or without value in both. If some only are sound, then these must be picked

out and applied impartially in both parts of the subject before any satisfactory result can be obtained in either.

The question of date can be brought to a very simple issue. Mr. Keith asserts that "both in *anuṣṭubh* and *triṣṭubh* verses the really important criteria of age are to be derived from the form of the four final syllables." In spite of his complaint of the deficiency of my collections here, I must maintain that I have given all the evidence, and that it is open to Mr. Keith to arrange and group it as he will. I agree with him that the criteria he suggests are important, and I venture to anticipate confidently that this evidence alone, if employed impartially, must lead any enquirer to the principal results which are contained in my book, not only with regard to the 'popular' *Rigveda*, but also with regard to the rest of the collection.

I fear, however, that Mr. Keith will not be convinced, even by the tests he selects himself. For evidently they will mark out the hymn X, 20 as an early hymn, whereas Mr. Keith "prefers the ordinary view" that the hymn is "badly written and late." Thus he very frankly admits that "marks of antiquity may equally well be signs of the incompetence of the poet," and therefore, it would seem, marks of lateness. And so, to get Mr. Keith out of his difficulty, his own tests must be invalidated, and also the charge of "incompetency" must be brought against the *Vimada* poet, who is nevertheless the only author in the *Rigveda* to employ the beautiful metre traditionally known as *āstārapaṅkti*.

It need surprise no one that a writer who thus plays fast and loose with evidence has little respect for facts. Thus Mr. Keith is of opinion that it is not possible in the history of *gāyatrī* verse to find any place for a stage of 'syncopation,' although anyone can ascertain that this metrical form exists in fact, which is more than can be said for the forms which Mr. Keith finds to be "*a priori* probable." Similarly Mr. Keith is "doubtful of the importance of the *cæsura*." What evidence, one may ask, would he find conclusive on this point?

I do not think it necessary to go further into details. I think I may shortly say that Mr. Keith has not realised that Vedic metre is an intricate and somewhat difficult study, and that many opinions are current about it which will not stand the test of serious investigation. I trust that his sweeping condemnation of all views which are not "ordinary" will not deter others from investigating for themselves, and from holding firm the principle that an ounce of evidence is worth a hundredweight of tradition.

E. VERNON ARNOLD.

By the courtesy of the Editor I have been permitted to see Professor Arnold's reply to my review of his "Vedic Metre," which appeared on pp. 484-490 of the Journal for April.

Professor Arnold is mistaken in thinking that I judge his arguments on the ground of their conclusions. The argument from conclusions occupies much less than a third of the review, and is only ancillary to a series of detailed arguments on metrical grounds which form the basis of my criticisms of his book. As Professor Arnold expressly states that he believes "that the formal scheme reached in this book, by which each hymn of the Rigveda proper is assigned to one of four successive periods, is a true adumbration of the historical development of the whole literature, and should be a real assistance to the study of its meaning" (p. x), I consider that a review would have been incomplete which ignored the results given on pp. 260 seq. of his book. But, in any case, I cannot admit that the argument from results is unfair. It is true that in the case of motives it is unfair to condemn by the event, because results are not always under the control of the actor, but I am not aware that it has ever been laid down by any authoritative source that it is unjust to criticise a theory by its logical consequences. For instance, any theory of the Iliad which on metrical grounds assigned to an early date the Doloneia would be held by classical scholars to be refuted by the

nature of the subject-matter. There is, of course, the possible danger that the author of the theory may not have deduced correctly the consequences of his view, but I did not consider that I was called upon to assume that Professor Arnold's deductions were not derived legitimately from the metrical results.

Professor Arnold argues that it is inconsistent to express appreciation of his examination and determination of the characteristics of the 'popular' Rigveda while rejecting his division of the main portion of the Rigveda into four periods. I am unable to see the inconsistency. Parts of Professor Arnold's tests are well known, and are derived from older authorities on the subject. These I have no hesitation in accepting, and, as I found myself unable to consider the other tests proposed by Professor Arnold as possessing any validity, I felt all the more bound to recognise the care with which he had developed in detail the fundamental tests. There are a certain number of hymns in the Rigveda which are clearly marked as late by the concurrent evidences of subject-matter, language, and metre. The majority of hymns, however, present no such characteristic features. Professor Arnold has in their case attempted to establish their relative dates by criteria of metre, language, and contents. The criteria of contents are hardly such as to satisfy any scholar, and Professor Arnold prudently does not lay much stress on them. The linguistic criteria are in many cases, I fear, worthless, and Professor Arnold himself (p. xiii) confesses that in postulating long quantities for many vowels he is running counter to comparative grammar. When it is realised how many vowels of this kind occur in Vedic verses, it will be seen how materially this philologically doubtful process influences the metrical results. Moreover, the practice of valuing equally the various linguistic peculiarities renders the figures given practically valueless, since in each case it would be necessary for scientific study to specify the peculiarity concerned in order to permit students to judge of its validity. In their present form these figures are, I fear, simply misleading.

Compare, too, the significant admission on p. 319 as to archaism.

There remain Professor Arnold's metrical tests. I regret that he has not seen fit to controvert in detail the arguments which I advanced on pp. 485-8 of the Journal, where I maintain that his reconstruction of the history of the metres was *à priori* improbable, and even, as in the case of the secondary cæsure, inconsistent. I have never denied that syncopation exists in the gāyatrī metre, and I do not understand how Professor Arnold can think that I did. What I did deny, and what I confess I consider few will believe, is that the syncopated gāyatrī represents a definite stage in the history of the metre. I may add that the forms which I consider are *à priori* probable are taken from Professor Arnold's examples, and I regret that they should be non-existent.

With regard to the cæsure, the strongest evidence against its importance would be supplied by Professor Arnold himself if we accepted his division of the triṣṭubh into four, three, and four syllables, since then, in very many cases, this division, which he regards as so important as to base his treatment of the triṣṭubh upon it, runs counter to the division by the supposed cæsure.

But what is of most importance is that we must recognise the influence of personal taste in determining metrical forms, and that a poet, for example, may use the iambic or trochaic ending in gāyatrī or anuṣṭubh long before this ending has become regular, and that the same poet may employ widely different styles. To take the example of X, 20, and I, 1, to which Professor Arnold alludes, it is misleading to compare from a metrical point of view the two hymns, since X, 20 is written in trochaic gāyatrī and I, 1 in iambic gāyatrī. Professor Arnold evidently does compare these two things, and concludes that X, 20 is an early hymn in comparison with I, 1. But I, 2 and 3, which are traditionally ascribed to the same author as I, 1, and which there is no conceivable reason for separating from I, 1, are written in gāyatrī of quite as ancient a type as X, 20.

Professor Arnold, of course, evades this difficulty by arbitrarily assigning I, 2 and 3 to a different author and period, but there still remains a serious difficulty, for it turns out that the writer of the irregular and therefore ancient trochaic gāyatrī of X, 20 was not indisposed to compose iambic anuṣṭubh of a most regular and therefore late character. Professor Arnold admits that the writer of X, 25 was Vimada, and the evidence for that view is absolutely conclusive. Now X, 25 is written in the "beautiful metre traditionally known as āstārapaṅkti." This metre, the beauty of which appears to be a discovery of Professor Arnold's, is, it may be explained, nothing more nor less than an ordinary anuṣṭubh, after the third verse of which is inserted the iambic rhythm "*vi vo made*" and after the last verse "*vivakṣase*." Of the forty-four verses omitting these iambic rhythms, according to my reckoning thirty-seven end in two iambs. Six stanzas have all four verses ending in two iambs, and in two cases only do two verses alone so end. In X, 21, also by Vimada and in āstārapaṅkti, of thirty-two verses thirty-one end in two iambs. This seems to me as conclusive proof as can be desired of the danger of arguments from metre alone. If Professor Arnold were consistent in his theory, I really think that he should relegate the "beautiful āstārapaṅkti" to a very lowly position in point of age among the metres.

The writer of I, 1, besides that hymn, has attributed to him by tradition, against which no satisfactory argument can be brought, the authorship of hymns 2-9, written in gāyatrī, partially trochaic, of a type at least as old as Vimada's hymns, and an anuṣṭubh hymn, I, 10, in which five out of forty-eight verses are irregular. These facts show that metrically it is impossible to decide as to the comparative age of the two collections, though it is significant that X, 24, vv. 4-6, are in epic anuṣṭubh, a distinct sign of lateness which Professor Arnold can only remove by rejecting them as a later addition. In my opinion, I, 1 is by no means an early hymn, but the accepted view that it is older than X, 20 appears conclusively

proved by the fact that the style of the Vimada collection is distinctly more elaborate than that of the collection I, 1, 10, and that the beginning of X, 20 is, as has always been recognised, an imitation of I, 1, v. 1. Further, the clumsy refrain introduced into the *anuṣṭubh*, with the repetition of the author's name, would seem a clear sign of a reflective and late period. On Professor Arnold's view, X, 20 is very much older than I, 1, the first belonging to the archaic, the second to the normal or third period.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

THE NEGATIVE *a* WITH FINITE VERBS IN SANSKRIT.

The kindly criticism which Mr. Keith has given to my humble little anthology from the Upanishads encourages me to put forth a few counter-remarks on points raised by him.

To my tentative suggestion that *asakad* in the Kaṭha vi, 4 may be the negative *a* with the subjunctive *śakad* Mr. Keith will not listen. I referred to the *vārttika* on Pāṇini, ii, 2, 6, which approves of the form *apacasi*; yet Mr. Keith thinks it "open to grave doubt" whether Pāṇini authorises such a compound, and in a note he adds "probably the use is later than Pāṇini, and based on a misunderstanding or illegitimate extension of the rule." This statement, I fear, is what Śaṅkara would call *sāhasa-mātram*. The negative *a* before finite verbs is found in the Mahābhārata and plenty of respectable later writings, not to speak of Pali and Prakrit; I would refer, e.g., to Hopkins' "Great Epic," pp. 263, 265, Z.D.M.G., xlviii, 84, and Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 464. And then Mr. Keith says that "until some clear Vedic cases are found, we cannot accept so hybrid a formation as possible in an Upanishad"; that is to say, he demands that an Upanishad which, as he admits, is comparatively modern in style shall be subjected to the criteria of Vedic style.

Mr. Keith thinks "unnecessary" my theory that the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka, iv, 4, 24 (*annādo vasudānaḥ*), refers to the epic legend of Suvarṇaśṭhīvin. I, on the contrary, venture

to think that it is a plausible explanation of two words which otherwise would be meaningless, and I was glad to find that I had been anticipated in it by a native scholar, Mr. Narayan Aiyangar, of Bangalore. *Annāda* means an infant; and in most cases where the word occurs in an Upanishad one may suspect reference to legends or myths of some kind.

L. D. BARNETT.

As the question of the negative *a* with finite verbal forms is of considerable interest, I may perhaps offer one or two remarks. The *vārttika*, on which Dr. Barnett relies, is certainly later, and in my opinion much later, than Pāṇini, who certainly cannot have known the usage, and even it does not go so far as to give an instance of a negative with a subjunctive. The construction probably originated with such simple cases as present indicatives. In view of the absolute uncertainty of the date of the passages of the *Mahābhārata*, to which reference is made, it is not possible to prove for Sanskrit that the use is pre-Pāṇinian, for the later writers no doubt conceived the *vārttika* as being sufficient justification, and I am afraid that it is premature to argue from the Pāli or Prākṛit examples.

But, whatever the history of the usage, it still seems to me extremely doubtful whether we should accept what would be an unprecedented form, a subjunctive with a negative *a*, in a work which is most probably anterior to Pāṇini, especially when the meaning obtained by this interpretation is distinctly inferior to that suggested by the passage in the *Bṛhadaranyaka Upanishad*, iv, 4, 5, referred to on p. 496 of the review. The *Suvarṇasthīvin* legend appears to me to throw no light on the passage in question.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

A REMARKABLE VEDIC THEORY ABOUT SUNRISE AND SUNSET.

Thibaut, in his sketch of Indian Astronomy, Astrology, and Mathematics in Bühler's *Grundriss* (iii, 9), makes

mention of what he calls an interesting statement of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa about what really happens when people think the sun rises or sets. "Interessant ist die Angabe des Ai. Brā. (iii, 44), dass die Sonne wirklich weder auf- noch untergeht, sondern dadurch dass sie sich umdreht, in den unteren Regionen, d.h. auf der Erde, abwechselnd Tag und Nacht hervorbringt." I cannot refrain from adding that the importance of this statement would be greater if its meaning were more perspicuous. As it is laid down here, it seems to explain a mystery by an enigma. Thibaut himself adds: "Wie die Sonne vom Westen zum Punkte des Anfangs zurückkehrt, darüber geben die vedischen Texte keinen Aufschluss."

Haug, the first editor of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, who has also translated it (1863), was himself struck by this theory. "This passage," so he writes in a note on his translation of it, "is of considerable interest, containing the denial of the existence of sunrise and sunset. The author ascribes a daily course to the sun, but supposes it to remain always in its high position on the sky, making sunrise and sunset by means of its own contrarieties." But Haug does not add of what kind these contrarieties are to be considered. Nor does this appear from the actual words of the text in his translation, which, for this reason, I transcribe here in full :

"The sun does never rise nor set. When people think the sun is setting (it is not so). For after having arrived at the end of the day it makes itself produce two opposite effects, making night to what is below and day to what is on the other side.

"When they believe it rises in the morning (this supposed rising is thus to be accounted for). Having reached the end of the night, it makes itself produce two opposite effects, making night to what is below and day to what is on the other side."

I fully agree with both distinguished scholars that this doctrine, which is so entirely contrary to the common and popular belief—of the Vedic mantras, too—that night and

day are caused by the sun's alternative setting and rising, is highly interesting. Perhaps I may help to the solution of the puzzle, and try to improve the understanding of that which the old ṛṣi whose doctrine is embodied in Ait. Br., iii, 44, meant by stating that Sūrya 'produces two opposite effects' (Haug) or 'revolves' (Thibaut). For this reason I put here the original text of the passage from the edition of Aufrecht (1879), p. 89 :—

“Sa vā esha na kadā canāstam eti nodeti [iii, 44] 7 taṃ yad astam etīti manyante, 'hna eva tad antam itvāthātmānaṃ viparyasyate, rātrīm evāvastāt kurute 'haḥ parastāt 8 atha yad enam prātar udetīti manyante, rātrer eva tad antam itvāthātmānaṃ viparyasyate, 'har evāvastāt kurute rātrīm parastāt 9.”

Here two uncertainties are to be settled. Firstly, Haug and Thibaut accept the sentence *athātmānaṃ viparyasyate* differently: the former, as he translated 'it makes itself produce two opposite effects,' considered the sentence next following, *rātrīm evāvastāt*, etc., to be nothing else but the detailed exposition of what was already concisely contained in the *viparyāsa*; the latter, who renders *ātmānaṃ viparyasyate* by 'sie dreht sich um,' cannot but see in what follows the necessary result of the *viparyāsa*. Secondly, Haug renders *parastāt* by 'what is on the other side,' whereas Thibaut deliberately, it seems, has avoided to mention that rather ambiguous adverb in the brief account he gives of the theory.

I think *parastāt* must needs mean here 'what is on high.' It is directly contrasted with *avastāt*, 'below.' But how may it be that Sūrya by his *viparyāsa* causes at the same time day on the earth and night in the upper regions, and inversely? Why, we must suppose the sun has a bright front-side and a dark back-side. During the daytime he keeps his bright side to the regions below—hence the sunlight illustrates this earth and the things on it—but his dark side to the regions on high—hence the other luminaries are obscured and cannot be seen on earth. At the end of the day, having reached the western *meta* of his daily course,

he turns himself to the other side and returns to the eastern *meta*, having his bright side opposed to the upper regions and his dark side to the earth; hence it is dark here, but the objects in the sky become visible; and this state of things lasts until the sun, reaching the eastern term of his course, turns his body again to bring the benefit of his light once more to the regions below, making night on high. In this manner the old ṛṣi whose doctrine has been preserved to us in the Ait. Br. expresses himself in plain and intelligible terms. The exegesis of his words is also in plain accordance with the incontestable meanings of *parastāt* and *viparyasyate*.

That which has obscured the true insight in catching the purport of the statement is Sāyaṇa's commentary. It is a common feature in the method of Hindu scholiasts and exegetes to judge and interpret everything from the point of view of their own orthodox tenets. Sāyaṇa, therefore, understands *ātmānaṃ viparyasyate* as referring to the dogma, universally accepted in his own days and long before, that the sun in his daily course is circumambulating Mount Meru. 'Sūryaḥ *svātmānaṃ viparyasyate | viparyastam karoti | katham viparyāsa iti | sa ucyate | avastād atīte deṣe rātrim eva kurute parastād āgāmini deṣe 'haḥ kurute | ayam arthaḥ | Meroḥ pradakṣiṇaṃ kurvann ādityo yaddeçavāsināṃ prāṇināṃ dṛṣṭīpatham āgacchati taddeçavāsibhir ayam udetīti vyavahriyate | yaddeçavāsināṃ dṛṣṭīpatham atikramya sūrye gate sati sūryo 'stam etīti taddeçavāsibhir vyavahriyate* (Aitar. Brāhm., ed. Aufrecht, p. 301). But Mount Meru does not play any part in the speculations of the Brāhmaṇas, and is, in fact, absent from the whole Vedic literature. Further, even if it be granted that Sāyaṇa's gloss operates with *parastāt* and *viparyasyate* within the legitimate sphere of the employment of these words, his explaining *avastād = atīte deṣe* is forced and something made *par besoin de cause*. There is no question here of the sun shining successively on different tracks of the surface of our earth, but of its making by its *viparyāsa* day and night alternatively at the same spot. So Sāyaṇa's explanation of the passage must be put aside.

We, however, who are not bound to the standard of Hindu orthodox tenets are free to contemplate this old Vedic theory in the light of its own time, as it appears to us by the help of a strict philological method of interpretation. At the time when this brāhmaṇa, revealing the real causes of sunrise and sunset, was composed for the few, the many—they may or may not have known of Mount Meru—believed in the *udayana* and *astamayana* of the Deva Sūrya. The Brahmanical philosopher, the holy ṛṣi, whose statement has been preserved in this remarkable passage, disbelieved that creed of the many. His esoteric revelation, however, about the true causes of sunrise and sunset is a rationalistic interpretation and nothing more. The interest of it consists in the fact that we have here a very early endeavour of Indian thought to explain physical phenomena by means of pure reasoning, by *tarka*, without the usual metaphysical and theosophical bias. Primitive as it is, this theory has a claim to be considered to give a more scientific answer to the question it pretends to solve than where this answer is given in the ordinary way of the Brāhmaṇas, e.g. Ait. Br., 8, 28, 9: *ādityo vai astam yann agnim anupraviṣati so 'ntardhīyate*, etc.

For the rest, the doctrine expounded was of little or no consequence, it seems. Nor is it mentioned, as far as I know, in any other Vedic text. It does not stand in connection with any ceremony or other religious act. Yet it may be observed that the supposed returning course of the sun at night, from the west to the east through the south, according to this theory, agrees very well with the religious practices always followed in the ritual pertaining to the *pitaras*, to Rudra, in the *abhicāra*-rites, and in all other performances which have in view the beings and spirits of night and darkness.

J. S. SPEYER.

Leiden.

THE DATE OF THE POET MAGHA.

An interesting article by Professor Kielhorn, published in the *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1906, part 2, has now settled, as closely perhaps as it is likely to be settled, the date of the Sanskrit poet Māgha. An epigraphic record from Rājputānā, an impression of which was sent to Professor Kielhorn by Mr. G. H. Ojha, gives us a king named Varmalāta, with a date in the (Vikrama) year 682, = roughly A.D. 625, when he was reigning in that part of India. According to the concluding verses of the *Śisupālavadha* of Māgha, the poet was a grandson of Suprabhadēva, a minister of a king whose name the published editions give as Dharmanābha or Varmalākhyā. The MSS., however, give a variety of other readings, and, amongst them, Varmalāta. Professor Kielhorn has pointed out that it is now plain, from the inscription, that the last-mentioned is the correct form of the name, and that it follows that Māgha must be placed in about the second half of the seventh century, A.D. 650-700.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE FAITHS OF MAN. A Cyclopædia of Religions. By Major-General J. G. R. FORLONG. 3 vols. large 8vo. (London: Quaritch, 1906. Price five guineas.)

If most men of the passing generation were asked to name the distinguishing characteristic of the present age, they would very probably answer that it is the progress of natural science. The verdict of the future will very probably include the rise of historical research. More difficult to follow, more difficult even to understand, it goes steadily on; gradually, and amid much discouragement, enlarging its field of conquest, and attacking, one after another, the many problems of the growth and evolution of human institutions and ideas. The old well-known classics are being ransacked again for evidence on the new problems; and the new literatures now being discovered and made known are valued chiefly, not on literary grounds, but on the assistance they can give in these new enquiries. In no department is the new method of enquiry more fruitfully pursued than in the study of Comparative Religion—a study always especially interesting to members of our Society, inasmuch as so large a proportion of the evidence it uses is derived from Oriental sources.

It is needless to point out that this new study is not pursued with the object of finding theological or religious truth. Its aim is simply to ascertain the facts about religious ideas held in different ages and in different countries, with a view to tracing the sequences in ideas from the earliest beginnings of religion down to to-day. And this study is beset with peculiar difficulties.

In the first place the collection of the facts required is rendered difficult by the very nature of the facts. They are in a large measure the facts as to what ideas were held. And not only are ideas less easy, both to grasp and to handle, than concrete statements of material fact, but ideas in ancient times are often so different from our own, so strange, so apparently illogical, that it is often not at all easy rightly to understand them. It is only necessary to refer, in support of this, to the wide divergences of opinion between the scholars most competent to judge, as to the interpretation of the Vedic hymns, or the Assyrian mythology, or the meaning of the Tao.

In the second place the results of the comparative study of religion lie beyond the grasp of the specialist who confines himself to one field, however accurate and scholarly he may be in his own department. To understand and appreciate the full significance of what he discovers in his own field, he must have not only a general knowledge of the results reached in other fields, but he must have also the necessary criticism to enable him to judge who are the workers in those other fields whose conclusions he can use with confidence. No man can be expected to be able to master the original records in more than one or two branches of the enquiry. But to contribute anything of abiding value to comparative studies there is required a first-hand knowledge of the main sources in one field at least, a thorough training in historical criticism, and a breadth of view which shall inspire interest in the greater problems at issue.

Another difficulty is the complete want at present of books of reference. There is no dictionary of Comparative Religion in which one may find, so arranged that it is easy to find them, the facts of which one is at want in any particular problem. There is not, at least in English, any textbook of the subject, giving with adequate fulness and scholarship the ascertained results, adding the names of the best works in which one could look for more detailed information on any particular point. The want

of a dictionary is mainly a matter of finance. Publishers at present do not admit that any money can be made out of such a venture, for it would be necessary that many authors should collaborate under a competent editor. They may possibly find out, before long, their mistake. Meanwhile we owe it to the author of the volumes under review that, with the generosity that so distinguished him, he provided the necessary means for the publication of this noble effort to meet a want that is being felt, day by day, with increasing urgency.

It is stated in the editor's preface that General Forlong spent twenty-five years in compiling this work. We can well believe it. It gives in separate articles, arranged in alphabetical order, and filling about 1800 large pages of print, an account of the books, persons, places, and languages; of the sacred animals, symbols, images, buildings, and festivals; of the philosophies, legends, and beliefs; of the various gods, demigods, and spirits, good and evil; and of the numerous sects, of all the religions current among men. It is no easy task to allot their due space and importance to all; to write with equal fulness and accuracy on Assyrian demonology and Egyptian necrology, on the Roman festivals and the Greek mysteries, on Indian saints and Japanese devotees to duty, on Chinese philosophy and the human sacrifices of Mexico, on the magic and totemism of Australia, on the religious dances of the South Sea Islands, and on the medicine men of the Red Indians.

The case of the gods is especially difficult. The kaleidoscope of ideas which make up the figure of a god is constantly changing. The dominant colour may persist, but the accessories vary, and by their variation alter the general scheme and balance. It appears from this work that the length of time during which the worship of a deity has lasted—that is, the length of life of the deity in question—varies from about one to two millenniums, only one or two having lingered on, in a semi-comatose condition, into the third millennium. It would not be possible within the short limits of a dictionary article to give the whole life of the

deity (that is, the ideas held about him and in connection with his ritual and worship), during the whole of this period, with the necessary distinctions of time and place. Possibly M. Cumont, the well-known authority on Mithra, might think that, compared with the number of his worshippers and the extent and influence of his cult, the space allotted to that deity should have been greater, and the wording somewhat different. It is certainly a pity that M. Cumont's work is not referred to; but the article is fairly full, and very interesting.

So with regard to the technical terms of the various philosophic and religious beliefs. They are often ambiguous, and—in such cases, for instance, as baptism, soul, arahat—have been used in different senses at different times and in different places. The expert would have dealt with them in more exclusively chronological an order. But the articles are full of curious and valuable information.

A striking feature of the work is the mode of spelling. Greek words are spelt as Greek, and not as Latin. We are so accustomed to the latter method that Skulla and Aishkullos for Scylla and Æschylus will startle some readers. 'Godess' for 'goddess' is logical, but new. The long marks over the vowels in Rīshī are probably intended to show that they are to be pronounced as Italian and not as English vowels; but in that case it is difficult to see why Sītā should be given as Sita, or what the marks signify in Vināya and Hināyana (iii, 417). In these innovations, except in his use of the long marks, General Forlong is very probably a pioneer of the spelling of the future, and whether one agrees with them or not, they should not be allowed to prejudice the estimate of his work.

It is, indeed, altogether as a pioneer work that the volumes here reviewed must be judged. A man of wide reading, rare culture, and of a deep religious spirit, the author has seen, before others had seen it, that a Dictionary of Religions is a *sine quā non* to any sure advance in our knowledge of the subject. The ideal dictionary would be the combined work of a hundred or more

scholars, each of whom should have devoted a lifetime to making himself master of one or other branch of the subject. There being no prospect, at that time, of such a work, General Forlong, undeterred by the difficulties of the task, set himself with amazing industry, and with all the resources of his wide knowledge gathered in years of personal intercourse, and then in years of reading and thought, to give us such a work. He would be the very last man to think, or even to desire, that his work should be the final word on the subject. His object has been to help others, to give us a useful contribution towards the spread of enlightened opinion on the history and meaning of religious beliefs. In this object he has admirably succeeded. But he has left us also a monument to a charming personality. And in years to come, when his object shall to some extent have been achieved, scholars will look back to his work as the pioneer movement in a department of scientific enquiry that is of the first importance to mankind.

A word of acknowledgment is due to the editor, who has modestly concealed his name. As a matter of fact, the additions he has made in many places (they are distinguished by square brackets) are of the greatest service, and add considerably to the value of the work. And merely to have seen these volumes through the press must have been a work of great labour, although that labour was evidently also a labour of love.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

A HISTORY OF ASSAM. By E. A. GAIT, Indian Civil Service.
(Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, & Co., 1906.)

The familiar complaints concerning the lack of historical literature in India do not apply to the countries on the edge of the Indian Empire. Ceylon in the south, Kashmīr in the north-west, Nepāl in the north, and Assam in the north-east, all have their chronicles. The native histories of Ceylon have been known for some seventy years; the story of Kashmīr, although not yet presented to ordinary readers

in a readable form, has been rendered accessible by the exhaustive labours of Dr. Stein; the dry chronicles of Nepāl have been transfused by the skill of M. Sylvain Lévi into a brilliant historical work on the best European model;¹ and now the obscure annals of Assam have been digested and arranged by the industry of Mr. Gait, the one person in the world who knows much about them. In 1897 that gentleman, encouraged by Sir William Ward and Sir Charles Lyall, published a comprehensive *Report on the Progress of Historical Research in Assam*, which disclosed the unexpected richness of the material awaiting the historian of the future. The author of such a Report could not well avoid the fate of himself becoming the historian. Mr. Gait has yielded to his inevitable destiny, and, notwithstanding the pressure of heavy official duties, has succeeded in writing a volume on the history of Assam, which seems to include everything that ought to be included, and will be of permanent value. The author does not pretend to rival the brilliant style of the French historian of Nepāl, and is content to tell his story in the level language of a blue-book. His work produces the impression of being thoroughly trustworthy, and accuracy is more important than liveliness of statement.

Very little is known about the ancient history of Assam—the valleys of the Brahmaputra and the Surma—before the Āhōm conquest in the thirteenth century. The most important datum is the information given by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang (Yuan-chwang) concerning Kumāra Bhāskara-varman, the vassal ally of King Śīlāditya or Harsha vardhana in the middle of the seventh century. The king of Kāmarūpa, or Assam, then took the place of honour among the feudatories of the paramount sovereign, and it is evident that he enjoyed considerable power and dominion. But the pilgrim's notice is almost completely isolated, and cannot be worked into a continuous narrative of local story.

The Āhōms, a small clan of Shāns, who made their way

¹ *Le Népal, Étude historique d'un Royaume hindou* (Paris, Leroux, two vols., 1905).

from Burma across the Pātkāi Mountains, and entered the upper valley of the Brahmaputra in 1228 A.D., had, as Mr. Gait observes, "the historic sense very fully developed," and maintained chronicles which were written up from time to time, and contain a careful, reliable, and continuous narrative of their rule. That rule lasted for six centuries, with many changes and fluctuations in the extent of the power of the dominant tribe. The last days of the Āhōm princes were made miserable by cruel Burmese invaders, from whom the country was delivered by the treaty of Yandaboo in 1826. From that time the province has been British territory. Mr. Gait gives an interesting account of the fighting with the Burmese, of the rise of the tea industry, and other important matters connected with the British administration, which we have not space to discuss.

One remark in the chapter headed "Consolidation of British Rule" (p. 309) is important from the purely scientific point of view. "The people whom we call Nāgas are known to the Assamese as Nagā; they belong to a diversity of tribes, each speaking its own language, and calling itself by a distinctive name. The collective designation by which they are known to the Assamese seems to be derived, as suggested by Holcombe and Peal, from *nok* (cf. Sanskrit *Loka*), which means 'folk' in some of the tribal dialects. . . . The lengthening of the first vowel sound in the English rendering of the word 'Nāga' is probably due to the old idea that it connoted snake worship."

The Āhōm language, now nearly extinct, is a member of the Tai or Shān group, and is written in a peculiar alphabet derived from the Pāli. Dr. Grierson has given an excellent account of it in vol. ii of the *Linguistic Survey*, including a vocabulary containing every word which the learned author could collect. But he overlooked the coin-legends published in *J.A.S.B.*, pt. i (1895). In the course of my work for the Indian Museum I have had occasion lately to catalogue the eight coins in that institution which bear legends in Āhōm, and so venture to offer Dr. Grierson the following additions to his vocabulary from the coins:—

bay = prayer.

chāō = great.

hēu chu = offer (1st pers. sing.); cf. *hau* = to give (Grierson).

lākni = year (Gait spells *lākli*, p. 361).

Leñ dan = Indra (the Āhōm deities were identified with Indian ones); cf. *ling*, pron. *leng* = light, not dark (Grierson); Gait (p. 70) spells *leng-don*, and explains as = 'one-powerful.'

phā = king (always the last syllable in the royal names, but there interpreted as meaning 'heaven'; see Gait, *History*, p. 240).

pinchāō or *pin khun* = reign (see Grierson s.v. *pin*).

Tārā = the Almighty.

Also a list of names of the years of the Jovian circle, the meaning of which is not known.

Mr. Gait's book contributes a few more words, namely:—

che = city, p. 89.

chi = burn (verb), p. 89.

dun = full, p. 72.

jāo = wide, p. 72 (= 'distant, far,' Grierson).

kang = drum, poison, p. 72.

kau = sworn, p. 81.

khu = great, p. 72.

khun = prince, p. 71.

khyān = life, p. 86.

lai = younger, p. 71.

lung = elder, p. 71.

pen = make, p. 89.

ri = deserted, p. 77.

rik = revive, p. 86.

tang = chase, p. 82.

And some others, chiefly collected on p. 240.

The chapter on the Āhōm system of government is of much interest. In his *Report* (p. 3) Mr. Gait, following the native writer, Kāsīnāth, places the reign of Pratāp sinha between 1611 and 1649, rightly noting that coins of his exist dated 1648 A.D. (= 1570 Ś.). But the *History*, following the authority of the *buranjis*, or local annals, kills this king in 1641, and places his accession in 1603 (pp. 102, 116). The coins prove that Kāsīnāth was right. Mr. Gait deserves hearty congratulations for having produced a work which is a solid and considerable addition to knowledge, and must be taken note of in all future histories of India.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

REPORT OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY WORK IN THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE AND BALUCHISTAN for the period from January 2nd, 1904, to March 31st, 1905. By M. A. STEIN, Ph.D., Inspector-General of Education and Archæological Surveyor, North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. (Peshawar: Government Press, 1905. Sold by the Agents for the sale of Government publications.)

Dr. Stein, who is now on his way to seek fresh triumphs as an explorer of the sand-buried cities of Khotan, held for a year and a quarter the combined offices of Inspector-General of Education and Archæological Surveyor for the newly-formed North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. This anomalous arrangement will not continue. We are pleased to learn from a recent Gazette that the Indian Government has decided to maintain the Archæological Survey as a permanent institution, and has readjusted the jurisdictions of the Surveyors, who will be known henceforth as Superintendents. Notwithstanding the anomalous nature of his position and the practical difficulties involved in combining antiquarian research with the administrative business of the head of the Education Department, Dr. Stein, animated by his habitual energy, managed to overcome all obstacles and to effect notable work on his archæological side, which is adequately reported and illustrated in the publication which lies before us. The hurried scamper through parts of Baluchistan, described in the concluding pages, did not produce results of much value, although it sufficed to show that the country offers a good field for detailed archæological research. The Government of India still clings to the delusion that in a few years more all interesting sites will have been explored, and that the archæological department will then be free to devote its energies solely to the work of conservation and repair. It is really comical to see how the expression of this belief crops up from time to time in official resolutions, but facts

will prove too strong for Simla theories. Baluchistan still offers virgin ground, although the department need not go so far afield to find ample scope and verge enough for research. As yet the Panjāb and Rājputāna hardly have been touched, and there is not a province in the Indian Empire in which there is not room for practically unlimited enquiry. Dr. Stein, luckily, was not hampered by 'mosque-mending,' and was able to devote the short time at his disposal to original research.

He performed a useful service in collecting at Peshāwar for deposit in the new museum there a collection of about 250 sculptures of the Gandhāra school. It is satisfactory to learn that he is fully satisfied with the correctness of certain current identifications important for understanding the ancient geography of the north-western frontier. He declares (p. 5) that "General Cunningham's identification of Hiuen Tsang's *Fa-la-na* with the territory of which Bannū was the natural and political centre must appear convincing to any student who is familiar with the actual geography of this part of the North-West Frontier," and that *Ho-si-na* "has been identified with certainty as the present Ghaznī." On the next page he shows that the territory called *Ki-kiang-na* by Hiuen Tsang (Watters, ii, 262; Beal, ii, 282), and known to Arab writers as *Kikan*, must correspond roughly with Wazīristān. Dr. Stein gives an interesting account, illustrated by good photographs, of the ruins at Ādhi-Samūdh near Kohāt, Akra, seven miles S.S.W. from Bannū, and Kāfirkot on the Kurram river.

The position of the Mansehra copy in the Kharoṣṭhī script of the rock-edicts of Asoka is puzzling at first, because the immediate surroundings could never have been occupied by habitations, and no important commercial or military route passes near. But the apparent puzzle is explained by the fact that the inscribed rock commands the passage to a popular place of pilgrimage now known as the 'Tirtha of Brēri' (Sanskrit *Bhaṭṭārikā*), so that the emperor's commands were well placed to secure the attention of numerous readers (p. 17). The copies of the edicts at

Junāgarh (Girnār) in Kāthiāwār and at Rūpnāth in the Central Provinces similarly were located on pilgrim routes.

The most important part of Dr. Stein's work was his exploration of the Mahāban mountain on the Indus, about seventy miles E.N.E. from Peshāwar. When the *Early History of India* was published in November, 1904, the evidence then available seemed sufficient to warrant amply the conclusion that Mahāban must be the long-sought Aornos of Alexander; and, if the late General Abbott's account had been thoroughly trustworthy, that conclusion was inevitable. But Dr. Stein's personal investigations prove that Abbott was misinformed on important points, and that the topography of Mahāban cannot be made to agree with that of Aornos, as described by the Greek and Roman historians. The identification therefore must be given up, and the problem can be solved only in one of two ways, either by holding that the historians were romancing, or that the true site lies higher up the Indus. Dr. Stein inclines to the former alternative (p. 31), and is disposed to push back the formation of the 'Alexander legend' to the contemporary writers. But this solution does not commend itself to me, and I believe that, when opportunity offers, a mountain, agreeing in most respects with the Greek descriptions, will be found higher up the river, and not very far from Mahāban. When the identity of Aornos and Mahāban seemed to be demonstrated, I was always conscious of a difficulty in understanding the statement of Curtius that the army, when leaving Aornos, did not reach Hephaistion's encampment on the Indus at Ohind until the "sixteenth encampment" (*E. Hist.*, p. 52). That statement requires some forcing to make it agree with the Mahāban site, but if the true site is an appreciable distance higher up the river, there is no difficulty in understanding it. I cannot believe that the companions of Alexander, from whom Arrian drew his information, were mere liars, and invented the whole celebrated story of the siege. It is important to note that Dr. Stein (p. 47) is prepared to admit as "highly probable" the identification of Asgrām with the Asigramma of Ptolemy. The geographer

places Embolima, the dépôt below Aornos, in long. 124° , lat. 31° , and Asigramma in long. 123° , lat. $29^{\circ} 30'$. If, then, the equation $\text{Asgrām} = \text{Asigramma}$ be admitted, although reliance cannot be placed on the exactness of the latitude and longitude, it is clear that Embolima was believed to be about a degree and a half farther north than Asigramma, and that Aornos cannot have been far from Embolima (Deane, *J.R.A.S.*, 1896, p. 674). My impression, therefore, is that, although the summit known as Mahāban is not Aornos, the true site will yet be found on another summit close to the Indus, and not many miles distant.

I have not left myself space to discuss in detail Dr. Stein's interesting attempt to fix the site of the famous *stūpa* supposed to commemorate the offering by Buddha of his body to the tiger. Everybody now is agreed that Cunningham was mistaken in supposing Mānikyāla to be the place, and Dr. Stein shows strong, if not absolutely conclusive, reason for believing that the buildings on Mount Banj, a spur of Mahāban, represent the scene of the 'body-offering,' as pointed out to Hiuen Tsang. The guides of Fa-hien, the earlier pilgrim (ch. xi of his *Travels*), located the famous legend at another place, only two marches to the east of Taxila. Dr. Stein (p. 45) claims no more than "great probability" for his own identification, and so much may be conceded, although it involves an awkward correction of a bearing given by the pilgrim from 'south-east' to 'north-east' (p. 41), and such 'corrections' always arouse suspicion.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

A VOCABULARY OF THE TROMOWA DIALECT OF TIBETAN
SPOKEN IN THE CHUMBI VALLEY. Compiled by E. H. C.
WALSH. (Calcutta, 1905.)

The Tromowa dialect of Tibetan is that used in the Chumbi Valley, which, while it is Tibetan in the main features of grammar and vocabulary, is affected in both

respects by modifications akin to those found in the languages of the adjoining countries, Bhutan and Sikkim.

Mr. Walsh has compiled this work by going through a vocabulary of colloquial Tibetan with the headsmen of different villages, and noting down phonetically all cases when the words or structure differ from the ordinary Tibetan. His clerk, a Sikkhimese, has tested the delicacies of doubtful sounds by comparison with his own language, and the vocabulary gives the words in English, Tromowa (Upper and Lower Tromowa being separated where, as sometimes, difference of origin, social customs, and religion have their counterpart in differences of speech), Sikkhimese, and Tibetan. The Tibetan is fortunately given in its own characters as well as in Roman spelling, and this lessens the feeling of walking amidst quicksands that results from wandering among words of which the solid etymological basis has disappeared.

One cannot on a cursory observation make generalisations as to the classes of words most affected by dialectic change. In some cases the variations are slight, in others the words are entirely different, but they often approximate to the Sikkhimese. Among the chief differences in structure are those in the use of the particles which help to form the future tenses, the imperfect tense (formed with *gañ*), and the past infinitive. In pronunciation the ordinary *a*-sound is rounded to *o*, as *lon* for *glañ*, 'a bull,' and many of the compounds formed with *r* lose their *r*-sound.

The work gives the impression of being done with care and accuracy. Every contribution to our knowledge of Tibetan dialects is to be gratefully accepted, and the more languages that can be dealt with before outside influences have levelled them down the better will it be. Mr. Walsh is to be congratulated on having carried out a task which could not fail to have been interesting in itself, and valuable as an addition to our knowledge of language, and through that of human life.

C. M. RIDDING.

TIBET AND THE TIBETANS. By GRAHAM SANDBERG.
(London, 1906.)

This book is an excellent example of the best kind of work published by the S.P.C.K. Its author, Graham Sandberg, was prepared by a varied experience and varied attainments for his researches. He left the career of a barrister on the Northern Circuit to take orders in 1879, and his work as a chaplain in several parts of India, and especially in Darjiling, led him to the lines of investigation which became specially his own. Besides other work, he published a Vocabulary of Colloquial Tibetan, and undertook the arduous duty of revising the Tibetan Dictionary of Sarat Candra Das. This book has the pathetic interest that though the author wrote the preface, dated in January, 1905, a long struggle with delicate health was ended in the March of that year by his death, before he was able to complete the final revision of the last sheets. This work has been done by Dr. L. Barnett, of the British Museum.

The book bears the impress of a vivid and eager personality, and throughout we can see that the collecting of facts has been a labour of love, undertaken both for the delight of knowledge in itself and for the sense of its bearing on the deeper questions of human life. Together with this vital sense of the significance and interest of all the details which make up the whole, goes an entire freedom from verbiage or fine writing. The facts speak for themselves, and make their own picture.

There is an account of Lhasa, taken chiefly from the Reports of the Native Survey Agents, which makes the reader feel that he could find his way at once through all the main streets of the city, and that its sights are as familiar to him as those of Rome, and this is done by mere terse description, with no word-painting.

The contest between the traveller and the scavengers who try to get blackmail from him, working on the superstition that those who refuse it never leave Lhasa alive, and so are ultimately in their power as being the disposers of the dead

at the cemeteries; the bargaining of the traders, who bargain by grasping each other's hands under their ample sleeves, so that bystanders cannot judge of their proceedings; and the stall of Mrs. Jorzom, the seller of pastry, are pictures that remain in the memory. The monastic life is treated shortly, but its main points are well brought out. The plan by which the teacher is beaten if the pupil does not pass his examination might be commended to the notice of educational reformers.

But social life and organisation is not the only topic of the book. It begins with a full treatment of the geography of Tibet, its climate and meteorology, while the final chapters are on the flora and mammalia of the country, in which the scientific tastes of Mr. Sandberg find their scope. In the mythology of Tibetan Buddhism he touches on ground more familiar to us, and does not contribute much fresh knowledge, though it is useful to have the information so compactly given. Tantras and Tantric rites are described and illustrated by the analysis of a volume of Tantras from the Tangyur, while the charm of the literature that is not derived from the Sanskrit nor inspired by it is shown in some specimens of the poems of the sage Milaraspa. This saint and poet, contemporary with the Norman Conquest, is as yet the most vivid personality in Tibetan story, and the one that most appeals to us.

“ Yet an old man am I, forlorn and naked (says he).
From my lips springs forth a little song,
For all nature at which I look
Serves me for a book.
The iron staff that my hands hold
Guides me o'er the ocean of changing life.”

Across the ages the ascetic who wandered among the snowy mountains, clad only in one thin robe, clasps hands with the most human of his kind, who found “books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in everything.” Sitting on the rock that overhangs the torrent, recalling the thought of Marpa, his dead teacher, “him who was the remover of

longings," for whom "yearning dirges should vanish away," wandering among the villagers at their dances, followed by his disciples to icy caverns, where their weak faith questions how he may be nourished, seeking and having found within himself a kingdom that is not of this world, he remains, in spite of quaint miracles and theological denunciations, a real and living friend. May a wider knowledge reveal other personalities as fascinating!

To sum up, this book, while it serves in its clear simplicity of statement as a manual for the natural history and social organisation of Tibet, is at the same time pleasant reading for those who desire a general impression only, and forms a useful introduction to Tibetan ideas for the now increasing number of those who are interested in the language and literature of the country.

C. M. RIDDING.

A HISTORY OF EGYPT, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE
PERSIAN CONQUEST. By JAMES HENRY BREASTED.
(Hodder & Stoughton, 1906.)

Dr. Breasted's "earliest" (historical) times begin with the accession of Menes of the First Dynasty, whose date he would put at 3400 B.C. The Persian conquest occurred in 525 B.C., and he has therefore some twenty-nine centuries to account for. By relegating all his "Quellen" or sources to another work, called "Ancient Records of Egypt," which will be reviewed here when complete, and by avoiding all discussion of theories, Dr. Breasted has succeeded in condensing his history of Egypt for this period into one thick volume of 600 pages. The book is well equipped with all necessary maps, indexes, reproductions of monuments, and photographs of scenery and other natural objects, taken for the most part *ad hoc*; while a fairly prolonged search has failed to reveal any important fact or date which has been omitted. Hence it must be looked upon as a masterpiece of condensation, and the general reader, to whom it is more particularly addressed, may be congratulated upon

having such a convenient and easy method of acquiring knowledge put before him.

The history of Egypt lends itself better to this somewhat summary mode of treatment than does that of most countries, because in the valley of the Nile the conditions of life have through many millennia remained the same. What we call Egypt is but a strip of extraordinarily fertile land on each side of a mighty river, and the great majority of its inhabitants have always been labourers whose economic condition has been not far removed from that of slaves, while they have been in everything dependent on a strong central power which has found it necessary, for their benefit quite as much as its own, to give them employment on huge public works. Nor is there much dispute as to the main facts of its history during Pharaonic times. First came the Old Empire, which united under one sceptre the many small principalities carved by the first invaders out of the territory of the aborigines. This endured from the First to the Sixth Dynasties, and was followed by a period not unlike our own Wars of the Roses, when the nobles, having become too powerful, warred against each other till settled government and orderly progress was impossible, and the land seemed fast relapsing into chaos. From this confusion emerged the Middle Empire, beginning perhaps with the Eleventh Dynasty, which formed the golden age of Egypt, and ended with the invasion of the Hyksos, a devouring host of Asiatic horsemen, who settled in the Delta like a flight of locusts somewhere between the Fourteenth and the Sixteenth Dynasties. These invaders were cast out by the conquering Seventeenth and Eighteenth Dynasties, who first organized Egypt for foreign conquest, and succeeded in laying a great part of Western Asia under tribute. But this state of things came to an end with the Nineteenth Dynasty, and thereafter Egypt fell more and more under the sway of the priests, who finally so managed matters that even the magnificent natural resources of the country were exhausted, and it became a mere milch-cow for its Ethiopian, Persian, Greek, and Roman conquerors. All this is recited in order

by Dr. Breasted, whose literary skill enables him to transform what would otherwise be a bald catalogue of disjointed facts into an easy and continuous narrative.

Dr. Breasted, however, though Professor in an American University, is in Egyptological matters more German than the Germans, and is directly inspired by the school at Berlin, from which he has derived his own erudition. Hence we are not astonished to find him imagining a "prehistoric" immigration of Semites into the Nile Valley, a Semitic basis for the Egyptian language, a much abbreviated chronology, and a rather fantastic arrangement of the reigns of certain monarchs like the Mentuhoteps and the family of the Thothmes. In the last two instances his vagaries have been corrected by discoveries made since his book was written, and in the others Egyptologists will know with how many grains of salt they are to take his 'Berlinisms.' Nor is the uninstructed reader likely to be led far astray by them if he will only collate them, as he should, with the published opinions of the greatest of living Egyptologists, M. Maspero. Subject to this caution, the book is to be in every way recommended.

F. L.

THE EGYPTIAN HEAVEN AND HELL. By E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. 3 vols. (Kegan Paul & Co., 1906.)

Under this title Dr. Budge gives us two of the most curious of the documents that the Egyptians placed in their tombs in the belief that they would thus magically assist the passage of the dead through the Underworld. The first of these, which is generally called the Book of *Am-Tuat*, shows us what was the perhaps secret doctrine of the triumphant priesthood of Amen regarding the next world, and describes the journey of the solar bark during the hours of night, when it was supposed to traverse the same path that the dead would have to tread, and to be exposed to the dangers from which only the faithful could free themselves by magical ceremonies. Here we see the dying Sun

leaving the earth and plunging into Amenti or "the hidden land," wherein are pits of fire, huge serpents, and lakes of boiling water of so sulphurous a stench that "birds fly away when they smell it." Beside these obstacles, there was also the giant serpent Apep, who consistently opposes the advance of the Sun; but, with the assistance of Isis, the great goddess of magic, and other helps, the solar deity manages to pass from one division of Amenti to another until at last he unites himself with Kheper, the sacred beetle, and emerges triumphant on the eastern horizon, thence to run another daily course through the heavens. Yet his coming into this hidden land is of vital importance to the dead. We may take it that the kings and higher initiates into the mysteries of Amen were supposed to be given a place in the Sun's boat, where they sang praises to him, constantly bathed in his light, fed on the offerings made to him, and perhaps were looked upon as mystically identified with him. But there were other less favoured dead already in Amenti, among whom the Sun passed, and the treatment of these differed widely. Some are represented as sunk in sleep, and without life until revived by the Sun's light, which they enjoy during the brief hour that he is with them, wailing sorrowfully as he departs. Others, again, are fed from the solar boat, which apparently forms their sole means of subsistence. But there are yet others who have in life proved themselves the enemies of Ra, who have blasphemed him, or who have merely been neglected by their descendants, and are therefore wandering about deprived of the sustenance they would otherwise get from the funereal offerings. These are 'judged' by Ra, and are handed over to certain executioner gods, by whom they are hacked in pieces and otherwise tortured until they are finally annihilated. The upshot of the whole was that, without the knowledge and the assistance that the priests of Amen-Ra could give him, the life of the dead was but of little worth.

Side by side with this, Dr. Budge puts the text known as the "Book of the Gates," which, in his opinion, was

written by the followers of Osiris to bring their ideas of the next world into line with those already professed by the priesthood of Amen. According to this, each region of the Underworld was marked off from the rest by gates, each of which was presided over by a warder appointed by Osiris, and it was necessary for the deceased to pronounce the name of this warder before he could pass through the gate. For the rest, there is no essential difference between the two different ways of describing the Underworld, the passage in both cases being made in a boat, the chief passenger in which was Afu-Ra or the dead Sun. But when half the journey was accomplished, according to the Book of Gates, the deceased had to undergo the judgment of Osiris, which was a very different thing from the judgment of Ra, which we have seen casually pronounced in the Book of Am-Tuat. The soul of the dead is brought before Osiris and 'weighed' against the feather of truth, the test not being, as in the other case, his loyalty to Ra, but his observance of the moral law as set forth in what is generally called the Negative Confession. Hence, says Dr. Budge, we see that it was the worship of Osiris that first introduced moral ideas into the Egyptian religion, and this view is probably correct. Moreover, the reward of the righteous differs considerably in this book from that impliedly assigned to them in the stricter doctrine of Amen. In the Book of the Gates, the justified dead is introduced to the Sekhet-Aaru or Elysian Fields, where he spends his days ploughing, sowing, and reaping, in much the same manner that he had been accustomed to do upon earth. In both cases the wicked are tortured and finally annihilated in much the same fashion.

The importance of these books for the history of religions is immense. Although their central idea is less religious than magical, their object being to compel rather than to persuade the supra-mundane powers, they contain, like most magical books, many allusions to religions and beliefs that had passed away long before the Nineteenth Dynasty, under which Dr. Budge's examples were written. Hence they

enshrine, as it were, some of the earliest religious conceptions of the Egyptians, such as, for instance, the description of the 'kingdom' or hell of Seker, an early Egyptian god of the dead about whom we otherwise know hardly anything. But more important even than this is the light they throw upon the shape which Christianity first took on its introduction into Egypt, and upon the early heresies which we are accustomed to class together under the name of Gnosticism. As we learn from the discourse of Origen against Celsus, there were in the second century sects of Christians who believed that after death they would have to pass through gates guarded by terrible powers, to whom the justified would have to address formulas which seem to be directly derived from those in the Book of Gates. Other documents tell us that the Manichæans, a sect that in many parts of the world were able to contend with the Catholic Church on something like equal terms, also adopted the views of the Egyptians as to the solar bark and many of the incidents attending its passage through the night. As for the tortures of the wicked, it is not too much to say that most of the apocryphal writings of the first few centuries which describe them, owe nearly all their inspiration to the two books here given; and thus it may be said that these last colour the eschatological views of all Christendom.

Dr. Budge's three volumes comprise the full hieroglyphic texts of the two books in question, a summary of one of them made in very ancient times, and full translations of both, together with reproductions of the curious vignettes or pictures with which they were originally illustrated. Dr. Budge's name is a guarantee for the scholarly execution of the work, the publication of which confers a benefit upon science that will before long be appreciated at its proper value.

F. L.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER.

(April, May, June, 1906.)

I. GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

April 10th, 1906.—Sir Charles Lyall, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Major Sir H. McMahon, K.C.I.E.,
 Rev. Walter Stapleton,
 Mr. Fritz V. Holm,
 Professor H. C. Norman,
 Babu Brajo Sundar Sannyal,
 Mr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy.

Major Vost read a paper on “Kapilavastu.” A discussion followed, in which Mr. Fleet, Dr. Hoey, Dr. Grierson, and Mr. Yusuf Ali took part.

ANNIVERSARY MEETING.

The Anniversary Meeting was held on May 8th, 1906, Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. D. L. McCarrison,
 Mr. Fritz Krenkow.

The Annual Report of the Council for the year 1905 was read by the Secretary.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1905.

The Council regret to report the loss by death of the following fifteen members :—

Mr. E. M. Bowden,
Lieut.-Col. Wilberforce Clarke,
Rev. J. N. Cushing,
Sir M. E. Grant Duff,
Rev. Dr. John Edkins,
Major A. S. Faulkner,
Mr. C. W. Kynnersley,
Mr. F. W. Madden,
Miss Manning,
Sir William Muir,
Professor C. K. Niemann,
Professor Jules Oppert,
Mr. R. D. Sassoon,
Mr. R. C. Stevenson,
Mr. W. Strachey,

and by retirement of the following twenty-seven members :—

Mr. Luxman Arya,
Mr. L. R. Ashburner,
Mr. H. K. Basu,
Sir Steuart Bayley,
Mrs. Bendall,
M. E. Blochet,
Mrs. Ole Bull,
Prince Boris Chakhovsky,
Mr. G. R. Dampier,
Mr. H. V. Davids,
Mr. G. P. Devey,
Professor Arthur M. Edwards,
Mr. W. Fyfe,
Mr. H. Haddad,
Mr. A. V. R. Iyer,
Mr. E. A. Khan,

Col. Sir H. E. MacCullum,
Mr. K. S. Menon,
Mr. K. K. Nayer,
Mr. L. H. Proud,
Mdme. Z. A. Ragozin,
Mr. D. J. Rankin,
Mr. Khaja Khan Sahib,
Major W. H. Salmon,
Mr. G. F. Sheppard,
Mr. Irach Sorabji,
Mr. N. B. Vakil.

The following forty new members have been elected during the year :—

Mr. S. Ramanath Aiyar,
Mr. Z. Gauhar Ali,
Dr. D. Anderson-Berry,
Mr. Muhamed Badr,
Mr. R. R. Bugtani,
Mr. Virendranath Chattopadhyay,
Mr. E. Colston,
Mr. Wilson Crewdson,
Mr. Jogindranath Das,
Mr. E. Edwards,
Col. R. Elias,
Sir Charles Eliot,
Sheikh Abul Fazl,
Mr. Jyotish Chandra Ghose,
Miss Winifred Gray,
Mr. Ganga Prasad Gupta,
Mr. Arthur Hetherington,
Mr. Mir Musharaf ul Huk,
Mr. Syed Asghar Husain,
Mr. Bijaya Chandra Mazumdar,
Mr. E. M. Modi,
Mr. Rustam J. J. Modi,
Mr. Yusuf I. Mulla,
Mr. W. H. Nicholls,

Mr. F. Handyman Parker,
Mr. F. G. Petersen,
Mr. Henry Proctor,
Mr. T. M. Rangacharya,
Mr. Joseph Nadin Rawson,
Mr. H. A. Rose,
Dr. F. Otto Schrader,
Mr. James W. Sharpe,
Mr. G. F. A. Stevens,
Dr. James W. Thirtle,
Mr. Jain Vaidya,
Mr. Gauri Datta Misra Vidyabhusana,
Dr. J. P. Vogel,
Mr. G. C. Whitworth,
Mr. K. Mohamed Yahya,
Mr. Mohamed Yunus.

There is a decrease therefore of two in the number of members.

Five additional Libraries or Societies have subscribed during the year, and none have withdrawn, so that the total of all classes of contributors is increased by three.

The amount received in subscriptions was less than in 1904, and it is noticeable that a decrease under this head has been steadily progressive during the last four years, and this is to be accounted for by a smaller proportion of Resident to Non-Resident Members. The number of the former has fallen from 103 in 1903 to 86 in 1905. But compensation is found in a larger sale of the Journal, which during the year has realized £46 more than in 1904, and £67 more than during 1900. This is an indication of increased appreciation of the value of the Journal, which the Council regard with considerable satisfaction, showing as it does that the high character of the communications published in it is maintained.

On the expenditure side there is nothing abnormal, except that the accounts show a donation of £10 10s. towards the cost of publication of the new Pali Dictionary by Professor

Rhys Davids, being the first of ten such sums to be paid annually by the Society.

In connection with the Oriental Translation Fund, the second volume of the late Mr. Watters' "Travels of Yuan Chwang" has been published during the year, forming vol. xv of this series. Vol. xvi has also been published, "The Lawā'ih of Jāmī," a facsimile of text and translation, edited by Mr. Whinfield, who has himself borne the cost of its production. The Council record their thanks to Mr. Whinfield for this contribution to the series.

Another volume has been accepted, and is in course of preparation by Mr. L. D. Barnett. The work is the "Antagado-dasão, the eighth Anga of the Jain Scriptural Canon." It will, it is hoped, be soon ready for press.

The Society's Public School Gold Medal for 1905 was awarded to Mr. E. W. Horner, of Eton College, for the best essay on "The Life and Times of Ranjit Singh." It was presented to the successful competitor by Mr. Brodrick, the Secretary of State for India, and a full report of the proceedings appeared in the Society's Journal, pp. 607-612 of the volume for 1905.

A new rule was adopted at a special meeting of the Society on December 12th, instituting the office of Honorary Vice-President, and Sir M. E. Grant Duff and Major-General Sir Frederick J. Goldsmid were at once elected.

By a resolution of Council in December last, a Committee was appointed to examine the Rules and Byelaws of the Society with a view to revision. The Committee have since then been engaged on the revision, but have not yet made their report.

Professor Rhys Davids, having been appointed to the Chair of Comparative Religions at the University of Manchester, resigned during the year his position as Secretary to the Society, which he had held for eighteen years. High appreciation of the valuable services he had rendered to the Society for so many years was expressed by the members of the Society at the last Anniversary Meeting on May 16th, 1905, and at a later meeting on December 12th, when

a further testimonial of good-will and of thanks for his services was given to him, with a portrait of himself painted by Mr. Ivor Gatty. An account of the proceedings will be found in the Journal for April, 1906.

Miss Hughes was appointed Secretary to the Society in March, 1905.

During the year the Society has lost two of its Honorary Members, the Rev. Dr. Edkins and Professor Jules Oppert. A full account of their life and valuable work will be found in the Journal for January, 1906. The Council propose in their place the election of

Sir Ernest Satow,
Professor René Basset.

This year, under the rules of the Society, Dr. Thornton and Sir Raymond West retire from the office of Vice-President. The Council recommend their re-election.

The Council have heard with great regret, which they are sure will be shared by the members generally, that Dr. Cust finds it necessary on account of his health to resign the office of Honorary Secretary, which he has held for twenty-seven years, and his Vice-Presidentship. It is proposed, as a slight recognition of the valuable services he has so long and continuously devoted to the Society, that he be elected an Honorary Vice-President.

Under rule 43 the following members of the Council retire, viz.:—Mr. Frazer, Dr. Gaster, Colonel Jacob, Professor Rapson, and Mr. Wollaston, two only of whom are re-eligible.

The Council recommend the election of

Dr. Hoernle,
Mr. Hoey,
Professor Neill,
Professor Rapson,
Mr. Wollaston.

The Council also recommend the re-election of

Mr. James Kennedy as *Honorary Treasurer* and
Dr. Codrington as *Honorary Librarian*.

The usual statement of accounts is laid on the table.

The Council recommend that a vote of thanks should be passed to the Auditors, Mr. Irvine, auditor for the Council, and Mr. E. T. Sturdy and Sir Frederick Cunningham, for the Society.

PROFESSOR MARGOLIOUTH: My lords, ladies, and gentlemen,—I have great pleasure in moving the adoption of the Society's Report. The gentleman who occupied this position last year expressed the hope that our numbers would increase. We find to-day that there has been a decrease of two, but I trust we are only retiring to make a forward spring. If we compare the numbers of similar societies abroad, we have no great cause for complaint. The French Oriental Society numbers 240 members, the American Society 270, the German Society about 400—largely supplemented, it must be observed, by English and American members—and the Royal Asiatic Society has a membership of about 500. We are therefore a good deal ahead, but not to the extent which the interests of Great Britain in the East would render likely. I hope that there will be a further increase in the future. When compared with other learned societies we are not quite at the bottom: the Mathematical Society has 270 members—about half our number; the Astronomical Society has 709; the Hellenic Society 870; the Geological Society 930; the Chemical Society 2,750. We have a long way to make up to be equal with some of them. What we must do is to prove, if we can, that the studies we pursue are as important to mankind as those of other societies—as valuable as chemistry, as fascinating as astronomy, and as refining as Hellenic studies. Then our membership ought to rise to four or five figures.

With regard to the members we have lost by death this year, tributes have been paid to their memory and work in our Journal, but I should like to mention one or two names. Professor Jules Oppert was closely connected with the exploit of which this Society is prouder than of any other—the interpretation of the cuneiform inscriptions. Sir William Muir was accorded the Society's Gold Medal.

ABSTRACT OF RECEIPTS AND

RECEIPTS.

Subscriptions—				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
84 Resident Members at £3 3s.	264	12	0			
1 „ „ in advance	3	3	0			
207 Non-Resident „ at £1 10s.	310	11	7			
16 „ „ in advance	31	0	0			
11 „ „ in arrears	21	1	0			
5 Library Members at £1 10s.	7	10	0			
2 „ „ in arrears	3	0	0			
13 Non-Resident Members at £1 1s.	13	13	0			
1 „ „ compounded	22	10	0			
							677	0	7
Rents				225	1	0
Donation				210	0	0
Journal—Subscriptions	181	1	0			
Sale	65	0	6			
Sale of Index	2	3	0			
Sale of Pamphlets	6	1	6			
Advertisements	18	4	9			
							272	10	9
Miscellaneous				19	10	0
Subscriptions paid in excess				10	9	0
Library Subscriptions				3	0	0
Dividends—N.S.W. 4 per cent.	30	10	0			
Midland 2½ „	5	0	10			
Local Loan	9	0	0			
							44	10	10
Interest on Deposit in Bank	4	5	9			
„ „ P.O. Savings	1	1	7			
							5	7	4
Total				1467	9	6
Balance at Bank, January 1, 1905	46	4	1			
„ Petty Cash	1	12	2			
„ on Deposit	166	7	11			
„ P.O. account	38	15	4			
							252	19	6
							£1720	9	0

FUNDS.

£802 13s. 10d. New South Wales 4 per cent.

£218 8s. Midland 2½ per cent. debenture.

£300 3 per cent. Local Loans.

EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1905.

EXPENDITURE.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
House—Rent	431	6	0			
Fire Insurance	10	0	0			
Water	12	8	0			
Gas	25	19	1			
Income Tax	15	5	6			
Repairs	29	15	10			
Coals	4	5	0			
	<hr/>			528	19	5
Salaries				275	10	0
Wages				86	0	0
Journal—Printing	312	0	0			
Illustrations	13	15	0			
	<hr/>			325	15	0
Library—New Books	15	18	3			
Binding	10	2	3			
	<hr/>			26	0	6
Donation to Pali Dictionary				10	10	0
Furniture				8	10	6
Stationery, etc.				24	2	4
Postage				60	0	0
Petty Cash				27	13	2
Advance for Indian Texts Series				13	15	0
Bank Charges				11	0	
Returned Subscriptions				5	16	0
Subscriptions paid in error				2	11	0
Miscellaneous				33	5	2
	<hr/>			1428	19	1
Total						
Balance at Bank, December 31, 1905	23	6	1			
„ Petty Cash	2	19	0			
„ on Deposit	216	7	11			
„ P.O. account	48	16	11			
	<hr/>			291	9	11

£1720 9 0

Examined with the books and vouchers, and found correct, February 26th, 1906. { WM. IRVINE, for the Council.
EDWARD T. STURDY, } for the
F. D. CUNNINGHAM, } Society.

SPECIAL FUNDS.

ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.
To Balance in hand, January 1, 1905	...	177	4 11
By Sales	...	42	14 6
By Interest	...	2	10 0
By Donation	...	121	10 10
		£344	0 3

	EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
Salary	7	10 0
Printing Vol. XIV	113	4 2
Binding "	9	10 8
			130	4 10
Balance	213	15 5
			£344	0 3

INDIA EXPLORATION FUND.

To Balance in hand, January 1, 1905	14	1	11	N%.								
By Subscriptions	13	0									
By Interest	7	2									
									
				£28	2	1	Balance	28	2	1		
				£28	2	1						£28	2	1

MONOGRAPH FUND.

[illegible]

Funds—Nottingham Corporation Stock, £600.

Total Receipts	662 9 4	Balance on Deposit	306 12 6
Total Expenditure	310 4 8	Balance at Bank	45 12 2
				<u>£352 4 8</u>						<u>£352 4 8</u>

Examined with the books and vouchers, and found correct, February 26th, 1906.

WM. IRVINE, for the Council.	}
EDWARD T. STURDY,	
F. D. CUNNINGHAM,	
	Society.

MEDAL FUND.

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.	
£	s. d.	£	s. d.
To Balance in hand, December 31, 1904...	27 17 10		
Dividends on £325 Nottingham 3 per cent. Stock	9 15 0		
Interest to December 31, 1905 ...	14 10		
	<u>£38 7 8</u>	Balance, December 31, 1905 ...	38 7 8
			<u>£38 7 8</u>

FUNDS—Nottingham Corporation Stock, £325.

PUBLIC SCHOOL MEDAL FUND.

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.	
£	s. d.	£	s. d.
To Balance in hand, December 31, 1904...	6 15 11		
Dividends on £645 11s. 2d. Nottingham 3 per cent. Stock	19 7 4	April 28. Cost of Medal ...	5 0 0
Donation, A. N. W. ...	1 5	May 8. Binding Prizes...	4 8 6
Interest to December 31, 1905 ...	3 4	Cards ...	11 6
		May 18. Plants ...	1 10 0
		Chairs, etc. ...	1 6 9
		Balance, December 31, 1905...	13 11 3
	<u>£26 8 0</u>		<u>£26 8 0</u>

FUNDS—Nottingham Corporation Stock, £645 11s. 2d.

WM. IRVINE, for the Council.
 EDWARD T. STURDY, }
 F. D. CUNNINGHAM, } Society.

A. N. WOLLASTON.
 January 1, 1906.

Examined with the books and vouchers, and found correct, February 26th, 1906.

Those who have joined us during the year have brought considerable strength. As an old fellow-student I welcome in particular the accession of Sir Charles Elliot, well known as an authority on East Africa, on Turkey, where he resided in the service of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, and on Oriental religion.

Then as to the budget. We know that with charitable or religious societies it is considered that they are not doing their work efficiently unless they are in debt. This does not apply to learned societies. We need make no attempt to hush up our balance. It has been pointed out that it is due to the additional sales of the "Journal"; this proves that non-members of the Society find that it contains valuable matter and desire to purchase it. At one time, when the *English Historical Review* was not getting on well, its editors resorted to the expedient of asking Mr. Gladstone to write an article for it. We have not as yet done anything like that, though we might be gratified to get articles by leading statesmen. Those who are responsible for what appears in the Journal have to see that in the interests of learning no genuine contribution shall be excluded, but no spurious one is admitted. It is sometimes difficult to decide these points, but it is probable that our "Journal" has maintained a standard equal to the Journals of other societies and academies dealing with the literature of the East. Some communications have opened out unexplored fields; others carry on exploration in these directions as well as in those fields that are fairly well worked, where they fill in gaps. Looking through the list of contributions we find that the field covered is wide with regard to subjects, countries, and epochs of time. The special funds of the Society have also been employed in the publication of works which will be found to be furthering the objects for which they were started. It gives me much pleasure to move the adoption of the Report.

MR. A. BERRIEDALE KEITH: In seconding the adoption of the Report I wish I could feel satisfied with the explanation offered by the learned mover with regard to the diminution

in the number of our members. It seems to me to be a serious question that the number of resident members should have decreased to 86. We are, no doubt, not fair judges of our own work, but the increase in the sales of the "Journal" proves conclusively that it maintains its high character and is valued by outsiders. But for one or two causes, or perhaps from both combined, those who might become members of the Society are not attracted to it. Professor Macdonell, in a lecture given here recently, showed the disadvantages under which Oriental studies labour. Candidates for the Indian Civil Service are no longer required to take Sanskrit for the Final Examination, and it is not surprising, therefore, that few members of the service take up such studies in India. Now, it must be admitted that all men would not care to do scientific work in Indian subjects, but there remain some who would and who have already done research work in Classics. If these men once had a start by even one year's teaching in Sanskrit, the results, if not great, would at least be valuable. Their interest would be aroused and in some cases good work would follow. It seems to me, therefore, that every candidate for the Indian Civil Service should take up Sanskrit, or if he is going to Burma, Pāli. I am well aware that Governments are not moved by pure reason, but the case for the inclusion of Sanskrit or Pāli in the Final Examination is so strong that if it were represented by the President and Council of our Society, it would, I think, move even the India Office.

If not, however, would it not be possible to bring the Royal Asiatic Society to the notice of probationers of the Indian Civil Service? At present few, if any, of them know of our existence. In this respect I should like, if I may, to make two suggestions. In the first place, steps should be taken to impress upon probationers the advantages that would accrue to them and to India through the study of Sanskrit, and the resulting sympathy with and understanding of Indian life and ideas. At present I fear that their teachers do not realise the duty of encouraging such studies. I know of a teacher of Indian law in one of our Universities

who, on being asked by a probationer what optional subject he should take up, replied to the suggestion that Sanskrit might be useful by a denunciation of that language as quite dead and wholly unprofitable. In the second place, we should bring to their notice the desirability of their associating themselves with the Royal Asiatic Society, and perhaps it could be arranged to admit Indian Civil Service probationers as members at a subscription of one guinea a year.

Further, would it not be well to bring the Royal Asiatic Society to the notice of all existing members of the Indian Civil Service by sending out a circular to everyone now in the Service in India or at home. Many may not know of the Society, and some at least might like to join.

With a view to increase the number of resident members, it might be considered whether it would not be possible to alter the hour of meeting. Four o'clock in the afternoon is an inconvenient time for those engaged in official or other business. A meeting at that hour breaks up the afternoon, and the tendency in other Societies is to transfer the hour of meeting to the evening. Some Societies have gone further and have instituted monthly dinners, after which a lecture is given. It may be thought to be beneath the dignity of the Royal Asiatic Society to adopt methods which tend towards popularity, but such methods might perhaps do good to the cause of Indian studies.

I feel that in seconding the adoption of the Report I am only anticipating the wishes of the members present in expressing on my own behalf and on behalf of all those who use the Library the great appreciation which we feel for the kind and efficient assistance rendered by our Secretary, who performs her duties in a most admirable manner.

SIR RAYMOND WEST: With reference to observations which have been made as to the extent to which the Society is known in India, everyone must be aware that the members of the Indian Civil Service are not ignorant of our existence. I was in India thirty-six years; from first to last I knew of the Royal Asiatic Society, and became a member of it

at an early period after retiring from the service. All members of the Society here are aware, of course, that it is impossible for distant members to attend the meetings, but there is no necessity to press the claims of the Society on the Indian Civil Service. If it should be thought desirable, I see no objection to a special appeal being made. But I do not think the Society is going down. The reason why resident members have decreased may perhaps be found in the rule made some years ago giving easier terms connected with the use of the library.

With regard to the Oriental studies at Oxford and Cambridge, I may say that I take an active part in the studies of probationers at Cambridge, and I can assure the members of the Society that it is not the case that the attractions of Sanskrit and Arabic have not been brought to their notice. My lamented friend Professor Bendall was active; Professor Browne is very active, and in so far as students have a taste for Oriental studies ample encouragement is given. It is only men with special linguistic tendencies who take up Sanskrit with profit in addition to the vernacular they are obliged to learn. A few do take Sanskrit, and their numbers probably might be increased. If pressure is brought to bear loss of time is often involved; the work is not done seriously, and it is dropped when the man reaches India. It takes time which should be devoted to matters of absolute necessity. Offer encouragement to students, by all means; but do not put on such pressure as will divert a man's attention from the matters that interest him. I have every confidence in the success of the Society; there are oscillations in every Society. We have this last year lost by death a rather greater number than usual; gaps must be filled up. We shall go on prospering as in the past. If members would take trouble to bring the claims of the Society before their friends, we should get new members who would not only pay their subscriptions, but who would add intellectual strength to the Society. The translations and other publications of the Society this year will do valuable service.

{

LORD REAY: Before I refer to the Report of our Society for the past year I have to mention that the Society's Gold Medal has been awarded to Dr. G. U. Pope, the well-known Tamil scholar, and the Public Schools Medal this year goes to Rugby for the first time, and is awarded to Mr. Nalder.

As already pointed out, we have lost this year a great number of members by death. To most of them allusion has been made on previous occasions at our meetings, and I shall not go through the entire list to-day, but I must mention one or two names.

In Sir William Muir the Society has lost a member who was both President and Gold Medallist; his life was remarkable for its varied achievements, and his works on Islamic history, particularly the "Life of Mahomet," are of special importance and value.

The loss of Professor Jules Oppert removes a commanding figure among Orientalists; he was, indeed, the Nestor of Assyriology. He was one of the earliest students of Zend and of the cuneiform inscriptions, and he received the reward of naturalisation in France for his services to Assyriology. He was an Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic Society from 1881; he founded the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, and was a permanent contributor to the *Journal Asiatique*.

Dr. Edkins, one of the founders of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, was an Honorary Member of our Society, and his Mandarin Grammar is one of the best books on the Chinese language.

There is one name which I greatly regret to have to add to the list of our losses by death, that of Professor Bendall, of Cambridge. This is the first occasion on which Professor Bendall has not been in our midst. There is hardly anything which I can add to the admirable obituary notice which has appeared in the "Journal," written by his friend, and, I am glad to say, successor, Professor Rapson. You will there find a record of his many and varied activities. Professor Bendall was a Sanskrit scholar, and more; he was a typical scholar of extraordinary versatility. We deeply regret that his Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine was not

further advanced. He was an ideal teacher ; he knew how to inspire his students with enthusiasm for the subject taught. He considered himself their friend, guide, almost colleague, as well as teacher. His loss to Cambridge is exceptional. His passionate love of music showed the artistic side of his wonderfully well endowed nature. Professor Bendall's memory will ever be held in honour and reverence in our Society.

I wish to pay a tribute of great respect to Dr. Cust in regretting his absence to-day. He has been associated with the Society for many years and has always shown the greatest interest in its work. He never failed to stimulate us by his advice with regard to the development of the Society.

It is with great pleasure that I allude to the excellence of our "Journal," and to the way in which it holds its own among other similar publications. It is the representative of the Society in the world of Orientalists everywhere. During the last year no subject has been loosely handled in its pages, and its success shows that although the number of members has dwindled to some small extent the number, and especially the quality, of those who contribute to the "Journal" cannot be said to be on the down grade. I should like to call attention to the articles by Professor Mills, of Oxford, on the Pahlavi Texts of the Yasna. They are especially valuable as it is now recognised that no further labour upon the Avesta of an exhaustive nature can be attempted until all the Pahlavi texts have been treated in a similar way. Indian Epigraphy is represented by five articles of great interest written by Dr. Fleet, Major Vost, and Professor Kielhorn. The "Journal" of 1905 is representative of the various interests of the East, and not unduly partial to any section. The Arabic articles from the pen of Professor Margoliouth, of Oxford, are of great value to scholars ; Persian is represented by Professor Browne, of Cambridge, whose knowledge of Persian poetry is unrivalled. He has dealt with the lives and writings of two hitherto little known poets. Numismatics, we are glad to see, find

a place in the "Journal"; three articles on this subject are contributed, one by Professor Rapson, whose reputation as a numismatist is equal to his reputation as a Sanskritist. Dr. Hoernle and Professor Takakusu elucidate some vexed problems of chronology and history, and in Colonel Gerini's article on Indo-China we have a valuable contribution to our knowledge of a field perhaps the least explored. We await with interest his long promised monograph on "Researches in Ptolemy's Geography." The Notices of Books form a feature in our "Journal" which is much appreciated by members.

There is only one more subject to which I shall refer. On various occasions we have had opportunities of criticising the neglect of Oriental studies by the Government and its want of encouragement to candidates for the public service with regard to the study of Oriental languages. The result is that only a limited number of students avail themselves of the opportunities that already exist. We cannot complain of the dearth of teachers, for there are always eminent scholars ready to fill the chairs the moment there is a demand for any particular branch of Oriental learning. But it is the demand which fails. With regard to the importance of Tibetan, until recently there was no Chair of Tibetan, but as soon as the need arose the gap could be filled. There are competent scholars who are prepared to give the ripe results of a lifelong study to fill Chairs, and to devote themselves to their students as occasion arises. You will be pleased to hear that meetings have been held of representatives of various societies interested in the development of Oriental learning, of Eastern trade, and of our relations with the East, and it is proposed that a united effort should be made to approach the Government in order to point out how they could stimulate Oriental studies in various directions. In many Government departments a proper appreciation of Oriental knowledge would create a vast improvement, so without it in the long run we shall not be able to hold the position which our great Oriental empire imposes on us. Unless our officers are trained as

other Colonial powers, the outlook is serious. Surely we who are the inheritors of a vast Eastern empire cannot do less than show ourselves equal to the responsibility which our ancestors have laid upon us to consolidate this great empire. I have much pleasure in putting the adoption of the Report.

We will now proceed to elect two Honorary Members. It is proposed that Sir Ernest Satow, our Minister to China, should succeed Dr. Edkins, one distinguished Chinese scholar thus succeeding another. In the place of Professor Oppert it is proposed to elect Professor René Basset, whose merits are so generally recognised that I need not enumerate them.

(The Report was carried unanimously.)

Before I sit down I should like to express on behalf of the Society our best thanks to Miss Hughes for the admirable way in which during her tenure of office she has fulfilled all the expectations raised by her election.

June 19th, 1906.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

PRESENTATION OF THE SOCIETY'S TRIENNIAL GOLD MEDAL
TO DR. G. U. POPE, AND OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL GOLD
MEDAL TO MR. L. F. NALDER, OF RUGBY.

LORD REAY: Ladies and gentlemen,—I shall reserve any remarks on to-day's interesting ceremony until the end, when I shall have the pleasure of moving a vote of thanks to the Secretary of State for India. I will now simply invite him to give to Dr. Pope the medal which the Royal Asiatic Society present every three years to the most distinguished Orientalist, and also the Public Schools medal given annually by the Society for the best historical essay on an Indian subject, and which has this year been obtained by Mr. Nalder, of Rugby. I may congratulate Dr. Pope and Mr. Nalder that they will be the recipients of these coveted medals at the hands of so distinguished a scholar and statesman as my Right Honourable friend Mr. Morley. I am quite sure that

in after years my young friend Mr. Nalder will look back upon this function as one of the most interesting and pleasant events in what we hope will be a most successful career.

MR. MORLEY : Ladies and gentlemen,—It is not necessary for me to-day to say anything about the Royal Asiatic Society. I am, perhaps, the person least qualified to expatiate on that topic. I understand the object of the Society—an object in which it has succeeded—is to collect knowledge of Eastern literature, thought, and archæology. Your “Journal” is regarded throughout the Empire, throughout the world in fact, as a tangible and continuous record of the discoveries that have been made in these various branches of Eastern knowledge.

The medal I have first to present is awarded as a tribute to Dr. Pope in recognition of his distinguished services. I for one am always delighted—perhaps because I am approaching that class—to pay tribute to a veteran in the walks of thought and knowledge. Dr. Pope may regard to-day’s proceedings and the recognition of his work by this distinguished and most competent Society as, in some senses, the crown of his long career. It is true that the real crown of knowledge is its acquisition, and that he has enjoyed to the full for long years. It is not necessary for me to go through all that he has done. I am not competent even to pronounce the names in the long list of books of which he is the author. He must have gone through what might be called great masses of drudgery—I mean grammars and vocabularies; the young recipient of the other medal to-day will probably realise this acutely. Dr. Pope’s researches in Tamil, Telugu, and the dialects of Southern India are well known to all who are concerned in that field of literature and action. He has not only been a most industrious scholar through the many years of a happily long life, but he has thrown his life and faculties into a most sympathetic and admiring intercourse with whose whom we call backward peoples among whom his lot was cast. For those who are responsible for the government of States there are two

views—I suppose no one will dispute it—of the work of missionaries. Whether we sympathise or do not sympathise with their immediate designs, whether we believe or do not believe them to be permanently fruitful, missionaries from old times—I am thinking particularly of the Jesuit missionaries in China—have performed great linguistic services, and have added vastly to our knowledge of backward races and peoples.

Dr. Pope's services have added permanently to our knowledge of the languages of Southern India. Perhaps the culminating effort of his literary career has been the production of the text and a translation of the work of one whom he calls a Saivite saint, who gave utterance to the deepest devotional thoughts of his community. What delights me is to know how he speaks of the book and of the saint. Dr. Pope refers to him in the sympathetic and admiring language which one good man ought always to use towards another, whatever his dialect. It adds to the pleasure I feel in being the humble performer in presenting this gold medal to him.

Dr. Pope, it is with great pleasure that, on behalf of the Royal Asiatic Society, I have the honour to present you with this medal, given, as Lord Reay has told us, every three years to the most distinguished Orientalist of the day. It was awarded to Sir William Muir, a man of the highest distinction. 'All my friends of the Indian Civil Service speak of him as a most able administrator, yet he found time and possessed the intellect to perfect and extend scholarship, and he afterwards became Principal of the University of Edinburgh. Your walk in life has been different from that of Sir William Muir, but you will take this medal as a mark of our honour for you and for your services.

Now I must turn from the veteran to the tyro. I do not think that it is quite accidental that the prize has gone to Rugby this year. I cannot forget that of all Public Schools Rugby, under the admirable inspiration of Dr. Arnold, was the first school in which history was taught in that spirit in which we pursue it to-day. Mr. Nalder is only perfecting

a Rugbeian tradition by signalling the fact that it has trained him in true historical study.

When I was a boy at school at Cheltenham—it seems a hundred years ago—we had admirable history lectures and classes, but I do not remember that we ever wrote prize essays. I know I did not. I once wrote what I wished to be a prize poem, but it was not successful. However, the Head Master said to me, “I am glad that you composed that poem, because it shows all the elements of a sound prose style.” I was wounded at the time by his remark, but I was cute enough to perceive its true significance. But although it was an extingisher it was also an incentive.

I have had the pleasure of reading Mr. Nalder's prize essay on Hyder Ali. I may say, even in his presence, that it shows great intelligence. I was struck by the promise of historical grasp, by the search for historical parallels, and by the aptitude of language. He draws a parallel between Hyder Ali and Frederick the Great. He compares the dominions of Frederick—the dominions Frederick appropriated, Silesia—with the dominions of Tipoo, which I rather think we appropriated. He reminds me in the essay of a saying of Napoleon's, “This old Europe bores me.” I think he made Tipoo a citizen, Citoyen Tipoo. I suppose it is some similar feeling to this which makes some of our friends reproach us for thinking too parochially, for not being sufficiently ‘bored’ with our own old and narrow little Europe, for not being ready enough to extend over the vast field which lies under the British flag.

The Royal Asiatic Society does well in giving this medal. The object it has in view of arousing an interest in Indian history is, I am sure, thoroughly well-timed; because, say what you will, it is inevitable, if not now, certainly before long, that the people of this country will interest themselves more constantly and more pressingly than they have hitherto done in India. Whether this will be an unmixed gain depends upon many things, but real gain certainly depends upon the people of this Island acquiring a real knowledge of the real conditions of Indian society. I hear political friends

•

of mine talking as if India, with all its vast variety of population, were exactly like this country, and could be dealt with in the same way. It ought to be dealt with in the same spirit. It is a truism that India contains an infinite variety of knowledge, every variety almost of thought, of belief, of social usage and conditions. Nothing is more important than that the people of this country who lead the mind of this country and who eventually decide on the policy on which India shall be governed should recognise that in India we have an excessively complex, diversified, and perplexing subject. You may talk one day to a native gentleman who speaks as good English as you do, who talks with as much intelligence as you do of the thought, literature, and politics of modern Europe. Then, in Southern India—with which Dr. Pope is so intimately acquainted—you have people who are not much more advanced than the tribes of Central Africa. It is not reasonable, and it may be dangerous, to forget this enormous diversity of conditions.

Sir Henry Maine said that it was a pity that the social and political beliefs and usages of India had been only superficially examined, and he himself made a powerful contribution to our knowledge of what lies at the bottom of those beliefs and usages. It is a matter for congratulation that we have still among us an authority in this respect who is not inferior to Sir Henry Maine; I mean Sir Alfred Lyall.

India has been written and spoken about, as Lord Curzon noticed the other day, by three first-class masters of English speech, Burke—he might have added Sheridan—Macaulay, and John Bright, that great and distinguished orator. Some of the finest and most striking passages in the English tongue are to be found in the writings of these men concerning India. We can never understand the people until we are acquainted with their speculations in religion and philosophy. Sir Henry Maine and Sir Alfred Lyall have revealed something of the variations of belief and social usage in India. I venture to make a present of this reflection to Mr. Nalder—he may perhaps make use of it in the future—that mastery in speculative beliefs, in religion and social

usage, is the true key to history. I hope one day, if he has nothing better to do—I do not know what he is going to do—that he will take that task in hand. Mill's "History of India" is getting out of date. Let him take the facts of Indian history, fertilise and expand them, and show their relation to our beliefs. This is a task of the first magnitude.

I was reading the other day a book on India by a traveller who had been round India with the Prince and Princess of Wales. The writer wondered whether the teaching and spread of English culture will be anything less superficial and transient than the pseudo-Hellenic culture which Alexander, or rather his generals, spread over Western Asia. It would be very discouraging if that were so, but I am persuaded that it is as yet too soon to forecast with confidence the reciprocal effect of European thought and literature upon Indian usages and beliefs. We cannot forecast with confidence, but nothing but good can come of an endeavour, as in this essay—your object in this Society points the way—to promote a better understanding of one another. I know it is said that East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet. That may be so, but we shall not be in a hurry to believe it. Everyone now taking part in public, literary, or philosophical affairs would be slow to admit the conviction to his mind. The British rulers in India, it has been said—but it is not quite true—are like men who are bound to make their watches keep time in two longitudes at once. It is a difficult task. You who belong to the Royal Asiatic Society, and I in the way open to me, and men like Dr. Pope in their way, are trying to bring about the solution of a difficult problem. It may not be soluble, but then statesmen—I do not mean only men in official life or Members of Parliament, but men who look to the welfare of States—are always dealing with insoluble problems.

It has been a great pleasure to me to be here to-day, and I hope both the veteran and the tyro have enjoyed the proceedings.

MR. R. W. FRAZER: We all know the great literary achievements of Dr. Pope, and it is therefore fitting that

this Society should combine to recognise and crown these achievements by the highest award it can bestow on Oriental scholarship.

His life-work has been to unravel the long-lost history of the life and thought of South India, of a race now to be found, in the words of the Dravidian scholar Caldwell, "wherever money is to be made, wherever an apathetic people is willing to be pushed aside, there they swarm, these Tamils, the Greeks or Scotch of the East." The language in which the Tamil ancient records are preserved is a language of no ordinary difficulty. It is absolutely unintelligible to the ordinary Tamil student of the vernacular. It is preserved in a style known as Classical Tamil or Straight Tamil as opposed to the Vernacular Tamil or Crooked Tamil of to-day. It abounds in the most complicated systems of metres, it is crowded with anomalies, full of obsolete words and forms, and archaic inflexions. The grandest period of this literature falls somewhere between the ninth and thirteenth centuries of our era. With the whole range of this extensive literature Dr. Pope is as intimately acquainted as are the ablest native scholars of South India, and to this knowledge he brings his great powers of critical analysis. Within the last few years he has given us translations of some of the most important works of this period, so that now, in his own words, we can undertake "a thorough scientific investigation of the historical foundation of South Indian beliefs."

He has not only given us these translations for purposes of research, but he has further enriched them with the most copious notes from the three great works of Jain or Buddhist origin, only recently published in Tamil, in Madras, and still untranslated. We therefore look still for much from the great storehouse of learning of Dr. Pope, for who else is to undertake the work, as he himself has truly said that "Tamil scholarship is the direct road to poverty."

Notwithstanding this, Dr. Pope has devoted almost sixty years of his life to the study of this literature and to its critical examination. It has been the study of a nation's literature, a study that is of the record of the best that nation has thought.

He has traced for us in that literature the early advent of Aryan learning into South India, and the literary influence of the Jains and Buddhists; then the story of the vehement disputes between the Jains, Buddhists, and Tamil teachers is told in his recent translation of the *Māṇikka Vāṇagar*, until the revival of the ancient worship of the personal God Siva, leading to the building of the great temples of South India from about the tenth century, and the final disappearance of Buddhism and Jainism from the land. At the same time a new philosophy was growing up.

The teachings of Sankara Ācārya, the Karma Yoga of Patanjali with a theistic Sāṅkya, all were united and formed an eclectic school of philosophy for South India known as the Saiva Siddhānta, which deals with the nature of a personal God, the soul, and its bonds or *Māyā*, which separate it from mystic union with the soul of all things.

Of this Saiva Siddhānta philosophy, as set forth in the long poems of the fourteen Santāna Gurus or Succession of Teachers, Dr. Pope is now almost the sole European exponent, and a textbook from him would be eagerly welcomed. As a true teacher or guru, Dr. Pope is revered not only here but in all Tamil land. His influence has been great, and the affection felt for him by his pupils is deep and lasting.

We are here to recognise a life's work of patient research and laborious scholarship, and I know that Dr. Pope will feel the honour deeper because it honours his beloved melodious Tamil, and will bring pride to that proud and sensitive people of South India, as well as to the many scholars and friends of Dr. Pope.

DR. POPE: It is not easy for me to speak on an occasion like this, and I do not know that I can do better than develop the idea which has grown up ever more and more in my mind during all the years I have been engaged in work and studies connected with the Tamil people and their literature. It appears to me that the first step where a European race has one of a widely different character entrusted to its guardianship, and earnestly desires to impart

all that it can to that other race, the very first step must be for the Europeans to acquire such a knowledge of the language of their protégés as shall bring them into contact with all that is best and highest in their speech and thought. It is not enough for the Englishman to talk common Tamil, he must be able to think and feel with the people, he must be able to understand and sympathise with their highest aspirations. Where they have gone astray, if it be so, he must be able to follow out the reasonings which have led them astray, and to comprehend the truth that lies behind their supposed errors. You must benefit any people by finding out what is best in them and developing—sometimes it may be correcting—their ideas. Amongst the Tamil people it is safe to say that very few Europeans who have sojourned among them have done this. Beschi was one of these, but anyone who reads the wonderful Tēmbāvani which he composed, or caused to be put together, must feel that in the mass of legend there accumulated he missed his way, and so failed to produce the full effect that his remarkable knowledge of the people, their language, and their literature might have enabled him to produce. The great Tranquebar missionaries acquired an unparalleled knowledge of the commonest forms of Tamil, but the chief result has been the formation of what may be styled a separate dialect—the ‘Christian Tamil.’ Another great scholar was a member of the Indian Civil Service, Mr. Ellis. He, on the other hand, devoted himself almost exclusively to the cultivation of the highest native literature, and had scarcely any intercourse with the ordinary native. On the whole the result has been that the great bulk of Europeans, official and missionary, have stood aloof very much from the highest life of the Tamil people.

On the other hand, chiefly through the influence of that truly great man Dr. Alexander Duff, the great body of missionaries has thrown itself with wonderful energy and success into the work of imparting to the pupils in the missionary schools throughout all India of a thorough English education. The young men of India, seeing in this the high

road to Government employment, and general success in life, have thrown themselves into English studies with marvellous enthusiasm. The general result has been that they have come to neglect and despise in many cases their own vernacular. In Madras the Free Church Christian College has given us some native scholars who have profited to the utmost by their English education, and have at the same time done very remarkable work in Tamil. To Dr. Miller and his colleagues South India owes very much; but the tendency is to Europeanise the students and lead them altogether to neglect their own vernacular. What is wanted is a race of men who shall transfuse into Tamil all that they gain from their English studies. I am afraid that Tamil literature, though it has made notable advances of late, is in danger of being put greatly in the background, in which case how are the many millions of the Tamil people to share in the enlightenment of these favoured few? English and the vernacular must advance side by side, and it will be an evil day for the Tamil country when its youth ceases to be proud of its own beautiful language, which is capable of expressing every variety of thought. It must be acknowledged that there is a wide chasm between Europeans and the Hindus of South India. This is not altogether—perhaps not mainly—the fault of the natives. It is true that the Hindu system of caste is a great barrier; but of course the English themselves are a caste, and at many points prevent free intercourse of the races. It will probably never be possible, even if it were desirable, to effect the fusion of races; but the study of Tamil by all Europeans would do very much to bring them together and to enable them to co-operate in works for the benefit of the people. It seems to me that every one who has work to do in the Tamil land should resolve to master its language, and this applies not to men only but to their wives, who surely have their work to do in the land.

There is an abundance of books by means of which a thorough knowledge of every kind of Tamil can be acquired. The study is not without its own peculiar

fascination. It must be acknowledged that in no part of the world in any age have more able, zealous, conscientious, and laborious men served their country than those who in the Indian civil and military services have spent their lives. A great number of missionaries and teachers have laboured with both zeal and success in the Tamil land.

Every department of the public service has been ably worked. Perhaps the time has now come when to all their other qualifications a thorough knowledge of the language and literature of the people may become something more than an accomplishment possessed by a select few. If I have been able in any way to help forward this desirable result I shall feel deeply thankful.

Antagonism must be banished. The tendency to look down with ill-disguised contempt upon all that differs from preconceived notions must be overcome. Strange varieties of social and religious customs must be tolerated and construed in a kindly spirit if alien races are ever to come together for their good. Both Europeans and Tamilians have felt this to be hard and well-nigh impossible. This question of native languages is beset with difficulties. Englishmen who have to devote their energies to the most difficult work of carrying on the government of the vast multitudes of India cannot find time and opportunity for linguistic studies, and it is quite possible for a man to become so absorbed in the study of language as to neglect the people who speak it. There have been some who could not see the wood for the trees. It is interesting to search out the Tamil roots; but the Tamil race, with its infinite wants, is of greater importance still. The study of languages is important; but after all it is but a means to an end, and that end is good government, and the elevation of the people themselves. Still, it must be asserted that the more a man makes himself acquainted with the thought of the people the greater will be his opportunity for exercising a real benefiting effect upon it. In regard to the training of native young men the matter seems much simpler. The more thoroughly they understand English the greater will

be the store of ideas and good principles which they can diffuse; but it will be a great mistake if they allow themselves to become alienated from their people. They really know just so much as they are capable of transmitting in their own language to their own people. Thus with them Tamil study must go hand in hand with the acquisition of English. This has not always been the case. For those Europeans who in any capacity seek to be teachers of the people, it seems self-evident that the directest way, if they can only find it, to the heart of the people must be through their own mother tongue. My whole lifelong experience enables me to attest the truth. The love shown to me by natives whom I have never seen has often affected me very deeply. My efforts were feeble, my mistakes many, but they have clung to me as though I were their father, because I knew and to a certain extent understood their own speech. I feel therefore compelled to emphasize as much as I possibly can the advice that I give to all who desire to do good work in India, "Learn the language, try to steep your mind in its idioms, to think in it, and to feel in it."

The way in which I was led to make Tamil the main study of my life was peculiar. It was in the Oldham Street Wesleyan Chapel in Manchester. I was a schoolboy of 13 years, and I had gone with a relative to hear a farewell address from one highly esteemed, who was going out as a missionary to Madras. I remember the words which arrested my attention—"I am going to Madras, where I shall have to minister in Tamil to a congregation of native converts." It was the first time, I think, that I had ever heard the word Tamil, and I said to myself, "When I have done with school I also will go to Madras, and will learn Tamil." I kept my word, and have been learning Tamil ever since! Seventy-three years have passed since that (to me) epoch-making missionary meeting. I shall never forget the first time that I met a Tamil man face to face, and spoke to him. It was on board the grand old Green's ship, in which I had sailed round the Cape to India.

It was somewhere in April, 1839. We had cast anchor in the Madras Roads, as it was too late to enter the harbour that night. I stood on deck, saw the distant lights, and wondered what my new home had in store for me. Close beneath me I saw a catamaran, from which a tall stalwart native made his way over the bulwarks on to the deck. I shall never forget his appearance. He had on the scantiest possible garments, but on his head there was a little cocked hat of plaited palm-leaves, from the recesses of which he extracted a parcel of letters for the Captain and passengers. He looked as though he might have been Matthew Arnold's "Merman" in search of his wife. When the packet was handed to the Captain he turned to me and said, "You are not called the Pandit for nothing, ask this Tamil man how far the ship is lying out from the shore." So after a few minutes of profound thought I looked the catamaran man in the face and said syllable by syllable in Tamil, "From the ship to the shore the distance how much?" He looked at me with his big black bright eyes as if astonished to hear Tamil words from one that was evidently a 'griffin'; but he understood what I meant, and with a condescending smile he opened his mouth and poured out a flood of soft-sounding mysterious sounds of which I could make nothing. It was my first attempt to act as the interpreter.

Even more vivid is to me the recollection of the time when my tongue was loosed, and I first felt that I could think in Tamil as well as speak. It was one of those glorious evenings that one sometimes enjoys in South India. I had wandered out to the beautiful beach of St. Thomé, which adjoins Madras and is close to the native village of Mailapur, where the great poet Tiruvallaver wrote his famous poem. The sun had just set, and the moonlight streaming over the sea where the noisy surf-waves were hushed into a gentle murmur. A native school, headed by a middle-aged teacher, was seated on the sand and reciting a lesson. I walked up and spoke a few words to the children, but the Brahman schoolmaster, who perhaps suspected that I was a missionary, interposed with a few words

that were not simply contemptuous, but even blasphemous. I must say here, by the way, that this was the only time in all my life in which such a thing occurred to me. I felt thoroughly angry, and denounced him as unworthy of his office, since he could show such an example to his pupils. From one thing to another I went on speaking of the grandeur of the creation around us, and how such an evening should uplift and tranquillize our souls, and so I glided into a regular discourse. Meanwhile a crowd had assembled, and some questions were asked, to which I replied to the apparent satisfaction of the people. I had gone on in this way for something like an hour before it struck me that I had been talking Tamil all the while, and talking with the people with perfect ease. I think I never felt so thankful in my life; for though I had been eleven months in the country, and had worked every day with a Munshi, and tried to talk with all manner of men, I had come to feel thoroughly discouraged, and had almost settled into the conviction that I should never be able to speak, think, and feel in an Oriental language. And now my tongue was loosed; I had taken the leap, and had got safe back to shore. I may add that I have never since felt any difficulty in saying in Tamil what I wanted to say. Before going on board ship I had taken some lessons from a returned missionary well known in his day (the Rev. Elijah Hoole), and had accumulated quite a Tamil library, containing a Tamil translation of the Bible, a prayer-book, and a hymnbook. So during the voyage I set myself the task of translating one of my sermons into Tamil, hoping to preach it on the first Sunday in Madras. I wrote it and re-wrote it; I have it still—it is a wonderful and mysterious document. However, when I arrived at Madras I got the Mission Munshi and read it over several times with him, and on the Sunday morning I read it. In the vestry afterwards a good old native Christian came up to me and said, as it was interpreted to me: “It is very nice to hear a young Englishman speak to us from the pulpit on his first Sunday in the country, but if there had been an interpreter would it not have been better?” I may say, by

the way, that native congregations have occasionally much to endure in this way. It is easy to mistake a word, and the school-children enjoy the joke. The first time I attempted an exposition without a written document I tried to unfold the parable of the Publican and the Pharisee. Now the Tamil word for tax differs from the word for a lion by a single letter, and I accordingly explained that the publican was hated and feared because he was a collector of lions, which, as one of the congregation said afterwards, made it quite justifiable for the Pharisee to hold aloof from him. All Europeans in India have their language difficulties. It is very much to be desired that everyone going to India should get a good grammatical grounding in the language he will have to talk. The first year a man spends in India is not favourable generally to the development of the energy of mind and body which the practical mastery of a new and strange language must necessarily require. Finally, there is one beautiful thing more than another for which I thank the good Providence that has guided me: it is that unity of purpose and energy of mind and body have been preserved well-nigh to the end.

DR. JAMES (Headmaster of Rugby): I have no wish to make a speech, but I desire to express my great pride and pleasure that one of my boys, a capable member of the Sixth Form who has learned to read and think for himself, has been this year the recipient of the Royal Asiatic Society's gold medal for an historical essay on India. I should be a more unworthy and degenerate successor of Dr. Arnold even than I am if I did not think that history was one of the most important subjects that could be taught either at school or at the university, or made the study of a lifetime. And the history of England, of her Dependencies and Colonies, is one of the most important branches of it: its educational value cannot be over-rated. I am amused when I see (as I saw the other day in a volume of essays on training for the Army, which contained the usual tirade against public schools) how generally it is assumed that we teach nothing but classical history. Classical history has its value. You

cannot teach boys intelligently Greek and Latin books without some knowledge of it, and it also has a value in the light it sheds on our social problems of to-day. But English history must have a prominent place; and in teaching English history for the last two or three centuries you must teach Indian history. No doubt if we wish to understand Indian history properly we must go back to the pre-English period; but the teaching of this opens out a great vista and difficulties of time. The point I wish to emphasize, however, is that we cannot understand English history thoroughly unless that part relating to India is included.

Many years ago, when I was Head Master of Rossall—it must be twenty-five years ago—it flashed across me that few boys had a working knowledge of Indian history. I made up my mind (I taught history then; of late years I have had to leave that to greater specialists than myself) to give a short series of lectures on Indian history. It was not an altogether easy matter to prepare the lectures. The authorities available then were not those of to-day. Mill's is the dullest of dull histories, and not altogether reliable. I had the brilliant but somewhat inaccurate essays of Macaulay, and some magazine articles. The lectures may, for aught I know, have fallen flat, but they interested me at least, and taught me much; and at any rate I felt that I had discharged a duty to the school. If India is to be governed intelligently and with the sympathy of which we have heard so much of late, we must not be content to teach those whom we send out to govern India something of its history; we must know it ourselves, and we must teach it to the citizens of this country. India is often said to be only "a geographical expression," and Mr. Morley has referred to this point; it is a country containing many distinct races, languages, and religions. We must have some knowledge of the history of these peoples if we are to govern and understand them. We are, I think, making advances in this direction. The Royal Asiatic Society is doing a great work in encouraging fresh literature on the subject. Histories, books on travel, on social questions,

appear almost week by week. There is that excellent series on the "Rulers of India," and there are the novels of Kipling and Mrs. Steel which tell of the inner life of the people. These are all great steps in advance. But there is one point which I must emphasize. If we are going to make the history of India, as that of any other country, known, if we are going to popularise it, we must make it interesting. Last time I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Creighton, who was my contemporary at Oxford, we had a little controversy on Froude's appointment as Lecturer on History at the University. Creighton said that it was unthinkable, that his inaccuracy and his partiality would do great harm. I ventured to press the other view, urging that, however important accuracy may be, the literary presentation of history is also of great importance. The new feature of the present day literature on the subject is that it presents Indian history in an interesting manner to English minds, and not the least valuable part of the Royal Asiatic Society's work in this direction is the encouragement of the study of Indian history by the offer to public school boys of medals for historical essays on subjects connected with our great dependency.

LORD REAY: I have great pleasure in moving a most cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Morley for his presence here this afternoon, and for the very interesting speech he made, which we shall be glad to read again in our "Journal" and consider carefully.

To me it has been a great pleasure that our gold medal has been awarded to Dr. Pope, for one reason, among many, because he is the representative of well-directed missionary effort in India—effort planned on the basis of intimate knowledge of the people among whom missionaries work. Speaking personally from my small experience, I am glad to think that my relations with missionaries, English, Scotch, Irish, and American, in the Bombay Presidency were always most cordial. It is also pleasant to see that the people of India recognise the disinterestedness of the work of missionaries. Missionaries can be friends of the people and

friends of learning' too. I sincerely congratulate Dr. Pope on his work. He has declared this to be the first occasion on which he has received public testimony to the great work he has done; it is an observation which must not be passed over. Speaking in the presence of a representative of the Government, I think that Government might on more occasions show its appreciation of disinterested work in the field of learning and philology.

Turning to the other medal that has been presented this afternoon, I am always extremely pleased to see my young countrymen show a desire to become acquainted with the history of India. As Mr. Morley has said—and he has given a theme to Mr. Nalder (I could give him others, but I want him to think of this one)—I hope this is not the last essay we shall receive from him. I hope we may enrol him among the future historians of India.

Sir William Hunter points out how the struggle between the East and the West during each successive period reflected the spirit of the times—military and territorial in the ancient world; military and religious in the middle ages; military and mercantile in the new Europe which then awoke; developing into the military, commercial, and political combinations of the complex modern world. And he points out that in one sense we are the residuary legatee of an inheritance painfully amassed by Europe in Asia during the past four centuries. As such we have assumed an immense responsibility for the welfare of millions in our Indian Empire. Inscriptions, coins, and manuscripts discovered in late years, and the study of Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian literature, have modified the views hitherto held of Indian history. Dr. Hoernle has contributed materially to this criticism as Philological Secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal and Numismatic Adviser to the Government of India. Dr. Hoernle's description of the earlier history of India of the first three empires came as a surprise to those who were not familiar with this research. There is still a good deal of spade-work to be done, as is evident from the memorandum of Dr. Fleet on the second volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*

Indicarum, which will deal with the so-called Kharoshti and Brahmi inscriptions. Dr. Fleet has in the third volume of the Corpus, dealing with the Gupta inscriptions, shown how the difficulties peculiar to this work can be overcome. Clive established British influence in the delta of the Ganges, and Warren Hastings extended it across India to Bombay in the west and to Madras in the south. The further extensions down to the annexation of Upper Burma by Lord Dufferin were the natural result of the policy of Clive and Warren Hastings. No education can be considered worthy of the name which does not take into account the development of British rule in India and the influence of that rule in the East, as well as its reflex influence on British statesmanship. H.R.H. the Prince of Wales has quite lately shown his insight into the conditions which ensure success by laying great stress on the necessity of sympathy. My Right Honourable friend endorsed those views, and everyone who has at heart the permanence of our peaceful connection with India will admit the immense importance of convincing our fellow-subjects in India that we are fully alive to the duty, not only of giving them full justice, but of showing our understanding of their traditions, customs, and needs. It reflects great credit on the Civil Service in our Indian Empire that, burdened by ever-increasing administrative toil, they cultivate amicable relations with the various races and classes of H.M.'s subjects. As representatives of this country they have a mandate to interpret to our fellow-subjects in India the benevolent disposition of all classes of Englishmen towards Indian princes, Indian ryots, Indian soldiers, Indian artisans, conscious of the fact that we are all fellow-workers in one common object—the improvement of the conditions under which all classes of the community contribute to the prosperity of the commonwealth. Our Indian Empire is indissolubly united to us by many ties. Its progress is different from our progress. The more we appreciate the complex machinery of government suitable to the various races and the different parts of India, the more careful we shall be in avoiding to hurt the just susceptibilities

of a thoroughly loyal people, essentially grateful for any benefits which it may be in our power to confer on them. It is a privilege to increase the happiness and to enjoy the confidence of those whose destinies have been committed to our charge.

SIR RAYMOND WEST: I am conscious of the extreme honour that it is to second the proposal of a vote of thanks to the Secretary of State for coming here this afternoon. We have heard much to-day from various speakers, and I have little that I can add to make this vote more worthy of your acceptance. As an ex-official, the whole of whose active life has been spent in the administration of government so far as might be upon wise and sound principles, I may be allowed to say, with reference to the venerable recipient of our gold medal, that in my personal experience and relations I always found missionaries, so ably represented here to-day by Dr. Pope, of great assistance and worthy of great honour and respect. I was sent to India just before the Mutiny, and I know that the utmost reliance was placed on their knowledge of the people in districts not immediately affected by the outbreak and on their information as to what might be anticipated. Officials are, by the nature of their duties, cut off by barriers from the people who know that they may either suffer or profit by what they tell the sirkar. With missionaries their relations are more intimate, more thorough; missionaries can go into the literature of the people; they can become familiar with the working of the native mind; they can become interpreters in a way impossible to officials. Those who, like Dr. Pope, devote themselves to such a life, are admired for their scholarly accomplishments, their simple devotion to duty, and their endeavour to promote thoughtful and reverent feelings. Such men gain confidence and respect. They are looked upon as saints, as *gurus*. There have been men in the Civil Service who have been regarded as *gurus*; there was one of my acquaintance for whom, when he died, the lamentations of the people were as sincere as if he had been one of their own scholars. This feeling exists

throughout India, and makes respect for Indian learning a public duty. It is of the utmost importance to members of the Civil Service to have knowledge of the feelings and undercurrents of thought, and in this the missionaries are of great assistance; they have, too, special means for promoting the spiritual and intellectual advancement of the people. Missionaries are not opposed in their work by the Civil Service, albeit the civilians are bound to stand somewhat aloof. Although Dr. Pope has said that until to-day he has received no public appreciation of his work, I can assure him and all missionaries that a large proportion of the Civil Service values their efforts, their studies, the benefits they confer upon the people, and honours them for their unselfish devotion to duty.

We have to-day not only a Nestor here, but also a young Marcellus. I hope he will not need a Virgil to secure him immortality, but that he will do something himself to secure it in historic productions. He and those associated with him must have been studying India and its people; they must thus learn to do something for their good, and I can assure them that the people of India are a most grateful and appreciative race. That has been my experience. Some speak of their failings and vices, but when compared with people of other countries I consider—and I speak from long experience—that no people are more appreciative or more grateful than the Indians.

A good deal has been said of late about want of sympathy between the rulers and the ruled in India. A sympathetic feeling is and has always been in existence between the typical members of the Indian Services and the people. I may, perhaps, give a personal instance. When I was called away from the judgeship of Canara to a higher position—after having once refused it because I did not wish to leave my post—the whole of the Bar and the Court accompanied me to the steamer. There were floods of tears. I tried to soothe them in the best way I could. "Don't be distressed," I said, "I hope to come back to you by and by." But the leader of the Bar replied, "No, no, when a Sahib

like you goes from us we never see him again. He lives only in our memory." Everyone who serves these people wins a place in their hearts. My happiest recollections are that I have been able to do something for them, and they always remember. In this I claim to represent the great service in which my life was spent. I represent it in doing honour to the great scholar and missionary whom we welcome to-day.

II. PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS.

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT.

Band lx, Heft 1.

Hell (J.). Al-Farazdak's Lieder auf die Muhallabiten.

Smith (V. A.). The Indo-Parthian Dynasties.

Mills (L. H.). The Pahlavi Texts of Yasna LV-LVI and LVIII-LXII.

Horn (P.). Der Dichter Sultān Selīm I.

Oldenberg (H.). Vedische Untersuchungen.

Hunnius (C.). Das Syrische Alexanderlied.

Goldziher (I.). Das Prinzip der takijja im Islam.

Bloch (T.). Excavations at Lauriya.

II. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Série x, Tome vii, No. 1.

Schwab (M.). Une amulette judéo-araméenne.

Lacôte (F.). Une version nouvelle de la Bṛhat-kathā de Guṇāḍhya.

Revillout (E.). La femme dans l'antiquité.

Scher Addai. Notice sur la vie et les œuvres de Dadisô Laṭraya.

Tome vii, No. 2.

Revillout (E.). La femme dans l'antiquité.

Amélineau (M.). Le Culte des rois préhistoriques d'Abydos.

Hamy (E. T.). Lettre inédite du voyageur J. B. Tavernier.

Chabot (J. B.). Note sur quelques monuments épigraphiques araméens.

III. GIORNALE DELLA SOCIETÀ ASIATICA ITALIANA. Vol. xviii, 1905.

- Scerbo (F.). Note critiche ed esegetiche sopra Giobbe.
Teloni (B.). Pietre incise orientali del Museo di Perugia.
Ballini (A.). La Upamitabhavaprapaṇcākhā di Siddharṣi.
Suali (L.). Il Lokatattvanirnaya di Hāribhadra.

IV. T'OUNG PAO. Série II, Vol. vii, No. 1.

- Cordier (H.). Bibliotheca Indo-Sinica (suite).
Chavannes (E.). Le cycle turc des douze animaux.
Ferrand (G.). Le dieu malgache Zanahari.

V. NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE. 1906. Part i.

- Head (B. V.). The Earliest Græco-Bactrian and Græco-Indian Coins.
Imhoof-Blumer (F.). The Mint at Babylon.

VI. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.
Vol. xxviii, Part 3.

- Sayce (Professor A. H.). Unpublished Hittite Inscriptions in the Museum at Constantinople.
Thompson (R. Campbell). The Folklore of Mossoul.
Pilcher (E. J.). Two Kabbalistic Planetary Charms.

Part 4.

- Loret (V.). Le dieu Seth et le Roi Séthôsis.
Sayce (Professor A. H.). The Ivritz Texts.—The Ardistama Inscriptions.—Some Hittite Seals.
Winstedt (E. O.). Some Munich Coptic Fragments.
Müller (D. H.). The Himyaritic Inscriptions from Jabul Jehaf.
Burkitt (F. C.). The Throne of Nimrod.

Part 5.

- Legge (F.). Magic Ivories of the Middle Empire.
Sayce (A. H.). Inscription of Sankh-ka-ra. — Karian and other Inscriptions.
Revillout (E.). Burgh Papyrus.

VII. ANTHROPOS. Band i, Heft 2.

Dunn (Very Rev. E.). Religious Rites and Customs of the Iban or Dyaks of Sarawak.

Gueselen (L'Abbé J.). La littérature Khmère et le Buddhisme.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY.

Becker, C. H. Papyri Schott-Reinhardt, i. *Heidelberg*, 1906. 4to.
From the Publishers.

Bobbili, Maharaja of. Advice to the Indian Aristocracy. *Madras*, 1905. 8vo.
Presented by the Author.

Breasted, J. H. Ancient Records of Egypt. 3 vols. Vol. i, First to Seventeenth Dynasties; vol. ii, Eighteenth Dynasty; vol. iii, Nineteenth Dynasty. *Chicago*, 1906. 8vo.
From the Publishers.

BRITISH MUSEUM, Catalogue of Coptic MSS. in. By W. E. Crum. *London*, 1905. 4to.
Presented by the Trustees of the British Museum.

Buckley, R. B. Irrigation Works of India. 2nd edition. *London*, 1905. 4to.
Presented by the India Office.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. The Egyptian Heaven and Hell. 3 vols. *London*, 1905. 8vo.
From the Publishers.

Casanowicz, F. M. The S. S. Howland Collection of Buddhist Religious Art in the National Museum, U.S.A. *Washington*, 1906. 8vo.
Presented by Dr. Cust.

Cotton, Major-General F. C. A Letter and two other Papers on the Water of the Great Rivers of India. *London*, 1906. 8vo.
Presented by the Executors of the Author.

- Dubois, Abbé J. A.** Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies. Trans. and edited by H. K. Beauchamp. 3rd edition. *Oxford*, 1906. Post 8vo.

Presented by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

- Ettinghausen, M. L.** Harṣa Vardhana. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

- Forlong, Major-General J. G. R.** Faiths of Man, a Cyclopædia of Religions. 3 vols. *London*, 1906. Large 8vo.

Presented by Mrs. Forlong.

- Gait, A. E.** A History of Assam. *Calcutta*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

- Grierson, G. A.** Linguistic Survey of India. Vol. vii, Maharathi. *Calcutta*, 1905. 4to.

Presented by Dr. Cust.

- Hedin, Sven.** Central Asia and Tibet. 2 vols. *London*, 1903. 4to.

Purchased.

- Hocéyue-Âzad.** La Roseraie du Savoir. Golzâr-é Ma'réfèt. Vol. i, Persian text; vol. ii, French translation. *Leide*, 1906. 12mo.

From the Publishers.

- Kershasp, P.** Studies in Ancient Persian History. *London*, 1905. Post 8vo.

From the Publishers.

- Kokowgoff, P.** Nouveaux Fragments Syropalestiniens de la Bibliothèque Impériale Publique de Saint-Pétersbourg. *St. Pétersbourg*, 1906. 4to.

Presented by the St. Petersburg Academy.

- de Lajonquière, Comte E. Lunet.** Le Siam et les Siamois. *Paris*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

- Lyll, Sir A. C.** Asiatic Studies. 2 vols. Series 1-2. *London*, 1899. 8vo.

Purchased.

- MADRAS DISTRICT GAZETTEERS.** Kurnool, vol. ii. *Madras*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the Government of India.

al-Moqaddasi. Descriptio Imperii Moslemici. 3rd part. 2nd edition. (Bibliōtheca Geographorum Arabicorum, ed. by M. G. de Goeje.) *Lugduni Batavorum*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Editor.

Nartzoſſ, Alexis de. (1) Symbolism of the Sacred Cup in Religion and History; (2) Stone Female Figures in Siberia and Russia; (3) The Buddhist Idol found near Tambov in 1900. Pamphlets from the Journal of the Archival Commission in Tambov.

Presented by the Author.

Nevill, H. R. District Gazetteers of the United Province. Vol. xlii, Kheri; vol. xliv, Gonda. *Allahabad*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the Government of India.

Pope, G. U. English Tamil Dictionary. A Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language, part iv. 7th edition. *Oxford*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.

Rangacharya, M. Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental MSS. Library, Madras. Vol. ii: Vedic Literature. *Madras*, 1905. 8vo.

Presented by the Madras Government.

Sandberg, Graham. Tibet and the Tibetans. *London*, 1906. Roy. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Seton-Karr, H. W. Flint Implements of the Fayum, Egypt. *Washington*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by Dr. Cust.

Sherring, C. A. Notes on the Bhotias of Almora and British Garhwal. Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. i, No. 8.

Sonneck. Chants Arabes du Maghreb. 2 vols. *Paris*, 1902-4. Imp. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Stapleton, W. H. Comparative Handbook of Congo Languages. *Takusa*, 1903. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Walsh, E. H. C. 'A Vocabulary of the Tromowa Dialect of Tibetan. *Calcutta*, 1905. 4to.

Presented by the Author.

Whitney, W. D. Atharva Veda. Translation and Notes. *Cambridge, Mass.*, 1905. Roy. 8vo. (*Harvard Oriental Series*, vols. vii and viii.)

Presented by the Editor of the Harvard Oriental Series.

Wiedemann, Professor Eilhard. (1) Über Wagen bei den Arabern;
(2) Auszüge aus Arabischen Enzyklopädien und anderes;
(3) Zur Mechanik und Technik bei den Arabern. *Erlangen*, 1905-6. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

von Zambaur, E. Contributions à la Numismatique Orientale. 2^{ième} partie. *Vienna*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

_____ **Kollektion Ernst Prince zu Windisch-Grätz.**
Wien, 1906. 8vo. Teil i: Orientalische Münzen.

Presented by the Author.

JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

XXV.

THE LIVES OF 'UMAR IBNU'L-FARID AND MUHIYYU'DDIN IBNU'L-'ARABI,

EXTRACTED FROM THE *Shadharātu'l-Dhahab*.

By REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON.

THE *Shadharātu'l-Dhahab fi akhbārī man dhahab*, briefly described in the J.R.A.S. for 1899, p. 911 seq., is a biographical dictionary of persons who died between the years 1 and 1000 A.H., of which, besides the MS. in my possession, the only copy known to me is one belonging to the Khedivial Library in Cairo (Catalogue, vol. v, p. 72). Some idea of its extent may be gathered from the fact that the articles printed below form approximately a 200th part of the whole work. It is unquestionably a compilation of great value, the author, Abu'l-Falāḥ 'Abdu'l-Ḥayy, having derived his material from many excellent sources which are not easily accessible to the modern Orientalist.¹ When I first

¹ I have to thank Mr. A. G. Ellis for calling my attention to a notice of 'Abdu'l-Ḥayy in the *Khulḍḡatu'l-Athar* (Cairo, 1284, vol. ii, p. 340), a biographical dictionary of the eminent men of the eleventh century by Muḥammad al-Amin al-Muḥibbī al-Shāmī († 1111 A.H.), who had formerly been a pupil of 'Abdu'l-Ḥayy in Damascus. According to this work, 'Abdu'l-Ḥayy b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad, generally known as Ibnu'l-'Imād, Abu'l-Falāḥ al-'Akārī al-Ṣāliḥī al-Ḥanbalī was born in 1032 A.H. After studying at Damascus under Shaykh Ayyūb, Shaykh 'Abdu'l-Bāqī al-Ḥanbalī, Shaykh Muḥammad

described the MS., I hoped that it might be possible to publish one or two of the longer articles by way of specimen. The names of 'Umar Ibnu'l-Fárid and Muhiyyu'ddin Ibnu'l-'Arabí, whose lives I have selected for this purpose, are too celebrated to require any further introduction.

Of the former there is a good biography by his grandson 'Alí, which is prefixed to Rushayd Dahdáh's edition of the *Díwán* (Marseilles, 1853). The notice in the *Shadharát*, though much briefer, adds several interesting details, and also touches on the controversy as to whether the poet was orthodox or not. Apparently the principal authority is 'Abdu'l-Ra'úf al-Munáwí († 1031 A.H.), who wrote a biographical work on Šúfiism entitled *Al-karākib al-durriyya fi tarājim al-sádat al-Šúfiyya* (Brockelmann, vol. ii, p. 305 seq.).

The lengthy notice of Ibnu'l-'Arabí includes a few passages which have already been printed in Maqqarí (ed. by Dozy and others, 1855-1861), vol. i, pp. 567-583. For the most part, however, the matter which it contains is entirely new, and although it is very deficient in biographical details it serves as a valuable supplement to Maqqarí's article, which was written about forty years earlier.¹ The author of the *Shadharát* does not conceal his opinion that Ibnu'l-'Arabí was a holy saint, and that all criticism of his books should be prohibited on the ground that their meaning is open to misconstruction. The discussion of his orthodoxy occupies a somewhat disproportionate space, but is full of interest, while the large collection of his mystical sayings will be welcome to students of Šúfiism. As regards the sources used by the author, we find—

b. Badri'l-Dín al-Balbání al-Šálihi, and other distinguished scholars, he transferred his residence to al-Qáhira, where he stayed a long time, receiving instruction from the savants of that city. He then returned to Damascus and devoted himself to teaching. His death took place in Mecca, after his pilgrimage, on the 16th of Dhu'l-Hijja, 1089 A.H., and he was buried in the cemetery of al-Ma'lát between Mecca and Badr. He is described as a man of wide learning, celebrated for his profound knowledge of Traditions (*al-áthár*). He had also unusual powers of composition and considerable skill in calligraphy. Besides the *Shadharátu'l-Dhahab* he wrote a commentary on the *Muntahá fi fighi'l-Hanábila*, and several other treatises.

¹ The *Nafḥu'l-Tib* was completed in 1039 A.H., the *Shadharát* in 1080 A.H.

- (a) A citation from the *نسب الخرقه* of al-Sha'ráwí (al-Sha'rání).
- (b) A citation from the *طبقات*¹ of 'Abdu'l-Ra'úf al-Munáwí, who quotes a passage from the *لسان الميزان* of Ibn Hajar.
- (c) Another citation from al-Munáwí.
- (d) A citation from the *تنبيه الغمى بتنزيه ابن العربى* of Jalálu'ddín al-Suyúfí.
- (e) Another citation from the same work.
- (f) Explanation of a passage in the *روض* (*Rawdu'l-tálib fi'l-fiqh*) of Ibnu'l-Muqrí (see Brockelmann, ii, 190).
- (g) Another citation from al-Munáwí.
- (h) A citation from the *زهر الرياض* of Aḥmad al-Maqqarí al-Maghribí.
- (i) Further citations from al-Munáwí.
- (j) A decree of Ibn Kamál Páshá² threatening to punish those who imputed heresy to Ibnu'l-'Arabí.
- (k) Another citation from al-Munáwí.
- (l) Opinions expressed by al-Ṣafí b. Abí Manṣúr and al-Ṣadr al-Qónawí³ regarding Ibnu'l-'Arabí.
- (m) A large number of his sayings.
- (n) The charge that he held the doctrines of *ḥulúl* and *ittiḥád* refuted by a quotation from the *Futūḥát al-Makkiyya*.
- (o) A citation from the *Yawáqit* of al-Sha'rání.

¹ Either the work mentioned above or the *Ṭabaqát al-ṣuḡhrá* (No. 14 in Brockelmann's list).

² The famous Turkish legist and man of letters who is generally known as Kamál Pasha-záde († 940 A.H.). See Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. ii, pp. 347-359.

³ Sadru'ddín Muḥammad b. Isháq of Qonya († 672 A.H.), a pupil of Ibnu'l-'Arabí and an intimate friend of Jalálu'ddín Rúmi. His life is in Jámí's *Nafahátu'l-Uns*, p. 645 sqq.

From this conspectus and from the words انتهى كلام المناوى (p. 821, l. 2, *infra*) it is clear that the bulk of the article is taken from al-Munawī's work which has been mentioned above. Probably this is the source of most, if not all, of the citations extending from (b) to (m) inclusively.

ترجمة عمر ابن الفارض

وفيهما [أى سنة اثنين وثلاثين وستمائة] سيدي ابن الفارض ناظم الديوان المشهور شرف الدين ابو القسم عمر بن على بن مرشد الحموى الأصل المصرى قال فى العبر هو حجة اهل الوحدة لوآء الشعراء وقال الشيخ عبد الرؤف المناوى فى طبقاته الملقب فى جميع الآفاق 'بسلطان المحبين والعشاق' المنعوت بين اهل الخلاف والوفاق 'بأنه سيد شعراء عصره على الإطلاق' له النظم الذى يستحق أهبل الجلوم 'والنثر الذى تغار منه المنثرة بل ساير النجوم' قدم أبوه من حماة الى مصر فقطن بها وصار يثبت القروض للنساء على الرجال، بين يدي الحكام ثم ولى نيابة الحكم فغلب عليه التلقيب بالفارض ثم ولد له بمصر عمر فى ذى القعدة سنة ست وستين وخمسمائة فنشأ تحت كنف أبيه فى عفاف وصيانة 'وعبادة وديانة' بل زهد وقناعة 'وورع أسدل عليه لباسه وقناعه' فلما شب وترعرع اشتغل بفقهِ الشافعية وأخذ الحديث عن ابن عساكر وعند الحافظ المؤذرى وغيره ثم حُبب اليه الخلا وسلوك

طريق الصوفيّة فتزهد وتجرد وصار يستأذن أباه في السياحة فيسيح في الجبل الثاني من المَقَطَّم ويأوى الى بعض أوديته مرّة وفي بعض المساجد المهجورة في خربات القرافة مرّة ثمّ يعود الى والسدة فيقيم عنده مرّة ثمّ يشتاق الى التجرد ويعود الى الجبل وهكذا حتّى أَلَفَ الْوَحْشَةَ وَأَلْفَهُ الْوَحْشُ فَصَارَ لَا يَنْفِرُ مِنْهُ وَمَعَ ذَلِكَ لَمْ يُفْتَحْ عَلَيْهِ بِشَيْءٍ حتّى أخبره¹ البقال أنّه انما يُفْتَحُ عَلَيْكَ بِمَكَّةَ فَخَرَجَ فَوْرًا فِي غَيْرِ أَشْهُرِ الْحَجِّ ذَاهِبًا إِلَى مَكَّةَ فَلَمْ يَزَلِ الْكَعْبَةُ أَمَامَهُ حتّى دخلها وانقطع بواب بينه وبين مَكَّةَ عَشْرَ لَيَالٍ فَصَارَ يَذْهَبُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ الْوَادِي وَصُحْبَتُهُ أَسَدٌ عَظِيمٌ إِلَى مَكَّةَ فَيُصَلِّيُ بِهَا الصَّلَوَاتِ الْخَمْسَ وَيَعُودُ إِلَى مَحَلِّهِ مِنْ يَوْمِهِ وَأَنْشَأَ غَالِبَ نَظْمِهِ حَالَتُنْذٍ وَكَانَ الْأَسَدُ يَكَلِّمُهُ وَيَسْأَلُهُ أَنْ يَرْكَبَ عَلَيْهِ فَيَأْبَى وَأَقَامَ كَذَلِكَ مِحو خَمْسَةَ عَشْرَ عَامًا ثُمَّ رَجَعَ إِلَى مِصْرَ فَأَقَامَ بِقَاعَةِ الْخُطَابَةِ بِالْجَامِعِ الْأَزْهَرِ وَكَفَّ عَلَيْهِ (f. 30a) الْأَيْمَنُ وَقُصِدَ بِالزِّيَارَةِ مِنَ النَّحَاصِّ وَالْعَامِّ حتّى أنّ الملك الكامل كان ينزل لزيارته وسأله أن يعمل له قبرًا عند قبره بالقُبَّةِ الَّتِي بَنَاهَا عَلَى ضَرْحِ الْإِمَامِ الشَّافِعِيِّ فَأَبَى وَكَانَ جَمِيلًا نَبِيلًا حَسَنَ الْهَيْئَةِ وَالْمَلْبَسِ حَسَنَ الشَّجْبَةِ وَالْعَشْرَةِ رَقِيقَ الطَّبْعِ 'عَذْبَ الْمَنْهَلِ وَالْمُنْبَعِ' فَصَحَّحَ الْعِبَارَةَ 'دَقِيقَ الْإِشَارَةِ' سَلِسَ الْقِيَادِ 'بَدِيعَ الْإِصْدَارِ وَالْإِيرَادِ' سَخِيًّا جَوَادًا تَوَجَّهَ إِلَى جَامِعِ عَمُرُو فَلَقِيهِ بَعْضُ الْمُكَارِبَةِ فَقَالَ آرَكَبْ مَعِيَ عَلَى الْفَتْوحِ فَمَرَّ بِهِ بَعْضُ الْأَمْراءِ فَأَعْطَاهُ مَائَةَ دِينَارٍ فَدَفَعَهَا لِلْمُكَارِي وَكَانَ إِتْيَامَ النَّيْلِ

¹ The story of the *baqqal* is related in the Marseilles edition of the *Diwān*, p. 7, l. 6 sqq.

يتردد الى المسجد المعروف بالْمُسْتَهَى في الرَّوْضَةِ وَحَبَّ مَشَاهِدَةِ
البحر مساءً فتوجه اليه يوماً فسمع قصاراً يقصرو يقول

¹ قَطَّحَ قَلْبِي هَذَا الْمَقْطَعُ * لَا هُوَ يُضْفُو أَوْ يَتَقَطَّعُ

فصرخ وسقط مُغْمَى عليه فصار يفمق ويردد ذاك ويضطرب ثم
يُغْمَى عليه وهكذا وكان يواصل اربعينات فاشتبهى هريسة فأحضرها
ورفع لقمة الى فيه فأنشق الجدار وخرج شاذب جميل فقال أف
عليك فقال إن أكلتها ثم طرحتها وأدب نفسه بزيادة عشر ليالٍ
ورأى المصطفى صلى الله عليه وسلم في نومه فقال الى من تنسب
فقال يا رسول الله الى بنى سَعْدِ قَبِيلَةِ حَلِيمَةَ فقال بل نَسَبُكَ
مُتَّصِلٌ بِي يَعْنِي نِسْبَةُ مُحَبَّةٍ وَتَبَعِيَّةٍ وَمِنْ خَوَارِقِ الْعَجِيبَةِ أَنْ رَأَى
جَمَلَ السَّقَاءِ فَكَلِّفَ بِهِ وَهَامَ وَعَارِ يَأْتِيهِ كُلَّ يَوْمٍ لِيَرَاهُ وَنَاهِيكَ
بِدِيَوَانِهِ الَّذِي اعْتَرَفَ بِهِ الْمُوَافِقُ وَالْمُخَالَفُ ' وَالْمُعَادَى وَالْمُخَالَفُ '
سَيِّمَا الْقَصِيدَةُ التَّائِيَّةُ وَقَدْ آعَتَنَى بِشَرْحِهَا جَمْعٌ مِنَ الْأَعْيَانِ كَالسِّرَاجِ ²
الهندي والخنفي والشمس البساطي المالكي والجلال القزويني
الشافعي وغير متعقبين ولا مباليين بقول المنكرين الحساد ' شَعْرُهُ
يُنْعَتُ بِالْإِتِّحَادِ ' وَكَذَا شَرْحُهَا الْفَرَاعَانِيُّ ³ وَالْقَاشَانِيُّ وَالْقَيْصَرِيُّ وَغَيْرُهُمْ
وَعَلَى النُّحْمَرِيَّةِ وَغَيْرِهَا شُرُوحٌ عِدَّةٌ وَقَالَ بَعْضُ أَهْلِ الرُّسُخِ إِنَّ الدِّيَوَانَ
كُلَّهُ مَشْرُوحٌ وَذَكَرَ بَعْضُ الْكَائِبَرِ أَنَّ بَعْضَ أَهْلِ الظَّاهِرِ فِي عَصْرِ الْحَافِظِ

¹ Cf. Diwān, p. 18, penult. line.

² Ob. 775 A.H. (Brockelmann, i, 383).

³ The Commentaries of Farghānī, Qāshānī, and Qaysarī are extant (see Brockelmann, i, 262 sqq.).

ابن حجر كتب على التائيه شرحاً وأرسله الى بعض¹ عظماء صوفية
الوقت ليقرضه² فأقام عنده مدة ثم كتب عليه عند إرساله اليه
سارَتْ مُشْرِقَةٌ وَسِرْتُ مُعَرَّبًا * شَتَانِ بَيْسٍ مُشْتَرِقٍ وَمُعَرَّبٍ

ف قيل له في ذلك فقال مولانا الشارح اعتنى بإرجاع الضماير
المُبْتَدَأُ والخَبَرُ والجناس والاستعارة وما هنالك من اللغة والبديع
ومراد الناظم وراء ذلك كله وقد أُنْتِى على ديوانه حتى من كان
سيئ الاعتقاد ومنهم ابن أبى حجلة الذى عزّره السراج الهندى
بسبب الوقعة فيه فقال هو من أرقى الدواوين شعراً، وأنفسها دُرّاً
بَرّاً وبحراً، وأسرعها للقلوب جَوْحاً، وأكثرها على الطول نَوْحاً، اذ
هو عادر عن نَفْثَةِ مصدور، وعاشقٍ مَعْجُور، وصَتٍ³ بِحَرِّ النُّوَى
مكسور، والناس يلهمون بقوافيه، وما أودع من النُّوَى فيه، وكثر
حتى قلّ من لا رأى ديوانه، او طمت بأذنه قصايدة الطنّانه، قال
الكمال الأذفوى وأَحْسَنُهُ القصيدة العائيه التى اولها
قَلْبِي يُحَدِّثُنِي بِأَنَّكَ مُثْلِفِي

واللامية التى اولها

هُوَ الْحُبُّ فَاسْأَلْكُمْ بِالْحَشَى مَا آلَهْوَى سَهْلٌ

¹ according to Sha'rání, *Yawáqit* (Cairo, 1277 A.H.),
p. 14, last line.

² MS. ليقرضه. Sha'rání has اجازة عليها.

³ MS. وُظِبَ.

⁴ *Diwán*, p. 202 sqq.

⁵ *Diwán*, p. 391 sqq.

والكافية التي أولها

¹ تِه دَلَالًا فَانَّتْ أَهْلٌ لِّذَاكَ

قال وأما التائية فهي عند اهل العلم يعنى الظاهر غير مرضية ،
مُشْعَرَةٌ بِأُمُورٍ رَدِيَّةٍ ، وكان عَشَّاقًا يعشق مُطَلَّقَ الْجَمَالِ ، حتى أنه
عشق بعض الجمال ، بل زعم بعض الكبار أنه عشق بَرَزِيَّةً بَدَّكَانَ
عَطَّارٍ وذكر القوصى فى التوحيد² أنه كان للشيخ جوارٍ بالبَهْكَسَاءِ يذهب
اليهن فيعتين له بالدُقِّ والشَّابَةِ وهو يرقص ويتواجد ولكل قوم
مَشْرَبٌ ، ولكل مَطْلَبٌ ، وليس سماع المُسَّاقِ ، كسماع سلطان
العشَّاق ، ولم يزل على حاله ، وإقباله فى سماء كماله ، حتى احتُضِرَ
فسأل الله تعالى أن يحضره فى ذلك الهول العظيم جماعة من
الأولياء فحضره جماعة منهم البرهان الجعبرى قال فيما حكاه سبط
صاحب الترجمة رأى الجنة مُثَلَّتْ له فبكى وتغيَّرَ لونه ثم قال

³ إِنْ كَانَ مَمَرِلَتِي فِي الْحُبِّ عِنْدَكُمْ * مَا قَدْ رَأَيْتُ فَقْدَ عَيَّعْتُ أَيَّامِي
قال فقلت له يا سيدي هذا مقام كريم فقال يا ابراهيم رابعة وهى
امرأة تقول وعزتك ما عبدتك رغبةً فى جنتك بل لمحبتك
وليس هذا ما قطعْتُ عُمُرِي فى السلوك اليه فسمعتُ⁴ قايلاً يقول
له فما تروم فقال

⁵ أَرُومُ وَقَدْ طَالَ الْمَدَى مَثَكِ نَظَرٌ

¹ Dīwān, p. 230 sqq.

² The *Kitābu'l-Wahid fī sulūki ahli'l-tawhīd* (Broekelmann, ii, 117).

³ Dīwān, p. 580.

⁴ Dīwān, p. 20, penult. line et seqq.

⁵ Dīwān, p. 172.

البيت فستهلل وجهه وقضى محبه فقلت انه اعطى مرامه وقد
شع عليه بذلك المنكرون فقال بعضهم لما كشف له الغطاء
تحقق¹ انه غير الله وأنه لا حلول ولا اتحاد وقال بعضهم والله² لما
حضره ملايكة العذاب الأليم، أستغفر الله سبحانه هذا بهتان عظيم
والحاصل أنه اختلف في شأن صاحب الترجمة وابن عربى والعفيف
الليثى³ والقونى⁴ وابن هود⁵ وابن سبعين⁶ وتلميذه الششتري⁷
وابن مظفر والصقار من الكفر الى القطبانية وكثرت التصانيف من
الفريقين في هذه القصيدة ولا أقول كما قال بعض الأعلام، سلم تسلم
والسلام، بل أذهب الى ما ذهب اليه بعضهم أنه يجب اعتقادهم
وتعظيمهم وتحريم النظر في كنههم على من لم يتأهل لتنزيل ما فيها
من الشطحات على قوانين الشريعة المطهرة (f. 30b) وقد وقع
لجماعة من الكبار، الرجوع عن الإنكار انتهى كلام المناوى مختصراً
وما أحسن قوله في الثائفة .

⁸ وكُلُّ أَدَى فِي الْحَبِّ مِنْكَ إِذَا بَدَأَ * جَعَلْتُ لَهُ شَكْرِي . كَانَ شَكِيَّتِي
وله وما رأيته في دواوينه وهو معنى في غاية اللطف والركة

خَلَصَ الْهَوَى لَكَ وَاصْطَفَيْكَ مَوَدَّتِي * إِنِّي أَغَارُ عَلَيْكَ مِنْ مَلِكِيكَ

¹ MS. وتحقق.

² MS. قاله .

³ † 690 A.H. (Broekelmann, i, 258).

⁴ Šadru'ddīn al Qónawī († 672 A.H.).

⁵ Badru'ddīn Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Amīri'l-Mu'minīn Abi'l-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf, generally known as Ibn Hūd († 699 A.H.).

⁶ See Maqqarī, i, 590, l. 17 sqq.

⁷ See Maqqarī, i, 583, l. 4 sqq.

⁸ This is the 48th verse of the *Greater Tā'iyya* in Von Hammer's edition.

وَلَوْ اسْتَطَعْتُ مَنَعْتُ لَفُطْكَ عَيْرَةً * أَنَسَى أَرَاهُ مُقْبِلًا شَفَقَيْكَ
وَأَرَاكَ مَخْطُرًا فِي شَمَائِلِكَ آتِي * هِيَ فِتْنَةٌ فَأَعَارُ مَثْكَ عَلَيْكَ

ورؤى في النوم فقليل له ليم لا مدحت المصطفى في ديوانك فقال
¹ أَرَى كُلَّ مَدْحٍ فِي السَّبِيِّ مُقْصَرًا * وَإِن بَالَعَ الْمُثْنَى عَلَيْهِ وَكَثَّرَا
إِذَا آلَهُ أَنَسَى بِالَّذِي هُوَ أَهْلُهُ * عَلَيْهِ فَمَا مِقْدَارُ مَا يَمْدَحُ الْوَرَى
ويقال انه لما نظم قوله

² وَمَلَى تَفَثْنِ وَاصِفِيهِ بِحُسْنِهِ يَفْتَى الزَّمَانُ وَفِيهِ مَا لَمْ يُوصَفِ
فرح فرحا شديدا وقال إنه لم يمدح صلى الله عليه وسلم بمثله
وبعض الناس يقول باطن كلامه مدح فيه صلى الله عليه وسلم
وغالب كلامه لا يصلح أن يراد به ذلك والله اعلم تُؤَقَّى رحمه الله
في جمادى الاولى عن ستة وخمسين سنة الا شهرا ودفن بالمقطم

ترجمة محيى الدين ابن العربى

وفيها [اى سنة ثمان وثلاثين وستمائة] ابو بكر محيى الدين محمد
بن على بن محمد الحاتمي الطائى الاندلسى العارف الكبير ابن
عربى ويقال ابن العربى قال الشعراوى في كتاب نسب الخرقه كان
مجموع الفضائل ' مطبوع الكرم والشمائل ' قد فض له فضله
ختام كل فن ' وبلى له وبلىه رياض ما شرَكَ من العلوم وعن ' ونظمه

¹ I cannot find these verses in any edition of the Diwân.

² Diwân, p. 225.

³ MS. واصفيك.

عُقُودُ الْعُقُولِ ، وَفُصُوصُ الْفُصُولِ^١ . وَخَسْبِكَ بِقَوْلِ زُرُوقٍ وَغَيْرِهِ مِنْ
 الْفُحُولِ ، ذَاكِرِينَ بَعْضَ فَضْلِهِ ، هُوَ أَعْرَفُ بِكُلِّ فَنٍّ مِنْ أَهْلِهِ ، وَإِذَا
 أُطْلِقَ الشَّيْخُ الْأَكْبَرُ فِي عُرْفِ الْقَوْمِ فَهُوَ الْمُرَادُ ، وَلِئِنْ بَمُرْسِيَةِ سَنَةِ
 سِتِّينَ وَخَمْسِمِائَةٍ وَنَشَأَ بِهَا وَانْتَقَلَ إِلَى أَشْبِيلِيَّةِ سَنَةِ ثَمَانٍ وَسَبْعِينَ
 ثُمَّ ارْتَحَلَ وَطَافَ الْبُلْدَانَ فَطَرَقَ بِلَادَ الشَّامِ وَالرُّومِ وَالْمَشْرِقِ وَدَخَلَ
 بَغْدَادَ وَحَدَّثَ بِهَا بِشْيًى مِنْ مَصْنُفَاتِهِ وَأَخَذَ عَنْهُ بَعْضُ الْحَقَاقِ
 كَذَا ذَكَرَهُ ابْنُ التَّجَارِ^٢ فِي الذَّيْلِ وَقَالَ الشَّيْخُ عَبْدُ الرَّؤُوفِ الْمُنَاوِي فِي
 طَبَقَاتِ الْأَوْلِيَاءِ لَهُ وَقَالَ الْحَافِظُ ابْنُ حَجَرٍ فِي لِسَانِ الْمِيزَانِ وَهُوَ مَتْنٌ
 كَانَ يَحْتَظُّ عَلَيْهِ وَيُسَيِّئُ الْإِعْتِقَادَ فِيهِ كَانَ عَارِفًا بِالْأَنَارِ وَالشُّنَنِ قَوِيَّ
 الْمَشَارَكَةِ فِي الْعُلُومِ أَخَذَ الْحَدِيثَ عَنْ جَمْعٍ وَكَانَ يَكْتُبُ الْإِنْشَاءَ
 لِبَعْضِ مَمْلُوكِ الْمَغْرِبِ ثُمَّ تَزَهَّدَ وَسَاحَ وَدَخَلَ الْحَرَمَيْنِ وَالشَّامَ وَلَهُ فِي
 كُلِّ بَلَدٍ دَخْلُهُمَا مَآثِرٌ وَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ بَرَزَ مِنْفَرِدًا مُؤَثِّرًا لِلتَّخْلِي وَالْإِنْعَزَالِ
 عَنِ النَّاسِ مَا أَمْكَنَهُ حَتَّى أَنَّهُ لَمْ يَكُنْ يَجْتَمِعُ بِهِ إِلَّا الْأَفْرَادُ ثُمَّ
 أَثَرُ التَّأَلِيفِ فَبَرَزَتْ عَنْهُ مَوْلُفَاتٌ لَا نِهَايَةَ لَهَا تَدُلُّ عَلَى سَعَةِ بَاعِهِ
 وَتَبَحُّرِهِ فِي الْعُلُومِ الظَّاهِرَةِ وَالْبَاطِنَةِ وَإِنَّهُ بَلَغَ مَبْلَغَ الاجْتِهَادِ فِي
 الْإِخْتِرَاعِ وَالِاسْتِنْبَاطِ وَتَأْسِيسِ الْقَوَاعِدِ وَالْمَقَاصِدِ الَّتِي لَا يَدْرِيهَا وَلَا
 يُحِيطُ بِهَا إِلَّا مَنْ طَالَعَهَا بِحَقِّهَا غَيْرَ أَنَّهُ وَقَعَ لَهُ فِي بَعْضِ تَضَاعِيفِ
 تِلْكَ الْكُتُبِ كَلِمَاتٌ كَثِيرَةٌ أَشْكَلَتْ ظَوَاهِرَهَا وَكَانَتْ سَبَبًا لِإِعْرَاضِ
 كَثِيرِينَ لَمْ يُحْسِنُوا الظَّنَّ بِهِ وَلَمْ يَقُولُوا كَمَا قَالَ غَيْرُهُمْ مِنَ الْجَهَابِذَةِ

^١ MS. الفصول.

^٢ See Brockelmann, i, 360.

المحققين، والعلماء الفاضلين، والأئمة الوارثين، إن ما أُوهِمَتْهُ تلك الظواهر ليس هو المراد وإنما المراد أمورٌ اصطُحِحَ عليها متأخرو أهل الطريق غيرَةً عليها حتى لا يدَّعِيَهَا الكذّابون فاصطلحوا على الكناية عنها بتلك الألفاظ المُوهِمَة خلاف المراد غير مُبالين بذلك لأنه لا يمكن التعبير عنها بغيرها قال المُنَاوِي وقد تفرق الناس في شأنه شَيْعًا وسلَكوا في أمره طَرِيقَ قَدَدَا فذهبت طائِفَةٌ إلى أَنَّهُ زنديق لا صديق وقال قوم أَنَّهُ عقد الأولياء، ورئيس الاصفياء، وصار آخرون إلى اعتقاد ولايته وتحريم النظر في كُتْبِهِ أقول منهم الشيخ جلال الدين السيوطي قال في مصَنَّفِهِ تنبيه الغبي بتنزيه¹ ابن العربي والقول الفَيَصَل (f. 38a) في ابن العربي اعتقاد ولايته وتحريم النظر في كُتْبِهِ فقد نُقِلَ عنه هو أَنَّهُ قال محن قوم يحرم النظر في كُتْبِنَا قال السيوطي وذلك لأن الصوفيّة تواضعوا على أَلْفَاظِ اصطَلَحُوا عليها وأرادوا بها معاني غير المعاني المتعارفة منها فمن حمل أَلْفَاظَهَا على معانيها المتعارفة بين أهل العلم الظاهر كَفَرَ نَصَّ على ذلك الغزالي في بعض كُتْبِهِ وقال إِنَّهُ شبيهة بالمتشابهة من القرآن والسنة من حَمَلَهُ على ظاهره كفر وقال السيوطي أيضًا في الكتاب المذكور وقد سأل بعض أكابر العلماء بعض الصوفيّة في عصره ما حملكم على أن اصطَلَحْتُمْ على هذه الألفاظ التي يُسْتَشْنَعُ ظاهرها فقال غيرة على طريقنا هذا أن يدَّعِيَهُ من لا يُحَسِّنُهُ ويدخل فيه من ليس من أهله إلى أن قال وليس من طريق القوم إقرآء المريدين

¹ بتجرئة. MS.

كُتِبَ التَّصَوُّفَ وَلَا يُؤْخَذُ هَذَا الْعِلْمُ مِنَ الْكُتُبِ وَمَا أَحْسَنَ قَوْلَ
بَعْضِ الْعُلَمَاءِ لِرَجُلٍ قَدْ سَأَلَهُ أَنْ يَقْرَأَ عَلَيْهِ تَأْتِيَةً ابْنِ الْفَارُضِ فَقَالَ
لَهُ دَعِ عَنْكَ هَذَا مِنْ جَاعٍ جَوْعَ الْقَوْمِ وَسَهَرَ سَهَرِهِمْ رَأَى مَا رَأَوْا ثُمَّ
قَالَ فِي آخِرِ هَذَا التَّصْنِيفِ إِنَّ الشَّيْخَ بَرَهَانَ الدِّينَ الْبَقَاعِيَّ قَالَ فِي
مُعْجَمِهِ حَكَى لِي الشَّيْخُ تَقَى الدِّينِ أَبُو بَكْرٍ ابْنُ أَبِي الْوَفَاءِ الْمُقَدِّسِيَّ
الْشَافِعِيَّ قَالَ وَهُوَ أَمْثَلُ الصُّوفِيَّةِ فِي زَمَانِنَا قَالَ كَانَ بَعْضُ الْأَصْدِقَاءِ
يُشِيرُ عَلَيَّ بِقِرَاءَةِ كُتُبِ ابْنِ عَرَبِيٍّ وَبَعْضُ يَمْنَعُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ
فَأَسْتَشِرْتُ الشَّيْخَ يَوْسُفَ الْإِمَامَ الصَّفَّادِيَّ فِي ذَلِكَ فَقَالَ أَعْلَمُ يَا
وَلَدِي وَفَقَكَ اللَّهُ أَنَّ هَذَا الْعِلْمَ الْمُنْسُوبَ إِلَى ابْنِ عَرَبِيٍّ لَيْسَ
بِمُخْتَرَعٍ لَهُ وَإِنَّمَا هُوَ كَانَ مَاهِرًا فِيهِ وَقَدْ ادَّعَى أَهْلُهُ أَنَّهُ لَا تُمْكِنُ
مَعْرِفَتُهُ إِلَّا بِالْكَشْفِ فَإِذَا فَهِمَ الْمُرِيدُ مَرَامَهُمْ فَلَا فَايِدَةَ فِي تَفْسِيرِهِ لِأَنَّهُ
إِنْ كَانَ الْمُقَرَّرُ وَالْمُقَرَّرُ لَهُ مُطْلَعَيْنِ عَلَى ذَلِكَ فَالتَّقْرِيرُ تَحْصِيلُ
الْحَاصِلِ وَإِنْ كَانَ الْمُطَّلَعُ آخَرَ هُمَا فَتَقْرِيرُهُ لَا يَنْفَعُ الْآخَرَ وَإِلَّا فَهُمَا
يَخْبِطَانِ خَبْطَ عَشْوَاءٍ¹ فَسَبِيلُ الْعَارِفِ عَدَمُ الْبَحْثِ عَنْ هَذَا الْعِلْمِ
وَعَلَيْهِ السُّلُوكُ فِيمَا يُوَصِّلُ إِلَى الْكَشْفِ عَنِ الْحَقَائِقِ وَمَتَى دُكِّفَ لَهُ
عَنْ شَيْءٍ عَلِمَهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ أَسْتَشِرْتُ الشَّيْخَ زَيْنَ الدِّينِ الْخَوَانِيَّ² بَعْدَ أَنْ
ذَكَرْتُ لَهُ كَلَامَ الشَّيْخِ يَوْسُفَ فَقَالَ كَدَلَامَ الشَّيْخِ يَوْسُفَ حَسَنٌ
وَأَزِيدُكَ أَنَّ الْعَبْدَ إِذَا تَخَلَّقَ ثُمَّ تَحَقَّقَ ثُمَّ جُذِبَ أَصْحَمَلَتْ ذَاتُهُ
وَذَهَبَتْ صِفَاتُهُ وَتَخَلَّصَ مِنَ السَّوَى فَعِنْدَ ذَلِكَ تَلَوَّحَ لَهُ بَرُوقُ الْحَقِّ

¹ MS. عشوى.

² This is perhaps a mistake for الخوانى. See Hájji Khalifa, vi, 220 and 444.

بالحق فيطلع على كل شيء فيغيب بالله عن كل شيء ولا شيئاً
سواه فيظن أن الله عند كل شيء وهذا أول المقامات فإذا ترقى
عن هذا المقام وأشرف عليه مقام أعلى منه وعنده التأييد¹
الالهي رأى أن الأشياء كلها فيئض وجوده تعالى لا عين وجوده
فالناطق حينئذ بما ظنه في أول مقام إما محروم ساقط وإما نادم
تائب ورثك يفعل ما يشاء انتهى ولقد بالغ ابن المقرئ في روضه
فحكم بكفر من شك في كفر طايفة ابن عربي فحكمه على طايفته
بذلك دونه يشير إلى أنه إما قصد التنفير عن كُتبه وأن من لم
يفهم كلامه ربما وقع في الكفر باعتقاده خلاف المراد إن للقوم
اصطلاحات أرادوا بها معاني غير المعاني المتعارفة فمن حمل
الناظر على معانيها المتعارفة بين أهل العلم الظاهر ربما كفر كما
قال الغزالي ثم قال المناوي وعول جمع على الوقف والتسليم
قائلين الاعتقاد صيغة الانتقاد حرمان وإمام هذه الطايفة شيخ
الاسلام النووي فإنه استفتى فيه فكتب تلك² أمه قد خلكت لها
ما كسبت ولكم ما كسبتم الآية وتبعه على ذلك كثيرون سالكين
سبيل السلامة وقد حكى العارف زروق عن شيخه النووي أنه سئل
عنه فقال آخِلف فيه من الكفر إلى القطبانية والتسليم واجب
ومن لم يدق ما ذاقه القوم ويجاهد مجاهداتهم لا يسعه من الله
الإنكار عليهم انتهى وأقول ومن صرح بذلك من المتأخرين الشيخ

¹ MS. التأييد.

² Kor. 2, 128.

أحمد المقرئ المغربي قال في كتابه زهر الرياض في أخبار عياض
والذى عند كثير من الأخيار وأهل هذه الطريقة التسليم ففيه السلامة
وهى أخوطة من إرسال العنان وقول يعود على صاحبه بالملامة
وما وقع لابن حجر وابن حيان في تفسيره من إطلاق اللسان في هذا
الصدى وإنظاره¹ فذلك من قلس² الشيطان والذى اعتقده ولا
يصح غيره أن الإمام ابن عربى ولحق صالح وعالم ناصح وإنما فوق اليه
سهام الملامة من لم يفهم كلامه على أنه دسست في كُتبه مقالات
قدرة يجل عنها وقد تعرض من المتأخرين ولحق الله الربانى سيدى
عبد الوهاب الشعرانى نفعا الله تعالى به لتفسير كلام الشيخ على
وجه يليق وذكر من البراهين على ولايته ما يشلج صدور أهل
التحقيق فليطالع ذلك من أراده وآله ولحق التوفيق انتهى كلام
المقرئ ثم قال المناوى وفريق قصد بالإنكار عليه وعلى أتباعه
الانتصار لحظ نفسه لكونه وجد قريته وعصرته يعتقدونه وينتصر له فحمله
حمية الجاهلية على معاكسته فبال في خذلانه وخذلان أتباعه
ومعتقديه وقد شوهد عود الخذلان والحمول على هذا الفريق وعدم
الانتفاع بعلومهم وتصانيفهم على أحسنها قال³ وممن كان يعتقدونه
سلطان العلماء ابن عبد السلام فإنه سئل عنه أولاً فقال شيخ سوء
كذاب لا يحترم فرجاً ثم وصفه بعد ذلك بالولاية بل بالقبطانية

¹ Apparently إنظار is the opposite of النظر, and means "to subject (or lay open) to criticism."

² MS. فلس.

³ This anecdote is related more fully by Maqqarî, i, 578, 4 sqq.

وتكرر ذلك منه وحكى عن اليافعى أَنَّهُ كَانَ يطعن فيه ويقول هو
 زنديق فقال له بعض أصحابه يوماً أريد أن تُرينى القُطْب فقال
 هو هذا فقبل له فَأُنت تطعن فيه فقال أَصُونُ ظاهر الشرع (f. 38b)
 ووصفه في إرشاده بالمعرفة والتحقيق فقال اجتمع¹ الشيخان
 الإمامان العارفان المحققان الربانيان الشهوروردى وابن عربى فأطرق
 كُلُّ منهما ساعةً ثُمَّ افترا من غير كلام فقبل لابن عربى ما تقول
 فى السهوروردى فقال مملوكٌ مُسْتَه من فَرَقَه الى قدمه وقيل للسهوروردى
 ما تقول فيه قال بحر الحقايق ثُمَّ قال المُنَاوَى وَأَقْوَى ما أَحْبَبَ به
 المنكرون أَنَّهُ لَا يُزَوَّلُ إِلَّا كلام المعصوم ويردّه قول السَّوَوَى فى² بُسْتَانِ
 العارفين بعد نقله عن ابى الحَئِيرِ التبيانى³ واقعةً ظاهرها الإنكار قد
 يتوهم من يتشبه بالفقهاء ولا فقه عنده أن يُنكر هذا وهذا جهالة
 وغباوة ومن يتوهم ذلك فهو جسارة منه على إرسال الظنون فى
 أولياء الرحمن فليحذر العاقل من التعرّض لشتر من ذلك بل حَقُّه
 إذا لم يفهم حِكْمَتَهُم الاستفادة ولطائفهم المستجادة أن يتفهمها ممَّن
 يعرفها وربما رَأَيْتُ من هذا النوع ممَّا يتوهم فيه من لا تحقيق
 عنده أَنَّهُ مخالف ليس مخالفاً بل يجب تأويل أفعال أولياء الله
 تعالى الى هنا كلامه وإذا وجب تأويل أفعالهم وجب تأويل
 أقوالهم إن⁴ لا فَرْقَ وكان المَجْدُ صاحب القاموس عظيم الاعتقاد فى

¹ Ibid., i, 581, 14 sqq.

² MS. om.

³ Apparently a mistake for التبانى.

⁴ MS. أن.

ابن عربى ويحمل كلامه على المحامل المحسنة وطرز شرحه للبخارى
بكثير من كلامه انتهى وأقول ومما¹ يشهد بذلك ما أجاب به
على سؤال رُفِعَ إليه لَفْظُهُ ما تقول العلماء شَدَّ الله بهم أَرْزَ الدين،
ولم² بهم شَعَثَ المسلمين، في الشيخ محيى الدين ابن العربى
وفى كُتُبِهِ المنسوبة إليه كالفتوحات والفصوص وغيرها هل تَجِلُّ
قراءتها وإقراؤها للناس أم لا أَفْتُونَا مأجورين فأجاب رحمه الله
تعالى رحمة واسعة اللهم أَنْطِقْنَا بما فيه رضاك الذى أقوله في حل
المسئول عنه وأعتقد وأدين الله سبحانه وتعالى به أنه كان شيخ
الطريقة حالاً وعلماً، وإمام الحقيقة حدّاً ورسمًا، ومُحْيِي رسوم
المعارف فعلاً وآسماً، إذا تغلغل فكر المرء في طرف من مجده³
غرقت فيه خواطره في عُباب لا تُذكره⁴ الدلاء، وسحاب لا⁵ تتقاصر
عنه الأنواء، وأما دعواته فانها تَخْرِقُ السبع الطباق، وتفتقر بركاته
فتملأ الأفاق، وأنسى أَصْفُهُ وهو يقيناً فوق ما وصفته، وغالب ظتى أتى
ما أنصفته،

وما على إذا ما قلت معتقدي * دَعِ الجَهِولَ يظنَّ الجَهِلُ عُذْوانا

¹ This passage occurs in Maqqarî, i, 576, 22 sqq.

² MS. والم.

³ Maqq. بحره.

⁴ Maqq. لا تذكره.

⁵ MS. om.

⁶ Maqq. يتخترق.

⁷ Maqq. العدل.

والله تالله¹ بالله¹ العظيم ومن * أقامه حُجَّةٌ لله² برهاننا
 إنَّ الذى قلت³ بعض من مما قبله * ما زدتْ إلا لعلّى زدتْ نُقصانا
 وأما كُتُبُه فأنّها البحار الزواجر، جواهرها لا يُعرَف لها أول من⁴
 آخر، ما وضع الواضعون مثلها، وإتّما جُصّ الله بمعرفتها أهلها،
 ومن خواصّ كُتُبِه أنّه من لازم مطالعتها والنظر فيها امحلّ فهمه لحلّ
 المشكلات، وفهم المُعضلات، وهذا ما وصلت إليه طاقتى فى مدحه
 والحمد لله ربّ العالمين وكذلك أجاب ابن كمال باشا بما
 صورته بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم الحمد لمن جعل من عباده العلماء
 المصلحين، وورثة الأنبياء والمرسلين، والصلاة والسلام على محمّد
 المبعوث لإصلاح النّصاليين والمصلّين، وآله وأصحابه المُجّدين،
 لإجراء الشرع المبين، أما بعد أيّها الناس اعلموا أنّ الشيخ الأعظم
 المقتدى الأكرم قطب العارفين وإمام الموحّدين محمّد بن على
 بن العربى الطائى الأندلسى مجتهد كامل، ومرشد فاضل، له
 مناقب عجيبة، وخوارق غريبة، وتلامذة كثيرة، مقبولة عند
 العلماء والفقهاء، فمن أنكره فقد أخطأ وإن أصرّ فى إنكاره فقد ضلّ
 يجب على السلطان تأديبه، وعن هذا الاعتقاد تحوّل له، إذ
 السلطان مأثور بالأمر بالمعروف والنهي عن المنكر وله مصتفات
 كثيرة منها فصوص حكيمته، وفتوحات ملكيته، وبعض مسائله معلوم

¹ والله . Maqq.

² للدين . Maqq.

³ ما قلت . Maqq.

⁴ ولا . Maqq.

اللفظ والمعنى وموافق للأمر الإلهي والشرع النبوي وبعضها خفى عن إدراك اهل الظاهر دون اهل الكشف والباطن فمن لم يطلع على المعنى المرام، يجب عليه السكوت في هذا المقام، لقوله تعالى وَلَا تَقْفُ مَا لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمٌ إِنَّ السَّمْعَ وَالْبَصَرَ وَالْفُؤَادَ كُلُّ أُولَئِكَ كَانَ عَنْهُ مَسْئُولًا والسَّله الهادى الى سبيل الصواب، وإليه المرجع والمآب، انتهى وكلا الجوابين مكتوب في صريح المترجم فوق رأسه والله اعلم ثم قال المُنَاوَى وأخبر الشعراوى عن بعض اخوان أنه شاهد رجلاً أتى ليلًا بنارٍ ليُحرق تابوته فحُسِفَ به وغاب بالأرض فأحس أهله فحفروا فوجدوا رأسه فكلمهما حفروا نزل في الأرض فعجزوا وأهالوا عليه التراب قَالَ ومن تأمل سيرة ابن عربى وأخلاقه المحسنة وانسلاخه من حظوظ نفسه وتَرَكَ العصبية حمله ذلك على محبته واعتقاده ومما وقع له ان رجلاً من دمشق فرض على نفسه أن يلعنه كل يوم عشر مرات فمات وحضر ابن عربى جنازته ثم رجع فجلس ببيته وتوجه للقبلة فلما جاء وقت الغدا أحضر اليه فلم يأكل ولم ينزل على حاله الى بعد العشا فالتفت مسروراً وطلب العشاء وأكل فقليل له في ذلك فقال التزمْتُ مع الله أننى لا آكل ولا أشرب حتى يغفر لهذا الذى يلعننى وذكرت له سبعين ألف لا اله الا الله فغفر له وقد أودى الشيخ كثيرًا في حيات وبعد ممات بما لم يقع نظيره لغيره وقد أخبر هو عن نفسه بذلك وذلك من غرر كراماته فقد قال في

الفتوحات كنت نايماً في مقام ابراهيم واذا بقائيل من الأرواح (f. 39a) أرواح الملائكة الأعلى يقول لي ادخل مقام ابراهيم أنه كان أواهاً حليماً فعلمت أنه لا بد أن يبتليني بكلام في عرضي من قوم فأعاملهم بالحلم قال ويكون أذى كثيراً فانه جاء بحلم بصيغة المبالغة ثم وصفه بالأواد وهو من يكثر منه التأوه لما يشاهد من جلال الله انتهى وقال¹ الصفى بن أبى منصور جمع ابن عربى بين العلوم الكسبية والعلوم الوهية وكان غلب عليه التوحيد علماً وخلقاً وخلقاً لا يكثرث بالوجود مقبلاً كان او معرضاً وقال تلميذه الصدر القونوى الرومى كان شيخنا ابن عربى متمكناً من الاجتماع بروح من شاء من الأنبياء والأولياء الماضين على ثلاثة أنحاء إن شاء الله استنزل روحانيته في هذا العالم وأدركه متجسداً في صورة مثالية شبيهة بصورته الحسية العصرية التى كانت له في حياته الدنيا وإن شاء الله أحضره في نومه وإن شاء انسلخ عن هيكله واجتمع به وهو أكثر القوم كلاماً في الطريق فمن ذلك ما قال ما ظهر على العبد ألا ما استقر في باطنه فما أترفيه سواه فمن فهم هذه الحكمة وجعلها مشهودة أراح² نفسه من التعلق بغيره وعلم أنه لا يؤتى عليه بخير ولا شر إلا منه وأقام العطر لكل موجود وقال إذا ترادف عليك الغفلات وكثرة النوم فلا تسخط ولا تلتفت لذلك فإن من نظر الأسباب مع الحق أشرك كُن مع الله بما يريد لا مع نفسك بما

¹ Maqqari, i, 571, 10 sqq.

² MS. ارواح.

تريد لكن لا بد من الاستغفار وقال علامة الراسخ أن يزداد تمكُّناً عند سلبه لأنّه مع الحق بما احبّ فمن وجد السلّة في حال المعرفة دون السلب فهم مع نفسه غيبة وحضوراً وقال من صدق في شيء وتعلّقت همّته بحصوله كان له عاجلاً أو آجلاً فإن لم يصل اليه في الدنيا فهو له في الآخرة ومن مات قبل الفتح رُفِعَ الى محلّ همّته وقال العارف يعرف ببصره ما يعرفه غيره ببصيرته ويعرف ببصيرته ما لا يذكره احد الا نادراً ومع ذلك فلا يأمن على نفسه من نفسه فكف يأمن على نفسه من مقدور ربّه وهذا ممّا قطع الظهور سَنَسَدَ رُجُومٍ¹ مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ وقال لا ينقص العارف قوله لتلميذه خذ هذا العلم الذي لا تجده عند غيره وبحوه ممّا فيه تركية نفسه لان قصده حتّ المتعلّم على القبول وقال كلام العارف على صورة السامع بحسب قوّة استعداده وضعفه وشبهته القائمة بباطنه وقال كلّ من ثقل عليك الجواب عن كلامه فلا تُجِبْهَ فإن وعاءه ملآن لا يسع الجواب وقال من صحّ له قدم في التوحيد انتفت عنه الدعاوى من محوريّات وإعجاب فإنّه يجد جميع الصفات المحمودة لله لا له والعبد لا يُعْجِب بعمل غيره ولا بمتاع غيره وقال من ملكته نفسه عُدّ بئار التدبير ومن ملكها² عُدّ بئار الاختيار³ ومن عجز عن العجز أذاقه الله حلاوة الإيمان ولم يَبْقَ عنده حجاب وقال من أدرك من نفسه التغيير والتبديل في كلّ

¹ Kor., 7, 181 ; 68, 44.² MS. ملكه.³ MS. الاختيار.

نَفْسُ فَهُوَ الْعَالَمُ بِقَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى كُلُّ¹ يَوْمٍ هُوَ فِي شَأْنٍ وَقَالَ مَنْ طَلَبَ قَلِيلًا عَلَى وَحْدَانِيَةِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى كَانَ الْحِمَارُ أَغْرَفَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْهُ وَقَالَ الْجَاهِلُ لَا يَرَى جَهْلَهُ لَأَنَّهُ فِي ظِلْمَتِهِ وَالْعَالَمُ لَا يَرَى عِلْمَهُ لَأَنَّهُ فِي ضِيَاءِ نُورِهِ وَلَا يُبْرَى شَيْءٌ إِلَّا بِغَيْرِهِ فَالْمَرَاةُ تُخْبِرُكَ بِعُيُوبِ² صُورَتِكَ وَتُصَدِّقُهَا بِمَعَ جَهْلِكَ بِمَا أَخْبَرَتْ بِهِ وَالْعَالَمُ يُخْبِرُكَ بِعُيُوبِ نَفْسِكَ بِمَعَ عِلْمِكَ بِمَا أَخْبَرَكَ بِهِ وَتَكْذِبُهُ فَمَاذَا بَعْدَ الْحَقِّ إِلَّا الضَّلَالُ وَقَالَ حُسْنُ الْإِدْبِ فِي الظَّاهِرِ آيَةُ حُسْنِهِ فِي الْبَاطِنِ فَيَأْتِيَاكَ وَسُوءُ الظَّنِّ وَالسَّلَامُ وَقَالَ مَعْنَى الْفَتْحِ عِنْدَهُمْ كَشَفَ حِجَابِ النَّفْسِ أَوِ الْقَلْبِ أَوِ الرُّوحِ أَوِ السِّرِّ لَمَّا فِي الْكِتَابِ وَالسُّتَةِ وَقَالَ رَبُّمَا فَيَهْمُ أَحَدُهُمْ مِنَ اللَّفْظِ نِدًّا مَا قَصَدَهُ الْمُتَكَلِّمُ سَمِعَ بَعْضُ عُلَمَاءِ بَغْدَادَ رَجُلًا مِنْ شَرِكَةِ الْحَمْرِ يُنْشِدُ

إِذَا الْعِشْرُونَ مِنْ شَعْبَانَ وَلَّتْ * فَوَاعِلُ شَرْبٍ لَيْلِكَ بِالنَّهَارِ
وَلَا تَشْهَرُ بِأَقْدَاحِ صِغَارٍ * فَإِنَّ الْوَقْتَ ضَاقَ عَلَى الصِّغَارِ

فَهَامَ عَلَى وَجْهِهِ فِي الْبَرِّيَّةِ حَتَّى مَاتَ وَقَالَ كَثِيرًا مَا تَهَبُّ فِي قُلُوبِ الْعَارِفِينَ نَفَحَاتُ الْهَيْبَةِ فَإِنْ نَطَقُوا بِهَا جَهْلُهُمْ كَمَلَّ الْعَارِفِينَ وَرَدَّهَا عَلَيْهِمْ أَصْحَابُ الْأَدْبَةِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الظَّاهِرِ وَغَابَ عَنْ هَؤُلَاءِ أَنَّهُ تَعَالَى كَمَا أُعْطِيَ أَوْلِيَاءَهُ الْكَرَامَاتِ الَّتِي هِيَ فِرْعُ الْمُعْجَزَاتِ فَلَا يَدَّعِي أَنْ تَنْطِقَ أَلْسِنَتُهُمْ بِعِبَارَاتٍ تَعْجِزُ الْعُلَمَاءَ عَنْ فَهْمِهَا وَقَالَ مَنْ لَمْ يَقُمْ بِقَلْبِهِ تَصْدِيقَ مَا يَسْمَعُهُ مِنْ كَلَامِ الْقَوْمِ فَلَا يَجَالِسُهُمْ فَإِنَّ

¹ Kor., 55, 29.

² MS. 'بُعْيُون'.

مجالستهم بغير تصديق سَمَّ قَاتِلٌ وَقَالَ شِدَّةُ الْقُرْبِ حِجَابٌ كَمَا أَنَّ
غَايَةَ¹ الْبُعْدِ حِجَابٌ وَإِنْ كَانَ الْحَقُّ أَقْرَبَ الْبَيْتِ مِنَ حَبْلِ الْوَرِيدِ
فَأَيُّ السَّبْعُونَ أَلْفَ حِجَابٍ وَقَالَ لَا تُدْخِلِ الشَّبَهَةَ فِي الْمَعَارِفِ
وَالْأَسْرَارِ الرَّبَّانِيَّةِ وَإِنَّمَا مَحَلُّهَا الْعُلُومُ النَّظَرِيَّةُ وَقَالَ نَهَايَةُ الْعَارِفِينَ
مَنْقُولَةٌ غَيْرُ مَعْقُولَةٍ فَمَا تَمَّ عَنْدهُمْ إِلَّا بِدَايَةٍ وَتَنْقُضِي أَعْمَارَهُمْ وَهُمْ
مَعَ اللَّهِ عَلَى أَوَّلِ قَدَمٍ وَقَالَ كُلٌّ مِنْ آمِنٍ بِدَلِيلٍ فَلَا وَثُوقَ بَايْمَانِهِ
لَأَنَّهُ نَظَرَتْ فِيهِ مَعْرَضٌ لِلْقَوَادِحِ بِخِلَافِ الْإِيمَانِ الْضَرُورِيِّ الَّذِي
يُوجِدُ فِي الْقَلْبِ وَلَا يُمَكِّنُ دَفْعَهُ وَكُلَّ عِلْمٍ حَصَلَ عَنْ نَظَرٍ وَفِكَرٍ لَا يَسْلَمُ
مِنْ دُخُولِ الشَّبَهَةِ عَلَيْهِ وَلَا الْحَيَرَةِ فِيهِ وَقَالَ شَرْطُ الْكَامِلِ الْإِحْسَانُ إِلَى
أَعْدَائِهِ وَهُمْ لَا يَشْعُرُونَ بِمُخْلَقًا بِأَخْلَاقِ اللَّهِ فَاتَهُ دَائِمُ الْإِحْسَانِ إِلَى
مَنْ سَمَّاهُمْ أَعْدَاءَهُ مَعَ جَهْلِ الْأَعْدَاءِ بِهِ وَقَالَ شَرْطُ الشَّيْخِ أَنْ يَكُونَ
عِنْدَهُ جَمِيعُ مَا يَحْتَاجُهُ الْمُرِيدُ (f. 39b) فِي التَّرْبِيَةِ لَا ظَهْوَرَ كَرَامَةٍ وَلَا
كُشْفُ بَاطِنِ الْمُرِيدِ وَقَالَ الشَّفِيقَةُ عَلَى الْخَلْقِ أَحَقُّ بِالرَّعَايَةِ مِنْ
الْغِيَرَةِ فِي اللَّهِ لَأَنَّ الْغِيَرَةَ لَا أَضْلَ لَهَا فِي الْحَقَائِقِ الشَّبَوْتِيَّةِ لِأَنَّهَا مِنْ
الْغِيَرِيَّةِ وَلَا غِيَرِيَّةَ هُنَاكَ² وَإِنْ جَحَّحُوا لِلْسَّلَامِ فَتَجَنَّحَ لَهَا وَجَزَاءُ
سَيِّئَةٍ سَيِّئَةٌ مِثْلُهَا فَجَعَلَ الْقِصَاصُ سَيِّئَةً أَيْ أَنَّ ذَلِكَ الْفِعْلَ سَيِّئٌ
مَعَ كَوْنِهِ مَشْرُوعًا وَكُلَّ ذَلِكَ تَعْظِيمًا لِهَذِهِ النِّشْأَةِ الَّتِي تَوَلَّى الْحَقُّ
خَلْقَهَا بِيَدِهِ وَاسْتَخْلَفَهَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَحَرَّمَ عَلَى عِبَادِهِ السَّعْيَ فِي إِتْلَافِهَا
بِغَيْرِ إِذْنِهِ وَقَالَ الصُّوفِيُّ مَنْ أَسْقَطَ الْبِئَاضَاتِ الثَّلَاثَ فَلَا يَقُولُ لِي وَلَا

¹ MS. غَاب.² Kor., 8, 63.

عندى ولا متاعى اى لا يُضيف لنفسه شيئاً وَقَالَ الدَّعَاءُ مَخَّ الْعِبَادَةِ
وَبِالْمَخِّ تَكُونُ الْقُوَّةُ لِلْأَعْضَاءِ فَلِهَذَا تَتَقَوَّى بِهَا عِبَادَةُ الْعَابِدِينَ وَقَالَ
مَحْفَظٌ مِنْ لَذَاتِ الْأَحْوَالِ فَإِنَّهَا مَسْمُومٌ قَاتِلَةٌ وَلِحُجُبٍ مَانِعَةٌ وَقَالَ
لَا يَغُرُّكَ إِمْهَالُهُ فَنَانَ بِطُشِهِ شَدِيدٌ وَالشَّقَى مَنْ اتَّعَظَ بِنَفْسِهِ لَا
يَغُرُّكَ مَنْ خَالَفَ فُجُوزَى بِأَحْسَنِ الْمَعَارِفِ وَوَقَّفَ فِي أَحْسَنِ
الْمَوَاقِفِ وَتَجَلَّتْ لَهُ الْمَشَاهِدُ هَذَا كَلَّمَهُ مَكْرَبُهُ وَاسْتَدْرَاجُ مَنْ
حَيْثُ لَا يَعْلَمُ قُلْ لَهُ إِذَا احْتَجَّ عَلَيْكَ بِنَفْسِهِ

سَوْفَ تَرَى إِذَا أَتَجَلَّى الْعُبَارُ² * أَفَرَسَ تَحْتَكَ أُمَ حِمَارٍ

وَقَالَ لَا يَصِحُّ لِعَبْدٍ مَقَامُ الْمَعْرِفَةِ بِاللَّهِ وَهُوَ يَجْهَلُ حَكَمًا وَاحِدًا مِنْ
شَرَائِعِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ فَمَنْ ادَّعَى الْمَعْرِفَةَ وَاسْتَشْكَلَ حَكَمًا وَاحِدًا فِي الشَّرِيعَةِ
الْمُحَمَّدِيَّةِ أَوْ غَيْرِهَا فَهُوَ كَاذِبٌ وَقَالَ أَجْمَعَتِ الطَّائِفَةُ عَلَى أَنَّ الْعِلْمَ
بِاللَّهِ عَيْنُ الْجَهْلِ بِهِ تَعَالَى وَقَالَ إِذَا ذَكَرَ اللَّهُ الذَّاكِرَ وَلَمْ يَخْشَعْ قَلْبُهُ
وَلَا خَضَعَ عِنْدَ ذِكْرِهِ آيَاهُ لَمْ يَحْتَرَمْ الْجَنَابَ الْإِلَهِيَّ وَلَمْ يَأْتِ بِمَا يَلِيْقُ
بِهِ مِنَ التَّعْظِيمِ وَأَوَّلُ مَا تَمَقُّقُهُ جَوَارِحُهُ وَجَمِيعُ أَجْزَاءِ بَدَنِهِ وَقَالَ
الْأَسْمَاءُ الْإِلَهِيَّةُ كُلُّهَا الَّتِي عَلَيْهَا يَتَوَقَّفُ وَجُودُ الْعَالَمِ أَرْبَعَةٌ لَا غَيْرَ الْحَيِّ
الْقَادِرِ الْمُرِيدِ الْعَالِمِ وَبِهَذِهِ الْأَسْمَاءِ ثَبَتَ كَوْنُهُ الْإِلَهِيَّ وَقَالَ أَخْبَرَنِي
مَنْ أَثِقْتُ بِهِ قَالَ دَخَلْتُ عَلَى رَجُلٍ فَقِيهِ عَالِمٍ مَتَكَلَّمٍ فَوَجَدْتُهُ
بِمَجْلِسٍ فِيهِ الْخَمْرُ وَهُوَ يَشْرَبُ فَنَفَرَ النَّبِيذُ فَقِيلَ لَهُ أَنْفِذْ إِلَى فُلَانٍ
يَأْتِي بِنَبِيذٍ فَقَالَ لَا فَائِي مَا أَضْرَرْتَ عَلَى مَعْصِيَتِهِ قَطَّ وَلِي بَسِيرٍ

¹ MS. باحسان.

² MS. الغبار إذا اجملى.

الكأْسَيْنِ تَوْبَةً وَلَا أَنْتَظِرُهُ فَإِذَا حَصَلَ بِيَدِي أَنْظَرُهُلْ يَوْفَقْنِي رَبِّي
فَأَتْرُكُهُ أَوْ يَخْذِلْنِي فَأَشْرِكُهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ اعْنِي ابْنَ عَرَبِي فَهَكَذَا الْعُلَمَاءُ انْتَهَى
كَلَامَ الْمَنَاوِي مَلَحَّضًا وَأَقُولُ وَمِنْ كَلَامِهِ أَيْضًا

مَا نَالَ مَنْ جَعَلَ الشَّرِيعَةَ جَانِبًا * شَيْئًا وَلَوْ بَلَغَ السَّمَاءَ مَنَارُهُ

وَمِنْ شِعْرِهِ الرَّايِقِ قَوْلُهُ

¹ حَقِيقَتِي هِمَّتُ بِهَا * وَمَا رَأَاهَا بَصَرِي
وَلَوْ رَأَاهَا لَغَدَا * قَتِيلَ ذَاكَ الْحَوْرِ
فَعِنْدَ مَا أَبْصَرْتُهَا * صِرْتُ بِحُكْمِ الدَّظْرِ
فِيهِتُ مَسْحُورًا بِهَا * أَهْيَمُ حَتَّى السَّحَرِ
يَا حَذَرِي مَنْ حَذَرِي * لَوْ كَانَ يُعْنِي حَذَرِي
وَاللَّهُ مَا هَيَّيْمَنِي * جَمَالَ ذَاكَ الْخَفَرِ
يَا حُسْنَهَا ² مِنْ ظَلَمِيَّةِ * تَزْعَى بِذَاكَ الْحَمْرِ ³
إِذَا رَنَتْ أَوْ عَطَفَتْ * تُسَبِّحِي عَقُولَ الْبَشَرِ
كَأَنَّمَا أَنْفَسُهَا * أَغْرَافُ مَسَكٍ عَطِرِ
كَأَنَّمَا شَمْسُ الصُّحَى * فِي النُّورِ أَوْ كَالْقَمَرِ
إِنْ سَفَرْتُ أَبْرَزَهَا * نَوْرُ صَبَاحٍ مُسْفِرٍ ⁴
أَوْ سَدَلْتُ غِيَّيَهَا * ظِلَامَ ذَاكَ الشَّعَرِ

¹ This poem occurs in Maqqari, i, 570, penult. line et seqq.

² Maqq. فِي حُسْنَهَا.

³ Maqq. بِذَاكَ الْحَمْرِ.

⁴ MS. سَفَرِ.

يا قمرًا¹ تحت دُجى * خُذى فؤادى أو ذرى²
عَيْنى لىكى أَبْصِرْكم * إِنْ كان حظى نَظْرى

وكان يقول أَعْرِفُ الاسمَ الأعظم وأعرف الكيمياء بطريق المنازلة لا
بطريق الكسب وكان مُجْتَهِدًا مُطْلَقًا بلا ريب قال فى رائيته
لقد حَزَمَ الرحمنُ تقليدَ مالِك * وَأَحْمَدَ وَالثَّعْمَانَ وَالكُلَّ فَنَاعَذِرُوا
وقال أيضًا فى نوبته

لَسْتُ مِمَّنْ يقول قال آبنُ حَزَمٍ * لا ولا أَحْمَدَ ولا الثَّعْمَانَ
وهذا صرح بالاجتهاد المطلق كيف لا وقد قال عَرَضْتُ أَحاديثَهُ
صَلَّى الله عليه وسلَّم جميعها عليه فكان يقول عن احاديث صحَّحت
من جهة الصناعة ما قُلْتُها وعن احاديث ضعفت من جهتها
قُلْتُها واذا لم يكن مجتهدًا فليس لله مجتهد
³ إِنْ لم تَرِيَهْ فهذه مآثره

هذا وما بقم عليه أَحَدٌ فيما أَعْلَمُ بغير ما قَهَمَهُ من كلامه من
الحلول والاتحاد، وما تَفَرَّعَ عليهما من كفر أو إلحاد، وساحته
الشُرْهَ منهما، وشأؤهُ أَبْعَدُ شأؤَ عنهما، وكلامه بنفسه يشهد بهذا،
خلى افتراك فذاك خلى لا ذاك⁴، قال فى فتوحاته المكيه، التى
هى قُرّة عين السادة الصوفيّه، فى الباب الثانى والتسعين ومائتين

¹ MS. قمر.

² Maqq. وذرى.

³ This must be a verse if the MS. reading تَرِيَهْ is sound.

⁴ I leave these words as they stand in the MS. They are evidently metrical, so perhaps we should read فذاك خلى لا ذاك.

من أعظم دليل على نفى الحلول والاتحاد الذى يتوهمه بعضهم أن تعلم عقلاً أن القمر ليس فيه من نور الشمس شىء وأن الشمس ما انتقلت إليه بذاتها وإنما كان القمر سحلاً لها فلذلك العبد ليس فيه من خالقه شىء ولا حل فيه وقال أيضاً فيها فى الباب الثامن¹ والسبعين كما نقله عنه الشعرانى فى كتابه اليواقيت والجواهر فى بيان عقائد الأكابر إن² الله تعالى لم يوجد العالم لافتقاره إليه وأما الأسباب³ فى حال عدمها الإمكانى لما⁴ طلبت وجودها ممن هى مفترقة إليه بالذات وهو الله تعالى لا تعرف غيره فلما طلبت بفقرها الذاتى من الله تعالى أن يوجد لها حق سؤالها لا من حاجة قامت به إليها لأنها كانت مشهودة له (f. 40a) تعالى فى حال عدمها النسبى كما هى مشهودة له فى حال وجودها سواء فهو يدرها سبحانه على ما هى عليه فى حقايقها حال وجودها وعدمها بإدراك واحد فلماذا لم يكن إيجاد الأشياء عن فقر بخلاف العبد فإن الحق تعالى لو أعطاه جزء⁵ كُن وأراد إيجاد شىء لا وجد⁶ عن فقر إليه وحاجة فما طلب العبد إلا ما ليس عنده فقد افترق إيجاد العبد عن إيجاد الحق تعالى قال وهذه مسئلة لو ذهبت عيئك جزاء

¹ Sha'rání has الثانى.

² Sha'rání, *Yawdíqil* (Cairo, 1277), p. 75, l. 6 sqq.

³ Sha'rání has الاشياء.

⁴ لها. MS.

⁵ حرف. Sha'rání

⁶ لا يوجد. MS. Sha'rání has لا يوجد.

لتحصيلها لكان قليلاً في حقها فانها منزلة قدم زل فيها كثير من أهل
الله تعالى والتحقوا فيها بمن ذمهم الله تعالى في قوله ¹ لَقَدْ كَفَرَ
الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ فَقِيرٌ وَحَنُ أَعْيَاءٌ انتهى فان قلت قد نقل
بعضهم عن الشيخ انه كان يُنشد

الْكُلُّ مُفْتَقِرٌ مَا أَلْكُلُّ مُسْتَعْنَى * هذا هو الحق قد قلنا ولا نكفى
فالجواب أن هذا ومثله من المدسوس عليه في كتاب الفصوص
وغيره فان هذا يكذبه الناقل عنه خلاف ذلك انتهى كلام الشعراني
توفي رحمه الله تعالى ورضى عنه في الثاني والعشرين من ربيع
الآخر بدمشق في دار القاضي مُحَبِّب الدين بن الزكي² وحمل الى
قاسيون فدفن في تربته المعلومة الشريفة التي هي قطعة من رياض
الجنة والله تعالى اعلم

¹ Kor., 3, 177.

² MS. الركي.

XXVI.

THE PAHLAVI TEXT OF YASNA LXV

(so in S.B.E. xxxi, otherwise LXIV),

FOR THE FIRST TIME CRITICALLY TRANSLATED.¹

BY PROFESSOR LAWRENCE MILLS.

*A Sacrifice to Ardvī Sūra Anāhita.**Her Attributes.*

I SACRIFICE to the Water Ardvīsūr, the *clear*² (or *pure*); [its (i.e. her) pureness is this, that in consequence of her purity her place is on the star track],³ (2) the *full*⁴ *forth-flowing*⁵ (one), [that is to say, she penetrates to every single place], the *healing* (one),⁶ [that is to say, she thoroughly heals a case (literally 'a matter')], the *Demon-severed*⁷ (one), [that is to say, in no connection with her

¹ The text upon which this translation has been made has been carefully prepared for Z.D.M.G. as edited with all the MSS. collated, and will appear in due course. Translations into Parsi-Persian and Gujarati from texts not collated and otherwise of an uncritical character have alone preceded this. Those previous texts are, however, of the last importance as materials for a critical edition, and we miss the Sanskrit of Nēryōsangh greatly here.

² I do not hesitate to emend the strange form χvüst (*sic* anavasit(?)), which I do not understand; a very slight change would make it anāhit, and this is exactly what the Parsi-Pers. translator renders xālīš.

³ Meaning that it is a supernatural river flowing in the heavens, and the supposed universal source of the rain, dew, etc.

⁴ Have we here an etymological hint, pūr = 'full' to pereθū?

⁵ Whether the letter which approaches č (in B. and E.) was really meant for č in tac is doubtful; but the meaning is well adapted, and it would be worth while to emend the sign to this form by a slight change to Avesta 𐬨 = č.

⁶ I will no longer delay the remark that 'Water,' considered to be the sacred principle in the Universe next after Fire, receives sacrifice as a Creature of Ahura's alone; see 'Mazda-made.' Surely nations devoted to cleanliness will readily acknowledge that it was an element well worthy to have been regarded as a sacred sub-divinity. See note on 61. This entire chapter is in harmony with Y. LI, 7, with which the chapter closes in the MSS.

⁷ The Demon of Putrefaction and Typhoid is especially opposed by Her as also by the Fire.

are the Demons], 'the one of Aūharmazd's Lore, [that is to say, her religious Lore (her Dēnā) is that of Aūharmazd¹ (and not that of the Devas, meaning that her sanctity stands in connection with the Dēn of Ahura)],

(3) the sacrifice-deserving (one) for (or 'in') the corporeal worlds, [that is to say, she imparts a particular gift (literally 'one thing')], and the (one) worth praise for (or 'in') the corporeal worlds, [that is to say, they would (or meaning 'she would') effect mediation (for those living (even) in the (corporeal) world who offer praise to her. So that she is worth sacrificing to and praising; she will mediate with God between Him and her sacrificer, and so effect his object)],

(4) the furtherer of life,² (she is) the holy (one) [the furtherer of its wealth also], the furtherer of the flocks [and of their wealth], the holy. (Or, furthering) the saintly [man,³ (the punctilious citizen)], (5) furthering (also) the (entire) settlements, the holy (one), furthering [the herds and] their wealth,⁴ the holy (one),⁵ [the wealth of the faithful friends (literally 'of the well beloved')],⁶

(6) furthering the Province (in prosperity), the holy [with a concentrated efficiency (literally 'with a single' efficiency')],

(7) (the one) who imparts purity qui omnium juniorum semini munditiam tribuat [that is to say, when pure and good, with (her; that is, 'with Ardvīsūr') it will not go to pollution; this is, by means of her 'the Ardvīsūr (it will be preserved)],

¹ She belongs to God *par excellence* and to His religion.

² Jān; it looks as if the trlr. read āyu for ādū; in an original Avesta-Pahlavi writing the signs might be the same. Yān = 'a boon' seems nearer ādū; but the Pers. MS. has jān.

³ This anšūtā is evidently an error, as the constant asaonīm refers with poetical iteration to the Ardvi Sūra Anāhita.

⁴ This word wealth 'šaetō' is in the original here; the above occurrences of Xvāstak are anticipative. A well-watered country thrives.

⁵ B. has a late erroneous martūm here.

⁶ C., the Parsi-Pers., has in the trl. 'veh dūstān.'

⁷ Was this idea of 'singleness' suggested by vī-(d(a)evām) elsewhere?, 'separate from'? Or is it here inserted by anticipation from 19 and 20?

(8) who imparts purity to the wombs of all women for (child)bearing, [that is to say, when a particular (or additional, so for *tanē* = 'another') result (*baharīh* (?), perhaps meaning 'another time,' a 'second birth' ¹ (*bār ī tanē*)) is desired, it so happens by the means of *Ardvīsūr*],

(9) who gives all women successful labour in the birth (of children); [that is to say, when it goes on straight ² and good with them, this is by her means, through *Ardvīsūr*],

(10) who imparts to all women what is regular [as much as is necessary] and what is straightforward, ³ so that (= *aē* here) they would continue on (*mē'im*) producing healthy ³ milk, (11) who is great (indeed), [that is to say, *Ardvīsūr*] and named ⁴ forth afar, [that is to say, her fame has extended to a distant place],

She is Supreme of Waters.

(12) who is (indeed great); [that is to say], she has as much size as all those waters ⁵ (together) which flow forth upon the earth. [(The meaning) is that *Ardvīsūr* is greater than other waters except the *Arvand* (*Orontes*), and the *Arvand* is not made by me ⁶ (to be) in connection or 'comparison (*levatā*) with' *Ardvīsūr*, nor *Ardvīsūr* with *Arvand* ⁷];

¹ Hardly 'twins.'

² Does *frārūn* render *raθvīm*(-yām), or is it a strengthening gloss to *dātihā*?

³ Perhaps 'tasteful'; lit. 'pleasant'; but *basīm* may be meant to correspond to *raθvīm*(-yām).

⁴ This should rather refer to her roar.

⁵ Possibly meaning 'as any of those rivers,' or that '*Ardvīsūr* represents them all.'

⁶ Notice the authorship of *Aūharmazd* in the gl.; the composer constructs the Hymn in His name. Does *Aūharmazd* therefore sacrifice to her as he does elsewhere to *Miθra*? If so, this proves that the word 'I sacrifice' does not imply idolatry.

⁷ Or, again, meaning that, 'whereas all other rivers are dependent upon *Ardvīsūr* for their water supply, the *Arvand* (?) was not so made by me, i.e. *Aūharmazd*, (is not so made by me thus (dependently) in connection with (*levatā*) the waters of the *Ardvīsūr*, nor the *Ardvīsūr* (in connection with it. They were alone of all waters independent of each other)).'

A Torrent.

(13) yea; I sacrifice to her who is a Torrent (literally 'who flows with strength') (14) from high Hukairya¹ on to the Sea of Wide Shores (the Caspian).

The Foaming Shores.


(15) All the shores of the Wide-Shored Sea rush² (or 'foam'); [that is to say, it wells up (lit. perhaps meaning 'she heaps it up')]; the whole of it stirs with foaming to the middle (16) when she flows forth upon them, (plunges into them, the Gulfs and the Middle of it) [with a separated section³ (broken channels; dashes on every side)], (in 16); and when she plunges forth into them with a single volume,⁴ (she) Ardvī Sūra Anāhita, the lofty, the heroic, and the spotless, the very pure (then thus I sacrifice to her) (then those shores and gulfs will foam); (17) whose (i.e. Ardvī-sūr's) are a thousand (side)-lakes (var) within (her sweep) and a thousand outflows⁵; [and the var (side-lake) is that whose water supply is from the springs, and the outflowing conduit (is that) within which the water (at times) stands back⁶ within Ardvīsūr. Some say that it is 'within the sea (and not in the torrent of the river' that this standing back takes place. So, to explain the anomalies of the expressions, the 'standing back' in connection with a 'torrent')].

¹ The highest peak of Hara, mother of mountains.

² Or 'she stirs all the gulfs or shores'; but see the original; sing. for pl. is common in the Persian; see the grammars.

³ Possibly 'with separated effect': 'she exerts her force on every side.'

⁴ fražgaraiti seems to be rendered as if it meant 'plunging in a single volume.'

⁵ A. has: 'man' bayen žag ray ī(?)ray  apxahih (apxāih (?)) var' (so);

the sign which looks like 'ī' is a mistake for var.

⁶ The apxāih (apxāih) must mean here outlets which prevail in times of flood and dry up in the summer season, or half dry up, so leaving 'lakes.' Hardly 'affected by tidal influences.'

Her Extended Tributaries, etc.

(18) And each of those side-lakes and each of the outlets is (as) a riding (or a driving) in a forty days (course), when a well-mounted man would ride [from one side (of them to the other). Some say 'from every side of them,' (that is, all around the shores of the side-lakes and outlets)].¹

Her Sublimity.

(19) This (is) my single one of waters (my River *par eminence*)² which goes on in its outflow with sublimity³ to all the Seven Karshvars (of the Earth),

(20) yea, this is my single one of waters⁴ [(meaning) of outflows⁴ since they would bear (her volume) on continually (so for ham, or read hamāi), [that is to say, they (these conduits of my River) would bear on (its waters) most singly⁵ (in a most unbroken manner)] in summer and in winter (so, never, like most other rivers in those regions, running dry in the summer season).

(21) She, my river, indeed purifies [that is to say, she keeps (pure from degeneration)] juniorum semen, the wombs of women and woman's milk.

The Fravašis invoked.

(22, 23) Here let the Fravašis of (those saints) approach, of those (now) existing, [of that (portion of them) which

¹ This is to relieve the appearance of exaggeration; 'from all sides' of them would seem to mean 'all around the sides'; there does not seem to be any reference to the sides of the Sea just here.

² She is the 'Mother of Waters.'

³ The Persian translates 'tars' 'with terror,' meaning as above.

⁴ B. ins. (?) min apṣānān to relieve the effects of the iteration; or else min apṣānān is gloss and min apṣahān (so); text (apṣāān (?)).

B. has zag li aēvak min ṣānān min apṣahān (-ṣāān?) amat av' ham yedrūnyēn, aēγ . . .

A. has zagic i li aēvak min apṣahān (apṣāān) amat av' ham yedrūnānd, aēγ aēvatūm (aēvaktūm) . . .

C. also om. a second term. It has zag li aēvak min āvān amat . . .

E. (Sp.) has apṣahān (apṣāān) amat, no further insertion.

⁵ 'Most singly'; so, to carry out in the gloss the idea of 'uniqueness' in the texts.

(is) within vigorous (life)] and of (those who have) been created (in the past, the portion long since created) [now dead], of those born¹ [who are even now (alive)], (in 22) and of those not (yet) born² [those in accordance (so for adin' here), (who) have not (yet) been destined to the business of life³ (?) (possibly lit. 'fallen to the work of the hand')] ;

(23) let them (the Fravašis) come⁴ (so the singular -āt' for jaseñtu) to the beyond (or merely 'thither'), the Fravašis whose⁵ bearers they (the waters) have been to the (face to face) meeting (of the waters) (so for paityāpem = 'up-stream') from (see the ablative of the original) that which is the nearest water (the first that meets one streaming down)⁶ ; [let them⁷ take the water (there) ; it is⁷ the zōhar (zaoθra). Those (waters) have been assigned (to be given) to him by whom (the zaoθra ceremonies) have been customarily (or 'specifically') performed⁸

¹ I read zātān ; so, much better than dātān. So C., the Parsi-Pers., zādahgān (?) trl. for the text jādān = zādān.

That the sign which resembled 'd,' 'i,' etc., is one which at times expresses 'z' is clear from yazadān, in which word we discovered that the sign for 'd,' etc., may represent 'y,' the meaning yazata deciding the matter.

² C., the Pers., has hastāp = hastān here, but see above, where it has jādān, translated zādahgān.

³ Karyadā (?), so possibly = 'hand work' ; C., the Pers., reads Karjadman = karyadā (translating 'šukm' = 'recompense' (?)) ; hardly kargadā, '(?) glory of work (or of 'agriculture') ; hardly read karzamān = 'Heaven' 'destined to Heaven.'

Hardly 'not yet fallen to the stomach (womb?)' ; see the Pers. trl. šikam (?) = 'belly' (karzadā (?), karzadman (?)), etc.

⁴ The singular for the plural jaseñtu.

⁵ So we should render man' valāšān' ; but it may well be that it was the Fravašis who carried on the waters ; and not the *vice versa*. The masculine yōi of the original refers irregularly to the Saints.

⁶ See note 5.

⁷ Here we have the form in -āñd followed by yegavimūnēt, as if it were a miswriting for -nūnt y. the past participle, as elsewhere we have something like it—āñd-ēt. But here I separate.

⁸ The allusion is evidently to some supposed signal sacred act of gathering the water to be used for the zaoθra, 'holy water.' Its original typical occurrence was mythically supposed to have taken place at the Heavenly River, Ardvīšūr. (It should be gathered from up-stream where it is purest. Possibly some reference may have been intended to the mode of gathering, the vessels being filled by the rush of the current without further manual exertion.)

A Rubric Intervenes.

(in 23) By him (the authorised official); (here a rubric seems to begin), (the water for the *zaoθra*) is to be taken from the (other person (?), the person who receives it from the river¹) and to be given to the (next one in the proper order of the incipient ceremony, sub-official, or worshipper); and when not a single one (sub-official, or 'worshipper') comes forward (to receive it, or to witness its offering by the Priest), and when with contempt he goes on (that is, 'they go on (away from it)'), that contempt is demon-sacrifice, whereupon (the proper official) says: "This water is spoilt; and so by him (the official) by as much; (i.e. with a corresponding exactness or 'in an equal quantity'; that is to say, in the same measure as if it were not spoilt) it is to be given to him (or 'her') who is excluded (on account of some impurity)]."²

*The Yašt Resumed.**Delinquents are Excluded.*

(24) Let not our Waters be with him who is of evil thought, (that is to say, let them not be favourable to him); let not our waters be favourable to him of evil speech, or with him of evil deed, nor with him of perverted creed. (25) Let them not be with him who harms a comrade, or a friend, nor with him who harms a Magian [or a Magian-man (subordinate member of that caste)], nor with him who harms the Var (the near community), nor with him who harms his offspring.³

(26) Let not our (Waters be) with him (that is, not with such an one as is among those above described).

¹ Or possibly 'taken back' (?) from the client or 'worshipper' (?), or other officiating Priest.

² That is to say, if the *zaoθra* is contemptuously avoided, it loses its efficacy, and is fit only for a male during some ceremonial contamination, or for a female during her periods of separation.

The difficulties lie, as always, in the extreme meagreness of the diction.

³ Of the original we should more naturally say 'his kinsmen.'

The Holy Water (i.e. the River) is addressed directly.

Thou, water, who art good (that is, 'of the clean creation'), do not help him on (that is, such as he is), O thou God-made (one),¹ and holy, (27) through whom we are non-wounders,² who are complete disorganisers (lit. 'who wound') [the wealth of our settlements, (their entire system of commercial and civic economy)] ;

(28) let not our Waters be with him ; yea, do not, O Waters, good and best, and Mazda-made and holy : do not help him on (29) through whom we are defenceless (so, again ; see just above, but possibly *ārēšītār* might be read again, and as just explained in the sense of some New Persian forms in -tār, as in a past sense : 'through whom we are severely wounded,' so, more rationally),³ who wounds our bodies ('assaults our person') ; let them, the waters, not be with the thief, or bludgeon ruffian ; nor with the harmful heretic (possibly 'the religious assassin'), (30) not with the sorcerer, nor the dead-burier, nor with the one who attacks our military (literally 'assaults the youths'), nor with the niggard (the man who withholds his offerings), nor with the infidel (so, for 'the unholy persecutor'),

(31) (not with) the evil (meaning 'the irreligious') man, the tyrant.

The Waters as Avengers.

On to him ; that is to say, against him (that is, against such as these) come on, O waters, to oppose him as his tormentors, [that is, keep him back (in his endeavours) ; (let it be up-stream with him)].

¹ God, of course, is everywhere worshipped through the waters.

² There is no doubt that the person who last wrote the word meant it as a negative, see C., the Pers., so that we had better make such sense of it as we can : 'through whom we are not smiters,' i.e. 'through whom we are helpless.' Or, should we recall the Persian forms in -tār, which have the force of the past participle ; cf. *giriftār* = 'seized,' 'a slave,' so reaching *ārēšītār* as = 'badly wounded' ? Hardly. We might emend to 'effective vanquishers,' '*ārēšītār*,' but how does this idea apply ?

³ Hardly "of whom we are the deadly wounders, '*ārēšītār*.'"

(32) Wishers (īša)¹ for (our) destruction² they¹ (are) [and from Hell³ (they come), (hardly 'who are of the evil,' so, however, C., the Pers.)]. Wasters⁴ of our settlements⁵ (they are), who are (indeed) wishers⁶ for (our) destruction, and who [(are so) called]⁷ its producers.⁸

(33) O Water, (be such) ever for the rejoicing⁹ of the kine (so, totally erroneous for gātava), [that is to say, be ever for their delighting (for the freshening of their pastures)] while, that is, so long as, for thee the sacrificing (priest) may offer.

Discriminations by Question : Catechetical.

The Representative Official speaks; was he technically called a Zartūšt?

(34) (Question) How¹⁰ shall the Zaoatar (sacrifice)?

(Answer) With the inculcated forms, [that is to say, they should learn the Avesta passages by heart (literally, 'make the Avesta easy (soft) (to themselves)'),], O good waters¹¹ (thus) let him (the Zaoatar) sacrifice.¹¹

¹ īša certainly determined xvāstār; yet see valāšān as if iš = 'those' was considered, this being the early commentator's notion of an alternative translation.

² I do not see why we cannot render 'wishers who (are) destructive'; but 'destruction' is more natural.

³ I suppose that this gloss 'from Hell' was natural enough after sēj = iθeyējāo; but C., the Parsi-Pers., translates 'of the evil.'

⁴ vādūstār (A., B.).

⁵ gēhān evidently translates (i)daḍa as if it were a form of dā = d'ā.

⁶ No valāšān here as above; and there is nothing in the termination of iθeyējāo to suggest it = 'to wish'; the idea was taken from above.

⁷ Perhaps this word 'gūft' refers to the interpretation just made of 'dī daḍa.'

⁸ 'Producers' again points to dā, and in fact so I formerly rendered in S.B.E. xxxi, yō dī daḍa. Or are the adverbials to be preferred with our late venerable pioneer, von Spiegel?

⁹ I would now emend my rendering in S.B.E. xxxi in this sense, 'rejoice ye,' rather than 'rest ye.'

¹⁰ I would now correct my too severely critical rendering of 1887 here, at least alternatively. I then read these words kuθra in the higher critical sense of a mere indication of a question, but the Pahlavi, I think, on the whole, may be right, and we should render 'how.'

¹¹ So D. (M.) inserts. C., the Pers., has 'Thou, who [art] the Good Water' (i.e. those of the clean creation); D. only translates yazāite.

(35) (*Quest.*) How shall it be (when) fettered (so hit',¹ for Avesta hitō; hardly the natural 'hat' = 'if'), i.e. if he sacrifices without the prescriptions, [that is to say, with clamouring]² tongue (and not as was so often requisite with the low chanting voice) ?

(*Ans.*)

(36) (*Quest.*) How may his speech be (continued) on (so for mē'im) (that is to say, what text exactly will he follow in his recital) ?

(*Ans.*) That which has been taught him as (the correct result of) the priestly studies. [That is to say, they should perform the exact Avesta (prescriptions). The meaning is (they should intone the exact Avesta), since they do not³ use the (mere) opinions of the commentary (in their celebrations); so it should be (done).]

(37) (*Quest.*) How shall I⁴ be promoted (so mistaking bavān, which may have stood in a form little distinguishable from bavam, or else the translator corrected his text (so) with this result) [for those sacrificial deeds, if I should perform them; that is to say, how shall I be promoted (in my fortune) ?; that is, by what means may our (just) possession of property be effected (or 'our possessions be established')] ?

(*Ans.*)

(*Quest.*) How shall I be promoted (be given free course) (so, again mistaking the pl. bavān for bavam, or else 'correcting' the text with this result), [for those (sacrificial) deeds ?; if I should perform them; that is, '(how) shall I be promoted (in my fortune) ?'; that is to say, by what

¹ No one would fail to read 'hat' = 'if' at the first glance, but see hitō = 'bound.'

² C., the Pers., has 'with evident tongue,' meaning 'with a full audible voice' as against the low intoning. The latter may have been, perhaps, much as the Roman Catholic priests undertone the sacrament at times, while the people sing an appropriate hymn.

³ This seems to be genuine protest against tradition, unless we change the reading lā to rāi, and translate: 'since they would celebrate in accordance with the reserved opinions of the commentary.'

⁴ The official, the 'zartūst' of the time, speaking for the individual; or the mythical Zartūšt as in all the post-Gāthic Avesta.

means may our (just) possession (of³ means), (or 'our possessions') be established]

How shall the indebtedness (to us) be (adjusted) for those (duties) which we may perform?; [that is to say, how shall our recognising-recompense (our reward) in presence of ('among,' or 'in the opinions of') the Yazats be so effected (in accordance with these deeds)?

(in 37) That is to say, (how may the proper) benefit be so, i.e. in accordance with what is just; how may it be transferred on to us as that reward for those (deeds), that is to say, (how) may a state of indebtedness toward us be (established) among ('in the presence of,' or 'in the minds (of)') the Yazats?

(The meaning) is (this). Aparg said that every person has indebtedness among the Yazats for those sacrifices which I should do, (meaning 'which one should do'); and how (shall it, the indebtedness, be adjusted) for those sacrifices?] Shall there be a (sufficiently) liberal gift for us (on account of them)?¹; [that is to say, how may the thing(s) (meaning 'the substantial reward') be given to us (how may the matter be adjusted)?],

(38) which Aūharmazd pronounced to Zartūšt,² and Zartūšt² proclaimed within the bodily worlds,

(39) through (or 'as') the petition, which is the one before [(that part of the sacrifice) when they have not poured out all the zaoθra water], (that is, while they are in the act of this part of the ceremonial)

on up to, or with, that yaθā ahū vairyō before which is the hušiti, continuing on from the prayer for the waters (so), O Zartūšt, (perhaps meaning 'from that moment of the consecration of the waters'), then after that thou shalt offer it (the fully consecrated) Zaoθra to the water³ (in

¹ Here we have no slur upon the efficacy of 'works,' not even upon ceremonial duties. Aparg was the name of a commentator.

² Allusion to the frequent formulas of the Vendidad, which had their origin irrationally from the 'tat θvā peresā,' cf. Y. XLIV, or from some lost Gāthic piece.

³ The preposition 'av' renders aivyō as dative; but how the zaoθra-water could be offered 'to' the waters it is difficult to see. Possibly 'to the waters (?) in general' must be meant, so I have rendered it in S.B.É. xxxi. For the original an ablative might be considered.

general), the pure (Zaoθrā, as now it is), searched, [that is, examined (hardly 'tested') by the officiating priest], [that is to say, it, the newly consecrated water, (now) stands (ready) for the Chief (Priest)]; (40) and this do thou, (O Zartūšt) pronounce forth in speech (41) as follows :—

A Boon Besought.

(41) O Waters, I ask of you a boon, a great one, [and I pray for the favour (nēvakih) (of it)] this grant me for a full (mē'im) gift which is (even) better than that just mentioned (or better) than that good one give it me with a full delivery on (avaspārešnīh for nisrīti) [when its possession may be effected as an advantage (possibly 'with exactness,' lit. 'for good') and let this happen] with no superlative lying;

[let (there) be (on the contrary) a Mobadship (a thoroughly qualified official adjustment of the sacrifice and of these rewards. Or, reading mānpatīh, 'may it be a householder's sacrificial adjustment, etc.').]

The Result, Prosperity.

(42) O Water(s), I ask of you for riches [even wealth] of many kinds, [that is to say, through it (the water) there is a specimen of everything (valued) which may be within (this general state of affluence), (hardly meaning here 'everything which is interior'), and (I ask also for) a source of strength and strengthening (amāvandih); [that is to say, when wealth is great, one's éclat is from them (the waters; lit. from it = 'therefrom')].

For Offspring.

(43) (Give me), O Waters, an offspring completely efficient (or 'self-efficient') whose [offspring (this for the second farzand; the translator is here puzzled by the genitive yeñhyāo) (is one)] which many [persons¹] may hold worthy of esteem.

¹ See note at the end of 43.

[It is an efficiency with (or 'toward,' 'in presence of') the Yazats (so accentuating in view of the following words 'many men,' which may have been thought to lower the allusions), and also it is an efficiency toward men. The efficiency as regards the Yazats is this, that for them the fivefold¹ recompense of (or 'for') their active energy is established (or 'attained') when not (i.e. except when) thou hast (meaning 'except when a person has') committed original (?) sin ('the sin of combination' (?); 'of the same constitution' (?); that is to say, except when his whole character is evil, and so (except) where the entire motives are false, in which case the particular sin would be of less account as being a mere accidental manifestation of a complete depravity. The efficiency as regards the Yazats might indeed look as if the idea of 'efficient activity' were taken over by attraction from the spontaneous activity of the human being and attributed to the Yazats . . . ; but it is better to render 'toward the Yazats'; resuming . . . except when with originality (hardly 'with combination,' as 'by one out of a multitude') thou hast committed sin; for then thou art (meaning 'a person is') worthy of death (there is no hope in the ordinary course of justice for one whose whole character is defiled; he is *primâ facie* outside of the ordinary privileges of a citizen in good standing).

Then (in this latter case) their indemnification is this (i.e. it proceeds as follows): when (i.e. after that) the discriminating-investigation (of the circumstances) has been made by them (the Yazats (or 'the proper judicial officials') or again 'for them the sinners'), then (they consider them (separated, each) by himself (hardly 'they hold them (the culprits) to themselves, taking the case out of its ordinary jurisdiction'), (better; they take him the culprit by himself, judge him individually, and not as one of the multitude of original sinners); (so much for efficiency as regards the Yazats).

¹ 'Fivefold' is probably an old mistake which arose from reading *pēñdāiḡyāi* for *mēñdāiḡyāi* in the *Gāθas* (?) at Y. XLIV, 8.

The efficiency as regards men (that is to say, their general activity as amenable to the laws of men aside from the supernatural interference of the Yazats, is) this, that they (the men, the officers in charge of civil matters) who will assume punitive jurisdiction *tūješn'* (in the matter) toward persons (implicated); (literally 'they will seize upon the castigation') (which is to be allotted) to persons—also their pardoning is this, that they (the sinners) should seek it (the pardon) in accordance with (the civil authority) *pavan patih* (or that they, the civil officials, should desire to exercise this jurisdiction in pardoning as (their) prerogative (*patih*), or again possibly 'accordingly' (*pataš*)).]¹

Deprecations of harm from that Offspring.

(44) May no one desire (that is, 'pray for') misfortune for them,² [that is to say, may it not be possible to effect (the misfortune) even if desired (or if 'ardently prayed for')]³; (45) nor may (any one) (also desire) the halbert (for them), nor death, nor vengeance, nor (any) affliction⁴ (whatsoever); (46) this I ask of you, O Waters, (as a benefit), this of the Earth, and this of the plants.

(47) And this I ask of the Amesaspends, the well-ruling, [that is to say, they would exercise sovereignty with an advantage (to the governed)], the well-giving,⁵ [that is to say, they will bestow things as (real) benefits (in a beneficial

¹ Was not this whole discussion caused by the form *pōuruš*, which suggested the Indian *pūrúś* n.s.m. = 'man.' Otherwise, where does this idea of *martum*, *anšūtā* come from? It seems clear that our alternative opinion that *pōuruš* = India *pūrúś* was a rediscovery, and would have been known a half-century earlier if the Pahlavi commentary could have been read. The *kabed*, which renders *pōuruš* as = 'many,' is properly the first idea of the trlr. on the subject, with the *anšūtā* = 'men,' as the alternative; and the early scholars knew of no other way of putting in an alternative than simply to add the alternative word with no proper explanation that an alternative was intended.

² The offspring.

³ This is a very sound gloss, for the allusion to mere 'desire for misfortune' seemed naturally tame to the translator.

⁴ So for *apayatē* = -*taye* = not their 'overtaking.'

⁵ Or 'well establishing.'

manner)], they, the good males and the good females . . .¹ [that is to say, that goodness which is exercised (or 'that benefit which is given') on the part of the males or females is this;² through them also is there an] establisher (or 'supporter') of good (persons).

(48) And this I ask from the good Fravašis of the Saints, who are the heroic and victorious. [(The meaning) is that this heroism is that of a person who is a hero as regards evil,¹ the victorious one is he who when one (an adversary) comes to a place, (i.e. will assault a position), they will (that is to say, the victorious persons will) strike him (the assailant) senseless (literally 'they would render him stupefied').³ The overmastering victoriousness and the overmastering strength are both one; the strength is that whereby a person who is not⁴ in prosperous circumstances (i.e. bayen xūpih, 'in position') is befriended (-nūt, hardly meaning 'shows friendship' (-nēt) on account of a favour, (not probably 'from goodness')), the reputation, xunīdakīh (or xvētakīh(?) the genuine originality?) of the victoriousness, and the doughtiness of the doughty, and the intellectual complete information (dānākīh) of the laborious energy, the gloriousness (of all), and the wide sphere of the spontaneous activity;—every benefit (is included) within the soundly-healthy (personality (drūd)) and the consummation of all is the Afrīn (its presuppositions of correct sanctity in the priest and in the layman,—its acceptability in the presence of God and its consequent efficacy for the spiritual and

¹ 'Males and females' express as usual the gender of the names or nouns. The males allude to the non-feminine names, the females to those in the feminine gender, āramaiti, etc.; see elsewhere. The terms zakar = 'male' and vagdān = 'female' are properly not gloss, but simply fix the genders of the vague adjectives.

² One might suggest an ai'tīh (?) in the sense of existence (i.e. 'proof of?' existence'; 'that goodness is . . . (proof of?) existence as regards them.'

³ The matter here in mind is deprecation.

⁴ I read the 'lā'; but am strongly inclined to emend to rāi: 'whereby a person is befriended on account of his being in a good position.' The lā would be awkwardly placed; though as to that, we should not be too particular here, as the texts are disarranged by an attempt to follow the order of the original.

temporal status of the suppliant who prays for the above justification).

(Where) strong fleetness (zavar = zavarē) is referred to, it is in the feet¹ (as swift and strong to move in the path of duty); (where) strength (in general, aōj, is mentioned, it is) in the arm; and the whole one refers to the splendour, the cleverness, the swift energy, and the ascendant capacity (avarkārih) of the (entire) person (tan').]²

(49) And this I pray for of Mitr' (Miθra) of the wide pastures, [that is to say, he is of the wide pastures because he maintains the meadow-reaches (in) comfort and fertility (hardly, 'I beseech of him that he may maintain . . .', etc.)]; (50) this I beseech from Srōš the holy, the stately, [that is to say, he has grown stately in uprightness³], (51) this from Rašn' the most just [that is to say, the pure³],

(52) this from the Fire (Ātaχš), Aūharmazd's son, (53) this from Būrz (Bereja), the sovereign (Lady),⁴ [the brilliant one of women], and this from Apām Napāt of the swift horses,⁵ (54) and this I beseech from all the Yazats who are beneficent and holy; (55) and this, O Water, do thou give me; this, O Earth; this, O Plants. [(The texts as written above (avar) from 46 to ašavanō are here to be repeated twice.)]

(56) And what also may be larger than that (the foregoing) [as regards body (bodily dimensions)], and what may be better than it [as regards understanding], and what may be more beautiful than that [to view], and what may be more superlatively valuable (in it);

(57) so (in like manner) do ye give (us), O ye holy Yazats,

¹ Possibly having the etymology in view.

² These distinctions between abstract terms remind one of the feeble Aristotelianism which lingered in Persia possibly as the effects of the visit of Simplicius.

³ Notice the ever-present attempt to maintain a deep moral and religious tone on the part of the glossist, and so throughout the entire Pahlavi Yasna.

⁴ χšaθrya.

⁵ The Lightning.

(58) a sovereign who a supplicator (lit. a wisher), swift (?)¹

(59) yea, grant me, ye holy creatures of Ahura, (an offspring) quick from (that is to say, 'ready upon') the occasion² (so *gās* here hardly renders *gāθvya* in the sense of *Gāθic*; *gatu* was seen in it, and I would so emend my former rendering) [and (one) in accordance with the occasion; that is, according to what is not³ (?) so A.] needed (or 'prayed for'), and according to what is (on the contrary) urgently (*barā*) needed, for ye are very able (lit. more able) to give (gifts) to men.

(60) (Yea, do ye) as those who work or 'act' obviously upon a prayer (that is to say, who sincerely and openly desire to meet our wishes; literally 'manifest workers to wish') (do ye do) what is most promotive of (our) desire, [that is to say, (cause) the reward of every person for his duty (done) and for his good works (to be) given without any restriction; i.e. most promotively (*frāztūm*)].

(61) Yea; give me [the reward and the recompense], Thou who art the Maker of the Herds (as above mentioned in regard to the Prosperity desired), and Creator of the Waters (see everywhere above), O *Aūharmazd*, Thou art, O most August Spirit; and deathless Long Life (that is, what

¹ The word *mošuča* seems to be translated only in C., the Parsi-Pers., and with *tīz*; perhaps it was omitted in the other MSS. because the sense of 'swift' was also seen in *āsuyā-*, and rendered by the mere indication of the root *su* + the frequent closing consonant -k, as in *vohu-k*, etc. With the sensible, but somewhat erroneous, text of C., the Parsi-Pers., we might have: 'a King who may be a desirer for our immediate (swift (*tīz*)) advantage *sūd(sūt)*,' so representing the -*su*- in *āsuyā*, erroneously of course. With the text of B. (D., Pt. 4) one might possibly (?) have: 'grant me a sovereign who is supplicant (lit. 'wisher,' so for *isanō*) from Heaven (?) sag, the stony Heaven).' With all the texts in view except that of C., the Parsi-Pers., which commits itself to *sūt(sūd)* = 'advantage, profit' as the idea lurking in *āsuyā* (?), it is better, as already said, to regard the peculiar form *suk* (?) as merely an indication of the root idea in the word; that is, as merely *su* + *k*.

² Or quite possibly, as in the *Ātaχš* chapter, 'an offspring quick from the couch.' Regard this as an alternative.

³ (So A.) *abavihūnasť*; but with the texts *bavihūnasť*, so B. (D., Pt. 4), we should have: 'and according to what is prayed and to what is hardly (so for *barā* as in the negative sense) prayed for.' Or, again, 'according to what is prayed for, and still more emphatically (so *barā* in this sense) prayed for'; unless *vača* is included in *bavihūnasť*, I do not see where it is rendered.

we term Immortality (Ameretatāt) and Healthful Weal (Haurvatāt), [(their) Maker Thou art]; grant (these all) through the teaching of Vohuman.¹

¹ Searching critics will have inquired throughout "why in this somewhat fervid section, not to say in this Yašt, all the appeals are made to the sacred objects of nature, with no direct mention of Ahura?" We see now the reason. All are addressed as the creations of Ahura in this verse from the Gāthas which sums up the chapter: nay, as we understand it, the entire chapter, being founded upon Yasna LI, 7, etc., is only an expansion of it; the nature-worship involved is entirely absorbed in the Mazda-worship; and so everywhere in Avesta.

XXVII.

SOME COINS OF THE MAUKHARIS, AND OF THE
THANESAR LINE.

By R. BURN.

THE history of the sixth century in Northern India is extremely difficult. As the Gupta empire fell to pieces petty states arose, of which but scanty records are available in the few inscriptions so far discovered. A recent find of coins seems to throw fresh light on the period, and in particular to afford material for fixing dates more exactly than has been possible hitherto.

In 1904 a labourer found an earthen pot of coins in the village of Bhitāura, *pargana* Amsin, District Fyzabad (Oudh). So far as is known, the whole of the coins, including one gold, 522 silver, and eight copper, were recovered. The following is a description of these coins :—

1. *A. Obverse.* King. Under left arm *Kidāra*.
Reverse. Goddess. Right margin *Kṛta(vīrya)*.

The coin resembles that figured in Cunningham's later Indo-Scythians (Little Kushāns), plate vi, No. 11, and described at p. 72.

2. *A.* Three very poor *varāha* *drammas* (cf. Cunn., *Mediæval India*, vi, 20) and a broken coin of uncertain type.

3. *Æ* (or a mixture). Eight copper coins of Pratāpāditya II of Kashmīr (cf. Cunn., *Mediæval India*, iii, 10).

4. The remaining 518 silver coins are of the Gupta silver type; that is, they bear a large head with a date on one side, and a peacock on the other with a long inscription. On seven coins the head faces the right, as on the Gupta coins, while on the others it faces the left. The inscriptions

round the peacock, in every case but one, which will be referred to later, read *Vijitāvaniravanipati Śrī* (name) *deva jayati*. The vowels are only marked in a few types. A summary of the names read on the coins is given below :—

	Number of Coins.
Īśānavarman	9
Śarvavarman	6
Avantivarman	17
(?) Harśa (not Harṣa)	1
Pratāpśīla	9
Śilāditya	284
	<hr/>
	326

The coins of Śarvavarman bear a head facing right, while on the others the head faces left.

The remaining coins may be classified as follows :—

Coins with names and dates both gone	134
Coins with names gone, and only faint traces of dates	57
	<hr/>
	191

The head on these faces left, and there is one more coin with name and date gone on which the head faces right. A more particular description of the coins may now be given.

Īśānavarman. As usual the name is written 'श्रीशानवर्म', the initial being merged in the title श्री. One coin bears a date which I read as 4x, but even the tens figure is doubtful. The head of the peacock is turned to the left on four coins and to the right on five. The portrait shows a face with a strongly-marked aquiline nose, and there is a small crescent at the crown of the head. (Pl. 1 and 2.)

Sarvavarman. Name written श्रीशर्ववर्म. Two coins bear dates which I read as 234 and 23-. The face is to right, and the reading of 200 is thus not quite certain, as the mark denoting the number of hundreds which stands at the right of the symbol is not on the coin. This point will be referred

to later. The peacock faces to right on all the coins. The king's head has the usual crescent at the crown, which also seems to contain a dot. (Pl. 3 and 4.)

Avantivarman. Name written श्रीवन्तिवर्म. Three distinct dates are found, viz., (a) 250 (one coin), (b) 57 (five coins), (c) 71 (one coin). The peacock's head is to left on all but two of the coins dated 57. Where the crescent is distinct on the king's head, it has a dot also. There are also six coins on which the dates are very doubtful, and four from which they have disappeared. The peacock faces left on all of these but one. (Pl. 5-8.)

Doubtful king: (?) Harśa. The inscription begins *Vijitavanir* and seems to end . . . *harśa*. I cannot make out the date, but it probably commences with the letter *sa* (= *saṃvat*, see below, coins of Śilāditya). (Pl. 9.)

Pratāpaśīla. Name written अप्रतपश्ल without vowels. The peacock's head is to left on all nine coins. The crescent on the king's head is about the centre of the top instead of at the crown, and each horn terminates in a knob. Two coins have dates, the reading of which presents a certain amount of difficulty. Each date consists of three symbols. The topmost is the letter *sa*, exactly of the type given in Bühler's table iv, Nos. xi and xii. One would ordinarily expect this to represent the hundreds as the other symbols are apparently 10 and 1 or 11. The only symbol for a number which resembles *sa* is, however, that used for 40, and I cannot find any symbol for hundreds which is at all like this letter. The coins of Śilāditya described below show clearly that the *sa* cannot be 40. This will be referred to later, but at present it is sufficient to say that I consider the *sa* stands for *saṃvat*. Four coins bear traces of dates which I cannot decipher, and three coins have lost all vestige. (Pl. 10-13.)




Śilāditya. The name is usually written श्रीश्लदत, vowels being very rarely given. On a few coins the final *akshara* is more clearly *tya*, the form varying between (1) ढ, (2) ण, (3) ण, and (4) ॡ. The crescent on the head has also

various forms and positions: (1) at the crown, either (a) plain or (b) with knobs on the points, and (2) in the centre of the top of the head, with knobs and usually a dot in the centre. The dates on many of the coins are varied and present considerable difficulty, as the symbols differ from the ordinary form. There can, however, be absolutely no doubt that the highest symbol is invariably *sa*, as on the coins of Pratāpaśīla, and the symbols for 30 + 1 and 30 + 3 are unmistakable. I think that *sa* stands for *saṃvat*, and the years are regnal years. The coins may be classified as follows:—

	COINS.
(1) Date 1 (?). Crescent at crown with knobs . . .	1
(2) Date 6 (?). Crescent in middle of head . . .	4
(3) Date 6 (?). <i>-tya = 3</i>	1
(4) Date 6 (?). Crescent nearer crown	5
(5) Date 10 (?). The symbol for date does not resemble any of those given in Bühler's table, but it might conceivably be a compound of <i>la</i> and <i>ta</i> , which are apparently used for 10. Crescent at crown. <i>-tya = 7</i> , the <i>ya</i> being marked by a very slight elongation of the right limb of <i>ta</i>	8
(6) Date 10 (?). As on the preceding, but <i>-tya = 7</i> . . .	2
(7) Date 20 (?). The symbol resembles those given by Bühler, but the top is open instead of closed, and it may be a defective form of the symbol read as 10	6
(8) Date 25 (?). Symbol read as 20 is more like the forms given by Bühler than the preceding. The coin appears to be of copper silvered over	1
(9) Date 30 (?). Crescent at crown (3) and on top of head (1)	4
(10) Date 31 (?). Crescent at crown	3
(11) Date 31. There is no doubt about this date. The crescent is almost invariably at the crown. Only two coins show any vestige of a final <i>ya</i> (Pl. 14)	24
(12) Date 33. This is also certain. The crescent is at the top of the head, and there is no sign of <i>ya</i> . The inscriptions are generally poor (Pl. 15)	27

- (13) Date 33. Name gone 3
 (14) Date 3—. Symbol for 30 is fairly certain, but the unit is gone or doubtful in every case . . . 14
 (15) Dates for which I can propose no readings . . . 11
 (16) The second letter of the name reads *ha* instead of *la*. This is probably the engraver's error . . . 2

The remaining coins have no dates legible, but may be roughly classified as follows :—

	COINS.
(17) The symbol <i>sa</i> is fairly clear	36
(18) <i>-tya</i> written 	2
(19) <i>-tya</i> written  . Crescent with knobs at crown . . .	3
(20) <i>-tya</i> written  . Crescent with dot, at top of head . . .	6
(21) <i>-tya</i> as on preceding, but crescent at crown . . .	4
(22) <i>-tya</i> as on 20 and 21, but crescent with dot at crown . . .	2
(23) Crescent at crown (Pl. 16)	52
(24) Crescent with knobs and dot at top of head (Pl. 17) . . .	27
(25) Crescent with knobs at crown (Pl. 18)	12
(26) Crescent doubtful	24

The first point to notice in discussing the results to be obtained from these coins is that the names Avantivarman, Pratāpaśīla, and Śīlāditya are now published on coins for the first time. The only coins of Śarvavarman known hitherto bear a head to left instead of to right. There can be no doubt that Avantivarman is the Maukhari ruler of that name. It also seems reasonable to identify Pratāpaśīla with Prabhākara-vardhana, and Śīlāditya with Harṣa-vardhana. The absence of coins of the last-named has for long been a difficulty, and the attribution to him by Dr. Hoernle of a peculiar gold coin does not seem quite satisfactory. If my readings of the dates are correct, the coins are especially valuable, and point to the establishment of a new era. The dates we have for the calculation of this era are as follows :—

Toramāṇa : 52 (Cunn, *Med. India*, p. 20).

Īśānavarman : 54 (Cunn., *Med. India*, ii, 12, and V. A. Smith in *J.A.S.B.*, 1894, p. 193) ; 55 (Cunn., *A.S.R.*, ix, p. 27, where name is read as Śānti Varma).

Śarvavarman : 58 (V. A. Smith, l.c.); 234 and 23- (present find).

Avantivarman : 57, 71, and 250 (present find).

There can be little doubt that the dates 234, 23-, and 250 are in the Gupta era, and thus equivalent to 553, 54- or 55-, and 569. It has generally been assumed that the dates 52, 54, 55, and 58 were in the same era, and this era has been the subject of considerable discussion, a summary of which will be found in Mr. V. A. Smith's paper on the Gupta period in J.A.S.B. for 1894, pp. 194-5 and 209. It is assumed that Toramāṇa's coins are dated in a "White Hun era," commencing about 448 according to Drouin, or 456-7 according to Cunningham. The initial date is checked by a variety of considerations which require the reign of Toramāṇa, the father of Mihirakula, to be dated about 500 A.D. The synchronism now afforded by the coins seems to point to one of two alternatives. Either the date on Toramāṇa's coins is in a different era from that of the Maukharis, or else this Toramāṇa is not the father of Mihirakula. The latter supposition is by no means improbable, as the same name was sometimes held by a grandfather and grandson, but I know of no other mention of a king called Toramāṇa. A more definite suggestion can be made with regard to the Maukhari era. It is agreed by all that the rulers of this line must be placed in the sixth century, and this fixes the dates on Śarvavarman's coins as 200 odd of the Gupta era. A comparison of the dates given in the Maukhari era with those given in the Gupta era points to the commencement of the former about 500 A.D. The great probability of a new era commencing from about that date appears to have escaped notice, but I would point out that Āryabhaṭa composed his great astronomical work in 499 A.D., when exactly 3,600 years of the Kaliyuga had elapsed. Dr. Thibaut, to whose volume on Astronomy, etc., in Bühler's Grundriss (p. 55) reference should be made, informs me that he considers it by no means improbable that Āryabhaṭa actually invented the Kaliyuga, in the sense that he fixed its definite

period, though the epoch was already familiarly recognised in a vague way. Whether this is so or not his work was important, and the completion of 3,600 years brought so prominently to notice was obviously a suitable point for the commencement of a new era. Assuming this, the known dates of the Maukharis become in the Christian era—

Īśānavarman, 553.

Śarvavarman, 553, 54- or 55-, 557.

Avantivarman, 556, 569, 570.

It will be noticed that Śarvavarman's and Avantivarman's dates overlap, and it is possible that what I have read as 57 for the latter should be 67.¹

The epigraphic references to the Maukharis will be found in Dr. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, Nos. 47, 51, and 46. From the two former the following genealogical tree has been compiled :—

Mahārāja Harivarman = Jayaswāmini	
Mahārāja Ādityavarman = Harṣagupta	
Mahārāja Īśvaravarman = Upagupta	
Mahārājādhirāja Īśānavarman = Lakshmīvatī	
Mahārājādhirāja Śarvavarman = ?	

It will be noticed that the earliest coins yet found are of Īśānavarman, who is the first to be styled Mahārājādhirāja. Avantivarman is only referred to in Dr. Fleet's inscription, No. 46, where he is called Parameshwara, a title also applied to Śarvavarman. From that inscription it may be inferred that he followed Śarvavarman, but no later limit can be assigned for his reign, except that he preceded Jīvita Gupta II, who was in power about the beginning of the eighth century. Dr. Fleet's inscription No. 42 records that Kumāra Gupta (II) conquered Īśānavarman. I would suggest that the different arrangement of the head on the

¹ Cf., for the difficulty in settling these dates, Dr. Fleet in *Indian Antiquary*, 1885, p. 68.

coins now found is connected with the relations between the Maukharis and the later Guptas. The same inscription records that Dāmodara Gupta, son of Kumāra Gupta II, also defeated a Maukhari king. The earlier coins of Śarvarman, now published, bear a head to right as on the Gupta coins, and are dated in the Gupta era, both points indicating that the Maukharis still recognised the Guptas as their suzerains. The later coin, published by Mr. Vincent Smith, uses the Maukhari era, and bears a head to left like the coins of Īśānavarman. Avantivarman's coins all bear a head to left, but the use of the Gupta era may indicate a temporary subjection or alliance.

Beyond the fact that their coins are now published for the first time nothing new is to be learnt about Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣavardhana from this find. The era of the latter is well known, but it is of interest to know that the former also used an era which in all probability was regnal.

LIST OF COINS REPRESENTED IN THE PLATE.

1. Īśānavarman: date 4x; head of peacock to left.
 2. „ date uncertain; head of peacock to right.
 3. Śarvarman: date 234.
 4. „ date 23x.
 5. Avantivarman: date 250.
 6. „ date 57; head of peacock to left.
 7. „ date 57; head of peacock to right
 8. „ date 71.
 9. Doubtful king: (?) Harśa.
 - 10-13. Pratāpaśīla: traces of dates.
 14. Śīlāditya: date 31.
 15. „ date 33.
 16. „ date uncertain; crescent at crown.
 17. „ date uncertain; crescent with knobs and dot at top of head.
 18. „ date uncertain; crescent with knobs at crown.
-

XXVIII.

AN UNIDENTIFIED MS. BY IBN AL-JAUZI,

IN THE LIBRARY OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM,

ADD. 7,320.

By H. F. AMEDROZ.

THE Arabic MS. Add. 7,320, Cat. cccvii, is unidentified.

It is a historical fragment beginning with the necrology of the year 58 A.H., and extending to the succession of Ma'mūn in 198 A.H. It contains 162 folios of 23 lines to the page: there is an omission at fol. 49^a, l. 10, where the narrative passes suddenly from the notice of Anas b. Mālik, under 92 A.H., to the killing of the poet Waddāh al-Yaman by Walid (as told in the Kitāb al-Aghāni, vi, 39, l. 9, a.f.), and at fol. 101 comes a gap of 23 years, the text breaking off in the midst of the obituary notice of the Caliph Saffāh, and resuming on fol. 102 in that of the poet Hammād al-Rāwiya, in a story on him by al-Dāraqutni (Brockelmann, i, 165) quoted from his Kitāb al-Taṣḥīḥ (H. Kh.², No. 9,975). Thence the text proceeds uninterruptedly to the point where it breaks off early in the year 198 A.H.

An examination of the MS. points to its being certainly the work of Ibn al-Jauzi, and probably a fragment of one recension of the "Muntazam." In form it resembles that work, being a record of the events in each successive year, followed by a necrology, some years containing the necrology alone, preceded in one or two cases by a statement of there being nothing to record.

First, as to the authorship. One of Ibn al-Jauzi's historical works is the "Shudhūr al-'Uqūd" (Brock. i, 502, No. 4),

which is cited in the Biographies of Ibn Khallikān, in many cases for dates which are at variance with those generally received. Such of these citations as fall within the years covered by the B.M. MS. are to be found therein.¹ Again, the notices of the reign of the Caliph 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz and of his death (MS. fols. 58*b* and 64*b*) comprise three lengthy anecdotes which are not to be found in Ṭabari, nor in Mas'ūdi's account of 'Omar in vol. v, nor in the full life of him given by Suyūṭi in his history of the Caliphs, transl. Jarrett, 233. But they are all three given, and in identical language, in Ibn al-Jauzi's 'Manāqib 'Omar, ed. C. H. Becker, Berlin, 1900, pp. 77-9, 100-1, 139-42. This also points to the B.M. MS. containing a work of this author.²

Next as to the identity of the work. The citations by Ibn Khallikān might suggest that it is the *Shudhūr al-'Uqūd*, but this work is extant. There is a copy in the Collection of the Royal Academy, Amsterdam (de Jong, Cat. Codd. Orient. Acad. Reg., No. 102), now for some time past deposited at Leyden.³ In the opening words of the manuscript

¹ These citations are: (1) that Wāṣit was built by Hajjāj between 75 and 78 A.H., instead of 84-86 A.H. (ed. Būlāq, i, 155; Sl. Eng. i, 360), in the MS. fol. 34*a*; (2) that the death of Farazdaq, as also of Jarir, occurred in 111 A.H., and not in some other year (ib. ii, 265; Sl. Eng. iii, 622), MS. 73*b*; (3) that Khalil b. Aḥmad, author of the 'Ain, died in 130 A.H., an error for 170 A.H., or some such date (ib. i, 217; Sl. Eng. i, 497), MS. 8*a*; (4) the date 135 A.H. for the death of Rabi'a al-'Adawiyya, given elsewhere as 185 A.H. (ib. i, 227; Sl. Eng. i, 516), MS. 97*a*; (5) the account of Aḥmad al-Sabtī, the son of Rashīd, who renounced his rank for a life of humble toil, which account, Ibn Khallikān says, is to be found also in the "Ṣafwat al-Ṣafwa" of Ibn al-Jauzi, and also in his "Muntazam" (ib. i, 66; Sl. Eng. i, 149), MS. 132*a*, where it corresponds verbatim; (6) the interval there was between the birth of 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Ḥashimī and that of his brother, and how Rashīd had three generations of uncles in his presence together (ib. i, 372; Sl. Eng. ii, 143), MS. 134*a*, verbatim, with changed order of paragraphs; (7) that Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan and al-Kisā'i died at al-Rayy on the same day in 189 A.H. (ib. i, 147; Sl. Eng. ii, 238), MS. 147*a*, the statement that the former died at Zanbarwaih being there omitted.

² Another slight indication of authorship is afforded by a citation in Ibn Khallikān, ed. Būlāq, i, 237, Sl. Eng. i, 534, from the Tanwīr al-Ghabash of Ibn al-Jauzi (Broek. i, 505, No. 75), of a saying of Abu Dulāma at the burial of a wife of Manṣūr. This saying does not appear in the MS. of the *Shudhūr al-'Uqūd* (as to which see *infra*), but it is given in the B.M. MS. at fol. 108*a*, and more fully than in the citation of Ibn Khallikān.

³ This MS. Willm. No. 174, dated 685 A.H., contains 152 folios of 11 short lines to the page, and extends from the Creation to 578 A.H. The Leyden MS. Warn. 1,008 (Cat. No. 755, Revised Cat. No. 833) contains only the opening portion of the former, that relating to angels and prophets.

the author states it to be an abridgment of his "Muntaẓam." In form it is highly condensed, the record of many a year comprising but a single fact or death, but it contains all the above citations by Ibn Khallikān, that relating to 'Abd al-Šamad appearing verbatim, whilst in the case of Aḥmad al-Sabtī only the bare fact of his death is stated. But for his life Ibn Khallikān cites equally the *Muntaẓam*. To the British Museum MS., assuming it to be the *Muntaẓam*, the Amsterdam MS. might, having regard to the similarity of contents, well stand as an abridgment, except that in the latter are included many deaths not noticed in the former. But the *Muntaẓam* is likewise, in part, extant, and two manuscripts which I have examined include portions of the work which cover to some extent the period of the B.M. MS. These are (1) the Bodleian MS. Pocock, 255 (Cat. Uri, No. 779, p. 171), for the years 96-136 A.H.; and (2) two fragments included in the B.M. MS. Add. 5,928 (Cat. No. 353), a collection of historical odds and ends, of which the fourth and ninth excerpts, at fols. 99*a* and 226*b*, are from the *Muntaẓam*.¹ A comparison of these two MSS. with B.M. Add. 7,320 shows that, although neither the historical narratives nor the biographies in the latter accord with the *Muntaẓam*, yet that in many cases the biographies correspond exactly but for the omission in Add. 7,320 of the 'Isnāds' and of some historical matter, which is mostly to be found verbatim in Ṭabari. The MS. may therefore be the *Muntaẓam*, either in a somewhat abridged form or in an earlier recension.² For it is not

¹ These excerpts are described in the catalogue as beginning, one with the year 33 A.H., and the other with the reign of Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik, viz. 86 A.H., but in each case, after a few lines given to those years, and a few biographies, the narrative passes abruptly to the reign of Rashīd.

² The Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi, in the "Mir'at al-Zamān" (B.M. Add. 23,277), twice quotes the *Muntaẓam*; on fol. 115*a*, for the death in 99 A.H. of Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Ṭalha, *محمداً بمضى ودفن باستنيل الساعة*, adding that Ibn Sa'd and al-Zubair b. Bakkār put his death later (as is implied also in Ṭab. ii, 1483): the date and words are given in Add. 7,320, 62*a*; again, on fol. 179*a*, for the death of Sukaina bint al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī, on a certain day of the month in 117 A.H., at Mecca: in Add. 7,320, 81*a*, the day is thus specified, but not the place, which may have been dropped out by the scribe.

only probable that more than one recension of the *Muntaẓam* was current, it is certain. The Berlin MS. of the work, Ahlwardt, No. 9,436, and the Schefer MS., Paris Arabe, No. 5,909, overlap to the extent of some years, and they differ in the presence or absence of some of their respective biographies. Similarly, in the case of the *Mir'āt al-Zamān* of the Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzi, more than one recension has reached us. For the matter contained in the B.M. MS. Or. 4,619, covering the years 282–460 A.H., is considerably exceeded in bulk by the corresponding parts of the Schefer MS., Paris Arabe, No. 5,866, of the Munich MS. Arab. 378c,¹ and of Paris Arabe, No. 1,506 (which together form an almost uninterrupted record for the years 358–517 A.H.), not by reason of the narrative being unabridged, but owing to added matter, drawn probably from authorities to which the author had later access. It may well be, therefore, that the B.M. MS. Add. 7,320 represents an early recension of the *Muntaẓam*.

But whatever be its title, as the work of Ibn al Jauzi the MS. is of high authority, and some information as to its contents may prove of value to students. How such information should be offered is not immediately obvious. An edition of the text, apart from the obstacles to such a task, would in a measure be superfluous. Much of the historical narrative is a mere repetition of Ṭabari, and much of the biographies, especially of the many poets noticed therein, is to be found in very similar language in the *Kitāb al-Aghāni*,² and these two great sources of Moslem history,

¹ This MS. is unidentified by the Catalogue (Suppt., No. 952, p. 157), but I have endeavoured elsewhere to show that it is a part of the *Mir'āt al-Zamān* (see J.R.A.S., 1905, p. 476 n.).

² Ṭabari is quoted by name in the latter part of the MS. for the manner of Hādī's death and for the Barmecides, and Abū'l-Faraj al-Iṣṭahānī for lines by al-Sayyid al-Himyari (Agh. vii, 23, l. 11) and for the sale of his Qur'ān by Salm al-Khasir (Agh. xxi, 110, l. 10). Other authors quoted by name are: Jāhiz; Ibn Qutaiba's "Ma'ārif," on fol. 37b, for the passage ed. Wüst., 265, l. 2, and his "Ṭabaqāt al-Shu'arā" for the passage ed. de Goeje, p. 490, on the heresy of the 'Ḥammādūn' poets; Ibn abī Ṭāhir Ṭaufūr, on fol. 97b, for the dream of Manṣūr's mother that she would give birth to a lion; Abū Bakr al-Sūli, frequently; Aḥmad b. Kāmil (Ibn Shajara), on fol. 87a, for Walid's shooting at the Qur'ān, Agh. vi, 125, l. 8; and, latest in date, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamadhānī, on fol. 47a, for Ma'mūn. This author died in 521 A.H., in the lifetime of Ibn al-Jauzi.

both now completed by an Index, could at most gain from such repetition an occasional emendation of their text. Numerous passages of the MS. occur, too, in Mas'ūdi's "Prairies d'or," and in the Biographies of Ibn Khallikān, the contents of which are equally accessible, and many of the anecdotes are to be found in printed works of 'Adab' literature. A precedent for editing the text of a MS., with the omission of so much of it as is already in print, is to be found in Becker's "Manāqib 'Omar," already mentioned; and it seemed possible to follow this method whilst presenting, not the text of the MS., but merely an outline of its contents sufficient to indicate what part of it is not readily to be got at elsewhere, that is to say, a brief abstract of so much of the historical matter as seems to add to, or differ from, the accepted narrative, and a list of the persons whose deaths are recorded, with so much of what is told of them as does not appear in their biographies elsewhere. To do this adequately would require a knowledge of Arabic history and literature to which I cannot pretend, but I have, at least, not failed to turn when possible to those possessed of such knowledge for assistance, as Professors at two seats of learning will readily and, let us assume, cheerfully, acknowledge. Some errors will thus, at least, have been avoided. The following pages deal with the historical matter in the MS.

60 A.H.

(fol. 5a) Mu'āwīa's last advice and Yazīd's accession are given as in Ṭabari, ii, 196-7; (fol. 8a) the notice of Mu'āwīa's illness and death, as Ṭab. 200-2, and how Yazīd's daughter 'Ātika, by her marriage with 'Abd al-Malik, became related to as many as twelve Caliphs, viz. all from Mu'āwīa onwards, with the exception of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz.¹ Traditions were transmitted by Yazīd from the Prophet through his father Mu'āwīa, but Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal rejected them.

¹ 'Ātika's unique position in the Omayyad pedigree is noticed by al-Tha'ālibī (d. 429 A.H., Brockelmann, i, 284) in his "Laṭā'if al-Ma'ārif," ed. de Jong, 55, and he instances also that of Zubaida, granddaughter of Manṣūr, wife of Rashīd,

(fol. 5*b*) The suspicious conduct of Ḥusain and of Ibn al-Zubāir, Ṭab. ii, 216-20, 222.

(fol. 6*b*) The disaffection at Kūfa, ib. 227-30, 231-5.

(fol. 8*a*) The advice given to Ḥusain and his march to Karbalā', ib. 273-81.

61 A.H.

(fols. 9*a*-12*b*) The defeat and death of Ḥusain, less fully than in Ṭab. It is stated (fol. 12*a*) that when the camel which bore heads of the slain was killed for food, its flesh proved more bitter than aloes. As to the head of Ḥusain, according to Muḥammad b. Sa'd (fol. 12*b*), it was sent by Yazid to the governor of Medina and buried there near the tomb of Fāṭima, but according to Ibn abi-l-Dunyā (d. 208, Brock., i, 153) it was found in Yazid's treasury and was buried at Damascus near the Bāb-al-Farādīs. Also (fol. 13*a*) that on the day of Ḥusain's death Ibn 'Abbās had a vision of the Prophet, dishevelled and dust-stained, bearing a bottle in which he said he had collected the blood of Ḥusain and of his followers.

63 A.H.

The account of the revolt of Medina against Yazid' and the battle of al-Ḥarrā follows Ṭab. ii, 405.

In disclaiming from the pulpit allegiance to Yazid, 'Abd Allah b. abi 'Amr said: "I throw him off as I do my turban; true, he has been a friend to me, but he is an enemy to Allah." Another said: "I throw him off like my slipper," and the heap of turbans and slippers grew apace. After the battle a woman told the victorious general that her son was among the prisoners. By his order he was brought

and mother to Amīn, quoting a saying on her by Abu-l-'Ainā (Ibn Khall., de Sl. Eng. iii, 56), that her hair, loosened, would attach solely to Caliphs and their heirs designate. Again, on the marriage of Fāṭima, daughter of 'Abd al-Malik, to 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, the 'Qubba' was inscribed with the verse:

بنت الخليفة والخليفة جدما: اخت الخلائف الخليفة عليها

which, according to al-Zubair b. Bakkār, was applicable only to her, for Yazid b. Mu'awia being her maternal grandfather, no less than thirteen Caliphs came within the prohibited degree of marriage (Mir'at al-Zamān, op. cit., 138*b*).

to her and his head struck off, the general ordering it to be given to her and saying: "Are you not satisfied at having your own life spared, but must also be interceding for your son?"¹

Khālīd al-Kindi relates (fol. 14*b*), as a result of the presence of black soldiery in Medina after the battle, that his aunt Umm al-Haitham b. Yazīd, seeing a Quraish woman meet and embrace a black, was told by her that he was her son by one of these soldiers, and according to Hishām b. Hassān, one thousand women of the tribe bore illegitimate offspring after the battle; cf. Fakhri, ed. Derenbourg, 126. Another of these soldiers named 'Amr, who had once arrived at Medina in a caravan from Yemen to Syria so ill that it was proposed to leave him for dead, and who had been saved and sent home cured, was now recognised by a servant of the family as 'Amr; and he, hearing that his benefactor was among those killed, told his comrades that the family was affluent and worth pillaging. His name passed into a byword for ingratitude at Medina.²

64 A.H.

(fol. 15*b*) On the occasion of the burning of the Ka'ba at the siege of Mecca (Ṭab. 426-7) a Quraish woman's funeral was largely followed, in the hope of averting any judgment by reason of the calamity; and Ibn al-Zubair prayed that the consequences might be visited on himself and not on the people." On their return he reminded them that whilst their own dwellings were kept in repair the Ka'ba was in ruins, and he proceeded to have it demolished to its foundations, and rebuilt it with the assistance of Persian and Byzantine workmen; cf. Mas'ūdi, v, 193, and Ibn al-Athīr, iv, 170. The plague at Baṣra (dated 65 A.H., Ṭab. 579) is said to

1. اما نرضين ان لا تُقتلى حتى تكلمى في ابىك¹.

² انت اقل شكراً من عمرو. The authority is the benefactor's son, Abu Bakr b. Ibrāhīm b. Nu'aim al-Najjām.

have carried off 76,000 persons daily for three days. A survivor related that when the burying of the dead became impossible, the houses where they lay were blocked up. On reopening one of these later, a male child was discovered alive having been suckled by a bitch. The plague is dated, alternatively, in 67 A.H.

The accession of Marwān and the battle of Marj Rāhiṭ, Ṭab. 467-70 and 481-2, and (fol. 16*a*) the Shī'a revolt at Kūfa to avenge Ḥusain, ib. 497. Marwān's short-lived predecessor, Mu'āwīa b. Yazīd, is commended for having refused the request of his mother, Umm Hāni bint Hishām b. 'Uqba b. Rabī'a, that he would name his brother Khālīd to succeed him, saying that he would not be swayed by affection.¹

65 A.H.

(fol. 17*b*) The circumstances of the death of Marwān are told rather more fully than Ṭab. 577; cf. Mas. v, 206. 'Ali said of him that he would attain power unlawfully and at an advanced age, and that his reign would be short.² There is also a story of a poetic contest between him and Ibn al-Zubair in the presence of 'Ā'isha.

66 A.H.

(fol. 19*a*) Mukhtār, on the occasion of his revolt at Kūfa (Ṭab. 598-606), is described as asking a traditionist, in return for an ample reward, to forge a tradition from the Prophet that he was to be Caliph, and was to avenge his descendant (i.e. Ḥusain). The man replied, from the Prophet, no, but from any one of the Ṣaḥāba he chose; for, although the Prophet's authority would no doubt be the

¹ لا احملها حتى وصيا.

² ليحملن راية ضلالة بعد ما تشيب صدته وله اميرة كلسمجة (كلسمجة).

كلعقة الكلب. In Fakhri, ed. Ahl., 144, ed. Der., 165, it is الكلب ايفه.

For the simile see Lisān, viii, 89, l. 10.

weightier, yet so would be his punishment for the forgery. That Mukhtār did forge a letter from Ibn al-Ḥanaḥfiyya (Muḥammad b. 'Alī) approving his proceedings, is stated. For a full account of this, cf. al-Akḥbār al-Ṭiwāl, ed. Guirgass, 1888, pp. 297-8.

67 A.H.

The killing of Mukhtār is recorded. He is said to have pretended that he received visits from Jibrīl and Mikā'il, and to have once told a follower that he would have given him a cushion, but that his brother Jibrīl had just risen from it. For this speech the man said he would have killed him, but for a tradition from the Prophet that a Moslem who killed another in violation of his word would forfeit his protection.¹

71 A.H.

(fol. 24a) The Caliph 'Abd al-Malik's hesitation as to attacking Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubair, Ṭab. 805; his wife 'Ātika's attempt to dissuade him, as Agh. viii, 35, and Ibn Khall., *sub* "Kuthayyir," i, 548, Sl. Eng. ii, 530; and the Caliph's expression of regret at beholding the head of Muṣ'ab, nearly as Ṭab. 811. Two couplets are addressed by Muṣ'ab to his wife Sukaina. As he was arming to depart, and, as she felt, not to return, she gave way to her grief. Unaccustomed to signs of affection from her he asked if she really was grieving for him, and on her replying yes, and more even than she showed, said it would have been well for both of them had he known this earlier.² Later, she recognised his body amongst the slain by a mole on his cheek.

¹ انما مؤمن آمن مؤمناً على دمه فقتله فانما من القاتل برئ.

² فصاحت : احزناء عليك يا مصعب . فالتفت اليها وقد كانت تخفى ما في قلبها عنه فقال : . وذل هذا لي في قلبك ؟ قلت : وما خفي أكثر . فقال : لو كنت اعلم هذا كانت لي ولك حال .

On the authority of al-Mājiṣhūn, whose nickname was given by Sukaina, Agh. xiii, 114, l. 19.

There follows (fol. 25*a*) the story how a prisoner once induced Muṣ'ab to spare his life, and to give him money besides, which occurs in the *Faraj ba'd al-Shidda* of al-Tanūkhī, ed. Cairo, 1904, ii, 65; and the story of 'Abd al-Malik's appreciation of Muṣ'ab's valour, which is told (with some variation) as in Agh. xvii, 166-7. When Muṣ'ab's death was imminent he offered a dependant a gem of great value, but the man refused to survive him and died fighting. The notice of Muṣ'ab concludes with the story how 'Abd al-Malik, hearing that the castle at Kūfa had been the scene of the bringing in of the heads of Ḥusain, of 'Ubaid Allah b. Ziyād, of Mukhtār, and of Muṣ'ab, in succession, ending with Muṣ'ab's head being brought to himself, ordered the chamber to be demolished (see Mas. v, 252, and Ibn Badrūn, p. 191).¹

72-73 A.H.

(fol. 26) Ḥajjāj is chosen to command against 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair, the rival Caliph at Mecca, Tab. 829-31. When the catapults used at the siege (ib. 844-5) set fire to the Mosque, the assailants slackened their efforts, but he encouraged them by saying that among the Israelites an

¹ In the *Shudhūr al-'Uqūd* this story likewise appears under this year, and Ibn al-Jauzi adds what he considers to be an equally remarkable circumstance, how the Caliph Mu'tasim sent *Ītākḥ* to al-Afshīn with a message to the effect that he was a vile traitor. Al-Afshīn replied that he, too, had gone with a similar message to 'Ujaif b. 'Anbasa, who told him how he had himself taken a similar one to 'Ali b. Hishām, and that 'Ali had told him how he had done the same to another; that 'Ujaif had warned him to beware of himself receiving a similar message; and he, in turn, now gave a similar warning to *Ītākḥ*. And, says Ibn al-Jauzi, in a few days *Ītākḥ* was himself imprisoned and slain. According to Ṭabari nine years separated the two events, as *Ītākḥ* was killed by Mutawakkil in 235 A.H. (Tab. iii, 1384), whereas al-Afshīn fell in 226 (ib. 1314). 'Ali b. Hishām was put to death by Ma'mūn for misconduct as a governor in 217 A.H., 'Ujaif being sent to arrest him (ib. 1107). 'Ujaif, who instigated the conspiracy of Ma'mūn's son, al-'Abbās, against Mu'tasim, died near Mosul, in the custody of *Ītākḥ*, al-'Abbās being, according to Ṭabari, in the charge of al-Afshīn (ib. 1265). A story how later one of 'Ujaif's victims came by chance on his place of burial near where he had died whilst in custody, is told by Ibn al-Athīr, vi, 350, and appears in a somewhat similar form in Tanūkhī's "*Faraj ba'd al-Shidda*," i, 92.

offering was not held to be acceptable until consumed by fire. Ibn al-Zubair's interview with his mother, and the account of his death, Tab. 845-7 and 849-52. Amongst those mentioned (fol. 27a) as doing homage to 'Abd al-Malik (ib. 852, l. 4) are ('Abd Allah) b. 'Omar, Abu Sa'id (Sa'id b. Mālik al-Khudri), and Salama (b. 'Amr) b. al-Akwa'. An anecdote follows of a strange petition addressed to the Caliph that he would be pleased to cause an inmate of his ḥarīm to sing thrice to the petitioner, whose life was then to be at the Caliph's mercy. The petitioner was both young and handsome, and the Caliph in his anger said that he would make an example of him, and summoned the lady. She came "as though Cynthia's Orb" bearing a lute. Told to order his melodies, the man specified three couplets by Qais b. Dhariḥ (which occur Agh. viii, 123, ll. 10-8 a.f., but in inverted order). She sang them, whereupon he rent his garments. Next he asked for verses by Jamil, and fainted. Recovering, he asked for her third song, one by Qais b. al-Mulawwah (Majnūn), after which he threw himself from the belvedere where they were to the ground, and so perished. The Caliph mourned his act, saying that he had intended a better fate for him, and he had the singer removed from the palace. Enquiry about the deceased revealed only that he was a stranger, and had been heard to ejaculate in public lines which presaged woe to himself and others.

75 A.H.

In this or the following year is dated the first issue of Moslem coinage, cf. Tab. 939, and Ibn al-Athīr, iv, 337. The various traditions on the previous coinage are collected by Sauvaire, Num. et Metr. Mus., *Journal Asiatique*, 7th ser., vol. xiv, 455 et seq., where much of what appears here is included. According to Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'i (d. 96 A.H., Naw. 135) the weight of the dirham and dinar was fixed by 'Omar as ten to six, and by Ziyād as ten to seven. According to other authorities the latter ratio was fixed also by 'Omar, ib. 494. If this was so, then he did in theory what 'Abd

al-Malik did in fact. The story of his coinage as told by Rashīd to Kisā'i appears in Schwally's edition of al-Baihaqi's *Maḥāsin wal-Masāwi*, Giessen, 1902, p. 498—it has been previously quoted through Damīri—see Sauvaire, *ib.* 480, and Lavoix, *Cat. Monn. Mus. Kh. Or.*, Preface, xxii. The same story is given in our MS. on the authority of Waqī' (Naw. 614), a contemporary of Kisā'i. He describes the then existing dirhams as of three sorts: the 'Wāfia' or 'Baghaliyya,' weighing a full mithqāl; the 'Jariyya,' weighing half a mithqāl; and the 'Ṭabariyya,' ten of which equalled six mithqāls; and that by fusing the three sorts together, 'Abd al-Malik made ten dirhams to equal seven mithqāls.

It is to be noticed that Sauvaire, in his definition of 'Ṭabariyya,' *ib.* xv, 476, quotes al-Māwardi for the statement that these weighed four dāniq, i.e. a half mithqāl, the Wāfia dirham being defined in the *Kāmūs* as equalling one dirham plus four dāniq. The dirham of that weight is here called 'Jariyya,' a term which does not occur in Sauvaire's list.

That prior to 'Abd al-Malik's coinage the dirham was legally seven-tenths of a mithqāl is apparent also from a previous passage in the MS. (fol. 2a), in the story of the sale of the house of Sa'id b. al-Āṣi (d. 58 A.H.) to Mu'āwia by his heir in return for the discharge of Sa'id's debts in 'Wāfia' dirhams. The story is given also in *Agh. i.*, 17, but here the term 'Wāfia' is explained to mean Persian dirhams of the weight of a gold mithqāl each, and we are told that the heir sorted and reckoned them up in the diwan on the footing that the 'Wāfia,' viz. the 'Baghaliyya,' dirhams exceeded the 'Jawāz' or current dirhams by three in every ten.

(fol. 30b) The appointment of Ḥajjāj as governor of 'Irāq, and his address to the people in the Mosque of Kūfa, Ṭab. 863-4, is followed by the account of how he volunteered for the post, fuller than Mas. v, 292, and Ḥajjāj's statement of how he should act is set out on the authority of 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Umair, Qaḍi of Kūfa (d. 136, at a great age, Naw.

396). He describes the scene in the Mósque when Ḥajjāj appeared and his address from the pulpit, Ṭab. 865-6 and Mas. v, 294-8 (a quotation from Qur. xiv, 31, preceding the reading of the Caliph's letter), and how Ḥajjāj struck terror by executing 'Umais b. al-Ḍābi, nominally for having exceeded the three days grace for joining the force under Muḥallab, the real motive being that he was one of 'Othmān's murderers. Here (fol. 32*b*) Ḥajjāj taunts him with having been ready enough then to act in person, whereas he now wished to fight by deputy, and hearing that 'Umais's tribesmen were clamouring outside, he directed his head to be thrown to them. The lines here appear in Ṭab. 871-2 and Mas. v, 301, and follow the latter with some variants.

78 A.H.

The completion of Wāsiṭ is thus dated on fol. 31*a*, but on fol. 40*b* in 83 A.H. The received date is 86 A.H., Ṭab. 1125, and Yāqūt, iv, 883-4. Its cost is said to have equalled the entire Kharāj of 'Irāq for five years. We are told how Ḥajjāj assigned quarters to the various trades, and that hearing his work was generally admired he had a prisoner brought in chains from the gaol and asked him what he thought of it. He replied, "You have built it on alien soil, and it will pass from you to aliens," whereupon Ḥajjāj ordered him to be set free. This sentiment is attributed to Ḥajjāj himself by Yāqūt, iv, 885, l. 17.

Again, (fol. 40*b*) al-Riyāshi ('Abbās b. al-Faraj, d. 257, Ibn Khall.; Sl. Eng., iii, 10) relates that Ḥajjāj sought also the opinion of Ḥasan al-Baṣri (Naw. 209). He replied that, as truth was incumbent on him, he considered it a misapplication of Allah's money and the act of his enemy, and he then withdrew. After reflection Ḥajjāj exclaimed that such language from a Baṣra man should not go unpunished in Syria, and he had him recalled for execution. But Ḥasan uttered a silent invocation which Ḥajjāj was powerless to resist, and he departed unmolested. The exact terms of the invocation were ascertained by a chamberlain sent after him,

and it was copied. 'It included the mystic opening words of Qurān, xix, xx, xxxvi, and according to Abu Ishāq al-Baihaqi, it was often used by al-Riyāshi and with success.¹

79 A.H.

(fol. 34b) Al-Ḥārith, a pretended prophet, is executed, after being exhorted in vain to repentance. A lance thrust from a soldier failed to take effect, and people began to protest against the execution, but another soldier with a sharper weapon despatched him. And the first soldier, admitting that he had forgotten to call on Allah when striking, was told by the Caliph that that accounted for his failure.

86 A.H.

The obituary notice of 'Abd al-Malik occupies fols. 44-5, and some of the anecdotes of him occur elsewhere. His repining at his greatness and the Qāḍi's reflection thereon, Ibn al-Athīr, iv, 414; and his longing for water, which was forbidden him, ib. 411. He expressed a fond regret for his only daughter, Fāṭima, the wife of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, and said his father Marwān had made her a gift of earrings (but the text here is doubtful). Next comes his dying advice to Walid, Mas. v, 368,² and then a story how, on his deathbed, he received Khālīd b. Yazīd b. Mu'āwīa b. Khālīd and 'Abd Allah b. Usayyid b. abi-l-Īs, and required from them an admission that his son Walid was his successor (making them name him in their admission), and that in their view no one had any better right. On

¹ This statement does not seem to occur in the Maḥāsin wal-Masāwi, ed. Schwally (the edition is not provided with an index), and I am informed by Professor D. S. Margolionth that there is another 'Adab' work by a 'Baihaqi,' which is often cited by Yāqūt. Stories as to the efficacy of silent invocations seem to have been current. One is told of a prisoner before Ziyād (d. 53 A.H., Tab. ii, 158), in the Faraj ba'd al-Shidda of Ibn abi Dunyā, Lith., Allahabad, 1314, p. 22, and of another before Yazīd b. Abi Murlim (governor of 'Irāq before 96 A.H., Tab. ii, 1282), in the Tadhkira of Ibn Ḥamdān, B.M. Or. 3180, fol. 88a. The above story is given, as in the text, in the Mir'āt al-Zamān, op. cit., 30a, and Paris, Ar. 6, 131, 255a.

² The MS. reads مستخبر in place of مشغول, the reading in Mas'ūdi, both masculine and feminine.

their doing this he told them that else he would have struck off their heads, and he disclosed a drawn sword which he had concealed in readiness for this purpose. (This story seems to be referred to in the "*Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*," 328, ll. 18-21.) He addressed his children, as in Mas. v, 370, adding some lines by Ibn 'abd al-A'la al-Shaibāni, and then commended his brother Mu'āwīa, who was weak in mind, to Walid, telling him that but for his affliction he would have made him his successor. He told him also to retain his other brother, Muḥammad, in his governorship of Jazīra, and to drop his resentment against his own brother 'Abd Allah, and retain him as governor of Egypt, and to pay regard to his cousin 'Ali b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbās (al-Sajjād, the head of the Abbasids), who was well disposed towards them, and to Ḥajjāj, even though he might dislike him, for they owed him their empire, and had more need of him than he of them; and he continued, as Mas. v, 369, saying of the sword, which he told Walid to use, that with it he had killed 'Amr b. Sa'id al-Ashdaq in 70 A.H. (Mas. v, 233). We are told later that 'Amr's son Sa'id was a bearer of the bier at 'Abd al-Malik's funeral, and was reproached and struck by Walid as rejoicing at their loss. Walid's altercation with his brother Hishām is given to same effect as Agh. xii, 104, l. 10 a.f., and Fakhri, ed. Ahl., 150; ed. Der., 172 (except that here the line he quotes in reply is attributed to Aus b. Hajar, and the third brother, Maslamā, also quotes some verse).

(f. 42b) Walid's character is described as Ṭab. 1271-3, and his demolishing a convent, as Mas. v, 381. He was particular as to his letters, and was the first Caliph to write on skins (*Tawāmīr*). Once whilst at chess with 'Abd Allah b. Mu'āwīa b. 'Abd Allah b. Ja'far b. Abi Ṭālib, a member of the *Thaqīf* tribe who was on his way to fight the infidel sought an audience of him. Before he was admitted the board was covered with a cloth so as to preserve the game. The visitor appeared to be a person of some consequence,¹

¹ معتم قد رجل لحيته .

and, after an exchange of compliments, was asked by Walid whether he could tell him anything on the Qurān, or the traditions or wars of the Prophet, or any Arab, Ḥijāz, or Persian stories. For none of these, he answered, had he found leisure; whereupon Walid removed the cloth and resumed the game, saying that in point of fact he and his partner were alone.

Walid's oration from the pulpit is given as Ṭab. 1177-8, and is repeated (fol. 45*b*) in the notice of 'Abd al-Malik very much as Mas. v, 371, with the addition that, whilst those doing homage were in doubt whether to congratulate or condole, a Thaqif tribesman said a few well-chosen words, which led to his stipend being increased, this being Walid's first act of favour.

(fol. 43*a*) Maslama's invasion of Byzantine territory is mentioned (Ṭab. 1181), with the story how a Christian captive got leave to procure two Moslems as his ransom, an Arab of the Banu Kilāb agreeing to be surety for his return, and how the Christian afterwards identified the surety as his son. This story occurs in al-Tanūkhī's "Faraj ba'd al-Shidda," i, 92, and also in the Tadhkira of Ibn Ḥamdūn, op. cit., 225*a*.

87 A.H.

(fol. 46*a*) The appointment of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz over Medina, and his proceedings there, Ṭab. 1182-3.

88 A.H.

(fol. 46*b*) On the occasion of the rebuilding of the Mosque at Medina, Ṭab. 1192-4, there was much public weeping, and Sa'id b. al-Musayyib regretted that the demolished buildings should not have been left as evidence of the simplicity of the Prophet's mode of life.

The expenditure on the Mosque of Damascus, also now rebuilt, is estimated at over one hundred million dinars, and Walid, hearing that this was disapproved of, demonstrated

that the treasury still contained enough to furnish three years' allowances for the whole of those entitled, 300,000 in number, by causing the bullion to be produced for inspection. And he told the people that his aim was to add a fifth marvel to those the city already possessed, viz., its air, water, fruit, and baths.

There follows a quotation from the historian Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamadhānī (d. 521 A.H.; Wüst., Gesch., No. 232), giving a saying of Jāḥiẓ (which is quoted from his Kitāb al-Buldān by Yāqūt, ii, 593, l. 7), and then an account of a visit by Ma'mūn and others to the Mosque, and their opinions thereon.¹ There follows the story how lead, required for the roof, was bought at its weight in gold, and (again from Hamadhānī) the sum spent on vegetables for the workers, and the placing in the Mosque of the jewel of the Caliph's dead daughter, Yāqūt, ii, 592-3, with the statement that the total outlay on the Mosque equalled thrice the land-tax of the entire world—presumably the Moslem part only.²

ودخله المأمون ومعه المعتصم ويحيى بن اكرم الناقضى فقال
المأمون : اى شئ يعجبكما من هذا المسجد ؟ فقال المعتصم : دهنة
فاننا نصنعه في قصورنا فلا تمضى عليه عشرون سنة حتى يحول وهذا
بحاله كأن الصانع قد فرغ منه الان . فقال : ما اعجبني هذا . فقال
يحيى بن اكرم : اعجبه يا امير المؤمنين تاليف رخامه فان فمه عقودا
ما يرى مثلها . قال : كلا بل اعجبني انه شئ على غير مثال شهود

² A marginal note on fol. 47a states that the reader had found in another history that Walid had built also a mosque in Spain where the pulpit had employed 18,000 workmen for seven years, at a half-dinar a day each. This must refer to the building by the Omayyad 'Abd al-Rahmān of the Mosque at Cordova in 170 A.H., which is mentioned in the Muntazam, add. 5,928, 104b, where the number of workmen on the pulpit is given as eight, and its total cost as 10,050 dinars. 'Abd al-Rahmān in fact only founded it, spending 500,000 dinars thereon; it was finished by his successor, Hishām, see Bayan al-Mughrib., ed. Dozy, ii, 20 and 70. The pulpit seems to have been placed in the 'Mimbar' by Ḥakam b. 'Abd al-Rahmān when he altered the building in 354 A.H., and the chronicler Ambrosio de Morales says that it was to be seen in the Cathedral at Cordova as late as the middle of the sixteenth century, when it was dismembered, and its materials employed in the construction of a Christian altar; see "Moorish Remains in Spain," by A. F. Calvert, London, 1906, p. 103.

89 A.H.

(fol. 47*b*) The Abbasid claims were now first openly preached in favour of the Imām Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, and spread continuously until his death in 124 A.H.

91 A.H.

Al-Qasri is appointed Governor of Mecca and addresses the people, Ṭab. 1231. He puts to death the poet al-Ja’dī b. Dirham, who had denied the claims of Moses and Abraham to their titles of al-Kalīm and al-Khalīl, the Governor remarking that whoever so wished might go and celebrate the Adḥā, or feast of victims, but that his victim was al-Ja’dī.¹ The authority for this is ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥabīb. Then follows Walīd’s pilgrimage and his interview with Sa’īd b. al-Musayyib, Ṭab. 1232-4, and the story of his wife Umm al-Banīn asking for the gifts of Ḥajjāj’s son Muḥammad, Ṭab. 1273-4.

94 A.H.

(fol. 49*b*) Sa’īd b. Jubair is put to death by Ḥajjāj, Ṭab. 1261-6. The manner of his death is told also in Mas. v, 376-7, Fragm. 9, and Naw. 279.

It is here stated that, with Sa’īd, was sent another prisoner, Ismā’il b. Ausaṭ al-Bajali, who is not mentioned in Ṭab. 1262, and that the escort, on seeing Sa’īd’s acts of piety, told him to escape as he was going to his death, but he refused, lest they should suffer for it; cf. Ṭab. 1263. On fol. 55 is an account of his dialogue with Ḥajjāj, as given by Mas’ūdi, but fuller, Ḥajjāj asking what he thought of the heads of the Moslem community from the Prophet to ‘Abd al-Malik, and lastly himself, to which Sa’īd replied, “You best know yourself”; but went on to express a very unfavourable opinion of his acts, and was beheaded. His

¹ In Ibn al-Qaisarānī, ed. de Jong, p. 31, the last Omayyad Caliph is said to have been given his laqab by the Abbasids as holding al-Ja’dī’s views.

severed head is said to have uttered a pious formula (as in *Fragm.* and in *Nawawi*), once completely and once partially.¹ Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri imprecated vengeance on Ḥajjāj for his act, and that its memory haunted him is mentioned on fol. 54*a*, as *Fragm.* 10.

95 A.H.

Ḥajjāj's death is recorded, with anecdotes. His incorrect mode of pronouncing Arabic was admitted, under pressure, by the grammarian Yaḥya b. Ya'mar, who illustrated it by a passage from *Qur.* ix, 24, and was banished to *Khurāsān* so as to be safe against hearing it again.² The number of his victims is given as in *Mas.* v, 382. Then follows a long story (fols. 53-4) how Anas b. Mālik escaped his vengeance by appealing to the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik, who forthwith ordered him to desist. This is told also in the *Akhhār al-Ṭiwāl*, pp. 327-8, but here more fully, the letters to Anas and to Ḥajjāj being set out.³ In excusing himself Ḥajjāj told Anas that but for the Caliph he would have dealt strongly with him, to which Anas replied that he knew of an invocation which protected him against all tyranny. Ḥajjāj tried to ascertain the formula both from him and his son, but failed. It is here given on Anas' authority. Next comes Ḥajjāj's minatory address at Baṣra on appointing his son Muḥammad (not his brother) as deputy for him, *Mas.* v, 336. And finally the physicians' mode of discovering

¹ A note to *Mas.* v, 503, states the genesis of this miracle. *Nawawi* relates, too, that a cock used to wake Sa'īd for prayer. He once failed to do so, and Sa'īd wished he might never crow again. The wish was granted. With this may be compared the story told by Saint Bonaventura, in the life of St. Francis of Assisi, that a falcon used to rouse St. Francis at the appointed hours for the offices, but that when the Saint was afflicted with any kind of infirmity it woke him somewhat later ("parcebat falco nec tam tempestivas indicebat vigilias"). It is not recorded that the Saint resented this in the falcon. Sa'īd was less merciful, if the cock's punishment is to be measured by the relief to his hearers.

² In the life of Yaḥya, in *Ibn Khall.*, ii, 300, *Sl. Eng.* iv, 61, the *Shudhūr al-'Uqūd* is quoted for this incident, and the passage appears verbatim in the *MS. de Jong*, 122, under 84 A.H. Earlier in the same life *Ibn Khall.* gives another version of the story; here we have a third.

³ The story is told at length in the *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, op. cit., 746.

the disease which was killing him is told as in Ibn Khall. i, 157; Sl. Eng. i, 362.¹

96 A.H.

(fol. 55*b*) Walid dies, being prevented by death from substituting his son as his successor² in place of Sulaimān, who succeeds.

His acts of clemency are stated, Ṭab. 1337, and he is said to have taken 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz as his vizier. His address from the pulpit, Mas. v, 398, appears here more fully (fol. 56). The next folio contains an anecdote of his excessive voracity, how having invited his courtiers to eat fruit with him he applied to the gardener for successive dishes of meat which he ate and then reverted to the fruit. This characteristic of his is mentioned Mas. v, 400-1.³

99 A.H.

(fol. 58*a*) Sulaimān dies after providing that 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz should succeed him, as Ṭab. 1341-4, but shorter. On fol. 63*a* is given the anecdote illustrating his vanity, and how swiftly death overtook him, Mas. v, 403-4,

¹ A similar story is told earlier in the MS. (fol. 28*a*) of Bishr, brother of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik, how his physician Banādūq (probably Thiyādhūq, Ibn Uṣaibi'a, i, 120) ascertained his disease and announced to him it would be fatal. And on Bishr saying that he had always avoided extremes of heat and of cold, the physician told him that it was precisely that which had ruined his stomach, **فعل حوفا**, heat and cold being both essential to health.

² In the fragment of the Muntazam, B.M. Add. 5,928, fol. 100*b*, this is stated more fully and exactly in accordance with Ṭab. 1274.

³ The story there given of al-Aṣma'i and Sulaimān's 'Jubba' is told in the Fakhri, ed. Ahl., 152-3, ed. Der., 174, in a somewhat different form, in which it occurs also in the Tadhkira of Ibn Hamdūn, op. cit., where the text, fol. 182*a*, l. ult., has **طبيباً** in place of **طبيباً** in the Fakhri text. In the Mir'āt al-Zamān, op. cit., 116*a*, and Paris, Ar. 6,132, 71*a*, al-Aṣma'i merely tells the story: the stains on the 'Jubba' are explained by an Omayyad present. Later al-Aṣma'i got the credit of the explanation and of Rashīd's wonder at his knowledge.

and Fakhri, ed. Ahl., 153, ed. Der., 175, with variants in the verses.¹

(fols. 58b-62b and 64b-65b) The stories relating to 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, given under his accession and death, occur in the notices on him in Mas. v, 416, Naw. 463, in Suyūṭī's life of him, p. 233, and in Agh. vii, 153-4 and 156, l. 9, a.f. (the last story being told in different language at fol. 64b). Three of the longer stories occur in Becker's "Ibn al-Jauzi's Manāqib 'Omar," pp. 77-9, 100-1, and 139-42.² The concluding story relates that the sovereign of India, the possessor of 1,000 elephants, and the suzerain of as many kings, and for whom aloes and camphor rose up in streams, sent to the monotheist sovereign of the Arabs a gift, one hardly deserving, as he said, the name, yet a rarity, with a request that someone should be sent to instruct him. The authority for this is Ḥajjāj b. Arṭāh (d. 150 A.H., Naw. 198).

100 A.H.

(fol. 64a) The embassy of the revolted Kharijites to 'Omar, and how it led to his being poisoned, is told as Ṭab. 1348-9 (cf. Mas. v, 434), and the beginning of the Abbasid movement in Khurāsān, as Ṭab. 1358. The MS. adds the instructions given by the Abbasid Muḥammad b. 'Ali to

¹ The MS. has also (fol. 101b) the story how al-Saffāh, with equal right to pride in his personal appearance, expressly disclaimed following Sulaimān's example, and asked for a long life in Allah's service. At that very moment he heard a slave say to another, "We fix two months and five days as the term." Saffāh accepted the augury, and (therefore?) died exactly at that interval of time.

² With some variations in the text, e.g., p. 77, l. 6, رزئت for ازريت; p. 78, l. 5, لها for بها; l. 10, n. 6, the editor's conjecture is confirmed, and the readings in nn. 3 and 7 are confirmed also; p. 77, l. 1, المسلمين for العرب; l. 4, بنيات as in n. 1; p. 102, l. 7, عن الهوى is inserted after النفس; p. 140, l. 8, مخرسة after كوددا; p. 142, the reading in n. 2 is followed; and 'Omar's vision occurs during, not a fainting fit, but slumber, which Abu Ḥazm attributes to his wakeful nights.

these emissaries, and why Khurāsān was the district which offered the most promising field for their work.¹

(fol. 64b) Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik’s attempt to emulate the piety of his predecessor is frustrated by Habāba singing to him the verses of al-Aḥwaṣ, as Agh. xiii, 157–8. The authority is ‘Ubaid Allah b. ‘Amr al-Fihri.

102 A.H.

(fol. 65b) In recording the death of the rebel Yazīd b. al-Muhallab, an anecdote is given, on the authority of al-Ṣūlī (d. 325 A.H., Brock. i, 143), how al-Kauthar b. Zufar (mentioned Tab. ii, 1455) attended on him when he was Governor of ‘Irāq, and began by observing that the Governor’s rank was such that aid against him could be procured only through him; that no favour coming from him could possibly be worthy the giver, and that people marvelled, not at what he accomplished, but at his leaving anything unaccomplished. Being then told to state what he wanted, he did so, but the dialogue proceeded at such a high level that it needed the Governor’s persuasion to induce his visitor to accept anything.

105 A.H.

(fol. 67b) Yazīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik dies, and the notice of him (fol. 70b) states that the cause was his grief at the

وكان يقول لرجال اهل الدعوة : اما الكوفة وسوادها فهناك شيعة¹
على وولده . واما البصرة فعثمانية . واما الجزيرة فمسلمون اخلاف
النصارى . واما اهل الشام فلا يعرفون الا طاعة بنى مروان . واما اهل
مكة فقد غلب عليهم ابو بكر وعمر . ولكن عليكم بخراسان فان
هناك الصدور السليمة والقلوب الفارغة التي لم تنقسمها الهوى ولم
توزعها النحل

death of Habāba. And the accident which occasioned his death is stated as Fragm. 77.

(f. 67b) Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik succeeds. The imbecility of his mother, and 'Abd al-Malik's dream about her, are stated as Fragm. 81-2, with the addition of a dream in which Hishām saw himself eating apples to the number of nineteen and a part of another, which was interpreted by reading regnal years for apples; after becoming Caliph he never partook of this fruit.

(f. 68a) Yūnus tells a story how an inmate of Hishām's ḥarim told him that, although her position was all that she could desire, yet earthly considerations must yield to the fact that she had belonged to a son of his.¹ Hishām highly approved her conduct and separated from her, giving her a position in his household. His daily habits are next described; how he first received the police report for the day, then heard a section of the Qurān read; then gave audience, and then had a meal, during which he heard petitions, his replies being taken down by clerks. Later, after the midday prayer, he attended to current business until the afternoon prayer, and then gave audience until the sunset prayer, when his evening guests, al-Zuhri and others, attended. And once, when the news of a rising in Armenia arrived, he rose forthwith and swore that no roof should shelter him until it had been suppressed. His punishment of his son for his absence from the mosque is told as Tab. 1733, and there follows a story how the Mu'tazil Abu Marwān Ghailān b. Marwān al-Dimashqi was put to death in this reign; cf. Tab. 1733, and Fragm. 130 (where he is called Ghailān b. Muslim). A question was put by him to Rabī'a b. (abi) 'Abd al-Raḥmān (Naw. 244), "Do you hold that it is by Allah's assent that people disobey Him?" To which Rabī'a answered, "Do you think that they disobey Him in His own despite?" and Ghailān was

¹ The words are—

ولكن الناس (الدنيا؟) ليس لها خطر ان ابنك فلا أنا اشتراكي الخ

silenced.¹ For the doctrine held by the Mu'tazila on this subject see Mas. vi, 21-2.

Next follows, from Madā'ini, the story how the grateful recollection of a Shaikh, who had been a dependant of Hishām, and his regard for his benefactor's memory, compelled the admiration of the Caliph Manṣūr, as Ṭab. iii, 412-13, and Mas'ūdi, vi, 167, but in different terms, and on other authority. And Hishām is said to have refrained from in any way favouring the children of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, saying that he should do no more for them than 'Omar himself had done.

Obituary notices occupy the intervening years until, under 118 A.H. (fol. 81a), Madā'ini tells how Mālīk b. Dinār (Naw. 537) expressed surprise at a man, whose apparel represented some three dirhams, paying twice that sum for a fish, and was told by him that the fish was intended, not for himself, but for their tyrannical governor Bilāl b. Abi Burda (then over Baṣra, Ṭab. 1593). Mālīk took the man to the governor, and by his influence procured him redress. The governor thereupon requested his prayers on his behalf, but he replied that this would be of little avail whilst ten score hands were being outstretched against him at his own gate.

121 A.H.

(fol. 82b) The death of the revolted Zaid b. 'Alī is stated, and how his body was exhumed, crucified, and afterwards burned, as Mas. v, 470-1; and then the expedition of Naṣr b. Sayyār to Farghāna, and how the queen-mother gave him her opinions on the essential requisites for a ruler, as Ṭab. 1297. On the question of what caused Zaid's rising (which is discussed Ṭab. 1668), fols. 83-4 contain the story of a dialogue between Hishām and Khālīd b. Ṣafwān b. al-Ahtam, which is related in the same terms in Agh. ii, 35, l. 14, to 36, l. ult.

أنشدك الله اترى الله يحب ان يعصى ؟ فقال ربيعة : أنشدك
الله اترى الله يعصى قسراً ؟ فكان ربيعة التقي غيلان حبراً

125 A.H.

(fol. 86a) Hishām dies, telling his weeping children on his deathbed (fol. 87b) that he had given them amply of this world's goods, and they were equally liberal of their tears; his worldly goods he left to them, but whatever of reward he might have earned remained his, and terrible indeed would his transition by death be should that reward fail him.¹

Walid b. Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik succeeds, as provided by the predecessor Walid. The new Caliph's misconduct when leader of the pilgrimage, as Tab. 1740-1, with the addition of a story, on the authority of Ṣāliḥ b. Kaisān, how the Qāḍi of Medina, Sa'd b. Ibrāhīm, told the people to burn the 'Qubba' which Walid had sent to be placed round the Ka'ba, and, on their hesitating because of its escort of 500 troopers, he called for the coat of mail worn by 'Abd al-Raḥmān on the day of Badr, and, placing himself at their head, burned it himself. The people's firmness protected him from the escort's anger. (Nevertheless his dismissal from his post soon followed, Tab. 1768.)

Hishām's wish to make his own son Maslama his successor, and his failure, is told as in Tab. 1742, and the further fact (fol. 86b) that applications for grants were refused by Hishām on the ground that he was merely in the position of treasurer for Walid, and that his death followed thereon (but scarcely therefore, as the act seems to indicate scrupulous honesty). The difficulty about preparing his body for burial is given as Tab. 1730, and the name of Walid's mother and his bodily vigour as Tab. 1810-11. Poetry follows by Walid on Sulaima, whom he had married after divorcing her sister, see Fragm. 113, where the lines are different. He was partial and generous to poets, with one of whom he drank from

جاد لكم هشام بال دنیا وجدتم له بالبكا وترك لكم ما جمع وتركتم¹
 عليه اتم ما كسب ما اعظم منقلب هشام ان لم يغفره الله

as corrected by B.M. Add. 23,277, fol. 205b.

a pool of wine. His heresy is vouched for by Aḥmad b. Kāmil (Ibn Shajara, the historian, died 350 A.H., Wüst., Gesch., 123), who gives the story of his piercing a Qur'ān with arrows, cf. Mas. vi, 10; Agh. vi, 125, l. 8; and Fakhri, ed. Ahl., 159, ed. Der., 182. And in conclusion is recorded a tradition handed down by al-Zuhri from Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib, that the Prophet was heard by 'Omar to say, on the occasion of the birth of a son named Walid to the brother of Umm Salma, that they had named him after one of their Pharaohs, and that in truth a man of this name would prove to this people even worse than Pharaoh. And al-Adhra'i ascertained from al-Zuhri that it was this Walid rather than the son and successor of 'Abd al-Malik whom the Prophet intended by the phrase "one of your Pharaohs."

126 A.H.

(fol. 87*b*) Yazīd b. Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik succeeds, Ṭab. 1825. He was the first Caliph whose mother was a slave, which the Omayyads believed to be of ill augury for the continuance of the dynasty.

127 A.H.

(fol. 88*a*) Marwān b. Muḥammad succeeds (Ṭab. 1876), and Ibrāhīm, Yazīd's successor, submits to him (ib. 1892). The name of Marwān's mother is given as Hāribat al-Birmā, cf. Mas. vi, 47, and Fragm. 154-5, where al-Ja'dī, from whom Marwān's nickname was derived, is called his uncle—here, his tutor—and is said to have been executed for heresy, as above mentioned.

129 A.H.

(fol. 88*b*) The mission of Abu Muslim to Khurāsān in the Abbasid cause, Ṭab. 1949, is followed by a statement of the divergencies between the Omayyad and Abbasid rites in the Mosque, Ṭab. 1955-6; and (fol. 89*a*) the correspondence between Marwān and his General, Naṣr b. Sayyār, Ṭab. 1973.

130 A.H.

Abu Muslim enters Merv, Tab. 1984.

131 A.H.

(fol. 91a) The plague of 'Ibn Qutaiba' is recorded, and al-Aṣma'i relates that 11,000 corpses were borne daily across the Ṭariq al-Mirbad (at Baṣra); that the deaths on the first day were 70,000, and still more on the second and third; and that doors were closed lest dogs should eat the bodies. This plague is mentioned also in the Kitāb al-Ma'ārif of the historian Ibn Qutaiba, ed. Wüst., 292, as having happened in this year, the Governor of Baṣra being Salm b. Qutaiba (cf. Tab. iii, 21). The authority there is al-Aṣma'i, and he is quoted as referring to it also as the plague of Salm.

132 A.H.

(fol. 93a) The defeat of Marwān at the Zāb River is related as Tab. iii, 40-2 and 45-6, and the narrative of his death follows in a form differing somewhat from the printed histories—see the text *infra*.¹ The story of the

وهرب مروان الى مصر فدخلها في رمضان وبها عبيد الله قد سبقه¹
ونزل (94b) عبد الله بن علي نهر ابي فرطس (فطرس) من فلسطين
وجمع بنى امية واظهر انه يريد ان يفرض عليهم العطاء وهم نيف
وثمانون انسانا (و) خرجوا عليهم فقتلوه . وجاء كتاب
ابى العباس بان ينفذ صالح بن علي لطلب مروان ويجعل
علي مقدّمته ابا عون والحسن بن فحطبة فبلغوا العريش وبلغ
مروان الخبر فاحرق ما حوله من علف وطعام وهرب ومضى
صالح ومن معه في طلبه الى الصعيد فساروا حتى ادركوه بقرية
تسمى بوعير من اخر الليل وقد نزل الكنيسة ومعه حرمه وثقله

Abbasid general 'placing Marwān's head in his eldest daughter's lap in requital for Zaid's head having been similarly placed in the lap of his sister Zainab, seems new; cf. *Mir'āt al-Zamān*, op. cit., 248*b*. Mas'ūdi, vi, 100, says that Marwān's daughter rebuked his conqueror for eating the meal prepared for her father, a rebuke which Saffāh confirmed.

(fol. 95*a*) The escape of some of the Omayyads to Abyssinia and their eventual surrender to Mahdi, *Tab.* iii, 46.

Thus ended the Omayyad dynasty. In the notice of Marwān's State Secretary, 'Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Yahya (fol. 97*a*), it is said that, according to the historians, the dynasty had

وولده . قال عامر : فوصلنا في جمع يسير فلو علم قلّتنا لشدّ علينا
فلجأنا الى شجرٍ ومخلٍ وقلّت لاصحابي : ان اصبحتنا وراى قلّتنا
اهلكونا . وخرج مروان فقاتل وهو يقول : وكانت لله علينا حقوق
ضيعناها ولم نقم بما يلزمنا فحلم عنا ثم انتقم منا . وكان قد عرض
جيشه بالرقة فمّر به ثمانون الف عربى على ثمانين الف فرس
عربى ففكر ساعة ثم قال : اذا انعمت المال ولم تنفع العدة . ثم
بالغ في القتال فقتل ثلثمائة رجلٍ وأخضع الجراح وحمل عليه رجل
فقتله واحتزّ راسه رجل من اهل البصرة كان يبيع الرمان . فقال
الحسن بن قحطبة : اخرجوا الى اكبر بنات مروان . فاخرجوها وهى
ترعد فقال لها : لا بهاس عليك . فقالت : اى بهاس اعظم من
اخراجك اياي حاضرة من حيث لم ار رجلاً قط . فاجلسها ووضع
الراس في حجرها فصرخت واضطربت فقيّل له : ما حملك على
هذا ؟ قال : كنعلمهم بزيد بن على حين قتلوه فانهم جعلوا راسه في
حجر زيد بنت على . وبعث براسه الى صالح بن على فنُصب
على باب مسجد دمشق وبعث به الى السقّاح فخرّ ساجداً وتصدق
بعشرة آلاف دينار

in its service at its close four men distinguished by qualities of the first rank:—Marwān himself, for his bravery and state ability; his secretary, for his skill and eloquence; Yazīd b. ‘Omar b. Hubaira, for administration and soundness of judgment; and Naṣr b. Sayyār, for vigour, moderation, and wide renown. The Caliph Maṣṣūr is reported (fol. 95*a*) to have said of the Omayyads: “Why were they not granted their lives; they would then have experienced under our rule what we experienced under theirs, and been as well disposed towards us as we were towards them, for, in truth, they were happy whilst alive and regretted when dead.”¹

He was given an occasion for putting his precept into practice. Marwān had two sons, ‘Abd Allah and ‘Ubaid Allah, the latter of whom he had preferred in the order of succession to an elder brother, ‘Abd al-Malik, on the ground of his greater similarity in name to his Abbasid opponent; see Ṭab. iii, 204–5. By the received account they both escaped to Abyssinia, where one of them was killed, and the other was later captured and surrendered to Mahdi, dying in prison in 170 A.H.; see *Fragm.* 205, Ṭab. iii, 46, 485, and 569.² There now follows (fol. 95*a*) the story of the adventure of one of them in Nubia, which is given, but less fully, in *Mas.* vi, 163. He is there called ‘Abd Allah, here ‘Ubaid Allah, and in the result is not reconducted to prison, as in *Mas’ūdi*, but kept under observation in one of the palaces with a suitable provision for his wants. And this, on the advice, not of ‘Īsa, but of Ismā‘īl b. ‘Alī, also uncle to Maṣṣūr. The story is not conclusive as to the Nubian monarch’s moral views; the Omayyad’s dynastic abasement may have been intentional, and as he thought, well-timed; and in this version of the story it proved not ineffective.

Another story follows (fol. 96*b*), told by al-Ḥasan b.

الآمستوا عليهم ليروا من دولتنا ما رأينا من دولتهم ويرغبون إلينا
كما رغبنا إليهم فقد لغمري عاشوا سعداء وماتوا فقداً

² The passage in Ṭab. iii, 46, l. 11, as corrected in accordance with *Fragm.* 205, makes ‘Ubaid Allah the one killed. In this text it is he who survives.

Khidr, how one of the fugitive Omayyads, Ibrāhīm b. Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Malik, who had been pardoned by Saffāḥ at the intercession of his uncle Dā'ud, was asked by the Caliph to relate what had happened to him whilst in hiding. He said that whilst at Hīra he saw troops approaching from Kūfa, and suspecting they had come after him he escaped in disguise to Kūfa. Knowing no one, in his perplexity he entered the courtyard of a house and sat there until the owner arrived with a retinue of attendants. He told him his life was in danger, and he was thereupon shown into a chamber overlooking the women's apartments, where he remained for a long period, well provided with all he needed, and not questioned in any way. Seeing his host ride out daily, Ibrāhīm asked him his motive. He answered that his father had been deliberately murdered by Ibrāhīm b. Sulaimān; that he had heard he was in hiding, and that he was looking out for his revenge. In astonishment at fate having conducted him to his house, and tired of life, Ibrāhīm said that he conceived himself bound to help him to his redress, and that he was able to hasten its attainment, and he told him who he was. The man replied that he believed him to be tired of hiding and anxious to be dead, but Ibrāhīm insisted that he was the murderer, and gave details of the deed. The man's anger rose, but checking it he replied that as for his father he would later have the opportunity of taking his revenge on Ibrāhīm; as for himself, he would not do anything to violate his asylum, but that he had better depart since he could not feel safe against a change of mind. And he offered Ibrāhīm a thousand dinars, which he refused, and departed. But never had he known, said he, a nobler character.¹

¹ This anecdote is given in similar terms in Ibn al-Jauzi's "Kitāb al-Mughaffalīn," Paris, Ar., 3,453, fol. 129a.

XXIX.

THE TRADITION ABOUT THE CORPOREAL RELICS
OF BUDDHA.

By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

II.

IN my previous note on page 655 ff. above, I have given the narrative of the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta about the cremation of the corpse of Buddha and the original distribution and enshrining of his corporeal relics.¹ We come

¹ There are two points in that narrative, in respect of which I would add some further remarks.

(1) In connexion with the quenching of the funeral fire (page 663 and note 3), it is perhaps not necessary to assume any supernatural agency.

It seems to me that, if the matter may be judged by the analogies of Western India, the case was as follows. The Mallas of Kusinārā began to extinguish the fire with perfumed water. At that moment, a hot-weather storm came on. The rain was the water which fell down from the sky to extinguish the pyre. The funeral pile having been placed in a hollow, the water which collected there was the water which for the same purpose "arose from the storehouse of waters (*beneath the earth*). And the text has simply put all this in a poetical fashion.

(2) As I have said at the end of the note on page 658, the actual cause of the death of Buddha was, coupled with extreme old age, an attack of dysentery induced by a meal of *sūkara-maddava*. And I have suggested that the dish consisted of "the succulent parts, titbits, of a young wild boar."

Since making that remark, I have, in looking into another matter, come across a suggestion by Mr. Hoey (JASB, 1900. 80, note) that the dish consisted, not of boar's flesh, but of *sūkara-kanda*, 'hog's root,' the root of a bulbous plant which is a *phalāhāra* or article of vegetarian diet. And I find that Mr. Watters arrived (*On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 28) at the opinion:—"I agree with Neumann that the "pious blacksmith was not likely to cook pickled pork for the Buddha, and think "that *fungus* or *mushroom* should be taken to be the meaning of *sūkara-maddava*."

These conjectures are ingenious,—Mr. Hoey's in particular,—and are not inapposite in view of the extent to which, we all know, the flesh of the pig is tabooed in eastern lands. But they are not really necessary; and they do not meet the requirements of the case, even apart from the points that the word in the text is not *sūkara-kanḍa*, and that I cannot find any word for 'fungus' or 'mushroom' containing a component which in any way resembles either *sūkara* or *maddava*.

That the dish was not an ordinary one, of which anyone might safely partake, is plainly indicated by the Sutta, text, 231/127; trans., 71. The dish was prepared for an entertainment, given at Pāvā by the blacksmith's son Chunda, at which the food consisted of:—*khādaniyaṃ bhōjaniyaṃ pahūtaṃ cha sūkara-maddavaṃ*; "sweet food both hard and soft, and an abundance of *sūkara-maddava*." This food was offered to Buddha and the Bhikkhus who were with him. But, by the direction of Buddha, the *sūkara-maddava* was actually served to only him, and his followers were regaled with the other food; and Chunda was bidden to bury in a hole whatever remained of the *sūkara-maddava*: because, said Buddha:—"I see no one, in the world of men and Dēvas, or in the world of

now to the tradition about the subsequent fate of the eight deposits of those relics, which were placed in Stūpas or memorial mounds at the localities shewn in the list given on page 671. And we take this matter in the order, as closely as we can determine it, of the dates of the writings from which we gather the tradition; which, however, is of course not necessarily the order in which the tradition was developed.

Divyāvadāna.

We therefore take first a story which is found in the Sanskrit Buddhist work entitled *Divyāvadāna*, in chapter 26, *Pāṃśupradānāvadāna*, "the gest of the giving of the dust." The composition of this story may be referred provisionally (see page 889 ff. below) to the period A.D. 300–350.

In respect of this story about the relics which is found in the *Pāṃśupradānāvadāna*, it has been asserted (this *Journal*, 1901. 400), by way of discrediting it off-hand, that "it begins in strange fashion, *à propos* of nothing."¹ As may now be seen, however, that is not at all the case; and the grounds on which the story is open to criticism do not include incoherence. The story stands quite naturally, as

Māra, or in that of Brahma,—no one amongst Sāmaṇas, Brāhmaṇas, gods, or men,—by whom, when eaten, that food could be properly digested, save only by a Tathāgata." And, as we learn from the following context, even Buddha himself did not eat that food with impunity on that occasion.

All this points distinctly to some very rich animal food, liable to quickly decompose with unpleasant results. In the present time, while 'only low-caste people eat the flesh of the village-pig, all classes of people in India who eat meat at all will freely eat the wild boar. And it seems not at all certain that, in ancient times, the higher classes did not eat even the domesticated pig, which may in those days have been somewhat more carefully looked after, at least occasionally, than is now the case. For instance, in *Jātaka* No. 30,^c one of the characters is a *sūkara*, a porker, named Muṇika, belonging to a *kuṭumbika*, a landed proprietor, "the squire" (translation); and Muṇika was fed up on rice-gruel to make all sorts of dainty dishes at the wedding-feast of the squire's daughter. The same feature figures again in *Jātaka* No. 286. It may, therefore, not even be necessary to assume that the pig was a wild pig.

It may be added that a list of prohibited meats given in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, *Mahāvagga*, 6. 23, 8, does not include the flesh of the pig. The list is confined to the flesh of man, the elephant, the horse, the dog, the serpent, the lion, the tiger, the panther, the bear, and the wolf or the hyena.

¹ It has also been said (*loc. cit.*) that the passage in it about the opening of the Stūpas is "very corrupt and obscure." The editors, however, did not find it necessary to make any such observation, or even to elucidate the meaning by notes. The text only requires to be read with a little thought and some general knowledge, and without a desire to place it in an unfavourable light.

part and parcel of a thoroughly well connected narrative which, as far as we have occasion to cite it, runs (see the text edited by Cowell and Neil, page 364 ff.) as follows:—

On a certain occasion when Buddha was sojourning in the neighbourhood of Rājagriha, he took his alms-bowl, and went into the city to collect alms (364). He came to the king's high-road (366). And he was seen there by two boys,—one, Vijaya by name, of good family; the other, Jaya, of a very leading family,—who were playing at making houses of dust. They recognized the signs which stamped him as a very great personage. And Jaya, having nothing else to offer, threw into the alms-bowl a handful of dust; coupling with his act a silent expression of hope that he might become a king, ruling over the whole world, and might, in that capacity, manifest in some form or another his devotion to Buddha.

Buddha accepted the offering. And, reading the thought, he turned to his companion, and said (368):—"This boy, Ānanda!, by reason of this groundwork of merit, shall, a hundred years after the death of (*me*) the Tathāgata,¹ become, at the city Pāṭaliputra, a king, Aśōka by name, a universal monarch over the whole globe, a pious man, a very king of religion; and he shall cause my corporeal relics² to be spread far and wide, and shall establish 84,000 monuments of religion."³

¹ Compare *ibid.*, pp. 379, 402; and pp. 348, 350, 385, for the same date for Upagupta, the spiritual adviser of Aśōka.

² The term used in the text here is *śarīra-dhātu*. It occurs wherever I give "corporeal relics." At the places where I do not include the word "corporeal," the text presents simply *dhātu*.

For *śarīra-dhātu* we have in Pāli works occasionally the term *sāṃvīrika dhātu*; sometimes in composition, sometimes as two separate words in apposition.

The terms *śarīra-dhātu*, *sāṃvīrika-dhātu*, distinguish 'corporeal relics' from *pāribhōgika-dhātu*, 'use-relics,' relics consisting of articles used or worn, and *uddēśika-dhātu*, 'illustrative or indicative relics,' i.e., apparently, memorials, including images, of acts performed.

The word *dhātu* by itself appears to have been used freely in all three senses, according to the context. It occurs both as a masculine and as a neuter. And it seems to mean indifferently either 'relic' or 'relics,' according to the context, whether it stands in the singular or in the plural.

³ The term used in the text here, and wherever I give "monuments of religion," is *dharma-vāṇīkā*, 'religion-line, or streak, or row.'

The editors have explained this term, in their index of words, as meaning

At that time, we are told (369), Bimbisāra was reigning, at Rājagriha. The text gives a succession of ten kings after him; commencing with his son Ajātaśatru, and going as far as Vindusāra, who was reigning at Pāṭaliputra.¹ Vindusāra

‘a royal edict on the Law.’ And it would not be surprising if the word should be found elsewhere used to denote the columns, sometimes inscribed, sometimes plain, which Aśoka appears to have set up in really large numbers. But it seems to be distinctly indicated as meaning in this text ‘a Stūpa,’ by the employment of the word *stūpa* itself in the two verses (page 889 below) which sum up what “the Maurya” did.

In order, however, to avoid confusion and to escape the inconvenience of having to give the original terms in brackets, I prefer to use, respectively, “monuments of religion” and “Stūpas,” according to the term actually standing in the text.

The number, 84,000, of these monuments of religion or Stūpas was determined by the number of cities at which they were to be placed. And the number of the cities was, of course, based on there being 84,000 *dharmakkhandas* or sections of the Law taught by Buddha (see, e.g., *Dīpavaṃsa*, 6. 92, 95), or 82,000 taught by Buddha and 2,000 by a disciple (*Theragāthā*, 1024).

The *Dīpavaṃsa* would intimate that there were 84,000 cities, and no more, in Jambudīpa, India; see the passage in 6. 86–99, which describes Aśoka as founding, in the course of three years, 84,000 *Ārāmas*, monasteries, one at each of the 84,000 cities which there were in Jambudīpa (in verse 98, exigencies of metre necessitated an omission of the word for ‘thousands;’ so the number of cities stands at first sight at only 84: “at that time, in Jambudīpa there were 84[000] cities”). So, also, *Buddhaghōṣa*, in the introduction to his *Samantapāsādikā* (*Vinayapiṭaka*, ed. Oldenberg, 3. 303), has described Aśoka as founding 84,000 *Vihāras*, monasteries, adorned by 84,000 *Chētiyas*,—(this may here denote either ordinary shrines or relic-shrines),—“in 84,000 cities in the whole of Jambudīpa.” At that rate, the cities, towns, and villages in Jambudīpa, India, would be outnumbered by the 99,000 in the three *Mahārāṣṭra* countries, and the 96,000 in the *Gaṅgavādi* province of Mysore. The 84,000 cities in Jambudīpa, however, were all selected ones, each with not less than a crore of inhabitants; see page 888 below.

This traditional Buddhist number figures, of course, in various other directions. In early ages of the present aeon, there were some successions of 84,000 kings (*Dīpavaṃsa*, 3. 17, 35, 38), and one of 82,000 (*ibid.*, 43). The great king *Mahā-Sudassana* possessed 84,000 cities, elephants, horses, chariots, wives, and so on (*SBE*, 11. 274 ff.). The praises of Buddha, when he was fit the *Tushita* heaven, were sung in 84,000 stanzas (*Lalitavistara*, ed. Lefmann, 7–11). And, while he was still leading a secular life, Buddha enjoyed the possession of a harem of 84,000 ladies, amongst whom *Gōpā*, daughter of the *Śākya* *Dandapāṇi*, was his chief queen (*ibid.*, 157).

Regarding the standard numbers, some traditional, some no doubt actual, of the cities, towns, and villages in the ancient territorial divisions of India, see a note in my *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, in the *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, vol. 1, part 2, p. 298, note 2. To the instances given there, it may be added that the traditional number for Kashmir was 66,063; see Stein’s translation of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, 2. 438.

It may be observed that the number 84,000 is found amongst the Jains also. For instance, the number of *paṇṇas* or scattered pieces of the *Siddhānta* which belonged to the first twenty-three *Tīrthaṅkaras*, was 84,000 (*IA*, 21. 299). And 84,000 years formed a period of punishment in hell (*Uvāsagadasāṇ*, translation, 162 f.).

¹ The text does not mention Chandragupta. It distinctly specifies Ajātaśatru as a son of Bimbisāra. The construction appears to imply that each successor is to be understood as the son of his predecessor. And thus this passage would actually seem to represent Vindusāra as a son of Nanda.

had a son named Susīma, and subsequently, from another wife, two other sons (370), of whom one was named Aśōka, and the other Vigataśōka, or Vitasōka (419 ff.).

At the time when Vindusāra was on his death-bed (372), Susīma was absent at Takshasilā, quelling an insurrection. With the help of the ministers (373), Aśōka fraudulently got himself appointed to the sovereignty. As soon as he heard that Vindusāra was dead, Susīma hurried back to assert his rights. He was slain, however, at the gates of Pāṭaliputra. And Aśōka was fully established as king.

Aśōka proved to be so ferociously cruel that he became known as Chaṇḍāśōka (374). And he took into his service, at Pāṭaliputra, to do his slaughterings for him, a man of similar disposition, originally named Girika, but in like manner known as Chaṇḍagirika. For this person, Aśōka built a house (375), so beautiful externally that it was known as *ramaṇīyaka-bandhana*, "the charming prison;" and he made him a promise that no one who entered the place should ever leave it again. And Chaṇḍagirika, going to the Kurkūtārāma monastery, acquired there, from overhearing a certain Bālapaṇḍita read a *sūtra*, a knowledge of all the tortures practised on people in hell by the keepers of hell.

Now, a certain Buddhist Bhikshu Samudra (376), who had come to Pāṭaliputra, was misled by the deceitful appearance of the house, which, charming enough outside, was internally like a very hell; and, strolling into it, he was promptly seized by Chaṇḍagirika, and (377) was bidden to prepare for death. As the result of his cries and supplications, a respite was given to him for seven days. But then (378) he was thrown into an iron cauldron, full of water and blood and fat of men and other filth, and a great fire was kindled under it. He remained, however, unharmed, and was found by Chaṇḍagirika seated on a couch on a water-lily on the surface of the contents of the cauldron.

Chaṇḍagirika sent word of the matter to the king, who came with a great company of people to see the sight. The Bhikshu recognized the opportunity of converting the king. After some preliminary observations, he told the king

(379) of the prophecy of Buddha, which marked him out for better things. "And," he said, "whereas thou hast established this hell-like place, into which thousands of living beings are thrown, thou oughtest, sire!, to give security to all creatures, and fulfil the wishes of the Blessed One."

Then the king (380) became filled with faith in Buddha, and asked pardon of the Bhikshu for the treatment given to him. And, when the Bhikshu had gone forth, the king himself prepared to depart. At that point, however, Chaṇḍagirika reminded the king of his promise, that no one who entered the place should ever leave it. "Which of us came in first?," said the king. "I did," said Chaṇḍagirika. Then the king had him seized by the slaughterers; and he was taken into the torture-chamber and was burnt. And the king had "the charming prison" demolished, and gave security to all creatures.

Then, having been thus converted, king Aśōka resolved to cause the corporeal relics of Buddha to be spread far and wide. And, going with a body of troops, an armed escort, composed of the usual four constituents of an army (elephants, chariots, cavalry, and infantry),¹ he opened to

¹ The expression in the text is:—*chaturāṅgēna bala-kāyēna gatvā*. In consequence of the desire to discredit the story by any means whatsoever, even this natural and harmless little detail has been seized as a pretext for hostile criticism, based on statements (this Journal, 1901. 400 f.) that "Ajātasattu's stūpa was at Rājagaha, a few miles from Asoka's capital," and "the time given was one of profound peace," and on the question:—"What, then, was the mighty force to do?"

As regards the "time of profound peace," there is no evidence either way. As regards the "few miles," the distance between Aśōka's capital, Pāṭaliputra, and Rājagriha, was not less than about forty miles, or four days' journey; and the subsequent tour embraced a stretch of not less than 220 miles to Kāpilavastu.

The word *balakāya*, 'force-body,' no doubt often denotes a large army. But there is no objection to taking it as meaning simply an armed escort, such as kings would always take with them even on peaceful tours. The Divisional Commissioner of the present day travels with what is, if he has an elephant with him, a complete *chaturāṅga-balakāya*. Is it to be supposed that Aśōka would go about alone? The same work similarly represents him (389) as taking a *chaturāṅga-balakāya* with him, when he went round with Upagupta to see the places at which Buddha had dwelt.

It may be added that, when Aśōka did travel in style with a "mighty force," he went with no mere *chaturāṅga-balakāya*, but:—*satta-yōjan-āyāmāya yōjana-vitthārāya mahatiyā sēnāya*; "with a great army seven *yōjanas* long and one *yōjana* broad:" so at least says Buddhaghōṣa (see *Vinaya-piṭaka*, 3. 335), in mentioning a certain occasion on which the king went from Pāṭaliputta to the Bōdhi-tree.

the bottom the *drōṇa-stūpa*, the Stūpa containing a *drōṇa* (of relics),¹ erected by Ajātaśatru, and took out the corporeal relics of Buddha. Then, having completely restored (*the damage*),² and having given (*back*) a portion of the relics,³ he erected (*again*) the Stūpa. In the same way, with a reverent intention (*bhaktimataḥ*), he treated in detail the second Stūpa; and so on, until, having taken (*relics*) from seven *drōṇas*,⁴ and having erected (*again*) the Stūpas, he went to the village Rāmagrāma.

There the king was received by the Nāgas, the serpent-demons, and was led down by them into their abode;⁵ and they preferred a request to him, saying:—"We will on this very spot do worship to it." To this, the king assented.⁶

¹ The word which I have rendered by "having opened to the bottom" is *utpātīya*, 'having torn up, extirpated.' The context implies that the Stūpa was not actually destroyed, though it was opened; so we do not give to *utpātīya* a force which it sometimes has.

In this passage, the term *drōṇa-stūpa* has been selected for hostile treatment, on the grounds (this Journal, 1901. 400 f.) that "the Droṇa Stūpa, the one put up over the vessel, was also quite close by" (and so an opening of it would not necessitate an expedition with a mighty force), and that "the expression Droṇa Stūpa is remarkable."

But the passage does not refer to the Stūpa erected by the Brāhman Drōṇa. It distinctly speaks of the Stūpa erected by Ajātaśatru. And it simply qualifies that Stūpa as a *drōṇa-stūpa* in accordance with the idea (see page 667 above) that each of the original eight Stūpas contained a *drōṇa* of relics.

² The text says:—*uddhāraṇam cha vistarēṇa kṛtvā*. Here, *vistarēṇa* = 'in detail, fully.' The expression *jīrṇ-ōddhāraṇam kṛi*, 'to make repairs of a thing worn out,' is of constant occurrence in epigraphic records; and the text must refer here to repairing the relic-chamber; not to "putting them (the relics) distributively in the place [or the places] whence they had been taken."

³ The text has:—*dhātu-pratyamśam dattvā*. And, in view of such terms as *prativarśam*, 'every year, yearly,' *pratigātram*, 'in every limb,' &c., it might be rendered by "having given (*away*) every item of the relics."

Cowell and Neil's index of words, however, assigns to *pratyamśa* the meaning of 'division, share.' And the word certainly seems to occur in that sense in the same work, 132 f. Also, the general tendency of the whole tradition seems to indicate that we ought to believe that the places visited were not entirely despoiled of their relics. At the same time, the text, mentioning the making of repairs before the giving back of a portion of the relics, would seem to imply that that portion of the relics was not replaced in the relic-chamber. On this point, compare page 908 below, and note.

⁴ The text has:—*yāvat śapta-drōṇād grahāya*; "having taken from as far as seven *drōṇas*."

⁵ That would be under the waters of a lake, according to the usual belief regarding the residences of the Nāgas: at any rate, in some subterranean place.

⁶ The meaning is this. The Nāgas were seeking to prevent the king from opening the Stūpa. So, to avoid exciting any temptation, they did not take him

Then the king was led up again by the Nāgas from their abode. And so people shall say (*vakshyati hi*):—

“But at Rāmagrāma (*there is*) to this day the eighth Stūpa; the reverent Nāgas preserved it at that time: from this one the king did not obtain relics; but the trustful king thought over the matter, and went away (*quite content, even*) without doing that (*which he had come to do*).”

Then the king (381) caused 84,000 boxes (*karaṇḍa*) to be made, of gold and silver and crystal and cat's-eye quartz, and placed the relics in them. Then one by one he distributed 84,000 earthen jars (*kumbha*) and 84,000 (*inscribed*) tablets into the hands of Yakshas, genii. And he commanded the Yakshas to establish a monument of religion in every city in the whole world, great, medium-sized, or small, in which there should be a complete crore (*of people*).

Now, at that time at Takshaṣilā there were thirty-six crores (*of people*). And they demanded thirty-six of the boxes. The king, however, saw at once that, at that rate, there would be no proper spreading abroad of the relics. So, being a man who had his wits about him (*upāya-jñā*), he said that thirty-five crores must of course be subtracted. And he explained fully that, wherever there should be more or less (*than one crore of people, after making any convenient deduction*), there a box was not to be given.

Then the king went to the Kurkuṭārāma monastery, and approached the Sthavira Yaśas, and said:—“This is my desire; that on a certain day, in a certain division of it, I should establish 84,000 monuments of religion.” The Sthavira replied:—“Be it so; at that time I will veil the disc of the sun with my hand.” So, on that day, the Sthavira Yaśas veiled the disc of the sun with his hand;¹ and thus, on a certain day, in a certain division of it, there

to it. They proposed that he should worship it from the place to which they led him. And they asked to be allowed the honour of doing so at the same time and in his company.

¹ This has been understood to indicate a solar eclipse. But of course it was a signal, by preconcerted arrangement, for all the Yakshas to work at one and the same time.

were established 84,000 monuments of religion. And so people shall say (*vakshyati cha*):—

“He indeed, the Maurya, having obtained relics of the Sage from (*each of*) those seven ancient works (*kṛiti*), made in a day, throughout the world, eighty (*and*) four thousands¹ of Stūpas of beautiful appearance like the autumn moon.”

When the king Aśōka had thus established 84,000 monuments of religion, he became pious, a very king of religion; and his name came to be Dharmāsōka. And so people shall say (*vakshyati cha*):—

“For the welfare of (*his*) subjects, the honourable and glorious Maurya caused Stūpas to be made throughout the whole world; having previously become Chaṇḍāsōka, the cruel Aśōka, by that deed he became Dharmāsōka, the pious Aśōka.”

* * * * *

Such is the story in the Divyāvadāna. As regards the date to which the composition of it may be referred, we have to make the following observations.

The Pāṃsupradānāvadāna, which contains this story, is part of a narrative, commencing with it and ending with chapter 29; which seems to have been known as the Aśōkāvadāna, though that title is attached to only chapter 29. And that narrative is one of a collection of stories in respect of which the editors have said (preface, p. 7, note 1, and p. 8) that they were evidently composed by various authors, and are to be regarded, not as translations from any Pāli original, but as having come from an independent source, and as being isolated surviving fragments of what was once a large literature.

As regards the earliest limit for the Aśōkāvadāna, its last chapter gives, after Aśōka, a succession of five kings, commencing with Saṃpadin, son of Dharmavivardhana, otherwise called Kunāla, who was a son of Aśōka, and

¹ The text of this Pāda is:— *lōkē sāsīti śāsad ahnā sahasram*. The metre (Vaiśvadēvi) is faulty at *sāsīti śāsad*, where we have — — — — instead of — — — — —. I conjecture that the original reading must have been:— *lōkē=śītim chatvāri ahnā sahasram*; with an hiatus after *chatvāri*.

In the second Pāda, *tasya rishēh* has of course to be scanned *tasya=arshēh*.

ending with Pushyamitra, son of Pushyadharman. And it says that, when Pushyamitra was slain, the race of the Mauryas was exterminated. There can be but little doubt, if any, that in this Pushyamitra we have, not a Maurya, but the Pushpamitra who, according, for instance, to the Vishṇu-Purāṇa, was the first of the Śuṅga kings, the successors of the Mauryas. But, however that may be, the Aśōkāvādāna carries on the succession after Aśōka for five reigns, and no further. This suggests about B.C. 150 as the earliest possible date for the composition of the Aśōkāvādāna. But, of course, it does not follow, nor is it at all likely, that the story was really composed in so early a time as that. And, amongst other features in the succession which is given from Bimbisāra to Aśōka's father Vindusāra, the omission to mention Chandragupta (see page 884 above, and note 1) points at once to an appreciably later time, when the tradition about the line of kings had become very imperfect, at least among the Buddhists, in that part of the country to which the author belonged.

As regards the later limit for the Aśōkāvādāna, the editors have only observed, in general connexion with the whole collection (preface, 9), that in the stories in the Divyāvādāna there is no mention of Avalōkitēśvara and Mañjuśrī, nor (except perhaps in one passage) of the formula :— Ōṃ Maṇi padmē (or Maṇipadmē) hūṃ. And, as Avalōkitēśvara and Mañjuśrī are gods of the Mahāyāna school, which according to tradition had its origin in the "Council" which was held under the patronage of Kanishka, the indication so given was perhaps intended to be much the same as that given subsequently by Professor Kern, when he wrote (*Man. Ind. Buddhism*, 10) :—"This valuable collection must have been reduced to its present state in a period after Kanishka, for the Dīnāra repeatedly occurs in it as the name of an Indian coin; yet the constituent parts of it are undoubtedly, for a large part, anterior to A.D. 100, abstraction made of the idiom, which may have been modified."

Now, as regards the *argumentum ex silentio*,—does any part of the Divyāvādāna mention any at all of the divinities

of the same class with Avalokitēśvara and Mañjuśrī?; such personages do not seem to have come within the scope of the work. However, we do not propose to discuss the date of the whole collection. We are concerned here with only the Aśōkāvadāna portion of it.

For the rest,— the difficulty indicated by Professor Kern, but not really existent,¹ may be removed by excepting the Aśōkāvadāna, under the effect of what may be implied by the words “for a large part,” from his expression of opinion regarding the date. And there is justification for doing that in the use itself of the word *dīnāra*, for which the editors have given in their index only two references, both to passages in the Aśōkāvadāna, pages 427, 434. Like the faulty succession of kings, the use of this word is indicative of a by no means early date; for, the earliest fixed instances of the use of this word to denote a coin or weight current in India are found in inscriptions of Chandragupta II. of A.D. 407–08 and 412 (F.G.I, 38 f., 33).²

Beyond that, all that we can say at present is this. An Aśōkarāja-Sūtra was translated into Chinese in A.D. 512; and we are told that this translation may be a translation of the Aśōkāvadāna (B. Nanjio's Catalogue, No. 1343). But, before that, an Aśōkarājāvadāna-Sūtra was translated into Chinese in A.D. 317–420; and we are told that it may be a part of the Aśōkāvadāna (id., No. 1344). And in A.D. 384 there was translated into Chinese a “Sūtra on the cause of the eye-destruction of Fā-yi (Dharmavardhana?) the prince of Aśōka” (id., No. 1367). This translation cannot, indeed, have been made from that part of chapter 27, the Kunālāvadāna, dealing with the same topic, which we have in the

¹ The difficulty is created by the combination, not at all made by Professor Kern for the first time (see, e.g., Beal, *Records*, I. 56, note 200; 151, note 97), of two separate statements, one of which is quite erroneous, without looking fully into them; with the result (used in *Man. Ind. Buddhism*, 118) of obtaining an interval of three centuries from the death of that king whom we always mean when we speak of simply Aśōka to the beginning of the reign of Kanishka, and so of placing Kanishka in the last quarter of the first century A.D., and his “Council” about A.D. 100 (id., 121).

On this point, see further a Note on “The Traditional Date of Kanishka” in the Miscellaneous Communications of this Number.

² For later instances in the same series, see *ibid.*, 40, 41, 262, 265.

Asōkāvadāna of the Divyāvadāna; because the latter is in prose interspersed with only some 55 verses, whereas the original of the translation consisted of 343 verses. But it can hardly be doubted that the story is the same in both; namely (Divyāvadāna, 405 ff.), how Asōka gave to his son Dharmavivardhana the name Kunāla, because his eyes resembled those of the *kunāla*-bird; how Kunāla submitted to having his eyes plucked out, in consequence of the machinations of his step-mother Tishyarakshitā; and how, in the end, truth and justice prevailed, and Kunāla's eyes were restored, and Tishyarakshitā was slain. And thus, while the text in the Divyāvadāna was not the original of the Chinese translation, still it may quite possibly have been in existence by A.D. 384.

Further, as we shall see, the Dipavamsa proves the existence by not later than A.D. 360 of a belief that Asōka the Maurya was in possession of relics of Buddha. And the Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king proves the existence by A.D. 414-21 of a belief that he obtained corporeal relics of Buddha by opening seven of the eight original Stūpas. And so the text in the Divyāvadāna narrating that occurrence may, also, quite possibly have been in existence by the same date, A.D. 384.

Thus, taking everything together, we may place the composition of the Asōkāvadāna of the Divyāvadāna provisionally in the period A.D. 300-350. But it must be added that Fa-hian (Beal, *Records*, I. introd., 63) has mentioned the legend of the giving of the dust and of the conversion of Asōka by a Bhikshu in the torture-house, without including the detail of the 100 years after the death of Buddha, and without, in fact, asserting that or any definite date for Asōka anywhere in his writings; and this tends to suggest that the detail of the 100 years may have been evolved, and the finishing off of the story as we have it in the Asōkāvadāna may have been accomplished, after A.D. 400. From either point of view, there is the possibility that, whatever may be the real date of this Asōkāvadāna, certain verses in it, introduced by the expression

rakshyati hi, rakshyati cha, "and so people shall say,"—(three of them are translated on pages 888, 889, above),—may be excerpts from an earlier framework around which the story, as we have¹ it, was built up.¹

We may perhaps determine something more definite hereafter, when we can fix the time of the evolution of the full story about Tishyarakshitā. Here, in the *Asōkāvadāna*, we have, not only the tale about her and Kunāla, but also (in the same chapter, 397 f.) a version of the tale about her attempt to destroy the Bōdhi-tree. Only the latter story figures, in A.D. 520–40, in the *Mahāvamsa* (Turnour, 122; Wijesinha, 78), and not in exactly the same form. It is mentioned, however, by also Fa-hian, in about A.D. 400 (Beal, *Records*, I. introd., 66), but there again with another difference.² The instructive points will probably be, when and how was the name itself, Tishyarakshitā, evolved?³

¹ We have this expression thirteen times in the *Asōkāvadāna*, and always introducing verses which, I think, may fairly be considered framework-verses. I do not find it anywhere else in the *Divyāvadāna*. But through the rest of the work there run two expressions, not found in the *Asōkāvadāna*, namely, *gāthāṃ bhāṣatē*, and *gāthāṃ abhāṣitā*, which may or may not mark the use of framework-verses there.

² According to Fa-hian, the queen of *Asōka*—(he does not mention her name)—sent men to cut the tree down.

According to the *Divyāvadāna*, Tishyarakshitā, the chief queen of *Asōka*—(Padmāvati, the mother of Kunāla, is only styled *dēvi*),—employed a woman named Mātāṅgī to make the tree wither by charms and by tying a cord round it.

According to the *Mahāvamsa* (Turnour, 122; corrected by Wijesinha, 78), Tissārakkhā, a queen of *Asōka*, destroyed the tree by a thorn (apparently poisonous) of a *munḍu*-plant.

Hüen Tsiang says (Julien, *Mémoires*, I. 462 f.; Beal, *Records*, 2. 117; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 115) that *Asōka* himself tried to destroy the tree by cutting through its roots; and that, when that attempt failed, his queen—(he does not mention her name)—cut it down, but *Asōka* had meanwhile repented, and by his prayers, and by bathing the roots with perfumed milk, he revived it.

³ According to Turnour (122), the *Mahāvamsa* says that four years after the death of his beloved queen Asandhimittā, who was a devoted follower of Buddha, the king Dhammāsōka:—*tassā rakkhaṃ mahēṣittē thapēsi visam-āsayam*; "installed as queen one of her guardswomen who was of a disagreeable disposition."

Wijesinha indicates (78) that the correct reading is, not *tassā rakkhaṃ*, but *Tissārakkhaṃ*.

Perhaps so. But, as *tissā* is another form of *tassā*, 'of her,' and as it seems that we have *Tissārakkhā* in Pāli against (with a difference in the quantity of the vowel in the second syllable) *Tishyarakshitā* in Sanskrit, it is not impossible that the name was not taken into Pāli from a Sanskrit original, but was evolved

and is it established for A.D. 384 by the Chinese translation made in that year?

Dīpavaṃsa.

Next in order of time we have the earliest extant Ceylonese chronicle, the Dīpavaṃsa, which carries the ancient history down to the death of king Mahāsēna, about A.D. 360,¹ and was plainly finished off soon after that occurrence.

The Dīpavaṃsa does not say anything about relics of Buddha in connexion with Susunāga's son, whom it calls both Kālāsōka (4. 44; 5. 80) and Asōka (5. 25).

It mentions Asōka the Mōriya, grandson of Chandagutta and son of Bindusāra, as Asōka (e.g., 1. 27; 5. 59, 102; 6. 18, 22), Dhammāsōka, "the pious Asōka" (1. 26; 7. 45), Asōkadhamma (5. 82, 101; 6. 23),² Piyadassana (6. 1, 2), and Piyadassi (6. 14, 24). It does not appear to say anything about his having borne the appellation Chaṇḍāsōka. Nor does it (as far as I can see) offer any explanation as to how he acquired the appellation Dhammāsōka, Asōkadhamma: at any rate, it does not give any such explanation in the passage (6. 86 ff.) which recites how in the course of three years he founded, in honour of the 84,000 sections of the

from *tissā rakkhā*, and consequently that it was of Pāli invention and was subsequently Sanskritized.

Is the name found in any of the writings of Buddhaghōsha? And, if so, in what precise form?

¹ The supposed date of this occurrence is A.D. 302. That, however, is according to the arrangement of the chronology with B.C. 543, for the death of Buddha, as the starting-point. But that arrangement antedates all the early chronology by just about sixty years; it places, for instance, the initial date of Chandragupta, the grandfather of Asōka, in B.C. 381, whereas we know from the Greek sources that Chandragupta's initial date was closely about B.C. 320.

Up to what exact time a continuous correction, perhaps gradually diminishing from about sixty years to a vanishing point in the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D., must be made in the Ceylonese chronology, is not quite certain yet. But an adjustment of closely about sixty years has to be made until at any rate after the times of Buddhaghōsha and the Thera Mahānāma.

² This form seems to have been obtained, not by inverting the components of *Dhammāsōka*, but by joining together, with an omission of the ending *rāja*, the two separate bases *Asōka* and *dhammarāja*, "Asōka the king of religion," from which we have the accusative *Asōkaṃ dhammarājānaṃ* in 15. 6, 9. Compare note 3 on page 903 below.

Law, 84,000 Ārāmas, monasteries, one at each of the 84,000 towns which there were in Jambudīpa (India).¹

It does not present any such story as that found in the Divyāvadāna. And it does not indicate how Asōka the Mōriya had obtained any relics of Buddha. But, in connexion with the possession of such by him, it gives the following story (ed. Oldenberg, 15. 5 ff.):²—

King Dēvānāmpiya-Tissa of Ceylon announced to the Thēra, the Elder, Mahinda, his desire to found a Thūpa of the Teacher, Buddha. Mahinda deputed a Sāmaṇēra, a novice, named Sumana,³ to go to Asōka the *dharmarāja*, “the king of religion,” at Pāṭaliputta, and to ask for some choice relic (*dhātu-varaṃ*; verse 7) for that Thūpa. Sumana took his alms-bowl and robe (*patta-chīvarāṃ*; verse 9), and instantaneously departed (*going through the air*) from the mountain (Missaka).⁴ Asōka filled the alms-bowl (*of Sumana*) with relics (verse 11).⁵ Sumana took the relics (verse 12), and went through the air to the god Kōsiya (Indra), from whom he obtained another choice relic (*dhātu-varaṃ*; verse 14), the right collar-bone of Buddha (verse 15).⁶ And then he straightway stood again upon the mountain (Missaka; verse 16).

The remainder of the account is somewhat obscure, no doubt through some of the text being missing; and it has

¹ See note 3 on page 883 above.

² We are, perhaps, not really concerned with anything after the gift of relics by Asōka. But the whole story may as well be given, to round the matter off, and to be available for any other purpose.

³ This novice appears to have been selected for the mission, partly because he had evidently attained magical powers, partly because (see 15. 93; also Buddha-ghōṣha, op. cit., page 903 below, 328, 334) he was a grandson of Asōka.

⁴ That it was this mountain, is indicated by 14. 56.

⁵ The verse says:—“Having heard the speech (*of Sumana*), the king, rejoicing and excited, *dhānu pattaṃ apūrēsi*, (and said): ‘Quickly depart, pious man.’”

The previous statement, that Sumana had taken his alms-bowl with him, indicates plainly that it was Sumana's alms-bowl that the king filled with relics. And so Oldenberg has translated:—“ filled the alms-bowl with relics.”

The point calls for comment because of the different meaning adopted, as we shall see, by Mahānāma in the Mahāvamsa. Compare page 904 below.

⁶ Nothing is said here about Indra possessing also a tooth of Buddha.

to be read in the light of the explanation given by Buddhaghōsha (page 904 f. below). It runs as follows:—

The king, with his brothers (verse 18), went with a great army, accompanied also by the community of Bhikkhus, to meet the relics. Verses 19 and 20, which are fragmentary, state that something was placed on the frontal globe of the (king's) elephant.¹ It was taken into the city by the eastern gate (verse 23), and then out by the southern gate (verse 24), to the spot which the ancient sages Kakusandha, Kōnāgamana, and Kassapa had visited. There the king deposited the relics of Sakyaputta, Buddha (verse 26).² Then the Sāmaṇēra Sumana caused bricks for the Thūpa to be made (verse 28). The Khattiyas all did worship to the Thūpa (verse 29). And, after a parenthetical recital (verses 34 to 64) of events attributed to the times of Kakusandha, Kōnāgamana, and Kassapa, we are given to understand (verse 65 ff.) that, in accordance with a prophecy uttered by Buddha, there was installed at the Thūpārāma monastery, in or soon after the year 236 after the death of Buddha, = B.C. 246, a corporeal relic (*sārīrikō dhātuh*; verse 73) of Buddha. What, exactly, that relic was, is not made clear in the extant text of the Dīpaṃsa. But Buddhaghōsha explains it as the right collar-bone.

Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king.

We have next the story given in a Sanskrit work which is known to us from a Chinese translation entitled Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king, = Buddhacharita-kāvya, “a poem on the career of Buddha.”

¹ From Buddhaghōsha and the Mahāvamsa, we learn that it was the right collar-bone that was thus disposed of.

The extant text of the Dīpaṃsa gives no clue as to what was done with the relics given by Asōka. So, even apart from what is stated by Buddhaghōsha, it would seem that an appreciable amount has been lost at this point.

The Mahāvamsa says (Turnour, 122; Wijesinha, 78) that the relics obtained from Asōka, including, according to it, the alms-bowl of Buddha himself, were installed by Devānampiya-Tissa *vatthu-gharē subhā*, or, according to the translators, “in a superb apartment of the royal residence.”

² We have here the plural, *dhātuyō*. But, from verse 73, as well as from what is said by Buddhaghōsha and in the Mahāvamsa, it appears to denote only the right collar-bone.

This Chinese translation was made by Dharmaraksha between A.D. 414 and 421 (B. Nanjio's Catalogue, No. 1351). The Sanskrit original, therefore, may quite possibly have been written before the time at which the *Dīpavaṃsa* was brought to a close. And the original is, in fact, attributed to the Bōdhisattva Aśvaghōsha, who is also the supposed author of a *Buddhacharita* of which the surviving cantos 1 to 13, with four others added in the last century, have been edited by Professor Cowell in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* Series, and have been translated by him in SBE, 49. 1-201. While, however, as far as the original part of the latter work goes, the titles of cantos 1 to 13 in the two works agree, still, the details are so discrepant that it is questionable whether the Chinese work can be regarded as even a very free translation of the *Buddhacharita*. And (setting aside any question as to the date of Aśvaghōsha) all that seems certain is that the *Buddhacharita-kāvya*, of which we have a translation in the *Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king*, was in existence by about A.D. 400.

The story found here, in canto 28, the last, "the division of the relics," is chiefly of interest in giving us a date, not later than about A.D. 400, by which time the tribesmen,—the Lichchhavis, the Sakyas, the Bulis, the Kōliyas, and the Mallas of Pāvā,—with even the Brāhmaṇ of Vēṭhadīpa, had become transformed into kings. These, with Ajātasatru, make the "seven kings" first mentioned in the *Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king*. And, with a similar metamorphosis of the Mallas of Kuśinagara themselves, we have the "eight kings" of verse 2284, and of the later statements of Hiuen Tsiang.

But it is otherwise peculiar in assigning the "ashes" and the "ashes Stūpa,"—in addition to their share in the corporeal relics and to the Stūpa over that,—to the Mallas of Kuśinagara; instead of agreeing with the *Mahā-parinibbāna-Sutta* in assigning them to the Mauryas of Pippalivana. Also, in allotting to the Brāhmaṇ Drōṇa a small share of the corporeal relics, in addition to the "relic-pitcher;" but without attributing to him either the theft charged against him by Buddhaghōsha (page 906

below) or the trick with which he was credited by the tradition reported by Hiuen Tsiang.

According to Mr. Beal's translation in SBE, 19, the story in the Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king runs as follows:—

Having heard (verse 2219) of the death of Buddha, "the kings of the seven countries"¹ sent messengers to the Mallas (of Kuśinagara), asking for shares of the relics. The Mallas replied (2220 f.) that they would die rather than part with any of the relics. So "the seven kings" (2221 f.) determined to take them by force, and laid siege to Kuśinagara. A Brāhmaṇ, however, named Drōṇa (2231), acted as mediator; with the result that the Mallas "(2280) opened out the "master's relics and in eight parts equally divided them. "Themselves paid reverence to one part, the other seven "they handed to the Brāhmaṇ; (2281) the seven kings, "having accepted these, rejoiced and placed them on their "heads; and thus with them returned to their own country, "and erected Dāgobas for worship over them.² (2282) The "Brahmachārin then besought the Mallas to bestow on him "the relic-pitcher as his portion, and from the seven kings "he requested a fragment of their relics, as an eighth share. "(2283) Taking this, he returned and raised a Chaitya, "which is still named 'the Golden Pitcher Dāgoba.'³ Then "the men of Kuśinagara collecting all the ashes of the "burning, (2284) raised over them a Chaitya, and called "it 'the Ashes Dāgoba.' The eight Stūpas of the eight "kings, 'the Golden Pitcher' and 'the Ashes Stūpa,' (2285) "thus throughout Jambudvīpa there first were raised ten "Dāgobas."

¹ The names are not given, either of the kings or of the countries. "The kings of seven countries" would perhaps be a more correct translation than "the kings of the seven countries," as we do not know of any particular seven countries, which could be mentioned without specific names, except the *sapta-dvīpa*, the seven divisions of the whole world.

² As is well known, the word *dāgoba* is a corruption of the term *dhātugarbha*, 'relic-chamber.' It seems, however, to have become established in the wider sense of the erection (Stūpa, or shrine) containing a *dhātugarbha*.

³ The "pitcher" is marked as a golden pitcher again in verse 2206, at the end of the account of the cremation:—"The scented oil consumed, the fire declines, the bones they place within a golden pitcher."

Further on, we are told as follows:—“(2293) King Asōka ‘born in the world when strong, caused much sorrow; (2294) when feeble, then he banished sorrow;’ as the ‘Asōka-flower tree, ruling over Jambudvīpa, his heart for ever put an end to sorrow, (2295) when brought to entire faith in the true law; therefore he was called ‘the King who frees from sorrow.’ A descendant of the Mayūra family, receiving from heaven a righteous disposition, (2296) he ruled equally over the world; he raised everywhere towers and shrines, his private name the ‘violent Asōka,’ now called the ‘righteous Asōka.’ (2297) Opening the Dāgobas raised by those seven kings to take the Śarīras thence, he spread them everywhere, and raised in one day 84,000 towers; (2298) only with regard to the eighth pagoda in Rāmagrāma, which the Nāga spirit protected, the king was unable to obtain those relics; (2299) but though he obtained them not, knowing they were spiritually bequeathed relics of Buddha which the Nāga worshipped and adored, his faith was increased and his reverent disposition.”

Fa-hian.

We take next the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hian, who travelled in India between A.D. 399 and 414.

There is no evidence that, amongst the places named in the list on page 671 above, Fa-hian visited (4) Allakappa,²

¹ The meaning seems to be that it was illness that led to his conversion.

² For *kappa*, = *kalpa*, as the termination of a place-name, compare Uchhakalpa, the town of a line of princes in Central India in the period A.D. 493–533 (F.G.I., 117 ff.). But, except to that extent, I do not at present recognize the Sanskrit form of the Pāli name Allakappa. A Tibetan translation of some version of apparently the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta itself with the later verses added at the end, substitutes for Allakappa a name which is explained as meaning “of wavering judgment” (AR, 20, 215). But, while we may no doubt render *kappa*, *kalpa*, by ‘judgment,’—(Monier-Williams assigns to it the meaning of ‘resolve, determination’),—that does not help to explain the first component of the name, which can hardly represent *alpa*; moreover, the term *alpa-kalpa* would mean ‘of little judgment,’ and ‘of wavering judgment’ would probably be *skhulati-*, or *skhalita-kalpa*. Childers gives a Pāli word *alla*, with the sense of ‘wet, moist’; but that would hardly suit the Tibetan rendering. Still less so would the Sanskrit *āla*, ‘not little or insignificant; excellent.’

Allakappa seems to have been a territory, rather than a town. But I do not find, either in Buddhaghōṣa’s commentary on the Dhammapada, 153, or in the

(6) Vēṭhadīpa,¹ and (7) Pāvā; or that he saw (9) the Stūpa erected by the Brāhmaṇ Drōṇa over the jar.

He did visit (2) Vaisālī, (3) Kapilavastu, and (8) Kuśinagara. But he does not mention having seen a relic-Stūpa of Buddha at any of these three places.

Between Rāmagrāma and Kuśinagara, he visited (10) the "Charcoal tope," i.e. Thūpa, Stūpa (Legge, *Travels of Fa-hien*, 70), or the "Ashes-tower" (Beal, *Records*, 1. introd., 51). But he has not mentioned the place by the name Pippalivana; nor has he connected the Mauryas with it. Further, he has placed this memorial only twelve *yōjanas* away from Kuśinagara, on the west. So, also, as we shall see, Hiuen Tsiang found it in the same neighbourhood. But this location of this Stūpa is hardly consistent with the indication given by the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta. The Mauryas of Pippalivana had to be content with the extinguished embers of the funeral fire, because (see page 664 above) their messenger reached Kuśinagara after the distribution of the eight shares into which the corporeal relics of Buddha had been divided, and consequently was

Buddhavaṃsa, 28. 2, the authority for the statement, made in Müller's List of Pāli Proper Names, that Allakappa was "a country adjacent to Magadha." In another direction, however, it would seem that Allakappa and Vēṭhadīpa were near each other, or perhaps that Vēṭhadīpa was a division of Allakappa. At any rate, Buddhaghōṣa says, in the passage indicated just above, that in the Allakappa country (*raṭṭha*) there were two kings, the Allakappa king and the Vēṭhadīpa king; they were companions, educated together, from childhood; and, together, they renounced the world, became wandering ascetics, and went to the Himālaya region and settled there.

¹ Here, again, I cannot at present determine the Sanskrit form of the name; beyond of course recognizing that it may have been Viṣṭadvīpa, Vēṣṭadvīpa, or Vaiṣṭadvīpa, of any of which words, however, as a place-name, I cannot find any trace. It may, however, be mentioned that the St. Petersburg Dictionary quotes Vaiṣṭapurīya, from the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, 14. 5, 5, 20; 7. 3, 35, as a personal name; and this suggests the existence of a town named Viṣṭapura, which might easily be the capital of a Viṣṭadvīpa territory. The Tibetan translation mentioned in the preceding note substitutes (loc. cit.) for Vēṭhadīpa a name which is explained as meaning "Vishṇu's region:" but we do not know any Viṣṇudvīpa; and it is difficult to find any connexion between *vishṇu* and *vēṭha*, except by assuming that *vēṭha* has been mistakenly confused with some Prakṛit form *biṭṭa*, *bitṭi*, etc.) of *vishṇu*.

From the statement of Buddhaghōṣa, mentioned in the preceding note, it would seem that Vēṭhadīpa was a town in, or a division of, a territory named Allakappa. Taking Vēṭhadīpa as a town, Mr. Hoey has suggested to me that we may recognize it in the 'Bettiah,' 'Bettia,' or 'Bettia' of the present day, in the Champāran district. This seems to me highly probable, if the true spelling of the modern name is such as to justify the connexion.

too late to assert their claim to a share in those relics. That distinctly suggests that Pippalivana was at some considerable distance from Kuśinagara; further away, at any rate, than Rājagriha, the distance to which is said (see page 907 below) to have been twenty-five *yōjanas*. Taking in connexion with this the statement in the Fō-sho-hing-tsan-king which assigns the "ashes" and the "ashes Stūpa" to the Mallas of Kuśinagara (page 898 above), we can hardly fail to think that the tradition about the embers-Stūpa had become corrupted, and that in this case there was shewn to Fa-hian and Hiuen Tsiang a monument which was not really that which it was supposed to be. At any rate, much as we should like to identify Pippalivana, because we probably have it in the ancestral home of Chandragupta and Aśōka, we can by no means agree with those who have held that the place is proved to have been somewhere between Rāmagrāma and Kuśinagara.

Fa-hian visited also (1) Rājagriha. And at this place he saw the "tope" (Legge, op. cit., 81) or "tower" (Beal, loc. cit., 58), which Ajātaśatru raised over the portion of the corporeal relics of Buddha which he received. He has said of this Stūpa according to Legge that it was "high, large, grand, and beautiful," and according to Beal that "its height is very imposing." And he has located it 300 paces outside the west gate of "New Rājagriha,— the new city which was built by king Ajātaśatru."¹ This, of course, was Ajātaśatru's original Stūpa; the one mentioned on page 908 below.¹ To Hiuen Tsiang there was shewn the Stūpa over Ajātaśatru's collective deposit of all the relics; the one attributed by Buddhaghōsha to Viśvakarman (page 911), which was pulled down and rebuilt by Aśōka (page 912 f.).

He visited also Lan-mo, = Rāma, = (5) Rāmagrāma. And in connexion with this place he left on record the following statement (Beal, loc. cit., 50) :²—

¹ So also Beal :—" . . . the new Rājagriha. This was the town which King Ajātaśatru built." Regarding the old and the new towns at Rājagriha, see more under Hiuen Tsiang.

² For the essential part of Legge's version (op. cit., 68), which does not differ in any material point, reference may be made to this Journal, 1901. 403.

“The king of this country obtained one share of the relics of Buddha’s body. On his return home he built a tower, which is the same as the tower of Rāmagrāma. By the side of it is a tank in which lives a dragon, who constantly guards and protects the tower and worships there morning and night.

“When king Aśōka was living he wished to destroy the eight towers and to build 84,000 others. Having destroyed seven, he next proceeded to treat this one in the same way. The dragon therefore assumed a body and conducted the king within his abode, and having shown him all the vessels and appliances he used in his religious services, he addressed the king and said :—‘If you can worship better than this, then you may destroy the tower. Let me take you out ; I will have no quarrel with you.’

“King Aśōka, knowing that these vessels were of no human workmanship, immediately returned to his home.”

Fa-hian goes on to say that the place became desert, overgrown with jungle, and there was no one either to water or to sweep it. But “ever and anon a herd of elephants carrying water in their trunks piously watered the ground, and also brought all sorts of flowers and perfumes to pay religious worship at the tower.” Also, pilgrims from distant countries used to come, to worship at the “tower.” Some of them took upon themselves the duties of Śrāmaṇeras, novices. And they built a temple or a monastery, in which there had continued to be a regular succession of monks, presided over by a Śrāmaṇera, up to the time of Fa-hian.

All else, of use, that I find in Fa-hian’s work in respect of the tradition that we are examining, is in connexion with his account of Pāṭaliputra. Here he has said (Beal, loc. cit., 57):—“King Aśōka having destroyed seven (of the original) pagodas, constructed 84,000 others. The very first which he built is the great tower which stands about three *li* to the south of this city.”

So, also, Legge (op. cit., 79):—“When king Aśōka destroyed the seven topes, (intending) to make 84,000, the

"first which he made was the great tope, more than three *le*
"to the south of this city."

Buddhaghōsha.

* We come next to the writings of Buddhaghōsha, who was in Ceylon in the time of king Mahānāma (about A.D. 470-90).¹

In the introduction to his Samantapāsādikā (see the Vinayapitaka, ed. Oldenberg, 3. 283 ff.), Buddhaghōsha has mentioned the son of king Susunāga as Kālāsōka (293) and as simply Asōka (321); and the details of the intervening reigns, given in the latter passage according to the text as we have it, place his initial year 100 years after the death of Buddha.² He has not made any allusion to relics of Buddha in connexion with him.

He has mentioned the grandson of Chandagutta as Dhammāsōka (295), and as Asōka (297 ff., 321, 329), and as either "the king Asōkadhamma" or "Asōka the *dhammarāja*, the king of religion" (321, 329), according as we may divide a certain compound;³ and (299) he has placed his initial year, as marked by his *abhiśhēka* or anointment to the sovereignty, 218 years after the death of Buddha. He does not seem to say anything about his having borne the appellation Chaṇḍāsōka. Nor does he (as far as I can see) offer any explanation as to how he acquired the appellation Dhammāsōka: at any rate, he does not give any such explanation in the passage (303) which

¹ The supposed period is A.D. 410-32. But see note 1 on page 894 above.

² On this point, see a note under the matter of the traditional date of Kanishka, further on in this Number.

³ On page 328 we have:—Asōkaṁ dhammarājānaṁ upasaṁkamitvā. This perhaps indicates that the compound *Asōkadhammarāja*, as used by Buddhaghōsha, should always be understood in that way.

Similarly, while presenting in various other places unmistakably the name Asōkadhamma, the Dipavaṁsa makes Mahinda say to Sumana (15. 6):—Asōkaṁ dhammarājānaṁ ēvaṁ cha ārōchayāhi tvaṁ; and in verse 9 we have:—Asōkaṁ dhammarājānaṁ ārōchēsi. Compare note 2 on page 894 above.

In the Divyāvadāna, 368, 379, 402, the expression is:—Asōkō nāmnā rājā bhaviṣyati chaturbhāga-chakravartī dhārmikō dhammarāja.

recites how, on his conversion to Buddhism by the Sāmaṇēra Nigrōdha, Asōka established, in 84,000 cities throughout the whole of Jambudīpa, 84,000 Vihāras adorned by 84,000 Chētiyas.

In this last passage, the word *chētiya* may denote either ordinary shrines or relic-shrines. And, except in this latter possibility, there seems to be in this work no allusion to any such occurrence as that which forms the subject of the story in the Divyāvadāna.

But, in respect of relics of Buddha in connexion with Asōka, we have here again (328 ff.) the story of the Dīpa-vaṁsa,— taken, very likely, from that work itself. (or some other recension of it), which is at least twice cited by name (322),— about the mission of the Sāmaṇēra Sumana to obtain relics for the Thūpa which king Dēvanāmpiya-Tissa of Ceylon was building. By Buddhaghōsha, again, no statement is here made as to how Asōka had become possessed of relics of Buddha.

As regards the first part of that story, it is sufficient to note here that, as in the Dīpavaṁsa, Sumana is expressly described as taking with him his alms-bowl and robe (329). And we are told that, when he had reached Pāṭaliputta, travelling through the air, and had preferred his request to Asōka:—"The king was pleased to take the alms-bowl from the hand of the Sāmaṇēra; and, having cleansed (*it*) with perfumes, he filled (*it*) with relics resembling choice pearls, and gave (*it back*)."¹ This seems to make it quite plain that Buddhaghōsha, also, believed that it was Sumana's own alms-bowl that was filled with relics; not the alms-bowl of Buddha, as is claimed by the Mahāvāṁsa.

Buddhaghōsha goes on to say that Sumana then visited Sakka (Indra), the lord of the gods, who had two relics, a right tooth and the right collar-bone. Sumana obtained the latter from him, and (*returning through the air*) alighted

¹ The words are:— *gandhēhi ubbaṭṭetvā vara-mutta-sadisānaṁ dhātūnaṁ pūretvā adāsī.*

on the Chētiyagiri mountain, whence he had started.¹ And there Mahinda and other eminent persons installed the relics which had been given by Asōka.²

They then took the right collar-bone to the Mahānāgavana park, where it was met by the king. In answer to a wish expressed inwardly by the king, the authenticity of the relic was proved by the king's umbrella bowing itself to the relic, by the king's elephant kneeling to it, and by the relic-casket (*dhātu-chaṅgōṭaka*) taking its stand on the king's head. The relic was then placed by the king on the frontal globe of the elephant. It was taken (330) into the city by the eastern gate, and out again by the southern gate, and so to a place named Pahechivatthu on the west side of the Thūpārāma, in which locality (331) there were the Chētiyas of three previous Buddhas, Kakusandha, Kōnāgamana, and Kassapa. And so, eventually (333), this relic, the right collar-bone, was installed, and the Thūpa was completed.

So far, Buddhaghōsha does not make any statement as to how Asōka became possessed of relics of Buddha. In another work, however, his Sumaṅgalavilāsini, in his commentary on the last chapter of the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta, he has transmitted to us the following highly interesting story, which I give from a transcription of the text published in Burmese characters, page 179 ff., for which I am greatly indebted to the kindness of Mrs. Bode:³—

As soon (179) as he had recovered from the shock caused by the news of the death of Buddha, king Ajātasattu sent off a messenger, bearing a letter, to claim a share of the relics. And, with the intention of taking it by force if

¹ The Chētiyagiri is the Missaka of the Dīpavaṃsa (page 895 above). The Mahāvamsa explains (Turnour, 106; Wijesinha, 68) that the Missaka mountain received the name Chētiyagiri because Mahinda deposited there the relics obtained from Asōka.

² Regarding the ultimate disposal of these relics, see note 1 on page 896 above.

³ The meaning of a few words here and there remains to be cleared up when we have a critical edition of the commentary. But no doubt of any kind attends any essential part of the story.

it should not be given by consent, he mustered an army consisting of the usual four components, and followed in person. So, also, did the Lichchhavis and "the others." And thus "the inhabitants of seven cities" arrived, and surrounded Kusinārā, waiting to see whether the Mallas would give them shares of the relics, or whether there was to be a fight for them.

At first (180) the Mallas of Kusinārā refused, for the reason stated in the Sutta (page 664 above). Challenges were shouted out, to and fro. And a battle was impending. But the Mallas were firm, knowing that they would be victorious against even such odds: why?; because the gods, who had come there to worship the relics, were on their side! Then, however, the Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa intervened. And (181), having won their consent to a division of the relics, he opened the golden trough.¹

Now, "the kings," standing round the golden trough, and gazing at the gold-coloured relics,² and being reminded thereby of the gold-coloured body of Buddha, glistening with also rays of six hues emanating from it, which formerly they used to see³ were overcome by grief, and broke out into lamentations. The Brāhmaṇ Dōṇa, seeing that they were oblivious of everything else, abstracted a right tooth, and hid it in his belt or in his turban.⁴ And he then divided the remaining relics into eight equal portions, one of

¹ This is explained by a previous statement by Buddhaghōṣa, that the bones of Buddha were conveyed from the cremation-ground to the townhall of the Mallas in *suvaṇṇa-dōṇi*, a golden trough, on the shoulders of an elephant.

² The relics, presumably, only seemed to be gold-coloured, as the result of reflection from the sides of the trough.

³ In explanation of this, see, e.g., the *Lalitaviṣṭara*, ed. Lefmann, 105; trans., Foucaux, l. 95. There, the great sage Āsita is enumerating to Suddhōdana the thirty-two signs of a great personage by which the body of the infant Buddha was marked. Amongst them, No. 17 is *sūkṣma-suvāṇavarna-cheḥkhavi*, "a fine smooth cuticle, of the colour of gold."

Compare the *Dīgha-Nikāya*, part 2, p. 17. There, the Brāhmaṇ astrologers were explaining the thirty-two signs of a great personage to king Bandhumat, when his son the Buddha Vipassī was born; and they said:—"He is of the colour of gold, and has a skin resembling gold; he has a fine smooth cuticle, and, because of the fine smoothness of it, dust and dirt do not adhere to his body."

⁴ The text seems to have *vēṭh-antarē*. I suppose that this stands for *vēṭhan-antarē*; unless *vēṭha* = *vēsṭha* occurs alongside of *vēṭhana* = *vēsṭha*, a waist-band, girdle; a headband, turban.

which he gave to "the inhabitants of each of the cities." But Sakka (Indra), the lord of the gods, had witnessed the act of Dōṇa. And, knowing that the Brāhmaṇ would not be able to do proper honour to such a relic, he took the tooth from where it was hidden; and, placing it in a golden casket, he carried it to heaven, and installed it in the Chūlāmaṇichētiya.

Dōṇa, having divided the relics, looked for the tooth, but could not find it. He did not dare to raise a hue and cry about a thing which he himself had stolen. And, having distributed the other relics, he could no longer ask for a share of them. So (182) he asked for, and obtained, the golden jar from which he had measured out the relics.¹

Now (182), the distance from Kusinārā to Rājagaha was twenty-five *yōjanas*.² Along the whole of that distance, king Ajātasattu caused a smooth road to be made, eight *usabhas* (about seventy yards) wide. And he made arrangements for conveying his share of the relics along that road, in a golden trough, and with just the same pomp and observances as those with which "the Malla kings" had conveyed the bones from their Makuṭabandhanachētiya to their townhall, and for exhibiting them in each intervening market-place in order to arouse the longing and veneration of the populace. He assembled all his people within a circuit of 500 *yōjanas*; and, taking the relics, they started from Kusinārā, making a regular, holiday-time of it as they went. Wherever they came across gold-coloured flowers, there they halted, and, placing the relics inside a cage of spears, did worship; and they went on again only when the flowers withered. Also, they moved so slowly that it took seven days for the

¹ The whole of Buddhaghōṣa's commentary is not before me. I presume that he introduced a mention of this *suvaṇṇa-kumbha* in some previous passage.

² I am informed that in both the Burmese and the Singhalese texts the reading is distinctly *pañchavisati*, 'twenty-five,' not *pañchattimsati*, 'thirty-five.' That being so, this statement, coupled with certain other statements of distances in the Pāli books and with other indications, would place Kusinārā somewhere about thirty-two miles towards the north-west of Chhaprā, the headquarters town of the Sāran district, and some fifty miles towards the south-east-by-south from Kasiā in the Gōrakhpūr district.

hindmost part of the chariot to advance to where the yoke had been.

In this fashion (182) there passed seven years, seven months, and seven days. And unbelievers became annoyed at the state of things, because it put a stop to all their business. Accordingly, seeing that mischief was brewing, the priests applied for help to the god Sakka. He frightened Ajātasattu into thinking that evil spirits were arranging to seize the relics. And so (183), on the seventh day, the king hurried the relics on into Rājagaha. There he built a Thūpa over them, and held a feast. So, also, "the others," each according to his means, built Thūpas and held feasts, each at his own place.

When all the Thūpas (183) had been built over the eight shares of the corporeal relics and over the jar and the embers, the Thēra Mahā-Kassapa saw that some danger was hanging over the relics; and, going to king Ajātasattu, he urged him to bring all the relics together into one deposit. The king assented, if the Thēra would collect the relics. So the Thēra went to "the princes," one after the other, and obtained from them their shares of the relics, with the exception in each case of a *paricharaṇa-dhātu*, a small portion sufficient for purposes of worship, and also with the exception of the relics at Rāmagāma: of these latter, the Nāgas had taken charge, and so no danger threatened them; moreover, they were destined for the great Chētiya at the Mahāvihāra in the island Laṅkā (Ceylon).

Having collected the relics (183) from, "the remaining seven cities,"¹ the Thēra took his stand at a place on the south-east of Rājagaha, and willed a resolve:—"This stone

¹ That is, excepting Rāmagāma, and including Rājagaha. We might assume that a *paricharaṇa*-relic was left at Rājagaha also; and that the *paricharaṇa*-relics were left inside the Thūpas, as is said to have been done by Asōka when he opened and closed again the underground deposit at Rājagaha (page 913 below). Against that, however, is the statement that Asōka obtained no relics at all from any of the original Thūpas (page 912 below), though, with the exception of that at Rāmagāma, he opened them all. It would seem, therefore, that the *paricharaṇa*-relics were left outside the Thūpas, in the hands of priests. On this point compare note 3 on page 887 above.

or rock (*pāsāṇa*) which is here, let it disappear ; let the dust or soil (*pañsu*) become very pure ; and let no water arise !”¹

Then the king (183) caused the place to be excavated, and bricks to be made from the dust taken out from it. And, to keep people in ignorance of his real object, he caused it to be given out that he was making Chētiyas of the eighty principal disciples of Buddha.

When the place (183) had been excavated to the depth of eighty cubits, at the bottom the king caused a flooring of brass to be laid. And he caused to be built on that a house of copper, of the same size with the house of the Chētiya at the Thūpārāma (in Ceylon).

He then (183) caused to be made eight boxes (*kaṇḍa*) and eight Thūpas of yellow sandalwood. He placed the relics in one of those boxes, and that box in another box, and so on until seven boxes were inside the eighth. And then, in the same manner, he placed the final box in one of the yellow sandalwood Thūpas, and that Thūpa in another Thūpa, and so on. Then, in the same fashion, the eight yellow sandalwood Thūpas were placed in eight red sandalwood boxes ; the latter, in eight red sandalwood Thūpas ; the latter, in eight ivory boxes ; the latter, in eight ivory Thūpas ; the latter, in eight boxes made of all the precious minerals ; the latter, in eight Thūpas made of the same ; and so on, in succession, with sets of eight boxes and Thūpas made of gold, of silver, of (?) lodestone (*maṇi*), of ruby, of cat's-eye, and finally of crystal.

Over the last, the outside Thūpa of crystal (184), he raised a crystal Chētiya, of the same measure with the Chētiya of the Thūpārāma. Over that, he made a house (*gēha*) of all the precious minerals. Over that, a house of gold. Over that, a house of silver. And over that, a house of copper. Over the last-mentioned, he sprinkled sand made by pulverizing all the precious minerals. And over that he

¹ I can only follow the text here just as it stands ; the ultimate meaning is not clear to me. But it seems to suggest an allusion to some enormous natural cavity, air-tight and waterproof, accessible through a crevice in a slab or stratum of rock, such as those which exist, and are used as grain-pits, in some parts of the Southern Marāṭhā country.

scattered thousands of flowers, both those which grow in the water and those which grow on dry land.

He then (184) caused golden statues to be made, of the 550 Jātakas (the previous existences of Buddha), and of the eighty great Thēras, and of king Suddhōdana, and of Mahā-Māyādēvi, and of the Seven who were all born at the same time; that is (as we learn from the Nidānakathā in the Jātaka, ed. Fausböll, 1. 54), of (1) Buddha himself in his last existence, (2) (*his wife*) the princess, the Mother of Rāhula, (3) the minister Chhannā, (4) the minister Kāludāyi, (5) Kanthaka the king of horses, (6) the Mahābōdhi-tree, and (7) the four treasure-vases which were of the size, respectively, of one *gāvuta*, half a *yōjana*, three *gārutas*, and one *yōjana*.¹

He then placed 500 water-jars of gold and 500 of silver, all filled to the brim. He set up 500 golden banners. And he made 500 golden and 500 silver lamps, and filled them with perfumed oil, and set wicks of fine cloth in them.

Then the venerable Mahā-Kassapa (184) willed a resolve that the garlands (*sic*) should not wither, the perfumes

¹ The text in the Nidānakathā runs:—Yasmin pana samayē amhakañ Bōdhisattō Lumbinivanē jātō tasmim yēva samayē Rāhula-matā devī Chhannō amachchō Kāludāyi amachchō Kanthakō assa-rājā Mahābōdhi rukkho chattārō nidhi-kumbhiyō cha jātā tattha ekā gāvuta-ppamāṇā ekā addha-yōjana-ppamāṇā ekā tigāvuta-ppamāṇā ekā yōjana-ppamāṇā ahos=iti imē satta saha-jātā nāma.

On some grounds which I cannot trace, Bigandet (*Life or Legend of Gaudama*, first ed., 36) and Hardy (*Manual of Buddhism*, second ed., 149) omitted Buddha, and inserted Ānanda between Chhanna and Kāludāyi. The text, however, makes no mention of Ānanda, and distinctly counts the Bōdhisatta, i.e. Buddha, as one of the Seven: it does not say "these are the seven *sahajātā* of the Bōdhisatta;" mentioning first the Bōdhisatta, it says "these (*including him*) are the seven *sahajātā*."

We might have expected that the learned translator of the Nidānakathā would have set things right. But, following previous writers instead of weighing the words of the text, he has said (*Buddhist Birth Stories*, 68, note):—"There is some mistake here, as the list contains nine—or if the four treasures count as 'one; only six—Connatal Ones. I think before Kāludāyi we should insert 'Ānanda, the loving disciple.' And unfortunately the mistake has been carried over into Kern's *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 14.

The tradition about Ānanda appears to have been that he was born when Buddha was either thirty (Laidlay, *Pilgrimage of Fa Hian*, 77) or thirty-five years of age (Hardy, *Manual*, 241). The four treasure-vases counted as only one among the *sahajātā* because, evidently, they fitted inside each other and were produced so arranged.

For another list, in two recensions, of persons and animals born at the same time with Buddha,—including Yaśōdharā-Yaśōvatī (= Rāhulamātā), Chhandaka, and Kanthaka, but otherwise differing very materially,—see the Mahāvastu, ed. Senart, 2. 25, and the Lalitavistara, ed. Lefmann, 95, trans. Foucaux, 1. 86.

should not fade, and the lamps should not be extinguished. And he caused to be engraved on a golden tablet the announcement:—"Hereafter, a prince by name Piyadāsa (*sic*) shall raise the umbrella (*of sole sovereignty*), and shall become a veritable king of religion, by name Asōka; and he shall spread these relics far and wide!"

Then the king (184), having done worship to everything from first to last with offerings of all kinds, closed the door, and went out. Shutting the copper door, he fastened it with a rope and sealed the knot. And he set therein a great magic jewel, on which he caused to be engraved the proclamation:—"Hereafter, let some poor king take this jewel, and do honour to the relics!"¹

Then Sakka, the king of the gods (185), summoned Vissakamma (the celestial architect and artificer), and bade him arrange for guarding safely the deposit of relics thus made by king Ajātasattu. So Vissakamma came, and set up a machine fitted with a revolving rim (an automatic roundabout), on which he fixed wooden figures, armed with swords, which went round and round the relic-chamber (*dhātugabbha*) with a speed like that of the wind. All around that, he built an enclosure of stone according to the pattern of the Giñjakāvasatha.² Over that, he spread dust or soil. And then, making the surface quite smooth, he raised over the whole a stone Thūpa.

When all that had been accomplished (185), in course of time the Thēra Mahā-Kassapa died. So, also, king Ajātasattu. ³And so, also, all the people of that day.

Subsequently (185), a prince named Piyadāsa (*sic*) raised the umbrella (*of sole sovereignty*), and became a veritable king of religion, by name Asōka. Under the influence of the Sāmaṇēra Nigrōdha, he became favourably inclined to the doctrine (of Buddha); and, having founded 84,000

¹ Of course, the jewel was to be sold, and the proceeds were to be applied. Compare the story about the inscribed tablet and the pearls mentioned by Sung-yun in connexion with the pagoda or tower built by Kanishka at the capital of the Gandhāra country; see Beal, *Records*, 1. introd., 105.

² This, the Brick Hall or Tiled Hall, was a building at Nāḍika.

Vihāras, he asked the community of Bhikkhus whence he might obtain relics to be enshrined at them. They said:—“Great king! we have heard that there is, indeed, a deposit of relics; but we know not in what exact place it may be.”

Then the king (185) caused the Chētiya at Rājagaha to be opened: and, not finding any relics there, he caused it to be restored just as it was before; and, assembling a company of Bhikkhus and Bhikkhunīs and lay-worshippers male and female, he went to Vēsālī. There, also, he obtained no relics. So, also, at Kapilavatthu. Then he went to Rāmagāma; but the Nāgas did not allow him to open the Chētiya at that place: directly the spades were applied to it, they broke into pieces. He then went to Allakappa, Pāvakā (*sic*), and Vēthadīpa, and caused the Chētiyas to be opened at those places. Not obtaining relics, he restored the Chētiyas just as they were before, and returned to Rājagaha.

Convening, again (185), an assembly of all the same four classes, he inquired whether anyone had ever heard anything about the exact place of the deposit of relics. Thereupon a Thēra, 120 years old, said:—“Where, exactly, the deposit of relics may be, I know not; but this much, great king!, I know: when I was a Sāmaṇēra of seven, the great Thēra my father used to make me take a basket of garlands, and used to lead me with him to where there was a stone Thūpa in between some bushes;¹ there he used to do worship; and he bade me remember the place.”

Then (186), the place having been pointed out to him, king Asōka caused the bushes to be removed, and also the stone Thūpa, and the dust or soil; and he found, below it, a cemented floor. Causing the cement and bricks to be removed, in due course he made his way down into a *parivēṇa*, a cell, and found sand made by pulverizing all the precious minerals, and saw the wooden figures, armed with swords, whirling round and round. Sending for the Yakkhas, the genii, who were his slaves, he caused propitiatory offerings to be made to the demons. But he found no means of stopping the revolving figures. So he pronounced aloud

¹ The suggestion is that the locality had become overgrown with jungle.

a declaration of his desire to take the relics, and to do honour to them by installing them at the 84,000 Vihāras; and he invoked the gods not to obstruct him.

At that time (186) Sakka, the king of the gods, was going round. Calling Vissakamma, he said:—"Asōka, the king of religion, has gone down into the cell, with a view to taking out the relics; go, and remove the wooden figures!" Going in the guise of a young villager, Vissakamma stood before the king, bearing a bow in his hand, and offered to remove the figures. On being bidden to do so, he fitted and discharged an arrow. And everything in the shape of an impediment was straightway scattered and removed.

Then king Asōka (186) broke the seal which secured the rope that fastened the door, and saw the magic jewel with the inscription:—"Hereafter, let some poor king take this jewel, and do honour to the relics!" Incensed by the idea that so great a king as himself should be styled "a poor king," he caused the door to be burst open; and he entered into the house, where, after even 218 years, the lamps were still all burning, the flowers were still all blooming, and the perfumes were still all fresh. Next, taking up the golden tablet, he read the announcement:—"Hereafter, a prince by name Piyadāsa (*sic*) shall raise the umbrella (*of sole sovereignty*), and shall become a veritable king of religion, by name Asōka; and he shall spread these relics far and wide!" "My friends!", said he; "I am the man foreseen by his reverence Mahā-Kassapa!" And, bending his left hand inwards (*across his chest*), with his right hand he smacked (*the upper part of his left arm*) in triumph.

Leaving in that place (186) a *paricharaṇa-dhātu*, a small portion of the relics sufficient for purposes of worship, king Asōka took the rest of them. As a matter of good policy, he closed the relic-house (*dhātu-gēha*), and made everything just as it had been before, and raised a stone Chētiya over the place. And he installed the relics at the 84,000 Vihāras.

XXX.

STUDIES IN ANCIENT INDIAN MEDICINE.

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

II. ON SOME OBSCURE ANATOMICAL TERMS.

IN the Vedas and the earlier medical works there occur some anatomical terms which have never, or [at least not usually, been correctly understood, but which, on reference to the actual human skeleton, can, with much probability, be identified. These terms, in alphabetical order, are the following :—

<i>anūka.</i>	<i>kusindha.</i>
<i>uchlakha.</i>	<i>grīvā.</i>
<i>uṣṇihā.</i>	<i>jatru.</i>
<i>kakātika.</i>	<i>prṣṭī.</i>
<i>kaphoḍa.</i>	<i>pratiṣṭhā.</i>
<i>karūkara.</i>	<i>bhāṃsas.</i>
<i>kīkasā.</i>	<i>skandha.</i>
<i>kuntāpa.</i>	<i>stana.</i>

Moreover, their identification brings out clearly the surprising amount of correct knowledge of the anatomy of the human skeleton possessed by the ancient Indians.

Uṣṇihā, grīvā, jatru, skandha.

These four terms form a set. They all refer to the neck. The neck comprises two distinct organs. Anteriorly it contains the windpipe, or trachea, which consists of 16-20 cartilaginous (imperfect) rings.¹ Posteriorly it contains the cervical column, consisting of seven bony vertebræ. The

¹ Only the upper part of the trachea (with the larynx) is in the neck; the lower part (with the bronchi) is in the thorax.

two parts are also often called the throat and the nape, being the front and the back of the neck respectively. The two terms *uṣṇihā* and *skandha*, as I shall endeavour to show, signify the posterior part of the neck, the nape, or cervical column, while the two terms *grīvā* and *jaṭru* denote the anterior part, the windpipe, or throat. In the Vedas, that is, the R̥g Veda and Atharva Veda, these terms are, as a rule, used in the plural number, and only very exceptionally in the singular. For reasons of convenience, I shall, in my translations, indicate them, in their plural use, by the terms 'cervical vertebræ' (or neck-bones) and 'cervical cartilages' respectively. It should be added that, in the ancient Indian anatomy, cartilages are counted among the bones. They are looked upon as *taruṇa*, that is, tender, or immature, bones. They form the third of the five classes into which Suśruta divides the bones; see *Śārīra Sthāna*, chapter v, clause 17 (Jiv. ed., p. 331).

(1) *Grīvā*.

In the Atharva Veda there is a famous hymn which describes the wondrous creation of man. It is the second hymn of the tenth book. In the earlier verses it enumerates in regular order the bones of the human body; and in the fourth verse it says :

- I. *Kati devāḥ, katame, ta āsanya uro grīvās-cikyuḥ pūruṣasya |*
kati stanau vyadadhuh, kaḥ kaphodau, kati skandhān, kati
prṣṭīr = acinvaṇ ||

That is, How many devas, and who among them, contributing, built up the breast-bone (*uras*, sternum) and the cervical cartilages (*grīvāḥ*, plur.) of man? How many disposed the two breast-pieces (*stanau*, ribs); who the two shoulder-blades (*kaphodau*)? How many piled up the cervical vertebræ (*skandhān*, plur.); how many the dorsal vertebræ (*prṣṭīḥ*)?

Again, describing the anatomy of the sacrificial cow, the Atharva Veda, x, 9, verse 20, says :

- II. *Yās=te grīvā, ye skandhā, yāḥ prṣṭīr=yās=ca parśavaḥ |*
(*āmikṣām*, etc.).

That is, What cervical cartilages (*grīvāḥ*, plur.) there are of thine, what cervical vertebræ (*skandhāḥ*, plur.), what dorsal vertebræ (*prṣṭīḥ*), what ribs (*parśavaḥ*), (let them all pour, etc.).

A similar reference to the bones of the bull, or cow, occurs in Atharva Veda, ix, 7, verse 3.

- III. *Vidyuj-jihvā, Maruto dantā, Revatīr=grīvā, Kṛttikā skandhā, Gharmo vahaḥ ||*

That is, Lightning is the tongue, the Maruts are the teeth, the Revatis are the cervical cartilages (*grīvāḥ*, plur.), the Kṛttikās are the cervical vertebræ (*skandhāḥ*, plur.), Gharma is the withers.

In another hymn on the creation of man, the Atharva Veda, xi, 8, verse 15, says :

- IV. *Śiro hastāv=atho mukhain jhivām grīvās=ca kikasāḥ |*

That is, Head, both hands, and mouth, tongue, cervical cartilages (*grīvāḥ*, plur.), and cervical vertebræ (*kikasāḥ*, plur.).

In a prayer against enemies the Atharva Veda, vi, 134, verse 1, says :

- V. (*Ayam vajrah*) *śrṇātu grīvāḥ pra śrṇāt=ūṣṇihā, Vṛtrasy=eva Śacipatiḥ |*

That is, (May this thunderbolt) cut thy cervical cartilages asunder, cut thy cervical vertebræ, as Śacipati (Indra) did to the (demon) Vṛtra.

Again, in a charm, against certain demons, the R̥g Veda, vi, 163, 2, and the Atharva Veda, ii, 33, verse 2, say :

- VI. *Grīvābhyas=ta uṣṇihābhyah kikasābhyo anūkyāt |*

That is, Forth from the cervical cartilages of thee, from the cervical vertebræ, from the thoracic vertebræ, from the lumbar spine (I drive the disease).—(With this may be compared the charm quoted below, No. XXIIX, p. 2, Jan. 1907.)

In these passages *grīvā* is contrasted with either *skandha*, or *uṣṇihā*, or *kikasā*, all in the plural number. *Grīvā*, therefore, cannot possibly be identical with any of the three: that would destroy the point of the passages. Now *skandha*, in the plural, cannot mean, as usually translated, the shoulders. There are only two shoulders; and if they were intended to be expressed by *skandha*, that word would be in the dual number, just as we have *stanau* and *kaphodau* in No. I. Whitney (*Transl. Ath. Veda*, vol. ii, p. 568) indicates the difficulty by adding “(pl.)” to his rendering “shoulder-bones.” As *skandha* admittedly refers to the back, or nape, of the neck, it can, in the plural, denote only the bones of which the back of the neck is composed, that is, the cervical vertebræ. In No. III the *skandhas* are said to be the *Kṛttikās*, or Pleiades, the (six or) seven stars in the neck of the constellation Taurus: as a fact, there are seven cervical vertebræ. *Uṣṇihā* and *kikasā*, as we shall see, likewise denote the neck-bones. Consequently *grīvā* must refer to the front of the neck, the throat, or windpipe; and in the plural it can denote only the cartilaginous rings which compose the windpipe, and which can easily be felt under the skin. In No. V we have *grīvā*, the windpipe, and *uṣṇihā*, the nape, together constituting the neck, the severance of which is prayed for, just as Indra, in the well-known story, severed the neck of the demon Vṛtra.

The word *grīvā* occurs ten times in the Atharva Veda, and three times in the R̥g Veda; and though sometimes it may mean the whole of the neck, yet whenever it is specialised, as in the six cases above quoted, it always refers to the anterior part of the neck, the throat, or windpipe. On the other hand, in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, *grīvā*, in the plural, is used to denote the seven cervical vertebræ. In the course of comparing certain hymn-forms to certain parts of the human body, that Brāhmaṇa, xii, 2, 4, clause 10, says:

VII. *Grīvāḥ pañcadaśaḥ | caturdaśā vā etāsāṃ karūkarāṇi,
vīryaṃ pañcadaśaṃ; tasmād=etābhir=anvībhiḥ satībhir=
guruṃ bhāraṃ harati; tasmād=grīvāḥ pañcadaśaḥ ||*

That is, The Pañcadaśa, or fifteen-versed hymn-form, is the cervical vertebræ. For there are fourteen transverse processes of these; their strength is the fifteenth; hence, by means of them, though they be very small, man can bear a heavy load. Hence the Pañcadaśa is the cervical vertebræ.

A vertebra consists, in the main, of a 'body' (including neural arch and spinous process) and two transverse processes, one on either side. In the clause quoted above the word *vīrya*, strength, refers to the series, or aggregate, of 'bodies' of the seven cervical vertebræ, irrespective of their transverse processes. It constitutes the real cervical column, and is emblematic of the load-bearing strength of man.

Proceeding now to the early medical literature, in a significant passage of Charaka's Textbook of General Medicine (*Charaka Saṁhitā*), the word *grīvā*, in the singular, denotes the cervical column. In its osteological summary, in the Anatomical Section (*Śārīra Sthāna*), chapter 7 (Jiv. ed., 1877, p. 370) that textbook says *pañcadaśa [asthīni] grīvāyām*, i.e. there are fifteen bones in the cervical column. On this point, it will be observed, the *Saṁhitā* agrees with the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Or rather, the author of that Brāhmaṇa, said to be Yājñavalkya, agrees with Ātreya, the celebrated medical teacher of Taxila, whose doctrines Charaka claims to report. The chronological coincidence may be noticed; both Ātreya and Yājñavalkya are, by Indian tradition, placed in the time of Buddha, or in the sixth century B.C. One of Ātreya's pupils was Agniveśa; and it is the latter's report of his master's teaching which Charaka reproduces in his *Saṁhitā*. The author of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, whoever he may have been, not being professionally a medical man, must have obtained his anatomical knowledge from the medical school current in his time.

On the other hand, in Suśruta's Textbook of General Medicine (*Suśruta Ayurveda Saṁhitā*), the term *grīvā*, in the singular, is used with both meanings: cervical column and tracheal column (windpipe). In the Anatomical Section

(*Śārīra Sthāna*), chap. v, clause 16 (Jīv. ed., 1889, p. 331), Suśruta first enumerates the bones according to their position in the body, and afterwards, in clause 17, describes them according to their shape. In the numerative list he says *grivāyāṁ navakam*, i.e. in the cervical column there are nine bones,¹ but in the descriptive list he applies *grīvā* to the tracheal column; for he says *ghrāṇa-karṇa-grīv-ākṣikoṣeṣu taruṇāṇi*, i.e., the soft (immature) bones, or cartilages, are in the nostrils, ears, windpipe, and eyeballs.

Again, in the *Śārīra Sthāna*, chap. v, clause 31 (Jīv., p. 342), defining the meaning of *aṁsa*, collarbone, Suśruta says:

VIII. *Bāhumūrdha-grīvā-madhye 'aṁsapīṭha-skandha-nibandunāv-aṁsau* ||

That is, The two collarbones (*aṁsa*) are the tie-bones (*nibandhana*) of the glenoid cavity (*aṁsapīṭha*) and the nape of the neck (*skandha*), lying between the acromion process (*bāhumūrdha*) and the throat (*grīvā*).

The above statement is practically equivalent to the modern anatomical description of the collarbone which I quote from Dr. Gerrish's Textbook of Anatomy (2nd ed., 1903, p. 131): "The *clavicle* or *collarbone* passes from the top of the sternum to the acromion process of the scapula, and forms the connecting link between the trunk and the arm." The inner end of the clavicle articulates with the top of the sternum at the base of the throat (*grīvā*). Its outer end articulates with the acromion process, which may be described as the "head of the arm", (*bāhumūrdha*) or the "summit of the shoulder" (*aṁsa-kūṭa*; both terms are used by Suśruta): it overhangs the shoulder-joint. In that joint, the arm (*humerus*) articulates with the glenoid cavity of the scapula, which is, as it were, the "seat of the shoulder" (*aṁsapīṭha*). The arm and scapula, on the one

¹ On this number Suśruta differs from Charaka. This is not the place to explain the difference. It is fully discussed in an osteological monograph which I hope shortly to publish.—In the numeration list the windpipe is called *kanṭhanāḍī* in distinction from *grīvā*, or cervical column.

hand, and the trunk, on the other, form two systems, the sole link between which is the collarbone. The main support of the trunk is the vertebral column. The nape of the neck (*skandha*) in the latter, and the shoulder-joint (*aṁsa-pīṭha*) in the former system, are the two points between which the collarbone (*aṁsa*) acts as a link or tie (*nibandhana*). The particular point to be noted, however, in Sūśruta's definition of the clavicle, is his use of the term *grīvā* as denoting the throat, or rather the base of the throat. This meaning, "base of the throat," is practically implied in Sūśruta's technical phrase *grīvāṁ prati-ūrdhvam*, i.e. from the neck upwards. For the phrase is used to denote one of the three great divisions of the body, viz. the neck and head, as will be shown more fully in connection with the synonymous phrase *jatīrūdhra* or *ūrdhvajatru* (p. 925).

Respecting the use of *grīvā* in general literature, it will suffice to adduce the testimony of the standard Sanskrit vocabularies (*koṣa*). The oldest of these, and the most authoritative, is the *Amarakoṣa*, of Amarasimha. Its date is not accurately known, but at the earliest it may be in the 7th century A.D. (see p. 941). It says (ii, 6, 88a, ed. Śiv., p. 266) :

Kaṇṭho galo 'tha grīvāyām śīrodhiḥ kandhar=ety=api |

That is, *Grīvā* denotes the throat (*kaṇṭha* or *gala*) as well as the cervical column (*śīrodhi* or *kandharā*, lit. head-supporter).

The next is the *Abhidhāna Ratnamālā* of Halāyudha, written about 950 A.D. It says (ii, 361, ed. Aufrecht, p. 55) :

Grīvā dhamanir=manyā śīrodharā kandharā galaḥ kaṇṭhaḥ |

That is, *Grīvā* denotes (1) the tubular vessel (of the neck, *dhamanī*), (2) the dorsal muscle (*manyā*), (3) the cervical column (*śīrodharā* or *kandharā*), (4) the throat (*gala* or *kaṇṭha*).

Finally, there is the *Abhidhāna Cintāmaṇi* of Hemachandra, written about 1141-3 A.D. It says (vv. 586-8, ed. Böhrling and Rieu, pp. 106-7) :

*Kandharā dhamanir=grīvā śīrodhiś=ca śīrodharā | grīvā-dhamanyau
prāg=nāle, paścād=manyē kalambike | galo nigaraṇaḥ
kaṇṭhaḥ ||*

That is, *Grīvā* denotes the cervical column (*kandharā* or *śīrodhi* or *śīrodharā*) and the tubular vessels of the neck (*dhamani*). Of the latter there are two in the anterior part (*prāg*), the windpipe and the alimentary canal (*nālā*). In the posterior part (*paścād*) there are the two sides of the Trapezius muscle (*manyā* or *kalambikā*). The term *gala* or *kaṇṭha* (throat) denotes the alimentary canal (*nigaraṇa*, lit. swallower).

These three explanations differ among themselves in minor points. These, as well as some anatomical inaccuracies, to be expected in non-professional vocabularies, need not detain us; the main point to observe is that they agree in the statement that *grīvā* may denote either the anterior or the posterior part of the neck, that is to say, either the throat (windpipe, alimentary canal) or the cervix (its vertebræ or muscles). On the whole, therefore, the ancient usage of the term *grīvā* is preserved. In this respect, as we shall see, the case of the term *jatru* widely differs from that of the term *grīvā*.

(2) *Jatru*.

With reference to the healing skill of Indra, the Atharva Veda, xiv, 2, verse 12, as well as the Ṛig Veda, vii, 1, verse 12, says :

1X. *Ya ṛte cid-abhiśriṣaḥ, purā jatrubhya ātrdaḥ | samdhātā
samdhim Magharū ||*

That is, The Bountiful One, who without a ligature, before the severance of the cervical cartilages, effects a union.

The idea is that the windpipe is injured, but before it is entirely severed, Indra, without applying a ligature, in

a miraculous way effects the union of the wounded parts. In my translation I have adopted the translation of Sāyana, who explains *jatrubhyaḥ* by *grīvābhyaḥ*. But it is quite possible that the reference here is not to the cervical, but the costal cartilages. For with the latter meaning the word *jatru* occurs in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Thus, that Brāhmaṇa, xii, 2, 4, clause 11, drawing a comparison between a certain hymn-form and the breast, says :

X. *Uraḥ saptadaśaḥ | aṣṭāv=anye jatravo 'ṣṭāv=anya, uraḥ saptadaśam ; tasmād=uraḥ saptadaśaḥ ||*

That is, The Saptadaśa, or seventeen-versed hymn-form, is the breast. For there are eight costal cartilages on one side, and eight on the other; and the breast-bone is the seventeenth. Hence the Saptadaśa is (like) the breast.

In order to understand this comparison we must remember that there are twelve ribs on either side of the breast. Posteriorly all the twelve ribs articulate with the transverse processes of the corresponding vertebræ of the spinal column. Anteriorly, only ten of them are connected with the breast-bone, or sternum, though not directly, but by means of cartilaginous bars, the so-called costal cartilages. The other two, the so-called 'floating' ribs, have their frontal ends free. Each of the seven upper ribs has its own cartilage; but the three next below them have a common cartilage, which is connected with the cartilage next above them. Thus, altogether eight costal cartilages may be counted; and, of course, there is an equal number of them on either side of the breast; altogether sixteen. To these sixteen the sternum itself is to be added as the seventeenth bone.

There is a similar passage in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, vii, 6, 2, clauses 7 and 10. It runs as follows:--

XI. *Uras=triṣṭubhaḥ | tā retaḥsicor=velay=opa dadhāti; prṣṭayo vai retaḥsicā, uro vai prati prṣṭayaḥ || 7 || Parśavo vai bṛhatyaḥ | kīkaḍāḥ kakubhaḥ; so 'ntareṇa triṣṭubhaś=ca kakubhaś=ca bṛhatir=upadadhāti; tasmād=imā ubhayatra parśavo baddhāḥ kīkaṣāsu ca jatruṣu || 10 ||*

That is, The *triṣṭubh* metres are the breast-bone. He (the builder of the altar) places them in the range of the two *retahsich* bricks. For the two *retahsich* bricks are the transverse processes (of the thoracic vertebræ), and these transverse processes lie over against the breast-bone. The *bṛihati* metres are the ribs; and the *kakubh* metres are the thoracic vertebræ. He places the *bṛihati* metres between the *triṣṭubhs* and the *kakubhs*. Hence these ribs, on either side (i.e. at either of their ends), are fastened to the thoracic vertebræ (at the back) and the costal cartilages (in front).

In order to understand this comparison we must keep in mind the construction of the Brahmanic altar.¹ It is made of five layers of bricks, and the central portion of it represents the trunk of the body laid on its back so that the diameter which runs east-west represents the vertebral column. The first, or lowest, layer of bricks is the back; the fifth, or uppermost, layer is the breast. The two *retahsich* bricks lie on the lowest layer, on either side of the diameter, or vertebral column, and represent the two transverse processes of the vertebræ. The bricks, representing the *triṣṭubh* metres, lie in the uppermost layer, exactly above (or "on the range of," as the verse has it) the *retahsich* bricks of the lowermost layer. There are three of these *triṣṭubh* bricks; one lies just on the median line (the diameter), and represents the breast-bone, or sternum, while the two others, one on either side, represent the costal cartilages.

The point which is particularly to be noted in the three passages quoted above (Nos. IX–XI) is that *jatru* is used in the plural number. It is quite obvious from this circumstance that in the Vedic literature that word does not mean collarbone. As there are two collarbones, the word, if it had that meaning, would be in the dual number. In the oldest medical literature we find the word used in the singular number, which fact also proves that it does not

¹ The figure of the altar, given in Professor Eggeling's translation (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xliii, p. 98), may be usefully consulted.

denote the collarbone. Thus Charaka, in his summary of the bones (*Caraka Saṁhitā*, *Śārīra Sthāna*, ch. vii, p. 370, in Jiv. ed., 1877), says *ekam jatru*, that is, "the *jatru*, or windpipe, constitutes one bone." In this summary the term *jatru* corresponds to the term *kaṇṭhanāḍī*, windpipe, in the osteological summary of Suśruta; while (as we have seen) both Charaka and Suśruta apply to the cervical column the term *grīvā*.

The word *jatru*, as used by Charaka in this connection, is a neuter noun, while in the Vedic passages previously quoted it is masculine. It occurs, however, in medical literature also as a masculine noun in the singular. Thus, describing the rheumatic disease *maṇyā-stambha*, or rigidity of the muscles of the neck, Vāgbhaṭa the elder (*Aṣṭāṅga Saṁgraha*, *Nidāna Sthāna*, ch. xv, in vol. i, p. 300, last line) says *jatruḥ=āyamyate*, "the cervical column becomes bent inward." Suśruta (*Nidāna Sthāna*, chap. i, verse 69), speaking of the same disease, says *grīvā aparartate*, "the cervical column becomes distorted." Dṛḍhabala (in his complement of the *Caraka Saṁhitā*, *Cikitsita Sthāna*, ch. xxvi, verse 41) says *antar=āyamyate grīvā*, "the cervical column becomes bent inward." This example shows not only that *jatru* and *grīvā* are synonymous, but also that both may signify the cervical column; or perhaps we should rather say, that both signify the neck generally, without any specific reference to its anterior or posterior part.

This general meaning of neck is involved in the terms *jatrūrdhva*, or *ūrdhva-jatru*, which are of very frequent occurrence as the designation of one of the three parts of the human body. The latter is divided by the early Indian anatomists into three parts: (1) the four extremities (*śākhā*), (2) the trunk (*antarādhi*), (3) the head and neck (*śiro-grīvam*). The last of these is also indicated by the terms *jatrūrdhva*, or *ūrdhva-jatru*, i.e. the part from the neck upwards, and inclusive of the neck, that is, therefore, practically from the base of the neck upwards. Thus Suśruta, in his Introductory Section (*Sūtra Sthāna*, chap. i, clause 5) says of Minor Surgery (*śālākya*) that "it is concerned with the cure of the

diseases which have their seat in the part of the body from the neck upwards (*ūrdhrajatru-gatānām rogānām*), namely, the maladies which affect the ears, eyes, mouth, nose, and other organs." Another instructive example occurs in Suśruta's description of the *Valmīka* disease¹ (*Nidāna Sthāna*, chap. xiii, verse 7, Jīv. ed., p. 286). Among the parts of the body which it affects he enumerates the cervical column and the part above the windpipe (*grīvāyām=ūrdhrajatruṃ*). Mādhava, in his *Nidāna* (Jīv. ed., 1901, p. 276), paraphrasing Suśruta's statement, substitutes *grīvā*, cervical column, and *gala*, throat, or windpipe, for Suśruta's *grīvā* and *jatru*. This shows that he understood *jatru* to be synonymous with *gala*. It is obvious that in the terms *jatrūrdhva*, or *ūrdhrajatru*, the word *jatru* might refer indifferently to the anterior or posterior part of the neck: practically it means simply the neck. In point of fact, the phrase *grīvāṃ praty-ūrdhvam* occurs as a synonym of *jatrūrdhvam* or *ūrdhrajatru*. Thus in chap. vi of the Anatomical Section (*Śārīra Sthāna*, vi, clause 4, Jīv. ed., p. 336), enumerating the so-called dangerous places (*marmāṇi*) of the body, Suśruta says that there are "thirty-seven in the part from the neck upwards" (*grīvāṃ praty-ūrdhvam*); but later on in the same chapter (clause 32, Jīv. ed., p. 342) he refers to them as "from the windpipe upwards" (*ūrdhrajatru = gala*), and proceeding to detail them, he says that there are four each in the *kaṇṭhanāḍī*, or windpipe, and in the *grīvā*, or cervical column. This shows that for Suśruta, *jatru*, and to a lesser extent, *grīvā* were somewhat vague terms for the neck generally; and that when he wished to be exact, he specialized *grīvā* for the posterior part, or the cervical column, while he denoted the anterior part, or the windpipe, by *kaṇṭhanāḍī*.

There is another term that requires to be noted in this connection, viz. *jatru-mūla*. Suśruta uses it, for example, in his description of *hikkā*, or hiccough (*Uttara Sthāna*,

¹ Suppurating serofulous glands, according to U. C. Dutt's translation in his edition of the *Mādhava Nidāna*, p. 193.

chap. I, verse 9, in Jiv. ed., p. 849). Speaking of a particular variety of it he says :

XII. *Kṣudrikā nāma sā hikkā jatru-mūlāt-pradhāvitā* |

That is, The form of hiccough called *kṣudrikā*, or slight, proceeds from the root of the windpipe.

It is perfectly obvious that in this passage the word *jatru* can refer only to the windpipe. The point intended by the word *mūla*, root, is, speaking roughly, that where the trachea divides into its bronchi.¹ The former resembles the trunk, the latter the roots of a tree.

We will now turn to the general literature of an older date. The word *jatru* is of comparatively rare occurrence; but the following examples may be quoted. In the Mahābhārata, iii, verse 713, we read *jatru-dṛṣe vyarāśidat*, he fell on his throat, and in the Bhagavat Purāṇa, viii, 11, verse 14, *jatru-atāḍayat*, he struck his throat. Here the word *jatru*, being in the singular, cannot refer to the collarbones. It refers to the neck, and more especially to its anterior part, the throat. Again, in the Bhagavat Purāṇa, i, 19, verse 17, we have the laudatory epithet *nigūḍha-jatru*, stout-necked, and similarly in the Rāmāyaṇa, i, 1, verse 12, *gūḍha-jatru*. Obviously, in this epithet, also, *jatru* refers to the neck.

That epithet directs us to a passage in the Bṛhat Samhitā. Its author, Varāha Mihira, who lived in the sixth century A.D., in chap. lxviii, verse 30 (Sudhākara Dvivedi ed., p. 844), writes as follows :—

XIII. *Viṣamair=viṣamo jatrubhir=artha-vihīno 'sthisandhi-pariṇa-*
ddhaiḥ | *unnata-jatru=bhogī*, *nimnair=niḥsvo*, *'rthavān*
pīnaiḥ ||

That is, A person with an irregular (crooked) neck is an irregular (evil) liver; one with a goitred (lit. girt at the joint of the bone) neck is destitute of wealth; one with a long neck is a man of pleasure; one with a short neck is poor; one with a stout neck is wealthy.

¹ Dr. Wise, in his *System of Hindu Medicine* (reprint, p. 325), identifies it with the *scrobiculus cordis*, *vulgo*, pit of the stomach.

Here the word *jatru*, being in the plural number, cannot possibly denote the two collarbones, which meaning would require the dual number. I have translated 'neck,' for reasons of convenience; but literally it should be cervical vertebræ. In the larger St. Petersburg dictionary, which translates 'collarbone,' the plural is marked with the sign of exclamation. But there is nothing to justify surprise: the meaning 'collarbone' does not suit the context; obviously the neck is meant. *Asthisandhi*, the joint of the neck-bone, indicates the base of the throat where the goitre attaches. I suspect that the reference in the verse is to that malformation.

Another passage of the *Bṛihat Samhitā*, in which *jatru* occurs, chap. lxix, verse 25, runs as follows:—

XIV. *Udaram kathayanti pañcamam, hrdayam śaṣṭam=ataḥ stan-
ānvitam | atha sapṭamam=aṃsa-jatruṇi kathayanty=aṣṭamam=
oṣṭha-kandhare ||*

That is, The abdomen, they say, is the fifth (tract, *kṣetra*), and the heart together with the breast-pieces (ribs, *stana*) the sixth. Further, the seventh, they say, is the shoulder (or collarbone, *aṃsa*) and the windpipe (*jatru*); the eighth, the lips (i.e. mouth or jaws, *oṣṭha*) and neck (or cervical column, *kandharā*).

Here *jatru*, in the singular, refers to the windpipe, or anterior part of the neck, as shown by its contrast with *kandharā* (lit. head-supporter), the cervical column or posterior part of the neck. The dual *jatruṇi*, of course, has no reference to the meaning of the word (it does not indicate two *jatru*), but to its nexus with *aṃsa*, exactly as in the dual *kandhare*. In either case the dual refers to the nexus of two organs: two collarbones *plus* one windpipe, exactly as two lips *plus* one neck. It may be added that in this passage *jatru* is used in precisely the same sense as in the phrase *jatruṃdhva* (*ante*, p. 925), that is, as equivalent, practically, to *jatru-mūla*, base of the throat; for that phrase "from the throat, or neck, upwards" includes the

throat, and, therefore, practically means, "from the base of the throat upwards."

The result of our enquiry, so far, is to show that in Vedic literature *jatru*, in the plural, denotes cartilages, either of the neck (cervical) or of the breast (costal). In the ancient medical literature, where it is used only in the singular, its application is limited to the neck, and practically it becomes a synonym of *grīvā*, denoting either the trachea (windpipe) or the cervix. The same limitation prevails in the ancient general literature, where *jatru* occurs both in the singular and plural. But now we meet the curious phenomenon that for a long time back the idea has prevailed that *jatru* means the collarbone. We find this idea stated in Sanskrit vocabularies and commentaries, even in recent medical dictionaries, such as the *Vaidyaka Śabda Sindhu*. The question naturally occurs how and when did this idea arise.

The earliest work, so far as I can trace the matter, in which that idea is met with, is the *Amarakoṣa*. In book ii, chap. vi, verse 78 (Śivadatta ed., p. 262) *jatru* is explained as follows:—

XV. *Skandh, bhujaśiro'mso ('strī), sandhī tasyaiva jatruṇi |*

That is, The three words *skandha*, *bhujaśiras* (lit. head of the arm), and *aṃsa* (all three not feminine) are synonyms of the peak of the shoulder. The two connections (*sandhi*) of the latter are the two *jatru*.

From the use of the dual (*sandhi, jatruṇi*) it must be concluded that the two collarbones are meant by the 'two *jatru*.' If the shoulder-joint (*skandha-sandhi*) were intended, there would be no object in using the dual, any more than the dual is used with the three other terms (*skandha*, etc.). The meaning obviously seems to be that the connection (*sandhi*) between the two 'peaks of the shoulder' (*bhujaśiras*) is made by the two collarbones which run across the body from one peak to the other. The matter, however, is by no means as clear as one could wish. This would seem to have been the reason why the *Abhidhānā*

Ratnamālā (c. 950 A.D.) puts the case as follows (ii, 368, ed. Aufrecht) :—

XVI. *Jatru vakṣo-'msayoh sandhir=ūru-sandhiś-ca vaṅkṣaṇaḥ ||*

That is, The word *jatru* denotes the connection of the breast-bone (*vakṣas*) and the peak of the shoulder (*aṁsa*); and *vaṅkṣaṇa*, the joint of the thigh.

The matter, however, is made quite clear by the *Abhidhāna Cintāmaṇi* (c. 1141–3), which combines the two versions. Its statement (verse 588 in ed. Böhlingk and Rieu, p. 117) is as follows :—

XVII. *Aṁso bhujasīraḥ skandho, jatru sandhir=uro-'msa-gaḥ ||*

That is, The three words *aṁsa*, *bhujasīras*, and *skandha* are synonyms of the peak of the shoulder; (but) *jatru* is the connection (i.e. connecting bone) between the breast-bone (*uras*) and the peak of the shoulder (*aṁsa*).

Here the first portion of the verse is obviously quoted from the *Amarakoṣa* (No. XV), and the second from the *Abhidhāna Ratnamālā* (No. XVI). Hemachandra, the author of the *Abhidhāna Cintāmaṇi*, repeats the same definition of *jatru* in his *Dhātu Pārāyaṇa* (iv, 22, ed. Kirste, p. 191), where he derives *jatru* from the root *jan*, and adds that it means *vakṣo-'msa-sandhi*, i.e. connection of breast-bone and peak of the shoulder.

From these explanations given by Halāyudha and Hemachandra there can be no doubt whatever as to what meaning they intended to attribute to *jatru*. That word is declared to signify the *sandhi*, or connection, between the breast-bone (*vakṣas* or *uras*) and the peak of the shoulder (*aṁsa* or *bhujasīras*). Obviously the 'connection' can be none else than the collarbone. The attribution of the meaning 'collarbone' is thus traced to the *Amarakoṣa*, that is, to (say) the seventh century A.D. The question now arises, how did Amarasimha, the author of the *Amarakoṣa*, come to attribute that meaning to *jatru*? On analysing his verse, No. XV (*ante*, p. 929), it will be noticed that his interpretation of *jatru* depends on two points: (1) the identification of *aṁsa* with *bhujasīras*,

and (2) the use of *sandhi* in the dual and with the meaning 'connection.' On both points he is at variance with the early Indian anatomical doctrine. According to the latter, the three words *aṁsa*, *bhujāsiras*, and *skandha* are by no means synonymous; but *aṁsa* denotes the collarbone (*vulgo*, shoulder), *bhujāsiras*, which literally means the head of the arm, denotes the acromion process of the shoulder-blade, and is called also *aṁsakūṭa*, peak of the shoulder; *skandha* denotes the nape of the neck, and in the plural the cervical vertebræ. The three words denote three different parts of the 'shoulder'; *aṁsa* denotes the central part, or the collarbone, and *bhujāsiras* and *skandha* its two extremities. The true anatomical meaning of *aṁsa* may be seen from Suśruta's definition, No. VIII (*ante*, p. 920). It denotes the collarbone, and is truly stated to form the tie-bone (*nibandhana*) between *skandha*, the nape of the neck, and *aṁsapīṭha*, the shoulder-joint (glenoid cavity). Let it be observed that Suśruta does not describe the collarbone by the term *sandhi*, but by the term *nibandhana*. In anatomical usage the term *sandhi* denotes an 'articulation,' that is to say, the connection between two contiguous bones: it does not denote a bone which serves as a connecting link between two distant bones. The latter idea is expressed by the term *nibandhana*. Amarasiṁha, being ignorant or oblivious of anatomical technicalities, uses the term *sandhi* in its general, literary, sense of connection of any kind. His misuse of the term *sandhi*, however, suggests that he found it applied to *jatru* in some reputed medical work, where, of course, it must have denoted an 'articulation,' though Amarasiṁha took it to mean a 'connecting link.' To this point I shall return presently. In the meantime, we will try to solve the problem how Amarasiṁha came to believe that *aṁsa* did not mean a collarbone, but the peak of the shoulder (*bhujāsiras*, lit. arm-head). The shoulder comprises two bones, and no more, viz. the collarbone (clavicle) and the shoulder-blade (scapula). This is the doctrine of both Charaka and Suśruta. They distinguish those two bones by the terms *aṁsa* (or *akṣika*) and *aṁsaphalaku* respectively. Vāgbhaṭa the elder,

for reasons of his own,¹ makes the shoulder to comprise three bones: (1) the collarbone (*akṣaka*), (2) the shoulder-blade (*aṃsaphalaka*), and (3) the peak of the shoulder, or the acromion process (*aṃsa*, or *bhujāsiras*), though the latter, as the name indicates, is only a projection or 'process' of the shoulder-blade. Vāgbhaṭa the elder is the third in the great Indian medical triad (Charaka-Suśruta-Vāgbhaṭa); and in my opinion there can be no doubt that it was on his authority that Amarasiṃha acted when he identified *aṃsa* with *bhujāsiras*. But once having accepted that identification, he was necessarily driven to take the further step of interpreting *sandhi*, in its application to *jatru*, to mean, not an articulation, but a connecting link, or tie-bone, and consequently of identifying *jatru* with the collarbone.

And now comes the further question as to what induced Amarasiṃha to consider *jatru* to be a *sandhi*. To this question I am, for the present, unable to offer a definite reply: I can offer only a conjecture. It has been shown previously (*ante*, p. 925) that *jatru* occasionally occurs in connections in which practically it is equivalent to *jatru-mūla*, the base of the throat. Now the base of the throat is marked by the 'sterno-clavicular articulation,' that is, by the spot where the collarbones (clavicle, *aṃsa*) are jointed with the breast-bone (sternum, *vakṣas*, or *uras*). In Sanskrit this articulation would be called *vakṣo-'ṃsa-sandhi* or *uro-'ṃsa-sandhi*. As a matter of fact, that phrase is found as the definition of *jatru* in the vocabularies (*koṣa*) of Halāyudha and Hemachandra (Nos. XVI and XVII, *ante*, p. 930). There, no doubt, the phrase is misinterpreted in a different sense (collarbone); still, it is probable that Halāyudha, who first uses it (c. 950 A.D.), did not invent it, but obtained it from some medical work of repute. What medical work can it have been?

A verse of Suśruta has been quoted, No. XII (*ante*, p. 927), in which the term *jatru-mūla* occurs. In explanation of

¹ I cannot enter into them here. This would take me too far afield. The case is fully discussed in my forthcoming monograph on the Osteology of the Ancient Indians.

this term, Dallāna (c. 1160 A.D.) observes, in his *Nibandha Saṁgraha* (Jiv. ed., p. 1249) :

XVIII. *Jatru kakṣ-orasoḥ sandhī=iti Jaijjāṭaḥ | jatru-grīvā-mūla-graḥaṇena hṛdaya-kloma-kaṇṭhasya grahaṇam=iti Gayadāsaḥ ||*

That is, According to Jaijjāṭa, *jatru* denotes the joint of armpit (*kakṣā*) and breast-bone (*uras*); but, according to Gayadāsa, the base of *jatru*, that is, the base of the throat (*grīvā*), signifies the windpipe (*kaṇṭha*) near the heart and lungs (in other words, the base of the trachea, or the 'pit of the stomach').

The definition of *jatru* here attributed to Jaijjāṭa yields no sense. There is no such thing as a joint (articulation) of armpit and breast-bone; or if we take *sandhi* to mean, not an articulation, but a connecting link, then *jatru* comes to mean the collarbone; and the reference, then, would be to Suśruta's definition, quoted above, No. VIII, p. 920; the collarbone might be described, in a loose way, as connecting the armpit (*kakṣā = cṛīsapīṭha*) with the breast-bone. But to this interpretation there are two serious objections: (1) it does not suit the context of Suśruta's verse, which treats of a variety of hiccough; (2) it ascribes to Jaijjāṭa, a medical writer of repute, a misuse of the medical term *sandhi*, in making it mean a connecting link, instead of an articulation. Now it so happens that Vijayarakṣita, in his commentary, *Madhukṣa*, on the *Mādhava Nīlāna*, comments on the same passage of Suśruta, and quotes the identical explanations of Jaijjāṭa and Gayadāsa (Jiv. ed., p. 105). But according to him Jaijjāṭa's explanation of *jatru* is *kaṇṭh-orasoḥ sandhīḥ*, the joint of the throat and the breast-bone, that is, the spot where the throat meets the breast-bone. This explanation certainly suits the context, because it indicates the base of the throat (*jatru-mūla*). It also avoids the misuse of the term *sandhi*. But there still remains the objection that there is no real articulation between the throat (*trachea*) and the breast-bone (*sternum*). There is indeed an articulation at the place indicated by the explanation, but it is between

the clavicle and the sternum. Now, curiously enough, there appears to exist a third version of Jaijjāta's explanation of *jatru*. It occurs in Dallana's comments on the passage of Suśruta on the scope of Minor Surgery (*śālākya*, *ante*, p. 925). There Dallana says (Jīv. ed., p. 7):

XIX. *Śālākya*=*iti* | *jatru grīvā-mūlam*, *anye vakṣo-'mśa-sandhim-āhuḥ* |

That is, With respect to Minor Surgery, the word *jatru* denotes the base of the throat; but others say that it denotes the joint between the breast-bone and collarbone.

Here we have the correct explanation of *jatru* (or rather *jatru-mūla*): it is the sterno-clavicular articulation;¹ and comparing this explanation with the previous one, No. XVIII, the similarity between them is so striking that it suggests itself that Dallana's reference really is to the same authorities, and that *anye* refers to Jaijjāta. To my mind the case stands thus: Jaijjāta explained the term *jatru-mūla*, base of the throat, to refer to the sterno-clavicular articulation; on the other hand, Gayadāsa referred it to 'the pit of the stomach.' Jaijjāta is a very early medical writer; as he still retains the ancient, correct meaning of *mśa*, clavicle, his date must be anterior to that of Vāgbhāta the elder. It is suggested that his comments on Suśruta's text were imperfectly preserved, and the versions *kaṇṭhorasoḥ* and *kakṣorasoḥ* are corruptions of the correct version *vakṣomśayoḥ*. This suggestion is favoured by a curious fact. In commenting on the passage of the Brihat Saṁhitā, No. XIII (*ante*, p. 927), Bhaṭṭotpala explains *jatru* by *kakṣayoḥ sandhiḥ*,² the joint, or the connecting link, of the two armpits. This yields no proper sense: between the two armpits there is neither a joint nor a connecting link. The dual *kakṣayoḥ* is inexplicable; clearly a second word to make up the dual has dropped out.

¹ The correct reading occurs also in Dallana's comment (Jīv., p. 644) on Suśruta, *Cik. Sth.* i, 39, where also the diseases of the neck and head (*ūr-dhva-jatru-gata-rōga*) are referred to.

² The edition of Sudhākara Dvivedi, p. 844, has *kukṣayoḥ sandhiḥ*, joint of the two abdomens. I have no MSS. to verify; but that reading is manifestly false; it is either a misprint or a false reading.

The probability is that the correct reading is *kakṣ-orasoḥ sandhiḥ*, connecting link between the armpit and the breast-bone; in fact, the very explanation that Dallana ascribes to Jaijjāta (No. XVIII). If so, the circumstance shows that Jaijjāta's text was corrupt at a very early date, for Bhaṭṭotpala lived about 950 A.D. The corruption, after all, is not very difficult to understand. The akṣara *va* (व) might easily be miswritten *ka* (क). Thus *vakṣo'ṁsayoḥ* would become *kakṣ-āṁsayoḥ*. Next, under the misapprehension, originated by the *Amarakoṣa*, that *aṁsa* denoted the peak of the shoulder and *jatru* the collarbone, the reading *kakṣ-āṁsayoḥ sandhi*, which apparently yielded no sense, would be emended to the reading *kakṣ-orasoḥ sandhiḥ*, connecting link between armpit and breast-bone, which, of course, might denote the collarbone.

Assuming, then, that the definition *vakṣo-'ṁsayoḥ sandhi*, sterno-clavicular articulation, occurred in Jaijjāta's well-known commentary (now lost) on Suśruta's *Samhitā*, it seems probable that it was in the mind of Amarasiṁha when he penned his explanation of the word *jatru* (No. XV). But believing, on the authority of Vāgbhaṭa the elder, that *aṁsa* denoted the peak of the shoulder (*bhujasiras*, head of the arm), the only way for him to extract a meaning from the definition of Jaijjāta was to take *sandhi* to mean a connecting link, and to understand Jaijjāta to mean that *jatru* denoted the connecting link between the breast-bone and the peak of the shoulder; that is to say, that *jatru* denoted the collarbone. This erroneous idea once started by Amarasiṁha, the great authority of his *Amarakoṣa* procured for it thereafter general acceptance in Sanskrit literature. For example, in the case of the phrases quoted above (p. 927) from the *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, and *Bhagavat Purāṇa*, where *jatru* obviously refers to the neck, the commentators Śrīdhara and Rāmānuja explain it to refer to the two collarbones. The former makes this quite plain by saying :

¹ XX. *Kaṇṭhasya adhōbhāgayoḥ sthite asthinī jatrunī* (dual) |

That is. The two *jatru* are the two bones situated on both sides of the lower part of the throat.

The latter says summarily :

XXI. *Jatruṇi rakṣo-'ṁsa-sandhi-gate asthinī* |

That is, The two *jatru* are the two bones which constitute the connection between the breast-bone and the peak of the shoulder.

Indeed, the authority of the *Amarakoṣa* was so unquestioned that commentators actually forced the false interpretation on the word *jatru*, even when it was explicitly excluded by the wording of their text. One example of this practice has been given already (*ante*, p. 935) from the commentary of Bhaṭṭotpala, where *jatru*, though the text has it plainly in the plural number, is treated by him as if it stood in the dual number and denoted the two collarbones. But a still more conspicuous example may be furnished. It occurs in connection with a summary of the bones of the human body, given in the third chapter of the celebrated law-book, the *Yājñavalkya Dharmasāstra*. This summary practically agrees with the osteological summary in the *Caraka Saṁhitā*, and like the latter, it enumerates, in verse 88, among the bones, 'one *jatru*' (*jatru=ekam*), that is, one windpipe. On it we possess four commentaries: those of Aparārka, Vijñāneśvara, Śūlapāṇi, and Mitramiśra. Aparārka (c. 1150 A.D.), quoting the well-known explanation of the Vocabularies (*koṣa*) says :

XXII. *Jatruṇi uro-'ṁsayoḥ sandhāv=ekam=asthi*.

That is, In *jatru*, which is the connecting link between the breast-bone and the peak of the shoulder, there is one bone.

This explanation, of course, is very confused; for there are, not one, but two collarbones. The truth is that the phrase 'one *jatru*' of the text does not refer to the two collarbones at all, but to the single windpipe. Still, Aparārka, at least, does not attempt, in so many words, to turn the 'one *jatru*' of the text into two bones. But Vijñāneśvara (c. 1100 A.D.), the author of the famous *Mitākṣarā* commentary, with the,

no doubt, laudable object to be explicit, sophisticates his explanation as follows:—

XXIII. *Vakṣo-'msayoh sandhir-jatru, pratijatru ekaikam |*

That is, The connecting link between the breast-bone and the peak of the shoulder is (called) *jatru*; (but) there is one *jatru* on either side.

This explanation, of course, makes out that there are two *jatru*, namely, the two collarbones. Sūlapāṇi (fifteenth century) passes over the phrase without attempting any explanation. But with Mitramiśra (seventeenth century), who follows the lead of the *Mitākṣarā*, the inconsistency becomes still more glaring. He says:

XXIV. *Ekam=asthi āsṛitya jatru vakṣo-'msa-sandhi-dvayam |*

That is, *Jatru*, while constituting one bone, refers to the pair of connecting links between the breast-bone and peak of the shoulder.

The fact is that the commentators were confronted with the difficulty that their text distinctly stated that there was but a single *jatru* (the windpipe) in the human body, while they, misled by the Vocabularies, understood *jatru* to denote the collarbone, of which, as they knew, there were two in the human body. Thus they were forced to interpret 'one' (*ekam*) to mean 'two' (*ekaikam*, lit. one on either side).¹ There was, indeed, another alternative: to emend the text so as to agree with their preconceived notion. As a fact, this alternative was occasionally resorted to. I have examined sixteen manuscripts; eleven of them in the India Office Library. Among them there are three which give the emended reading *jatru=ekaikam*, i.e. one *jatru* on either side; two are uncertain; while all the others, altogether eleven,

, ¹ Of course this interpretation necessarily disconcerted the whole count of the osteological summary; and they were compelled to resort to all sorts of shifts to work out the required total of 360 bones. These shifts cannot be explained here; they are fully discussed in my forthcoming monograph on the Osteology of the Ancient Indians.

give the correct reading *jatru=ekam ca*, i.e. and a single *jatru*.¹

It remains to review the attitude of the Medical Vocabularies (*nighaṇṭu*) towards the question of the meaning of *jatru*. There is one called *Śabda Candrikā*, compiled by the well-known medical writer and commentator Chakrapāṇidatta, who lived about 1060 A.D. He quotes the verse in question, No. XV, from the *Amarakoṣa*, and then proceeds to comment on it as follows (Bodleian MS. No. 453, Wilson, 410b, fol. 88a, last line):—

XXV. *Skandhe katsavaram proktaṃ, vijñeyam ciru jatruṇi |*

That is, By *skanda* (or the peak of the shoulder) *katsavara* is indicated; by *jatru*, *ciru* is to be understood.

Unfortunately, this explanation does not help us much. For the two words *katsavara* and *ciru* are themselves unknown. They occur nowhere outside this particular passage of the *Śabda Candrikā*. Still, one point seems clear: Chakrapāṇidatta wishes to correct what he understood to be the erroneous interpretation of Amarasiṃha. Hence he gives what appear to be the vernacular equivalents, current in his time, for the two leading words of Amarasiṃha's statement, *skandha* and *jatru*. At the present day those two words are quite obsolete. In the Medical Dictionary (*Vaidyaka Śabda Sindhu*) of Kavirāj Umeśachandra Gupta, *katsavara* is said to mean *skandha*, shoulder; and *ciru* is identified with *bāhu-sandhi*, arm-joint or shoulder-joint. The sole authority for these meanings which the dictionary adduces is the very passage of the *Śabda Candrikā*,—obviously a mere vicious circle. The Bengali dictionary, *Śabda Mahānidhi* (Calcutta, 1896), the smaller St. Petersburg Dictionary, and M. Williams' Dictionary adduce the same meanings on no better authority. The attribution of the new meaning 'shoulder-joint' to *ciru=jatru* is especially baseless. There

¹ Unfortunately, Professor Stenzler, owing to insufficiency of manuscripts, and no doubt misled by the commentaries, has adopted, in his edition, the spurious reading *ekaikam*.

is no authority for it either in the older literature or in the older vocabularies. Considering that Chakrapāṇidatta was a medical man of considerable eminence, who was well acquainted with and wrote commentaries on the ancient Saṃhitās of Charaka and Suśruta, it is quite incredible that he should have used words which assigned to *skandha* and *jatru* meanings unknown to those Saṃhitās. I suggest, therefore, that in all probability those two words, *katsavara* and *ciru*, denote, respectively, the nape of the neck and the windpipe, or its base (*jatru-mūla*), the sterno-clavicular articulation.

Respecting the meaning 'shoulder-joint' attributed to *jatru*, there is indeed a supposed authority. This is the well-known medical vocabulary called *Rāja-nighaṇṭu*. The Ānandāśrama edition, in the *Parīśiṣṭu*, ch. xviii, clause 38 (p. 397), reads as follows:—

XXVI. *Dhamanī tu śir=āṃse tu skandho 'dhaḥ-śikharam tathā |
tasya sandhis=tu jatru syāt, kakṣā dor-mūla-saṃjñakā ||*

That is, *Dhamanī* denotes a vascular organ (*śirā*); *āṃsa* denotes the peak of the shoulder (*skandha* or *adhaḥ-śikhara*, lit. head-foremost); the joint of the latter is *jatru*; *kakṣā* denotes the base of the arm (or armpit).

This reading, no doubt, makes *jatru* to be equivalent to *skandha-sandhi*, or shoulder-joint; but it is a reading which is very doubtful. I have examined two manuscripts of the *Rāja-nighaṇṭu* (the only two accessible to me): India Office, No. 1507 (fol. 135a, l. 8), and Bodleian MS. No. 755 (Wilson, 410b, fol. 105b, line 1). Both manuscripts read as follows:—

*Dhamanī tu śir=āṃse tu skandho doḥ-śikharam tathā | stana-
madhye tu jatru syāt, kakṣā dor-mūla-saṃjñikā ||*

That is, *Dhamanī* denotes a vascular organ (*śirā*); *āṃsa* denotes the peak of the shoulder (*skandha*, or *doḥśikhara*, lit. head of the arm). In the middle of the breast (or between the two breasts) is *jatru*; *kakṣā* denotes the base of the arm (or the armpit).

This reading, if correct, identifies *jatru* either with the sternum and costal cartilages or with the windpipe. I do

not know what support for his reading the Ānandāsrama editor may have found in his manuscripts: he mentions none. But I am disposed to prefer the reading of my manuscripts; for two reasons. First, it is the *lectio difficilior*; the reading of the edition obviously recalls the statement in the Amarakoṣa, No. XV (*ante*, p. 929), and in all probability it has been suggested by it. Secondly, the *lectio difficilior* is in agreement with the true meaning of *jatru* as observable in the Vedic and earliest medical literature. But even assuming that the reading of the edition is the genuine one, the date of the *Rāja-nighaṇṭu* is much too late to allow the opinion of that work any decisive value in determining the meaning of such a rare and obscure anatomical term as *jatru*. The author of that work, Nara-hari, lived certainly after 1374 A.D., and probably as late, at least, as the fifteenth century (see Professor Aufrecht, in *Journal*, German Oriental Society, vol. xli, p. 187). At that date effective anatomical knowledge had ceased to exist in the Indian medical schools; and in any case the opinion of the *Rāja-nighaṇṭu* cannot be utilized in interpreting the meaning of the much older *Śabda Candrikā*. However, as I said, for the present I prefer crediting the *Rāja-nighaṇṭu* with the more appropriate reading of my manuscripts.

I am tempted to conclude the discussion about *jatru* with a chronological inference suggested by it regarding the date of Amarasimha. He must be placed between Vāgbhaṭa the elder, on whose identification of *amśa* with the peak of the shoulder his statement on the meaning of *jatru* is based, and Chakrapāṇidatta, who quotes that statement. Itsing (*Records of Buddhist Religion*, by Takakuṣū, p. 128) mentions an Epitome, "lately" made by a physician, of "the eight books" of medical science, which in his time had become the standard textbook throughout India. As the textbook of Vāgbhaṭa the elder bears the title "Epitome of the Octopartite Science" (*Aṣṭāṅga Saṁgraha*), it can hardly be doubted that Itsing's statement refers to that work. As Itsing was in India from 673 to 695 A.D., and as a reasonable interval must be allowed for the spread of the "Epitome of

the Eight Books" throughout India, we may take about 600 to 625 A.D. to be the date of Vāgbhaṭa the elder. Chakrapāṇidatta's date is about 1060 A.D. Between these two dates, accordingly, the composition of the *Amarakoṣa* should fall. Moreover, Bhaṭṭotpala's explanation of *jatru* as the collarbone presupposes a knowledge of the theory of the *Amarakoṣa*; and his date is about 950 A.D. Accordingly the date of the *Amarakosa* should lie between 625 and 950 A.D.

(To be continued.)

XXXI.

STUDIES IN BUDDHIST DOGMA.¹

BY LOUIS DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, M.R.A.S.

THE THREE BODIES OF A BUDDHA (*TRIKĀYA*).

ONE of the more interesting features of the Great Vehicle, or Mahāyāna School of Buddhism, is the system of the Three Bodies. Being at first a 'Buddhology,' a speculative doctrine of the Buddhahood, this system was afterwards made to cover the whole field of dogmatic, of ontology, and was in particular substituted for the antiquated 'dependent origination' (*pratītyasamutpāda*). At first the Buddhas alone had three 'Bodies'; afterwards the whole universe was looked upon as residing in or made of the Bodies. Later, or by parallel development, new mythological, mystic, and physiological reveries caused serious alterations of the primitive 'trinitarian' form, and in particular the addition of two more Bodies to the 'classical' ones; and the Tantric school, in its own fanciful, mystic, and theurgic way, reduced the speculative system to a mere practical method of Yoga.

Much has been written by several scholars on the Trikāya. The latter form of the trinitarian theory, its philosophical aspects, and its points of contact with Hindoo cosmologies have been thoroughly elucidated by the able observations of Professor Kern; whereas Wassilieff has thrown some light on its older signification, we mean the theological and truly

¹ See *Journal Asiatique*, 1902, ii, 237; 1903, ii, 358; *Muséon*, 1905, 178.—The MS. of the present article has been kindly revised by Dr. W. H. D. Rouse.

Buddhistic one. There are also documents on the Tantric aspect of the three or five Bodies scattered in the works on later or Tibetan Buddhism.¹ It seems, nevertheless, that something remains to be said. There is no hope of fully illustrating the antecedents, the growth, and the numerous alterations of the dogma under examination, as it is too intimately connected with Buddhist dogmatic as a whole and the history of the schools. But even if our researches should be completely wanting in chronological accuracy, and even fruitless as concerns the historical development of the Faith, we are confident that they will to some extent ascertain the meaning of some important Buddhist tenets. At least it is interesting to gather new original documents and to collect the interpretations which have been presented by native or European authorities.

It is a common misfortune when dealing with Indian or Buddhist topics that comprehensive and detailed accounts are far from being clear, and that intelligible summaries are always somewhat misleading. The genuine methods of the Indian thought are on the one hand the genial but incoherent effusions of the Brāhmaṇa-Upaniṣads, on the other the pedantic categories of the Brahmanic or Buddhist 'māṭrkās' (compilations of technical terms). The Buddhists of old, as a rule, scarcely realize what they mean, and the best scholastical interpreters had to organize the obscure or contradictory statements and nomenclatures of the Sūtras. Therefore, tradition must be squeezed through a filter if one wants coherent theories. This very case offers special difficulties, because the philosophical views are mixed together with

¹ See H. Kern, "Over den aanhef eener Buddhistische Inscriptie uit Battambang" (Versl. en Med. der k. Akad., Letterkunde, 4^e r., 3 deel, Amsterdam, 1899), French translation by L. de la Vallée Poussin, Muséon, 1906, 46; Wassilieff, Buddhism, p. 127; Schlagintweit, Waddell, passim.—Csoma, Fäschke, Eitel, see below, pp. 946, 958, 968.—A small treatise, Kāyatraya (ཀླུ་གཟུགས་), Kandjur, Mdo, xxii, 16 (Csoma-Feer, p. 274), has been translated by Rockhill, "Life of the Buddha," pp. 200–202.

theological postulates and mythological traditions, because we gather documents from Sūtras so old as the Prajñāpāramitās, the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, or the Amitāyurdhyānasūtra, down to the Tantric literature, which knows too much about Jinas (the so-called Dhyānibuddhas) and Vajrasattvas.

We shall endeavour to make out the prominent lines of the diverging theories, and to characterize their mutual relations. The *exposé* of the sources will enable the reader to correct or to complete our very imperfect sketch.

General view of the matter.

I. The doctrine of the Trikāya as Buddhology, after its completion, but yet free from 'ontological' and cosmogonic speculations.

(A) The very nature of a Buddha is the Bodhi (Enlightenment), or Prajñāpāramitā (Perfect Wisdom), or knowledge of the Law (Dharma), i.e. of the absolute Truth. By acquiring this knowledge, nirvāṇa is realized *in potentia* or *in actu*. The Dharmakāya, Body of Law, of a Buddha is the Buddha in nirvāṇa or in nirvāṇa-like rapture (samādhikāya = dharmakāya).

(B) A Buddha, as long as he is not yet merged into nirvāṇa, possesses and enjoys, for his own sake and for others' welfare, the fruit of his charitable behaviour as a Bodhisattva. The second body is the Body of Enjoyment or Beatific Body (saṃbhogakāya).

(C) Human beings known as Buddhas are magical contrivances (nirmāṇakāya) created at random by real Buddhas, i.e. by Buddhas possessed of beatific bodies, sovereigns of celestial worlds, Tuṣita-heavens or 'Paradises' (Sukhāvatī).

II. The doctrine of Trikāya as an ontologic and cosmologic system.

- (A) By Body of Law one has to understand the void and permanent reality that underlies every phenomenon (dharma), or the store of the 'dharma,' or more exactly the uncharacterized Intellect (vijñāna).
- (B) Body of Enjoyment is the Dharmakāya evolved as Being, Bliss, Charity, Radiance, or the Intellect as far as it is individualized as Buddha or Bodhisattva.
- (C) Magical or rather Transformation's Body is the same Intellect when defiled, when individualized as 'common people' (prthagjana), infernal being, etc.

I. DHARMAKĀYA, BODY OF THE LAW.

Whatever be, in Mahāyānist books, the precise meaning of 'dharmakāya,'¹ we are taught that this is the true Body of a Buddha. *Śvabhāvakāya*, 'essential body' (自性身 = རོ་བོ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་སྒྲི), and dharmakāya (法身 = རྒྱལ་ཀྱི་སྒྲི) are interchangeable terms.² Elsewhere we meet the expression

¹ See Csoma, Dict., p. 305, "The Supreme Moral Being"; Jäschke, Dict., p. 22a, "Absolute Body, Buddha in the Nirvāna, the so-called first world of abstract existence, i.e. non-existence"; Eitel, Handbook, p. 179; sources quoted by St. Julien, "Voyages," ii, 224; Wassilieff, pp. 127, 286.

² *Sarvaprapañcavyatirikto bhagavatām svābhāviko dharmakāyaḥ sa eva cādhiḡamasvabhāvo dharmah. (Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā, 3. 16.)*

According to Csoma, Dict., p. 305 [སྒྲི་བཞི་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ = catvāraḥ kāyāḥ], the *svabhāvakāya* should be a fourth and yet more sublime body: "the body, substance, or essence of nature itself, the First Being, God."—Jäschke, Dict., p. 22a, supports the same view: "More recent speculators have even added a *no-bo-ñid-sku* superior to the three, viz., that which is eternal in the essence of a Buddha, even *chos-sku*, the absolute body, being described by these philosophers as transient." [That would very well suit the conclusions at which Professor Kern arrives (op. cit., p. 72 = Muséon, 1906, 55): "For the Realists (and amongst Buddhists Realism

śuddhakāya,¹ that is to say, the Body in its true nature, resting in itself, free from developments (*prapañca*) or external coverings or hindrances (*āvaraṇa*), translucent or radiant (*prabhāsvara*).

1. THE DOCTRINE OF THE DHARMAKĀYA AS BUDDHOLOGY.

(1) *The material body of Buddha contrasted with Buddha as the Law embodied.*

As early hints or foreshadowings of the 'Body of Law,' one can quote the identification of the Law with the Buddha, to be met frequently in the Pāli literature: "To see the Law is to see the Buddha." To follow Śākyamuni and to touch his robe is not to see the Buddha: "He is far from me and I am far from him, because he has not seen the Law."² The meaning seems to be that, when one has understood the Dharma, i.e. the doctrine of dependent origination (*pratītya-samutpāda*),³ one has seen the best of a Buddha, one has reached everything that can be derived from a Buddha. Preachers first and foremost and preachers only,⁴ the Buddhas are the 'embodied law' or the 'living law'; in

had supporters) is the Dharma something really existing; not so for the Idealists of the Mahāyāna: according to them Dharma is a production of the mind, of the *Saṃvṛti*, and therefore an appearance, a *kāya*, a body: therefore the Mahāyānist can consider the Body of the Law like the two others, as an apparent manifestation of the sole and real Being."]

I think that the 'svābhāvika kāya' as a fourth body is a Tantric conception (see below, p. 977). We are said in the *Amṛtakanikā*, a commentary to the *Nāmasaṃgīti* (v. 156), that the Law-body (styled 'yuganaddhakāya'), to be known by the ascetic in himself, is different from the 'sāmbhogikakāya' (Enjoyment-body) and from the 'svābhāvika' (the very Body, etc.).

¹ *Kālacakra*, quoted ad *Nāmasaṃgīti*, *Amṛtakanikā*, v. 92.

² See Minayeff, *Recherches*, p. 218, n. 2.—*Mahāparinibbāna*. 60; *Itivuttaka*, 91. 12; *Saṃ. N.* III, 120; *Saddhammasaṃgaha*, 62. 3 (*J.P.T.S.* 1890); *Śālistambasūtra*, quoted *Madhyamakavṛtti*, p. 6, note 2.

³ *Majjh. N.* I, 191. 1; *Śālistambasūtra*.

⁴ "You yourself must make an effort: the Tathāgatas are [only] preachers."

the same way, after the nirvāṇa, the Law must be the ruler of the Church, the Refuge, a living Buddha.

Further, the phrase *dharmakāya*, with the same import, in the Divyāvadāna¹ and in a Jātaka,² contrasted with *rūpakāya* or *bhūtikāya*, 'material, visible body.' Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa wanted to see the material body of the Master; he had but seen the Buddha in his Law-body, that is to say, he knew the sacred books, of which he gives a very interesting list. In fact, 'dharmakāya' can be and is understood as an equivalent of 'dharmaśamūha,' the collections of the books, the second jewel (ratna).³ Chinese authorities confirm this distinction of the two bodies: "Primitive Buddhism (in China)," says Eitel, "distinguished a material, visible, and perishable body (*rūpakāya*) and an immaterial, invisible, and immortal body (*dharmakāya*) as attributes of [Buddha's] human existence."⁴ It would perhaps be more exact to state that the 'material body' of a Buddha is his 'body,' endowed with the marks which he already possesses as a Bodhisattva⁵; whereas his 'soul' or his knowledge is his Body of Law, eternal and unalterable, a "series of undefiled principles,"⁶ the same in all the Tathāgatas, and beyond the range of thought: "The Buddhas ought to be looked upon as equivalent to the Dharma; the leaders indeed are the Dharma embodied; the nature of the Dharma is beyond the discriminative powers of mind."⁷

¹ See Div. 19. 11, 20. 23.

² See the story of Upagupta, *ibid.* 356 (Windisch, *Māra und Buddha*, 161). Cf. the Pāli text edited Bulletin de l'École Française, 1904, 420 (where occurs *bhūtikāya*). [Also, as synonyms: *tāthāgataṃ vapuṣ, buddhaṃ rūpaṃ*.]

³ See Bodhicaryāvat. p. 3. 18: samūhārtho rā kāyaśabdah . . . [dharmakāyaśabdena] pravacanasya grahaṇām.

⁴ Handbook, p. 178.

⁵ See below, p. 962, n. 2; p. 971, n. 2.

⁶ *dharmakāya* = *anāśravadharmasamūhā* (Abhidharmakośav. MS. Burn. 443b).

⁷ See Vajracchedikā, Max Müller's edition, p. 43 (Anecd. Oxon. i, 1). [Read: dharmato buddhā draṣṭavyā dharmakāyā hi nāyakāḥ, dharmatā cāpy avijñeyā na sā śakyā vijñānitum], Madhyamakaṭṭhi, xxii, ad finem; Bodhicaryāv. ix, 38.

(2) *Dharmakāya* = *Bodhi* = *Nirvāṇa*.

It is the knowledge of the truth (*tattvajñāna*), the 'arriving at' or understanding the truth (*adhigama* = *dharma*),¹ that makes a Buddha. A Buddha's mind is made of the 'knowledge of the non-birth of anything' (*anutpādayñāna*).² Now the true knowledge being styled 'Dharma' or 'Prajñāpāramitā,' there is no wonder that the Buddha's real nature should be defined as 'dharma' or 'prajñā,' whereas 'prajñā' is styled the mother of the *Tathāgatas*. We read that "Prajñā is the real body of the *Tathāgatas*";³ that "all the Buddhas, past, present, and future, have for body the Dharma."⁴

Prajñākaramati, the commentator of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, well illustrates this topic: "The Bodhi or Buddhahood is the absolute (*paramārtha*) reality; empty of any essence, be it unique or multiple; neither born, nor extinct; neither perishing, nor permanent; free from any cogitable contingency, æther-like; it has for name *Dharmakāya*. From the point of view of practical truth, it is styled *Prajñāpāramitā*, Void, Suchness, Actual (or real) apex, Element of existence, etc."⁵

¹ See above, p. 946, n. 2, and *Madhyamakavṛtti*, xxiv, 4, where a fourfold meaning is given of the word *dharma*: *phaladharmā* (= *nirodha*), *phalāvatāradharma* (= *mārgasatyam*), *āgamadharmā* (= *deśanā*), and *adhigamadharma*.

² See *Madhyamakāvatāra*, quoted below, p. 962.

³ *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, 94. 11. A single manuscript of the *Prajñā* is worth the whole *Jambudvīpa* full of relics, because the *Prajñā* is the real body (*bhūtārthika śarīra*) of the *Tathāgata*. *Bhagavat* has said: "Do not believe that this [material] body is [my] true body (*saṅkāya*)"

⁴ *Ibid.*, 462. 1.

⁵ *Bodhicaryāv.* ix, 38 (*Bibl. Indica*, p. 421. 5; Poussin's *Etudes et Matériaux*, p. 277): *bodhir buddhatvam ekānekasvabhāva-viviktaṃ anutpannāniruddhaṃ anucchedaṃ aśāsvataṃ sarvaprapaṇcavinirmuktaṃ ākāśapratisamaṃ dharmakāyākhyam paramārthatattvam ucyate, etad eva ca prajñāpāramitāsūnyatātathatā-bhūtaḥkoṭidharmadhātvaśābdena samvṛtim upādāyābhidhīyate.*—Our translation of *bhūtaḥkoṭi*, 'the actual or real apex' = 'the true end, aim, opinion,' rests on the Tibetan ཡང་རྟག་པོའི་མཐོང་པོ་ — *Aṣṭ.s.* 94. 14, '*dharmakāya*' is styled '*bhūtaḥkoṭiprabhāvita*.'

In short, the 'Body of Law' of a Buddha is his possessing Nirvāṇa *in actu* or *in potentia*, as Occidental scholastics would say. The synonym, given by a Tantric Commentary, '*samādhikāya*,' 'the state of highest trance,' is a very good one.¹ Just as an Aupaniṣadic ascetic merges into Brahman during dreamless sleep, in the same way the Buddhist adepts in 'unconscious abstraction' realize the Body of Law, but for a time only. The Bodhisattva, on the contrary, since he has become a Buddha, does not abandon the state of trance,² i.e. his never to be abandoned real Body.

2. DHARMAKĀYA AS AN ONTOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE.

The dialectic of the old Suttantas, put in the best scholastical frame by the Mādhyamikas and already driven to its last results in the Prajñāpāramitā books, seems to be such as to prevent any positive system. It aims at an absolute denial of the reality of anything, substance or appearance. Not only the old lesson on 'soullessness' (*nairātmya*) coupled with 'dependent origination,' excludes the notion of being, and reduces the whole world to a process of becoming (*πάντα ρέει*), but enquiries on causality, on 'momentaneity,' on the theory of knowledge, turn to the negation of the very becoming of things. The 'saṃsāra' is a mere show, like the water in a mirage, like the daughter of a barren woman. Nor is nirvāṇa or Buddha anything: "The Buddhas are names only, and if there be any more distinguished (*viśiṣṭa*) a thing than a Buddha, I should say it is a mere name." Everything merges into void; but the distinction of the two truths provides the doctors with

¹ Amṛtakanikā ad Nāmasaṃgīti, v. 146.—See J. de Groot, Code du Mahāyāna, p. 16.—Perfect *samādhi*, however, is said to be the characteristic of the saṃbhogakāya (Trikāya, translated by Rockhill, p. 200).

² See the sources quoted in Bodhicaryāvatāra, ix, 36, and also J.R.A.S. 1902. p. 374, n. 1.

a rather solid basis for the establishing of a Path (relative truth) leading to nirvāṇa (highest truth or void).¹

Nay, actual voidness is a *postulatum* of this very Path! If there were something, this 'something' could not be extinguished. In fact, like the Buddhists of old, the Mādhyamikas are almost exclusively interested in final release (mokṣa); and, in general, one may say that the Orthodox (amongst whom are the Mādhyamikas) have elaborated metaphysics (*skandha*-theory, dependent origination, void, momentaneity) chiefly to support their eschatology and the practices leading to one's end, be it Arhatship or magnified Buddhahood.

There are many Sūtras (scriptural texts) and Śāstras (treatises) to inform us whither are going the Arhats and the Buddhas, i.e. the purified or magnified individual beings; they are going to nirvāṇa *alias* Buddhahood or dharmakāya. And the good middle Path is also fully described. But whence come the individual beings? The Orthodox, the Mādhyamikas in chief, content themselves with stating that there is a term to saṃsāra, an apex or limit of being (bhūtakoti), but that 'saṃsāra' or 'becoming' has had no beginning. But the constructive Vijñānavādins attach themselves to the realistic clues forwarded by the nihilistic speculation.²

The 'equivalences,' established by nihilistic speculation, are indeed pregnant with positive surmises. Granted that 'things' and Buddhas are equally void, it follows

¹ See Journal Asiatique, 1903, ii, 358.

² The attitude of the Mādhyamikas can be appreciated from their authoritative treatises (Mādhyamakasūtras and commentaries) and from the criticisms of the Yogācāras = Vijñānavādins, who style them *sarvavaināśikas* and *nāstikas*. However, it is difficult to state exactly the contributions of the two great Mahāyāna schools to the theories which will be summarized below. Our observations, so far as the historical relations of the schools are concerned, are possibly wanting in accuracy: Śāntideva is sometimes named amongst the Mādhyamika, sometimes amongst the Yogācāras. In short, by Mādhyamika we mean the purely critical and negative system of the Mādhyamakasūtras, by Yogācāra the system of Aśvaghōṣa.

that ordinary beings and Buddhas are possessed of the same nature. Further 'saṃsāra' = 'nirvāṇa,' but there is no doubt that 'nirvāṇa' = Buddhahood. Thus the Void (= nairātmya, pratītyasamutpāda) was from the first less or more tinged with mystic colours; it was identified with the Prajñā, which, to speak correctly, is but the knowledge of the universal nothingness; it became apt to bear a more or less definite ontological meaning under the name of 'Dharmakāya,' which associates it with immortal 'Nirvāṇa' or Buddhahood.

From the very statement that everything is 'void,' chaotic speculation would draw the conclusion that everything is evolved out of the 'void.' Absolute nothingness or nirvāṇa is the perfect wisdom, Buddhahood, the Law-body; it is the absolute truth (paramārthasatya) and the only reality: the doctrine is near at hand that the process of purification taught by all the schools (*vyavadāna*, 1 common people (prthagjana), 2 bodhisattva, 3 buddha, dharmakāya) is but the counterpart of a process of defilement (*saṃkleśa*), from dharmakāya down to prthagjanatva. Old Buddhism was indeed, *mutatis mutandis*, a theory and a method of 'going back into the Brahman.' The school of the Vijñānavādins, out of genuine Buddhist tenets, sūnyatā = buddhatva = dharmatā, nirvāṇa = saṃsāra, has evolved a positive system of emanation.

Unlike the Mādhyamikas, who identify the 'Void' with momentaneity and caused origination, unlike the redactors of the Prajñā, who play rather with words than with ideas, the Vijñānavādins, 'supporters of the existence of the only Intellect,' maintain that the 'Void,' as emphasized by the Sacred Books, is 'the absence of characteristics,' and really designates a 'something.'¹ "For Vacuity to be a justifiable position, we must have, firstly, existence of that which is empty (the receptacle), and then non-existence of that in

¹ One can refer to the Sūtras that the school of the Yogācāras style "Sūtras of exact meaning," see Wassilieff, p. 302. The Mahābherī goes so far as to say that Tathāgata is possessed of a permanent bliss, of a pure self, not of Nirvāṇa, etc. (ibid., 162).

virtue of which it is empty (the contents); but, if neither exists, how can there be vacuity? In objects to which 'notes' such as form and the like are commonly attributed, there are not really such 'notes,' but the substrate of the designations such as form exists in the same way as there is a rope on which serpent's notion is superimposed. The denotable properties do not exist."¹ Now the undenotable real 'something' or 'mere thing' (*vastumātra*) is further defined as Intellect (*viññāna*), receptacle or quiescent intellect (*ālayaviññāna*),² according to the general tenet of the school that the things are only mental representations. The 'going on' (*pravṛtti*), or particularizing evolution, or defilement (*saṃkleśa*) of Intellect, by work or thinking, is what is called 'saṃsāra,' and by 'nirvāṇa' nothing else can be meant than the purification (*vyavadāna*) of Intellect, its restoration to its primitive void or radiant transparence (*prabhāsvaratā*).

Here we find an adequate basis for the interpretation of the mystic nomenclature of the *Prajñāpāramitās*: *dharmakāya*, *tathatā*, *tathāgatagarbha*, further *dharmadhātu* and *garbhadhātu*, etc.

a. By *Tathatā*, better *Bhūtatathatā*, 'Suchness,' 'True nature,' stress is laid upon the primitive and permanent non-differentiation or unheterogeneity of everything. We might compare the *Sāṃkhya* 'Nature' or *pradhāna*.³ As far as it is evolved and differentiated, Nature is an illusion (*māyā*), and when non-evolved it is like a pure void (*śūnyatā*).

β. By the phrase *Tathāgatagarbha*, 'Tathāgata's Womb,' we have to understand: (1) The *Prajñā*, mother of the *Tathāgatas*, knowledge of the 'void reality,' and identical

¹ *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, I, iv (fol. 29b foll.). The first part (book I, i and ii) of an English summary of this excellent book has been published by Bendall and myself in *Muséon* (1905, 2).

² On *ālayaviññāna* see *Āśvaghoṣa*, *Mahāyānaśraddhotpādaśāstra*, translated by T. Suzuki, "Awakening of Faith" (Chicago, Open Court, 1900), Suzuki's article, "Philosophy of the *Yogācāra*" (*Muséon*, 1904, 370), *Mādhyamakāvatāra*, vi, 46.

³ Cf. Kern, "Inscriptio uit Battambang"; Beal, "Catena," p. 12.—On 'suchness,' *Āśvaghoṣa*, Suzuki, 96.

with this 'void reality' itself. But this womb of the Buddhas is at the same time their cemetery, since the 'being a Buddha' (buddhatva), the 'being a Tathāgata,' i.e. the 'being arrived at true knowledge,' can by no means be realized as long as the very idea of a distinction remains. (2) The matrice of every pseudo-individual being. The Lankāvatāra describes the Womb as "genuinely radiant and pure, bearer of the thirty-two marks, present in all beings, like a precious gem covered by dirt, covered by the *skandhas*, the *dhātus*, and the *āyatanas*; defiled by the wrong imaginations due to love, hatred, and error; permanent, firm, blessed, everlasting."¹ "But is not such doctrine of a Tathāgata - Womb identical to the doctrine of Ātman supported by the non-believers?" The sūtra formulates this objection, and clearly states that one must not separate the doctrine of the Tathāgatagarbha and the doctrine of soullessness (nairātmya): "Like a pot-maker who would mould different kinds of pots with the same mass of clay, the Buddha teaches the soullessness sometimes directly, sometimes under the veil of the Tathāgata's Womb."² Indeed, neither the Tathāgatagarbha nor the Prajñā is a 'self'; they are identical with—

γ. The Dharmadhātu, *alias* 'Dharmarāśi,'³ the store of the 'dharma's' or phenomena, the collection of the intellectual unconscious elements apt to be transformed into, i.e. to be perceived as sound (rutarāśi), as form or matter (rūparāśi), as happiness (sukharāśi, sukhacittarāśi). It is scarcely

¹ Buddhist Text Society, p. 80. 3: sa ca kila [tathāgatagarbhas] tvayā prakṛtiprabhāsavaraviśuddhyādiviśuddha eva varṇyate dvā-triṃśallakṣaṇadharāḥ sarvasattvadehāntargataḥ mahārgghamūḷyaratnam malinavastupariveṣṭitam iva skandhadhātuvāyatanavastupariveṣṭito rāga dveṣaṃ mohābhūtaparikalpamalamalino nityo dhruvaḥ śivahśāśvataś ca bhagavatā varṇitaḥ.

² Ibid., p. 80. 20.

³ The Svamatoddeśa by Nāgārjuna, quoted in the Nāmasaṃgīti's ṭīkā, Cambr. 1708 (v. 156), gives the following definitions: rūparāśir ananto me nirmāṇakāya uttamah, rutarāśir ananto me sambhogakāya uttamah, dharmarāśir ananto me dharmakāyaḥ prakīrtitaḥ, sukarāśir ananto me sukhakāyo kṣayaḥ paraḥ.

needful to observe that everything cannot but be made of mind (*monomaya*), since Intellect (*viññāna*) is the only matrice and substance.

δ. The 'Dharmakāya,' 'the Body of Law of all the Tathāgatas,' is the most remarkable and probably the oldest amongst these synonymous terms. Since Buddhahood, according to the quasi-universal tenet of the Great Vehicle, is a necessary condition of *nirvāṇa*;¹ since every creature is hoped to become a Buddha; since Buddhahood consists in actual cessation or purification of thought; since thought could never be purified if it were 'really' defiled; since every individual being is but mere illusion, it is obvious to consider Buddhahood, i.e. the Body of Law, as the real and 'really' unmodified nature of everything.

A good definition of the Dharmakāya is furnished by a stanza, possibly of Nāgārjuna (?), and known to us from a Chinese transcription of Fa-t'ien.² It runs as follows:—
 "Homage to the incomparable Law-body of the Conquerors, which is neither one nor multiple, which supports the great blessing of salvation for oneself and for one's neighbour, which neither exists nor exists not, which like the ether is homogenous, whose own nature is unmanifested, which is

¹ It is more difficult to obtain Arhatship than to obtain Buddhahood, because it is next to impossible to abandon the sin-hindrances without pity (*karuṇā*). One must, moreover, remark that the knowledge of the 'void' is a necessary condition; people who believe in a future '*nirvāṇa*,' as the Arhats of the old schools, cannot reach it by any means.

² Published and read by Sylvain Lévi as a part of Ed. Chavannes's first article on the "Inscriptions chinoises de Bodhi-Gayā" (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, xxxiv, 1, 1896). See Nanjio, No. 1072; Fa-t'ien, 982 A.D. The Chinese document contains the adoration of the three Bodies, plus a concluding stanza. A commentary of the *Nāmasaṃgīti* quotes in full the stanzas 2 and 3 (*sambhogakāya*, *nirmāṇakāya*); it gives us the first words of the stanza 1 (*dharma*) and of a fourth stanza (*mahāsukhākāya*; = *Pinḍikrama*, 1 = *Pañcakramā*, i, 1) unknown to the Chinese Pilgrim. [*Nāmasaṃgīti* *śloka*: yo yaiko nāpy aneka ityādinā dharmakāya-lakṣaṇam, lokātītām acintyām ityādinā sambhogakāyasya, sat-tvānām pākahetor ityādinā nirmāṇakāyasya, trailokyācāramuktam ityādinā mahāsukhākāyasya.]

undefiled, unchanging, blessed, unique in its kind, diffused, transcendent, and to be known by everyone in himself.”¹

The Body of Law is not ‘one,’ since it pervades and supports everything; nor multiple,² since it remains identical with itself. It is the supporter of Buddhahood, by which every Buddha realizes his own aim and universal welfare. It is unmanifested, being free from ‘form’ (arūpa).³ It is transcendent, being free from any cogitable characteristic (prapañca). As it is the universal pervader, everybody can recognize it as his true self;⁴ and there is not another way of knowing it, as it is uncogitable and out of the range of words.⁵

From the above representation it follows that the Body of Law is a purely metaphysical conception, alien to any mythological exegesis. But, as a matter of fact, although every Buddha has for ‘dharmakāya’ the unique ‘dharmakāya,’ every Buddha has been said to have his own ‘dharmakāya’ and receives under this aspect special denominations: thus, whereas Amitābha and Akṣobhya are ‘dharmakāyas,’ Amitāyus and Vajrasattva respectively are their ‘sambhogakāyas.’ One distinguishes two Vairocanas and two Amogha-

¹ yo naiko nāpy anekaḥ svaparahitamahāsāmpadādharabhūto |
naivābhāvo na bhāvaḥ kham ivā samaraso nirvibhāvasvabhāvaḥ |
nirlepaṁ nirvikāraṁ śivam asamasamaṁ vyāpinaṁ niḥprapañcaṁ |
vande pratyātmavedyaṁ tam aham anupamaṁ dharmakāyaṁ
jinānāṁ || The reading °samaraso nirvibhāva° is somewhat
doubtful. The Chinese gives *no-li + wei* = nirvi° [訥哩尾],
whereas in the following line we have *ni-li + wei* = nirvi°
[你哩尾].

² Aśvaghoṣa, Suzuki (p. 96), has *anekārthā, anānārtha*. (Cf. Madhyamakasūtras, introductory stanza.)

³ Nāmasaṁgīti, Comm. ad v. 79.—Or, when manifested, it is pure light.

⁴ pratyātmavedya, svasaṁvedya. Cf. Vedāntic theories on the knowledge of Brahman.

⁵ The definition offered by the sūtra, whose summary *apud* Wassilieff, p. 161, is purely Vedantic. The little Trikāya sūtra has: “perfectly pure *svabhāva*, exempt from *svabhāva* like space” (Rockhill, 200). Another source, hitherto untouched, is Saṁdhi-nirmocanasūtra, chapter x.

siddhis, under different Law and Enjoyment forms. Further, as Mañjuśrī is from of old a personification of Wisdom or 'prajñā,' it is said to be by excellence the *jñānakāya* (= dharmakāya). Nevertheless, in the Tantras and in the modern monotheist school, the Body of Law is named Vairocana,¹ Vajrasattva, or Ādi Buddha. It seems that Vairocana, 'the Radiant,' or the mythological delegate to 'dharmakāyatva,' whatever be his name, is the complete or integral Dharmakāya, being made of the five 'sciences' or constituents of Prajñā; whereas the five Jinas (Dhyānibuddhas) are parts of the Dharmakāya, each of these being the personification of one 'science.' We cannot insist on these details, as they are later than the full development of the doctrine under examination, and generally admit of a fourth and even a fifth Body (ānanda°, paramānanda°, vajrakāya, etc.). But to show the speculative deficiency of these theories of the Dhyānibuddhas, we will observe that sometimes the best amongst the Jinas are not placed higher than the Akaniṣṭha abode, i.e. in the very world of Form, whereas the Dharmakāya is by definition 'immaterial' (arūpin).²

II. SAMBHOGAKĀYA, BODY OF ENJOYMENT.

Sambhoga is well translated by Tibetan བོད་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ 'enjoyment, abundance, wealth.' Wassilieff has 'Seligkeit' or 'beatitude.' The Chinese 報 conveys the idea of recompense, or, rather, of retribution. Both interpretations are correct. The 'Body of Bliss' is the state in which a Buddha enjoys his Buddhahood, or, more accurately, his

¹ See Eitel s. voc. and the "Lotjana Buddha" *apud* J. de Groot, *Code du Mahāyāna*, p. 16.

² A better system *apud* Eitel, p. 180, the Dharmakāya resides in the Arūpadhātu, and the Akaniṣṭha abode is occupied by the second body. See also Waddell, "Lamaism," p. 349 (Dharmakāya = Samantabhadra = Vajradhara = Vajrasattva), and contrast p. 351.

merits as a Bodhisattva (*vipāka-kāya*).¹ Although the 'glorious body' be not theoretically predicated of the Bodhisattvas, such beings as Avalokiteśvara are scarcely inferior to the Buddhas in this respect.²

1. ANTECEDENTS OF THE SAMBHOGA-KĀYA'S THEORY.

The phrase 'dharmakāya' does not occur in the oldest literature, but it is clearly foreshadowed by such expressions as are mentioned above (p. 947, n. 2). On the contrary, I fear that not a single trace of a 'sambhogakāya' has been met with in the books of the Little Vehicle. We nevertheless are told that the Sautrāntikas did admit both Law and Enjoyment bodies; yet we are not able to test this assertion of Wassilieff.³

Be that as it may, let us observe that the theory according to which the Tathāgatas may choose to live during a 'cosmic period' or the rest of the period;⁴ that the tenets concerning the Uddhamsota, a kind of 'never returning saints' (anāgāmin) who will go up the heavens to the Akaniṭṭha-abode before reaching nirvāṇa;⁵ that the sculptures of

¹ Kern: "Het lichaam waarvan de genietingen volkomen zijn" (op. cit., p. 71).—St. Julien: "Le corps de la jouissance, l'état de celui qui a pu unir son intelligence avec la nature subtile de la loi."—Csoma: "The most perfect Being."—Jäschke: "The body of happiness or glory, Buddha in the perfection of a conscious and active life of bliss in the second world (heaven or Elysium)."—Śarad Candra (p. 91) has: རྒྱལ་པོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ = 'celestial existence.'

² But see Eitel, Handbook (p. 179): "Buddha was said to be living, at the same time, in three different spheres, viz., (1) . . . ; (2) as living in reflex in the rūpadhātu, and being, as such, in the intermediate degree of a Dhyāni Bodhisattva in the Sambhogakāya state of reflected Bodhi." This view is not supported by any text I know; but see below, p. 963.

³ See p. 286 (German, 313).

⁴ Mahāparinibbāna, iii, 1-4, etc.: also Cullavagga, xi, 1, 10.

⁵ J.R.A.S. 1906, p. 450 ('Akaniṭṭhaga' is given by the Trikaṇḍaśeṣa as a synonym of Buddha).

Gandhāra, illustrating, as they do, divine Buddhas and Bodhisattvas,¹ can be reckoned as more or less suggestive tokens or antecedents of the Buddhology of the Great Vehicle—Buddhas as living gods, eternal or quasi-eternal, kings of blissful lands, worshipped by hosts of Bodhisattvas and holy beings.

The orthodox schools of the Little Vehicle well stated the fact that, since “the Buddhas are only preachers,” the worship of the Buddhas is a mere cult of commemoration; that there is no difference, as concerns the benefits to be drawn from him, between living or extinguished Buddha.² But, on the other hand, it was by no means held certain, even by the compilers of the Pāli Nikāyas, that the Tathāgatas do not exist after death.³ And one cannot help thinking that the vulgar worshippers of the Buddha, of his relics, of his symbols and icons, believed in some existence of their deceased god, did not pay much attention to the dogmatic of the scholars, did not even dream of a *pūjā* whose *devatā* were extinguished and no more to be seen by gods or by men.

2. BUDDHOLOGY.

(1) *The Saṃbhogakāya of the Mahāyāna.*

(a) Some beings long after rest: they become ordinary saints in this very world of men (arhats) or in some heaven (anāgāmin), and will directly plunge into final Void. One can observe, by the way, that such a good Mahāyānist as Hsüan Chwang was not assured as concerns the future Buddhahood of every creature. Some beings long for others' welfare: these are of the stock and breeding of the Bodhisattvas who make a firm resolve to obtain Buddhahood

¹ See Grünwedel, *Buddhistische Kunst*², p. 170.

² The author of the *Milinda* perfectly agrees with Śāntideva (*Bodhicaryāvatāra*).

³ See Oldenberg's Buddha.

in order to teach the Law and to secure universal happiness in their future kingdoms or 'fields of a Buddha' (buddha-kṣetra). Carried out during numerous 'periods' the 'vow' of the Bodhisattvas will succeed in the end; and thus we see that, according to their more or less generous principles and behaviour as Bodhisattvas, the Buddhas govern more or less glorious universes, with their hells, their ordinary worlds, their paradises or Sukhāvatī: in the case of Amitābha, the whole 'field of Buddha' is a paradise exclusively peopled by holy beings. The Buddhas, who differ as concerns radiance, length of life, etc., reign as colossal figures framed of light and surrounded with 'halos' made of created or magical Buddhas. Their fellow-workers, or more accurately—as the Buddhas content themselves with attitudes of teaching, of meditating, of appeasing—their officers, the Bodhisattvas of high rank, masters of the ten Bodhisattva-stages (daśa-bhūmiśvara), possess, like their kings or patrons, beatific bodies. But, as a rule, they bear on the head a smaller image of the Buddha whom they attend. It happens that the body of a Bodhisattva is no less marvellous than any Buddha's body can be, and e.g. in the case of Avalokita we have a description of a 'glorious body' which proves of great interest. Avalokita's body is either an enthroned image at the side of Amitābha¹ or the receptacle of the whole chiliocosm: in each of the pores of his skin there are worlds with hosts of meditating or singing worthies.²

One finds in the Bhagavadgītā a good parallel of this cosmological-theological doctrine: we mean the eleventh lesson, where Hari shows to Arjuna "his sovran form supreme, framed of radiance, universal, boundless"; it bears some anthropomorphic features, just as the fantastical icon of Amitābha does in Sukhāvatī; but "the whole universe in its manifold divisions is solely lodged in it."³ The relation

¹ Sukhāvatīvyūha.

² See Kāraṇḍavyūha *apud* Burnouf, *Intr.*, p. 224. Cf. the body of Śākyamuni, Karuṇāpūṇḍarika, p. 122.

³ See L. D. Barnett's translation, p. 137.

between Brahman and transfigured Kṛṣṇa is not unlike the relation between 'dharmakāya' and 'saṃbhoga.' And again, the third body of a Buddha, as we shall see later on, has something in common with the human and 'unnatural' form of Kṛṣṇa.

(b) The preceding account is drawn from various sources.¹ We are happy to meet a still better piece of theology in the little poem mentioned above.

The Fa-t'ien's stanza, as I may venture to style it, describes the Saṃbhogakāya in every particular: "Homage to the Enjoyment-Body, which develops in the middle of the (holy) assembly for the joy of the meditative saints, his large, manifold, supramundane, uncogitable manifestation, acquired by numberless good actions, which shines into all the Buddha's worlds, which uninterruptedly emits the sublime sound of the good Law, which is enthroned in the great kingship of the Law."²

Unlike the Dharmakāya,³ the Enjoyment-body is visible (rūpavān), manifested (vibhūtim . . prathayati), although it is 'made of mind' or 'spiritual.' Its manifestation is above the [three] worlds [of love, form, non-form], beyond explication (acintya), made for the joy of the 'meditating' (dhīmatām),⁴ i.e. of the Bodhisattvas, who alone can behold it in rapture, and are, as it were, already Buddhas (yathā bodhiprāpta). It emits uninterruptedly the good preaching, and therefore is elsewhere named 'collection of sounds' (rutarāśi).⁵ It is the very body of the King of the Law (dharma-rāja): it bears the thirty-two marks of a Buddha.

¹ Sukhāvativyūha (147-186 A.D.), Amitāyurdhyānasūtra (424 A.D.), Kāraṇavyūha (?).

² lokātītām acintyām sukr̥tāsataphalām ātmano yo vibhūtim | parśanmadhye vicitrām prathayati mahatīm dhīmatām prītihetoh | buddhānām sarvalokaprasṣtam aviratodārasaddharmaghoṣam | vande saṃbhogakāyaṁ tam aham iha mahādharma-rājya-pratiṣṭham ||

³ I add some details from the commentaries of the Nāmasaṃgīti.

⁴ Dhīmān = bodhisattva, see Mahāvvyutpatti, 22. 3, and Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā, p. 23. 2.

⁵ See above, p. 954, n. 3.

As far as a Buddha can be visible—the problem shall be debated later on—this body of Enjoyment is his real visible body (*svābhāvikarūpakāya*).

(2) *Saṃbhogakāya and Nirmāṇakāya in their relation to Dharmakāya.*

Candrakīrti, in fact, uses the phrase *rūpakāya* as a synonym of *Saṃbhogakāya*, and contrasts it with the *dharmakāya*. His observations on this topic well deserve attention, as they illustrate the relations between the Body of Law, or ‘voidness,’ and the Body of Enjoyment, which seems to belong to the ‘world of becoming.’

In his own commentary to his *Madhyamakāvatāra*,¹ Candrakīrti states that the ‘equipment of knowledge’ (*jñāna-saṃbhāra*), i.e. the full achievement in meditation (*dhyāna*) and wisdom (*prajñā*), causes the Body ‘consisting in Dharma,’ ‘whose characteristic is no-birth’ (*anutpāda*); whereas ‘equipment of merit’ (*puṇyasambhāra*), i.e. long and energetic practice of gift, morality, and patience, is the cause of the *rūpakāya* of the perfect Lords Buddhas, “endowed with the mark of hundred merits, marvellous, incogitable, and multiform.”² This last epithet, methinks, alludes to the Body’s

¹ Chapter iii, v. 12, pp. 62–63 of the forthcoming edition in *Bibl. Buddhica*. Our translation is from the Tibetan; the original Sanskrit would run as follows: *tatra yaḥ puṇyasambhāraḥ sa bhagavatām samyaksaṃbuddhānām śatapuṇyalakṣaṇavato ’bhhutā-cintyaśya nānārūpaśya rūpakāyaśya hetuḥ; dharmātmakāśya kāyasya anutpādalakṣaṇasya jñānasambhāro hetuḥ*.

² A synonym of *rūpakāya* is *vipākakāya*, ‘the body where is enjoyed [the merit of good acts]’ (*Aśvaghōṣa*, Suzuki, p. 102).—The fragment of the *Prajñāpāramitā* quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 244, [*bodhisattvena . . . buddhakāyaṃ niṣpādayitukāmena dvā-triṃśanmahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāny aśītiṃ cānuvyañjanāni pratilabdhu-kāmena . . .*], clearly alludes to a *rūpakāya*; but it seems that the human body of Buddha is meant. Also, in *Bodhisattvabhūmi* on *Buddhapūjā*: *yad bodhisattvaḥ sāksāt Tathāgatarūpakāyaṃ eva pūjayatīyam asyocyate śārīrapūjā*.—On the contrary, *Bodhicaryāḥ*. 323. 12 (*Bibl. Indic.*), the *lokottarakāya*, contrasted with the decaying body of men, is a beatific body.

faculty of manifesting itself under various appearances (see below, *Nirmāṇakāya*).

The reader of Mahāyānist treatises, whether *Mādhyamika* or *Yogācāra*, is frequently confronted with the doctrine that Buddhahood is the result of the two so-called 'equipments' (*sambhāra*), knowledge (*jñāna*) and merit (*puṇya*), or wisdom (*prajñā*) and charity (*karuṇā*); these are the two wings without which the bird cannot fly. Charity, morality, and patience, without wisdom, are blind, do not even deserve the name of *Pāramitās*. Conversely, although wisdom be the unique way to Buddhahood, nay, Buddhahood itself, it requires a purified ground to grow in; merit, therefore, is only a mediate means, but a necessary means, to the reaching of Buddhahood.

The theorem of *Candrakīrti*, as we may call his above quoted saying, illustrates this topic with a new light, and teaches us a double lesson. The first is easy enough to understand; the second requires more attention.

1. If the 'equipment of merit' causes the 'beatific body,' no wonder that the *Bodhisattvas* partake of it with the *Buddhas* themselves; some of them, heroes of compassionate behaviour, have indeed better claims to its possession than such and such a *Pratyekabuddha*-like *Buddha*. Further, *Bodhisattvas* are not deficient in wisdom; they remain in the world, because they are compassionate, but they think, act, speak, etc., without being defiled, because they are 'purified by *Prajñā*.' They have claims to all 'Buddha-principles' or *Buddha's* qualifications (*buddhadharma*), but do not as yet realize them (*na sāṅsāt-kurvanti*).

2. *Candrakīrti* suggests to us that the 'Enjoyment-Body' is something real, from the point of view of practical truth, even as concerns the *Buddhas* who are perfectly accomplished, who have perfectly understood and reached the *Dharmakāya*, i.e. the *Vacuity*.

There is indeed a double-edged problem, as *Milinda* would say. Granted that the *Buddhas* have achieved the equipment of knowledge, and are merged into the *Dharmakāya*, how can they be possessed of a '*sambhogakāya*'? Inversely,

how can they be styled Buddhas if they have not achieved the equipment of knowledge?

On the one hand, in the later literature under examination, Buddhahood is commonly defined as twofold: (1) Full realization of the Law-Body, pure and void knowledge, non-production of thought. (2) The immaterial yet visible image in the Paradise, such as Śākyamuni in the Lotus, Amitābha in the Sukhāvātī. — And Candrakīrti seems to agree with this Buddhology.

On the other hand, even from the point of view of practical truth, Bodhisattvas sink into nothingness by the very reaching of Buddhahood, and therefore Buddhas are only possessed of the 'body of Law,' that is to say, a 'non-body.' How can Enjoyment-body be predicated of them? Two answers may be given:—

(A) The scholastical or philosophical answer can easily be drawn from some well-attested principles: the Buddha's 'saṃbhogakāya,' fruit of his charitable behaviour, does indeed exist as concerns the Bodhisattvas who behold it; but it does not exist as far as the Buddha himself is concerned, since a Buddha, from the very moment of Supreme Enlightenment, has abandoned the world of becoming for the everlasting 'dharmakāya.' Śākyamuni on the Vulture-Peak in the Lotus, or Amitābha, etc., no more exist than the Buddhas of old whose miraculous *stūpas* enrich the 'fields' of Buddhas. Owing to his equipment of knowledge a Bodhisattva at last realizes his own aim and sinks into Buddhahood, i.e. 'nirvāṇa without residue.' His equipment of merit, which has caused the storing of knowledge, causes, *par surcroît*, even after nirvāṇa, the welfare of the creatures, and that in the following way. Although extinguished—and extinguished he must be since he is a Buddha—the Buddha will be seen for thousands of cosmic periods as 'saṃbhogakāya' and as 'nirmāṇakāya,' that is to say, endowed with a glorious and beatific body or with a human frame, according as the ripening of Bodhisattvas or the conversion of men is to be promoted. Buddha's former merits cause the delusion, the joy, and the salvation of

the beings who behold him under various aspects. More explicitly, his surabounding good *karman* has been 'pariṇāmita' or 'turned to others' welfare,'¹ and will fructify for others. When this immeasurable store of merit is at last nearly exhausted, the ideal image of the Glorious Body will fade away, Tathāgata's earthly apparitions (nirmāṇakāya) will come to an end, and a *stūpa* will appear, less effective than the apparently living Tathāgata was, but still an abundant principle of benediction.

I venture to believe that Candrakīrti's answer would be such or approximate to it.² (The point of view of the Yogācāras will be presently illustrated, see pp. 967-8.)

(B) But, beyond doubt, such a system will not prove satisfactory historically.

Without underestimating scholastical tenets, which can often be ascertained, and the deductions we may draw from them, which may be sound, without being over-anxious to understand the doctrines in their historic shape, generally to be only guessed by doubtful yet prudent assumptions, one is overcome with the conviction that the Buddhists have not commonly framed their philosophical terms and concepts with the same precision as we do; nor do they carry any principle to its legitimate consequences. Whereas we are led, by their apparent earnestness, to suppose that they are building coherent theories, we afterwards too often ascertain that they have been indulging in reveries, sharpening arms for disputes, or framing at random nomenclatures and mystic identifications. The long labours of the compilers of the

¹ And, in so many words, turned "in order that they could be reborn in purified Buddha's fields," etc. See Śikṣāsamuccaya, p. 32.

² There is, it may be, another answer bearing on the difference between 'nirvāṇa with residue' or 'nirvāṇa *in potentia*,' and 'nirvāṇa without residue' or 'nirvāṇa *in actu*.' But, granted that there are material elements (*rūpa*), it is quite possible to understand what 'nirvāṇa with residue' may be: the survival of the material body after extinction or liberation of thought. But, according to the Mahāyānist tenets, there is no matter in the case of dignified saints.

Suttantas, of the Mādhyamika doctors, of the Dignāga's school of logic succeeded, indeed, in making out a rather clear notion of vacuity, *sūnyatā*, *nirvāṇa*; it is, in short, full and conscious negation of any cogitable characteristic, material (*rūpin*) or spiritual (*arūpiṇaḥ skandhāḥ*). But, without even mentioning the wild speculations that have the word 'vajra' ('thunderbolt' or 'diamond') for origin and support, no Buddhist would admit that 'void' or 'nirvāṇa' could be the same in the case of an ordinary saint (*Arhat*) and of a Buddha. Is it reasonable to compare the small part of void ether in a pore-hole and the limitless expanse of the sky? ¹ So great a being as a Buddha ought to possess perfect wisdom and highest trances; but it cannot even be surmised by a pious Mahāyānist that he does not interfere amongst worldly things. No wonder that he is styled "free from 'nirvāṇa' (absolute quiescence) and from 'saṃsāra' (becoming)," ² that is to say, that he is active and self-conscious, in so far as he is free from 'nirvāṇa,' yet undefiled by this very activity, since he is free from becoming; and Śūntideva, when he quotes a Sūtra to this import, seems not aware that this statement, right as it is in the case of a Bodhisattva, is rather questionable in the case of a Buddha. Conversely, the same idea, in short the idea of a living God, will be expressed by an opposite phrase. Buddha has reached 'nirvāṇa,' but remains in the world of becoming; he is possessed of a double body: the 'Body of Law,' since he is all-wise, the 'Body of Enjoyment,' since he is compassionate ³ and perfectly happy. The former, as we saw above (p. 957), can be styled 'Immeasurable light' and 'All-propitious'; the latter is not a mere show, but

¹ See Mātreceta's Varṇanārhaṇa, v. 11 (edited and translated by F. W. Thomas, Ind. Ant. 1905, 145).

² *saṃsāra-nirvāṇa-vimukta*. See Śikṣāsamuccaya, p. 322. 7 (from Dharmasaṃgītisūtra).

³ "Is Buddha compassionate?" The question was put at the so-styled Pāṭaliputra Council (see Kathāvatthu, xviii. 3). As it often happens, the heretics (Uttarāpathakas) are right in denying Buddha's pity.

visible and embodied Buddhahood. Buddhas are at the same time Brahman and Brahmā.

3. THE DOCTRINE OF SAMBHOGAKĀYA AS ONTOLOGY.

From the orthodox point of view—we mean from the point of view that has some claims to be styled Buddhist—the Sambhogakāya, or glorious possession of Buddhahood, is but a stage leading to the effective and exclusive possession of the Dharmakāya, or a rather active state mystically associated with the possession of quiescence (Dharmakāya). In any case the Enjoyment-body is to be obtained by the practice of the Bodhisattvas. Further, every Buddha is endowed with such a body.

Now we observe several transformations of the theory bearing upon very important points in it. (1) It seems that the 'Enjoyment-bodies' belonging to the host of the Buddhas unite to form one; we mean the marvellous appearance manifested in the abode of the gods Akaniṣṭhas, which is substituted for the innumerable 'Paradises' of old.¹

(2) According to the doctrines stated above (p. 954), Tāntrikas maintain that the Sambhogakāya is "an effluence or emanation (syandana)² of the Dharmadhātu (or Dharmakāya)," an Æon as Neo-Platonists would say, but the first Æon, 'the Womb,' 'the abode from which all things take their origin by emanation.'³

The Vijñānavādins practically agree with the Tāntrikas. Under the name of "subtle dependent origination" (sūkṣma pratītyasamutpāda) they understand a very well delineated system: Vijñāna, pure, immaculate, and quiescent, gives birth to the mind (manas), which in turn becomes defiled

¹ Śrīgṛhyendratilaka, quoted Gūḍhārtha, v. 42.—Journal Buddhist Text Society, i, 45, n. 3.—Waddell, "Lamaism," p. 85.

² dharmadhātuniṣyanda (Nāmasaṃgīti, ad v. 79):

³ sarvasattvānām utpattisthānatvān mahāsukhākārasambhogakāyo yoniḥ (Amṛtakaṇṭhikā ad Nāmasaṃgīti, v. 60), prakṛtisyandana-samartha (Gūḍhārtha, Nāmasaṃgīti, v. 41).

(klišṭamanas) and originates the whole complexus of thought which constitutes this very world.¹ Traces (vāsanās) made on Vijñāna by the thought cause uninterrupted continuance of the circle. Enjoyment-body corresponds to the undefiled mind. We scarcely need to observe that this system, very like the Brahmanic ones, well harmonizes with the process of purification and defilement taught in the oldest books of the Vijñānavādins. (See above, p. 952 and below, p. 975.)

III. NIRMĀṆAKĀYA.

There can be but little doubt of the etymological meaning of this word, 'created or transformed body.' The Tibetan translation, རྒྱལ་པོ་འཛིན་སྐྱོད་, conveys the idea of a magical, fictitious, or metamorphic phantom; just as we see that the Buddha creates magical beings (*nirmita*, *nairmāṇikas*) of different kinds, Buddhas, bhikṣus, etc., to promote the conversion of men.² The Chinese 化身 or 應身, 'body of transformation' or 'of suitable transformation,' illustrates another feature of the theory.³

¹ "World as representing the mind."

² Not only Buddhas, but magicians also, can create such phantoms. In the Divyāvadāna, Māra creates an image of Buddha; elsewhere he appears under the appearance of Buddha. (See Hardy, "Māra in the guise of Buddha," J.R.A.S. 1902, p. 961.)

³ See Burnouf, Introduction, 601: "*Nirmāṇa*, et les termes appartenant à la même famille que ce mot, n'ont jamais d'autre sens, dans le style bouddhique, que celui de 'transformation résultant de la magie.'"—Śarad Candra, Dict., p. 91 (སྐྱོད་གསལ་པོ་), has: "bodily existence, also miraculously emanated existence." Both translations are very good, see below, p. 973.—Csoma, Dict., p. 305: "an emanating person, a Buddha."—Jäschke, p. 22: "body of transformation and incarnation . . . Buddha in the third or visible world, as man on earth."—"Vie et Voyages de Hiouen-Thsang," 231 and note, and i, 244: "Nirmāṇakāya (litter. le corps doué de la faculté de se transformer), l'état de celui qui,

1. OLD FORESHADOWINGS OF THE NIRMĀṆAKĀYA'S DOCTRINE.

Buddha used to compare himself to a lotus-flower: "Just as a lotus born in water, bred in water, overcomes water, and is not defiled by water, in the same way, born in the world, bred in the world, I have overcome the world."¹ Sākyamuni was born as a man; but Buddhahood has caused an ontological modification, not only a spiritual one, as it is the case (at least according to the former dogmatic) with Arhatship. No one would say that an Arhat is not a man, although he be living his last existence; whereas, according to the earliest records, Gautama, when asked what kind of being he is, flatly and categorically denies that he is a man: "Are you a Deva? a Gandharva? a Yakṣa? a man?"—"I am not a man Know, O Brahman, that I am a Buddha."²

That the historical or rationalistic school, of which a sub-branch had its books written in Pāli, did not suppress such declarations, attests indeed the antiquity of the schools which held the Buddha for a hyperphysical or supramundane being (*lokottara*).³

Further, if the Singhalese tradition were to be relied upon, one could lay some stress on the so-called Council of Aśoka (246 B.C.). At this early date the Pāli Vibhajjavādins (*alias* the Sthavira-school) are said to have strongly

étant déjà doué des deux [corps] précités, peut suivant les circonstances apparaître où il veut, développer la voie, et sauver les créatures."—Eitel, *Handbook*, s. voc. *trikāya* and *nirmāṇakāya*.—H. Kern, *Inscriptio uit Battambang*.—J. J. M. de Groot, *Code du Mahāyāna*, pp. 16, 17.—*Bodhisattvabhūmi*, I, v, on the *nairmāṇikī pīḍhi* (*nirvastukam nirmāṇam nirmāṇapīḍhena yathā-kāmaṃ abhisamskṛtam*).

¹ *Ang. N.*, II, 38; *Sam. N.*, III, 140.

² *Ang. N.*, II, 38; see Kern, *Manual*, 65.

³ Cf. the *ὑπερκόσμιος* of Basilides. See the able article of J. Kennedy, *J.R.A.S.*, 1902, p. 401.—See above, '*lokottarakāya*,' p. 962, n. 2.

opposed some varieties of primitive Docetism, namely, the Vetulyaka theory that the Buddha remained in the Tūṣita-heaven, and only sent a phantom of himself to the world.¹

2. NIRMĀṆAKĀYA.—MAHĀYĀNIST ORTHODOX BUDDHOLOGY.

The strictly Buddhist theories of the great Vehicle embodied in the dogma of the Nirmāṇakāya are easily accounted for by the speculations met with in the *Anguttara* or in the *Kathāvatthu*, granted that the belief in magical phantoms created by Buddhas, by Māra, by holy men of any kind, was a current one.

Our documents allow us to analyze this dogma under three entries.

(A) As soon as a Bodhisattva—we mean a future Buddha of the old human type—becomes a Buddha, he is immediately promoted to the high state of radiance above described as Beatific Body; in the same way, it happens that Arhats directly sink into nirvāṇa, and that their mortal frame is consumed by a mystic fire. But, “out of pity for the world,” the new Buddha causes his human body to survive: the men and the gods see it, hear the lessons it gives, admire the wheel it moves, become pious witnesses of its nirvāṇa, and preserve its bones in the stūpas. One scarcely needs to remark, but texts expressly state it, that a Buddha’s bones are not bones²; that after Enlightenment nothing earthy, human, heavenly, or mundane remains in a Tathāgata. Therefore, his visible appearance is but a contrived or magical body. Thus we obtain the definition, *nirmāṇakāya* = ‘human Buddha,’ or more explicitly ‘unsubstantial body which remains of a Bodhisattva after he has reached Buddhahood.’

¹ *Kathāvatthu*, xviii, 1. 2.

² See *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, p. 8: *anasthirudhire kāye kuto dhātur bhaviṣyati*.—Contrast the views of the *Aśtasāhasrikā*, pp. 94–5, on the worship of the relics.

As it has been ably observed by Wassilieff, this theorem seems to be a primitive Mahāyānist interpretation of the Hīnayānist tenets on nirvāṇa with residue (*sopadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*). It very well suits what may be anticipated from the above quoted Pāli documents, although, to say the truth, it rests on the sole authority of the Russian scholar.¹

(B) It cannot be questioned, however, that more coherent and advanced 'hyperphysical' (*lokottaras*) theories have been framed, and, very possibly, at the very dawn of Buddhist speculation.

The reader is well aware that, according to one school of the Little Vehicle, or, more exactly, according to a dogmatical and religious tendency largely spread in the whole Buddhist world, Śākyamuni was an extraordinary being, not only after his reaching Buddhahood, but even from his last birth as a Bodhisattva. To content ourselves with the mention of a single point, it seems evident that the thirty-two marks are more than mere tokens of the future Buddhahood of a Bodhisattva; they assure to the Bodhisattva's body founded claims to be looked upon as supramundane.²

The Lokottaravādins believe that the Bodhisattvas are 'superior to the world'; and it is not a mere clerical or pious mistake if the Mahāvastu, one of their authoritative books, styles them 'Bhagavantas' ('Lords'). There is no precise difference between Lords Buddhas and Lords Bodhisattvas; what is human-like in the appearance and behaviour of the latter is such by charitable contrivance (*upāya*). "To comply with the world" (this phrase is a Pāli one), "out of compassion for the world," they cause to appear as made of blood and flesh a body that is 'made of mind.' People believe that Bodhisattvas have father, mother, wife, son; but it is a mere show, etc.³

¹ See Wassilieff, 127 (137). The statements of Grünwedel (*Mythologie*, 35, 112) and others depend on Wassilieff.

² The Bodhisattvabhūmi has elaborate theories on the gradual acquisition of the marks by the Bodhisattvas of the different stages.

³ See the Mahāvastu and Barth, *Journal des Savants*, 1899, August.

Very similar is the opinion held by Vetulyakas, according to Buddhaghōṣa, and already disposed of by the Fathers of Aśoka's Council, that the Buddha did not for a moment resign the royalty amongst the Tuṣita-gods, and sent a phantom to be born as Bodhisattva, to reach Bodhi, and to play the part of a Tathāgata. However, this system is unknown to the redactors of the Mahāvastu. But the phrase used in Kathāvatthu's commentary, *nirmīṭṭarūpamātraka*, 'being only artificial body,' exactly covers the notion conveyed by the word *nirmāṇakāya*, and Buddhaghōṣa's description well agrees with the Mahāyānist human (i.e. phantom-like) and celestial Buddhas. Mythological features only are modified, the Vulture peak (Saddharmapuṇḍarīka), the Sukhāvatī or Paradise (Vyūhas and Amitāyuh-sūtras), the Bhagavatiyoni or Female-Buddha's lap (Tantras) making for the Tuṣita-heaven of old, as residences of the 'real' or beatific Buddha. From measureless Æons, nay, at the very beginning, Śākyamuni (or Amitābha, or Vajrasattva) has reached the supreme and perfect Enlightenment, not, as people fancy, first at Gayā: he is repeatedly born in the world of the living, i.e. he causes magical Buddhas to obtain Body, teach the Law, and be extinct.¹

This Buddhology, so very like the Viṣṇuit system of Avatārs, overrules multiple mythological surmises. One can mention the lists of the thousand human Buddhas of the Blessed Æon or Glorious Age (Bhadrakalpa), where the same names occur more than once; Vairocana e.g. appears five times. Another application of the principle, and a more celebrated one, is the system of the Five Jinas (the so-called Dhyānibuddhas), and of the corresponding five Mānuṣibuddhas: the former are real Buddhas, like the Śākyamuni of the Lotus; the latter would be exactly termed 'nairmāṇikas' ('contrived').

(C) Further, the question can be raised whether a Buddha has many contemporaneous 'magical bodies,' and whether

¹ See Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, S.B. of the East, xxi, Introduction, p. xxv, and pp. 295 (xiv), 307 (xv, 1).

they always appear in a Buddha-shape? The old legends (Divyāvadāna, etc.) show us that Śākyā[•]muni created such 'phantoms' (*nirmitakas*) that were required, and, accordingly, the principle seems to be that the magical forms will be adapted to every particular case. The 'nirmāṇakāya' of a Buddha is multiform,¹ or, in other words, Buddha transforms himself according to the dispositions of the creatures to be saved. Therefore 'nirmāṇakāya' is rightly translated 'transformation body.'

The Buddha-like appearances are the best of the 'transformations'; rather, they ought to be called 'reflexes' (*pratibimba*),² as they bear the excellent marks which characterize 'real' Buddhas in their Enjoyment-body. But the Buddhas are sometimes transformed as glowing bolids, as Maheśvara, as an ape, etc. There is not a place where they do not manifest themselves; and therefore 'nirmāṇakāya' is styled 'omnipresent' (*sarvatraga*), and rightly defined 'collection of forms' (*rūparāśi*).³

One could be of opinion that, according to the 'better orthodoxy,' transformations are more suitable in the case of the Bodhisattvas than in the case of the Buddhas, except as far as Buddha-like appearances are meant. A Buddha's nirmāṇakāyas are rather Avatar-like, human Buddhas; a Bodhisattva's transformations are more like the 'rūpas' or forms of some Hindu deities. Be that as it may, Avalokita is *par excellence* the polymorphical being.

The 'Fa-t'ien's stanza' well illustrates the Nirmāṇakāya, and can be quoted as a summary of what precedes:—
 "Homage to the greatly beneficent Magical [or Transformation] Body of the Munis, which, in order to promote

¹ nānārūpa, Nāmasaṅgīti's Commentary ad v. 79. Cf. Karuṇā-puṇḍarīka, 94. 12. .

² Vajrapāṇi is the reflex (*pratibimba*) of Vajrasattva. There are two classes of 'contrived Buddhas': some of them are immediate creations of the Buddha and produce new 'contrived Buddhas'; these last are wanting in this generative power (*de Groot*, *Code du Mahāyāna*, p. 16).

³ See above, p. 954, n. 3.

the ripening of beings, sometimes blazes and glows like fire; sometimes, on the contrary, at the Illumination or in moving the Wheel of the Law, appears in full appeasement; which evolves under numerous aspects, gives security to the triple world by its various contrivances, and visits the ten regions.”¹

3. DOCTRINE OF NIRMĀṆAKĀYA AS A PART OF THE ONTOLOGY.

We have seen how the doctrine of ‘magical projections’ completes the orthodox or semi-orthodox Buddhology, peoples the heavens, and, in the case of Lamaism, furnishes the Church with worthies. This doctrine has yet another claim to our attention. Owing to the vicinity of some philosophical views, both Buddhist and Hindoo, met above (pp. 954, 967), it has been curiously modified. In a great number of late documents (Tantras), and according to the tenets of the Vijñānavādins, which are pretty old, one has to understand as Buddha’s *nirmāṇakāya* not only the Buddha-like appearances contrived by some Buddha for special aims, the complete or partial Buddha’s Avatārs, as many mythological entities can be, but, rather, the universality of worldly things. These are but ‘untrue’ transformations of the cosmic ether-like substance known as ‘Body of Law’ or ‘Vijñāna’ (Intellect). *Nirmāṇakāya* is multiple or manifold, as it is caused by the disintegration of the Body of Law, by the particularization of the Intellect, or more accurately as it is the particularized Intellect itself. Nevertheless, granted that its matrix (*garbha*), or ‘spring source’ (*syandana-samartha*) is unique and ‘really’ remains undivided, the world as a whole can be styled Buddha’s *nirmāṇakāya*.

¹ *sattvānām pākahetoḥ kvacid anala ivābhāti yo dīpyamānaḥ |
saṃbodhau dharmacakre kvacid api ca punar dṛśyate yaḥ
praśāntaḥ |
naikākārapravṛttaṁ tribhavaḥ śaṅkharāṇāṁ viśvarūpāṇāṁ upāyair |
vande nirmāṇakāyaṁ daśadīganugataṁ taṁ mallāṛthaṁ
munīnām ||*

Here, again, we have to do with speculations which are very like the Sāṃkhya or Vedāntist cosmologies. Dharmakāya = pradhāna = brahman; nirmāṇakāya = prakṛti or pradhānapariṇāma = brahmavivarta, etc. It is of interest to observe that, compared with 'pariṇāma' of the Sāṃkhyas, 'nirmāṇa' has the advantage of illustrating the irreality of the evolved or transformed things, and well suits a philosophy which is pervaded by Vacuity (śūnyatā). Nor is the character of the doctrine under examination to be misunderstood. Āśvaghoṣa, its earliest known promoter, was not, we can assume, a Vedāntist *sans le savoir*.

His "Awakening of Faith in the Great Vehicle," one of the best Buddhist treatises that have been written, furnishes us with a very strongly organized synthesis of the theological and ontological notions connected with the three bodies.¹ Void (śūnya) and radiant (prabhāsvara) Intellect is the Dharmakāya or Buddhahood. When agitated by all-good influences its limpidity is lost to some extent, and it originates or transforms itself into 'karmavijjāna,' actual or active Intellect, out of which are projected, i.e. by which are thought, the beatific conceptions known as Bliss- or Enjoyment-bodies. Further, primordial Intellect, owing to previous traces (vāsanās), is brought down to the state of 'Intellect who distinguishes particulars' (vastuprativikalpavijjāna): this is the creator (nirmātar) of the so-called material world and world of concupiscence (rūpaloka, kāmāloka). Common people, śrāvakas and Pratyekas beget, i.e. see, numberless and various transformation bodies.

People who believe that there is a self, that there are pleasant and unpleasant things, create such 'bodies' as human body, enjoyable things, Īśvara, Mahādeva; at the best they keep a very wrong idea of a Buddha, as they have not yet removed the notion of existence and non-existence: they believe in a human Buddha to be extinct in nirvāṇa, and themselves long for nirvāṇa; they behold a Buddha in 'nirmāṇakāya,' and themselves appear as 'nirmāṇakāyas'

¹ See Suzuki's able translation, p. 100.

of definite order. Not so as concerns the Bodhisattvas: such beings have got the notion of the 'Body of Law,' as they know that there is neither existence nor non-existence; they are *en communion* with the Dharmakāya (dharmakāya-prabhāvita),¹ as they theoretically know their substantial non-differentiation therefrom; but they have not yet realized (sākṣātkar) it, since they are conscious of their identity with it. Although undefiled by the world, owing to their knowledge (jñānasambhāra), they practise the career of merit (punyasambhāra), and enjoy an illusory but purifying activity: they will obtain or have already obtained beatific bodies; they behold celestial Tathāgatas, endowed with marvellous qualifications, ripe for, if not already arrived at, everlasting quiescence in Dharmakāya.

I shall not endeavour to unravel the many problems and sub-problems that the preceding *exposé* will no doubt suggest to the reader. Some of them need long and wearisome discussion. The most interesting, viz., the statement of the historical and speculative affinities of the Buddhist theologies and metaphysics with the Brahmanical ones, is hardly ripe for inquiry, and in any case requires wider knowledge of the Brahmanism and Hinduism than I can profess to have.²

On the other hand, I have avoided any too technical reference to Tantrism, although Tantrism lays much stress on the Bodies, and that for some obvious reasons. Tantric books profess to be mysterious, and such they really are. Again, whereas Mādhyamika and Vijñānavādin scholars are as intelligible as the common deficiencies of Hindoo mind and the general rules of dialectic disquisition bearing on mixed mythological-ontological postulata allow them to be, it is an unquestionable yet painful fact that the Tantric

¹ See Śikṣāsamuccaya, 159, 7; Suzuki, 64, 94.

² Jaina theories are also of interest; see, for instance, Upamitabhavaprapañcā Kathā, pp. 677 foll., on the Sadgiri, the Jaināsatpura, which bear strong analogies with the Sukhāvātī of the Buddhists.

authors, Vajrācāryas and Siddhas of every rank, are the more obscure and abstruse the more vulgar or obscene are the facts that they have made the starting-point of their insane or frantic lucubrations. Without mentioning the five 'vital-airs' and the Tantras of 'common yoga,' which chiefly deal with them, a commentary tells us in so many words that the five Bodies identified with the five Jinas—the so-called Dhyānibuddhas, with the five Knowledges, with the five 'Vital-airs,' with the five Joys (ānanda)—are nothing else than five carnal pleasures, to be better explained in a Kāmasāstra than in a Buddha tract. Nevertheless, the Tantras contain much that is old, philosophical views, nomenclature, mythology. In their worst exegesis they pretend to be truly Buddhistic, namely, when they identify with the 'fifth joy' this Law- or Thunderbolt-body (vajrakāya), "which is present in everyone like a precious gem, and is to be known by personal experience."¹ They afford strange and interesting instances of the plasticity of the Buddhism; but their speculations are to some degree coherent and organic, and therefore are not beyond the reach of European analysis. Professor Grünwedel and M. A. Foucher have done much to elucidate their hagiography in every respect; such publications as Bendall's edition of *Subhāṣitasamgraha* afford good materials for their dogmatic. But I cannot as yet deal seriously with the Five Bodies.

¹ The Siddhas aim at obtaining a hypercosmic (lokottara) body, on the pattern of the Bodhisattva-body.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE TRADITIONAL DATE OF KANISHKA.

The tradition of Gandhāra and Kashmīr, as reported by Hiuen Tsiang (A.D. 630–644), placed Kanishka 400 years after the death of Buddha; as follows:—

According to the Si-yu-ki, under Gandhāra, Buddha on a certain occasion said to Ānanda (Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 106):—‘In the 400 years which will follow my *nirvāṇa*, there will be a king who will make himself illustrious in the world ‘under the name of Kanishka.’ And immediately after this we are told (*ibid.*, 107) that:—‘In the 400th year after ‘the *nirvāṇa* of the Tathāgata, king Kanishka ascended ‘the throne, and extended his power over the whole of ‘Jambudvīpa.’¹

And the same work tells us, under Kashmīr (Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 172), that:—‘In the 400th year after the *nirvāṇa* ‘of the Tathāgata, Kanishka, king of Gandhāra, ascended the ‘throne at the time fixed by heaven. The influence of his ‘laws made itself felt far and wide; and foreign peoples

¹ Beal, *Records*, 1. 99:—“400 years after my departure from the world. “there will be a king who shall rule it called Kanishka this king “ascended the throne 400 years after the *nirvāṇa*, and governed the whole of “Jambudvīpa.”

Watters, *On Yang Chwang*, 1. 203:—“400 years after my decease a sovereign “will reign, by name Kanishka Exactly 400 years after the death of “the Buddha Kanishka became sovereign of all Jambudvīpa.”

The *Life* does not present a passage answering to this one.

'came to make submission to him.'¹ This passage goes on to give an account of the "Council" convened by Kanishka and the honourable Pārśva, which it may, or may not, be understood to place in the 400th year.

Whether we should accept this tradition about Kanishka, is a question regarding which there may be, no doubt, a justifiable difference of opinion. But, either the tradition must be accepted and applied as it stands, or else it must be definitely rejected. It is not permissible to accept it, but to misapply it by distorting it so as to make it say or mean something which it does not really assert. Yet that has been done, in the manner explained further on, with a view to making it place Kanishka in the last quarter of the first century A.D.; or, to be more explicit, in order to set up, on one side, the view that he founded the so-called Śaka era commencing in A.D. 78, and, on another side, the view,—without determining exactly his initial year,—that his known dates, ranging from the year 3 onwards, were recorded on a system of "omitted hundreds" in the fifth century, commencing in A.D. 89, of the Seleucidan era which began in B.C. 312: that is, the year 3 mentioned in connexion with Kanishka may or may not mean the third year of his reign, but it does at any rate mean the year 403, = A.D. 91-92; the year 18 means 418, = A.D. 106-107; and so on.²

¹ Beal, *Records*, 1. 151:—"In the 400th year after the *nirvāṇa* of Taṭhāgata, Kanishka, king of Gandhāra, having succeeded to the kingdom, his kingly renown reached far, and he brought the most remote within his jurisdiction." Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 1. 270:—"Our pilgrimonext proceeds to relate the circumstances connected with the great Council summoned by Kanishka. This king of Gandhāra, Yuan-chuang tells us, in the 400th year after the decease of Buddha, was a great and powerful sovereign whose sway extended to many peoples."

For the corresponding passage in the *Life*, see Julien, 95; Beal, 71.

² By the application of "omitted hundreds" in another direction, Mr. Vincent Smith arrived at the result that the year 5 for Kanishka means the year 3205, = A.D. 129-30, of a certain reckoning, belonging to Kashmir, which has its initial point in B.C. 3076. But, after referring to a certain passage in Alberūni's *India*, which shews that the use of "omitted hundreds" did exist in certain parts at a certain time, and after quoting a remark by General Sir Alexander Cunningham that (see *Num. Chron.*, 1892. 42) "the omission of the hundreds was a common practice in India in reckoning the *Sapt Rishi*

As regards this last view, we shall be happy to give full consideration to that or any other such arrangement, when anyone can adduce, against the dates which we have for Kanishka ranging from the year 3 to the year 18, or against those which we have for Vāsudēva ranging from the year 80 to the year 98, a date connected with the name Kanishka,—a date which is not based on a speculation, a theory, or an inference, but is distinctly given and so connected either in an inscription or on a coin,—in a year ranging from (say) 91 to 100, or a similar date connected with the name Vāsudēva in a year ranging from 1 to (say) 10. Meanwhile, I can only say that, as far as I can work the matter out, the idea that the Hindūs had any system of “omitted hundreds” for stating dates before the eighth or ninth century in Kashmīr and the tenth century in some of the northern parts of India more or less near to Kashmīr, is pure imagination. And I invite attention to a very sound remark made by a judicious writer in this Journal, 1875. 382; in respect of this theory of “omitted hundreds,” or as it might also be called “suppressed centuries,” Professor Dowson there said:—“It supposes that the number of the “century was suppressed, as we now suppress it in saying “’75 for 1875. But we never adopt this practice in dating “documents,¹ and it is obvious that it would entirely defeat

kāl, or Era of the Seven Rishis,” Mr. Smith has proceeded to say (this Journal, 1903. 17):—“No such mode or practice ever existed. The actual practice was “and is very different, and requires the omission of both thousands and hundreds. “The year 3899 is actually written as 99, and might conceivably be written as “899, with the omission of the thousands, but it could not possibly be written “as 3·99, omitting the hundreds only. This observation is fatal to the theories “which seek to explain the Kuṣāna dates”—[i.e., the dates of the series of the records which mention Kanishka, etc.]—“4 to 98, as meaning 404 to 498 “of the Seleucid era, 204 to 298 of the Śaka era, and so forth. There is no “evidence that the year 98 ever meant either 298 or 498, although it might “mean 3298 or 2498, or any other figure in thousands and hundreds ending “with 98.”

On that I will only remark that, while a certain freedom of argument may be permissible in writing about matters of ancient history, it really is going too far, to credit Sir A. Cunningham with such nonsense as is imputed to him by suggesting that, if he had omitted the hundreds of any such number as 3899, he would have given any remainder except 99.

¹ Meaning, of course, documents in any way of a formal nature.

"the object of putting a date upon a monument intended to endure for a long period." However, we are not now concerned with the matter of "omitted hundreds;" I apply myself here to another question.

We have quoted, above, the tradition of Gandhāra and Kashmīr about Kanishka. We have next to note that the tradition of Kashmīr and India placed a king *Asōka* 100 years after the death of Buddha.¹ This date is asserted in the *Asōkāvādāna* (page 883 above, and note 1). It is also reported by Hiuen Tsiang,² and by I-tsing (A.D. 671-695).³

As regards the *Asōkāvādāna*, there is no doubt that, by the *Asōka* to whom it assigns that date, there was meant *Asōka* the Maurya, the promulgator of the famous rock and pillar edicts, the grandson of Chandragupta. The work omits, indeed, to mention Chandragupta (see note 1 on

¹ It may be useful to remark here that the name *Asōka* is not at all unique. Without making any detailed search, and without taking count of double-barrelled names such as those of *Asōkavarṇa*, an alleged king, perhaps = *Asōka* the Maurya (*Divyāvādāna*, 140), *Asōkavarman*, an alleged ancestor of the Pallava kings (H.S.II, 2. 355), and *Asōkavalla*, a ruler of the *Sapādalaksha* country in the twelfth century A.D. (EI, 5. appendix, Nos. 575-577), we have the following instances of the occurrence of the name *Asōka* pure and simple:—

(1) The Maurya king *Asōka*-*Dharmasōka*; as is well known, in the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* he is called *Asōkavardhana*.

(2) The Śāiśunāga king *Asōka*-*Kālāsōka*, regarding whom see fully further on.

(3) *Asōka*, younger brother of king *Dēvaṇāmpiya-Tissa* of Ceylon, a contemporary of *Asōka* the Maurya; commentary on the *Mahāvamsa*, Turnour, 95; Wijesinha, 61.

(4) *Asōka*, a prehistoric king, apparently at *Bārāṇasī*; *Dīpavaṃsa* 3. 37.

(5) *Asōka*, the personal attendant of the Buddha *Vipaśyin*; *Dīgha-Nikāya*, part 2, p. 6, and *Nidānakathā*, 41.

(6) *Asōka*, a *Brāhmaṇ*, in the time of the Buddha *Kāśyapa*; *Mahāvamsa*, Turnour, 162; Wijesinha, 104.

(7) *Asōka*, maternal uncle of an alleged king *Mahāprajāda*; *Divyāvādāna*, 59.

² Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 170, 414, 422; 2. 140: Beal, *Records*, 1. 150; 2. 85, 90, 246: Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 1. 267; 2. 88 (at 2. 92, 234, this detail has been omitted). See also in the *Life*, Julien, 137, 198; Beal, 101, 144.

The first of the passages in the *Si-yu-ki* is found in the account of Kashmīr. The last of those passages, and the second of the two in the *Life*, are found in the accounts of Ceylon: but the statement is so opposed to the Ceylonese tradition, both in this detail and in representing *Mahendra* as the younger brother instead of the son of *Asōka*, that it is practically impossible that Hiuen Tsiang can have heard it there, even if he actually went there, as to which there is a doubt; in this detail, at any rate, he must have worked into his account of Ceylon information obtained in India.

³ Takakusu, *Records of the Buddhist Religion*, 14.

page 884 above). But it expressly mentions its Aśōka as a son of Vindusāra (ibid.), who is well known from other sources as a son of Chandragupta and as the father of Aśōka; and it styles him "the Maurya" (page 889).

As regards the statements reported by Hiuen Tsiang,—it is possible that two passages (the second of the four in the Si-yu-ki, and its counterpart, the first of the two in the *Life*) which mention A-shu-ka instead of A-yü (on which detail see page 669 above, note 2) refer to someone else. But there is practically no doubt that all the other statements reported by Hiuen Tsiang were intended to refer to Aśōka the Maurya. This is made clear, as regards the last of the passages in both the Si-yu-ki and the *Life* indicated in note 3 on page 982 above, by the concomitant mention of Mahēndra therein, and, as regards the bulk of his writings, by a comparison of various details recited in them with the stories about acts attributed to Aśōka the Maurya in the Aśōkāvadāna.

As regards I-tsing, the point is not so certain. He says (loc. cit., note 4 on page 982 above) that on a certain occasion Buddha said to king Bimbisāra :—"More than "100 years after my attainment of *nirvāṇa*, there will arise "a king named Aśōka, who will rule over the whole of "Jambudvīpa. At that time, my teaching handed down by "several Bhikshus will be split into eighteen schools." It is understood, and probably quite correctly, that in another statement in the same work (73), in which he said :—"The "image of king Aśōka has its garment in this way," I-tsing has referred to Aśōka the Maurya. But it is difficult to take the reference to the eighteen schools in the same way. At any rate, I cannot trace any other statement of that kind in connexion with Aśōka the Maurya; whereas the Mahāvamsa (Turnour, 21; Wijesinha, 15), though perhaps it does not place the establishment of any of these schools in actually the time of Aśōka the Śāisunāga (whom we shall mention more fully farther on), refers to them in the course of passing from that king to his ten sons who succeeded him, and allots the foundation of all the eighteen schools to some

undefined times in "the second century," i.e., between the years 100 and 201, after the death of Buddha, fourteen years at least before the earliest date of Aśoka the Maurya.

Now, in all matters of the most ancient Indian chronology, the great "sheet-anchor" is, and has been ever since 1793, the date of Chandragupta, the grandfather of Aśoka the Maurya, as determined by the information furnished by the Greek writers. In recent years, indeed, there has been a tendency to believe that we have something still more definite in the reference to certain foreign kings in the thirteenth rock-edict of Aśoka. But, as may be shewn on some other occasion, there is nothing in that, beyond proof that that edict, framed not earlier than the ninth year after the *abhishēka* or anointment of Aśoka to the sovereignty, and most probably in the thirteenth year, was framed not before B.C. 272; and that does not help us much, because the *abhishēka* of Aśoka might, so far as that goes, be put back to even as early a year as B.C. 284. In all that we have as yet been able to determine about Aśoka, there is nothing that enables us to improve upon what we could already determine about Chandragupta. From the Greek writers, we know that Chandragupta became king of Northern India at some time between B.C. 326 and 312. Within those limits, different writers have selected different years; B.C. 325, 321, 316, 315, and 312. The latest selection is, I suppose, that made by Mr. Vincent Smith in his *Early History of India*, 173; namely, B.C. 321. And, having regard to the extent to which ancient history must always be more or less a matter of compromise, and giving the consideration which is due (whether we accept or reject his results) to the earnestness with which Mr. Smith works and writes, I would not lightly seek to replace that selection by another; especially for the sake of only one year. But Mr. Smith's chronological details are even *inter se* wrong and irreconcilable. The most reliable tradition, adopted by Mr. Smith himself for other ends, gives an interval of 56 years from the commencement of the reign of Chandragupta to the *abhishēka* of Aśoka; yet, on the same page,

Mr. Smith has adopted only 52 years, placing the *abhishēka* of Aśōka in B.C. 269. And further, he has placed only three years earlier, in B.C. 272, that which he has termed the "accession"—(in reality, the usurpation)—of Aśōka; regardless of the fact that the same tradition makes that interval one of four years.¹ A chronology which includes such inconsistencies and errors as these in some of its radical details cannot in any way be accepted as final. And therefore, for my own results, and on grounds which I will fully justify hereafter, I do not hesitate to lay out a different scheme, as the most convenient and satisfactory one that we are likely to arrive at. I take B.C. 320 as the initial year of Chandragupta. The initial date, then, of Aśōka, as determined by his *abhishēka*, which is placed by tradition 56 years after the initial date of Chandragupta, and is cited

¹ This is easily arrived at, by deduction, from the *Dīpavaṃsa*, 6. 1, 20, 21. It is expressly stated by the commentary on that work, the *Mahāvamsa*, in the statement about Aśōka (Turnour, 21 f.) that:—

Vemātikē bhātārē sō hantvā ekūnakam satanū |
sakalē Jambudīpasminū ēkarajjam apāpuni ||
Jina-nibbānatō pachchhā purē tass = ābhisekatō |
atthārasanū vassa-satanū dvayam evam vijāniyam ||
Patvā chatuhi vassēhi ēkarajja-mahāvāsō |
purē Pātāliputtasmin attānam abhisēchayi ||

"Having slain (*his*) brothers, born of various mothers, to the number of a hundred less by one, he attained sole sovereignty in the whole of Jambudīpa. After the death of the Conqueror (Buddha), (*and*) before the anointment of him (Aśōka), (*there were*) 218 years; thus is it to be understood. Having reached (*a point of time marked*) by four years, he, possessed of the great glory of sole sovereignty, caused himself to be anointed at the town Pātāliputta."

In the last verse, Turnour translated "in the fourth year of his accession to his sole sovereignty;" and this was reproduced by Wijesinha (16). I infer that that is what misled Mr. Vincent Smith.

Again, Buddhaghōsha makes an equally clear statement. After telling us that Aśōka slew all his brothers with the exception of Tissa who was born from the same mother with himself, he says (see *Vinaya-piṭaka*, ed. Oldenberg, 3. 299):—Ghātentō chattāri vassāni anabhisittō = va rajjam kāretvā chatunnam vassānam achchayēna Tathāgataassa parinibbānatō dvinnam vassa-satanam upari atthārasamē vassē sakala-Jambudīpē ēkarajj-ābhisekam pāpuni.

"While slaying (*them*), he reigned for four years without, indeed, being anointed; and then, at the end of (*those*) four years, in the 218th year after the death of the Tathāgata (Buddha), he attained anointment to the sole sovereignty in the whole of Jambudīpa."

So, also, in another place, Buddhaghōsha says (*loc. cit.*, 321):—Chandaguttō cha chatuvisati Bindusārō atthavīsam tass = āvasanē Aśōkō rajjam pāpuni tassa purē abhisēkā chattāri.

"And Chandagutta (*reigned*) for twenty-four (*years*); (*and*) Bindusāra for twenty-eight. At his death, or at the end of that (*period*), Aśōka obtained the sovereignty; before his anointment (*took place, there passed*) four (*years*)."

prominently as the starting-point in all the dated records of Aśoka himself, is B.C. 264. And the death of Buddha, placed by the same tradition 218 years before the *abhishēka* of Aśoka, occurred in B.C. 482.

The preceding digression has been necessary in order to arrive at two working dates; namely, B.C. 264 for the initial date, marked by his *abhishēka*, of Aśoka, and B.C. 482 for the death of Buddha. We can now proceed to consider how the tradition about Kanishka has been misapplied.

The tradition of Kashmīr and India gives us 100 years from the death of Buddha to Aśoka. The tradition of Gandhāra and Kashmīr gives us 400 years from the death of Buddha to Kanishka. Hardly anything could be plainer than the point that these statements were intended to carry us from the death of Buddha to certain homogeneous dates in the careers of Aśoka and Kanishka, and in fact to their initial dates. Consequently, the initial date of Aśoka, marked by his *abhishēka*, being 100 years after the death of Buddha, the initial date of Kanishka was 300 years after the initial date of Aśoka. Instead of that, however, the artificial understanding has been adopted that these statements, combined, place the initial date of Kanishka 300 years after the final date, the "death"—(for which, because the two events were not coincident, it is better to substitute here the "end of the reign")—of Aśoka.¹ Aśoka reigned

¹ It is sufficient, I think, to cite only two instances in illustration of this:—

(1) In commenting on the statement recorded by Hiuen Tsiang in his account of Kashmīr, which places Kanishka in the 400th year after the death of Buddha, Mr. Beal said (*Records*, I. 151, note 97):—"That is, 300 years after Aśoka (B.C. 263-224), or about A.D. 75." It is only from B.C. 224, the final date of Aśoka, that 300 years take us to "about A.D. 75;" to be exact, to A.D. 77. Compare Beal, *ibid.*, 56, note 200; there, however, perhaps on the whole, seeking rather to place Kanishka between A.D. 10 and 40, he counted the 300 years from B.C. 263.

(2) Professor Kern has adopted, from Lassen and other writers, B.C. 259 as approximately right for the initial date of Aśoka (*Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 112). He has understood that Aśoka "died after a reign of 37 years" (114). He has cited "the three centuries which elapsed between the death of Aśoka and the reign of Kanishka" (118). And, adopting the view that the Śaka era of A.D. 78 dates from Kanishka, he has taken A.D. 100 as the approximate date of the "Council" held under his patronage (121). Here we have, Aśoka reigned B.C. 259-222; and 300 years from B.C. 222 take us to A.D. 79. ,

for 37 years;¹ that is, from B.C. 264 to 228. Counting 300 years from B.C. 228 as the end of the reign of Aśoka, we of course reach A.D. 73. And, taking this as only an approximate result, of course we at once arrive at A.D. 78, or any desiderated date thereabouts, for the initial date of Kanishka; Q.E.D., according to the postulates! But this result ignores the point that the traditional period of 400 years from the death of Buddha to the initial date of Kanishka is, by this process itself, deliberately and unauthorizedly increased from a period of $100 + 300 = 400$ years into one of $100 + 37 + 300 = 437$ years. In other words, the traditional statement of 400 years from the death of Buddha to the initial date of Kanishka is quietly wiped out; and there is substituted for it a purely imaginative assertion, not really found anywhere, of an interval of 300 years from the end of Aśoka to the beginning of Kanishka.

Now, if the basis of the matter were sound,—if there was really an interval of 100 years from the death of Buddha to the initial point, the *abhishēka*, of Aśoka the Maurya,—then the real result would be that, with B.C. 264 as the date of the *abhishēka* of Aśoka as determined from B.C. 320 as the initial date of Chandragupta, we should have, not A.D. 73, but A.D. 37 for the initial date of Kanishka, and we should have B.C. 364 as one amongst various more or less fictitious dates for the death of Buddha. And this latter result, also, has been propounded, practically.²

But tradition does not in reality lead to any such results as B.C. 364 for the death of Buddha and A.D. 37 for the initial date of Kanishka. The whole matter has been simply

¹ Dīpavanīsa, 5. 101; Mahāvanīsa, Turnour, 122; Wijesinha, 78. The point that these 37 years were counted from the *abhishēka*, not from the time, four years before that, when he usurped the sovereignty, must be handled on some other occasion.

² I say “practically” because, though that has been the process, the exact year put forward has not been B.C. 364. Instead of working with B.C. 264 for the *abhishēka* of Aśoka, the years selected have been B.C. 268 and 270; and so, by adding sometimes 100 years, sometimes 118 years, the years arrived at in this way for the death of Buddha have been B.C. 368, 370, 380, and 388; see, e.g., views cited (some of them quite possibly subsequently abandoned) by Max Müller in SBE, 10. introd., 44 ff.

based upon a mistake, which is removed at once when we turn to the Ceylonese tradition.

The Ceylonese tradition has not been found to mention Kanishka. But it places the *abhishēka* of Aśōka the Maurya 218 years after the death of Buddha; ¹ in which respect it is corroborated by that record of Aśōka himself, found at Sahasrām, Rūpnāth, and Bairāt in Northern India, and at Śiddāpura, Brahmagiri, and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmēśvara in Mysore, which was framed and is dated 256 years after the death of Buddha and 38 years after the *abhishēka* of Aśōka.² And it mentions a predecessor, called (see page 89f above) sometimes Kālāsōka, sometimes simply Aśōka, the Śaisunāga, with the statement (Dīpavaṃsa, 4. 44, 47) that it was when he had been reigning for 10 years and half a month, and when Buddha had been dead 100 years, that there arose the heresy of Vēsālī which led to the second "Council."³

Thus, then, the tradition of Kashmīr and India, found in the Aśōkāvadāna and in the writings of Hiuen Tsiang, simply confuses in respect of his date,—in which it presents 100 years instead of 90 either by making a statement in round numbers or by pure mistake,⁴—Aśōka-Dharmāsōka

¹ See Dīpavaṃsa, 6. 1, and, for Buddhaghōsha and the Mahāvaṃsa, the note on page 985 above.

² This latter detail is proved whether the word *adhātīya*, *adhātiya*, does or does not actually mean 'thirty-eight.' I regret that I have not yet been able to pursue that topic further. But in all these matters there are important side-issues which must be considered; and they delay progress even when other affairs do not intervene.

³ The Mahāvaṃsa introduces the account of this heresy, etc., by saying (Turnour, 15):—

Atitē dasamē vassē Kālāsōkassa rājinō |
Sambuddha-parinibbānā ēvaṃ vassa-satam ahu ||
Tadā Vēsālīyā bhikkhū anēkā Vajjiputtakā, etc.

"When the tenth year of king Kālāsōka had elapsed, then it was a century of years after the death of Buddha. Then many Bhikkhus of Vēsālī, sons of the Vajji people, etc."

⁴ The first is the case according to the information given by the Dīpavaṃsa and the Mahāvaṃsa. Both of them place the commencement of the reign of Kālāsōka 90 years after the death of Buddha.

The second is the case if the statement was based on information similar to that put forward by Buddhaghōsha. The details of reigns given by him (loc. cit., 321) place the commencement of the reign of Kālāsōka 100 years (instead of 90) after the death of Buddha. The sum, however, of all the reigns up to the initial date of Aśōka, given in the same place, shews a mistake of ten years; it amounts to 228 years, instead of the 218 which he has elsewhere (see note on page 985

the Maurya, who reigned at Pāṭaliputra, with Aśoka-Kālāśoka the Śaiśunāga, who had previously reigned at the same place. It misplaces Aśoka the Maurya by referring him to a time 128 or 118 years, as we may like to take it, before his real initial date. As regards Kanishka, the plain and only safe course is, not to combine the two statements about 100 and 400 years, and then to count 300 years from a point which is determined either by a mere statement in round numbers or by a mistake, but to take the 400 years themselves, and count them from the point from which the tradition itself counted them; namely, from the death of Buddha. And that gives us B.C. 82 as the initial date of Kanishka indicated by this tradition.

In respect of this tradition about an interval of 400 years from the death of Buddha to the initial date of Kanishka, we must not ignore the point that, while the first of Hiuen Tsiang's statements, in the *Si-yu-ki*, comes from Gandhāra, from that same territory we have another statement, by Sung-yun (A.D. 518), which places Kanishka only 300 years after the death of Buddha (Beal, *Records*, I. introd., 103). But that is undeniably wrong. Is it, by any chance, a result, though Sung-yun does not seem to mention Aśoka, of some similar erroneous combination, made in early times, of the 100 years for Aśoka and the 400 years for Kanishka? Or was it in some way evolved from a tradition reported by Fa-hian (Beal, *Records*, I. introd., 30), not indeed from Gandhāra but from a neighbouring territory, that a certain image of Maitrēya was set up rather more than 300 years after the death of Buddha?

On the other hand, quite on a line with the statement about the 400 years is another traditional statement, reported by Hiuen Tsiang in his story about Pāṇini under his account

above) explicitly stated. And a comparison with the *Mahāvārṇava* (Turnour, 15; Wijesinha, 11) shews that the mistake—(whether made by Buddhaghōṣa or by copyists, we can hardly say)—lies in assigning eighteen instead of eight years to kings Anuruddha and Muṇḍa in the time between Ajātasatru and Kālāśoka.

The statements in the *Aśokāvadāna* and in the traditions reported by Hiuen Tsiang and I-tsing may give 100 years on the authority of that mistake, just as well as in the shape of an even century for ninety years.

of Śalātura,¹ which has been held² to place 500 years after the death of Buddha, not simply an alleged contemporary of Kanishka (which would be conceivably quite possible), but also Kanishka himself. We are told that, 500 years after the death of Buddha, a great Arhat from Kashmīr arrived at Śalātura, and saw a Brāhman teacher chastising a young pupil. He explained to the teacher that the boy was Pāṇini, reborn. And he told to the teacher the story of 500 bats, which, in a subsequent birth, had as the result of their merits become the 500 wise men whom "in these latter times" (Julien), "lately" (Beal), "in recent times" (Watters), king Kanishka and the reverend Pārśva had convoked in the "Council," held in Kashmīr, at which there was drawn up the Vibhāshā-Śāstra. The great Arhat asserted that he himself had been one of the 500 bats. And, having narrated all this, he proved his divine power by instantly disappearing.

Having been one of the 500 bats, this great Arhat was necessarily also one of the 500 members of the "Council" of Kanishka. And the story certainly places the great Arhat, at the time when he was telling it, in the 500th year after the death of Buddha. But the plain indication that he was a somewhat miraculous being entitles us to at any rate credit him with a certain amount of longevity, even to the occasional Buddhist extent (see, e.g., page 912 above) of 120 years. Anyhow, the story distinctly does not place the "Council" itself in the 500th year after the death of Buddha; it places it "in these latter times," "in recent times." And even if we should admit, though it seems hardly probable, that the "Council" was held in the very first year of the reign of Kanishka, which was in reality the 424th year but must be taken as the 400th year in round numbers according to tradition, still, an occurrence placed in even the 400th year of any particular reckoning surely

¹ Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 127 ff.; Beal, *Records*, 1. 116 f.; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 1. 222.

² E.g., to quote what is probably the latest instance, by Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 1. 224.

belongs, from the point of view of the 500th year, to "latter times" or "recent times" as compared with the opening years of the reckoning.

Tradition placed the initial date of Kanishka 400 years after the death of Buddha. It is open to anyone to accept that tradition, or to reject it. But anyone who, accepting any traditional statements at all of the series to which this one belongs, rejects this one, is bound to shew for his rejection of it some better reason than simply that it does not happen to suit his general views and theories. And anyone who accepts it must apply it as it stands, without distorting it so as to make it say or mean something which it does not really assert.

I accept the tradition, and apply it exactly as it stands. Taken in that way, and applied to B.C. 482 for the death of Buddha as determined by considerations into which the question of the date of Kanishka does not enter in any way whatsoever, the 400 years bring us to B.C. 82. That is, taken as a statement of 400 in round numbers for 424,¹—which is about all that we are usually entitled to expect from the ancient Hindūs, except in the few cases in which they were able to cite the lengths of individual reigns and to present definite totals, sometimes right sometimes wrong, by adding up such details,—it carries us practically to the truth, which certainly is that Kanishka founded the so-called Malava or Vikrama era commencing in B.C. 58.

I shall deal separately with some other points which have to be considered in connexion with this matter. I will close this note by inviting attention to some observations which have apparently not received the recognition to which they are entitled; namely, the remarks made by Professor Kielhorn in the *Indian Antiquary*, 26, 1897. 153, on the terminology presented in certain dates. He has there

¹ If Mr. Beal has rightly reported the Avadānasāṭaka as placing Aśōka 200 years after Buddha (*Records*, 1. 151, note 97), then we certainly have there such a round statement, of 200 for 218 years. In the assertion about 100 years from Buddha to Aśōka, we may have another such statement, or we may not; see page 988 above, and note 4.

shewn that the wording of the dates of the dated records which mention Kanishka, Huvishka, and Vāsudēva, is radically opposed to the wording of Śaka dates. On the other hand, it is identical with the wording of dates in the so-called Mālava or Vikrama era.

J. F. FLEET.

THE USE OF THE PASSIVE GERUND IN ŚANSKRIT.

The remarks of Mr. Keith on the 'passive gerund' (p. 693) seem to be based on a misapprehension. The 'gerund' is only the oblique case of a verbal noun, the general sense of which is best expressed by calling it an instrumental or comitative (= attendant circumstances): the word implies no voice, but the logical relation to the sentence depends on the meaning and the context. So in Latin we have *uritque videndo*, 'sets aflame at the sight,' i.e. by being seen; *lentescit habendo*, 'grows soft by use.' Thus Hitop. (ed. Pet.), p. 20, *ālokya kākenoktam 65 tataḥ Saṃjīvaka ānīya darṣanam kāritaḥ*. If it would serve any interest, I could quote a good many other instances from Sanskrit and Pali to substantiate this; but I have no doubt scholars will immediately see that it is true. The instances given would then be properly 'after the making,' 'after the breaking,' 'after the favouring.'

W. H. D. ROUSE.

THE PESHAWAR VASE.

Mr. Fleet's note on the Peshawar vase suggests that it would be useful to examine Buddhist-Sanskrit verse with some critical care. I have noted both in Sanskrit and in Pali many instances of violation of the strict rules of position, and I subjoin these from the *Çikṣāsamuccaya*:

Page 101¹⁵: -āvy-, dūṣkh- (i.e. no doubt dūkkh-)

„ 103²: -āsmṛti (cf. Pali *sati* = smṛti).

W. H. D. ROUSE.

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE PESHAWAR VASE.

On p. 714 Dr. Fleet says that it does not follow that in popular records of this class we must always restore double consonants up to the full standard of literary productions. I would point out that even this *caveat* is unnecessary for the Prakrits of the North-West. The Piśāca dialects and the neighbouring tertiary Prakrits (Sindhī and Labndā) do not as a rule lengthen a vowel before a simplified double consonant. Thus Sindhī has *bhatu* (not *bhātu*), rice, from *bhattō*, *bhaktas*; modern Paisācī *uṭh* (not *ūṭh*), a camel, from *utṭhō*, *uṣṭras* (see J.R.A.S., 1904, p. 730). Forms like *rachita-*, *Takhasilā-*, *pratithāvita-* are hence perfectly regular in the North-West. The preservation of *r* in the *bhr* of *bhrātarēhi* is also typical of these North-Western dialects.

G. A. GRIERSON.

Camberley.

August 1st, 1906.

THE NEGATIVE *a* WITH A FINITE VERB IN SANSKRIT.

To p. 722 of the Journal, July, 1906.

Kātyāyana, in a Vārttika to Pāṇini VI, 3, 73, says :

नञो नलोपे ऽवक्षेपे तिङ्युपसंख्यानम् ॥ १ ॥

नञो नलोपे ऽवक्षेपे तिङ्युपसंख्यानं कर्तव्यम् । अपचसि वै त्वं
जाल्म । अकरोषि वै त्वं जाल्म ॥

i.e., when a reproach is to be expressed one can say : "Surely, you rogue, you cannot cook a bit! You cannot work a bit!"

This is nothing more than a vulgarism.

TH. AUFRECHT.

THE ORIGIN OF 'SABAIO.'

With reference to the last part of Mr. Beveridge's note *supra* (pp. 705-6), I would offer the following remarks:—

That Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh was living when the Portuguese first captured Goa (March, 1510) there seems to be no doubt.¹ To the testimony of Ferishta, as quoted by Mr. Beveridge, I would add that of Zain al-dīn, who says that at that time Goa "belonged to the most exalted 'Ādil Shāh, *grandfather of 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh*." ² But that he was still alive when the Portuguese recaptured Goa (November, 1510) appears somewhat doubtful. "According to Ferishta," says Mr. Beveridge, "Yūsuf did not die till 916 or 917 (1511)"; while Professor Morse Stephens (*Albuquerque*, p. 90) asserts that Yūsuf "died on December 5, 1510," though whence he obtained this exact date does not appear.

That Albuquerque thought that Yūsuf was dead when he first attacked Goa is certain. Not only does Albuquerque's son mention the death as a fact three several times,³ but in the official report⁴ of the council held on 13th February, 1510, on board the *Flor de la mar* by Albuquerque and his captains, to decide whether they were to go to the Red Sea or to attack Goa, it is stated⁵ that—

"Item the said captain major [Albuquerque] said that Goa was only great as long as the Çoay was there, and that he knew for certain from Coja Biqui⁶ and the Moors that the Çoay is dead and that his son is therein as captain, weak and in great fear of our coming to attack it."

As, unfortunately, all of Albuquerque's letters have not come down to us, I cannot tell when he discovered his error; but, judging from the following extracts, it would seem that after his first occupation of Goa he became aware that the

¹ Mr. Whiteway, in his *Rise of Portuguese Power in India*, p. 133, says that in the early part of 1510 Yūsuf was "just dead"; but he gives no authority for the assertion.

² D. Lopes's *Historia dos Portugueses no Malabar por Zindāim*, p. 43. The words I have italicized are wanting in Rowlandson's faulty translation of the *Tuhfat al-mujāhidin*.

³ *Commentaries of the Great Afonso Dalboquerque* (Hakluyt Soc.), ii, pp. 82, 85, 87. In the first two cases Timoja is named as the authority, and in the third case a yogi.

⁴ Printed in *Cartas de Affonso de Albuquerque*, in pp. 3-5.

⁵ Compare what follows with Timoja's report to Albuquerque on p. 82 of vol. ii of the *Com. of Af. Dalb.*

⁶ See *Com. of Af. Dalb.*, ii, 59.

reports of Yūsuf's death were false. Writing to King Manuel on 17th October, 1510, shortly before leaving Cananor for the second attack on Goa, Albuquerque says¹:—

“The king of Daquem [the Dakhan] gave the territory in captaincies or lordships divided amongst his slaves, Turks by nation, and some few Persians. These rebelled, and do not obey him except that they call him king; they now send him some jewel, if they choose. These wazīrs [*alguazis*] wage continual war one with another, and take towns one from another, and at times enter into alliance some against the others, and each one strives to get the king of Daquem into his hands and to have him in his power: the Çabayo has him now, and this man is the greatest wazīr of them and who has most territory and he who is lord of Goa. Another wazīr is the lord of Chaull; this man was always and is at war with the Çabayo, and if at the time that I won Goa the lord of Chaull had not died, I had never lost it, because soon would he have come upon the son of [? the] Çabayo when he came to besiege the island, and would have routed him, but he left a young son, who began first to occupy himself with his wazīrate.”

Again, in a letter of 4th November, 1510, of which only a summary remains to us, Albuquerque wrote² to Dom Manuel “of the king of Narsymga [Vijayanagar] of the help that he gave³ to the son of the Çabaio.”

Soon after he had recaptured Goa, however, Albuquerque dispatched a letter⁴ to the ‘Hidalcán,’ whom he addressed by the name of ‘Milohau,’⁵ saying: “and for all that the Çabayo, your father, be dead, I will be your father, and bring you up like a son.” Evidently, therefore, Albuquerque

¹ *Cartas de Aff. de Alb.*, i, p. 22 (misprinted 24 in the reference on p. 778 of the second ed. of *Hobson-Jobson*).

² *Cartas de Aff. de Alb.*, i, p. 420.

³ Cf. Sewell's *A Forgotten Empire*, p. 124.

⁴ Given in *Com. of Af. Dalb.*, iii, 20–1. Unfortunately, like most of the letters printed in this work, there is no date. The version given in the edition of 1774 varies from that printed in the first edition of 1557.

⁵ This may represent ‘Mālū Khān’ (the son of Ismāil), or possibly the person intended may be the ‘Mealecan’ referred to below.

was convinced that at this time Yūsuf was really dead. It is possible, however, that he may have been not actually dead, but dangerously ill, and that, as Ferishta states, he did not die until some months later.

Now as to the titles Sāvai and Sabaio. That with the Portuguese these referred to the same person, and that person Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh, is clear from the fact that where in the above quoted passage from the consultation of 13th February, 1510, the word 'Çoay' is used, in the corresponding passage in the *Commentaries*, ii, 82, we have 'Çabaio.' Mr. Beveridge refers to the note in the second edition of *Hobson-Jobson*, p. 778, in which Mr. Whiteway seeks to controvert the statement of Barros (II, v, ii), supported though it is by Ferishta,¹ by a quotation from Couto (IV, x, iv), in which the latter writer asserts that the Savay was a Canarese lord, a vassal of the King of Canara, who owned Goa at the time that Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh conquered it. Whence Couto obtained this information is not very clear, and his statement does not seem to be borne out by other writers. What Barros records regarding Yūsuf is fairly correct,² except for the statement that the latter was a native of Sāvā, whereas he was only brought up there. But in the last sentence of the quotation from Couto Mr. Whiteway makes the latter say the exact opposite of what he does say. The sentence runs as follows³ (*Hobson-Jobson*, 2nd ed., p. 778) :—"At this his sons laughed heartily when we read it to them, saying that their father was anything but a Turk, and his name anything but Çufo." What the "sons" (of Yūsuf, not of any Hindu chief, as Mr. Whiteway has it) actually did say to Couto was, "that their father was nothing but a Turk, nor was he called anything but Çufo [Yūsuf]." By "sons" Couto means,

¹ Mr. Beveridge has fallen into an error in saying that "Mr. Whiteway refers to Briggs' translation of Ferishta": the reference to Ferishta is Yule's.

² Mr. David Lopes, on p. lvii of the introduction to his *Chronica dos Reis de Bisnaga*, supports Barros in this matter against Couto.

³ See also *Rise of Port. Power in India*, pp. 133-4, note, where Mr. Whiteway states that Couto "says that the Sabaio was a Hindu chief in Kanara, whose sons he knew personally. These sons laughed heartily when Couto read them Barros's derivation of the word Sabaio; their father, they said, was neither a Turk nor a Yusuf."

I think, son and grandsons; for in this same chapter he tells us that he talked over these matters of the origin of Yūsuf with his son 'Meale,'¹ when the latter was in Goa, and this seems to have been the only one of Yūsuf's sons with whom Couto could have had the chance of conversing.

In Albuquerque's later letters he frequently uses the title Çabaio in reference to Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh, whom he less frequently terms "the Idalham";² so that it is plain that Albuquerque, at any rate, did not consider Yūsuf the one and only Sabaio.

Finally, I may point out that Varthema³ says that when he was in India (1505) the island of "Goga" had a "Mameluke" captain called "Savain,"⁴ and that Barbosa, writing about 1514, says that the "Sabayo" when he died left the city of Goa to his son "Çabaym Hydalcan."⁵

Considering all things, I think that Couto's version of the origin of 'Sabaio,' which Mr. Whiteway accepts, must be regarded as "not proven."

DONALD FERGUSON.

27th July, 1906.

VEDIC METRE.

The divergence between Mr. Berriedale Keith and myself has extended, as I ventured to anticipate, to the treatment of the differences between the 'Rigveda proper' and the 'popular Rigveda.' I do not wish to quarrel with Mr. Keith's former expression of appreciation of this part of my work:

¹ The history of this unfortunate individual (? Mīr 'Alī) is told in the *Rise of Port. Power in India* (pp. 231-2, 285-6, 303-4, 314, 320) down to 1549. Couto continues the story for a few years longer, when 'Mealecan' disappears from sight. For the greater part of his life he was a mere puppet, pensioned and then kept a prisoner, of the Portuguese.

² See the references in the index to *Alguns Documentos do Archivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo*.

³ Hak. Soc. ed., p. 116.

⁴ In the quotation in the second ed. of *Hobson-Jobson*, p. 779, this is misprinted 'Savaui.'

⁵ So the Lisbon edition, as quoted in *Hobson-Jobson* s.v. 'Sabaio' (in the second ed. the extract is credited to *Barros*). The Spanish version translated in the Hak. Soc. ed. has "Vasabaxo" and "Sabaym Delcani."

in it he has at least displayed a kindly personal feeling, for which I desire to thank him. But I think it important to notice that this appreciation is not equivalent to conviction, as is shown by the test case of the hymns X, 20-26. These hymns are shown, according to my methods, to belong clearly to the 'Rigveda proper,' with the exception of X, 24, vv. 4-6. The linguistic indications are in favour of the earlier period, in the proportion of 59 to 3: the details I can supply if they are of interest. The metres employed are such as are strange to the 'popular Rigveda,' but cognate to those of 'Rigveda proper.' The recording of the author's name, and the contents generally, favour the same supposition. Mr. Keith, if I understand him rightly, refers the whole group to the 'popular Rigveda': at any rate he objects to separate the three stanzas in 'epic Anuṣṭubh metre' from the rest, and he considers the whole group to be relatively late. In any case he makes no attempt whatever to employ the tests of which he once expressed his appreciation, and he now declares the most important of them, the linguistic test, to be "practically worthless."

I cannot ask for space here to discuss these hymns in detail; nor have I anything to alter in the statement made in *Vedic Metre* (pp. 170, 171). Mr. Keith errs strangely in thinking that my views have been drawn from metrical considerations only; but his own statement of the metrical evidence is altogether inaccurate. The "iambic anuṣṭubh" of these hymns is far from being of the "most regular character": in fact, the large number of variations in this metre points strongly to a very early date. Mr. Keith quotes X, 25 as an example of regular metre, whilst himself giving figures which show that in 16 per cent. of the verses the cadence is irregular. He does not seem to be aware that this percentage is extraordinarily high, although he can find the facts in *Vedic Metre*, p. 169; nor does he allude to the fact that according to my figures (given on p. 285) the variations found in the hymns 21, 24-26 together precisely correspond to those which are characteristic of anuṣṭubh of the earliest period. This lack of attention to

details vitiates his whole argument. His own conception of the literary character of the author of these hymns does not seem to me possible. Although he is "incompetent" and "clumsy," yet he is a man who, according to his "personal taste," can not only imitate various styles employed by earlier poets, but also anticipate others not yet become regular. I have a higher opinion than Mr. Keith has of the skill of "Vimada," but I do not think he was capable of such feats as these.

Mr. Keith reiterates his disbelief in the existence of an intentional cæsura in Vedic trimeter verse, and calls it the "supposed cæsura" (p. 720). This, in my view, is to shut one's eyes to the most plainly demonstrated and most essential fact in the whole metrical system of the Rigveda.

The discussion in this Journal, necessarily short, may (I hope) be useful in bringing out the difference between our methods and our results, and thereby stimulating future students to further examination of the Rigveda itself.

E. VERNON ARNOLD.

[The discussion of this subject is now closed.]

A SAYING OF MA'RUF AL-KARKHI.

In my article on Šúfism which appeared in the April number of the Journal, I cited (p. 319) a saying of Ma'ruf al-Karkhî as evidence that he was acquainted with the doctrines of the Mandæans. The words in question are printed in the *Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyâ*, pt. i, p. 272, l. 7, as follows: چشم فرو خوابانید اگر همه از نری بود و ماده, which may be rendered, "Close your eyes, if all is derived from a male and female." I have since, however, come across the Arabic original of this injunction in the *Tabaqât al-Súfiyya* of Abû 'Abdîl-Rahmân al-Sulamî (British Museum MS. Add. 18,520, f. 18a), viz., غَضُّوا أَبْصَارَكُمْ وَلَوْ عَنْ شَائِقَةِ أَنْثَى,

“Close your eyes even to a female goat.” We must therefore read in the *Tadh. al-Awliyā* ماَذَهْ بُونْ بُزِيْ اَگر همه از بُزِيْ بُونْ — a correction which is supported by some MSS. of that work — and confess that the particular saying has nothing to do with Mandæan doctrine, although the general probability that Ma'rúf was influenced from this source is hardly affected by the failure to find a decisive parallel. The present example is only one of many which might be adduced to show the need of caution in dealing with Persian translations of Šúfī sayings. My experience has convinced me that cases are not rare in which the true reading will be sought in vain amongst the best and oldest Persian MSS., and cannot possibly be restored without reference to the original Arabic.

R. A. NICHOLSON.

ALEXANDER'S ALTARS.

Alexander's altars were erected on the west side of the Hyphasis or Beas river. He had captured Sangala, and proposed to cross that river and advance to the Ganges, but his troops mutinied. In response to their clamour he announced his intention to return, and he divided his army into twelve brigades, and erected twelve altars, “each to be equal in height to the highest military tower, but to far exceed it in breadth.”

At lat. $31^{\circ} 9'$, long. $74^{\circ} 30'$, about 33 miles almost due west of the present junction of the Beas and Sutlej rivers, is ‘Kusoor,’ which exactly satisfies these conditions. We learn from Thornton's Gazetteer that this “is a place of great antiquity, is enclosed by a wall, and has several divisions, each surrounded by a separate wall, strengthened with bastions. According to tradition there were formerly twelve of these divisions, corresponding to the number of the twelve sons of the founder, who assigned one to each. Hough observes that at this place ‘an army might make a good stand, as not only are there heights,

but each division of the town might be turned into a fortified position.'”

Thornton's 'Kusoor' is the Kasur of later gazetteers and maps. It is in the Lahore district, and is a station on the Firozpur branch of the North-Western Railway.

W. HOEY.

19th July, 1906.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE POEM ATTRIBUTED TO
AL-SAMAU'AL.¹

The editor of the Beyrūt journal *al-Machriq* has kindly sent me the number for July of this year, in which a text of Samau'al's poem is printed from a copy made by a Syrian priest, Dāwūd Irmīyā Maḳḳisili, after a MS. found by him “in one of the old collections.” It contains twenty-five lines, nearly all identical with those published by Hirschfeld; but instead of 8, 9, 10, and 11, it has the following:—

8 ومن نسله يعقوب ابا ليوسف الذي اشيع الاسباط قميم السنايل

9 وصار بعصر بعد فرعون امره بتعبير تدبير لحل المشاكل

10 ومن بعد احقاب نسوا ما له من ال

أيادی ففی موسى قدامنا السلاسل

Line 18 is omitted. Finally, for the last line it has—

وفي آخر الزمان جاء مسيحننا فاهدي بني الدنيا سلام التكامل

from which Père Cheikho justly argues that the writer must have been a Christian.

This recension of the poem fully bears out Hirschfeld's suggestion that the metrical irregularities were due to corruption of the text; for though a few remain, most of the lines conform accurately to the Tawil metre. Thus line 2, which in Hirschfeld's text is—

• واحصي مناقب قومة اختارهم رخصانهم بشواهد ودلائل

¹ See J.R.A.S., 1906, pp. 363 sqq. and 701.

appears thus—

واحصى مزايا سادة بشواهد قد اختارهم رحمانهم للدلائل

in which the metre is correct. The sense, however, is poor ; it could be slightly improved by altering ودلائل, but even so مائة ought not to be separated from اختارهم. Various emendations suggested in the articles quoted are confirmed.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

NOTES ON DR. FLEET'S ARTICLE ON THE CORPOREAL RELICS OF BUDDHA.¹

The following notes on points of detail may be of some interest :—

P. 658. "Though Kusinārā is several times mentioned in the Sutta as a *nagara*, 'a city,' still it is distinctly marked as quite a small place." I do not know what is the case in Western India, but in Bihar even the smallest village may have a name ending in *nagar*. I know a 'Rāmnagar' with not a score of houses in it. So also, in the fifteenth century, Vidyāpati Thakkura (who, be it noted, was a learned Sanskrit paṇḍit) employs *nagara* in places where it can only mean 'village.' Thus (from a Maithilī song descriptive of a rural sunrise) :—

Cakavā mōra sōra kaya cupa bhela
ōṭha malina bhela candā |
Nagara ka dhēnu ḍagara kē sañcara
kumudini basu makarandā ||

"The Brahminy duck and the peacock have finished their songs and are silent, the lip of the moon is growing dim.

"The village cows are moving towards the field-path, the honey stays (untouched by bees) within the water-lily."

On p. 660 Dr. Fleet raises the question as to how Buddha's body was preserved from decomposition during the six days

¹ J.R.A.S., July, pp. 655 ff.

preceding his cremation. In Tirhut, at the present day, honey is used for this purpose. In 1877 I was in Madhubanī, on the Nepal frontier, just at the time of Jang Bahādūr's death a few miles away in the Tarāī. Natives told me that the body was kept in a trough (*ḍrōṇa*) filled with honey for quite a long time, while his wives were being sent from Kaṭhmāṇḍū, so that one or more (I forget how many) should become *satī* at his cremation.

P. 666. The reference to the kings of the Nāgas who honoured a *dōṇa* of the Buddha relics, and who dwelt at Rāmagāma, a place beyond the borders of India, may be compared with the *Sūrya-garbha-sūtra* of the *Mahā-saṃnipāta* quoted by Monsieur Sylvain Lévi on p. 4 of No. v of his *Notes Chinoises sur l'Inde*. Here Buddha gives the Nāgas special charge of the *caitya* at *Gōśrṅga* in Khotan. I have often mentioned that by tradition the earliest inhabitants of Kaśmīr were Nāgas.

G. A. GRIERSON.

THE ALLEGED USE OF THE VIKRAMA ERA IN THE PANJAB IN 45 A.D.

In the July (1906) number of this Journal Dr. Fleet again discusses the date of the Takht-i-Bahai inscription,¹ which is dated in the year 103 of an era not specified by name and also in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of a king named Guduphara (Gondophares). Dr. Fleet reiterates his conviction that the era to which the figures 103 must be referred is that usually called the Vikrama era, but known in early times as the era of the Mālavas; and states that "to Mr. Vincent Smith's expression of doubt, not even supported by any indication of a reason, about the Indian era of B.C. 58 having been in use in the time of Gondophernēs, no importance attaches" (p. 707). The

¹ M. Foucher, who visited the site, spells the name Takht-i-Bahai (*L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique*, passim), and says, "Takht-i-Bahai doit son nom à un puits légendaire qui est censé en communication souterraine avec le Swāt" (*ibid.*, p. 171).

criticism might have been worded more courteously, but let that pass; the substance is the important matter. When I have expressed doubts as to the use of the Vikrama or Mālava era in the north-western Panjāb in 45 or 46 A.D., the date of the Takht-i-Bahai inscription, if it is rightly referred to that era, I did not think it necessary to show in detail that the doubts are based on strong grounds, because the question of the early history of the era has been so thoroughly discussed by Professor Kielhorn in articles familiar to Dr. Fleet that I supposed the reasons for my hesitation to be obvious from perusal of those articles. But the criticisms on my silence compel me to set them forth.

Professor Kielhorn, in his concluding article (*Ind. Ant.*, xx, 401), examines the "locality and names of the era." The leading propositions which he deduces from the 200 earliest dates investigated are as follows:—

"The earliest known dates, from V. 428 to 898, are therefore all from eastern Rājputānā, chiefly from that part of eastern Rājputānā which borders on, or is included in, Mālava . . . From Rājputānā the list takes us in an eastern direction, first to the neighbouring State of Gwālīor, and afterwards through Bundelkhand and Rewah as far as Gayā in Bihār . . . Our earliest known dates to about V. 900 are all from eastern Rājputānā, especially from that part of Eastern Rājputānā which borders on, or is included in, Mālava. From there, if we may judge by the dates collected, the era spread first towards the north-east and east, to Kanauj and to Gwālīor and Bundelkhand, and afterwards towards the south-east and south, to Mālava proper and Anhilvād (including Kāthiāvād). And, speaking generally, down to about A.D. 1300 the use of the era was confined to that comparatively small portion of India which would be included by straight lines drawn from the mouth of the Narbadā to Gayā, from Gayā to Delhi, and from Delhi to the Runn of Cutch, and by the line of coast from the Runn of Cutch back to the mouth of the Narbadā. Within these limits and down to the time mentioned the era was officially employed, especially by the Chaulukya and Vāghēla princes of Anhilvād, the Paramāras of Mālava, the Chandēlas of Bundelkhand, the earlier and later dynasties of Kanauj, and the chiefs of Rājputānā."

These conclusions, being based on a rigorous induction from all the available material, and drawn by the greatest authority on the subject, are absolutely trustworthy. Most readers, I think, will be of opinion that they offer at least "an indication of a reason" for hesitating to affirm categorically that the Vikrama era was used by the subjects of an Indo-Parthian kingdom in the north-western Panjāb in 45 or 46 A.D. I have never denied that the Takht-i-Bahai inscription may possibly be dated in the Vikrama era, although I always hesitated to affirm that it was so dated, and now believe that the probabilities are against Dr. Fleet's theory. It seems to me extremely unlikely that an era, the ascertained use of which, previous to 1300 A.D., was confined within the limits defined by Professor Kielhorn, should have been familiar to the residents of an Indo-Parthian kingdom of Taxila in 45 A.D. My statement (*Z.D.M.G.*, 1906, p. 71) that "I doubt very much if the so-called Vikrama era was then in use" appears to be fully justified by the facts, as ascertained by Professor Kielhorn.

He proceeds to note that only five inscriptions specify their dates as being recorded in the 'Mālava era,' or some variety of that expression. "They show that from about the fifth to the ninth century the era was by poets believed to be especially used by the princes and people of Mālava, while another era or other eras were known to be current in other parts of India. At the same time, considering that our earliest dates are actually from south-eastern Rājputānā and the parts of Mālava adjoining it, the employment of the word *Mālava* in connection with the era may be taken to point out fairly, accurately the locality in which the era was first employed. What special circumstances may have given rise to its establishment I am unable to determine at present."

Dr. Fleet's theory concerning the Takht-i-Bahai inscription date would be much strengthened if he could indicate any probable means by which an era, not known to have been in use anywhere earlier than 370 A.D., and, as shown by Professor Kielhorn, originating apparently in Mālava,

became familiar at Taxila in 45 A.D. What grounds exist for his assertion that "the era was in current use from the very year in which we know its initial point fell?" I am not aware of any, and Professor Kielhorn's exhaustive collection of facts supplies none. Of course, Dr. Fleet holds the opinion that the inscriptions of the reign of Kanishka, beginning from the year 3 (*Ep. Ind.*, viii, 176), are dated in the Vikrama era, but the proof of the validity of that opinion has not yet been published. He asserts (*Journal*, 1905, p. 232) that "whatever may be urged to the contrary, it [the Vikrama era] was certainly founded, though the fact cannot perhaps be actually proved at present . . . by Kanishka, whose northern capital, it may be remarked in passing, was Takshasilā, Takkasilā, Taxila, close to the locality to which the Takht-i-Bahi record belongs." Such *ex cathedra* assertions of 'certainties' which 'cannot be proved at present' do not necessarily carry immediate conviction. I may remark also, in passing, that some difficulty may be experienced in proving that Taxila was the capital of Kanishka.

Dr. Fleet's theory about the origin of the Vikrama era is categorically stated in the continuation of the passage above quoted. "The Mālava or Vikrama era," he writes, "was founded by Kanishka, in the sense that the opening years of it were the years of his reign. It was actually set going as an era by his successor, who, instead of breaking the reckoning, so started, by introducing another according to his own regnal years, continued that same reckoning. It was accepted and perpetuated as an era by the Mālava people, whose territory, with its capital then at 'Nāgar' or 'Karkota-Nāgar' near 'Tonk,' was in the immediate vicinity of Mathurā, the southern capital of Kanishka and his direct successors, and who were plainly subjects at that time of the kings of Mathurā. It thus derived from the Mālavas its earliest known formal appellation; namely, *Mālava-gaṇasthiti*, 'the reckoning of the Mālavas,' as explained by Professor Kielhorn (*IA*, 19, 57). And eventually, in or about the ninth century A.D., it came to be known as the

Vikrama era, in circumstances which have been elsewhere indicated by the same scholar (IA, 20, 407 ff.).”

Several propositions embedded in this remarkable statement are pure hypotheses, unproved, and beset with many difficulties. It is legitimate for other people to interpret the evidence in another fashion. I am quite ready to accept Dr. Fleet's or anybody else's views on any subject when adequately supported. In the present case I accept Professor Kielhorn's, which rest upon a well-laid basis of ascertained fact, and are inconsistent with Dr. Fleet's theory.

My statement (*Z.D.M.G.*, 1906, p. 71) that it is “quite possible that the [Takht-i-Bahai] inscription may be dated in the Cæsarean era of Antioch for instance, which ran from 49 or 48 B.C., or in some other foreign era,” was intended merely as a caution and a hint that archæologists might easily be mistaken in confining their attention to eras of purely Indian origin when discussing the chronology of semi-foreign frontier kingdoms in the first century A.D. Coins of Antioch exhibit dates in the Cæsarean year up to 257 (*Num. Chron.*, 1904, p. 134). But I do not attach importance to the particular suggestion. The idea in my mind when I made it was that it is possible that in an Indo-Parthian kingdom of the period in question an era of Græco-Roman origin might have been in use; and that idea is, perhaps, not so absurd as it seems to Dr. Fleet.

It is hardly worth while to argue about the exact form of the name Gondophares. The coins exhibit several varieties of it, and it is true that there is no authority for Dr. Fleet's form Gondophernēs, although it is to some extent supported by the analogy of Holophernes, etc., and the Kharoṣṭhī form Gudapharna. But we may just as well write Gudaphernēs as Gondophernēs, and so it is more convenient to keep the form Gondophares, which is sanctioned by European usage since about 1841. Whatever form we use is merely a roughly Hellenized transcription of a native name, and several variations are equally legitimate. The native name itself was written in more ways than one.

I may utilize this opportunity to notice certain small

matters, and to point out, with reference to Dr. Fleet's article on the inscription of the Peshāwar or Taxila vase, (Journal, 1906, p. 712), that we are not "dependent upon two reproductions of it." We have a third, Dr. Vogel's (ibid., p. 550), taken direct from the vase, now in the Lāhor Museum, which is presumably correct, and differs from that used by Dr. Fleet.

Again (ibid., p. 655), Dr. Fleet prefers Major Vost's spelling Piprāhavā to Piprāhwā or Piprāwā as written by me. But either of the latter forms correctly expresses the local pronunciation of the name, and if a stranger were to ask the way to Piprāhavā he might find himself in a difficulty. Major Vost never has visited the Kapilavastu region, and his spelling is a purely fancy one. The name seems to be modern, meaning, like scores of other village names, 'the place with a conspicuous *pīpal* (*pīpar*, *Ficus religiosa*) tree'; and the correct spelling is whatever best expresses the pronunciation.

Dr. Fleet (ibid., p. 708) quotes my definition of the position of Taxila as being "now represented by miles of ruins to the north-west of Rāwalpindī, and the south-east of Hasan Abdāl"; and adds the sarcastic comment, "or, as other writers have decided, it may be closely located at the modern Shāh-Dhēri, which is in that locality." A city like Taxila occupied much space, and its site cannot be taken as equivalent only to a single village. "The ruins," writes Cunningham (*Reports*, ii, 116), "of the ancient city near Shah-dheri, which I propose to identify with Taxila, are scattered over a wide space extending about three miles from north to south, and two miles from east to west." The various villages included in that area are shown in Cunningham's plate lvii. My statement, therefore, is perfectly accurate, and properly indicates the position with reference to well-known places marked on ordinary maps.

My view that Gondophares was king of Taxila, who extended his sway over Sind and Arachosia by conquest, is criticised with the remark that "it is not quite evident

why the matter has been put in that way: unless it is because other writers have rather suggested the contrary" (*ibid.*, p. 708). There is no justification for such an innuendo. Differences of opinion must continue to exist concerning the obscure problems of ancient history, and may be expressed without exposing an author to the unfounded charge of writing merely for the sake of opposition.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

WRONGLY CALCULATED DATES, AND SOME DATES OF THE
LAKSHMANASĒNA ERA.

With great interest I have studied various papers on historical subjects published by Mr. Monmohan Chakravarti in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. I am also glad to see that Mr. Chakravarti has attempted to verify a number of Indian dates taken from inscriptions and manuscripts. But his results do not seem to me to be always reliable. The following remarks may perhaps induce him to re-examine some of his calculations.

In a paper of his on the last Hindu kings of Orissa, in the *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. lxix, pt. 1, p. 180 ff., I find on four pages no less than six wrong week-days.

On page 180, the 29th May, A.D. 1437, is put down as a Tuesday, but was a Wednesday. Similarly, on page 181, the 26th August, A.D. 1455, was a Tuesday, not a Saturday; and the 12th May, A.D. 1461, a Tuesday, not a Monday. On page 181, the 28th November, A.D. 1470, was a Wednesday, not a Tuesday. And on page 183, the 20th June, A.D. 1472, was a Saturday, not a Thursday; and the 18th April, A.D. 1485, a Monday, not a Thursday. As it is very easy to find the week-day for a particular date A.D., I am at a loss to account for such errors. But I clearly see that any conclusions drawn from such dates may not perhaps be very readily accepted.

Mistakes of another kind we find in a paper of

Mr. Chakravarti's, in the *Journ. & Proc. As. Soc. Bengi.*, n.s., vol. ii, pages 15 ff., on certain dates of the Lakshmanasēna era in Hara Prasād Śāstri's catalogue of palm-leaf and selected paper MSS. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal. Here Sunday, the 15th October, A.D. 1591, is wrongly given instead of Sunday, the 10th October, A.D. 1591; Tuesday, the 15th August, A.D. 1491, wrongly instead of Tuesday, the 16th August, A.D. 1491; and Monday, the 23rd February, A.D. 1511, wrongly instead of Monday, the 23rd February, A.D. 1512. These could hardly be mere printer's errors.

In this second paper there are one or two other matters to which I should like to draw attention.

The words *nētr-ābdhi-rāma* of one date, Mr. Chakravarti, on page 16, has taken to denote the year 372. But since the word *abdhi* (like *jaladhi*, *udadhi*, *vāridhi*, etc.) in Vikrama and Śaka dates denotes 4, the year intended undoubtedly is 342.

On page 17 he states that the only colophon in the catalogue, which gives the year of the Lakshmanasēna era together with that of another era, is one (which is clearly incorrect) on page 13. It has escaped his attention that on page 109 of the catalogue there occurs the statement *Śākē 1536 La-sam 494*. This would give us a difference of 1042 between the Śaka and Lakshmanasēna eras, which, with my epoch of the latter, is the correct difference between the two for the months from Chaitra to Āśvina.

Finally, I would add to the dates given by Mr. Chakravarti two other dates from the catalogue, which, with the Lakshmanasēna era commencing in A.D. 1119, also would work out correctly :—

Page 20: *La-sam 171 Mārga-vadi 3 Chandrē*. This date, for the expired year 171 of the Lakshmanasēna era and the *amānta* month Mārgasīra, corresponds to Monday, the 20th November, A.D. 1290, when the 3d *tithi* of the dark half commenced 2 h. 3 m. after mean sunrise.

Page 29: *La-sam 339 | Śrāvaṇa-śudīśhashṭhyām Ravi-vāsar*
This date, for the current year 339 of the Lakshmanasēna

era, corresponds to Sunday, the 16th July, A.D. 1458, which was entirely occupied by the 6th *tithi* of the bright half.

Göttingen.

F. KIELHORN.

THE YOJANA AND THE LI.

Pending the issue of a full article on the values and use of the Indian *yōjana* and the Chinese *li* as measures of itinerary distance, I give the following brief statement of what I shall establish.

There were in ancient times two specific *yōjanas*: a general Indian *yōjana* of 32,000 *hasta*, cubits; and a *yōjana*, called the Māgadha *yōjana*, of 16,000 *hasta*. The use of the latter, however, was not confined to actually the Magadha country; and this *yōjana* might perhaps be called the Buddhist *yōjana*, it being the *yōjana* which was generally, but not always, cited in the Buddhist books for distances in India.

For present purposes, I take the value of the ancient *hasta* or Indian cubit as 18 inches. It may be possible hereafter to make a small refinement in this detail. But this much is certain. Of the measure of 4 *hasta*, = 96 *āṅgula*, 'finger-breadths,' which came to be called *dhanus*, 'the bow,' *daṇḍa*, 'the staff,' or *dhanurdaṇḍa*, 'the bow-staff,' the earlier name was *nṛi*, *purusha*, etc., 'the man;' and this measure was the accepted standard height of a normal man.¹ Consequently, the value of the ancient Indian cubit cannot have been appreciably in excess of 18 inches; and, on the other side, it is very improbable that it should have been less than 17·75 inches. With units of 17·75 and 18·25 inches against one of 18 inches, we have to lay out a distance of as much as 72 miles, before we arrive at a difference of one in the number of the miles. And it is, therefore, here at least, sufficient to take the ancient Indian cubit at 18 inches.

¹ This measure, occasionally perhaps called also *paurusha*, is not to be confused with a measure, called properly *paurusha* but sometimes *purusha*, which was the measure of a man standing up with his arms and hands stretched up over his head. The accepted length of the *paurusha* was 5 *hasta* = 120 *āṅgula*.

With this value of the cubit, we have—

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \text{ yōjana of } 32,000 \text{ hasta} &= 16,000 \text{ yards} \\ &= 9\frac{1}{11} \text{ or } 9\cdot09 \text{ miles.} \\ 1 \text{ yōjana of } 16,000 \text{ hasta} &= 8,000 \text{ yards} \\ &= 4\frac{6}{11} \text{ or } 4\cdot54 \text{ miles.} \end{aligned}$$

In addition to these two specific *yōjanas*, there was a third *yōjana*, in respect of which we gather from Hiuen Tsiang—(and I see no reason for doubting his statement on this point, though his general account of the Indian measures has come to us in a somewhat corrupt form)—that the value of it was $1\frac{1}{3}$ of the *yōjana* of 32,000 *hasta* = 16,000 yards.¹ This third *yōjana*, we can easily see, was the original *yōjana* in the true sense of the word as meaning the “yoking” distance, the “inspanning” distance, the distance along which a pair of bullocks could draw a fully laden cart, and for which it was worth while to take the trouble of placing a full load in the cart and of properly adjusting the components of it; in short, the standard distance of a day’s journey for consignments of trader’s goods, for travellers moving with baggage, and for all such purposes. And thus, since $16,000 + \frac{16,000}{3} = 21,333\cdot3$, we have—

$$\begin{aligned} \text{the Indian day's journey} &= 21,333\cdot3 \text{ yards} \\ &= 12\frac{4}{3} \text{ or } 12\cdot1\bar{2} \text{ miles.} \end{aligned}$$

While, however, the standard day’s journey in India was thus $12\cdot1\bar{2}$ miles, the actual day’s journey was, of course, determined in each case by such considerations as the nature of the country traversed, and the distances between villages, rest-houses, and other convenient halting-places. And so the actual day’s journey might easily in ordinary circumstances be anything from 10 to 14 miles; and, in exceptional cases, it might have even a wider range in either direction.

As regards the *li*, there is ample evidence that, by the

¹ Putting the case reversely, we see that the *yōjana* of 32,000 *hasta* was obtained by taking $\frac{3}{4}$ of this other *yōjana*. For that there was a good reason, in ancient custom, which will be explained in due course.

term 100 *li*, Fa-hian, Hiuen Tsiang, and other Chinese pilgrims denoted either the actual length of a day's journey, or the time occupied in making such a journey. That means, for their movements in India, the distance at which we have arrived above. And so we have—

$$\begin{aligned} 100 \text{ } \bar{\text{li}} \text{ for India ordinarily} &= 21,333\cdot3 \text{ yards} \\ &= 12\frac{4}{3} \text{ or } 12\cdot1\bar{2} \text{ miles.} \end{aligned}$$

This was the standard value of 100 *li* for travelling in the limits of India, and outside India itself wherever Indian customs and measures prevailed. But the actual value varied, of course, just as the length of the particular day's journey varied, under conditions indicated above.

It was in that manner, at any rate for the quantity of 100 *li*, for multiples of that quantity, and for divisions of it into tenths, that the *li* was used by Fa-hian and Hiuen Tsiang, in whose movements we are chiefly interested. The *yōjana* cited by them cannot be either a *yōjana* invented by them, or a *yōjana* laid out in modern times, partly from interpreting too strictly distances stated by them broadly in round-numbers, partly from supposed identifications, of which some are now known to be wrong and others are to say the least extremely doubtful, of places and memorials visited by them; it can only be one or other of the ancient indigenous Indian measures, according to the particular locality or source of information. And a practical testing of their statements on the lines which I indicate,— though it will not immediately remove all difficulties, and enable us to identify off-hand every place that they visited,— will be found to throw a new and satisfactory light upon various details, which, by other asserted values for the *yōjana* and the *li*, have unnecessarily been made obscure.

J. F. FLEET.



PORTRAIT OF THE EMPEROR BABAR.

*Enlarged from a Miniature (Natural size 1 3/8 in. x 1 1/16 in.)
in the British Museum (MS. Add. 5717, fol. 52).*

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE BĀBAR-NĀMA, BEING THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE
 EMPEROR BĀBAR, now reproduced in
 facsimile from a Manuscript belonging to the late
 Sir Sālār Jang, of Ḥaydarābād, and edited with a
 Preface and Notes by ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE.
 "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series. Vol. i. 4to.
 (London : Bernard Quaritch, 1905.)

Les mémoires de l'empereur Zāhir ed Din Mohammed Bāber sont vraisemblablement l'œuvre la plus importante de toute la littérature turque orientale ; en plus de son extrême intérêt au point de vue de la connaissance de la langue parlée dans le Ferghána et dans les provinces orientales de l'Iran à l'époque de la décadence de la dynastie timouride, ces mémoires, écrits dans un style très personnel et dénué d'artifices, ont une valeur littéraire considérable. Cette œuvre est presque entièrement isolée dans l'ensemble de la littérature musulmane, et c'est probablement celle qui, par la mentalité et, jusqu'à un certain point par la forme, se rapproche le plus des œuvres de la littérature occidentale. Sans aller jusqu'à comparer l'Autobiographie du fondateur de l'empire de l'Indoustan aux Commentaires du conquérant des Gaules, il est impossible de ne pas remarquer dans les deux ouvrages de nombreux traits de ressemblance : la sévérité du style d'hommes d'épée qui ne perdent point leur temps à imiter les élégances un peu vides des rhéteurs et des écrivains à la mode de la capitale, une indépendance

d'esprit absolue, et par dessus tout, une sincérité un peu brutale dont les œuvres des littérateurs de métier n'offrent que trop peu d'exemples.

Si les mémoires de Báber sont, avant le *Hébib el-siyer* de Khondémir, la principale source de l'histoire compliquée et enchevêtrée des dernières heures de la dynastie timouride, ils ont une importance aussi grande au point de vue de l'histoire littéraire de cette époque troublée. Báber, qui était un écrivain de premier ordre, fut en relation avec les principaux littérateurs qui florissaient à la cour brillante et un peu décadente de Sultan Hoseïn, et il a émis sur eux des jugements à l'emporte-pièce, d'un rigoureux bon sens que l'étude de leurs œuvres ne fera guère que confirmer.

Cet ouvrage d'une importance si considérable pour l'histoire générale, et si distinct des œuvres mièvres et alambiquées de la littérature persane, n'a été connu jusqu'à ces dernières années que par deux côtés: une version persane très fidèle, dont le texte, resté manuscrit, mériterait d'être publié dans son intégrité, et qui a été traduite en anglais par Erskine, et une édition du texte turc-oriental imprimée à Kazan par les soins de Mr. Ilminski.

L'édition du texte turc offrait de sérieuses difficultés; les manuscrits connus en Europe à l'époque à laquelle le savant russe entreprit la tâche ingrate de publier les mémoires de Báber étaient tous de basse époque, fort éloignés du manuscrit original et de plus fragmentaires. La connaissance du turc oriental est rare, infiniment rare, chez les copistes, même, ce qui peut paraître antinomique, chez ceux qui sont originaires des pays de la Transoxiane et l'on ne peut se fier en aucune façon aux documents qui sont sortis de leurs mains. Même à des époques relativement anciennes, auxquelles le turc oriental était encore parlé dans les provinces de l'extrême est de l'Iran, à Hérat, par exemple, sous le règne de Shâh-Rokh Béhadour, la connaissance de cet idiome était tombée si bas que le copiste de la version en caractères ouïghours du *Tezkérèh-i Evliâ d'Attâr* et du *Mirâd*, Námèh a introduit dans son texte des fautes qui le rendent souvent complètement incompréhensible. A plus forte raison, les copies exécutées

aux Indes des exemplaires des mémoires de Báber, dérivés de celui de la bibliothèque impériale des Timourides ne méritent-ils qu'une créance des plus limitées. Les matériaux que Mr. Ilminski avait à sa disposition pour établir son texte étaient donc des plus médiocres, et il fallait bien s'attendre à ce que son édition s'en ressentit, mais il n'est pas exagéré de dire que le savant russe aurait pu en tirer un meilleur parti et donner un texte très supérieur à celui qui a été imprimé à Kazan. Son premier soin aurait dû être de comparer phrase par phrase le texte qui lui était fourni par ses manuscrits avec la version persane, et de corriger d'après l'autorité de cette version les fautes évidentes des manuscrits turcs qui défigurent le récit de Báber et le rendent incompréhensible. En fait, cette édition qui ne comporte qu'une préface très insuffisante, dans laquelle on ne trouve pas l'indication d'une seule variante, ne peut guère qu'égarer les personnes qui sont tentées de s'y fier, car il est vraiment inadmissible que dans un ouvrage où l'on trouve des centaines de noms propres turcs et mongols dont les trois quarts sont loin d'être expliqués, il ne se trouve ni une seule variante, ni un seul point douteux. Le texte turc d'Ilminski qui a été traduit par Mr. Pavet de Courteille a souvent induit ce dernier en erreur par ce qu'il n'a pas pris soin de le comparer continuellement avec la version persane; cette comparaison, qui d'ailleurs n'offrait pas de difficultés essentielles, lui aurait évité de fâcheuses erreurs du genre de celle que l'on va trouver signalée un peu plus bas.

Le texte du manuscrit de Haydarábád qui a été reproduit en photozincogravure par Mme. Beveridge dans les "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series est de beaucoup supérieur à celui de l'édition d'Ilminski, et il se rapproche infiniment plus de celui de la version persane; il est probable, malgré les fautes inévitables qu'on y remarque, qu'il a été copié par une personne qui savait le turc, sur un exemplaire qui n'était pas très éloigné comme date du manuscrit original de l'Autobiographie de Báber; de plus, on y trouve des passages, tant en prose qu'en vers, qui ne figurent pas dans

l'édition de Kazan. La valeur comparative exacte de l'édition et du manuscrit reproduit par Mme. Beveridge ne pourrait s'établir que par la collation intégrale des deux textes qui fournirait beaucoup de corrections à l'édition de Kazan et, par conséquent, à la traduction française de Pavet de Courteille. Sans avoir ni la compétence ni le temps nécessaires pour entreprendre un travail de cet importance, j'ai vérifié plusieurs passages sur lesquels mon attention avait été attirée anciennement, et que j'avais spécialement étudiés en les collationnant avec la version persane; cet examen m'a prouvé d'une façon évidente que le texte du manuscrit d'Haydarabad est beaucoup plus correct, je ne dis pas que celui des manuscrits qui ont servi à Ilminski, mais que son édition.

Comme exemples de l'incorrection de l'édition d'Ilminski et de la supériorité du texte du manuscrit reproduit par Mme. Beveridge, je citerai les deux passages suivants Dans la description de Samarkand, Bâber dit d'après Ilminski, page 57 :—

تیمور بیگ نینگ نبیره بی جهانگیر میرزا نینگ اوغلی محمد
سلطان میرزا سمرقند نینگ تاش قورغانیدا چاقاردور بیر مدرسه
سالیپ تور تیمور بیگ نی قیزی واولادی دین هر کیم که سمرقندته
پادشاه لیق قیلیپ تورلار بارنی قبری اول مدرسه دا دور

Cette phrase, très incorrecte au point de vue grammatical, a été traduite tant bien que mal, par à peu près, par Pavet de Courteille: "Mohammed Sultan Mirza, fils de Djihanguir Mirza, et petit-fils de Timour-Beg, a fondé une médresèh dans l'enceinte extérieure de Samarkand qui forme un ouvrage à part (*sic*). C'est là que se trouvent les tombeaux de la fille de Timour-Beg et de tous ceux qui ont régné sur cette capitale." En admettant même qu'il soit question, dans ce passage du tombeau de la *fille* de Timour-Beg, la forme تیمور بیگ نی قیزی serait incorrecte, et il faudrait

نیمور بیک نینک قیزی ; d'autre part, on ne voit pas à quelle fille de Timour-Beg, Báber ferait allusion dans ce passage, d'autant plus que dans la crypte du Góur-i Mír de Samarkand, on ne trouve le tombeau d'aucune des princesses de la dynastie timouride. La version persane des Mémoires de Báber, qui est trop souvent un décalque fidèle jusqu'à la servilité du texte tchaghátaï, aurait du suggérer à Ilminski et, au défaut de l'éditeur, à Pavet de Courteille, une correction qui s'imposait d'ailleurs en l'absence même de tout contrôle ; elle porte en effet—

نیمور بیک پسر جهانگیر میرزا محمد سلطان میرزا برآمد
قلعه سنکین سمرقند یک مدرسه انداخته قبر تیمور بیک و از اولاد
او هر کس در سمرقند پادشاهی کرده قبر آنها در آن مدرسه است

Quoique cette phrase rende d'une façon peu claire le "la forteresse de pierre" littéralement "تاش قورغان" par le décalque le plus servile qui se puisse imaginer, چاقار et qu'elle saute la difficulté du mot سنکین, elle n'en corrige pas moins le قیزی d'Ilminski en قبری "tombeau," de façon à rétablir la leçon primitive du texte de Báber qui a été méconnue à la fois par l'éditeur russe et par le traducteur français ; or le texte du manuscrit d'Haydarábád porte correctement, en conformité avec la version persane—

تیمور بیک نینک نیمور سی جهانگیر میرزا نینک اوغلی محمد
سلطان میرزا سمرقند نینک تاش قورغانیدا چاقاردا بیر مدرسه
سالیپ تور تیمور بیک نینک قبری و اولادی دهر هر کیم که سمرقندته
پادشاهلیق قیلیپ تورالار نینک قبری اول مدرسه دا دور
(folio 46 recto).

- Il corrige trois fautes qui rendent absolument incompréhensible le texte d'Ilminski, چاقار au lieu de دور, "dans l'enceinte extérieure," au lieu de "c'est une enceinte

and they mention Gondophares — or Gondophernes as Dr. Fleet will have us call him—the Indo-Parthian king of the Indus valley in the middle of the first century A.D. They go back even in their present much revised form to the fourth century; and Epiphanius tells us that they were among the most esteemed scriptures of certain ascetic but heretical sects of Phrygia and Syria, which prescribed poverty and entire continence, even in the married life, as primary conditions of salvation. This, indeed, is the obvious purpose of the work, enforced in every part of it.

Upon the basis of these Acts the Bishop of Tricomia (what Indian town does Tricomia represent?) founds his history of the Indian Apostolate of St. Thomas, criticising, rejecting, or confirming their statements by extraneous evidence taken from antiquity or from the traditions and habits of the natives. In many respects he is well fitted for his task. He has a knowledge of Syriac, and is acquainted with the local legends of Mylapore, and the latest researches of Indian scholars, as well as of English and German students of the Apocrypha. He brings an immense mass of material to the discussion—the Epitaph of Abercius, the Acts of Paul and Thekla, of Andrew, and of Archelaus; he gives the history of the apostle's relics; and he goes through the evidence for an Indian Church before the days of Cosmas Indicopleustes. Moreover, he has given as his own special contribution to the subject extracts from the Church calendars and sacramentaries.

Before we can state the Bishop's argument, we must glance at three preliminary questions which have to be disposed of. The Abbé Tixeront has tried to prove, and many scholars hold, that Christianity did not cross the Euphrates until the middle of the second century. If Christianity did not cross the Euphrates before the middle of the second century, the Mesopotamian author of the Acts cannot have embodied the tradition of the Indian, Persian, or Babylonian Church, and his authority is worthless. The Bishop does not discuss the point. Probably he considered that the Abbé's opinion would be sufficiently refuted if the

Indian Apostolate of St. Thomas is proved. The second point is the date of the composition. External evidence does not take us beyond the fourth century. The Clementine Recognitions and the Didascalia, which date from the middle and latter part of the third century, mention writings or epistles of St. Thomas sent by him on his missionary tour, but they are silent as to the Acts. It is certain, however, that a considerable part, if not the whole, of the Acts goes back in substance to the second century. This is certain from the reference to Gondophares, or Gondophernes, and from the traits the work has in common with the Leucian Apocrypha, a group with which the ancients classed it, going back to the second century. All these Leucian Acts (including the Acts of Thomas) have been largely altered and re-edited; and it is an interesting question whether the visit to Gondophares and the martyrdom of Thomas were not originally separate works. But the Bishop scarcely touches on the question of date and composition: he is content to give the general opinion that the Acts were composed in Syriac, the work of a Mesopotamian author of the second century. He differs from the critics only in considering that the original author was orthodox, and that the work was interpolated by an heretical hand. Most critics hold, on the contrary, that the author was a Gnostic, and that the work, especially the Syriac version, has been revised in the interests of orthodoxy. On the third point, the credibility of the Acts, the Bishop is much stronger. "That the stories in the Acts of Thomas have little or no historical basis is indeed almost self-evident," says Professor Burkitt. The Bishop holds a somewhat different opinion. The narrative, he says, is often confused; and events which happened at one place are ascribed to another: indeed, the Bishop feels himself at liberty to transfer the whole story of the building of the heavenly palace from the court of Gondophares to Southern India, and to discard the story of the wild asses, and everything that militates against Mylapore. Such confusion, he says, is natural in an author living at a distance. But he relies on two arguments to

prove a historical substratum. He quotes the case of Paul and Thekla, whose Acts, formerly considered as a pure romance, have recently been proved to contain a great deal of historical truth, in order to show by analogy that the contemporary Acts of Thomas ought to have much historical matter. And next he examines the Acts of Thomas for evidence of local customs. But the Bishop will scarcely convince the incredulous. The rehabilitation of the Acts of Paul and Thekla is due to the historic names they contain. The few names in the Acts of Thomas are for the most part Persian; three or four are Latin, and one Greek. None of these (always, of course, with the exception of Gondophares) take us to India, for the Bishop will hardly persuade the world to accept his identification of Mazdai with Mahadeo any more than M. S. Lévi has succeeded with his Vasudeva. Nor are the Indian customs referred to on pp. 277-281 decisive; none of them appear peculiar to Southern India. He might perhaps have succeeded better had he recognised Indian traits in the story of Gondophares. But this would hardly suit him, for he regards the introduction of Gondophares into the Acts as a mistake, the visit to Gondophares belonging to the Apostle's Parthian tour, while the Acts in the Bishop's revised version must relate wholly to Southern India. Many a reader will demur to such an arbitrary treatment of the subject. Granting, however, that the Acts, in part at least, contain a historical substratum, let us see what farther advance we can make through extraneous sources. It is here, and not in the examination of the Acts, that the Bishop's work proves of value. The Bishop devotes himself to proving three propositions—St. Thomas came to India, he was martyred there, and Mylapore was the scene of his martyrdom.

The first of these propositions will be the most readily admitted. Origen records a tradition that Parthia was the scene of St. Thomas' missionary labours. The Persian tradition, as embodied in the *Acta*, is earlier than Origen, and knows the facts more precisely; the Apostle visited the Indo-Parthian Gondophares (or Gondophernes), king

of the Indus valley, in the middle of the first century. The rule of these Indo-Parthian *Reguli* ended before the century closed, and a resident of Nisibis, or Edessa, writing a hundred years later, would hardly have selected one of them for a principal personage of his tale, had he not received it upon good authority. We find a Bishop of "Persia and the Great India" at the Council of Nicæa, and the Persian Church long claimed exemption from all other jurisdiction on the ground that it was founded by the Apostle Thomas. In the fourth century, when the political connection between the Parthians and the Indus valley was at an end, India was regarded as the scene of the Apostle's labours. St. Ephraem Syrus, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. John Chrysostom, and other Fathers of the same period bear witness to the general belief. Nor is there anything incredible in the story. The Indus country was well known to the Jews of the Apostolic age, who identified it with Ophir, and it is certain that the converts of Pentecost would exert themselves to spread Christianity among the Jewish communities of the East. With such a catena of evidence before us, we may regard the visit to Gondophares as highly probable, if not fully proved.

Come we to the martyrdom. Apart from the Acts, we first find it mentioned in the hymns of St. Ephraem Syrus. A little later St. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, mentions it, and Brescia, Nola, and Milan boasted their possession of relics of the Apostle. At Rome a special mass in honour of his Natalitia was instituted at this time. The Philocalian (354 A.D.) and Leonine (388 A.D.) calendars make no mention of him, but his festival is included in the Gelasian of 395 A.D. The Apostle's martyrdom was therefore universally and officially recognised in the West during the latter part of the fourth century. In the East it must long have been the popular belief, as we can see from the hymns of St. Ephraem Syrus. Moreover, a magnificent martyrion in his honour was erected at this time in Edessa, and the Apostle's bones were transferred to it in 395 A.D. This age witnessed a general outburst of devotion to the Apostle.

The general belief in the martyrdom is therefore thoroughly attested for the fourth century. But how far was the belief well founded? That is a question hard to answer. The Gnostic Heracleon, in expounding his views regarding martyrdom, includes St. Thomas among the Apostles who had died in peace. "Not all who were saved," he says, "made the oral confession (before the tribunals) and then departed from the world; among them were Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others." And the great Clemens of Alexandria, who quotes the passage, does not contradict him on this point, although it would have advantaged his argument to have done so. Heracleon belonged to Sicily or Italy, and Clemens is an excellent witness for Alexandria. It is clear, therefore, that neither the Western nor the Alexandrian Church in the last quarter of the second century knew anything of the martyrdom. On the other hand, neither Italy nor Alexandria was likely to know much of events which had occurred outside the limits of the Roman Empire. Thus the whole evidence for the martyrdom rests upon the Acts of Thomas, and although part at least of these Acts is contemporary with or earlier than Heracleon, it is by no means certain that the martyrdom is not a later addition. The names given in the Acts are mostly Persian, a few are Latin, one is Greek, and in any case the Acts, even in their much revised form, make the apostle, not a martyr for his denunciations of idolatry (*comme il faut*), but for his ascetic views of marriage.

The fact of the martyrdom is the weakest point in the chain of the Bishop's argument, and we think he is more successful with regard to Mylapore. On this point two lines of reasoning are, as he holds, convincing. First, he says, the Christians of the Malabar coast would never have admitted the authenticity of the shrine on the opposite shore of India had the tradition not been true. This argument suffices for the moral conviction of the Bishop, but as the world is sceptical, he brings forward two early witnesses to the existence of the shrine. These witnesses are Gregory of Tours and the Saxon Chronicle. Gregory

wrote a Latin history of St. Thomas about 590 A.D., and in it he mentions a certain Theodore who had personally visited the martyrion in Edessa and the Apostle's shrine in India, and Gregory gives an account of both on Theodore's authority. According to Theodore, "in loco regionis Indiæ quo prius (Apostolus) quievit, monasterium habetur et templum miræ magnitudinis." The building boasted of a wonderful log which shone day and night with a supernatural illumination. Now this log plays a great part in the local legends of Mylapore, for it blocked up the river, and no human force could move it, until the Apostle drew it after him by means of his girdle. Here, therefore, is a local touch which helps to identify the place. Another may be found in the *monasterium*. For St. Jerome talks of monks from India, and St. Paula tells us of Indian visitors to Palestine. The wooded mount of St. Thomas covered with jungle was precisely the place which Christian or Buddhist monks would select for a retreat, and a clearing in the jungle is still said to mark the site of a Bishop's residence. Theodore's 'monasterium' is as important a part of the business as the shrine.

The evidence of Theodore and Gregory is borne out by a reference in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which says that King Alfred sent an embassy in 883 A.D., bearing gifts to Rome, "and also to India to St. Thomas and to St. Bartholomew." According to William of Malmesbury, Alfred's ambassador, Sighelm, reached India and returned bringing with him Oriental pearls and fragrant *attar*. William, who lived when the Crusades had barred the gates of the East, thought this journey very wonderful. But in the ninth century there was nothing incredible about it. King Alfred had communications with Jerusalem, the route from Jerusalem to Basrah was open, and there was a constant trade, although sometimes disturbed by pirates, between Basrah and the west coast of India. Sighelm would find many Christian communities on his way.

We may therefore regard it as fairly certain that a shrine of St. Thomas existed in India in the latter part of the sixth century, and that that shrine was at Mylapore. Indeed, no

other site has ever been suggested for it, and the Persian cross of the ninth century dug up on the mount shows the continuity of its history. On the other hand, Cosmas Indicopleustes, who visited the west coast of India in the beginning of the sixth century, knew nothing of it; had it then been famous he would certainly have mentioned it. It sprang into fame in the 60 or 70 years between Cosmas and Theodore; and at that time the shrine was closely connected with the monks. But before we pass further it may be well to point out the connection between the story given by Gregory, as well as in local tradition, and some famous mediæval legends. According to one of these legends the Virgin after her death appeared to doubting Thomas and gave him her girdle. This is obviously the magic girdle with which Thomas drew the log from the sea. And the supernatural splendour of the log when imbedded in the temple has many Christian and Buddhist parallels. One of the most striking will be found in the life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the Apostle of Armenia. The bones of St. John Baptist which Gregory buried in a church erected on the ruins of an Indian temple, shone with such surpassing splendour that no one might approach them. In the sixth century we are near the well-head of many a popular legend.

We are therefore at one with the Bishop in identifying the shrine visited by Theodore with Mylapore; but we have arrived at this conclusion by a somewhat different route. And we cannot refrain from pointing out that the Bishop's way is unsound. We have identified Mylapore by the log; the Bishop identifies it by the monsoon. And he brings in the monsoon by transferring details which Gregory gives of the shrine at Edessa to India. Gregory's words (which he quotes p. 80) are perfectly clear—"In supra dicta urbe in qua beatos artus diximus tumulatos," i.e. in Edessa, an open market was held for 30 days at the great festival of St. Thomas in July (a precisely similar fair used to be held two centuries earlier, according to Ammianus Marcellinus, not far off at Batne). At this festival certain wonders happened; among other things the water in the wells, usually 100 feet

down, rose nearly to the surface, no fly settled on the meat, and at the close of the festival a miraculous shower, "*emissa divinitus pluvia*," swept the temple clean of all traces of the multitude that had thronged to it. No such rain, says the Bishop, could possibly have fallen in Mesopotamia in July, and the fair must evidently be transferred to Mylapore and the July monsoon. But the very point of Gregory's story is that the rain was miraculous, "*emissa divinitus*," and Gregory says that he meant, and he evidently did mean, Edessa.

To return to Mylapore. We have seen that the shrine existed in the sixth century; may we hazard a conjecture as to its origin? By the fourth century, as we have seen, the mission of St. Thomas to India was universally accepted, and it was equally an article of popular belief that all the Apostles had suffered martyrdom. The Persian Church regarded St. Thomas as its founder; he was supposed to be the twin, and the Acts make him almost the duplicate, of our Lord. The Malabar Christians were a branch of the Persian Church. Now the author of the Acts had taken only a subordinate interest in the martyrdom of St. Thomas, and none at all in the locality; and it was open for these Indian Christians to discover the spot. In the fifth and sixth centuries the monks were the inventors of most of the popular miraculous legends; they were especially active in discovering the tombs of martyrs, and we have seen that there was a monastery at Mylapore.

Now there is a curious peculiarity about the spot where the Apostle was martyred—the earth is red; and it is very noteworthy that both in the Acts and in the local legend it is not the bones of St. Thomas which work miracles, but the dust from the scene of martyrdom which effects miraculous cures. At Edessa, on the other hand, miracles were worked by the bones. A Christian hermit who settled on the Great Mount might easily imagine, seeing the earth red, that here was ocular demonstration of the scene of the martyrdom. With the spread of the belief, a monastery and a shrine would arise, and the legend of the Acts be transferred bodily to Mylapore. The discovery of the site, far from awakening

the jealousy of the Malabar Christians, would ensure their enthusiastic assent. Such, if we may hazard a conjecture, is the probable origin of the fable.

We have confined ourselves to the main argument of the work. The Bishop also casts his net over a vast number of cognate or subordinate questions. But considerations of space forbid us to follow him in so wide a flight. It must suffice us to point out that while we entirely disagree with him regarding Pantæus, and he fails to convince us that Arabia Felix was ever called India, we must congratulate him on being the first ecclesiastical historian, to our knowledge, who has recognised Theophilus as a native of the Maldives, a fact obvious to all who have studied the connections of India with the Roman Empire. The history of early Christianity in the East, and especially in India, is a fascinating subject, but full of obscurity and of puzzling questions which, in the absence of evidence, must remain for ever open. If we are seldom convinced by the Bishop's arguments, we are thankful to him for the fulness of his materials and the antidote he offers to the ultra-sceptical position of Milne-Rae.

J. KENNEDY.

THE PENINSULAR MALAYS. I: MALAY BELIEFS. By R. J. WILKINSON, of the Civil Service of the Federated Malay States. (London: Luzac & Co. Leiden: late E. J. Brill, 1906.)

Within the compass of eighty-one pages the author of this little book endeavours to explain the mental attitude of the Malay people towards the Universe and its Maker. Nowhere else, perhaps, has this been so well done: the style is simple and unhampered by technicalities, and is sometimes not without a touch of poetry; one feels that the author has grasped the spirit of his subject and entered into the point of view of the mentality he is portraying.

The Malay is first and foremost a Muhammadan, and the

author's characterisation of Islam, as it appears in Malaya (though much of it is common ground and a good deal is derived from Snouck Hurgronje's great work on the Achinese), is well expressed, clear and to the point. On the whole his estimate is decidedly favourable, though he does not fail to note the incidental drawbacks (such as absolutism, inhumanity to non-Muhammadans, and the lowering of the status of women) which are characteristic of this great social system. For it is as a social system, a worldwide fellowship, and not merely as a creed, that Islam is regarded by the author of this book. As he justly points out, this fact has an important practical bearing: Muhammadanism, no less than Roman Catholicism, cannot, if it would, divest itself of its political aspect.

Behind his official Muhammadanism, the Malay has preserved relics of superstitious beliefs and practices that are survivals of the earlier phases of religious development through which his race has passed. Scratch off the veneer of Islam and you come to a stratum of Hinduism, where Brahma, Vishnu, and particularly Siva, together with other obsolescent half-forgotten gods of a deserted Pantheon, figure still as demonic powers unlawfully invoked in moments of supreme necessity. But these in their turn are mere shells, and at the back of them it is not difficult to detect the ancient Indonesian animism which, often masquerading under Hindu or Muhammadan forms, still remains as the core of Malay popular religion and magic. Addison asks in the *Spectator*, somewhat playfully, whether a good Christian can be a conjuror: but the Malay 'village sorcerer' and his simple clients do not realise the glaring incongruity of his position in an orthodox Muhammadan community; only a few very puritanically minded superior persons are shocked at the anomaly. Characteristically enough, for he comes of a polite race, the Malay magician's chief weapon is courtesy, the soft answer which turneth away wrath. But he is not above using threats on occasion, and his favourite form of bluff is to tell the ghost or spirit he is dealing with that he knows all about its origin and

antecedents, and that it will get into serious trouble if it does not at once comply with his requests.

In his account of the weird Malay demonology, Mr. Wilkinson of course borrows largely from Skeat's "Malay Magic," the standard work on the subject, and it were to be wished that he had given more frequent references to this and the other sources he has evidently used. But the present work is intended to be of an elementary character, and no doubt the author did not want to overburden his pages with many footnotes. Moreover, his method of presenting the subject is his own, and his analysis throws a good deal of new light on this jumble of curious superstition and ritual. In a later chapter he gives an extremely good account of the Malay conception of the soul (or rather vital principle, for it is not a soul in our sense of the word) which is at the base of this primitive system of ideas.

It would be interesting to obtain further evidence on some of the points he raises here and elsewhere throughout the book: for instance, that the primitive Indonesians did not believe in the immortality of the souls of people who died a normal death, that the black Earth Genie represents a divinity of the local aborigines (which of them? for there are at least three distinct races), and was therefore originally not Malay at all, and so on. The author criticises Skeat's explanation of Malay witchcraft as being akin to sympathetic magic, objecting that it is not sympathetic because spiritual agencies are invoked. But need a magician be strictly logical? And what is to prevent him from availing himself at one and the same time of all the means in his power? Again, Mr. Wilkinson's identification of the *raja's* share of the produce of the land with the *zakat* can hardly be historically correct: the former is an institution found in Hindu monarchies generally, and is therefore of much older standing in Malaya than the latter, which is of Muhammadan introduction. That the two may, in certain places, have been confounded by uncritical people seems no reason for perpetuating the misconception. But these, after all, are matters of secondary importance.

It will be seen that this work, which is intended to assist junior members of the Civil Service in their studies, is calculated to help the local European public, and particularly the official section of it, to understand the native point of view. That they should do so is urgently necessary. For thirty years past there has been going on in the Malay Peninsula, in countries that are technically and legally Native States, a continuous process of Europeanising the administration of government. The native princes and chiefs, who ought, theoretically, to rule these states under the supervision and with the assistance of British officers, have been quietly pushed aside and put on the shelf; and the Government is fast running to red-tape and losing touch with native ideas, customs, and requirements. Nothing could be more deplorable, for in the long run this is bound to lead to an estrangement between the European officials and the native population, of which the first symptoms are, in fact, already noticeable.

Meanwhile there has appeared on the horizon a portent that ought to serve as a danger-signal. A great revival of Muhammadan self-consciousness (we may call it fanaticism if we will) seems to be in progress, and in many parts of the Muslim world there are signs of a development of the Pan-Islamic movement, which, resting as it does on the essentially political character of Muhammadanism, draws its main strength in Malaya as elsewhere from this very same process of incautious Europeanisation. In place of the local Sultans, whom we have been in such a hurry to pension off and turn into mere ornamental figureheads, the Malay is beginning to reverence—of all people—the Sultan of Turkey! Instead of cherishing a harmless and laudable local patriotism, he is beginning to yearn for the political union of the Muhammadan world under the banner of the Khalif!

These facts have not escaped the notice of the author of this book (though, being an official, he does not express himself precisely in these terms), and they certainly call for prompt and serious consideration. The study of a work like

this will help to interpret the Malay to his European rulers, and will serve to draw the attention of the local Governments to some of the problems that beset them. It is intended to be one of a series; the others that are yet to come are to deal with Malay literature, life and customs, government and law, history, and industries. If these maintain the standard set by the present work, the student of Malay subjects will have reason to look forward to their appearance.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

EPIGRAPHIA CARNATICA, Vol. IX. Inscriptions in the Bangalore District. By B. LEWIS RICE, C.I.E., MRAS., Director of Archæological Researches in Mysore. (Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press, 1905.)

By the recent issue of this volume, containing the inscriptions of the Bangalore District, Mr. Rice has completed the series of his *Epigraphia Carnatica*, so far as the texts and translations are concerned. Vol. x. was published in 1905; vol. xi. in 1902; and vol. xii. in 1904.

The present volume is to a certain extent a disappointment. From hints thrown out in the Introductions to volumes previously issued, it was expected that this volume would contain records which might help to settle some of the disputed questions regarding the Gaṅga princes of the Gaṅgavāḍi province. It does not, however, include any such records. And, in the table and detailed account of the Gaṅgas which Mr. Rice has given in his present Introduction, he has only been able, for the period before about A.D. 750, to recapitulate the fictions, presented in the spurious records, with which we have long been familiar. The volume, however, gives us 1,069 new inscriptions, amongst which some forty appear to belong to the period before A.D. 1000. And these fresh materials are sure to yield much matter valuable from one or another point, when we have time to study them in detail.

A general idea of the amount and nature of the work produced in this series has already been given (see this Journal, 1905. 289 ff.). It is gratifying to learn from the present Preface that it is proposed to continue the services of Mr. Rice, so far at any rate as to produce another volume "bringing to one convenient focus the varied historical details scattered throughout the series." It is hoped that that volume will give us more than simply an historical discourse. To enable us to utilize properly all the records of the whole series, we need a general index, which shall give us an arrangement of the inscriptions according to the consecutive order of their recorded or deducible dates, with a second arrangement of them according to the dynasties and families to which they belong, on lines similar to those of Professor Kielhorn's List of the Inscriptions of Southern India in the *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. vii, Appendix, and an index of at any rate all proper names and names of territories and places.

It is also earnestly hoped that the Government of Mysore will eventually give us a volume which shall be devoted to actual facsimile reproductions of all the more important records anterior to, say, A.D. 1000, with a selection from the later ones. In this enormous mass of some 9,000 records, there is much matter which, without such facilities for critical study, can never be properly examined and utilized to advantage.

J. F. FLEET.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

FRIEDRICH VON SPIEGEL.

It seems but fitting that our Journal should contain some record of the passing of that venerable scholar and master of Avestic learning, Friedrich von Spiegel, whose death occurred as far back as December 15th. With Spiegel, the last but one—for Justi still remains—of the ‘Old Guard’ of Iranian and Avestic scholarship disappears, after a career of unusual length (aged 85) and still more unusual fulness. In default of a more competent pen, may I be permitted to contribute these few words as a modest *Nachruf* in memory of one who for over half a century was, in his own department of Oriental research, “il maestro di color che sanno”? Spiegel’s activity goes back sixty years; but what is more worthy of record is that his literary output forms in itself a complete library of Iranian and Avestic lore in all departments, as the mere list of his publications will show, as far as I know, a unique record in any department of Oriental scholarship. This is probably owing to the fact of Spiegel’s lifelong and undivided devotion to the one special department of Orientalism—Ancient Irān, its history, people, languages, and literatures, above all its national religion and sacred books. He declined to allow himself to be drawn aside, like so many other scholars, into other, even adjacent, fields of study, and he was true to his first love till old age and increasing infirmity forced him to lay down the pen for ever.

As a young man, Friedrich von Spiegel’s first book on Iranian literature was a foretaste of what his subsequent lifework was to be. It is a well-selected and well-arranged reading-book of Persian literature, *Chrestomathia Persica* (Lipsiæ, 1846), containing extracts from the poets Jāmi,

Firdūsi, Nizāmi, Chāqāni, Saadi, with a glossary. But (with two notable exceptions) all his literary output in the following years was devoted to the more ancient literary records of the Iranian race, and was part of the great outburst of activity in this field inaugurated by the epoch-working writings of Eug. Burnouf. This can best be shown by a chronological list of Spiegel's chief books, for his contributions to periodical literature are too numerous to be chronicled. The following contains the principal ones:—

- 1841. *Kammavakya*. First German edition of the Pāli text.
- 1845. *Anecdota Pālica*. By these two works Spiegel became the founder of Pāli studies in Germany.
- 1850. *Ueber einige eingeschobene Stellen im Vendidad*,¹ a short essay which he distinctly sets forth as a forerunner of an edition of the Vendidad and a commentary thereto.
- 1850–1853. *Der 19^{te} Fargard des Vendidad*.
- 1851. *Grammatik der Parsi-Sprache*.
- 1852–1863. *Avesta, die heiligen Schriften der Parsen. Aus dem Grundtexte übersetzt*. 3 vols. This was the first authoritative translation of the Sacred Book in a European language. [An English rendering of Spiegel's version by Bleek appeared at Hertford in 1864.]
- 1853. *Zur Interpretation des Vendidad*.
- 1853–1858. *Avesta, die heiligen Schriften der Parsen. Zum ersten Male im Grundtexte sammt der Huzvarēsh-Uebersetzung herausgegeben*. 2 vols. This may be reckoned his *opus magnum*. The Zend text was not superseded till Geldner's great edition in 1895, and for the Phl. Vendidad it is still the only edition.
- 1856–1860. *Einleitung in die traditionellen Schriften der Parsen*. The two vols. under this very inadequate title contain (1) the first Pahlavi (Huzvarēsh) Grammar ever published, and (2) the first chrestomathy and glossary of the same language.
- 1861. *Neriosengh's Sanskrit-Uebersetzung des Yagna*. Still the only edition.

¹ Spiegel had already communicated a paper on "Parsi Traditions" to the very first volume of the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society (1846), and one on "MSS. of the Vendidad and the Relations of the Huzvāresch (Pahlavi Version, to the Zend Text" to the Bavarian Royal Academy in 1848.

1862. *Die Altpersischen Keilinschriften. Im Grundtexte mit Uebersetzung, Grammatik, und Glossar.*
1863. *Erän: das Land zwischen dem Indus und Tigris.*
- 1864-1868. *Commentar über das Avesta.* 2 vols.
1867. *Grammatik der Altbaktrischen Sprache.* The first, and for long the only, Zend grammar.¹
1867. *Das Leben Zarathustra's.*
- 1871-1878. *Eränische Alterthumskunde.* 3 vols. Still an indispensable thesaurus of Ancient Iranian history and geography.
1874. *Arische Studien.*
1881. New edition of *Altpersischen Keilinschriften.*
1882. *Vergleichende Grammatik der Alteränischen Sprachen.* The only comparative grammar of these languages that we possess. This was the last book which Spiegel published; but numerous learned articles from his pen in the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society and other reviews attested his intellectual activity during the last twenty years of his life.

The mere enumeration given above suffices to show that Spiegel's astonishing literary output practically covered by itself the whole ground later on worked so effectually by the numerous scholars who co-operated in the invaluable *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*. The two dozen volumes which contain it is in reality an Iranian Cyclopædia; of the greater part of it, it can by no means be said that it is obsolete, and much of it is still alone in the field.

How much succeeding generations of Avestic scholars have owed to Spiegel's *bahnbrechend* works, from which most of them have learnt their first elements, it would not be easy to say. It is all the more strange that his name and merits seem to have been somewhat neglected of late among the younger generation.

Spiegel was not only a prodigious worker; he was the leader of a school. The very title-page of his translation of the Avesta contained a profession of principles ("mit steter Rücksicht auf die Tradition"). Avestic scholarship

¹ The title indicates that Spiegel shared the now generally abandoned view that Zend was the language of Bactria.

in those days was sharply divided into two camps: there was the 'Vedic' school of Roth, which saw everything through Sanskrit spectacles, and interpreted the Avesta in terms of the Veda, despising as valueless the indigenous traditions represented by the later Pahlavi literature, and to some extent retained by the modern Parsis; and there was the Traditionalist school, which refused to deny all weight to these latter, and still more to treat everything Avestic as a mere local variety of Vedic thought and belief. Spiegel, with Justi by his side, was the champion of the latter school. Long and bitter was the warfare waged. But Spiegel lived long enough to see the triumph of the methods he had so long contended for. De Harlez, who was virtually his pupil, inflicted a deathblow on the more extreme views of the Vedic school; and Darmesteter, himself much more largely influenced by de Harlez than he ever acknowledged, may be said to have completed the victory, which has since been consolidated by scholars like Wilhelm and Jackson and their school. It is pathetic to note that the very last article I can find from the hand of the aged Spiegel is a short note in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society* for 1903, "Über den Zoroastrismus," in which the veteran sums up the results in the case India *v.* Irān, and, as a kind of scientific 'last will and testament,' reasserts that "the Old Persian religion has nothing to do with India," and that the chief influence came from the West, originally from Babylon.

Spiegel, a Bavarian, was born at Kitzingen, near Würzburg, on 11th July, 1820, and as a young man entered the neighbouring University of Erlangen, with which his entire scientific career was destined to be connected. As a pupil of Rückert's, he devoted himself early to Oriental study; took his doctor's degree in 1842 at Jena, and then spent some time at Copenhagen studying the Zend and Pahlavi MSS. there preserved, following up this work by similar researches in the libraries of Paris, London, and Oxford. He was called to the Chair of Oriental Languages at Erlangen in 1849, and faithfully laboured at that post

until 1890. I well remember paying him a visit at the University in the early 80's, and was impressed with the modest simplicity and kindly geniality of the great scholar, and the almost humble surroundings of his unpretending home, which he laughingly contrasted with the lordly splendour he had seen enjoyed by the 'dons' of Oxford in their beautiful Colleges. The tenour of his whole life was in keeping with this domestic simplicity and entire absence of all pretence or personal pride. A fair share of honours, academic and royal, fell to him during his long career, yet he was never drawn from his life of quiet retirement and strenuous labour, in which few Orientalists have surpassed him. On his resignation of his chair in 1890 Spiegel retired to Munich, where he passed his last years of life.

Spiegel may be said to have left as his scientific heir his son-in-law, Dr. Eugen Wilhelm, Professor at the University of Jena, who already stands in the very front rank of Iranian and Avestic scholars.

✠ L. C. CASARTELLI.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, Annual Report, 1903-4.
Calcutta, 1906. 4to.

Presented by the Government of India.

AVESTA, PAHLAVI, AND ANCIENT PERSIAN STUDIES in honour of the
late Shams-ul-Ulama Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana.
First Series. *London*, 1904. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Beccari, Camillo. Documenti Inediti per la Storia d'Etiopia.
Roma, 1903. Imp. 8vo.

Bobbili, Maharajah of. Sri Krishna Karma-Thraya and Matha-
Thraya. Pamphlet. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Breasted, J. H. Ancient Records of Egypt. Vol. iv: Twentieth
to Twenty-sixth Dynasties. *Chicago and London*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Browne, E. G. Literary History of Persia. Vol. ii: Firdawsi to
Sa'di. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publisher.

Brünnow, R. Das Kitābu-l-Itbā'i wa-l-Muzāwagati des Abu-l-
Husain Ahmed ibn Fāris ibn Zakariya. *Giessen*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publisher.

Bushell, S. W. Chinese Art. 2 vols. Victoria and Albert Museum
Art Handbook. Large-paper edition. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

————— Chinese Art. Vol. ii. *London*, 1906. Crown 8vo.

Presented by the Board of Education, S. Kensington.

Clay, A. T. Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur.
Series A: Cuneiform Texts. Vol. xv. Edited by H. V.
Hilprecht. *Philadelphia*, 1906. 4to.

(*Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.*)

Presented by the University of Pennsylvania.

Dobrée, Alfred. Japanese Sword Blades. 8vo.

(*Reprinted from the Archæological Journal.*)

Presented by the Author.

Edmunds, A. J. Buddhist Texts in John. *Philadelphia*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Eliot, Sir John. Climatological Atlas of India. *Edinburgh*,
1906. Fol.

Presented by the Government of India.

Ettinghausen, Maurice L. Harṣa Vardhana, Empereur et Poète
de l'Inde Septentrionale. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Foster, William. Descriptive Catalogue of the Paintings, Statues,
etc., in the India Office. 3rd ed. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

Presented by the India Office.

Gratzl, Emil. Die Altarabischen Frauennamen. *Leipzig*, 1906. 8vo.

Grierson, G. A. Linguistic Survey of India. Vol. vii: Specimens
of the Marāthī Language. *Calcutta*, 1905.

Presented by the Government of India.

Hurgronje, Dr. C. Snouck. The Achehnese. Translated by
A. W. S. O'Sullivan. 2 vols. *Leyden and London*, 1906.
Imp. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

JAPAN SOCIETY'S EXHIBITION, 1905. Catalogue of Arms and Armour.
London. 4to.

Presented by Alfred Dobrée, Esq.

Karabacek, J. von. Arabic Palæography. *Wien*, 1906. Pamph. 8vo.

Presented by the Author.

Keene, H. G. History of India. 2 vols. New and revised
edition. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

Klein, Rev. F. A. The Religion of Islam. *London*, 1906. 8vo.
• *From the Publishers.*

Lajonquière, E. Lunet de. Ethnographie du Tonkin Septentrional.
Paris, 1906. 8vo.
From the Publisher.

Langdon, Stephen. Lectures on Babylonia and Palestine. *Paris*
(*New York and London*), 1906. Sm. 8vo.
From the Publisher.

Lévi, Sylvain. Notes Chinoises sur l'Inde. *Hanoi*, 1906. 8vo. \
Presented by Lord Reay.

Paez, P. Petri. Historia Æthiopiæ. Liber i et ii. *Romæ*,
Parisiis, Lipsiæ, Londini, 1906. Imp. 8vo.
(*Rerum Æthiopicarum Scriptores Occidentales*, vol. vii.)

Russell, Alexander David, and Abdullah al-Ma'mûn Suhrawady.
First Steps in Muslim Jurisprudence. Arabic text, English
translation, notes, etc. *London*, 1906. 8vo.

Schiaparelli, Celestino. Ibn Gubayr, Viaggia. *Roma*, 1906. 8vo.
From the Publishers.

Smith, Vincent A. James Prinsep. Pamphlet. 8vo.
(*Reprinted from "East and West," July, 1906.*)
Presented by the Author.

Thurston, Edgar. Ethnographic Notes in Southern India. *Madras*,
1906. 8vo.
Presented by the Madras Government.

Vollers, Karl. Volksprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien.
Strassburg, 1906. 8vo.
• • *From the Publishers.*

———. Katalog der Islamischen, Christlich-Orientalischen,
Jüdischen, und Samaritanischen Handschriften. *Leipzig*,
1906. 8vo. •
(*Katalog der Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Leipzig*,
Bd. ii.)
From the Publishers.

- Wilson, C. R. Old Fort William in Bengal. 2 vols. London,
1906. 8vo. •

(*Indian Records Series.*)

Presented by the India Office.

- Zwaan, J. de. The Treatise of Dionysius Bar Salibhi against the
Jews. Part i, Syriac Text. Leiden, 1906. 8vo.

From the Publishers.

INDEX FOR 1906.

A.

- ‘Abd al-Šamad, 853.
 Abū Naṣr-i-Fārsī, 11.
 Abū Nu‘aym al-Isfahānī, 304.
 Abu’l-‘Alā ‘Aṭā b. Ya‘qūb, poet, known as Nākūk, 42.
 Abu’l-Falāḥ ‘Abdu’l-Ḥayy, 797.
 Abu’l-Faraj, 23.
 Abu’l-Faraj-i-Rūnī, poet, 31.
 Aḍhakōsikyā, 693; in the seventh pillar edict of Aśōka, 401.
 Aḥmad al-Sabtī, 853.
 AṬYANGAR, S. K., Bṛhat Kathā, 689.
 Ajātasattu, 665, 884.
 Akhtari, poet, 42.
 Alexander’s altars, 1000.
 ‘Alī b. Uthmān al-Jullābī al-Hujvīrī, 304.
 AMEDROZ, H. F., Unidentified MS. by Ibn al-Jauzi, 851.
 Anas b. Mālik, 851.
 Anniversary meeting, 751.
 Antioch, its three eras, 708.
 Antiquarian notes in Java, 419.
 Arabic inscriptions on textiles at the South Kensington Museum, 387.
 Ardvi Sūra Anāhita, Sacrifice to, 825.
 ARNOLD, C. VERNON, Vedic Metre, 716, 997.
 Arrow well, 577.
 Aśōka, story of conversion to Buddhism, 885.
 — traditional date in Kashmīr and India, 982.
 Aśōka’s seventh pillar edict, 401.
 Aśōkarāja-Sūtra, translated into Chinese 512 A.D., 891.
 Aśōkāvadāna, 889, 891.

- Atharva Veda, Anatomical references in, 916.
 ‘Ātika, Yazid’s daughter, 855.
 Ātreya, the medical teacher of Taxila, 919.
 AUFRECHT, T., Negative *a* with finite verb in Sanskrit, 993.
 Aurangzeb’s revenues, 349.
 Avantivarman, Coins of, 844.

B.

- Bābar-nāma, Bukhārā MS., 79; British Museum MS., 80; Naẓar Bāy Turki-stānī’s MS., 81; St. Petersburg Foreign Office MS., 81; John Rylands Library MS., 83; Asiatic Society of Bengal MS., 84; India Office MS., 84; Senkovski MS., 84; St. Petersburg University MS., 85; Haydarābād MS., 87.
 Bahrāmshāh, 27.
 Bargī and Sabaio, Derivation of, 704.
 BARNETT, L. D., Negative *a* with finite verbs in Sanskrit, 722.
 Baṣra, Plague at, 857.
 BAYNES, H., History of the Logos, 373.
 Bendall, C., obituary, 527.
 BEVERIDGE, A., Haydarābād Codex of the Bābar-nāma, 79.
 BEVERIDGE, H., Aurangzeb’s Revenues, 349.
 — Derivation of the words Bargī and Sabaio, 704.
 Bhānumatī of Cakrapānidatta, 283.
 Bhāskara identical with Bhāskara - bhaṭṭa, 286.

- Bhoja and Dallana, 692.
 Bijoli rock inscription, 700. ●
 Bishru'l-Hāfi, 309.
 BLADEN, C. O., Siam and the Malay Peninsula, 107.
 Boro-Būdūr temple, 423.
 Brahmadeva, 292; identified with Śrī-brahma, 699.
 Brahmanic altar, Construction of, 924.
 — influence now supreme in Bengal, 361.
 Brambanan temple, 421.
 Brhaddevatā, metre, 1 et seq.; date, 1; decisive for the early date of Sanskrit epic poetry, 3.
 Brhaddevatā and the Sanskrit epic, 441.
 Brhat Kathā, its versions, 689; date, 689; Tamil recension, 690.
 BROWNE, E. G., Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān, 11.
 Buddha, Corporeal relics of, 655, 881; distribution according to Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, 657, 881; according to Divyāvadāna, 882; according to Dipavaṃśa, 894; according to Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king, 896; according to Fa-hian, 899; according to Buddhaghōṣa, 903; Thūpas built over, 908.
 — Three bodies of a, 943.
 Buddhaghōṣa's account of relics of Buddha, 903.
 Buddhism introduced into Java, 420.
 Buddhist dogma, Studies in, 943.
 Bukhārā MS. of the Bābar-nāma, 79.
 BURGESS, J., Mo-la-p'o, 220.
 — Orientation of Mosques, 454.
 BURX, R., Coins of the Maukharis and of the Thanesar Line, 843.

C.

- Cabala, theosophical work, 121.
 Cakrapāṇidatta, date, 280; commentary on Susrūta, 283.
 Candrakīrti on doctrine of Three Bodies, 962.
 Careri, Dr. Gemelli, Credibility of, 352.

- Chandi Būbrāh temple in Java, 430.
 Chandi Jāgō temple in Java, 434.
 Chandi Jāvī temple in Java, 437.
 Chandi Kidal temple in Java, 421.
 Chandi Mendūt temple in Java, 428.
 Chandi Pārī temple in Java, 438.
 Chandi Pāvon temple in Java, 429.
 Chandi Sēvu group of temples in Java, 422, 430.
 Chandragupta, Date of, 984.
 Coins of the Maukharis and of the Thanesar Line, 843.
 Commentaries on Susrūta, 699.
 Corporeal relics of Buddha, 655, 881; distribution according to Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, 657, 881; according to Divyāvadāna, 882; according to Dipavaṃśa, 894; according to Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king, 896; according to Fa-hian, 899; according to Buddhaghōṣa, 903; Thūpas built over, 908.
 — Note by Dr. Grierson, 1002.
 CRAWSHAY - WILLIAMS, E., Rock-dwellings at Rench, 217.
 Cuneiform inscriptions of Van, pt. vii, 611.

D.

- Dallana, his Nibandha Saṃgraha, 283; date, 283; relation to Cakrapāṇidatta, 290; and Bhoja, 692; quotes Brahmadeva, 699.
 Date in the Takht-i-Bahi inscription, 706.
 — of the poet Magha, 728. ●
 Davids, Testimonial to Professor Rhys, 519.
 Delhi-Siwālik column, 401; removed from Topa, 407.
 Devadaha or Koli, city, 578.
 Dharmakāya, 946; as Buddhology, 947; = Bodhi = Nirvāṇa, 949; as an ontological principle, 950; in relation to Sambhogakāya, 962.
 Dhu'l-Nūn al-Miṣri, founder of theosophical Sūfism, 309 et seq.
 Dipavaṃśa, narrative of possession of relics of Buddha by Aśoka, 894.

- Divyāvadāna, narrative* of distribution of Buddha's relics, 882.
Durgā, her origin and history, 355.

E.

- Edkins, Rev. Dr., obituary, 269.
Epics (Sanskrit), controversy as to date, 2.

F.

- Fa-hian's account of relics of Buddha, 899.
Farīdu'ddīn 'Attār, 303.
FERGUSON, D., Origin of Sabao, 993.
FLEET, J. F., Inscription on the Piprāvā Vase, 149.
— Meaning of Adhakōsika in the Seventh Pillar-Edict of Aśoka, 401.
— The name Gujarāt, 458.
— Tradition about the Corporeal Relics of Buddha, 655, 881.
— Date in the Takht-i-Bahi Inscription, 706.
— Inscription on the Peshawar Vase, 711.
— Traditional Date of Kanishka, 979.
— The Yojana and the Li, 1011.
Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king, account of relics of Buddha, 896.

G.

- Gadādhara, father of Vangasena, 287.
Ganvarā village, stūpa, 574.
Gauḍa Deśa, 442.
Gayadāsa, 285, 293; date, 302.
General meetings, 265, 523, 751, 769.
Gerund as passive in Sanskrit, 693, 992.
Gold Medal Presentation to Dr. Pope, 769.
Gondophernes, date of accession, 706.
GRIERSON, G. A., Yuan Chwang's Mo-la-p'o, 95.
— Bhaddēvatā and the Sanskrit Epic, 441.
— Dallana and Bhoja, 692.
— Adhakōsika, 693.

- GRIERSON, G. A., Inscription on Peshawar Vase, 993.
— Notes on Dr. Fleet's Article on the Corporeal Relics of Buddha, 1002.
Grīvā, meaning of term, 916 et seq.
Gūḍhabodhaka Saṁgraha, 699.
GUEST, A. R., Arabic Inscriptions on Textiles at the South Kensington Museum, 387.
Gujarāt, derivation of name, 458.
Gurudharmas, 443.
Guṭihavā, 553.

H.

- Haft Iqlīm, 23.
Hajjāj, 860, 862; death, 869.
Hāmūn lake or Zarrah, 198.
al-Hārith, pretended prophet, executed, 864.
al-Harrā, battle, 856.
Harṣa, Coin of, 844.
Haydarābād codex of the Bābar-nāma, 79.
Herambasena, author of Gūḍhabodhaka Saṁgraha, 679.
Hilyatu'l-Awliyā of Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣfahānī, 304.
HIRSCHFELD, H., Notes on the Poem ascribed to al-Samau'al, 701.
Hishām, 875.
History of the Logos, 373.
HOERNLE, A. F. R., Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine, 283, 915.
— Ancient MSS. from Khotan, 695.
— Commentaries on Suśruta, 699.
HOEY, W., Sakyas and Kapilavastu, 453.
— Alexander's Altars, 1000.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Institution of, 265.
HOPKINS, E. W., Modifications of the Karma Doctrine, 581.

I.

- Ibn al-Jauzi, Unidentified MS. by, 851;
Shudhūr al-'Uqūd by, 851.
Ibn Qutaiba, The plague of, 877.

Identifications in the region of Kapilavastu, 553.

Imām Muḥammad b. 'Alī, 868.

Indian (ancient) anatomy, 916.

Indian medicine, Studies in, 283, 915.

— some obscure anatomical terms, 915.

Indo-Parthian names, etymology, 204.

Indo-Scythian names, etymology, 204.

Inscriptions (Arabic) on textiles at the South Kensington Museum, 387.

Inscription, Takht-i-Bahi, 706.

— on the Peshāwar Vase, 711, 993.

— on the Piprāwā Vase, 149, 452, 453; arrangement, 153; construction, 155; text, 156 et seq.; translation, 157 et seq.; people referred to, 159 et seq.; age, 178.

Inscriptions (Cuneiform) of Van, pt. vii, 611.

Īśānavarman, Coins of, 844.

Issedones, 200.

Ithāsa literature, Early date of, 1.

J.

Jaijṇa, 285, 292.

Jatru, meaning of the term, 922.

Java, antiquarian notes, 419; introduction of Buddhism, 420.

Javanese supremacy over Malay peninsula merely pretension, 107.

— art, 420.

JOLLY, J., *Suśruta* on Mosquitoes, 222.

K.

Ka'ba, Burning of, 857.

Kālsī version of the rock-edicts, 407.

Kanakamuni's town, 563.

Kanishka, traditional date, 979.

Kapilavastu, Identifications in the region of, 553; position of, 554.

— and the Sakyas, 453.

Karma doctrine, Modifications of, 581; its Brahmanistic form, 581; its Buddhist form, 582; its relation to hell torture, 582; its incongruities, 583; changed by prayers for the dead, 584; abrogated by divine grace, 586;

transferred Karma, 587; causes of modifications, 588.

Karṣaka, 568.

Kārtikakunḍa, 286.

Kashfu'l Mahjūb by 'Alī b. 'Uthmān al-Jullābī al-Hujvīrī, 304.

Kēdah, Malay state, 110.

KEITH, A. B., *Metre* of the Bṛhad-devatā, 1.

— *Gerund* as *Passive* in Sanskrit, 692.

— *Vedic Metre*, 718.

— *Negative a* with *finite verb* in Sanskrit, 722.

Kelishin inscription, 611.

Khotan, Ancient MSS. from, 695.

K'ie-ch'a identified by Mr. V. A. Smith with Cutch, 100; with Khīṭa, i.e. Kaira, 100-101.

KIELHORN, F., *Bijoli Rock Inscription: The Uttamaśikhara-purāṇa*, 700.

— *Wrongly Calculated Dates*, and some *Dates of the Lakshmanasēna Era*, 1009.

Koli or Devadaha, city, 578.

Koṇā, 563.

Koṇāgamana (Buddha), 553.

Koṇāgamana's town or Koṇā, 563.

Kos measures less than 3 miles, 410.

Krakucchanda, 454, 553.

Krakucchanda's town, 561.

Krośa or kos, 410.

Kūfa, 856.

Kumārī worship in Oriya tracts, 358.

Kunāla, son of Aśoka, 892.

Kunālāvadāna, 891.

Kuru-Pāṇchāla war, 225.

Kushans, 200.

L.

Lahari Kudān, 567.

Lakshmanasēna era, dates, 1009.

Langkasuka, 119.

Li, Value of, 1013.

Logos, History of, 370 et seq.; in Kabballistic system, 374-375; in *R̥gveda*, 377; in Chaldean epic of the Kosmos, 376; in *Vedānta sūtras*, 377; in *Avesta*, 378; in China and Japan, 380-383.

Lumbini garden located, 177.

M.

- MACDONELL, A. A., Study of Sanskrit as an Imperial Question, 673.
 Madhuban plate of Harṣa, 693.
 Madhukoṣa, 289.
 Magha, Date of the poet, 728.
 Mahābhārata (Ādiparva, ch. 94), 225.
 Mahāparinibbāna Sutta on Corporeal Relics of Buddha, 655, 881; value of narrative, 667.
 Mahā-prajñāpāramitā Sūtra, MS. from Khotan, 696.
 Mahāyāna school of Buddhism, 943.
 Mahāyānism of Javanese art, 420.
 Mahēśvara, author of Viśva-prakāśa and Saḥasāṅka Carita, 699.
 Majma'u'l-Fuṣḥā, 23.
 Malacca in fifteenth century an independent Malay kingdom, 112.
 Malay history, Questions of, discussed, 108.
 Malay peninsula formerly occupied by a Mon-Khmer race, 117.
 Maldivian talismans, 121.
 Manāqib 'Omar, 852, 855.
 Manucci on Aurangzeb's revenues, 353.
 Manuscripts, Turkish and Persian, in Hunterian Library, Glasgow University, 595.
 — Ancient, from Khotan, 695.
 MARGOLIOUTH, D. S., Poem attributed to al-Samau'al, 363; Additional Note on, 1001.
 Marj Rāhiṭ, battle, 858.
 Ma'rūf al-Karkhī defines Sūfiism, 306; acquainted with doctrine of the Mandaeans, 999.
 Marwān, Accession of, 858; death, 858.
 Marwān b. Muḥammad, 876; defeated at the Zāb River, 877; his two sons, 879.
 Maslama's invasion of Byzantine territory, 866.
 Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān, interned in Castle of Maranj, 11; composed poems in praise of Mas'ūd, 11; released, 11; composed M-qasīda, 14; length of imprisonment, 25; later qasīdas, 25 et seq.; poets contemporary with, 31.
 Maukharis, Coins of, 843; epigraphic

- references to, 849; defeated by Dāmōdara Gupta, 850.
 MAZUMDAR, B. C., Mahābhārata, 225.
 — Durgā, her Origin and History, 355.
 — Gauḍa Deśa, 442.
 Medal Presentations, 769.
 Medicine, Ancient Indian, 283, 915; some obscure anatomical terms, 915 et seq.
 Metre of the Brhaddevatā, 1.
 MILLS, L., Pahlavi Texts of Yasna LVII-LXI, 53.
 — Pahlavi Text of Yasna LXV, 825.
 Mir'āt al-Zamān, 854.
 Mirātu'l-'Aālam records, statistics of Aurangzeb's revenues, 349.
 MİRZĀ MUḤAMMAD of Qazwin, Mas'ūd-i-Sa'd-i-Salmān, 11.
 Modifications of the Karma doctrine, 581.
 Mo-la-p'o of Yuan Chwang, 95, 220; identical with Mālava, 221.
 Mosques, Orientation of, 454.
 Mosquitoes mentioned by Sūruta, 222; and malaria, 224.
 Mu'āwīa, 855.
 Muḥammad Khaṭībī, Commissioner of Quzdār in Seistan, 11.
 Muḥiyyuddīn Ibnū'l-'Arabī, Life of, 797.
 Mu'izzī, poet, 49.
 Mukhtār, 858.
 Muntazam of Ibn al-Jauzī, 851.

N.

- Nafaḥatu'l-Uns of Jāmī, 303.
 Navamī day, 360.
 Nibandha Saṁgraha, 283.
 NICHOLSON, R. A., Origin and Development of Sūfiism, 303.
 — Lives of 'Umar Ibnū'l-Farīd and Muḥiyyu'ddīn Ibnū'l-'Arabī, 797.
 — Saying of Ma'rūf al-Karkhī, 999.
 Nirmāṇakāya in relation to Dharmakāya, 962; doctrine, 968; Mahāyānist orthodox Buddhology, 970; doctrine as a part of the ontology, 974.
 NOTICES OF BOOKS—
 Adler, E. N., About Hebrew Manuscripts, 228.

- Ananda Ranga Pillai, *Private Diary of*, 246.
- Arnold, E. V., *Vedic Metre*, 284.
- Bābar, Emperor, *The Bābar-nāma*, being the Autobiography of, edited with Preface and Notes by Annette S. Beveridge (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, vol. i), 1015.
- Barnett, L. D., *Some Sayings of the Upanishads*, 295.
- Bevan, A. A., *The Nakā'id of Jarir and al-Farazdak*, 256.
- Blechynden, Kathleen, *Calcutta, Past and Present*, 236.
- Bowrey, Thomas, *Geographical Account of the Countries round the Bay of Bengal*, 465.
- Breasted, James Henry, *A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest*, 744.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis, *The Egyptian Heaven and Hell*, 746.
- Chotzner, J., *Hebrew Humour, and other Essays*, 227.
- Christensen, Arthur, *Recherches sur les Rubaiyat de 'Omar Hayyām*, 508.
- Comparetti, D., e Vitelli, G., *Papiri Greco-Egizii*, vol. i, 228.
- Cotton, Julius James, *Indian Monumental Inscriptions*, vol. iii: Madras, 260.
- Dahlke, Paul, *Aufsätze zum Verständnis des Buddhismus*, 505.
- al-Dahṣa, Ibn Ḥaṭīb, *Tuhfa Dawī-l-Arab über Namen und Nisben bei Boharī, Muslim, Mālik*, 473.
- Das, Syamsundar, *Annual Report on the Search for Hindi Manuscripts*, 497.
- Decorse, Dr., and Gaudefroy-Demombynes, M., *Rabah et les Arabes du Chari*, 475.
- Deussen, Paul, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, translated by Rev. A. S. Geden, 490.
- Edmunds, Albert J., *Buddhist and Christian Gospels*, 243.
- Flemming, Joh., and Lietzmann, *Apollinaristische Schriften Syrisch*, 229.
- Forlong, J. G. R., *The Faiths of Man*, 729.
- Fuye, Allotte de la, *Monnaies de l'Elymaïde*, 507.
- Gait, E. A., *A History of Assam*, 733.
- Gerini, Colonel G. E., *Historical Retrospect of Junkceylon Island*, 503.
- Hill, S. C., *Bengal in 1756-57*, 231.
- Hirsch, S. A., *A Commentary on the Book of Job from a Hebrew MS.*, 482.
- Hirschfeld, Hartwig, *Judah Halevi's Kitab al-Khazari*, 513.
- Hirth, Friedrich, *Scraps from a Collector's Note Book*, 479.
- Löhr, Max, *Der vulgararabische Dialekt von Jerusalem nebst Texten und Wörterverzeichnis dargestellt*, 481.
- Medlycott, Bishop A. E., *India and the Apostle Thomas*, 1020.
- Murray, Margaret A., *Elementary Egyptian Grammar*, 509.
- Newberry, Percy E., *Scarabs: an Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings*, 511.
- Rabbath, Père Antoine, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du Christianisme en Orient*, 249.
- Rice, B. Lewis, *Epigraphia Carnatica*, vol. ix: *Inscriptions in the Bangalore District*, 1033.
- Ryder, Arthur William, *The Little Clay Cart (Mṛcchakatikā)*, 258.
- Sandberg, Graham, *Tibet and the Tibetans*, 742.
- Schulthess, Friedrich, *Christlich-Palaestinische Fragmente aus der Omajjaden-Moschee zu Damaskus*, 230.
- Stein, M. A., *Report of the Archæological Survey Work in the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan*, 737.
- Taylor, Arnold C., *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, vol. 238.
- Waddell, L. A., *Lhasa and its Mysteries*, 476.

Walsh, E. H. C., A Vocabulary of the Tromowa Dialect of Tibetan spoken in the Chumbi Valley, 740.
 Wilkinson, R. J., The Peninsular Malays: I. Malay Beliefs, 1029.
 Workman, W. H. and F. B., Through Town and Jungle, 519.
 Numismatics, coins of the Maukharis and of the Thanesar Line, 843.
 Nyagrodha Grove, city, 572.

O.

OBITUARY NOTICES—

Bendall, Professor C., 527.
 Edkins, Rev. Dr. J., 269.
 Oppert, Professor J., 272.
 Spiegel, F. v., 1035.
 Om Maṇi padme hūm, 464.
 Omar b. 'Abd al-Azīz, 871.
 "Omitted hundreds," Theory of, 981.
 Oppert, Professor J., obituary, 272.
 Orientation of mosques, 454.

P.

Padmapāṇi, 464.
 Pahlavi texts of Yasna lvii-lxi, 53; of Yasna lxxv, 525.
 Pali and Sanskrit, 443.
 Paltā Devī, 553.
 Pāṃśupradānāvadāna, 882, 8:9.
 Panataram group of stone temples in Java, 431.
 Paraṇa village, 578.
 Paśēnadi, king of Kōsala, 167; consults Buddha, 168; marries a Sakya, 168.
 Pasianoi, 200 et seq.
 Patani, Malay state, 110.
 Persian and Turkish MSS. in the Hunterian Library, Glasgow University, 595.
 Peshawar Vase inscription, 711, 992, 993; in verse, 712.
 Piprahavā ruins, 553.
 Piprahavā Vase inscription, 575, 655; in verse, 711.
 Piprahavā Vase inscription, 149, 452, 453, 575, 655; arrangement, 153; con-

struction, 155; text, 156 et seq.; translation, 157 et seq.; people referred to, 159 et seq.; age, 178.
 Poem attributed to al-Samau'al, 363; not pre-Koranic, 366; additional note on, 1001.
 POUSSIN, L. DE LA V., Pali and Sanskrit, 443; Les Gurudharmas, 443.
 — Three Bodies of a Buddha (*Trikāya*), 943.
 Prajāpati, 573.
 Pratāpśīla, Coins of, 844; identified with Prabhākara-varḍhana, 847.
 Pratolī (Sanskrit) and its New-Indian derivatives, 539.

Q.

al-Qasri, governor of Mecca, 868.
 Qushayrī's Risāla, 303.

R.

Rāshidī, court poet of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, 37.
 Rashidī of Samarqand, poet, 34.
 Reneh, rock dwellings, 217.
 Risāla of Qushayrī, 303.
 Rock-dwellings at Reneh, 217.
 Roga-viniścaya, 289.
 Rohiṇī rivers, 576.
 ROUSE, W. H. D., Peshawar Vase, 992.
 — Passive Gerund in Sanskrit, 992.
 Ruang, Siamese king, 114.
 Rummindeī, 564.

S.

Sabaio, Derivation of, 704, 993.
 Saddharma Puṇḍarīka, MS. from Khotan, 695.
 Sahasaṅka Carita of Maheśvara, 699.
 St. Thomas and Gondophernes, 706.
 Śāka as applied to the sāl-tree, 453.
 Śakas, Earliest references to, 181; dwelling-place of, 181 et seq.
 Sakastāna, 181.
 Sakiyā, origin of name Śākya, 161 et seq.

Śākya as tribal name, 453.
 Śākyas, Relics of, 152; of Kāpilavasthu, 159; name derived from Śākiyā kinsmen, 161; massacre of, 167.
 Sākya and Kapilavastu, 453.
 SALFORD, Right Rev. Bishop of, Obituary of F. v. Spiegel, 1035.
 al-Samau'al, Poem attributed to, 363; the Jewish hero of Taimā, 363; poem not pre-Koranic, 366; notes on poem ascribed to, 701; additional note on the poem, 1001.
 Sambhogakāya, 957; antecedents of the theory, 958; of the Mahāyāna, 959; and Nirmāṇakāya in relation to Dharmakāya, 962; as ontology, 967.
 Sanā'i of Ghazna, poet, 46.
 Sanskrit a spoken language? 2.
 — epic, Date of, 441.
 — and Pali, 443.
 — *pratolī* and its New-Indian derivation, 539.
 — as an Imperial question, 673.
 — use of gerund as passive, 693, 992.
 — use of negative *a* with finite verbs, 722, 723, 993.
 Śarvavarman, Coins of, 844.
 SAYCE, A. H., Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van, pt. vii, 611.
 Sayyid Muḥammad b. Nāṣir-i 'Alawī of Ghazna, poet, 40.
 School medal, presentation to Mr. Nalder of Rugby, 769.
 Seal of Solomon, symbol, 122.
 Sepher Yetzirah or Book of Formation, 121.
 SEWELL, R., Antiquarian Notes in Java, 419.
 Shadharātu'l Dhahab, 797.
 Shield of David, symbol, 122.
 Shudhūr al-'Uqūd by Ibn al-Jauzi, 851.
 Siam and the Malay Peninsula, 107.
 Siamese occupation of Malay Peninsula doubtful, 109-119; doubt confirmed from Chinese sources, 111.
 Siddhayoga, 287.
 Sila, river, 200-202.
 Śilāditya, 103; coins of, 844; identified with Harṣa-vardhana, 847.
 Singosāri temple in Java, 433.
 Sisaniā Pāṇḍe, 553.

SMITH, V. A., Alleged use of Vikrama Era in the Panjab in 45 A.D., 1003.
 Special general meeting, Hon. Vice-Presidents, 260.
 SPEYER, J. S., Remarkable Vedic Theory about Sunrise and Sunset, 723.
 Spiegel, F. v., obituary, 1035.
 Śrībrahma, father of King Sahasanka, 699.
 Śrīkanthadatta, commentator on Siddhayoga, 288.
 Śrī-Mādhava, gloss-writer, 288.
 STITT, Rev. S. S., Maldivian Talismans, 121.
 Study of Sanskrit as an Imperial question, 673.
 Šūfi, Definitions of term, 303; shaykhs, list of, 320-321.
 Šūfism, origin and development, 303; and Vedānta, 315; and Neo-Platonism, 316; history till end of third century, 321.
 Sukiti, appellation of Buddha, 154.
 Sulaimān succeeds Walid, 870; dies, 871.
 Suśruta, Commentaries on, 699.
 — on mosquitoes, 222.
 — Ayurveda Saṁhitā, 283; commentary on, 283.
 Suvarṇabhāṣottama Sūtrā, manuscripts from Khotan, 696.

T.

Tadhkiratu'l - Awliyā of Faridu'ddīn 'Attār, 303.
 Takht-i-Bahi inscription, Date in, 706.
 Talismans, Maldivian, 121.
 Tantric aspect of the "three bodies" of a Buddha, 944.
 Taṣawwuf, definition of term, 303 et seq.
 Taxila, 708.
 Textiles, Arabic inscriptions on, 387.
 Thanesar line, Coins of, 843.
 Thiqtu'l-Mulk Ṭahir b. 'Alī, minister of Masūd, 12, 16, 20.
 THOMAS, F. W., Sakāstana, 181, 460.
 — Inscription on the Piprāwā Vase, 452.
 — Om Maṇi padme hūṃ, 464.

Three bodies of a Buddha, 943; Tantric aspect, 944.
 Tilaurā Kot, 553, 555; and Yuan Chwang, 556.
 Tishyarakshitā, 892.
 Toramāna, Coins of, 847; era of date on coins, 848.
 Traditional date of Kanishka, 979.
 Trikāya, The doctrine of, 943 et seq.
 Turkish and Persian MSS. in the Hunterian Library, Glasgow University, 595.

U.

‘Umar Ibnu’l Fārid, Life of, 797; biography by his grandson, 798.
 Unidentified MS. by Ibn al-Jauzi, 851.
 ‘Uthmān Mukhtārī of Ghazna, poet, 44.
 Uttama-sikhara-purāṇa, 700.

V.

Van (Cuneiform) inscriptions, pt. vii, 611.
 Vangaśena, 287.
 Vāsabhakhattiyā, marries King Pasēnadi, 169.
 Vedic metre, 716, 718, 997.
 Vedic theory about sunrise and sunset, 723.
 Vikrama era, 706; alleged use in Panjāb in 45 A.D., 1003.
 Viśva-prakāśa of Maheśvara, 699.
 Viḍūḍabha, visits Sakyas, 167; discovers fraud of father's marriage, 170; vows vengeance, 170; takes vengeance on Sakyas, 173; destroys Tilaurā, city of Kapilavastu, 553.
 Vogel, J. Ph., Sanskrit *pratolī* and its New-Indian Derivates, 589.

Vost, Major W., Identifications in the Region of Kapilavastu, 553.
 Vṛinda, author of Siddhayoga, 288.

W.

Waddāh al-Yaman, poet, killed by Walid, 851.
 Walid kills Waddāh al-Yaman, 851; succeeds ‘Abd al-Malik, 864; death, 869.
 Weir, T. H., Persian and Turkish Manuscripts in the Hunterian Library of the Glasgow University, 595.
 Wrongly calculated dates and some dates of the Lakshmanasēna era, 1009.

Y.

Yasna lvii-lxi, Pahlavi texts, 53.
 Yasna lxxv, Pahlavi text, 825.
 Yazid, Accession of, 855; revolt against, of Medina, 856.
 Yazid b. Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik, 876.
 Yojana, 410-411; Indian, 1012; Magadha, 1012; 1½ of the Indian, 1013.
 Yojana and the li, 1011.
 Yuan Chwang, Mo-la-p’o, 95; his interpreters, 95-105; description of Mo-la-p’o, 98-103; account of Ujjain, 102; Fa-la-pi, 104; and Kapilavastu, 553; and Tilaurā Kot, 555; and Lahari Kudān, 557; and Koṇā, 564.

Z.

Zaid b. ‘Alī, revolts, 874.
 Zarrah or Hāmūn lake, 198.
 Zoheir, 704.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND:

FOUNDED, *March*, 1823.

CORRECTED TO 1ST JANUARY, 1906.

22, ALBEMARLE STREET,
LONDON.

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

PATRON:

HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING.

VICE-PATRONS:

H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.
THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

PRESIDENT:

1902 THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD REAY, P.C., G.C.S.I., LL.D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

1905 ROBERT N. CUST, Esq., LL.D., *Hon. Secretary.*
1905 PROFESSOR SIR ROBERT K. DOUGLAS.
1905 SIR CHARLES J. LYALL, K.C.S.I.
1904 THE RIGHT HON. LORD STANMORE, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.
1903 T. H. THORNTON, Esq., C.S.I., D.C.L.
1903 SIR RAYMOND WEST, K.C.I.E., LL.D.

COUNCIL:

1905 BLUMHARDT, PROFESSOR J. F.
1905 BROWNE, PROFESSOR E. G., M.A.
1905 CODRINGTON, O., M.D., F.S.A., *Hon. Librarian.*
1902 DAMES, M. LONGWORTH, Esq.
1904 ELLIS, A. G., Esq.
1902 FLEET, J. F., Ph.D., C.I.E.
1904 FRAZER, R. W., Esq., LL.B.
1903 GASTER, M., Ph.D.
1904 GRIERSON, G. A., Ph.D., C.I.E.
1903 IRVINE, W., Esq.
1905 JACOB, COLONEL G. A.
1905 KENNEDY, J., Esq., *Hon. Treasurer.*
1905 MARGOLIOUTH, PROFESSOR D. S.
1905 PINCHES, T. G., LL.D.
1901 RAPSON, PROFESSOR E. J., M.A.
1903 THOMAS, F. W., Esq.
1901 WOLLASTON, A. N., Esq., C.I.E.

TRUSTEES:

1895 PROFESSOR SIR R. K. DOUGLAS.
1895 H. L. THOMSON LYON, Esq., F.S.A.

SECRETARY AND LIBRARIAN:

1905 MISS HUGHES.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND LIBRARIAN:

1905 MR. H. A. GOOD.

HONORARY SOLICITOR:

ALEXANDER HAYMAN WILSON, Esq.,
Westminster Chambers, 5, Victoria St., S.W.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

SIR C. J. LYALL.
DR. M. GASTER.
W. IRVINE, Esq.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

DR. M. GASTER.
T. H. THORNTON, Esq.

ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND COMMITTEE.

PROF. MACDONELL.
DR. M. GASTER.
A. G. ELLIS, Esq.

MEDAL COMMITTEE.

A. N. WOLLASTON, Esq. (Chairman)
DR. M. GASTER.
T. H. THORNTON, Esq.
PROF. E. J. RAPSON.

HONORARY AUDITORS, 1905.

W. IRVINE, Esq. (for the Council).
E. STURDY, Esq. }
D. FERGUSON, Esq. } (for the Society).

*The President of the Society and the Honorary Officers of the
Society are ex-officio members of all Committees.*

Members.

RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT.

N.B.—The marks prefixed to the names signify—

* Non-resident Members.

+ Members who have compounded for their Subscriptions.

‡‡ Library Members.

‡ Members who have served on the Council.

- 1863 HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING, K.G.
 1902 HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
 1882 FIELD-MARSHAL HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF
 CONNAUGHT, K.G.
- 1902 *ADERS, Walter Mansfield, *Sports Club, Cairo, Egypt.*
 1890 ADLER, Elkan Nathan, M.A., 15, *Copthall Avenue, E. C.*
 1900 *AHMAD, Kazi Aziz - uddin, *Magistrate, Fyzabad,*
Oudh, India.
 1902 AINSLIE, Douglas, 26, *Mount Street, Grosvenor*
Square, W.
 1903 *AIYANGAR, S. Krishnaswami, *Chamarajendrapet, Ban-*
galore, India.
 1903 *AIYAR, S. Parameswara, *Huzur Secretariat, Trivandrum,*
Travancore, S. India.
 10 1905 *AIYAR, S. Ramanath, *Karamanai, Trivandrum, Travan-*
core, India.
 1874 *†AKAMATZU RENJO, Rev., *Nishi Hongwanji, Kioto*
Japan.
 1880 ALLEN, H. J., *Winton House, Holly Walk, Leamington*
 1905 ‡‡ALI, Z. Gauhar, *Common Room, Middle Temple, E. C.*

- 1904 *ALVAREZ, JUSTIN C. W., *H.B.M. Consul-General, Tripoli of Barbary, via Makta.*
- 1901 AMEDROZ, H. F., 48, *York Terrace, N.W.*
- 1904 AMEER ALI, SYED, C.I.E., *Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1880 AMHERST OF HACKNEY, The Right Hon. Lord, 8, *Grosvenor Square, W.; Didlington Park, Brandon, Suffolk.*
- 1905 *ANDERSON-BERRY, David, M.D., 23, *Grosvenor Crescent, St. Leonards-on-Sea.*
- 1898 *ANDREWS, James Brayn, *Cercle Littéraire et Artistique, Rue Volney, Paris; Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 20 1888 *ARNOLD, T. W., *Assistant Librarian, India Office, S.W.; Professor of Arabic, University College; 31, St. Thomas' Mansions, Westminster, S.W.*
- 1904 *ASHRAF, Amir-uddin, *Honorary Magistrate, Beguserai, Bengal, India.*
- EXT. 1900. ATĀBAK-I-A'ZAM, His Highness, *Prime Minister of Persia, Teheran, Persia.*
- HON. AUFRECHT, Emeritus Professor T., 33, *Baumschuler Allee, Bonn, Germany.*
- 1867 †BABBAGE, Maj.-Gen. H. P., *Mayfield, Lansdowne Place, Cheltenham.*
- 1905 *BADR, Muhamed, *University Union, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1903 *BAILEY, Rev. T. Grahame, M.A., B.D., *Wazirābād, Panjab, India.*
- 1873 †BAINES, A. E., 19, *Castle Street, Holborn, W.C.*
- 1883 *†BALL, James Dyer, H.M.C.S., *Fernside, Mt. Kellett, The Peak, Hong Kong.*
- 1878 †BARKLEY, David Graham, *Annadale Avenue, Belfast, Ireland.*
- 30 1904 *BARNETT, Lionel D., *British Museum, W.C.*
- 1890 *†BARODA, His Highness Mahārāja Sayaji Rao Bahadur, G.C.S.I., *Gaekwar of.*
- HON. BARTH, Auguste, 10, *Rue Garancière, Paris, France.*
- 1881 *†BATE, Rev. J. Drew, 15, *St. John's Church Road, Folkestone.*

- 1904 ††BATESON, Vaughan (late Surgeon R.N.), *Sonāda, 89, New Cross Street, Bradford, Yorks.*
- 1885 *BAYNES, Herbert, *The Hawthorns, Collingwood Avenue, Muswell Hill, N.*
- 1901 *BEATSON, Surgeon-General W. B. (*late Bengal Medical Service*), *Vicarsgrange, Eastbourne.*
- 1898 *BEAUCHAMP, Henry, *Editor "Madras Mail," Madras, India.*
- 1901 BELL, Miss Gertrude, 95, *Sloane Street, S.W.; Red Barns, Redcar.*
- 1883 †§BENDALL, Professor Cecil, 105, *Castle Street, Cambridge.*
- 40 1897 *BENSUSAN, S. L., *Glen Lyn, Wickham Avenue, Bexhill; Royal Societies Club, St. James's Street, S.W.*
- 1880 *BEST, J. W., *Mangalore, Madras.*
- 1892 *BEVAN, A. A., M.A., *Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic, Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- 1893 §BEVERIDGE, H., *Pitfold, Shottermill, Surrey.*
- 1899 ††BEVERIDGE, Mrs. H., *Pitfold, Shottermill, Surrey.*
- 1904 *BEVIR, Edward Laurence, 2, *Rue Mésangère, Avenue des Balives, Valence-sur-Rhône, France.*
- 1882 *†BHABHA, Shapurje D., M.D., 8, *Drakefield Road, St. Catherine's Park, S.E.*
- HON. BHANDARKAR, Professor Ramkrishna Gopal, C.I.E., Ph.D., *Sangamaśrama, Poona, Bombay, India.*
- 1888 *BILGRAMI, Syed Ali, 6, *Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.*
- 1895 BLAGDEN, C. Otto, *Hillbrow, Holmdene Avenue, Herne Hill, S.E.*
- 50 1897 §*BLUMHARDT, Professor James Fuller, 24, *Beechcroft Road, Oxford.*
- 1861 *BLUNT, Sir John E., C.B., K.C.M.G., *Union Club, Malta.*
- 1902 *†BOBBILI, Maharaja Sri Rao Sir Venketasvetasvetachalapati Ranga Rao Bahadur, K C.I.E., *Raja of Bobbili, Vizagapatam, S. India.*
- 1895 BODE, Mrs. M. Haynes, Ph.D., 29, *Cambridge Mansions, Battersea Park, S.W.; per cura Signora Biondi, 14, Lung' Arno Regio, Pisa, Italy.*
- 1903 *BORGSTRÖM, Henrik, 7, *Mariegatan, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1902 *BOUEDILLON, Sir James Austen, K.C.S.I., *Westlands, Liphook, Surrey.*

LIST OF MEMBERS.

- 1862 BOUVERIE-PUSEY, S. E. B., 35a, *South Audley Street, W.*
1903 *BOWEN, Rev. John, *St. Lawrence Rectory, Wolffs Castle, Pembrokeshire.*
1870 §BOWRING, Lewin B., C.S.I., *Woodlands, Torquay.*
1899 *BRANDHENDLER, Boris.
60 1857 †§BRANDRETH, E. L., 32, *Elvaston Place, Queen's Gate, S.W.*
1898 *BRIGGS, Rev. W. A., M.D., *Chieng Rai, Laos, via Moulmein and Raheng, Burma.*
1900 *BRÖNNLE, Dr. P., 73, *Burdett Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.*
1889*†§BROWNE, Edward Granville, M.A., *Pembroke College, Adams Professor of Arabic, Cambridge; West Acres, Benwell, Newcastle-on-Tyne.*
1884 *†BUCHANAN, J. Beaumont, C.E.
1905 ††BUGTANI, R. R., 82, *Talbot Road, Bayswater, W.*
1866 *†BURGESS, James, C.I.E., LL.D., 22, *Seton Place, Edinburgh.*
1897 *BURN, Richard, *Under Secretary to Government, Allahabad, N.W.P., India.*
1880 §BUSHELL, S. W., M.D., C.M.G., *Ravensholt, Mount Park, Harrow.*
- 1881 *†CAIN, Rev. John, *Dumagudam, S. India.*
70 1902 *CALDECOTT, Rev. W. Shaw, *Silver How, West Cliff Gardens, Bournemouth.*
1886 *†CAMA, Jehangir K. R., 12, *Malabar Hill, Bombay, India.*
1867 *†CAMA, K. R., *Mount House, Victoria Road, Mazagone, Bombay, India.*
1887 *†CAMPBELL, Rev. W., *Tainan, Formosa, Japan.*
1890 *CARPENTER, Rev. J. Estlin, 109, *Banbury Road, Oxford.*
1900 *CARUS, Dr. Paul, *La Salle, Chicago, U.S.A.*
1888 *CASARTELLI, The Right Rev. L. C., *Bishop of Salford, St. Bede's College, Manchester.*
1897 *CAVE, H. W., 44, *Sussex Square, Brighton.*
1899 *CHAKRAVARTI, Mon Mohun, 14, *Palmer's Bazar Road, North Entally Post Office, Calcutta, India.*
1877 *CHAMBERLAIN, Basil Hall, *Professor of Japanese, The University, Tokio, Japan.*

- 80 1895 *†CHAND, Diwan Tek, *Deputy Commissioner, Gurgaon, Panjab, India.*
- 1905 ††CHATTAPADHYAY, Virendranath, 106, *Elgin Crescent, Bayswater, W.*
- 1885 *†CHURCHILL, Sidney, *H.B.M. Consulate, Palermo, Sicily.*
- 1882 CLARKE, Sir C. Purdon, C.S.I., *Director, Metropolitan Art Museum, New York, U.S.A.*
- 1904 *CLEMENTI, C., *Hong Kong, China.*
- 1899 *CLOUGH, Mrs. E. Rauschenbusch, *Ongole, Nellore Dist., Madras, India.*
- 1885 *COBHAM, Claude Delaval, C.M.G., *Commissioner, Larnaca, Cyprus.*
- 1900 *†COCHIN, H.H. the Raja of, K.C.S.I., *Cochin, South India.*
- 1877 §CODRINGTON, Oliver, M.D., F.S.A., *HON. LIBRARIAN, 12, Victoria Road, Clapham, S.W.*
- 1905 *COLSTON, E., *Burma Civil Service, Duxford House, Duxford, Cambridge.*
- 90 1891 *CONDER, Colonel C. R., R.E., LL.D., *Ordnance House, Ennis, Co. Clare, Ireland.*
- 1892 *†CONSTANT, S. Victor, *c/o Messrs. Coghill & Constant, 420, West 23rd Street, New York, U.S.A.*
- 1901 *§COOK, Stanley A., 26, *Lensfield Road, Cambridge.*
- 1904 COOKE, Edgar Malcolm, Tankerville, *Kingston Hill, Surrey.*
- 1903 CORBETT, N. E. F., *Mombasa Civil Service, Mombasa, East Africa.*
- HON. 1893 CORDIER, Prof. Henri, 54, *Rue Nicolo, Paris, France.*
- 1904 *COSTA, Alessandro, 46, *Via Quirinale, Rome, Italy.*
- 1902 *COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, Count Henry, LL.D., Ph.D., *Secretary of Legation, Romperg, Bohemia, Austria.*
- 1888 *COUSENS, Henry, *Archæological Surveyor for Western India, Poona, Bombay, India.*
- 1879 *CRAIG, W., *Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.*
- 100 1882 §CRAWFORD AND BALCARRES, The Right Hon. the Earl of, K.T., F.R.S., *Haigh, Wigan.*
- 1904 *CRAWSHAY-WILLIAMS, E., *Coed-y-Mostwr, Bridgend, Glamorgan.*
- 1905 *CREWDSON, Wilson, F.S.A., *Southside, St. Leonards-on-Sea.*

- 1883 CUMINE, Alexander, I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54, Parliament Street, Westminster.*
- 1893 *CUNNINGHAM, Sir A. F. D., K.C.I.E., *Baynton House, Westbury, Wilts.*
- 1852 §CUST, Robert N., LL.D., VICE-PRESIDENT, HON. SECRETARY, 63, *Elm Park Gardens, S.W.*
- 1888 *DADABHAI, Rustamji, *Civil Surgeon, Chaderghat, Haidarabad, India.*
- 1891 *†D'ALVIELLA, Goblet, M. le Comte, *Rue Faider 10, Bruxelles, Belgium.*
- 1884 DAMES, M. Longworth, I.C.S. (retired), *Alegria, Enfield.*
- 1905 *DAS, Babu Jogindra Nath, *Rector, High School, Khalispur, Bengal, India.*
- 110 1902 *DAS, Babu Kali Kumar, *Sub-Inspector of Schools, Araria, Purnea, Behar, India.*
- 1899 *DAS, Babu Ram Saran, M.A., *Manager, Oudh Commercial Bank, Fyzabad, N.W.P., India.*
- 1902 *DASS, Lala Benarsi, *Vakil, High Court, Saharampur, U.P., India.*
- 1904 *DAVAR, M. B., Ph.D., 89, *Gilder Street, Grant Road, Bombay, India.*
- 1904 DAVIES, T. R. Hart, *East India United Service Club, St. James's Square, S.W.*
- 1894 *†DAVIES, Rev. T. Witton, B.A., Ph.D., *Professor of Semitic Languages, University College, Bangor, N. Wales.*
- 1896 *DEANE, Major Sir H. A., K.C.S.I., *Political Officer, Malakand, Swat, via Mardan, Panjab, India.*
- 1903 *DEEN, M. J., *c/o Sayid Muslihuddin Residency Bazaar, Haidarabad, India.*
- 1898 *DERASARI, Dahyabhai Pitambaradasa, *Barrister-at-Law, Ahmedabad, India.*
- 1896 *DEUSSEN, Professor P., 39, *Beseler-allee, Kiel, Germany.*
- 120 1894 *DEVIPRASAD, Munshi, *Jodhpur, India.*
- 1882 DEVONSHIRE, His Grace the Duke of, K.G., LL.D., *Devonshire House, Piccadilly, W.*

- 1904 *DEWHURST, Robert Paget, 24, *Wellington Square, Oxford*.
- 1882 †§DICKINS, F. V., C.B., *Seend Lodge, Seend, Melksham, Wilts.*
- 1904 DOBRÉE, Alfred, 11, *Palace Street, Buckingham Gate, S.W.*
- 1894 *D'OLDENBURG, Serge, Ph.D., *Professor of Sanskrit, The University, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- HON. DONNER, Professor O., *Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1901 *DORPH, W. P. F., *Hon. Secretary for Sydney Palestine Exploration Fund, 10, Carlton Crescent, Summer Hill, Sydney, N.S.W.*
- 1874 §DOUGLAS, Sir R. K., VICE-PRESIDENT, *Professor of Chinese, King's College; British Museum, W.C.; 3, College Gardens, Dulwich, S.E.*
- 1888 *DOYLE, Rev. James, *Diocese of Mylapore, San Thomé, Madras, India.*
- 130 1879 *†DOYLE, Patrick, C.E., F.G.S., F.R.S.E., M.R.I.A.,
" *Indian Engineering,*" *Calcutta, India.*
- 1896 *DUFF, Miss C. M. (Mrs. W. R. Rickmers), *The Mettnau, Radolfzell am Bodensee, Germany.*
- 1884 §DUKA, Theodore, M.D., F.R.C.S., 55, *Nevern Square, Earl's Court, S.W.*
- 1883 *DUKE, Lieut.-Colonel Joshua, M.D., *Malwa Bheel Corps, Sirdarpur, India (Messrs. Grindlay & Co.).*
- 1896 *DUTT, Babu Kedar Nath, *Bhakti Vinōda; Satasan Bhajankuti, Puri P.O., Orissa; Swarupganj P.O., Nadia; 181, Maniktala Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 1904 *DUTT, Girindranath, *c/o Her Highness the Maharanees of Hutwa, Hutwa, P.O. Chapra, Bengal, India.*
- 1894 *DUTT, M. N., 40, *Nayan Chand Dutt Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 1893 *DUTT, Romesh Chandra, C.I.E., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54, Parliament Street, Westminster, S.W.*
- 1905 *EDWARDS, E., *Oriental Books and Manuscripts Department, British Museum, W.C.*
- 1905 *ELIAS, Colonel Robert, *late 59th Regiment, Rendham Barnes, Sazmundham, Suffolk.*

- 140 1905 *ELIOT, Sir Charles, K.C.M.G., C.B., *Vice-Chancellor University of Sheffield, Endcliffe Holt, Endcliffe Crescent, Sheffield.*
- 1897 *§ELLIS, Alexander George, *British Museum; 32, Willow Road, Hampstead, N.W.*
- 1904 *ETTINGHAUSEN, Maurice, *Prannerstrasse iiⁱⁱⁱ, Munich, Germany.*
- 1902 FANSHAWE, Herbert Charles, C.S.I., *c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 9, Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1881 *†FARGUES, J., 81, *Rue de Paris, Montmorency, Seine et Oise, France.*
- 1880 *†FARIDUNJI, Jamshedji, C.I.E., *Private Secretary to His Excellency the Minister, Hyderabad, Dekkan, India.*
- HON. FAUSBÖLL, Professor Dr. V., 37, *Nordre Fasanvej, Frederiksborg, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
- 1905 *FAZL, Sheikh Abul, LL.D., *Jullundher City, Panjab, India.*
- 1902 *FENTON, Ferrar, 8, *Kings Road, Mitcham, S.E.*
- 1877 *†FERGUSON, A. M., *Frognaal House, Hampstead, N.W.*
- 150 1877 *†FERGUSON, Donald W., *Samanala, 20, Beech House Road, Croydon.*
- 1883 *†FERGUSON, The Right Hon. Sir James, Bart., K.C.M.G., G.C.S.I., 80, *Cornwall Gardens, S.W.*
- 1901 *FERGUSON, J. C., I.C.S., *Assistant Settlement Officer, Bareilly, N.W.P., India.*
- 1904 *FERRIEU, Théodore, *Commissaire de la Marine à bord du Calédonien, Ecole de Canonage, Toulon (Var), France.*
- 1881 *FINN, Alexander, *British Consulate, Chicago, U.S.A.*
- 1887 FINN, Mrs., *The Elms, Brook Green, W.*
- 1893 *FINOT, Louis, *Directeur adjoint à l'école des Hautes Études, 11, Rue Poussin xvi^e, Paris, France.*
- 1877 §FLEET, J. F., C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. (ret.), 8, *Leopold Road, Ealing.*
- 1902 *FORBES, Edmund, 16, *Eversfield Place, St. Leonards-on-Sea.*

- 1894 *FRASER, E. D. H., *China Consular Service, H.B.M. Consulate, Shanghai, China.*
- 160 1886 §FRAZER, R. W., LL.B., I.C.S. (retired), *London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C.*
- 1897 *FRERE, Miss M., 7, *Camden Place, Regent Street, Cambridge.*
- 1899 *GAIT, Edmund Albert, *Commissioner, Burdwan District, Hoogly, Bengal, India.*
- 1894 *GANGULI, Sanjiban, **Head Master, The Mahārāja's College, Jeypore, India.*
- 1881 *GARDNER, Christopher T., *H.B.M. Consul, Amoy, China.*
- 1890 §GASTER, M., Ph.D., 193, *Maida Vale, W.*
- 1865 †GAYNER, C., M.D., F.R.S.E.
- 1895 *GERINI, Lieut.-Col. G. E., *Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1902 *GHINE, Moungh Ohn, C.I.E., 26, *Lewis Street, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1904 *GHOSE, Babu Jogendra Chandra, *Tagore Law Professor, Calcutta High Court, Calcutta, India.*
- 170 1905 ††GHOSE, Jyotish Chandra, 58, *Talbot Road, Bayswater, W.*
- 1893 *GHOSE, Hon. Dr. Rashbehary, C.I.E., 56, *Mirzapur Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 1893 *†GIBSON, Mrs. J. Young, LL.D., *Castlebrae, Chesterton Road, Cambridge.*
- HON. GOEJE, Professor De, *Leiden, Holland.*
- 1897 *GOKHALE, Professor Gopal Krishna, C.I.E., 101, *Civil Lines, Poona, India.*
- 1864 †§GOLDSMID, Major-Gen. Sir F. J., C.B., K.C.S.I., HON. VICE-PRESIDENT, 29, *Phoenix Lodge Mansions, Brook Green, Hammersmith, W.*
- HON. 1893 GOLDZIER, Professor Ignaz, *vii Holló-utza 4, Buda Pest, Hungary.*
- 1900 *GONDAL, The Thakur Sahib, *Gondal, Kathiawar, India.*
- 1884 *†GORPARSHAD, Thakur, *Talookdar of Baiswan, Aligarh, India.*
- 1885 GOSSET, Major-General M. W. Edward, C.B., *Westgate House, Dedham, Essex.*

- 180 1900 GRATTON, F. M.
 1894 *GRAY, J., *Professor of Pali, Rangoon College, Burma.*
 1905 ††GRAY, Miss Winifred, *Oakholme, Parklands, Surbiton.*
 1904 *GREY-DOWNING, John de, 4, Fairlie Place, *Calcutta, India.*
 1893 *GREENUP, Rev. Albert W., *The Principal's Lodge, St. John's Hall, Highbury, N.*
 1884 GRIERSON, George A., C.I.E., Ph.D., *Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey.*
 1852 *†GRIFFITH, R. T. H., C.I.E., *Kotagiri, Nilgiri, S. India.*
 1890 *GROSSET, Joanny, 5, *Boulevard des Bains, Sanary, Var, France.*
 HON. 1890 GUBERNATIS, Conte Comm. Angelo De, 11, *Via San Martino, Rome, Italy.*
 1897 *GUEST, A. Rhuvon, 14, *Bedford Square, W.C.*
 190 HON. 1898 GUIDI, Professor Ignace, 24, *Botteghe O'Seure, Rome, Italy.*
 1905 *GUPTA, Ganga Prasad, *Benares, India.*
 1904 *GUPTA, Hem Chandra Das, *Professor of Geology, Presidency College, Calcutta, India.*
 1904 *GUPTA, Iswar Chandra Das, *Pleader, Arrah, Shahabad, India.*
 1901 *GUPTA, Rājani Kanta, *Assistant Surgeon of Arrah, Shahabad, India.*
 1894 *GURDON, Capt. Philip R. T., I.S.C., *Assistant Commissioner, Shillong, Assam, India.*
- 1883 *HAGGARD, Sir W. H. D., K.C.B., *H.B.M. Minister Resident and Consul-General to the Republic of the Equator.*
 1902 *HAGORIAN, Professor G., 25, *Chesilton Road, Fulham, S.W.*
 1898 *HAIG, Captain T. Wolseley, I.S.C., *The Residency, Hyderabad, India.*
 1902 *HALIL, Halil, *Teacher of Turkish, Cambridge University, 12, Trumpington Street, Cambridge.*
 200 *1904 *HANSON, Rev. O., *American Baptist Mission, Kachin, Bhamo, Upper Burma.*

- 1904 *HAQUE, Maulavi Abu Musa Ahmad al-, *Dacca College, Dacca, Bengal, India.*
- 1902 ††HARDCASTLE, Miss A. L. B., 25, *Boundary Road, N.W.*
- 1897 *HARIDAS, Hardevram Nanabhai, *Barrister-at-Law, 161, Malabar Hill, Bombay, India.*
- 1883 †HATFIELD, Captain C. T., *late Dragoon Guards, Harts Down, Margate.*
- 1834 *†HEMING, Lieut.-Col. Dempster, *Deputy Commissioners Police Force, Madras.*
- 1885 †HENDERSON, George, 7, *Mincing Lane, E.C.*
- 1900 HERTZ, Miss, 20, *Avenue Road, N.W.*
- 1880 *HERVEY, The Hon. D. F. A., *Westfields, Aldeburgh, Suffolk.*
- 1905 *HETHERINGTON, Arthur, *Principal of the Government Collegiate School, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 210 1888 *§HEWITT, J. Francis K., *Holton Cottage, Wheatley, Oxford.*
- 1897 *HILL, Gray, *Mere Hall, Birkenhead.*
- 1901 *HILL, Rev. J. R., *S.P.G. Mission, Banda, U.P., India.*
- 1885 *†HIPPLEY, Alfred E., *Commissioner of Chinese Customs, and Chinese Secretary to the Inspector-General of Customs, Peking; 26, Old Queen Street, Westminster, S.W.*
- 1891 *HIRSCHFELD, H., Ph.D., *Lecturer on Semitics at the Jewish College, Tavistock Square; 14, Randolph Gardens, N.W.*
- 1902 *HNYIN, Moung Tha, *Barrister-at-Law, Moulmein, Burma.*
- 1897 *HODGSON, Mrs. Brian, *Pasture Wood House, Abinger, Dorking; Villa Himalaya, Mentone; 53, Stanhope Gardens, S.W.*
- 1900 *HOERNLE, Dr. A. F. Rudolf, 8, *Northmoor Road, Oxford.*
- 1881 HOEY, William, D.Litt., *Ashleigh House, Linden Road, Bedford.*
- 1897 *HOGG, Hope Waddell, *Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature, Manchester, 30, Brook Road, Fallowfield, Manchester.*
- 220 1865 *†HOLROYD, Colonel W. R. M., *Under Secretary to Government, Lahore; 23, Bathwick Hill, Bath.*

- 1889 *HOPKINS, Lionel Charles, *China Consular Service, Consul-General, Tientsin, China.*
- 1898 †HORNIMAN, F. J., M.P., *Falmouth House, 20, Hyde Park Terrace, W.*
- 1901 ††HOSFORD, John Stroud, 20, *St. James's Place, S.W.*
- 1892 *HOUGHTON, Bernard, *Deputy Commissioner, Moulmein, Burma.*
- HON. 1902 HOUTSMA, Professor, *The University, Utrecht, Holland.*
- 1905 *HUK, Mir Musharaf ul, *University Union, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1905 *HUSAIN, Syed Asghar, *Barrister-at-Law, Gray's Inn, W.C.*
- 1893 *INNES, John R., *Straits Service, Singapore.*
- 1879 §IRVINE, W., *Holliscroft, Castlenau, Barnes, S.W.*
- 230 1901 *IYER, Sri Kanti, *Manager, Pension Department, Government Office, Madras, India.*
- 1888 *JACKSON, Arthur Mason Tippetts, *c/o Messrs. Grindlay, Groome, & Co., Bombay.*
- 1901 §*JACOB, Colonel G. A., *Oakridge, Redhill.*
- 1893 †JAGO-TRELAWNY, Major-General, *Coldrenick, Liskeard, Cornwall.*
- 1885 *†JAIKISHAN DASS BAHADOOR, Rajah, C.S.I., *Muradabad, Rohilkhand.*
- 1904 *JALAL-UDDIN, Mirza, *Lahore, India.*
- 1878 *JARDINE, Sir John, K.C.I.E., M.P., 34, *Lancaster Gate, W.*
- 1901 *JARDINE, W. E., *The Agency, Nowgong, Bundelkhand, India.*
- 1903 JARETT, Colonel H. S., C.I.E., *South Lodge, Imberhorne, East Grinstead.*
- 1881 *†JAYAKAR, Lieut.-Colonel Atmaram S. G., *Khar Road, Bandra, near Bombay.*
- 240 1904 *JAYAKAR, M. R., *Common Room, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.*
- 1883 *†JAYAMOHUN, Thakur Singh, *Magistrate and Tahsildar of Seeri Narayan, Bilaspur, Central Provinces, India.*

- 1900 *JINARAJADASA, C., 1054, *Walnut Street, Newton Highlands, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1882 *†JINAYARAVANSA, Rev. P. C., *Buddhist Monk (formerly His Excellency Prince Prisdang).*
- 1904 *JOHNSTON, Reginald Fleming, *Secretary to Government, Wei-hai-Wei, China.*
- HON. 1904 JOLLY, Professor Julius, *The University, Würzburg, Bavaria.*
- 1901 *KANTA, C. Sri, *Beaumonde, Rosmead Place, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- HON. 1899 KARABACEK, Professor J., *Vienna, Austria.*
- 1900 *KARKARIA, R. P., *Tardeo, Bombay, India.*
- 1900 KEITH, Arthur Berriedale, B.C.L., 49, *Albert Bridge Road, S.W.; Colonial Office, Downing Street, S.W.*
- 250 1864 *†KEMBALL, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arnold, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., 62, *Lowndes Square, S.W.*
- 1895 *KENNEDY, Miss Louise, *Fairacre, Concord, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1891 §KENNEDY, James, Hon. TREASURER, 14, *Frogna Lane, Finchley Road, N.W.*
- 1890 *KERALA VARMA, His Highness, C.S.I., *Valeyukoil Tamburam Trivandrum, Travancore State, Madras, India.*
- HON. KERN, Heinrich, *Professor of Sanskrit, Utrecht, Holland.*
- 1895 *KHAN, Gazanfar Ali, I.C.S., *Assistant Commissioner, Chanda, C.P., India.*
- 1904 *KHAN, H. M. A. Husein, *Pembroke College, Cambridge.*
- HON. 1872 KIELHORN, Geheimer Regierungsrath Dr. F., O.I.E., *Professor of Sanskrit, Göttingen, 21, Hainholzweg, Germany.*
- 1892 KING, Major J. S., *I.S.C. (retired), St. Albans, 15, Clarendon Road, Southsea.*
- 1884 *KING, Lucas White, C.S.I., LL.D., F.S.A., *Roebuck Hall, Co. Dublin, Ireland.*
- 260 1902 *KING, W. Joseph Harding, *Wollescote Hall, Stourbridge.*
- 1884 *†KITTS, Eustace John, 51, *Norton Road, Hove, Sussex.*
- 1894 KLUHT, Rev. A., *Thorshill, Hind Head, Haslemere.*
- 1904 *KOLASKER, Mangesh Bal, Barrister, *Jagannath Bungalow, Gurgaon, Bombay, India.*

- 1904 ***LAL**, Hira, *Extra Assistant Commissioner, and Assistant to Superintendent Imperial Gazetteer, Central Provinces, Nagpur, C.P., India.*
- 1901 ***LAL**, Dr. Munna, *Civil Surgeon, Banda City, N.W.P., India.*
- 1904 ***LAL**, Hon. Munshi Madho, *Chowkhumba, Benares, India.*
- 1902 ***LANDBERG**, Count C., *Chamberlain to H.M. the King of Sweden and Norway, Akademistrasse 11, Munich, Germany.*
- HON. 1880 **LANMAN**, Charles R., *Professor of Sanskrit, Harvard College, 9, Farrar Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1884 *†**LANSDALL**, Rev. H. H., D.D., *Morden College, Blackheath, S.E.*
- 270 1874 **LAWRENCE**, F. W., *Hillcote, Lansdown, Bath.*
- 1901 ***LEADBEATER**, W., *c/o Theosophical Society, 42, Margaret Street, Sydney, Australia.*
- 1900 §**LEE-WARNER**, Sir W., K.C.S.I., *Eaton Tower, Caterham Valley, Surrey.*
- 1899 **LEGGE**, F., 6, *Gray's Inn Square, W.C.*
- 1896 ***LEIGH**, Colonel H. P. P., C.I.E., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54, Parliament Street, Westminster.*
- 1883 ***LE MESURIER**, Cecil John Reginald, *Barrister-at-Law, Perth, Western Australia.*
- 1878 *†**LEPPER**, C. H.
- 1880 †**LE STRANGE**, Guy, 3, *Via S. Francesco Poverino, Florence, Italy.*
- 1890 ***LEVESON**, Henry G. A., *Deputy Commissioner, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1865 †**LEWIS**, Mrs. A. S., LL.D., *Castlebrae, Cambridge.*
- 280 1897 ***LINDSAY**, Rev. James, M.A., D.D., B.Sc., F.G.S., F.R.S.E., *Springhill Terrace, Kilmarnock, N.B.*
- 1879 ***LOCKHART**, J. H. Stewart, C.M.G., *Commissioner, Wei-hai-Wei, China.*
- 1898 ***LOPES**, David, 61, *Rua da Escola Polytechnica, Lisbon.*
- 1882 †**LOVELACE**, The Right Hon. the Earl, 9, *St. George's Place, S.W.*
- 1895 *†**LOWELL**, P., 53, *State Street, Boston, U.S.A.*
- 1904 ***LUARD**, Captain C. E., M.A., *Indian Army, Superintendent of Gazetteer, Indore, C.I., c/o Messrs. Grindlay, Groome, & Co., Bombay, India.*

- 1895 *LUPTON, Walter, *Settlement Officer, Mainpuri, U.P., India.*
- 1904 *LWIN, Maung Tun, *Senior Magistrate, Bassein, Burma.*
- 1899 §LYALL, Sir Charles James, K.C.S.I., LL.D., VICE-PRESIDENT, 82, *Cornwall Gardens, S.W.*
- 1889 †§LYON, H. Thomson, F.S.A., 34, *St. James's Street, S.W.*
-
- 290 1898 *MACAULIFFE, M., B.A., I.C.S. (ret.), 10, *Sinclair Gardens, West Kensington, W.*
- 1898 MACDONALD, A. R., 10, *Chester Street, S.W.*
- 1900 *MACDONALD, Duncan B., *Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.*
- 1882 *§MACDONELL, Arthur A., M.A., Ph.D., *Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Fellow of Balliol; 107, Banbury Road, Oxford.*
- 1887 *McDOUALL, William, *Vice-Consul, Mahammerah, through Bushire, Persia.*
- 1901 *MACKENZIE, A. St. Clair, *Professor of English and Logic, State College of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A.*
- 1894 *MACLAGAN, E. D., *Under Secretary Agricultural Department, Lahore, Panjab, India.*
- 1900 *MALLICK, Babu Ramani Mohun, *Zemindar of Meherpore, Nuddia, Bengal, India.*
- 1904 *MANJEE, Purshottam Vishram, *Warden Road, Bombay, India.*
- 1901 *MĀPPIĻĻAI, K. I. Varugis, *Editor of the Malayalam Manorāma, Kōṭṭayam, Travancore, India.*
- 300 1889 *MARGOLIOUTH, Rev. D., *Professor of Arabic, 88, Woodstock Road, Oxford.*
- 1902 *MARKS, Rev. John E., D.D., "*Birma*," 147, *Lower Addiscombe Road, Croydon.*
- 1904 *MARSDEN, E., *Pembroke House, Bath Road, Cheltenham.*
- 1901 *MARSHALL, J. H., *Director-General of Archaeology, Ravensdale, Simla, India.*
- 1896 *MARZETTI, Charles J., 8, *Greycoat Gardens, Victoria Street, S.W.*
- 1888 MASTER, John Henry, *Montrose House, Petersham.*

- 1898 *MAXWELL, W. George, *Straits Civil Service, Singapore.*
- 1894 *MAY, A. J., *Ecclesbourne, Forabridge Road, Ashford, Middlesex.*
- 1905 *MAZUMDAR, Babu Bijaya Chandra, *Pleaser, Sambalpur, C.P., India.*
- 1894 MEAD, G. R. S., 42, *Cheyne Court, Chelsea, S.W.*
- 310 1901 *MENON, K. P. Padmanabha, *High Court Vakil, Ernakulam, Cochin, S. India.*
- 1900 *MENON, Kunhi Krishna, B.A., *Todtakadt House, Ernakulam, Cochin State, Madras Pres., India.*
- 1899 *MESTON, James Scorgie, *3rd Secretary to Government N.W.P. and Oudh, Allahabad and Naini Tal, India.*
- HON. MEYNARD, Professor Barbier de, *Membre de l'Institut, 18, Boulevard de Magenta, Paris, France.*
- 1898 MIESEGAES, Herman, 37, *Porchester Terrace, W.*
- 1863 *MILES, Colonel Samuel B., *Bombay Staff Corps.*
- 1897 *MILLS, Laurence Heyworth, M.A., D.D., *Professor of Zend Philology, 218, Ifley Road, Oxford.*
- 1903 *MIR IMDAD ALI, M.B., *Kapurthala, Panjab, India.*
- 1899 *MISRA, Ramshankar, M.A., *Officiating Magistrate and Collector, Ghazipur, U.P., India.*
- 1903 *MITRA, S. M., 62, *Cornwall Gardens, S.W.*
- 320 1874 *MOCKLER, Lieut.-Col. E., *Bombay Staff Corps, Political Agent, Muscat.*
- 1905 *MODI, E. M., *opposite Grant Road Station, Sclater Road, Bombay, India.*
- 1905 *MODI, Rustam Jivanji Jamshedji, 16, *Trebovir Road, Earls Court, S.W.*
- 1882 *†MOHANLAL VISNULAL PANDIA, Pundit, *Gorepārā Mohallā, Muttra, N.W.P., India.*
- 1884 MOLONEY, Sir Alfred, K.C.M.G., *Ingatestone Hall, Essex.*
- 1900 MONS, MRS., *The Poplars, Avenue Road, N.W.*
- 1901 MONTEFIORE, Claude, 12, *Portman Square, W.*
- 1877 §MORRIS, HENRY, *Eastcote House, St. John's Park, Blackheath, S.E.*
- 1881 MORRISON, Walter, M.P., 77, *Cromwell Road, S.W.;*
Matham Tarn, Bell Busk, Leeds.
- 1882 *†MORSE, H. Ballou, *Chinese Imperial Customs, Shanghai;*
26, Old Queen Street, Westminster, S.W.

- 330 1890 *MOSS, R. Waddy, *Didsbury College, Manchester.*
 1895 *MUKERJEE, Babu Najendra Nath, M.A., F.R.S.L.,
Professor of English Literature, Maharajah's College,
Jaipur, Rajputana, India.
 1882 *MUKERJI, Phanibhusan, *Inspector of Schools, Presidency*
Division, Bengal; 57, Jhowtolah Road, Ballygunje,
Calcutta, India.
 1901 *MUKERJI, Benoy Vehari, *Professor of History and Logic,*
St. Andrew's College, Gorakhpur, N.W.P., India.
 1904 *MUKHERJEA, Babu Satis Chandra, *Advocate, 82d Street,*
Mandalay, Burma.
 1904 *MUKHERJI, Babu Harendra Krishna, 54, *Sankaripara*
Road, Bhowanipur, Calcutta, India.
 1900 *MULIYIL KRISHNAM, B.A., *Malayalam Translator to*
Government and Professor at the Presidency College,
Madras, India.
 1905 *MULLA, Yusuf I., 1, *Twenty-eighth Street, Rangoon,*
Burma.
 1895 *MÜLLER-HESS, Dr. E., *Professor of Sanskrit at the*
University, Berne, 47, Effingerstrasse, Switzerland.
 1898 *MYSORE, H.H. the Maharaja, *The Palace, Bangalore,*
S. India
- 340 1903 *NAIR, Chitūr Madhanan, *Barrister-at-Law, Madras,*
India.
 1898 *NARTZOFF, Alexis de, *Tambov, Russia.*
 1891 *NATHAN, P. Rama, The Hon., *Colombo, Ceylon.*
 HON. NAVILLE, Edouard, D.C.L., *Malaguy, near Geneva,*
Switzerland.
 1901 NEILL, J. W., *Professor of Indian Law, University College;*
12, Holland Park Avenue, W.
 1860 *†NELSON, James Henry, M.A., *Cuddalore, Madras, India.*
 1900 *NEVILL, Henry Rivers, *Assistant Commissioner,*
Allahabad, U.P., India.
 1905 *NICHOLLS, W. H., *Archæological Surveyor for United*
Provinces, Naini Tal, India.
 1895 *NICHOLSON, R. A., 51, *Bateman Street, Cambridge.*
 HON. NÖLDEKE, Professor Theodor, *Strassburg, Germany.*

- 350 1903 *NOYCE, W. F., K.I.H., 76, *Greyhound Lane, Streatham Common, S.W., and Common Room, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.*
- 1900 *OERTEL, C. H., *Barrister-at-Law, Lahore, Panjab, India.*
- 1900 *OERTEL, F. O., *Benares, U.P., India.*
- 1901 *OHTANI, Fusamato H., *Higashi Hongwanzi, Kyoto, Japan.*
- 1904 *OLD, W. Gorn.
- 1888 OLDHAM, Brigade-Surgeon Charles Frederick, *The Lodge, Great Bealings, Woodbridge, Suffolk.*
- 1900 *OMAN, Professor J. Campbell, 10a, *Hillfield Gardens, Muswell Hill, N.*
- 1900 *OSTROG, Count Léon, *Rue de Suède, Constantinople, Turkey.*
- 1904 *OUNG, Moung Ba Hla, "*Burma*," 147, *Lower Addiscombe Road, Croydon.*
- 1904 *PADUVAL, M. R. Ry Apat Krishna, *Sub-Registrar of Assurances, Manantoddy, Malabar, India.*
- 360 1898 *PANDIT, V. R., B.A., *Sitabaldi, Nagpore, C.P., India.*
- 1902 *PARASNIS, Dattatraya B., *Happy Vale, Satara, Bombay Presidency, India.*
- 1893 *PARGITER, F. E., B.C.S., *United Service Club, Calcutta, India.*
- 1905 *PARKER, Frederick Hardyman, *President of the District Court, Nikosia, Cyprus.*
- 1900 *†PARLA KIMEDI, The Raja of, *Parla Kimedi, Ganjam, Madras Presidency, India.*
- 1902 PEROWNE, Edward S. M., F.S.A., 20, *Randolph Road, Meila Vale, W.*
- 1905 *PETERSEN, F. G., *Abildsgaardsgade, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
- 1890 *PFUNGST, Arthur, Ph.D., 2, *Gärtnerweg, Frankfurt, Germany.*
- 1901 *PHILIP, M. J., *Alleppey, Travancore, India.*
- 1874 *†PHYA RAJANATTAYANUHAR, His Excellency, *Private Secretary to the King of Siam.*

- 370 1903 *PILLAY, J. Ponnambalam, *Quilon, Travancore, Madras, India.*
- 1881 §PINCHEs, Theophilus G., LL.D., 38, *Blomfield Road, Maida Hill, W.*
- HON. 1901 PISCHEL, Prof. Dr. Richard, *Joachim Friedrichstrasse 47, Berlin, Halensee, Germany.*
- 1895 PITT, St. George Lane-Fox, *Travellers' Club, Pall Mall, S. W.*
- 1894 PLINMER, Mrs., 3, *Hall Road, N. W.*
- 1893 *§PLUNKETT, Lieut.-Colonel G. T., R.E., C.B., *The Museum, Kildare Street, Dublin, Ireland.*
- 1874 POPE, Rev. G. U., D.D., *Teacher of Tamil, Indian Institute, Oxford.*
- 1893 *POUSSIN, Professor Louis de la Vallée, 13, *Boulevard du Parc, Ghent, Belgium.*
- 1902 PRICE, F. G. Hilton, F.S.A., 17, *Collingham Gardens, South Kensington, S. W.*
- 1903 *PRICE, Harry, *c/o B. Weakin, Esq., Cherrington, near Newport, Salop.*
- 380 1905 *PROCTOR, Henry, *H.M. Stationery Office, Westminster, S. W.*
-
- HON. 1901 RADLOFF, Professor Dr. V., *The University, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- 1903 *RAE, H. B., *Presidency College, Calcutta, India.*
- 1899 *RAM, Lāl Sita, *Deputy Collector, Moradabad, U.P., India.*
- 1902 *RAM, Pandit Bolaki, *Shastri Vidyasagar College, Ajmere, India.*
- 1874 *†RAMASVAMI, Iyengar B., *Bangalore, Madras.*
- 1905 *RANGACHARYA, T. M., *Tanjore, India.*
- 1891 *RANKING, Lieut.-Colonel G. P., A., I.M.S., 14, *Baumont Street, Oxford.*
- 1869 †RANSOM, Edwin, 24, *Ashburnham Road, Bedford.*
- 1888 §RAPSON, E. J., *Professor of Sanskrit, University College, London; British Museum, W. C.*
- 390 1897 *RAWLINS, J. P., *District Superintendent of Police, Rawalpindi, Panjab, India.*
- 1905 *RAWSON, Joseph Nadin, *Jesus College, Oxford.*

- 1896 *RAY, Khirad C., *Headmaster Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, India.*
- 1895 *RAYNBIRD, Hugh, *Garrison Gateway Cottage, Old Basing, Basingstoke.*
- 1887 *REA, A., F.S.A.Scot., *Archæological Survey Department, Bangalore, Madras.*
- 1892 §REAY, The Rt. Hon. the Lord, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E. LL.D., PRESIDENT, *Carolside, Earlstoun, Berwickshire; 6, Great Stanhope Street, Mayfair, W.*
- 1886 *REES, John David, C.I.E., M.P., 17, *Pall Mall, S.W.; Hillmedes, Harrow.*
- 1889 REUTER, Baron George de, 86, *St. James's Street, S.W.*
- 1897 *REUTER, J. N., 21, *Fabriksgatan, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1879 *RICE, Lewis, *Director of Public Instruction, Bangalore, India.*
- 400 1892 †RIDDING, Miss C. Mary, *St. James's House, St. James's Square, Holland Park, W.*
- 1893 *†RIDDING, Rev. W., 3, *Grove Street, Chapelgate, Retford.*
- 1860 RIPON, The Most Hon. the Marquess of, K.G., F.R.S., *Chelsea Embankment, S.W.*
- 1902 *RIVERS, W. H. R., *St. John's College, Cambridge.*
- 1872 *†RIVETT-CARNAC, Colonel J. H., C.I.E., F.S.A., late I.C.S., *Schloss Rothberg, Rougemont, Switzerland; 40, Green Street, Park Lane, W.*
- 1880 ROBINSON, Vincent J., C.I.E., F.S.A., *Parnham, Beaminster, Dorset.*
- 1882 *ROCKHILL, His Excellency the Hon. W. W., *United States Minister, United States Legation, Pekin, China.*
- 1892 ROGERS, Alex., 38, *Clanricarde Gardens, W.*
- 1905 *ROSE, H. A., I.C.S., *Castelnau House, Mortlake, S.W.*
- HON. 1896 ROSEN, Professor Baron von, *The University, St. Petersburg.*
- 410 1894 *ROSS, E. D., Ph.D., *Principal, Calcutta Madrasah, Calcutta, India.*
- 1891 *†ROUSE, W. H. D., F.R.G.S., *Headmaster of Perse School, Cambridge.*
- 1898 *ROW, B. Suryanarain, *Editor of "The Astrological Magazine," Bellary, S. India.*
- 1891 †ROY, Robert, 2, *Garden Court, Temple, E.C.*

- 1904 *RUETE, Saïd, 2, *Magdeburger Platz, Berlin W., Germany.*
- 1900 *RUFFER, M. A., M.D., *President of the Sanitary, Maritime and Quarantine Board of Egypt, Minival, Ramleh, Egypt.*
- 1872 *†RUSTOMJI, C., *Jaunpur, India.*
- HON. SACHAU, Kgl. Geheimer Regierungsrath, Professor Eduard, *Director of the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Berlin, Germany.*
- 1899 *SANDHURST, Lord, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., 60, *Eaton Square, S.W.*
- 1893 *SANJANA, Dastur Darab Peshotan, *High Priest of the Parsees, 114, Chandanawadi, Bombay, India.*
- 420 1892 *SANKARANĀRĀYANA, P., *Tutor to the Princes of Nuzvid, Nuzvid, Kistna District, India.*
- 1895 *SARAWAK, H.H. the Ranees of, *Grey Friars, Ascot.*
- 1891 *†SARDA, Har Bilas, B.A., *Guardian to H.H. the Maharawal of Jaisalmer, Ajmere, India.*
- 1904 *SARRUF, Dr. Y., *Editor of al-Muktataf, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1902 *†SASSOON, David, *Malabar Hill, Bombay, India.*
- 1880 *SATOW, H.E. Sir Ernest M., G.C.M.G., Ph.D., *H.B.M. Minister, Pekin, China.*
- 1874 †§SAYCE, Rev. A. H., *Professor of Assyriology, Queen's College, Oxford; 8, Chalmers Crescent, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1870 *SCHINDLER, General A. Houtum, *Teheran, Persia.*
- HON. SCHRADER, Professor Dr. Eberhard, 20, *Kronprinzen-Ufer, N.W. Berlin, Germany.*
- 1905 *SCHRADER, Friedrich Otto, Ph.D., *Director, Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras, India.*
- 430 1885 *SCOTT, Sir James George, K.C.I.E., *Deputy Commissioner, Burma; Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1903 *SEATON, E. H., *Principal, Nizam's College, Haidarabad, India.*
- 1903 *SEDDON, Charles Norman, *Baroda, India.*
- 1867 *†SELIM, Faris Effendi, *Constantinople.*
- 1887 *SELL, Rev. Canon E., K.I.H., *Church Mission House, Egmore, Madras, India.*
- 1904 *SEN, Nirmal Chandra, 80, *Lower Circular Road, Calcutta, India.*

- HON. SENART, Émile, 18, *Rue François 1^{er}, Paris, France.*
- 1898 *SESHACHARRI, V. C., *High Court Vakil, Mylapore, India.*
- 1877 §SEWELL, R., I.C.S. (retired), 6, *Palace Mansions, Buckingham Gate, S.W.*
- 1905 *SHARPE, James William, *Woodroffe, Portarlinton Road, Bournemouth.*
- 440 1895 *SHAW, F. B., *The College, Bishop's Stortford, Herts.*
- 1903 ††SHERIFF, Syed M., 53, *Torrington Square, W.C.*
- 1884 *†SHYAMAJI KRISHNAVARMAN, M.A., *Barrister-at-Law, 9, Queen's Wood Avenue, Highgate, N.*
- 1902 *SINGH, Kishan, *Professor of Mathematics and Philosophy, Church Mission College, Amritsar, India.*
- 1902 *†SINGH, Raja Pertab Bahadur Singh, C.I.E., of *Tiraul, Partabgarh, Oudh, India.*
- 1903 *SINGH, Thakur Joonjar, *Jodhpur, Rajputana, India.*
- 1903 *SINH, Bhārat Bhooshan Lāl Romesh, Heir Apparent to the *Kālākāṅkar Rāj, Oudh, India.*
- 1895 *†SINHA, Kunwar Keshal Pal, *Raio Kotla, P.O. Narki, Agra District.*
- 1900 *SKEAT, W. W., *Romeland Cottage, St. Albans, Herts.*
- 1904 *SMITH, Miss A. A., 172, *Finchley Road, N.W.*
- 450 1883 *SMITH, Vincent A., M.A., I.C.S., *Hazelwood, The Park, Cheltenham.*
- 1901 *SOHRAWARTHY, Z. R. Zahid, M.A., 26, *Elliott Road, Calcutta, India.*
- 1902 ††SOHRAWARTHY, Abdullah al-Mamoom, 9, *Warwick Crescent, W.*
- 1889 *SRI RAJA MRUTINJAYA NISSENKA BAHADUR GARU, *Zemindar of Sangamvalsa, near Parvatipur, Vizagapatam Division.*
- 1861 *STANMORE, The Right Honourable Lord, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., D.C.L., VICE-PRESIDENT, *Red House, Ascot.*
- 1904 *STEELE, Mrs., 23, *Homer Street, Athens, Greece.*
- 1887 *STEIN, M. A., Ph.D., *Inspector-General of Education and Archaeological Surveyor N.W. Frontier and Baluchistan, Peshawar, India.*
- 1905 *STEVENS, George F. A., *Tabriz, Persia.*
- 1898 *STEVENS, H. W., M.Inst.C.E., *Consulting Engineer, 8, Hastings Street, Calcutta, India.*

- 1901 *STEVENSON, Malcolm, *Ceylon Civil Service*.
- 460 1904 *STRONG, MRS. S. A., 23, *Grosvenor Road, Westminster, S.W.*
- 1891 STURDY, E. T., 6, *St. John's Wood Park, N.W.*
- 1900 *STURGE, P. H., M.A., *Professor of History, Nizam's College, Haidarabad, India.*
- HON. 1892 SUMANGALA, H., *Mahā Nāyaka, Tripitaka Wāgiswar Ācharya, Principal of Vidyodaya College, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- 1893 *†SVAŚTI SOBHANA, H.R.H. Prince, *Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1895 *†SYKES, Major Percy Molesworth, *H.B.M. Consul, East and South-East Persia, Meshed, viā Ashkhabad, Transcaspia, Russia.*
- 1875 *†TAGORE, Rajah Bahadur Sir Sourendro Mohun, C.I.E., *Mus.D., Calcutta.*
- 1896 *TAKAKUSU, Jyan, Ph.D., 207, *Motomachi, Kobe, Japan.*
- 1897 *TALBOT, Walter Stanley, *Srinagar, Kashmir, India.*
- 1897 *TATE, George P., *Indian Survey Department, Dehra Dun, United Provinces, India.*
- 470 1893 *TAW SEIN KO, 2, *Latter Street, Rangoon.*
- 1883 TAWNEY, C. H., C.I.E., *Southlands, Weybridge.*
- 1894 *TAYLOR, Arnold C., *Uppingham, Rutland.*
- 1880 *†TAYLOR, Rev. Charles, D.D., *Master of St. John's College, Cambridge.*
- 1879 *§TEMPLE, Colonel Sir R. C., Bart., C.I.E., *The Nash, Worcester.*
- 1898 *THATCHER, G. W., M.A., *Mansfield College, Oxford.*
- 1904 *THEIN, Maung Ba, *Subordinate Judicial Service, Burma, Common Room, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.*
- 1881 †THEOBALD, W., *Burnside, 3, Bicklescombe Road, Ifracombe.*
- 1905 THIRTE, James William, LL.D., 23, *Borthwick Road, Stratford, E.*
- 1898 THOMAS, F. W., *Librarian, India Office, S.W.*
- 480 1880 *†THORBURN, S. S., *Bracknell House, Bracknell, Berks.*
- 1881 §THORNTON, T. H., C.S.I., D.C.L., *VICE-PRESIDENT, 10, Marlborough Buildings, Bath.*
- 1901 THURN, Sir Everard im, K.C.B., C.M.G., *Suva, Fiji.*
- 1859 *†TIEN, Rev. Anton, Ph.D., 28, *Maresfield Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.*

- 1903 *TILBE, H. H., Ph.D., *Upper Alton, Illinois, U.S.A.*
- 1895 *†TRAVANCORE, H.H. the Maharaja Sir Bala Rama Varma, G.C.S.I.
- 1879 *TROTTER, Coutts, *Athenæum Club; 10, Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh.*
- 1884 *TROTTER, Lieut.-Col. Henry, C.B., *H.M. Consul-General, Galata, Roumania.*
- 1902 *TSAIN, Moung, *Pegu, Burma.*
- 1903 *TSONG, Lim Chin, *Hon. Magistrate, China Street, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 490 1900 *TUCKWELL, Rev. John, 7, *Collingwood Avenue, Muswell Hill, N.*
- 1882 *UDĀIPŪR, His Highness Fateh Singhji Bahadur, Maharána of, G.C.S.I., *Rajputana, India.*
- 1902 *VAID, Narmadāshankar Popatbhai, 189, *Gilmar Place, Edinburgh.*
- 1905 *VAIDYA, Jain Sahityabhusan, *Johri Bazar, Jaipur, Rajputana, India.*
- 1902 *VAIDYA, Visvanath P., 2-3, *Anant Wadi, Bombay, India.*
- HON. 1898 VAJIRĀNĀNA, H.R.H. Prince, *Pavaranivesa Vihāra, Bangkok.*
- 1884 *VALENTINE, Rev. Colin S., LL.D., *Medical Missionary, Training College, Agra.*
- 1901 *VARMA, A. R. Rajaraja, *Superintendent of Vernacular Studies, Maharaja's College, Trivandrum, S. India.*
- 1884 *†VASUDEV, Mādhav Samarth, R. R., B.A.
- 1898 *VENKETSWAMI, M. N., *The Hermitage, Secunderabad, Deccan, India.*
- 500 1883 VERNEY, F. W., M.P., 12, *Connaught Place, Hyde Park, W.*
- 1905 *VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA, Pandit Gouri Datta Misra, *Ganhati, Assam, India.*
- 1899 *VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA, Satis Chandra Āchārya, *Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Calcutta, India.*
- 1905 *VOGEL, J. P., Ph.D., *Archæological Surveyor for Panjab and United Provinces, Lahore, India.*
- 1899 *VOST, Major W., I.M.S., *Edenside, Newlands, Glasgow, N.B.*

- 1897 *WACHA, Dinsha Edalji, 87, *Hornby Road, Fort Bombay.*
- 1892 *†WADDELL, Lieut.-Colonel L. A., C.B., C.I.E., LL.D., I.M.S., 61, *Lissenden Mansions, Highgate Road, N.*
- 1873 §WALHOUSE, M. J., 28, *Hamilton Terrace, N.W.*
- 1904 WALKER, Sir James, C.I.E., 7, *Grosvenor Street, W.; Worplesdon Place, Worplesdon, Surrey.*
- 1898 *WARE, Capt. F. Webb, I.S.C.; *Political Assistant to Agent of Governor General, Quetta, Baluchistan.*
- 510 1900 *WEIR, T. H., B.D., 64, *Partick Hill Road, Glasgow.*
- 1892 §WEST, Sir Raymond, K.C.I.E., LL.D., VICE-PRESIDENT, *Chesterfield, College Road, Norwood, S.E.*
- 1873 *WESTMACOTT, E. Vesey, B.A., *East India United Service Club, St. James's Square, S.W.*
- 1882 WHINFIELD, E. H., *St. Margaret's, Beulah Hill, S.E.*
- 1893 *WHITEHOUSE, F. Cope, 8, *Cleveland Row, St. James', S.W.*
- 1905 WHITWORTH, G. C., *Crowhurst, College Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.*
- 1899 *WICKREMASINGHE, Don M. da Zilva, *Indian Institute, Oxford.*
- HON. 1896 WINDISCH, Geh. Hofrath, Professor E., 15, *Universitätsstrasse, Leipzig.*
- 1876 †§WOLLASTON, A. N., C.I.E., *Registrar and Superintendent of Records, India Office, S.W.; Glen Hill, Walmer.*
- 1896 *WOOD, J. Elmsley, 110, *Blackford Avenue, Edinburgh.*
- 520 1900 *WORKMAN, Mrs. Bullock, c/o Messrs. Brown, Shipley, & Co., 123, *Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1902 *WRENSHALL, Mrs. John C., 1037, *North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*
- 1894 *WRIGHT, H. Nelson, I.C.S., *Allahabad, U.P., India*
- 1905 *YAHYA, K. Mohamed, *Raio, Aligarh, India.*
- 1899 YERBURGH, Robert Armstrong, 25, *Kensington Gore, W.*
- 1899 *YULE, Miss Amy Frances, *Tarradale House, Tarradale, Ross-shire, N.B.*
- 1905 ††YUNUS, Mohamed, 82, *Middle Temple, E.C.*
- 527 1895 *YUSUF ALI, Abdullah ibn, I.C.S., c/o Messrs. King, King, & Co., *Bombay.*

Honorary Members.

- 1866 Professor T. Aufrecht, *Heidelberg*.
 1894 Mons. A. Barth, *Paris*.
 Professor Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, C.I.E., *Pana-*
Bombay.
 1893 Professor Henri Cordier, *Paris*.
 5 1895 Professor O. Donner, *Helsingfors*.
 1890 Professor V. Fausböll, *Copenhagen*.
 1885 Professor De Goeje, *Leiden*.
 1893 Professor Ignaz Goldziher, *Buda Pest*.
 1890 Conte Comm. Angelo De Gubernatis, *Italy*.
 10 1898 Professor Ignace Guidi, *Rome*.
 1902 Professor Houtsma, *Utrecht*.
 1904 Professor Julius Jolly, *Würzburg*.
 1899 Professor J. Karabacek, *Vienna*.
 Professor H. Kern, *Leiden*.
 15 1898 Professor F. Kielhorn, *Göttingen*.
 1902 Professor Lanman, *Harvard, Mass.*
 1873 Professor Barbier de Meynard, *Paris*.
 1895 Professor Ed. Naville, *Geneva*.
 1890 Professor T. Nöldeke, *Strassburg*.
 20 1901 Professor Dr. R. Pischel.
 1901 Professor Dr. V. Radloff.
 1896 Professor Baron von Rosen, *St. Petersburg*.
 Professor Eduard Sachau, *Berlin*.
 1892 Professor Schrader, *Berlin*.
 25 1892 M. Émile Senart, *Paris*.
 1892 Sumangala Mahā Nāyaka Unnānsē, *Colombo, Ceylon*.
 1898 H.R.H. Prince Vajirañāna, *Bangkok*.
 1896 Professor Windisch, *Leipzig*.

Note.—The number of Honorary Members is limited by Rule 9 to thirty.

Extraordinary Member.

H.H. Atābati-A'zam, Prime Minister of Persia.

LIST OF LIBRARIES AND SOCIETIES

SUBSCRIBING TO THE

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

- ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 ABERYSTWITH. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF WALES.
 ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Mass.
 ASTOR LIBRARY, New York.
 ATHENÆUM CLUB, Pall Mall, S.W.
 BENARES, QUEEN'S COLLEGE, India.
 BERLIN ROYAL LIBRARY.
 BIRMINGHAM CENTRAL FREE LIBRARY.
 BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 10 Breslau University Library.
 Brighton Public Library.
 BRITISH & FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY, 46, Queen Victoria St., E.C.
 CAIRO KHEDIVIAL LIBRARY.
 CALCUTTA IMPERIAL LIBRARY.
 CHICAGO UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, ILLINOIS.
 CHRISTIANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 CINCINNATI PUBLIC LIBRARY, Ohio.
 COLUMBIA COLLEGE LIBRARY, New York.
 CONNEMARA PUBLIC LIBRARY, MADRAS.
 20 CONSTITUTIONAL CLUB, Northumberland Avenue, S.W.
 CORNELL UNIVERSITY, Ithaca, New York.
 CRERAR LIBRARY, New York.
 DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY, Michigan.
 EAST INDIA UNITED SERVICE CLUB, 16, St. James's Square, S.W.
 EDINBURGH PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 ERLANGEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 FLORENCE. BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE.
 GENEVA. BIBLIOTHÈQUE PUBLIQUE.
 30 GLASGOW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 GÖTTINGEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, Home Department.
 HALLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 HARVARD COLLEGE.

- JABALPUR. GOVERNMENT COLLEGE.
 JENA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Deansgate, Manchester.
 JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, Baltimore.
 JUNAGADH COLLEGE, Kathiawad.
- 40 KIEF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 LONDON LIBRARY, 14, St. James's Square, S.W.
 LUCKNOW MUSEUM.
 LUND UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 MADRID. BIBLIOTECA DEL ATENEO, CALLE DEL PRADO.
 MANCHESTER FREE REFERENCE LIBRARY, King St., Manchester.
 MARBURG UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 MELBOURNE PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 MÜNICH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 NAPLES UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- 50 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 OXFORD. THE INDIAN INSTITUTE.
 OXFORD. QUEEN'S COLLEGE.
 PEABODY INSTITUTE, Baltimore.
 PENNSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 PHILADELPHIA. LIBRARY COMPANY.
 PRAG. DEUTSCHE UNIVERSITÄT.
 PRATAP SINGH MUSEUM, Sirinagar, Kashmir.
 PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY, U.S.A., THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
- 60 RICHMOND WESLEYAN COLLEGE.
 SAN FRANCISCO FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY, California.
 SHILLONG PUBLIC LIBRARY, Assam.
 STOCKHOLM ROYAL LIBRARY.
 STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 STRASBURG UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 SYDNEY FREE LIBRARY.
 TOKYO. IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LITERATURE.
 TÜBINGEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 UPSALA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- 70 WASHINGTON CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 WÜRZBURG UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 ZÜRICH STADT BIBLIOTHEK.

Note.—There are many other libraries which subscribe through the booksellers. The Secretary would be much obliged by the Librarians of such libraries to send him their names to be added to the above list.

	Resident Members.	Resident Compounders.	Non-resident Members.	Non-resident Compounders.	Library Members.	Honorary and Extraordinary Members.	Subscribing Libraries.	Total.
1901 ...	94	30	279	66	5	32	60	566
1902 ...	93	26	291	66	6	32	63	577
1903 ...	103	26	302	69	9	32	66	607
1904 ...	93	26	291	68	11	32	66	587
1905 ...	90	24	304	68	12	31	67	596
Deaths ...	3	2	4	4	...	2	...	15
Retirements	3	...	19	...	5	27
Elected since	84	22	281	64	7	29	67	554
	2	...	32	...	6	...	5	45
Transfers ...	86	22	313	64	13	29	72	599
	-2	...	-3	...	-1	-6
	+2	...	+3	+1	+6
Jan. 1st, 1906	86	22	313	65	12	29	72	599



00042290

