

which I am responsible, a considerable effort is required to misunderstand most of the passages, which I feel sure few readers will make.

The right to issue a translation without comment has not, I think, been questioned hitherto. How much will be intelligible will depend on the amount of knowledge with which the reader starts. Thus we might expect the *reviewer* of a book on Islam to know that the name Jurjî indicated that its bearer was a Christian, but we see from Mr. Brooks's case that a reviewer may lack this information. A translator who undertook to provide for every possible form of ignorance in his readers would find his life draw to a close before his translation was ended.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

BHAMAHA AND DANDIN.

Mr. Narasimhiengar contributed in this Journal, 1905, p. 535 ff., an interesting article on Bhāmaha, the Rhetorician. Through the kindness of Professor Rangacharyar, of Madras, I secured a transcript of the manuscript of Bhāmaha's work. In this communication I propose to discuss some of the points raised by Mr. Narasimhiengar, and to make a few observations on other points connected with the subject.

I demur to the conclusion arrived at on p. 535 that Bhāmaha was a Buddhist. My transcript reads the introductory verse differently from the manuscript used by Mr. Narasimhiengar, and presents the name Śārva instead of Sārva.¹ This shakes the foundations of his theory. Śārva is a well-known name of Śiva.² As to the word

¹ प्रणम्य शर्वं सर्वज्ञं मनोवाक्कायकर्मभिः ।

² ईश्वरः शर्व ईशानः शंकरश्चन्द्रशेखरः । (Amara, I, i, 30). Compare

also Bhāmaha's own words : सरूपशेषं तु पुमान्स्त्रिया यत्र च शिष्यते ।

यथाह वरुणाविन्द्रौ भवौ शर्वौ मडाविति ॥ (Bhāmaha, vi, 32).

Sarvajña, it cannot be argued that it is applied exclusively to Buddha. Mr. Narasimhiengar has cited the Amarakośa, I, i, 13, as giving Sarvajña as a name of Buddha, but has overlooked what occurs a few lines farther on. Amara himself says that Sarvajña is also a name of Śiva.¹ This fact, together with the reading Śarva in Bhāmaha's introductory verse, takes away almost all the ground from under the feet of Mr. Narasimhiengar. The transcript in my possession reads, in the other verse quoted from Bhāmaha, *sārvas sarvīya ityapi*, and not *sārvas sārīvīya*, as that of Mr. Narasimhiengar does. As the introductory verse contains a salutation to Śarva, i.e. to Śiva, the derivation of the words *sārva* and *sarvīya* does not prove anything either one way or the other. The two words simply mean 'well disposed to all.' It is doubtful whether Pāṇini (v, 1. 10) regards *sārva* as a name of Buddha. On the contrary, it seems very probable that he applied the word to anything that was well disposed or beneficial to all. The name Rakrilagomin cannot prove much. When the Buddhists had lived for centuries on good terms with their rivals in religion, it is quite possible that some of the names peculiar to the Buddhists might have been adopted by the followers of Brahmanism. A remarkable point militating against the view that Bhāmaha was a Buddhist is that there is not, in the whole of the work, a single quotation or verse bearing a distinctive mark of Buddhism, while all the verses refer to the Brahmanic gods and to Brahmanic ideas. Compare in this respect the commentary of Namisādhu, which bristles with quotations from Jaina writers. For all these reasons, I think that it has not been proved that Bhāmaha was a Buddhist. On the contrary, I have shown good grounds for saying that he was a Hindu and a worshipper of Śiva.

¹ कुशानुरेताः सर्वज्ञो धर्जटिर्नीललोहितः। हरः etc. (Amara, I, i, 35).

As to the age of Bhāmaha, I am glad to see that Mr. Narasimhiengar arrives at the same conclusion as that which I independently reached in my essay on the history of Alamkāra literature (not yet published).¹ He incontestably proves that Bhāmaha is later than Daṇḍin. He omits, however, one point bearing on the relation of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. There is one verse common to both.² The verse is given by both as an example of the figure Preyas. Daṇḍin, it is generally supposed, does not borrow any verse, except the much-discussed one, *limpativa tamo*, from any writer. If this be correct, then we must regard the verse in question as composed by Daṇḍin. In that case it would furnish another argument for saying that Bhāmaha is later than Daṇḍin.

On p. 542 Mr. Narasimhiengar discusses a passage from Namisādhū and comes to the conclusion that there were two rhetoricians, Medhāvinanda and Rudra, and finds fault with those who regard Medhāvīrudra as the name of one author. The evidence, in his opinion irrefutable, that he produces, will not hold water, if properly examined. Because Bhāmaha and Namisādhū give quotations under the name Medhāvin, Mr. Narasimhiengar supposes that Medhāvin is quite distinct from Rudra in the passage quoted by him from Namisādhū.³ Mr. Narasimhiengar overlooks the fact that, when a person's name is compounded of two separable elements, he is often referred

¹ The Bombay University awarded to me a gold medal for this essay in 1906.

² Compare, however, the following verse from the Mahābhārata :
 या मे प्रीतिः पुष्कराक्ष त्वद्दर्शनसमुद्भवा । सा किमाख्यायते तुभ्य-
 मन्तरात्मासि देहिनाम् । (Udyogaparvan, lxxxix, 24). The verse
 common to both is : अथ या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते ।
 कालेनेषा भवेत्प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात्पुनः ॥ (Kāvyādarśa, ii, 276, and
 Bhāmaha, iii, 5).

³ ननु दण्डिमेधाविद्भामहादिकृतानि सन्धेवालंकारशास्त्राणि
 (Namisādhū on Rudraṭa, i, 2).

to by the first component only or sometimes by the second, e.g., Dharmakīrti is quoted as Kīrti, Bhartṛihari as Hari, and Bhīmasena as Bhīma. In the same way, Medhāvīn may be a shorter form of Medhāvīrudra. This would not be an unusual name, for a Mālavarudra is mentioned by Kshemendra in his *Auchityavichāra-charchā*.¹ The strongest argument, however, against the theory that Medhāvīn and Rudra are two distinct rhetoricians is that, while Namisādhū often quotes Daṇḍin, Medhāvīn, and Bhāmaha by name, there is not a single quotation expressly taken from Rudra. If Rudra were an eminent and ancient rhetorician as Mr. Narasimhiengar supposes, we naturally expect that Namisādhū, in his voluminous commentary, should have at least once quoted him, especially as he quotes many times from the three others who have been joined with the supposed Rudra. I am, therefore, led to the conclusion that the rhetorician Rudra, the predecessor of Bhāmaha, is an imaginary person.

On p. 543 Mr. Narasimhiengar accepts the end of the sixth century as the date of Daṇḍin. There is a line of evidence which has apparently not been investigated by anyone up to the present, and which might go far to settle the question of Daṇḍin's age. Daṇḍin, in his *Kāvya-darśa*, refers to a king Rājavarman.² The date of Rājavarman would help us in determining the date of Daṇḍin. I hope that antiquarians will take up my humble suggestion. Pandit, in his masterly introduction

¹ Under verse 15 : . यथा वा मालवश्चन्द्रस्य

अभिनववधूरोषखादः करोषतनूनपादसरलजनाश्लेषकूरस्तुषारसमीरणः । गलितविभवस्याज्ञेवाद्य बुतिर्मसृणा रवेर्विरहिवनितावक्रौपम्यं विभर्ति निशाकरः ।

² सोमः सूर्यो मरुद्भूमिर्वीर्यम होताऽनलो जलम् । इति रूपाण्यतिक्रम्य त्वां द्रष्टुं देव के वयम् ॥ इति साक्षात्कृते देवे राज्ञो यद्वाजवर्मणः । प्रीतिप्रकाशनं तच्च प्रिय इत्यवगम्यताम् ॥ (*Kāvya-darśa*, ii, 278-279).

to the Gaudavaho, has pointed out that Śaṅkarāchārya mentions a king Rājavarman in his Bhāṣhya on the Chāndogya-Upanishad.¹

There is a commentary ascribed to a Bhāmaha on the Prākṛitaprakāśa of Vararuchi. It is noteworthy that the introductory verse contains a salutation to Gaṇeśa.² If some scholar proves the identity of the two Bhāmahas, he would render a great service to the cause of Sanskrit studies.

P. V. KANE.

INSCRIPTION AT KAL'AH-I-SANG.

In 1902 I had the honour of reading a paper before the Royal Asiatic Society entitled "Historical Notes on South-East Persia" (*vide* J.R.A.S. for October, 1902). In it I described my discovery of Kal'ah-i-Sang, an ancient capital of the Kirmān province, and gave the purport of an inscription which was chiselled in honour of Sulṭān Aḥmad, 'Imād-ud-Dīn of the Muẓaffar dynasty of Kirmān in A.H. 789 (1387). My first visit to these ruins, the importance of which has since been fully demonstrated in Mr. Guy Le Strange's "The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate" (*vide* pp. 300 et seqq.), was in 1900. Four years later I was fortunate enough to be able to make a second inspection of this interesting site, and this time I was accompanied by a competent Persian scholar, who carefully copied the pulpit inscription. Moreover, thanks to my cousin, Mr. H. R. Sykes, I am able to illustrate

¹ यथा पूर्णवर्मणः सेवा भक्तपरिधानमात्रफला । राजवर्मणस्तु सेवा राज्यतुल्यफलेति तद्वत् । (Chhāndogyopanishadbhāṣhya, ii, 23, p. 104, Poona ed.).

² जयति मदमुदितमधुकरमधुररुताकलनकूणितापांगः । करविहितगण्डकण्डूविनोदमुखितो गणाधिपतिः ॥