

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY


CENTRAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CALL No. 891.05/J.R.A.S.
ACC. No. 24631

D.G.A. 79.

GIPN—S4—2D. G. Arch. N D./57.—25-9 58—1,00,000.





THE JOURNAL
OF
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

115



1911

1911

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

FOR

1911
24631



1911.05
J.R.A.S.


A345

A.D. MDCCLXXII. INST.

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

MDCCCLXI

STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LIMITED



PRINTERS, HERTFORD

CENTRAL AGRICULTURAL AND GEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI:

Acc. No. 2.H.631.

Date 23.10.56.

Call No. 891.05. / F.R.B.S.

CONTENTS FOR 1911

ARTICLES

	PAGE
I. Notes on the Classification of Bashgali. By STEN KONOW	1
II. The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van. Part VIII. By the Rev. Professor A. H. SAYCE	49
III. The Bābar-nāma: a passage judged spurious in the Haydarābād Manuscript. By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE	65
IV. L'Inscription funéraire de Ts'ouan Pao-tseu. Réponse à M. Farjenet. Par ÉDOUARD CHAVANNES	75
V. Āryabhaṭa's System of expressing Numbers. By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (Retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E.	109
VI. Archæological Exploration in India, 1909-10. By J. H. MARSHALL, C.I.E.	127
VII. Another Unknown Language from Eastern Turkestan. By A. COWLEY	159
VIII. Dr. Stein's Turkish Khuastuanift from Tun-huang, being a Confession-prayer of the Manichæan Auditores. Edited and translated by A. v. LE COQ	277
IX. Kānaurī Vocabulary in two Parts: English-Kānaurī and Kānaurī-English. By the Rev. T. GRAHAME BAILEY, B.D.	315
X. A Preliminary Study of the Fourth Text of the Myazedi Inscriptions. By C. O. BLAGDEN	365
XI. Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa. By L. A. WADDELL, C.B., LL.D.	389
XII. Chinese Riddles on Ancient Indian Toponymy. II. Nan-ni-hwa-lo. By Colonel G. E. GERINI	437
XIII. The "Unknown Languages" of Eastern Turkestan. II. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE	447
XIV. The Kaliyuga Era of B.C. 3102. By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (Retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E.	479
XV. Note sur la Langue et l'Écriture inconnues des Documents Stein-Cowley. Par R. GAUTHIOT	497

	PAGE
XVI. English – Svanetian Vocabulary. By OLIVER WARDROP	589
XVII. The <i>Mağālim</i> Jurisdiction in the Ahkām Sulṭādiyya of Māwardī. By H. F. AMEDROZ	635
XVIII. The Kaliyuga Era of B.C. 3102. By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (Retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E.	675
XIX. Notes on the Disposal of Buddhist Dead in China. By W. PERCEVAL YEITS	699
XX. The Epic Use of Bhagavat and Bhakti. By E. WASHBURN HOPKINS	727
XXI. The Ethiopic Senkessār. By I. GUIDI	739
XXII. Documents Sanscrits de la Seconde Collection M. A. Stein. By L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN	759
XXIII. Coins collected by Sir A. Henry McMahon, K.C.I.E., in Seistan. By O. CODRINGTON, M.D., F.S.A.	779
XXIV. Buddhism in the Shan States. By Sir J. GEORGE SCOTT, K.C.I.E.	917
XXV. The Pāñcarātras or Bhāgavat-sāstra. By A. GOVINDACARYA SVAMIN	935
XXVI. Recent Theories on the Origin of the Alphabet. By HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD	963
XXVII. The Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, D.C.L.	979
XXVIII. Chinese Writing in the Chou Dynasty in the light of Recent Discoveries. By L. C. HOPKINS, I.S.O.	1011
XXIX. Tablets from Tel-loh in Private Collections. By T. G. PINCHES	1039
XXX. Documents Sanscrits de la Seconde Collection M. A. Stein. (Continued.) By L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN	1063
XXXI. The Lingual <i>la</i> in the Northern Brāhmī Script. By H. LÜDERS, Ph.D.	1081
XXXII. The 256 Nights of Aśōka. By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (Retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E.	1091

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

	PAGE
The Sāñchi Edict of Aśōka. By E. HULTZSCH	167
On some Irregular Uses of <i>me</i> and <i>te</i> in Epic Sanskrit, and some Related Problems. By TRUMAN MICHELSON	169
Note on the above. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	177
Further Note on the Genitive-Accusative Construction in Marāṭhī. By V. LESNÝ	179
Dattaka-sūtra. By R. NARASIMHACHAR	183
Remarks on Mr. Narasimhachar's Note. By J. F. FLEET	186
The Keḷadi Rājas of Ikkēri and Bednūr. By R. NARASIMHACHAR	188
The Translation of the term Bhagavat. By F. OTTO SCHRADER	194
A Case of Hindu Syneretism. By G. A. GRIERSON	195
Note on Dr. Sten Konow's Article on Bashgalī. By G. A. GRIERSON	195
Udānam. By B. C. MAZUMDAR	197
Does Al Ghazzali use an Indian Metaphor? By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS	200
Note on the "Unknown Languages" of Eastern Turkestan. By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE	201
Tibetan Invasion of India in 747 A.D. By L. A. WADDELL	203
Seal of the Dalai Lama. By L. A. WADDELL	204
Seal of the Dalai Lama. By E. H. WALSH	206
Ancient Indian Anatomical Drawings from Tibet. By L. A. WADDELL	207
The Standard Height of an Indian Man. By J. F. FLEET	208
Early Use of the Buddhist Era in Burma. By C. O. BLAGDEN	209
— By TAW SEIN KO	212
Remarks on the Preceding two Notes. By J. F. FLEET	216
The Khatu or Khattar Tribe. By WILLIAM IRVINE	217
Lost MSS. of the "Arabian Nights" and a projected Edition of that of Galland. By DUNCAN B. MACDONALD	219
The newly discovered Arabic Text of "Ali Babu and the Forty Thieves". By CHARLES C. TORREY	221
La Fondation de Goeje	229
First Universal Races Congress	229

	PAGE
Seraps from the Śaḍḍarśana. By G. A. JACOB	509
Bṛihaspati and Tishya. By J. F. FLEET	514
The Use of the Abacus in India. By J. F. FLEET	518
Vēlūrpālayam Plates of Nandivarman III. By V. VENKAYYA	521
The Origins of Bengali. By J. D. A.	524
Hēro and Rao. By J. KIRKIE	528
The Dalai Lama's Seal. By A. H. FRANCKE	528
Asoka's Fourth Rock-Edict. By E. HULTZSCH	785
The Kaṭapayādi System of Expressing Numbers. By J. F. FLEET	788
The Planet Bṛhaspati. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	794
The Birthplace of Bhakti. By G. A. GRIERSON	800
The Language of the Kambōjas. By G. A. GRIERSON	801
The Ṭākī Alphabet. By G. A. GRIERSON	802
Suggestions regarding Rigveda X, 86. By F. E. PARGITER	803
Mahishamaṇḍala. By L. RICE	809
Remarks on Mr. Rice's Note. By J. F. FLEET	816
"Genitive-Accusative" in Marāṭhī. By T. K. LADDU	819
The Genitive-Accusative Construction in Marathi. By L. J. SEDGWICK	821
The Dalai Lama's Seal. By L. A. WADDELL	822
Oriental Numismatics	825
A Second Note on the Bhabra Edict. By E. HULTZSCH	1113
A Fourth Note on the Rūpnāth Edict. By E. HULTZSCH	1114
A Note on the Above. By T. K. LADDU	1117
Bṛihaspati and Tishya. By J. F. FLEET	1119
Ratanapūṇṇa : Yadanabon : Mandalay. By J. F. FLEET	1123
Saundarananda Kāvya, viii, 35. By F. W. THOMAS	1125
Dravida Prāñāyāma. By K. R. V. R.	1126
Seraps from the Śaḍḍarśana. By G. A. JACOB	1127
An Ahom (Shan) Legend of Creation (from an old MS.). By W. W. COCHRANE	1132
The Date of Buddhādāsa of Ceylon from a Chinese source. By EDWARD R. AYRTON	1142

NOTICES OF BOOKS

	PAGE
JOSEPH CHAILLEY. Administrative Problems of British India. Translated by Sir WILLIAM MEYER, K.C.I.E. Reviewed by WILLIAM IRVINE	231
“The Search after God” (Brahma-mīmāṃsā) by the Inspired Saint, Bādarāyaṇa, with “the Holy Interpretation” (Śaiva-blāshya) of the Teacher-in-God (Śivāchārya), Śrīkaṇṭha, known also as Nīlakaṇṭha. By L. D. BARNETT	236
R. GEYER. Beiträge zum Dīwān des Ru'bah. By FRITZ KRENKOW	237
Major P. M. SYKES (trans. and ed.). The Glory of the Shia World. By H. B.	239
AHMAD BEY ZERI. Mémoire sur les moyens propres à déterminer en Égypte une renaissance des lettres Arabes. By A. R. G.	241
Rev. ARTHUR LLOYD. Shinran and his Work: Studies in Shinshu Theology. By F. VICTOR DICKINS	242
HARTWIG DERENBOURG. Oumâra du Yémen, sa vie et son œuvre. Vol. II. By H. HIRSCHFELD	244
MARY HOOKER. Behind the Scenes in Peking: being Experiences during the Siege of the Legations. By J. DYER BALL	246
Lieut. V. C. P. HODSON. Historical Records of the Governor- General's Body Guard. By WILLIAM IRVINE	248
M. MOIN-UD-DIN. The History of the Taj and the Buildings in its Vicinity. By WILLIAM IRVINE	250
K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR. A History of India. Part I: The Pre-Musulman Period. By WILLIAM IRVINE	251
Sir BAMPFYLDE FULLER, K.C.S.I., C.I.E. Studies of Indian Life and Sentiment. By WILLIAM IRVINE	253
HAROLD H. BENDER, Ph.D. The Suffixes <i>mant</i> and <i>vant</i> in Sanskrit and Avestan. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	254
KARL SCHÖNFELD. Das Śāntisātaka, mit Einleitung, kriti- schem Apparat, Übersetzung, und Anmerkungen. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	257
LEOPOLD VON SCHROEDER. Die Wurzeln der Sage vom heiligen Gral. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	261
R. F. JOHNSTON, F.R.G.S. Lion and Dragon in Northern China. By J. DYER BALL	261

	PAGE
GEORGE CŒDÈS. Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Latins relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient depuis le IV ^e siècle av. J.-C. jusqu'au XIV ^e siècle. By C. O. BLAGDEN	536
D. K. WIELENGA. Schets van een Soembaneesche Spraakkunst (naar 't dialect van Kambara). By C. O. BLAGDEN	541
R. GRANT BROWN, I.C.S. Half the Battle in Burmese. By J. G. S.	543
MRS. LESLIE MILNE. Shans at Home. By J. G. S.	546
GEORG M. STENZ, S.V.D. Beiträge zur Volkskunde Süd-Schantungs. By J. DYER BALL	551
SUPERIOR of KRUÛ CÛ MONASTERY, Paklat. Paṭhamam Sudhammawatī, Gawampati, Rājādhīrāt. By R. HALLIDAY	554
J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, D.Litt. The Dīgha-Nikāya. Vol. III. By C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS	556
E. D. ROSS. Alphabetical List of the Titles of Works in the Chinese Buddhist Tripiṭika. By L. A. WADDELL	560
LÉON WEIGER, S.J. Bouddhisme Chinois. Tome I: Vinaya-Hīnayāna. By L. A. W.	562
MAX L. MARGOLIS, Ph.D. A Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud. By M. GASTER	563
FR. THUREAU-DANGIN. Inventaire des Tablettes de Tello conservées au Musée Impérial Ottoman. Tome I: Textes de l'époque d'Agadé. By T. G. PINCHES	568
DAVID W. MYHRMAN. Sumerian Administrative Documents, dated in the Reigns of the Second Dynasty of Ur, from the Temple Archives of Nippur preserved in Philadelphia. By T. G. PINCHES	571
ARNO POEBEL, Ph.D. Babylonian Legal and Business Documents from the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon, chiefly from Nippur. By T. G. PINCHES	573
HUGO RADAU. Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to the God Nin-ib from the Temple Library of Nippur. By T. G. PINCHES	576
MAULAVI ABDUL WĀLĪ. The Quatrains of Abū Sa'īd s. Abu Khair. By H. BEVERIDGE	827
ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. Mediaeval Sinhalese Art. By J. H. MARSHALL	839

	PAGE
C. SNOUCK HURGRONJE. Michael Jan De Goeje. By C. J. LYALL	843
PANDURANG VAMAN KANE. The Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha Kavirāja. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	848
Archæological Survey of India. Vol. XXXV: Akbar's Tomb, Sikandra. By H. B.	850
IBN ḤAJAR AL-'ASQALĀNĪ. The Tahdīb at-Tahdīb. By F. KRENKOW	853
W. H. VALENTINE. Modern Copper Coins of the Muhammadan States. By J. ALLAN	856
C. E. WILSON. The Maṣnavī, by Jalālu'd-Dīn Rūmī. Book II. By J. S. HAIG	858
Rapporten van de Commissie in Nederlandsch-Indië voor Oudheidkundig Onderzoek op Java en Madoera. By C. O. BLAGDEN	861
Sprachvergleichendes Charakterbild eines Indonesischen Idiomes. By C. O. BLAGDEN	862
GIUSEPPE DE LORENZO. India e Buddhismo Antico. By C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS	865
K. SEIDENSTÜCKER. Pali Buddhismus in Uebersetzungen. By C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS	867
IAN C. HANNAH. Eastern Asia, A History. By W. PERCEVAL YETTS	868
GERTRUDE LOWTHIAN BELL. Amurath to Amurath. By T. G. PINCHES	873
T. W. and C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS. Dialogues of the Buddha. Part II. By M. WINTERNITZ	1145
SHWE ZAN AUNG and Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS. Compendium of Philosophy. By M. WINTERNITZ	1154
BEHARI LAL. The Vedas and their Angas and Upangas. Vol. I. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	1157
SHRIDHAR V. KETKAR, Ph.D. History of Caste in India. Vol. I. By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS	1158
EDUARD KÖNIG, Dr. phil. und theol. Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. By H. HIRSCHFELD	1160
C. H. ARMBRUSTER. Initia Amharica. By EUGEN MITTWOCH	1163
ALBERT HERRMANN. Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien. By J. DYER BALL	1166

	PAGE
Le Commandant D'OLLONE. Les Derniers Barbares: Chine, Tibet, Mongolie. By J. DYER BALL	1168
IMMANUEL GOTTLIEB GENAHR. A Chinese-English Dictionary in the Cantonese Dialect, by Dr. Ernest John Eitel; revised and enlarged. By J. DYER BALL	1172
JOSEPH DAUTREMER. La Grande Artère de la Chine: Le Yangtseu. By W. PERCEVAL YETTS	1176
Le Commandant GASTON CROS, LÉON HEUZÉY, and FR. THUREAU-DANGIN. Mission française de Chaldée. By T. G. PINCHES	1182
Dr. JOSEPH KRAUSZ and Professor Dr. FRITZ HOMMEL. Die Götternamen in den babylonischen Siegelcylinder-Legenden. By T. G. PINCHES	1184
CH.-GUILL. JANNEAU. Une Dynastie Chaldéenne: Les Rois d'Ur. By T. G. PINCHES	1186
RENÉ DUSSAUD. Les Civilisations préhelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Egée. By T. G. PINCHES	1187
R. B. WHITEHEAD, I C.S. Catalogue of the Collection of Coins illustrative of the Rulers of Dehli up to 1858 A.D. in the Dehli Museum of Archæology. By O. C.	1190

- - - - -

NOTES OF THE QUARTER

General Meetings of the Royal Asiatic Society	265, 581, 879, 1191
Anniversary Meeting	879
Presentation of the Public Schools' Medal	903
Principal Contents of Oriental Journals	266, 582, 905, 1191

OBITUARY NOTICES

DONALD WILLIAM FERGUSON. By R. C. TEMPLE	269
ALEXANDER ROGERS	270
DUDLEY FRANCIS AMELIUS HERVEY, C.M.G. By C. O. BLAGDEN	909

CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY	273, 585, 913, 1195

INDEX FOR 1911	1199
--------------------------	------

TRANSLITERATION OF THE SANSKRIT, ARABIC, AND ALLIED ALPHABETS.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR 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.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

1911

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS

	PAGE
AMEDROZ. The <i>Mazālim</i> Jurisdiction in the Aḥkām Sulṭāniyya of Māwardī	635
BAILEY. Kānaurī Vocabulary in two parts: English-Kānaurī and Kānaurī-English	315
BEVERIDGE (A. S.). The Bābar-nāma: a passage judged spurious in the Haydarābād Manuscript	65
BLAGDEN. A Preliminary Study of the Fourth Text of the Myazedi Inscriptions	365
CHAVANNES. L'Inscription funéraire de Ts'ouan Pao-tseu	75
CODRINGTON. Coins collected by Sir A. Henry McMahon, K.C.I.E., in Seistan	779
COWLEY. Another Unknown Language from Eastern Turkestan	159
FLEET. Āryabhaṭa's System of expressing Numbers	109
— The Kaliyuga Era of B.C. 3102	479, 675
— The 256 Nights of Aśōka	1091
GAUTHIOT. Note sur la Langue et l'Écriture inconnues des Documents Stein-Cowley	497
GERINI. Chinese Riddles on Ancient Indian Toponymy. II. Nan-ni-hwa-lo	437
GOVINDACHARYA. The Pāñcarātras or Bhāgavat-sūtra	935
GUIDI. The Ethiopic Senkesār	739
HIRSCHFELD. Recent Theories on the Origin of the Alphabet	963
HOERNLE. The "Unknown Languages" of Eastern Turkestan	417
HOPKINS (E. W.). The Epic Use of Bhāgavat and Bhakti	727
HOPKINS (L. C.). Chinese Writing in the Chou Dynasty in the light of Recent Discoveries.	1011
KEITH. The Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama	979

	PAGE
KONOW. Notes on the Classification of Bashgali	1
LE COQ. Dr. Stein's Turkish Khuastuanift from Tun-huang, being a Confession-prayer of the Manichæan Auditores	277
LÜDERS. The Lingual <i>ḷa</i> in the Northern Brāhmī Script	1081
MARSHALL. Archæological Exploration in India, 1909-10	127
PINCHES. Tablets from Tel-loh in Private Collections	1039
POUSSIN. Documents Sanscrits de la Seconde Collection M. A. Stein	759, 1063
SAYCE. The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van. Part VIII	49
SCOTT. Buddhism in the Shan States	917
WADDELL. Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa	389
WARDROP. English-Svanetian Vocabulary	589
YETTS. Notes on the Disposal of Buddhist Dead in China	699



JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1911

I

NOTES ON THE CLASSIFICATION OF BASHGALI

BY STEN KONOW

THE Bashgalis are the inhabitants of the valleys of the Bashgal River and its tributories. Their settlements extend so far as Birkot on the Chitral stream. According to Dr. Grierson, their dialect can be taken as the type of the language of the Siāh-pōsh Kāfirs of Northern Kāfiristan. An excellent book on Bashgali has been published by Colonel J. Davidson, C.B., I.S.C.,¹ and the remarks which follow are exclusively based on it. I have also, throughout, adopted Colonel Davidson's writing of Bashgali words, with the sole exceptions that I have substituted χ for his kh (sometimes written *kh*), γ for his gh (sometimes written *gh*), \hat{n} for his *ny*, and cancelled the underlining of *sh* and *zh*.

Bashgali is not an isolated language. It forms part of a group of dialects spoken on the North-Western frontier of India. The relationship of this group within the Aryan family, to which it belongs, has been variously defined. Trumpp² states that "the Kāfir tongue being

¹ *Notes on the Bashgali (Kāfir) Language*. Calcutta, 1902. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1902, vol. lxxi, pt. 1, Extra No. 1.

² "On the Language of the so-called Kāfirs of the Indian Caucasus": J.R.A.S., 1862, Vol. XIX, pp. 1 ff., see p. 7.

a pure Prakrit dialect, separated from its sister dialects since the irruption of Mohammadan power, in the tenth century of our era, is of the greatest importance to Indian philology". Tomaschek¹ describes the dialects of Kāfiristan as various forms of a pure Prakrit language. He draws attention to the fact that the Kāfirs count by twenties and sees herein traces of a non-Aryan substratum. Kuhn² classes the languages in question as a separate group within the Aryan languages of India. Biddulph³ is inclined to consider χōwār and the Kāfir dialects as an intermediate link between Indian and Iranian. Dr. Grierson, finally, in his exhaustive monograph⁴ infers "that these languages, which I group together under the name of 'Modern Paisācī', form a third, independent, branch of the great Aryan family, and that they are neither Eranian nor Indian, but something between both. They seem to have left the parent stem after the Indo-Aryan languages, but before all the typical Eranian characteristics, which we meet in the Avesta, had become developed".

In drawing up a Bashgalī Dictionary for Dr. Grierson's Linguistic Survey I have repeatedly been confronted with the question about the relationship of that dialect to other Aryan languages. I have come to the result that Dr. Grierson was right in separating Bashgalī, and consequently the whole group,⁵ from Indo-Aryan, but I think that Bashgalī is essentially an Iranian dialect and cannot.

¹ Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, s.v. Kafir.

² Berichte des VII. Orientalisten-Congresses, Wien, 1888, p. 81; *Album Kern*, pp. 221 f.

³ *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh*, p. 158.

⁴ *The Pisāca Languages of North-Western India*. London, 1906. Asiatic Society Monographs, vol. viii. see p. iii.

⁵ Dr. Grierson calls the group Modern Paisācī. This name is based on the assumption that the language or languages described by Prakrit grammarians under the name of Paisācī was spoken on the North-Western frontier of India, and derived from the same branch as Bashgalī and connected languages. I am unable to accept this theory, for several reasons which I have set forth in a paper, *The Home of Paisācī*, in the ZDMG. lxiv, pp. 95 ff.

consequently, be derived from a third branch of the Aryan family intermediate between Indian and Iranian. The other dialects connected with Bashgali are, with the exception of Kāśmīrī, which seems to occupy a position apart, insufficiently known and cannot be so minutely analysed as Bashgali. I have therefore thought it necessary to publish the materials on which I have based my conclusions as to the affiliation of the dialect, separately without reference to other connected forms of speech. Such a detailed analysis of the individual dialects is the necessary preliminary to a final classification of the whole group. In our case it will also be found of interest because it reveals a state of affairs which we can trace back to the middle of the second millennium B.C.

In trying to characterize the philological position of a dialect such as Bashgali we must keep in mind that the various branches of one and the same linguistic family are not separated from each other like the branches of a tree, and that they have never been absolutely one like the stem. The language of the Aryans before they separated was probably comparatively uniform. There were, however, dialectic varieties. When new grammatical or phonological developments had been started, they spread now in one, now in another direction. The whole area was therefore divided up, but not into well-defined compartments with marked boundaries and definite characteristics. The different groups overlap, and one feature which may be characteristic of one class is often found outside its territory, and is, on the other hand, sometimes absent where it might be expected. Thus the common change of *s* to *h* in Iranian languages can also be traced, outside the Iranian area, in India,¹ while I hope to show that there have, from the oldest times, been Iranian dialects in which it did not take place. Similarly, the more modern change of Iranian *s* (Aryan *ś*)

¹ Grierson, ZDMG. L. p. 17.

to *h* is found in Western Indo-Aryan and in Persian, but not in non-Persian dialects. We cannot, therefore, at the present day expect to find anything but a complicated state of affairs in a border dialect such as Bashgali, spoken between the territories occupied by two connected but different families. Some features will be found to point in one and others in another direction. The details examined below will, however, show that in most phonological features Bashgali agrees with Iranian languages, while the chief characteristic in which it follows the Indian tongues as against Iranian can be traced in an Iranian dialect at a very early period. The grammatical system, on the other hand, has been so thoroughly recast, both in modern Iranian and in modern Indo-Aryan, that it is, in this respect, all but impossible to draw any conclusions from the state of affairs in Bashgali at the present day. Phonology will therefore prove a safer guide, and though I am not able to sketch the history of Bashgali sounds with anything approaching completeness, I think it is possible to point at so many certain facts that we can form a well-founded opinion about the position of the dialect within the Aryan family. Full certainty can only be obtained when we get fuller materials and more precise information about the pronunciation. Colonel Davidson's book is, it is true, remarkably reliable, and I have over and over again had occasion to admire how faithfully he tries to reproduce what he has heard. Only a scholar with systematical phonetical training is, however, able to reproduce the sounds of a strange language with absolute certainty. Moreover, the difficulty is, in the case of Bashgali, enhanced by the great number of loan-words, which are often almost impossible to recognize. My own knowledge of Iranian languages is, finally, rather limited, and I have not been able to explain more than a certain portion of the known Bashgali words etymologically. I have therefore only aimed at collecting and arranging

such certain facts as are apt to elucidate the question under consideration, leaving alone words which I cannot explain and such features in which Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages agree with each other and with Bashgali.

VOWELS

The short Aryan *a* is often kept unchanged; thus, *aiā*, fire, cf. Sanskrit *agnī*, fire, *āṅgāra*, charcoal; *nach*, to loose, S. *naś*. In many cases, however, it is changed to *i*; thus, *ī*, this, S. *ayām*; *gīr*, to count, S. *gaṇaya-*; *mij*, middle, S. *mādhyā*; *wasemā*, we will halt, but *wisilom*, I will remain, S. *vas*. In such instances the change may be due to the neighbourhood of an *i* or *y*. More difficult is the change in *ī*, *iā*, or *ō*, I, S. *ahām*. The vowel of this word is probably not exactly like any English vowel, because then we could not understand why it should be written in such different ways. If it actually sounds like an *i*, we may compare the substitution of *i* for *a* in new-Persian if the *a* is followed by an *h* or a sibilant. The change of *a* to *i* in Indian vernaculars, which is already found in the Prakrits, does not seem to be of the same kind.¹ Still, it is of interest to see that the use of an *i* for an old *a* is most common in Sindhi, where we have already found another feature which connects the dialect with Iranian, viz. the change of *s* to *h*. In connexion with the change of *a* to *i*, I may also draw attention to the form *emā*, we, S. *asmā-*, which is comparable with Avestan *šhma*.

The *i* of the base *pilt*, to fall, is apparently also derived from an *a*, cf. Prakrit *paḍ*, to fall. It is, however, more likely that *il* in this word represents a *li*-vowel, just as we find *ir* for the *ri*-vowel in *zira*, heart, S. *hrīdaya*. The Prakrit *paḍ*, to fall, has usually been derived from S. *pat*.

¹ See Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. § 101 seq.; Grierson, *Phonology of the Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars*, ZDMG. xlix, p. 402.

cf. Pischel, § 218. I think that it would be more likely to connect it with Bashgalī *pilt*. The instances in which a cerebral is spontaneously substituted for a dental in the Prakrits are very few, and they would probably become fewer still if we were better informed about the history of such words. Thus, Prakrit *paḍāū*, a flag, S. *patākā*, may owe its *ḍ* to the word *paṭa*, to which it might have been put in connexion, and so on. If, therefore, Prakrit *paḍ* corresponds to Bashgalī *pilt*, it must be separated from S. *pat* (Greek *πίπτω*), and connected with Lithuanian *pālu*, *pālti*, fall. The Prakrit and Bashgalī verb then contains a suffix *t*, while the corresponding base in Teutonic languages has been increased by adding an *n*.

A short Aryan *a* often becomes *o* or *u*; thus, *uṣhp*, horse, S. *ásva*; *osht*, *usht*, eight, S. *ashtá*; *kur*, ass, S. *khāra*; *kutoss*, says, S. *kathaya-*(?); *kōr*, ear, S. *kārṇa*; *gun*, smell, S. *gandhā*; *chiom*, leather, S. *chárman*; *dots*, *duts*, ten, S. *dása*; *dutt*, tooth, S. *dánta*; *dōn*, handle, S. *duṅḍá*; *pōch*, *pōj*, *pōnj*, five, S. *pāñcha*; *pott*, *putt*, road, S. *pánthās*; *mōch*, *mōsh*, but also *manchī*, man, S. *manushyá*; *lughā*, light, S. *lughá*; *wosut*, spring, S. *vasantá*. In some of these words the *o* or *u* perhaps indicates an indistinct vowel. If, however, we compare *usht*, eight, but *ashtits*, eighteen; *sutt*, seven, but *sapits*, seventeen, another explanation presents itself: the difference between *a* and *o*, *u*, is perhaps due to a difference in quantity. Words such as *ashtits*, eighteen, *sapits*, seventeen, have perhaps transferred the accent to the last syllable, and the first one has consequently been shortened. Now a long Aryan *ā* often becomes *ō* or *o* in Bashgalī; thus, *kon*, arrow, S. *kāṇḍa*; *kōn*, a mine, S. *khāni*; *grom*, *grām*, a village, S. *grāma*; *drōs*, grapes, S. *drākshā*; *nom*, *nām*, name, S. *nāma*; *pōl*, ploughshare, S. *phālu*; *bōr*, a load, S. *bhārá* (but *barwái*, a load-man, a coolie); *mōs*, moon, S. *māsa*; *wōr*, turn, time, S. *cāru*. If we consider cases such as *mōch* and *manchī*, man; *dott*, tooth, but *atēr*,

inside, it becomes probable that the change of *a* to *ō* or *o* is caused by a lengthening of the vowel, and this lengthening can, in many cases, be considered as a compensation for a corresponding shortening of the consonantal element. Thus, *kōr*, ear, S. *kárṇa*; *dutt*, tooth, S. *dánta*; *dōn*, handle, S. *danḍá*; *pōch*, five, S. *pún̄chu*; *sutt*, seven, S. *sápta*; *wosut*, spring, S. *vasantá*, all end in consonants which have been simplified by means of assimilation. Now it is a well-known fact from Indo-Aryan languages that a consonant which has been derived through assimilation from a consonantal compound, has a strong tendency to be shortened, while, as a compensation, the preceding vowel is lengthened. Compare Hindī *āg*, Prakrit *aggi*, Sanskrit *agnī*. The Bashgali substitution of *o*, *u* for an old *a* can, in some cases, be the result of a similar tendency. It should, then, be remembered that the same is also the case in Iranian dialects,¹ and the substitution of an *o* or *u* for a long *ā* is as much in agreement with Iranian as with Indian tendencies,² the long *ā* being liable to be pronounced as an *ō* or *û* in all Iranian languages.

The various changes which the old vowels *i* and *u* undergo in Bashgali have been registered by Dr. Grierson, *Pisāca Languages*, par. 13 ff. I cannot find much in them which would help us to better define the position of Bashgali within the Aryan family. Attention may be drawn to the not infrequent substitution of an *i*-sound for an *u*-sound. Thus *piṭr* and *puṭr*, son, S. *putrá*; *pīsh*, flower, S. *púshpa*; *biā*, *bā*, became, S. *bhūtá*; *bhīm*, earth, S. *bhūmi*; *misht*, hilt, S. *mushtī*. The intermediary step between *u* and *i* was probably *ü* (the sound in German "Mühe"), and this sound is perhaps intended in writings such as *iash*, *yazhī*, morning, S. *ushás*; *miok*, face, S. *múkha*. In words such as *bhīm*, earth, S. *bhūmi*; *misht*, hilt,

¹ See *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, Bd. I, pt. ii, pp. 22 ff.

² See *Grundriss*, I, i, pp. 21, 207, 295, 350, 384.

S. *mushṭí*, the change of *u* to *i* might be ascribed to the influence of the following *i*: in other cases no reason for the change is apparent. It is of interest for the question here under consideration, that a similar substitution of *i* for *u* is quite common in Iranian; compare Persian *pisar* and *pusar*, son; *dizh* and *duzh*, bad; *mishk* and *mushk* musk; *sift* and *suft*, shoulder: *surīn* and *surūn*, hip; Balūchī *dīt* and *dūt*, smoke; Kurd *bīn*, *būn*, base, Persian *bun*; *mishk*, mouse, Persian *māsh*: Sāriqolī *yūγ*, yoke, S. *yugá*; Waḫī *ḍīt*, smoke. Iranian *dūta*: *dīr*, far, S. *dūrá*: Gabrī, *dīr*, far, etc.¹

In the treatment of the vowel *ṛi* the Indian and Iranian branches of the Aryan family have gone different ways. In India the consonantal element was dropped already in the Prakrits. Some few instances of the old *ṛi* occur in Apabhraṁśa (Pischel, § 47), but such words are certainly nothing but learned loans from Sanskrit. An initial *ṛi* often becomes *ri* (Pischel, § 56), but even here the forms without the *r* are quite common, and, at least in many cases, older (Pischel, § 57), so that the *r*-forms may, also in such cases, be due to the influence of Sanskrit. The state of affairs in modern vernaculars is quite in accordance with this conclusion. The old *ṛi*-vowel in genuine tadbhavas is always represented by one of the vowels *a*, *i*, or *u*.

The history of the *ṛi*-vowel in Iranian languages is quite different, the *r*-element having, in all dialects, been preserved to a considerable extent. In new-Persian *ṛi* has become *ur* after labials, *t*, *z*, and *zh*, and *ir* after other sounds; *ṛid* and *ṛish* become *ul*, *il*, and *ush*, *ish*, respectively: and *ṛiy* becomes *īr*: thus, *purr*, Avestan *perena*, full: *kirm*, worm, S. *krīmi*: *mul*, wine. cf. S. *mṛīdvikā*: *mushta*, rubbed, S. *mṛishṭá*: *dil*, heart. S. *hṛid*: *tish*, thirst, S. *tṛishṭá*; *mīryaḍ*, dies, Aryan *mṛiyatai*.² In Pashtō an old *ṛi* is represented by *ar*, *ir*.

¹ See *Grundriss*, I, 1, pp. 25, 27, 235, 266, 294 f., 384. ² *Ibid.*, i, p. 273.

ur, or, before *sh* and *zh*, *a*, *i*, *u*, and *rit* becomes *r*; thus, *mar*, dead, S. *mṛitá*; *vur*, carried, S. *bhṛitá*; *yazh*, bear, S. *ṛiksha*; *kish*, pulled, S. *kṛishtá*.¹ In Balūchī we find *ar*, *ir*, *ur*, or *a*, *i*, *u*; thus, *gvark*, wolf, S. *vṛika*; *zirdē*, heart, S. *hrīdaya*; *murta*, dead, S. *mṛita*: *o-kan-īn*, I do, S. *kṛiṇōmī*; *gipta*, seized, Avestan *gṛapta*; *tunnag*, thirsty, cf. S. *tṛishṇá*.² In the Pamir dialects we have *er*, *ór*, *ūr*, *or*, *ār*, *el*, *ō* (before sibilants), while *rit* in Shighnī sometimes becomes *ād*; thus, Sariqoli *cherm*, worm, S. *kṛimi*; *porsam*, I ask, S. *pṛichchāmi*; *zārd*, heart, S. *hrīd*: Shighnī *yūrsh*, bear, S. *ṛiksha*; *chūdām*, I did, S. *kṛitá*; Waxī *worz*, long, S. *bṛihát*; *celk*, kidney, S. *vṛikká*.³ The Caspian dialects have *ar*, *a*,⁴ and so forth. It will be seen that the prevailing tendency is to retain the *r*-element unless a sibilant follows.

If we now turn to Bashgalī, the state of affairs is as follows. The *r*-element is well preserved in most cases. Thus in *wrikī*, *wriḡī*, *ivrakī*, fox, cf. S. *vṛika*; *kṛā*, did, S. *kṛitá*; *mṛā*, died, S. *mṛitá*; *awēṛā*, brought, S. *ābhṛita*; *mṛi*, earth, soil, S. *mṛid*; *zira*, heart, S. *hrīdaya*; *tarēn* and *tarī*, thorn-bush, dog-rose, cf. S. *tṛiṇa*, English thorn. The word *kakak*, cock, cannot therefore well be derived from Vedic *kṛikarāku*. Like that latter word and like English *cock* it is an onomatopoeic word and belongs to the same class as nursery words, which are not, in many cases, subject to ordinary phonetic laws; compare the nursery word *papa*, father, which has kept its *p* in Teutonic languages, while the ordinary word *pter*, which is derived from it, has developed into English *father*. *Kakak* can therefore just as well be compared with English "cock" as with Vedic *kṛikarāku*. It is a parallel formation and not derived from either. The words *mṛi*, earth; *zira*, heart, show that *r* is also retained before an old *d*. The word *mol*, *mal*, dirty, is therefore scarcely connected

¹ *Grundriss*, I. ii, p. 207.

² *Ibid.*, p. 235.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 297.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 349.

with Prakrit *maṭḍa* (i.e. **mṛḍila*), but rather with S. *māla*.

The long *ṛi*-vowel is treated in a similar way; thus, *drgr*, long, cf. S. *dīrghá*; *tār*, ford, S. *tīrthá*, Prakrit *tāha*; *wishtr*, broad, S. *vistīrṇa*, cf. Avestan *stōrōta*.

If the *ṛi*-vowel is followed by a sibilant, the *r*-element regularly disappears; thus, *īsh*, spear, S. *ṛishṭī*; *kshē*, rub, S. *ghṛish*; *ksho*, drag, S. *kṛish*; *ptī*, back, S. *pṛishṭhā*, Prakrit *putṭhī*; *pmisht*, forget, S. *pramṛish*; *michō*, tell lies, cf. S. *mṛishā*. The only exceptions from this rule which I have noted are *krujā*, *kruzhī*, but also *kish*, *kujhī*, cultivation, cf. S. *kṛishī*, *parmarshṭētī*, and *p'mishtētī*, forgetfully. We may infer that the *r*-element is still slightly sounded in such words.

The sound represented by *ksh* in Sanskrit *ṛiksha*, bear, is apparently treated as a sibilant in Bashgali. The usual form of this word seems to be *īts*, *ṛts* (Davidson, Nos. 129, 930, 1123). In one place (1123) we find *rīts* mentioned as a parallel form. It is noticeable that Iranian languages commonly retain the *r*-element of the vowel in this word; thus, Persian *χīrs*, Shighnī *yārsh*.

Curiously enough the *r*-element of *ṛi* is apparently dropped also after sibilants; compare *shī*, horn, S. *śṛīṅga*, *shīāl*, a jackal, S. *śṛigāla*; *shīnar*, handsome, S. *śṛīṅgāra*; *uzzam*, to yawn, S. *vijṛimbh*.

Dr. Grierson¹ mentions various forms corresponding to S. *nṛittā*, dance, in which the consonantal element of *ṛi* has disappeared; thus, Bashgali *naṭ*, *nōt*, Kāsmiri *nats*, Veron, Wai-alā, Kalāshā, Gawar-Batī *naṭ*, and so forth. All the instances of this cancelling of the *r*-element belong to the base *nṛit*, and it is in disaccord with the common tendency in Bashgali and connected languages. The words in question must therefore be considered as Indian loan-words. With regard to the treatment of the old *ṛi*-vowel in Bashgali we can accordingly lay down the rule that the

¹ *Pisāca Language*, par. 31 ff.

r-element is preserved unless a sibilant follows or precedes, i.e. the state of affairs is almost the same as in most Iranian languages.

CONSONANTS

I now turn to the history of the Aryan consonants in Bashgali, and begin with the sounds corresponding to the surds of the vargas in Sanskrit.

ARYAN STOPS. The history of stops (surd consonants) in Indian and Iranian languages differs to a considerable extent. In India a new class, the so-called cerebrals, has been added to the vargas, and the palatal varga has been largely added to from old sibilants. In other respects the original Aryan state of affairs has been much better preserved than is the case in Iranian tongues. In these latter ones the history of the Aryan stops can be sketched as follows:—

Unaspirated voiceless stops (*tenuēs*) remain unchanged before sonants and after sibilants. In other positions they develop into the surd spirants χ , \acute{s} , θ , f . The corresponding aspirates become surd spirants, or, after sibilants and nasals, unaspirated voiceless stops.

Unaspirated voiced stops (*medie*) remain unchanged if they are not followed by sibilants, in which case they become sonant spirants γ , z , w . The aspirated voiced stops lose their aspiration.¹ All the Iranian languages point back to such a state of affairs. In order to define the position of Bashgali it will be necessary to examine the material in some detail.

The old Aryan *k* is, on the whole, well preserved. As a medial it is often also changed to *g*. Compare *ka*, who? what? S. *ka* : *kṛ*, to do, S. *kṛi* : *kar*, *kōr*, ear, S. *kārṇa* : (*gom*) *pōk*, (wheat) harvest, cf. S. *pāka* : *māṛak*, frog, S. *maṇḍūka* : *ušpik*, wasp; *wrikī*, *iurakī*, and *wrigī*, fox, cf. S. *vṛīka*; *mukiss* and *mugiss*, he fled, cf. S. *much* :

¹ *Grundriss*, vol. i, pt. i, p. 6.

pagann, get ripe, cf. S. *pāka*. The softening of a medial *k* to *g* is also common in Iranian languages such as new-Persian, Pashto, and the Pamir dialects.¹ In India a medial *k* was already dropped in the Prakrit stage. In later loan-words it is often softened to *g* in modern vernaculars (including the Apabhraṃśa).

The old Aryan *kh* is not distinguished from *k*. compare *kur*, ass, S. *khāra*; *miok*, face, S. *mākha*. If *tsó*, branch, is identical with S. *sākhā*, a medial *kh* can be dropped. My materials are not, however, sufficient for judging with certainty.

A hard spirant χ , written *kh* or *kh*, occurs in some few words. In such cases where the *kh* has not been underlined in Colonel Davidson's book, it is possible, though not likely, that it denotes an aspirated *k* and not the spirant. I have therefore noted such cases in enumerating the words in which the spirant χ seems to occur. They are *attχī*, *atχī*, or *attkī*, near; $\chi\bar{a}n$, a khān; $\chi unz\bar{a}$ and *kunzā*, a princess; $\chi azonn$ (written *khazonn*), treasure; $\chi ozla$ (written *khozla*), a certain vegetable; χel (written *khel*), sweat; *mulχen* (written *mulkhen*), violet; $p\chi ul$, $p\chi ul\bar{a}$, rotten; $p'\chi ur$ (written *p'kkur*), on the top of; *tichēlosh* (written *tikhēlosh*), thou wilt be caught. There cannot after this be any doubt that the spirant χ is occasionally heard in Bashgali. It is, however, doubtful whether it can be considered as a genuine Bashgali sound. Of the words enumerated above $\chi\bar{a}n$, $\chi unz\bar{a}$, $\chi azonn$, $\chi ozla$, χel (cf. Waχī χil), *mulχen* (said to be Chitrāli), *tichēlosh* (cf. Brāhūi *tich*), are certainly loan-words, and the same is perhaps also the case with the rest. Instances of the use of χ and *k* in the same word, such as *attχī* and *attkī*, $\chi unz\bar{a}$ and *kunzā*, seem to show that the voiceless spirant χ is commonly pronounced as a *k*. Compare also *kabā*, angry, P. كابه ; *karbīza*, melon, P. خرمیز ; *kanak*, rope.

¹ *Grundriss*, I. ii. pp. 62, 209, 209.

P. خماق : *frūk*, loose, P. فراخ, where a *k* has been substituted for a χ in Persian loan-words, and *chkrī*, polo ball, where *kr* has not been changed to χr (cf. S. *chakrá*). It does not, therefore, seem as if the hard spirant χ actually plays a rôle in Bashgali phonology. In this respect the dialect apparently agrees with Balūchī. In the isolated instances *muγo*, on the face; *biliuγ*=*biliuk*, much; *chaγ*, *choγ*=*chuk*, low, the spirant has become softened. The whole evidence points to the conclusion that the spirant χ is disappearing, being commonly replaced by *k*.

The unaspirated palatal *ch* is apparently retained, both as initial and as medial; thus, *chē*, *chī*, how many? cf. Avestan *chaiti*; *chiom*, leather. S. *chárman*; *chitt*, mind, S. *chittá*; *chkrī*, a polo ball, cf. S. *chakrá*; *chashton*, four and four, cf. S. *chatur-*; *kāchī*, somewhere, cf. S. *krachūl*; *pach*, to cook. S. *pach*; *morch*, pepper, cf. S. *maricha*; *ruch*, light, S. *rúchī* (but also *ruzh*, daylight, cf. Persian *rōz*); *pōch*, *puch*, five; *puchits*, fifteen, S. *pāñchan*, *pāñchadaśa*. The forms *pōj*, *pōnj*, five, are, perhaps, Persian loan-words. Compare, however, the softening of a medial *k* to *g*. In *shto*, four; *cha-shton*, four and four; *shtrits*, fourteen. *ch* has become *sh* before *t*, i.e. a hard spirant has been developed as in Iranian.

There are no instances of the aspirated Aryan palatal *chh* in my materials. The secondary *chchh*, *chh* in Sanskrit, is apparently represented by an affricata in Bashgali: compare *ats*, come, *atsā*, *atsī*, came, cf. S. *āgachchha*; *tsāwē*, shade, S. *chhāyá*: *watsá*, *wetsá*, *wetzá*, shoe, cf. S. *avachchhada*.

The Aryan dental stops have developed into two different sets of sounds in Indian languages, the so-called dentals and cerebrals. Dr. Grierson¹ maintains that there is no such distinction between the two groups

¹ *Pisāca Languages*, p. 17.

in Bashgali and connected languages, where all these sounds are, in fact, semi-cerebrals. I am not able to add anything to his materials in this respect. I shall mention below that there seem to be some cerebral sounds in Bashgali, viz. a cerebral *r* and a cerebral *ɲ*, the latter usually written \bar{r} or \bar{r} . A cerebral *t* and a cerebral *d* occur in some few words, viz. *ashtur* and *ashtr*, hill; *ulet*, is heaped up; *bittā*, *but* (also *burī*), rice, bread; *chattā* (also *charṛā*), idiot; *giṭu*, grafting; *gott*, a stack of grass; *juṭ*, a leopard; *peṭ* (and *peṛ*), to break; *piṭr*, *puṭr*, son; *ṛattutt* (cf. *rāṛṛā*, noise), barks; *shurṛr*, sport; *uḍr*, box; *uḍr*, yellow; *uḍrā*, pale; *uḍerl*, thundering; *iṇḍron*, rainbow; *daḍr*, thin; *kaḍṛ*, quicksand; *lḍel* and *ladel*, lying; *peḍṛī* and *paḍṛī*, axe. It will be seen that in most cases the cerebral is found in the neighbourhood of an *r*, and its existence is probably due to this fact. In other cases, such as *ulet*, *giṭu*, *gott*, *juṭ*, we have perhaps to do with loan-words; cf. Hindi *uṭāl*, heap; *gōṭī*, grafting; *guṭ*, heap. At all events, there is no indication to show that Bashgali has, like Indo-Aryan vernaculars, developed two sets out of the Aryan dental stops, and it seems to be allowed to deal with the sounds noted as dentals and as cerebrals by Colonel Davidson as identical.

The unaspirated *t* is kept as an initial, and regularly dropped as a medial. Compare *tā*, thou, S. *tvam*; *tel*, oil, S. *tailū*; *tāp*, *tāb*, heat, S. *tāpas*; *troi*, *trē*, three, S. *trāyas*; *brā*, brother, S. *bhrātri*; *gwā*, went, S. *gatā*; *kṛā*, did, S. *kṛitā*; *lwī*, blood, S. *lōhita*; *mī*, self, Latin *met*; *siū*, *sū*, *sūī*, bridge, S. *sētu*; *shē*, *shī*, cold, S. *śītā*; *shil*, *shillā*, cold, S. *śitalā*; *shilā*, smallpox, S. *śitalā*; *zamān*, son-in-law, cf. S. *jāmātri*. It will be seen that *rit* becomes *r* as in Pashtō; cf. *kṛā*, did; *mṛā*, died; *āwērā*, brought (cf. S. *ābhrīta*); *kuṛo* (but also *kato*), knife (Awestan *karēta*). A final or medial *t* has apparently been preserved or sometimes changed to *d*, in *ut*, to use;

ūd, ōd, use, advantage; cf. Latin *utor, usus*. It is, however, possible that the final *t, d* of this word has been derived from a double consonant. *Kilār*, cheese, on the other hand, is probably an Indian loan-word; cf. S. *kilāṭa*.

The aspirated voiceless dental stop apparently becomes *t* and is kept as a medial; thus, *kutos*, says, S. *kathaya-*; *shott*, oath, S. *śupātha*; *ta, te*, or, S. *ātha*. None of these instances is, however, quite certain. *Th* is dropped after *r*; thus, *tār*, ford, S. *tīrthā*, Prakrit *tūha*.

The hard dental spirant *θ* does not seem to exist in Bashgali. A *t* forming the first part of a consonantal compound would naturally become such a spirant in Iranian, while such compounds are simplified in Indo-Aryan, usually so that the *t* prevails. The different Iranian languages have then gone different ways in their treatment of such compounds. Thus the Iranian *θr* (Aryan *tr*) becomes *hr, r*, or *s* in Persian, *r* in Pashtō, *s* in Balūchī, *tr* in Pamir dialects, and so forth. In Bashgali the *t* of such compounds is well preserved; compare *trē, troi*, three; *trits*, thirteen; *pitr, puṭr*, son; *rōtr, rōtar*, night; *tū*, thou; *-tī*, suffix of the gerund, cf. S. *-tvī*; *matsa, matsī*, fish, cf. S. *mātsya*. Forms such as *radar, radhar*, night, occur in addition to *rōtar*. They may be loan-words. It is, however, also possible that *rātr* has become *rātar*, and further *radar*; compare *ūt* and *ūd*, use. It is hard to say which sound is meant with the *dh* in *radhar*. A *dh* is also written in some few other words, viz., *andhar* and *andṛ* dark; *odh*, merciful; *widhar* and *widar*, to fear. Of these *andhar* is probably a loan-word. It can hardly be an original word derived from the same Aryan base as S. *andhakāra*, because *ndh* becomes *n* in Bashgali. The alternative writing of *d* instead of *dh* in *andṛ* and *widar* seems to show that the sound intended is a *d* and not the soft spirant *δ*.

In several cases we find a sound marked *th*, and it might be suggested that the hard spirant *θ* is meant. The

sound occurs as an initial in *thurus*, a precipice ; as a final in *ashtrith*, bedding ; *Gairath*, name of a place. It is occasionally used in the suffixes of the second present and the gerund instead of the usual *t* : thus, *mṛēthum* and *mṛētam*, I die : *widerthum* and *widarēttum*, I fear ; *widarathī*, *widhertī*, and *vidraitī*, having feared. In the base *atl*, to fall, we once find *th* written : thus, *vott athalon*, stones will fall (wrongly translated "there is a bog ahead of you" in No. 171). In all other instances *th* is preceded by a sibilant and interchangeable with *t*. The most common case in which this *th* is used is the infinitive termination *sth* (also *st*) ; thus, *bu-sth*, to become. Other authorities write *st* in this form, and there cannot be any question but that a voiceless stop and not a spirant is meant. Other instances of *th* are *hosth* and *hōst*, they are ; *ashth* and *asth*, but usually *asht*, they are ; *osth* and *aosht*, they come : *giṛan-gusthē*, knotted gone, a knot (cf. *gittan-gus*, got knotted) ; *mṛisth*, probably miswriting for *mṛisht*, a corpse : *jistha*, uncle, probably miswritten for *jishṭa*, cf. *jisht*, oldest. It is possible that the *h* denotes a greater emphasis of the off-glide which may, according to the personal equation of the hearer, make the impression of an aspirated consonant. It is here of interest to remember that the result of a compound consonant containing a sibilant always is an aspirated group in the Prakrits.

The Aryan *p* remains unchanged as an initial : thus, *pi*, drink, S. *pā* ; *pott*, *putt*, road, S. *pīnthās*. A medial *p* has become initial in *p*, *pi*, on, Greek *ἐπί*. This preposition is very common in Bashgali. Before voiced consonants it becomes *b* ; thus, *bḅdi*, in the mind ; *budo*, on the hill. A final or medial *p* remains or is changed to *b* in *tap*, to be hot ; *tāp*, *tapī* and *tāb*, *tabī*, hot. It is possible that we have here to do with loan-words, and that is almost certainly the case with *karbosh*, cotton, cf. S. *karpāsa*. In other instances a *p* in such positions

seems to have been changed to *w*, as in many Iranian dialects. This *w* has then usually disappeared after having darkened the preceding vowel : compare *áo*, water, S. *āp*; *shá*, night, S. *kshap*; *shott*, oath, S. *śapátha*; *nawōs*, nephew, Persian *narāsa* (probably a loan-word).

The aspirated labial stop *ph* is apparently treated as a *p*; the only certain instance is *pól*, S. *phúla*, a ploughshare.

The voiceless spirant *f* does not appear to exist in Bashgali. We find an *f* written in *frāk*, loose, Persian *فراخ*, and *fuidā*, produced, Persian *پیدا*. The usual form of this latter word is, however, *paidā*, and the Persian *فرنگی* is represented by *prang*, English. The isolated instances of an *f* accordingly occur in loan-words. In such cases where, from an Iranian point of view, we should expect an *f* we always find *p*. Compare *prē*, go, S. *pra-i*; *ptā*, given, S. *prattu*; *prezhamá*, let us sit, cf. S. *pra + sad*; *pshā*, grind, cf. S. *pish*; *pshu*, sleep, cf. Avestan *hvafs*, Balūchī *vapsag*; *sapīts*, seventeen, S. *saptáduśa*. In *sott*, *sutt*, seven, S. *sáptan*; *ngūtā*, took, Avestan *gərəpta*,¹ *pt* has become *tt*, *t*, as in Indian.

It will be seen that in the treatment of voiceless stops Bashgali agrees with Iranian languages in so far as it does not appear to possess any aspirates, and also in preserving several consonantal compounds. There are some few traces of spirants developed from such stops. In most cases, however, where such spirants are used in Iranian, Bashgali retains the old stops, and it is, at the present state of our knowledge, impossible to decide whether this state of things is inherited from the Aryan period as in Indian, or a secondary development as in Balūchī.

A peculiar interest attaches itself to the treatment of voiced stops in Bashgali. Dr. Grierson² mentions

¹ Compare Balūchī *gipta* as to the cancelling of the *r*-element of the *ri*-vowel.

² *Pisāca Languages*, p. 3.

as a characteristic feature of the languages grouped together by him as Piśāca languages the hardening of sonants. So far as I can see, this only applies to loan-words, and in that case it does not signify more than e.g. the common Indo-Aryan adaptation of English *lord* in the form *lāṭ*. Such cases of interchange between voiced and voiceless stops only show that the aspiration of surds is different in the borrowing language and in the tongue from which the loans have been made. Dr. Grierson also gives some instances of the same hardening in indigenous words, viz., Bashgali *shūwā*, alive; *shū*, life, which he connects with S. *jīv*; Shīnā *t-am*, I do, identified with S. *dhā-*, and Waiālā *jip*, tongue, S. *jihvā*. I do not think that any conclusions can be based on such stray instances, some of which can also be explained otherwise. Bashgali *shū*, life, occurs in Colonel Davidson's book in one sentence (No. 803), *ikīā tā shū ness*, in her (the dead woman) there is no life. Here *shū* can just as well correspond to S. *śvāsa*, breath, and *shūwā*, which does not occur in Colonel Davidson's sentences, would naturally be derived from *shū*. Shīnā *t-am*, I do, can also be connected with S. *tan*, and the various forms of the word "tongue" in Indo-European languages differ so much from each other that none of them can well be used alone to prove the existence of phonetic laws. So far as I can see, all the evidence available from certain forms in Bashgali is to the effect that voiced stops are never hardened unless they are immediately followed by hard sounds. On the other hand, several instances have been quoted of the opposite change, the softening of hard consonants.

The details which follow will show how the old Aryan voiced stops have been developed in Bashgali. It will be most practical to deal with the unaspirated ones first and to discuss the aspirated mediæ apart from them.

A *g* is kept as an initial and, apparently, dropped

when medial. Compare *gū*, to go, S. *gā*; *gáo*, cow, S. *gō*: *gun*, smell, S. *gandhá*; *gír*, count, S. *gun*; *grom*, *grām*, village, S. *grāma*: *grish*, noon, S. *grīshmá*; *garo*, eclipse, S. *gráha*; *shiāl*, jackal, S. *sṛigālá*; *ats*, come, S. *āgachchha* (?).

The voiced spirant γ , written *gh*, occurs in some few words. I have already mentioned that it has been substituted for a voiceless stop in *biliuγ*, *biliuk*, much; *chāγ*, *choγ*, *chak*, low; *muγo*, on the face (*muk*). It further occurs in loan-words such as *ūγ*, water (Bashgali *áo*); *aoγān*, an Afghan; *chirāγ*, a lamp; *zuγ* (written *zugh*), a yak (Tibetan *gyag*). The other instances of the use of this γ in Colonel Davidson's materials are *charaγ*, foolish (No. 87, cf. *chayṛā*, *chattā*, foolish); *mashoγott*, he became angry (No. 45, cf. *mashu*, anger); *wideγ*, fear (No. 458, cf. *widar*, to fear); *vrāγuttus*, I have received; *vrāγuttasā*, hast thou received? *vrāγalam*, I shall receive (No. 1136). Of these the final γ of *charaγ* and *mashoγ(-ott)* is derived from an old *k*: compare the Persian suffixes *-ā*, *-āk*, *-āγ*, etc. The final γ of *wideγ* seems to denote a rough *r*, while the base *vrāγ* is probably connected with *ngā*, take. This verb is probably a compound of the base *grabh*; compare the past tense *ngūtā*, Avestan *grəpta*, Balūchī *gipta*. *Vrāγa-* is then perhaps comparable to forms such as *bragom* instead of *ba-grom*, in the village, and derived from a **va-γru*. If so, we must infer that *gr* originally became γr , and that the γ has been kept on account of the transposition of the *r*; *grom*, village, shows that the old *gr* has finally been restored. This would point to the conclusion that the use of voiceless stops in such positions where we would, from the point of view of Iranian phonology, expect spirants, is also a secondary development and comparable to the state of affairs in Balūchī.

The Aryan soft palatal *j* is retained as an initial and dropped as a medial: thus, *jasht*, eldest, S. *jyēshtha*; *bī*,

seed, S. *bīja*, Balūchī *bīj*. Compare also the remarks about the soft palatal sibilant below.

The voiced dental stop *d* likewise remains as an initial and is dropped as a medial. Compare *dī*, sky, S. *dyaus*; *doī*, *duī*, arm, hand, S. *dōs*; *dā*, gift, S. *dānu*; *dōn*, handle, S. *daṇḍā*; *dush*, fault, S. *dōsha*; *dots*, ten, S. *dāśa*; *drōn*, bow, S. *druṇa*; *dros*, grape, S. *drākshā*; *dū*, door, S. *dvār*; *dū*, two, S. *dvau*: *ū*, to go up, S. *ud-i*; *mṛi*, earth, soil, S. *mṛid*: *nichī*, sit, S. *ni-shīd*: *pō*, *pū*, foot, S. *pādu*; *yū*, *eo*, eat, S. *ad*; *kāchī*, sometimes, S. *kvachīd*; *prē*, give, S. *pru-dā*; *zira*, heart, S. *hṛīdaya*; *dlits*, twelve, S. *dvādaśa*: *trits*, thirteen, S. *trāyōdaśa*; *shtrits*, fourteen, S. *chāturdāśa*; *pachits*, fifteen, S. *pāñchadaśa*, and so forth. The final *ts* of these last words is derived from Aryan *ś* and not from *-daś* > *-dś* > *-ts*; compare *dots*, ten, S. *dāśa*. In *vidar*, *vidhar*, to fear, the preservation of the *d* is perhaps due to the existence of a base *dar*.

Rd becomes *r*: thus, *mar*, shampoo. A similar development must probably have taken place in *gur*, sugar, S. *guḍa*, if this word is not an Indian loan-word. Before a voiceless stop *d* becomes *t*; thus, *ptā*, given, S. *prāta*; *tē*, *etē*, give, from **dtu*, cf. S. *dattā*. In other positions the *d* remains, and *atamsh*, to bite, to sting, cannot therefore be derived from the base *damś*, but might be compared with English *sting*, Old Norse *stinga*.

The sound written *dh* has been referred to above in discussing the voiceless dental stop *t*.

The Aryan *b* is treated like other voiced unaspirated stops, i.e. it remains as an initial and is dropped as a medial; thus, *bī*, seed, S. *bīja*; *bdī*, mind, S. *buddhi*; *ku*, hump, cf. S. *kubjā*, English *hump*. In two cases (Nos. 526 and 672) we find *bapdī*, in the mind, instead of the common *babdī*, but this cannot be anything but a miswriting.

The state of affairs in Bashgali with regard to

unaspirated voiced stops is accordingly the same as in Indo-Aryan vernaculars and as in the Caspian dialects of the Iranian family. We shall now see how the Aryan voiced aspirates have developed in the dialect.

Colonel Davidson (preface, p. xi) draws attention to the fact that some few examples of aspirates occur in his sentences. At the same time he reminds us that Dr. Trumpp and Sir G. Robertson denied the existence of aspirates in the language. The latter added that he had found it impossible to get his Kāfirs to pronounce the English *h*. Colonel Davidson's materials seem to confirm this statement. An *h* occurs in the beginning of the interjections *hē* and *hai*, and, cockney way, in some words which usually begin with a vowel, such as *hāu*, camest: *haiss*, has come (base *a*); *hatt*, there (pronominal base *a*): *hōst*, *hosth*, are (base *as*); further, in borrowed words such as *Hindustān*, Hindustān; *hinju*, tamarisk: *hukm*, command; *hōst susnī*, handkerchief ("hand" is *dash*t). In none of these cases the *h* seems to belong to the dialect. A final *h* is also sometimes written, apparently without any justification; thus in *boh*, to become (No. 43), base *bā*; *bāloh*, will become (p. 20, usually *bulā*); *nāh*, male (Nos. 675, 680, 682, p. 1, instead of *nai*); *noh*, not (Nos. 43, 277, pp. 61, 62, usually *na*): *karoh*, in (?) (No. 235). About *mēh*, mist, see below. Finally, a medial *h* occurs in borrowed words such as *bihistī*, heaven: *mehar*, Mehtar; *mīhrbānī*, kindness. So far as I can see, it is quite certain that Bashgali does not possess an indigenous *h*. This conclusion is further strengthened by a consideration of the history of the Aryan aspirated voiced stops, which, as a general rule, lose their aspiration in Bashgali.

The Aryan *gh* becomes *g* and *jh* becomes *j*; thus, *drgr*, long, S. *dīrghá*; *lugā*, light, S. *laghú*; *jān*, kill, S. *han*. In *kshē*, rub, S. *ghrīsh*, the aspirate *gh* has become hardened before the voiceless spirant *sh*. If *lushtisth*,

to be frost-bitten, has anything to do with S. *dah*, to burn, it must be compared with Prakrit (*vi*)*aḍḍha* and not with S. *daḡḍhá*, i.e. its final consonant is an Aryan *ḡh* and not a *gh*. Compare spirants below.

Aryan *dh* becomes *d* as an initial; thus, *dum*, smoke. S. *dhūmá*; *dōr*, to endure, S. *dhri*. Similarly *d* represents an Aryan *ddh* in *bīdī*, mind, S. *buddhi*. A medial *dh*, preceded by a vowel, by an *n* or an *r*, seems to be regularly dropped; compare *ushā*, medicine, S. *ōshadhi*; *lūi*, blood, S. *lōhita*; *gun*, smell, S. *gundhá*; *war*, grow, base *vardh*. Words such as *band*, imprisoned; *andṛ* and *andhar*, dark, are perhaps loan-words; cf. *gun*, smell. I am unable to make anything out of the forms *mish*, *mīsh*, *mīzhā*, *mīch*, *mij*, *mīju*, *mīzhā*, *mījhu*, middle. If they are connected with S. *mādhyā*, Armenian *mēj*, the forms with *sh* and *ch* must be due to misunderstanding or perhaps to a confusion with *mesh*, with. In this connexion I may also mention the curious forms *je*, and, cf. Vedic *ádha*; *jā*, daughter, cf. S. *duhitṛi*; *zū*, milk, cf. S. *duḡdhá*; *jijil*, loose, cf. S. *śithilá*, where a dental has apparently been replaced by a *j*. I am not, however, able to explain any of these forms.

An initial Aryan *bh* becomes *b*: thus, *bās*, flame, S. *bhās*; *bā*, to become, S. *bhū*; *bamo*, hornet, cf. S. *bhramará*; *bōr*, load, S. *bhārú*; *brā*, took away, cf. S. *bhrítá*; *brá*, brother, S. *bhrátṛi*. In the face of all these forms the isolated *bhām*, *bhiom*, earth, ground, S. *bhāmi*, cannot be correct, but must owe its *h* to its similarity with the Indian word with which it has unconsciously been confounded in the mind of the hearer.

An Aryan *bh* between vowels apparently becomes *w*, as in Iranian: thus, *āwar*, bring, S. *ā-bhri*; *awīzh*, necessity. S. **abhikshā*, cf. *apēkshā*. This *w* has been transferred to the un-compounded base in *wi*, beat, cf. S. *bhid* and Old Slavonic *bi-ti*, beat: *aul*, say, cf. S. *bhar*; cf. also *crāqt*, to get, which perhaps corresponds to S. *abhī-grabh*.

In some cases a medial *bh* has apparently disappeared; compare *garo*, eclipse, S. *gráha*; *guru*, deep, S. *gabhīrá*; *gaiet*, *gaiesth*, to seize; *gaitī*, having taken; *gaiē*, take, cf. S. *grabh*, *grah*.

It will be seen that, on the whole, Bashgali follows the Iranian languages in discarding the aspiration of stops. We shall see below that the same disaspiration is also carried through in the case of the aspirated Aryan palatal sibilant *śh*.

ARYAN NASALS. The guttural nasal *ñ* in Aryan languages only occurred before gutturals. I have not come across any example which shows how it is treated in Bashgali if it is followed by a voiceless guttural. A voiced guttural, on the other hand, disappears, and *ñg* becomes *ñ* (written *ng*); thus, *rañ*, colour, S. *rañga*; *añā*, fire, S. *agní*, cf. *áñgāra*; *añur*, finger, cf. S. *añgúli*; *shiñar*, pretty, S. *śringāra*. In *anī*, side, *n* is written instead, if this word is connected with S. *áñga*.

The only instances of an Aryan *ñ* in Bashgali occur before *ch*, where the nasal seems to be regularly dropped; compare *pōch*, *puch*, *pōj*, five, S. *pāñcha*; *pachits*, fifteen, S. *pāñchaduśu*. The form *pōñj*, five, which occurs in Nos. 69, 969, 1058, is probably a Persian loan-word.

The most common Aryan nasal was the dental *n*. In Bashgali it remains unchanged as an initial; thus, *nom*, *nām*, name, S. *nāma*; *non*, nine, S. *nāva*; *nōn*, mother, cf. S. *nanā*. A single uncompound *n* between vowels is regularly cerebralized, and this cerebral *n* is then written *ñ*; thus, *kār*, blind, S. *kāñá*; *gār*, count, S. *gañ*; *jār*, kill, S. *han*; *zār*, know, S. *jāñáti*; *shtār*, to utter inarticulate sounds, S. *stan*; *shtār*, a thief, S. *stēñá*. The cerebralization does not appear to take place if an *r* precedes; compare *dron*, bow, S. *druṇa*; *zarīn*, yellow, S. *hariñá*; *tarīn*, *tarī*, thorn, cf. S. *triṇa*. In some cases such an *n* apparently sounds simply as a nasalization of the preceding vowel; compare *dā*, gift, S. *dāñá*; *dutziē*, right, S. *dákshīṇa*:

shō, food, S. *śana*. Sometimes also *n* is written instead: thus, *zān*, knee, S. *jānu*; *ziān*, damage, harm, S. *jyāntī*; and in a few cases *n* and *ṛ* are written in one and the same word: thus, *iārā* and *iānā*, eaten; *parmēr* (*parmiṛ*) and *parmen*, small, boy. It therefore seems as if the sound is not always quite distinct. There cannot, however, be any doubt about the general tendency to cerebralize such an *n*. This is of some interest. We know that in the Indian Prakrits the cerebralization of a dental *n* is a very common feature, and that something still more analogous is found in modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars. Marāṭhī, Rājasthānī, Gujarātī, Pañjābī, and Sindhī have all preserved an initial *n* unchanged, while a single medial *n* becomes an *ṇ*. Dr. Grierson has been good enough to inform me that the pronunciation of this *ṇ* becomes more and more cerebral as we go westwards, and that it goes still further west into Pashtō. In eastern languages, such as Hindī, Bihārī, etc., on the other hand, the cerebral *ṇ* is not used. There is accordingly a parallelism between these Indo-Aryan vernaculars and Bashgali in this respect. And this parallelism becomes still more significant if we recall the fact that the same Indo-Aryan vernaculars which change a single medial *n* to *ṇ* "have a medial *n* in the place of the double *ṇ* of the Prakrits, resulting from a Sanskrit conjunct of which *n* is a member".¹ The same is the case in Bashgali: compare *ano*, food, S. *āna*; *man*, mean, S. *manya-*; *riṇā*, beaten, cf. S. *bhinna*; *wan*, make, Old Norse *vinna*; *kan*, laugh, Persian *خندیدن*. We thus see how a phonological tendency spreads over territories which do not all fall under one and the same linguistic family, while, on the other hand, it does not affect all the dialects of the same family.

It has been mentioned above that an old *ṅ* becomes *ṅ* while *ṅch* becomes *ch* in Bashgali. The obvious inference is that a nasal is dropped before a voiceless stop while it

¹ See Bhandarkar, JBRAS., xvii, pp. 165 f

remains before a voiced one, which then itself disappears. This inference is made almost certain by considering the combinations of a dental *n* and a dental stop. *Nt* and *nth* become *t*, while *nd* and *ndh* become *n*; compare *atūr*, lung, S. *antra*; *dutt*, tooth, S. *dānta*; *wosut*, spring, S. *vasantā*; *putt*, road, S. *pūnthās*; *kon*, arrow, S. *kāṇḍa*; *dōn*, handle, S. *daṇḍā*; *in(dron)*, Indra (bow), rainbow cf. S. *indra(-dhanūsh)*; *lon*, slave, Persian لون ; *kāno*, tree, S. *skandhā*; *gun*, smell, S. *gandhā*.

The Aryan *m* remains unchanged as initial and as medial; compare *manshī*, man, S. *manushyā*; *nom*, name, S. *nāma*. It is of interest to note that the base *mrū*, to say, which became *brū* in Sanskrit, retains its *m* in Bashgali; compare *kai mārechī*, what dost thou say / *kai mārnazushba*, thou wast saying something. *Mbh* becomes *m*; thus, *uzzam*, yawn, S. *vijrimbh*; *shtom*, a tree, S. *stambha*.

In all compounds containing a nasal and a voiced consonant the nasal alone remains. This state of affairs is comparable to the disappearance of the last part of consonantal compounds in Caspian dialects.¹

ARYAN SEMI-VOWELS. The initial Aryan *y* is well preserved in Bashgali as in non-Persian Iranian languages, while in India it has commonly developed into a *j*. Compare *yās*, grass, S. *yāvasa*; *yamna*, double, cf. S. *yāma*. As in the Pamir dialects, a *y* is often also used prothetically before initial vowels: thus, *yo*, *eo*, one, Avestan *aēwa*; *yūr*, down, S. *āru*; *yach*, *iash*, morning, S. *ushās*; *yāsht*, lip, S. *ōshtha*. Writings such as *cyag*, a yak (Tibetan *gyag*): *zhātī* and *yātī*, having eaten, seem to show that the pronunciation of the *y* is rather emphatic. After consonants *ya* is apt to become *i*: thus, *ashi*, mouth, S. *āsyā*; *matsi*, fish, S. *mātsya*.

The Aryan *r* is well preserved; compare *rach*, light, S. *rūchi*; *rañ*, colour, S. *rañya*; *rōtr*, night, S. *rātri*; *ōr*.

¹ See *Grundriss*, I, ii, p. 354.

chest, S. *áras*: *kur*, ass, S. *khúra*; *dār*, far, S. *dārá*: *bōr*, load, S. *bhārá*. A medial or final *r* is, however, liable to be dropped: compare *awē* and *awar*, bring, S. *ā-bhara*; *dū*, door, S. *dvār*; *dār*, *dāo*, wood, S. *dāru*; *sā*, *sai*, *sē*, sun, S. *sūra*; *shai*, *shē*, head, S. *śiras*; *sus*, sister, S. *sváspi*; *sho*, four, S. *chatvāri*. Consonantal compounds containing an *r* are as a rule simplified in such a way that the *r* disappears in Indian languages. In Iranian, on the other hand, the *r* is to a great extent preserved. The same is the case in Bashgali. If the *r* follows a stop, this latter sound is not changed to a spirant as in many Iranian tongues. Compare *chkrī*, a polo ball, cf. S. *chakrá*; *grom*, village, S. *grāma*: *jerik*, shame, S. *hrīka*: *troi*, *trē*, three, S. *tráyas*; *trits*, thirteen, S. *tráyōdaśa*; *atūr*, lungs, S. *antra*; *dron*, bow, S. *druṇa*; *āros*, grape, S. *drākshā*; *prusht*, bed, S. *prastará*; *prōr*, wound, S. *prōhāra*; *brá*, brother, S. *bhrātṛi*. Note also *garo*, eclipse, S. *grāha*; *gaitī*, having seized, cf. S. *grīhītva*; *ngā*, take, S. *grah*; *sanḡā*, hear, S. *sarī-grah*. It is of interest that the *r* has also disappeared in Balūchi *gipta*, Caspian *giṭa*, Central dialects *gaft*, seized.

R is also retained as the first member of a compound; cf. *drgr*, long, S. *dīrghá*. If the last part of the compound is a dental, it regularly disappears. Compare *krū*, done, S. *krítá*; *karō* (and *kato*), knife, Avestan *karsto*; *gīr*, knot: *gīran-gusthē*, a knot (but also *gittan-gus*, knotted), cf. S. *grath*; *tār*, ford, S. *tīrthá*, Prakrit *tūha*; *koru*, *kūr*, mud-stream, cf. S. *kardama*; *mar*, shampoo, S. *mará*; *war*, grow, S. *vardh*: *warī*, word, cf. Lat. *verbum*; *kōr*, *kar*, ear, S. *kārṇa*: *por*, leaf, S. *purná*; *parī*, full, S. *pārṇá*; *wishtr*, broad, S. *vistīrṇa*. In the face of such instances it is probable that *son*, gold, is an Indian loan-word. Similar changes are also found in Iranian languages: cf. *Grundriss*, I, ii, pp. 53, 207, 304, etc.

It is uncertain how the compound *rp* was treated. The only example I have found, *karbosh*, cotton, S. *karpāsu*,

is probably a Persian loan-word. *Rm* seems to become *m*, as in India; cf. *chiom*, leather, S. *chárma*; *bamo*, hornet, cf. S. *bhramara*. *Kār*, want, is therefore probably S. *kāryá*.

R is often marked as a cerebral. I am not, however, able to find any rules regulating the matter. Occasionally we find one and the same word written sometimes with an *r* and sometimes with an *ṛ*; thus, *azhir* and *azhiṛ*, hail-storm; *uru* and *urū*, headman; *brá* and *bráṛ*, brother; *brā* and *brāṛ*, took off; *dūr* and *dūrṛ*, bent; *drgr* and *drgrṛ*, long; *badur*, abroad; *badūr*, far off; *koṛṛ* and *kor*, crow; *maṛī* and *māṛī*, money; *māṛī* and *māroī*, stick; *pror* and *prōr*, wound; *shinur* and *shinūr*, numb; *tarī* and *tarīn*, thorn, etc. Sometimes also *ṛ* interchanges with *t* or *ṭ*; thus, *kaṛo* and *kato*, knife; *peṛ*, *prēt*, and *peṭ*, break; *charrā* and *chattā*, idiot; *rārā*, noise; *ṛattatt*, barks, etc.

The cerebral *ṛ* occurs in all positions, as an initial, however, only in very few words, viz., *ṛanzann*, he shakes (but *ranzol*, shaking with fever, feverish); *ṛanzāo*, *ṛanzēi*, shake; *ṛattatt*, he barks; *ṛitī*, yellow. It is used as a final in words such as *atsiṛ*, return; *azhiṛ* and *azhir*, hail (S. *āsāra*); *urṛ*, wing, chakor; *utseṛ*, calf (cf. S. *vatsú*); *beṛ*, *bēṛ*, foolish; *kuṛ*, chicken; *kār*, pigeon; *puṛṛ*, smallpox; *shīṛ*, crop; *shuṛṛ*, goat; *shuṛṛ*, waistband; *toṛ*, ruin; *waṛ*, see (cf. *ópáω*). In *wideṛ*, fear (No. 458), the *ṛ* probably denotes a very rough *r*; cf. *widerasth*, to fear. The cerebral *ṛ* is also used as a medial between vowels; thus, *āri*, *parmīṛ* and *parmēr*, *maṛiṛ*, boy (cf. *parmen*, small); *aṛu*, silver; *aṛin*, narrow; *aṛuṛ*, tight; *buṛā*, plough; *baṛī*, blacksmith; *boṛ*, *buṛī*, bread; *duṛa*, *duṛu*, blunt; *kaṛu*, trunk; *kaṛṛū*, root; *kiṛā*, shield; *paṛē*, veranda; *pārṛo*, apple, etc. We also find *ṛ* combined with other consonants; thus, *gidṛ*, sheaf; *kaḍṛ*, quicksand; *digṛī*, shirt; *mṛā*, died; *mṛī*, earth; *wotṛiss*, is lying; *paṛchē* (and *paṛcher*), polo-stick, polo; *uḍeṛl*, thunder; *aṛsett*, they are lowing; *kaṛtā*, fat; *shuṛṛ*, sport; *amāṛts*,

pomegranates: *durwā*, musician: *karwā*, strong. An aspirated *r* apparently occurs in *deṛh*, surprised: *purhī*. letter; *wishirwoph* (also *wizhirwor*), figure. Such words are, however, scarcely indigenous Bashgali words.

There cannot, after all, be any doubt that Bashgali possesses a cerebral *r*. The use of this sound as an initial and in cases where it must be derived from an Aryan *r* (cf. *azhīr*, hail, S. *āsāra*: *war*, see, Greek *όπάω*; *nrā*, died, base *mṛi*; *mṛi*, earth, S. *mṛid*) shows that it is not comparable with the cerebral *r* of Indo-Aryan vernaculars. In *nrā*, died, S. *mṛitā*: *mṛi*, earth, S. *mṛid*, we have the same development of a cerebral *r* from *r* and a dental as in Pashtō.

Finally, I may also mention the apparent interchange of *r* or *r̥* and *w*; thus, *wagachī*, *ragachī*, and *awēguchī*, askest; *wasanristai* and *wasuwestai*, they are gathered.

R and *l* are, broadly, distinguished as in Indian; compare, however, *welī kshī*, ask for (cf. S. *xpi*); *añur*, finger, S. *aṅgūli*; *garak*, neck, S. *gala*; *parch*, burn, S. *plush*; *tur*, weigh, S. *tul*; *kurr*, bald, S. *kulva*, etc. Of compounds containing an old *l* we may note *pilt*, fall, Prakrit *pad*: *wal*, speak, S. *bhaṇ*.

An initial *v* is kept in Bashgali as in Western Indian and non-Persian Iranian dialects, a new example of what we have seen above, that a certain characteristic does not pervade the whole territory of one linguistic family, but does, on the other hand, extend into the area of another family. Compare *wāi*, wind, rheuma, S. *vāyū* or *vāta*; *wou*, prepare, S. *va*. Hindī *banānā*: *was*, *wis*, to remain, to spend the night S. *vas*: *wōs*, day, S. *vāsara*; *wosut*, spring, S. *vasantā*: *wish*, poison, S. *viśha*: *wissī*, *witsī*, twenty, S. *vimśati*: *riśhī*, neighbour, cf. S. *vēśā*: *vēl*, time, S. *vēlā*. The substitution of *b* in *bosut*, spring (No. 831): *ba-ben*, in the forest (No. 129): *bannē tū*, the same (No. 1712). S. *vāna*, is a strong indication that these words are borrowed. If *utsep*, calf, is connected with

S. *vatsá*, we have a case of a kind of *sanprasāraṇa*. It is possible that it is due to the neighbourhood of a sibilant. Similarly, *vi* is apparently dropped in *shurṭi*; sport, Persian *bishgard*, Pehlevī **viškart*: compare also *oshī*, to knit, and S. *vishīc*.

A final *v* and a *v* between vowels and in consonantal compounds regularly disappear; thus, *shī* and *shew*, sew, S. *sīv*; *noi*, new, S. *nāva*: *non*, nine, S. *nāva*; *duṛ*, brother-in-law, S. *dēvara*; *purōsh*, belt, cf. S. *parivēshṭana*: *shū*, rose, cf. S. *sēvatī*; *tu*, thou, S. *tvam*; *shto*, four, S. *chatvāri*; *-tī*, termination of the gerund, S. *-tvī*; *dū*, door, S. *dvār*; *dū*, *duī*, two, S. *dvan*, *dvē*; *dits*, twelve, S. *dvādaśa*; *dūr*, *dur*, bent, S. *dhrī*; cf. *shū*, *shūs*, breath, life, S. *śvāsa*; *sus*, sister, S. *svāsi*. Similar features are found in Persian¹ and other Iranian languages. In *wā*, down, S. *āva*, a medial *w* has become initial. Another form of this word is *yā*, from *au* (cf. Latin *au*) with a prothetic *y*.

ARYAN SIBILANTS. In the treatment of sibilants the Indian and Iranian branches of the Aryan family have gone widely different ways. In India the number of voiceless sibilants has been reduced to one, and consonantal compounds containing a sibilant are simplified in such a way that the sibilant disappears after aspirating the consonant. The voiced sibilants have disappeared or been changed in various ways. In Iranian languages an unprotected dental *s* becomes *h*; *ś* becomes *s* in non-Persian dialects and *s* or *h* in Persian; *sh* is well preserved; sometimes, however, it is confounded with *s* in non-Persian dialects,² and sometimes also in Persian.³ The sibilants are well preserved in compounds, and the voiced sibilants have not disappeared.

In most of these features Bashgali marches with Iranian as against Indian languages. There is one important exception: the dental *s* is retained and not changed to *h*

¹ *Grundriss*, I, ii, pp. 51, 298.

² *Ibid.*, p. 416.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

as is the case in all Iranian languages.¹ Colonel Davidson does not distinguish more than two voiceless sibilants, a dental *s* and a cerebral or palatal *sh*. The latter sign, however, perhaps denotes two sounds, an *ś* and an *sh*, for we often find *ts* or similar writings instead of an original *ś*. All these sibilants have a strong tendency to be softened, i.e. pronounced with voice. There is, however, in this respect considerable confusion, and the materials available are not sufficient for laying down definite rules in every respect. The difficulty of noting down the sounds of a strange language like Bashgali is so considerable that we cannot expect the orthography in a pioneer work like Colonel Davidson's to give an absolutely adequate image of the actual sounds. Still, it will be possible to define the position of Bashgali within the Aryan family, as evinced by its treatment of the Aryan sibilants, with comparative certainty.

The Aryan *ś* as an initial is represented by a sound which is written *sh*, and which may be a cerebral or a palatal sibilant. Compare *shē*, *shī*, cold, S. *śītá*; *shī*, horn, cf. S. *śrīṅga*, Avestan *srā*, *srwā*, Greek *κέρας*; *shīāl*, jackal, S. *śrīgālā*; *shālī*, rise, S. *śālī*; *shīl*, cold, S. *śītulā*. A voiced *zh* is apparently used instead in *zhī*, black, cf. S. *śyāma*; *zhuchī*, grievest, cf. S. *śuch*. The etymology of these two words is not, however, certain. Instead of *sh* we sometimes also find *ts*; thus, *tsá*, branch, cf. S. *śákhā*; *tsuiē*, empty-handed, S. *śūnyá*; *tsir*, head, S. *śiras*; *tsitt*, dung, cf. S. *śákrít*(?). In addition to *tsir* we also find *sir*, head, and a dental *s* also represents an initial Aryan *ś* in (*host*)*susnā*, a (hand)kerchief, but this word is almost certainly a loan-word.

A medial *ś* similarly becomes sometimes *sh*, *zh*, and sometimes *ts*, *ch*, or *s*; compare *kshul*, clever, S. *kósala*;

¹ Dr. Grierson's remark (*Pisāca Languages*, p. 131) that the preservation of *s* in Iranian is typical of the non-Persian dialects, does not refer to the Aryan *s*, but to the Iranian *s* derived from Aryan *ś*.

posh, trap, S. *pāśa*; *sho*, *ishá*, food, S. *áśana*; *nash*, *nazh*, and *nach*, to spoil, to loose, S. *naś*; *dots*, ten, S. *dáśa*: *witsī* and *wissī*, twenty, S. *vimśati*; *dits*, twelve, S. *dvádaśa*; *trits*, thirteen, S. *tráyōdaśa*, etc.

There are only very few examples in my materials of consonantal compounds of which a palatal *ś* originally formed part. An Aryan *śr* becomes *ch* or *zh* in *achu*, tear, S. *áśru*; *ozham*, to rest, S. *viśram*. *Śr* apparently becomes *shp* (cf. Iranian *sp*); thus, *ushp*, horse, S. *áśva*. In *shū*, *shūs*, breath, sigh (cf. S. *śvas*, *śvāsá*), we probably have a representative of an older *śush*; cf. Balūchī *sāh*.

The cerebral *sh* is very well preserved. Between vowels, however, it often becomes *zh* (also written *j*): thus, *shu*, six, S. *shash*; *shets*, sixteen, S. *śōdaśa*: *kshē*, rub. S. *ghṛish*; *kshō*, drag, S. *kṛish*; *pshī*, grind, S. *pish*; *dush*, fault, S. *dōsha*; *ushā*, *uzhā*, medicine, S. *ōshadhi*; *iasht*, *yazhtī*, morning, S. *ushás*; *nishī*, *nizhtī*, *nijī*, sit, S. *nishīd*: *misho*, *mizho*, *mijo*, lie, cf. S. *mṛishā*. In *tās*, chaff, S. *túsha*; *mussā*, *mussu*, *muzza*, mouse, S. *mūshika*, there is apparently a confusion of *s* and *sh*. Similar features are also found in Iranian languages.¹ In *mōsh*, *mōch*, *manchī*, *manjī*, man, S. *manushyā*, the actual sound cannot be fixed with certainty.

As in Iranian tongues, the cerebral *sh* is also generally kept as first part of consonantal compounds. The second component of such compounds, on the other hand, is often dropped, as is also the case in Iranian languages.²

An Aryan *ksh* becomes *ch*, *ts* (*tz*), and *sh*, and it does not seem to make any difference whether this *ksh* represents an Indo-European *qs* or *ks*. Compare *achē*, eye, S. *ákshi*, Avestan *ashi*; *kachkruī*, armpit, cf. S. *káksha*, Aw. *kasha*; *uchar*, empty out, S. *ut-kshar*; *marchī* (i.e. *māchī*), honey, *mācherik*, bee, cf. S. *mākshikā*, *mākshika*, Aw. *maχshī*: *īts*, bear, S. *ṛíksha*, Aw. *arōsha*: *datziē*, right, S. *dukshīṇa*, Aw. *dushīna*; *aīsh*, investigation.

¹ See *Grundriss*, I, ii, p. 416.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 354, 416.

S. *ikshā*, Aw. *aesha*; *shosh*, witness, S. *sākshin*; *ashu*, *azhē*, a bull, S. *ukshán*, Aw. *uχshau*: *shú*, night, S. *kshap*, Aw. *χshap*. In *dros*, grape, S. *drākshā*, *s* has been used instead, perhaps under the influence of the preceding *r*.

Sht is, as a rule, kept as *sht*: compare *īsh*t, spear, S. *ṛishṭī*: *osh*t, *asht*, eight, S. *ashtaú*; *usht*ar, *sht*ur, camel, S. *úshtra*; *yāsh*t, lip, S. *ōshṭha*; *jasht*, *jisht*, eldest, S. *jyēshṭha*: *mish*t. hilt. S. *mushṭī*. The *t* of this compound is occasionally dropped: thus, *jash* *tōt*, elder father. paternal uncle (No. 1573), cf. *jasht*, eldest; *parōsh*, belt, cf. S. *parivēshṭana*. In *ptī*, back, S. *prishṭhā*, **prishṭhī*, the dropping of the *sh* is due to the shortening of the word caused by the accent. Cf. *bdī*, mind, S. *buddhi*.

Shp and *shm* are simplified to *sh* or *zh*; thus, *pish*, *pizh*, flower, S. *páshpa*; *grīsh*, noon, S. *grīshmá*; *shá*, you, S. *yushmē*, Aw. *χshmā*.

An initial Aryan *s*, which is changed to an *h* in Iranian languages, remains in Bashgali; thus, *so*, well, S. *su*; *sā*, *sūī*, bridge, S. *sētū*; *sā*, *sai*, *sē*, sun, S. *sāra*, *sūrya*; *sain*, army, S. *sēnā*, *sainya*; *sott*, *sutt*, seven, S. *saptá*; *sapits*, seventeen, S. *saptádaśa*. Sometimes, however, it becomes *sh*, i.e. it is treated like the palatal *ś*; thus, *shu*, sew, S. *sīv*: *shū*, rose, cf. S. *sēvatī*: *shūāo*, saw, cf. Latin *securis*; *shosh*, witness, cf. S. *sākshin*.

A final *s* is sometimes dropped: thus, *doī*, *duī*, arm, hand, S. *dōs*, *dōshán*; *shū*, *shūs*, breath, life, cf. S. *śvas*: *ūsh*, *yozhī*, morning, S. *ushás*: *ōr*, chest, S. *úras*. Usually, however, a final *s* remains: compare *bās*, flame, S. *bhās*; *das*, yesterday, S. *hyas*; *kas*, cough, S. *kas*: *mōs*, moon, S. *mās*; *was*, to stay, to spend the night, S. *vas*. The final *s* of the base *as*, to be, occurs in many different forms; compare *edsam*, *adzum*, *ashim*, *assum*, *azzum*, I am: *ashi*, *oshih*, *assi*, *assish*, art; *ass*, *ess*, *oss*, *az*, *azt*, is: *assumish*, *azzamish*, we are; *azār*, you are; *asht*, etc., they are. The commonest forms are *s* and *z*, and, before *i* and *t*, *sh*. It is possible that forms such as *edsam* do not correspond to S. *ásmi*,

but contain an old suffix *sk*; compare Prakrit *achehhai*, is.¹ A medial *s* is treated in the same way, i.e. it is preserved or, before *i*, changed to *sh*, *zh*; thus, *assā*, ashes, S. *ásā*; *wosut*, spring, S. *vasantá*; *oshī*, knit, cf. S. *sīv*; *ushī*, *wizhu*, unsewn, undone of sewing, cf. S. *vi* + *sīv*. We have seen above that an old Aryan palatal sibilant sometimes becomes *ch*. The same is also the case with an old *s*; thus the suffix *si* of the 2nd pers. sing. takes the form *ch* or *chī* in the old (indefinite) present. This *ch* is softened to *j* after *n* and before *b*. In the definite present formed from an old present participle in *t* (Aryan *ut*) and in the past and future tenses the suffix is *sh*; thus, *gūchī*, goest: *enjī*, goest; *gūj-bá*, if thou goest; *ētish*, art going; *gūsh*, wentest; *elosh*, wilt go.

An *s* as first part of a consonantal compound is commonly changed to *sh*, so that we get *sht* for *st* and *shp* for *sp*; compare *ashtrith*, bedding, cf. S. *āstārāṇa*; *dusht*, hand, S. *hāsta*; *prusht*, bed, S. *prastarā*; *shtār*, to utter inarticulate sounds, S. *stan*; *shtār*, thief, S. *stēndā*; *shtrī*, *shtarī*, *ishtrī* (occasionally also *istrī*), woman, S. *strī*; *ushpik*, wasp, cf. Latin *vespa*. As in the case of Aryan *sht*, we sometimes find *sh* alone; thus, *dush* = *dusht*, hand. Sometimes *st* alternates, in the same words, with the more common *sht*; thus, *starak* and *shtarak*, to-day; and the common infinitive suffix *sth*.

In the compounds *sth* and *sm* the sibilant seems to disappear in *attī*, seed, stone, cf. S. *ástthi*; *emá*, we, S. *asmē*. I am not, however, able to lay down rules. Cf. *otisth*, to remain; *oshtasth*, to rise, both of which apparently belong to the base *sthā*, and the forms of the 1st persons of the verb substantive mentioned above.

The history of the compound *sv* is not quite clear. In *sus*, sister, S. *svásri*, *sva* has become *su*: in *psku*, sleep, S. *svap*, a comparison of Aw. *hrafš* seems to show that the old *sv* has been dropped. If we compare *psūr*,

¹ Pischel, *Grammatik*, § 480.

father-in-law, S. *śvāsura* < *svāsura*, it seems probable that *sv* before a sibilant became *p*. In *yo, yot*, self, S. *sva*, Aw. *hvatō*; *yār*, sunshine, S. *svār*, we find *sva* changed to *yo, yū*, where the initial *y* is perhaps prothetic, and this is perhaps the regular development.

The Aryan voiced palatal sibilant *ś* has been confounded with the palatal *j* in India. In modern Persian both *j* and *ś* become *z*, while the two sounds are distinguished as *j* (*zh*) and *z* respectively in non-Persian Iranian dialects. Bashgali seems to agree with those latter forms of speech: compare *uzzam*, to yawn, S. *vi-jṛimbh*; *zāp*, to know, S. *jñā*; *zamān*, son-in-law, Aw. *zāmātur*, S. *jāmātri*; *zān*, knee, Aw. *zānu*, S. *jānu*; *ziān*, damage, harm, Aw. *zyāni*, S. *jyāni*, etc. Instead of *zāp*, to know, we also find forms such as *n'zhārtish*, dost not know (No. 611); *n'jāṛsam*, I do not know (No. 751); *Imrā jāṛtaun*, God knows (No. 1002); *n'jānṛl* (?), not knowing (No. 1080); *nā jāṛetam*, I do not know (No. 1173); *na jāṛetish*, dost not know (No. 1176); *na jāṛamish*, we do not know (No. 1238). If *j* is not here simply a miswriting or due to a confusion with the corresponding Indian word, we must compare the change of an old *ś* or *s* to *ch* mentioned above. A medial *ś* regularly becomes *zh*; compare *wizhamam*, I think, I fear, S. *vi-jñā*; *vizhom* (and *vishṭī*), having feigned, cf. S. *vyāja*; *nizhē*, wash, S. *nij*. Also here we sometimes find *j* instead; thus *ninjō*, wash; *purjanam*, *purzanam*, and *purzhanam*, I think. Such instances must be judged as in the case of an initial *ś*. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that the orthography of Bashgali is far from being absolutely exact.

The aspirated voiced palatal spirant *śh*, which has become *h* in India, loses its aspiration. As an initial it becomes *z*; thus, *zīm*, snow, S. *himá*; *zira*, heart, S. *hŕ̥daya*; *zār*, *zīr*, coloured, yellow, S. *hári*. If the *h* in S. *hŕ̥ka*, shame, is actually derived from an Aryan

žh, the *j* in *jerik*, shame, is comparable to the initial of *jār*, to know, etc.; see above. It is, however, also possible that S. *hrī* represents an Aryan *ghrī* in spite of the phonological difficulties.

As in Persian dialects, we sometimes find *d* instead of *z*; thus, *dus*, yesterday, S. *hyás*; *dusht*, hand, S. *hásta*. The explanation of *dits*, tongue, S. *jihvā*, Aw. *hizū*, *hizwō*, is not easier than that of other Indo-European words for "tongue".

A medial *žh* is apparently dropped; thus, *ī*, *iā*, *ō*, I. S. *ahām*, Aw. *azem*, Old Pers. *adam*; *prōr*, wound, S. *prahāra*. In *mēh*, mist, dew, hoar-frost (cf. S. *mih*, mist; *mēghā*, cloud), there is apparently an old confusion with the base *mih*, to urinate. The final *h* in *mēh* cannot, in any event, be organic.

INFLEXION

If we now turn from phonology to grammar there is very little to assist us in our endeavour to define the philological position of Bashgali within the Aryan family. Such characteristics as can be found point to a closer connexion with non-Persian Iranian tongues.

GENDER. Colonel Davidson has shown (pp. 1 f. and 7) that there are several remnants of a feminine as distinguished from the masculine, but that the two genders are no more strictly distinguished. Bashgali in this respect occupies a position intermediate between Pashtō and the Pamir dialects, which distinguish two genders, on one side, and Persian and the Caspian dialects, where the distinction of genders has been discarded, on the other.

NUMBER AND OBLIQUE BASE. Bashgali possesses two numbers, and the plural is sometimes distinguished by adding the suffix *ān*, *ēn*, *in*, or *an* (Davidson, par. 17), which is well known from Iranian dialects. There are also traces of an oblique base, as in non-Persian Iranian and in Indo-Aryan languages: thus, *manchī-ē tū*, to a man.

In most cases, however, the oblique base is identical with the nominative, as is also the case in Pashtō, the Pamir dialects, and some Central dialects. Whether it has a separate form or not, the oblique is also used to denote the agent with the past tenses of transitive verbs, which are construed passively as in non-Persian Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages; compare *manchī-ē iā ushp brī*, man-by my mare taken, the man took off my mare.

PRONOUNS. The common form of the personal pronoun of the 1st pers. sing. is *ī*, *iā*, or *o*, which must be the same word as S. *ahám*, Aw. *azem*, Old Pers. *adam*, Pashtō *za*. It is impossible to tell which of these forms more particularly corresponds to *iā*. Old Pers. *adam* is perhaps the most likely one. There is a fuller Bashgali form *ōts*, I. The final *ts* here probably represents some emphatic particle: compare Gāthā dialect *aschīt*, I. The plural *emá*, we, corresponds to Persian *mā*, Balūchī *mā*, Caspian dialects *amā*, Aw. *āhmā*. "Thou" is *tū*, *to*, corresponding to Aw. *tū*, *tām*, Old Pers. *tuvam*, and similar forms in all Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages. The plural form *shá*, you, on the other hand, is again distinctly Iranian: cf. Persian *shumā*, Balūchī *shumā*, Caspian *shamā*, Central dialects *shumō*. Nothing corresponding is found in Indo-Aryan. The pronoun *yū*, *yō*, *yōt* (*zara*), self, corresponds to Persian *χud*, *χod*, Balūchī *vat*, Pamir dialects *χat*, and so forth, while *amo*, own, is perhaps identical with S. *ātmán*.

PERSONAL TERMINATIONS. The suffixes added to verbal tenses in order to denote the person are: Singular, 1st pers., *m*; 2nd pers., *sh(ī)*, *ch(ī)*; 3rd pers., *ā*, or no termination. Plural, 1st pers., *má*, *mish*; 2nd pers., *r*; 3rd pers., *ā*, *d*, *tt*. It will be seen that there are two different forms of the suffix of the 1st pers. pl. The form *má* is regularly used in the imperative-future and the aorist, the form *mish* in the present, the aorist (which also represents an old present), and in the past tenses.

There cannot, however, be any reasonable doubt that the two forms have been derived from the old terminations of secondary and primary tenses, Aryan *ma* and *masi*, respectively. The use of the "primary" suffix *miş* in the past tenses is easily explained if we remember that a form such as *gāmish*, we went, is derived from the past participle and corresponds to a Sanskrit *gatāḥ smaḥ*. The termination of the 2nd pers. pl. is more difficult. The *r* of forms such as *būr*, you are, must be derived from a single *n*, and the termination perhaps corresponds to Vedic *tana*. Compare however, the enclitic pronoun *tān* of the 2nd pers. pl. in Persian, Caspian, and Central dialects, and the verbal terminations *-inī*, *-on*, *-in* in the 2nd pers. pl. in Caspian dialects. The 3rd persons singular and plural are constantly confounded. The termination *ā* is probably derived from the suffix of some participle. The termination *d* only occurs in a certain form of the present in which personal suffixes are added to a participle ending in *n*; thus, *end*, they go; *bund*, they become. It is hardly possible to derive this *nd* directly from Aryan *nt* (Persian *nd*), which would give *t* or *tt* in Bashgalī. This suffix is probably represented by Bashgalī *tt* in forms such as *zāṛtett*, they know. It seems, however, as if a Bashgalī *t*, derived from *nt* or from other compounds, undergoes a secondary softening to *d* after nasals. Thus the termination of the gerund is *tī* (Aryan *-trī*): compare *katī*, having done. After an *n*, however, we find *dī* instead; thus, *achūdī*, having run. It is therefore possible that the termination *nd* is derived from *n + t*, where the *t* is the representative of the Aryan suffix *nt*.

The personal terminations in Bashgalī are more in accordance with the old Aryan suffixes than is the case in other Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages at the present day. The preservation of both the primary and the secondary suffix of the 1st pers. pl. is, in this respect, of especial interest. On the other hand, Bashgalī agrees with

Iranian in using the personal suffixes, not only to denote the subject, but also to mark other syntactic relations such as the direct and indirect object.

VERBAL FORMS. The usual form of the infinitive ends in *sth*; thus, *osth*, to come; *kusth*, to do. It must probably be compared with the Persian infinitive in *-istan*, which has been explained¹ as a compound form containing an infinitive of the base *as*, to be. A shorter infinitive, corresponding to the Persian infinitivus apocopatus, is identical with the base, or, if the negative *na* follows, it also often ends in *n*. This form is commonly used in connexion with the verb *busth*, to become, to be able, just as the Persian infinitivus apocopatus is used with *shāyaδ*, it is possible, and *bāyaδ*, it is wanted. Compare *na pū bunu*, he cannot go; *pshō-n n'battam*, I cannot sleep. The final *n* of some of these forms is perhaps only a duplicate of the initial *n* of the negative *na*.

In the formation of tenses Bashgali has struck out lines much similar to those followed in India. With one single exception all the tenses are formed from participles. The exception is a form in which personal terminations are added directly to the base. Compare *gū-m(-bā)*, (if) I go; *gū-j(-bā)*, (if) thou goest; *gū-mish(-bā)*, (if) we go, etc. This form is used as a conjunctive present, as an aorist, and as an imperative. Other tenses are formed from participles, and the number of such participles is comparatively great. As in Indian languages, there is a gerund or conjunctive participle. It is formed by adding *tī* or, after nasals, sometimes *dī*: thus, *bitī*, having become; *gītī*, having gone; *wītī*, beating, etc. It is probably connected with Vedic *tvī*. In some few cases we find a gerund ending in *m*; thus, *achūnam iē*, running go, go quickly; *bo-m azzibā*, becoming be-if, if we become. Compare the corresponding gerund ending in *am* in Old Sanskrit.

¹ See *Grundriss*, I. ii, p. 142.

The most common present participle ends in *l* or *n*; compare *mrl*, dying; *piltil*, falling; *yūl*, eating; *otin*, remaining; *tin pin*, wine-drinking, drunkard. The forms ending in *l* and *n* are often used promiscuously; compare *yūl-azzam* and *yūn-azzam*, I was eating. It is therefore likely that they are identical. In that case we may perhaps compare the substitution of *l* for *n* in Pashtō in words such as *dzal* and *jan*, girl,¹ and the interchange of *l* and *n* in Indo-Aryan vernaculars.² This, then, would furnish a new example of a phonetical tendency affecting both Indo-Aryan and Iranian vernaculars. This participle is used to form a present, an imperfect, and a future. Compare *yū-n-am*, I eat; *yū-l-ai*, they eat; *ku-n-am* and *ku-l-om*, I do; *yū-n-azzam* and *yū-l-azzam*, I was eating; *yū-l-om*, I shall eat; *ku-l-om*, I shall do. It will be seen that both the form ending in *l* and that ending in *n* are used in the present and in the imperfect. The *n*-form is, however, here most usual, while only the *l*-form seems to be used in the future. This state of affairs can scarcely be anything but a secondary arrangement, and it seems allowed to assume that *n* and *l* are originally one and the same suffix.³ If so, it cannot be derived from Aryan *nt*, which becomes *tt* or *t*. It is also doubtful whether it can be the old Aryan *-āna-*, *-ana-*, because, in that case, we would certainly expect to find, at least occasionally, a cerebral *ṇ* (written *r*). With verbs meaning "to go" the *n*-suffix is often used to form a kind of passive; thus, *peṛon-gā*, broken went, was broken; *waṛon-end*, seen go, are visible. This would point to a connexion with *-āna-*, *-ana-*, or perhaps with Latin *-ndus*. The latter explanation would be in best

¹ *Grundriss*, I, ii, p. 208.

² Grierson, *ZDMG.*, vol. I, p. 7.

³ An *l*-suffix is also used to form participles in the language called "Tocharisch" by Messrs. Sieg & Siegling, *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akademie*, 1908, vol. xxxix, p. 926, and in Slavonic.

accord with Bashgali phonology, for, as we have seen, *nā* regularly becomes *n*.

Another present participle ends in *k* or *g*; thus, *áo pi-k* (or *pi-g*), water-drinking, thirsty; *pshui-k*, sleeping, sleepy. It seems to indicate inclination. Formally it is identical with Persian *-ā*, Pehlevī *-āk*.¹

A third present participle formed with a suffix *tt* or *t* only occurs in a compound present; thus, *mṛē-t-am*, I die; *mṛē-tt*, dies; *mṛe-tt-ett*, they die. This seems to be the regular representative of the old Aryan participle ending in *-nt*.

The past participle passive ends in *ā* or *a*; thus, *uttā*, left; *jāra*, killed; *kṛā*, done. It certainly contains the old *ta*-suffix. In *winā*, beaten, we apparently have an *n*-suffix; compare S. *bhinnā*. It also occurs in *iyārā*, *iyānā* = *iyā*, eaten, where it has been added to the old participle in *ā*. Compare Aryan *na*. This participle is used to form the past tenses: thus, *gā-mish*, we went; *mṛ-issam*, I had died. The pronominal terminations denoting the subject are only added in intransitive verbs. With transitives they denote the object; thus, *iā tū ē tung ptā-sh*, I thee one rupee gave-thee, thou wast given one rupee by me. In the *paradigms* in Colonel Davidson's book, it is true, the personal terminations are also added in transitive verbs; thus, *ptā-sh*, gavest. This is not, however, in accordance with the practice in the *sentences*. There cannot, therefore, be any doubt that the past tenses of transitive verbs are passives in Bashgali as in non-Persian Iranian and in Indo-Aryan vernaculars.

POSITION OF BASHGALĪ WITHIN THE ARYAN FAMILY. The preceding remarks will have shown that Bashgali agrees with Iranian languages in most important points, such as the treatment of the Aryan vowels, especially of *ṛi*; the absence of aspirated sounds; the distinction made between the voiced Aryan palatals and

¹ *Grundriss*, I, i, pp. 278, 306; ii, pp. 146, 172.

sibilants and the retaining of the latter as sibilants; the non-development of a separate cerebral *varga* from the dentals; the preservation of numerous consonantal compounds, and so on. All these are of the greatest importance, and some of them, such as the disaspiration and the preservation of voiced sibilants, have from the oldest times been the chief distinguishing features of Iranian languages as compared with Indian. I may add some less important features in which Bashgali agrees with Iranian, and especially with non-Persian languages. Such are the preservation of the old semi-vowels *y* and *v*; the weak sense of gender; traces of a separate oblique base and of the same plural termination as is used in Iranian; the passive construction of the past tenses of transitive verbs. The last-mentioned feature is also characteristic of Indo-Aryan vernaculars. One important feature Bashgali shares with the Indian branch of the Aryan family, viz. the preservation of the old dental sibilant *s*. If we abstract from this, it will be seen that all other points of agreement between our language and Indo-Aryan belong to later stages of development, when the Aryan family had long ago split up into two branches. The most important ones are the development of a cerebral *ŋ* from a single medial dental *n*, which Bashgali shares with Western Indo-Aryan, and the general use of participles in the formation of verbal tenses. Such points of agreement would be quite natural even if Bashgali were a pure Iranian language, for grammatical tendencies are not restricted to the area of one single language, but often extend beyond its limits. It must be remembered that up to the fifteenth century Indian tribes and Indian civilization extended up to the very borders of Kāfiristan. If it were not for the preservation of the old dental sibilant, I do not think that anybody would hesitate to class Bashgali as an Iranian form of speech. The few instances in which

Bashgali can be compared with European languages, such as the words *ut*, to use, Latin *utor*; *ushpik*, wasp, Latin *vespa* (cf. Balūchī *grabz*); *wāo*, grandfather, Latin *avus*; *mī*, self, Latin *met*; *p*, *b*, on, Greek *ἐπί*; *wa-nam*, take, Gothic *nima*; and perhaps the *n*-participle, Latin *-ndus*, are too insignificant to affect the classification. They must all be considered as inherited from Indo-European times, though they have not survived or have not been discovered in other Aryan forms of speech.

The preservation of the Aryan dental *s* has usually been considered as one of the chief characteristics which distinguishes the Indian from the Iranian branch. It is, however, evident that the substitution of *h* for *s* must have spread gradually, and did not from the beginning affect the whole Iranian area. It would therefore be quite allowed to assume that there did, at some remote period, exist dialects which in every other respect were Iranian, but which did not change the old *s* to *h*. If such dialects could be proved to have existed, they would be just what is wanted in order to explain the curious intermediate position of Bashgali. Now I think it possible to show that such has really been the case, that we possess information of an old Iranian dialect which had preserved the old Aryan *s* as in India. I refer to the language from which the names of the Mitani gods have been taken.

In a treaty between the Mitani king Mattiuaza and the Hittite king Subbiluliuma brought to light by Professor Winckler, the deities of the two countries are invoked as protectors of the treaty. Among the Mitani gods we now find the following:—¹

ilāni mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il ilāni u-ru-w-na-aš-ši-el (var. *u-ru-na-aš-ši-il*)

ilu in-dur (var. *in-da-ra*) *ilāni na-ša-a[t-ti-ia-u]n-na*.

¹ Winckler, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 35, Dezember, 1907, p. 51.

It is now commonly recognized that this list contains the names of the well-known Vedic gods Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatyas, which must accordingly have been worshipped in Mesopotamia in the fourteenth century B.C. The first three names can be Iranian as well as Aryan; the fourth one, *na-ša-at-ti-ia*, with its *š*, militates against the rules of Iranian phonology, the Awestan form of this word being *nānhaīpīa*. Professor Eduard Meyer¹ therefore maintains that "the Aryans who pushed forward to the Euphrates and to Syria in the fifteenth century or earlier, did not speak Iranian but Aryan", and he remarks that "the gods which the inhabitants of the Panjab worshipped as their principal deities in Vedic times are here met with, four hundred miles farther to the west, as the gods of the Aryans of Mitani. The differentiation only took place later on, principally as a result of the appearance of the prophet Zarathustra". He is accordingly of opinion that the gods in question were common Aryan gods, and the language from which they have been taken common Aryan, and neither Iranian nor Indian. This is also the opinion of Professor Oldenberg,² and apparently also of Mr. Keith.³ Professor Jacobi,⁴ on the other hand, thinks that the Mitani gods were Vedic, and had been brought to Mitani from Eastern Iran, where they must have been adopted from India about the sixteenth century. According to him, therefore, the language in question should be characterized as Indian. Now it seems impossible to answer the question about the language from which the names of the Mitani gods have been taken without considering the nationality of the Mitani chiefs of Aryan race. Names of Aryan chieftains are, as is well known, found in Cuneiform

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der K. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1908, vol. i, pp. 14 ff.; *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, vol. xlii, pp. 24 ff.

² *JRAS.*, 1909, pp. 1095 ff. ³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1100 ff. ⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 721 ff.

inscriptions from very early times. Many such names are found in the Tell-el-Amarna letters; thus, *Artamanyu* (*Ἀρταμίνης*), chief of Ziribašani, probably about Basan; *Bawarzana* or *Mawarzana* (or perhaps *Mayarzana*), chief of Hazi, probably to the north of Palestine; *Šubandu* or *Šubandi*, from Philistæa (cf. S. *Subandhu*); *Šurardata*, the adversary of Abdiḥiba of Jerusalem (cf. S. *Swardatta*); *Šutarna* or *Šuttarna*, chief of Mušihuma, probably in Northern Palestine; *Yašdata* or *Wašdata*, probably from the neighbourhood of Megidda; *Zirdamiašda*, probably from Northern Palestine, and so forth. The name of the Kassitic sun-god *Šurias* (cf. S. *sūrya*) points to a similar Aryan element to the east of Babylonia. It will be seen that forms such as *arta-*, *-warzana*, *zirda-*, *-miašda*. and probably also *-data* are Iranian and not Aryan, while the use of an *š* corresponding to Aryan *s* can be both Aryan and Indian. The names of the Mitani kings are of the same kind. They are *Sa-uš-ša-tar*, *Artatama*, *Šuttarna*, *Dušratta* (or *Tušratta*), *Artuššumara* (or *Artuššuwara*), and *Mattiwaza*. Of these, *Sa-uš-ša-tar* must correspond to an Indian **Saukshatra*, and the final portion of the name is *šatar* = Old Pers. *χshaštra*, which, again, is Iranian and not Aryan. *Artatama* has been explained as a superlative of the Old Pers. *arta*. *Toma* can, however, also be derived from a base *tam*. The Indian Dhātupāṭha knows such a base *tam*, to desire. The initial *duš* of *Dušratta* is Aryan or Iranian; *ratta* may correspond to S. *rātha* (cf. *Zurata* or *Šarātum*, chief of Akko). Scheftelowitz compares S. *raddha*. *Uwaza* in *Mattiwaza* (S. *māti-vāja* ?), again, is Iranian.¹ I think that the explanation of these facts has been given by Professor Bloomfield,² who considers it possible that

¹ Names such as *Mattiwaza*, *Biriwaza*, *Namiwaza*, which all occur in Cuneiform documents, betray the same interest in races which is so well known from Vedic India.

² "On some alleged Indo-European Languages in Cuneiform Character": *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xxv, pp. 1 ff.

“the Mitani and other Western Asiatic Iranoid proper names came from a dialect closely allied to Iranian but not yet exactly Iranian, i.e. a dialect which did not change *s* to *h*”. It seems as if the change of *s* to *h* is not so old as the other Iranian characteristics. It only began after the Iranian branch had separated itself from the common Aryan stock, and did not at once spread over the whole Iranian area. If so, the names of the Mitani gods do not prove anything as to whether they had been inherited from the Aryan period or imported from India. The language from which they have been taken does not differ from the language which has furnished the names of the Mitani kings, and that form of speech was neither Aryan nor Indian, but Iranian. This conclusion is now considerably strengthened by the state of things in modern Bashgali. I hope to have shown that we have here, at the present day, a form of speech which in phonology is mainly Iranian, but does not change *s* to *h*. It seems necessary to infer that Bashgali is the modern representative of an Iranian language, the oldest traces of which are found in the names of the Mitani chiefs and other chieftains known from Cuneiform inscriptions. This language was more closely connected with Old Persian than with Avestan, but differed from both in retaining the old Aryan *s*. It must have been distributed over a wider area¹ than at the present day, where it is represented by Bashgali and connected dialects. The change of *s* to *h* must then have spread gradually over most of the Iranian area, just as we see the change of the Aryan *ś* (Iranian *s*) to Old Pers. *θ*, New Pers. *h*, spreading over part of the territory occupied by Iranian tongues.

The tribes who spoke this old Iranian dialect worshipped gods which are well known from India—Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatyas. It is of peculiar interest to note

¹ The Mordwin loan-word *azor*, *azoro*, lord, has been borrowed from such a form of speech.

that one of these gods, viz. Indra, must have been worshipped by the Bashgalis. I infer this from words such as *indrōn*, a rainbow, and perhaps *indrish*, *indrish*, an earthquake. *Indrōn* can scarcely be anything but *in-drōn*, the *drōn*, bow, of *in*, and *in* would regularly correspond to an old *Indra*. Compare S. *indra-dhanás*, *indra-chāpa*. the bow of Indra, rainbow. It is, of course, impossible to decide whether this acquaintance with Indra is an inheritance from ancient times or a later loan from India. The former alternative would be quite possible when we consider that Indra was, in ancient times, worshipped by Iranians in Mesopotamia. Moreover, it is doubtful whether a later loan-word would have assumed the same modern form as a direct descendant of the old Aryan name. On the other hand, the influence of Indian civilization must have made itself felt in Kāfiristan down to the Mohammedan conquest of the adjoining districts towards India. To this later influence is perhaps due the idea of *garo*, the *grāha* of the Indians, as causing eclipses. Compare *sā garo yaristhē dugā*, sun *garo* eating on-account-of, because *garo* has eaten the sun, owing to an eclipse of the sun (Davidson, No. 325); *sā garo n'yāriss*, the sun has not been eaten by the *garo* (No. 406). Colonel Davidson translates *garo* in such sentences with "shadow"; there cannot, however, be any doubt that the word is the regular representative of *grāha* (or **grahaka*). It is also possible that some of the instances of correspondence in phonology and grammar between Bashgali and Indo-Aryan vernaculars may be due to such later influence. At all events, I hope to have shown that Bashgali is derived from an ancient Iranian dialect, which had still retained the Aryan *s* and not changed it to *h*, and that we know of the existence of such a language, spoken by tribes who in the fourteenth century B.C. worshipped gods such as Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatyas. While the old Persians, the adherents of Zarathustra's religion, raised their dialect to the

dignity of an imperial language, the old *s*-dialect gradually disappeared from most parts of its area, and at the present day we can only trace it in the extreme east, where there are still indications that the worship of Indra has continued down to comparatively modern times, but no traces that the law of Zarathustra has ever prevailed. I may add that the existence of Iranian worshippers of Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatyas well explains the evident animosity against *daeva* worshippers which so often meets us in the Avesta.



II

THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS OF VAN

PART VIII

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE

PROFESSOR Nikolsky has been kind enough to send me a photograph and copy of a new and important Vannic inscription which he has published, with translation and commentary, in the Reports of the Imperial (Russian) Archæological Commission, 37. The inscription was found at Armavir. Its importance for the study of Vannic philology, as well as the fact that I believe I can improve upon Professor Nikolsky's translation, induces me to reproduce it here. In continuance of my previous notation its number will be XCI.

1. † AN-RI-du-ri-s † Ar-gis-ti-khi-ni-s
Sarduris son of Argistis
2. a-li-e DIN a-li-i-si i-ku-ka-ni
says: Of the life of the community in this place
3. e-di-ni sa-u-e ma-nu-li-e
for the sake, (and) for the security public
4. me-i i-ni E-GAL ku-ul-di-a-ni
of it, of this palace the altar-priests
5. me-i se-bu-ya ar-di-a-ni me-i
of it, the windows for lighting of it,
6. gi-e-i i-na-ni ar-ni-u-si-na-ni
(and) a wall of the city for the building
7. la-ku-ya-ni a-lu-ki-e bi-di-i
as a place of offering at all times of victims
8. † Ar-gis-ti-ni † AN-RI-du-ri-ni
on the part of Argistis (and) Sarduris

9. gu-bu-us-ta-li a-li is-ti-ni-ni
after making strong and its limits
10. a-du-li-e tsi-su-li ta-na-ni-ni
defining and registering (?), of the planting
11. † Ar-gis-ti-e-i † AN-RI-di-ri-e-i
of Argistis (and) Sarduris
12. ti-ni e-si-ni te-ir-di la-ni-ni
what is called the place at the foundation . . .
13. me-i-e-si me-tsi el-mu-s ma-nu-ni
of wine native libations has prescribed.
14. † AN-RI-du-ri-i-s a-li-e
Sarduris says:
15. a-lu-s i-ni E-GAL ku-u-li-e
whoever this palace shall seize,
16. a-lu-s kha-ar-kha-ar-su-li-i-e
whoever shall dig up,
17. a-lu-s gi-e-i i-na-a-ni
whoever the city-wall
18. ar-ni-u-si-na-ni la-ku-du-li-e
of the building shall surrender,
19. a-lu-s gi-e-i i-na-ni KA-MES-ni
whoever of the wall of the city the gates
20. se-bu-ya-li-e a-lu-s i-ni DUP-TE
shall open, whoever this monument
21. tu-li-i-e a-lu-s pi-tu-li-i-e
shall remove, whoever shall remove (its) name,
22. a-lu-s se-ir-du-li-i-e a-lu-s
whoever shall bury (?) (it), whoever
23. u-li i-ni-li du-li-i-e
to another it shall assign,
24. ti-u-li-e u-li tu-ri
pretending (it belongs) to another person,
 tu-ri-ni-ni
as for that person

25. AN Khal-di-s AN IM-s AN-UT-s AN-MES-s
Khaldis Teisbas (and) Ardinis the gods
26. ma-ni IV IV IV AN-UT-ni pi-i-ni me-i
him 12 times publicly the name of him,
27. ar-khi-u-ru-li-a-ni me-i i-na-i-ni
the posterity of him, (and) the city
28. me-i na-ra-a a-u-i-e u-lu-li
of him to fire (and) water shall deliver.

1. Sarduris gives himself no royal titles, and as he couples his father Argistis with himself in ll. 8 and 11 it is clear that his father was not only still alive, but also that he himself had not been associated with him in the government.

2. Professor Nikolsky has misread the ideograph, which the photograph shows to be DIN, "life." The Vannic equivalent was *ulgusiani*. For the phrase see my note on the bilingual inscription, lvi, 13, JRAS., 1906, p. 622. For *ali-si*, from *al*, "to increase," see JRAS., 1901, p. 648.¹

3. *Sa-ue* has the same origin as *sa-na*, which is the rendering of the ideographs E-GI, "stronghold" (JRAS., 1894, p. 717), and *sa-tubi*, "I took hostages," and consequently denotes "security". Hence Schulz's reading *sa-u-e* in li, 1, 5, is correct, and the passage should be transcribed and translated *i-ni a-li-i-si i-ku-ka-ni e-di-ni sa-u-e ma-nu-li me-i a-se-e-i tu-ur-ta-a-ni kha-i-di-a-ni*

¹ The same root is found in the adverb *ali-ki*, which does not signify "partly", as we have hitherto supposed, but "in multitudes". It is also the second element in the verb *khasi-al-me* in the formula *khutia-di AN Khaldi-di EN-di AN IM-di AN UT-di AN-MES-as-te MAT Biana-s-te alu-si-nini alsui-si-ni alia-ba-di khasi-al-me*, for which I should now propose the translation "under the leadership of (or under the leaders) Khaldis the lord, Teisbas and Ardinis, the gods of Biaina, the company of the great ones who dwell (there), may the gods continue-victory" or possibly "O gods, continue victory (to me)". We have the same construction in xxiv, 6-8, *ase askhu-me AN UT ITU AN Khaldiei AN-ris nus*, "to the temple may Saris the queen grant food (or O queen Saris, grant food) daily during the month of Khaldis." "Khaldis the lord" is parallel to the Babylonian Bel-Merodach.

te-ri-khi-ni-e D.P. AN-RI-*du-ri-ni-i ti-i-ni* D.P. AN-RI-*du-ri-ni-i* GIS-U *du-li-e-i*, "for the sake of this community here (and) its public security, as the revenue (?) of the temple the field (?) planted by Sarduris which is called the pasturage of Sarduris he assigns."

4. *Kubudi* is "altar" (JRAS., 1906, p. 624); the derivative *kuldia* would mean "altar-priests". Or does the suffix here denote locality ("altar"), as in *sebuya* (l. 5) and *lakuya* (l. 7)?

5. In l. 20 the verb *sebu-ya-lé* is used of the gates of a city-wall in connexion with their surrender to an enemy, so that it must have the sense of "opening". *Ardi* is "light", hence *ardiu* would be "light-bringers". *Sebuya* consequently must signify "opening" or "window".

6. I was wrong in following Dr. Belck and giving *gieis* the signification of "temple" instead of that of "wall" which I originally assigned to it. *Arni* is "work", the suffix *-na* denotes a place, while *-u* and *-si* are adjectival suffixes. Hence the translation of the line will be "a city-wall for the place of the work" or "building".

7. *Lakuya*, as I stated in 1882, seems to be a bye-form of *luqu*, "to give." At all events in SAYCE, v, 26, *luqu-ni* signifies "offer (victims)": "to the neighbouring (*qabqarili*) Khaldises of every kind as well as to the foreign gods three oxen and three sheep together with the flesh (*klusu*) they have offered at various times during the day" (*laku-ni aluki ardini*).

The adverbial *aluki* from the pronominal *alus*, "whoever," "anyone," must have some such sense as "in any case", "at any time".

For *bidi*, "sacrifice," "victim," see SAYCE, lxviii, 6, 7, and the compound *bidi-udibad* (SAYCE, l, 18), which denotes some kind of weapon.

9. *Gubus-ta-li* is a compound of *ta* and the Assyrian *gubus*, "mass," "thickness." Perhaps it means "to enlarge" rather than "strengthen".

Besides the pronoun *isti* there was a verb *isti*, "to mark out," as has been shown by Professor Lehmann (JRAS., 1906, p. 621). Hence in SAYCE, lxii, 7, we have XVMIIIIC *kapi is-ti-ni*; "15,300 *kapi* it measured."

10. *Adu* is used of "counting" in SAYCE, xlix, 26. *Tsi-su-li* is a compound of *su*, "to make," while the first element occurs in the compound *esiu-tsiu-li* (SAYCE, lxxxvi, 22), where I rendered it "to prescribe a tariff".

Tuna-nini has the same root as *tanu-li*, for which I can now offer a satisfactory translation. In SAYCE, v, 29-31, we should read: *teruni ardise ase GIS-MES ui aldinie gudali AN Khaldie III LU-MES SUM III LU-MES AN-MES UKKIN-MES ase GIS uldi tanuli AN Khaldie III LU SUM III LU AN-MES UKKIN-MES ase GIS uldi mesuli AN Khaldie III LU SUM III LU AN-MES UKKIN-MES GESTIN mesi ulini miesi metsi elmu[s m]ununi*, "they have established a sacrificial tariff: when the trees of the temple along with the Khaldis-statues are consecrated three sheep shall be sacrificed to Khaldis (and) three sheep to the foreign gods; when the vine of the temple is planted three sheep shall be sacrificed to Khaldis (and) three sheep to the foreign gods; while the vine of the temple is vintaged three sheep shall be sacrificed to Khaldis (and) three sheep to the foreign gods; the libations of foreign wine and grape-wine they have prescribed."

For *Aldinie* see SAYCE, lvi, 1, etc. That *guduli* refers to consecration is apparent from the word *gudulia*, which in lxviii, 5, is used of a class of priests. The festivals connected with the vine must have taken place either at its planting or its bearing leaves and at the gathering of the grapes. That *tanuli* cannot refer to the bearing of leaves is clear from lix, 1, where the reading is: *uldi sui uli tanu[li]*, "after planting a vine on another property". *Mesuli* must refer to the vintage, and is doubtless connected with *mesi*, which has the determinative

of "wine" prefixed to it. As *metzi* also had the ideograph of "wine" attached to it (*Topzawu*, 14), and is here contrasted with *ulini*, it would appear that by the first the imported palm-wine of Babylonia was meant, while the native grape-wine of Armenia was denoted by the second expression. *Mesi* is a genitive after *el-mus*, which must therefore signify "libations", which were naturally offered after the vintage.

12. Instead of *lu-nini*, *te-nini* is possible. The word perhaps means "customary", "the customary libations of wine." The present passage enables us to restore *lix*, 2, 3, which should be: [*me-i-*] *si me-tsi el-mu-us mu-nu-u-[ni]* [*la-ni-*] *ni*, "the libations of grape-wine he has prescribed as usual." *Manuni* is literally "he has published".

15. *Ku-lé* has the same root as *kui* (*lvi*, 35), "occupancy," "appropriation."

18. *Laku-du* is literally "set for a gift".

19. It is clear from this passage that the ideograph KA-MES, "mouths," must mean "gates", and not "words" as I supposed in *JRAS.*, 1906, p. 613 (where the translation ought to be "they founded the gates"). There may have been a confusion between the two ideographs KA, "mouth," "opening," and KA, "gate."

20. *Sebuyali* is in parallelism to *luku-duli*, and since the object of it is "gates" the only signification it can have is that of "opening" them to the enemy. See note on l. 5. The photograph has DUP-TE.

22. The first element *ser* in the compound *ser-duli* may be identical with the Cappadocian word *siri*, which, according to Pliny (*N.H.*, xiii, 73), signified "pits".

As the notes have shown, the new inscription throws a good deal of light upon the mutilated inscription *lxviii*, which has also received a certain amount of elucidation from recent Vannic research. It is therefore advisable to give a revised translation of it here.

1. AN Khal-di-ni-ni al-śu-i-si-ni, . . . [D.P. Ar-]
To the Khaldis-gods the mighty . . . as the land
 gis-ti-khi-na D.P. Ha-za-ni eba-ni
of Argistis the land of Hazas
2. ki-ni MAT Lu-lu-e ma-nu i-u
who have made in sight of the land of Lulus when
 D.P. Ar-[gis-ti-s D.P. Me-nu-a-khi-ni-s] a-ru-u-ni
Ar-[gis-tis son of Menuas] gave
 su-ga-ba-ra-ni
a thankoffering
3. i-na-ni u-se u-su-ul-mu-us [ma-nu-ni ?
to the city, (then) juniper-juice libations [he prescribed?
 . . .] . . . li-u-a-ni bar-za-ni zi-el-di
 . . .] *in the altar-chapel*
4. D.P. Ar-gis-ti-e D.P. Me-nu-a-khi-ni
of Argistis the son of Menuas . . . [Of sheep ?]
 D.P. khu-su DUP-ni-ni e-śi-ni
the flesh in the place where the inscription is
5. XX ku-ur-ni D.P. Se-e-lu-i-ni
 20 priests called Seluians [shall offer]
 [u-]e gu-du-hi-a me-li u-li-ni
with priests . . . other ;
6. a-lu-ki a-ma-ni su-ga-ba-ri
in all cases a part of the thankoffering [they shall
 a-li bi-di as-ta
receive . . .] whoever the place of sacrifice
 nu-la-li
shall enter,
7. a-li ta-a-se a-ma-ni bi-di
and to the people the part of the sacrifice
 [u-li-ni . . .] i-ni te-ir-du-hi-ni
[other they shall give]. Of this place
 e-śi-e
that has been founded

8. U-ni D.P. Ur-bi-ka-ni-ka-a-s [kha-u-li]
the pasturage the chief of the Urbikans [shall take]
 . . . u-e ta-ra-i-u-khi ma-nu-li-e
together with the second class in common ;
9. LU-a-bi ip-dhu-u-ni ma-a-[sa-ni]
the flocks he has set apart (?) (both) lambs
 khi-e U-ni
[and sheep] . . . (and) the . . . pasturage
 D.P. Ur-bi-ka-a-s
the Urbikan,
10. ma-sa-ni ti-is-nu a-ma-ni h-[a-li] . . .
after the lamb's flesh in part has been sa[crificed],
 [kha-u-] li a-li
shall take] whoever (of them)
 bi-di as-ta nu-la-a-li-e
the sacrificial place shall enter.
11. U-ni D.P. Bu-ru-nu-ur-da-di-[s u-li-ni kha-u-]li
Pasturage the Burunurdulians [other shall take]
 a-li bi-di as-ta nu-la-a-li-e
whoever the sacrificial place shall enter.
12. GUD-ni-ni i-ra-di-ni-ni III a-[ma-ni? . . .
Of an ox's . . . three [parts? . . .
 . . . D.P. Se-] lu-u-i-ni-e U-ni D.P.
and the Se]luvians, pasturage
 Nu-nu-li-e
on Nunulis's
13. a-la-e D.P. I-kha-i-du-s i si-ni
river Ikhaidus [shall receive . . .] . . .
 ur-di-du D.P. Se-lu-i-ni-e . . .
 . . . the Selvians . . .

2. Since *Argistikhi-na* is a dative, the literal meaning of *ki* is probably "to turn", "convert". In the Topzawa Inscription Lulu is rendered Urdhu, "Ararat," in the Assyrian version. Hence Armavir, where lxviii was found, will represent the country known as Ararat to the

Assyrians. The significations of *manu*, *iu*, and *aru* have been fixed by the bilingual texts.

3. GIS *use* is the Assyrian *usu*, "juniper" (JRAS., 1901, p. 650), hence *usu-lmus* will be "libations of gin".

Zili-bi is "sacrifices", *ziel-du-bi* "I sacrificed" (JRAS., 1906, p. 624). With the locative suffix, therefore, the word ought to signify "sacrificial altar".

4. Like *tisnu*, which has the determinative of "flesh" in lix, 11, *khusu* will signify some part of the sacrificial victim. The next two words are in agreement with *kurni*.

5. *Kurni* is from the root *kuru*, "to offer." The name of the Seluian priests seems connected with *sel* in Sel-ardis, "the moon," which may signify "the light of the evening". If *sel* is the same word as *sili* (v, 26) the three words *sili*, *guli*, *tisulduli-ni* would mean, not "dawn", "midday", and "evening" as I supposed, but "evening", "morning", and "midday", and we should have to regard the Vannic calendar as counting the day from evening to evening. But it is difficult not to see in *tisuldu* a compound of *uldis*, "a vine."

For *gudulia* see note on l. 10 above, where the passage quoted from v, 29 makes it clear that *gudu* means "to consecrate".

Meli is possibly connected with *mes*, "he:" "other priests belonging to them"?

6. The meaning of *nululi* has been settled by the bilingual texts, like that of *ali*. *Asta*, "within," is from *asis*, "house."

7. *Tasé* has a more extended signification than that of "visitors" which I formerly assigned to it. In ll. 30, 31 we have ALU *Qulbitarri-ni* ALU *Tasé* ALU AN *Kuerai-tasé*, "the people of the city of Qulbitarris and the people of the city of the god Kueras." Hence *tasmus* (xxx, 17) will be "people-heads".

8. The Assyrian equivalent of *U-ni* is *rétu*, but here the context seems to show that the word is used in the

sense of "endowment", or "rent" derived from pasturage lands. The suffix *-ka*, as we now know from the bilingual texts, denotes what is "in front": the verb is *khauli*, as that is the verb used with U in lxxxvi, 15-17. The final *-l* occurs in l. 11.

Turai-u-khi is from *tara-ni*, "second."

9. The Vannic word was possibly *susiyu-bi*, where *-bi* is the plural suffix. The meaning of *ipdhu-ni* is unknown.

10. As *susis* was "sheep", *masa-ni* will be either "ewe" or "lamb", and in a sacrificial tariff "ewe" is out of the question. For *tisnu* see above on l. 4.

11. *Burunurdadi* seems to be a compound of *Buru-ni* and *urdadi*, of which we probably have another form in *urdidu* (l. 13). With *Buru-ni* compare *bu-ru-li* . . . (xix, 8, where we should read: *a-li AN Khal-di-[e ni-ip-]si-di-e SUM-e a-li bu-ru-li-[e-ni-]na-u-e su-i-ni-ni bar-za-ni zi-el-[di D.P. Me-]nu-a*, "whatsoever is sacrificed to Khaldis the . . . , and whatsoever to the many spirits of the land of Burulis (?) in the altar-chapel of Menuas"). It will be noticed that there are three classes of priests, the Seluians, the Urbikans, and the Burunurdadians, corresponding with the three divisions of the day (see note above on l. 5). The Urbikans are subdivided into "a chief" (or perhaps "a first class") and a "second" class, and their name signifies "one who is in front of *urbi*". It is possible that their "chief" was the Ikhaïdus mentioned in l. 13.

VOCABULARY

A

- A-du-li-e. 'Defining.' xci, 10.
 A-la-e. 'River.' lxxviii, 13.
 A-li. 'And.' lxxviii, 7; xci, 9.
 A-li. 'Whoever.' lxxviii. 6, 10, 11.
 'Whatsoever.' xix, 7, 8.
 A-li-e. 'He says.' xci, 2, 14.

- A-li-ki. 'In multitudes'; not 'partly'.
 A-li-i-sí. 'Community.' li, 1. 4; xci, 2.
 Al-di-ni-i-e. 'Khaldis-images.' v, 29.
 Al-sú-i-si-ni. 'Great.' lxviii, 1.
 A-lu-ki. 'At any time.' lxviii, 6.
 A-lu-ki-e. xci, 7.
 A-lu-s. 'Whoever.' xci, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22.
 A-ma-ni. 'Part,' 'share.' lxviii, 6, 7, 10.
 Ar-di-a-ni. 'Lighting.' xci, 5.
 Ar-gis-ti-ni. Argistis. xci, 8.
 Ar-gis-ti-e-i. lxviii, 4; xci, 11.
 Ar-gis-ti-khi-ni-s. 'Son of Argistis.' xci, 1.
 Ar-gis-ti-khi-na. 'Land of Argistis.' lxviii, 1.
 Ar-khi-u-ru-li-a-ni. 'Seed.' xci, 27.
 Ar-ni-u-si-na-ni. 'Place of building.' xci, 6, 18.
 A-ru-u-ni. 'He gave.' lxviii, 2.
 As-ta. 'In the place,' 'within.' lxviii, 6, 10, 11.
 A-u-i-e. 'Water.' xci, 28.

B

- Bar-za-ni. 'Chapel.' xix, 9; lxviii, 3.
 Bi-di. 'Victims,' 'sacrifice.' lxviii, 6, 7, 10, 11.
 Bi-di-i. xci, 7.
 Bu-ru-li-e-ni. xix, 8.
 Bu-ru-nu-ur-da-di-s. A class of priests. lxviii, 11.

D

- Du-li-i-e. 'Shall assign.' xci, 23.

E

- Eba-ni. 'Land.' lxviii, 1.
 E-di-ni. 'For the sake.' li, 1. 4; xci, 3.
 El-mu-s. 'Libations.' v, 31; lix, 2; xci, 13.
 E-sí-e. 'Place.' lxviii, 7.
 E-sí-ni. lxviii, 4; xci, 12.

G

- Gi-e-i. 'Wall.' xci, 6, 17, 19.
 Gu-bu-us-ta-li. 'Making strong.' xci, 9.

Gu-du-u-li. 'Consecrating.' v, 29.

Gu-du-li-a. 'Consecrated priests.' lxviii, 5.

H

Ha-za-ni. Hazas. lxviii, 1.

H-a-li. 'Sacrificing.' lxviii, 10.

I

Ib-dhu-u-ni. 'Set apart (?)' lxviii, 9.

I-kha-i-du-s. lxviii, 13.

I-ku-ka-ni. 'In this place.' li, 1. 4; xci, 2.

I-na-ni. 'City.' lxviii, 3; xci, 6, 19.

I-na-a-ni. xci, 17.

I-na-i-ni. xci, 27.

I-ni. 'This.' lxviii, 7; xci, 4, 15, 20.

I-ni-li. 'It.' xci, 23.

I-ra-di-ni-ni. lxviii, 12.

Is-ti-ni-ni. 'The limits.' xci, 9.

I-u. 'When.' lxviii, 2.

K

Ki-ni. 'Appointed.' lxviii, 2.

Ku-ul-di-a-ni. 'Altar-priests.' xci, 4.

Ku-u-li-e. 'Shall seize.' xci, 15.

Ku-ur-ni. 'Offerers.' lxviii, 5.

KH

Kha-i-di-a-ni. 'Field (?)' li, 1. 6.

Khal-di-s. xci, 25.

Khal-di-ni-ni. lxviii, 1.

Kha-ar-kha-ar-su-li-i-e. 'Shall dig up.' xci, 16.

Khu-su. 'Flesh,' some part of a victim. lxviii, 4.

L

La-ku-du-li-e. 'Shall surrender.' xci, 18.

La-ku-ya-ni. 'Place of offering.' xci, 7.

La-qu-ni. 'Offered (victims).' v, 26.

La-ni-ni. 'Customary (?)' lix, 3; xci, 12.

Lu-lu-e. Ararat. lxviii, 2.

M

- Ma-ni. 'Him.' xci, 26.
 Ma-nu. 'In sight of.' lxviii, 2.
 Ma-nu-li-e. 'Public.' li, 1. 5; lix, 2; lxviii, 8; xci, 3.
 Ma-nu-ni. 'He made public,' 'prescribed.' xci, 13.
 [Ma]-a-nu-u-ni. v, 31.
 Ma-sa-ni. 'Lamb.' lxviii, 10.
 Ma-a-sa-ni. lxviii, 9.
 Me-i. 'His.' xci, 4, 5, 26, 27, 28.
 Me-li. lxviii, 5.
 Me-nu-a-khi-ni. 'Son of Menuas.' lxviii, 4.
 (GESTIN) me-si-i. 'Wine.' v, 31.
 Me-i-e-si. v, 31; lix, 2; xci, 13.
 Me-su-li. 'Vintaged.' v, 30.
 Me-tsi. 'Grape' or 'native wine'. v, 31; lix, 2; xci, 13.

N

- Na-ra-a. 'Fire.' xci, 28.
 Nu-la-li. 'Shall enter.' lxviii, 6.
 Nu-la-li-e. lxviii, 10.
 Nu-la-a-li-e. lxviii, 11.
 Nu-nu-li-e. lxviii, 12.

P

- Pi-i-ni. 'Name.' xci, 28.
 Pi-tu-li-i-e. 'Remove the name.' xci, 21.

S

- Sar-du-ri-s. xci, 1.
 Sar-du-ri-i-s. xci, 14.
 Sar-du-ri-e-i. xci, 11.
 Sar-du-ri-ni. xci, 8.
 Sa-u-e. 'Security.' li, 1. 5; xci, 3.
 Sa-na. 'Stronghold.' See E-GI.
 Sa-tu-bi. 'I took securities.'
 Se-bu-ya. 'Windows.' xci, 5.
 Se-bu-ya-li-e. 'Shall open.' xci, 20.
 Se-e-lu-i-ni. A class of priests. lxviii 5, 12, 13.

- Se-ir-du-li-i-e. 'Shall bury (?)' xci, 22.
 Su-ga-ba-ra-ni. 'Thankoffering.' lxviii, 2.
 Su-ga-ba-ri. lxviii, 6.
 Su-i-ni-ni. 'Many.' xix, 8.

T

- Ta-na-ni-ni. 'Planting.' xci, 10.
 Ta-nu-li. 'Planted.' v, 30; lix, 1.
 Ta-ra-i-u-khi. 'Second class.' lxviii, 8.
 Ta-a-s. 'People.' lxviii, 7.
 Ta-s-mu-s. 'Heads of the people.' xxx, 17.
 Te-ir-di. 'Foundation.' xci, 12.
 Te-ir-du-li-ni. 'Founded.' lxviii, 7.
 Te-ri-khi-ni-e. 'Planted.' li, 1. 6.
 Ti-ni. 'Called.' xci, 12.
 Ti-is-nu. 'Flesh,' part of a victim. lxviii, 10.
 Ti-u-li-e. 'Pretend.' xci, 21.
 Tu-li-i-e. 'Remove.' xci, 21.
 Tu-ri. 'Person.' xci, 24.
 Tu-ri-ni-ni. xci, 24.
 Tu-ur-ta-a-ni. 'Revenue (?)' li, 1. 5.

U

- U-e. 'With.' lxviii, 8.
 (GIS) ul-di. 'Vine.' v, 30; lix, 1.
 U-li. 'Another.' xci, 23, 24.
 U-li-ni. v, 31; lxviii, 5.
 U-lu-li. 'Shall consign.' xci, 28.
 Ur-bi-ka-a-s. A class of priests. lxviii, 9.
 Ur-bi-ka-ni-ka-a-s. 'Chief of the Urbikans.' lxviii, 8.
 Ur-di-du. lxviii, 13.
 U-se. 'Juniper-trees.' lxviii, 3.
 U-su-ul-mu-us. 'Libations of juniper-juice.' lxviii, 3.

Z

- Zi-el-di. 'Altar.' xix, 9; lxviii, 3.

TS

- Tsi-su-li. 'Registering (')' xci, 10.

IDEOGRAPHS

- AN-MES-s. 'The gods.' xci, 25.
 AN IM-s. Teisbas, the Air-god. xci, 25.
 AN UT-s. Ardinis, the Sun-god. xci, 25.
 AN UT-ni (ardini). 'Publicly.' xci, 26.
 DIN (ulgusiani). 'Life.' xci, 2.
 DUP-TE (armanilis). 'Written monument.' xci, 20.
 DUP-ni-ni. 'Inscription.' lxviii, 4.
 E-GAL (dhuluris). 'Palace.' xci, 4, 15.
 E-GI (sana). 'Stronghold.'
 GIS-MES. 'Trees.' v, 29.
 GIS-U. 'Pasturage.' li, 1. 7. See U-ni.
 GUD-ni-ni (pakhinini). 'Of an ox.' lxviii, 12.
 KA-MES-ni. 'Gates.' xci, 19.
 LU-a-bi. 'Flocks.' lxviii, 9.
 U-ni. 'Pasturage.' lxviii, 8, 9, 11, 12. See GIS-U.
 IVIVIV. 'Twelve times.' xci, 26.
-

III

THE BABAR-NAMA

A PASSAGE JUDGED SPURIOUS IN THE HAYDARABAD MANUSCRIPT

By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE

IT is with regret that I now find it impracticable to accept as authentic a passage in the Haydarābād MS. which had been welcomed there, (1) because being with that good text, it accredited the same passage in Ilminsky's imprint and in the *Mémoires de Baber*, and (2) because, however ineffectually, it provides something to fill the Bābar-nāma gap of 908 A.H.

As it concerns Bābar's escape from impending death it may be distinguished as the Rescue Passage. In the Hay. MS. it begins on fol. 118*b*, l. 2, and runs on for a folio and a half; in Kehr's MS. it is on fol. 385 [455], in the Kāsān imprint on p. 144, and in the *Mémoires* in vol. i, p. 255. It occurs also in the St. Petersburg University Codex which is copied from Kehr's MS.

On the other hand, it is not with the Elphinstone MS. (fol. 89*b*) or with its archetype (a fact learned from a scribe's note, fol. 90). As it is not found in either of the Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī it is safe to say it was not with their original when they were translated (1586 A.D. and 1590 A.D.). Consequently, it is not with the Memoirs, the lineal descendant of the Elphinstone MS. and of the second Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī.

A few preliminary words must be said about the gap of 908 A.H. Its presence in the Elph. MS. and archetype does not prove that Bābar left it, but shows merely that the gap existed before the Elph. MS. was copied (1556-67) and before either of the Persian translations was made.¹

¹ JRAS., 1907, p. 137, and 1910, p. 882 [H. Beveridge].

It appears to me due to loss of pages; in this, however, I regretfully differ from my husband. A textual detail which supports my view is that in the Elph. MS. the sentence before the gap lacks the terminal verb.¹

If for a moment it is considered why the gap of 908 A.H. should have been filled by an annotator (as we suppose it to have been filled) while the next gap, that of 914 A.H., remains empty, an explanation is found in the following salient difference between them. It is well known that the section of Bābar's writings of earliest date as to contents is a composed narrative put together at the end of his life. It breaks off within 914 A.H. and a gap of some eleven years separates it from the next and diary section beginning with 925 A.H. The gap of 914 A.H., even if the broken sentence preceding it suggests some loss of pages, appears due to the author's last illness. On the other hand, the gap of 908 A.H. occurs within the composed narrative and can reasonably be attributed solely to loss of pages, perhaps during Humāyūn's wanderings in exile. Its abrupt ending at a critical point of Bābar's story offers to an annotator the temptation of devising a *dénouement*.

I. THE PREVIOUS CONTEXT AND THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE RESCUE PASSAGE

(a) *The context in various sources.*

Elph. MS., fol. 89b :

قوتنوم باغ کوشه سی غه باردیم اوزوم بیلک اندیشه قیلدیه دیدیم
کیم کیشی اگریوز و اکرهینک یاشاسا آخره چیچ

Hay. MS., fol. 118b : Varied ending آخر اولماک کیراک .

Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī, I.O. 215, fol. 96b, Pāyanda Hasan's trans. :

سرخاسته و درکوشه باغ رفتیم بخود اندیشه کردد گفتیم که اکر
کسی صد سال یا هزار سال عمر داشت باشد آخره چیچ است

¹ Pāyanda Hasan's Wāqī'āt supplies the verb, and, moreover, so far supports rejection of the Rescue Passage that it agrees verbally with the Elph. MS. (e.g. it reproduces its word *hech*) ; this agreement suggests manipulation of the Haydarābād text for the reception of the Rescue Passage.

It will be noticed that the Elph. MS. and No. 215 agree as to the final همیچہ.

Wāqī'at-i-bābarī, I.O. 217, fol. 79, 'Abdu'r-rahīm M.'s trans. :

برخواستم و بکوشه باغ رفتم بخود اندیشیدم و کفتم کہ اگر
کسی صد و اکر هزار سال عمر بیابد آخر

The final آخر is followed by اینجا, which may be a part of the next heading.

Muḥ. *Shīrāzī's* lith. ed., p. 75, ends with آخر خود باید مرد, a translation of what is in the Haydarābād Codex.

Kehr's MS., fol. 383 [454], (Ilminsky, p. 144) :

قوتوم باشنبک بیر بورجی غا باریب خاطریم غا کیلتوردیم کیم
اگر آدم یوز بیل و اکر مینگ بیل تیریک بولسا آخر اولماک دین
اوزکا چارد یوقتور

Attention is asked to the peculiarities of the last extract; (1) to its studied verbal changes from the Wāqī'at-i-bābarī, which yet reproduces Bābar's own words; (2) to its singular "I brought it to my mind" (lit. caused to come); (3) to its free completion of the broken ending.

(b) *English translation of the Rescue Passage.*

[N.B. The numbers refer to "III, General grounds for Rejection"; the letters to "IV, Grounds of Style and Diction urging Rejection".]

(Persian couplet, in Kehr's MS. only.) "If you remain (*mānī*) a hundred years, on the one day (*yakī*) it must be gone from this heart-rejoicing palace."

I steadied myself for death (*qarār bīrdīm*). In that (*auṣhāl*) (a) garden a stream came flowing (b); I made ablution; I recited the prayer of two inclinations (*ra'kat*); having raised my head for silent prayer, I was making earnest petition when my eyes closed in sleep (c). I (2) am seeing (d) that Khwāja Yaq'ūb (3), the son of Khwāja Yahyā, and grandson of His Highness Khwāja 'Ubaidu'l-lāh, came facing me, mounted on a piebald horse, with a large company of piebald horsemen (e). He said: "Lay sorrow aside! Khwāja *Ahrār* (i.e. 'Ubaidu'l-lāh) has sent me to you; he said, 'We having asked help for him (i.e. Bābar), will seat him on the royal throne (*masnad*) (f); wherever difficulty befalls him, let him look towards us (lit. bring us to sight) and call

us to mind; there will we be present.' Now, in this hour, victory and success are on your side; lift up your head! awake!'

At that time (or, in that state, *hāl*) (*g*) I awoke happy, when Yūsuf and those with him (*h*) were giving one another advice. "We will make a pretext to deceive; to seize and bind (*i*) is necessary." Hearing these words, I said, "Your words are of this sort, but I will see which of you will come to my presence to take me." I was saying this when outside the garden wall (*j*) came the noise of approaching horsemen. Yūsuf *darogha* said, "If we had taken you to Tam̄bal our affairs would have gone forward. Now he has sent again many persons to seize you." He was certain that this noise might be the footfall of the horses of those sent by Tam̄bal. On hearing those words anxiety grew upon me; what to do I did not know. At this time those horsemen, not happening to find the garden gate, broke down the wall where it was old (and) came in. I saw (*kursam*, lit. might see) that Qutluq Muḥ. *Barlās* and Bābā-i *Pargharī* (4), who (were) my life-devoted servants, having arrived [with], it may be, ten, fifteen, twenty persons (*k*), were approaching. Having flung themselves (*tāshlāb*) (*l*) from their horses, bent the knee from afar and showed respect, they fell at my feet. In that state (or time, *hāl*) such ecstasy (*ḥāl*) came over me that you might say (*goyā*) God gave me life from a new source (‛: *bāsh*). I said, "Seize and bind that Yūsuf *darogha* and these here (*tūryhān*) hireling manikins." These same manikins had taken to flight. They (i.e. the rescuers), having taken them, one by one, here and there, brought them bound. I said, "Where do you come from? How did you get news?" Qutluq Muḥ. *Barlās* said: "When, having fled from Akhsī, we were separated from you in the flight, we went to Andijān when the Khāns also came to (5) Andijān (2). I saw a vision that Khwāja 'Ubaidu'l-lāh said, 'Bābar *pāshāh* (*m*) is in a village called Karnān; go and bring him, since the royal seat (*masnad*) has become his possession (*ta'alluq*).' I having seen this vision and become happy, represented (the matter) to the Elder Khān (and) the Younger Khān. I said to the Khāns, 'I have five or six younger brothers (and) sous; do you add a few soldiers. I will go through (*dīn*) the Karnān side (*tarf*) and bring news.' The

Khāns said, 'It occurs to our minds also that (he) may have gone that same road (?).' They appointed ten persons; they said, 'Having gone in that direction (*sāri*) and made very sure, bring news. Would to God you might get true (*zāhirā*) (*n*) news!' We were saying this when Bāhā-i Pargharī said, 'I too will go and seek.' He also having agreed with two young men, (his) younger brothers, we rode out. It is three days (9) to-day that we are on the road. Thank God! we have found you." They said (*dīdīlār*, [!] for *dīb*). They spoke (*atīlīār*), "Make a move! Ride off! Take these bound ones with you! To stay here is not well; Tam̄bal has had news of your coming here; go, in whatever way, and join yourself to the Khāns!" At that time we having ridden out, moved towards Andijān (6). It was two days that we had eaten no food; the evening prayer had come when we found a sheep, went on, dismounted, killed, and roasted. Of that same roast we ate as much as a feast. After that we rode on, hurried forward, made a five days' journey (9) in a day and two nights (9), came and entered Andijān (6). I saluted my uncle the Elder Khān (and) my uncle the Younger Khān, and made recital of past days. With the Khāns I spent four months (7). My servants, who had gone looking in every place, gathered themselves together; there were more than 300 persons (8). It came to my mind, "How long must I wander, a vagahond (*sar-gardān*), in this Farghāna country? I will make search (*talab*) on every side." Having said, I rode out in the month of Muḥarram to seek Khurāsān, and I went out from the country of Farghāna.¹

II. REASONS AGAINST THE REJECTION OF THE RESCUE PASSAGE

Two weighty facts urge against the rejection of the passage: (1) its presence with the Haydarābād MS. and (2) its earlier acceptance by Dr. Ilminky and M. de Courteille.

As to the first of these facts, it must be admitted that it does give value to the passage, and that it gives it the

¹ The last sentence here is an adaptation of Babar's first of 910 A.H. A surmise of mine as to this sentence (JRAS. 1902. p. 749) is now abandoned.

more value because there is no second item of extra matter with this codex. Nevertheless, I hope to show that the passage cannot owe its place of honour to intrinsic merit; that it owes it to distinguished authorship appears probable. Something as to its source may be gleaned by comparing it with other royal writings; Jahāngīr and Shāh-jahān were both prone to annotation. When time allows, it shall be compared in detail with other anonymous writings included in Kehr's volume, notably with the Fragments.

I shall now explain how it seems to me even natural that the two above-named Turkī scholars should accept the Rescue Passage without comment. The strong argument, on linguistic grounds, of their acceptance against my own rejection will seem weaker if the specialities of their text (Kehr's) are considered.¹

Of those specialities the one pertinent here is this: Kehr's text down to the entry of the Rescue Passage is corrupt so continuously and in such a manner as to be explicable only by regarding it as a re-translation into Turkī of the second Persian Wāqī'āt.

This being so, its corrupt diction would set up in the minds of those who, like Ilminsky and de Courteille, were initiated in the Bābar-nāma through it only, a false standard of Bābar's style and vocabulary. Most books of any merit demand re-perusal of their earlier portion to give freedom in their authors' style and diction; amongst those imperatively needing this re-perusal is assuredly the Bābar-nāma in European hands. Both the Turkī scholars having studied first the corrupt text, would come to the Rescue Passage with impressions differing from those made by the true text; they would the less feel transition to its un-Bābar-like Turkī. Their unquestioning acceptance of the passage seems to show that they were not conscious of any transition. On the other hand, a student working

¹ JRAS., 1908, pp. 76 ff.

ab initio on the true text experiences a literary shock when passing from it to the passage.

Of course, to all this it may be opposed that granting a wrong standard would be set up by Kehr's corrupt text, that standard would or could be corrected by the true text which in his volume succeeds the passage. In words this objection is sound, no doubt, and such reflex criticism is now easy. It was not easy, however, when Ilminsky and de Courteille were working; they had no second text; the Bābar-nāma is a lengthy book, needing time to poise and grasp. It is a difficult book to handle even with the literary gains since the seventies; work on it is still tentative.

I would further point out that few of the grounds authoritative with us for rejection were known to the two Turkī scholars; of these it suffices to mention three major ones, viz. the testimony of the Elphinstone and Haydarābād Codices and the collateral help given by Teufel's critique on the Fragments. Several useful Oriental histories, again, were not easily accessible to them: for myself there is the great gain that my husband's thought accompanies my work and the guidance of his great knowledge of related Oriental literature is at my service.

In sober truth, looking back to the drawbacks of those two earlier workers on Kehr's text, their acceptance then appears as natural as our to-day's rejection.

III. GENERAL GROUNDS FOR REJECTION

These mostly need here only recapitulation from my husband's article in the JASB., 1910, p. 221. They are as follows:—

1. The passage is in neither of the Wāqī'āt-i-bābarī.
2. The dreams are too *à propos* and miraculous for credence.
3. Khwāja Yahyā is not known to have had a son named Yaq'ūb.

4. The names of the rescuers do not appear in the Bābar-nāma.

5. The Khāns were not in Andijān.

6. Bābar did not go to Andijān. but to the Khāns in Kand-badām.

7. He did not set out for Khurāsān after spending four months with the Khāns, but after their deaths and after about a year in Sukh and Hushiār.

8. Not over "300" followers gathered to him, but "under 300 and over 200".

9. The "three days" and a "day and two nights" and "five days" road were some seventy miles.

10. The passage is singularly insufficient for filling a gap of some eighteen months, during which events of the first importance occurred both to Bābar and to his uncles, the Khāns.

11. Khwāja Ahrār's promises came to nothing as far as Bābar's wishes in 908 A.H. were concerned, and those of Yaq'ūb for immediate victory were closely followed by defeat and exile. Bābar knew the facts; the passage seems the product of an annotator looking back after the conquest of Hindūstān.

IV. GROUNDS OF STYLE AND DICTION URGING REJECTION

Between the style of the true text and that of the Rescue Passage stands the gulf between the master's and the tyro's; moreover, as can be seen in the English translation, there is marked change in the choice of the details recorded: e.g., when Bābar mentions prayer, he does so simply: at a crisis he would not note down signs of ceremonious respect; when, as once, he tells a dream one feels that it was a true one. The passage leaves a general impression that the writer did not think in Turki: did not write it with ease: had not Bābar's thoughts; was of the class alien from Bābar who talk of "heart-rejoicing palaces".

The following are some of the many points of divergence in the Rescue Passage from Babar's habit in the true text. I omit numerous clerical errors and minor phrases unusual to him.

(a) and (b) Hay. MS., fol. 118*b*, l. 3: اوشال باغدا سو آقيب *اوشال* The dem. pronoun *اوشال* is rare with Bābar; it occurs seven times in the Rescue Passage. B.'s common phrase is *سواقار*. Cf. fol. 2, l. 2; fol. 3, l. 5; fol. 4, l. 7, etc.

(c) Fol. 118*b*, l. 5: گوزوم آويقيغا باريب تور. Cf. fol. 117*b*, l. 2 from foot: گوزوم آويقوغه باردی

(d) Fol. 118*b*, l. 5: کورا دور مين. lit. I am seeing. Cf. fol. 83, l. 5: توش کورار مين and id. توش کوردوم

(e) Fol. 118*b*, l. 7: ابلتی سوار بیلان. lit. with piebald horsemen. Three points attract attention here: the odd use of "piebald"; the Persian *suwār* for T. *ātliq*, or *ātliq kīshī*; the form *bīlān* for Bābar's *bīla*.

(f) Fol. 118*b*, l. 8, and fol. 119*b*, l. 1. *Masnad* betrays Hindūstān; Bābar's word is *takht*. Cf. fol. 23, l. 3 from foot, and fol. 30, l. 2 from foot.

(g) Fol. 118*b*, l. 5 from foot, and fol. 119, l. 7 from foot. *Hal*, used as though for time, and *hain* (fol. 119, l. 4) are both unusual.

(h) Fol. 118*b*, l. 4 from foot: همرايلاری [sic] بربکا [sic] مصلحت *همرايلاری* Here two clerical errors, and *qīlmāk* used for *bīrmāk*. *Hamrūh* is not a common word for "companion" with Bābar, who uses some one of several phrases with *bīla*.

(i) Fol. 118*b*, l. 3 from foot, and fol. 119*b*, ll. 5 and 7 from foot. باغلاماق — باغلاماق Bābar does not write of "binding", but of taking (*ālmāk*) or of seizing (*tūtmāq*). He uses *bāghlamāq* with the sense of putting together, e.g. an observatory or a *dīwān*.

(j) Fol. 118*b*, last line, and fol. 119, l. 5: *dīwār* for *tām*.

(k) Fol. 119, l. 6, the triple number for Bābar's 10-20; and fol. 119, l. 6 from foot, گویا for some form of لیک like.

(l) Fol. 119, l. 7: آت نین اوزلارنی تاشلاب. For "dis-mounting", Bābar does not use *tāshlāmāq*. Twice already he has

used this verb (fol. 94b, l. 5 from foot, and fol. 95, l. 3) as from *tāsh* "outside", of people who got out of forts by dropping from walls. If, however, it were taken as from *tāsh* "a stone", it might be metaphorical, i.e. flung themselves, but I have not found it in the Bābar-nāma.

(m) Fol. 119, last line. (Bābar) *pādshāh* is an anachronism. Cf. fol. 215.

(n) Fol. 119, l. 6: ظاهراً خبراً، definite news; Bābar's phrases are made with حقیقته.

V. CONCLUSION

On the various grounds given, therefore, we judge that the Rescue Passage is no part of Bābar's writings.

IV

L'INSCRIPTION FUNÉRAIRE DE TS'OUAN PAO-TSEU

REPONSE A M. FARJENEL

PAR EDOUARD CHAVANNES

LE numéro d'Octobre 1910 du JRAS. a publié des critiques de M. Farjanel sur la traduction d'une inscription du *Yun-nan* que j'ai fait paraître dans le *Journal Asiatique* de Juillet-Août 1909. La place dont je puis disposer ici ne me permet pas de discuter phrase par phrase et mot par mot le texte dans son intégralité; je m'efforcerai cependant de ne laisser dans l'ombre aucun point essentiel; je donnerai d'ailleurs à la fin de l'article une traduction complète de la stèle, ce qui permettra au lecteur de juger des modifications que j'ai apportées à ma première traduction; ces modifications résultent, non des critiques de M. Farjanel, qui me paraissent mal fondées, mais des recherches nouvelles que j'ai faites pour élucider quelques unes des obscurités de ce texte.

Dans les pages qui vont suivre je reproduirai au-dessous de chaque phrase chinoise la traduction que j'en ai donnée dans le *Journal Asiatique*, et j'examinerai ensuite la légitimité de mon interprétation.

§ 1.

晉故振威將軍建寧太守爨府君之墓

“Tombe du gouverneur Ts'ouan, qui eut, de son vivant, les titres de général au prestige redoutable et de gouverneur de (la commanderie de) Kien-ning, sous la dynastie des Tsin.”

Les mots 爨府君 ont été traduits par moi comme signifiant “le gouverneur Ts'ouan”. Double erreur, dit M. Farjanel: d'une part *Ts'ouan* n'est pas un nom de

famille; c'est un nom qui désigne les aborigènes: d'autre part le titre de 府君 doit être traduit par "préfet"; c'est un titre distinct de celui de 太守 "gouverneur"; le défunt avait une double qualité: en tant que gouverneur, il régissait l'ensemble de la préfecture: en tant que préfet des barbares, il s'occupait spécialement des aborigènes. D'ailleurs, "la règle de position veut qu'on traduise le mot *T'souan* au génitif": par conséquent, l'expression "le gouverneur *T'souan*" est fautive, et il faut lui substituer l'expression "le préfet des *T'souan*".

Nous possédons un assez grand nombre d'inscriptions funéraires érigées en l'honneur de personnages qui eurent, à l'époque des *Han*, le titre de 太守 "gouverneur"; voici les titres de quelques-unes d'entre elles:—

漢故博陵太守孔府君碑

Stèle du défunt gouverneur *K'oung*, qui fut gouverneur de (la commanderie de) *Po-ling*, sous la dynastie des *Han* (*Kin che tsouei pien*, éd. lithographique de 1893, ch. xiv, p. 3 r°).

後漢桂陽太守周府君紀功銘

Inscription célébrant les mérites du gouverneur *Tcheou*, qui fut gouverneur de (la commanderie de) *Kouei-yang*, sous la dynastie des *Han* postérieurs (*Tsi kou lou de Ngeon-yang Siéou*, ch. iii, p. 9 r°, de l'édition du *Hing sou tsao t'ang kin che tsoung chou*).

吳故衡陽郡太守葛府君之碑

Stèle du défunt gouverneur *Ko*, qui fut gouverneur de la commanderie de *Heng-yang*, à l'époque du royaume de *Wou* (*Kin che tsouei pien*, ch. xxiv, à la fin).

A propos de cette dernière stèle, l'épigraphiste *Tsien Tu-hin* 錢大昕 (1728-1804) nous dit dans son ouvrage intitulé *Tsien yen t'ang kin che wen pa wei* 潛研堂金石文跋尾: "A l'époque des *Han*, on donnait le nom

honorifique de *fou kiun* aux gouverneurs de commanderie et aux conseillers de royaume 漢世稱郡國守相爲府君.” On sait en effet que l'empire des *Han* était divisé en commanderies 郡, où l'autorité était exercée directement par un gouverneur 太守, et en royaumes 國 dans lesquels le pouvoir impérial intervenait auprès du roi par le moyen d'un conseiller 相. Les gouverneurs et les conseillers étaient de même importance, et c'est pourquoi on attribuait aux uns aussi bien qu'aux autres le titre honorifique de *fou kiun* 府君. Dans toutes les stèles que nous venons d'énumérer, le titre de *fou kiun* est décerné au défunt parce qu'il fut gouverneur d'une commanderie; il ne constitue pas pour lui une qualité nouvelle. Ce titre honorifique se place directement après le nom de famille, que ce nom de famille soit *K'ong*, ou *Tcheou*, ou *Ko*, ou enfin *Ts'ouan*, car il est bien évident que dans le titre de l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* le mot *Ts'ouan* joue exactement le même rôle que les mots *K'ong*, *Tcheou*, et *Ko* dans les trois autres inscriptions précitées. J'avais d'ailleurs fait remarquer dans mon article du *Journal Asiatique* que le mot *Ts'ouan* désignait proprement des tribus aborigènes, mais que les Chinois avaient tiré de ce nom ethnique un nom de famille.¹ En conclusion, il faut considérer comme entièrement fausses toutes les observations de M. Farjanel sur la valeur propre du titre de *fou kiun*² et sur la règle de position qui empêcherait de considérer le mot *Ts'ouan* comme un nom de famille.

Mais ces erreurs ne sont pas les seules que M. Farjanel ait commises sur ce simple titre. Le mot 故 figure sur

¹ Cela nous est expressément affirmé dans l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Long-yen* (*Journ. As.*, Juil.-Août, 1909, p. 32, ligne 5).

² Le passage de *Ma Touan-lin* cité par M. Farjanel ne concerne pas le titre de *fou kiun*; il est d'ailleurs mal traduit, car, dans ce texte, le mot 戎 signifie “les militaires”, par opposition au mot 民 “la population civile”.

un grand nombre d'inscriptions, car il signifie "défunt": c'est ainsi que l'inscription de Kul tegin est intitulée 故闕特勤之碑, "Stèle du défunt Kul tegin." Dans certains cas on aura quelque peine à traduire le mot 故 par "le défunt" parce qu'il y aurait accumulation d'épithètes avant le nom du mort: on peut alors tourner la difficulté en traduisant "un tel, qui eut de son vivant les titres de . . ." Par exemple, soit la phrase suivante: 漢故兗州刺史雒陽令王君稚子之闕 (cf. ma *Mission archéologique dans la Chine septentrionale*, pl. civ), au lieu de dire "Pilier du défunt, honorable Wang Tche-tseu, qui fut préfet de Yen tcheou et sous-préfet de Lo-yang", on pourra dire: "Pilier de l'honorable Wang Tche-tseu qui eut, de son vivant, les titres de préfet de Yen tcheou et sous-préfet de Lo-yang." Mais, dans l'inscription de Ts'ouan Pao-tseu, lorsque M. Farjanel traduit "Tombe du préfet des Tsouan, gouverneur de Kienning, général de l'ancien (titre de) Tchennwei, (sous les) Tsin", il commet un contresens formel sur le mot 故 en le rapportant au seul terme 振威將軍.

§ 2.

君諱寶子字寶子。

"L'honorable défunt avait pour nom personnel Pao-tseu, et pour appellation Pao-tseu."

L'appellation, ai-je dit en note, est identique au nom personnel; cette particularité se retrouve dans quelques autres cas. M. Farjanel affirme au contraire: "Nous voyons ici que ce personnage n'avait qu'un seul nom Puotze, ce qui nous prouve qu'il n'était pas chinois d'origine." Pour établir que j'ai raison, il me suffira de citer un texte où un Chinois de pure race a même nom personnel et même appellation; ce texte, le voici: "K'ong Ngan-kouo avait pour appellation Ngan-kouo" (孔) 安國字安國 (*Tsin chou*, ch. lxxviii, p. 2 r°).

§ 3.

長挺高邈之操。

“*Quand il fut devenu grand, il maintint une règle de conduite haute et profonde.*”

M. Farjanel veut qu'il s'agisse, non de conduite, mais d'affaires, et il traduit: “adulte, il mania des affaires importantes et délicates.” Le mot 操 me paraît, au contraire, impliquer l'idée de “pratique constante”; par exemple, la phrase 秉仁義之操 signifie “observer la pratique constante de la bonté et de la justice”. (Inscription de *Lou Siun* 魯峻; dans *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xv, p. 3 v°.)

§ 4.

通曠清恪發自天然

“*Il était pénétrant et vaste, intègre et respectueux; c'étaient là des manifestations provenant de la nature que lui avait donnée le Ciel.*”

La divergence entre M. Farjanel et moi porte ici sur la valeur du mot 自. Voici mon mot-à-mot: “pénétration, étendue, pureté, respect, se manifestaient à partir de la nature céleste.” M. Farjanel traduit: “L'étendue de son intelligence, le caractère respectable de son intégrité, manifestaient ses qualités naturelles”: son mot-à-mot, pour le second membre de phrase, est, comme nous l'apprenons à la p. 1085: 發 “manifestaient”, 天然 “les qualités naturelles” ou “la céleste essence”, 自 “de lui-même”, c'est-à-dire du défunt. M. Farjanel comprend donc le mot 自 comme l'équivalent de ce que serait en langue parlée moderne, l'expression 自己的. Les sinologues apprécieront.

§ 5.

冰絜閒靜。道兼行卓。

“*Avec une pureté semblable à celle de la glace et avec une netteté semblable à celle de l'orchidée, sa sagesse réunissait toutes les supériorités de la conduite.*”

Le second mot est écrit 潔 sur la stèle, mais il est certainement l'équivalent de 潔, de même que dans cette phrase du *Che king* (*Ta ya*, vi, ode 5, str. 2; Legge, *Chinese Classics*, vol. iv, p. 369) : 潔爾牛羊 “les bœufs et les moutons étant purs”. Le mot 蘭 est expliqué par les commentateurs du *Che king* comme l'équivalent de 蘭 (Legge, *C.C.*, vol. iv, p. 148).

J'ai traduit la première phrase par les mots “avec une pureté semblable à celle de la glace et avec une netteté semblable à celle de l'orchidée”. M. Farjanel écrit : “Les deux premiers caractères forment un mot composé qui exprime l'idée de pureté, de probité, il n'y a point là de comparatif [je pense que M. Farjanel veut dire ‘de comparaison’]. Le quatrième exprime l'idée de calme, le troisième celle d'excellence par image.” Je ne comprends pas très bien en quoi le mot 蘭 exprime l'idée d'excellence par image; mais ce qui m'échappe tout à fait, c'est la raison pour laquelle on refuse de voir une image dans les mots 冰潔 tandis qu'on en admet une dans les mots 蘭靜.

La seconde phrase a été traduite par moi : “sa sagesse réunissait toutes les supériorités de la conduite.” J'avais en effet présent à l'esprit le passage de Mencius (ii, *a*, 2, § 18; Legge, *C.C.*, ii, p. 68), où, après avoir montré que certains disciples de Confucius possédaient des qualités éminentes, l'auteur ajoute : Confucius réunissait en lui ces qualités 孔子兼之. M. Farjanel propose de voir dans le mot 兼 une “préposition copulative” (je pense qu'il veut dire “une conjonction”); il traduit donc : “sa morale ainsi que ses actes étaient sublimes.”

Pour ma part, ma première traduction ne me satisfait pas parce qu'elle considère l'adjectif 卓 comme un substantif abstrait; quant à celle de M. Farjanel, elle pourrait être exacte si nous avions affaire à un texte en langue ordinaire; elle me paraît peu admissible dans le style épigraphique où l'usage des conjonctions est fort limité. Je proposerai

donc une troisième explication : le mot 兼 peut être un adjectif ; il signifie alors “compréhensif”, c'est à dire “qui contient en lui les qualités de plusieurs personnes” ; c'est ainsi que, dans le *Louen yu* (xi, 21), *Tchong Yeou* est appelé un 兼人 ; Legge (*C.C.*, i, p. 108) traduit ce terme en disant : “Yeu has more than his own share of energy.” De même, dans la phrase qui nous occupe, je traduirai : 道兼 “sa sagesse était compréhensive”, c'est à dire qu'elle réunissait en elle les qualités de plusieurs personnes ; 行卓 “et sa conduite était éminente”.

§ 6.

淳粹之德 戎晉歸仁。

“Grâce à sa vertu sans mélange, Barbares et Chinois se soumettaient à sa bonté.”

M. Farjanel dit de son côté : “Par sa vertu sans mélange, Barbares et Chinois revenaient à l'humanité.” Il ajoute : “歸 retourner à, revenir à ; 仁 la vertu d'humanité, une des cinq vertus cardinales qui consiste à traiter autrui comme on voudrait être traité soi-même.” Je ne connais pas cette définition du terme 仁. Confucius a seulement posé la règle négative : “Ne faites pas à autrui ce que vous ne voudriez pas qu'on vous fit à vous-même” (*Louen yu*, v, 11 ; xv, 23), et d'ailleurs cette maxime ne définit pas complètement le concept exprimé par le mot 仁.

Confucius a dit (*Louen yu*, xii, 1) : 克己復禮爲仁 “se dompter soi-même et restaurer en soi les rites, voilà en quoi consiste la bonté”. En d'autres termes, la bonté intrinsèque de l'homme est réalisée par celui qui a su vaincre ses passions et restaurer en lui les rites qui sont les règles auxquelles obéit la nature humaine dans son intégrité primitive. Lorsqu'on traduit le mot 仁 par “humanité” on veut dire par là que ce mot exprime la réalisation parfaite du type humain dans un individu ; quand on le traduit par “bonté” on entend par là qu'il exprime

l'excellence de la nature humaine ramenée à sa pure essence. L'une et l'autre de ces deux façons de traduire correspondent à un seul et même concept.

Quant au mot 歸, il peut être compris dans notre texte de deux manières. La première, qui est celle que j'avais adoptée, attribue au mot 歸 le sens de "se soumettre à". C'est ainsi que, dans l'inscription de *K'ong Piao* (*Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xiv, p. 3^{re}), on lit: (百) 姓 樂 政 而 歸 于 德, "Tous les gens du peuple étaient heureux de son bon gouvernement et se soumettaient à sa vertu."

Mais il y a un autre sens possible et c'est celui que je crois maintenant le plus vraisemblable. Dans le passage cité plus haut du *Louen yu* (xii, 1), Confucius ajoute ces mots à ceux que nous avons déjà rappelés: "Si, pendant un seul jour, un homme pouvait se dompter lui-même et restaurer en lui les rites, le monde entier lui reconnaîtrait la vertu de bonté" 一 日 克 己 復 禮 天 下 歸 仁 焉. Le mot 歸 a ici le sens de "rapporter à quelqu'un", "attribuer à quelqu'un". Ce passage du *Louen yu* devait sans doute être présent à l'esprit de l'auteur de l'inscription quand il écrivait la phrase 戎 晉 歸 仁; cette phrase signifie donc: "Barbares et Chinois reconnaissaient sa bonté." Il n'est pas question des rapports de bonne harmonie entre les deux éléments de la population, Barbares et Chinois.

§ 7.

九 臯 唱 於 名 嚮。

"(La cigogne qui crie dans) le neuvième étang le célèbre dans son pays natal honoré d'un nom."

M. Farjenel dit de son côté: "Le neuvième ciel était rempli du bruit de son nom."—Ici la discussion doit être tout particulièrement approfondie parce que nous arrivons au grief fondamental de M. Farjenel contre moi; voici comment M. Farjenel s'exprime (p. 1099) en un passage dont je me ferais scrupule de modifier le style: "C'est ainsi sur une citation mal traduite que la traduction est

basée, et nous voyons que, comme presque toujours, cette citation n'a aucun autre rapport avec le texte, que quelques mots semblables qui s'y trouvent, sont employés dans un autre sens. Ce sont justement ces références continuelles qui donnent aux œuvres de M. Chavannes une apparence de si grande érudition, elles sont pour lui une occasion d'erreur de plus." Ainsi, l'appareil d'érudition qui accompagne mes travaux n'est qu'un trompe-l'œil : en premier lieu, les citations que je fais sont mal traduites ; en second lieu, ces citations n'ont le plus souvent aucun rapport avec le texte que je prétends expliquer par leur moyen. Ces imputations sont graves et mettent en jeu mon honneur professionnel ; voyons ce qu'elles valent.

A propos de l'expression 九臯, j'ai cité la phrase du *Che king* (*Siao ya*, iii, ode 10) 鶴鳴于九臯 et je l'ai traduite : "La cigogne crie dans le neuvième étang (c'est à dire l'étang qui est au centre du marécage)." Cette traduction est fautive, dit M. Farjanel ; le sens est : "La grue crie dans le neuvième ciel, c'est-à-dire dans l'espace." M. Farjanel m'accuse d'avoir été induit en erreur par le Dictionnaire du P. Couvreur, qui avait traduit : "La grue crie dans les neuf marécages."

Il aurait pu aussi bien m'accuser d'avoir été induit en erreur par l'illustre James Legge (*Chinese Classics*, vol. iv, p. 297), qui a traduit : "The crane cries in the ninth pool of the marsh" ; et qui ajoute en note : "The ninth pool is equivalent to the centre of the marsh." Mais sans recourir à Couvreur ou à Legge, M. Farjanel aurait pu m'accuser d'avoir été induit en erreur par les centaines de commentateurs et de lexicographes Chinois qui ont glosé ce texte et qui tous ont attribué au mot 臯 le sens d'étang ou de marais. Tous se trompent, déclare M. Farjanel ; le vrai sens de l'expression 九臯, c'est "le neuvième ciel, l'empyrée" ; en voulez-vous la preuve ? Le mot 臯 est expliqué étymologiquement par le dictionnaire *Chouo wen* comme formé de deux éléments qui signifient "la blancheur

qui progresse” 白之進也 : il symbolise donc à l'origine le progrès de la lumière du soleil ; d'autre part, le caractère 臯 est employé parfois pour 高 “élevé”, qui est son équivalent phonétique (ce que M. Farjenel appelle “sa phonétique”). Mêlons ensemble la valeur étymologique et l'équivalent phonétique en réunissant l'idée de hauteur à celle de lumière progressive ; nous obtenons “la haute région du ciel où se forme progressivement la lumière”. Voilà comment il se fait que 九臯 signifie “le neuvième ciel”. Voilà comment M. Farjenel démontre que mes citations sont mal traduites.

Passons au second point : entre la phrase de l'inscription 九臯唱於名嚮 et le vers du *Che king* 鶴鳴于九臯 il n'y a que deux mots communs ; d'après M. Farjenel, cette coïncidence de deux mots est fortuite ; elle ne prouve pas que l'auteur de l'inscription ait voulu faire allusion à ce vers du *Che king* ; il est donc illégitime de supposer, comme je l'ai fait, que la cigogne du *Che king* est sous-entendue dans notre texte. A cela il est aisé de répondre que ce qui prouve précisément qu'il y a ici une allusion littéraire, c'est qu'on se trouve dans l'impossibilité de traduire si on ne sait pas ce que sous-entendent les deux mots empruntés à l'ode du *Che king*. Quand on a quelque pratique du style épigraphique, on s'aperçoit que ce style est tout farci d'allusions littéraires plus ou moins visibles : celui qui les méconnaît s'expose aux plus lourdes méprises : c'est pourquoi il y a un réel mérite à publier sans erreurs graves une traduction princeps d'une inscription Chinoise d'allure littéraire ; une fois ce débrouillement acquis, n'importe qui pourra se donner des airs d'habile homme en rectifiant ici ou là un détail qui aura échappé à son devancier : mais celui qui a accompli une œuvre utile, celui qui a vraiment fait avancer la science, c'est celui qui a le premier résolu intégralement la série des énigmes en sachant dépister dans mainte phrase la citation sous-jacente qui souvent en modifie le sens apparent. Après que la citation a été

retrouvée, il faut encore expliquer quelle idée l'auteur de l'inscription se proposait d'exprimer en faisant cette citation; la tâche devient ici délicate; je vais essayer de m'en acquitter pour le texte qui nous occupe: qu'est-ce qu'on a voulu dire en écrivant les mots 九臯唱于名嚮? Les odes du *Che king* ont presque toutes un sens symbolique; c'est ainsi que "la cigogne qui crie dans le neuvième étang" signifie, d'après le commentateur *K'ong Ying-ta*, l'homme qui vit caché mais qui a une réputation éclatante 言身隱而名著也; c'est une métaphore représentant le sage qui, bien que demeurant dans la retraite, est connu de tous les hommes 喻賢者雖隱居人咸知之. L'auteur de l'inscription, en faisant allusion à ce vers du *Che king*, a voulu dire que la renommée de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* s'était répandue au loin, quoiqu'il vécût dans l'obscurité de son pays natal. "La cigogne qui crie dans le neuvième étang chantait dans son pays natal honoré d'un nom," cela signifie: *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* se trouvant dans l'obscurité de son pays natal, sa renommée d'homme de bien s'était répandue comme s'étend au loin le cri de la cigogne dans l'étang qui est au centre du marécage. Que cette manière de s'exprimer soit alambiquée, nul ne le conteste; mais elle ne surprendra aucun de ceux qui connaissent les subtilités du style épigraphique.

Si je suis certain que mon explication des mots 九臯 est exacte, je serais moins affirmatif en ce qui concerne les mots 名嚮; l'interprétation que j'en ai donnée en me fondant sur un texte historique est, cependant, la seule que j'aie pu découvrir jusqu'ici; je la crois plausible et je la maintiens donc aussi longtemps qu'on n'en a pas proposé une autre. Ce qui me paraît évident, c'est que les mots 於名嚮, occupant la même place que les mots 於閨庭 dans la phrase parallèle suivante, il s'agit dans les deux cas du lieu où s'accomplit l'action exprimée par le verbe.

§ 8.

東帛集於閨庭

“*Les pièces de soie en rouleau s'accumulaient dans sa demeure.*”

J'ai ajouté en note : les pièces de soie en rouleau sont le cadeau officiel du gouvernement, et leur présence dans la maison d'un particulier indique l'estime qui est faite de lui en haut lieu. M. Farjanel me reproche de n'avoir pas su “tenir compte des métaphores dont une langue orientale comme le chinois fait un emploi continué” ; il croit que 東帛 signifie tout simplement “les richesses”. Au lieu donc de louer *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* d'avoir été honoré par des cadeaux de ses supérieurs, l'auteur de l'inscription aurait compté l'opulence au nombre de ses vertus. Suivant son habitude constante, M. Farjanel n'invoque aucun exemple pour appuyer son opinion. J'en donnerai qui confirment la mienne : (1) *Li ki*, ch. *Nei tsö* : 宰醴負子賜之東帛, “le cuisinier offrait une coupe de liqueurs douces à l'officier qui avait porté l'enfant et lui donnait en présent des rouleaux de soie (trad. Couvreur, t. ii, p. 663).” (2) *Tch'ouen ts'ieou* (19^e année du duc *Siang*) : 賄荀偃東錦加璧乘馬, “il donna à *Siun Yen* un paquet de rouleaux de soie (a bundle of silks, ap. Legge, *C.C.*, vol. v, p. 482), un anneau de jade et un attelage de quatre chevaux.” On voit que dans ces deux cas (et il serait facile d'en citer beaucoup d'autres) le terme 東帛 exprime, non les richesses en général, mais des paquets de rouleaux de soie donnés en cadeau.

§ 9.

抽簪俟駕。朝野詠歌。

“*Alors qu'il n'avait pas encore l'épingle de tête, il attendait déjà l'équipage officiel ; à la cour et à la campagne on célébrait ses éloges.*”

A mon avis, cette phrase est en rapport étroit avec celle-ci que nous trouvons dans la partie versifiée de l'inscription :

弱冠稱仁。詠歌朝鄉。

“ Dès que, à l'âge de vingt ans, il eut pris le bonnet viril, on loua sa bonté ; on le célébra par des chants à la cour et à la campagne.”

Dans ce second passage M. Farjanel est d'avis que les mots 弱冠 ont été mal compris par moi puisque je les rapporte tous deux à un même moment de la vie ; il faut traduire : “ Dans ton enfance et lorsque tu eus la coiffure virile . . . ” En effet, “ Le premier caractère : *faible*, exprime, métaphoriquement, l'idée d'enfant ; de même que le second : *la coiffure virile*, caractérise l'adulte.” Cette réflexion prouve simplement que M. Farjanel n'a jamais lu le *Li ki* ; ce livre classique nous apprend en effet que : “ à vingt ans, l'homme est appelé faible ; on lui donne le bonnet viril ” 二十曰弱冠 (trad. Couvreur, t. ii, p. 8 : Viginti, dicitur debilis : virili pileo donatur). La formule 弱冠 apparaît souvent dans le style des inscriptions pour signifier “ à l'âge de vingt ans ”.

Si nous revenons maintenant à la comparaison des deux textes cités plus haut, nous constatons que la seconde phrase de chacun d'eux est la même, à cela près que dans l'un on lit 野, et dans l'autre 鄉 ; ici, ces deux mots sont d'ailleurs équivalents. D'autre part, dans la première phrase de chacun des deux textes précités, il me semble que le terme 抽簪 peut être considéré comme évoquant une idée du même ordre que le terme 弱冠 ; en effet, l'épingle de tête est le symbole de l'entrée dans la carrière officielle, tout comme le bonnet viril est le symbole de l'entrée dans la virilité. “ Retirer l'épingle de tête ” peut signifier “ n'avoir pas encore l'épingle de tête ”, à tout aussi juste titre que, dans les inscriptions de *Wou Leung* et de *Wou Jong*, les mots 闕幘 “ manquer du bonnet ”

signifient “ n'avoir pas encore le bonnet viril ”. Je crois donc que les mots 抽簪俟駕 donnent à entendre que le défunt, avant d'avoir mis l'épingle de tête de la coiffure officielle, attendait déjà le char qui est le symbole des fonctions publiques. Je maintiens ma traduction jusqu'à ce qu'on en propose une qui soit préférable ; cette meilleure interprétation n'est assurément pas celle de M. Farjanel : “ il retirait sa coiffure pour servir ses chefs ” ; le mot 駕 ne signifie pas “ chefs ”, et d'ailleurs, en Chine, on n'ôte pas sa coiffure en présence d'un supérieur.

§ 10.

寢疾喪官

Une maladie qui l'alita lui fit perdre ses fonctions.

Je commencerai par expliquer ma traduction, puisque M. Farjanel affecte de n'en pas comprendre le sens.¹ C'est un usage fréquent dans les inscriptions de dire, pour exprimer la mort d'un fonctionnaire : “ il cessa de recevoir un traitement ” 不祿. Ainsi l'inscription de *Leou Cheou 叟壽* (ap. *Tsi kou lou*, ch. iii, pp. 8 v^o–9 r^o) nous apprend que ce personnage cessa de recevoir un traitement (c.-à-d. mourut) le jour *kia-tseu* du deuxième mois de la troisième année *hi-p'ing* (174 p. C.) 熹平三年二月甲子不祿 ; l'inscription de *K'ong Tò-jung 孔德讓* (ap. *Li che de Hong Koua*, ch. ii, p. 10 v^o) dit de même : “ Il tomba malade et cessa de recevoir un traitement (c.-à-d. mourut) dans le septième mois de la deuxième année *yong-hing* (154 p. C.) 永興二年七月遭疾不祿.” Cette locution se justifie par un texte du *Li ki* (ch. *K'iu li*, trad. Couvreur, t. i, p. 102) : “ En parlant du

¹ J'avais écrit dans ma traduction : “ On a composé en commun une épitaphe pour bien célébrer sa belle fin et pour la mettre éternellement en lumière sans que jamais elle soit retranchée (de la mémoire des hommes). ” M. Farjanel (p. 1090) interprète cette phrase en prétendant que je fais dire aux auteurs de l'inscription quelque chose de bien bizarre, “ à savoir qu'ils veulent mettre éternellement en lumière la perte des fonctions du défunt, sans que jamais elle soit retranchée de la mémoire des hommes. ”

Fils du Ciel pour dire qu'il est mort, on dit qu'il est tombé comme la cime d'une montagne 崩; en parlant d'un prince, on dit qu'il s'est écroulé avec fracas (comme un grand édifice) 薨; en parlant d'un grand préfet, on dit qu'il est arrivé au terme de sa carrière 卒; en parlant d'un simple officier, on dit qu'il ne reçoit plus de traitement 不祿; en parlant d'un homme ordinaire, on dit qu'il est mort 死." C'est par analogie avec l'expression 不祿 que j'ai vu dans le terme 喪官 l'idée de mort exprimée par celle de perte de la fonction officielle. D'ailleurs l'expression 寢疾 "avoir une maladie qui force à garder la chambre" implique déjà, par elle-même, que la mort va survenir.

Les recherches que j'ai dû faire dans l'épigraphie Chinoise pour répondre à M. Farjenel m'ont amené à trouver pour les mots 喪官 une autre interprétation que je crois plus exacte: ces mots doivent signifier "mourir dans l'exercice de ses fonctions". Voici en effet comment cette idée est exprimée dans diverses inscriptions: (1) Inscription de *Fang Yen-k'ien* 房彥謙 (631 p. C.; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xliii, p. 2 r^o): 終於官舍 "il mourut dans sa résidence officielle". (2) Inscription du gouverneur de *Yi tcheou*, *Kao Yi* 高頤 (+ 199 p. C.; *Li che* de *Hong Koua*, ch. xi, p. 13 r^o): 於官卒 "dans l'exercice de ses fonctions il mourut". (3) Inscription de *Hia Tch'eng* 夏承 (170 p. C.; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xiii, p. 6 v^o): 淹疾卒官 "il tomba gravement malade et mourut dans l'exercice de ses fonctions". (4) Inscription du *hiao-wei* qui tranquillise le peuple, l'honorable *Hiong* 綏民校尉 熊君碑 (+ 216 p. C.; *Li che* de *Hong Koua*, ch. xi, p. 15 r^o): 卒官 "il mourut dans l'exercice de ses fonctions". Il est évident que l'expression 喪官 a exactement le même sens que l'expression 卒官. La phrase 寢疾喪官 doit donc être traduite: "Il tomba gravement malade et mourut dans l'exercice de ses fonctions." La traduction de M. Farjenel ("Une maladie à la chambre fit mourir le

magistrat," ou "une maladie grave emporta ce magistrat") ne pourrait se justifier par aucun texte.

§ 11.

莫不嗟痛。人百其身。

"*Il n'est personne qui ne s'en afflige ; chaque homme centuple sa personne.*"

En note j'ajoutais : c'est-à-dire que chacun se lamente comme cent. Je justifiais cette façon de parler en la rapprochant de la locution française "courir comme quatre" qui se trouve dans la *Princesse d'Elide* de Molière ; mais, comme j'ai rappelé le titre de cette comédie sous la forme abrégée *Princ. d'El.*, M. Farjanel, qui paraît connaître les classiques français de la même manière que les classiques chinois, dit que j'ai cité Molière dans la *Princesse d'Elvire*.¹

M. Farjanel trouve que ma traduction : "chaque homme centuple sa personne" n'a guère de sens ; il l'aurait jugée moins singulière s'il s'était aperçu que nous avons affaire ici à une réminiscence de ce vers du *Che king* (*Kouo fong*, xi, ode 6) : 如可贖兮人百其身. Couvreur (*Che king*, p. 140), d'accord avec la plupart des commentateurs Chinois, traduit en latin : "Si liceret redimere, homines centuplicarent suum corpus" ; et en français : "S'il était possible de le racheter, chacun de nous voudrait avoir et donner cent vies pour le sauver." Ainsi, ma traduction "chaque homme centuple sa personne" est en accord rigoureux avec la traduction latine, c'est-à-dire littérale, que le p. Couvreur donne du texte classique.² On peut

¹ La *Princesse d'Elvire* reparaît dans un article de la *Press. Coloniale* du 19 Octobre 1910, qui traite aussi de l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Pao-tsen*. A la date du 19 Octobre, le numéro d'Octobre du *JRAS.* n'avait pas encore été distribué en France.

² Legge (*C.C.*, iv, p. 200, note) adopte une autre manière de voir : "Choo makes this = 'men would have wished to make their lives a hundred to give in exchange for him'. But the construction is

maintenant discuter sur la question de savoir comment il faut comprendre, dans notre inscription, cette citation du *Che king*. Doit-on lui conserver le sens qu'elle a avec son contexte primitif et dire: "Il n'est personne qui ne s'en afflige; chacun aurait voulu donner cent fois sa vie pour le racheter?" ou bien, au contraire, considérant que l'idée de rachat est remplacée dans notre inscription par celle d'affliction, doit-on dire: "Il n'est personne qui ne s'en afflige: chacun se lamente comme cent?" J'ai opté pour la seconde alternative: je ne crois pas avoir eu tort; mais je ne conteste pas la légitimité de la première. L'essentiel était de reconnaître ici la citation extraite du *Che king*, afin d'éviter l'erreur qui consiste à dire comme le fait M. Farjanel: "*Tous multiplièrent leurs inclinations de corps.*"

§ 12.

山嶽吐精。海誕降光。

"*Le pic de la montagne ayant craché son essence, et la vaste étendue de la mer ayant fait descendre son éclat.*"

La première de ces deux phrases peut être éclaircie au moyen d'autres inscriptions: (1) Inscription de *Keng Hiun* 耿勳 (174 p. C.; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xv, p. 7 v°): 泰華惟岳。神曜吐精。育茲令德。既詰且明。 "(Les montagnes) *T'ai* et *Houa* sont élevées; leur divin éclat a craché son essence; ainsi a été nourrie cette vertu éminente qui fut donc sage et aussi intelligente." En d'autres termes, les qualités du défunt lui viennent d'une substance surnaturelle émanée du *T'ai chan* et du *Houa chan*, les pics sacrés de l'est et de l'ouest. (2) Inscription de *K'ong Piao* 孔彪 (171 p. C.; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xiv, p. 3 v°): 惟嶽降精。誕生忠良。 "Or les pics firent descendre leur essence qui donna naissance au caractère loyal et excellent (du défunt)." (3) Inscription perhaps, "The price would have been of men a hundred."—Mais ce dernier sens n'était pas celui qu'on attribuait à cette phrase au temps où fut rédigée l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu*.

de *Yang Tchen* 楊震 (173 p. C.; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xv, p. 1 r°): 乃台吐耀, 乃嶽降精. “(Si un tel homme apparut), ce fut parce que (la constellation *San-*) *tai* avait craché son éclat: ce fut parce que les pics avaient fait descendre leur essence.” (4) Inscription de *Lieou Hiong* 劉熊 (époque des *Han* orientaux; *Kin che kou wen*, ch. vii, p. 2 v°): 惟嶽降靈, 篤生我君. “Or les pics firent descendre une influence surnaturelle qui, en se solidifiant, donna naissance à notre honorable défunt.” Comme on le voit, dans tous ces textes, la naissance d'un homme supérieur est expliquée par une émanation provenant des pics: ces pics sont, selon toute vraisemblance, les cinq montagnes sacrées de la Chine, dont deux sont d'ailleurs expressément nommées dans le texte n° 1 (inscription de *Keng Hiun*). L'origine de cette idée que nous voyons reparaitre si souvent dans les inscriptions doit être cherchée dans le *Che king* (*Tu ya*, iii, ode 5): 嵩高維嶽, 駿極于天. 維嶽降神, 生甫及申. “Etendus et élevés sont les pics; leurs masses atteignent jusqu'au ciel; ces pics ont fait descendre des esprits qui ont donné naissance (aux princes de) *Fou* et de *Chen*.”

Comme le montre la citation n° 3 (inscription de *Yang Tchen*), on peut adjoindre aux pics une autre puissance naturiste telle qu'une constellation: il n'y a donc rien de surprenant à ce que l'auteur de l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* ait eu l'idée d'associer aux pics la vaste étendue de la mer. Ainsi, comme je le disais dans mon premier article: “ce début ampoulé donne à entendre que l'apparition dans le monde d'un homme tel que *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* ne put se produire que grâce à des influences divines émanées de la montagne (plus exactement ‘des pics’) et de la mer.”

Après ces explications, on pourra apprécier la traduction de M. Farjenel et les commentaires dont il l'accompagne:

“*Eminence qui a rendu l'esprit, immensité d'où descend la lumière.* Dans le chinois littéraire, comme dans toutes les langues orientales, la métaphore est très

usitée. Nous sommes ici en présence d'une de ces figures de rhétorique, épithètes placées devant le sujet par emphase ; l'immensité dont il est ici question, de même que l'Eminence, sont le défunt lui-même dont une âme est dans le ciel ou l'espace éthéré, tandis que l'autre est dans la terre, c'est pour cela qu'il peut descendre de la première des rayons éclairant les hommes, les descendants et les amis vivants du défunt. M. Chavannes a confondu le sens propre avec le sens métaphorique, et c'est là ce qui lui a fait dire que *la vaste étendue de la mer fait descendre son éclat* ; probablement, croit-il, dans les profondeurs océaniques."

§ 13.

宮宇數刃。循得其牆。

“Le palais qui a plusieurs fois huit pieds d'élévation — il en trouva le mur qu'il longea.”

M. Farjanel écrit : “ Il y a ici à signaler une différence entre la stèle et la copie ; la stèle porte 幾 *quelques* *quelque peu* ; et la copie 數 *plusieurs, nombreux.*” Sur quoi se fonde M. Farjanel pour lancer une pareille affirmation ? Je l'ignore ; en réalité, le caractère qui est écrit sur la stèle correspond à la troisième des variantes du caractère 數 citées dans le *Kin che wen tseu pien yi* 金石文字辨異 composé en 1809 par *Hing Tchou* 邢澍 pour “distinguer les variantes des caractères simples et des caractères dérivés dans les monuments épigraphiques” ; la lecture 數 est donc parfaitement correcte.¹

¹ Dans quelques autres cas, mon copiste s'est effectivement trompé, mais c'est par simple inadvertance, comme il est aisé de le constater : ces fautes n'ont eu aucune influence sur le sens de ma traduction ; elles sont néanmoins regrettables, et je dois quelques explications à ce sujet : quand le commandant d'Ollone est venu me demander d'étudier les estampages qu'il avait rapportés de sa mission, je lui ai répondu que, surchargé de besogne, je ne pouvais entreprendre aucun nouveau travail ; devant ses instances, cependant, j'ai cédé, et, comme je l'avais fait précédemment pour les inscriptions de Bodli Gayà estampées par M. Foucher, pour les inscriptions de l'Asie Centrale envoyées par M. Bonin, pour les diverses inscriptions du *Yun-nan* que nous devons

Que signifie cette phrase ?—“ Elle donne à entendre, ai-je dit, que *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* comprit quelque peu la doctrine de Confucius ; il y a certainement ici une allusion à ce passage du *Louen yu* (xix, 23) : 譬之宮牆 . . . 夫子之牆數仞。不得其門而入。不見宗廟之美。百官之富。 Prenons la comparaison d'un palais et de son mur d'enceinte . . . Le mur d'enceinte de mon maître est haut de plusieurs fois huit pieds ; si on ne trouve pas la porte pour y entrer, on ne saurait voir la beauté du temple ancestral ni le brillant spectacle de tous les officiers assemblés.” Ce texte, affirme M. Farjenel, n'a aucun rapport avec la phrase de l'inscription ; cette phrase signifie : “ Ta maison n'avait que quelques toises ; on

à MM. Gervais-Courtellemont et Charria, pour une inscription du *Kouang-si* relevée par M. Beauvais, comme je le fais en ce moment même pour les fiches en bois exhumées par M. Stein dans le Turkestan oriental, j'ai pris sur le temps que j'aurais dû consacrer à mes travaux personnels pour mettre en lumière les résultats des efforts d'autrui. Au moment où j'ai fait exécuter les planches et les copies de l'article du *Journal Asiatique*, je terminais les deux albums de ma *Mission archéologique dans la Chine septentrionale*, qui comprennent 1179 numéros, c'est-à-dire près de 1200 e-tampages ou elichés qu'il a fallu choisir, classer, mesurer, réduire à une échelle convenable, numérotter et munir d'une lettre ; au milieu de ces occupations très absorbantes, j'ai négligé de vérifier l'exactitude de deux des copies qui avaient été faites des quatre inscriptions de M. d'Ollone, et c'est ainsi que les fautes que présentaient ces deux copies ont subsisté. J'ai d'ailleurs publié dans le *Journal Asiatique* (Novembre-Décembre 1909, pp. 511-14) une nouvelle transcription, correcte celle-là, de l'inscription de *Che tch'eng*. Il ne restait donc plus que l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* dont la copie présentât des inexactitudes : c'est celle que M. Farjenel a choisie pour la critiquer dans le *JRAS*. M. Farjenel, qui à l'œil si exercé pour voir les inadvertances chez les autres, aurait bien dû les éviter dans son propre article ; voici la liste des fautes qu'il a commises : p. 1086, ligne 7, 各 au lieu de 名 ; p. 1088, ligne 26, 寸 au lieu de 才 ; p. 1090, ligne 3, 於 au lieu de 與 (c'est là une faute de mon copiste que M. Farjenel a fidèlement reproduite), et 誅 au lieu de 誅 ; p. 1090, ligne 24, 誕 au lieu de 誕 ; p. 1092, ligne 7, 幾 au lieu de 數 ; p. 1099, ligne 22, 己 au lieu de 己 ; p. 1100, ligne 17, 各 au lieu de 名 ; p. 1101, ligne 13, 享 au lieu de 亨, 己 au lieu de 巳, et 旬 au lieu de 旬 ; p. 1102, ligne 14, 史 au lieu de 吏. Sont en tout douze caractères fautifs ; M. Farjenel me paraît avoir assez mauvaise grâce à me reprocher de n'avoir pas remarqué les inexactitudes de mon copiste.

pouvait (facilement) suivre ses murs.” Les rédacteurs expriment l'idée “très simple, suite des précédentes, à savoir que le défunt, modeste, n'habitait qu'une petite demeure”.

Puisque M. Farjanel se refuse à voir l'allusion littéraire dans un texte, même quand on la lui montre, je n'ai aucun espoir de le convaincre que j'ai raison et qu'il a tort. Mais, m'adressant aux sinologues dignes de ce nom, je leur ferai remarquer que l'inscription de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* n'est pas la seule qui s'inspire de ce passage du *Louen yu* : (1) Dans l'inscription de *Kouo T'ai* 郭泰 (169 p. C. ; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. vii, p. 7 v^o) on lit : 宮廡重仞。允得其門。“Le mur du palais. mur qui a plusieurs fois huit pieds d'élévation, il en trouva véritablement la porte.” Cela revient à dire que *Kouo T'ai* comprit la doctrine confucéenne. (2) Dans l'inscription de *Wou Pan* 武班 (147 p. C. ; *Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. viii, p. 1 r^o), on lit : 闕門見○廡 “on pouvait regarder par dessus le mur d'enceinte de sa demeure”¹; cela signifie : le défunt était semblable à *Tseu-kong*, qui disait, pour comparer sa sagesse à celle de son maître Confucius : le mur d'enceinte de ma demeure ne s'élève qu'à la hauteur des épaules d'un homme, en sorte que chacun peut regarder par dessus ; le mur d'enceinte de la demeure de Confucius a plusieurs fois huit pieds d'élévation, en sorte qu'il faut nécessairement en trouver la porte si on veut voir l'intérieur. Ici encore, c'est toujours ce même passage du *Louen yu* auquel il est fait allusion.

§ 14.

周遵絆馬。烏能赦放。

“On lui obéissait à la ronde comme font des chevaux dont les pieds sont liés,—comment aurait-on pu lui échapper?”

Je comprends maintenant ce passage d'une autre manière : dans la biographie de *Pan Tch'uo* (*Ts'ien Han*

¹ Le mot qui manque dans le texte est certainement le mot 宮.

chou, ch. lxxvii, p. 2 v°; *T'oung pao*, 1906, p. 15) on lit que les gens de Khoten, craignant que cet excellent officier ne les quittât, “tenaient étroitement embrassées les jambes du cheval de *Pan Teh'ao* et l'empêchaient d'avancer.” C'est la même idée qui doit être exprimée dans notre inscription: je traduirai donc: “L'entourant et le suivant, ils entravaient son cheval (en tenant embrassées les jambes de celui-ci); comment auraient-ils pu le laisser partir?”

Quant aux considérations de M. Farjanel sur le cheval qui marche à l'amble, j'estime superflu de m'y arrêter. Je ne puis d'ailleurs tout discuter, car autrement j'aurais fort à dire sur la manière dont, dans les deux phrases suivantes, M. Farjanel explique le mot 𠄎 et le mot 保. Mais mon but n'est pas de faire de la polémique; je me suis proposé seulement de montrer quel est le véritable sens de l'inscription, de justifier ma première traduction et de l'améliorer quand il y a lieu.

§ 15.

一 匱 始 倡。

“(Il mourut) au moment où il commençait (à verser) son dernier panier de terre.” En note j'ai ajouté: C'est-à-dire au moment où il allait atteindre au but de tous ses efforts. La métaphore du dernier panier de terre qui manque au monticule est tirée du chapitre *Lu ngao* du *Chou king*: 爲山九仞功虧一簣.

“En fait,” dit M. Farjanel, “il n'y a ni métaphore, ni panier, ni allusion au *Chou king*; il n'y a qu'une confusion du traducteur entre le caractère 匱 *coffre, cercueil*, et 簣 *panier* et une méconnaissance complète du sens des mots de ce vers compliquée d'une violation des règles de la syntaxe.” Il faut traduire, “en un coffre, au commencement, on te mena”; ou. “en un cercueil, de bonne heure, on te mena (au tombeau).”

J'ai donc complètement méconnu le sens des mots en ne traduisant pas 匱 par "cercueil" et 倡 par "faire aller". J'attends en effet que M. Farjenel cite des textes confirmant ces deux sens que je n'ai jamais rencontrés. Mais il y a plus, et ma traduction reposerait sur une grossière méprise que j'aurais commise en confondant le caractère 匱 "coffre" avec le caractère 簣, qui désigne un panier pour transporter la terre. Voici ma réponse : dans le *Ts'ien Han chou* (ch. xxii, p. 3 v°) on lit une citation du *Louen yu* (ix, 18) qui est ainsi conçue : 孔子曰, 辟如爲山。未成一匱止。吾止也。 "K'ong tseu a dit : Pour prendre une comparaison, si en élevant un monticule je m'arrête au moment où il ne manque plus qu'un panier de terre, c'est moi qui aurai fait échouer l'entreprise." Ici, le mot qui est écrit 簣 dans le *Louen yu*, est écrit 匱. Le commentateur *Yen Che-kou* ajoute à propos de ce passage : 匱者織草爲器所以盛土也。 "Le mot 匱 désigne un panier fait en herbes tressées ; on s'en sert pour le remplir de terre." Cette définition se trouve répétée dans le ch. xcix, a, p. 16 v°, du *Ts'ien Han chou*, à propos de la phrase 成在一匱, "la réussite ne dépend plus que d'un dernier panier de terre." Enfin, dans l'inscription de 626 p. C. sur la salle du temple de *K'ong tseu* 孔子廟堂碑 (*Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xli, p. 5 v°) il est dit : 資覆匱以成山, "il suffira de verser le dernier panier de terre pour achever le monticule." Tous ces exemples nous montrent le caractère 匱 employé à la place du caractère 簣, et, en m'accusant d'avoir confondu ces deux caractères par ignorance, M. Farjenel s'est mépris sur la qualité de mes connaissances sinologiques. Les mots 一匱始倡 signifient littéralement : "le seul panier dès qu'il commençait," ce qui revient à dire : "(il mourut) au moment où il commençait (à verser) le dernier panier de terre." En d'autres termes, il mourut avant d'avoir pu achever l'œuvre de sa vie.

§ 16.

如何不弔灑我真良

“*Comment pourrions-nous ne pas nous lamenter—de ce qu'a été anéanti notre (concitoyen) homme droit et excellent?*”

J'avais mis le mot *concitoyen* entre parenthèses pour bien montrer qu'il n'est pas dans le texte; M. Farjencel supprime les parenthèses et a beau jeu pour démontrer que j'introduis un mot qui n'était pas dans le texte. Nous avons ici une réminiscence de ce vers du *Che king* (*Kouo jong*, xi, ode 6, str. 1): 彼蒼者天灑我真良人, “O toi, Ciel azuré, tu détruis nos hommes excellents.” La substitution du caractère 灑 au caractère 殲 pourrait se justifier par de nombreux exemples: c'est ainsi que, à la date de la dix-septième année du duc *Tchouang*, dans le texte du *Tch'ouen ts'ieou*, *Kong-yang* écrit 灑 là où le *Tso tchouan* et *Kou-leang* écrivent 殲. Quant aux mots 不弔, ils doivent ici s'appliquer au Ciel, comme dans le *Che king* (*Siao ya*, iv, ode 7, str. 3 et 6), et comme dans l'inscription de *Wou Jong* (*Kin che ts'ouei pien*, ch. xii, p. 1 r^o). La traduction littérale est donc: “Comment se fait-il que le sans pitié (c'est à dire, le Ciel) ait anéanti notre homme droit et excellent?” Nous sommes loin de la traduction de M. Farjencel: “Comment ne nous lamenterions-nous pas! Tu nous pénétrais de tes bontés.”

§ 17.

回抱聖姿影命不長

“*Bien qu'ayant constamment en lui des qualités saintes, son ombre et sa destinée ne durèrent pas longtemps.*”

Le second caractère est l'équivalent du caractère 抱 “embrasser, enfermer en soi”. Le sens de la phrase reste, cependant, peu clair: il me semble maintenant qu'on peut en donner l'explication suivante: “(*Yen Houei*) eut en lui la belle forme du saint (c.-à-d. qu'il sut, mieux que tous

les autres disciples, se pénétrer des enseignements de Confucius); sa destinée, qui suivait celle de son maître comme l'ombre suit le corps, ne fut pas longue." Ainsi, après avoir dit : Comment pourrions-nous ne pas nous lamenter de la perte d'un tel homme? l'auteur ajoute : Il mourut prématurément comme *Yen Houei*, celui des disciples de Confucius qui avait le mieux compris la doctrine de son maître.

§ 18.

幽潛玄穹携手顏張

"Soit dans le monde souterrain, soit dans la voûte azurée,—il pourrait donner la main à Yen (*Houei*) et à Tchang (*K'an*)."

J'ai supposé que le personnage appelé *Tchang* était *Tchang K'an* qui, vivait au premier siècle de notre ère; peut-être, cependant, *Tchang K'an* est-il trop éloigné de *Yen Houei* dans le temps pour être ainsi associé avec lui. Je proposerais donc d'identifier *Tchang* avec le disciple de Confucius qui figure sous ce nom dans le *Louen yu* (xix, 15 et 16); ce *Tchang* n'est autre que *Touan-souen Che* 端孫師, dont l'appellation était *Tseu-tchang* 子張. *Yen Houei* mourut à 32 ans; *Tseu-tchang* était un des plus jeunes disciples de Confucius; il est donc assez naturel qu'on évoque leur souvenir à propos de *Tsouan Pao-tseu* mort à vingt-trois ans.

La traduction de M. Farjanel est ici tout à fait extraordinaire : "Dans les mystérieux enfers, sous la voûte azurée, tu tiens en main la feuille de Yen." 携手 ne signifie pas "tenir en main"; cette expression a le sens de "tenir par la main quelqu'un"; 顏 ne saurait être l'équivalent de 閻王; enfin l'explication que M. Farjanel donne ici du mot 張 rappelle celle qu'il a déjà proposée de ce même mot lorsque, traduisant un sceau sur lequel il y avait les mots 富平張清如藏金石章, il y découvrit ce sens mémorable : "(Cette) feuille d'égalisation des

richesses est nette et semblable aux compositions sur pierre et métal en magasin.”¹ C'est cette traduction au nom de laquelle M. Farjenel condamna celle que j'avais proposée : “Sceau de la collection épigraphique de *Tchang Ts'ing-jou*, originaire de *Fou-p'ing* :” *Fou-p'ing* est une sous-préfecture de la province de *Chèn-si*.

§ 19.

至人無想江湖相忘

“L'homme parfait n'a pas de caractéristiques individuelles;—il est comme (les poissons) qui dans le grand fleuve et dans le lac n'ont aucun souci les uns des autres.”

Le mot 想 traduit, dans le Bouddhisme, le terme *saṃjñā*, qui désigne la conscience personnelle s'affirmant, d'une part, dans le moi, et, d'autre part, dans les dénominations qui s'appliquent aux êtres individuels. L'expression 無想定 désigne la contemplation qui est obtenue lorsque l'esprit se dégage de toutes les pensées particulières qui correspondent aux êtres individuels du monde de la forme. L'idée que veut exprimer l'auteur de l'inscription est celle-ci : le défunt n'est point malheureux, car cet homme parfait avait affranchi son esprit de toutes les pensées particulières et s'était uni à la raison universelle où aucune individualité ne subsiste ; il ne regrette donc pas les autres hommes dont il a été séparé par la mort ; il est semblable à ces poissons dont parle *Tchouang tseu* (ch. *T'ien yun*) qui n'ont aucun souci les uns des autres dans le grand fleuve ou dans le lac 相忘於江湖. M. Farjenel me reproche d'avoir mal compris ce texte de *Tchouang tseu* : libre à lui de le traduire autrement : pour moi, je me conforme au sens qui a été indiqué par Legge (SBE., vol. xxxix, p. 357) : “When the springs (supplying the pools) are dried up, the fishes huddle together on the dry land. Than that they should moisten one another there by their gasping, and

¹ Voyez *Echo de Chine* du 11 Novembre 1909.

keep one another wet by their milt, it would be better for them to forget one another in the rivers and lakes."

§ 20.

於穆不已肅雍顯相

Il y a ici une allusion évidente au début de l'ode *Tsing miao* (*Che king, Tcheou song*, i, ode 1) : 於穆清廟。肅雍顯相。 Legge (*Chinese Classics*, vol. iv. p. 569) traduit : "Ah! solemn is the ancestral temple in its pure stillness. Reverent and harmonious were the distinguished assistants." J'ai traduit à mon tour le passage précité de notre inscription : "Mais, dans la solennité infinie (du temple funéraire), respectueux et harmonieux sont les aides distingués." Quand M. Farjenel s'exclame d'indignation à propos de cette traduction, il montre simplement qu'il ne connaît pas les classiques chinois.

Je crois utile, en terminant, de reproduire intégralement ma traduction de cette inscription en y apportant les quelques modifications qu'un nouvel examen du texte m'a suggérées :—

TRADUCTION.¹

TOMBE DU DÉFUNT GOUVERNEUR TS'OUAN, QUI EUT LES TITRES DE GÉNÉRAL AU PRESTIGE REDOUTABLE ET DE GOUVERNEUR DE (LA COMMANDERIE DE) KIENNING, SOUS LA DYNASTIE TSIN.

L'honorable défunt avait pour nom personnel *Pao-tseu* et pour appellation *Pao-tseu*² ; il était originaire de (la sous-préfecture de) *T'ong-lo* (dans la commanderie de)

¹ Je ne crois pas nécessaire de reproduire le texte de l'inscription puisque les lecteurs du JRAS. peuvent le trouver dans l'article de M. Farjenel ; mais ils devront avoir soin, en s'y référant, de corriger au préalable les douze fautes d'impression que j'ai signalées à la fin de la note de la p. 94.

² L'appellation est identique au nom personnel. Cette particularité se retrouve dans quelques autres cas. Cf. p. 78, lignes 25-34.

Kien-ning.¹ Dès sa jeunesse il fut doué de qualités précieuses et éminentes; quand il fut devenu grand, il maintint une pratique haute et profonde. (Il avait un esprit) pénétrant et vaste, (un caractère) intègre et respectueux; c'étaient là des manifestations provenant de la nature que lui avait donnée le Ciel. Avec une limpidité semblable à celle de la glace et avec une pureté semblable à celle de l'orchidée, sa sagesse renfermait en elle celle de plusieurs hommes,² sa conduite était supérieure. Eu égard à sa vertu sans mélange. Barbares et Chinois reconnaissaient en lui la bonté.³ (La cigogne qui crie dans) le neuvième étang chantait dans son pays natal honoré d'un nom⁴; les paquets de rouleaux de soie s'accumulaient dans sa demeure.⁵ Alors qu'il n'avait pas encore l'épingle de tête, il attendait déjà l'équipage officiel;⁶ à la cour et à la campagne on célébrait ses éloges. Il fut successivement *tchou-pou* (greffier et comptable) de l'arrondissement, *tche-tchong* (directeur de l'administration), *pie-kia* (adjoint): il fut recommandé pour ses qualités

¹ La sous-préfecture de *T'ong-lo* 同樂 était à l'ouest de la sous-préfecture actuelle de *Nan-ning* 南寧, laquelle dépend de la préfecture de *K'in-tsing*.

² Cf. p. 81, lignes 1-10.

³ Cf. p. 82, lignes 10-22.

⁴ C'est à dire que, bien qu'il fût resté dans son pays natal, sa renommée s'était répandue, de même que se propage au loin le cri de la cigogne au milieu des marais: cf. p. 85, lignes 6-22. Le terme 名嚮 (que je considère comme l'équivalent de 名鄉) me paraît pouvoir s'expliquer par le fait qu'on donnait un nom particulier aux endroits illustrés par la présence de quelque homme éminent: c'est ainsi qu'un certain *Yao Si-yun* 姚栢雲, s'étant fait remarquer par son dévouement à ses parents, on conféra à son district le nom de "Piété filiale et respect envers les frères aînés" 名其鄉曰孝悌 (*Song che*, ch. cccclvi, p. 71ⁿ). L'expression 名鄉 donne donc à entendre que le pays natal de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* avait été (ou tout au moins méritait d'être) honoré d'un nom particulier à cause des vertus de ce personnage.

⁵ Les paquets de pièces de soie en rouleau étaient des cadeaux officiels du gouvernement, et leur présence dans la maison d'un particulier indiquait l'estime qui était faite de lui en haut lieu. Cf. p. 86, lignes 5-28.

⁶ Cf. pp. 87-8.

remarquables;¹ il devint gouverneur de sa commanderie. Il calma et entoura de soins la multitude du peuple; tous les êtres furent à leur place naturelle.² A l'âge de vingt-trois ans il eut une grave maladie et mourut dans l'exercice de ses fonctions.³ Il n'est personne qui ne s'en afflige; chaque homme (se lamente) comme cent.⁴ L'émotion s'étant produite dans nos cœurs, nous avons composé en commun une épitaphe pour bien célébrer sa belle fin et pour la mettre éternellement en lumière sans que jamais elle soit retranchée (de la mémoire des hommes). Le texte en est ainsi conçu:—

Les pics montagneux ayant craché leur essence—et la vaste étendue de la mer ayant fait descendre son éclat,⁵

Très majestueux fut l'honorable défunt⁶;—sa renommée imposante sonnait clair comme le jade.

Dès que, à l'âge de vingt ans,⁷ il eut pris le bonnet viril, on loua sa bonté;—on le célébra par des chants à la cour et à la campagne.

¹ 舉秀才. Cette expression peut être rapprochée des expressions 舉孝廉 “promu à cause de sa piété filiale et de son intégrité”, 舉方正 “promu à cause de sa rectitude de caractère”, 舉有道 “promu à cause de la sagesse dont il était doué”, expressions que nous trouvons souvent dans les textes de l'époque des *Han*. Si le titre de *siéou-ts'ai* est devenu plus tard un grade dans les examens littéraires, il n'avait point cette valeur à l'époque des *Han* et des *Tsin* où les examens littéraires n'existaient pas.

² C'est une idée fondamentale de la philosophie chinoise que le bon gouvernement influe sur le cours de la nature; il n'est donc point surprenant que l'auteur de l'inscription attribuée au défunt le mérite d'avoir, par ses vertus, assuré la prospérité de tous les êtres dans le territoire dépendant de sa juridiction.

³ Cf. p. 89, lignes 12-36.

⁴ Ou: chaque homme aurait voulu donner cent fois sa vie pour lui. Cf. p. 91, lignes 2-14.

⁵ Cf. pp. 91-2.

⁶ L'expression 君侯 se retrouve dans diverses inscriptions funéraires. Voyez par exemple l'inscription de *Ssu-ma Ping* 司馬昞 (520 p. C.; *Kin che ts'ouï pien*, ch. xxix, p. I v°), où la partie versifiée commence par les mots 君侯烈烈. C'est là une simple appellation honorifique qui n'implique aucunement que le défunt eût réellement le titre de marquis.

⁷ Cf. p. 87.

Quand il était encore obscur, on approuvait sa conduite harmonieuse¹; — quand il se trouvait encore dans les profondeurs, il répandait son parfum.²

La demeure qui a plusieurs fois huit pieds d'élévation, — il en longea et en trouva le mur.³

La bonne odeur (de sa renommée) se propageait avec l'impétuosité du vent; — l'éclat (de sa gloire) s'élevait aussi haut que les nuages.

Il était semblable à l'oie sauvage s'avancant pas à pas, dont les plumes servent d'ornement⁴; — il bondissait comme le dragon; il voltigeait comme le phénix.

Déployant son essor jusqu'au-delà des vapeurs aériennes, — il s'apprêtait à être reçu comme un hôte par le souverain.

A faire résonner les clochettes de son attelage à la porte violette,⁵ — et à laver les cordons de son bonnet dans la rivière *Ts'ang-lang*.⁶

¹ Il y a ici une réminiscence d'une phrase du *Yi king* dont le sens est d'ailleurs modifié; la phrase du *Yi king* est la suivante (61^e hexagramme; Legge, SBE., vol. xvi, p. 200): 鳴鶴在陰其子和之 "La grue criant dans la solitude tandis que ses petits lui répondent."

² 處淵. Cette expression, elle aussi, est une réminiscence du *Yi king* (1^{er} hexagramme): 或躍在淵, "parfois bondissant dans les profondeurs." Il s'agit du dragon qui bondit dans les profondeurs avant d'avoir pris son vol dans le ciel; on applique tout naturellement cette image à un homme éminent qui n'a pas encore manifesté publiquement ses talents.

³ Cette phrase donne à entendre que *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* comprit quelque peu la doctrine de Confucius. Cf. pp. 94-5.

⁴ Cf. *Yi king*, 53^e hexagramme (Legge, SBE., vol. xvi, p. 179) 鴻漸于陸其羽可用爲儀. "L'oie sauvage s'avance pas à pas sur la terre ferme; ses plumes peuvent servir d'ornement." Dans notre inscription, cette citation du *Yi king* donne à entendre que le défunt progressait et qu'il était prêt à servir son souverain dans de hautes fonctions.

⁵ Je crois maintenant (et c'est ici le seul cas où M. Farjenc ait entrevu une lueur de vérité) que 紫闥 désigne le palais impérial; mais alors il faut admettre que tout ce vers dépend du mot 將 qui se trouve dans le vers précédent: en effet, *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* s'apprêtait à aller voir le souverain, mais il n'y alla pas effectivement, car il fut retenu dans son pays par l'amour de son peuple, qui ne voulut pas le laisser partir.

⁶ Cf. Mencius, iv, a, 8: "Il y avait un enfant qui chantait: quand l'eau de la rivière *Ts'ang-lang* est claire, elle me sert à laver les cordons

Mais les gens du peuple vinrent à lui ainsi que des fils (qui viennent à leur père);—ils mirent des entraves, ils mirent un licou¹ à leur compatriote.²

L'entourant et le suivant, ils embrassaient les jambes de son cheval;—comment auraient-ils pu le laisser partir?³

Jouissant par hérédité d'une haute situation et de grandes capacités,—il demeura donc dans son propre pays.

Sa volonté s'appliqua à l'exact accord⁴;—sa sagesse s'éleva jusqu'aux vêtements jaunes.⁵

de mon chapeau; quand l'eau de la rivière *Ts'ang-lang* est bourbeuse, elle me sert à laver mes pieds." Ce passage peut être expliqué de la manière suivante: Confucius engage ses disciples à prendre modèle sur l'enfant qui disait qu'il faisait un emploi différent de l'eau de la rivière *Ts'ang-lang*, suivant que cette eau était pure ou bourbeuse. De même, le sage doit faire un usage différent de l'époque où il vit suivant que cette époque est vertueuse ou perverse: si le gouvernement est bon, il acceptera des fonctions officielles: dans le cas contraire, il refusera de participer à la vie publique. L'auteur de notre inscription dit que *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* se proposait de laver les cordons de son bonnet dans la rivière *Ts'ang lang*; cela signifie qu'il était prêt à accepter les fonctions officielles qui lui auraient été attribuées par l'empereur. Voilà comment on peut, à mon avis, justifier cette citation dans notre texte.

¹ Il y a ici une allusion à un vers du *Che king* (*Sito ya*, iv, ode 2, str. 1): 繫之維之, "tether it by the foot, tie it by the collar" (Legge, *C.C.*, iv, p. 299). Cette ode du *Che king* compare à un poulain blanc un officier vertueux que les gens du peuple voudraient retenir dans le service public. Ici, cette réminiscence du *Che king* s'explique fort bien puisqu'il est question des efforts que firent les compatriotes de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* pour l'empêcher de les quitter et d'aller à la cour de l'empereur.

² 同嚮 doit être l'équivalent de 同鄉 (cf. p. 102, n. 3, lignes 3-4).

³ Cf. pp. 95-6.

⁴ Le seul exemple que le *P'ri wen yun jou* (s.v. *fang hi*) donne de l'expression 方熙 nous la montre dans la locution 玉燭之方熙 "L'exact accord de la torche de jade." La torche de jade est une métaphore qui signifie que les quatre saisons sont en harmonie; voyez le dictionnaire *Eul ya*: 四時和謂之玉燭. Ainsi l'expression 方熙 désigne ici l'exact accord qui existe entre les quatre saisons. Ce doit être un sens analogue qu'elle a dans notre inscription: on loue le défunt de s'être appliqué à maintenir l'exact accord qui est la condition de toute harmonie dans ce monde. Je suis obligé d'admettre que, dans ce passage, le mot 業 est l'équivalent de 業 et qu'il a une valeur verbale de même que le mot 隆 qui est symétrique par rapport à lui dans la phrase suivante.

⁵ Cf. *Yi king*, 2^e hexagramme: 黃裳元吉 "vêtements inférieurs jaunes; grande bonne fortune." L'auteur de l'inscription me paraît

Il aurait dû conserver (une longévité aussi durable que) les montagnes du sud,¹—qui ne diminuent ni ne s'effondrent.

Mais, il ne jouit pas de longues années de vie ;—(il mourut) au moment où il commençait (à verser) son dernier panier de terre.²

Comment se fait-il que le (ciel) impitoyable—ait anéanti notre homme droit et excellent ?

(Il fut comme *Yen Houei* qui avait en lui l'image du saint, mais dont la destinée, reflet (de celle de son maître), ne dura pas longtemps.³

Pour tout être qui n'est pas en métal ou en pierre,—c'est une règle constante qu'il y ait l'alternance de l'épanouissement et du dessèchement.⁴

Soit dans le monde souterrain, soit dans la voûte azurée,—il donne la main à *Yen* et à *Tchang*.⁵

L'homme parfait n'a pas de pensées individuelles⁶ ;—

avoir voulu dire que le défunt fit progresser la bonne fortune ou la prospérité que symbolisent les vêtements jaunes.

¹ Les montagnes du sud sont toujours associées à l'idée de longévité. Une des suscriptions les plus fréquentes sur les amulettes est celle-ci : 福如東海壽比南山 "Que votre bonheur soit vaste comme la mer orientale ; que votre longévité soit durable comme les montagnes du sud." C'est cette idée de longévité impliquée dans le nom même des montagnes du sud qui explique l'emploi du mot 保 dans notre inscription ; on ne protège pas les montagnes du sud, ce qui serait absurde ; on conserve une longévité aussi durable que les montagnes du sud.

² C'est à dire, au moment où il allait atteindre au but de tous ses efforts. Cf. p. 97, lignes 1 et suiv.

³ La traduction de ce passage reste hypothétique Cf. pp. 98-9.

⁴ C'est là une des idées les plus fréquemment exprimées dans la littérature chinoise ; voyez notamment les "Avertissements de l'institutrice du palais" par *Tchang Houei* (dans *T'oung pao*, 1909, pp. 80-1).

⁵ Il est vraisemblable qu'il s'agit ici de *Yen Houei* 顏回 et de *T'seu-tchang* 子張 ; cf. p. 99, lignes 8-19. Le nom de *Tchang* doit avoir été suggéré à l'auteur de l'inscription par la nécessité de trouver une rime en *ang*.

⁶ L'expression 無想 est d'origine bouddhique ; elle désigne l'identification de l'être avec la pensée universelle où il n'y a plus aucune caractéristique individuelle. Cf. p. 100, lignes 6-13.

il est comme (les poissons) qui dans le grand fleuve et dans le lac n'ont aucun souci les uns des autres.¹

Mais, dans la solennité infinie (du temple funéraire),—respectueux et harmonieux sont les hôtes distingués.²

Parceque, constamment, nous fûmes accoutumés (à vivre avec le défunt),—nous éprouvons de l'émotion, nous avons de l'affliction.

Quoique *Lin-tsong* soit mort,—sa belle renommée est restée manifeste d'une manière prolongée³ :

C'est pourquoi nous avons gravé cet éloge funèbre,—pour conserver (le souvenir d'un homme comparable à celui que célèbre l'ode) *Kan-t'ang*.⁴

¹ Cf. *Tchouang tseu*, ch. *Tu tsong che* (Legge, SBE., vol. xxxix, p. 242); voyez plus haut, p. 100, lignes 13 et suiv. Dans notre inscription le sens me paraît être le suivant : le défunt, qui est parvenu à la perfection, s'est affranchi de toutes les pensées se rapportant à des êtres individuels et s'est uni à la raison suprême : dans cet océan de la sagesse, il est semblable, aux poissons dont parle *Tchouang tseu*, et il n'a plus cure des autres hommes ; mais, comme on l'exprimera dans les phrases suivantes, il n'en va pas de même pour les amis du défunt qui sont pénétrés de tristesse.

² Cf. *Che king*, *Tcheou song*, ode 1 du livre i ; voyez plus haut, p. 101, lignes 1-6. L'allusion à ce passage du *Che king* introduit les amis qui viennent rendre hommage au défunt.

³ *Lin-tsong* 林宗 est l'appellation de *Kouo T'ai* 郭太, excellent lettré qui vécut de 127 à 169 p. C. ; cf. Giles, *Bioq. Dict.*, N° 1073. Pourquoi le nom de *Kouo T'ai* intervient-il ici ? On peut l'expliquer de la façon suivante : après la mort de *Kouo T'ai*, on fit en son honneur une inscription funéraire grâce à laquelle son nom est resté célèbre jusqu'à l'époque, cependant assez éloignée de lui, où mourut *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* ; l'exemple de *Kouo T'ai* prouve donc l'utilité des inscriptions funéraires, et c'est le souvenir de la stèle érigée en son honneur qui a encouragé les amis de *Ts'ouan Pao-tseu* à faire à leur tour une inscription. Cette mention de *Lin-tsong* est intéressante parce qu'elle prouve que la stèle de *Kouo T'ai* était, au commencement du cinquième siècle de notre ère, un monument bien connu. Cette stèle existe encore aujourd'hui ; je l'ai vue dans le *Wen miao* de *Tsi-ning tcheou* (*Chan-tong*) ; elle présente, au revers, des sculptures que j'ai reproduites dans l'album de ma *Mission archéologique dans la Chine septentrionale*, pl. xviii, N° 182. Le texte de l'inscription se trouve dans le *Liang Han kin che ki* (ch. xvii, p. 6r°) et dans le *Kin che ts'ouei pien* (ch. xii, p. 7v°).

⁴ Le *Kan-t'ang* était un sorbier au pied duquel, dit *Sseu-ma Ts'ien* (trad. fr., t. iv, pp. 134-5), le duc de *Chao* jugeait les procès et décidait

Hélas ! que cela est triste !

Erigé en la quatrième année *tu-heng* (405), le rang de l'année étant *yi-sseu*, dans la première décade du quatrième mois.

des affaires de gouvernement ; l'ode 5 du *Chao-nan* rappelle le respect que le peuple avait voué à cet arbre et fait ainsi l'éloge du duc de *Chao*.

[The Council, while gladly giving M. Chavannes an opportunity of replying to M. Farjenel, are unable to afford further space for the discussion of this matter.—ED.]

ARYABHATA'S SYSTEM OF EXPRESSING NUMBERS

By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

SEVERAL systems of expressing numbers, used in India, have been explained by Professor Bühler in §§ 33 to 35 of his work on Indian palaeography.¹ There is a system, a highly interesting one, which was not noticed by him, because it has not been found used in inscriptions or in the pagination of literary works; namely, that of the astronomer Āryabhaṭa. It has been mentioned briefly by various other writers. And it was considered in some detail by Mr. C. M. Whish in 1820,² and at more length by M. Léon Rodet in 1880.³ Those two treatments of it, however, scarcely suffice to do justice to it; particularly from lacking any table to make its details clear.⁴ And it deserves a full exposition, because it is of special interest in connection with two topics which have been reopened lately by Mr. G. R. Kaye;⁵ namely, the

¹ Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, vol. 1, part 11: English version in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 33 (1904), appendix.

² In the course of his article "On the Alphabetical Notation of the Hindus" published in the Transactions of the Literary Society of Madras, part 1 (1827), p. 54 ff.

³ In his article "La Notation Numérique inventée par Āryabhata" published in the *Journal Asiatique*, series 7, vol. 16 (1880, part 2), p. 440 ff.

⁴ A translation of Mr. Whish's article was given in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1835, 2, 116 ff., and was accompanied by a large "paradigme synoptique", which, however, only shows the 297 combinations with single letters and the values of them from one to a trillion (British): it does not illustrate the principles of the system.

⁵ See his articles "Notes on Indian Mathematics: Arithmetical Notation" in JASB, 1907, 475 ff., and "The Use of the Abacus in Ancient India", id., 1908, 293 ff. He has noticed this system of expressing numbers in id., 1908, 117-8, in the course of a third article, "Notes on Indian Mathematics: No. 2: Āryabhata": but he, again, has not given a table.

early use of the abacus in India, and the development of the decimal notation, that is, of the system of the nine significant digits 1 to 9, with the zero, cipher, or naught, used with place-value so that any particular sign denotes units, tens, thousands, etc., or the absence of them, according to its position as written in a row of figures. I propose, therefore, to consider it exhaustively here, but without venturing at present to offer any opinion on the two topics which Mr. Kaye has reopened: I only seek to exhibit fully, with a few introductory remarks about Āryabhata himself, a system of numeration which must certainly be regarded as an important factor in considering them.

Āryabhata belonged to a school of astronomers which had its home at Kusumapura, i.e. Pāṭaliputra, the modern Patnā in Behār. He himself tells us that: he says:¹—

Brahma-Ku-Śaśi-Budha-Bhṛigu-Ravi-
 Kuja-Guru-Kōṇa-bhagaṇān = namaskṛitya ।
 Āryabhataḥ = tv = iha nigadati
 Kusumapurē = bhyaarchitān jñānam ॥

“Having done worship to Brahman, the Earth, the Moon, Mercury, Venus, the Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, and the stars,² Āryabhata declares here (*in this work*) the science which is revered at Kusumapura.”

This verse has been often cited as telling us that Āryabhata was born at Kusumapura. But he does not say that anywhere: and it does not necessarily follow. What he does give us is the more important detail, the school to which he belonged. And, though he has not named any predecessors, this verse tells us, I think, that

¹ Gaṇitapāda, verse 1.

² More technically, “the troupe of the *nakshatras*”.

he did not claim complete originality: he expounded an astronomical system which was already established at Paṭṇā. Whether his work was preceded by any similar scientific Hindū production, either in the same school or in any other, is another question.

Āryabhaṭa was born in A.D. 476. There is no question of this being only a point of general acceptance: nor does any element of doubt attach to it. He has marked the date of his birth by the following statement: ¹—

Shashty-abdānām shashtir =
 yadā vyatītās=trayaś=cha yugapādāḥ |
 try-adhikā viṃśatir=abdās =
 tad=ēha mama janmanō=titāḥ ||

“When there elapsed a sixty of sixty years and three Yugapādas, then in this present (*cycle of the ages*) ² there expired twenty-three years since my birth.”

Here, the expression “a sixty of sixty years” gives us 3600 years, and means of course that number of solar years. It does not (we may observe) contain any allusion to the sixty-years cycle of Jupiter: because sixty of the true astronomical years of that planet do not amount to sixty solar years, ³ and the conventional treatment of the cycle, by which the years are taken as coinciding with either the solar or the lunar year according to the prevailing calendar, did not come into existence till

¹ Kālakriyāpāda, verse 10.

² The commentator explains *īha* by *vartamānē=shūārīnīśē chaturyugē*, to which there seems no objection: for *īha* in the sense of ‘now, at present’, see the St. Petersburg Dictionary. It, however, because only Vedic references are given, we prefer to say “here (*at this place*)”, it will not affect the bearing of the verse.

³ Moreover, it is questionable whether this cycle was in use in Āryabhaṭa’s time: at any rate, he has not mentioned it; he has given only the twelve-years cycle.

about three centuries after the time of Āryabhaṭa. The expression means sixty times the planetary period of sixty solar years, mentioned by Āryabhaṭa two verses farther on,¹ the idea of which is that, while the nearer planet seems to travel more quickly than the next distant one because its orbit is smaller, all the planets really move at one and the same speed, and each of them covers in sixty solar years a distance equal to the circumference of the circle of the *nakshatras*, the stars and groups of stars which form the so-called lunar mansions or signs of the lunar zodiac.

The term *Yugapāda*, 'a quarter Yuga', means one-fourth of Āryabhaṭa's *exeligmos*, his Yuga or calculative period of 4,320,000 solar years,² which was arranged by him in four equal parts each of 1,080,000 years. Three-quarters of the total period had elapsed, and 3600 years of the fourth *Yugapāda*. The fourth *Yugapāda* is the period, beginning at sunrise on Friday, 18 February, B.C. 3102 (or, according to another school, at the preceding midnight), which subsequently became identified, with a reduction of its length to 432,000 years, with the Kali age. And thus, though Āryabhaṭa does not either here or elsewhere mention that age by name, he tells us practically that he was 23 years old at the end of the 'Kaliyuga year 3600; that is, on 19 March, A.D. 499. It follows that he was born in A.D. 475 or 476: we may say, in A.D. 476.

We have often been told that this statement shows, further, that Āryabhaṭa was writing at that same time, when he was just 23 years old. And that explanation

¹ *Kālakriyāpāda*, verse 12.

² For the term *exeligmos*, frequently a very convenient one to use, we are indebted to Dr. Burgess, who brought it to the front from Geminos and Ptolemy: see this *Journal*, 1893. 721. It answers to the Roman *annus magnus* or *mundanus*, and denotes a period of evolution and revolution in the course of which a given order of things is completed, as, for instance, by the sun, the moon, and the planets returning to a state of conjunction from which they have started.

is in fact given by the commentator, Paramādīśvara. Āryabhaṭa, however, has not actually said that: and his words are at least not explicit like, e.g., those of Brahmagupta: ¹—“The Brāhma-Sphuṭa-Siddhānta has been composed by Brahmagupta, thirty years old, when there have elapsed 550 years of the Śaka kings.” And Paramādīśvara quotes another commentary to the effect that the statement marks a point of time for which the mean places, apexes, and nodes of the planets, as worked out by simple rule of three from the elements used by Āryabhaṭa, were correct, while for subsequent times corrections established by traditional teaching were to be applied. This latter explanation is perhaps quite as good as the other. However, the age of Āryabhaṭa when he wrote is not of any special importance for our present purposes: we only want to know his period and school.

Āryabhaṭa belonged to the school of astronomy at Pāṭaliputra, Paṭnā, and wrote in or soon after A.D. 499. And from some remarks made by two not much later writers we gather that he wrote, or was credited with, two astronomical works, which did not altogether agree with each other.² Only one of them, however, has become known to us. It is the work which has been edited by Professor Kern, in 1874, under the title of the Āryabhaṭīya, with the commentary, named Bhaṭadīpikā, of Paramādīśvara.³ It consists of three

¹ Brāhma-Sphuṭa-Siddhānta, ed. Sudhakara Dvivedi, p. 407, verses 7, 8.

² Thus, Varāhamihira (died A.D. 587) says in his Pañchasiddhāntikā, 15. 20, that Āryabhaṭa taught in one place that the day begins at midnight, and in another place that it begins at sunrise: but only the latter doctrine is found in the Āryabhaṭīya. Again, Brahmagupta (wrote A.D. 628) says in his Siddhānta, ed. cit., p. 148, verse 5, that Āryabhaṭa laid down in one place a number of civil days in his *exeligmos* which exceeded by three hundred the number taught by him elsewhere: but no such two statements are found in the Āryabhaṭīya.

³ Or, as the name occurs thus only in verse, should we rather say “Paramēśvara”? : especially since the colophons style the commentary “Paramēśvarikā Bhaṭadīpikā”.

principal chapters, entitled Gaṇitapāda, Kālakriyāpāda, and Gōlapāda, containing respectively 33, 25, and 50 verses in the Āryā metre. From its total number of verses, it was sometimes known as the Āryāṣṭaśata, "the 108 Āryās", by which name it is mentioned by Brahmagupta.¹ And it is now sometimes spoken of as the First Ārya-Siddhānta and the Laghu or Smaller Ārya-Siddhānta, by way of distinguishing it from a later and larger work generally mentioned as the Second Ārya-Siddhānta. The name given to it by Āryabhata himself, however, is Āryabhaṭīya; in its final verse.² And Paramādiśvara has classed it, not as a Siddhānta, but as a Tantra.³

The three chapters of the work, named above, are preceded by a preliminary section, consisting of ten verses in the Gīti metre, which states the revolutions of the sun, the moon, and the planets, and the other leading elements which were used by Āryabhata. This section is named the Daśagītikasūtra, from the number and metre of its verses, in an Āryā verse, extolling the merit of mastering the ten Gīti verses, which stands after verse 10.

The Daśagītikasūtra, again, is preceded by two introductory verses. The first of them, in the Āryā metre, runs thus:—

Pranīpaty = aikam = anēkaṁ
 Kaṁ satyāṁ dēvatāṁ param̄ brahma ।
 Āryabhaṭas = trīṇi gadati
 gaṇitaṁ kālakriyāṁ gōlam ॥

“Having prostrated himself before Brahman, one (*in*

¹ Op. cit., p. 149, verse 8.

² The words are:—Āryabhaṭīyaṁ nāmnā pūrvam̄ Svāyambhuvan̄ sadā sad = yat : “the foregoing (*work*) by name Āryabhaṭīya, which is derived from the Self-existent (Brahman) (*and*) is always good.” They are in the nomin. sing. neuter: and we are left to supply *sūtram*, *tantram*, or any other suitable word.

³ See his remarks under that verse and under Gaṇitapāda, verse 1; and the third of his introductory verses to his commentary.

himself, but) many (in his manifestations), the true deity, the supreme divine principle, Āryabhaṭa relates three things; Gaṇita (the science of calculation), Kālakriyā (the fixing of time), (and) Gōla (the sphere)."

From this statement it might certainly be argued that the Daśagītikasūtra was not a composition of Āryabhaṭa himself. It has, however, passed as his work from at any rate the time of Brahmagupta (A.D. 628), who assigns to him both it and the Āryāśṭaśata.¹

There then follows what the commentator terms a Paribhāshā, an explanatory rule, given in a verse in the Gīti metre, which teaches the system of numeral expression which is used in the Daśagītikasūtra, though not in the principal chapters of the Āryabhaṭīya. It runs thus:—

Varg-āksharāṇi vargē-
 vargē=varg-āksharāṇi kāt ūmau yaḥ |
 kha-dvinavakē svarā nava
 vargē=vargē nav-āntya-vargē vā ||

"The classed letters (are used) in (any space which is) a square, (and) the letters which are not classed in (any space which is) not a square, from *k* onwards: *ūa + ma* (gives) *ya*: the nine vowels (are used) in the two nines of spaces square (and) not square, or in the square immediately following the nine."

Such is the rule for the system of expressing numbers which we are considering. But it leaves, as regards the application of it, several details to be supplied by the commentary, partly under this same verse, partly under the Daśagītikasūtra, verses 1 and 3.

We may take first the term *kha-dvinavaku*, 'the two

¹ See, e.g., the verse referred to in note 1 on p. 114 above.

nines of spaces'.¹ This has the same meaning with what other writers term *ashṭādaśa padāni*, 'the eighteen positions', and *ashṭādaśa sthānāni*, 'the eighteen places', of numbers. The idea is this. There are eighteen units of reckoning, consisting of 1 and successive multiples by 10 up to 10^{17} , which gives us, as the eighteenth unit, one-tenth of the cube of a million (i.e., of the British trillion), or, more in accordance with the Hindū principle, one-tenth of the square of a thousand millions. These eighteen units of reckoning belong, in the same order, to "the eighteen places". And after the general terms *eka*, 'one', *daśan*, 'ten', *śata*, 'hundred', and *sahasra*, 'thousand', each of them has a special conventional name, which (even apart from the use of synonyms) is not always the same in the various lists. Āryabhata has given the names of the numbers only as far as the tenth: apparently because none of the really practical and fundamental elements, which it was absolutely necessary to state in the *Daśagītikasūtra*, runs beyond ten places of figures:² they are found in the *Gaṇitapāda*, verse 2, where, after the word *vṛindam*, he has said:—*Sthānāt-sthānam daśaguṇam syāt*; "from place to place each is a multiple by ten." I give his names in the table on p. 119 below, the last column; and, following

¹ It seems more conformable to general ideas to use in the sequel the term 'place' rather than 'space': and Āryabhata himself in some words quoted farther on above has substituted *sthāna* for the *kha* which is used here. But the proper literal translation of *kha* in this verse seems to be 'space': the word is used in that sense in the *Kālaknyāpāda*, verse 15, where the earth is described as *kha-madhya-sthā*, "situated in the middle of space"; and in the *Daśagītikasūtra*, verse 4, which, with a view to deducing the orbits and distances of the planets and the *nakshatras*, teaches the measure of the circumference of *kha* in the sense of space, the visible universe, figured (according to the commentary) as the central section of the *brahmāṇḍa* or cosmic egg.

² The highest such number is that of the rotations of the earth on its axis in his *exeligmos*; namely, 1,582,237,500 (verse 1). Verse 4 teaches the number of *yōjanas* in the circumference of space, which runs to fourteen places: but it does not state the number; it only shows how it is to be arrived at.

the commentary, I supply the other eight names from Bhāskarāchārya's *Līlāvati*:¹ in the first ten places the only differences are that Bhāskarāchārya gives the familiar *lakṣha* instead of *niyuta*, No. 6. and *abja* in the place of *vṛinda*, No. 10.

The eighteen places are divided into nine pairs: each pair containing a place for the indicating unit 1 of, alternately, the number which is a square (*varga*) and the number which is not a square (*avarga*). In my table I mark the places by alternate squares and circles. The square places are those of $1 = 1^2$; $100 = 10^2$; $10,000 = 100^2$; $1,000,000 = 1000^2$; and so on: the not-square places are those of 10, 1000, 100,000, and so on, which numbers are not squares of integers. In other words, the square places are those of the units, hundreds, tens of thousands, etc.; and the not-square places are those of the tens, thousands, hundreds of thousands, etc. And in other terms, again, the commentary explains *varga-sthāna* by *ōja-sthāna*, 'odd place', and *avarga-sthāna* by *yugma-sthāna*, 'even place'.

Each of the nine vowels *a* to *au* is used in two places: a square place and the not-square place which comes next to it. Thus the nine vowels govern the eighteen places in nine pairs.

Of the consonants, etc., the *varga-akṣarāṇi* or 'classed letters', the five groups of gutturals, palatals, linguals,

¹ *Līlāvati*, ed. Sudhakara Dvivedi, p. 2: a precisely similar list, except in substituting the synonymous *mahāmbuja* for *mahāpalma*, No. 13, and *vārdhi* for *jaladhi*, No. 15, is given by Hēmaçhandra in his *Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi*, verses 873, 874. I should have preferred to use some older list, giving all the eighteen names and at the same time agreeing exactly with Āryabhaṭa in respect of the first ten: but I have not been able to find any such.

As regards the time to which this scheme of numbers, or its embryo, can be traced back, it may be observed that the Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa, 9. 1. 2. 16, 17, mentions two high quantities called by it *anta* and *parārdha*: but they are not necessarily the *antya* and *parārdha* of the list given above.

dentals, and labials, from k to m , are used in only the *varga* or square places, the odd places. The *avarga-aksharāṇi*, 'the letters which are not so classed', that is, the semivowels, the sibilants, and the sonant aspirate, are used in only the *avarga* or not-square places, the even places.

To the consonants from k to m there belong the powers 1, 2, 3, etc., up to 25, in the order in which they stand in the alphabet. But neither have the consonants, etc., nor have the vowels, any numerical value in themselves: it is only by the combination of them into syllables that values are arrived at. In the syllable, the vowel marks the place to which the consonant, etc., is to be referred: and the consonant, etc., marks the number of times by which the number belonging to that place is to be multiplied. Thus, neither can k nor can a be used to denote 1: this number is expressed by the syllable ka , meaning 1×1 : similarly, gi means 100×3 , and denotes 300; and iu means $10,000 \times 5$, and denotes 50,000.

After m a different order sets in. The text tells us that ya is equal to ia (5) + ma (25): that is, it denotes 30. For the rest, it leaves us to learn from the commentary that ra denotes 40, la denotes 50, and so on up to ha which denotes 100. Here, again, it is only the syllables ya , ra , la , etc., which have these values: the powers which belong to y , r , l , etc., are really 3, 4, 5, and so on, up to 10: and ya means 30 only because the vowel a refers the y to the first not-square place, to which the number 10 belongs, and the y multiplies the 10 by 3. In the same way, ri means 1000×4 , and denotes 4000: lu means $100,000 \times 5$, and denotes 500,000; and so on.

The vowel attached to a conjunct consonant belongs to all the members of the combination. Thus, $khri$ is to be analysed, not into kha and ri , but into $khi = 200$ and $ri = 4000$; and $chyu$ is to be analysed into $chu = 60,000$ and $yu = 300,000$.

A.—Powers of the consonants, etc.

k	1	kh	2	g	3	gh	4	ñ	5
ch	6	chh	7	j	8	jh	9	ñ	10
t	11	th	12	d	13	dh	14	n	15
ṭ	16	ṭh	17	ḍ	18	ḍh	19	n	20
p	21	ph	22	b	23	bh	24	m	25

y	3	r	4	l	5	v	6
ś	7	sh	8	s	9	h	10

B.—The vowels, the places, and the names of the numbers.

au		ō		ai		ē		ḷi		ṛi		u		i		a		Names of the numbers.
○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	
																	1	ēka
																	1 0	daśan
																1 0 0	śata	
																1, 0 0 0 0	sahasra	
													1			0, 0 0 0 0	ayuta	
																0, 0 0 0 0	niyuta	
																0, 0 0 0 0	prayuta	
																0, 0 0 0 0	kōṭi	
																0, 0 0 0 0	arbuda	
								1								0, 0 0 0 0	vṛinda	
																0, 0 0 0 0	kharva	
																0, 0 0 0 0	nikharva	
																0, 0 0 0 0	mahāpadma	
																0, 0 0 0 0	śaṅku	
																0, 0 0 0 0	jaladhi	
																0, 0 0 0 0	antya	
																0, 0 0 0 0	madhya	
																0, 0 0 0 0	parārdha	

C.—Examples.

Sun				○	□	○	□	○	□	○	□	
khyu-ghri	khu yu ghri											
					3		2					
				4								
				4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	
Jupiter		khi ri chu yu bha										
khri-chyu-bha									2			
					6		4					
					3						24	
					3	6	4	2	2	4		

Length of vowel makes no difference. Thus, 1 is either *ka* or *kā*; 200 is *khi* or *khī*; 30,000 is *gu* or *gū*; and so on.¹

The concluding words *nav-āntya-varṅē vā*, "or in the square immediately following the nine", that is, "in the tenth square place",² are enigmatical. They seem to indicate a nineteenth place (the number belonging to which, the British trillion, would be the square of the *crinda*, No. 10) and nothing after it. And Albērūnī tells us that some of the Hindūs maintained the existence of a nineteenth number, named Bhūri, which they regarded as the limit of reckoning.³ But, as Albērūnī himself indicated, the places and numbers are in fact unlimited. And the commentator explains the clause as meaning that, if any numbers, square or not square, are wanted beyond that belonging to the eighteenth place, they may be expressed by using the vowels again with the help of any such device as the attachment of an anusvāra: "but (he adds) the usage of the Śāstras does not go beyond eighteen places." Albērūnī does not disclose a knowledge of this particular system: but his statement seems to be ultimately based on the fact that the number for which he has brought forward the term Bhūri (I do not find the word in this sense in dictionaries) is the highest unit of reckoning which can be expressed in this system without some such aid as that suggested by the commentator. The highest such unit falling absolutely within the eighteen places is the *parārdha*, expressed by *ṅau*: but there is the combination *haru*, in which the *h* multiplies

¹ As a matter of fact, however, we find that the only long vowel actually used in the Daśagītikasūtra is *ā*; ten times, in verses 3, 5, 7, 9, 10. Combinations of two consonants, etc., are frequent: but the only combinations of three letters are *hlya* in verse 7, and *chsya* as a various reading in verse 10.

² Compare *aṣṭam-āntya*, 'the ninth; immediately following the eighth': see the St. Petersburg Dictionary, under *antya*. The commentary explains *antya* by *ūrdhva-gata*, 'gone above, higher'.

³ Trans. Sachau, vol. 1, p. 175.

the *parārdha* by ten :¹ this is to be actually inscribed in the eighteenth place ;² but, when it (or any number including it) is read off for use elsewhere, it runs to nineteen places.

I give on p. 119 above the tabulated arrangement which seems necessary for practically understanding this system of numeration and applying its details: the divisions A. and B. show the system itself; and in C. I give two simple instances to illustrate it, from verse 1 of the *Daśagītikasūtra*; the revolutions of the Sun and of Jupiter in the *exeligmos* of 4,320,000 years. It may be said that, in doing this, I am presenting a form of abacus, and am attributing to Āryabhata the use of the abacus, if not also of the cipher, without further inquiry. I do not seek to prejudge by this or any other means the settlement of the questions reopened by Mr. Kaye. But I think that we must always bear in mind a point which has been stated in plain terms by Dr. Gow, in his *History of Greek Mathematics*, § 27 :—“The cipher is yet to be invented before the abacus can be discarded.” And it seems to me that, even alongside of the use of the cipher, this system postulates the use of a board divided and lettered in some such manner as in my divisions A. and B, with, in its lower part, a table ruled, but otherwise left blank, for resolving the details of any particular statement: some such means seems absolutely necessary to enable anyone to disentangle, interpret into their numerical values, and add them up so as to get the total which is wanted for any particular operation to be worked out on a separate blank board or sheet of birch-bark, palm-leaf, etc., the components of (for instance) the expression which gives

¹ Or, by the means suggested by the commentator, the number thus arrived at might be expressed by *kaṁ*.

² Is it possible that the *rā* at the end of the verse is a corrupt reading for *hau*? In that case we might translate :—“*hau* (stands) in the square at the end of the nine (pairs of spaces).”

the number of the rotations of the earth on its axis, i.e. the number of sidereal days, in the *exeligmos*: namely, *niśibuṅḷikḥṣṭvī* = 1,582,237,500.¹ In the division B, however, I have entered the ciphers, and pointed them, only with a view to help us to read the numbers off easily in our modern terms: the question remains open, whether Āryabhata, or anyone else of his period, would have filled in those parts of the table either with the cipher, or with the dot which is found used for it in the Bakshālī manuscript,² or with any other precursor of it: or whether he would have left them blank, as I have done in the division C. above the totals, contenting himself with the slanting row of ones marking the beginning-point of each successive number.

A few miscellaneous comments which suggest themselves are as follows:—

The system is a decidedly ingenious one, and evinces considerable thought in the devising of it. It was plainly elaborated with a view to being used in verse. If the vowels had been applied so that the short *a*, *i*, to *ḷi* should mark square or odd places, and the long *ā*, *ī*, to *ḷī* should mark not-square or even places, and if the consonants, etc., had been made all applicable to both the odd and the even places, the result would have been much difficulty in framing syllables to suit a metrical composition: especially in respect of the (in that case) inevitable frequent use of long vowels. It is plainly with a view to avoiding such difficulties that the devices were adopted (1) of ignoring the quantity of vowels: (2) of confining the consonants proper to the odd places; and (3) of assigning special powers to the semivowels, sibilants, and *h*, and using them in only the even places.

¹ Daśagītikasūtra, verse 1. In the third syllable the published text has *shu*, by a misprint for *bu*: the mistake is shown by examination of details, as well as by the commentary.

² See *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 17, pp. 36-8.

The rules of euphony are disregarded: and we have such combinations as *klsh*, verse 1; *chln*, verse 3; *hd*, verse 7; and *śgh* and *śjh*, verse 10; also, in the latter verse, *chsg* in a various reading. This feature has to be borne in mind in estimating the difficulties, in one direction, of retaining the verses in the memory, and in another, of realizing the values of the formulae without the help of a ruled table for resolving them. Another difficulty in the latter direction lies in the point that a framer of numerical expressions in this system was not bound by a certain rule, applying rigorously and for a good reason to two other artificial systems of numeration, regarding the order and direction in which the components of numbers were to be stated.¹

There are no good grounds for thinking that there was any desire to aim at esoteric mystery. The object of the system was conciseness, which was certainly achieved: its formulae are far more compact than any expressions that could be framed in any other terms. And some of them, such as *khyughṛi*, *khrichyubha*, and *buphinacha*, for the revolutions of the Sun, Jupiter, and the nodes of the Moon, are free from the objection due to disregard of euphony, and are not difficult to retain in the memory. But the case is different with others: especially the longer ones. And what are we to say about such a verse as this one. No. 10, which gives the table of sines ? :--

Makhi bhakhi phakhi dhaki ṅakhi ṅakhi
 ṅakhi hasjha skaki² kishga śghaki kighva |
 ghlaki kigra hakya dhāhā sta³
 sga śjha ṅva lka pta pha chha kal-ārdhajyāḥ ||

¹ The rule in question is:— *Aṅkānām vāmatō gatih*. More may be said about it on some other occasion.

² The *sraki* of the published text and commentary is either a misprint or a corrupt reading.

³ The metre is faulty here: it is set right by the various reading of another commentary; *dhaha kach=sga* instead of *dhāhā sta sga*.

Viewing the matter all round, we are not much surprised that this system failed to meet with general approval, so that it did not survive: even Lalla, the early special exponent of Āryabhaṭa, rejected it in favour of the system of numerical words.

The text of the Daśagītikasūtra lies before us, not in the characters in which it was written, but in our modern (and somewhat idealized) Nāgarī type. In verse 1 the revolutions of the moon are given by चयगियडुशुकु. Here, the last syllable might at first sight be taken as *chh* with the vowel *ḷi*, giving 700,000,000. But an examination of results, coupled with careful scanning (not altogether an easy matter with some of these uncouth formulae), shows that it is to be analysed into *chh* with *ṛi*, = 7,000,000, and *l* with *ṛi*, = 50,000,000; so that the syllable gives only 57,000,000. On the other hand, in the same verse, in the expression for the rotations of the earth (see p. 122 above), we have षुः and the same double process shows that this can be only *u* with the vowel *ḷi*, = 1,500,000,000. It would appear, therefore, that in Āryabhata's time there was some means, which the modern Nāgarī alphabet does not possess, of showing at a glance, by a differentiation of forms, the distinction between the subscript vowel *ḷi* and the subscript semivowel *l* with *ṛi* attached.

It is a curious feature that, while various numbers can be expressed in this system in more than one way,¹ the first two numbers of each alternate column from the thousands upwards cannot be named in it in literal terms at all. We can say *ki* = 'one hundred' (or express the number by *hu* = 'ten times ten'), *khi* = 'two hundreds', and *gi* = 'three hundreds'. But, while we have *yi* =

¹ I mean in a direct manner, as in cases given above; not to the indefinite extent to which it becomes possible when it is found convenient to break totals up into somewhat unusual components, illustrated by the following instances: in verse 10, for 106 we have *sta* = 90 + 16, instead of *chaki* = 6 + 100 or *kichu* or *hcha* both = 100 + 6; and for 37 we have *pta* = 21 + 16, instead of *chya* = 7 + 30 or *ycha* = 30 + 7.

'three thousands', we cannot say 'one thousand' or 'two thousands', because we cannot use k and kh in the *avarga* or even place, and there are no other consonants which have the powers 1 and 2: we can only express 1000 by $\tilde{n}i$ = 'ten hundreds', and 2000 by ni = 'twenty hundreds'. We can say ku = 'one *ayuta*' (or express the number by hi = 'ten thousands'), khu = 'two *ayutas*', and gu = 'three *ayutas*'. But, while we have yu = 'three *niyutas*', we cannot, for the same reason, say 'one *niyuta*' and 'two *niyutas*': we can only express 100,000 by $\tilde{n}u$ = 'ten *ayutas*' and 200,000 by nu = 'twenty *ayutas*'. And so on, alternately, all the way through. Actual instances of this are found as follows: in the second verse, 2200 is expressed by phi = 'twenty-two hundreds', and 2300 by bi = 'twenty-three hundreds'; in the first verse, 140,000 is $\dot{d}hu$ = 'fourteen *ayutas*', and 230,000 is bu = 'twenty-three *ayutas*'; and in the same verse 17,000,000 is, not 'one $k\ddot{o}\tilde{t}i$ and seven *prayutas*', but $thri$ = 'seventeen *prayutas*'.

The origin of this system of expressing numbers is not known. We may conveniently call it Āryabhaṭa's system, because, so far, we meet with it only in connection with him. But there is no proof that he did not take it over, and, indeed, the Daśagītikasūtra with it, from a predecessor: he claims, in so many words (see p. 115 above), only the Gaṇitapāda, the Kālakriyāpāda, and the Gōlapāda as his own work. In any case, knowing the Greek source of the greater part of the astronomy, etc., which we have in the Āryabhaṭīya and subsequent works, we naturally think of the possibility of a similar origin for this system of numeration. But it is certainly not an adaptation of the Greek system in which $\alpha' = 1$, $\beta' = 2$, $\iota' = 100$, $\rho' = 100$, $\alpha = 1000$, $\ddot{u} = 10,000$, and so on.

I would find the inspiration of it in another method which the Greeks had for expressing the higher numbers,

by which (see, e.g., Gow, op. cit., § 30), using M , as the initial of $\mu\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota$, for 10,000, they could express, e.g., 20,000 by M with a β placed above it, or before or after it. They could thus say, in algebraic form, βM , γM , δM , and so on. Exactly the same idea underlies the whole of Āryabhaṭa's system, except only that he used vowels instead of the initials of specific names, and is very clearly recognizable in a certain part of it: thus:—

In this Greek system 20,000 is $\beta M = 10,000 \times 2$
 30,000 is $\gamma M = 10,000 \times 3$
 40,000 is $\delta M = 10,000 \times 4$
 and so on.

In Āryabhaṭa's system 20,000 is $khU = 10,000 \times 2$
 30,000 is $gU = 10,000 \times 3$
 40,000 is $ghU = 10,000 \times 4$
 and so on.

VI

ARCHÆOLOGICAL EXPLORATION IN INDIA, 1909-10

By J. H. MARSHALL, C.I.E., M.A.

BHĪTĀ

THE excavations at Bhītā, near¹ Allahabad, which I am about to describe, signalize a new departure in Indian Archæology; for they mark the first occasion on which a serious effort has been made to explore the remains of an ancient Indian town, and the results attained from them consequently deserve a somewhat more detailed description than would otherwise be given here. The site at Bhītā is far from being an extensive one, and the old town, of which even the name is uncertain,² could never have been of any great importance, except perhaps from a military standpoint; yet in spite of this, and in spite, too, of the fact that the digging was confined to a very small part of it, the discoveries that have been made are full of archæological interest, and serve to indicate very clearly what a rich harvest of finds may be expected when the sites of the great cities like Taxila, Pāṭaliputra, and Vidiśā come to be systematically and thoroughly investigated, as I sincerely hope they will be in the course of the next decade. I myself had hoped to start on the exploration of the last-named city during the past winter, but owing to unforeseen difficulties raised by the Gwalior Darbar the project had to be abandoned, and at the last moment I was reluctantly compelled to fall

¹ About 10 miles S.S.W. from Allahabad, on the south bank of the Jumnā.

² General Cunningham (A.S.R., iii, 47) held that Bhītā represented the ancient Bitbhaya-paṭṭanā, but his arguments are not convincing. On the other hand, the place-name *Fichhī* occurs on a seal-die which I found at Bhītā, and the longer form *Fichhīgrāma* on a sealing. The former, at any rate, is unlikely to have been brought from elsewhere, and it probably gives us, therefore, the name of the ancient town.

back on the much inferior site at Bhīṭā, where it was manifest from the outset that, whatever other discoveries might be brought to light, little or nothing of a highly artistic order or of great historical value need be looked for. I mention this, in order to make it plain that, in going to Bhīṭā, I had no expectation of making any startling finds: what I did hope to achieve there was to throw some light on the ordinary domestic architecture and possibly, also, on some features of domestic life in ancient India.


Space does not permit me to explain here the course which my excavations took or to give an account of all the structures unearthed; so I propose to describe only the single group of three houses of which the plan appears in Plate I, and which may be taken as fairly typical of the rest. This group is near the south-east gate of the town and on the right-hand side of the road leading to it. The earliest complete structure in it is the *House of the Guild*,¹ which I have ventured so to name from a seal-die of terra-cotta found beneath the floor-level of room O. The legend on this die appears to read *Suhijitīyē nigamaśa*, in letters of about the third century B.C.² Probably it was buried by chance when the foundations of the house were being laid, but, whether this was so or not, the house must on other grounds be assigned to the Mauryan epoch. The plan of the building is simple. It consists of an open rectangular courtyard in the centre, with twelve rooms disposed around it on the four sides, access to the courtyard being obtained through

¹ I have attached this name to the house for the sake of distinguishing it, though the seal is probably older than the house. In the case of the other houses there is every reason to suppose that the names given to them were the names of their actual occupiers.

² Pl. III, 2; the reading is doubtful. The lettering on this seal is raised, not countersunk. A full account of the many seals found on this site is being prepared by my assistant, Pandit Daya Ram, and edited by Dr. Vogel. To their notes I am indebted for the transcripts of the seals mentioned here.

BHITA PLAN OF EXCAVATIONS NEAR S.E. GATE


R O A D T O S . E . G A T E →



KEY TO COLOURS

- Pre-Mauryan or Early Mauryan
- Mauryan
- First century B.C.
- Third or fourth century A.D.
- Late Gupta
- Later Mediaeval

SCALE IN FEET





two entrancees (J and M) facing each other on opposite sides of the building. In front of the chamber B is what appears to have been a verandah, while in front of the room P is a later addition, intended perhaps to screen off the door. The resemblance of this plan to the plans of the old Buddhist monasteries is patent, and it may be taken for granted, I think, that the latter were copied from this type of domestic house. As regards construction, this and the other houses which I shall describe are all built of kiln-burnt bricks. The foundations of the walls in the "house of the guild" are set on a layer of broken brick and pottery debris, below which, again, is a thick layer of pounded clay. Foundations of the same kind are found in other structures of the Mauryan epoch, but in some cases the broken brick and pottery is mixed with *kankar* in alternating layers, and the corners of the walls are protected with massive boulders laid against them under the ground. In the "house of the guild" the walls of the rooms on the south-east side descend some 2 feet lower than those on the other three sides, and their bricks are laid as headers instead of stretchers.¹ This greater thickness and stability were, I think, given to the walls on this side of the house in order that they might carry a second story; for the same phenomenon is observable in other buildings on this site, and it is well known that upper stories were in vogue at that period. All the floors in this house had been destroyed, but in another house of the same epoch (No. XL) they were still almost intact and were found to be composed of a single course of brick laid flat, above which was a layer of pounded clay about 3 inches thick, and above this, again, a layer of concrete. In the same house, as well as in the "house of the guild",

¹ The bricks of the chambers on the south-east side average $18\frac{1}{2}'' \times 9'' \times 2\frac{1}{2}''$, while in the rest of the house they average $21'' \times 10\frac{1}{2}'' \times 2\frac{1}{2}''$. The two sizes were, no doubt, used at one and the same time for purposes of economy.

were found numbers of well-preserved roof tiles, together with some of the pinnacles with which the ridges of the roofs were crowned. The former are roughly fluted on one side, plain on the other, and provided with flanges which overlapped each other at the edges.

The "house of the guild" does not appear to have stood for any great length of time, or to have been rebuilt when once it had fallen to ruin. That its remains had vanished from sight by the end of the third century A.D., is proved by the position and orientation of the well at the side of the courtyard, built about that time; but it is probable that the house had been destroyed long before then, viz., about the time when the neighbouring house of Nāgadēva was being erected. I conclude this from the fact that the antiquities found in the debris above the floor-level, which may be assumed to have been left there when or soon after the house was deserted, belong to the Śuṅga period, and are contemporary with those discovered in the foundations of the house of Nāgadēva. Moreover, it will be seen from the plan that in the Śuṅga period a circuit wall was put up around the area occupied by the "house of the guild", and it seems likely that the remains of the house were then levelled up, and the site converted into an open courtyard or garden attached to the house of Nāgadēva.

The interior of the rooms and courtyard were excavated to a considerable depth below the floor-level, but only a few objects of terra-cotta were found. These include the seal-die referred to above, a primitive vessel modelled in human shape, the torso of a female figurine, and the wheel of a toy cart. The last-mentioned came from a depth of some 7 feet below the foundations of the house, and, to judge from the deposits above it, cannot be assigned to a later date than the sixth century B.C. The other three objects are probably but little older than the house itself.



GENERAL VIEW OF HOUSES SHOWN IN PLAN ON PREVIOUS PLATE.

Of the antiquities found on the floor-level of the house and belonging, as stated above, to the Śūnga period, the most interesting were: (a) Two wheels of a terra-cotta toy cart, minutely decorated on the outside with spokes, rosettes, and floral ornaments in the characteristic style of the period. Many other remnants of similar carts and their riders were found in other buildings, and from them it is easy to restore these little toys, so interesting in connexion with the well-known play of the *Mṛicchakaṭikā*. Usually, they were fashioned like tricycles (see Pl. III, 6), the rider between the two front wheels being sometimes a man or woman, sometimes an animal, while in one case the four horses themselves of the chariot are represented in relief. (b) Three caskets of finely veined steatite, found on the floor-level of the passage M. One of them is spherical and the other two round, with a flat base and lid. All are turned on the lathe, and the spherical casket, unfortunately incomplete, is of singularly fine workmanship. These caskets no doubt, like the Greek *pyxis*, did duty in the ordinary way as jewel or toilet boxes, and were adapted by the Buddhists as convenient receptacles for the sacred relics deposited in their *Stūpas*. A broken specimen of the Early Gupta age was found in another part of the site, and near by it a large number of necklace beads of great variety and interest.¹ (c) Half of a stone grinding stool, decorated in the Śūnga style with two winged lions rampant.

From the higher strata in the debris came a small *āyāyapaṭṭa* slab of green slate, belonging to the Kushaṇa period, two clay sealings inscribed in characters of the same age, and a number of other sealings dating from the

¹ Some of these beads are unique, being composed of glass laid on in thin layers, with gold leaf between. Among other pieces of jewellery found on this site were: the gold medallion of Gupta date figured in Plate III, 3; a crystal pendant with face in relief, of the same age; a gold serpentine finger ring with *rajra* device, of the Mauryan epoch; and a beaded earring.

second or third century A.D. onwards. Among the latter I may notice the two following, as furnishing new names of rulers, connected, apparently, with the Andhra line of kings: (a) Oval. Bull standing l. with crescent under neck, and female figure in front. Behind the bull, a spear (?). In exergue, bow with arrow and *caitya*. Across middle of field, legend in northern characters of second or third century A.D.: *Mahārāja-Gautamiputtrasya śrī-Śivam[ē]ghasya*; of the illustrious Mahārāja Gautamiputra Śivamēgha. (b) Similar to above, but devices transposed. Legend in same characters: [*Ra*]jña *Vasasu[shtha]puttrasya śrī-Bhīmasēna[sya]*: "of the illustrious Rājā Vasishṭhiputra Bhīmasēna."

House of Nāgadēva.—To the north-west of the house described above and separated from it by the narrowest of lanes, is the house and shop of Nāgadēva, which appears to have been built in the late Śuṅga epoch. It is very much the same in plan as the "house of the guild", the most noticeable differences between them being that in the later structure there is more variety in the relative sizes of the rooms, and that the verandah is considerably larger. The shop consists of three rooms only, divided from the house by what was probably an open court, and in front of these rooms was a raised platform or verandah, such as is commonly seen in the Indian bazaars of to-day. Originally, this platform was divided into two by a passage leading into the central chamber, but in Early Gupta days, when the floor-level had risen several feet, a flight of steps was inserted and a new doorway constructed higher up.¹ Considering that they are built of a single course of brick without mortar, the walls of this and of many other houses on the site are remarkably well preserved. In this particular building they were found standing in

¹ Lying against these steps was found a coping-stone of a railing with a line of writing in Brāhmī characters of about the second century B.C., to the following effect: *na(?) Sēṭiyā-putreṇa Gōmitrēn(ṇ)a kārītā bhagavatō Nāgasa . . .*



1



3




2



4



5



6



places to a height of over 11 feet above the original floor-level. Of course, they were repaired many times, and, as the ground-level rose, the lower courses were effectually protected against damage; but, even so, it seems surprising that they could have held together so well through all the centuries that have elapsed since they were finally deserted.

The stratification in this house and shop of Nāgadēva is singularly well defined, and as instructive as in any building on the site. From the earliest stratum exposed comes the interesting little mould of which an impression is figured in Pl. III, 1. It was found between 6 and 7 feet underneath the foundations of room N, and can hardly be later than the fourth century B.C., though it may be earlier. The device is that of a woman under a palm-tree with an uncertain object on her proper right. To the next, or Mauryan, stratum belong the walls shown in blue, and the well which is partly concealed beneath the wall separating the chambers P and O. This well starts 3 feet below the foundations of the party wall referred to, and was excavated to a depth of 20 feet from its top, a great deal of pottery being found in its shaft. The third stratum is reached in the foundations themselves of the house and shop of Nāgadēva, mixed with which were found a number of terra-cotta figurines, iron implements, and pottery of the Śūṅga epoch. Among these may be mentioned: (a) Figurine of male figure, in squatting posture, and wearing a sleeved coat something like the modern *chogah*, with a head-dress of floral fillet and plumes in the typical Śūṅga style (Pl. III, 5). (b) Plaque with four horses facing, in relief, and floral border above. The horses are plumed and harnessed as in the Sāñchi and other contemporary sculptures. (c) Two miniature figures of a camel and elephant. (d) An iron hatchet and chisel. Nothing that can be ascribed to a later date than the Śūṅga period was found in the

foundations of this house,¹ and we may assume, therefore, that the house was erected about the close of that period.

The next, or fourth, stratum is found on the original floor of the house. Among the minor finds in this stratum, all of which belong to the Kushāṇa period, were : (a) Seventeen copper coins of Kaṇishka and Huvishka ; (b) terra-cotta male bust ; (c) grinding table of stone ; (d) a well-preserved water-bottle of fine clay, painted red ; (e) circular clay sealing with device of bow and arrow, as in Andhra coins, and the legend *Gagasa* in Kushāṇa characters ; (f) circular seal-die of ivory, with the device of a conch shell and the legend *Nāgadēasya*, apparently for *Nāgadēvasya*, which I have assumed to be the name of the owner of the house and shop. That the house was hurriedly deserted, owing to some catastrophe, in the Kushāṇa period, and afterwards suffered to fall to ruin, seems indicated by the coins and other articles left lying on the floors, and by the subsequent accumulation of debris in the rooms and court ; but how long the edifice had been standing when this happened, it is impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy. One fact, however, which seems to assert itself on this site as well as elsewhere, is that a considerable period must have elapsed between the art epoch associated with the dynasty of the Śūngas and the epoch of the Kushāṇas. The art of the former was widespread and deeply rooted throughout Northern and Central India, and must have flourished

¹ As to the character of the foundations themselves, they are very similar in buildings of this date to the earlier foundations of the Mauryan epoch, the chief points of difference being as follows : (1) In the earlier foundations, where *kankar* is used, it is laid with broken pottery or brick in alternating courses, while in the later the *kankar* is mixed indiscriminately with broken brick ; (2) broken potsherds are almost entirely absent in the later ; (3) in the earlier the walls are generally carried deeper under ground than in the later ; (4) heavy stones are used to protect the corners in both periods, but in the later they project above the ground-level, whereas in the earlier they are completely buried.

well on towards the close of the first century B.C., if not longer. Yet, when we come to the well-defined Kushāna strata among the buildings on this site, we find no objects whatever even in the most decadent Śūṅga style. How is their absence to be explained, if we place the beginning of the Kushāna era in the middle of the first century B.C.? It may, of course, be argued that the sudden disappearance of the earlier naturalistic school is sufficiently accounted for by the political upheavals of the time and by the powerful influence which the foreign art of Gandhāra was then exerting through the medium, particularly, of the Mathurā school. But it is difficult to believe that the widely prevalent traditions of the older school could have been swept away so completely and effectually in such a short space of time. Certainly, the date of 78 A.D. for Kanishka's accession seems to suit much better the data obtainable here.

The fifth stratum, like the fourth, is also clearly defined by a *pakka* floor, constructed some 3 feet above the original one, when the deposits inside the house had gradually accumulated to that height. This seems to have happened towards the end of the third century A.D., at which time the additions to the house shown in green on the plan were also made; but the minor objects found on this second floor belong, as we should naturally expect, to the time when the house was again evacuated, not to the period of its restoration. This second evacuation, which took place in the early Gupta epoch, seems to have been as precipitate as the first, and to have resulted from some hostile attack on the city; for many missiles, such as catapult¹ and sling balls, were found in the houses

¹ The engines of war used for propelling these balls must have been of considerable power, the balls, which are of stone, measuring as much as 8½ inches in diameter. A large number of them were found on the site, the finest, though not the largest, specimens being those of the Mauryan period, which are perfectly spherical and finished with that wonderful precision which characterizes all the stone-work of the Mauryan period.

and lanes, and most of the houses themselves were burnt, while in the house which I am describing even the sacred images of the gods were abandoned to their fate. These images, numbering seven, were found in room B; one of them is a terra-cotta figure of Śiva with his wife Pārvatī, seated side by side on a throne with bull and lion *couchant* in front: another is a terra-cotta model of a shrine, consisting of a circular dish (diam. 13 inches) with a portal on one side, inside of which are seven female figures seated in a ring, with a pedestal in the centre. The group of figures was damaged by a large sling-stone, which had lodged between them, doubtless during the attack on the city. Other objects found on and above this floor were: a stone grinding table, decorated with leaf designs, quarter lotuses, waves, and dots: a copper tripod intended to hold a *tāmrakuṇḍa*; a copper bowl, saucer, and ladle; two copper bangles; an arrow-head in the same metal; and a number of clay sealings, among which may be mentioned the four following: (a) Oval. Śivaliṅga on pedestal with *caitya* to right and axe trident to left. Below, legend: *K[ā]lu[m]jara*. Apparently from Kālañjar. (b) Circular. Ornamental wheel on pedestal. Below, legend: *Mulāduḍḍanāyaka*, followed by illegible name. (c) Oval. Axe-trident with wavy line below and uncertain devices to right and left. In lower half, legend in Eastern Gupta characters: *Kālēśvaraḥ priyatām*; "may Kālēśvara¹ be pleased." (d) Oval. Lakshmi standing on lotus with elephants, and attendant figures on each side. Below, legend in northern characters of fourth or fifth century A.D.: [*Ku*]mārāmāty-ādihikaranasya; "(seal) of the office of the councillor of the heir apparent."

A singularly interesting problem is presented by the discovery in this house of Nāgadēva, as well as in several

¹ The name of a Śiva-linga.

other buildings on the site, of a number of celts and other neolithic implements of slate, sandstone, and diabase. They were found in the Kushana and Early and Late Gupta levels, and there can be no mistake as to the periods to which they belong. How, then, is their presence to be accounted for? I think that the most reasonable explanation is that, after being sacked and desolated by enemies, the town was on several occasions occupied by neighbouring jungle tribes, who were still in the neolithic state of culture, and who left these implements behind them. Another possible explanation is that stone implements were still being used for sacrificial or other religious purposes¹ by people who had emerged centuries before from the neolithic state; but this is less likely in view of the variety of the implements, which, if due to artificial conservatism, would reasonably be expected to be of a more or less uniform type. Whatever may be the true explanation, we have here conclusive proof that neolithic implements were in use in India until mediæval times.

House of the banker Jayavasuda.—This house is of the same age and of much the same character as the house of Nāgadēva, though it boasts of a well in the courtyard, and of a store or treasure chamber beneath the floor of the corner room R. The latter feature is common to several other houses on the site, and recalls the somewhat similar chambers in the Palace at Knossos, though there they are relatively shallow. In this case, the chamber is 13 feet deep,² provision being made for descending to the bottom by the insertion of cross beams at intervals; the beams, however, were widely spaced, and in such a confined area

¹ Examples of such conservatism are to be found among the ancient Egyptians and the Mexicans. The Jews, too, it will be remembered, continued to use stone knives for circumcision in a metal age (Ex. iv, 25 and Josh. v, 2), while the Romans used them for sacrifice; whence the proverb *inter sacrum saxumque stare*. But I do not know that the true neolithic types of implements were preserved in any of these cases.

² In some other houses they are over 20 feet deep.

it must have been extremely inconvenient to climb up and down.

The stratification in this house corresponds precisely to that in the house of Nāgadēva, and there can be no doubt that it was built, destroyed, and rebuilt at the same times. Of the Śuṅga period the most notable find was the terracotta medallion figured in Plate IV, which came from the foundations of room F. The scene, which is repeated on both sides of the medallion, recalls in every feature the reliefs of Sāñchi, but the workmanship of the die with which this medallion was stamped, was infinitely more minute and delicate than any workmanship in stone or marble could ever be. In this case I think it probable that the die was of ivory, the material of several of the seal-dies found at Bhiṭā; but, whether this surmise be right or wrong, I have no doubt that this was just the sort of work that was being turned out at the time by the ivory carvers of Ujjain, who, as we know, were employed upon the sculptures at Sāñchi. On the Kushaṇa level, i.e., on the lower floor, were found a variety of potteries, a female figurine of rough make, and several seals, among which was one with the legend *nigama* in Kushaṇa characters, and another, reading *Pusamitusa*, in characters of the same or a somewhat earlier date. On the second floor, evidences of a conflagration were obvious in all the rooms, but most especially in the verandah and south-west side of the courtyard, where there were great quantities of charred rice and other grain. Here it was that a particularly fine collection of clay sealings, containing twenty-three different types, were found. From the fact that they were scattered about over a thick layer of charred rice and ashes, with other burnt debris above them, I think it likely that they had fallen from the upper story, when it collapsed in the flames. The whole collection is an extremely interesting one, but here I shall give only two examples from it. (a) Circular. In centre,



TERRACOTTA MEDALLION · ACTUAL SIZE

caitya with circle and crescent above, post on either side, and wavy line below. Around the margin, in beautifully¹ cut lettering of the third or fourth century A.D.: *Śrī-Vindhya - bēdhana - mahārājasya Mahēśvara - Mahāsēn-ātisṛiṣṭa-rājyasya Vṛishadhvajasya Gautamīputrasya*; "Of the illustrious Mahārāja Gautamīputra Vṛishadhvaja, the penetrator (?) of the Vindhya, who had made over his kingdom to the great lord Kārttikēya." The name Vṛishadhvaja is not known from other sources, but the device on the sealing and the metronymic *Gautamīputra* indicate a connexion with the Andhras. (b) Circular. In upper part, Lakshmi with elephants on lotuses. Below, legend in Eastern Gupta characters: *Mahāśvapati-mahādaṇḍanāyaka - Viṣṇurakṣita - pādānuḡṛihītakumārāmāty-ādhiparāṇasya*; "seal of the office of the councillor of the heir-apparent, a recipient of the favour of the Mahāśvapati and Mahādaṇḍanāyaka Viṣṇurakṣita." From the same floor, room P, came a seal die of ivory with the legend, in Northern Gupta characters: *Śrēṣṭhī Jayavasuda*; "the banker Jayavasuda".

Among the smaller antiquities found in the deep accumulation of debris beneath which this and other buildings on the site were buried, special interest attaches to a series of several hundred terra-cotta figurines of men, women, and children, which range in date from the fourth to the sixth century A.D. All are mechanical reproductions from moulds, a few of which were found, but duplicates in the collection are rare. Some are without slip or paint: others are painted in a monochrome—red or yellow, for instance; while others are coated with a slip and adorned with a variety of colours—red and pink and yellow and white. But apart from their artistic interest, these figurines are valuable for the information they furnish as to the fashions in vogue during the Gupta period.

¹ This sealing has the most perfectly cut legend of any yet found in India.

Thus the modes of dressing the hair were as numerous then as they are among women to-day, and perhaps even more startling. The men, certainly, must have been foppish to a degree, with their long curls falling loose on one side only, or elaborated like a full Georgian wig, or coiffured with jewels in the Antoinette manner, or arranged more severely in the regal style of Persia. But the description of the coiffures and dress of these figurines is one which I must defer to another time.

None of the brick buildings that have been excavated on this site can, in my opinion, be assigned to an earlier date than the fourth century B.C., and there seems little chance of finding older ones here, though kiln-burnt bricks seem to have been in use on this site for about a century before that. Several broad trial trenches were sunk deep below the Mauryan level, but in every case the brick debris terminated within a few feet of the Mauryan buildings, though the deposits beneath extended down for 20 feet and more, before virgin soil was reached. I do not regard this as proof that the use of bricks was unknown in India before the fifth century B.C. It may well be that up to that time Bhīṭā had been occupied by an unimportant village, the houses of which would naturally have been of mud, as they still are in the India of to-day. My excavation of a portion of the city wall proves that it was built of brick, for the first time, in the Mauryan epoch, and it can reasonably be supposed that the place was then growing in importance, and that the erection of the city wall marks, in fact, the conversion of the village into a town. On the other hand, it may be that kiln-burnt bricks were, in fact, unknown in this part of India before the fifth century B.C., and in that case it is quite possible that the town was originally defended, like the city of Pātaliputra, by a wooden wall. The total absence of bricks in the lower strata certainly tallies well with the testimony of

Megasthenes about the fortifications of Chandragupta's capital;¹ but the question is one which cannot be settled until some more important city sites have been examined.

In spite, however, of the absence of *pakka* buildings my excavation of the lower strata was not without interesting results. Thus, concrete was found in use for flooring at least as far back as the seventh century B.C.; while another kind of pavement, which fell into disuse here after the introduction of kiln-burnt bricks, was composed of a thick layer of clay mixed with broken potsherds, the whole being afterwards burnt *in situ*, so as to form one unbroken slab of terra-cotta. Wheel-made pottery occurred in the earliest deposits of all, which can hardly be placed later than 1200 B.C., and may be considerably earlier; and a fine black lustre ware with highly burnished surface was found, in company with rough terra-cotta figures, in deposits of the seventh or eighth century B.C. onwards.

SAHRIBAHLOL

In the Frontier Province Dr. Spooner returned again to Sahribahlol, where in 1907 he had succeeded in recovering such a splendid collection of Gandhāra sculptures. This year he directed his efforts to another of the largest mounds on the site, and his labours were equally well rewarded.² The eastern half of this mound he found to be occupied by a monastic quadrangle, surrounded by twenty rooms: that is, five on each side, four of them being square in plan and the corner one oblong. The foundations of these rooms are mostly *kachcha*, except in parts of the northern and eastern outer walls. To the south of the quadrangle, and in a line with its western

¹ Arrian, it will be remembered, states (Ch. X) that cities situated on the banks of rivers or on the sea-coast were built of wood, while those in higher and dryer situations were built of brick and mud.

² In the absence of Dr. Spooner, who is on leave in the South Sea Islands, I am indebted to his Assistant, Wasi-ud-din, for the information contained in this note.

wall, was a large conference hall, about 30 feet square, of which, again, only the eastern side was built of sound masonry. The western half of the mound is mainly taken up with an irregular pavement presenting an obtuse angle to the monastic court on the east. On it are two Stūpas in good condition, one being circular and the other square in plan; and not far from them, running north and south, is the eastern façade of a ruined building, set with large figures still *in situ*. While the round stūpa is comparatively plain, the square one, to the north of it, and another square one still further north-east and beyond the limits of the pavement, are adorned all round with fine sitting Buddha images, in alternating *mudrās*, and cut in bold relief. On the main square stūpa, too, there is, higher up, a fine stucco frieze; and on both these monuments the Corinthian pilasters, which intervene between the images, and the modillion cornices above, are strikingly well executed.

The sculptures unearthed by Dr. Spooner numbered some 200 pieces in all, of which the most remarkable perhaps are two colossal Buddhas in almost perfect preservation (see Pl. V, 1), lying close by the bases in which they were originally fixed, on either side of a low platform. These two statues stand 9 feet high, and are by far the most perfect of any such colossal figures that we possess from Gandhāra, even their detached right hands having been found along with them. Another unusually fine figure is that shown on Pl. V, 2, which is nearly 6 feet in height. In the note on it furnished by Dr. Spooner's Assistant, the suggestion is made that it represented some royal male person, but I agree with Dr. Vogel in thinking that the contour of the torso and particularly the broad hips indicate a female rather than a male. The figure on the pedestal is, perhaps, an earth goddess. The whole is gracefully executed, and finished with a refinement that is seldom surpassed in Gandhāra



1



2



3



4

work, even the rings on the fingers being most delicately delineated. That the arched receptacle held in the hands was intended for some sacred little image seems more than probable, though no traces of the image remain. Yet another sculpture that deserves particular notice, is the portrait head figured in Pl. V, 3. It is of rough workmanship, but decidedly full of character, and we can well believe that with its prominent forehead, aquiline nose, compressed lips, and determined chin, it gives us a very faithful portrait of some abbot in the monastery.

As to the rest of the sculptures, they consist mainly of Buddhas and Bōdhisattvas and legendary scenes in relief. The former are of the well-known types, though for the most part in a better state of preservation than is usually the case. The latter are conspicuous for the novelty of many of the scenes portrayed, among them being several that do not appear to be represented in any museum. Their publication by Dr. Spooner will be awaited with no little interest by students of Buddhist iconography.

WESTERN TIBET

While speaking of the frontier of India I must mention some important discoveries made in the remote districts of Kashmir and British India, once comprised in the empire of Western Tibet. The explorer to whom these discoveries are due, is the Rev. A. H. Francke, the well-known authority on Western Tibet, whose services I was fortunate in securing for my department for a period of eighteen months, for the purpose, primarily, of preparing a systematic catalogue of the existing monuments in those little-known regions.

The most ancient remains in Western Tibet to which a definite date can be given, are several inscriptions in the early Brāhmī and Kharōshthī scripts, which Mr. Francke found at Khalatse, some 50 miles below Leh. The earliest


of them dates back to the second or third century B.C., and they are valuable as testifying to the fact that Indian influence had penetrated into these mountainous tracts at that far-off date. Whether the people who left these records, were Dards who came from Gilgit or Buddhist missionaries from Kashmir, is a point that yet remains to be determined. Another discovery, also made in the Leh district, is that of a series of graves containing numbers of jars filled with human bones and accompanied by many ornaments of bronze and iron and gold. The skulls are of the dolicho-cephalic type, and probably belong to a family of Dard chieftains, who had adopted the unusual mode of burial which, as the Chinese Sui Shu tells us, was practised in the "Empire of the Eastern Women" in the sixth century A.D. "When," says that authority, "a person of rank dies, they strip off the skin and put the flesh and bones mixed with gold powder into a vase, and then bury it. . . . At the burial of the Sovereign, several of the great ministers and relatives are buried at the same time." This, Mr. Francke thinks, may account for the great number of skulls found in a single grave.

To the same pre-Buddhist period of Tibetan history belong various other finds made by Mr. Francke; namely, a manuscript containing a hymnal used on the occasion of human sacrifices at Poo; rock carvings and frescoes illustrating the primitive religion of the people; an ancient Bonpo temple with paintings of Bonpo priests at Lamayuru; and a hymn relating to the now forgotten worship of the Morning Star.

To a later and better known epoch belong some remarkable records, which, among other things, establish the reality of the great Atisha, who figures so prominently in the folk-tales of the country, but whose personality had hitherto been regarded as legendary rather than historical. Atisha flourished in the eleventh century A.D., when, to judge by the frescoes and other antiquities which



1. FIGURES IN CENTRAL HALL OF TABO MONASTERY. CIRCA 11TH CENTURY.



2. PICTURE ILLUSTRATING CONCLUSION OF TREATY BETWEEN BASHAHR KING AND THE MUGHALS ON THE ONE SIDE, AND WESTERN TIBET ON THE OTHER. A.D. 1650.

Mr. Francke has discovered, the art of Western Tibet must have reached its zenith. The frescoes referred to illustrate life in the Buddhist monasteries of India during the declining days of that religion, and were probably the work of Indian monks who had been forced to migrate to Tibet. They also furnish us with portraits of the kings of Ladakh and Guge, and with pictures of Tibetan sports, such as falconry. The high quality of art exhibited by these paintings is seen also in wood-carvings of the same epoch brought back by Mr. Francke, which are executed with a delicacy and finish which would do credit to the best Chinese craftsmanship. The spirit which pervades these paintings and sculptures is mainly Indian, and it is important to observe that this strong influence from the plains of Hindustan, which was noticed in connexion with the earliest inscriptions at Khalatse, runs through the whole history of Western Tibetan art and culture. In Mughal days, indeed, it is still more conspicuous than in the mediæval and earlier epochs. Thus, in a monastery at Alchi Mr. Francke found numerous wall paintings dating from the eleventh century, but renovated in the time of the Mughals. The outlines of many of the original pictures are still preserved, but it is curious to see how strongly imbued the later artists must have been with Mughal ideas of painting, and how they strove to give greater variety to the details, and to add greater brilliancy and effect to the colouring. In part of the frescoes, in fact, where nothing was left of the original picture, the artist has introduced scenes entirely in the Mughal style, depicting Indian houses and gardens, Indian musicians and acrobats, animals and the like, all finely designed and executed, and all resplendent from the free use of gold and silver. No doubt the Mughal tendency was strong in Tibet at this time, and its appearance in pictorial art is merely a reflexion of the political interference on the part of the Emperor of Delhi in the affairs of the northern

frontier. For that the Mughal power reached even to these fastnesses of the Himalayas, is amply evidenced by a treaty between the Tibetan Government and the King of Bashahr State in 1650 A.D., of which Mr. Francke has secured copies giving both the Bashahr and the Tibetan versions. From this treaty it appears that Kehari Singh, the king of Bashahr, had been helped during the conflict by the Mughal emperor, and that he secured from Tibet the cession of a large part of Guge—from Shipki to the Wangto bridge.

MIRPUR KHĀS

The excavation of the big Stūpa at Mirpur Khās in Sind, foreshadowed a year ago in this Journal,¹ has now been carried through by Mr. Cousens, and has been productive of even better results than were then anticipated. "The mound which covered this Stūpa," says Mr. Cousens, "had been so devastated, that I hardly hoped to find any of its walls standing, and, at first, I directed my attention to sinking a well down the centre on the chance of finding a relic chamber. Soon after beginning work, however, I found the lower parts of the walls of the square basement (over 50 feet each way), and, not long after this, came upon the relic chamber itself, 25 feet below the present top of the mound, upon the original ground level and placed exactly in the centre. The chamber measured only 15 inches square and a foot deep, and was constructed of burnt brick. Within this was found a roughly formed circular stone coffer, and placed in the south-west and south-east corners beside it were two little earthen pots. These contained nothing but sand. On raising the lid of the coffer a small crystal bottle was disclosed, standing in a cup-shaped hollow. Around it was a quantity of white sand, in which, as well as on the outside of the coffer's lid, were a number of coral beads and other small offerings,


¹ JRAS., October, 1909, pp. 1080-1.



1



2



3

consisting of crystal, gold, and other beads, seed pearls, a few grains of wheat or other cereal, and ten much corroded copper coins.¹ The crystal bottle contained a small gold and silver case, the one inside the other, and the relics of charred bone and ash.

“As to the outer walls of the Stūpa, they were found to be embedded in burnt brick laid in mud, for a distance of some fifteen feet or more from the walls. On laying bare the original walls down to the ground level, the reason for this became at once apparent. For it was obvious, from the lines of the great mouldings running round the base, that the walls had bulged out, and at the same time had sunk in the centres, owing, no doubt, to the immense dead weight of the superstructure. The danger of the whole building collapsing must have been so imminent, that this wholesale buttressing was necessary to prevent a disaster. And to the burying of the walls is due the good state of preservation in which the remains of the Stūpa, and particularly the images of Buddha, have been found. The most perfect of the four walls is that on the north, which, I think, rises to within some two and a half feet of its original height, which I take to have been about 17 ft. 6 in. It is built of brick with a fine smooth surface. The moulded basement is six feet high, the mouldings, as the photograph shows, being bold and well proportioned. Above this the walls were divided into five spaces by two corner and four intermediate pilasters with bases and capitals. The cornice mouldings above the capitals are gone, and only one pilaster still retains its cap. The corner pilasters are square below and octagonal (fluted) above. Each of the five bays has a large niche with ornamental drip-stone above. In each of the three central bays is a seated Buddha, in the contemplative attitude,

¹ In another note on this find Mr. Cousens wrote that these coins were $\frac{3}{8}$ " square and $\frac{1}{8}$ " thick, but that, owing to corrosion, it had not been possible to identify them.

while in the outer panel at the east end of the north wall and round the corner on the east wall is a trellis pattern looking like a trellis window. The corresponding one at the west end is missing. The Buddhas are of terra-cotta, and have been painted with fair complexions, red robes and black hair, eyebrows, and pupils of the eyes. The majority have woolly, wig-like hair, while two have straight long hair. Beneath the paint on the images is a thin clay slip, which has peeled off in places. The seat of the image in most cases is a double lotus seat, but the central image on the south side is seated on a four-legged stool.

“The western face of the basement differs from the other three, and would appear to have been the principal side of the monument. In the middle of it were found three cell shrines, built into the body of the Stūpa wall, with remains of seats, upon which images were probably placed. No remains of these images were found, but in the central shrine, standing against the side wall, was a standing image of a male figure in a heavy curled wig, having a wallet tied round his waist, upon which his left hand rests, and holding in his right hand, against his breast, a flower offering of a lotus. This may be a portrait of the prince who erected the Stūpa, the wallet representing the money bag.

“In the débris in front of the west face of the stūpa were found great numbers of votive tablets of unburnt clay, some with seated Buddhas and some with stūpas in relief, but nearly all inscribed with the Buddhist formula. Here, too, were uncarthed between thirty and forty copper coins in a much corroded condition, and the two round terra-cotta medallions figured in Pl. VII, 2.”

SCULPTURE FROM HARASNĀTH TEMPLE IN SĪKAR

The interesting sculpture figured in Pl. V, 4, was found by Mr. Bhandarkar when visiting the village of Haras in

the little principality of Sikar in Jaipur, Rajputana. The temple to which it belonged is now an utter wreck, most of its material having been used up in the construction of two modern temples close by. The sculpture represents Brahmā and Vishṇu trying to fathom the liṅga of Śiva, Brahmā soaring upwards to find the top, and Vishṇu going down in search of the bottom. The same legend is illustrated in a well-known sculpture in the Kailāsa Temple at Ellorā, and is not infrequently met with among the sculptures of Southern India; but in all the examples which I have seen Śiva appears inside the liṅga, while in other respects the treatment is less elaborate and conventional than in this one.

SCULPTURES OF THE MATHURĀ SCHOOL

Thanks to the unceasing labours of Pandit Radha Krishna, I have been able to purchase on behalf of the Government of India and to place in the local Mathurā museum a great number of interesting sculptures belonging to the early Mathurā school, which the Pandit had collected in the neighbouring districts. For the following note on them I am indebted to Dr. J. Ph. Vogel, who has done so much for the Mathurā Museum, and whose admirable catalogue of the collections there will very shortly be issued:—

“ Earliest in date are two fragments of a colossal statue (height 4 ft. 2 in. and 2 ft. 5 in.), which were obtained from the village of Barōda, 4 miles from Parkham and 2 miles from Chhargāon. The early date of these fragments may be inferred from their great similarity to the well-known Parkham statue, now in the Mathurā Museum, which bears an inscription in Mauryan Brāhmī. The Barōda figure, when entire, must have exceeded the Parkham one, and can have been hardly less than double life-size.

“ Additional proof of the prevalence of Nāga worship

in ancient Mathurā is afforded by an inscribed statuette which was being worshipped as Dāu-jī (i.e. Baldēv) in a temple in the city of Mathurā, but which undoubtedly represents a Nāga. The inscription, which is dated in the year 52, shows that this statuette was made during the reign of Huvishka and is only twelve years posterior to the Nāga statue of Chhargāōn, which was set up in the year 40 and in the reign of the same king. This is particularly interesting, as the Chhargāōn Nāga is very superior in workmanship and style to the statuette in question.

“The inscriptions found on the acquired sculptures are mostly fragmentary. Nearly all of them are written in Brāhmi of the Kushaṇa period, the time when the Mathurā school of sculpture flourished. More particularly may we consider the reign of Huvishka as the great flourishing period of Mathurā art. Among the nine newly recovered epigraphs of the Kushaṇa period no less than six may be assigned to the reign of that monarch, and three of these actually contain his name.

“The sculptures collected by Pandit Radha Krishna also prove that, side by side with Buddhism and Jainism, there flourished in ancient Mathurā the popular cults of the Nāgas and Yakshas. Nāga worship, particularly, must have been very prevalent, considering the great number of Nāga images, all of which are nowadays adored as Dāu-jī or Baldēv. The Nāgas were supposed to reside in rivers, springs, lakes, ponds, and tanks, and to possess power to bring rain. This explains why they were so extensively worshipped by the agricultural population of India. The Yakshas, like the dwarfs of old German mythology, were regarded as keepers of treasure, and Kubēra, the god of wealth, was their chief. Among the sculptures found in the Mathurā district there are numerous statuettes of a corpulent deity, who may be identified with Kubēra or Vaiśravaṇa. Sometimes he is accompanied



1



3



2



4

by a female figure holding a child. Sculptures of the latter type remind us of the well-known groups of Kubēra and Hārītī, which have been found in the Peshāwar district.

“Images of the goddess of fertility occur also at Mathurā. I may mention an interesting sculpture obtained from the village of Tāyāpur, 2 miles north of Mathurā on the road to Rāyā. It represents a female deity seated with an infant in her lap and four children between her feet. The pedestal is carved with a group of children at play. There can be little doubt that there exists a close connexion between this sculpture and effigies of Hārītī, the goddess of fertility and queen of Yakshas. The villagers of Tāyāpur worshipped the image as Gāndhārī, the mother of Kauravas.

“In the course of my stay at Mathurā I had an opportunity to visit the site of Mōrā, 7 miles west of the city and north of the road to Gōvardhan. This site has yielded the famous Mōrā slab inscription,¹ which contains the name of the great-satrap Rājūvula. Unfortunately, this inscription was partly defaced at the time of its discovery by General Cunningham, and since then it has become still more obliterated. It is now preserved in the Mathurā Museum. On my visit to Mōrā I noticed the remains of a building, probably a temple, constructed of very large bricks. Round about were considerable fragments of images in the style of the Kushana period. They appear to belong to four standing figures, three male and one female. It has occurred to me that this discovery may be connected with the mention of ‘images of the five heroes’ (*pañcha-vīrānām pratimā*) in the Mōrā inscription. ‘The five heroes’ are probably the five sons of Pāṇḍu, and it is a plausible conjecture that the

¹ Cf. Cunningham, A.S.R., vol. xx, pp. 48 f., pl. v, No. 4. The designation “well-inscription” is misleading, as the slab does not appear *originally* to have belonged to a well.

fragments belonged to the images mentioned in the inscription. If this identification is correct, we may further assume that the female image represents Draupadī, the spouse of the five Pāṇḍava brothers.

“The discoveries of images of the five Pāṇḍava heroes belonging to the Kushaṇa period would, in itself, be a find of considerable archæological interest. There is yet another historical question to be mentioned. The inscription on the female image is incomplete, but we can still trace the name of Huvishka, in whose reign it was apparently dated. The slab inscription contains, as we saw, the name of the great-satrap Rājūvula, or, properly speaking, it mentions the son of Rājūvula. If, indeed, these two inscriptions are contemporaneous, it would follow that Rājūvula and his son were not independent rulers of Mathurā, but were governors under the Kushaṇa king Huvishka. This conclusion would not only be supported by the palæographical evidence of the two inscriptions in question, but would find a parallel in the Sārnāth Bodhisattva inscription in which two satraps are mentioned, the great-satrap Vanashpara and the satrap Kharapallāna, who evidently were deputies of King Kaṇishka, in the third year of whose reign the epigraph is dated.

“In view of the importance of the questions involved, I have arranged for the exploration of the Mōrā site. It is hoped that excavation round the ruined temple will lead to the discovery of further sculptural remains, and thus enable us to decide whether indeed the fragments found on the surface belonged to images of the five Pāṇḍavas and their consort Draupadī. The work will be carried out under the direct supervision of Pandit Radha Krishna, who has given such signal proof of his intelligent interest in the antiquities of Mathurā.”

The sculpture figured in Pl. VIII, 2, which is among those collected by the Pandit, belongs, according to the

inscription on its base, to the reign of Huvishka, and is particularly interesting, inasmuch as the figure is attired in the Indo-Scythian dress depicted on the coins of the Kushāṇa emperors and on the bronze casket from Kaṇishka's Stūpa at Peshawar. On that casket the emperor Kaṇishka is shown in precisely the same attitude as this statue, holding a lotus in his right hand and an uncertain object (? purse) in his left, and there can be little doubt that he is there portrayed as the donor of the casket and of the stūpa which enshrined it. A similar figure is that referred to on p. 148 above, which Mr. Cousens justifiably identifies as the donor of the Stūpa at Mirpur Khās. It seems probable, therefore, that this Mathurā sculpture also represents the donor of some Stūpa or other holy memorial, near which it was erected.

RĀMATĪRTHAM

In⁴ the Madras Presidency, Mr. Rea continued his excavation of the Buddhist Monastery at Rāmatīrtham in the Vizagapatam District. "Several other buildings," he writes, "chiefly *chaityas* and cells for the monks, were unearthed, and the whole range of structures that exist on the long rocky platform on the hill was exposed. Among these remains there was a singular lack of small objects of interest, but in this respect they resembled the Śāṅkaram ruins. At that place, the bulk of the finds of small inscribed and other objects was obtained at the black ashes deposits lower down on the hill side. This being so, similar deposits were searched for at Rāmatīrtham, and were at last discovered about half-way down the hill, and directly below the cliff on which the monastery stands. These deposits are of some considerable extent, and are from 10 to 12 feet in depth. They are thickly mixed with broken pottery to the very bottom, and in them were found a number of iron

implements and other small articles. The deposits are formed from the debris of a village once attached to the monastery as well as from the refuse of the monastery itself, which must have been thrown over its walls on to this ground below."

YATHEMYO

In Burma, the excavations at Yathemyo, in the Prome District, were taken up again by Mr. Taw Sein Ko, and fresh ground was broken at the Singyidaing, Atwin Muktaw, and Kanthonzindaung Pagodas. Of his work on this site Mr. Taw Sein Ko sends the following account: "Among the finds made at the Singyidaing Pagoda, which consisted chiefly of terra-cotta tablets, there is a small headless figure of the Buddha carved in light porous stone, which the Burmese call 'Andagu' (Pl. VIII, 4). It is anatomically well moulded, and its workmanship forms a striking contrast, in neatness and finish, to that of the votive tablets. It is the first of its kind ever discovered at Prome.

"Among the mounds of debris which were discovered at Hnawza, the one marking the site of the Atwin Muktaw Pagoda is the largest. It measures about 174 feet in diameter at the base, and 39 feet in height, and local tradition assigns it to the early centuries before the Christian era. No evidence has yet been discovered to confirm this date, but a find which was made here is well worth some notice. It is a fragmentary stone with the figure of an ogre cut upon it in low relief. Half of the upper part is missing. The ogre is represented as holding with both hands a club placed on his right shoulder. It was discovered in the core of the pagoda, and was probably placed there as a guardian of its valuable contents (Pl. VIII, 3). There is a superstitious belief among the Burmans that such figures become animated with life whenever sacrilege is committed on

a sacred shrine. The figure is much defaced, and its date cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

“To the south of Hmawza, there is a low range of hills isolating Thayekittaya (Śrīkṣētrā) from the Irrawaddy River. Almost every peak on it is crowned by a pagoda, which is now a mass of debris. There are indications that, at some ancient period, the hillsides were used for burying the funeral urns of the Pyu, who are known as Piu or P'iao in the Chinese annals of the T'ang dynasty (618-907 A.D.). They are now used for a utilitarian purpose, that is, for quarrying gravel for the railway and public roads. On the top of a hill, which is known as 'Kanthonzindaung', a small mound of debris was discovered with a low depression in the centre. It was opened and some interesting finds were made, most of which consist of terra-cotta votive tablets. A great number of these were found a few feet below the surface on the eastern side of the mound. One of them is illustrated in Pl. VIII, 1. On its obverse face, is the figure of a Bōdhisattva with an aureoled head. On his right, is a small Stūpa, and on his left a flower. The palms of both hands rest on the knees and the right foot hangs down. On the proper right of the figure is a legend which appears to be the Buddhist creed in Sanskrit.¹ On the reverse face of the tablet are some characters in an unknown language, which I imagine may be Pyu.”

OTHER EPIGRAPHICAL FINDS

In conclusion let me add the following note with which Mr. Venkayya, the Government Epigraphist, has favoured me regarding the latest finds in the epigraphical line, apart from those already mentioned.

“The earliest inscription discovered in the Western

¹ [These tablets are of a type frequently met with on Buddhist sites in India, and there can be little doubt, I think, that they were stamped with dies brought from India. They belong to the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.—J. H. M.]

Circle during the last field season was found at Sakrāi in the Jaipur state. It is dated in Saṃvat 879 and records the building of a *maṇḍapa* in front of the goddess Śāṅkarā (now called Śākambharī). At Chātsū, 26 miles south of Jaipur, is an epigraph which belongs to an entirely new Guhila dynasty hitherto unknown from other records. The inscription is not dated, but it cannot be later than the tenth century A.D., to judge from the characters. The Guhila king Bālāditya is here said to have erected a temple of Murāri (Vishṇu) in memory of his dead queen Raṭṭavā, daughter of the Chāhamāna prince Śivarāja. From certain short inscriptions at Jiṅ-mātā¹ in the Śēkhāvāṭi province of the Jaipur state (not far from Sakrāi) we get the date Vikrama 1162 for the Chāhamāna king Pṛithvirāja I, and Vikrama 1196 for Arṇōrāja of the same family. A certain Durgarāja is mentioned with the date Saṃvat 982 in an epigraph from Pushkar, now removed to the Ajmer Museum.

"In the Southern Circle, the Assistant Superintendent and his staff visited 80 villages belonging to eleven different districts, and copied nearly 800 stone inscriptions. As in previous years, several natural caves with rock-cut beds and Brāhmī inscriptions were discovered in the Madura district. In some of the caves, figures of Jaina saints, with Vaṭṭeḷuttu inscriptions on their pedestals, have also been found. The Brāhmī inscriptions may be assigned to the third or second century B.C.

"An important find is the copper-plate charter of the early Chalukya king Vikramāditya I (obtained from a native of Gadval in the Nizam's Dominions). It is dated in Śaka-Saṃvat 596 (corresponding to A.D. 674)

¹ [The temple in which these inscriptions occur was found by Mr. Bhandarkar in the *jahāgir* of Khaṇḍelā, in the midst of a thick jungle. Only the *sabhāmaṇḍapa* and parts of the outside shrine wall are now preserved of the old structure. Mr. Bhandarkar states that the pillars of the hall are "deeply and elegantly carved in the pot and foliage style, and, though perhaps not earlier than the ninth, are certainly not later than the tenth century A.D."—J. H. M.]

and the 20th year of the king's reign. He bears the titles *Anivārīta*, *Śrīvallabha*, *Raṇarasika*, and *Rājamalla*, and claims to have caused the destruction of the Mahāmalla family (i.e. of the Pallavas of Kāñchī).¹ The grant recorded in the inscription was made at the request of Queen Gaṅga-Mahādēvī, while the king's 'victorious army having entered the Chōlika province (*viśhaya*) was encamped in Uragapura situated on the southern bank of the Kāvērī'. This invasion of the Chōla country evidently took place after the defeat of the Pallava king Paramēśvaravarman and the capture of Kāñchī. Uragapura, on the southern bank of the Kāvērī, where Vikramaditya's victorious army was encamped, seems to be the Sanskritised form of Uraiyyūr, the ancient Chōla capital. In other inscriptions of the Chalukyas of Bādāmi hitherto known, we are told in a general way that the Chōlas, Pāṇdyas, and Kēralas were overcome. But the Gadval plates state specifically that the Chalukyas actually penetrated as far south as the banks of the river Kāvērī during the reign of Vikramāditya I.

"In Southern India considerable importance was attached in ancient times to stone inscriptions. When any temples had to be rebuilt, all the records found on its walls were first copied into a book and then re-engraved on the new walls on completion of the building operations. Re-copying of ancient inscriptions had been noticed in previous years at Tirupati and Tiruvallam in the North Arcot District, and at Tirumalavāḍi in the Trichinopoly District. The last field season has brought to light a fourth case of this kind. During the reign of the Chōla king Kulōttunga I (A.D. 1070-1118) the temple at Siddhalingamaḍam in the South Arcot District was rebuilt and copies of old inscriptions, which had already existed on the walls of the original building, were re-engraved. Hence we find

¹ This inscription resembles closely the Haidarābād plate of the same king in the historical portion. The latter is, however, not dated.

a number of early Chōla and Rāshtrakūṭa records in the temple written in comparatively later characters.

“ The other inscriptions discovered in the Southern Circle belong to the following dynasties :—The Pallavas, the Gaṅga-Pallavas, the Western Gaṅgas, the Western Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi, the Rāshtrakūṭas, the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṅgi, the Chōlas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Kēraḷas of Koṅgu, the Hōysaḷas, the Kākatiyas, the Redḍis, the Vijayanagara kings, and the Quṭb Shāhīs of Golconda.”

VII

ANOTHER UNKNOWN LANGUAGE FROM EASTERN TURKESTAN

By A. COWLEY

IT is only with the greatest diffidence that I offer the following notes on the document, in a hitherto unknown script, of which a facsimile is appended in the accompanying plate. My remarks may appear premature, and in any case the results obtained are very slight, but it was thought advisable to publish them as a preliminary notice, in the hope that some more competent scholar might be able to help in the decipherment.

The document is one of eleven excavated by Dr. Stein in the course of his explorations along the ancient Chinese *Limes* which he discovered in the desert extending from the oasis of Tun-huang on the extreme western confines of the Chinese province of Kan-su towards Lop-nor, the terminal marshes of the Tarim River. A preliminary account of these explorations carried out in the spring of 1907 has been given by Dr. Stein in his paper "Explorations in Central Asia 1906-08", in the *Geographical Journal* for September, 1909, pp. 33 sqq.

According to the information supplied to me by Dr. Stein these documents, all of which are on paper, were brought to light by the clearing of a narrow passage within the modest quarters which adjoined one of the ruined watch towers on the ancient border wall, marked T. XII in Dr. Stein's survey. They were found in the midst of a thick deposit of refuse of all kinds which filled the passage, and at about 3 feet above the floor. On a somewhat lower level in the same rubbish heap there were found three Chinese documents on wood, with writing of the Han period. Amongst other Chinese records on wooden slips recovered from adjoining small

rooms, two bear exact dates corresponding to the years 3 A.D. and 20 A.D. The westernmost portion of the *Limes* where this particular ruin is situated is proved by an abundance of accurately dated Chinese records to have been regularly garrisoned from the beginning of the first century B.C. down to the first half of the first century A.D. But the ancient trade route from Tun-huang to Lop-nor and thence through Chinese Turkestan to the West, which the *Limes* was intended to protect, remained in use for caravans during subsequent periods, at least intermittently, and as its line passes within a mile of the watch station T. XII, the temporary occupation of the ruined quarters in the latter by passing travellers during the early centuries of our era appears to Dr. Stein very likely.

With regard to the question of the age of the documents in an unknown script recovered from T. XII, Dr. Stein points out to me that the only other specimen of this identical script discovered by him in this region is a fragmentary tablet of wood showing a few words written in ink. This was found on a ruined watch tower, T. VIc, guarding the western flank of the *Limes* and situated at a direct distance of over 22 miles to the south of the nearest point of the ancient trade-route. A variety of archaeological observations induce Dr. Stein to believe that this fragment must have been left behind during the period when the frontier line was still actually held by a garrison.

Another chronological indication is supplied by the discovery of a small paper fragment, showing the same script, which Dr. Stein excavated in December, 1906, in a large refuse heap of the ancient site in the northern part of the Lop-nor desert, some 350 miles west of Tun-huang (see *Geographical Journal*, 1909, pp. 27 sq.). This site, according to the conclusive evidence of dated Chinese records, must have been finally abandoned in the first half of the fourth century A.D. It is significant that it lay on the northern branch of the above-mentioned

ancient trade-route from Tun-huang to the West, which branch from that period onwards became impassable through desiccation of the desert region. It was the thought of these several local indications which led Dr. Stein in his above-quoted paper (p. 35) to hazard the question: "Are these [documents in an unknown script resembling Aramaic] perhaps in some Iranian tongue, and were they left behind by some early traders from Persia or Western Turkestan coming for the silk of the distant Seres?"

Of the eleven documents excavated at T. XII five were entirely or nearly complete, being found neatly folded and still tied with string. One among them, the largest, measuring when unfolded $16\frac{3}{4}$ by $9\frac{1}{2}$ inches and showing sixty lines of writing, was found wrapped up in silk and thus placed within an inscribed envelope of a stout, probably woollen, fabric. The other six documents were also folded, but were in a more or less fragmentary state. The paper has not yet been scientifically examined, but closely resembles in appearance that of Chinese and Kharoshthi documents discovered by Dr. Stein at the site north of Lop-nor, and belonging to the second half of the third and commencement of the fourth century A.D.


As the paper was very much "perished" the work of opening and flattening it required great skill and patience. It has been most successfully accomplished by Messrs. Maltby and Son, of Oxford, to whom I am much indebted for the interest they have taken in the matter. The partly legible writing on the outside of some of the documents was recognized by Dr. Stein as being in an Aramaic alphabet, and knowing my interest in that branch of palæography he very kindly handed them over to me. I expected to supply a translation of them as soon as they were unfolded, but up to the present I must confess to being defeated.

The alphabet is evidently Aramaic in origin. It has

a curiously familiar appearance, and is perhaps the written counterpart of that found in the Sassanian inscriptions of Hajiabad and elsewhere. Unfortunately no really satisfactory faesimiles of these inscriptions exist and the legends on coins do not give much help. The ordinary representations of the Sassanian alphabet will, however, explain several characters in this writing, though others are widely different. The direction of the writing is clearly from right to left.

As to the language, the only really certain fact is that it is not Aramaic or any other Semitic dialect. Naturally I looked again at F. W. K. Müller's excellent papers in the publications of the Prussian Academy, dealing with various fragments from the Turfan region, but none of these seem to have any relation to the present documents. There can be no doubt that the documents are letters or dispatches (see below). They are therefore not necessarily in any language which may have been spoken at the place in which they were found. Considering the character and main purpose of the ancient trade-route along which they occur, their language, as well as their script, is more likely to belong to the West. One or two words can be read with tolerable certainty as Aramaic, although the rest are certainly not Semitic. Taking these few poor facts in connexion with the resemblance of the alphabet to that of the Sassanian inscriptions, we seem forced to conclude that the language is some form of Iranian in which, as in Pahlavi, Aramaic words were used.

It has been mentioned that the documents are letters or dispatches. They are written on one side of the paper only, and on the outside of six of them, as folded, are the more or less legible remains of a few lines of writing arranged like the address in mediaeval Oriental letters, thus—



If this is the address, one side must mean "to X" and the other "from Y". As a matter of fact, where the outer inscription is legible, one side always begins with a word which can only be read as 𐭮 *min*, the Aramaic-Pahlavi preposition "from", and the other side with what seems to be the Pahlavi *vad* = Aram. 𐤆 "to". The view that this is really an address is confirmed by the fact that the words introduced by "to" are repeated at the beginning of the document.

The address may be expected to take the form "to his Excellency X from his humble servant Y", or "to X, the general commanding at Z, from Y". As the initial words are used also on the outside, they must be some merely complimentary formula or title. The formula is the same in all the documents in which it is legible, but the following remarks refer only to the text reproduced in the plate, leaving out of consideration for the present the question whether all the letters, which are in different hands, are addressed to the same person. The word after *vad* begins with an evident 𐭮 and ends with a character which elsewhere seems to be a vowel. I suggest that the intervening character is a 𐭬, and that the word is 𐭮𐭬 *bagī*, which occurs on Sassanian coins, and in the inscription of Naqsh-i-Rustam is translated by the Greek *θεός*, being a derivative from the Old Persian *baga* = "God". Originally no doubt it was equivalent to *minochetr*, used of kings on coins, etc. = "offspring of the gods", but here, if the person addressed was not a king, probably in a modified sense, "excellent." The next word begins with a character like the 𐭬, but really different and always distinguished from it, the left-hand stroke being curved, whereas that of 𐭬 is straight. It is evidently the Sassanian 𐭮. Then follows a character something like the Sassanian 𐭮 and like (but really distinct from ?) the *i* in *bagī*; then a Sassanian 𐭮 (𐭮); then a very common letter like the Sassanian 𐭮, which may be the vowel *a*;

and lastly the vowel *i* again. The word may therefore be read הוּתְאִי, Pahl. *khûtâi* (mod. Persian خدای) = "master". The first three words, then, on the address and in the letter may be translated "to his excellency the governor". If this is right, we have the values of ת, י, מ, י, ח, ו, ד, ג, ב, א.

After these three words there follow, both in the first line of the letter and on the address, two words which must be either the names or a further description of the person to whom the letter is sent. Then in the first line and also on the *left*-hand side of the address there is a word which, since it is followed here, as elsewhere, by מן "from", can only mean "sent" or "a missive". The first character is most like a פ; the third, judging from a subsequent word, seems to be ש; and the fourth is the ת as in הוּתְאִי. It looks as though the second letter must therefore be a ר, making פרשת = فرست = "something sent." After מן there are two words which must be the names or description of the sender. Then two words which occur in the same position in the first line of several of the documents, and which must be some form of salutation, since the phrase does not appear in the addresses or elsewhere. The latter of the two words ends with a ה, preceded by a character which can only be ל (obliterated in the facsimile, but clear in other documents). It seems probable that the word is the Aram.-Pahl. שלם *shalam* = "peace", the first character being the same as the ש in פרשת. The preceding word, which must be transliterated ילה, looks as though it might be the Pahlavi corruption of אלה "a thousand", but I hardly like to suggest this. If these words are rightly read we have the additional values of ל, פ, ר, ש.

So far the results seem fairly probable. The proof of them depends on the application of these values to other words in the documents. We ought in fact to be able to

read the rest of the text with at least a small measure of success. This, I confess, I cannot do; but considering the very great difficulty of elucidating the Sassanian inscriptions, I am inclined to hope that the reason lies in my own ignorance. I will therefore only add a few further identifications.

The most commonly recurring word, appearing in every line of the present document, ought, according to the values ascertained, to be read **אהריר**. Since it is used so often, it can only be either the verb "to be" or some common conjunction like "and", "item". It is not likely to be a substantive, since it is found in all the documents, and they can hardly all relate entirely to the same thing. It is natural to think of the Aram.-Pahl. **אהר** used frequently for "then", amounting to little more than "and". That the same form should serve for **ר** and **ר**, as in some forms of Aramaic, would not be surprising, but there can hardly be two forms for **ר**, namely this and the form in **פרשת**. Also the word never occurs in the bare form **אהר**, but always with two additional letters. The last of these ought to be **ר** as in **פרשת**, but perhaps they are meant to be distinguished, since the forms are slightly different. The word takes suffixes, as conjunctions regularly do in Pahlavi. They are **ם**- in l. 3 (twice) and l. 4 (twice), **ת**- in l. 7 and **תן**- in l. 6, **שו**- in l. 8. I take these to be the suffixes of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons respectively, corresponding to the Pahlavi *-m*, *-t*, *-sh*, with a conjunction, "and I," "and you," "and he." One of these suffixes, **תן**-, appears again in l. 6 appended to a word **אפיר** (?), which is used almost equally often in apparently the sense of a conjunction in other documents. It seems to be the Aram.-Pahl. **אק** with the same termination as in **אהריר** (?). With regard to the termination **ת**- (l. 7), there can be no doubt that this is a final form of **ת**, as in the Sassanian alphabet, and not a **ק**, which it more resembles: note e.g. the latter part of the

fourth word in l. 1 and the sixth word in l. 2. However, the form without a tail is used as final in **פרשת** and sometimes elsewhere. Other words recognizable are Aram.-Pahl. **לא** "not" in ll. 5, 6, 7 (twice), 8; **ך** Persian **یک** "one", "a" (probably not **וך** Aram.-Pahl. "this"), ll. 2, 4, 7, elsewhere **כי**, sometimes apparently connected with its noun, as **יכרחמי** l. 2, **יכרבין** (?) l. 2; Aram.-Pahl. **כל** "all" in ll. 3, 7, 8 (twice), cf. also **כליכי** "each one", l. 8. Perhaps, too, **בח** l. 7 = **بھ** "good", and **דולך** (with **ך** for **ك** as in Pahlavi) = **دلج** "a measure", l. 8.

Further, the numerals appear to be written as in Pahlavi, e.g. l. 2 **سج** = 4; l. 3 **سج گن** = 8, with a suffix. In fact, in ll. 2-4 we seem to have an enumeration of objects, the higher numbers being in ciphers and **ך** "one" being used several times. The number in l. 3 preceded by **כל** is perhaps the total of the preceding, but as the numerals are rather broken it is not possible to be sure of this. In l. 9 (margin) the "one" is written with a cipher, instead of **ך**, after **כל**. The line seems to mean ". . . **לרכי** 3, each one (being) **מרך**, (and) **מאיי** (? numeral) each one (being) . . ."

In conclusion, I give a table of the probable values of the characters, a hand-copy of the address on the back, a list of words found in the document, and a reduced facsimile of it from a photograph. The table of characters contains all the forms found, seventeen or nineteen in number. No sign has been identified as **ז** or medial **ן**, which must occur, so that some signs must have double values, or at any rate are not distinguishable. Possibly the doubtful equivalents of **י** and **ך** correspond to **ז** and **ן**. There seem to be no signs for **ה**, **ט**, **ע**, **ק**. The last sign in the table is perhaps a final form of the letter doubtfully given as **י**, but the larger form of it is used as a cipher. The last but one, which only occurs once, is probably a high numeral, as it precedes numeral units in l. 3.

Alphabet

א	א	}	(final)	ן
ב	ב	ח		ס
ג	ג	-		ע
ד	ד	ו		פ
ו	ו	ז		צ
-	ז	ח	?	כ
ח	ח	ט		ש
י	י	ת	(final)	ת
כ	כ	מ		numeral
ל	ל	נ		?
מ	מ	ס		?

Address


פולטנה	}	{	פולטנה
פולטנה			פולטנה
פולטנה			פולטנה



List of words

(cf. address) 7	זנהך	line 4	צצחק
5, 2	עלעק	2	צצח[ק]
3	בע	6	צעלצעמ
8, 3	כהלך	7	צבלצא
		8	צעלצחש
(elsewhere) 1	עך	5, 2, 2, 2	צמענה
8	כחלצן	7, 7, 6, 5	
(?) 8, 8	כחל	4, 4, 3, 3	צמענהא
(+ ad.) 1	מחמצה	8	צמענהש
4	מעלני	7	צמענהק
5	מעלק	6	צמענהרע
(+ ad.) 1	מעפל	6	צענהרע
		6	צחל
3	נענצעך		
4	נעצלחל		
7, 4, 2	נך	2	נח
2	נדעלעט	2	נחצצ
2	נדלעש	3	נחצלע
1	נלפ	(+ ad.) 1	נחה
1	נחצצלה	5	נעצא
(+ ad.) 1	נלצנעל[ל]	6	נעצא
(+ ad.) 1	נלצנעלדחה	6	נעק
3	נלען	7	נע

1	[א]ן	4, 4	נלל
7	אללן	5	נללולל
9	אלל	5	נלל
2	מלללללללל	3	נלללל
9	מללל	2	נללל
7	מלל	(?) 5, 2	(ל)לל
5	לללללל	3	(ל)ללללללללל
3	לללל	3	(2)ללל
6	ללללל	9	לללללל
5	ללללל	8, 8, 7, 3	לל
6	ללללל	8	ללללל
7	לללל	9, 9	ללל
(+ ad.) 1	ללללל		
4	לללל	8, 7, 7, 6, 5	לל
6	לללללל	7	ללללללל
7	לללל	9, 4, 4	לללל
3	לללללל		
4	לללללל	9	ללללל
(cf. 3, 7) 2	ללל	3	ללל
1	ללללללל	5	לללל
1	לל[ל]ל	6	ללל
4	לללל	address	לל
5	ללללל		



DOCUMENT FROM E. TURKISTAN IN ARAMAIC CHARACTERS.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

THE SANCHI EDICT OF ASOKA

The short and much damaged edict of Aśōka at Sāñchi is not without interest, because it supplements and explains the still more fragmentary Allahabad edict and the mutilated fourth line of the Sārnāth edict. The beginning of the Sāñchi edict is lost, and the legible words of the first and second of the preserved lines do not yield a complete sentence. The end of the second line and the beginning of the third have not yet been deciphered completely.

Bühler in *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 2, p. 367, read:—

[2] . *ta pa* [3] . [. *ikhī(?)tam*] . *m . . ri(?)* . [*ke ?*]

M. Boyer in *Journal Asiatique*, série 10, vol. 10 (1907), p. 123, transcribed the same portion thus:—

[2] [*hu*]ta pa- [3] . *ti[kam]tam* . *ma[bhe]ri [lo]ke*

His conjectural restoration (p. 124) runs:—

[2] *huta pa-* [3] *chamtikamtam dhamnabheri loka*

Finally, Professor Venis in *Jour. and Proc. As. Soc. Bengal*, new series, vol. 3 (1907), p. 4, read:—

[2] *otupa* [3] *vatike bhante madhūriyake*

A careful examination of the existing traces of letters enables me to state with perfect confidence that the actual reading of the stone is:—

[2] *putupa-* [3] [*po*]tike *chamtamasūriyike*

As the facsimile (EI, 2. 369) shows, the first letter cannot be *hu* or *o*, but may be *pe* or *pu*: more probably the latter, which is required by the context. The first letter of l. 3 is lost, but can be supplied with certainty. The third is *kam* or *ke*, more probably the latter. The

fourth is distinctly *chan̄n̄*, not *tan̄n̄* or *blan̄n̄*. The fifth is destroyed, but the outlines of *da* can still be traced. The seventh letter is not *bhe* or *dhū*, but *sū*. The ninth letter is surely not *lo*, but *ya* or, more probably, *yi*. That my reading is correct, can be proved from the circular part of edict 7 on the Delhi Siwālik pillar, l. 10, where Dr. Fleet's excellent plate (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. 13, p. 310) reads distinctly :—

putāpapotike chaṇḍamasuliyike hotu ti

The adverb *chaṇḍamasūriyike* corresponds to the well-known term *āchandrārkan̄* of later records, and exhibits, like *putapapotike*, the Prākṛit affix *ika*, which we find also in two Pallava inscriptions and on the Koṇḍamudi plates; see *vadhanike* and *vejayike* in *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 1, p. 6, text l. 9, and vol. 6, p. 87, text l. 5 f., p. 317, text l. 8 f.

In the last line the stone does not read *saṅghasa maye*, as Bühler and M. Boyer have transcribed, but *saṅghe samage*.

I now subjoin a translation of the preserved portion of the Sāñchi edict :—

Translation

“ . . . path is prescribed both for the monks and for the nuns.

“ As long as (my) sons and great-grandsons (shall reign, and) as long as the moon and the sun (shall shine), the monk or nun who shall cause divisions in the Saṅgha¹ should be caused to put on white robes² and to reside in

¹ This translation is based on M. Boyer's explanation of the words *ye saṅghaṇ bhokhati* (p. 130 f.).

² M. Boyer (p. 130) quotes a passage from Buddhaghōsha in which Aśoka is said to have given white robes (*satakāni rathāni*) to the heretical monks whom he expelled: see *Vinayapitaka*, ed. Oldenberg, vol. 3, p. 312. The proper colour of the robes of a Buddhist monk is yellow.

a non-residence.¹ For what is my desire? That the Saṅgha may be united² (and) of long duration.”

E. HULTZSCH.

ON SOME IRREGULAR USES OF ME AND TE IN EPIC
SANSKRIT, AND SOME RELATED PROBLEMS

In his “Grammatical Notes”, JRAS., 1910, pp. 468–74, Mr. Keith undertakes to disprove any alleged uses of *me* and *te* in the Rāmāyaṇa other than as datives and genitives. Some other apparent irregularities are also treated by him. This article came to my notice just as I was preparing to take up my new duties as Ethnologist at the Bureau of American Ethnology, so that I have not had the full amount of time that I should ordinarily desire in replying to it. But as there is but little likelihood of my having more leisure in the near future, I think it as well to say a few words now.

I am glad to acknowledge that he has properly corrected me on several individual points (see below), but I regret to state that as a whole I am unconvinced by his arguments. We differ radically in principle.

We read (p. 469) “though in any case arguments from Pāli or Prākṛit syntax to Sanskrit are apt to be quite unscientific and lead to unsound results”. I am quite sure that a careful perusal of Franke’s *Die Casuslehre des Pāṇini*, BB. xvi, pp. 64–120, would make him exceedingly reluctant to make such a sweeping statement. Compare Delbrück, Brugmann-Delbrück, *Grundriss*, iii, 86; Jacobi, *Erz.*, p. vi; Kielhorn, JRAS., 1898, p. 18. This last reference may be quoted: “In the so-called epic Sanskrit

¹ i.e., a residence unfit for members of the Saṅgha. Professor Venis (loc. cit., p. 3) quotes Buddhaghōṣha’s explanation of the term *anūrāsa*: see *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. 17, p. 388, note 1.

² The word *saṅga*, as well as *bhūta* in l. 3 of the Sārnāth edict, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 8, p. 168, supports my translation of *bhokhata*.

there are not a few forms and constructions which seem to me Pāli rather than Sanskrit."

On p. 474 we read "The use of these forms [*me* and *te* are meant] in other senses in Pāli and Prākṛit is of no value for Vedic or Sanskrit". In so far as both Pāli and Prākṛit share a number of lexical and grammatical features with Vedic as opposed to Sanskrit (Pischel, *Grammatik*, section 6; Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit*, pp. 150 ff., and the literature cited in these references), in principle there is no reason why Pkt. *me* and *te* (*de*) cannot be used as arguments in favour of the view that in Veda *me* and *te* may be used as accusatives. Cf. Pischel, GGA., 1877, p. 1066. Whether they actually are is an entirely different matter. It is an acknowledged fact that Epic Sanskrit teems with Middle Indic forms (Kielhorn, JRAS., 1898, p. 18; Hopkins, *Great Epic*, pp. 261 ff., especially p. 263. foot-note 2: "I think the more the epic is studied the more Prākṛit will be found"). To cite a few such cases: *eṣo* (for *eṣa*): *gāvas* as acc. pl.; the accusatives *duhitām*, *svasām*; *mātā* as vocative; *mātavaḥ* as acc. pl.; *durvacas* as nom. sing. masc.; *-antī* for *-atī*: *sma*, *brumī*, *dulmī*, *kurnī*, *sambhriyantu* (passive with active termination): gerunds in *-ya* for *-tvā*: causatives in *-āpaya*. Citations for all of these will be easily found in my "Linguistic Archaisms of the Rāmāyaṇa", JAOS., xxv¹, 89-145. Hence the occurrence of *me* or *te* in other functions than dat. and gen. in Epic Sanskrit should not surprise us.

Mr. Keith on p. 472 says that the argument available from the use of *me* and *te* as accusatives found by Pischel in R̥gveda is of no weight. I quite agree with him that there is a great gulf between R̥gveda and the Epic: but once admitting this apparently irregular use of *me* and *te* in R̥gveda (which Mr. Keith does not), I see no reason why *per se* we should reject the possibility of *me* and *te* occurring in the Epic in other functions than dat. and gen., for the reason that we find Vedic archaisms (despite

Böhtlingk and Jacobi) in the Epics. Such are: the sandhi of pragṛhya vowels; "double sandhi"; acc. pl. neut. of *a*-stems in *-ā*; nom. pl. of *u*-stems in *-vas*; acc. pl. of *i*-stems in *-ayas*; *gās* as nom. pl.; nom. pl. of *ī*-stems in *-īs*; acc. pl. of *ī*-stems in *-yas*; *āpas* as acc. pl.; a few isolated agreements in the voice of certain verbs: improper subjunctive; *bravīta* as 2nd pers. pl. imp.; the participle *stuvāna*-; sporadic absence of reduplication in the perfect; perfect middle participle: absence of augment (not rare); the use of *i* in the futures *jayiṣya*- (J.B.E.: *jeṣya*- V. +), *svapiṣya*- (AV.R.: *svapsya*- B. +); *mīthuna* as a masc. noun; *surīṣṛpa* as a neuter; *rodasī* construed with a singular; a number of verbal forms. These will be found duly registered in my "Linguistic Archaisms", etc. Hopkins, *Great Epic*, pp. 261 ff., should also be consulted, as well as Holtzmann's monograph on the language of the Mahābhārata.

Now if the use of *me* and *te* other than as datives and genitives is admitted for both Vedic and Middle Indic, then to a still greater degree there is no inherent reason why we should not find use also in the Epic. For there are some, though very few, agreements between Vedic, Epic Sanskrit, and Middle Indie as opposed to Classical Sanskrit. Such are more free sandhi and the stem *apsarā*- (Pkt. *accharā*- phonetically). Note too the construction of *mā* with augmented tense in ŚB., TA., KS.: the shortening of final vowels in compounds in ApŚS.: with Epic (R.) *patnīṣu* compare TB. and ApŚS. *patnībhis*.

Now let us turn to the individual cases. First we take up *me* as instrumental. The only case I claim is at iv, 14. 14: *anṛtaṁ noktapurvaṁ me ciram kṛchre tiṣṭhatā*. Mr. Keith here suggests a double construction. In principle this is quite permissible. And Mr. Keith lays emphasis on the fact that *me* and *te* as instrumentals in Pāli are by no means certain. I go further, and admit that I have never met either in Pāli where they must be

instrumentals and cannot be simple genitives. And not a single example of *me* cited by Pischel as instrumental is necessarily to be taken as such. Nevertheless *me* as instrumental cannot be denied to certain Middle Indic dialects, namely, certain Asokan ones, as Wackernagel pointed out long ago (KZ. xxiv, 599). I may perhaps be permitted to go into this further, and add more proof for his contention, as of recent years I have devoted considerable attention to the Asokan inscriptions. We have in the third edict of the Kālsī, Jaugāḍa, and Dhauli redactions of the Fourteen Edicts of Asoka, at iii. 7, iii, 10, iii, 9 respectively, *me* in concord with an instrumental. The Gīrnār version (at iii, 1) has *mayā* as the correspondent to Māgadhan¹ *me*, which accordingly must be an instrumental. The Mansēhra corresponding passage is nearly valueless as it teems with Māgadhisms, and the Shāhbāzgarhī one happens to have a lacuna where we otherwise would find a correspondent to *me*.

Similarly, at Dh. v, 22 we have *me* in concord with an instrumental. The Gīrnār text has *mayā* as the correspondent, the Mansēhra and Shāhbāzgarhī versions have *mayā* (vowel quantities are not distinguished in the alphabet in which these versions are written), the Kālsī recension has *mama[yā]*. The Jaugāḍa redaction has a lacuna in the corresponding passage. It will be seen that *me* of the Dhauli redaction here, too, must be an instrumental.

And corresponding to Dhauli *me* at v, 20, the Gīrnār text has *mayā* as the correspondent, the Shāhbāzgarhī

¹ For the benefit of those who are not specialists I mention that it is a recognized fact that the Gīrnār, Shāhbāzgarhī, and Mansēhra redactions of the Fourteen Edicts are translations from an original composed in a Māgadhan dialect, that is, a speech essentially the same as that of the Dhauli, Jaugāḍa, and Kālsī (Edicts 1-14) redactions of the Fourteen Edicts, and that of the various versions of the Seven Pillar Edicts; and that this dialect has left traces in the translations. Such traces are called Māgadhisms, as the dialects of the above-named monuments were Māgadhan.

and Mansehra recensions have *maya*, the Kālsī text has *mamayā*. Here, again, *me* must be an instrumental.

In the dialects of the various versions of the Seven Pillar Edicts *me* is found in concord with an instrumental: see Delhi-Sivalik, i, 1, 2; iv, 1, 2; v, 1, 2; v, 19, 20; vi, 1, 2; vii, 2, 10; Delhi-Mirat, v, 14, 15; Allahabad, i, 1; v, 20; Radhia, i, 1, 2; iv, 14; vi, 14; Mathia, i, 1, 2; iv, 17; v, 14, 15; vi, 16 (1).

By the analogy of Dh. v, 20 we can be sure *me* is an instrumental at ii, 14 of the D.S. redaction of the Seven Pillar Edicts, and similarly in the other versions. The same applies to D.S. iii, 17, 18, and the corresponding passages of the other redactions.

For the construction of the past participle of \sqrt{kr} with the instrumental of the 1st personal pronoun singular see also Dh. vi, 28; J. vi, 1; K. vi, 18; G. vi, 2; Shb. vi, 14; Mans. vi, 27. These references will even further strengthen our belief that *me* can be used as an instrumental.

As I have stated above, Middle Indic forms teem in the Epic, and for this reason, since *me* as an instrumental cannot be denied for certain Asokan dialects, I shall continue to regard *me* in the combination *me-tiṣṭhatā* as a true instrumental. I may add that Pischel adduces but one certain example where *te* is an instrumental in Prākṛit; there are a few other cases in which it is either possible or probable. However, Hemacandra (the only native authority to whom I have access at the present moment) vouches for the form as an instrumental: and in view of Asokan *me* the form is unquestionably genuine.

Let us now turn to *te* as accusative singular. The first case is by far the most important: *apāpān̄ vedmi Sīte te* of the Bombay recension at vii, 49, 10. On p. 470 Mr. Keith remarks: "But Gorresio's edition has *tvām*, and the corruption is obvious." This shows that he is not acquainted with the interrelation with the Bombay

and Bengal redactions of the Rāmāyaṇa. One of the most prominent features of the Bengal text is the suppression of all grammatical deviations from Classical Sanskrit (cf. Jacobi, *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 5, and the literature cited there), typical of the avoidance in the Bengal text of *brūmi* and *bravīhi* of the Bombay version (see section 632 of my essay). The very fact that Gorresio has *tvām* for *te*, so far from being any argument against *te* as accusative, in point of fact is one of the most cogent proofs of its genuineness. When we note that *te* (*de*) as accusative cannot be denied to Prākṛit on the general lines I have indicated above, I think that *te* as accusative in the Bombay redaction should be accepted without question, quite irrespective of whether or not *te* is used as accusative in RV. If it is, then we have an additional argument. But our case does not need it.

Mr. Keith then proceeds to say: "After this we will hardly be inclined to take very seriously the use in vii, 53, 21: *sa te mokṣayitā śāpāt*. The sense is clearly either dative 'for thee', or genitive 'of thee', not an accusative at all." To begin with, I think that I have shown that the previous case of *te* as accusative is not to be dismissed so lightly as Mr. Keith imagines. As the passage under discussion is a difficult one, I give it in full—

*sa te mokṣayitā śāpād
rājais tasmād bhaviṣyasi
kṛtū ca tena kālena
niṣkṛtis te bhaviṣyati.*

An ellipsis occurs in pāda *b*: a past participle is to be supplied.¹ Then we render the above: "He will release thee from the curse, O king, thou wilt become freed from this curse, and at that time thy expiation will be made." That is, *mokṣayitā* is the periphrastic future of *mokṣay-*, requiring an accusative as the direct object. But if

¹ The commentary wrongly supplies *rekūāso* (from v. 18).

bhaviṣyati is to be supplied from pāda *d*, another ellipsis, then of course *mokṣayitā* is a nomen agentis and *te* a genitive.

The parallel of *niṣkrtis te* to *te mokṣayitā* does, indeed, rather favour the last view. But native tradition has preferred the first (comm.: *sa te tvām śapān mokṣayitā*). Under these circumstances I think that an absolute certainty as to whether *te* is accusative or genitive is impossible. As was to be expected, the Bengal text affords no help. As the correspondence cannot be found in Jacobi's *Concordance*, I give it here—

<i>Bombay.</i>	<i>Bengal.</i>
vii, 53, 21a.	vii, 55, 21c.
vii, 53, 21b.	vii, 55, 21d (partially).
vii, 53, 21c.	vii, 55, 22a.
vii, 53, 21d.	vii, 55, 22b.

The Bombay edition of 1895 reads—

sa te mokṣayitā rājāns
tasmāc chāpād bhaviṣyati
kṛtā ca tena kālena
niṣkrtis te bhaviṣyati (vii, 53, 21).

Here all difficulties are removed; *te* must be a genitive. To Mr. Keith this will obviously be the correct reading. But to my mind it is much easier to suppose a corruption of *bhaviṣyasi* in pāda *b* to *bhaviṣyati* than the reverse. The truth is that we have an attempt, and a successful one, at getting rid of a difficult passage exactly as *sa tvām cikṣepa* as a 2nd singular in the Bombay edition of 1902 at v, 67, 13 is replaced by *kṣiptavāns tvam* (G. curiously agrees with By.: see v, 68, 11).

But at the same time, since the Bombay text can be explained by an ellipsis, this particular passage should not be used to prove *te* an accusative. Yet it can legitimately be used to show how *te* came to be felt as such.

In *aham ājñāpayāmi te* at vii, 47. 9. I wrongly followed the commentator in taking *te* as accusative. But Mr. Keith's example from R. vi, 103, 10, taken from BR., to show this, is no proof at all. For *ājñāpayā* in the sense of "assure" takes the genitive. See OB., and Williams² under *ājñā* 1.

On p. 471 Mr. Keith discusses *suhṛu mahyam*. He says that this is a clear dative as in RV. *cāruv āyave*. Though "there is a great gulf between Ṛgveda and Epic" (p. 472), he is quite ready to bridge this when it suits his purpose. Speyer, *Ved. u. Skt. Syntax*, section 46 Anm., may be quoted: "die Dat. *mahyam* und *tubhyam* im epischen Dialect und in den Volkssprachen; ja, sie übernehmen so gar auch genetivische Function." For Prākṛit, see Pischel, *Grammatik*, sections 415, 418, 420, 421; Jacobi, *Erz.*, section 43; for Pāli, Kuhn, *Beiträge*, pp. 85, 86; E. Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, pp. 86, 87; Henry, *Précis*, section 147; Torp, *Flexion*, p. 15; Childers, under *aham* and *trām*. Hence I see no reason for altering my view. As I have said before, the Epic dialect teems with Prākṛitisms and Pālicisms.

At vi, 19, 20 I took *me* as an ablative (comm. *mattah*). Mr. Keith (p. 469) says that Homeric *τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο* shows that *me* is a dative. Interesting though this Homeric example be, it is unnecessary to go outside the Indic range for the solution of the problem: *me* is a genitive, pure and simple, as is shown by iii, 51, 27 (see Speyer, *Ved. u. Skt. Syntax*, section 73).

Similarly, at vii, 10, 17 I thought *me* was ablative (comm. *mattah*). Mr. Keith again makes use of Homer to prove the form is a dative. From *vare prasādum viprendrāt*, i, 30, 31, and *varāni ca mat katācāna mānāvendra vṛṇīsva*, Bh.P. iv, 20, 16 (Speyer, *Ved. u. Skt. Syntax*, section 51), it certainly does seem as if *me* were ablative. Or if *me* as accusative were firmly established, one might consider this one: compare *tad vṛṇīsva mām*

Mark.P., 24, 4 (Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, section 95, 5). But inasmuch as *Vyāc* is construed with the genitive (this rarely; ablative usually) I have little doubt that in this case we have an extension of the ablatival genitive (cf. Speyer, *Ved. u. Skt. Syntax*, section 73).

I am glad to be corrected regarding *tubhyam* as a variant to *trayā* at iii, 49, 39, and *yūyam* at v, 64, 17; but I would like to register a protest against the citation of a reprint which has different pagination than the periodical in which the article originally appeared, unless this latter is cited as well (see p. 470, foot-note 3; BB. 16 [1890], pp. 82, 83, are intended).

Mr. Keith (p. 472) would amend *asyā* at v, 16, 11 if it is to be taken as a locative. I am not so sure of that; *vikṣepa* as a 2nd person singular at v, 67, 13 is fully as great an anomaly. In fact, it seems to me that Mr. Keith's passion for emendation (see pp. 470, 472, 473) is a decided weakness to his case.

I regret exceedingly that I cannot go into the question at full length as to whether *me* and *te* as accusatives are to be recognized for the Veda. At present I must content myself with saying R. iv, 20, 10 certainly is not evidence for such alleged use.

In conclusion I add that vol. v of Delbrück's *Synt. Forsch.* and his *Altind. Syn.* were not to be had in New York nor in Washington when this was written, so that I could not look up Mr. Keith's reference to each of these.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D.C.
June, 1910.

NOTE ON THE ABOVE

I have had pleasure in reading the proofs of Dr. Michelson's note printed above, which contains some interesting contributions to the Asokan grammar. As he says, the

interpretation which we put on the evidence differs in principle. He sees readily in the Epic on all sides traces of Pāli or Prākṛt syntax, while I, though not desiring to deny the presence of such traces, consider that it is more sound in principle not to resort to Pāli or Prākṛt parallels until Sanskrit parallels fail, and my study of Franke's papers has not altered this view. Of course, if the Epic is a Sanskrit version of a Prākṛt original, to explain its linguistic vagaries by Prākṛtisms is at once natural and proper, but I still feel convinced that Jacobi's arguments against that view are conclusive, though I do not think it necessary to accept his theory of the dating of the epics exactly as he presents it. If, then, the Epic was from the first written in Sanskrit, it is legitimate to seek to reduce its usages to the norm of ordinary Sanskrit, and it seems possible to do that in the great majority of cases without any real difficulty.

I need not review Dr. Michelson's discussion of the individual cases, with regard to all of which I see no reason whatever to modify my opinion, except to say that he has clearly missed the point of my remark as to the alleged *te* as accusative in *apṛpāṇi vedmi Sīte te*, or he would not have made the gratuitous accusation of ignorance of the relation of the Bombay and Bengal redactions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The point is one of palaeography: *Sīte te tvām* is a corruption of *Sīte tvām*, which is one of the most obvious imaginable, and the next stage is for a predecessor of Dr. Michelson's in the belief in *te=tvām* to omit the *tvām* as a gloss on *te*. On Dr. Michelson's own theory I cannot see how the presence of *tvām* in Gorresio's text is a " cogent proof " of the genuineness of *te* in the Bombay edition. It would only be cogent if (say) the correct form grammatically spoiled the metre or something of that sort, and its whole effect is spoiled by the fact that the preceding *Sīte* takes away all the value of *te* as evidence. And the more one

sees of Sanskrit MSS. the more one hesitates to create linguistic atrocities out of variant readings.

I may add that in a note in the October number of the *Journal* will be found some criticisms on Dr. Michelson's linguistic archaisms in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which, though written before, answer some of the remarks in his note.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

October, 1910.

FURTHER NOTE ON THE GENITIVE-ACCUSATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN MARATHI

Mr. T. K. Laddu, in reply (pp. 870-3 of the *Journal* for July) to my article on genitive-accusative construction in Marāṭhī (pp. 481-4 of the *Journal* for April), seems to represent a peculiar point of view of philology in general and of comparative philology in particular. May I be allowed to add a few remarks to it?

Mr. Laddu's derivations are doubtful. As regards his etymology of the Marāṭhī termination स (p. 872: "and so स also might have come from another postposition साठों"), Mr. Laddu does not know that Dr. Hoernle showed many years ago (*JASB.* xlii, p. 61) that the postposition साठों is really a compound of the old genitive termination स and the postposition आठों (Ap. Pr. अट्टहिं, Skt. अर्थे = for the sake of). Dr. Hoernle's derivation, repeated in his still very useful *Grammar (A Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian Languages, with special reference to the Eastern Hindī, London, 1880), § 365*, has been accepted by other scholars (cf. Beames, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, ii, § 57).

Dr. Hoernle further (Gr., § 375) warns us against confusion of two postpositions in Indo-Aryan languages: N. लाई, S. लाइ, M. ला (Skt. लाभे = for the benefit of) and the

postposition N. लागी, S. लगे, M. लागीं (Skt. लगे = in contact with). This notwithstanding, Mr. Laddu, deriving the Marāṭhī termination ला from the postposition लागीं (p. 872: "The termination ला has come from the postposition लागीं"), confuses them.

Mr. Laddu seems to be astonished (cf. p. 871: "regarding the use of what he (Dr. Lesný) calls the genitive," or further below: "inflected accusative (which Dr. Lesný calls genitive)") that I call the Marāṭhī form in स a genitive. He could, however, very easily have ascertained that that is nothing new. See, for instance, Dr. Grierson's L.S. vii, p. 24, where Dr. Sten Konow says: "bāpās is derived from Prākṛit bappassa, the genitive of bappō, a father, the genitive having replaced the dative in all Prākṛits." Mr. Laddu assumes that I have followed in my grammatical studies only Navalkar's *Student's Marāṭhī Grammar* (cf. especially p. 872: "The terminations of the inflected accusative, स, ना, are derived by the Rev. G. R. Navalkar (whom Dr. Lesný has followed) from the Sanskrit स्य"), but the case is, it seems, entirely the reverse. J. Beames (Gr. ii, § 59) derives the Marāṭhī termination चा from Skt. त्व (also Dr. Bhandarkar), Dr. Hoernle (JASB. xli, p. 139, and Gr., § 374) from Skt. दत्तः, Dr. Grierson (K.Z. xxxviii, p. 473) again from Skt. त्या (+ लो). But Mr. Laddu, disregarding these leading authorities, says (p. 872): "As regards the genitive proper in Marāṭhī, we have the termination चा . . . , which is most probably derived from the Sanskrit स्य." So far as I am aware, only the Rev. G. R. Navalkar derives चा from Skt. स्य, an impossible derivation; cf. Navalkar's Grammar, § 81, note: "The genitive चा is the modification of the Sanskrit genitive inflection स्य." But on p. 873 Mr. Laddu proposes a new etymology: "Perhaps this स has nothing to do with the Sanskrit स्य, from which we have झ and च through Mahārāṣṭri. There is also another and better derivation

possible. . . . the accusative plural termination, which was originally *ams* अंस in Sanskrit, was probably modified and taken into Marāṭhī as अंस (*amṣa*) or स with a nasal on the preceding syllable." I suppose it is not necessary to refute such an etymology, which would have been more natural a hundred years ago than to-day. On the Indo-Aryan phonology we have to-day Dr. Grierson's excellent essays, "On the Phonology of the Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars." ZDMG. xlix, pp. 393-421, and l. pp. 1-42. L. Gray's *Indo-Iranian Phonology* and Dr. Hoernle's *Grammar* can also be recommended.

As to the whole question, I must repeat the views of Dr. Sten Konow (L.S. vii. p. 25), Dr. Grierson (K.Z. p. 490). and other scholars (from the Indian grammarians for instance, Yoshi, Gr. iii, p. 376) that the Marāṭhī form in चा is originally an adjective and no case. Thus when I compared the genitive-accusative construction in Old Slavonic with a construction in modern Marāṭhī everyone sees I must have meant not an adjective but a case, the original old genitive (L.S. vii, p. 24): Skt. *devasya*, Pkt. *devassa*, Mar. *devās*. And in that sense I have used the term genitive. Most of the Marāṭhī grammars call that case according to the Sanskrit syntax dative or inflected accusative, and European scholars have followed this use. In my opinion it would be better to call an accusative only that form of a noun which is equal to the nominative, and which is called now "uninflected accusative", but the form in स (originally an old genitive) and the new equivalents a genitive: the form चा is a pure adjective, a possessive adjective. As in Prākṛits there will be no dative. If less practical such nomenclature would be more philological.

As to the animate and inanimate object of a transitive verb in modern Marāṭhī (in prose), the position is as I have stated in the Journal of April, pp. 481-4. In *Marāṭhī English Primer*, by Ganesli Hari Bhide, Bombay, 1889,

we read on p. 17: "When a noun denoting a person is the object of a transitive verb, it is always put in the dative case (ending **स**, etc.); but when a noun denotes an irrational animal, it is optionally put either in the accusative or dative case. In all other notions the accusative case is generally used." Exactly the same is said in the 2nd edition, 1901, p. 30. Navalkar (*Student's Marāṭhī Grammar*, p. 43) says the same. Now Mr. Laddu writes that I have misunderstood the Marāṭhī construction (p. 871), that the rule is erroneous and inaccurate, and quotes a few verses from Dnyānēśvarī from the thirteenth century. On the contrary, it is due to the development of the language that it does not remain the same. His statement concerns the language of Dnyānēśvarī, but not the Marāṭhī of to-day: to-day the Marāṭhās speak otherwise than in the thirteenth century. Secondly, Mr. Laddu ought not to quote poetry, which differs in all languages from prose. I did not conceal the fact that my instances on pp. 781-2 of this Journal were taken from the reading-books (Mr. Laddu says in the very beginning of his paper (p. 870) a little ironically: "Dr. Lesný has quoted a few sentences from Marāṭhī reading-books and shown . . ."). I think the Marāṭhī reading-books prepared by the Vernacular Text Books Revision Committee, bearing the dates 1906-8, illustrate very well the Marāṭhī as spoken to-day, and I observe that the use in these books agrees with the rule as stated by Bhide and Navalkar. Of course, the use in old Marāṭhī poetry and also in Marāṭhī proverbs differs considerably from the use in Marāṭhī prose.

Nevertheless, I am glad to learn Mr. Laddu's opinion, because Marāṭhī is his own language.

PRAG.

September 5, 1910.

V. LESNÝ.

DATTAKA-SUTRA

In almost all the copperplate grants of the Western Ganga series, the epithet *Dattaka-sūtra-vṛttēḥ prañētā* occurs in the description of the second king of the dynasty, who was known as Kiṛiya-Mādhava or Mādhava II. All the scholars who have dealt with these records have translated this expression by "author of a treatise, or a commentary, on the law of adoption". I venture to think that this is a mistake, and that the word *Dattaka* here has nothing to do with adoption.

Among the known works bearing on the law of adoption we may name the *Dattaka-chandrikā*, °-dīdhiti, °-mīmāṃsā, and °-mayūkha, and the *Datta-kaumudī*, °-ratnāpaṇa, °-smṛtisāra. °ādarśa, °-ratnākara, °-saṅgraha, °-chintāmaṇi, °-kalpalatā. °-kaustubha, °-ratna-pradīpikā, and °-siddhānta-mañjarī. Judged in the light of these names, the expression *Dattaka-sūtra* appears to be too indefinite to be the name of a work on the law of adoption, unless we are sure of the existence of a special work in the *sūtra* style on the subject. But no such work is known to exist. I therefore take the expression *Dattaka-sūtra* of the grants as meaning "the *sūtras* or aphorisms of Dattaka", and identify Dattaka with a writer on erotics who is mentioned by Vātsyāyana, the author of the *Kāma-sūtra*. We learn from Vātsyāyana's preface that the *Kāma-sūtras* were originally composed by Nandi in 1,000 *adhyāyas*; that they were abridged into 500 *adhyāyas* by Auddālaki Śvētaketu; that they were further condensed into 150 *adhyāyas* by Bābhravya Pāñchāla, who divided the subject into 7 *adhikaraṇas*: and that Bābhravya's sixth *adhikaraṇa*, entitled *Vaiśika*, was made the subject of a separate work by Dattaka at the instance of the dancing-girls of Pāṭaliputra. We are further told that Chārāyaṇa, Suvarṇanābha, Ghōṭakamukha, Gōnardīya, Gōṇikāputra, and Kuchumāra similarly dealt with other particular portions of the subject in separate treatises of their own. As the order in which

the authors are named appears to be chronological, Dattaka must have lived some centuries before Vātsyāyana. He is also referred to several times by Vātsyāyana in the body of his work :—*iti Dattakah* ;¹ *Dattaka-sāsanaḥ uktam* ;² *parigrahakasya = ēti Dattakasya*.³ Dattaka is likewise mentioned in Dāmōdaragupta's *Kuṭṭanīmata*, written at the close of the eighth century A.D., in a verse which runs thus :—

Vātsyāyanam ayam abudhaṃ
 bāhyān dūrēṇa Dattakāchāryān ;
 gaṇayati Mammatha-tantrē
 paśu-tulyaṃ Rājaputraṃ cha |.

In Kannaḍa works Dattaka's name is given as Jattaka. Chandrarāja, the author of a Kannaḍa work called *Madana-tilaka*, who flourished in the middle of the eleventh century A.D., names in the following verses Jattaka and other writers on erotics, and says he has drawn upon their works :—

Anakaṃ Kuṇḍali Babhravīyan ati-laulyaṃ Kūbaraṃ
 kātaraṃ
 kinipaṃ Bhadrān arūpi Kētu ku-ṛiṭaṃ Vātsyāyanaṃ
 Gōṇikā- |
 tanayaṃ nirdayan alpa-vīryaṃ enipaṃ Chārāyaṇaṃ
 Jattakaṃ
 tanu-hīnaṃ dorey allar int inibarṃ pratyaksha-
 Kandarpano! ||
 Ene negalda Chandran aljā-
 nana-chandraṃ Śvētakētu-Jattaka-Vātsyā- |
 yana-Pāñchāl-ādi-mahā-
 muni-matamane pēdan eseye posa-Gannaḍadiṃ ||

There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that the *Dattaka-sūtra* of the Gaṅga grants refers to the aphorisms of Dattaka mentioned by Vātsyāyana ; and it was on this

¹ Bombay ed., p. 186.

² *Ibid.*, p. 322.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

work that Kīriya-Mādhava or Mādhava II wrote a *ṛtti* or commentary.

Nothing is known, however, about the date of Dattaka. If the date of Vātsyāyana can be determined, that will give us the lower limit in time for Dattaka. Vātsyāyana often quotes from the Gṛhyasūtra of Āpastamba, whose period, according to Professor Macdonell, is 400 B.C. What is more important for fixing his period is his reference to the Āndhrabhṛtya king Kuntala-Sātakarṇi having killed his queen Malayavati.¹ Kuntala-Sātakarṇi's period is supposed to be about 35 B.C.² This may be taken as the upper limit of Vātsyāyana's period. We shall now try to determine the lower limit. Quotations from Vātsyāyana are found in the works of many of the early Sanskrit poets, such as Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, and Māgha : the following two instances are from Kālidāsa :—

1. Mitra-kāryam apadiśy = ānyatra śētē.

Kāma-sūtra, p. 328.

Mitra-kāryam apadiśya pārśvataḥ
prasthitaṃ tam anavasthitaṃ priyāḥ |
vidmahē śaṭha palāyana-chehhalāny
añjas = ēti rurudhuḥ kacha-grahaiḥ ||

Raghuvamśu, xix, 31.

2. Bhōgēshv anutsēkaḥ | parijanē dākshīṇyam.

Kāma-sūtra, p. 239.

Bhūyishṭhaṃ bhava dakshīṇā parijanē bhāgyēshv =
anutsēkiṇī.

Śākuntala, iv, 17.³

As it is generally agreed that Kālidāsa was a contemporary of Chandragupta II (A.D. 375–412) of the Gupta dynasty, his period may be taken to be about A.D. 400. We are thus led to the conclusion that the

¹ Bombay ed., p. 154.

² Smith's *Early History of India*, Table opposite to p. 202.

³ I owe these references to the kindness of Professor K. B. Pathak, B.A.

Kāma-sūtra was composed at some period between 35 B.C. and A.D. 400, and we shall not be far wrong if we assign Vātsyāyana to the second or third century A.D. And from the way in which Dattaka is mentioned in the *Kāma-sūtra* it may be safely inferred that he preceded Vātsyāyana by one or two centuries. We may take his period to be the first century A.D., though there is nothing to preclude the possibility of his having lived much earlier than that period.

As the period of Kiriya-Mādhava or Mādhava II is said to be the close of the second century A.D., there is nothing improbable in his having written, as stated in almost all the known Gaṅga plates, a commentary on the aphorisms of Dattaka, an author who preceded him by at least a century. So there does not appear to be any discrepancy in this statement, at any rate, of the Gaṅga plates, though the authenticity of most of them is called in question by some eminent scholars on palæographical and other grounds.

R. NARASIMHACHAR.

REMARKS ON MR. NARASIMHACHAR'S NOTE

Mr. Narasimhachar's explanation of the term *Dattaka-sūtra* as denoting the aphorisms of Dattaka, a writer on erotics, may be accepted as probably correct. But, even if we should go farther and agree with him in assigning Dattaka to the first century B.C. or A.D., the result is hardly sufficient to prove that there really was a Gaṅga king Mādhava II or Kiriya-Mādhava, reigning at the close of the second century A.D. A commentary on the aphorisms of Dattaka might be attributed to any person, real or imaginary. And the existence of Mādhava II, Kiriya-Mādhava, as a Gaṅga king, has no basis, except in the imagination of the persons who evolved the fictitious pedigree presented in records which are unmistakably spurious and were fabricated many centuries after that time. This, however, does not detract from the interest

of what Mr. Narasimhaচার tells us in connexion with Dattaka and the Dattakasūtra.

In the spurious records of this series, there is another expression regarding which a remark may be added. Another of the imaginary Gaṅga kings is Durvinita, who is supposed to have begun to reign in A.D. 482. And the records in question speak of him as *Kirātārjunīyasya pañcadaśa-sarga-tīkākārah*. The customary interpretation has been "author of a commentary on fifteen sargas of the Kirātārjunīya". In editing the record on the Sūḍi plates, however, I pointed out (EI, 3, 166-7, 182) that the allusion might be to the fifteenth canto, quite as much as to fifteen cantos, of the poem. And I entertain, in fact, no doubt that that is what is to be understood. Why should anyone write a commentary on fifteen cantos of Bhāravi's poem, and leave the remaining ones, only three, unnoticed? On the other hand, the fifteenth canto contains various curiosities which present ample matter for comment, such as the following. Verse 45 has three meanings. Verse 29 has no labial letters in it. In verse 5, practically only four consonants were used: *s* in the first pāda; *y* in the second; *l* in the third; and *ś* in the fourth; but *n* occurs in the last word, *śūśan*. Verse 38 goes farther, and uses practically only two consonants, *ch* and *r*. Verse 14 goes farther still: except in the last word, *nut*, only one consonant, *n*, is used in it. In verse 16, the first and third pādas are identical; and so also the second and fourth: so, again, in verse 50. In verse 52, all the four pādas are identical. In verse 18, the first pāda read backwards gives the second pāda; and the third, similarly treated, gives the fourth. And verse 22 read backwards gives verse 23. In these circumstances we may, I consider, decide that the meaning of the expression applied to Durvinita is "author of a commentary on the fifteenth canto of the Kirātārjunīya".

I may add that the Kavirājamārga of Kavīśvara, written

under the patronage and inspiration of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Nṛpatuṅga-Amōghavarsha I. shows (l. 29) that a writer of *gadya* or ornate prose, by name Durvinita, flourished in the Kanarese country at some time before A.D. 815. I feel little doubt, if any, that that Durvinita is the original of the Durvinita who was introduced into the Western Gaṅga pedigree. We may perhaps trace, someday, a real author Mādhava, who did write a commentary on the Dattaka-Sūtra.

J. F. FLEET.

THE KELADI RAJAS OF IKKERI AND BEDNUR

With reference to Dr. Barnett's note on "The Keladi Rājas of Ikkēri and Bednūr" in this Journal, 1910, p. 149 f., and Mr. Sewell's reply thereto, pp. 487-9, I should like to say a word or two with regard to the point at issue, viz. whether Basavappa was an adopted son or not. There are three unpublished works in Kannaḍa bearing on the history of the Keladi Rājas, namely, *Keladi-arasara-pūrvōttara*, *Keladi-arasara-vamsāvali*, and *Keladi-nṛpa-rijaya*, the first two in prose and the third in the form of a *champū*. The first work was composed by Chemabhaṇḍāra Purushōttamayya, but the authors of the other two works are not known. Of the three works, all of which appear to belong to the eighteenth century, the *Keladi-nṛpa-rijaya* is perhaps the best, as regards both literary merit and the items of information given. It is divided into eleven *āśvāsas*, and continues the narrative down to A.D. 1763, in which year the kingdom was overthrown by Hyder. At the end of the work the manuscript in my possession contains the following interesting note:—In Śaka 1727, Krōdhana, Nārāyana Rao, the *mutsaddi* (writer) of Parangi (European) Major Mackenzie Sāheb, had a transcript made of this work.

I shall now proceed to the point at issue. The *Keladi-nṛpa-rijaya* clearly says that Sōmasēkhara's consort

Channamāmbike adopted Mariyappa-seṭṭi's son Basava. The verse in the original runs thus:—

Ariyalke Sōmaśekhara-
 vara-nṛpatiya patni Channamāmbikey embal |
 dharey ariye tad-*gṛhītaṃ*
 Mariyappa-seṭṭara kumāra Basava-mahīpaṃ ||

A prose passage in the ninth *āśvāsa* of the same work gives a reason for selecting this boy for adoption. It says that, as Siddammāji, the consort of Bhadrappa, who was the elder brother of Sōmaśekhara, and Gauramma, wife of Mariyappa-seṭṭi, were sisters, the latter's son Basava, who stood in the relationship of a son to Bhadrappa, also stood in the same relationship to his younger brother Sōmaśekhara, and that consequently Channamāmbike selected the boy as a fit person to occupy the vacant throne of the Keladi kingdom, and adopted him with due ceremony in Śaka 1595, Parīdhāvi (A.D. 1672). The expression used in the original is *gṛhīta-putra*, 'a taken son', which is habitually used in the sense of 'an adopted son'. So the word *tanūja*, 'born from the body', used by Shaḍakshari, is not to be interpreted literally. As Mr. Sewell rightly observes, a properly adopted son is, according to Hindu ideas, as good as a son of the body.

I may also give here a few more details about the Keladi kings, not hitherto published, which are found in the *Keladi-nṛpa-vijaya*. The pedigree given in this work is identical with that given in Dr. Barnett's paper as far as it goes. The narrative is, however, continued two steps further. Basavappa, the patron of Shaḍakshari, adopted Channa-Basavappa, who died when only 14 years old. Thereupon Basavappa's consort, Chammaviramāji, adopted Sōmaśekhara. It was during her time that Hyder subverted the Keladi kingdom. It will thus be seen that there were altogether three instances of adoption in this dynasty.

Chauḍappa, the first king in the pedigree as given by Shadakshari, was the son of Basavappa, a cultivator of Hallibail, and Basavamāmbē. He had a younger brother named Bhadrappa, and the two brothers having, by order of Kṛṣṇa-Rāya of Vijayanagar, led a successful expedition against the Kirātas, were invested with the government of Chandragutti, Keladi, and six more *māyāṇis* (or small districts). Chauḍappa built a palace at Ikkēri in A.D. 1511. Sadāśiva married Vīramāmbē and Bhadrāmāmbē, and was crowned in Ikkēri. He was a great warrior and a devout Liṅgāyat. Doḍḍa-Saukaṇṇa set up the god Aghōrēśvara at Ikkēri, and the god Virabhadra at Keladi. He defeated Virupaṇṇa-Oḍeyar and took possession of Jambūr. He also defeated Bhairasa-Oḍeyar of Kārkaḷa and Sāḷuva-Timma. Chikka-Saukaṇṇa was murdered by his nephew Rāma-rāja. The latter had two sons: Vīra-Oḍeyar and Basavaliṅga. Veṅkaṭa's son Bhadrappa was married to Bhaṅgāramma, daughter of Venkaṭādri-Nāyaka of Bēlūr; and his daughter Hiriyamma was given in marriage to Jambūr Virupaṇṇa-Oḍeyar, their son being Sadāśivaiya. Venkaṭa defeated Keṅge Hamma-Nāyaka, Narasiṅga-rāya of Benkipūr, and Bhairasa-Oḍeyar of Kārkaḷa: routed the Chauḷas and captured Mangalore; seized the Bārakūr kingdom, once ruled by the Pāṇḍyas: and, having defeated Banirukali(?) Bhairā-dēvi, took possession of her kingdom. He caused the following works to be written by his court Pandits: (1) a metrical translation in Kannaḍa of *Śivagīte*, consisting of eighteen *adhyaṅgas* in the *uttarakhaṇḍa* of the Padma-purāṇa, by the poet Tirumala-bhaṭṭa: (2) *Śivāshṭapadī*, in Sanskrit, by the same poet: (3) a commentary on the *āgama* work called *Tantra-sāra*, by Raṅganātha-dikṣhita: and (4) a large work called *Mānapriya* relating to horses, by Aśvapaṇḍita. He set up the god Gaṇapati at Sāgar, and built a fine tank and palace there. He was the first to assume the title *viśiṣṭa-vidikādvaita-sthāpanāchārya*. Bhadrappa died during

his father's lifetime, leaving two sons, Rāmaliṅga, who died young, and Virabhadra, and a daughter who was given in marriage to his sister's son Sadāśivaiya. On Bhadrappa's death, both his consorts died with him, i.e. became *satis*. Siddappa, son of Chikka-Saṅkaṇṇa, also died during Veṅkaṭa's rule, leaving Śivappa and three daughters by his first consort and Veṅkaṭa by his second consort. Virabhadra defeated the king of Biḷagi, came into collision with Bijāpūr, and removed his capital to Bidarūr (Bednūr) in A.D. 1638. During his absence from Bidarūr on a pilgrimage, Rāma-rāja's son Vīra-Oḍeyar set himself up as king at Ikkēri, but he died soon after. Then Virabhadra's sister's husband Sadāśivaiya made a similar attempt, and, as a preliminary step, mutilated (*aṅga-vikalanaṇṇi māḍi*) Vīra-Oḍeyar's brother Basavaliṅga lest he should aspire to the throne. But he had to flee and take refuge with the king of Sōde, who, not surrendering him when asked to do so, was attacked and defeated by Virabhadra. Meanwhile Sadāśivaiya died. An attempt was then made by the people of Sōde to set up his son with the help of Bijāpūr, but without success. On Virabhadra's death his consort Kollūrammāji became a *sati*. Śivappa was crowned in Vēṇupura (Bednūr), which he greatly improved and enlarged. He had five consorts, two married before coronation and three after that event; their names being Liṅgammāji, Śāntammāji, Bhadrammāji, Basavaliṅgammāji, and Nāgammāji. The second was the mother of Bhadrappa, and the fourth of Sōmaśēkhara. The first and the third had each a daughter, and the fifth had no issue. Śivappa defeated Kṛṣṇappa-Nāyaka of Bēlūr, helped the king of Vijayanagar who had taken refuge with him, and, having conquered and seized the kingdom of Madhuliṅga-Nāyaka of Sōde, made it over to him in response to his prayer. His brother Venkaṭa's consort was Mallammāji. Bhadrappa married Bommaammāji and Siddammāji. It was the latter's sister, Gauramma,

who was married to Mariyappa-setti, whose son Basavappa was, as stated above, adopted by Sōmasēkhara's consort Channamāmbike. Bhadrappa liberally endowed Kṛshṇā-nandasvāmi's *matha* at Muḷbāgal. Sōmasēkhara having gone mad, his consort Channamāmbike or Chennammāji carried on the government. During her rule, Sōmasēkhara's sister's husband Basavalinga tried to seize the throne, but Chennammāji had him mutilated and sent into exile. Another pretender, Śivappa, was also similarly punished. Chennammāji waged several wars against her enemies, and ruled for nearly twenty-five years. She defeated the king of Sudhāpura and the Mysore general Tinmappa, and took the latter's son Kṛshṇappa captive. Her adopted son Basavappa, who succeeded her, was known as Hiriya-Basavappa. "the Senior Basavappa." He had four consorts: Chennammāji, Vīrammāji, Hebbe Chennammāji, and Chennabasavammāji. The first was the mother of Virabhadra, and the fourth of Sōmasēkhara. Hiriya-Basavappa was a good scholar, and wrote these three works: (1) *Śivatata-ratnākara*, (2) *Subhāshita-sura-druma*, both in Sanskrit, and (3) *Sūkti-sudhākara*, in Sanskrit and Kannaḍa. Sōmasēkhara had three consorts: Vīrammāji, Basavammāji, and Nilammāji; but none of them had any issue. He honoured the Śṛṅgēri guru and cleared his debts. His contemporaries were Sarajā Hanumappa - Nāyaka of Tarikere and the Mahratta general Ghōrpaḍe. Virabhadra married Chennammāji and Mallammāji. The son of the latter, Basavappa, the patron of Shadakshari, was known as Kumāra-Basavappa, "the Junior Basavappa," to distinguish him from his grandfather Hiriya-Basavappa. Virabhadra died before his elder brother Sōmasēkhara. Kumāra-Basavappa had two consorts, Chennammāji and Chennavīrammāji. He caused a *matha* to be built in Vēṇupura (Bednūr), and made it over to Tōṇṭa-svāmi of the Siddhēśvara-*gadduge* (or *pīṭha*) at Ḍambaḷa.

It may not be out of place to mention here another Sanskrit author who was also, like Shaḍakshari, at the court of Kumāra-Basavappa. He was a Viraśaiva poet named Mari Tōṅṭadārya. His work, called *Vīraśaivānanda - chandrikā*, was written for the instruction of Kumāra-Basavappa at the instance of Tōṅṭa-svāmi, the same person to whom, as stated above, a *matha* was granted by Kumāra-Basavappa. The author has, also like Shaḍakshari, given at the beginning of his work a pedigree of his patron's family, which is identical with that given by Shaḍakshari. We are told that Sadāśiva was also known as Rāya-Nāyaka, and that he built an *agrahāra* and the Rāmēśvara temple at Keḷadi. Of the works caused to be written by Veṅkaṭa, only three are mentioned :—

Tantrādhikāra-nirṇayam
 anyāṃ gēyāṃ tathā Śivāśṭapadiṃ |
 Śivagītā-vyākhyānam
 Veṅkaṭa-saṃrāḍ achikarat kīrtiyai ||

Bhadrappa's son Vīrabhadra is said to have been honoured by the *Pādushā* of Vijayapurī (Bijāpūr). The adoption of Basavappa by Channamāmbike is also mentioned. To the three works of Hiriya-Basavappa, a fourth, namely, a commentary on *Siddhānta-śikhāmanī*, is added. The colophon of the work runs thus :—

Śrīmad - anādi - nirañjana - Jaṅgamāparāvātāra - Tōṅṭada - Siddhēśvara - prasād - āsādita - Śāmbhavāgamāmbōdhi - mathana - janita - niruttar - aikōttara - śata - sthala - bhēda - bhīna - shaṭ - sthala - tattva - bōdha - sudhāsvādānanda - sandōha - pradāyak - āchāryavarya - Mari - Tōṅṭadārya - virachitē Basava - vasudhā - Saṅkrandan - ōpadēśē Vīraśaivā - nanda - chandrikāyām.

R. NARASIMHACHAR.

THE TRANSLATION OF THE TERM BHAGAVAT

I wonder why nobody, so far, has spoken in favour of the good old word *holy*, which has the sanction of centuries, like *bhagavat*, and means the same. My objection to *perfect* is that it is too vague in that the relation to religion is not expressly indicated by it but has to be inferred from the context. You may be *perfect* in one respect and *imperfect* in another, and the same holds good with *blessed*, *glorious*, *excellent*, etc., but the word *holy* is quite unequivocal, and it implies perfectness, for the Holy One is *eo ipso* perfect, adorable, glorious, etc. The word *bhagavat* is at once recognized as a religious term, and so is *holy*, but *perfect* is not and *adorable* neither. *Holy* has the further advantage over all other renderings that its original meaning coincides exactly with that of *bhagavat*. For *holy* (*hál-eg*) is a derivation, with a possessive suffix, from the Anglo-Saxon substantive *hál* (German *heil*), which means "health, welfare, good luck", etc., that is to say, everything auspicious and desirable; and *bhaga-vat* is a derivation, with a possessive suffix, from *bhaga*, the original meaning of which is also "good luck, health, wealth", etc., as is clearly shown not only by Sanskrit *bhagin*, *bhageśa*, etc., but also by the undeniable connexion of the word with Old Slavic *bogatŭ*, "wealthy," Avestan *bayō*, "God," etc. It is also noteworthy that the German adjective *heil* (= English *whole*) has the meaning "uninjured, complete, whole" (*aksata*), i.e. *perfect*.

For these reasons I hold that *holy* is the most exact English rendering of the term *bhagavat* that is possible.

F. OTTO SCHRADER.

ADYAR, MADRAS S.

August 11, 1910.

A CASE OF HINDU SYNCRETISM

A curious instance of Hindū syncretism may be noted for future reference. Saiyad Sālār Mas'ūd, the nephew of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, was slain at Bahraich by the Hindū Rājā Sōheldēo in 1032 A.D. There is a shrine here in Saiyad Sālār's honour, said to be on the site of an earlier temple of the sun, and by a pilgrimage to this place the blind daughter of Saiyad Jamālu'd-dīn of Rudauli is said to have recovered her sight. My friend Bābū Sitā Rām, now a Deputy Collector at Bahraich, writes to me that Saiyad Sālār "is now worshipped with banners by Hindūs of Upper India, as the great curer of leprosy and the giver of eyes to the blind, though the cluster of hair fixed on each of these banners is said to represent the *cōṭīs* (or top-knots) of Hindūs, which had been cut off by him".

The *Bahraich Gazetteer* (p. 150) says, "a very picturesque feature of the fair [at the shrine] are the flags brought by pilgrims, worked in gay colours with figures of men and animals. These are mounted on bamboos of great length with some coins tied up in a knot at the point. The pinnacle of the shrine is touched with the point, and the coin taken. If the pilgrim's desire has not been fulfilled he takes away the flag, but if the request has been granted the flag is left at the shrine."

G. A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.

August 27, 1910.

NOTE ON DR. STEN KONOW'S ARTICLE ON BASHGALI

Dr. Konow has very kindly given me an opportunity of perusing the proofs of his "Notes on the Classification of Bashgali" appearing in this number of the *Journal*. I much regret that pressure of other work prevents my devoting myself to a detailed consideration of this most

interesting paper, with much of which I am in entire agreement.

Dr. Konow considers that he and I differ as to the position of Bashgali in regard to Eranian and Indo-Aryan languages; but to me it appears that the difference is rather one of terms and of their application than one of fact. He quotes me as saying that the "Modern Piśāca" languages (including Bashgali) left the parent Aryan stem after the Indo-Aryan languages, but before all the typical Eranian characteristics, which we meet in the Avesta, had developed. Dr. Konow maintains (p. 46) that Bashgali is derived from an ancient Eranian dialect, which had still retained the Aryan *s*, and had not changed it to *h*. Now, as this very change is one of the characteristics referred to by me, I do not see any grave discrepancy between the two theories, except in regard to the use by me of terms such as "branch" and "stem". Whether an Aryan language that is on the way to change an Aryan *s* to an Eranian *h*, but has not yet done so, is entitled to be called "Eranian" is a question of nomenclature that is of small importance.

My one great regret in regard to Dr. Konow's article is that he has confined himself to Bashgali, and has not discussed the other languages of the same group. If he had done so, I am convinced that he would have largely modified some of his statements, and perhaps would have not have been so definite in classing Bashgali as Eranian. No one who desired to fix the exact relationship of French to Latin would think of omitting to consider any of the other Romance languages, and so it is with Bashgali. The group to which it belongs, looked upon as a whole, exhibits a number of curious phonetic changes that are strange both to Eranian and to Indo-Aryan. A list of the more important of these will be found on p. 3 of my *Piśāca Languages*. There is a great deal of information regarding at least *χōwār*, *Kalāshā*, and *Shinā*

in the works of Biddulph and Leitner, not to speak of special works such as O'Brien's *χōwār Grammar and Vocabulary*. Biddulph gives vocabularies of most of the other minor ones. As for Kāshmirī, it already possesses quite a literature, and more will shortly be forthcoming.¹ I cannot admit that it occupies a place apart, any more than Italian occupies a place apart among the Romance languages. Over and over again in the course of my studies has it thrown light upon puzzles in the other "Modern Piśāca" forms of speech.

Finally, may I take this opportunity of stating that, while I have read with respect and interest Dr. Konow's paper on "The Home of Paiśācī" in ZDMG., lxiv, I must confess that he has failed to convince me, and that I am still impenitent in my belief that the ancestors of these tribes of the North-West Frontier once spoke a language akin to the Paiśācī of the Indian grammarians. At present I have no time at my command, but I hope on some future occasion to take the matter up and to give a sound reason for the faith that is in me.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.

November 2, 1910.

UDANAM

(Published by the Pali Text Society.)

I beg to invite the attention of Pali scholars to the readings of several verses of Udānam which appeared to me to be incorrect when I was translating them of late into Bengali. My own humble suggestions for the reconstruction of the texts are also submitted to the judgment of scholars.²

¹ The Clarendon Press is now printing a Kāshmirī Manual, and a Kāshmirī-English Dictionary is under preparation for the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The text of the Kāshmirī Śiva Pariṇaya is also in the press for the *Bibliotheca Indica*.

² [The reader should consult Professor Windisch's notes in the JPTS. for 1890, pp. 91 ff.—Ed.]

1. *Udānam*, i, 4.—The metre is Indravajrā, which undoubtedly attained perfection in the fifth century B.C. The first portion of the verse from *Yo* to *Dhammo* is perfectly faultless, but *Nihuhuṅko* (— ◡ — — for — — ◡ —) in the second foot, and *Vusito* (◡ ◡ — for — ◡ —) in the third, show unexpected irregularities. We may read *Vāsito* for *Vusito* very easily, as both forms may represent in Pali the Sanskrit word (*vi + uṣitaḥ*) *vyuṣitaḥ*. *Nihuhuṅko* seems to convey no meaning. With reference to the Huhuṅka Brāhmaṇas (who, by the way, were never notorious for haughtiness), it cannot mean “not haughty” as has been suggested by one translator. The Pali word *Nhiṃsako* (= Skt. *Niḥ + hiṃsakaḥ*), which could be easily misread as *Nihuhuṅko*, improves the metre and the meaning of the verse. I may also note that the Atharva-vedī Brāhmaṇas were once called *Hīṃsakāḥ*.

One point is clear beyond a shadow of doubt: the word *Brāhmano* after *dhammena so* in the fourth foot crept into the text from a marginal explanatory note. As such this word with three additional syllables must be expunged. Though the verse would not suffer in any way if the whole of the fourth foot were left out, I cannot and should not assert that the whole of the fourth foot is but a portion of a marginal note, for even in later times an Indravajrā verse was composed with an additional foot.

2. *Ibid.*, i, 8.—I need hardly state that the introductory stories for the Udānas (explaining the occasion for the inspired utterances) are not very authentic. I am inclined to reject the story of Saṅgāmaji solely on the ground that the honorific addition *ji* for a man did not come into vogue in early Buddhist times.¹

The meaning of the first line of the verse is very clear: “(He) welcomes him not who comes to him, and mourns not his loss who passes away.” Consistently with this we expect something to be stated with reference to Saṅga and

¹ [The name Saṅgāmaji occurs in the *Netti Pakaraṇa*, p. 150.—ED.]

Asaṅga (Saṅgāsaṅga), and those words are really there. But the words Saṅgā and Saṅgāmajim are rather stumbling-blocks, for even in the light of the introductory story the second line cannot be construed correctly in accordance with grammar. I am strongly inclined to think that the last portion of the compound word *saṅgāsaṅga* being partially illegible, the early editor introduced the story and brought about a restoration of the text in conformity with his story. This was also done in a slovenly way, as no good grammatical construction is possible.

Consistently with what has been stated in the first line of the verse, I beg to suggest that *Ujjhitam* is the likely word which formed a compound with Saṅgāsaṅga in the form *Saṅgāsaṅgojjhitam*. There is no doubt that this compound word improves the text in all respects.

3. Ibid., ii, 3. — It is quite clear that the words *Sukha-kāmāni bhūtāni* have also crept into the text from some marginal notes. The very metre requires that these words should be expunged. Then, again, I prefer *pecca* (or *paccā*) of MS. A to *pecca*, which Dr. Steinthal has adopted, for it is inconsistent with other teachings of the Buddha that happiness as a reward in the other world should be held out as an incentive for doing duties here. *Pecca* or *paccā* (= Skt. *paścāt*) as an adverb may mean "afterwards" in the usual sense.¹

4. Ibid., ii, 4.—I think that the text improves if we accept the reading *Dasātha* of the MS. B in the second line. The meaning then would be: Whether living in a village or in forests, a man who is *Sukha-dukkha-phuṭṭo* thinks in this fashion: *Ahaṃ sukhito ca, ahaṃ dukkhito ca; parena idaṃ mahyaṃ sukha-dukkhaṃ uppāditaṃ*—"this has not been caused by me (*neva attato*), this (*atha* or *itha*) condition (*dasā*) of ours (*no*) comes from others (*parato*), etc."²

¹ [Cf. Fausboll's and Hardy's notes on *Dhammapada*, v. 131, and *Netti Pakaraṇa*, pp. 130, 134.—ED.]

² [Windisch, loc. cit., agrees with Steinthal.—ED.]

Phusseyyum in the fourth line is clearly incorrect. We must read *phusseyyu*, for the meaning is: "In what way, then (*kena*), should *phassā* affect (*phusseyyu*) him who is *nirūpadhi*?"

5. *Ibid.*, ii, 5.—I am inclined to read *vatam* (= Skt. *vrātam*) for *vata* (an Ayyaya indicating certainty) in the text, as in the first place the metre becomes faultless thereby, and in the second place the meaning of the text improves. We clearly see on reference to the second line of the verse that the words were addressed to one who had recently adopted the Buddhist faith. So he was reminded that *vrata* (duty) does not become easy of fulfilment merely for the reason of having heard much of religious principles, etc.: and that, in spite of such knowledge, a man may remain *sakiñcana* and so may not get salvation.

B. C. MAZUMDAR.

DARJILING.

October 26, 1910.

DOES AL GHAZZALI USE AN INDIAN METAPHOR?

In the *Udāna*¹ a parable is put into the Buddha's mouth. Shortly it is as follows:—

Long ago a king of *Sāvatti* had all the blind-by-birth in the place brought together, and shown an elephant. The attendant who showed it them let some feel its head, some its feet, some its back, some its tail, and so on. The king asked them what an elephant was like. Those who had felt its leg said it was like a pillar; those who had felt its tusk said it was like a ploughshare; those who had felt its ear said it was like a winnowing basket; and so on.² Each one was so sure he was right that they came to blows, to the amusement of the king.

¹ *Udāna*, vi, 4. Retold in my *Dialogues of the Buddha* (vol. i, 1899, pp. 187-8). Translated by Maj.-Gen. Strong (1902, pp. 94 ff.).

² Nine answers are given.

The parable is directed against the theologians, who wrangle, on insufficient evidence, about such questions as the eternity of the world or the soul.

In the just published English abstract of the Persian abstract of Al Ghazzali's *Ihya*¹ the very same simile is used. But it is used for the theologians against the scientists; and in the abstract it is worded more briefly than the Pali.

Colonel Jacob has shown that the parable became so well known in India that it was referred to in a standing phrase, "like the blind men and the elephant."

It would be very interesting if some Arabic scholar would give us the exact wording, in English, of the original passage in Al Ghazzali's *Ihya*, and discuss the possible connexion.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

NOTE ON THE "UNKNOWN LANGUAGES" OF EASTERN TURKESTAN

Having had no opportunity of giving a final revise to the footnotes of my paper on the "unknown languages" of Eastern Turkestan, in the October number of the Journal for 1910, the following points need correction. On p. 1285, at the end of footnote 8, for "footnote 22" read "footnote 3 on p. 1286". Similarly, on p. 1286, footnote 3, read "footnote 8 on p. 1285". Also, on the same page, cancel "footnote 6" and substitute "See footnote 12 on p. 1285".

After the publication of that paper Baron v. Stael Holstein had the kindness (on November 3 and 29) to send me offprints of two papers published by him in the *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, on "Tocharisch und die Sprache I" (1908)

¹ C. Field, *The Alchemy of Happiness*, p. 36.

and on "Tocharisch und die Sprache II" (1909), as well as a copy of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xii, the second part of which consists of his "Bemerkungen zu den Brāhmīglossen des Tīśastvustik Manuscripts". I regret that I had no earlier intelligence of these scholarly efforts, especially of the small collection of identified words on p. 483 of the second paper, in order to utilize them in my own paper. It would seem that the form khāysā (my footnote 3 on p. 1285) is correct, as it occurs also in some Petrovski manuscript fragments, and that prahauṣṭi (footnote 5 on p. 1286) means, not "to take off", but "to put on" (a robe). The Buddhist monastic rule is to bare one shoulder when coming into the assembly or into the presence of a superior. Accordingly the phrase *ekāṃsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ kṛtvā*, as Childers' Dictionary in effect explains, means lit. "making the outer robe single-shouldered", i.e. placing it so as to cover but one shoulder. Therefore the corresponding E. Turk. phrase *śausve cīvarā prahauṣṭi* must mean "placing the robe on a single shoulder". Some of the identifications in the collection, of course, are still doubtful, and most of them were first suggested by Professor Leumann in his contributions to JGOS., lxi, lxii; but some words, as haḍā = day, were identified by me as early as 1901 (in my "Report", Extra No. to JASB., lxx, p. 34). The peculiar letter which I transcribed *vu* (p. 1295, 4) would seem, after all, to signify the vowel *o*. In a manuscript fragment, e.g., to which the Baron has kindly drawn my attention, it appears as the initial letter of the Sanskrit word *osadhī*.

With regard to the alternative spellings *balysā* and *baysā* (p. 1297, 11), Professor Leumann reminds me of an opinion communicated to me in 1908, which had escaped my memory, but which, in the present uncertain state of our knowledge, deserves to be mentioned. He at that time suggested that the subscript arc may simply indicate the absence of some consonant which originally closed

a syllable, and which need not always have been *l*, as e.g. in *tcemañyau*, Skt. *caḥṣurbhīh*, where *tceman* might = Avestic *čašman*.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

TIBETAN INVASION OF INDIA IN 747 A.D.

The "Chinese Riddles on Ancient Indian Toponymy" which Colonel Gerini, in the October number of the *Journal* (1910), restates from Professor Lévi's notes, have been solved, satisfactorily, it seems to me, in my article on the "Tibetan Invasion of India in 747 A.D." in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for January, 1911.

Ch'u-po-ho-lo, or rather *T'u-po-ho-lo*,¹ is the old capital of Vriji, Tirhūt, or Mithilā, in the north-west of Darbhanga District.

Ku-p'i-li River and "Country" are the Kamla River and "Kapila" country of that district.

Shan-lien and *Kien-t'o-wei* (not "*Kan-t'o-wei*") are the Rivers Bagmati and the "Old Gandak" or *Bur Gaṇḍakī*, to the south-east of Darbhanga.

In that article I have also shown that this invasion was an achievement of Tibetan and not Chinese arms; that it occurred in the year 747 A.D., and not 748 A.D. as hitherto stated; that King Harsha-vardhana's death occurred not later than the middle or beginning of 747 A.D., and probably in 746 A.D., instead of 748 or "the end of 747 or beginning of 748 A.D." as hitherto calculated;² and that both the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet and the reduction of

¹ This latter is the reading suggested by Professor Parker, to whom I referred this Chinese form of the name of the chief city captured by the Tibetans, namely, 茶 鋪 和 羅. "The first character," Professor Parker writes, "is probably not *ch'a*², as therein represented, but 茶 *t'u*², as *ch'a*², which means 'tea' or 'camellia', was scarcely a common word so early."

² The current histories, and especially the latest of all: V. A. Smith's *Early History of India*, pp. 326, etc.

the language of that country to writing (in the Indian character) were probably the result of that invasion.

L. A. WADDELL.

SEAL OF THE DALAI LAMA

In his interesting "Note on the Dalai Lama's Seal" and his important analysis of the Tibeto-Mongol seal-characters, in the Journal for October (1910), Mr. A. H. Francke publishes a reading of the legend on this seal. Doubt is expressed respecting the third "group" in the second column (pp. 1205-7), which, Mr. Francke states, "consists (probably) of a *ra* and a *u* vowel-sign, and has to be read *ru* . . . The reading of the seal is therefore—

talai blamai ru thamka rgyal";

and this he translates—

"Standard seal of the Dalai lama, *bene!*"

To me the legend reads decidedly different from this, both in transcript and in sense. I find that in addition to the obvious misreading of *ru* two other characters have been omitted, one at the beginning and the other at the end of the sentence.

The omitted initial character is the one which Mr. Francke in his alphabetical list terms "the snake ornament", which represents the Tibetan ས. This character, however, is not a mere ornament. It is the recognized abbreviation of the word འོམ, usually transcribed *Oñ*, though literally *AOÑ*. It appears to me to represent the first limb of the initial letter (*A*) of that word, with the head modified for cursive purposes; though it might conceivably be a cursive form of the superscribed འ or *OÑ*, which is somewhat analogous to the *anusvāra* of its Indian prototype. In any case it is undoubtedly regarded by the Tibetans as representing *Oñ* in ordinary literature.

The other omission is the concluding syllable of the

sentence, namely *va*, which conveys a totally different sense from *bene*. That the letter here is clearly a *v* (=Tibetan བ) will be evident by referring to Mr. Francke's Table II, p. 1212. There the basis of the seal-letter for *w* (=Tibetan ས) will be seen to have as in Tibetan the same form as a *v*, and in both, the addition of superscribed tails converts the *v* into *w*.

The syllable read doubtfully as *ru* by Mr. Francke appears to me to be *rtsa*, meaning "original" or "primary". In the key-alphabet the letter *tsa* has its third horizontal limb from the top joined to the vertical, whilst in the seal this is not so—this is probably owing to a mistake in copying the key-alphabet, as presumably in the case of the seal care would be taken to ensure that the characters were formed correctly.

Thus I would read the legend on the seal as—

Om ta-lui bla-mai rtsa-t'amka rgyal-va,

which I translate—

"*Om!* The original seal of the 'Dalai Lama, the *Jina*."

Jina, in its Tibetan form of *rgyal-va*, is the commonest of all the titles of the Dalai Lama, who is ordinarily known in Tibet as "The precious *Jina*", or *rgyal-va rin-po-ch'e*.¹

It is interesting to find that my representation, based upon the literary evidence of the edicts I found in Lhasa, that the correct form of the Grand Lama's title was *Talai* and not *Dalai* (see Journal, 1910, p. 74), is here confirmed by the Grand Lama's own seal.

I feel glad that Mr. Francke has published a revised print of the seal, all the more so as the copy which I published in my *Lhasa* was not reproduced, as I had expressly desired, by a photomechanical process from an original impression of the seal which I provided; but was re-drawn, and in this process suffered slight alteration; whilst my footnote, in which I corrected the defects, was

¹ My *Buddhism of Tibet*, pp. 228, etc.

accidentally omitted. I have now compared Mr. Francke's revised copy with two originals and find it to be perfect.

L. A. WADDELL.

SEAL OF THE DALAI LAMA

In his most interesting "Note on the Dalai Lama's Seal and the Tibeto-Mongolian Characters", which appeared in the last number of this Journal (p. 1205), the Rev. A. H. Francke observes that "Reproductions of the Dalai Lama's seal are found in Waddell's *Lhasa and its Mysteries*, p. 448, and in Walsh's *Coinage of Tibet*, MASB., vol. ii, p. 16. No attempt to read it has as yet been made, and neither of the reproductions is absolutely correct, though Waddell's is by far the better of the two". I feel that a word of explanation is needed as regards the copy of the seal, which I gave in my paper referred to. That copy was taken from the facsimile given in Landon's *Lhasa* (vol. i, facing p. 1). I had a smaller-size impression of the seal by me, but, as it was indistinct, I copied that given in Landon's *Lhasa*, which was a larger-size seal and clearer.

My reference to the seal was to suggest that certain meaningless characters on the coins minted in Nepal for currency in Tibet might be an attempt by the Nepalese mint to make a general imitation of the sort of characters on the Dalai Lama's seal as they would appear to be if the lines were looked at as running horizontally, as those accustomed only to Indian script would naturally do, and not vertically, as they are meant to be. I remarked: "The characters on the coin are not any of them a correct reproduction of characters on the seal, which might be expected from workmen who did not understand what the characters were intended to represent, and the resemblances suggest that the Newar artificers took the characters as running

horizontally and not vertically, which is also natural; as they would assume the lines to be horizontal, as in the Indian and Tibetan languages, with which they were acquainted" (MRAS., p. 17). I may mention that I have since found that my suggestion that the meaningless characters on the Nepal minted coins might be meant for an imitation of those on the Dalai Lama's seal was incorrect, and that they are an imitation of the Arabic characters on the rupees of Ghiasuddin Mahmud Shah, who was king of Bengal from 1256 to 1537, as I have noted in my paper on "The Coinage of Nepal", JRAS. 1908, p. 687.

I was not concerned with the characters on the seal itself more than to suggest a general resemblance, so did not compare the facsimile of the seal as given in Landon's *Lhasa* with the small-size impression that I had or with that given by Waddell in *Lhasa and its Mysteries*.

Tibetan seals are not stamped in wax, but in red ink on the paper, and consequently the lines of the characters on them are often indistinct. It is, no doubt, for this reason that the facsimile of the same seal from the Tibetan treaty, as given by Landon and by Waddell, do not coincide.

All interested in Tibet are greatly indebted to Dr. Francke for having given a correct facsimile of the seal, and having shown that the characters are Tibetan characters in a special square form, written vertically under one another instead of horizontally.

E. H. WALSH.

December 15, 1910.

ANCIENT INDIAN ANATOMICAL DRAWINGS FROM TIBET

With reference to the above set of drawings discovered in Lhasa in 1904, of which Mr. Walsh has published a detailed description in this Journal for 1910, pp. 1215-45,

I have already pointed out¹ some evidence for the Indian origin of the pictures.

Another point indicating this Indian origin is that the stature of the average man is therein represented as being 96 finger-breadths. This is the identical figure recorded by Āryabhaṭa (*circa* 500 A.D.) as the standard height for a man in India. That writer states²—

1 *nṛi* (or man) = 4 *hastu* (cubits) = 96 *aṅgula*.

Aṅgula, literally “finger”, is more correctly defined in the Tibetan as “finger-breadths”.

L. A. WADDELL.

THE STANDARD HEIGHT OF AN INDIAN MAN

Col. Waddell's reference, in his note given above, seems to be to p. 1232, line 18 f. :—“The human body of normal power is 96 *sor-mos*.” The *sor-mo* is defined on p. 1243, last line, as the width of a finger across the second knuckle. And on p. 1221, line 10 ff. from the bottom, we are told :—“In *Jambudwīpa* [India] the measure of a man's height is 1 fathom or 4 cubits; deformed bodies have only 3½ cubits, measured by their own.”

The *sor-mo* is the Hindū *aṅgula*, the finger-breadth, of which 24 make one *hastu* or cubit. And the passage on p. 1221 seems to be based on the *Bṛihat-Saṁhitā*, 68/67, verse 105 :—

Ashtaśatam śaṅṅavatiḥ
 parimāṇam chaturaśītir-iti puṁsām |
 uttama-sama-hīnānam =
 aṅgula-saṁkhyā sva-mānēna ||

“The measure of the finest man is 108 *aṅgula* [= 4½ cubits], of the normal man 96 [= 4 cubits], and of the low man 84 [= 3½ cubits], by (*its*) own measure :” i.e. by the own proper measure, the standard measure, of the *aṅgula*.

¹ *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 1910, pp. 336-40.

² Dr. J. F. Fleet, *JRAS.*, 1907, p. 655.

As regards the expression *sva-mānēna*, it stands to reason that the measures must be taken according to an *angula* or a cubit which is of a fixed standard length; not according to the varying finger-breadths and cubits of individuals who are to be measured, as seems to be suggested by the Tibetan text, or by the translation of it.

Verse 107 tells us that the measure should be taken at the age of 25 years. And Bhaṭṭōtpala says, in his commentary under verse 105, that it is to be made for a man standing upright, "from the junction of the ground and the feet to the middle of the head:" i.e. from the soles of his feet to the crown of his head, just as is shown in the drawing from Lhasa at p. 1244.

J. F. FLEET.

EARLY USE OF THE BUDDHIST ERA IN BURMA

I have no thesis of my own to maintain, and should not venture to say more on this matter if I did not hope that the discussion of it would elicit new facts. I merely entered a respectful *caveat* against Dr. Fleet's conclusion, founded on Ceylonese evidence, which appears to be of a negative character for the period prior to A.D. 1165. It was precisely because Dr. Fleet had not distinguished the issues involved that I thought it necessary, for the sake of clearness, to do so. It is no wish of mine to trouble him with the details of Burmese chronology, which is no more my subject than his. But the issues, though distinct, are more or less interdependent. In a discussion on the origin of the Buddhist era any apparent use of a similar reckoning in any Buddhist country is material evidence. *Non constat*, at present, that the reckoning was not invented in Burma and transported thence to Ceylon, modified there, and subsequently re-imported into Burma. (I hasten to add that I am not putting this forward as a proposition to be argued.) My

point is that the Talaing and Burmese evidence is entitled to as much consideration as the Ceylonese.

Dr. Fleet does not appear to take that view. From the fact that no Ceylonese records have been found giving instances of the use of the Buddhist era (revised reckoning) before *circa* A.D. 1165, he is ready to infer that it was invented about that time. But when one quotes Indo-Chinese inscriptions bearing (or appearing to bear) against that conclusion, he brushes them aside as being probably not synchronous documents, and objects to the arguments by which they are supported as being "hypothetical". When definite evidence is wanting, the use of hypothesis is inevitable. Dr. Fleet's hypothesis is that the three inscriptions I have cited are all of some date later than A.D. 1170-80 (Buddhist reckoning 1713-23), although their sole purport is to discuss certain particular events and circumstances connected with a king, or kings, associated with the Buddhist date 1628 or 1630. I submit that in the overwhelming majority of cases inscriptions, and especially bulky records on stone pillars, are put up soon after the events which they are erected to record: if people do not think it worth while to record them at once, much less are they likely to do so half a century or more afterwards. Should we at this present time be inclined to set up inscriptions giving a full and particular account of the events connected with the death of King William IV?

I submit that Dr. Fleet's hypothesis is far more improbable than mine. As two of the inscriptions do not mention their own dates and I am not yet prepared to deal in detail with the longer one, I cannot put the case higher than that. As regards the third, I regret exceedingly that owing to its present dilapidated condition the date on which it claims to have been made is doubtful, and must perhaps remain so. But as Dr. Fleet has put certain questions on it, I will do my best to answer them.

It is possible that the draftsman misspelt the name of the *nakṣatra*, but its initial is certainly *ph*, not *bh*. The two letters bear no resemblance to one another in this script. The modern Talaings do not use Indian names for the two lunar fortnights, but have terms of their own. Probably the Talaings of the twelfth century also used these. It so happens that (in the modern language) both the words in question end in *-k*. Dr. Fleet's discussion about the Indian names seems, therefore, hardly in point. I have already given reasons why I consider it quite out of the question that this record could have been put up in any century later than the twelfth. And what other date than the one suggested will fit the particulars that have been preserved? In any case this Shwesandaw inscription relates to the same matters as the Shwezigon one. If it is long odds against either of them having been put up when those matters had ceased to be of practical interest, the odds against the double event are ever so much longer, I should imagine.

Burmese inscriptions are quite beyond me, and I must leave them to be dealt with by some one who knows Burmese. But I have been at some pains to go through the published untranslated collections of inscriptions from Upper Burma and Bodawpaya's Mandalay Inscriptions with a Burman, and I find several cases of the use of the Buddhist era apparently before A.D. 1165. Most of these appear to be from copies made by the order of King Bodawpaya. But as the originals are no longer available, and there seems to be no particular reason for suspecting that the dates have been altered, they seem to be as good evidence as we are likely to get. Until they have been critically examined, I cannot venture to say very much more about the use of the Buddhist reckoning in Burma in early times. Whether it is connected in any way with the Ceylonese reckoning is a further point on which it may be advisable for the present to suspend

judgment. I suspect that variations in the initial point of the Buddhist era are responsible for many of the discrepancies in early Burmese chronology of which Dr. Fleet justly complains. That is another reason why, in my judgment, all this evidence, Talaing and Burmese as well as Ceylonese, will have to be considered together before any final conclusions can be arrived at.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

In this *Journal*, 1910, pp. 474-81 and pp. 850-60, is an interesting discussion on "The Revised Buddhist Era in Burma", carried on between Dr. Fleet and Mr. Blagden, and the latter has asked me to intervene. Most willingly do I comply with his request.

The thesis laid down by Dr. Fleet and questioned by Mr. Blagden is this:—That the reckoning with the initial point in B.C. 544 was devised in Ceylon, was put together in its complete form just after A.D. 1165, and was carried to Burma in the decade A.D. 1170-80.

At pp. 256-7 of the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxiii, 1894, I have discussed about the Burmese eras and the mode of reckoning them. There are three eras, namely, the Era of Religion, which began in B.C. 544: the Śaka Era, which began in A.D. 78: and the Chinese Era, now current, which began in A.D. 638. The Śaka Era was established in its own second year, after wiping out 622 ($544 + 78 =$ Dodorasa) years of the Era of Religion: and the Chinese Era was established after wiping out 560 (Khachhapañcha) years of the Śaka Era.

There appears to be strong evidence to show that the Era of Religion or the Nirvāṇa Era, which began in B.C. 544, was known to the Burmans long before the twelfth century A.D. When they adopted the Śaka as well as the Chinese Era, the year was reckoned in its equivalent of Anno Buddhæ. Further, at pp. 49-50 of the *Kalyāṇi*

Inscriptions (Rangoon edition) precise dates are given of three principal events: Anno Buddhæ 1601, Sakkarāj 419 = Anmruddha or Anawrata conquered Thaton; Anno Buddhæ 1708, Sakkarāj 526 = Siri Saṅghabodhi Parakkamabāhu, king of Ceylon, reformed Buddhism; Anno Buddhæ 1714, Sakkarāj 532 = Mahāthera Uttarajīva set out for Ceylon.

In order to convert a year of Anno Buddhæ into a year of the Christian era, we have to deduct 544 from the former: and in order to turn a year of Sakkarāj into a year of the Christian era, we have to add 638 to the former. It will thus be seen that in Burma it is customary in all important documents to record dates in Anno Buddhæ as well as in Sakkarāj, the one acting as a salutary check on the other.

The Myazedi inscription, which has been referred to in the discussion, is the earliest lithic record, as yet found in Burma, which is inscribed in the Burmese characters. It has four faces, each of which is engraved in a different language, namely, Burmese, Talaing, Pāli, and an unidentified language. Mr. Blagden notes that there are two copies of the quadrilingual epigraph, and Dr. Fleet doubts its being a contemporary record because it states only the year of the accession of King Kyanzittha, namely, 1628 Anno Buddhæ (A.D. 1084), and omits the month and day of the erection of the pagoda. As regards Mr. Blagden's query, the following account will show why, unlike the majority of other lithic records, two copies of the same inscription were made.

The stone now in the Pagan Museum appears to be the original. It was found at the foot of a cross-legged image of the Buddha which is on the north face of the Myazedi Pagoda. The palace of the king being situated to the north of the pagoda, its northern face would afford the nearest approach to royal worshippers. The workmanship of the inscription is neat and clear, and the letters are

finely cut. The stone is hard and is closely grained. The letters, as compared with those on the second, are smaller, and on the face of the inscription recorded in Pāli twenty letters take up a space of 12 inches. The stone is cubical in shape ; its length, covered by letters, is 3 ft. 3½ in., and its breadth or thickness is 1½ feet.

The second stone, which is an exact replica of the first and which is now conserved on the platform of the pagoda, is soft in grain, and several layers have been peeled off. The letters are larger in size, twenty letters on the Pāli face covering a space of 2ft. 2in. Its height is 4ft. 8in., breadth 1 ft. 9½ in., and thickness 1 ft. 0½ in. It was found close to the remains of a library which is to the north-east of the pagoda.

The above circumstances explain why there are two exact copies of the epigraph. One, the original, was set up close to the image, whose construction it commemorates. The second, which is a copy of the original record, was put up in the Library for safe custody. In the case of three or four inscriptions found at Pagan, duplicates have also been discovered. This fact disposes of the alleged unique peculiarity of the Myazedi record.

Dr. Fleet's objection may be met by saying that the Myazedi inscription only gives the year of the Era of Religion because it records a past fact, namely, the year of accession of King Kyanzittha, and because that era was common to the four communities using the four scripts of the epigraph. It is not customary for the Burmans to incise on stones records which are not contemporary, or to make forgeries of lithic records, for the simple reason that the epigraphs declare the relinquishment of property and its dedication to a sacred purpose, and not its acquisition for a temporal or utilitarian purpose.

It now remains to consider the great historical value attached to the Myazedi inscription, and how it may

be utilized in revising the chronology, given by Phayre in his *History of Burma*, of the reigns of the four kings of Pagan — Anawrata, Sawlu, Kyanzittha, and Alaungsithu. Phayre based his work on the Hman Nan Yāzawin or Mahāyāzawin, which was compiled in 1829 during the reign of King Bagyidaw (1819–37). As these chronicles were compiled under Royal patronage, their chronology is generally accepted to be correct throughout Burma, although it does not coincide with the dates given in the older records, both historical and epigraphic. Assuming that the Myazedi inscription is a contemporary record — there are no reasons to the contrary — King Kyanzittha, otherwise called Śri Tribhuwanāditya-dhammarāj, ascended the throne in 1628 of the Era of Religion corresponding to A.D. 1084. He reigned for twenty-eight years, that is, up to A.D. 1112. The corresponding dates in Sakkarāj will be 446 and 474. These latter figures correspond, in a remarkable degree, with those given in the “Jātā bon Yāzawin” or the Chronological Tables based on the Royal horoscopes. As the Burmans, in common with the Hindus, set a great store by astrology and horoscopes, these tables appear to afford us trustworthy chronological data. Relying on the Myazedi inscription as well as these tables and the older records, Phayre’s dates may be revised as follows:—

NAME OF KING.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.			LENGTH OF REIGN.
	YEAR OF RELIGION.	A.D.	BURMESE ERA.	
Anawrata	1588	1044	406	33
Sawlu	1621	1077	439	7
Kyanzittha	1628	1084	446	28
Alaungsithu	1656	1112	474	75

Mr. Blagden appears to mistake Alaungsithu for Kyanzittha in his later article. Kyanzittha’s title is

“Śri Tribhuwanāditya-dhamma-rājā”, and he reigned from A.D. 1084 to 1112. Alaungsithu’s title is “Śri Tribhuwanāditya - pavarapaṇḍita - Sudhamma - rājā - Mahā-dhipati Narapati-Sithu”, and he reigned from A.D. 1112 to 1187. If the dates given above are accepted, Burmese chronology, so far as it relates to the four kings, will rest on a firmer basis, and the elucidation of Burmese history by the light of Talaing epigraphs, which Mr. Blagden has so kindly undertaken to do, will proceed more satisfactorily.

TAW SEIN KO.

REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING TWO NOTES

It is very good of Mr. Taw Sein Ko to comply with Mr. Blagden’s request to intervene between him and me. And it is satisfactory to learn that the Myazedi inscription is to be understood (whether it is or is not a contemporaneous record) as placing the beginning of the reign of Kyanzittha (not some other event in his career) in A.B. 1628 expired, i.e., as Mr. Taw Sein Ko tells us, in A.D. 1084; and that, on this basis and others, Phayre’s dates for a certain period of Burmese history may be revised to advantage. But it is difficult to see how any of the statements in the Kalyāni inscription, which have been long known to me (as also have Mr. Taw Sein Ko’s notes on the Burmese eras, to which he alludes), throw any more light on the matter which has been under discussion between Mr. Blagden and me. This record, framed in A.D. 1476 or 1479,¹ presents a double date in telling us² that Rāmādhipati, the king in whose time it was framed, began to reign in A.B. 2002 expired, Sakkarāj 820: i.e., as Mr. Taw Sein Ko has told us,³ in A.D. 1458. And in another passage⁴ it gives another such date, A.B. 1601, Sakkarāj 419 (A.D. 1057),

¹ The dates in it run on to Sakkarāj 841, = A.D. 1479-80.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 22, pp. 34, 155.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 34, note 22.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 151.

as cited by Mr. Taw Sein Ko.¹ But this is no contemporaneous entry: the date belongs to four centuries before the record. And the point is, is it traceable back to some synchronous record, inscriptional or literary, actually written in or just after A.D. 1057?: or was it arrived at, at some later time, by calculation backwards? We want to know which was the case, and in the former event exactly what its source was, before we can decide whether this date helps to establish the point that a reckoning from the death of Buddha, placing that event in or about B.C. 544, existed in Burma before A.D. 1170-80.

That Mr. Blagden has no thesis of his own to maintain, comes somewhat as a surprise to me. However, the general tenor of his present note seems to be that any further discussion may best be postponed until certain definite evidence, which appears to exist, has been critically examined and placed on record. I should willingly assent to that: I did not open the discussion: and it is hardly worth while to give any more time to it on the inconclusive evidence which, so far, is all that is before us.

J. F. FLEET.

THE KHATUR OR KHATTAR TRIBE

When reviewing the *Memoirs of Jahāngīr* (this *Journal* for 1910, p. 950) I raised a question about the identity of the Khatur tribe settled between Hasan Ābdāl and Aṭak. *Memoirs*, p. 100. Dr. Grierson has kindly pointed out to me that there is a Kator tribe in the Chitral Valley; and he refers me to Elliot & Dowson, *Mahomedan Historians*.

¹ Mr. Taw Sein Ko has cited the record as if it gives also the double dates "Anno Buddhae 1708, Sakkarāj 526" = A.D. 1164, and "Anno Buddhae 1714, Sakkarāj 532" = A.D. 1170. But it does not do so. After the date A.E. 1601, Sakkarāj 419, it says (*ibid.*, pp. 17, 151):—"At 107 years after that, in Sakkarāj 526": and:—"In the 6th year after that, again, in Sakkarāj 532".

ii, 407, 409 : iii, 401, 407, 481 : v, 370 : and J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (1889), pp. 61 and 148. I also find the Kators and their country referred to in the *Āīn-i-Akbarī* (Jarrett), ii, 390 and n. 3, 391, 392, 406 (Šūbah Kābul).

At the time he made the entry above referred to Jahāngīr was encamped at Anroliē between Ḥasan Ābdāl and Aṭak ; in other words, in the northern part of the present Attock district. This is, I find, the home-country of a numerous Mahomedan tribe, the Khattars, who have been settled there since the time of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī. They still occupy the country from the Indus at Aṭak as far east as the western boundary of the present Rawalpindi district : that is, the very country in which Jahāngīr was encamped and where dwelt the Khatur of whom he speaks, *Gazetteer of the Rawalpindi District*, 1893-4, p. 112.¹

Thus, on investigation, I come to the conclusion that Jahāngīr's Khatur ought not to be identified with the Kator tribe in the Chitral Valley. In his 14th year Jahāngīr, on his way to Kashmīr, visited *Sarkār* Paklī, and mentions the Kator country as that *sarkār's* northern boundary (Elliot & Dowson, vi, 370). Paklī itself is quite in the north of the Hazārah district, as shown in Biddulph's map. Thus the Kator country must be still farther to the north, and at least 70 or 80 miles from the location of the Khatur tribe spoken of by Jahāngīr (p. 100); while Chitral, where there is a Kator ruling family, is quite 150 miles to the north-west of Aṭak and far outside the range of Jahāngīr's contemplation when camped east of the Indus near Ḥasan Ābdāl. The Dilāzāk Paṭhāns, who are coupled with the Khatur in the passage under discussion, are still found in small numbers in the Attock district, *Gazetteer*, p. 104.

¹ Until quite recently the Khattars have been notorious for the turbulence attributed to them by Jahāngīr.

There seems little or no justification for Biddulph's identifying (p. 148) the Kators of Chitral with the Khattars, spelt by him Katār, living east of the Indus near Hasan Ābdāl.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

November 2, 1910.

LOST MSS. OF THE "ARABIAN NIGHTS" AND A
PROJECTED EDITION OF THAT OF GALLAND

In Richardson's *Grammar of the Arabick Language* (London, 1776) a considerable extract is printed from a MS. of the *Arabian Nights* "in the possession of William Jones, Esq." It consists of Night 162 and part of Night 163, and covers, with a translation, pp. 200-9 of the Grammar. There exists also a twenty-page print containing two extracts from the *Arabian Nights*, Nights 162 and 163 on pp. 1-4 and Nights 57-65 (beginning) on pp. 5-20, but giving no name of editor or place or date of printing. It is known, however, that the editor was Joseph White, D.D., Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford from 1775, who died in 1814 as Canon of Christ Church. Comparison of his first extract (The Story of the Barber's Fifth Brother) with the extract in Richardson makes it plain that his source also was the MS. of Sir William Jones. But as to the date of printing of this fragment, which was evidently a specimen of a projected edition, I have absolutely no information.

So much is commonly to be found in the bibliographies (cf. e.g. Schnurrer, *Bibliotheca Arabica*, p. 487); but Richardson has another reference which has not, I think, been hitherto noticed. On p. 181 he speaks of ". . . the celebrated tales called *حكاية ألف ليلة وليلة* (*sic*) *حكاية*, *The Stories of a Thousand Nights and a Night* (of which we have an imperfect translation of not quite one half, known by the title of *The Arabian Nights' Entertainments*) . . ."

From this it is clear that Richardson had access to

a MS. which contained rather more than twice what is in Galland's translation. But what known MS. of such length was accessible in England before 1776? The Wortley Montagu MS. seems to be the only possibility: but it was written in 1764-5. and passed into the hands of Joseph White only after the death of Edward Wortley Montagu in 1776. From White it passed to Jonathan Scott, and thence to the Bodleian in 1803. It is hardly probable, then, that it could have been known to Richardson before 1776. According to the *Dictionary of National Biography* (xxxviii, pp. 239 f.) Edward Wortley Montagu died and was buried at Padua, and his MSS. were not sold until 1787.

The MS. which Richardson did know and use, and of which an edition was begun, as I have shown, by Joseph White, was that of Sir William Jones. Since then that MS. has vanished, and is not, as might have been expected, among the books of Sir William Jones in the Indian Office Library. Yet it was a MS. of high interest. Its text is clearly of the same recension as that of the Galland and the Vatican MSS. But these are both very incomplete, and the Jones MS., if it contained more than twice as much as Galland, would be of unique value. My work on the Galland MS., of which I am preparing an edition to be published in the series of Arabic texts projected by Professor Jewett, of the University of Chicago, has convinced me that there was in the mediæval Arabic world a more or less complete *Thousand and One Nights*, of which the Galland and the Vatican MSS. are only fragments. Later, after this complete collection had been broken up, various attempts were made to fill out the number of Nights. One of these is the Wortley Montagu MS., and another, much more successful, is the recension which Zotenberg called the Egyptian recension, and which, though no older than the eighteenth century, has become the standard text of the *Arabian Nights*.

I write, therefore, now to urge anyone who may have access to uncatalogued collections of Arabic MSS., or collections of which the catalogues have never been published, to examine these carefully on the chance that they may contain the lost MS. of Sir William Jones. They should look for a MS. in which the division into Nights and the numbering of the Nights agrees with those in Galland's translation, at least up to the Story of Sinbad, which Galland interpolated. This agreement will indicate a MS. of the Galland recension. A further comparison with the text either of Richardson or White will determine whether it is the Jones MS. or another of the same recension. For there is another lost MS., that of Dr. Patrick Russell, which also agreed with the Galland text. See Dr. Russell's letter in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February, 1799, reprinted by Jonathan Scott as Appendix V in his sixth volume. Either of these two MSS. would be of the greatest value for the editing of the Galland MS. which I have undertaken, and I earnestly beg anyone who may come upon a trace of them to communicate his discovery to me.

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD.

HARTFORD, CONN., U.S.A.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED ARABIC TEXT OF "ALI BABA AND THE FORTY THIEVES"

The finding of an original Arabic text of the story of Ali Baba is an event of considerable importance. Professor Macdonald is to be congratulated on his discovery of the Bodleian MS., as well as on the way in which he has edited and discussed the text, in this Journal, April, 1910, pp. 327-86. The story is an uncommonly interesting one in itself; there has been an air of mystery about it ever since Galland published his translation: it was even doubted whether an Arabic original of it ever existed. Now

fortunately, there is hardly room for further doubt. Macdonald's conclusions, stated with due caution, will be generally accepted as sound. This version of the story is not a translation from the French, nor from any other Occidental language. It was composed freely in Arabic, as the attempt to put a popular tale into written form, and is independent of Galland's recension, though closely related to it. If, as is possible, the two versions were derived from a common *written* ancestor, then it is certain, at least in the case of the text now before us, that the tale was reproduced from memory and with considerable freedom.

It is perhaps not surprising that only these two copies should have become known thus far. The story is doubtless a comparatively recent one, though with older affinities, as Macdonald has pointed out. It seems to have taken shape on Turkish soil, and to have been transplanted into Syria. The dialect in which this version is written contains a few forms which are characteristically Syrian: the words اجوا (336, 2) and اورثه (333, 12) are certainly not the result of transcriptional errors, but are to be accepted as they stand, side by side with اجزبه (366, 18) and other similar colloquialisms. The word جانب, "some" (365, 16), which is much used in the Egyptian popular idiom, is expressly designated in Hava's *Dictionary* as Egyptian in contrast with Syrian; but in view of the other indications, our text must be regarded as giving evidence of its occasional use in the latter dialect also.

The scribe of the Bodleian MS. gives his name, at the end, as يوحنا بن يوسف وارسى. It seems to me very probable that he was not only the scribe but also the author of this recension. This might perhaps be suggested by the colophon itself, which is somewhat unusually prominent, considering the nature of the text, and in the style of its long-winded rhymes resembles the main body of the composition. But a more cogent argument is obtained

from the extraordinary correctness of the whole MS. Here we have fifty-three closely printed pages of Arabic, and in that whole extent only a very few insignificant slips of the pen, just such as would be inevitable in a composition of this length when written down carefully by the author himself: but which would surely be increased many-fold, and with the addition of errors of a more serious character, with every fresh transcription. Macdonald has emended the text in a number of places where the MS., if I am not mistaken, really gives the reading which the author intended. Thus, p. 340, n. 2: The writing of the suffix *كي*—side by side with *ك*—is common in such MSS. as this, and is not infrequent in old MSS. of classical compositions. It is by no means to be regarded as a mistake: it may have been chosen here, moreover, because it stands at the end of the sentence.—Same page, n. 1: Here, also, there can be no question of carelessness. This is merely an instance of the passing over of verbs *tertiæ* *آ* into *tertiæ* *ى*, which is so common in late Arabic. This text contains a good many other examples of the same phonetic change.—p. 349, n. 2: *خوف* should have been left in the text. It is colloquial, and especially natural before *أن*. Exactly the same thing occurs on p. 373, and the fact is particularly to be noticed that in both cases the word is found, not in the author's own narrative, but in the speech of one of his characters.—p. 357, n. 1: Macdonald's emendation is a natural one, but is it not more probable that the vulgar adverb *بئى*, "further," was intended? The adverb *عاد*, "again," in *ما عاد يرجع*, 346, 1, is a good parallel in this text. For the use of *بئى* (only mentioned in Dozy) compare the following examples in Salliani's *Contes Arabes*: 8, 1, *لم بقاء يقدر يتكلم*, "he could not speak further"; 9, 10, *أين بئى يوحد مشلك*, "where shall another like thee be found?"; 95, 1, *ما بقا*, "neither brother nor friend can give

thee further help". See also 38, 16 : 59, 21 : 89, 22.—
 p. 359, n. 3 : The two verbs are certainly to be retained as they stand in the MS. (so it seems to me), and not emended to the second person, which is not suited to the context ; the first person is what the sense requires. The fact that the manner of writing the ending is contrary to rule ought certainly to count for nothing in a text which swarms with vulgarisms, and whose author lays no great weight on classical orthography (on this point see further below).
 —p. 361, n. 1 : The reading of the MS., اقبل (i.e. اقبِل " I will accept "), is the correct one.—Same page, n. 2 : The text-reading is correct, and the form to be pointed يَمَانُكَ.—p. 373, n. 4 : See the note on خوف above.—
 p. 375, n. 1 : Is it possible that the phrase ليت شعري is used here as though it were equivalent to ليت alone ? If not, then Macdonald has certainly emended correctly.—
 p. 376, n. 1 : I doubt the emendation, as Macdonald himself does. It may seem quite unlikely that even this whimsical writer would employ إناءة as a quasi-synonym of دار ; still, I would rather keep it than attempt to substitute anything for it.—Same page, n. 2 : The reading of the MS. is, I think, the original one, " nor inhabiting any dwelling-place in either town or desert." The rhyme is needed, and as for the inelegant repetition of the word, that happens again and again in this text.—p. 377, n. 4 : If I mistake not, this is merely the author's own defective orthography for اللبى, since he permits himself a good deal of freedom in omitting the mark of the long ā where the form is unmistakable. Thus we have حابوت for حابوت, 340, 13, 16 ; 351, 2, and so regularly elsewhere wherever the word occurs. Similarly, الجاسوس for الجاسوس, 356, 12 ; خراسان for خراسان, 333, 2 ; and الجمران for الجمران, 347, 9. In like manner the plural آلت, " implements," is everywhere written آله (343, 15 ; 351, 18 ; 371, 12, etc.), there being nowhere any possible doubt that the plural is

intended.¹—p. 382, n. 2 : The MS. reading يتعاقب is correct and must not be changed to تعاقب. Translate: “the first (lit., first thing) to be punished will be thou.”—p. 384, n. 1 : The form ارتكبتوا should not be emended. It was intended to rhyme with استكثروا and اطمأثروا just preceding. The fact that it is not “grammatical” counts for nothing ; what the author wanted was rhetoric. It is a precisely similar case when at the bottom of p. 378 we find البدايات (for البدايا) simply for the sake of the rhyme with المناديات and المسامرات.

With these readings restored the MS. must certainly be pronounced marvellously correct. Some of the forms corrected by Macdonald would pretty certainly have been corrected by any expert copyist, and the argument seems to me strong that we have before us the handwriting of the author of this recension. He seems to have been a well-educated and well-read man, perfectly familiar, of course, with the ordinary forms and constructions of classical Arabic, but not feeling himself in the least bound by them in a popular narrative of this sort. Much of what he writes is in *quasi* high-flown style, namely, his own embellishment of the story, in a cheap and careless rhetoric, on which, though it is often long drawn out, he evidently spent very little effort. He felt that this sort of thing could not be regarded as *literature*, and yet felt obliged to make it at least imitate literature. In the long passages on p. 376 f. especially, he treats his rhymed prose as a sort of joke. But in all the dialogue of the story, where the characters are represented as speaking, he throws in vulgarisms with the greatest freedom. In

¹ It has occurred to me as possible that the troublesome word خيمته 373, 11 (see Macdonald's note), is an instance of this defective orthography, though in that case we must suppose the accidental omission of a word also ; that is, the whole clause would have read : فهذا خبرى مع هؤلاء [الليصوص] الخيمته .

fact, his literary proceeding, taking into account the traditions by which he was bound, is not without a real resemblance to that of modern writers of popular tales. I can see no evidence that he "prided himself on his *irāb*" (p. 332): on the contrary, his frequent neglect of it seems to me to be deliberate rather than accidental—it certainly was not due to ignorance. He omits the accusative ending, for instance, again and again, even where the substantive is the direct object of a finite verb immediately preceding. Thus we find such phrases as حتى تریه 369, 13; 374, 13; 338, 22; راجع البک 346, 15; صاروا حسد کامل 352, 21; 354, 13; فوجده . . . قاعد "he found him sitting," 356, 11; so ما زال الزيت موجود عندنا 372, 16 (contrast 368, 9); لأن الله الكيل ما كان موجود عندها 339, 18; see also 379, 6; 381, 5, 13; انتبیت الى قریبتین ملانین 372, bottom (so 365, 5), cf. 373, 19; 381, 13. فحلین رومان (noticed by Macdonald): the use of ذی for ذو, 376, 5; 377, 10; the characteristic vulgarism فقط (for فقط), 352, 12; 357, 12 (the word occurring once in the speech of the girl Murjāna, and the other time in that of one of the robbers); the phrase جاریة سودد (i.e. سَوْدَد for سوداء; here Macdonald should not have edited with the dotted *ḍ*), etc. Beyond all question, the author of this recension was perfectly familiar with the classical forms and constructions in these and the many other similar cases. He dropped easily into "bad grammar", as a modern writer might in similar circumstances, simply because the nature of the composition required nothing more formal.

The text is an interesting one throughout. It contains numerous words and constructions which will be useful as further examples in the textbooks of vulgar Arabic. Such are *إسواس*, for *وسواس*, 347, 10; *واراک*, probably not

a *lapsus calami*, 349, 2 (the phrase means "what news dost thou bring?"): the verb *تبسّر*, "be suitable," 350, 13: 369, 13; 382, 15: the use of the adverbs *عاد* and *بقي*, mentioned above: *اندرج*, "chat familiarly" (vii. stem instead of viii.), 361, 21: 364, 4: *طرق*, "remain silent with downcast eyes" (i. stem, not iv.), 363, 9 (Macdonald, note, regards this as passive, but the correlation with *وعيس* makes it much more likely that it is one of the numerous vulgar substitutions of i. for iv.); *الزومه* used in the same way as *أمكنه*, 364, 9; 374, 12: the use of *دست*, "basin," for *طست*, 368, 4; 369, 14, 17; 373, 1: *حيث* (if not an error) for *حتى*, "so that," 369, 17; *طال ما*, "as long as," 374, 1; the plural *أمرار*, "times," 374, 16; 375, 13; the form *سايّله* for *أسيّله*, 376, 13 (cf. 377, 12): *رئّص*, "tame, subdue, quiet," 383, 1 (not as remarkable as Macdonald's note implies; see the verb in Dozy and Spiro); the plurals *قيسان* (from *قوس*), 334, bottom, 376, 15, and *كيسان* (from *كأس*), 376, 15; and one or two others which have received mention above.

A few comments on the text and its interpretation may be added.—333, bottom: Is it not possible to emend the corrupt half-verse satisfactorily? Macnaghten's text (i, 141; Bombay lithograph, i, 112) gives the last word in the line as *المحقّره*, i.e. *المحقّره*, "wretched, miserable," which is exactly what both meter and sense demand. The form is not classical (the ii. stem being ordinarily used), and was probably employed here merely under the compulsion of the meter. This fact would suffice to explain its alteration or omission in most of our texts. But it is just the sort of form to expect in popular verse.—334, 7: The form intended is *مآله*.—341, 6: The use of the article in *بالسعادة أخيه* is a remarkable slip of the pen.—344, bottom: Should not the *second* *وكلما* be *كذلك*?—

346, 2: Read الملعون and جل.—347, 10: The form intended was certainly كآبه; see also 350, 20.—Line 16: Read الممانح instead of الممانع.—352, 10: Read فرأى صه.—353, 19: Read بالنعش instead of بالنعش.—354, 1: The correct reading is, I think, واستقضى بيا, “and he appeared with her before the qāḍī.” The *public* part of the marriage is what is described here: see what immediately follows. In the account of the marriage of the son to Murjāna, 384, 21 f., an almost identical clause occurs, and the words above quoted are replaced by عند قاضي المسلمين.—358, 10, and note 1: This is the *verb* خَطَى, and has nothing to do with خَطًا. Translate: “until he came to a street, in which he walked along for a few paces.”—Same line, read للص.—Line 12: Read المرحوم.—359, 2: Read of course عن.—360, 4 from bottom: Instead of أن read عن.—361, 2 from bottom: For الأ read الی.—362, 6, and note 1: دخلی سميله, in just this sense, is common in classical Arabic.—Line 3 from bottom: Read وسكنتت in place of دروب ضروب.—363, 4 from bottom: For دروب read ضروب.—364, 11: عرفه should be عرف. Cf. 365, 11; 378, 16; 383, bottom.—367, 8: Read of course والاضطجاع.—Line 10, and note 3: على حال does not mean “for a moment”. This is an instance of the construction of اتفق with مع of the person and على of the thing. حال has here its ordinary meaning, “circumstance.” The robber captain wished to go down to the courtyard “in order that he might have an understanding with his gang about a certain circumstance.”—370, 11: The correct reading here is not قربة, natural as that seems. Read فعند قُربيه من القرب, “so when he drew near to the jars,” etc.—375, 3 from bottom: الكبار is a mistake for الكبار.—378, 1: Read وآن.—380, 15: It would be better to edit وآن, since

there is nothing unusual in this writer's manner of writing the *hemza*, and similar interpretations of it have been made elsewhere in the text.—381, 1 : The particle *;* has fallen out at the beginning of the line.—382, 3 : Instead of *جزها* read *هزها* . See Boethor, in Dozy, on *هز* viii : “ se donner des grâces en marchant, se balancer.”—384, 5 : Read *فيقتضى* .

CHARLES C. TORREY.

LA FONDATION DE GOEJE

1. Le conseil de la fondation, n'ayant subi aucun changement, est composé comme suit : MM. C. Snouck Hurgronje (président), H. T. Karsten, J. A. Sillem, M. Th. Houtsma, et C. van Vollenhoven (secrétaire-trésorier).

2. Le capital de la fondation étant resté le même, le montant nominal est de 19,000 florins hollandais (39,000 francs) ; en outre, au mois de Novembre, 1910, les rentes disponibles montaient à plus de 1,850 florins (3,700 francs).

3. Conformément à l'avis de M. le Professeur A. A. Bevan et M. H. F. Amedroz, le conseil a offert à titre gratuit un exemplaire de la reproduction de la *Ḥamāsah d'al-Buḥturi* à un certain nombre de bibliothèques publiques ou privées, de sorte que maintenant cette publication peut être consultée par ceux qui désirent en profiter pour leurs études. Les autres exemplaires ont été mis en vente à 200 francs par exemplaire, aux conditions des circulaires distribuées ; la vente se fait au profit de la fondation.

4. La fondation a subventionné un voyage scientifique que M. le docteur A. J. Wensinck a fait en Angleterre.

Novembre, 1910.

FIRST UNIVERSAL RACES CONGRESS

A Congress dealing with the general relations subsisting between West and East will be held in London

from July 26 to July 29, 1911. So far as possible special treatment will be accorded to the problem of the contact of European with other developed types of civilisation, such as the Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Turkish, and Persian. The official Congress languages are to be English, French, German, and Italian; but Oriental and other languages will not be rigidly excluded. The papers (which will be taken as read) are to appear, collected in volume form, both in an all-English and an all-French edition, about a month before the Congress opens, and among the contributors will be found eminent representatives of more than twenty civilisations. All schools of thought are hereby invited to take part in the proceedings. *Resolutions of a political character will not be submitted.*

Object of the Congress.

To discuss, in the light of modern knowledge and the modern conscience, the general relations subsisting between the peoples of the West and those of the East, between so-called white and so-called coloured peoples, with a view to encouraging between them a fuller understanding, the most friendly feelings, and a heartier co-operation.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS OF BRITISH INDIA. By JOSEPH CHAILLEY, Member of the French Chamber of Deputies. Translated by Sir WILLIAM MEYER, K.C.I.E. Macmillan, 1910.

Monsieur Chailley has done his countrymen a rare service; he has presented them with an elaborate and impartial exposition of the problems which have to be faced, and if possible solved, by the English in their government of India. What a contrast he forms to the globe-trotting French *Chauviniste*, who must needs sneer at us even on his title-page, forgetting that his tour, if it could have been made at all, would have been made under very different conditions *sans les Anglais*. In this English version Sir William Meyer has added to the services mentioned by the author in his Preface, by preserving in his translation a great deal of the clearness and daintiness of good French prose.

The work is divided into two Books; the first devoted to a résumé of facts and a statement of the issues; the second to the subjects of a "Native Policy", the mode of dealing with native states, and the situation in Burma, followed by chapters on landed property and the agriculturist classes, Law, Justice, the Education Problem, and the share of the Indians in the administration of the country. Of all these ably treated subjects perhaps Burma and Education are those to which the author has chiefly devoted himself. It is difficult, if not impossible, to criticize where everything is so fairly and so accurately placed before the reader. Of course, there is not much that is new for experienced Anglo-Indian officials to learn; but it can be confidently asserted that no better book could

be placed in the hands of a student commencing the study of Indian administration. It can also be strongly recommended to any English politician desirous of arriving at serious, well-grounded, and unbiassed opinions on a subject too often treated in a spirit of irresponsible ignorance.

Tempted by the vastness and absorbing interest of the subject, it would be possible to convert this notice into a vehicle for setting forth the conclusions of a lifetime, but even if space allowed, the matter when handled honestly would become too polemical for these pages. I content myself with calling attention to one or two points.

Monsieur Chailley seems to think (p. 74) that the English are wrong in asserting that the Hindu and the Mohammedan will never combine. At all events, we see no signs at present of any such approach of the two classes; in fact, it is all the other way, and they seem more openly hostile politically than they have ever been since we entered on the task of Indian government. Mohammedans, as our rivals for rule in India, would be more formidable antagonists than the Hindus, and we can conceive their joining a movement against us. But it would be on one condition only—that they must be the head of it. Such a concession of superiority would not suit the modern English-speaking Hindus, in the frame of mind which they have displayed for years past. They look on themselves as the destined heirs of all the ages; they claim the country as theirs by right of numbers; and are willing to accord Mohammedans only a very subsidiary place in the New India.

What is said on p. 163 about the advanced Indian party is quite true: that they are theorists, puffed up with book knowledge, proud of caste, disdainful of the lower orders; and drawing all their information from that very Anglo-Indian administration which they charge with selfishness, oppression, and ignorance. Their instruments are the Press, local conferences, and the National Congress. The history and activities of all three of these organs are

succinctly but clearly set forth on pp. 166-83. Monsieur Chailley considers that in spite of the narrow class views of its members, the Congress is working for the interests of the masses (p. 177). We look around for these results and do not find them. What has the Congress done, or attempted to do, for the masses? In his next paragraph M. Chailley seems to disprove his own assertion.

The author holds that England intends never to give up India: "She rules India and intends to go on ruling it" (p. 188). He believes that we have abandoned the earlier and better opinion of Elphinstone and Malcolm that our rule is only temporary. It is quite possible that those great men thus expressed themselves, but it must be remembered that they were speaking some eighty years ago. At that epoch the possibility of any such abandonment was so remote that their words were rather vague sentiment than an expression of deliberate intention. Would they repeat those words now, with the prospect before them of having to fix some fairly near date for their fulfilment? I much doubt it. A healthy man in his prime will sigh and say, "All flesh is grass," without that sentiment evoking any lively sense of his own mortality. We all admit that this world must come to an end, without the remotest expectation of seeing that dread day arrive. Elphinstone and Malcolm in the same way expressed a pious opinion, never dreaming of its having any practical bearing on their own conduct. Similarly, we may, and most of us do, admit that some day or other English control over India will cease; but we equally deny that the time has come, or can come before several generations have elapsed. In that case, to proclaim, as Monsieur Chailley thinks we ought, that we are deliberately working for our ultimate exodus, at some period already visible to us, is merely to bring that event upon us without our consent, and possibly at a moment when chaos would result, bringing sore disaster on the

country for which we have made ourselves responsible. In brief, if I read the situation aright, and if I understand in the least my fellow-countrymen, Labour Members and Socialists included, we have no intention whatever of being forced out of India if we can prevent it, and mean to hold on, if possible, until we leave with our own deliberate assent. We must either keep control or clear out of the country, bag and baggage. Half measures are impossible: we cannot, in justice to ourselves, accept responsibility after we have ceased to control.

In summing up, after a long examination (pp. 442-51), the question of separation between judicial and executive powers, the author declares that their union violates all theoretical rules. This finding seems to be quite inadequate for determining the course we ought to pursue. No one seems to have called attention to the fact that such separation was tried in Bengal and abandoned again in 1859. Why did the attempt fail then? The change was perhaps worth trying, at any rate in Bengal. By our legislation of 1793 we had already abdicated our position as rulers in the Oriental conception of that position, and had substituted what we intended should resemble the landlordism and squirearchy of eighteenth century England. The detailed administration was left to the landholding classes, and until recently Bengal seemed the most thoroughly loyal and contented of our provinces, and the Bengali seemed to have cast in his lot entirely with us to whom he owes everything political that he possesses. During the Mutiny of 1857 he was as much an object of popular vengeance as any European. If the separation of judicial from executive functions was safe anywhere, it could not be safer than in Bengal. Yet, in 1859, even there the old powers of district officers were restored. At the present time, when we find Bengal undermined with sedition, how can it be wise to weaken the hand of the executive, and to make the Calcutta High Court more completely than ever what it

has always been, the real ruler of the Bengal province. The practical advantages of the union of powers quite overweigh any theoretical arguments.

In conclusion, a few minor points may be briefly touched on. To the list of European ascetics given on p. 72, the name might be added of Captain Remington, Indian Army, who within the last forty years dwelt as an anchorite at Lucknow, and, if I recollect aright, proved his title by his nakedness; sanctity and want of clothing have always been closely connected in the East. The note about Jesuits in Agra (p. 91) seems to be erroneous. When the order of the Jesuits was re-established about 1815 the mission of Agra was not restored to them. It has been since 1823, and is still, in charge of the Capuchin Order. I doubt if the present Agra Mission possesses anything beyond the church and other buildings at Agra. It lost the lands at Parel, near Bombay, long ago, in the eighteenth century. The remarks on p. 91 as to the "slackness" of all workers in India have an element of truth, but must not be pushed to an extreme. The better agriculturists, so far as my experience goes, are an exceedingly laborious class, not to be excelled anywhere. The same praise might be extended to the sadly overworked clerical staff in a district office. On p. 383 is the statement that "the Charter of 1833 for the first time constituted a government of India", with this note added: "The Governor-General had previously been Governor-General of Bengal." These statements having been passed by Sir W. Meyer, it is perhaps rash to challenge them. But they are inconsistent with what is said, for instance, in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India* (1908), ii, 482. As I understand matters, from 1773 the Governor-General in Council *legislated* for the Bengal Presidency alone, while he *governed* the whole of India. He *governed* India as much before as he did after the Act of Parliament of 1833.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

August 3, 1910.

“THE SEARCH AFTER GOD” (BRAHMA-MĪMĀMSĀ) BY THE INSPIRED SAINT, BĀDARĀYAṆA, WITH “THE HOLY INTERPRETATION” (ŚĀIVA-BHĀSHYA) OF THE TEACHER-IN-GOD (ŚIVĀCHĀRYA). ŚRĪKAṆṬHA. KNOWN ALSO AS NĪLAKAṆṬHA. Madras, 1910. etc.

Until very recently the importance of the Śaiva theological literature was not realized in Europe, and even in India few students outside Śaiva circles had any idea of its antiquity and the influence that it has had in moulding classical Hindu literature. Now, however, there seems to be an awakening of interest, as a welcome token of which we greet the work bearing the above title, which is the first instalment of a translation by Mr. V. V. Ramanan of Nīlakaṇṭha's great Bhāshya or doctrinal exposition of the Brahma-sūtra, together with the commentary of Appaya Dikshita. Nīlakaṇṭha's work is admittedly one of the earliest and most authoritative treatises on Śaiva theology. Unfortunately his date and literary relations are very obscure. Tradition, perhaps rightly, describes him as the disciple of a certain Śvetāchārya; but it also gives a list of twenty-seven mostly fabulous *yogāchāryas* who carried on the spiritual succession from the latter, and it has no really historical information on the subject.

Mr. Ramanan himself is a devout Āgamic, and his personal beliefs on the subject of Indian and European mysticism will not be generally accepted in Europe. But he is profoundly versed in the literature of the Āgamas, and his translation, with the exhaustive notes appended to it, is very good. From his notes we extract for the benefit of bibliographers the following list of the twenty-eight Āgamas, referring them to the book itself for the names of the numerous Upāgamas:—

1. Śaiva Āgamas: Kāmika, Yogaḥa, Chintya, Kāraṇa, Ajita, Dīpta, Sūkshma, Sāhasraka, Aṃśumān, and Suprabha (Suprabheda or Suprabodha).

2. Raudra Āgamas: Vijaya, Nīśvāsa, Svāyambhuva, Āgneya (Anala), Bhadra (Vīra), Raurava, Makuṭa, Vimala, Chandrahāsa (Chandrajñāna), Mukhabimba (Bimba), Udgīta (Prodgīta), Lalita, Siddha, Santāna (Śānta), Nārasimha (Sarvokta or Sarvottara), Pārameśvara, Kiraṇa, Para (Pārahita or Vātūla).

L. D. BARNETT.

BEITRÄGE ZUM DĪWĀN DES RU'BAH. Von R. GEYER.

(Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1910. Band clxiii, Abhandlung iii.)

By the publication of this work Professor Geyer has completed his notes and additions to the Dīwāns of the three Rağaz poets al-'Ağğāğ, az-Zafayān, and Ru'ba, originally edited by Ahlwardt in his *Sammlungen*. The notes on the first two appeared in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, vol. xxiii. With his customary thoroughness he has brought together all that is attributed to these poets in a large number of works which Ahlwardt had not consulted, and especially he has carefully compared the manuscript copies of the Dīwān of Ru'ba which had belonged to Spitta and are now in the library at Strassburg. Ahlwardt had not used these manuscripts, and the variants found in them will elucidate many obscure passages in the works of a poet who studies the use of words not readily understood even by his own contemporaries. The number of variants is astonishing when we consider that the philologists who were interested in transmitting this class of poetry actually read (قرأ) the poems under the author; among them are named al-Ašma'i and Abū 'Amr aš-Šaibānī. As Geyer points out, the Rağaz poetry is really a revival of an antiquated style. To make it interesting the poets had to have recourse to special means to find a hearing: al-'Ağğāğ, Ru'ba, and several of their contemporaries literally stuffed their compositions with strange words taken from the vocabulary of the

Bedouins which appealed to the thirst for such things among the *littérateurs* of the towns, but we find in other Rağaz poets the first attempts at humorous and grossly obscene poetry, two features which are scarcely to be found in the longer Qasīdahs; the obscene passages in the Hiğā' differing in being taunts at others, while in the Rağaz of this kind we find that after the manner of Martial the poem is intended for a coarse joke. Abū Tammām has towards the end of the Hamāsa several pieces of this kind, but the Rāğiz Ziyād aṭ-Ṭammāhī appears to have made a speciality of it.

It is noteworthy that the Rağaz poetry flourished principally in certain tribes. All three poets treated by Professor Geyer are of the tribe Sa'd, a branch of Tamīm; other Rağaz poets of note of this tribe are 'Umar b. Lağā', the adversary of Ġarīr, Himyān b. Quḥāfa, al-Qulāḥ b. Hazn, Dukain b. Rağā', and Abū Nuḥaila: the tribe of 'Iğl has chief representatives in al-Ağlab, Abū Maimūn al-'Iğlī, and Abū-n-Nağm, the latter a contemporary and adversary of al-'Ağğāğ; of the tribe of Asad are Abū Muhammad 'Abd Allāh b. Ribī al-Haḍlamī al-Faqa'sī,¹ Maidān al-Faqa'sī, Muḍrik b. Hiṣn al-Asadī; other poets frequently quoted are Ġandal b. al-Muthannā aṭ-Ṭuhawī, Miqdām b. Gassās ad-Dubairī, and Ribī ad-Dubairī. The latest poet who practised this class of poetry extensively was al-'Umānī under Hārūn ar-Rashīd. After this the Rağaz falls into disuse except for descriptive hunting poems, and finally it is used principally for didactic poems on law, etc., but these rhymers abandon the same rhyme through the whole poem and employ couplets which rhyme with one another. The Rağaz poems of the classical period all abound in difficulties, and it is to be hoped that Professor Geyer will soon publish the text of what remains of al-Ağlab al-'Iğlī and the remains

¹ He is quoted under any of these names in the dictionaries and philological works.

of some of the other poets named above, and, if possible, also the commentaries upon the *Diwāns* of al-‘Aġġāġ and Ru’ba.

No doubt many of the fragments collected by Geyer are, as he has indicated in several places, not by the poets to whom they are attributed. The verses in other metres than Raġaz are without doubt not their property. The fragment Ru’ba No. 176 is by al-Kalḥaba, and is found in the *Mufaḍḍaliyyāt*, ed. Thorbecke, No. 2, v. 5; the fragment No. 59 found in the *Diwān* of al-‘Aġġāġ is by aṭ-Ṭirimmāḥ.

We are grateful to Professor Geyer for this further contribution to the understanding of the Arabic literature at a period when it was little influenced from outside, but these contributions show us how much has yet to be brought to light before we can see plainly before us the teeming life of early Arab civilization.

Fritz Krenkow.

THE GLORY OF THE SHIA WORLD. Translated and Edited by Major P. M. SYKES. Macmillan & Co., 1910.

This book has appeared at an unfortunate time, for Persia is now in the throes of a revolution, and neither she nor her friends is in a mood for enjoying the light-hearted raillery of a successor to Hāġi Bābā. To read this book to-day is like reading the tremendous adventures of Major Gahagan during the stress of the Indian Mutiny, or Charles O’Malley in these days of cattle-driving, or witnessing the *Mikado* after the Japanese victories. But the appearance of the book at this untoward time is not the fault of the very clever author, for it was written more than two years ago. It must also be said that Nūrullah Khān is a much more respectable character than his grandfather Hāġi Bābā, and that he writes in a much more kindly spirit. He is garrulous and boastful, but he

is not a rascal, and his book might be translated into Persian without much danger of offence to Persian susceptibilities. This is more than can be said of Hāji Bābā's book, which is a satire as clever and as unfair as Le Sage's *Gil Blas*. Surely it was a mistake for the Asiatic Society of Bengal to publish the Persian translation of the Hāji's book for the edification of Orientals and Orientalists. Major Sykes' book is written in a different spirit, and abounds in amusing stories. It also shows great knowledge of Persia and of Persian modes of expression, and might be taken as a sequel to the autobiography of Muḥammad 'Alī Hazīn. Only in one place, I think, does Nūrullah make a slip in his statements, and that is where he writes of the saint Shah Niāmat Ullah's travelling to India to the Court of Aḥmad Shah Bahmanī. From Ferishta's History and Rieu's Persian Catalogue, ii, 634, it appears that it was the saint's grandchildren who visited the Deccan, and that he himself never went there. The mistake, however, is just such an one as a modern Persian versifier would be likely to make.

Major Sykes' book—for it is really written by him—professes to be the autobiography of a Persian poet, and in particular gives a detailed account of a visit to Mashhad, the glory of the Shīa world. It is difficult to believe that so enlightened and good a prince as Al-Māmūn could have been so base as to poison his relative and heir-apparent the Imām Reza, and in spite of the tradition we prefer not to credit the story. It is one that Orientals tell of nearly every great man who died in his bed. D'Herbelot does not mention it in his notice of Al-Māmūn, and in his notice of the Imām he only says that his death was "peut-être procurée par le poison". What makes the story especially doubtful is that Al-Māmūn's father, Hārūn-ar-Rashīd, is also said to have poisoned the seventh Imām, that is, Imām Reza's father. Would the son have accepted grapes from the son of his father's murderer, and would he also, as

Nūrullah tells us, have asked to be buried in the same shrine as Hārūn-ar-Rashīd ?

The book contains some excellent photographs ; one of them is of the beautiful mosque built by Gauhar Shād, the daughter-in-law of Timur. It is sad to think that this gracious lady was put to death by Abu Sa'īd, but it is a comfort to know that this bloodthirsty prince was himself executed by a descendant of her husband.

H. B.

MÉMOIRE SUR LES MOYENS PROPRES A DÉTERMINER EN ÉGYPTÉ UNE RENAISSANCE DES LETTRES ARABES. By AHMAD BEY ZEKI. Cairo : Imprimerie M. Roditi & Cie, 1910.

This is a pamphlet of twenty-two pages, dated last April. The author is the second secretary of the Council of Ministers of the Egyptian Government and a Member of the Institut Égyptien. The means he advocates to carry out the object indicated by the title is to extend the collection of Arabic works in the Royal Khedivial Library by supplying photographic reproductions of important books from manuscripts in other places. Thus, in the course of ten years or so, and at a comparatively small expense, all the principal works on Egypt, Arabic literature, and Islamic civilization would be brought together, and as part of the project the Imprimerie Nationale would bring out texts selected for printing.

By way of showing what could be done, Ahmad Bey gives particulars of some fifteen books of which he has obtained photographic copies. Most of the originals are in the Libraries of Constantinople, but some appear to be new discoveries of his. Among the finds are the missing first volume of the Encyclopædia of Ibn Fadlillâh el Umari, a small Encyclopædia hitherto unknown, by one Furai'in, a disciple of Abū Zaid el Balkhī, and a neo-Platonic

fragment of a translation from a Greek original conjectured to be by Iamblichus.¹

It is evident that the execution of the scheme suggested would do much for the study of Arabic literature in Cairo. It is not there only, however, but in every other place that Arabic researches are hampered by the inaccessibility of most necessary books. To meet the immediate need for the multiplication of copies, photography is the best way; and among its other advantages there is the smallness of the cost of copies additional to the first. One may urge, then, that the reproductions should not be limited to Cairo, but that enough should be made for distribution to all the principal centres where Arabic is studied. It is, no doubt, particularly desirable to stimulate Arabic scholarship in Egypt itself, but this object would not be helped in the least by withholding facilities that might easily be given to other countries. On the contrary, activity abroad is likely to have a good effect in Egypt. A hope may be expressed that the Egyptian Government will give their approval to the project and that the necessary financial support will be forthcoming.

A. R. G.

SHINRAN AND HIS WORK : STUDIES IN SHINSHU THEOLOGY.

By Rev. ARTHUR LLOYD, M.A. Tokyo Kyobunkwan, 1910.

This little book deserves the serious consideration of all who are interested in Buddhism. It is perhaps wrong to call Shinshuism Buddhism at all—it is more properly Amidism, the doctrine of Jōdo or the Pure Land, the Western Paradise of the Chinese, and of the supremacy

¹ In this category our author includes (p. 15) the life of Sultān Jaqmaq, by Ibn 'Arabshāh. He has apparently overlooked the MS. of this work contained in the British Museum, which the late Professor Strong proposed to print for our Society. The first part of the work appeared in our Journal in 1907.

of Amida or Amida Nyorai or Amida Butsu. In the *Shinshu Hyakurwa*—a Hundred Talks on Shinshu—a sort of catechism recently published by Nishimoto, we are told that Sakyamuni the Buddha was manifested for the sole purpose of introducing Amida, who is the one original supreme Buddha, the crown and glory of the last and highest of the three yānas, the Mahāyāna. So in the Shōshinge or religious poem of which Mr. Lloyd gives the Chinese text, the Japanese paraphrase, and an English translation, we are taught not to strive for salvation by the hard path pointed out by Sakyamuni, the path of painful works and knowledge, but solely by faith in Amida, who may be regarded as a Trinity in Unity, composed of Amitābha the Supreme (= God), Avalokiteśvara or Kwannon (a male form), the Compassionate one, Mediator, Helper, Saviour (= Jesus), and Mahāsthāmaprāpta or Seishi, Wisdom (= the Holy Ghost). The Buddhism of Sakyamuni is not rejected exactly, but rather neglected; there is, it is true, the gate of Wisdom (Knowledge) leading into the paradise of Jōdo, but the better gate is that of the Shinshuist, the Gate of Mercy (Piety), and to enter this latter gate the better way is not *shōdo*, the practice of virtue, but the way of faith, faith in the Helper, Kwannon, and this way has the merit of being the casier one, for it has been prepared by Kwannon. Such is a brief and imperfect account of Amidism, which, to my mind, like other forms of Buddhism, may be compared to an elaborately carved shell (such as the sculptured coco-nut shells one sees in the East) with a surface of complicated chasing, but with an empty interior.

Of Shinran himself—but his very existence is disputed—there are various popular hagiologies, abundantly illustrated, but to none of these does the book before me contain any reference. They would not probably be recognized by Shinshuist theologians in Japan, where, and where alone, at the present day at least, Shinshuism

flourishes, comprising with Jōdo more than half the Buddhists in Japan. It may well be popular, for it prescribes no ascetic observances of any kind; in a word, its sphere is not the cell but the agora. Shinran Shōnin flourished towards the end of the twelfth century, a period of great disturbance in Japan, and appears to have been an adherent rather of the Minamoto than of the Taira faction-mongers of that unruly time. For the rest I must refer to Mr. Lloyd's book, which is founded on that of Mr. Nishimoto, and is an interesting and learned exposition of that form of Buddhism which comes nearest to the Protestantism of the West, and still preserves its empire over millions of Japanese folk.

F. VICTOR DICKINS.

OUMĀRA DU YÉMEN, SA VIE ET SON ŒUVRE. Par
HARTWIG DERENBOURG, membre de l'Institut.
Vol. II. pp. 403. Paris: Leroux, 1910 (1904).

To review the last book of a scholar whose loss is still fresh in our minds is a sad task. Hartwig Derenbourg was no one-sided specialist. His studies extended over every important branch of Arab literature, poetry, grammar, history, and epigraphy. His edition of Sibawaihi's famous work on grammar is an achievement of enviable merit and is indispensable to every student of the Arabic language. The last twenty years of his life he devoted to the study of Eastern history of the twelfth century, selecting two persons, distinguished by many gifts and fitting representatives of a great age. The one, Usāma b. Munkid, was a warrior and politician of repute, and the author of an autobiography which forms an important source for the history of the first century of the Crusades. The other, the hero of the work mentioned above, excelled as juriconsult, poet, *littérateur*, and historian.

In his last-named capacity, Omāra has been introduced

to English readers by Mr. H. C. Kay's edition and translation of his *History of Yaman*. A sketch of his life had previously been published in De Slane's Translation of Ibn Khalliḡān's Biographical Dictionary (vol. ii, pp. 367-72), but a fuller and critical account is given in an article by the late Professor Robertson Smith in the April number 1893 of this Journal. These preliminary studies were supplemented and concluded by H. Derenbourg. He first published, in two Arabic volumes, Omāra's autobiography and a selection of his poems and letters, together with extracts from other writers who dilated on his person and work, and then added a volume in French which epitomises the whole material in a narrative on Omāra's life. The attention which Omāra received at the hand of later Arab authors testifies to the renown he enjoys in Arab literature.

Much greater is the value of this publication to modern students, as it lifts the prose and poetic writings of so interesting a personality above the confines of the student of Arab literature, providing parallel information to that drawn from Usāma's autobiography alluded to above. Both authors lived and worked in different spheres of the Moslim world, both were in almost continual contact with princes and leaders of men, and a combined reading of their memoirs cannot fail to give as vivid a picture of the history of their epoch as can be gained anywhere. Derenbourg makes the interesting observation that his heroes, although they both enjoyed, at different times, the protection of Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḡ b. Ruzziḡ, the vizier of Cairo, never met and probably knew nothing of one another. More strange still, that Omāra arrived at Cairo one year after Usāma (who was about twenty years his senior) had left this place where the vicissitudes of life had forced him to seek refuge.

Omāra was a pure Arab by birth, and a Sunni of the Shafeite school by creed. It is greatly to his credit that

he never wavered in his religious convictions, although he lived at the Shi'ite court of the Fatimide rulers of Egypt. He was animated by strong feelings of gratitude towards his benefactor, the above-mentioned Ibn Ruzziq, which found vent in numerous poems. In his autobiography Omāra tells of various attempts made by courtiers to convert him. His obstinate refusal, however, did not lose him the favour of the vizier, who greatly admired his poetry. Subsequently he was appointed Kādi. Omāra's loyalty to his benefactor eventually cost him his life. When Saladin overthrew the Fatimide rule of Egypt, Omāra, whilst endeavouring to ingratiate himself to the new Sultan, retained a grateful remembrance of his past patron, and composed a feeling elegy on the dethroned dynasty. Later on a conspiracy against Saladin's life was discovered. Omāra, being rightly or wrongly suspected of having dealings with the conspirators, was put to death.

The volume, with its handsome style, fluent reading, and attractive subject, forms a fitting termination of the lifework of a scholar, and leaves us with keen regret that so fruitful a literary career was cut short before its time.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

BEHIND THE SCENES IN PEKING: BEING EXPERIENCES DURING THE SIEGE OF THE LEGATIONS. By MARY HOOKER. With illustrations. John Murray, London. Price 7s. 6d. net.

Books not a few have been written and published on the memorable siege in Peking; one at least was prepared but disappeared completely on its road out to civilization. This one has survived, though it is composed largely of letters that never went to those they were written to. A "diary written spasmodically", as the authoress terms it, amidst all the tragedies of this unique experience,

combines with the letters to give the reader a first-hand account of those terrible eight weeks. In this story of the siege, told as it occurred amidst the exploding bombs and the crack of the rifle fire, one gets as vivid a picture of what the life was at that time as it is possible to obtain: the anxiety, the hope deferred that made their hearts sick, the squeezing into tight quarters, the insupportable heat (the thermometer on the 1st of August at 108°), the picnic style of living, the semi-starvation diet, the levelling of all rank, the treachery of the Chinese, the innocent play of the children, making a game of the dread realities that surrounded them by playing at Boxers—all these and many other incidents are woven into the interesting narrative. But strangest of all that Christian Science was doing its best to try and believe the impossible and urging against reason that the real bullets which flew about were only figments of the brain!

The book is written in a light, easy style, and well illustrated with views and photographs of Sir Robert Hart, Sir Claude Macdonald, Mr. Conger, Generals Chaffee, Gaselee, the authoress, and others.

Mrs. Hooker is an American and, naturally enough, she has a pardonable amount of national pride in her countrymen and their deeds during those trying times when the best or the worst of each individual showed itself.

It seems strange at a time when death was staring all in the face that "exaggerated racial feelings" should so exert themselves as to cause "a possible division of forces", especially as all hope of a successful defence consisted in union. We are told, however, that the danger was averted by one of her nationals who "held both people and things together".

There are but few Americanisms, though some have crept in, such for instance as "whipped" for beaten. We presume "lickety split" is another.

There seems to be some confusion of date and circumstances on p. 13 as to the great massacre of Portuguese in Ningpo. Does not the authoress refer to that in 1542, when 800 out of 1,200 were killed ?

It is curious to note how after the city gate names given in Chinese the English word "gate" is added when the Chinese has it already, as "Ha Ta Men Gate" and "Chien Men Gate".

We are glad to see a just meed of praise to the missionaries and the native Christians. The former she describes as collectively a splendid lot of men; of the latter she tells how all worked during the siege, though some amongst them were not accustomed to manual toil. The heathen, when they saw how matters were going to shape themselves, deserted.

The book is furnished with an index, as all books of any value should be, and is tastefully bound with a figure in gilt of one of the redoubtable Boxers on the cover.

J. DYER BALL.

HISTORICAL RECORDS OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S BODY
GUARD. By Lieut. V. C. P. HODSON. W. Thacker &
Co., 1910.

Mr. Hodson's very handsomely produced volume contains everything that a regimental history ought to give—the constitution of the corps at various periods, its war services, nominal rolls of the officers with their portraits and biographics, and full details on financial matters, establishment, dress, and equipment. There are seven coloured illustrations, besides three in half-tone, and ten portraits. The uniform of 1906 as seen in the frontispiece shows a great advance in taste on the hideous semi-European style of 1815 (p. 76), or even on the more picturesque get-up of 1884 (p. 170).

Contrary to the popular belief that the Body-guard is a merely "processional" corps, we find that their war services during some eighty years were most distinguished. In fact, in the eighteenth century they were the only cavalry the Company possessed. They served in Egypt in 1801-2 and volunteered for Java in 1811. In the first Burmese war they covered themselves with glory in a charge led by a Mohammedan native officer. In 1824 they helped to suppress a Sepoy mutiny at Barrackpore : their last field service was in the Sonthal troubles of 1855.

They were raised in 1773 by Sweny Toone, the great friend of Warren Hastings, of whom we hear so much in Miss S. C. Grier's *Letters of Warren Hastings*. Distinguished officers have served in the corps, such as that *beau-sabreur* Brigadier W. Mayne and the equally admirable Field-Marshal Sir N. Chamberlain. Among them also is the founder of the well-known Anglo-Indian family, the Angelos, who bore originally the truly tremendous names of Anthony Angelo Malevolti Tremamondo ; and Mr. E. A. H. Blunt may glean from pp. 298 and 299 some additional particulars about the Chevalier de l'Etang, knight of St. Louis, for his forthcoming volume on *European Monuments and Inscriptions in the United Provinces*.

A strange, one might almost say unknown, fact revealed by Lieut. Hodson's labours is the existence from 1762 to 1772 of a European Body-guard, consisting of thirty-two men and one officer. Just one remark more. In the glossary *Alkhalak* (Arabic) and *Chapkan* (Hindi) are really, I believe, different names for the same thing, perhaps the *alkhalak* being a little the longer of the two in the skirt. This latter is, or was, the name usual on the Bombay side and in the Haidarabad Contingent.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

THE HISTORY OF THE TAJ AND THE BUILDINGS IN ITS VICINITY. By M. MOIN-UD-DIN. Agra, 1905.

The author offers here a translation of his Urdu work *Mu'in-ul-aṣār*, published in 1894; and although his English is at times erratic and occasionally, as he would call it, too "floral", we accept his plea of its being his first venture in a foreign language the more readily that only rarely is his meaning obscure.

First we are told all about Muntāz Maḥal, Shāhjahān, and their children, collected from the best authority, the *Bādshāhnāmah*. The Mausoleum is then described with various details. Next we enter on the controversy as to the designer, in which, as was to be expected, the author unhesitatingly adopts the view of Mr. Havell and others that no European was employed. This debateable question has been settled for us in trenchant fashion by a recent German traveller, Professor Rouleux, of Berlin, "Eine Reise quer durch Indien": "The Italian myth must be entirely rejected. From a Persian MS. the following most interesting particulars have been extracted . . ." Then follows a repetition of all the old details about 'Isā Afandi and the rest. These details, mostly derived from the *Bādshāhnāmah*, ii, 322-30, are found in M. Moin-ud-din's treatise and also in Mahomed Latif's *Agra, Historical and Descriptive*, to which M. Moin-ud-din seems to be largely indebted. But the Professor has assumed as proved the very matter in dispute. What is the value of the alleged manuscript, who wrote it and when, where is it now? I have looked at similar works in the British Museum, and the principal one, passing under the name of Mānik Chand, is unmistakably a production of the early nineteenth century. More must be found out about this MS., and the alleged original plans in the possession of 'Isā Afandi's descendants must be examined, before we can arrive at any conclusion.

M. Moin-ud-din's dates must be accepted with caution;

they are nearly all out by one year. The statement on p. 25 that the tomb of I'timād-ud-daulah († 1621) was built before Austin of Bordeaux arrived in India, cannot be true, as Von Poser found Austin at Āgrah in 1621, and he probably arrived in 1616. Thevenot (p. 19) is not a good witness about the Tāj: he was never at Āgrah, never nearer it than Aḥmadābād (Gujarāt). "Bright Quarter" (p. 55) seems a wrong rendering for *Jilau-khānah*, meaning the place where the retinue and led horses assembled. On p. 71 there is a bad misprint; 40 lakhs of *dām* equal 1 lakh, not 4 lakhs of rupees; and Mr. Oscar Browning will hardly know himself under the description of *Persian* professor (p. 79, note). The book has some nice illustrations and gives the original text of all the inscriptions. The most valuable section is perhaps that devoted to the vanished, or fast vanishing, tombs, mosques, and palaces between Āgrah fort and the Tāj.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

A HISTORY OF INDIA. Part I: THE PRE-MUSULMAN PERIOD.

By K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR, M.A. Longmans, 1910.

Mr. Aiyangar intends this work for use in the higher forms of secondary schools, and in my judgment it is admirably suited for that purpose. Indeed, it may well be retained at their side by more advanced students as a convenient conspectus of the subject, contained in a very small bulk. The appearance of the book is attractive, the paper and print are good, while the twenty-seven illustrations and eight maps are well executed. The English style is remarkably correct and pleasing, and I have come across only one obscure sentence (p. 26, ll. 7 and 8).

The author has made excellent use of the most recent

results of modern research, giving also at the end of the book a good list of his authorities. His narrative is direct and simple, devoid of racial bias, and contains no rhodomontade about an Indian Golden Age. I see he adopts the theory (p. 14) of a separate stream of Aryan immigration over the Pamirs, through Gilgit and Chitral. This hypothesis is founded, I believe, on linguistic evidence only, and is hardly sufficiently established to find place in a school book. The passage on p. 140 about the date of the Tamil poem the *Kural*, coupled with the note on the same page, suggests the inference that the work in question belongs to the first century of the Christian Era, which would make it one of the earliest productions of the human mind which still survive. Adverting, however, to the statement in the *Imperial Gazetteer* (India), 1908, ii, 434, it would seem that the poem could not be earlier than the eighth or ninth century. Naturally, it being the author's home country, the South of India is given due prominence; and he brings out well the great importance of South India in the early commerce between East and West, an importance which it has long lost. It is usual to divide India into two parts, North India (Hindūstān) and South India (the Dakhin). Our author subdivides the second of these regions into (1) Dakhin and (2) South India. The dynastic history of the two parts having moved on different lines, perhaps for the author's purpose this unusual distinction was required. Mr. Aiyangar himself admits (p. 140) that the South Indian states so constantly shifted their boundaries that "it is difficult to describe them correctly". This difficulty, judging by my own experience, has not been quite overcome. The position of the northern states and those in the northern half of the Dakhin I can visualize, and have retained them in my memory; for those of South India I have not been able to form any such picture. Another map is, I think, needed, to be devoted solely to South India

(south of the Krishna), and showing by dotted lines and various tinting the position and limits of each state at each change in its fortunes.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

STUDIES OF INDIAN LIFE AND SENTIMENT. By Sir BAMPFYLDE FULLER, K.C.S.I., C.I.E. Murray, 1910.

Sir Bampfylde Fuller's articles in recent monthly reviews have shown how well he can write ; and the work before us serves to confirm that estimate of his powers. From an intimate acquaintance, official and personal, with the land, he is able here to present a most satisfactory general view of what Sir John Rees calls "the Real India", that is India outside the presidency towns. Every phase of the subject is adequately, if briefly, treated, and from the first page to the last I do not think there is one statement to which serious objection could be taken. I might pick small holes in his historical allusions, but after all these are but superficial things which do not affect the fabric of his arguments.

Sir B. Fuller possesses the gift, denied to most ex-officials, of conveying accurate information in a pleasing unpedantic form. From time to time he mingles with the results of his reading a touch of personal experience, some anecdote which clinches an argument while adding to the effectiveness of the picture. No better book could be put into the hands of any person desiring to know something of India but unable to devote much time to the acquisition of that knowledge. The first chapter on the Indian Monsoon gives in sixteen pages an account of the phenomena which is the easiest to understand I have ever read, without accuracy being in any way sacrificed. Almost as much praise can be accorded to the remaining eighteen chapters.

WILLIAM IRVINE.

THE SUFFIXES *MANT* AND *VANT* IN SANSKRIT AND
 AVESTAN. By HAROLD H. BENDER, Ph.D. Baltimore,
 1910.

Dr. Bender's monograph is a careful study of the suffixes *mant* and *vant*, which are so common in Sanskrit. As is often the case, fuller treatment adds little to what has already been determined with regard to the use of the suffixes. They denote possession with its derivate significations, and the former is only from a third or to a fourth as common as the second. What remains doubtful is the question of their original relation. According to Dr. Bender's final results (pp. 34, 35), in Indo-Iranian and Avestan *mant* was used where there was a *u* or *ū* in the last syllable of the word¹ to which it was affixed, and in all other cases *vant*. Avestan retains this use, but Vedic (by which he means the literature anterior to the Brahmanas) also uses *mant* with all the vowels other than *a*, *ā*, and *ī*, while in classical Sanskrit the vowel *ī* also is followed by *mant*. The evidence is not, however, quite sufficient to establish these views: the preference for *m* after *u* is natural and is clear, but we cannot safely deduce the view that *vant* is original and *mant* a result of dissimilation, nor go beyond the clear interchange of *v* and *m* in the Vedic which has been emphasized by Bloomfield.²

As is inevitable in a monograph Dr. Bender is a critic, and sometimes a captious one. In this case his victim is Whitney, who is commented upon for his treatment of the so-called past active participle in *tarant* or *navant*. "The heading of Whitney's chapter," Dr. Bender writes (p. 64), "on this class of possessives. 'Past Active Participle in *tarant* (or *navant*),' would exclude such words as *pakravant* or *nisiddhavant*, which have as much claim to consideration

¹ Whether as final or as followed by a consonant.

² PAOS. May, 1886; JAOS. xxix, 290.

here as has *kr̥tavant*. *tu* and *na* belong to the participial stem and not to the suffix." This is simply to ignore the fact that the heading is a mere summary explained in the first words of the section dealing with the matter, and that *niṣiddhavant* is not excluded even by the heading (for it is merely *tavant* in euphonic combination), while *pakvavant* is certainly and properly excluded, since it is not used in the sense of a past active participle. Then Dr. Bender proceeds to criticize the view that "derivate words of this formation are found in Rig Veda, but without anything like a participial value", on the ground that in the few possessives of the type in the RV. the first element is clearly of nominal value (which Whitney does not even implicitly deny), and that in RV. i, 180, 7 *hitāvān* is derived directly from a past passive participle and yet retains its participial value, Grassmann rendering it as "der sein Gut versteckt hat". But this is merely one of the many cases where Grassmann is a poor guide; the passage runs—

vayaṃ hi vām jaritāraḥ satyāḥ
vipanyāmahe vi pañir hitāvān |

The sense seems clearly to be that adopted by Hillebrandt,¹ and approved by Oldenberg,² "We boast ourselves to be your true praise-singers: the Paṇi boasts of his hidden treasure," where *hitāvān* is simply a possessive, "as one who possesses *hita* (deposited treasure)"; and Pischel,³ who took it as "wohlwollend", evidently also felt it as a possessive pure and simple. Such cases show how a past active participle developed itself, and are instructive in that light, but to treat them as past participles is quite misleading, and Whitney's

¹ *Vedische Mythologie*, i. 87.

² In his *Rgveda-Noten* ad loc. See also Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, i, 138. Griffith seems to take it as a passive participle from *hā*, "abandon."

³ GGA. 1890, p. 537.

dictum is certainly correct; at any rate, if it is to be impugned it must be on more substantial grounds than a mere citation of a rendering by Grassmann.

One or two smaller points may be noticed. Dr. Bender has evidently overlooked the literature¹ as to the words *paraśvant* and *parasvant*, in which he sees apparently the suffix *vant*. Nor is it very satisfactory to treat the suffixes as having a majorative or pejorative value,² or to divide these two significations into two categories separated from each other by eight other categories. As Dr. Bender's own example, the English (or American) slang expression "having a head", might have reminded him, it is not the suffix which has the majorative or the pejorative value: *keśavant* means "having hair"; now if one says of a man that he is hairy, it denotes that he has much or long hair, but it is not the suffix which adds the sense: *ākāravant* means "well-formed", just as "shapely" has that sense and for the same reason: a word in itself by formation of neutral meaning applied to any object takes a sense from that application. So with the pejorative *jihvāvant* as "greedy", or perhaps as "of evil speech" (cf. the English "she has a tongue").

On the other hand, the clear case of *rājavant*, "having a good king," and *rājavant*, "having a bad king," shows very obviously how much the use depends on the context, not upon the suffix. *Āgamavant* and *caṅkramāvant* can hardly be deemed examples of pejorative sense: *āgama* in itself has the pejorative sense when used independently, and the intensive *caṅkram* already has the sense of "more slowly or crookedly".

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

¹ See my *Āitar-ya Aranyaka*, p. 377, n. 1.

² See pp. 67 (§ 10), 72 (§ 19).

DAS ŚĀNTISĀTAKA, MIT EINLEITUNG, KRITISCHEM APPARAT, ÜBERSETZUNG, UND ANMERKUNGEN, herausgegeben von KARL SCHÖNFELD. Leipzig, 1910.

Dr. Schönfeld's edition and translation of the *Śāntiśataka* is an excellent piece of work, and presents in an acceptable form a very complete account of that century of stanzas on Śānti which has so often been printed in India, but of which no really critical text has hitherto appeared, except in so far as Böhtlingk, in the second edition of his *Indische Sprüche*, included 111 verses, and in many cases greatly improved the text.

Dr. Schönfeld deals in the introduction satisfactorily with the question of the origin of the *Śāntiśataka*, and if his conclusion is not novel it is well to have the evidence collected, even if much of it is hardly of any cogency. The *Śāntiśataka* is clearly in great measure a compilation: it owes some twenty-two stanzas to Bhartṛhari, and there can be no legitimate doubt that this is a mere case of borrowing. Sometimes, indeed, the changes of the text in the *Śāntiśataka* point directly to deliberate alteration: thus in i, 12 *yācñāśūnyam* replaces *hīṃsāśūnyam*, and thus accords with the rest of the *Śataka*, which is frequently concerned with *yācñā*, but not with *ahīṃsā*. How far the remainder of the text is genuinely the product of one hand cannot yet be decided. Dr. Schönfeld is inclined to believe that the compiler himself produced some considerable part of the verses, as did Śārngadhara and other producers of anthologies. To deny this is impossible, but there is no very good ground for accepting the view.

The date of the compilation is quite uncertain; it is evidently known to the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* of Śrīdharadāsa, which is said to have been written in A.D. 1205,¹ and it is posterior to Bhartṛhari's *Śatakas*, though the date of those

¹ See Mitra, *Notices*, iii, 139 seq.; Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 210.

Śatakas as handed down is not absolutely certain. But in all probability the book belongs rather to the period immediately before the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* than to an earlier epoch.

The name of the author is uncertain; in i. 2 and in a doubtful verse (11) he calls himself according to what seems the best reading, Śilhaṇa or Śilhaṇamiśra; in a commentary he appears as Śilhanācārya, and in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* he is styled Silhana of Kaśmīr. Pischel was inclined to see in him Bilhaṇa, the author of the *Vikramāṅkadēvacarita* (about A.D. 1085), the *Caurīsuratapañcāśikā*, and the drama *Karṇasundarī*; and there is a certain amount of support of this view in the fact that, as Aufrecht¹ has pointed out, the name Bilhaṇa is variously read as Silhaṇa and Cilhaṇa, while one verse attributed to Bilhaṇa is found in the *Śāntiśataka*, at any rate in some versions. The evidence is clearly inadequate to establish any result. Dr. Schönfeld points out that Bilhaṇa in his reputed works is not a compiler or borrower as in the *Śataka*, and that the complaints of poverty and attacks on erotic poetry contained in the *Śataka* are hardly consistent with his prosperity as seen in the *Vikramāṅkadēvacarita* and his eroticism as seen in the *Caurīsuratapañcāśikā*. These arguments are in themselves by no means conclusive, as the *Śataka* might well represent the reflections of one tired of mundane pleasures, but in the absence of any real reason for the attribution of the *Śataka* to Bilhaṇa the authorship cannot fairly be ascribed to him. It is much more doubtful if Śilhaṇa is a real name; it is far from being well authenticated, and it may be a corruption. Nor can we follow Dr. Schönfeld in his interesting attempt to make him into a real figure, a Paṇḍit from Kaśmīr, who lived in Bengal (whence come nearly all the MSS. of the *Śataka*), a Viṣṇuite with Vedānta tendencies, for the

¹ *Bibliothecan Catalogue*, p. 124.

stanzas cannot with any certainty be attributed to his authorship. In one case, indeed, Dr. Schönfeld seems to allow his rendering of the text to be adversely affected by the desire to attribute Viṣṇuism to his author; in i, 27 Böhtlingk sees in *kapālam* a reference to the skull carried by ascetics, but Dr. Schönfeld rejects this, as the practice is in his view confined to Śivaïtes (a somewhat doubtful assertion), and therefore should not be read into a Viṣṇuite poem; but this is to forget the remarkable catholicity even of Viṣṇuites, and in iii, 12 the reading *Śiva Śiva* is clearly to be preferred to *Harikara*, showing that the collection cannot be treated—whether it is by one or more hands—as being purely Viṣṇuite.

The text of the *Sātakas* presents many interesting problems; it differs greatly in the various MSS., and the citations in other works also possess considerable variations. On the whole Dr. Schönfeld is wise in simply seeking to restore the best available text from the *Sātaka* MSS. themselves, and both in arrangement of stanzas and in his decision as to the authenticity of the doubtful stanzas his judgment seems sound. Here and there, of course, differences of opinion are inevitable, but on the whole Dr. Schönfeld's judgment is sound and cautious. In iii, 18 his correction *phaṇamaṇi* for *phalamaṇi* is probably sound; similarly, in the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*¹ the version of Śāṅkarānanda reads for *phalāhastāḥ* the curious *phaṇahastāḥ*, which must be a mere blunder, for *phaṇa* cannot mean "ornament". I am more doubtful about the emendation *samārjane* in v. 8 of the apocryphal verses: the MSS. have *duḥkhādīkamārjane*, and I am not certain that Böhtlingk's *duḥkhādīkamājjane* is not more probable: the expression is in either case, it may be said, not a very happy one; *mājjane* is good, but *duḥkhādīka* is weak, while on the other hand *samārjane* is not elsewhere well authenticated nor very easy.

¹ i, 4; see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 19, n. 1.

In i, 27 the author takes *yat praśastam muninām* as denoting "prescribed for sages", and he compares *Manu* iii, 24 :

caturo brāhmaṇasyādyān praśastān kavayo viduḥ |

But the cases are hardly parallel; it is at least as easy in this case to take the genitive as denoting the authority by which the rule is promulgated, while in the passage from *Manu* the genitive is really a possessive predicative genitive, and does not depend on *praśastān*; the real sense is, "sages know that it is laid down that the first four are for the Brahmin." Nor do I follow the criticism of iv, 17, as exhibiting a difficult use of the future with the perfect participle as equivalent to a future, which is supported by a reference to Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*.¹ The form is *kudaitat sampūrṇam . . . bhaviṣyati*, which with a past participle, not a perfect, is quite in order and normal: "when will it be complete." Again, while Dr. Schönfeld recognizes that the Dvandva *gauravajarā* offends against the rule *alpāctaram* in Pāṇini,² he does not note that it offends much more seriously in retaining the feminine ending.³ Nor is it quite fair to call *ayam* in iv, 9 (*satyaṃ sūnur ayam*) a mere verse filler, or to doubt its accuracy; not only is it in all the MSS. and editions, but it has a distinct deictic force, and is far from being otiose or spoiling, as verse fillers do, a verse otherwise good.

It need only be added that the *Śāntiśataka*, if clearly inferior to the *Vairāgyaśataka* of Bhartḥhari, is still of substantial poetic merit, and that Dr. Schönfeld's German version is clear and satisfactory.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

¹ 2nd ed., § 1075*d*, a section which really relates to perfect participles; Whitney ignores the usage with a past participle passive, no doubt because syntactically it is not in any way worth notice, being equivalent to a mere adjective plus a verb.

² ii, 2, 34.

³ See Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, ii, 2, 165. For *skandha-sirasi*, clearly a locative of a neuter Dvandva, in iv, 18, see *ibid.* 164.

DIE WURZELN DER SAGE VOM HEILIGEN GRAL. By
LEOPOLD VON SCHROEDER. Wien, 1910.

This is a most interesting study of the antecedents of the legend of the grail and an effort to find the origin of the conception in pre-Christian ideas. It must at once be conceded that so far as the general principle is concerned the correctness of the theory can hardly be gainsaid: that the legend of the grail is purely Christian is not in itself probable, and it is far from being supported by the available evidence; much of the legend is plainly taken over from an older tradition.

It is, however, a more doubtful matter when Professor von Schroeder seeks to find the prototype of the grail in the *Rgveda*. The grail is a magic dish which ever fills itself and has to be won by a spell from its guardian, and its winning involves the restoration of prosperity to the land wherein it is. These characteristic features von Schroeder sees as paralleled by the Vedic conceptions of the sun as an *odana* or as a *caru* which confers all desires, and of the moon as Soma, which eaten by the gods yet never fails to supply sustenance: Soma is guarded by the Gandharva or Gandharvas, in whom he finds the prototype of Lohengrin, reminding us of the connexion between Gandharvas and Apsarases, "swan maidens" as they appear in the tale of Purūravas and Urvaśī. The spell is illustrated by the Vedic riddles, and the prosperity which follows the finding is none other than the breaking up of the drought by the rain which falls as the result of the Soma sacrifice. Moreover, the fact that the grail is found among the departed dead is meaningless in the Christian tradition, but not when it is realized that the dead in the Veda live in the sun or moon, and the tradition of purity and simplicity in the discoverer of the grail is paralleled in the story of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga.

It may at once be said that much of this is of interest and importance: the importance, however, is that of parallel

religious conceptions rather than that of a real prototype of the grail legend. It is, for example, by no means improbable that the record of the afflictions of the land of the guardian of the grail and their dispersal by its discovery is a new and altered form of the older legends of the driving away of drought by a rain spell seen in the R̥ṣyaśṛṅga legend, and the purity of R̥ṣyaśṛṅga is a simpler prototype of the purity of the seekers of the grail, which varies of course with the conception of the mediaeval and modern poet. The spell also can be illustrated by the Vedic riddles, and von Schroeder does not claim to explain fully the real character of such spells. But the connexion of Lohengrin and the grail, and with it the identification of Lohengrin and the Gandharva who guards the Soma, is very doubtful: Lohengrin is not found in the grail saga as told by Crestien de Troyes; it does occur in the version of Wolfram von Eschenbach, and apparently he claims to have followed a Provençal, Kyot, but some doubt is thrown upon the existence of this Kyot by the fact that he cannot be traced in any other source, and such authorities as Birch-Hirschfeld and Heinzel consider that he is a pure invention of Wolfram's, and that the Lohengrin legend was originally in no connexion with the grail saga at all. In any case, the parallelism with the Gandharva is by no means adequately made out. The Gandharva is not an Apsaras: von Schroeder himself thinks he is a representation of the horde of the souls of the dead, as indicated in the *Aśsalāyana Sutta*,¹ and his connexion with the Apsarases is not sufficient to make up for this difference.

More important is the question whether either the sun or the moon is the prototype of the grail and of the popular tales of the dish which never fails² or the mill

¹ Von Schroeder curiously ignores Windisch's elaborate discussion of this topic in *Buddha's Geburt*; see above, *JRAS.* 1910, pp. 213 seq.

² This sort of dish is found in the *Mahābhārata*, iii, 3, 73 seq.

which continually grinds, a version which von Schroeder is no doubt right in holding to be merely a variant of the more simple dish motive. There are other forms of the same conception, and the normal Indian one is of course the wish-cow, but in all von Schroeder (p. 20) sees the sun, or, as indicated elsewhere, the moon, from which perhaps the sun, which does not wax or wane, borrowed its character as an object of consumption which replenishes itself. It is, however, precisely this identification which is the least plausible. The *kāmaduh* has been traced to the bountiful clouds,¹ and this conception may have played its part in the result, but there must also be borne in mind the fact of the importance of the cow in itself to Indian agriculturists and pastoralists, and the conception therefore needs not any attribution to the sun. The evidence of the connexion of the sun with a dish which never fails is very unsatisfactory. It is perfectly true that in the ritual the sun is sometimes represented by a dish: in the Pravargya, as Oldenberg² and Hillebrandt³ have shown, the dish called Mahāvira, filled with hot milk, represents the sun, but there is nothing here about a self-filling dish, and the self-filling dish (*piṭhara*) which Yudhiṣṭhira in the *Mahābhārata* receives from Vivasvant cannot be held to prove anything for the Veda. Again, the *odana viṣṭārin* of an Atharvan hymn⁴ is a symbol of the sun: but the fact that the cooking of that *odana* is said elsewhere⁵ to secure to the cook prosperity, union with gods, and fellowship with the Gandharvas, is totally inadequate to show that the sun was deemed a self-filling dish, and yet if this cannot be shown the essence of von Schroeder's argument disappears. Further, it is very doubtful if the identification of the *odana* with the sun

¹ Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 150.

² *Religion des Veda*, pp. 448, 449.

³ *Vedische Mythologie*, i, 299; ii, 217 seq.

⁴ xi, 3. See Whitney, Translation of the Atharvaveda, p. 625.

⁵ viii, 66, 6; cf. 58, 14; i, 61, 7.

is more than priestly speculation: von Schroeder treats it as if it represented a popular conception of the sun, but for that there is no hint at all: the Atharvan hymn where it represents the sun is clearly priestly (the practice of calling the whole Atharvan more popular than the *Rgveda* is simply unwise), and we get no further than we are carried by the Pravargya rite, for the passages of the *Rgveda*,¹ in which von Schroeder sees a reference to the sun as an *odana* which Indra rescues from the Gandharva who guards it, are merely references to a cooked mess, and the interpretation of it as the sun is quite needless and most improbable.² Nor is it at all strengthened by the fact that Pūsan is called *karambhād* in ridicule.³ It is hard to follow von Schroeder's argument (pp. 25, 26) that this conception is natural if the sun were regarded as a warm mess, and that one of the sun-gods must have been an eater of mush.

The moon, indeed, is more plausible a prototype, but again it is hardly satisfactory, for its connexion with Soma⁴ is not a precise parallel to the grail. That the moon had a potent influence over plant life and that it was identified by the priests with Soma because *inter alia* of its swelling is certain, but there is no adequate trace in Vedic or classical literature of the moon as a dish which satisfies all desires. The conception of such a dish may have some mythological explanation: but such an explanation seems needless, and at any rate the moon or sun explanation must be ranked with the less plausible theories of comparative mythology.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

¹ viii, 66, 6; cf. 58, 14; i, 61, 7.

² See also Macdonell, JRAS. xxvii. 166 seq.

³ RV. vi, 56, 1; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 35.

⁴ Von Schroeder insists on this as primitive, accepting Hillebrandt's view of the original identity of Soma and the moon, which he thinks he has successfully upheld against Oldenberg. This, however, is most improbable, and needs further support; cf. Macdonell, p. 113; Whitney, JAOS xvi. p. e.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(October, November, December, 1910.)

I.—GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

November 8, 1910.—Sir Raymond West, Director, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Nawab Framurz Jung Bahadur.

Mr. Hirachand L. Jhaveri.

Mrs. Alicia Simpson.

Professor V. V. Sovani.

Mrs. E. M. Wölker.

Twenty-two nominations were announced for election at the next General Meeting.

The Rev. J. J. Johnson read a paper entitled “Notes on Two Schools of the Vedanta (Vallabhiya and Naimbarka)”.

A discussion followed, in which Dr. Grierson, Mr. Thomas, and Professor Barnett took part.

December 13, 1910.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. H. M. Anthony.

Babu Ras Bihari Banerjea.

Mr. Warren Dela Bère Barnes.

Rev. W. W. Cochrane.

Rai Bahadur Priya Lal Ganguly.

Mr. S. C. Ghatak, M.A.

Mr. L. K. Ananta Krishna Iyer.

Mr. T'ien Chěng Kong.

Pandit T. K. Laddu.

Mr. Shyam Lal, M.A.

Rev. Dr. J. Arbuthnot Nairn.

Mr. Hakim Habibur Rahman.

Mr. E. T. Richmond.
 Rev. Alexander Robertson.
 Pandit C. N. Ananta Ramaiya Sastri.
 Rev. Father A. M. Tabard.
 Surgeon W. Perceval Yetts, R.N.
 Ahmed Zeki Bey.
 Khan Bahadur Ahmad Din Khan.
 Mr. W. A. Graham.
 Mr. Harry G. Hillas.
 Mr. Saw Hla Pru.

Four nominations were announced for election at the next General Meeting.

Mr. H. W. Codrington read a paper on the Kandyan Constitution.

A discussion followed, in which Mr. F. H. M. Corbet and Mr. Fleet took part.

II.—PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLANDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT.
 Bd. LXIV. Heft iii.

Rescher (O.). Mitteilungen aus Stambuler Bibliotheken.

Goldziher (I.). Schī'itiches.

Keith (A. B.). The Origin of the Indian Drama.

Francke (A. H.). Die Geschichte der Dogra-Krieges.

— Ein Siegel in tibeto-mongolischer Schrift von Bhutan.

Nöldeke (Th.). Zum Buch der Gesetze der Länder.

Wensinck (A. J.). Qejāmā und Benai Qejāmā in der älteren Syrischen Literatur.

Bork (F.). Das Alter der altpersischen Keilschrift.

II. RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI. Vol. III. Fasc. ii.

Blochet (E.). Études sur le Gnosticisme Musulman.

Campani (R.). Il "Kitāb al Farghānī" nel testo arabo e nelle versioni.

Griffini (E.). Lista dei MSS. arabi, nuovo fondo della Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano.

III. VIENNA ORIENTAL JOURNAL. Vol. XXIV, Nos. ii-iii.

Bartholomae (C.). Zum Lautwert der awestischen Vokalzeichen.

Aptowitz (V.). Die Rechtsbücher der syrischen Patriarchen und ihre Quellen.

Franke (R. O.). Die Gāthās des Vinayapīṭaka und ihre Parallelen.

IV. JOURNAL OF THE SIAM SOCIETY. Vol. VII, Pt. i.

Ravenswaay (L. F. van). Translation of van Vliet's Description of Siam.

V. TAMILIAN ANTIQUARY. No. vi.

(1) Pura-poruḷ Venbā Mālai, and selections translated from.

(2) Pura Nanūru.

No. vii.

Subramaniya Mudular (V. P.). Critical Review of the Story of the Ramayana and an Account of South Indian Castes.

Pillai (P. V. Nanu). The Ramayana. An Historical Study.

Naidu (C. T.). The Ramayana. The Geography and Ethnology of the Poem.

Pillai (P. Ponnambulam). The Morality of the Ramayana.

Aiyengar (M. R.). Valmiki and South India (in Tamil).

VI. SIDDHĀNTA DĪPIKĀ. Vol. XI, No. i.

Gopinatha Rao (T. A.). The Chikuru Grant.

Piechhu Aiyar (C. V.). Sankarācharya and the Date of his Birth.

Nos. ii-iii.

Barnett (L. D.). The Śaiva Siddhānta.

Rāmasvāmi Chettiyār (S. R. M. M.). The Tamil Language.

VII. JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.

Vol. XL. 1910.

Crooke (W.). Rajputs and Mahrattas.

Tucker (A. Winifred) and Myers (C. S.). Contribution to the Anthropology of the Sudan.

O'Sullivan (Capt. H.). Dinka Laws and Customs.

Seligmann (C. G.). A Neolithic Site in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

MacMichael (H. A.). The Kabābish: Remarks on the Ethnology of a Sudan Arab Tribe.

VIII. MITTEILUNGEN DES SEMINARS FÜR ORIENTALISCHE SPRACHEN.
Berlin. Vol. XIII.

Laufer (B.). Christian Art in China.

Hartmann (M.). Chinesisch-Arabische Glossen.

Franke (O.). Zur Frage der Einführung des Buddhismus in China.

Hell (Oberleutnant). Idiomatiche Schriftzeichen in Japan.

Mittwoch (E.). Abessinische Kinderspiele. Amharische Texte.

IX. T'OUENG PAO. Vol. XI, No. iii.

Cordier (H.). La politique coloniale de la France au début du Second Empire.

Saussure (L. de). Les origines de l'astronomie chinoises.

Maspéro (G.). Le Royaume de Champa.

OBITUARY NOTICES

DONALD WILLIAM FERGUSON, M.R.A.S.

WHEN Donald Ferguson passed away on June 29 last, under sad circumstances, I personally lost a friend to whom I could always turn in confidence for light on obscure points of Oriental knowledge requiring acquaintance with the languages and literature of the European nations connected with the East. For, besides his knowledge of Sinhalese and Tamil, he was well versed in French, German, Dutch, Portuguese, and Spanish.

His tastes were all literary, and though educated as a medical man he spent the greater part of his life in connexion with the *Ceylon Observer*, with which his family have had an honourable connexion for about seventy years. Indeed, it is hard to dissociate that well-known paper from the name of Ferguson. Donald Ferguson's father, A. M. Ferguson, C.M.G., was connected with it as chief proprietor and editor from 1837 to 1892, the date of his death in the island. The subject of this notice was co-proprietor and co-editor with his father for many years till ill-health drove him from Ceylon in 1893. The present editor, John Ferguson, C.M.G., nephew and cousin of those just mentioned, is still occupying that position after nearly fifty years of residence in the country.

Donald Ferguson was born at Colombo on October 8, 1853, and died at Croydon on June 29, 1910. Since 1893 he spent his retirement in studying and illustrating works connected with the history of Ceylon, and also greatly in helping others who were engaged in Oriental studies.

The following is a list of his works extracted from the British Museum Catalogue:—

1. Translation of E. W. A. Kuhn's *Earliest Aryan Element in the Sinhalese Vocabulary*. 1885.
2. Enlargement of Wilham Ferguson's *List of Writers on Ceylon*. 1886.
3. Translation of Daalman's *Belgian Physician's Notes on Ceylon*. ?1888.
4. "Captain João Ribeiro: his Work on Ceylon and the French translation thereof by Abbé Le Grand." Journ. Ceylon Branch RAS. ?1888.
5. Translation of Ribeiro's *Account of the Siege of Colombo in 1655-56*. 1891.
6. *The Reverend Philippus Balldæus and his Work on Ceylon*. Colombo, 1895.
7. *Captain Robert Knox: the twenty years' captive in Ceylon: Contributions towards a biography*. Privately printed, 1896.
8. Edition of Robert Knox's *Sinhalese Vocabulary*. 1897.
9. Edition of the *Travels of Pedro Teixeira*. 1902.
10. Edition, Portuguese and English, of Vieyra and Calvo's *Letters from Portuguese Captives in Canton in 1534 and 1536*. 1902.
11. "Correspondence between Raja Sinha II and the Dutch in 1645-1660." Journ. Ceylon Branch RAS., 1904.
12. *Cartas de Raja Singa II, Rei de Caudia, aos Hollandases, 1636-60*, publicadas por D. Ferguson. 1907.
13. "Discovery of Ceylon by the Portuguese in 1506." Journ. Ceylon Branch RAS., 1908.
14. Translation and edition Barros and de Coutos' *History of Ceylon from the earliest times to 1600 A.D.* Journ. Ceylon Branch RAS., 1909.

R. C. TEMPLE.

ALEXANDER ROGERS

THE Society has lost a well-known and respected member in the person of Mr. Alexander Rogers, who died on the 27th of November in his 86th year. Educated finally at

Haileybury, he joined the Indian Civil Service, in the Bombay Presidency, in 1845. Electing for the executive branch, he served in the Northern Division, and rose to be Collector and Magistrate in 1860, and Revenue and Police Commissioner in 1865. He was appointed a Member of Council in 1872, and he retired in 1879. He was the author of a *History of the Land Revenue Settlement of Bombay*, and of translations of three modern Persian plays and of *Yusuf and Zuleika*, and he edited the *Bostan* of Sadi.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

ABHIDHAMMATTA-SANGAHA. Compendium of Philosophy. Translated by Shwe Zan Aung, revised and edited by Mrs. Rhys Davids. 8vo. *London*, 1910. *From the Editor.*

Ahmad Abdul Aziz. *Asif-ul-Lughat*. Vol. iii. 8vo. *Haidarabad*, A.H. 1328. *From the India Office.*

Aiyangar, K. V. R. *History of India*. Part i. 8vo. *London*, 1910. *From the Publisher.*

Al-Ghazzali. *The Alehemy of Happiness*. Translated by C. Field. *London*, 1910. *From the Publisher.*

Armbruster, C. H. *Initia Amharica*. Part ii. 8vo. *Cambridge*, 1910. *From the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.*

Āryabhat. *Mahāsiddhānta*. Edited by Professor Sudhakara Dvivedi. 8vo. *Benares*, 1910. *From the Editor.*

Bender, H. H. *Suffixes mant and vant in Sanskrit and Avestan*. 8vo. *Baltimore*, 1910. *From the Author.*

BONE Fragments inscribed with ancient Chinese Characters. *From Mrs. Leslie Milne.*

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Supplementary Catalogue of Bengali Books, 1886-1910, by J. F. Blumhardt. 4to. *London*, 1910.

Catalogue of the Kannada, Badaga, and Kurg Books, by L. D. Barnett. 4to. *London*, 1910.

From the Trustees of the British Museum.

Dickson, G. (trans.). *A Jerusalem Christian Treatise on Astrology*. 8vo. *London*, 1910.

From the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund.

DICTIONARY OF THE PATHAN TRIBES ON N.W. FRONTIER OF INDIA. New ed. 16mo. *Calcutta*, 1910.

From the Chief of General Staff, Army Headquarters, India.

- DĪGHA NIKĀYA.** Dialogues of the Buddha. Part ii. Translated by T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids. 8vo. *London*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
- Divākara,** Siddha Sena. Nyāyavatāra. Edited by Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana. Pamphlet. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1909.
From the Indian Research Society.
- ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ISLAM.** No. vii. *Leyden* and *London*, 1910.
From the Publishers.
- Framurz Jung,** Nawab, Bahadur. The Medak District. *Secunderabad*, 1909.
From the Author.
- Goldziher,** I. Vorlesungen über den Islam. 8vo. *Heidelberg*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
- Gordon,** E. A. Messiah, the Ancestral Hope of All Ages, from Ancient Records. Fol. *Tokyo*, (1910?).
From the Publishers.
- Hamdu'llāh Mustawfī-i-Qazwini.** Ta'rīkh-i-Guzīda, or "Select History". Facsimile, with Introduction, by Ed. G. Browne. 8vo. *Leyden* and *London*, 1910.
From the Gibb Memorial Trustees.
- Händler,** G. H. Elchanan: the Legend of a Jewish Pope. *London*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
- Hodson,** Lieut. V. C. P. Historical Records of the Governor-General's Body Guard. 4to. *London*, 1910.
From the India Office.
- Hooker,** M. Behind the Scenes in Peking. 8vo. *London*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
- Hossain,** W. Anglo-Persian Word Book. No title-page. 8vo. (*Calcutta*, 1909?)
From the Author.
- Notes on the Arabic Portion of the Persian Course for the Matriculation Examination. Pamphlet. *Calcutta*, 1910.
From the Author.
- JAPANESE OLD AND MODERN FINE ARTS,** Illustrated Catalogue of, at the Japan-British Exhibition. 2 vols. 4to. *Tokyo*, 1910.
From the Commissioner-General of Japanese Government to the Exhibition.

- Jhaveri, H. L.** First Principles of Jain Philosophy. 8vo.
London, 1910. From the Author.
- Johnston, R. F.** Lion and Dragon in Northern China. 8vo.
London, 1910. From the Publisher.
- Machir Bar Abba Mari.** The Yalkut on Amos, Obadiah, etc.
Edited by A. W. Greenup. Small 8vo. *London, 1910.*
From the Editor.
- Majumdar, Jnanendralal.** The Eagle and the Captive Sun. 8vo.
Calcutta, 1909. From the Indian Research Society.
- Milne, Mrs. Leslie.** Shans at Home. With two chapters on
Shan History by Rev. W. W. Cochrane. 8vo. *London, 1910.*
From the Author.
- Naidu, C. T.** Tyagayyar. Pamphlet. *Madras, 1910.*
From the Author.
- Narasimhiengar, M. T.** Kalidasa's Religion and Philosophy.
Pamphlet. 4to. *Bombay, 1910. From the Author.*
- NUBIA.** Archæological Survey. Report for 1907-8. Vols. i and ii,
with plates. Fol. *Cairo, 1910.*
From the Ministry of Finance, Egypt.
- PANJAB CUSTOMARY LAW.** Rawalpindi District. Revised edition.
8vo. *Lahore, 1910. From the India Office.*
- Parker, H.** Village Folk-Tales of Ceylon. Vol. i. 8vo. *London,*
1910. From the Publisher.
- PATROLOGIA ORIENTALIS.** Tome vi, fasc. ii, and tome vii, fasc. iv.
8vo. *Paris, 1910. Purchased.*
- Radloff, W.** Chuastuanit, das Bussgebet der Manichäer. 8vo.
St. Petersburg, 1909.
From the Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg.
- Ramsden, H. A.** Corean Coin Charms and Amulets. 8vo.
Yokohama, 1910. From Dr. O. Codrington, F.S.A.
- Sangaraj, Somdet Phra.** Phra Bhikku Patimoka. 8vo. *Bangkok,*
129 (1910). From the Fajirañana National Library.

- Schönfeld, K.** (ed.). Śāntīśataka. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
- Schroeder, L. von.** Die Wurzeln der Sage vom heiligen Gral.
8vo. *Wien*, 1910.
From the Kais. Ak. Wissenschaften in Wien.
- Spoer, H. H., and Haddad, E. N.** Manual of Palestinian Arabic.
8vo. *Jerusalem*, 1909. *From Messrs. Luzac & Co.*
- Stenz, Georg M.** Beiträge zur Volkskunde Süd-Schantungs.
Herausg. von A. Conrady. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1907.
From the Städtischen Museums für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig.
- Sykes, Major P. M., and Ahmad Din Khan.** Glory of the Shia
World. 8vo. *London*, 1910. *Presented by the Author.*
- UNITED PROVINCES DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Vol. xxii: Hamipur.
8vo. *Allahabad*, 1909.
From the United Provinces Government.
- Wacha, D. E.** A Financial Chapter in the History of Bombay
City. 8vo. *Bombay*, 1910. *Presented by the Author.*
- Wieger, L.** Bouddhisme Chinois. Tome i. 8vo. *Paris*, (1910?).
From the Publisher.
- Younghusband, Sir F.** India and Tibet. 8vo. *London*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
-

JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1911

VIII

DR. STEIN'S TURKISH KHUASTUANIFT FROM TUN-
HUANG, BEING A CONFESSION-PRAYER OF THE
MANICHÆAN AUDITORES

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY A. V. LE COQ

EUROPEAN science is indebted to Dr. M. A. Stein's industry for the remarkable document here published. It is one of the many valuable MSS. which fell to his lot through the partial acquisition in 1907 of an ancient library discovered, by a Chinese priest, in one of the Buddhist cave temples of the "Halls of the Thousand Buddhas" to the south-east of the Tun-huang oasis, as described by him in the *Geographical Journal* for September, 1909.¹ Its excellent state of preservation, and the fact of its being written in the clear unequivocal letters of the Manichæan alphabet, renders this MS. a most valuable help to all interested in the study of the ancient Turkish speech in which it is edited.

The form of the MS. is that of a book-roll composed of

¹ [The MS. which now bears the number Ch. 0015 was found mixed up in a bundle with Chinese manuscript rolls, mainly containing Buddhist texts. It is rolled on a stick of hard close-grained wood, about 4½ inches long and ¼ inch thick, with broader knobs at the ends. The paper is tough and stout, with a very smooth surface, apparently sized; in appearance it seems to resemble the paper of certain dated Chinese MSS. of the T'ang period discovered in the same library.—M. A. STEIN.]

a number of leaves of paper, each having a breadth of 4 inches and a length of from $10\frac{1}{4}$ inches to $13\frac{1}{2}$ inches: these leaves are carefully pasted together, so as to form a sheet of 4 inches broad and 14 ft. 8 in. long, containing a total of 338 lines. The writing in Manichæan letters is beautiful and clear; the punctuation shows the characteristic signs hitherto exclusively observed in Manichæan MSS., namely, one or two black dots surrounded by little circles or ovals executed in red lead or vermilion.

It is difficult to form an opinion as to the age of this copy, but as the orthography is not carried out with that strict uniformity for which our best Turkish Buddhist, Turkish Manichæan, and especially Persian Manichæan texts are remarkable,¹ and as there are not infrequently found uncorrected clerical errors,² we may have to adjudge this MS., as well as some of the Berlin fragments of the same category, to a relatively more recent date.

This chronological order seems further to be confirmed by the discovery, amongst the Turkish Buddhist MSS. brought from Turfan to Berlin, of a number of similar confession-prayers, which evidently have served as models for the composition of the Manichæan prayers of the same character. These latter may be translations from the Persian, and it is by no means an established, or even probable, fact that they originated in Turkistan.

A copy of this identical prayer, written in the Uighur character, has found its way from Turfan to St. Petersburg. It has been edited under the title "Chuastuanit, das Bussgebet der Manichæer", by Professor W. Radloff, in the publications of the Imperial Russian Academy, St. Petersburg, August, 1909.

¹ Here are some instances of varying spellings: *aki* and *iki*, *ijid* and (the presumably older) *ijidd*; *ıçac* and (presumably older) *'ıçac*, *içrâ* and *'içrâ*.

² For these cf. n. 49; in our more carefully written MSS. clerical errors are commonly blotted out by an application of opaque white colour, on which the correction is carefully entered.

The difficulties of the Uighur writing have misled Professor Radloff in many instances, as already in the title,¹ and as the translation also is by no means convincing, a new edition is called for by the importance of the text. The want of familiarity with the Manichæan faith is, however, a great obstacle in the way to a reliable translation; the present attempt is offered with a due sense of the difficulties of the task.

The St. Petersburg text is but little less complete than Dr. Stein's MS., beginning at about the 28th line of the latter. Fortunately, parts of the identical prayer have been found by my own expedition to Turfan as well; and as some of these fragments contain part of the beginning of the confession, I have availed myself of Dr. Stein's permission to add them, under a separate heading, to this publication, which thereby becomes the most complete edition of the text hitherto existing. As these fragments are also written in the Manichæan alphabet, the readings throughout are clear and incontestable. The whole of the Berlin fragments is being published in the *Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*.

The contents of the text are important. They consist of an enumeration of possibly committed sins, for which forgiveness is being implored.² This enumeration comprehends fifteen articles or counts, each being introduced by the words "the Second", "the Third", etc. Some of these articles contain fragmentary descriptions of the combat between the God of Light and his elements, against the Demon of Darkness and his creatures, and of the intermingling of Light and Darkness consequent upon this combat; in others we seem to get a glimpse of

¹ Cf. A. v. Le Coq, "Ein christliches und ein manichäisches Manuscriptfragment in türkischer Sprache (aus Turfan)": Sitzber. d. kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. W., xlvi, 1909.

² For the importance assigned by the Manicheans to repentance cf. Baur, *Das manichäische Religions-system*, Tübingen, 1831, p. 262.

the manner in which the auditores, or Manichæan laymen (for whose use this and similar prayers were intended), could contribute their share towards the extrication of the ensnared Light from the embraces of Matter. For the attempts at explanation of these symbolistic recitals I must refer the reader to the appended notes.

I close this introduction with the expression of my sincere appreciation of the courtesy which has caused Dr. Stein to honour me by entrusting the edition of so valuable a document to my care.

KHUASTUANIFT

THE BERLIN TEXT

(Containing part of the beginning and of the First Article of the
Khuastuanift destroyed in Dr. Stein's MS.)

Additions of vowels by the editor are placed in (): destroyed letters and words have been reconstructed and stand in []. The addition of *-i*, *-u*, and *-h* to some words is an expedient to fill spaces.

T. II, D. 178, 1.

1. *Ḫormuzta-h t(ä)ngri-i bis t(ä)ngri-i*¹⁰
Khormuzta the God and the Five-God
2. *birhü qam(a)γ t(ä)ngriür süzünlūa(ü)n*¹
came descending (from the heavens), with the purity of
3. *yäkkä*²⁰ *söngüskäli-i k.ä.ti-i-h*
all the gods, in order to engage in battle against
4. *'inti-i . qurγ qilinē(i)γ smnuburγun*²
the Demon: he battled against the Šmnudom
5. *bis ürlüγ yäklärlüγün söngüsd-i*.
inclining to evil deeds, and against the five kinds of Demony.
6. *t(ä)ngriüi y.äkl-i q(a)ruqli-i qaralı-i ol*
God and the Demon, Light and Darkness at
7. *ädün q.ä.tild-i . Ḫormuzta t(ä)ngri-i-h*
that time intermingled . God Khormuzta's
8. *olan-i-i, bis t(ä)ngri-i*¹⁰ . *bi zünny üzüt(ü)müz*
youth, the Five-God, (and) our souls engaging in

9. *suin*⁵⁵ *y[ǎk]lūgǎn sǎngǎsǎp bal(i)γ basl(i)γ (?)*¹
 combat with Sin and Demoury became ensnared (?) and
10. *bolti-i . ymǎ qam(a)γ yǎklǎr ul[ur]lar*
 inter-entangled (?). All the princes of the demons
11. *toǎunǎsuz ovutsuz soq*⁵³ *yǎk [bir]ǎ ?*
 came with the insatiable shameless Envy-Demon
12. *yǎz qrtuqǎ qir[γ t]ǎmǎn yǎk [y(a)claq ?]*
 (and with) a hundred and forty myriads of (lesser) demons
 united in [evil ?]

T. II, D. 178, iv, 2.

13. *bilıqmǎ-h qatılıp ǎgsǎz kǎngǎl-*
 knowledge (intent), and bereft of understanding
14. *sǎz k(ǎ)lti-i . k(ǎ)ntǎ turmus qılınmǎs*
 and sense . He Himself, the Born and Created (i.e. Biş
 Tangri)
15. *mǎngıgǎ t(ǎ)ngri yırın unıtu-u 'ıtdı-i .*
 forgot (forgetting sent away) the eternal heaven of the Gods
16. *y(a)ruq t(ǎ)ngrırdǎđǎ atrılti-i . antadda-*
 and became separated from the Light-Gods . There-
17. *ta baru t(ǎ)ngrı yǎk qılınǎyga-h .*
 after, my God! if, because the Şınu intending evil
18. *qırı qılınǎl(i)γ şınu ǎgǎmǎzınu-i*
 deeds, has led our understandings and our thoughts
19. *saqınǎm(i)zıni-ıazıqurluqın u . . q (?)k (?) . . un .*
 astray . . . to demoniacal actions and if, because thereby
20. *bilıqsı ǎgsǎz boltuqumu [ǎ]ǎın .*
 we have become unwise and void of understanding,
21. *qam(a)γ y(a)ruq ǎzǎllǎnıny tǎzınıqǎ*
 we should have sinned and erred against the four-
22. *[yıl]tizi[nıqǎ] . qırı y(a)ruq ǎzrua t(ǎ)ngrıkǎn*
 dation and the root of all bright spirits (namely) against
23. *[kǎ ?] yazıntım(i)z yanqıltım(i)z ǎrsǎr .*
 pure bright Azrua the Lord .
24. *[y(a)ruqlı-i] qaralı-i t(ǎ)n[qr]lı-i yǎklı-i-h*
 [and if thereby] Light and Darkness. God and the Demon
 [should have intermingled (?)]

Between this and the following leaf there is evidently a lacuna of one or more leaves, which had contained, perhaps, an explanation of the allegorical story of the combat between the Five-God and the Šmnu, and had shown its application to the ordinary events of daily life.

T. II, D. 178, iii, 1.

25. *tözi-i yltizi-i . . . [tidim(i)z] ürsär .*
[if we should have said ?] . . . is its foundation and root .
26. *tırğüdsär t(ä)ngr̄i-i tırğüdür ?] . öllürsär*
if we should have said if (some one?) enlivens (a body). God
enlivens; if (some one) kills,
27. *t(ä)ngri-i öllürür t(ä)dimiz ürsär . üdgüq*
God kills . . . if we should
28. *qurıqı qop t(ä)ngri-i yaratmış ol*
have said the Good and the Bad, all has been
29. *tiddim(i)z ürsär . mǎngüü-ü t(ä)ngriürüq*
created by God : if we should have said, it is He that
30. *[yara]t(i)li-i ol tidim(i)z ürsär . xormuzta*
creates the eternal gods. . . If we should
31. *[t(ä)ngri-i] [šmmu-i] 'ulu-i 'icili-i ol*
have said : Khormuzta the God and the Šmnu are
32. *[tidim(i)z] ürsär . t(ä)ngrim suıda baru-u*
brothers. . . My God! if in (our) sinfulness
33. *[b]ilmätin t(ä)ngrikä 'ıgdäyü-ü muntıq*
we should have pronounced such tremendous blasphemous
34. *uluq çulvu-u⁹ sav sözlädim(i)z ürsär*
words through our having unwittingly become false to God :
35. *muntıq bu adunçusuz yazıq yaz(i)nt(i)m(i)z .*
and if thus we should have sinned this unforgivable (un-
changeable)
36. *ürsär . t(ä)ngrim qmtı-i⁴² m(a)n raim(a)st*
sin : My God! now I Raim(a)st

T. II, D. 178, iii, 2.

37. *f(ä)rzind⁵ ögüür m(ä)n⁶ yazıqda bosunu*
f(a)rzind, I repent! I pray, cleaning myself

38. *ütünür m(ä)n . m(a)nastar ħirza-h.*
 from sin: M(a)nastar ħirza! (My sin remit!)
39. *qutluγ pads⁷ . . . 'ikinti ymä*
qutluγ pads . . . THE SECOND.

Here begins Dr. Stein's Tun-huang text, the first 15-17 lines of which being torn and mutilated, the editor has been able to reconstruct from the remainder of the page above begun.

DR. M. A. STEIN'S TEXT

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. [<i>'ikinti ymä kün ai t[ängrikä]</i> | [THE SECOND.] When, for the sake of the God of the Sun and the Moon, |
| 2. [<i>'i]ki-i y(a)ruq ord[u 'iërä]</i> | and of the Gods enthroned in the two resplendent |
| 3. <i>olururma t(ä)ngri:lärkä qamaγ]</i> | Palaces, the Basis and the Root |
| 4. <i>burxanlarn(i)ny [yr suv]*</i> | of the Light of all the Burkhan's, |
| 5. <i>y(a)ruqn[uv]y tözi [ymlızı]</i> | of the Earth and [of the Water?] |
| 6. <i>turnayülü-i⁸ . . . t(ä)ngri</i>
<i>[yringürü]</i> | should go to the heaven intended for them (for Basis and Root) |
| 7. <i>barsar öngü-ü qa [pür'i]</i> | to assemble in, then their foremost (first?) gate |
| 8. <i>kün ai t(ä)ngri ol . . . bis</i> | is the God of the Sun and the Moon. ⁸ With |
| 9. <i>t(ä)ngriγ boşuralı-i y(a)r[uquγ]</i> | intent to deliver the Five-God, and to part |
| 10. <i>q(a)raγ ad(i)rçalı-i t[ägdä]</i> | the Light from the Darkness, does he |
| 11. <i>toli-i tüzünür tört-t</i> | roll along from the bottom (of the sky?) in fullness (as full moon) |
| 12. <i>bulunuguγ(!)¹⁰ yarutı'r] t(ä)n-</i>
<i>grim</i> | and illuminates the four corners (the four points of the compass).—My God! |

* This whole passus (ll. 1-8) differs somewhat from the Berlin MS. The word *suv* (being destroyed in the Berlin text also) is a suggestion of the editor.

13. *suda baru-u bil[mǟtin]* if, in sins, we should somehow
14. *kün ai t(ä)ngrikü [‘iki]* unwittingly have sinned against
15. *y(a)ruq ordu-u iē̄rā;* the God of the Sun and the
Moon (and ?) the
16. *oluruqma t(ä)ngriür[kä]* Gods enthroned in the
17. *nača yaz(i)nt(i)m(i)z ärsär̄* two resplendent Palaces :
18. *ymä kirtü ärkly küēl(ü)g* if, albeit, we have called him
the True, the Mighty, and
the Powerful
19. *t(ä)ngri-i tipän kirtkü-ü-n-*
mäl(i)m(i)z God, we should not have be-
20. *ärsär . . näčä äküs* lieved in him . . if somehow
we should have
21. *y(a)rlaq ealru-u sacⁿ* uttered a many wicked
22. *süzläd(i)m(i)z ärsär . . ymä* blasphemous" words . . if we
should
23. *kün ai ülür tul(i)m(i)z ärsär* have said: the God of the Sun
and the Moon dies and
24. *. . ärk(s)i-z(i)n turjar batar*
ärki-i his rise and his setting is void
of strength: should he
25. *bar ärsär turmazun tul(i)m(i)z:* own strength, (then) he shall not
26. *ärsär . . k(ä)ntü üzümüzni-i* rise . . If we ourselves should
have said
27. *küntä aida öngri-i bi:* our own bodies have been
created before
28. *tul(i)m(i)z ärsär . . bu-u ikinti* the Sun and the Moon, (then)
this second
29. *bilmǟtin yaz(i)nmis yazuruq* unwittingly committed sin
30. *boşunu-u ütünür bi:* we pray to be made void of:
31. *m(a)nastar hirza* *M(a)nastar hirzu ! . .* (Middle
Pers. : Our sin remit !).
32. *üçünē ymä bis t(ä)ngrika* THE THIRD. Because, in de-
fence of the Five-God,¹⁰
33. *χorm(u)zta t(ä)ngri oqlanngä¹⁰* theyouth of Khormuzta the God,
[his five elements, to wit:]
34. *bir tintura t(ä)ngri . ikinti* firstly: the God of the Zephyr,
secondly:
35. *yl t(ä)ngri-i . . ucunē y(a)ruq* the God of the Wind, thirdly:
the God of the

36. *t(ä)ngrı-i . . törtünë sur* Light . . fourthly: the God
t(ä)ngrı of the Water,
37. *bısınë oot t(ä)ngrı-i . . suin* fifthly: the God of the Fire,
. . having battled
38. *yäklügün sönqüsüp* against Sin and Demony . .
39. *bal(ı? a?)⁹duqın¹¹ q(a)raqa* have been ensnared and have
qat(i)ltu- intermingled
40. *qın ücün . . t(ä)ngrı yırngürü* with the Darkness . . . they
have been unable to go
41. *baru umatın bu-u yırdü* to the Heaven of God and are
[*now*]
42. *ürür¹² . . üzä o-o-n qat* on this Earth . . . The tenfold
43. *kök asra säqız (!)⁴⁹ qat* heavens above, the eightfold
44. *yır bıs t(ä)ngrı-i ücün turur* earths below stand (exist) on
account of the Five-God.
45. *. . q(a)m(a)ı yır üzäkın(i)ny* Of everything that is upon
qutı earth, the Five-God is
46. *qıvı-ı öngı-i mänyzı özi* the Majesty, the (radiant)
Colour(?), the Likeness, the
Body,
47. *üzütı-i küürı y(a)ruqı-i tözi* the Soul, the Strength, the
Light, the Foundation,
48. *yıltızı-i bıs t(ä)ngrı-i ol . . .* and the Root . . .
49. *t(ä)ngrım sunda baru bıs* My God! If, in (our) sinful
condition, we unwitting-
50. *t(ä)ngrıg bılmätın amı y(a)rlaq* ly should somehow have been
infractors against, or
51. *bılğın näcä säd(i)m(i)z b(i)rti-* causers of discontent in¹⁴ (read
m(i)z¹⁴ *bırtımız*), the Five-God by
52. *ürsür . . tört yıq(i)rmı-i* a bad and wicked mind . . if
türlüg we should have allowed the
fourteen kinds (of our
members)
53. *bıs qıltım(i): ürsür . . on* to rule it over us . . . if,
taking
54. *yılan başl(i?a?)ı ürnyäkin¹⁴* living bodies (as) food and drink
ıkı-i
55. *qırq tışın turıq üzüg* with the ten snake-headed
finger-ends and

56. *aš 'ičkū-ū t(ä)ngriy näčä* the thirty-two teeth, we should somehow have
57. *acitim(i)z arřitim(i)z ärsär* angered and pained God . .
58. . . *quruγ öl yırkä bış* if somehow we should have sinned against
59. *türlüγ tınl(i)γqa bış türlüγ* the dry and the wet earths, against the five
60. *ootqa 'ıruäqa näčä* kinds of living beings and against the five
61. *yaz(i)nt(i)m(i)z ärsär¹⁵ . .* kinds of herbs and trees: now, *γmti t(ä)ngrim* my God!
62. *yazuqda bosunu ötünür* cleaning ourselves from sin,
63. *bız m(a)nastar hırza* we pray: *Manastar hırza*
64. *törtünē süki-i t(ä)ngri-h* THE FOURTH. If, unwittingly, we should somehow
65. *yalavaäi-i burxanlarqa¹⁶* have sinned against the divine *yalavaäi* Burkhans¹⁶
66. *buyanäi-i böγtüäi-i²⁰ qırıγ* of the Host [of Light], against the merit-attaining (?)²¹ pure Electi . .
67. *dintarlarqa bilmätin näčä*
68. *yaz(i)nt(i)m(i)z ärsär . . γmā* If, albeit, we have called them *kirtü*
69. *t(ä)ngri-i yalavaäi-i burxan* true and divine *yalavaäi* Burkhans and
70. *tıpän üdgü qilinēl(i)γ qırıγ* beneficent pure Electi,
71. *dintar tip kirtkünmäd(i)-m(i)z* we should not have believed
72. *ärsär . . t(ä)ngri-i nomın sözlä-* in them, if albeit we should have pronounced
73. *sär bilgsiz(i)n ötrü (?) üzäd(i)-m(i)z¹⁷* the word of God, we should foolishly have
74. *ärsär . . nomuγ törüγ* broken it . . if by not spreading the
75. *yadturmatın tıdtim(i)z ärsär* faith, we should have impeded it . .
76. . *t(ä)ngrim γmti-i ökünürbız* My God! now we repent!
77. *yazuqda bosunu-u ötünür* cleaning ourselves from
78. *bız m(a)nastar hırza* sin, we pray: *Manastar hırza!*

79. *bışınē bış tūrlūg tīnl(i)ḡḡa* THE FIFTH. If, [misbehaving against] the five kinds of living beings, (to wit)
80. *bir ymā āki-ı aduql(i)ḡ kisikā* firstly, against two-legged man,
81. *ākinti-ı tōrt butluḡ tīnl(i)ḡḡa* secondly, against the four-footed living beings,
82. *ūēūnē uēurıma tīnl(i)ḡḡa* thirdly, against the flying living beings,
83. *tōrtūnē suv 'ıērākı-i tīnl(i)ḡḡa* fourthly, against the living beings in the water,
84. *bışınē yırdāki bārın yorıma tīnl(i)ḡḡa*¹⁸ fifthly, against the living beings on earth, that creep on their bellies (livers) :¹⁸
85. *suda baru-u t(ā)ngırm bu-u bış* my God! in (our) sinful state, these five kinds of
86. *tūrlūg tīnl(i)ḡ(?)ḡ tural(i)ḡ(?)ḡ¹⁹ uluḡḡa* living and moving beings, up to the large ones and down
87. *kiēıgkā t(ā)ḡı-ı . . nācā qorḡit(i)m(i)z* to the small ones : if somehow we should have frightened or
88. *ūrkit(i)m(i)z ārsār nācā urtum(u)z* scared (them) ; if somehow we should have beaten
89. *yūntūmūz²⁰ ārsār . . nācā ḡēit(i)m(i)z* or struck (them) : if somehow we should have angered
90. *agrīt(i)m(i)z ārsār nācā ōlūrdūm(ū)z* or pained (them) ; if somehow we should have killed
91. *ārsār . . munēa tīnl(i)ḡḡa tural(i)ḡḡ* (them) ; and if thus we have ourselves become tor-
92. *ḡa ōz ōtāḡēi-i boltumuz* mentors to such living and moving beings :
93. *. . ḡmtı-i t(ā)ngırm yazuḡda boşunu* now, my God! cleaning ourselves from
94. *ōtūnrbiz m(a)nastar hırza . . sin ! we pray : Manastar hırza !*
95. *. . . . altınē ymā* THE SIXTH.
96. *t(ā)ngırm suda b(a)ru-u My God! if in sinful state, we saḡınēın* should have committed
97. *sozun (for sōzūn)⁴³ ḡlūnēın* the ten kinds of sin through
- . . on tūrlūg*
98. *su-i yazuḡ ḡlūm(i)z ārsār* thoughts, words, or deeds ;

99. . . *näcä iqıl iqıdäd(i)m(i)z* if somehow we should have
ürsür coined falsehoods:
100. *ymä näcä iqıdäyü ant(i)qıl(i)-* if somehow we should have
*m(i)z*²¹ perjured ourselves:
101. *ürsür . . näcä iqıl kısı-i* if somehow we should have
become a false
102. *tanuqı-ı boltumuz ürsür* man's witness: if somehow we
should have per-
103. . . *ymä yazuqsuz kisiq näcä* secuted an innocent man:
104. *govlad(i)m(i)z ürsür . . ymä sav* if, carrying
105. *ihıp*²² *sav kälürüp kisiq* words to and fro (?), we should
somehow
106. *näcä kıkısürü-ü sözläd(i)m(i)z* have talked people into living
in enmity
107. *ürsür . . köngülün biligin* (and thereby) should have cor-
rupted
108. *qırtatd(i)m(i)z ürsür . . näcä* their hearts and minds . .
*yılvrı-ı*²³ if somehow we should
109. *yılvrıld(i)m(i)z ürsür . . ymä* have practised sorcery²³ . . if
näcä somehow we should
110. *öküs tım(i)γ(?)γ tural(i)γ(?)γ* have killed a many living
ölürldümüz moving beings:
111. *ürsür . . näcä t(ü)vläd(i)-* if somehow we should have
m(i)z practised
112. *kürıld(i)m(i)z ürsür . . näcä* fraud and deception: if some-
how we should have de-
113. *ürümq oruncaq*²⁴ *ııdd(i)m(i)z* voured an industrious (?)
[man's homestead (?):
114. *ürsür*²⁵ . . *kün ar t(ü)ngri-ı* if somehow we should have
tapla- done deeds
115. *maz isiq näcä isläd(i)m(i)z* displeasing to the God of the
Sun and the Moon:
116. *ürsür . . ymä ilkrı-ı özün bu* again, if in our first self
117. *özün uzınlonurγ*²⁶ *wılar* (or) in this self, now that we
ourselves have become
118. *öz bolup näcä yaz(i)nt(i)m(i)z* Manichean (?)²⁶ youths, we
should somehow have sinned
119. *yang(i)lt(i)m(i)z ürsür . .* and erred, and should thus have
munča brought damage and ruin

120. *öküs tınl(i)ıqa năcâ üz* over so many living beings,
 121. *boz qılt(i)m(i)z ürsür . .* My God!
t(ä)ngrim
 122. *qımtı bu on türlüg yazuqda* now, cleaning ourselves from
 the-
 123. *boşunu ötümürbız m(a)nastar* se ten kinds of sin we pray :
Manastar
 124. *hız(a) . . . yitinc ymâ* *hıza!* THE SEVENTH.
 125. *suidu b(a)ru-u äki-i arıluı* If one should say, who is he
 [that comes?] to
 126. *yol başına tamu qap(i? a?)-* the entrance of the two poison-
ıngı laden roads
 127. *azıruıı-i yolı kim tısür²⁷* and to the road that leads astray
 to the gate of Hell?
 128. *. . bir iqıdıl nomıı törüı* The first is he that adheres to
 false
 129. *tuturıma . . äkıntı-i ymâ* faiths . . the second is he
yäkkä that, calling the
 130. *t(ä)ngri-i tıpân yükünç yükü-* Demon by the name of God,
nüqmâ worships him with prostra-
 tions.
 131. *. . suidu b(a)ru-u t(ä)ngrim* My God! if, in (this) sinful
kırtı state, through our
 132. *t(ä)ngriıı grıı nomıı bilmätın* failing to understand and to
 comprehend the true God
 133. *uqmatın . . burhanlar grıı* and the pure Faith, through
 not believing what
 134. *dınarlar nomlasar kırtkün-* the burkhans and the pure
mâd(i)n Electi might have prea-
 135. *t(ä)rtırü yana ıgläyü t(ä)ngriçı-* ched, and (*trırü*?) having
man placed confidence (?) in
 136. *nomcımın t(i)ymäkä artıııı²⁸* those that falsely say: "I am
 a man of God, I am
 137. *anııı savın alıp năcâ* a preacher," and having
 accepted their words, we
 138. *yang(i)lu-u baçaıı bacad(i)m(i)z* should, somehow, have erringly
 (by mistake) fasted fasts and
 139. *ürsür . . năcâ yang(i)lu* should, somehow, have erringly
yüküntümüz (by mistake) prostrated

140. *ärsär näčä yang(i)lu puši-i* ourselves and should, somehow, erringly (by mistake)
141. *bird(i)m(i)z ärsär . . ymä buyan* have given alms: or if, saying "We will acquire
142. *bögtäg²⁹ qilurbiz tıp* merit", we should somehow
143. *yang(i)lu näčä qnri qilinē* erringly (by mistake) have committed
144. *qilt(i)m(i)z ärsär . . ymä yäkkä* evil deeds . . or if, invoking the
145. *ičkääkkä³⁰ t(ä)ngrı-i tıpän* Demon and the Preta¹⁰ by the name of God,
146. *tın(i)γ(i? a?)γ tural(i)γ(i? a?)γ öllürüp* we should have killed (sacrificed) living and moving
147. *yüküntümüz ärsär . . ymä* beings and prostrated ourselves (to the demons)
148. *burxan tıpän iqidd nomqa* or if, saying: this is the (law of the) Burkhan, we should have
149. *uduntumuz tap(i)nt(i)m(i)z ärsär* subjected ourselves to a false Law, and
150. *. . qut qolu yüküntümüz* should have worshipped it, by blessing it,
151. *ärsär t(ä)ngrıkä yazınıp* (thus) sinning against God and worshipping
152. *yäkkä tapint(i)m(i)z ärsär . .* the Demon:
153. *t(ä)ngrım qmtı-i ökünürbiz* My God! now we repent!
154. *yazuqda boşunu ötünürbiz* cleaning ourselves from sin we pray:
155. *m(a)nastar hırz(a) Manastar hırza!*
156. *säkızinē kirtü t(ä)ngrı-i-q* THE EIGHTH. When we had come to know the
157. *qrıγ nomuγ biltükümüzdä* true God and the pure Law,
158. *b(a)ru-u . . äki yiltızıγ üē* we knew the two Roots and the Law of
159. *ödkı-i nomuγ biltımız . .* the Three Times.
160. *y(a)ruq yiltızın t(ä)ngrı yırın* The Bright Root we knew to be the Paradise
161. *tünärıγ yiltızın tamu yırın* of God, the Dark Root we knew to be the

162. *biltim(i)z . . ymă yir t(ă)ngri* Empire of Hell. We knew
yoq what had been
163. *ărkăn ũngrŭ nă bar ărmis* in existence (at the time) before
there was
164. *tipăn biltim(i)z . . t(ă)ngrih* an Earth-God. We knew why
yăkl God and the
165. *nădă ũtrŭ sŏngŭsmis . .* Demon had battled against
each other,
166. *y(a)ruql-i q(a)ral-i qalt-i* and how (thereby) Light and
Darkness
167. *qatilmis yirg t(ă)ngriy kim* had intermingled. We knew
who had
168. *yaratmis tipăn biltim(i)z . .* created Heaven and Earth and
by what means
169. *ymăurqon yirt(ă)ngri-i¹¹ năldă* the arqon Earth-God¹¹ will
again
170. *ũtrŭ yoq boljai . . y(a)ruql-i* be reduced to nought, and how
(thereby)
171. *q(a)ral-i-ï q(u)lti-ï adr(i)ljai-i* Light and Darkness will (again)
be parted: we
172. *antada kivră nă boljai tipăn* knew what will happen after
these (events).
173. *biltim(i)z . . ăzrua t(ă)ngrikă* Believing in and placing
kŭn
174. *ai t(ă)ngrikă küčlŭg t(ă)ngrikă* our reliance upon Azrua the
God, upon the Sun- and
Moon-God, upon
175. *burxanlarqa¹² ĩnantim(i)z* the Powerful God and upon
the Burkhan,¹²
176. *tayantim(i)z n(i)rošak¹³ boltu-* we became Auditors.¹³
m(u)z
177. *. . tŏrt y(a)ruq tamja¹⁴ kŏn-* Four bright Seals¹⁴ have we
gŭllŭmŭz- sealed
178. *dŭ tamjalad(i)m(i)z bir qmran-* in our hearts. One is Love¹⁵
maq¹⁵ (and this is)
179. *ăzrua t(u)ngri-i tamjas-i* the seal of Azrua the God: the
ăkinti-i second (is)
180. *kirtkŭnmăk kŭn ai t(ă)ngri-i* Faith (and this is) the seal of the
God of the Sun and the Moon:

181. *tamγ(a)sī-i ücünē gorgmaq* the third is the Fear of God
182. *bis t(ä)ngri-i tamγasī-i törtünē* (and this is) the seal of the
Five-God; the fourth
183. *bilgü biliγ burxanlar* is the wise Wisdom (and this
is) the seal of
184. *tamγasī-i . . t(ä)ngrim biligi-* the Burkhans . . My God!
m(i)zu-i if, somehow, we
185. *köngülümüzni-i bu-u tört-t* should have caused our under-
standing and our hearts
186. *türlüg t(ä)ngriürdä arıtıl(i)-* to drift away from these four
m(i)z (kinds of) Gods,
187. *ärsär . . ornüta qamsat(i)-* if we should have overthrown
*m(i)z*⁴⁸ them
188. *ärsär t(ä)ngri-i tamγasī-i* from their places and if God's
bozultı seal(s) should
189. *ärsär . . qmtı t(ä)ngrim* have been violated: now, my
yazuqda God!
190. *bosunu ötünürbiz m(a)nastar* cleaning ourselves from sin!
we pray: *Manastar*
191. *hırz(a) toquzunē on* *hırza . . . THE NINTH.* In
192. *ç(a)xsap(a)t tulduqumuzda* our keeping of the ten Com-
b(a)ru mandments it
193. *üc arzın üc köngülün üc* was ordained to keep, perfectly,
three
194. *älqm bir q(a)m(a)ı özün* with the mouth, three with the
tökättı-i heart, three
195. *tutmaq k(ä)rgäk ürtı-i . .* with the hand (and) one with
t(ä)ngrim one's whole self. My God!
196. *bilip bilnättin ät'öz*⁴⁷ if wittingly or unwittingly,
having walked in the
197. *s(ä)ııqıncā yorıp y(a)claq is* love of the body or having
followed (accepted) the words
198. *tus alas qulas sacın* and agreed to the intentions
of bad comrades and chance
acquaintances, of (bad) friends
and associates,
199. *alıp köngülün körüp yılqıqa* (or) if having obtained
200. *bar(a)mqa*⁴⁹ *bulup*⁴⁹ . . *azo* cattle and (other) possessions;
munqumuz or if, having been overpowered

201. *taqim(i)z*⁴⁰ *t(ä)qip bu on* (lit. "met") by our foolish
ç(a)xsap(a)t(i)ç (worldly) attachments,⁴⁰ we
 should
202. *sid(i)m(i)z ärsär . . nää* have broken these ten command-
äqsütümüz ments, or should somehow
203. *k(ä)rgättim(i)z*⁴¹ *ärsär . .* have been found wanting (or)
*qmti*⁴² *t(ä)ngrim* of no avail⁴¹ . . Now, my
 God!
204. *yazuqda boşunu ötünürbz* cleaning ourselves from sin!
205. *m(a)nastar hırz(a)* we pray: *Manastar hırza!*
206. *onunç künkäll tört qıçs* THE TENTH. It had been
 ordained to call down,
 207. *üzrua t(ä)ngrikäll kün ai* with an undivided mind and
t(ä)ngrikäll a pure heart,
 208. *küçlüqt(ä)ngrikäll burxanlarqa*⁴³ every day, four blessings upon
 Azrua the God,
 209. . . *bir bulıgın qırıç künğülüm* upon the God of the Sun and
 the Moon,
 210. *alqansıç*⁴⁴ *törü bar ärti-i . .* upon the Powerful God and
 upon the Burkhans.⁴⁴
211. *ymä qorqmatın ärmägürüp* If, through want of the Fear of
 God, or from being lax,
 212. *älğütı-i tökätti-i alqanmad(i)-* we should not have uttered
m(i)z (these) benedictions in a good
 213. *ärsär . . ymä alqanur ärkün* and perfect manner, or if, while
 we uttered them, we
 214. *künğülümüzni-i saqınçım(i)z-* should not have kept our hearts
ni-i and thoughts directed
 215. *t(ä)ngriğärü-ü tutmad(i)m(i)z* upon God:
ärsär . .
216. *alqışım(i)z ötügümüz t(ä)ngrikäll* if (thereby) our benedictions
 and prayers should not have
 217. *arıçın t(ä)qmälı-i ärsär . . nää* reached God in a pure manner,
yirdä (but) should
 218. *tıldinti-i tutuntı-i ärsär . .* have, somewhere, obstructed
qmti-i their own way, and held
 themselves fast,
 219. *t(ä)ngrim yazuqda boşunu* now, my God! cleaning our-
ötünür selves from sin,

220. *biz m(a)nastar hırz(a)* we pray: *Manastar hırza!*
221. *bir y(i)g(i)ruinē ymā yiti* THE ELEVENTH. It had been
türllüg ordained thus reverent-
222. *puşi-i*¹⁵ *gırı nomqa unēolasıq*¹⁶ ly to offer seven kinds of alms¹⁵
for the sake
223. *törü bar ürti-i* . . *ymā bis* of the pure Faith, (and) it had
t(ä)ngri-i been ordained that,
224. *y(a)ruqın quvat(i)gli-i f(ä)ri-* when the angels collecting the
tilür light of the Five-God
225. *xrošt(a)g p(a)duaxt(a)g t(ä)n-* (and ?) the god (gods ?) Khrosh-
*gri-i*¹⁷ . . *t(ä)ngriürü* tag Padwaktag,¹⁷ should
226. *bardaēi-i bosuntaēi-i bis* have brought to us (that part
t(ä)ngri of) the light of the Five-God.
227. *y(a)ruqın biz(i)ngürü* that, going to God is (there) to
k(ä)lürdi-i ärsär be purified (delivered of its
dark particles) :
228. . . *biz adruq adruq itıp* (that then) much adorning our-
y(a)ratıp selves, we should cause
229. *nomqa k(ä)ngürsüg*¹⁸ *törü bar* ourselves to dress in accordance
with the Law.¹⁸
230. *ürti-i* . . *azo mung ücün azo* If, because of (our) foolishness,
or because we
231. *puşi-i birqäl-i qızıanıp* have stinted giving alms, we
should have been
232. *yiti-i türllüg puşi-i nomqa* unable to give the seven kinds
of alms perfectly and in
233. *tökäti-i birü unuul(i)m(i):* accordance with the Law (or
ärsär "to the Law"),
234. . . *t(ä)ngriqürü parlaēi-i(!)*¹⁹ (or) if we should have bound¹⁹
bosuntaēi the light of the Five-
235. *bis t(ä)ngri-i y(a)ruqın ärkä* God, that is to go to God to
*barqa (!)*¹⁹ (read *barqın*) purify itself, to our
236. *baul(i)m(i):*²⁰ *ärsär* . . *gırı* house and household (or) if
qilinē(i)g we should have given
237. *kisikä y(a)claq tin(i)ıqı* it to men inclining to evil
deeds or to bad living
238. *tural(i)ıqı bırd(i)m(i): ärsär* . . and moving beings
239. *töktümüz saētım(i): ärsär* and should (thereby) have
spilled it or thrown it away,

240. *t(ä)ngri-i y(a)ruqin y(a)vlaq* thus sending the divine light
yirgär'ü-ñ
241. *ïdtim(i)z ärsär³¹ . . . t(ä)ngrim* to the Bad Place³¹: my God! now
amti-i
242. *yazuqda boşunu ßtünür biz* cleaning ourselves from sin,
 243. *m(a)nastar hırza* we pray: *Manastar hırza!*
244. *äki-i yögirmine bir yilqa* THE TWELFTH. It had been
 ordained to keep (sit
 245. *ällig kün qırı dıntarëa . .* down to) every year a fifty
 days' *vos(a)ntı*
246. *vos(a?)nti-i³² olursuq törü bar* after the manner of the pure
 Electi ;
247. *ärti-i . . qırı baçaq baçap* and it was a prescription to
 offer worship to
248. *t(ä)ngrikü ançolasıq k(ä)rgäk* God by fasting pure fasts.
249. *ärti-i . . ymü är barq tutduq* If, because we have and hold
 house and
250. *ññün yitqıqa barmqa bulup* household, and have obtained
 cattle and (other) posses-
 251. *azo munqumuz tuqim(i)z* sions, or because our foolish
t(ä)qıp . . . attachments overpower us,
 252. *ymü todunësuz orutsuz soq³³* or because of the insatiable,
 shameless Envy-Demon,
 253. *yäk ññün ymü qorqunësuz* or because of our irreverent
 254. *könqülönüz ññün . . qıruıp* hearts, we should have broken
 the fast,
255. *ärmägürüp³⁴ ärklugin ärksiz(i)n* being faint-hearted and lax,³⁴ in
 strength
256. *baçaq sıd(i)m(i)z ärsär . . ymü* or void of strength: (or) if,
 albeit,
257. *baçaq oluruıp ädgüti nomëa* sitting down to fast, we should
 not have
258. *törücü baçamad(i)m(i)z ärsär* fasted in accordance with Law
 and Ritual :
259. *. . t(ä)ngrim amti-i yazuqda* my God! now, cleaning our-
boşunu selves from sin,
260. *ßtünürbiz m(a)nastar hırz(a) . .* we pray: *Manastar hırza!*
261. *. . . . ñc y(i)girmine ai* THE THIRTEENTH. It was a
 prescription to pray

262. *t(ä)ngri-i künin sayu t(ä)ngrikä* every day of the Moon-God
nomqa
263. *qırı dıntarlar³⁰ . . . sayumuznu-i³⁰* to God, to the Law (and) to the pure Electi
264. *yazuqumuznu-i bosunu qolmaq* to clean ourselves of our sins and
265. *k(ä)rqäk ärti-i . . . ymä ärkligin* trespasses. If, in strength
266. *äksız(i)n qıncıp ärmägüüp* or void of strength, being faint-hearted and lax, (and)
267. *iskä ködügkä tıtanıp* keeping up (too close) relations to (worldly) affairs, we
268. *yazuqda boşırqalı-i barma-* should not have gone [to the
d(t)m(t)z Electi?] to clean ourselves
269. *ärsä . . . t(ä)ngrim qantı-i* from sin: my God! now, clean-
yazuqda ing ourselves
270. *boşunu ötünür biz m(a)nastar* from sin! we pray: *Manastar*
271. *hırz(a)* *hırza*
272. *tört y(i)qirminc bir yılqa yiti-i* THE FOURTEENTH. It had been
ordained to sit
273. *y(i.)mki-i³¹ olarsuq töñü bar* down, each year, (to) seven
ärti *ymki* and it was
274. *. . . bir ai c(a)xsap(a)t tutmaq* a prescription to keep one
k(ä)rqäk month's *caxsapat*.
275. *ärti-i ymä çaudan-ta³⁰* Further, it was a prescription
y(i)mki-i that,
276. *olunıp baéuq butéap . . .* sitting down in the prayer-hall³⁰
to observe the
277. *t(ä)ngri-i burxanqa bir bılıqın* *ymki* (and?) to fast the fasts,
we should pray, with an
278. *köngültä b(a)ru-u bir yılıqı-i* undivided mind from (our)
heart (?) to the divine
279. *yazuqumuznu-i bosunu ötünmäk* Burkhan to make void our sins.
280. *k(ä)rqäk ärti . . . t(ä)ngrim* My God! if we should have
yiti y(i)mki
281. *tökäti-i oluru umad(t)m(t)z* been unable to sit down to the
ärsär seven *ymki* in a perfect
282. *bir aıqı-i c(a)xsap(a)tı(ı)ı(?)* manner, if we should have been
ädgütı-i unable to keep the
283. *tökäti-i arıtı-i tutu umad(t)-* one month's *caxsapat* in a good,
m(t)z perfect, and pure manner,

284. *ürsür . . ymü candan-ta* if, sitting down in the prayer-
y(i)mki-i hall to [keep] the *yimki*
285. *baéuq ädügüti-i nomca törücü* (and the fast?) well and in
accordance with
286. *oluru umad(i)m(i)z ürsür . .* Lawand Ritual, if we should not
bir
287. *yilqi-i yazuqumuzni-i bir* have prayed from our heart (?)
bılıqın with a single
288. *köngültä b(a)ru-u bosuqu qol-* intent to shake off our one
year's
289. *mad(i)m(i)z ürsür . . näcü* sins: if, somehow, shortcomings
ägsüü
290. *k(ä)rqäk boltı-i ürsür . .* and unavailability should
t(ä)ngrim have been (in our conduct):
my God!
291. *qmü yazuqda boşnu ütüür* now, cleaning ourselves from
sin!
292. *biz m(a)nastar hırz(a)* we pray: *Manastar hırza!*
293. *bis y(i)qirminé küm sayu näcü* THE FIFTEENTH. Every day,
how many
294. *y(a)rlaq saqinè saqınurbiz* evil thoughts do we think!
295. *. . näcü sözlämäsüq irnèñlüq* how many miserable
296. *söz sözläyürbiz . . näcü* words, that ought not to be
spoken, do we speak! how
many
297. *islämäsüq is islâyürbiz* deeds, that ought not to be done,
do we do!
298. *qmü qilnèqa irnèñkü* On account of (our) evil deeds
and (our) wretchedness
299. *k(ä)ntü özümüzni-i ämgätirbiz* do we ourselves cause torments
to our own bodies!
300. *. . ymü künkä asaduqumuz⁷⁴* Because we ourselves have
walked (lived), body and soul,
in the love of the insa-
301. *bis t(ä)ngri-i y(a)ruqi-i k(ä)ntü* tiable, shameless, envious De-
özümüz mon, (therefore) does
302. *üzütümüz . . todunèsz orutsuz* (that part of) the light of the
Five-God, that, every day,
303. *soq yäk s(ä)virinèü yorıduq* we have absorbed in our food,⁷⁴

304. *ñeñn y(a)rlaq yirgârû barîr* go to the Bad Place.
 305. . . *anî-î ñeñn t(â)ngrim* Because of this, my God,
yazuqda
 306. *boşunu ñlünñrbiz m(a)nastar* cleaning ourselves from sin! do
 we pray: *Manastar*
 307. *hırza . . t(â)ngır-ı dımmurwa*⁷⁹ *hırza!* Because of the divine
ñeñn *dın-murwa.*⁷⁹

[Follow four empty lines.]

308. *t(â)ngrim ägsüklüñ yazuqluñ* My God! We are imperfect
 and sin-
 309. *biz ñtägêr-ı birımcıbiz*⁶¹ ful! We are tormentors and
 malcontents!⁶¹
 310. *todunêsuz orutsuz soq* For the sake of the insatiable,
 shameless, envious
 311. *yâk ñeñn . . saqınên sözün* Demon, by thoughts, words,
 (and)
 312. *qılınên ymâ közün körüp* deeds: seeing with eyes,
 313. *qulqaqın üsıdıñ tılın sözlüp* hearing with ears, speaking
 with tongues,
 314. *âlgın sunıp qılaqın yorıp* touching with hands, walking
 with legs,
 315. *ñrkâ*⁶² *ñzñksüz ängâttıñbiz . .* do we long⁶² and unceasingly
 torment
 316. *bis t(â)ngır-ı y(a)ruqın qurucı* the light of the Five-God, the
ñl dry and wet
 317. *yırıñ bis tññüñ tınl(ı)ñ(ı)ñ*⁶¹ *bis* earths, the five kinds of living
 beings (and) the five
 318. *tñrlüñ oturı ıraqıñ . . ymâ* kinds of herbs and trees! (In-
 deed) we are
 319. *ägsüklüñ yazuqlıñrbiz . . on* imperfect and sinful! On
 account of the ten
 320. *ê(a)xsap(a)tqa yırı-ı pusıqa üc* Commandments, the seven Alms,
 the three
 321. *t(a)mrıaqa*⁶¹ *n(ı)tosakatıntatar* Seals⁶¹ do we hold the name of
 Anditores:
 322. *biz . . qılınên qılın unazbiz* to act their actions we are
 unable.

323. *ymä y(a)ruq t(ä)ngriälärkä qırı* If, somehow, we should have
sinned or erred against
324. *nomqa t(ä)ngriäi-i nomäi-i qırı* the resplendent Gods, against
the pure Law, against the
325. *dıntarlarqa . . näää yaz(i)-* Men of God, the Preachers,
nt(i)m(i)z (namely) the pure Electi :
326. *yang(i)lt(i)m(i)z ärsär ymü* if, somehow, we should not have
t(ä)ngri-i
327. *aimis öteä bilgä*⁶² walked (lived) according to the
letter (sound)⁶² and the
328. *yorımad(i)m(i)z ärsär . .* meaning of God's spoken
t(ä)ngriälär (words); if we should
329. *köngülin b(i)rt(i)m(i)z ärsär* have caused discontent in the
ymü hearts of the Gods ;
330. *y(i)mkı-i bacaq alqıs ä(a)χsa-* if we should have been unable
p(a)t to keep the *yımkı*, the
331. *nomäu törüceä tutu umad(i)m(i)z* fasts, the benedictions, and the
commandments according
332. *ärsär . . näää ägsütümüz* to Law and Ritual: if, somehow,
we have been found wanting
333. *k(ä)rgätim(i)z ärsär . . kün* and unavailing, (then indeed)
sayu do we commit sins
334. *ai sayu sui-i yazuq qılu* every month and every day !
335. *biz . . y(a)ruq t(ä)ngriälärkä* To the resplendent Gods, to the
nom qutınga Majesty of the
336. *qırı dıntarlarqa suıdu yazuqla* Law, to the pure Electi, clean-
ing ourselves
337. *boşunu ötüñürbiz m(a)nastar* from sin! do we pray: *Manastar*
338. *hırz(a) . . bir y(i)girminä ai* *hırza* ! (On the 25th day of
bis otuzdu . . the 11th month.)

Here follows, after an interval of about five lines, the drawing of a beardless male person standing in a respectful attitude with crossed arms and hands hid in the sleeves of his coat. The costume consists of a long coat (*çapan*) with a narrow collar (!): it is held together by a cloth tied around the waist. The legs are covered by trousers, the feet by low boots, while the head is protected

by a (fur-rimmed ?) cap. Altogether the costume resembles strikingly that worn by the modern inhabitants of these regions.

NOTES

Abbreviations : B. = F. C. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionsystem*, Tübingen, 1831. F. = G. Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1862. K = K. Kessler, *Mani, Forschungen über die manichäische Religion*, Berlin, 1889.

¹ *szuzubaq*. Noun substantive derived, perhaps, from the root *sz* = "to purify". I cannot explain the way in which it is formed.

² *šman*. A word of Soghdian origin : the vowel of the first syllable is not yet fixed with any degree of certitude. It is an appellation of the Demon of Darkness himself as well as of the lesser demons of the dark world. It appears to be interchangeable with the term *yok*.

³ *bal(v)γ* *bas(v)γ*. *bal(v)γ* is perhaps, although the manner in which this word is formed is by no means clear, to be derived from *ba* = "to bind", and should be translated as "bound, ensnared". *bas(v)γ* may be from the same root *ba* + *s* = "to bind one another". Whether the transposition should be *bal(v)γ* or *bal(u)γ*, etc., we have as yet no means of knowing.

⁴ *antahala-ta*. This appears to be a clerical error for *antada*.

⁵ *rum(a)st(r)azind* (رزم) np. a son?). The Persian (?) name of the person for whom this text was copied. In Buddhistic confessions the name (or names) of the possessor, etc., of the prayer is frequently inserted in the same manner.

⁶ *aymanir*. Clerical error (?) for the common word *akanur*.

⁷ *quthuy pads* . . . The mutilation of the second of these words, which are both written in red ink, renders it impossible to guess at its meaning.

⁸ *tirnaqula*. Verbal noun formed, perhaps, from a root *tirna*, which still survives in the (Osm.) *تروك، تروك*, "assembly" (Yousouf, *Dict turco-français*). [The interpretation of this entire passage is doubtful.] We cannot as yet decide whether *kan ai (ta)uyri* stands for one or for several gods. Here only one single deity appears to be meant by this appellation, and this would coincide with the passage B., p. 291 : "Some und Mond oder der in diesen beiden herrlichsten Lichtwesen thronende Christus." (Cf. also F., p. 256.) The "gods enthroned in the two palaces" are perhaps only the particles of light accumulated in these two purest bodies of light : the exact explanation of this passage must, however, be left to others. In the following lines there begins the description of the road of the light, which, having been rescued from the embraces of matter, is ascending to heaven ; unfortunately the recital breaks off at the "foremost gate", namely, *kan ai (ta)uyri*. For the hitherto received tradition concerning this road cf. F., p. 341, n. 292. The words *toh tazienne* seem to describe the moon here as *maris lucida*, the crescent

being changed into the full moon by the reception of the particles of ascending light (cf. B., pp. 305-7).

⁹ *enru sar* = "sacrilegious words, blasphemous". This interpretation appears assured by the following passage (F., p. 290): "Der Begriff Gotteslästerung war aber ein weitschichtiger und umfasste alles, worin irgendwie ihrer Dämonologie ein Zustandnis gemacht wurde, z. B. die Behauptung, dass der menschliche Körper von Gott geschaffen sei, war eine Gotteslästerung." The meaning "Zauberwort" which I had suggested in "Kokturkisches aus Turfan", *Sitzber.*, xli, 1909, is therefore erroneous.

¹⁰ The "Youth of the God Khormuzta, the Fivefold God" is to be identified with the "Primal Man" or "Urmensch". The "five god-fighting in his defence" are his five "elements" or *members*, namely, the five gods of the Zephyr, the Wind, the Light, the Water, and the Fire. Cf. F., pp. 87, 88.

¹¹ *bal(a)qduq, balq(a)duq* (?). Radloff translates "because they were in constant glimmering motion", but does not attempt to explain the form. According to the *Fihrist* (cf. F., pp. 87, 88): "After having done battle, the Demon vanquished the Primal Man, devoured part of his light and surrounded him with his generations (*Generationen*) and with his elements." I therefore propose to derive the word *balqduq* from the root *ba-*, "to bind, to ensnare"; following a suggestion of F. W. K. Müller, one may think of *ba + γ + ba-*, by metathesis = *balγ(a)-* or *balq(a)-*: the omission, here, of the vowel *a*, in writing, is, however, an unusual feature.

¹² *bu yirli arur*. The "Five-God" or "Primal Man" is on or in this earth, because our world was constructed from the mixed generations of the Light and Darkness, which had come into existence by his defeat. Cf. F., p. 89.

¹³ *b(i)rtim(i)z*. (In the Petersburg MS., l. 19, *b(i)rt(i)m(i)z*.) This word is apparently derived from a root *bur-*, surviving in Osmanli in the forms: *مر*, *myr*, partic., *imite un bruit très-leger fait à voix basse comme celui d'un chat*; *مرلدامق, مرلدانق, myryldamaq, myryldanaq, murmurir, balbutier, fig. manifester du mécontentement*; *مرلدى, myrylty, murmurir, etc., fig. mécontentement* (Samy). Radloff mistook the *r* in the root-syllable for a *a* and read *bat*. Following a suggestion from Vilhelm Thomsen, I now believe it to be more correct to connect this word with *برتمك, torde, disloquer* (Baubier de Meynard).—*birimci* (l. 309) I would therefore connect with Osm. *بوريم, bourym*, "torsion," and propose to translate with "tormentor". As I find *otay ünyük* as synonyms in another fragment (T. II, D. 173a), *otagci birimci* may well be considered a head-synonym for "tormentor".

¹⁴ *arugük*. Radloff reads *arukuk*. This word still exists in the Chaghatai *ارتاك* (*ärnak*), *bout des doigts* (Pavet de Courteille).

¹⁵ We have sinned against the light contained in these objects. The enumeration somewhat resembles that of St. Augustine as quoted B., p. 204: "Ipsam partem naturæ Dei ubique permixtam . . . in omnibus corporibus siccis et humidis, . . . in omnibus seminibus arborum herbarum," etc.

¹⁹ There is as yet no means of explaining the words *yulawaci* and *bagtaci*. (The Petersburg text has *bagtacyci*.) *bagtuy* may be a synonym for *buyan*.

¹⁷ *azalimiz*. Radloff reads *azalimiz*. The verb is apparently the root *az* + *a*.

¹⁸ The five kinds of creatures of the *dark* world are enumerated in *inverse* order B., p. 23, quoting St. Augustine: "novimus etiam animalia serpentina, natantia, volantia, quadrupedia, bipedia." This sounds much like the passages ending with *bilimiz* in the Eighth Count. l. 156, etc., of the MS.

¹⁹ *tul(ı)γ turat(ı)γ*. The meaning of the second word is as yet unexplained. Perhaps it may be translated with "moving", on the strength of the following passage in Baur quoting Turbo (B., p. 312): "an dem Wesen des guten Vaters hat jede Seele und jedes *sch bewegend* lebende Wesen Teil"

²⁰ *yanturuz*. From a root *yuu-*, still existing in the "heavy" form in Chaghatai Turki (cf. Pavet de Courteille, *Diet. Turco-oriental*: *يوئيمق*, *tailor, sculptor, roboter*).

²¹ *antqimiz*. Radloff's MS. apparently has the form *antq-*; the interpretation "to swear an oath", cf. Ösm. *af. ant.* seems to be unassailable.

²² *ıltıp*. Radloff's MS., if correctly rendered, reads *altıp*. The verb *alt-* occurs several times in other texts, and seems to have the meaning of "to bring" or "to cause to bring", the contrast being *yanturuz* or *ıngıtar*, meaning "to cause to come back", "to come back".

²³ *yıtri*. This word is frequently accompanied by the word *ıman*, and means "(deception by) magical arts". Radloff translates erroneously with "passion".

²⁴ *tav-* and *kar-* appear several times together in our unpublished texts, and seem to be a hendiadyoin. The meaning in our Buddhist texts is apparently "to deceive". Another fragment (T M. 180) shows, as things not to be found "in the other world", the enumeration *tav kar yalrı* (= *yıtri arırs*, of which the first two seem to have the signification of deception by simple fraud, the two others of deception by magical arts. Radloff translates *tavıduuz* (which he erroneously writes *ıdu-*) *kıradıuz* with "we have given ourselves up to lasciviousness and greed".

²⁵ *nıca arııııy orııııy yadılıuz arsar*. This passage appears to be corrupted. It reads *nıca arıııy kısı orııııyım* both in the Berlin and in the St. Petersburg texts. The words *arıııy* and *orııııy* do not occur in our other texts. Radloff's Dictionary has the (Uig.) forms *abak, awak (cılık, nabıstandıq, flachtıp)*. Another, perhaps, only mistaken readings for *arıııy* or *ıbtıııy*: as the translation suggested by Radloff for this passage seems acceptable, I have followed him in this instance.

²⁶ *uzun toudıy* appears to be an appellative restricted, in these texts, to Manichaeans. *uz* is a frequent word apparently both in Buddhist and in Manichean texts, meaning "an adult youth".

²⁷ *ısar*. Radloff reads erroneously *ısar*, and translates *ısr* by "to open a path". Really it is the conditionals of the verb *ı-*, "to say."

and its translation ought to be "if one should say". There is a difficulty in the construction of this passage that I cannot overcome.

²⁸ *artizip* is another word of which I cannot trace the meaning. It can apparently only mean "to confide, to believe in".

²⁹ *buyan bogtay* is evidently a hendiadyoin, of which the first word only has been explained by F. W. K. Muller as a loan-word from Sanskrit *puṅga*.

³⁰ *yak* has the same meaning as *šmuu*, and is used to designate the Demon of the Darkness and also all lesser demons. The origin of the word is, according to F. W. K. Muller, from the Skt. *yakṣa*. *īkak* is the appellation of a special kind of evil spirits, which are probably identical with the *pretas* of the Buddhists. The mention of animals offered as victims has caused Radloff to suppose that this text was written for Turks recently converted from Shamanism, an idea that appears very strange, for surely it is a translation from the Persian, and its original had been composed for the Manichaeans before they had come in contact with the Turks (cf. B., p. 351).

³¹ *arqon yir t(a)ngri*. Perhaps it is not too bold to suppose that this word corresponds to the Greek word *αρχων*, which seems to be used indiscriminately for the Demon of Darkness himself and for all the lesser demons of the dark world (cf. F., pp. 7, 8, etc.). The combination of *αρχων* and *t(a)ngri*, however, sounds so strange that a different interpretation may be found more correct.

³² The four divine beings, or classes of divine beings, here named are identical with the four *gros-herrlichen Wesenheiten*, to believe in whom was the first commandment, to wit, God, His Light, His Power, and His Wisdom (cf. F., p. 95).

³³ *m(a)γōsak* (*m(a)ngōsak*), "hearers," was the designation of the members of the lay congregation, the lowest grade in Manichaean hierarchy. The second was that of *dindar*, or fully initiated Manichaeans. Yet a third term occurs in some of our texts, and seems to be applied to a still higher grade: it is *m(a)γi-sak*. The former two appellations are identified with those of the *auditors* and the *elect* (*perfecti*), while the correct translation of the third has not yet been found. According to the Western tradition, the senior Manichaeans were called *magisters*, *preshyterii*, and *diaconi*, but there were also seventy-two *episcopi*, while the highest rank was occupied by the twelve *magistri* (B., p. 297).

³⁴ *tort tamya*. It is rather puzzling to find here an enumeration of *four seals*, while on ll. 320-1 the number of *three seals* only is mentioned. According to St. Augustine, *three seals* (*signacula* [B., p. 248], خواتيم [F., p. 290]) or ordinances contained the whole of the ethics of the Manichaean faith: "quum os nomine, omnes sensus, qui sunt in capite, intelligi volo, quum autem manum, omnem operationem, quum sinum, omnem libidinem seminalem." Possibly the expression *four tamya* employed here is merely a paraphrase of the commandments contained in the expression *the three signacula*.

One would be tempted to identify these *four seals*, to wit, Love, Faith, Fear of God, and Wisdom, with the *five* spiritual members of the God of Light, but according to the tradition the tale of these members is

ün : Love, Faith, Fidelity, Nobleness of Mind, and Wisdom (cf. F., p. 86).

³⁵ *ünranııaq* = "to love"; *ünraq* (adj.) = "beloved". Radloff translates with "quiet, tranquillity". The assumption that "love" is meant seems to be confirmed by the following passage (K., p. 226): "Send-schreiben an Abi nber die Liebe (فی الحب), insofern als mit der 'Liebe' gewiss das erste Glied des Lichtgottes nach manichäischen Lehren gemeint ist."

³⁶ *qamšat(u)mitiz*. The Petersburg text apparently has *qamšard(u)mitiz*.

³⁷ *öz* = "the being", "the entire body", *at'öz* perhaps = "the carnal body". The words *at'özluq*, *azatluq* seem to be employed for "pertaining to the body, to the soul".

³⁸ *barın*. Other texts show the forms *barın* — *barın* may also be read *bar(a)m*, for the form *barım* occurs in other texts.

³⁹ *bulup*. Probably from the root *bul-*, "to find, to attain to": the construction with the dative is indicative of an extension of the meaning.

⁴⁰ *unıqıııtuz taqııız*, *unıq* is perhaps connected with Osm. بویک *boııq*, "sot, idiot"; نوگان *noııq*, "vieillard tombé en enfance" (Samy); *taq*, perhaps with Osm. تاق, *taq*, "fixer, attacher, accrocher" (Samy).

⁴¹ *k(a)rgatimiz*. Radloff reads *kak(a)atimiz* or *kikat(a)imiz*. The translation "to be nought, to come to nought" is founded upon this passage and l. 290, *ıysıı k(a)rgak*, which is evidently a hendiadyon.

⁴² *anti*. In many texts the spelling is *anati*; thus assuming the guttural quality of the initial *a*, which is further confirmed by the occurrence, in other texts, of *anti-qua*. Analogous spellings are *arıy*, *arıy*, which very frequently occur instead of *arıy*, *arıy*.

⁴³ The four gods named here are identical with the four *grossherrlichen Wesenheiten* الرب العظيم الأربع (cf. F., pp. 64, 95), to believe in which was the first commandment, namely, God, His Light, His Power, and His Wisdom.

⁴⁴ *alquarıy*, *arıcolarıy*. These forms in *arıy*, *arıy*, etc., follow here the expressions *tıru bar artı* and *ktarıyık artı*, which both appear to have the meaning "it was a rule or prescription". (Indeed, perhaps they were interchangeable, for the Berlin fragment Y. 60b, l. 37, has *ktarıyık artı* where both Dr. Stem's and the St. Petersburg MSS. have *tıru bar artı*.) The form appears to be a sort of *participium necessitatis*. (On ll. 295-7 the same forms are used as adjectives: *sozııamııarıy soz*, *ıshamııarıy ız*.) *alquarıy* apparently means "to call down blessings", *arıy* still meaning "a blessing" in modern Türkı. In other texts (not published as yet) *alquarıy* evidently has the signification of "to combat against", perhaps even "to devour", and it is necessary to mention the fact that many Turkish words, ancient and modern, have several and very divergent meanings. Cases in point are *arıy*, *ız*, *ktarıyık*, and perhaps *arıcolarıy*, but the instances could easily be multiplied.

⁴⁵ *paıı*. According to F. W. K. Müller this is a Chinese word simply meaning "dms". As we know that the *dicto (di)ntar* were dependent upon the *antıtaos (antı)paııak*, *arıy(paııak)* for their means of sustaining life (cf. B., pp. 269, 283), it is possible that these *paıı* were the food-gifts of the *antıtaos*.

⁴⁶ *anēolasiq* and *anēola*. *anēolayū* has the signification of "so" or of "acting in such a manner", and this meaning is assured by many passages. (The Sanskrit word *tathāgata*, for instance, is commonly translated by *anēolayū kālmiṣ*.) As, however, in F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica*, p. 30, there is found the combination *tapīnzū anēolazū*, which one might take for a hendiadyoin, and as the translation of *anēolasiq taru har ārti* by "it was a prescription thus to act" appears rather unsatisfactory, it appears admissible to suggest the translation "it has been the rule to thus reverently give the seven kinds of alms". In like manner I should propose to translate the passage (ll. 247-9) *arıy bacıq bacıq t(ā)ngrika anēolasıq k(arıyık: ārti* by "it was a rule thus to revere God by fasting pure fasts".

⁴⁷ *χροστay p(a)lraχt(a)y*. These names (which Radloff still writes *χροστάρ padraχtár*) are as yet unidentified with any of the names occurring in the Western and Arabic sources.

⁴⁸ Radloff misunderstood this whole passage. The words *itip yarayıp* he translates as follows (p. 38, n. 75): "Wortlich: wir Verschiedenes Verschiedenes tuend und schaffend in die Satzungen Herein-bringungs-Gesetz bestand." This interpretation is the result of his ignoring the meaning of *itip yarayıp*, "adorning one's self," given already by F. W. K. Müller (*Uigurica*, p. 29). Further, there can be but little doubt that the word transcribed by Radloff *kıpur-* (to cause to enter into, to bring into) is to be transliterated *k(a)yyur-* (to cause to put on clothes), under the assumption that the change of *d* to *y* already had taken place when this text was written down. Examples of this change *do* occur in other texts.

It is difficult to explain the *realia* of this passage. It treats of the *puṣi*-alms, which evidently were proffered by the *auditores* after they had dressed themselves in ritual (*nomqa*) robes. The "light of the Five-God which, brought to us by *χροστ(a)y* (and?) *p(a)lraχt(a)y t(a)ngri*, is going to God to be purified" is, perhaps, the light contained in these offerings of food, and the *electi* by eating this food were the means of purifying it from the gross particles by which it was bound into the shape of fruits, flour, or bread. Cf. B., p. 286: "Auf der anderen Seite waren aber auch die Auditores selbst die Organe, durch welche den Electi das in ihnen sich concentrierende Licht zuströmte, nur kehrte auch hier der Manichäismus seine materialistische Seite recht auffallend heraus. Indem die Auditores die Früchte, die den Electi zur Nahrung dienen sollten, pflukten, und die Electi sie genossen, wurden dadurch die in denselben gebundenen Lichtteile frei, die nach der Wanderung durch verschiedene Körper nun endlich zur Rückkehr in das Lichtreich reifen Menschenseelen. Von den Electi aus konnten sie, da sich diese der fleischlichen Vermischung, wodurch die Seelen immer aufs neue mit den Banden der Materie umschlungen werden, völlig enthielten, ihren Weg nur nach oben nehmen."

⁴⁹ *puṣiawı*. This word, derived from the root *har-*, "to go," deviates here from the usual spelling by showing *p* instead of *b*. The Berlin text T. II, D. 178, v, 1, 11, shows a similar deviation from the rule established in our texts by spelling, once, *puṣıaq* for *bacıq*. As in the

text here treated we miss the strict attention to careful orthography for which the majority of our MSS. is remarkable, these spellings may be mere clerical errors like the following: *barqa* instead of *barqqa* (l. 235), *dintarlarqa* instead of *dintarlarqa* (l. 263), *bulwunqay* instead of *bulwunqay* (l. 12), *saqiz* instead of *sakiz* (l. 43), *soz* instead of *soz* (l. 97), *nuwâ arinuy oruncuq* instead of *nuwâ arinuy kisi oruncuq* (ll. 112-13), etc.

⁵⁰ *baŋ(i)m(i)z*. As the light contained in fruits, cereals, etc., could only be delivered through the consumption of these foodstuffs by the *electi*, this passage may mean that by storing up such articles instead of giving them away to the *electi* the *auŋitor* impedes its purification and so commits a grievous sin.

⁵¹ It is evident that the giving away of articles of food containing light to human beings not belonging to the class of the *electi*, or indeed to impure lower creatures, caused these light-particles to enter into new and closer relations with the Darkness. St. Augustine, *De mor. Munich*, (quoted B., p. 286, note), says: "animalia cibum capiunt, que si concumbunt, ligant in carne divinum illud membrum, et a certo suo itinere aversum atque impeditum erroribus ænunusque implicant."

This conception explains the charge of inhuman hard-heartedness brought by the Christians against the Manicheans (K., p. 363, *Ab-schwarzungsfornit*).

⁵² *ros(a)nti*, *rus(a)nti*. Another word of perhaps foreign origin and unknown signification.

⁵³ *soq, suq*. *سوق = curie* (Pavet de Courteille). *suq* = stroke of the evil eye (R. B. Shaw).

⁵⁴ *arunp arunpuruq*. According to F. W. K. Muller the verb *arunpuruq* has the meaning "to be (or become) indolent, weary, or lax". The verb *arun-* has a similar meaning, and its root has survived in the modern dialect of Turfan in the words *As hâr*, "to be, or to become weary," and *حورون hârun* (for *hârun = arun*), "a sluggard". Our MS. writes *arunp* (with one ahi only), but as in well-known words the guttural *a* is often expressed by the single ahi alone (et. n. 36), and as moreover the Bethu text T. M. 180, l. 5, distinctly spells *arunp*. I prefer to transliterate *arunp*. Whoever in spite of this should prefer to read *arunp* may still do so, for the "light" form *arun-* may have existed as well, as it still does in Osm. *ار بتمك*, *ar buse, sajjusse* (Samy). Indolence (or laxness) and laziness were specially prohibited by the Manichean faith (et. F., p. 96). For *qorqunese*, et. B., p. 253.

⁵⁵ *su* (spelt also *tsu* in Buddhist texts) is, according to F. W. K. Muller, an expression loaned from the Chinese.

⁵⁶ *caidan*. The Bethu MS. T. II, D. 178, v. 1, 2, has also *caidan*. After F. W. K. Muller *caidan* is a Chinese word. Its signification is "a hall or room for fasts or prayers, a temple". The view that the Manicheans possessed no temples (et. B., p. 351) may consequently be safely abandoned, the more so as our finds of religious pictures on the walls of buildings, or votive flags closely resembling those of the Buddhists, appear to confirm the use of such buildings, at least by the Manicheans of Turfan.

⁵⁷ *y(i)mki*. This word is as yet unexplained, and may belong to a language other than Turkish.

⁵⁸ *ašaduqumuz biš t(i)ugri y(a)ruqi*. This passage appears to mean that the more the conduct of the *auditores* resembled that of the *electi* in purity, the more were their own bodies capable of purifying, or at least of *keeping* in its state of purity, the light consumed in their food. The bodies of impious *auditores*, on the contrary, appear to have injured the light introduced into them, perhaps just as much as the bodies of other impious human beings might have done.

⁵⁹ *dinmvrca*. This word is composed of *din*, "faith," and *murca* = *مور* (neo-Pers.), "omen, prognostic" (Steingass).

⁶⁰ *urka*. Dative of a word *ur*, signifying "a long time": cf. Radl., *Chaustranüt*, p. 42, n. 102.

⁶¹ *biš türüg tnd(i)γ*. Another fragment (T. II. D. 171, i. 8-9) shows the passage: *biš türügün balgubug bolarlar* = "they become apparent in five manners" (*ving fünf Arten*). *türüg* therefore appears to be a noun-substantive.

⁶² *ota bilüca*. Evidently "according to the sound and the meaning (letter and spirit)". Radloff writes (p. 42, n. 104): "*ot* ist ein mir unbekanntes Wort, da die mir bekannten *ot-* and *üt-* nicht zum Kontext passen, übersetze ich nach dem Zusammenhang." Samy's dictionary, however, has the verb *اوتمك* = *autmek* = *chauter, résouner, rendre un son*, still existing in Osmanli. Besides, Radloff's own *Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Turk-Dialecte* contains the verb on p. 1263.

⁶³ *otagi*. In an unpublished MS., T. II. D. 173a, I find the hendiadyoin *otag amgak* = "pain", "torment". The words *otagi burmet* are evidently synonyms.

LIST OF WORDS

The words occurring in the Berlin text are distinguished by an I before the Arabic numeral.

<i>at</i> , 321.	<i>azo</i> , 230.
<i>atrül-</i> , - <i>ti</i> , I 16 (see also <i>adrül-</i>).	<i>asra</i> , 43.
<i>ač-</i> (for <i>ačit-</i>), - <i>tim(i)z</i> , 57:	<i>aš</i> , 56 (<i>as 'ičkü</i>).
(<i>ači(t)arri(t)-</i>).	<i>asa-</i> , - <i>duq</i> , 300.
<i>ulaš</i> , 198 (<i>adaš qudas</i>).	- <i>aγ</i> (accus. in - <i>aγ</i>), <i>qniγ-aγ</i> , I 28.
<i>adaq</i> , - <i>l(i)γ</i> , 80.	<i>aγi-</i> (for <i>aγrit-</i>), - <i>tim(i)z</i> , 57,
<i>adr(i)l-</i> , - <i>γai</i> , 171.	90 (<i>ačit(i)m(i)z aγrit-</i>
<i>ad(i)r-</i> , - <i>γalī</i> , 10.	<i>m(i)z</i>).
<i>artiz-</i> , - <i>īp</i> , 136.	<i>aγulurγ</i> , 125.
<i>arqou</i> , 169.	<i>aγit-</i> , - <i>ā(i)m(i)z</i> , 186.
<i>ari-tī</i> , 283.	<i>aγüz</i> (<i>aγzün</i>), 193.
<i>azγur-</i> , - <i>duq</i> , I 19.	<i>al-</i> , - <i>īp</i> , 137, 199.
<i>azγururli</i> , 127.	<i>altünč</i> , 95.

- alqan-*, -ur, 213: -sıγ, 210: -mad(i)m(i)z, 212.
alqıs, 216, 330 (*alqıs ütüğ*, 216).
anı, 305: *anına*, 137.
antada, 172.
antaddata, I 16.
ant(i)q-, -d(i)m(i)z, 100.
anēolasiq, 222, 248.
ai, 274.
ai-, -mıs, 327.
qēit-, (d(i)m(i)z, 89.
qdaq, 314.
qdrug, 228.
qđunēsz, I 35.
qrtat-, -dīmiz, 108.
qrtuq, I 12.
qrıγ, I 22, 66.
qrın-, -ıp, 254, 266 (*qrınıp ärmägüüŕp*).
qlqıs, 206.
qnti, I 36, 61, 189, etc.
qnrar-, -maq, 178.
qrıγ, I 4, I 18, 50, 236, 298 (accus. *qrıγ-arı*, I 28).
ät'öz, 196.
ädgü, I 27, 70.
ädgü-ti, 212, 257, 285.
är-, -ür, 42: -ti, 195, 275: -sür, I 23: -mıs, 163: -kän, 163, 213.
ärk, 24: -ıq, 18, 255, 265: -sız, 24, 255, 266.
ärmägüŕ-, -ıp, 211, 255, 266 (*qrınıp ärmägüüŕp*).
ämgäk, 54.
äzrua, I 22 (see *ä-t(u)narı*).
äsud-, -ıp, 313.
äki (see *ıki*), 80, 125, 158.
äkinti, 81, 129, 179.
ägsü-, -tümüz, 202, 332 (*ägsü-tümüz k(ä)rgätim(i)z*).
ägsüğ, 289 (*ägsüğ k(ä)rgäk*).
ägsüklüg, 308.
ällq (hand), 194, 314.
ällig (fifty), 245.
ämğätir-, -biz, 299, 315.
är, 235, 249 (*är barq*).
ävrnng, 113.
u-, -maz, 322: -mad(i)m(i)z, 233: -matın, 41.
ot, 318 (*ot 'ıraē*).
oot (fire), 37.
oot (herb), 60 (*oot 'ıraē*).
otuz, 338.
uēcrıma, 82.
udun-, -tumuz, 149 (*uduntumuz tap(i)nt(i)m(i)z*).
ur-, -tumuz, 88 (*urtum(u)z güntümüz*).
oroi, 187.
orunēaq, 113.
orlu, 15.
urı, 117.
uzun, 117 (*uzuntolurı*).
orlan, I 8, 33.
ol, I 6, I 28, I 30, I 31, 48.
olur-, -ap, 257, 276: -u, 281: -suq, 273: -urıma, 3.
ulurı, I 10, I 34, 86 (*ulurı kicıq*, 86).
uq-, -matın, 133 (*bolmätın uqmatın*).
oon, 42: *ou*, 191: -nunē, 206.
auit-, -u, I 15 (*auitu 'ııldi*).
orutsuz, I 11, 252, 310 (*toāunē-suz orutsuz*).
üt, 327 (*ütēä bilıgēä*).
ütügēi, 92; 309 (*ütügēi bırımei*).

- ütrü*, 73, 165, 170.
ütün-, -ür, I, 38; -māk, 279,
 etc.
ütüg, 216.
üç, 158: *üçünç*, 181.
üçün, I 20, 40, etc.
öl, 159.
ülün, I 7.
ür, 315.
ürkit-, -(d)ım(i)z, 88 (*qorqit-*
ürkit-).
üz, 46, 92, 118, 299: *tıryg üz*,
 55: *ilki üz*, 116; *q(a)m(a)γ*
üz, 194.
üz-: *üz-ä-dimiz*, 73; *üz boz*,
 120.
üzä, 42; -ki, 45.
üzüt, I 8, I 21, 47, 302.
üzüksüz, 315.
üküş, 110.
ükün-, -ür, 76, 153, etc.
ügün-, -ür, I 37.
üg, I 18 (*üg saqınç*).
üqsüz, I 13, I 20 (*ü. köngülsüz*,
bılıqsız ü.).
ül, 58, 316 (*qururγ öl*).
ül-, -ür, 23.
ülür-, -ür, I 27: -düm(ü)z, 90,
 110: -sür, I 26: -üp, 146.
üng (front, fore?), *üng-ü*, 7:
üng-ı, 27; *üngrä*, 163.
üng (colour?), 46.
üd-, -tim(i)z, 241.
ıman-, -tim(i)z, 175 (*ınantim(i)z*
tayantim(i)z).
ıt-, -ıp, 228 (*ıtıp y(a)ratıp*).
ıç(rä), 15.
ıkäk, 145.
ıvinçü, 298; -lüg, 295.
ıs, 115, 297; *ıs ködlüg*, 267; *ıs*
tuş, 197.
ıslä-, -yür, 297: -mäsiq, 297;
 -d(i)m(i)z, 115.
ıktı, 54; *ıkıntı*, 34.
ıyıl, 99, 101: *ıyıld*, 128, 148.
ıyıldä-, -d(i)m(i)z, 99: -yü, 100.
ıyıldüyü, 135.
ılki, 116.
ilitip, 105.
ba-, -d(i)m(i)z, 236.
bat-, -ar, 24 (*turγar batar*).
bača-, -d(i)m(i)z, 138; *madı-*
m(i)z, 258; -ap, 247, 276.
baçaq, 138, 247, 256, 257, 276,
 285, 330.
bar, 163, 273, etc.
bar-, -ır, 304; -mad(i)m(i)z,
 267; -sar, 7; -daçı, 226; -u,
 I 17, I 32, 13, 41, 49, 85;
b(a)ru, 96, 125, 131, 158,
 192, 278, 288.
barq, 235, 249 (*üv barq*).
barm (*barım*, *baram*), 200,
 250 (*yılıqı bar(i)m*).
baş, 53 (*b. qılmaq*), 126 (*yol*
başınqı).
başl(i)γ, 54 (*yılın b.*).
başl(i)γ, I 9 (*bal(i)γ b.*).
baγır (*baγırın*), 84.
bal(i)γ, I 9 (*b. başl(i)γ*).
bal(i)q-, *balq(a)-(?)duq*, 39.
bu, I 35, etc.
butlurγ, 81.
burγan, 4, 65, 69, 133, 148,
 175, 183, 208, 277.
boz, 121 (*üz boz*).
bozul-, -tı, 188.
boşu-, -yu, 288: -γalı, 9.

- boşun-*, -u, I 37, 30, 62, 77, 93, 123, 154, 190, 204, 219, 242, 259, 264, 270, 279, 291, 306, 337: -*çalı*, 268: -*taçı*, 226, 234.
bul-, -up (governs -qa), 200, 250.
bol-, -tı, I 10: -*tumuz*, 176: -*up*, 118: -*çarı*, 170, 172: -*tuq*, I 20.
bulunug (clerical error (?) for *bulunq*), 12.
buyan, 141 (*buyan bögtäg*).
buyançı, 66 (*buyançı bögtäçi*).
b(ı)rt-, [d'ımız, 52: -d(i)m(i)z, 329: *birimçi*, 309.
bir, 178, etc.
bir-, -d(i)m(i)z, 141: -ü, 233: -*qılı*, 231.
birli, I 2.
biz, 63, etc.
biş, I 5: -*mç*, 37.
bil-, -tim(i)z, 159, 162, 164: -ıp, 196: -*mätin*, 50, I 33: -*tük*, 157.
bilq, I 13, 107, 183, 184 (*öt bilq*, 327: -y(a)claq *bilq*, 51: *bir bilq*, 277).
bilqisi: 120 (*bilqisi: şıqsız*): 73.
bilqı, 183.
bögtäg, 142 (*buyan bögtäg*).
bögtäçi, 66 (*buyançı b.*).
p(a)dwaxı(a)q, 225.
parlaçı (for *bar-*), 234.
pusa, 140, 222, 231, 232, 320.
tapla-, -maç, 114.
tap(i)n-, -t(i)m(i)z, 149, 152 (*uduntumuz*: t.).
taq, 201, 251 (*muny taq*).
tamıca, 181, 182, 184, 188: *tört tamıca*, 177: *üç t(a)mıca*, 321.
tamıcala-, -d(i)m(i)z, 178.
tamu, 126 (*t. yırım*, 161).
tannuq, 102.
tut-, -ar, 321: -*mad(i)m(i)z*, 215: -u, 283, 331: -*duq*, 192, 249: -*ırma*, 129: -*maq*, 195, 274.
tutan-, -tı, 218 (*tidinti tutuntı*).
todunçsuz, 252, 302, 310.
tur-, -ur, 44.
tural(i)ı, 86, 91, 110, 146 (*tin(i)ı tural(i)ı*).
tus, 198 (*ıs tus*).
toğançsuz, I 11.
turı-, -ar, 24: -*mıs*, I 14: -*mazun*, 25 (*turıar batır*, 24), (*turımsıqılınmıs*, I 14).
toquzunc. 191.
tolı, 11.
tonluı, 117.
tı-, -tı: *arıtı*, 283: *üdqütı*. 212: *tökütı*, 194.
tid-, -tim(i)z, 75.
tidın-, -tı. 218 (*tidinti tutuntı*).
tiltan-, -ıp, 267.
tin-tana, 34.
tin(i)ı, 59, 79, 91, 110 (*tin(i)ı tural(i)ı*, 146).
t(ä)rtürü, 135.
tüq, 10.
t(ä)q-, -ıp, 201: -*mädı*. 217.
tüqzin-, -ür, 11.
t(ä)qı, 87.
t(ä)ngrı, I 6, 56: *t. yırınqürü*, 40: *t. yırım*, 160.
arqon gur t(ä)ngrı, 169.

- ai t.*, 261.
üzrua t., I 22, 173, 179, 207.
oot t., 37.
bıs t., I 1, I 8, 32, 44, 48, 49, 182, 223, 226, 235, 301, 316.
p(a)dvax(t)a g t., 225.
tin-tura t., 34.
xrošt(a)g p.t., 225.
xormuzta t., I 1: *xorm(u)zta t.*, 33.
suv t., 36.
süki t., 64.
küclüq t., 174, 208.
kün ar t., 1, 8, 14, 114, 173, 180, 207.
y(a)ruq t., 35.
yir t., 162.
yıl t., 35.
t(ä)ngriči, 135, 324 (*t(ä)ngriči nomči*).
t(ä)ngrikän, I 22.
t(ä)ngrič, I 24 (*t(ä)ngrič šmnuli*, I 31), (*t(ä)ngrič yäkli*, I 6, 164).
t(ä)vlä-, *dd(i)m(i)z*, 111, (*t. kürläd(i)m(i)z*, 111).
tört, 52, etc.: *-ünč*, 64.
türlüq, I 5, 52, etc.
törü, 74, 210, 223, 229, 246, 273.
töz, I 21, I 25, 5, 47 (*töz yultız*).
tök-, *-tümüz*, 239 (*töktümüz saçtim(i)z*).
tökäti, 194, 212, 233, 281, 283.
tümän, I 12.
tünarq, 161.
ti-, *-dimız*, I 25, I 30: *-ddimız*, I 29: *-sär*, 127; *-p*, 142; *-pän*, 19, 130, 145, 148, 164, 168, 172; *t(i)gmä*, 136.
tirig, 55.
tirgüd-, *-sär*, I 26.
tirnägül, 6.
tiš, 55.
til (til), 313.
xrošt(a)g, 225.
xorm(u)zta, 33.
xormuzta, I 1, I 7, I 30.
-ča, *-čä*.
ötčü bilgčä, 327.
dintarča, 245.
s(ä)viginčä, 197.
nomča törüčä, 257, 285, 331.
č(a)xsap(a)t, 192, 201, 274, 282, 320, 330.
čaidan, 275, 284.
čulvu, I 34, 21 (*čulvu sar*).
dintar, 67, 71, 134, 245, 263, 325.
dın murça, 307.
rain(a)st, I, 36.
-ra, *-rä*.
asra, 43.
öngrä, 163.
kısrä, 172.
saqın-, *-ur*, 294.
saqınč, I 19 (*öq saqınč*), 294.
sar, I 34, 21, 105, 137, 198.
sagu.
künın sayu, 262.
kün sayu, ar sayu, 293, 333-4.
soq, I 11, 252, 303, 310.
sun-, *-up*, 314.
suv, 36, 83.
sui, I 9, 37, etc.
st-, *-d(i)m(i)z*, 51, 202, 256

- (s*ad*(i)m(i)z b(i)rt(d)i- y(a)ruqlı.
 m(i)z).
 -s*ı*γ, -s*ı*q, etc.
 a*l*qansıγ, 210.
 an*e*olasıq, 222, 248.
 olursuq, 246.
 k(ä)ygürsüg, 229.
 islämäsıq, 297.
 sözlämäsıq, 295.
 s*ä*qız, 43.
 s*ä*kızınç, 156.
 s(ä)vıγ, 197.
 s*ö*z (soz !), 97; s*ö*z, 296.
 s*ö*zlä-, -yür, 296; -dım(i)z,
 I 34, 106; -s*ä*r, 72.
 s*ü*zınlüg, I 2.
 s*ü*ki, 64.
 s*ö*ngüs-, -d*i*, I 5; -mäs, 165;
 -üp, I 9, 38; -k*äl*i, I 3.
 smnu, I 18.
 smnuluγ, I 4.
 smnuli, I 31.
 'it-, -ä*d*i, I 15.
 'ıγac, 60, 318.
 'ıer*ä*ki, 83.
 'ıek*ü*, 56 (as 'ıek*ü*).
 'ıılı, I 31 ('ıılı 'ıılı).
 'ııldiyü, I 33.
 'ıkintı, I 39.
 'ın-, -tı, I 4.
 'ıılı, I 31 ('ı. 'ıılı).
 f(ä)rzımd, I 37.
 f(ä)rsıtı, 224.
 -lı, li.
 t(ä)npılı (q.v.).
 smnuli.
 'ıılı.
 'ıılı.
 q(a)ralı.
- gap(i)γ, 7, 126.
 gat, 42, 43.
 qatıl-, -d*i*, I 7; -mäs, 167; -ıp,
 I, 13; -tuq, 39.
 q(a)ra, 39.
 quralı, I 6, I 24.
 q(a)rulı, 166, 171.
 qam(a)γ, I 2, I 11.
 q(a)m(a)γ, 45, 194.
 qamša-, -t(i)m(i)z, 187.
 qaltı, 166.
 q(a)ltı, 171.
 qop, I 28.
 qut, 45 (qut qıv).
 qut qolmaq, 150.
 qutluγ, I 39.
 qudas, 198 (adas qudas).
 qorq-, -maq, 181; -matın, 211.
 qorqıt-, -(ä)imüz, 87 (qorqıtı-
 m(i)z ürkıtım(i)z).
 qorqucsuz, 253.
 qururγ, 58, 316 (qururü).
 qol-, -mad(i)m(i)z, 288; -maq,
 264.
 qulqag, 313.
 qurrat(i)γlı, 224.
 qorlı-, -d(i)m(i)z, 104.
 qıγ, I 12, 55.
 qıγan-, -ıp, 231.
 qıl-, -ar, 142; -tım(i):, 53, 98;
 -n, 322.
 qılın-, -mäs, I, 14.
 qılınç, I 17; -lıγ, I 4.
 qır, 46 (qut qıv).
 k(ä)raqük, 195, 248, 265, 274,
 280 (äqsüg k(ä)raqük, 290).
 k(ä)raqü-, -tım(i)z, 203, 332

- (äqsütümüz k(ä)rqätim(i)z).
- käl-, -ti, I 3, I 14.
- kälür-, -üp, 105: -di, 227.
- k(ä)ntü, I 14, 299.
- k(ä)ygürsüg, 229.
- küç, 47: -lüg, 18.
- ködüg, 267 (is ködüg).
- kür-, -üp, 199, 312.
- kürlä-, -d(i)m(i)z, 112 (t(ä)rlä-d(i)m(i)z k.).
- küz, 312.
- kök, 43.
- kün, 245.
- köngül, 107, 177, 185, etc.
- köngülsüz, I 13 (öqsüz köngül-süz).
- kucug, 87 (uluγ k.).
- kürtü, 18, 68, 131, 156.
- kırtkür-, -mäd(i)m(i)z, 19, 71: -mäd(i)n, 134: -mük, 180.
- kisrä, 172.
- kisi, 80, 101, 103, 105.
- kıksür-, -ü, 106.
- kım, 127, 167.
- m(a)nastar lurza (hurz(a)), I 38, etc.
- muntar, I 33.
- mundar, I 35.
- munča, 91, 119.
- munq, 230, 251, 200 (munq taq).
- m(ä)n, I 36, I 38.
- mängiz, 46.
- m(ä)nyıgü, I 15.
- mängıgü, I 29.
- mm, 135, 136.
- nom, 72, 132, 148, 157, 222, 229, 324 (üç ödkı n., 159); nom törü, 74, 128.
- nomcı, 136, 324 (t(ä)nyırcı nomcı).
- nomla-, -sar, 134.
- nä, 163, 172 (nä yirdä, 217).
- näcä, 51, 56, 60, 87, 88, 90, 99, 100, 101, 103, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 137, etc.
- nädä, 165.
- näddä, 169.
- n(i)γosak, 176, 321.
- rus(a)ntı, ros(a)ntı, 246.
- yadtur-, -matın, 75.
- yarat-, -mıs, I 28, 168: [-ırlı], I 30.
- yarat-, -ıv, 12.
- y(a)ruq, I 16, 2, 47, etc.
- y(a)ruqlı, I 6, I 24, 166, 170 (y(a)ruqlı q(a)ralı).
- ya zuq, I 35: -luγ, 308 (äqsük-lüg y.): -suз, 103.
- ya zın-, -tim(i)z, I 23, I 35, 61, 68, 118: -ıp, 151 (ya z(ı)n-t(i)m(i)z yangıl(t(i)m(i)z).
- yalavacı burxan, 65, 69.
- yana, 135.
- y(a)ng(i)l-, -t(i)m(i)z, I 23, 119: -u, 138, 139, 140, 143.
- y(a)vlug, 50, 197, etc.
- yori-, -p, 197, 314: -mad(i)m(i)z, 328: -duq, 303: -γma, 84.
- yoq, 162, 170.
- gol, 126, 127.
- gil, 244.
- gilan, 54.
- ylqı, 199, 250.
- yäk, I 3, I 11, I 12, I 17, 129, 152, 253, 311.

- yäklär ulurılar*, I 10.
yäk içkäk, 144.
yäklärlüg, I 5.
yäklüg, I 9, 38.
yäkli, I 6, I 24, 164 (*t(ä)ngri* *yäkli*).
yüz, I 12.
yüküm-, *-tümüz*, 139, 147, 150; *-ügmä*, 130: *-č*, 130.
yün-, *-tümüz*, 89.
yı-, *-dđ(ı)m(ı)z*, 113.
yiti, 221, etc.
yitinč, 124.
- yır*, 41, 44, 45, 58, 169, 317: *-däki*, 84.
 [*yır suv*], 4: *t(ä)ngri yır*, I 15.
y(ı)g(ı)rmunč (*bir y.*), 221, etc.
yıl, 35.
yıltız, I 22, I 25, 5, 48, 158; *y(a)ruq y.*, *tünärıy y.*, 160, 161 (*tüz yıltız*).
yılvı, 108.
yılvılä-, *-dımız*, 109.
ymä, I 10, etc.
y(ı ?)mki, 273, 275, 280, 284, 330.
-

136	69
137	70
138	71
139	72
140	73
141	74
142	75
143	76
144	77
145	78
146	79
147	80
148	81
149	82
150	83
151	84
152	85
153	86
154	87
155	88
156	89
157	90
158	91
159	92
160	93
161	94
162	95
163	96
164	97
165	98
166	99
167	100
168	101
169	102
170	103
171	104
172	105
173	106
174	107
175	108
176	109
177	110
178	111
179	112
180	113
181	114
182	115
183	116
184	117
185	118
186	119
187	120
188	121
189	122
190	123
191	124
192	125
193	126
194	127
195	128
196	129
197	130
198	131
199	132
200	133
201	134
202	135

FIRST PART OF DR STEIN'S MANICHEAN MS SCROLL FROM TUN-HUANG. SCALE ONE THIRD OF ORIGINAL.

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 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

308.	270	216
309.	271	217
310.	272	218
311.	273	219
312.	274	220
313.	275	221
314.	276	222
315.	277	223
316.	278	224
317.	279	225
318.	280	226
319.	281	227
320.	282	228
321.	283	229
322.	284	230
323.	285	231
324.	286	232
325.	287	233
326.	288	234
327.	289	235
328.	290	236
329.	291	237
330.	292	238
331.	293	239
332.	294	240
333.	295	241
334.	296	242
335.	297	243
336.	298	244
337.	299	245
338.	300	246
	301	247
	302	248
	303	249
	304	250
	305	251
	306	252
	307	253
	308.	254
	309.	255
	310.	256
	311.	257
	312.	258
	313.	259
	314.	260
	315.	261
	316.	262
	317.	263
	318.	264
	319.	265
	320.	266
	321.	267
	322.	268
	323.	269
	324.	
	325.	
	326.	
	327.	
	328.	
	329.	
	330.	
	331.	
	332.	

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 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

IX

KANAURI VOCABULARY IN TWO PARTS: ENGLISH-KANAURI AND KANAURI-ENGLISH

BY THE REV. T. GRAHAME BAILEY, B.D., M.A., M.R.A.S.,
FELLOW OF THE PANJAB UNIVERSITY, WAZIRABAD, INDIA

(Continued from 1910, p. 105.)

KĀNAURĪ-ENGLISH VOCABULARY

- ā*, adv., still, yet.
- āchōchā*, interj., oh! ah! (T.R.).
- acī lāmō*, n., Thebörskad' song.
- ācō*, i.q. *atē* (Thebörskad') (T.R.).
- adaryōn* (T.R.), i.q. *adāro*.
- adāro*, n., ginger.
- adēmo*, adj., uncomfortable, badly made or put on.
- ādēshōs pādēshōs*, n., neighbourhood.
- adhōn*, adj., half.
- ae*, conj., and.
- ag'*, n., cave, den.
- āgoth*, n., income.
- agrē*, adv., indeed, certainly (T.R.).
- āī*, *āīl*, adj., other.
- āī*, n., grandmother (Upper Kanaur, T.R.).
- akhā*, n., pain (T.R.).
- akhrōn*, n., letter of the alphabet.
- alagin*, n., woman who brings bad luck.
- alkōlōn*, adj., false; n., lie; — *lanmig'*, v., lie, tell a lie.
- alkōlōs*, n., masc., liar; fem., *alkōlē*.
- alṭh*, n., trap for leopard.
- amā*, n., mother, mother's sister.
- amāts*, n., father's sister-in-law.
- amī*, n., enemy (T.R.).
- amjī*, n., doctor.
- amōlōn*, n., pretence.
- amonōn*, n., wild pear, *besrōs*.
- an*, *anī*, pron., self (objective case), myself, etc.
- an*, *anu*, pron., my.
- ancimig'*, v., rise.
- andō*, dome.
- ane*, n., father's sister, mother's sister-in-law.
- anesī*, pron., self (nom. case), myself, yourself, etc.
- āngī*, n., counting up to a hundred.
- anī*, see *an*.

- aiṅkō*, adv., in my direction, towards me.
annaē, n., anna (= one penny).
apōū, n., corn, grain (T.R.).
ānu, pron., own (H. *apnā*):
 pl. masc., *apēpānā*; fem. pl., *anēvānā*.
ānu, see *ān*.
anyāroū, n., adj., darkness, dark.
anyāros, adj., dark (T.R.).
apa, n., father: — *tētē*, fore-fathers.
apats, n., father's brother.
apī, n., maternal grandmother, midwife.
ārēāmīg, v., call.
argā, n., string of bells on horse.
armīg, v. tr., warm.
arpyāmīg, v., keep, preserve (T.R.).
arshimīg, v., warm oneself at fire or in sun.
āsbāb, n., goods, luggage.
āshā, n., hope (T.R.).
āshān, adj., barren (land).
āshāroū, n., month June–July.
āshīu, n., bad fuel (T.R.).
āshuts, n., mirror.
āsōū ā, n., wild geranium, columbine.
āspāmīg, v., endure.
atēāmīg, v. tr., bury.
athal, n., plant whose berries are used as soap (Hindi *rēthā*). See *nakapānī*.
atiū, n., rites for the dead: — *lanmīg*, perform the rites.
atū, n., call. — *tshā, rēāmīg* proclaim.
aya lai, interj., oh!
ayārou, n., infant (T.R.).
ayo, interj., alas! oh! (T.R.).
ayō, n., grand- and great-grandmother (T.R.).
azh, male goat.
bācēāmīg, v., escape (Hindi *bacnā*).
bādārī, n., storekeeper (i.e. watchman), fem., *bādārīnī*, his wife, etc.
bādroū, n., month August–September.
bagf, n., mask.
bāg, n., fortune, fate (T.R.).
bāgār, n., labour forced but paid.
bāgarēa, man with double teeth (one behind the other): fem., *bāgarē*.
bāgē, adj., last.
bagits, adj., thin.
bagī, n., share, part (T.R.).
Bāgavān, n., God. *Bāgavānā* *dā-ār-lanmīg*, pray to God
bagyālos, n., one who in anger has separated himself from his house and household.

- baī, baīts*, n., younger brother.
bājēāmīḡ, v. tr., play (music)
 (Hindi, *bajānā*).
bajon, n., leather belt.
bakhōr, n., female goat.
bakhōs, adj., fat.
baklos, adj., thick.
bakṭāts, n., male kid.
bāl(h), n., head, summit,
 mountain-peak.
bālbāl shō, n., wild straw-
 berry (T.R.).
bālīn, n., sand (Urdu, *bālī* ?).
bālmōṭh, n., small plant with
 sweet-smelling root.
bāltis, n., diminutive of *bal(h)*,
nāniū baltis, nipple.
balā, nose-ring.
bām, n., large drum.
bāmīḡ, v., be defeated, lose.
bampī, n., bladder.
bamsutrou, n., ulcer.
ban, n., oak, *Quercus incana*.
ban, n., foot, paw, leg, leg of
 bed : --- *sab*, (woollen)
 sock, stocking : *banā den*
sarmīḡ, rear (of a horse's
 rearing) : *shol ban*, leg
 straight out in sitting :
 --- *shēnmīḡ*, sit with legs
 straight out.
banāros, n., miser, fem.,
banārē.
band lanmīḡ, v., abolish,
 stop.
bandāros, n., monkey : fem.,
bandrāṅīḡ.
bandīr, adj., barren (woman).
bāndō, n., servant.
bandrāṅīḡ, n., see *bandāros*.
bāndāā, n., prisoner, captive.
bāṅēāmīḡ, v. tr., cross (river)
 (T.R.).
baṅīā, n., shopkeeper.
baṅīn, n., vessel.
banmīḡ (-lo), v., be boiled
 (of food).
banth, adj., regrettable : ---
tanmīḡ (-lo), threaten.
bāṅṭhā, prep. w. gen., instead,
 e.g. *an chāmū bāṅṭhā*, in-
 stead of my son.
bāṅṭhō, n., part, portion (T.R.).
baṅṭhos, adj. fem., *banṭhē*,
baṅṭhīn, beautiful.
bāṅū, *bāṅūts*, n., sister's
 daughter.
banzā, *banzāts*, n., sister's
 son.
baṅ, n., price, rate : --- *dēba'sh*,
 cheap.
bāṅābār, adj., equal : --- *lai*,
 noon.
bāṅāson, n., rhododendron.
bāṅēāmīḡ, v., save.
barēāshimīḡ, v., escape.
barāmīḡ, v. intr., burn (wood).
barāmīḡ, v. intr., split, tear.
barō, n., rent.
baron, n., load : --- *thoṅmīḡ*
 or *lanmīḡ*, unload.
baron, n., day (T.R.).
bāros, n., coolie whose labour
 is forced, but paid.

- bāsh*, n., cause, reason.
bāsh, adj., similar, like. w.
 gen. or nom.
bashēnniḡ, v., bleat, bray,
 caw, crow, mew, neigh, etc.
bashmiḡ, v. intr., burst.
bāshōñ, n., flute.
bāsiñ, n., adze.
bāshkyōñ, conj., prep., than,
 except, besides.
bāt(h), n., brass vessel.
bāt, n., cooked rice.
bāt(h), n., cotton for weaving.
bāt, n., weight for weighing.
batēāshimīḡ, v., converse.
batīñ, see *batōñ*.
batits, n., small brass vessel.
 See *bāt(h)*.
batlēōmīḡ, v. tr., make round
 or circular (T.R.).
batlos, adj., spherical, round :
 see following words, which
 seem to imply that there
 had been other (square)
 coins of different value ;
 — *pōlī*, three annas ; —
 rupēā, twelve annas.
batōñ, n., affair, matter ; —
 cuy, conversation ; —
 lanmīḡ, converse : *ḡižāb*
 batīñ (or *batōñ*) *sea*, great
 talker.
bātrāñoli, n., forced, unpaid
 labour during one week in
 year.
batśēāmīḡ, v., save (Hindi,
 bācāñā).
batshā, n., tinder.
bātshērñ, n., colt, foal (Pan-
 jabi, *uāchērñ*).
bat, n., father.
bayā, n., younger brother.
bāyāmīḡ, v., fire a gun.
bazāñ, n., brass vessel.
bāzār, n., town, street of
 shops.
bazēnniḡ, v. intr., sound, be
 struck : *hastlon* —, clap
 hands (Hindi, *bājñā*).
bazḡ, n., music, etc. (Hindi,
 bājā).
bazī, n., vegetable.
becōñ, n., rate of selling.
bēižātī, n., dishonour : —
 lanmīḡ, v., insult.
beñ, n., grasshopper.
bēñnoñ, adj., loving.
bēñnoñ, n., Cotoneaster baccil-
 laris.
bēpār, n., trade.
bēparñ, n., trader.
bēr, n., palace.
bergā, n., long stick for
 gathering walnuts (T.R.).
berīñ, adv., out, outside :
 — *lanmīḡ*, put out,
 exile.
bērins ḡoññē, n., concubine.
bērñ, n., blacksmith, car-
 penter : *bērññiḡ*, female
 of same caste.
beshāḡōñ, n., month April-
 May.
bēshlor, n., plait of hair.

- bēsros*, n., wild pear, i.q. *amonōn*.
bhorōrēnniḡ, v. intr., spin round.
bī, n., bastard.
bī, n., lower verandah of house.
bīāz, n., interest, usury; *gān* —, winter interest; *shōl* —, summer interest.
bīd, n., shoulder.
bījā, n., kernel of apricot stone (T.R.).
bījēnniḡ, v., be fine weather.
bīl(h), n., woollen thread (T.R.).
bīmīḡ, v., go, flow, climb (tree).
bīnānos, n., man of one of the lower castes.
bīnēāmiḡ, v., choose.
bīniā, n., brim of vessel, rim of hat.
bīnniḡ, v., be extinguished.
bīnos, adj., good.
bīōn, n., seed.
bīsh, n., a fair held in April.
bīshārēnniḡ, v. intr., grieve, repent, be surprised, wonder.
bīshārēn shēnniḡ, v. tr., grieve, surprise, etc.
bīshāron, adj., strange, wonderful (T.R.).
bīshōn, n., poison.
bīshṭ, n., prime minister; fem., *bīshṭānī*, his wife.
bītiā, n., wall.
bītsārikōs, adj., helpless poor (Hindi, *bēchāra*) (T.R.).
bītsū, n., bolt of door (T.R.).
bīzēl, n., lightning; — *bōnniḡ*, v., lighten (Hindi, *bijli*).
bīzēnniḡ, v., be fine weather.
blānniḡ, v., masticate.
blēmīḡ, v., slip.
blomīḡ, v. tr., mix.
blusmiḡ, v., fall (house).
bēba, n., father.
bōbats, n., father's brother.
bol, n., skin of man, dogs, cats: peel, rind: — *khōmiḡ*, v. tr., skin, take bark off tree or wand: — *piānniḡ*, v. tr., peel.
bōdālēāmiḡ, v. tr., change.
bōdēnniḡ, v. intr., increase (T.R.).
bodī, adj., adv., much, very.
bōēnniḡ, v. intr., wear out.
bōēsa, n., husband's brother, wife's sister, a woman's sister's husband, a man's brother's wife. Note that in each case the relationship is between a man and a woman. See *bōre*, *shakpō*.
bōḡāt, n., time (Urdū, *wāqt*).
bogros, adj., coarse, inferior.
bōkh, adj., hot.
bōlbōl, n., chapping of hands and feet. See *bolmiḡ*.

- bōlī*, adj., mad, crazy: rabid
(of dog).
- bōlk(h)*, n., two children born
same day in different
families.
- bōlmīg*, v., grow.
- bōlmīg*, v. intr., chap (of
hands, feet), crack (es-
pecially with *dāmrits*),
split. See *bōlbōl*.
- bōmīg*, v., run, flee.
- bon*, *boun*, n., father: *mann*
bonn, parents.
- bōna*, n., dirt, dust.
- boṅṅṅs*, adj., good, healthy:
adv., well.
- bōnī*, n., window in verandah
(T.R.).
- boṅṅṅ*, n., jungle.
- boṅmīg*, v. intr., burn.
- boṅmīg*, v. intr., be filled.
- bonnīg*, v. intr., come: blow
(of wind).
- bōnmīts*, n., dwarf.
- bonmō*, n., female ass.
- bōnprats*, n., thumb.
- boṅshēs*, adj., full: see *lub*,
stub.
- bōr*, n., banyan, *Ficus Indica*.
- bor(h)*, n., time, e.g. *boḍī*
—, many times, and so
with other words for
many.
- bōrām*, n., suspicion, doubt:
— *lanmīg*, suspect, doubt.
- borbor*, adj., circular.
- bōre*, n., wife, husband's
sister, a woman's brother's
wife. See *bōesa* *shakpa*.
- bōrkōt*, n., blessing. — *lan-*
mīg, bless.
- bōrmīg*, v. intr., disperse
(meeting, etc.): *bōrim-*
shōmīg, v. tr. disperse
(meeting).
- bormīg*, v. tr., brush with
hand or brush.
- bōrshīmīg*, v. intr., i.q.
bōrmīg, disperse (meeting)
- bōrt(h)*, n., fast, --- *lanmīg*,
fast.
- bōsāamīg*, v., cause to inhabit
or be inhabited (Hindi.
bāsānā).
- bōsēmīg*, v., inhabit.
- bosh*, n., rope.
- bōshīmīg*, v., forget
- boshmīg*, v. tr. twist: see
thakpa.
- bōshōn*, n., year.
- bōspā*, n., earth, soil, ashes.
- bōt(h)*, n., buttermilk.
- bōthōn*, n., tree, *gāṭo*
bush: *nish* -- *id lanmīg*,
graft.
- boṭia*, n., cook.
- botō*, n., large spider (T.R.)
See *butukts*.
- bōtōk*, n., duck.
- bōtōn*, n., button.
- bōtuā*, n., purse.
- brā*, adj., forked cross (of
roads).
- brad*, n., branch, bough.

- brājē*, adj., i.q. *brā*.
brulām, n., cross road (T.R.).
brulmīg', v., reel fall (drunk).
brāmēts, n., rainbow.
bran (Th.), n., sleeve (T.R.).
braspāt, n., Thursday.
brass, n., an inferior grain.
brass, Rhododendron arbo-
reum.
brē, n., oak, Quercus ilex.
brē, a measure; *ništo* —,
one ser: *tēg* —, one ser
and a half.
brējālīn, n., thorny shrub,
Prinsepia utilis.
brēnnīg' (-do), v. intr., get
well.
brimē, n., female yak.
brin bīmīg', v., fall: —
shēnnīg', knock down.
brōlmīg', v. tr., say farewell
to (T.R.).
brōmīg, v. tr., mix (T.R.).
bū, n., leprosy: — *sea*, leper.
bubīn, n., story of house.
bucimīg', v. intr., boil: *bucim*
shēnnīg', v. tr., boil.
būcō, n., a medicinal plant,
also for dyeing (T.R.).
būdāroin, n., Wednesday.
būdd, n., union (T.R.).
būgjyēl(h), n., cymbal.
būkhlo, n., intoxicating pre-
paration from bhang.
bukhrīn, n., brass musical
instrument (T.R.).
bulon, n., debt: — *sea*, debtor.
- bulōs*, adj., generous.
bumīg', n., Tibetan character
in holy books.
būncālīn, n., earthquake
(Hindi, *bhauṅcāl*).
būnnīg, v., i.q. *bōnmīg'*.
būriū, n., bribe: — *runmīg'*,
v. tr., bribe; — *zāmīg'*,
v., take bribe.
bāsōn, n., fine straw.
būt(h), n., European shoe or
boot.
butukts, n., spider (small),
also *dāl butukts*. See *botō*.
byatū kar(h), Tibetan ram;
— *khāss*, Tibetan sheep.
byatūmīg', v. intr., be afraid:
byatūmīg' bash, danger:
byatūntsea, coward.
byonmīg' (-no), v. intr., go
away from one's country.
- cā*, n., tea; *ca thān*, tea water
without the leaves.
ca k'āz, n., large Tibetan dog.
cakthāl, n., iron cooking
vessel (T.R.).
cālāk(h), adj., cunning, clever.
calčāmīg', v. tr., strain, sift
(T.R.).
cām or *cāmna tōshimīg'*,
v. intr., be silent; *cām*
tōshīn, hush!
cāmariīg', n., see *cāmoū*.
cāmīg', see *c(y)āmīg'*.
cāmna, see *cām*.
cāmoū, n., shoemaker; fem.,

- cāmariḡ*, female of same caste.
- caṅḅos*, n., basket-maker (T.R.).
- caṅmiḡ* (-go), v. tr., fill full up.
- caṅmiḡ* (-go), v. tr., break, crush (T.R.).
- cāros*, n., headman of village (T.R.).
- cāsgā*, n., dried ginger.
- cāshimīḡ*. See *cayāmīḡ*.
- cē, cēī*, n. and adv., sixth day (forwards), on sixth day.
- cēḅ*, n., line in cloth, line across front of fingers for counting.
- cekhyāmīḡ*, v. tr., crush.
- cēlēāmīḡ*, v. tr., sift in sieve.
- cēlloṅ*, n., sieve.
- cēmīḡ*, v. tr., write.
- cēṅḅēr*, n., basket.
- ceṣṭen*, n., pea.
- cēsoṅ*, n., flour.
- cētroṅ*, n., month March-April.
- cētsa*, n., clerk. See *cēmīḡ*.
- chadī*, n., son-in-law.
- chāgsāl*, interj., lama's reply to salutation.
- chakron*, n., screw of water-mill.
- chal tī*, n., whitewash. See *chalmiḡ*.
- challī*, n., shawl.
- chalmiḡ*, v. tr., plaster (wall), whitewash.
- chāmba*, n., cough, cold (T.R.).
- chāmiḡ*, v. tr., plaster floor with leaves and mud.
- chanmiḡ*, v. tr., fold (T.R.).
- chaṅ*, n., child, son brother's son: *chaṅts* infant, little child: *yōcimiḡ chaṅ* (play child), doll: *chaṅ khāl* uterus.
- chanmiḡ* (-do), v. intr., lag behind.
- chapron*, n., roof of temple.
- charbā* n., rain (Theborskad').
- chata*, n., expense, injury.
- chatkoṅ*, n., temple (T.R.).
- chatmēts* n., woman who lags behind. See *chanmiḡ*.
- chatpō, chatsea* n., man who lags behind. See *chanmiḡ*.
- chātrōḷī*, n., umbrella: *padu chātrōḷī*, bark umbrella.
- chatsa*, n., i. q. *chatpō*, fem. *chatsī*.
- chāyōa*, n., shade, shadow.
- chātkon*, n., chin.
- chēts* n., woman (T.R.).
- chī*, n., gum.
- chomā*, n., mother's sister (Theborskad') (T.R.).
- chob* n., vegetables, lentils (T.R.).
- chodoṅ*, n., waterfall.
- chodpā*, n., fine collected by village headman, not inflicted by law-court.
- chōḡ raumiḡ*, v. intr., bow

- to lama with forehead to ground.
- choga*, n., reading religious books (T.R.).
- chölbā*, n., dice-player.
- cholmig'*, v. intr., play at dice.
- cholo'*, n., brass die: *cholo yöcimig'*, play dice.
- choñmī*, n., man (not woman).
- chös pothī*, Tibetan holy books; *chös* or *chös pothī tilmig'*, read these holy books.
- chostēn*, n., Buddhist shrine (T.R.).
- chöshūtūñ*, n., amulet.
- chot'köñ*, n., Buddhist shrine.
- choto'*, n., earthen vessel.
- chozgoñ*, n., waterfall (T.R.).
- chū*, n., salt-trough. wooden watercourse.
- chūā*, n., grain; *chūā lam-mig'* or *gonmig'*, reap.
- chub*, n., noise of sucking.
- chubā*, n., long woollen coat.
- chūkṣpō*, adj., rich.
- chukshimig'*, v. intr., meet.
- chñnpā*, n., female servant.
- chūr*, n., descent: *jikpo chūr*, steep descent.
- chūrā*, n., dried curds (T.R.).
- cī(h)*, n., grass, fodder; *tshars cī*, hay: *cī kotō*, stack of grass.
- cīknsīs*, n., grease: — *shēl-mig'*, v. tr., grease.
- cīlēāmig'*, v. tr., beat, strike.
- cīlmig'*, v. intr., get close to.
- cīmed'*, n., daughter, brother's daughter.
- cīmīg'*, v. tr., wash (not metal things).
- cīmtū*, n., tongs.
- cīmū*, n., *Morus serrata*.
- cīn*, n., claw, nail of finger or toe.
- cīñmig'*, v. tr., bite, sting.
- cīñōs*, n., pinch: — *ranmig'*, v. tr., pinch.
- cīpār*, n., crop of birds, sheep.
- cīshītīn*, n., kind of lentils.
- cīsmīg'*, v. intr., decompose, rot. See *cosmig'*.
- cīs cīs*, adj., rotten. decomposed. See *coscōs*.
- cīthra*, n., rag.
- cīz bāst*, n., chattels, goods.
- coñmīg' (-go)*, v. intr., leak, drip.
- connīg' (-do)*, v. tr., burn, light (lamp = *duññ*).
- cōros*, n., thief: fem., *corē*: *corōs lanmig'*, steal.
- coscos*, adj., rotten, decomposed. See *cīs cīs*.
- cōsmīg'*, v. intr., rot, decompose. See *cīsmīg'*.
- cūt(h)*, a black bird (T.R.).
- cūl(h)*, n., wild apricot, *Prunus Armeniaca*.
- cūnc(h)*, n., sting.
- cūnt(h)*, n., miser (T.R.).
- c(y)āmīg'*, v. intr., dance.
- c(y)āshīmīg'*, i.q. *c(y)āmīg'*.

- dā'*, prep., beside.
da da hīmiḡ, v. intr., drop :
 — *shēniḡ*, v. tr., drop.
dabrēāmiḡ, v. tr., threaten
 (T.R.).
dabriñ, n., cave. den.
ḡae, n., woman who brings
 bad luck (Hindi. *ḡāin* ').
ḡānmiḡ, v. intr. run.
ḡāk, n., post. letters.
ḡakeimiḡ, v. intr., stop, be
 incomplete. See rain.
dākdār, n., post-runner.
ḡakhoñ, n., vine, grape ;
bōñ ḡakhoñ, wild grape
 or vine.
ḡakhrā, n., small drum.
ḡaklō, n., bracelet.
ḡakpō, n., master.
ḡal ḡal, adj., astray (*ḡalmiḡ*).
ḡaljēs, adj., poor, needy.
ḡalmiḡ, v. intr., go astray.
ḡalmōñ, n., pomegranate.
ḡāloñ, n., plant.
ḡalonmiḡ, v., salute with
 joined hands.
ḡām, *ḡāmbā'sh*, *ḡāmkh*, adj.,
 adv., good, well, healthy.
ḡāms, n., bull.
ḡāmbā'sh, see *ḡām*.
ḡāmkh, see *ḡām*.
ḡānmiḡ (-*bo*), v. tr., draw,
 pull.
ḡānriḡs, adj., small, little.
ḡāñ, n., pad under saddle of
 beast of burden.
ḡāñ, n., fruit remaining after
 first gathering (walnut,
 seed of *Pinus Gerardiana*,
 etc.).
ḡāñ, n., pheasant.
ḡāñ, n., asparagus (T.R.).
ḡāñēōmiḡ, v. tr., punish.
ḡāñi, n., hill.
ḡāñkhor, n., kind of grain.
ḡāñmiḡ (*ḡo*), v. intr., dis-
 perse, finish (of assembly).
ḡāñōñ, fine; — *lanmiḡ*, v. tr.,
 fine.
ḡāñshārōs, n., kite.
ḡāph, n., scabbard.
ḡāpshimiḡ, v. intr., pull
 against one another.
ḡārchōd, n., flag, prayer-flag.
ḡāryā, n., name of god.
ḡārī, n., beard, whiskers.
ḡārou, n., beam in ceiling.
ḡārsonōñ, n., opening above
 door.
ḡārū, n., gunpowder : *yañ*
ḡārū, dust in rotten tree.
ḡārzō, n., grindstone.
ḡāshimiḡ, v. intr., fight,
 quarrel : *ḡāshim shēniḡ*,
 v. tr., cause to fight,
 quarrel.
ḡāsho, n., fight, quarrel.
ḡāts, n., husband.
ḡāturo, n., thorn-apple (T.R.).
ḡāyon, n., flock (T.R.).
ḡe, see *ḡea*.
ḡe ma, adv., no more.
-ḡea, fem. *-ḡē*, suffix, one
 who is, or has or does.

- dēbush*, adj., adv., good, clean, healthy, well.
- dēkhrā*, n., boy; *dēkhrāts*, small boy.
- dēkhār*, n., girl.
- dēkkoimiy* (-go), v. tr., fear.
- dēla*, n., clod.
- dēlā*, n., threshold.
- dēlī*, n., † anna piece, † annas. Cf. Paujābi *dhēlī*, 8 annas. See *pālī*.
- dēlmīy*, *dēlna*, adj., lazy.
- dēna*, adv., then (inferential).
- dēmīy*, v. intr., go away.
- dēmō*, adj., pretty, beautiful (T.R.).
- dēn*, *dēn*, adj., standing; *dēn tōshimīy*, stand: — *sarshimīy*, stand up.
- dēna*, n., stick; *dēnats*, small stick.
- dēōn*, n., body.
- dēōroñ*, n., temple (T.R.).
- dēcī*, n., delay: — *lanmīy*, v. intr., delay.
- dēs*, suffix, somewhat, ' -ish,' added to adj. or adv.
- dēs*, prep., similar, like, with gen. or nom.
- dēshā*, n., fellow-villager.
- dēshoñ*, n., village.
- dēwī*, n., goddess.
- dhom*, n., leather box.
- dīār*, n., day.
- dīārō*, adv., daily.
- dīy*, n., brass vessel.
- dīk chās*, n., Tibetan holy book.
- dīkhrī*, n., liquor prepared from honey.
- dīkshimīy*, v. intr., be transacted.
- dīkts*, n., small brass vessel. See *dīy*.
- dīl*, n., heart.
- dīl, līmīy*, v., be well off.
- dīlos*, lazy (Hindi, *dhilā*).
- dīn mīy* (-go), v. tr., transact.
- dīnōs*, adj., smart, clever (bad sense).
- dīnyāmōñ*, i.q. *dīnōs*.
- dīshimīy*, v., enter, lie down.
- dīwāl*, n., retaining wall on road.
- do*, pron., he, she: — *anēi*, he (she), himself (herself); plur., *doyo, dogoa, dogoga*; plur. with *anegāsī* or *anegāi*, they themselves; *dōsōñ*, those two.
- dō*, n., kind of fern.
- dōw*, prep., with, beside; adv., there, thither.
- do bāns*, n., a Tibetan holy book.
- dobār*, n., midday (T.R.).
- dōbra*, n., large brass or iron vessel (T.R.).
- doñ*, n., leak, hole.
- dōk*, adv., after that, then.
- dokha*, n., collection of hills.
- dokhēmīy*, v. tr., cheat out of money.

- dōkhou*, n., hill.
dōkō, adv., in his (her) direction.
dōkts, prep., adv., from thence.
dōl, n., large drum.
dōlkhī, n., small drum.
dōm(h) (i.e. *dhōm*), leather box.
dōmij, v. intr., speak in oracle.
dōmīdkh, *dōmīdij*, n., female of *dōmōn* caste.
dōmōn, n., blacksmith.
dōmōn, n., wooden spoon.
dōn, adv., there, thither.
dōn, prep., to.
dōnmij, v. intr., emerge, go or come out.
dōnmij (-*go*), v. intr., start on journey.
dōnmij (-*go*), v. tr., surround.
dōnmō, n., butter churning cylinder (T.R.).
dōno kāshimij, v. intr., invite one another to food.
dōnos, n., man of higher caste. (In this word the *n* is almost *u*.)
dōnts, adv., thence.
dōplēāmij, v. tr., chide, threaten.
dor, adv., far.
dōr chōd, n., a Tibetan holy book.
dōrēnmij, v. intr., run (Hindi, *daurūnā*).
dōrī, n., carpet.
dōrī, n., blanket, woman's skirt.
dōriṅ, n., retaining wall in field.
dōrjē chōtpac, n., a Tibetan holy book : i.e. *dōr chōd*.
dōrma, n., wreath.
dōrōn, n., beehive.
dōshā, n., evil fate (T.R.).
dōshimij, v., go to meet superior on road.
dōshon, n., fault (T.R.).
doyon, n., cream, curds.
doyōn, n., hole, leak. See *doiṅ*.
dramon, n., contract.
dromōn, n., kind of grass (T.R.).
drua, n., plain.
dūā, adv. prep., there, thither, beside.
dūb dūb, n., charm, incantation; - - *lāmij*, v., pronounce charm.
dūbēnmij, v. intr., sink.
dūbon, n., smoke vapour mist.
dūbos, adj. n., deep, deep hole.
ducy, v. subj., I was; *duc*, with infin., had to (idea of necessity).
dūj, v. subj., I am; *dū*, with infin., has to (idea of necessity).
dūgna, -fold, e.g. *nā dūgna*, fivefold.

- duññ*, n., lighted lamp (including wick, oil, etc.).
duñkhòñ, adj., angry, grieved.
duñkhriñ, n., censor.
duñ(h), n., dung (of sheep, goats).
duñ butukts, n., small spider (T.R.). i.q. *butukts*.
duñcimig, v. intr., doze: *duñcim bònñig*, doze.
duñkhòñ, n., earthen pot for oil.
duñm, n., assembly.
duñmākh, n., small drum.
duñngyūr(h), n., praying wheel; temple.
duñmig, n., clerk (writing Persian Urdu).
duñmñig (-*m*), v. intr., assemble.
duñchañ, n., small shell used as coin (T.R.).
duññeròñ, n., halo round sun or moon, lunar rainbow.
duñnyā, n., world.
duñpòñ, n., incense: — *ranmñig*, burn incense.
duñrē, adj., adv., first.
duñroñ, n., first place (T.R.).
duñros, *duñrosòñ*, n., man's father-in-law's family.
duñstī, n., perspiration: — *duñmñig*, perspire.
duñtāvī, n., flute (T.R.).
duñvāñ, adj., extravagant.
duñwāròñ, n., door: *sīsò sea duñwāròñ*, window.
- dyāsoñ*, n., day.
dzangūñ, n., jungle.
dzigits, adj., small; *dzigitsots*, from childhood.
e, ēī, n., adj., fifth day, on fifth day (forwards).
eke lunmñig, v. tr., collect.
ēkō, adv., only.
ēkur, n., medicinal plant (T.R.).
ēm, n., taste (pleasant): *me ēm*, bad taste.
ēmei, n., *Viburnum stellulatum*.
ēmō, n., kind of deer.
ērìñ, hunting: *ērìñò bīmñig*, *ērìñ lunmñig*, v., hunt: *ērìñò bītsea*, *ērìñ lanzea*, n., hunter.
ēròs, n., hunter.
ētsñ, adj., alone.
ētwaròñ, n., Sunday.
- gachòñ*, n., girdle, servant's belt.
gachos, n., forced but paid, labour.
gadār, n., marriage among lower-caste people.
gadī(h), n., wheelbarrow. (Cf. Hindi *gāpī*.)
gāñm, n., bullet.
gāññ, n., abuse: — *shēññig*, v. tr., abuse.
galñig, v. intr., be reconciled; *galòm shēññig*,

- v. tr., reconcile, mediate: — *shetsea*, n., mediator, peacemaker.
- galshimiy*, v. intr., be reconciled: *galshom shënniy*, v. tr., reconcile, mediate: — *shetsea*, n., mediator, peacemaker.
- gamniy* (-bo), v. intr., be pierced.
- gatom*, n., smell (generally sweet): *mār gatom*, bad smell.
- gavthôn*, n., knot: — *tshñniy*, v. tr., knot: — *thōniy* or *thōrniy*, v. tr., untie knot.
- gāo*, n., amulet.
- gar*, n., tooth, tusk: — *cilmiy*, gnash one's teeth.
- garmēč*, adv., certainly.
- gāroñ*, n., stream, brook.
- gārpāth*, adj., tight.
- gasa*, n., cloth, clothes: — *salniy*, undress.
- gato*, adj., few, small, narrow: *gato ca*, minority.
- gatos*, adj., narrow.
- gē*, n., kernel of walnut, edible part of Pims Gerardiana.
- gētshāl*, n., non - celibate lama (inferior to *gyēlon*).
- gīna*, n., entrails.
- gīndā*, n., ball.
- gīthōñ*, n., song: — *lonniy*, sing.
- go*, pron. I: — *goi*, I myself.
- gob tsoros*, adj., much.
- gobī*, n., cabbage.
- gōlron*, n., urine of sheep, goats, cattle: — *shënniy*, v., urinate.
- gōl*, n., mouth.
- gōlēnniy*, v. intr., melt, thaw (Hindi, *gōlunā*).
- gōlmiy*, v. dig (for sawing).
- gōlon*, n., throat: — *tsāmniy*, v. tr., choke: — *tsām tsām setnniy*, v. tr., choke to death, strangle: — *jiūnniy* (-no), v. intr., choke.
- gōlpāt(h)*, n., dog's collar (iron).
- gōlson*, n., moon.
- gōlti*, n., blunder, mistake: adj., incorrect.
- gōlthos*, n., vulture.
- gompōh*, n., one who brings bad luck.
- gōpata*, n., hammer.
- gompaso*, n., iron vessel.
- gōwē*, n., wife. See *bīriñs goēnē*.
- gōwū*, n., log trunk of tree.
- gōwma*, n., mare.
- gōnniy*, v. tr., cut: *chūa gōnniy*, reap.
- gonniy*, v. tr., commit adultery with (with accus. of person): *tsām tsām gonniy*, v. tr., rape, ravish.

- g'ñō*, n., foundation.
g'ñoiñ, n., flock of birds.
gōwōs, n., ape.
gōnpā, n., Buddhist shrine.
gōr, n., churn; — *lanmīg'*,
 v. tr., churn.
gor, adv., very.
gor hurenmīg', v. intr., jump
 about (horse).
gorđ, n., kind of deer.
gorženmīg', v. intr., be able,
 became well-to-do after
 having been poor.
gōrētsea, n., well-to-do (not
 rich).
gōryōr, adj., late.
gōrmīg', v. intr., fall.
gōrsa, n., adj., late, lateness:
 — *shženmīg'*, be late: —
hacimīg', be late (of time):
 — *hac'*, it is late.
goshimīg', v. intr., commit
 adultery with one another.
 See *gonmīg'*.
gōshitoñ, n., herd of cattle.
gōtāñrā, n., snail.
gōthoiñ, n., millstone, wheel:
 — *kim*, mill: *has gōthoiñ*,
 hand - mill; *gadī* ---
 wheelbarrow wheel.
gōtots, n., bundle.
gots rōlēñmīg', v. tr., amoy,
 tease.
g'žāb, adj., adv., much, very.
grē, n., death.
grokts, n., man who gives
 oracle.
- gropōñ*, n., eclipse.
grū lanmīg', v. tr., cause
 to crumble; — *bōnmīg'*,
 v. intr., crumble.
grugu, n., crumb.
grūññmīg', v. intr., growl.
gu, see *gub*.
gūdh, n., witness.
gūđ', n., hand, arm; *gu sab*,
 glove; *i gūđ'*, one hand-
 ful; *gūđ shženmīg'*, touch;
gūđos khoyāmīg', touch;
nish gūđ ipōñ lanmīg'
 (make two hands one,
 join hands), entreat.
gūī, adj., nine; *gūē*, ninth.
gūī rā, 900; *gūī rāē*, 900th.
gūlāb, n., nose-ring.
gūlāb, n., rose.
gūlām, n., rein (Urdu,
lāgām).
gūm, n., bow (for arrows).
gūnn, n., winter.
guptī, n., dove.
gūvām, n., coarse sugar, *gur*:
 — *shīñ*, sugar-cane.
gūryār, n., thunder.
gurmīg', v. intr., thunder.
gūstākhī, n., rudeness.
gūthā, n., tub.
guzōr, n., mosquito, large
 brown stinging insect.
gūwāhis, n., cowherd.
gūwāñōs pōñ, n., Pleiades.
gyāhōñ, n., male ass.
gyalmīg', v. intr., win.
gyalma, n., queen.

- gyaltsha*, n., lower country near Rampur and below.
- gyāmīg*, v. tr. and intr., wish, desire, love, require, be advisable, be necessary : *ma gyāmīg* or *ma gyāshēs* or *ma gyāshid*, unloved.
- gyāts*, it is advisable. See *gyāmīg*.
- gyēlōn*, n., non-celibate lama (inferior to *tāry* lama).
- habā*, n., doctor.
- hacimīg*, v., become.
- hak*, n., call ; — *shēnūig*, v., call, proclaim.
- hākḍār*, n., heir.
- hākom*, n., governor.
- hakiḍā*, n., enemy's loss (causing joy to hearer).
- hāl*, adv., quickly.
- hala*, *halē*, adv., how ?
- halekō*, adv., whither ?
- halūāna*, adv., however, in whatever way.
- hālkarā*, n., post-runner.
- hālōn*, n., plough : — *līmīg*, v., plough.
- halā*, n., potato.
- ham*, adv., where ? *hami ma*, nowhere ; *hamiāna*, where, wherever.
- hāmēsh*, adv., always.
- hami ma*, *hamiāna*, see *ham*.
- hānar pōn*, n., Orion's Belt.
- hāmīg*, v. intr., be able.
- harēnīg*, v. intr., be defeated, lose.
- har bīmīg*, v. intr., elope (of married women).
- hārkān*, n., yew, *Taxus baccata* : i.q. *nyandāl*.
- hāroñ*, n., bone.
- harulē*, n., eloping woman : *harulea*, man with whom she elopes. See *har bīmīg*.
- hāsal*, adv., quickly, fast.
- hōsh*, n., yawn : — *katmshimīg*, v. intr., yawn.
- hastlou*, n., palm of hand.
- hathu*, n., an iron vessel.
- hāt*, pron., who ? *hāti ma*, no one : *hātiāna*, who, whoever ; *hatsōn*, which two : *hāt gyāma lī*, whoever wishes.
- hatekō*, adv., in which direction ?
- hatī*, n., shop.
- hazār*, adj., thousand.
- hē*, adv., again.
- hēḍ*, adj., other, more : — *mēā*, next year : *ḍō hēḍ mēā*, in two years (*mēā*, probably, i.q. *myā*, q.v.).
- hica pyā*, n., name of a small bird.
- hidāks*, n., miser.
- hige*, n., Tibetan epistle.
- hōḍ*, n., barley bread.
- hodē*, adv., thus, in this way.
- hodei sūbābos*, adv., for this reason, therefore.

hodlērōñ, adv., then, at that time.

hodo tēñēs, adv., for this reason, therefore.

hōdoñ, adv., there, thither : *hōdōñts*, thence.

hojoñ, here ; *hojōñts*, hence.

hōlāī, v., sweetmeat seller.

hōlāshōñ, n., Rhus Panjabensis.

hōldō, n., flood.

hōlmīgʹ, v. tr., scratch, scratch oneself.

hōlshimīgʹ, v. intr., scratch oneself.

hōlu telōñ, n., varnish ; — *shēlmīgʹ*, v., varnish.

hom, n., bear.

hoñ, n., caterpillar : *mē hoñ*, *mē hoñts*, fire-fly. See *mē*.

hoñēʹ, adv., this way, thus.

honnīgʹ, v. intr., laugh ; adj., amusing ; *honnigu*, amusing.

hōñoñ, adv., there, thither : *hōñoñts*, thence.

hōriñ, n., log of wood (one man's load).

horkū, n., Rhus Wallichii.

hozā, n., potter ; *hozēnikʹ (gʹ)*, female of the caste.

hōzō, adv., quickly, fast.

hākṃ, n., command : — *ru-mīgʹ*, v., command.

hulos, n., breeding ram.

hāñ, *hāñā*, now : *huñokstōñ*,

up to now. (Cf. Panjabi *hāñ*, *hāñā*, now.)

hāñēʹ, adv., in that way.

huñokstōñ, see *hāñ*.

hunnīgʹ (-do), v. tr., teach.

hūrēāmīgʹ, v. tr., close, shut.

hūrōñ, n., wooden bolt or latch.

hūrshimīgʹ, v. tr., deny.

hushimīgʹ, v., learn, read.

ī, īlʹ, one ; *ījobʹ*, once : *īmyā*, one day, once on a time ; *īlʹ*, first ; *ī pōñ lanmīgʹ*, unite.

īmīgʹ, v. tr., ask ; *sālā īmīgʹ*, consult.

indrōmōñ, n., month September–October.

itrits, adj., small, little.

jublē, n., liar.

jālʹ, n., good.

jālbolē, n., very wide-meshed coarse cotton cloth.

jāmīgʹ, v. tr., collect cow's urine.

jammīgʹ, v. intr., come down, descend.

junetōñ, n., marriage among higher castes.

janñyā, n., silk.

janoro, n., dizziness : — *harimīgʹ* or *lanshimīgʹ*, become dizzy.

jashkhāñ, n., trap for bear.

- jekō*, adv., in this direction.
 on this side, near.
jemēāmiṅ, v., taste
jēshmoñ, adj., eldest.
jeshṭoñ, n., month May-June.
jikpo, adj., good: — *chur*,
 steep descent; — *ṭau*,
 steep ascent.
jiloñ, n., root of tree.
jiñmiṅ (-*no*), v. intr., be
 entangled, wear out. See
gōlōn.
jiti, *jitits*, *jitrīts*, adj., small,
 little: n. infant.
job', n., time, as in three
 times, four times, etc.: i. q.
yōb'.
jōkts, adv., hence.
jōñ, adv., here: *jōñts*, hence.
jā, he, she, this; plur., *jāgo*,
jāgoa, *jāgoṅa*, these:
jāsōñ, these two.
jā, n., cloud.
jāā, here.
jiyā, n., what remains after
 drawing off buttermilk.
jiyāl', n., stick for oxen,
 goad. See *jat'*.
jiyārō, dumb.

ka, pron., thou: *ka kai*,
 thou thyself.
kā, than.
kā, n., walnut, *Juglans regia*.
kacōñ, prep., towards.
kacōñs, adv., on behalf of,
 for sake of; *kacōñs batōn*
dām lāñmiṅ, intercede
 for.
kacṅa, n., news.
kag, adj., bitter.
kag, n., crow
kag, n., part.
kaglī, n., letter, paper
 (Urdu, *kāghīz*).
kagōñn, n., ring.
kaitāṅī, n., female of *kaitos*
 class.
kaitos, n., clerk (Hindi
 writer). See *kaitāṅī*.
kakeāt(h), n., kind of small
 bird.
kakshoz, n., *Lonicera hypo-*
leuca.
kakts, n., neck: *kaktsā bosh*,
 halter.
kalishōñ, n., *Salix elegans*.
kāmbāl(h), n., blanket.
kancik (Thēbörskad'), n.,
 matter, affair.
kāñmiṅ (-*ho*), v. tr., pierce,
 dig.
kamōñ, n., work, deed,
 — *lāñmiṅ*, v., work.
kāñshimiṅ, v., see *hāsh*.
kau, adj., thy.
kāñā, adj. (see *kāṅo*), blind
kāñāre, n., edge, side: *po*
kāñāre, on all sides.
kāñgyāc(h), n., temple.
kāññ, n., mortar for pound-
 ing.
kāññam shēñmiṅ, v., annoy,
 give trouble to

- kankōsh*, n., instrument for extracting wax from ear.
- kanmīg*, v. tr., bring.
- kanmīg* (-yo), distribute, divide; *ciṭhī kaktsea* or *ciṭhī kago ketsea*, postman.
- kāṇō*, adj., blind (Hindi, *kānā*, one-eyed). See *kāṇā*.
- kānōñ*, n., ear; — *kho*, wax in ear.
- kānōrē*, see *kānōriñ*.
- kānōriñ*, n., adj., Kanaur, Kanauri; *Kānōrós*, pl. *Kānōrēta*, Kanauri man; *Kānōrē*, pl. *Kānōriž*, Kanauri woman; *Kānōriñ chěsmī*, Kanauri woman; *Kānōriñ skat*, *Kānōrēta skat*, Kanauri language.
- kānōros*, see *kānōriñ*.
- kār(h)*, n., ram; *byañ kār(h)*, Tibetan ram; *kārts*, male lamb.
- kāryjōl(h)*, n., cup.
- kāśh*, n., root used as soap.
- kāśhiñ*, n., beehive, honey-comb.
- kāshōñ*, pron., we two (thou and I); *kāshōñš*, our (thine and mine).
- kastiñ*, n., Indigofera Gerardiana.
- kātāb*, n., book.
- kātā*, n., peach.
- kātā mīg*, v. tr., spin thread (Hindi, *kātū*).
- kāthos*, n., miser.
- kātiñ*, n., month October–November.
- katsā*, *katso*, adj., raw, unripe (Hindi, *kāccā*).
- katsbāl*, n., *Pyrus baccata*.
- katsrī*, plait of hair; — *kermīg*, plait hair.
- kayōñ*, n., festival, fair.
- kēb*, n., needle.
- kēdī*, n., prisoner, captive.
- kēmīg*, v. tr., give (especially with indirect object in first or second person).
- kermīg*, see *katsrī*.
- kes*, n., armpit.
- kēs*, than.
- kēsroñ*, n., white or yolk of egg.
- khaḍḍlōñ*, bank of river.
- khakōñ*, n., mouth; *bodī khakōñ sea*, great talker.
- khalēvī*, n., sweeper, "milhtar."
- khāmcū nokpo*, n., Tibetan holy book.
- khañ*, n., three-quarters of a ser.
- khāñiñ*, n., mine.
- khañ mīg*, v. tr., seize, catch.
- khāñnā*, n., Ephedra vulgaris.
- khañōñ*, n., half.
- khasdār*, n., groom.
- khāss*, n., sheep; *byañ khāss*, Tibetan sheep.
- khatēbs*, n., like wild fig. *Viburnum cotinifolium*; i. q. *tšstš*.

- khāts*, n., female lamb.
khāū, n., food.
khāzī, n., itch : — *hārmīy*,
 v. intr., itch.
khēr, adj., slanting, crooked.
khērmīy, v. intr., be slanting,
 crooked ; *mīy* —, squint :
khērtsea, squinter.
khēron, n., milk : — *shūtū-*
mīy, wean.
khetsī, adj., separate : —
lanmīy, separate.
khīmīy, v. tr., look. see.
khīss, n., pocket.
khlog, n., Abies Webbiana or
 pindrau.
khō, n., waist.
khō, n., excrement of dog or
 bird, wax in ear.
khob, n., cover.
khōbūr, n., news.
khocimīy, v. intr., boil ;
khocim shēnnīy, v. tr., boil.
khōcob, n., hoof : in divided
 hoof each half is *khōcob*.
khōjīūmīy, v. intr., die off
 (of whole family).
khōjōn, adj., left (not right) ;
 — *kō*, to the left.
khōlōn, n., threshing-floor.
khōlōp, n., bark of tree.
khōmīy, v. tr., skin, peel.
 with accus. of word for
 skin or peel.
khōnmīy (-*bo*), v. tr., cover.
khōn, n., earthen cooking
 vessel.
- khoinā*, n., plain.
khoinmīy, v. tr., bend.
khōishimīy, v. intr., be bent.
 bow oneself, stoop : *khōi-*
shēs, bent.
khōrī, n., native lamp.
khōrō, adj., lame.
khōrts, n., expense ; — *lan-*
mīy, v., spend : *yārkhōrts*,
 extravagance.
khōřāks, n., mushroom.
khōřōs, adj., counterfeit (coin),
 deceitful.
khōtsōr, n., mule.
khōtsōř, n., measles.
khoyōū, n., rust ; — *lāgēn-*
mīy or *tupēmīy*, v. intr.,
 rust. See *tāmīy*.
khōrā khōrā, adj., late ; -
hacimīy, be late. See
khōrāmīy.
khōrāmīy, v., delay.
khōā, n., well.
khāl ā, n., a thorny shrub.
khāl(h), n., skin (of sheep,
 goats, birds) ; *khālkhōmīy*,
 v. tr., skin : *chōn khāl*,
 uterus.
khānmīy (-*bo*), cover.
khānālī, *khānālīs*, n., nose-
 ring.
khānū, n., murder.
khānkhōrī, n., Gurkha dagger.
khānmīy, v. tr., steal.
khānon, n., forced unpaid
 labour.
khūr, *khōrts*, n., knife.

- khāron*, n., earthen floor of lower story.
khuroñts, n., razor.
khuroñts, leopard-trap.
khūr̥sa, n., fruit-stone.
khūr̥sī, n., chair.
khūr̥ts, see *khūr̥*.
khūshī, *khūstī*, n., joy, delight.
khwār, adj., much.
khwās, n., raja's concubine.
khyāmīg', v. tr., look, see, look at; *sū* —, take one's pulse.
khyampō, adj., extravagant.
khyēr̥ khyēr̥, n., gentle ascent or descent.
khyāmmīg' (-*bo*), v. intr., give oneself airs.
khyañ pyā, n., eagle.
kī, pron., thou (respectful). See *kin*.
kim, n., house.
kin, pron., thy (respectful). See *kī*.
kinā', *kinapōñ*, you (plur.); *kinanā*, your.
kishī, pron., you two; *kishū*, of you two.
kishōñā', *kishōñā poñ*, we (all of us); — *nā*, of us (of all of us).
kishū, see *kishī*.
kismat, n., fate.
-kō, suffix, towards, direction of.
kōbzā, n., hinge.
kōd', n., dried cattle-dung.
- kōdā*, n., a very small grain.
koē . . . *koē*, conj., either . . . or.
koē', n., wedge.
kog', n., wild fig.
kōkājē', n., ant.
kōkōr, *kōkōrts*, n., jackal.
kōlān, n., stone.
kolēāmīg', v. intr., seem, appear.
kōlōm, n., pen.
kōlōs, adj., loose, soft.
kōmo, adv., inside.
kōñdī, n., basket, kiltā.
kōñčā, n., kind of small bird.
kōñekhyyōñ, n., wheat-flour.
kōñōs, n., friend.
kōñsōñ, adj., youngest (son, etc.).
kōñtāī, n., earring.
kōñtalī, i.q. *kōñtāī*.
kōrkhtū, n., dried cattle-dung.
kōrnāl, n., curved trumpet.
kōrtshī, n., spoon.
kōshū, n., oath: — *tūñmīg'*, take oath; — *tūñm shēnnīg'*, administer oath.
kōshīsh, n., effort: — *lanmīg'*, attempt.
kōshūtoñ, n., effort.
kōshūr, n., fault, error: — *seu*, culpable.
kōth, n., box (wooden).
kōtha shēnnīg', v., preach.
kōthī, n., house; *shū kōthī*, temple.
kōthōñ, n., comb.

- kōtēāmiy*, v. tr., dig.
koṭō, n., stack : *ci koṭō*, stack of grass : *shūn koṭō*, stack of wood.
kōtol, n., testicle : *kōtolū pōtō*, testicle.
kōtson, adj., bad, difficult.
koziā, n., violence, rudeness : — *lanmiy*, be violent, rude, attack.
krā, n., hair : — *sea*, hairy.
kramāl, n., poplar, *Populus ciliata*.
krammiy (-*ho*), v. intr., weep, cry, mourn, mew : *krapshimiy*, v. intr., weep together, mourn.
krapshimiy, see *krammiy*.
krī, n., dirt : — *sea*, dirty.
krīn ṭod, n., fever.
Krīshṭīn, n., Christian.
krūn, n., bird cherry, *Prunus padus*.
krūngōl, n., wasp.
kū, *Celtis Australis*.
kūaṭī, adv., absolutely, altogether.
kucōn, broom (for sweeping) : — *lanmiy*, sweep.
kūy (*kūkh*), n., owl.
kūī, n., dog, plur., *kōē* : *ku cha uts*, puppy.
kūklī, see *kūy*.
kukhrī, n., hen : *cha uts*, chicken.
kukhrōs, n., cock.
kūlḍōn, n., lake, tank.
kūḥī, n., forced but paid labourer.
kūlmiy, v. tr., beat, strike, pound.
kulupshimiy, v. intr., be strained.
kum, n., head of bed.
kumāl, n., brass vessel.
kūḡd, n., pond.
kūḡḡū, n., image, - *tanmiy*, make image.
kūnkh, adj., wide, broad.
kūnuḡy (-*lō*) fut. *kūtoy* v. tr., call.
kūpōn, n., large earthen vessel.
kūroī, n., adv., seventh day on seventh day (forwards).
kūrtī, n., shirt.
kurūkt(h), n., elbow.
kūshēāmiy, v. tr., wipe.
kushoy, n., head lama (celibate).
kushṭ, *kushṭils*, n., *Spiraea bella*.
kūshūr, i. q. *koshūr*.
kutā, adj., bent, crooked : *lanmiy*, bend. *hacimiy*, be bent.
kuttī, n., penis (not polite word).
kyōlmoḡn, n., cedar, (*Cedrus Libani* deodara).
kyālokhā, adj., much.
kyāuol, n., jaw.
kyāūth, n., spark.

- kyō*. adj., male.
kyōs kyōs, adj., drunk, intoxicated. See *kyōsmig'*.
kyōsmig', v. tr., drink or smoke intoxicants.
kyunmīg', v. tr., lift load.
kyāshimīg', v., meet; *ma kyāshid mī*, enemy.
lā ū, n., saxifrage (T.R.).
labr, n., flame.
labroñ, n., Buddhist shrine.
lācimīg', v. intr., look at oneself in glass.
ladroñ, n., *Picris ovatifolia*.
lagf, n., sleeve.
lagjēnmīg', v. intr., rain.
lāgjets tī, *lāget tī*, n., rain.
lāgon, n., temple.
lai, n., day (not night): see *lē*; *om lai*, forenoon.
laik, adj., good, adept, clever, worthy.
lajon, n., shame (T.R.).
lākḥ, adj., 100,000.
lalcē, adj., covetous, avaricious.
lalots, n., avarice, covetousness: — *lānmīg'*, covet.
lamā, n., lama.
lama pyā, n., a red bird.
lāmbārdār, n., headman of village.
lamgiāds, adj., light (not heavy).
lānmīg', see *chūā*.
lamōs, adj., long, high: —
- thāshimīg'*, lie resting on one's elbow.
lamthā, n., brass vessel.
lān, n., wind, air: — *kan-nīg'*, v. tr., fan.
lāñ, n., cow.
lāñ, n., jump: — *tshārēa-mīg'*, jump.
lambō, n. (Thēbörskad'), dried cow-dung (T.R.).
lan pyā, n., kind of bird as large as crow.
laññ, n., pine needle: *butuksä* — spider's web.
lānmīg', *lānmīg'*, v. tr., do, make, cook.
lānmīg', v. tr., wait for.
lānmēts, see *tī*.
lā patrōñ, n., ivy, *Hedera helix*.
lāss, n., mud.
lasta, n., axe.
laṭa, adj., dumb.
lathou, *latōñ*, n., kick: — *cīlēāmīg'*, v. tr., kick.
laṭī, girl. See *laṭū*.
lāts, n., shadow.
laṭū, n., boy. See *laṭī*.
lē, day (not night), by day.
lē, n., tongue: *tsokōs lēsa*, great talker.
lēāmīg', v., thaw.
lēāz, n., shame.
lēñ, *lēñna*, adv., undoubtedly, at once (T.R.).
lēnmīg' (-*mo*), v. tr., lick.
lēph, n., mattress.

- lēsh*, n., penis (not polite).
lī, adv., too, also.
lī pyā, n., bird about as large as crow.
lid(h), n., horse-dung.
lik, heavy.
likpā, n., penis (polite word).
likshimiy, v. intr., clothe oneself.
līm, n., blue pine, *Pinus excelsa*.
līmīy, *dil* —, be well off: *hālōn* —, plough.
līmīy (-*bo*), take off as jewels on death of husband, load, etc.
līmno, n., mushroom.
līn, n., penis (polite word).
līnkāt(h), n., kind of edible fern.
līnīy, v. tr., dress anyone (generally as an honour) with obj. of thing put on, shoes, flowers, clothes.
lipāīy, v. tr., plaster (floor with leaves and mud).
līshōn!, n., kind of small bird.
liss, n., cold.
līt(h), n., egg.
līts, n., medlar, *Pyrus communis*: i.q. *shēyāl(h)*.
lō, adv., on this side, near: *lokō*, on this side, in this direction, near.
lōn, prep., with, along with.
lōmīy (-*do*), v. tr., say, speak: *mēsāūs* —, whisper: *shāī* —, whistle.
lōnmīy (-*go*), v. tr., roll up (bedding, etc.), take down (bridge, load).
lōsār, n., name of fair held in January.
lōstōn, n., garlic.
lotō, n., astrologer's book: — *khyāzēt*, astrologer.
lōtōn, n., corpse: *lotōn shīn*, bier (Panjabi, *lōth*).
lotrī, n., brass vessel (Hindi *lōtā*).
lōzānōn, n., iron vessel.
lub, n., hands joined in position of holding: — *bōn*, double handful.
lubāīy, v. tr., cover.
lubā, n., cover.
lumā, n., thigh.
lumīy, v. intr., ripen (grain, etc.): *lūmlūm*, ripe: *ma lūnts*, unripe.
lūnts, see *lumīy*.
luḷāīy, v. tr., rob (T.R.).
ma, adv., not (not used with imperative): — *nīma*, otherwise (lit. if it be not).
madānīy, v. tr. (T.R.), i.q. *mandāīy*.
madōī, n., coral (T.R.).
majōn, adj., middle: prep. (also *majōnō*), among, between, in middle of.

- do majōno*, in the mean-
time.
- makpa*, n., son-in-law living
in father-in-law's house
(T.R.).
- māl*, n., poplar, *Populus alba*.
- māla*, n., property.
- mālī*, n., one who gives
oracle.
- mālī*, n., gardener.
- maū*, n., dream.
- māñ*, n., month January-
February.
- mandēāl(h)*, n., wreath : i.q.
mōṇḍēāl.
- mandēāmiḡ*, v. tr., wash
clothes in *gūthā*, tub.
- manē*, n., hand prayer-wheel.
- manjo*, n., bed (T.R.).
- manlag*, n., sleeve.
- manmiḡ*, v. intr., dream :
manmiḡ (-*ūo*), v. tr.,
conceal.
- māññ*, n., mother : — *bōññ*,
parents.
- māñpāl*, n., remission of
forced labour to orphan
(T.R.).
- manshīmiḡ*, v. intr., conceal
oneself, disappear.
- māñthōñ*, n., flat mud roof.
- manṭos*, adv., secretly. See
manmiḡ.
- māp lanmiḡ*, v. tr., forgive
(Urdu, *mā'āf*).
- mapōñ*, n., mother's house
and family.
- mār*, adj., bad.
- mār*, n., ghi (clarified butter) :
mar tī (Thëbörskad'), oil.
- mar mē*, n., temple lamp
burning ghi (T.R.). See
mē.
- marī*, adj., feeble (T.R.).
- marpōl*, n., *Pyrus lanata*.
- marshēāmiḡ*, *mashēāmiḡ*
(Thëbörskad'), give oneself
airs (especially of poor
mau).
- marshēāmiḡ*, v. tr., plaster
(floor with leaves and
mud).
- māsālō*, n., torel.
- māsh*, n., kind of lentils.
- māshāzōm*, n., inkstand.
- mashēāmiḡ*, see *marshēā-*
miḡ.
- mashkāts*, adj., bad.
- mashṭits*, *mashṭos*, adj.,
smooth.
- mātkpa*, adj., conceited,
proud.
- māthī*, n., sweeper, house-
cleaner (not *mihtar*).
- matīu*, n., earth, soil.
- matūñ*, n., pearl.
- māts*, n., female kid.
- matshī*, n., fish : — *tsūmmiḡ*,
v., fish : *matshī tsūmzeā*,
fisher.
- māya*, n., property.
- māzēāmiḡ*, v. tr., scour
(metal vessel).
- māzā*, n., bed (for sleeping).

mē, n., fire : — *hoñ*. — *hoñts*, fire-fly. See *mēpyāts*.
mē, adv., yesterday : — *sha*. yesterday evening (T.R.).
mēv(h), n., table.
mēl, n., mile.
mēliñ, n., earthen fire-place.
mēmē, n., paternal grandfather (used in Upper Kanaur).
mēpyāts, n., ashes (lit. fire-bird ?).
mērā, n., flint (for fire).
mērā, n., mica.
mēsāñ, *mēsāñts*, adv., slowly. gently : — *louñig*. whisper : — *shōthēñmīg*, pour.
mēsh, n., buffalo.
mēshin, n., *Lonicera obovata*.
mēshpā, adv., last night.
mētāññ, n., complete outfit of tinder and flint.
mētēñmīg, v. tr., wrap.
mēthō, n., burning cinder (T.R.). See *mē*, *thō*.
mētiñ, n., woman's parents' house.
mēts, suffix meaning woman. See *pā*.
mē, n., man.
mīg, n., eye : — *stēñmīg*. blink. wink : — *spū* or — *-tsam*, eyelashes; *mīggrā*, spectacles. See *mitti*.
mīg^gpā, n., horse-shoe horse-shoe shaped iron on man's

shoe : — *pū shūñmīg*. See shoe.
mīñchād, adj., remarkable (T.R.).
mīñchāp, *mīñchāññ*, n., Koci nickname for Kanauri language (Koci being spoken round about Rāmpur).
mīsṛē, n., sugar.
mīthāñ, n., sweetmeat.
mītti, n. (= *mīg tī*, eye-water), tear.
mō, n., mushroom, toadstool.
mō chūā, see *mōñmīg*.
mō, pron., our, my (reflexive like Hindi *āpnā*).
mōñ, n., footprint.
mōññ, n., willow.
mōg, n., grain given to birds (T.R.).
mōñ, n., arrow.
mōkhār, n., beehive.
mōkshiron, n., month November–December.
mō(h) [almost *mō(h)*], n., silver.
mōñm, n., ointment. *shēñmīg* apply ointment.
mōññ, n., elm, *Ulmus Wallichiana*.
moliñ, n., Hindu pigtail.
mōñmīg, v. tr., cut.
mōññ, n., price.
mōññ, n., cattle-dung.
mōñññ, n., flat mud roof : i. q. *mōñññ*.

- mōmā*, n., mother's brother, father's sister's husband.
mōmīg', v., pay for damage done by cows in field; *mō chūā*, grain given in payment (T.R.).
mōnāyamīg', v. tr., persuade, cause to believe.
mōndēāl, n., garland offered to god (T.R.). See *maṇḍēāl*.
mōnūāmīg', v. tr., agree to, believe, obey; *ma* —, disobey, etc.
mōṇiṇ (almost *mūṇiṇ*), n., jewel.
mōṇlārōṇ, n., Tuesday.
mōṇōṇ, n., attention: — *shēnnīg'*, pay attention.
mōṇōṇ, n., plait of hair.
mōṇṭh, adj., female.
mōṇṭhōn, n., flat mud roof, i.q. *mōlṭhōn*.
mōṇriṇz, n., woman (T.R.).
mōrchau, n., man (not woman).
mōrjōṇ, n., oak, *Quercus dilatata*.
mōrī, see *mōros*.
mōros, n., f., *mōrī*, peacock.
mōrṭhliṇ, n., Hindu burning place.
mōrṭs, n., black pepper.
mōs, n., *Desmodium floribundum*.
mōsliṇ, n., pestle.
mōt, n., death.
mōṭōs, adj., fat, thick.
mōzārī, n., day labourer.
mugōṇ, n., lentils (Panjabi, *mūṅṅē*).
mūkhia, n., headman of village.
mūkhōṇ, n., upper part of front of body, chest.
mūkhōṇ, n., god's silver necklace, with eighteen rings.
mukōṇ, n., spade with inverted head.
mūlchā, n., mercury.
mūlī, adv., very, absolutely, altogether.
mūlōk, n., country; *mūlōk-hia*, fellow-countryman.
mūmēsī, n., piles (illness).
mūndī, n., ring.
mūṇmīg', v. tr., plaster (wall).
mūṇshī, n., clerk; fem. *mūṇshīāṇī*.
mūrda, *mūrō*, n., corpse.
mūrō, see *mūrda*.
mūshkīl, adj., difficult.
mūsor, n., kind of lentils.
mūṭh, n., handle.
mūṭshē, n., moustache.
mūṭṭhu, n., fist.
mūṭṭūmīg', v. tr., wring out.
mūzōrī, v., obstinacy, contumacy.
mūzro, n., salam to raja (T.R.).
myā, n., time, in three times,

- etc. : *ī* —, once, once on a time, one day.
- myag*, n., kind of grass (T.R.).
- myūmiḡ*, v. tr., swallow.
- nā*, adj., fire : *nāḡ*, fifth : *nā rā*, 500 : *nā rāḡ*, 500th.
- nāḡs*, n., barber : fem. *nāḡnikh* (*g*), female of same caste.
- nāḡāro*, n., drum.
- nāḡrōs*, n., hunter.
- nāḡḡts*, n., navel.
- nakapani*, n., black stone in *athal*, q.v.
- nakits*, small, fine : n., two annas (a secret word).
- naksā*, n., picture : — *tonmiḡ*, draw picture.
- nāḡkui hocimig* or *bīmiḡ*, v. intr., die off (of whole family).
- nālōn*, n., stream, brook.
- nām*, n., gift (Urdu, *inām*).
- nāmiḡ*, v. intr., be hurt : *nām shēnnig*, hurt.
- nām nām*, n., mould (from damp).
- nāmōn*, n., name.
- nāmōnā*, adj., wonderful.
- nāḡ*, n., brass vessel.
- nān chōs*, n., Tibetan book of spells.
- nāne*, n., father's sister, mother's sister-in-law.
- nāpā*, *nāpūā*, *nāpōn*, adv., in that direction.
- nāpūā*, see *nāpā*.
- nāpōn*, see *nāpā*.
- nār*, n., wife.
- Nārān*, n., God (Hindi, *Nārāyaṇ*).
- nārāḡḡt*, n., orange.
- nārāz*, adj., displeased : — *hocimig*, become displeased.
- narmig*, v. tr., count.
- nāshimig*, v. intr., rest.
- nāsīmī*, n., morning.
- nāsum*, adv., to-morrow.
- nēḡt*, n. : fem. *nēḡḡḡt*, state servant of inferior rank.
- nēkō*, adv., in that direction.
- nēmig*, v. tr., know.
- nerōn*, adv., near.
- nērpa*, n., one who burns incense.
- nēs*, adv., in that direction.
- nēs kō*, adv., in that direction, thither.
- nēs nēs*, adv., thither.
- nī*, adv., yes.
- nīchol*, adj., loving.
- nīmig*, v. intr., become, with infin. of other verbs = to have to, to be necessary to.
- nīmīlā*, adj., weak.
- nīnā*, pron. we (all of us except thee); gen. *nīnānā*, of us, our.
- nīpā*, adv., after that, then.
- nīpōn*, pron., we.
- nīrā*, 200 : *nīrāḡ*, 200th.

nish, *nī*, adj.; two : *nishō*, second: — *dāgnā*, double: — *nizā*, forty : — *nizō*, fortieth : — — *id*, forty-one : — — — *nish*, forty-two : — — — *shum*, forty-three : — — — *pō*, forty-four : — — — *nā*, forty-five : — — — *tāg*, forty-six : — — — *stish*, forty-seven : — — — *rūi*, forty-eight : — — — *zyāi*, forty-nine : — — — *sai*, fifty : — — — *sigit*, fifty-one : — — — *sōnish*, fifty-two : — — — *sōvām*, fifty-three : — — — *sapō*, fifty-four : — — — *sōnā*, fifty-five : — — — *sōrng*, fifty-six : — — — *sōstish*, fifty-seven : — — — *sōrūi*, fifty-eight : — — — *sōzyāi*, fifty-nine. For ordinals add *ō* to last numeral in each case, except in the case of *nizā*, which changes *ā* to *ō*.
nishi, pron., we two (he and I): gen., *nishn*, of us two, our.
niso brē, n., one ser.
nizā, pron., twenty : *nizō*, twentieth : — *id*, twenty-one. The numerals 21 to 39, *nizō id* to *nizō sōzyāi*, are formed in the same way as 41 to 59, see under *nish nizā*.

nizār, n., pitch.
nizō, adj., twentieth.
nizron, n., dozing : — *bannig*, v. intr., doze.
nōliū, adv., n., last year.
nāmīg (almost *nōmīg*), v. tr., rub, massage, stretch.
nōū, adv., there, thither : *nōūts*, thence.
nōn, prep., with, along with.
nōrōū, n., deceit : — *lanmīg*, cheat, deceive : — *seu*, n., deceiver, cheat.
nōskō, adv., in that direction.
nū, pron., he, she, that : plur., *nūgo*, *nūgva*, *nūgoya*, they, those : *nūsoū*, those two.
nū, than.
nūā, adv., there, thither.
nūksān, n., loss.
nūnī, n., mamma, either breast : *nūnīn balt*s (lit. little breast of mamma), nipple.
nūnnāzīg, n. : pl. *nūnnāzige*, full sister.
nūzūhāz, n. : pl. *nūzū hāza*, full brother.
nyam, n. and adj., Tibetan : *nyamēd*, Tibetan woman : *nyam mūlik*, Tibet.
nyamālāl, n., yew, *Taxus baccata*, i. q. *hārākā*.
nyamāil, see *nyam*.
nyamtsō, n., *Caragana brevispina*.

- nyar*, n., kind of lentils.
nyoklēāmīg, *nyoklēnīg*, v. tr., chew.
nyōlits, n., musk-rat.
nyotōñ, n., couple, pair.
nyū, n., *Ulmus nepalensis* and *nitida*.
nyūg, adj., new, young.
nyumlai, n., afternoon (lit. behind light).
nyums, adv., behind.
nyuskō, adv., back, behind.
ō, adv., yes.
ōlāō, n., accusation : adj., difficult : — *phēmīg* or *lanmīg*, accuse.
ōlyō, n., kind of grain.
om, n., path, way.
om, *omē*, *omī*, adv., at first, formerly.
omlai, n., forenoon (lit. fore light).
ōmlān, adv., three years ago.
oms, adv., in front.
ōn, n., hunger.
ontou, n., relation (T.R.).
ōntos, adj., hungry.
ōrēnik(h) (*g*), see *ōros*.
ōrygāmīg, v. tr., request, petition.
ōros, n., carpenter : fem. *ōrēnik(h)* (*g*), woman of same caste.
ōrō, n., entreaty, request : — *lanmīg*, entreat.
- ōrō*, n., resignation : — *ranmīg*, resign.
ōshōñ, n., dew.
ōskō, adv., before, in front of.
ōtār, see *bhang*.
ozrū, n., lock of hair.
-pā, suffix meaning man, generally with place-name, e.g. *Rogpā*, man from Rogē : *Ṭūkpaḥpā*, man from Ṭūkpa : *Rapā*, man from Rarōn. The fem. is *mēts*.
paboñ, n., treeless grass jungle in Tibet.
pāch, n., help : — *lanmīg*, help.
pad, n., bark of *shyay*, *Betula utilis*, used for roofs, umbrellas, etc. : *padā chatrolī*, bark umbrella.
pāē, n., adv., fourth day, on fourth day (forwards).
pāg, n., turban.
pāglou, n., hoar-frost.
pakāth, n., ankle.
pakhou, n., fan, feather, bird's tail : — *rālāāmīg*, v. tr., fan.
pakits, adj., ripe : *ma*, unripe.
palāngī, n., salutation to Brahman.
palē, n., apple : *palē bōthou*, apple-tree.

- palō*, n., piece of cloth in coat-tail.
- pālōs*, n., shepherd: *raipālōs*, groom.
- palshimig'*, v. tr., warm oneself at or in (acc. of fire or sun).
- pāmig'*, v. intr., go, walk: *pāō*, on foot.
- pan*, n., large flat stone: *pants*, small flat stone.
- pānkhōn*, *pānkhā*, n. (fan).
- pānmig'*, v. tr., spin thread.
- pānnig'*, v. tr., boil (food).
- pānmig'*, v. tr., build.
- panthōn*, n., wooden floor of upper story.
- panūig'*, n., pheasant.
- panṭṣī*, n., decision: — *lanmig'*, decide.
- pāō*, see *pāmig'*.
- pāōnōkōs*, n., guest.
- pāp*, n., sin.
- pāprōn*, n., *Buxus sempervirens*.
- pāpū*, n., kiss: — *ranmig'*, v., kiss.
- Pārmēsārōs*, n., God.
- pārmig'*, v. tr., burn (wood): — *shin*, firewood.
- parōn*, n., scar: — *hacimig'* or *lanmig'*, v. intr., heal.
- paśhīn*, n., bone die: — *gōcimig'*, play dice: — *gocizea*, dice-player.
- paśhmig'*, v. tr., break (stones); *sūrāngōs* —, blast.
- pātē*, adj., paralysed; — *hacimig'*, become paralysed; — *lanmig'*, paralyse.
- pathōn*, n., custom.
- pātra*, n., harlot.
- patrōn*, n., leaf.
- pātūts*, n., earthen vessel (like *lōtā*).
- pēdā lanmig'*, v. tr., create: — *hacimig'*, be created (Urdu, *paidā*).
- pēlē*, adv., at first, formerly.
- pērā*, *pērōnā'*, n., kindred.
- pērōn*, n., relative. See *pērā*.
- perōnā'*, see *pērā*.
- pēthōn*, n., kind of lentils.
- pētīn*, n., stomach: *pētīnū chān sē*, pregnant.
- peto tonmig'*, v., appoint day (of consulting oracle).
- pēts*, n., raja's shoe.
- phad'*, n., bag, sack, gift-bag.
- phāūda*, n., advantage, blessing: — *lanmig'*, bless.
- phaisāla*, n., decision: — *lanmig'*, decide.
- phāloṅ*, n., ploughshare.
- phammig'*, v. tr., defeat, win.
- phanmig'* (-no), v. intr., be useful: *phanzeā*, useful: *ma phānts*, useless.
- phanē*, adv., long ago (T.R.).
- phaūmig'* (-go), v. tr., split (wood), incise (surgically).

- phāṅṅōṅ*, n., month February-March.
phāṅṅī sbhēniṅ, v. tr., hang (execute).
phāṅṅts, see *phāṅṅniṅ*.
phāṅṅpī, n., stammerer.
phāṅṅniṅ, v. tr., burst, tear: dig (with word for hole).
phāṅṅsāyāniṅ, v. tr., entangle, entrap.
phāṅṅshōṅ, n., cattle - itch (T.R.).
phāṅṅniṅ, v., vomit.
phāṅṅsūr, n., liquor prepared from cereals.
phāṅṅts, n., bag, gift-bag.
phāṅṅts, n., vagina, with surrounding parts.
phāṅṅkūniṅ, see *thupōṅ*.
phāṅṅrā, n., *Deutzia corymbosa*.
phāṅṅm, n., opium.
phāṅṅniṅ, v. tr., take away, remove.
phāṅṅsmiṅ, v. tr., knock down (house).
phāṅṅ, n., deer.
phāṅṅgār(h), n., earthen vessel (Hindi, *ghāṅṅā*).
phāṅṅshiniṅ, v. tr., clothe oneself (with acc. of *gasā*, clothes, etc.).
phāṅṅlāṅ, n., fruit.
phāṅṅniṅ, break (T.R.).
phāṅṅniṅ, v. tr., put clothes (*gasā*) on anyone.
phāṅṅrāk, n., difference, blemish.
phāṅṅrēṅniṅ, v. tr., spin round, turn round.
phāṅṅsēniṅ, v. intr., be entangled (Hindi, *phāṅṅsuā*).
phāṅṅts, n., ass.
phāṅṅniṅ, v. tr., knock down.
phāṅṅskē, adj., rough (not smooth); n., coarsely ground flour.
phāṅṅkrēṅniṅ, v. intr., blow (with mouth).
phāṅṅniṅ, v. tr., wash clothes with feet.
phāṅṅ, n., human dung.
phāṅṅsū lān, n., whirlwind.
phāṅṅ, forehead.
phāṅṅ, n., onion.
phāṅṅ, adj., yellow, pale (face, etc.).
phāṅṅts, n., calf of leg.
phāṅṅ, n., cheek.
phāṅṅjor, n., cage.
phāṅṅniṅ (-go), v. tr., extinguish. See *boṅ*.
phāṅṅpī, n., red pepper.
phāṅṅpōṅ, n., *Ficus religiosa* (Hindi, *pīpāl*).
phāṅṅr, n., raja's or wazir's flock of sheep or goats.
phāṅṅhī, n., cat: - *chāṅṅts*, kitten.
phāṅṅhīṅ, n., back.
phāṅṅtāl, n., brass.
phāṅṅhā, adj., bald.
phāṅṅhos, n., fine cloth.
phāṅṅton, n., door.

- pītōnts*, n., breast piece of coat.
- pītsu*^ʿ, n., clasp, brooch.
- pīā(h)*, n., mouse.
- plāmīgʹ*, v. tr., spread (carpet, grain).
- po*, four: *pō̄*, fourth. See *poñizā̄*, *pōrā̄*.
- pōcīmīgʹ*, v. tr., seek.
- poglōn*, n., lot: — *shēnnīgʹ*, draw lots.
- pōl(h)*, n., feather.
- pōlāng*, n., bed (for sleeping).
- pōlāts*, n., blood.
- pōlē*, n., capati cooked in oil.
- pōlī*, n., two amas. Cf. Panjabi *paulī*, 4 amas. See *dēlī*.
- pōlīvōlts*, i.q. *pōlē*.
- pōltēāmīgʹ*, v. intr., return (Hindi, *pālīnā*).
- pōn*, prep., to.
- pōn*, n., small number of men, cattle, stars.
- poñizā̄*, *poñizā̄*. 80: *poñizā̄*, *poñizā̄*, 80th: *poñizā̄ id̄*, 81. The numbers 81 to 99. *poñizā̄ id̄* to *poñizā̄ sōzqū̄*, are formed like *nish nīzā̄ id̄*, etc., q.v. The ordinals add *ā̄* to the last number, except in the case of *nīzā̄*, which changes *-ā̄* to *-ā̄*.
- pōnmīgʹ*, v. tr., sew.
- pōnmīgʹ*, v. tr., burn. sting (of nettle).
- pōnmīgʹ*, v. tr., fill.
- pōnnīgʹ*, v. intr., arrive; *pōpō shēnnīgʹ*, cause to arrive.
- pōnōn*, n., hide.
- pōnlsēnnīn*, n., tail (see *pakhōn*).
- pōpō shēnnīgʹ*. see *pōnnīgʹ*.
- pōrā̄*, 400: *pōrā̄*, 400th.
- pōrā̄tōs*, n., breeding male goat.
- pōrdēshī*, n., stranger.
- pōrē*, n., scales, balance.
- pōrēnmīgʹ*, v. intr., be obtained (Hindi, *pāpūā* ?).
- pōrīnā tēpōn*, small Kanauri cap.
- pōrj(y)āmīgʹ*, v. tr., persuade, cause to believe.
- pōsh*, n., dry pine-needles.
- pōshnīgʹ*, v. tr., saw.
- pōshpōn*, n., knee: — *tsā̄nīmīgʹ (-go)*, kneel.
- pōtēnnīgʹ*, v. tr., believe.
- pōtlōn*, n., sole of foot.
- pōtōks*, n., ball (v. *kōtōl*).
- pōtrops*, n., kidney.
- pōtshēnnīgʹ*, v. intr., arrive (Hindi, *pāhāncuā*).
- pōžerkits*, adj., cross-legged.
- pōrāl*, n., message: — *phīmīgʹ*, bear message: — *phītseu*, messenger.
- pōrānā*, n., written licence.
- pōrāts*, n., finger, toe.
- pōrēy*, n., nail.
- pōrīnd*, n., *Buddleia paniculata*.

- prāss*, n., cone of Pinus Gerardiana.
pā, n., horse - chestnut.
Æsculus indica.
pāḍ', n., cow's teat.
pālōs, n., policeman.
pārcūtiā, n., dust.
pārkh, adj., brown.
pātōl, n., cone of fir-tree.
puzā lanmīg, v. intr., pray, worship.
pyā, n., bird : *pyāts*, little bird ; *kīm pyāts* or *kofoñ pyāts*, or *kōthōñ pyā* (lit. house bird) sparrow : *khyūñ pyā*, eagle.
pyāñmīg, v. tr., frighten.
pyār, n., love : adj., beloved.
pyāñ bañ, n. (lit. bird's foot), maidenhair fern.
pyāḍ', n., woolf.
pyāñḍō, n., boil.
rag', n., rock, stone.
rāg, adj., blue, green.
rāi, adj., eight : *rāiḥ*, eighth : *rāirā*, 800 : *rāirāḥ*, 800th.
rāino', n., necklace.
raksōs, n., demon.
rakt(h), n., liquor, prepared from *gūr* or grapes.
rāl(h), n., rice (grains).
Rām, n., God.
Rām rām, n., Hindū salutation
rammīg' (-bo), grind, crush (food with hand).
rāñ, n., hill, mountain.
rāñ gyāl, n., Rosa macrophylla and Webbiiana.
rāñ rag, Pyrus foliosa, also Rhamnus dauricus and purpureus and triqueter.
rāñ, n., horse : *rāñ pālōs*, groom : *rāñ usza*, harness.
rāñḍōlē, see *rāñḍōlōs*.
rāñḍōlōs, n., widower : *rāñḍōlē*, widow.
rāñg, n., colour.
rāng, adj., high.
ranmīg, v. tr., give (especially to third person). See *kēmīg*.
rāñḍōl, n., hornet.
rāñshññ, n., straight trumpet.
rāñsñlī, n., very small lizard.
rapēā, n., dove : adj., destitute : — *ra* (lit. dove-grass), anemone : — *sho* (lit. dove-berry), Daphne oleoides. i. q. *zīko*.
rāshññ, n., long shadow or ray : — *banmīg*, v., dawn
rāshññ, n., heap.
rāshññ, n., pain.
rāsk, adj., sharp : *ma* — blunt.
rasmīg, v. tr., grind (knife) : *rasmik pāñ*, grindstone.
rātī, n., buttermilk.
rātīc, see *rātīñ*.
rātīñ, n., night : — *sanmīg*, v. intr., dawn (lit. night end).

- rats*, n., calf; *ratsă kuñöh* (lit. calf's ear), a small plant.
răřăa, n., fem., *răřăe*, wanderer.
raula, n., beggar.
razăi, n., mattress.
răzăi, adj., content.
redăo, n., mushroom.
reg, n., *Prunus persica*.
răgăen, adj., high.
răk(h). *reköh*, n., straight line.
reköh, see *răk(h)*.
rămăg, adj., beautiful (in both character and appearance).
rămăo, n., kernel of fruit-stone.
răv, n., oath: — *lavămăg*, take oath, repent: — *ravămăg*, administer oath.
renăm, n., season of spring.
rănnăg (-do), v. intr., set (of sun).
rănnăg (-do), v. tr., sell.
răv, adj., eighth. i.q. *răiv*. See *răi*.
răsăm, n., silk.
rător, n., saw.
ră, n., adv., day before yesterday.
ră, edible pine. *Pinus Gerardiana*.
rib, n., rib.
răd, n., twine, cord, thread.
rige, adv., up.
rigră, n., servant.
rihănts, n., tortoise.
rim, n., field.
rin, n., debt: *rinia*, *rinsea*, debtor.
rin, n., forearm, cubit.
riñ, adv., up.
riñ, n., warp.
rinia, see *rin*.
riñmăg, v. tr., say.
riñsă, n., breath.
rinsea, see *rin*.
riñz, *riñze*, n., sister.
răşăr, n., melting snow falling into river.
rătăts, n., a kind of small bird.
rătsămyăi, n., adv., fourth day, on fourth day (back).
riyyăen, adv., up.
ră, *răts*, n., board, plank.
răcimăg, v. tr., hear.
răş, n., *Picea morinda*.
răşen skuv, n., evening star.
răkăămăg, v. tr., hinder.
răkăăşimăg, v. intr., be hindered.
răkh, adj., black: *răkshyă*, mole on body.
răkshimăg, v. intr., graze.
răkshyă, see *răkh*.
răl(h), n., name of a tree with edible berries.
rălăămăg, v. tr., or *găts* — annoy, tease.
rălin, adv., two years ago.
rămă, n., adv., day after to-morrow.
rămăg, v. tr., say.

rāmōñ, n., goat hair.

ron, n., iron, fetter; *ronū*
mōh, arrow; *ronpatar*,
iron vessel.

rōñ, prep., with, along with.
rōñ tī, n., water flowing
very gently.

ronñemiy, v. intr., echo (with
nom. of echoing place).

ronniy (-*gō*), v. tr., graze.

ronpatar, see *ron*.

rōshōñ, adj., angry; — *tan-*
niy, frown, be displeased;
— *tanniy*, — *tanōñ*
shēnniy, displeasure.

rōt(h), n. (plur. *rōtē*), bread.

rōthōñ, n., idol.

rōts, n., musk-deer.

rōts, see *rō*.

rā, n., father-in-law.

rād, n., horn; — *tsūñniy*,
v. tr., cup, bleed; *sññih*
rād *sea*, barasingha deer.

rāñ, n., cotton, cotton wool.

rakshiniy, v. intr., agree
with, resemble.

rālāñniy, v. tr., shake.

rāñciniy, v. intr., chew cud.

rāñḍōñ, n., animal born
without testicles.

rāñkō, n., iron for flint, tinder
with flint and iron.

rāñniy, v. tr., guard;
rāñṅea, n., guard.

rapea, n., rupee.

rāñzā, adj., old (not used of
woman).

sā, n. pulse (in body): —
khyāñiy, feel pulse.

sāb, see *bañ* and *gūd*.

sābāb, n., reason.

sādhē, adj., half more than,
e.g. — *pā*, 5½ (Hindi,
sādhē; Panjabi, *sādhē*).

sā khō, n., otter. See *shāphō*.

sāñ, ten; *sāññ*, tenth.

sāl, n., harvest.

sālā, n., advice; — *ñniy*,
consult.

sālāñ, n., salutation.

sālēt, n., slate.

sālgī, adj., naked.

sālñiy, v. tr., take off
(clothes, *gasā*).

sāñbāññ tshā, n., salt.

sāmōñ, n., soap.

sāñ māñsālō, n., torch.

sāñ skar, n., morning star.

sāñāl, n., flute.

sāñgā, n., ladder.

sāññiy, v. tr., kill, murder.
See *gōññ*.

sāpō, fourteen; — *sāpōñ*, four-
teenth.

sāpos, n., snake; *tūñ* —,
worm.

sāpos cī, n. (lit. snake-grass),
a small plant.

sāposā dakhon, n. (lit. snake's
grape), strawberry.

sār(h), n., kind of deer.

sārñiy, v. tr., lift, carry, bear.

sārshiniy, v. intr., rise;
den —, stand up.

- sāsōñ*, n., breath: — *kaunig*
 or *būnig*, breathe.
sāthīrā, n., beam.
sawā, adj., quarter more than.
 e.g. *sawā nish*, 2½ (Hindi,
sāvā).
sawāl, n., question.
saza, see *rañ*.
sea, fem. *sē*, suffix meaning
 one who is or does, or is
 connected with. See *dea*,
zea.
sedñ, n., earring.
sēgdār, n., file.
sēsōrpāl, n., shrub whose
 leaves are burned in
 religious rites.
shabāsh, n. intr., praise,
 applause, well done!
shachob, n., soup.
shāgyē, n., empty.
shakpō, n., wife's brother,
 man's sister's husband.
shalī, n., a small bird.
shālīñ, flock of sheep or
 goats.
shāñ, n., very small stone.
shāñḍē, n., man with one big
 and one small testicle.
shāñgār, n., shin.
shāññemig, v. intr., freeze.
shāñlīñ, n., chain.
shāño, n., throat.
shāñōñ, n., lock of door:
 — *shēñnig*, lock.
shāphō, n., porcupine.
sharā, n., boy.
- shārōñ*, n., small field, garden.
shējāl(h), n., medlar, *Pyrus*
communis, i.q. *lits*.
shēl, n., medicine.
shēlēāci mig, v. intr., feel pain.
shēlēā mig, *shēlēlēā shēñnig*,
 v. tr., expel.
shēlmig, see *hōl*.
shēñmīg, v. tr., send, insert,
 put; (with verbal nom)
 permit, allow, cause: *ma*
 —, forbid.
shēññōñ, n., house in fields.
shēr, n., town.
shī-, infix, passive or middle,
 or with reciprocal sense,
 e.g. *shoñmig*, cause to ride:
shokshīmīg, ride: *sūmig*,
 wash (tr.): *sūshīmīg*,
 wash oneself: *suāmīg*,
 spoil: *suāshīmīg*, be
 spoiled, get spoiled; *kram-*
mīg, weep: *krapshīmīg*,
 mourn together: *tsām-*
mīg, seize, embrace:
tsāmshīmīg, embrace one
 another, go to law with
 one another.
shikts, n., vagina.
shīmīg, v. intr., die.
shīñ, n., liver.
shīñ, n., wood: — *lōtōñ*,
 bier: — *koṭō*, wood-stack:
 — *thōñ*, woodpecker:
 — *toñmig*, divorce (lit.
 break stick): — *parmīg*,
 split firewood.

shishě tāmīg, v. tr., hang up.
shīshīrvī, n., Urdu *shīshīm*.
 Dalbergia sisu.
shīsmīg, v. tr., recognize.
shkū, n., Cornus macrophylla.
shkum, n., clay.
shkōl(h), n., yoke.
shkōnnīg(-do), v. tr., acknow-
 ledge, agree to.
shō, n., berry, acorn, etc.
 (with name of tree).
shō shēnnīg, v. tr., destroy,
 lose: — *hīmīg*, be de-
 stroyed, lost.
shokrōn, n., orphan.
shōkshīmīg, v. intr., ride.
shōl, n., summer.
shōl krī, long loose hair.
shōlmīg, v. tr., scratch.
sholū, n., locust.
shōmīg, v. intr., ripen: *sho*
sho, ripe.
shōn, n., sackcloth.
shōn, adv., down.
shōn, adj., alive. See *shou-*
mīg.
shōnmīg (-go), cause to
 ride.
shōnmīg, v. intr., live: *shōn*.
 alive.
shōnōn, n., month July
 August.
shōnshīros, n., Saturday.
shōrdār, adj., clever (Urdu.
sārdār, chief, etc.).
shōrū, n., hailstone.
shōthēāmīg, v. tr., throw

(Panjabi. *sāffpā*): *mēsāū*
 —, pour.
shōz, adj., ripe: *ma* — unripe.
shpāy, n., kick of horse:
 — *cilēāmīg* or *kēmīg*.
 v. tr., kick.
shpōy, n., flea.
shpōn, n., shoe.
shpānmīg, v. tr., wean (acc.
 of *khērōn*, milk).
shī, n., red pine. Pinus longi-
 folia; i. q. *tsil*.
shīn, n., trap for rats.
shīy, n., breast.
shū, n., god: *kim* —, house-
 god: — *kōthī*, temple.
shub, n., foam, froth, bubble.
shūī lonmīg, v. intr., whistle.
shukārōn, n., Friday.
shūm, adj., three: *shūmē*.
 third: *shūm nīzā*, sixty.
 The numbers 61-79, -
nīzā id to — — *sōzyūī*,
 are formed like 41 51.
 see under *nīsh nīzā*.
 Ordinals are formed by
 adding *ē*. *nīzā* changes
ā to *ē*.
shūm rā, 300: *rāv*, 300th
shūmmīg (-bo), slaughter,
 butcher (animals): *zēd*
shūbtseu, butcher.
shūnmīg, v. tr., finish.
shūpā, n., evening.
shūpānūts, n., dwarf.
shūpēlōn, n., twilight.
shūpūth, n., butterfly.

- shūr*, n., *Juniperus excelsa*.
shūvĕnmig', v. intr., turn, eddy.
shūrōs, adv., quickly.
shutōñ, n., a kind of liquor.
shwikh' (*g'*), adj., red.
shyā, n., game, meat.
shyag', n., *Betula utilis*.
shyāl, n., fox.
shyarē, adj. : fem. of *shyarō*.
shyarō, adj., beautiful.
sāt, n., ink.
sigūl', adj., eleven : *sigūl'*, eleventh.
sirī bācān, Brahman's reply to salutation.
sīrvōū, n., artery, vein.
sīso, n., glass : *sīso sa* *dwārvōū*, window. See *tsīso*.
sītĕnmig', v. intr., be cooked.
sitōñ, n., wax for candles.
sitōñ, n., furrow.
skud', n., language, noise : — *tōnmig'*, shout, scream.
skau, n., vegetable.
skar(h), *skaro*, n., star : *roĕñ skar*, evening star : *sañ skar*, morning star.
skar, n., thirst (including desire to smoke).
skarmig', v. intr., be thirsty (including desire to smoke).
skaro, see *skar(h)*.
skūn, n., kind of deer (called in Kōci *āskūn*).
skolī, n., urine of man, dog, horse, bird : — *shĕnmig'*, urinate.
skolmig', v. tr., change.
skrapshimig', i.q. *krapsheimig'*.
skāmig', v. tr., comb.
skānmig' (*-mo*), v. tr., put to sleep.
skyō, i.q. *kyō*.
sōclī, adj., true (Hindi, *sācā*).
sōla, adv., always.
sōdlh, n., cold.
sōkĕnmig', v. intr., be able (Hindi, *sāknā*).
sōko, n., scorpion.
sokoñ, earring.
sōllōs, adj., level, straight.
solo', n., half ser.
sōlts, n., tree when it is of the height of a man.
sōm, n., morning.
sōmādroū, n., river.
sōmzāyamig', v. tr., explain (Hindi, *sāmjhānā*).
sōmzĕāmig', v. tr., understand (Hindu, *sāmjhānā*).
sōñ, suffix meaning two (used with pronouns).
sōñā, fifteen : *sōñāṅ*, fifteenth.
sōnāriē, n., fem. of *sōnārōs*.
sōnārōs, n., goldsmith.
sōnāyyā, n., friend.
sōndūk, n., box (wooden).
sōnish, adj., twelve : *sōnish'*, twelfth.
sōniñ, n., basket ('*kīlta*').

- sūnoū*, n., shade.
sonyāṁ, n., ahims.
s̄rai, adj., eighteen : *s̄raiṁ*,
 eighteenth.
s̄rgoū, n., heaven.
s̄rm, n., shame : *s̄rmēṁmīg*,
s̄rmēṁshimīg, v. intr., be
 ashamed.
sormīg, v. tr. break (thread,
 string).
sorom, n., large tank.
sortsuyā mīg, v. tr., reconcile.
s̄ruy (*l'*), adj., sixteen :
s̄ruyṁ, sixteenth.
s̄rūṁ, adj., thirteen : *s̄rūṁṁ*,
 thirteenth.
s̄sta, adj., cheap.
s̄tarts, n., wild cat.
s̄ts, adj., true (Hindi, *s̄ce*).
s̄zgāṁ, adj., nineteen : *s̄zgāṁṁ*,
 nineteenth.
spulmīg, v. tr., change.
spunmīg, v. tr., press down
 (used of demon in night-
 mare).
spiṁmīg, see *piṁmīg*.
spīṁhā, see *pīṁhā*.
sprāshimīg, v. intr., wrestle.
sprēd, adj., level.
sprūmīg, v. tr., wrap.
sprūss, see *prūss*.
spū, n., fine hair on body or
 clothes. See *mīg*.
spyūṁmīg, see *pyūṁmīg*.
stāg, n., pus.
stamīg (*-mō*), v. intr., give
 forth smell.
- stēm*, see *tēm*.
stēmīg, v. tr., knead.
stēn, see *tēn*.
stil(h), see *til(h)*.
stil(h), n., ice, perpetual snow.
stish, see *lish*.
stō, see *tō*.
stokol tū, n., wave.
stōū, prep., up to.
stos uṁmīg, see *tos*.
stos stos, see *tos*.
stosmīg, see *tosmīg*.
stub bon, n., handful in one
 closed hand.
stū ṁmā, n., amulet.
stuṁmīg, v. tr., give milk
 (mother to child).
stū ṁmīg, v. tr., push.
sūāmīg, v. tr., spoil : *suāshi-*
mīg, get spoiled, wither.
sūārēṁmīg, v. tr., mend.
sūārōṁ, n., Monday.
suāshimīg, see *suāmīg*.
sūkh z̄ṁy, adj., happy.
sūkhī rō, reply of Kānet to
 salutation from man of
 lower caste (Hindi, *sūkhī*
rāhō).
sūkon, n., consolation, ease :
 adj., easy : --- *ranmīg*,
 console.
sūmīg, v. tr., wash.
sūmīg, v. intr., spring up
 (plants).
sūmproū, n., name of a con-
 stellation.
sūncēṁmīg, v. intr., reflect.

- think (Hindi, *sōcnū*): also *sūntsēnniḡ*.
- sāṇḍ*, n., elephant's trunk.
- sāūros*, n., pig: *bōṇiūū* —, wild pig.
- sūntsēnniḡ*, i. q. *sāncēnniḡ*.
- sarkh*, adj., sour.
- sārō*, n., thorny plant with cone and poisonous seed.
- sarts*, n., Hippophæ rhamnoides and salicifolia.
- sārūṅ*, n., tunnel: *sārūṅos* *pushniḡ*, blast (v. tr.).
- sūshiniḡ*, v. intr., wash oneself. See *sūniḡ*.
- sāsmiḡ*, v. intr., dry up: crumble (of inside of tree).
- sāst*, adj., lazy.
- sāth*, n., dried ginger.
- sathān*, n., Kānaurī trousers.
- sutrāñjī*, n., carpet: — *pōsh* *shēnniḡ*, spread carpet.
- sutt(h)*, n., bug: plur., *sutē*.
- sarī*, n., tailor.
- ta*, adv., indeed (inferential).
- ṭaj*, n., barley.
- tailū*, n., *Juniperus communis* or *Pseudo-sabina*.
- takasiu*, n., tree-frog.
- talgoū*, n., palate, part of top of head (where Hindū lock is).
- tāliāts*, n., key.
- ṭalk(h)*, adj., difficult, hard, tight: n., miser.
- ṭalōn*, n., — *shēnniḡ*, v. tr., patch.
- ṭalōā*, n., leather, hide (cut, incomplete): — *khōṇiḡ*, v. tr., skin.
- ṭāmāth*, n., measure of two to eight sers.
- tāmiḡ*, v. tr., set, place, appoint: *yokpō* —, employ servant: *chān* —, bear child.
- ṭān*, n., ascent: *jikpō* —, steep ascent.
- ṭānā*, n., jewellery.
- ṭānāmā*, adv., then (inferential).
- ṭānniḡ*, v. tr., look.
- ṭānmiḡ*, v. tr., weave (object *gas*, cloth, etc.).
- ṭānmiḡ*, v. intr., ascend: *tīo* —, v. tr., wet, pass through water.
- ṭānniḡ*, see *bānth*.
- tār*, n., wire.
- tārākālī*, n., balance, scales.
- ṭatā*, n., pony.
- tē*, adv., how many? : *ṭestou*, for how long time? See *stou*.
- tē ca* (for *teḡ ca*), see *teḡ*.
- tēor*, adj., ready: — *ṭānniḡ*, prepare.
- teḡ*, adj., big: *tē ca* (for *teḡ ca*), majority.
- tēḡo*, n., grandmother (paternal or maternal).

- tēlōn*, n., oil; — *shēumig*,
 v. tr., oil.
tēm, n., daughter-in-law.
temmig, v. tr., press.
tēn, n., memento, gift.
tēñēs, prep., on behalf of, for
 sake of.
tē pīrōñ, n., smallpox.
tēpōñ, n., hat; *pōrññ* —
 small Kānaurī cap.
tērōñ, adv., when? ever;
 — *ma*, never; — *tērōñ*,
tēsterōñ, sometimes.
terōññ, adv., when.
tēsterōñ, see *terōñ*.
testōñ, see *tē*.
tētē, n., grandfather (paternal
 or maternal).
tetrī, adv., how much or
 many?
tetrīññ, how many soever,
 as many.
tha, adv., not (used with
 imperative).
thach, n., sheepfold.
thāgāyannig, v. tr., cheat out
 of money (Hindi. *thāgnā*).
thāy, n., Tibetan character
 in holy books.
thakpā, n., rope: — *boshmig*,
 wind or twist rope.
thākār, n., praying-wheel.
thālōs, adj., old.
thāmgon, n., wooden pillar.
thamsiñ, n., adj., darkness,
 dark.
tham, n., price of labour, hire.
- thāñ tī*, n., tea-water with
 leaves extracted.
thāñmig, v. tr., sacrifice
 (bread, etc.) to evil spirit
 for recovery of sick child
 or other object.
thāñmig, v. tr., feel, touch.
thāññōñ, n., ice, perpetual
 snow.
thāññtī, n., verandah.
thapēro, n., slap: — *cīlēñmig*,
 v. tr., slap.
thar, n., hyena.
tharā, n., forced and unpaid
 labour (one month in year).
tharmig, v. intr., push one's
 way on.
thasmig, v., hear, listen.
thāñē, n., jest: — *lanmig*,
 mock.
the, pron., what? *thediññ*,
 whatever, what.
Thēhorskud, n., Kānaurī
 dialect, spoken in Upper
 Kanaur, in the district
 covered by the villages
 Lippā, Āsrāñ, Kāñām,
 Labrāñ, Shūmmām, Shāsō.
 up to the Tibetan area.
thēllots, n., teetotum.
thī ma, pron., nothing.
thīg, adj., sweet.
thīklāpts, n., child, bigger
 than *ayīññ* (T.R.).
thīsmig, v. tr., beat, strike.
thīss, adj., wet.
thō(h), n., charcoal, cinder.

- thó*,¹ pron., what? *thódũ̀na*, whatever, what. See *the*.
thól(h), n., hill.
thõmig, v. tr., pick up (said of bird), pluck (e.g. vegetables).
thõmig, v. tr., untie, i.q. *thõrmig*.
thõnmig (-go), v. tr., roll up (bedding); take down (bridge, load).
thõnmig, v. tr., fold: *cuprĩ* —, become wrinkled.
thõñöl, n., heel.
thõrmig, v. tr., untie, i.q. *thõmig*.
thõskõ, adv., up.
thõsh bãn, n., *Desmodium floribundum* or *concinnum*, i.q. *mõs*.
thõpẽamig, v. tr., vaccinate.
thõtsĩ, adv., most: — *dãm* or *dẽbãsh*, best: — *ma*, pron., nothing.
thũ, adv., why?
thũcũ, adj., upper.
thũd. thũg, adv., up.
thũllu, adj., without hands.
thũm, n., arms: *thũmo*, in one's arms.
thum, n., *Fraxinus xanthoxyloides*.
thũmbã, n., brass vessel.
thũmmũ, n., metal spoon.
thupõn, n., saliva: — *phĩkũamig*, spit.
tĩ, n., water, rain, juice, sap; *tĩõ bibĩ shĩmig*, be drowned; *tĩũ dẽn tõshimig* or *bĩmig*, float: *tĩ lãnmeĩs*, rainbow; *rõn tĩ*, very gently flowing water: *stõkol tĩ*, wave: *chal tĩ*, whitewash; *thũn tĩ*, tea-water with leaves extracted. See *mig*.
tig, n., partridge.
tĩl(h), n., gum (in mouth).
tĩlmig, see *chõs pothĩ*.
tĩniũ, n., smoke-hole in roof.
tĩntã, n., kind of grain.
tĩplõkth, n., frog.
tĩpõl(h), n., blister.
tĩsh, adj., seven; *tĩshõ*, seventh: *tĩsh rã*, 700: — *rãõ*, 700th.
tĩshãm, n., slug: *gato* —, leech.
tĩthõv, n., pilgrimage.
tĩtsik mĩtsik lanmig or *shẽnnig*, excommunicate.
tõ, n., face.
to, v., is (3 s. of *toq*, am), with verbal noun *tõ*, means, has to, is necessary.
tõb, adj., correct.
tõd, n., disease, illness: *kriũ tõd*, fever.
toq, v., am.
toke, see *tokeq*.
tokeq, v., was (3 s. *toke*), with verbal noun, means had to, was necessary.

- tokhyāmīf.* v. tr., throw stones at house.
toks. n., edge.
ṭokṭokyāmīf. v. tr., knock, peek at.
tol. n., weight heaviness.
tolēāmīf. v. tr., weigh.
tōliū. adv., this year.
tōḷb. n., pay.
tōmākā. n., tobacco.
tōmāsho. n., fun.
tombuā. n., tent.
ṭomou. n., division.
toū. prep., up to, i. q. *stoū.*
ṭoṃsāmīf. v. intr., groan.
tōnkā. n., pay.
tonmīf. v. tr., take out, dismiss, bring down (= Hindi. *ṭtārṇā*), pluck (flower): *skad* —, shriek, scream.
tonmīf. v. tr., beat, strike;
tonmīf. v. tr., open: *toū-shēs*, open.
tonmīf (-go) v. tr., break.
tōnmīf. v. intr., be ill.
ṭonmīf. v. tr., massage.
toūnoū. n., balcony.
ṭonō. adj., deaf.
torēnmīf. v. intr., cross, cross over (Hindi, *tārṇā*).
torō. adv., to-day.
torou. n., bridge: *thakpo* —, rope bridge: *ronū tārū* —, wire bridge.
tos. see *tosmīf.*
tōshīmīf. v. intr., sit, remain: *cām oreāmna* —, be silent.
tosildār. n.: fem. *tōsildārū.*
tāhsildār.
tosmīf. v. intr., be anxious (especially on account of absent person), *tos uīmīf.* become so anxious: *tos tos*, anxious.
totā shēnmīf. v. tr., dismiss, exile.
tōtā. n., parrot.
tōthī. n., iron vessel.
tōts. n., fir-tree cone.
trōmou. n., copper.
-ts. suffix added to nouns to give diminutive sense; *chan*, boy; *chauts*, small boy.
-ts. suffix meaning from. *hojon*, here: *hojonts*, hence.
tsabrea. n., a kind of rhododendron.
tsādār. n., blanket, shawl.
tsadk(h). n., light: *tsadkh ray*, *tsa ray*, mica.
tsālēnmīf. v. intr., flow (Hindi, *cālū*).
tsaliā. n., maize (Pahari, *chālī*).
tsalmīf. v., reflect, think, consider.
tsam. n., wool, fleece: *mīf*
tsām. eyebrows, eyelashes.
tsāmūk(h). n., whip, lash: *tsāmūk cālēmīf.* flog.
tsaū. n., moss.

- tsāñ bōñ ā*, n., everlasting
(a flower).
tsāt, n., lodging.
tsē, tseā, i.q. *sē. seat*.
tsēl, adj., all.
tsēla, n., disciple.
tsēmniḡ, v. tr., sew.
tsērniḡ, v. tr., tear.
tshā, n., salt; — *rag* (*tsa ?*
see *tsalk*). mica: — *pā*,
salt merchant: *tshārōn*,
salt trough.
tshabroñ, tshapróñ, n., roof
of wood, stone, or slate.
tshāl, n., violently flowing
water.
tshalē, n., borax; — *pā*,
— merchant.
tshalshī, n., straw.
tshāniḡ, v. tr., light (T.R.).
tshamm, n., bridge: — *lan-*
niḡ, build bridge.
tshanī, n., thatched temporary
hut in fields.
tsharēāniḡ, v. tr., leave,
divorce (Hindi, *chōṇā*).
tsharmī, n., autumn.
tsharmiḡ, v. tr. and intr.,
dry.
tshars, adj., dry.
tshēmār, n., lizard.
tshēniñ, n., chisel (T.R.).
tshēmniḡ, v. tr., pluck
(vegetables, etc.) (T.R.).
tshērēp, adj., adv., little, a
little.
tshēshfā (Th.), n., plait of hair.
- tshēmī*, n., woman.
tshētshāts, n., girl.
tshirkyāniḡ, tshif — v. tr.,
cord cotton.
tshikī, n., carding instru-
ment.
tshifkyāniḡ, i.q. *tshirkyā-*
niḡ.
tshitsho, n., white mud; —
shēniḡ, plaster, white
mud, whitewash.
tshō, n., perpetual snow.
tshobo, tshop, adj., little
(latter word probably
tshob).
tshōñ, n., trade.
tshōñpā, n., trader.
tshōrēāniḡ, v. tr., leave.
See *tsharēāniḡ*.
tshōs, adj., fat.
tshū, n., handle of whip.
tshūlmiḡ, v. intr., bark (dog).
tshūniḡ, v. tr., bind, tie.
tshūtēāniḡ, v. tr., set free.
tshuwāniḡ, v. tr., leave
(T.R.).
tšif, n., joint (in bones);
pratsā — knuckle.
tsikār, n., mud, mire (Pan-
jabi, *cikkār*; Hindi, *kicār*).
tsil, n., red pine, *Pinus longi-*
folia.
tsil(h), n., marrow.
tsilīm, n., huqqa.
tsimfā, n., tongs (Hindi,
cimṭa).
tsindriñ, n., wick.

- tsiniñ lanmīg*, v. tr., recog-
nize.
tsīsō, n., mirror, glass. See
sīsō.
tsō(h), n., thorn, brier; *tsōshō*
(thornberry), blackberry;
tsōbōthōñ (T.R.), raspberry.
tsō, suffix apparently having
idea of place, added to
words indicating place or
building. e.g. *kin* —,
house: *ruñ* —, mountain:
bōñiñ —, jungle: *shēñnoñ*
—, hut in fields.
tsōcōñ, n., wart, corn (on
foot, hand).
tsōkōs, adj., sharp: — *lē sea*
(sharp-tongued), talkative.
tsōkōs, adj., safe: — *lanmīg*,
keep safe.
tsōkōsōs, adj., safe: — *tāmīg*,
keep safe.
tsōlī, n., jacket.
tsōlū, n., long cotton coat.
tsom ketseu ruḡ, stone mag-
net: *tsom ketseu ron*, iron
magnet.
tsouē mā, adv., never.
tsūñē, n., gram (Hindi. *cāñā*).
tsoumīg, v. tr., stretch,
extend.
tsoumīg (-*go*), shave (*krā*,
hair).
tsoutī, adv., jestingly, falsely
(T.R.).
tsopron, n., butter.
tsōr, n., fence.
- tsoruedur* n., groom.
tsōshō, see *tsō*.
tsōl(h), n., wound.
tsōtrūñ, n., thorny plant.
Berberis aristata.
tsōyo, n., nettle.
tsū, n., cough.
tsōkshimīg, v. intr., commit
adultery. See *tsūñmīg*.
tsōlin, n., hump of bull.
tsūñ pālūñts, n., nurse (T.R.).
tsūñmīg, v. intr., cough.
tsūmmīg, v. tr., seize, catch,
embrace.
tsūmshimīg, v., embrace one
another, go to law.
tsuno, n., lime for building.
tsūñmīg (-*go*), v. tr., insert
(e.g. pole in ground, etc.):
rūd —, cup, bleed:
poshpon —, kneel. See
tsōkshimīg.
tsūrmīg, v. tr., milk, with
acc. of 'milk' or 'cow'.
tsū! kon, adv., quietly,
silently (T.R.).
tsūts(h), n., hook.
tūñ sapos, n., worm.
tūñlū shūñb, n., scabbard.
tūñḡ lamā, n., head lama
(celibate).
tūñākh, n., gum.
tūñāl(h), n., kind of very tall
grass.
tūḡ, six: *tūḡḡ*, sixth: *tūḡrā*,
600: *tūḡrāv*, 600th.
tūkrūts, n., piece.

- tūktōkyāmīg'*, v. tr., knock, peck at, i.q. *tōktōkyāmīg'*.
tāmīg' (*tāo-*), v. tr. and intr., swell, squeeze out (with object of thing squeezed or thing squeezed out).
tummīg' (*-bo*), v. tr., stick to, attach to (Hindi, *lāgānā*): also intr., stick, be attached, be caught (of disease), be contagious.
tūṅḍān, adj., without hands.
tuṅmīg', v. tr., drink, smoke: *tuṅ ranmīg'*, give to drink. See *kōsh*.
tunōn, n., lip.
tupcimīg', v. intr., be attached, stick, be caught (disease), be contagious: *khoyōn* —, get rusty: *tñpēideu*, *tñpēitsea*, sticky, contagious (disease).
tūr. tūro, n., adj., dark, darkness.
tūroṅ, n., log (one man's load).
tūr pēāts, n. (for *tūr pyāts*, darkness-bird), bat (animal).
tūstās, n., like wild fig, *Viburnum catinifolium*, i.q. *khātēbs*.
tūtlā, n., stammerer.
tuyāmīg', v. tr., appoint (day) (T.R.).
tyōn, adj., more; — *zāzeā*, glutton. See *zāmīg'*.
ū, n., flower.
ūkhyān, n., a fair held in September.
ūncimīg', v. tr., beg.
unmīg', v. tr., take.
unnīg', v. tr., beg. See *ūncimīg'*.
urts, n., box for grain.
ūshk, adj., old.
ūshterzāmīg', v. tr., complain of.
ūt, n., camel.
ūth, n., brooch.
ūtpāṅ, n., fine not inflicted by court but collected by village headman.
wā, n., den, nest.
wāmōn, adj., mistaken, wrong, upside down.
wāmthām, adj., absurd.
wāṅḍa, n., climbing plant, with strongly scented flowers.
wānnīg', v. intr., laugh: *wān shēnnīg'*, amuse.
wāntōn, n., child's swing: — *yōcimīg'*, v. intr., swing oneself.
war(h), n., kind of deer (called in Kōci *bērd*).
wark, adv., adj., far, distant.
wās, n., honey; — *yāūth*, bee.
wasab, n., small plant.
wāso, n., room of house.

- yabcēn*, n., stirrup (T.R.).
yad, n., memory.
yagf, n., yak.
yal, n., wild rose. *Rosa moschata*.
yalmiḡ, v. intr., get tired :
yal yal, weary.
yamniḡ, v. intr., fly : *yam*
shēniḡf, cause to fly.
yau, n., old age : — *zeu*, old
man : — *zē*, old woman.
yāñ, *yāñth*, n., fly, bee :
kim yāñ, house-fly : *waś*
yāñth, bee.
yāñlāks, n., shawl.
yāniḡ, v. intr., sleep.
yanniḡ, v. intr., waken :
yau yau, *yāñshēs*, awake.
yāñshēs, see *yanniḡ*.
yāñth, see *yāñ*.
yānyau, see *yanniḡ*.
yar, adj., other.
yārbahō, n., paramour (man
or woman)(T.R.). See *zār*.
yob, n., time, in three times,
four times, etc.
yōcimiḡ, v. intr., play.
yōcē, adj., law.
yokpō, n., servant.
yōlīñ, n., twin.
yōniḡ, v. tr., nourish, rear.
yōškō, *yūwā*, *yāḡf*, adv., down.
yūdāl, n., a barley drink
(*ā* almost *ū*).
yūḡf, see *yōškō*.
yūm(h), n., a Tibetan holy
book.
- yamē*, n., mother-in-law.
yauēḡf, n., sun.
yāniḡf, v., go, walk :
yāñō, on foot.
yāñniḡ (-*do*), v. tr., grind
corn.
yāñniḡf (-*ḡo*), v. tr., brush
(with hand or brush).
yāñō, see *yāñniḡf*.
yāñhōñ, adv., beneath below.
zā, n., palsy : *zāseu*, man
with palsy.
zābāb, n., reply.
zacos, n., centipede.
zāḡo, n., place, space.
zakhḡā, *zokhḡā*, n., friend,
friendship : — *kāshimiḡf*,
invite one another to food.
zakon, adj., right (not left) :
— *kō*. — *kacōñ*, to the
right.
zālōrā, n., Hindu water-
carrier.
zāmiḡ, v. tr., eat : *zāmiñ*
raumiḡf, give to eat.
bāriñ zāmiḡf, take a
bribe.
zāñ, n., gold.
zāñchāḡ, n., pilgrimage, in
which the pilgrim covers
the distance measuring his
length on the ground the
whole way : — *lanmiḡf*,
perform such a pilgrimage.
zāngāl, n., jungle.
zau, n., I do not know.

- possibly a Kōcī word, meaning "knows", or may know, with the word "God" understood.
- zānmiḡ*, v. tr., show.
- zār*, n., mistress, concubine.
- zārāb*, n. sock.
- zārārī*, adj., necessary.
- zās*, n., food.
- zāshē*, n., *Lonicera angustifolia*.
- zbe'n*, i.q. *be'n*.
- zbī*, i.q. *bī*. bastard.
- zblōmiḡ*, i.q. *blōmiḡ*.
- zbōrmiḡ*, i.q. *bōrmiḡ*.
- zbōrshimīḡ*, i.q. *bōrshimīḡ*.
- zbyūr*, n., camphor-scented plant (T.R.).
- zdōmiḡ*, i.q. *dōmiḡ*.
- zdoñmiḡ*, i.q. *doñmiḡ*.
- zē*, *zeu*, i.q. *sē*, *sea*, one who does or is connected with.
- zēb*, n., stallion.
- zēd*, n., sheep and goats.
- zērmīḡ*, v. tr., tear.
- zēthvōñ*, n., sickle.
- zḡmiḡ*, v. tr., sight (gun).
- zḡī*, i.q. *ḡī*.
- zḡyūd*, n., mistletoe, *Viscum album* (*ū* almost *ü*).
- zhāñ*, n., heat, summer.
- zḡbāñ*, n., *Abelia triflora*.
- zhḡā*, n., saddle.
- zhōñmiḡ* (-*go*), v. intr., be broken.
- zid*, n., enmity: — *sea*, enemy.
- ziko*, n., *Daphne oleoides*, i.q. *rapēashō*.
- zimādār*, n., farmer.
- zīr*, n., corner.
- zītēnmiḡ*, v. tr., win (Hindi. *jītnā*).
- zō*, adj., adv., most (superlative): *zō dīm*, *zō dēhēsh*, best.
- zō*, n., hybrid yak (male). See *zomo*.
- zōā*, *zochog*, *zom*, n., wooden vessel.
- zōd*, n., corn (for eating).
- zohhyā*, i.q. *zakhhyā*.
- zom*, see *zōā*.
- zōma lōnmiḡ*, v. tr., collect (Urdu, *jāmā*).
- zomo*, n., hybrid yak (female). See *zō*.
- zōmshimīḡ*, v. intr., go together (many people): from *zōma*?
- zōph lōnmiḡ*, v., pray (especially Hindus).
- zōr*, n., strength; — *sea*, strong; — *mā tsea*, *mā zōr sea*, weak.
- zorī*, n., adj., anxiety, anxious: — *hōcimiḡ*, be anxious, become anxious.
- zōrmēñniḡ*, v. intr., be born.
- zorniḡ*, v. intr., rise (sun).
- zōrōp*, *zōpōt*, adv., immediately, suddenly.
- zōtḡe*, n., quarrel.

- zããā*, n., heart (Hindi, *jī*);
lamgids zããā sea, irrit-
 able.
zakyāmij, v. tr., shake; *bāl*
 —, nod.
zãl(h), n., lichen.
zãmrëa, n., one of musician
 caste.
zãmroñik (-gʷ), female of
zãmrëa, caste.
zãngā, n., earthquake.
- zũnlëāmij*, v. tr.: *zãnlënnij*,
 v. intr., shake, swing.
zãnmijʷ (-lo), v. tr., like
 (person, food).
zãñmijʷ (-go), v., begin.
zũprë, n., crease, wrinkle:
 — *thoñmijʷ*, become
 wrinkled.
zãrgoi, n., fever.
zũshimijʷ, v. ref., like one
 another. See *zãnmijʷ*.

A

B

2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26

Handwritten text in column A, consisting of approximately 26 lines of script. The text is highly stylized and appears to be in an ancient script, possibly Myazedi. The characters are dark and somewhat obscured by the texture of the original document.

2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28

Handwritten text in column B, consisting of approximately 28 lines of script. Similar to column A, the text is in an ancient script. There are some dark, irregular patches in the lower half of the column, possibly due to damage or ink bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.

A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF THE FOURTH TEXT OF
THE MYAZEDI INSCRIPTIONS

BY C. O. BLAGDEN

HAVING dealt in *JRAS.*, October, 1909, and July, 1910, with the Talaing text of the inscriptions of the Myazedi pagoda at Pagan (Burma), I propose to offer a few suggestions here upon the hitherto undeciphered fourth text of this polyglot record. This text, like each of the others, exists in two copies, on two separate pillars. On the one it measures about 39½ by 13 inches, on the other about 45½ by 11 to 12 inches. I shall call the former A, the latter B, when a distinction has to be made between them. The script is an old form of the Indian alphabet.

I have to thank M. L. Finot and Mr. Taw Sein Ko for valuable assistance in dealing with this text. The former lent me two photographs and an estampage of it, the latter also furnished me with photographs and estampages, both of this text and of others which might throw some light upon it. Each also gave me useful hints and information, for which I am much indebted to them.

I am informed that this text has puzzled a good many people, and that a number of views have been held as to the language in which it is written. It has variously been conjectured to be in some old form either of Assamese, Tibetan, Cambodian, or Shan. These suggestions appear to have been purely hypothetical: they are certainly not confirmed by the internal evidence of the document itself. It did not seem to be practicable to make a start by attempting to identify the language of the text, there being too many languages that might conceivably have been used for epigraphic purposes on this occasion. Yet, as a matter of fact, one circumstance that made the inscription the more mysterious and interesting was just

this, that apart from Pāli, Burmese, Talaing, and Sanskrit, no language was known to me as having been so used in Burma about this time: and it was certainly none of these, so that all *a priori* theories were necessarily of the vaguest kind.

My own method has been to study the text itself, in both copies, compare it with the parallel versions and endeavour to analyse it as far as possible. It seemed to me that when this process had determined a certain number of words and thrown some light on the structure of the unknown language, there would be a reasonable chance of identifying it, supposing that it still existed. For one must not lose sight of the possibility that in the eight centuries or so which have elapsed since the engraving of this record the language may have become absolutely extinct, leaving no direct descendant or closely related collateral to represent it. In that case, unless further material for its study is made available, it does not seem likely that a complete analysis of this short record can ever be made. If, on the other hand, the language has survived in some modern form, a careful comparison of it with our text will probably (as in the case of the Burmese and Talaing versions) succeed in solving all or nearly all the problems presented by this inscription.

The script being Indian and the parallel versions containing a number of proper names and Indian loanwords, there was no lack of clues to help towards the reading of the alphabet: and the first step was to pick them out and thus identify as many of the letters as could be determined in that way. A first glance at the A text brought out two leading facts: one, the very frequent use of symbols resembling the *visarga*; and *anusvāra*¹ (and also

¹ Sometimes written on the right of the character, when by reason of the presence of vowel symbols there is no room for it on the top. A similar reason appears to account for ² (but there is apparently one case of ³).

a subscript form of anusvāra $\underset{\circ}{\text{v}}$ and various combinations of these, $\underset{\circ}{\text{v}}$, $\underset{\circ}{\text{g}}$, and $\underset{\circ}{\text{g}}$); the other, the division of the text into clauses by marks of punctuation |; similar to those of the other versions, and also in some cases by a simple stroke |, which is not, as has sometimes been supposed (e.g. in Haswell's *Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary of the Peguan Language*, 2nd ed., p. 12), a modern invention, but quite a common feature in the Talaing inscriptions of this period. Next a comparison with the other versions of the Myazedi record brought out the proper names and some of the loanwords which are common, *mutatis mutandis*, to all or more than one of them. They are the following¹:—

FOURTH TEXT (A).	OTHER TEXTS.
1. 2 ² . Rmadhanabū	Arimaddanapur
8. Sri Tribhuvanādī ³ tyadhama- maraja	Śrī Tribhuwanādityadham- marāj
4. Triḷogavādasagadeṽjī	Trilokawaṭaṃsakāḍewī
4, 6, 8, 18, 22. Rajagunna	Rājakumār
15. mahaṭhe	mahāther
Mūgaḷubūdadisaṭhe	Muggaliputtatissatther
Sūmedhabadī ⁴	Sumedhapandit
16. Vrahmaba	Brahmapāl
Vradeyo ⁴	Brahmadiw
Sū	Son
17. Sagarasiyarabadi ³	Saṅghasenawarapaṇḍit

¹ The forms in the first column are transliterated to the best of my ability, having regard to the shapes and probable values of the letters. Those in the second column are taken from one of the other versions, usually the Burmese, as spelt therein and transliterated (except that I here write *v* instead of *r*) in the ordinary way, without any reference to the modern peculiarities of Burmese or Talaing pronunciation. I leave the visarga and anusvāra symbols (and their variants and combinations) in their original shapes for the present.

² The line-references throughout are to A unless otherwise stated.

³ The engraver forgot the *Sū* and put it in afterwards below the line, adding a small cross to mark its proper place.

⁴ A mistake for *Vrahmadeyo*²: *v. infra*.

FOURTH TEXT (A).	OTHER TEXTS.
l. 20. Samanaḷō: ¹	Sakmunalon
Rabai	Rapāy
[?̣ivūḥ	Henbuiw
23. saveñodeñe	sarwvañutañān
breñe	prajñā
26. Medeya	Metteya

I need not detail the various steps by which these words were identified: of course it was not all done at once, but these were the points to which inquiry was first directed, and their identification produced a goodly array of letters of the alphabet. In l. 26 the two words preceding *Medeya* were presently recognized as *Ḃāḷha Ari* (i.e. *Buddha Ariya*, in the Burmese text *Ari*), thus discovering two more letters, a new *b*² (oblong in shape, rather like the other *b*, but with a cross-bar), evidently related to and perhaps borrowed from the Talaing *b*, and an initial *a* (a most archaic form, closely resembling the *a* of the fourth century Vengi script) which apparently does not occur elsewhere in our text.

The variants of the above words presented by the B text are curious and instructive. They are: (B) l. 3, Triḷogavadasagadeḷi; l. 15, mhaṭhe, Mūgaḷubūdiḥsaṭhe; l. 16, Saumedhahadi, Vrahmadeyo; l. 20, Samanaḷō, and l. 21, Jiḥvū (or, possibly, Ji vū).

Before attempting to decipher any more of the text I think it will be as well to set out in tabular form the letters thus identified, together with their equivalents in the other versions and their probable phonetic values in this text.

¹ The *o* has a hook on the top turning to the right, the force of which I do not know: it looks like *o + aa*, an improbable combination; perhaps it is meant to denote *ō* (or *ā*?).

² I distinguish it conventionally by a dot underneath, as I have previously done in the case of the Talaing equivalent.

APPARENT PALEO- GRAPHICAL VALUES.	CORRESPONDING LETTERS OF OTHER VERSIONS.	PROBABLE PHONETIC VALUES.
I. Consonants.		
g	k, (gg), (ngh)	k
j	j, h	j (and ś ?)
ñ	ñ, (jñ)	ñ
ṭh	th, (tth)	th
t	t	t
ḍ	ṭ, (ṇḍ), t, (tt), d	t, ḍ
ḍh	dh, (ḍdh), (dd)	ḍh
n	n	n
b	p	p
bh	bh	bh
m	m, (mm), (km)	m
y	y, (eyo = iw)	y
r	r, (ar)	r
v	v (Pāli), w, (rww), b, (nb)	v (or w ?), b
s	ś, s, (ss), (ṃs)	s
h	h	h
l	l	l
ḷ	b, p	b (or p ?)
II. Vowels.		
a (initial)	a	a
a (inherent)	a, (aṃ), (ak), (aṅ), (aṇ), (at), (ad), (am), ¹ ā, u	a
i	i, (it), ī, (īya), (en), (ena)	i (and ī ?)
u	u, i	u
ū	u, (ug), (ut), (ud), (ur), (uiw), (on)	ū
e	e, (et), (en), (er), a, (aj), ā, (āṇ), (eyo = iw)	e
o	o, u, (eyo = iw)	o
ō (?)	(on)	ō (?)
ai	āy	ai
au	u	ū (?)

¹ These and some of the other groups in parentheses are of course alternatives to some of the double letters similarly grouped in the first

I shall not attempt to discuss in detail the palæographical characteristics of the script. I have compared it with the various forms of the Indian alphabet given in Holle's *Tabel van Oud- en Nieuw-Indische Alphabetten* (Batavia, 1882) and with a good many Indian inscriptions without finding anything quite like it. But I am struck with its extremely archaic character, especially as regards the letters *dh*, *b*, initial *a*, and subscript *y*. This fact was also pointed out to me by M. Finot, who drew my particular attention to the last-named letter, which in its anchor-shaped form (he informs me) is characteristic of the early period of the Indian alphabet, up to *circa* 350 A.D. and is quite exceptional in an inscription of *circa* 1100 A.D. It appears further from the table of letters just given (1) that the letters are not used consistently but interchangeably, so that it looks as if the traditions of correct spelling had almost died out, (2) that there is a tendency to use the sonants as surds,¹ from which it may perhaps be inferred that the language had had time since its first acquisition of this alphabet to suffer considerable phonetic changes, some of its original sonants having become surds.²

In view of all these facts I think it may reasonably be inferred that this script had been in use for several centuries for writing this particular language and that the people who wrote and spoke it had an ancient but

part of the Table. The object in displaying them thus is to draw attention to the peculiar phonetic character of the language pointed out *infra*.

¹ I am not quite sure that the letter I have rendered *d* may not (in some cases, at any rate) be *l*.

² Or, alternatively, that the language of our text derived its alphabet not direct from India, but through a language in which this phenomenon had occurred. In Talaing similar changes have taken place; but whether they can be dated as far back as some centuries before the date of this inscription is a question that needs further inquiry. In any case the form of this alphabet is much more archaic than the contemporary Talaing.

rather decaying civilization (of Indian origin, like all the civilization of western Indo-China) and lived in some little backwater of their own rather outside the main current of progress and change. It also seems to follow that the language of these people (1) did not draw a very clear distinction between long and short vowels, (2) did not tolerate closed syllables at all, and therefore objected to final consonants and also such medial combinations as *km*, *ugh*, *ud*,¹ etc., and doubled consonants such as *mm*, *ss*, but (3) allowed combinations beginning a syllable, if they were of the type *ty*, *tr*, *br* (= *pr*), *rr* (= *br*),² and (4) tended (like the languages of Indo-China in general) to abbreviate long Indian words by cutting off the last syllable. These facts, so far as they may be confirmed by the rest of the record, when ultimately deciphered in its entirety, must be taken into account in any speculation that may be made as to the identity of the language.

Going back now to the beginning of the text and applying these ascertained results, we find the Indian word *siri*, "prosperity," occurring near the beginning of l. 1. The name of Buddha does not occur close to it, as it does in the Burmese and Talaing versions, but instead of it is a group which appears to read *Dathayūda*, for Tathāgata, a title of the Buddha. The second letter, conjecturally recognized as *th* by its characteristic form, will be found confirmed later on. The word *Būdhā*, however, occurs *passim* in the text with reference to the Buddha-statue which the prince Rājakumār made. It will be found in ll. 10 (twice), 11, and 22; and in l. 19

¹ Aspirated consonants do not count as two but as one. This may serve to explain the apparent exception *hm* in *Vrahma*-; or it may have sounded *Vrahma*- (cf. the variant spelling *mhathe* for *mahathe*). It is noticeable that even *ñ* and *ṅ* are unrepresented in the language of this text. This goes to show that its anusvāra does not stand for either of these.

² And even *sr* in *Sri*; but this may be merely a conventional way of writing. There are some subscript letters in the text where a vowel *must* be supplied.

occurs *gūdhā*, which I take to be a mistake for the same word (in the variant spelling *Būdhā*).¹ Transliterating the other words that can now be read more or less completely, we find after *Rimadbanabū* in l. 2 a formula of which the first letter is as yet undetermined. It looks rather like an initial *u*.² The vowel over the next letter is evidently a form of *i*, but as it appears to have an extra hook I take it provisionally for *i̇*³ and tentatively read the whole formula as *umī bi̇ si*. The same expression occurs after *Sri Tribhuvānādityaullhamaraja*, the king's name, in l. 3 and in the variant form *bi̇ si umī* after *Trilōyavālasagadevi*, the queen's name, and *Rajaḡama*, the prince's (*vide* ll. 4, 5, 8, 19). Evidently it means something like "(was) named", and consists of two parts, *umī* and *bi̇ si*. (But what is meant by *bi̇ si* alone in l. 14 is not clear, unless it means "exclaimed". It may be a mere expletive.)

As we find the prince's name repeatedly preceded by the formula *mayā u (?) sa* (in ll. 6, 8, 21, where this formula is preceded by a word *bā*?, and in l. 18, where it is not), the natural inference is that this formula means "the queen's son". Testing this, we find that *mayā* precedes the queen's name in l. 3 and *u (?) sa* occurs just before the prince's name in l. 4, where they are respectively introduced. Therefore *mayā* means "queen" or "consort" and is the *mayā* of the Burmese version, the modern Burmese မယော, "wife," and *sa* means "son" and is the Burmese ⁴ *sā*, modern မိသ, and the syntactical order here is the same as in Burmese, but contrary to the Talaing idiom. This conclusion is confirmed by the phrase in l. 24, where we find *gi* (probably to be pronounced *ki*)

¹ B rightly has *Būdhā* here.

² Or initial *i*?

³ Perhaps, however, the hook is merely a prolongation of the left part of the *m*, and the vowel symbol stands for *i*.

⁴ Hereafter, when giving a word in the Roman character and calling it simply Burmese I imply that it occurs in the Burmese text of the Myazedi record.

saḥ with the meaning "my son" or "my child", as the parallel versions require. From this it follows that *gi*, which occurs thrice in this line, means "my" and precedes the noun it qualifies (as in Burmese, not in Talaing), and that in the phrase *mayāḥ u (?) saḥ* the word provisionally read *u* is a possessive affix or particle.

From the analogy of the corresponding Burmese words it also appears highly probable that the visarga symbol is used in this text as a tonal mark: and it seems not unlikely that the Burmese (who did not use it in the parallel version) subsequently borrowed its use as such from the people who spoke the language of our text. This use of the visarga symbol as a tonal mark is confirmed by the proper names in which it occurs. Similarly, the proper names show that the subscript anusvāra can only indicate some slight peculiarity in the pronunciation of a vowel, while a combination of it with an anusvāra symbol placed rather higher and to the right of a letter-group also has some such effect. These are therefore apparently also tonal marks.

We should expect to find a word for "city" somewhere near *Rimadhunabū* in l. 2, and looking for it we find a group which apparently reads *priḥ*. The close analogy of the Burmese *priṅ*, modern ဝြိၣ်, sufficiently confirms this reading, but it is to be noted that the order is different from the Burmese, for the word *priḥ* precedes the proper name instead of following it. Reverting again to l. 24, we see that the word occurring immediately after the second *gi* must be the equivalent of "grandchild" and looks like *pli*, which compares very well with the Burmese *mliy*, modern ငါးလိၣ်, and also confirms the reading *priḥ* above.

Going back now to ll. 20-1, which contain the names of the three villages, *Samutalōe*, *Rabai*, and *[J]i[-]vāḥ*, we see that each is followed by a similar pair of characters, which on the analogy of the Burmese and Talaing versions

may be supposed to mean "village" and "one" respectively, reading the second one *tā*. To test this we look a little further on in l. 21 and find the other character in a phrase which must mean "those three villages of slaves", between a word *tra* and something that looks like *ho*: and looking back at ll. 5, 6, and 12 we see that these same three words have also been used there in the same order and with the same meaning of "three villages of slaves". Therefore the middle one, which may be conjecturally read *o*, though this is a mere guess founded on its shape, must mean "village", and the other two, *tra* and *ho*, must mean "slave" and "three". But which is which? Line 24 tells us that *tra* means "slave", for it occurs there without any of the other words. Therefore *ho* (if that be the right reading) means "three" and may be compared with the Burmese *sañ*, modern ၵ, and *tā* means "one", Burmese *tac*, modern ၵ. Moreover, the language uses the order "slaves villages three", not like the Burmese and Talaing "slaves three villages", and in this respect apparently resembles Chin, Lushai, Miri-Abor (and Kachin, sometimes), but differs from Shan and Karen.

Going back to l. 10 we find a phrase *Bādha u (?) cha¹ bo bradīma tha*. The long word *bradīma* suggests an Indian loanword, and my friend M. Cabaton, to whom I referred it, at once identified it with the Sanskrit *pratimā*, "statue." The natural inference is that *tha* means "golden" and is a loanword from the Talaing *thac*, modern ၵ. Testing this by reference to l. 19, we find *tha* there twice, once after *gādha* (for *Bādha*) and again after a word which must mean "spire". It also occurs in l. 11 after *Bādha* and in l. 13 after *bāṅ hra*. Therefore the word really is *tha* and means "gold" or "golden"; and the language, though it follows

¹ The *ch* is a new letter, conjecturally identified by its characteristic shape, which is not unlike the older Indian forms and the contemporary form in the parallel Burmese and Pali versions.

the Burmese order in putting the possessive before the principal noun, nevertheless agrees with Talaing in putting this descriptive word (which may, however, be regarded as being primarily either noun¹ or adjective, though here used as the latter) after the principal noun. Incidentally this identification also confirms the reading *Dathayāda* in l. 1. The words *chaꝳ bo* may be compared with the Burmese *achañ*, modern အဆင့်, "likeness," "image," and the modern Burmese ဝံ, "shape"; the whole phrase must mean "golden image in the likeness of the Buddha".

Before *gūḍha* [sic] in l. 19 we find what looks like *stabana* (to be pronounced *stapana*), clearly the Sanskrit *sthāpana*, "placing," here with the special meaning of "enshrining" (like the Talaing *thāpanā*). The use of the Sanskrit instead of the Pāli form used by the other versions is quite in harmony with the other archaic characteristics of our text. We need have no hesitation now in identifying *gō* in the same line with the Sanskrit *guhā*, "cave" (i.e. a particular type of pagoda), for this is confirmed by its recurrence in ll. 20 and 22. Clearly also the word for "spire" which follows almost immediately in l. 19 can be read *stau* (probably to be pronounced *stū* or *stu*, cf. *Saumedha* in B), and it would seem to be the Sanskrit *stūpa*. These words are supported by the Pāli version with its *gahañ kañcanathūpikañ*, and thus the reading *stabana* receives corroboration.

Going back to l. 18 we find a phrase of three words which must mean "that having been done", or the like, as the other versions show. The second and third words are *biꝳ tadā*. The inference is that *tadā* is a participle denoting the past tense, and this is confirmed by its occurrence, mostly at the end of clauses and just before punctuation marks, in ll. 5, 7, 18, 20, and 22. We may provisionally assume that *thadā* in l. 2 and *dā* in ll. 9, 14,

¹ Probably primarily a noun : cf. *traꝳ hūꝳ sayha*, infra.

and 21 are mere variants of the same word. The first word of the phrase of three above referred to suggests the meaning "that". Testing this by l. 4 we find that when followed by the possessive affix *u* (?) it means "her". Conjecturally one may compare the Burmese *thuiw*, *thiū*, modern နွီ , and having regard to the form of the letters one may provisionally read the word *dhau*. The consonant agrees well with some of the older forms of *dh* and with the modern Burmese form. The vowel is the same as in *stau* and *Saumedha* (B), and the pronunciation was probably *thā* or *thu*. Anyhow, the use of the word (as appears from ll. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 20) is parallel to that of the Burmese word which resembles it so closely. The word *yā* (ll. 2, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 24, 26) appears also to be a demonstrative and may perhaps be compared with the Burmese *iy*, *īy*, modern ဣ . Both these words precede the nouns they qualify, as in Burmese. In Talaing such words usually follow their nouns.

Another word very frequently used in our text is *bā* ၃, which we find before *mayā* ၃ (ll. 5, 6, 8, 21), before *Bādha* (ll. 9, 10, 11, 26), and preceded by another symbol (possibly to be read *trā* ၃, and in that case apparently identical with the word for "slave")¹ before the names of each of the ecclesiastics mentioned in ll. 14-17, and again in the same combination before what looks like *sayha* ၃ (probably representing *sangha*, "church") in l. 17. The inference is that *bā* ၃ is an honorific prefix or title, meaning "lord" or "lady" as the case may be. It is to be noted that the Burmese version also uses what appears to be an honorific (*paŷ* or *pāŷ*) before its *mayā*, "consort." As

¹ Very possibly "slave" is here used as in Burmese to replace a personal pronoun of the 1st person, so that the combination *trā* ၃ *bā* ၃ would mean "my lord". It must have some such meaning in any case, however arrived at. Note that the syntax is analogous to that of possessive pronouns (which precede) but contrary to that of descriptive words (which follow the principal noun).

² The *gh* is a new letter conjecturally identified by its shape.

this $h\acute{a}3$ in ll. 7 and 13 precedes a word which looks like $td\grave{a}8$ (also occurring in ll. 9 and 17) where a word for "king" must occur, we infer conjecturally that $td\grave{a}8$ means "king". If rightly read, this can only be pronounced with a short indeterminate vowel after the t -, as $td\grave{a}8$ is unpronounceable.¹ Going back to l. 7, we see that the words for "28 years" must be found somewhere between this $td\grave{a}2$, "king," and the $tad\acute{a}$ (past participle) at the end of the clause. Comparing the intervening symbols with the corresponding ones in ll. 1, 2, where equivalent² words must occur, we are forced to the conclusion that $hr\acute{a}$ means "eight" and the word beginning with s and ending with $i3$ means "year". If the subscript letter can be n the word is to be read $sn\grave{i}2$, and we may compare the Burmese *anhuac*, *nhuac*, modern ဆနှစ်, နှစ် . With $hr\acute{a}$, "eight," we may compare the modern Burmese ၇၈ ; but the contemporary Burmese spelling, curiously enough, was *het*. (The Burmese h - must have been almost a palatal sibilant: cf. *Henbuiw* = *Ji^hv^hā^h3*.)

As the word for "death" or "to die" must occur with reference to the king and queen in ll. 5 and 7 respectively, we look for what the clauses have in common and find a word hi , which in l. 5 is immediately followed by $tad\acute{a}$, denoting the past tense. Therefore hi means "to die", and one may compare the Burmese equivalent *siy*, modern ဆိ , which goes some way towards confirming our former equation $ho\dot{}$ = Burmese *sam*, modern သံ . In the clauses which contain the word for "to give" (ll. 5, 6, 12, 13)

¹ It is possible that the subscript anusvāra in this and other such words is the tonal mark of the first, indeterminate, syllable. But as I have at present no means of deciding the point I transcribe them just as I find them.

² Unfortunately it appears that different expressions for "twenty" are used in these two places. Consequently I have not been able to identify either of them with certainty, and cannot be quite sure of the equivalents for 1,000, 6, and 100 which should occur in l. 1.

we find the form *pāḥ* recurring and infer that it means "to give". The Burmese *p'ig*, modern ခဝ်, is apparently a distant relative; and there are somewhat similar equivalents in other languages of the family.

The king's speech in l. 14 gives us a phrase of three words, repeated. This must mean something like "good deed", and the reading appears to be *ha pra cho'*. As the word *pra* appears to recur in l. 23, where a word "deed" or the like must occur, it seems likely that *pra* means "deed". Perhaps one may compare the modern Burmese ခု; but I note that the contemporary forms are *plu* and *plo'* and that in the Burmese version they mean "to make". Here, on the other hand, the word for "to make" appears to be *se* (l. 10, *hī' se kyaḥ(?)*;¹ ll. 11-12, 19, *hī' se*). The syllable *hī'* is found constantly before verbal roots. Thus, besides the cases already quoted (and others as yet unexplained) we have *hī' hi' tadā*, "died" (l. 5), *hī' pāḥ*, "gave" (ll. 5, 6, 12), *hī' stabana*, "enshrined" (l. 19). It would seem that this *hī'* is some sort of verbal auxiliary or prefix. In view of the other words which have proved to be more or less closely related to Burmese equivalents, it is now perhaps legitimate to assume (at any rate provisionally) that *umī* (if rightly so read) is related to the modern Burmese ဘဝဉ်, "name." The old Burmese formula corresponding to *umī hī' si* is *mañ su*, while *mañ e'* corresponds to our *hī' si umī*.

Besides the points of syntax already noted a few more are illustrated by the portions of the text which can now be made out. The direct object generally precedes the verb (as in Burmese: not Talaing, as a rule, though exceptions do occur). Thus, in l. 10 we have *Bādha u chaḥ bo braḥimathatā hī' se kyaḥ(?)*, "made a golden image in the likeness of Buddha." Likewise in l. 6 we

¹ I cannot explain *kya'*, which may be a verbal affix helping out the sense of *se*. The letter *k* is a new one, conjecturally identified as such by its resemblance with old forms in various Indian alphabets.

find *maya*ꣳ *u tra*¹ *tra*ꣳ *o ho*ꣳ *hi*ꣳ *pā*ꣳ *tba*ꣳ *bā*ꣳ *maya*ꣳ *u sa*ꣳ *Rajagumā uvā*, "gave the queen's goods and the three villages of slaves to the queen's son Rājakumār" (see also ll. 5, 12, 23, 26). But there appear to be instances to the contrary in l. 19. It is almost certain that the language, like Burmese but unlike Talaiṅg, uses postpositions for prepositions. This seems to follow from the order of the words in l. 17, where after enumerating the names of the several ecclesiastics the next clause begins *lhou tra*ꣳ *bā*ꣳ *sayha*, "these church dignitaries" (?). The equivalent of "in the presence of" must be found in the words that follow this phrase.² On the whole the syntax comes fairly close to the Burmese without, however, being actually identical with it. The language is largely monosyllabic, and it evidently possessed a fairly developed system of tones, some of which (perhaps all) are indicated in the script by the visarga and anusvāra symbols and their combinations.

At this stage it seems desirable to make a provisional summing up of the results arrived at up to the present. As the language is certainly not Indian, the Indian loanwords can have no bearing on its identity, and I leave them out of count, like the proper names. There then remain the following words (I add a query to such readings or interpretations as seem to me at all doubtful):—

1. *sa*ꣳ = son (Burmese *sā*, modern ဝဝ၈).
2. *maya*ꣳ = wife, consort (Burmese *mayā*, modern ဝဝဝ၈).
3. *hi* = to die, death (Burmese *siy*, modern ငဝ).
4. *hrā* = eight (Burmese *het*, modern ၵၼ).
5. *pā*ꣳ = to give (Burmese *piy*, modern ငဝ၃).
6. *tā* = one (Burmese *tac*, modern ဝ၈).

¹ This *tra* may represent Sanskrit *dravya*, "goods."

² On the other hand there is the curious position of the word *ti* (apparently = "in") between the demonstrative *yā* and the noun *pri*ꣳ. Cf. its use in ll. 23, 24, 26.

7. priɛ (?) = city (Burmese prañ, modern ပြည်).
8. hoʒ(?) = three (Burmese sām, modern သုံး).
9. sniʒ(?) = year (Burmese aṅhae, modern အနှစ်).
10. pli (?) = grandchild (Burmese nliy, modern မြေး).
11. u (?) = possessive affix (? cf. modern Burmese ၏).
12. ḍhau (?) = that, the (? cf. Burmese thuiw, thiw, modern ထို).
13. umī (?) = name, called (?) (? cf. Burmese mañ, modern အမည်).
14. yā (?) = this, that (? cf. Burmese iy, iy, modern ၏).
15. chaʒ(?) = likeness (?) (? cf. Burmese aḥan, modern အဆင်).
16. bo (?) = shape (?) (? cf. modern Burmese ဝံ့).
17. traʒ = slave.
18. gi = my.
19. hā: = honorific prefix or title.
20. o (?) = village.
21. tad^o, thad^o (?), dā (?) = past auxiliary or participle.
22. td^oʒ (?) = king.
23. ha pra (?) choʒ(?) = good deed (?).
24. se = to make (?).
25. hī^o = verbal prefix (?).
26. tha = gold, golden (Talaing thar, modern ထင်).

A large proportion of this list of words is related to Burmese. In the first few words on the list the relationship appears to me to be quite certain, in other cases it is at least probable. There should be clues enough here for the identification of the language, assuming that it still exists. But one thing is plainly proved even by this preliminary survey. It is that we have before us a specimen of a language of Burma, not some distant and foreign tongue. Moreover, the language must have been in some kind of contact with Talaing: the Talaing loanword and the peculiar letter *b* necessitate that inference. It seems therefore probable that it was spoken

somewhere on the northern fringe of the Talaing language-sphere, which at this time must have extended nearly to the latitude of Prome. Curiously enough, the only other specimens of the script in which our text is written have been found just there. They consist of two much dilapidated inscriptions discovered at the Bèbè pagoda and Kyaukka Thein referred to by General de Beylié¹ in his work *Prome et Samara* and a small clay votive tablet more recently found by Mr. Taw Sein Ko at Hmawza, near Prome.² Mr. Taw Sein Ko was good enough to send me estampages of these inscriptions. The two former are practically illegible, at any rate in our present state of almost complete ignorance of the language. But from a few combinations of letters that can be made out pretty clearly, I think it is likely enough that they are in the language of our text. The votive tablet is plainer: but though I can identify some of the letters, I am not able to make any sense out of it. Provisionally, however, I think the language of our text may with much probability be ascribed to the neighbourhood of Prome, and it is not an extravagant conjecture to suggest that it may have been the language of the Pyu (or Pru) tribe which is said to have inhabited that region at an early period. Mr. Taw Sein Ko informs me that "Pyu" is the name applied to Burma by the Arakanese as late as the twelfth century A.D. and by the Chinese in the eighth and ninth centuries. He says that the Pyus appear to have been converted to Hinduism and that they burnt their dead and buried the ashes in earthenware urns. He suggests that they were probably of Shan origin.³

¹ The recent death of this explorer (by drowning in the rapids of the Me Khong) is a great loss to Indo-Chinese exploration and research.

² The latter is illustrated in *JRAS.*, Jan., 1911, Plate VIII. I (facing p. 150).

³ See also his Report of the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Burma, 1910, pars. 44-5. He there quotes some remarks made by the late Professor Buhler on our text. But that eminent epigraphist only

. On this last point I should be inclined to disagree with him. So far as I have been able to make out this Myazedi inscription, I have found no evidence of any close relationship to the Tai languages. What is quite certain is that the language of our text (though assuredly not a mere dialect of Burmese) is either a Tibeto-Burman one or has been deeply modified by some member of the Tibeto-Burman family. If the second alternative is the correct one, then such modifying influence would almost certainly be that of Burmese. But both the nature of the Tibeto-Burman words found in our text (which include such common words as "to die", "to give", "son", "wife", and the like, to say nothing of the numerals) and also their form make me regard the language as an independent member of the Tibeto-Burman family. I am not myself familiar with that vast group of languages and am therefore not qualified to pursue the inquiry much further. But I believe that enough has been done in this preliminary survey to open a path for other explorers who may be better equipped than myself.

A complete interpretation of this record will throw some light on the historical ethnography of Burma. It would seem as if the Burmese had been preceded by other Tibeto-Burman tribes who had got down to the neighbourhood of Prome long before the Burmese arrived there. But apart from legendary traditions of an ancient kingdom in that region, next to nothing appears to be known about them. They must, however, have received some measure of civilization from India, probably through the Talaings of the coast districts, for their possession of this peculiar script cannot otherwise be explained. This inscription may therefore be of considerable importance in its bearing on the date of the introduction of Indian culture into

glanced at the inscription and did not attempt to study it, as he at once recognized that the language was not Sanskritic. His remarks are therefore not very helpful. As to the votive tablet, see *ibid.*, par. 38.

Western Indo-China. The forms that survive in its alphabet are so archaic that they point to an importation of it from India at a fairly remote period. But I cannot deal with these matters, and I therefore leave the field to the palæographers and the Tibeto-Burman scholars who (I hope) will presently succeed in solving most of the remaining problems which this curious inscription presents.

I append a tentative transcription of the A text, divided into sections, with a conjectural translation added after each. It may be of use to other students, but I recommend them to regard it with a critical eye.¹ The lines are numbered according to A, and the B variants are added below.

§§ Siri §§ Dathagāda ḥa do ḥā^c ḥi' pḍy sgu daḥ ḥa
tva eū jha (2) ^e2 hrā u sni^s ḥi. tvā. thada ||³—Prosperity!
1628 years after the Tathāgata's parinirvāṇa—yā ti^c
pri. Rimadhanabū umi ḥi si || (3) Sri Tribhuvāna-
dī tyadhamarāja umi ḥi si || u do. da ḥā- uvō. ⁴ ma(4)yaḥ
Triḷogavādasagadevi⁵ ḥi. si umi ||—in this city called
Arimaddanapur Sri Tribhuvanādityadhammarāja so-called
was lord, his queen consort was called Trilokawaṭānsakā-
dewī—ḍhau u sa. Rajaguma ḥi (5) si umi ||—her son
was called Rājakumār—uvā tra. o hoḥ ḥi⁶ pā. to. ||—
(the king) gave her three villages of slaves—ḍhau ḥa'
maya ḥi' hi tadā (6) ⁶ ma[ya] ⁷ u tra tra. o ho' ḥi⁸ pā.
ṭha ḥā maya^c u sa. Rajaguma uvā ||—when the queen

¹ Many letters are still doubtful, and there are also in several places marks above or between the lines to which I cannot at present attach any definite meaning.

² This and the three or four preceding words are somewhat of a puzzle. They must represent "1620". I am not at all sure that what I have transcribed ^e is not the old numeral figure for "20". The readings eū and jha are also very doubtful. Perhaps the latter is really hūa or jhūa. The former might possibly be thū.

³ B omits ||.

⁴ I am by no means sure of the final vowel.

⁵ B reads Triḷogavadasagadevi.

⁶ B inserts || hāc.

⁷ B reads maya^c.

had died, he gave the queen's goods and the three villages of slaves to the queen's son Rājakumār—(7) dhau ḥā:¹ tḍa: sniō sū² hrā ḥi³ tadā⁴ ḥi³ sri ḥi lmi³ ḥi hi u mtu dū (8) ro⁵ ||—when the king had reigned twenty-eight years, he fell sick nigh unto death—dhau ḥā maya⁶ u sa⁷ Rajaguma ḥi³ si umi || udi⁸ (9) ḥi mtau ma dhau tḍa. to⁴ u lo tro: di³ ḥi, mdau ha³ da dḍu ||—the queen's son named Rājakumār, being mindful of the benefits wherewith the king had nourished him—(dhau ḥā: (10) Būḍha u cha: bo bradima tha tū⁵ ḥi³ se kya: ||—caused this golden image in the likeness of the Buddha to be made—dhau ḥā: Būḍha⁶ ḥi³ tu: (11) thmū loō yā na ḥi tḍi. to. ||—and brought this Buddha into the presence and spake thus—yā ḥā:⁷ Būḍha tha ḥā:⁸ ra: sa⁹ ḥi³ (12) se maḥū: ḥā:⁸ uva pā:⁸ che cho:⁸ ||—I present to my lord this Buddha which I have made on my lord's behalf—yā tra: o⁸ ho: ḥi³ pa: (13) maḥū: ||—the three villages of slaves that my lord gave me—ya ḥā:⁸ hra tha uva pā:⁸ che ||—I give to this sacred image of gold—dhau lo⁹ ḥā: tḍa: ḥi³ ri⁹ (14) pa¹⁰ ḍa ḥi³ nu ha pra cho:⁸ ha pra¹¹ cho:¹² ḥi³ si ||—thereupon the king was delighted and exclaimed, "A good deed, a good deed!"—(dhau u ḍo⁹ tra: ḥā:⁸ (15) maḥaḥe¹³ tra: ḥā:⁸ Mūgalubūḍadisaḥe¹⁴ tra: ḥā:⁸ Sūmedhabadi¹⁵ (16) | tra: ḥā:⁸ Vrahmaba | tra: ḥā:⁸ Vradeyo:¹⁶ | tra: ḥā:⁸ Sū tra: ḥā:⁸ (17) Sagasiḥarabadi⁹ || dhau tra: ḥā:⁸ sagha

¹ B wrongly reads *bi*².

² Very doubtful reading, perhaps *dū*. ³ B has |' |; for ||.

⁴ A appears to read *tḍ*, but the mark under the line may be accidental. B has *to*, only.

⁵ Perhaps to be read *tka*.

⁶ B reads *Būḍha*.

⁷ B omits *ḥa*⁸.

⁸ B omits *o*.

⁹ B perhaps reads *ri*.

¹⁰ A appears to read *pha*, a doubtful letter; B has *pa*.

¹¹ B omits this *pra*.

¹² A appears to have *cho*⁸ here. I have followed the B reading.

¹³ B reads *maḥaḥe*.

¹⁴ B reads *Mūgalubūḍhaḥe*.

¹⁵ B reads *Sūmedhabadi*.

¹⁶ B reads rightly *Vrahmadeyo*. (The *o* is doubtful in both copies.)

tvo u hñu di° dū tdaḡ (18) tu hãḡ hiḡ cha toḡ tdū || —
 then (in the presence of) my lord the chief monk, my
 lord the senior monk Muggaliputtatissa, my lord the
 scholar Sunedha, my lord Brahmāpāl, my lord Brahmadiw,
 my lord Son, my lord the eminent scholar Saṅghasena,
 in the presence of these lords of the church the king
 poured water (on the ground)—dhan hiḡ tadāḡ mayaḡ u saḡ
 Raja(19)guma hiḡ si umī ma [|]¹ hiḡ stabana² gñdha³
 tha hiḡ se goḡ u stau tha hiḡ⁴ (20) tadāḡ ||—that having
 been done, the queen's son named Rājakumār enshrined the
 golden Buddha, and having made the golden spire of the
 cave-pagoda—dhan goḡ u hñau hiḡ sãḡ toḡ⁵ || Samanaḡ⁶
 o tā |⁷ Rabai o tā | [J]i⁸(21)vñḡ⁸ o tā ||⁹ yã traḡ o hoḡ diḡ
 hiḡ diḡ dāḡ ||—he pronounced the dedication of this cave-
 pagoda, and having assembled (the men of) Sakmunalon,
 one village, Rapāy, one village, and Henbuiw, one village,
 these three villages of slaves—yã hãḡ mayaḡ [u saḡ]¹⁰
 (22) Rajaguma yã goḡ¹¹ Būdhā uvã tdū hiḡ chai tadāḡ ||—
 the queen's son Rājakumār, having poured out water to
 this cave-pagoda and Buddha—yã na hiḡ diḡ cho [|]—¹²
 spake thus—[yã]¹³ (23) ma gãḡ pra hñḡ saveñodeñe breñe
 hiḡ hiḡ pãḡ che na? tiḡ plãḡ pa¹⁴ ||—may this my act be
 a cause for giving me omniscience and wisdom—(24) yã
 traḡ tiḡ mtu kũḡ dñ¹⁵ gi saḡ da | gi plī da¹⁶ gi sruḡ da¹⁶
 mra ja hñu da¹⁷ yã (25) [Būdhā]¹⁸ uvã gãḡ hñiḡ toḡ ma

¹ B has |. There is a blur in A.

² B reads stabana.

³ For Būdhā: B reads Būdhā.

⁴ B rightly reads hiḡ. A has hi only, no trace of any ḡ.

⁵ B reads ma roḡ instead of toḡ (which is not quite distinct in A: it might be roḡ).

⁶ B reads Samanaḡḡ.

⁷ B has || instead of |.

⁸ B reads Jiḡvñḡ (or, possibly, Jiḡvñḡ).

⁹ B has | instead of ||.

¹⁰ B reads u saḡ.

¹¹ B inserts hãḡ.

¹² B has ||.

¹³ B reads yã.

¹⁴ Or perhaps pi or pau, though I hardly think so. It has one of the unexplained marks over it.

¹⁵ Conceivably these two words may be read kũḡ dñ. ¹⁶ B inserts |.

¹⁷ B inserts || or |.

¹⁸ B reads Būdhā.

dī² | ga jhī¹ chi ga bro pda ma ta | nū² hū² ||—as for these slaves, be it my son, be it my grandson, be it my kinsman, or any other person, who shall do violence to those that I have dedicated to this Buddha—(26) yā ḥā² Būḍha Ari Medeya dā ḥa² dī chi² ti tmū ma pā² che cho² ||²—may he never be permitted to approach the presence of the lord Buddha Ariya Metteya.

The following may be regarded as more or less probable identifications:—tvā² (l. 2) = “to elapse”; u do² (l. 3) = “therein”, do² (l. 14) = “in” (ḍhau u do² = thereupon); da, perhaps to be read ja² (l. 3) = “was”, (l. 24) = “be it”; uvā (l. 5) = “to her”, (ll. 6, 12, 13, 22, 25) = a suffixed particle forming the dative: to² (ll. 5, 11, 18 (20), 25) = a verbal affix (cf. Burmese tmh, modern ၵ); hñi² (l. 7) = “to be sick” (cf. Burmese nā, modern နာ); u mtu dū (l. 7) = “near unto”, ti² mtu (l. 24) = “as for”, di² dū (l. 17) = “in the presence of”; ro² (ll. 8 (20)) = a verbal affix (meaning “when” ?); tu² (l. 10) = “to bring”, lo² (l. 11) = “into”, (l. 13) = “in”; thmū² (l. 11), tmū (l. 26) = “presence”; na (ll. 11, 22) = “manner” (yā na = “thus”); tdi² (l. 11), dī² (l. 22) = “spake” (but this will not account for dī² in ll. 9, 21, 25); che (ll. 12, 13, 23, 26), cho² (ll. 12, 14, 26), and perhaps cho (l. 22) = particles used together and separately, mainly as verbal affixes (with the former cf. Burmese ciy, modern စေ); ha (l. 14) = “good”, “worthy”; tvo (l. 17) = a plural affix (cf. Burmese tui, modern ၵ); cha (l. 18), chai (l. 22) = “to pour” (cf. Burmese စက်ချသည်); tū (ll. 18, 22) = “water”; h₂lau (l. 20) = “dedication” (Burmese lhot, modern လှူတော်); gā² (ll. 23, 25) = “I”; kū. dū (if it can be so read, l. 24) = “in the future”; sru (l. 24) = “kinsman”; mra ja hñu (l. 24) = “other men” (but the

¹ Very doubtful transcription; perhaps hm should be read.

² B has some more punctuation marks to indicate the end of the text.

³ If ja is the right transcription here, then da² in l. 9 is probably to be read ja².

hñu in l. 17 is not quite explained); hñi^o (l. 25) = "to dedicate, to give to pious uses" (cf. Burmese lhū, modern ၵူ), but the hñi^o in l. 7 seems to be a different word; ga (l. 25) = "if"; hñi chi (l. 25, if it is the right reading) = "violence, oppression" (cf. Burmese anhip acak, modern ၵိပ် ၵေပ်). Other possible identifications will suggest themselves to anyone who studies this text and compares it carefully with the parallel versions. But I feel that I have already dealt rather too freely in conjectures, which at this stage of the inquiry are at least somewhat premature, and I must refrain from throwing out any more hints that might perhaps only serve to mislead other students.

I take this opportunity of correcting two slight misprints in my last paper (JRAS., July, 1910, p. 806):—

l. 20, for ၵိပ် ၵေပ် read ၵိပ် ၵေပ်.

l. 21, for ၵိပ် ၵေပ် read ၵိပ် ၵေပ်.

Also (with reference to JRAS., October, 1909, p. 1042) with the Talaing expression *blah goh*, "this having been done," "thereupon," compare Balmar *bloh*, l'un des signes du préterit: "c'est fait, c'est réussi, c'est fini: déjà, oui," Cham *blauh*, "puis, ensuite, après; fini, achevé, fin, c'est fait."

Finally, I have to thank Mrs. Bode for the following corrections and emendations of Pāli words and phrases in my article in JRAS., October, 1909:—

p. 1022, l. 26, for *patitthāpiya* read *paṭitthāpiya*.

ibid., ll. 27, 32, for *paṭimāya* read *paṭimāya*.

ibid., l. 28, for *nibbinno bhavasaṅkate* read *nibbinno bhavasaṅkate*.

ibid., l. 29, for *karentena* read *karontena*.

ibid., l. 36, for *Metteyya-dipa-dinnasa* read *Metteyya-dīpadinnassa*.

p. 1033, l. 17, for *māraṇ' antikarogassa* read *māraṇantikarogassa*.

p. 1035. l. 11. for *mahantayama sañcayam* read *māhantayamaśāñcayam*.

p. 1038. l. 30. for *tutthahattlo* read *tutthohattlo*, with the meaning "glad and joyful", not "clapped his hands". (This emendation, I may remark, brings the Pāli version into line here with the Burmese and Talaing texts, an additional proof of its correctness.)

p. 1042. l. 20. for *jalam . . . sakkhinta casudhātalam* read *jalam . . . sakkhim tu casudhātalam*.

ibid., l. 31. for *thāpaṇā* read *thapattam*.

p. 1048. l. 30. for *upuddavam* read *upuddavam*.

p. 1050. n. 2, for *Tilokaratañsikā* read *Tilokāratamśikā*.

POSTSCRIPT. Since the above was written, I have received from Mr. Taw Sein Ko estampages of another inscription in the script and (apparently) the language of our text. It consists of a few words on the back of yet another votive tablet recently discovered at Hmawza, near Prome. The discussion of this and the other "P̄yū" documents must be deferred to a future occasion, but it seems as though we were on the eve of interesting discoveries. If the evidence accumulates, a completely new line of research will be opened up, and our text will acquire additional importance as the only available clue to it.

XI

ANCIENT HISTORICAL EDICTS AT LHASA

By L. A. WADDELL, C.B., LL.D.

(Continued from *JRAS.*, 1910, p. 132.)

V. LHASA TREATY-EDICT INSCRIPTION B OF 783 A.D. (The so-called "Mu-Tsung joint edict of 822 A.D.")

THIS edict is displayed on the western face of the great monolith pillar standing in front of the Jo-k'än temple of Lhasa, the eastern face of which bears the joint treaty-edict between the Emperor Tê-Tsung and King K'ri Sron-Ido-btsan of 783 A.D., already published by me in the first article of this series.¹ Like the latter edict it is in bilingual form Tibetan and Chinese.

It is already known through three translations of its Chinese version from Peking. Firstly, one into French in 1789 by the Jesuit missionary M. Amiot, from a Chinese history of the time of Kang-hsi;² one into Russian about a century ago by the Archimandrite Hyacinthe; and a more precise one into English by Dr. Bushell, from a rubbing (which I understood him to say had been made by a mandarin at Lhasa), and published in this Journal in 1880.³ Although not dated, nor any Chinese emperor specified by name,⁴ either regnal or dynastic, Dr. Bushell, following

¹ *JRAS.*, 1909, pp. 923, etc.

² *Mémoires des Chinois*, par les missionnaires de Peking, vol. xiv, pp. 209-13, Paris, 1789. M. Amiot does not specify the title of this work, but states that it was edited by Kiang-fan, a doctor of the Haulin, and completed in 1696.

³ *JRAS.*, pp. 535-8.

⁴ The introductory paragraph quoted by Amiot is not represented in the text, and appears to be a gratuitous note by the copyist. It is "La première année de Tch'ang-tsing, l'Empereur des Tang et celui des Tou-fan ont juré l'observation exacte ce que est gravé sur cette pierre". *Tch'ang-tsing*, or properly Ch'ang-k'ing, is the title that Mu-Tsung gave to the years of his reign, the initial year of which corresponded to 821 A.D.

M. Amiot, believed it to be the treaty of the Emperor Mu-Tsung of 821 A.D.¹

An examination, however, of the Tibetan version, here translated for the first time, renders it practically certain firstly, that it is an integral portion of the joint treaty-edict of Tê-Tsung and K'ri Sron-*lde-btsan*, which is inscribed on the same pillar: and, secondly, that it is a record of the more technical articles of that treaty of 783 A.D.

This position for it is indicated by external as well as internal evidence—

1. The official Chinese chronicle of 1792² positively records that the Mu-Tsung treaty-edict tablet no longer existed.

“Before the Jo-k'an there were two tablets of the T'ang period. One the tablet of the Tê-tsung treaty, the other that of the Mu-tsung treaty or the ‘Tablet of long happiness’. *At present there remains only the Tê-tsung tablet.*”³

2. The complete official list of extant Chinese inscriptions at Lhasa, published in 1851, contains no reference whatever to the Mu-Tsung edict⁴ whilst enumerating the Tê-Tsung.

3. The name of the Tibetan king in the text although defaced in its first portion, is clearly legible in its concluding portion, which reads “-*lde-btsan*”, and is evidently no other than K'ri Sron-*lde-btsan*,⁵ the final syllable of whose name is spelt in the Tê-Tsung as well as in the Potala edict indiscriminately both as ‘*btsan*’ and ‘*lde-btsan*’. On the other hand, the Mu-Tsung treaty was concluded with King Ral-pa-chan, the grandson of K'ri Sron-*lde-btsan*, the ‘Kolikotsu’ of the Chinese, whose name, as

¹ That treaty was made in 821 A.D. and ratified in Tibet in 822 A.D., when the pillar was erected.

² The *Wei Tsung Lu chih*, dated 1792. Rockhill, *JRAS.*, 1891, pp. 2, 121, 193, 281.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 264

⁵ The ‘Chu-li-tsan’ of the Chinese (*Bushell, loc. cit.*, p. 439)

we know it, contains neither of the two syllables in question.¹

4. The title of the Chinese emperor which is used is identical with that employed in the Tê-Tsung edict, where the name of the emperor is not specified but only the general Chinese title, namely, "the lord of China *Wān-wū heū-ti Hwang-te*, or 'the learned, warlike, filial, and virtuous emperor'."²

5. The signatures of the witnesses appear to comprise the names and titles of several known officials who are recorded as having signed the Tê-Tsung treaty.

6. The place where the Tê-Tsung treaty sworn ceremony was performed on the frontier, namely Ch'ingshui, is conspicuously mentioned by name in our edict, and this name is not found anywhere in relation to the Mu-Tsung treaty.

¹ The Mongolian historian Ssanang Sset-sen, writing in the latter half of the seventeenth century, confuses this king with his grandfather and gives him the title of "Thi-b/Tsong-/Te" and "Thi-a/Tsong-/Te-bDsan Chongho-tsoktu", whilst he calls the grandfather "Thi-srong-/Te-Dsan" (Schmidt's *Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen*, pp. 47, 49, 358). Direct proof, however, that this writer confused these two kings is clearly seen, to my mind, at p. 48 of his MS. (as translated by Schmidt, p. 49), where he states that Ral-pa-chan "killed the emperor Tschotsong [=Su-Tsung] of the Tang when he conquered China in the field and took great booty". Now Su-Tsung we find from the Potala Treaty-edict B died the year before Ral-pa-chan's grandfather (i.e. K'ri Sron-Ides-btsan) "conquered China in the field and took great booty", namely, on the occupation of the imperial capital in 763; whilst if Chao Tsung he intended, this emperor was assassinated in 904, i.e. about sixty-six years after Ral-pa-chan's death. Thus Sset-sen's, as well as Sumpa's (see n. 2, p. 405), confusion of the two names may be set aside.

² Properly *Wên-wu-hsiao-té*. See Art. I, p. 930, n. 3. It is probably, at least, the first two syllables of it, the stereotyped title used in Tibet for every Tang emperor, after the famous Wên and Wu, the founders of the earlier Chou dynasty; as we find it applied in Edict A to Tai Tsung (Art. I, p. 932). It is translated by M. Annot (op. cit., p. 209) as "Empereur Suprême, sous lequel fleurissent les lettres, les armes, la doctrine, et la vertu", and by Bushell (loc. cit., p. 534) as above. Professor Parker kindly informs me that "Most, if not all, Chinese emperors of most dynasties seem to have the complimentary *Wên Wu* added to their posthumous titles in some form or other. The late emperor (1908) was also *Wên* and *Wu*". Here, in the edict, it seems applied to the reigning emperor, and not posthumously.

7. The style of composition in the Tibetan version of this edict is similar to that of the Tê-Tsung joint edict on the eastern side of the same monolith. Several phrases and expressions are identical.

8. The matter of the text nowhere conflicts with that of the Tê-Tsung, already published by me, which latter, indeed, requires these supplementary articles to complete it as a working document, and to complete its text in accordance with the manuscript record of the Tê-Tsung treaty as preserved in the Chinese annals.

9. Finally, the text of this edict is essentially different in several particulars from that recorded in the Tang annals and elsewhere as forming the actual text of the Mu-Tsung treaty.

The reason why there should have been two separate edict pillars and treaties, like the Tê-Tsung and Mu-Tsung, dealing with practically the identical subject, within the space of only two generations, is well explained in the terse words of the Tibetans of those days themselves. The Tibetan king writing in 726 A.D. says¹: "The *tsunp'u* [i.e. himself] and his officers wish to make a sworn treaty and engrave it on stone," because "the chief ministers of the Tang whose names are engraved upon the [former] treaty [of twenty-two years before²] are all dead and the present ministers do not follow the former treaty: therefore it is necessary to repeat the ceremony". Exactly similar to this is the political experience of our own British Government at the present day in regard to the warlike tribes on the north-western frontier of India. It is invariably found that the new generation of those tribes which have previously been utterly defeated do not abide by the treaties concluded with their fathers, but commit the same depredations and demand a new settlement, albeit on the very same lines as their fathers: so that history goes on

¹ Bushell, J.R.A.S., 1880, p. 460

² See p. 422.

repeating itself. Even in the West, too, at the present day the younger generation unfortunately is less guided by the wise and dearly bought experience bequeathed by its ancestors than by what it learns at first hand for itself, however dearly it has to suffer for it.

The best source of the text of this inscription that is available at present is the ink-estampage or "rubbing" which was obtained by Dr. Bushell at Peking, of which a very good photographic reproduction was published by him in this Journal, as an appendix to his translation of the Chinese text. It was taken about a hundred years ago—so it was ascertained—by a mandarin keenly interested, as many of the Chinese literati are, in the ancient history of their country and in the ancient form of the letters of their alphabet. In this latter study some of the mandarins are in the habit of taking impressions of ancient inscriptions, and to this palæographic instinct we owe the rubbing in question. In addition to a careful examination of this rubbing, which was very kindly lent to me by Mrs. Bushell, I have compared it with my own eye-copy of the original inscription taken whilst I was at Lhasa. This has enabled me to decipher several letters barely legible in the rubbing.

The dimensions of this inscription are 11 ft. 3 in. long by 31½ inches broad. Each incised Tibetan letter averages an inch in height, and the lines average 16 inches in length.

The language of the Tibetan version, here translated for the first time, is of the early classical period, like that of the Tê-Tsung edict. The orthography, as in the latter, is entirely free from the archaic final *d*, the "*d-drag*"¹; but an archaic *y* is prefixed frequently to *i*, and the same differentiation is made between the long and the short *i* by reversal of the superscribed limb, a practice which was early dropped, and is not found in the sacred scriptures

See my previous articles, I, pp. 942 5, and II, pp. 1250, etc.

of the classical period, that is after the last quarter of the eighth century A.D.

The text, as deciphered by me, is also appended (see p. 418).

Translation.

Curved brackets enclose doubtful readings and restorations of the text, whilst explanatory interpolations are placed within square brackets.

“The great king of Tibet, the enchanted divine ruler,¹ and the great king² of China, the lord of China. Hwang-te,³ the two [allied] as nephew and maternal uncle,⁴ having united their dominions in friendship, have made a great and important peace-meeting.⁵ In order that this [peace] shall never become shaken all the gods and men . . . have been called to witness, and that to all time . . . it shall be clearly recorded, and never be . . . (?forgotten the sworn text is engraved) on this stone pillar.

“The enchanted (divine ruler K’ri Sron)-*lde-brtsan* of (Great Tibet and) Wūn-wū-heū-ti (of Great China) the two [allied] as . . . (nephew) and maternal uncle having . . . (desired that no) misfortune whatsoever (may befall) the happiness [of the people]

¹ *brtsan-po*, the same as in opening sentence of Lhasa Edict Inscription A. See Part I of my article in *Journal*, 1909, p. 930.

² Here the same title is applied to the emperor of China as to the Tibetan king, namely *rgyal-po*.

³ The Tibetan phonetic for Hwang-ti or supreme ruler. There is nothing here in the Tibetan text equivalent to the Chinese title of “the learned, warlike, filial, and virtuous” of Bushell’s translation, loc. cit., p. 536.

⁴ The expression *lbon-z’ian*, whilst ordinarily meaning “nephew and maternal uncle”, may also mean “father and son-in-law”: cf. Jaeschke’s *Dict.*, p. 389. “Son-in-law,” says Yule (*Marco Polo*, 1st ed., i, p. 253), was a recognized title of honour conferred by the Chinese on those who married into the imperial blood—in Mongolian this title is “Gurgan”. In this regard Professor E. Parker writes to me: “I think *Kin* and *Shéng* [the Chinese equivalents], though often meaning ‘maternal uncle and nephew’, throughout mean ‘father-in-law and son-in-law’: even now they are so used colloquially.”

⁵ There is nothing in the Tibetan text here regarding “to unite the gods of the land and of grain”, as translated by Dr. Bushell from the Chinese version. See p. 395, n. 5.

and having great compassion,¹ with gracious consideration, without distinction of native and foreign, in order to cause happiness to everyone of the multitude (of families), they have resolved to form an alliance, and to complete by this conference a great reconciliation and long lasting good deed. They desire . . . [? a renewal of] the ancient (friendship), and to cement this union it is [hereby] declared that the [following] great and important peace-agreement has been made.

“The two [countries], Tibet and China, shall keep whatsoever countries they possess² and the frontiers as [they exist] at present. All to the east³ of that is the country of great China. All to the west is absolutely the country of great Tibet. From these [frontiers] there must be no intercourse in enmity or fighting; neither soldiers nor the peasantry must encroach on any part.

“If any man is properly suspected, he shall be captured his business be inquired into, a dispatch be sent, and he be permitted to go outside⁴ [the frontier].

“Now that the vast dominions have become united⁵ by

¹ It is noteworthy that here the title of the Buddhist “God of Mercy”, *Avalokita*, or “the one with great compassion”, is applied to both sovereigns; and especially to the king of Tibet, whose latter-day successors, the Talai Lamas, pose as the earthly manifestations of that deity. See further, p. 417.

² *mñä-pa*.

³ “The Chinese versions in books,” says Bushell, p. 538. “give here to the east of T’ao and Min the names of two cities in the south of Kansu,” but this obviously refers to the Mu-Tsung treaty and not to this one. T’ao-chow stands in 34° 21’ N. and 103° 14’ E., and Min-chow 34° 15’ N. and 104° 1’ E.; but the Ch’ing-shui or Ts’ing-shui is 106° 15’ E., or about 130 miles further east. If, therefore, *T’ao-Min* occurs in the Chinese version of this edict, it must refer to the districts of that name, and not the mere towns. Professor Parker suggests that T’ao and Min may perhaps refer to the two rivers of the name passing through those districts. See further, n. 3, p. 399.

⁴ There is nothing about “clothes and food” to be supplied.

⁵ There is no mention in the Tibetan text of “the gods of the land and grain” as translated by Dr. Bushell from the Chinese version; but Professor Parker tells me that this phrase is often used elliptically as “dynasty” or “dominion”.

means of this great peace-meeting, it is the command of the gratified nephew and uncle that it is all the more necessary henceforth to cultivate friendship constantly. Envoys¹ for intercommunication, shall go forth freely on the ancient roads according to former custom.

"Between Tibet and China, the horses [of envoys] will be changed below Chang-kun [?pass].² From Tse-z'ung-eh'eg [barrier]³ China shall respectfully provide for missions proceeding downwards in China. From Cheng-shu-hywan,⁴ in Tibet, Tibet shall respectfully provide for missions proceeding upwards in Tibet. Every ceremonial honour⁵ shall be shown. This shall be duly performed befitting the near kinship of the [royal] nephew and uncle, so that inside both countries no smoke or dust [of conflict] will arise, neither dread of suddenly uprising hostilities, nor even the name of war shall be heard.

"Henceforward no guards of the frontier [are needed]. Since this beneficent event has been achieved there is nothing to fear. In each bed in each home⁶ shall be the happiness of stretching out fearlessly [undisturbed].

"This gracious decree of happiness shall produce fruit

¹ *p'o-nu*, literally "man-woman", with reference, as I believe, to the envoy being often a eunuch. See p. 416. This phrase in Part I of article, l. 6, p. 934, should be altered to "envoy".

² "At the Chiang-chun pass" in Chinese version (Bushell, p. 537).

³ "Suiyung barrier" in Chinese version (Bushell, p. 537); *eh'eg* is obviously the Tibetan form of the Chinese word *eh'eh* 栅, the ordinary word for "barrier", which Professor Parker informs me is the actual word used by Dr. Bushell here—and that in modern Chinese it is usually pronounced *cha* or *sha* or *eh'ak*. Professor Parker further tells me "in my *T'ung-chi* copy, borrowed in 1893, the words 'east of T'ao Min' take the place of Bushell's 'east of Suiyung barrier'; but that copy had many other places where it added and omitted sentences or words not in or added by the *T'ung-chi* used by Bushell to amend his text".

⁴ "The city (i.e. *hsun*) of Ching-shun" in Chinese version (Bushell, p. 537). See p. 407 for discussion on this site.

⁵ The word employed *p'u-dul* is now almost obsolete. It literally means "bowing to superiors".

⁶ This expressive phrase, *sa-so mal-mal*, is not met with now in literature.

unto ten thousand generations. The sound of their [the two sovereigns] praises will penetrate [all] the frontiers wherever the sun and moon travel. Tibet happy in [its own] land of Tibet, and China happy in [its own] land of China, each in [its own] great dominion shall keep [this] official sworn oath¹ so that it shall never become changed.

“They each have begged² the Three Rarest Ones³ and all the Saints,⁴ the unchanging⁵ sun and moon, and planets and stars to be their witnesses that they each have sworn again and again the agreement [against breaking], and this they have done by swearing on oath after having slaughtered⁶ the living victims. Accordingly, should anyone not obey this decree . . . (fully) or break it, whether Tibetan or Chinese, may there come [to him] misfortune and painful plague—only if broken by a rebel, even though belonging to one [of the contracting parties] it shall not count.

“Thus the sovereigns and ministers⁷ of Tibet and China have explained this important decree in writing and sworn [it] on oath. By the sign-manual⁸ of the two great kings themselves it has been witnessed. The ministers who ascended the peace-meeting earthen altar⁹ have

¹ The Chinese version has “sworn oath”, and the Tibetan text, which is slightly indistinct here, is read by me as *bro'bor*, which has that sense.

² *g-sol-te*. There is nothing about “looking up”, as translated by Bushell. Professor Parker tells me that the character *wang*, which Bushell translates “looking up”, also means “in face of”, and that in his (Parker's) copy of the *Tung-chi* the word *wang*, “in the presence of,” is substituted for *wang*, so that “have begged” is really translated in effect.

³ This is not necessarily the Buddhist Triad, see p. 417.

⁴ This term, *'p'ags-pa*, includes nowadays Buddha and the celestial Bodhisattvas as well as the earthly saints.

⁵ *ba* is here so translated; it may, however, merely mean “also”.

⁶ This word *bsad* is the ordinary word for “killed” or “slaughtered”, and is not the one now employed for “sacrifice”.

⁷ *rje-blon*; but we know from the Chinese records that both of the sovereigns were absent at the public ceremony.

⁸ Literally “seal of hand”, namely *p'yag-rgyas*.

⁹ Literally “earthen throne”, *sa-k'ri*, see p. 413

written here their signatures of hand.¹ A copy of this document has been deposited in the sealed treasury, as a witness."

To facilitate the comparison of this translation from the Tibetan version with that from the Chinese text of this bilingual edict, I here translate, from the French, M. Amiot's rendering, as it is not easily accessible for reference.² I have noted wherein it differs from Dr. Bushell's more precise translation of the Chinese version.³

"In the first year of *Tchang-tsong*,⁴ the emperor of the Tang and he [the emperor] of the *Tou-fan* have sworn to observe exactly everything which is engraved on this stone. [N.B. This seems to have been a paragraph introduced by the copyist who wrote the Chinese work from which M. Amiot extracted this document, and it is non-existent on the stone.]

"The great emperor *Ouen-ou-hiao-te-hoang-Ty*,⁵ and the great emperor of the Great Fan⁶ *Cheng-chen*⁷-*Tsan-pou*, regarding themselves as uncle and nephew, and desirous, the one and the other, that the affairs of the two powerful empires [at present] out of shape may be discussed without any obstacle, in a manner according to their respective usages and governments, after mature reflection and repeated deliberations have made this written declaration, that they themselves and their descendants will observe it. They have sworn in the presence of the spirits and the saints, and in order that posterity may be instructed exactly in accordance with what agreement¹ has been made between them, and conform to it, they have ordered that the articles be engraved on this stone.

¹ These "signatures" form Lhasa Treaty edict Inscription C, p. 422.

² *Mémoires des Chinois*, par les missionnaires de Pékin, vol. XIV, pp. 209-13, Paris, 1789.

³ JRAS., 1880, pp. 535-8.

⁴ "*Tchang-tsong* est le nom que *Mou-tsong*, douzième Empereur de la Dynastie des *Tang*, donna aux années de son règne."

⁵ "L'Empereur de la Chine prend les titres de *Ouen, ou, hiao, te, hoang, Ty*. En voici l'explication: *Empereur suprême, sous lequel fleurissent les lettres, les armes, la doctrine, et la vertu.*" Sec II, 2, p. 391.

⁶ *Tu-fan* = Great Fan, or Great Po[t], i.e. Great Tibet.

⁷ This is spelt in the next paragraph without the *g*—the proper form, however, Professor Parker informs me, is *Shên-shêng*, meaning "divine and holy".

“ *Ouen-ou-huot-te-hoang-Ty* and *Chen-chen-Tsan-pou*, the two great emperors, whose foresight extends to the remotest future, and whose profound wisdom takes every means to guard against all inconveniences [to their people], having resolved to procure a peace as lasting as the universe, without any regard to their own personal interests, as they have only at heart the [good of the] community both inside and outside [i.e. native and foreign], wishing above all that their respective subjects may enjoy all the advantages which contribute to the happiness of the people, after mature reflection and repeated deliberation, of common consent and with full and entire liberty, have made between themselves the treaty of which these are the articles.

“ In the present settlement, the *Han* [= Chinese¹] and the *Fan* [= Tibetans²] shall have limits fixed as boundaries between the two empires. All to the east of *Tao-Min*³ belongs to the great empire of the *Tang*, and all to the west of *Tao-Min* shall be under the rule of the great kingdom of the *Fan*. Content with this partition, the two empires shall never seek to encroach the one on the other by means of arms, under any pretext.

“ The sovereigns of the one and the other empire will never credit anything which may be reported to them contrary to what has been here decreed. But if any altercation happens, some disturbance or some fight between their respective subjects residing on the frontiers, that one of the emperors who believes himself to be wronged will neither take his own revenge nor do himself justice by himself. He shall inform or send word to the [other] emperor his ally, sending him those subjects he considers culpable, [who] if Chinese will be sent to China, if *Fan*

¹ *Han* and “The Son of Han” has come to be a synonym for the Chinese, so called after the famous Han dynasties (202 B.C. – A.D. 221), whose epoch is considered to be the most glorious of the purely Chinese dynasties, so that we find here even the *Tang* emperors (also a pure Chinese dynasty) proudly describing themselves as “Han”. Even now, says Professor Parker (*in epist.*), the Cantonese always call themselves “Men of *Tang*”, and the Cantonese dialect *Tong-wai* (= *Tang-hwa*) or “*Tang* speech”.

² The character *Fan* = “barbarian”, but was more expressly applied by the Chinese to the Tibetan and associated tribes.

³ “*Tchao-min* ou *Tao-min*. C’est le nom général des lieux qui sont sous la dépendance de *Koung-tchang-fou* d’aujourd’hui. *Tao* est la ville qu’on appelle aujourd’hui *Tao-tcheou-ou-i*; et *Min* est ce qu’on appelle aujourd’hui *Min-tcheou-ou-i*.” See my n. 3, p. 395, above.

they will be sent to their own country. He will inform himself of the truth of the facts without prejudice, and if they are found guilty he will punish them, each according to the laws of his country. On the exact observation of this article in particular will depend the good understanding between the two empires.

“Although the two emperors are related between themselves as uncle and nephew, it will nevertheless be difficult for them to give preference one to the other by force. To make up for their being unable to converse in the living voice, they must write letters to each other with that confidence which parents or persons of the same family have between themselves. They must exhort each other mutually by their good counsels. They will themselves lend every helping hand to those who depend on them, and will never forget to maintain an intimate correspondence between the two courts.

“When a party of couriers from China to the court of the *Tou-fan* arrives at *Tao-Min*, the Chinese couriers shall place their dispatches in the hands of the *Tou-fan* officers, who shall be charged with the duty of forwarding them to their destination. Similarly, when the *Tou-fan* couriers charged with dispatches from their masters will arrive in the same way, the Chinese officers to whom these dispatches are handed shall charge themselves on their side with the duty of delivering them to the court of their master. In other words, when the *Tou-fan* couriers will arrive on the frontiers of China, the Chinese officers shall charge themselves with the rest, and when the Chinese couriers arrive at *Tsing-chou-hien*¹ they shall discharge their packets and hand them to the *Tou-fan* officers.

“The people of the two empires, instead of provoking or insulting each other by words of reprisal, ought to lay aside all sentiment of defiance; they ought to anticipate each other by their good offices. They ought always to speak well of each other and avoid every occasion for disputes and quarrels. In this way travellers will be able to pursue their route tranquilly without fear of being arrested in the midst of their course. The inhabitants of towns and villages will enjoy the sweet fruits of a constant peace. Those of the country will not be apprehensive

¹ “Les Couriers *Tou-fan* pouvoient s'avancer jusqu'à *Tsing-chou-hien*, ou apparemment il y avoit des Officiers *Tou-fan*,” etc. This is *Tsing-shan*, the identity of which is discussed on p. 407.

of parties of the enemy coming to ravage their lands just as they are on the point of recompensating their labours. And our descendants, full of gratitude to a government which procured for them the welfare they enjoy, will compare it to the brilliant splendour of the sun and moon, and will regard them as deserving all their praises.

"Everyone ought to regard all that is declared here as if he himself had sworn to observe the same exactly. After having called to witness the heavens, the earth, and the Three Priceless Ones,¹ the great officers deputed by the emperor of China and the great officers deputed by the emperor of the *Tou-fan* have slaughtered a victim, they have prostrated their faces to the earth and have sworn in the name of their masters and the two empires that they shall rigorously conform with all that is contained in this treaty. If it happens that anyone violates these articles, then may the powers who have been invoked to attest this see to it and submit him to the penalty he deserves!

"The deputies of the two empires have themselves sealed² this monument. The words which it contains are published to all the world: they are clear and without ambiguity, so that everyone may conform to them."

The Tibetan version, it will thus be seen, follows very closely the Chinese one as translated by M. Amiot and Dr. Bushell.³ Where the differences are of consequence I have referred to them in footnotes to my translation. In keeping with the independent spirit of the Tibetans, the Tibetan king is given precedence over the Chinese emperor in the Tibetan version.

The point for us now to determine is whether this text is the Mu-Tsung treaty of 822 A.D. or merely a portion of the Tê-Tsung treaty of 782 A.D. on the same pillar. The array of facts already indicated (p. 390) is overwhelmingly against our regarding it as the Mu-Tsung treaty-edict.

¹ " Dans le texte Chinois il y a seulement *les trois Pao*, c'est-à-dire, *les trois choses qui n'ont point de prix, ou qui sont d'un prix mesurable.*" These are not necessarily the Buddhist triad, see p. 417.

² *Elle est* here is obviously a mistake for *scelle*.

³ See n. 1, p. 389.

We are now in a position to see how the text in question differs specifically from that of the Mu-Tsung treaty, as recorded in the Imperial Chinese annals and elsewhere.

The Mu-Tsung text as recorded in the Chinese books, differs almost completely from the foregoing for a document dealing avowedly with a practically identical subject: and these two certainly differ from each other to a very much greater extent than the book-version of the Tê-Tsung treaty does from its pillar-version. The form of the Tê-Tsung treaty as found in the Imperial annals¹ does not purport to be a verbatim reproduction of the joint pillar-edict, but a record of the treaty for the information of the Chinese. Thus in saying, 'The Emperor compassionate his black-haired people [it is obviously referring to the Tibetans].'² and again, 'the Government have alienated their ancient territory,' it is China alone that speaks—an *ex parte* statement, and not a joint declaration to which Tibet could subscribe, such as we have on the pillar. Still, both versions of the Tê-Tsung treaty, in the books and on the pillar, display a remarkable agreement in detail as well as in the general sense and are in great part paraphrases of each other. Not so however, the edict in question with the Mu-Tsung treaty of the books.

The book-version of the text of the Mu-Tsung treaty is thus given:—

"The Tang have received from heaven rule over the eight points of the compass, and wherever their wise commands penetrate, all come to their court, and with awe and reverence, fearful of punishment for their misdeeds. Successors of Wu and mutators of Wên,¹ each emperor has acquired additional fame,

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, pp. 488-90.

² "The black-heads" is a common Chinese term for the Chinese, but I have shown (in Art. II, pp. 1254, 1258) that it was applied to the Tibetans by their own kings.

³ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, pp. 516, etc.

⁴ See n. 2, p. 391.

and excelled in showing deeper wisdom, and none have failed in the glorious succession of twelve reigns during two hundred and four years. The great founder of our dynasty issued wise commands, and his rules are not to be broken; he acquired wide-spreading fame, and it will be handed down for ever. They worship the high God and receive a favourable response, they pray to the souls of their imperial ancestors and obtain abounding happiness: how can there be a break?

“In the cyclical year *Kwei-ch'ou* in the winter, on the cyclical day *Kwei-yu* of the 10th month of the year, the Wên-wu-hsiao-tê Huangti decreed that the ministers of state, his servant Chih, his servant Po, and his servant Yuan-ying, should conclude a sworn treaty with the great general, the Fan envoy, Lunnalo, President of the Board of Rites, and his colleagues at the capital, on an altar built in the western suburb of the city, with a pit dug on the north side of the altar. We have recited the oaths, sacrificed the victims and buried them together with the written text, reverently ascended and descended the altar, and performed all the proper ceremonies without omission.

“Now, therefore, weapons shall be put by, and men be given rest, the bonds of kinship be honoured, and friendship re-established: the far-reaching policy has been carried out, and will produce abundant fruits. As the vault of heaven above overspreads the yellow earth below, so the swarming multitude of men look for rulers towards the ministers and high officers, for if left without leaders they would prey on and destroy each other. What the Chinese now rule shall have the T'ang as the sovereign, and the country of their western race shall have the great Fan as ruler. From this time henceforth both shall put by weapons and armour, forget their differences and old grievances, and respect the honoured kinship of their sovereigns and the ancient bonds of mutual aid. The frontier guard-houses shall be left ungarrisoned, and the watch-fires no longer lighted. In danger and difficulty they shall think of each other, and oppression and plunder be stopped; the barrier stations and fortifications shall be disused, and invasion and plunder shall cease. The important strong posts of defence shall be carefully kept as of old; they shall not plot against us, and we will make no preparations against them.

“Ah! Love men with benevolence, protect your country with loyalty, worship heaven with wisdom, and serve the gods with

reverence: for if any one of these duties be neglected, it will bring down misfortune upon the body.

"The frontier-mountains are lofty, the river flows on unceasingly. On a propitious day and favourable season have we fixed the two boundaries: the west to belong to the great Fan, the east to be ruled by the great Tang. The great ministers, holding up the sworn treaty, proclaim it afar to the autumn country."

Although stating that the above was "the text" ¹ of the Mu-Tsung treaty the Chinese annals go on to mention other articles than the above which were in the Tibetan version. The *T'ang shu* says ²—

"The *tsanpin* of the great Fan i.e. the king of Tibet had sent the treaty beforehand, the important articles of which were: 'The two countries, Han and Fan, shall keep the borders which each one now rules, and neither shall fight with nor attack the other: they shall allow no plundering raids into each other's border nor secret plots to acquire territory. If any persons be suspected they shall be taken alive and their business inquired into, then they shall be given clothes and food and sent back into their own country. All now fixed shall be followed; there shall be neither addition nor change. The officers who take part in the sworn ceremony, seventeen persons, shall all sign their names.'"

This portion certainly bears a general resemblance to part of the contents of the edict text now under examination. Such resemblance however, does not necessarily exclude the Tê-Tsung, as it is only reasonable to suppose that some such practical and elementary provisions must also have formed part of the Tê-Tsung treaty and be repeated in the Mu-Tsung text. For the Tibetans like the Chinese, are sticklers for precedent and for the repetition of ancient forms of expression.

¹ In regard to Dr Bushell's use of the word "the text" Professor Parker notes: "I doubt if 'text' was meant. The Chinese always say 'it ran' in a vague sort of way."

² Bushell, *JRAS.*, 1880, p. 518.

The Mongolian account of the Mu-Tsung treaty preserved in the *Bodhimör*, a Kalmuk work of the seventeenth century, translated by I. Schmidt,¹ though not professing to give the actual text verbatim, but merely a description of its contents and of the sworn ceremony attending the conclusion of the treaty, nevertheless throws some valuable light on the subject. As this account has been manifestly misinterpreted in an important detail by Schmidt, and still further complicated by some later writers who have quoted him,² I have consulted Schmidt's

¹ *Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen verfasst von Ssanang Ssetsen*, v. I. J. Schmidt, p. 361, St. Petersburg, 1829.

² The chief confusion has occurred in regard to the term *rMe-ru* or "The Mark", where the Mu-Tsung-Ralpachan edict pillar was erected on the Chinese frontier. This place was suggested by Schmidt to be the Mt. Meru of the Indian Buddhists, i.e. Kailas in the North-West Himalayas, an impossible misinterpretation which nevertheless was somewhat excusable at that early period over eighty years ago, though the Sanskrit "Meru" is never spelt by the Tibetans with a prefixed *r*. Subsequently the matter was further complicated by a writer interpreting the word *gung-gui*, which occurs in the same sentence as "the Ganges" with the sense of "Meru of the Ganges streams". I find that a Tibetan historian, Sumpa, writing in the eighteenth century and generally following the Mongolian account as used by Schmidt so closely as to suggest that he either copied it or referred to the same source, uses this identical expression in regard to Ralpachan's reign, but in a clearer sense. The paragraph reads (Calcutta text of 1908, p. 151, l. 10): "rGya-böd so-so dan bar-gyi rme-rur rdo-riñ gsum-la mñā eh'od bkod-pa sog-skyis kyañ bod-la drin-che la." This I would translate: "Since China and Tibet [in Ralpachan's reign] each on their own land [and] on a spot [or 'mark', *rMe-ru*] between. [i.e.] at the three stone pillars, pledged themselves by oath and other ceremonies, there has been great benefit to Tibet." Fortunately Sumpa, in a note to *so-so*, says that that word = the Chinese *gung-gui*. Now *so-so*, though ordinarily meaning "each separately", also means "each land or country"; and Professor Parker suggests that *kung* might be either "both" (i.e. each), or "publicly", and that *gui* is most likely a *kui* of some kind. In any case, this effectually disposes of the mis-reading of "Meru of the Ganges". A somewhat curious coincidence is that I was informed many years ago by a lama at Darjeeling that at the great cloister bearing the somewhat similar name of Mu-ru in the north-west of Lhasa, at the *Gya-bum-kan Chorten*, was an inscription recording a great victory of the Chinese; but on my visit there in 1904 I could find no trace of any such inscription. See my *Lhasa and its Mysteries*, pp. 331, 402.

translation of the *Bodhimör*, and give here my revised translation of his, which affords, amongst other things, positive information in regard to the location of the Mu-Tsung-Ralpachan joint edict-pillars. The *Bodhimör* says—

“At rMe-ru¹ [or ‘The Mark’] between the boundary posts, a temple was erected by both sides and a great stone set up as a jurisdiction² [mark], upon which the sun and moon were figured, to indicate that as the sun and moon wandered in friendship in the heavens without touching each other, so also should it be between both kingdoms, so that from rMe-ru [or ‘this Mark’] downwards no Tibetan, and from there outwards no Chinese, warriors shall enter by force. Further, a boundary-line between both kingdoms was drawn and demarcated by thorough masonry, by loose stones set down, and again by earth mounds. On the conclusion of the treaty the Three Precious Ones, the sun, moon, planets, and the avenging *Tenggeri* [= *Tengri* or Heaven] were invoked as witnesses against its breaking, for [in that event] their denunciation. After this, under the seal of each great monarch to conform accordingly, a peace-alliance was made and confirmed by oath by the great [officials] and the subjects of both kingdoms. And the selfsame words were engraved upon three great stones. One of these is near the *Jö* [temple of Lhasa], the second is in the palace of the emperors of China [at Ch’ang-an], and the third is on the boundary at rMe-ru [‘The Mark’], where the jurisdiction [mark] was set up.”

The reference here to the sun and moon, it will be observed, is in quite a different sense to that found in the eighth paragraph of the edict, where, by the way, the edict terms itself “This gracious decree of happiness shall produce fruit unto ten thousand generations”. This description might almost justify its claim to be considered “The Tablet of Long Happiness”, a Chinese appellation of the Mu-Tsung edict,³ though this title could even be

¹ See n. 2, p. 405.

² *aufgericht* (Schmidt, op. cit., p. 361).

³ Rockhill, JRAS., 1891, p. 281.

applied to the general tenor of the undoubted Tê-Tsung peace treaty-edict. On the other hand, the concluding paragraph of the latter in the manuscript version recorded in the Chinese books is almost identical with the concluding sentence of our edict now under examination: as it states: "The text of the covenant shall be preserved in the ancestral temple, and the officers in charge, according to the regulations of the two nations, shall always keep it."¹

The spot where the great sworn compact for the Tê-Tsung treaty was concluded was at Ch'ing-shui,² and the text of that treaty expressly states that that place was on the frontier. Now this edict in question mentions this place under the name of *Ch'ing-shui-hien* in the Chinese version,³ and "*Cheng-shu-hywan*" in the Tibetan version, as being situated on the Tibetan side of the frontier and the place where Chinese dispatches were to be handed to the Tibetan officials (par. 6). On the other hand, the sworn ceremony of the Mu-Tsung treaty was made at *rMe-ru* on the frontier (a place which I have shown in n. 2, p. 405, is nowhere near India, where it has been located by the mistaken reading "Meru-Ganga"), as noted in the above Mongol history as well as in the Tibetan ones.⁴ As, however, the boundary appears to have remained the same from the Tê-Tsung until the Mu-Tsung treaty, it seems to me probable that *rMe-ru* or "The Mark" was in the pass a few miles to the east of the city of Ch'ing-shui-hien.

The identification of this city of *Ch'ing-shui-hien*, the *Cheng-shu-hywan* of our Tibetan edict, where the sworn compact of the Tê-Tsung treaty was performed, is of much importance, as supplying us with a sure key to the frontier line of those days on the chief route of

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 480.

² Ibid., p. 488; Rockhill, loc. cit., p. 193.

³ Both M. Amiot and Dr. Bushell agree in this reading.

⁴ See details, p. 405. There is no note in the Chinese books of any ceremony on the frontier in respect to the Mu-Tsung treaty.

communication between the two capitals. The only attempt at locating it of which I am aware is that by Dr. Bushell, in which he identifies it with "the modern city of Ch'ingshuihsien in the prefecture of Kungel'angfu in Shensi". He says it is called after a small river of the same name, and adds—

"The geographical description of this district city published in 1687 says that the river is outside the western suburbs, near the Hsiao Lung Mountain, which the Governor-General of Lungyu made the boundary with the T'ufan. The district was reconquered in 847."¹

Kungchang, I find from the map, is in the modern province of Kansu, over 100 miles west of the border of Shensi. Possibly Dr. Bushell intended *Ts'ing-shui* in Kansu, 15 miles from the Shensi boundary. At any rate, from a study of the topography on the maps, I would identify this city in lat. 34° 37' N. and long. 106° 15' E. with the Ch'ingshui of the treaty.

This position for it is clearly indicated in the book-version of the Tê-Tsung treaty, which says² [N.B. I have interpolated my identifications and interpretations within square brackets]—

"The boundary that the government [Chinese] now keep are: On the west of Chingchow [=Kingchow in Kansu, lat. 35° 10', long. 107° 18'] the western mouth of the T'an-tsên pass, on the west of Lung-chow [=Lung-chow in Shensi, lat. 34° 45', long. 106° 55'] the city of Ching-shui-hsien [=Tsing-shui-hsien in Kansu, as above located], and on the west of Fêng-chow [=Feng-hsien? on the Tung River, lat. 33° 54', long. 106° 37'] the city of Tung-ku-hsien, while in the western mountains of Chien-nan [=Ch'êng-tu] the bank of the Tatu River is the Han [=Chinese] boundary. The Fan [=Tibetan] nation rule over Lan [=Lan-chow-fu, capital of Kansu], Wei, Yuan [=Wei-yuan, lat. 35° 7', long. 104° 12'], and Hui [=? Hei-shui] River in Kansu, lat. 33°, long. 104° 55', reaching on the west to Lin T'ao [=T'ao-chow in Kansu, lat. 34° 21', long. 103° 11'] and on the east as far as Chêngchow [=Chêng in Kansu, lat. 33° 49', long. 105° 32']," etc.

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 532, n. 49.

² Ibid., p. 489.

Its location here is not only fixed definitely by its specified direction from Lungehow, from which it is about 35 miles nearly due west, but it is confirmed by its relative position in the line of the other boundaries enumerated on either side of it, from the north to the south. This line forms a natural frontier to some extent, following as it did the water-parting of the Lung Mountain range and the corresponding range to the south of the River Wei.

The city stands on the western slope of the Lung Mountains on a small river, doubtless the *Ts'ing-shui*, from which the city takes its name, *shui*, the Chinese word for "water" and "river", being the same root, by the way, as the Tibetan *ch'u*, which is the ordinary Tibetan term for "water" and "river". The river on which the city stands is a tributary of the Niotow River, itself an affluent of the Wei, on which the Imperial capital Ch'ang-an (Si-ngan) stands about 150 miles lower down.

In the above translation of the Chinese book-version of the Tê-Tsung treaty, the city of Ch'ingshui is stated to belong to China: and in keeping apparently with this is the statement, in the same record, that the sworn ceremony was performed to the west of Ch'ingshui,¹ whereas our Tibetan edict text, in both its Chinese and Tibetan versions, expressly places that city within the Tibetan side of the border. We have positive proof in the same narrative that Ch'ingshui was *outside* the Chinese barrier or fortified frontier, for it states (at p. 488) that a pig could not be got for the sacrifice because "there were no pigs *outside* the barrier". The fact that the ceremony was performed "to the west of Ch'ingshui" was doubtless an arrangement prescribed by the astrologers to secure favourable omens and proximity to the river. Besides, it is improbable for strategical reasons that a city lying on the western or Tibetan side of the mountain range,

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 488.

which here till the present day separates Shensi from Kansu, should belong to the Chinese. Indeed, the same Chinese account implies that it was Tibetan territory when it states¹ that "the district was reconquered in 847 A.D.", that is, sixty-four years after the Tê-Tsung treaty.

Whilst the name Ch'ingshui thus occurs prominently in the Chinese manuscript text of the Tê-Tsung edict, and also in our edict in question, it is nowhere mentioned in connexion with the Mu-Tsung treaty in any of the known manuscript records and accounts. Neither is it met with in the text of the Mu-Tsung treaty as recorded in the T'ang annals, nor, as we have seen, in the Kalmuk account in the *Bodhimör*; nor is it found in the Tibetan manuscript accounts, which generally confirm the Mongolian.

The rGyal-rabs says²: "In the time of this king [Ralpachan] the eastern frontier marched with that of exhausted China at the P'o-lon Shan,³ a mountain range, rising like a white curtain. Here, by means of a stone pillar which was erected, this matter of the power [of Tibet] was set down in writing."

Sumpa in his history, writing of Ralpachan's reign and the Mu-Tsung treaty, says⁴: "Since China and Tibet each on their own land and at rMe-ru [=a spot or mark] between, [i.e.] at the three stone pillars, pledged themselves by oath and other ceremonies, there has been great benefit to Tibet."

The geographical indication here given, namely, the "P'o-lon Shan," which I have obtained from the Tibetan history-books, is important as fixing the furthest eastern point of the ancient Tibetan empire when at its zenith. This mountain range is obviously a part of the great Lung or Dragon range, about longitude 108° E., which bends the

¹ Bushell, J.R.A.S., 1880, p. 532. n. 49.

² Text, E. Schlagintweit's ed., p. 12.

³ This is clearly a proper name, a Tibetan phonetic reproduction of the Chinese word. Schlagintweit has taken it etymologically as a Tibetan literary phrase, though without any aptness in sense. Professor Parker tells me *pei*, *pēh*, or *po* means "north" in the Mandarin dialects.

⁴ *dPag-bsam tjon-bzai*, by the Abbot Sumpa in eighteenth century A.D. S. C. Das' ed., Calcutta, 1908, p. 151.

Yellow River to the north. It may also be the "Ho-lan Shan" of the Chinese records, which state that the Tibetans wished to fix there the frontier for the treaty of 783 A.D. after their occupation of the imperial capital and the "valleys of the Lo and Ho Rivers" to the north of the latter.

"In the second year Chien-chung (781 A.D.) the T'u-fan requested that the frontier be fixed at Ho-lan Shan (賀蘭山). In the fourth year (783) they sent officials to make a treaty at Ch'ing-shui, and in front of the Ta-chao (i.e. the 'great' Jo temple Lhasa) is the tablet of the treaty between the nephew and uncle."¹

The "Ho-lan Shan", stated by the *T'ung-chi* to be west of Ning-hia, may possibly be the "P'o-lon Shan" of the above Tibetan text, and the "Pai-lan Syan" of the Nepalese itinerary of Hodgson,² which is placed two days march to the east of Singan Fu (the Sing-ha-p'u of that itinerary), and thirty-two days march from Peking,³ that is to say, apparently near the Lo River about Tungechow. Now all these areas, within the northern half of Shensi, comprising the entire valley of the Lo, were held by the Tibetans after 756 A.D.⁴ The Lo rises in the "Pai-yu" Shan range, 108-9° E. longitude, and one of its main tributaries, joining it about 35° 7' N. latitude, is named Ts'ing-shui, which possibly may be the Ch'ing-shui of the edict.⁵ This word "P'o-lon", therefore, I consider to be "North Lung", and possibly the semi-legible name in l. 9 of the treaty-edict,⁶ which I proposed to read "mts'o-sñon", and for which I would now substitute the "P'o-lon" Mountains.

¹ Rockhill, JRAS., 1891, p. 193.

² *Essays*, ii, p. 189.

³ Between it and Singan Fu the Nepalese Mission crossed in a journey of 14 kos, i.e. about 30-40 miles, four lakes, eight rivers, seven bridges, and passed two forts.

⁴ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 475.

⁵ It is not probably so, as it is not on the route between the two capitals of China and Tibet.

⁶ Journal, 1909, p. 949.

It is noticeable, too, in connexion with the Mu-Tsung treaty, that there is no record of any sworn ceremony having been performed on the frontier at all, except in the last-quoted extract from Sumpa, who is not authoritative on such a matter. The T'ang annals merely speak of a sworn ceremony "at the capital" of China,¹ i.e. at Ch'ang-an, and another "at the Tufan capital chief camp,"² which I should think was Ralpachan's summer quarters, about 10 miles below Lhasa, on the right bank of the Kyid River, which I have visited and described.³

The Mu-Tsung-Ralpachan joint treaty-edict, it will be seen from the above, was inscribed on three pillars. One of these stood within⁴ the Imperial palace at Ch'ang-an (Si-ngan-fu), the second at "The Mark" or *rMe-ru* on the frontier near Ch'ing-shui (Ts'ing-shui) on the western border of the Shensi province of China, and the third near the *Jo* temple of Lhasa, the *Jo-k'ang*: the last is the one now in question. The vernacular narratives do not expressly say that these pillars were new ones specially erected, but they imply that they were so, and that the inscriptions were not merely engraved on the old Tê-Tsung-K'ri Sron-*lde-btsan* pillars. In particular it is on record that the Ch'ing-shui pillar was destroyed in 787.⁵ Then we have the positive statement of the Chinese official record of 1792,⁶ confirmed by the 1851 list, that the Mu-Tsung treaty-pillar at Lhasa had disappeared and no longer existed, as already detailed.

Finally, we find, as is pointed out to me by Professor Parker, that Dr. Bushell's own account furnishes almost absolute proof that the edict is Tê-Tsung's, and not Mu-Tsung's. Dr. Bushell notes that the Tibetan

¹ Bushell, *JRAS.*, 1880, p. 517.

² *Ibid.*, p. 519

³ *Lhasa and its Mysteries*, p. 320.

⁴ *Bothinor*, see above, p. 405. The sworn ceremony at Ch'ang-an was performed on "an altar to the west of the capital" (Bushell, *loc. cit.*, p. 491).

⁵ Bushell, *loc. cit.*, p. 494.

⁶ See p. 390.

sovereign's name is a blank in the Chinese text of the rubbing, but he supplies the name himself from the *Yih-fung-chi*, namely 德之黎贊陛下, i.e. "His Majesty *Tê-chi-li-tsan*". Now the Tibetan king in 780-97, who made the treaty of 783 A.D. with the Emperor Tê-Tsung, is called in the Chinese record, translated by Dr. Bushell, "Ch'i-li-tsan,"¹ which is sufficiently near "K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan" for a Chinese translation of the name of a barbarian.

Altogether, therefore, the above reasons and the weighty facts before cited (p. 390) seem to warrant us in considering that the edict in question forms part of the Tê-Tsung treaty-edict of 783 A.D., which is engraved on the other side of the same pillar, and that it is not the treaty-edict of Mu-Tsung of 822 A.D. It thus may be called the "Tê-Tsung - K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan joint edict Inscription B" to distinguish it from the two others on the same pillar.

The other more noteworthy points respecting this edict, to which I will here refer, relate mainly to the sworn ceremony, as throwing light on the pre-Buddhistic indigenous religion of Tibet—the Bon. Sacrificial rites were also invariably performed by China in the ratification of treaties. These involved the killing of an animal and the throwing of a part of it or of its blood into a ditch in order that the "Spirit of the Earth" might bear witness to the deed, and the rest of the blood was rubbed on the lips of the contracting parties.²

The altar for the sworn ceremony is described in our edict text (last paragraph, p. 397) as "an earthen throne" or a "mud platform", upon which the treaty officials ascended. It was a temporary structure, the Chinese annals tell us,³ erected to the west of Ch'ingshui for the pagan indigenous sacrifice and not for Buddhistic purposes. This is made clear by the statement: "after the conclusion

¹ Bushell, *JRAS.*, 1880, pp. 439, 485.

² Parker's *Ancient China Simplified*, p. 95.

³ Bushell, *loc. cit.*, p. 488.

of the sworn ceremony Chieh-tsan [the Tibetan general] proposed to Yi [the Chinese plenipotentiary] to go to the south-west corner of the altar into a Buddhist tent to burn incense and make oath."¹ It was evidently raised in an open plain on the bank of the river, for the same narrative relates that the Tibetans and Chinese "agreed that each party should proceed to the place where the altar was raised with 2,000 men, half of them to be armed and drawn up two hundred paces outside the altar, half unarmed attendants to be distributed below the altar. . . . Seven persons all in court costume : . . . also seven persons ascended the altar together to perform the sworn ceremony". In this a minister of state "on his knees read aloud the covenant".² A similar altar was erected near Lhasa for the ratification of the Mu-Tsung treaty, of which more precise particulars are given.³

"The ceremonial altar was ten paces wide and two feet high. Our [Chinese] envoys stood opposite the ten and more Tibetan great ministers, while over a hundred chiefs were seated below the altar. Upon the altar was placed a wooden bench, on which stood the Po-ch'e-p'u [elsewhere called Po-ch'an-p'u, evidently the head Buddhist priest or lama] as he recited the sworn treaty, a man standing at his side to translate it for those below. When he had finished the blood was smeared, but the Po-ch'e-p'u did not smear his lips. After the conclusion of this ceremony another oath was taken before Fut'u [Buddha], when *sumbul* water was poured out and drunk."

The living victims sacrificed at this sworn ceremony were a wild ram, a dog, and a sheep, but these were substituted for larger animals.

"It had at first been agreed that the Han [=Chinese] should sacrifice an ox, the Fan [=Tibetan] a horse: but Yi [the Chinese envoy], ashamed of his part in the ceremony, wished to depreciate the rites, and said to Chieh-tsan [the Tibetan general], 'The Han cannot cultivate the ground without oxen, the Fan cannot travel

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 490.

² Ibid., p. 491.

³ Ibid., p. 521.

without horses: I propose, therefore, to substitute a sheep, pig, and dog as the three victims.' Chieh-tsan consented. But there were no pigs outside the barrier, and Chieh-tsan determined to take a wild ram, while Yi took a dog and a sheep."¹ It adds the "victims were buried" in a "pit" by themselves.²

The text of the [other(?) portion of the] Tê-Tsung treaty states³ that they had "as a sacrifice split asunder the dead bodies [in front of?] the grain and the gods, the [spiritual] peaceful helpers on the altar, [and] have by this means made the country, the dwellings, and the lakes to be more thoroughly united into one kingdom".

The oath, we are told in the text, was taken "after having slaughtered the living victims" and before calling on "all the gods and men to be their witnesses". For this solemn ordeal we read that the generals and ministers of the two countries "fasted [for three days⁴] and purified themselves in preparation for the ceremony", and they "proclaim to the gods of heaven and earth, of the mountains and rivers, and call the gods to witness that their oath shall not be broken".⁵ The nature of the oath itself seems to have been an asseveration that the individual who took part in it might meet with a bloody death like those victims in the event of breaking their covenant.⁶ There is nothing in the above ceremony in Professor Parker's opinion which is not to be found in Chinese practice. Afterwards the two principal representatives went to a Buddhist tent at the request of the Tibetans to make an affirmation. "When this was finished they again ascended the altar, when they drank wine and both gave and received ceremonial presents, each offering the products of his country as a mark of liberal friendship."

Smearing of the lips of the covenanting individuals

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 488.

² Ibid., p. 490.

³ See first part of my paper, p. 933.

⁴ Ibid., p. 491.

⁵ Ibid., p. 490.

⁶ For forms of such oaths see my *Buddhism of Tibet*, p. 569.

with the blood of the sacrificed victim is seen to have been an essential part of the ceremony for rendering the oath binding. This practice still survives at the present day amongst Mongoloid tribes in Eastern Asia and Malaya, and also, so Professor Parker tells me, in China, for oaths and as part of the initiation for blood-brotherhood. It is found in Tibet amongst the tribes of Eastern Nepal, and just as I write comes the news from New Guinea that a party of European travellers were not admitted to the friendship of the savage tribe of the interior until the savages "sacrificed a pig and smeared each of us on the forehead with the creature's blood".¹

The Tibetan word used in the edict for "envoy" or "messenger" is curious and suggestively neutral. It is *p'o-nā*, literally meaning "man + woman", and is the word adopted by missionaries in translating the "angel" of the Bible. It seems probable, however, that the envoys or imperial messengers in those ancient days were usually eunuchs.² Persons of this class of palace official appear to have been the confidants of the Chinese emperors and empresses from time immemorial. In particular we find it recorded in the Tang annals that in the treaty negotiations with Tibet in 730 A.D. the emperor sent "the eunuch Chang-Yuan-fang on a mission of inquiry to the Tufan [= Tibetans]".³ In 780 A.D., i.e. only three years before this edict, the same authority states "when captives were taken eunuchs were always sent in charge of them to take them" back.⁴ And four years after this edict, in 787, we read: "The emperor sent the eunuch Wang Tzūheng with dispatches to Chieh-tsan [the Tibetan general];"⁵ and a few months later a eunuch is

¹ Dr. H. A. Lorentz, *Daily Press*, August 27, 1910.

² On this Professor Parker notes that "Eunuchs as envoys were sent to the Huns, but never to the Tibetans or Turks, only as messengers".

³ Bushell, *loc. cit.*, p. 465.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 485.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 498.

mentioned¹ as being, after the Chinese generals, the chief captive and envoy.

Evidence of the predominance of Buddhism at this early period is possibly afforded in the ninth paragraph, where the first place in the invocation of witnesses is accorded to "the Three Rarest Ones". The word used (*dkon-mch'og-gsum*) is that now employed to denote the Buddhist triad, the *Tri-ratna* or Three Precious Ones: namely, Buddha, His Word (*Dharma*), and His Assembly (*Sangha*). But the Chinese triad as represented in the Chinese version usually connotes another triad: namely, Heaven, Earth, and Men. (Cf. Mayer's *Manual*, p. 300, No. 43.) That it was used in the Buddhist sense is in keeping with the Tibetan king, K'ri Sron-lde-btsan, who, as we have seen, is the reputed founder of the Order of the Lamas, and who at the date of this edict (i.e. as we take it at 783 A.D.) had a large staff of learned Indian and Tibetan monks engaged in translating the Indian Buddhist scriptures into the Tibetan. This also would confirm the Chinese narrative of the Tê-Tsung treaty that "after the conclusion of the [pagan] sworn ceremony" the principals went "into a Buddhist tent to burn incense and make oath".²

Upon the question of the origin of the priest-kingship in Tibet, this document provides us with the earliest allusion to that office, and the earliest record of the assumption by the predecessors of the Talai Lama of the epithet of *Avalokita*, the Buddhist God of Mercy, whose invocation-formula is the "*Om-mani padme Hum*". In this edict of 783 A.D. both of the sovereigns of the joint-treaty, Tibetan and Chinese, have applied to them the epithet of that god, namely "The one of great compassion". This title, which was believed to have originated with the first of the Sovereign Grand Lamas of Lhasa about the middle of the seventeenth century A.D., is now seen to

¹ Bushell, *JRAS.*, 1880, p. 500.

² *Ibid.*, p. 490.

have a very much earlier origin. As regards China, Professor Parker informs me that the reigning Emperor, at any time, is usually called "Old Buddha": and the late Empress Dowager (died 1908) was always popularly called "Old Buddha": indeed, Messrs. Bland & Backhouse in their recent book give a photograph of her posing as *Avalokita*.

I now append my reading of the text, which may be compared with the Tibetan version in the copy of the rubbing of that bilingual inscription attached to Dr. Bushell's translation¹ of the Chinese version.

TEXT OF THE TÊ-TSUNG JOINT TREATY-EDICT OF 783 A.D.

Inscription B

Note. The lines are numbered as on the pillar. The distinction of the short *i* by reversal of the superscribed limb has been preserved. My doubtful readings are placed within curved brackets and restorations within square ones. Each dot in mid-line represents an illegible letter.

1. ༄ || བོད་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་པོ་ཚེན་པོ་
2. འབྲུལ་གྱི་ལྷ་བཙན་པོ་དང་།
3. རྒྱའི་རྒྱལ་པོ་ཚེན་པོ་ཀྱཱ་ཇེ་ཉུང་དེ།
4. དབེན་ཞང་གཉིས། | ཚབ་སྲིད་
5. གཅིག་དུ་སོལ་ནས། | མཇེལ་དུ་ས་
6. ཚེན་པོ་མཚོད་དེ་གཉི་ཀྱིས་
7. བ། | རྣམ་སར་ཡང་སྲི་འབྱུང་བ་ .
8. ལྷ་སྲི་ཀུན་ . . . ཞེས་(ཅི)ང་དབང་བྱིས་
9. དེ། | ཚོ་ཚོ་ བཟོད་
10. དུ་ཡོད་པའི་
11. ཀྱི་མེད་ལོ་རིང་

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 536.

² For ས་ལ་ or ས་ཏུ.

- 12. ཨོ།། འབྲུལ་གྱི [ལྷ་བཙན་པོ་ཁྲི་སྤོང་]
- 13. ལྷ་བཙན་གྱི [བོད་ཆེན་པོ་དང་]
- 14. ལྷན་ལྷ་ཉེ་ཉེ་དུ་ཉི་ཤུ་ལྷ་གྱི་ལྷ་ཆེན་པོ་དོན་བོན་]
- 15. ཞང་གཉིས་མོ། (ར་)
- 16. བོ། | ལ་ ལྷ་ལེགས་(ལྷ་)
- 17. ཉེས་ཅི ལྷ་གསལ་ཆེ་ཆེན་
- 18. པོས་ནི། | བཀའ་རྒྱན་གྱིས་དགུ་བ་
- 19. ལ་གྱི་ནང་གྲོད་པས། | མ(ང་)པོ་ཀུན་བདེ་
- 20. ལྷོད་པར་བྱ་བ་ལ་ནི་དགོངས་པ་གཅིག།
- 21. ལན་རིང་པོར་ལེགས་པའི་དོན་ཆེན་པོ་
- 22. ལ་ནི་བཀའ་ལྷོས་མཐན་ཏེ། | ལ་ . .
- 23. ལྷོང་པོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ནི་ ལྷོ་ཆེ་ .
- 24. དུགས་པའི་ཆ་ བཅོམ་པར་
- 25. མོལ་ནས། | མཇལ་དུས་ཆེན་པོའི་
- 26. མཇལ་དེ། | བོད་ལྷ་གཉིས། | ལ་རྣམ་
- 27. ལྷ་མངའ་བའི་ལྷལ་དང་མཚམས་ལྷུང་
- 28. ཞིང་།¹ | དེའི་ཞིང་གྲོགས་ཐམས་ཅད་ནི།
- 29. ལྷ་ཆེན་པོའི་ལྷལ། | ལྷལ་གྲོགས་ཐམས་
- 30. ཅད་ནི་ཡང་ཐལ་པར་བོད་ཆེན་པོའི་
- 31. ལྷལ་ཏེ། | དེ་ལས་པན་ཚུན་དགུར་གྱི་
- 32. འཐབ། | དསལ་གྱི་དང། | ལྷལ་གྱི་
- 33. མ་རྣམ། | ཡིད་ས་ཆེས་པ་ཁྲིག་ཡོད་

¹ The Chinese version according to Bushell has here “of the great Fan”, loc. cit., p. 536. The same word recurs in l. 30.
² The Chinese version has here “of the great Han”, ibid., p. 536.
³ Here the *i* has the modern form, though in l. 4 the same word has the reversed form.
⁴ The *o* is doubtful.
⁵ There is a dot (ཆེག *ts'eg*) here in addition to the comma or vertical stroke (*shad*).

34. ན། །སྤྱི་བརྒྱུང་ཞིང་གཏམ་མིས་ཉེ།
 35. བཟང་ས་ནས་མྱིར་གཏང་ངོ།
 36. ད་ཆལ་སྤོང་གཅིག་ཅིང་། །སེམ
 37. རྣམ་ཚེན་པོ་འདི་ལྟར་མཚན་བས་།
 38. དཔོན་ཞང་དབྱེས་པ་དེ་བཀའ་མིན་དེ་
 39. ལྷན་པས་ཀྱང་འདྲམ་དེ་གོས་ཉེ།
 40. བན་ཚུན་གྱི་པོ་ཉ་འདོང་བ་ཡང་། །ལས
 41. ལྷིང་པར་བྱང་ནས། །སྤྲུག་པ་བཞིན་
 42. །། བོད་གྲུ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་བར་། །ཅང་ཀྱན་
 43. ཡོག་དུ་དྲ་བཟེས་ལ། །ལྷེ་རྒྱུང་ཚེག་དུ་
 44. ལྷ་དང་ལྷ་པ་མཚན་ཅན་ལྷ་ལྷ་ལྷ་དུ་
 45. ལ། །ཅིང་ལྷ་ལྷ་དུ་བོད་དང་ལྷ་པ་
 46. ལམ་ཅན་ལྷི་བོད་ལྷ་ལྷ་ལྷ་དུ་ལྷེ།
 47. དཔོན་ཞང་ཉེ་ཞིང་གཉིན་པའི་ལྷ་པ་བཞིན་
 48. དུ། །སྤྱི་རྒྱ་དང་བཀའ་ལྷི་དེ་ལྷ་ལས་
 49. ཡོད་པར་སྤྲུང་ཉེ། །ལུས་གཉིས་ཀྱི་
 50. བར་ན་དུ་དུ་ལྷི་ལྷ་ལྷ་། །ལྷོ་ལྷ་
 51. དུ་ལྷ་དང་བ་དང་དབྱེས་ལྷིང་ལྷི་ལྷི་ལྷ་ལྷེ་
 52. །། མཚན་སྤྲུང་བའི་ལྷི་ལྷ་ཅན་།
 53. ཀྱང་དོགས་ཞིང་འཛིགས་པ་ལྷིང་པར་
 54. ས་ས་མལ་མལ་ན་བཀའ་བཀྱང་ལྷེ་ . .

¹ This *d* I take as a separate syllable, and as the adverb *da*, "now," and not as a "d-drag", its preceding dot seems to be below the line like that of the word *shun* immediately following it.

² The mark on the *d* like a subjoined *r* is apparently an accidental scratch.

³ *Yog* for modern 'og = "down".

⁴ མན་ with correlated ལན་ (l. 46) is used for modern མར་ and ལར་ = "lower" and "upper".

⁵ *P'u-dud* is an almost obsolete word. See note 5 in translation, p. 396.

55. བར་འཁོར་ཅིང་། །སྤྱིད་པའི་བཀའ་བློན་
56. བོ་རེ་བས་ཁྲིའི་བར་དུ་བྲོག་། །སྤྲོན་པའི་
57. རྒྱ་སྐད་ནི་གཉི་རྒྱས་སྤྱིབ་པས་ཚསས་
58. རྒྱ་ལྟེ། །འདྲ་བོད་ལུལ་ན་སྤྱིད།
59. རྒྱ་རྒྱ་ལུལ་ན་སྤྱིད་པའི་སྤྱིད་ཚེན་པོ་
60. རྒྱར་ནས་གཅིགས་བཅས་པ་(འདྲི)་
61. རྒྱས་པར་རྒྱ་འབྱུང་བར། །དཀོན་མཚོག་
62. གསུམ་དང་། །འབགས་པའི་རྣམས་(དང་)
63. བོ་ཉི་རྒྱ་དང་གཟ་སྐར་ལ་ཡང་དབང་དུ་
64. གསལ་དེ། །གཅིག་གི་རྣམས་པས་ཀྱང་
65. (བོ)་འད། །སྤོག་ཚགས་བསད་དེ་སནན་
66. (ཡལ)ང་བོར་ནས། །གཅིགས་བཅས་པོ།།
67. (ག)ཅིགས་འདྲི་བཞིན་དུས་བྱ་ས་(སམ་) . . .
68. བཞིག་ན། །འདྲ་རྒྱ་གཉིས་གང་གིས་ལྷར་ཉེས
69. བ་ལ་མྱིག་ཅིང་། །ལན་དུ་དུག་(སྤྱི)ཅི་བྱས་ཀྱང་
70. གཅིགས་པོ་བཞིག་ལ་ས་ . . . གས་ . . .
71. འདྲི་ལྷར་བོད་རྒྱ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་རྒྱ་སྤོན་གྱིས་ .
72. རྒྱས་བཞགས་མནན་བོར་དེ། །གཅིགས་
73. རྒྱ་ . . . མོད་རྒྱས་ནས། །རྒྱལ་པོ་ཚེན་
74. པོ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་ནི་བྲག་རྒྱས་བདབ། །སྤོན་པོ་

¹ This is not clearly legible: it may be read བ་འདྲི, or possibly རྒྱ་བོར་ = "to swear an oath". The Chinese version in this place reads "swear".

² A dot here in addition to the vertical line.

³ Here བ་ seems to mean "unchangeable or eternal", a possible meaning according to the vernacular dictionaries.

⁴ Possibly རྒྱ = "to swear".

⁵ Same as n. 1.

⁶ Perfect of འདྲེབས་.

75. གཅིགས་འཛིན་པ་ལ་གཏོགས་པ་(ན)མས
 76. གྱིན་ལག་ཡིག་དུ་བྲིས་དེ། །གཅིགས་ཀྱི་
 77. ཡི་གེ་(· · ·)ལ་ · · ཟུག་མྱོད་དུ་བཞག་གོ། "

VI. LHASA TREATY-EDICT INSCRIPTION C'

Signatures of the Witnesses

The edict pillar at the door of the great Jo-k'an temple in Lhasa, in addition to the two treaty texts already detailed (inscriptions A and B), displays on one of its remaining faces, the northern, the "signatures" of the chief Tibetan ministers and others who took part in the treaty ceremony and officially witnessed it.

Although no mention is made in the Chinese narrative in respect to either the Tê-Tsung or Mu-Tsung treaty that the names of the chief witnesses were engraved on the pillars, it was clearly the practice to do this. For we read in the T'ang annals² for the year 726 (i.e. half a century before the Tê-Tsung edict), in connexion with the proposal for a new treaty expressly to be "engraved on stone", that "the emperor Hsiao-ho³ granted a sworn treaty, and at that time the T'ang ministers of state . . . in all twenty-two persons, concluded a sworn ceremony with the Tufan sovereign and officers . . . But the chief ministers of the T'ang whose names are engraved on the treaty are all dead, . . . therefore it is necessary to repeat the ceremony".

The original sworn ceremony for the treaty of 783 was, as we have seen, performed at Ch'ing-shui, near the

¹ The མ་ here is evidently not an archaic form, but a mistake for རྩ་, which is the form of this word which occurs in the same connexion in l. 2 of inscription VI (p. 433), giving འཛིན་པ་ = "an upholder", also "a treaty" itself in the sense of a "binding or holding" agreement.

² Bushell, loc. cit., p. 460.

³ Hsiao-ho = "the late Ho". Bushell does not explain who he is. The late emperor in 726 A.D. was Jui Tsung, whose regnal title was Yen Ho.

frontier between the two countries, in the first month of that year. This ceremony, as customary, was repeated at the capital of each of the two powers. In the seventh month it was repeated at Changan, the Chinese capital; and in the same month the emperor sent an "envoy to Fan [Tibet] to *conclude* the sworn covenant".¹ At each of these three spots an edict-pillar appears to have been erected. The one at Ch'ingshui manifestly was destroyed in 787, as the Tang record of that year says that "because of the destruction of the monument fixing the boundary . . . it was necessary to repeat the ceremony at Ch'ingshui".² No positive reference, however, is made in the Tang records to the one erected either at Changan or Lhasa, though the latter by its three inscriptions, including the list of signatories, speaks for itself.

This inscription of the signatories covers an area of 11 ft. 2 in. in length by 14½ inches in breadth. A photographic reproduction of a "rubbing" of it accompanies the rubbing of inscription *B* attached to Dr. Bushell's article,³ but no attempt has hitherto been made to decipher it.

It consists of twenty bilingual paragraphs, each in a Tibetan and Chinese section. The text is badly defaced. Several paragraphs are obliterated, and a good deal of the remainder is illegible. Enough, however, remains to show the designation of the offices of the chief ministers and some of their names and titles, and thus afford insight into the administrative machinery by which the government in those early days was carried on. The ancient territorial names of certain of the nobles are of some geographical interest.

The signatures are restricted to Tibetan witnesses; no Chinese are included. The names of the Chinese witnesses

¹ Bushell, *JRAS.*, 1880, p. 490.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 490, 495.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 541. It is cut in two halves to print it within the limits of a folded page. The left-hand one is the top half.

would doubtless in like manner be engraved on the corresponding pillar in the Chinese capital, in accordance with the practice as above recorded. The Chinese section of each paragraph will be seen from the accompanying translation kindly furnished by Professor Parker to be a phonetic transliteration of the Tibetan names into Chinese characters.

The number of the signatories is apparently seventeen: there is some uncertainty as to the exact number of persons specified owing to the obliteration of two paragraphs. At the Ch'ingshui ceremony only seven Tibetan officials are mentioned by name as having ascended the altar for the sworn ceremony in the Tè-Tsung treaty.

No details whatever are recorded in respect to the Lhasa celebration of the Tè-Tsung treaty: nor are any names given of the Lhasa witnesses to the Mu-Tsung covenant. Indeed, there is no mention in the T'ang annals that any edict-pillar was erected in Lhasa for either of those treaties. But with reference to the Mu-Tsung, it is recorded that the Tibetan king requested that "The officers who take part in the sworn ceremony [in China?], *seventeen* persons, shall all sign their names"¹ to the manuscript treaty. And the Chinese emperor, on his part, on dispatching his envoy to Lhasa to complete the treaty, "commanded Yuanting [his envoy] on his arrival [in Tibet] to instruct the ministers and the lesser officers all to write their names below the text of the treaty."¹

The coincidence of the number of the Chinese witnesses to the Mu-Tsung manuscript treaty with the number of the Tibetan witnesses whose names are engraved on this Lhasa pillar is certainly remarkable. It may probably, however, be merely another instance of the formal adherence to precedent, which is so marked a feature of political procedure, not only in Tibet and China, but in all countries.

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 518.

In keeping also with such official formalities we find the order of the names in our list arranged according to the rule of precedence which is still observed in Tibet. According to this usage the lowest in rank comes first, and the higher ranks later and later according to their order of precedence, the highest coming last of all.

The seventeen signatures are divided into two groups. The first nine are special treaty commissioners to whom brevet rank has been granted to give them increased status for the occasion, whilst the last eight are substantive ministers of State.

In the following translation of this text, the first apparently hitherto attempted, I have inserted after each paragraph of my translation from the Tibetan the translation of the Chinese text, as kindly deciphered for me by Professor Parker. This latter has proved most useful in confirming the Tibetan and in supplying deficiencies in the blurred or illegible text of that version, as well as displaying the phonetic pronunciation of the Tibetan words in those early times—a matter of great importance with reference to the origin and affinities of that language. The semi-legible and doubtful words which have been provisionally translated have been placed within brackets or referred to in footnotes.

The Tibetan text as deciphered by me is appended at the end of the article.

Translation

[I have numbered the paragraphs for convenience of reference, and have placed the personal names in capitals, and Ñ is expressed in full as NG to facilitate comparison with the Chinese form of transliteration. The Chinese text as translated by Professor Parker, with his remarks, follows each paragraph in smaller type and marked C.]

1. "The great ministers of great Tibet, the holders of

the agreement at the peace-meeting, who ascended¹ [the altar], their official rank, name, and lineage.

C. "Great Fan ministers (*tsai-siang*), treaty of peace mounting-the-altar, to set up sworn treaty-officials, names, and ranks.

2. "The special commissioners,² the great ministers of State of great Tibet, with their official rank, name, and family.

C. ". . . Ministers to handle government department (*p'ing-chang*) business" [the words practically mean "with brevet rank added as Secretary of State"], names, and family. [The two first words are rubbed out, but probably were "Great Fan" (*Ta Fan*).]

3. "The high special commissioner holding the rank of Secretary of State³ in the land-governing department,⁴ the great minister dPAL-CHE'EN-PO . O .

C. Only one word is visible—*chang*, i.e. "with".

4. "The army commander, the minister of (military) ceremonies⁵ CHE.

C. Only three words visible, "command . . . army with" (*tu . . . shih chang*).

5. "The great minister bLON LO

C. Illegible.

6. "The great minister, the army commander bZANG.

C. Only three words visible, "army (*shih*) with government" (*p'ing-chang*).

7. "The great minister bLON rGYAL [LI ?]

C. Illegible.

¹ ལ་ལོ་ for modern ལ་ལོ་.

² *bkā-la gtog* = literally "rank by (special) command", which the Chinese shows to have the sense of brevet rank.

³ Literally "holding state[office]".

⁴ *Sa-la dba'u z'uñ*.

⁵ *Ch'o-ga gi* (possibly *ch'og gi*); the latter = of the adorned or excellent (*mchog*), the former = of the rites or ceremonies.

8. ["The great minister of State] . . . [Z'ANG rGYAL bTSAṂ . . JE].

C. . . . "with government department (business), *Shang-chieh tsan* . . . *je*."

9. "The great minister of State Z'ANG(K'RĪ-L)I-K'OD NE sTANG.

C. "Minister with government department business, *Shang-k'i-li* . . . *tsan*" (last word doubtful) and *chang* (to handle or manage).

10. "The great minister of State Z'ANG-K'RĪ bZI LHA mT'ONG.

C. "Minister with government department business, *Shang-k'i-li-je* . . . *t'san-? tung*."

11. "The great minister of State bLON rGYAL bZANG 'DUS KONG.

C. "Minister with government department business, *Lun-chieh tsang Nu-si ? kung*. [*Nu* is quite certain.]

12. "Ministers [of substantive rank] of Great Tibet who ascended [the altar], their official rank, name, and family.

C. "Great Fan all officials, mount altar, those who, names and ranks.

13. "Minister of Interior (nang-blon) mCH'IMS-ZANG rGYAL-bZER K'OD-NE br'TSAṂ.

C. "*Nang-lun Chim-shang chieh-je k'uh-mung-tsan*."

14. "Minister of External [Affairs] by Command (p'yi-blon bkā-la gtogs-pa) CHOḠ-RO(I) bLON-bTSAṂ-bZER LHA-GONG.

C. "*P'i-lun K'a-lo-tuh-po Chuh¹-lu Lun-tsan-je Ch'eh kung*."

15. "Ministers of External [Affairs, substantive]² mCHIMS-ZANG br'TAN-bZER sTAG CHANG.³

C. "*Lun-p'i-po Chim-shang* . . . *je chung (no-pu ?)*."

¹ *Chuk* in Cantonese still (as with *chim* in No. 13).

² The title of this office differs from the previous one in the absence of "by Command" (i.e. by special appointment), and also in having blon-p'yi-pa or minister + external instead of p'yi-blon or external + minister.

³ Or *Chu-la*.

16. "The lord of cursing (*mngan*) called the *luma*¹ of civil ceremonies² BAL-bLON KU-bZANG MYES-rMA.

C. "Nyan-mang . . . su . . . lun . . .

17. "The proclamation-issuing great minister bLON-sTAG bZER-HA(B)-(?)EN.

C. "Kih (or *chi*)-shih-chung (a Chinese title) knower or governor of (? *T'ien*) chou.

18. "The Accountant- (or Commissary) General, the minister of flour³ bLON sTAG-ZIG rGYA NO-LA.⁴

C. "Po . . . (?)tung . . . lun . . . kuh.

19. "Minister of external [affairs, i.e. p'i-blon] the director⁵ Z'ANG . . bZANG [rJE-WO] . . (?)CHE.⁶

C. "P'i . . . (?)tt.

20. "Great (?) deputy of the king,⁷ his honourable mouth-piece for the treaty,⁸ Z'ANG-bLON rGYAL . N-LAM bTSAŃ."

C. "Shang-lun chieh . . ."

The signature occupying the leading place of honour in the list, namely the last of all (par. 20), is clearly and indisputably the name of the chief Tibetan minister of the Tê-Tsung treaty negotiations, as recorded in the

¹ This word is doubtful, as the second element is blurred; if correct, it is the first instance of the occurrence of the word "lama".

² Literally "of the rites of the land". (Cf. with title in paragraph No. 4.

³ *rt-sam-pa* = barley meal, the staple food of the Tibetans.

⁴ Or rGyan O-la.

⁵ The text seems to read here སྐྱོ་ལྗོ་ (or ལྗོ་), literally "mouth + wise mind or counsel (or if ལྗོ་ = saying or interpreting"; but as a compound meaning "steerer or governor").

⁶ The last word is possibly *btan*.

⁷ This manifestly reads *rgyal-tsab ch'en-po*; the modern spelling of the second syllable as read would be *ts'ab* (ཚེབ་).

⁸ In this sentence *z'al-che* appears for the modern "z'al-che" = the honourable tongue or a judge or magistrate.

T'ang annals of that time, namely "*Shang(-lun) chieh-tsan*". Here in the Tibetan portion of the bilingual inscription he bears a title which seems to read "the king's deputy and honourable mouthpiece for the treaty". The Chinese version of the inscription, as read for me by Professor Parker, gives "*Shang-lun chieh . . .*", and the proper form of the name, thus phonetically rendered by the Chinese, is given in the Tibetan of the inscription as "*Z'ang-blon . rgyal . . . btsan*", which is pronounced nowadays as "*Shang-lon-jyé . . . tsan*", which is practically identical with the Chinese phonetic transcription. The Tibetan chief envoy of the Mu-Tsung treaty, on the other hand, was named Shang-chi-li-t'ossü.¹

This of itself is conclusive evidence that the signatures belong to the Tê-Tsung treaty and not to the Mu-Tsung. This position is confirmed by the undoubted occurrence of the names of others of the officials who are recorded in the T'ang annals to have witnessed the treaty of 783 A.D.

"*Shang Chieh-tsan*" was the chief Tibetan minister in charge of the peace negotiations of 783. "At this time," says the T'ang annals,² "the Tufan chief minister Shang Hsi-chieh, who was tyrannical and fond of slaughter, having been overthrown and beaten in Chien-nan [Cheng-tu], was anxious to wipe out his disgrace and unwilling to make peace. The second minister, Shang Chieh-tsan, an able and politic man, reported to the *tsanp'u* [king] to ask him to fix the boundary and to conclude a treaty so as to give rest to the inhabitants on the borders. The *tsanp'u* consented and appointed Chieh-tsan chief minister in place of Hi-chieh [= Hsi-chieh] to negotiate the treaty of peace and friendship." It was he who headed the Tibetan officials at the sworn peace compact at Ch'ingshui in the first month of 783 A.D.² "*Shang*

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 516.

² Ibid., p. 488.

Chieh-tsan, with the generals and ministers of his nation, *Lun-hsi Chia-tsang*, *Lun-tsan-je* [par. 14 of our inscription], *Lun-li*, *T'o-ssü*, *Ku-an-ché*, and *Lun-lih-sü*, also seven persons ascended the altar to perform the sworn ceremony. at Ch'ingshui."¹

In examining the bilingual list of names for others of the above witnesses it will be seen that the Chinese have rendered the Tibetan words merely by their sounds, i.e. phonetically: and have omitted the silent consonants which were present in the Tibetan spelling even of those very early days. Thus the Tibetan word for "minister", namely *blon*, in which the initial letter is silent, is written by the Chinese *lun*: so too the Tibetan *rgyal* (presently pronounced *gyé*), is systematically rendered *chieh* in the Chinese, *btsan* as *tsan*, and so on. Moreover, the letters *g*, *d*, and *b* are wanting in the Chinese alphabet, and so are transcribed in the harder form of *k*, *t*, and *p*.

It is also to be remembered that the above-named seven officials were the Tibetan officers who took chief part in the treaty ceremony at Ch'ingshui, not at Lhasa: so it is not to be expected that all of them *en bloc* proceeded thereafter to Lhasa, about a thousand miles distant, to attest the treaty in that place, which is the one we are now concerned with. Indeed, the Tang annals record that the Chinese mission to Lhasa to conclude that ceremony differed in composition from that which went to Ch'ingshui. We therefore must not expect to find the names of all these Ch'ingshui witnesses present in the list of subscribers to the Lhasa edict, especially as several of the names therein are more or less illegible in both their Tibetan and Chinese versions.

Comparing these lists in our search for the remaining names, it seems to us possible that the second name of the manuscript record, *Lun-hsi Chia-tsang*, may be the second

¹ Bushell, J.R.A.S., 1880, p. 488.

last one of our inscription (par. 19), of which the first two syllables and the last three might be so pronounced by the Chinese. The third of the list, *Lun-tsan-je*, is a certainty. It is undoubtedly the same as in the fourteenth paragraph of the inscription. There the name as given in the Chinese version is absolutely identical in every detail, and it is there shown to be the Chinese phonetic rendering of the Tibetan *bLon-btsan-bz'er* (pronounced nowadays *Lon-tsan-she* [or *che*]). The fourth and seventh of the Ch'ingshui list may be one or other of those names containing the element *li* in paragraphs 7 and 9. The fifth, *T'o-ssü*, may possibly be that of the eleventh paragraph, where 'dus of the Tibetan is rendered *Nu-si* in the Chinese. *Kuan-che* may possibly be the name in paragraph 4, where only *che* is visible.

Amongst the additional names in the inscription those of paragraphs 13 and 15 are noteworthy. Both of these officers were probably of the royal race in bearing the title of *mChims-z'ang*. *mChims* is a district near Sauiyäs, the summer residence of the king of this edict, K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan, and it gave a "princess" to the latter to wife. One or other of the two officers so named may be the general of the Potala edict (inscription *B*), who shared with Lu-koñ the command of the victorious Tibetan army which occupied the Chinese capital in 763 A.D. He was therein called "Zang *mChims* of the royal race Shu-teng", and the one here in paragraph 13 bears the title of *rgyal* or "royal". *Z'ang* literally means "maternal uncle", also the name of a district in Western Tibet. It is possibly used here in the former sense, that he was "of the Queen Consort's family". With the addition of the word for "minister", namely *blon*, it then means, as I have already noted,¹ a sort of privy councillor. The new *T'ang-shu* (eleventh century A.D.)² defines "Shang-lun" as being the

¹ Cf. previous article JRAS., 1910, p. 1274.

² Bushell, loc. cit., p. 440.

title of "those who have the control of state affairs", and that it includes *all* the chief ministers "Nang-lun," etc.

Possibly No. 14 was the *Lun-chiamu-tsang* who was a Tibetan envoy at the Ch'ing-shui treaty,¹ and No. 18, "bLon . . . rGya No-lo," is the *Lun-hsi No-lo* who was Tibetan envoy to China in 781,² and who afterwards emigrated with his retainers to China in 796³; probably he was of Chinese stock, as suggested by the rGya⁴ in his title, which literally means "China".

The family titles and lineage, we are told in paragraphs 1, 2, and 12, are specified in the inscriptions. Of this character, in addition to the two above cited, I find the following territorial names: *Choy-ro* (par. 14) is a place in Eastern Tibet in the district of Tsang-dkar. *Bal* (par. 16) is an epithet of the Dong tribe of Eastern Tibet,⁵ rMa (in par. 16) is a district in North-East Tibet, near Koko Nor, and apparently named after or giving its name to the upper course of the great Yellow River of China, Hoang Ho, which is called in Tibetan rMa Chu.

For philology too, upon the vexed question of the origin and significance of the silent consonants which form such a conspicuous feature of Tibetan orthography, this bilingual series of personal and place names offers exceptionally favourable criteria for ascertaining the phonetic changes and orthoepic decay. The Tibetan proper names have been rendered phonetically into Chinese, thereby fixing the ancient pronunciation as it existed about twelve centuries ago. The function of the silent consonants is obviously determinative, and to express differences of tone in homonyms. For the present, however, I must postpone the results of such an analysis.

¹ Bushell, JRAS., 1880, p. 490

² *Ibid.*, p. 485. " *Ibid.*, p. 506.

³ It may possibly be rGyan, see text.

⁵ See Article II, JRAS., 1910, p. 1253.

The following is my reading of the Tibetan version of the text:—

TEXT OF THE ATTESTATION

Tibetan version

In this reading of the Tibetan text, as deciphered by me, I have numbered the paragraphs on the margin for convenience of reference. The length of the lines is transcribed as in the text.

1. །|| བོད་ཆེན་པོའི་ཚོན་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་ལ་སངས་
 རུས་གྱི་ག་ཅིགས་འཛིན་ཡ་ལ་གཏོགས་
 པའི་ཐབས་དང་ལྷིང་རུས་ལ། ||
2. །|| བོད་ཆེན་པོའི་ཆབ་སྲིད་ཀྱི་ཚོན་པོ་ཆེན་
 པོ་བཀའ་ལ་གཏོགས་པའི་ཐབས་དང་ལྷིང་
 རུས་(ལ)། ||
3. །|| (བ)ཀར་ཆེན་པོ་ལ་གཏོགས་ཏེ་
ས་ལ་དབང་ཞིང་ཆབ་སྲིད་འཛིན་
 ཚོན་ཆེན་པོ་དཔལ་ཆེན་པོ་
4. །|| དམག་གོ་ཚོག་གི་(ཚོན་) ར་(གི) ཆེ་' ||
5. །|| ཚོན་ཆེན་པོ་ཚོན་ལི་
6. །|| ཚོན་ ན་དམག་
 བཟང་ ||
7. །|| (ཚོན་པོ་)ཆེན་ཚོན་རྒྱལ་[ཡི]
 ས་
8. །|| (ཚོན་) [ཞང]

9. །|| ཆབ་སྲིད་ཀྱི་ཚོན་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་ཞང་(ཡི) . . .
 ཁོད་ནི་ལྟང་ ||

¹ For modern ཡར་. The word recurs in par. 12.

² Might read རི་.

10. །|| ཚབ་སྲིད་ཀྱི་སློན་པོ་ཚེན་པོ་ཞང་གྲི་བ་(ནི་)¹
ལྷ་མཚོང་ ||
11. །|| ཚབ་སྲིད་ཀྱི་སློན་པོ་ཚེན་པོ་སློན་རྒྱལ་བཟང་
འདུལ་གོང་ ||
12. །|| བོད་ཚེན་པོ་སློན་པོ་ཡ་ལ་གྱི་ཐབས་དང་
སྤྱིང་རུས་ ||
13. །|| ནང་སློན་མཚེས་ཞང་རྒྱལ་བཞེང་ཁོང་ནི་
བཅན་ ||
14. །|| ཕྱི་སློན་བཀའ་ལ་གཏོགས་པ་ཙོག་རོ(འི)
སློན་བཅན་བཞེང་ལྷ་གོང་ ||
15. །|| སློན་ཕྱི་བ་མཚེས་ཞང་བདན་བཞེང་ལྷག་
ཅང་¹ ||
16. །|| མངན་བོན་ལ(བ་)སའི་ཚོ་ག་གི་སྐ(འ)བལ་སློན་
ཀྱ་བཟང་སྤུས་མ་ ||
17. །|| བཀའི་ཕྱིན་སློན་ཚེན་ཀ་སློན་ལྷག་བཞེང་ཉ(བ་)
(ཉི)ན་ ||
18. །|| ཅེས་པ་ཚེན་པོ་ཅུས་པ་སློན་ལྷག་
ཟིགས་རྒྱན་འོ་ལ་ ||
19. །|| ཕྱི་སློན་ཁ(ལོ་)ཞང་ . . . (ཇེ་བོ་བ . ཚེ)²

¹ Or ཁྲི་.

² Possibly བལ་.

³ Compare with same letter in par. 1, l. 2, sixth letter from end.

⁴ Or ཅ་བ་.

⁵ This may read ས (= s), in which case the name may be "Blas", which was the second name or surname of the chief minister of K'ri Ston-*de-bt-san's* father (see Article II, p. 1254, etc.); but it seems more likely to belong to the following word, which would then read 'Bal', an epithet of the Dong tribe of Eastern Tibet (see my Article II, JRAS., p. 1253).

⁶ The ཀ here may be a contraction for བཀའ་.

⁷ The last word here may be བཅན་.

20. ༄ || (ཀྱ)ལ་ཅི(བ)་ཆེན་པོ་ཞལ་ཅེ་དོན་ལ་གི་
 ཞང་ཁྱོན་ཀྱལ་(ཆེ)ན་(ལམ)(བ)་ཅོན་ ||

¹ This possibly might be ལྷམ་, which has the same meaning as "treaty" or "agreement".

² This letter is blurred and resembles ས་, which here has no meaning; ས་ཅན་ would mean "possessor of land".

This important series of inscriptions, comprising the earliest historical Tibetan documents yet known, and all, with the exception of one of the later ones, here published and translated for the first time, will, I hope, form the nucleus of a *Corpus Inscriptionum Tibeticarum*.

XII

CHINESE RIDDLES ON ANCIENT INDIAN TOPONYMY

II. NAN-NI-HWA-LO

By COLONEL G. E. GERINI, M.R.A.S.

CHAO JU-KWA, in his famous ethnographical work published during the first half of the thirteenth century (between 1205 and 1258 A.D.), mentions, among the one hundred and more countries of Western India (*Hsi-T'ien* = the *Sind* of Edrisi and later Arab writers), that of *Nan-ni-hwa-lo*, of which he gives an interesting account. This has been made readily accessible to non-Sinologists through a translation by Professor Hirth which appeared in an earlier number of this Journal.¹

Though from the description given of this country its location may be vaguely inferred to be somewhere in the West of India, possibly towards the Western Frontier, its exact site has not yet, that I am aware, been determined, nor its puzzling name *Nan-ni-hwa-lo* explained. The hybrid rendering "Southern *Ni-hwa-lo*", put forward by the learned translator, far from furnishing a clue to identification, is, on the contrary, as will presently be seen, misleading.

No supplementary information appears to be available in Chinese literature about this mysterious country, except in later works which merely reproduce, more or less closely, Chao Ju-kwa's account.² Fortunately, however, this drawback does not affect identification, for in fact I have long since readily recognized in *Nan-ni-hwa-lo* the

¹ JRAS. for 1896, pp. 495-6; see also p. 494 for a passing reference.

² See op. cit., p. 495, n. 2. The *Sun-tsu T'u-hwei* was published in A.D. 1607, and the *T'u-shu-chi-ch'eng*, which reproduces the same version, also belongs to the seventeenth century.

well-known mediaeval kingdom of *Nahraṅga*, *Ahīlāra*, or *Ahīlāḍa* in Gujārāt, which flourished between c. 746 and 1298 A.D. The toponomastic correspondence is so evident as to discountenance objection, and it is indeed a wonder the coincidence has not struck other inquirers before this.

As it seems unnecessary to repeat here the translation of Chao Ju-kwa's account of the country, to which the reader may easily refer, I shall limit myself merely to a few remarks on some of its leading passages in view of the sidelights that may thereby be thrown on the history of that wellnigh forgotten State.

It is gratifying and withal not a little interesting to have Chao Ju-kwa's account of it and its capital at a period when the latter, although taken by Bhojadeva of Dhārā Paramāra of Mālava (c. 1020-30), sacked by the hosts of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī (c. 1026) and again by those of Ḳutbu-d-Dīn (1195), still retained most of the magnificence for which it was justly celebrated. Chao Ju-kwa did certainly not live long enough to hear of its fall, still less of its walls being levelled to the ground, which latter event happened at the vandalic hands of the Muḥammadans under Khiljī 'Alāu-d-Dīn in, or soon after, 1298. It is probable that his information was gathered early in the thirteenth century, and may chronologically go back to an even earlier period. At any rate it is, I believe, the earliest we have on that country after the somewhat meagre account from Edrīsī, of which more anon.

Chao Ju-kwa states that the capital has a threefold wall, a particular which has probably not been handed down in the records so far available from both Western and local sources. At the same time he speaks of *Hu-chu-la* (Gujārāt) as a distinct State with a distinct capital, which could hardly be the case at this late period, as we shall see further on. In common with Edrīsī he seemingly is in error as regards the worship obtaining among the

people of Anhilvāḍa, for he says that they [as well as in *Hu-ch'a-la* (Gujarāt ?)] were Buddhists, whereas the ruling class at any rate, from 941 down to 1143 and even later (1242), were Śaivas in religion, being especially attached to the temple of Somnāth.

He is, however, correct in mentioning *putchuck* (*Costus*) and fine white flowered and spotted cotton cloth (*patolas*) as the principal productions of the country, which is even nowadays the case. *Su-lo*, one of the articles of food much indulged in by the people, is probably neither kumiss nor ghee, as surmised by the translator, but some variety of millet or pulse (*masār* = lentil ?), if actually not *chora* = *Dolichos catiang* ¹.

The road, Chao Ju-kwa goes on to say, leads to the Western Regions (*Hsi-yü*) whence raids are made into the country by light horsemen. These were undoubtedly Muḥammadans from the desert of Rājputāna, to whom our author alludes in a neighbouring passage as frequenters of the country, terming them "foreigners of *Ta-shih*" (*Tājik*, *Tājika*, i.e. Arabia).

Discouraging is the closing statement as to the unmanly behaviour of the inhabitants in the face of such raids. "All the resistance they offer," he says, "is to lock their gates. In a few days provisions run short and [the intruders] withdraw of their own accord." Alas! for such passive tactics. No wonder that Anhilvāḍa was tottering to its fall!

That Chao Ju-kwa's information on *Nan-ni-hua-lo* was considerably hazy is exemplified by the fact, already pointed out above, that at the same time he mentions *Hu-ch'a-la* (Gujarāt ?), to which he devotes a separate

¹ *Su-lo* is presumably a rendering of some native term. I am unable to suggest, besides the above, any nearer approach than: (1) *shalu* = *Holcus saccharatus*; (2) *shaluk* = (a) *Nymphaea Lotus* (white); (b) root of the *kavul*; (3) *shālu*, not explained but given as the name of a crop in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vii, 81.

chapter of his work,¹ while in another section he refers to the same *Hu-chu-la* among the States subject to *Nan-p'i* (Malabar ?).² Now, it is well known that in our author's time, and, broadly speaking, from the tenth to the thirteenth century, the whole of Gujarāt was part and parcel of the Solanki kingdom of Anhilvāda, of which this city was the capital.

Notwithstanding this Chao Ju-kwa tells us³ that "the country of *Hu-chu-la* rules over more than a hundred *chou* [cities]; its [main] city has a fourfold wall", and that *Hu-chu-la* connects with *Ma-lo-hwa*. As the *Ma-lo-hwa* here referred to is presumably Mālava or Mālwa (and seemingly not Mārwar), the *Mālwah* of Edrisī and later Arabic writers,⁴ Chao Ju-kwa's *Hu-chu-la* appears to mean more particularly Southern Gujarāt, with its later capital *Ashāval* or *Ashāul* (the modern Ahmadābād); and it would, indeed, not be surprising that *Hu-chu-la* was, in his mind, intended to render the term *Ashāval* rather than the name *Gujarāt*, as it has hitherto been assumed.⁵

These observations made, it will be interesting to compare Chao Ju-kwa's account of *Nan-ni-hwa-lo* or Anhilvāda with the earlier one left us of the same country by Edrisī (c. 1154), as there are points in which the two agree pretty well, while in other respects they complete one another. For the place-names occurring in Edrisī's account which have remained so far unexplained (and these are the majority), I have suggested identifications of my own, which, it is hoped, will now make Edrisī's narrative of more practical value. To these I shall limit my remarks: other particulars may be looked up in Edrisī's treatise.

¹ See JRAS., July, 1896, pp. 478, 487-8.

² Op. cit., p. 485.

³ Op. cit., p. 487.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 488.

⁵ For Edrisī see Jaubert's transl., t. 1, pp. 175, 182. Paris, 1836.

In short, then, Edrisī says that the city of *Nahrwāra* (as he calls it) is ruled by a great prince taking the title of *Balhāra*, who is a Buddhist. It lies on the western bank of the Ganges (read Sarasvati), in a desert plain, and at—

(a) Eight days' march from *Barūh* or *Barūṣ* (Bharōch).

(b) Seven days' march from *Mādyār* on the Ganges (Mathurā on the Jamnā ?), which lies at five days from *Māwah* city (= Dhār, p. 181).

(c) Five days by cart-road from *Kandahar* (Ghandhār, in the Bharōch district, p. 182).

Between *Barūh* (Bharōch) and *Nahrwāra* there are two towns about equal in size and distant from one another little more than one day's march, viz. :

1. *Hanāūl* or *Janāūl* (= Hālol; less probably Kālol, 7 miles further to the north).

2. *Dūlka* (= Dholka). This lies on the bank of a river (the *Sābarnavati*) which falls into the sea, where it forms a gulf, to the west (read south) of which is *Barūh* or *Barūṣ* (Bharōch).

Both these towns lie at the foot of a mountain range stretching northwards of them and called the *Undaran* (Uttara?) Mountains (the Arāvali range), which are of a yellowish hue.

In the neighbourhood of *Hānāūl* is the town of *Asāūl* (= Ashāval, the modern Ahmadābād).

The people of *Nahrwāra* eat rice, peas, beans (probably *Phaseolus radiatus*), kidney beans, lentils, *māsh* (= *Phaseolus Mungo*), fish, and meat.

This almost tallies word for word with Chao Ju-kwa's statement that "the people eat much *su-lo* (lentils?), rice, beans, and vegetables; they will rarely eat fish or meat".

The two writers again agree in describing the people as Buddhists; while Edrisī's statement that "the town of

Nahrwāra is frequented by a large number of Musalmān merchants who resort there on business" elucidates Chao Ju-kwa's mention of foreigners from *Ta-shih* coming to the country.

Strange to say, nowhere in Edrisi does the term *Gujarāt* occur, whereas it appears over a century later on in Ibn Sa'id (1274) and Abū-l-Fedā (1321), not to mention Marco Polo, who though having sailed past the west coast of India in 1298, does not speak of Aṅhīlvāḍa, but only of *Semenat* (Sōmnāh) *Gozurat*, and *Cambuet* (Cambay). In former writers, as well as in local records, Gujarāt, or at any rate its central and southern parts, is designated *Lār*, *Lāḥa*: while the *Gurjjara* kingdom proper (Hwēn Tsang's *Kū-che-lo*, as well as Al Birūnī's doubtful *Guzarāt*, for which see below) lay farther north in what is now called Rājputānā. This further intensifies the doubt I have already expressed above, as to Chao Ju-kwa's *Hu-ch'a-la* being a rendering of the term *Gujarāt*.

Abū-l-Fedā calls this country *Jazarāt*, and locates *Nahlawārah* (or *Nahravālah*) in it.¹ He then proceeds to say that according to Ibn Sa'id (1274) *Nahravālah* is the capital of *Jazarāt*, which is quite true at this stage when Gujarāt had already become a Muḥammadan province governed from Aṅhīlvāḍa. He adds, moreover, that, according to a certain traveller, *Nahravālah* is a port situated at three days' march from the sea: but, he hastens to observe, it is Cambay which is, properly speaking, its seaport. This is correct, as even since the eleventh and twelfth centuries Cambay appears as one of the chief ports of the Aṅhīlvāḍa kingdom.

According to the same unnamed traveller, adds Abū-l-Fedā, *Nahravālah* lies to the west of Malabar and is larger than Cambay: the dwellings in the town are separated from one another by orchards and watercourses.

¹ See Reinaud & Guyard's *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, t. ii, pt. ii, pp. 115, 117. Paris, 1883.

The only other reference Abū-l-Fedā has to Anhilvāda is in connexion with a town called *Jālūr*, which, he says (p. 115), is situated on a hill between *Nākūr* and *Nahrwārah*. *Jālūr*, he adds, is the only town of *Jazarāt* (Gujarāt) which has not yet submitted to the King of Delhi. He locates *Nākūr* at four days' march from Delhi (p. 115), which latter he places at about one month's march from *Nahlawārah* (p. 120).

I have identified *Jālūr* with Jālor fort, standing on a hill, one of the most famous strongholds in Rajputāna, which was captured by Alau-d-Dīn in about 1310: and *Nākūr* with Nāganr, north-east of Jālor.

Dimashkī (c. 1300) almost ignores *Nahrwāra*, but mentions Gujarāt with the following cities,¹ of which my identifications are appended:—

1. *Koss*, very considerable, with a port and a large trade (= Kacch).
2. *Kir*, near by on the seaboard (= Khārāghoda?).
3. *Bazāna*, on the coast, with a port (= Bajāna on the Rann of Kacch).²
4. *Rakla*, near the sea (= Rawal np the Miāni River?).
5. *Manjarursa* (= Māngrol).³

¹ See Mehren's *Manuel de la Cosmographie du Moyen-Âge*, Copenhagen, 1874, p. 230.

² Al-Bīrūnī (1031) refers to a "*Bazāna*, the capital of *Guzarāt* . . . called *Nārāyana* by our people" (see Professor Sachau's *Al-Bīrūnī's India*, vol. 1, p. 202, London, 1910), which Cunningham (*Ancient Geography of India*, London, 1871, p. 338) has identified with Nārāyana (or Nārāyanpur), the capital of Bairāt. This *Bazāna* in Rajputāna can evidently have nothing to do with Edrīsī's seaport of *Bazāna* on the coast—the more so as Al-Bīrūnī adds (loc. cit.) that "after it [*Bazāna*] had fallen into decay the inhabitants migrated to another place called *Jadūra*". This is, I believe, the same as Abu-l-Fedā's *Jālūra* (= Jālor, see above). It is interesting in this connexion to notice that Hwèn Tsang places the capital of *Kū-chi-lo* (Gurjjara) at *Pi-to-mi-lo* (most probably Bhīmāl) near by.

³ This the translator rashly identifies with Mangalore, which is positively absurd, also in view of the fact that Mangalore is referred to further on (p. 234) as *Manjarūr*. It is therefore here a question of Māngrol, or Māngrol Bandar the "*Surati Mangalor*" of Barbosa (1516).

After the coast of Gujarāt. *Dīnashkī* proceeds to say, comes the coast of *Lār* with the kingdom of *Sumenāt* (Somnāth). He then passes on to describe Cambay and *Barūṣ* (Bharōch).

For him *Nahāwar* (= Nahrwāra. Anhilvāḍa) and *Mālvah* are parts of the *Korūrō* kingdom stretching between the eastern boundary of the country of *Sīnd* and Coromandel. By Gujarāt, on the other hand, he evidently means only what we now call Kāṭhiāvar.

The first—and probably the last—appearances of Anhilvāḍa in Western mediaeval cartography are in the Medicis (or Catalan) map of Florence (c. 1380–1400) under the form *Nerualla*, and in the Catalan map of Paris (1375) as *Nerualla*. In the last-named document, around the Gulf of Cambay are marked—

1. An unnamed city.
2. *Burochi* (= Bharōch).
3. *Cambetum* (= Kambāyat, Cambay), at the head of the Gulf.
4. *Nerualla*, in the interior, to the north or north-east of the preceding.
5. *Hocibelch* (or *Hucibelch*), near both to *Nerualla* and Bharōch (= Ashāval).

Professor Fischer, in his elucidation of the Catalan map of Florence, has supposed *Nerualla* to be identical with the modern Nadiād (which he spells *Nerual*, north-east of Cambay and north-west of Baroda).¹

In so far as local records are concerned, it seems worth while noticing that Anhilvāḍa is still mentioned (though prefixed with its new name *Patan*) as *Patan Nahrwāla* in Bābar's Kandahār inscription of 1522–7 (see JRAS., October, 1898, p. 801).

¹ *Sammlung Mittheile rischer Welt- und Seekarten Italienischen Ursprungs*, Venedig, 1886, p. 133. See also Hallberg's *L'Extrême Orient dans la litt. et la cart. de l'Occident*, Goteborg, 1906, p. 370, s.v. *Nerualla*.

Evidently, it was now high time that something more rational should be suggested in the place of so many fanciful interpretations of mediaeval geography, extending over the documentation of two centuries, and ranging from the *Nan-ni-hwa-lo* of the Chinese to the *Neruala* of European cartographers. Hence I venture to hope that the foregoing necessarily brief notes will have cleared the roughest part of the ground for the benefit of future inquirers.

XIII

THE "UNKNOWN LANGUAGES" OF EASTERN TURKESTAN. II

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE

SINCE writing the article in the October number of the Journal for 1910 (pp. 1283 ff.), I have been further examining some of the manuscript treasures which Dr. Stein succeeded in recovering from the immured Temple Library near Tun-huang. In that article I gave extracts from two "bilingual" texts which I discovered among those treasures, and which promised to furnish us with the key to the southern of the two unknown languages of Eastern Turkestan.¹ In the present article I propose to report another discovery, which seems to throw light on some phonetic peculiarities of that language.

Among the Stein MSS. there are a number of rolls, varying in length from about 2 to 23 feet, and in breadth from about 10 to 12 inches. They are inscribed on one side with Chinese and on the other with Eastern Turkestani characters.² The latter are not that species of upright Gupta characters of the essentially Indian type in which the two "bilingual" texts are written, and of which a specimen is shown in the Plate accompanying my article in the Journal for 1910. They rather constitute a development from the Indian Gupta characters, which has never been found in India, but which appears to have originated among the Eastern Turkestanis themselves. Moreover, in our present state of knowledge, this

¹ It is the "Sprache II" of Professor Leumann: see his articles in JGOS., lxi, p. 651; lxii, p. 83. His "Sprache I" is the Tokhari of the German savants mentioned below.

² They present, however, in no case anything bilingual: so I am informed by Dr. Stein, who has had the Chinese writing examined by M. Chavannes.

essentially Eastern Turkestani species of Gupta characters, which in my early report on them, in 1897, in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (vol. lxvi), I have named "cursive", appears to have been restricted to that relatively southern area of Eastern Turkestan in which the language of the two "bilingual" texts was current. In the relatively northern area of the other "unknown" language of Eastern Turkestan, to which the Berlin savants propose to give the name of Tokhari, the Indian Gupta developed what, in my still earlier report on the Weber MSS., in 1893 (*ibid.*, vol. lxii, p. 4), I named the "slanting" species of it: and this species appears to have been limited to that area. We have, therefore, in Eastern Turkestan three species of Gupta characters: (1) the upright Gupta of the Indian type, (2) the "slanting" Gupta, and (3) the "cursive" Gupta, both these latter species being of Eastern Turkestani origin, and apparently restricted to the relatively northern and southern parts of Eastern Turkestan respectively. In the sequel, I shall, for the sake of brevity provisionally distinguish the two still undefined languages of these two areas as the "northern unknown" and the "southern unknown".

Further, according to our present knowledge, the "slanting" species originated at a very early period (*circa* fourth century A.D.): for it appears in manuscripts which, so far as we know, are practically contemporary with the earliest written in the upright Gupta species.¹ On the other hand, the "cursive" species appears to have originated at a much later period, about the sixth or seventh century A.D.² if we may judge from the

¹ e.g., in the Weber MSS., and in Dr. Stein's palm-leaf MS. from Miran, of the third or fourth century A.D.

² According to the testimony of Chinese pilgrims of the sixth and seventh centuries, the script of Khotan and its district was that of the Brahmins. This, however, may, and probably does, refer to the upright Gupta script, which was current in those parts of Eastern Turkestan alongside of the "cursive" Gupta. See Dr. Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. 1, p. 90, where the authorities are quoted.

age of the Chinese documents, together with which the documents in "cursive" Gupta have been found, and which belong to the eighth century (see Dr. Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. i, p. 271). There is a curiously suggestive similarity of *ductus* between the Kharoshthi and "cursive" Gupta types of writing found in Eastern Turkestan. Both favour an elongated form of letters, as compared with the squat form of the upright or Indian Gupta. This similarity suggests that the "cursive" Gupta may have developed under the influence of the Kharoshthi script, which was current in the same area at a much earlier period, and that the "cursive" Gupta came in when the Kharoshthi went out of fashion.

Our acquaintance with the "cursive" Gupta script dates from the year 1895, when the Godfrey MSS. fell into my hands. The first specimens of it were published by me from those manuscripts in 1897, in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (vol. lxxvi, pp. 225 ff., pls. iv-vii). Additional specimens from them were published in 1901 in my "Report on the British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities", pt. ii (published as an Extra Number of *JASB.*, lxx, pp. 30 ff., pls. vi, vii), and by Dr. Stein in his *Ancient Khotan*, vol. ii, pl. ex (D. iii, 12). In my description of the documents in which the script occurred, I said that "the characters of the writing are evidently Brāhmi of a very cursive type" (*JASB.*, vol. lxxvi, p. 229), and in my Report (p. 32) I spoke of the script as "a species of cursive Brāhmi". The main reason for thus designating the script was that it represented a very degraded type of the upright Gupta script, and that its use seemed to be confined to documents, public or private, semi-religious or secular, to the exclusion of all literature proper, whether religious or secular. The latter distinction still holds good. Even now, with all the mass of manuscripts, literary and documentary,

which Dr. Stein has brought back from his last tour of exploration, the 'cursive' Gupta script has not been found employed in any literary work, nor in any *pothī*. The single exception I know of are the two folios 7 and 8, which have been inserted into the *pothī* of the *Aprīmotāyuh Sūtra*, to replace two lost folios which had been written in the ordinary literary upright Gupta of the rest of the work (see this Journal for 1910, p. 834). Still, though provisionally I retain it, because of its convenience, the term 'cursive' is hardly appropriate, because the letters of the script, however quickly or badly written are not 'running', that is, not connected with one another. In this respect they do not differ from the letters of the upright or slanting species of Gupta. Moreover, as may be seen from the illustrative plates accompanying this article, they may be written with any variety of neatness or coarseness.

The initial difficulty in reading the letters of the "cursive" Gupta script was that some of them had grown so similar to one another and others had wandered so far away from their original Gupta form that their identity became almost unrecognizable. As explained in my Report of 1901 (*loc. cit.*, p. 32), it took some years before the identity, e.g. of the signs for *na* and *bha*, was recognized. In these circumstances it was a most welcome discovery to find on the back of some of the rolls, which Dr. Stein submitted to me for examination, more or less complete tables of the Eastern Turkestani cursive alphabet and its syllabaries, which were evidently modelled on the similar tables current in India. For an account of the latter I may refer to Buhler's *Origin of the Indian Brahma Alphabet* (2nd ed., 1898, pp. 27 ff.), and of their Eastern Turkestani counterparts, to Watters' remarks in his *Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, vol. i, pp. 154 ff., and to Dr. Rothorn's letter in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*,

vol. x, pp. 280 ff., also to Dr. Takakusu's Translation of Itsing, pp. 170-1. From the report of the Chinese writers about these tables, which they call *si-tan-chang*, i.e. siddham-sections, it appears that they commenced with the word *siddham*, followed by the alphabet, or series of radical signs (Sanskrit *mātrkā*), that is, the twelve (so-called) vowels, *a ā i ī u ū e ai o au am ah*, and the thirty-four consonants, *k kh g gh ṅ, c ch j jh ṣ, ṭ ṭh d dh ṇ, t th ḍ dh n, p ph b bh m, y r l v, ś ṣ s, h, kṣ*. Huilin, a native of Kashgar, who wrote his account at some time between 788 and 810 A.D., adds the four vowels *ṛ ṝ ḷ ḹ*, which he calls supplementary. From this it may perhaps be inferred that the rolls none of the alphabets of which includes these four supplementary vowels, must be referred to a date earlier than Huilin. The alphabet was followed by a set of syllabaries, the first of which gave the combinations of the consonants, singly, with the vowels, while the others gave the same vowel-combinations with the consonants in various ligatures. All Chinese accounts agree with regard to the first syllabary, which comprised thirty-four series of combinations, beginning with the series *ka kā, ki kī, ku kū, ke kai, ko kau, kam kah*, and ending with the series *kṣa kṣā, kṣi kṣī*, etc. Regarding the other syllabaries the accounts do not agree. Hiuen Tsiang (seventh century) gives their number as twelve; but the number usually given (e.g., by Itsing, seventh century, Huilin, ninth century) is eighteen. The precise reason for this difference does not clearly appear from the accounts; but according to Buhler the tabulated ligatures included those made with y, r, l, v, and the five nasals; and that much the rolls tend to confirm. The whole *siddham-chang*, then, would appear to have been a long statement, consisting of a number of "sections" (*chang*), which began with the alphabet and continued with a varying number of syllabaries, the whole statement being headed by the word *siddham*, which served as its

name. The term *siddham-chang*, accordingly, would mean "the sections of the siddham".¹

Now the rolls discovered by Dr. Stein in the main confirm those Chinese accounts. The most important, for our immediate purpose, is the Roll Ch. cviii. 007, which is 10 ft. 9 in. long by 10 $\frac{3}{8}$ inches wide. On its back it is inscribed with a very long statement, which practically covers its entire length. It is divided into three sections, the first of which gives the alphabet, while the two others contain syllabaries. See Plate I, which shows the alphabet in ll. 1-6, and the commencements of the two syllabaries in ll. 8-10, 42, and ll. 43, 44. Of the two syllabaries, the first gives the vowel combinations of the single consonants (l. 9), *ka k̄a ki k̄i ku k̄u*, and so forth, down to (l. 42) *kṣa kṣ̄a kṣi kṣ̄i*, etc., while the second gives the syllabary of the conjuncts made with *y*, that is (l. 43), *kya kyā kyī kyī̄*, and so forth down to *lya lyā lyī lyī̄*, etc. It is not complete: the series of vowel combinations of the last six ligatures, *vy, śy, sy, sy, hy, kṣy*, are wanting. Why they should have been omitted is not apparent, for there is just sufficient blank space left at the bottom of the roll to have taken them. But whatever the reason may have been, the omitted six series are found at the extreme top of the back of another roll, Ch. xc. 002. See Plate II, ll. 1-6 (the original size of the portion shown is 19 by 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches). The line of the first series (*rya ryā ryī ryī̄*, etc.) stands so close upon the upper margin of the roll that its edge cuts through some of the vowel marks, thus proving that at one time the roll must have been somewhat larger than it is at present, its present length being only 6 ft. 5 in. (with a width of 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches). As, however, the papers of the two rolls are of entirely different make—Roll 002

¹ There has been some dispute as to the precise meaning of the Chinese word *chang*, whether it means "table" (Legge) or "section" (Julien) or "chapter" (Watters) or "composition" (Takakusu). The evidence of the rolls supports the meaning "section". But the translation "table", if not literal, is at least more suggestive of what the thing really was.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, consisting of ten lines. The text is highly stylized and appears to be a form of shorthand or a specific dialect. The characters are dense and often connected, making them difficult to decipher without context. The lines are roughly as follows:

- Line 1: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 2: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 3: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 4: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 5: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 6: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 7: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 8: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 9: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 10: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.

42
43
44

42
43
44

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, consisting of three lines. The text is highly stylized and appears to be a form of shorthand or a specific dialect. The characters are dense and often connected, making them difficult to decipher without context. The lines are roughly as follows:

- Line 42: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 43: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.
- Line 44: A series of characters, possibly starting with a vowel sign.

is soft, while Roll 007 is hard—they cannot have constituted two portions of a single roll torn asunder. At the same time, the handwriting in the syllabaries on the two rolls is so strikingly alike as to make it impossible to doubt the identity of their writers. Roll 002 is so short that it may be suggested that originally it was some 10 feet longer, and that the portion now missing carried the alphabet and the complement of the syllabary. The upper portion being torn away and lost, the missing portion of the statement was rewritten on Roll 007. This would explain the abrupt ending of the second syllabary on the latter roll. Following immediately on the completion of the syllabary of the conjuncts with *y*, on the back of Roll 002, there comes the syllabary of the conjuncts with *r*. It begins (l. 7) with the series *kra krā kri krī*, etc., and ends (l. 39) with the series *kṣra kṣrā kṣri kṣrī*, etc., each series occupying a separate line. There are, however, only thirty-three lines instead of thirty-four, because the series with the vowel notations of the conjunct *bhr* is omitted—whether intentionally or not will be considered in the sequel (p. 464). At the end of this third syllabary there is appended the following remark:—

*vinjilaki byam di ni tsa nrvi (?) hā yañ ñi dau la ni pa
ja dra ā ysā ja ga tea sni pī ka sadham*

This remark concludes the statement of the alphabet and syllabaries, which commences on the back of Roll 007 and continues on the back of Roll 002; for what follows the remark on the back of the latter roll is written in an entirely different hand, and refers to a different statement, which will be explained further on (p. 457).

The precise meaning of the remark is at present not intelligible, but one point is fairly certain, namely, that the term *vinjilaki* must denote the preceding “statement”, and is probably equivalent to the Chinese term *chang* or *siddham-chang*, “sections of the siddham.” For we meet with that term, variously spelled *vajalaka* or *vañjalaka*, also

on other rolls, but always in immediate reference to statements of the alphabet and syllabaries. Thus (below, p. 457) it occurs twice on the back of Roll Ch. 0042, by way of introducing a *siddham* statement. It is found also in a like connexion on three minute fragments of the Roll Ch. 0046 in the phrase

- (1) eysa vaijalaka sūhaṅka.
- (2) . . . vaijalaka sūhaṅka.
- (3) eysa sūhaṅka vaijalaka.

We have, then, here on the back of the Rolls 007 and 002 an example of the *siddham-chung* as described by the Chinese witnesses, comprising the initial *siddham*, the alphabet, and a varying number of syllabaries, in the present case only three. But our example amplifies their testimony in two particulars. In the first place, the word *siddham* stands at the head, not only of the whole statement, but introduces also each of the "sections" (*chang*). In fact, our example interpolates a sentence between the alphabet and the series of three syllabaries. The latter are introduced thus (Pl. I, l. 7):—

sidham nta nta mahājsa pyū,
i.e. "listen to this siddham from me".

In the second place, the alphabet includes not only the radical signs of the letters, but also those of the numerals. It runs as follows (Pl. I, ll. 1-6):—

- l. 1, sidham a ā e i ū ū e ai o au aṅ a
- l. 2, k kh g gh ṅ • c ch j jh ṅ • t th ṅd
- l. 3, ḍh ṅ • nt th ḍ dh ṅ • p ph b bh m
- l. 4, y r l v ś ṣ h ks 𑖀 𑖁 𑖂
- l. 5, tā 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 20 30
- l. 6, 40 50 70 60

There are some peculiarities in this scheme of radical signs, to which I shall return later on. With regard to my transcript of the radical signs of the consonants, it should be observed that, as written in the original (viz., without the *vīrāma* attachment), they represent, considered from the Sanskrit point of view, not radicals

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely Indic, arranged in eight horizontal lines. The characters are dark and somewhat obscured by ink bleed-through or damage to the original document.


30
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely Indic, arranged in seven horizontal lines. The text is more legible than the top section, showing distinct characters and some recognizable words.

(*k kh*, etc.), but syllables (*akṣara*, *ka kha*, etc.). But the Chinese accounts explain that in the alphabet the signs express "half-sounds", while in the syllabaries they express "full-sounds" (VOJ., x, 281). Thus the "full-sound" of a syllable (*akṣara*), e.g. of *ka*, consists of the two "half-sounds", the consonantal element *k*, and the vocalic element *a*.

The second peculiarity, regarding the composition of the alphabetical table, is fully confirmed by another roll. This is Roll Ch. xc, 003. It is very long, measuring 22 feet, with a width of 10 inches; but with the exception of the small space (about four inches) at the top of the roll, occupied by the alphabetical table, the remainder is blank. The table is shown in Fig. 1, reduced to about one-third of the original.


FIG. 1.



It runs as follows: —

- 1. 1, sidham a : u k kh g gh ñ • e ch j jh ñ • t th
- 1. 2, ṇḍ ḍh ṇ : nt th d dh n : p ph b bh m : y
- 1. 3, r l v ś s h ks Tā 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- 1. 4, 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 1000 10000 100000

It will be observed that in this table the series of the numeral radicals is more extended: and that it places the radicals for 60 and 70 in their proper order. In the table of Roll 007 they are misplaced, probably by a mere scribal error. The syllable *tā* which introduces the series of the numeral radicals in both tables may possibly be the



The term *vaijalaka* (l. 13), the probable meaning of which has been referred to previously (p. 453), occurs also among the disorderly lines, in the statement in the upper right-hand corner, which runs as follows:—

- l. 1. ḍam̄ vaja(la)¹laka
- l. 2. -sidhama a u k kh g
- l. 3. gh ñ c ch j jh ñ

The same, or a very similar, coarse handwriting appears on the back of Roll 002, immediately below the remark, above referred to (p. 453), with which the three syllabaries conclude. It consists of an exceedingly ill-executed and incomplete *siddham-chang* (Pl. II, ll. 42–6), which runs as follows:—

- l. 1. sidhama a ā ū k (kh)¹ kh g gh ñ c ch j jh
- l. 2. ñ ṭ th ṇḍ ḍh ṇ nt th d dh n p ph b bh
- l. 3. m y r l v ś s h ks ' sadhama
- l. 4. ka kā (ka)¹ ki kī ku kū ke kai ko kau kani ka kha khā
- l. 5. khi khī (kha) khu khu khe khai kho khau (kha)¹
- l. 6. kham̄ kha ga gā gi gī gu gū go gau gam̄ ga gha ghā
- l. 7. ghi ghī ghu pu ghe (gha)¹ ghai gho ghau gham̄
- l. 8. gha ṇa ṇā ṇe ṇī ṇu ṇū ṇe ṇai ṇo ṇau ṇam̄ (ṇa) ṇa ca cā
- l. 9. ci ci eu ce cai co² cau cam̄ ca cha chā chi chī chu
- l. 10. chu cho chau che chai cham̄ cha ja jā ji jī ju ju je
- l. 11. jai jo jau jam̄ ja jha (jha) jhā jhi jhī jhu jhū
- l. 12. jhe jhai jho jhau jham̄ pa sa(l dha)¹ dhama a

That this statement was written by an illiterate person is shown not only by its coarse execution, but also by its numerous errors: *ge gai* is omitted in l. 6, *cho chau* and *che chai* are misplaced in l. 10, *kha, ṇa, and jha* are superfluously repeated in ll. 5, 8, and 11; *khu khu, ṇu ṇu, eu eu, chu chu, ju ju* stand for *khu khū, ṇu ṇū, etc.*, in ll. 5, 8–10; *pu* and *pa* are wrongly written for *ghū* and *jha* in ll. 7 and 12: the *virāma* is omitted in *sindhama* in ll. 1 and 12. Occasionally *i* is hardly distinguishable from *e*, as in *khi*, l. 5; it is better in *chi*, l. 9, *jhi*, l. 11.³

¹ See n. 2 on p. 456.

² *co* had originally been written *cu*; afterwards *u* was crossed through, and *o* substituted.

³ After the *siddham-chang* there comes a short text, in twelve lines, at present not intelligible, which, however, is written again in fairly good cursive Gupta characters.

There is still another roll. Ch. 0046, which deserves notice on account of the striking peculiarities in its scheme of the alphabet and syllabary. It is a mere fragment of a roll, measuring 15 by 10 inches. The inscription on its back has the unusual arrangement that it commences with the simple syllabary, and then proceeds, in the concluding three lines, to the alphabet. The latter (Pl. IV. ll. 17-19) runs as follows:—

- l. 1. Sidham a ā e ī ā ū e va ai au va au a a k kh g g-h ŋ c ch
 l. 2. j j-h ŋ nt th d dh n p ph b bh m y r l va ś s s h
 l. 3. k

Here the following points are noticeable: (1) The entire omission of the group of cerebral radicals: (2) the dissociation of the aspiration in *g-h* for *gh*, and in *j-h* for *jh*: (3) the identity, or practical identity, of *ñ* with *j*, and of *d* with *s*. Turning to the syllabary (ll. 1-16), the most striking point is that the radical elements of the several syllabic series are arranged in a very unusual and apparently fanciful way,¹ and that some of them apparently are wanting. This may best be seen from the subjoined table, in which the radicals are placed in their normal order, while the raised numbers indicate their actual order on Roll 0046. The missing radicals are within brackets.

a²² | k¹ kh⁴ g¹¹ (gh) (ñ) | c⁷ ch¹⁸ j⁹ (jh) ŋ¹⁵ | (t th d dh ṇa) |
 nt²¹ th²¹ d²¹ dh¹⁶ n²⁶ | p¹² ph²⁰ b⁸ bh²⁵ (m) | y¹ r¹⁰ l⁶ v² |
 ś¹¹ s¹⁴ (s) | h¹⁷ | ks¹⁶ | ys⁷

It will be noticed that (1) the cerebrals are entirely omitted. (2) the aspirates *gh* and *jh* are omitted: but they are so only in appearance, for owing to the dissociation of their aspiration in the table of radicals there was no need of showing *gh* and *jh* in the syllabary, seeing that their dissociated elements, *g*, *j*, and *h*, were already exhibited: moreover, as we shall see (p. 464), the

¹ On a still smaller fragment of the same roll, measuring only 6 by 4 inches, the commencement of a syllabary in precisely the same peculiar order is repeated, viz. *ka, ca, ga, kha, ca, ka*.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

existence of *gh* and *jh* seems doubtful in the "southern unknown" language, which appears to have an aversion to aspirates. (3) For a similar reason, *ñ*, *m*, and *s* are omitted, for their forms are practically not distinguishable from those of *j*, *b*, and *d* respectively. (4) *bh* has the same peculiar form as in the table of radicals: and (5) *e*, *ā*, and *au* are substituted for *i*, *u*, and *o* respectively in the alphabet; but in the syllabary *u* and *e* are omitted altogether. Thus, e.g. in l. 2, we have *ya yā yē yī yū yai yau yau yam̄ ya* instead of *ya yā yi yī ya yū ye yai yo yau yam̄ ya*. Substantially therefore in all the five points the syllabary agrees with, and confirms, the evidence of the alphabet. The only striking point of difference is that the syllabary adds a series of vowel notations for the conjunct *ys* (ll. 4 and 5), apparently treating that conjunct as a radical exactly as the conjunct *ks*.

What precisely the significance of the substitution of *e*, *ā*, *au*, and *a*, for *i*, *u*, *o*, and *ah* may be, remains to be discovered. The full tale of radicals is shown only in Rolls 007 and 0046. The others apparently omit the vowels entirely, for their mention of *a u* may have reference to the mystic syllable *om̄*. The substitution of *a* for *ah* is probably a mere formality, for the Sanskrit *visarga*, in all probability, did not exist in the languages of Eastern Turkestan, as little as it does in the vernacular languages of India; thus we have, e.g., *nama sarva*^o for *namaḥ sarva*², in l. 10 of the Dhāraṇī on Roll 0041 (p. 462). The omission of the *u*-syllables from the syllabary of Roll 0046, and the substitution of *e* and *au* for *i* and *o* respectively, would seem to indicate that the southern unknown language of Eastern Turkestan did not distinguish particularly between the sounds of *u* and *ā*, *e* and *i*, *o* and *au*: and this explanation would seem to be confirmed by the fact that in their proper places the *e*-syllables are omitted in the syllabary, so that in it the single *e*

represents both *i* and *e*. Somewhat similar phenomena may be observed in the vernaculars of India. Numerous illustrations, on all these points, are furnished by the Dhāraṇī on Roll 0041. The curious interpolation of *ea* (or *e?*) in the vocalic series of radicals on Roll 0046 is also a point, the explanation of which remains to be discovered.

The most striking point in all the alphabetic and syllabic tables is that they uniformly write *nd* and *nt* in the place of the simple cerebral *d* and dental *t* respectively. It seems to me probable that the intention is not so much to indicate a nasal conjunct consonant, as a simple consonant nasalized, or in some other way modified; but I must leave it to experts in phonetics to determine what the precise significance of the graphic notation may be.¹ All with which I am now concerned is to show that those tables really represent a truth, namely that the people who spoke the language which is now under discussion always spoke *nd* and *nt*, where others (e.g. Sanskrit speakers) pronounced *d* and *t*. Among Dr. Stein's rolls there is one, (Ch. 0041, measuring 10 ft. 10 in. by 10½ inches, the back of which is covered, from top to bottom, with a long Buddhist Dhāraṇī, or rather with a pair of Dhāraṇīs, or mystical litanies for protection from evils, which extend to 151 lines. The first ends in the middle of the tenth line, and bears no name. It is, however, the well-known *Uṣṇīṣa-sijaya-dhāraṇī*, the Sanskrit text of which has been published by Max Müller in the *Anecdota Gromiensia*, vol. i, pt. iii, pp. 9, 22, 35, 36; and a copy of which exists also in the Hodgson Collection of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. 79, pt. iv. The second comprises the

¹ In this connection it may be worth noting that, as Dr. Waddell points out in his *Buddhism in Tibet*, p. 353, in Japanese Skt. *raiḍhrya* becomes *hizura*. The southern unknown language has *vaiḍhrya* (see pl. v, l. 23 of the Dhāraṇī on Roll Ch. 0041).

remainder of the Dhāraṇī, from the middle of l. 10 to the end of l. 151. Its name occurs repeatedly in the body of Dhāraṇī. e.g. on ll. 105 and 126. where it reads ntathā-gantaus-ṛiṣa-sāntāntapantra-nāmāparājanta-mahāprantya-garā, i.e. Skt. *tathāgat-o-ṛiṣa-sitātapatra-nāmā Aparijitā mahāpratyāṅgirā*. A Sanskrit copy of this Dhāraṇī exists in the same Hodgson Collection. No. 77, as well as in the gigantic roll of Dr. Stein's collection, which will be noticed in the sequel (p. 471). The Eastern Turkestan text, however, appears to be mutilated in two places, and in some others it differs not inconsiderably from the Sanskrit text of the Hodgson MS. Both the Dhāraṇīs were originally written in Sanskrit (of a kind), but on Roll Ch. 0041 they appear in the form in which their Sanskrit was "transmogrified" in the mouth of the natives of Eastern Turkestan. It is this transmogrification which constitutes their interest, for they are written, one might say, phonetically, and thus illustrate the phonetics of the language. Plate V shows the initial twenty-three lines, which give the whole of the *Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya* and the commencement of the *Aparājita-mahāpratyāṅgirā Dhāraṇī*. I give the Eastern Turkestan text from the roll, and below it, in italics, the Sanskrit text from the *Anecdota Oroniensiā* and the Hodgson MS., No. 77.

[l. 1] Sadhahama Namau rahna-ntriyāya namau bagavante ntraile-
(*Namo ratna-trayāya*)¹ namas (bhagavate)¹ trailo-

kyanta prantaviśaiṣṭāya bād[h]ā[. 2]ya bagavante ntadyathā auma
kyā prataviśiṣṭāya mahāhāya bhagavate tadgyathā om
viśaudīya viśaudīya sama sama samantāvabāsa [l. 3] (spha)² spharaṇa
viśodhaya viśodhaya sama sama samantārabhāsa spharaṇa
gauta gahana svabāva viśūdhie abaṣaicantū mā suganta vara vante³
gati-gahana svabhāva-viśudhī abhiśāicantu mām sugata-vara-vacana

¹ Ane. Oxon. om. bracketed words.

² See n. 2 on p. 456.

³ Apparently wrong for vara-vacane.

a[. 4]mrantābaṣauka: ¹ mahā madra padā āhāra² āhāra āyū sādāraṇe •¹
amṛtābhīṣekaviḥ mahā-madrā-padāiḥ āhara āhara āyuh-sandhāraṇi
 śādhi[. 5]va śādhyā gagana viśūdhe usm² vijaya viśūdhe saha(sra)⁴sra
śadhaya śadhaya gagana-viśudhe usm-sa-vijaya-viśudhe sahasra-
raśmi sacāda[. 6]nte sarva ntathāganta hrdayādhe-śhānādhe-śhānta
raśmi saṁcālite sarva-tathāgata hrdayādhi-śhānādhi-śhānte
 mādre vajra kāya sagāntanaviśū[. 7]dhe sarvāvarana viśūdhe pṛantanar-
mudre vajra-kāya-saṁghatana-viśudhe sarvāvarana-viśudhe pṛantnar-
varantaya āyū viśūdhi •¹ samayādhi-śhānte mahā[. 8]mane ntadyathā
raṭtaya āyur-viśudhe samayādhi-śhānt mahā-muni tadypathā
 būnta kautī paraśūdhi vaiśphutinta būdha śūdhi he he jīya vajīya
bhūta-kotī-pariśudhe vaiśphūṭita bhūdhī-śudhe he he jīya vajīya
 va[. 9]jeya smara smara sarva ntathāgantā būdhādhe-śhau śūdhi
vijaya smara smara sarva-(tathāgata)⁵ bhūdhādhi-śhānte śudhe
 vajre vajre va paraśūdhi sarva ntathā [. 10] gantā hrdayādhiśhāun-
vajre vajre — pariśudhe sarva-tathāgata hrdayādhi-śhān-
 ādhe-śhānta mūdre svāhā || Sadhama namau rahna-triyāya nama
ādhi-śhānte mūdre svāhā || Sadham namo rahna-triyāya namoḥ
 sa[. 11]va būdha-baudhasatvebya | namau baulhāya namau dharmāya
sarva-būdhā-būdhī-satvebyaḥ |⁶ namo baulhāya namo dharmāya
 namau sagāya namau sapntānā [. 12] samya sabandha kautinā namau
namo saṁghāya namo sapntānām samyak-sambuddha-koṭinām namo
 lake ahantānā namau⁷ spāntāpannūnā namau sakrautāgau[. 13]mīnā
loke ahantānām namoḥ spāntāpannūnām namoḥ sakrautāgāmīnām
 namau anāgaumīnā namau lake samya gantānā samya pṛantapanānā
namo anāgāmīnām namo lake samyag-gatānām samyak-pṛantapanānām
 namau de[. 14]va raṣīnā śāpīnā gra(ha)⁴ha samarthhānā namau saidha
namo deva-rāṣīnām (Śāpīnām)⁸ graha-samarthhānām namo śaidha-

¹ The double dot and single dot appear to be marks of interpunctuation ; they do not signify the visarga and anusvāra respectively.

² Note the peculiar serpentine mark under *h* in ll. 4, 15, 17. It seems to correspond to the semicircular mark which is found in the upright Gupta script.

³ Wrong for ushāsa.

⁴ See n. 2 on p. 456.

⁵ See n. 1 on p. 461.

⁶ The bracketed passage is not found in the Hodgson MS., No. 77. Instead, it has the usual conventional opening: *evam mayā śrutam ka-smīr samaye bhagavān de-veṣa-trayast-pūṣeṣu riharati sma | sadharmāyām de-va-sabhāyām mahatā bhikṣu-saṁghāna mahatā bodhisattva-saṁghāna śakrau de-vaṇām Indroṇa sārđham ||*

⁷ *na* is inserted below the line ; and the insertion is marked by a cross above the line.

⁸ The Hodgson MS., No. 77, has *sāpāyādhi-śhāntā namo sāyānugraha°*.

vidyādhara rasinā namau brāhma[. 15]nā namau Aidrāyi namau
*vidyādhara-(rṣinām)*¹ *namo brāhmaṇebhyaḥ namo Indrāya namo*
 bagavante Rau(dra)²drāya Umāpanta-sih³āya namau bagavante [l. 16]
bhagavate Rudrāya Umāpati-sahitāya namo bhagavate
 Nārāyaṇāpa⁴ ca mahānūdra namaskrantāya namau bagavante
Nārāyaṇāya ca mahānūdra-namaskrāntāya namo bhagavate
 mahākālāya ntra[. 17]pura veksaupanā karāya adhimūh²anta śamaśāna
mahākālāya tripura-(rikṣapaṇa)³-krāya adhimuktika⁶-śamaśāna
 vāsane māntra gaṇa nama-(skra)²skrantā[. 18]ya namau bhagavante
*rāsinu mātr-gaṇa-(nama-skrtāya)*⁷ *namo bhagavate*
 ntathāganta kūlāya namau padma kūlāya namau vajra kūlāya [l. 19]
tathāgata-kulāya namo padma-kulāya namo vajra-kulāya
 namau maṇā kūlāya namau gaja kūlāya namau kūmāra kūlāya namau
namo maṇi-kulāya namo rāja-kulāya namo kumāra-kulāya namo
 nāga kūlāya [l. 20] namau bagavante draiṇḍi sūrasena pṛaharaṇa rājāya
nāga-kulāya namo bhagavate draiṇḍi-sūrasena-pṛaharaṇa-rājāya
 ntathāgantāyārahente samya [l. 21]sabaudhāya namau bagavante
tathāgatāyārhatḥ samyak-sambuddhāya namo bhagavate
 Amintābhāya ntathāgantāya rahente samya sabādhā[. 22]ya namau
(Amitābhāya tathāgatāya arhatḥ samyak-sambuddhāya namo
 bagavante Aksubyāya ntathāgantāyārahente samya sabā(dha)²dhāya
bhagavate Akṣobhyāya tathāgatāyārhatḥ samyak-sambuddhāya
 namau ba[. 23]gavante baisaja gūrū vaiṇḍarya praba rājāya ntathā-
namo bhagavate bhaiṣajya-guru-rājāyāya-prabha-rājāya tathā-
 gantāyārahente samya sabandhā[. 24]ya, etc.
*gatāyārhatḥ samyak-sambuddhāya, etc.)*⁸

It will be seen from the preceding extract that every Sanskrit *t* becomes *nt* in Eastern Turkestani. Either singly or in ligature, *t* occurs upwards of 400 times in the Dhāraṇi, and with two exceptions it is in every case

¹ Hodgson MS., No. 77, om. the bracketed words.

² See n. 2 on p. 456.

³ See n. 2, p. 462.

⁴ Wrong for *Nārāyaṇāya*.

⁵ Hodgson MS. reads *vidrāpaṇa* for *rikṣapaṇa*.


⁶ The full reading of the Hodgson MS., No. 77, is: *adhimuktika kāmāra-mahāśmaśāna*. The Eastern Turkestani *adhimūhanta* = Skt. *adhimukta*, with ^hanta for *kata* = *ka*.

⁷ The Hodgson MS., No. 77, reads *raṇḍita-sahitāya* for *namaskrāntāya*.

⁸ The Hodgson MS., No. 77, omits the bracketed final three clauses. Dr. Stein's gigantic roll omits the first and second clauses, but it has the third clause referring to *bhaiṣajya-guru*.

spelled *nt*. The two exceptional cases are the conjuncts *te* and *st*. In these the simple *t* appears to be preserved regularly; thus we have—

FIG. II.



1. 11 (Plate V), *baudha-atvebya* = *baudhi-atvebhyaḥ*.
1. 101 (Fig. II. 1), *namas = tathāganta*? = *namas = tathāgata*.
1. 114 (Fig. II. 2), *vasta-sūla*? = *vasta-sūla*.

The cerebral *ḍ* does not occur so often, but whenever it does occur it appears as *ṇḍ*. Thus we have—

1. 23 (Plate V), *vaiṇḍarya* = *vaiḍārya*.
1. 52 (Fig. II. 3), *garuṇḍa-grahā* = *garuḍa-grahā*.
1. 102, *vaintāṇḍi-ṇḍākani* = *vaiṇḍī-ḍākani*.

Another example, *garuṇḍa* = *garuḍa*, occurs in the passage quoted above (p. 456) from Roll 0042.

Another striking point, which however is not so prominently indicated in the alphabetic and syllabic tables, is the loss of aspiration in *b* for *bh*: e.g. in Plate V,

1. 1, *bagavante* = *bhagavate*.
1. 3, *svabhāva* = *svabhāva*.
1. 8, *būnta-kauti* = *bhūta-koṭi*, etc.

This loss of aspiration is practically absolute in the Dhāraṇī, for in a total of about 150 cases there are only two exceptions: these are—

1. 18 (Plate V), *bhagavante* = *bhagavate*.
1. 118, *bhayaupadravebya* = *bhayaupadravebhyaḥ*.

In this connexion it may perhaps be not without significance that in the syllabary on Roll 002 (as noticed on p. 453) the line referring to the vowel notations of the conjunct *bhr* is entirely omitted, though, of course, the omission may be due to an error.

In the case of *gh* and *jh*, probably disaspiration was equally regular: still, those two aspirates are of infrequent occurrence, and hence examples are rare: but we have, e.g.,

1. 6 (Plate V), *sagāntana* = *saṅghātana*.
1. 11 (Plate V), *sagāya* = *saṅghāya*.
1. 130, *vaigna-vanāya* = *viṅha-vināya*.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Handwritten text in an ancient script, possibly Sumerian or Akkadian, arranged in approximately 23 horizontal lines. The text is heavily obscured by dark ink blotches and physical damage to the original surface, making many characters difficult to decipher. The script appears to be a cuneiform or similar wedge-shaped character system.

The case of *dh* is peculiar. It is often disaspirated, as in

- l. 2 (Plate V). *viśaudiya* = *viśodhaya*,
- l. 4 (Plate V). *sādāraṇe* = *sāndhāraṇi*;

but equally often aspiration is retained, as in


- ll. 6, 9, 10 (Plate V), *adhesthāna* = *adhiṣṭhāna*,
- l. 11 (Plate V), *dharmāya* = *dharmāya*,
- l. 14 (Plate V), *vaidyādhara* = *vidyādhara*,

specially when *dh* stands for Skt. *ḍdh*, as in

- ll. 3, 5, 7 (Plate V). *viśūdhe* = *viśuddhe*,
- l. 9 (Plate V). *būdhā . . . sūdhe* = *buddhi . . . suddhi*,
- l. 10 (Plate V). *sadhama* = *siddham*.

On the other hand, occasionally *dh* is introduced in the place of *d*, e.g.,

FIG. III.



- l. 50 (Fig. III, 1), *udhaka-bayā* = *udaka-bhaya*,
- l. 51 (Fig. III, 3), *rāja-dhaṇḍi-bayā* = *rāja-daṇḍi-bhaya*,
- l. 134 (Fig. III, 5), *gagā-nadhū-vālakā* = *gaṃgā-nadī-vālukā*.

Altogether the treatment of aspiration in the case of *d* and *dh* appears to be very capricious; thus we have, e.g.,

- l. 73 (Fig. III, 6), *vaidyādaraiḅya* = *vidyādhara-bhaya*,
- l. 85 (Fig. III, 4), *kāla-daṇḍiye* = *kāla-daṇḍine*,
- l. 104 (Fig. III, 2), *udaka* = *ulaka*.


Of the dissociation of aspiration we have an example in l. 1, *sadhahama* for *siddham*, where one would rather expect *sadaham*, to represent the usual spelling *sadham*.

The Dhāraṇī illustrates also some other curiosities of spelling in the southern unknown language of Eastern Turkestan previously noticed, such as the substitution of *e*, *ā*, and *au* for *i*, *u*, and *o* respectively. Thus, *i* occurs eight times in the 23 lines shown in Pl. V, viz.,

l. 5, uṣṇi and raṣmi: l. 7, viśūdhī and samayādhi: l. 8, paraśūdhī and būdha-śūdhī: l. 10, hṛdayādhi: l. 17, adhimūhanta. In some cases the writing is not sufficiently distinct: e.g. l. 8, kauṭī or kauṭi: l. 20, drainḍi or drainḍi, etc. Generally long \bar{i} takes its place, as in l. 5, vijaya-viśūdhe (= *vijaya-viśuddhe*), etc.: but occasionally *e*, as in ll. 6, 9, 10, adheṣṭhānādheṣṭhānta (= *adhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhānta*), or *ai*, as in l. 1, viśaiṣṭāya (= *viśiṣṭāya*). l. 3, abaṣaicantu (= *abhiṣaicantu*): l. 8, vaisphuṭinta (= *viṣphuṭita*): l. 14, saidha-vaidyādhara (= *siddha-vidyādhara*): l. 15, Aidrāyī (= *Indrāya*). Not uncommonly it is represented by *u*, as in ll. 1, 7, pṛanta (= *prati*); l. 15, Umāpanta (= *Umāpati*), etc.: exceptionally also by \bar{u} or *au*, as in l. 6, adheṣṭhānta, and l. 10, adheṣṭhaunta (= *adhiṣṭhita*). Again, *o* never occurs at all; we have, e.g., regularly namau and auma (= *namo* and *om*); l. 8, kauṭi (= *koṭi*), etc.; and in l. 1 even ntrailekyanta apparently represents a barbarous Sanskrit *trailokita* (for *trailokya*). Again, \bar{a} takes the place of *u* in ll. 11, 21, 22, bādḥāya (= *buddhāya*), and occasionally of *o*, as in ll. 4, 5, śādiya (= *śodhaya*), and, as above noted, even of *i*. But occasionally *u* is represented also by \bar{u} or *au*, as in ll. 8, 9, būdha (= *buddha*), ll. 18, 19, kūlāya (= *kulāya*); or ll. 11, 21, baudhāya (= *buddhāya*), l. 15, Raudrāya (*Rudrāya*).

A noticeable curiosity is the spelling *gn* for Skt. *jñ*, as shown below.

FIG. IV



1 83. vaidyā-rāgnīye = *vidyā-rājñya*.

This may be compared with the pronunciation of Skt. *jñ* in the vernaculars of India, e.g. *gy* in Hindi and *gny* in Gujarāti.

Finally, attention may be drawn to the peculiar form of *lh* in all the rolls, and of *bh* in Roll 0046. The more

original form of *kh* may still be seen in the syllables *khū* and *khā*. Both forms of *kh* occur in the Dhāraṇī, but *bh*, as already observed, never occurs but twice, and in those cases it is the ordinary form of *bh* (Fig. I. l. 2, as in Pl. V, l. 18, *bhagarante*).

When I published, in the October number of the Journal for 1910, the extracts from the two "bilingual" texts, I had not yet seen the rolls. The information of the latter on the phonetics of the southern unknown language of Eastern Turkestan is borne out to a considerable extent, though not altogether, by those two texts. Thus the pronunciation *nt* for *t* is illustrated by the pronouns *nta*, *ntyē*, *ntiñā*, etc., the nouns *ntirā-jaśa*, *pāntara*, *bisīpīrmānta*: the verbs *paraunta*, *untaipastisa*, etc. *Per contra*, the spelling of the conjuncts *tv* and *st* (without the nasal) is illustrated by the words *baudhisatva*, *gyasta*, *mista*, *dasta*, etc. On the other hand, in certain words, *t* is preserved, where one would expect *nt*, as e.g. in *napatata* (for *napantanta*?). The nasalization of *ḍ* (as *ṇḍ*) is entirely absent, e.g., in *yudai*, *haṇḍā-ḍana*, *beḍamī*, etc. What the true explanation of this discrepancy may be has yet to be ascertained. Further research among the manuscript treasures, brought back by Dr. Stein from his recent tour of exploration, may furnish us with the answer. In the meanwhile I suspect that the discrepancy may be due to the fact that the rolls were inscribed by natives of Eastern Turkestan, who wrote exactly as they spoke, while the translations from the Sanskrit which we have in the "bilingual" texts were written by "pandits", men from India, who wrote under the spell of Sanskrit phonetics rather than Eastern Turkestani, a suggestion which is supported by the fact that the Eastern Turkestani "bilingual" texts are written in the upright Indian Gupta characters, while the rolls are inscribed in the peculiar Eastern Turkestani "cursive" script. There is also another possibility, viz. that of clerical

errors. For example, the word (above referred to) which I have transcribed *napatata* (JRAS.: 1910, p. 1286, l. 5), is transcribed *napanata* from another manuscript by Professor Leumann (JGOS., lxii, p. 107, l. 32). Both transcriptions, as such, are undoubtedly correct, but obviously the original spellings cannot both be correct: there must be a scribal error in one of the two manuscripts. The graphic signs for *n* and *t*, in the upright Gupta script as current in Eastern Turkestan, are, in some manuscripts, rather difficult to distinguish. They are so in the manuscript fragment (Dr. Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. ii, pl. cx, D. iii, l. obv. of fol. 8, l. 2) from which Professor Leumann transcribed. His transcription I believe to be correct; yet the *n* and *t* are so nearly alike that the real reading might be *napananā*. In the *Vajracchedikā* manuscripts, from which my transcription was made, the signs for *n* and *t* are easily distinguishable, for *t* is written with a very elongated left limb, while *n* has two short and equal limbs.¹ There can be no doubt, therefore, that the reading of the *Vajracchedikā* manuscript, as it now stands, is correctly represented by *napatata*. Yet, after all, there might be a clerical error, and the true form of the word might be *napanana*: and if that were so, there would be no violation of the rule that *t* becomes *nt* in Eastern Turkestani.

Some confirmation of the view above expressed is afforded by the fact that the two folios 7 and 8 of the *Aparimitāyuh Sūtra*, which are written in "cursive" character (of a rather slovenly kind), absolutely agree with the Dhāraṇī and alphabetic and syllabic tables of the rolls with respect to the spelling *nt*. There is also much agreement with reference to the treatment of the vowels. The main difference from the Dhāraṇī is in

¹ Compare, e.g., *ta* and *na*, sixth and third letters from the right, on l. 3 of fol. 3 rev. on the accompanying plate; or *ti* and *ni*, third and fourth letters from the left, on l. 2 of fol. 32 obv.

FOL 7 OVERSE

1
 2
 3
 4

REVERSE

1
 2
 3
 4

FOL 8 OPVERSE

1
 2
 3
 4

REVERSE

1
 2

respect of the aspirate *bh*, which is regularly preserved, as in the tables. All the other folios of the manuscript are written in well-formed Indian Gupta characters, and exhibit all the peculiarities of the *Vajracchedikā* manuscript. The two folios 7 and 8 were evidently added subsequently by a native of Eastern Turkestan in order to supply a lacuna. They are shown in Plate VI, and read as follows. Sanskrit equivalents being added occasionally in bracketed italics :—

[Fol. 7a. l. 1] samāhḍaganta (*samudgate*) : sūbhāva vaṁśūde mahānīyaṁ parivāre svāhā : ntī vā pā nea -pam ra (nea)¹ cai sna na yū [l. 2] ntu ja sna ḥe ysa hañi mye a-ysmūñ-ja ha mye bī jā ṣṭa ntū Aparāmañtāyañi sūtra (*Aparimāñtāyañi sūtra*) hṛvānda : namau bhagavante aparāmañtāyañi [l. 3] mñtāyū jñāñña sūvanaiścanta ntejāñi (*suriniścātejo*) rājāyañi utathāgñtāyañi (*tathāgatāyañi*) rahante samyañi-sabaudhāyañi : ntadyethā [l. 4] auma sarva sa-kāri paśūñde (*sarva-saṁskāra-pariśūñde*) darmante gagāñne (*gaganā*) samāhḍagāñnta sūbhāva śūde mahāñīya parvare

[Fol. 7b. l. 1] svāhā : ntī vā pā nea gagāññyañi grī nce -ye ja hañi ma gi na yū nta ja -sna ḥe ysañi ha mye a-y-smū-ja ha [l. 2] ha mye bī jā ṣṭa ntū aparāmañtāyañi sūtra hṛvāda namau² bhagavante aparāmañtāyū jñāñña sūvanaiścanta ntejāyañi utathāgāntāyañi rahanta samyañi sabaudhāyañi ntadyethā auma sava skāra paśūñde : [l. 4] dharñanta gagāna samāhḍagāntāñi sūbhāva vaśūñde mahāñīya parvare svāhā :

[Fol. 8a. l. 1] kññi ma ṣa ha mā ve cañi ntū aparāmañtāyañi sūtra pī rī ntey ja stāñi na jañi na saññāññi pa -skya ṣṭa u kha [l. 2] ysde : naman² bhagavanta aparāmañtāyañi jñāñña sūvanaiścanta ntejāyañi rājāyañi utathāgāntāyū [l. 3] rahante samyañi sabaudhāyañi ntadyethā auma sa-kāra paśūñde darmante gagāna saññāññā gagāna sūbhāva [l. 4] vaśūñde mahāñīyañi parvare svāhā

[Fol. 8b. l. 1] kau ma ṣa hañi mā ve nea ntū aparāmañtāyañi sūtra pī ye : ntū na dā jañi ve ñ na brī yvā [l. 2] nam ntrāi ṣṭi u na ha śdā a ha ksa :

* * * * *

In order to complete the present preliminary account of the rolls, I may add a few interesting particulars of a different kind.

I. Four of the rolls contain dated statements. Thus at the bottom of the back of Roll Ch. 0042 there are six

¹ Apparently cancelled.

² The original text seems to read *namāñ*, but the apparent *ñ* is merely a very crudely formed cursive *an*.

or seven very brief entries, one of which gives the following date, three times repeated:—

si salya (so twice, but once asa salya) ḥadyaja māste ksausmya haḍai
(rabici)

i.e. "in the first year, in the ḥadyaja month, on the sixth (or sixteenth?) day". Signature in oval.

Again, the back of Roll. Ch. 0048 is inscribed with a Buddhist text in seventy-one lines, which begins with the following date:—

ssa salya cūvija māste nāmaḥa haḍai

i.e. "in the sixth year, the cūvija month, the ninth day".

Again, on the back of Roll. Ch. cvi. 001, there is some text, which begins with the following date:—

maḍala (?) salya evāvaja māsti bi-timye haḍai

i.e. "in the maḍala year, the evāvaja month, the twentieth day".

Again, among Dr. Stein's manuscripts there is a gigantic roll, about 70 feet long, entirely covered on one side with 1,108 lines of writing. On it there occur the following four dates:—

(1) On ll. 196-7, sahaica salya pūhye māsti padauyse¹ haḍai ārdra naksatra

i.e. "in the sahaica year, the fifth month, the first day, the ārdra lunar asterism".

(2) l. 846, si sūntri pūhye¹ māsti 20 mye haḍai

i.e. "this sūtra, in the fifth month, the 20th day".

(3) l. 1058, sahaici salya naumye māsti pūhye haḍai

i.e. "in the sahaici year, the ninth month, the fifth day".

(4) l. 1102, sahaici salya dasumye māste 8 haḍai pūrva-bhadrava naksatri

i.e. "in the sahaici year, the tenth month, the 8th day, the pūrva-bhādrapāda lunar asterism".

In the foregoing series of dates we have the mention of the following two months, (1) Ḥadyaja, (2) Cūvaja or Cūvija. The names of other nine months are quoted in my "Report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia", pt. ii, p. 35 (Extra Number 1 to JASB., vol. lxx. pt. i, 1901), and shown there in pls. ii, 6: vi.

¹ See Professor Leumann's remarks in JGOS., vol. lxi, p. 87, footnote 1.

and vii, 1. 2 (see also JASB. vol. lxvi. pl. v). They are (1) Skarhvāri or Skarihvāri (2) Cvābhaja or Cvuābhaja, (3) Mūnānija, (4) Khahsāja or Khahsā, (5) Hamdyaja. (6) Ũahaja or Ũaha. (7) Jeri, (8) Kaja. (9) Pāñija (or Māñija?).¹ The names of three months are mutilated, viz., (10) . . khaja or . . caja. (11) . i . ĩja. (12) . vāraja. As the names hadyaja and hamdyaja, and the names cvāvaja (or cūvija) and cvābhaja (cvuābhaja) are evidently identical respectively, we thus have the names of twelve months, nine complete and three mutilated. The months in the four dates of the gigantic roll are not named, but numbered, viz., *pāhya* or *puhya*, fifth: *navmya*, ninth: and *dasamyā*, tenth. Among the names Skarhvāri is clearly identical with the old Persian Kṣatravairyā, and the modern Persian Shahrivār; but none of the others has as yet been equated. The days (*baḍa*) in the dates are always indicated by numbers: so also the years (*salva*, modern Persian *sāl*). The term *isi*, or *aśa*, in the date of Roll. Ch. 0042 I take to be connected with *śau*, one (see JRAS. for 1910, p. 1297, note 10), and *ssu* to be six; but *sahaica* and *madala* (the reading is not quite certain) I cannot explain for the present. Two nakṣatras, or lunar asterisms, are mentioned in the date of the gigantic roll, viz. *ārdrā* and *pūrva-bhādrapāda*.

II. The gigantic roll, above referred to, is one of the proceeds from the Temple library of Tun-huang. It is made of tough buff-coloured paper, and measures, in its present condition, 70 ft. 10 in. by 11½ inches, but about 3 or 4 inches are torn off at the top. The interior side is entirely covered with 1,108 lines of writing. The exterior side is blank with the exception of a parti-coloured figure at the top. This figure consists of two geese, standing on two open lotuses, facing each other, and holding in their bills flowering tendrils. The whole of the writing is in fair upright Gupta script, excepting three interspersed

¹ My readings of the names in JASB. have to be amended as above.

paragraphs which are written in "cursive" Gupta characters. The contents are as follows :—

ll. 1–197 are a long Dhāraṇī, in corrupt Sanskrit, named, in ll. 193–4, *tathāgatauṣṇīsa siddhāntapātraṃ nāimāparājita mahāpratyagīrā*, i.e. Skt. *tathāgatoṣṇīsa-sitātapātraṃ nāimāparājitā mahāpratyagīrā*. A manuscript of this Dhāraṇī is in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. 77 in its Catalogue. Another is described in R. Mitra's *Catalogue of Sanskrit Buddhist Literature*, No. B. 46. p. 227. It is practically identical with the long Dhāraṇī, in "cursive" Gupta script, on the back of Roll Ch. 0041, but the opening passage, down to the middle of l. 5 (uṣṇī vijaya viśūdhē), is torn away. It ends with the first of the four dates above quoted. Its name is spelled variously *sitātapātra*, or white umbrella, in l. 178, or *sitāntapātra* in ll. 91, 158, 169, or *setāntapātra* in l. 190, or *satāntapātra* in l. 136. or *siddhāntapātra* (apparently Skt. *siddh-ātapātra*) in ll. 58, 72, 193, or *sūdhāntapantri* (Skt. *sūdh-ātapātra*) in l. 841.

ll. 198–220 are a story of the communication of the 1,000 names of Buddha, in the southern unknown language, and in upright Gupta script.

ll. 221–728 contain the enumeration of the 1,000 names, in corrupt Sanskrit and upright Gupta script. At the end, however, in l. 728, there are the numeral figures for 1,000 and 5 (i.e. 1,005), though the names actually enumerated are only 1,000.

ll. 728–754 give the text of the Buddha piṭai *bhadra-kalpya-sūtrā*, i.e. Skt. *bhadra-kalpa-sūtra*, followed in

ll. 755–840 by an enumeration of classes of superhuman beings (such as 12 koṭi of Ratnottama, 18 koṭi of Ratnāva-bhāsa, etc.); the whole in the southern unknown language and in upright Gupta script.

ll. 841–8 contain a short statement with reference to the preceding two texts (the *sitātapātra* and the *bhadra-kalpa* with its enumeration), including the second date

previously mentioned : the whole in the southern unknown language and in cursive Gupta script.

ll. 848-1058 give the text of *Sumukha-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, in the southern unknown language and in upright Gupta script.

ll. 1058-60 contain a statement referring to the preceding (third) text, with the third above-quoted date, in the southern unknown language and cursive Gupta script.

ll. 1060-1100 practically repeat the enumeration of classes of superhuman beings which was given in ll. 755-840, in the same language and script.

ll. 1100-5 contain a statement referring to the preceding enumeration, nearly alike to that in ll. 841 ff., with the fourth above-quoted date, also in the southern unknown language and cursive script.

ll. 1106-8 conclude with a few salutations to *Ratnatraya*, etc., in corrupt Sanskrit language and in upright Gupta script.

As a curiosity it may be noted that the frequently occurring term *gyusta* is once (l. 841) spelt *jasta*, while in other places it has the usual spelling *gyusta*.

III. On the upper portion (about 5 feet) of the back of Roll Ch. 0044, which measures 23 ft. 10 in. by 10 inches, there are seventy lines of writing in cursive Gupta script and in corrupt Sanskrit language. They contain the text of the *Kausākī Prajñāpāramitā*, the end of which may be compared with the ending of the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*, printed in the *Anecdota Oroniensis*, vol. i, pt. iii, pp. 50, 54, and in R. Mitra's *Catalogue of Sanskrit Buddhist Literature*, No. A, 15, p. 192. It runs as follows, the Sanskrit version being in italics:—

Namah prajñāpā[l. 66]ramintāyai ntadyathā gante gante pāragante
Namah prajñāpāramitāyai tadyathā gante gante pāragate
 pārasagante baudhi svāhā[l. 67] idam avaucant bhagavān ātmanā
pārasaṅgate bodhī svāhā | idam avocāt bhagavān ātmamanā

āyūsmā Sārapūtra Śakrau devān[.l. 68]nām idra nte ca baudhisatvā
āyūsmān Sāripūtraḥ Śakro devānām idraḥ te ca bolhi-attra
 mahāsatvā sā ca sarvāvanti parsa sa-de[.l. 69]va-gaṃddharva-mānūṣ-
mahā-satvā sā ca sarvāvanti parsat sa-de-ca-gaṃddharva-mānūṣy-
 āsūmraś ca lokau bhagavantau bhāṣintam abhyanaṃda } kauśaki [. 70]
āsuras ca loko bhagavanto bhāṣitam abhyanaṃtan } kauśaki
 nāmā prajñāpāramitā samāpnta
nāmā prajñāpāramitā samāptā

Notice the invariable substitution of *nt* for *t*.

IV. Roll Ch. 0048 is one of the smallest. It measures only 7 ft. 11 in. by 12½ inches. Its back bears seventy-one lines of writing in the southern unknown language and in exceedingly crude cursive Gupta script. The initial thirteen lines are introductory prose, and are followed on ll. 14-71 by a Buddhist story which opens in the conventional way, except that here the opening statement is not in the usual prose, but in verses (one and a half), as follows :—

[l. 14] Siddham Nta pyūṣṭi sau bāṃ de ḥaysi • Srāvasti ksīri sa
 mūn de • jintiri-pūri udāṃṃa • pharūṃkye [l. 15] parṣiṣa
 hansa • I Dharmi sai nava misti • Sāripūtra sthīri ntū
 kān la •

After these verses the story proceeds in prose. In the prose portion the word *ḥaysi* appears several times spelled *biysi*. Perhaps the versified opening may hereafter lead to the identification of the Sanskrit version of the story.

V. Roll Ch. cvi, 001, which is only a sheet of thick, tough, dun-coloured paper, measuring 24½ × 13 inches, is remarkable also on account of being inscribed, not in Chinese, but in Tibetan. The obverse, or what appears to be the principal side, is covered entirely with thirty-one lines of writing in extremely crude cursive Gupta script, and in the southern unknown language. It opens with the date, above quoted, and is continued on the reverse side with eight lines of similar writing. This is followed by fifteen lines of fair writing in Tibetan script and apparently Tibetan language, which runs, however, in the

opposite direction to the cursive Gupta inscribed above it. Below this again, and finishing the reverse side, there is another Tibetan inscription of nine lines, which again runs in the opposite direction to the Tibetan above it, and therefore in the same direction as the cursive Gupta inscription at the top of the reverse side.

On the obverse side, on the eighth and ninth lines from the bottom, there is a cancelment of eleven syllables (*aksara*) of the cursive writing (crossed through), and below is written interlinearly, in Tibetan script, *manant* with an unintelligible mark after it. On the same side, on the ninth line from the top, there is what looks like the indication of a fresh paragraph in the cursive writing which here begins with *am*, and below it is written, interlinearly, *am* (or *ama*) in Tibetan. The corrections in Tibetan seem to indicate that the Tibetan inscription on the sheet was made at a date subsequent to the inscription in cursive script. If that be so, and if the Tibetan inscription contain a date (which I have not been able to make out), it may furnish a key to the identification of the era and the system of dating of the documents in cursive script.

VI. Towards the end of the *Aparājītā Pratyāṅgirā Dhāraṇī* there occurs a curious clause enumerating the different kinds of writing material which was in use at that period of time. The clause runs as follows :—

- (1) Roll Ch. 0041, ll. 125 ff., ya imā ntaḥgantausṇīsa-sāntāntapantra-
 (2) Gigantic Roll, ll. 158 ff., ya imām tathāgatausṇīsaṁ sitāntapatraṁ
 (3) Hodgson, No. 77, fol. 17b. — mā tathāgatosṇīsa-sitātapatrā
 (4) Sanskrit : *ya imām tathāgatosṇīsa-sitātapatra-*
 (1) nāma-parājānta pratyagatā lakṣatvā bhvyū-pantraī vā vastre vā
 (2) nāma-parājītaṁ pratyāṅgirā likhitvā bhūja-patre vā vastre vā
 (3) nāma-parājīta pratyāṅgirā likhitvā bhūja-patre vā vastre vā
 (4) *nāmān aparājītaṁ pratyāṅgirāṁ likhitvā bhūja-patre vā vastre vā*
 (1) kalke vā kāyagante vā karyagante vā likhitvā dhārayasyante |
 (2) kalke vā kāyagate vā kaṭhagate vā likhitvā dhārayesyate |
 (3) bhūvatkare vā kāyagatāṁ vā kaṭhagatā vā kītvā dhārayisyanti |
 (4) *kalke vā kāyagate vā kaṭha-gatāṁ vā kītvā dhārayisyati |*

- (1) *ntasya yāva-jīva vasa na kramisyante*, etc.
 (2) *tasya yāva-jīvaṃ viśaṃ na kramisyate*, etc.
 (3) *tasya yāvaj-jīvaṃ viśe na kramisyanti*, etc.
 (4) *tasya yāvaj-jīvaṃ viśaṃ na kramisyati*, etc.

i.e. " who, having written this powerful Pratyāṅgirā (Dhātupā), named the white sunshade of the Tathāgata's crown, either on birch-bark, or on cloth, or on paste, or on paper, or having committed it to memory, makes use of it : him throughout life no poison will injure ", etc.

This clause names four kinds of writing material—
 (1) *bhūcja-patra* or birch-bark, (2) *rastra* or cloth, (3) *kalka* or paste and (4) *kāyagata* or paper. There can be no question about the identity of the words for birch-bark and cloth. The form *buryā*, if the reading is correct, would seem to be the name of the birch in the southern unknown language. As to *kāyagata* or *kāyaganta*, it is clearly identical with the Arabic word *kāghadh*, or, as it is pronounced in India, *kāghaḥ* (Ūrdu) or *kāghad* (Hindī). This word, as I have shown in this Journal for 1903, p. 669, on the authority of Professor Karabacek, is a mere loan-word in Arabic, into which it was introduced from the Chinese *kok-tz'* through Eastern Turkestan in the middle of the eighth century. Dr. Stein's rolls would show that, by the natives of Eastern Turkestan, the Chinese word was pronounced *kāyaganta* (or *kāganta*, p. 477); and in that case the Arabic pronunciation of it, as *kāghadh*, might throw light on how the Eastern Turkestanis pronounced their *kāyaganta*. Of *kalka* I am unable to make anything unless it may be an error for *valka*, and unless the latter may signify skin or parchment. The ordinary meaning of the word is " paste " (e.g., made of powdered dry, or crushed fresh drngs. in medicine). Might it here refer to mortar, or beton, which when plastered on a wall would make an inscribable surface? The reading *bhūvatkare* (*bhūvatkale* ?) of the Hodgson MS. is equally puzzling. The reference of the fifth alternative to memorizing seems clear from its version in the gigantic roll and the Hodgson MS. That version, however, is the

lectio facillior, and the version in Roll 0041 seems to point rather to a fifth kind of writing material, but what that material might be I am unable to suggest. It seems possible that the name of paper should be *kāganta* or *kāgata*, the existing reading *kāya-ganta*, or *kāya-gata*, lit. "gone into the body", being erroneously due to the following phrase *kaṇṭha-gata*, or "gone into the throat", the well-known Sanskrit idiom for "committed to memory".

XIV

THE KALIYUGA ERA OF B.C. 3102

1675

By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

THE Kaliyuga era is a Hindū reckoning beginning at mean sunrise, 6.0 a.m., Lankā or Ujjain time, on Friday, 18 February, B.C. 3102.¹ Its 5013th year will have begun just before the time when these pages come into the hands of readers of this Journal.

In consequence of the seeming antiquity of this reckoning, there has been manifested recently in certain quarters a desire to demonstrate that it is a real historical era, founded in Vedic times and actually in use from B.C. 3102. But any such attempt ignores the fact that the reckoning is an invented one, devised by the Hindū astronomers for the purposes of their calculations some thirty-five centuries after that date. And it ignores, not a theory of the present writer or of anyone else, but a position which was clearly established as soon as the Hindū astronomy had been well explored, and was fully recognized at least half a century ago.² There is, however, this to be said: that the statements of the fact are mostly confined to writings which are not often consulted or even seen now, except by specialists who are concerned more with the study of the Hindū astronomy than with that of the calendar and the eras and other reckonings.

¹ It may be useful to note that in terms of the Julian Period beginning with Monday, 1 January, B.C. 4713, and regarded as having its days running for Indian purposes from sunrise (instead of the preceding midnight), the first civil day of the Kaliyuga era, the Friday mentioned above, is the day 588,467 current, or, as it is taken for purposes of calculation, the day 588,466 elapsed.

² As, for instance, by Whitney in his notes below E. Burgess's translation of the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, published in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 6 (1866), pp. 145-498.

In these circumstances, the present article is given in order to bring the matter into an easily accessible publication, and to show, without entering into the complex question of the antiquity of the Vēdas and the various topics connected therewith, the real nature of this reckoning and the circumstances in which it was established. Also, taking the matter farther, to show the leading part which the reckoning has in the Hindū system of cosmical periods, and the extent of its connexion with historical chronology, legendary and real.

The Kaliyuga or Kali age is the Hindū Iron Age. It is the last and worst in each cycle of the Four Ages in the Hindū system of cosmical periods. Nevertheless, it is intrinsically the most important item in the whole scheme, since, as will be seen the beginning of it is the pivot of the entire system.

Each cycle of the Four Ages called sometimes Chaturyuga, 'the four ages', sometimes Mahāyuga, 'the great age', sometimes simply Yuga, 'the age', has the duration of 4,320,000 solar years or, as some of the books explain, years of men: that is, years beginning at the Hindū nominal vernal equinox, and measuring 12 minutes and a few seconds more than $365\frac{1}{4}$ days. According to the view now prevailing, which is traced back to the time of Brahmagupta (wrote A.D. 628), each Chaturyuga is divided in the descending scale of 4, 3, 2 and 1 tenths, into the Krita or Golden Age of 1,728,000 years, the Trētā or Silver Age of 1,296,000 years, the Dvāpara or Brazen Age of 864,000 years and the Kali or Iron Age of 432,000 years.¹ Each age opens with a 'dawn' and

¹ As regards the method of stating the lengths of the ages, Brahmagupta (ed. Sudhakara Dvivedi, p. 3, verses 7, 8) first gives the length of the Chaturyuga, 4,320,000 years, which, he says, comprises "the four, the Krita and the others, with dawns and twilights." He then takes

closes with a 'twilight', each of which measures one-twelfth of the whole period assigned to the age, and is included in that period; so that what we may call the full daytime of the age lasts for ten-twelfths of that period;¹ and it is from this point of view that the Kali age is sometimes mentioned as measuring 360,000 years.² The divisions of the Chaturyuga on these lines are shown on p. 483 below. And the table shows also the constitution of the cycle on the principle of 'divine years', the basis of which is the idea that one year of men is a day of the gods, and 360 such days are one divine year.

the tenth part of that, viz. 432,000 years: and he multiplies this latter figure by 4, 3, 2, and 1.

A different course is taken by Lalka, an early exponent of Āryabhata, who may or may not have come before Brahmagupta. He differs from his master regarding the divisions of the Chaturyuga (for Āryabhata's arrangement of this matter see p. 486 below), and agrees with Brahmagupta, but fixes the lengths of them by other means. He takes the orbit of the moon, 216,000 *yōjanas*, as stated by Āryabhata on the assumption that the moon is at such a distance from the earth that one minute of arc along her orbit round the earth measures ten *yōjanas*; and he gets the figures for the ages by multiplying this figure by 8, 6, 4, and 2: see his *Śiṣhyadhāraṇībhāṣā*, ed. Sudhakara Dvivedī, p. 3, verse 14, with p. 27 f., verses 2, 3 (there are rather serious mistakes in some of the explanatory figures interpolated by the editor here).

¹ I follow Whitney and other scholars in using the terms 'dawn' and 'twilight'. The original texts sometimes discriminate by presenting *sāndhyā* where the term 'dawn' has been adopted, and *sāndhyāṃśu* where 'twilight' is used. But in other places they use the term *sāndhyā* in both senses, and also another term, *sāndhi*, which, however, is perhaps used more specially in connexion with the Manvantaras, to which we shall come next.

The term *sāndhyā*, lit. 'a holding together, union, junction', occurs freely in literature in the sense of both the morning and the evening twilight. *Sāndhyāṃśu*, lit. 'a portion of *sāndhyā*', seems to have been selected simply in order to obtain, for the purpose of the ages, *sāndhyā* in the sense of the opening 'twilight', and another term for the closing one. *Sāndhi*, lit. 'junction, connexion, place or point of contact', appears also to occur in the sense of 'twilight', both of the morning and of the evening. But the *sāndhis* are not parts of the Manvantaras, as the *sāndhyās* and *sāndhyāṃśus* are of the Ages; and the idea seems to be more that of 'a junction-period', and to be better taken in this way: see, further, p. 482 below, and note 2.

² For instance, in the *Vishnu-Purāna*, 4. 24. 41: trans., vol. 4, p. 236.

Such are the divisions of the Yuga. Mahāyuga, or Chaturyuga. In the other direction, 71 Chaturyugas constitute a Manvantara, 'the period of a Manu or patriarch': and during each Manvantara the Four Ages run on, in cycle after cycle, without any break: the 'twilight' of one age gliding straight into the 'dawn' of its successor, and the events proper to each age beginning at once to repeat themselves. There are 14 Manvantaras, each presided over by a different Manu, who is the progenitor and protector of the human race of his period: and the first of them is preceded by a 'junction-period',¹ of the same length with a Kṛita age, which seems to be the time that was originally allotted for the process of creation, before the *Sūrya-Siddhānta* found reasons for greatly lengthening that time; and each of them is followed by a 'junction-period' of the same duration, which appears to be a time of abeyance of existence.²

The 14 Manvantaras, with the 15 'junction-periods', constitute a Kalpa or aeon, which thus measures 1000 Chaturyugas or 10,000 Kaliyugas. The Kalpa is the daytime of a day of the god Brahman; and his night is of the same length.³ At the end of the daytime of a day of Brahman everything is destroyed: during his night a state of chaos prevails: and then creation is renewed by him. This process of creation and destruction alternates during the whole life of Brahman.

¹ The term is *saṁdhi*, regarding which see note 1 on p. 481 above.

² The *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, l. 18, says that the *saṁdhi* at the end of a Manvantara is a *jalaplava*, 'a deluge'. The *Vāyu-Purāna*, 61. 136, says that there is a *saṁhāra*, 'a suppression, destruction', at the end of a Manvantara, and a *saṁbhava*, 'a birth, production', at the end of the *saṁhāra*.

³ The astronomers had no need to go beyond the Kalpa: and neither does Āryabhata nor does Brahmagupta seem to have done so. The *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, l. 21, however, found it worth while to add that the extreme age of Brahman is 100 (*years*) of such days-and-nights, and that half of his life has passed.

The divisions of the Chaturyuga

THE AGES	YEARS OF MEN	DIVINE YEARS
Krita :—		
Dawn	144,000	400
Daytime	1,440,000	4,000
Twilight	144,000	400
	1,728,000	4,800
Trētā :—		
Dawn	108,000	300
Daytime	1,080,000	3,000
Twilight	108,000	300
	1,296,000	3,600
Dvāpara :—		
Dawn	72,000	200
Daytime	720,000	2,000
Twilight	72,000	200
	864,000	2,400
Kalī :—		
Dawn	36,000	100
Daytime	360,000	1,000
Twilight	36,000	100
	432,000	1,200
Yuga, Mahāyuga, or Chaturyuga	4,320,000	12,000

which is known as the Mahākālpa and lasts for 100 years, each composed of 360 such days and nights. Then everything is overwhelmed by a final destruction and resolution into ultimate sources, and apparently remains so until another Brahman comes spontaneously into existence.¹

¹ This part of the matter is obscure. But it was recognized at an early period (see, e.g., Āryabata's Kalakriyā chapter, verse 11) that, though time is measured by the courses of the planets (including in this term the sun and the moon), time itself has no beginning and no end; and it was consequently seen that even the life of Brahman, as specified above, would not cover the duration of time. The idea seems to be that even Brahman himself dies, and is followed by a new Brahman: not that he sinks into quiescence and becomes revived. Thus Bhāskarāchārya, writing in A.D. 1150, says that at the end of the 100 years, which period, he tells us, was named Mahākālpa by early people, there comes "another Brahman": on the point as to how many such beings there may have been, he adds:—"Since this same time had no beginning, I know not

It may be added that we are held to be now in the Kaliyuga or Iron Age of the twenty-eighth Chaturyuga or cycle of the Four Ages in the seventh Manvantara in the first Kalpa in the second half of the life of Brahman.¹ But we are still in only the 'dawn' of the Kali age: this dawn lasts for 36,000 years; and the daytime of the age, with all its depraved characteristics fully developed, will not begin until A.D. 32,899.

The general idea of the Ages, with their names, and with a graduated deterioration of religion and morality

how many Brahmans have passed away: " see his *Siddhāntasīrōmanī*, and his own commentary on it, edited by Bapu Deva Sastri, p. 10, verse 25.

¹ See, e.g., the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, ed. FitzEdward Hall and Bapu Deva Sastri, 1. 21, 22: where we are further told that the Manu of the current Manvantara is Vaivasvata. See also the *Vishnu-Purāna*, 1. 3. 26, 27, which adds that the present Kalpa is named Vāraha, and the last preceding one was Pādma: in verse 4 it uses the terms Para and Parārdha to denote respectively the whole and the half of the life of Brahman.

There has been, however, a difference of opinion on this point. Bhāskarāchārya says in his *Siddhāntasīrōmanī*, ed. cit., p. 11, verses 26, 27, and his own commentary thereon:—"How much of the life of the existing Brahman has gone, I know not; some say half of it; others, eight and a half years. Let the tradition be: there is no use for it either way, because the planets are to be calculated only according to the elapsed time of his current day. Since they are created at the beginning of such a day and are destroyed at the end of it, it is proper to examine their courses only for the time during which they exist: those persons who, on the other hand, consider their courses for times when they were not. — I give my compliments to those great men!"

The *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, 1. 21, teaches that half of the life of Brahman has elapsed, and that we are now in the first Kalpa of the second half. The other view appears to be taught by some followers of the Brāhma-Siddhānta.

The Lashkar Pañchāṅg, printed at Gwalior, says in the introductory passages of its issue for the Vikrama year 1966 and the Saka year 1831, expired. = A.D. 1909-10, that the view that half of the life of Brahman has passed is the Saura-mata, the opinion of those who follow the *Sūrya-Siddhānta* (see just above), and the other view is the Brāhma-mata. It adds that in the first day of the remainder of his life there had elapsed, up to the year of its issue, 1,972,949,010 years, or, in terms of the time of Brahman, 13½ *ghatikās*, 12 *pālas*, 3 *ripālas*; that is, 5 hrs. 28 min. 49·2 sec. Some other almanacs make similar statements: but it is enough to cite this one as an example.

and shortening of human life,—with also some conception of a great period known as the Kalpa or aeon, which is mentioned in the inscriptions of Aśoka (B.C. 264–227),—seems to have been well established in India before the astronomical period.¹ But we cannot refer to that early time any passage assigning a date to the beginning of any of the Ages, or even allotting to them the specific lengths, whether in solar years of men or in divine years,

¹ In rock-edict 4 we have :—“ And the sons of the king Dēvānāmpīyā-Piyadassi, and the sons’ sons and their sons, will cause this observance of *dharma* to increase throughout the aeon.” The Kālī text, line 12, has *āra kapam*, = *yāvat = kalpam* : and the Shālibāzgarhī and Mansehra texts yield the same expression. The Gīrnār text, line 9, has *āra saṁvāṭa-kapā*, = *yāvat = saṁvarta-kalpāt*, “ until the aeon of destruction ” : which indicates a recognition of an ensuing aeon of non-existence, following the aeon of existence in which we now are.

In rock-edict 5, again, Aśoka speaks of “ my sons and sons’ sons, and my offspring after that throughout the aeon.” Here, also, we have *āra kapam* in the Kālī text, line 14, and in the Shālibāzgarhī and Mansehra texts : while the Gīrnār text, line 2, has again *āra saṁvāṭa-kapā*.

The Dhauli text has in edict 5, line 21, *āra kapam*, but in edict 4, line 17, *ā-kapam*, which may be of course a mistake for *āra kapam*, but also may represent quite regularly *ā-kalpam*. In the Jaugada text both the expressions are lost.

Early epigraphic references to the system of cosmical periods are rare : but two instances may be cited. The Junāgaḍh inscription of Rudradāman, dated in A.D. 150, says (*Epi. Ind.*, vol. 8, p. 42, text line 6–7) that the dam of the great lake Śudarśana was burst by the effects of a great fall of rain, which swelled to excess the rivers that filled the lake and was accompanied by “ a wind of a most tremendous fury befitting the end of the Yugas.” And the Gaṅgulhār inscription of A.D. 423 (*Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 74, text line 7–8), describes the king Viśvavarman as “ surpassing in brilliance the most unendurable *saṁvartaka*-fire”. These allusions may be explained from the Mahābhārata, 3, Vanap., § 188, 12869–90. At the end of the 1000 Yugas (which make the daytime of a day of the Creator) there will appear seven blazing suns, which will dry up all the waters in the rivers and the oceans. They will be followed by the *saṁvartaka*-fire, “ the fire of destruction”, accompanied by a great wind, which will invade the earth, already dried up by the suns, and will burn up everything that is left, penetrating even through the earth down to the nether regions. This fire will be quenched eventually by a tremendous fall of rain, lasting for twelve years, from vast masses of clouds driven by the same terrible wind, which will flood the whole surface of the earth. Then, when the clouds are exhausted, the Self-existent One will drink up that terrible wind, and will go to sleep.

mentioned above.¹ And as regards their lengths, taking the earliest evidence to which a definite period can be assigned, we find a different scheme of the system of cosmical periods presented to us by Āryabhaṭa, who wrote in or soon after A.D. 499. He had the period of the Chaturyuga, called by him simply Yuga with the same duration of 4,320,000 solar years of men. But he took the Manvantara as consisting of 72 (instead of 71) Yugas, = Chaturyugas; so that his Kalpa, consisting similarly of 14 Manvantaras, but without the fifteen 'junction-periods', measured 1008 (instead of 1000) Yugas, = Chaturyugas. And, in the other direction, he has not mentioned or indicated the graduated division of the Yuga into the four ages, but has divided it into four equal parts, called by him Yuga-pādas, 'quarter Yugas', each consisting of 1,080,000 years. Further, he has not assigned names to the Yuga-pādas, but has given us his date by saying that he was 23 years old when there had expired, not 3600 years of the Kali age, but three Yuga-pādas and 3600 years of the fourth Yuga-pāda.²

To the above account we must add that Brahmagupta mentions still another scheme of the Kalpa, according to which it was composed of 14 Manvantaras, each of 71 Chaturyugas, without the fifteen 'junction-periods'; so that it measured 994 Chaturyugas.³ This represents

¹ Detailed remarks on this point must be held over, but the following may be said. The original scheme of the Yuga seems to have been on the decimal system of notation; a cycle of 10,000 years (*Atharvaśāhikā*, 8. 2. 21), which was then divided, when the idea of the Ages with fixed decreasing periods arose, into four parts of 4000, 3000, 2000, and 1000 years. It was subsequently recast on duodecimal lines; by adding 2000 years, which were divided in the same proportion into 800, 600, 400, and 200, and were attached to the Ages as their 'dawns' and 'twilights', thus making 4800, 3600, 2400, and 1200, = 12,000 years. This enabled the primitive Yuga to be adapted to the astronomical Yuga of 4,320,000 years, by multiplying the 12,000 years and the divisions thereof by 360.

² See page 111 above.

³ Ed. cit., p. 4, verse 11.

The three systems of cosmical periods

Aryabhata's system	Intermediate system	The system of Brahmagupta and the present day
1st Yugapāda	<i>The divisions of the Yuga in this system are not known</i>	Kṛta
2nd		Tṛeta
3rd		Dvāpāra
4th		Kali
Yuga	Yuga	Yuga
Manvantara	Manvantara	Manvantara
Kalpa	Kalpa	Kalpa
		15 junction-periods each equal to one Kṛta
		Yuga × 1000

an intermediate stage in the development of the scheme favoured by him from that presented to us by Āryabhaṭa.

The divisions of the Chaturyuga according to this intermediate system are not known. In other respects, the table on p. 487 above presents a comparison of the three schemes.

The settlement of the Hindū system of cosmical periods, first in the form in which it is given by Āryabhāṭa, and finally in the form which it now has, is due to a combination of astronomical necessities with the pre-existing popular ideas. And it was in these circumstances that there were developed the features which distinguish the Hindū from the Greek and Roman systems. The Ages of the Greeks and the Romans had no specific duration: their Golden, Silver, and Brazen Ages included the whole period from "the beginning of years" to the commencement of the Iron Age, and were past and done with for ever: and their Iron Age was to last until the end of everything. But the Hindū Ages are of definite lengths, and recur again and again; and the cycle of them constitutes a unit in the measurement of time, with the result that, by means of the initial point assigned to the current Kali age, the beginning of any other age in the life of Brahma, or any other point in his existence, can be determined. The circumstances in which this distinguishing feature was introduced were as follows:—

At some time not long before A.D. 400 the Hindūs received the principles of the Greek astronomy and astrology, and developed their own application of them.¹ Amongst other details, they adopted the idea of a solar year beginning at the vernal equinox as marked for them

¹ There is, I believe, now a tendency to refer this receipt of the Greek sciences to a somewhat earlier period. As far as the matter is clear to me, it cannot be placed before about A.D. 225-50, and A.D. 350 seems more probable.

by the entrance of the sun into their constellation and sign Mēsha, the ram, which answers to our Aries, though it does not coincide with our constellation Aries, and much less with our present astronomical sign Aries.¹ And, as that equinox was then occurring in their synodic lunar month Chaitra, they adopted also a lunar year beginning with Chaitra śukla 1, the first day of the bright fortnight of Chaitra, and bound it to that solar year by the system of lunisolar cycles and the intercalation of lunar months.

Like other Oriental peoples, and like the Greeks themselves and the Romans, the Hindūs had had the system of lunisolar cycles and intercalation from a great antiquity. But, so far, all that they had been concerned with was the harmonizing of the courses of the sun and the moon, and the keeping of a lunar reckoning as closely as possible in agreement with the natural seasons, by those means. Now, however, under the influence of the Greek sciences, they had to compute, both for astronomical and for astrological purposes, the courses of the planets as well as those of the sun and the moon. And to this end they required bases for calculation going far beyond any ordinary lunisolar cycles.

In the first place, for laying down their elements in integers and for introducing refinements of them in the

¹ The first point of Mēsha is the fixed initial point of the Hindū sphere: it is either at, or 10° on the east of, the star ζ Piscium, which is about 10° west of the beginning of our constellation Aries. Our "first point of Aries", i.e. of our sign Aries, which gives the tropical equinox, is now about 18° farther to the west from ζ Piscium.

The Hindū mean vernal equinox is the time when their mean sun comes to the first point of Mēsha. According to the Hindū bases, this was, in B.C. 3102, on 18 February: now, as a result partly of the Hindūs maintaining the sidereal solar year and disregarding the precession of the equinoxes in connexion with their calendar, partly of our introduction of New Style in A.D. 1752, it comes on 13 or 14 April. The Hindū true vernal equinox occurs two days and a few hours earlier, when their true sun comes to the first point of Mēsha.

same convenient form, they required a large calculative period of the kind called by the Greeks an *exeligmos* and by the Romans an *annus magnus* or *mundanus*:¹ that is, a period of evolution and revolution, in the course of which any given order of things runs through an appointed course and is completed by returning to the state from which it started. And they adopted an *exeligmos* beginning and ending with a conjunction of the sun, the moon, and the planets, at the first point of Mēsha; which conjunction of course involved a new-moon and the vernal equinox.²

The Hindū astronomers themselves may have determined the precise length of time which they assigned to their *exeligmos*, and the all-important date to which (as will be shown) they referred the last occurrence of this conjunction before their own time. But the suggestion for the particular nature of the conjunction seems plainly

¹ As I have said on a recent occasion, for the term *exeligmos*, which is frequently a very convenient one to use, we are indebted to Dr. Burgess (this *Journal*, 1893, 721), who brought it to the front from Geminos and Ptolemy in the course of his instructive article entitled "Notes on Hindu Astronomy and the History of our Knowledge of it."

² This conjunction is usually indicated, perhaps not too clearly, by statements such as that made by Āryabhata in his *Kālakriyā* chapter, verse 11:—"The Yuga (i.e. the Mahāyuga or Chaturyuga), the year, the month, and the day began all together at the beginning of the bright fortnight of Chaitra;" which is to be read in connexion with the statement in the *Dakṣiṅgīkasūtra*, verse 2 (a part of his work, whether he himself composed it or not: see p. 115 above), that the revolutions of the sun, etc., laid down for the Yuga in that verse and the preceding one, are counted from (the first point of) Mēsha and from sunrise on a Wednesday at Laikā.

But it is defined in very plain terms in the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, l. 57. This work purports to have been revealed by the Sun to the great Asura Maya when the Krita age was being superseded by the Trētā: and we are here told that:—"At this same end of the Krita age, all the planets, by mean motion, but excepting (*their*) nodes and apsides, have come to equality (conjunction) at the beginning of Mēsha." The term 'planets' here includes, as usual, the sun and the moon. The sequel will show that the conjunction thus referred to the end of the Krita age, that is, to the beginning of the Trētā, comes also at the beginning of the Kaliyuga.

to have been obtained from Greek or other sources: a passage found by Professor Jacobi in the *De Die Natali* of Censorinus (A.D. 238) tells us thus:—"There is also the year, which Aristotle [B.C. 384-322] calls *maximus* rather than *magnus*, which the orbs of the sun, the moon, and the five wandering stars bring to an end when they are all together carried back to that same sign in which they once were at one and the same time: and of which year the midwinter is a cataclysm which our people call a deluge, and the summer is a conflagration which is a burning of the world: for in these alternate times the world is perceived to be turned now into fire, now into water."¹

Whatever may be the origin of the idea of this conjunction the Hindū astronomers adopted it. And, as regards one of the details of their system, it was necessary, in view of the number of the heavenly bodies concerned, that the *exeligmos* to be used in connexion with it should be a very long one, to admit of assigning a sufficiently great number of revolutions to the sun, the moon, and the planets, to bring them all together again at the end of it, and at the same time to state those numbers as integers without the inconvenience of fractions. Now, the Hindūs have sometimes used the Kalpa as an *exeligmos*. But that was laid out and adopted expressly with the same object of avoiding the introduction of fractions in making refinements in the elements.² The more general *exeligmos* has

¹ The passage has been given by Professor Jacobi in the Acts of the Tenth Oriental Congress, Geneva, 1894, part 1 (1897), p. 106, in his article "Contributions to our Knowledge of Indian Chronology." See also this Journal, 1893, 721, note 2, where it has been given by Dr. Burgess, to whom it was communicated by Professor Jacobi. It goes on to say:—"Aristarchus [between B.C. 280 and 264] estimated this year at 2484 successive years: Arctes Dyrachinus at 5552; Heraclitus [about B.C. 513] and Linus at 10,800; Dion at 10,884; Orpheus at 120,000; Cassandrus at 360,000. But others have expressed the opinion that it is infinite and cannot ever complete itself."

² An example may be given, to make the meaning clear. For the planet Jupiter, Āryabhata had 364,224 revolutions in the Yuga, giving

been the Yuga, Mahāyuga, or Chaturyuga of 4,320,000 years. And this was the earlier *exeligmos* of the two, and was nominally the *exeligmos* of Āryabhata. But, except in the case of the apsis and node of the moon, all the figures for the principal elements, taken for that period by him and his successors, are exactly divisible by four. And it is recognizable from this that the true original Hindū *exeligmos* was the quarter of that period, namely, Āryabhata's Yugapāda of 1,080,000 years, with the conjunction recurring at the beginning of each Yugapāda.¹

a certain rate of motion and a certain length in years for each revolution. Brahmagupta found reasons for making the motion of the planet somewhat quicker and the period of its revolution somewhat less; and he did this by increasing the number of revolutions in a given time. With the Yuga as the *exeligmos*, he would have had to state the number of revolutions, taken by him, as $364,226\frac{21}{100}$; but, using the Kalpa, he was able to put it as 364,226.455.

Further, the *Sūrya-Siddhanta*, while using the Yuga as its *exeligmos* for all ordinary purposes, had to adopt the Kalpa for stating (l. 41-44) the revolutions of the apsis of the sun and the apsides and nodes of the five planets; because the numbers are too small to be stated as integers for the Yuga.

¹ Before the publication of Kern's edition of the *Āryabhaṭīya* in 1874, Āryabhata was known only from quotations from him in other Hindū works; and even in those quotations he was confused with the author of the later work, the *Ārya-Siddhānta*. the real Āryabhata, in fact, was so little known that Colebrooke thought it possible (see *Essays*, 2. 429) that he might be placed even before B.C. 58. Whitney, however, recognized and illustrated that the Yugapāda might be substituted for the Yuga for purposes of calculation; see the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, trans., p. 160 f.

The reason for the precise length of the Hindū *exeligmos* in either form, Yuga or Yugapāda, does not come within the scope of this article: it has been much debated, but is still a matter of conjecture, and seems likely to remain such. In respect, however, of any suggestion that it was selected to suit some particular rate of precession of the equinoxes (see, e.g., Cunningham, *Indian Eras*, p. 4), it may be observed, in the first place, that (as may be seen, loc. cit.) more rates of precession than one can be manipulated, according as we deal with any fractions that are involved, in such a manner as to yield the period of either a Yuga or a Yugapāda; and in the second place, that it is tolerably certain that the Hindūs did not pay any attention to precession, even if they knew exactly what it is, until about the tenth century, and that, when they did take the matter up, they fixed their estimates of the annual rate of

As regards another detail, the Hindū astronomers found that they required also a specific date to which they could refer the conjunction or some fairly recent recurrence of it, so that they could state the positions of the heavenly bodies for any desired times. And, applying themselves to this detail, and working, let us say (simply taking a convenient year at any time more or less near the real period) in A.D. 399, they found, whether by calculations of their own or from some extraneous hint,¹ that the said conjunction had occurred exactly 35 centuries previously. There was not, indeed, really such a conjunction, or even a close approximation to it: nor, apparently, is it even

precession at 54" and 1' simply because these rates gave periods which go without fractions into the period of their *exeligmos*. And it may be noted that the Greeks had an *exeligmos* of 10,800 years (see note 1 on p. 491 above); also, that the Chaldeans had a period of 432,000 years, extending from Creation to the Flood, which was supposed to represent the reigns of ten kings, but seems more likely to be of the nature of an *exeligmos*: the Hindū *exeligmos*, either the shorter one, the Yuga-pāda, or the longer one, the Yuga, may have been an adaptation by extension of one or the other of those two periods.

There can, however, be little doubt, that, as was intimated by Dr. Burgess in this Journal, 1893, 722, it is a natural development of the system of sexagesimal subdivision, which is ancient enough: its ultimate origin lies in such facts as that there are 10,800' in 180°, and 21,600' in the whole circle, and also, by the Hindū divisions of time, 21,600 *nidīś* or *ghaṭīś*, periods of 24 minutes, in 360 days. And, if the subject should ever be taken up again, attention might be paid to the manner in which Lalla obtained the figures for the subdivisions of the Yuga from 216,000 as the number of *yūjanas* in the orbit of the moon (see note 1 on p. 480 above): this item was used also to determine the circumference of space, in the sense of the visible universe lit up by the sun, and to deduce from that the orbits and distances of the sun, the planets, and the *nakshatras*. That the moon was an important factor in the determination of the period seems also to be indicated by the point that the numbers of the revolutions of her apsis and node are integers only for the Yuga: divided by four, they give fractions, three-quarters and one-half.

¹ The Kaliyuga era was known to the Arabian astronomers as the Era of the Deluge: see Alḥarīrī's *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, trans. Sachau, p. 29; also the *Āin i Akbarī*, trans. Jarrett, vol. 2, p. 22. It is not impossible that some tradition about the Flood, obtained from the Greeks or the Romans, may have indicated to the Hindūs the period in which, in a general way, they should look for the date of the great conjunction.

the case that the sun was actually at the first point of Mēsha at the moment arrived at.¹ But there was an approach to such a conjunction, which was turned into an actual conjunction by using the mean instead of the true positions of the sun the moon, and the planets, and by taking liberties with some of them.² And, partly from the reckoning which has come down to us, partly from the statements of details in the astronomical books, we know that the moment assigned to the assumed conjunction was according to one school mean sunrise at Laṅkā-Ujjain on Friday, 18 February, B.C. 3102, and according to another school the preceding midnight.³

¹ It cannot be said safely, off-hand, as has been said, that no such conjunction ever did or ever will occur: as Al-Bērūnī observed (see his *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, trans. Sachau, p. 30), it must have occurred and must occur again, if only our solar system lasts long enough. This, however, is a question which must be left to the astronomers in consultation with the geologists.

² Whitney gave the mean places of the planets for mean sunrise at Ujjain on Friday, 18 February, B.C. 3102, in accordance with three of the Hūdū books: of those three, the *Ārya-Siddhānta* gives the nearest approach to a conjunction; and according to it the sun, the moon, Mars, and Saturn were exactly at the first point of Mēsha; Venus and Jupiter were $2^{\circ} 52' 48''$ west of that point; and Mercury was $8^{\circ} 38' 24''$ west of it: see *Sārya-Siddhānta*, trans., p. 425. For the true positions of the planets for the preceding midnight at Ujjain, furnished to Whitney by Professor Winlock, see *ibid.*, p. 162.

Two items may be added, as worked by Schram's *Kalenderographische und Chronologische Tafeln* (1908). The true new-moon in February, B.C. 3102, was at about 7.13 a.m., for Ujjain, on Thursday, the 17th. The true vernal equinox of B.C. 3102 was at about 1.25 p.m., for Ujjain, on Sunday, 17 April.

³ Āryabhata belonged to the sunrise school: the midnight school is represented by the original *Sārya-Siddhānta*, which existed before the time of Varāhamihira (died A.D. 587), and by the present work of the same name, which dates from probably about A.D. 1000. Brahmagupta also placed the conjunction at sunrise: but his position in respect of its connexion with the Kaliyuga seems to have been an anomalous one which cannot be conveniently examined here.

Colebrooke said (*Essays*, 2, 384):—"A third school began the astronomical day, as well as the great period, at noon." But that is a mistake. In the place alluded to by him, Bhāttōtpala dealt with a different matter, and mentioned four views as to the moment—sunset, midnight, sunrise, and noon—at which a planet becomes the lord of

This difference, however, is only a technical point of detail for purposes of calculation: all the Hindū books agree that the civil day runs from sunrise: and for all purposes of chronology the period beginning with this conjunction runs from the sunrise on the Friday.

For the rest, the case is as follows. To suit the pre-existing notions about the Ages, which involved the understanding that the Kali age had already begun, the Hindūs took the moment of the conjunction, fixed in B.C. 3102 as stated above, as the initial point, not of the Yuga, but of the last Yuga-pāda or quarter Yuga, which accordingly became the Kali age. Further effect was given to the same notions by redistributing the period of 4,320,000 years into the unequal Kṛita, Trētā, Dvāpara, and Kali ages, in the proportion of 4, 3, 2, and 1 tenths. And the result was the peculiar position which marks the beginning of the Kali age as the pivot of the whole system of Hindū cosmical periods: namely, the conjunction taken as the starting-point of the entire Yuga now recurs, as originally, at the beginning of each Kali age: in a Dvāpara age, it does not occur at all; in a Trētā age, it occurs twice, at the beginning and at 216,000 years before the end:¹ and in a Kṛita age, in spite of that age being always the first and the best of the ages, it occurs, not at its beginning, but after the lapse of 648,000 years from its beginning.

We may add, however, that though the Kṛita age was thus at first left without any particular occurrence to mark its arrival, the deficiency was subsequently supplied. The next Kṛita age, and of course each Kṛita age after it,

a day: see the *Bṛihat-Saṃhitā*, ed. Vīṣṇanagaram Sanskrit Series, vol. 1, p. 32.

¹ It is a curious point that the length of the daytime of this age is the same with the length of the true original *ædligmos*, the Yuga-pāda, 1,080,000 years. This, however, is perhaps a mere coincidence, a natural result of the period which had to be redistributed and of the principles on which that was to be done.

End of
Treta aadya
to शुभशुक्रवारे

is to be attended by a conjunction of the sun, the moon, the planet Jupiter, and the *nakshatra* Tishya, perhaps better known as Pushya, which is part of the constellation and sign Karka, the crab (Cancer).¹ But it must be noted that every Krita age, like all the other cosmical periods, must begin at the vernal equinox: and such a conjunction as this one can only happen shortly after the Hindū summer solstice: it is only at that time of the year that the sun is in Karka.

¹ See, e.g., the *Vāyu-Purāna*, 99. 413:—

Yadā chandraś=cha sūryaś=cha tatlā Tishya-Bṛiha-ṣṭī |
ēka-rāśau bhaviṣyanti tadā Kritayugaṁ bhavēt ||

The *Matsya* does not seem to include this statement: at any rate, it is not found in the passage, 272/273. 27 ff., where in agreement with the other Purāṇas it should be. The *Brahmānda*, however, has the verse, 74. 225, word for word the same.

The *Viṣṇu*, 4. 24. 30, has the first half of the verse in the same words: its second half runs:—ēka-rāśau samēshyanti bhaviṣyati tatali Kṛitam

The *Bhāgavata*, 12. 2. 24, follows the *Viṣṇu*, except that its last *pāda* runs:—tadā bhavati tat=Kṛitam.

The verse is found also in an interpolated passage in the *Mahābhārata*, 3, Vanaparvan, § 190. 13099: here it agrees with the *Viṣṇu* and the *Bhāgavata*, except that the last *pāda* runs:—pravart-yati tadā Kṛitam.

This verse does not exactly assert what is technically known as a conjunction: it only says that the sun, the moon, Jupiter, and Tishya “will come together, or will be (*together*), in one sign.” But a conjunction is obviously implied; because otherwise the occurrence would be too common. Jupiter spends nearly one year out of every twelve in Karka; and, on each occasion while he is there, he will be in conjunction with Tishya, and the sun and moon will be in conjunction with each other in that same sign once if not twice: but it is only at very long intervals that all the four will be in conjunction.

(To be concluded in the next number.)

NOTE SUR LA LANGUE ET L'ECRITURE INCONNUES
DES DOCUMENTS STEIN-COWLEY

PAR R. GAUTHIOT

LE fascicule du mois de janvier 1911 du JRAS. contient un mémoire de M. A. Cowley intitulé "Another Unknown Language from Eastern Turkestan", dont il paraît impossible de dire qu'il n'est pas "sensationnel". Il nous apporte en effet une écriture inconnue d'origine araméenne, une langue mystérieuse, des documents d'un type précieux et rare puisqu'il s'agit de lettres et non de textes publics religieux ou civils; il nous fournit enfin des textes dont il est possible de déterminer l'âge de façon approximative, dont la haute antiquité est à peu près certaine et qui proviennent du *limes* chinois lui-même, d'un point situé, il est vrai à l'ouest de Touenhouang mais à l'extrême limite de ce que l'on peut appeler le Turkestan. Pour tous ceux qui s'intéressent à l'histoire de l'Asie, à la résurrection des langues, des peuples, et des civilisations qui ont vécu entre la Chine, la Perse, et l'Inde, que d'attraits nouveaux et de problèmes irritants!

Avec une conscience et un sang-froid des plus remarquables, M. Cowley s'est gardé d'insister dans son travail sur le caractère nouveau, l'aspect imprévu ou l'intérêt actuel des documents qu'il présentait au public pour la première fois. Il s'est attaché, au contraire, à fournir à ceux que les textes rapportés par M. M. A. Stein devaient intéresser des documents sûrs, des résultats critiqués avec soin, des lectures que chacun peut contrôler sur un fac-similé joint à l'article. Il a agi aussi en véritable savant en publiant ce qu'il savait, bien qu'il fût d'avis que c'était peu de chose, en se refusant à garder par devers lui ce que d'autres plus heureux pourraient

peut-être lire un peu mieux. Et il ne faut pas perdre de vue que les quelques notes et indications qui suivent reposent en entier sur les travaux préliminaires de M. Cowley : elles se présentent à l'examen et à la critique compétents de la même façon et dans les mêmes conditions que celles de M. Cowley : elles aussi ne visent qu'à être utiles à l'œuvre commune.

Deux points doivent être considérés comme définitivement acquis : Tout d'abord il est hors de doute après l'examen fait par M. Cowley des originaux et pour quiconque veut bien examiner le fac-similé publié dans le *Journal* que l'écriture des documents épistolaires trouvés par M. M. A. Stein est d'origine araméenne, mais qu'elle est d'un type fortement aberrant : d'autre part il reste établi que la langue qui se dissimule sous cette graphie n'est pas un dialecte sémitique ; M. Cowley, qui fait autorité en la matière n'y a retrouvé que ce que l'on est convenu d'appeler des "cryptogrammes", c'est à dire de ces mots sémitique fossiles qui étaient écrits mais non lus en pehlvi par exemple et qui faisaient partie de l'écriture araméenne, comme des sortes de sigles. Il a reconnu ainsi de façon à peu près certaine מ mu (loc. laud., p. 163) et la négation שׁוֹ ל' (loc. laud., p. 166). Il ne nous a pas été possible non plus de découvrir dans la langue "inconnue" un parler sémitique, et M. Israël Lévi, qui a bien voulu examiner le fac-similé publié par M. Cowley, n'y a pas réussi davantage. Dès lors il y avait deux possibilités dont il fallait tenir compte avant tout, et d'ailleurs de façon inégale : celle que la langue en question fût turque ou iranienne. Déjà M. Cowley avait été amené tout naturellement après avoir trouvé des "cryptogrammes" à l'hypothèse qu'il avait à faire à du pehlvi : suivant cette idée, il avait cru reconnaître מַתָּא *xātāi* (loc. laud., p. 164) et יֶכְ *yäk* (loc. laud., p. 166) c'est à dire les mots "maître, seigneur", et "un" précisé-ment sous leur forme persane la plus caractéristique :

ailleurs qu'en Perse le nom de nombre "un" et le mot "maître" affectent en effet des formes tout différentes. On aperçoit de suite l'importance de pareilles identifications: si elles étaient exactes les lettres retrouvées par M. M. A. Stein nous fournissaient les spécimens les plus anciens que nous possédions du pehlvi des livres, et nous attestaient l'usage de cette forme particulière du moyen persan en Chine, à l'est de Tourfan, d'où les expéditions allemandes avaient rapporté les précieux documents qui témoignent qu'au 3^e siècle de notre ère la sourde intervocalique *t* de הוּתַי par exemple était déjà devenue la sonore *d*. Malheureusement les cryptogrammes si nombreux du pehlvi des livres restaient impossibles à retrouver: les graphies sémitiques des conjonctions, des pronoms, et des verbes demeuraient méconnaissables bien qu'elles fussent connues par ailleurs. En fait cette amorce de solution aboutissait à ajouter de nouveaux mystères aux anciens.

D'autre part l'examen de l'alphabet que M. Cowley avait dressé, à titre d'hypothèse bien entendu, mais tel qu'il résultait en fin de compte de la somme des identifications qu'il avait cru pouvoir faire révélait deux lacunes singulières: on n'y trouvait de 𐭪 que final et point de 𐭫. Or *u* et *z* existent l'un et l'autre en turc comme en iranien (cf. loc. laud., p. 166) et sont, on le sait, très abondants en pehlvi. En revanche le second des deux caractères que M. Cowley lisait 𐭫, celui auquel il joignait d'ailleurs un point d'interrogation, devait être selon toute vraisemblance un 𐭪: au point de vue paléographique il apparaît sur le fac-similé et dans les diverses reproductions que M. Cowley a données comme fort voisin du *nūn* araméen et M. Israel Lévi auquel cette hypothèse a été communiquée de suite l'a couverte de son autorité en s'y ralliant aussitôt. Il y a là, au premier abord, une observation intéressante et une probabilité: à y regarder de près au contraire, un changement grave dans la lecture de M. Cowley tout entière et une quasi certitude.

Alphabet

כ	א) (final)	ן
ט	ב	ח	ס
ז	ג ע	-	ע
ז	ד	ו	פ
ו	ו	ז	צ (??)
-	ז	ח (??)	ך (??)
ז	ח	ט	ש
ו (??)	י	ת (final)	ת (final)
ז	כ	מ	numeral
ז	ל	נ (once)	?
ז	מ	ו	?

Address

פלעטל און	}	}	פלעטל און
אלפלעטל			אלפלעטל
אלפלעטל			אלפלעטל

En effet en substituant simplement la valeur de *n* à celle de *y* on obtient de suite une indication précieuse sur la nature de la langue des documents en question et sur la direction dans laquelle il convient de chercher la clef de l'écriture. Dans l'adresse même, dans la partie de gauche où figure le nom de l'expéditeur, on lit à la deuxième ligne le mot attendu (cf. loc. laud., p. 163) de "serviteur" sous sa forme *sogdienne* de בנתך qui se trouve répétée fréquemment dans les documents bouddhiques en écriture sogdienne, et qui apparaît aussi sans l'élargissement en *-k-* dans les textes chrétiens publiés par M. F. W. K. Müller (*Sitzungsberichte* de l'Académie de Berlin, 1907, pp. 264-7). C'est là une forme nettement dialectale qui s'oppose au *bandak* du pehlivi (pers. بندد) et au *bandaka* du vieux perse. Le mot correspondant du côté droit de l'adresse, le mot "seigneur" se trouve aussitôt confirmé : seulement c'est le *sogdien* חותא qu'il faut lire, qui dans les textes bouddhiques en écriture sogdienne est γut'w, prononcé *xutuw*, selon la supposition faite par M. Andreas et moi dès janvier, et non le חותאי suspect qu'y avait cru reconnaître M. Cowley, préoccupé de retrouver le correspondant du pehlivi חותאי et du persan خدای (v. loc. laud., p. 164). Du coup se trouve enfin éliminée la distinction sûrement artificielle, tant elle était ténue et incertaine, que M. Cowley avait été amené à établir entre deux variétés indéfinissables et interchangeable d'un même caractère qui est en fait un *w*, ۱.

Ainsi l'on se trouve en présence de cette conclusion, *provisoire encore*, mais qui va se vérifier avec une rapidité singulière que les lettres rapportées par M. M. A. Stein des confins de la Chine propre et étudiées par M. Cowley sont en langue *sogdienne* notée au moyen d'un système graphique qui est à peu près à celui des manichéens et des chrétiens de langue sogdienne ce que le pehlivi est au pazend. Or il importe de noter avant tout qu'une écriture à cryptogrammes sémitiques a existé pour le sogdien

comme pour le persan, avec cette différence que le nombre des "sigles" étrangers y était singulièrement moindre. c'est dans cette écriture que sont fixés les textes bouddhiques que les expéditions en Asie centrale nous ont révélés et dont des spécimens précieux se trouvent à Berlin, à Londres, et surtout peut-être à Paris : c'est dans cette écriture qu'est rédigée l'inscription sogdienne de Qara-Balgassoun, où M. F. W. K. Müller a reconnu dès 1909 un texte iranien parsemé de cryptogrammes (*Sitzungsberichte* de l'Académie de Berlin, 1907, p. 726 et suiv., et surtout p. 729). Il n'y a donc rien de surprenant à retrouver dans les documents de M. M. A. Stein les termes sémitiques לל et מן à côté des mots *sogliens* בנתך et חותא : c'est au contraire une constatation qui s'accorde avec les données historiques et linguistiques connues, et qui est conforme aux probabilités.

C'est en outre une observation essentielle au point de vue de l'écriture. L'usage des cryptogrammes est particulier, comme nous venons de l'indiquer, non pas à un dialecte ou à un peuple, mais à un système graphique ; il appartient en commun aux textes *bouddhiques* les plus anciens et à l'inscription *manichéenne* de Qara-Balgassoun. Si les textes manichéens déchiffrés et publiés par M. F. W. K. Müller avec la maîtrise que l'on sait n'offrent pas de cryptogrammes, c'est qu'ils sont notés en écriture estranghélo modifiée dite manichéenne. La conclusion s'impose : les textes épistolaires dont il s'agit ici *doivent* être en *écriture sogdienne*, s'ils sont vraiment en *langue sogdienne avec cryptogrammes* : ou plutôt, conformément aux conclusions d'une étude dont les principaux résultats ont été communiqués à la Société Asiatique de Paris à la séance du 13 janvier 1911, et qui est actuellement sous presse, ils doivent être notés en une cursive araméenne intermédiaire entre l'araméen proprement dit et l'écriture sogdienne d'où est issu l'alphabet ougour. Il ne faut donc pas essayer de les lire en partant des systèmes graphiques des langues

sémitiques, ni surtout en s'inspirant de leur évolution propre et du sens dans lequel ils se sont développés ; c'est du point d'arrivée, l'écriture sogdienne, qu'il faut partir en remontant.

A procéder ainsi la ressemblance entre l'écriture du fac-similé publié par M. Cowley et celle des plus beaux textes bouddhiques sogdiens d'Asie centrale apparaît tout à coup à qui a pratiqué suffisamment ces derniers et a étudié de près leur graphie et leur ductus. Les quelques ligatures encore rares, du document dû à M. M. A. Stein sont particulièrement claires : **𐰪** par exemple montre déjà la liaison du **𐰪** avec le **𐰃** suivant par le trait d'en haut, et non de gauche, comme cela se fait en syriaque. Les ligatures du **𐰪** avec le **𐰃** ou le **𐰣** qui suivent annoncent déjà le ductus sogdien ; de même celles du **𐰪** et du **𐰣** avec le **𐰃**. La forme du **𐰣**, celle du **𐰪** sont déjà toutes proches de celles du *p* et du *k* sogdiens ; celle du **𐰪** est quasi identique. Il y a plus : on sait que, sauf quelques exceptions le **𐰣** et le **𐰃** sont confondus en écriture sogdienne : si l'on admet une confusion pareille dans le document publié par M. Cowley on retrouve aussitôt le cryptogramme **𐰪** qui vient remplacer de façon toute naturelle et singulièrement avantageuse ce **𐰪** purement persan que M. Cowley avait été obligé d'admettre et qui ne pouvait trouver place en un document sogdien. L'on sait que ce **𐰪** est le cryptogramme par excellence et que son absence suffirait presque à faire douter du caractère "pehlvi" ou "cryptographique" d'un texte (cf. loc. laud., p. 166).

Voici d'autres conséquences plus graves qui aboutissent toutes à des résultats importants. Après les changements de lecture qui ont été admis jusqu'ici, il se trouve que si le **𐰣** et **𐰃** sont représentés, le **𐰃** en revanche ne l'est plus. D'après la direction générale de l'évolution des écritures sémitiques on s'attend d'ailleurs à le voir noté par un signe de dimensions extrêmement restreintes ; et il n'y a plus de caractère réduit à tel point dans le système

graphique nouveau que M. Cowley met sous nos yeux. Mais l'étude de l'alphabet sogdien nous apprend que dans l'Iran du nord le ' a suivi un développement différent : il ne s'est pas rabougri comme en hébreu, en syriaque, en palmyrénien, il a au contraire grandi. Il y est représenté par un trait oblique large et fort qui ressemble assez à un Δ syriaque tronqué et se termine par une petite barre disposée verticalement par rapport à la haste principale. Bref, il est tout pareil dans son ensemble au caractère nouveau que M. Cowley a lu 𐰪 . Quant à celui-ci, qui maintenant fait défaut, il se retrouve lui aussi si l'on remonte de l'écriture sogdienne bouddhique à celle des lettres en question au lieu de chercher à reconnaître en celle-ci les caractères sémitiques : il est représenté par le signe où M. Cowley a cru voir un 𐰪 , qui ressemble en effet au 𐰪 de façon exceptionnelle et ne diffère de lui que par la dimension de sa queue, exactement comme le fait le 𐰪 par rapport au 𐰪 sogdien bouddhique. Et, de fait, si l'on substitue ces valeurs nouvelles aux anciennes, celle de ' à celle de 𐰪 , et celle de 𐰪 à celle de 𐰪 , tout en tenant compte de ce qui a été dit plus haut du 𐰪 et du 𐰪 , on voit l'aspect du texte se modifier singulièrement, se préciser et gagner en clarté : ainsi on lit immédiatement, sans autre difficulté, au lieu des monstres 𐰪𐰪𐰪𐰪 et 𐰪𐰪𐰪 (v. loc. laud., p. 165) les beaux cryptogrammes 𐰪𐰪𐰪𐰪 et 𐰪𐰪𐰪 , qui fourmillent dans les documents sogdiens bouddhiques et qui sont formés des conjonctions sémitiques 𐰪𐰪 et 𐰪𐰪 suivies de leur traduction 𐰪 (*nē*) en sogdien (cf. p. ex. Muller, *Sitzungsberichte* de l'Académie de Berlin, 1909, pp. 727-8). Ces identifications sont d'une importance toute particulière, non seulement parce qu'elles portent sur des mots sogdiens bien établis pour la forme comme pour le sens, mais encore parce qu'elles confirment l'un des traits les plus caractéristiques de la langue des textes étudiés ici. M. Cowley a fait ressortir très justement que ces mots, qui restaient inintelligibles pour lui,

étaient munis souvent, comme le sont les conjonctions en pehlevi. d'affixes qui devaient être sans doute les formes enclitiques des pronoms personnels. **מ** pour la première, **ת** et **תן** pour la seconde, **שו** pour la troisième personne : or, ce sont bien là des formes nettement iraniennes et sogdiennes, comme, par exemple, **שו**, qui est particulièrement fréquent et alterne avec **שי**. De la même façon on arrive à lire dans l'adresse **פישת** "something written" au lieu de **פרשת** "something sent" (loc. laud., p. 164).

Un dernier point à éclaircir, pour compléter l'alphabet nouveau, est celui de la notation du **ד**, dont la place est vide momentanément, et qui est un son relativement fréquent en sogdien. Nous n'hésitons pas à admettre que, comme dans l'écriture sogdienne proprement dite, c'est le caractère qui vaut **ḥ** dans les mots sémitiques, dans les cryptogrammes, qui sert à noter **ד** dans les mots sogdiens. Ceci nous permet d'ailleurs immédiatement de lire le début de la partie gauche de l'adresse qui devient : **פישת מן היפר בנתך** c'est à dire *pyšt MN hypδ βntk*, en transcrivant lettre pour lettre et en notant les cryptogrammes par des majuscules, ce qui signifie sans doute "écrit de son serviteur . . ." : car *hypδ*¹ qui était prononcé à peu près *x̄pυθ* est la forme correcte du réfléchi en sogdien où il signifie, placé devant les noms, ce que veulent dire en français "son, sa, ses". De la même façon on arrive à lire **כר** *kδ* "si, quand" le mot où M. Cowley voyait **כל** cryptogramme du sens de "tout" (loc. laud., p. 166) : on retrouve la forme sogdienne **אאהת** du verbe "aller" aux lignes 2 et 4 du fac-similé, celles de **בירת** de "tenir, obtenir" aux lignes 2 et 5, et **חרית** de "acheter" à la ligne 5 et d'autres encore. Sur-tout, il est intéressant de constater que la ligne 1 du document, qui contient la formule d'introduction devient

¹ Nous avons maintenu ici, comme on le voit, la distinction faite par M. Cowley entre *h* et *γ*, quoiqu'elle nous paraisse très ténue et peut-être bien artificielle.

tout à fait intelligible ou peu s'en faut, sauf la part à faire aux noms propres possibles. Le destinataire est introduit pas les mots **עך בנגו הוהתא** soit $\Delta \beta\gamma\omega$ *hwt w* où δ est un cryptogramme reconnu par M. Cowley (loc. laud., p. 163) mais faussement transcrit par *rad* selon une tradition qui croit devoir lire un λ là où il y a en réalité un ψ cursif et rattaché à la lettre qui se trouve à sa gauche, où $\beta\gamma\omega$ est tout comme *hwt w* une belle forme sogdienne attestée dans les textes bouddhiques comme aussi sur le monument de Qara-Balgassoun (cf. F. W. K. Muller, *Sitzungsberichte* de l'Académie de Berlin, 1909, p. 728). Suit l'indication de l'expéditeur dans les mêmes termes que sur l'adresse et qu'il est inutile de répéter ici. En fin vient la formule de salutation qui est très intéressante. Elle se termine en effet par un mot, jusqu'ici inintelligible, mais qui n'est autre que **נמאציו** *nm'cyw*, c'est à dire un terme sogdien bien connu qui signifie dans les textes bouddhiques où il apparaît fréquemment 'hommage, adoration' et qui traduit ici tout simplement le cryptogramme sémitique **שלם** qui le précède. Devant celui-ci enfin est un nom de nombre où M. Cowley a reconnu, non sans hésitation (loc. laud., p. 164) une forme altérée du sémitique **אלף** "mille": il lisait, en effet, **ילף**, ce que, d'après les conclusions exposées plus haut, on doit lire **נלף**. Or, tandis que **ילף** était non seulement anormal mais inexplicable et isolé, **נלף** est précisément la forme du nombre mille en sogdien bouddhique et peut s'expliquer comme une altération cursive de **אלף** sous les doigts d'hommes qui ne prononçaient plus rien qui fût en rapport avec ce qu'ils notaient et qui ne pouvaient plus voir qu'un chiffre dans ce qui avait été un mot. En effet le passage de **א** à **'** est inexplicable et presque impossible dans l'écriture sogdienne des documents bouddhiques aussi bien que dans la cursive des lettres rapportées par M. M. A. Stein: au contraire le changement de **א** en **נ** s'explique dans l'un et l'autre système graphique par une simple oblitération et par la perte d'un petit trait

transversal planté sur le principal. Il est à noter que la même altération s'est produite précisément dans l'alphabet sogdien tardif, en ougour, où, sauf des cas déterminés, l'*u* ne se distingue plus de l'*u*. On voit comment dans le détail le rapprochement se confirme entre la langue et l'écriture sogdiennes que nous connaissions déjà et celle que les découvertes de M. M. A. Stein nous révèlent. Tout le système des chiffres est le même dans les documents de l'un et l'autre type : dans la lettre publiée par M. Cowley on trouve les groupes d'unités, les signes pour 10 et pour 20 que l'on connaît déjà par les textes bouddhiques et qui sont d'ailleurs apparentés à ceux du syriaque.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

SCRAPS FROM THE SADDARSANA

Study, extending through many years, in what is to me the most attractive section of Indian literature, namely the philosophical systems, has naturally brought to light many points of interest. Amongst these are the nyāyas, which play such an important part in this class of literature: but there are others, not immediately connected with philosophy, which come in incidentally, as it were, and with a few of these I now propose to deal, confining myself chiefly, though not exclusively, on the present occasion to a work of the thirteenth century, viz. Amalānanda's *Vedānta-kalpataru*, a commentary on Vācaspati-miśra's *Bhāmatī*, itself a commentary on Śāṅkara's great bhāṣya. It was published in the Vizianagram Sanskrit Series in 1895-7.

1. The first scrap is a grammatical one. In the *Dhātupāṭha*, in addition to the well-known लज् “to be ashamed”, we find also लज् with the same meaning, and Westergaard (in 1841) quoted *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, xiv, 105, namely—

केचित्संचुकुटुभीता लेजिरेऽन्ये पराजिताः ।

as an example of it. No others seem to have been discovered by later lexicographers, and Monier-Williams asserts that the verb is restricted to the third person plural of the perfect tense, as above. I am glad, therefore, to be able to furnish another instance of it, in the same tense indeed, but in the singular number. It occurs on p. 213 in the following verse:—

जीवाज्जज्ञे जगत्सर्वं सकारणमिति ब्रुवन् ।

क्षिपन् समन्वयं जीवे न लेजे वाक्पतिः कथम् ॥

2. At the beginning of *Ubhāndogya Upaniṣad*, 1. 10, 1, we are told of the devastation of [the crops in] the Kurn country, which had been brought about by मटची, a term which translators, following Śāṅkara have rendered "hailstones". The passage is quoted by Śāṅkara in his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra*, 3, 4, 28, and there Ānandagiri gives रक्तवर्णाः बुद्धपक्षिविशेषाः as an alternative equivalent. This is adopted by Amalānanda (on p. 496) as the correct meaning, and I suggest that these "red-coloured winged creatures" are no other than *locusts* which, even in our own time, have so often laid waste the fields of India. I know of no other passage in which the word occurs, and it looks like an importation from outside Āryāvarta.

3. The author of the *Bhāmātī*, when elucidating the bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra*, 2. 1. 14, wrote न चेयमवगतर्दुल्लिचीरप्राया, "this knowledge is not [an imaginary thing] like turtle's milk," and Amalānanda (on p. 238) expounded it thus: दुलिः कच्छपी । न तस्याः चीरमस्ति खृत्या हि सापत्त्वानि पोषयति. He omitted, however, to explain the process of nourishment by *smṛiti*, and I cannot supply the deficiency!

We are indebted to Venkaṭanātha Deśika, a distinguished writer of the Rāmānuja school, for another interesting bit of natural history in connexion with the flying-fox. In the vṛitti to his *Tattvamuktākālāpa*, iv, 37, he says: कथं तर्हि मान्यालव्यालादिष्विन्द्रियवृत्तिसंकरः । मान्यालो हि मुखे-
नैवाभ्यवहरति निर्हरति च. Again, on verse 110: मान्यालाना-
माहारनिर्हारकरणयोरेकस्थानवर्तित्वम्. Then, on p. 22 of the *Nyāyasiddhāntajana*, he quotes from the *Nyāyatattva* the words यथा वा मान्यालादीनामास्थेन विण्मूत्रविसर्ग इति. How could this strange belief have arisen? It seems to be on a par with the काकाक्षिगोलकन्याय.

4. In the revised edition of the *Second Handful of Popular Maxims* I included Kumārila's saying सङ्कल्पवृत्तायाः किमवगुण्ठनेन, and we assuredly have an echo of it

in Amalānanda's *सहस्रवृत्तस्य . . . अवगुण्डनाभावात्* at the top of p. 492. And is there not a reminiscence of Patanjali's *पयो वा पिबेत्* (under vārtika 3 of *Śirasātra* 2) in Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's vigorous utterance (in *Nyāyamanjarī*, p. 236): *मीमांसका यशः पिबन्तु पयो वा पिबन्तु बुद्धिजाड्यापनयनाय ब्राह्मीघृतं वा पिबन्तु वेदस्तु पुरुषप्रणीत एव नात्र भ्रान्तिः ॥*

In view of the prominence given recently to the *Tantrā-khyāyikā* it may be of interest to note that the above quotation from Amalānanda forms part of an interesting discussion (under sūtra 3. 4, 23) as to the kind of stories to be recited at the *Pāriplava* of *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 13. 4. 3; and it is decided by the commentators that they are to be of the type of those in the *Tantrākhyaṇīkā*, or *Tantrapākhyaṇīkā* as Amalānanda calls it.

5. I will give one more "scrap" from Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's most interesting book. It is a description of a performance called *nīlāmbāravata*, which a king named Śankara-varman considered to be improper and therefore suppressed. The verses are found on p. 271, and read thus:—

अमितैकपटनिवीतानियतस्त्रीपुसविहितबहुचेष्टम् ।
नीलाम्बरव्रतमिदं किल कल्पितमासीद्विदुः कैश्चित् ॥
तदपूर्वमिति विदित्वा निवारयामास धर्मतत्त्वज्ञः ।
राजा शंकरवर्मान पुनर्जैनादिमतमेवम् ॥

From the concluding words it would appear that the king was a Jain. Is anything known of him? I do not know Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's date, but the "ācārya" to whom he attributes the words *जातं च संबद्धं चेत्येकः कालः* on p. 312, l. 13, is clearly Vācaspati-miśra, in whose *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā* (p. 267, l. 5) we find the expression *जातः संबद्धश्चेत्येकः कालः* in a similar context (editor's preface, p. 1). If the Jayanta whose name is twice mentioned in *Tārikīkarakṣā* (pp. 347, 355), in conjunction with that of Viśvarūpa, is the author of the *Nyāyamanjarī*, as is most probable, we then have a limit for

him in the other direction. Vācaspatimiśra is assigned to the latter part of the tenth century, and Mr. Arthur Venis thinks that "possibly Varadarāja [the author of the *Tārkikarakṣā*] may have to be placed not later than the first half of the twelfth century".

6. Amalānanda quotes several authors of whom little or nothing is known. Who, for example, is the Ācārya Sundarapāṇḍya to whom three verses are attributed on p. 429? Then, on p. 263, we have a reference to an ācārya named Vyomaśiva, our knowledge of whom is limited to the fact that, in a commentary on the *Nyāyakandalī*, a work named *Vyomavatī* is ascribed to him. and that he is mentioned in the commentary on verse 67 of *Śaddarśanasamuccaya* (see *Catalogus Catalogorum*. s.v. *Vyomavatī*). Under sūtra 4, 1, 19 a certain Amṛitānanda is cited as the setter forth of strange views regarding *mukti*, namely, that even after attaining to that condition the subject of it might be compelled to return to earth again; but who he was I cannot say. The identical words in which this writer's views are expressed by Amalānanda are found in Ānandagiri's *ṭikā* also, but without being attributed to any particular ācārya. Lastly, on p. 227, an author named Brahmanandin is mentioned, together with his work entitled *Chhāndogyu-vākya*: and the views attributed to him here are identical with those with which he is credited in the commentary on *Sankṣepaśārīraka*, iii, 217. etc.; but beyond this we seem to know nothing of the man or his work (see *Catalogus*. s.v. *Brahmanandin*).

7. On p. 82 of the *Kalpataru* we have a definition of *lakṣaṇā* in the following verse, which is ascribed to Śālikanātha, the well-known exponent of the teaching of Prabhākara. It reads thus -

वाच्यार्थस्य वाक्यार्थे संसर्गानुपपत्तितः ।

तत्संबन्धवशंप्राप्तस्यान्वयाल्लक्षणोच्यते ॥

It is not to be found, however, in the *Prakaraṇapancikā*.

the only work of Śālikanātha's which has been published, and that in a somewhat incomplete condition. It may be traced, however, to the missing parts of the work which have been recently discovered by my friend Dr. Gangānātha Jhā, or even to the *Ṛijurimalā*, another treatise of his to which he refers on p. 142 of the *Prakarāṇa-pancikā*. Dr. Jhā is now in possession of portions of the *Ṛijurimalā*, and also of some chapters of the *Bṛihatī*, a commentary on the Mīmāṃsā sūtras by Prabhākara himself; and with these materials he is now giving in *Indian Thought* a sketch of the tenets of that school. In his Tanjore Catalogue Dr. Burnell wrote: "The atheistic Mīmāṃsā of Prabhākara (or Guru) has been almost completely lost, and is chiefly known by the quotations in the *Śāstradīpikā* and similar works." He of course knew nothing of the works named above; and, as for the *Śāstradīpikā*, I can say with a considerable degree of confidence that Prabhākara's name is not to be found in it.

8. In his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3, 3, 37, Vijnāna-bhikṣu quotes the nyāya शिरोवेष्टनेनांगुल्या नासिकाप्रवेशवत्, which is found also, in a slightly different form, in the *Laukikanyāyasangraha* in conjunction with others expressive of a roundabout way of doing things. After giving a short explanation of it Raghunāthavarmā says अथमेव कैश्चिद् द्रविडप्राणायामन्यायोऽभिधीयते, and on turning to Molesworth's Marāṭhī Dictionary (for the Sanskrit lexicons give us no help) we find the expression द्राविडप्राणायाम defined as "a circuitous or devious mode of speaking or acting". Now how came it to have that meaning?

G. A. JACOB.

PS. Since writing the above I have found in Kumārila's *Tantravārtika* (pp. 852-3) the three verses which Amalānanda ascribes to the unknown Ācārya Sundarapāṇḍya,

and they are preceded by the words "आह च." and some one has said." If Amalānanda's statement is correct, then that ācārya was indeed an ancient writer: for Professor Max Müller and Dr. Bühler both held that Kumārila could not be placed later than 700 A.D. (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv, p. 613).

G. A. J.

BRIHASPATI AND TISHYA

The balance of opinion, if not quite a general consensus, seems to be that no mention of any of the planets can be recognized in the Vedic literature. But has the matter ever been considered by anyone who is interested in the by-ways of astronomy, as much as in the interpretation of texts in accordance with general appearances and the technical explanations of commentators? As one who is so interested, I venture to offer some remarks.

From the time when the Hindūs received the Greek astronomy and astrology, the Indian Brihaspati, the preceptor of the gods, has been undeniably identified with the planet Jupiter, or, if it is preferred, with the regent thereof. Whether they had before that time the full list of the planets which were known to the ancients—Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn—is a moot-point. But it is incredible that even the Vedic Hindūs should not have known at any rate the two bright planets Venus and Jupiter. It is difficult to believe that, knowing them, they should leave them altogether unnoticed in their bulky literature, which deals so much with celestial phenomena. And, while the general characteristics of the Vedic Brihaspati, also known as Brahmanaspati, are certainly those of a priest and a promoter of prayer and sacrifice, still, like other Vedic deities, he is associated largely with celestial myths: and there are two passages relating to him which seem to me to mention him distinctly as a celestial luminary or as the regent of one.

One is the *Rig-Vēda*, 4. 50. 4:—

Bṛihaspatiḥ prathamam jāyamāno
mahō jyōtishaḥ paramē vyōman |
sapt-āsyas=tuvi-jātō ravēṇa
vi sapta-raśmīr=adhamat=tamānsi ||

“Bṛihaspati, when first being born from a great light or brightness in the highest heaven, seven-mouthed, of a powerful nature, seven-rayed, with a deep sound blew away the darkness.”

The other is the *Taittirīya-Bṛāhmaṇa*, 3. 1. 1. 5:1—

Bṛihaspatiḥ prathamam jāyamānaḥ |
Tishyam nakshatram=abhi sambabhūva |
śrēṣṭhō dēvānām pṛitanāsu jishṇuḥ |
diśō=nu sarvā abhayan=nō astu ||

“Bṛihaspati, when first being born, came into existence over against the *nakshatra* Tishya. —he the best of the gods, victorious against hostile armies: let us be free from fear in all directions!”

It is to be noted that the second of these verses occurs in a passage which is certainly of an astronomical nature, dealing with all the *nakshatras* and their presiding deities. The expression “Bṛihaspati, when being born”, establishes an intimate connexion between the two verses. And the application of them becomes clear enough, I think, as soon as we look closely into the nature of Tishya and its surroundings.

The *nakshatra* Tishya, perhaps better known as Pushya, and also called Bārhaspatya because its regent is Bṛihaspati, is a part of the zodiacal constellation and sign Karka, the crab, Cancer. It consists according to some authorities of three stars: according to others, of one. And it or its principal star has been identified with δ Cancri, and is certainly to be placed in that position or very close to it.

Now, the Crab is not a conspicuous constellation: it

¹ Text in *Bibl. Ind.*, vol. 3, p. 2. The verse also occurs, I think, as *Taittirīya-Saṁhitā*, 4. 4. 10. 1.

includes no stars of a greater magnitude than 3.7. And an object in it quite as noticeable as any of its stars is Praesepe (Praesaepe) the beehive or manger, which is an important star-cluster at a small distance on the north-west of δ Cancri, and is regarded by some writers as the most striking feature in the whole constellation. This star-cluster is visible to the naked eye, as a misty patch, on a clear night. A telescope of small power, even a good opera-glass, will resolve it. Though its components are by no means great in number as compared with those of some other clusters, still they contrast favourably in magnitude, and no fewer than 151 of them have been counted: and its central star is a double one. Among the Arabian astronomers,¹ according to one school this star-cluster is a component of their mansion which answers to the Hindū Tishya, and according to another school is itself the mansion. Attention was evidently paid to it from very early times, since Aratus (B.C. 270) and Theophrastus (B.C. 322) tell us that its disappearance was reckoned by the ancients a sure presage of rain.² And a verse which will be quoted below makes it practically certain that the Vedic Hindūs also watched it, whether from that same point of view or from some other, and noted its disappearances.

We know what happens now and again in star-clusters and nebulae: a temporary star, a *nova*, suddenly shines out, attaining sometimes to the first magnitude or even more, remains visible for a while, and then fades out more or less completely. And I venture to suggest that it is

¹ See Colebrooke, *Essays*, 2. 294: Whitney, *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, translation, 331.

² A. M. Clerke, *System of the Stars*, p. 241: the references are, for Aratus, *Dioscorida*, verses 160-80, 265: for Theophrastus, *De Signis Pluviarum*, ed. Heinsius, p. 419. We may compare Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 18. 80:—"In the sign Cancer there are two small stars, known as Aselli (the Little Asses, γ and δ Cancri), the small space between them being occupied by a cloudy appearance which is known as Praesepia: when this cloud is not visible in a clear sky, it is a presage of a violent storm."

to some notable occurrence of this kind in Praesepe, happening of course in the winter when the skies are clearest and probably at a time when the Crab was on or near the meridian at midnight, that the two Vedic verses quoted above refer. My suggestion is that Jupiter was at the time quite close to Praesepe, perhaps apparently in actual contact. The association would add exceptional lustre to the outburst: producing "the great light or brightness in the highest heaven".¹ It would of course be seen in a very short time that the planet was moving away from the new star, which may have begun already to fade. And this would not unnaturally suggest the poetical idea that the planet, to which perhaps not much attention had previously been paid except in its part as a morning and an evening star, was then "born for the first time". In short, in these two passages, certainly, I would find a distinct mention of a planet in the Vēdas; the planet in this case being Brīhaspati, Jupiter.

The *nakshatra* Tishya or Pushya consists according to the older books of one component, according to the later books of three.² And the latitude and longitude given in the astronomical works place it, or, if it consists of three components, its *yōgu-tārā* or 'junction-star', the star which would represent it for determining conjunctions, closely about δ Cancri, a star of the 4th magnitude, which is on the ecliptic or practically so and is now in R.A. 8 hrs. 40 mins., nearly.

Colebrooke and Whitney knew only the statement that Tishya consists of three components. They both identified its *yōgu-tārā* with δ Cancri. For the other two stars, Colebrooke selected γ Cancri (magnitude 4.8), which is about 3° north by a little west from δ , and β (3.7), which

¹ Anyone who has watched the stars in winter in India will appreciate the kind of appearance that I indicate: especially if he saw the meeting of Venus and Jupiter some twenty years ago.

² See Thibaut, in *Ind. Ant.*, 14, 43-5.

is about $13^{\circ} 15'$ towards S.W. by S. from γ : Whitney preferred γ with θ ($6^{\circ}0$), which is a little south of the ecliptic and about $3^{\circ} 45'$ south-west from γ .

Praesepe is slightly to the west of a line from γ to δ , and is on the north of the ecliptic and somewhat nearer to γ than to δ . And alongside of the attention which the Greek and Roman writers show was paid to it, as mentioned above, we have now to note the latter half of the verse *Rig-Vēda*, 5. 54. 13, which says --

Nā yō yuchelhati Tishyō yathā divaḥ
asmē raramta Marutaḥ sahasriṇam ||

“ Give us, O Maruts, (*wealth*) a thousandfold which (*will*) not (*disappear*) as Tishya disappears from the sky ! ”

It is difficult to recognize here an allusion to anything except the occasional disappearances of the star-cluster Praesepe. And it would seem, now, that we should preferably take Praesepe as Tishya itself if the *nakshatra* is regarded as consisting of only one component, or as one of the three components, and as the ‘junction-star’, if we are to treat the *nakshatra* as having three members.

J. F. FLEET.

THE USE OF THE ABACUS IN INDIA

In an article published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1908, 293-7, Mr. Kaye has pointed out that, while various writers have said that the abacus was in common use in ancient times in India, they have not given any proof of their assertion. As he has remarked, from the fact that a form of abacus is now in use in India we cannot safely affirm that the appliance dates from any early times there. Nor, I think, can we draw such a conclusion definitely even from the point (see p. 121 above) that the system of expressing numbers presented by the astronomer Āryabhaṭa (wrote in or soon after A.D. 499) seems plainly to postulate the use of the

abacus in some shape or another. What is wanted is distinct evidence. And I would draw attention to a passage which perhaps yields such evidence.

The passage is found in the *Divyāradāna*, which is regarded, I believe, as dating generally from before A.D. 100, though parts of it may be placed two centuries or more later. It is in chapter 19, entitled Jyōtishkāvadāna (ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 262 ff.), the story in which begins thus:—

There lived at Rājagriha a rich householder named Subhadra, who greatly favoured the Nirgranthas, the Jains. On a certain occasion Buddha, wandering through Rājagriha for alms, came to Subhadra's house, and in the course of conversation told Subhadra that his wife was about to bear a son who would devote himself to the Buddhist faith and attain the condition of an Arhat. The interview was witnessed by a person named Bhūrika, who apparently was the owner or keeper of a charitable hall, and was entitled to expect that Buddha should have applied to him for alms rather than to Subhadra. When Buddha, having his alms-bowl filled by Subhadra, had gone away, Bhūrika went to Subhadra, and asked what had occurred. Subhadra explained. And then, we are told (p. 263, line 8):—

Sa Bhūrikō gaṇitrē kṛitāvī śvētavarṇāṃ grihitvā gaṇayitum = ārabdhah.

“He, Bhūrika, who was skilled in the *gaṇitra*, took a *śvētavarṇā* and began to count or calculate.”

The upshot was that Bhūrika confirmed the prediction — an unwelcome one to him, at any rate — made by Buddha: and, though Subhadra, led on by Bhūrika, actually brought about the death of his wife in an attempt to falsify the prediction, there was ultimately born from her, after she had died and had been almost entirely cremated, a boy who became the Jyōtishka who is the hero of the story.

It seems clear that Bhūrika was an adept in making

and testing predictions by means of calculations. And the editors regarding him as an astrologer, have explained *gaṇitra* in their index of words as meaning 'an astrologer's instrument, an abacus', and *śrētavarṇā* as meaning also 'an astrologer's instrument'. There can, however, be little doubt, if any, that the appropriate meaning for *śrētavarṇā*, lit. 'having a white colour', is '(a piece of) chalk', as assigned to it in Monier-Williams's Sanskrit Dictionary;¹ perhaps as qualifying *śalākā*, 'a small stake, stick, or rod of wood, bamboo etc., or other pointed instrument', in short 'a pencil', or some similar term, understood. The question is, what precise meaning is to be attached to the term *gaṇitra*.

I have not succeeded, so far, in finding this word anywhere else. I can find only *gaṇayitrikā*, with irregular forms *gaṇatrikā* and *gaṇitrikā* and the Prākṛit form *gaṇettiyā*, used in Jain literature in the sense of 'a rosary'. But, while the beads of a rosary might well be employed for counting or calculating, even to test a prediction, the use of the term *śrētavarṇā*, 'a piece of chalk', seems to render that meaning unsuitable here, even if we might take *gaṇitra* as still another form of *gaṇayitrikā*.

Taking, however, the word *gaṇitra* in a natural way, we recognize that it is formed with the suffix *itra*. For this we turn to Pāṇini, 3. 2. 184, which teaches the use of this suffix in the sense of 'instrument' to form such words as *khanitra*, 'an instrument for digging, a spade', *aritra*, 'a rudder', *laritra*, 'a sickle', and *dharitra*, 'a fan'. This gives an appropriate meaning for *gaṇitra* in our passage, which we may accordingly take as saying:—

“He, Bhūrika, being skilled in the use of the appliance for counting or calculating, took a piece of chalk and began to count or calculate.”

¹ Compare *pāṇḍulekha*, 'chalk', lit. 'white writing': see Bahler, *Indian Paleography*, § 37, C; and Burnell, *Elements of South-Indian Paleography*, p. 87 and note 2.

This distinctly seems to suggest the use of some form of the abacus, in the shape of a board—the well-known *phalaka*¹—coloured black and ruled ready for use so that calculations could be made on it with a piece of chalk.

Perhaps some of our Buddhist and Jain specialists can tell us more about the *gaṇitā*. Perhaps, also, they or others can adduce other literary passages which may be interesting in connexion with the general question of the use of the abacus in ancient India.

J. F. FLEET.

VELURPALAIYAM PLATES OF NANDIVARMAN III

Vēlūrpalaiyam is a village in the Arkonam division of the North Arcot District, about seven miles from the Arkonam Railway Junction. The existence of a copper-plate grant at this village was made known to me by a certain Subrahmaṇya Dēśika who is collecting materials for a history of the Toṇḍai-nāḍu and its twenty-four districts (*kōttam*), and the plates were eventually obtained by me for examination.

The inscription on these plates is engraved partly in Grantha characters and partly in Tamil. The portion in the Grantha characters is in the Sanskrit language, and the rest is in Tamil. The former opens with the usual mythical genealogy of the Pallavas. Then we are introduced to Aśōkavarman.² Virakūreha is said to have married a Nāga princess and to have obtained the insignia of royalty with her. Then there was Skandaśishya, who took possession of the *ghoṭikā* of the Brāhmaṇas from Satyasēna. Kumāravishṇu, who took Kāñchinagara (Conjeeveram), came next, and after him was Buddha-varman, who defeated the Chōla army. After the death

¹ See Buhler, *Indiān Paleography*, p. 5 and § 37. C.

² It is worthy of note that kings like Sivaskandavarman and Vishnugōpa are not even referred to.

of Vishṇugōpa and other kings came Nandivarman (I),¹ who, by the grace of the god Śīva, made the serpent Dṛiṣṭīviṣha dance. Then came Siṃhavarman, from whom was born Siṃhaviṣṇu, who conquered the Chōla country. His son was Mahēndra, who was succeeded by Narasiṃhavarman I, the conqueror of Vātāpi (Bādāmi).² Paramēśvaravarman I is reported to have conquered the Chalukya army, and Narasiṃhavarman II³ is said to have built a temple of Śīva resembling Kailāsa.⁴ His son was Paramēśvaravarman II. Nandivarman (II) is said to have subsequently obtained, together with the goddess of the earth, the goddess of the glory of the Pallava family. His son was Dantivarman, who married the Kadamba princess Aggalaninmaḍi. And their son was the donor, Nandivarman (III), called Kō-Vijaya-Nandivarman in the Tamil portion of the record. He is reported to have obtained the kingdom by killing his enemies in battle. The object of the record is to register the gift of the village of Tirukkātṭuppaḷli in Nāyaru-nādu, a subdivision of Pularkōṭṭam, to a temple of Śīva named Yajñēśvara built by a certain Yajñabhaṭṭa, who seems to have been the priest of the king. The *vijñāpti* was made by a Chōla-Mahārāja called Kumārānkuśa.

The importance of the inscription for the history of the Pallava dynasty will be clear from the foregoing brief summary of its contents. This is not the place for a lengthy discussion of the historical facts furnished by the grant, and I intend to publish the record in full, with

¹ Vinakūrcha, Skandavarman, Kumāravishṇu, Buddhavarman, Vishṇugōpa, and Nandivarman are mentioned in the earliest Sanskrit charter of the dynasty; *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 37 (1908), p. 283 i.

² His son Mahēndravarmān II is omitted here.

³ Narasiṃhavarman II is described as the son's son (*putra-sūnu*) of Paramēśvaravarman I.

⁴ This evidently refers to the Kailāsanātha temple which was called in ancient times Rājasimhēśvara after the builder Rājasimha (also called Narasiṃhavarman (II), Narasiṃhaviṣṇu, and Narasiṃhapōtavarman).

a photo-lithograph, at an early date in the *Epigraphia Indica*. But we may note here the following points. The usurpation of Nandivarman Pallavamalla on the death of Paramēśvaravarman II, which is hinted in the Kāśākuḍi plates,¹ seems to be confirmed by the present grant. The successors of Nandivarman Pallavamalla appear to have been in power until the Chōlas became supreme in the Tamil country about the end of the ninth century. And Kō-Vijaya-Nripatuṅgavarman² of the Bāhūr plates was apparently the son of Nandivarman III, the donor of the Vēlūrpalaiyam grant. This branch of the Pallavas Dr. Hultzsch has called the Gaṅga-Pallavas for want of a better name.

Either the successors of Chitramāya-Pallava who was killed by the usurper Nandivarman (II) Pallavamalla according to the Udayēndiram grant,³ or the descendants of Paramēśvaravarman II, seem to have continued some sort of rule in the ancient Pallava dominions. To this branch may be tentatively assigned Dantivarman-Mahārāja of the Triplicane inscription,⁴ Dantivarman and Nandivarman who belonged to the Pallavatilakakula,⁵ and Nandivarman who conquered (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru.⁶ Perhaps the Gaṅga-Pallavas were not always supreme: and it is not unlikely that the other branch occasionally asserted itself. This may account for the fact that the inscriptions of Kō-Vijaya-Dantivikrama and Kō-Vijaya-Nandivikrama are not found over any very large extent of country.

¹ *South. Ind. Inscr.*, vol. 2, part 3, p. 344.

² The word *vijaya* prefixed to the names of Dantivikrama, Nandivikrama, Nripatuṅgavikrama, and other kings of this series, may be taken to show that the first king of their line acquired dominion by victory. The word was probably added to distinguish Dantivarman and Nandivarman from their namesakes of the other line. It is worthy of note that Nandivarman (II) is altogether omitted in the Bāhūr plates. Besides, Vimala and Koṅkaṅka are mentioned as the ancestors of the dynasty.

³ *South. Ind. Inscr.*, vol. 2, p. 372.

⁴ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 8, p. 290.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 293, n. 4.

⁶ Director-General's *Annual Report* for 1906-7, p. 240.

The political relationship between these two series of kings cannot be satisfactorily made out at present. And much of the history of the Pallavas during the eighth and ninth centuries is still obscure. It would be easy to identify Kō-Vijaya-Dantivikramavarman with Dantippōt-taraśar or Dantivarma-Mahārāja, and Kō-Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman with Tellārreṇḍa - Nandippōttaraiyar, i.e. "Nandippōttaraiyar who defeated (his enemies) at Tellāru", or even with Nandippōttaraiyar of the Pallavatilaka family.¹ But the available facts do not warrant any such identification. We have to keep the two series of kings quite distinct until their identity is established beyond all doubt.

V. VENKAYYA.

THE ORIGINS OF BENGALI

May I venture to call the attention of members of the Society to the work that is being done by Bengalis in the investigation of the origin and history of their native speech? It seems to me that their inquiries might often be aided and directed to practical ends if they had the advice of Europeans acquainted with similar studies in the West. Dr. Grierson in his work on *The Languages of India* has told us that Bengali is a secondary Prakrit, into which, in comparatively recent times, was imported an enormous number of pure Sanskrit words, so that the difference between the literary speech and the language spoken by common folk is far more marked than in any other Indian language. The result is that the dictionaries of Bengali are practically Sanskrit dictionaries, from which all but a few popular and domestic words are banished.

¹ Even if Dantivarman and Nandivarman are disposed of in this way, there will still be left Kō-Vijaya-Narasimhavarman, Vijaya-Īśvaravarman, and Kō-Vijaya-Skandaśiśhyavikramavarman, who seem to have been Gaṅga-Pallavas, but whose relationship to the other members of the Pallava family remains to be disclosed by future researches.

But indigenous students chiefly no doubt as an indirect result of Dr. Grierson's great Survey, have become aware of the extraordinary interest and importance of the spoken dialects. The "Vangīya Sāhitya Parisad" has been working for some years now in collecting ancient MSS. of the literature of pre-English days, with a view to the preparation of an historical account of the language, and the last issue of the *Sāhitya-Parisat-Patrikā* has an excellent extra number from the pen of Mr. Yoges Candra Rāya, which contains a special study of the phonetics and dialectical peculiarities of the bhāsā of the Rāḍh country, of the part of Bengal, that is, lying to the west of the Ganges. He has found many remarkable survivals of the ancient speech as it is recorded in old poetry, many interesting coincidences with the pronunciation or idiom of Uṛiyā, Marātha, and Hindi. This kind of study is likely to be even more interesting and remunerative in Bengal and Assam than in other regions of the Outer Dispersion of the Indo-Aryan languages. There, as elsewhere, there must have been a time when the mass of the people spoke their indigenous pre-Aryan speech, and, again, a later period when the common folk, as distinguished from the immigrant Indo-Aryan aristocrats, were bilingual. In the Rāḍh country the aborigines, one supposes, must have had a strong Dravidian element, and perhaps introduced Dravidian idioms into the language of their Hindu invaders. In Eastern and Northern Bengal (the seat of the old Koch kingdom) the native element must have been Tibeto-Burman, and this may account for the marked difference of idiom and pronunciation between the people of Western and of Eastern and Northern Bengal. Indeed, the Hindnizing of the race in speech and creed is not yet complete, and all over Eastern Bengal and Assam are Tibeto-Burman communities, some still speaking only their native languages and practising their indigenous religion, some coming

under Hindu influences and becoming biglot. Hence it is possible actually to watch the process which is gone through when a race changes its language. It is analogous to what is happening in Celtic Brittany, except that in North-East Bengal and Assam the change is not from one Indo-European speech to another, but from a language still partly agglutinative to a language almost as analytic as our own. Perhaps I may be allowed to explain briefly what happens in the case of speakers of Bodo who have come into contact with Indo-Aryan Bengali or Assamese. They do not at first abandon their own vocabulary. They import into their speech such Western luxuries as the relative pronoun, conjunctions, adverbs, and (very sparingly) a passive voice. But the chief difficulty is in dealing with their very interesting and expressive "agglutinative" verb. The nature of this verb is best explained by giving an example or two. The normal verb, nowadays, consists of stem *plus* suffix. But between these two can be "infix" or "agglutinated" an almost unlimited number of monosyllables, which are sometimes themselves verbal stems and sometimes only exist as "infixes", as modifiers of the meaning of verbal roots. Thus *thāng-bai* is "go-did" = went; *thāng-ā-bai* is "did not go"; *thāng-ā-hāi-bai* is "did not go from a distance"; *thāng-ā-hāi-thī-bai* is "did not pretend to go from a distance"; etc., etc. But this habit of infixing monosyllables into a verb seems to be early recognized as a barbarous and impolite mode of speech. Bilingual Kacharis split up the agglutinative verb. Where the infixes have no separate meaning or existence in the pure vernacular, they tend to assume an adverbial form and meaning. Where they are themselves verbal stems they are converted into conjunctive participles. For instance, in a folk-tale told to me, I came across the following queer string of such participles: *bī-kho* (him) *hōmnānāi* (seizing) *lāngnānāi*

(taking) *jōpnānai* (burying) *dinnānai* (leaving) *jai-naise* (came). This, in the pure vernacular, would have had the much compacter, and at least equally expressive, form of *bī-khōhōm-lāng-jōp-din-jai-naise*—"They seized him, and took him, and buried him, and left him, and came away." Now I venture to think that this habit of turning an agglutinative verb into long strings of participial forms has left traces in even literary Bengali. For instance, in one of Bankim Chandra Chāṭtopādhyāya's novels I came across the following phrase: *āmi tomāke saṅge kariyā laiṅyā baliyā diyā āsiba*, which is literally "I you together having-made having-taken having-spoken having-given will come", or, in a free translation, "I will take you with me and will speak (to some one about you)." Sometimes a string of participles like this is used as a mere expletive, to take the place of the "hums and haws" of an unready English speaker. An old friend of mine, a Brāhmaṇ pleader (now dead), was in the habit of inserting into his pleadings, whenever he was at a loss for breath or for an appropriate word, the expression *giyā miliyā sariyā*, which is as if an Englishman were to interject "having gone, having met, having finished" into his oratory when words or breath failed him. My friend was quite unconscious of his little peculiarity. In fact, he offered to pay a fine into the dispensary poor-box every time I caught him out. He had very soon to withdraw his rashly generous offer!

These examples are taken from now distant memories of the speech of North-East Bengal. But they may be worth recording as giving a possible clue to some of the idioms of Eastern Bengal. The great mass of the people must once have been, many of them still are, bilingual, and thus afford a probably unique opportunity of studying the transition from a monosyllabic to an Indo-Aryan language. Now that the Bengalis have

themselves seriously taken up the systematic study of the origins and history of their language and literature. any hints however trifling, may lead to fruitful fields of inquiry.

J. D. A.

HERO AND RAO

Mr. Fleet's identification of Hēro, the name of a goddess on a coin of Huvishka (see this Journal, 1908 p. 62), with the Babylonian Ēru reminds me of my deriving *Rao*, 'king', found (I maintain) on the same set of coins, from the Semitic root רעה (see *Vienne Or. Journal*, 1888, p. 242), inasmuch as this root exists also in Assyrian, a fact I have only lately become aware of, viz. רעה, *re'u*, 'to pasture, to rule,' *re'ū*, 'herdsman ruler' (see Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handbch.*, p. 602). I think that the two hypotheses endorse each other in a very satisfactory manner.

J. KIRSTE.

THE DALAI LAMA'S SEAL

In his note on the Dalai Lama's seal, pp. 204-6 of this Journal Colonel Waddell suggests a new interpretation of the seal, based mainly on the addition of two characters omitted by myself. He reads—

'Oñ talai blamaí rtsa thanka rgyalva' :

and translates —

'Oñ! The original seal of the Talai Lama, the Jina.'

Even if his reading of the seal were correct, his translation would still be wrong. The word *rgyalva*, Jina, if placed after *thanka*, seal, could only be understood to refer to the seal. It would mean that the seal was a Jina. If the man who composed the legend intended to express the idea that the Talai Lama and not the seal was a Jina, he would have placed the word *rgyalva* either

directly before or directly after the title of Talai Lama
The legend would then run thus---

“Om rgyalva talai blamaï thanka.”

or---

“Om talai blama rgyalvai thanka.”

But there is no need to say anything about a Jina at all, for the word *rgyalva*, Jina, does not occur in the legend. It reads simply *rgyal*, and the sign after *rgyal* is either a full-stop or an ornamental sign without any meaning. This sign is used to fill up empty spaces at the beginning or end of a column. Let me refer to my reading of a Tibeto-Mongolian seal from Bhutan (ZDMG., vol. lxiv, p. 553), where the same square figure is found at the end of columns 2 and 3. If in this case we should have to read a *va* at the end of those lines, the sense would be obscured.

Now as to the *om*. I am very glad Colonel Waddell has nothing against my identification of the angular snake-ornament with the rounded form of the same (see my Table I, p. 1211 of this Journal for 1910). But when he says that both of them have to be read *om* I cannot help feeling a little doubtful. This sign is found at the beginning of every chapter. If it has to be read *om*, why, then, do not the Tibetans read *om* whenever they see it? Why do not all the translators write *om* whenever the sign occurs in the Tibetan text? Well, I have never heard a Tibetan say *om* when he saw this sign in the text he was reading. But the most extraordinary thing is this, that Colonel Waddell himself does not translate this sign by *om* in his translation of the Tē Tsung edict. At the beginning of the text of this edict the sign is plainly written (see p. 948), but in his translation of the edict (see p. 930) an *om* cannot be found. Well, if Colonel Waddell himself does not read the sign as *om*, how can he expect me to do so? The interpretation of this sign as a snake-ornament (relating to Nāga worship) was advanced by Dr. B. Laufer

on p. 26 of his edition of the *Klu 'abun bsduspai snyingpo* (Mémoires de la société Finno-Ougrienne, No. xi).

Now as to Colonel Waddell's reading *tsa* instead of my reading *ru*. The latter is doubtful, as stated before. I should with much pleasure accept his reading *tsa* if it were confirmed by an examination of the original seal. But unfortunately it is not, for Colonel Waddell, to my entire satisfaction, says that he has compared my revised copy with the original seal and finds it to be perfect. But then he says: "In the key-alphabet the letter *tsa* has its third horizontal limb from the top joined to the vertical, whilst in the seal this is not so—this is probably owing to a mistake in copying the key-alphabet, as presumably in the case of the seal care would be taken to ensure that the characters were formed correctly." No: I am fully convinced that in the case of the key-alphabet care was taken to ensure that the characters were formed correctly. I therefore prefer to stick to my reading *ru*, standard (compare *ru dar*, *ru thson*, banner, ensign, colours). But I readily admit that this syllable is the most doubtful part in my interpretation of the seal. Let me add that meanwhile I have succeeded in reading the seal of the West Tibetan king *rDorje the dpul mi 'aggyur don grub rnam rgyal*. This again proves the usefulness of the key-alphabet.

A. H. FRANCKE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

LION AND DRAGON IN NORTHERN CHINA. By R. F. JOHNSTON, M.A., F.R.G.S., District Officer and Magistrate, Weihaiwei, formerly Private Secretary to the Governor of Hong Kong, etc., author of *From Peking to Mandalay*. With map and illustrations. London: John Murray, 1910.

This is a goodly volume of 461 pages octavo, which the author informs us is a description of "The people of Weihaiwei, their customs and manners, their religion and superstitions, their folk-lore, their personal characteristics, their village homes": and he eschews all desire to enter into political controversy as to the place, its strategic importance, or commercial possibilities.

This little portion of country which is thus dealt with is a miniature of the greater whole of China, though customs and manners differ to some extent in different districts. Mr. Johnston was stationed for some years in Hong Kong, and this has doubtless made him keen to notice the differences. He describes the curious custom of the living marrying the dead. Marriages also take place between the dead who "neither marry nor are given in marriage", so the living in China perform the ceremony for them. Archdeacon Gray informs us that he was present at such a ceremony in Canton, when two defunct spirits were united in matrimony. The manner in which it was done was somewhat different from that described by Mr. Johnston in the marriage of a living girl to a dead man.

Another curious practice mentioned by our author, also connected with ancestral worship, is the burying of a man's soul when the body is not available for the purpose.

It is by a systematic and careful study, such as the author has employed, that many an old-world usage is brought to light, and we could wish that all our officials abroad took as intense and keen an interest in the people they govern.

Ancient legend and present-day fact are blended together, and the compound makes very pleasant reading. Indeed, many a page is most intensely interesting, and the book is replete with information. Mr. Johnston has availed himself of the native topographical works on the district in which Weihaiwei is situated to cull incidents bearing on the past, etc. How trustworthy these old chronicles are may be judged from one fact, though it comes to us in the vehicle of a legend. It is the statement that that part of China was once upon a time under the sea. Now our modern geologists, who know nothing about the legend, inform us that such was the case. Content with stating the fact, the legend proceeds to relate the marvellous as to how the princess, drowned and turned into a bird, in revenge for her death dropped stones into the sea, and thus the dry land, which now exists, was formed, so we find a grain of wheat amidst a bushel of chaff.

In chapter four a number of paragraphs are translated in their bare detail from these Chinese chronicles. These present to us in strong aspects the vicissitudes of Chinese agricultural and village life, for floods, storms, snow, great famines, epidemics, locusts, pirates and brigands, and robbers and wolves are plentifully sprinkled over the pages, as well as astronomical phenomena, such as parhelia and comets. One of the latter, noted as appearing in 1682, was possibly, or probably, Halley's. Evidently the Shantung peasantry have not an easy life with their incessant toil and battle with Nature in her roughest and sternest moods: and yet, most surprising for China, Mr. Johnston tells us there is not a beggar to be seen in the territory.

One of the beneficent results of the British occupation is the vaccination of the children, with the result that, instead of half of them dying from smallpox, as used to be the case, these little lives are spared. When vaccination is once introduced the Chinese are fully alive to the benefit of it, but unfortunately have yet to learn that re-vaccination is necessary in later years to render themselves immune from the dreadful scourge.

The more we know of China and the Chinese the less do we find them to be a people set apart by themselves with no links to connect them with the rest of the world. Our author enjoys tracing similarity of custom between East and West, and many a footnote contains references which to the folklorist and the student of human nature will be found most instructive.

In a notice of the drama Mr. Johnston does not state the opinion held by some that the Chinese drama was derived from the Greek. He also seems to dissent from the generally received opinion that the Chinese are pre-eminently a people fond of supplementing their speech by gesture.

Mr. Johnston evidently holds the same views as a former writer on China who said—"It is the misfortune of the Chinese government and people to be weighed in a balance which they have never accepted, and to have their shortcomings, so ascertained, made the basis of reclamations of varying degrees of gravity." The actions and beliefs of the Chinese are put in this book in the best possible light that can be turned on them. We think that the author in his enthusiasm carries this too far at times, and lays himself open to criticism in the attitude which he takes. Much of what he thus says must meet with well-deserved approval, but some of the conclusions that he arrives at will not always carry conviction.

Many of the gods of the Chinese would be equally

well described as saints, but we question if, in all respects, he has—notwithstanding his exceptional facility to look at things from a Chinese standpoint—quite entered into the Chinese mind, the mind of the mass of the Chinese, as regards their objects of worship. He would appear to try to argue that the images are simply aids to devotion; for he says, “unless the goddess is endowed with multiple personalities, it is obvious that she cannot possibly be present in every image.” This, of course, is the view which one surrounded by Christian influences and not brought up in the midst of idolatry naturally takes; but the heathen mind is better shown in the practice of other heathen nations, such, for example, as that of the ancient Egyptians. Speaking about statues in the temples, Sir G. Maspero says they “were not inanimate images solely commissioned to eternize the features”, but had a soul attached to them, the priest holding a service over them when they were erected “by virtue of which a particle of the life of the donor was infused into them”. In the same way proper measures, as they think, are taken by the Chinese to ensure the presence of the god or goddess, and then they are worshipped as the Egyptians also worshipped the images mentioned above: for the spirit of the deity, god, or saint—call it what we like—is believed to be enshrined within the image, just as one of the souls of a deceased person is supposed to be present in the ancestral tablet. The god of a temple near which we lived in Canton was invited to leave the image while extensive repairs were undertaken in the temple, and after these were effected a similar ceremony to the one which preceded the departure of the spirit took place to reinstate him in his abode in the idol.

Our author takes a very lenient view of ancestor-worship. Without entering into any discussion on the subject, one may just quote what Professor Giles has

said on it—"I feel bound to say that in my opinion these ancestral observances can only be regarded, strictly speaking, as worship, and as nothing else." De Groot also speaks of "this sacrificial worship of the dead, the real religion of classical China".

As to the worship of Confucius: homage, reverence, worship so blend into one another in the Far East that there will always be found those of Western descent who will hold to the opinion that it is not worship. If it is not worship, it is perilously near it. The Christian Chinese consider it as such, they hold the same opinion as to ancestor-worship, and their verdict is more worthy of acceptance in such matters than that of those of our own countrymen from the West who have doubts.

One gathers that Mr. Johnston believes that ancestor-worship and Confucianism are moral forces that could still in the future prove of incalculable value to China: but surely, surely, it is too late to write as if they could be saviours of China, if that is what he means. They have been in many of their aspects and results, especially Confucianism, good, very good, and China owes much to them we admit: but both have been tried for thousands of years and China is feeling the lack in them. We trust with the author that all that is good in them may be retained, such as, in the one, the family ties that bind the clansmen together, and the respect for the aged, and the high ethical maxims of the Great Sage in the other; but a higher motive-power to make for righteousness than either possesses is required ere the corruption of official life and the other evils which Mr. Johnston calls attention to can be adequately overcome. This dynamic force is making itself felt increasingly every day. The uplift which China is experiencing is largely due to it.

J. DYER BALL.

TEXTES D'AUTEURS GRECS ET LATINS RELATIFS Á
L'EXTRÊME-ORIENT DEPUIS LE IV^e SIÈCLE AV. J.-C.
JUSQU'AU XIV^e SIÈCLE. Recueillis et traduits par
GEORGE CÉDÈS. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1910.

The present volume is an instalment (the first, I believe) of a series entitled *Documents Historiques et Géographiques relatifs à l'Indochine*, which is appearing under the editorial direction of MM. Henri Cordier and Louis Finot. These names, as well as that of the author of the volume under review, a well-known contributor to the excellent *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, are a sufficient guarantee of the scholarly character of the work. Supplemented, as it is to be hoped it will soon be, by a similar catena of extracts from Arabian geographers, the book should serve as a useful introduction to the obscure ancient history of the Far East and its early relations with the West.

Though the series, by its running title, indicates that Indo-China (i.e. Further India) is the point of view taken up by the editors, the present volume includes references to China as well. Indeed, it is not easy, nor would it have been advisable, to keep these two spheres of interest apart. In the writings of the early geographers and travellers they merge into one another; it is difficult to say precisely where the one leaves off and the other begins. Their history and culture are also to some extent interwoven; Chinese influence was even then beginning to prevail along the eastern coast of Further India, and for the early navigators and traders the latter country was rather a stepping-stone to the economically far more important Chinese empire than of special importance on its own account.

That is one reason, I suppose, why it is so difficult to build up a clear retrospect of Further India from the data handed down by these early writers. One can follow more or less exactly the coasting route along which they

travelled. one can identify with more or less certainty and accuracy the ports and marts where their ships put in. But on the interior of the country, its inhabitants and their conditions and modes of life, these scanty notices throw very little light. Then, again, for China we have in this period native sources of information which are sufficiently ample in detail to enable a connected history of the country to be constructed. China, in spite of wars, dynastic changes, and shiftings of frontier, has long been a stable and in a great measure a unified and well-defined entity. But Further India has always been in a state of flux: its history presents to our view a congeries of relatively small states with shifting borders and varied ethnographical contents, eternally engaged in the exhilarating pastime of attempting, with more or less success, to conquer, enslave, or exterminate one another. States were formed and settled down into something like civilized stability, only to be overthrown after a few generations by new incursions of alien invaders. Thus there was a succession of kaleidoscopic changes, a continual shifting of landmarks, and of course a repeated destruction of the materials from which ancient history might have been reconstructed. The result is that for the greater part of this period we have hardly any trustworthy and connected native histories. The past has to be recovered, as in India, by the laborious piecing together of all sorts of broken threads. Fragments of more or less authentic chronicles, traditions, and legends have to be supplemented (and in most cases superseded) by the detailed researches of archæology, epigraphy, and numismatics.

A good deal has been done in these directions, but it may well be doubted whether the half of what is necessary has been achieved. French scholars have done excellent work in Camboja and Champa, and the ancient history of these countries is gradually being brought into the light of day. In Burma an understaffed and insufficiently

supported department has done a good deal in the way of putting archæological and epigraphic material on permanent record, but of the latter very little has been made available to the ordinary reader by translation into English. In Siam it would seem that there should still be much ungathered material: indeed, throughout the whole of Indo-China it is to be expected that excavation will produce results of great value. I mention these things in this connexion because they illustrate the difficulty of appraising such a work as the one under review in its relation to the past history of Further India. At the most it can only be expected to throw a somewhat dim sidelight on certain parts of that region, and at present we know so little about the whole country from other sources that it is very hard to make use of the scanty data handed down to us by classical and mediæval writers. This is bound to be the case so long as the past of Further India remains in a sort of penumbra: but when new materials locally collected have thrown fresh light upon it, these notices (scanty though they be) will acquire a new value. It is not, perhaps, unreasonable to hope that in time it will be possible to trace in local sources the place-names that have been preserved to us by the older European authorities, and thus establish their identity with a much higher degree of certainty than is now attainable. That in itself would be an object well worth striving for, and I imagine that the editors of this series and the author of the present volume have undertaken their work largely with this end in view.

The authorities from which extracts are given extend from Ctesias of Cnidus to the Byzantine historian Nicephorus Gregoras, and include a long series of writers lying chronologically between these two. In reading through them one is struck by the somewhat unpleasing, but very natural, circumstance that in a great measure they copy one another. The silk of the Seres and the

geographical details furnished by Ptolemy run more or less through the list. This aspect of the authorities is reviewed and discussed by M. Cœdès in an Introduction which adds considerably to the value of the volume. He also gives us a general bibliography and several useful maps to illustrate the works of Strabo, Pomponius Mela, Ptolemy, and other authors, as well as an index of the authorities cited and an index of geographical names. It is rather to be regretted that an index of subjects has not been included, for it would have been very useful: but I suppose that if it had been at all a full one it would have involved considerable labour and must have added a good deal to the size of the volume.

The author discusses several points of interest in his Introduction. I note that he confidently accepts the identity of the *Χρυσή* (sc. *ἤπειρος*, not *νῆσος*) of the Periplus of the Erythræan Sea with the *Suvarṇabhūmi* of Indian literature. I am disposed to agree with him, for I have never been able to appreciate the difficulty which some recent writers seem to feel with regard to this identification. *Χρυσή* is undoubtedly the western coast-land of Indo-China, beginning a little beyond the mouth of the Ganges and therefore equivalent to Burma, broadly speaking: and local tradition in that country claims the term *Suvarṇabhūmi* for itself. I fail to see why this should not be accepted, at any rate until it has been definitely proved to be wrong. Of Ptolemy's geography, and the attempts which have been made to make it tally with the facts derived from other sources, M. Cœdès has a good deal to say. He is not at all favourably impressed by those attempts. He urges that, having regard to the arbitrary and purely hypothetical manner in which the Alexandrian geographer sometimes handled his materials, it is hopeless to endeavour to extract mathematically accurate conclusions from his maps. It must certainly be admitted that many of Ptolemy's data were only vague

estimates of marching or sailing distances, that he pieced them together as best he could, and in the process sometimes made rough-and-ready allowance for deviations from the straight line, and so forth. One need only look at his maps to realize the distortion which all this compilation inevitably implies, and which the preconceived ideas of the compiler only helped to accentuate. But I am not quite sure that that concludes the whole matter. M. Cœdès commends the historical and linguistic method which in some cases has established the identity of Ptolemy's place-names. What if, starting from this relatively safe ground, a further investigation should tend to show that for certain localities Ptolemy had more accurate data to deal with than mere reports of travelling distances and directions? May not astronomical observations, the measures of the relative length of shadows at midday, and other particulars have been available in some cases? It is difficult otherwise to understand how it comes about that a number of Ptolemy's errors appear to be fairly constant over considerable areas, so that their reduction in such cases by uniform formulæ of rectification seems to yield results agreeing very closely with verifiable facts. To attribute this to mere coincidence requires a stronger imagination than I for one can claim to possess. But I have already had occasion to say something on that point, and am not prepared at present to add anything to the remarks I made on it in reviewing Colonel Gerini's recent monograph for this Journal last year.

Be this as it may, the alternative method still remains and is capable of considerable development, if favoured by new archæological discoveries. Some day, I trust, local research penetrating further back into the dim past of this region will succeed in linking up many of its ancient sites with the names handed down to us by classical writers. Of China itself little can be said: as M. Cœdès himself observes, "le sinologue n'a pas appris grand chose

sur la Chine" from the texts collected in this book. The same may be said of the Eastern Archipelago, a region even obscurer than Further India during that period. For this collection, of course, does not include Marco Polo and the later mediaeval travellers who visited Sumatra and other islands of that neighbourhood. Their reports have been discussed elsewhere and do not fall within the scope of this work. In turning to them one seems to be entering into a new world. We get personal experiences instead of literary tradition. But the latter is not altogether without importance: as M. Cœdès rightly remarks, "la critique de ces documents n'est pas achevée," and it may be that the real value of the classical data is yet to be revealed. It is beyond my competence to offer any new contributions towards the attainment of that end. I can only express the hope that a careful comparison of all the evidence, Eastern and Western, may gradually solve the many problems that still remain to be dealt with, and in the meantime I commend M. Cœdès' work as a convenient and useful one which will be of assistance to further research and comparative study.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

SCHEETS VAN EEN SOEMBANEESCHE SPRAAKKUNST (NAAR 'T DIALECT VAN KAMBERA). Door D. K. WIELENGA. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1910.

This is a manual of the Kambera dialect of the language of Sumba, one of the smaller islands of the Eastern Archipelago (also known as Chëndana or Sandalwood Island), and is issued by the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen which has done so much useful work in that region. The volume under review comprises a grammatical sketch, a number of texts in prose and verse (including a curious collection of riddles), and a fairly long vocabulary. References are in many

cases given to other dialects of Sumbanese and to corresponding forms in neighbouring and cognate languages, so that apart from its primary purpose the work includes a certain comparative element which undoubtedly adds to its scientific value.

It is, of course, impossible for anyone who does not himself know the particular language illustrated to deal adequately with such a work as this. I can only say that an examination of it from the general point of view of a student interested in Indonesian linguistics seems to indicate that it is a scholarly performance. Indonesian languages differ very much in the relative complexity of their grammatical systems. In this respect Sumbanese seems to come more or less midway between the simplicity of Malay and the highly developed and archaic complexity of Sangirese and the Philippine languages. The chapter on the verb exemplifies this point. In Sumbanese we find a number of the well-known Indonesian prefixes, but most of them are in a fossilized state, that is to say, they have become attached to particular stems and can no longer be freely used to build up new formations. The system throughout bears evidence of having degenerated from a fuller and more complex organization. Yet there is much in it that will appear very strange to anyone who looks at Indonesian languages only through Malay spectacles. It is true that substantives in Sumbanese, as in Malay, take no account of the changes of number, gender, and case to which we are accustomed in Indo-European and Semitic grammars. But Sumbanese possesses a definite article with distinct forms for plural and singular, and (like some other Indonesian languages) it has a completely inflected set of personal pronouns.

There is much besides that points in the same direction, and goes to show that the apparent grammatical simplicity of Malay and some of its cognate neighbours is a secondary phenomenon, like that of modern Persian or

English. Some day, I suppose, a comparative grammar of the Indonesian languages will be written, though it may be doubted whether its time is as near as we might be disposed to wish. When that day arrives, grammatical sketches like the above will be the foundation of the work, and its value will depend largely on their accuracy and completeness. It is just that consideration which invests a book of this kind with a certain importance other than its intrinsic one. The dialect which it illustrates may be spoken only by a few thousand half-savage inhabitants of an insignificant and remote island, who have contributed nothing (or hardly anything) to the world's history and civilization. But, for all that, their language may be an indispensable element in the reconstruction of the past history of their linguistic family, a family which extends from Madagascar to Easter Island and from Formosa to New Zealand, and has played a great part in the colonization and settlement of that vast geographical area.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

HALF THE BATTLE IN BURMESE. By R. GRANT BROWN,
I.C.S., M.R.A.S. Henry Frowde, 1910.

Mr. Grant Brown altruistically warns the student that he is firmly of the opinion that Burmese should be learnt not from his or any other book, but with the aid of a native. This is true of any language, but it is especially true of such languages as Burmese and Chinese. The student at his desk is apt to adopt combinations of sounds for himself which seem eminently reasonable, and when he has acquired, as he thinks, a quite creditable command of the language, he is discomfited, and, unless he is of an eminently equable disposition, apt to be enraged when he finds that no native understands him. The Germans are fond of telling everyone, whether it concerns or interests

them or not. that their language is pronounced exactly as it is written. There are those who dispute this, but at any rate it ignores the existence of stress, as Mark Twain found for himself after he thought, as the result of considerable study, that he had thoroughly got hold of one word. He put the accent on the wrong syllable. was misunderstood, and remained a Germanophobe ever after.

The probability of similar mishaps is immensely increased in Burmese, because the alphabet is a foreign importation and not by any means suited to the Burmese sound system. It never was well suited, and since it was adopted Burmese has altered very much in its pronunciation, with the result that nowadays the number of words that are pronounced as they are written is quite insignificant. The Burmese alphabet has not the fascination about it that Chinese characters have. There are people who may have quite a creditable knowledge of several thousand Chinese characters and yet might just as well know no Chinese at all for all the use it is to them in the outside world. Mr. Grant Brown therefore impresses upon the learner that though he cannot learn the alphabet without the sounds, he can very well learn the sounds without the alphabet. Therefore he is a strong supporter of the system of phonetic writing, by which means the sounds may be fixed on paper and recalled to memory at one's leisure.

He therefore devotes a great deal of trouble to phonetics, and is met by the ordinary Englishman's difficulty in pronouncing *k*, *p*, *t*. The national tendency is to aspirate these. The Chinese teachers of the Legations in Peking get over the matter with least trouble to themselves by persuading their pupils to use *b* and *d* for the unaspirated letter. This may be slovenly, but it is characteristic of the modern student interpreter. Mr. Grant Brown is more helpful. Briefly speaking, he advises the

learner when he has to tackle the aspirated letter to think of the vowel and when it is unaspirated to think of the consonant. This may not be more effectual, but it is at any rate less humiliating, than the method of the Chinese *munshis*. The Burmese *w* and *y* are always true consonants. In English they are semi-vowels, and when Burmese is written in English characters the result is somewhat uncouth-looking. The Burmese *k* is intermediate between our *g* and *k*, and when this is combined with *y* it produces a sound which according to the Government system of transliteration is written *ky* or *gy*. Mr. Grant Brown prefers to write this *ty* or *dy*, and when his manual reached Burma last year there was an immediate acrimonious correspondence in the Rangoon papers as to whether he was justified in doing so or not. Whether *tywet* was better than *kywet* as the Burmese for a rat, and whether *gyi* was a better way of writing the Burmese word for "big", or *dyi*, was discussed at considerable length, and there were nearly as many natives of the country on one side as on the other. We are distinctly inclined to agree with Mr. Grant Brown that less slovenly pronunciation is likely to be the result of the adoption of his system of pronunciation than would come of strict adherence to the authorized version. Nothing is commoner than to hear an English officer call out "Maung Po Tchè" (as the French would write it) and to notice that it is passed on by the Burmese peon outside as "Maung Po Tyè" (as Mr. Grant Brown would have us write it).

For this reason of accuracy of pronunciation also Mr. Grant Brown would have nobody begin learning the written language before he can talk the colloquial with accuracy and fluency. Unfortunately this would interfere very emphatically with the Departmental Examination Syllabus, and young Assistant Commissioners, at any rate, are not likely to listen to him. He advises them to

keep to the spoken language alone for the first three or four months of their six, but it would imply considerable aptitude for languages to have a fluent and accurate command of Burmese in four months' time.

Mr. Grant Brown's dialogues are a great improvement on the ordinary Ollendorffian sort of stuff one finds in such books. He might with advantage expand it into an emulation of the Japanese *Kwan hwa chih wan*, which is beyond comparison the best of all compilations for the acquiring of a foreign language. Wade's dialogues in the *Tzu Erh Ch'i* are clever, but they have not the range of the Japanese instructor in Chinese. Mr. Grant Brown's book may be commended to all who are beginning the study of Burmese in this country, and it would be wise for all to have it by them when they are beginning in earnest in Burma itself. The characters from the *Kammawa-sa* on the cover are a welcome relief from the peacock or pagoda which one usually sees on the outside of books about Burma or Burmese.

J. G. S.

SHANS AT HOME. By Mrs. LESLIE MILNE, M.R.A.S.
John Murray, 1910.

It is an indisputable fact that Government officers very seldom give us a readable description of the countries of which they have charge. The British Tai States have now been nearly quarter of a century in our hands, but there has been no work published which gives us an account of the manners and customs of the people. This may be due to the fact that officials have not the leisure to undertake anything of the kind, or that when they do undertake it they are apt to consider an account of the management of the country and of its resources of much more importance than a description of its ways and traits. Or it may be due to the fact that the official very seldom

comes in real contact with the people. Mr. Putnam Weale accuses British civil servants of being entirely lacking in sympathy with Orientals, of priggishness, and sheer incapacity, from previous training, of doing anything but learn their work at the expense of the coloured races. This may be so, and it may account for the fact that they do not write readable books about them, but it may be noted that it is the same with the officials of other countries. The best books about the Tonkingese are certainly not those by French residents and commissaires. Thus it happens that the first book about the Tai is written not merely by a person who is not an official, but by an English lady.

Mrs. Leslie Milne made exceedingly good use of her time. She spent five months at Hsipaw, where the Tai native is a good deal sophisticated by the presence of a large alien population connected with the Mandalay-Lashio Railway, and then she very wisely moved north to Namhkam, one of the Môngs of the North Hsenwi State, but formerly ruled over by a Myosa, who was something more than a sub-feudatory. Mrs. Leslie Milne's primary object was to study the language of the Rumai, better known to most people as the Palaungs, who are of an entirely different race from the Tai, and ethnologically connected with the Wa, some of whom are still head-hunters. But the Rumai only come to Namhkam on market days, every fifth day, and Mrs. Milne very profitably spent the off days in studying her immediate neighbours, the Tai.

At first sight one might think that Namhkam was hardly central enough for a study of the Shans—the name by which the British section of the Tai race is known—but, as a matter of fact, there are many Tai across the border in Chinese territory, in Mông Mao, Nantien, and a number of other states, stretching up to T'êngyieh (the Shan Mông Myen), and Yung Ch'ang. Namhkam is only

half a mile or so from the Shweli, which forms the boundary, and every market day there are hundreds of visitors from across the border. Namhkam is therefore very probably a better place to study the Tai in than Mông Nai or Lai Hka would be, or even than Kēngtūng. Mông Nai was too much Burmanized in the old days, and the Lao influences are very strong in Kēngtūng. At any rate, Mrs. Milne's book shows no trace of being local, except in her very excellent photographs, which certainly, as far as the ladies are concerned, represent a dress which is confined to the Shweli Valley. The panel skirt would immediately attract attention as something unusual in any other part of the British Shan States, and so would the exceedingly massive armlets—they can hardly be called bracelets—which seem suited rather to a militant suffragette than to a submissive house-wife.

The Tai know very little about their origins, but what little knowledge exists all points to the north as the first home of their race. The Siamese are the strongest body of the Tai now existing, but their history does not begin before the thirteenth century, and the small amount that they have preserved in the way of tradition points to the north as the dwelling-place of the older Tai. They may think little of the Ngio, as they call the inhabitants of the British Shan States, but far birds have fair feathers, and they are persuaded that the Tai Nö, the Upper or Northern Shans, are a very much superior race. The Lao of the Northern Siam provinces are equally convinced that the north-countrymen represent all that is purest and best and most national, and the British Tai to a less degree share the same conviction. Whatever we may think of the theory of learned Western students that the Tai are the descendants of the great T'su nation, which between eight and nine hundred years before Christ controlled what is now Central and Southern China, and were succeeded by the Tsen kingdom, which had been shifted farther to the

south, there can be no doubt of the existence and of the power of the Mao Shan kingdom, and it was established in the valley of the Shweli, whose Tai name is the Nam Mao. There are the traces of many old capitals all along the river basin, and one of them, at Sèlan, not a dozen miles from Namhkam, may well have been the residence of Hsö Hkan-hpa, the greatest of the Mao Shan chiefs. It is also at no very great distance, as distances are counted in these countries, from Tali-fu, the old Yangtsüme, which was the old capital of Nanchao, the country of the Tai when the Tai were a very considerable power and came near to establishing themselves as the lords of China.

Mrs. Leslie Milne's choice of Namhkam, therefore, whether accidental or designed, was very fortunate. The Tai race, like the negroes, has a tendency to break up into tribes rather than to unite into a nation. Whether this is due to the physical character of their country or to inherent natural defects is another matter. It has prevented them from taking the position in Asia which at one time seemed open to them, but it does not seem to have greatly affected their manners and customs. Mrs. Milne has studied these with great diligence and zeal, and there are none that she records that would not be true in the main of the Tai of Mawkmai or those of Këngtūng. Her industry is proved by the enormous amount of information which she records, and her indifference to loneliness and discomfort could only be paralleled by Mrs. Bishop. When she first reached Namhkam she took up her abode in the ordinary way in one of the local rest-houses or *sarawps*. She had, however, very soon to leave this, because a family of pigs from a neighbouring monastery had acquired the habit of sleeping under the floor and could not be prevailed upon to give it up. She had therefore to get a bamboo house built for herself. Possibly this was the occasion when she made a note of a custom which we do

not remember to have heard before. When the house-posts are put in position the holes are at first not quite filled. The posts are put in, but before the earth is rammed down the master builder and his assistants chew betel-nut with particular energy and perhaps a little more lime and spices than usual. "This is to ensure a large supply of saliva, to which the little devils which hide under house-posts have a strong objection. The men chew, then they expectorate copiously into each hole, and when the little devil has fled in disgust the hole is quickly filled to the top with earth, the earth being pounded hard to prevent its return." This method of keeping off devils is certainly not universal, and may possibly be peculiar to the Chinese Tai, or even to Nanhkam and its neighbourhood. It was possibly also at this period of her story that Mrs. Leslie Milne scored down the call to the pigs to come home at night. It compares quite favourably in its cadences with the specimen serenade most affected by young lovers with their flutes when they are out courting at night. She also does not disdain to give some Tai cookery receipts, including the proper way to cook snails and frogs, how to make green mustard pickle, and the preparation of beef to be eaten raw, which is not nearly so simple as might be rashly assumed.

The chapters on Shan history and literature have been furnished by the Rev. Wilbur Cochrane of the American Baptist Mission. Mr. Cochrane has been a long time in the Shan States, both North and South, and it is not a little disappointing that he has not been able to add to the facts already known. The late M. Terrien de Lacouperie's conclusions were largely the result of great learning and are interesting rather than conclusive. Mr. E. H. Parker's deductions from Chinese Annals were much more valuable and indeed form the structure on which later students must work. It is now practically certain that no Tai chronicles will be found in the British

Shan States. Very little is to be hoped from the Lao States. The only hope remaining seems to be a discovery in the monasteries of the Chinese Tai, much more permanent structures than those of our Shan States. Mr. Cochrane seems inclined to follow the Burmese in their assertion that Buddhism was introduced among the Tai by Buyin Nawng and other Peguan kings. It seems much more probable that the Northern form of Buddhism was introduced by the apostles of Dhammathawka, and that all that Burmese kings did was to reform the heresies that came from Tibet, just as Anawrata reformed the Ariya of Pagān. The book may be confidently recommended to all who wish to learn something of an interesting race.

J. G. S.

BEITRÄGE ZUR VOLKSKUNDE SÜD-SCHANTUNGS. Von P. GEORG M. STENZ, S.V.D. Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von A. CONRADY. R. Voigtländers Verlag.

This contribution to our knowledge of the customs of the people of South Shantung is a brochure in folio of 116 pages. It contains an Introduction, Foreword, and four chapters. These latter deal (1) with the feasts and customs during the year, (2) the customs at birth and in connexion with infancy, (3) those at betrothal and marriage, and (4) those at deaths and funerals. There are nearly a score of illustrations and reproductions of Chinese documents, which include pictures of several of the Chinese gods.

It must not be supposed that China is divided in regard to customs and objects of worship into watertight compartments, and that in passing from one district of country to another everything changes as in ancient Gaul, where "Hi omnes lingua, institutis, legibus inter se differunt", as Cæsar said. At the same time there are differences. to instance only one case, that of the important

marriage documents, which are drawn up in various ways according to where they are prepared. The Chinese themselves say that their customs differ every ten Chinese miles, and that there is a difference in speech every hundred.

It is well that books, like this under review, should be written dealing thus with different sections of the country. Especially would it be well that all resident in China who know the language should note customs, manners, and superstitions in the districts in which they live, as with all the changes that are now taking place in the empire it may in the future be more difficult to gather such information, nor should any think that as others are doing this there is no need for anything more to be done.

A recent writer, who has devoted a book to a similar small portion of China, expresses the opinion that the day for general description of this empire and its people is well-nigh past, and that future writers on the Far East will find it better to concentrate their efforts on parts of the country instead of scattering their endeavours over the whole extent of this vast land with its teeming populations. And there is on these lines an extensive and wide field open for research in all subjects connected with the customs, manners, and practices of the Chinese. There are large tracts of country unexplored in these directions, untouched, and of which we know in these respects practically nothing, and looked at from the standpoint of the folklorist and student of mythology instinct with interest. Knowing both language and people, one may live for many years in China and be constantly finding out something new about the people and their ways.

The present work has been preceded by a similar book by Professor W. Grube entitled *Zur Pekingener Volkskunde*, and we trust that many others from the scholarly pens of our German neighbours will follow. In the *Vorwort*

lists are given of the twenty-four Chinese hours, the names of the twelve animals which are supposed to govern the years and a useful table of the sexagenary circle for a century and a half, commencing with the year 1804.

In the first division of the book we are taken all through the Chinese year, and descriptions of saints' days and feast days follow each other in rapid succession; but it is impossible to give a lengthy description of all that appears between the two paper covers of this large pamphlet. Most interesting little rhyming saws from the Chinese are interspersed. Most quaint and curious some of them are.

As to the illustrations, they are good. One of the most interesting is the bride in her wedding garments and crown, with the large "small feet" prevalent in the north of China.

We note that of the Taoist *Yü-huang-shang-ti* it is said, "jetz vielfach die Stelle des *Tien-lau-ye-ye* ver-tretend." This we do not think is the case in the south. The idols of this deity are not very common in Kwong-tung, nor are his temples.

On p. 33 we have the picture of a god with an attendant. If we mistake not, it is the god who has to do with official appointments; but he is described as "*Fu-lu-schow*, ein Glücksgott (Turbild)". The three, represented by the Chinese words, are three distinct personifications, and have each a god assigned to them, at all events in a great part of China.

Du Bose, in his *The Dragon, Image, and Demon* (p. 412), gives the name of the protector of children as *Chang Sien*. He is shown on p. 63 of this book, and described as "ohne bestimmten Namen (Turbild)". Doolittle in *Social Life of the Chinese* omits all mention of his name.¹

J. DYER BALL.

¹ We also find in a native work published in Canton a picture of this patron saint of children, with his name given as Chang Hsien, the genie Chang.

PAṬHAMĀ SUDHAMMAWATĪ, GAṬAMPATĪ. RĀJĀDHIRĀT.
 Edited and published by the Superior of Kruñ Cīn
 Monastery, Paklat, 1910.¹

The above, as the title indicates, is a first volume of historical or quasi-historical records in the Mōn language of old cities of Lower Burma, recently printed at the Elephant Creek Monastery (Bhā Kruñ Cīn), Paklat, Siam. These works, which would no doubt be brought over by the forefathers of the present-day Mōns of Siam when they fled from the oppression of the Burmese conqueror Alaungphra about the middle of the eighteenth century, and which have hitherto been in circulation only in palm-leaf manuscript copies, are now made accessible to a wider circle of readers.

The volume is printed in clear type on good paper, and is well bound in a kind of half leather. At the beginning there is a table of principal contents, giving page and line where the matter named is mentioned. A few pages of corrections give evidence alike of the difficulties of printing and the care taken to represent the text accurately. A number of misprints still remain unnoticed. At the end of the volume there is a summary of events in Peguan history showing the different parts of the volume where each matter is treated. It thus also serves as a kind of index.

Like all Talain or Mōn books, written as they are either by monks or scholars with monastic training, there is a strong religious element all through. What takes the place of a preface or introduction to the volume serves the double purpose of exalting the Buddha, and showing how in a former existence the Bodhisat reached the region of Suvamabhūmi and so started its history. This name

¹ The following minor works in the Mōn language have been issued by this monastic press: *Likh Bodhisat Cah* (1908-9), *Likh Blāi Bhā* (1909-10), *Likh Pāramī Kān* (nd), *Lik Kyāk Trai Bā Cōh Deññ* (id.),—C. O. B.

is usually taken to represent Burma, simply or more strictly that part of it which was originally under the domination of the old kings of Thatun; but according to an authority cited by Childers it comprises also Siam and Cambodia. This view is quite in keeping with the references in this volume to the visit supposed to have been made by Gotama Buddha to the region in question, where places in the Malay Peninsula and in Siam are distinctly mentioned.

The two shorter sections of the volume, which purport to relate, each in its own way, the origin and history of the old Talain kingdom of Thatun, and between which two varying accounts the wise reader is desired to make his choice, seem to our ideas anything but historical. Buddha on his personal visit to the country is made to foretell through his disciples Ananda and Gawampati events which were to happen after his Parinibbāna. Yet these forecasts represent the facts of history as known to the writers, and the careful reader by setting aside the embellishments may easily reach the plain facts.

The larger section, Rājādhirāt, or the History of the Kings of Pegu, occupying some three-fourths of the entire volume, is in more strictly historical form. In fact chapter viii of Phayre's *History of Burma*, after the first three paragraphs, forms a very good summary of this part of our book. Phayre in some dozen pages gives in a rapid glance the main facts of our three hundred and odd Mōn pages. It begins with the story of Magadū, who afterwards became king of Martaban under the name of Warerō. Whereas, however, Phayre makes him of Shan race, the native history distinctly makes him *kōn Mōn*, of Mōn race. So in Schmidt's *Rājāwan* he is called *smiñ Mōn mod*, a Mōn king. The story ends practically with the death of Rājādhirāt. The incident of the famous Buddhist monk dissuading Rājādhirāt from continuing the attack on Ava, mentioned by Phayre, is very fully

reported in the Mōn work. Indeed, the details throughout the work are at times so minute that one is forced to the conclusion that the author must often have largely drawn on his imagination. Some stories and sayings current amongst the people are very evidently made use of.

The work is of use alike to the student of Burmese history and to the scholar interested in the languages of Indo-China.

R. HALLIDAY.

THE DĪGHA-NIKĀYA. Vol. III. Edited by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER. D.Lit. Pali Text Society, 1910.

The *Dīgha-Nikāya*, important in so much of its contents for the history of custom and belief in India, is at length complete in its English edition, twenty-one years having elapsed since the appearance of the first volume. The Pali Text Society may well hail its going forth with relief and self-congratulation, for, though the whole work stands first in canonical order among the four Nikāyas, it has proved a laggard compared with its brothers, all of which were completely edited eight years ago. With the publication of this volume the whole of the Sutta Piṭaka has now been edited in Europe with the exception of the two Niddesas and the Apadāna. These last laggards have also long been placed in hands too busy as yet to be occupied with them, but a transcription of both Niddesas from the Siamese by Miss Noakes is very nearly completed, forming an excellent basis for collation.

We cannot afford to do without any part of the Piṭakas if we would obtain a right scale of historical values. We need to know fully, and not only for the most part, the nature and range of the several records which the editors of the Piṭakas, either deliberately or in deference to current taste, held worthy to be gathered up into the canonical casket. The miscellaneous nature of the Suttas or Suttantas in the *Dīgha-Nikāya* is well maintained in

this concluding volume. There is not the *Leitmotif* of a graduated ethics of morality and insight that runs through the Sila-vagga of vol. i. Nor is there even the grouping of suttas entitled "Great" this or that, which make up one-half of the Mahā-vagga of vol. ii. No sequence of subjects is discernible, and the range is wide. They constitute not so much novel contributions to the materials already edited as interesting complementary developments and adjuncts to points raised elsewhere. In the Pāṭika-Suttanta the power and the reluctance of the Buddha to work wonders or miracles forms a complement to the Kevaḍḍha-Suttanta in vol. i. In the Udumbarika-Suttanta a searching criticism of the morals of ascetics forms a good pendant to the Kassapa-Sihanāda-Suttanta in vol. i. The Lakkhaṇa-Suttanta is the fullest exposition of the lore of the "Great Man"—world-monarch or Buddha—treated of in the Mahāpadāna-Suttanta of vol. ii, and in the Brālumaṇa-vagga of the Majjhima-Nikāya. The Ātānātiya-Suttanta¹ is an elaboration of the simple naive charm or protecting spell to avert harm from snakes which we find in the Vinaya. Both of these it is instructive to compare with the method and spirit shown in the long tale of spells in the Atharva-Veda. In the Cakkavatti-Suttanta we meet with the legends, not elsewhere arising in the Piṭakas, of the sun-myth of the wheel and its travels, and of the Buddha who "is for to come". Metteyya. The striking cosmogony of the Aggaṇṇa-Suttanta is used as a weapon against caste, that is, against the social claims of the brahmins. The Sampasādanīya- and Pāsādika-Suttantas constitute a summary and review of the methods and merits of the Teacher and the Doctrine respectively, Jainist schisms arising on the death of Nātaputta serving as a foil, as in the Majjhima. The Singālovāda-Suttanta,² with which

¹ Edited in 1876 in Grimblot's *Sept Suttas Pālis*.

² Edited by Grimblot. op. cit.

Childers's translation, "The Whole Duty of a Layman," rendered us familiar, is ethically the freshest departure in the volume, and affords a charming development of fragmentary themes in the third and fourth Nikāyas.

The most striking departure from the prevailing methods of the *Dīgha* is found in the last two Suttantas: the Sangīti and the Dasuttara. The discursive cadences of the *Dīgha* refrains in argumentation and admonition are set aside. The rosary methods of the Anguttara and the Dhamma-Saṅgaṇi are substituted. The dread of schisms like those (here again) ascribed to the Jains is upon the young Saṅgha. And we find in these discourses, by Sāriputta and the Master, two of those, to us, pathetic efforts of a bookless, yet deeply thoughtful society to sift and classify every conceivable phase and aspect of the moral and intellectual consciousness, and so to achieve that Cartesian ideal: *valde clare et distincte percipere*, to which it aspired. The classifying cannot be said to have been worked on any principle worthy of the name. It was, as elsewhere, by way of the accident of number. But in early thought, as is well known, the significance and gravamen in a number ranks next to that in a name. Enclosed in the shell of number were all the thousand and more names of notions or dhammas pregnant with meaning in *the* Dhamma. A comparison of the order and structure of these groups with those in the *Anguttara-Nikāya* may possibly throw a little light on the question of the literary dependence of the two works. Here I would only note that the one case of 'eko dhammo' in the Sangīti-Suttanta, as compared with the number of single notions in the *Anguttara*, is that given in the Khuddaka-Pāṭha (and in the Anguttara Dasa-Nipāta), with an interesting addition: Sabbe sattā āhāraṅgīhīkā, *sabbe sattā saṅkhāraṅgīhīkā*: "all beings are sustained by food, *all beings are sustained by activities*"—not, I believe, met with in this form elsewhere. The

commentary has a discursive paragraph on the two phrases. "Food" or "intake" (*āhāra*), understood as material and mental, covers for the Buddhist, as we know, practically the whole field of "paccaya", that which conditions, or comes into relation with, the personality, modifying it in its never-ceasing change and becoming. Similarly, our doing and compassing yield results that modify us no less: "attano phalassa karaṇato sankharaṇato sankhāro ti." It also tries to meet the case of beings other than human, gods and those in purgatory, who also are "sustained" by conditions, though these may differ from the "four nutriments" conditioning life on earth. Absolute existence, self-dependent, static, was rejected for gods as for men. The scope and force of these two terse propositions (of the former, any way) was not discerned by Childers when, in this Journal some forty-two years ago, he rendered the Pali by "Food is the sustenance of all *animals*".

There are in these last two Suttantas, not to mention others, many terms and phrases one would gladly have had at hand ere this, when engaged on Abhidhamma phraseology. The facile guess that this or that is "later Pali" may find itself confuted. The seven Bojjhangas, for instance, are in this *Nikāya* already (and not only in the Vibhanga) as well as in Saṃyutta v, called "bodhipakkhiyā dhammā". "Buddhi," in the general sense of wisdom, which I had imagined a late term (e.g. in *Nettipakarṇa*, 122 ff.), occurs in a line of poetry. No technical meaning relating it to psychology or metaphysic is attached to it, as in other Indian philosophies of later development. And the psychological and Jhānic phraseology in this volume are all of the older type—the type wherein we do not find such distinctions as the *bhavaṅga-sota* and *cittacetasikā*, any more than we find *kammaṭṭhāna*, *upacāra*, *appanā*, etc. There is one notable exception: the term *viññāṇa-sota* (p. 105), "stream of consciousness." And it

is the more interesting because it was never, I believe, perpetuated by the Hinayāna culture. *Sota* became associated not with conscious, but with in- or sub-conscious flux of being (*bhavanga-sota*) which was intercepted (*upacchinna*) by conscious states. Nevertheless, Buddhaghosa talks past it unperturbed: *viññānam eva*: (it means) "simply viññāna".

But this is not the place to prolong discussion of details. More incumbent is it on the reviewer to revert to the Buddhist virtue of *muditā* or *συγχαίροσύνη*, and felicitate Dr. Carpenter at so excellently carrying to completion the work so long associated with his name and that of the founder of the Pali Text Society. We should only expect finished workmanship from him, but one cannot refrain from specifying the considerateness shown in the double references (by nipāta and section, and also by volume and page) to passages in the *Anguttara*. Seeing that proposals are on foot to publish in Ceylon the whole of the Tipiṭaka in Sinhalese type, and in India parts of it in Devanāgarī type, this careful editing may prove the more useful. The full indexing is also a very great boon. If he could only be persuaded, for the further "weal and happiness of gods and men", to see through the press his completed and collated transcript of the Commentary, now, as in the past, so kindly placed at our service for purposes of translation of the text!

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE TITLES OF WORKS IN THE CHINESE BUDDHIST TRIPITĪKA. Being an Index to Bunyiu Nanjio's Catalogue and to the 1905 Kioto Reprint of the Buddhist Canon. Prepared by E. D. Ross, Archæological Dept. of India, Calcutta, 1910. 8vo: pp. xvii. Price one rupee.

Bunyiu Nanjio's classic catalogue, published in 1883, although compiled from a Japanese reprint of the Ming

Collection of A.D. 1368–1644,¹ is still our chief authoritative list for the works contained in the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Canon. Intended primarily for the information of Indianists, it was furnished with an index of the Sanskrit titles of the works as far as these could be elicited—which was only in respect to about one-fourth of the total 1,662 works specified. But no index to the Chinese titles was provided, with the result that the contents have not been easy of reference to Sinologists, on whom we are dependent for the detailed examination of the various works.

This want is now supplied by Dr. Ross, who has added elaborate references to another Japanese edition, namely, the modern reprint of the Ming Collection published at Kioto in 1905, an edition which is now easily procurable, and doubtless the one which European scholars will mostly consult. References to the latter are greatly facilitated by a simple arrangement of figures and letters, by which the particular work can be promptly located in its fasciculus and case in the bulky series.

Some little confusion is likely to be experienced, especially by beginners, by the substitution of the Wade system of transliterating the Chinese names for the Wells Williams system as employed by Bunyiu Nanjio, without, however, any table or note having been provided as a guide to the manner in which the one system is to be converted into the other. Thus the *Vajracchedikā* has its Chinese title transcribed by Nanjio, following Wells Williams (whose system generally resembles that adopted by Max Müller in the *Sacred Books of the East*), as “Kin-kän-pän-zo-po-lo-mi-kin”, whilst it appears in Dr. Ross’ Index as “Chin-kang-pan-jo-po-lo-mi-ching”, without any cross reference to connect it with the form

¹ The original from which it was compiled is the copy of the edition of 1678–81 A.D. in the India Office Library, which was procured through the Rev. S. Beal.—*Abstract of Four Lectures*, etc., 1882, p. vii.

in the Catalogue. It seems a pity, too, that this Index was not printed of the same size as the Catalogue itself, so as to permit of it being bound up with the latter.

L. A. WADDELL.

BOUDDHISME CHINOIS. Tome I: VINAYA-HINAYĀNA. Par le P. LÉON WEIGER, S.J. 8vo: pp. 479. Paris: E. Guilmoto. 1910.

This is the first volume of what promises to be a considerable series, dealing exhaustively with Buddhism as it is expounded in the Chinese texts. For this purpose extensive extracts are translated from the canon and commentaries, supported by the text itself in Chinese characters, which latter form indeed nearly half of the letterpress of the volume. The work embodies a considerable amount of research, and should prove helpful to Chinese readers, especially to those who are desirous of becoming specialists.

For the general reader the more interesting portion of the book will doubtless be the introduction. In this the author points out that Buddhism is not to be considered an isolated religion, apart by itself: but merely a link in a chain of many antecedent and subsequent creeds. Its antecedent factors he traces briefly from Indo-Iranian Mazdēism and Vedism, through the Upanishads, which he terms a realistic pantheism and first attempt at philosophy; the Vedānta, systematic and idealistic pantheism: the Sāṃkhya or atheistic multianimism: and the Yoga or theistic asceticism.

L. A. W.

MAX L. MARGOLIS, Ph.D. A MANUAL OF THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE OF THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD. Grammar, Chrestomathy, and Glossaries. Munchen: O. Beck, 1910. xvi + 99 + 184. 10s.

Under the able direction of the well-known scholar Professor Strack, a new series of "Keys of Semitic Languages" is now appearing. It differs somewhat from the older series, and also the material dealt with is somewhat different from that treated in the aforementioned. Professor Strack himself is the author of the Hebrew Grammar. Dr. Ungnad has written the Babylonian (Assyrian) Grammar, and Professor Margolis presents us with a Manual of the Aramaic language of the Babylonian Talmud. It is the eastern dialect of the Aramaic language, and in some points it reminds us of the Syriac, and in others helps us to understand the Mandaic spoken in the same locality, viz. Babylon, where the former was also spoken close to the eighth or ninth century, when it was supplanted by Arabic.

It is a difficult undertaking to reconstruct a reliable system of grammar and syntax out of texts which are not always absolutely reliable.

A critical study of the Aramaic language is of comparatively recent date, and the discovery of the different forms of pronunciation of the Targum MS. compiled from Yemen has had a profound influence in moulding the new presentment of the grammar of this language. Dalman undertook on the basis of these texts to write a grammar of the Palestine or Western Aramaic language, a book which within a short time appeared in a second edition. The real problem is to define exactly which of the monuments belong to the Western or which to the Eastern branch of Aramaic: it does not seem to have been satisfactorily solved even by so keen an investigator as Professor Dalman, for a pure text uninfluenced by other dialects would form a standard or point of departure for

such investigation. But there is not a single text that can confidently be pronounced to belong exclusively to the West or to the East, still less to the West than to the East: not even the Targum, which he takes as the basis for his grammar, can be said to be pure Western text.

It is curious that in an old document from the Genizah in my possession a Pentateuch was presented to a synagogue in Cairo, and it is distinctly said that it had a *Babylonian* Targum. Now no such Targum is known to the Pentateuch, and this could therefore refer only to the Targum which goes under the name of the T. Onkelos. Of course it is not impossible that the donors should have desired to emphasize the fact that the Targum in that volume was not the one known as the Jerusalemite. The very fact that one Targum was called after its local origin or supposed local origin (Jerusalem = Palestine) shows that the other was not considered to be Palestinian or Jerusalemite. Once this foundation gone, much of what is called Western Aramaic remains somewhat doubtful, and the Targum to the Prophets might be said to be just as much Babylonian as Palestinian, as far as the language is concerned. The mixed character assigned by Dalman to most of the documents is rather perplexing, in spite of his trying to explain this curious form as being an artificial language and not representative of the living language. If that be so, then what reason was there for writing such a Targum? Unless it was a translation of the Hebrew into the vernacular better understood by the people, because it was no longer understood by the people, there would be no reason for a Targum at all. I am mentioning these facts in order to raise the question. "Why did Professor Margolis not include some of these so-called Western texts in his grammatical survey?" He may have thought it advisable to eschew doubtful problems, and to limit his investigations to a text which at any rate is expected to present one single dialect

uninfluenced by linguistic tendencies of the Palestinian dialect. But this text has also suffered, for it has passed through so many hands that the linguistic character must have suffered considerably.

These texts, moreover, have come down to us with practically no vocalization, the pronunciation being more or less traditional. It differs besides, as I have been able to ascertain, between the Jews of the East and those of the West. There seems to be a somewhat different tradition as to how the Talmudic texts ought to be read, among the Jews of Yemen, Palestine, Bagdad, etc., and the pronunciation in the schools of the West in modern times in Russia, Poland, and Hungary. This difference runs parallel with that between the so-called Sepharadic and Ashkenazic pronunciation, and affects not only vowels, but also consonants, the pronunciation of the Shewa, and the grammatical forms.

A good number of MSS. have also since come to light in which scarce words, technical expressions, and proper names have been punctuated: among these the Arabic commentary of the Mishna, by Maimonides, which probably dates from his lifetime (twelfth to thirteenth centuries), in which a number of words so punctuated occur. A careful examination of these will help to establish the Eastern tradition, and will prove of no small assistance in settling the pronunciation of the language of the Babylonian Talmud. There is also another important and very voluminous MS. in existence, dating from the beginning of the fourteenth century, the famous "Sepher Assufoth" (Cod. Montefiore, No. 134), of which I have given a full description in the *Report of the Montefiore College* (1893, pp. 31-74). This MS. of an halachic character is fully vocalized, and it is surprising that it should have escaped Professor Margolis's attention, as it is the only one which, to such an extent, has preserved passages from the Talmud with a full vocalization. If stress is laid by me on these

points, it is because they affect to a great extent the Phonetics and Morphology of the grammar, e.g. the value and rôle of the Shewa, the question of the pricks (Daggesh) in the six letters **בגדכפת**, which thus become Rafeh and Ḥazaq, and the peculiar use of certain vowel-signs may be an indication for the accent; all these are points in which even tradition fails us, and for which we cannot rely, as the author does (p. 15), on the accents of the Bible.

It is a fact that in old MSS. and first prints, some even of a later date, the Targum Onkelos is endowed with accents which, however, are mere copies of the corresponding accents in the Hebrew text; they are probably only notes for the cantillation of the Targum in accordance with the system of the Hebrew text. It might be of interest to compare these two systems, for it sometimes happens that there are more words in the Targum than in the Hebrew, and then additional accents are inserted in the latter. But so far as the word-accent itself is concerned, I do not believe that much reliance can be placed on these signs; and for the Aramaic passages in the Bible there are also various traditions in existence, and there is not sufficient material to settle the accentuation of the Aramaic words. Professor Margolis evidently did not know this fact, which might have been of use to him, and in spite of it he has endeavoured to grapple with the problem before him and has gone to the ancient MSS. and fragments both for the purpose of obtaining a reliable text and also to note those passages where from time to time words are vocalized.

The book compiled by Professor Margolis is the very best that has yet appeared. Within a very short compass, perhaps too short, he has been able to give a concise, clear, and complete scheme of the Aramaic grammar of the Talmud. By an ingenious system of cross-references he is able to condense his material, and by referring backwards

and forwards the different rules explain one another, although it is somewhat difficult for a beginner to master these intricacies. The various tables of paradigms are drawn with conspicuous scholarship and skill, and we owe thanks to the author for his first attempt at the syntax of this language. He follows, no doubt, the example of Nöldeke, but he is able to group the material in a lucid and satisfactory, and withal independent, manner. He has added a graduated chrestomathy, following step by step the rules laid down in the preceding pages. Professor Margolis has shown admirable discrimination and full mastery of his subject in the careful selection of the pieces printed. He has selected pithy sentences, elaborate stories, and halachic disquisitions so as to introduce the student to the manifold contents of that vast Encyclopædia known as the Talmud. It is a pity that considerations of space have induced him to omit references to the sources and variants of readings. In these texts he has been very sparing with the vowel-points, and he has preserved the orthography in most cases as he found it in the ancient documents, which were written with the so-called *Matres lectionis* indicating the pronunciation. For he rightly says in the Introduction that to add vowel-points to these texts would cause confusion. What is missing in the grammar is fully supplied in the elaborate Glossary, in which all the words and stems are systematically arranged and explained. Here the author has ventured to vocalize. Of course, it still remains an open problem, in some places at least, whether he has been justified, by analogy or by personal deduction, to fix the pronunciation in the way in which he has done it: but this hypothetical element is not of sufficient weight to diminish the great value of this excellent book, almost the first of its kind, which is a solid, comprehensive, reliable, lucid, and independent investigation and presentment of the language of the

Babylonian Talmud. It can safely be recommended to the students of Aramaic as one of the best books hitherto written on that subject.

M. GASTER.




MISSION FRANÇAISE EN CHALDÉE. INVENTAIRE DES TABLETTES DE TELLO CONSERVÉES AU MUSÉE IMPÉRIAL OTTOMAN. Tome I: Textes de l'époque d'Agadé (Fouilles d'Ernest de Sarzec en 1895). Par FR. THUREAU-DANGIN. Publié sous les auspices du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux Arts. Paris: E. Leroux. 1910.

Again we have, from the pen of M. Fr. Thureau-Dangin, a most useful work, testifying once more not only to his boundless industry, but also to his unflagging zeal for the science of Assyriology. The present work consists of 30 pages of matter descriptive of the tablets in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople, comprising the running numbers 1040-1476, and 30 plates of text—about 125 inscriptions in all. All are tablets of the period of *A-ga-de*, forming a homogeneous collection, and were discovered by Sarzec, piled in confusion on the remains of a baked brick pavement 3 m. 70 cm. deep, in the centre of a mound lying about 200 metres SSE. of mound K, and now known as "the tablet-mound". Their date may be set down as being about 3,000 years B.C. The whole collection is of unbaked clay, and testifies to the durability of that seemingly unstable material.

To all appearance there is nothing of a really literary nature among these tablets—they consist mainly of sales, receipts, lists, accounts, notes or letters, messages, and similar short communications or documents. They are mostly very clearly written, and furnish a few historical details in the date-colo-phons which a small number of them bear.

The following examples will show the nature of some of these inscriptions :—

1042, obv.	<i>Gi dušu</i>	1 ass,
	<i>mu lugala im-du-a</i>	year the king came.
	<i>Gi dušu</i>	1 ass,
	<i>mu mina-kam</i>	the 2nd year.
	<i>U-ia gin ku-babbar</i>	15 shekels of silver,
	<i>mu esa-kam</i>	the 3rd year.
rev.	<i>U-mina gin ku-babbar</i>	12 shekels of silver :
	<i>gi dušu</i>	1 ass,
	<i>mu lama-kam.</i>	the 4th year.
	<i>Uru-uru enqa</i>	Uru-uru, the farmer.

The doubtful word in the above is   , *dušu*, which seems to indicate an animal of the horse kind—it is translated by the Assyro-Babylonian *ágalu*, and occurs in a Sumerian saying where yoking it to a *parû* is referred to. These words have hitherto been translated “heifer” and “mule” respectively.

As an example of a note or letter the following is interesting :—

1100, obv.	<i>Gu-sil-la</i>	Gu-silla,
	<i>dumu Saga-a-du</i>	son of Saga-du,
	<i>Dingira-mu-da</i>	with Dingiramu
	<i>an-da-ti</i>	has been living—
	<i>Du-lugal-û-a^{ka}-a</i>	in Du-lugal-ûa
	<i>ab-duru</i>	he dwelt :
	<i>Lugal-nam-dag</i>	Lugal-nam-dag,
	<i>dumu Ur-te</i>	son of Ur-te,
	<i>Enim-ma</i>	(with) Enima,
rev.	<i>nu-banda</i>	the overseer (?),
	<i>an-da-ti</i>	has been living—
	<i>Bara-si-ga^{ka}-a ab-duru</i>	he dwelt in Bara-siga.
	<i>Dumu Nipri^{ka}-me</i>	They are Nippurites,
	<i>Lagaš^{ka}-a</i>	} (and) wish to dwell } at Lagaš—
	<i>ab-duru-duru(n)-ni-eš</i>	
	<i>ha-mu-ra-ne-šum-mu</i>	may they be given to thee.

Nothing is said about payment, but it seems hardly

likely that the writer would have made the proposal (if such it be) that (Gu-silla and Lugal-nam-dag should stay with the person to whom he was writing unless some advantage was to accrue from it. *Du-lugal-ûu* and *Barsiga* were probably villages in the neighbourhood of Lagas. As citizens of Nippur, they would naturally prefer to dwell in the capital, small as it may have been.

With regard to the city-names *Barsiga* and *Du-lugal-ûu*, it is to be noted that the former may be a variant of $\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$, with the same pronunciation, and would, in that case, mean 'the strip' or 'bandage'—here 'the outskirt', 'suburb', or the like. The meaning of the latter is 'the king rider', and the question arises whether it may not be a bird of some kind. The birds called 'riders' *-û-sig* and *û-gis*—I formerly regarded as being ducks (P.S.B.A., June, 1886, p. 245), and if the same sense for *û* be intended here perhaps the swan may be meant. A figure of a swan appears in *The Amherst Tablets*, vol. i. No. 57 (p. 114), and it is to be noted that the ideographic group for Lagas itself is simply a lengthening of one of the groups for 'raven', according to an entry in a four-column syllabary: -

PRONUNCIATION.	GROUP.	NAME OF GROUP.	MEANING.
<i>Bu-ur</i>	$\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$	<i>sir-bur-musennû</i>	<i>ûribu</i> , raven.
<i>La-ga-as</i>	$\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$	<i>sir-bur-lû-kiku</i>	𒀭 , i.e. Lagas.

The question therefore naturally arises whether Lagas may not have been regarded as 'the raven-city', which would be a parallel to such a name as 'swan-abode', if that turn out to be the meaning of *Du-lugal-ûu*.

But one could continue long making quotations from and finding important comparisons in this noteworthy book, which so well sustains the author's renown as the foremost Sumeriologist in France.

THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES.

SUMERIAN ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS. DATED IN THE REIGNS OF THE SECOND DYNASTY OF UR, FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR PRESERVED IN PHILADELPHIA. By DAVID W. MYHRMAN, Docent of Semitic Languages at the University of Uppsala. (Vol. III. Part I, of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. Series A: Cuneiform Texts, edited by H. V. HILPRECHT.) "Eckley Brinton Coxe, Junior, Fund." Philadelphia: published by the Department of Archæology, University of Pennsylvania, 1910.

The texts contained in this volume belong to the period of that dynasty which begins with Ur-Engur, and includes the names of Dungi, Bûr-Sin, Gimil-Sin, and Ibi-Sin. A large number of inscriptions of these reigns have been already published, most of them from the French excavations at Tel-loh. The present work, however, deals with tablets found at Niffer, and which differ, to a certain extent, from those hitherto published.

It is needless to say that the work is done with all the thoroughness for which the publications of the Department of Archæology of the University of Pennsylvania is renowned. The present volume consists of 146 pages of letterpress, and 70 plates of copied texts, followed by 12 plates of tablets reproduced by means of half-tone blocks. In the fourteen sections or chapters into which the letterpress is divided various points in connexion with these tablets are treated of—the subject-matter, the dating, the names and order of the months, the cuneiform signs and their readings, the various terms used in the different classes of documents, etc.: a list of names and titles: descriptions of the tablets, lists of signs, and an alphabetic list of their transcriptions. To this must be added the most interesting part for the general reader, namely, specimen translations of twenty-four of the tablets given therein.

One of the most interesting documents of the collection is that first translated (No. 1, p. 52), under the heading "Court Proceedings". It reads as follows:—

(1) *Sir-ka* (2) *ár À-la-la-kam* (3-4) *À-la-la igi-ni-ni-igi + gur* (5) *mu lugal [u]l-ba H_A-A gé-* (6) *na-mà* (7) *ner-da he-a* (8) *ne-[i]n-du(g)* (9) *Zu-an-me-ni ama-ni* (10) *ù Gin-^dEn-zu nin-* (11) *na-ni* (12) *šu-tu(r) na-H_A-A-da* (13) *ba-an-gub-ša*. (Here follow the names of seven witnesses and the month: *Še-gur-kud minu*.)

Translation: Sirka is slave of Àlala, Àlala has caused him to appear. "By the name of the king, the day when he shall make an escape, a *nerda* may he be," he said. Zan-me-ni, his mother, and Gin-Sin, his sister, for (his) remaining (?), that he shall not run away, they shall stand. (Witnesses, followed by the words "Month Adar 2" (2nd Adar), the last (intercalary) month of the Babylonian year.) There is no day of the month, and also no year-date.

In another text, a certain *Gulu-Enlilla* (I read simply *Lu-Enlilla*) swears that he will not run away from the house of *Ur-Nusku*.

Other texts include sales, purchases, receipts, promissory notes, accounts, inventories, and memoranda.

In the chapter upon the chronological data, the author mentions the text published by me in the *Journal* of this Society, October, 1905, pp. 821-2, in which, if the texts of the envelope and the tablet itself be correct, there is no escape from a correction of the received chronology. Dr. Myhrman's opinion is that "in any case there must be a mistake on the envelope. Perhaps the scribe wrote *mu* for *mu us-sa*. The explanation offered by Pinches, that the *en Kar-ki(d)-da* formula must designate the 2nd year of Gimil-Sin, and has to be taken away from Bur-Sin, cannot be maintained. It would upset the whole order of dates".

I have no objection to accepting the received chronology.

but I feel that more evidence is needed on the subject. I would only note here, that Lau's date, "Year after he invested the lord of Namma-kar-zida," might come just as well during the reign of Gimil-Sin as at the end of that of Bûr-Sin, his predecessor.

The whole book is a publication of considerable value, and the remarks upon the words and signs are especially noteworthy. The copies too, are excellent. No. 13 has a royal cylinder-impression with the name of *Lu-Utu* (*Awel-Šamuš*), ruler of Adab (Udab), now Bismaya. He was vassal of Gimil-Sin. No. 14 has a seal of Ur-Dumu-zida, servant of Dungi: and others impressed are Nos. 32, 39, 62, and 65.

T. G. PINCHES.

BABYLONIAN LEGAL AND BUSINESS DOCUMENTS FROM THE TIME OF THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON, CHIEFLY FROM NIPPUR. By ARNO POEBEL, Ph.D., formerly Harrison Research Fellow in Assyriology, University of Pennsylvania. (Vol. VI, Part II, of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, edited by H. V. HILPRECHT, etc.) 1909.

Though published before the preceding (fourth) volume, this work is part of the sixth volume of the series, and consists of 164 pages of letterpress, followed by 60 autographed plates (138 inscriptions) and 10 plates of half-tone reproductions. The sections or chapters consist of an introduction, the scheme of legal documents from Nippur, the seals, the date-formulas of the reigns from Hammu-rabi to Samsu-ditana, the naming of the years after events, the political history from Sin-muballiṭ's seventeenth year to the end of the dynasty, concordance of proper names, etc.

The greater part of these inscriptions were excavated at Nippur, and belong to the reigns of Warad-Sin,

Rim-Sin, Hammu-rabi, Samsu-iluma, and Ilma-ilum, embracing a period of eighty or ninety years. That the various tablets here published are in many respects closely connected, is clear from the fact that they name to a large extent persons connected with the temple of Enlil at Nippur, and that there are several documents among them belonging to one and the same person.

The formulæ of the various legal documents from Nippur are a feature of this book which will be greatly appreciated by many. We find, for example, the legal forms used in the purchase of house property, with the variant wording employed at Babylon, at Sippar before and after the time of Hammu-rabi, etc. Documents referring to redemption, exchange, adoption, manumission, loans, leases, acquittance, confirmation, etc., with similar comparisons, follow.

Among the most important information obtained from these documents, however, are the colophon dates, and of these Dr. Poebel has published the most perfect list, with translations, that has yet appeared. These go from the time of Hammu-rabi to that of Samsu-ditana, a period of about 160 years. Many historical events are recorded therein, and they form excellent material for an outline of the history of that period in Babylonia. The completion of the year-dates of the reign of Hammu-rabi is very important, as the invasion of Palestine in alliance with Chedorlaomer, Tidal, and Arioch ought to be referred to therein. Up to the present time, however, this has not been discovered, and if Hammu-rabi be in reality Amraphel, some other explanation of that expedition will have to be found. As the ruler of Larsa with whom he came into conflict was called Rim-Sin, it seems probable that the explanation will be that Hammu-rabi warred in the west in alliance with the kings mentioned before he came to the throne: but more light is needed, not only on that portion of Babylonia over which Hammu-rabi

ruled, but also on the political history of Larsa and the district understood by the Hebrews as constituting the domain of the "Goini" or "nations".

Though the language of Hammu-rabi's Babylonian domains was Semitic, it is noteworthy that at this period it was the non-Semitic Sumerian which was used in the documents of this class. The following marriage contract will serve as an example:—

(1) *Enlil-idzu nueš Enlilla dumu Lugal-â-zida*
 (2) *Ama-sukkal dumu-sal Ninib-manšuma-ge* (3) *nam-*
dama-šu bantug (4) *û-îlima gin ku-babbar Ama-sukka-*
la-ge (5) *Enlil-idzu dama-ni-ra* (6) *innanintur* (7) *û-*
kura-šu tukundi-bi Enlil-idzu-ge (8) *Ama-sukkal dama-*
ni-ra (9) *dama-mu nu-men banangu* (10) *û-îlima gin*
kua-bi gurrudam (11) *û bar mana ku dam-taga-ni-ra*
nila(l)e (12) *û tukundi-bi Ama-sukkal-ge* (13) *Enlil-*
idzu dama-ni-ra (14) *dama-mu nu-men banangu*
 (15) *û-îlima gin kua-bi bardéne* (16) *û bar mana ku-*
babbar nila(l)e (17) *šegu-nene-ta* (18) *mu lugal ur-bi*
inpadeš.

"Enlil-idzu, priest of Enlil, son of Lugal-â-zida, has taken Ama-sukkal, daughter of Nirig-manšum, to wife. Nineteen shekels, the silver of Ama-sukkal, she has brought to Enlil-idzu, her husband. When later Enlil-idzu says to Ama-sukkal, his wife, 'Thou art not my wife,' he shall return the 19 shekels of money, and shall pay half a mana as her divorce-money. And when Ama-sukkal says to Enlil-idzu, her husband, 'Thou art not my husband,' she shall forfeit the 19 shekels of money, and pay half a mana of silver. In mutual agreement they have invoked the spirit of the king."

Here follow the names of twelve witnesses and the date—

Iti Bara-zag-gar û-niš-ussa, mu Samsu-iluna lugal-
lug Enlilla-ta Kišur-ra Sabum-bida-ge KA-sillaš nen-
tura, "Month Nisan, day 28th, year Samsu-iluna the
 king, by the command of Enlil, brought Kišurra and

Sabum to obedience." (The thirteenth year of Samsuiluna.)

For the denying (divorcing) of a husband, the penalty was generally death, but in this case the wife is on an exact equality with the husband, a noteworthy departure from the custom elsewhere. Another and more elaborate document translated by Dr. Poebel ordains in a like case the sale of the unfaithful wife as a slave.

It seems probable that in the list of dates of Hammurabi's reign 38*b* is really identical with 39. They read as follows:—

Mu Hammu-rabi lugal ugnim Turukku Kagmu u Subé-bi-ta, "Year Hammu-rabi the king (? went forth with) the army of Turukku, Kagmu, and Subé."

Mu Hammu-rabi lugale kilib gu duobi Su-edinne sag-giš-neria, "Year Hammu-rabi the king subdued the district of Su-edin, all of it."

The texts are excellently copied, and the impressions of the cylinder seals, which are very numerous at this period, are always given. The work is a worthy companion to its fellow-volumes, and the author shows a power of analysis which many a scholar might envy.

T. G. PINCHES.

SUMERIAN HYMNS AND PRAYERS TO THE GOD NIN-IB FROM THE TEMPLE LIBRARY OF NIPPUR. By HUGO RADAU. (Vol. XXIX, Part I. of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, etc., edited by H. V. Hilprecht.) 1911.

This portion of the great publication of the University of Pennsylvania consists of 88 pages of letterpress and 15 autographed and 6 half-tone plates, the drawings of the tablets being executed in the usual careful style adopted for the series. The dedication is noteworthy—

“To Eckley Brinton Coxe, Junior. President of the Department of Archæology and founder of the ‘Eckley Brinton Coxe, Junior, Fund’, Who, By his liberal support of Archæological investigations and his profound interest in Sumeriological and Assyriological studies (has) made the publication of this volume possible, (it is) Gratefully inscribed.” Many English Assyriologists will probably wish that there were such generous patrons of their subject in this country, and envy the Assyriological school of the United States their good fortune in possessing such an enthusiastic supporter.

The study of the ideas of the Babylonians concerning the god Ninip is a very fascinating one, and not without its importance, in consequence of the mysterious nature of that divinity. In the first place, there is considerable doubt as to the reading of his name, notwithstanding the discoveries of its (Semitic) Aramaic form on contract-tablets found at Nippur (*Enu-réstū* by Professor J. D. Prince and myself: *En-úsāti* by Dr. Radau in other works—with regard to its non-Semitic pronunciation. I still look upon the dialectic *Urib* as indicating a possible non-dialectic form *Nirig*). In many respects he was the prototype of Merodach, who seems only to have attained to the lordship over the gods when Babylon became the chief city of the empire. Ninip is described as “the son of Bel”. “whom Bel caused to be greater than he himself is”, “the royal son, whose father he had caused to bow down the face to him from afar, when he sat on the throne in the royal chamber, when he raised on high his splendour”, etc.

Passing over the prayers of Gimil-Sin and Bûr-Sin his father to Ninip (notwithstanding that they are exceedingly interesting), a very noteworthy text is the hymn given on pp. 65–70. Here we see that Ninip, son of Enlil, was the god who protected his land, to whom prayer was made that the small rivers (canals) should be made to flow

with fullness, that the innocent should not be cast down in the dust, that arid and dry fields, and the lands where corn stood not, should be made glorious with crops at harvest-time. But among his titles are some which are especially noteworthy, the most striking being that which Dr. Radau renders as the "rock of ages" in the following lines:—

"The 'mighty waters' with stones he has conquered:

Now, the waters, though from hades, against the 'rock of ages' could not prevail."

This, as the author remarks, is a very noteworthy expression, recalling, as it does, Matt. xvi, 18. It is written 𒌷 𒊕𒌷 𒌷𒍪 , *kur-da-ri*, "everlasting mountain," a form which is found with the determinative prefix for "god" in *Cuneiform Inscriptions from Babylonian Tablets*, xxv, 12, 10, and with the variant *Kur-da-ru* in *ibid.*, xxiv, 6, 37-23, 132a. There can, then, be no doubt as to what is meant. *Kur*, however, has been hitherto supposed to stand for "mountain" or "country" only, so that there is apparently not such a complete parallel, as far as our knowledge goes, as might be wished. Nevertheless, the rendering may turn out to be correct.

But it would be impossible to give a list of all the interesting things which this book contains, and all the suggestive statements and comparisons made—Dr. Radau's wealth of illustration is too great for that—but it may at once be said that, modest as its dimensions are, it is such that no Assyriologist can afford to neglect it. Like the others of the series, it is divided into sections, but on a somewhat different plan. The author speaks of the Sumerian gods in their human and their divine aspects: treats of the epochs in the history of the Babylonian religion, including the prehistoric or *An* epoch, with *An* as the first "Mother-Father"; *An* differentiated; and Enlil, the "Son", in his genealogies, his nature, and his seven manifestations. I was engaged in indicating the

importance of Enlil when this work appeared, so that I was able to quote just a little from it ; but Dr. Radau promises more material still, and this will doubtless be looked for with interest by all students of Babylonian religion.

A defect common to most modern Assyriological publications is that works referred to in the course of the arguments adduced are indicated simply by one or more of the initials of their titles, and I, for one, find it utterly impossible to carry in my head, and recall (with or without an effort) the works intended. Paper is cheap, and the few extra lines needed would not take up very much more room. In this work, however, I have been unable to find even a reference-list or key to the abbreviations used. But that is a detail which does not detract from the excellence of Dr. Radau's work.

T. G. PINCHES.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(January, February, March, 1911.)

I.—GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

January 10, 1911.—Sir Raymond West, Director, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. A. B. Miller.

Hon. Tikka Sahib Ripudaman Singh.

Mr. Bihari Lal Shastri.

Mr. Wali ul-Haque.

Seven nominations were announced for election at the next General Meeting.

February 14, 1911.—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. M. Sakhawat Ali.

Mr. H. C. P. Bell.

M. l'Abbé A. M. Boyer.

Mr. Mirza Kazim Namazi.

Babu Padmini Mohan Neogi.

Rai Bahadur P.M. Madooray Pillai.

Mr. Surendra Narayan Roy.

Four nominations were announced for election at the next General Meeting.

Sir Charles Lyall, K.C.S.I., read a paper entitled “‘Abid of Asad, an Ancient Arabian Poet”.

A discussion followed, in which Professor Margoliouth, Miss Ridding, and Mr. Dames took part.

March 14, 1911.—Lord Reay, President in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. C. C. Seton.

Mr. F. S. Tabor.

Mr. F. G. Whittick.

Professor Ghulam Yazdani.

Two nominations were approved for election at the next General Meeting.

Dr. H. Hirschfeld read a paper entitled "Recent Theories on the Origin of the Alphabet".

A discussion followed, in which Professor Hagopian and Professor Margoliouth took part.

II.—PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLANDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Bd. LXIV, Heft iv.

Hartmann (R.). Die Strasse von Damaskus nach Kairo.

Haupt (P.). Elul and Adar.

König (Ed.). Die babylonische Schrift und Sprache und die Originalgestalt des hebräischen Schrifttums.

Bloch (T.). Eine indische Version der iranischen Sage von Sānu.

— Die zoroastrischen Gottheiten auf den Münzen der Kusana-Könige.

Schulthess (Fr.). Noch einmal zum "Buch der Gesetze der Länder".

Jacobi (H.). Eine zweites Wort über die *vakrokti* und das Alter Daḍḍin's.

Franke (R. Otto). Die Suttanipāta-Gāthās mit ihren Parallelen.

II. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Tome XVI, No. i.

Amélineau (E.). Étude sur le chapitre xvii du " Livre des Morts " de l'ancienne Égypte.

- Martin (F.). Le juste souffrant babylonien.
 Berchem (Max van). Sur la routes des villes saintes.

No. ii.

- Nau (F.). Notes d'astronomie syrienne.
 D'Ollone (M. le Commandant). Stèle de Sa Lien.
 Weill (R.). Les Hyksôs et la restauration nationale dans
 la tradition égyptienne et dans l'histoire.

III. T'OUNG PAO. Vol. XI. No. v.

- Maspero (G.). Le Royaume de Champa.
 Cordier (H.). La politique coloniale de la France au
 début du Second Empire.
 Saussure (L. de). Les origines de l'astronomie chinoise.
 Marquart (J.). Die Nichtslawischen Ausdrücke in der
 Bulgarischen Fürstenliste.

IV. JOURNAL OF THE CEYLON BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC
 SOCIETY. Vol. XXII. No. lxiii.

- Perera (E. W.). The Age of Sri Parākrama Bāhu VI.
 Vos (F. H. de). Fourth Supplementary Paper on the
 Monumental Remains of the Dutch East India Company
 in Ceylon.
 Still (J.). Tantri-Malai: some Archæological Observations
 and Deductions.

V. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.
 Vol. XXXI, Pt. i.

- Jacobi (H.). The Dates of the Philosophical Sūtras of the
 Brahmans.
 Barton (G. A.). Hilprecht's Fragment of the Babylonian
 Deluge Story.
 Bloomfield (M.). Some Rig-Veda Repetitions.
 Conant (C. E.). The R.G.H. Law in Philippine Languages.
 Kyle (M. G.). The "Field of Abram" in the Geographical
 List of Shoshenq I.

Part ii

- Edgerton (Franklin). The *k*-suffixes of Indo-Iranian.
 Part i: The *k*-suffixes in the Veda and Avesta.

Asakawa (K.). Notes on Village Government in Japan after 1600.

Blake (R.). Vocalic *r, l, m, n* in Semitic.

VI. SIDDHĀNTA DĪPIKĀ. Vol. XI, Nos. iv-vi.

Pillai (J. M. Nallasvāmi). Śrī mantra nālikā.

Aiyar (C. V. S.). A Yogin in Samādhi at Negapatam.

Govindāchārya (A.). Nammālvār's Tiru-vīruttam.

Chakladar (H. C.). Maritime Activity and Enterprise in Ancient India.

Ramana Śāstrin (V. V.). Mrigendra-Āgama (continued).

— Jnāna-pada of the Sūkshma-Āgama (continued).

VII. ANNALS OF ARCHEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY.

Vol. III. No. iii.

Pinches (T. G.). Notes upon the Fragments of Hittite Cuneiform Tablets from Yuzgat.

VIII. RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI. Vol. III. Fasc. iii.

Meloni (G.). Alcuni temi semantici tratti dalle vesti presso i Semiti.

Amedroz (H. F.). An Arabic Version of a Ballad of Schiller.

Griffini (E.). Lista dei MSS. arabi, nuovo fondo della Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano.

Levi della Vida (G.). Sentenza pitagoriche in versione siriana.

IX. CALCUTTA REVIEW, July, 1910.

Mitra (Sarat Chandra). Some Bihari Modes of Trial by Ordeal.

Chatterji (J. L.). The Origin and Traditions of Kathis.

X. NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE, 1910. Part iv.

Burn (R.). A Find of Gupta Gold Coins.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

- ADYAR LIBRARY. List of the Samskr̥t and Prak̥t MSS. by the
Pandits of the Library. 8vo. *Madras*, 1911.
From the Adyar Library.
- al-Ansāri, Abu Zaīd. Kitāb al-Hamz. Ed. par. L. Cheikho.
Pamphlet. 8vo. *Beyrouth*, 1911. *From the Editor.*
- ARABIA AND THE PERSIAN GULF. Map. Compiled by Captain
F. F. Hunter. 1908. *From the India Office.*
- Ariyamuni, Phra. Phra Khatha Dharmabot. 8vo. *Bangkok*,
R.S. 129. *From the Vajiranan National Library.*
- BENGAL DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Vol. xxiii: Burdwan. Vol. xxiv:
Nadir. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Government of Bengal.*
- BOMBAY CITY AND ISLAND. Gazetteer. 3 vols. 8vo. *Calcutta*,
19—, *From the Government of India.*
- Brandstetter, R. Sprachvergleichendes Charakterbild eines
Indonesischen Idiomes. 8vo. *Luzern*, 1911.
From the Author.
- Burton, Lieut.-Col. R. G. Mahratta and Pindari War. Sm. fol.
Simla, 1910. *From the Chief of the General Staff, India.*
- Carra de Vaux, Baron. La Langue Etrusque. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911.
From the Publishers.
- Chapman, F. R. H. Urdu Reader for Military Students. 8vo.
London, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Cœdès, G. Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Latins relatifs à l'Extrême-
Orient. 8vo. *Paris*, 1910. *From the Publisher.*
- Dautremer, J. La Grande Artère de la Chine, Le Yangtseu. 8vo.
Paris, 1911. *From the Publisher.*

- Dieulafoy, M.** Les Piliers Funéraires de Ya-Tcheou Fou.
Pamphlet. 8vo. *Paris*, 1910.
From M. le Vicomte D'Ollone.
- DĪGHA NIKĀYA.** Vol. iii. Edited by J. Estlin Carpenter. (*Pali Text Society.*) 8vo. *London*, 1911. *Purchased.*
- Distant, W. L.** Rhynchota. Vol. v. (*Fauna of British India.*)
8vo. *London*, 1910. *From the India Office.*
- D'Ollone, Vicomte.** Recherches Archéologiques, etc., dans la Chine Occidentale. Pamphlet. 8vo. *Paris*, 1910.
From the Author.
- EASTERN BENGAL AND ASSAM DISTRICT GAZETTEERS.** Vol. i: Bogra.
8vo. *Allahabad*, 1910. *From the Government of India.*
- Gezelius, B.** Japan. 8vo. *Linköping*, 1910.
From the Royal Upsala University.
- Griswold, H. W.** The God Varuna in the Rig Veda. 8vo.
Ithaca, 1910. *From the Author.*
- Gupte, B. A.** A Prabhu Marriage. (*Ethnographic Survey of India.*) 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1911.
From Sir H. Risley, K.C.I.E.
- Haines, H. H.** A Forest Flora of Chota Nagpur. 16mo.
Calcutta, 1910. *From the Government of India.*
- Hannah, Ian C.** Eastern Asia. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the Publisher.
- al-Hujwiri.** The Kashf al - Mahjúb. Translated by R. A. Nicholson. (*"E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series, vol. xvii.*)
8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the Trustees of the Gibb Memorial.
- Hurgronje, C. Snouck.** M. Jan de Goeje. Trad. franç. de M. Chauvin. 8vo. *Leide*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Jastrow, M.** Religion Babylonians und Assyriens. Lief. xvi.
8vo. *Giessen*, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- Johansson, K. F.** Solfågeln i Indien. 8vo. *Upsala*, 1910.
From the Royal Upsala University.

- Karabacek, J. von.** Zur orientalischen Altertumskunde. iii. 8vo. *Wien*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Montet, E.** De l'État présent et de l'Avenir de l'Islam. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Nicolas, A. L. M.** Cheikh Ahmed Lahçahi. 8vo. *Paris*, 1910. *From the Publisher.*
- PANJAB CUSTOMARY LAW. Vol. viii (B). Panipat Tahsil, etc., by C. C. Garbett. 8vo. *Lahore*, 1910. *From the Government of India.*
- Pizzagalli, A. M.** La Cosmogonia di Bhṛgu. Pamphlet. 4to. *Milano*, 1910. *From the Author.*
- Printz, W.** Bhāṣā-Wörter in Nīlakaṇṭha's Bhāratabhāvadīpa. usw. 8vo. (*Göttingen*, 1910.) *From the Author.*
- Puukko, A. F.** Das Deuteronomium. 8vo. *Leipzig and Greifswald*, 1909. *From the Publisher.*
- Rafiqi, A. S.** Inversion of Times. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- Ray, Mallinath.** Monograph on Wire and Tinsel Industry in Bengal. Fol. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Author.*
- Ross, E. Denison** (ed.). Marhamu'l-'Ilali'l-Mu'dila, by the Imām Yāfi'i. Fasc. i. (*Bibl. Ind.*) 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Editor.*
- (ed.). Mabāni'l-Lughat, by Mirzā Medhi Khān. (*Bibl. Ind.*) 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Editor.*
- St. John, R. F. St. A.** Burmese Self Taught. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Stein, M. Aurel.** Note on Maps illustrating Explorations in Chinese Turkestan and Kansu. Pamphlet. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Storm van's Gravesande, L.** Rise of British Guiana. Compiled by C. A. Harris and J. A. J. de Villiers. 2 vols. (*Hakluyt Society.*) 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the India Office.*

Thatcher, Rev. G. W. Arabic Grammar with Key. 8vo. London, 1911. *From the Publisher.*

TRIVANDRUM SANSKRIT SERIES. Edited by T. Ganapati Sastri. Vols. i-x. 8vo. *Trivandrum*, 1905-10. *From James Kennedy, Esq.*

UNITED PROVINCES DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Vol. vi, Aligarh; vol. xvii, Shahjahanpur; vol. xxiv, Jhansi; vol. xxxi, Gorakhpur. 8vo. *Allahabad*, 1909-10. *From the United Provinces Government.*

Weissbach, F. H. Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden. (*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, Stück iii. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1911. *Purchased.*

WISDOM OF THE EAST SERIES. 10 vols. Small 4to. *London*, 1908-10. *From the Editors.*

Path of Light	by L. D. Barnett
Way of Buddha	by H. Baynes.
Awakening of the Soul	by P. Bronnle.
Book of Filial Duty	by Ivan Chên.
Bustan of Saoh	by A. Hart Edwards.
Alchemy of Happiness	by Claud Field.
Confessions of al-Ghazzali	by Claud Field.
Sayings of Confucius	by L. Giles.
Instruction of Ptah Hotep	by B. G. Gunn.
Conduct of Life	by Ku Hung Ming.

Wortham, B. Hale. The Enchanted Parrot. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*

JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1911

XVI

ENGLISH-SVANETIAN VOCABULARY

By OLIVER WARDROP

THE recent establishment of a fund in the University of Oxford for the encouragement of the study of the Georgian family of languages may in the course of time attract the attention of British philologists to the Western Caucasus, and an increasing stream of travellers will doubtless find their way thither seeking knowledge, health, sport, and scenery: it is for such visitors that the following vocabulary has been compiled. More than twenty years ago the late Mr. D. Peacock included Svanetian among the five languages of which he published vocabularies in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, but the material was scanty, and a large number of errors are to be found in it. Most of the books on the subject are in Russian, and the script into which the Svanetian words are transliterated is troublesome and is inconsistently used. What is required is an exact record of the spoken language by means of the phonograph, and it is to be hoped that some British student may undertake the task before long. All that is attempted here is to give a starting-point for serious study. As many forms as possible have been included, and no

attempt has been made to distinguish the dialects of Upper and Lower Svanetia. The spelling is phonetic as far as may be. The abbreviation G. shows that there are Georgian words strikingly similar, and generally, though not always, having the same meaning: many of such words are borrowed by the Georgian from other languages.

The following bibliographical note may be useful, though it does not claim to be by any means a complete list of the books on the subject:—

1. *Lushnu Anban, Scanetskaya Azbuka*. Tiflis, 1864. Published by the Society for the Propagation of Christianity in the Caucasus. Baron Uslar is believed to be its author. It is still a most useful book to a student of the language, but copies are rare. Among its merits may be mentioned the Georgian translation of every word, as well as the Russian. It gives several specimens of the language in the form of prayers, Bible history, and a few phrases.

2. Vol. x of *Sbornik materialov dlya opisaniya . . . Kavkaza*, containing four lists of words collected by I. Nizheradze (himself a Svanetian), M. Zavadskii, A. Stoyanov, and A. Gren: the systems of transliteration employed are inconsistent and irritating. There are also ethnographical, statistical, and other sketches, folk-tales, folk-songs with music, etc.

3. The Proceedings (*Trudy*) of the Fifth Archaeological Congress, Tiflis, 1881, with an article by A. I. Stoyanov.

4. A. Tsagareli, *O grammaticheskoi literaturie gruzinskogo yazyka*. St. Petersburg, 1873. pp. 70-9 and 81.

5. A. Tsagareli, *Sravnitelnyi Obzor morfologii*. St. Petersburg, 1872 (lithographed).

6. Uslar, in vol. ix of *Sbornik svedeni o kavkazskikh gortsakh*, p. 4.

The above are only of use to those who read Russian.

7. Rosen, *Ueber das Mingrelische, Suanische, u. Abchasische*.

8. Fr. Bopp, *Die Kaukasischen Glieder des Indo-Europaischen Sprachstammes*. Berlin, 1847.

9. Max Müller, *Languages of the Seat of War*, p. 114.

10. Ferd. Bork, *Kaukasische Miscellen*. Königsberg, 1907.

11. R. von Erckert, *Die Sprachen des Kaukasischen Stammes*. Wien, 1895.

12. D. Peacock, "Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages": *JRAS.*, Vol. XIX, Pt. I, 1887.

13. G. Radde's *Reisen (v. infra)*, on pp. 84-91, contains a vocabulary.

The following authors of works relating to Svanetia, but not dealing especially with the language, may be mentioned:—
D. Freshfield, Munnery, C. Phillips-Woolley, von Dechy. Merzbacher, Nadiezhdin, Dubrovin, Gamrekeli, Mamatsov, Nemirovich-Danchenko, Shakhovskoi, Bartolomaei, Dobrovolskii. Giley, K. A. Borozdin, Gabriel Cicodze (late Bishop of Imeretia). D. Bakradze (in vol. vi, 1867, of *Memoirs of Caucasian Section of Russ. Geog. Soc.*, in Nos. 1, 2, and 4 of newspaper *Kavkaz* for 1867 and Nos. 59, 77, and 80 of *Kavkaz* for 1877: also reprinted at Tiflis in 1877 as a small pamphlet of 37 pages), A. I. Stoyanov (in vol. x of *Memoirs of Caucasian Section of Russ. Geog. Soc.*, pp. 239-472, Tiflis, 1876—travels, topography, etc.), G. Radde (in vol. vii, 1868, of *Memoirs of Caucasian Section of Russ. Geog. Soc.*, 222 pp., chiefly biological and geographical, being a Russian translation of *Reisen im Mingrelischen Hochgebirge*, Tiflis, 1866, with three maps and nine plates in separate atlas in 4to), R. Bernoville (*La Souanethie libre*, Paris, 1875, 4to, 181 pp., with seven plates, illustrations in text, and map—chiefly historical and ethnographical), G. D. Filimonov (in *Viestnik* of Society of Ancient Russian Art. Moscow, 1876—archæology), M. Kovalevsky's *Law and Custom in the Caucasus* (Moscow, 1890), and numerous articles in the Georgian and other newspapers and periodicals of Transcaucasia.

The late Miss Marjory Wardrop left in manuscript an English translation of a collection of Svanetian folk-tales which may be published shortly.

Able (to be), *lumade*, *libets*: I can, *mi mubits*: thou canst, *si dchubits*: he can, *achas khobits*: I could, *maymada*: thou couldst, *dchaymada*: he could, *khaymada*: he was able to bring water, *achas khaymada nitsi lkhde*.

Abode, *lulzıgal* (*lizge*, to live), *sadgem* (G. *sadqomi*).

Accompany (to), *linkhri*.

Account, reckoning, *anyarish* (G. *anyarishi*).

Acorn, *shqviḅ*.

Advantage, *lisarqəbel* (G.).

Afterwards, *echunqho*, *achunqho*, *amunqho*.

Again, *dehuad*, *adjaqḡ*, *zhud*.

Agree (to), *lit'hanqhme* (G. *dat'hanqmeba*).

Aim, target, *nishani* (G.): to take aim. *lant:uno*, *linshani*: he aimed, *lekhmetsuna*.

Air, *haer* (G. *haeri*).

Alarm: do not (thou) be alarmed! *qhanunp'hesheni*.

Alder (*Alnus incana*), *balqach*, *bolqosh*.

All, *maq*, *mak*, *chi*, *chiv*; more than all, *chul*, *chinmashenam*.

Allow (to), *hmbe*, *lkhvie*: he allowed, *kat'huebe* (G.): allow me! (sing.), *khakhvi*.

Alms (to give), *limkheeri*.

Alpen-stock, *midchvra*, *mudchvra*, *mudchra*, *pavv*.

Already, *ser*.

Altogether, *hadurd*, *mehad*.

Always, *chigar*, *chujarmek*.

Ambush, *hpəzh*, *halp'har* (G. *sap'har*).

Amusing, *lushi'hbin*.

Ancient, *dziqhydkhanishh* (cf. G. *didkhan*), *djuncel* (? cf. G. *dzveli*).

And, *v*.

Angry (to be), *lkhtsi*, *lst'hike*, *ltsral*: he was angry, *adsest'hke*.

Annual, *kuinlyngene*, *piryutkh* (beast) (G.): *tzkhovel* (living thing) (G.).

Ankle, *purskal*.

Annual, yearly, *luzv* (cf. *za*, year).

Another, *ishgen*.

Answer (to), *lipsakhe* (G. *pasakheba*).

Ant, *dehndechvil* (G. *dchndechvlel*), *morshk*, *myshk*.

Anvil, *kradeh*.

Appear (to), it appears, *esrenish*.

Apple, apple-tree, *visgv*, *vusgv*, *vusk* (G. *rashli*).

Archangel, *t'harvrezet*, *t'harvzela*, *t'harvqdzera* (G. *mt'havaravjelozv*).

Arn, *mekhar* (G. *mkhari*).

Arms, weapons, *havedeh* (G. *avedeh*, household goods, furniture).

Army, *lashgar* (G. *lashkari*).

Around, *qirkid*.

- Arrive (to), *likhed*, *lizi*, *liqed*: he arrived, *emquedi*, *anqad*,
at'hqedun: he has arrived, *lukhagan*: they arrived,
anqadkh.
- Arrow, *tsku*, *tskhui*, *tzukhend*.
- Artisan, *ostat* (G.).
- As if, *mugvda*.
- Ascent, slope, *lamlezha*, *lamelzha*.
- Ashamed (to be), *lishqvre*.
- Ashes, *tyt*.
- Ask (to), *lidched*, *likural*, *likhir*. *lishquem*: ask! (thou), *isgalakluran*.
- Aspen, *yerkliv* (G. *verklivi*), *elklivra*.
- Ass, *tsel*, *tsanika*: she-ass, *dchak tsel*, i.e. mare-ass (cf. horse);
foal of an ass, *tseli sabel*.
- Assembly, *korvan* (? caravan), *lalkhori*, *lakhori*, *lizvre*: to
assemble, *linzore*, *lizvri*, *likkhore*: they assembled, *adzu-
renkh*: folk-moot, *djan nazuran*, *lukhor*, *luzor*: place of
assembly, *lakhori*.
- Astonish (to), *luskurelal*: to be astonished, *limbazhe*: he was
astonished, *ambazhini*, *lakhumbazhan*.
- Attack, *lishgeb*; to attack, *lidchvad*.
- Aunt, *giga*.
- Autumn, *muzhigura*, *muzhghver*.
- Avarice, *litsingvil*.
- Axe, *kada*, *kaqda*, *nassol* (a large axe).
- Azalea pontica, *hadra*.
- Baby, *chinchvlid*.
- Bachelor, *uchizha*, *uchi zhala*.
- Back, *shiq*, *shikka*, *siki*, *chagar*: back of the neck, *qintchkh*.
- Backside, posteriors, *sadrak*.
- Backwards, *ghveshy*, *gheshymar*, *gheshymarghuk*. *osh*, *osh't'h*,
goshkht'h, *gosh't'h*, *oshkmagd*, *oshkmal*, *ueshkmal*, *uveshymau*.
- Bad, *khola*, *leg*: badly, *kholamd*.
- Bag, *dzadzra* (sack): leathern bag, *katsi*, *khalt'ha*.
- Baggage, load, *barg* (G.).
- Bake (to), roast, *linqe*.
- Bank, shore, *dzgid* (G. *cide*).
- Barberry, *gotskhir* (G. *cotsakhuri*).

Bare, naked, *metqop'he*.

Bark, rind, *tzil*.

Bark (to), *lkhshde*.

Barley, *chomin*, *chemen* (cf. Russ.), *kere* (G. *keri*: cf. *Gerste* in German).

Barn, *kalv* (cf. G. *calo*).

Barrel, *sagomela*: small cask, *okhri*.

Basin, *tashd* (G. *tashti*).

Basket, *kuid*, *lashyq*. *Kuid* is a measure of 2 poods Russ.; *kuidol* (dim.) is half a pood: *leghe'liak* one-third or one-fourth of a *kuid*. (Cf. M. Kovalevsky, vol. ii, p. 14 note: *gvdol* (*kudol*) is 2 poods 17 lb. Russ.)

Bastard, *bush*, *byushv* (G. *bushi*).

Bat, *mat'hkhu'p'h* (G. *muchkateli*).

Battle, *lizuriel*.

Be (to), *lirde*, *lide*: it is, *ari*, *li*: they are, *arikh*: thou art, *khi*, *khe*; we are, *khuud*: I was, *nichde*: he was (Lat. *erat*), *urda*: they were, *erdekh*, *at'hasdakh*: he will be, *gueri*: it will be, *va*, *vi*.

Beads (string of), *dzivar* (G. *mdzivi*, bead).

Beak (of bird), *nisqurt'h*, *niskert* (G. *niscarti*).

Beam, joist, *dir*, *shdukhr*.

Beans, *roqv*, *rog*, *geder* (cf. peas).

Bear, *dasht'h*, *dashte*, *dashdv* (G. *dat'hvi*).

Bear a child (to), *lt'hne*; she bore, *akht'hanan*.

Bear fruit (to), *lishne*; it bears fruit, *khashne*.

Beard, *ver* (G. *tsveri*), *vere*, *vare*, *chadsh*, *chardsh*, *lazpara*: bearded, *luve*.

Beast, *khets* (G. *mkkhetzi*).

Beat (to), *liqer*; beat (thou) him! *khatqat'zdas*: beat ye him (or them)! *khakhidd*.

Beautiful, *sgvam*, *lamas* (G. *lamazi*), *musquen*

Because, *adjghere*.

Bed, *tukht* (G.): bedding, *laqra*, *lukura*, *lakhura*, *lerchal*, *lerkuali*: bed-cover, *saban* (G.), *shkartun*: feather bed, *bumbyl* (G. *bumbuli*, down): to make a bed, *laqvrash lirshi*.

Bee, *mer*, *laghrba*.

Beech (*Fagus sylvatica*), *tzipra* (Mingr. *tzipelli*, G. *tsipheli*).

Beech forest, *letzp'her*.

- Beef, *zer*, *leghe*.
- Beer, *uorash*.
- Before, in front, *zgebin*.
- Before, previously, *mankwi*.
- Beg (to), entreat, *likhural*.
- Begin (to), *libne*: I began, *akhuibin*: they began, *lagsibuds*: from the beginning, first of all, *chiq*.
- Behind, *reshgin*: from behind, *gheshkim*, *goshkim*, *ghoshgin*.
- Believe (to), *ludjruv* (G. *djera*).
- Bell, *zara* (G. *zari*): little bell, *rozhven* (G. *ezhvani*).
- Belly, *kadil*, *kadu*, *khat'h*, *khad* (G. *cutchi*).
- Below, beneath, *anchu*.
- Belt, *lartq* (G. *sartqeli*): below the belt, beneath the waist, *lartq anchu*.
- Bench, seat, *sqam* (G., Lat.).
- Better, *khochumd*, *makhecheni*: better than all. *chidmachene*, *chinmachene*, *khecheni*.
- Between: between the legs, *nabrakhs*.
- Beyond, *qamechu*.
- Big, *dzkhod* (G. *didi*), *khosha* (elder).
- Bind (to), (cf. tether), *lildjenu*: he bound him (or them), *at'hladj*: to bind up, bandage, *lit'hle*.
- Birch-tree (*Betula alba*), *zhukhver*, *yokvera*, *yokver* (G. *arqi*).
- Bird, *nep'hal*, *nepol*, *napr*, *p'hrinvel* (G.): chick, *tzindav*.
- Birth, *chvadguash*.
- Bitch, *jua* (G. *dzucna*).
- Bitter, *mykhim*, *mynny*, *modzib* (G. *mtsare*, *mdzaqhe*).
- Bitterness, *limkhyme*.
- Black, *meshkhe*, *neshkhe*.
- Blacksmith, *myshkid* (G. *mlchedeli*).
- Bless (to), *ldjgry*, *lmzyri*: blessed, *namzur*, *chothmezira*: bless! (imp. sing.), *chothmozurad*: a blessing, *lamzur*.
- Blind, *t'havir* (cf. eye), *teral lupikhar*.
- Block, lump, clod, *khuv*.
- Blood, *ziskhv*, *ziskh* (G. *siskhli*).
- Blood feud, vendetta, *litsvri*.
- Blow, stroke, *naqer* (G. *garda-nacari*).
- Blue, *urzhi* (G. *lurdchi*, azure): sky-blue, *detsemp'herish*, *detsep'herish* (cf. sky and colour).

- Blueberry (see whortleberry).
 Blunt, *lvre* (? G. *dalabra*).
 Boar (wild), *avlukham*, *voralkham*, *valnu* (cf. G. *veluri*, wild),
t'akh, *takh* (G. *takhi*) (cf. pig).
 Boast (to), *ip'hashtv*: he boasts, *ip'hashtuel*.
 Body, *tan*, *ten* (G. *tani*).
 Bog, *dchib* (G. *dchaobi*).
 Boil (to), *ludchab*: boiled, *mudchab*.
 Boiler, kettle, *tskhual*.
 Bold, *mobqari*.
 Bolt, bar, *hurdum* (G. *urduli*).
 Bone, *dchulchsi*, *dchulchmi*, *dchudchu*, *dchulchv*.
 Book, *lur* (Lat.), *tzingi* (G. *tsigni*).
 Boots, *chegmar*, *chekmaral* (G. *chekmebi*): footgear generally,
byskhem ledisk.
 Borrow (to), *livleni* (cf. lend).
 Bosom, lap, *kholezh*.
 Both, *erquda*, *yerquda*.
 Bound, tied, *lotzarkhe*, *lutzkhansha*.
 Boundary, *zghvid* (G. *zghude*, wall).
 Bow (archery), *khemad*.
 Box-tree (*Burus sempervirens*), *sakal*.
 Boy, *dchqmt'h*, *bep'hsh* (G. *barshvi*).
 Bracelets, *kheshnauri*.
 Brain, marrow, *t'hael*, *t'hvel* (G. *trini*).
 Bran, *gat*, *gad* (G. *kato*).
 Branch, *arshkhal*, *ashkhal*.
 Brass, *chei*.
 Bravery, *lymarg*, *lymargv*.
 Bread, *diar* (gen. sing. *diri*): bread for the priest after the
 liturgy, *tablash*.
 Break (to), *liqvshe*: they broke, *akushekh*.
 Breakfast, *ulup'h* (any meal), *khersa* (morning meal)
 Breast, *mudchod*, *mudchved*, *mudchvet'h*.
 Breastplate, cuirass, *abjar* (G.): breastplate of a horse, *chap'hrud*.
 Bride, *lekhhuri*, *letsvile*.
 Bridegroom, *lechzhervi*, *lechshori* (*lichizhe*, to marry).
 Bridge, *boq* (G. *boqiri*).
 Brilliant, *myklyne*.

Bring (to), *likhdekh, likhdune, li, likhde*; he brought, *kokhkud*: bring hither (sing.), *anikhd*: to bring up, rear (a child), *litskhmune*.

Broad, *masherı*.

Brother (of a sister), *dchimıl*, pl. nom. *ladchmıla*, pl. gen. *ladchmılre*: (of a brother), *mukhbe*, pl. *lakhuba, lakhua*: brother-in-law (wife's brother), *sentun*, pl. *lasmuna*: brotherhood, *lmkhub*.

Brow, *nep'hkuı, nebyna, nagcha, naba*.

Brush, *kuındchıl*.

Brushwood, *kuadal*.

Buckle, *khurdjik*.

Bud, *kumpr*.

Builder, *myshnarı* (G. *sheneba*, to build).

Bull, *bughva*.

Bullet, *p'hunt'hukhr, p'hindukh, p'hindigh, tzkhrı* (G. *tqvia*).

Bundle, *ladcher, k'hap*: to bind, *lidchrenı*.

Burn (to), *hshkhi, zihbdıne*: it was burned down, *akhshikhena*.

Bury (to), *lish'hkhuı, lishdkhrı, hshdyhrı*: they buried, *asht'hukhekh*: burial, *chvashtukh*.

Business, *gresh*.

But, *mare, mar, yago*.

Butt (of a gun), *dzur*.

Butter, *letzımi* (? G. *chumi*).

Butterfly, *parpond* (cf. G. *pepela, p'harp'hara*, and Lat. *papilio*).

Button, *legem, ghıl*, pl. *p'holkar* (G. *p'holakı*).

Buy (to), *hqdı*.

Cake, pie, *ku't'h, kubdar* (G. *cupatı*): cake made of millet and cheese, *dchishvt'har*.

Calf, *ghun, ghunua*.

Calf of the leg, *pashrd, paasht*.

Call (to), summon, *lituh*.

Calm, *shvidbian* (G. *mshvıdı*).

Campaign, expedition, *nalashgarı* (cf. army).

Candle, *letvre*.

Cannon, *jazail* (G.), *zarbazanı* (G.).

Cap, hat, *p'haqv* (*papakh*), *luqundıp'haqv* (of sheepskin).

Carbine, *qu't'hkhva*.

- Carefully, cautiously, *mekrbal*.
 Caress (to), *lip'hrebal* (G. *p'hereba*).
 Carpenter, *mutabé*.
 Carpet, *nokh, nekhr* (G. *nokhi*).
 Carry (to), *lghuane*.
 Cat, *tsitsv* (G.). dim. *tsitsuld*: kitten, *kitav*.
 Catarrh, cold in the head, *machkhuna*.
 Catch (to), *lirmi*: he caught, *at'horma*.
 Cattle, *kumash, vetklmaral*.
 Cave, *krab* (G.).
 Caw (to), croak, *liqulhuw*.
 Ceiling, *lydcher* (G. *dcheri*).
 Cellar, *diuleg, gem*.
 Certain one (a), *ierkhi* (G. *ert'hi*).
 Chaff, *libale*.
 Chain, *nudcha* (G.): chained, *lushkad* (cf. blacksmith).
 Chair, *skam* (G.), *suskam*.
 Chalice, cup, *bardzim* (cf. G. *Bardzimumani*, the Holy Grail, *bardzi*, blood of Christ, *bardzumi*, cup, chalice).
 Chamois, *yersken*.
 Change (to), *litsadi*.
 Charcoal, *shukh*: live coal, *ghuerghad, ghvireh, ghvyrch, muqhvaz*.
 Cheap, *rep'h* (G. *rep'li*).
 Cheat (to), *lghbrovi*.
 Cheek, *aqba, haqba*.
 Cheese, *t'hesh, tash*.
 Cherry, *heb, ga'be* (both fruit and tree).
 Chest, box, *skivr* (G. *sevrri*).
 Chestnut (*Castanea vesca*), *guidchi, qridj, quich*.
 Chicken, *tsitsil, tsuntsil* (G. *tsitsila*).
 Child, *bebshi, bebshv, bobsh* (G. *barshvi*), *dchqunt'h, pitsqil*:
 children, *bobshar*: childhood, *liqzel*.
 Chin, *niktza, nikare* (G. *ncapi*).
 Chintz, *chimt'h* (G. *chit'hi*).
 Choose, elect, prefer, *liqve, litskhane, zhulqche, lit'hshi*:
 chosen, elected, *nalqui*: choose (imp. sing.), *zhakhulkvch*.
 Christ, *Kristes*.
 Christening, *lepristi* (? cf. Christ).
 Church, *mezra, lakuan, lakhcam, lakhumi*.

- Churchyard, *sasp'hlar* (G. *sasap'hlaos*).
- Clay, *oqal* (G. *aqalo*); made of clay, *voqlar*.
- Clean (to), *lishdbune*, *likvtzani*.
- Clear (sky), *matzkhe*.
- Clearly, in order, *lumskadad*.
- Cleft, chink, crack, *p'hutu*.
- Clever, *bazhian*, *chqvian* (G. *dzhecviani*).
- Climb (to), *zhilizi*.
- Cloak (of felt), *ghart'h*.
- Cloth, *skalat* (G. *sclati*, Gr. *skarlatton*), *kuli*.
- Clothing, *lereqč*, *lerkual*.
- Cloud, *lamerua*, *mere*, *mare*: clouds, *marolar*.
- Coat (of sheepskin), *keesh*: overcoat, *uosare*.
- Cock (bird), *qvech*, *quich*, *momal* (G. *mamali*).
- Cock (of a gun), *chakhmakh* (G.).
- Coffin, *kub* (G. *cubo*).
- Cold, *mytskhi* (both subst. and adj.).
- Colic, *khadmezgi* (cf. belly and disease).
- Collect (to), *limaral*, *zhilindehrme*, *lizvri*, *lizvriale*, *lizvrenu*: he collects, *inzaralal*.
- Colour, *p'her* (G.), *ruhi*, *hub* (cf. cherry).
- Colt, *sabel*.
- Column, *sot* (G. *sveti*).
- Comb, *latskhvir*.
- Come (to), *liqed*, *lizi*, *linkhri*, *likhed*: I come, *uri*: they come, *agrikh*: they had come, *agrit'hakh*: come here! *agher*: come with me! *munkher*: to come in, *licheh*: he came in, *chode*.
- Command (to), *liqqanu*.
- Companion, comrade, *ap'hkhnek*, *amp'hkhu* (G. *amkhanagi*), *atzkhneg*, pl. *atzkhnegar*: travelling companion, *munkhri*.
- Complain (to), *lichivle* (G. *vuchivi*, I complain).
- Complexion, *heb* (cf. colour).
- Condition, agreement, *pirob* (G.).
- Conquer (to), *zhilitznavi*, *lmtzir*.
- Conscience, *namu* (G. *namusi*).
- Consent, approval, *qeru*.
- Contradict (to), *litskhude*.
- Conversation, to converse, *raqual*, *lingual*, *lmbual* (G.).

- Copper, *spilendi* (G.): made of copper. *chesh* (cf. brass);
copper vessel, *t'hring*.
- Copse, *dziqr* (G. *dchamari*).
- Corn, grain, *t'hq*: corn-bin, *kibden* (G.). *kibden*.
- Corner, *kat'hkhr* (G. *cut'hkhe*).
- Corpse, *dzver* (G. *mdzovr*).
- Couch, *takht'h* (G. *takht'hu*).
- Cough, *khvash* (G. *khvela*): to cough, *iqshel*.
- Count (to), *lshildani* (from *sheld*, number).
- Country, land, *khv* (G. *khveri*—glen).
- Court (to), beg, supplicate, *limkhal*.
- Courtyard, yard, *qo*.
- Cousin, *lakhbagezi*.
- Cow, *p'hyr*, *p'hyre* (G. *p'huri*).
- Cowardice, *lmqal*: cowardly, *maqlyra*.
- Crack, crevice, *p'hut'hu*.
- Cradle, *aqvan* (G. *acvani*).
- Crawl (to), creep, *libolal*.
- Cream, *nagheb* (G. *naghebt*).
- Croak (to), caw, *iqulhune*.
- Cross, *dehvari* (G.): sign of the Cross, *starvin* (Gr. *stevros*).
- Crust (of bread), *dzyd*.
- Cry (a), shout, *kil* (cf. G. *cilo*, tune).
- Crystal, *brol* (G.), *mintzora*, *nutzura* (? G. *mina*, glass).
- Cuckoo, *qago* (G. *quguli*).
- Cunning, trickery, *hernob*: adj. *lyria*.
- Cup, *t'has* (G.), pl. *t'hasar*, *p'hakvan*: large cup, *kob*, *bardzim*
(cf. chalice).
- Curd, *tot*.
- Currant (bush, fruit), *muntskhar* (G. *motzkhar*).
- Curse (to), *hehte*, *lidcht'hune*, *litsral*: may he curse, *ot'hd-
chat'huna*.
- Cut (to), *htseni*, *litsqem*: to cut off, *lqrtsure*, *hehkere*, *lqitse*.
he cut off, *kat'hkuts*: to cut down, *lidhqori*.
- Dagger, *khandjar* (G.).
- Damage (to), *mushurias*.
- Dance (a), *dchishkash*, *lshparé*: to dance, *lshb*, *lshushpari*.
- Darkness, *mubur*, *mubvir*, *libure*: to get dark, *libere*.

- Daughter, *dina*, dim. *dinol*.
- Dawn, *ruhi* (cf. colour), *lirhal*, *iburghan*: to dawn, *lirhal*.
- Day, *lulegh* (G. *djhe*): in the daytime, *luleghu*: to spend the day, *libleghu*.
- Deacon, *dikven*.
- Dead, *ludjar*, *lydjyar* (G. *mevdari*).
- Deaf, *qormandji*, *qurmendj*, *quk*, *qurman* (G. *qu*).
- Dear, expensive, *dzevir* (G.).
- Death, *dagra*, *chvadjan*.
- December, *Barblash*.
- Deep, *skodi*, *nachtzu*: depth, *naskodi*.
- Deer, *lachv*, *liachv*, *rem* (G.).
- Deformed, *khohalatsvash* (cf. bad).
- Demon, *devi*, *djinn*, *dar* (G. *devi*).
- Deserter, *namched*.
- Desire, wish, *haulv*, *lekvel*.
- Despise (to), *lisge*.
- Devil, *eshmaq*, *ashma* (G. *eshmaci*), *qadj*, *kadj* (Ar.), *hornu* (cf. Jew), *mabeger*.
- Dew, *tsuar* (G. *tzvati*), *riv*, *dusar*, *bibkh*.
- Die (to), *ludjari*, *ludjari*: he is dead, *chuvadjan*, *chuvadjan*: dead, *ludjar*.
- Difficult, *t'hemi*.
- Dig (to), *liburdje*.
- Diminish (to), *limyrkheldi*.
- Dinner, *sadil* (G.), *ulup'h* (any meal).
- Direct, straight (adv.), *metsvinl*.
- Direction, *namtsvin*.
- Disappear (to), be lost, *ht'hp'he*: he disappeared. *at'huaph*, *uodchlekedu*.
- Discover (to), find out (about something). *likve*: he found out, *adkrih*.
- Disease, *maziq*, *legmerle*.
- Dish, *djar*, *qreb*.
- Dislocation, luxation, *liqvech*, *liqeb*.
- Displease (to), *lilone*.
- Dissolute, dissipated, *bozai* (G. *bozi*, a whore).
- Distant, *dchuedia*.
- Ditch, trench, *t'hkhrilz* (G. *t'hkhril*).

- Divine, *ghert'ha* (cf. god).
- Do (to), make, *lichem*, *lish't'hab*: do! (sing.), *khak*. to do anything to anybody, *liqrine*.
- Doctor, *akim* (G.).
- Dog, *qurcha*, *zhugh*, *zhegh* (G. *dzaqhi*): bitch, *dehuo*: pup.
p'hakvna: kennel keeper, *mezhech*.
- Door, *kari* (G.), *qor*, *qorr*.
- Dough, *khitz*.
- Dove, *mukv*, *mugv*.
- Down, *chukuan*.
- Dowry, *nachvlash*.
- Dragon, *gvelarshap* (G. *gvaleshap*).
- Drawers (of men), *arshule*; (of women), *zurulash arshul*.
- Dream, *isnau*, *istam*: to dream, *lustam*, *listam*: I dreamt.
lamistam: he dreamt, *lakhistam*.
- Drink (to), *litre*, *lit'hre* (cf. G. *vit'hvreb* and *mt'hvrali*):
drinking, *lat'hra*: drinking vessel, *lat'hro*: to drink up.
chulitre: to get drunk, *chulishdme*.
- Drop (of liquid), *tsvet'h* (G. *tsvet'hi*).
- Drought, *qval* (G. *qvalva*).
- Drowned (to be), *lishqodi*; you will be drowned! *esshqudan*
- Drunk, intoxicated, *mushdmar*: drunkenness, *lishdame*.
- Dry, *p'huri*.
- Duck, *multz*, *milt*s, *tsqashind*.
- Dumb, *blu*, *blv*.
- Dust, *birqhc*.
- Dyer, *mykhpöre* (G. *maqhebari*).
- Each, *mag*, *t'hcit'h* (G.), *t'huut'hzhin*, *chi*, *chiv*: each other,
ushqware, *ushkhuar*, *ushkhear*.
- Eagle, *verb* (G. *orbi*).
- Ear, *sht'hum*, *sht'henum*, *net'hunen*, *shtish*, *shtam*, *chimrale*,
shdim, pl. *shdumar*: ear of corn, *shda*.
- Early, *dosd*.
- Ear-rings, *lesh't'huarar*, *lesh'dmaral*: ear-ring, *leshdim*.
- Earth, *qimas*, *qim*, *ver*: earthen, *coral*.
- East, *lezh*, *lezhe*, *lezhu*: eastern, *zhabe*.
- Eat (to), *liz'zeb*, *lezob*, *chulidiaral* (*dhar*, bread), *hvlup'hal*.
- Eclipse (of the sun), *betzelibure* (? *detselibure*, cf. heaven and

darkness), *mizhemlbure* (cf. sun): (of the moon), *doshdlalibure* (cf. moon).

Edge, *pil* (G. *puri*, mouth).

Egg, *lige*, pl. *liqraal*: white of egg, *tsil* (G. *tzila*): yolk, *gvi* (cf. heart): egg-shell, *kuan*.

Eight, *ara* (G. *rva*).

Elbow, *chit'khk*.

Elbruz (Mount), *Yalbuз*.

Elm (*Ulmus campestris*), *stskymra*.

Embrasure of a tower, *shdul*, *shdur*, *santzkhrer*.

Emperor, *keser* (G.), *khentzipe* (G.).

Empty, *lergene*, *tsarvel* (G.).

Enclosure, fence, *dzghudh* (cf. boundary).

End, *khem*, *pilu*, *pil* (cf. edge): to end, *luq'hari* (G.): finally, *khomas*, *ghoshqunpils*.

Enemy, *amakhr*.

Enough, *musard*, *kali*, *bizh*: to be enough, *lire*: it was enough for him, *kat'khkade*: it will be enough for us, *qaquar*.

Enquire (to), *lidchrdiel*.

Entertain a guest (to), *lkhme* (cf. G. *lkhmi*) (cf. feast).

Environ, *zghudil* (cf. boundary and enclosure).

Eternally, *was*.

Evening, *naboz*: in the evening, *nabos*.

Everywhere, *chiag* (cf. *chi*, each, all).

Ewe, *laila*.

Ewer (copper vessel like a coffee-pot), *t'hiriq* (G. *t'hunqi*).

Exchange (to), *hitzadi*.

Excrement, faeces, *nusken*.

Exhaust (to), *lshtkhe*.

Eye, *t'he* (G. *t'hrali*), *let'he*, pl. *t'hera*: a man with eyes in his head, *hute*: to cast the evil eye, bewitch, *nat'halquen*: pupil of the eye, *tsughraz*: white of the eye, *kak*: eyebrow, *nekdeha*, *nakhtsha*: eyelash, *t'halap'ha*, *t'halap'hal*.

Face, *vishkr*, *utshkr*.

Faith (religion), *dchruh* (G. *rdjuh*).

Falcon, *shevarden*, *shavarden* (G.), *mimi* (?).

Fall (to), *lshqed*, *ly'heshet*: he fell, *kamchu*, *qamchu*: they fell, *ashqadkh*: to fall down, *ligramal*, *lygruamal*.

Famous, *lip'hash*, *lahrak*.

Far, *dehedua*, *deheduan*, *dehedua*, *dehuedua*, *dpedrash*, *djuedias*.

Farewell (to bid), *leshobal*.

Farmer, cultivator, *motskhu* (cf. to plough).

Fast (a), *markhr* (G. *markho*), *lilchal*; to fast, *lvulchm*.

Fat (subst.), *chyon* (G. *kon*), adj. *mepe*: to grow fat, *lkvashqi*.

Fatal, fateful, *leshti*.

Father, *mu* (G. *mama*), gen. sing. *muve*, nom. pl. *mular*:
father-in-law, *muot'hul* (G. *mamamt'huli*): stepfather,
muenatsad (G. *mamamtzeali*): grandfather, *baba*.

Fatigue, *lip'hash*.

Fear, *maqal*.

Feast, banquet, to feast, *lakhodal*, *lakhudal* (G. *lkhm*).

Feathery, *shkhar*.

Feed (to), *bulnare* (*diar*, bread).

Felt (material), *nabal* (G.).

Fence, *zgherd*, *dzgherd* (cf. boundary, enclosure, environs): to
fence in, *ldzghuli*.

Fern, *qumor* (G. *qemra*).

Festival, *ukrm* (G. *ukm*) (cf. holiday).

Fettered, chained, *bushkad* (cf. blacksmith and chain): to fetter,
libukile: fetters, *berkhar* (G. *borcili*).

Fever, *mant'khua*, *mat'hra*.

Fidelity, *lert'hkul* (? G. *ert'hquloba*).

Field, *mindor*, *mindrer* (G. *mindori*): cornfield, *dab* (G. *daba*,
village).

Fifty, *volkhrishdesul*.

Fight (to), *lshal*.

Fill (to), *lgershli*.

Finally, *khomas*, *ashkhunechkhac*

Find (to), *lkheie*; you found, *ad'khud*; he found, *okhuuda*:
to find out, *zhulumkhare*; find out! (pl.), *zhakhmechhed*.

Finger, *t'hu* (G. *t'hit'hi*), *p'hkhule*, *p'hkhole*: finger-nail, *t'zkhara*,
t'zkhara.

Fir (*Abies orientalis*), *ghumir*, *qumyr*, *maqhra*; (*Abies Nord-*
manniana), *nense* (G. *nadzvi*).

Fire, *lemes*, *lemesq*; to light a fire, *lshve*.

First, *eshkhu*, *t'hkhuem*, *manku*: first of all (previously),
mankvi, *chiq*.

- Fish, *qalmakh, calmakh* (G. *calmakhi*, trout); fishing-rod, *ankes* (G. *ancesi*).
- Five, *vokhrishd*.
- Flea, *zysq* (G. *rtsqili*).
- Flint (for striking fire), *kadeh* (G.), *tol*.
- Flock, herd, *dehueg*; flock of birds, *khurvan* (? caravan).
- Flood, *litzilitzkhem* (cf. water).
- Floor, *lydchrave*.
- Flour, *p'hek* (G. *p'hkvoli*): flour-bin, *kıbdren*; flour-mill, *legvher* (*liqreh*, to grind).
- Flow (to): it was flowing swiftly, *ghuarsemizda*.
- Flower, *dadıl*, dim. *dadılud* (?): flowers, *mughuai*.
- Fly, *meer* (G. *mtseri*).
- Fly (to), *liper*, *liperiel*, (frequentative) *lipanal*.
- Foam, *per* (G. *peri*).
- Fodder, *lezreb* (cf. eat).
- Fog, *dındgvil*.
- Follow (to) (run after), *lidehem*: he is following me, *madchim*.
- Food, *luzub*, *lezreb* (cf. eat).
- Fool, *dau*.
- Foot, *dchiskh*, *dchish*, *dchisk*, *dchishekh*, *kishk*: on foot, *kveit'h* (G.); foot of a hill, *dzir* (G. *dzırı*, root); footpath, *lakdaban*.
- Forbid (to), *lidurvani*.
- Ford, *ladt'hkkel*, *p'hion* (G. *p'honi*).
- Forehead, *nebyva*, *nep'hkui*, *nyba*.
- Foreign, *khevish* (cf. country): foreigner, *ishknemı*.
- Forest, *tskheq*, *tskhek* (G. *tqe*): woody, *tskheqi*.
- Forever, *vas*, *chigarishd* (cf. all).
- Forget (to), *chulishdne*.
- Forgive (to), *lizhri*, *lıshdobal*.
- Fortress, castle, *muqwan*.
- Fortune-telling, *lalobwal* (stone on which divination is practised): to tell fortunes, *lılobwal*.
- Forward, *sgebin*.
- Foundation, *khun*.
- Four, *vosht'h*, *voshdkhv*.
- Fox, *mal* (G. *mela*).
- Fracture, *lkvesh*.
- Fraud, *lighroval* (cf. cheat).

- Free, *t'havisup'hal* (G.) (lit. lord of head or self): freedom.
lit'havisup'hle: liberated, *lit'havisup'hleh*: freely, *t'havisup'hald*.
- Freeze (to), *hkrremi* (cf. *krarem*, ice): hoar-frost, *duser*.
- Friday, *uebish*, *rebish*, *robish*, *mebish*.
- Friend, *tsal*, pl. *lats'ha*, *abkhneq* (G. *amkhanuqi*), *kertz*: friendship, *mykt'hop'h*.
- Frighten (to), *liq'ave* (cf. fear, *maqal*).
- Frog, *ap'hkhr*, *amp'hkhr* (G. *baqaqi*).
- From, *ka*.
- Front (in), *squebm*.
- Frost, *krarem* (cf. freeze and ice): frozen, *hukrame*.
- Froth, *per* (see foam).
- Fruit, *khil* (G.): to bear fruit, *lishne*: mixed fruits, *khilmakhil*.
- Fugitive, deserter, *namchad*.
- Full, *greshi*, *gueshi*, *gros'hi*, *goshi*, *bingoshia*, *imgoshih*, *ingoshili*: fullness, *hqvshile*.
- Funeral, *nashtghun*, *lashdkhval*; funeral feast, *lujean*.
- Fur cloak, *keesh* (cf. coat).
- Game (hunting), *nat'hkhuare*.
- Gamecock (? ptarmigan), *musur*.
- Garden, *bagh* (G.): vegetable garden, *lar't'ham* (G. *hostan*).
- Garlic, *nirra* (G.).
- Gate, *hazuaqor*.
- Gentian (*Gentiana cruciata*), *djager*.
- Gentleman, *p'hust'h*, *lebsugh*.
- George (St.), *Djurag*, *Djughurag*, *Dchgmraqi*.
- Gift, *sachukar* (G.), *zhir*, *zhyr*.
- Gild (to), *lnkrori* (cf. gold).
- Gird (to), *lilortqe*: girdle, *hartq* (G. *sartqeli*).
- Girl, *simaq*.
- Give (to), *lrde*, *hkhedi*, *hhvdi*: he gave, *womune*, *kaulamome*.
 give! sing. *lame*, pl. *lakhucmd*: let him give! *korlakhuem*:
 I shall give, *qakhuardi*, *qadchauch*: give us, *qalamo*:
 I shall give thee, *ladchodi*: he gave to him, *khohvedda*.
- Glad (to be), *hbazh*, *lichone*: he was glad, *at'humbazhun*.
- Glass (material), *dchik* (G. *dchika*): (tumbler), *kat'hkhul*.
- Glitter, lustre, *muqure*.

- Gloves, *khesmar*, *khelt'hat'ymar* (G. *kheli*, hand).
- Gnat, *kughnar*.
- Go (to), *lizi*, *liqrab*, *lizhegh* (to go forward); I come, *ghuri*; I come hither, *enghuri*; he went, *khozhoghda*, *amched*; go there! *adyher* (sing.); go! (pl.) *oskhurid*; to go thither, *chulizi*; he goes, *esghuri*, *eskhri*; they are setting out, *esghurikh*; I shall go, *esghurine*; to go in front, *lizhuegh*; he went in front, *emzhogh*; to go out, *kalizi* (*ka*, from).
- Goat, *dakhul*, *p'hukv*, *zurai*; wild goat, *yersken*; young goat, *neghshti*, *neghasht*.
- God, *ghertem*, *qherti*, *ghmertv* (G.), *ghermet*, *gherbed*.
- Goitre, *quch*.
- Gold, *okvr*, *vokv*, *vokvr* (G. *okro*); golden, *okvresh*, *okvremish*.
- Good, *khocha*, *dadil* (cf. flower), *ezalli*, *ezar*, *khochemi*, *bedneri* (good-hearted, cf. G.); very good (used of gold in fairy tales), *khalas*; good fellow, *bednier*.
- Goose, *gharghad*, *gharghad*, *bat* (G.).
- Grain (cereals), *diar* (cf. bread), *kakal* (G. *cacale*, nut, grain).
- Granary, *maran* (G.).
- Grandfather, *baba*; grandmother, *dada*, *tata*; grandson, *nebashi*, *gezlash*, *qezal*.
- Granite, *gurna*.
- Grapes, *qurzen*, *qurdzen* (G.).
- Grass, *chqivar*, *balakh* (G.).
- Grasshopper, *myntzla*.
- Gratitude, *madil* (G.), *hasham*.
- Gravel, *qub*.
- Great, *dzhkhod* (G. *didv*), *khosha*.
- Green, *irzhi* (cf. blue).
- Grey, *parv*; greyish, *momprev*, *krishemperish*; grey-haired, *khosqar*.
- Grind (to), *liqveh*.
- Groan (to), *likvretz*.
- Group, *dehurtv* (G. *dehgyup'hu*).
- Grow up (to), *zhilitzkhem*; to grow, *litskhem*.
- Guard (to), *liqrule* (G. *qaraul*).
- Guest, *mushgua*, *mushgyrv*; to be a guest, *limshgyar*, *limshgyoral*.
- Guide, *sguebin*, *muzhvegh*.
- Guilty, *danashavv* (G. *shavv*, black).

Gun, *t'hep'h*, *t'hop'h*: rifle, carbine, *qut'hkhva*, *kolaqut'hkh*,
kolaqut'hkhva: gun-barrel, *stvir* (cf. Russ. *strol*): muzzle,
khuru: flint, *tol*(G.) (see also cock, butt, ramrod, powder, etc.).

Habit, custom, *lmt'hkve*.

Hail, *skarkhal*: to hail, *liskurkhal*.

Hair, *p'hat'hr*, pl. *p'hat'hvar*, *lust'hyu*: plait, tress, braid of
 hair, *ludgr*.

Halter, *hap'hshara* (G. *avshara*).

Ham, *lerv*, *lor* (G. *lori*).

Hammer, *tzurol*, *tzirol* (G. *tserakvi*), *qwaba*, *qreba*, *kuat'hkh*,
quer (G. *everi*).

Hand, *shu*, pl. *shur*, *shun*, *t'hot'h*, *t'hot'hul*, *tvet*, gen. sing. *toti*,
 pl. nom. *totar*; right hand, *mursghven t'hvet'h*; left hand,
mirt'hen t'hvet'h; nails, *tzkharal*: fingers, *p'hkhuliar*;
 palm, *mimi quigr*.

Handkerchief, *lep'hkhvnash*, *lakvtzan*.

Hang, intr. *lirkunc*, tr. *liqme*.

Happen (to), *liqrne*: it happened, *deheqar*, *khochunda*.

Happy, *lukhev*; happiness, *libedner* (G. *bedneroba*).

Hard, *bygi*, *bygiar* (G. *magari*).

Hare, *rach*, *rachv*, dim. *rachuld*.

Harrow, *ladchadir*, *ber*.

Harvest, *mosawal* (G.); to harvest, *lit'hi*.

Hat, *p'hsaku* (cf. *cap*).

Hate (to), *lssge*: hatred, *orgulob* (G.).

Have (to), *lghvane*: I have, *mava*, *mar*: I have (an inanimate
 object), *mughva*, *mughve*, *mughva*: thou hast, *djigva*,
djiri: thou hast much money, *su djiri khva t'het'hr*:
 I had, *mughvanda*: thou hadst, *djighvanda*, *dchughvan*;
 he had, *qonda* (G.); I have a horse, *khad maqa chazh*;
 I have money, *mughw t'het'hr*.

Hawk, *tzkhavr*.

Hay, *chem*: hay meadow, *lare*.

Hazel (*Corylus avellana*), *shtukhund* (cf. *nut*).

He, *adcha*, *adja*, *edji*.

Head, *t'hkhum*, *tkhrish*, *t'hkhvim*: from head to foot, *t'hkhume*
dchishkhe; on the head, *t'hkhumishi*; big-headed, *ash-*
corblan: headlong, *ut'hkmuł*; occiput, *lakhmir*; skull,

t'hhkrimihagar: crown of the head, *lat'hat'huel*: temple,
laghadehv: headache, *thkhumi maziq* (cf. disease),
t'hhkhumish maziq.

Health, *Ishduebi*, *khochamdar*.

Heap, *dehurti* (cf. group and herd).

Heart, *gr*, *gu*, *gu* (G.): I wish, *grimar* (*mar*, I have).

Hearth, *ker*, *ker* (G.).

Heat, *at'hu*.

Heaven, *dets* (G. *zetza*).

Heavy, *t'hymi*, *qvami* (G. *mdzime*).

Heel, *hagra*, *hagnar*.

Height, *didab* (G. *dideba*), *naklat'hhkhu*.

Heir, *cmsede* (? Pers.).

Hell, *dchoekhheet'h* (G. *dchodehokhet'hu*, ? cf. *dchodeho*, lizard).

Hellebore (*Helleborus orientalis*), *karsin* (G. *kharis dzira*).

Helmet, *azrunchi*, *zurukh*.

Help (to), *lished*, *lutse*, *lmurdjri*: help! (pl.), *logucsh'th*: let him
 help, *eshulogsheda*, *enlogsheda*, *adchgulogsheda*: helpful, *nad*.

Hemp, *kanc* (G. *eanap'hi*, cf. Lat. *cannabis*): hemp-seed, *gimbash*.

Hen, *kat'hal* (G.).

Hence, *amkhenchu*, *amkhanqa*, *amkhan*.

Herd, flock, *dehueg* (G. *djogu*).

Here, *amech*, *amechu*, *ame*: down here, *amechu*: local, *ame-
 ehunash*.

Hero, *dehabigr* (G. *ehabuki*).

Hide (to), *lshkhrni*, *lpezh* (G. *p'hareba*).

High, *kylt'hhkhu*, *kintkhi*, *koltkhe*: higher, *khosha*, *kutkhi*:
 highest, *gun kuitkhi*.

Hill, *zug* (cf. place-name *Zugdudi*).

Him, *msi*: himself, *edj*, *edja* (in Lower Svanetia), *adj*, *adja*
 (in Ushkul); his, *mieha*.

Hither, *iska*, *amkhar*, *adjkhar*, *amkhal*.

Hitherto, *at'hhkadv*.

Hive, *laghob* (G. *roqo*).

Hoar-frost, *duser*.

Hold (to), *hqdan*: hold! (sing.), *lekhqeden*; I held, *mi miqdanan*;
 thou heldest, *si dehqdanan*; he held, *achas khogdanan*.

Hole, gap, rent, *jatsigr*, *khuru* (G. *khvrel*).

Holiday, *vigrm* (G. *ukmi*), *lisqvresh* (cf. festival).

Holly (*Crataegus*), *santsi*.

Holy, *tzkiluan*.

Home, *argi*; homewards, *korvad* (cf. house).

Honesty, *namyrtali*.

Honey, *saradj*, *t'hvi*.

Honourable, *putiosani* (G.).

Hoof, *chilk* (G. *chliki*, *djlicit*), *p'hol*.

Hook, *ghilk* (G. *khrici*).

Hoop (for casks), *betq*.

Hope (subst.), *imed* (G.): to hope, *limesdi*.

Horn, *mudchu*, *mudchr*, *karakhs* (G. *rka*).

Horse, *chazh*, *chash*, *dadj* (G. Tatar—*tađı*): bay horse, *mytzram*: piebald, dappled horse, *amluk*; flying horse (in fairy tales), *rash* (G.); horse with white spot on forehead, *saghari chash*: stallion, *kuaril*, *qvaryul*: unbroken horse, *lenchq*; mare, *dchug*; mounted, equestrian, *lalsgura* (from *lisgure*, to sit): foal, *sabol*, *sabel*: ambler, *t'hukvrig* (G.): on horseback, *mychazhi*; to mount a horse, *chazh liskere*; to dismount, *chazhi likekh*; to saddle, *lihngre*: to unsaddle, *hingrliked*: to shoe, *lishkadi*: horseshoe, *nashkadun*: belley-band, *musurtan*: horse-tail, *haquud*, *hauquet*.

Hostage, *dzeval* (G. *mzevali*).

Hot, *at'hu*, *at'hvi* (cf. heat).

Hour, *sat'h*, *saat'h* (G.); half an hour, *saat'huygynsya*.

House, *agi*, *kor*, *qor*; uninhabited house, *uktsire*, *ukvtsir* (G. *okheri*); little house, *kuruld*: lower story, *machula*: upper story, *darbaz*.

How, *inzhi*; how much, *uosha*, *isava*.

Howl (to), *litskuli*.

Hundred, *ashir* (G. *azi*).

Hunger, *maid*; hungry, *maidar*: to be hungry, *libune*.

Hunt (to), *lat'hkhvar*; hunting-ground, *lat'hkhuer*: hunting, chase, *lat'h*, *khuial*, *lat'hkhuar*: hunter, *met'hkhvar*, *met'hkhviar*, *met'hkhveri*.

Husband, *dchash*, *dchashmi*; future husband, *lechshori*.

Hut, *sadyem* (G. *sadyomi*), *karavi* (G. *caravi*) (cf. abode).

I, *mi* (G. *me*).

Ice, *ol*, *uol*, *hol*, *kuarem*.

- Iconostasis, *samkar* (? G. *sami*, three, and *cari*. door).
 If, *akhi*, *ere*, *he*, *hessa*.
 Ill, sick, *leymerde*; to be ill, *liže* (cf. disease).
 Image, icon, *khat'h* (G.).
 Immediately, *shishl*.
 In. *sku* (suffix).
 Incense, *sakmel* (G. *saemeli*).
 Indecent (to be), *lishqde*.
 Inexhaustible, *ush'hikha*.
 Inform (to), *likmari*, *libzhine*.
 Ink, *melon* (Gr., G.).
 Inside, *iska*, *ska*, *isgan*, *isga*, *isganchu*.
 Instead, *muqap'h*.
 Interpreter, *monin* (cf. tongue).
 Interrupt (to), *lizhme*.
 Into, through, *lisga*.
 Invite (to), *litsse*, *litznari*.
 Iron, *beredj*, *berezh*; made of iron, *berzhemish*, *berzhash*; made of cast iron, *ehvhenura*; of wrought iron, *lyshkiad*.
 Itch, *makheru* (G. *myhieri*).
- January, *Kuagh*, *Kvakh*.
 Jar (large), *kets*; jar, *stama*, *staman* (a liquid measure).
 Jesus Christ, *Eshu Kriste*, *Kristesua*.
 Jew, *viria* (G. *uriai*) *urii*.
 Joke (to), *lilgatsal*, *likhrmaral*.
 Journey, *gzavroh* (G.); to start on a journey, *lingzarre*.
 Joy, *sarvoshale*, *khiad*, *lekhiad* (G.), *lkhiriul* (G. *sikharuli*); joyful, *makharobel* (G. *mkharuli*), *lykhiadal* (G. *lkhinu*).
 Jump (to), *lisknal*: to jump out, up, *lisqne*: he jumped up, *okhosquna*: he jumped over, *kaisqine*.
 Juniper (*Juniperus* sp.), *dehkeru*.
 Just, right, *mart'hal* (G.).
- Keg, *vokhar*.
 Kettle, *tskhuad*, *tzkhvadr*.
 Key, *kel*, *kyl* (G. *elite*, cf. Pers. and Lat.).
 Kick, *ishvd*.
 Kill (to), *lidgari* (cf. die, death): he killed, *adgar*, *adyghar*, *chukhdogara*: they killed, *ehadgarkh*, *ehuadgarkh*.

Kind, sort, *rigi* (G.).

Kindle (to), light a fire, *lishve*.

King, *kheltziṗ'h* (G. *khelmtziṗ'he*).

Kinsman, *tzani*.

Kiss, *kalemqaen* : to kiss, *likhhaal*.

Knee, *ghula*, *guhu*, *kutulai*, *hulaika*, *ghwibat'hkhum*, *chveq* :
he knelt, *cheschoqve* : knee-breeches, *zedkhu*.

Knife, *giadj*.

Knock, *byrgyn*.

Know (to), *likhal*, *litzikh* : not to know, *madma likhal* : I know,
mitzokh, *chumit'hra* : you knew. *dchikhaldokh* : not
knowing, *ukhlu*.

Ladder, *kichkh*.

Lady, princess, *lup'hkel*.

Lake, *myh*, *tob* (G. *tba*).

Lamb, *zhinagh*, *zhingh* : to lamb, *lizhneqhi*.

Lame, *chort'ha*, *krachkhu*, *mykh*.

Lance, spear, *shub* (G.).

Land, *ver* : plot of land, *adqil* (G.).

Landslide, *zheh*.

Large, *khosha*, *dzghid* (G. *didi*).

Lasso, *balir*.

Late, to be late, *hrage*.

Laugh (to), *hitsnal*, *litvual*, *litvunal* (G.) : laughter, *lutsu*
(G. *sitzili*).

Laurel (*Daphne glomerata*), *madjora*.

Lazy (to be), *hmchire*, *hmchirral* : lazy, *mandjirral* : laziness,
lmchir.

Lead, *tqve*, *tkhò* (G. *tqvta*) : leaden, *tqrenish*

Lead (to), *li* : he led, *esqa*.

Leaf, *bale*.

Leather, *t'hup'h*, *qruare*.

Left (hand), *lart'hen* (G. *martzkhena*) : when of the 1st per.,
murten.

Leg, thigh, *makudshage*.

Lend (to), *lvlen* (cf. borrow).

Length, *nalchvdi*.

Lentils, *kus*, *kirtzi*.

- Leprous, scabby, *khuarsa*.
 Lie (to), lay, *liqvre*, *lude* : he lies, *khas* : he lay, *khadena* : lying, *meqvre*.
 Life, to live, *lurde* : I live, *khviri* : thou livest, *khiri* : he lives, *iri* : living, *meide*, *lucar*.
 Light (not heavy), *hashu*.
 Light, daylight, *ryhi*.
 Lightning, *megh*, *mekh* (G. *mekhi*, cf. Arab. and Arm.), *lilhal*.
 Like, alike, *khavjesh*, *madjona*, *khal* : like him. I . . . *khal adcha*, *adchzhi mi* . . .
 Like (to be), resemble, *lip'hesh*.
 Linen, *squir*, *skyr* (G. *shira*).
 Lip, *pil* : lips, mouth, *pilar* (G. *pirt*).
 Listen (to), overhear, spy, *livnari*, *lignari*, *livnari* : I listen, *khovnari* : listen! (sing.), *lokhhuar*.
 Litter, stretcher, *chat'hr*.
 Little, *kotol*.
 Live (to), *lizge* : he lived, *khilzugal* : living, alive, *lyar*.
 Liver, *qvizhe* (G. *ghrudzli*).
 Lizard, *hasht'hakv*.
 Load, baggage, *barq* (G.).
 Load a gun (to), *lisqe*, *lisqene*.
 Loan, *lmpshten*.
 Lock of a door, *kyliar* (cf. key).
 Long, *djodi*.
 Look (to), *lisqdi*, *isqdi*, *zhiltsvane* : he looks, *kot'hdzqi* : look! (pl.), *kavakhsuddal*, *zhakhtsvaned*.
 Lord, God, *p'hust*.
 Lose (to), *likrari*.
 Louse, *tish* (G. *tili*).
 Lousewort (*Pedicularis atropurpurea*, Nord.), *menkel*.
 Love, *lilat* : to love, *lilat* : O beloved Christ! *ai lilo Qriste* : thou lovedst, *dchaltan*.
 Low, *lekva* (G. *kvena*) ; lower, *chube*, *dzurmu*.
 Lung, *persveda* (G. *philtvi*, *phirtvi*).
 Madder (*Rubia tinctoria*), *handra* (G.) (cf. azalea), (Mingr. *endro*).
 Magpie, *khavich*.
 Maize, *simud* (G.), *simudi* : maize straw, *chala* (G.).

- Make (to), do, *lehem. lsgem, lsh't'hub. lechume. lechme, lsgt* : they made. *achminkh. okhsqekh.*
- Man, *mare* (homo). *amsuald, grajmare* (vir). little man, *marol* : manliness, *limar.*
- Mane, *p'hap'hal* (G. *p'hap hari*).
- Manger, *gval.*
- Maple (*Acer campestre*), *pychvra.*
- Mare, *chag*, pl. *chagar.*
- Mark, sign, *nishani* (G.).
- Marriage, *nishnoga* (cf. *nishani*, mark).
- Marry a wife (to), *liqt, lechizhal, lachizhal, lechizhe.* he married, *iqi, kovachizhe* : to perform the wedding ceremony, *lyurgune* (G.) (cf. G. *gyrgvin*, crown) : unmarried man, *uchizha* : married man, *lykhekhv* : man who wishes to marry, *mechizhal* : not every man can marry, *lakhval chi mad khobits.*
- Marry a husband (to). *litzvile, litzvilal* : married woman, *qalutzvile* : unmarried woman, *utzvila.*
- Marsh, bog, *dchib, chuib* (G. *dchaobi*).
- Marten, *qven* (G. *cverna*).
- Mary (St.), *Lamaria, Lamria.*
- Mass (to celebrate), *litbuli.*
- Master, lord, *p'husd, p'hust'h.*
- Mead (liquor), *rang* (G. *raki*).
- Meadow, *ladchma.*
- Meal (breakfast, dinner), *ulup'h* : slight meal, *khers.*
- Measure, *lazma* (G. *zomi*) : to measure, *lizme* (G. *zomvreb*).
- Mediator, *metzkhvil, motzkul* (G. *motzikuli*, envoy, apostle).
- Medicine, *zhagar, zhagiar* ; medicine man, *melt'her, qad.*
- Medium, central, *nesga, manesgure.*
- Meet (to), *limkhvi, lkhvie* : meet us ! (sing.), *enkhvud* : to go to meet, *lizzvi.*
- Meeting (of people), *lakhor.*
- Melon, *nesvi* (G.) : water-melon, *harpuzak.*
- Melt (to), thaw, *lipzhune.*
- Mention (to), *lirshvni.*
- Merchant, *ghvadchar* (G. *radjari*).
- Merciful, *maldian* (G. *madliani*).
- Mercy, blessing, *lamzur.*

- Merry, *khyrul* (G. *mkhuaruli*): merriment, *khin* (G. *lkhini*):
to be merry, *lilkhne* (G. *lkhinoba*).
- Michael Archangel, *Mukem T'haringzel*.
- Midnight, *isglet'h* (cf. night).
- Milk, *ludjo, ludje* (G. *rdze*): sour milk, *martsven* (G. *matsoni*):
to milk, *gali*; milker (masc.), *mushqi*.
- Mill, *lekveer* (G. *tsiskvili*): millstone, *shira*.
- Millet, *p'hatv, pötu, pötv* (G. *p'hetvi*).
- Mind, wit, *t'hvel, t'hvel*; intelligent, *t'hvelian*.
- Mingrelia, *Zane*; Mingrelian, *Luznu*: native of Mingrelia, *Muzan*.
- Miracle, *sakvrel* (G. *sacvrveli*).
- Mirror, *sark* (G. *saree*) (cf. Russ. *zerkalo*): to look in the glass,
lisurkal.
- Miserly, *tsinguil*.
- Misfortune, *dehir* (G. *djiri*, plague), *ubdorob* (G. *ubeduroba*):
to become poor, *ludchir*.
- Mist, *dindgvil, bintv, nisl* (G. *nisl*).
- Mistake (to make a), *lqed, likiad*: you have made a mistake,
adjgat'hkh.
- Mistress (leman), *lelat*.
- Mix (to), *lichdune, lichdine*.
- Moisture, *myzhir*.
- Monday, *Deshtish, Doshtish, Dueshdish, Deshdish, Doshdish*
(cf. moon).
- Money, *t'het'hr* (G.): *varchkhil* (G. *vertzkhi*, silver).
- Monk, *ber* (G.).
- Month, *dosht'hul, makhe, t'hev* (G. *tht'hve*), pl. *t'hevar*.
- Moon, *dosht'hul, doshdul*; moonrise, *doshdlalakhud*; eclipse of
the moon, *doshdlalibure*; full moon, *greshi doshdul*; new
moon, *mokhe doshdul* (cf. young).
- Morning, *gham, han, dziner, dzinar* (G. *dila*), *dzunar, dzurva*:
in the morning, *ghamas, hams*.
- Moss, *khavis* (G. *khavsvi*).
- Mother, *ti, did* (G. *deda*), *dia, di* (in caressing form, *dede, dialu*).
- Mother-in-law, *dmt'hil* (G. *dedamt'hili*).
- Mountain, *t'hangh, zagar, t'hanagh*, pl. *t'hanghar*; to cross
a mountain, *lt'huaghi*; mountainous, *t'hanghiash*:
mountain chain, *zaghar, zaguar*: mountain top, *t'hangha-
kunchil*; mountain foot, *t'hanghadzir* (G. *dziri*, root).

Mourn for (to), *laguan*.

Mouse, *shduy*.

Moustache, *ulmash, armash, ulmashar* (G. *ulvashi*).

Mouth, *kharkh, lakra, ushkr, pilar* (lips): gums, *viriaul*.

Move (to), *bkhqrtunal, lkt'huue*: he moved (himself), *ct'hkut'han*; we moved, *kat'hkut'hand*: they moved, *kalat kut'hakh*.

Mow (to), reap, *liti, lichme*: mower (fem.), *mtashi*.

Much, *khvas, khvai, khvai, masard, robash, obash*: as much, *mazu, osha*.

Mud, *talakh* (G.): muddy, *talkhuur*.

Multiply (to), *lp'hshire*.

Mushroom (edible), *tkobut*.

Music, *lashmar*.

Musket, *qurmil, t'hop'ha* (G. *t'hop'hi*).

Mutton, *uliakushleghr* (cf. sheep and meat).

Muzzle, bore, *nuchlehra*.

My, *mishgu, myshgvi, mishku, mishku, mishqua*, pl. *nishqvei*.

Nail (of iron), *dchkuaral, musmar, lusmar, lurtsman* (G.).

Naked, bare, *metqop'he, metqrp'he, qhverkle*.

Name, *zhakhe* (G. *sakheli*).

Narrow, *nakhutsi*.

Nastiness, *reb*.

Nausea, *khola gumiz* (cf. bad, heart, and disease).

Navel, *chip* (G. *djipi*), *shtikhr*.

Near, *p'hedia, p'hedi, p'hedias*.

Necessary, *khaku, chukhaku*: he needs bread, *achas khaku diar*: for marriage a good man is necessary, *luakhrals khocha mare khaku*.

Neck (throat), *qa, qea* (G. *qeli*), *qimchkh, kush* (nape of neck) (G. *cintsi*): necklace, *lebar, dzivar* (cf. beads).

Needle, *nesqal* (G. *nems*), *nofske*.

Neigh (to), *lichirkhne* (G.), *lit'huptyne*.

Neighbour, *mezbel* (G. *mezobeli*).

Nephew, *ubashm, nebashi* (cf. grandson).

Nest, *sabdar* (G. *bude, sabudari*).

Net, *dehachui* (*dehadjvi*, G.).

Nettle, *merchel* (Mingr. *dchudchele*).

Nevertheless, *eshi*.

New, *makhe* (cf. young).

News, *ambar*, *amban* (G. *ambavi*).

Night, *let'h*: midnight, *isqlet'h*: to-night, *buzi*: in the night, *laat'hshv*.

Nine, *chkhora* (G. *tzkhra*).

No, not, *dessa*, *madma*. *nom*, *num*, *deme*, *dem*. *dom*, *desh*, *demis*, *mad*, *made*, *madeo*, *madu*, *mama*: do not, *num* as prefix with imperative: do not do that (sing.), *nom khich alas*.

Nobleman, *varg* (G. *vargi*, worthy).

Nobody, *daar*, *der*.

Noise, *tqbiy'h*.

Noon, *isyludegh* (cf. day and midnight).

Nose, *nafkhvna*, *lopkhna*, *nepkhuna*: nostrils. *neshtal*.

Nothing, *madma*, *mama*.

November, *Sasish*.

Now, *at'hkhe* (G. *ekhla*, *ats*).

Nowhere, *deme*, *demeghmu*: no whither, *demt'he*.

Number, *sheld*; 1, *eshkhu*: first, *mankvy*; 2, *iori*, *heri*, *ierri*; second, *merve*; 3, *semi*; third, *mesme*; 4, *voshtkhv*; fourth, *mesht'hkhve*; 5, *rokhrishd*: fifth, *mekhrshde*; 6, *usgva*, *usgvashd*; 7, *ishqvud*; 8, *aru*; 9, *chkhara*; 10, *ieshd*; 11, *ieshd eshkhu*; 12, *ieshd iori*; 20, *ierveshd*; 21, *ierveshdi eshkhu*; 30, *semeshd* (*samveshd*, *ervesht'hi*, *esht'h*); 40, *vosht-khveshd* (*urinervesht'hi*); 50, *rokhrishdeshd*; 60, *usgvashd*; 70, *ishgudaashd*; 80, *araashd*; 90, *chkharashd*; 100, *ashir*; 101, *ashir eshkhu*; 200, *oriashir*; 300, *semashir*; 1,000, *at'has*; 10,000, *iesht'hat'has*.

Nurse (wet), *dzidzai* (G. *dzidza*).

Nut, *sht'hekhi*, *shtukhund*, *shdikh*, *gak* (cf. hazel).

Oak, *dchihra*, *djiyra*.

Oath (to take an), *lymbanal*.

Oats, *zint'hkh*, *suntkho*, *magdenar*.

Obedient, *muhnari*.

Offended (to be), *lisdike*: they were offended, *at'hsastkunkh*.

Offering (an), *namzurun*.

Often, *khvai* (cf. much).

- Old, *mechi*, *djanel*: older, *mashen*, *makhvshib*: old age, *lmachr*: old man, *mechi*: old woman, *mechi zural*: to grow old, *lmche*: elected village elder, *makhvshi*.
- On, *zhi* (suffix).
- One, *eshkhu*, *wshkhu*, *esho*, *eshu*, *eshkhvi*: one at a time, *t'huit'hu* (G.).
- Onion, *khakhr* (G.).
- Only, *gar*, *alapur*.
- Open (to), *likre*: open! (pl.), *kared*, *niqared*: they opened, *niqarekh*: wide open, *muka*.
- Opinion (hope), *imed* (G.).
- Or, *ed*.
- Osset (an), *musvi*, *saval*, *musar*: ossetian, *savash*, *saviash*, *lusu*.
- Other, another, *merba*, *merme*, *ishyen*.
- Our, *gvyshyveri*, *gvishke*, *gvishge*.
- Out, outside, *qa*: from the outside, *kamen*: out of doors, *qam*.
- Ox, *khan* (G. *khari*), *qan*: an ox that has never been yoked, *uskhvar*: an ox with a white spot on the forehead, *shkharil*.
- Pace, step, *brakh*: between the legs, *nabrakhs*.
- Paul, *qab*, *segda*.
- Pair, *tqub* (G. *tqubi*).
- Palm, span, *kamin*.
- Pan (frying), *tap'hai* (G. *tap'ha*, *tap'haei*).
- Paper, *kalgharil* (G. *kayhaldi*).
- Paradise, *samet'hkhr* (G. *samot'hkhe*).
- Part, portion, *nat'hi*, *noqril* (G. *natsili*).
- Part (to), separate, *liqrle*.
- Pass, defile, gorge, *t'hup'h*, *t'huibi*, *t'hubi*, *t'huba*, *t'huber*, *trub* (dat. *tabas*), *triv* (G. *khoba*).
- Pasture, *barar*: mountain pasture, *lakhoard*, *lakhe*: hayfield, *lare*.
- Path, *lakedaban*, *qashan*.
- Patient, *mot'hmime* (G.).
- Peace, *lisqal*.
- Peach, *atam* (G.).
- Peacock, *p'harshmaq* (G.).
- Pear, *itzkh*, *bytsikh*, *ystz*.
- Pearl, *marqht*, *marqh*, *marqah* (G. and Pers.).

- Pearls (string of), on woman's costume, *grekhel*.
- Peas, *gheder, ghedar, netsiny qeder* (cf. small and beans)
- Pebble, gravel, *qub*.
- Pen, *kalam* (G.).
- Penis, *qom* (G. *qle*).
- People, *khalkh* (G.).
- Perhaps, *uebs, uebe*.
- Permit (to), *lkhvie*: permit me! (sing.) *khakhrv*.
- Pheasant, *dakhoklu, khokhueb* (G. *khokhobi*).
- Pig, *khom, kham, takh*: sow, *nezv* (G. *nezvt*): sucking-pig, *gucch* (G. *godvt*).
- Pigeon, *mukv, mugv*.
- Pillow, *balish* (G.).
- Pine-tree (*Pinus silvestris*), *ghuqib, góqib*.
- Pipe (for tobacco), *lat'hral* (cf. drink and smoke).
- Pistol, *tanbacha* (G. *dambacha*), *laghlata*.
- Pitchfork, *p'hutsal* (G. *p'hutzkht*).
- Pity, *mazhur*: to pity, *litklabe*.
- Place (room, quarters, abode), *larða, mukab*: place (generally), *adyl* (G.).
- Place (to), put, *luchsq, ludi, lujem*: I place, *masda*: thou placest, *djasla*: he places, *khasla*: he placed, *esust'la, ulqe* (G.), *umast'handa*.
- Plagne, *zham* (G. *zhami*).
- Plane (to), *htabe*.
- Plank, *p'hutzar* (G. *p'hutzari*).
- Plate, *sain* (G.) (i.e. ? *Sinensis*).
- Play (to), *luhial, lishtrual*.
- Pleasant, *sasiamun* (G. *sasiamorno*).
- Pledge, bet, wager, *dzevel* (G. *nalzlevi*).
- Plough, *ghantsvish, gentzish*: to plough, *hkhm*, ploughing-time, *lkhuvel* (G. *vkhnar*, I plough).
- Plum, *khau* (G. *khavi*), *barqen*.
- Pocket, *dehb* (G.).
- Poisonous, *khara, shkhamian* (G.), *shkhamar*: to poison, *lizhyeni*.
- Poor, *dehivar*: to become poor, *luchir* (G.), *luhnibe*, poor man, *gharib* (G.).
- Poplar (*Populus tremula*), *ekhura*.
- Porter, bearer, *mukap'hi*.

- Pot. *tuu* (G. *ko't'han*).
- Potato, *kartoqil*.
- Pound (lb.), *qrvanqa* (G.).
- Pour (to) out, *lyrshv* : pour out! (sing.), *khayrshus*.
- Powder, *zhag, de'bage* : powder-horn, *vaznai*.
- Power, strength, *khamshash* : powerful, *lokmash*.
- Praise, *zhakhe* (cf. name) : praiseworthy, *lotakh* : to praise,
lip'hashdv, lip'hshvdi.
- Pray (to), *lmzuri, linzuri, likhural* : prayer, *lotz* (G.).
- Precipice, *byhvit'h, nadzgvib*.
- Prepare (to), *lmare* ; prepare! (pl.) *lamarad*.
- Present, gift, *sachukar* (G.).
- Press (to), crush, oppress, *linqli*.
- Price, *p'has* (G.).
- Priest, *bap, pap*.
- Prince, *vary* (cf. G. to be worthy), *t'haud*, (G. *t'harad*).
- Princess, lady, *lip'hkel* : princess in fairy tales, *ununl*.
- Prisoner, *tqve* (G.), gen. *tqremi* : to take prisoner, *lrmi*.
- Probably, *gheurd, heurd*.
- Promise, *lip'htze* (cf. G. *p'hitzi*, oath).
- Property, *lemghveni*.
- Provisions, *lezia*.
- Prudence, *lynt'hkhal*.
- Pudendum muliebre, *budum* (cf. *p'hutu*, G. *muteli* and Lat.).
- Pumpkin, *kuakhne*.
- Punishment, *sasdchel* (G.) : to punish, *lisyrdjeli*.
- Pup, *p'hakvna*.
- Pupil, *let'hvri* (cf. teacher).
- Pure, *tsqilian* : purest, *matsquliane* : Holy Ghost, *Tsqilian Qvin*
(cf. soul).
- Purse, *djurdan*.
- Pursue (to), follow, run after, *lyhreeh, lulchem*.
- Put (to), *lidisg, lulesgi, ludi, lyem, lkche, zhilygem* (cf. to
place) : put! (sing.), *eskach, zhatag*, to put on, *laude,*
liktem.
- Quail, *shqazh, shqazhv*.
- Quarrel, *lashal, qarqash, litzual* : to quarrel, *lishal*.
- Queen, *dedp'hal* (G.).

Quickly, *chqard* (G.).

Quiet, *tsqnar* (G.).

Quite, *mehad*.

Quoth he, *eser, roqv, ur, u, v* (cf. affixed G. o).

Rain, *wuchkha, uchkha*.

Rainbow, *detziliartq* (cf. heaven and girdle).

Raise up (to), *likehe*; he raised, *ankache, akhkachin*.

Rake, *lishdik, lap'htzkhur* (G. *p'hotzkhu*).

Ramrod, *chkhur*.

Ransom, *sakhsar*.

Rare, *dut'hkkel*; rarity, *dzvird* (G.).

Raspberry, *ingha, vykh*.

Rat, *madshudai*.

Raven, *ghvemal, dchwer* (? crow).

Raw (beef), *ziskhi* (cf. blood).

Razor, *tzabr, tsab*.

Read (to), *lichvdi*; he read, *tzevikitkha* (G.).

Ready, *lumaral*.

Real, *dadil* (G.) (cf. flower and good).

Reap (to), mow, *liti* (cf. mow); mower (masc.), *myt'hu*.

Recognize (to) (a person), *liter*.

Red, *tzine* (G. *tsit'heli*), *tzunu, tzurni, tzurnu, tsorny*.

Refusal, *var*.

Rejoice (to), *lichone, likhudal*.

Related, *akin, tsam*.

Remain (to), *lised*; he remained, *amsad, asad*; they remained, *amsadkh*.

Remember (to), *zhulishqed, lishqad*; he remembered, *zhilakhshqad*.

Repent (to), *lhdgyre*.

Reproach, *mandrev* (G. *tsaqvedreba*).

Request (a), *shgom, likhyral*.

Resemble (to), *ludchem*; he resembles him, *khudchish*; thou resemblest me, *si madchish*.

Respect (to), *likitzkhar, lishyural*.

Rest (to), *lishen, lishvem, lishuem*; unresting, *vismequli*.

Return (to), come back, *litekh, goshlitekh, limekh*; they returned, *osht'hat'hakh, vont'hakh*; he has returned, *lakhtakh*.

Revile (to), *litsral*.

Rhododendron Caucasicum, *skore* (Imer., Mingr., and Gurian, *shkeri*, ? R. Ponticum).

Rib, *kıp* (G. *tsibo*, cf. thread): ribs, *lesq* (cf. side).

Rich man, *didar* (G. *mdulari*): to become rich, *luddari*.

Ridicule, *litze*: ridiculous, *latzunur* (G. *satzinuri*).

Rifle, *qut'khka*.

Right hand (cf. hand), *lersqven*, *lersqvan*: when of the 1st pers., *mursqven*: on the right, *lerskuankhen*, *lersquamkhen*.

Ring, *muskad*, *myskiad* (cf. blacksmith, wrought iron, horseshoe, chained, fettered).

Ringworm, *mykhchyl*, *lekhechi*.

Ripe, *muli*.

Rise (to), get up, *lignal*.

River, *lts*, *dehala*, *dehalaishu* (cf. water): rivulet. *ltsald*, *tsqaro* (G.), *sarak*, *tubra*, ? *sargel*.

Road, *shuq*, *shuqa*, *shugv*, *shuk*, *shukv*, gen. *shukwi*, pl. nom. *shukwor*: to make a road in the snow, *lichabi*: to make a road, *lishkwi*.

Rob (to), *lughlati* (cf. G. *ghalati*, treachery).

Rock, *kodj*, *qodja*.

Roof, *lyquar*, ? *lasq*.

Root, *behashuam*, *dzir* (G.).

Rope, *t'hoqi*, *t'hoqe* (G. *t'hoct*).

Rose (Rosa sp.), *quari* (G. *vardi*).

Rosy-faced, *p'herish* (G., cf. colour).

Rotten, *mekvre*.

Round, circular, *quabai*, *qirgold*, *murqel*, *myrqual* (G. *mrqali*): round about, *metzkhep'he*.

Row, series, *tzkwer*.

Run, destruction, *khatsa*, *akra*: ruin (building), *merqhrv*.

Run (to), *lichme*, *lichume*, *lnt*: to run away, *liched*.

Rye, *manash* (winter rye), *kale*, *kul* (summer rye).

Sack, *dsadsra*.

Sacrifice (to), *lilyeni*: sacrifice, *lalqena*, *qvizh*.

Sad (to be), *litskhue*.

Saddle, *hunqir* (G.), *kek*: pack-saddle, *kap'h*: to saddle, *lilingre*, *zhulihungiri*.

- Salt, *dchum*; salted, *lydjim*.
 Saltpetre, *quardshili* (cf. *quardjila*).
 Sand, *kuishau*, *krishe* (G. *krisha*): sandy, *krishar*.
 Satiated, *banzar*, *mubiz*.
 Saturday, *Sabt'hm*, *Sap'htin*, *Samtin*.
 Save (to), *lished*.
 Saw, file, *kherkh* (G.).
 Say (to), *hqvisq*, *likvisq*: you told me, *maqred*: I say, *chuidch*;
 he said, *lakhekun*, *qalaqr* (G.), *qakhaqr*, *laqr*, *khaqr*; let
 him say, *khaqres*: what hast thou to say? *ma dchuqhs*
leqvisq?
 Scabbard, *uerchkh*.
 Scarcely, *vedn*.
 Scatter (to), throw, *lishte*, *lishde*, *lygrimbe*.
 Scissors, *t'hurkel*, *t'hrkiud*, *turkate* (G. *maeratel*).
 Screw, *dchakhrak* (G. *khrahkhiñ*).
 Scythe, *merhil*.
 Sea, *dzughva* (G. *zghva*).
 Seal, *bedched* (G. and Russ.).
 Secretly, *ukba*, *uukbad*, *lyupzhunad*, *ushdvind*, *vuqbul*.
 See (to), *litzed*: I saw, *amad*: thou sawest, *dehuljva*, *adjad*: he
 saw, *akhad*, *naukhe* (G. *nakhva*).
 Seed, *lashi*.
 Seek (to), *lat'hkhel*, *lit'hkheh*.
 Seize (to), *lirmi*: they caught, seized him, *ulvrmkh*.
 Seldom, *merkhald*.
 Sell (to), *lifdi*, *lihfdi*: to sell dear, *lihrdi dzvird* (G.): to sell
 cheap, *lihrdi iep'hd* (G.).
 Send (to), *lizzr* *lit'hone*: he sent, *karadzuzr*, *kudzuzr*, *adzuzr*:
 send them here! (sing.), *at'hzuz*.
 September, *Mykakh*.
 Sermon, *qudag* (G. *kudageba*).
 Serpent, *uidch*, *uidcheb*, *uidchelu*, *videl*, *hertsem*, *vich*, *hich*.
 Servant, *moznan*, *p'haml* (? *famulus*), *momsakhvir* (G. *samsak-*
huri); travelling servant, *moyakhl*; maidservant, *moakhl* (G.).
 Serve (to), *lmsakhvre* (G.), *lisp*: I serve, *khvemsakhvre* (G.).
 Seven, *tshgvid* (G. *shvidi*).
 Sew (to), *lishkhibi*, *zhulishkhibi*.
 Shadow, shade, *mahera* (? *chimera*), *mahrera*.

- Shaft of a cart, *markhul* (Arab., G. *markhuli*, sledge).
 Shame, *shyur* (G. *sirtzhkchuli*).
 Sharp, *skyre*.
 Shave (to) (act.), *litsburi* : shaven, *litsbare*.
 Sheaf, *lenchver* (G. *mdcheleuli*).
 Sheath, *verchkh*.
 Shed, *keshq*.
 Sheep (ram), *oluak*, *qholuka*, *qhveluak* : (ewe), *gits*.
 Sheepskin coat, *keesh*.
 Shelter, *sadgem*, *sadgomi*, *sadgum* (G.), *lagua*.
 Shepherd, *muldegh*, *andav*.
 Shining, brilliant, *mykyre*.
 Shirt, *p'hatan*.
 Shoes, *ber*, *chap'hul* : bast shoe, *dehabr* (cf. boots).
 Shoot (to), *mat'hkuep'hi*, *lit'hvep'h* (cf. gun).
 Shore, *pitu*, *dzyid* (G. *cide*).
 Short, *mekvshde*.
 Shoulder, *bardj*, *hardchili*, *lagleash* : shoulder-blade, *lirtqan*,
bardjual.
 Shout, cry, *kil* (G.).
 Shovel, *berq*, *bergyed*, *laghir*, *lakhir*, *kaukhe*, *nichap'h* (G. *nichabi*).
 to shovel snow from the roof, *lilghahi*.
 Shut (to), *lunkhuemi*.
 Sickle, *nashtak*, *nashtk*.
 Sickness, *lize* (cf. disease).
 Side, *t'hqeb*, *lesq* (ribs) : from that side, *echkhen* : from this side,
ankhen : on that side, *echkhan*.
 Silent (to be), *lechume* (G.), *likutse*.
 Silk, *qadch*.
 Silver, *vorchkhil* (G. *certskhli*) : silversmith, *vorchkhuli mshkid* ;
 made of silver, *vorchkhulish*, *tsqenlish*.
 Sin, *tsodv* (G.), *tsod*, pl. *tsodar*.
 Sing, *lighral* (cf. play).
 Sister, *dachvir*, pl. *dachura*, *adil*, pl. *lavdila* (cf. G. *da*).
 Sister-in-law (daughter-in-law), *t'helyhra*, pl. *lot'helyhra*.
 Sit (to), *lsgere*, *lsgvre*, *zhulisqvre* : sit down ! (pl.), *chesgurdal* ;
 he was sitting down, *lakhsgurda* : he sat down, *zhilakhs-*
gurda : mounted man, *lalsgura*.
 Six, *usqua*, *usgua*, *usgra* (G. *ekrst*).

- Sixty, *uusqvashd*, *rusqvashd*.
 Skin, hide, *t'hup'h*, *tup'h* (*qrare*), *kesh*.
 Skinny, thin, *djaghm*.
 Skirt, *kalt'ha* (G.).
 Skull, *t'hkhrimi haqar*.
 Sky, *detz*, *deg*.
 Slab of stone, *sbendik*.
 Slave, *p'hamli* (cf. Lat. *famulus*), *qlek'h* (G.) (cf. *servant*).
 Sledge, *sau*, *sava*, *sar* (cf. Russ. *sa-ni*).
 Sleep, *uzh* : sleepy, *makluar* : to sleep, *lvzhe* ; to put to sleep, *lvzhune* (*vzh* in the verb is *uzh* in the noun).
 Sleeve, *dchvenczh*.
 Slip (to), *lqeb*, *lvzert*.
 Slipper, *koshul*.
 Slope of a mountain, *p'hap'hal* (cf. *ascent*).
 Slowly, *tsquard* (G.), *t'hamashd*.
 Small, fine, *netsm* (? G. *nazi*), *khokhra*.
 Smallpox, *mughvai*, *bogir* : pock-marked, *namghavar*, *nabygir* (*mughvai*, flowers, so in G. flowers and smallpox are both *khvarilni*).
 Smell, odour, *qrin*, *kuin* (cf. *soul*) : to smell, *likhane* ; there was a smell of, *lamkanda*.
 Smith, *mushkid* ; smithy, *lashkldash*.
 Smoke, *kuam* (G. *crامل*) : to smoke (of a chimney), *likuami* ; to smoke tobacco, *t'hut'huni lit'hre* (i.e. to drink).
 Snaffle, *heghrir*.
 Sneeze (to), *lichchkhune*.
 Snore (to), *likhyrtune*, *lit'hkholi*.
 Snow, *mus*, dm. *musul*, *shtur* ; snowstorm, *kuse* (? also snow-drift) ; frozen snow, *hol* (cf. *ice*) : to snow, *lishulve* ; it is snowing, *shlure* ; to make a road in the snow, *lichabi* ; snowshoes, *tkilmare*.
 Snub-nosed, *bant'ha*.
 So much, *adjzum*, *amzum*, *echsheld* (cf. *number*).
 Socks, *kheral*.
 Sofa, *lurgim* (cf. *couch* and for root, *round*).
 Soft, *menshyve*, *menshgrar*.
 Sole of foot or boot, *ghokerid*.
 Solid, durable, *p'harsaq*.

- Somebody, *darghal*, *er*, *ere*, *urvale*.
 Something, *mæsesir*, *invale*, *male*, *urma*.
 Sometimes, *esesny*, *esesin*, *khuat dinas* (cf. much).
 Son, *gezal* (adult), *bep'hsh* (boy): adopted son, *gezabl lugne*:
 son-in-law, *chizhe*, pl. *chizhal* and *lachzha*.
 Song, *lighral* (G. *simghera*) (cf. play and sing), *layral*.
 Sorcerer, *qal* (cf. medicine man).
 Soul, *qvin*, *kuin* (cf. smell: in Mingrelian *shuri* has also this
 double sense, and cf. *dukh* in Russ.).
 Sour, *zhav* (G. *mzhave*), *mokhim* (G. *tsmakhi*).
 Sow (to), *lilashi* (cf. seed).
 Sow, *nezv*, *nezu* (G.).
 Span, *kamin* (cf. hand).
 Sparrow, *quinch*.
 Speak (to), say, *limbari*, *lunwal*, *ligurgali*. *lrygal* (cf. say)
 (cf. G. *ambari*); speak! say! (sing.), *khonubar*.
 Spend (to), *likhirdjari* (G.), *likhmari*: to squander, *libake*.
 Spider, ? *op'hop'hai* (in G. *op'hop'hi*, hoopoe).
 Spirit, *qvin* (cf. soul).
 Spirits, liquor, *haraq* (G.).
 Spit (for cooking), *shampurur* (G.), and cf. ramrod in Russ.
 Spit (to), *litbyne*: to spit upon, *khatbuna*.
 Spoil (to), damage, *lrashvi*.
 Spoon, *kis* (G. *covzi*).
 Spring, fountain, *mazuab*, *mæzvab*, *sarak* (*keed*).
 Springtime, *lup'hkhr*, *kamlizal*.
 Spur, *des* (G. *dezi*).
 Staff, stick, club, *lakht*: ironshod staff, *mudchrra* (cf. alpenstock).
 Stag, *lachu*, *lachv*.
 Stammerer, *bekrai* (G. *brgu*, *brqvil*).
 Stand (to), *lugne*: standing, *meqne*: I stand, *mi khvag*: thou
 standest, *si khag*: he stands, *alcha khag*.
 Star, *ant'hkhuask* (G. *varscravri*), *antqvsqa*, *antqvash*.
 Starling, *parpand*.
 Stay (to), *lised* (cf. remain).
 Steal (to), *likt'her*: they stole, *t'hkut'hkh*.
 Steel, *p'holal* (G.).
 Steel for striking fire, *mort'har*, *lakhach*, *lakrech*.
 Steep, *kach*, *tsap'hkh*.

- Stern, severe, *mukhdji*.
- Stick, *p'hawu*, *p'havu*.
- Stinking, *mukvnia* (cf. smell).
- Stirrup, *avzhand*, *abzhand* (G. *avzhandu*).
- Stocking (of cloth), *ber* (cf. shoe).
- Stomach, *madchik*.
- Stone, *bach*, *lurn*, *mukokh*: big stone, boulder, *gurna* (cf. granite): white stone, *mugkhu*; stony, *bachaar*.
- Stool (three-legged), *bolchq*.
- Store, provision, *khordchi* (G.), *leziz*.
- Storm, *maota*, *bikhr*.
- Story-teller, narrator, *membualdu* (cf. speak).
- Straight, direct (adv.), *metsvind*.
- Straw, *chal* (G.), *part*.
- Strawberry, *basq*.
- Strength, *khamsha*.
- Stretch (to), *lyt'hkhune*, *libit*: stretched, *lugzune*: in order to stretch, *lagt'hkhunad*.
- Strike (to), *likulp'hi*; I strike, *qaliqulp'hi*: he struck, *kakhakhud*.
- Stroke, *naqer* (G.).
- Strong, *badayi*, *lok mash*, *lykh mash*, *mayar* (G.), *bygr*.
- Stump, *bik*.
- Stupid, *udjkriv* (G.): stupidity, *umbazh*, *ulchkriv* (cf. wit).
- Succeed (to); he succeeded, *adjisr*.
- Such, *amguar* (G.).
- Suck (to), *litssdan*; suckling, *isgamechem*.
- Suddenly, *esnar*.
- Suffer (to), *lit'hmine* (G.).
- Suffice (to), *lur*: it will be enough for us, *qayvar*.
- Sugar, *shakar* (G.).
- Suit (to), *limarg*.
- Sulphur, *gogir* (G. *gogirdi*).
- Summer, *zai*, *anzar* (cf. year).
- Summit, *t'hkhum* (cf. head), *kvindchil*.
- Sun. *muzh*, *mizh* (G. *mze*), ? *mlok*; sunlight, *mizhi narhi*, *mizhimnarhi*: sunrise, *mizhi lakhad*, *mizhi latsad*; sunset, *mizhi lahar*, *mizhi laz*; eclipse of the sun, *mizhi libure*.
- Sunday, *Mishladeq* (cf. sun and day).

Superfluous, *masar*, *nametan* (G.).

Supper, *vakhsham* (G.).

Surprised (to be), *liskvrale*: he was surprised, *at'hsokvralunda*.

Surround (to), *litskhep'h*: to be surrounded, *litskhap'h*: he surrounded, *akhtskhep'ha*.

Suspect (to), *librali* (G.).

Svanetia, *Shvon*: Svanetian, *Mushir*, *Mushvri*. native of Svanetia, *mushran*.

Swallow, *shdaval*.

Swallow (to), *lirtqvi*.

Sweet, *mudchkhvi*, *khoja gomasch* (i.e. good taste).

Swelling, tumour, *myskir*.

Swiftness, *lynchkar* (G.).

Swim (to), *litzrevi*.

Sword, *dashna*, dim. *dashni* (G.), *khmal* (G.): hilt, *mudchr*: blade, *berezh* (cf. iron); edge, *uishkr*.

Table, *tabag* (G.), *stol* (Russ.); round table with three legs, *p'hichk*: tablecloth, *chithish tabag*.

Tail, *hakved*, *hakvad*.

Take (to), *liked*, *lipshe*, *li*, *libishd*; let us take, *lelkuded*: he took, *enie*, *adie*; take! (sing.), *atkha*: to take out, *lishgvne*, *litkhe*; they took out, *it'hkhekh*; to take away, *lkhi*, *lyhu*. he took away, *emkhin*: to take off, *likche*, *likeidi*: he took off, *chokhokida*.

Tall, *khocha tamish* (cf. great and *tani* G., form).

Tape, ribbon, *suinai* (G. *zonari*).

Tar, *p'hise* (G. *p'hisi*).

Tea, *chan* (G. *chai*).

Teach (to), *lit'hvri* (cf. pupil): teacher, *mat'hvri*.

Tear, *kun*, pl. *kumrar*, *kim*: to shed (throw) tears, *likvane*.

Tear off (to), *litqrp'he*.

Teat, nipple, *lus*, *lyus*, *dudul* (G. *dzudz*).

Telescope, spyglass, *millionka*, *milyuen*.

Tell (to), say, *lqvrsq*, *limbu*, *likiadi* (cf. say, speak): tell me! *mekrt'h*, *grebt'h* (sing.), *akhambuet'h* (pl.); they told, *kokhumbarekh*: you told me, *maqved*: he will tell thee, *dcheqvni*.

Temple (of the head), *laghachir*.

- Ten, *eshl*.
- Tether (to), *libem* (G. *lma*, to bind); the tethered horse broke loose, *lube chazhd anqrts*: he is tethered, *khab*.
- Thank (to), *likhuami*.
- Thankful (to be), *libazh*: he will be grateful, *khebzh*.
- That (dem.), *edchi* (G. *ese*).
- Thaw (to), melt, *lpzhune*.
- Then, at that time, *enrdiser*, *echka*, *echkas*, *achqa*.
- Thence, *echon*, *echkhan*.
- There, *chughal*, *echichu*, *echo* (a long way off), *echo*, *echau*, *echkhe*, *echechvin* (near at hand).
- They, *adjar*, *edjar*, *min*: their, *adjaresh*; them, *mine*.
- Thick, *skel* (G. *skeli*).
- Thief, *kvit'h*.
- Thigh, *p'hoq*.
- Thimble, *sat'hat'hr* (G. *sat'hit'huri*) (cf. finger).
- Thin, *netsin* (cf. small), *dotchol*: to grow thin, *chulichkhep'h*, *lichkhep'h*: I have grow thin, *chvochkhap'h*.
- Think (to), *lichne*, *lichkvani*: they thought, *eschmekh*: let him not think! *garesen*.
- Third, *mesma* (G. *mesame*).
- Thirst, *map'hun*: to thirst, *lp'hne*: thirsty, *ubza*.
- This, *al*, *ali*, *ala*, *ale*, *am*, *ami* (G.).
- Thither, *enqad*, *echad* (a long way off), *echkhar* (near at hand), *echkhan*.
- Thorn, *tzaq*.
- Thou, *si*.
- Thought, opinion, mind (*azri* G.), *sazr*.
- Thread, *kip*, *kip'h* (see rib).
- Threaten (to), *likhuznal*.
- Three, *semi* (G. *sami*): thrice, *samdchel* (G.).
- Threshing-floor, *kerr*, *kiarir*, *kal*: to thresh, *liklari*.
- Throat, *qunchkh*, *qia* (G. *qeli*), *kharkh* (G. *qarqanto*).
- Through, *lisga*.
- Throw (to), *likvane*, *liqvane*, *lp'hshtra*, *lishde*. *likvri*: he threw, *adkvar*, *akhp'husht*: I shall throw, *ot'hqvane*: thrown, *meshde*.
- Thrust in (to), *ludzgrin*, *litzqere*.
- Thunder, to thunder, *lirkhunai*: lightning, *meqh* (G.).

- Thursday, *Tsash*, *Tzaush*.
 Thus, *adjzhin*, *adjzhu*, *ash*, *esh* (G. *aset'hi*).
 Thy, *isgu*, *iskcu*, *isqui*, *isqua*, *isquau*, *isgye*.
 Tick (insect), *dchghubar*.
 Time, *dreu*, *drrev* (G. *droeba*), *ona*, *khan* (G.).
 Tin, *kaliai* (? *Gallia*) (G. *caha*).
 Tinder, *hobed* (G. *abedi*).
 Tired (to be), *lip'hash*.
 To, at, *tsakhan* (suffix).
 Tobacco, *t'hut'hi*, *t'hut'hyn*.
 To-day, *ladi*, *ladyhi* (cf. day).
 Toe (see finger).
 Together, *ashkhvd*: we went together, *na ashkhvd ochadd*.
 To-morrow, *mukhar*, *makhar*, *mkhar*: day after to-morrow,
mykhar echkhan (cf. thence).
 Tongue, *nin* (G. *ena*).
 To-night, *bazi*.
 Too much, *suru*.
 Tooth, *sh'thuq*, *shduk*, *shty*; molar, *lelygy* (cf. heart); tooth-
 ache, *shtygre mazy* (cf. disease).
 Touch (to), *libik*, *lp'hde*.
 Towel, *laktzan*, *pirsakhots* (G.).
 Tower, *murqam*, *murkma*, *muqam*, *qoshq* (Turk.).
 Town, *kalak* (G.).
 Trace, track, *nazu*.
 Trade (to), *lighvchari* (G. *vajari*, merchant).
 Transform (to), *hspe*.
 Translate (to), interpret, *ht'hirymani* (G.).
 Tree, *meqan*, *meqham*: trunk, *dchuk*.
 Tribe, *t'hem* (G. *t'homi*).
 Tripod, three-legged stool, *bodchy*.
 Trouble (to), *lp'hesh*; do not trouble thyself, *nun p'heshem*;
 do not trouble yourselves, *nom p'heshnu*.
 Trough, *sarqil* (? root, *rq*, cf. round).
 Trousers, *sakhshur*, *sakhshvir*.
 Truth, *samtsan*: in truth, really, *tkitad*; it is true, *samtzvud*.
 Tuesday, *T'haqush*, *T'hakhesh*, *T'hakhat*.
 Tumbler (wooden), *kat'hkh*, *p'haken*.
 Tumour, swelling, *myshy* (cf. swelling).

- "Tur" (*Ægoceros Pallasii*), *ghvash*, *ghuash*, *uasher*, *qvitsra*.
 Turkey-cock, *qyrma*, *quich*; turkey-hen, *qyrma kat'hal*.
 Turn (to) (intr.), *lisip*.
 Tusk, *kil*, *lelqui* (cf. tooth, molar).
 Twelve, *ieshtieru*, *eshdyerri*.
 Twenty, *yarveshd*.
 Twist (to), *litsurkhi*, *lispune*.
 Two, *veri*, *yerri* (G. *ori*).
 Uncle (on father's side), *buba*; (on mother's side), *pidzai*.
 Under, underneath, *chuqa*, *chukvan*, *chubal*.
 Undying, *udgara* (cf. die).
 Unexpectedly, *t'hei*.
 Unhappy, *sabral* (G.), *sabrila*, *sabrala*, *ubdevr* (G. *ubeduri*).
 Universe, *kveqana* (G.); universal, *abuasti*.
 Unpleasant, *maidchale* (cf. ? *maul*, hunger).
 Unripe, *ughu*, *uha*.
 Unsuitable, it is unsuitable, *mat'hkhuqa* (? cf. not and necessary)
 Until, *echkad*, *rod*.
 Up, *zhubar*, *zhikan*.
 Upon, *lokhkrem*.
 Upper, *zhibe*; upper floor, *darbaz* (G.).
 Upright, *kach* (on end).
 Urine, *nasen*.
 Useful (to be), *lmkakhai*; useful, *sargeb* (G.).
 Useless, in vain, *ughuri*, *tsvidd*.
 Ushkulian (native of Ushkul), *Mursjgril*.
 Vain (in), to no purpose, *tsvidd* (G. *tzudad*): vam chatter, *tsvidi muqurgali* (cf. speak).
 Valley, *mindori* (G.).
 Variegated, *chirel* (G.).
 Vein, *dsarghual* (G. *dzarghvi*).
 Velvet, *khaveril* (G.).
 Very, *qun*, *gunu*, *suru* (cf. too much), *mawar*, *mevar*.
 Victory, *ltsre*.
 Village, *sop'hel* (G.); village green, *sup'h*, *svip'h*; member of village council of twelve, *mybari*.
 Vine, *vaz* (G.); vineyard, *menakh* (G. *venakhi*); grapes, *qudzen* (G.).

Vinegar, *dzmar* (G.).

Voice, *tq̄bɪp'h* (cf. noise), *ker*.

Vomiting, *lishkhuue*.

Wail, lamentation, *zar* (G. and Pers.).

Waist, *lartqa* (cf. girdle).

Wait (to), *ldranal*, *lighlt*, *lighalve*; he waits, *khedranal*: he waited, *ighalva*.

Wake up (to) (intr.), *litskhne*, *litskhine*, *lietzkh*: they woke (themselves) up, *t'hotskhustakh*: to wake up (trans.), rouse, *litzkhuue*.

Walk (to), *lizelal*, *izelal*, *lezna*: walking, *mezalal*.

Wall, *chvad*.

Walnut (*Juglans regia*), *gak*, *kak* (G. *cacali*).

Want (to), wish: I want, *mitzya*.

War, *lashkrianob* (G.) (cf. army): warrior, *lamarynash*.

Warm, *tebdi* (G.).

Wash (to), oneself, *lbral*, *labral*; he was washing himself, *ibralda*: to wash clothes, *lishq̄edi*.

Wasp, *bızık*.

Watchman, guard, *melcha*, *qarvil* (G. *qaraul*).

Water, *lits*, *nuts* (cf. river); to bring water, *litsı*; water running through a trough or conduit, *savaq* (cf. spring): mineral water, *skim*, *sgimer*: to water, *lit'hrne*: water-carrier, *myltsı*: waterfall, *mach*, *khap'h* (G.): water-jug, *rokhar*.

Wax, *djvid*.

We, *na*, *nai*.

Weak, *umbets*; weakness, *listve*.

Wealth, *qet'hil* (G. *cehili*, good), *lymdudre* (G. *simdudre*).

Weapons, *havedch*, *ıraqhu* (G.) (cf. arms).

Weather, *dar* (G.): good weather, *khocha dar*: bad weather, *khola dar*.

Wedding, *qortzil*, *krertsil* (G.).

Wedge, *t'hal*.

Wednesday, *Dchimash*.

Week, *nagzi*, *nagza*.

Weep (to), *ligvni*: I weep, *khvıqcu*: he weeps, *ırvni*.

Weigh (to), *litsni* (G.).

Well, *khochamd* (cf. good).

- West, *lekva*, *dasavlet'h* (G.); westward, *lakva*.
- Wet, *zyski*; to wet, *lizhre*; moist, moisture, *myzhir*.
- What, *ma* (G. *ra*), *mai*, *maghal*, *maroq*, *im*: what art thou doing? *im khicho?*
- Wheat, *kuetsen*, *quetzen*, *diar* (bread): winter wheat, *namzhghor*.
- Wheel, *barbedl*.
- When, *zhilakh*, *shoma*, *lakh*, *lakhasa*.
- Whence, *iman*, *imkhan*.
- Where, *imeq*, *imegue*, *imera*, *ime*.
- Whetstone, *lasheer*.
- Whey, *tsak*.
- Which, *khedu*.
- Whilst, *zhi* (as suffix to verbal noun).
- Whip, *mudrakh*, *madrag* (G. *matrakhi*).
- White, *t'het'hne*, *t'het'hna*, *t'heet'hvne* (G. *t'het'hri*): white stone, *mygkhu*: whitish, *mot'ht'hwan*: whiter, *khot'ht'hwana*: whitest, *mat'ht'hwana*.
- Whither, *imar*, *im'he*.
- Who, *ur*: to whom, *ias*: whose, *isha*.
- Whortleberry (*Vaccinium myrtillus*), *melgumi* (*Vaccinium arctostaphylos*), *tzinka*.
- Why, *ma*, *mggha*, *mgghar*, *mgghesr*: why not, *kaimghadom*.
- Wide, *lygan*, *masheri*: to widen, stretch, *limshari*: widened, *lumshare*.
- Widow (to become a), *likrvive* (G.).
- Wife, *khekhr*, *iekhul*, *iekhrt*, *ekhrt*, *oekh*: wives, *lalukhva*: house of wife's family, *lamtil*.
- Willow (*Salix* sp.), *bagura* (the tall broad-leaved variety), *qunchish* (bush).
- Wind, *bike* (cf. storm), *biyk*, *biklo*.
- Window, *lakvra*, *lakhvra*, *lakhura*, *sennar*.
- Wine, *ghvinal*, *ghvine*, *ghvinol* (G. *ghvino*): wine-cellar, *kets*: Eucharistic wine, *zedash*.
- Winter, *lnt'hr*, *amhnt'hr*.
- Wish, desire, *hadv*: to wish, *hkred*: I wish, *gvimar* (cf. have and heart): I do not wish, *mamaqu*: thou wishest, *djaku*: thou wishedst, *dchekuad*: they wish, *khakud*. I wish, *mi maku*: thou wishest, *si dchaku*: he wishes, *achas khaku*.
- Wit, intelligence, *bazh*, *dchkuiv* (G. *dchkua*), *tqel*.

Witch, *gudmetsar*.

Without, *u* as prefix and *ad* as suffix, e.g. *udharad*, without bread.

Wolf, *t'hkhere*, *t'hkherem*, *t'khhare*, *t'hkheril*.

Woman, *zural*.

Wood, forest, *tzkhek* (G. *tqe*): wood, firewood, *zek*: wooden, *zekish*, *meqmemish* (cf. tree).

Woodpecker, *muqune*, *maquna*.

Wool, *matq* (G. *matqli*); woollen cloth. *shart'lkvin*.

Word, *naku*.

Work, *lmshai* (G. *mushaoba*), *lyirdje*: to work, *lmshiel*.

World, *qreqana* (G.).

Worm, *myt* (G. *matli*).

Worthless, *leg* (cf. bad).

Wound, *lyqach*: to wound, *lkchen*: wounded, *lukach*: he wounded, *chadkache*.

Wrath, *riskhc* (G.).

Wrinkled, *lukhudche*.

Wrist, *mekhra*.

Write (to), *lm* (cf. book).

Yard, farmyard, courtyard, *hazv*, *haz* (G. *ezo*), *sup'hil*: churchyard. *sasp'hlar* (G.).

Yawn (to), *lkshiel*.

Year, *za*, *zai*, *zau* (cf. summer).

Yellow, *qvit'hel* (G.).

Yes, *adu*, *ho* (G.).

Yesterday, *lat'h*; day before yesterday, *squebi ludeqh* (cf. day).

Yield (to), *lyqekh*.

Yoke, *ughva* (G. *ugheli*).

You, *sqā*, *sqai*: your, *isqvi*.

Young, *makhe*, *ghvazhi* (G. *vazhi*): younger, *khokhra*, *mayhrene*: young man, *makhe uazh*.

XVII

THE MAZALIM JURISDICTION IN THE AHKAM SULTANIYYA OF MAWARDI

By H. F. AMEDROZ

MĀWARDI'S chapter on the office of *Kāḍī* in the *Aḥkām Sultāniyya*, ed. Enger, dealt with in *JRAS.*, 1910, p. 761, is followed by that on *Walāyat-al-Maḥālim*: the substance of this chapter is as follows.

The *Maḥālim* jurisdiction is defined as compelling those who would do each other wrong — *mutaḥālimān* — to mutual justice, and restraining litigants from repudiating claims by inspiring fear and awe in them. The moral qualities required in the person exercising the jurisdiction are set out: practically he is to combine vigilance with firmness (p. 129). Viziers and governors with full powers¹ have the jurisdiction inherent in them; if their power be restricted, they require a special mandate; and, inasmuch as the jurisdiction is general in scope, the nominee must be apt for the offices of successor-designate to the Caliphate, vizier, or governor of a large province. If, however, the jurisdiction be restricted to supplementing the deficient authority of the *Kāḍīs*, persons of lesser rank are eligible so long as no suspicion of injustice or bribery attach to them.

The jurisdiction was exercised by the Prophet in the case of a dispute about priority of right to irrigation, and his decision, given in resentment at an imputation of favouritism, is variously regarded, either as a positive rule or a permission.

¹ The distinction in a vizier's powers is explained by Ostorog, *Aḥkām Sultāniyya*, i, 197 ff.

The omission of the four succeeding Caliphs to exercise the jurisdiction (p. 130) is attributed to the sufficiency of moral sanctions in the early age of Islām, when doubtful questions were solved by the Kāḍī, whilst Arab lawlessness yielded to admonition and reproof. Their enforcement of the judicial sanction was submitted to: nevertheless, 'Alī in the later and disturbed days of his reign felt the need of¹ firmer rule and a closer adherence to the niceties of legal forms, and he did not have recourse to this jurisdiction. Two decisions of his are mentioned.²

After his time open acts of lawlessness necessitated recourse to a form of jurisdiction (p. 131) in which the vigour of the executive arm was combined with an observance of judicial principles. 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān was the first to fix a day for going into the case of persons complaining of unjust treatment (*mutu-ẓālimūn*) — not hearing them in person, but by his Kāḍī Abu Idrīs, who, in dread of his master's close knowledge and attention, cleared up doubtful points and did what was necessary to enforce the decrees made.

Later the number of excesses on the part of governors and other insubordinate persons called for firm and effective repression, and the first Caliph to sit in person in the Mazālim Court was 'Omar b 'Abd al-'Azīz, who checked acts of injustice by members of the ruling family, repressing them severely, and that in spite of the fear of their retaliating on him. Succeeding Caliphs also sat in person, from Mahdi to Muḥtadī,³ and restored to

¹ For *فصل*, p. 130, l. 7, read *فصل*, as also *Cairo*, 74, l. 7.

² One of them seems to turn on contributory negligence: it is explained in the *Lisān*, viii, 338, l. 1. The other, which seems akin to the Judgment of Solomon, is described as amounting to a settlement of the law.

³ For the Caliph's zeal and efficiency in this duty see *Tab.*, iii, 1736, l. 11, and *Mas'ūdī*, viii, 21. He used to have the Court warmed for the suitors' convenience (*Buhārī*, *Mahā-sin wa Mas'ūri*, 577, l. 17). A decision by him on giving bounty out of the poor rate is mentioned in *Hilāl*, *Wazirā*, 222.

rightful owners their property according to the practice of the Persian sovereigns (pp. 132-4) and of the Kuraish tribe, whose efforts before Islām to repress acts of violence by means of concerted action by the various tribes led to the creation of the "Hilf al-Fuḍūl",¹ to which the Prophet by his approval gave legal sanction.

Unless the Judge (*nāẓir*) be appointed exclusively to deal with Mazālim matters he should assign to these certain fixed days when the parties should attend, leaving the rest of his time to his other duties. He should be accessible to people, and his Court should include these five sets of persons: (p. 135) Guards (*ḥāmi* and *'aun*), for the use of necessary force; judicial persons (*kāḍi* and *ḥākim*), for ascertaining the principles of law and the procedure applicable; jurists (*faqīh*), as referees on doubtful or difficult points; scribes (*kātib*), to note down what passes between the parties, and what is decided for or against them; and approved witnesses (*shāhid*), to show by evidence where the right lies and what the judgment should be.

Matters proper for the cognizance of the Mazālim tribunal are next specified under ten heads—

1. Acts of injustice and tyranny committed against people by Governors (*wāli*), a matter essentially the province of this Court, whose duty it is to scrutinize their actions very closely with a view to encouraging or restraining the same, or, if necessary, superseding the Governor. And an extract is given from the first pulpit

¹ See Lane, 2412^c, Aghāni, xvi. 65-6, and Ibn Khall., transl. iii, 611, n. 4. The origin of the league is also stated by Makrīzi, *Muqaffā* (Paris, Ar. 2144, 191^a), in the life of 'Abd Allah b. Jad'ān, at whose house the Prophet is said to have witnessed the compact. Here the term "Fuḍūl", said by Lane, 2412^c, to be of uncertain meaning, is explained on the authority of al-Zuhri (Ibn Khall., Sl. Eng. ii, 581); the two existing leagues, the Mutatayyibin and the Aḥlāf (Lane, 1902^b) having refused from mutual fear to assist a wronged man, the Kuraish said:

تعالوا ولنكن حلقة فصولاً دون المتطّيبين ودون الاحلاف

address of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, in which he refers to denials of justice on the part of Governors.¹

2. (p. 136) Injustice in the levying of taxes, to be remedied on the just principles which governed the administration of the early Caliphs, any excessive levy to be refunded by the Treasury, or by the revenue official if he has retained it. Muhtadi² had occasion to consider the question of the sufficiency of payments of taxes made in the coins of Khosroes, and the history of the matter was explained to him by Sulaimān b. Wab̄b (his vizier, Ibn Khall, Sl. Eng. i. 597). 'Omar had made the land-tax of sundry conquered provinces payable in coin, and coin of that date was struck on either the Persian or the Byzantine model. Payment was habitually made by number without regard to the coins' actual weight. With the decay of primitive virtue the "Ṭabari" dinars, which contain but four dānaḡ, were alone paid in, whilst those of full weight were retained.³ Ziyād, when Governor of Irāk, required payment to be made in coin of full weight and imposed liability

¹ p. 135. l. 3 a.f., for حتى اقتدى منهم قداً Cairo, 76. l. 6 a r., reads حتى اقتدى منهم قداً the sense being that Governors denied justice until it had to be purchased from them, and distributed injustice (*al-būḡ*) until it had to be avoided "by the payment of ransom".

² "Mahdi" in both texts, but clearly an error, for in both the name appears correctly at the story's close; moreover, Sulaimān b. Wab̄b was contemporary, not with Mahdi, but with Muhtadi.

³ In an account of 'Abd al-Malik's coinage in a MS. which is probably part of the *Muntazam* of Ibn al-Jauzi, given on the authority of Waki', d. A.H. 197 (Nawawi, 614), the equivalent of Māwādi's Ṭabari dirham is the *ḡariyya*, the Ṭabari there weighing, not four, but nearly five *dānaḡ*. The text is as follows:—

و ضرب الدنانير عبد الملك وأما الدراهم فكانت ثلاث أصناف
الواقفة وهي البغلية وزن الدرهم الواحد مثقال والصف الأخر المجرية
وزن الواحد نصف مثقال وكان يُتعامَل بيا في المشرق والصف
الثالث منها الطبرية وزن العشرة منها ستة مثاقيل فجمع عبد الملك

for deficiency—an injustice which was continued by the Omayyad Governors, and, after the adjustment of the coinage under 'Abd al-Malik, also by al-Hajjāj and onwards, except under the second 'Omar, who discontinued it. Under Maṣṣūr the desolation of the *Sawād* led to the tax being levied mainly in kind instead of in money, and this was still the case as to most of the crops (p. 137). On hearing these facts Muhtadi, in spite of an anticipated loss of revenue to the amount of twelve million dirhams, refused to follow the practice described, and ordered the deficiency not to be exacted.

3. Supervising the acts of the secretaries of the Government offices (*dīwān*), since they are in a fiduciary position towards Moslems in respect of what they receive and disburse from their property: they should therefore be kept strictly to rule, all irregularities in their receipts or outgoings restrained, and all excesses punished. Maṣṣūr is recorded to have chastised forgery and alterations on the part of this class of officials.

The foregoing three heads of complaint can be dealt with in the absence of an actual complainant (p. 138).

4. Claims by regular troops in respect of reduction in, or withholding of, their pay. These should be closely attended to, and the proper sum to be allowed should be settled by the Diwān, unpaid arrears to be made good either by the officials, if accountable, or by the Treasury. Ma'mūn declared that mutinous movements among his troops would cease on their being promptly paid, and saw this done.

5. Restoring property taken by force. If the taking be official and be the act of an unjust governor with the

الثلاثة الاصناف عشرة عشره فصارت ثلاثون درهما عددًا ووزنًا احدى وعشرون وثنثالاً فصير السبعة عشرة

(BM. Add. 7320, 30b.)

والطبرى ثلثا الدرهم وهو اربعة

دوانيق شامية يستعملها اهل نصيبين

The *Tāj*, iii, 355, l. 4 a.f., has:

object either of acquiring the property or of spiting its owner, then, if the act be manifest on inquiry into the case, restoration may be ordered forthwith: otherwise only after complaint made, when the matter may be referred to the Dīwān, and if the seizure be registered there¹ restoration may be ordered without further proof, the entry in the register being sufficient (p. 139). A case is mentioned where ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-Aziz acted on this view.

On the other hand, if the taking be by private act of violence and arrogated power, redress must be preceded by a complaint, and restoration must be justified, (*a*) by the wrongdoer’s admission: or, (*b*) by the Court’s own knowledge, which is sufficient to proceed upon; or, (*c*) by proof adduced either of the violent seizure or of the complainant’s title: or, (*d*) by the concurrent effect of the whole evidence, coupled with the absence of any suspicion of collusion or of doubt, for such corroborating evidence being receivable in cases of title to immovables (*amlāk*) it may *a fortiori* be acted upon by the Mazālim Court.

6. The case of pious foundations (*wakf*), whether public or private. The former should be supervised even in the absence of complaint, and be brought into conformity with their declared objects. These are to be gathered from the register of legal decisions kept for the purpose; or from the state register as shown by the dealings (*mu‘āmalat*) or entries (*thibt*) recorded there; or (p. 140) from relevant documents rendered trustworthy by reason of their age, although not regularly deposited to by approved witnesses, inasmuch as there is no precise question at issue, and the jurisdiction here is wider than in the case of private foundations. In these a plaint on some disputed point is requisite to enable the Court to act, and no reliance can be placed on the state register and its entries, nor on

¹ That the register in question was that of the Dīwān al-Šawāfi, or confiscated estates, is shown by the case before ‘Omar.

old documents unless they be confirmed by approved testimony.

7. Enforcing decisions given by the Kādi which have remained unenforced by reason of the overmastering arrogance and position of a defendant. In such a case the Mazālim Court, having the greater means of compulsion, should proceed against the party in fault either by ousting him from his possession or compelling him to perform his obligation.

8. Open evil doing which the Muhtasib is not strong enough to repress¹; this should be restrained in accordance with revealed law, and the wrongdoers should be brought to account.

9. The care of public worship, and of religious practices in general, and seeing to the due performance and observance of the same.

10. The hearing and decision of disputes generally, in which cases (p. 141) the decision must proceed in accordance with the law as administered by the ordinary Judges (*kādi* and *hākim*), for it often happens that the Mazālim Court misconceives its jurisdiction and oversteps proper limits.

Next are set out, under ten heads, the respects in which the jurisdiction of this tribunal differs from that of the Kādi's Court.

1. Superiority in dignity and power, enabling it to check groundless denials on the part of litigants and restrain acts of violence on the part of wrongdoers.

2. A jurisdiction wider and more unfettered, both in scope of action and in sentence.

3. Greater power of intimidation and of eliciting and getting at the facts of the case, a task which judges find difficult, and of thus arriving at the truth.

4. Power of checking open wrongdoing and visiting overt transgression with correction and discipline.

¹ The Ḥiṣba jurisdiction is the subject of chapter xx (Enger, p. 404).

5. Power of deliberation, by recalling the litigants to attend when a case is doubtful and making searching inquiry into the facts, whereas a *Ḳāḍī* is bound to adjudicate when required to do so by a litigant without any such delay.

6. Power to refer the litigants, if they be obstinate, to an *amīn*, as referee, to settle the dispute without the need of any consent, whereas the *Ḳāḍī* can do this only by consent of the parties (p. 142).

7. Full power of securing the attendance of a litigant (*mulāzumu*) in cases where an absence of good defence is apparent, and of requiring security when that is admissible, to the furtherance of justice and discouragement of false defences.

8. Power to hear the evidence of persons leading a retired life (*mustūrīn*) on matters beyond the *Ḳāḍī*'s means of knowledge, through approved witnesses.

9. Power of putting the witnesses on oath where they seem to be wanting in their duty from complaisance, or where their number is very great, so as to remove doubt and suspicion. This again a judge (*ḥākim*) has no power to do.

10. Power, at the outset, to summon the witnesses and to interrogate them as to their knowledge of the dispute, whereas the practice of the *Ḳāḍī* is to require the complainant to bring forward his witnesses, and they are heard only after being examined by the complainant.

These are the main points of difference between the two jurisdictions, which in other respects are uniform in their practice. These general differences are then set forth in some detail.

On a hearing in the *Mazālim* Court elements may exist to either strengthen or weaken the plaint, or these may be absent. The former are of six sorts, varying in their degree (p. 143).

1. A document supported by the evidence of approved

witnesses who are present. The Court may either summon these to testify, or it may disallow the denying party his right (i.e. to meet the claim by his oath), having regard to the facts. In the first case regard is to be had to the rank of the person exercising the jurisdiction, as (for instance) a Caliph, vizier of full powers, or governor, and if so, whether the rank of the disputants justifies his hearing the case in person, or whether a Kāḍī should not be deputed to hear it, and that either in his presence or not, according as the party be of middle or of lower rank. This is illustrated by a plaint before Ma'mūn (p. 144), to which his own son was defendant: which the Caliph caused to be heard before him by a deputy, forbidding an official's attempt to check the plaintiff's vehemence; and the plaint was redressed. Ma'mūn's course of proceeding was guided by the above rule, and was furthermore in conformity with the rule which disqualifies from adjudicating on a son's case, or, at any rate, in his favour¹ (p. 145).

2. In the case of a document in support of a claim the witnesses to which are absent the Court has four courses open: (a) intimidating (*irhāb*) the defendant so as to overawe him into an admission and avoid the necessity of hearing the evidence: (b) ordering the witnesses' attendance if their whereabouts be known and the inconvenience be not excessive: (c) securing the defendant's attendance (*mulāzama*) for three days, or longer if the Court deem it right, having regard to the cogency of the evidence against him: or (d) to pay regard to the nature of the claim, and if it be on a money liability to require a surety: or, if on account of a specified object such as land, to sequestrate it, leaving at the same time the possession unaffected and making the rents payable to

¹ This story is told also by Baihaki, *Muḥāsina wa Masāwa*, 530. To decide a case against a son is declared permissible to a Kāḍī (text, Enger, 128).

an *am̄n* to be held on behalf of the party entitled. If the witnesses' attendance be long delayed or become impossible, the Court may interrogate the defendant, with intimidation, as to his claim to possession. And although on this head the schools differ, yet the Court's power clearly extends to what is permissible and not merely to what is obligatory; moreover, it may be too that the defendant's answers may terminate the litigation, but failing this the ordinary law must prevail.

3. The witnesses to such a document, although present, may not have been approved by the judge presiding (p. 146). In that case they must be summoned and the facts about them must be probed into to see in what degree they are trustworthy, whether good, bad, or indifferent, when the presence of the first or of the second class will tell for or against the claim as the case may be. An oath may be required of them as a precaution either before or after they are heard. Moreover, the hearing may be either by the Court itself and be acted on, or by a *Ḳāḍī* to whom it may be referred to report thereon, in which case all action thereon is deferred, for, be it observed, it is not open to the *Ḳāḍī* to act on the evidence of witnesses other than those who have been approved by himself. Or, again, the hearing may be referred to approved witnesses to report thereon, in which case, if the terms of the reference be that they should report the evidence to the Mazālim Court, they are under no obligation to inquire into the sufficiency of the deponents, whereas if the terms of the reference be to satisfy the Court on this head, then they are bound to inquire into their sufficiency, so as to be able to certify the same on their own knowledge with a view to judgment following thereon.

4. The witnesses to the document, although approved, may be dead, and the document may require to be authenticated by them. In such case it is open to the

Court to use intimidation so as to force the truth from the defendant: or (p. 147) it may make inquiry of him as to his possession (of the disputed property) on the chance of his answer disclosing the truth: or, again, it may inquire into the state of the case from those living near, whether to the property or to the parties, so as to get at the truth as to the person entitled. If these means fail the matter should be referred to some person of respectability (*muh̄tashim*) who is under the Court's control and is acquainted with the matter of the dispute, so that the consequent deliberation and delay may force either an admission or a compromise. Failing this the matter must be decided by the ordinary law.

5. The claimant may possess a written admission by the defendant of the claim. If the latter admit the writing to be his, and the admission to be true, judgment will follow, but if he deny its validity the practice differs. Some Courts, in spite of such denial, give judgment on the admission in the writing, treating the denial as merely a legal element in the case, and laying stress on the acknowledgment. The opinion of very precise jurists is as follows: some hold this course to be not open to the Court: others, that the admission in the writing may be acted on only if followed by proof of the truth of its contents, inasmuch as the Mazālim Court must not deal with what is the province of positive law (p. 148). And the Court may reconsider the admission in a writing: the defendant may allege that the writing implied a letting to him not carried out, or a sale at a price still unpaid, as sometimes happens: in such a case the Court can resort to intimidation as the probabilities may require, and then refer the case when, failing a compromise, the Kādi must decide by putting the defendant on oath. If the denial be persisted in, some Courts proceed to a comparison of other documents undoubtedly in the defendant's hand, and so numerous as to exclude the

possibility of forgery, and decide by the result. This is the view of those who hold that judgment should follow on an admission of handwriting: but very precise judges do not hold this to be a ground for judgment, but only for intimidation, for the doubt which remains after the denial is weaker than that which remains after the admission, and it is removed altogether if the hand-writings do not correspond, whereupon the intimidation becomes applicable to the plaintiff with subsequent reference and eventually decision by the *Ḳāḍī* on the oath of the party.

6. The production of a stated account (*ḥisāb*) which bears out the claim—a matter of constant occurrence in commercial transactions (*muʿāmalāt*). Its effect varies according to whether it proceed from the claimant or the defendant. In the first case its effect is the less strong, and the Court will take into consideration its form: and if this be irregular (p. 149) and so open to suspicion, it is rejected and tends to weaken the claim, but if it be regular and clear, it commands confidence and affords ground for applying intimidation or for subsequent reference or decision by the *Ḳāḍī*, as the case may be. If it proceed from the defendant as either in his own hand or that of a clerk of his, the claim is thereby strengthened. If he admit the writing to be his, that he is aware of its purport and that it is correct, he is bound thereby: but if he admit only the writing, then some Courts act as in the case of the written admission (*supra*), holding indeed an account to be of greater weight than a mere written document, for in a stated account credit is given only for what is in fact received. Very precise judges, with whom some jurists are in agreement, hold that judgment should not be given on an account the contents of which are not admitted, but that it justifies a greater amount of intimidation than does a mere writing on the ground of its greater

certainty. The next steps are the reference, or judgment by a Kādi.

If the account be in the hand of the secretary, the defendant is questioned in the first instance, and if he acknowledge it he is bound thereby, otherwise the secretary is questioned (p. 150), and if he deny it his denial tells against it, with a liability on his part to intimidation if his character be open to suspicion, but not if he be of good repute. His acknowledgment of its correctness is evidence against the defendant and judgment may follow thereon, provided the secretary be himself an approved witness, and the case is determined on the evidence of one witness or on the defendant's oath as the case may be, either under the tenets of the school to which the judge adheres¹ or on the law as administered by the Court, according to the circumstances. For the varying circumstances of Mazālim cases require variety of decision, each admitting of only a certain degree of intimidation, to be determined by the circumstances.

Next are noticed, and in the same order, the six converse cases which result in the claim being not strengthened, but weakened, whereby the liability to intimidation is shifted from defendant to plaintiff.

1. A document supported by approved and present witnesses, and calculated to displace the claim by showing, for instance, (*a*) that the plaintiff had sold the subject of the claim (to the defendant); (*b*) admission by him of no title; (*c*) or by his father, under whom he claims (p. 151); or (*d*) ownership by the defendant of the subject of the claim: such defences negative the claim (*batul*), and expose the plaintiff to punishment (*ta'dib*). If it be contended that the alleged sale was due to fear, and was a voluntary creation of tenancy to get a powerful

¹ The divergent views on this question are stated by Goldziher, *Vorlesungen u. d. Islam*, 1910, pp. 58-9. Instances of the practice are given in Kindi, pp. 345, l. 1, 384, l. 2, 552, l. 20, and 584, l. 8.

protector¹—a matter of not uncommon occurrence—the document of sale either negatives this or it does not: and the claim becomes strengthened or weakened accordingly and intimidation is applicable to the one or to the other party, with power of seeking information from neighbouring proprietors. If the result be to displace the apparent effect of the document, that result must follow: otherwise effect must be given to its terms as testified to by the witnesses to the sale. Opinions differ as to whether the defendant can be required to swear that the sale was a genuine one and not as above stated, some holding the affirmative, because his contention is a plausible one: others the negative, on the ground that the first contention (viz. no sale) is inconsistent with the later case (viz. a sale, but impeachable). Each case must be judged by its own special circumstances. Thus, if the claim be on a personal liability to which a release be pleaded, and the reply be that the release was perfected before the claim was satisfied (the claim being still unsatisfied), then the question of putting the defendant on oath is to be decided as above (p. 152).

2. Absence of the defendant's witnesses to the document. Here, if the denial of the claim be precise and definite in character, as, for instance, purchase from the plaintiff and price paid and purchase deed produced, then the defendant becomes, as it were, plaintiff on this document with his witnesses absent, and the procedure appropriate to that state of things is followed. Nevertheless the defendant is entitled to wide powers of possession and management, for both facts and indicia are in his favour, although they fall short of actual proof of ownership. Intimidation follows as may be required, and if possible the witnesses are made to attend within a fixed period during which

¹ إِنْجَاء. see Dozy. The *Majālih al-'Ulm.* 62, has this definition:
 الشَّلْجَةُ أَنْ يُلْجَى الضَّعِيفَ ضِعَّتَهُ إِلَى قَوَى نِيحَامِي عَلَيْهِا

a reference can be ordered with a view to compromise, whereby the claim will abate and the witnesses be dispensed with, failing which a searching inquiry should be made from the adjoining owners. In the interval the Court may, in its discretion, and on a survey of the facts and probabilities of the case, either give possession to the plaintiff pending proof of the sale or to an *amīn* to hold the profits on behalf of the person entitled, or may leave the defendant in possession with a restraint on his disposal of the profits, these being made payable to the *amīn*. Matters will thus rest on one of these alternatives as the Court may think right, until the truth be established either by inquiry or by evidence (p. 153). If these means fail the law must decide, and the defendant may require the plaintiff to be put on oath, which is conclusive. If, however, the denial be not precise, but a mere traverse of the plaintiff's right, the evidence in support of the document may either go to this, or it may assert ownership in the defendant. In such case he should not be deprived of possession, but his management should be restricted, and the profits safeguarded pending inquiry and reference as the Court may direct, having regard to the facts of the case.

3. That the witnesses to the document are not of the approved class. In such case the same procedure is followed as in the similar case of the plaintiff's witnesses, having regard to whether the denial be precise or not, and to the Court's discretion on the facts.

4. That the witnesses are approved, but dead. Here judgment can only follow on the extent of intimidation implied by a very close inquiry, and the Court's decision must be governed by whether the denial be precise in its character or not.

5. If the defendant meet the claim with a document under the plaintiff's hand which involves disbelieving him, the procedure is similar to that in the case of written

admissions, and intimidation depends on the facts of the case.

6. (p. 154) The production of a stated account which negatives the claim is treated on the same principles as one supporting it, the inquiry, intimidation, and postponement of the decision depending on the facts of the case. If these fail the Court must give a decision with a view to finality.

A claim, however much divested of strengthening or of weakening elements, must be affected by the fact of the Court's opinion leaning in favour of plaintiff, or of defendant, or being evenly balanced. The result will be that intimidation and close inquiry will become applicable against one or other party, for the actual decision of a case cannot be affected by inclination of opinion. Now if opinion incline to the plaintiff and doubt rest on the defendant, it may happen, apart from any conclusive proof of the claim, that the plaintiff is of mild and friendly disposition and the defendant the reverse: this raises a presumption that a claim, e.g. for the forcible taking of property, would not, by such a plaintiff and against such a defendant, be put too high. Again, if the plaintiff be of known integrity and the defendant be notoriously the reverse, this tells in favour of the honesty of the claim. Or, again, the litigants' characters may be on a par (p. 155), but the plaintiff may be known to have exercised in the past possessory acts, whilst no motive can be assigned for the defendant's interference. In all such cases the Court may either intimidate the defendant because of the suspicion attaching to him, or it may require an explanation of his possessory acts and of his sudden accruer of title. A *Kāḍī*, according to *Mālik*, may do this in any case which raises suspicion: *a fortiori* therefore the *Mazālim* Court.

It happens, too, that a defendant of high rank may

recoil from being put on the same level as his litigant in a suit, and may therefore make a voluntary surrender to him. An instance is given of this happening under Hādī, where a defendant preferred to keep his distance from the plaintiff by abandoning to him the property claimed.¹

For the Mazālim tribunal will strive to grant a complainant redress in such a way as will save the face of the defendant, or it will induce the defendant to so act as will bring about the result and avoid the imputation of injustice and of the withholding of right. Thus a claim by the inhabitants of a place near Baṣra against successive Caliphs (p. 156) was decided in their favour by the action of Ja'far the Barmecide in buying for them the subject-matter of the claim, and this he did either spontaneously, or, more probably, in collusion with Rashīd. In either case the result inured to the furtherance of justice and the safeguard of reputation (p. 157).

On the other hand, if opinion incline to the defendant by reason of his character for integrity being better than that of the plaintiff, or because the latter is of low and mean repute whilst the defendant is a man of austerity and dignity,² and it be sought to put him on oath with the object of disparaging him, or it so incline by reason of his acts of ownership being intelligible whereas the plaintiff's acts are not, in all these cases suspicion attaches to the plaintiff. Mālik requires as a preliminary that a prima facie case should have been established to immovable property, or proof of mutual dealings in a claim on personal liability; the other doctors do not admit this even as regards the Kādi, and in the Mazālim Court, where the jurisdiction is based on expediency, and which is guided rather by what is permissible than

¹ Id., Ibn al-Jauzi, *Adhkiyā*, ed. Cairo, 1304, 60.

² p. 157, l. 4, for منصوبًا read مَحْرُوبًا (Dozy, Supp. i, 60^b, sub بَدَل).

by what is obligatory, it is allowable in cases where suspicion attaches, or obstinate disobedience is attempted, to make stringent inquiry with a view to getting at the truth, and to protect the defendant by all available legal methods. And if the matter comes to a mutual oath by the parties, that is the final and conclusive test which cannot be denied to a litigant either by *Ḳāḍī* or by *Mazālim* Court whenever intimidation and exhortation have proved unavailing.

If a claim be split up, and it be sought to impose repeated oaths in regard thereto (p. 158), with the object of distressing and disparaging an adversary, under *Ḳāḍī* practice this is allowable, but under *Mazālim* practice a plaintiff may be compelled to combine his claims wherever they appear oppressive, and an oath is imposed such as will cover the whole.

If the litigants' merits and evidence be of equal weight both as regards proof and presumption, they must be exhorted to agree, and this under both the practices, but the *Mazālim* practice allows also of intimidation, inquiry, with a transfer of possession, and, if the right remain in dispute, a reference of the case to neighbours of repute and to leading kinsfolk, failing which the ultimate resort is the *Ḳāḍī*'s interposition in person or by deputy for the decision of the matter.

In case of difficulty and doubt the *Mazālim* judge will often welcome and act on the advice of learned persons present. 'Omar, in a case which raised a nice point between husband and wife (p. 159), on receiving advice from one present forthwith called on him to decide it,¹ approving afterwards his decision and (p. 160) appointing him *Ḳāḍī*. This case further illustrates the fact that the

¹ p. 160, l. 3, for *تعمد* read as *تعمد* Caro, p. 89, l. 17, *تعمد*. The story occurs in the *Kitāb al-Awā'id* of Abū Hilāl al-Askarī, Paris, Ar. 5986, 1867, and in *Adhkiyā*, 49, on the authority of al-Sha'bi, d. A.H. 104 (Abū Khall., Sl. Eng. ii. 4).

Mazālim jurisdiction is guided by what is permissible, not by what is obligatory.

Where orders are made to inquire into petitions addressed to the Mazālim Court, the person to whom the order issues may or may not have inherent power to carry out the order. In the case of a *Ḳādi*, the order may empower him to decide the question, or merely to inquire into it and to act as referee. If the order be to decide, he can do this under his inherent jurisdiction, the order being affirmative merely and not restrictive in this respect; if the order be to inquire into the facts, or to act as referee between the parties, and it prohibit him from giving a decision, such prohibition effectively restricts him from so doing (p. 161), but in other respects¹ his general jurisdiction remains, for just as the conferring of jurisdiction may be twofold, general and special, so may be the restriction. If the order do not prohibit a decision except in so far as it specifies an inquiry, some hold that a decision is allowable under the general jurisdiction, for an order as to a part does not imply a prohibition of the rest: others hold that it is prohibited, as the order is limited by its terms to an inquiry and to a reference, and its scope is defined by those terms.

Under an order referring a matter no report of the facts to the Mazālim Judge is required, but it is otherwise under an order for an inquiry, as an inquiry requires to be answered. But if the person to whom the order issues have no inherent power, such as a jurist or an approved witness, then the order may be either to inquire, or to act as referee, or to decide the case. In the first case he must make such a report as will enable a judgment to be founded thereon, and if the contents of the report fall short of this, the Court may yet treat it as matter which affords ground for applying

¹ For 161, l. 1, *فيمن عداها*, read as Cairo, 90, l. 4, *فيما عداها*.

intimidation or for making inquiry as against one or other of the parties. In the second case, that of a reference, the referee need not concern himself with the exact terms of the order (p. 162), for no special appointment or conferring of power is needed: the order requires merely the choosing and indicating a referee and imposing him on the parties. And if the result be a compromise, no report is needed, for the evidence can be deposed to by himself, if summoned to do so. If, on the other hand, no compromise follows, the referee can adduce the parties' statements as evidence to the Mazālim Court if the proceedings there continue, otherwise not. And in the third case, that of an order to decide, this is not equivalent to a conferring of jurisdiction, and the true meaning of the order must be considered and given effect to. It may empower the satisfying a litigant's claim; in such case it must be scrutinized and the relief be limited thereto. For instance, if the plaintiff claim a reference or an inquiry and this be ordered, the relief must be limited thereto, and that whether the order be imperative in form, or consultative, for no power to give a binding judgment being required the order does not go to this length.

Where a complainant asks to have his case decided, both the litigants and the dispute must be specified, failing which the jurisdiction does not arise, for it does not fall under the general jurisdiction, and the uncertainty ousts the special jurisdiction. Provided the dispute be duly specified (p. 163), then, if the order to grant relief be imperative, this authorizes a decision thereon: if it be consultative in form, this according to state practice is equivalent to an imperative order, and it is customary to act on it. But as regards matters of revealed law there is on this head a conflict of opinion: some hold to the strict letter and require the order to be imperative in its terms. And even if the plaintiff

ask for judgment and the order be to satisfy his claim, this according to ordinary practice confers jurisdiction, but on the strict meaning of the terms it does not do so, for what has been claimed is an order for judgment, and not a judgment itself.

On the other hand, if the order be to grant the claimant's petition, then the matter has its inception in the actual terms of the order, and on those terms depends the conferring of jurisdiction. Such an order may be in form a full one, combining an order to inquire with an order to decide; this is effective, for to decide implies a decision according to law: the term is descriptive merely (p. 164) and not restrictive, and the order confers full jurisdiction. Or, the order may be permissive and fall short of the former in that it orders a decision but does not order inquiry: this also operates to confer jurisdiction, because to decide presupposes a previous inquiry which is involved therein. But if the order be limited to an inquiry, this will not be effective to confer jurisdiction, because to inquire between the parties is equally consistent with a permissive reference and with a binding order. And it is doubtful whether the addition of the words "according to law" cures the defect. for both a compromise and a reference are matters of law, although they be not obligatory.

Māwardi's account of the Mazālim tribunal suggests that what in its origin was an exceptional appeal for redress to the sovereign in person, came to be an every-day application to his representative to be dealt with according to a settled practice.¹ He dates the system from the time

¹ Described by Maḳḳūzi, de Saey, Chrest. Ar., 2nd ed., i, 132, who translates Mazālim by "plainte de quelque vexation"; Ostrorog, *Ahkam Sultaniyya*, i, 209, has "torts", restricted in meaning to such as the ordinary Courts are unable to repress. The equivalent "affaire criminelle" given in *Prairies d'Or*, viii, 21, is scarcely appropriate, yet the term does bear the sense of eriminal responsibility. Māwardi.

of 'Abd al-Malik : Baihaqi. *Maḥāsini wa Masāwi*, pp. 525-8. gives indeed Omayyad cases, mostly decisions of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, but his character and acts were largely idealized in later times, and in some of the instances he is made to grant the applicants consequential, and rather remote, damages. Under the Abbasids the jurisdiction was regularly exercised, and more and more by viziers apart from the Caliphs. For the inevitable increase in the volume and complexity of the applications found some of these either unfit or disinclined for serious business. Baihaqi wrote under Muḥtadir, but Mazālim cases of that Caliph he has none to relate : it is Ma'mūn alone of the dynasty who provides him material.¹ Of his successors,

p. 106, in dealing with the punishment of rebels and bandits, says that one view of the law was that the effect of repentance after detection was to abrogate the sin, *ma'tham*, but not the responsibility for the act, *mazālim*. The two terms are again contrasted in Baihaqi, *Maḥāsini wa Masāwi*, 535, l. 11, where a ruler is made to say that he could not hold himself clear of moral blame, *ma'tham*, for having appointed an unfit person to investigate *mazālim*.

¹ The story on p. 531 is that given by Māwardī, *supra*, p. 643. That on p. 529 tells how Ma'mūn shamed Alḥmad b. Hishām into repairing his wrong done : that on p. 530 (cf. Yākūt, *Buldān*, iii, 847) contains 'Omar's appreciation of a Nabathæan. Both these are told by Ibn Ṭaifūr, B.M. Add. 23318, 29a and 49b, with two others, 41a, ed. Keller, transl. 46-7. The last of Baihaqi's stories (p. 532, and, shortly, in Ibn Ḥamdūn, *Tadhkira*, B.M. Or. 3179, 187a-b) tells how the seller of a jewel claimed its price from Ma'mūn on the ground that it had been bought for him, and been left unpaid by his agent. The Caliph raised a good defence, but ended in making a politic submission. It is to be noticed that on p. 533, l. 14, the claimant quotes the passage from 'Omar's letter of instructions that "the claimant must produce evidence, from the defendant an oath may be exacted" (J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 311), as though from a legal Magna Charta, and another passage is quoted in the letter of instructions from Tahir b. al-Ḥusain to his son (Tab. iii, 1056, l. 1). Ma'mūn appears again before us in Mazālim, and not to his advantage, in al-Kindī, ed. Guest, 506. Al-Ḥārith b. Ma'sūm, attending as Kādi-designate in Egypt before the official sitting in Mazālim, was appealed to by the complainant as to the reputation of his wrongdoers. He declared them to be of bad character. The Court sought to evade his testimony, but he persisted. Thereupon he was summoned by Ma'mūn and admitted he had neither suffered at their hands nor had any dealings with them, but said he had spoken from common knowledge (which was,

Muhtadi, as one of his reforming efforts, resumed Mazālim sittings (Tab. iii. 1736), and was found engaged thereon when overawed by his Turkish troops (ib. 1738).

Muqtadir preferred to act by deputy, and was represented in the various quarters of Baghdad by jurists chosen by the head of the *Shurfa*, but in Rusāfa by the stewardess Thumal, chosen by his mother for the purpose. At first public disapproval left her Court deserted, but a Qādi attended and kept matters straight, which satisfied the public ('Arīb. 71), so it may well be that the president's acquiescence in his proceedings was expressed by her quiescence. But the singularity of the appointment must have struck Makrīzi, for it is recorded in the *Sulūk* in the brief notice of Muqtadir's reign.¹ Previously, under Mutawakkil, we find the poet 'Alī b. Jahm presiding over Mazālim at Hulwān (Agh. ix. 108), and nothing that we are told of him suggests any special fitness for judicial duties. To attend to Mazālim was one of the Caliph Kāhir's promises of amendment (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 193).

As a rule Abbasid viziers heard the applications in person. Aḥmad b. Abi Khālid Ma'mūn's voracious vizier, allowed the attractions of a litigant's table to so entirely outweigh the demerits of his case that complaints led to the Caliph allowing him a thousand dirhams daily for table money (Ibn Ṭāifūr. B.M. Add. 23318, 88^a). A story

indeed, the legal method of testing credibility of witnesses). Nevertheless Ma'mūn ordered him to leave Egypt for good. This episode is a specimen of the interesting matter added by Mr. Guest to the text of al-Kindi.

¹ *Hist. d'Égypte de Makrizi*, by E. Blochet, 1908, p. 72. Thumal's character is described by Ibn Miskawah. *Tajārib al-Umam*, v. 164, as follows:—

كانت ثمل موصوفة بالشر لانها كانت قهرمانة احمد بن عبد
العزیز بن ابي دلف وكان احمد یسلم اليها من سخط عليه من
جواریه وخدمه فاشتهرت بالتسود والسرف في العتوبات

in the Kitāb al-Awā'il¹ depicts Ibn al-Zayyāt sitting jointly with Aḥmad b. 'Ammāra in a case where a complaint of the forcible seizure of property was met by the inquiry whence it had been derived. The Court had better have been content with the evidence of lawful possession in the applicant, for his explanation was that it represented profits made by a father and an uncle in the respective trades practised by the parents of the presiding officials. This so amused Murtasim that he granted redress. In another case Ibn al-Zayyāt was protected against all misreception of evidence by the claimant's suggesting that it was of no real use: better disregard it altogether (Agh. xx, 47).

¹ The author, Abu Hilāl al-ʿAskari (Brock. i. 126), was writing in A.H. 395; see *Irshād al-Arif*, iii, 135. Ibn al-Zayyāt is mentioned as the first vizier who served three Caliphs. Ibn 'Ammāra, who appears in *Tabari*, iii, 1183, as Ibn 'Ammār, was charged to supervise the falling vizier al-Faḥl b. Marwān, on whose fall Ibn al-Zayyāt became sole vizier. The text is as follows:—

اخبرنا ابو احمد عن الصولى عن احمد بن محمد بن اسحق عن محمد بن على كاتب على بن صالح الثعلبى قال : جلس احمد بن عمارة للمظالم ايام وزارته فتقدم اليه رجل فقال : ان كاتب عجيف وجهه بغلمانه فتيبوا منزلى واخذوا كل ما فيه ثلثين الف دينار. فانكر كاتب عجيف ذلك وقال : من اين كان لك هذا المال . قال : انى اقيم البيئنة على صحة ما اقول . فقال احمد : لعمرى ان هذا مال جليل ولكل شىء دليل فمن ابوك حتى نستدل على صحة قولك به . قال : كان ابي طحاناً من اهل المذاذا (كذا) انتقل الى البصرة فاتخذ بيها ضياعاً ففتح الله عليه وعلى بعده حتى ملكت هذا المال واكثر منه . فتغافراهل المجلس فقال محمد بن عبد الملك : ما علينا من ابيك هات بينتك . فقال الرجل : نعم وكان عمى زياناً كثير المال ولا ولد له فمات وورثته . فبلغ الخبر المعتصم فصحك وامران يتصف من كاتب عجيف . وتحدث الناس بما كان من الرجل وعجبوا من جدله وفطنته . (Paris, Ar. 5986, 183*.)

Murtadid's vizier, Ubaid Allah b. Sulaimān, heard Mazālim cases, for it was an application by a son of Ibn al-Zayyāt that gave him occasion to obey his own father's injunction to befriend him.¹ The incompetent al-Khaḡāni acted as his deputy (Ibn Misk. v, 88), and it must have been under his vizierate, or that of his son al-Kāsim, that Ahmad b. al-Furāt is described as cleverly parrying Mazālim claims by thrusts both administrative and legal (Hilāl, *Wuzarā*, 253).

The neglect of Mazālim matters by Muḡtadir's first vizier, al-'Abbās b. al-Ḥasan, was regarded as a dereliction of duty ('Arib, 25, l. 18); and his successors, Ibn al-Furāt and 'Ali b. 'Isa, held regular sittings, for several of their decisions are recorded by Hilāl. Some of these are mere begging applications (pp. 144 and 222); one was a dispute about shops, *dukakīn* (p. 143); another between districts as to the width of a bridge (p. 256). But the grievances were mainly fiscal, in respect of the land, e.g., a complaint of the basis on which it was taxed (p. 163); of an oppressive assessment, on which 'Ali b. 'Isa wrote a letter of instructions (p. 345); and of the *takmila*, i.e. the liability for the quota of the land-tax attributable to those who had left Fars owing to the Saffarid occupation (p. 340), on which a letter of 'Ali b. 'Isa is set out, which Ibn Miskawaih refers to as widely known and admired.²

¹ *Faraj ba'd al-Shidda*, ed. 1904, i, 107-10; a version by Ibn Ḥamdūn (*Tadhkira*, B.M. Or. 3180, 231^b) discloses that the grievance was against Ahmad b. Isrā'īl and about landed property. The deficiencies of this edition of the *Faraj* are as abundant as its inaccuracies. The original MS. is not indicated, but a comparison of Leyden, No. 449 (Cod. 61 Gol.), and of Bodl. Poc., 64, shows how much matter is wanting—*inter alia* the story of the thirteen millions sought to be exacted from Ibn al-Furāt (Hilāl, *Wuzarā*, 103-5).

² Vol. v, 93. On p. 92 he gives the text of a general letter of instruction by the vizier on the getting in of taxes, as follows:—

وكتب الى العمال في امر المظالم كتابًا نسخته : بسم الله الرحمن
الرحيم سبيل ما يرفعه اليك كل واحد من المتظلمين قبل النوروز
من مظلمته ويدعى انه تلف بالآفة من غلته ان تعتمد في كشف

One case relates to Bādūrayā (p. 346). By the statement of an official its population was known for powers of endurance and for an abundant supply of grievances. Their governor, having exhausted the means in his power for recovering arrears of taxes, asked the vizier's leave to proceed to stronger measures. But 'Ali replied that his only lawful remedy was *malāzama* (*supra*, p. 642), and that he must not exceed it. This equitable ruling caused an increase in the taxes' yield of 20 per cent.¹ 'Ali acted when out of office (Arīb, 150 l. 19), and when al-Kalwadhāni was vizier (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 166), but the next vizier stipulated that he should not act (Misk. v, 354. l. 11). The Fatimide General Jauhar on entering Egypt in A.H. 358 forthwith sat in Mazālim as representing his sovereign al-Mu'izz (al-Kindi, 298).

It is at this point in his history that Ibn al-Athīr reflects that in general it was the prospect of gain alone and no sense of duty, that led viziers and other high officials to concern themselves with people's grievances, and he adds that this was borne out by his own personal

حَالِهِ عَلَى أَوْثَقِ ثِقَاتِكَ وَأَصْدَقِ كِتَابِكَ حَتَّى يَصِحَّ لَكَ أَمْرٌ فَتُزِيلَ
بِالظُّلْمِ فَمَهْ فَتَرْفَعُ، وَتَضَعُ الْإِنصَافَ مَوْضِعَهُ وَتَحْتَسِبُ مِنَ الْمَظَالِمِ بِمَا
يُوجِبُ الْوُقُوفَ عَلَيْهِ، حَسَبَهُ، وَيَسْتَوْفِي الْخَرَاجَ بَعْدَهُ مِنْ غَيْرِ مُخَابَرَةٍ
لِلْأَقْوِيَاءِ وَلَا حَيْفٍ عَلَى الضَّعَفَاءِ فَاعْمَلْ فَمَا رَسَمَ لَكَ مَا يَظْهَرُ وَيُشِيعُ
وَيَكُونُ الْعَدْلُ بِهِ، عَلَى الرِّعَاةِ كَامِلًا وَالْإِنصَافَ لِجَمْعِهِمْ شَامِلًا إِنْ
شَاءَ اللَّهُ .

¹ The grievances so prevalent at Bādūrayā are described as connected with *walāḥīf*, *rusām*, and *ḥarāḥīs*. Charitable endowments have ever been fruitful in litigation. *Rusām* must signify binding usages with regard to taxation, for we find a complaint (Hilāl, 163) that land was assessed on the ordinary footing of the district, *astān*, whereas it was really a *ḥarāḥīa*, with a *rusm*, usage, of old standing. And among the acts of misgovernment of al-Khaḳām is mentioned (p. 263) that he made a corrupt profit by abrogating usages (*isḥāt al-rusām*). On *ḥarāḥīs* I can find nothing.

experience. That experience was just commencing at the time when Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī died. A.H. 569. and of that exemplary Moslem's Mazālim decisions an instance has been preserved in a legal treatise dedicated to Saladin.¹ We read that from the reign of Muhtadi onwards the eclipse of the Caliphs' authority under their Turkish troops led to inquiries into Mazālim being delegated to their viziers, but that when Nūr al-Dīn ruled over Syria he heard the cases in person with jurists in attendance for points of doubt, and that he disposed of the whole within the day. And he himself related how, when examining the land-tax of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, he resolved to deprive the inhabitants of their land on the ground that he had been told it had been acquired by each having backed up his neighbour's claim by evidence—a state of things which recalls the population who earned a livelihood by taking in each other's washing. Nūr al-Dīn's hearer objected to this barely credible and unsupported story being acted on; still he persisted, and ordered his secretary to write accordingly. But, as the document awaited his signature, he heard a voice on the river bank singing verse in praise of justice: this he regarded as a warning from above, and contrite and humble he tore up his order.

Acts of injustice by courtiers and officials, especially in respect to tax-gathering, are in the forefront of Māwardī's list, and represent a large majority of the cases recorded by Baihaki. The cases covered by headings 3 and 5 are such as call especially for a tribunal at once more powerful and more unfettered in procedure than ordinary law courts. In the former the entire community is the aggrieved party: in the latter, a single

¹ *Al-Minhāj al-Maslūk fī Siyāsat al-Mulūk*, Cairo, 1327, brought to my notice by Professor Margoliouth. Apart from the anecdote here given the contents of its chapter on Mazālim are copied from Māwardī. The author, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd Allah, I cannot identify.

and maybe lowly member thereof: and it might well happen that a weapon of irresistible force lacked an individual arm to wield it, or that an arm eager to strike was held back by deficiency of strength. In both cases this tribunal could supply what was wanting. As regards heading 4, it is to be feared that the troops imperfectly realized their lawful remedies thereunder, for I can find no instance of their appealing to the tribunal. Occasion was not wanting, but they preferred the simpler weapons, revolt and violence.

Headings 6 to 8 suggest matters which were the peculiar province of our Courts of Equity, e.g. trusts, charitable and private, and mandatory and prohibitive injunctions in aid of the defective powers of the common law.

In heading 9 it is again the community which is aggrieved by the irregularities in religious practice which the Court is to check.

Heading 10 states a general jurisdiction in aid of the ordinary courts, like English equity, or the Star Chamber until it came to supersede the ordinary courts where they were too weak to act. But whereas the rules of equity, like the Prætor-made Roman law, differed from the common law, Māwardi lays it down that the Mazālim rules should conform thereto. In respect of the letter of the law this must have been so, having regard to the divine origin of its provisions, but in respect of procedure Māwardi himself goes on to indicate points of divergence under further headings.

He had indeed already touched on their respective spheres in ch. iii (Enger, p. 51), saying that, whilst a judicial decision already pronounced might be enforced by the Mazālim Court against a dilatory or recalcitrant party, in cases which still awaited decision the jurisdiction was ousted. But this rule, like many others of Moslem law, may have been little more than theory. For it is

recorded of Egypt that the zeal shown by Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn in dealing with Mazālim matters caused the people to desert the tribunal of the Kāḍi Bakkār (Kindi, 512, l. 21); that the same result followed later from similar activity by Kāfūr, so that the Kāḍi became "as though under interdiction", *mahjūr 'alaihi* (ib. 584, l. 2); and that a seven years' hiatus in the succession of Kāḍis in Egypt under Khumārawaih proved of no moment, as the Mazālim tribunal continued its sittings (ib. 515, l. 11).

None of the headings expressly includes proceedings by way of appeal from a legal decision, but every appellant is an aggrieved person, and success shows his grievance to be well founded. In the notice of al-Ḥārith b. Maskīn (ib. 504), is an account of a litigation carried before a succession of judges with varying result, and terminated by an application by way of Mazālim in Baghdad where the jurists, to whose decision Mutawakkil referred the case, held the latest Kāḍi decision to be wrong. Again we find successive and similar decisions on a *ḥubs* referred by the Fatimide Mu'izz, as a Mazālim matter, to the Kāḍi al-Nu'mān, whose decision was probably intended to be final (ib. 586).

Ḥariri, born four years before Māwardi died, has also a passage bearing on the concurrent jurisdiction of legal tribunals. In the *Maḳāmāt* (de Sacy, 2nd ed., 311) is the story of a debtor who, finding his creditor resolved on taking him before the Kāḍi, deliberately assaulted him in order that his case might come rather before the *Wāli al-Jurā'im* than before the *Hākim fi-l-Mazālim*. Chenery translates (p. 261): "the Governor having authority over offences," and "the judge of civil wrongs", i.e. the criminal and the civil tribunal. Ḥariri thus identifies the Kāḍi with the Mazālim Court, where he did, in fact, very frequently preside (al-Kindi, *passim*). The commentator of Hariri says that *jarā'im* were the concern of the *shihna*, and Māwardi, when dealing with

the matter in ch. xv (Enger. p. 375), says on pp. 376-8, that assaults are peculiarly matters of *ahdāth* and *ma'āwīn*, i.e. of police—cases which would be dealt with by the *shihna*, or in earlier times by the *shurfa*. The reason he gives is, that this official has better means of discovery than either *Ḳādi* or *Hākīm*: their province it was to pronounce judgments (*ahkām*), whereas government (*siyāsa*) was the concern of the *Amīr*. It is apparent too that at Baghdad in A.H. 331 crimes liable to the fixed penalties (*ḥudūd*) were habitually dealt with by the *Ṣāhib al-Shurfa*.¹

That a *Ḳādi* could act with vigour against a high-placed wrongdoer appears from the story how Abu 'Uбайд Ibn Harb, *Ḳādi* in Egypt A.H. 293-311, dealt with Muḥammad b. 'Ali al-Mādarā'i, a very powerful personage. Having refused a woman's claim to exercise the right of pre-emption (*shuf'a*), he sought to evade meeting it on oath by dilatory tactics suggested to him by the jurist al-Taḥāwī (Ibn Khall., Sl. Eng. i, 51), but in the end he had to yield (*Ḳindi*, 529-30). Abu 'Uбайд's predecessor, Ibn 'Abda, had exercised the *Mazālim* duties before being appointed *Ḳādi*, and it is not apparent from the narrative in which capacity Abu 'Uбайд was appealed to by the woman. His intention was, he states, to meet the defendant's continued

¹ Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 302, where Nāsir al-Daula the Hamdanid, then in power at Baghdad, is described as performing the duties of the office, including the infliction of *ḥudūd*. The passage appears more fully in what is evidently Ibn al-Athīr's authority, the *Tajārib al-Umam*, vi, 74, thus:—

وكان ناصر الدولة ينظر في قصص اصحاب الجنايات من العامة
وفيما ينظر فيه صاحب الشرطة، وتتمام الحدود الواجبة عليهم من
ضرب وقطع يد ورجل بحضرة، وتعرض عليه الايدي والارجل اذا
قطعت وتعد بحضرة، ويستوفى العدد عليهم لئلا يرتفق اصحاب الشرطة
من الجناة ويطلقوا من غير علمه

In Egypt in the time of Mansūr the *ḥudūd* were inflicted by the *Ṣāhib al-Shurfa* (*Ḳindi*, 119).

contumacy by closing his court and applying to be relieved of his office. And it is noticeable that a full century earlier the same method was adopted at Kūfa by the Kāḍī Sharīk (Ibn Khall., Sl. Eng. i, 622) against the Hashimite Mūsa b. 'Isa, Mahdi's cousin. He had wronged a woman by destroying her boundary wall and annexing her property to that purchased from her brothers, and had met a summons to attend the court by sending the *Sāhib al-Shurṭa* to remonstrate. He went reluctantly, and had the foresight to provide himself with necessaries in the prison in the belief that he would be sent there. This happened, and Mūsa's chamberlain coming later was sent to join him. Mūsa next sent a number of the Kāḍī's own friends, but they, too, were imprisoned for bringing a message from a *ẓālim*, and these Mūsa released by force. Next day, when Sharīk, sitting in his court, heard of this he sealed his official bag (*kimāṭr*), and, ordering his luggage to follow, set out for the bridge of Kūfa and for Baghdad, saying that he had been induced to accept office against his wish in the belief that it was hedged by dignity. Mūsa overtook him, and he yielded to his entreaties only on condition that the prisoners all went back to prison, and he did not move until they had done this. He then returned to his court in the mosque, had the parties before him, and gave the woman full redress.¹ In this case, although the woman is referred to as *mutaẓallima*, it is stated that Sharīk was sitting as Kāḍī, and it may be that Abu 'Ubaid b. Ḥarb was doing likewise.

Some idea of deference to the person of a Kāḍī, apart from his office, seems to have been implied by an attendance on his summons, for in Egypt, *temp.* Rashīd, a man whom the Kāḍī had affronted declared that he would never attend, and that the Kāḍī might decide any Mazālim

¹ Paris, Ar. 5903, 9^b, in the notice of Sharīk *sub* A.H. 177. The *Isnād* make it probable that the MS. is a part of the *Muntaẓam* of Ibn al-Jauzi, rather than of his grandson's work, the *Mir'āt al-Zamān*.

claim against him, with liability for any damages he pleased (Kindi, 389, l. 9).

The Mazālim tribunal's edge was sometimes turned, and vindictively, against a disgraced Kāḍī. One¹ who had petitioned Ma'mūn against appointing his brother Mu'tasim to be Governor of Egypt, felt the latter's displeasure in proceedings against himself by way of Mazālim (ib. 441, l. 4); and it is stated that Aḥmad b. Ṭulūn gave vent to his resentment against Bakkār by inviting Mazālim complaints against him, and that with small success (ib. 513). Under Omayyad rule, 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Malik, Governor of Egypt, having been lampooned by the Kāḍī, ordered him to be publicly exposed (*yākaḥ*) in a paper shirt inscribed with his misdeeds, but he was saved from this by the governor's dismissal (ib. 328-9). And a Kāḍī who, after turning a deaf ear to an orphan's complaint (*taẓallam*) that his property had been wasted by his guardian, the 'arīf of his tribe, imprisoned the orphan for writing satirical lines on his case, was dismissed by order of the Caliph Hishām (ib. 341).

The later and larger part of the chapter is concerned with certain typical cases in which the Mazālim tribunal strove, on what we term equitable grounds, to exclude the operation of the ordinary law. By law the burden of proof lay on the plaintiff to be met by the oath of the defendant; and proof meant the oral deposition of witnesses possessing the qualification of *'udūl*. Māwardī gives two sets of instances of a presumption of right existing in favour, first of the plaintiff, and then of the defendant. Headings 1-4 presuppose a document tendered in evidence by the plaintiff which constitutes *prima facie* proof, with indications of various methods whereby the tribunal can evade the necessity of its strict proof in cases where the witnesses are either present and available,

¹ This Kāḍī had ordered a man who neglected to attend a Mazālim summons to be flogged in the mosque (Kindi, 439, l. 16).

or else absent, or unqualified, or dead. Where the presumption is in favour of the defendant, the object is to avoid the necessity of putting him to his oath.¹ Headings 5 and 6 presuppose a written admission binding on a litigant; how effect is to be given to it, and how in certain cases it can be displaced. All the instances seem well founded in reason, and some are of familiar occurrence in our own legal system. For instance, the allegation that the release of a claim was anterior to its satisfaction and that the claim is yet unsatisfied we describe as delivering a deed as an escrow.

The tribunal's methods for making the weight of its inclination tell in a litigant's favour were, according to Mālik, open likewise to the Kādi's Court. This does not appear, however, from the published excerpts from the *Risāla*, an authoritative exposition of *Māliki* tenets by a follower, called "the little Mālik", d. A.H. 389.²

To contrive to grant redress without thereby causing disparagement to the wrongdoer was the course adopted by Ma'mūn both in the case of Ibn Hishām (*ante*, p. 656) and of his favourite Ishaq b. Ibrāhīm, as told in the *Kitāb al-Diyārāt* of al-Shābushti.³

¹ The efficacy of the oath is illustrated by a case which Alḥmad b. Tūlūn, following 'Omar's example, referred to the decision of the Kādi Bakkār. The litigant was sworn by Allah, as was customary, whereupon his opponent asked that he should be sworn, further, on the head of the Amīr; and this he refused. Bakkār was aghast, but the incident did the man good service in the eyes of the Amīr (Kindi, 511, l. 12).

² Abu Muḥammad 'Abd Allah b. Abi Zaid 'Abd al-Rahmān, noticed by Dhahabi, *Ta'rikh al-Islām*. B.M. Or. 48, 212^b, who says that he composed the *Risāla* when aged 17 years. The publication is *First Steps in Muslim Jurisprudence* (Russell & Suhrawardy, 1906). pp. 61-5.

³ MS. Ahlwardt Cat. vii, 309, No. 8321. For the author see Wust., No. 153 and Brock. i, 523-4. The text is as follows:—

ذَكَرَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ خُرْدَادْبَةَ أَنَّهُ حَضَرَ مَجْلِسَ الْمَامُونِ يَوْمًا وَقَدْ
عَرَضَ عَلَيْهِ أَحْمَدُ بْنُ أَبِي خَالِدٍ وَقَاعًا فِيهَا زُقْعَةٌ قَوْمٍ مُتَطَلِّمِينَ مِنْ
أَسْحَقِ بْنِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ فَلَمَّا قَرَأَهَا الْمَامُونُ أَخَذَ الْقَلَمَ وَكَتَبَ عَلَى ظَهْرِهَا :

Commissions to a Kāḍī to inquire into Mazālim cases are subjected in the chapter's close to a somewhat technical treatment. I have not come across any form of commission, nor any mention of one which was restricted in its scope. They are of frequent occurrence in al-Kindi's history and in the matter added thereto in Mr. Guest's edition, but it is always an appointment only that is recorded. Nor have I found any trace of objection by litigants to the Kāḍī's jurisdiction, and it may be suspected that the discussion in the text was, and remained, purely academical.

It may indeed be surmised that it was "Kāḍī justice", as we understand the phrase, that prevailed largely in legal proceedings which, with the parties conducting their case in person,¹ must have been

ما ف هولاء الأوباش الأكل طاعين وأش اسحق غرس بيدي ومن غرسه
 انجب ولم يُخلف لا عدا عليه، أحدًا. ثم كتب الى اسحق رقعة فيها:
 من مؤذنب مشتق الى حصيف متأذّب يا بُنى من عز تواضع ومن
 قدر غنى ومن راحى انصف ومن رافب حذير وعافته الدالة فبر
 محمودة والمؤمن كش فطن والسلام (Berlm, We. 1100. fol. 13^v.)

¹ No mention of advocacy in Moslem legal procedure is known to me: had it existed it would assuredly have furnished anecdote in *Adab* literature. *Wakīl* seems to be the equivalent of "attorney", in its strict sense of *alter ego*. A claim by al-Mādarā'i to be represented by his *Wakīl* was rejected by the Kāḍī Ibn Harb, on the ground that he would be incompetent (as would be likewise an attorney) to depose on oath in his stead (Kindi, 530). The gain to judicial decisions from the arguments and criticism of advocates is unquestionable. A Kāḍī of great repute in Egypt held, soon after the Fatimide conquest, that a child born of infidel parents, whose mother had adopted Islām, was not a Moslem. Popular outcry made him reverse his decision, which the text says was contrary to both Shafite and Shi'a doctrine (Kindi, 586). The Kāḍī was a Malkite, but no diverging view of the law on this head is suggested in the *Hidāya*. It may be that some Shāhid in attendance should have reminded him of the law, for, apparently, judgments were read over to them, and they could raise objection (Kindi, 593). One case is indeed recorded where a Shāhid cross-examined a witness closely on his evidence, but his object was to vindicate a previous and conflicting decision by a rival Kāḍī in the case, as against the proposed judgment

informal, and often incoherent. The opening scene in a lawsuit has been preserved in Dhahabi's notice of the *Kādi* Abu Bakr b. Sayyār in the *Tu'rikh al-Islām sub* A.H. 368.¹ The litigants were women, and the *Kādi* was a man of venerable but somewhat forbidding aspect, with a long beard. On his calling on the defendant for her defence, she exclaimed: "I am frightened at your face and your beard and your head-dress, each of them a cubit in length." Thereupon the *Kādi* removed his cap, masked his beard with his sleeve, and saying that he had thus abated two-thirds of the alarm, invited her to proceed. The result may have been to extract from her an intelligible case which the *Kādi* grasped and appreciated, and we may indulge the hope that justice ensued.

The note in my previous article (JRAS. 1910, p. 780) needs amending. The name of the *Kādi* of the Shawārib family dismissed by Mu'izz al-Daula (A.H. 352) on an Alide's advice is given by Ibn Miskawaih (*Tajārib al-Umam*, Bodl. Marsh, 357, 23^b) when recording his appointment (A.H. 350) as Abu-l-'Abbās 'Abd Allah b. al-Ḥasan. He says that the Caliph refused his concurrence, or to ever admit him to his presence, on the ground that he had

(Kindi, 588). And the only apparent sanction to support his action was the right (which the Shāhids at times exercised) of refusing to attend a tribunal—in fact, of going on strike.

¹ قال عبد الكريم بن محمد الشيرازي : سمعت ابا حامد احمد بن ابي طاهر الاسفراييني يقول : كان ببغداد قاضي يُعرف باحمد بن سيّار وكان له هيبة وجسده مُتَوَلِّدٌ ولحمية طويلة، فنُتدَمُّ اليه امرأتان ادعت احدهما على الاخرى فقال : ما تقولين في دعواها . قالت : افترغ ايد الله القاضي . قال : ممّا ذا . قالت : لحمية طولها ذراع ووجه طولها ذراع ودنّية طولها ذراع فاخذتني هيبتها . فوضع القاضي دنّيته وغطى بكمّهِ لحميةً وقال : قد نتصتكت ذراعين اجبيني عن دعوتها (B.M. Or. 48, 104*).

procured office through the influence of the Amīr's cup-bearer (*jāmdār*) on the condition of paying 200,000 dirhams yearly into the treasury. And he adds that this led to the *hisba* and the *shurfa* likewise becoming venal. Dhahabi (*Ta'rikh al-Islām*, B.M. Or. 48*, 251*) gives a similar account of the matter, and concludes with a prayer that Mu'izz al-Daula might never be forgiven. On the margin attention is drawn to this novel form of imprecation (*mubtada'*). In Ibn al-Athīr's account the Kādi's name appears wrongly as Abu-l-Abbās Ibn 'Abd Allah (viii, 399), and Ibn Hajar (*Raf' al-Isr.*, MS. 107', Kindi, 545-6), in error, makes him to be Muḥammad b. al-Husain, who had died A.H. 347 (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 393, called there Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan): it was this that caused the difficulty of date. Ibn Miskawaih records also, *sub* A.H. 352 (ib. 28^b), that he was superseded by 'Onar b. Aktham, without mention of the Alide's advice, but he gives his name there as Abu-l-'Abbās, whilst Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 407) has merely Ibn abi-l-Shawārib.

The Alide adviser, Abu 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. al-Dā'i, a more important personage, was son of the Dā'i Saḡhīr al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim, and he is himself recorded as one of the Zaidi Imams (*al-Ḥadā'ik al-Wardiyya*, B.M. Cat. Supp. 534, Or. 3586, fols. 60-8). The partial and one-sided account there given may be checked by the rather full details of his career in the *'Umdat al-Ṭālib* (lith. 62-5, MS. B.M. Add. 7355, 27^a). There his descent from the Sibī al-Ḥasan is traced from a great-grandson, al-Kāsim, through both his sons, 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Shajari and Muḥammad al-Baṭḥānī. The *Ḥadā'ik* adopts the former pedigree; it is followed in the general table to Kay's *Yaman*, and the *'Umdat* (lith. 51-2, MS. 23^{a, b}) declares it to be supported by Persian, i.e. local tradition, although it sets out in full the other descent. The narrative of the *'Umdat* says that he arrived at Ahwāz when Mu'izz al-Daula was residing there (i.e. after A.H. 326), in the

pursuit of learning. Some Dailamites acknowledged him as Imām, whereupon he was sent off to ‘Imād al-Daula, who imprisoned him (the *Hudā’ik* says honoured him greatly). In a year he was released on condition of adopting the garb of the *kubā* and the *dashni* (?) and of departing for Kirmān. Thence he went to Mukrān, where the Zaidites acknowledged him, so the ruler, Ibn Ma’dān (Iṣṭakhri, 177, and Ibn al-Athīr, ix. 281 *bis*), sent him to Baṣra. There an accession of adherents led Abu Yūsuf al-Baridi (d. A.H. 332) to quiet him with an income. Later he settled in Baghdad and studied under Abu-l-Ḥasan al-Karkhi and Abu ‘Abd Allah al-Basri, gaining great repute as a legist, although in his speech his Ṭabaristān origin was evident. In 348 he yielded to Mu’izz al-Daula’s pressing invitations to his court, on condition that he might come in his *ṭailasān*, and he was appointed Naḳīb of the Alides, who prospered greatly under him. (The *Hudā’ik* says that he accepted the office only after repeated pressure, and on condition that he was never to be required to attend on the Caliph Muṭī nor wear the *sawād*.) He was highly favoured by the Amīr and was admitted at all hours, even during his siesta, and once, as the *Hudā’ik* records, on the occasion of his having in a Mazālim complaint (which the Naḳīb dealt with—Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 54, 129, 184) inflicted a penalty on the Alide Abu Aḥmad al-Ḥusain al-Mūsawi (father of al-Raḳī and al-Murtaḏā and himself later Naḳīb), whom the vizier al-Muhallabi sought to shield. In natural disposition (*khilka*) he was said to resemble ‘Alī. Al-Tanūkhī dates his birth in 304, and an anecdote is given (*‘Umdat*, lith. 206–7, MS. 75^a), from that author’s *Nishawār al-Muhādāra*,¹ of a member of the *Āl al-Mulit*, descended from a grandson of Mūsa Kāzīm, who waylaid the Mecca caravan and led the life of a lawless brigand, but did not,

¹ The MS. of this work (Paris, Ar. 3482) is now being edited by Professor D. S. Margoliouth.

at any rate, adds the author, claim the Imamate or head a religious rising. Repenting his course of life, he came to Baghdad and asked Ibn al-Dā'i to induce the Amīr to appoint him head of the *Mausim*. The Amīr liked not the security, but proposed that Ibn al-Dā'i should be appointed and that his protégé should act as his deputy. This Ibn al-Dā'i declined, but said he would guarantee his man, so he was appointed, and the Pilgrimage never fared better than under his lead. Let us picture him ending his career, without surprise on his part, "a holy man."

Ibn al-Dā'i is described as resisting constant invitations to head the Dailamites, and the *ʿUmdat*, lith. 165, MS. 61^b, gives a story of Yaḥya Maṣṣūr, son of the Imām al-Nāṣir Aḥmad, sending an envoy to Baghdad to inquire about him, saying that were he the worthier he would readily acknowledge him. His acceptance was brought about by reproaches incurred from ʿIzz al-Daula, when deputy during his father's absence at Mosul, by reason of certain Alide disturbances, and he left Baghdad by stealth in 353. The *Ḥudūʾik* describes Muʿizz al-Daula as distressed at finding him gone, and reproaching his son as being the cause. The flight is recorded by Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 411, following Ibn Miskawaih, 36^a, 37^a. He forthwith adopted ascetic habits and proclaimed himself as al-Mahdi lidīn Allah. The *Ḥudūʾik* says his departure was aided by the Malik al-Dailam, Abu-l-Fawāis Mānādhīr b. Justān,¹ who sent troops under his nephew Bākālījār to support him. Quitting the hills for Hūsam (Yāqūt, *Bullān*,

¹ *Mānādhīr* is thus identified as the son of Justān (murdered by his uncle Wahsūdhan in 349, Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 395) who figures on Dr. Marquart's "Probable Pedigree of the Sallāri and Rawwādi Rulers of Ādharbījān and Ganza" (JRAS. 1909, p. 174), and, further, as the father of Khusru Shāh (JRAS. 1905, p. 472), and the spelling of the name there quoted from Ibn Khaldūn, B.M. Add. 23272, 254^b, is thus justified. The name *Bākālījār*, too, borne by the late Buwayhid ʿImād al-Dīn, is in his case often written Bākālīmjar, but against the name on the margin of the *Ḥudūʾik*, B.M. Or. 3786, 65, is a gloss in an ancient hand. باکالی جار, which negatives the other form.

iv, 996, "Hausam"), he was resisted by its governor, Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Thāir (Ja'far), known as Amīrkā, but he took the town and was joined by his sister's son, Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Nāṣir Aḥmad (the late Imām). Amīrkā next attacked with fresh troops, and took the Imām prisoner, but he had to release him (cf. Ibn al-Athīr. viii, 443), and the release is attributed in the *ʿUmdat* to his great repute, for even the Hanbalite section of the Dailamites, the followers of Abu Ja'far al-Tharī, although differing in creed yet respected his character. Amīrkā now submitted, and gave the Imām his daughter in marriage. The proposed attack on Ṭabaristān was met by a force sent under Naṣr b. Muḥammad al-Isfīdār, and the Imām, deserted by his nephew from jealousy of Amīrkā (cf. Ibn al-Athīr. viii, 411), was checked at Shālūs and had to retire to Ḥūsam. Probably this is the warfare with "Ibn Washmaghīr" referred to by Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 424, following Ibn Miskawaih, 41^a, and thus, apparently, inverting the dates of this warfare and of that with Amīrkā: the *Ḥudā'ik* says only that the Ṣāhib of Ṭabaristān was in great dread of the Imām, whom, however, fortune did not befriend. The *ʿUmdat* puts his death in A.H. 359, from poison administered by Amīrkā by means of his daughter; the *Ḥudā'ik* gives A.H. 360, and also mentions poison as the cause.

That the latter narrative was intended to edify no less than to inform is apparent from some of its contents. For instance, Mu'izz al-Daula, when inquiring of some adherents of the Imāmiyya sect when their Imām was likely to appear, was asked where, after all, was his own Imām: he said he would soon disclose him, and on Ibn al-Dā'i entering he said that there he was (fol. 63^{a, b}). This, in spite of his Alide proclivities, was a bold statement to make when almost within earshot of Muṭī, but bolder still is what he is represented (fol. 62^b) as telling the Alides;

who were clamouring to have Ibn al-Dā'i as their Naḳīb, that he held him too great for the office, as he ought to be occupying the place of Muṭīr.

فقال معز الدولة : انا اعظمُّ من هذا العمل واجلته ان أخطبته
فيه فانى اعتقد ان مكان المطيع هو مكانه وهو المستحق له دون غير

The narrative of the *Ḥodū'ik* purports to be based on traditions derived from the Zaidi Imām al-Nāṭiq bil-Ḥaḳḳ Yaḥya, d. A.H. 424, and I am told by M. C. van Arendonk, of Leyden University, who is collecting material for a work on the Zaidi Imāms of Yaman, that its text accords with that of the Imām's own work *al-Ifāda fi ta'rikh al-ʿimmat al-Sāda*, MS. Leyden 1974 (Rev. Cat., ii, p. 63. No. 912), on which see R. Strothmann, *Die Literatur d. Zaiditen*. Islam, 1910. p. 358. Ibn al-Dā'i is the latest Imām noticed in the work.

XVIII

THE KALIYUGA ERA OF B.C. 3102

419 |

BY J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

THE case set out in the first part of this article pp. 479-96 above, will, it is hoped, make it clear that the Kaliyuga era is not of historical origin, dating from the occurrence of any actual event in B.C. 3102, and running in actual use from that time. It is nothing but an artificial reckoning—(almost as much so as is our Julian Period, beginning 1 January, B.C. 4713)—devised by the Hindū astronomers some thirty-five centuries after the initial point which they assigned to it; that is, roughly, at some time about A.D. 350-400. And it is the principal Hindū astronomical reckoning (the other being the Śaka era beginning in A.D. 78);¹ used in particular—(just as we use the Julian Period)—for the *aharyama* or sum of days from the beginning of the reckoning down to any given time.

Still, the Kaliyuga reckoning having been once set going and having required more or less publicity, it is not surprising that some of the ancient Hindūs should have believed, as some of their descendants do now, that it really dated from its apparent initial point, and proceeded to find an origin for it in their traditions. They did this by connecting it with the events of the great struggle for supremacy between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kurus, which is the topic of their greatest epic, the *Mahābhārata*.² But, while agreeing on the general

¹ For a note on the Śaka era and its adoption by the astronomers, see this Journal, 1910. 818.

² It is perhaps desirable not to omit to remark, though the point is not exactly relevant to our present topic, that another school differed radically from those which interest us here, and placed the Pāṇḍavas and the Kurus 653 years after the beginning of the Kaliyuga; that is, in B.C. 2449. This view is presented by Varāhamihira (died A.D. 587)

principle, they adjusted the connexion on different lines, on the bases of three of the leading events in the epic story.¹

One view (not necessarily the earliest, though it is convenient to mention it first) treated the Kali age and reckoning as dating from the time when Yudhishtira mounted the throne. In accordance with this, an inscription of A.D. 1798 in Rājputānā (see p. 694 below) is dated 4898 years after the time when Yudhishtira seated himself on the throne: the Vikrama and Śaka dates, given in the same record, showing that these 4898 years were reckoned from B.C. 3102, and are in fact years of the Kaliyuga era. In further agreement with this and with a practice which is traced back to at any rate the sixteenth century, the Hīndū almanacs call the first 3044 years of the Kaliyuga — (the period from its beginning to the beginning of the Vikrama era in B.C. 58) — the era of Yudhishtira. And, as they proceed to say that he founded his era at Indraprastha, Delhi, this view plainly dates it from the first occasion on which he was enthroned as king: namely (see p. 685 below), at the new capital in the Khāṇḍava-prastha territory which he made when the kingdom had

in a well-known verse in which, quoting, he tells us, the opinion of a previous writer, Vriddha-Garga, he says (*Bṛhat-Saṁhitā*, 13. 3):— “The Munis (the Saptarshis, the seven stars of the Great Bear) were in the *nakshatra* Maghā when king Yudhishtira ruled the world; and the Śaka time is joined with 2526 (*years*) of that king.” The verse was given to furnish the means of finding, by the Śaka reckoning, the *nakshatra* for the Saptarshis at any given time, on the basis that they entered Maghā when Yudhishtira began to reign, and that that event took place in 2526 – 77 = B.C. 2449.

This view was adopted by Kalhaṇa for the chronology presented in his *Rājataranginī*, which he wrote in A.D. 1148–50: he says (l. 48–56, and compare s. 3407) that some people had built up a false chronology through being misled by a statement that the Bhārata affair took place at the end of the Dvāpara; and, following Varāhamhira's verse, which he quotes, he tells us that the Pāṇḍavas and the Kurus lived when there had elapsed 653 years of the Kal.

¹ Regarding the order and indicated chronology of these events, see the Special Note A, p. 684 below.

been divided with him by Dhṛitarāshṭra. The Mahābhārata seems plainly to take practically the same view: according to it, shortly after that enthronement of Yudhisṭhira there came the exile of him and his brothers in the Kāmyaka forest on the banks of the Sarasvati; and one of the earliest occurrences there was a visit by Hanumat, who delivered a discourse on the moral characteristics of the four ages, in the course of which he observed that the Kali age had recently begun.¹

Another view selected for the starting-point of the Kali age an event which came some thirty-six years later, and treated the age as beginning when Yudhisṭhira, having anointed his grand-nephew Parikshit to reign in his place, started with his brothers and their joint wife Draupadi on the journey to heaven. This was the final occurrence in the story of the Pāṇḍavas and the Kurus. We may, no doubt, refer to this school Ravikīrti, the author of the Aihole inscription of A.D. 634 (p. 689 below, No. 1), which is dated in the year 3735 expired after the Bhārata war and in the Śaka year 556 expired, which latter detail identifies the year 3735 after the Bhārata war with the year 3735 of the Kaliyuga reckoning: we could hardly understand the words "after the Bhārata war" as indicating a reckoning running from the end of the fighting, which was no well-defined point; we take them as meaning "after the last of the occurrences connected

¹ Ētat = Kaliyugam nāma achirād = yat = pravartatē : 3, Vanap., Calcutta text, § 149, verse 11261; Kumbakonam text, § 151, verse 39. So also, 9, Salyap., § 61, verse 3364, speaks of the Kali age as having arrived (*prāptam Kaliyugam vidhi*): this is one of the excuses made by Kṛishṇa for the unfair fatal blow dealt by Bhīma to Duryōdhana in their fight with clubs.

On the other hand, another statement, 1, Ādip., § 2, 282, speaks of the great war as taking place in the interval between the Dvāpara and the Kali (*antarē Kali-Drāparayōh*). But this statement, made in the general introduction to the epic, is plainly nothing but a broad one which is not to be taken literally, any more than the statement in the same passage, verse 272, that (Paraśu)-Rāma slew the Kshatriyas at the junction of the Trētā and the Dvāpara (*Trētā-Drāparayōh samīdhan*).

with the Bhārata war". And it seems* probable that the astronomer Āryabhata, who wrote in or soon after A.D. 499, belonged to this school. At any rate, the Daśagītikasūtra, verse 3, mentions as *Bhārata Gurudivasa*, "the Bhārata Thursday", the day before the day with which there began his fourth Yugapāda which is in other terms (not his) the Kali age. And his commentator Paramēśvara remarks:—

Bhārata Yudhisṭhir-ādayah | tair=upalakshito Guru-
divasō Bhārata-Gurudivasaḥ | rājyam charatām Yudhi-
shṭhir-ādinām=antyō Gurudivasō Dvāpar-āvasāna-gata
ity=arthaḥ | tasmīn=diuē Yudhisṭhir-ādayō rājyam=
utsṛijya mahāprasthānām gatā iti prasiddhiḥ ||

"The Bhāratas are Yudhisṭhira and the others; the Thursday distinguished by them is the Bhārata Thursday; the meaning is the Thursday at the end of the Dvāpara which was the last day of the time during which Yudhisṭhira and the others were occupied in reigning; it is well established that on that day they laid aside the sovereignty, and went on the great journey."

The third view is that of the Purāṇas which adopted an occurrence somewhat earlier than the abdication of Yudhisṭhira, and treated the Kali age as beginning on the day when Kṛishṇa died.¹ This is another event of leading importance in the story of the Pāṇḍavas and the Kurus. Kṛishṇa was an incarnation of Viṣṇu and was friendly to both parties, being in fact connected by descent with both. When the preparations were being made for the great battle, Arjuna on one side and Duryōdhana on the other went to Dvārakā to secure Kṛishṇa as an ally. He was not willing to fight on either side. But he gave them a choice: either of them might have him as an adviser, or his army as combatants. And Arjuna chose Kṛishṇa himself, and Duryōdhana obtained the army. Kṛishṇa survived the war, and died not very long before

¹ See the Special Note B, p. 688 below.

the abdication of Yudhishthira, which seems, in fact, to have been largely induced by the death of his old friend and counsellor.

While, however, so much importance came to be attached to the Kali age and its reckoning from the legendary point of view, the reckoning has not played any leading part in real historical chronology and other practical affairs. Its running year is shown, indeed, along with the Vikrama and Śaka years and the year of any local reckoning, in most, if not quite all, of the leading Hindū almanacs. But this seems to be done simply because it is the principal astronomical reckoning: it is agreed on all sides that the era is not now in any general use, if it is quoted at all, for practical purposes of civil dating.¹ And as regards the custom of previous times as indicated by the inscriptional records, which furnish a good guide in view of the large number of them that we have, the position is as follows:²—

From Southern India we have one inscriptional instance of A.D. 634, one of A.D. 770, one of A.D. 866, three of the tenth century, and then, from the twelfth century onwards, but more particularly from the fourteenth, a certain number of instances, not exactly very small in itself, but extremely so in comparison with the number of cases of the use of the Śaka era and the other reckonings which prevailed in those parts.

From Northern India the earliest known inscriptional instance is one of A.D. 1169 or 1170: and the later ones number only four.

¹ So, also, our leading almanacs and diaries show the running year of the Julian Period: but little practical use, if any, is made of the reckoning for the record of current events.

² For the inscriptional instances see the Special Note C, p. 689 below. If any readers of this article can adduce any other such dates ranging from before A.D. 1100 for Southern India and A.D. 1169 for Northern India, and any literary dates earlier than A.D. 976, their contributions to the history of the reckoning will be welcome.

Literary instances are not at all common, even in astronomical writings: because the Śaka era was so soon adopted by the astronomers for laying down epochs and stating dates. The earliest available one¹ seems to be one of A.D. 976 or 977 from Kashmīr: it is the year in which Kayyāṭa, son of Chandrāditya, wrote his commentary on the Dēviśataka of Ānandavardhana, when Bhīmagupta was reigning.²

It seems also worth adding that the era is ignored as a practical reckoning of civil life in a passage in the *Akbar-nāma*, written in A.D. 1584, which specifies the Lakshmaṇasēna era as the reckoning of Bengal, the Śaka era as the reckoning of Gujarāt and the Dekkan, and the Vikrama era as the reckoning of Mālwa, Delhi, and those parts.³

The popular view divides the Kaliyuga into six eras. Some of the leading Hindū almanacs quote to this effect a certain stanza which is apparently a floating verse not traced to any particular source, and supplement it by a statement in prose.⁴ Others give the prose statement

¹ That is, after the statement in which Āryabhaṭa indicated his date and age: and, while he gave what is virtually a year of the Kali reckoning, he did not cite it as such: see p. 111 f. above.

² The verse giving the date, which I quote from the *Kāryamālā*, part 9 (1893), p. 31, runs thus:—

Vasu-muni-gagan-ōdadhu(4078)-sama-
kālē yātē Kalēs=tathā Lōkē |
dvāpañchāsē varshē
rachit=ēyam Bhīmagupta-nripē ||

The details of the month, etc., not being given, the date does not admit of actual verification. The given Kaliyuga year, 4078 expired, means A.D. 977-78; but the Lōkakāla or Laukika year 52 indicates A.D. 976-77, unless, as was suggested by Professor Kielhorn (*Ind. Ant.*, 20. 154), we may understand that, contrary to the usual custom for this reckoning, it is here cited as the expired year: on this point compare the date of A.D. 1428 or 1429, p. 693, below.

³ See the translation by Beveridge, vol. 2, p. 21 f.

⁴ See the Special Note D, p. 694 below.

without citing the verse. The prose statement is presented with some slight differences. But the general purport of it is as follows :—

First there came the era of Yudhishtira, or Dharma as he is called in one version. He founded his era at Indraprastha, Delhi. And it lasted for 3044 years; that is, from the beginning of the Kaliyuga to the beginning of the so-called Vikrama era in B.C. 58.

Next there came the era of king Vikrama. He founded his era at Ujjain, in Mālwa. And it measured 135 years: that is, from B.C. 58 to the beginning of the so-called Śaka era in A.D. 78.

Then there came the era of king Śālivāhana :¹ that is, the Śaka era beginning in A.D. 78. He founded his era at Pratishtāna, Paithān on the Gōdāvarī in the Nizam's Dominions. It is to have a duration of 18,000 years.

The next will be the era of king Vijayābhinandana, which is to last for 10,000 years. This king is located by some *Vaitaraṇyān sindhu-saṅgamē*, which might perhaps mean at some place named Vaitaraṇī at the confluence of the Indus and the five rivers of the Panjāb. But another version places him *Gautamī-sāgara-sambhēdē*; that is, apparently, at the place where the Gautamī branch of the Gōdāvarī flows into the sea, which is at Point Koringa near Coconada, in Madras. And this suggests that the other expression may mean "on the Vaitaraṇī, at the place where it flows into the sea." The Vaitaraṇī rises in the north-west part of Orissa, and, joining the Brāhmaṇī near Cuttack, after which the joint river is known as the Dhāmṛā, flows into the Bay of Bengal at Palmyras Point.

The next will be the era of king Nāgārjuna, which will

¹ This is an imaginary king, whose name first figures in connexion with the era in an inscription of A.D. 1272, and seems plainly to have been introduced in imitation of the coupling of the equally imaginary king Vikrama, Vikramāditya, with the era of B.C. 58.

last for 400,000 years. He is located by some at Dhārā-tīrtha in the country of Gauḍa, or, roughly, Bengal; apparently with reference to a place of this name somewhere near the beginning of the delta of the Ganges. But the other version places him on the bank of the Kāvērī, in Mysore or Madras.

The last will be the era of Kalkin: this will endure for the 821 years which are the remainder of the 432,000 years of which the Kaliyuga consists. One version styles Kalkin a king, and locates him vaguely in the Gauḍa country. Another, styling him an incarnation (of Viṣṇu) in accordance with the more general view, places him at the city Karavīra in the Karnāṭaka country: that is, at Kōllhāpūr, in Bombay. A third version, which again marks him as a king, places him, in accordance with some of the Purāṇas, at a village named Sambhala or Śambhala, which is held to be Sambhal in the Mōradābād District, United Provinces.

The *Jyōtirvidābhāraṇa* (see p. 696 below) gives the same lengths for the six eras, but in other respects puts the matter somewhat differently. There will be, it says, in the Kali age, in the land of the Bhāratas, many warrior kings: amongst them, the Śakas. Any prince who slays half an *abja* and five *koṭis* (550,000,000) of Śakas, becomes the founder of an era, a universal king, and a slayer of founders of eras. There are to be six such in the Kali age: Yudhisṭhira at Hastināpura: Vikrama at Ujjain: Śālivāhana at the mountain Śālēya: Vijayābhinandana at Chitrakūṭa:¹ Nāgārjuna at Rōhītaka, Rōhtak in the Panjāb; and Bali (so, instead of Kalkin) at Bhṛigukachchha, Broach in Gujarāt, Bombay. After that the Kṛita age will come, and there will be the kings of the Solar Race again.

To what time the idea of this division of the Kaliyuga

¹ Perhaps Chitōr in Udaipūr, Rājputānā: perhaps Chitakōṭ in Bānda, United Provinces.

may be carried back, is not known. But it is mentioned by Abul Fazl in his *Āīn i Akbarī*, in a passage written in A.D. 1595,¹ which gives the names of the six founders of the eras and the duration of each era just as we have them in the almanacs, but does not state the places to which the almanacs refer them. And it is perhaps carried back to a somewhat earlier time by the spurious record on copperplates at the Bhīmankarṭṭi Maṭha near Tīrthahalli in Mysore,² which purports to record a grant made by king Janamējaya (son of Parikshit) in the *Plavaṅga samvatsara* which was the 89th year in the Yudhishṭhira-śaka, "the era of Yudhishṭhira", that is, in the Kaliyuga year 89 (current), in B.C. 3014. But it is not likely to be of any early origin: since no trace of it is found in the Purāṇas, etc., which do not assign the foundation of an era even to Kalki or Kalkin: they only mention him as the future incarnation of Viṣṇu, destined to pave the way for the next Kṛita age.³

In connexion with the general topic of the Ages, the following remark may be added in conclusion.

According to the astronomical scheme, every Age, Manvantara, and Kalpa begins at the Hindū nominal vernal equinox, as marked by the entrance of the sun into the constellation and sign Mēsha, which occurs in the *amānta* lunar month Chaitra,⁴ the first month of the principal lunar year, but of course not on any fixed *tithi*

¹ Translation by Jarrett, vol. 2, p. 15. As regards the first era, the passage says:—"In the beginning of the present Yuga, Rājā Yudhishṭhira conquered the universe and being at the completion of an epoch [i.e., at the end of the Dvāpara age], constituted his own reign an era."

² No. 41 in my List of Spurious Records, *Ind. Ant.*, 1901, 219.

³ See the Special Note E, p. 697 below.

⁴ The *amānta* month is the synodic lunar month, beginning and ending with the new-moon. The *pūrṇimānta* month begins and ends with the full-moon.

or lunar day in that month. The popular practice, however, for some reason which is not apparent, treats the matter otherwise, and observes certain fixed *tithis* as anniversaries of the beginning of each of the great periods. For the Ages, the days as shown in almanacs are as follows:—

The Kṛitayugādi *tithi*, or lunar day which is the anniversary of the beginning of a Kṛita age, is Kārttika śukla 9. The Trētāyugādi *tithi* is Vaiśākha śukla 3. The Dvāparayugādi *tithi* is the new-moon *tithi* of the *amānta* Māgha or *pūrṇimānta* Phālguna. And the Kaliyugādi *tithi* is the 13th of the dark fortnight of the *amānta* Bhādrapada or *pūrṇimānta* Āśvina.

This practice dates from at any rate the beginning of the eleventh century, since it is mentioned by Albērūnī, writing in A.D. 1030. But he has given the details differently, except as regards the Kaliyugādi *tithi*: according to him the “3rd Vaiśākha” is Kṛitayugādi: the “9th Kārttika” is Trētāyugādi; and the “15th Māgha” is Dvāparayugādi.¹

It is also alluded to in the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa*, 3. 14. 12, 13, but without full details:—“The 3rd *tithi* of Vaiśākha, the 9th in the bright fortnight of Kārttika: the 13th in the dark fortnight of Nabhasya (Bhādrapada), and the 15th in Māgha; these have been declared by the ancients to be Yugādyā *tithis*: they are four *tithis* of infinite merit.”

SPECIAL NOTES

A: see p. 676 above.—The chronology of some leading events in the story of the Pāṇḍavas and the Kurus

Yudhishṭhira ascended the throne twice. The first occasion was as follows:—

After the death of their nominal father, Pāṇḍu, who abdicated and ended his days in retirement in the forests

¹ *India*; trans. Sachau, vol. 2. p. 186.

of the Himālaya Mountains, Yudhisht̥hira and his four younger brothers, Bhīma, Arjuna, Nakula, and Sahadēva, were taken to the capital Hāstinapura, and were brought up there with the sons of the reigning king, their uncle Dhṛitarāsh̥tra. And, when they had completed their education and attained years of discretion, Yudhisht̥hira was installed by Dhṛitarāsh̥tra as Yuvarāja or heir apparent associated in the government :¹ this was done partly in recognition of Yudhisht̥hira's many good qualities, but also in view of the facts that his father Pāṇḍu had reigned before Dhṛitarāsh̥tra, —the latter having been passed over, though he was the elder brother, because he was blind,— and that he himself had been born before Dhṛitarāsh̥tra's eldest son, Duryōdhana. When Yudhisht̥hira had been installed as Yuvarāja, the people, to whom he quickly endeared himself, wished, for the reason that Dhṛitarāsh̥tra, being blind, ought not to reign, to take a further step and anoint him as king. This inflamed the jealousy and enmity of Duryōdhana, which had existed from an early time: and he began to plot to secure the sovereignty for himself. Eventually Dhṛitarāsh̥tra sought to arrange matters by dividing the kingdom: he gave Hāstinapura to his sons, the Kurus, and assigned to the Pāṇḍavas, Yudhisht̥hira and his brothers as the sons of Pāṇḍu, a territory named Khāṇḍavaprastha, where they founded the city Indraprastha, Delhi. And after various occurrences, including a conquest of surrounding kingdoms on behalf of Yudhisht̥hira by his brothers, Yudhisht̥hira celebrated a Rājasūya sacrifice, and had himself anointed as paramount king of Indraprastha and the territories which were thus added.² This was the first occasion on which he ascended the throne.

The second occasion on which Yudhisht̥hira mounted the throne came some fifteen years or so later. Even the

¹ *Mahābhārata*, Calcutta ed., 1, Ādiparvan, § 139. 5517.

² 2. Sabhāp., § 32. 1230, 1247; § 35. 1307; § 45. 1628-30.

partition of the kingdom made by Dhṛitarāshṭra failed to satisfy Duryōdhana: and by his conspiring with Śakuni, the skilled gambler and cheat, there was brought about the great gambling match which ended in Yudhisṭhira losing all his possessions to Śakuni on behalf of Duryōdhana, and going into exile with his brothers for thirteen years, the first twelve of which were passed in the Kāmyaka forest on the banks of the Sarasvatī. There followed, ultimately, the great war, at the end of which there remained alive, on the Pāṇḍava side, Yudhisṭhira and his brothers, with Sātyaki and Kṛishṇa, and, on the other side the aged king Dhṛitarāshṭra, with Aśvatthāman, Kṛipa, Kṛitavarman, and Bhīshma, who lay dying on a bed of arrows on the battlefield. A reconciliation was effected between Dhṛitarāshṭra and the Pāṇḍavas. Yudhisṭhira proceeded to Hāstinapura, and was there enthroned as king of the united kingdom of Hāstinapura and Indraprastha, with Bhīma as his Yuvarāja.¹ And thus Yudhisṭhira mounted the throne for the second time.

The death of Kṛishṇa came about twenty years after the last event noted above. Some intermediate occurrences were as follows. Bhīshma died when he had lain for fifty-eight nights on his bed of arrows.² After some unstated interval there was born Parikshit, the posthumous son of Abhimanyu son of Arjuna.³ A year was then occupied with an Aśvamēdha sacrifice.⁴ Some little time after that, and when fifteen years had elapsed since the anointment of Yudhisṭhira as king at Hāstinapura Dhṛitarāshṭra withdrew from the world, to spend his remaining days in the forest.⁵ Apparently about a year later, Yudhisṭhira and his brothers paid a visit to

¹ 12. Śāntip., § 37. 1386-92; § 40. 1443; § 41. 1475.

² 13. Anuśāsanap., § 167. 7732; § 168. 7765.

³ 14. Āśvamēdhikap., § 66. 1943.

⁴ 14. Āśvamēdhikap., § 72. 2095; § 89. 2644.

⁵ 15. Āśramavāsikap., § 1. 6; § 3. 71-2, 84. 96; § 15. 428.

Dhṛitarāshṭra in his retirement.¹ Two years after their return,² the sage Nārada came to Yudhishṭhira, and reported that Dhṛitarāshṭra had perished in a forest fire. And we are told farther on that, when Dhṛitarāshṭra died, he had spent three years in the forests and fifteen in the city.³ The epic then tells us that, when thirty-six years had elapsed,⁴ Yudhishṭhira beheld unlucky portents: this has been understood to mean thirty-six years after the great war: but we would suggest thirty-six years after the first anointment of Yudhishṭhira as king at Indraprastha. And it was apparently not long after this that Kṛishṇa died, being slain by the hunter Jarā, who mistook him, seated in yellow robes engaged in meditation, for a deer. Thus, we are told, the lord Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu, of whom Kṛishṇa was an incarnation) went back to his own abode.⁵

The news of the death of Kṛishṇa must have taken some little time to reach Yudhishṭhira, since it was carried to him by Arjuna, who first went to Dvārakā to perform the funeral rites and make some other arrangements, and then visited the sage Vyāsa on the way to his eldest brother. As soon, however, as he heard it, Yudhishṭhira made up his mind to withdraw from the world;⁶ in which resolution his brothers joined. Accordingly, he anointed Parikshit to reign in his stead.⁷ And with his brothers, their joint wife Draupadī, and a dog, he started from Hāstinapura on the journey which landed them one by one in heaven.⁸

¹ 15. Āśramavāsikap., § 23. 624.

² 15. Āśramavāsikap., § 37. 1011.

³ 15. Āśramavāsikap., § 39. 1102.

⁴ 16, Mausalap., § 1. 1, 13; § 2. 52.

⁵ 16, Mausalap., § 4. 125-30.

⁶ 17. Mahāprasthānikap., § 1. 1, 2.

⁷ 17. Mahāprasthānikap., § 1. 6.

⁸ 17. Mahāprasthānikap., § 1. 24-5.

B: see p. 678 above.—The connexion of the beginning of the Kali age with the death of Kṛishṇa

On the subject of the Kali age beginning on the day on which Kṛishṇa died, there is a standard verse, which in the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* runs thus :¹—

Yasmīn = Kṛishṇō divaṁ yātas = tasmīn = ēva tadā dinē |
pratipannaḥ Kaliyugas = tasya saṁkhyāṁ nibōdhata ||

The *Matsya-Purāṇa* gives *tad āhāni* for *tadā dinē*, and presents the second line thus :²—

pratipannaḥ Kaliyugaḥ pramāṇaḥ tasya mē sṛiṇu |

The *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* agrees with the *Matsya* in the first line, and presents the second thus :³—

pratipannaḥ Kaliyugam = iti prāhulī purāvidah ||

The *Vishṇu-Purāṇa* agrees with the *Matsya* and the *Bhāgavata* in the first line, and presents the second thus :⁴—

pratipannaḥ Kaliyugaḥ tasya saṁkhyāṁ nibōdha mē ||

The *Vāyu*, *Matsya*, and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* confine themselves to the statement:—“The Kali age arrived on that same day on which Kṛishṇa died.”

The *Bhāgavata* says :⁵—“ (When) this lustre of the lord Vishṇu, by name Kṛishṇa, went to heaven, then Kali⁶ entered the world, whereby people delight in sin. As long as he, the lord of Lakshmi, touched (*the earth*) with feet beautiful as water-lilies, so long indeed Kali availed not to invade the earth. Those who know the events of

¹ For the *Brahmāṇḍa* I quote the text printed at the Sūi-Veṅkatēśvata Press, Bombay, in *Saṁvat* 1963, Śakē 1828 (A.D. 1906-7); chapter 74, verse 241. For the *Vāyu*, the edition in the Ānandaśrama Sanskrit Series (1905); chapter 99, verses 428-9.

² Ed. Ānandaśrama Sanskrit Series (1907); chapter 273, verses 49-50.

³ Text printed at the Nirmayasāgar Press, Śakē 1826, Saṁ (A.D.) 1905, book 12, chapter 2, verse 33.

⁴ Text printed at Kṛishṇasastrī Sarman Garjara's Press in the *Kshaya-samrat-sara* (A.D. 1866-67); book 4, chapter 24, verse 40.

⁵ Loc. cit. in note 3 above, verses 29-33.

⁶ The Kali age is personified as Kali, an evil spirit presiding over it.

former times say that the Kali age arrived on that same day on which Kṛishṇa went to heaven.”

The *Vishṇu*, expanding the topic more, says: ¹—“ When indeed, O Brāhmaṇ !, the portion of the lord Vishṇu which was born in the family of Vasudēva went to heaven, then indeed Kali came. As long as he touched this earth with feet beautiful as water-lilies, so long Kali was not able to have contact with the world. When the portion of the eternal Vishṇu had gone from earth to heaven, Yudhishṭhira, the son of Dharma, with his younger brothers, laid aside the sovereignty. And, having seen unlucky portents, he, the Pāṇḍava, when Kṛishṇa had gone, performed the anointment of Parikshit. The Kali age arrived on that same day on which Kṛishṇa died.”

C: see p. 679 above.—Some inscriptional dates in the
Kaliyuga era

The earliest known South-Indian dates in the Kaliyuga era, six in number, referred to on p. 679 above, are as follows:—

(1) The inscription of the time of the Western Chalukya king Pulakēśin II at Aihole in the Bijāpūr District, Bombay, is dated: ²—

Triṁśatsu tri-sahasrēshu Bhāratād=āhavād=itah [1*]
sapt-ābdaśata-yuktēshu śatēshv ³=abdēshu pañchasu [1*]
Pañchāśatsu Kalau kālē shaṭṣu pañcha-śatāsu cha [1*]
samāsu samatitāsu Śakānām=apī bhūbhujām ||

“ When thirty, three thousand, (and) five years, joined with seven centuries of years, have gone since the Bhārata war: when fifty, six, and five hundred years of the Śaka kings also have elapsed in the Kali time.”

¹ Loc. cit. in note 4 on p. 688 above, verses 35-8. 40.

² *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 6, p. 7.

³ Read *gatēshv*.

The mention of the Śaka year shows that the 3735 years since the Bhārata war are the first 3735 years of the Kaliyuga era. Accordingly, this record gives the Kaliyuga year 3735 and the Śaka year 556, both expired. As the details of the month, etc., are not stated, the date does not admit of actual verification. But the year is A.D. 634-35.

(2) An inscription of the time of the Pāṇḍya king Parāntaka at Āṇamalai in the Madura District, Madras. is dated:¹—

Kalēḥ sahasra-tritayē=bdā=gōcharē gatē=shṭa-śatyām=
api saikasaptatau [I*] Paushṇē=hani māsi
Kārttikē [II*]

“When there have gone, in the range of the years of Kali. three thousands and eight centuries together with seventy-one. on the Paushṇa day in the month Kārttika.”

This gives the Kaliyuga year 3871 expired, with a certain day in the lunar month Kārttika. The expression “the Paushṇa day” is of course capable of being taken to denote a day of Pūshan, the sun, i.e. a Sunday, in which sense it was taken by the editor: but this rendering leaves the date vague, since there would be four or five Sundays in the month. The expression is made definite if, in accordance with a frequent custom in Chōla and Pāṇḍya dates by which the dates were denoted by the *nakshatras*,² we take it as meaning the day of Rēvatī, the regent of which is Pūshan. The result, however, suggests that the words *Paushṇa ahon* may have been used here intentionally, in preference to the name Rēvatī, in order to give a double meaning. Thus, the day of Rēvatī in the given year and month was Sunday, 4 November, A.D. 770: this was the civil day of the eleventh *tithi* of the bright fortnight of Kārttika; and the moon was in Rēvatī at sunrise and up to about 9.45 p.m.

¹ *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 8, p. 320.

² See, e.g., No. 4 below.

(3) The record of a king Karunandaḍakkan, inscribed on copperplates which were found in the Huzūr Office at Trivandrum in the Travancore State, is dated :¹—

Kaliyuga-kkōṭṭu nāl padināngu-nūr-āyirattu nārpattu onbadiṅ-āyirattu eṅbattu ēlu ſenra nāl.

“The day on which there have elapsed fourteen-hundred-thousand, forty-nine thousand, and eighty-seven days of the number of the Kaliyuga.”

This specification of the day 1,449,087 elapsed in what is known technically as the *aharyana* or sum of days of the Kaliyuga reckoning, takes us to 8 July, A.D. 866, in the year 3968 current.

(4) The inscription of the time of the Chōla king Parāntaka I at Grāmam in the South Arcot District, Madras, is dated :²—

Kaliuga-vashaiṅ³ nāl-āyirattu nār[pa]ttu-nālu Madirai-koṇḍa kō = Pparakēśaripaṅmaṅku yāṅḍu 36āvadu Kalu-
[ga nra] nāl padināngu-nūr-āyirattu ēlu-[ba
.]irattu [m]appattu ēlu i[v]v-
āṭṭ[ai] Ma[gara-nā]yarru = Chchani-kkiḷamai perṅa Iravadi⁴-
n[āṅru].

“The Kaliyuga year four thousand and forty-four, the 36th year of king Parakēsarivarman who took Madirai, on the day fourteen-hundred-thousand, seventy- . . . thousand, and thirty-seven, . . . on the day of Rēvati corresponding to a Saturday of the month Makara in this year.”

This gives the Kaliyuga year 4044, not specified either as current or as expired, with a day in the solar month Makara which is marked as the day 1,47·037, not specified either as current or as elapsed, and is further described as the day of the *nakshatra* Rēvati and as

¹ See the Travancore Archeological Series, No. 1 (1910), p. 5. The editor has wrongly placed the record in A.D. 864-65.

² Annual Report of the Archeological Survey of India, 1905-6, p. 183.

³ Read *vashaiṅ*.

⁴ Read *Irēvati*.

a Saturday. Professor Kielhorn has shown that the date is Saturday, 14 January, A.D. 943, in the year 4044 current:¹ it was the day 1,477 037 current of the reckoning, and the twenty-third day of the solar month Makara; and the moon was in Rēvatī at sunrise and up to about 3.12 p.m.

(5) An inscription of the Chōla king Parakēsarivarman-Uttama-Chōla at Uyyakkondāṅ-Tirumalai in the Trichinopoly District, Madras, is dated in the year Śaka 901 and Kaliyuga 40[8]0.²

The record does not state the month, etc. But, with the given years both taken as expired, it belongs to A.D. 979-80.

(6) An inscription of the same king at Tiruvīḍaimarudūr in the Tanjore District, Madras, is dated Kaliyuga 408[3].³

Here, again, the record does not give the month, etc. But, with the year taken as expired, it belongs to A.D. 982-83.

As regards the five instances of the inscripational use of the Kaliyuga era in Northern India, referred to on p. 679 above, the case is as follows:—

Dr. Vogel's forthcoming volume of inscriptions in the Chambā State will present one of these dates, of the Kali year 4270 expired, with details falling in A.D. 1169 or 1170, recorded in an inscription at Sai, and will mention two others from Mando and Kashmir: namely, one of the year 4530 (current), in A.D. 1428; and one of the year 4622 (current), in A.D. 1520.⁴

The other two, the only ones that can be given here in full, are the following:—

An inscription on a stone found lying at the mouth of

¹ *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 8, p. 261.

² See the Annual Report on Epigraphy, Madras, 1908-9, para. 41.

³ See the Annual Report on Epigraphy, Madras, 1907-8, para. 53.

⁴ I am indebted to Dr. Vogel for being able to notice these three here.

a spring known as the Bhuvanēśa or Bhuvanēśvari at Khunmōh in Kashmir refers itself to the reign of Zainu-l-ābidin, son of Sikandar, and is dated :¹—

Sam 4 Mārga śuti 5 Śukrē Triṁś-ādhikē cha
śata-bhūta-yutē Kalasya² yātē sahasra-chaturē śaradāṁ
. Mārgaśyurśē³ sitē pakshē chaturthē=py=apī
vatsarē | pañchanyām Śukravāsarē ||

“The year 4, the 5th day of the bright fortnight of Mārga, on Friday: and when there have gone four thousand years of Kali joined with five centuries (*anul*) increased by the thirtieth; in Mārgaśirsha, in the bright fortnight, and in the fourth year: on the fifth *tithi*, on Friday.”

This gives the year 4 of the Laukika or popular reckoning, also known as the Śāstra reckoning, the Kaliyuga year 4530 expired, Mārgaśirsha śukla 5, Friday. The date, however, is not satisfactory. The specification of the Kaliyuga year as expired would place the actual day in A.D. 1429: but the given year 4 of the Laukika reckoning places it in A.D. 1428.⁴ And in neither year does the given *tithi* work out for a Friday: in A.D. 1429 its civil day was Thursday, 1 December, and it cannot by any possibility be coupled with the Friday; and in A.D. 1428 it was what is known technically as an expunged *tithi*, beginning and ending in between the sunrise at the beginning, and the following sunrise at the end, of Thursday, 11 November.⁵ We can only say that the record may be referred to either A.D. 1428 or 1429; with a preference for A.D. 1428 if we may assume

¹ See Mr. Marshall's Note on Archaeological Work in Kashmir, 1908, p. 19.

² Unless we may correct the reading into *Kalē-ztu* or something like that, we can only find here an imaginative genitive invented to suit the verse.

³ Read °*śirshē*.

⁴ Compare the date of A.D. 976 or 977, p. 680 above.

⁵ The results are the same both by the tables in Sewell and Dikshit's *Indian Calendar*, and by Jacobi's tables in *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 1.

that the person who computed the date carried the *tithi* on to the Friday by making it end not less than about an hour later than the ending-time given by our tables.

An inscription at the temple of Hanumat at Jaisalmer in Rājputānā is dated :¹—

Śri-Yudhishṭhirasya ajāta-śatroh śimhāsan-ādhyāsanāt
varsha-vṛinda 4898 gatē Vikramārka-rājyāt sainvat 1854
Śālivāhana-śakāt śakē 1719 uttarāyana²-gatē.

“When a total of 4898 years has gone since the glorious Yudhishṭhira, having no enemies, seated himself on the throne ; in the year 1854 from the reign of Vikramārka : in the year 1719 from the era of Śālivāhana :”

The given Vikrama and Śaka years show that the year 4898 expired since the time when Yudhishṭhira ascended the throne is the Kaliyuga year 4898 expired. The corresponding year is A.D. 1797–98. And, if *uttarāyana-gatē* means “when the winter solstice has just gone by”, the actual day is 10 January, A.D. 1798.

D: see p. 680 above.—The six eras in the Kali age

A certain verse, apparently not traced to any particular source, says :—

Yudhishṭhirō Vikrama-Śālivāhanau
tatō nṛpaḥ syād=Vijayābhinandanah |
tatas=tu Nāgārjuna-bhūpatiḥ Kalau
Kalkī shaḍ=ētē śaka-kārakāḥ smṛitāḥ ||

“Yudhishṭhira, Vikrama and Śālivāhana, then king Vijayābhinandana, then king Nāgārjuna, (*and*) Kalkin; these are declared by tradition to be the six founders of eras³ in the Kali age.”

¹ See Professor S. R. Bhandarkar's Second Report on Sanskrit MSS., 1907, p. 98.

² Read *ma*.

³ As a result of being the standing name of an era of very leading importance, the word *śaka*, also its derivative *śaka*, came eventually to be used in the general senses of ‘an era’ and ‘a year.’

This verse is given in the introductory parts of some of the Pañchāngs, Pañjikās, Tithipatras, or Hindū almanacs. And in the almanac which is published in Bombay by the Ganpat Krishnaji Press Company, and in the Paṭwardhani Pañchāng, started by Professor Kero Lakshman Chhatre, which also (it is believed) is still published in Bombay, it is supplemented by a passage in prose which runs:—

Prathama Indraprasthē Yudhishṭhīras=tasya śakaḥ
3044 ॥ Dvītiya Ujjayinyām Vikramas=tasya śakaḥ
135 ॥ Tṛtīyaḥ Pratishṭhānē Śālivāhanas=tasya śakaḥ
18000 ॥ Chaturthō Vaitarīnyām¹ Śindhu-saṅgamē Vijayā-
bhinandanas=tasya śakaḥ 10000 ॥ Pañchamō Gauḍa-dēsē
Dhārātirthē Nāgārjunas=tasya śakaḥ 400000 ॥ Shashṭhaḥ
Kāravīra-pattanē Karnāṭakē Kalky-avatāras=tasya śakaḥ
821 ॥ Ēvaṁ shaṭ 6 śaka-kartāraḥ ॥

An almanac prepared by astrologers of Uppina-Betgēri in the Dhārwar District, and printed at the Prasādarāghava Press at Dhārwar,² does not present the verse, but says:—

Adhunā-vartamāna-Kaliyuga-madhyē shaṇ nṛipāḥ śaka-
kartāraḥ ॥ Ādāv=Indraprasthē Dharma-śaka-pramāṇaṁ
3044 Ujjayinyām Vikrama-śaka-pramāṇaṁ 135 Pratishṭhā-
nagarē³ Śālivāhana-śaka-pramāṇaṁ 18000 Vaitarīnyām⁴
Śindhu - saṅgamē Vijayābhinaṁdana - śaka - pramāṇaṁ
10000 Kāvērī-tirē Nāgārjuna - śaka - pramāṇaṁ 400000
Gauḍa-dēsē Kalki-bhūpati-śaka-pramāṇaṁ 821 ॥

With the Uppina-Betgēri almanac there agrees practically an almanac prepared by astrologers of Savaṇūr and Kaḷas in the Dhārwar District, and printed by Khanolkar & Co. at their Karnāṭaka Book Depot Press. It differs only in beginning:— Ētat-Kaliyuga - madhyē shaṇ nṛipāḥ⁵ śaka-
kartāraḥ ādāv=Indraprasthē Dharmāḥ 3044; and in

¹ Read °ranyām.

² For the copies of this almanac and the next one, from which I quote them, I am indebted to Mr. R. K. Targondkar, Nazir of the District Court, Dhārwar.

³ Read Pratishṭhāna-nagarē.

⁴ Read °ranyām.

⁵ Read shaṇ=nṛipāḥ.

giving, throughout, on the same lines. *Vikramah 135*, instead of *Vikrama-śaka-pramāṇam 135*, and so on. It has the same mistake, *Pratishṭhānagarē* for *Prati-śṭhāna-nagarē*: on the other hand it has the correct form *Vaitaraṇyām*, instead of *riṅyām*.

An almanac printed at the Electric Printing Press, Gwalior, and known, I think, as the Lashkar Pañchāṅg.¹ also does not present the verse, but says:—

Asmin Kalau shaṭ śaka-kartārō nṛpāḥ || Tatṛ=Ēndra-prasthē Yudhisṭhira-śakaḥ 3044 || Tata Ujjayinyām Vikrama-śakaḥ 135 || Tataḥ Pratishṭhānē Śālivāhana-śakaḥ 18000 | tan-madhyē gata-Śakaḥ 1831 śēsha-Śakaḥ 16169 || Tatō Gautamī-sāgara-saṁbhēdē Vijayābhinandana-śakaḥ 10000 || Tatō Dhārātīrthē Nāgārjuna-śakaḥ 400000 || Tataḥ Saṁbhala-grāmē Kalkī bhavitā tach-chhakaḥ 821 || Tataḥ Kṛitayuga-pravṛttir-bhavitṛi ||

The *Jyōtirvidābharana*, a spurious astrological work, of late but unknown date,² which claims to have been written by the poet Kalidāsa in the Kaliyuga year 3068 expired, in B.C. 34, when king Vikramārka was reigning, says, in chapter 10, verses 107-13:—

Kalau bhavishyanty=atha Bhārat-āvanau
mahābhujō bhāmbhuvō=py=anēkaśah |
Śakās=tath=aishām=abhishēchan-ādikaṁ
hitam sad=ōdirita-kāla-sādhitam || 107
Dharādhibhūr=Bhilla-Śak-ādi-jāti-jas=
tad=āsana-sthō=bhijanaṛ=namaskṛitah |
stutah sa rāj-ādhijanaṛḥ pratishṭhitō
na mantra-bhēd-ādy-abhishēchan-ōchitah || 108

¹ For the copy from which I quote I am indebted to Mr. Hira Lal, Extra Assistant Commissioner, C.P., and Mr. Prem Shankar.

² Except that a commentary on it was written by Bhāvaratna in the Vikrama year 1768 expired, in A.D. 1711 or 1712. The pretended date of the work is given in chapter 22, verse 21. A translation of chapter 22, the last, by Dr. Bhau Daji, may be seen in JBBRAS., 6. 26. Weber proposed to refer the work to about the sixteenth century: *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 201, note *.

Nihanti yō bhūtala-maṇḍalē Śākān=
 sapañchakōṭy-abjadala-pramān=Kalau †
 sa rājanputrah śaka-kārakō bhavēn=
 nripādhirāj=ōdyata-śāka-kartri-hā ‖ 109
 Yudhishṭhīrō Vikrama-Śālivāhanau
 narādhināthau Vijayābhinandanah †
 imē tu Nāgārjuna-mēdinīvibhur=
 Balih kramāt shaṭ śaka-kārakāh Kalau ‖ 110
 Yudhishṭhīrād=vēda-yug-ānbar-āgnayah † (3044)
 kalamba-viśvē (135)=bhra-kha-kh-āshṭa-bhūmayah
 (18,000) †
 tatō=yutañ (10,000) laksha-chatusṭhayañ (400,000)
 kramād=
 dharā-dṛig-ashṭāv (821)=iti śāka-vatsarāh ‖ 111
 Yudhishṭhīrō=bhūd=bhuvī Hastināpurē
 tath=Ōjjayinyāñ puri Vikram-āhvayah †
 Śālēya-dhārābhṛiti Śālivāhanah
 su-Chitrakūṭē Vijayābhinandanah ‖ 112
 Nāgārjunō Rōhitakē kshītau Balir=
 bhavishyat=īndrō Bhṛigukachehha-pattanē †
 Kṛita-pravṛittis=tad-anantaram bhavēt=
 tadā bhavishyanty=avanībhritō=rkatah ‖ 113

E: see p. 683 above.—Kalkin, Vishṇuyaśas, and the village Sambhala

What the *Purāṇas*, the *Mahābhārata*, and the *Harivamśa* say about Kalkin and his surroundings is as follows:—

The *Vāyu-Purāṇa*, 99. 396–7, the *Matsya*, 273. 27–8, and the *Brahmāṇḍa*, 74. 206–7, only say, in almost identical words, that Kalkin will destroy the Mlēcchhas in the ‘twilight’ of the Kali age.¹ They make no mention of Vishṇuyaśas and the village Sambhala.

The *Vishṇu-Purāṇa*, 4. 24, prose paras. 26–9, says that, when the Kali age is nearly ended, a portion of the lord Vāsudēva (Vishṇu) will descend to earth in the form of

¹ For what is meant by the ‘twilight’ of an age, see p. 481 above.

Kalkin in the house of Vishṇuyaśas, a leading Brāhman at the village Śambhala, and will destroy the Mlēcchhas and other wicked people, and will re-establish the world in righteousness; after which, at the end of the Kali age, the minds of people will become as pellucid as crystal: and from these renovated people there will arise offspring which will follow the practices of the Kṛita age.

The *Bhāgavata* announces in 1. 3. 25, that in the 'twilight' of the Kali age Vishṇu will be born as Kalki from Vishṇuyaśas. For the rest it says, in 12. 2. 16-23, that, when the Kali age is almost gone, Vishṇu will manifest himself as Kalki in the abode of the Brāhman Vishṇuyaśas, a chief man of the village Śambhala, and, riding a swift horse and armed with a sword, will slay all evil people: and so the Kṛita age will come.

The *Mahābhārata*, 3, Vanap., § 190. 13097-106, says that in the troublous times at the end of the Yuga the Brāhman Kalkin, also named Vishṇuyaśas, deputed by Time, will be born at the village Sambhala, an auspicious Brāhman settlement: and, conquering by religion, he will become a universal sovereign, and will lead back the world to tranquillity, and, exterminating the Mlēcchhas, will bring about the passing of this Yuga into the one which is to follow it. But this is part of a passage which has been adjudged an interpolation and could hardly be regarded in any other light.

The *Harivaṁśa*, 2367-73, mentions the Brāhman Kalkin, also named Vishṇuyaśas, of the village Sambhala, who is to be the tenth incarnation of Vishṇu in the 'twilight' of the Kali age: after which, that age being destroyed, the Kṛita age will come again. But, whether this statement was contained in the *Harivaṁśa* which was known to Bāṇa and Subandhu at the beginning of the seventh century, may be regarded as very doubtful.

XIX

NOTES ON THE DISPOSAL OF BUDDHIST DEAD IN CHINA

By W. PERCEVAL YETTS

IN China the corpse of a Buddhist priest is commonly disposed of by one of three methods, viz.: cremation, burial, or preservation by drying.

The first is the most general, and is the one honoured by ancient usage of the Order.

From the dawn of their history the Chinese have considered it a sacred duty to endeavour to preserve the bodies of their dead, though their efforts to ward off decay have rarely gone beyond providing massive coffins and elaborate mausolea. Classical literature, much of it prolix on the subject of death rites, makes no mention of cremation occurring before the advent of Buddhism, except in a solitary passage,¹ which is considered unreliable.² It seems certain that the introduction into China of the use of the funeral pyre was brought about during the opening century of our era by the first effective Buddhist mission from India.

Cremation spread in China with the growth of the exotic religion, and there is evidence that during periods of Buddhist prosperity the funeral pyre became a popular institution even among the laity.³ From time to time

¹ It occurs in a chapter on funeral rites by the philosopher Mo 墨 (c. 500 B.C.), which Professor De Groot has translated. The passage runs thus: "And the people of I-ku, a state to the west of Ts'in, at the death of a relative piled up fuel and brambles, and converted the body into ashes, saying, when the smoke whirled up, that the deceased was ascending to distant regions; and they did not become fully qualified for the title of filial sons ere they had done this." (*Religious System of China*, vol. ii, p. 680.)

² *Ibid.*, p. 682 et seq.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 1393 et seq.

Confucianists have conducted crusades against a custom so contrary to the principles of their creed, but it was not till A.D. 1370 that it was forbidden by imperial edict.¹ The reigning dynasty, in its wholesale assumption of the Ming code, adopted this law amongst others directed against heretical practices, and so at the present time cremation is officially tolerated only within the ranks of the priesthood.

The following notes are concerned with the actual disposal of the corpse, and make no attempt to deal with the religious ceremonial, which has been described by Professor De Groot in his learned work *Le Code du Mahāyāna en Chine*.²

At approach of death many monks compose themselves in the *chuan-t'ing* 禪定 (Skt. *dhyāna*) posture, thus to await their release,³ but in every case directly life is extinct the body is washed, shaved, clothed, and finally arranged in the correct attitude of Buddhist meditation. It is considered expedient not to delay the preliminary toilet because manipulation is more easily performed before *rigor mortis* has set in. The *dhyāna* posture consists in sitting cross-legged, the back of each foot resting on the opposite thigh, while the soles are turned upward. The hands lie in the lap.⁴ Preparatory to cremation, however,

¹ De Groot, *Religious System of China*, vol. iii. p. 1411.

² Ch. vii, pp. 144, 145.

• Priests have assured me that occasionally their dying brethren are placed in the *kang* or other receptacle, and the lid closed actually before death. The Rev. Wilfrid Allan kindly contributes the fact that it is the custom at the Wu-chang Monastery to place upon the pyre moribund monks seated upon a board. Just as the final release is about to happen, the pyre is kindled and fire is thus allowed to take the place of the man's spirit as it leaves the body, and also to help it on its journey to the "Western Heaven". This idea seems curiously like that expressed in one of the hymns of the *Rig-veda* addressed to the god Agni. See Monier-Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, 4th ed., p. 16.

⁴ It is the classical and ideal attitude of Buddhist devotees and saints, and one chosen as being the most helpful to meditation and to acquisition of mental as well as of bodily equilibrium.

the hands may be tied together, palm to palm, in front of the breast.

The body is enveloped in the *chia-shu* 袈裟 (Skt. *kāśhāya*), which covers any under-garment and leaves only the head, neck, and hands visible. It is often a brilliant crimson-vermilion colour, and is made of a material resembling satin.¹ Outside all a very characteristic article of Buddhist attire is sometimes draped round the body. It envelops the left arm and shoulder, passes round the back, and then to the front under the right arm, the two ends hooking together upon the left breast. This is the *yü-to-lo-séng* 郁多羅僧 (Skt. *uttarāsaiṅghātī* or *saṅkukshikā*), a shawl made of cotton or silk, which is covered with a network of lines dividing it up into a number of oblong panels. By thus presenting a patched appearance it formally obeys the command of the Buddha that the garments of Bhikshus should be pieced together from valueless rags picked up on dust-heaps or in cemeteries.

Often the corpse is crowned with the head-dress worn by monks on ceremonial occasions.² This consists of two

¹ Except in as far as it is dyed and occasionally patched, the *chia-shu* conforms to none of the stringent rules laid down in the *Vinaya* texts. The material is generally cotton, though sometimes silk is used in spite of the prohibition against wearing articles the preparation of which entails destruction of life. In colour the *chia-shu* varies: it may be blue-grey, black, brown, yellow, or crimson-vermilion; the first is the one most generally met with, while robes of the last-mentioned gorgeous hue are seen only on special occasions. To judge from a lengthy exposition on this subject, written in the seventh century by the famous pilgrim I-tsing, it appears that from the first the costume of the Chinese church was unorthodox. See I-tsing's *Record of the Buddhist Religion*, Takakusu's trans., pp. 53-82. In referring to the three orthodox garments I-tsing says (p. 54): "In the countries of the North these priestly cloaks are generally called *Kāshāya* from their reddish colour. This is not, however, a technical term used in the *Vinaya*." Cf. De Groot, *Le Code du Mahāyāna en Chine*, p. 74.

² A head-covering was unknown to primitive Buddhism. Like much of the attire of Chinese priests, its adoption was necessitated by climatic conditions.

parts, viz. a cap called *pi-lu mao* 毘盧帽, and an article called *wu-fo wei* 五佛帷. The former—the “Cap of Vairocana”¹—fits the skull and has an upturned flap behind. Its apex is furnished with an ornamented spike representing the “Diamond Baton” 金剛杵, an “emblem of Buddha’s power over evil”²—the Chinese form of the well-known *vajra* of Indian mythology.

The *wu-fo wei*, or “Veil of the Five Buddhas”³ is composed of a broad band carrying five tongue-shaped leaves which bear a representation of a highly important group of deities.⁴ Upon each leaf is either painted or embroidered the figure of a Dhyāni-Buddha seated on a lotus-bloom and with a nimbus of flames encircling his head. The material may be paper, cotton, or silk. The “veil” is tied round the brow in front of the cap, so that

¹ Vairocana is regarded as the Dhyāni-Buddha of the fabulous being who was the first in chronological order of the five chief human Buddhas of the present age. See note 4, *infra*. This metaphysical creation, held to be the personification of essential *bodhi* and absolute purity, is the highest of the *Trikāya*. See Eitel, *Handbook*, pp. 178 et seq., 192.

² Eitel, *Handbook*, p. 190.

³ See De Groot, *Sectarianism in China*, vol. i, pl. iii, for a picture of this article.

⁴ In response to the instinctive craving of mankind for personal deities accessible to prayer, Northern Buddhism has invented Dhyāni-Buddhas as ethereal counterparts of earthly Buddhas, whose destiny is on attainment of their *nirvāna* to fade away beyond the ken of human petitions and sympathies. This special group of Five represents celestial reflexes of the human Buddhas allotted to the present age, viz., Gautama, his three fictitious immediate predecessors, and Mi-lê Fo 彌勒佛 (Skt. Maitreya), the Buddha-designate, whose advent on earth is expected when some five thousand years shall have elapsed since the death of Sākyamuni. Of these the historical Buddha occupies the place of chief importance, and likewise does his reflex in the domain of the spiritual, O-mi-t’o Fo 阿彌陀佛 (Skt. Amitābha), who is, perhaps, the most popular figure in the Chinese Buddhist pantheon. O-mi-t’o has lost his abstract nature as a Dhyāni-Buddha, and has materialized into a deity possessing the attributes of a personal saviour, the “Guide to the West” 西方接引—to that glorious paradise which offers to the Chinese mind more tangible and attractive joys than does the negative bliss of *nirvāna*. For an excellent picture of the Five Dhyāni-Buddhas see Waddell, *Buddhism of Tibet*, p. 336.

an observer facing the combined head-dress is struck by its resemblance to a crown. On either side of the wearer's face there is a streamer which hangs down just in front of the ear.

To complete the equipment of the corpse, two articles of religious significance are sometimes added. A rosary may be placed in one hand, while the other is made to grasp a fly-whisk.

The rosary is an essential adjunct to the outfit of every pious monk, who uses it, like his Christian brother, as a means of checking the performance of his daily devotions. Primitive Buddhism knew it not. "As a Buddhist article," to quote Col. Waddell, "the rosary appears only in the latest ritualistic stage when a belief had arisen in the potency of muttering mystic spells and other strange formulas."¹ The Chinese rosary is called by various names. Sometimes it is simply "a string of pearls" 素珠, or the first character may be replaced by 念 "repetition", or by 誦, which means "to hum over", "read in a sing-song voice";² two expressions, the aptness of either of which must strike anyone who has watched monks at their devotions.

It is outside the province of this paper to discuss the size and material of rosaries, of which there is great variety. Suffice it to say that the beads of uniform size vary in number from 18 to 540, and, in the case of the longer strings, several larger beads may be attached also.

¹ See *Buddhism of Tibet*, pp. 202-10, where the learned author fully describes the rosaries used in Tibet. Much of his account applies equally to those of China. Indeed, Chinese have informed me that their rosary originally came from Tibet. It is well known that to a Lamaist source is attributed the adoption during Manchu rule of the necklace 朝珠 worn as a part of the regulation costume of officials. The use of the rosary is not confined to the Buddhist among Oriental religions, for worshippers of Siva and Vishnu have the same custom. See Monier-Williams' essay, "Indian Rosaries," in *Modern India and the Indians*, p. 108.

² Giles, *Dict.*, No. 10,456.

Strings of 108 are the most common. Though multiples of 9 seem to be the rule, it is interesting to find it stated that in Japan a rosary of 112 uniform beads is the one most generally used.¹ Various explanations have been given of the numerical symbolism of the beads.

The fly-whisk, called "yak's² tail" 麈尾 or "brushing-away-tail" 拂尾, is made of a bunch of horsehair or of vegetable fibre fixed to the end of a short stick. It is of great interest, both on account of its ancient Indian origin, and because it is employed as a religious emblem. In the *Vinaya Pitaka* the Buddha is recorded to have given permission to Bhikshus to use the fly-whisk, but to have forbidden the use of one made of a yak's tail, presumably because unwilling to usurp an appanage of royalty.³

The fly-whisk has come to symbolize obedience to the first and greatest of Buddhist commandments, for by its gentle agency insects are brushed away and saved from destruction. The Bodhisattva Kuan-yin 觀音 is sometimes represented holding one in her hand, and images of Buddhist worthies are often furnished with fly-whisks. From early times the Taoists have borrowed this emblem,⁴ and they still use it as an instrument of magic, sometimes with the addition of a bell at the end of the handle.

In some temples a square box-like chair is kept ready to receive the remains of any monk immediately after death, and this may itself be used to convey the body to the burning and be consumed together with it. More often the corpse is packed into a square wooden chest,⁵ furnished with a sliding front, which is shut down before

¹ James, *Trans. As. Soc. Japan*, vol. ix, p. 173.

² Literally *chu* is the Chinese elk (*Elaphurus Davidi*), which is wrongly believed by some to furnish the hair for these whisks. See Williams, *Dict.*, p. 88; and Giles, *Dict.*, No. 2,541.

³ *Kullaragga*, v, 23; SBE., vol. xx, pp. 131, 132 note.

⁴ See De Groot, *Le Code du Mahâyāna en Chine*, pp. 138, 139.

⁵ A monk enclosed in a receptacle and awaiting cremation is referred to by the phrase 坐龕和尙.

the pyre is lit. An iron chair to seat the body during cremation is described by Mr. Hackmann.¹ There is often employed yet another kind of receptacle, which does not seem to have been mentioned by writers, although, if my information be correct, its use is widespread. I refer to the covered earthenware tub or *kang* 缸 to be described later. Certainly my own observation proves that this mode of enclosing the corpse is practised throughout the region of the Middle and Lower Yangtse (i.e. approximately of the last 1,000 miles of the river).

Sometimes the corpse is merely seated unenclosed on the pyre, and burnt in full view of the onlookers. This may happen in places remote from a religious house of importance, but every monastery of any size is provided with a crematorium, generally built a short distance outside the precincts. These crematoria are all constructed on the same simple plan of a many-sided or circular chamber, about seven feet high and a little less in diameter. Except for four stone blocks acting as supports for the bier, its interior is bare. The roof may be made of ordinary tiles resting on an iron framework, and is pierced by a vent-hole. The entrance is about five feet high and three and a half in width. There is a large monastery, the Kuei-yüan-ch'an Ssü 歸元禪寺, close to Han-yang 漢陽府. Its crematorium is an unimposing hexagonal hut, built on some waste land to the south of the temple precincts. Since the monks in residence number between four and five hundred, it follows that a funeral is not a very infrequent occurrence. The following account is based largely on the procedure followed there.

The process of cremation 闍維 may take from six to twelve hours before incineration is complete. Sandal-wood 檀 is the ideal form of fuel, but, for sake of economy,

¹ *Buddhism as a Religion*, p. 229.

ordinary firewood is generally used, and bits of the more expensive and fragrant kind are thrown on the pyre from time to time. On one occasion at the Han-yang monastery when I was a witness, ignition of the logs was assisted by the ubiquitous, and in that instance somewhat incongruous, tin of kerosene. As soon as the pyre is well alight the entrance to the crematory hut is closed by a screen of bricks, which, being loosely piled up, admit a free draught of air. A lay brother is left in charge of affairs after the monks have performed the initial ceremony.

A cremation always draws a large crowd of onlookers who, though apparently attracted more by curiosity than by pious motives, yet are willing to throw cash into an alms-box displayed in a prominent position by the priests, who are nothing loth to improve the occasion by collecting contributions to temple funds.

Generally less than a day is allowed to elapse between the demise and cremation of a monk, but sometimes, when an abbot or priest of conspicuous sanctity dies, the body is kept for a week or more while special masses are being celebrated. In such a case the corpse is quickly fitted either into a *kang* (see Plate III. B), or into a wooden box, and packed round with charcoal mixed with fragments of sandal-wood. The receptacle is made quite airtight. When the time for burning comes the bier and its contents are put on the pyre just as they are, except in the case of a *kang*, when the vent-hole in its lid is opened. After cremation a handful or two of relics 舍利 are collected from among the ashes and deposited in an urn or in a red calico bag, which is then consigned to a room set apart for the purpose. At the Han-yang monastery the urns consist of a heterogeneous collection of jars, some of which bear with strange incongruity the character for "wedded joy" 喜喜, showing that they were originally intended for a very different purpose. The ashes may be thus stored for months or even years, but ultimately the ashes are

committed to a pit¹ over which has been built a pagoda-like structure called the "All-mingling Tower" 普同塔. It stands often about ten feet high and has a small opening just large enough to allow of a bag of ashes being passed through. Relics of distinguished monks may escape the fate of the majority beneath the "Mixture Pagodas", and be honoured with an individual tomb. This usually takes the shape of a mound surmounted by a monument² 支提 exhibiting the symbolic forms used by Northern Buddhists.³

BURIAL

Professor De Groot in his classic work on disposal of the dead states that the coffins of the Buddhist clergy do not differ from those used by the laity.⁴ It is, however, a fact that receptacles capable of containing a seated figure are employed widely for the burial of priests. Such a receptacle is called a *k'an* 龕. It takes the form either of a square wooden box, or else of a covered earthenware tub. This tub or *kung* 缸 resembles that commonly used for holding water or for storage of manure. In fact, occasionally two ordinary domestic *kung*, joined mouth to mouth, are made to act as a coffin, though usually tubs specially manufactured for funeral purposes are obtained. These are made in pairs, and are so designed that the rim of the lid or uppermost *kung* fits closely over the rim of the other, producing a joint easily rendered airtight by

¹ Often called *ch'an k'an* 禪龕. It is said that the ashes of no more than 5,048 monks should be buried in one such receptacle.

² See Chavannes, *Mission Archéologique dans la Chine Septentrionale*, pp. 385-7, for illustrations of these monuments.

³ A series of superimposed symbols is found with slight variations in the Buddhist grave monuments of China, Japan, and Tibet. In its simplest form it is composed of five symmetrical parts, which, it is said, represent the elements into which the body is ultimately resolved. The apex, pear-shaped and tapering upwards, is emblematic of ether; next below is a bowl-like figure—the inverted vault of heaven; this rests on a cone representing fire; next, a globe typifies water; and a square block for the base stands for solid earth. See Rémusat, *Foë koué ki*, pp. 91, 92.

⁴ *Religious System of China*, vol. i, p. 330.

the aid of cement. A pair thus joined together forms a chamber resembling a barrel in shape. In cross-section the tubs are generally circular, though some are made polygonal. Upon the lid is cemented a simple ornament that probably represents the distinctive finial of Buddhist monuments (see Plates II, III, B). It is said that most of these vessels come from the potteries of Wu-hsi 無錫縣 on the Grand Canal.

Burial in earthenware coffins is a very ancient practice. It is referred to in the *Book of Rites* as having been in vogue more than 2,000 years B.C.¹ Dr. Bushell quotes a record of the discovery in A.D. 506 of an ancient coffin which is almost identical with that now used for Buddhist priests; "it was described as five feet high, over four feet in circumference, wide and flat-bottomed below, and pointed above, opening in the middle like a round box with a cover: while the corpse was found buried inside in a sitting posture."² The passage in the *Book of Rites* cited above goes on to state that wooden coffins replaced the earthenware kind under the Yin 殷 dynasty (B.C. 1766-1122), many centuries before Buddhism existed.

But, apart from ancient precedent, there are obvious reasons why the *kang* should be utilized for this purpose. It offers a cheap, efficient, and ready means of constructing an airtight chamber of the required size and shape.³

¹ SBE., vol. xxvii, p. 125.

² *Chinese Art*, vol. ii, p. 6.

³ In view of the theory of the Chaldean origin of Chinese civilization, it is interesting to note that excavations in the Babylonian Plain have brought to light countless numbers of earthenware coffins. Though most of them bear evidence of having been used to contain the body during a process of partial cremation, yet some are found almost identical with the Chinese kind of the present day. Taylor, describing finds on the right bank of the Euphrates, says: "In other trenches I exhumed numerous coffins, formed of two large jars, precisely of the same shape as the largest kind at present used in Bagdad for containing water, joined together by a bitumen cement. . . . In each was a skeleton" (JRAS., Vol. XV, p. 413, 1855; see also *ibid.*, p. 414, where a woodcut is given of one of these coffins).

With the priesthood, as with the laity, interment may be postponed for months or even years, until a suitable site and auspicious day are found. In such a case the receptacle with its human contents is kept in a corner of one of the temple buildings.¹ That this can be done without giving offence to the living is due to the fact that the vessel is airtight—if a box, it has been efficiently caulked with putty, or if a *kang*, it has been hermetically sealed with cement. The deceased under these conditions is spoken of as “a priest sitting in the *k’an*” 坐龕和尚. Usually burial takes place in the vicinity of the temple to which the priest in his lifetime belonged.

PRESERVATION BY DRYING

This practice is specially interesting because, notwithstanding it is very common, no writer, as far as I know, has done more than merely mention its existence. Mr. H. Hackmann, in his valuable book *Buddhism as a Religion*, p. 229, alludes to it as follows: “Some strict ascetics also shut themselves up in small caves of mountains, devoid of all daylight. When the inhabitant of such a prison dies, his body (which has become greatly emaciated by the scant nourishment it has received) is embalmed and prepared in a special manner, then painted and gilt, and set up in the temple to be worshipped under the name of ‘flesh-body’ (*jou shén*).”

The custom of preserving the remains of Buddhist saints intact may be attributed chiefly to two motives: first to the ancient belief in the corporeal immortality of persons who have attained great sanctity, and secondly, to a pious desire to keep, in their most perfect form, relics of revered and distinguished exponents of the faith. As I hope to

¹ Nearly three years ago I found in the Tung-nêng Ssū 東能寺 at Wuhu two sealed funeral *kang* containing bodies of priests. They had been already some months in the temple, and were still there about a year and a half later. A correspondent informs me that they were buried recently.

show later, this conservation custom has also its worldly side—an aspect of relic cult not confined to China.

Belief in the incorruptibility of the corpse of a saint is prevalent among Mahāyāna Buddhists. A conspicuous Chinese example is that of the human prototype of the Bodhisattva Ti Tsang 地藏, the over-lord of hell, to whom special reverence is paid throughout the province of Anhui. On earth this important deity became, during the eighth century, incarnate in a Siamese prince, who, tired of worldly vanities, wandered as a mendicant till he settled on Mount Chiu-hua¹ 九華山, where he eventually died. Chiu-hua Shan has long ranked as one of the four great Buddhist Sacred Hills of China and the chief of its many shrines is the "Precious Mortal Body Hall" 肉身寶殿, in which, it is said, the undecayed earthly frame of Ti Tsang is still preserved.

However, the Buddhists are not alone in this belief. Referring to universal cremation among Hindus, Monier-Williams says: "It is true that the bodies of great Hindū ascetics and devotees are exempted from this rule. They are usually buried—not burnt. Not, however, because the mere corporeal frame is held in greater veneration, but because the bodies of the most eminent saints are supposed to lie undecomposed in a kind of trance, or state of intense ecstatic meditation (*samādhi*)."²

Śākyamuni no less than the Brahmans regarded the earthly frame with repugnance, and insisted on the fact of its impermanence, and, though cremation was consistent with his teaching, he was merely following the custom in

¹ This beautiful group of hills is in Anhui, about thirty miles due south of a small town on the River Yangtse, called Ta-tung 大通, and nearly twice that distance east of the capital of the province. It is said that upwards of 80,000 pilgrims visit Chiu-hua Shan yearly. Its temples contain four or five "dried priests". Except during winter-time it can be approached by boat from Ta-tung along a stream that winds through the most enchanting scenery.

² *Buddhism*, p. 496.

vogue when he directed that his body should be burnt. The Buddha is not recorded to have given instructions as to the disposal of the ashes or other relics of his person. Indeed, it is a curious fact that the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, though explicit in rules regulating the daily life of Bhikshus, lays down no law concerning the mode of dealing with the dead. On the contrary, there is evidence that the Buddha regarded death rites as of small importance.¹ As Burnouf pointed out,² it was the disciples of Gautama who made the departure from long-established funeral procedure by preserving relics of their Founder. The cult of relics became a prominent feature of Buddhism, and in the particular process under discussion we find its most complete development.

Buddhist priests in China differ in their accounts of the motive for this custom. Some deny that artificial means are employed to preserve the corpse, and maintain that it is the exalted sanctity of the individual alone that defies corruption—in short, their explanation tallies with that given in the passage by Monier-Williams quoted above. Others frankly admit that the bodies are carefully prepared with the express purpose of manufacturing relics. Probably there is truth in both explanations. With regard to the first: surely it must be admitted that nothing but profound religious fervour would induce a man voluntarily to undergo starvation severe enough to produce the degree of emaciation almost essential to the success of *post-mortem* drying. Sometimes, this self-imposed starvation is carried even to the extent of causing death. That such ascetics do exist is no less wonderful than the fact that at several Buddhist centres in China there are to be found monks who have sought a living martyrdom by immurement in a dark cell lasting for years, or, in some cases, for life. Further, in proof that some “dried priests”

¹ See SBE., vol. xi, p. 91.

² *Introd. du Budd. Indou.*, p. 354.

are not intentionally produced by artifice there are the instances when the discovery of them has been a matter of chance and quite innocent of any preconcerted plan. See the history of the Yang-chon specimen described below (Example No. 4).

Secondly, there seems no doubt that the majority of "dried priests" are specially prepared with intent to provide popular relics—relics that will not only attract the public to the temples, but also inspire them to generous contributions. The interesting temple notice found at Wuhu clearly shows that the relic it refers to was prepared in order to fill this catchpenny capacity. (See Example No. 2.)

The actual preparation of a body for the drying process is briefly as follows. It is first subjected to the same treatment as that described above for cremation. Most of my informants agree that the preliminary toilet ends there, but some have stated that the viscera are removed. On this point Mr. Hackmann has kindly given me information concerning a "dried priest" preserved in the P'u-hsien T'a 普賢塔 on Mount O-mei¹ 峨眉山. He says that a priest of the temple told him that in that case the abdomen had been opened, its contents removed, and the cavity washed out with a certain decoction of herbs.

From all accounts it seems that the viscera are taken out only when the deceased is not emaciated sufficiently for the success of desiccation to be ensured.

Before packing the body into the *kung*, the bottom of the vessel is filled to the depth of about a foot with the ash either of rice-straw or of incense-sticks. There is always plenty of the latter to be found accumulated in the temples. Upon this bed of ash the body is arranged

¹ In his account of O-mei Shan, Mr. R. F. Johnston mentions that there are several "dried priests" to be found on this sacred mountain. *From Peking to Mandalay*, p. 98. The author kindly informs me that one of these is reputed to be 500 years old.

seated in the *dhyaṇa* posture. Around it is then packed charcoal and wadding and, according to some accounts, salt is included.¹ Finally the lid of the *kung* is cemented on, and should there be a hole in the lid, that is closed; the greatest care being taken that the vessel is hermetically sealed.

The *kung* is not opened for two or three years, and in the meanwhile is either kept in a corner of one of the temple buildings or else buried. The opening of it is made a ceremonial affair, and if the body is found then to be undecayed a subscription list is started for the gilding and enshrining of the relic.

There is another and less common method of preserving Buddhist dead, concerning which the Rev. Wilfrid Allan, of Wu-ch'ang, has kindly sent me a most interesting account written by a convert who was formerly a noted leader of a vegetarian society.² Mr. Allan is able to vouch for the reliability of the informant, whose statement runs as follows: "I have received your letter, and know something about the subject of men becoming 'Carnal Body Immortals' 肉身仙. A few years ago I had a disciple named Li Kao-fu, who afterwards became one of these 'Immortals'. Influenced by my teaching, he not only

¹ This use of salt is a point in common with the process of embalming practised by the ancient Egyptians. An essential part of all the three methods described by Herodotus is the steeping of the body in a saline fluid. See Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. ii, p. 141. But the closest analogy to be found in the West is the method used till recently by the Capuchin Order to preserve their dead. The bodies were subjected for several months to the action of a clayey limestone soil (supposed to have been brought from the Holy Land) which had desiccating powers. The dried corpses were then arrayed in the clothes worn during life and arranged in life-like attitudes within a crypt. The best-known examples are to be found near Palermo.

² Strict vegetarianism, the logical outcome of obedience to the commandment "Thou shalt not kill", is the chief principle of numerous semi-secret religious societies which probably owe their existence to the influence of Buddhism. The question of how far these sects can be said to come within the pale of the Buddhist Church is discussed by Professor De Groot in his *Sectarianism and Religious Persecution in China*.

refrained from animal food, but evinced a passionate desire to push his self-denial to the utmost extent. He therefore gradually left off eating rice, taking a little less each day till he gave it up altogether. After that he had a small quantity of biscuit or pulse, and by degrees this also was discontinued.

“Next he restricted himself to water, which he took for a double purpose—to maintain life and also to flush out his bowels. Thus he became moribund, and a drop of warm water was given just to keep him alive. In this way he gradually died, the process of dissolution, from first to last, extending over a period of several months.

“After he was dead we took a hundred catties of cedar-wood and forty catties of sandal-wood, which we split up and mixed with incense-powder. This compound was burnt in a censer placed between the thighs and feet of the dead man, who thus was smoked. The corpse was enveloped in a hood or cloak, but if any worshippers came the covering was removed and the smoking process stopped, and was not recommenced till after the departure of the visitors. When the body had been thoroughly dried we pasted over it varnish, lime, and wood-oil¹ 桐油, together with other things. Afterwards we bound it firmly with cords. It now sits upright and is an object of worship.

“This is the method by which a man becomes an ‘Immortal’, and it differs little from that followed in the curing of pork.”

The preservation process finished, the body has become what is commonly called a *kan-ho-shang* 乾和尚, a “dried priest”. More reverential names are *jou-shén-hsien* 肉身仙, a “Carnal or Material Body Immortal”, or simply *hsien* 仙, an “Immortal”. In the Nanking

¹ The oil pressed from the nut of *Elaeococcus carnicifera* (Williams, *Diet.*, p. 934). When mixed with lime it forms the putty used by Chinese carpenters, which when dry becomes extremely hard and durable.



"DRIED PRIEST" AT PUKOC

district the term *jén-kan* 人乾, "dried man," is generally used in preference. This is explained by an anecdote that is still recounted locally concerning the famous fourth emperor of the present dynasty. During one of his visits to Nanking¹ he heard of a gilded priest preserved in the San-tsang Tien 三藏殿, a temple then standing outside the South Gate.² Out of curiosity he visited the temple, but on seeing the relic exclaimed in disgust, "He is no Buddha, but merely a *jén-kan*."

The gilding of these relics is in accordance with Indian tradition, for a skin of golden lustre was one of the thirty-two characteristics described in Vedic lore as appertaining to a great hero,³ and naturally Śākyamuni possessed these signs of greatness. Hence the ideal colour for Buddhist images has always been gilt. Before gold-leaf is applied the body is varnished, and any weak spots may be built up with a composition of clay or putty and powdered sandal-wood.⁴ The lobes of the ears are often enlarged to the size prescribed in Buddhist iconography (see Plate I). An *ūrṇā* may be added to the forehead (see Example No. 3). The dress and equipment of a "dried priest" is similar to that allotted to a dead monk awaiting cremation, and has been already described.

Sometimes, in the case of specially distinguished saints, memorials are forwarded to the throne praying that titles

¹ This emperor visited Nanking seven times between the years 1751 and 1789.

² It was destroyed during the T'ai-p'ing Rebellion.

³ See Burnout, *Lotus de la bonne Loi*, appendix viii, pp. 568, 569.

⁴ It is interesting to note that an analogous process is practised in Burma in the disposal of dead members of the Buddhist clergy, though it is used but as a temporary expedient to preserve the body until cremation can take place. After death the viscera are removed and the cavity filled with hot ashes, sawdust, spices, or honey. The body is then swathed in strips of linen, and after being varnished is often gilded. Thus protected it may lie in an ornamented sarcophagus for weeks, months, or even more than a year. See Spence Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, pp. 322, 323; Bigandet, *Life of Gaudama*, pp. 528, 529; Shway Yoc, *The Burman*, pp. 578-83.

of canonization may be conferred. In response titles are occasionally given. An example is that of a "dried priest" near Wuhu who is called "The Buddha who gazes upon the River" 望江佛. Memorials requesting recognition for two priestly relics at the town of Tung-chêng 桐城 in Anhui arrived at the capital within the space of a few months, and afforded a certain emperor the opportunity of displaying a cynical wit. The first he named *K'o-shih Fo* 可是佛. "Is he really a Buddha?" The second was endowed with the title *Yu-shih Fo* 又是佛, "Yet another Buddha!"

As to the antiquity of this custom of drying corpses I regret to have no definite data to offer. It may be coeval with the Buddhist church in China, since there is a tradition concerning the two Indian monks who were brought back by the envoys of the Emperor Ming Ti (A.D. 58-76) to the effect that their bodies after death remained undecomposed and were kept in a building at Lo-yang.¹ It has been mentioned above that one of the "dried priests" on O-mei Shan is reputed to be 500 years old. There seems no doubt that a specimen on T'ai Shan, described by M. Chavannes,² dates back to the year 1703.

An article in *China's Millions* for May, 1910, gives an account of two examples, which, if genuine, must be among the oldest in existence. These dried bodies are

¹ This tradition is mentioned in a recent article by M. H. Maspero, in which the writer quotes a passage from a Chinese work explaining the origin of the use of the character 寺 (*ssü*) to denote Buddhist edifices. According to this authority the building at Lo-yang, in which the incorruptible remains of the two Indian missionaries were housed, was one of the Government offices. At that time *ssü* was the term used for buildings of that class. The repository of these relics was regarded as a shrine of the new religion, and hence it followed from this connexion that *ssü* came to be adopted as a generic term for the Buddhist temples that later sprang into being. See *Bull. de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, tome x, No. 1, p. 107, note 3.

² *Le T'ai Chan*, p. 91. These are the remains of a Taoist priest. So far as can be judged from the short account of it given, this relic does not differ from the Buddhist kind.

supposed to have been those of a brother and sister who lived at the beginning of the fourteenth century, and they are said to be now preserved in a Hunan village about fifty miles from the capital of the province. The history of their lives is a long record of ascetic practices and searchings after drugs with miraculous properties, and so successful were they that they attained to corporeal immortality. The pair were evidently votaries of Taoism, yet now their shrines are in charge of Buddhist priests, and this fact together with the close relationship existing between the two religions brings them within the scope of these notes. It must be added that the writer of the article did not verify the existence of the relics.

My own search for examples has been confined to the valley of the Middle and Lower Yangtse, a region that was devastated half a century ago by the T'ai-p'ing rebels, who signalized the decade of their power by practising a ruthless iconoclasm that was directed specially against objects of Buddhist devotion. It would be surprising, therefore, if this region possessed any specimens of "dried priests" of a date prior to 1860. I have met with one relic only for which a greater age was claimed, and then there was every reason to doubt its authenticity (see Example No. 5).

Below will be found accounts of six representative examples, which have been picked out for detailed description in order to illustrate various aspects of this custom.

Example No. 1. On the north bank of the Yangtse, opposite to Nanking, is the ruined walled town of P'u-k'ou 浦口, which has lately come into prominence as the southern terminus of the Tientsin Railway. Near the north gate is a small temple, the San-yüan An 三元庵, in the entrance hall of which there is enshrined a good specimen of a "dried priest". Fortunately it was possible to open the glass-panelled door in front of the

relic, and I was therefore able to get excellent photographs (Plates I and II).

Seated in the *dhyāna* attitude upon a lotus dais, the body is enveloped in red cotton gown and draperies, his face, neck, and hands alone being visible. I must confess to the sacrilegious act of having, for purposes of photography, lifted the robe from over the legs. He is unshaven, and his long hair is confined by the metal circlet called *ku* 箍 which crowns his head. These signs proclaim him to have reached the enlightened rank of *lo-han* 羅漢.¹

Apparently the body has been subjected to little preparation beyond the drying and gilding processes. The sunken cheeks have been artificially filled out, and the ears have been enlarged to the traditional size assigned to Buddhist notables.² Otherwise, the state of the relic probably has not changed since it was taken from the *kany* that now stands by the side of the shrine (see Plate II).

Above the door of the shrine is nailed a piece of yellow silk inscribed as follows: "In the autumn of the year 1848 he forsook the world and joined the priesthood. Freed from anxiety and undisturbed by mundane cares, he used to sit, garbed in a *chia-shu*, in the Hall of Meditation, the while an understanding of the Sacred Doctrine gradually illuminated his soul. Just as a struggle is necessary to overcome the dragon and tiger, so he by striving succeeded in quelling his mortal passions, and now, tranquil and happy, he has attained his true reward and walks in the realms of Ju-lai."³

¹ *Lo-han* represents the Sanskrit *arhat*, and is a term applied to one who has attained distinction as a zealous follower of Buddha's teaching. It is also the stage of Buddhist enlightenment next below that of a *bodhisattva*. See Eitel, *Handbook*, p. 16. Hermit and immured monks come under this heading.

² This feature is not peculiar to Buddhist imagery. There is a saying current in China. "Both ears hanging to the shoulders.—a most illustrious man." See Smith, *Chinese Proverbs*, p. 306.

³ 如來 is the Chinese equivalent of *Tathāgata*, a Sanskrit title applied to Gautama as well as to other Buddhas.



DRIED PRIEST AT PU'KOU' IN SHRINE, SHOWING THE KING IN WHICH THE BODY WAS PREPARED.

PLATE II

So far as could be learnt from an ancient monk, the sole occupant of the temple, the history of the "dried priest" is as follows: He was a native of Hupeli. Pao-hua Shan¹ 寶華山 was the place of his novitiate and ordination. He remained in the San-yüan An for some twenty years, and died about ten years ago. On account of his superior piety he was dried for two or three years, and after being taken from the *kung* was varnished and gilded.

Example No. 2. Outside the East Gate of Wuhu is a group of small temples. One of these is a one-roomed building called the Chüeh-t'a Ssü 覺塔寺, in which the principal object is a glass case containing the dried and gilded body of a priest. The case occupies a pedestal in the centre of the room with a clear space around it. The body sits huddled up in the usual attitude and is attired in a faded red satin *chiu-sha*, which leaves only his head, neck, and hands visible. Round the forehead is tied a "Veil of the Five Buddhas", and the right hand grasps a fly-whisk. A board hangs on the wall of the temple bearing a most interesting notice, of which the following is a rough translation:—

“INSCRIPTION TABLET CONCERNING THE ‘MORTAL BODY
BUDDHA’ 肉身佛.

Within the T'ai-p'ing Garden in the eastern suburb of Wuhu there once stood an ancient fane named the Lung-shü An 龍樹庵 which was erected during the last dynasty. Having been destroyed at the time of the Rebellion, it was generously restored about the year

¹ This important and historic monastery (called also 慧居寺) is the headquarters of the "Discipline School" 律宗. It is said to have accommodated no fewer than 1,800 monks previous to its destruction by the T'ai-p'ing rebels. Within recent years it has been rebuilt and has regained somewhat its former splendour. Many priests are still ordained there, and many pilgrims make it their goal. It is beautifully situated on a hill some 800 feet high, between Chinkiang and Nanking.

1862 by a benefactor belonging to the Tai-p'ing district. The Magistrate, moreover, appreciating the profound benevolence and conspicuous merit of our preceptor the Worthy Yao 耀, commissioned him to take charge of the scheme and to canvass subscriptions for rebuilding the temple. In spite of wind and rain he carried out his arduous task with loyalty and zeal. After much hard work he collected a sufficient sum, and at the time of the defeat of the Tai-p'ing Rebellion he began building operations. He vowed he would erect the main hall, but, as is generally known, died before his wish was fulfilled.

"The Worthy Yao, our preceptor, entered the priesthood as a pupil of the Worthy Kai-yüeh of the Ch'u-shih Temple.

"In middle life he made pilgrimages and travelled in search of expounders of the Doctrine. Also, he fasted and obeyed the ordinances with exemplary strictness. During the vicious Rebellion the rebels invaded this district and he was made a prisoner. In spite of captivity he still fasted, and never allowed his Buddhist heart to falter. What a rare example!

"He was chosen by the gentry and elders of the Tai-p'ing district to manage the Lung-shu Temple. Here he laboured in hundreds of ways and strove to improve its fortunes. Not only did he worship Buddha morning and evening, but his very thoughts were constantly with Buddha. Whilst engaged in burning lights and incense he cultivated spiritual affinity.

"Having lived to the age of 78 he fell ill and died in the first month of the year 1900. His body was washed and then placed in a *k'an* 龕 with the knees bent. That was three years ago, and his body remains undecomposed. What a marvellous occurrence!

"According to rule, we have gilded and enshrined our preceptor's remains. Devotees of both sexes who come to view the body, may perceive its crystal and jade purity

and its complete innocence of dishonesty or fraud. This proves the purity of his mind, his enlightenment in the Doctrine, and his attainment of true Buddhahood—an example of cause and effect.

“We are anxious to fulfil the desires of our preceptor, and would appeal to the gentry, officials, elders, and almsgivers in general to give practical expression to their benevolent thoughts and generous hearts by opening their purses and presenting contributions. Thus will they accumulate a store of merit. Their gifts may be offered in the form of money to be spent in regilding the Buddhas and other dilapidated images, or they may take the shape of bricks and tiles for the rebuilding of the main hall. Thus our preceptor’s wishes may be carried out and the donors will be silently blessed by Buddhist power. Also, their illustrious progeny will continue for countless ages to be distinguished scholars and to enjoy glory and riches.

“The appeal for alms is made by Hui-hai, resident priest of the Lung-shu Temple.

“The preface is respectfully prepared by Hui-tung, resident priest of the Ch'u-shih Temple.”

Example No. 3. About twelve miles from Wuhu is the town of San-shan 三山鎮. There is a small temple there, the Ting-yün Ssü 定雲寺, a part of which is occupied by a “Mortal Body Hall” 肉身殿, where there is preserved a gilded priest inside a glass-fronted case. Except for the head and neck, the relic is concealed beneath a faded red satin *chia-sha*. It is seated upon the usual lotus dais. A knob has been placed on the centre of the forehead. This represents the 眉間白毛 (lit. “white hair between the eyebrows”),¹ corresponding to the Sanskrit *ūrṇā*. The brow is crowned with a paper “Veil of the Five Buddhas”. The history of this “dried

¹ Eitel, *Handbook*, p. 188. The *ūrṇā* is one of the thirty-two signs characteristic of a great man. See Burnouf, *Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, app. viii, p. 563.


priest", as given me by one of the resident priests. is briefly as follows: His name was Shan-kèn 善根. He originally came from the Pai-sui Kung 百歲宮, a well-known temple on Chiu-hua Shan. All his life he remained a vegetarian. He died, aged 97, in 1896, and was placed in a *kang*. After two years the *kang* was opened. His body was taken out and gilded, and money was collected to repair the temple. His posthumous title is "He who awaits canonization as Buddha of the Yangtse" 待封長江佛.

Example No. 4. This relic is kept in the Kao-ming Ssü 高冥寺, a large temple standing on the west bank of the Grand Canal, about six miles south of Yang-chou Fu 揚州府. There is nothing specially noteworthy in its appearance. It is clothed in a red *chia-sha*, and is furnished with a "Veil of the Five Buddhas", and with a fly-whisk. Its history obtained from the priests on the spot is interesting. The priest's name was Hui-ch'ao 慧超. He joined the monastery at the age of 27, and remained there till he died in 1876 aged 72. He was buried inside a closed *kang* on the opposite bank of the canal. There he was left undisturbed for seventeen years, till, the ground where he was interred being required for some other purpose, it became necessary to exhume him. The *kang* was cleared of earth, but, to the surprise of all, it was found impossible to move it. In searching for the cause of this difficulty the lid of the *kang* was slightly lifted, when the body was seen to be undecayed and still sitting upright. This discovery led to a discussion, and it was decided to collect money to gild and enshrine the body. It is said that directly this resolution had been made it became possible to move the *kang* easily.

Example No. 5. In the Pao-t'ung Ssü 寶通寺 at Wu-ch'ang 武昌府, a temple that has been already referred to, there is preserved a most curious relic. It is gilded, and to this extent is similar to the usual



B FUNERAL KING AT THE HAN YANG MONASTERY



A SPURIOUS "DRIED PRIEST" AT WU-CHANG

“dried priest”, but in other respects it is strikingly abnormal, and therefore it merits a detailed description.

Instead of being in the attitude of meditation, this figure is perched upon a raised seat, the right foot planted on the ground, while the bent left leg is held horizontal by being supported at the ankle upon the opposite thigh. The body leans slightly forward, and the head rests upon the left hand, which holds a rosary;¹ it is undraped except for a small skirt,² which is gilded like the figure and appears to be made of the same material. (See Plate III, A.)

An examination proved that it is not a genuine “dried priest”; at any rate, it can be affirmed that no portion of human remains recognizable as such is left visible. I was led to this conclusion chiefly by the fact that the relations of the bony prominences are anatomically incorrect. The priests state that the body was swathed with strips of calico and fortified with plaster before being gilded; but, allowing for this method of preparation, certain significant bony points should remain recognizable had an actual corpse been the basis of the figure.

It is claimed that these are the remains of an abbot of the monastery at the time of the T'ang 唐 dynasty. However, the priests are unable to give a satisfactory explanation of how this relic has escaped the vicissitudes of some ten centuries, and especially the demolition of the temple by the T'ai-p'ing rebels about sixty years ago. The bogus abbot has received canonization under the title of “The Penitent Buddha” 苦恨佛.³

¹ This attitude is a rare one for Buddhist figures. There is a picture of a Japanese image of Padmapāni in a similar pose to be found in Grünwedel, *Mythologie des Buddhismus*, p. 27.

² This garment probably represents the Indian *nirāsana*, one of the “Thirteen Necessaries” that any priest is allowed to possess. See Takakusu, *I-tsing*, p. 55.

³ Professor Parker kindly informs me that 苦恨 often occurs in the poetry of the T'ang dynasty in the literal sense of “bitter regrets”, the same meaning, in fact, that it has in colloquial use at the present day. He suggests that the expression refers to the remorse for his past life



FUNERAL KING AT THE HANYANG MONASTERY

B




PLATE III

"dried priest", but in other respects it is strikingly abnormal, and therefore it merits a detailed description.

Instead of being in the attitude of meditation, this figure is perched upon a raised seat, the right foot planted on the ground, while the bent left leg is held horizontal by being supported at the ankle upon the opposite thigh. The body leans slightly forward, and the head rests upon the left hand, which holds a rosary;¹ it is undraped except for a small skirt,² which is gilded like the figure and appears to be made of the same material. (See Plate III, A.)

An examination proved that it is not a genuine "dried priest"; at any rate, it can be affirmed that no portion of human remains recognizable as such is left visible. I was led to this conclusion chiefly by the fact that the relations of the bony prominences are anatomically incorrect. The priests state that the body was swathed with strips of calico and fortified with plaster before being gilded: but, allowing for this method of preparation, certain significant bony points should remain recognizable had an actual corpse been the basis of the figure.

It is claimed that these are the remains of an abbot of the monastery at the time of the Tang 唐 dynasty. However, the priests are unable to give a satisfactory explanation of how this relic has escaped the vicissitudes of some ten centuries, and especially the demolition of the temple by the Tai-p'ing rebels about sixty years ago. The bogus abbot has received canonization under the title of "The Penitent Buddha" 苦恨佛.³

¹ This attitude is a rare one for Buddhist figures. There is a picture of a Japanese image of Padmapāni in a similar pose to be found in Grunwedel, *Mythologie des Buddhismus*, p. 27.

² This garment probably represents the Indian *nirāsava*, one of the "Thirteen Necessaries" that any priest is allowed to possess. See Takakusu, *I-tsing*, p. 55.

³ Professor Parker kindly informs me that 苦恨 often occurs in the poetry of the Tang dynasty in the literal sense of "bitter regrets", the same meaning, in fact, that it has in colloquial use at the present day. He suggests that the expression refers to the remorse for his past life

Example No. 6. This account was given me by a native of Shanghai, and is interesting chiefly because it describes an instance of an official causing the prompt destruction of one of these sacred relics. It serves, moreover, to illustrate the contempt often shown by members of the Chinese mandarinatc for anything connected with Buddhism,¹ and also the fact that the fortunes of the heretical faith in any district depend largely on the religious proclivities of the local officials.

Just outside the west gate of Shanghai native city there stands the Hsi-fang An 西方庵. A certain priest, named Jung-k'ung 容空, died there in the year 1895, after having served in the temple for fifty-four years—ever since the day when his parents dedicated him to the priesthood at the tender age of six. According to custom his remains were placed in a *kung*, and when three years later the *kung* was opened the body was found to be still undecayed. It was therefore varnished, gilded, and enshrined in the temple. Huge crowds came to view the relic, some attracted by curiosity, others by desire to burn incense before it. So great a number flocked to the temple that the Chief of Police intervened after a few

felt by Gautama at the time of the Great Renunciation, and thus in this particular instance to the abbot's regrets for his unregenerate days in imitation of the Buddha. Cf. 苦行 used for Skt. *tapashto*, "Penitence," one of the "Four Causes of Longevity". See De Harlez, *T'oung-p'ao*, vol. viii, p. 132. 1897.

¹ On the other hand, there are officials who do all in their power to further Buddhist interests within their jurisdiction. In the Chueh-t'a Ssü at Wuhu, which contains a "dried priest" (see Example No. 2), there is posted a long proclamation by the District Magistrate in which he places the shrine under his special protection. It concludes as follows: "All persons must understand that reverence and silence should prevail in a temple, and that rowdy behaviour cannot be allowed. After the issue of this proclamation, should any lawless characters, whatever their pretext, assemble and clamour loudly, or hustle the crowd, or create any other disturbance, the monk in charge is empowered always to report them by name to the Magistrate. Thus the matter may be inquired into, and the delinquents be arrested for severe punishment without lenience. Let all reverently obey! A special proclamation!"

days and ordered the "dried priest" to be burnt, giving as the reason for this action the fear of a riot.

NOTE ON DISPOSAL OF THE DEAD IN TIBET

Since Tibet might now be considered an integral part of the Chinese Empire, this article would be incomplete without mention of the disposal of Lamaist dead. Writers describe four methods, viz. cremation, burial, preservation of the body intact, and lastly, the most common mode, that of dismemberment followed by distribution of the fragments, either by giving them to dogs and vultures or by casting them into running water.¹ It is stated that cremation is rare on account of the scarcity of fuel, and that burial is practised only after death from smallpox.

The preservation method bears a striking resemblance to that described above; indeed, perhaps it was from Tibet that the custom reached China. Were this so, it would be by no means the sole instance of Lamaist practices being adopted by the Chinese Church. Bodies of none but reincarnate Lamas are preserved. The process is briefly as follows:—The corpse, attired in ceremonial garb, is placed in a sitting attitude inside a metal chest, and is surrounded with a packing of salt.² The vessel is then hermetically sealed, and left unopened till at least three months have elapsed. When the body is removed it is found to have "become hard and dry". As in the case of the Chinese relics, a protective compound is applied to its surface, the sunken or shrivelled parts being filled in so as to give the figure a life-like contour. Finally the relic is gilded, and it is then ready to be enshrined.

¹ For information concerning these customs see the following authorities: Markham, *Narratives*, pp. 122, 339, 340; Horne, *JRAS.*, Vol. VI, pp. 28-35, 1873; Chandra Das, *Journey to Lhasa*, pp. 255, 256; Schlagintweit, *Buddhism in Tibet*, p. 269 et seq.; Sven Hedin, *Trans-Himalaya*, vol. i, pp. 327, 369-73. The fullest account of the preservation process is given by Kawaguchi, *Three Years in Tibet*, p. 389 et seq.

² One writer states that salt after being used for this purpose is much prized as a panacea for all ills. Kawaguchi, *op. cit.*, p. 395.

THE EPIC USE OF BHAGAVAT AND BHAKTI

BY E. WASHBURN HOPKINS

NO doubt Dr. Grierson is right in translating the first of these words as "Adorable" (JRAS., 1910, p. 159 f.), in so far as that translation expresses to the devout believer the supreme divinity of his adored God. Nor is there any objection to the view taken by Govindācārya Svāmi in his paper on the Artha-Pañcaka (ibid., p. 591), that, to the same believer, Bhagavat is the perfect God possessed of the five (or six) attributes—knowledge, power, etc. In a later paper (ibid., p. 861), Govindācārya Svāmi shows that Blessed, Perfect, Glorious, or God, anything, in short, to render approximately the content of the native word, would be sufficient in a translation, which is at best a makeshift, and, because it is devoid of the connotation of the original, can never really translate it to the heart. Any merely etymological translation would, of course, be as unsatisfying to a worshipper of Bhagavat as "loaf-holder" would be if offered as an equivalent of our "Lord".

But while the religious sense must be satisfied, it will scarcely do to turn from that position, the impregnable fortress of sensibility, and interpret the sacred word as if it had always connoted what it does to-day, a point made by another native writer whose article follows the one last mentioned. In this paper Mr. V. V. Sovani, endeavouring to trace back the meaning of Bhagavat (ibid., p. 866), says: "First it was used of great spiritual teachers and inquirers, as we find in the Upaniṣad. Then it came to be used as an epithet to those persons who had acquired spiritual powers. Then it came to be used of the emancipated souls, and then of God." I pass over

the etymological analysis offered in this article as being unessential: though the fact that an etymology is offered seems to show that the various stages of meaning were intended by the writer to present a series without a break, from "endowed with merit" to "God" (as the "Perfect" one).

I trust enough has been said to show that, without pretending to be a worshipper of the Bhagavat, I fully appreciate the dislike of resting content with any merely etymological rendering of this word, and I will add that a merely historical view of the concept would doubtless be equally distasteful. The Blessed Lord of any faith means far more than can be conveyed by the radical or historical meaning of his name. But apart from what such a word means as a symbol of faith, the history and etymology of any divine name or epithet may be studied with profit as a problem purely historical, etymology itself being only a corner of the historical field.

Looking at the matter from this point of view, I venture first to suggest that the idea of merit does not lie in the word *bhaga*; and then to propose for the word Bhagavat itself a stage which seems to have been omitted in the analysis mentioned above. Before the word was used in the Upaniṣads it was current in the Sāmhītās, where it is used, for example, of a man's hand, *ayám me hásto bhágarān*, RV. 10, 60, 12; or of a man, *cakāra bhadrām asmábhyam abhagó bhágaradbhyaḥ*, AV. 5, 31, 11. At this period *bhaga* means a share and so a lucky share (cf. *bhagatti*). Bhagavat, then, is the one who has luck, or, in other words, the fortunate one: so that he whom the luckless wight has made fortunate is described as getting what is *bhadrum*. Somewhat the same process goes on when this word is applied in the Upaniṣads to the priest or learned man, e.g. *varam bhagavate Gāutamāyu dadmah* (BA. 6, 2, 4), as when Śrī, another word meaning fortune, is used as an honorific title. But the Upaniṣads

do not confine the use to teachers and inquirers, as would seem to be implied by Mr. Sovani's "then". The use in Śvetāśvatara is significant. Let us put side by side 3, 11, and 6, 6: *sarvavyāpī sa Bhagavān* and *dharmāvaham pāpanudam bhageśam*, where the last word paraphrases the word Bhagavat, and "the universal lord of blessings" would unite the two. In Śīras., 6, *vyāpako hi Bhagavān Rudrah* expresses the same idea. It does not seem to me that the advance in application indicated by *teacher, spiritually gifted persons, emancipated souls, God*, can be maintained as a strictly historical fact.

But my main object is rather to question whether we can legitimately divorce the meaning of Bhagavat as it appears in the sacred scriptures from its ordinary meaning. The sacred scriptures of the Bhāgavatas know no better authority than the Bhagavat himself as revealed in his gospel Gītā (which is not song but recitation, or rather that intoned chant inseparable from śloka verse). Now, of course, Bhagavat as used in the Gītā cannot be so very different from *bhagavat* as used elsewhere in the epic poetry of which the Gītā forms the crowning glory.

In 3, 302, 1 f., Karna addresses the Sun-god in the following verses:—

*Bhagarantam aham bhakto, yathā māmi vettha, gopate,
tathā, paramatigmaṅśo, nāsty adeyaṅi katham cana :
na me dārā¹ na me putrā na cātmā suhrdo na ca
tathesṭā vā sadā bhaktyā yathā tram, gopate, mama :
iṣṭānām ca mahātmāno bhaktānām ca, na saṁsuyah,
kurvanti bhaktim iṣṭāṅi ca, jānīse tram ca, bhāskara :
iṣṭo bhaktas ca me Karṇo na cānyad dāivataṅ divi
jānīta iti vāi kṛtvā Bhagarān āha maddhitam.*

It is clear from this, which is a typical epic passage illustrating the use of *bhakti* in what may be called a sectarian but not Bhāgavata use, that *bhakti* is devotion

¹ *dārās*, "darling" (etymologically connected?), means as such not wife alone but "delight"; so *dāraka* and *dārikā* are epic words for son and daughter (cf. *nandinī*, etc. ; plural like *delicior*).

to any god conceived as the special object of worship. Similarly Aśvapati's devotion to the goddess Sāvitrī is manifested by eighteen years of ascetic practices (3, 293. 12), and the goddess formally acknowledges her pleasure in the vows, fasting, and whole-hearted *bhakti* of the king by the usual formula "choose a boon".

But *bhakti* may be used of devotion to other than divine beings, as, in the farther course of the Sāvitrī-story, *sneho* expresses a wife's love, *preman* is (rather oddly) used of a man's affection for his daughter's expected father-in-law, and *gurubhakti* is devotion to parents, teachers, and other venerable persons (3, 295, 11 : 297. 22).

At this point it is necessary to indicate a certain leaning to sense-devotion (one hesitates to say sensuousness) on the part of *bhakti*. It may perhaps be explained best as connoting affection rather than faith. In the theological religious sense of the Bhāgavatas, *bhakti*, as was well expressed long ago by Barth, is "faith, humble submission, absolute devotion, love for God". Now faith, to a Christian, means intellectual conviction, and the Gītā shows clearly enough that Barth is right in including this element in the Bhāgavata conception of *bhakti*. The only questions in my mind are whether, from the Bhāgavata's point of view, intellectual conviction ought to stand at the head of the definition, and whether faith anyway belongs to the conception of *bhakti* as usually employed in the epic.

If Śacī says to "Bhagavat Bṛhaspati", *bhaktāyāḥ kuru me dayām*, when she is escaping from the attentions of the evil-minded Nahuṣa (5, 15, 24), Nahusa himself says to her, *bhaktam mām bhaja* (ibid. 7), and this use of *bhakta* is current in similar situations in every part of both epics (c.g. 1, 214, 29). Compare R. (SI) 7, 80, 15, *prasādan kuru . . . bhaktam bhajaseu mām, bhīru, bhajamānam suvivealam ; evam uktvā tu tām kanyām dorbhyaṁ gṛhya balād balī vīspurantīm yathā-kāman māitkrvāyo pacakrame*. Urvaśī says to Arjuna,

bhaktān ca bhaja; Rāvaṇa to Sitā, *bhajasva mām* (3, 46, 44 and 281, 9): in general, *iṣṭūn dārēn ātmabhogān bhajadhvam* (5, 48, 97). There is neither kittenish nor monkeyish dependence in the attitude here; only it is to be observed that the same word also denotes a wife's exclusive devotion. To be sure, in 1, 118, 32, the Satī, who will follow her husband to the pyre, will do so (owing to a curse) in rather special circumstances: *kāntā . . . bhaktyā tvā 'nuṅamiṣyati*, and the passion which makes *bhaktā* almost equal to *raktā* cannot be gainsaid. But let us take a passage where the wife's love (here *bhāva* and *preman*) is expressed by (her husband's words) *sarvātmanā mām bhajati* (3, 234, 4-7). Here we have what is given in one word as *bhartṛbhakti* or *bhaktir bhartari*, which from the context (R. 5, 59, 34 and 6, 117, 12; 6, 119, 16) refers to a wife's attitude toward her husband. The passage in Vana is especially interesting because this conduct is that which should be adopted toward Kṛṣṇa himself, and if practised is *bhagadāivatam* or (3, 235, 12 of the southern text) *bhagavetanam* (also *ibid.* 234, 9 = B. 233, 8): the general directions here being given in the words *sā Kṛṣṇam āvādhaya sāuhṛdena, premnā ca nityam pratikarmaṇā ca* ("kāyakleśena").

Now to take up cases where women are not concerned, Arjuna is *bhaktānukampī, kāntas ca priyaś ca*, but as this is held out as a bait to Urvaśī (3, 45, 12), it will be better to cite his attitude toward the Gandharva, *parayā bhaktyā (pūrṇacandra irā 'babhāu, 1, 174, 1)*: or the attitude of Bhagadatta toward the Pāṇḍu, *snehabaddhas ca manasā pityvad bhaktimāns tvayi* (2, 14, 16); or that of Yuyudhāna, *adya snehan ca bhaktim ca Pāṇḍaveṣu . . . darśayiṣyāmi* (7, 119, 36).

But the nearest approach to the attitude of the worshipper is shown in the love of the people toward the king, who unites different divinities. As any god is *bhaktavatsala*, "fond of his devotees," such as Kṛṣṇa (7, 83, 12), or Durgā

(4, 6, 26), so the king is *bhaktavatsala* (1, 172, 23). The devoted servitor of a king is called a *bhṛtya bhakta* (5, 37, 22), and "loyalty" is expressed by *rājabhakti* (3, 59, 15; 92, 22). *Bhaktimat* is the converse of *bhagavat*; and as *bhaktimān tam* (accusative! 6, 77, 30) means "devoted to this man", so *rājabhaktimat* is "loyal". This loyalty is, however, no cold fidelity but a warmer feeling. Compare the description of the people's devotion to their king in 1, 222, 10: *atiprītyā . . . na tu kevala-dāivena prajā bhāvena remire* (sc. on the king); where *atiprīti* and *bhāva* are equivalent to *rājabhakti*. *Prīti* is pleasure ("there is no pleasure like seeing foes in distress," 3, 237, 18-20, synonymous here with *sukha* and *śrī*); but it is much more, for in 1, 172, 20 it expresses sensual love (often of family relations, however, such as that of a man for his brother), and *atiprīti* is in fact the equivalent of the rare word *atibhakti*, which is found in 1, 75, 33: *atibhaktiyā pitṛṇ arcan devāṅś ca prayataḥ sadā*, of Yayāti (compare, for the *ati*-idea, the expression *sā Jisṇum adhikam bheje*, Southern text, 1, 242, 41, of Subhadra). The same idea is expressed by *adṛḍhabhakti*, of citizens devoted to their king Rāma (R. 7, 107, 16, etc.). Probably in Mbh. 5, 37, 37, *adṛḍhabhaktika* expresses this also, though from the context it may refer to one "not firm in affection" toward the gods (*bhaktika* is not otherwise used).

Animals as well as men may have *bhakti*. Thus Rāma entreats Brahman for all those who have followed him through love, *snehāt*, and says in explanation of his request, *bhaktā hi bhajitavyāś ca* (that is, I must show the same affection for them), and Brahman, granting the request, says that all the animals that have died for Rāma because of their *bhakti*, shall live in a world next to the Brahmaloaka (R. 7, 110, 20).

In 3, 2, 7, the king says he has the highest *bhakti* toward priests, as the priests say they are devoted to him

and add "even deities show pity to their devotees", *anukampāṁ hi bhakteṣu devatā hy api kurvate*, where the Southern text has the rather striking variant *snehakarmāṇi bhakteṣu dāivatāny api kurvate* (3, 2, 6 f.). The same text has *vṛtti* for *bhakti* at 3, 26, 20 (also *brāhmaṇeṣu*). The verb *bhajate* means in many cases simply favours. "Lakṣmī favours the Pāṇḍavas" (3, 237, 4); or favours "him who worships the sun on Sunday with *bhakti*" (3, 3, 64, "does *pūjā* on the seventh or sixth lunar day"). Sugrīva is one whom the bears prefer, favour, love, *bhajanti* (3, 282, 6). *Bhakti* leans to love very perceptibly, even to erotic passion, but it expresses affection of a pure sort as well as that of a sensual nature; which latter aspect, however, is to be found and cannot be ignored. In fact, the danger of *bhakti*, become too ardent and lapsing into mystic eroticism, is apparent in the mediaeval expression of this emotion. It is not intellectual, yet the play of meaning between faith and love (perhaps trust) is generally present. It may indeed be illustrated by another word, *śraddhā*, as it appears in such phrases as *yathāśraddham*, "according to your inclination," as compared with *śraddadhasva mama*, "put faith in me" (3, 215, 10); so that eventually *yuddhaśraddhā* means "love of fighting" (*passim*). Hence *bhakti* and *rāga* appear together, of a woman's devoted love (3, 57, 23). But especially frequent is the use of *bhakti* in respect of human devotion to the gods, not by any means to Bhagavat alone. Thus the House-goddess says, *yo mām bhaktyā likhet kudye*, "who with *bhakti* paints me on the wall" (of the house, will be prosperous, 2, 18, 3). Again, Yudhiṣṭhira, ignoring all other gods, says of the creator *īśvara dhātṛ* (= Brahman), "Blame not the lord creator through whose grace, *prasāda*, a mortal devoted to him, *tadbhaktah*, gets immortality" (3, 31, 41 f.). This conjunction of the two great words of the Gītā is by no means unusual. Hanumat says in general to Bhīma,

(*mānyāni . . . balihomanamaskarāir mantrāis ca*) *dāivatāni prasādāni hi bhaktyā kurvanti*, *Bhāvata* (3, 150, 24), that is, the divinities should be respected by man, with offerings, etc., and then, because of man's *bhakti* as thus shown, they become gracious to him. Neither here nor in the case of Brahman already cited can be intended that special love characteristic of the Bhāgavatas.

The title Bhagavat is one commonly employed for various gods in the epic. Brahman is Bhagavat (1, 63, 64: 3, 276, 2), as he is also Jagannātha (7, 53, 14). He is besought, as a god *prasādamukha*, by Rudra-Śiva not to destroy the world (*ibid.*). So Agni (5, 15, 29) and Indra (1, 34, 15) are each called Bhagavat, as are various priests and worthies. Cf. 3, 294, 31, *gurur hi bhagavān mama*, "you are my *guru*." Each god on occasion is the object of *bhakti*, as need arises. Skanda gets happiness by seeing Śiva and by *bhakti* toward him (3, 231, 57). Bhagavat Hara, who is *pāriśulapriya*, "fond of his followers," "protects them as if they were his own sons, if they are devoted to him in thought, word, and deed," *manovākharmabhir bhaktān pāti putrān ivāurosān*. This is Śiva, "lord of past, present, and future" (10, 7, 8 f., and 43). The special importance of this statement lies in the fact that Śiva's followers are not his human worshippers, but the host of horrible demons that surround him (described here). *Bhakti* towards Śiva is shown by a horse-sacrifice, according to R. 7. 90, 17.

Why is a god called Bhagavat? Obviously, tracing the word from its first use in the R̥gveda, we must say that the one who is fortunate, he who possesses *bhaga*, has that title. Cf. RV. 7, 41, 4—

*utédānīm bhāgavantaḥ syamotā prapitrā utā mādhye āhnām
utóditā maghavan sūryasya rayām devānām sumatāū syāma.*

Indra in the epic is Bhagavat and Maghavat (cf. in Vedic phrase *bhagatti* and *maghatti*). As he has fortune, so has he gifts (to give). The *bhaktas* are rewarded by the boon.

varam vṛṇīṣva, to which allusion has already been made, and which is the common accompaniment of the statement that they are *bhaktas*. As Śrī-Bhagavat says that "no one who does well comes to an evil course", *durgati* (Gītā, 6, 40), so Dharma says, *varam vṛṇīṣva . . . datā hy usmi tava*, and adds, *ye hi me puruṣā bhaktā na teṣāṃ asti durgatih* (3, 314, 11).

The constant proclamation of their *bhakti* is what makes Keśava so prone to favour the Pāṇḍavas, according to the accusation of Duryodhana (*bhaktivādena*, 5, 127, 3). What that *bhakti* consists in, is explained long before the Gītā, when the same unbeliever scoffs at the *bhakti* of Sañjaya toward Bhagavān Devakīputraḥ, and the question is formally put: *kā bhaktir, yā te nityā Janārdane?* The answer is given thus: *māyāṃ na seve . . . na vṛthādharmaṃ ācare, śuddhabhāvaṃ gato bhaktyā śāstrād vedmi Janārdanam* (5, 69, 4 f.). The devotion to the god is shown by renouncing delusions (such as works) and all wrong practices. This devotion gives purity of heart, and study gives knowledge of the god.

God is the Blessed One, not because he gives gifts (*maghavat*), but because he has in himself all good things (*bhagavat*). But originally in the simpler application of *bhagavat* to man, the good things one gets are conceived as portions or parts given to him by the power that has and shares, portions out (Bhaga as god). Conversely, man is partial to one god and so is *bhakta*. Thus *bhakti* is what influences an unjust judge, who is partial (R. 2, 75, 57). Hence too *bhaj* is like English (apportion to one self) take, take to (*diśo bhejire*, "they took to the quarters," took to flight), take for oneself, choose, hence favour, and so on to love, just as *dilectus* and *dilectio*, love, come from *diligo*, choose. The man chooses out, elects, *diligit*, or loves, a woman or a god, and he is then *bhakta*, partial to, devoted to, that woman or god. In Latin we say *quem di diligunt*, "whom the gods favour."

So as a matter of fact either man or god may favour the other. Bhagavat from the beginning (RV., loc. cit., v. 5) shows that the owner of *bhaya* may by implication be the giver: *Bhūga evā bhūgavān astu devās tēna rayām bhūgarantaḥ syāma*, "may we be blessed through him."

Thus *bhakti* is used of god or of man, and is convertible with *prasāda*, a meaning impossible of course in the Bhāgavata sense. The passage where the old priests entreat Rāma shows the approach to the use of *bhakti* which is now to be illustrated—

*bhaktimanti hi bhūtāni jaṅgamā 'jaṅgamāni ca
yācamāneṣu, Rāma, tvam bhaktim bhakteṣu darśaya.*
(R. 2, 45, 29.)

Here *bhakti* = *sneha*, but it is from the superior to the inferior. This, however, is what was to be expected. If the goddess Lakṣmī *bhujate* (above), she must show *bhakti*. And so in fact we find that the gods have *bhakti* to men as men have towards gods. Thus in the story cited at the outset of this paper, as Karna is *bhaktu* and has *bhakti* toward Sūrya, so the god says to Karna, *mamāpi bhaktir utpannā* (3, 301, 9). Again, when the god Yama wishes to express his kind regard for the young woman who has followed him and entreated him so insistently, he says: "As you have been speaking to me, *tathā tathā me tvayi bhaktir uttamā, varam vṛṇīṣva*" (3, 297, 51). In such cases *bhakti* is not faith at all, nor is it humble, adoring love.

A peculiar locution may perhaps be mentioned here, that of using *bhakti* in the plural for emblems of devotion, as in R. 5, 49, 4, where Rāvaṇa is described as *svanuliptam vicitrābhīr civiḥkābhīś ca bhaktibhiḥ*. The scholiast says, *śāivatripundraścaḥ rucanāriṣeṣūiḥ* (like the ash-marks on the forehead of a Śivaite). Compare *bhaktis* as "adornments" (PW. s.v.). The Itihāsa of R. 6, 120, 33 would of course make the *bhaktimantaḥ* of this epic the adorers of that Rāma who is both Rāma and Kṛṣṇa;

ibid. 29: *Sītā Lakṣmīr bhavān Viṣṇur devaḥ Kṛṣṇaḥ Prajāpatiḥ, radhārthanī Rāraṇasye 'ha pravaiṣṭo mānuṣīm tanum.* They are described as in the Gītā: *amoghās te bhavisyanti bhaktimantāś ca ye narāḥ, ye tvām devam dhruvaṁ bhaktāḥ purāṇam puruṣottamam, prāpnuvanti sadā kāmān.*

Although the *bhaktas* of the epic are manifold, those of the Bhagavat are naturally more often mentioned than any others, and are by no means confined to the Gītā. Thus we read of Bhagavadbhaktāḥ in 1, 214, 2, nominally before the Gītā was proclaimed, and of course long afterwards, as it is said in 12, 47, 33: *nānyabhaktāḥ kriyāvanto yajante sarvakāmudam (Kṛṣṇam), yaṁ devaṁ Devakī devī Vasudevād ajījanat (29); eko yaṁ veda Bhagavān dhātā Nārāyaṇo Hariḥ;* the eulogizer finally acknowledging himself as *prapanna* and *bhaktu* (97). The Bhagavat here and elsewhere is clearly Devakī's son; though this has been denied by some scholars.

Apart from Kṛṣṇa the same *bhakti* is shown to Viṣṇu. For only a sectary could find in 3, 163, 23-4, an allusion to Kṛṣṇa, where Hari Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu dwells to the east of Meru (20), and is reached not by seers but by Yatis through *bhakti*: *yatayas tatra gacchanti bhaktyā Nārāyaṇam Hariṁ pareṇa tapasā yuktā bhūvitāḥ karmabhīḥ śubhīḥ, yogasiddhāḥ, etc.* Such a passage is interesting in showing that *bhakti* is directed wholly toward Viṣṇu as supreme god, above Brahman, without any indication whatever that the author of the description recognizes the identity of Kṛṣṇa with the deity, though Gītā, 8, 10, *bhaktyā yukto yogabalenu cāi 'ru,* has the same idea.

Finally, in the part of the epic devoted to the exaltation of Śiva, Viṣṇu himself shows his *bhakti* toward the greater god. Here, however, Nārāyaṇa is distinctly Vāsudeva Keśava. He sees Śiva, becomes *bhaktimat*, and (in 7, 201, 77 f.) says: *bhaktam ca mām bhajamānam*

bhajasva . . . abhiṣṭataḥ pravikārṣīs ca māyām. The language is that of despairing passion, as in 1, 172, 8, the lover to his mistress, *bhajasva bhajamānam mām, prāṇā hi prajahanti mām*; *ibid.* 15, *bhaktam mām bhaja.* This is, of course, a late passage, probably an interpolation.

To sum up, from the point of view of the epic poets, who also wrote the *Gītā*, *bhakti* is affection rather than faith. It may belong to man or god and have for its object man as well as god; its nearest human equivalent in the latter case is the love of a wife for a husband. It inspires animals as well as men. It interchanges with all words of deep affection, *prīti*, *bhāva*, *rāga*, *sneha*. As to *Bhagavat*, I should prefer to retain, as nearest to the original sense, the translation Blessed, he who is blest with the possession of all good attributes, and, by implication, makes blessed his *bhaktas*, those who have made him theirs, and are devoted to him.

THE ETHIOPIC SENKESSAR

BY PROFESSOR I. GUIDI

THE Synaxaria, as also the Menologia, are not among the oldest of hagiographical texts, and consequently their use in public worship in Oriental churches is relatively modern. In the case of the Coptic-Alexandrine Church with which I am now dealing, at the date when its Synaxarium was composed, Arabic had for long past taken the place of Coptic as the living language; indeed, in my view, its compilation was an outcome of that religious and literary movement which, from the thirteenth century onwards, gave fresh life and improved order to the Church of Alexandria. The question of the immediate sources of this work—one not as yet ripe for treatment—cannot be dealt with in this place; it may, however, be pointed out that the Synaxarium, as the product of Arabic speaking people, could be easily put together from all the hagiographical works in use throughout Eastern Christendom by speakers of that tongue. Hagiographical literature is to a great extent a monastic product, and its Greek branch had for its main centre Palestine, and the convents of St. Sabas and of Sinai—witness the names of Cyril of Skythopolis, of John Moschos, of Sophronios, Patriarch of Jerusalem, etc.

As far back as in 1888 I pointed out in my memoir *Sulle traduzioni degli evangelii in Arabo e in Etiopico* the fact, now generally admitted (cf. Graf, *Die christ. arab. Lit.*, p. 6, and Brockelmann, *Die syr. und d. christ. ar. Litt.*, pp. 67–8), that it is precisely in this quarter that Arab-Christian literature had its birth and development; it was to a great extent made up of hagiographical legends derived, directly or indirectly, from the Greek;

and it was by this channel that the abundant stream of Byzantine hagiographies reached Arabie speaking Christians. It reached them, as was natural, not in independent rivulets from the various sources, such as the Acts of the Martyrs, the *ἐγκώμια*, and the *βίοι*, but in a flood of mixed matter. This primary supply of Graeco-Arabie literature was augmented later on, in Egypt, by other texts, such as the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in their Coptic form (the Arabic translation of which dates back certainly to the fourteenth century), the Coptic legends of martyrs, whether of Diocletian's cycle or otherwise, the Apophthegmata Patrum in some one of its forms, etc.: and that these Arabic texts were already in existence in the thirteenth or in the fourteenth century is proved by the actual age of many of the MSS., e.g. Paris, Nos. 253, 259, 260, 266, 278, 283, and others. There existed, therefore, an ample supply of hagiographic material in Arabic for the use of the compilers of the Copto-Arabie Synaxarium of Egypt. But, again, this is not the place to consider the precise sources of the Synaxarium, nor the question of priority of date between it and the *Difnār*, on which Mr. Crum's remarks may be referred to¹; it is enough here to say that late in the fourteenth or early in the fifteenth century the Synaxarium of the Coptic Church, but in Arabie form, was in existence in the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

The translation of the Synaxarium into Ge'ez must have taken place at no great interval of time in the course of the fifteenth century, when Abyssinian literature was enriched by many a hagiographical text; this rendering of it into Ge'ez may be assigned to the second half of the century, for it is mentioned in the time of King Nā'od (1494-1508), and the age thus attributed to it is fully confirmed by the MS. D'Abbadie No. 66, assignable palaeographically to precisely this period.

¹ Cat. Copt. MSS. Coll. Rylands Lib., p. 213.

Nevertheless, to find other MSS. of the Senkessār we must pass on to the beginning of the seventeenth century, for not until that date do they become at all numerous. Not a few copies of the work exist in the libraries of Europe: several are mentioned by Dr. Conti Rossini in his *Note per la Storia letteraria di Abissinia*.¹ Since then other copies have come to light, e.g. those of Keren² and of Berlin³; and the Khedivial Library at Cairo possesses a magnificent although imperfect copy, the conclusion of Genbot and the whole of the last quarter of the Abyssinian year being wanting. These MSS., however, present a text which diverges from that of the earlier one, the result either of modification or of addition of various sort. This is distinctly so in the case of the three months of Sanē, Hamlē, and Nahasē, and the same is doubtless true of the remaining portions of the work. It is clear, therefore, that in the history of the Ge'ez Senkessār two periods must be distinguished—(1) that of the first translation (second half of the fifteenth to beginning of the seventeenth century), and (2) that of revision and added matter (seventeenth century onwards).

I

It appears from a note on the MS. D'Abbadie 66, communicated to me by Dr. Conti Rossini, that the early translation was the work of one Simon the Egyptian, priest and monk in the monastery of St. Anthony.⁴ The note is as follows:—

¹ *Rendiconti della R. Accad. d. Lincei*, 1900, p. 630.

² C. Conti Rossini, "I manoscritti Etiop. della Missione Cattolica di Cheren": *ibid.*, 1904, p. 276.

³ G. Flemming, "Die neue Samml. abess. Handschr.": *Zentralbl. f. Bibliotheksw.*, 1906, pp. 7-21.

⁴ The doubt expressed by Zotenberg (*Cat.*, p. 152) as to whether the recension by John of Burlos (Borollos, Πάπαλος) is that contained in the later version of the Senkessār is unfounded; the name of John together with that of Mikā'el appears already on the MS. D'Abbadie 66. Cf. Duensing, *Liefert d. äthiop. Synax.*, etc., 8.

. . . ዐለአተረጎሞ : ለዝነቱ : መጽሐፍ : ዐለዕለዎ :
 ለሥልጣን : ዓረቢ : ኃብ : ልሳን : ግዕዝ : ስራዓን : ኃግዕ : ግብጻዊ :
 ቀሲጥ : ዐመነጥን : በስራ : ዘለሥደብረ : ቅዱስ : ስባ : ለንጦንዮን ::

The first question which arises is this: which one of the available Arabic MSS. was it that was used by the Abyssinian translator? On this I can say nothing, for it is only the three last months of the Abyssinian Senkessār that I have studied—Sanē, Hamlē, and Nahasē (Paoni, Abib, and Mesori)—whilst the two critical editions of the Arabic Synaxarium now in progress, that of Basset in the *Patrologia Orientalis* (Graffin & Nau), and that of Forget in the *Corpus Script. Christ. Orient.* (Chabot), stop at the month of Kihak and of Mechir respectively. As for the Vatican Codices Arab. 62-5, although they are free from any great discrepancies, they certainly do not contain the precise text which the Abyssinian translator must have had before him.

The translation is a literal one; at times the meaning of the Arabic is not grasped: thus, at S. 606,¹ 8, the words *قديمًا وحديثًا* are erroneously made to refer to the Old and New Testaments; p. 670, 7, *الجزيرة*, viz. Mesopotamia, is rendered "the island". Abba Nob is described as wearing a "garment of iron", p. 663, the Arabic being *ثوب جديد*, viz. a "new garment", and it may be that in the translator's original the dot of the *ج* was wanting, and that he failed to notice the obvious correction. Again, H. 372, 14, St. Sisinnius is said to have been *كثير الرحمة والمعروف*, which is rendered that he was compassionate and "knew everyone"; in the statement that Patriarch Simon, H. 397, 11, ate only bread, salt, and herbs, *لا غير*, "and nothing besides," the last words are rendered "not cooked at the fire", perhaps reading them as *لا تُغَيَّر* (?); and the words on

¹ S. = Sanē, H. = Hamlē; the page numbers refer to *Patrol. Orient.*, vols. i and vii.

the same page relating to the convent of Abbā Severus were misunderstood by the translator. Still less can we expect corrections of corrupt passages in the original Arabic, such as H. 330, 4, where the obviously faulty passage **مدينة المنجور نصيين**, which should be read (**بوصف بالمسجون**) **التخوم**, has been retained and rendered by **ሀገረ : ከዋክብት**.

The elegance of the Ge'ez idiom is destroyed, for example, in the passage at H. 273. 1, where **كنت قد تركت** is rendered **እሥጥኒኑ : ወእሥጥኒደጉ**, just as the often repeated **ለዘዘ : ወ** (**لورف**) *passim*. More will be said later on the corrections thus occasioned, whether verbal or by grammatical forms of unusual character. The matter is, however, more serious when well-known and well-established rules of Ge'ez, both as to form of words and syntax, are disregarded; thus we read **ተእሥጥኒኑ** for **ተእሥጥኒኑ**, H. 263, 13; **ወፀለኩ** for **ወፀለኩ**, H. 290, 14; **በጸፀኩ** for **በጸፀኩ**, H. 291, 1, etc.

Again, **ከኒ** is found with the nominative in cases where its explanation as proposed by Dillmann is less easy (Dillm.—Chrichton, p. 442). Cf. S. 573, 10; 666, 14; 676, 12; H. 260, 6; 276, 12–13; 330, 4; 340, 7; 392, 13–14. The accusative is wanting, too, in the second object, S. 571–2. The substantive in the accusative case is often found combined with the adjective in the nominative, S. 677, 14, and *passim*;¹ this last form cannot, indeed, be termed faulty, but it affords evidence that the text has not undergone correction by the “Mammerān”. Some forms are, however, undoubtedly wrong; the **ከፊ** final with the indicative, e.g. **ከኒ : ልዳደፊ : . . . ከፊ : ደገብረ**, S. 606, 7; **ሀሎ : ከፊ : ደበውሉ**, H. 228, 4; **ደቤለከ : . . .**

¹ As to this not uncommon occurrence in old MSS. see Bezold, *Kebra Nagast*, xviii. That the age of MSS. is no adequate criterion for judging the regularity of the forms occurring therein, may be gathered from what Dr. Conti Rossini says in the Preface to the Acts of Baṣalota Mikā'el (Corp. Script. Christ. Orient. Script. Ethiop., ser. II, t. xx).

ከወ : ትጼሊ, H. 265, 2 (327, 8): . . . ከወ : ይሔሊ. S. 635. 12, etc., and vice versa. ይዘወ for ይዘወ. S. 605; ትፀላከ for ትፀላከ, S. 585, 4. We even meet with ዝኝቱ as accusative: H. 273, 10. ባህቦወ : . . . ዝኝቱ : ክብረ : S. 585, 15 (588), ከወ : ትህደጊ : ለወደብ : ዝኝቱ : ይጽዋታተ. and so ይለቲ for ይለተ, S. 636, 6.

But in addition to these defects of form, the work had, in Abyssinian eyes, a serious defect of substance in this, that by merely reproducing the Arabic Synaxarium, it omitted all mention of the saints most revered in Abyssinia, from the renowned Nine Saints—Aragāwi. Garimā, Panṭalēwon, etc.—down to Takla Hāymānot and Ēwostātēwos, with many others. Even the apostle of Abyssinia, Abbā Salāmā, is hardly noticed. It was perhaps this reason which, in addition to its bulk, prevented the work from becoming current in Abyssinia; during some two centuries and a half it was but rarely copied: for any copies destroyed by the Grāñ and Moslem invasions might easily have been replaced in the sequel by others. Another, and as it seems to me, an important fact is this, that the Jesuit missionaries, who undoubtedly took much interest in Abyssinian hagiography, never mention the Senkessār. When they have occasion to refer to Abyssinian saints such as Panṭalēwon, Takla Hāymānot, etc., they quote, not this work, but the individual lives of those saints. This appears clearly in their most important work, the history of P. Paez. The texts which he translates relating to Kāleb and Abbā Salāmā have no connexion with the narrative of the Senkessār; his knowledge of the Nine Saints is derived from another source, but he is unable to furnish any precise details about them; and this he could assuredly have done, had the Senkessār been known to him. He does indeed give a translation of the life of Takla Hāymānot, but as to Ēwostātēwos he admits he

can tell nothing, on the ground that he had been unable to procure a copy of his life, owing to the reluctance of the monks of Ēwostātēwos, and in spite of his own efforts to procure it. Now the monks' reluctance could have been no bar to his using the Senkessār, where Ēwostātēwos is dealt with at length (18 Mask., 21 Hamlē). The same argument holds good in the case of D'Almeida, whose knowledge of this saint is not derived from any written source, and on this account I am led to surmise that his very name has been wrongly transcribed by these authors as "Stateus". The life of Lālibalā (Paez, i, pp. 616-17) may indeed appear to tell against my view, inasmuch as it accords exactly with the text of the Senkessār, but Paez states that he had taken it from a work "which narrates the life of this emperor", and that could scarcely be the Senkessār; moreover, the opening words would have run rather "on this day" than "on June 19th", were they a translation from the Senkessār. This consideration has greater weight than may appear at first sight, for Paez' translation is a verbatim one, and it is therefore to be presumed that he had before him the very text which was afterwards included in the Senkessār. It is therefore evident from the above that in the early part of the seventeenth century the Senkessār had hardly spread at all in Abyssinia, nor is it matter for surprise that of this first translation only a single MS. should be known in Europe.

II

During the sixteenth century and the first decades of the seventeenth, Abyssinia was the scene of events which had an important influence on the religious life of the country. Struggles with Moslems on the one hand, and on the other, strife with the Jesuits, coupled with religious persecution, had given renewed life and energy to the large body of clergy attached to the Church of Alexandria,

a state of things which, in my view, could not fail to react on public worship in that Church by bringing about improvement in its mode of celebration. Among the results I am inclined to include the revision of the Senkessār, for it is just at the opening of the seventeenth century that copies of the work became numerous. The dates of the London MSS. of this period, which extend over rather more than half a century, fall many of them within the years of the pious sovereign John (1667-82): the Berlin MS., No. 66, dates from this period also, and so in all probability does the Khedivial MS. at Cairo, whilst the Keren copy dates from the time of Fāsīladas (1632-67). But by that time the work had undergone profound modification, so that its form now differed widely from that of the first translation.

As above stated, the main defects of that translation consist, as regards form, in incorrectness of expression, and as regards substance, in the omission of numerous name-days, those of Abyssinian saints in particular. Both these defects were remedied by the new recension: it then became widely current in Abyssinia, and it is represented in Europe by many MSS. For shortness the first translation is henceforth called A, and the new recension B.

A comparison of the two texts shows clearly that the basis of B was A. The language is everywhere the same, saving some corrections to be noticed later. Moreover, the passages wrongly translated in A, have either remained so, or have been emended conjecturally in places where a comparison of the Arabic original would have readily disclosed the true meaning. On S. 606, 8 (cf. *supra*). A misunderstood **وحديثا قديما**, and rendered it by a phrase which does not run properly; B corrects this by a conjectural reading which deviates widely from the Arabic text. At H. 406, 9-10, **ḌḌ : ፌነጽረታ** answers to the **عقلها** and **انظرها** of the Arabic, and B inserts a **(ḌḌ)ጽኑዓ**, which

is superfluous. Again (S. 667, 10–11), the words *معتبر بالرواد* were not clearly rendered in A: B simply omits the ሐዎድ, instead of correcting the phrase with the easy aid of the Arabic. Similar passages are H. 301, 11; H. 310, 1, where perhaps the MS. D'Abbadie should be altered to ፀሐራ. but where the mention of soldiers, inserted in B, is a mere conjecture (ሐራ). The trifling mistake in A, H. 384, 14, ፀሐለስ for ፀሐሎ (‘*amlakka*’) or ሐሎለስ, is corrected in B. contrary to the sense, into ፀሐሎልስ. On S. 575, 1, the name of the city ጣሕዎኝ, a transcription of the Arabic *طاحمون*,¹ has been changed to ግሕዎኝ. And this change (ጣ to ግ), notoriously of likely occurrence in Ge'ez script, is not so in the Arabic; this shows that B proceeds from a Ge'ez text, and not from a fresh translation. The same reasoning holds good in the case of ቀርተስ written for ቀርተሐ by the change of ሐ to ስ, S. 609, 8, where the Arabic has *قرطسا*,² and again in the case of ፊልጳስ, S. 609, 4, which in A is ፊልጳ, corresponding to *فيلبا*, that is, *فيلبا*, *φιλίας* (cf. the well-known martyr and bishop of *Θμοῦις* in Lower Egypt).

Nevertheless, the MS. D'Abbadie 66 was not the copy in fact used for the revision B, for certain passages which occur therein are wanting in the MS., whereas they are to be found in their proper place in the Arabic. Such omissions are: S. 651, 4, *فجدد عليه* and *بالعصر*: H. 268, 2, *بعد بطرس*: H. 443–4, *بامر الملك قسطنطين*, etc., with some due to homoteleuton, as S. 600, 1, *ዘሰዎ—ሊትዎጳዖ*; 691. 4, *ፀሐባ—ፀሐቱሎስ*; 688, 8–9, *ፀሐባ—ጳፀሎስ*. Such omissions not only prove that the MS. D'Abbadie was not the one used by the revisers of B, but also raise a presumption that it is not the autograph of the translator.

In recension B all the verbal mistakes are corrected.

¹ Cf. Amélineau, *Géogr. de l'Égypte à l'époque copte*, p. 472.

² Cf. Amélineau, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

We find, for example, an accusative after ኮኒ; cf. the passages cited above, and they might be multiplied; and the adjective to a word in the accusative is put regularly in the accusative. With ከጭ final is combined the subjunctive; moreover, the above-mentioned errors are corrected, as also the bad errors of concordance such as H. 224, 17, ዝኔቱ : ሃይጣኖት : ሩትዕት : H. 301, 9, ለኔነት : ጭሃይጣኖን.

Not merely actual errors of grammar, but incorrect or antiquated expressions also have been removed and others substituted; such are ተለሰን by ተልሰን, H. 260, 1; ጭልዖልይ by ጭለዖ", *passim*; ተጸገጠ, in a meaning which it does not bear in Ge'ez, by ጸገጠ, S. 620, 7; ለሉኔቱ by ለሎ", S. 563, 5; 565-6; 648, 15; 662, 14; ተኔባላታት by —ላት, S. 635, 1; 636, 1, and *passim*; ጠባይዓት by ጠባይዕ. H. 224, 15; ደጠንድ by ደሰድ, H. 340, 16; 341, 2, etc. (401, 6). Generally, too, in place of ተለጭኒ is substituted ተለጫ (iv, 2, in the schema of Prætorius), S. 552, 18, etc.; and for ተረፈ, ተርፈ, H. 211, 8; 332, 1, etc., ጠንተ is often replaced by ንብ, S. 570, 9; 647, 3; 615, 8. On S. 579, 2, A reads ጸገት, which is the verbal equivalent of النعم, but in B it appears as a singular, ጸገ, which is far more in accordance with usage; for ለከጭ (= ان) stands ሀለጠት, H. 331, 15; and at times ለከጭ (ان) is suppressed as untranslatable into Ge'ez; on H. 232, 13, the ጭቅሩ:ለለገዚለኔ (حب ل) is corrected into ጭቅሩ:ለለገ"; and the Arabic امرل in the sense of "to cause to receive, to make a present of", which, translated in A merely by ለዘዘ, is rightly emended in B by ጠሀብ. Sound emendations are: S. 533, 10, ጠሰብ: ሐኔጸ, changed into ለዘዘ: ለሐኔጸ; S. 605, 4, ሰብ in place of ጠሰብ; and more especially S. 615, 3, 4, ኔረክብ in place of ኔብብኔ, thus restoring the imperfect in the apodosis of a simple conditional

proposition, whereas A, in violation of correct Ge'ez usage, repeated the duplicated perfect of the Arabic. On H. 393, 16, the ጫኑኝኝ, which is determinate, has been corrected to ቀለቱ : ጫኑኝኝ (= ὁ), and, H. 398, 10, where 𐩈𐩌𐩎 had been translated merely by ቀለቱ, B adds (ቀለቱ) ሕጫዛ in accordance with the rules of Ge'ez.

Sometimes, however, the corrections in B are not justified; e.g., H. 343, 10, የጭ is changed into ለጭ, which is contrary to the Arabic. Another superfluous emendation occurs H. 359, 4, where St. Pantālēwon is described as thrown to "the lions", and the ለኛብሽት of A has been changed into ለኝብሳ. It may be that the recensionists of B were surprised at the plural, in their ignorance of the "venationes" of antiquity and of the penal condemnation "ad bestias". And similarly, H. 399, 15, ሕልዋኝ, viz. the little town of Helwān (Hélouan), near Cairo, now so well known, is wrongly changed into ለልዋሕ.

Some passages corresponding to Scriptural texts are in B made to accord more closely with the Ethiopic version of the Bible, from which A deviated somewhat. Thus, S. 571, 5, ደከጭፀ has been changed to ደከጭፀን in accordance with 1 Kings (Sam.) iii, and in S. 586 the passage 1 Cor. ii, 9 has been brought nearer to the ordinary Ethiopic text. Many analogous examples of correction could be found in the month of Nahasē, but I refrain from citing them as the text in question is as yet unpublished.

Another change is in the name of Jesus Christ, which appears generally in Arabic as السيد المسيح, the equivalent of which in A is ለግዚእ : ክርስቶስ; for this B, in closer accord with the forms usual in the prayer books, substitutes (ለግዚእ) ሊዮሴስ : ክርስቶስ : ሉቱ : ከብሐት. To some extent the festivals are transposed: that of St. Mary Magdalene, for instance, which is fixed in A for the 28th Hamlē

(H. 433), as it is by the Coptic Calendar (Nilles, *Calend.*, ii, 722-3), whereas the ordinary Abyssinian Calendar makes it fall on the 6th Nahasē (at the outset it was a "commemoratio").

As above stated, A had, besides its defects of form, yet more serious defects of substance in omitting so many anniversary festivals and obituary notices, especially those of Abyssinian saints. Their absence was the more felt from the fact that during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Ge'ez literature had been enriched with many hagiographical works. The lives of some of the famous Nine Saints, such as Aragāwi, Garimā, Panṭalēwon, had already been told at length in the form of *ἐγκώμια*: so also the lives of many saints of the following period. Lālibalā, Na'akueto La'ab, Gabra Manfas Qeddus, Takla Hāymānot, and later Ēwostātēwos, Samuel of Waldebbā, and many others. The unabridged legends of the Apostles, the "Gadla Hawāryāt", had long since been translated into Ge'ez. The festivals introduced or fixed by Zar'a Yā'qob had encouraged the composition, or the translation, of Homilies—those of St. Michael, for instance, which included not a few legends. Non-Abyssinian saints, too, belonging to the Coptic Church, such as Ebsoy possessed their "Gadl". Such an abundance of hagiographical literature, especially on the national saints, must have emphasized the feeling aroused by the omission of so many anniversaries and lives in the Senkessār, and especially at a moment of reaction in the national religion. It was, indeed, impossible that with struggles going on with the Jesuits and the West, the commemoration of saints of the Church of Alexandria, who were themselves Abyssinians, should be matter of indifference to the numerous clergy in the land.

It was natural, therefore, that the authors of recension B, besides making verbal corrections, should have sought to complete A by recourse to the numerous sources indicated. What may have been the additions made at

the outset, on the completion of recension B, might be ascertainable from the oldest MSS., such as those in the British Museum, Oriental 667, 670, 660, etc. Later MSS. naturally received considerable addition, e.g. it was not long before, the well-known saint, Walatta Pēṭros, herself a devoted student of the Senkessār, obtained her place in the work, on the 17th day of Hedār.

The compilers of B made, too, a further addition, viz. the "Salām", at the close of each life or anniversary. These, in my belief, were not then drawn up expressly for the Senkessār, but were taken for insertion therein out of some collection of hymns. This was done apparently in the case of another work (cf. Zotenberg, Cat. 60-1), the "Ta'amera Māryām" or Miracles of the Virgin, for in the oldest MSS. (cf. Paris, 62) the Salām are absent. (The MS. Lady Meux No. 2, ed. Budge, *Miracles of the Virgin Mary*, has the Salām, but it can scarcely be of any great age.)

My view is based on various circumstances. Sometimes these Salām are not connected closely enough with the Senkessār's text. For example, the Salām of St. Menas, S. 613, refers to the legend of the pig restored to life, which forms one of the saint's miracles in Abyssinian texts; now it is nowhere mentioned in the Senkessār. The same holds good as regards the miracle of the fishes, which is alluded to in the Salām of Theodore I, S. 696. In the second Salām of St. Ananias, S. 681, the saint is only incidentally mentioned, the Salām being actually composed for the Holy Sepulchre. Thus it comes about that occasionally the forms of the names in the Salām and in the Senkessār differ. In the Salām of the Martyrs of Esneh, H. 352, the Oxford MS. has "Esnā", whilst the text has "Esnē" or "Ensenē"; in that of Hilarion, S. 538, the Paris MS. has "Ilāryon", whilst the text has "Keryon"; and in the case of the Salām, at S. 697, the names differ from the forms they bear in the texts of some MSS.

Besides, the Oxford MS. does not insert the Salām after the commemoration to which it relates, but they are put together one after the other at the close of each day, and at times out of place, as is the case with the Salām of Theodore of the Pentapolis, which comes after the commemoration of Theodore of Corinth, H. 302. It may be that the Salām was not inserted at the outset at the end of every commemoration, and that some were added by hand. We find, indeed, many a Salām to be missing in the Oxford MS., such as those of Ishāq, H. 253, of Masqal Kebrā, H. 255, of St. Thomas, H. 215, of the Trinity, H. 369, of Pāwli, H. 296, of the prophets of Israel, H. 232, and many more. Some, again, are wanting in the Paris MS., such as that of Eḥwa Krestos, H. 374. On the other hand, many a Salām added in the last-mentioned MS. is wanting in that of Oxford and in D'Abbadie 163: such are those in honour of Basalota Mikā'el, S. 602, of Za-Iyasus, S. 617, of Tasfā Mikā'el, S. 641, of Amonēwos (Ammonius), H. 354; indeed, at S. 633 is added a poem, which is rather in the style of a "qenē" than of a Salām. The MS. D'Abbadie 163 possesses its own peculiar Salāms. It may, indeed, be surmised that many a proper name of unwonted form occurring in A, has been converted by the revisors of B into the shape in which it appears in the Salām, as, for instance, ብዮክላ (بيوحا), which in B appears in the same form as in the Salām, viz. Beyok (H. 212).

These considerations seem to me to make it excessively improbable that the Salām were the work of the revisors of B, and intended for the Senkessār; it is far more likely that they were taken from some already existing collection, such as the "Egzi'abehēr nagsa", properly so called, of Zar'a Yā'qob, and the "Weddāsē Samāwyān wamedrāwyān"; another collection of Salām and other hymns exists at St. Petersburg¹ in a MS. of the fifteenth

¹ Императорскія рукописи въ С.-Петербургѣ, р. 14 (MSS. Ethiop. at St. Petersburg).

century, whilst there is another in Rome belonging to Dr. Pietro Ambrogetti. These collections are all arranged in accordance with the sacred calendar of Abyssinia, and it was thus an easy matter, to extract the hymns relating to any particular saint and to insert them in the Senkessār. The question remains, to what collection did those hymns belong, but the hymnology of Abyssinia is as yet too little known for the answer to be forthcoming. Some few hymns of the "Egzi'ab. nagsa" of Zar'a Yā'qob have passed into the Senkessār, that of Azqir for instance, as I have been informed by Dr. Conti Rossini. Nevertheless, as has been often pointed out, it is the "Weddāsē Samāwyān" that discloses such close affinity with the Salām of the Senkessār. MSS. of this work are preserved at Paris and at Tübingen (cf. ZDMG., i, 37), one of the eighteenth century and the other of the opening years of that century; the MS. D'Abbadie 133 is probably of the eighteenth century, and the Oxford MS., which was used by Ludolf and is known to have been in the possession of Pococke, may have been acquired by the latter in the East, before 1640. In any case, it may well be earlier in date than revision B, although only an actual examination of the MS. could ascertain the date more closely. Another collection of Salām exists in the MS. B.M. Or. 534. The MS. is dated in 1586, but the Catalogue does not specify its relationship to the Weddāsē nor to the Senkessār. The Salām in Cod. Vatic. 43 seem to be quite different from those of the Senkessār. But were it established that the Weddāsē proceeded from the Senkessār, none the less would it be necessary to look to some already existing collection for the source of the Salām which the Senkessār contains.

These, then, are the modifications and additions characterizing recension B, which, representing as it does the texts of all the known MSS., excepting only D'Abbadie 66, may well be termed the "Vulgate" of Ethiopic

Senkessār. It would be well if the spot where this revision B was made, could be fixed, but as to this I have no certain knowledge. The fancy at once suggests Gondar as the spot, then Abyssinia's principal centre, with the convents adjacent or connected, and the surmise seems confirmed by the fact that whenever in the MSS. of the seventeenth century, and they are the oldest, the church or the convent for which they were destined is specified, it is generally a church of Gondar. The MS. B.M. 667 was destined for the church of St. Michael; B.M. 660, for Our Lady of Gemgābēt, etc.; and it must be added, too, that the saints of Northern Abyssinia are unknown to the revisors of B, who seem to have been under the influence of Dabra Libānos.

As is indeed natural, and as I have ascertained to be the fact from an examination of four MSS., which I had at my disposal for the edition of Sanē, Hamlē, and Nahasē, each MS. has its own special additional matter, additions being readily made when all that was needed to this end was a $\text{O}\eta\theta\sigma$. Thus, in D'Abbadie 163 commemorations are added which often bear relation to Abyssinia, e.g. that of Abbā Endreyās, the superior of Dabra Libānos, H. 345; of Filpos of the same convent (in the Paris MS. he is scarcely mentioned), H. 438; of Gabra Iyasus, disciple to Ēwostātēwos, H. 369; and of Jonah, H. 339. This MS. also contains corrections which are not always justified; e.g., in the legend of St. Peter, H. 240, "Altabyos" is changed into "Awsābyos", whereas the former retains the original "Albinos" in its Arabic form (البيئوس التبيوس); again, "Aksetnā" (Xanthippe) is changed into "Aksetyānā", H. 255; likewise the ϠϢ of other MSS. (= قار) should not have been converted into λϠϢ (cf. Dillmann, *Lexicon*, s.v.).

Greater variants occur in the Paris MS. There, not unfrequently, the commemoration is extracted from the

Salām relating thereto, and is repeated in a few words. This is done in the case of the Commemorations of the Trinity, H. 269; of Argis (Giyorgis, *ibid.*); of the dedication of the church of Ebsoy, H. 324, where the Oxford MS. actually omits the Salām, of the martyrs of Esne, H. 355, etc. The absence of these commemorations in other MSS., and of any fresh additions therein to the Salām, (of which, indeed, as a rule, they are abridgments), show such commemorations to have been subsequent interpolations peculiar to that MS. It possesses, too, this further feature, that its narrative is sometimes abridged, as in the curious story of Abbā Misā'ēl, H. 281; again, in the commemorations of Ēwostātēwos, H. 375-6, and of Filpos of Dabra Libānos, H. 438. Especially is this the case in the passages taken from the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, as in that of St. Thomas, H. 212; of St. Thaddeus, H. 216; of SS. Peter and Paul, H. 233-40, S. 240; of SS. Peter and Paul with King Parāgmon, H. 334; of St. James the Less, H. 347; and of the miracle of SS. Andrew and Matthew in the land of the Anthropophagi, H. 447. And seeing that these lengthy narratives of the Gadla Hawāryāt occur likewise in the most ancient MSS. of B (British Museum, 667, etc.), I feel no doubt that the Paris MS. represents an abridgment of later date. One good correction in this MS. occurs on S. 672, 1, where "Vespasian" is turned into "Justinian", whereby the gross anachronism occurring in other MSS. in respect of the exile of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Theodosius, is removed. Noteworthy, too, is the passage where this MS. retains the words ፬ንኑ-ሰብርኮንዖን , H. 327, 12-13, which, corresponding, as they do, to the Arabic, must have been present in the original translation; their omission in the other MSS. is due to homoteleuton.

The Oxford MS. has fewer variants; it is, however, very carelessly written, with frequent omissions due to

homoteleuton, and errors, some of them ludicrous, as, for example, H. 382, 6, where the town of Satanuf appears as ጫጽቲፍ, "a book;" and 399, 15, where in place of ቀደብረ, "and the monastery," is written ቀገብረ, "and he did"; and again, in reference to Andronicus and Athanasia, H. 437, 7, the statement that Abbā Daniel spoke to them of their ረኃብ:ኅፋሶ ጫ, "their soul's hunger," instead of ረባሐ:ኅፋሶ ጫ, "the salvation of their soul."

Another type of additions are those relating to the church or convent to which the MS. belonged. Thus the ancient MS. D'Abbadie 66, having been the property of the renowned sanctuary of St. Stephen on the island of Dagā, we find on its margin remarks relevant to that sanctuary, one, for instance, referring to Gabra Krestos, the abbot of the monastery, H. 372, another to Figtor and to a certain Henoch (?), the sons of King Minas, who were interred in the sanctuary, etc., H. 329, 445.

The story, then, of the Senkessār, as told up to this point, on a basis in part well established and in part probable, may be summed up thus. It was one of the many Arabic works translated in the fifteenth century, but was not widely known until the revival of religious activity, and improved service and creed in the Church of Abyssinia, drew increased attention towards it. It was then emended in Gondar or in its neighbourhood as to form, and completed as to contents, by the addition of many commemorations, more especially of Abyssinian saints whose names, in spite of the great veneration in which they were held, had found no mention in the early Senkessār. The same period saw the addition of the Salām, or brief final hymns, taken in all probability from some pre-existing collection and arranged in conformity with the calendar. This recension spread rapidly, and in spite of its bulk was very largely reproduced. But the reproductions, although belonging all of them to this one recension, yet present differences

due either to the addition of commemorations or of Salām, or to abridgment. A perusal of the MSS. hitherto unexamined would doubtless yield further instances of this, and of the contamination of some of their texts. It must, too, be born in mind that a given MS. may have been copied in part from one original and in part from another, and may thus offer example, as it were, of intrinsic diversity.

These considerations show how difficult would be the task of preparing a really critical edition of the Senkessār. If the first translation may be taken to be adequately represented in the MS. D'Abbadie 66, it is no easy matter to decide the form in which revision B first appeared, and it may be plausibly assumed that it is the most ancient MSS., Oriental 667, 660, etc., that conform most closely to the original. Of the three MSS. examined by me to the extent of the months of Sanē, Hamlē, and Nahasē, that of Oxford, although very inaccurate, seems to be the nearest, for the MS. d'Abbadie 163 already discloses certain corrections and special additions, whilst the Paris MS., as already stated, bears evident trace of late reconstruction.

Before bringing this brief article to a close I must make one observation. The colophons to Ge'ez MSS. show how numerous were the translations into Ge'ez made by Abyssinian monks resident in Egypt, or in the Coptic convents of St. Anthony, of Quesquām, of Hāra Zuwēla at Cairo, etc. It may be that in these spots the Abyssinians formed, as it were, a separate community, although in the case of Hāra Zuwēla no local record of the fact remains. We now find the Senkessār translated in Egypt, and by a "Gebšāwi" or an Egyptian; whether the name was due to birth or to long residence in Egypt, or to some other reason, is uncertain; but at any rate the man was not proficient in either of the two languages, Arabic or Ge'ez. The same is the case with

the text of the martyrdom of St. Cyriacus (the pretended Bishop of Jerusalem), with that of the story of King Claudius, and others besides, and this raises a doubt whether the mother tongue of their respective authors can have been Ge'ez: the well-known Embaqom, the translator of Abū Shākir, al-Makīn, etc., was a native of Yemen. This serves to explain, on the one hand, the want of correctness in the Ge'ez of many texts, and, on the other, the curious fact that so many Abyssinian works should have been revised and emended from the seventeenth century onwards.

.

XXII

DOCUMENTS SANSKRITS DE LA SECONDE COLLECTION M. A. STEIN

By L. DE LA VALLEE POUSSIN

NOTE PRELIMINAIRE

I. Je suis très reconnaissant au Dr. M. A. Stein de m'avoir confié l'étude de la plupart des documents sanscrits qu'il a découverts au cours de sa seconde expédition en Asie Centrale, au prix de quels labeurs, et grâce à quelle ingéniosité prudente et hardie, il nous a permis, avec autant d'humour que de modestie, de le deviner.

Je ne suis pas moins obligé à M. L. D. Barnett, qui m'a montré la plus désintéressée amitié : car, classant ces documents, il a vu du premier coup qu'ils contenaient de précieuses reliques du Dharmapada (de son vrai nom Udānavarga), de la littérature de Rakṣā, de la littérature de Stotra, du Saddharmapūṇḍarika : je lui sais grand gré, dussent nos confrères le regretter, de ne pas s'être réservé ces petits trésors de sagesse indienne si heureusement conservés dans le sable de l'oasis abandonné au désert ou dans les ténèbres de la *library* des Mille Bouddhas à Touen-houang.

Avec infiniment d'obligeance, M. R. O. Franke a identifié, dans la littérature pâlie qu'il connaît si bien, un grand nombre des stances de l'Udānavarga : je ne distinguerai pas dans la table de références que je joindrai aux douze feuillets que nous possédons de ce texte, celles qu'une connaissance vulgaire des textes pâlis m'avait fournies, de celles, plus curieuses sinon plus nombreuses, qu'il a ajoutées à ma liste primitive.

Les petits fragments, où domine la Prajñā, seront négligés dans la présente étude : tout ce qui paraît

intéressant, au point de vue littéraire ou paléographique, sera relevé. Par exemple, le superbe MS. sur *palm-leaves*, d'écriture si archaïque (Touen-houang, Ch. 0079A), où j'ai été si navré d'apercevoir le fatal nom de Subhūti, et qui ne contient, hélas, qu'une recension un peu abrégée de la Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā.

2. Si on excepte deux MSS. sur *palm-leaves*, qui sont en Upright Gupta indien, tous les autres MSS., sur papier,¹ sont en divers types de Upright Gupta d'Asie Centrale et en *slanting*.

On sait que le Dr. Hoernle, de qui nous tenons ces désignations (*Report on the British Collection* . . . JASB., lxx, Table ii, 1901), plaçait, en gros, les MSS. en Gupta indien au vème siècle, les papiers en Gupta d'Asie Centrale (Macartney, i, 7 ; ii, 3) au vième, la *slanting* (Weber, 5 ; Macartney, i, 2) au vème. Il semble, dans ses dernières publications, porté à reculer légèrement ces dates, notamment en ce qui concerne la *slanting*, "circa fourth century" (JRAS., 1911, p. 448).

Un document comme le "drame" récemment publié par M. H. Lüders, dont le *m* triangulaire nous reporte aux épigraphes de Mathura (150–100 B.C.), des Kushanas, etc.—sans parler de ses autres caractères archaïques—écarte tous les scrupules que pourrait provoquer l'antiquité attribuée à ces fragiles feuillets.

Le *terminus a quo* peut donc être reporté très haut : peu importe que soit mal assurée la relation établie par M. Hoernle entre la *slanting* et l'*upright* d'Asie,—ni pour *m*, ni pour *y*, l'antériorité de la *slanting* n'est évidente (voir JASB., xlii, 1893, p. 8) ; peu importe que les variétés, la répartition géographique, l'histoire de ces écritures ne soient pas encore élucidées.

Cependant, les *block-prints* de Grünwedel (Idikutsari, Pischel, *Sitzungsberichte* de Berlin, 1904, pp. 807, 1137)

¹ Les "papiers" peuvent être très vieux, témoin le Macartney, i, 6 (JASB., lxvi, 1897, p. 244).

montrent que la *slanting* est demeurée, a dû demeurer longtemps en usage.

Je ne pense donc pas qu'on puisse actuellement, du seul point de vue paléographique, fixer le *terminus ad quem* des feuillets en *slanting*, nide nos feuillets en général.

Ici interviennent des considérations d'un autre ordre.

Nos documents proviennent de Khadalik, endroit situé au nord de Domoko, à l'est de Khotan (marqués *Kha.*), de Farhad-Beg (marqués *F.*), au nord-ouest de Khadalik, et de la Grotte des Mille Bouddhas (Touen-houang, marqués *Ch.*).

Si le lecteur se reporte à l'article du Dr. M. A. Stein, "Explorations in Central Asia" (*Geographical Journal*, July-Sept., 1909, p. 17 et suiv. du tiré à part), et à ses observations sur Dandân-Uiliq, où il a exhumé des documents chinois datés de 781-90 A.D. (*Ancient Khotan*, p. 283), il conclura avec lui que l'abandon et la ruine de Khadalik doivent être placés vers la fin du viiième siècle. Nous avons ici un *terminus ad quem* solide pour les documents en Upright Gupta.¹ Il n'y a pas, ce semble, de *slanting* à Khadalik.

Pour ce qui concerne Touen-houang et sa pothi de *slanting*, aujourd'hui inégalement partagée entre le British et la Nationale, le Dr. M. A. Stein pense que la grotte-library a été murée peu après l'an mille (*Explorations*, p. 42). M. Paul Pelliot précise : ". . . la niche a été murée dans la première moitié du xiè siècle, et probablement à l'époque de la conquête *si-hia* qui eut lieu vers 1035" ("Une bibliothèque médiévale" dans *Bulletin de l'École d'Extrême Orient*, viii, p. 506, 1908). Sans doute, comme le prouvent les stèles de 1348, 1351 et le témoignage de Marco Polo sur l'idolatrie des gens de Tangut (*Explorations*, p. 39), le site, avec ses 500 grottes, ses stèles, et ses peintures, est resté bouddhique ; mais "les derniers

¹ La ruine d'Endere est encore plus ancienne, voir H-suan-tsang allégué *Explorations*, p. 25.

nienhao que portent les documents chinois sont ceux des premiers règnes des Song (976-83, 995-7)”—ce qui fournit le *terminus ad quem*—et tous les autres indices (stèles de 698, 776, 851, 894, etc.) indiquent que la collection est plus ancienne. Le MS. sur *palm-leafes* dont nous parlions ci-dessus, permet d'en reporter assez haut les origines. Le fait que “la grande stèle de pierre gravée en 851” fut trouvée dans la cachette, rend bien vraisemblable l'explication de MM. Stein et Pelliot: la niche fermée, dans la crainte de quelque danger, après qu'on y eut entassé—peut-être à coté d'un fonds primitif, “500 pieds cubiques” de rouleaux, feuillets, et peintures.

COLLECTIONS M. A. STEIN: CH. VII, 001B; ET
PAUL PELLIOT, TOUEN-HOUANG, 3510, FOL. x¹

FRAGMENTS DU ŚĀTAPAÑCĀŚĀTKASTOTRA D'ĀŚVAGHOṢA-
MĀTRCĒṬA

MS. sur papier; *slanting* brāhmi²; trois folios plus ou moins mutilés, numérotés au verso, ne portant plus de numéro lisible, semblables aux folios contenant l'*Udānavarga* (Ch. vii, 001A), à celui contenant un fragment de *stotra* non encore identifié (Ch. vii, 001C), à celui contenant un fragment du *Daśabalasūtra* (Ch. vii, 001D); 367 × 88 mm., 6 lignes à la page.

Des folios faisant partie de cette poṭhi (ou de ces poṭhis semblables) ont été rapportés par M. Paul Pelliot, et ont été publiés par M. S. Lévi (J.A., 1910, ii, pp. 433 et suiv.), notamment un demi-folio contenant la fin de notre texte

¹ M. Paul Pelliot me dit que sa collection comprend un ou deux fragments de Mātrceta (2 juin, 1911).

² Nos feuillets sont bien en *slanting*. Remarquons que M. S. Lévi, dans sa note sur les MSS. Paul Pelliot (J.A., 1910, ii, p. 435) confond les différents MSS. Macartney et leurs écritures très différentes, et fait dire au Dr. Hoernle des feuillets Macartney en général (*slanting* compris): “not later than the middle of the fourth century . . .”, ce qu'il dit en effet d'un MS. déterminé de la collection Macartney (“ . . . this Macartney MS. . . . the oldest existing Indian MSS. . . .”: JASB., lxvi, 1897, p. 245).

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, heavily obscured by ink blotches and damage. The text is arranged in approximately 12 horizontal lines across the leaf.

A
(Obv.)

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, heavily obscured by ink blotches and damage. The text is arranged in approximately 12 horizontal lines across the leaf.

A
(Rev.)

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, heavily obscured by ink blotches and damage. The text is arranged in approximately 12 horizontal lines across the leaf.

B
(Obv.)



Specimens of leaves from MSS. of (A) Śatapatha's 'alkastotra' (Ch. VII. 001B, fol. 3 and (B) Nagatapamasūtra (Ch. XLIII. 001, fol. 132, obverse

dans un état très fragmentaire. Le colophon porte les syllabes *cārya—tr*; d'où la conjecture de M. Lévi *Mātrceta*. La version tibétaine (P. Cordier, *Cat. du fonds tibétain de la Bibl. Nationale*, p. 9) désigne comme auteur *Rta-dbyans*, c'est-à-dire *Aśvaghoṣa*. Sur les relations de ces deux personnages ou de ces deux noms, voir, outre les particules de M. Lévi (J.A., 1897, i, p. 40, et 1910, ii, p. 433), l'étude de M. F. W. Thomas, "Matriceta and the Mahārājakanikalekha" (*Indian Antiquary*, 1903, p. 349; Album Kern, pp. 405 sqq.).

J'ai comblé les lacunes, à l'aide du tibétain, partout où la restitution paraissait vraisemblable, quelquefois ailleurs. Je traduis, dans les notes justificatives, là où le tibétain, seule ressource, est douteux.

D'après la version tibétaine, le *Śatapañcāśatka* est divisé en treize chapitres—

1. Introduction (bstod pa gleñ bslai: stotrakathodghāta?).
2. Hetustotra.
3. Nirupamastotra.
4. Adbhutastotra (rmañ du byuñ bai, *citra*° ?).
5. Rūpastotra (sku la bstod pa).
6. Cittastotra (thugs la = *cetahstotra* ?).
7. Vākstotra (gsuñ la).
8. Louange de l'enseignement (bstan pa la = *deśanā*° (?), mais *deśanā* = bçags-pa, Cordier, *Cat.*, p. 11).
9. Prañidhānastotra.
10. Mārgapraveśastotra.
11. Louange de l'enseignement (bka ba mdzad pa la, *sūsana*, *sūstṛ* ?).
12. Louange du prudent (mkhas pa la = *kuśala*, *duṣa*, *pravīṇa*, etc.).
13. Louange du sans-dette (bu lon med par = *anṛṇa-stotra*).

Nos fragments contiennent la fin de 4 (jusque stance 51), le 5 (52-7), le 6 (58-66), le commencement de 7, la fin de 11 (jusque 125), le commencement de 12.

Première feuille

[pra]tīghānūyaṃ prati .

yasya te cetaso nyatva[ṃ] tasya te kā stutir bhavet 48
 guṇeṣv api na saṅgo stī [d]ṛ[sto na guṇa]vatsu api .
 aho te suprasannasya balasya pariśuddhatā 49
 indriyāṇaṃ prasādena nityakālānapā[yinā
 cet]o nityaṃ prasannaṃ te pratyakṣaṃ eva dṛśyate 50
 ābālebhyaḥ prasiddhyante matismṛtiviśuddhaya[ḥ
 uttama]bhāvapiśunaiḥ suvyāhṛtasuceṣṭitaiḥ 51
 upaśāntaṃ ca kāntaṃ ca dīptaṃ apratighāti ca .
 nibh[ta] ce[dam] rūpaṃ kam iva nākṣipet 52
 yenāpi śataśo dṛṣṭaṃ yo pi tat pūrvam iksate .
 rūpaṃ prīṇāti te cakṣuḥ samaṃ [tadubhayaor idam] 53
 asecanakabhāvād [dh]i saunyahā[v]āc ca te vapuḥ
 darśane p[r]itip[.]i[na]vāṃ na vā . 54

ī ī ◡ — — ◡ guṇa

ru ya 5[5]

48. dgra beom pa dañ mu stegs la | rjes su chags dañ khoñ khro bar |
 khyod kyī thngs ni mi lgyur na | khyod la . . .

“ Votre esprit ne se modifie ni vers la sympathie ni vers la colère
 à l'égard de l'arhat et de l'hérétique . . . ”

c. so transcription fort approximative d'une graphie de seconde main ;
 d. MS. *ku static*.

49. *dr̥ṣṭo na* = bzhed mi miā = *mato* ; MS. *suprasannasya trasya* = khye
 ma o khyod kyī thngs stobs ni | rab dad yois su dag pa lags ; — *bala* =
utobala.

51. rañ bzhim dam pa . . . bsgrags pas—*piśuna* = manitestant.

52. dul la riñom brjid che ba yis | sku hdis su zhig dad mi mdzad :
 “ Par une grande gloire (*śrī, kāñī*, etc.) dans un humble (*nībhṛta*), ce
 corps qui ne convertirait-il pas ? ” (MS. *rūpaṃ*).

53. sku de . . . de gñis ka hdra bar = *samaṃ tadubhayaor idam*.

54. *b*. MS. *sāmya* = mdzes pa ; — mthoñ ūo cog ni phyi phyir zhiñ | dga
 ba skyed par mdzad pa lags. Il manque quatre akṣaras au MS.

55. rten gyi yon tan dag dañ ni | rten pai yon tan phan thsun du |
 lthsan pas khyod kyī sku dañ ni | yon tau phun thsogs mehog dañ ldan :
 “ Comme les qualités qui reposent [en lui], et les qualités de leur
 réceptacle, s'harmonisent, votre corps possède la meilleure bénédiction
 (*sampad*) de qualités. ”

¹ Ce sigle représente, d'ailleurs sans exactitude, les traits qui figurent
 le *ri-argha*, mais font aussi office de ponctuation, concurremment avec le
 point allongé en virgule (◡).

[kvān]yatra su[sthito bhūyād ayam tāthāgato guṇaḥ
 ṛt]e [rū]pā[t] tavaivāsmāl lakṣaṇavyañjano[j]jval^fā^t 56
 dhanyam asmiti te rūpaṃ vadativāśritāṃ guṇā[n
 va]lyam api pratyāhur iva tadguṇāḥ 57
 sarvam evā[vi]śeṣeṇa kleśair baddham idaṃ jagat •
 tvaṃ jag[atkleśamokṣā]rtho []ta[h] karuṇayā ciram 58
 kan nu prathamato vande tvāṃ mahākaruṇām uta •
 yayaiv[am api doṣa]jñas tvaṃ saṃsāre dhṛtaś ciram 59
 vivekasukhasātmyasya yad ākirṇasya te gatāḥ
 kālā labdhaprasārayā¹ []karuṇa]yā matam 60
 śāntād arañyād grāmāntaṃ tvaṃ hi nāga iva hradāt
 vineyārthaṃ karuṇayā vidyayaivā[gataḥ punaḥ 61

Deuxième feuille

p]i karuṇāparavattayā
 kāritas tvaṃ padaṃ nātha kuśilavakalāsv api 62

56. mthsan dan dpe byad bzan hbar ba | khyod kyi sku las ma gtogs pa | de bzhin gcegs pai yon tan hdi | gzhan gañ zbig la legs gnas hgyur : “ Si on excepte votre corps qui brille des signes principaux et secondaires, où ailleurs se trouve bien placée cette qualité de Tathāgata ? ”

57. c. nes legs bkod = *surinyastū rayam* . . . Le MS. devant *yam* de *rayam*, porte l’empreinte d’une autre feuille. Comparer le trait au-dessus de *pra* dans *pratyāhur*.

58. khyod ni hgro bai ñon moñs dag | dgrol slad yun riñ thugs rjes bsdams. bsdams = *samyataḥ, nīyataḥ, yataḥ*. — Peut-être *arthodyataḥ*.

59. c. skyon mkhyen yun riñ de lta bur. *api* n’est pas représenté dans le tibétain.

Je crois la lecture *kan nu* certaine ou très probable. Une graphie analogue (peut-être *mur*) a dérouteré M. S. Lévi (J.A., 1910, ii, 438).

60. dben pai bde ba spañs gyur khyod | mañ poi nañ du bzhugs pa gañ | de khyod thugs rjes dus hdas pa | glags çig thod nas bgyis par bas = “ Quand, abandonnant la béatitude de l’isolement, tu entres au milieu de la foule, le temps ainsi passé est regardé par la pitié comme opportunité ”. Le sauserit porte : “ Le fait que toi, qui as pour essence la béatitude de l’isolement, entres . . . est regardé . . . par la pitié, qui obtient une [opportunité pour] expansion . . . ” — *ma* de *matam* est peu lisible.

61. dgon pai zhi nas groñ gi mthar = *arañyaśānter grāmāntam*. c. MS. *sūndā?* *rañyid*; d. MS. *vidyayerā* = rig pa yis ni . . . slad du drañs.

62. a. ñer zhi mehog la gnas bzhin du = *paramopaśamastho*.

[] y sva[guṇo]dbh[āv]anās ca yāh
 vāntecchopavicārasya kārūṇyanikasaha sa te 63
 parārthaikā[natabhadrāpi svārthe dhy]āśayaniṣṭhūrā
 tvayy eva kevalam nātha (karuṇā)karuṇā bhav[e]t 64
 tathā hi kṛtvā ba[]m iva kva cit
 pareṣām arthasiddhyartham tvāṃ vikṣiptavati diśah 65
 tvadicchayaiva tu vyaktam[] varitate
 tathā hi bādhamānāpi tvā[m] sati [nā]parādhyate 66
 supadāni mahārthāni tatthyāni ma[dhurāni ca]
 [sam]ā[sa]vyāsavan[t]i ca 67
 kasya na syād upa[śru]tya vākyaṇy eva[m]vidhāni te
 bh[] sarvajña iti niścayaḥ 68
 pr[āyo na]madhura sarva kiñcid tha
 vākya[m] tav[ārthasiddhyāpi sarva]m e[va subh]āṣitam 69

63. *a-b.* rdzu hphrul seü gei sgra dan ni | ñid kyī yon tan brjod pa
 gañ : *ñdhiś ca śiṅharutaṃ ca svaguna . . .* Le MS. porte *ānās ca yāh* ou
bhanās ca yāh.

64. gzhan gyi don du rab bzai gi | ñid kyī don la brtse med pas |
 mgon po khyod ñid bha zhig la | thugs rjes thugs rje mdzad ma gyur—
 “Tout favorable à l'intérêt d'autrui, sans pitié pour ton intérêt propre.
 O protecteur, c'est pour toi seul que, par compassion, tu ne fais pas
 compassion.” L'aksara qui précède *śaya*, d'une seconde main, peu
 lisible; MS. *niṣṭhūrāḥ . . . nātha karuṇā bhavet.* Je comprends: *karuṇā*
 . . . *bhadrā . . . niṣṭhūrā . . . akarūṇā bharet.*

65. hdi ltar res hga brtan pas gañ | gzhan don b-grub pa mdzad slad
 du | khyod ni lan brgyar phyogs dag tu | gtor ma lzhin du btañ ba lags.
 Le sanscrit indique que le sujet est *karuṇā*: “Si, de la sorte, pour le
 bien d'autrui, la pitié, immobile quelque part, t'a cent fois projeté aux
 points cardinaux, comme une offrande” (*bañi*).

MS. *tatha no ce* (seconde main) *parepām.* *krtrā*: le tibétain semble
 exiger *śatakrtrā?* *tathā hi śatakrtro yañ (=gañ) dhruā balim ira kvañ |*
pareṣām . . . ???

66. de ltar khyod la gnod mdzad kyañ | noñs pa can du mi tse bas |
 khyod kyī lzhed pa kho na dan | mthun hjug pa ni lags par gda = “Elle
 te fait mal, mais ne t'offense pas, car elle ne fait que se conformer
 à ton désir”.

67. *madhurāpi ca* = sñan pa dan. zab gsal gñis kai dou ldan dan | bsdus
 dan spros pa dan ldan pa = “doués du double sens profond et clair, doués
 de concision et de développement”. *gambhīravyakta . . .*

68. . . . khyod kyī dgra bos . . . | thams cad mkhyeu pa lags so
 zhes | su zhug ñes pa skye mi hgyur = *tracchatroh = tat paripāṇḍhakaśyāpi*
bh. au troisième pāda, est probable.

69. mañ po il gyis sñan ma lags | beos ma hga tsam sñan pa lags |

yac chlakṣṇa[m] y[ac ca] paruṣaṃ yad vā tadubhayānvitam
 sarvam evaik[arasatām vicārya] yāti te vacaḥ 70
 aho supariśuddhānām karmaṇām naipuṇaṃ param
 yair idaṃ [vākya ratnānām ī]dr̥śaṃ bh[āja]naṃ kṛtam 71
 asmād dhi netrasubhagād idaṃ śrutimanoharam
 mukhā[vacanaṃ] candrād dr[avad] ivām[r]tam 72
 rāgareṇuṃ praśamayad vākyaṃ te jaladāyate
 vainateyāyate dve[śasarpam]] 7[3
 madhyamdinā]yate bhūyo hy ajñānatimiraṃ nudat
 śakrāyudhāyate mānagirin abhivid[ārayat] 4 74

Troisième feuille

mū mū kṣuṇṇāḥ supto gokaṇṭakeṣv api 4 117
 prā[jy]ākṣepā kṛtā sevā viṣabhāśāntaraṃ kṛtam
 nātha vain[e]yavātsaly[ā]t prabhunāpi satā tvayā 4 118
 prabhūtvam api te nātha sadā nātmani vidyate
 vaktavya iva sarvair hi svairam svārthe niyujyase 119
 yena kena cid eva tvaṃ yatra tatra yathā tathā
 coditaḥ svām pratipadaṃ kalyāṇiṃ nātivartase 4 120

khyod kyi gsuñ don grub pas kyañ | thams cad legs gsuñs kho na
 lags = " La plupart des discours dans l'ensemble ne sont pas agréables ;
 quelques-uns, fictifs, sont agréables . . . ". — *arhasiddhyā tu?*

70. rnam brtags na . . . ro geig ñid du hgyur.

71. de yis (*lire gañ gis*) rin chen gsuñ rnam kyi | snod hdi hdra ba
 hdi gyis so.

72. khyod zhal blta na rab sdug pa | de las mñan na sñan pa yi | gsuñ
 hdi dag ni zla ba las | bdud rtsi hdzag pa bzhiñ du gla = " De cette votre
 face agréable à voir, ces paroles agréables à entendre sont comme l'effusion
 d'ambrosie de la lune ". Les lectures *candrād* . . . sont incertaines.

73. zhe sdañ sbrul ni gdou pai phyir = *dveśasarpam* . . .

74. rab rib hjom pas gdugs dañ hdra. *gdugs* = parasol, midi. Avant
yate bhūyo le MS. paraît porter une lettre souscrite n? *madhyāhñāyat*
bhūyo pi hy (?).

117. ñam ñai çul du añ gçegs mdzad ciñ | rad rod can du añ mñal
 ba mdzad : " Allant même dans des chemins dangereux dort sur des
 terrains inégaux. " *gokantaka*, voir *Divya*, pp. 19 et 704.

118. sku ñas (?) brdo (?) dañ gcam thsul dañ | -kad dañ cha lugs sgyur ba
 añ mdzad. Malgré l'incertitude du tibétain, je crois que F. W. Thomas
 lit bien le premier pāda : " Tu supportes un service plein d'insultes. "
 Le second pāda est écrit de la manière la plus nette du monde ; le tibétain
 indique : " Tu changes de vêtements (*cha-lugs* = *reçā*) et de langage. "

prabhunā (gtso bo) paraît certain malgré la graphie fort peu claire.

nopakārapare py evam upakāraparo janah
 apakārapare pi tvam upakāraparo yathā ५ 121
 ahitāvahite śatrau tvam hitāvahita[h] suhṛt
 dosānveṣaṇanītye pi guṇānveṣaṇatatparah 122
 yato nimantraṇam te bhūt saviṣam sahutāśanam
 tatrābhūd abhisamyaṇam sadayaṇam sāmṛtañ ca te ५ 123
 ākrobdhāro jitāḥ kṣāntyā drugdhāḥ svastyayanena ca
 satyena cāpavaktāras tvayā maittryā jighāmsava[h] 12]4
 anād[i]k[ā]laprahatā bahvyaḥ prakṛtayo nṛṇam
 tvayā vibhā(vi)tāpāyāḥ kṣaṇena parivartitāḥ 125
 yat soratya[m gatā]ś tikṣṇāḥ kadaryāś ca vadamnutām
 krūrāḥ peśalatāṇ yātās tat tavopāyakauśalam 126
 indriyopāśamo nande mānastabdhe ca sam[nat]iḥ
 ksamitvaṇ cāṅgulimāle kaṇ na vismayam ānayet 127
 bahavas tṛṇasāyyāsu hitvā śayyā hiraṇmay[āḥ]
 āśerate sukhaṇ dhīrās tṛptā dharmarasasya te ५ 128
 pṛṣṭenāpi kva cin noktam upetyāpi kṛtā kathā
 tarpayitvā [] ktaṇ kālāśayavidā tvayā ५ 129
 pūrvam dānakathādyābhiś cetasy ntpādyā sauṣṭhavam
 tato dharmo gatamale vestre raṅga iv[] 1]30
 na ko p[ryu]pāyaś ś[ak]yo [st]i yena na vyāyatam tvayā
 ghorāt saṃsārapātālād uddhartu[m] kṛpaṇam jagat 131
 bahūni bah

122. MS. *ahitārāhite . . . hitārāhite*.

124. Cf. Dhammapada, 223—*ākrośtāro*.

125. MS. *vibhūtāpāyāḥ* = ūan soṇ rnam bzlog nas.

126. Cf. Pāli *vātañña*.

127. *saṅgati* = hūd. MS. deuxième main : śamo ; nanto (dga bo) māna ;—*aṅgulimādam*.

129. res hga zlus na añ mī gsuñ la | spros gyur gzhan la bstan pa dañ | druñ du gcegs nas bçad pa añ mdzad = “ Quelquefois, même interrogé, tu ne dis rien ; un autre, l’ayant satisfait (excité, encouragé), tu enseignes, et, abordant, . . . ”

MS. *a. tu ci*. Deuxième main : noktām, upetyāpi.

130. *d*. Deuxième main *rāṅga*. Le mot qui manque doit correspondre à *bstan* : “ est enseigné, ” “ est imprimé. ”

131. *upāyaś . . .* MS. peu lisible na so . . . śś . . . yo. Le tibétain *thabs dañ spyod pa* = *upāyacāritram*.

Feuillet P. Pelliot

parārtham ev[e]me dharmarūpakāyā[h] kṛtā iti
 tvayā viśvāsiloke śmin nirvāṇam upadarsitam 147
] ? i ? satsu saṃkrāmya dharmakāyā^[1]am aśesataḥ
 tilaśo rūp[am āchīdya tvam eva parinirvṛtaḥ 148
 aho nītir aho sthānam aho rūpam] aho guṇāḥ
 na nāma buddhadharmāṇām [asti kaś cid avismayaḥ 149
 hitakṛṇnetrasubhage śāntavākkāyaka]rmaṇi
 tvayy api pratihanyante paśya mohā [amarṣaṇāḥ 150
 punyodadhīm ratnanidhīm dharmarāśīm guṇākaram
] ? tvā namasyanti tebhyo pi sukṛtaṃ namaḥ 151
 akṣayās te [guṇā nātha kṣīṇaṃ tu vetanaṃ mama
] ? ad avitṛptitaḥ 152
 aprameyam asaṃkhye[ya]m acintyam anidarśana[m]
 bhavato hi svarūpatvaṃ tvayaiva jñāyate svayam. 153

147 et suiv. Voir la photographie et la version tibétaine. J. A., 1910, ii, pp. 434, 434.

147. Le traducteur tibétain a lu *ime* (hdi dag). c. Le texte porte : yid ches dga.—yid ches pa = *risrāsin*, yid-dga = *sumanās*. Peut-être *risrabdha*°, etc.

148. *i* paraît certain ; *satsu*, possible. de *slad* . . . sras kyi mchog la gtañ mdzad do = *ataḥ sutasya rare saṃkrāmya* ?

149. *ya mhsan che ba* = *atirismaya*.

150. *netrasubhaga* = *blta na sdng*, cf. 72.—*rmaṇi*, lisible.

151. c. *trāṇ ye satrā* ; mais les traits qui précèdent *trā* ne peuvent être, à en juger par la photographie, ni *sa* ni *ye* (*satrā ye trāṇ*, l'anuvāra est peut-être marqué).

152. *b. zho-śa* = *vetana*, le tribut à payer aux qualités. *bas hthsal ba* = "qui prend fin", comme dans *Parinirvāṇasūtra*, cité par Foucaux : *sku thsei thsad kyañ bas mi hthsal bar rig* par *bgyio* = "la durée de sa vie aussi est interminable".

c-d. des *na hjiḡs pa mchis slad du | glo ba la ni gcags bzhin mchis*. On a : *gcags pa* = *sañya*, *sakta*, affection (ch. *chags-pa*) ; *glo ba dga ba* = être satisfait, voir son souhait réalisé (Schmidt). Cet attachement constitue *arīṭṛpti*, "non satiété."

M. Lévi lit (*yat ta*) *l a*°. Ni les deux premiers akṣaras ni le *d* ne paraissent très nets sur la photographie.

153. *acintya*, lisible.

COLLECTION M. A. STEIN : KHA. I, 183

FRAGMENT D'UN BUDDHACARITA

MS. sur papier ; Upright Gupta d'Asie Centrale. Deux fragments, milieu et droite, d'une feuille très endommagée (120 et 140 sur 93 mm.). Sept lignes visibles. La feuille devait avoir environ 380 sur 150 mm.

Contient, plus ou moins visibles, les stances 68-75, 81-6 d'un neuvième chapitre (*navamo varga*) identique par le sujet au septième *varga* du Buddhacarita attribué à Aśvaghōṣa. On peut supposer, par l'étendue de la lacune entre les derniers mots de la stance 86 et la partie conservée du colophon, que ce neuvième chapitre était intitulé *Taporanapraveśu* : Visite du Bodhisattva aux pénitents qui lui désignent Arāḍa comme maître de philosophie. Par le fait, le dixième chapitre commence par le nom Arāḍa.

Stances 68-83, jagati ; 84 — — — — — — — — — — — — — — ; 85-6, praharṣiṇī. On comparera 70 et Buddhacarita, vii, 38 ; 82 et vii, 48 ; 84 et vii, 54.

Particularités graphiques : une forme anormale de *ḍ* (*sadanāt*, st. 84) ; double forme de *i* après consonne (*upright*, et bouclé à gauche) ; double forme de *r* : tantôt il est écrit au-dessus de la ligne (*svargāya*, st. 86 ; *arjana*, st. 75), tantôt au-dessous (*sarveṣu*, st. 83). Remarquer *ādhyā*, st. 85, et st. 68, une graphie dont la lecture me paraît difficile. On a *ppraśāntaye*, st. 82, et *sakḥyam*, st. 70 ; *ṛ* pour *r*, st. 84 *ṛśu*?

salḥ

tvayo ?i te smīn dhṛtimā[— — — —] 68

 ā hi tapasvi — — — —

 na v[. .]y[a — — — — pa]rikṣyate vapus

tapasphalaṃ khalv idam i[.]ya[— ◡ — 69
 — — ◡ — — .]ya tad asya mānada
 vyapekṣya vṛddhi[ṃ] tapasāṃ tapaḥ pri[yaṃ
 — — ◡ — — ◡ — —]nārhasi
 sthirāśayaḥ sakkhyam ivānvayāgatam 70
 prayātum evātha [— ◡ — — ◡ ≍
 — — ◡ —]mo vayam apy arindama
 muhūrtam eva pravipālyatām [— ≍
 — — ◡ — — ◡ — — —] ya[≍] 7[1
 k]ṛtāgnihotrair hi karais tapa[s]vinaś
 [t]athaiva yā[.]y[o ◡ ◡ — ◡ — ◡ ≍
 — — ◡] ? tvaṃ svam ativa garhayāṃś
 tapovanaṃ sthāsyati kevalaṃ tv i[≍ 72
 — — ◡ — — — ◡ — — — ◡ ≍
 v]igarhito durjanasaṃgamaḥ sadā
 guṇas tv ihaiko [— ◡ — ◡ — — ◡ ≍
 vi]yogaduḥkhaṃ yad ato na jāyate 73
 bhavadvidhānām tu sa [— ◡ — — ◡ ≍
 — — — ◡ — — — ◡ — — — ◡ ≍
 — yaṃ ta do — ◡ ja — ◡ aṃ — e]
 [v]iyogad [— — ◡ — — — ◡ — — ◡ ≍] 74
 atha dvijāṃś tāṃ sahitārjanadvijaḥ
 sa r[ā]jasutaḥ
 . . . ti y 80
 — — ◡ — — — ◡ — — — s ca bhāṣitais
 tapasvivargo yaṃ ajihlad — ◡ ≍
 — cai ◡ — — — ◡ — — — ◡ ≍
 — — ◡ — — — ◡ — — —] tā na nāsti me • 81
 surendralokādhighamāya [kevalam
 — — — ◡ yu]ṣmākam ayaṃ pariśramaḥ
 mama prayatnas tu bhavappraśāṃ [taye
 — — — — — ◡ — — — — — ◡ ≍ 8]2
 mamopadeṣṭuṃ ta vi arhatha drntaṃ
 kam āśra[y — — — ◡ — — — — — ◡ ≍

bha]veṣu sarvesu na khalv ahaṃ rame
 davāgnidīpteṣu tarusv i[vāṇḍajah 83
 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~] arāḍam āśramibhy[o
 j]ananapariksayadr̥ṣtamārgam aśrauh
 tad adhiśam [— ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ — ~ ~ ~ ~
 mun]isadanād ṛśasatvaro jagāma • 84
 lakṣmyāḍhye naraviśa[bhe gate vanāntāt
 — — — ~ ~ ~] pi tāpasair vanam [tat]
 [—]mānadyuti na babhau yathāntarikṣam
 naksatrai[r iva ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ — ~ ~ ~ ~] 85
 mokṣāya prasṛtam avekṣya tam ca nūnam
 naivāgni [~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
 — — — ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~] yuś ca
 svargāya vratam iha te [~ ~ ~ ~ ~ — — — —
 tapovanapraveś]o nāma navamaḥ sargaḥ
 arāḍāsi

83. *tari* et *arhatha* paraissent sûrs.

85. Il n'est que trop facile d'achever *rigate niśakare hi* ou *ḥkare śam*, etc.

CH. XLIII, 001

NAGAROPAMASUTRA ET RAKSA

MS. sur papier; *slanting* brāhmī. Trois folios numérotés au verso 130-2, 368 × 88 mm., 6 lignes, 46 akṣaras à la ligne environ.

L'écriture est du type ordinaire de "slanting". On peut attirer l'attention sur les graphies de *ḍha* (fol. 231a, l. 1), de *ḍa*, *ṇḍa* (*kumbhāṇḍā*, *śauṇḍika*, fols. 231a, l. 5, 232b, l. 3): on a *ṭṛpradakṣiṇē* et *ṭṛḥpradukṣiṇē* (231a, l. 5, b, l. 4). Le *visarga* est représenté par *ḥ*, mais ce signe est aussi, souvent, "a mark of interpunctuation" (Hoernle, Bower, p. 225, n. 39). Le 5 et le 10 diffèrent assez sensiblement des formes du MS. de l'Udāna (Ch. vii, 001A), la base du 10 étant une ligne droite. Nous marquons entre () les syllabes omises par le scribe, entre [] les syllabes illisibles ou détruites.

Ce MS. contient 1° la fin d'un *sūtra* dont nous connaissons le titre par le colophon *Nagaropamaṃ sūtram* (fol. 132a), et qui est aussi nommé dans le texte *Nagaropamaṃ ryaḅkaranaṃ*; 2° le commencement d'une *Rakṣā* contre les serpents.

Le *Nagaropama* nous était connu par les MSS. Macartney, Set I (JASB., lxvi, 1897, p. 242). Il doit être comparé à l'*Ātīnāṭiya Suttanta* (*Dīgha* xxxii, Grimblot, et PTS., iii, p. 194). Ici aussi les Quatre Grands Rois apportent à Bhagavat des mantras contre tous les esprits malfaisants. La ressemblance ne va pas aux détails; mais nous ne possédons que la fin de l'ouvrage. Comparer le feuillet gupta publié dans JRAS., p. 51, 1908, et la *Mahāsāhasrapramardīnī*, une des cinq *Rakṣās*.

La *Rakṣā* présente d'étroites relations avec la *Khandha-parittā* (*Cullavagga*, v, 6, 1; *Aṅguttara*, ii, p. 72; *Jātaka*, nr. 203; *Milinda*, p. 150), dont nous connaissons une rédaction septentrionale par le MS. Bower, part vi ("really an extract from *Pañcarakṣā*," Bendall, *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, p. 192, q.v.).

Il faudrait faire quelques recherches dans la Bibliothèque népalaise.

FOL. 130

. . . purata ime mantrapadā bhāsitavyaḥ¹

buddha śreṣṭho na śreṣṭhas tvaṃ nāsti śreṣṭhas tathāgataḥ²
pūrvavat yāvad anyatra pūrvakeṇa karma(2)[nā] ||

athottarāyāṃ diśi niḥśṛtya vaiśravaṇo mahārājā ५ yena
bhagavāṃs tenāṃjalīm praṇamya bhagavantam gā[tha]jyā
abhyabh[ā]ṣat (3)

aho vidyā mahāvidyā kleśaviṣapraghātani
bhāṣitā te mahāvīra nirjvarā jvaranāśanī

santi māriṣa [uttarā]jyā(4)n diśi bhaumā yakṣāḥ aneka-
yakṣasahasrah parivāra prativasantī te mānuṣikāṃ prajāṃ

¹ *Sic.*

² Voir ci-dessous, B. I. 2.

rakṣāṃ guptiṃ balaṃ phalaṃ¹ su[kha](5)sparsāvihāra-
tāyai paripālayanti • pathagatā api utpathagatā api ārāma-
gatā api śūnyāgāragatā² api cat[— — pa](6)riśado
bhikṣūṇāṃ bhikṣuṇiṇāṃ upāsakānāṃ upāsikānāṃs (3)
tadany(eṣ)āṃś ca manusyāṇāṃ tatreme mantrapadā bha-
vanti yena teṣ[ā]ṃ ākarsa[B]ṇaṃ bhavati tadyathā bhāviṇi
bhāviṇi jātini • jātini • maraṇi • maraṇi • svāhā || āgamisyati
māriṣa māra pāpiyāṃ (2) tasya purata ime mantrapadā
bhāṣitavyaḥ³

buddha śreṣṭho na śreṣṭhas tvaṃ nāsti śreṣṭhas tathāgatāt
buddho hi śreṣṭho lokasya dharmarājō [hy anu]-(3)-
ttaraḥ

dharma śreṣṭho na śreṣṭhas tvaṃ nāsti śreṣṭho tra
dharmataḥ

dharmo hi śreṣṭho lokasya virāgopaśamaḥ sukham
saṃgha śreṣṭho (4) na śreṣṭhas tvaṃ nāsti śreṣṭho tra
saṃghataḥ

saṃgho hi śreṣṭho lokasya puṇyakṣetro hy anuttara(h)⁴

yaḥ kaś cin mā[rīsa] i[(5)maṃ na]garopamaṃ vyāka-
raṇaṃ uddeksyati dhārayisyati grāhayisyati vācayisyati
svādhyāyisyati paryavāpsyati[ti] manasika[ri]ṣyati (6)
[— — — —] na [—]kṣyati viṣaṃ kāye na tariṣyati
śāstraṃ na kramisyati nodakena kālaṃ kariṣyati agniṇā
na dhakṣyati rājāno pi va [131A]

FOL. 131

[— — — —]ṣyamti corā na muṣiṣyamti • rājakula-
madhyagato pi svastinottariṣyati⁵ gāḍhabandhanaabaddho pi
mucciṣyatiāsannasamāga(2)?? • abhyavakāśagato bhaviṣyati

¹ ? Cf. *Mahāvastu*, i, 323, 20.

² *Sic.* Cf. *Dīgha*, iii, p. 195, 16.

³ *Sic.*

⁴ *Buddha*, *dharmā*, et *saṃghasatya*, voir *Meghasūtra*, ed. Bendall, *JRAS.*, 1880, April, p. 22, du tiré à part.

⁵ *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, p. 104, n. 5.

4 sarve ca kṛtyakākhordamantravetāda¹ prativigamiṣyanti
sarve ca bhūta[ga]ṇā na vihe[ṭha]yiṣyaṃ(3)ti anyatra
pūrvakena karmaṇā !!

atha catvāro mahārājānaḥ yena bhagavāṃs tenāṃjalim
praṇanya bha[gava]nta[m i](4)dam avocan²

aho subhāṣitā vidyā śakyasiṃhena dhūmatā
dvādaśāṅgasamāyuktā sarvabhūtanivāra[ṇ]i
sa(5)rve devā nāgā yakṣā pretā kuṃbhāṇḍā kāḍapūtanā³
yo ime atikramen mantrāṃ⁴ mahārājñā mukhanirgatam
saptadhāsyā spha[lec chīṣaṃ](5)⁵ daśadhā hṛdayaṃ
sphalet

idaṃ vaditvā catvāro mahārājāno bhagavatpādaū śīrasā
vaditvā bhagavantaṃ tṛpradakṣiṇikṛtvā⁶ ta[B]traivānta-
rhitā] [atha bhagavāṃs tasyā eva rātryā atyayāt purastād
bhikṣusaṃghasya prajñapta evāsane nyaśīdat niśadya
bhaga[vā]ṃ(2) bhikṣūn āmantrayatiy • athādyā bhikṣavo
brahmā sanatkumāro tikrāntavarnaḥ abhikrāntāyāṃ
rātryāṃ yenāhaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta [upe](3)tya mama
pādaū śīrasā vanditvā ekānte asthād ekāntasthitaḥ brahmā
sanatkumāro mama purato gāthāṃ babhāṣe [aho vi](4)dyā
mahāvidyā pūrvavad yāvad idaṃ (vadi)tvā sanatkumāro
mama pādaū śīrasā vanditvā māṃ tṛpradakṣiṇikṛtvā
[tatraivā](5)ntarhitāḥ atha catvāro mahārājāno tikrānta-
varṇā bhikrāntāyāṃ rātryāṃ yenāhaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta
upetya ma[ma] pādaū śīrasā [vandi]tvā(6) [— — —]
kāṃ[]aṃ niḥś[ṛ]tya] ekānte tasth[u]r ekāntasthita
pūrvavad yāvad idaṃ vaditvā catvāro mahārājāno mama
pādaū śīrasā vanditvā māṃ [132A]

¹ Sic. See Bower, p. 227, n. 8 (*kṛtyā*, *khakḥhorda*); *Śikṣūsamuccaya*,
p. 192, l. 8; *Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, p. 240 (*kṛtya*); Stein, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*,
i, p. 25 (*kṛtyaka*) et p. 128.

² MS. avocat ?

³ Bower, *kaṭa pātana*.

⁴ See JRAS., 1908, p. 52.

⁵ Cf. *Dīgha*, iii, p. 203; *Lotus*, xxi, st. 1, etc.

⁶ Below, B, l. 4, *tṛhpra*°.

FOL. 132

[tr̥hprada]ksinīkṛtvā tatraivāntarhitāḥ udgr̥hṇata bhik-
 ṣavo nagaropamaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ dhārayata gr̥hayata
 vācayata paryavāp[nu](2)ta manasikuruta tat kasmād
 dheto arthopasaṃhitam nagaropamaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ dhar-
 mopasaṃhitam ādibrahmacaryasyābhijñāyai [saṃ]bo(3)
 dhaye nirvāṇāya saṃvartate ¹ • atha ca punaḥ kulaputrena
 śraddhāpravrajitena śraddhayā agārād anagārikam [pra-
 vraji](4)tvā nagaropamaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ sādhu ca suṣṭhu
 ca udgr̥hṇitavyam dhārayitavyam gr̥hayitavya[m]
 vācayitavyam [svādhyāyi](5)tavyam paryavāptavyam
 manasikartavyam idam avocat !| nagaropamaṃ sūtram
 samāptaḥ rakṣam bhavatu pṛṣtagautamāya ² !|

|| [maitrī] kha(6)dhṛtirāṣṭreṣu ³ maitrī kharāvaṇeṣu ca •
 chimbaputreṣu ⁴ me maitrī kambalāśvatareṣu ⁵ •
 karkoṭakeṣu me maitrī kṛṣṇagautamakeṣu ca ⁶
 na[ndopa][B][ua]nd[o]y[e] nāgateṣu[maitrī ca me]sadā 2
 apādakeṣu me maitrī mai(trī) me dvipadeṣu ca ⁷ •
 catuṣpadeṣu me maitrī maitrī bahupadeṣu ca ⁸ 3
 [sarva](2)nāgeṣu me maitrī ye nāgā udadhiniḥṣṛtā ⁹ •
 sarvasatveṣu me maitrī *yatra śāstāvurāśca yet* 4 ¹⁰

¹ Cf. *Saṃyutta*, ii, pp. 75, 223, etc.; JASB., lxvi, 1897, p. 243 (Macartney).

² *Sic*, *kṛṣṇagautamāya* ???

³ *Kha* peu lisible ; conjecturé d'après *kharāvaṇeṣu* (*M. Vyut.*, § 167, 18, *cāraṇo nāgarājā*), Bower, p. 224, 1 : *maitrī me dhṛtarāṣṭreṣu maitrī nairāvaṇeṣu ca* (le MS. porte seulement *narā*). Voir p. 231, No. 2. Khandhaparittā : *virūpakkehi me mettam mettam erūpathehi me*.

⁴ *Ch* peut être lu *ry*. La graphie de *chanda* dans un de nos MSS., Udānavarga, ii, 9, rend la lecture certaine. Cf. le *Chibbasutu* de Bower, p. 224, 5 (?), et les *Chabhyāputra* du Pāli.

⁵ Bower, pp. 224 f.

⁶ Khandhaparittā : *chabhyāputtehi me mettam kañhāyotamakehi ca*. Bower, p. 224, 1 : *virūpakkeṣu me maitrī kṛṣṇagautamakeṣu ca*.

⁷ Bower, p. 224, 12b-c ; Khandhaparittā.

⁸ Bower, p. 224, 13a-b ; Khandhaparittā.

⁹ Bower, p. 225, 14c-d (*jalanīsritāḥ* ; ailleurs *śṛta*).

¹⁰ = *ye trasāḥ śhāvarāś ca ye*. Bower, p. 225, 15c-d : *sarvasatveṣu me maitrī ye satrā trasāśhāvarāḥ jaṅgamā*.

sukhiṇaḥ sarvasatvā hi sarv[e bhontu] (3) nirāmayāḥ
 sarve bhadrāṇi paśyantu mā kaś cit pāpam āgamet 5¹
 sarpaśauṇḍikaprāgbhāre nityaṃ viharato mama
 āśi(4)viṣo ghoraviṣajīvitāṃ uparudhyatu 6
 yena me satyavākyena śāstā lokeṣv anuttara
 tena me satya[vākye]na(5)[]kāya viṣaṃ kramet 7
 rāgo dveṣaś ca mohaś ca ete loke trayo viṣaṃ
 nirviṣo bhagavāṃ buddha satyabuddhahataṃ viṣaṃ [8]
 rāgo [— —(6)— —]ha[—] ete loke trayo viṣaṃ
 nirviṣo bhagavāṃ saṃgha satyasamghahataṃ viṣaṃ 10
 hataṃ viṣaṃ ghoraviṣaṃ kṛto rak[ṣ

¹ Khandhaparittā ; Bower, p. 225, 16a-d.

(To be continued.)



I



2




3



4



5



6




7



8



9



10



11



COINS FROM SEISTAN.

XXIII

COINS COLLECTED BY SIR A. HENRY McMAHON,
K.C.I.E., IN SEISTAN

By O. CODRINGTON, M.D., F.S.A.

SOME time after the descriptions of the coins collected by Mr. G. P. Tate were published in the Journal for 1904 and 1905 Sir Henry McMahon brought home the collections which he had made during the time he was the Boundary Commissioner in Seistan, but unfortunately there has been much delay in giving a description of them.

The varieties of classes of coins represented were as numerous as those gathered by Mr. Tate, and although the great majority were in poor condition and many hardly recognizable, some rarities were found, as will be seen by the following list; and again the wondrous field for numismatic finds offered by that wind-swept region of shifting sands is evidenced.

UMAYYAD KHALIFS. \mathcal{R} . Wāsiṭ, A.H. 96, 105, 123. Eight pieces apparently cut to divide dirhems into fractional parts, which is not a common practice, it is thought, with Musalman coins.

ABBASID KHALIFS. \mathcal{A} . A.H. 167.

Sijistān. \mathcal{R} . A.H. 174 (Tiesenhausen, 1184). No date. $\mathcal{Æ}$. A.H. 367.

Madīnat al-Salām. \mathcal{R} . A.H. 167, 183.

Baṣrah. \mathcal{R} . A.H. 182.

Madīnat Zariñj. $\mathcal{Æ}$. A.H. 192.

Balkh. \mathcal{R} . A.H. 183.

No mint. $\mathcal{Æ}$. A.H. 163.

SASSANIAN. Hormaz II. 1 \mathcal{R} , 1 $\mathcal{Æ}$. Firuz. 1 \mathcal{R} . Vargharsh. 1 \mathcal{R} . Kobad. 1 $\mathcal{Æ}$. Hormaz IV. 1 \mathcal{R} . Ardeshir II and Shapur III. 4 $\mathcal{Æ}$, uncertain, 2 \mathcal{R} , 1 $\mathcal{Æ}$.

PARTHIAN. Orodes I. 3 \mathcal{R} . Mithradates IV. 4 \mathcal{R} . Goterzes. 1 \mathcal{R} . Vardanes II. 2 \mathcal{R} . Vologeses I. 1 \mathcal{R} .

SAMANID. Manṣūr b. Nūḥ. $\mathcal{Æ}$. Bukhāra, A.H. 354; no

mint, A.H. (3)56 : 1 no mint or date. **Nūh b. Mansūr.** .E.
No mint, A.H. 376.

KART OF HARAT. Ḥusain. Harāt, no date (B.M. Cat.,
No. 592).

TIMURID. Tīmūr. 1 .E. **Shāh Rukh.** .R. 1 no mint,
A.H. 830 ; 1 overstruck doubtful.

ṬĀHIRID. Silver dirhem. **Ṭalḥa.** Madinat Zarinj,
A.H. 209. (Fig. 1.)

Obv. Area. لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريك له.

Margin. بسم الله ضرب هذا الدرهم بمدينة زرنج سنة تسع
ومائتين.

Rev. Area. محمد رسول الله . مما امر به الامير
طلحة | عبد الله | ببح * ببح

Margin. (الله) ارسله باليدي ودين الحق ليظهر على الدين كله
ولو كرد المشركون.

Obv. Annulets ⊙ ∞ ⊙ ∞ ⊙ ∞. Size 9. Weight 41.

E. von Zambour devotes several pages of *Contributions à la Numismatique Orientale, Deuxième partie*, to the history and coinage of the Ṭāhirids, and gives a list of pieces known to him struck between A.H. 200 and 211, none of which seem to correspond with this one. The *rev.* of the coin of Zarinj, dated A.H. 209 in his list, is thus described in Tomberg, *Numi Cufici*, p. 130, Area II : محمد . طلحة , *supra* محمد | رسول | الله | ببح . Other coins in the list have طلحة above or below the Area legend, but on this coin the name is in the adjectival form with the article ال attached, indicating, it is supposed, Ṭalḥa's coinage. Whether the name 'Abd Allah is added as an indication of Ṭalḥa's acting under the authority of his brother, or whether it is the name of some other person, a governor or prefect such as the Muhammad on the coin of Tomberg, is doubtful. The former seems probable.

According to Tabari's account, on Ṭāhir's death, A.H. 207, Mā'mūn named Ṭalḥa governor as deputy for his brother 'Abd Allah, then at Raḡḡa fighting Naṣr b. Shabath, but

sent the patent of governor over Khurasān and all that Ṭahir had held to 'Abd Allah in Syria, and further that Mā'mūn sent his vizier to Khurasān to establish Ṭalḥa in his office. Kindī's history shows that 'Abd Allah returned to Baghdad from Egypt only in A.H. 212. The *Kitāb al-Dijārāt* of Shabastī says that 'Abd Allah remained a year at Court and was then sent, against his wish, by Mā'mūn to fight Babak, stipulating that, this done, he was to remain at Court and choose as his deputy over Khurasān any one of his brothers; and the account adds that his stay in Khurasān at the date of his death, A.H. 230, had lasted fifteen years, that is, he went there in A.H. 215. It is evident, therefore, that he was not in Khurasān nor in countries beyond it in the East in A.H. 209.

GHAZNAVID. **Mahmud.** 6 \mathcal{R} of common type. **Mas'ud.** 1 \mathcal{E} .

GOVERNORS OF SIJISTAN

Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad. 1. A number of copper coins similar to No. 34, B.M. Cat., vol. iii, with dates 339, 340, 341, 344.

2. Zariñj (?), A.H. 334. \mathcal{E} . (Fig. 2.)

Obr. Area. لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريك له || ابو جعفر

Margin. Within a plain circle and an outer one of annulets. . . . بزوجه سنة اربع وثلثين وثلثمائه

Rev. Area. الله || محمد || رسول الله || احمد بن محمد

Margin. Illegible inscription. Size .9. Weight 48.

3. A considerable number of small copper coins with the name Abū Ja'far on them. All are in poor condition, but Figs. 3 and 4 may give a general idea of the *obr.* and *rev.* of two different coins. There are three or four varieties of a common type.

Obr. Area. لا اله الا الله || وحده لا شريك له || ابو جعفر

Margin. . . . غرب هذه فلس بزوجه سنة . . .

Rev. Area in a circle of annulets. الله || محمد || رسول الله || ابو جعفر

One has the *obv.* filled with a star of six leaves radiating from a central circle with pellets between the rays and a marginal circle of amulets between two of plain lines. *Rev.* as above, its date being *سنة ثمان وثلثين وثمانائة*. Æ. Size .9. Weight 48.

Doubts as to the attribution of these Abū Ja'far coins have been removed by the kindness of Mr. Amedroz, who has found the following passages concerning Aḥmad b. Muḥammad:—

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Laith was in the service of the Samanid Aḥmad b. Isma'īl at his (Isma'īl's) death, A.H. 301. (Ibn al-Athir, viii, 58, l. 19.)

Khalaf b. Aḥmad is noticed by Dhahabi in *Tarīkh i Islām* as Amir of Sijistān, and son of its Amir. Born A.H. 326, died A.H. 399. (Dhahabi, B.M. Or. 48, 257a.)

The poet Badi' al-Zamān al-Hamadhāni (d. A.H. 398), in lines quoted in *'Uṭbi Kitāb Yamīni*, lith. Sprenger, 207, describes Khalaf as descended from both the Ṣaffārīds 'Amru and Ya'qūb, sons of al-Laith, and Ibn al-Athir, ix, 57, makes him to be great-grandson of 'Amru by his grandmother Banū, daughter of 'Amru.

Ibn Miskawaih, in the *Tajārib al-Umam*, *sub* A.H. 354, describes the investiture of Khalaf thus: "In this year Abū Aḥmad Khalaf b. Abī Ja'far, the son of Banū, attended on the Khalif by the introduction of Mu'izz al-Daula, and the Khalif appointed him Governor of Sijistān and conferred on him a robe of honour and a banner" (Bodl., Marsh, 357, 37a). And Khalaf is mentioned again later on (*ib.*, *sub* A.H. 357, fol. 72a): "And when 'Adud al-Daula had terminated the conquest of Kirman, and the news of this had reached the ruler of Sijistān, the latter wrote to him and an exchange of letters followed, and he came to terms with him, acknowledging him as his overlord. The ruler in question was Abū Aḥmad Khalaf b. Abī Ja'far, who was known as the son of Banūya."

In the *Irshād al-'Amr*, iii, 100, l. 11, the grammarian

Abū Sa'īd al-Sirāfi (*ob.* A.H. 368) is described as receiving a letter from "Abū Ja'far Malik Sijistān", containing a list of Kuranic and literary queries. It is evident from the dates that Abū Ja'far was the Malik in Sijistān a short time before Khalaf, whose rule began in A.H. 354, and from all the above extracts that he was the father of Khalaf b. Aḥmad and his predecessor; but it is remarkable that the known gold, silver, and one type of copper coins should be struck in the name of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, and another type of copper in that of Abū Ja'far. Possibly the explanation is that the latter was a local currency for Sijistān.

The gold coin of Aḥmad in the Tate Collection described in JRAS., 1895, but not then figured, is now given (Fig. 5), as is also No. 2 copper of Mr. Tate, the reading of the *rev.* of which is now made out to be **مما امر به || الامير ابو || احمد بن محمد || ايدد الله** (Fig. 6).

Khalaf b. Aḥmad. Gold. Sijistān, A.H. 378, as B.M. Cat., No. 40, but marginal legend in full: **ضرب** سجستان سنة ثمان وسبعين وثلاثمائة (Fig. 7.) Fig. 8 is the gold coin of the Tate Collection described JRAS., 1905, p. 550, which differs somewhat from this one. Copper. 3 as No. 2 of Tate Collection, JRAS., 1905, p. 550. (Fig. 9.)

Harb b. Muḥammad. Copper. 2 as B.M. Cat., Nos. 42*f* and 42*m*.

KINGS OF NIMRUZ. 'Izz al-Dīn. Copper. 70 as in JRAS., 1905, p. 551. Quṭb al-Dīn. Copper. 13 as in JRAS., 1905, p. 551. Qāān al-'Adil. Copper. 1 as in JRAS., 1905, p. 552. Without a king's name, but dated in the time of Shams al-Dīn 'Ali b. Quṭb al-Dīn. Copper.

Obv. Arabesque pattern of interlacing curved lines with floriated ends.

Rev. **ضرب نيمروز ٨٣٦** in plain circle. Æ. Size .75. Weight 53. (Fig. 10.)

KHAWARIZM SHAH. 'Ala al-Dīn **Muhammad.** Gold. No mint or date.

Obv. Area in plain circle. ornament above, annulet and pellets at sides. لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله الناصر. Margin illegible.

Rev. Area in circle with annulet and pellets at side. لله "السلطان الاعظم" علا الدنيا والدين ابو الفتح محمد بن السلطان تكش. No marginal inscription. A. Size 1. Weight 50. (Fig. 11.)

SHAHS OF PERSIA. Gold. 'Abbas I. Isfahan. Silver. Isma'il I. Nimruz, no date. Tahmasp I. Harat, no date. Sulaimān I. Huwayza, 1086. Husain. Tabriz, 1133. 'Abbas III. No mint or date. Maḥmūd. Isfahan, no date. Copper. Fals of Nimruz with *obv.* two curled fishes.

AFGHANISTAN. Fals of leaf pattern and one of Kandahar, A.H. 92x.

GANDHARA. Copper. Samanta Deva.

GRECO-BACTRIAN. **Pacores.** Copper.

GREEK. Athens. Owl. Silver, corrupt.

English brass token. "To Hanover."

Imitation of a sequin of Doge Aloyses Mocenigo. Stamped "Made in Austria". This curious piece would appear from its stamp to have been made in Austria for the British market. We know that the Venetian sequin has been a popular ornament in India for three centuries or so. being used to decorate horse harness, as well as the persons of men and women, that the poorest woman in Bombay and Western India usually has one of sorts hung round her neck, and that imitation pieces are largely made in the native bazaars; but that they should be made in Europe for export to the East is somewhat of a surprise.

By Sir Henry McMahon's desire the above coins which are of sufficient value to be so kept are to be deposited in the British Museum.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

ASOKA'S FOURTH ROCK-EDICT

In the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the R.A.S., vol. xxi, pp. 395 ff., Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has shown in a convincing manner that the first rock-edict is in perfect order if the word *samāja* is taken in its proper sense of "banquet", and that Pischel and Bühler were not justified in assigning to this word the meanings of "battue" or "assembly". Another case in which I consider it necessary to revert to an earlier translation is the following passage:—

Girnar rock, fourth edict, lines 2-4.

ta aja Devānām-priyasa Priyadasino rāño dhamma-charaṇena bherī-ghoso aho dhamma-ghoso vimāna-darsaṇā cha hasti-dasaṇā cha agi-khaṇḍhāni cha añāni cha divyāni rūpāni dasayitpā janaṇi.

This sentence was translated by Burnouf (*Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, p. 731) as follows:—

"Aussi, en ce jour, parce que Piyadasi, le roi chéri des Dēvas, pratique la loi, le son du tambour (a retenti); oui, la voix de la loi (s'est fait entendre), après que des promenades de chars de parade, des promenades d'éléphants, des feux d'artifice, ainsi que d'autres représentations divines ont été montrées aux regards du peuple."

In his *Jaartelling der Zuidelijke Buddhisten* Professor Kern published a totally different rendering, which was translated in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. v, p. 261, as follows:—

"But now, when king Devānāmpriya Priyadarśin practises righteousness, his kettle-drum has become a summons to righteousness (and not to war, as is usually the case), while apparitions of chariots of the gods, and

apparitions of celestial elephants, and fiery balls, and other signs in the heavens, showed themselves to the people."

M. Senart did not adopt Professor Kern's views, but followed Burnouf. The English translation of his French version (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. x, p. 84) runs thus:—

"But now king Piyadasi, dear to the gods, being faithful in the practice of religion, has made the noise of drums to resound (*in such a way that it is*) as the (*very*) sound of religion, pointing out to the people the processions of reliquaries, elephants, torches, and other heavenly spectacles."

Finally, Bühler (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. ii, p. 467) translated the same sentence thus:—

"But now, in consequence of the fulfilment of the sacred law by king Priyadarśin, beloved of the gods, the sound of drums, or rather the sound of the law, (*has been heard*), while the sight of cars of the gods, elephants,¹ and other heavenly spectacles were exhibited to the people."

To the two last renderings apply all the objections which Professor Kern had urged against Burnouf's translation.

1. The word *vimāna* does not designate elsewhere "a car used in processions", but is restricted to the aerial chariots of the gods. I may add that the very expression *vimāna-darśana*, "the apparition of aerial chariots," is mentioned in Varāhaṃihira's *Bṛihat-saṃhitā*, xlvi, 90, among the portents which are believed to be auspicious in autumn.

2. "The expression *divyāni rūpāni* might in itself be sufficient to convince us that celestial phenomena are meant" (Kern, p. 262).

3. The proposed renderings of *agi-khaṇḍha* are quite arbitrary. As neither *vimāna* nor *divyāni rūpāni* are terrestrial objects, it must mean "a ball of fire, a meteor".

¹ The word "illuminations" seems to have dropped out here. Cf. Bühler's German translation, *ZDMG.*, vol. xxxvii, p. 257.

4. Consequently *hastin* cannot refer to terrestrial elephants. Professor Kern reminded us of *airāvata* (neuter), which is employed as the designation of a certain kind of rainbow; see his edition of the *Bṛihatsaṃhitā*, xxx, 8, and xlvii, 20.

5. Another point, which Professor Kern did not state specially, because he considered it self-evident, is this: namely, the sentence as understood by Burnouf, Senart, and Bühler, remains a torso, without a verb, if *aho* is taken either as an interjection (Burnouf) or as an equivalent of *athavā* (Senart, Bühler, and Pischel, *Göttinger Gel. Anz.*, 1881, p. 1328). Professor Kern solved this problem by explaining *aho* as a Prākṛit form of *abhavat*. In his *Dialekt der sogenannten Shāhbāzgarhi-Redaktion*, pt. i, p. 32, Professor Johansson showed that *aho* is a perfectly justifiable equivalent of **abhot*, just as the Gīrnār version uses *hoti* for *bhoti* = *bhavati*. He added that *aho* cannot be derived from *athavā*, because *th* is never represented by *h* in the Aśōka inscriptions or in Pāli.

6. As the four accusatives depending on *dasayitpā* are celestial objects, I venture to proceed one step farther than Professor Kern, and to refer *bherī-ghoso*, which is the subject both of *aho* and of *dasayitpā*, to the sound of the "heavenly drums", i.e. of thunder. A reference to the article *dundubhi* in the St. Petersburg Dictionary and to *devadundubhi* in Childers' Pāli Dictionary will show that this meaning is not far-fetched, and it seems quite natural that Aśōka in his naive faith believed some thunder and other atmospherical phenomena, which happened to take place at the time of his conversion to morality, to be signs of approval on the part of the gods themselves.

7. There remains *dharma-ghoso*. It is easiest to take the word *ghosa* in this compound as an adjective formed of *ghōshayati*, "to proclaim." I would then translate the whole sentence as follows:—

“But now, in consequence of the practice of morality on the part of king Dēvānāmpriya Priyadarśin, there has arisen the sound of (*celestial*) drums, proclaiming morality (*and*) showing the people apparitions of aerial chariots, apparitions of (*celestial*) elephants, balls of fire, and other heavenly signs.”

E. HULTZSCH.

THE KATAPAYADI SYSTEM OF EXPRESSING NUMBERS

In this Journal, 1901. 121, Dr. Barnett brought to notice some Pāli chronograms from Burma, based on a certain use of the letters of the alphabet. The system is one which is popularly known as the Kaṭapayādi system. It has been described by Professor Bühler in his *Indian Paleography*, § 35, B.¹ But, like some other published notices of it, that one is imperfect: particularly in not stating what value attaches to initial vowels, —a detail which Dr. Barnett consequently found not clear. It may be useful, therefore, to give a note on the system here.

The verse which defines this system was given by Mr. Whish, from some unspecified source, in the Transactions of the Literary Society of Madras, part 1 (1827), p. 57, in the following form:—

Nanyāvacaxca xūnyāni sankhyāḡ katapayādayah
misrētuvandyahalsankhyana ca cintyō halaswarah

In this we recognize:—

Na-ñāv = achāś = cha śūnyāni saṅkhyāḡ kaṭapay-ādayaḡ |
miśrē tv = ēv = āntya-hal = saṅkhyā na cha chintyō hal =
asvarah ||

“N and ñ and the vowels are ciphers; the numbers are k, etc., ṭ, etc., p, etc., and y, etc.: in a conjunct consonant it

¹ Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, vol. 1, part 11: English version in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 33 (1904), appendix.

is the last consonant which is the number ; and no attention is to be paid to a consonant which has no vowel."

To the definition thus given we must add that in accordance with a certain rule *Añkānān vāmatō gatih*, which applies rigorously to this system and to that of numerical words,¹ the numbers must be stated with the lowest figure. the unit, on the left. but are to be applied in the opposite direction. with the unit on the right. It must also be noted that, as intimated by Dr. Barnett, the Pāli alphabet, having only one sibilant, requires a different arrangement of the last row of letters, and that there is sometimes a confusion between *l* and *!*. The results are as shown in the table on page 791 below.

This system of expressing numbers being used in the astronomical work known as the Second Ārya-Siddhānta, we shall be better able to estimate its general utility when that work has been edited, and perhaps may then carry back the use of it to an earlier time than is known for it now.² Meanwhile, the earliest published instances of the use of it seem to be as follows :—

Shaḍguruśishya gave the date of the completion of his Vēdārthadīpikā thus :—

Khagō =ntyān =Mēsham =āp =ēti Kaly-ahargaṇanē sati |
Sarvānukramaṇi-vṛittir =jātā Vēdārthadīpikā ||

Lakshāṇi pañchadaśa vai pañchashashṭi-sahasrakam |
sa-dvātrīṁśach-chhataṁ ch =ēti dina-vāky-ārtha iritaḥ ||

This statement, quoted and explained by Professor Kielhorn in *Ind. Ant.*, 21. 49, No. 4, tells us that Shaḍguruśishya finished his work when the *ahargana*

¹ That is, the system which uses, e.g., the word *bhūmi*, 'earth', to denote 'one', *uḡyana*, 'eyes', to denote 'two', and so on.

² Bentley said that the work in question is dated in its first chapter in Kaliyuga 4423 (expired), A.D. 1322: see his *Hindu Astronomy* (1825), p. 138. But Sh. B. Dikshit said that its date is not given, and expressed the opinion that it belongs to about A.D. 950: see *Indian Calendar*, p. 6, note 4.

or sum of days of the Kaliyuga era was 1,565,132. The *ahargana* is given twice. (1) By the clause—

kha(2)-*gō*(3)-*ntyā*(1)-*nmē*(5)-*sha*(6)-*mā*(5)-*pa*(1).

In addition to giving the number, this says :—“The sun passed on from the last (*sign*) to Mēsha”: by which it marks the day as the day of the Hindū vernal equinox. (2) In ordinary words, as “fifteen lakhs, sixty-five thousand, one hundred and thirty-two”: this statement is added as giving “the meaning of the *dina-rākya*, the sentence for the day”, that is, the clause *khagō*, etc. In this instance, the number gives the current day, not the elapsed day: and it takes us to 24 March, A.D. 1184, on which day the Hindū true sun entered Mēsha. Professor Kielhorn was of opinion, however, that Shadguruśishya simply took the number of the day from some almanac which presented it as giving the initial day of the solar year, and meant that he finished his work, not actually on that day, but at some time during the year which then began.

An inscription at the Aruḷāla - Perumāl temple at Conjeeveram¹ tells us that the Kēraḷa king Saṅgrāmadhīra-Ravivarman was born—

Dēhavyāpya-Śak-ābda-bhāji samayē.

This means “in the time which had the Śaka year *dē*(8)-*ha*(8)-*cyā*(1)-*pya*(1)”: i.e. in Śaka 1188 (expired), A.D. 1266-67. Here, the composer of the verse evidently selected the expression *dēha-ryāpya*, “which should be pervaded by a body”, to suit the event which he was recording, as well as to mark its date.

The two instances given above, and others, indicate that it was the custom to use, at any rate for civil dating, not a mere jumble of artificial syllables, but real words having a meaning, and to select, if practicable, words

¹ Kielhorn's Southern List of Inscriptions, *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 7, appendix, No. 939.

Values of the consonants, etc.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
k	kh	g	gh	ñ	ch	chh	j	jh	ñ
t	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	ṇ	t	th	d	dh	n
p	ph	b	bh	m					
y	r	l	v	ś	sh	s	h	ḷ	
<i>For Pāli:—</i>									
y	r	l	v	s	h	ḷ			

Rules.

1. Initial vowels, *a* to *au*, are ciphers.
2. In a conjunct consonant, only the last member of the combination has value.
3. A consonant without a vowel—that is, a final consonant at the end of a formula or a sentence; e.g., the *t* of *āsīt* and the *m* of *puram*—has no value. This applies to also Visarga and Anusvāra.
4. The numbers are to be applied in the opposite direction to that in which they are stated.

giving a meaning suitable to the particular idea. But it is not always easy to see how the words are to be translated in individual instances. And still less easy is it to realize that practice permitted the use of even the cardinal numeral words in this manner. Such, however, was the case; since Mr. Whish quoted from a work entitled *Jaiminīsūtra* an astrological passage beginning (loc. cit., p. 58):— *Atha svāinśō grahāṇām pañcha mūshika-mārjārāḥ*; in which *pañcha* means, not ‘five’, but 61.

On these lines we may have *ekam* as meaning, not ‘one’, but 10; *daśu* in the sense of 58; *śatam* in the sense of 65; *sahasram* in the sense of 287; and so on; with results which might easily be very confusing if we should not be on our guard.

It was supposed that this method of expressing numbers was confined to Southern India. It is therefore interesting to find Dr. Barnett adducing instances of its use from Burma. He has obliged me with the full texts of two of them, from which he gave in his note only the words themselves which express the numbers.

One —apparently the oldest that he can cite— is from the Saddasārattahājalinī, a grammatical work by Nāgita : it runs thus :—

Chakkē pattē guṇaggaram̃ Sakkē pana alappāyam̃ |
Māghē māsē su-niṭṭhitō tam̃ sādhavō viehārentu ||

Here, the figures for the Buddhist era show that the figures for the other reckoning must be, not 0311 (i.e. 1130), but 0711 (i.e. 1170), and that *alappāyam̃* must be amended into *alappāyam̃*. With this correction, the verse tells us that the work was finished in the month Māgha, when the Jinachakka, the reckoning from the death of Buddha according to the later treatment, had reached the year *gu(3)-ṇa(5)-gga(3)-ra(2)*, i.e. 2353, and the Sakkarāj, the common Burmese era, had reached the year *a(0)-ḷa(7)-ppā(1)-ya(1)*, i.e. 1170. In Sakkarāj 1170 the said month Māgha, i.e. Tabodwè, began in Burma on 16 January, A.D. 1809.¹

The other is from the Saṁvēgavatthudipani, a religious work by Jāgara : it runs thus :—

Sabba-khattiya-dhammēna Dhammarājēna yāchitō |
māpita-Ratanapuṇṇēna katā Saṁvēgadīpanī ||
Niṭṭhitō ēsō sampattē Sakkarājē raṭṭhakkhayam̃ |
bhānuvakkham̃ Jinachakkē Phagguna-māsa-pañchamē ||

This tells us that the work was finished on the fifth day of Phālguna, when the Sakkarāj had reached the year

¹ It is to be noted that the equation between the two eras differs here by one year from the equation used in the next date.

It may also be noted that the Sāsanavaiśa says (p. 89) that Nāgita, otherwise known as Khaṇṭakakhippathēra, wrote the Saddasārattahājalinī in the time of king Kittisīhasūra, who began to reign in Sakkarāj 713, = A.D. 1351-52.

ra(2)-tṭha(2)-kkha(2)-ya(1), i.e. 1222, and the Jinachakka had reached the year *bhā(4)-nu(0)-ra(4)-kkha(2)*, i.e. 2404. In Sakkarāj 1222 the given day, the fifth of Phālguna, i.e. Tabaung waxing 5, was 13 February, A.D. 1861.

The Dhammarāja at whose request this work was written was king Mindōn Min, who became king of Burma by dethroning his half-brother Pagan Min early in 1853. He is mentioned here as the founder of Ratana-puṇṇa: this name, which takes in Burmese the form Yadanabon, is the Pāli literary and official appellation of Mandalay, which town Mindōn Min founded in 1859.

When this work was written, the events were culminating which resulted in our permanent acquisition of the Province of British Burma, which was placed under a Chief Commissioner in 1862. And that, no doubt, is why the Sakkarāj year which included the date 13 February, 1861, was called *raṭṭha-kkhaya*, 'loss of territory'. But, why the Buddhist year was called *bhānuruḷkha*, meaning apparently 'the chest or the eye of the sun', is not apparent. Nor is it evident why the two years in the other date, of A.D. 1809, were expressed by *guṇaggara* and *aḷupāya*.

The following item may be added as a curiosity. Mr. Whish cited a work entitled *Sadratanamālā* as telling us that the proportion of the circumference to a diameter of one *parārḍha* (one tenth of a trillion: see p. 119 above) is expressed in this system by—

bhadrāmbudhisiddhajanmagamitaśraddhāsmayadbhūpagiḥ.¹

This is tantamount to saying that the value of π is—

$$3.14159265358979324,$$

which is practically correct; the last figure is properly 3, followed by 8, and the decimal runs on to infinity.

¹ Mr. Whish, loc. cit., p. 60, gave *sīlha*, *gamita*, *śraddā*, and *giḥ*. In these details I have had to amend his transliteration.

The expression is a line of a verse in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita metre, the first syllable of which was not given. It comes from a work which is probably of quite late date: and its value of π was taken, no doubt, from the work of some member of the European body of " π -computers", one of whom in the last century carried his value of π to over six hundred places. And it appears to have no connected meaning as a whole. But it is easy to remember, whereas the figures themselves (after the first six) are not so: and it seems an interesting sample of what can be done with this system of notation.

J. F. FLEET.

THE PLANET BRHASPATI

In the last number of the *Journal* (pp. 514-18) Dr. Fleet has, from the point of view of one interested in the by-ways of astronomy, revived the theory of the connexion of the Vedic Bṛhaspati with the planet Jupiter. So much interest attaches to the question of the Vedic knowledge of the planets, and so much weight attaches to any opinion of Dr. Fleet's, that no excuse is needed for an examination of the hypothesis from the standpoint of the general principles affecting the interpretation of Vedic texts.

It should, however, first be noted that there is in favour of the identification of Bṛhaspati and Jupiter the high authority of Dr. Thibaut.¹ But Thibaut does not give the reasons for his belief in this view, and it is therefore impossible to estimate precisely what weight should be assigned to his opinion on this point. On the other hand, Mr. Tilak² asserts the identity, but only for the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, though he finds other mentions of planets in the *Rgveda* itself. But these other references need not

¹ *Astronomie, Astrologie und Mathematik*, p. 6. Cf. Oldenberg, *Gott. Nach.*, 1909, p. 568.

² *Orion*, p. 161.

here be discussed; that the planets are really meant in any case is most improbable.

Dr. Fleet's argument is much more ingenious than that of Mr. Tilak. He takes together the passages in the *R̥gveda*¹ and the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*² referred to by Mr. Tilak, and reads the two as referring to one event, the sudden shining out of a temporary star in the cluster Praesepe at a time when Jupiter was quite close to Praesepe, perhaps apparently in actual contact.

Now what are the facts? The *R̥gveda* verse tells us that "Bṛhaspati, when first born, from a great light in the highest heaven (or perhaps 'in the highest heaven of the great light'), seven-mouthed, mighty, seven-rayed, with thunder dispelled the darkness". The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*³ tells us that "Bṛhaspati when first born came into being over against (or rather 'became lord of') Tīṣya the Nakṣatra, best of gods, victorious in battle—throughout all the quarters be safety ours!" Unless the two verses are read together I think it will be admitted that Dr. Fleet's hypothesis falls to the ground and that we are left in the position of Mr. Tilak, who recognizes Bṛhaspati as a planet in the *Brāhmaṇa* but not in the *R̥gveda*.

Now, argues Dr. Fleet, the identity of the first quarter-verse in each verse establishes an intimate connexion between the two verses. With this I quite agree, but it is hardly a connexion which helps his argument. That requires us to assume that the relation of Tīṣya and Bṛhaspati as contained in the *Brāhmaṇa* is to be read into the *R̥gveda*, but the simple solution is that the first quarter-verse is merely a normal case of borrowing by the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* from the *R̥gveda* or from the earlier part of the *Brāhmaṇa*, where the verse also occurs.⁴

The whole matter becomes clearer if it be remembered

¹ iv, 50, 4. ² iii, 1, 1, 5. The verse does not occur elsewhere.

³ Not also in the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, as suggested on p. 515, n. 1.

⁴ ii, 8, 2, 7; *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, iv, 12, 1; *Kāthaka Saṃhitā*, xi, 13.

what this passage of the *Brāhmaṇa* is. It is patently a late passage (it is significant that it has no parallel in the *Kāthaka* or *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitās*) in which the regents of the Nakṣatras are invoked to grant protection, and for the regents we have much earlier and better authority, the concurrent authority of the *Yajurveda Saṃhitās*, which all give Brhaspati as the regent of Tisya.¹ If the hymn in the *Brāhmaṇa* is regarded in the light of this fact, it will be seen at once to be a conglomerate of Vedic tags, and the borrowing of *Bṛhaspátih̄ prathumám̄ jāyamānah̄* ceases to have any significance whatever. We cannot with any logic for a moment say that the content of the *Rgveda* verse is to be read into the *Brāhmaṇa*; the verse as it stands in the *Brāhmaṇa* makes perfectly good sense: Brhaspati from birth is the regent of the Nakṣatra Tisya, a doctrine taken over from the *Saṃhitā*, where it has no connexion with the *Rgveda* passage at all.

Mr. Tilak, indeed, argues that the *Brāhmaṇa* passage as it stands shows Brhaspati as Jupiter, but probably Dr. Fleet would decline to put forward this argument, unless, indeed, in rendering *abhi sam̄babhūra* as "came into existence over against" he desires to press the space relation. It is certainly untenable: there is a long list of twenty-seven or twenty-eight Nakṣatras and regents in the *Yajurveda Saṃhitās*, and to assert that the connexion of one special pair is due to an actual observation of a connexion of Jupiter and Tisya is totally unscientific. There is no reasonable room for doubt that the Nakṣatras are merely borrowed by the Vedic Indians from some other people; there is no trace in the Vedic literature of any real astronomical observation or science, and in any case no ingenuity can make any theory by which the regents generally are due to astronomical facts.

¹ *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, iv, 4, 10, 1: *Kāthaka Saṃhitā*, xxxix, 13; *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, ii, 13, 20.

As for the *R̥yveda* passage, its meaning is plain at a second glance; Bṛhaspati here appears in his true light, Agni conceived as the priest. He has seven rays, and so has the sun¹ (and Agni is sun as well as fire); he has seven mouths, and so has Agni.² He is born in the highest heaven, as Agni is born.³ He smites away the darkness with his thunder, as Agni smites it away.⁴ There is not an obscure phrase in the verse; it is perfectly in harmony with all we know of Bṛhaspati as a priestly Agni. There is no place for the interpretation of Bṛhaspati as a planet. It is, of course, possible to hold that everywhere Bṛhaspati is a planet, but a mere ungrounded possibility is of no real value.

It is possible that stress may be laid on the force of *abhi sambabhūva* as meaning "came into existence over against". But this is hardly more than a mistranslation. With *abhi* and *sam* the root *bhū* regularly has the accusative in the sense of "obtain mastery over" or some similar sense, and this sense is perfectly in place here; from birth Bṛhaspati was lord over, was the regent of, the Nakṣatra Tīṣya. Sāyaṇa, it is true, in his commentary accepts *utpannah* as a synonym of *sambabhūva*, but he does not take *abhi* as denoting place, but in the sense of *abhilakṣya pr̥t̥iyuktaḥ san*, and in the absence of strong reasons for the contrary rendering, it is inadvisable to lay aside the established sense of *abhisaṃbhū* which is very common in Vedic literature.⁵ Perhaps the writing of the text *abhi sambabhūva* may seem to give *abhi* an independent prepositional value, but it must be

¹ RV. viii, 72, 16: *sūrya-ya sapta rasmbhūh*.

² Cf. RV. iii, 6, 2; *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā*, xvii, 79: *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, i, 5, 2, 4; *Kāthaka Saṃhitā*, vi, 14, and often.

³ See Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 92. The lightning is born from the celestial Agni. It may be noted that *jyōtiṣaḥ* is most probably gen., not abl. Cf. RV. vii, 36, 3: *maho diviḥ sādane jāyamānah*.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁵ See Bohtlingk & Roth's Dictionary, v, 332; *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, i, 3, 8; ii, 3, 7, and i, 1, 2, note 10 in my edition.

remembered that it is the rule (when the second prefix is not *ā* or *ava*) that if the verb is as here unaccented, both prefixes are accented. This is the rule of the *Rgveda*,¹ of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*,² and I may add of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*; there is an excellent example in iii. 1. 1. 7, *ápa sám vīśema*, and similarly here the text is *abhí sám babhūva*, not as the editions like to write, (*abhí*) *sám* *babhūva* as one idea.

There remains, however, one passage which, if rightly interpreted by Dr. Fleet, tells in his favour. In the *Rgveda*³ he finds a passage in which it is difficult to recognize an allusion to anything except the occasional disappearance of the star cluster Praesepe. If the rendering is correct, we must of course revise our theory of probabilities, and the equation of Br̥haspati and Jupiter will assume a new aspect. But is it correct? Dr. Fleet's version is, "Give us, O Maruts, (*wealth*) a thousandfold which (*will*) not (*disappear*) as Tishya disappears from the sky," and the text is—

*ná yó yáchatī Tīsyò yáthā diváh
asmé rāraṇta⁴ marutaḥ sahasrīyam |*

Clearly the reference is to the Maruts granting wealth (*rāyéh* occurs in the preceding part of the verse) which is abiding, and a parallel is put in to strengthen the statement: the wealth is described as wealth "which disappears"⁵ not, just as Tīsyā (disappears not) from the

¹ See Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 107; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 47. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1083a, is less precise than usual. The same rule prevails in the *Atharvaveda*, Whitney, AVPr. 185.

² Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xiii, 62 seq.

³ v. 54, 13.

⁴ *Raranta*, as on p. 518, seems to be a misprint. The rendering "gave" is hardly strictly correct; the form must be a perf. imper. from *ran*, not *rauh* or *rā*; see Oldenberg, *Rgveda-Noten*, 1, 351, and cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 362, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 813: *rāraṇthī* in RV. x. 59, 6; the sense is "make wealth enjoy itself with us".

⁵ *Yachati* is not desirable (cf. Oldenberg, loc. cit.), for the present gives a perfectly good sense, describing the kind of wealth, and accords best with the sentence, making the construction of the comparison simple and easy.

sky". There can be no doubt that this is the natural sense both logically and grammatically; logically it is extremely feeble to describe wealth as not being like some object which sometimes disappears but is normally there; a comparison with a fixed object or a contrast with what is notoriously unstable is reasonable, but not a comparison with an object which occasionally disappears: grammatically it is excessively harsh to read the sentence as *ná yó—yáchatí Tiṣyò yáthā diváh*, supplying very awkwardly a future or subjunctive for a predicate of *yó*; and on the other hand if the sentence be read *ná yó yáchatí—Tiṣyò yáthā diváh* all is simple and in order; *ná yáchatí* is supplied as the predicate to *Tiṣyò* without the slightest difficulty,¹ and in accordance with the natural and normal usage of the language.

It may, however, be objected that if *Tiṣya* is the same as the *Nakṣatra* of that name, it is not a very happy example of permanence, and indeed, apart altogether from the question of occasional disappearances of *Praesepe*, it is true that the *Crab* is not a conspicuous constellation, as it includes no star of a greater magnitude than 3·7. But we have no right to equate the *Tiṣya* of the *Rgveda* with the later *Nakṣatra*. One of the few practically certain things about the *Nakṣatras* is that they are not known to the *Rgveda*: the only exception occurs in the wedding hymn of *Sūryā*,² where *Aghās* and *Arjunis* are clearly priestly variants of *Maghās* and *Phalgunis* as read in the *Atharvaveda*,³ and that that hymn is late is not questioned by any Vedic scholar.⁴ That *Tiṣya* is really the *Nakṣatra*

¹ Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 594, 595. Cf. also RV. i, 143, 5: *ná yó várāya marūtām ira svandh sévera śṣṭā diryā yáthāsinih*, where *na* likewise must be taken with the comparison.

² RV. x, 85, 13.

³ xiv, 1, 13. See references in Whitney's translation, p. 742.

⁴ See e.g. Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, p. 287; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 34. RV. v, 54, is one of the *Atri* collection, and though perhaps not a very early member of that group, is certainly older than x, 85.

is thus most improbable; Sāyana takes it as the sun, but we need not say more than that some bright constellation must have been meant.¹ The only other occurrence of the name in the *Rgveda*² is colourless and affords no assistance.

My conclusion is that the new evidence adduced by Dr. Fleet does not really help us towards proving the Vedic knowledge of the planets: it may be incredible that even the Vedic Indians should not have known Venus and Jupiter, but it is impossible to accept, as evidence that they did know Jupiter, a view which (a) involves the bringing into close connexion in sense of two passages which have only an external bond of union, and (b) necessitates the wholly unnatural translation of a Vedic verse. If the planets are mentioned in the *Rgveda*, other passages must be found to serve as proof.³

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

THE BIRTHPLACE OF BHAKTI

The statement that the religion of Bhakti, in its modern forms, spread from Southern India to the North is not accepted by all scholars.

The *Bhāgavata Māhātmya* is a supplement to the *Bhāgavata Purāna* of considerable authority, and is usually printed at the end of Indian editions of the latter work. In i, 27 ff. Nārada relates how in this Kali Yuga he has wandered over the whole of India and has failed to find righteousness.⁴ At length (36) he arrives at the bank of

¹ For the question of Ti-sya = Tistrya = Sirius, cf. my *Sūkshyama Āraṅyaka*, p. 77; Max Muller, SBE. xxxii, 331, and other references in SBE. I, 582, 583.

² x, 64, 8, with Kṛṣānu. See Weber, *Narada*, ii, 289 seq. Ludwig identifies him with Kṛṣānu, but cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.* ii, 207, 208.

³ For further discussion of the question of the planets and the Nakṣatras in the RV., I may refer to the forthcoming *Vedic Index* (i, 243, 244, 409 seq.) of Professor Macdonell and myself.

⁴ A long list of defects is given. One is that the *āsrama*s are obstructed (*vaddha*) by Yavanas.

the Yamunā, the scene of the exploits of Hari (i.e. Kṛṣṇa). There he finds two old men dying, and a young woman (*taruṇī*) lamenting over them. In response to his inquiries she says (44)—

“I am Bhakti. These two are considered to be my sons. They are Knowledge (*Jñāna*) and Freedom from Desire (*Vairāgya*), and are become decrepit through the influence of (the present) time . . . (47) I was born (*utpanna*) in Draviḍa; I grew up in Karnāṭaka [*sic*]; I became old as I dwelt sometimes in Mahārāṣṭra and sometimes in Gurjara. There, under the influence of the terrible Kali Yuga, my limbs were mutilated by heretics (*pākhaṇḍa*), and with my sons I fell into a long continued feebleness. Since I came to Vṛndāvana I have recovered and am now young and beautiful.” She goes on to ask why her two sons have not also become young. Nārada explains that she has been rejuvenated by the holy influence of Vṛndāvana, but that (61) Knowledge and Freedom from Desire still remain old, as there is no one who will accept them.

It is clear from the above passage that the author of the *Bhāgavata Māhātmya* considered that Bhakti was first taught in the south, and that its teaching in the north, centreing in Vṛndāvana, was a later development and a revival.

G. A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.

May 6, 1911.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE KAMBOJAS

The Kambōjas were a North-Western tribe, always mentioned in Sanskrit literature in connexion with Yavanas, Śakas, and the like.¹

Muir (*Sanskrit Texts*, ii², 152) quotes, in another connexion, a passage from the *Nirukta* which throws light upon the nature of their language.

¹ See e.g. *Viṣṇu Purāna* (Wilson-Hall, ii, 182).

Yaska (II. i, 3, 4), speaking of dialectic forms of Sanskrit, says that *śavati*, in the sense of "going" is used only in the language of the Kambōjas:¹ while its derivative, *śava*, is used in the language of the Āryas.

Without discussing the correctness of the statement that *śava* has a connexion with *śavati*, we can gather from this that Yaska considered that the Kambōjas were not Āryas, and that they spoke Sanskrit, but with dialectic variations of vocabulary.

Śavati does not occur in Sanskrit, but it is a good Eranian word. There is the Old Persian *√ śiyav-*, and the Avesta *√ šar*, *šaraitē*, to go. Cf. Persian *šudan*, Skr. *√ cyav*.

In other words the Kambōjas, a barbarous tribe of North-Western India, either spoke Sanskrit with an infusion of Eranian words, to which they gave Indian inflexions, or else spoke a language partly Indo-Aryan and partly Eranian.

G. A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.

May 6, 1911.

THE TAKRI ALPHABET

On pp. 67 ff. of the Journal for 1904 there is a paper on the modern Indo-Aryan alphabets of North-Western India.

The alphabet current over the lower ranges of the Himālaya north of the Panjāb is known as Ṭākri, with variants such as Tākri, Ṭakkari, and Ṭhākari. The origin of this name has not been, so far as I know, discussed, though there are traditional interpretations connecting it with the Ṭhākurs of the hill country.

I think that the most probable signification is that the word means "the alphabet of the Ṭakkas". Dr. Stein's

¹ *Athāpi prakataya ērañkēṣu bhāṣyantē, rikṭaya ṭkēṣu. Śavatir gatikarmā Kambōjēṣu ēra bhāṣyatē . . . rikāram asyāryēṣu bhāṣyantē śava iti.*

note to Rājatarāṅgiṇī, v, 150, gives a summary of what is known about this tribe. In Hiuen Tsiang's time the Ṭakkas ruled the greater part of the northern Panjāb. Their capital, the famous Śākala, appears to have been somewhere between the Cināb and the Rāvī.

Assuming the derivation of the word to be correct, its proper spelling would be "Ṭakkarī" or "Ṭākri", not "Tākri" or "Thākari".

G. A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.
May 6, 1911.

SUGGESTIONS REGARDING RIGVEDA X, 86

The hymn Rigveda x, 86 is discussed at length by Geldner in the *Vedische Studien*, vol. ii, p. 22, where it is said that every trace of the itihāsa on which the dialogue in the hymn was originally based has been lost to the later tradition. This is true as regards brahmanical books, but in the Brahma Purāṇa is narrated a fable about Indra, Indrāṇī, and Vṛṣākapi, which has a close connexion with the hymn, and as it does not appear to have been noticed before, it may be of some interest to Vedic scholars. It is not my intention to enter upon a discussion of the hymn, but merely to set out the fable and offer some general remarks upon both compositions.

A large part of the Brahma Purāṇa, namely chap 77 to 175, consists of a mātmya of the R. Godāvarī, which is highly exalted under the names Gaṅgā and Gautamī. In chap. 129 is extolled the tīrtha at its junction with the Phenā or Sindhuphenā, which may be the Penganga. That tīrtha had the names Mārjāra, Hanūmata, Vṛṣākapa, and Abjaka. The former two names are explained by a fable which I will notice afterwards; and the latter two by the following fable in verses 11, etc.

Hiraṇya, the first-born of the Daityas, became through austerities invincible by the gods. He had a mighty son

Mahāśani, who is styled more ancient than the ancients.¹ Mahāśani conquered Indra, and binding him with his elephant presented him to his father, who then kept Indra secured. Mahāśani then went against Varuṇa, but Varuṇa prudently gave him his own daughter and gained his friendship. Being deprived of Indra the gods took counsel thus: "Let Viṣṇu give us Indra and slay the Daitya, or let him see the mantra and he will make another Indra." But Viṣṇu said he could not kill Mahāśani, and begged Varuṇa's help. Varuṇa went to his son-in-law Mahāśani and induced him to give up Indra. Mahāśani dismissed Indra with a most contemptuous harangue and ordered him to behave as Varuṇa's servant. Indra returned home in great shame and consulted Śacī how he might rehabilitate himself. Although Mahāśani was her uncle's son, she advised Indra to seek aid from Viṣṇu and Śiva by worshipping them with her on the Godāvarī in Daṇḍaka forest. So they went there and praised Śiva and asked for his help to conquer the Daitya. Śiva replied that he could not accomplish that alone, and told him to worship Viṣṇu also. So Indra and Śacī with the assistance of Āpastamba worshipped Viṣṇu at the confluence of the Godāvarī and Phenā, and Viṣṇu granted him the boon asked for. There, through the favour of Śiva, the Godāvarī, and Viṣṇu, a man was born from the water, who had the nature of Śiva and Viṣṇu; and he went to Rasātala and killed Mahāśani. "He became Indra's friend; he was Abjaka Vṛṣākapi. And Indra, although dwelling in the sky, follows Vṛṣākapi. Seeing him devoted (*āsakta*) to the other, Śacī was enraged at his affection (*praṇayo*), and Śatamanyu (Indra) soothing her laughingly spoke thus (verses 97-100):—

"I am not a protection, O Indrāṇī, without my friend

¹ पूर्वेषां पूर्ववत्तरः, verse 16.

Vṛṣākapi, whose water or oblation always gives pleasure to Agni. I will not go elsewhere, and I swear to thee, my dear, by a member.¹ Therefore deign not to speak to me with distrust regarding another, O beautiful one. Thou art my dear devoted wife, my helpmeet in righteousness and holy verse: thou hast borne a child and art of noble family. What other woman is dearer to me than thou art? Therefore by thy advice I went to the great river Gaṅgā (Godāvarī), and by the favour of the discus-armed god of gods Viṣṇu and of the god Śiva, and by the favour of Vṛṣākapi, who sprang from the water, my friend, world-famous Abjaka, I have escaped from misfortune. Hence I am Indra the steadfast (verses 101-6). (Then follow verses extolling a good wife, Gaṅgā, Śiva, and Viṣṇu, 106-13.) And through the favour of Śiva, Viṣṇu, and Gaṅgā (Godāvarī) my Indra-hood is firm henceforward, I believe, and through the might of my friend. Vṛṣākapi is my friend, who was born in the waters. And thou art my dear friend continually. I have none other more dear' (verses 113-15)."

Then follows a blessing on the tīrthas Indreśvara and Abjaka² (verses 115-24): and among multitudes of tīrthas on the R. Gantamī "Abjaka is called the heart of the Godāvarī" (verses 125-7).

The only other references that I have found in this Purāṇa to Vṛṣākapi in this connexion occur in chap. 70, verse 40, where *Vṛṣākapi arin-dama* is mentioned as one among various kings and rishis who had established tīrthas, and in the other fable which will be cited.

This fable is directly connected with the Rig-Vedic hymn in that Indra begins his soothing answer to Indrāṇī

¹ Or perhaps "body". नाहमन्यत्र गन्तास्मि प्रिये चाङ्गुलं ते शृणु ।
Āṅgena here may have a special sense.

² *Abjaka* is also mentioned in chap. 128, verse 82.

by using words which closely resemble the 12th verse of the hymn. That verse runs thus:—

Nāham Indrāṇi rāraṇa sakhyur Vṛṣākaper ṛte
Yasyedam apyaṁ havīḥ priyaṁ deveṣu gacchati.

And the corresponding verse in the Purāṇa stands thus:—

Nāham Indrāṇi śaraṇam ṛte sakhyur Vṛṣākapeḥ
Vāri vāpi havir yasya Agneḥ priya-karaṁ sadā.

In the first half of the verse the Purāṇa has substituted *śaraṇam* for *rāraṇa*, no doubt because *rāraṇa* had become unintelligible and did not suit the śloka metre. The second half varies considerably, yet retains some of the words of the hymn and conveys a similar meaning. Further, while in the hymn Indrāṇi avows her affection for Indra and her repugnance to Vṛṣākapi in very plain terms, the fable makes Indra handsomely acknowledge her affection, though insisting on his great debt of gratitude to Vṛṣākapi; and this modification of Indrāṇi's part may have been due to a later feeling that the situation required a more restrained treatment.

In other respects there is a wide difference between the fable and the hymn, yet the plot in both is Indrāṇi's jealousy of Indra's attachment to Vṛṣākapi. I will not enter on a detailed comparison of the two stories, but will leave that to Vedic scholars, and only offer some general remarks, touching only the chief points briefly.

The fable is narrated in rather a matter-of-fact way. Indra cuts a sorry figure in it, and its treatment of him seems to verge on familiarity and something akin to humour. The tirtha is hardly said to have obtained its sanctity from him, but rather the success of his quest for revenge on Mahāśani is largely attributed to the prior merits of this confluence of the two rivers. The easy way in which Indra is treated in this fable appears as ribaldry in the hymn, for, if the refrain, "Indra is supreme above all," with which each verse ends and which ill accords

with much of the hymn, be put aside, *Indrāṇī* is made to speak in the manner of the commonest folk.¹

Such a fable and such a hymn could hardly have originated in a part of India where *Indra* and the other gods were objects of genuine worship as in *Madhyadeśa*, and we should presumably look to some outlying region where popular belief, while gradually accepting the brahmanic gods, yet failed at first to receive them with deep reverence. Such a region might well be the *Dekhan*, where the *Dravidians* must have had their own deities before the *Aryan* religion superimposed itself and ultimately ousted them. In this direction also points the connexion between the names *Hanūmat* and *Vṛṣākapi* in the *Purāna*.

In chap. 84 occurs the other fable. One *Kesarin* had two wives, *Añjanā* and *Adrikā*; they were *apsarases* under a curse, and the former had a monkey's head and the latter a cat's head. By *Vāyu* and *Nirṛti* they had sons: *Añjanā* bore *Hanūmat*, and *Adrikā* bore *Adri* king of the *Pisācas*; and by the favour of those gods they were delivered from the curse thus. *Adri* took *Añjanā* and caused her to bathe at a *tīrtha* which then gained the names *Añjana* and *Paiśāca*, and *Hanūmat* took *Adri* (i.e. *Adrikā*) to the *Gautamī* (*Godāvarī*) at its junction with the *Phenā*, which *tīrtha* thus obtained the names *Mārjāra*, *Hanūmat*, and *Vṛṣākapi*. This fable is referred to and completed

¹ The comparative expressions employed in verse 6 have a general reference, and therefore the last expression implies an allusion to some custom and may perhaps find an explanation in a custom common among the lower classes, which may be cited: वङ्गदेशे सङ्गमप्रकारो ऽयं प्रायशो ऽद्य वर्तते । भूमौ पृष्ठनिषणा नारी सक्थिनी देहस्त्रोपर्युद्यम्य श्रुते । ततः पुरुषस्तामुपागम्य विजृम्भितसक्थिः स्वपादोपविष्टो भूत्वा स्वहस्तगृहीतया तया सम्भवति । कामसूत्रान्तर्गतसाम्प्रयोगिकाधिकरणषष्ठाध्याये निरुक्तः प्रकारो ऽयमिन्द्राणीत्यभिधीयते ॥ This custom is widespread in India and may perhaps have belonged to the aborigines. Cf. perhaps verses 16 and 17.

in chap. 129, verse 9, where it is said that Hanūmat's *upamātrī* (that is, mother's co-wife) by bathing there was freed from her cat-condition.

The point to be noticed in this fable is this, that, although nothing is said about Vṛṣākapi in it, yet this tirtha at the confluence of the Godāvārī and Phenā, where Hanūmat took the cat-headed Adrikā, obtained in consequence not only the names Mārjāra and Hanūmat (or rather Hanūmata as in chap. 129. 1) but also that of Vṛṣākapi (or rather Vṛṣākapa. *ibid.* 1 and 11). The former fable explains how it obtained the names Vṛṣākapa and Abjaka. There would appear, therefore, to have been some connexion between Hanūmat and Vṛṣākapi. Now Hanūmat was admittedly a denizen of the Dekhan, and in these fables we have a tirtha which claimed an interest in both those personages. Moreover, it may be noted that a king named Mahākapi is mentioned as ruling at Krauñcapura in the Dekhan.¹

I would therefore venture on the following suggestions. The Dravidians probably worshipped monkeys, Vṛṣākapi represents some ancient Dravidian monkey-god, and this fable about Indra and Vṛṣākapi grew up in the Dekhan, at the time when the Aryan religion was gaining a footing there, but Vṛṣākapi was still a greater deity than Indra. There would be no difficulty in its so originating or its being incorporated in a modified form in the Rigveda. The Aryans had extended their influence into the Dekhan long before the time of Devāpi, who lived about a century before the Pāṇḍavas and whose hymn has been admitted into that collection²; because Rāma, who was much earlier, found rishis in the Dekhan, and the kingdom of Vidarbha was founded by a branch of the Yādavas long before Rāma's time. The fable is probably the more ancient

¹ Hariv. 96, 5333. A *graha* or demon, named *Sumahākapi*, is mentioned, *id.* 168, 9562.

² See JRAS., 1910, pp. 6, 53.

version, in that it represents Vṛṣākapi as Indra's deliverer, and the hymn is probably later since it inverts their position.¹ After the Aryan religion obtained the ascendancy that change would naturally have taken place, and the altered story might have been thrown into dramatic form in the dialogue which we have in the hymn, while the outspoken language would have suited the people of that region. Finally, by the addition (often incongruously) of the refrain ascribing supremacy to Indra, it might have been deemed admissible into the Rigveda.

F. E. PARGITER.

MAHISHAMANDALA

Mahishamaṇḍala is associated with Māhishmatī in a recent article (1910, p. 425) on the assumption that the latter was the capital of the former. After rejecting a long-standing identification of Māhishmatī with Mahēśvara or Mahēshwar on the Narmadā, it is proposed to identify Māhishmatī with Māndhātā, higher up on the Narmadā. Whether or not this be so, no connexion, it would seem, necessarily exists between the two places save the similarity in the first component of their names.

Mahisamaṇḍala or Mahishamaṇḍala (with slightly variant forms, as noted in the article) was beyond dispute one of the nine countries to which Buddhist missions were sent in the third century B.C., in the time of Aśoka. And it may be remarked that they were all countries, and in no case only cities. Mahisamaṇḍala occupies the second place in the list, followed by Vanavāsa or Vanavāsi. That the countries were all strictly border lands, contiguous to the Buddhist Middle land, cannot be upheld in the face of one being Lankādīpa or Ceylon and another Suvannabhūmi, which has been taken, whether rightly or

¹ Yāska's and Sāyaṇa's explanations of Vṛṣākapi seem so fanciful that it may be doubted whether they were not meant to cloak the fable.

wrongly, to mean Burma, or rather Pegu. We are therefore not restricted to the location of all the countries in that manner. The only requirement is that they should be Indian and beyond the borders of the Maurya empire. With regard to Vanavāsi, which appears as the next neighbour to Mahisamaṇḍala, though the order does not seem to count for much in the list, the name is so distinctive and so well attested from early times that there is no difficulty in assigning it to the well-known Banavāsi on the north-west of the Mysore country. It is true that Banavāsi is called in some records Jayantī or Vaijayantī, but these seem to be only Brahmanical names of the city, and are not, I believe, anywhere applied to the province.

There remains, then, the question as to Mahisamaṇḍala, which has commonly been understood as meaning the Mysore country; not, of course, the existing Mysore State, but the tract or territory of which Mysore (Maisūr, Mahishūr) was then the principal town. In support of this allocation of Mahisamaṇḍala we have references in the earliest Tamil literature to Erumai-nāḍu, the equivalent in Tamil of Mahisamaṇḍala, and to Erumaiyūran, the chief or king of Erumaiyūr and Erumai-nāḍu.

Thus, Māmūlanār, who is assigned to the period 100-30 A.D., among countries visited by him mentions¹ Erumai-nāḍu, which he describes as being to the west, that is of the Tamil country. Nakkīrār, a contemporary of his, tells² of a war of the Pāṇḍyan king Neḍṇṇjeliyan (reigned 90-128) against a league of seven kings, of whom one was the Erumaiyūran or king of Erumaiyūr. And he is said to be of Vaḍuga descent, a reference to the Baḍagas

¹ *Aṅgūṇūru*, 115, 252. This paper has been delayed in order to obtain from India the references to these authorities, which exist only in manuscript. The original poems seem to be lost, but numerous extracts are found in this anthology

² *Id.*, 36, 253.

or "northerners" of the Nilgiri (Kanarese), the language of M which has been called Baḍaga. I period, who became a Nirgranth his *Śilappadikāram* of the same a Chēra king, on his journey r Nilgiris and witnessed with pl Kannaḍas (Kannaḍigas or peop amongst those who fought aga with Erumaiyūran is mentionec (said to be Dharmapuri in the Sa to be a title corresponding with we meet with in connexion with inscriptions. It appears that in time of the Chōla king Rājarāj. in Gaṅgavāḍi and was given a Brahmādirāja.² The donor's fath of Ariyūr in Puramalai-nāḍu wh nālgāmuḍan, or Gāmuḍa of Er nāḍu was a district bordering actually included in it.

These references serve to sho according to ancient Tamil recor may be placed in the southern pa country. The presentation of t form it had in their own lang objection, as it is in accordanc more suitable to poetry in the ve form was in use in the country the mention in an inscription n Emmeyara-kula.³

¹ Baḍagas hardly occur away from the xix, 92).

² Madras No. 204 of 1909 (Rep. fo a Tagaḍūr in the Nanjangūḍ tāluq of M

who speak Kannada
ore, or a dialect of it
nkō-adikal, of the same
or Jaina monk, says, in
riod, that Śengatṭuvan,
thwards halted in the
sure the dance of the
of Mysore). Again,
at Neḍuñjeliyan along
Adigamān of Tagaḍūr
n District). This seems
hat of Adiyama which
lakāḍ in early Hoysala
e tenth century, in the
Tagaḍūr was included
a *jāgīr* to Panchavan
is said to be a native
ad the title Erumaiya-
aiya-nāḍu. Puramalai-
n Mysore, though not

that Mahisamaṇḍala,
of the second century,
of the present Mysore
name in the familiar
ge is not a ground for
with Tamil usage and
acular. That a similar
tself may be seen from
r Seringapatam of the

algiri plateau (*Imp. Gaz. Ind.*,

1910, p. 88). There is also
ore, described as *hiriya-mūḍu*

Additional support of this allocation is found in my discovery of edicts of Aśoka in three places in the north of the present Mysore country. These are clear evidence that in the third century B.C. that part of what is now Mysore territory was included in the Maurya empire. For it is an unheard of proceeding that any State should set up its decrees in a country foreign to it. To this it is objected that these edicts now in Mysore, unlike the similar ones in Northern India, are prefaced by a preamble, a greeting addressed by the Aryaputra and Mahāmātras of Suvarṇāgiri to the Mahāmātras of Isila, which indicates that they were being sent to a foreign country. But, as already said, the idea is preposterous that any State should issue and have its edicts engraved on rocks in a country which did not belong to it, still more that it should address itself to local officials and not to the ruling power. The reasonable explanation of this feature is that this southern province of the Maurya empire was not, like the northern one, under the immediate jurisdiction of the Mahāmātras of Suvarṇāgiri, who therefore, in accordance with official usage, communicated with the officials of equal rank with themselves in the province to which the edicts were transmitted. Moreover, the Mahāmātras were a special order of officials created by Aśoka in the Maurya empire, and there is no evidence that the designation was in use elsewhere at that time. On these grounds we may conclude that a portion of the northern part of what is now the Mysore State was included in the Maurya empire, of which Mahisamaṇḍala and Vanavāsa or Banavāsi were border lands, and that Mahisamaṇḍala was situated in the southern part of the present Mysore country.

It may farther be pointed out that a record exists in a stone inscription that Kuntala, an extensive province which included the north of the present Mysore country, was once ruled by the Nandas, the predecessors of the Mauryas: while another traces the origin of the

Kadambas to Nanda.¹ And it is a question whether we have not some evidence of Nanda rule, though not very decided, in certain coins recently found near Chitaldroog.² Some of these bear the legends *Raṇō Muḍā Naṃdasa* and *Raṇō Chutukadā Naṃdasa*, and similar coins have been found at Karwar in North Kanara. Of course, the mere existence of such coins at these spots does not prove that the country belonged to the Nandas, any more than the antique Chinese brass coin found with them at the former place shows that it belonged to China, or the Roman silver coin of Augustus shows that it belonged to Rome. But we have the testimony of the Sātakarṇṇi inscriptions at Malavaḷḷi and at Banavāsi,³ in which occurs, as one of his titles, *Vinhukadū Chutukulā Nanda*. These inscriptions may, it would seem, bear witness to an occupation of the country in which they exist by Nandas, or by kings in some way of Nanda connexion. It must be stated, however, that although even Professor Rapson read the legends on the coins at first in this sense, which had suggested itself to me some time before I knew that he had done so, he has since adopted the reading of the latter part as *kulānanda*, "joy of the family."⁴ Of course this can be justified. But it may be remarked that in the limited field of a coin only essential terms or titles are likely to be inserted. The expression *ānanda* adds nothing to the meaning and is quite superfluous, whereas the name Nanda would be of historical importance. The former word does not occur in any of the coin legends given in the catalogue. *Chutukulānanda* yields an intelligible meaning certainly, but what are we to say of *Muḍānanda*, unless we adopt a rather forced interpretation? And how are we to account for the omission

¹ *Ep. Carn.*, vii, Sk. 225, 236.

² *Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1909, 1910.

³ *Ep. Carn.*, vii, Sk. 263; *Ind. Ant.*, xiv, 333.

⁴ *Cat. Ind. Coins: Andhras, W. Kshatrapas, etc.*, Introd., p. 83.

of *kula* here? Mauryas and Guptas are mentioned as in the Southern Bombay and Northern Mysore districts, the former in the sixth century and the latter in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹ If so, there is no reason why Nandas should not be met with. And yet another inscription² expressly tells us that Nāgakhaṇḍa, a district corresponding more or less with the present Shikarpur tāluq in the north-west of Mysore, was "protected by the wise Chandra Gupta". It is singular too that the kistvaens and similar structures which are generally known in the other parts as Pāṇḍu-kolli, or cells of the Pāṇḍus, should, in the north of the Mysore country and by the Baḍagas of the Nīlgiris be called Mōryaramane, houses of the Mōryas or Mauryas. These various items, though not all of equal value, can hardly be set aside as having no meaning, and to what do they point but to an occupation of the north of the present Mysore country, not only by the Maurya Government, but perhaps even by the earlier rulers who preceded it.

In the south of the present Mysore country, Mahisamaṇḍala, or the territory, whatever it may have been, to which Maisūr or the present city of Mysore gave its name, was probably the most accessible and populous part, occupying a physically well-defined situation between the River Kāvērī and the Nīlgiris, which form the junction of the Western and Eastern Ghats.

An objection is made that the name Maysūr-nāḍ, leaving aside the evidence of the Tanjore plates,³ which profess to be of the third century, does not appear till the tenth century, and that Mysore city itself does not present any remains of antiquity. But there is a Haḷe Maisūr or Haḷli Maisūr a little to the north of the Yeḍatore tāluq which may possibly be a relic of the early period. And apart from other reasons, the want of old remains in the

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, viii, 11, 13; Fleet, *Dyn. Kan. Dist.*, p. 6.

² *Ep. Carn.*, viii, Sb. 263.

³ *Ind. Ant.*, viii, 212.

city can be accounted for by the deliberate demolition of set purpose to which the place was subjected by Ṭipu Sultān towards the close of the eighteenth century. When the Gangas had established their rule, and fixed the capital at Talakād in the third century, the prominence of Mysore as a centre naturally fell into abeyance, the two places being only 28 miles apart. At the same time the whole dominion of the Gangas, which extended far beyond the original Mahisamaṇḍala, came to be known as the Gangavāḍi Ninety-six Thousand, a designation which is met with as so thoroughly well established in the eighth century that the latter part sufficed to describe it, as in the case of the Seven and a half Lakh country and similar terms. When, at the opening of the eleventh century, the Ganga power was overturned by the Chōlas from the Tamil country, these gave Chōla names to the provinces in the south and east of the country, which were the only ones they conquered. And although they continued to use the name Gangapāḍi, the present Mysore District was denominated the Muḍikoṇḍachōla-maṇḍala and the Kolar District the Nikarilichōla-maṇḍala. But, notwithstanding this, the Maysūr-nāḍ had appeared again, as above stated, in the tenth century, showing that it was not extinct. The remaining parts of the Mysore country, beyond the Chōla districts, were at the same time known as the Hoysala-rājya, the capital of which was at Dōrasamudra (Halebid, in the Hassan District). After the overthrow of the latter in the fourteenth century, the name Karṇāṭa was often applied to the country under Vijayanagar, and Karṇāṭak under Bijāpur. But Mysore again came into notice, though for a time Seringapatam, which is only 10 miles distant, was more prominent. The disuse of any general name derived from Mysore during the Ganga period from the third to the tenth century was owing to the seats of power being established elsewhere. But that

the place had continued in existence evidence may be gathered from the statement that when the Kshattriya princes from Kathiawar, who became the progenitors of the present royal family, arrived from the north, they found Mahisha-pura or Mahiśūra-pura ready to their hands in which to settle.

L. RICE.

REMARKS ON MR. RICE'S NOTE

There are few people, I think, who would now dispute the points, that Māndhātā is the Māhishmatī of Patañjali and of the Mahābhārata, the Suttanipāta, and the Raghuvamśa; that the name Māhishmatī marks the place as the city of people called Mahishas or Māhishas; and that the territory of which it was the capital would be naturally known as Māhisharāshṭra, Māhishamaṇḍala. For the rest, it is unnecessary to discuss in full arguments which find bases, on which to build up views about historical matters of the third and fourth centuries B.C., in wrong readings of legends on coins of the third century A.D., and in fanciful statements made in inscriptions ranging as late as from A.D. 1174 to 1342 or 1402 when some of the great families of Southern India were still elaborating pedigrees connecting them with the north. I will ask only for space enough to notice two details which can be treated at no great length.

Mr. Rice's belief in a connexion between the Mauryas and Mysore is based ultimately on a wrong reading of the plain unmistakable text of an inscription of the eighth century A.D. at Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa.¹ The record is the synchronous epitaph of a Jain teacher named Prabhāchandra, who died at Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa. That part of it which is concerned with his death begins:—Ataḥ

¹ The inscription was first brought to notice by Mr. Rice in *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 3 (1874), p. 153. It was re-edited by him in *Epi. Carn.*, vol. 2, Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa (1889), p. 1, and by me in *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 4 (1896-7), p. 22. It has been discussed on various occasions; and I have referred to the story in this Journal, 1909, p. 23, note 3.

āchāryyaḥ Prabhāchandrō nām=āvanitala-lalāmabhūtē; in which he is distinctly mentioned as “the Āchārya by name Prabhāchandra”. Mr. Rice, however, would still suggest,¹ on the strength of legends strung together into a complete story in quite modern times, that we should find here the expression *Prabhāchandrēn = ām = āvani°*, “the Āchārya along with [*amā*] Prabhāchandra”; that the Āchārya is the Śrutakēvalin Bhadrabāhu I, and Prabhāchandra is Chandragupta, the grandfather of Aśōka, though the record contains no allusion of any kind to him; that the inscription commemorates the death of Bhadrabāhu; and that we thus have evidence that Chandragupta went with Bhadrabāhu to Śravaṇa-Belgoḷa, and ended his days in religious retirement there. This needs no further comment.

In support of the claim that the Mysore territory was known in ancient times by some name answering to the Tamil Erumai-nāḍu and the Sanskrit Mahishamaṇḍala or Pāli Mahisamaṇḍala in the sense of ‘buffalo-country’, Mr. Rice has said (p. 811 above):—“That a similar form was in use in the country itself may be seen from the mention in an inscription near Seringapatam of the Emmeyara-kula.” He has omitted to state the date of this inscription and to give the ordinary reader any means of considering what importance, if any, may attach to its mention of a family called Emmeyara-kula. But with the reference which he furnishes, we find that the inscription is a record dated in A.D. 1175 which registers the making of a tank at the village Mālānahalli, the building of a temple, and a grant of some land to the god thereof, by a village-headman’s son who is mentioned as:—Kurukki - nāḍa Mālānahalliya Emmeyara - kolada Chāka-gāvunḍana maga Harada-gāvunḍa. This is translated thus:²—“Harada-gāvunḍa, son of Chāka-gāvunḍa,

¹ *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions* (1909), p. 5 ff.

² *Epi. Carn.*, vol. 3 (Mysore), translations, p. 32.

of the Emmeya (buffalo-keeper's) family of Mālanahalli in Kuṛukki-nāḍ." The authority for altering *kolu* into *kula*, 'family', is not apparent. However, whether reference is made to a family or to some place called Emmeyarakola, we may, I suppose, accept the first member of the compound as the genitive of *emmeyarū* in the sense of 'keepers of female buffaloes'. But what possible value, in the direction in which Mr. Rice would apply it, can attach to this mention of buffalo-keepers near Seringapatam in A.D. 1175?

The so-called "edicts" of Aśōka at Brahmagiri and in its neighbourhood are not administrative orders, indicative of sovereignty over the locality in which they are: there is not even anything in them to mark them as emanating from a king: they are simply precepts about morality such as any friendly State would readily allow to be published by any of its subjects interested in them. There is no good reason for thinking that the dominions either of the Mauryas or of the Nandas extended into Southern India; except in so far as that Aśōka conquered the Kalinga country on the eastern coast. The facts adduced by me in my article referred to by Mr. Rice make it certain that the present city of Mysore stands on a site which down to at least the eleventh century was occupied by a mere village incapable of furnishing an appellation for the entire territory in which it lay or even for any appreciable part thereof, and that no such name as Mahisharāshṭra or Mahishamaṇḍala can have been used to denote the province of Mysore or any portion of it before at least the seventeenth century. And it is tolerably plain that, even if the Erunai-nāḍu of Māmūlanār may be located anywhere outside the Tamil country, it was some small district, in or bordering on the extreme south of Mysore, which, again, cannot have furnished an appellation for the whole province or any appreciable part of it. The identification of Mahishamaṇḍala with Mysore has nothing at the bottom of it, except the point

that the first part of the vernacular name, Maysūr, Maisūr, Mayisūr, of a village which began to rise to importance about A.D. 1500 and eventually became the name-giver to the province, lent itself naturally in that period to be represented in Sanskrit by *mahisha* as giving the nearest approach to it in sound, and was thought by archæologists of the last century to have been actually derived from that word.

J. F. FLEET.

“GENITIVE-ACCUSATIVE” IN MARATHI

Dr. Lesný (pp. 179-82 of the Journal for January) appears to raise three objections to my criticism on his first note : (1) that my derivations are doubtful, (2) that he meant by genitive that case which Marāṭhī grammarians call dative or accusative, and (3) that he is correct in maintaining what he had said in his first note about the use of animate and inanimate objects of a transitive verb. And he sums up by informing me that Marāṭhī prose of to-day differs from Marāṭhī poetry of the thirteenth century. Will you allow me to offer my final remarks on the subject ?

1. My derivations were only suggestions, and I do not see how the enumeration of the names of the “leading authorities” who do not agree in those derivations can disallow other derivations. To prove the existence of a genitive construction, we must examine the Marāṭhī literature of all periods—from the thirteenth century onwards—and I think if Dr. Lesný studies it more critically he will find no justification for the assumption of such a construction as far as Marāṭhī proper is concerned. Confusion between old genitive and modern dative or accusative is likely to be found, if at all it existed, in the oldest Marāṭhī literature, and it is for this that I quoted from **ज्ञानेश्वरी**. As far as the meaning is

concerned, such a confusion exists no more in old than in modern Marāṭhī, because accusative or dative forms are used in old Marāṭhī precisely as they would be used to-day, and the terminations **ला** and **ते** are as common as the termination **स**. As regards the form, its connexion with the Sanskrit genitive is doubtful, and even if it be admitted the confusion must have taken place before the language could be called Marāṭhī. Dnyānēśvari is written in **अोवी** metre, which is hardly different from prose, in so far as the structure of the sentence is concerned.

2. The so-called genitive is formed by one of the terminations **स**, **ला**, **ते**, and is called by native and European grammarians dative or accusative according to the relation actually expressed by it in the sentence. From this point of view, Dr. Lesný's nomenclature was not clear to me, and the same impression was produced on some other readers. But after Dr. Lesný's explanation as to what he means by genitive, I have no further comments to make regarding this point.

3. Dr. Lesný's statement in his first note was that a transitive verb "governs the accusative case, when the object is a thing, . . . but . . . genitive, when the object is a *human or other living being*". The rule now quoted is: "when . . . a person is the object . . . it is *always* put in the dative case . . . but when . . . an irrational animal [is the object], it is *optionally* put either *in the accusative or dative case*. In all other notions the accusative case is *generally* used." These two statements are not the same. The first is more inaccurate than the second. Dr. Lesný in his first note had classified all living beings into one group, and all inanimate things in another group, and had assigned the inflected case to the former and uninflected accusative to the latter. Such a classification is not correct. But even the rule quoted in the second note from Bhide's Primer is not quite accurate. To make it

accurate we must substitute "generally" in the place of "always"; otherwise the examples given by me in my last note (such as पोर घेऊन, मूलजापाज, etc.), though quite correct and common in the prose of to-day, will not be covered by the rule given by Bhide.

I am well aware of the difference between prose and poetry and between old and modern Marāṭhī. If Dr. Lesný desires to make a more critical study of the Marāṭhī construction, it would be advisable for him to compare old prose as is found in books like the मराठ्यांच्या इतिहासांचो साधनें, ज्ञानेश्वरी, एकनाथी भागवत, etc., with the standard Marāṭhī of to-day in works like the निबंधमाला of Chiplokhar and other modern writers.

T. K. LADDU.

CAMBRIDGE.

January 25, 1911.

THE GENITIVE-ACCUSATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN MARATHI

Dr. Lesný's remarks on this subject, both in his first note in JRAS., 1910, p. 481, and in his reply to Mr. Laddu in JRAS., 1911, p. 179, call for one or two remarks.

1. Dr. Lesný has used the term "genitive" for the Marathi inflexion in **०स** on the strength of the origin of the termination. But there is no evidence that I know of to show that the termination in question ever bore a genitive signification in any period of Marathi. For the purposes of Dr. Lesný's argument we must consider the inflexion in the signification which it bears, and has always borne, in the minds of persons who use Marathi as a mother tongue.

2. It is true that the poetical language of all nations differs from the prose language. But in Marathi we have no early prose, and the old poetical grammatical forms which have been perpetuated to some extent in modern verse probably represent fairly accurately the spoken language of the early Mogul period.

3. Dr. Lesný justifies his use of the expression "genitive-accusative" on the ground that the termination is derived originally from the Sanskrit genitive. But this is only one out of the many dative terminations in Marathi, all of which are or have been used in the objective sense, e.g. *mod.* °ला and °ना, *old* °ते, °सी (the earlier form of °स), and the crude form in the long vowel, and *coll.* °सनि. I suppose none of these forms except °सी can be referred to Sanskrit or Prakrit genitives.

That the advantage of what I (obstinately) prefer to call the dative-accusative or dative-objective in Marathi is to prevent ambiguity is undoubtedly true, as all who have been compelled habitually to use that elaborate and difficult language know by experience. And as a matter of fact in the modern colloquial language, wherever it is possible to use the accusative of a noun (not of a pronoun) without danger of ambiguity, the latter is preferred. For instance, त्याला इकडे पाठवा, "send him here," but कुलकर्णी इकडे पाठवा, "send the accountant here," in which latter case the dative would have been the literary form. As regards the origin of the use, there seems some reason to suppose that the crude form in the long vowel, e.g. पुरवा, वधू, पृथ्वी, which, as I have said above, is normally used both as the dative-objective and as the true dative in poetry, was originally not a dative but an objective, and when it dropped out of use its place was naturally taken by the dative, which had always been somewhat interchangeable with it, and which in all languages is nearer in sense to the objective than the genitive is.

L. J. SEDGWICK.

POONA.

March, 1911.

[This discussion is now closed.]

THE DALAI LAMA'S SEAL

In the January number of the Journal (p. 204) I had occasion to suggest a different reading of the legend on

this seal from the version published by the Rev. A. H. Francke in a previous issue (1910, p. 1206). That new reading, I regret to observe from his note at p. 528 of the current issue, is not acceptable to Mr. Francke, who nevertheless adduces no conclusive arguments against it.

In Mr. Francke's opinion, two out of the three characters in question are "without any meaning". Such an assumption, however, seems to me to be *a priori* improbable, for these characters form one-fifth of the entire inscription, which is in an imperfectly known variety of Indo-Tibetan script, and the Tibetans are not in the habit of introducing meaningless elements into their practical documents, least of all into their personal seals, which on the contrary I have found to contain, as a rule, contracted and concentrated sentences. Indeed, I shall show here conclusively that one at least of these two represents the recognized form of one of the commonest words current in Tibet, although unrecognized as such by Mr. Francke.

As my fresh reading was based mainly upon two characters omitted by Mr. Francke, and on a different interpretation of a third which is almost illegible, it is desirable in the interests of accuracy to re-examine these three characters.

The initial character omitted by Mr. Francke in his translation is unmistakably *Om*. Mr. Francke defends his omission of it on the assumption that it is merely a "snake ornament", and therefore untranslatable. Such a view, however, is altogether indefensible. In Indian epigraphy the character in question represents the commonest form of *Om*, and its Tibetan form is absolutely identical with that found in the inscriptions and manuscripts of mediaeval India from which the Tibetan form of script is derived. This character is invariably translated as *Om* by the best scholars (see Dr. Fleet's *Corpus Inscript. Indicarum*, iii, pp. 198,

204, *et passim*). I found, in Tibet also, that the more literate lamas recognized it as *Oñ*, and usually pronounced the initial one accordingly.¹ Owing, however, to its extravagant reduplication in later times as a *Mañgala* or auspicious sign, in accordance with Brahmanical precedent, its subsequent repetition in the texts is disregarded by readers: and in my translation of the Lhasa edicts I likewise disregarded it, as it did not affect the historical sense of those documents, though strictly, it should have been expressed therein. In noticing this symbol Professor Bühler wrote:² "Since the fifth century we find also new symbols consisting of highly ornamental forms of the ancient *O* of the word *Oñ*, which latter is a great *Mañgala*. They are used both at the beginning and at the end of inscriptions, and occasionally even on the margin of copper-plates." This symbol, then, is clearly and indisputably *Oñ*.

The second element in question is defaced and doubtfully legible in all the available impressions and facsimiles of the seal inscription. In my note (p. 205) I stated my reasons for the alternative reading therein suggested, and I shall be very pleased to accept a more likely reading if one is forthcoming.

The third element which Mr. Francke considers to be "without any meaning" appeared to me, for the reasons already noted (p. 205), to represent *va*. This would form with the preceding stem the word *rgyal-va* as the concluding word on the seal, and this word would be peculiarly appropriate as it is the ordinary and commonest of all the titles of the Dalai Lama, whose seal it is. This interpretation I felt inclined to give to it notwithstanding that its position in the sentence was obviously

¹ At p. 529 Mr. Francke writes: "I have never heard a Tibetan say *oñ* when he saw this sign in the text he was reading."

² *Indische Paleographie*, 1896, p. 85; also English edition of Dr. Fleet in *Indian Antiquary*, 1904, p. 90.

not in the strict syntactical order of the Tibetan idiom, as I had found that ordinary personal seals exhibit some laxity in such respects. I am not alone in so reading it. Dr. Bushell, to whom belongs the credit of having first published the reading of this seal—a fact overlooked by Mr. Francke¹—has independently read it as I have done.² It is not impossible that, as is conjectured by Mr. Francke, it may be a symbol “used to fill up empty spaces at the beginning or end of a column”; but this use for it remains to be proved. There is some presumption that it is so used in the Bhotanese seal in the same script which Mr. Francke has published in the ZDMG., lxiv, p. 553, and of which he has courteously sent me a copy. Bhotanese manuscripts, however, I have found generally corrupt and not quite trustworthy or authoritative.

As conclusive light on this question is doubtless to be gained at Darjiling, where the Dalai Lama is at present in exile, I have now written to an official connected with the staff of that dignitary to elicit, if possible, the points in respect to the latter two symbols which still remain doubtful. But in regard to the identity of *Oṃ* there can be no question whatever.

L. A. WADDELL.

ORIENTAL NUMISMATICS

The medal of the Royal Numismatic Society has this year been presented to Dr. Oliver Codrington in recognition of his long and important services to Oriental Numismatics. Many articles have been published by him in our Journal, that of the Bombay Branch, and in the *Numismatic Chronicle*. His *Manual of Musalman Numismatics* is widely known.

¹ JRAS., 1910, p. 1205.

² JRAS., 1906, p. 478.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

THE QUATRAINS OF ABŪ SA'ID S. ABU KHAIR. Edited from a beautiful MS. belonging to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, by MAULAVI ABDUL WĀLĪ (JASB. for 1909).

The Maulavī has done well to publish these quatrains, for some of them are beautiful, and the whole series of 228 tetrastiches is interesting on account of the author's having been one of the earliest mystic poets of Persia. As remarked by Dr. Ethé,¹ Abū Sa'id, whose proper name was Fazl Ullah, is the first Oriental who devoted his powers to the service of a mystical pantheism, and may justly be regarded as the real founder of the Persian quatrain. For though Rudagī and others used the measure, Abū Sa'id was the first to develop it and make it the exclusive vehicle of a poet's thoughts. He was born at Maihana, which seems to be the Miania of Johnston's map, a village in the district of Dasht Khāwarān, in the north-east corner of Persia. It apparently was not far from Nādir Shah's birthplace, or from his famous fortress, and was situated among the mountains. It is stated by Rieu that Mahna, i.e. Maihana, was also the birthplace of the poet Anwarī, who was about a century later than Abū Sa'id. Abū Sa'id's birth took place in December, 967 A.D., and he died in January, 1049. He was educated and spent several years at Merv and Sarakhs, and also visited Nishāpūr, Mashhad, and Āmul, but he spent thirty² years in seclusion at his native village, during which time he is

¹ He is noticed by Chardin, and described as the founder of Şūfiism (vol. v, p. 155, of 1723 ed.). At p. 15 of the same volume Chardin seems to refer to Umar Khayyām. He calls him Omarel Ssufi, and says he was a gnomonic writer.

² The *Asrār* says seven years.

said to have done nothing but repeat the words "Allah, Allah", night and day, until the very walls repeated the sacred name. And it was at Maihana that he ended¹ his long life. He was a precursor of Umar Khayyām, who was probably his junior by half a century, but if Umar was, as Mr. Pickering supposes, of the school of Abū Sa'īd, he was one whom his teacher would have abhorred. Had they been contemporaries, Abū Sa'īd would probably have denounced him even more than he did Avicenna. For there is no evidence that Abū Sa'īd had any tincture of science, or that he had any sympathy with Umar Khayyām's spirit of revolt and infidelity. On the contrary, he was, and still is, regarded as a saint, and some of his verses are employed as charms for the cure of diseases, e.g. No. 198 = 45 of *Ethé*. See also Rieu's *Cat.*, ii, 826^b, No. iv. It was on account of his sanctity that Farīdu-d-dīn 'Attār included him in the following century in his *Biographies of Saints*. No such place does he assign to that "large infidel" Umar Khayyām. Abū Sa'īd really was a Ṣūfī in temperament and in mode of life, though from two quatrains, slightly varying in form, which appear in the British Museum MS. Add. 7822, and also from No. 72 of the collection under review, it seems that he did not always regard himself as belonging to that order.

"The Sultan says, 'Mine is the full treasury,'
The Ṣūfī, 'Mine is the woollen garment,'
The Lover, 'Mine is the hidden wound,'
I and my soul know what is mine."

In reply, however, to some one who asked him what was the essence of Ṣūfism, he said, "Suppress all that is in the brain (all desires), give all that is in thy hands, start² not at whatever befalls thee." To another who asked him where he could find God, he replied, "Where

¹ *Asrār*, pp. 443 et seq.

² The word is *najāhī*, نَجَى. The *Asrār*, p. 373, of Zhukovsky's ed., has *naranjī*, نَرْجَى, "do not grieve," but there is the variant *najāhī*.

have you sought Him that you could not find Him? If you had taken one honest step in search, you would have seen Him in everything that you beheld" (*Tuz̄kirātu-l-Auliyā*).

Though at one time the Musalman commonalty had doubts about his orthodoxy, and the women pelted him with filth, all Abū Sa'īd's biographers say that he was an ascetic and a deeply religious man. But his overstrained pietism could not fail to produce a reaction, and so he was succeeded by Umar Khayyām, who bears the same relation to Abū Sa'īd that the author of Ecclesiastes does to the Psalmists. It is possible that as a young man Abū Sa'īd may have felt, like Martin Luther, the joys of Wein, Weib, und Gesang, and one or two of his quatrains may be evidence of this, but there is no sign of blasphemy in his verses. In one, addressed apparently to a girl of Ṭarāz, a lost city of Turkestan, famous, like Arles, for the beauty of its women, he says—

“Lamp of Ṭarāz, since I saw thy face
I do no penances, I fast not, I pray not.
While with thee, all profanity (*majāz*) is prayer;
While without thee, all prayer is profanity.”

It seems possible that the expression *shamū'-i-tarāz* does not mean “Lamp of Ṭarāz”, but “Lamp of Beauty” or “Ornament of the Lamp”. It may also refer to some saint of Ṭarāz, and not to a girl. Certainly, the quatrain has a mystical air, and this view is corroborated by the circumstances under which, according to Jāmī, it was uttered. For he represents it as having been spoken by Abū Sa'īd on his death-bed, after he had recited a religious quatrain of which the first line was “In the path of Oneness (*īyānūgī*) there is neither Faith nor Infidelity”, and also after he had recited and expounded the quatrain which he wished to be pronounced over his bier. The word *kār* in the second line of the “Lamp of Ṭarāz” quatrain seems to have the technical meaning

of ascetic exercises, such as holding the head downwards, scourging oneself, etc. See the *Tuzkirātu-l-Auliya*, ii, 324 and 328, Nicholson's edition. But it is also used in the sense of "deeds, not words" in the quatrain for his funeral, as his explanation of his meaning. in Jāmi's work, shows.

In another quatrain Abū Sa'id taunts the Hindu with his worship of the cow. He tells him that, if his eye cannot see God, it would be better for him to worship a maiden of 14, who in her beauty resembles the moon of the fourteenth day of the month (the full moon). Sun-worship, he says, is better than worship of the cow-stall. There are also some quatrains in praise of wine, but probably these are to be understood in a mystical sense.

I subjoin some prose translations of the quatrains.

No. 1 of A. Wāli, 65 of Ethé.

"The world to Jamshed, the Sultan, and the Great Khān,
To angels Glory, and to Heaven's gatekeeper Purity,
Hell to the Bad, Paradise to the Good,
To me my Love, and my soul to my Beloved."

No. 7.

"In the ka'aba, if your thoughts are astray
Your devotion is false and the ka'aba a church;
Be your heart with God and be you in a pagoda,
Rejoice, for 'twill be well with you at the last."

No. 36, 5 of Ethé.

"The *ghāzī* strives after martyrdom,
Oblivious that Love's martyr is greater than he:
How will they appear on the Resurrection-morn,
The one slain by his foe, the other by his friend?"

No. 64, 50 of Ethé.

"O God, send life's nourishment to all living things;
Send divers favours from the table of Thy bounty;
Send from the cloud-nurses the milk of rain
For the parched lips of the daughters of the fields (the plants)."

No. 98.

“ Sometimes they call me a bead-telling ascetic,
 Sometimes they call me a reprobate and a tavern-haunter;
 O woe for my hidden nature
 Should they call me what I really am!”

With this No. 19 of Ethé may be compared.

No. 109.

“ O God, leave nought in my heart but Thee;
 Leave no dust of desire in my eyes.
 I said again and again, no good work comes from me;
 Mercy, mercy bestow upon me.”

No. 120, 36 of Ethé.

“ My sins were in number more than raindrops,
 And from shame I had cast down my head.
 A voice came saying, ‘Peace, dervish,
 Do thou thy part, We do ours.’”

In the third line A. Wāli has *shādbāsh*, “rejoice,” but Ethé has *suhl*, and this agrees with the British Museum MS. and seems preferable.

Quatrain No. 49 of Ethé is a fine one and is not in the Maulavi's collection—

“ Till the soul be freed from earthly bonds
 The pearl may not enter our being's shell;
 The head's cup of desire cannot be filled,
 For never may an inverted cup become full.”

The last line is a conceit based on the resemblance between the cranium and a cup set upside down. I should never have understood the allusion had I not remembered an interview I had nearly fifty years ago with a Mufti or Muhammedan law-officer who was retiring from the world. Discoursing on the vanity of human wishes he said, pointing to the crown of his head, “The head is an inverted cup, and so can never be filled or satisfied.” The last two lines of the quatrain occur in Umar Khayyām's quatrain No. 179, p. 120 of Whinfield's translation, 2nd edition. But if Umar really stole them, and the

lines be not a copyist's interpolation, he has marred them in the stealing, like as Campbell is said to have done with Blair's line about angels' visits. For instead of *hawās*, desire, Umar's quatrain has in the third line the somewhat inept word *sandā*, melancholy, or madness.

The following quatrain, No. 57 of Ethé, is not in Abdul Wālī's collection :—

“ Possible to flush the cheek of a saint (*shāh*) with wine :
Possible to sound the Armenian's gong in the ka'aba :
Possible to import true religion (Islām) from Europe :
But not possible wholly to comprehend Thee.”

In the second line Dr. Ethé follows his MSS. by reading *ba qawm*, “ with a crowd,” and this has been taken by Mr. Pickering to be an allusion to the small dimensions of the ka'aba. But the reading in the British Museum MS. is *nāqūs*, that is, the wooden gong still used in Eastern churches, and this makes a much better sense.

No. 197, 45 of Ethé, beginning

“ O Thou, in presence of whose Attributes
High and low are bewildered”,

is remarkable because used as a charm when there is an attack of fever. See *Khuzīna Asfīyā*, ii, 229, and the *Safīnan-l-Auliyā* under the article Abū *Khair*.

Quatrain No. 122, beginning

“ I cast fire with my own hands into my granary”,

was, as Badayūnī (Lowe, ii, 260) tells us, often quoted by Abūl Fazl, and is to be found in the second book of the *Akbarnāma* and in the *Āin-i-Akbarī*. No. 169, beginning “ I have not the good fortune to commune with the friend”, is also quoted by Abūl Fazl, *Akbarnāma*, ii, 388.

The merit of introducing the quatrains of Abu Sa'īd to the Western world belongs to Dr. Ethé, who, in two valuable papers¹ read before the Bavarian Academy in

¹ See also Dr. Ethé's article on “ The Mystic and Didactic Poetry of Persia ” in Geiger & Kuhn's *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, vol. ii, p. 273.

1875 and 1878, gave an account of the poet, taken chiefly from the *Haft Iqlīm*, and quoted ninety-two quatrains, furnishing at the same time metrical translations. These papers were the foundation of Mr. Pickering's article in the *National Review* for March, 1891. Maulavī 'Abdul Wālī is not the first person to publish the quatrains in the East, for it appears from Dr. Ethé's article in Geiger and Kuhn's *Grundriss*, p. 275, that a series of *ganz eigenartig* (characteristic) quatrains of Abū Sa'īd was published at Tehran in lithograph in 1277 A.H. (1860-1). This publication I have not seen. Maulavī 'Abdul Wālī proposes to publish hereafter a prose translation of the quatrains along with notes and a biography. I hope that he will soon be able to do this. When doing so he will doubtless collate the MSS. of the quatrains even more than he has already done, and will add to their number. He should also omit No. 94, for it is not by Abu Sa'īd, but by his teacher Abū-l-Qāsim Gurgānī, that is, of the district of Jūrjān (*Tuzkirātu-l-Auliyā*, Nicholson's edition, ii, 323).

In 1899 Professor Zhukovski published at St. Petersburg two volumes dealing with Abū Sa'īd's life. The first volume consists of a lengthy biography called the *Asrār-ī-Tauhīd fī Maqāmāt al-Shaiikh Abī Sa'īd*, written by a descendant of the poet named Muḥammad b. al-Manawwar al-Maihānī, and of a short commentary by another writer on one of Abū Sa'īd's quatrains. The second volume contains a shorter biography of Abū Sa'īd, and is entitled *Hālāt u Sakhmān S. Abū Sa'īd Faḍl Ullah*. It is based on a MS. in the British Museum, Or. 249. Unfortunately for me, though the texts are in Persian, the introduction and notes are in Russian. The *Asrār* consists of nearly 500 pages, and I cannot say that I have read the whole of it or of the *Hālāt*. As far as I have gone, however, the two volumes, which seem to have been most carefully edited by Professor Zhukovski,

are, I think, tedious and wanting in interest. Probably the cream of them has been given by Farīdu-d-dīn 'Aṭṭār in his *Taẓkirātu-l-Auliyyā*. They do not say much about Abū Sa'īd's poetry, though a few quatrains of no greater importance are quoted at p. 428 of vol. i. At p. 251¹ there is an interesting account of an interview between Avicenna and Abū Sa'īd at Nishāpūr. They discussed together in private for three days and three nights. At the end each was asked by his disciples what he thought of the other. Avicenna said, "Whatever I know he sees"; and Abū Sa'īd said, "Whatever we see he knows." It is added that Avicenna became a disciple of the saint, and witnessed his miracles. We are told in the *Asrār* that Abū Sa'īd's father was called Bābū (said to be a title for a wandering monk) Bū-al-Khair, and that he was a druggist by trade. He was in the habit of attending a weekly service in Maihana where a number of dervishes met, and listened to or took part in hymns and then spent the rest of the night in dancing. On one occasion Abū Sa'īd's mother begged her husband to take their son to the meeting so that the glance of the dervishes might fall upon him. He did so, and the child heard the preacher read a mystical hymn in praise of the religious life, which was rapturously received by his auditors. When he came home Abū Sa'īd asked his father what was the meaning of the hymn, but he was curtly told that the understanding of it was a matter with which he had nothing to do. It was after the deaths of his father and mother that Abū Sa'īd went out into the wilderness for seven years. At one time, according to Abū Sa'īd's own account, he was greatly revered by the countryside, the husks of his gourds were sold for twenty *dīnārs*, and the droppings of his camel were gathered by some of his followers and rubbed on their faces and bodies. But there came

¹ The story is also told in the *Ḥālāt*, p. 68, and at p. 65 *ibid.* there is given a letter of Abu Sa'īd's to Avicenna.

a reaction. He was accused of heresy, and the failure of the crops was ascribed to his malign influence. When he was praying in the mosque, the women would get on the roof and throw filth on him.

When he was on his death-bed his followers asked him what verse should be recited over his bier. He recited in reply—

“*Khūbtar andan jahān azīn ch būd kār*
Dost bar-i-dost raft u yār bar yār
Ān hama andūh būd, u īn hama shādī
Ān hama guftār būd u īn hama kardār.”

“What within the universe can be better than this?

The friend has gone to the friend's bosom, the lover to the loved.

All *that* was sorrow, all *this* is joy;

All *that* was talk, all *this* is act.”

The above is taken from the *Asrār*, p. 445. The quatrain is given, with some variations, in the *Nafahātu-l-Uns* and the *Şafīnu-l-Auliyā*.

The *Asrār* was dedicated to Ghīāşu-d-dīn b. Sām, who is interesting to Anglo-Indians as being the brother and supporter of Shihābu-d-dīn, the Ghoride prince who conquered India. It seems probable that the book was not written till 1180, or even later, for in the dedication Ghīāşu-d-dīn is styled Abu-l-Fath, a title which, according to D'Herbelot, he obtained on account of his victories, the most of which occurred after he had been twenty years on the throne. If this be so, Professor Zhukovski may be wrong in supposing that Farīdu-d-dīn 'Attār borrowed from the *Asrār*. Under any circumstances Farīdu-d-dīn had little need to borrow from the author of the *Asrār*. He was born near Nishāpūr in 513 A.H. = 1119-20, and was probably the older man of the two. One at least of his stories, namely, that about Abū Sa'īd and the hot loaf, I do not find either in the *Asrār* or the *Hālāt*. Professor Browne notices that the *Asrār* refers to the death of Sultan Sanjar, which shows that the book was written

not earlier than 552 A.H. or 1557. for that is the date of Sultan Sanjar's death. The inference might be carried still further, for at p. 451 of the *Asrār* mention is made not only of Sultan Sanjar's death, but also of two defeats sustained by his nephew and successor, Sultan Maḥmūd.

The preface of the author of the *Asrār* is interesting on account of its pathetic description of the sufferings of the inhabitants of North-Eastern Persia at the hands of the Ghazz or Turkamāns. It states that in Maihana alone 115 of the descendants and other relatives of Abū Sa'id suffered martyrdom. At p. 119 a story is told to illustrate the dislike of bigoted Moḥammedans to Abū Sa'id, and to show how victoriously he overcame their prejudices. He was then in Nishāpūr, and there was an Imām there who was always abusing and cursing Abū Sa'id as a heretic. Nevertheless Abū Sa'id resolved to visit him, and having ordered his horse he sent a messenger to let the Imām know he was coming. The latter replied that Abū Sa'id had nothing to do with him, and bade the messenger tell him that he should visit instead the Christians' church, as that was his proper place. The day happened to be Sunday, and so Abū Sa'id took him at his word and went to the church. The Christians (*Tursiān*) were all assembled there, and marvelled at his presence. Inside the church were the figures of the Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ, and the congregation was worshipping them. Abū Sa'id cried out, "You say that you and your Mother are Divine; if Muḥammad and his religion are true, fall down at once and worship God." Immediately the figures fell to the ground with their faces pointing towards the ka'aba. The result was that forty Christians tore off their girdles (*zinnār*) and became Moḥammedans, and that the Imām begged Abū Sa'id's forgiveness.¹ Though, as I have said,

¹ This story is also told, with some unimportant variations, by Faridu-d-dīn 'Attār; see Nicholson's edition, ii, 333.

the *Asrār* is not generally interesting, the account of Abū Sa'īd's last illness and death (pp. 443 seq.) has its charm. After his last appearance in the pulpit he bade them saddle his horse, and then he mounted and went round his native village and took leave of every spot and every tree in it, especially of every place where he had prayed or sate in retirement. Doubtless, like St. Columba in Iona, he took leave of his horse also, and gave his blessing to the villagers and their fields.

Professor Zhukovski's book was reviewed by Professor Browne in our Journal for 1900, p. 352. The same scholar has also given a notice of Abū Sa'īd, and metrical translations of some of his quatrains in the second volume of his *Literary History of Persia*. There is also an interesting article on Abū Sa'īd by my friend Mr. Whinfield in the *Calcutta Review* of April, 1896.

Until the appearance of Zhukovski's volumes the fullest account of Abū Sa'īd in Persian was that in the *Tuzkīrātu-l-Auliya*, ii, 322, of Farīdu-d-dīn, who was a druggist, just as Abū Sa'īd's father was. There is also a sympathetic notice of Abū Sa'īd in Prince Dārā Shikoh's *Ṣafīna*. There is a somewhat lengthy account of Abū Sa'īd in the *Nafahātu-l-Uns*, p. 192, of Newal Kishore's edition, and there is a reference to the saint at p. 189 of the same volume.

The commentary on one of Abū Sa'īd's quatrains at the end of vol. i has the merit of brevity. The quatrain begins with—

“The Hūrīs formed line to behold my Darling,
Heaven's gatekeeper smote his palms in surprise.”

Or, in Mr. Whinfield's translation—

“The Hūrīs stood in ranks my Love to see,
And Rizwān clapped his hands in ecstasy.”

And it is said to be used as a charm in case of deadly sickness.

The commentator says he was much puzzled to understand the appropriateness of the verse, but that at last he understood it as follows. A truly pious person, he says, is delighted to die, because then there will be no longer a bar to union with the Beloved (God). This quatrain dwells on the happiness of such an union, and so pleases and exalts the apparently dying man. Joy, say the physicians, relaxes the tension of the bodily elements and produces sleep, and so is a means of restoring the patient to health, or, at least, of lessening his sufferings.

But the commentary is surely an instance of misplaced ingenuity, for it seems very doubtful if the quatrain is a mystical utterance. Jāmī, himself a poet and a mystic, gives in the *Naḥḥātu - l - Uns* a much more natural explanation of the quatrain, and of the reason why it should be regarded as a charm for the removal of sickness. He says (p. 195 of Newal Kishore's lithographed edition, Cawnpore, 1893) that the saint's reader, Abū Ṣāliḥ, fell ill. Probably he was a youth, such as the neophyte to whom the Venerable Bede was dictating the last verse of his translation when on his death-bed. Naturally, the aged saint—he was 1,000 months old, that is, he was 83 years 4 months old when he died—was much grieved at his disciple's illness. So he called to Khwāja Abū Bakr, his children's tutor, for paper, pen, and ink, in order that he might dictate something for the benefit of Abū Ṣāliḥ. He then recited the quatrain in question, and the Khwāja having written it out, it was taken to Abū Ṣāliḥ's bedside and laid upon his face. On the same day he recovered and went out. I cannot believe that what Abū Sa'īd dictated at such a solemn moment was a frigid piece of mysticism. I would therefore translate the last two lines of the quatrain thus :—

“ A dark mole threw a veil over his countenance,
The ascetics (*abdāl*) in alarm took into their hands (*chang*)
the Holy Book.”

The word *khāl*, a mole, may also mean a veil, and the word in the fourth line is *chang*, "grasp," and not *jang*, "battle," and the meaning is that the *abdāl* or *abdāls* took refuge in the Koran against being dazzled by the young man's beauty. It is quite possible that the young disciple was the "lamp of *Ṭarāz*" of the other quatrain, for the two seem to have been composed about the same time. The idea of a beauty hiding her face lest it should be too dazzling (the "*vultus nimium lubricus aspici*" of Horace) occurs also in quatrain 3 of *Abdul Wāli's* collection—

" Yestreen that Moon combed her tresses,
 She laid a musky curl over her face ;
 By this device she hid her beauteous cheek
 So that no profane person might recognize her."

Presumably the *abdāls* are the men of insight who could perceive the beauty *maugre* the veil, and so were obliged to have recourse to their scriptures for protection. The use of the quatrain as a charm in time of sickness is probably more due to the happy effect it had on *Abū Ṣāliḥ* than to its supposed mystical meaning.

H. BEVERIDGE.

MEDIAEVAL SINHALESE ART. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY, D.Sc., Fellow of University College, London.
 Printed under the care of the author at the Essex House Press, Broad Campden, Gloucestershire, 1908.

This admirable monograph by Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy relates chiefly to the Sinhalese arts and crafts of the eighteenth century, and it may be that exception will be taken to the term "mediaeval" in the title of the volume. The author's reason for adopting it is explained in his "Foreword". Mediaeval conditions, he says, survived in full force in Ceylon until the British occupation of Kandy in 1815, and what he actually describes is the work of

Sinhalese craftsmen under mediaeval conditions, mainly as those conditions survived in the eighteenth century, and, in a lesser degree, even to the present day. Whether the title, however, correctly describes the contents of the volume or not, the latter will be found to be full of substance and variety. Indeed, it would hardly have been possible for the author to treat his subject more thoroughly or comprehensively. His object has been not merely to figure and describe specimens of the work of Sinhalese craftsmen, but to provide his readers with a picture of the environment and conditions in which those craftsmen worked; and he has omitted nothing which could help to make that picture complete. The first chapter of the book summarizes the political history of the Sinhalese, and introduces us to the more important monumental remains of the island. Then follows a well-thought-out dissertation on the social economy of the people in the eighteenth century, to which is added an appendix on education and books. This leads on to an account of the artificers and their guilds, and in the appendices to this chapter Dr. Coomaraswamy deals at length with the teaching of drawing in Ceylon, with the Nētra Maṅgalya ceremony, with the tenant holdings of artificers, with Vihāra grants, and with Viśvakarma. Chapter iv is devoted to an explanation of all the chief elements in Kandyan decorative art, the names used by the craftsmen themselves being given and the majority of the *motifs* freely illustrated. This closes the introductory chapters, and the author proceeds to describe systematically and in detail all the various arts and crafts to be found on the island: architecture; wood- and stone-work; figure sculpture; painting; ivory, bone, horn, and shell-work; metal-work and jewellery; lac-work; earthenware; weaving; embroidery; and dyeing. Finally, he sketches the history of Sinhalese art from its first beginnings down to the present day, gives a lengthy

glossary and index, and closes the volume with fifty-three plates of illustrations beautifully reproduced and carefully described.

The value of such a complete monograph to art students and archaeologists can hardly be over-estimated; it will also prove of great use, as the author has intended it should, to anthropologists and students of sociology and folk-lore. Dr. Coomaraswamy protests that scholarship has not been his aim in writing this work, and that any pretensions to finality are out of the question in such a pioneer effort. No doubt there is much yet to be learnt and much to be written about this particular branch of Indian art: yet, in spite of his modest disclaimers, it is likely to be a very long time before a more solid or, on the whole, more scholarly work is produced in the same field.

That Dr. Coomaraswamy holds extreme views on many questions connected with Indian and Sinhalese art, and on the subject of British administration in the East, is known from his previous writings. Unfortunately, these views rather obtrude themselves again at the beginning of the present volume, and it may be that, after perusing the Foreword, some readers will be disposed to close the volume and lay it aside. May I warn them, therefore, that the body of the work cannot be judged by its introduction? Dr. Coomaraswamy's prejudice against England as the ruling power in Ceylon is not difficult to understand, and may well be forgiven on the score of his patriotism. So, too, may his lack of appreciation of Western art, for which he appears to have little real sympathy. The only pity is that he should feel himself constrained, particularly at the outset of a work of this kind, to give such uncompromising expression to his convictions.

The same prejudice against the West manifests itself in the concluding chapter of his book and its appendix, where he discourses on the origins of Indian art—a subject with

which he is obviously less familiar than with Sinhalese art. In this question he follows the lead given by Mr. Havell, and contends that in its spirit and aims Indian art is fundamentally different from Greek art, and that the influence which the latter exerted on it is an almost negligible factor. Indian art long stood in need of champions against those writers who, wholly misunderstanding its genius and creative power, persisted in judging it by the standards of classical art and in denying to it all independence and individuality. One cannot but feel sorry, however, that in attacking this older school of critics—already, be it said, sufficiently discredited—Dr. Coomaraswamy should go to the opposite extreme. For, by doing so, he undoubtedly weakens a good case and gives a handle to his opponents for justifiable criticism. Let me take, for example, his special pleading in support of the proposition that Gandhāran art played no part in evolving the ideal type of the Buddha. One of his arguments is to the effect that literary evidence proves that images existed in India before the Gandhāra epoch, but that such images were invariably made of some precious metal or of some impermanent material, and have not, consequently, been preserved to us. Dr. Coomaraswamy is unaware, apparently, that there are stone images in the round in India of a date long anterior to the Gandhāra sculptures. These stone images, however, though executed on a grand scale and brought to a high technical finish, have little affinity with the ideal types of post-Gandhāran art, and consequently they militate directly against Dr. Coomaraswamy's theory. That many of the divine types of the Gupta and later ages possess a great dignity and impressiveness is, or ought to be, beyond dispute. But, surely, it is possible to appreciate their beauty to the full without decrying the classic art which helped to pave the way to their creation. If Indian art owed nothing to Hellenistic influence in the invention of these

types, how comes it that there is no trace of such types having existed in India before the advent of that influence? I do not wish to imply that Greek art pointed the way to transcendentalism. That was a peculiar quality of Oriental art, and the Greeks themselves would, no doubt, have ridiculed the idea of suppressing physical beauty in order to express the beauty of the soul. But the conclusion to which all the evidence at present available leads us is, that it was under the influence of Hellenistic iconism that the chief standard types of the Buddha were first evolved, and that it was reserved for Indian artists to infuse those types with their own spiritual conceptions. Of a truth, it was no reproach to Indian art that it was able thus to borrow forms and ideas from the Greeks. On the contrary, it was its particular merit that it had strength enough to convert those forms and ideas so completely to its own purpose without losing its own vitality and character in the process of assimilation.

J. H. MARSHALL.

MICHAEL JAN DE GOEJE. Par C. SNOUCK HURGRONJE.
Traduction française de Madeleine Chauvin; avec
portrait. Leiden: Brill.

The life of a scholar, especially one passed throughout in peaceful labour at the same University, offers little in the way of adventure. It is not, therefore, surprising that Professor Snouck Hurgronje has found it possible to give, in this memoir presented to the Amsterdam Academy, within the compass of seventy-two pages an admirable sketch of the personality and achievements of the late Professor M. J. De Goeje, his predecessor in the Chair of Arabic at Leiden.

De Goeje was born in 1836, the second son of a country clergyman, in the Frisian village of Dronrijp, the native place also of Sir L. Alma Tadema. One of eight children,

his early life was for many years a struggle with insufficient means. His father died in January 1854. Jan, in August of that year, was admitted to the University of Leiden as a student of theology, and on the death of his elder brother Bernard in 1856 the burden of providing for the education of his remaining brothers and sisters devolved to a large extent upon him. In 1856 Jan, finding that he had no vocation for the clerical profession, passed from the faculty of theology to that of literature; and in the same year he commenced the serious study of Arabic with Reinhart Dozy, the celebrated historian of the Mussulmans in Spain, and one of the greatest Arabic scholars of his day. His studies were pursued in concert with W. H. Engelmann (whose early death in 1868 was a great loss to Arabic learning) and our own William Wright (+ May 1889), to whom De Goeje was bound by the most intimate ties of friendship. But of all those whose fellowship he enjoyed the greatest was Theodor Nöldeke, who, already a Doctor, spent the winter from October 1857 to March 1858 in the study of the great Warner Collection of Arabic MSS. at Leiden. From 1858 to his death in May 1909, for more than half a century, De Goeje maintained an active correspondence with Nöldeke: and this memoir owes much to his letters to his brother scholar, who generously permitted the writer to make use of them—carefully preserved as they were almost from the first to the end as a sacred memorial of fraternal affection and intimate interchange of ideas.

De Goeje obtained his Doctor's degree *summâ cum laude* in October 1860. Already, in 1859, he had been appointed *Adjutor Interpretis Legati Warneriani*; in 1866 he was named Extraordinary Professor, and in 1869 he became, on the departure of De Jong for Utrecht, full Professor and *Interpres Legati Warneriani*. In 1877 his title was changed to that of Professor of Arabic, and

he held this post until, in 1906, he retired on attaining the age of 70.

His first original work was his dissertation of 1860, an account of the North-West of Africa (*al-Maghrib*), taken, in text and translation, from al-Ya'qūbī, one of the earliest of Arabic geographical writers. This was determined from the outset one important field of his activity, the study of Arabian geography. His great *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum* (1870-94), in eight stately volumes, includes all the most important works of the third and fourth centuries of the Hijrah on this subject, which, as Nöldeke observes, is "in many respects the most brilliant department of Arabic literature". All of the authors treated were furnished with complete indices and glossaries, and of one (al-Muqaddasī) a second edition appeared in 1906. In addition he produced, in 1866, in collaboration with Dozy, an edition of that part of Idrīsī's great work, named after the Norman king Roger II of Sicily, dealing with Africa and Spain, with text and translation, notes and glossary.

Side by side with geography the kindred study of history occupied him from an early date. In 1863-6 he published his edition of al-Balādhurī, the most important source of information for the early conquests of Islam. This was followed, in 1869-71, by the *Fragmenta Historicorum Arabicorum*, in two volumes. In the following year he began the preparations for the second great enterprise of his life, the monumental edition of the *Annals* of Ṭabarī, which fills thirteen volumes of Arabic text, with two more containing (1) an introduction and glossary, and (2) the indices (1879-1901). In this work he was aided by a number of collaborators, among them his lifelong friend Nöldeke; but nearly one-sixth of the text (1,553 pages out of 10,108) was prepared by himself, and of the whole he had the editorial supervision, while every proof passed under his hand; and to him alone is

due the immense labour of preparing the introduction and glossary (803 pages) and indices (708 pages). To Tabari he added the work of his continuator 'Arib, edited by himself in 1897.

In the field of poetry, he published, in 1875, the *Dīwān* of Muslim ibn al-Walīd, a poet of the second century of the Hijrah; and in 1904 he edited the *Book of Poetry and Poets*, by Ibn Qutaibah.

The work of his life was the production of texts, rather than the exposition and discussion of results in a European language; and in this field he became, and will remain, the Master of all the Arabists of his time. For this there were two reasons: the first and the more important was his conviction of the necessity of establishing, as the foundation of all accurate study, the best possible versions of the original sources. The record of the exploration of Oriental history and literature teems with uncorrected errors, false deductions, hasty and premature generalizations. For these, with the few and imperfect texts available, the writers to whom they are due are not severely to be blamed. But De Goeje felt that before any great edifice could be planned and built it was necessary to supply better material; and to this his activity throughout his life was devoted. For translations, in the great mass of texts to be edited, he had no time. The second reason was (as he once said to the writer of this notice) that, although he wrote fluently in Latin, and was also master of an excellent pedestrian style in English, French, and German, he felt that original composition in his native Dutch appealed to but a small circle of readers. Notes and *comptes rendus* in an alien language were easy to put together; but true literary work could be done only in one's own mother tongue. For this reason he confined himself, in elucidating his texts, to introductions, notes, and glossaries.

One great region of his activity was the full and ready

assistance he gave to others. Of his great master Dozy he edited a number of posthumous works, and was the most important contributor to the *Supplément des Dictionnaires Arabes*. For his deceased friend Wright he completed the *Kāmil of al-Mubarrad* (part xii, critical notes, 1892), and he revised and issued the third edition of the *Arabic Grammar* (1896–8), besides preparing, for the Gibb Trust, a second edition of his *Travels of Ibn Jubair*. But, as Professor Snouck observes, “besides the enormous amount of work for which he was himself responsible, de Goeje had in addition to correct, in the last resort, almost all the critical editions of Arabic works which appeared during his time.” How helpful he has been those only know who have experienced his unfailing kindness and generosity.

His last great enterprise was the planning and starting of the *Encyclopædia of Islam*. To this failing health prevented him from personally contributing, except the article on “Arabia”, vol. i, pp. 367–77; but the lines of the work were laid by him, and he cheerfully undertook the ungrateful task of inviting contributions and corresponding with Governments and Academies.

Professor Snouck gives a list of 272 articles and minor contributions from his hand to journals, Proceedings of learned Societies, encyclopædias, and reviews; and it is probable that even this list is not exhaustive.¹ “These admirable editions of Arabic works, with their apparatus of textual criticism, their indices, their glossaries and introductions; all these memoirs and articles on literary, historical, and geographical subjects; all these essays published on festal occasions, these biographies and reports—speak to us of an inexhaustible ardour for work, of conscientiousness, patience, penetration, of knowledge enlarged from day to day; they speak to us also of

¹ The list contains no mention of the important article on “The Caliphate” in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. v, pp. 23–54.

a goodness of heart, of a modesty, and of a simple straightforwardness which nothing ever impaired."

Honoured and respected by all, surrounded by affection and returning to the full the affection of his friends, his life, simple and strenuous, was beautiful and happy: and the final passages of the memoir give touching and fitting expression to this conclusion in language which, in its restrained pathos and dignity, recalls in some degree the closing sentences of the *Agricola* of Tacitus.

The French translation of Professor Snouek's work is admirably done, and—to a foreigner at least—does not read like a rendering from another language.

C. J. LYALL.

THE SĀHITYADARPAṆA OF VIŚVANĀTHA KAVIRĀJA. The text with an Introduction and English Notes by PANDURANG VAMAN KANE. Bombay, 1910.

This is an edition for the use primarily of the university student in India of Paricchedas I and II and of that part of Pariccheda X of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* which deals with Arthālaṃkāras. Mr. Kane has evidently been at great pains to explain the text, he has consulted with care the Alāṃkāra literature, and he has certainly succeeded in rendering the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* less difficult to follow. This is what he has aimed at, and to criticize his work from the basis of the requirement of a strictly scientific edition would be out of place. But it is to be regretted that a more modern transliteration has not been adopted.

It is Mr. Kane's wish to interest in the study of Sanskrit rhetoric not only the student but also the general reader, but it may be doubted if Viśvanātha's work will achieve this result. It is true that Viśvanātha is by no means destitute of judgment; his definition of poetry as *rasātma*, "consisting of sentiment," is no doubt faulty, but it is decidedly more to the point than Mammaṭa's, preferred by Mr. Kane (p. 15), which defines a Kāvya as *adoṣaru*

śabdārthau saguṇāv analaṃkṛtī punaḥ kvāpi, and Viśvanātha's criticisms on *adoṣau* are both sensible and ingenious. But Viśvanātha's textbook suffers, as do all works on Alaṃkāra, from the author's devotion to system and the inordinate love of subdivision, which insists on a rigid classification, obscuring the essential similarity of the examples classified under sub-heads. A simile is a simile, and as a figure of speech there is not the slightest difference between a simile carried out by the use of particles like *yathā*, *vā*, or *iva*, and one carried out by the use of *tulya* compounded with the object of comparison; and minute subdivisions, like Mammaṭa's sixteen classes of *luptopamā* and nine of *pūrṇopamā*—subdivisions which Viśvanātha does not fully accept—are of no real interest or value. No doubt rhetoricians' rules serve only to aid analysis, but when based on broad considerations they are invaluable as assisting the appreciation of poetry; but the Sanskrit writers on Alaṃkāra have clearly lost all taste for literature in their search for minute distinctions and in their far-fetched analyses of expression. The verses most admired by the rhetoricians seem to us frigid or stupid and their criticisms on them pointless; to take an obvious example, the verse cited by Ānandavardhana as a model of Dhvani (*nyakkāro hy ayaṃ eva me yad arayas tatrāpy asau tāpasah | so 'py atraiva nihanti rīksasakulaṃ jīvaty aho Rāvaṇah | dhig dhik chakra-jitaṃ prabodhitavatā kiṃ kumbhakarṇena vā | svarga-grāmaṭikāviluṭhanarṥthocchūnaiḥ kiṃ etair bhujaiḥ ||*) is a poor and mechanical production, but nothing can be more absurd than the *vidheyāvimarśadoṣa* found in it by the rhetoricians in the position of *ayaṃ* after *nyakkārah*, although *ayaṃ* is subject and not predicate.

In a brief introduction Mr. Kane adduces the evidence¹

¹ The older dating was about 1450 A. D. : see Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 231, n. 244 ; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 434 ; Eggeling, *India Office Catalogue*, p. 337. The uncertainty of the tradition is noted by Oldenberg, *Die Literatur des alten Indien*, p. 205, n. 1.

for the dating of Viśvanātha in the fourteenth century. There exists at Jammu a MS. of 1384 A.D., and Viśvanātha mentions the king Alāvadāna, i.e. the Sultan 'Alāu-d-Din, who was poisoned in 1315 A.D. or rather 1316 A.D. Moreover, Viśvanātha quotes from the *Gītagovindā* of Jayadeva (first half of twelfth century); the *Ūpāyokūsumāñjali* of Udayana, whom Mr. Kane identifies with a pupil of Govardhana, a contemporary of Jayadeva and author of the *Āryāsaptati*, and dates in the first half of the twelfth century A.D.; the *Alaṅkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka (probably after 1150 A.D.),¹ and the *Naiṣadhyācarita* of Śriharṣa (about 1170 A.D.),² while his grandfather, Nārāyaṇa, was a contemporary of Narasiṃha, King of Kalinga. It is true that there were several Narasiṃhas,³ but the total evidence is quite adequate to fix the century of Viśvanātha's work. But the date and identification of Udayana can hardly be correct, for reasons which we have given elsewhere.⁴

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA. Vol. XXXV: AKBAR'S
TOMB, SIKANDRA. Allahabad, 1909.

This is a handsome volume and a valuable record of the building erected by Jahāngīr to his father's memory. The photographs and plans are excellent, and the technical details, of which I am no judge, are full and are, I presume, perfectly correct. The literary part of the work is less satisfactory, and is not so accurate or informing as it should be. This seems partially due to the unfortunate circumstances under which the book has been prepared. Mr. Edmund Smith, the primary author of the report, died

¹ Cf. Bühler, *Kashmir Report*, pp. 51, 68.

² See JBRAS. x, 31 seq. : xi, 279 seq.

³ See Fleet, *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, ii, 493 seq. ; Bhandarkar's note in introduction to K. P. Trivedi's edition of the *Ekāvalī*.

⁴ See JRAS. 1908, pp. 522 seq.

before his manuscript was "little more than a rough preliminary draft", and his successor, Mr. Nicholls, left the department before he could see the proofs through the press.

On p. 2 it is stated that Sher Shah was "succeeded by a son and grandson". But the grandson was a boy of 12, and was almost immediately murdered by his maternal uncle Mubāriz Khān, who took possession of the throne, and became known by the name of 'Adalī. On p. 11 it is stated that one of the tombs at Sikandra is that of a daughter of Jahāngīr. It should have been added that her name was Sultānu-n-Nisā, and that she was Jahāngīr's eldest child and the full sister of the unfortunate Khusrau. She died at Agra in September, 1646 (see JRAS. for 1908, p. 164). Her aunt Shakaru-n-Nisā, who is also buried at Sikandra, lived to a great age and died in Shāh Jahān's reign in 1652. She was the wife of the Badakhshān chief Mirzā Shāhrukh. As regards Aurangzeb's daughter the poetess Zēbu-n-Nisā, referred to in the report, she was buried, according to Beale, near the Kabulī gate of Delhi. In Appendix I, p. 28, an account of Arām Bānū, one of Akbar's daughters, and the full sister of Shakaru-n-Nisā, is given as if it were the writing of Jahāngīr. The passage occurs in Saiyid Ahmad's edition of the *Tūzuk*, but it is not by Jahāngīr, but by a late writer named Muḥammad Hādī, and is verbally copied from the *Iqbāl-nāma*, p. 225. The statement that "she departed (in the same condition) as she had come into the world" simply means that she died unmarried. In writing of Mirzā Sulaimān Shikoh it might have been mentioned that he was a distinguished Urdu poet (see Garçin de Tassy, iii, 172). He died at the age of 82. The translation "descendant of the spiritual guide of the world" is wrong. It is Sulaimān Shikoh who is called murshidzāda-ī-āfāq, i.e. "pupil of the horizons", the allusion being either to his scholarship or to his spiritual

guide. At p. 32 the epithet *Abū-l-Ghāzī* given to Akbar is explained as meaning that he was the father of Jahāngīr. But surely *Abū-l-Ghāzī* merely means one possessed of the dignity of a *Ghāzī*, that is, a *Ghāzī*. When Sultan Husain Baiqara of Herat was styled *Abū-l-Ghāzī Bahādur*, there can have been no reference to his sons, who never did any fighting. Nor could the historian of the Moghuls, *Abū-l-Ghāzī* of Khiva, have got his title from any allusion to his son, who was a mere boy when *Abū-l-Ghāzī* died. The point of the last couplet in *Abdu-l-Haqq's* verses about Akbar is rather lost by the omission to point out that the allusion is to Akbar's title after death, *ʿArsh ʿAshiyānī*, "Nested in Heaven." The word "denizen" is "bird" in the original.

The translation of Jahāngīr's account of Akbar's tomb in Appendix I is stated in a note to p. 7 to be a literal one. But the last words of it. "People called the building after me," are quite wrong. The meaning of the original is simply "They reported to me" (that the cost of the building was so and so). See the *Tūzuk*, p. 73, and Elliot's *History of India*, v, 320. Instead of the coarse translation at p. 33, "Time has the cup in the hand, and the corpse on the back," the rendering should have been "Time hath in his hand the cup, [equivalent to hour-glass] and on his shoulder the bier".

Another instance of mistranslation is on p. 31, where l. 30 is rendered "How well said the eloquent sage [the poet Sa'di], in the jewel of whose wisdom he found a treasure". The correct translation is, "How well said that perfect critic (of life), who gathered a treasure out of the materials of knowledge."

It is satisfactory to learn that Mr. Smith was able to dispose of the myth about the tomb in the crypt of the Bāradāri's having a cross engraved on it. It is almost certain that it is not the tomb of a wife of Akbar, but there does seem to be some evidence that Akbar had

a Christian wife. See p. 324 of the *Tūzūk*, where Jahāngīr states that a daughter of 'Abdu-l-Ḥai, an Armenian, *was in service* in his father's harem, and that Akbar afterwards gave her in marriage to Iskandar the Armenian, by whom she had two sons.

With reference to Jahāngīr's visit to his father's tomb, it might have been noted that he paid another visit to it in the fourteenth year (p. 278 of *Tūzūk*). On this occasion he was accompanied by all his ladies. Apparently the building had been completed by this time, for he speaks of it as being very grand. According to the report, p. 14, Finch visited the tomb about 1611, but according to the *Imperial Gazetteer*, xxii, 363, the visit was paid in 1609.

Father Botelho states that when he saw Sikandra in Shāh Jahān's time there were many portraits in the vestibule, and that among them he recognized the likenesses of the Jesuit fathers who had introduced Christianity during Akbar's reign. See Father Hosten's paper on "The Marsden MSS.," JASB. for 1910, p. 457.

H. B.

THE TAHDĪB AT-TAHDĪB OF IBN HAJAR AL-'ASQALĀNĪ.

Haiderābād (Deccan), 1325-7 A.H. 12 vols.

Through the generosity of Sayyid Ḥusain Bilgrāmī I have before me this monumental work on traditionists, the last volume of which has just issued from the press.

The author explains in the preface that his work is a critical extract from the *Tahdīb* of al-Mizzī, and that he was induced to write this work because he found that ad-Dahabī in his work on traditionists, which also has the title *Tahdīb at-Tahdīb*,¹ had dealt very partially in dealing with the biographies he had selected, and that he intends to treat the subject with impartiality. Then he gives a list of the abbreviations used and the arrangement of

¹ Extracts from this work have been published by A. Fischer, *Biographien von Gewährsmannern des Ibn Ishāq*, Leiden, 1890.

the biographies which follow. This short introduction fills the first seven pages: then the biographies follow in fairly strict alphabetical order, e.g. Aḥmad heads the letter Alif and Muḥammad the letter Mīm. The contents of the twelve volumes are as follows:—

I. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm b. Ḥālid Abū ‘Alī al-Mausili—Tauba Abū Ṣadaqa al-Anṣarī al-Basrī. 961 biographies, 516 pages.

II. Thābit b. al-Aḥnaf—Ḥakīm b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd-Allāh b. Qais b. Maḥrama b. al-Muḥallib al-Quraṣī. 790 biographies, 454 pages.

III. Hammād b. Usāma b. Zaid al-Quraṣī—Sa’wa al-Mahrī, grandfather of Ma’n b. ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Sa’wa. 912 biographies, 488 pages.

IV. Sa’id b. Abān al-Warrāq — Dumaira aḍ-Ḍamrī. 801 biographies, 464 pages.

V. Ṭarīq b. Aṣyam b. Muḥammad al-Aṣḡa’ī—‘Abd-Allāh b. Abī-l-Muḥill al-‘Āmirī. 664 biographies, 391 pages.

VI. ‘Abd-Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abī Ṣaiba Ibrāhīm b. ‘Uthmān b. Ḥuwāstā al-‘Absī—‘Abda b. Abī Lubāba al-Asadī al-Ghāḍirī. 951 biographies, 463 pages.

VII. ‘Ubaid-Allāh b. al-Aḥnas an-Naḥā’ī Abū Mālīk al-Kūfī al-Ḥazzāz—‘Umar Maulā Ghufra b. ‘Abd-Allāh. 852 biographies, 507 pages.

VIII. ‘Amr b. Abān b. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān al-Amawī al-Madanī—Laith b. ‘Āṣim b. al-‘Alā’ b. Mughīth b. al-Ifārīth b. ‘Āmir al-Ḥaulānī al-Ḥaddādī Abū-l-Ḥasan al-Miṣrī. 835 biographies, 470 pages.

IX. The Muḥammadūn. Muḥammad b. Abān b. ‘Imrān b. Ziyād b. Nāsīḥ (or Sālīḥ) as-Sulamī—Muḥammad b. Yūsuf an-Nasā’ī (followed by two M. whose fathers’ names are not known). 888 biographies, 546 pages.

X. Al-Mādī b. Muḥammad b. Mas‘ūd al-Ghāfiqī at-Taimī Abū Mas‘ūd al-Miṣrī—Niyār b. Mukram al-Aslamī. 887 biographies, 494 pages.

XI. Hārīm b. Ibrāhīm al-Ahwāzī Abū Muḥammad al-Baṣrī—Yūnus b. Yūsuf b. Ḥimās b. 'Anr al-Laiṭhī al-Madanī. 871 biographies. 453 pages. With this volume the biographies of the men end.

XII. The Kunā in alphabetical order. pp. 2-284; the Abnā', pp. 284-317; Ibn Aḥī, pp. 317-18; Ibn Umm, p. 318; Nisbahs, pp. 319-62; Mubhamāt, pp. 362-96. *Women* in alphabetical order, pp. 397-492 (first names to p. 458, then Kunā and Mubhamāt to p. 492). Here the work ends. Taqriḏ, pp. 494-7, and the biography of Ibn Ḥaḡar, with a list of his works, pp. 498-504. This volume contains 3,043 notices on 504 pages, and the whole work contains 12,455 notices on 5,750 pages.

The aim of the author is to establish the identity of all traditionists mentioned in the Isnāds of the six canonical works on Muḥammadan tradition, giving in each biography the principal authorities (but not all) of each traditionist, as well as his principal pupils, and wherever possible the date of his death. He also gives short notices concerning their trustworthiness, corrects errors, and, as a special feature of his work, he claims the mention of the names of relatives, who are also known as traditionists.

Ibn Ḥaḡar states in the *Ḥātima*, vol. xii, p. 493, that Ḍahabī completed the composition of his work in 712 A.H. after having worked at it for seven years and eleven months, and that he (Ibn Ḥaḡar) completed his redaction on Wednesday, the 9th of Ġumādā II, 808 A.H.

It will be seen from the scope of this work what valuable service the Ḥaidarābād Society for the Publication of Arabic Works has rendered to Arabic science, and to that of Muḥammadan traditions especially. The paper and execution also are much superior to those of the earlier issues from the same press. I am confident that the publication of this work will be highly appreciated by all students of Arabic, and it is to be hoped that the works issued from the press at Ḥaidarābād will become more

generally known in Europe. We wish the undertaking, which has unlocked already so many treasures lying in Indian libraries, every success for the future.

F. KRENKOW.

W. H. VALENTINE. MODERN COPPER COINS OF THE
MUCHAMMADAN STATES. With 77 plates and 6 maps.
London: Spink & Co., 1911. 10s. 6*d.*

Muhammadian copper coins have not hitherto received the attention which their historical interest deserves: collectors and writers on numismatics, with the notable exception of the late Mr. C. J. Rodgers, have been as scornful of them as was al-Makrizi. It can hardly be denied that they are not so attractive as their intrinsically more valuable contemporaries: they are usually more carelessly struck and in poorer condition, but the chief cause of their neglect has been the want of aids to their study. The object of the present work is to remedy this defect and to encourage the study of Oriental coins by providing a book which will enable a person ignorant of Arabic to obtain all particulars of any specimens he may have. The work contains seventy-seven plates of coins accompanied not only by the transcription, but also by the transliteration and translation of their legends. It is divided into a number of sections, each of which has an historical introduction and a map illustrating the mints. The cost of printing such a work in the ordinary way would have been prohibitive; the example of the Berlin Catalogue of Oriental Coins has therefore been followed and the whole work, text as well as plates, has been lithographed. Thanks to the remarkable neatness with which the author has prepared his manuscript, the result is quite as pleasant to read as a printed book, and there are no printers' errors. The author has spared no

pains to collect coins to illustrate his book; besides the British Museum Collection, numerous private collections have been examined and many rare and interesting coins brought to light.

The title "Modern Muhammadan Coins" gives rather a limited idea of the scope of the work, which begins with the coinage of the Othmanli Murad I, and comes down to the present day. Going from west to east, the author describes in convenient sections all copper coins with legends in the Arabic character, that have been struck from Turkey and Morocco to the borders of China, with the exception of India, which it is proposed to treat of in a separate volume. The series of Othmanli coins is particularly fine and will be found of great value, though the author's rigid adherence to his geographical arrangement rather breaks up the series. The coins of the petty dynasts of South Arabia are mostly published for the first time. The author has collected a remarkable series of the autonomous copper coins of Persia: their types are of special interest; the majority appear to be zodiacal in origin, but some, like the Sword of Ali, are of religious origin, while others, like the bull and stag, may be traced back to Achaemenid times. The Afghan series includes a number of rare coins struck by the Mughal emperors at Kabul. The final section of the work gives a full account of the bilingual and trilingual coins of Chinese Turkestan.

Besides the usual indices the work contains a list of mints, numerous genealogical lists, metrological notes, tables of the Arabic and Georgian alphabets and numerals, and a list of Arabic words occurring on coins with transliteration and translation. The volume is, therefore, much more than a mere catalogue of coins; it forms a most valuable introductory textbook to Muhammadan numismatics and should do much to encourage this study. Mr. Valentine has earned the gratitude of all interested in Oriental coins, and we trust the reception of this work

will be such as to encourage him to proceed with his proposed volume on similar lines on Indian coins.

J. ALLAN.

THE MAṢNAVĪ. By JALĀLU'D-DĪN RŪMĪ. Book II, translated for the first time into English prose by Professor C. E. WILSON, University College, London. 2 vols. Vol. I, Translation; Vol. II, Commentary. Cr. 8vo. Probsthain & Co., 1910.

Students of Persian and students of comparative religion, especially those of the latter who have devoted some attention to that mystical tendency characteristic of the Oriental religious mind, will congratulate themselves on the means for further study which these two volumes of Professor Wilson offer them.

It is indeed strange that as yet no complete translation exists in any European tongue of a book which, as Professor Pizzi in his *Storia della Poesia Persiana* points out, serves as a text for all Oriental mystics from the Ganges to the Bosphorus, and which is certainly, in spite of many obvious defects, not only the masterpiece of the poetical genius of its author, but is one of the noblest and greatest works in Persian literature.

The *Mathnavi* is on the whole not an exceedingly difficult poem so far as translation and superficial understanding is concerned. Its author, Jalālu'd-Dīn-i-Rūmī, writes simply and without linguistic affectation. His individual verses are direct, concise, flowing, and wonderfully expressive. It is the subtlety of his thought, the abstruse allusions, the incoherence of the matter that constitute the real difficulty, as well as the fact that he presupposes that the reader has already made considerable advance along the Ṣūfī path.

Though there is no complete version, there have, however, been various attempts at translating portions. The

magnificent Song of the Reed, as Palmer calls the introduction to the *Mathnavi*, has always attracted and defied the skill of versifiers. Rosen and Redhouse and Whinfield have made the most sustained efforts as yet; the first two in verse (Redhouse translates Book I only) and the last in an abridgment of the complete work in prose. Professor Wilson in his preface suggests that a translation of the *Mathnavi* should be in prose; and certainly unless the translator himself be a poet, or at least have fully mastered the technique of English versification, that is the better course to follow. His regret that Redhouse did not translate into prose is quite justifiable, for that translation is neither poetry nor good verse. Yet it should not be impossible poetically to render the *Mathnavi*. Rosen's German translation is good; and both Professor Browne and Professor Nicholson have shown how excellently in English verse Persian verse not less abstruse and mystical than that of the *Mathnavi* may be given.

Professor Wilson's translation is in prose. He has given an excellent literal and accurate rendering. His aim has been to set forth the meaning pure and simply without any pretension to style. Persian scholars will recognize how well he has succeeded in doing so. This desire, however, has led to some inconsequential slips: to mention two, the words (vol. i, p. 184) "*thick stone*", سنگی سخت, and (p. 256) "*Look reiteratedly at this celestial sphere*", اندرین کردن مکرر کن نظر, grate rather on the English ear, when "heavy" and "repeatedly" or simply "again and again" would have served as well.

The texts on which the translation is based are those of a Turkish translator and of the Turkish commentator Anqiravî. There are, however, a number of verses found in other texts (they may or may not be interpolations) which would have been worth while incorporating in the translation. The eleven *abyāt* found in some texts

beginning with the words *از محبت*, "through love," do not, I think, merit reduction to three. But a thoroughly critical text of the *Mathnavi* is a desideratum.

Vol. ii of Professor Wilson's work is most important. With infinite labour and diligence he has explained practically every difficulty to be met with in the text. He has pressed into his service Turkish, Persian, Urdu, and Arabic commentaries, and the result is that the darkness of the subtlety and obscurity of the thoughts and allusions of Jalālu'd-Dīn has been lightened as only such a thorough method and laborious work could lighten it. The commentary takes the form of notes on difficulties as they occur in each verse. One could have wished that he had confined his explanations to the commentary, but his evident desire that the meaning should not be mistaken has led him to what one must think is an excessive use of parenthetical suggestions and additions in the text itself.

The two books, as already intimated, are not meant for beginners in the study of Sūfism. The *Mathnavi* is no systematic treatise; it was written for those already disciples. Hence, unless one has acquired some knowledge concerning Sūfism elsewhere, much of the excellency of Professor Wilson's work, both of the translation and commentary, will fail of proper recognition. The work is one to be studied, not read merely. Professor Horn well says, with regard to the *Mathnavi* as a whole, "In einem Zuge hintereinander soll es auch nicht gelesen werden, bruchstückweise wird es seine grosse Wirkung auf den Leser nicht verfehlen." Otherwise the reader without the magic of the syllables of the Persian will pay no heed to the warning of Jalālu'd-Dīn himself—

تا نکوئی مرا بسیار کو من ز صد یکت کویم و آن هم چو هو

and miss the "hair". If he do, the blame will not attach to Professor Wilson or his work.

RAPPORTEN VAN DE COMMISSIE IN NEDERLANDSCH-INDIË
VOOR OUDHEIDKUNDIG ONDERZOEK OP JAVA EN
MADOERA, 1908. Albrecht & Co., Batavia; M. Nijhoff,
's Gravenhage, 1910.

This annual report of the Archæological Survey of Java and Madura, issued by the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, is chiefly concerned with the Residency (or administrative area) of Kēdiri, though it also contains supplementary information relating to Madura, Surabaya, and Madiun. It enumerates and describes a large number of antiquities, the most interesting being perhaps the bas-reliefs on a ruined temple at Panataran. The descriptions are supplemented by quotations from the works of earlier authorities who had written on the subject. The Panataran bas-reliefs, of which illustrations are given at the end of the volume, apparently represent scenes from the Rāmāyaṇa, and attest the widespread popularity of the old Indian epic; it has had a considerable influence on Indonesian literature, and various recensions of it exist in Javanese and other Indonesian languages.

A few other objects of antiquarian and artistic interest are illustrated in the plates accompanying the report, and among them a fine statue of Durgā deserves special mention. The number of statues of Hindu deities enumerated or described in the report itself is very large. Śiva, Durgā, and Gaṇeśa figure very often; Viṣṇu, Pārvatī, Lakṣmī, and Brahma also occur. Besides these there is a fair sprinkling of Mahāyānist Buddhist divinities, such as Amitābha, Akṣobhya, Mañjuśrī, and Padmapāṇi. If we may draw any inference from their relative numbers, it would seem that the prevailing form of faith among the people was Hinduism, though in some places Buddhism was no doubt the fashionable religion. The latter seems to have been much favoured at times in Court circles. But it plays a very small part in Bali,

where the conditions of mediæval Java have survived to this day. In any case the Buddhism of Java accepted the Hindu deities as Bodhisattvas, and there was much fusion between the religions.

It is regrettable that there are so few plates in this volume relatively to the large number of objects described in the text, and also that there is nothing to connect the illustrations with the descriptions. As the former do not face the text, one has to hunt through the latter in order to identify any object. On plate 102 there is an illustration of an inscribed stone (apparently described on p. 43, No. 63) which has not been deciphered. As the lettering seems to be sufficiently clear, I presume the difficulty in deciphering it must be due to the use of abbreviations. Another inscription, of no very great intrinsic interest, is dealt with at some length (pp. 273-6).

Considering that the bulk of this volume is concerned with the antiquities of a single Residency only, one is deeply impressed with the wonderful wealth of Java in archæological material. Much of it is unfortunately in a state of hopeless dilapidation and decay. It is worth noting that in many cases the sacred sites and images are objects of veneration to the neighbouring villagers even to this day. But the legends they tell about them have as a rule little or no relation to their original import: the conversion of the Javanese to the Muhammadan religion which they now profess, imperfect as it may be in some respects, has sufficed to blur and confuse their old traditions.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

SPRACHVERGLEICHENDES CHARAKTERBILD EINES INDO-
NESISCHEN IDIOMES. (Renward Brandstetters Mono-
graphien zur Indonesischen Sprachforschung, vii.)
Luzern: Buchhandlung Haag, 1911.

The Indonesian idiom illustrated in this monograph is Bugis, the language of a people whose homeland is in

the south-western peninsula of the Island of Celebes, but whose adventurous spirit has carried their influence far and wide throughout the Eastern Archipelago, to the Malay Peninsula at the one end of it and New Guinea at the other. During the eighteenth century these Vikings of the Eastern seas raided the islands and the Peninsula, and carved out for themselves amongst the rather decadent Malay States a number of new principalities, some of which their descendants still possess. In the old Johor empire, whose centre had shifted from Malacca to the Land's End of the Peninsula and thence to the Riau-Lingga Archipelago to the south of it, the Bugis pirate chieftains played the part of Mayors of the Palace to an ancient but effete Malay dynasty, to which they were content for a while to leave the semblance of royalty without the reality of power. In modern times the representatives of these high-spirited raiders have in their turn dwindled into phantom kinglets under the protecting ægis of the Dutch or British flag. But they have not forgotten their origin, and one of them, the late Sultan of Sēlangor, who in his youth, if fame speaks truly, possessed to the full the warlike prowess of his ancestry, and in old age preserved a singular dignity and personal charm, is reported sometimes to have said: "Don't speak to me of Malays! I am a Bugis." In these days, however, it is chiefly as prosperous inhabitants of their own country and enterprising traders in other islands that the Bugis are known; and their language, though neither the vernacular of many millions, like Javanese, nor the *lingua franca* of a whole island-world, like Malay, has a certain local, and more than local, importance.

It appears plainly from Dr. Brandstetter's brief exposition of its leading characteristics, that Bugis is not exactly a simple form of speech. It possesses a fairly elaborate system of prefixes and suffixes, the common heritage

(more or less being preserved) of all the Indonesian languages. But to these it adds another system (also not peculiarly its own but much less important in some other languages of the family) of proclitic and enclitic words. These are pronouns, demonstratives, articles, conjunctions, particles conveying emphasis, or what not. But the trouble is that they coalesce with the main word into a complex kind of word-sentence, within which phonetic phenomena of assimilation, ellipsis, interposition of a consonant to avoid hiatus between vowels, and the like, seem to have free play and singularly increase the difficulty of analysing the "complex" into its component parts. Fortunately the syntax, as usual in Indonesian languages, is fairly transparent and straightforward, and the phonetic system is on the whole simple. But even so, the language must present formidable difficulties to the beginner, especially as its alphabet is one of the most inadequate kind, a very degenerate descendant of its Indian prototype.

This treatise is not, however, written merely for those who wish to learn Bugis, either as a written or a spoken vernacular, but rather to set forth its structure for the benefit of linguistic students in general. It is a clear, comprehensive, and succinct piece of work. The author has made a good use of the comparative method, and his illustrations are drawn from Old Javanese, Makassar, Tontemboan, Bontok, the Kambara dialect of Sumbanese, Malagasy, and Malay, as well as from Bugis itself. The languages chosen are sufficiently typical of the main divisions of the Indonesian family, and Dr. Brandstetter uses them with his accustomed skill and erudition to explain the characteristic features of Bugis. Thus the work is a valuable contribution to the comparative philology of the Malayo-Polynesian family as a whole. And though not intended to replace a specifically Bugis grammar, it will certainly make that language easier to

learn, if the student is versed in the elements of linguistic method.

To criticize Dr. Brandstetter is always a difficult task; his range is wide and his accuracy and soberness of judgment are exemplary. In the present treatise I have noticed little to find fault with; indeed, to review it critically would require a preliminary study of the various languages which he cites and a mastery of them equal to his own. I should not myself have instanced Malay as a language in which the genitive construction formed with the possessive pronoun occurs. That brief statement is rather ambiguous; for while, for example, *kuda-nya* is perfectly typical Malay, such an expression as *kuda-nya Si Ali* (which I remember to have heard used by a Boyanese *suis* in my employ) is a foreign idiom, derived in this instance, I suppose, from Madurese. The usual and typical Malay would omit the pronoun. The only other thing that strikes me as odd is the meaning "near" given to *mudoh* in Old Javanese; if I mistake not it means "far", just as *doh* (= Malay *jauh*) does in modern Javanese. Presumably this was a mere slip which somehow escaped correction, for the sentence in which the word occurs is rightly translated, the phrase *tan mudoh dahat saka ike* being rendered "nicht gar weit von hier".

C. O. BLAGDEN.

GIUSEPPE DE LORENZO. INDIA E BUDDHISMO ANTICO.

2^a edizione, riveduta e notevolmente aumentata dall'autore. Bari: Laterza e Figli, 1911.

After an interval of seven years Professor de Lorenzo has once more carved out sufficient leisure from his professional scientific studies to republish his very charming study of Indian Buddhism. The new issue is considerably longer, and is included in the publishers' "Library of Modern Culture". The original volume was published at

the time of the Russo-Japanese war. In his revised Introduction the author holds up the spectacle of the virile and progressive Japanese, educated for a millennium and a half on Buddhist doctrine, more than holding their own against a Western power, as a refutation of the cheap theory as to the "effeminate immobile East". That theory is no doubt unsound. And yet—and yet, somehow, we don't seem to hear the Exalted One ratifying cause and effect with his *Sādhu, sādhu, Lorenzogotto!*

The genial author has not, as he tells me, found sufficient leisure these seven years to learn to know his texts in the original. Hence his book, if revised and enlarged, is still a study of Buddhism in translations, i.e. in his case in the translations of Dr. K. E. Neumann, almost exclusively. For him there is practically but one intermediary between Pali and Europe who deserves to be named, and prior to whom, before 1890, there was virtually no one. This delimitation of study has its advantages. The narrowed data can, with greater ease and clearness, be wrought up into a series of images and concepts of a movement and its doctrines. And this series is set forth both clearly and attractively, and, so far as I can judge, with great charm of diction. It has also its drawbacks. Somehow the "otherness" of the Buddhist Indian standpoint is softened down over much. The founder and his elect seem on the whole, as their converse and aspirations are here depicted, too little distinguishable from a group of West European patricians. Resemblance, of course, there is and plenty of it. And possibly a popular work cannot be better employed than in breaking down the barriers of race-alooftness by bringing out resemblances in all that is great and good and interfraternal in humanity. It needs the wider and deeper inquiry to see points of difference, to make them felt, and to hail them as the greater educators.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

K. SEIDENSTÜCKER. PALI BUDDHISMUS IN UEBERSETZUNGEN. Breslau: W. Markgraf, 1911.

In twenty chapters and 464 pages we have here a very laudable and excellently carried out effort at popularization, corresponding to the English pioneer work published fifteen years ago by Henry Warren. There is this difference: *Buddhism in Translations* included excerpts, too indiscriminately introduced, from canonical and from scholastic Pali. Mr. Seidenstücker confines his attention to the former sources, and among them entirely to the five Nikāyas, i.e. to the whole range of the four first and to a few books of the fifth. In them he believes he has the "ancient genuine documents of Buddhism face to face", a faith that engenders much peace of mind. But of Warren's book he has evidently not heard. In Part I we have fundamental doctrines: four truths, three signs, Khandhas, dependent origination, Karma, *saṃsāra*, Nibbana; in Part II, the path, knowledge, *sīla*, and *samādhi*; in Part III, Buddha, Dhamma, Sangha. The all-useful Index is omitted. The work is well compiled and carefully printed. There are a few good brief foot-notes on renderings, and, in their absence, the Pali word is sometimes added. This is especially reasonable where the renderings, for the most part scrupulously literal, are free, for instance, in *Kämpfer* and *Wahrheitskenner* (warrior, fighter, and truth-knower), by which the author renders *sek(k)ha* and *asek(k)ha* (p. 460). I much regret the author's choice. There are few terms in Buddhist diction so unambiguous as this, so free from secondary and tertiary implications. The word is tied so tightly up to *sikkhati*, "to train," that Buddhaghosa introduces not a single synonym (*Asl.*, 44; cf. Childers s.v.). And whereas the *sek(k)ha* is occupied with the four Paths and three lower Fruits, the *asek(k)ha* has, besides, won the highest Fruit, is an Arahant (*Pug. Pañ.*, 14). "Other persons are neither the one nor the other." Why, then,

drag in "fighting" and "truth" with a capital W? It was so needless.

This is, after all, a slight blemish to a good piece of useful work. Yet it is on all fours with what has been said above respecting the greater value in seeing differences. Warlike analogies appeal on the whole more to the Christian than to the Buddhist. Truth, it is true, appeals to both. But the *asekha* is a sort of glorious *graduate*.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

IAN C. HANNAH, M.A. EASTERN ASIA, A HISTORY.
London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911.

Any work that tends to a better understanding between East and West should be hailed with gratitude. Mr. Hannah's history enables the general reader to gain some insight into the past of the great East Asian nations, and thereby does the cause of inter-racial amity an important service.

The scope of this volume is ambitious indeed; it attempts to outline the story of about half the human race from the earliest times to the present day. It is obvious that in achieving such a stupendous task within the compass of some 300 pages the picture drawn can be at best nothing else than a superficial sketch, yet the author has succeeded in making his sketch more vivid and illuminating than many histories of greater elaboration.

Over such debatable ground as the origin of the Chinese race Mr. Hannah wisely treads with caution; "possibly," he writes, "they were connected with the Akkadians of the Mesopotamian Valley." Several writers have attempted to trace the Chinese back to a hypothetical colony that migrated from the West, but not one has been able to adduce convincing proofs of his theories. As early as 1764 De Guignes located the cradle of the race in Egypt, basing his arguments on resemblances between

Egyptian hieroglyphics and Chinese characters. Some later writers placed it in Chaldea. Foremost among these was T. de Lacouperie, who, though he failed to prove conclusively a Western origin for the Chinese, brought together a vast amount of evidence which effectually dispelled their claim to a splendid isolation and a self-developed civilization dating from remote antiquity.

In early times foreign culture made its influence felt through the channels of trade, and since the beginning of our era this transmission of ideas was aided by a still more potent agency—that of religion. Missionaries of Christianity (Syrian and European), of Manichæism, of Islam, and—above all in importance—of Buddhism received a welcome in China, where they inevitably became apostles not only of their respective creeds but also of their national culture.

Mr. Hannah might well have given greater prominence to the subject of Buddhism. As Dr. Eitel said, "The history of Eastern Asia is the history of Buddhism." And when it is remembered that this great religion exerted a civilizing influence over all the nations dealt with in the book under review, and was, moreover, the one feature common to the histories of them all, it is disappointing to find no more than some fifteen pages devoted to its study.

With regard to its influence in China, the summary given on p. 74 seems hardly adequate, even allowing for the limitations of space—

"Sometimes favoured, sometimes persecuted by the Government, it has made great progress among the people, introducing Indian architecture, evolving the ubiquitous pagoda from a mingling of styles, and covering the country with monasteries. So unsusceptible to foreign influences, however, are the Chinese, that the religion which transformed Japan has done little to modify their national character. They almost universally affect to despise Buddhism to-day: 'The image-maker doesn't worship Buddha: he knows too much.' 'Not shaven no priest, no priest no scoundrel.'"

During the first nine or ten centuries of our era many

thousands of foreign Buddhist priests settled in China. They came from the Himalayan States, from Central Asia, and from India. No doubt various motives led them to make these arduous migrations, and it is likely that desire to escape persecution and hope of patronage influenced them as much as did disinterested religious zeal. They brought with them a knowledge of Indian arithmetical notation (learnt from Babylonian sources), of Indian art (copied from the Greeks), of astronomy, of astrology, of medicine, and of grammar. Translations of Sanskrit sūtras led to a phonetic analysis of the Chinese language and to the discovery of the four tones, results which have left a permanent impression on the national lexicography. Moreover, the record of Buddhism as introducer of foreign culture does not end here. The famous monk Fa Hsien (c. 400) was the first of a long succession of Chinese pilgrims, who, as we know from inscriptions found at Buddha-Gayā, continued for six centuries to journey to the Holy Land of the religion. These travellers must have carried back to their native land great store of alien knowledge—in fact, their writings prove that several of them did so.

A great revival of Buddhism took place about the middle of the fifth century and awoke the admiration of neighbouring and even distant states. Embassies of congratulation arrived from ruling princes of India, Burma, and Ceylon. But it was not till A.D. 502, the date of the Liang dynasty, that the golden age of Chinese Buddhism began. It is recorded that the first Liang emperor, who eventually adopted the manner of life of a priest, pushed his veneration of Buddhist principles to such extravagant extremes that in 517 he issued a rescript forbidding in the official factories the weaving of figures of genii, birds, and beasts, lest in the cutting up of the fabric these might become mutilated.

Lo-yang, then the Wei capital, regained its former

religious importance, and even rivalled the southern capital, Chien-k'ang (modern Nanking), as a centre of Buddhism.

In the year 526 an event occurred which added to the prestige of China in the eyes of the Buddhist world. Bodhidarma, the twenty-eighth successor of Śākyamuni, came and settled in Lo-yang, thus transferring the seat of the patriarchate from India to China.

Korean missionaries carried Chinese Buddhism to Japan about A.D. 550, and, as Mr. Hannah points out, laid the foundation of its civilization and of the wonderful art which is to-day the admiration of the Western world.

In A.D. 618 the great T'ang dynasty established itself on the Dragon Throne, and a period began which is associated with all that is best of China's poetry, music, and painting. The debt that Chinese letters owe to Buddhism has been alluded to; the music shows traces of Western influence that was probably brought to bear through Buddhist intercourse; and there is no doubt that the Greco-Buddhist art of India dominated the development of Chinese painting.

A strong light upon this last-mentioned phase of Buddhist influence has been thrown within the last twenty years by the remarkable series of excavations carried out in Eastern Turkestan by MM. Klementz, Grünwedel, Sven Hedin, Stein, von Le Coq, and Pelliot. Their discoveries, viewed in conjunction with those of M. Chavannes, made during his recent archæological survey of Northern China, demonstrate in the clearest manner the transmission of ancient Mediterranean art to the Far East via Assyria, Persia, Bactria, Gāndhāra, and Turkestan.

A fifth century temple image found by M. Chavannes at Lung-mên in Honan illustrates to what an extraordinary extent the practice of indiscriminately copying Greek models existed at the time of the great Buddhist revival. This figure is endowed by its maker with attributes of no

less than three distinct Greek deities. The *thyrsos* of Dionysus is held in its right hand, the trident of Poseidon in its left, while the winged *petasus* of Hermes crowns its head.

Enough has been said to indicate the considerable part Buddhism has played in the development of Chinese culture. In order to complete my criticism of Mr. Hannah's summary it remains but to add a few words concerning the ethical results of the religion. The annals of the church in China show a large preponderance of adversity, yet persecution has never succeeded, even temporarily, in stamping it out. Indeed, during the greater part of three centuries Buddhism remained indubitably the predominant faith. In view of these facts can it be doubted that this exalted code of universal love has effected some amelioration of society and some mitigation of Oriental cruelty? Further, Mahāyānistic teaching disclosed a glorious vista of salvation beyond the grave, a prospect denied by Confucian materialism. It was just this spiritual function of the heretical church that has enabled it to hold its own to the present day. Degenerate and corrupt though it be, Buddhism in China still occupies a place in the hearts of the bulk of the people.

In outlining the features of the least important of the "Three Religions" our author again fails to grasp the most salient points. To quote the words of Professor De Groot: "If we may ascribe to Taoism some merit in the life of the human race, it is certainly this, that it has endowed East Asia with ideals about a future life of bliss, accessible by a first life of virtue and self-abnegation."

Exception must be taken to the statement (p. 186) that "the title *Dalai*, a Mongol term meaning Ocean, was conferred by the Chinese". Authorities differ as to the circumstances connected with the inception of this title, but they agree that it was originated by a Mongol chieftain. The donor is identified by Rockhill as the

redoubtable Altan Khan, the recipient being the third successor of Tsongk'apa, and the date of investiture 1576. Waddell gives the name of the chief as Gusri Khan, and the date 1640, thus making the fifth Grand Lāma of the established church the first bearer of the title. In 1650 and on subsequent occasions Chinese emperors included *Dalai* among the numerous grandiloquent titles they conferred upon the Popes of Lhasa.

There must necessarily be many omissions of important events in a book with such a wide range as this, yet it is probably due to an oversight that no mention is made of the fact that on August 29, 1910, Korea was formally annexed and became a Japanese province called by the ancient name of Chosen.

W. PERCEVAL YETTS.

AMURATH TO AMURATH. By GERTRUDE LOWTHIAN BELL, author of *The Desert and the Sown*, etc. Illustrated. London: W. Heinemann, MCMXI.

This is an exceedingly interesting book of travels, beginning at Aleppo, extending as far as Babylon, and ending at Konia in Asia Minor: and in its eighteen score pages and twelve score pictures the reader will find much to amuse and instruct. All those acquainted with Miss Lowthian Bell's work know it as that of a born traveller, aware, not only of the general interest, but also of the literary, historical, and antiquarian value of things. It is a book which has all the charm of the Orient in it, enhanced by the fact that the Semitic East has been the author's life-study.

And of the value of the book there is hardly any doubt; it is the work of one going about with the eyes open, intent in finding out all that is possible concerning the people in whom she, in common with her fellow-countrymen, is interested. In the matter of the political changes

which have taken place her testimony is disappointing. The majority of the people of the Turkish empire, it is to be feared, were, and are still, not only unprepared for it, but unsuited for it. They do not see how the franchise can possibly be of use to them. As for the Christians, the sects are so hostile to each other that they have no chance of electing a member of their own, and are therefore outvoted by the Mahommedans. They are of opinion that a strong hand is needed to govern, and they would like better a government which they know rather than one full, to them, of uncertainties. The hoped-for reforms are slow in coming, and the new regime is such an uncertain factor. Such sentiments, however, are not to be wondered at; they are bound to exist in the early years of a political change such as that which has taken place in Turkey, for a nation cannot be educated for such a thing in advance: the majority of the population, ignorant of constitutional government, is certain to look upon it with suspicion, and even to imagine that things are worse than they were before.

More information is needed concerning Aleppo than is at present available. That the city existed during the Hittite period seems incontestable from the Hittite lions first identified by Mr. Hogarth, of which photographs appear in Miss Bell's book. Whether the name gives any evidence of the origin and antiquity of the place, in the present state of our knowledge, is doubtful. Assyriologists are agreed in regarding it as the *Hulman* (*Hulwan*) of the Monolith of Shalmaneser II (850 B.C.). The pictures supplement the historical sketch and description of the city most interestingly. The authoress left Aleppo through "a world of mud", when the corn was beginning to sprout; but there were signs of another crop—that of the locusts—which the natives were making ineffectual efforts to root out by destroying their eggs. To all appearance it is a promising district for the discovery of antiquities, but

it is an open question as to whether any of real importance will be found except on the sites of the great cities, where the architectural remains at least are worth study, if only for the sake of the plans of the buildings. The authoress points out that Kiepert does not mark the tenth part of the existing villages, and those indicated on his maps are not always rightly placed.

Corruption seems to be still rife in some places, and the conflict between the East and the West, the former symbolized by the Semites and the latter by the (more or less Europeanized) Turks, still continues. "Open your eyes, O sheikh," says the Qadi, whose sympathies are with the townsman who is the sheikh's opponent. "Asia, open your eyes," re-echoes Miss Bell.

Approaching Babylon, the authoress gives a graphic account of the bitumen springs at Hit, several of which she visited. A striking feature of the town, even in that land of dirt, is its dirtiness: "a more malodourous little dirty spot I hope I may never see . . . The sun was setting as we came down to the palm-groves by the river. The fires under the troughs of molten bitumen sent up their black smoke-columns between the trees; half-naked Arabs fed the flames with the same bitumen, and the Euphrates bore along the product of their labours as it had done for the Babylonians before them. So it must have looked, this strange factory under the palm-trees, for the last 5,000 years; and all the generations of Hit have not altered by a shade the processes taught them by their forefathers."

After that the full description of the glories of ruined Ukhedir come as something most refreshing, with the plans and photographs which the authoress gives in such profusion. It is a wonderful series of erections of the Sassanians, the walls and the palace being of an admirable symmetry. The description of this ruin is excellent, and excellent also is the discussion of its date.

The first portion of the ruins of Babylon which the authoress saw was that which retains even to-day the ancient name—the northern palace, called Babil. When the German expedition, which has been engaged in exploring the site for the last twelve years, will be able to attack it, would seem to be doubtful. They estimate the work remaining to be done on the great palace of Nebuchadrezzar as likely to occupy them eight or ten years longer—a tale of continuous effort which would be well imitated in this country. What a show-place for the Ottoman Empire it would have made if its structure had not been the quarry for those who needed building material for the last 2,000 years! “Greek, Persian, and Arab used it as a quarry, and as you climb the stairs of the German house (the headquarters of the explorers) you will become aware of the characters which spell the king’s name upon the steps beneath your feet.” Whether the great hall be that in which Belshazzar made his feast or not is uncertain—the kingdom was “numbered, weighed, divided” so long ago that the tradition has been lost. There, in any case, King Nebuchadrezzar must have sat, in the niche provided for the throne, and all his successors must have made use of it too. There is an excellent picture of the great stone lion of Babylon, but the glazed brick reliefs of the bull and the *šir-huššū* of Babylon, introduced by the great king as decoration for the walls at and near the great festival-street and the gate of Ištar, have not come out so well, apparently on account of the unfavourable light. The temple of Ištar itself the authoress describes as raised on a high platform and commanding the city below.

But in this enjoyable book there is more than can be referred to in a mere book-notice, however complete one may strive to make it. And then the pictures. Ctesiphon is followed by the architectural beauties of Bagdād; the

walls and the ruined spiral minaret of Samarra, reminding us of the pictures of the Tower of Babel in the Bibles of old time, carry us on to the divine statue at Tel-Nimrūd; the ruins at Qal'a-Shergāt, Assyria's old capital, are followed by views of Mōsul and Nineveh, Assyria's later capital. The writer of this would like to deal with them all, but time and space are limited. Many more books of this kind from Miss Bell's pen are probably in store, but there is room for other travellers, and such as have youth, strength, and the needful funds would do well to flatter her in the way which the proverb suggests. But to all interested in the near East, whether prospective explorers or stay-at-homes, the advice to give is: read the book, and read at least some portions of it more than once.

T. G. PINCHES.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(April, May, June, 1911.)

I.—GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

April 11, 1911.—Sir Raymond West, Director, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins.

Don Richard Wijewardene.

Three nominations were approved for election at the next General Meeting.

Sir George Scott read a paper on "The Religions of the Shan States".

A discussion followed, in which the Rev. F. Penny, Mr. Sewell, Mr. Blagden, and Sir Charles Lyall took part.

ANNIVERSARY MEETING

The Anniversary Meeting was held on May 9, 1911, Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Professor Sarat Chandra Bhattacharya.

Mr. Akhil Kumar Chatterji.

Sirdar Nihal Singh.

One nomination was approved for election at the next General Meeting.

The Secretary then read the Annual Report.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR 1910-11

In the year 1910 the Society mourned the loss of its Royal Patron King Edward, who had been a member of the Society since 1863.

The Council regret to report the loss by death of ten other members—

Mr. Sheik Mahomed Ali,	Mr. M. Sakhawat Husain,
Mr. F. H. Baynes,	Major J. S. King,
Mr. Lewin B. Bowring,	Mr. Vincent J. Robinson,
Mr. Donald Ferguson,	Mr. Alex. Rogers,
Captain C. T. Hatfeild,	Mr. R. Froude Tucker.

The name of the Right Hon. Lord Lovelace has been taken out of the list: Lord Lovelace died in 1906, and his name was left in the list in error.

The Society has also lost by retirement—

Dr. D. Anderson-Berry,	Mr. T. Hart-Davies,
Mr. S. E. B. Bouverie-Pusey,	Sir J. J. Digges La Touche,
Mr. J. E. Bridges,	Mr. H. D. Graves Law,
Professor A. Fischer,	Mr. Terence Zetland Oung,
Mr. Sanjiban Ganguli,	Mr. J. P. Rawlins.
M. J. Grosset,	

Under Rule 25 (*d*) the following cease to be members of the Society:—

Miss Shaila Bala Das,
 Professor Hem Chandra Das Gupta,
 Mr. M. Krishnamachariar,
 Mr. Maung Ba Soe.

His Excellency Sir Abul Kasim Khan, G.C.M.G., Nasir-ul-Mulk, Regent of Persia, was elected during the year as an extraordinary member. And fifty-seven ordinary members were elected, as follows:—

Khan Bahadur Ahmad Din Khan,	Rev. W. W. Cochrane,
Maulvi Makbul Ahmad,	Mr. H. W. Codrington, C.C.S.,
Mr. H. M. Anthony,	Mr. F. C. Conybeare, M.A.,
Mr. E. R. Ayrton,	Lady Davis,
Mr. S. A. Aziz,	Mr. Alfred W. Domingo,
Babu Ras Bihari Bauerjea,	Mr. D. L. Drake-Brockman,
Babu Rakhai Das Banerji,	I.C.S.,
Mr. Warren D. Barnes,	Nawab Framurz Jung, Bahadur,
Mr. M. Roy Chowdhury,	Priya Lal Ganguly, Rai Bahadur,

Mr. S. C. Ghatak, M.A.,	Mr. A. H. Nomani,
Mr. W. A. Graham,	Mr. J. E. O'Connor, C.I.E.,
Mr. W. F. Gunawardhana,	Mr. Saw Hla Pru,
Mr. Krishna Gobinda Gupta, C.I.E.,	Mr. Hakim Habibur Rahman,
Mr. Mg. Maung Gyi,	Mr. F. J. Richards, M.A., I.C.S.,
Rev. J. S. Haig,	Mr. E. T. Richmond,
Mr. Wali ul-Haque,	Rev. Alexander Robertson,
Mr. A. H. Harley, M.A.,	Mr. Parames Prasanna Roy,
Mr. Harry G. Hillas,	Pandit C. N. Ananta Ramaiya Sastri, M.A.,
Pandit Hirachand L. Jhaveri,	Dr. Edward J. L. Scott,
Mr. T'ien Cheng Kong,	Mrs. Alicia Simpson,
Pandit T. K. Laddu,	Hon. Tikka Sahib Ripudaman Singh,
Mr. Bihari Lal, M.A.,	Professor V. V. Sovani, M.A.,
Mr. Shyam Lal, M.A.,	Dr. D. B. Spooner,
Dr. V. Lesný,	Baron A. von Stael-Holstein,
Mr. C. H. H. Macartney,	Rev. Father A. M. Tabard,
Rev. Donald MacGillivray, M.A., D.D.,	Babu Nogendra Nath Vasu,
Mr. A. B. Miller,	Mrs. Elaine Wolker,
Maharaja Sriram Chandra Bhanj Deo of Mourbanj,	Surgeon W. Perceval Yetts, R.N.,
Rev. J. Arbuthnot Nairn,	Ahmed Zeki Bey.

The total number of members at the end of 1910 was 624, showing an increase of thirty during the year. The subscriptions received exceed those of the previous year by £53, and the Journal account shows an increase of £24. The receipts show a net increase of £160 over those of the preceding year. The total receipts over expenditure are £290: £70 of this, being due to composition fees, has been transferred to capital account.

The Journal has appeared regularly, and has totalled some 1,400 pages.

A Subject Index has been made for the books added to the Library since the compilation of the Printed Catalogue in 1892.

No volume has actually appeared in any of the three series of publications: but the Council are able to announce

that Dr. Hultzsch's edition of the Meghadūta is practically ready for publication in the Prize Publication Fund, and that they have accepted for the Oriental Translation Fund an edition by Professor R. A. Nicholson of the collection of mystical poems by Ibn al-'Arabī entitled the *Tarjumān al-Ashwāq*, with a translation and abridgment of the Commentary, as well as a translation by the late Miss Marjory Wardrop of the Georgian poem "The Man in the Panther's Skin" by Shot'ha Rust'haveli, both of which will appear during the present year.

The Annual Dinner was held on May 2 at the Hotel Cecil. In the absence of the President the chair was taken by Sir Mortimer Durand.

The Public School Gold Medal for 1910 was won by Mr. C. E. Wade, of Merchant Taylors' School, for his essay on "The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great". The presentation of the medal was made by the President on May 30.

The usual Statement of Accounts is appended. The Council recommend that a vote of thanks be passed to the Auditors—Mr. Keith, Mr. Crewdson, and Mr. Waterhouse.

The recommendations of the Council for filling vacancies on the Council for the ensuing year, 1911-12, are as follows:—

Under Rule 29, Lord Reay retires from the office of President.

The Council recommend his re-election.

Sir Raymond West resigns from the office of Director.

The Council recommend the election of Sir Mortimer Durand in his stead.

Under Rule 30, Sir Robert Douglas retires from the office of Vice-President.

The Council recommend in his stead, and to fill the other vacancy caused by the nomination of Sir Mortimer Durand as Director, the election of

The Right Hon. Syed Ameer Ali,
Sir Charles Lyall.

Under Rule 31, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Fleet, and Dr. Codrington retire from their respective offices of Hon. Treasurer, Hon. Secretary, and Hon. Librarian.

The Council recommend their re-election.

Under Rules 32 and 33, the following Ordinary Members of Council retire :—

The Right Hon. Syed Ameer Ali,
Dr. Gaster,
Mr. Keith,
Mr. Pargiter.

The Council recommend in their stead, and to fill the other vacancy caused by the nomination of Sir Charles Lyall as Vice-President, the election of—

Dr. Hoernle,
Mr. J. H. Marshall,
The Right Hon. Sir Ernest Satow,
Sir J. George Scott,
Dr. M. A. Stein.

Under Rule 81,

Mr. Crewdson,
Mr. Sewell,
Mr. Waterhouse,

are nominated Auditors for the ensuing year.

The Council recommend that Sir Raymond West and Sir Robert Douglas be elected Honorary Vice-Presidents.

It is with great regret that the Council lose Sir Raymond West as Director. His long association with the work of the Society on the Council, and for the last four years as Director, has proved of invaluable service to his colleagues and will be appreciated by the Society at large.

Sir Robert Douglas also will be much missed from the active list of the Council, of which he has been so long a member.

ABSTRACT OF RECEIPTS AND

RECEIPTS.		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
SUBSCRIPTIONS					971	2	2
Resident Members—92 at £3 3s.	289	16	0			
Advance Subscriptions	10	10	0			
Non-Resident Members—							
8 at £1 1s.	8	8	0			
350 at £1 10s.	525	0	0			
Advance Subscriptions	48	1	0			
Arrears received	16	0	0			
Non-Resident Compounders—3 at £23 12s. 6d.		70	17	6			
Part Subscriptions, etc.	2	9	8			
		971	2	2			
RENTS RECEIVED					270	11	0
GRANT FROM INDIA OFFICE .. .					210	0	0
JOURNAL ACCOUNT					310	18	0
Subscriptions	216	0	0			
Additional copies sold	82	5	6			
Sale of Pamphlets	4	8	9			
Advertisements	7	8	9			
Sale of Index	0	15	0			
		310	18	0			
DIVIDENDS					48	17	4
New South Wales 4 per cent. Stock	30	4	8			
Midland 2½ per cent. Debenture Stock	5	0	0			
Local Loans Stock.	13	12	8			
		48	17	4			
INTEREST ON DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS . . .					18	1	4
Lloyds Bank	15	7	2			
Post Office Savings Bank	2	14	2			
		18	1	4			
SUNDRY RECEIPTS					5	15	5
					1,835	5	3
Balance as at January 1, 1910 .. .					589	0	0
		£2,424	5	3			

FUNDS.

£802 13s. 10d. New South Wales 4 per cent. Stock.
 £212 8s. Midland Railway 2½ per cent. Debenture Stock.
 £454 16s. 9d. 3 per cent. Local Loans Stock.

PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR 1910.

PAYMENTS.					£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
HOUSE ACCOUNT				454	4	7
Rent	350	0	0			
Insurance	10	13	11			
Repairs	24	13	7			
Lighting, Heating, and Water	36	9	0			
Other Expenditure			32	8	1			
					454	4	7			
SALARIES AND WAGES				300	13	6
OFFICE EXPENSES				50	12	3
LIBRARY				44	1	0
New Books	24	8	10			
Binding	13	2	5			
Catalogue, Card Index	6	9	9			
					44	1	0			
JOURNAL ACCOUNT				623	0	11
Printing	553	10	0			
Illustrations	17	5	6			
Postage	47	0	5			
Purchase of out of print Copies	5	5	0			
					623	0	11			
DONATION TO PALI DICTIONARY					10	10	0
POSTAGE				37	17	5
SUNDRY PAYMENTS				19	6	6
								1,540	6	2
Balance as at December 31, 1910, being cash at Bankers and in hand				883	19	1
								£2,424	5	3

We have examined the above Abstract of Receipts and Payments with the books and vouchers of the Society, and have verified the Investments therein described, and we hereby certify the said Abstract to be true and correct.

{ A. BERRIEDALE KEITH,
 for the Council.
 W. CREWDSON,
 for the Society.
 N.E. WATERHOUSE, F.C.A.,
 Professional Auditor.

J. KENNEDY, Hon. Treasurer.

LONDON, *March 8, 1911.*

SUMMARY.

MENTAL TRANSLATION FUND	...	258	11	8
DIA EXPLORATION FUND	...	129	0	0
IZE PUBLICATION FUND	...	62	13	2
NOGRAPH FUND, Deficit	...	450	4	10
		67	3	2
		<u>£383 1 8</u>		

Lloyds Bank Deposit Account	311	12	6
Do.	71	9	2
				<u>£383 1 8</u>		

FUNDS—£600 Nottingham Corporation 3 per cent. Irredeemable Stock (Prize Publication Fund).

have examined the above Statement with the books and vouchers, and hereby certify the same to be correct. We have also had produced to us certificates for Stock investments and Bank balances.

March 8, 1911.

MEDAL FUND.

	£	s.	d.
1. Balance ...	23	19	0
2. 31. Dividends ...	9	15	0
Interest ..	0	12	11
	10	7	11
	<u>£34 6 11</u>		

	£	s.	d.
1910. Expenses
Dec. 31. Balance at Bank
	33	5	11
	<u>£34 6 11</u>		

FUNDS—Nottingham Corporation 3 per cent. Irredeemable A Stock, £325.

	£	s.	d.
1. Balance ...	9	11	6
2. 31. Dividends ...	19	7	4
Donation, A. N. W. ...	0	1	8
Interest ..	0	4	0
	19	13	0
	<u>£29 4 6</u>		

	£	s.	d.
Dec. 31. Cost of Medal ...	5	0	0
Cost of Prizes and Binding, etc....	6	0	0
Balance at Bank
	11	0	0
	18	4	6
	<u>£29 4 6</u>		

FUNDS—Nottingham Corporation 3 per cent. Irredeemable B Stock, £545 11s. 2d.

WOLLASTON,

January 1, 1911.

J. KENNEDY, *Hon. Treasurer.*

LONDON, March 8, 1911.

have examined the above accounts with the vouchers and have verified the Investments above described, and we hereby certify that the said accounts are true and correct.

(A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, for the Council.
W. CREWDSON, for the Society.)

(N. E. WATERHOUSE, F.C.A.,
Professional Auditor.)

MR. BLAGDEN: I wish that the duty of moving the adoption of the Report had fallen upon more capable shoulders, but I am somewhat reconciled to the difficulties of my position by the fact that the Report is so excellent that it speaks for itself. I notice that every year we continue to add a substantial number to our membership. I have looked at the figures for the last twenty years, and I find the average increase to be about twelve or thirteen; but for last year the number was thirty. That is a substantial increase, and I hope it may be maintained.

In the matter of finance, too, we are in a prosperous condition. Our current revenue has grown in a very satisfactory way, and I have been a member of the Society long enough to know that finance is a very important item. Scholarly enthusiasm could not go far without funds to back it; and I am glad to note that our revenue for the past year exceeded our expenditure by almost £300.

The house expense is a considerable item and will be larger in the future, but it is in a great measure met by the rents we receive from our sub-tenants. Then there are salaries, wages, and office expenses. I am sure that we shall all agree that the salaries and wages are a very small item considering the work that is done. We have a secretary, Miss Hughes, whom we all know. She does not stand in need of any words of praise from me. If I have ever had any difficulty, if I have wanted advice, I have gone straight to Miss Hughes and I have never gone in vain. We have also an assistant secretary, who is doing his best. Then there is the housekeeping staff.

The most substantial item of our expenditure is the Journal. Last year it cost us over £600; this is a record, but a very gratifying one. The bulk of the Journal exceeded 1,400 pages, which is very good value for 30s. Looking back about twenty years I find that at that time it consisted of 700 to 800 pages. Even allowing for this increase the Journal pays its way; it is our financial

mainstay as well as our most important literary output. Then as to its quality, I may well say that the high standard set by the Society has been maintained with good and varied contents. The Indian Empire takes the lion's share, as usual; but this is as it must and as it should be. India is the greatest of our Eastern Dependencies, and must always be the central and special interest of the Society. But other Asiatic countries have not been neglected: there have been articles on Tibet, Persia, Assyria, Arabia, and China, amongst others. I should like to mention the importance to our Society of such expeditions as that of Dr. Stein to Chinese Turkestan; material has been brought back which has been distributed among several experts; it finds its way into our Journal, and the experts have sufficient matter to keep them busy supplying us with articles for several years to come.

Another point I should like to mention is the more or less international aspect of our Journal; foreign scholars seem to look upon it as a convenient vehicle for the publication of their researches; it stands foremost among publications devoted to Oriental scholarship and research. Speaking lately to an Oriental scholar in a European capital—I refrain from mentioning names—I said that our Journal was sometimes rather hard reading. "Yes," he replied. "but I wish we had anything as good in our country." Our Journal is thoroughly appreciated on the Continent, where it is regarded as the leading Asiatic periodical.

There is a subject in which I am personally interested—I do not know whether I ought to mention it here—but coming from a part of Asia that is not India, though included in her sphere of culture, I have often regretted the scarcity in our Journal of articles dealing with the Far East—with China, Indo-China, Japan, Korea, the Malay Peninsula, the Eastern Archipelago, etc. It is not our fault; I am sure that the members and the Council

would welcome such articles: but they do not come in. If any influence can be brought to bear through members at this meeting upon our members in these countries an assurance may be given them that their contributions would be welcome; the Society and the Journal would benefit thereby. We wish to be representative of Asia as a whole and to avoid any particularist tendency. But I know it is easy to preach and difficult to practise in this respect. Our subject-matter is limited by our Charter to the science, literature, and arts of Asia. Unlike some of our Branch Societies, we have not done anything with natural history; such subjects as geology, botany, zoology we have left to technical societies. But with regard to man, we must take care that our sphere is not narrowed. Subject to our geographical limits, we may fairly claim *quidquid agunt homines* as our motto. It is sometimes objected to our Journal that it contains special technical articles which few but the writers can be expected to understand. But specialization is a necessary condition of modern progress; we cannot have scientific work without it. So long as we are not unduly restricted in the range of our subjects no such objection holds good.

We were told last year that the Journal showed too much of an antiquarian tendency, and that we ought to do something more for modern subjects, such as the living languages of Asia. But I would point out the difficulty in this matter. Up to now contributions of antiquarian interest are most generally offered. You cannot make bricks without straw. We open our pages to the articles which do come in. If a modern article is offered of sufficiently high standard it is welcomed.

One suggestion has occurred to me which might be fruitful. We could well do with articles from time to time which are not, strictly speaking, pioneer work, as are most of our articles. If a writer, taking a particular subject, would bring together up to date all that has been

written on the subject, scattered in different languages in the back numbers of various publications, so that scholars could see how matters stood at the present moment, with bibliographical references so that it would be possible to look up fuller information, a great service would be rendered to research. I take some interest, for instance, in Indonesian linguistics. If anyone would take the trouble to work up what has been written on that subject I should be extremely obliged. But I deprecate anyone asking me to do it: it would be a big undertaking. It is for members to send in articles; the matter concerns individual members. The Council has been extremely fortunate of late; such good material has been sent in that there has been much from which to choose; in fact, it has been, as our French friends say, *l'embaras du choix*. One article is always welcome, and that is the annual article on the Archæological Survey of India. These articles make a wide appeal; though they are technical they are also of great general interest.

I should like to say a few words upon one or two other points. The way in which our special funds have been used will be found in a separate account; they are self-supporting and do not need any comment from me. They are an important part of the Society's work, and though they were not actively in operation last year we are to begin at once to publish other works by these means. The amount spent on our library is exceptionally small, and I hope that a larger amount may soon be available. But we are very fortunate in having many books presented by the writers, editors, and publishers, and on this matter we may well congratulate ourselves. We are largely indebted for this courtesy to the fact that reviews and notices of books appear in the Journal; they are written with care, and publishers have now come to realize that a favourable notice in our Journal is a hall-mark for a book, and so they find it worth while to send us copies

for review. We also get many periodicals through our system of exchanges; we are liberal. I think wisely liberal, in this matter. It is our duty to spread the light and to keep in touch with the good work that is done everywhere.

All that I have said up to now has been pleasant hearing: I have something to say now which is not so pleasant. I have been comparing our position with regard to membership for the past twenty years, and I regret to find a lamentable decrease in *resident* members. Twenty years ago we had over 150 resident members; now we have barely 100—a decrease of one-third. I do not know why. It cannot have been due to the supertax or the undeveloped land duty, for it has been going on for years past, long before the new-fangled legislation was heard of. To what is it due? I do not know precisely. But is it not partly our own fault? As individuals, are we doing all we can to recruit our membership? Learned societies cannot very well advertise themselves; they must leave their increase of membership to individual members. When we find friends who take an interest in the subjects with which we are concerned, we should press the claims of the Society. The more members we have the better it will be for our finances. The Journal helps to make the Society better known, and in the same way the annual dinner serves a useful purpose as well as being enjoyable.

We are extremely fortunate in our President, Lord Reay; he has rendered us great service in the past, and will, we know, continue that excellent service in the future. We have also an efficient set of officers.

I should like to ask the President if he can tell us anything to-day as to the position of the project for a School of Oriental Languages in London; it is a subject in which the Society is deeply interested, and we all know that Lord Reay has taken a most active and practical part

in bringing it forward. We should be glad if he can tell us what progress has been made.

I have much pleasure in moving the adoption of the Report.

COLONEL PLUNKETT: After the clear statement of the proposer there is not much for me to say. But on a few points I should like to make some remarks. If a Society is in difficulties or if there is contentious matter in a Report, it is not easy to propose or second the adoption of a Report. But here, on the occasions of our annual meetings, we have nothing of that sort. We go on quietly, prosperously, and satisfactorily. The Council is on excellent terms with the members, and the members with the Council, which is always a matter for congratulation.

As regards the accounts, although they are flourishing, we must feel a certain regret that there is not a larger number of resident members. We have not the income we ought to have to enable the Society to do all it should, being the one Society in this country for encouraging the study of Asiatic languages, literature, history, and religion. Since such a very important part of the British Empire is formed by India, not to mention minor Oriental States, we ought to receive from the nation, or at least from a larger section of the public, the means to carry on our work. Our library merits help on a larger and more liberal scale; when we consider the large funds given to many other useful Societies, which are, however, not so valuable as this, the support we get is totally inadequate. As regards special funds, the Oriental Translation Fund flourishes, but it pays its own way. It has already brought out nineteen volumes of valuable matter, and two more are coming; twenty-one volumes of work of a very high quality is a reason for great congratulation, but, as I have stated, the work is efficiently carried on without expense to the Society, and the public ought to know that much more valuable matter is waiting to be brought out

if only funds were available. This is one reason for which we ought to get more support.

As regards membership, there are not enough resident members, and we ought to get more. We are glad to see Indian gentlemen join the Society: it is a great advantage when we are discussing the literature, traditions, or arts of Eastern countries to have with us those to whom these subjects are, as it were, their mother-tongue, and not simply acquired by years of work. And, similarly, our Indian members will also feel the advantage of association here or in India with those who know European literature by being born to it; the reaction of the association is advantageous to both, and it is a great pleasure to know that the Society is encouraging friendly contact between scholars of both East and West.

It is a matter of surprise to me how few Englishmen who have spent many years in India join the Society when they come home. There was a larger proportion in former years. I do not know whether it is because they stay for shorter periods or do more work in England than formerly, but the civil and military officers do not join in the numbers they ought. English officials in India, if they are anything like the men I used to know, take great interest in the people among whom they live, in their arts, religion, and languages, and I regret that they do not join us in larger numbers, for it would be to their advantage and ours. I hope those of our members who have opportunity will suggest to friends serving in India, China, Japan, the Malay States, Asia Minor, and elsewhere, the desirability of joining this Society.

The proposer has said something as to the scope of our Journal and of our meetings. It is limited in a great measure to philological, historical, and archæological work, though not confined to it, and it is not the fault of the Council that we do not have more papers on vernacular languages or general knowledge. If we had more of such

contributions sent in I am sure that the Council and the Editor of the Journal would welcome them. I speak as a member of the Society, not as a member of Council, but I know that the Council would be glad to widen the sphere of influence of the Journal and to increase its popularity. Anything which encourages the study of modern languages of the East would be welcomed.

There is matter of special interest to us to which the President has rendered great service for many years in trying to inaugurate a school in London of Oriental languages. It is a perfect disgrace to the Empire that there is not a properly established and easily accessible school of Oriental languages. We all know how Lord Reay has pressed the need of it on the Government, the Treasury, the Universities, and various other ruling bodies. In many years a small measure of success has been achieved, not so great as we could have wished for, and the school is not yet on the footing everyone hoped it would be by this time. It is extraordinary, considering our long connexion with the East and the number of Englishmen who show a real interest in Eastern languages, that there should be no properly established school in London, where men going out to the East or men at home on leave can work up the languages they desire. The difficulties met with here as regards teachers and expenses do not exist in other capitals of Europe, and they ought not to exist in London.

As for this Society, any increase of interest in the modern languages or the antiquities of the East, or any extension of work which will tend to popularize the Society with the public and gain recruits, and make the Society more useful in many ways, must be of value.

There is another subject to which I may refer, namely, our premises, the lease of which will expire within two years. The question arose whether we should leave these premises and remove to others which might be more

convenient, or stay on here. A committee was constituted to deal with the matter. We met many times, and I can assure you it was not with prejudiced minds. First we went carefully into the question of staying in this house: then we tried others: we saw many, but found no place where we could rest our heads or our books: then again we considered the possibility of staying here. Our indefatigable Secretary, Miss Hughes, furnished us with more orders from house agents; we went out again on the quest, but we found that rents were high and accommodation such as we require difficult to find at a moderate price, so, after further consideration, we found the best thing would be to remain here. We had all heard of the enormous rents asked: some thought reports were exaggerated, and seeing many houses empty we thought we could find premises for which the rent would be moderate. But it was impossible. So we have decided to pay the enhanced rent and have improvements made, and to stay here. It is not for want of careful inquiry or from deciding in a hurry. We shall be more comfortably housed by reason of the improvements, and we hope the funds of the Society, which are so well managed, will leave a little surplus, and that if we are a little more prosperous we shall be able easily to meet our extra liabilities.

But we must make a wider appeal for members. It should be pointed out to the public and to the Press that the Society occupies a unique position in bringing together Western scholars and the scholars of our great dependency; and not only scholars, but those who, like myself, only take an intelligent interest in Oriental studies.

As to the Report, it is, I think, very carefully got up, but I trust I shall not be wrong if, speaking in the presence of gentlemen concerned, I say a word or two more. That Lord Reay should retain his office as President is a desire that comes naturally to us all; we

know the useful work he has done with so much ability and energy, and it would be impossible to replace him. He has wide knowledge of the East, he is a successful practical administrator, he has a great love for languages and for literary work. The Society is most fortunate in having had the privilege of his services, and our only anxiety is whether we shall be able to retain him.

We are losing Sir Raymond West as our Director, and many members feel that we are losing an old friend, not merely one who has devoted much leisure, time, and thought to the Society, but one who has been a friend to many members. We are glad that Sir Raymond remains with us, although he retires from his post as Director.

I have much pleasure in seconding the adoption of the Report.

LORD REAY: Ladies and gentlemen, it is my first pleasant duty to-day heartily to welcome the Tikka Sahib of Nabha, the Heir-Apparent of the Nabha State. We are always pleased to see members of the highest Indian aristocracy appearing in our midst; all the more so in this case, as the Tikka Sahib takes great interest in Oriental languages; he has already distinguished himself in this respect; and, although he is happily in the earlier part of his career, he has succeeded in passing through the Viceroy's Council a Bill which contained advantageous conditions for the community he represents—a community loyal to the British Crown, as the Sikhs always are.

Mr. Blagden and Colonel Plunkett have given various details of our work in the Society, so my remarks will be short. The past year has shown no decrease in the activity of the Society, the numbers keep up satisfactorily, and the election of fifty-eight new members has filled up the vacancies caused by our losses and added over thirty to our previous year's total. I confess that I agree with what has been said with regard to the number of resident members; I think steps should be taken to increase such

members. It is regrettable when we take into account the large number of those who return home to enjoy a well-earned rest after their labours in India that so few enter our ranks.

We have sustained some specially heavy losses by death. The year 1910 was a mournful one in the history of the Empire, and this Society suffered no less than the country at large in the loss of our beloved Sovereign, who for fifty-seven years was a member, and who showed, on many occasions, special interest in the Society. His Majesty always took a deep interest in everything connected with his Indian Empire. It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that we have again secured Royal patronage for the Society. King George has shown his interest by accepting the office of Patron, and we hope he may, in the Providence of God, be spared many years to remain at the head of our affairs.

Among those who have done good work for the Society, and whose names appear in the list of losses, mention may be made of Mr. Lewin Bowring, Mr. Donald Ferguson, Major Stuart King, our old friend Mr. Alexander Rogers (the Bombay official, whose loss we recall with regret), and Mr. Vincent J. Robinson.

We welcome as an extraordinary member the distinguished scholar and statesman, H.E. the Nasir ul-Mulk, the Regent of Persia, for we value friendly relations with Persia.

The ever-increasing size of our Journal is satisfactory, inasmuch as it shows the desire of scholars to be represented in its pages; but its size of late has become almost a source of anxiety to members, who must begin to fear whether it will not soon be too heavy to handle—in bulk, I mean, not in contents. But the great wealth of material received and the scholarly character of the articles have caused the Council to decide to publish as much as possible rather than keep back for a long period the results of research.

We hope that, in the near future, the Journal may revert to a more normal size.

A pressing want in connexion with the library has been supplied this year by the compilation of a complete Subject Index to the Additions to the Library since the Catalogue was printed twenty years ago. Anyone who has had to do with cataloguing will realize the time and patience expended by Dr. Codrington on this Index, and will wonder at his untiringness when I also add that he is now performing the same task for the old printed catalogue, the index to which is most inadequate. Our best thanks are due to Dr. Codrington for his indefatigable zeal in thus serving the Society. Mr. Blagden has alluded to the fact that the more money we can spend on the library the better; we ought not to be dependent only on those publishers or authors who send us books.

I hoped to have had on the table to-day a copy of Professor Hultzsch's edition of the *Meghaduta*, but it will not be many days before it is finally ready for publication. The two other books which have been accepted by the Council will prove of unusual interest.

Our Public Schools' Medal has this year been won by Mr. A. L. Jenkins, of Marlborough College, for an essay of special merit on the administration of Lord Dalhousie, and it will be a great pleasure to me to present the medal to the successful competitor after the Society's annual dinner next Monday.

You will see by reference to the accounts that are before you that the finances of the Society are flourishing, and this is specially necessary now that the Council have decided to renew at an increased rental the lease of these premises which terminates next year. The Society has occupied the house for more than forty years, and although in some respects it is not everything we might desire, yet a large committee, consisting of members of the Society, together with some of the Council, recommended, after

much deliberation and inspection of many houses, that we should remain where we are. It is in a central position: there was some idea of migrating to the precincts of the British Museum, which has become the Mecca of Orientalists in London. But I am pleased that there will be no change of itinerary, and that we may still turn our footsteps to the familiar spot.

The house will be thoroughly redecorated this year and electric light installed. Our meetings suffer from want of space, and it is proposed to enlarge the meeting-room by an expensive alteration, which involves the removal of the wall between the two libraries. This we are enabled to do owing to a generous gift of £100 from Mr. Walter Morrison. The thanks of the Society are due to the House Committee for the amount of time and trouble they have bestowed upon this most important matter, and also to our Hon. Solicitor, Mr. Wilson, to whose never-failing kindness we owe so much, and who in this instance undertook the negotiations with our landlords.

I should now like to express our sincerest acknowledgments for the signal service rendered to the Society by our able Secretary, Miss Hughes. We do this every year with an increasing sense of gratitude. Miss Hughes is ever ready to assist us in all sorts of ways; her knowledge of all the affairs of the Society and her sound judgment have made her an invaluable Secretary.

A question was addressed to me by Mr. Blagden, in the course of his interesting speech, about the School of Oriental Languages. I am sorry it is not possible to say anything definite at the moment, but I may explain that we are awaiting with keen interest the results of a Committee and a Commission still sitting and investigating the question from somewhat different points of view. There is the Departmental Committee, presided over by Lord Cromer, of which Lord Curzon is a member, which is still considering the form that the School or Institute

should take. Then there is the Commission under the Chairmanship of Lord Haldane, which is dealing with the complicated state of things of the University of London. I trust that the prolonged negotiations will lead to some result. Every day bears witness to the fact that the present position is untenable. Without betraying any confidence I may also say that there is a feeling among Missionary Societies that something must be done on this question. A Board of Studies has been appointed to go into the matter of the preparation of missionaries before they go to the East. I have always held that one of the interesting duties of such a School as we have in view would be to train missionaries before they leave this country in a practical knowledge of the conditions of life they are likely to experience and in a knowledge of the languages and religion of the people to whom they will be sent. This idea is now accepted by the Societies themselves; it is one of the results of the remarkable World's Missionary Conference which met last year in Edinburgh.

We are to-day parting with our Director. On the last occasion on which I bade good-bye to Sir Raymond West it was when I left Bombay: he remained. To-day I perhaps remain and he is going. But though he vacates the position of Director he is not going to leave the Society, to which he has rendered so much valuable service. Few men can boast such a record in an Indian career as Sir Raymond West. He directed with knowledge and sagacity trials and legal proceedings, and he laid down the principles of jurisprudence. We shall still be able to consult Sir Raymond West, and we know that his talents will be at the service of the Society, and we trust that he will be able to give us advice for many years to come. We also wish him many years of *otium cum dignitate*, which no one deserves more than Sir Raymond West.

SIR RAYMOND WEST: The first step, on which we are all unanimous, is to proceed to the election of Lord Reay as our President. It is with the fullest appreciation of his very great services that we ask him to accept the office again. Lord Reay has been the honoured President of this Society for eighteen years: he has been re-elected again and again, showing the complete confidence felt in his services and the gratitude of the Society for the way in which he has furthered our interests and the manner in which he has represented us before other nations of Europe. No one could have filled the position with so much learning, dignity, and knowledge of affairs as Lord Reay. We are specially fortunate in having him as our President; there is no need to go into all the matters in which he has done us service.

LORD REAY: I am very much obliged to you all, and especially to my old and distinguished friend Sir Raymond West, for the way in which he has proposed that I should continue to be President of this Society. I have considered whether the time has not come for new and younger blood to be introduced into the office, but as you urge me with such kindly insistence to remain, I shall be glad as long as health and strength suffice to be your President, and I hope to devote myself to the best of my power to the service of the Society. I should like to add a word of gratification that Sir Ernest Satow now becomes a member of our Council for the first time. You have heard what Mr. Blagden has said about the representation of the Far East in our Journal, and, with Sir Ernest on the Council, you will have a guarantee that China will not be overlooked, nor anything of importance connected with Japan.

PRESENTATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS' MEDAL

May 15, 1911

On the conclusion of the speeches after the annual dinner at the Hotel Cecil on May 15, Lord Reay, the President, made the presentation to Mr. A. L. Jenkins, of Marlborough College.

LORD REAY : I saw Lord Minto recently and he greatly regretted that he could not come to the dinner this evening, as he had hoped to do, and give our Public Schools' Gold Medal to the fortunate winner, Mr. A. L. Jenkins, of Marlborough College, because he regarded Mr. Jenkins' father as one of his most valuable coadjutors in the Government of India. It would have been a great pleasure to Lord Minto to have borne his personal testimony to the merits of the father, and to have wished the son a prosperous career.

This year the medal goes to Marlborough for the first time, and I congratulate Mr. Fletcher, the Head Master, that he has been successful with one of his boys in obtaining the medal after a somewhat severe competition. It has given me the greatest pleasure to read the essay on my countryman, Lord Dalhousie : you all know the pride with which one Scotsman reads of the achievements of another. I can assure you that it is a most promising essay, and if the writer pursues his studies in the same spirit in which he has begun them, he may blossom out into a good historian unless he decides to become a member of the distinguished Indian Civil Service. He may be all the more pleased in his success because one of the judges of the essay was Sir William Lee Warner, the distinguished author of the *Life of Lord Dalhousie*. I should like to congratulate Sir William Lee Warner most heartily on having obtained the highest distinction in the power of the Crown to bestow upon a civilian. When years ago I gave Sir William his first promotion I did not foresee

that one day it would be my good fortune to congratulate him on his highest honour, as I do this evening. .

But, to come back to the essay. It is a remarkable essay; it does not err on the side of cocksureness, as is often the case with young essayists, somewhat to the surprise of those who have grey hairs. It shows a modesty that is most commendable: the writer is prepared to leave certain questions open for decision in more mature years. I may also tell you that Lord Dalhousie comes out of the examination very well. I hope Mr. Jenkins will apply to his own career the same industry and devotion to duty which were strong characteristics of the Viceroy, whose administration he has so well studied. The Head Master of Merchant Taylors', a school which has twice won the medal, will be glad to know that his boy, though beaten, came second in this year's competition. Dr. Nairn will probably next year make an extra effort to win. There is one matter of regret with regard to the competition, and that is, that it does not produce an essay from each Public School. I am sorry that we do not find all the Schools sending in competitors.

I will now ask Mr. Jenkins to come forward in order that I may hand him the Gold Medal.

After the medal had been handed to Mr. Jenkins a reply was made for him and for his School by Mr. Fletcher, the Head Master of Marlborough.

MR. FLETCHER, the Master of Marlborough, in responding, said: My function is to represent my pupil and myself.

I should like to say one thing for myself as representing on this occasion the Public Schools. Naturally it is your wish that we should endeavour to bridge over with our boys the extraordinary and immense gulf which separates East and West. Whether we can do anything of this kind at their age, anything to make boys realize what the East, and more particularly India, means, I am not quite sure. But we of the Public Schools can and do

prepare boys for great imperial duties in the future. We cannot teach them much of Oriental thought or anything of Oriental languages, but we can and do teach them the great principle of administration so nobly exemplified in the history of the Indian Civil Service, that "to rule is to serve". So long as India is served by men who have passed through our Public Schools, and have spent their full time there—a matter of great importance—that lesson will have been taught. So much for myself. Now a word for my friend and pupil. He would wish me, I know, to thank you warmly and to say that he has long ago chosen his career; unless the examiners are adverse he will join the Indian Civil Service and follow in his father's footsteps.

II.—PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Bd. LXV. Heft i.

Hertel (J.). The Story of Merchant Campaka critically edited.

Fischer (A.). Das Omen des Namens bei den Arabern.

Wünsche (Aug.). Die Zahlensprüche in Talmud und Midrasch.

II. VIENNA ORIENTAL JOURNAL. Vol. XXIV, No. iv.

Charpentier (J.). Zur Geschichte der Cariyāpīṭaka.

Hertel (J.). Literarisches aus dem Kauṭīliyaśāstra.

Müller (D. H.). Zur Reihenfolge der babyl.-assyrl. Planetennamen.

Torezyner (H.). Der Name Sanheribs.

Schorr (M.). Die altbabylonische Rechtspraxis.

III. GIORNALE DELLA SOCIETÀ ASIATICA ITALIANA. Vol. XXIII, 1910.

Faitlovich (J.). Versi Abissini.

Sorani (A.). Dai Poemi di Ch. N. Bialik. (Italian translation of modern Hebrew poetry.)

Belloni-Filippi (F.). *La Yogaśāstravṛtti.* (Sanskrit text.)
 Rivetta (P. S.). *Some Problems on Japanese kana and roma-ji.* (On transliteration.)

Ballini (A.). *La Upamitabhavaprapañcā Kathā di Siddharṣi.*
 (Italian translation.)

IV. *RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI.* Vol. III, Fasc. iv.

Rossini (C. C.). *Studi su popolazioni dell' Etiopia.*

Griffini (E.). *Lista dei MSS. arabi nuovo fondo della Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano.*

V. *TRANSACTIONS OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF JAPAN.*
 Vol. XXXVIII, Pt. iii.

Munro (N. Gordon). *Some Origins and Survivals.*

Lloyd (Rev. A.). *A Sutra in Greek.*

Sansom (G. B.). *Notes on Dialectical Usages in Nagasaki District.*

— *Translations from Lyrical Drama.*

VI. *BULLETIN DE L'ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT.*
 Tome X, No. iii.

Deloustal (M. R.). *La Justice dans l'ancien Annam.*

Kemlin (M.). *Les Songes et leur interprétation chez les Reungao.*

Maspero (M. H.). *Le protectorat général d'Annam sous les Tang.*

VII. *T'OUXG PAO.* Vol. XII, No. i.

Liétard (A.). *Essai de Dictionnaire Lo-lo-Français, dialecte A-li.*

Cordier (H.). *La politique coloniale de la France au début du second empire, Indo-Chine, 1852-8.*

Maspero (G.). *Le Royaume de Champa.*

VIII. *DER ISLAM.* Bd. II, Heft i.

Becker (C. H.). *Materialien zur Kenntnis des Islam in Deutsch Ost-Afrika.*

Strothmann (R.). *Die Literatur der Zaiditen.*

Strzygowski (J.). *Felsendom und Aksamoschee.*

IX. TIJDSCHRIFT VOOR INDISCHE TAAL-LAND- EN VOLKENKUNDE.
Deel LII, Afl. 3-6.

- Adriani (N.). Contes du peuple Toradja.
Moquette (J. P.). Les monnaies des Indes néerlandaises.
Rinkes (D. A.). Les Saints de Java : (1) Le chaikh
Abdoulmoulyi.
Pleyte (C. M.). Folklore de Bantam.

X. VERHANDELINGEN VAN HET BATAVIAASCH GENOOTSCHAP VAN
KUNSTEN EN WETENSCHAPPEN. Deel LIX, St. 1.

- Talens (J. P.). Een en Ander over het Talaoetsch (Islands
north of Celebes).

XI. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.
Vol. XXXI, Pt. iii.

- Michelson (Truman). The Inter-relation of the Dialects of
the Fourteen Edicts of Asoka.
Barton (G. A.). The Babylonian Calendar in the Reigns
of Lugalanda and Urkagina.
Montgomery (J. A.). Some Early Amulets from Palestine.
Bradley (C. B.). Graphic Analysis of the Tone Accents of
the Siamese Language.
Breasted (J. H.). The "Field of Abram" in the Geographical
List of Sheshonk I.
Edgerton (F.). The *k*-suffixes of Indo-Iranian.

XII. SIDDHĀNTA DĪPIKĀ. Vol. XI, Nos. vii-ix.

- Pillai (J. M. Nallasvāmi). Mantra-Mālikā of Mula-Nātha.
Govindāchārya (A.). Nammālvār's Tiru-viruttam.
— The Brahman Conception of God.
Aiyar (C. V. Śvāminātha). Karapātram : what is it ?
— Judicial Astrology.
Pope (late Rev. Dr.). Maṇi-Mekhalai.
Ramaṇa Śāstrin (V. V.). Viraśaivism, a phase of the
Āgamānta.
— The Jnāna-pāda of the Sūkshma-Āgama (continued).
Gorn-Old (W. F.). Astronomical Remarks on Śankara's
Horoscope.

Chakladar (H. C.). Maritime Activity and Enterprise in Ancient India.

The Śaiva Siddhānta Conference.

Subramanya (R. S.). Tāyumanavar. his life, teachings, and mission.

Vāsudeva Śāstrin (T. B.). The Esoteric Meaning of the Form of the Devi.

XIII. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Tome XVI, No iii.

Lévi (S.). Textes sanscrits de Touen-houang.

Meillet (A.). Remarques sur le texte de l'historien arménien Agathange.

Decourdemanche (J. A.). Notes sur les poids médicaux arabes.

Schwab (M.). Un médaillon italo-hébreu.

Weill (R.). Les Hyksos et la restauration nationale dans la tradition égyptienne et dans l'histoire.

OBITUARY NOTICES

DUDLEY FRANCIS AMELIUS HERVEY, C.M.G., M.R.A.S.

THOUGH a member of this Society for more than thirty years, the subject of this obituary notice was seldom seen at our meetings and was not one of our contributing members. But he was one of the founders and supporters of our Straits Branch, which some years ago conferred on him the distinction of honorary membership. This he had well merited by many services, and particularly by contributing to its Journal a number of valuable papers, mainly on the history, topography, and ethnography of the southern part of the Malay Peninsula.

It is in connexion with that field of research that Dudley Hervey's name will be remembered. Few men had a more thorough and intimate knowledge of it or were more keenly interested in it from every point of view than he. As an authority on the Malay language he was probably unsurpassed by any Englishman of his time. But unfortunately the world has never had an opportunity of fully realizing the depth of his knowledge in this department, for with the diffidence of a true scholar he was inclined to hide his light under a bushel, and his critical instinct often deterred him from publishing material which, though of undoubted value, might be still further improved by subsequent revision. In the linguistic field, therefore, his publications were in no way commensurate with his acquirements, and he allowed himself to be outstripped by men who were his inferiors in knowledge, scholarly accuracy, and critical acumen. But he collected and published a considerable amount of lexicographical matter illustrating the dialects of the wild tribes

of the South of the Peninsula. He was also greatly interested in folk-lore, native law and custom, in short in every aspect of Malay and aboriginal life, and he had much more than an average acquaintance with the geology, botany, and zoology of the country. In fact, his knowledge of all matters connected with Malacca, the Nĕgĕri Sĕmbilan, and Johor was almost encyclopædic.

Dudley Hervey was a son of the late Rev. Lord Charles Amelius Hervey, rector of Chesterford, Essex, and a grandson of the first Marquis of Bristol. He was born at Chesterford on January 7, 1849, educated at Marlborough, and entered the Straits Settlements Civil Service in 1867, being the first "cadet" of that newly established service, which thus by his death loses its doyen and one of its most distinguished members. In 1882 he became Resident Councillor at Malacca, a post he continued to hold till his retirement in 1893. During these years he was *ex officio* a member of the Executive and Legislative Councils of the Colony, and for some time he also superintended the affairs of parts of the Nĕgĕri Sĕmbilan. In 1892 he was created a C.M.G. After his retirement he married and settled at Aldeburgh, Suffolk. He became a County Councillor and J.P. for the county, with which his family has long been associated, and took a leading part in local political, municipal, and educational matters, besides keeping up his connexion with a number of learned societies. His death occurred unexpectedly on June 1, 1911, at his residence; it was due to heart failure, accelerated by the shock of a carriage accident which had taken place a week before.

Since his retirement from the East he had become so much engrossed in other matters that Orientalism ceased to be the first object of his thoughts, being thrust into the background by the pleasures and duties of family life and the new interests of a different environment. But he never quite lost touch with Asiatic studies, and a chance

meeting with an old friend or colleague from the Straits sufficed to revive his interest in them. It has been my good fortune to meet him occasionally during the last few years, and I shall always remember the cordiality of his welcome and the charm of his conversation. Having had the privilege of serving under him at Malacca, I knew him well, both in his official capacity and personally. There never was a more amiable man, or one that was more considerate and tactful towards his subordinates than Dudley Hervey. As an administrator he possessed in a high degree the invaluable gift of guiding without interfering, and his influence stimulated and encouraged all who worked under him. My own indebtedness to him is greater than I can find words to express. I can but apply to it the Malay saying: *hutang emas dapat di-bayar, hutang budi di-bawa mati*; it was a debt that could in no wise be repaid, the sort of debt that creates a lifelong obligation.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

- Asaṅga.** Mahāyāna-Sūtrālamkāra. Ed. et trad. par S. Lévi.
2 tomes. 8vo. *Paris*, 1907 and 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Bell, Gertrude L.** Amurath to Amurath. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the Author.
- BENGAL DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Vol. xxv: Purnea. 8vo. *Calcutta*,
1911. *From the Government of Bengal.*
- Bharucha, Ervad S. D.** Avesta-English and English-Avesta
Glossary. 8vo. *Bombay*, 1910.
From the Trustees of the Parsee Panchayet Funds and Properties.
- Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsis. Part ii :
Ijsni (Yasna). 4to. *Bombay*, 1910.
From the Trustees of the Parsee Panchayet Funds and Properties.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis (ed.).** Coptic Homilies in the Dialect of
Upper Egypt. 8vo. *London*, 1910.
From the British Museum.
- CENTRAL PROVINCES DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Akola, A and B vols. ;
Amraoti, B vol. ; Bilaspur, A vol. ; Buldana, B. vol. 4to.
Allahabad, Calcutta, and Nagpur, 1909-11.
From the Government of India.
- CENTRAL PROVINCES (STATES) GAZETTEERS. Chhattisgarh Feudatory
States. 4to. *Bombay*, 1909.
From the Government of India.
- Chamberlain, B. H.** Japanese Poetry. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the Publisher.
- Chavannes, Éd.** (trans.). Cinq Cent Contes et Apologues.
Extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois et Traduits en Français.
Tomes i-iii. 8vo. *Paris*, 1910-11. *From the Translator.*

- CHRONICA MINORA. Pars ii-iii. Edited by E. W. Brooks, etc.
8vo. *Paris*, 1904-5. *From H. F. Amedroz, Esq.*
- Cordier, H. Un interprète du Général Brune. 4to. *Paris*, 1911.
From the Publisher.
- D'Ollone, H. Les Derniers Barbares. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911.
From the Author.
- ÉCOLE DES LANGUES ORIENTALES VIVANTES. Publications, sér. I.
tome v; sér. II, tome xx; sér. III, tomes vii, pt. ii; tomes viii-
x, xii, xiii, xv; sér. IV, tomes i, x, xiv, xvi, xix; sér. v,
tomes i, ii, vi, vii. Imp. 8vo. *Paris*, 1877-1909.
From the Ministère de l'Instruction Publique.
- Edgerton, F. *k*-suffixes of Indo-Iranian. Part i: Veda and
Avesta. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Eitel, E. J. Handbook of Chinese Buddhism. 2nd ed. 8vo.
Hong-Kong, 1888. *Purchased.*
- Foster, W. English Factories in India, 1634-6. 8vo. *Oxford*,
1911. *From the India Office.*
- Frank, Dr. Carl. Studien zur Babylonischen Religion. 1^{er} Band.
8vo. *Strassburg*, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- Gould, F. J. Youth's Noble Path. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the Publishers.
- Hāshimī. The Faras-Nāma. Edited by Lieut.-Colonel D. C.
Phillott. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Editor.*
- Hinke, W. J. Selected Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions. 8vo.
Leiden, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- JALALU-D-DĪN RŪMĪ. The Masnavi. Bk. ii. Translated by
C. E. Wilson. 2 vols. 8vo. *London*, 1910 and 1911.
From the Publisher.
- Krausz, Dr. J. Götternamen in der Babylonischen Siegecyllinder-
legenden. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- Lal, Bihari. The Vedas and their Angas and Upangas. Vol. i.
8vo. *Lahore*, 1910. *From the Author.*

- Laufer, B.** (ed. and trans.). *Der Roman einer Tibetischen Königin.* 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Lorenzo, G. D.** *India e Buddhismo Antico.* 2nd ed. 8vo. *Bari*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Luzzatto, Marco.** *Hebrew Glosses and Notes.* Edited with English Translation, by H. Gollancz. 8vo. *London and New York*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- MADRAS GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL MSS. LIBRARY. *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS.* Vols. viii and ix, by M. Rangacharya. 8vo. *Madras*, 1910. *From the Madras Government.*
- Mayers, W. F.** *Chinese Reader's Manual.* Reprinted from edition of 1874. 8vo. *London and Shanghai*, 1910. *Purchased.*
- MÉLANGES D'INDIANISME offerts par ses élèves à M. Sylvain Lévi. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- Minorsky, V.** *La seete persane dite les Ahlé-Haqq.* 8vo. *Moscow*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Moses de Leon.** *Sheḳel-Haḳ-Kōdesh.* Edited by A. W. Greenup. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Editor.*
- Muth, G. F.** *Stilprinzipien der primitiven Tierornamentik bei Chinesen und Germanen.* 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Nāgārjuna.** *Die Mittlere Lehre.* Übertragen von Max Walleser. 8vo. *Heidelberg*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Nair, Rao Bahadur C. Gopalan.** *Wynad, its Peoples and Traditions.* 8vo. *Madras*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Narasimhachar, R.** *Archæological Survey of Mysore. Report for 1909-10, with Government Review.* *From the Author.*
- Rothenstein, W.** *Two Drawings by Hok'sai.* Fol. *Broad Campden*, 1910. *From Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy.*
- Roy, S.** *Customs and Customary Law in British India.* (*Tagore Law Lectures*, 1908.) 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1911. *From the Senate of the Calcutta University.*

- Schleifer**, Dr. J. Sahidische Bibel-Fragmente a. d. British Museum.
ii. 8vo. *Wien*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Sovani**, V. V. Discovery of a Long Metre in Prabodhachandradaya.
Pamphlet. 8vo. (*Calcutta*), 1910. *From the Author.*
- Spat**, C. Maleische Taal. 8vo. *Breda*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Sprengling**, M. Chronological Notes from the Aramaic Papyri.
Pamphlet. 8vo. *Chicago*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Stephens**, Winifred. Legends of Indian Buddhism. 8vo.
London, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- SCDDHARMAVATI RĀJĀVAṆISA, etc. Edited by Phra Candakanta.
8vo. *Pāk Lāt, Bangkok*, 129.
From the Vajirañāna National Library.
- Tate**, G. P. The Kingdom of Afghanistan. 8vo. *Bombay and
Calcutta*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Seistan. i-iii. 4to. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Author.*
- Valentine**, W. H. Modern Copper Coins of the Muhammadan
States. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Publishers.*
- Whitehead**, R. B. Catalogue of Coins illustrative to the History
of the Rulers of Delhi in the Museum of Archæology. 8vo
Calcutta, 1910. *From the Publishers.*
-

JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
1911

XXIV

BUDDHISM IN THE SHAN STATES

BY SIR J. GEORGE SCOTT, K.C.I.E.

IN a very excellent book on the *Shans at Home*, recently published by a member of this Society, Mrs. Leslie Milne, it is stated that "the chief source of early Shan Buddhism was probably the Talaiings and Cambodians". This is the opinion of the Rev. Wilbur Willis Cochrane, who at the same time states that it is his conviction that the Tai got their alphabet and early literature probably from the same sources. Mr. Cochrane is an American missionary, who has spent something like twenty years among the Tai and is an accomplished Tai scholar. There is a quite considerable Tai literature, mostly of a religious kind, but with a very creditable amount of folk-tales. Unfortunately there is nothing that throws any light on the early history of their country. Previous to our occupation of the Shan States, as a consequence of the annexation of Upper Burma, the whole of the States had been involved in almost incessant civil war, and for a century before that the wars between China and Burma and Burma and Siam had led to the marching and counter-marching of armies through the hills. The troops were Buddhists, no doubt, but they had very little

regard for sacred things, and the result is that most of what writings there may have been on the history of the country perished with the monasteries.

It is therefore quite impossible to say with any certainty where the Shans had their original home, and it is equally impossible to be certain whence they got their religion and their written character. Whether they were the Ts'u or the Pang or Pan-hu race, as Professor Douglas and Mr. E. H. Parker would have us believe, and whether this can be proved by the eight or ten words which the industry of the late M. Terrien de Lacouperie collected in his *Languages of China before the Chinese*, is a matter of doubt. We are, however, on surer ground when we come to the Ai or Ngai-lao of Southern Yünnan, concerning whom Mr. Parker has given so much information to us, derived from Chinese annals. It seems to be generally accepted now that the Nan-chao kingdom, which had its capital at Tali-fu, formerly called Yang-tstime, was the first historical appearance of the Shans. That was a powerful confederation, and it held its own in alternate struggles with the China of those days and with Tibet. But the Tai always seem to have had an inclination rather to tribal than to racial rule. They were never intended to become a great nation. They could join together for resistance or for the purpose of punishing aggression, but they could not consolidate their successes. They raided as far as the Great Plain of China and the Han River, and they sent colonies far down the Mèkhong River and west of the Irrawaddy, but the raiders apparently settled down there and forgot their connexion with the parent kingdom. Nevertheless Nan-chao nominally ruled over all Yünnan, a part of Ssu-ch'uan and of Kwang-hsi, extended far westward to Magadha (the modern Oudh), included most of Northern Burma and parts of Assam, and bordered Tongking and Cambodia on the south. The most notable Ngai-lao chieftains or kings were

Koh-lo-fêng and I-mou hsün, who reigned in the eighth century of our era. The Ngai-lao kingdom fell more and more under Chinese influence from the tenth century onwards, and was finally broken up by Kublai Khan with his Mongolian hordes in 1254 A.D.

The disruption of the Ngai-lao kingdom was the opportunity of the Mao Shan kingdom. It had existed alongside of and almost as long as the Tali-fu branch of the Tai. The two ruling houses were connected by marriage, and they had also had wars with one another, but when Tali-fu fell the Mao Shans became the undoubted chief representatives of the Tai race. They were reinforced by the fugitives from Tali, and they pushed west and gave kings for a time to Burma. Another swarm of the Ngai-lao went south, and either drove before them earlier settlers, or themselves went on to the Gulf of Siam and founded the kingdom of Siam, the beginning of which Bishop Pallegoix fixes in 1350.

The interference of the Shans of Mêng Mao in Burma led to the final breaking up of the Tai as a great power. They remained prosperous and formidable until the sixteenth century. In 1562 Bayin Naung, the king of Pegu, sent up an army said to have numbered 200,000 men. This is no doubt an exaggeration, but whatever the strength of it was it was enough to destroy the city of Mêng Mao and to reduce the kingdom to vassalage. According to the Burmese this was the beginning of the Buddhist religion amongst the Tai. It is expressly stated that teachers of Buddhism were left behind to instruct the Shan priests in the worship of Gautama and to convert the people. This may have implied the introduction of the Southern Canon, but it can hardly have meant any more. Probably it is no more correct than it is to say that Nawra'ta, the great hero king of Burma, introduced Buddhism into Pagān when he destroyed Thatôn and carried off king, monks, people, and holy

books to the capital on the Irrawaddy. It is certain that there were Buddhists there before. Their Buddhism may have been as corrupt as that of Tibet is now, and their monks, the Ariya, may have been as dissolute as Burmese chronicles say they were, but they certainly were followers of the Northern Canon. It was almost certainly the same in the country of the Mao Shans. We are expressly told that there were priests among them, and if the people were not Buddhists they were animists, and animists have no priests.

We may therefore take it as quite certain that the Burmese theory is wrong. They may have reformed the Buddhism of the Tai, but they did not give it to them. There are other items of information which confirm this. The Tibetans have two theories as to the introduction of Buddhism into their country. One is that it was introduced by a Tibetan king's Chinese wife, the daughter of a Chinese emperor. Books and relics came from India, but it was the personal influence of the Chinese princess which seems to have had the greatest practical results in establishing Buddhism. Another theory is that it was introduced by a lama, who converted Kublai Khan to Buddhism. The Chinese claim that Kublai Khan annexed Tibet, but it is a question of high politics whether Tibet was ever annexed at all, and the date would not be till the middle of the eighteenth century. At any rate there is evidence of lamaism among the Mongols and in the train of Kublai Khan two hundred years and more before the Peguan king came with his Buddhism to the Mao Shan kingdom.

It seems therefore very clear that Buddhism existed most probably in both the Ngai-lao and Méng Mao kingdoms at least as early as it did in Burma, and that it was of the Northern Canon, just as the Buddhism of Upper Burma was till it was reformed by Nawra'ta. The great king Asoka (Dhammasawka as the Tai call

him) was, we know, both a Saul and a Constantine. It seems probable that it was he who introduced Buddhism into Tibet. He sent apostles north and south and east and west, and if they did not penetrate directly into Tibet they very probably did so by way of Chinese Turkistan, and Mongolia. The Nan-chao kingdom had wars and alliances and frequent communication in various ways with Tibet. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suppose that it got Buddhism from this direction and not from the south. If we assume the Buddhism we must also assume that it brought literature. The missionary enterprises of Asoka included the building of pagodas, and we are told that 86,000 of them were built throughout the world known to him. In many of the Shan States there are shrines which claim to be among this number. The object of all pagodas is to enshrine sacred relics or sacred books. It does not seem probable that MSS. of some kind did not form part of the sacred things deposited in these pagodas, and it is reasonable to suppose that the writing of the country was modelled on these examples. The Môn or Talaing alphabet, and not impossibly that of Chiampa and Cambodia, were equally founded on Indian models, and it seems at any rate quite probable that the original Tai developed it for themselves and did not have to get it from neighbours on the south, long after they themselves would seem to have adopted Buddhism.

Some old Ahom (Tai) MSS. from Assam have recently come into the hands of the Rev. Mr. Cochrane. It may be hoped that more will follow, but in the meantime one of them proves to be a Mao Shan chronicle from the reign of Hsö Hkan-hpa through the earlier part of Burman-Shan history. Hsö Hkan-hpa was the greatest of all the Mao chiefs, and it is gratifying to find that the Assam chronicle confirms in most points the story of the Hsen-wi chronicle in Mr. Cochrane's possession, as well as another

chronicle translated in the *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*. The chief matter of interest from the point of view of this paper is that it confirms the assertion that the early rulers of the Mao Shan kingdom were invited to come there by the "Elders" who first administered the country from Mông Hi-Mông Ham. It is quite impossible to identify these two principalities, but they are supposed to have been on the Nam Hkawng, the Cambodia River. It was quite a common affair in later days for Shan States which had no direct or no suitable heir to send to Mông Mit (Momeit) for a ruler. The direct line of Tai chiefs was supposed to be maintained untainted by outside alliances there, and it may be noted that the Shweli River, the Nam Mao, which gave its name to the Tai kingdom, or took its name from it, flows through Mông Mit. In the same way Mông Hi-Mông Ham may be assumed to have best preserved the ruling house either of the Mao Tai or of the Ngai-lao. Mr. Cochrane points out that *Hi* is an old Shan word, now only used in poetic compositions, meaning "long", and *Ham* is the ordinary Tai couplet, so that the whole phrase may mean "the great country", and may be applied equally to China or to the kingdom of the Ngai-lao, or to the Wying Lông, the great Tai principality on the Nam Hkawng River. If chiefs were sought for from the south, it would be a reversal of the later process, which considered that the true and most purely national Tai were those of the north.

But there is another point. The Ahom chronicle expressly says *Ton taw pai tai lik pa lwe hkwaw*, which, literally translated, means "Their Excellencies marching brought letters (or manuscripts) with them". This, of course, may mean that they first brought letters, in the shape of script or alphabet, to the north country, but if it does it is a reversal of everything else in the history of the Tai race. Their original home was certainly in the

north, possibly or probably in Yunnan and parts of Ssu-ch'uan, and it was from there that they extended, so far as we know, in all directions except the north. There is no suggestion that religion was brought, as well as letters. Such evidence as we have seems rather to point to the introduction of Buddhism, either direct from India or from Mongolia. If religion was introduced it seems more than probable that it came, not in the mere form of sermons and addresses, but with written texts to support it.

The Ahom chronicle gives no dates, but when it is read with the Hsen-wi chronicles, which it confirms, we can fix them. The latter say that Hkun Lai's reign ended in 239 B.E., which is 817 A.D. He had no issue and was succeeded by the "Elders", who when they became old were wearied of official cares and sent to Mōng Hi-Mōng Ham for the princes of the Tai ruling line to succeed them. This may bring the date up to the middle of the ninth century of the Christian era, or a little later. Mr. Cochrane says: "there is nothing improbable in this date, though it brings the introduction of Shan letters into the Mao kingdom at least two centuries earlier than my suppositions."

The matter is only one of minor interest. It is indisputable that the alphabet of our Tai of the hither Shan States has been greatly modified by the connexion of these Tai states with Burma. A very large number of the more earnest monks went down to study in the well-equipped monasteries of Burma, near the great shrines of the faith. The much more elaborate alphabets of the Siamese, Lao, Hküin, and Lü may possibly be more characteristically Tai, and they may have reversed the national trend and have come up from the south, as no doubt the purer form of the Buddhist faith itself did come from the south and not from the north. That may be conceded; but it does not prove that Buddhism of

a kind, the Buddhism of the Northern Canon, debased, like that of Tibet, largely with devil-worship, did not exist long before.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the most outwardly fervent Buddhists are at heart really animists. This is true of the Burmese, and it is still more true of the less highly civilized Tai. True Buddhism is essentially the religion of the thinker. It is a system of philosophy or a code of morality rather than a religion, and it does not satisfy the heart-searchings of ordinary mortals. It does not fit the everyday life of the modern Burman or Shan, and still less can it be supposed to have suited the conditions of a much less civilized age. The people have a much greater faith in the calculation of lucky and unlucky days and in the deductions from their horoscopes than in the virtue of almsgiving and the efficacy of worship at the pagoda. Dragon-worship overlaid the Buddhism of Pagan before it was reformed by Nawra'ta, and the Shan cycle of *hpèwan* is still used by the more northerly of the British Tai States, just as it is used by the Chinese, Siamese, Annamese, Cambodians, and Lao. It was the original Indo-Chinese form of chronology, but it is now much more commonly used for the less dignified purposes of fortune-telling, though Siam in certain connexions still talks of "the year of the rat" and "the year of the pig". The system is doubtless the same as the Jovian cycle of the Hindus, and both Hindus and Chinese probably got it from the Chaldees, but in any case it is animistic and not Buddhistic, and it came from the Chinese to the Tai and went southwards. It did not come up from the coast.

Animism covers all sorts of religious beliefs besides the belief in spirits; it covers fetishism, tree and animal worship, and the doctrine of transmigration. The Tai, like the Burmese, worship chiefly the spirit of the house and the spirits of the village, and their tree-worship is

rendered more respectable by the legend that the Buddha Gautama attained supreme wisdom under the bo-tree. Their country is divided by parallel ranges of hills running from the eastern end of the Himalayas down to the sea. This produces a series of valleys, some of them narrow, some of them broad, and some of them flattening out into what may be called downs. It is in these valleys that the Tai live. The hill-ranges are inhabited by tribes that are most of them in no way related to the Tai and belong to quite different sub-families. These are all of them animists, and they keep alive the tendency to spirit-worship among the Tai themselves. Some of them worship the dead, or at any rate propitiate disembodied spirits, like the head-hunting Wild Wa. There are signs that the Tai, like the Burmese, themselves did this in the old days. Most of the rest worship trees and rocks and natural phenomena generally, and it may be noted that the Wild Wa, in addition to their head-hunting practices, also follow the cult of the pipul-tree, the *Ficus religiosa*, under which the Buddha attained supreme knowledge.

There is, however, one particular race which shows signs of having been at one time Buddhistic, and so adds ground for belief that Buddhism was adopted in the early years of the Ngai-lao and Mao Shan monarchies, and was not adopted from the south, whether from the Môn or the Khmér. This race is the Lahu, which is the name they give themselves. They are called Lawhē or Loh-êrh by the Chinese, and Muhsö by the Shans and Burmese. They have wandered far, and settlements of Lahu are to be found away down with the Lao or Siamese Tai States. The farther south they go the more they seem to become like the ordinary spirit-worshippers of the hills. In the great Trans-Salween State of Kēngtūng they worship Tiwara, who are spirits of the ordinary type, guarding houses, villages, mountains, rivers, trees, and so on, and the offerings are of the usual kind. But even in the

farthest strayed villages they say that they also worship one great spirit who dwells in the skies, and so far as one is able to judge from, up to the present, very scanty information, this is the only religion of the parent stock. They say their original home was on the Irrawaddy, probably far up at its sources, and that while their forefathers still lived there they were ruled by *fu*. Now *Fu* is the Chinese name for the Buddha, and the fact that these *fu* of the Lahu were spiritual as well as temporal rulers immediately suggests the Dalai Lama and the Tashi Lama of Tibet, and hints at the early connexions of the race. In the Nan Cha Tōng-chu settlement of the Lahu there were thirty-six of the *fu*, and over them were set *ta fu yè*, or Great Buddhas or Lamas, whose number is not clearly established. These thirty-six *fu* were, it is asserted, established at the instance of a great teacher. Kyan Sit Fu, who appeared mysteriously and ordered the construction of thirty-six *fu-fang* or sacred Buddhistic houses. When they had been built he disappeared as mysteriously as he came. There were originally 360 *huyè* or priests in charge of these *fu-fang*. These are insignificant numbers compared with the huge communities of the Tibetan lamasseries, but the Lahu are now broken up into small settlements and their ideas may have shrunk with their surroundings. There is also no suggestion that the *huyè* lived in the *fu-fang*, but the story told that they abstained from eating flesh and practised asceticism of various kinds seems to hint at it.

The only *ta fu yè* known still to exist, or at any rate who has been met with, is the Chief of Mōng Hka, a village on the summit of a huge ridge, a few miles farther north along which is Nawng Hkeo, the sacred lake of the Wild Wa. This *ta fu yè* is not only the chief of the village, but is also, if not himself the actual object of worship, at any rate the chief ministrant during the annual festivities, which fall at about the same time as

the Chinese New Year. He lives in a house which is the last of a series of squares, arranged in a line from east to west, and marked out by loose stone walls. They are all absolutely empty, like the entrance courts leading up to a Confucian temple, except for the second, which has in the centre a rudely squared cubical altar or block of stone. Similarly squared altar-stones crown the knolls round about. At the time of the New Year festival each of these is visited in turn by processions firing guns and beating gongs, and lighted candles and burning joss-sticks are deposited before them. There are also a series of small sheds—they are too insignificant in material and flimsy in construction to be called anything else—with no adornments of any kind, nothing but a board with an inscription in Chinese, the purport of which has not been ascertained. These constructions are called alternatively *kaw-mu* and *fu-fang*. *Kaw-mu* is almost certainly the Burmese *kaung-hmu*, which means a work of merit and is commonly applied to a pagoda, and *fu-fang* is the ordinary name for a Buddhist shrine in Chinese.

The main *fu-fang* at Mōng Hka stands on the top of the ridge behind the village. This also is approached through a series of bare courts outlined by low loose-stone walls, but in several of them stand the formal white umbrellas and long poles, with pennants or streamers attached, such as are familiar in the enclosures of Burmese and Shan pagodas and monasteries. The shrine itself is in the farthest court, and consists of no more than a couple of long low barrack-like sheds, of the most modest possible construction. They stand in a line with one another, and the entrance to each is in the middle of the side. There is nothing within except a line of tables or altars, with erections on them like troughs reared on end and inscribed with Chinese characters. There is no suggestion of an image of any kind. The offerings of food, fruit, and flowers are placed on the tables, as they might be in any

ordinary spirit-shrine, and candles and joss-sticks burn outside the shed and at the foot of the pillars, but there is no priest or monk in charge, and there appear to be no regular services or days of worship. The whole in its simplicity and vagueness recalls the altars in the courts of the Temple of Heaven in Peking, with its worship of the *Tien* or *Huang-tien*, the vast concave expanse of heaven, rather than a Buddhist shrine.

The name *tu fu yè*, and the sacred character of its bearer, inevitably suggests something less than the Dalai Lama of Lhasa and something more than the ordinary lama of the monasteries. At any rate both temporal and religious power are concentrated in the person of the Lahu *tu fu yè*. There is nothing in their history or their traditions, so far as they are known, that connects them with Tibet, but they may well have been made prisoners in the wars of the Ngai-lao with Tibet, which went on for long years. The change of climate might account for the change of architecture, but there is nothing whatever that suggests a lamassery in any Lahu village that has so far been seen.

Temples such as that at Mōng Hka are striking rather because they are deserted than because they are crowded like the Tibetan monasteries. Apparently, too, the Lahu *fu-fungs* can only exist where there is a *tu fu yè*, which may account for the fact that the ordinary Lahu village, at any rate in the parts where they have lately settled, not only do not build them, but seem to be steadily becoming more and more like their hill neighbours, who are all elementary spirit-worshippers. At any rate there is no record of any *fu-fung* except that at Mōng Hka. The head-quarters of the Chinese prefecture of Chên-pien, established at the expense of the province of Burma and of the Lahu, is now at an old Lahu *fu-fung*. Lahu information directly asserts it, and indeed it is proved by the Shan name of Chên-pien, which is Hpu-hpien,

and in Chinese Shan the aspirated *p* is always pronounced *f*. Whatever the character of the shrine may have been it is entirely built over by the ordinary Chinese official *yamén*.

There is much about the Lahu customs which suggests that they must at one time have been Buddhists. Their religion has, at any rate in the outskirts of the race, been influenced on the one hand by the Taoism of China and on the other by the spirit-worship of their immediate neighbours. Where they have not been broken down by oppression and misfortunes, mostly brought upon them by the Chinese, they are a greatly superior race to most of the mountain tribes.

Mr. Warry, who was for a good many years the exceedingly able Chinese adviser to the Burma Government, says that the Chinese call them Loh-êrh out of pure mischief. "Lahu would have been an equally easy sound, but to the Chinese mind it would not have been so appropriate a designation, for it would not have conveyed the contemptuous meaning of Loh-êrh. Loh-êrh may be translated Lo or La 'niggers'. The translation 'Black Lo-lo' is incorrect and also very misleading, because it suggests that the Lahu are akin to or identical with the black-bone Lo-lo, the 'tall, handsome, oval-faced, Aryan-like race' of Western Ssu-ch'uan described by Colborne Baber. The Lahu are a very different people. They are of small stature, with sharp prominent features, and a keen and distrustful expression. Dressed in Chinese costume, which they usually affect, the men are very like Chinamen in reduced circumstances. Their women are somewhat better-looking, with bright, intelligent faces, and figures well set off in their picturesque national dress. As a rule the Chinese have two names for aboriginal tribes on their borders; one contemptuous, if not contumelious, for general use, and the other euphemistic, and employed only in the presence of members of the tribe, or when the

speaker is superstitiously apprehensive of some hurt from them. This second designation in the case of the Lahu is *Fu-chiu*, or the 'happy family'. The unintentional irony of this term cannot fail to strike anyone who has seen the wretched discomfort in which the Lahu live and recollects that for several years past they have been remorselessly hunted and oppressed by the Chinese and robbed of whatever happiness might once have been their lot. If they are in any way related to the Moso tribes of North-West Yunnan, whose ancient capital was at Likiang-fu, they have lost all tradition of the connexion, and indeed the Mosos of that region, as described by Cooper and others, seem to have little or nothing in common with them."

Prince Henri d'Orleans, on the other hand, found that in some places the Lahu called themselves Lo-lo, and he was told that they had a written character which was like the writing on mandarins' seals. The people of a village near Mien-ning told him that the Lahu, like the Lo-lo, came from near Nang-king ages ago, and the Lissu who inhabit the Salween Valley between latitudes 26° and 27° N. have a similar tradition. They have marked aquiline noses and straight-set eyes, with a copper complexion, and at their New Year's feasts they have *lao-tien shu*, firs like our Christmas trees. It may be remarked in this connexion that at the New Year time the Chinese of the Yunnan province have a custom of carpeting their floors with pine needles.

The Mosos have a king at Yet-che, near the Nam Hkawng, a little south of Tseku, about the 28th parallel. In the view of Terrien de Lacouperie the Musus or Mosos would be of the same Tibeto-Burmese group as the Jungs or Njungs, who appeared on the frontiers of China six centuries before Christ, coming from the north-east of Tibet. Chinese historians mention the Mosos 796 years after Christ, the epoch of their subjection by the King of Nan-chao. They regained their independence for a time

and were then again conquered by the Tali kingdom, and when that fell before Kublai Khan they came under Chinese rule. They and the Lo-lo probably have the same origin. The names of both races are Chinese. The national name of the Lo-lo is Ngosu, and the Moso call themselves Nachi. The dialects have many points in common. Formerly their influence extended far into Tibet beyond Kiang-ka. There is a popular Tibetan poem, the *Keser*, which celebrates the prowess of a warrior who strove to drive back the Moso.

Moreover, they have a New Year's festival. A pig which has been fattened on peaches is sacrificed. Nothing but the Moso language is talked, and if any Tibetans are in the village they are excluded. This at once recalls the Lahu New Year's feast, which is called the *Waw-lóng*. At Mông Hka at this season jingals are fired at sunset for three days, and during that period at frequent intervals parties firing guns and beating gongs make the round of the shrines and deposit wax candles and lighted joss-sticks. In other Lahu villages where the old traditions have been forgotten, the festival is kept, but it is purely animistic. The sacrifices are made to the spirits and there is much playing on the *ken*, the reed mouth-organ, and dancing by both men and women. During the festival, however, no stranger is allowed to enter the village, and if by chance one happens to be there he is detained till the feast is over and is then sent away deprived of everything he has, even to his clothes. No language but Lahu may be spoken while the *Waw-lóng* lasts. The Lahu also celebrate another festival a fortnight later, which they call the Little New Year, the *Waw-noi*, which only lasts a single day, and it is worth noting that Mr. R. C. Bourne, of the Chinese Consular Service, found that in some places the Lo-lo have a similar festival, while elsewhere some of the Lo-lo tribes have adopted Buddhism, even to the extent of building monasteries. Prince Henri d'Orleans

made a superficial study of the languages of the Lahu, the Lo-lo, and the Lissu, another tribe which inhabits the western portions of much the same tract of country reaching up towards Tibet. and he found general resemblances in all three dialects.

The Lissu have no written character. The Moso writing has no real existence as such. The Lahu, at any rate in the British Shan States, have none. The Moso written character is only known to their "medicine men", who may be compared with the *tu fu yè* of the Lahu. Their manuscript books have the pages divided into little squares running horizontally from left to right. These partitions are filled with hieroglyphics or rough drawings of men, houses, animals' heads, and conventional signs for the sky, lightning, and other natural phenomena. They are prayers beginning with the mention of the creation of the world, and ending with an enumeration of all the ills which menace mankind, which man can avoid if he is pious and gives alms to the magicians, or religious teachers.

The Lo-lo, as we know, have, or perhaps it would be more correct to say had, a written character which Terrien de Lacouperie found to have resemblances with that of the Bugis and Mankassars of Sumatra, as well as with the Indo-Pali characters of the Asoka fragment. Their writing is a sort of ideographic system based on picture-writing, and the difficulty of studying it is vastly increased by the disconcerting fact that few of their literary men nowadays are able to read any but their own particular MSS.

The resemblances to Indo-Pali script, however, are distinctly suggestive. Asoka we know sent missionaries far and wide. The equally great, and perhaps even more zealous, Kanishka some generations later also sent apostles north and south and east and west. It was these missionaries who introduced Buddhism into Tibet and

Mongolia and beyond. It is impossible to believe that they came only to preach by word of mouth. They would certainly take their texts with them, and where the creed was taught it is not likely that the means of recalling its details would be omitted. The fact that all these texts have disappeared proves nothing, for fighting in these parts was continuous for centuries and the conquering soldier has no respect for anything. The Chinese in their recent movement into Tibet destroyed lamasseries in preference to anything else, and it is one of the most grievous complaints of the Dalai Lama that they used religious MSS. for resoling their boots. The Chinese annals speak of the Ngai-lao kingdom as being quite a reasonable approximation to their own civilization, which is a concession that they are not too free in making, in much later times. Some of the details given certainly suggest Buddhism. When the Tai were overthrown at Tali-fu they were exterminated quite as effectually as the Hui-hui, the Panthes, were six hundred years later, when the Mohammedan insurrection was quelled. It is not surprising, therefore, that there are no remains of their Buddhism or of their literature to be traced, but the suggestions of Buddhism still to be found among the surrounding hillmen inevitably create the belief that it must have existed, and if they had the religion they must also have had written characters of a kind, probably not known to the mass of the people, because religion always has tried to keep to itself an esoteric character—witness the Vulgate, the *Abhidhamma*, written in the Pali, which never was a spoken tongue, and the *Granth*. The matter is one quite incapable of proof at the present time, but very little is known about the Tai; Mrs. Leslie Milne's book is likely to remain the standard work about them for a good many years, and it seems desirable to enter a caution against the adoption of the belief that the Tai derived their religion, and with it their writing and

literature, from the south. It was they who colonized the south country: more than likely they got their present form of Buddhism from there, but that is no more a proof that they had neither Buddhism, literature, nor written character before than it is true that Buddhism and literature were first introduced to Upper Burma when King Nawra'ta destroyed Thatôn and carried off everything living and portable to Pagān on the Irawaddy.

THE PANCARATRAS OR BHAGAVAT-SASTRA

By A GOVINDACARYA SVAMIN, M.R.A.S.

PART I

1. The synonymy of what is well known as the *Pāñca-rātra* is thus given in the *Pādma-tantra* (one of the 108 Tantras or *Saṁhitās*) :—

Sūris suhṛīd bhāgavatas sātvaṭaḥ pañca-kāla-vit¹ |
 Ekāntikas tanmayaś ca pāñcarātrika ity api ||
 (iv, 2, 88.)

From this it is evident that *Pāñcarātra* = Bhāgavata = Sātvaṭa = Ekāntika.

2. This Śāstra or Science (of the Worship of the One God = Monotheism) is also called Ekāyana, which means the *Only Way* (Monotheism). For, as is stated in *Īśvara-Saṁhitā*, Nārada tells the Sages—

Mokṣāyanāya vai panthā etad anyo na vidyate |
 Tasmād *Ekāyanam* nāma pravādanti manīṣiṇaḥ ||
 (i, 18.)

i.e. “Whereas there is no other Path than this One to Emancipation (*mokṣa*), the wise call this by the name Ekāyana”.

3. This Science is also known as the Mūla-Veda or Root-Science (or Root-Knowledge), inasmuch as Vāsudeva is at the Root of all Knowledge, as the following verse explicitly says—

¹ See par. 7 *infra*, where the term *Pañca-kāla-parāyana* occurs. For explanation, see par. 9 *infra*. The confusion of this with *Pāñcarātra* must be avoided, as in footnote 53, p. 16, Dr. G. A. Grierson's *Nārāyaṇīya* (*Ind. Antiq.*, 1909, Reprint).

Mahato Veda-vṛkṣasya mūla-bhūto mahān ayam |
 Skandha-bhūtā Rg-ādyās te śākhā-bhūtāś ca yoginaḥ ||
 Jagan-mūlasya Vedasya Vāsudevasya mukhyataḥ |
 Pratipādakatā siddhā Mūla-Vēdākhyatā dvijāḥ ||
 Ādyam Bhāgavatam dharmam ādi-bhūte kṛte yuge |
 Mānavā yogya-bhūtās te anutiṣṭhanti nityaśaḥ ||

(Id. i, 24-6.)

i.e. "This (Science) is the root of the Veda-tree; the Rg and others are its trunk and branches. This (Science) is called by the name Mūla-Veda (= Root-Veda), because it is an exposition of Vāsudeva, the Root of the Universe. This is the Original Bhāgavata-Dharma,¹ which in the Kṛta age worthy men observed always".

4. That this Ancient Science is *Ancient*, and not *originated* by Vāsudeva, the Son of Vasudeva = Kṛṣṇa, is evident from the word Vāsudeva, meaning "He who permeates all", though grammatically it is also a patronymic, viz. "son of Vasudeva". For firstly, the word Vāsudeva occurs in the Taittiriya - Upaniṣad passage known as the *Viṣṇu-Gāyatrī*. Secondly, we have in the *Pādma-tantra*—

Vasudeva-sutasyāpi sthāpanam Vāsudeva-vat ||

(iii, 29, 28.)

i.e. "The installation of the Son of Vasudeva (Kṛṣṇa) is like that of Vāsudeva (the Ancient One)".

Thirdly, that the Ekāyana Science is one of the Ancient Sciences learnt by Nārada, is evident from what Nārada himself tells Sanatkumāra in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣat*—

"Rg-Vedaṁ Bhagavo 'dhyeini Yajur-Vedaṁ Sāma-Vedaṁ Ātharvaṇam caturthaṁ Itihāsa-Purāṇam pañcamaṁ Vedānām Vedaṁ Pitryam Rāśim Daivam Nidhiṁ Vāko-vākyaṁ *Ekāyanam*." (vii, 1, 2.)

¹ From such Upaniṣad passages as "na khalu *Bhāgavatā* Yama-
 viṣayaṁ gacchanti", oft quoted by the ancient Ācāryas, it is further
 evidence of the eternality of the Bhāgavata Religion.

i.e. "O Sanatkumāra, I have learnt Ṛg-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda, Atharvaṇa . . . *Ekāyanam*." ¹

Also see the word occurring in the same Upanisat, vii, 1, 4 ; 2, 1 ; 5, 2 ; 7, 1.

Fourthly, Śrī Kṛṣṇa Himself says in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (vii, 19)—

Vāsudevaḥ sarvam iti sa mahātmā sudurlabhaḥ.

i.e. "That great soul is hard to find who knows 'Vāsudeva is all':"

showing that the Bhāgavata or Vāsudeva Religion was not originated or invented in Kṛṣṇa's days, but was existent from time primeval.²

Further, Śrī Kṛṣṇa confirms this position, viz. the eternity of the Bhāgavata Religion, by telling Arjuna that what he taught him now was the Ancient Religion, which from time to time is forgotten by men, and He comes and revives it. Read *Bhagavad-Gītā*, iv, 1-3—

Imam Vivasvate yogam proktavān aham avyayam ||
 Vivasvān Manave prāha Manur Ikṣvākave 'bravīt |
 Evam paramparā-prāptam imam rājarṣayo viduḥ ||
 Sa kālen-cha mahatā yogo naṣṭaḥ Parantapa |
 Sa ev-āyam mayā te 'dya yogaḥ proktaḥ purātanah ||

i.e. "It was I (the Ancient, not merely as Kṛṣṇa now) who taught this Divine Science (Yoga) to Vivasvān (the Sun). Vivasvān taught Manu; and Manu taught

¹ *Ekāyana* appears to have been one of the Upanisads, or the crown of all Upanisads, of which the whole Pāncarātra literature appears to be a vast commentary. So do we learn from the *Śrī-praśna Samhitā*, ii, 38, 39--

"*Vedam ekāyanam nāma Vedānām śirasi sthitam*
Tad arthakam Pāncarātram moksadam tat-kriyāvatām,
Yasmin eko mokṣa-mārgo Vede proktas sanātanah,
Mad-ārādhanā-rūpeṇa tasmād ekāyanam bhavet."

² Śrī Kṛṣṇa's reference here is to the primeval Vāsudeva Dharma, not to Himself as the *son of Vāsudeva*, to which latter He Himself alludes in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, v, x, 37, viz. "Vṛṣṇinām Vāsudevo 'ham". Also see my note on Vāsudeva in the *Indian Antiquary*, p. 319, November, 1910.

Ikṣvāku. That this is thus traditionally derived, the Royal Sages know. But by long lapse of time the Science was lost. And this Ancient Science has again by Me now told thee, O Foe-dread (Arjuna) ”.

Here “Royal Sages know” does not mean that only the Royal Sages or Kṣatriyas know, and that Brāhmaṇas therefore do not know: nor does it mean that Kṣatriyas originated it without reference to the Brāhmaṇas. Also, the term “Royal” is also interpretable as “those Sages who have attained royalty or eminence in the Divine Science”; and therefore need not necessarily mean Kṣatriyas.¹ Besides, if the Ancient, as He says, taught Vivasvān, may it be adduced from this that the Ancient was a Kṣatriya, or that Vivasvān (the Sun) is a Kṣatriya? It is simply Nārāyaṇa, the Primeval God, teaching Nārada to begin with—Nārada, the mind-born son of Brahmā and therefore a divine Brāhmaṇa (*Brahmarṣi*)—as may be seen from *Īśvara-Sūhitā*, i, 4 ff.—

Nārāyaṇaṁ tapasyantaṁ Nara-Nārāyaṇāśrame
 Saṁsevantaḥ sadā bhaktyā mokṣōpāya-vivitsavaḥ.
 Saṁsthitā munayaḥ sarve Nārāyaṇa-parāyaṇāḥ
 Kālena kena cit svargāt Nārāyaṇa-dīdṛkṣayā
 Tatrāvatrīya devaṛṣiḥ Nāradaḥ sa kutūhalaḥ
 Dṛṣtvā Nārāyaṇaṁ devaṁ namaskṛtya kṛtāñjaliḥ
 Puḷakāñcita-sarvāṅgaḥ prahr̥ṣṭa-vadano muniḥ
 Stutvā nānāvīdhaḥ stotraḥ praṇamya ca muhur muhur
 Pūjayāmāsa taṁ Devaṁ Nārāyaṇaṁ anāmayam
 Atha Nārāyaṇo devaḥ tam āha munipuṅgavam
 Munayo hy atra tiṣṭhanti prārthayānā Hareḥ padam
 Eteṣāṁ Sāvataṁ śāstram upadeṣṭuṁ tvam arhasi
 Ityuktv-āntardadhe Śrīman-Nārāyaṇa-munis tadā.

i.e. “The Sages (*munis*) lovingly served Nārāyaṇa absorbed in meditation at Nara-Nārāyaṇ-āśrama (Badari

¹ Similarly *Rāja-vidyā* of Bhagavad-Gītā, ix, 2 does not mean “the Science of the Kings (i.e. Kṣatriyas)”, but means “Royal Science or Princely Knowledge”.

in the Himalayas). Wishing to see Nārāyaṇa, Nārada descended from Svarga; and seeing Him, prostrated and stood up with hands clasped, with joy beaming in his face and thrilling in his frame. He burst forth in praise, again and again casting himself at His feet. He worshipped (thus) the Holy Nārāyaṇa. Then spake Nārāyaṇa to the sage-chief thus: ‘The sages sit here praying for Hari’s feet, and Thou art fit to teach them the *Sātvata-Śāstra* (= Pāñca-rātra).’¹ So saying Śrīman-Nārāyaṇa made Himself invisible”.

Also read *Bhāradvāja-Saṁhitā* cited under par. 6 *infra*, as also iii, 41 (id.), and its *Pariśiṣṭa*, i, 88.

As to the primordial or primeval character of this Bhāgavata (= Vāsudevic or Pāñcarātra) religion, further reference is invited to Mahā-nārāyaṇa, Brahma-bindu, Mukti, Rāmatāpanī, and Vāsudeva Upaniṣads.²

5. That *Pāñcarātra* is Vedic and possesses Authority (so that its precepts and practices are to be followed by all those who own allegiance to Veda) is expressed in the *Pādma-tantra* verse—

¹ The whole literature of the Bhāgavata Religion is called the *Sātvata-Śāstra* in a generic sense. In a specific sense *Sātvata* is also the name of one of the 108 and odd Pāñcarātra-Saṁhitas or Treatises comprising the Āgamic Science. The *Sātvata-Śāstra* is again divided into two branches, the bigger of which is called the Pāñcarātra, and the smaller the Vaiḥānasa, probably the fifty-third in the list of the Saṁhitas given *infra*, par. 13. Read *Īśvara-Saṁhitā*, i, 62: “Tat syāt dvedhā Pāñcarātra-Vaiḥānasa vibhedataḥ.” It is not borne out by orthodoxy, to consider *Sātvatas* and *Bhāgavatas* as of two different schools, for *Sātvata* = Bhāgavata. The term *Sātvata* is thus derived: “Sat Brahma, sattvam vā; tadvantas Sātvantaḥ Brahma-vidah, sātvikā vā; tesāṁ idam karma, śāstram vā, sātvataḥ; tat-kurvāṇāḥ tad-ācakṣaṇās ca vā; sātayati sukhayaty āśritān iti sāt Paramātma; sa eteṣāṁ astīti vā sātvataḥ; *sātvanto vā mahā-bhāgavatāḥ*” [*Viṣṇu-Sahasra-nāma-bhāṣya* by Parāśara-Bhaṭṭārya].

² See par. 7 *infra*. We wish to invite the attention of Dr. G. A. Grierson (and other Oriental scholars as well) with reference to his opinion, reiterated again in JRAS. for April, 1910, p. 284, note, viz., “It is an historical fact that the Bhāgavata religion took its rise, *not amongst the Brāhmanas, but amongst the Kṣatriya caste*” (italics ours. See n. 3, p. 942).

Śruti-mūlam idam Tantraṁ pramāṇam Kalpa-sūtravat.

(i, 1, 88.)

i.e. "This Tantra is Śruti-originated or Śruti-rooted, and is an Authority like, for example, the Kalpa-Sūtra".¹

6. The meaning of the term Pāñcarātra is thus explained :—(a) *Pādma-Tantra*. The question is put—

Mahopaniṣad²-ākhyasya śāstrasy-āśya mahāmate!

Pāñcarātra-samākhy-āśau katham loke pravartate.

(i, 1, 68½-69.)

i.e. "How, O wise sire! is this Mahopaniṣat currently known in the world as Pāñcarātra?"

To which Śaṁvarta is made to answer thus :—

Pañc-etarāṇi śāstrāṇi rātrīyante mahānty api

Tat-sannidhau samākhyāśau tena loke pravartate.

i.e. "Because the *Five* Other Great Śāstras are like *darkness* in the presence of this (Pāñcarātra), thence is it currently known by the term Pāñcarātra".

The other Five Śāstras are—

- (1) Yoga (author Viriñca or Hiraṇya-garbhā).
- (2) Sāṅkhya (author Kapila).
- (3) Buddha (author Buddhi-mūrti).
- (4) Ārhata (author Arhata or Jina).
- (5) Kāpāla, Śuddha-Śaiva, Pāśupata (a group—author Śiva).
(*Vide op. cit.*, i, 1, 47-50.)

Or it may be also thus interpreted :—

Pañcatvam athavā yadvat dipyamāne divākare

Rechanti rātrāyas tadvat itarāṇi tad-antike.

(*Id.*, i, 1, 71.)

¹ We would also recommend our readers to a perusal of the subject-matter, viz. Pāñcarātras noticed in chapters 20-49 of the Agni-Purāna (Pūna Ānandaśrama Series).

² Read *Mahābhārata*, Śānti-Parvan, Mokṣa-Dharma, 340, 111—

"Sātvatam vidhim āsthāya gītas Saṅkarsaṇena yaḥ
Idam Mahopaniṣadam sarva-Veda samanvitam."

i.e. "As when the Sun rises, the *nights die*, so others die in the vicinity of this (Pāñcarātra)".

(b) *Nārada-Pāñcorātra*—

Rātram ca jñāna-vacanaṃ jñānaṃ pañca-vidhaṃ smṛtam
Tēn-edam Pañca-rātram ca pravādanti manīṣiṇah.

i.e. "*Rātram* is a term signifying knowledge, and because of this there are five (*pañca*) kinds, therefore the wise call it *Pañca-rātram*". (i, 1, 44.)

The Five Kinds of Knowledge (read op. cit., verses 45–56) are said to be—

- (1) Tattva (this is *sāttvika*).
- (2) Mukti-prada (also *sāttvika*).
- (3) Bhakti-prada (this is *naiṅguṇya*).
- (4) Yaugika (this is *rājasa*).
- (5) Vaiṣayika (this is *tāmasa*).

(c) *Srī-Praśna-Saṃhitā*, ii, 40, states—

Rātrir ajñānam ity uktam
Pañc-ety ajñāna-nāśakam.

i.e. "*Rātri*, night, means nescience, and *pañc*, derived from the root *pac*, to cook, means that which 'cooks', i.e. destroys that nescience". Hence Pāñcarātra is the science which dispels ignorance.

Also (d) *Ahīrbudhnyā-Saṃhitā*, xi-64, 65, 66 (?), and (e) *Kapīñjala-Saṃhitā*, chap. i, may be referred to.

7. The Ācāryas or Teachers in succession who promulgated these doctrines (omitting Nārāyaṇa and Nārada, *vide par. 4 supra*) are thus stated :—

Purā Totādri-sikhare Śaṅḍilyo 'pi mahā-muniḥ
Samāhita-manā bhūtvā tapas taptvā mahattaram
Anekāni sahasrāṇi varṣāṇāṃ tapaso 'ntataḥ
Dvāparasya yugasy-ānte ādan kali-yugasya ca
Sākṣāt Saṃkarṣaṇāt labdhvā vedam Ekāyanābhīdam
Sumantuṃ Jaiminiṃ caiva Bhṛguṃ caiv-Aupagāyanam
Mauñjyāyanam ca taṃ Vedam samyag adhyāpayat purā.
(*Īśvara-Saṃhitā*, i, 38–41.)

i.e. "In days past, on Totādri peak, Śāṇḍilya the great sage sat fixed in severe austerities (*tapas*) for many many years. In the end he obtained from Saṁkarṣaṇa—in the interim between Dvāpara age and Kali age—the Veda going by the name of *Ekāyana*, and taught them well to Sunantu, Jaimini, Bhṛgu, Aupagāyana, and Mauṅjyāyana".¹

And then in viii, 175-7, of the same *Saṁhitā*, Nārada tells—

Ekāntino mahābhāgāḥ Śaṭhakopa-purassarāḥ
 Kṣoṇyām kṛt-āvatārā ye lokojjivana-hetunā
 Śāṇḍilyādyāś ca ye c-ānye Pañcarātra-pravartakāḥ
 Prahlādaś c-aiva Sugrīvo Vāyusūnur Vibhīṣaṇaḥ
 Ye c-ānye Sanakādyāś ca Pañcakāla-parāyauḥ

i.e. "Śaṭhakopa and others, great devout saints, became incarnate on earth to save creatures. Sanaka and others, Śāṇḍilya and others, Prahlāda, Sugrīva, the Wind-Son (Hanumān), Vibhīṣaṇa and others—the strict observers of the Five-Timed Injunctions (*Pañca-kāla*)²—(these) are the Promulgators of the Pañcarātra".

With reference to Śāṇḍilya, attention is invited to No. 10, Śāṇḍilya-Vidyā, and No. 32, Śrīman-Nyāsa-Vidyā, in the Table of the 32 Vidyās, pp. 129-30 of our *Bhāgavat-Gītā* with Rāmānuja's Commentary.³

Next, after Śaṭhakopa and others, comes Rāmānuja. For Nārāyaṇa tells Bala-bhadra (or Bala-rāma, the brother of Kṛṣṇa) thus (*Īśvara-Saṁhitā*, xx, 278-80):—

¹ Thus the descent of the Bhāgavata Religion is, in the *Kṛta* Age, from Nara-Nārāyaṇa to Nārada; at the end of the *Drūpara* Age, from Saṁkarṣaṇa to Śāṇḍilya; in the *Kali* Age, from Viśvakṣena to Śaṭhakopa, as will further appear.

² Cf. the term *Pañca-kāla-rit* in par. 1 *supra*.

³ From this it is evident that a succession of Brāhmaṇa teachers precede the Kṣatriyas as the promulgators of the Bhāgavata doctrine. Nor need the monopoly be solely accredited to the Kṣatriyas (see note 2, p. 939 *supra*) or even to the Brāhmaṇas. For among the exponents of the doctrine figure archangels (Viśvakṣena, etc.), angels (Sanat Kumāra, etc.), Rsis (Śāṇḍilya, etc.), Rākṣasas (Prahlāda, etc.), men of all castes (Śaṭhakopa, etc.), and even monkey-gods (Sugrīva, Hanumān, etc.).

Asti te vimalā bhaktiḥ Mayi Yādava-nandana ! |
 Prathamam Śeṣa-rūpo Me kaimkaryam akarod bhavān ||
 Tatas tu Lakṣmaṇo bhūtvā Mām arādhitavān iha |
 Idānim api Mām yaṣṭum Balabhadra ! tvam arhasi ||
 Kalāv api yuge bhūyaḥ kaścid bhūtvā dvijottamaḥ |
 Nānā-vidhair bhoga-jālair arcanam Me kariṣyasi ||

i.e. "O Son of Yadu-race (Balarāma)! thou hast clean (or pure) devotion (or love) for Me. Thou, first as Śeṣa, didst great service for Me. Then next didst thou worship Me as Lakṣmaṇa.¹ Thou art now serving Me as Balabhadra. Thou shalt again in Kali age be born as a great Brāhmaṇa (= Rāmānuja), and shalt worship me with many things of joy".²

Bṛhad-Brahma-Sūhītā (ii, 7, 66 ff.) makes this clear, thus :—

Dviḥ-rūpeṇa bhavitā yā tu Saṅkarṣaṇābhidhā |
 Dvāparānte kaler ādau pāṣaṇḍa-pracure jane |
 Rāmānuj-eti bhavitā Viṣṇu-dharma-pravartakaḥ ||
 Śrīraṅgeśa-dayā-pātraim vidhī Rāmānujam munim |
 Yena sandarśitaḥ panthā Vaikuṅṭhākhyasya sadmanaḥ ||
 Pāram-aikāntiko dharmo bhava-pāśa-vimocakaḥ |
 Yat-ānanyatayā proktam āvayoh pāda-sevanam ||
 Kālen-āchhādito dharmo madīyo 'yam varānane ! |
 Tadā mayā pravṛtto 'yam tat-kāl-ōcita-mūrtinā ||
 Viṣvaksen-ādibhir bhaktair Śathāri-pramukhair dvijaib |
 Rāmānujena muninā kalan samsthām upesyati ||

i.e. "My Saṅkarṣaṇa part (O Śrī)," says Nārāyaṇa, is the form of a Brāhmaṇa, by the name Rāmānuja, which it is going to take, after the Dvāpara age and in the Kali age, to expound the Viṣṇu-dharma (= Bhāgavata Religion), when the world will be full

¹ Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, vi, 131, 121—

Adi-devo mahā bāhuḥ Harir Nārāyaṇo vibhuḥ |

Sāksād Rāmo Raghu-śresthāś Śeṣo Lakṣmaṇa ucyaṭe ||

i.e. Nārāyaṇa Himself becomes Rāma and Śeṣa becomes Lakṣmaṇa.

² Cf. the verse cited in our *Bhāgavat-Gītā*, Introd., p. xiv—

Anantaḥ prathamam rūpam *Lakṣmaṇaś* ca tataḥ param |

Balabhadras tṛtīyas tu kalan *Kaścit* (Rāmānuja) bhavisyati ||

of heretics or renegades (*pāśandu*). Know that Rāmānuja will be the specially favoured of Śrī-Raṅga (-nātha), and he will show the Way to the Realm known as Vaikuṅṭha. The One-pointed Religion exclusively to be rendered to Thee and Me (= Śrīman-Nārāyaṇa)—the religion which delivers (creatures) from the bonds of saṁsāra (material existence)—becomes dimmed by age, O fair-faced one! According to the requirements of the age, I take many forms,¹ and act by means of My devotees such as Viṣvaksena, Śaṭha-kopa, etc., and Rāmānuja in the Kāli age ”.

Bhāradvāja-Saṁhitā, iv, 92, teaches—

Abhyarthito jagad-dhātryā Śrīyā Nārāyaṇas svayam
Upādiśad imam yogam iti me Nārādāt śrutam.

i.e. “Prayed to by Śrī, the Universal Mother, Nārāyaṇa Himself taught (Her) this yoga. So did I hear from Nārada ”.

From the above it will be seen how the hierarchy (*Guru-paramparā*) of the Śrī-Vaiṣṇavas or Śrī-Sampradāyins came to be constituted thus:—

(1) Nārāyaṇa }
(2) Śrī² } = { Śrīman-Nārāyaṇa, or Universal
Mother-Father or Father-Mother.

¹ Curiously enough, theosophists [for example read C. Jinarājadāsa’s “Lives of the Initiates” in the April (1910) number of the *Theosophic Messenger*, p. 386] affirm that he who was Apollonius Tyana and subsequently Jesus the Christ became Rāmānuja thereafter in India. The following extract is made therefrom to incite inquiry: “In India, next to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who proclaimed the Path of Devotion, Śrī Rāmānuja holds a unique position among his brother philosophers. When we realize that the gentle Jesus of Palestine, after a life as Apollonius of Tyana, later took birth in South India about the twelfth century as Rāmānuja, we can account for the intensely devotional trend of his philosophy. Indeed, as we study his life and work, we can see that he took birth there for the special purpose of reviving the idea of Bhakti that was being lost to Indian thought.”

² Read—

“Śrī-Viṣṇu-loke Bhagavān Viṣṇur Nārāyaṇas svayam
Proktavān mantra-rāj-ādīn Lakṣmyai tāp-ādī-pūrvakam.”

(Cited in Comm. on *Vākya-Guru-paramparā*.)

(3) Viṣvaksena¹ = Seneśa = the Lord of Hosts (the Eternals).

(4) Śaṭhakopa or Śaṭhagopa² (the Mortal-Innmortal).

(5) The others between (4) and (6).

(6) Rāmānuja.³

(7) Succession after (6), up to one's own Holy Preceptor.⁴

In a work called *Vārtā-mālā* (or Garland of Talks), p. 98, 202nd Talk (Telugu edition, Madras, 1887, Sarasvatī-Bhandāra Press), a question was asked how the efficaciousness of the Apostolic Pedigree would be affected by the omissions of many names between. The answer was that it would not be affected, inasmuch as the efficaciousness of the Patriarchal Pedigree would not be affected by the omission by a Brāhmaṇa, of the Parentage beyond the Great-grandfather, the Grandfather and the Father, when he offers to these ancestral libations such as *Tarpana* and *Śrāddha*. *Inter alia*, the story of Viṣvaksena is told in *Pādma-tantra*, iii, 32, 113 ff. Thus he comes next to Śrī. And his worship is enjoined (*inter alia*) in *Lakṣmī-tantra*, ch. 40, and *Bhāradvāja-Saṁhitā*, i, 84. Also see JRAS.,

¹ Read—

“ Sv-upadiṣṭān ati-prītyā tāpah-pundr-ādi-pūrvakam
Viṣṇu-loke (a)vatirṇāya priyāya satatam Hareḥ
Seneśāya Priyā Viṣṇoḥ mūla-mantra-dvayādikam.”

(Op. cit.)

² Read—

“ Seneśas svayam āgatya prītyā Śrī-nagarim śubhām
Śaṭhagopāya munaye tintriṇi-mūla-vāsine
Tāp-ādi-pūrvakam mantra-dvaya-śloka-varān kramāt
Viṣṇu-patnyā Mahālakṣmyā myogād upadiṣṭavān
Punāś ca Nāthamunaye pañca-saṁskāra-pūrvakam
Bhaṭṭa-nātha-prabhrtibhiḥ nirmitar divya-yogibhiḥ
Divyair viṁśati-saṁkhyākaiḥ prabandhais sala deśikāḥ
Svokta-Drāmiḍa-Vedānām caturṇām upadeśa-kṛt.”

(Op. cit.)

³ Read p. 270 with footnote, JRAS. for April, 1910, by Dr. G. A. Grierson.

Read—

“ Ādāv upadiśed Veda-Khila-Rg-Veda-saṁjñikam
Asmad-gurubhya ity ādi vākya-trayam Arindama !”

(Op. cit.)

January, 1910, p. 108 (G. A. Grierson). *Ahīrbudhnyu-Saṁhitā*, 6, 40, also narrates the fight between Viṣvaksena (called Śeṣāsana also here) and Madhu-Kaitābha.

8. The Diksā, or what may be called the Masonic initiation for the Śrī-Vaiṣṇavas, consists of—

- (1) Tāpa (the fire-marking with Holy Divine Symbols).
- (2) Puṇḍra (the paint-marks on forehead and body).
- (3) Nāma (the name-taking, like christening and baptism).
- (4) Mantra (receiving the Holy Formula).
- (5) Yāga (Divine Worship).¹

A man may belong to any caste, and still be eligible for becoming a Vaiṣṇava mason (or freemason). *Īśvara-Saṁhitā*, viii, 179, says—

Sva-sva-varṇāśram-ācāra- sadṛśākṛti-ceṣṭitān |
Lāñchitān Cakra-Śaṅkhābhyān bhujayor dakṣiṇāditaḥ ||

i.e. "They remain severally in their own *Varṇa* (caste), *Āśrama* (sacramental stage), and *Ācāra* (customs), but are all impressed (without distinction) with the *Cakra* (discus) and *Śaṅkha* (conch) ".

¹ These are called the *Pañca-Samskāras*, or the Five Vaiṣṇava Sacraments, the esoterics of which it is not the purpose of this paper to deal with. These several symbols represent cosmic truths. See the chapter on "Symbology" in our *Lives of Saints*. Freemasons or simply Masons know that symbols have each their meanings. With reference to Vaiṣṇavic masonry and the Holy Symbols employed by it, the best English article that has yet been written is the one by Dr. G. A. Grierson, viz. "The Auspicious Marks on the Feet of the Incarnate Deity" (*JRAS.*, January, 1910, pp. 87 ff.), to which particular attention is invited, especially of the *Masonic* world. This is what a certain writer says: "These symbols were not picked up, discovered or invented by men in ancient monasteries or temples. They were given to men directly from on High by the ministers of God. Their deeper meaning is so recondite that it could never have been discovered by man without such aid" (*A Primer of Theosophy, Masonry*, 1909, p. 60, Rajput Press, Chicago, U.S.A.).

Also, like the ritualism of Masonry, these Five Sacraments are of great value to those who know and practise them.

Also *Pādma-tantra*, iv, 23, 113 ff., may (*inter alia*) be read.

That all are eligible for this Dīksā without distinction, says further, *Īśvara-Saṁhitā*, xxi, 40, 41—

Sarve samānās catvāro gotra-pravara-varjitāḥ |
 Utkarṣo n-āpakarṣaś ca jātitaḥ teṣu saṁmataḥ ||
 Phaleṣu niḥ-sr̥bhās sarve dvādaśākṣara-cintakāḥ |
 Mokṣa-aika-niḥcayāś śāva-sūtaka-śāuca-varjitāḥ ||

i.e. "There is no distinction of *Gotra* or *Pravara* (i.e. racial, clannish, and such other guild-denominations): all the Four (i.e. Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Sūdra) are equal. There is no high and low (distinctions) of caste (*jāti*). They are (all) meditators of the (Holy) Dvādaś-ākṣari (or the twelve-syllabled Bhagavad-Vāsudeva formula), unconcerned in other fruits than that of sure Mokṣa: and to them no (sacramental) impurities consequent on births and deaths (of kin) attach".

Also read *Bhāradvāja-Saṁhitā*, i, 14-16; *Sudarśan-opaniṣat* and *Mahā-Sudarśan-opaniṣat*.

Viṣṇu-Tilaka, iv, 189-90, gives the verse—

Tāpaḥ pundras tathā nāma manthro yāgaś ca pañcamah |
 Pañca-sauṁskāra-dīkṣa-aiṣā Deva-deva-priyāvahā |
 Pañca-sauṁskāra-dīkṣāvān mahā-bhāgavatas smṛtaḥ ||

i.e. "*Tāpa*, etc., are the Five¹ Sauṁskāras or Initiations (*dīkṣā*) dear to the God of Gods. He who receives these is called the great Bhāgavata".²

For elaborate treatment read *Bhāradvāja-Saṁhitā*, *Parīṣiṣṭa*, ch. ii.

9. The term *Pañca-kāla* or Five-time-(observances) has already occurred (*vide* pars. I and 6 *supra*). These are observances enjoined on the pious Bhāgavatas. The *Pādma-tantra* devotes a whole chapter to this, viz.

¹ *Vide* enumeration of these above.

² Also see *Parāśara-Saṁhitā*, ch. iv, and *Tapta-cakrāṅkana-Vijaya*.

iv (*Caryā-pāda*), 13, which may be read. Briefly they are, as Bhagavān tells—

Ādyam karm-ābhigamanam (1) upādānam (2) atah-param |
Ijyā (3) ca paścāt svādhyāyas (4) tato yāgas (5) tatah-param ||

(1) Abhigamana (morning prayer, outing, ablution, etc.).

(2) Upādāna (earning things for Divine worship).

(3) Ijyā (Divine worship).

(4) Svādhyāya (study of sacred works).

(5) Yāga or Yoga (meditation on the Divine).

The day, commencing at about 4 a.m. and closing at about 10 p.m., is to be appropriated, in five different divisions, for each of the Five Holy Acts enumerated above—

Pañc-aite vidhayas te'āni kālāḥ pañc-aiva te kramāt ||
(*Padma-tantra*, iv, 13, 4.)

Also read the third chapter of *Bhāradvāja-Saṁhitā*.

Śāṅḍilya, who, as found in previous pages, was a strict Bhāgavata, enters elaborately into a disquisition on this part of that religion in his Smṛti, the *Śāṅḍilya-Smṛti*. Also consult *Vṛddha-Hārīta-Smṛti*, a great authority on the Bhāgavata religion, and in whose ancestral line is Rāmānuja born. Of Hārīta it is written in the *Bṛhad-Brahma-Saṁhitā* (iv, 10, 75)—

Hārīt-ādyās ca munayaḥ śrutv-edam Brahma-bhāṣitam |
Pravartayāmāsur ime smṛtīr ekāntinām priyāḥ.

i.e. “Hārīta and other sages (initiated all into the Vaiṣṇava-dīkṣā) heard this Word of Brahmā, and promulgated these Smṛtis (Sacred Codes of Creed and Conduct)”.

10. Śaṭhakopa,¹ Rāmānuja, and such other saints (Āzhvārs) and sages (Ācāryas) were born in Southern India to teach men the Bhāgavata religion. That the

¹ Same as St. Namm-āzhvār, whose life read in our *Lives of Āzhvārs or Drāvidā Saints*.

former Śāthakopa did so in the Drāviḍa language (Tamil)¹ is borne out by such texts as—

(a) *Bṛhad-Brahma-Saṁhitā*, i, 4, 94—

Drāviḍeṣu janim labdhvā Mad-dharmo yatra tiṣṭhati |
Prāyo bhaktā bhavanti 'ha Mama-pād-āmbu-sevanāt ||

i.e. "Taking birth in the Drāviḍa land, where My (Bhāgavata) Religion prevails, mostly My devotees come into existence here, by drinking the water of My (holy) Feet".

(b) *Īśvara-Saṁhitā*, xi—

Gāyadbhir agre Devasya drāmiḍim śrutim uttamām (v. 235) ||
Pāṭhayed drāmiḍim c-āpi stutim Vaiṣṇava-sattamaiḥ (v. 252) ||

i.e. briefly, "The Drāviḍa Scriptures (revealed by Śāthagopa, etc.) shall be recited before God by the Vaiṣṇavas."

(c) References to Pādma and other Puraṇic literature are also available; but Śrī-Bhāgavata (v, 38-40) summarizes the matter thus:—

Kṛtādiṣu mahā-rājan Kalāv-icchanti sambhavam |
Kalau khalu bhaviṣyanti Nārāyaṇa-parāyaṇaḥ ||
Kvacit kvacit mahārāja! Draviḷeṣu ca bhūriśaḥ |
Tāmraparūi-nadī yatra Kṛtamālā Payasvini |
Kāverī ca mahā-punyā, etc. ||

i.e. "Men born in the Kṛtā, Tretā, Dvāpara ages, wished to take birth in the Kali age, because they knew that in this age would be born great souls devoted to Nārāyaṇa. But these souls would be thinly scattered here and there; but in the Drāviḷa (i.e. Drāviḍa) Land

¹ How among the main Drāviḍa languages, Tamil, Telugu, and Kannaḷa (Kanarese), Tamil alone comes to be sanctified and has been chosen as the medium of spiritual instruction, and is ranked on a par with Sanskrit (hence the dual or *Ubhaya-Vedānta* of the Śrī-Vaiṣṇavas), may be learnt from a Sanskrit work called *Sambhu-Rahasya*, and from the *Ācāra-Hṛdaya* by Azhagiya Maṇavāla-p-perumāl Nāyānar, the younger brother of Lokācārya, the author of *Artha-Paṇḍaka* (vide JRAS. for July, 1910). He is numbered 48 in the Succession List (see our *Life of Rāmānuja*).

they would be found in some numbers, living by the side of such rivers as Tāmraparūī. Kṛtamālā. Payasvinī. Kāveri the Holy ”.

The *Bhaktamāla*, written by the men of the North of India, tells us how the Science and Traditions of the Bhāgavata Religion were carried North, from South, by Rāmānanda the disciple of Rāmānuja. and spread by his disciples again.¹

PART II

11. The antiquity and authoritativeness of the *Pāñca-rātra* may be gathered from—

(1) The summary of its doctrines given in the *Mahā-bhārata*, *Mokṣa-Dharma*, *Nārāyaṇīya*.² ch. 336–53.

(2) *Vedānta-* or *Brahma-Sūtras*, in which the Sūtra

Utpaty-asambhavāt (ii, 2, 40 ff.)

takes up the question, and both Śāṅkara³ and Rāmānuja have commented on it.

(3) Yāmunācārya's *Āgama-Prāmāṇya*.⁴

(4) Rāmānuja's *Nītya*.

(5) Vedāntācārya's *Pāñcorātra-Rukṣā*.

¹ In this connexion the article “Notes on Tul’si Dās”, by Dr. G. A. Grierson, in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxii, p. 266. 1893, narrating the list of succession, beginning from Śrīman-Nārāyaṇa, streaming down to Tul’si Dās, through Lakṣmī (Śrī), Senāpati, Kāri-sūnu (= Saṭhagopa), Nāthamuni, Yāmunācārya, Rāmānuja, Lokācārya, etc., Rāmānanda, etc., is very interesting, as proving the solidarity of the Bhāgavata Religion throughout *Bharata-khanda* (India). *JRAS.* for April, 1910, p. 270. has already been referred to.

² A neat and faithful translation of this has been recently made by Dr. G. A. Grierson (vide *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxxvii, September, 1908).

³ Also in Ānandagiri's *Śāṅkara-Vijaya* references occur; and it is chronicled therein that two of Śāṅkara's disciples were specially ordained to teach Vaiṣṇavism.

⁴ In another work written by Yāmunācārya, viz. the *Siddhi-Traya*, he mentions Śāṅkara as a *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣyakāra*. The year of Yāmunācārya's birth is A.C. 916 (see Hierarchie Table in our *Lives of Saints*). Hence, from this internal evidence, Śāṅkara must go to the ninth or eighth century at least. In the work *Āgama-Prāmāṇya*, Yāmunācārya refers to a *Kāśmīr-Āgama*.

(6) References in the Purāṇas, such as the Viṣṇu and Śrī-Bhāgavata.

(7) Madhva's or Ānandatīrtha's *Tantra-Sūtra*.

(8) Utpaladeva's *Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-darśana*, a Śaiva author, outside the pale of the Bhāgavata Religion, refers to the *Pāñcarātra* thus:—

Śrī Pāñcarātra-Śrutāv api . . . evam, etc.

i.e. "In the Blessed Pāñcarātra Veda also . . . thus".

If the *Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya* on the Brahma-Sūtras were closely studied, Śaṅkara's predilection for Nārāyaṇa—which in other words is of the Bhāgavata Religion—will be made manifest.¹

12. The creed of the Bhāgavata System is summarized in the *Nārāyaṇīya*, *Mahā-bhārata*, as pointed out in par. 10 above. The cult of it may be learnt from the four divisions in which the subject-matter is treated. These are—

- (1) Jñāna-pāda.
- (2) Yoga-pāda.
- (3) Caryā-pāda.
- (4) Kriyā-pāda.

Briefly the first, or *Jñāna-pāda*, treats of the nature and attributes of Brahman (God), the nature and purpose of Creation, the several regions of space, and so forth. The second, or *Yoga-pāda*, treats of the constitution of man or the Microcosm, and how by austerities and meditation, Self and God may be realized. The third, or *Caryā-pāda*, treats of the selection of places for building

¹ A special paper is intended in due course to be presented on this part of the subject to the Royal Asiatic Society. The following short extract from *Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya*, however, will suffice now, as illuminating our contention here: "Tatra yat tāvad ucyate yo 'sau Nārāyaṇaḥ Paro 'vyaktāt prasiddhaḥ Paramātmā Sarvātmā, sa ātmanā - (ā)tmānam anekadhā vyūhya vyavatiṣṭhata iti, tan na nirākriyate" (ii, 2, 42). Also in ii, 2, 45, "vipratīṣedhāc-ca," Śaṅkara writes: "Veda-vipratīṣedhaś ca bhavati, caturṣu Vedeṣu evaṁ śreyo (a)labdhvā Saṅḍilya idaṁ Sāstram (Pāñcarātram) adhītavān ity ādi." See reference to Saṅḍilya in par. 7.

temples, the architectural details connected with them, the method of making the several holy statues, and the ritual connected with their consecration, to render them fit for worship, and so forth. The fourth, or *Kriyā-pāda*, takes up the qualifications of the Temple celebrants (the worshippers), the daily, monthly, yearly, etc., modes of worship, and processions of various kinds, in cars, etc., and celebrations of other casual festivals; the measure, meaning, efficacy, and method of applying various Vaiṣṇava mantras, and so forth.

It will be seen from this division that the first two divisions constitute the theoretical, and the second two the practical, side of the Bhāgavata Religion. From another standpoint the former half deals with abstract or inner worship, and the latter half with concrete or outer worship.

After treating the first half, the *Pādma-tantra* prefaces the second half thus:—

Brahmā asks Nārāyaṇa —

Bhagavan ! Deva-devēśa ! Śaṅkha-cakra-gadā-dhara ! |
Jñāna-Yogau ca kārtsnyena nirvāṇa-phaladau śrutau ||
 Tayor aviduṣām Deva ! nādhikāraḥ kadācana |
 Ajñānīnām ca bhaktānām gatim tvām icchatām nṛṇām ||
 Yen-ōpāyena nirvāṇa-phalām svarg-ādi e-etarat !
 Bhavaty upāyam tam ṛjum upadeṣṭum Tvam arhasi ||

(iii, 1-3.)

i.e. "O Bhagavan ! God of Gods ! Wearer of Discus, Conch, and Club ! heard (by me) have been the *Jñāna* and *Yoga* (parts, of the subject), the Givers of salvation (*nirvāṇa*). But the ignorant are not qualified, Lord, for these (ways), and Thou desirest them also, Thy devotees, to win Svarga, etc., and Nirvāṇa (material heavens and the ultimate spiritual state). Which, then, is the way for these ? Prithce, teach me."

After this the Outer or Objective Worship, constituting the *Kriyā-pāda* and *Caryā-pāda*, are explained.

13. "How can the All-pervading Spirit be limited within any required dimensions, how can the Infinite and Abstract be confined within the limits of a concrete object, symbol, or image?" Such is the question Brahmā puts to Bhagavān (Nārāyaṇa).

Vyāpino Deva-devasya pratiṣṭhā kīḍṣī matā !
Bhagavan saṁśayānasya mama niścayato vada ||

(Pādma-tantra, iii, 26, 1.)

i.e. "Blessed Lord! I have a doubt how to an all-pervading Lord (God of Gods) there can be *pratiṣṭhā*, or fixture or fixing, in a particular spot? Prithhee, unravel the truth".

To this question Bhagavān thus replies:—

Sarva-bhūtasya jātasya Harir ātmā sthito 'pi san |
Mantra-vīryācca mähātmyāt sthāpakasya guros tathā ||
Pratimāyāñi prakarṣena saṁnidhatte Haris svayam |
Kāmāñ aśeṣāñs tatraiva Harim arthayate janañ ||
Tena pratiṣṭhā-nām-edam anvartham vartate bhuvī |
Yathā ca vahnir dahano na dahan vyāpya tiṣṭhati ||
Arañi-mathanād bhūyo jāyamānañ pradṣyate |
Dahan-ādini karmāñi karoti ca yathā-tatham ||
Tathā sarva-gato Viṣṇur adṣyañ prakṛtair janañ |
Dṣyate ca pratikṛtau mantriño mantra-gauravāt ||
Tasmāt sarvātmanā Viṣṇuñ pratiṣṭhāpy-ābhīpūjayet |
Śilpibhir nirmite bimbe Śastra-dṛṣṭena vartmanā ||

(Pādma-tantra, iii, 26, 2-7.)

i.e. "Though Hari (Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa) is the soul of all existing things, He condescends to (specially) dwell in Symbols by the Power of Invocations (*mantra*) and the Power of the Invoker. Creatures intreat the Lord (Hari) in *this* form for what they wish to possess. Hence this Installation (*pratiṣṭhā*, of the Lord) is full of meaning. As the Burner Fire permeates (objects) but burns not, but burns and becomes practically useful for other purposes when evoked by attrition of two pieces of wood, so does Viṣṇu, the All-Pervader, invisible to

worldly men, become visible in the counterpart (i.e. the Symbol or Image), to the Evoker, by the strength of the Invocation (*mantra*). Hence by all means install Viṣṇu (in His Representative Forms), by means of statues, sculptor-made, according to rules laid down by Śāstra".¹

14. According to the *Pādma-tantra* the chief number of Saṁhitās or Compendiums devoted to the exposition of the Bhāgavata religion are 108 ; and the list given therein is as follows :—

- (1) Pādmam, (2) Padmodbhavam, (3) Māyā-vaibhavam,
- (4) Naḷakūbaram. (5) Trailokya-mohanam. (6) Viṣṇutilaka,
- (7) Parama, (8) Nāradiya or Nārada.² (9) Dyānadiya,
- (10) Vāsistha, (11) Pauskara, (12) Sanatkunāra, (13) Sanaka,
- (14) Satya, (15) Viśva, (16) Sananda, (17) Mahi-praśna,
- (18) Śrī-praśna, (19) Puruṣottama, (20) Māhendra. (21)
- Pañca-praśna, (22) Tatva-sāgara, (23) Vāgīśa, (24) Sātвата,
- (25) Tejo - draviṇa, (26) Śrikara, (27) Samvarta, (28)
- Viṣṇu-sadbhāva, (29) Viṣṇu-siddhānta, (30) Viṣṇu-tatva,
- (31) Kaumāra, (32) Viṣṇu-rahasya, (33) Viṣṇu-vaibhava,
- (34) Saura, (35) Saumya, (36) Īśvara, (37) Ananta,
- (38) Bhāgavata, (39) Jaya, (40) Mūla, (41) Puṣṭi-Tantra,
- (42) Śaunaka, (43) Mārīca, (44) Daksa, (45) Upendra,
- (46) Yoga-hṛdaya, (47) Hārīta, (48) Pārameśvara, (49)
- Ātreya, (50) Āṅgiras, (51) Viṣvaksena, (52) Arśanasa,
- (53) Vaihāyasa,³ (54) Vihagendra, (55) Bhārgava, (56) Para-
- pūruṣa,⁴ (57) Yājñavalkya, (58) Gautama, (59) Paulastya,
- (60) Śākala, (61) Jñān-ārṇava, (62) Jāmadagnya, (63)
- Yāmya, (64) Nārāyaṇa, (65) Pārāśarya, (66) Jābāla,
- (67) Kāpila, (68) Vāmana, (69) Kātyāyaniya, (70) Vālmika,
- (71) Aupagāyana, (72) Hairanya-garbhā, (73) Āgastya,

¹ Read *Rationale of Image-Worship* by Yogi Pārthasārathi.

² This is perhaps not to be confounded with what goes by the name of Nārada-Pāncarātra, until they can be proved to be the same. Also, there are two editions called by this name, one published by Banerji in 1865 (*Bibliotheca Indica*), and another by Bhuvanacandra Vasāka in 1887, in the Jñānarātnākara Press, Nīmtala, Calcutta.

³ Vaihānasa (?).

⁴ Parama-puruṣa (?).

(74) Kārṣṇya, (75) Bodhāyana, (76) Bhāradvāja, (77) Nārasimha, (78) Uttara-Gārgya, (79) Śātātapa, (80) Āṅgīrasa,¹ (81) Kāśyapa, (82) Paingala, (83) Trailokya - vijaya,² (84) Yoga, (85) Vāyavīya, (86) Vārūṇa, (87) Kṛṣṇa, (88) Ambara, (89) Āgneya, (90) Mārkaṇḍeya, (91) Mahā-Sanatkumāra, (92) Vyāsa, (93) Viṣṇu, (94) Ahirbudhnya, (95) Rāghava, (96) Mārkaṇḍeya, (97) Pāriṣada, (98) Brahma-Nārada, (99) Śuka-Rudra, (100) Umā-Māheśvara, (101) Dattātreyā, (102) Śarva, (103) Vārāha-Mihira, (104) Saṅkarasana, (105) Pradyumna, (106) Vāmana, (107) Kali-rāghava, (108) Prācetasā. (*Pādma-tantra*, i, 1, 96-111.)

Of these, No. (18), Śrī-praśna, is said to be the same as the Lakṣmī-tantra, but there are two separate treatises of these names also; and (98) Brahma-Nārada is probably the same as the Bṛhad-Brahma Saṁhitā (?).

In another list, in the place of (9) Dyānadiya, (15) Viśva, (26) Śrīkara, (37) Ananta, (50) Āṅgīras, (53) Vaiḥāyasa, (74) Kārṣṇya, (87) Kṛṣṇa, (88) Ambara, (97) Pāriṣada, (98) Brahma-Nārada, (99) Śuka-Rudra, (106) Vāmana, and (107) Kali-rāghava, are given: Kāṇva, Arjuna, Śrīdhara, Kāṇva, Madhura, Vaikhānasa. Jiyottara, Jaimini, Kṛṣṇacamara, Saṁhitā-Saṁgraha, Kalki, Vārāha, Śuka, and Kapiṅjala.³

In the list given here, Mārkaṇḍeya (96) and Vāmana (106) are repeated; in their place I would safely substitute Vārāha, Kāṇva, and Kapiṅjala of the second list; and if (50) Āṅgīras and (80) Āṅgīrasa are both the same, I would replace one of them by Vārāha. But the number of Saṁhitās need not be strictly 108.

According to the *Pādma-tantra* (iv, 33, 197v.) the Six Gems, out of this Ocean of Bhāgavata Literature, are said to be—

- (1) Pādma,
- (2) Sanatkumāra,

¹ See No. 50.

² Also called Bharata (?).

³ See *Introduction to Mantra-Śāstra* by S. E. Gopālāchārlu, pp. 33-5.

- (3) Parama,
- (4) Padmodbhava,
- (5) Māhendra.
- (6) Kāṇva.

And according to the *Īśvara-Saṁhitā* (i, 64) the chief Saṁhitās are said to be three—

- (1) Sātvata,
- (2) Pauṣkara,
- (3) Jaya.

Īśvara, Pārameśvara, and Pādma are said to be the expansions of these three respectively.

15. *Bibliography.* The Saṁhitās (= Tantras = Āgamas) which have so far been printed are—

- (1) Pādma (in Telugu type).
- (2) Īśvara (Telugu).
- (3) Lakṣmī-tantra¹ (Telugu).
- (4) Bhāradvāja, with Paṛiśiṣṭa (Telugu).
- (5) Ahirbudhnya (part) (Telugu).²
- (6) Nārada (Devanāgarī).³
- (7) Sātvata (Devanāgarī).
- (8) Viṣṇu-tilaka (Telugu).
- (9) Pārāṣara (Telugu).
- (10) Kapiñjala (Telugu).
- (11) Bṛhad-Brahma (Telugu).⁴
- (12) Śrī-praśna (Grantha).
- (13) There is a Viṣṇu-Dharma, printed in Telugu characters, which may or may not be one of the Pāncarātra Saṁhitās.

¹ This is probably the Mahā-Lakṣmī-Tantra of the list given in the first chapter of the Kapiñjala-Saṁhitā.

² Dr. Schrader, Ph.D., Adyar, Madras, has taken up a Devanāgarī edition of this Saṁhitā, and is collecting rare MSS.

³ It is doubtful whether this is the same as No. 8, Nāradya-Saṁhitā, of the list given above.

⁴ This name is not found amongst the 108 of the Pādma enumeration. This may, after examination, happen to be No. 49, or 74, or 98, as the Saṁhitā is also known by the name Kṛṣṇ-ātreyī. The Bṛhad-Brahma is also popularly known in the Gujarat country as the Nārada Pāncarātra.

16. It will thus be seen how meagre the published literature is compared with the enormous volume betokened by the lists given. It was Colebrooke who first drew attention, I believe, to this monotheistic system; but till Dr. G. A. Grierson eloquently spoke in his paper "The Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India, etc.", read before the Third International Congress of the History of Religions, held at Oxford in September, 1908, and reported in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, July, 1909, scant courtesy seems to have been paid, and little countenance to have been given, to this subject by Oriental scholars, nor am I aware of any serious or zealous attempt made so far to search and secure manuscripts. Here, then, is a large field for investigation. I have but broken a trail in the ice-seas leading to the North and South Poles of Bhāgavatism, by means of this paper; and it is for the Oriental Pearys and Scotts not to lose sight of it. There is much food for the Royal Asiatic Society yet, and much more provender for its valuable pages. The harvest is vast, the labourers are as yet few. A practical move in this direction would be for all libraries in India, Europe, and America to publish lists of all *Pāñcarātra* works they may have secured, in the pages of the JRAS., for universal information and enable Oriental heroes to plan and conduct a campaign thereon. The Adyar Library of the Theosophical Society (Madras) is in a peculiarly favourable situation to engage its attention to this work. The benefits that would accrue to the world by this investigation cannot be better expressed than by the weighty as well as sympathetic words of Sir Herbert Risley, who presided at the Royal Asiatic Society's annual gathering in May, 1910:—

"Perhaps I have said enough to demonstrate the necessity of a knowledge of Eastern thought, if the new developments that are taking place in the East, both in India and elsewhere, are to be fully understood. For nearly ninety years this Society

has laboured to add to the sum of that knowledge and to disseminate it in Europe. It has attained the influence that Colebrooke foretold for it, and its mission continues to grow in importance as time goes on. To draw closer the ties that bind India to England, to remove the misunderstandings that arise from ignorance, to promote mutual sympathy and confidence, to bring home to the English people the true significance of their Eastern dominions and their obligations towards them—these are no unworthy aims for a learned and patriotic Society to cherish.”¹

17. I append two extracts bearing on the subject from the *Indian Antiquary*—

[1. Extract from the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xviii, pp. 189–90, June, 1889. “Report on the search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency,” by R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar, M.A., Ph.D., for 1888–4.]

“In the next section Dr. Bhāṇḍārkar discusses the contents of the philosophical works purchased, among which those on Rāmānuja’s system and on Kāśmīrian Śaivism are particularly interesting. Here we have also, pp. 69–74, the nucleus of his new theory on the Bhāgavata sect, which has been set forth more fully in his valuable paper inserted in the *Abhandlungen der Arischen Section des VII. Intern. Orientalisten Congresses*, pp. 101–9. He shows that the Viśiṣṭa-Advaita system of Rāmānuja is a somewhat modified and more methodical form of the ancient Bhāgavata, Pāñcharātra, or Sāttvata religion, which is named and described in the *Śāntiparvan* of the Mahābhārata. This creed, which inculcates the worship of the supreme Vāsudeva and teaches the doctrine of *bhakti*, has originally nothing to do with the Vedas and Upanishads. It arose from the same current of thought from which the Bhagavadgītā sprang. Its sacred books are the Saṁhitās of the Nārada-pāñcharātra, some of which turned up at Aṇhivāḍ, while one has been printed and known long ago. Its founder was a Kshatriya, like Sākyamuni-Gōtama and Vardhamāna, the Jñāṭṭhika who originated the systems known as Buddhism and Jainism. He seems to have been Vāsudeva of the Sāttvata

¹ *The Hindu*, Madras, May 30, 1910.

subdivision of the Yādava tribe. Or it may be that this Vāsudeva was a king of the Sāttvatas, who after his death was deified, that a body of doctrines grew up in connection with his worship, and that the religion spread from his clan to other classes of the Indian people. In its origin this religion must have developed into the Pāñcharātra system of the Saṁhitās. Then it was mixed with other elements, indicated by the names of Vishṇu, Nārāyaṇa, Kṛishṇa, Rāma, gods and deified heroes, who were identified with Vāsudeva. Hence arose the various forms of modern Vaishṇavism. In order to prove the great age of the original worship of Vāsudeva, Dr. Bhāṇḍārkar points to the often-quoted Sūtra of Pāṇini, iv, 3, 98, where the formation of the name of a devotee of Vāsudeva is taught, and to the remarks of Patañjali thereon, who states that the Vāsudeva meant is *tatra-bhagarat*. He further shows that the Pāñcharātra system was known to Śaṁkarāchārya as well as to Bāṇa, and that one of the Saṁhitās is quoted by Rāmānuja.¹

“I believe that Bhāṇḍārkar is on the right track, and that if he fully works out his ideas with the help of all available materials, he will be able to offer the outlines of the earlier history of Vaishṇavism. The task is of course a very difficult one. It will require a careful study of the Saṁhitās, and of their history, and a careful utilization of the hints contained in Brāhminical, Jaina, and Buddhist literature, as well as in the inscriptions.

“It will, I firmly believe, eventually appear that both Vaishṇavism and Śaivism, which Dr. Bhāṇḍārkar too declares, p. 76, to be perhaps as old as the worship of Vishṇu, are co-eval with even the earlier portions of the so-called Vedic period. Already in my discussion of the great Nānāghāṭ inscription of Queen Nāyanikā, *Arch. Surv. W. India*, vol. v, p. 74, I have pointed out that the invocation *namō Saṁkamsana*²-*Vāsudevānam Chandasū(tā)nam* furnishes additional proof for the age of the worship of Kṛishṇa in India. Of late an apparently still older inscription has been discovered in Rājputāna and published by Kavirāj Śyāmaladāsa and Dr. Hoernle in the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. vi, pp. 77 ff.,

¹ That is in the Śrī-Bhāṣya (A. G.).

² *Sankarṣaṇa* (A. G.).

in which 'the worship of Bhagavat Saṁkamsana¹ and Vāsudeva', and a Vaishṇava Temple, are mentioned. This is another valuable piece of evidence for the antiquity of the worship of Vāsudeva. The earliest mention of the Sātvata sect, known to me, occurs in the Tuśām rock inscription, *Corp. Inscr. Indic.*, vol. iii, p. 270, where an *āryya - Sātvatta - yōgāchārya* is mentioned; Mr. Fleet assigns it to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century A.D. Professor Kern, who too is convinced that Vaishṇavism does not date from modern times, states, *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, vol. i, p. 17, that the Ājivikās, who existed in Buddha's times, and who received caves from Aśoka, and from his son Daśaratha, were Brāhmaṇical ascetics, worshipping Nārāyaṇa. Dr. Bhāṇḍārkar will, perhaps, be able to say in a future report whether this assertion receives support through the Saṁhitās of the Pāñcharātra religion.

"G. BÜHLER.

"VIENNA.

February 20, 1889."

[2. Extract from *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxiii, p. 248, 1894 :
"Jacobi's age of the Veda and Tilak's Orion."]

"Still more irreconcilable with the theory that the literary activity of the Indo-Aryans began about 1200 or 1500 B.C. is another point, which, I think, can be proved, viz., that the ancient Bhāgavata, Sātvata, or Pāñcharātra sect, devoted to the worship of Nārāyaṇa and its deified teacher Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra, dates from a period long anterior to the rise of the Jainas in the eighth century B.C. To give the details here would unduly lengthen this already long note. And I reserve their discussion to my *Indian Studies*, No. iv. The essentials may, however, be stated. They are (1) that the recovery of the Vaikhāṇasa *Dharma Sūtra* permits me to fully prove the correctness of Professor Kern's (or rather Kālakāchārya's and Ūtpala's) identification of the *Ājivikas* with the *Bhāgavatas*, and (2) that the sacred books of the Buddhists contain passages showing that the origin of the *Bhāgavatas* was traditionally believed to fall in very remote times, and that this tradition is supported by indications contained in Brahmanical works. It is even possible

¹ *Sankarṣana* (A. G.).

that ultimately a *terminus à quo* may be found for the date of its founder, though I am not yet prepared to speak with confidence on this point.

G. BÜHLER.”¹

¹ Also see R. Garbe's *Philosophy of Ancient India*, pp. 83, 84, quoted in my *Vade Mecum of Vedānta*, pp. 21 ff. See also Colebrooke, Barth, and Hopkins. Also read anent the antiquity of the Bhāgavata Religion, and conversion of Greeks to it, as revealed by the Besnagar Inscription, the revised translation of the latter as given on p. 817, *JRAS.* for July, 1910, runs thus:—“This Garuḍadhvaja of Vāsudēva, the god of gods, has been caused to be made here by Heliōdōros, a votary of Bhagavat, a son of Diya (Diōn), a man of Takshasilā, a Yōna ambassador, who has come from the great king Antalkidas to king Kāśīputra-Bhāgabhadra, the saviour, who is prospering in the fourteenth year of (*his*) reign.” Also refer to *Indian Antiquary*, p. 13, 1911, *re* this inscription.

RECENT THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE
ALPHABET

By HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD

FEW people ever give a thought to the origin of the alphabet they use beyond the Latin or perhaps Greek characters, and fewer still are aware that many letters in daily use now have scarcely altered their shapes in the last 3,000 years. This would mean that the inventors have given finality to some letters and all but finality to others. Nothing could be more satisfactory than this, yet the question of the origin of alphabetic writing remains a profound mystery. Many famous scholars have attempted to solve this mystery, have displayed amazing ingenuity and profound learning, yet the result thus far has only been divergent opinions and theories which flatly contradict one another.

What I propose to place before the reader will hardly be more than a brief survey of these opinions, reflecting the difficulties and perhaps possibilities of the task. Ideogrammatic and syllabic writing was, as is known, practised long before alphabetic writing. Had the former system prevailed it is easily conceivable that the art of writing would not have spread so rapidly as it has done, nor would it have penetrated to the lowest strata of civilized mankind, as is the case in our time. It is therefore of the greatest interest to ascertain when and where the step was made of devising simple signs and creating simple consonantic sounds by detaching it from the accompanying vowel.

It is well known that both ancient Egypt and Babylon held sway in turns over Palestine, Syria, and the neighbouring countries. Both were possessed of elaborate

systems of writing, but of quite heterogeneous character. It is therefore not unnatural that scholars of high repute, devoted to either of these branches of study, claimed to find the primordia of alphabetic writing in the system which they happened to represent. To treat here of all endeavours in this respect would take much more time than is allowed to me, and I will therefore confine myself to the most important.

Egypt entered the field first. A certain prejudice favourable to the Egyptians was created by Tacitus (*Annales*, xi, 14), who credits the Phœnicians with having derived their alphabet from the hieroglyphics. In the earlier half of the past century scholars were all but agreed that the letters had been evolved from the hieroglyphics. This view was modified by Emmanuel de Rougé,¹ who, whilst maintaining the Egyptian origin of the alphabet, replaced hieroglyphic writing by the more cursive hieratic characters. An excellent résumé of this attempt is given in the first volume of Isaac Taylor's *History of the Alphabet*, and fully endorsed by this author.²

Unfortunately this theory, however ingenious it may be, did not meet with general approval. It was fiercely assailed by the late P. de Lagarde,³ and less decisively by the late W. Robertson Smith⁴ and others. The strongest objection advanced is that by de Lagarde, who maintained that he failed to see a sufficiently close resemblance between the two groups of characters to acquiesce in a filial relation of the one to the other. This is undoubtedly correct. But there is another point to be considered. De Rougé operated on one side with the cursive, i.e. somewhat unsettled Egyptian characters, and on the other with

¹ "Mémoire sur l'origine de l'alphabet phénicien," Paris, 1874 (read before the Académie des Inscriptions in 1859).

² New edition, London, 1899 (pp. 89 seqq.).

³ *Symmicta*, i, p. 113.

⁴ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., art. "Hebrew", p. 597.

those of the Moabite Stone. Now, however ancient the latter is, the writing it exhibits does not represent the oldest type of Semitic alphabet, because several letters show a slight tendency to cursiveness in their curved tails. It is just these curves which are essential for comparison with the hieratic characters, but being unessential in themselves it is clear that they cannot give a basis upon which to work. The Moabite Stone dates from the ninth century B.C. Its alphabet manifests a maturity which could only have been acquired after a practice of several centuries. There exists a small Phœnician inscription, found at Cyprus, the letters of which are much more rigid and evidently more primitive than those of the Moabite Stone. In this inscription, called that of Ba'al Lebanon, not the slightest trace of cursiveness can be detected, and any alleged resemblance to the hieratic characters becomes non-existent. No one will ascribe the invention of the alphabet to the Moabites. This honour belongs to the Phœnicians.¹ The Ba'al Lebanon inscription dates, in my opinion, from not later than 1000 B.C., and there is so much firmness in its letters that it must have passed far beyond the initial stage of writing. Apart from all this the hieratic writing is syllabic, and even an occasional consonantic use of its characters is far removed from systematic and exclusive employment of letters as consonants.

Practical expression to the general disapproval of de Rougé's system was given by the renowned French

¹ Evans, *Scripta Minoa* (Oxford, 1909, pp. 79 seqq.), is inclined to assume that the Phœnician inventors of the alphabet might have been influenced, through the medium of the Philistines, by ancient Cretan "linear or quasi-alphabetic writing". Some of these Cretan characters show, indeed, a striking resemblance to Phœnician ones, but the latter represent a much younger type. This resemblance is therefore a mere accidental one, and has probably grown out of quite heterogeneous elements. Thus far there exists no indication of any literary influence exercised by the Philistines on Canaanite culture, no inscriptions having been found on Philistine soil.

Orientalist and epigraphist, Joseph Halévy.¹ While maintaining Egyptian origin, he rejected the derivation of the alphabet from hieratic writing, and returned to the hieroglyphs, from which he derived *eleven* Phœnician signs direct. The remaining *eleven* were, in his opinion, evolved from several of the former group by a process of modification, i.e. either strengthening or weakening. But to find common features between two corresponding characters is even more difficult than in de Rougé's system as the following few examples will show: Phœnician 𐤀 is supposed to have been evolved from 𐤁 , 𐤂 from 𐤃 , 𐤄 from 𐤅 , and 𐤆 from 𐤇 . Even in the eleventh, $\text{𐤈} = \omega$, the resemblance is exceedingly remote. Finally, here, too, remains the further change from compound syllables to simple consonants to be explained.

In 1877 Dr. W. Deecke² published an article in which he discarded the Egyptian theory altogether and claimed to have found the elements of alphabetic writing in Assyrian cuneiform characters. But a glance at the parallel columns of his tables reveals an artificiality which is unconvincing. The Phœnician characters are simplicity itself, and it is not credible that they should have arisen from a condensation of complicated ones that express whole words and syllables. So this system was abandoned soon after it had been published.

At this juncture Professor Friedrich Delitzsch entered the lists.³ "All attempts," he says, "to derive the Phœnician alphabet from hieratic or hieroglyphic script of the Egyptians have ended in fiasco; for all this," he

¹ (1) *Mélanges d'épigraphie sémitique*, p. 168. (2) "Nouvelles considérations sur l'origine de l'alphabet": *Revue sémitique*, ix, pp. 356-70. (3) "Un dernier mot sur l'origine de l'alphabet": *ibid.*, x, pp. 331-46. See also Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i, pp. 128 seqq. and 261 seqq.

² ZDMG., xxxi, pp. 102 seqq.

³ *Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems oder der Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen* (Leipzig, 1877), p. 221: "Ausblick auf das phönikische Alphabet."

adds, "one cannot say that Phœnician writing was an absolutely new invention." Yet so far from completely abandoning an Egyptian origin of the alphabet, he steered a middle course and advanced a new theory, maintaining that it was the result of blending Egyptian and Babylonian characters. Forgetting his words just quoted, he says that a series of Phœnician characters has been *invented*¹ by Canaanite picture writers, but Babylonian influence cannot be denied completely. This is as vague and unsatisfactory as can be. A serious flaw in his theory is that he, like de Rougé, takes his stand on the writing of the Moabite Stone, which alone is sufficient to render his deductions inconclusive.

Meanwhile a discovery was made which for the moment promised to bring the question of alphabetic writing considerably nearer its solution. I allude to the Tell-al-Amarna tablets found in 1887. These are several hundred clay tablets containing official correspondence between the King of Egypt and a number of princes and governors in Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, and Asia Minor. The most remarkable feature of these tablets is that, although the correspondents belong to different nations and races, all the writing is in Babylonian uniform characters. Even the Egyptian king and some Hittite princes used the same language and script. This points to the far-reaching Babylonian influence during the fifteenth century, from which these tablets date. As they contain many Canaanite names and occasional explanatory glosses, one would expect to see some of these rendered in Canaanite writing. This, however, is not the case, and the inference is drawn that at that time alphabetic writing was not yet known. Of course it is just as possible that mixed writing was avoided in official dispatches from other reasons. However that may be, the tablets offer us no clue as to the origin of the Phœnician alphabet.

¹ The italics are mine.

The Babylonian theory was nevertheless revived afterwards by Professor Hommel of Munich. Identifying, as others before him had done, the origin of the alphabet with that of the *names* of the letters, he sees in *aleph* the "head of a bull", being the symbol of the moon, in *bēth* one of the stations of the moon, in *dāleth* the gate between the constellation of Taurus and the Milky Way, in *ayn* the eye of Taurus, etc. On the whole he finds astral origin for eighteen letters. The four missing ones he derives from as many cognate ones. For the rest he considers his theory as final, confirming an earlier view of his of the Chaldaean origin of the alphabet. "One should," so he concludes, "particularly observe *aleph* and *bēth* as overture and *shīn* and *tāv* as finale of this grand astral symphony, which, like the music of the spheres from remote times, even now strikes the ear at the recitation of the alphabet as soon as our senses are but properly attuned to understand it."

This sounds grand enough, but the theory is poetic rather than convincing, and teaches us absolutely nothing as to when, how, and by whom both shapes and names of the letters were introduced. It is hardly conceivable that the alphabet, which was of purely utilitarian make, should have so lofty an origin. It is the astral theory run wild, and I can only concur with the criticism levelled against it in Lidzbarski's *Ephemeris*.¹

Now the last-named scholar has advanced another theory on the origin of the alphabet. He considers it to be based on the Egyptian system of writing, and the creation of a Canaanite man who had some knowledge of the existence of a system of Egyptian writing, but whose acquaintance with the same was not so extensive as to enable him to borrow single letters from it. Had he been more familiar with it he would not have invented new signs, but would

¹ Vol. i, pp. 269 seqq.

have done the same with the Egyptian writing as the Persians did with the Babylonians.

However that may be, Lidzbarski is undoubtedly right in dissociating the origin of the signs of the alphabet from the names of the letters. This, I believe, is the principal reason why all previous theories failed. The alphabet did not spring, Athene-like, in a finished state out of the head of a Phœnician inventor. Lidzbarski is also correct in maintaining that a thoroughgoing system of adaptation cannot be discovered. It now remains to be seen whether in the two new theories which have been published during the last five years any such system can be found.

In 1905 Professor F. Praetorius, of Halle, offered a new and rather startling solution of the question of the alphabet. While rejecting Babylonian as well as Egyptian origin he maintained that he had discovered it in the Cypriote epictorian syllabic writing,¹ adding that the Canaanite consonants were not in reality simple consonants, but syllables. Now in order to understand this theory we must first try to get an insight into the origin and nature of the Cypriote syllabic signs, and examine their possible or probable relation to the Phœnician alphabet. Ever since the first discovery of Cypriote inscriptions scholars have endeavoured to find its affinity with older scripts. Dr. Deecke, who, as we have seen before, derived the Phœnician alphabet from Babylonian arrow-headed writing, did exactly the same with the Cypriote characters. Subsequently, however, he abandoned his theory in favour of Sayce's. This scholar recognized in it a member of what he called the Asiatic family of scripts which have their origin in the Hittite hieroglyphics.

The language of the Cypriote inscriptions is a Greek dialect, and the characters, as we know them, cannot but represent a later type. Praetorius is, indeed, driven to admit that the real origin of the Phœnician alphabet was








¹ *Ueber den Ursprung des kanaanischen Alphabets*. Berlin, 1906.

an older form of Cypriote writing. But there are several grave objections to his theory.

First, it is well known that the Phœnician alphabet was communicated to the Greeks of Asia Minor not later than about 1000 B.C. It is therefore inconceivable that the Phœnicians should have learned their writing from the Greek-speaking inhabitants of an isolated island. On the contrary, Phœnico-Greek influence on Cypriote writing can be shown with at least equal probability.

Secondly, Phœnician is always written from right to left, and so are the oldest Greek inscriptions. The practice of *boustrophedon*, or writing every second line in the opposite direction, is of later origin, and led subsequently to the adoption of writing from left to right only. In the Cypriote writing the *boustrophedon* prevails. From this we infer (1) that the custom had come to Cyprus from the Greeks; (2) that in the form as we know Cypriote writing it must be of later date than the beginning of the Phœnician alphabet.

Thirdly, a comparison between Phœnician and Cypriote characters reveals a striking difference. Whilst nearly all Phœnician letters offer a side view facing towards the left, the Cypriote ones offer the reader, so to speak, an open front, and can be shaped and read equally well from the right and from the left. Thus Phœnician 𐤀 differs entirely from Cypriote ✕ . One of the most conspicuous Cypriote characters is the sign for *se*, viz. Ⲕ or ⲕ . The oldest form of the Phœnician *shîn*, however, is 𐤍 , whilst a later form is 𐤎 . This instance shows clearly the affinity of the Cypriote character to the *later* Phœnician one, and that the former cannot possibly be the parent of the latter. Something similar can be shown concerning the Cypriote sign Ⲛ (*li*) and the Phœnician 𐤏 (*lāmed*); or the Cypriote signs ⲧ Ⲩ (*ta*) and the Phœnician 𐤓 (*tāv*), later 𐤔 . The resemblances in other letters are most difficult to detect.






Fourthly, Praetorius maintains the syllabic character of the Phœnician alphabet, which would offer another argument in favour of its being developed from the Cypriote system. Now the latter consists, as far as we know, of about *sixty* signs, so that syllables of the same consonant but with a different vowel are expressed by quite different signs, e.g.  *mi*,  *mo*;  *pi*,  *pa*;  *tu* (or );  *te*, etc. On what system these signs were condensed to the twenty-two letters of the Phœnician alphabet does not become clear. If, as Praetorius maintains, these letters were in reality syllables, each of them would have at least the three vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, and perhaps two diphthongs besides. The question whether the Phœnician letters are syllabic or purely consonantic will engage our attention a little later.

There is only one more theory to be considered, a theory which deserves the most careful consideration, not only for the name attached to it, but also because it is the most recent. Only a few months ago Professor Sayce read before the Society of Biblical Archæology¹ a paper on "The Origin of the Phœnician Alphabet". His analysis culminates in eight propositions, the main points of which are that the characters are of pictorial origin independently invented by persons who were acquainted with the Hittite hieroglyphics, that these persons were a West Semitic tribe of semi-nomads, who knew the ox and the camel, and whom the Babylonians called *Ainorites*, and lastly that we must recover the primitive forms of the letters through their names.

It is curious that Professor Sayce speaks in the heading of his paper of the "Phœnician alphabet", yet it does not follow from his remarks that the Phœnicians were the inventors. Moreover, he, also, uses the letters of the Moabite Stone as his base of operations. We might agree

¹ Proceedings, vol. xxxii, pp. 215-22.

with him that "the names prove them to have been of pictorial origin". But the question of the names itself is still an open one, and as long as they are not philologically explained, a real connexion between the name and the letter which it denotes cannot be established. Here, however, all is as obscure as possible.

Aleph, so Sayce reasons, is generally taken as meaning an "ox" or "head of an ox", its Hittite hieroglyph being . From this sign the Phœnician  is supposed to have developed. This is, however, as uncertain as can be. We do not find the remotest connexion between the form of the letter and its sound, nor why it should find its place at the head of the alphabet.  is supposed to have been developed from ; but in Sayce's own opinion it has no Babylonian or Hittite model. The Phœnician sign for *gîmel* () does not, unfortunately, occur in the Ba'al Lebanon inscription. If it is meant to represent the camel, I would not, as Sayce seems to assume, see in it the neck as well as the head of the camel, but its hump. Yet even here one fails to see any connexion between the name of the letter and its nature.

Without going further into details we will now briefly survey the results of his investigations, of which the most important are: (1) "The names were given to the characters before they became cursive," i.e. they were not added later on from supposed resemblances to animals or other objects. (2) The Semitic dialect from which the names were derived was possibly a Canaanite one spoken in Northern Syria by a semi-nomad people which knew the ox and the camel. (3) The three characters *zayin*, *yōd*, and *kaph* reveal acquaintance with Hittite hieroglyphs. (4) To judge from the shapes of *mēm* and *shîn*, the Phœnician pictorial system of writing was a separate and independent invention. (5) He draws up an ingenious double column of the twenty-two Phœnician characters

headed by *aleph-bēth* = ox and tent, *gīmel-dāleth* = camel and door (of tent), *hē-wāw* = house with the nail, *zayin-hēth* = weapon and fence, *ṭēth-yōd* = cake and hand. *kaph-lāmed* = open hand (or arm) with ox-goad; *mēm-nūn* = water and fish, *ʿayn-pē* = eye and mouth, *šādē-qōph* = trap and cage, *rēsh-shīn* = head and tooth. Lastly come *sāmekh-tāv*, which find no place in the foregoing arrangement.

Although this system is most fascinating, we must admit that it is also somewhat fantastic, and it is not without regret that I am unable to acquiesce in it. Is *aleph* really "the ox" and is *hē* "the house of stone, brick, and wood"? Whilst in Sayce's opinion *ṭēth* (תט) is the picture of a cake, and stands for Assyrian *tēnu*, "to bake a cake of wheat-flour," Lidzbarski¹ derives the same word from מַעַת of the root מַעַן, and translates it "a parcel". One etymology is as acceptable as the other, yet one excludes the other. Coupling "cake" and "hand" is not more convincing than "packet" and "hand" or any other object of daily use made by or carried in the hand. Sayce takes *šādē* as "bird-trap", connecting the root with Hebrew צוּר "to hunt"; but *šādē* would be a participle of the Aramaic root *šādā*, which means "to be desolate". In *qōph* he sees the hieroglyph of a "cage"; Lidzbarski, however, sees in *šādē* the sign of a "stair" א, and explains פ (Φ) as "headgear".

I cannot help thinking that all this is exceedingly unconvincing and makes one doubt the historic connexion of the letters with their names. Now, philologically speaking, the unity of the names cannot be maintained, nor is it even possible to classify every one under a certain Semitic group. Several of them have a common Semitic ring, others sound Aramaic or Hebrew, and nearly all of them have suffered some modification through phonological

¹ *Ephemeris*, ii, 128 seqq.

influences, so that the original form cannot longer be ascertained. Even the Greek forms of the names help us little, as can be seen by the change of the gutturals into vowels, by the $\vartheta = \theta$ and others.

All those who have dealt with the question seem to consider the invention of the alphabet as the deliberate work of an inventor or of inventors. I cannot share this view, and feel inclined to take the alphabet as the result of *gradual* evolution. This, as I believe, took its beginning with the isolation of the pure consonant from its concomitant vowel. We know that in the pre-alphabetic period the smallest units of speech were open syllables, and it was left to the Phœnicians to make the split. How did they set about it? I am under the impression that they were led to do so by the peculiar nature of the gutturals in their speech.

If we consider the Semitic guttural letters we find a double pronunciation according to either closing up the windpipe or letting a stream of air pass through. In the first case a slight pressure produces the *aleph* (*spiritus lenis*), a stronger one produces the *ʿayn*, and a still stronger one the *ghayn*, which is preserved in Arabic. On the other hand, if the air current is allowed a free passage the result is *hē*, and with increased energy we produce *hēth* and *khā*, which again still exists in Arabic only. We thus gain two groups of three gutturals each, forming a climax of either retaining the air in the windpipe or letting it pass through. Now when uttering a sound in this way one will automatically produce it without any vocalic elements, and there is therefore no need to assume that some Phœnician psychologist first speculated on the abstractness of the vowel and then detached it from its consonant, in a manner suggestive of Peter Schlemihl's separation from his shadow. A similar spontaneous detachment of the consonantic element was also possible with some palatals and perhaps one or two

sibilants and liquids. But this is not even necessary, since as soon as the possibility of isolation of a few consonants became clearly understood the same process could systematically be applied to all others. The result was a great simplification of the system, and I should even think that at this early period the alphabet consisted of considerably less than twenty-two letters.

Now as to the graphic expression of the consonantic sound, I see no necessity for borrowing picture-writing from anywhere. I am under the impression that the sign ◄ is nothing but the outline of the open mouth looked at sideways, whilst the point at the left side would correspond to the closed up windpipe. On the other hand, the sign for ◄ shows a similar outline with windpipe open, whilst the perpendicular line was added in order to give the characters greater stability. The upper horizontal line, which is not essential, was probably added later on by a bend of the perpendicular line, thus ◄ . So here also we probably have gradual development from small beginnings. Thus the sign for *hēth* ◄ , as already suggested by the late Dr. M. A. Levy,¹ is but the strengthened ◄ . The completely closed sign for *‘ayn*, viz. ◄ , perhaps arose from writing ◄ with one movement and rounded off. The open mouth probably suggested the sign for ◄ . "row of teeth," and this might have been done quite deliberately as soon as a basis was given. The further increase of the number of letters was then a comparatively easy task. To speculate on the way they were invented is to my mind futile, and unless inscriptions are found older than that of Ba'al Lebanon a solution of this question is scarcely to be hoped for.

What I principally object to are cut-and-dried rules alleged to have been followed by the inventors of the alphabet. It is quite possible that in one or two cases

¹ *Phoenizische Studien*, i, p. 49.

the name was evolved with the sign, but this could only happen after several others had, so to speak, suggested themselves. It seems to me that the creation of the names of many letters were largely left to chance. In five of them, viz. *aleph*, *gāmel*, *dāleth*, *lāmed*, and *sāmekh*, the first consonant is in the Hebrew spelling, followed by either of the liquids *lāmed* or *mēm*: sixteen names of letters, viz. *bēth*, *hē*, *wāw*, *zayīn*, *hēth*, *ṭēth*, *yōd*, *kaph*, *mēm*, *nūn*, *‘ayn*, *pē*, *qōph*, *rēsh*, *shīn*, and *tāv*, were formed by the addition of one consonant only with a long vowel between them. It seems to me that this second consonant was in most cases chosen at random, the selection being supported by the result giving a complete word, as in *bēth* = house, *yōd* = hand, etc.; the names *hē*, *hēth*, *ṭēth*, and *tāv* probably never had any meaning. In far the most cases, however, the name was given *a posteriori* as a help for the learner.

The Phœnicians must have perceived at an early period that the modes of writing practised by the great conquering nations such as the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Hittites did not answer their purpose. For their commercial intercourse with their Semitic neighbours as well as with the foreign peoples of Asia Minor and Europe they required a kind of shorthand writing which could be easily learned by everybody. When this was procured, it was absorbed by its votaries so rapidly that even in Palestine and Syria each nation developed distinguishing features of their own. The writing of the Ba'al Lebanon and later Phœnician inscriptions differs from that of the Moabite Stone (ninth century B.C.), and this from the Aramaic inscriptions of the kings of Sam'al in North-West Syria, known as the inscriptions of Zenjirli (eighth century B.C.), and these again from the *ductus* of the Siloam inscription (700 B.C.). The firm hold which the new style of writing held over those who adopted it is best illustrated by the inscriptions of Zenjirli. The kings

of Sam'al speak on several occasions of their overlords, the kings of Assyria, yet their obedience did not go so far as to employ cuneiform writing.

The independent origin of the Phœnician alphabet has not, as yet, been irrefutably disproved, and there is no sufficient reason to deprive the Phœnicians of the credit of having provided the world with a serviceable mode of writing.

XXVII

THE VEDIC AKHYANA AND THE INDIAN DRAMA

By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, D.C.L.

THE chief cause of the undoubted monotony of the *Rgveda* is, of course, its essentially sacerdotal character. In the case of the vast majority of the hymns there can be, and has been, no doubt as to their purpose: they are praises of the gods who are worshipped in the ritual, and the native commentator, whose work, with all its defects, has done much to render the study of the *Rgveda* fruitful, provides us with references to the passages in the Sūtra where the ritual use of the verses is laid down. It is true that we cannot believe that the later ritual really gives us an accurate idea of the employment of the hymns which make up the Saṃhitā: without postulating any very violent change of practice, we can yet readily feel that the ritual has deviated from the form in which it must have appeared when the Saṃhitā was brought into being, but at any rate it is certain that there was a ritual, and that the hymns normally found a natural place therein. All the more interest attaches, therefore, to the comparatively small number of hymns for which Sāyaṇa gives no technical ritual employment, and which have generally a dialogue form, or may legitimately be deemed to have that form. The *Bṛhaddevatā*¹ shows that the technical term for such hymns was Saṃvāda, but there seems no doubt that

¹ Cf. ii, 88; iv, 44, 47 (dialogue of Indra and the Maruts); v, 163, 184 (a dialogue of Agastya, Vasistha, their sons, and Indra, RV. vii. 33); vi, 154 (dialogue of Yama and Yamī, RV. x, 10); vii, 29 (dialogue of the seer and Indra, RV. x, 28); 153 (dialogue of Purūravas and Urvaśī, RV. x. 95). vii, 140, given in Macdonell's Index of Words (i, 192), is an erroneous reference to *saṃvāda*.

they could also be included in the more general term Itihāsa and perhaps Ākhyāna.¹

Now these hymns have served as a main support of the very brilliant Ākhyāna theory, which is associated with the name of Professor Oldenberg,² and that theory until quite recently seemed to be becoming a fixed part of the theory of early Vedic literature. Although it owed its vogue to Professor Oldenberg, it had earlier been set out by Professor Windisch,³ who has remained firm to his belief in its genuineness, and has adduced evidence from Pāli texts in its favour. Moreover, it has won acceptance by two critics who are by no means ready to accept without examination Professor Oldenberg's theories: Professor Pischel⁴ and Geldner⁵ adopt it as a basis of Vedic interpretation, and Professor Geldner, in a very careful investigation of the evidence, came to the conclusion that actually there existed at one time a literary work called the *Itihāsa*, a term which, with some justice, he preferred to the term Ākhyāna chosen by Professor Oldenberg to designate the literary genus which he conceived he had discovered. Mention should also be made of the careful

¹ Thus RV. x, 95 was called a Samvāda by Yāska, according to the *Bṛhaddeśatā*, vii, 154 (though, as Macdonell points out, this view cannot be found in the *Nirukta*, v, 13; x, 46, 47; xi, 36). In iv, 46 the "Indra and Maruts" dialogue is described as an Itihāsa, and even if the hue is of doubtful authenticity (see Macdonell, i, 138) it shows that Samvāda and Itihāsa were naturally interchangeable. So in the Epic; see Winternitz, VOJ. xxiii, 126. For Ākhyāna and Samvāda cf. *Nirukta*, xi, 25, *devaśanūndrena prahitā panibhir asuraiḥ samūda ity ākhyānam*, and *Bṛhaddeśatā*, i, 53, with vii, 154.

² See ZDMG. xxxvii, 54 seqq.; xxxix, 52 seqq.; *Literatur des alten Indien*, pp. 44 seq., 125 seq., 153 seq.; GGA. 1909, pp. 66 seqq.

³ *Verhandl. der 33 Philologenversammlung*, pp. 28 seqq.; *Māra und Buddha*, p. 128. On the other hand, Charpentier, VOJ. xxiii, 50, takes the Māra and Bhikkunī Saṃyuttas as dramatic.

⁴ *Vedische Studien*, ii, 42 seqq. (he so explains RV. iv, 18).

⁵ *Ibid.*, i, 284 seqq. (RV. x, 95); ii, 1 seqq. (RV. x, 102); 22 seqq. (RV. x, 86). It should be noted that Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 346, claims to have converted Geldner, but the treatment of RV. x, 95 in his *Rgveda, Kommentar*, p. 191, seems hardly adequate evidence of the conversion.

work of Dr. Sieg,¹ who accepted the theory as the foundation of a valuable series of studies on the mythology of the *R̥gveda*, and in England the theory has won wide acceptance from its adoption by Professor Macdonell in his *Sanskrit Literature*.² It must suffice to add to the names of those who have adhered to the theory those of Professors Hopkins,³ Winternitz,⁴ and von Bradke.⁵ It is not without justification, then, that Professor Oldenberg claims that his theory is the generally accepted one.

Nevertheless I must admit that it has never appeared to me even plausible, although it is impossible to ignore the great ability with which it is put forward and defended by its parent. Quite recently it has been assailed more or less independently by two scholars of high standing—by Professor Leopold von Schroeder,⁶ who has rendered

¹ *Die Sagenstoffe des R̥gveda und die indische Itihāsatradition* (Stuttgart, 1902). Sieg, at pp. 17 seq., analyses the terms used of these narrative or dialogue hymns, and discusses the question of the existence of an Itihāsa-Purāṇa as a collection, a fifth Veda, which is asserted by Geldner. He arrives at a positive result, but he admits that no such collection had a finally fixed form, and, what is much more important, it must be noted that there is nothing to hint that the form of this collection was a blend of prose and verse. The passage in favour of Geldner's view, cited by Hertel, VOJ. xxiv, 420, from the *Kautilīya Śāstra*, i, 3, is of no cogency, as it does not go beyond the expressions found in Vedic texts of much greater authority. The disputes as to the nature of a hymn as an Itihāsa or Samvāda are explained by him to refer to the question of the deity: see p. 27, a passage overlooked, as it seems, by Winternitz, VOJ. xviii, 103, for it is more satisfactory than the explanation either of Oldenberg, ZDMG. xxxix, 80 seq., or of Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, i, 292 seq. It may here be noted that Professor Oertel, in a note to Dr. Hertel (VOJ. xxiv, 121), points out that A. Holtzmann in 1854 anticipated in some measure Windisch's theory, and he holds the view that there were "nicht nur vorbrāhmanische itihāsa-Sammlungen, sondern auch fest redigierte exegetische Sammlungen": see also AJP. xx, 446; JAOS. xviii, 16; xxiii, 325.

² pp. 119, 120.

³ *The Great Epic of India*, pp. 266 seqq., 386.

⁴ In his *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, see i, 103; VOJ. xxiii, 102 seqq. See also Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 180 seqq.

⁵ ZDMG. xxxvi, 474 seqq.; xlv, 445 seqq.

⁶ *Mysterium und Mimus im R̥gveda* (Leipzig, 1908).

to Vedic scholarship the invaluable assistance of his editions of the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* and the *Kāṭhaka*, and by Dr. Johannes Hertel,¹ who has cast quite a new light on the fable literature of India by his researches into the earlier forms of the *Pañcatantra* and his publication of the *Tantrākhyāyikā*. But the opposition of these scholars to Professor Oldenberg is very far from being a mere negative: they object to the Ākhyāna theory—for so, in deference to Professor Oldenberg, we may continue to call it—not because it seems to them to be inaccurate, but because they think that they have a truer account to give of the hymns in question; that in short these hymns are ritual drama. Dr. Hertel² claims that already his theory has prevailed over the view of Professor Oldenberg, but, so far as I can judge, his claim to have convinced Professor Geldner is not made out, and von Schroeder's presentation of the theory has received severe criticism from Professor Oldenberg,³ while Professor Winternitz⁴ in a very careful and lucid study of the whole issue has, while admitting the validity of the new theory in certain cases, maintained that it merely provides an alternative to and not a substitute for the Ākhyāna theory, which in certain other cases he still maintains. At first sight this *via media* seems attractive and safe, but renewed study has left me still of the opinion which I expressed more than two years ago in a review⁵ of von Schroeder's *Mysterium und Mimus*, namely, that neither theory affords a satisfactory solution of the facts.

Professor Oldenberg considers that the hymns to which he applies his theory are unintelligible as they stand, and that from the beginning they must have been accompanied with prose explanations. We are not, of course, to think of the verses being composed as riddles which from the

¹ VOJ. xviii, 59 seqq., 137 seqq.; xxiii, 273 seqq.; xxiv, 117 seqq.

² VOJ. xxiii, 346.

³ GGA. 1909, pp. 66 seqq.

⁴ VOJ. xxiii, 102 seqq.

⁵ JRAS. 1909, pp. 200 seqq.

first required a comment. We are rather to conceive of a form of literature which was essentially a mixture of prose and verse, and which was narrative in character. But with the natural liking of people for direct speech, the narrative every now and then took the dialogue form, just as in the Homeric poems the poets show so marked a preference for the direct form. And in these passages verse was normally used. It was not necessarily confined to these passages, but it might occur wherever there was a heightening of the interest or of the feeling. Now originally composed thus in mixed prose and verse, the fate of the Ākhyāna was a curious one. The verses remained fixed, and were handed down with little or no change, but the prose was allowed to change, each new narrator being at liberty to alter the form while retaining the sense, and the dialogues which are found in the *R̥gveda* represent the verse of these Ākhyānas, the prose having disappeared, whether before or after their incorporation in the Saṃhitā. But not only was there such a Vedic Ākhyāna, but it was, it is urged, probably Indo-European: there are traces of it in Celtic, there are traces of it in the Edda, and there is high authority for accepting it as explaining the genesis of the Homeric poems.

Before examining the hypothesis in the light of Indian evidence, it may be well at once to say that from any standpoint the theory of an Indo-European Ākhyāna cannot be regarded as even probable. The Celtic evidence is late, and, whatever its value, on which I am happily debarred from pronouncing an opinion, has no cogency for Indo-European times. The evidence from the Edda has been discussed by many scholars, and the result of their discussions has been made available by the care of Professor Winternitz.¹ It is clear from his review that there is great reason to doubt if there was a Norse prose

¹ VOJ. xxiii, 127, 130.

poetic Ākhyāna at all, and in any case even those who believe in its existence seem ready to admit that the theory of parallel development is far more likely than that of common ancestry. And coming to a ground on which one can speak with intelligence, I feel utterly unable to discover any evidence of a Homeric Ākhyāna in the sense ascribed to it by Professor Oldenberg.

We must indeed be careful to realize precisely what the Ākhyāna is if we are to understand the theory. That a poem should have been prefaced by a prose introduction is in itself natural enough: at the court of the Homeric chieftain the poet might well discuss what he would sing to his audience, and if he had a new song tell them briefly what he was about to recite. Nor need we wonder if after his song he explained in prose obscure parts, or answered questions regarding it. But the introduction and the explanation form no part of the poem: it is intended as a complete whole, and the poet does not interrupt his song to explain it. In the supposed Ākhyāna all is different: the substance is in prose, the prose is an essential part, and only the moments of supreme emotion are marked by outbursts of verse. That such a literary form is possible it would be idle to deny, but that it actually existed in Vedic times would, it seems to me, require cogent proof.

It is perfectly true that the mixture of prose and poetry is quite familiar to us in Indian literature. One regular path of entrance into Sanskrit is afforded by the *Hitopadeśa*, and there the mixed form exists in perfection. Moreover, we can safely accept the view that the form is quite old: without pledging ourselves to accept the views of Dr. Hertel regarding the precise age of the *Tantrākhyāyikā*,¹ it may be admitted that the prose-poetic form goes back beyond the beginning of the first century B.C., and how much earlier we cannot say. In a sense, too, the verse

¹ Cf. Kirste, VOJ. xxiii, 388 seq.; Thomas, JRAS. 1910, p. 973.

then does mark a heightening of the interest, for the verses often contain in summary form the point of the narrative. But the real similarity to the Ākhyāna is infinitesimal: the essential nature of the verses is gnomic, anything rather than dramatic, and this dramatic quality is precisely the striking thing about the verses of the Ākhyāna.¹

It is not therefore wonderful that Professor Oldenberg does not seek in the gnomic literature the evidence for the Vedic Ākhyāna. He finds it instead in the Jātakas, that strange collection of folk-lore which has played so conspicuous a part of late in the reconstruction of Indian life, and of which it would be perfectly true to predicate the famous lines: *hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua*. In the Jātaka he finds the required phenomenon: they consist of verses set in a prose which is admittedly not contemporaneous; but prose was always necessary for the understanding of the verses, and we must therefore see in the Jātaka actual examples of the Ākhyāna with prose, if not indeed the older prose, still with a prose which replaces a genuine prose. But, effective as was this argument in the hey-day of the vogue of the Jātakas, it cannot now stand examination. It would, indeed, be premature to assert anything definitely of the collection as a whole: some parts may be on a par with the gnomic verse and prose of the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, but there is no cogent evidence that any part is a real Ākhyāna: there is no means of ascribing any date to the composition of

¹ Cf. Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 296, 299. It is impossible to ignore the complete distinction of the types of the theoretic Ākhyāna and the actual Ākhyāyikā, and Winternitz, VOJ. xxiii, 126, seems to overlook the fact. The *Kāthaka Upaniṣad*, indeed, is somewhat more allied to the Ākhyāna type than to the Ākhyāyikā, but its source, the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, iii, 11. 8. 1, has no verses mingled with its prose, and so the Upaniṣad proves nothing for the early Vedic period which is the subject of this discussion.

the tales, and there is no answer to Dr. Hertel's¹ emphatic assertion that in view of our present state of knowledge of the composition of Pali texts—a question on which the comparisons of the Gāthās which Professor Franke is carrying out will ultimately throw much light—it is methodologically unsound to draw any argument from the text of the Jātakas. If we are to find any answer to the difficulties of the problem, it must be in the earlier Vedic literature, the relationship of which to the *R̥gveda* stands on quite a different footing to that of the Jātakas.

Now if we turn to the Vedic literature, it is at once worthy of notice that that literature contains no trace whatever of the recognition of the existence of the prose poetic Ākhyāna. Even in Yāska we find no hint that such a thing exists: on the contrary, when he tells us² that there was a narrative regarding Trita made up of what seems to be an ideal Ākhyāna form, he calls it a mixture of R̥gvedic verses, of Gāthās, and of Itihāsa. But, indeed, it is not necessary to labour the point: it is beyond all doubt clear that there is no direct evidence in the Vedic literature for the existence of the Ākhyāna. It would perhaps be unfair to argue that the silence of the literature is fatal, but when one remembers how fond of analysis

¹ See Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 278–81, 343. Franke, ZDMG. lxiii, 13, shows in one case clearly (by a comparison of J. 507 and J. 539) that the existing prose and verse must be deemed contemporary (i.e. the verse was fitted into the existing prose when it was composed, not the prose inserted to replace a missing prose), and he thinks it was often the case. What is important, however, is that the discrepancies of prose and verse are no reasonable evidence in favour of the prose being a replacement of an older prose which really was consistent with the verse. The prose is just as probably an original composition without any predecessor, and reflects a type of literature which is seen in its perfection in the *Hitopadeśa* type; see Hertel, VOJ. xxiv, 121–3. The type of mixed prose and verse is essentially originally one of prose in which verses are quoted, whether taken from the epic or the Śāstras or perhaps the drama. The style in which verses are composed by the writer of the prose, as in the *Campūs*, is decidedly later.

² iv, 6. This passage clearly distinguishes *ṛc*, *gāthā*, and *itihāsa*; see Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 284.

the later literature is, the silence of the texts becomes a very formidable fact, and one for which no very adequate explanation suggests itself. It might, indeed, be thought that the form of literature was very old and died out before the later texts came into being, but that line of argument, for which there seems to be little or nothing to say, is not of course open to Professor Oldenberg, who adduces the case of the Jātakas in his favour, and who also saw in the *Suparnādhyaṅya* a case of the Ākhyāna.

Another objection to the theory, and a serious one, is urged by Dr. Hertel. It is an essential part of the theory that the prose in some way was lost, for obviously it is not there, and indeed has left no tradition behind it, for Professor Oldenberg, unlike some of his followers, does not believe, and in this I agree with him, that the strange rubbish which is served up by the later texts to explain Ākhyāna hymns has any traditional value. But why was it lost? It is, of course, simple and natural to answer that the verse was preserved by its form and the ease with which it could be remembered, but there is to set against these theoretical grounds the solid fact that there is a very formidable body of early prose which has not been lost. Even if the very earliest prose which really belonged to the Ākhyāna may be deemed to have disappeared, how was it that the prose which accompanied the Ākhyānas in the days of the Brāhmaṇas has not survived? Moreover, the argument can be carried further. Not only have we the texts of the Brāhmaṇas, evidently very carefully preserved from old times, but the Brāhmaṇas and the Saṃhitās of the White and the Black Yajurvedas show clear signs of descending from a common source. It is not a case merely of the handling of a common material. No one who has compared the texts can doubt that there was at one time a prose text of the Yajurveda which must have been carefully handed down until radically different schools developed their own individual texts.

We are thus carried farther than ever back to a period when prose also was carefully preserved alongside with the Mantras of the Yajurvedas. The prose, as is well known, explains the Mantras and the rites which are accompanied by the Mantras, and the question inevitably presents itself, on what grounds can we claim that the loss of the prose, which was an essential part of the Ākhyānas, was a natural thing, when the prose of the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, which is not half so closely related to the Mantras, is preserved, clearly and beyond doubt, with jealous care? Ingenuity will of course suggest possible explanations, but logically what value can we ascribe to an ingenious device to explain the non-existence of that whose existence is unknown to tradition, and which had it existed would according to a very strong parallel case have been handed down to us?

Of course, these theoretic arguments would have to yield if it were true that embedded in the Vedic literature itself there were, as Professor Oldenberg asserts, two specimens of his Ākhyāna, namely, the legend of Śunaḥśepa in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*¹ and in the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*,² and the tale of Purūravas and Urvaśī as told in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. It is, indeed, not too much to say that but for these passages the theory would never have seen the light, or at least have won any general acceptance. But what do these passages really prove? Nothing, I fear, which can help Professor Oldenberg's theory.

It will hardly be claimed by anyone that the Śunaḥśepa legend in the form in which it appears in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* is a sound old legend. The passage in which it occurs is admittedly late, and it is admittedly the case that the *Rgveda* verses which are put into the mouth of Śunaḥśepa have nothing to do with the legend in the Brāhmaṇa. It is not claimed, therefore, that the story

¹ vii, 13-18.

² xv, 19 seqq.

illustrates a Vedic hymn by showing it to be an Ākhyāna, but it is alleged that the actual narrative itself is in Ākhyāna form. But this view is not borne out by the facts. In section 13 of the seventh book of the Brāhmaṇa we find a dialogue in verse of the simplest gnomic kind. Nārada, the great sage, is asked what are the advantages of having a son, and he replies in ten verses. The ten verses are continuous, and they follow naturally on the one verse of the question, nor is there any legitimate reason for doubt that we have simply here a fragment of a gnomic poem, or rather poems,¹ taken over bodily. Similarly, in section 15, where the next verse passage occurs, another little gnomic poem regarding the excellencies of energy is presented to us. The four verses here are separated by prose which tells of the wanderings of Rohita, the son of Hariścandra, but there cannot be the slightest doubt that the separation is artificial: they are taken over from a gnomic poem addressed to one Rohita, whence it may be feared the name and existence of the elsewhere unknown Rohita are borrowed. So far there is no shadow of evidence for an Ākhyāna. Rather, we see in the Vedic text how much gnomic literature was floating about and how ready the Vedic writer was to weave it into a narrative, not indeed a beast narrative as usual later, but a narrative with human actors. In sections 17 and 18, again, we find quite a different phenomenon: the author has woven into his narrative some verses regarding Viśvāmitra's adoption of Śunaḥśepa. It is utterly needless to suppose that this is a true Ākhyāna: everything is satisfied by our supposing that it was an independent poem worked into the text. It has no connexion with Hariścandra or with Rohita, and it can safely be said that if the story of Śunaḥśepa is a genuine Ākhyāna, no more extraordinary literary type ever existed.

¹ Dr. Thomas is no doubt right in thinking that the verses are not from one poem.

To turn from the *Aitareya* to the tale of Purūravas at least brings us into a region where the idea of an Ākhyāna is more open to argument. No question here presents itself of a gnomic poem, and we have what we have not in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* — a case where the Ākhyāna, if real, would be a R̥gvedic one. But, again, what are the facts? Apropos of the Araṇis, or kindling sticks, whence the fire is made for the sacrifice, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*¹ narrates to us the tale of Purūravas and Urvaśī — how Urvaśī loved Purūravas, the mortal, and dwelt with him on a condition which the Gandharvas, jealous of her preference for a mortal, induced him to break; how Urvaśī disappeared, and how Purūravas wandered distracted over Kuruksetra until he found her with her companions at the lake Anyataḥplakṣā. Urvaśī appears to him, and then the text inserts vv. 1, 2, 14, and 15 of the hymn *R̥gveda*, x, 95, with a brief word of explanation after each verse. Then follows a single verse, the sixteenth of the hymn, and then, without commenting on that verse, the text continues, "This discourse in fifteen verses has been handed down by the Bahv̥rcas." Thereafter the story pursues its way untrammelled with reference to the *R̥gveda*.

Now it is right to point out that Professor Oldenberg does not hold that we have here a complete Ākhyāna; he admits² that it has been curtailed for ritual reasons by the author of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, who was not interested in the Ākhyāna at all, and merely cited it in connexion with his theme. But surely the explanation of the passage is simple enough without adopting the Ākhyāna theory. The one thing noteworthy about it, which distinguishes it from the ordinary Brāhmaṇa passage of the legendary type, and such passages are legion, is that the text on which the legend is based happens to be one taken from outside the texts of the

¹ xi, 5, I.² GGA. 1907, pp. 69, 70.

White Yajurveda, and therefore reference has to be made to it. And reference is made by citing four lines and explaining them not at all in the manner in which a genuine Ākhyāna would have been constructed, with additional facts between the verses carrying on the narrative, but simply by paraphrases of the text of the hymn in the regular Brāhmaṇa style; nay more, in the explanation of the fourteenth verse the Brāhmaṇa seems to propose two different renderings of the original text, interpreting Purūravas' intention as being either to throw himself down, i.e. hang himself, or to start forth, presumably on his wild rushing over the earth. And it is quite in keeping with the Brāhmaṇa spirit that four verses out of fifteen should exhaust the energy of the compiler, and it may finally be noted that he emphatically refers to the Bahvṛcas as handing down a hymn of fifteen verses: no hint of a prose Ākhyāna seems to have crossed his mind.¹

It seems to me, therefore, that the legend of Purūravas and Urvaśī cannot help us to a real Ākhyāna. Whether the explanation of the hymn is really given to us by the Brāhmaṇa it would be too long here to inquire, even had I any conviction of being able to solve the problem: what is sufficient for our purpose is to note that the Brāhmaṇa presents us merely with an explanation of and introduction

¹ There are several difficulties as to the *Śatapatha* passage. The mention of fifteen verses when the hymn has eighteen is very strange, and not yet fully explained. Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 346, thinks that the present text, which mentions v. 16 without commenting on it, is interpolated, and that the fifteen verses refer to the first fifteen, the Brāhmaṇa having referred to 1, 2, 14, and 15; and this is not impossible. Winternitz' view, VOJ. xxiii, 131, that the Brāhmaṇa does not cite the verses, but that the copyists saved themselves trouble by merely referring to the RV., is certainly untenable, for Hertel points out that the Brāhmaṇa has given its summary of the omitted verses in the prelude, and that the citation of vv. 1, 2, 14, and 15 only is deliberate and artistically necessary, thus also rendering needless Oldenberg's view of a shortening of the Ākhyāna.

to the dialogue; it does not present us with a new literary type.

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to examine one other class of evidence adduced by Professor Oldenberg in support of his theory, namely, certain passages in the *Mahābhārata*, for Dr. Hertel¹ has shown in detail that they do not in the slightest correspond with the theoretic Ākhyāna; the verses do not form points of special interest in the narrative: in one case the verse and the prose narratives simply cover the same ground, while in another, that cited also by Hopkins,² the story of the Frog girl in *Mahābhārata*, iii, 192, the version before us seems beyond all question to be merely a verse-story rewritten in part in prose. The prose is full of reminiscences of the original verses, and though it is not obvious why it should have come down to us in its present form, there are too few things known about the Epic to render the absence of a reply to such a question unnatural. There remains, therefore, but one argument of Professor Oldenberg's which seems to demand consideration, and that is his application of his theory to the explanation of *Ryveda* viii, 100. The case deserves special treatment, because it is one of the few instances which are adduced by Professor Oldenberg which von Schroeder³ regards as being a plausible argument for the theory. In the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, iv, 1, 3, there is told a tale of the division of speech which runs as follows. After he had hurled his bolt at Vṛtra, who in this narrative is also Soma, Indra was afraid, thinking he had missed, and he with the other gods would not go to see how the missile had fared.

¹ VOJ. xxiii, 285 seq. The Pausyākhyāna, cited by Oldenberg in favour of his theory, is all in prose—dialogue as well as narrative; only three hymns and two citations are in verse; that is, there is no Ākhyāna at all in Oldenberg's sense.

² *The Great Epic of India*, pp. 266 seqq. See Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 286, 287, 345, and compare *Viṣṇu Purāna*, iv, 10.

³ *Mysterium und Mimus*, p. 340.

But at their entreaty Vāyu went, and found Vṛtra dead. The dead Vṛtra gave forth an evil odour, but Vāyu purified him, and as a result of his services Vāyu became the first Vasat of the Soma, or, in more intelligible form, obtained as his share the first cup of Soma. Indra desired to have a share of it, and Vāyu promised to give him a share if he made speech intelligible. But Vāyu only wished to give Indra a quarter, and Prajāpati, to whom they appealed for his decision, awarded one-half to Vāyu and but a quarter to Indra, who accordingly made only a quarter of speech intelligible, the part spoken by men; the remaining three-quarters, the speech of animals, birds, and reptiles, remained unintelligible. Now in the *R̥gveda*, viii, 100, there is a strange hymn which seems to present nothing but a jumble of verses. The first six refer evidently to Indra and the Soma, and perhaps the next three may go with them; the twelfth, again, is clearly taken from the myth of the slaying of Vṛtra, while vv. 10 and 11 refer to Vāc, the four parts of Vāc and the noblest portion thereof, but in what sense it is impossible to say. The *Anukramanī* gives us, as usual, no help: and the *Bṛhaddevatā*,¹ which here is more full than the *Anukramanī*, is likewise useless. It asserts that the first three lines were spoken by Nema Bhārgava in praise of Indra, though without seeing him; then Indra revealed himself with vv. 4 and 5, and the sage in joy uttered the next two verses, and in v. 8 praises the bird—presumably the falcon which bears the Soma—and in v. 9 the bolt of Indra. In vv. 10 and 11 he praises speech, and in v. 12 tells of a further exploit of Indra against Vṛtra. It is only worth noting that no effort is made here to connect the passage of the *Śatapatha* with the hymn. Oldenberg² with great ingenuity reconstructs the sense: in v. 1 he sees as the speaker Vāyu, and he holds that the

¹ vi, 117-23.² ZDMG. xxxix, 58.

first nine verses show us the league of Indra and Vāyu, and the tenth and the eleventh show us the result to speech of Indra's faithlessness. The sense of the hymn was made good by the prose explanations and insertions which must be supplied before we can understand it.

Now if this theory is correct, we have indeed a real Ākhyāna. This is essentially a case where the hymn is not intelligible as it stands: the passages in prose, which we must assume to have intervened between the verses, would have given not, as in the case of the supposed Ākhyāna of Purūravas and Urvaśī, explanations of the text, but would have carried the narrative over the breaks in the sense between the verses, while at the decisive points there would occur the bursts of verse which are postulated by the theory. Von Schroeder, indeed, is so much struck by the parallelism that he is reduced first to suggesting that the theory may really be justified for once in this case as he admits it *may* be justified in the case of the Jātakas, or in the alternative he throws out the wild suggestion that perhaps the verses were added to the hymn because of the Brāhmaṇa narrative. Oldenberg is perfectly justified in thinking the explanation much more wonderful than any Ākhyāna hymn theory could ever be.

But does the Brāhmaṇa narrative really cast any light on the hymn at all? In the first place, the Brāhmaṇa clearly puts Vāyu in the position of the possessor of the Soma and Indra as him who begs for a share. In the hymn, accepting the view that the first speaker is Vāyu, and of course without that assumption the whole ground for the hypothesis of Professor Oldenberg disappears, Vāyu appears as asking Indra to secure for him his portion, precisely the reverse of the rôles in the Brāhmaṇa. Then the hymn has no hint at all of the bargain between the two: instead it deals merely with the greatness of Indra, whose existence has been questioned by some. It is from the some (*nema*) that the alleged seer Nema Bhārgava

draws his feeble life. The two verses about Vāc also fail to help: it is not said or implied that one part is intelligible. Finally, the last verse is nothing but a fragment from a speech of Indra in his fight with Vṛtra, and it can only be made a part of the narrative by the theory that Indra proceeds to slaughter Vṛtra over again, for already in v. 7 he has driven his bolt into his vital part. It seems to me, therefore, that the parallel has no cogency whatever for the interpretation of the hymn. Of course, if every *Rgveda* hymn were admittedly and beyond question a complete whole, we might be driven to invent some Ākhyāna to hold the parts together; but it is absolutely certain that verses have been added to hymns, and I do not doubt that the original hymn ended either at v. 6 or v. 9, and that the remaining three verses are waifs and strays which have been attached in late times.

It is unnecessary to review in similar detail the theory as applied to other hymns. As Professor S. Lévi¹ long ago pointed out, the difficulty in each case is that the dialogue as it stands is too clear to need the connecting remarks which the theory postulates. Yet the existence of such connecting remarks is of the essence of the Ākhyāna theory, which demands a literary type of mixed prose and verse. If the dialogue will run without any additions, then we have no right to say that there were ever any additions, or to deny that it was composed from the first as a piece of verse pure and simple and intended to stand on its own basis.

But Professor Lévi went a step further, and has claimed that already in these pieces of dialogue we are to see the signs of an Indian drama. The germ of this view is to be found in Professor Max Müller's remark apropos of the Marut hymn, *Rgveda*, i, 165, where he said² as early as 1869: "If we suppose that the dialogue was repeated at

¹ *Le théâtre indien*, p. 307.

² *Hymns to the Maruts*, pp. 172, 173; repeated in SBE. xxxii, 182, 183.

sacrifices in honour of the Maruts, or that possibly it was acted by two parties, one representing Indra, the other the Maruts and their followers, then the two verses at the beginning and the three at the end ought to be placed in the mouth of the actual sacrificer, whoever he was." Professor Lévi¹ was yet more decided: he quoted the love of the Indians for music, song, and dance; the dialogue poems were not a poetic invention, they were reproductions of scenes actually before the poet's eyes. The priests availed themselves of the drama as a means of bringing vividly before the people the majesty of the gods and their laws, and he recognizes in this primitive drama the restriction of the actors to three persons, but also the employment of a chorus, human or divine. Professor Lévi's ingenious theory was curiously unfruitful for years, and it is only now that the support of von Schroeder and Hertel have again made it an object of serious consideration.

It is, of course, essential to understand what is meant by the claim that ritual drama existed. In the first place, we must distinguish it sharply from a dramatic ritual. The ritual of the ancient Indian sacrifice was not in the least of the character of a mere series of songs of praise and prayer. It is full from first to last of ritual dialogues: sometimes they were of the simplest character. Thus in the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* the sacrificer asks the priest, as he looks at the sounding holes which have been dug under the southern cart, "Is it well?" The priest answers "Yes", and the sacrificer utters the prayer, "Be it well for us both." Besides such simple dialogue we have the elaborate dialogues in the Aśvamedha rite, dialogues the ritual purpose of which is abundantly clear.² Then there

¹ *Le théâtre indien*, pp. 333 seqq.

² e.g., the speech of the Queen in *Vājussanyī Saṃhitā*, xxxiii, 18 seqq.; cf. the speech of the Brahmin student and a hetaira in the Mahāvratā, *Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā*, xxxiv, 5; *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, vii, 5. 9. 4; my *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 277, n. 15.

are the Brahmodyas¹ of the priests, a recognized and important part of the sacrifice. But this is not drama, for drama is essentially *μίμησις*, a representation, and the dramatic ritual is a presentation pure and simple.

The point seems a simple one, but it is necessary to make it, for it at once disposes of part of the evidence for the dramatic theory which von Schroeder brings forward. Thus he claims as dramatic the famous frog-hymn of the *Rgveda*, vii, 102. He suggests that it was recited or rather sung by a party of Brahmins beside or standing in a pool or tank with frogs in it; nay, he goes further, and compares it with the *Frogs* of Aristophanes and the many other dramas of beast names of the Greek comedy, and suggests that originally the whole was derived from a mimetic frog-dance, the frog being one form of the vegetation spirit. Whatever the value of this hypothesis, the fact remains that the hymn as it stands is essentially nothing more than a rain-spell: it is not a dramatic reproduction at all, and to call it a drama is merely to confuse the issue. Then, again, as a case of drama is adduced the dialogue of Agastya and Lopāmudrā (*Rgveda*, i, 179), in which we are asked to see the old ritual for ensuring the fertility of the fields when the corn has been cut. In this case it is really impossible to agree with von Schroeder's interpretation: sufficient perhaps to condemn it is the fact that it leads him to the singular view² that Lopāmudrā means that which has the seal of disappearance upon it, doubtless a suitable name for the worn-out corn spirit, but a feat beyond the capacity of the Vedic language.³ But even if the theory were correct, there

¹ Ludwig, *Dcr Rigveda*, iii, 390 seqq.; Bloomfield, *JAOS*. xv, 172 seqq.; *Religion of the Veda*, pp. 215 seqq.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

³ Oldenberg, *GGA*. 1909, p. 77, n. 4. He suggests that the sense is rather "die unter Verletzung (des *vṛata*) (sinnlich) Erfreueude", which is very plausible, for in *RV*. x, 10. 12 we have *pramūdaḥ* in this sense, and so the root *mud* in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, xiv, 7. 1. 14: *stribhīḥ saha modamūnaḥ*.

would still be nothing to carry us beyond a dramatic ritual, and of that, as we have seen, there is abundant evidence in the ritual texts without excursions into the impossible. In the same spirit the harmless little hymn *Rgveda*, ix, 112, which has ever¹ been regarded as the utterance of a Brahmin while the Soma is being pressed, showing his desire to win a rich patron even as other mortals seek other things to satisfy them, becomes a wild scene of revelry by a masked crew of vegetation spirits dancing to music and singing the song.² This is a mere case of imagination run wild, but even were it not, again we have but a dramatic ritual, and not real drama.

Nor is there any proof of drama in the fact that dance was liked by the Vedic Indians. This is not denied for a moment, but von Schroeder³ seeks to go further and prove that the hymns show that the idea of a god dancing was familiar to the Indians, and further that it was derived from seeing a god portrayed as so dancing on the primitive stage. The latter part of the theory is of course pure hypothesis, but it is just worth noting how singularly few references there are to the dancing of gods. Uṣas is compared with a dancer, for it is only by forcing the meaning of *iva*⁴ that von Schroeder can make out that

¹ Again neatly defended by Oldenberg, GGA, 1909, pp. 79 seqq.

² Op. cit., pp. 408 seqq.

³ Op. cit., pp. 13 seqq.

⁴ RV. i, 92. 4; Schroeder, p. 44. He repeats this view in VOJ, xxiii, 8, n. 1, in respect of RV. x, 72. 6, where he seeks to show in the RV. the recognition of the cosmic power of dancing, and he compares the use of *ῶστε* or *ὥς* in Greek (e.g., *Il.* iii, 380, 381; *Soph. Oid. Tyr.* 1078) and *ut* in Latin (e.g. *Cic. Tusc.* i, 43. 104; *de Or.* ii, 1. 2). The argument is, however, very weak: in both cases *iva* naturally is a comparative particle, and there is no ground for the unusual sense ascribed to it. It is no argument for the version of von Schroeder that *urtau* is used of Uṣas in RV. x, 29. 3: the comparison shows that Uṣas could be conceived as a dancer, and *urtau* is consistent with this. Von Schroeder sees dance as the sense of *urt* throughout, e.g. in RV. v, 33. 6: *urṃṇāni urtāmāno āmarataḥ*, and so *urtu* in ii, 22. 4; vi, 29. 3; viii, 24. 9, 12, etc., but how far he is right in doing so is a question of some difficulty. That the gods danced is of course in itself probable, and x, 124. 9 seems to show it of Indra.

she herself is said to dance, and the word *nṛtu* is used occasionally of gods, but in what sense is doubtful. When it is said of Indra *nṛmṇāni nṛtamānaḥ*, it is hard to believe either that it means that he accomplishes his mighty deeds when dancing or that he acts in the dance his deeds.

If the dance is insufficient to prove a drama, can any help be derived from the question of song? Von Schroeder¹ accepts and Hertel² lays great stress upon an argument which is somewhat hard to follow. It is laid down that verses were, as nowadays is the case, always sung, that therefore it would be impossible to distinguish in the dialogue hymns the different rôles unless the verses were sung by at least two persons, and that therefore each dialogue hymn presumes that there was the element of a drama, namely, two actors, for we may willingly admit that if we are to accept the fact that the rôles were sung by two persons, there may well have been appropriate action and, as von Schroeder adds, dance, making up all the elements of a primitive drama, if once the idea were grasped of representing in this form some action. But this theory of Hertel's is open to the fatal objection that it assumes far too much. In the first place, we have absolutely no knowledge how far a distinction between the expression of different speakers was desired at the very early days when the Vedic hymns were in process of production: no doubt if a single actor nowadays produces a play he depends on his vocal abilities to render his acting the several parts effective, but we cannot interpret the *Rgveda* in the light of a modern *tour de force*. In the second place, there is no evidence whether at the time of the *Ryveda* the verses were sung at all: the theory that they were sung cannot be supported by any evidence before the Prātiśākhya and the Śrauta

¹ *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 11-13.

² VOJ. xviii, 64, 73, 137, 138; xxiii, 274, 275.

Sūtras, and the one thing we really do know that goes back to an early date is that there was a great distinction between Sāmans and ordinary Re verses. The Brāhmaṇas regularly use the word *gai*, "sing," of the former, and of the latter the term *śams*, "recite": exactly the difference between the two modes it is impossible for us to say, and it is quite unscientific to assert that in the recitation of dialogue hymns differences of speakers could not be brought out if desired by the reciter. Hertel's argument depends for its force on the hypothesis that the difference of speakers must be made clear to the audience, and that it could not be made clear save by a change of performer: we neither know nor shall we ever know whether either of the hypotheses is correct, and this argument of Hertel must definitely be abandoned as possessing any weight.¹

We are reduced, then, to inquiring whether there is anything in the dialogue hymns which suggests dramatic performance. The chief hymns which come into question are those which first gave ground for Max Müller's conjecture, namely, the dialogue of Agastya, the Maruts, and Indra, *R̥gveda*, i, 170, 171, and 165; the dialogue of Indra and Varuṇa, RV. iv, 51; the narrative of the flight of Agni and his return, RV. x, 51-3, 124; the dialogue of Saramā and the Paṇis, RV. x, 108; that of Purūravas and Urvaśī, RV. x, 95; of Yama and Yami, RV. x, 10; and that of Viśvāmitra and the streams, RV. iii, 33. Then there may be added three hymns in which Indra plays a part—the hymn of his wonderful birth, RV. iv, 18; the Vṛṣākapi hymn, RV. x, 86, and his dialogue with Vāyu, if Vāyu it be, in RV. viii, 100; and

¹ Cf. Oldenberg, GGA. 1909, p. 68. Hertel's criticisms in VOJ. xxiii, 274, 275, do not seem to me effective. They rest on modern Indian practice, and on assertions which assume that our modern musical sense is a criterion for ancient music, a view which the dispute regarding the character of Greek music would seem to render yet more dangerous where the Indian musical sense of the second millennium B.C. is in question.

finally the well-known Mudgala hymn, RV. x, 102. If these are really to be regarded as performed by several performers, who adopt the rôles of the gods celebrated, then we have a real drama, doubtless in miniature, but still a drama, to which the Aristotelian definition could without impropriety be applied. There is representation in speech and action,¹ and the real literary merit of some of the hymns and dramas is quite undeniable. Nor would there be lacking some evidence of the gradual advance of the dramatic art, for the dialogue of Agastya and the Maruts presents us with a miniature trilogy of a kind, and in the *Suparnādhyaṃya* Hertel² finds a fully developed drama, a historical link between the *Rgveda* and the later Indian world.

The hypothesis is attractive, especially when set out with all the ingenuity of Professor von Schroeder; but it must be admitted that it has one enormous difficulty to overcome, and it offers us little help to overcome it. Why is the later literature wholly silent regarding this ritual drama? Von Schroeder³ realizes the difficulty, and he finds the solution in the theory that the Vedic drama is no feeble beginning: it presents the climax of a long stage of development, and it has no connexion with the later drama of India. No doubt we see in the Yātrās the same root from which the Rgvedic drama sprung, but the one is literature, the other merely popular, and historically the Vedic drama is dying out when we find it. The refined taste of the Vedic priests who have handed us down the ritual could not bear the presence of dancing

¹ It is of course true that the drama springs from the dramatic ritual, and that there must be a stage when the two seem but one. But the essence of the two is distinct, and depends on the relation of the performers to the action. In the dramatic ritual they are actors themselves seeking some direct end: in the drama they consciously represent the actions of others: thus the Mαινades who tore Pentheus to pieces performed a dramatic ritual, the actors of the *Bacchae* represent in a higher form that ritual. As the ritual ceases to be intelligible, the possibility of drama emerges.

² VOJ. xxiii, 299 seqq.

³ Op. cit., pp. 70 seqq.

and singing gods on the stage, and only a few relics of the old literary drama have been admitted into the ritual books. The priests could, indeed, accept much that was popular, such as the chariot races,¹ the shooting of arrows,² the use of the swing,³ the popular abuse,⁴ but they could not in the long run see their way to incorporate the drama where gods appeared on the scene in their ritual. Moreover, stress must be laid on the fact that the ritual drama was in great measure a phallic drama, and phallic rites were hated of the priests. The *Rgveda*⁵ itself detests the *śiśnadevas*.

This is all very ingenious, but it is hard to accept it as at all effective. To begin with, it is difficult for any student of the Vedic ritual to think that the priests were really people who would dislike phallic rites. It is absurd to deny that in some schools they were disliked: it is notorious that the *maithuna*, which is prescribed by all the older texts for the Mahāvratā rite, and which is clearly a fertility spell, is described by the late *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* as old and obsolete, and not to be performed.⁶ All honour to the school of Śāṅkhāyana, but it is a late school, and the Śaunakins do not criticize the rite. Again, the Yajurveda gives us in its fullest detail the revolting practices of the horse sacrifice.⁷ But, indeed, it would be foolish to multiply examples: the coarseness of the older ritual is unquestionable, and no strength can be laid on any argument which assures us that

¹ Cf. the Vājapeya, Hillebrandt, *Vedische Opfer*, p. 142.

² In the Vājapeya and Rājasūya, Hillebrandt, pp. 141, 145, 146; in the Mahāvratā, Keith, *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 82.

³ In the Mahāvratā, Keith, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁵ x, 99, 3; vii, 21, 5. The sense is rather "phallus worshippers" than phallic spirits or deities, as von Schroeder, pp. 63-4. would prefer to take it. His suggestion that the name Kṛkadāśu, in RV. i, 29, represents a phallus (cf. κέρκος) worshipper is as improbable as it is ingenious.

⁶ See my *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 277, n. 15.

⁷ Hillebrandt, *op. cit.*, pp. 149 seqq.

modesty was the cause of the obsolescence of the drama. Besides, what ground is there for assuming that the drama was inevitably bound up with phallic practices? The finest of all the alleged dramas is, perhaps, that of Agastya and the Maruts, wholly devoid of phallic suggestion. Or again, what has the dialogue of Saramā and the Paṇis, or the tale of the recovery of Agni, to do with such topics, and the same remark applies to the dialogues of Varuṇa and Indra, of Purūravas and Urvaśī, of Indra and Vāyu, and in all probability to that of Yama and Yamī, which seems to us an early morality, though von Schroeder¹ finds in it a variant of the fertility magic which he sees in the Lopāmudrā hymn. It may of course be said that these dialogues have survived precisely because they were different from the ordinary drama of the time, but why should they have ceased to have successors? Why did the Vedic Indians come to the opinion that to present gods dancing and singing was improper, after they had long practised it, and had produced several fine poems by aid of the convention? Surely, even if Indra and the Maruts became an unsuitable subject for the stage, Viśvāmitra and the streams might have held the boards. After all, rather than lose ourselves in this wilderness of speculation, is it not wiser to recognize that the Indian drama did not terminate, for the simple reason that it had not yet begun?

Hertel² has quite a different view of the development

¹ *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 275 seqq. This is a peculiarly gratuitous theory, and it is not supported in the least by the R̥ṣyaśiṅga and Sāntā story, which belongs to a totally different type of idea.

² VOJ. xxiii, 297 seq. Winternitz, VOJ. xxiii, 110, doubts the evidence of the connexion of the Vedic and the classical drama, and Hertel, VOJ. xxiv, 118-20, finds a link in the *Harivaṃśa*, ii, 91, where it is said: *tatra yaḥṇe rartamāne sunāḍyena naṭas tadā | maharṣiṅs toṣayām āsa Bhadrānāmeti nāmataḥ ||* But this is a very poor piece of evidence: the *Harivaṃśa* is a late text, and undoubtedly contemporaneous with the classical drama, at least in its earlier stage, and that this text should recognize a *naṭu* (it is not clear if "actor" is really meant, but

of the drama. He finds in the *Suparṇādhyaḡya*, a late Vedic text, a drama in full form, showing in its elaboration a marked advance upon the dramas of the *Rgveda*. Indeed, if his version were accepted, the piece would be a remarkable one, and his version and explanation are really of great ingenuity. But that, I fear, exhausts all that can be said in their favour. By a plentiful supply of stage directions, by adding a complete and elaborate list of dramatis personæ, and by careful translation based on a preconceived theory, a drama *can* be made out of the *Suparṇādhyaḡya*. But, on the other hand, Oldenberg¹ with equal ease can make an Ākhyāna out of it, and in truth for his theory there speaks the fact that part of the tale is certainly narrative.² Naturally this does not trouble Hertel much, for are there not the prologues of the Greek plays and the narratives of the heralds, all mere devices of the primitive drama to avoid the necessity of explaining things which the audience must be told, but which cannot conveniently be put in dramatically? There remains the hypothesis that both are wrong, and to this view I strongly incline.

But von Schroeder³ has still an argument left. He has seen with Hertel in three hymns dramatic monologues: the first is the boast of the drunken Indra, RV. x, 119, which he imagines had a place in the performance of a Soma feast: the second is the mime of the medicine man, RV. x, 97; and the last the song of the gambler, RV. x, 34. The medicine man he imagines as coming forward in some part of a Soma festival, and the song of the gambler would find its place, accompanied by dances of the personified dice and of Apsarases at the kindling

it does not matter much) as filling up a period in the horse sacrifice really does not help us to any connexion of the secular and ritual drama, which must rest on other evidence.

¹ See GGA. 1909, pp. 71 seqq.

² See Hertel, VOJ. xxiii, 331 seqq.

³ Op. cit., pp. 361-95.

of the fire of the Sabhā, which served also as the place of dicing. It would serve as an interlude in the midst of the offering to recall the mind of the spectators to the dangers of dicing, and it would thus play the part of a morality of the middle ages. The idea is beyond question ingenious, but we can say no more. The ritual is silent, nor can we readily imagine that the Vedic stage would readily have witnessed the appearance of a drunken god, and we may be excused from belief in the dancing dice and the Apsarases, just as we may be allowed to disbelieve in the dance of the Apsarases which we are told introduced the tale of Purūravas and Urvaśī, or in the curious farrago of nonsense which is represented to us as the inward meaning of the Mudgala song.¹

What, then, are we to make of these dialogues and these monologues, and why are they found in the *Rgveda Saṃhitā*? Unfortunately that is a question which is much easier to ask than to answer, and it is one of those questions which seem to be likely never finally to be answered. The obscurity of the matter justifies to the full such attempts as those of von Schroeder and Hertel, but the fact that we have no certain answer must not be deemed to be a reason for accepting any answer which is utterly improbable. It must be remembered that these hymns do

¹ Winternitz, VOJ. xxiii, 137, admits the weight of Bloomfield's criticism (ZDMG. xlviii, 541 seq.) of Geldner's version (*Vedische Studien*, ii, 1 seq.) of this curious hymn, to which I called attention in JRAS. 1909, p. 207. Mr. Pargiter, JRAS. 1910, pp. 1328 seqq., has connected the hymn with the genealogy of Mudgala in the Purāṇas, and has seen in *vāthriṇā* (v. 12) and *indrasiṇā* (v. 2) references to Vadhryaśva, a grandson of Mudgala, and Indrasenā his daughter-in-law. The difficulties of the hymn do not, however, seem in the slightest degree to be diminished by these assumptions, and that either *vāthriṇā* or *indrasiṇā* is intended as a proper name seems most improbable. The whole hymn seems to me, as it did to Bloomfield, to be of mythological content, and I do not think the Purāṇic genealogy rests on any Vedic tradition. Yāska already evidently could not explain the hymn: see *Nirukta*, ix, 2, 3. Here may be noted Mr. Pargiter's attempt, JRAS. 1911, pp. 803-9, to find a rational explanation of the genesis of the Vrsākapi poem, RV. x, 86. I fear that the explanation is more rational than probable.

not stand alone in the *Rgveda* as being outside the ordinary category of prayer and praise. There are many hymns, certainly the overwhelming majority,¹ which were written for the ritual, but there are others which clearly are somewhat different in character. Take for example the three hymns in the seventh Maṇḍala² of the *Rgveda* which celebrate the deeds of Sudās under the guidance of Vasiṣṭha. These are beyond doubt occasional hymns, the tribe or family expression of joy over the victories of the great king, one of the few whose names are more than words to us in Vedic history. What essential difference is there between this hymn and the dialogue of Viśvāmitra and the streams?³ Each celebrates a historic event, and if Viśvāmitra himself, as may be the case, is the author of *Rgveda*, iii. 33, what difficulty is there in understanding the preservation of the hymn by his descendants? Or, again, what is there to distinguish the dialogue of Yama and Yamī from the philosophic hymns in the tenth Maṇḍala⁴ except the form? And why should the dialogues regarding the deeds of the gods be deemed any less suited for their praise in the ritual than the simple narratives which make up part of the *Rgveda*? It must be remembered also that besides the formal hymns which had fixed places in the rites there was need of other matter to fill up the pauses in the sacrifice. In the horse sacrifice Brahmin and warrior alike were called on to sing to fill up time,⁵ and ancient tales were among the things with which the period of mourning after the burial of the dead was made to pass.⁶ Nor need we deny that it may be that hymns are found in the *Rgveda* which are neither

¹ Cf. Bloomfield, JAOS. xvii, 177.

² vii, 18, 33, 83.

³ RV. iii, 33.

⁴ See x, 72, 81, 82, 121, 129, etc.; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 131 seqq.

⁵ Cf. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, xiii, 5. 3. 4; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, iii, 9. 14. 4.

⁶ *Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, iv, 6. 6. Cf. also *Kāthaka Upaniṣad*, i, 3. 16; Winternitz, VOJ. xxiii, 132, 133.

intended for magic nor religious ends ; possibly the dicer's song¹ falls within this category, though that of the medicine man is rather a magic spell.

After all, when the slow growth of the drama in Greece is remembered, it will not seem so surprising that the true drama was tardy in appearance in India. Song dance and music are not, when all is said and done, enough to produce a drama and the further steps required to reach that end have in all countries proved hard to take. But one conjecture may be permitted as to the slow growth of the drama in India, and that because it raises a point of interest with regard to Indian religion. It is the view of von Schroeder² that the Vedic Indian was really an earnest believer in the spirits of the dead and their leader Rudra, who appeared as wind and vegetation deities, and with whom he compares the Sileni, the Satyrs, the Lemures, and so forth. The *Rgveda* ignores largely this side of religion, and in his view that is due to priestly preference for other religious manifestations. But there is possible another view: it is at least as plausible that the advance in the greatness of Rudra is due to the progressive admixture of the Vedic Indian with the aboriginal population, a fact which I conceive is hardly open to serious doubt. It may be that in the hymns of the *Rgveda* we have preserved not so much a priestly refinement as rather the expression of a less diluted Aryan belief. It is not necessary for us to deny that the Vedic Aryan did believe in vegetation spirits, but it is a perfectly legitimate hypothesis that he cared less for them than he did for other sides of religion. And the hypothesis has the advantage of explaining why the true Indian drama appears so late. Recent research has shown, it seems to me beyond serious doubt,³ that the Greek drama found its

¹ x, 34.

² Op. cit., pp. 53 seqq. ; VOJ. ix, 233-52.

³ See my note in the *Classical Quarterly*, iv, 283, 284. Ridgeway's theory of the origin of the drama from the festivals in honour of the

origin in the representation in literature of the rude folk-religion which portrayed the struggle between winter and summer: such contests of the representatives of the two spirits prevail even to-day in Greece, and it seems that Athens actually took the step from dramatic ritual to the actual drama, though the details of the fundamental change from presentation to a representation are wanting. Now the first mention of drama in Indian literature is unquestionably that in the *Mahābhāṣya*,¹ where we are told how the slaying of Kāṁsa by Kṛṣṇa could be represented either in actual action or by mere words: the *granthikas* divided themselves into two parts, one representing the followers of Kāṁsa with blackened faces, the other those of Kṛṣṇa with red faces, and they expressed the feeling of both parties throughout the struggle from Kṛṣṇa's birth to the death of Kāṁsa. The mention of the colour of the two parties is most significant: red man slays black man: the spirit of spring and summer prevails over the spirit of the dark winter. The parallel is too striking to be mistaken: we are entitled to say that in India as in Greece this primitive dramatic ritual slaying of winter is the source whence the drama is derived. But these contests are in all likelihood no substantial part of the Ṛgvedic cult: when they appear as in the Mahāvratā² we are long past the time of the *Ṛgveda* proper, and we need not be surprised if the *Ṛgveda* contains no trace of drama. How far back this drama goes—for it is clearly a real drama—we cannot say, but there is much to be urged for the theory that it developed outside the Brahminical stratum of the populace. The names of player and play alike and the technical terms of the

dead is set forth at length in his work on the Origins of the Greek Drama, but his thesis seems to be still improbable as an explanation of the origin of tragedy.

¹ See Weber, *Indische Studien*, xiii, 354 seqq., 488 seqq.: my note, ZDMG. lxiv, 534 seqq., and cf. JRAS. 1908, p. 172.

² See my *Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 78.

drama are too overwhelmingly Prākṛtic to allow us to doubt its essentially popular origin, even if the Yātrā were not there to remind us of the roots of the drama in popular life. The drama has its origin in religion, but rather in popular religion than in the higher cult: the parallel between Greece and India in this regard is too obvious to be overlooked. Dionysos is the great lord of the Greek drama, but he is no favourite in the Homeric age.

XXVIII

CHINESE WRITING IN THE CHOU DYNASTY IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERIES

By L. C. HOPKINS, I.S.O.

IT is the aim of the following paper to present to the readers of this Journal the problem of the origin of Chinese writing as it appears at the opening of the historical period in the ninth century B.C., and to give some account of the new light thrown upon the subject by recent discoveries in North China. It is also my hope to show that there are reasons for endeavouring to stir an interest in this question of origin, and some grounds for defining, as clearly as present conditions allow, the main features of what is already known of the problem, and indicating the lines along which fruitful investigation must advance. Especially valuable it should be to investigators of other primitive systems of writing to have a working knowledge of the rise and progressive changes of a script, probably of very ancient origin, certainly claiming a continuous history of 3,600 years, still in vigorous activity, betraying no signs of impending decay. The facts of such a life-history, properly ascertained and appreciated, might well contribute some illuminating sidelights or useful suggestions on analogous inquiries.

Chinese is a monosyllabic language, and there is no evidence even tending to show it was ever otherwise. It has now numerous dialects which range from a mere difference of accent or burr to the point of complete mutual unintelligibility. Probably the existing variety of dialects is much larger at present than at the opening of the semi-historical period in the twelfth century B.C.; but we do not know whether there once existed a single parent stem of all the later Chinese dialects, or whether

the ancient Chinese speech was itself only one of several cognate languages, coexisting in Eastern Asia, and perhaps contributing some ancestral features to the actual dialectal multiformity. However the fact may have been, the present syllabaries, or aggregates of separate monosyllabic sounds, of the dialects vary much in richness, one of the poorest being the *Kuan hua*, the so-called Mandarin dialect of North China, which comprises about 425 syllabic units, while that of Hankow has only 316.

If such a language, monosyllabic and non-inflected, is to grow in some sort of correspondence with the growth of national life, if, that is, it is to add new words to its primitive and meagre stock, the increase must come either from outside or from within. But if the genius of the language will not admit the entry of words of hitherto unknown sound, then the only alternative is that the expansion should be effected by the free multiplication of homophones, old sounds with new meanings. This was the course followed by the Chinese speech before the earliest documents still surviving were written down. What we shall never know is whether the ancient Chinese homophones are to be attributed in all cases, as they certainly must be in many, to mere differentiation of meanings developed from a single phonetic base, but the original relationship of which had faded from the consciousness of the speakers of the language; or whether, on the other hand, these homophones sometimes represent fundamentally unrelated words, syllables, that is, identical to the ear, but expressing meanings not merely dissimilar at a given moment in the life of the language, but meanings that had never been otherwise than independent growths. To take an example, the sound pronounced in modern Northern Chinese *pai* or *pé* (and probably *pak* in the ancient language) covers, among others, a group of characters having the sign 白 as their phonetic element. Singly this element stands for the word *pai* (or *pé*),

"white." With various additions it represents homophonous syllables meaning respectively "hundred", "a father's elder brother", "chief", "fir", "silk stuffs", "metal foil", "to moor", "to urge". Were these diverse senses all developed from one primitive syllable *puk*, though no clue remains to the process of differentiation? Or were they always separate "words", always independent units of speech, each due to a special formative impulse corresponding to its special sense, but all expressed in one indiscriminate body of sound? It is a question to which there is no answer. But this characteristic feature of the Chinese language, a restricted phonesis coupled with a plethora of words (or of senses, as the case may be) to each syllabic unit, was to prove a potent, a predominating force in determining the path of advance to be followed by the national writing. Viewed from its later stages that path is seen to be the line of least intellectual resistance, not only for the producers of the stock of characters, but equally for the consumers, the readers of the body of visible tokens gradually accumulated.

"Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte" is very often true, but it probably applies less to the progress of early writing than to most arts. It must always have been an easy and an obvious device to select certain natural objects and products of human handicrafts in order to suggest by drawing or carving their simple outlines the names borne by such things in the racial speech. But the scope of this first achievement is narrow, and many words in the speech of even a primitive people do not easily allow themselves to be thus captured and imprisoned by the forces of pictorial art. When the early Chinese had amassed a small nucleus of these pictograms, and felt the growing need of other word-signs, it must have soon occurred to the individuals or the class concerned that by recourse to homophones the obstacle might be surmounted and visible shape be given to a previously unwritten word. We may

illustrate this by considering the group of syllables mentioned above having the ancient sound *pak*. Let us suppose that one of these words, "fir-tree," had acquired a graphic token, a character, but that none of the other words (or senses) so pronounced were thus equipped. The scribe desired to write the word "chief" or "leader", having the same sound *pak*. Why should he not write *pak*, "a fir-tree"? The context would show well enough that "fir-tree" was not meant, nor yet "white", nor "hundred" nor "silk stuffs", nor "metal foil", nor "moor", nor "urge". No doubt some degree of confusion was now and again involved. But what will you have? This is an imperfect and makeshift world, and we must often do the best we can with our materials, leaving perfection to the angels and the Bodhisatvas.

That these loan characters existed in the earliest extant documents is known to all educated Chinese. They are designated in the analytic system of the Han dynasty scholars as the class of *Chia chih* or Borrowed characters, and appear to be generally considered as the latest device adopted for the reduction of the spoken language to a written form, whereas they are probably one of the very first.

If this view is well founded, another of the "six scripts" (or sixfold division of written characters), and far the largest of them all, is merely an extension or elaboration of the same principle of borrowing homophones, the class, namely, known as *Hsieh shéng*, or Phonetic characters. This division only differs from the cruder device of loan characters by the addition to the borrowed sign of what may be called a graphic affix, being another character fitted to suggest that particular sense of the sound borne by the borrowed sign which was intended. The group already introduced above, having the conjectural ancient sound *pak* (and the modern ones *pai* or *pé*) will serve as an illustration. Assuming the need of greater

precision was increasingly felt, we can see that a natural device was to add such then existing characters as those for "man", the horizontal digit representing "one", "cloth", "metal", to the overworked sign *pak*, gradually felt to be inadequate, and by so adding to suggest to the mind of the reader the particular word *pak* intended, whether it were "chief", or "uncle", "hundred", "white silk", or "metal foil".

Thus regarded, the use of homophones, employed because it was an easy system to adopt and a simple one to understand, was modified later for the sake of precision by the selection of differentiating symbols. But although thus modified, the principle was essentially the same, and made its appeal to the understanding, as the borrowed characters had done in the first instance, mainly through the sense of sound, but reinforced by appropriate graphic finger-posts.

There is, however, another and more subtle contrivance to which the early pioneers of writing had recourse, and though it never covered the same immense field that was filled by the phonetic class, perhaps because it was felt to be too difficult and uncertain in practice, it deserves notice, partly because it is not clear why it need ever have been brought into play. This is the method of Suggestive compounds. In this class no appeal is made to the phonetic principle. But two existing characters were selected which, when combined in a new graphic unit, would (theoretically) suggest to the reader the word required to be written. Thus, for example, the word *hao*, now usually meaning "good", but the primitive sense of which was probably "to love", "to be fond of", was provided with a written counterpart by combining the signs for "woman" and "child", whereupon to every right-minded person and upholder of family life would naturally occur the word *hao*, "to love." So by a slightly different selection, the word *muo*, "to protect," acquired

a written form by the juxtaposition of the signs for "man" and "child".

But why, it may be asked, with the fruitful and facile principle of homophonic borrowing in full operation, and seemingly capable of indefinite expansion, should this less obvious, less handy, expedient of suggestive combination have come into use? The answer is not apparent, but perhaps I may put forward the following as a possible solution. It is likely that the early coiners of characters were sometimes faced with the difficulty that a hitherto unwritten word did not admit of direct pictographic representation itself, while at the same time it belonged to one of the smaller syllabic groups of which, as might sometimes happen, no unit had yet acquired a written form. In such a case no existing homophone would have been available, and we may suppose the method of suggestive combination might in consequence have been adopted as a kind of scribal *pis aller* and counsel of despair, to which the character-maker was driven in default of his normal phonetic standby.

But "this, all this, was in the olden Time long ago", and when the Chou dynasty opened in B.C. 1122, these principles of formation for the written character must have been already ancient, for we find them exemplified in every inscription attributed to the Chou and its predecessor, the Shang dynasty. Such inscriptions have been made available for research by the admirable labours of numerous Chinese antiquarians in well-known collections of facsimile reproductions, most faithfully carried out and often annotated with wide and apposite learning. Without their aid the Western student could scarcely take the first steps along this laborious and difficult line of inquiry. With them he can learn the conclusions reached by these highly qualified specialists, and judge for himself of their weight and validity. There is one point about these indispensable works, however,

on which some caution and reserve seem to be desirable. It is the habit of Chinese authors on this subject to allocate the oldest inscriptions extant between the Shang and Chou dynasties according to certain orthodox views laid down as to the alleged diversity in the dominant principles and tendencies operating during these two periods, and exemplified, as native scholars believe, not less in written compositions than in the forms of their artistic preferences. Simplicity, severity, solidity characterized, they say, the dynasty and times of the Shang. Accordingly they judge and classify the shorter and, so to speak, cruder inscriptions as dating in most cases from this earlier dynasty. It may be they are usually right in such an attribution. But it should not be overlooked that these legends have not furnished any internal and independent evidence by which this opinion can be tested, or a Chou attribution shown to be improbable. But in any case the legends in question present the most archaic appearance of any Chinese writing that has survived to our times. The symbols comprised in them fall into two categories, easily distinguishable. First there are undoubted characters, identifiable as the prototypes of definite modern forms, such as those for "father", "ancestor", the different members of the "Ten Stems" used in the Cycle of Sixty, "make," "record," "sacrificial vessels." Secondly, we find certain signs of enigmatic import, but having for the most part an obviously pictographic origin. It has been impossible hitherto to decide whether these also are genuine characters (that is, tokens of particular words) in very ancient guise, or merely pictorial emblems of a symbolical or quasi-heraldic nature. Plate I gives six examples taken from Yuan Yuan's *Chi Ku Chai Chung Ting K'uan Shih*, and the annexed explanations will illustrate the two classes indicated above.

Leaving for the time these interesting but ambiguous figures, how may we shortly describe the other and much

larger class, known as *ku wén* or "ancient forms", the unquestionable "characters" of this archaic period of Chinese writing, which were supplemented rather than supplanted by the introduction of the so-called Greater Seal character in the reign (as is affirmed) of King Hsuan of Chou, between B.C. 827 and 781? The *ku wén* writing is a script in which frequent unmistakably pictorial elements point backwards to a time when all that was written or incised was pictographic. But that time had already been left behind, and the actual earliest forms seen are in the penultimate stages of morphologic decay. Corruption due to various causes, but in the main to the desire for ease and speed, had long been at work. Linearizing contractions, the replacing of imitative forms by conventional tokens, an impatience of the smaller variations, negligence of slight but essential distinctions, the deadening effect of constant repetition, the natural preference of the scribe for simplicity of shape to fidelity to an uncouth or difficult original,—all these tendencies operated to produce the degenerate character of that last part of the archaic period which alone we know. As a result we have the distorted and linearized wreck of a primitive pictography.

A great desideratum to the investigator in the study of these early inscriptions is to secure a few unquestionable dates as fixed points for comparison. It is the last thing he will find. It is not rare to read such an opening as "It was the king's first year, the ninth month, the day *ting hai*", but which king is meant there is nothing to show. One well-known bronze tripod, indeed, exists at Silver Island on the Yangtze, near Chinkiang, which from internal evidence has been plausibly assigned to the reign of King Hsüan of the Chou dynasty, B.C. 827-781. It is known as the Wu Chuan Ting, or Tripod of Wu Chuan, and if I may venture to express an opinion on merely epigraphic grounds, we may provisionally accept such an attribution. Plate I, B, reproduces the inscription from

Yuan Yuan's work above cited, and will help to illustrate the characteristics of Chinese writing at this stage, as above described.

The mention of King Hsüan may fitly lead us to the consideration of the most obscure and least avouched of the changes undergone by the Chinese script since its first appearance in history, the alleged introduction, namely, during the same reign, of the modification known as the *tu chuan* or Greater Seal character. Of this no examples are known to survive beyond the inscriptions of the "Stone Drums", now kept in the Confucian temple in Peking, and the numerous individual forms found in the pages of the well-known dictionary *Shuo Wen*. And even this statement is to put the evidence too high. For the assumption that the Stone Drum inscriptions are in the Greater Seal is, to a great extent, an inference conditional on the correctness of the dating of the Drums themselves to the reign of King Hsüan. If, as some authorities hold, the Drums are some four centuries earlier, then their legends cannot be in the Greater Seal, which was not introduced till the reign of the above-named king. If, on the other hand, the Drums are really of much later date, as M. Chavannes believes, who would assign them to a king of Ts'in about B.C. 300, the argument for deeming their legends to be specimens of the Greater Seal loses its force.

There remain the forms adduced by the *Shuo Wen*. As to these, it is to be noted that the author does not make use of the term *chuan* when speaking of them, but of *chou wén*, 籀文, or "Chou characters", reserving *chuan* to designate the characters of the later Lesser Seal writing which formed the subject of his dictionary. The relevant passage in the *Shuo Wen* Preface deserves careful treatment. It runs as follows: 及宣王大史籀著大篆十五篇與古文或異. "In the time of King Hsüan the Chief Recorder Chou published

fifteen chapters in the Greater Seal character, which in many cases differed from the ancient forms." Observe that it is not here expressly said that the Chief Recorder *invented* these variations (though this is the general Chinese belief), but only that he published what was apparently a collection of existing forms. Again, it is not certain whether Chou is a personal name or a surname. Whether a family or a personal name, it seems a sufficiently strange one, for as the notes to the *Shuo Wen* Preface explain in detail, it means "to draw out", "unravel", and carries also a special application to the methods of divination, having then the sense of *deduction* from omens observed, an oracular response given by the tortoise-shell or the *shih* plant to the pious inquirer, as explained by the expert diviner. Is there, perhaps, in this statement of the *Shuo Wen* some early misunderstanding, some now indurated mystification? It seems possible, and I venture to put forward as an alternative explanation the following hypothesis.

There is no need at this time of day to labour the great part played by divination in ancient Chinese life. It is everywhere admitted, and, as will be seen from the latter part of this paper, new and unexpected evidence on the subject has come to light during the last ten years. I will only add here that, in my own belief, to the needs and ambitions of the diviner's caste is owing not only the venerable hoens-pocus of forecasting the future, but the incomparably more far-reaching and fruitful influence, the power to record the past, the very art of writing itself.

But whether or not the professional diviners devised and developed the system of written characters, it is certain that they must have been at first among the most regular practitioners of the art, since we now know that every act of divination was followed by a record of the date, nature of the inquiry, and some indication

of the character of the response. The responses, as announced by the diviner, were known as *chou*. This term, when occurring in the *Tso Chuan*, is found in modern editions written 繇, e.g. in the passage on the second year of Duke Min, translated by Legge "When Ch'ing Fung . . . heard the oracles concerning Ch'ing-Ke, she honoured him" (Legge's *Classics*, vol. v. pt. i. p. 131). But the *Shuo Wen*, under the character 籒 *chou*, writes 春秋傳曰卜籒云, "The Commentary [of Tso] on the Spring and Autumn Classic speaks of the divination responses, saying," etc., using the character 籒 and not 繇 for *chou*. It is thus clear that the first of these two characters was also undoubtedly used to write the word *chou*, an oracle or response, and for reasons too long to give here it is far more likely to have been the true script than the second.

The term 籒文, *chou wen*, then, may have really meant "oracle-writing", and have come into use to denote peculiarities of formation or *tourneur*, developed in the course of time by the caste of diviners, the great exponents of the art and mystery of writing in Chinese antiquity. The true origin of the term may have been gradually forgotten, and scholars of later date, in some access of hermeneutic passion, may have been responsible for the retrospective birth of a "Recorder" named or surnamed "Oracle", to serve thenceforward as the eponymous author of a novel form of character. On this hypothesis the Recorder Chou was invented in order that he might himself invent the style of writing known sometimes as "Chou characters", and more often as the Greater Seal, or *ta chuan*.

This last term *chuan*, which is never applied to any other phase of the character but the Greater and Lesser Seal, also merits some explanation. The true or genetic meaning of this word is "curving", "sinuous", and it is evident that it must have corresponded to some modification

of older and more angular forms. That modification, I submit, must have been the change of appearance due to the adoption of the writing brush and the use of a liquid medium such as varnish. When these were first employed we do not know, but it was long before the modern hair-pencil and Chinese ink had been introduced by the First Emperor's General, Mêng T'ien, about B.C. 215. The term *chuan*, then, indicates the sweep of a brush in the formation of characters by *writing*, in contrast with the sharp precision of the metal style in cutting them. But it does not follow that the use of the term itself was contemporaneous with the novelty, and I doubt if any date previous to the Ts'in dynasty (B.C. 255 to 206), mentioned in the *Shuo Wen's* Preface, can be quoted in illustration of its application to writing.

And here, had the time of writing been only a dozen years ago, this imperfect survey of the subject would have closed. But the present century has already furnished new and welcome discoveries. The first of these, indeed, dates from 1870, but for some reason it did not for a long time excite the interest due to an authentic, historical, and hitherto unstudied text. This is the "Bushell Bowl", with its inscription of 538 characters. This splendid antique and invaluable document, which, it is believed, has never been described or figured in any Chinese book, is now in the Victoria and Albert Museum in the collection of Far Eastern metal-work in the South Court of the Ground Floor, having been acquired from the late Dr. Stephen Bushell, a much regretted member of our Society. Bushell bought it in the year 1870 in Peking under circumstances detailed in his *Chinese Art*, vol. i. pp. 84-7, where will be found photographs of the bowl and of the inscription upon it, together with a translation of the latter. After its acquisition by the South Kensington Museum, it remained in a position of much dignity and seclusion, the world forgetting, by the world forgot.

Here, about a dozen years ago. I obtained access to it, and remember spending some hot but happy hours in copying a few of the first columns of the legend, what time an attendant in those deserted corridors, with a tolerant pity for the futility of my proceedings, regaled me with personal experiences deserving a less divided attention than I was able to give them.

In 1909 Professor E. H. Parker came on the scene and contributed an article upon the bowl and its inscription to the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, following this up in the October number by a Latin rendering of the inscription made at his request by the late Père Pierre Hoang, otherwise Huang Peh-hu, of the Zicawei Catholic establishment near Shanghai. Meantime Mr. Parker had himself published in the *Toung Pao*, vol. x, No. 4, 1909, an independent English translation accompanied by very full notes, a photograph of the original inscription, and a transcription into modern Chinese character. It is interesting to find that from the particulars supplied by the Chinese text Père Hoang had worked out the year 590 B.C. as the equivalent of the date mentioned in the inscription for the casting of the bowl.

In the present article, however, we are mainly concerned with the epigraphic aspect of the inscription, which is of much value for comparative purposes. Thanks to the courtesy and efficient help of the authorities of the Victoria and Albert Museum, I have been able to make a close study of the inscription in original, and also to gain some expert information which supplements and partly corrects the particulars given by Dr. Bushell. This I now append, and hope in the following number of the *Journal* to publish in parallel columns a list of the characters contained in the inscription, with their Lesser Seal equivalents, and some additional forms besides.

The bowl itself is not bronze, but pure copper. Bushell, *Chinese Art*, vol. i, p. 84, writes: "The inscription inside

would appear once to have been overlaid with beaten gold as scratches made through the patina with a knife to bring out the characters produce lines of glittering yellow indicating a thick layer of gold." The incrustation which covers the whole of the inside of the bowl, so far as the inscription extends, is found, however, to be artificial and not what is ordinarily known as patina, naturally produced. The composition of this thick and obscuring coat is copper carbonate plus shellac and carbon. The pulverized carbonate mixed with melted shellac was applied over the inscribed portion, and its surface may have been subsequently darkened by the carbon (animal or vegetable charcoal) mixed with oil. Below this coating there is little trace of oxidation, and the edges of the characters are curiously fresh. It seems also not to be the fact that the characters were overlaid with gold, the traces of which, it is believed, result from the filling up of flaws in the casting.

Turning now to the style of writing employed, how may we describe it in its relation to what preceded and what followed it? Indeed, it is not very easy to characterize it concisely. Bushell says of it (*Chinese Art*, p. 85): "The epigraphy resembles closely that of the stone drums . . . although this inscription is two centuries or more later than that of the drums. The lines of the characters are firmly cut in the finished style of the official script of the period, and present a document which may be compared with those of the *Shu Ching*, the canonical Book of History."

A detailed comparison of the Bowl characters with the corresponding forms of the Lesser Seal appears to me to bring out a rather close similarity between the two styles. In certain instances, however, which perhaps weighed considerably with Bushell, the forms in the Stone Drums and in the bowl are identical while quite unlike those of the Lesser Seal. Such are the characters (in modern script) 庸 *yung*, 以 *i*, 若 *jo*, 吾 *wu*, and 栗 *li*.

On the whole I am now inclined to believe that in this bowl inscription we have a fine example of the Greater Seal character. The date renders this probable, though not certain, since the *ku uén*, or ancient forms, undoubtedly did not fall into total disuse, being found on pottery as late as the Han dynasty—witness a pot dated the 2nd year of Wu Feng, or B.C. 55, in the British Museum. Bushell, accepting the prevalent Chinese opinion of the Stone Drums “as certainly early relics of the Chou dynasty”, which must date “at any rate . . . before B.C. 770”, bases his judgment of the bowl characters upon their close likeness (as he thought) to those on the drums, and hence. I presume, for he does not explicitly say so, considered the writing of the bowl to be in the Greater Seal.

I have reached the same conclusion, but by a different route, which may be summarized in this way. Whether we regard the “Recorder Chou” as a man or a myth, an author or an eponym, we must accept the fact that the new fashion of writing, known later as the *ta chuan* or Greater Seal, came into use in the ninth century B.C. From this Greater Seal was developed, some six centuries later, the Lesser Seal of the Ts’in dynasty, “by considerable contractions and alterations of the Recorder Chou’s Greater Seal,” as the *Shuo Wen’s* Preface states. The later form was, then, the earlier form with numerous simplifications and some radical alterations, and to a type such as is thus indicated for the Greater Seal the characters of the bowl appear to conform very fairly.

THE HONAN INSCRIBED BONES

The French proverb that “c’est l’imprévu qui arrive toujours” received a new and signal illustration by the discovery in 1899 of several thousand fragments of bone, inscribed in a very archaic form of character, in the

province of Honan. These are destined eventually to throw a flood of fresh light on primitive Chinese writing, but meantime they constitute a dense mass of difficulties and exasperating obscurities, brightened, it is fair to add, already by numerous rifts of welcome and stimulating illumination.

In 1903 a Chinese official, one Liu T'ieh-yün, published six volumes of phototypic plates reproducing the inscriptions of a thousand selected pieces among some five thousand acquired by him. Liu did not attempt the task of transcribing these legends into modern guise, beyond a few commented on in his preface. But for those interested in this subject, and not themselves the possessors of a collection of such bones, the book is invaluable, though difficult to procure.

But it is to the Rev. F. H. Chalfant of Weihsien, Shantung Province, that the Western student is indebted not only for the first published account and illustrations of these curious relics given in his *Early Chinese Writing*, 1906, but for the fact that by his zealous and efficient efforts were formed the fine collections now possessed by the British Museum, the Royal Scottish Museum, the Carnegie Museum of Pittsburgh, U.S.A., and the Museum of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society at Shanghai. And to the same gentleman my own gratitude is due for the opportunity of forming a cabinet of over eight hundred specimens, not one of which would have reached me without his disinterested aid.

The find was made in the province of Honan in North China. The exact locality and the circumstances are more uncertain. M. Chavannes in a short but admirable article in the *Journal Asiatique* for January-February, 1911, on "La Divination par l'écaille de tortue dans la haute antiquité chinoise", cites the latest Chinese author on this subject, Lo Chên-yü, as asserting that the point is about 2 miles west of Chang Tê Fu, a well-known city in North

Honan. No non-Chinese person has seen the place, and I have sometimes wondered whether in fact the whole of these fragments have come from the same spot.

Several thousand specimens have passed through the hands of Mr. Chalfant, and of all these, as well as of those illustrated by the above-mentioned Liu T'ieh-yün, he has prepared outline drawings with their legends in facsimile. in a large number of plates, ready for publication. Funds alone are wanting for this, but unless some Mæcenas will appear in the shape of an idle rich defying the death duties, or a learned society liberally interpreting its own, it is not easy to see how the much to be desired publication can take place.

The find comprises fragments of tortoise-shell, of pieces of shoulder-blades, leg-bones, and pelvis of some ruminant (presumably sheep and oxen), as well as a very considerable number of small but well-executed amulets in bone and of various designs, and, lastly, many examples of bone "cowries". All these are inscribed with incise characters in a script of a type obviously more ancient than any hitherto known to us. Plates II to VI illustrate specimens in my collection.

What was the purpose of these inscribed fragments, and what have their legends to tell us concerning early Chinese writing? Briefly defined, these bones are the vestiges of the ancient diviners' craft, and the records of their patrons' inquiries.

It has, of course, always been known that a system of divination by means of cracks produced in a tortoise's carapace by scorching was in regular use in ancient China. By these bones we can see exactly what was done and how it was done, which is more than could be truthfully said for the most celebrated Chinese commentators, who have not had this ocular evidence. I cannot do better on this point than to quote a passage from M. Chavannes' article above cited, referring the reader to Plates III and IV,

where specimens from my own collection illustrate the double process described.

“Sur plusieurs fragments,” writes M. Chavannes, “d'écaïlle de tortue, on remarque, d'une part, des trous ronds ou ovales, de 5 à 10 millimètres de diamètre, qui ont été pratiqués avec un instrument tranchant : d'autre part, des traces de brûlure. Les brûlures étaient destinées à provoquer, à la surface de l'écaïlle, des fissures qui, suivant leurs formes, étaient interprétées par l'augure : mais, pour que ces fissures pussent se produire plus aisément, on avait eu soin au préalable de faire ici et là des trous qui rendaient l'écaïlle plus aisé à fendre.”

Plate III shows a bone with a line of these holes, which are always worked, at the deepest part, almost but not quite through to the further surface. In the three middle holes, and slightly to one side of the vertical median line (never at the deepest point), will be seen the black spots produced by the touch of a hot iron. Apparently by the action of this hot iron were produced two very thin cracks in the surface on the opposite side of the bone. One reveals itself as the vertical median line of the hole; the other, as a line joining the first at or about right angles, and running transversely across the centre of the unseen burn. Why the application of heat should produce such a crack, not on the surface where it was applied, but on the other, and with sometimes a considerable intervening thickness of bone, I leave to some light-hearted osteologist to explain, for I cannot. Fig. 722 of the same Plate III, and, better still, Fig. 391 on Plate IV, show the normal result, which sums up in visible form the divining process known from the most ancient times by the word *pu*. It does more; for I cannot doubt that Mr. Chalfant's belief that it is the explanation and the origin of the character *pu* 卜, is well founded.

Before passing to the epigraphic features of the bones, there is one peculiarity which deserves notice, for it is, at

first sight, very surprising. This is the singular freshness of the inscribed surfaces, and the clearness of the incised characters. For my part I should never have believed that bones, which must by the most cautious estimate be 2,500 years old, and are by the two Chinese authors who have described them, with whom also is M. Chavannes, dated back to some 600 years earlier, could have resisted decay, still less could have retained legible inscriptions. Yet they have done both in nearly every case. What is more, some of the burnt points present a blue-black brilliancy as though the searing were a thing of yesterday. What is the explanation of the strange endurance of these unperished tissues and their undimmed legends? The explanation lies, literally, on the surface. Here and there in hard adherent incrustations; oftener, falling from the cracks and the incised characters themselves, as a very fine powdery dust, we see the *loess* of Central Asia and Northern China, the time-defying, damp-destroying *loess*. In this soil these bones have always rested. And their *loess* is our gain—if the exactness of the statement may redeem its seeming triviality, for under no other conditions could documents on such commonly perishable a material have retained through three millennia a desiccated vitality.

And lastly, what of the writing itself, and how does it compare with the oldest inscriptions of the bronzes? More than three years study of these relics has neither diminished their interest nor greatly lessened the swarming difficulties and perplexities they present. But it has rendered it possible to make certain generalized statements “on account”.

In the first place, with one or two exceptions, all the thousands of legends yet seen exhibit, in every sense, a homogeneous character, each more closely resembling any of the same find than any of the find resemble inscriptions of a different origin. Notwithstanding this, there is a considerable range of variation, possibly corresponding to a greater or less antiquity of type.

In the next place, the part taken by pictographic forms (obviously such, though not always to be identified with their precise natural or artificial prototypes) is greater than in any previously known Chinese script.

But even so, the forces of convention, contraction, and corruption have already largely changed the early simplicities of pictographic expression. Were it otherwise, these characters would not prove so baffling, nor should we be obliged to admit that out of nearly 3,000 different characters catalogued we can as yet identify only about 600.

Variants of the same character occur so often as to be the rule rather than the exception. The most fertile in variety are the members of the Ten Stems and Twelve Branches used for the Cycle of Sixty, as will be seen from Plate VI.

This group illustrates also another very interesting point, and one that, I think, constitutes a new fact in this study. This is that the same word is found written in these documents, not merely with several variations of the same character, but sometimes with different characters, or in other terms, that in some cases (how many, future research must determine), in writing the same word one type of character was exchanged for another type. I mean by "types", forms which are of independent construction, neither derived from, or due to, the other through mere modification, omission, or addition of strokes.

This point is so important that I must break through the rule I have tried to observe, not to introduce characters in the body of the page. If the reader will refer to Plate VI he will see among the numerous variants of *tsū*,

"a son," the forms  Each of these is a type,

each has variants, and none of the three types appears derivable from either of the other two. And while it is quite true that in various instances the recognized Chinese

collections of old characters give examples of such different types, it could always be supposed that they were gathered from bronzes of different periods, while here we have them used contemporaneously.

I have an increasing belief that the existence of independent types, or as we may put it, of more than one character for the same word, explains the difficulty of deciphering these inscriptions. No wonder we cannot transcribe these undecipherable signs into their modern forms, if no such modern forms have ever existed. How can we help being at fault if the fault is, in truth, an abrupt breach of continuity in the epigraphic stratification; if one type has been discarded and another adopted without record of the change being left?

Many such changes are, indeed, known to Chinese scholars, who have used the term *ku chin tzu*, or "characters ancient and modern", to connote them, when one constructional type has replaced another in historical sequence, even where in the case of compound characters the replacement is only partial, as when the character for "hand" is replaced by the character for "hand holding a baton", e.g. in 收 *shou*, "to take in hand," in place of 扌, which, but for this partial change of type, would have been the modern equivalent of the earlier form. In such instances of substitution in writing words, we may not inaptly illustrate the sequence of types by calling the later character the successor in title, and not the descendant by lineage of the earlier.

The execution of the inscriptions deserves some notice. It is usually bold and clear, and often fine and even minute. Much freedom is affected in the treatment of compound characters, the right-hand half in one case becoming the left hand in another, even when the second example of the same character is repeated immediately after the first. An instance occurs in a very remarkable genealogical tree of, it would seem, a Wang, or king of

Chou, unless the Shang dynasty attribution favoured by M. Chavannes is the true one. This freedom of composition, however, is found also in the ancient bronzes. What appear to be conventional abbreviations reduced to mere dots are not uncommon, and punctuate our exasperating embarrassments with an ironic insignificance.

The characters run in vertical columns, which usually follow each other from right to left, but sometimes from left to right. Their incise surfaces are very commonly coloured with some foreign substance, usually black, sometimes vermilion, and occasionally, when the bone surface is very dark, with white. The cutting instrument must have been a fine metal style, but this is far from having resulted in a dead uniformity of execution. We easily distinguish several marked differences of style, or perhaps here once again it may be "the man behind" that counts, and the varying style of the character be due, not to the character of the style, but of the scribes who wielded it.

A general comparison with the writing of the oldest bronzes proves that there are many known characters common to the latter and the bones. A further and significant fact is that out of some 270 unknown and doubtful forms collected from bronzes by the late Wu Ta-ch'êng and published in his *Shuo Wên Ku Chou Pu*, I have been able to find no less than 87 as occurring also on the bones, and there are probably a good many others. On the other hand, by the kindness of Mr. Chalfant I have been supplied with a detailed list of characters met with in the Honan find, which are identical with or differ very slightly from the Lesser Seal forms. From this list I have removed a number as not quite conforming to a rigid test of similarity, but even so there remain no less than 186, which are to all intents examples of the Lesser Seal writing.

In conclusion, a few words remain to be said regarding

the difficult question of the date to be attributed to these relics. In the first place, are they all of even approximately the same date, or have we to do with some store of oracular archives extending over many centuries? It is probably too early to speak confidently on this point, but I incline to this latter supposition.

M. Chavaumes, however, appears to adopt definitely the opinion of the Chinese writers Liu T'ieh-yün and Lo Chên-yü, who are positive that these bones are relics of the Shang or Yin dynasty. The frequent occurrence in the legends of what are taken to be the posthumous titles of a number of the sovereigns of that line, e.g., Tsu I, Tsu Hsin, Tsu Ting, Tsu Kêng, Ta Chia, Hsiao Chia, and others, is obviously significant, and seems to have determined M. Chavaumes' view. He writes in the before-mentioned article, *Journal Asiatique*, Janvier-Février, 1911, p. 134, "Qui avait le droit de s'adresser à ces empereurs défunts? Ce ne pouvaient être que leurs descendants. Ces documents doivent donc émaner d'un des derniers empereurs de la dynastie des Yin." But is this, after all, so certain? Let us see.

We must remember that similar titles (for they are not personal names) are frequent on the oldest bronzes, where they are by no means always held to refer to the rulers of the Shang dynasty. But what is of greater importance is that on these same bone fragments we find numerous instances of analogous couplets, in which, instead of the word *tsu*, ancestor or grandfather, we find, as the first member of the couplet, the words *fu*, father, *mu*, mother, *hsiung*, elder brother, *nü*, woman (unless this should be taken as a variant script for *mu*, mother), and, strangest of all and most common, *jen*, man. It would seem we must consider all these groups together, and not isolate the "ancestor" sub-group on pinnacles of Imperial distinction. The true explanation of this curious custom of describing certain categories of deceased



persons by terms ending in one of the "Ten Stems" or Denary Cycle, lies, in my opinion, in the very ancient rule of Taboo. The rule is stated in De Groot's admirable work, *The Religious System of China*, pt. iv, p. 1141: "China's history shows convincingly in all its books that it has always been obligatory for its people to abstain strictly from mentioning the fate-names of parents, emperors, and certain other superiors, as well before as after their death." This abstention from mentioning the personal name is, as I suppose, exemplified in all the groups specified above as occurring in the bone inscriptions, including the group of titles taken by Mr. Lo Chên-yu and M. Chavannes for those of Shang dynasty sovereigns, though, if my explanation be accepted, "Ancestor I," "Ancestor Ting," and the rest may be only the pious designations employed by any family fortunate enough to possess an ancestry, equally under the Chou dynasty as under that which preceded it.

A consideration of a different order is the following. A fragment, now in the Royal Scottish Museum, contains the name Chên Huan-tzu, 陳 隄 子. Now Chên Huan-tzu is a known historical personage, mentioned in the *Tso Chuan* under the twenty-second year of Duke Chuang, where it is stated that when the State of Chên received its first great blow Chên Huan-tzu had begun to be great in Ts'i. Legge (*Chinese Classics*, vol. v. pt. i, p. 103) gives this date as B.C. 533. This bone fragment, then, cannot possibly be much earlier than that year, though it may be much later.

And so we may take leave of the question for the time, hoping that when we shall have been able to decipher the two Royal Genealogies that have been unearthed, we may once more prove the truth of the motto "Ex oriente lux".

西王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山
 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山 王母之山

11



11

1

1

1

(EXPLANATION TO PLATE I.)

- A. Yuan Yuan's explanation for this and the following five figures are given in inverted commas. The word translated "cartouche" is *ya*, 卮, which of course does not bear that meaning. I use it for convenience. "Within a cartouche, between two footprints, a figure of a tortoise. (Below), figure of a sacrificial vessel. (Below the cartouche), the character 父, *fu*, father."
- B. "Within a cartouche, (on the right) a figure of a wine-jar, (below which) the character 其, *ch'i*. (On the left), a figure of three arrows on a rack."
- C. "A son holding a standard."
- D. "Within a cartouche, a figure of a goblet and of an arrow. (Below the cartouche), the characters 父丁, *fu ting*, Father Ting."
- E. "Within a cartouche, a figure of a son grasping an unstrung bow. (Below the cartouche), a figure of an upright halberd."
- F. "A son shouldering two strings of shells. (Below), the characters 父丁, *fu ting*, Father Ting." The word "figure" is here omitted by Yuan.

(EXPLANATION TO PLATE II.)

TWO TYPICAL SPECIMENS OF BONE FRAGMENTS


H. 645. Two vertical columns of characters. Below the label four characters written horizontally, of which the left-hand one is *san*, three. The remaining three form a constantly recurring formula as yet undeciphered. The two vertical columns read, in modern script, 戊申卜? 貞受年位. It is clear that this is an inquiry about the year's harvest.

H. 639. This is the obverse side of the bone figured on Plate III, with the holes and scorched spots. It contains an inscription in two entries or paragraphs. The upper one runs in vertical columns, as follows: 甲午卜今日? 干? 爽二犬二? 二吉. The lower entry runs: 今日用二犬二?? 爽.


The inscriptions on H. 639 appear to record an inquiry as to killing as a sacrifice to some personage, the second character of whose name is *shih*, two dogs and two swine. But the second character, though differing only by a dot from that for *shih*, 豕, swine, may be some other term for such beasts. The formula 二吉, meaning, apparently, "doubly lucky," is constant on the bones.


Plate II, B. H. 385. Fragment to illustrate the occurrence of a pictographic character of a human figure with conventionalized and contracted head in profile, and left arm trailing sword or staff. Modern equivalent unknown. Below is (probably) 禾 *ho*, grain. Above are 申 *shen* followed by 貞 *chen*, the latter one of the commonest of all the characters on the bones. In the right-hand column only 其 *ch'i* and 用 *yung* are certain.

II. B



II. A







IV



V. B.



V. A.



(EXPLANATION TO PLATES III. IV. V.)

Plate III. Three typical fragments, that on the right showing holes bored and touched with hot iron to produce cracks, such as those on H. 722. Notice on H. 722 the five characters 弗告于祖乙, which would mean (if I correctly read the second) "Not to announce to Ancestor I".

Plate IV. H. 391. Notice the typical occurrence near the fissures of the numerals 一, 二, and 三. H. 683. A pictograph of some large beast with horns or antlers and tufted tail. Possibly the famous tailed deer *Elaphurus Davidii*, now recently extinct. Below are 五月, Fifth Moon.

Plate V. A. Part of a long inscription, enlarged to show pictographic human figure holding what seems to be a sword. Modern equivalent unknown.

B. Various inscribed bone amulets, slightly reduced in size.

(EXPLANATION TO PLATE VI.)

Several variants have even now been omitted from this list, which must not be taken as complete.

THE TEN STEMS

- No. 1. *Chia*. The Seal Character and modern form of this have so far not been found in the bones.
No. 5. *Wu* or *Mou*. In certain instances the scribes write this and *Hsu*, the eleventh of the Twelve Branches, in an absolutely identical form.

THE TWELVE BRANCHES

- No. 3. *Yin*. Note the extreme simplification in some examples, which virtually reduces the character to the form of *shih*, arrow.
No. 6. *Ssü*. This branch appears *in propria persona* but rarely on the bones. Liu T'ieh-yün in the Preface to his *T'ieh Yün Tsang Kuei* says that the character *ssü*, with one doubtful exception, does not occur in his collection. It does, however, occur both in the specimen he cites and in several other instances. What is remarkable is that in certain cycle couplets where it ought to occur, such as *chi-ssü*, *i ssü*, and *kuei ssü*, it is always represented by the character *tzü*, 子. Conversely, in two of the very few instances of the occurrence of the character *ssü*, both in the couplet *jén tzü*, the second member, as written, is *ssü*, but must stand for *tzü*. Why the diviners should have exchanged these characters in this way is hard to understand, but the words *ssü* and *tzü* may have been homophones in the region and period of the writers, as they are now in the Canton dialect.
No. 7. *Wu*. Note the instance of the contraction of this character to a simple vertical stroke, identical with the third form of the stem *Chia* above. The numeral ten is frequently thus contracted also on the bones.

XXIX

TABLETS FROM TEL-LOH IN PRIVATE COLLECTIONS

By T. G. PINCHES, M.R.A.S.

THOUGH large numbers of the temple-records of Tel-loh have been published, and notwithstanding that they are mainly texts of but little importance, linguistic and minor historical details, to say nothing of the questions involved in Babylonian manners, customs, and religious beliefs, require that as many of these seemingly worthless records of the people who used the wedge-formed characters of the Sumerians should be published as is possible. On this account I need not crave the indulgence of the reader for issuing here these minor texts from the little Southern Babylonian state of Lagas. Their contents will be their own justification for claiming the attention of the student, as they have claimed mine.



Among the tablets of the oldest period from Tel-loh are certain inscriptions on oblong pieces of clay which may be described as rough beads, pointed at each end, and pierced by a hole for a cord. In the Berens Collection are six such objects, varying in size from 38 to 51 mm. in length by 28 to 38.5 mm. in greatest diameter. The writing is large and sometimes rough, but is generally clear, as in the case of most documents of the early age of Uru-ka-gina, whose name they bear.

An object of this class has already been published by me in the first volume of the *Amherst Tablets*, p. 14, with a suggested translation. These inscriptions are always identical with the exception of the second and third lines, which are therefore, in all probability, names, as their forms suggest, though the third line may in some cases give the title of an official. In the publication in question


CLAY LABELS IN THE POSSESSION OF RANDOLPH BERENS, ESQ.

Berens 3.


Berens 1.




Berens 4.




Berens 2.



Berens 5.





Berens 6.





I have regarded the first line as meaning "the lord of the fortification", and if we adopt this rendering the following will be the transcription and translation of the six clay beads of which the copies are given:—

1.	2.	3.
<i>En nu-bada</i>	<i>En nu-bada</i>	<i>En nu-bada</i>
<i>Zaga-mu</i>	<i>Amar-d. Kiski</i>	<i>Sur-d. Nin-X</i>
<i>gal-un</i>	<i>paSur-du</i>	<i>paDun-bara</i>
<i>Uru-ka-</i>	<i>Uru-ka-</i>	<i>Uru-ka-</i>
<i>gi-na</i>	<i>gi-na</i>	<i>gi-na</i>
<i>lugal</i>	<i>lugal</i>	<i>lugal</i>
<i>Sir-la ki</i>	<i>Sir-la ki</i>	<i>Sir-la ki</i>
<i>pur-</i>	<i>pur-</i>	<i>pur- mu ia</i>
The lord of the fortification, Zagamu, the general, Uru-ka-gina, king of Lagaš.	The lord of the fortification, Amar-Kis, the official Sur-du, Uru-ka-gina, king of Lagaš.	The lord of the fortification, Sur Nin-X, the official Dun-bara, Uru-ka-gina, king of Lagaš. Year 5.
4.	5.	6.
<i>En nu-bada</i>	<i>En nu-bada</i>	<i>En nu-bada</i>
<i>Lu-ka- . . .</i>	<i>Amar-iz'in</i>	<i>Mesi-bara</i>
<i>paAmar-iz'in</i>	<i>paLu-iyi</i>	<i>paLu-a(?)mah(?)</i>
<i>Uru-ka-</i>	<i>Uru-ka-</i>	<i>Uru-ka-gi-</i>
<i>gi-na</i>	<i>gi-na</i>	<i>na</i>
<i>lugal</i>	<i>lugal</i>	<i>lugal</i>
<i>Sir-la-pur ki</i>	<i>Sir-la ki</i>	<i>Sir-la ki</i>
	<i>pur-</i>	<i>pur-</i>
The lord of the fortification,	The lord of the fortification,	The lord of the fortification,





Lu-ka- . . .	Amar-izin,	Mesi-bara,
the official	the official	the official
Amar-izin.	Lu-igi,	Lu-amah(?),
Uru-ka-gina.	Uru-ka-gina.	Uru-ka-gina,
king	king	king
of Lagaš.	of Lagaš.	of Lagaš.

It is to be noted that the order of the characters for the group composing the name of Lagaš in the last line of each text is, in every case, as elsewhere, *Sir-la-pur^{ki}* (see especially No. 4). In other inscriptions, as in the Assyrian and Babylonian bilingual tablets, it is always *Sir-pur-laki* (see p. 570). Against the rendering there suggested ("raven-city") is the fact that the group never has the determinative suffix for "bird", but this is likewise absent in the place-name *Du-lugal-ûa* (i.e.) also. Notwithstanding that *âribu* means "raven" (Heb. עֲרִיב, Arab. عُرَاب), and is one of the renderings of  it is not improbable that some other bird may be intended, as the fragment discovered by Rassam, 36669 + 37958 (see pp. 1057 ff.), implies. This text gives (lines 12-16) the Sumerian equivalents of the birds called *êribu* (not *âribu* in these lines), including the reed-*êribu*, the white, the black, and the wheat-field *êribu*. The *âribu*, however, is represented (line 19) by another group, namely,  with the pronunciation of *uga* in Sumerian. This seems to indicate that, though the Sumerians distinguished between the *âribu* and the *êribu*, the Babylonians confused the two birds, probably in consequence of the likeness between their names. The *êribu*, both white and black, seems to have been the bird of Nergal, the god of war and plague.

There is much doubt as to the reason why these ideographic groups were used to designate these and other birds, especially in the case of those containing the element , *sir*, the general meaning of which seems to be "brightness", or the like. If a bright colour


could be indicated by it, then we may, perhaps, be justified in regarding this character, followed by , *bur*, as meaning "crest", in which case the familiar "chicken" still so popular may be intended. The *éribu* could be either white or black, it ate seed (fragment, l. 16), it killed (as does the gamecock), and was then called a *hurugu* (?) (l. 17), and the cock-bird (l. 18) was called *bibinakku*. The fighting-cock would naturally be the bird of Nergal, the god of war and battle. But could this have been the emblem of Lagaš, and (as has been suggested) the origin of the Austrian, German, and Russian eagles?

What the inscriptions on these bead-like objects refer to, and how they are to be understood, is uncertain. That they are addresses is not improbable, but they may be also simply indications of possession. They would in that case merely state that the objects—bags, in all probability—to which they were attached were the property of the chief of some garrison (whose name is given in the second line), that he had either a second in command (No. 1) or a secretary, or the like (Nos. 2–6), and that the king was Urn-ka-gina, ruler of Lagaš. It is noteworthy that Amar-izin, the official mentioned in No. 4, appears as the chief personage in No. 5, suggesting a case of promotion. No. 3 has an indication of the year in the final horizontal wedge crossed by five slanting ones (as shown by Colonel Allotte de la Fuyé). This chronological indication is absent in the case of the other five objects of this class.

The character represented by X in No. 3. l. 2, is equivalent to the rare Assyrian  in *Cuneiform Texts*, xi, pl. 35 (76–4–13, 1, l. 6), and was there originally preceded by , *udu*. Both the pronunciation and the meaning, however, are broken away. It may be asked whether this combined group may not be a variant of  with , *lal*, inside. If this be the case the name might be read *Sur-Nin-asilal*, the deity *Nin-asilal* being possibly "the lord of joyous festivity", or the like.

BERENS, 1*b*

An unbaked clay tablet, 27 mm. high by 24 mm. wide, inscribed with five lines of writing on the obverse and three on the reverse, a broad space intervening between the sixth and seventh. Neatly made and well written, but somewhat damaged on the reverse.

*Obverse*

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Ušu lam qa zida</i> | 34 <i>qa</i> of meal, |
| 2. <i>niš qa zida gu</i> | 20 <i>qa</i> of <i>gu</i> -meal, |
| 3. <i>áš qa zida kala</i> | 6 <i>qa</i> of fine (?) meal |
| 4. <i>na-me</i> | the (work-)men ; |
| 5. <i>niš lam šuššan qa zida kula</i> | 24½ <i>qa</i> of fine (?) meal, |

Reverse


- | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| 6. <i>rim-me</i> | the couriers. |
| 7. <i>[z]i-gu</i> | Taken away |
| 8. <i>nangara</i> | (by) the carpenter. |

This text is characteristic of the period and class to which it belongs. The supplies of meal were apparently for the food of the men referred to, but what was their occupation is not stated. By meal (l. 1), in all probability, wheat-meal may be understood. The *gu*-meal (line 2) has still to be identified. That *kula*-meal was something superior may be surmised from lines 5 and 6, where the quantity for the couriers is given—these had fine (?) meal only, no ordinary, and no *gu*-meal. The carpenter who received the supplies on behalf of the others may have been the chief of the gang. Later on the amounts allotted

to each man was stated—so many *ga* each. Date about 2600 B.C. This and the two following texts are apparently of the period represented in *Amherst Tablets*, vol. i, by Nos. 4–15, which seemingly belong to M. Fr. Thureau-Dangin's third and fourth series (see the notice of his *Recueil de Tablettes*, JRAS., 1904, pp. 337 ff.).

BERENS, 1c

An unbaked clay tablet, 27 mm. high by 26 mm. wide, inscribed on the obverse with four lines of writing in three "cases", and on the reverse with the same number, the only difference being that the third line is separated from the fourth by a small space.



Obverse

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. <i>Aš di-eš</i>
<i>zal-nun</i> | 1 jar of butter, |
| 3. <i>gi ga zal-nun</i> | 1 <i>ga</i> of butter, |
| 4. <i>d.En-zu</i> | (for) the god Sin |


Reverse

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 5. <i>d.Nanna (?)</i> | (and) Nannar (?), |
| 7. <i>pa-rim</i> | (by) the courier. |
| 8. <i>zi-ga</i> | Taken away. |

Butter would seem to have been delivered both by measure and by weight. In this case it appears to have been taken by a courier as an offering, possibly, to the gods Sin and Nannar, two forms of the moon-god. The second character of the first line of the reverse, however, is very doubtful. Date about 2600 B.C.

BERENS, 2^r

An unbaked clay tablet, 29.5 mm. high by 26 mm. wide, inscribed with four lines of writing in three cases on the obverse, and four lines in four cases on the reverse.

*Obverse*

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1. [Aš di]-eš | [1 j]ar |
| 2. [zal]-nun | (of) [but]ter |
| 3. A-ba-mu nu-banda | Abamu the steward : |
| 4. aš di-eš | 1 jar |

Reverse

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 5. u-du-pa | of ulapa, |
| 6. Be-li-ilu | Béli-ilu, |
| 7. pa-rim | the courier, |
| 8. zi-ga | has taken away. |

Though the first two lines are damaged at the beginning the restoration may be regarded as practically certain (cf. line 4 and Berens, 1c, l. 1).


The nature of the substance designated by *ulapa* is unknown.

Though the name *Abamu* ("my patriarch," or the like) is Sumerian, the second name (in line 6), *Béli-ilu*, "my lord is God," is Semitic, and testifies again to the presence of Semites in Babylonia (apparently the little state of Lagaš) at an exceedingly early period. As there is no double line, this latter person was possibly the courier who took charge of the *ulapa*. Date about 2600 B.C.


BERENS, 9

An unbaked clay tablet, 45 mm. high by 35.5 mm. wide. inscribed with five lines or cases of writing on the obverse and the reverse respectively. The third and the fourth of the reverse are divided from each other by a space.

Obverse



Reverse



Obverse

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. <i>Eš šuš ninná še gur lugala</i> | 230 gur of grain royal, |
| 2. <i>ma a-si-ga</i> | by the ebb-tide ship |
| 3. <i>Nipriki-ku</i> | to Niffer, |
| 4. <i>ki Ma-ni-ta</i> | from Mani |
| 5. <i>Reš-ti-um</i> | Rêstium |

Reverse

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 6. <i>šu-ba-ti</i> | has received. |
| 7. <i>Gir: Lugal-ki-gala</i> | Official: Lugal-kigala: |
| 8. <i>pa Sur-d-Isi-d-Ba-u</i> | secretary: Sur-Isi-Bau. |
| 9. <i>Iti Še-il-la</i> | Month Še-illa, |
| 10. <i>nu Ki-maški-ba-hul</i> | year he ravaged Kimaš. |


The "ebb-tide" boat was probably one used when the river was low, and was possibly of shallow draught. To all appearance in this case it went from Lagaš to Nippur. I have transcribed the name of the receiver as

Réšium in consequence of its Semitic appearance. Though more rare than the non-Semitic names, those of the Semitic section of the population sometimes occur, and among the examples known may be mentioned *Šarrum-ili*, "the king is my god"; *Matimum: Pi-ša-ḫali*, "word of the seer (?)" ; *Aḫi-milum*, "my brother is the flood (?)" ; *Nuḫalum*, "palm-tree (?)" ; *Tábum*, "the good" ; *Addu-bani*, "Hadad has created (him)" ; *Matini, Abzolum*, etc. (*Amherst Tablets*, pp. 76, 78, 120, 145, 180, 183, 186). See also Berens, 2c, l. 6 above.

The name *Lugal-kigula* occurs in Reisner's *Tempelurkunden*, 164¹⁶, rev. 19. *Sur-Isi-Bau* occurs in three of his texts, but it is doubtful whether the same man is meant. The date is Radau's No. 39 of king Dungi.

BERENS, 3b

An unbaked clay tablet, 38.5 mm. high by 34.75 mm. wide, inscribed on the obverse with five lines of writing in as many cases, and on the reverse with five lines in three cases. Well preserved.



Obverse

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Aš šuš ú-gi kula | 371 men |
| 2. ú gi(u)-ku | for 1 day— |
| 3. erim ma še-ka | the grain-ship's workmen. |
| 4. pa Sur-d. Ba-u | Secretary : Sur-Bau ; |
| 5. nu-banda Lu-dug-ga | captain : Lu-dugga ; |

Reverse


- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. <i>gir Lu-l-a-mu</i> | overseer : Lulamu, |
| 7. <i>dumu Lu-d-En-lil-la</i> | son of Lu-Enlilla. |
| 8. <i>Iti I-zin-d-U-s-si</i> | Month Izin-Ussi, |
| 9. <i>mu An-ša-anki</i> | } year he ravaged Anšan. |
| 10. <i>ba-hul</i> | |

The date corresponds with the 37th of Dungi, according to Radau.


BERENS, 6b

An unbaked clay tablet, 38 mm. high by 31 mm. wide, inscribed with four lines on the obverse and the same number on the reverse, with a blank space of one line between the second and third lines of the latter.

Obverse



Reverse



Obverse


- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. <i>Ešmina šuš šegurlugala</i> | 3 gur 120 qa of grain royal |
| 2. <i>ki Ab-ba-mu-ta</i> | from Abbamu |
| 3. <i>Lu-kul-la</i> | Lu-kalla |
| 4. <i>šu-ba-ti</i> | has received. |

Reverse

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. <i>su-su-dam</i> | Delivered |
| 6. <i>šag ē-ga-šur-ra</i> | within the storehouse. |
| 7. <i>Mu Ki-maški</i> | } Year he ravaged Kimaš. |
| 8. <i>ba-hul</i> | |

BERENS, 10

An unbaked clay tablet, 36 mm. high by 33 mm. wide, inscribed with six lines of writing in five cases on the obverse, and four lines in two cases on the reverse, each case in the latter separated by a widish space.

*Obverse*

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Ušu luma šuš nimin-
imīna qa | } | 30 gur 297 qa of grain |
| 2. še gur lugala | | royal, |
| 3. á lu hun-ga | | the wage of the workman. |
| 4. ki Du-du-ta | | from Dudu, |
| 5. Sur-d. En-zu | | Sur-Enzu |
| 6. šu-ba-ti | | has received. |





Reverse




- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| 7. a-šag a-sag zal-la(?) | } | The field of the flowing |
| 8. a-du-du-a | | head-water(?), |
| 9. Mu uš-sa Ki- . . . | | (where) the water runs. |
| 10. nu uš-sa-bi | | Year after Ki[maš]—
year after that. |


In the first line, after <<<, are traces of the wedges of an erased character, suggesting that the scribe had begun to write 𒀭 instead of 𒀭 , and inserted the right form after the erasure.

The reading *hunya* for 𒀭 𒀭 is indicated by the

fragment 80-11-12, 106, reverse. from which I extract the following paragraph:—

				<i>hūn</i> <i>a-ga-rum</i> , to hire. <i>a-pa-KáŠ-GIŠ-paḍ-dir</i> <i>ig-rum</i> , hire. <i>á-hun-ga</i> „ hire. <i>urdu hūn-ga</i> <i>ag-rum</i> , hired man.
--	--	--	--	--

My first reading of the first line of the reverse was *a-sag* , *a-ka-du-sub*, but this, on a more searching examination, seemed to be incorrect. For , *zala*, with the meaning of *ábālu*, “to bring,” see Reisner’s *Hymns*. 88, rev., 13, 18, etc.;  also means “to cross” (*étēqu*). Elsewhere *a-sag* appears as a kind of field-produce, and has the prefix *zida*, “meal.”

Line 9 may be completed , *mu uš-sa Ki-maski*, “year after (the king ravaged) Kinaš,” and this I have adopted.



The date corresponds with Radau’s 50*a* of king Dungi.

BERENS, 2*b*

An unbaked clay tablet, 48.5 mm. high by 39 mm. wide, inscribed with seven lines of writing in four cases on the obverse, and nine lines in seven cases on the reverse. Well written, but the text has suffered somewhat

Obverse

Reverse



on account of the soft surface and a certain amount of chemical action.

Obverse

1. <i>Niš gi ga-gi ba (?)</i> - 2. <i>tab-ba</i> }	20 double cane-sections (?)
3. <i>Sur-šah na-ga-</i> } 4. <i>ip</i> }	Sur-šah—stock (?),
5. <i>Āš gur dup engur-zu-ri</i>	6 gur of <i>dup-engur-zuri</i> ,
6. <i>Sur-šag-ga</i>	Sur-šagga,
7. <i>dumu Lu-d. Ana</i>	son of Lu-Ana ;

Reverse

8. <i>ga-nuna-ta</i>	from the depôt ;
9. <i>U-ia gur dup</i>	15 gur of <i>dup</i>
10. <i>Nam-ḥa-ni dup-šura-</i> } 11. <i>ga,</i> }	Namḥani, the scribe.
12. <i>ē-gala-ta</i>	from the palace
13. <i>zi-ga</i>	taken away.
14. <i>Iti mu-ša-du</i>	Month Mušudu,
15. <i>mu d. Nu-muš-da</i>	year the god Numušda
16. <i>ē-a ba-tur-ra</i>	entered the temple.

This text is one presenting considerable difficulty on account of the unusual words. If my suggestion that *gagi* (?) means "piece" be correct,¹ *gi gagi* would mean literally "section-reed", and designate a kind of bamboo. as the prefix $\text{𒄠} \text{𒄡}$ *gi* = *qanû*, "cane," indicates.² For the substances referred to in lines 5 and 9, see note ².

¹ Cf. the British Museum tablet I7753 (*Cuneiform Texts*, v, pls. 39 ff.), where woven stuffs are referred to ; also *Amherst Tablets*, vol. i, No. 7.

² Lines 1 and 2 may, however, refer to reed-mats, not to reeds or canes themselves, and *dup-engur-zuri* is possibly to be translated "water-channel clay", or the like : the juxtaposition of the two reminds us that clay was used for bricks, and that, in the temple-towers, every seventh course of brickwork was separated from the rest by a layer of reed-matting. *Dup* in line 9 might, in that case, signify the superior kind of clay needed by a scribe—here Namḥani in lines 10-11.

The meaning of *na-ga-ip* is uncertain. Compare, however, *na-da-ip*, applied to animals (oxen).¹


The date is a rare one, and indicates the 8th of the reign of Dungi—the 13th date of that king, according to Radau.

HARDING SMITH, 83


A baked clay case-tablet, unopened, 53.5 mm. high by 47 mm. wide, inscribed with six lines of writing on the obverse and five lines on the reverse. There is a wide space between the 5th and 6th line of the obverse, and a still wider space between the 2nd and 3rd of the reverse, in which are excellent impressions of the scribe's cylinder-seal.

HARDING SMITH, 83, WITH TRANSCRIPTION INTO LATE BABYLONIAN CHARACTERS

Obverse



Reverse



① 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ② 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ③ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ④ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑤ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑥ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶
 ⑦ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑧ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑨ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑩ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑪ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑫ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶
 ⑬ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑭ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑮ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑯ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 ⑰ 𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶

¹ Reisner, *Tempelwäuden aus Telloh*, 5, viii, 20, etc. If these are Semitic words, the readings are probably *nagatum* and *nadatum* respectively.

Obverse

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Šuš ušu eš lama šuš še gur</i> | } 93 gur 240 qu of royal grain |
| 2. <i>lugala</i> | |
| 3. <i>gir Lu-dig-ga</i> | the official Lu-digga ; |
| 4. <i>šuš gur gir Sur-šag-ga</i> | 60 gur the official Sur-šagga ; |
| 5. <i>a-sag Galama-ḥa</i> | field of Galama-ḥa. |
| 6. <i>Ki Lu-dingir-ra-tu</i> | From Lu-dingira. |

Reverse

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 7. <i>Dup Sur-d-En-lil-la-</i> | { Seal of Sur-Enlilla of the |
| 8. <i>ka gura</i> | { storehouse. |
| 9. <i>Iti Šu-umuna</i> | Month Šu-umuna, |
| 10. <i>mu cu mah d-Nanna</i> | year the oracle announced |
| 11. <i>maš-e ni-padu</i> | the supreme high-priest
of Nannar. |

To all appearance the two men, Lu-digga and Sur-šagga, were the depositaries of the two amounts of grain referred to, which came from the field of Galama-ḥa, and was received from the hands of Lu-dingira.

The seal-impression confirms the statement of the text, that the scribe who recorded the transaction was Sur-Enlilla. The three lines with which it is inscribed read as follows:—

<i>Sur-En-lil-la</i>	Sur-Enlilla.
<i>dup-šara</i>	the scribe,
<i>dumu Dug-šag-ab</i>	son of Dug-šagab.

The design on this cylinder is a common one. It represents the leading of the owner into the presence of his god, apparently Sin, whose crescent, with the sun's disc within, occupies the field above and in front of the deity. Sur-Enlilla stands before him, his wrist held by another divinity or divine attendant. In front of the last-named, and facing the seated deity, is a small lion-like figure erect, and holding with its forepaws a standard consisting

of five balls or discs—one at the top and two on each side, a little lower down.

But one of the most important things in this design is the deity's seat—apparently a living goat, upon whose back he rests. Attached to its nose, and going over the shoulder of the god (though it cannot be said whether it descended to his left hand and was held there), is the cord by which the animal was led. Sur-Enlilla, the owner of the cylinder, was apparently, at the time (the end of the reign of Dungi), a comparatively young man, for Heuzey,¹ Scheil,² and Delaporte³ have all published descriptions of another cylinder-seal belonging to him, used during the reign of Gimil-Sin, Dungi's grandson—fourteen or more years later. In this later design there are noteworthy differences: Sur-Enlilla enters without being led by a divinity, and simply faces the god with his hands folded or clasped, whilst the divine attendant stands in the rear with her hands raised in adoration. The seat of the god is, in this later design, not a living goat, but a seat with a goat's head for its back, and seated by the side of this throne is a lion. The bird with wings displayed occupies the upper field behind the seated deity, and underneath it we again see the lion which, standing erect, holds the standard in his forepaws. As this last is behind the god, he does not face to the right, but to the left. Other examples of differing cylinders used by the same scribe occur, and are of considerable interest. Whether the later ones are due to those first used having been lost, or become too worn, is uncertain. It is not improbable, however, that the scribes of Babylonia may have had fresh seals engraved from time to time, for various reasons—to

¹ *Découvertes en Chaldée*, p. 309.



² *Notes d'Épigraphie et d'Archéologie Assyriennes*.

³ *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Comptes Rendus de l'année 1909*, p. 613.

commemorate a new king's accession, or some other event.

HARDING SMITH, 93

A baked clay tablet, 49.2 mm. high by 44 mm. wide, inscribed with six lines of writing in three cases on the obverse, and eight lines in six cases on the reverse and edges.

Obverse*Reverse**Obverse*

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>Ašgun ninnú ma-na sig</i> | 1 talent 50 mana of wool, |
| 2. <i>gun udu šey</i> | the produce of the fatling sheep : |
| 3. <i>Ašgun ušu ma-na sig</i> | 1 talent 30 mana of wool, |
| 4. <i>gun udu uš</i> | the produce of the service-sheep : |
| 5. <i>Îšgun ninná-lal-gi</i> | 3 talents 49 mana |
| <i>ma-na</i> | |
| 6. <i>siggun udu ešu-kam uš</i> | of wool, the produce of the third service-sheep : |

Reverse

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 7. <i>Û-ussa gun nimin-eš</i> | 18 talents 43 mana |
| <i>ma-na</i> | |

8. *sig-ḫi-a* the (various) wools—
9. *niš-ia gun ninná-mina* 25 talents 52 mana
ma-na
10. *Sur- d. Ba-u niš-imina* Sur-Bau. 27, 51.
ninná-gi
11. *sigi-ba lal U imina-kam* His wool is deficient. Day 7th.
12. *Sag gu-ab-baki* Within Gu-abba.
13. *Mu en Nina* Year Nina's high-priest
14. *maš-e ni-pada* the oracle announced.

The "service-sheep" were possibly those pastured for and assigned to the servants of the palace. As *uš* may be simply short for *ušbur*, "weaver," it is not improbable that the servants (*uš*) were the weavers of the stuffs referred to. The figures in line 9 give the totals of the four entries, which may be regarded as enumerated in the order of quality. Apparently these amounts were delivered into the hands of Sur-Bau, but the amounts ought to have made a total of 27 (talents) and 51 or more (mana)—line 10, and was therefore deficient (line 11). Though the day is given (line 11), the month is not stated. The city of Gu-abba has still to be identified. The year corresponds with the second (and last) certain date of king Ibi-Sin, and, freely rendered, is as follows: "Year the oracle announced the high-priest of Nina (or Ištar)."


APPENDIX TO pp. 1042-3.

NAMES OF BIRDS, BRITISH MUSEUM, 36669 + 37958.

1.	D.S. ¹
2.	D.S.
3. . . . mun	D.S.
4. . . . a-dim-ma	D.S.
5. . . nin (?)	D.S. <i>e[š-še-pu]</i>

¹ Determinative suffix standing for the Sumerian *mušen*, "bird."

- | | | |
|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|
| 6. AN-NIN-NENNI (nin) | D.S. | <i>minu</i> |
| 7. AN-NIN-NENNI (mina) | D.S. | <i>ki (?)</i> |
| 8. AN-NIN-NENNI (mina) | D.S. | <i>is-sur</i> |
| 9. AN-NIN-NENNI (mina) | D.S. | <i>mina li-[mut-ti]</i> |
| 10. AN-NIN-NENNI (mina) | D.S. | <i>an-pa-tum</i> |
| 11. GIS-NUM-SIR | D.S. | <i>mina</i> |
| 12. SIR-BUR (buru) | D.S. | <i>e-ri-bu</i> |



- | | | |
|---------------------|------|---------------------|
| 13. SIR-BUR-GI | D.S. | <i>na'-i-hu</i> |
| 14. SIR-BUR-babbar | D.S. | <i>pi-zu-u</i> |
| 15. SIR-BUR-gig | D.S. | <i>sal-mu</i> |
| 16. SIR-BUR-še-umun | D.S. | <i>e-rib ze-ri</i> |
| 17. SIR-BUR-gaza | D.S. | <i>hu-ru-gu (?)</i> |
| 18. SIR-BUR-NITA | D.S. | <i>bi-bi-wak-ku</i> |
| 19. U-UG-GA (u-ga) | D.S. | <i>a-ri-bu</i> |
| 20. . . bi-ib-ri | D.S. | <i>bi-ib-ru-u</i> |
| 21. . . -KUR | D.S. | <i>u-si-gu (?)</i> |


22. . . . -KUR	D.S. <i>a-mur sig</i> . .
23. . . . -KUR	D.S. <i>nim-du-</i> . .
24.	D.S. <i>muš-ku-</i> . .
25. <i>zal-lul (?)</i>

In the third line the word *mun* means "salt", but this does not help to determine the nature of the bird, unless a sea-fowl be intended. The incomplete word *a-dimma* (? "water-protector" or "protectress") in the fourth line is rendered as *šarrat kīpri*, "queen of the region," and *lullartu* possibly means "she who gives voice", or the like, in *Cuneif. Inser.*, XIV, 4, 10, and 5, K. 4368, rev. 13. The restoration *eššepu* in line 5 is based upon the rendering given elsewhere (*Cuneiform Texts*, XIV, 6. obv. 12; 7, obv. 10; 14, S. 995, obv. 7) for the group expressing the Sumerian *nin*-bird in lines 6 ff. In the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, IV, i, col. 1, 21-2, the *eššepu* appears as a bird which "cries aloud in the city" (*eššepu ša ina āli išaggumu*). Though expressed by a long ideographic group, its name in Sumerian is given in every case simply as *nin* (*mina* = "ditto", lines 7-10). It is unfortunate that the renderings in lines 7 and 8 are defective, as these, especially the second, might have enabled some identification to be made. It was a bird of evil omen (line 9), but that explanation does not greatly help. Indicated by the same Sumerian name is the *anpatum* (l. 10), which has been compared with the Hebrew אֲנַפְתָּ, rendered "heron" in the A.V. The Syriac ܐܢܦܬܐ, however, is explained as the *Gallus agrestis*, which is probably the true meaning. To all appearance it was a bird with a crest or "ensign" (𒀭 𒀭 𒀭 𒀭¹), and its name begins with the determinative prefix for "wood" on account of ensigns or standards being made of that material.











¹ 𒀭 𒀭 𒀭 (without 𒀭 in *Cuneiform Texts*, XIV, 4, S. 996, obv. 8

After the *Gallus agrestis* the ordinary farmyard fowl follows naturally on, and this, in fact, seems to be the true meaning of the word *éribu*, as is shown on p. 1043. The birds mentioned are, to all appearance, the "fowl" *par excellence* (*éribu*, l. 12), called *burn* in Sumerian (see also p. 570); the "reed-fowl" (*na'ihu*, or perhaps *na'iri*, if the last character be 𒌦 instead of 𒌦), in Sumerian *bur-gi*; the white and the black fowls (ll. 14 and 15), in Sumerian *bur-babbar* and *bur gig*; the "seed-" or "cornfield-fowl" (*érib zēri*, l. 16), in Sumerian *bur-še-unun*; the fighting-cock and the "cock" *par excellence*, called *bibinakku*. Reference has already been made (p. 1042 f.) to this portion of the text, as well as to the confusion in the inscriptions between *éribu*, "fowl," and *áribu*, "raven"; and it may here be noted that this confusion probably exists in the larger legendary fragment of the history of the king whose name I read as Kudur-laḡgumal and regard as Chedorlaomer. If this be the case, we ought probably to read, not *áribi*, but *éribi muttabrišu irámu*, "he loveth the winged fowl," and in the next line *áribi širḡu tabbik martum*, "the loud-crying fowl, pouring forth gall" (i.e. "bitter" or "fierce defiance"). But besides these, he favoured also *kalbu kasis NERPADDA*, "the dog crunching the bone," and *širḡuššu awel ḡabbātum tabik* [*? imti*], "the great serpent of the robber which pours forth [*? poison*]." All this would stamp the ruler in question, whether Chedorlaomer or anyone else, as "a sporting man", whose taste lay in the direction of dogs, game-birds, and snake-charming—things which evidently appeared undignified in the eyes of the early Babylonians.

Except the "raven" (Sumerian *uga*, Semitic Babylonian *áribu*) in l. 19, the remaining bird-names are either unknown or exceedingly doubtful. *Bibri* in l. 20, Semiticized as *bibrā*, possibly had as its ideograph 𒌦 𒌦 , one of the meanings of which might possibly









be "joyful bird". but more information is needed. The *mušku* was also known as the *saqatum* and *gamgamma*. Its Sumerian name was , *gir-gid-du* D.S. = *šep árik*, "long foot" (*Cuneiform Texts*, XIV, 4, 19-21). *Zullul* in the last line is apparently to be completed as *zallullu*; see *zallulu* below.


In addition to the above may be mentioned the following bird-names from K. 4229:—

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1.  |  |
| 2.  |  |
| 3.  |  |
| 4.  |  |
| 5.  |  |


- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| 1. na-an-tum | D.S. <i>man-</i> |
| 2. U-KU-KU | D.S. <i>zal-la-lu qaq-[qa-ri]</i> |
| 3. U-KU-KU-BA-BAT | D.S. <i>it-be (?) i-nam-</i> ² |
| 4. a-ia-u | D.S. <i>a-a-[u ?]</i> ³ |
| 5. KI-SAG-RAK | D.S. <i>i-gi-ru-u</i> |


Also the following, from an incomplete copy which I made, and to which no number is attached:—

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1.  |  |
| 2.  |  |
| 3.  |  |
| 4.  |  |

¹ *Cuneiform Texts*, XIV, 13, 91012, has , and the pronunciation of the whole is given as *igiraši*. No. 36785 on pl. 12 has simply *igira*.

² Cf. *Cuneiform Texts*, XIV, 14, S. 996. obv. 5.

³ Possibly the Heb. , rendered "vulture", "kite", "falcon".

⁴ Probably a mistake for .

⁵ Probably a mistake for *ha-an-zi-zi-tum* = *pilaggi Istar*, "Istar's ax."

The rendering of these four is "bird of the orchard", "bird of the water", "bird of the mountain", and "bird of the marsh". The *arabā* is apparently not connected either with the *áribu*, "raven," or the *éribu*, "fowl." It is apparently this bird whose name occurs in W.A.I. ii. pl. 37 : C.T. XIV. pl. 4, l. 18. and was called *girgílum* in Sumerian, and had another name, *zahu*, in Assyrian.

B

C

D



SPECIMENS OF SANSKRIT MSS. DISCOVERED IN COURSE OF DR STEIN'S SECOND CENTRAL ASIAN EXPEDITION. SCALE ONE HALF

A. Obverse of palm leaf, Kha. 1. 109, from Khadabik. B. Obv. of leaf, Kha. 1. 183, Khadabik. C. Obv. of palm leaf, Ch. 109, b. 1. from Burma. D. Obv. of palm leaf, Kha. 1. 183, Khadabik.

XXX

DOCUMENTS SANSKRITS DE LA SECONDE COLLECTION
M. A. STEIN

By L. DE LA VALLEE POUSSIN

(Continued from the July Journal, p. 777.)

CH. VII, 001D

DASABALASUTRAM

Un folio (papier), *slanting* brāhmī, 367 × 80 mm. Même format, même écriture que les autres fragments Ch. vii, 001. Numéro d'ordre, au verso, peu lisible.

Une feuille de la même poṭhi, qui fait partie de la collection Paul Pelliot, contient la fin du texte; elle en indique le nom; elle a été publiée par M. S. Lévi, avec les références pâlies, dans l'article cité du J.A.

L'ordre et la description des *tathāgatabalas* diffèrent dans les nombreuses sources. Outre *Aṅguttara*, v, p. 33, voir *Mahāvīyutpatti*, § 7; *Dharmasaṃgraha*, lxxvi, et références; *Mahāvastu*, i, 159; *Mudhyamukāvātāra*, vi, 211; *Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*, Ch. 0079a, fol. 675; *Bodhisattvabhūmi*; *Abhidharmakośa*, Burn., fol. 438b.

[sthā]nañ cāsthānataḥ yat tathāgataḥ sthānaṃ ca sthānato yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti asthānañ cāsthānataḥ idaṃ prathamaṃ tathāgatabalaṃ yena balena samanvāgatas tathāgato rhaṃ samyaksambuddhaḥ udāraṃ āśabhaṃ sthānaṃ pratijānāti brāhmaṃ cakraṃ vartayati pariṣadi [sa]myakṣiṃhanādaṃ nadati •

punar aparaṃ tathāgato titānāgataḥ pratyutpamṇāni karmadharmasamādānāni sthāna[t]o hetuto vastuto vipākataś ca yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti yat tathāgato titānāgata-pratyutpamṇāni karmadharmasamādānāni sthānato hetuto vastuto vipākataś ca yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti idaṃ dvitīyaṃ tathāgatabalaṃ yena bale[na] pūrvavat

punar aparaṃ tathāgato dhyānavimokṣasamādhisamā-
pattināṃ saṃkleśavyavadānavyavasthānavisuddhiṃ yathā
[B][bhūtaṃ prajānāti]ti yat tathā[gato]yāvad idam)ṭṭriyaṃ
tathāgabala[ṃ yena bale]na pūrvavat

punar aparaṃ tathāgataḥ parasatvānāṃ indriyaparā-
varatāṃ yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti • yat tathāgataḥ parasatvā-
nāṃ yāvad idam caturthaṃ tathāgatabalaṃ yena balena
[pūrva]vat

punar aparaṃ tathāgataḥ parasatvānāṃ nānādhimukti-
tāṃ yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti yat tathāgataḥ pa[rasa]tvānāṃ
nānādhimu[kt]itāṃ yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti idam pañcamaṃ
tathāgatabalaṃ pūrvavat

punar aparaṃ ta[thāga]to nānādhātukaṃ lo[ka]ṃ
anekadhātukaṃ yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti • yat tathāgato
nānādhātukaṃ lokam anekadhātukaṃ yathābhū[taṃ
prajā]nāti idam ṣaṣthaṃ tathāgatabalaṃ pūrvavat

punar aparaṃ tathāgataḥ sarvatragāminīṃ pratipadaṃ
yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti

COLLECTION M. A. STEIN : KHA. i. 199B

FRAGMENT DU GUṆAPARYANTASTOTRA

MS. sur papier. Central Asian Upright Gupta
(cf. Macartney, set ii. No. 3). Deux fragments d'une
feuille numérotée au recto 12. Dimensions primitives,
320 × 60 mm.

Particularités : confusion du jihvāmūliya et de l'upa-
dhmāniya ; redoublement de ṣ (viśaya, gatiṣṣu), de
g (ggaṇa) : la sifflante palatale ś, transrite tantôt ś, tantôt
bś (?). Scribe négligent : *rdāte* pour *d ārte*.

Le Guṇāparyanta est connu par le Tandjour, Bstod,
fols. 229b-34a ; auteur Ratnadāsa (= Triratnadāsa ; voir
P. Cordier, *Cat. du fonds tibétain*, 2^{ème} partie, p. 10 ;
F. W. Thomas, *Album Kern*, p. 407). En outre, une
stance de ce stotra est citée, sans mention de source, dans le
commentaire du Bodhicaryāvatāra (p. 488, l. 13, Bibl. Indica).

Mètre Çikharinī.

Transcription

[yata-]

- [12A] h¹ praññā tatvaṃ bhajati karuṇā saṃvṛ[tim atas
 tavābhūn niḥsatvaṃ] jagad iti yathā-
 rthaṃ vimṛśataḥ yadā tv āviṣṭo bhū[r daśabala-
 jananyā karu]ṇayā tadā te bhū-
 rd ā te² suta iva pituḥ prema [jagati || ∪ — —
 — —] śah³ kṣatagatir avāpno-
 ti paramāṃ udirṇakleśā⁴ bda⁵ svahita [∪ ∪ —
 — ∪ ∪] te • iti prāptuṃ bodhiṃ sthi-
- [12B] ravihitavīryeṇa bhavatā na nirda [— — — ∪
 ∪ ∪] laghutvaṃ tu gamitāḥ 3 []⁶
 smṛtijñānagrastā vividhaguṇāni [— ∪ ∪ ∪ —
 ∪ — —] bśā bodher upakaraṇa-
 tām eva bhavataḥ tathā hy ebhi [— — ∪ ∪ ∪
 ∪ ∪ — —] rgaviṣṣayā gguṇānām
 t[u] kṣetraṃ gatiṣṣu vibhito janma vi [∪ — | ∪ —
 — — —] śair vyasanaśatasam-

Version tibétaine

gañ slad ṣes rab don dam bsten ciñ sñiñ rje kun rdzob
 bsten mdzad pa |⁷

[232b] | de slad don bzhin dgoñs mdzad khyod la sems
 can mehis pa ma lags kyañ |

| gañ thse khyod ni stobs beu bskyed pai thugs rje dag
 dañ klan gyur pa |

| de thse hgro ba ñams thag rñams la khyod byams bu la
 pha byams bzhin | 33

| hgro ba gtubs⁸ dañ ñon mois bas pas byañ chub mehog
 thob ma mehis la |

¹ Voir 12A, l. 3.² Lire *d'arte*.³ Voir l. 1.⁴ Cf. 12B, l. 2. et ci-dessus l. 2, *vimṛśataḥ*.⁵ Il semble bien qu'on doive lire *bda* ?⁶ Trente est lisible ; je restitue 34 d'après la version tibétaine.⁷ La version tibétaine du commentaire du Bodhicaryāvatāra porte :
 gañ gis ṣes rab don dam dañ ni kun rdzob thugs rje bsten par bzhed.⁸ Xyll. *gtugs*. Correction de F. W. Thomas.

- | ñon moñs phyogs pas rañ la sman par bgyid pa añ
thob hgyur ma lags pas |
- | de slad khyod kyis byañ chub brñes slad brtson hgrus
brtan pa mdzad pa na |
- | ñon moñs ñes par ma bsregs ran gyi dum bu bzhin du
yañ bar mdzad | 34
- | khyod kyì ñon mons dran dan mkhyen pas bzuñ pas
yon tan sna thsogs hgrub |
- | ñon moñs yañ bar gyur pa byañ chub rgyur yañ ñe
bar hgyur lags te |
- | hdi ltar de yis khyod blo çol gol yul can du yañ ma
bgyis la |
- | hgro ba rnams su skye ba brgyud pa añ yon tan
rnams kyì zhiñ du mdzad | 35
- | hgro ba ñon moñs gyur dañ sdug bsñal brgya dag byuñ
bas beom pa yis |
- | rtsol dañ bral zhiñ ngon ma mehis pas gañ dañ gañ
du spyod bgyid pa |
- | hgro ba de ni ñon moñs dgra thul khyod kyì thugs
rjes spyod pa na |
- | srid pa len dañ gtoñ dañ gnas pa dag la mña bdan
mehis pa lags | 36

yata[12A]h̄ prajñā tatvaṃ bhajati karuṇā saṃvṛ[ti]m atas
tavābhūn niḥsatvaṃ jagad iti yathārthaṃ vimṣataḥ
yadā tv āviṣṭo bhū[r] daśabalajananyā karuṇayā
tadā te bhūd arte suta iva pituh prema [jagati] 33
na bodhiṃ niḥkle]śaḥ ksatagatir avāpnoti paramām
udīrṇakleśa(ś ca) svahita[karaṇo nopalabha]te
iti prāptuṃ bodhiṃ sthi[12B]ravihitavīryeṇa bhavataḥ
na nirda[gdhāḥ kleśā lava i]va laghutvaṃ tu gamitāḥ 3[4]
smṛtijñānagrastā vividhaguṇa[ni — — — —
laghukle]śā bodher upakaranatām eva bhavataḥ
tathā hy ebhi[r] no buddhir adhikavisam̄sa]rgaviṣayā
guṇānām t[u] kṣetraṃ gatiṣu vihito janmavis[arah] 35
— — — — —] śair vyaśanaśatasam̄ [13A]

Nous connaissons la stance 33 par le Bodhicaryāvatāra ; les autres stances ne se peuvent restituer que par conjecture. Je crois du moins avoir rencontré le sens.

Le tibétain donne pour 34 : “ Celui qui en a fini (bas-pa = zad pa am mtha dag) avec la passion et a brisé l'existence, n'obtient pas la suprême illumination . . . ,” et pour 35 : “ Vos passions, enveloppées par l'attention et le savoir, produisent diverses qualités ; les passions, devenues légères, tournent même en cause d'illumination . . . ”

34b *ulīrakleśo pi ?*

35a *gūṇānispattiparatāṃ (gamitāḥ) ?*

35c *no = na.*

COLLECTION M. A. STEIN : F. XII, 7

SADDHARMAPUNDIRIKA

MS. sur papier. Brahmi, Central Asian Upright Gupta, 32 feuilles complètes 390 × 118 mm., numérotées au recto 5-37, un grand fragment de la feuille 38, un petit de la feuille 39. Fait probablement partie d'un second volume (*pothi*) du Saddharma. Le chap. xl se termine fol. 10 ; xii. fol. 14 : xiii, fol. 26 : xiv, fol. 37.

1. Recension qu'on peut appeler “ Central Asian ”, distincte de la vulgate du Népal, et connue par les fragments de divers MSS. acquis à Kashgar par M. N. F. Petrowski, utilisés par M. H. Kern dans son édition de la Bibl. Buddhica. Le Sūtra est nommé dans nos colophons *Saddharmapuṇḍarika mahāvaitulyasūtraratna* (ch. xiii) (Kashgar : *Saddharmapuṇḍarika mahāratna vaitulyasātra*) ; voir Kern, *Versl. en Med. der K. A. von W.*, 4^e série, viii, p. 312, Amsterdam, 1907 ; *JRAS.* 1907, p. 432. Nos lectures concordent souvent avec celles des fragments de Kashgar. En outre, et le fait est digne de remarque, la recension “ Central Asian ” omet la fin du ch. xii, comme font les traducteurs chinois Kumārajīva et Dharmarakṣa (voir Kern, p. 256 de son édition).

2. Même écriture, ou pen s'en faut, que la Vajracchedikā de Dandān-Uiliq, qui se distingue nettement, comme on sait, de Macartney, i, 7, et ii, 3 (Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, p. 295, et planche cviii) : même emploi du visarga comme ponctuation¹ (particularité assez répandue) : même double très long trait vertical pour isoler les stances, ce qui semble plus caractéristique (D iii, 13*a*, première ligne).

Notre MS. présente normalement la forme verticale de *e* suscrit (Macartney, set i, No. 7, que le Dr. Hoernle considère comme cursif), mais sans la courbe. Toutefois fol. 8*a*, 5 (*sarve*) et fol. 11*b*, 2 (*vyākṛāṇena*), on a une forme apparentée à celle de l'Upright Gupta indienne (par exemple, Weber, No. 1). La Vajracchedikā de Dandān-Uiliq a normalement cette seconde forme. Plusieurs formes de *a* initial : types de Macartney, i, 7, et ii, 3. Quelquefois la verticale est séparée de la partie de gauche : quelquefois la partie de gauche est rattachée, par le bas, à la verticale.

Deux formes de *ā*, au moins. La longue est marquée, ou par la demi-boucle, à mi-hauteur, à droite, comme dans les Macartney, ou par une seconde verticale qui porte, dans la partie supérieure, un trait supplémentaire.

ī (*īrṣyā*, xiii, st. 39, fol. 21*a*, 1) se distingue nettement des Macartney, et s'apparente au Bower 1.

Le *bh* est formé, comme dans les Macartney, par une courbe de droite à gauche, à laquelle sont souscrites, parfois sans contact, les deux "virgules" dans un mouvement de haut en bas.

Le *e* comporte la même courbe de droite à gauche, et une boucle, point toujours fermée, de gauche à droite et remontant. On remarquera que, dans le groupe *ñca* (*pañca*), le *ñ* est souscrit au *c*.

Le *k* hésite entre la forme du Macartney, i, 7, et celle des "Documents" de Hoernle (pas de contact entre la partie supérieure et l'inférieure).

¹ Bower ; *Vajracchedikā* du Japon apud Max Muller, planche 2, etc.

Tous ces caractères accusent peut-être la nature cursive de l'écriture, excepté la double verticale de *ā*, qui paraît bien post-Gupta (Dighwa-Dubauli, 761 A.D.) encore qu'elle soit amorcée dans le Weber, No. 2, et développée dans le Horiuzi (6^{ème} siècle d'après Hoernle): excepté le *ī*, qui, au contraire, est archaïque.

Les chiffres sont très archaïques: le 4 doit être comparé à Bühler, table xii, cols. 8 et 10: le 5 à col. 9 (avec un trait horizontal, terminé en boucle. au-dessus): le 10, col. 6, mais orienté de gauche à droite et de haut en bas; le 40 paraît isolé.

Nous donnons ci-après la transcription 1^{re} des stances du ch. xi. 2^e du début du ch. xii. et 3^e des stances finales du même chapitre. Notre MS. numérote les stances, mais sans additionner les différents groupes de stances; d'où, dans la partie finale du ch. xii. la divergence avec l'édition de H. Kern.

L'orthographe est hésitante, irrégulière.

Le visarga (que nous transcrivons: comme signe de ponctuation) est souvent omis. L'anuvāra est placé à tort et à travers (par exemple. xi. st. 7B; xii. st. 28), remplace parfois le visarga. double parfois le visarga: *āyatāṃh* pour *āyatāḥ*, etc.

On a *maṭhye* et *madhye*; *adhyabhāṣat* et *addhyabhāṣat* (7B *ad finem*, xi. st. 18; 13B, l. 3), *e* pour *ai*, *o* pour *au*, et réciproquement (*hetauḥ*, *ṛṣṇāṭṛka*), *tt* pour *t*, soit dans le corps du mot (*vicitra*, xiii. st. 30), soit au début d'un pāda (xi. st. 14, 17, 33 ?). *gautamī* et *gautamī* (11B), *sarra* et *sarra*.

Les lectures *bhikṣma* (xii. st. 2. cf. xiii. st. 10), cf. Kern, p. 271. l. 11; *mannjā* (xi. st. 9); *tātaka* (xi. st. 25), *yātaka* (xii, 11A, 1) (= *yātaka*); *ṭṛ* (= *tri*); *bhikṣunnām* (et *bhikṣūnām*); comme aussi *kalpe*, *kalpsmī*, *kalpsmī* (*āsanasmī*, Kern, p. 252, n. 11), *mūli dāraṇasmī*, sont dialectales ou "gāthiques". A noter la lecture *ḥbhīḥ* (*ḥsthebhīḥ vīnā-yakēbhīḥ*) constante pour le prācrit *hi*; l'impératif *kāmāhi*, sanscritisé dans la vulgate: *mahyam* au lieu de *mama*.

A titre d'exemples, quelques variantes non fournies par les fragments de Kasgar.

CHAPTER XI

st. 3B. vulgate *yul āst*.

st. 4A. *sarve mama*.

st. 5C. *saddharmasamprakṣaṇahetu sarve yathā* (sāddharma, dans notre texte).

st. 6B. *koṭyaḥ*.

- st. 6C. *tatha.*
 st. 7D. *sobhanti yathaiva pulmāh.*
 st. 8C. *sobhanti tiṣṭhanti.*
 st. 8D. *hutāśaneneva yathāndhakāram.*
 st. 9B. *lokavīnūyākānām.*
 st. 9D. *vāte pravāte iha.*
 st. 11D. *vyurasāyam karoti yaḥ.*
 st. 14B. *yair iya sobhitā bhāh.*
 st. 16D. *utsahanti.*
 st. 17B. *na tal bhavati duṣkaram.*
 st. 18B. *muṣṭinā.*

Les fautes de copiste sont assez nombreuses : par exemple---

CHAPTER XI

- st. 1. *jananeta* pour *na janeta.*
 st. 2. *dharmamayera* pour *dharmā yam eva.*
 st. 7. *utsakarā* pour *utsukatā.*
 st. 16. *cintanatha* pour *cintetha.*
 st. 27. *dāyasmi* pour *dāhasmi.*
 st. 36. *śaṃmukhan tu stathāgata* pour ²*kham eva tathāgata.*
 st. 37. ^o*nāthenaṣu* pour ²*nātheṣu.*

CHAPTER XII

- fol. 10B. l. 2. *riharita* pour *civahita.*
 fol. 11A. l. 5. *anokalpanā.*
 l. 6. *bhagarato dhimātreṣvāsā śaḍḍhi* pour *mātr^o śaḍḍhi (dhi²*
s'explique peut-être par adhimātra, l. 8).
 fol. 11B. l. 5. *bhānaka* pour *bhānaka.*
 st. 2. *śaṃsthāḥiṣyāma* pour *samsakṣiyāma.*
 st. 4. ^o*rariyāna* pour ^o*rariyāma.*
 st. 10. *kṣapikṣyāma* pour *kṣamiṣyāma.*
 st. 14. *dārika* pour *dhārika.*
 st. 16. *cērat* pour *tēra.*

CHAPTER XI, AD FINEM

atha khalu bhagavāṃ tasyāṃ velāyāṃ imā gāthā
 addhyabhāsat
 ayam āgata nirvṛtako maharsī ratnamayaṃ stūpa
 pravīśya nāyakaḥ
 śravaṇā[8A]rtha dharmasya imasya bhikṣavaḥ ko
 dharmaheto jananeta vīryam
 bahukalpakoṭīparinirvṛto pi sa nāma adyāpi śṛṇoti
 dharmam

- [2] tahi tahiṃ gacchati dharmahetauḥ sudurlabhaṃ
 dharma mayevarūpam
 prañidhānam etasya vināyakasya niṣevitaṃ pūrvva-
 bhave[3]ḥ āsi
 parinirvṛto pi [imu] sarvvalokaṃ paryañṭhate sarv-
 vadaśaddiśāsu 3
 ime ca mahyaṃ bahu ātmabhāvān sahasrako[4]tyo
 yatha gaṅgavālikāḥ
 te dharmakṛtyasya kṛtena āgatāṃḥ parinirvṛtaṃ
 draṣṭuṃ imaṃ vināyakam 4
 echoritvā kṣetrā[5]ṃ svakasvakāni tatha [śrā]vakā
 naramaruṇaḥ ca sarvve :
 ihāgatā sarvvi saddharmahetauḥ yathā ciraṃ [t]iṣṭhiya
 dha[6]rmanetri 5
 eteṣa bu[ddhāna] niṣīdanārtha bahulokadhātūna sahas-
 rakoṭayaḥ
 saṃkrāmitā me tatu sarvva[7]satvān rddhibalena pari-
 śodhitāś ca 6
 etādṛśī utsukavā ayaṃ mama kaṃṭhaṃ prakāśe ima
 dharmametri
 ime ca [8] buddhā sthita aprameyā drumamūli śobhanti
 yathaiva padmāḥ 7
 drumamūlakoṭiya anantakāni siṃhāsanaṣṭhebhīḥ vi-
 [8B]nāyakebhīḥ
 śobhanti dīpyanti ca nityakālam hutāçano vā yatha
 andhakāre 8
 gandho manuḥḥo daśasu diśāsu pravāyate lokahitāna
 sāntike
- [2] yena ime mūreḥḥita sarvvasatvā vātena vāyanta ca
 nityakālam 9
 mama nirvṛtasmi ko hy eta dharmaparyāya dhārayet
 ksipraṃ vyāharatu[3] vācā lokanā[thānasaṃmukham 10]
 pa[r]i[n]irvṛto yaṃ buddhaḥ prabhūtaratano muni.
 sihanādaṃ śruṇet tasya [vya]vasāyaṃ ya kurvati 11
- [4] ahaṃ dvitiyo bahavo [imās ca y]ā koṭ[i]ya āgata
 nāyakānām

vyavasāya śroṣyāma jinātinajānām ya utsahe dha[5]r-
mam imam prakāśitum 12

a[ham] ca tena bhavi pūjita sadā prabhūtaratnaś ca
jina svayambhuḥ

yo gacchati diśa vidiśā[6]ś ca nityam śruṇanāya
dharmam i[mam e]varūpam 13

ime ca ye āgata lokanāyakām vicitritā śobhati yer
iyam mahī

te[7]śā pi pūjā vipulā anal[p]akā kṛtā bhavet sūtra-
prakāśanena 14

aham ca dṛṣṭo iha āsanasmi bhagavānś ca yo ya
sthi[8]ta stūpamaddhye

ime ca anye bahulokanāyakāl ye āgatām kṣetrasahas-
rakoṭibhi 15

cintenatha yūyam kulaputīāho [9A] sarvasatvānukam-
payā :

suduṣkaram idam sthānam utsāhenti vināyakā 16

bahusūtrasahasrāṇi yatha ga(m)gāya bālikāl

ttāś caiva [2] yaḥ prakāśeta na tad duska(ra)kaṃ
bhavet 17

yaś ca sumeru hastena addhyālambitva pāpinām :

kṣepeta kṣetrakoṭiṣu na tad bhavati duṣkaram 18

[3] yatho []imam tṛsahasr[im pādāṅguṣṭh]ai[na] kṃpayait
kṣipeta ksetrakoṭiṣu na tad bhavati duṣkaram 19

yaś ca bhavāgra tiṣṭheta dharmam bhā[4]se naro iha

anyasūtrasahasrāṇi na tad bhavati duṣkaram 20

nirvṛtasya mama loke paścā kāle sudāruṇe

ya imam dhāraye[5]t sūtram bhāṣed vā tam suduṣ-
karam 21

ākāśadhātuḥ yat sarvvaṃ ekamuṣṭismi prakṣipet

prakṣipitvā vraje dūram na ta duṣkaraka [6] bhave 22

[yaś tu idṛśakaṃ sūtram nir]vṛtasmi mayi tadā

paścā kāle likhed vāpi idam duṣkarakaṃ bhave[t] 23

prthividhātu[7]ś ca yaḥ sarva nakhaprāntasmi prak-
ṣipet

prakṣipitvā ca gaccheta brahmalokaṃ ca āruhet 24

na ta duṣkarakam asya nāpy asya vīrya [8] tātakam
 ta duṣkaram karitvāna sarvvalo(ka)sy ihāgrato : 25
 ato duṣkarataram tasya nirvṛtasya mama tadā :
 paścākāle idaṃ sū[9B]tram vācaye yo muhūrttikam 26
 na ta duṣkarakam bhoti kalpe dāyasmī yo narah
 maddhye gacche adahyantas tṛṇabhāraṃ ca gr̥hṇi-
 yāt 27

a[2]to duṣkaramtaram tasya nirvṛtasya mamātyayāt
 dhārayitvā imaṃ sūtram ekasatvam pi śrāvayet 28
 dharmaskandhasahasrāṇi aśīti yaś ca [3] dhārayet
 sopadeśā[n yathā] pr[o]ktā[n deśa]yait prāṇ[i]koṭi-
 nām 29

na eta duṣkaram bhoti tasmi kālesmi bhikṣuṇām
 vineyāc chrāvakā [4] mahyam yaś cābhijñāsu sthāpa-
 [yet] 30

tasyaita duṣkarataram ya imaṃ sūtra dhārayet
 śraddhadhed adhimucyeta bhāṣeyā ca punaḥ (punaḥ
 31) [5]

koṭisahasrabaha[va]ḥ a[rha]tve yaś ca sthāpayet
 ṣaḍ abhijñā mahābhāgā yathā gaṃgāya vālikāḥ 32
 ato bahu[6]taram karma karoti [sa] mmaro[ttam]o
 nirvṛtasya yo mahya sūtram dhāretimaṃ varam 33
 lokadhātusahasreṣu bahu me dharmā bhā[7]ṣitāḥ
 adyāpi cāhaṃ bhāṣāmi buddhajñānasya kāraṇam 34
 idaṃ tu sarvasūtreṣu agraṃ sūtram pra-ucyate
 dhāreti yo [8] imaṃ sūtram dhāreti jinavigraham 35
 bhāṣatha vāca kulaputrā saṃmukhaṃ tu stathāgataḥ
 yo utsahati yuṣmā [10A] yuṣmā paścākāle smi dhāri-
 tum 36

mama priyam kṛtam bhavati lokanāthenaṣu sarvvasuḥ
 durdhāraṇam idaṃ sūtram yo dhāreta muhū[2]rtta-
 kam 37

saṃvarṇitaś ca so bhoti lokanāthebhiḥ sarvvaśaḥ
 śauro śaṅṭīrya so bhoti kṣiprabhijñāś ca bodhiya : 38
 dhurāvahaś ca [3] so bhoti lokanāthāna [au]rasaḥ
 dāntabhūmim anuprāptaḥ sūtram dhāreti yo imam 39

cakṣurbhūtaś ca so bhoti loke sanna[4]rumānuṣ[e]
 idaṃ sūtram prakāśitvā nirvṛtasya vināyake 40
 vandanīyaś ca so bhoti sarvasvatvāna paṇḍitaḥ
 paścīme kāli [5] yo bhāsi sūtram eta m(uh)ūrta-
 kam 41 |

saddharmapondarīke mahāvaitulyasūtraratnai stūpadar-
 śanaparivartto nāmai[6]kadaśamaḥ samāpta[ḥ 11]

CHAPTER XII

atha khalu bhaiṣajyarājā bodhisatvo mahāsatvaḥ mahā-
 pratibhānaś ca bodhisatvo ma[7]hāsatvaḥ te viṃśadbodhi-
 satvaśatasahasraparivārāḥ bhagavataḥ puratam imā vācā
 bhāṣinsuḥ alpotsu[8]ko bhagavān bhavatu asmi sthāne
 vayan etad dharmaparyāyaṃ tathāgatasya parinirvṛta-
 syaimasmi saha lokadhātāu : [10E] deśayisyāmaḥ sampra-
 kāśayisyāmaḥ ki cāpi bhagavān krūrāḥ kakkaḥ[ā]s
 tasmim samayai paścīmai kālai satvā bhaviṣyanti parittaku
 [2]śalamūlā adhimānikāṃḥ lābhasatkārasa[ṃ]niśṛtāḥ
 akūśalamūlapratipannaṃḥ durdamāḥ kaṭunkāḥ adhimuk-
 tiviharitāṃḥ [3] anadhimukti[ba]h[u][āl] api tu [khalu]
 punar bhagavān vayan ksāntibalanu upadarśayitvā tasmī
 sa[ma]ye : paścīme kāle [4] imaṃ sūtram u(d)de[kṣ]y[ā-
 maḥ dhāra]y[i]syāmaḥ vācayisyāmaḥ deśayisyāmaḥ sam-
 prakāśayisyāmaḥ likhisyāmaḥ [5] satkarisyāmo : [guru-
 karisyāma]ḥ mānaysisyāmaḥ pūjayisyāmaḥ kāyaṃ ca
 jīvitam ca vayan bhagavān parityaktvā [6] imam eva
 guṇa[— — —]sūtram prakāśa]yisyāmaḥ alpotsuko bha-
 gavān bhavatu :

atha khalu tataḥ parisāyaḥ pañca [7] bhikṣuśatāni
 śaikṣāśaikṣāṇāṃ bhikṣuṇāṃ te ekasvareṇa bhagavantam
 etad avocur vayan api bhagavān utsahāma imaṃ [8]
 dharmaparyāya[ṃ] tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasyaimasmi sahe
 lokadhato samprakāśayitum apy anyāsu lokadhātuṣu [11A]

atha khalu yāttakāṃs te bhagavataḥ śrāvakāṃḥ śekṣā-
 śekṣā ye te bhagavatā vyākṛtān uttarāyāṃ samyaksam-
 bodhau : te sarve ye[2]na bhagavā[ṃ]s tenopasaṃkramaṣuḥ

upasaṅkramitvāṃ bhagavataḥ pādaṃ śirasā vanditvā
 bhagavato ca pradakṣiṇīkrtvāñjali[m] praṇāma[3]yitvā-
 ṣṭamātrāṇi [bh]j[ksusaha]srāṇi bhagavantaṃ etad avocur
 alpotsuko bhagavāṃ bhavatu : vāyaṃ apīmaṃ dharmā-
 paryā[4]yaṃ tathāgatasya pariṇirvṛtasyaimasmi sahe
 lokadhātāu : samprakāśayisyāmaḥ apy anyesu lokadhātuṣu
 tat kasya [5] hetaur imasmi [bhaga]vāṃ sah[e] lokadhātāu
 adhimānikāḥ satvāṃ anokalpanābahulāḥ alpakuśalamūlāḥ
 [6] nityavyāpannacittāḥ []śaṭā vankajātikāḥ

atha khalu mahāprajāpati bhikṣuṇī bhagavato dhimā-
 [7]tṛṃsvāsā : śaḍdhi bhikṣuṇīsahasraibhiḥ śaikṣāśaikṣābhir
 bhikṣuṇībhiḥ sārddham utthāyāsanaḍ yena bhagavāṃs
 tenāñjali[m] pra[8]ṇāmayitvā bhagavato bhimukhā
 bhagavato dhimātraṃ mukhaṃ avalokayanti sthitāṃ
 abhūt atha khalu bhagavāṃs ta[11B]-yā velāyā mahā-
 prajāpati gottamīm āmantrayati sma mā heva tvaṃ
 gotamī daurmanasvinī sthitās tathāgataṃ avalokayasi
 nāhaṃ tathā[2]gatena nāmadheyaparikīrttanavyākaraṇena
 vyākṛtāṃ : anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhaḥ : iyaṃ ca
 sarvva-pariṣad vyākṛtā : api tu kha[3]lu punar gauttamī
 sar[vva]pariṣad vyākaraṇena me gauttamī iyaṃ pariṣad
 vyākṛtānuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhaḥ : api tu gauttamī
 ita[4]s tvaṃ cyutāṃ samānā a[nrupū]rveṇa saporivārā
 istribhāvaṃ vivarttayitvā aṣṭātriśānāṃ buddhakoṭinayuta-
 śatasa[5]hasrā sāntike bodhisatvo [dharma]bhānako bha-
 visyasi imāny api te śaḍ bhikṣuṇīsahasrāṇi śaikṣāśaikṣānāṃ
 bhikṣuṇyāṃ tvaye[6]va sārddhaṃ tesā buddhānāṃ bhaga-
 [vatāṃ] sāntike dharmabhānakāṃ bhavisyanti bodhisatvāḥ
 tataś ca pareṇa bodhisatvā caryā paripūrayi[7]tvā paścīme
 saṃucehraye sarvasatvapriyadarśano nāmas tvaṃ tathāgato
 rhā samyaksambuddho loka bhavisyasi : vidyācaraṇa[8]
 saṃpannaḥ sugato lokavid anuttarapurusaḍamyasārathih
 śāstā devamanuṣyānāṃ buddho bhagavāṃ.

atha khalu te bodhisatvā mahāsatvāṃḥ samasaṃgītyā
 ekasvareṇa bhagavantaṃ gā[13B, 3]thābhir adhyabhāṣi[isu]

[a]l[p]ot[suko bhagavaṃ] bhavāhi atra: vayanṃ ti sūtraṃ
 parinirvṛtasya
 subheravi kālī kṣayāt ti paścime [4] sūtram idaṃ vista-
 [rata prakāśa]yet
 ākrośā tājanā bhikṣmā daṇḍā mudgaranāṃni ca
 bālānāṃ saṃstahisyā[5]ma adhvāsīsyāma nā[ya]ka 2
 durbuddhīnāṃ ca vaukānā śathā bālādhimānīnāṃ
 aprāpte prāptasaṃjñīnāṃ bhik-su[6]nāṃ kālī paścime 3
 araṇya[v]r[ttaka]tye kaṃsthā prāvariṃyāna ca
 saṃlekhaçāritā asmai evaṃ vaksyanti durmati 4
 raseṣu [7] gr̥dhāḥ ātpāne gr̥hīṇā[m] dharma deśayi
 satkṛtās ca bhaviṣyanti: śadabhijñā yathaiḥ te 5
 raudracittās ca duṣṭās ca gr̥[8]haçittā vicintakāḥ
 araṇyaguptiṃ praviṣitvā asmākaṃ parikuṭṭakāḥ 6
 asmākaṃ eva vaksyanti lābhasatkāraṇiḥ[14A]śṛtāṃḥ
 tīrthikā vādime bhikṣū svāni kāvyāni deśayi 7
 svayaṃ sūtrāṇi granthītvā lābhasatkārahetavo:
 pariśāya ma[2]ddhye bhāṣanti asmākaṃ parikuṭṭakāṃḥ 8
 rājānāṃ rājaputrāṇāṃ rājāmātyāna ca tathā
 brāhmaṇagr̥hapatīnāṃ ca [3] anyeṣāṃ caiva bhikṣuṇāṃ 9
 asmākaṃ avarṇa bhāṣanti tīrthikāṃ vāca cārayī
 sarva vayanṃ k-apikṣyāma goravaiṇa maha[4]rṣiṇaḥ 10
 ye cāsmā[m] [kut]sayisyanti tasmī kalesmī durmatī
 ime buddhā ti vaksyanti adhvāsīsyāma sarva[5]śa 11
 kalpasamkṣobhi bhī[ksmasmi] dāruṇasmi mahābhaye
 yakṣarūpā bahū bhikṣu asmākaṃ paribhāṣakāṃ 12
 [5]goravaiṇa tu lokaiṇ[dr]e utsahāma suduskarām
 kṣāntīya kaccha bandhitvā sūtram etat prakāśayit 13
 anarthikā (kā)yena [6] jīvitena ca nāyakaḥ
 arthikā vayanṃ bodhāya: tava nikṣepadāvakaṃḥ 14
 bhagavān eva jānāti yādṛśāḥ pā[8]pabhikṣavaḥ
 paścime kālī bheṣyanti: saudhābhāsyam ajānakāṃḥ 15
 bhṛkuṭi vīvrat soḍhavyam aprajñapti punaḥ puna [14B]
 niṣkalanā vihāvebhyo upakrośā bah[ū]vidhā 16
 ājñapti lokanāthasya smaranta kālī paścime
 [bh]āṣīsyāma imaṃ sūtraṃ pa[2]rīṣāmmaddhye viśāradāḥ 17

nagareṣv atha grāmeṣu ye bhaviṣyanti [a]rthikāḥ
 gatvāṃ gatvāṃ sya dāsyāma niksepaṃ tubhya nāya-
 [3]ka 18

[pr]eṣaṇā tava lokendra [sa]tataṃ ka[rṣ]yīma te mune
 alpotsuko bhavāhi tvam śāntiprāptaḥ sunirvṛtaḥ 19

sarve ca loka[4]prādyota āgatāṃ [y]e daśa [d]iśā :
 satyavācam prabhāṣāma adhimuktita jānatha 20 !]

saddharmapoṇḍarike mahāvetu[5]lyasūtraratne utsāha-
 [pari]vartto nāma dvādaśamaḥ samāptaḥ 12

COLLECTION M. A. STEIN, CH. 0079B

FRAGMENT D'UN MAHAYANASUTRA

MS. sur feuille de palmier ; une feuille de 424 × 45 mm.,
 numérotée au recto 292 (?) ; sept lignes, 85 akṣaras
 environ.

Préhistoire de Maitreya racontée par le Bouddha à
 Ānanda. Le jeune brahmane Bhadrāsuddha se prosterne
 devant le Bouddha Jyoti[r]vikrīditābhijña : " S'il touche
 des pieds ma tête je deviendrai un Bouddha semblable
 à lui." Comparer le Dūrenidāna, etc.

Un spécimen intéressant, et nouveau par plusieurs parti-
 cularités, d'écriture gupta. Les caractères, très bien formés,
 sont très cursifs ; dans l'ensemble, ils rappellent ceux du
 Bower iii, mais s'en distinguent nettement comme aussi
 de ceux de Ch. 0079A. Le document mériterait une étude
 approfondie.

1. *a*, deux formes (*atha*, a, 5) paraît nouveau.
2. *e* (*eramāha*, a, 7), cf. Ch. 0079A
3. *kha*, avec le trait horizontal de Bower iii (*khalu*, a, 3).
4. *ja*, forme nouvelle (*pratīti tjasā*, a, 7).
5. *ḍa* (*vikrīḍita*, a, 3, b, 4).
6. *tha*, avec le trait central incomplet (*atha*, a, 5 ; *tathāgata*, a, 7).
7. *da*, comparer Bower.
8. *ya*, " three-pronged," comparer Bower.
9. *ra*, avec la courbe au bas (*dāvaka*, a, 4) comparer Bower iii, Buhler,
 table in, 1-2, 32, et vii. I. 33.
10. *ḷa*, " long-limbed " (*khalu*, *khalrā*, a, 3, *loka*, a, 4, *pratīlābho*, b, 4).

11. *ga* et *śa*, avec une large boucle à gauche (*tathāgata*, a. 7. *śaka*, a. 3. *śāstā*, *śuddho*, a. 4. *āścarya*, a. 2): comparer pour le *śa*. Bower. iv, p. 42. Hoernle, *Ind. Ant.* 1892. p. 349.
12. *kra* (*rikṛdīta*, a. 3. b. 3).

A

1. *pāragas tvam atah asamasama lokabandho niruttarah vināyakaḥ pravara buddhe*¹ *karu t[e] nyas[i]dat atha kha[l]v [ā]-*

2. *yusmān ānando bhagavaṃtam etad avocāt āścaryam bhagavan yāvād ayaṃ maitreyo bodhisatvah pratibhāna-saṃpannaḥ śakaḥ śakaḥ śivacca*² *gabhirapadadharmadeśakaḥ yāvād anusandhipada-*

3. *dharmadeśakaḥ bhagavān āha na khalu punar ānanda maitreyo bodhisatvo mām etarhi saṃmukhaṃ gāthābhīr abhiṣṭavati. bhūtapūrvam ānandāṭite dhvani daśāsaṃkhyeṅāḥ kalpāḥ paripūrṇāḥ yadāsīt tena kālena tena samayena jyotivikṛdītabhijño nā-*

4. *na tathāgato rhāṃ saṃmyaksaṃbuddho loka udapādi vidyācaraṇasaṃpannaḥ sugato lokavid anuttarah puruṣa-damyasārathīḥ śāstā ddevamanuṣyāṅṇaṃ buddho bhagavān. atha khalu ānanda tena kālena tena samayena bhadra-sūddho nāma brāhmaṇadārako bhūd abhirūpaḥ*

5. *prāsādiko darśanīyaḥ paramaśubhavarṇapuṣkalatayā samanvāgataḥ atha so utarāpaṇamadhyagato drākṣīt taṃ jyotivikṛdītabhijñaṃ tathāgatam arhaṇtaṃ saṃnyak-saṃbuddhaṃ śāntendriyaṃ śāntamānasam uttamadamaśāmathaparamapāramiprāptaṃ*

6. *paramadamaśāmathaparamapāramiprāptaṃ nāgaṃ jitendriyaṃ hradam ivācchaṃ viprasannam anāvilaṃ suvarṇayūpam ivābhyudgataṃ śrīyaṃ (?) rājamānaṃ tapamānaṃ virocamaṇaṃ dvāṭṛṃśadbhīr mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇais samanvāgatam atha taṃ drṣṭvā tasyaitad a-*

7. *bhūd āścaryaṃ yāvād divyo yaṃ tathāgatakāyo*

¹ Il n'est pas difficile de reconstruire un morceau d'*ūryā*—

pāragas tvam atah

asamasamalokabandho niruttaravmāyakaḥ pravara buddhe.

jvalati varṇena jvalati tejasā jvalati śryayā jvalati lakṣaṇair atha khalu bhadrāsuddho brāhmaṇadāraka evam āha aho ham apy evam eva ca jvaleyam varṇena tejasā śriyayā lakṣaṇai[ś ca]

B

1. atha khalu bhadrāsuddhasya brāhmaṇadārakasyaitad abhūd ya nv aham ātmānaṃ bhagavataḥ prajñāpayeyaṃ atha khalu tasminn eva samaye bhagava[t]kumje¹ pṛthivyāṃ nīpatitaḥ tasyaitad abhūt sa ced aham anāgate dhvanīdṛśaḥ syāṃ yādrg jotivikṛīḍitābhijñas ta-

2. thāgato rhaṃ saṃnyaksambuddhaḥ saṃspr̥ṣatu mām eṣa tathāgataś caraṇābhyāṃ atha khalv ānanda jyotivikṛīḍitābhijñas tathāgato bhadrāsuddhasya brāhmaṇadārakasya cetasaiva cetaḥparivitar kam ājñāya yenāsau bhadrāsuddho brāhmaṇadārakas tenopasamkrāmad upa-

3. saṃkramya bhadrāsuddhasya brāhmaṇadārakasya kāyaṃ caraṇābhyāṃ spr̥ṣati sma samanantaraspṛṣtaś ca khalu punar ānanda jyotivikṛīḍitābhijñena tathāgatena bhadrāsuddhasya brāhmaṇadārakasya kāyaṃ caraṇābhyāṃ atha tasminn eva samaye

4. nutpattikadharmakṣāntipratilābho bhūd atha khalv ānanda jyotivikṛīḍitābhijñas tathāgataḥ pṛṣṭhato valokya bhikṣusaṅgham āmantrayati sma asya punar bhikṣavo bhadrāsuddhasya brāhmaṇadārakasya na kena cit kāyaś caraṇābhyāṃ spr̥ṣta-

5. vyaḥ tat kasṃd dhetoḥ eṣo hy anāgate dhvani tathāgato bhaviṣyati atha khalv ānanda tasminn eva samaye divyaṃ cakṣuṃ pūrvakarmavipākajaṃ pratilabhamti sma pūrvakarmavipākajaṃ divyaṃ śrotraṃ paracittajñānaṃ pūrvanivāsānusuṃti rddhi-

6. vikurvitaṃ ca pratilabhati sma atha khalu punar ānanda bhadrāsuddhasya brāhmaṇadārakasya tataḥ pa

.....

¹ Lecture plus que douteuse.

(To be continued.)

THE LINGUAL LA IN THE NORTHERN BRAHMI SCRIPT

BY H. LÜDERS, PH.D.

IT is generally supposed that the lingual *la* is a very rare letter in the inscriptions north of the Narmadā before the time of the Guptas. From the Sānchi inscriptions Buhler¹ quotes one instance only: *Vāḷī-vaḥanikāyā* in B.² 344 (EI., ii, 378, No. 199): the *lī* is reproduced in Bühler's *Indische Palaeographie*, table ii, 41, xviii:³ the form of the letter is practically the same as that appearing in the Allahabad Praśasti. The second instance is furnished by the word *Āḷikāyān* in the inscription B, 43 (JBBRAS., xx, 269 f.), the find-place of which is unknown, but which must come from Northern India: there is no reproduction of this inscription. A third *la* is found in *kālavāḷasa* in the archaic Mathurā inscription B, 94 (EI., i, 396, No. 33). According to the reproduction of this inscription in the *Ep. Ind.*,⁴ there seems to be a great difference between the Sānchi and the Mathurā signs. But this is actually not the case. Two beautiful impressions before me clearly show that the sign in the plate has been "corrected". In reality the long line slanting upwards, which in the reproduction forms the tail of the *la*, is not connected with it, but is the *i*-stroke of the *ti* of the mutilated word *pruti[sthāpito]* in the next line. The whole difference of the two signs thus consists in the greater cursiveness of the Sānchi sign.

¹ EI., ii, 368.

² B refers to my "List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the earliest times to about A.D. 400" in the *Ep. Ind.*, vol. x, appendix, where further references may be looked up.

³ See p. 33, n. 1.

⁴ The sign given in Buhler's *Palaeographie*, table ii, 41, xx, has been taken from the reproduction in the *Ep. Ind.*

This certainly is a short list, but I think I can show that the apparent scarcity of the letter is due only to misreadings of the texts, and that on the contrary the *la* occurs in the Brāhmī inscriptions of Northern India just as frequently as in those of the western and southern parts of the country.

In the Jaina inscriptions from Mathurā we often find the name of a *gaṇa* which we are accustomed to read *Koṭṭiya*, since Bühler first established that reading. Doubts, however, will arise when we take, e.g., the word supposed to be *Koṭṭiyāto* in B, 28 (EL, i, 395, No. 28). and compare the form of the second letter with the ordinary form of the *ta* and the *ttu* in the Mathurā inscriptions. Just as in the Aśoka alphabets, the *ta* generally consists of a semicircle open to the right; see the "archaic" inscriptions B, 94 (EL, i, 396, No. 33: *āyāgapato*); B, 95 (EL, i, 397, No. 35; *āyāgapatā*); B, 100 (EL, ii, 200, No. 5; *āyāgapato*); B, 103 (EL, ii, 200, No. 8; *āyāgapato*); B, 105 (EL, ii, 207, No. 30; *āyāgapato*); B, 107 (EL, ii, 207, No. 32; *āyāgapato*), and the Kuṣana inscriptions B, 16 (EL, ii, 201, No. 11; *Grūhacetenu*); B, 32 (EL, i, 384, No. 5; *kumṭābinīya*¹); B, 37 (EL, ii, 203, No. 16; *kuṭumbinīye*); B, 56 (EL, i, 386, No. 8; *kuṭumbinīye*). Sometimes, however, a vertical bar is added at the top of the character: this bar is quite distinct in B, 34 (EL, i, 385, No. 6; *kuṭubinīye*²); B, 121 (EL, i, 389, No. 14; *kuṭubinīye*²). If an *i*-stroke is added to the character, it is often hardly possible to say whether the first or the second form is used; see B, 38 (EL, viii, 181; [°]*kuṭīye*); B, 39 (EL, i, 385, No. 7; *Kumārabhātī*); B, 42 (EL, i, 387, No. 9; [°]*Cetiye*); B, 45 (EL, i, 396, No. 30; *kuṭibini*³): and there are some more cases where the character is not quite distinct, although probably

¹ Not *kumṭābinīya*, as Bühler read.

² More probable than *kuṭumbinīye*, as Bühler read.

³ The lower part of the *ti* is mutilated.

the first form is used; see B, 36 (EL, ii, 202, No. 15; *kuṭumbiṇiye*); B, 38 (EL, viii, 181; *trepitakasya*); B, 70 (EL, i, 388, No. 12; *kaṭubiniye*¹); B, 73 (EL, ii, 205, No. 22: [*ku*]*tubanie*). As regards the origin of the bar, which does not seem to have been noticed by Bühler, it appears that it was first employed only in ligatures with *ṇa*, *ṣa*, and *ṭa*, in order to avoid the fusion of the upper line of the subscript *ṭa* with the base-line of the superscript letters, and that later on it was considered an essential part of the character, and was therefore added to the letter also when it stands alone or as superscript letter of a ligature. Accordingly, in the ligature *ṭṭa* the bar of the subscript letter is always quite distinct, whereas the superscript *ṭa* is sometimes plain, as in B, 85 (EL, i, 390, No. 18; *śilapatto*), and sometimes furnished with the bar, as in B, 24 (EL, i, 382, No. 2; *Bhaṭṭisenasya*).²

Now if we look again at the second sign of the word read *Koṭṭiyāto* by Bühler, it appears at once that it cannot possibly be *ṭṭa*. That sign has a distinct *serif* never found in a genuine *ṭa*. Moreover, there is no vertical bar in the middle of the sign, and its upper portion at least has not a semicircular shape. On the other hand, the sign is practically identical with the Sānchi form of the *ḷa*. The

¹ Not *kuṭubiniye*, as Bühler read.

² The *ṭṭa* of *Jayabhṭṭasya* in B, 32 (EL, i, 384, No. 5) is quite indistinct and uncertain. There is only one inscription at Mathurā where the *ṭa* is supposed to have quite a different form. In B, 118 (EL, ii, 208, No. 33), which in several respects is an abnormal inscription, Bühler read in the first line *Vardhamānapaṭimā*, in the second line *kuṭṭiṇi*. Here the two letters supposed to be *ṭi* and *ṭi* do not show the semicircular form occurring in all other inscriptions, and both of them have a *serif* at the top. There can be little doubt that the second word really is *kuṭṭiṇi* or *kuṭṭirini*, the third letter being quite peculiar. It is true there occurs a less cursive form of *ḷa* in this inscription in *baḷima*², but anybody familiar with the Mathurā records knows how often different forms of the same letter are found side by side in these inscriptions. The first word may be *ṇpadima* or *ṇpaḷima*, though on comparing the letter with the *ḍi* in *Dināye* the former alternative would seem to be the more plausible one.

only difference lies in the appendix at the bottom, which in the Sānchi form seems to be a straight line, while here it is slightly curved. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the true reading is *Koḷiyāto*. And in turning to the other inscriptions that contain the name of this *gana*, we find that the reading everywhere is *Koḷiya* or *Koḷeya*,¹ not *Koṭṭiya* as assumed by Bühler.

Almost the same form as in B, 28 appears in B, 32 (EL, i, 384, No. 5; *Koḷiyato*); B, 17 (EL, ii, 201, No. 12; *Koḷ[ī]yā . .*); B, 29 (EL, i, 383, No. 4; *Koḷiyato*); B, 84 (EL, i, 389, No. 15; *Koḷiyāto*); B, 54 (EL, i, 391, No. 21; *Koḷiyāto*); B, 75 (EL, i, 392, No. 22; x, 117, No. 11; *Koḷiyāto*); EL, x, 110, No. 3 (*Koḷeyāto*); EL, x, 111, No. 4 (*Koḷiyāto*). Often the sign is stretched in a vertical direction; see B, 18 (EL, i, 381, No. 1; *Koḷiyāto*); B, 27 (EL, i, 382, No. 3; *Koḷi[yāto]*); B, 39 (EL, i, 385, No. 7; *Koḷiyato*); B, 77 (EL, ii, 205, No. 24; *K[o]ḷiyāto*); B, 121 (EL, i, 389, No. 14; *Koḷiyāto*); EL, x, 112, No. 5 (*Koḷiye*). The same form is found also in B, 122 (EL, ii, 209, No. 37; *Koḷiyato*), but the *i*-stroke is attached here to the middle of the letter, because there was no room for it at the top. In other cases the sign is stretched in a horizontal direction; see B, 47 (EL, ii, 204, No. 20; *Koḷiyāto*); B, 56 (EL, i, 386, No. 8; *Koḷiye*). In B, 53 (EL, ii, 203, No. 18; *K[o]ḷiyāto*) the *la* shows a very large hook at the bottom. Of B, 19 (*Arch. Surv. Rep.*, iii, 30, No. 2) and B, 22 (*ibid.*, iii, 31, No. 4) no reproductions have been published except the drawings by General Cunningham, which are quite misleading. I have two impressions of B, 19, which show that the name of the *gana* is much damaged, but there is just enough visible to make it certain that here also it was *Koḷ[īyāto]*, the *la* being probably of the vertically stretched type. Of B, 22, which seems to be lost now, I have

¹ It is often very difficult to distinguish between the signs for medial *i* and *e* in these inscriptions, but in some cases the *e* seems to be certain.

a rubbing which distinctly reads *Koḷeyāto*, the sign for *ḷa* resembling that of B, 56. The form *Koḷiya* or *Koḷeya* thus being established in all cases where it is possible to check the reading, it has, of course, to be restored also in those inscriptions of which no reproductions are available, as in the short fragment B, 124 (*Vienna Or. Journ.*, iii, 233, note 3; *Koḷiya*), or where the letter in question is entirely lost or quite indistinct, as in B, 20 (*Arch. Surv. Rep.*, iii, 31, No. 3: *Ko[ḷiyato]*); B, 25 (E.I., ii, 202, No. 13: [*Koḷi*]yāto); B, 36 (E.I., ii, 202, No. 15: [*Koḷi*]yāto¹); B, 73 (E.I., ii, 205, No. 22: *Ko[ḷiyāto]*). The form *Koḷiya* is in perfect harmony with the traditional *Koḷiya* found in the *Sthavirāvalī* of the *Kalpasūtra*, *ḍa* and *ḷa* being interchangeable letters. The later commentators give *Kauṭika* as the Sanskrit equivalent of the name, and this form has to be substituted everywhere for *Kauṭika* in my List of Brāhmī Inscriptions.

There is another name in the Mathurā inscriptions containing a *ḷa* that has not been recognized hitherto. In B, 116 (E.I., i, 397, No. 34) Bühler read *Aya-Hātṭi[ye] kule*; in B, 16 (E.I., ii, 201, No. 11) *Arya-Hātṭakīyāto kulato*; and in B, 48 (E.I., i, 387, No. 11) *Āryya-Haṭṭikīyāto kulato*. A look at the photolithographs will be sufficient to show that here again *ṭṭi* has been misread for *ḷi*, and *ṭṭa* and *ṭṭi* for *ḷa*, the true readings being *Aya-Hāḷiye*, *Arya-Hāḷakīyāto*, and *Āryya-Hāḷakīyāto*.² Taking into account the phonetic laws of the later Prakrit, in this case also the form of the name of the *kula* perfectly agrees with *Hāḷijja*, the form used in the *Sthavirāvalī*, though it is hardly in favour of the assertion of the later commentators that *Hāḷijja* goes back to Skt. *Hāridraka*.

¹ According to the photolithograph only the upper portion of *Koḷi* is preserved.

² The true value of the sign in B, 16 seems to have been recognized later by Bühler himself: in his *Indische Palaeographie*, table iii, 39, iii, he gave a *ḷa* that is apparently the sign occurring in B, 16.

Two more instances of the occurrence of a *la* are found in the Mathurā inscriptions B, 29 (E.L. i, 383, No. 4) and B, 53 (E.L. ii, 203, No. 18). In B, 29 Bühler read [*Kho*]t[*imi*][*tt*]*asya mānikarasya [gī]* . . . I read, from an impression, *Khālamittasya māṇikarasya dhītu*, "of the daughter of the jeweller Khālamitta (*Khādamitra*)."¹ The *la* is here just as distinct as in the word *Koḷiyāto* in line 1. In B, 53 Bühler read *Śūrasya Śramaṇakaputrasya Goṭṭikasya lohikākārakasya*, "of the worker in metal, Goṭṭika, the Śūra, the son of Śramaṇaka." In my "Epigraphical Notes" (*Ind. Ant.*, xxxiii, p. 104 f.) I have tried to show by a comparison with another inscription that Śūra is the real name and *goṭṭika* a qualifying epithet. I have then connected *goṭṭika* with Skt. *goṣṭhika*, "member of a Panch." But in that I was wrong. The impression before me¹ leaves no doubt that the second letter of the word is the same as the second letter of *Koḷiyāto* in line 1. The reading *goḷikasya*, therefore, is certain, though I am at present unable to offer an explanation of the term.

In my opinion the *la* is clearly extant also in the word *Kaḷulasya* in the inscription of unknown origin edited by Mr. Banerji in E.L., x, 110, No. 3. The distinct hook at the base-line of the second letter of that word makes it impossible to read *ḷa* as done by the editor.

The frequent occurrence of the *la* in the Mathurā inscriptions proves that the common opinion that this sign was borrowed from the southern alphabets can no longer be upheld. There is absolutely no reason why it should not have formed part of the Brāhmī alphabet from the very beginning. And this is fully confirmed by the Aśoka inscriptions. Bühler (*Ind. Pal.*, p. 37) has noticed that there is a modification of the *ḷa* in the representative of Skt. *duḷī* or *dulī* in the fifth edict of the Delhi-Sivalik, Mathia, and Radhia inscriptions, and in the representative of Skt. *dvādaśa*, which elsewhere becomes

¹ The reproduction in the *Ep. Ind.* is inaccurate.

duvāḍasa, in the sixth edict of the Mathia and Radhia inscriptions. The sign is formed by the addition of a dot at the lower end of the vertical of the *ḍa*. Bühler thought it possible that it was meant for *ḷa*. What kept him from speaking with more confidence on this point was probably the belief that the *ḷa* was properly restricted to Southern India. Now, when this opinion has proved to be erroneous, we may safely assert, I think, that the sign really is *ḷa*. And there is nothing to prevent us from considering the sign of the Aśoka inscriptions the original form from which the cursive forms of the Mathurā inscriptions have been developed by changing the impracticable dot into a hook.

Bühler's statements, however, have to be modified also in other respects. The *ḷa* is far more frequent in the Aśoka inscriptions than was assumed by him. In the Radhia inscription we have clearly the *ḷa* in *duḷi* (v, 3) and *duvāḷasa*^o (vi, 14), as stated by Bühler. But it is just as distinct in *eḷake* (v, 11). It is therefore a priori very likely that this word was written in the same way also in v, 5, and I think I can recognize, if not a dot, at any rate a thickening of the lower end of the vertical of the sign, so that here also the reading *eḷakā* is the more probable one. Moreover, if Skt. *dvāḍasa* has become *duvāḷasa* in vi, we should expect to find the *ḷa* also in the representative of Skt. *pañcaḍasa* in v, 8 and 10. In fact, the *ḷa* is quite distinct in *paṁṇaḷasaṁ* in v, 8, and I am almost sure that in v, 10 also we have to read *paṁṇaḷasāye*, the lower end of the sign again being thickened.¹

The state of things is the same in the Mathia inscription. Here also the *ḷa* has distinctly a dot in *duvāḷasa*^o in vi, 1, and in *paṁṇaḷasāye* in v, 11. In *duḷi* in v, 3, *eḷakā* in v, 6, and *paṁṇaḷasaṁ* in v, 9, the letter shows the

¹ In the *kha* also we find often only a thickening of the end of the vertical instead of the dot, at any rate in the plate; see e.g. the second *nilakhitarāye*, v, 11; *paṭivekkhāmi*, vi, 15, etc.

thickening, and only in v, 12 the photolithograph would be rather in favour of reading *edaḷke*. But I think it quite possible that here also the true reading is *elake*, and I hope that Professor Hultzsch will soon clear up this point with the help of impressions.

In the Delhi-Sivalik inscription we have distinctly *daḷī* in v, 4, as recognized by Bühler, and even more distinctly *elakā* in v, 8. In v, 17 *elake* is more probable at any rate than *edaḷke*. But the representative of Skt. *ḍaśa* seems to show *ḍa*: *paṁnaḍasaṁ* in v, 12; *paṁnaḍasāye* in v, 15; *duvāḍasa*¹ in vi. 1.

Only three of the test-words are found in the Delhi-Mirat inscription. In v, 11 the reading *elake* is absolutely certain, but in v, 5 we have *paṁnaḍasaṁ*, and in v, 9 probably *paṁnaḍasāye*. In the Allahabad inscription only *dudī* is found in v, 21, probably with the *ḍa*, besides *paṁcaḍasaṁ*, which has preserved here the original dental. None of the words occur in the preserved portion of the Rāmpūrva inscription.

There may be some more instances of a *ḷa* in the Aśoka inscriptions, but the reproductions available are not sufficient to decide this point. In the Jaugada inscription ii, 6, e.g., Bühler read *Coḍā Paṁḷiyā*, but to judge from the plate there is a considerable difference in the shape of the two signs supposed to be *ḍa*, and I should not feel surprised if the first one on closer inspection should turn out to be *ḷa*.

The question of the *ḷa*, of course, is not merely a palæographical one. If the sign occurs in the pillar edicts of Aśoka and in the Mathurā inscriptions, we may safely conclude that the sound also existed in the Old-Ardhamāgadhī and in the Old-Prakrit dialect of Mathurā. This is in perfect harmony with certain facts in the language of the recently discovered Buddhist dramas.¹

¹ *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*, Preuss. Turfan-Expeditionen. Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Heft i.

Here we find *ḷa* in *dāḷima°* and *lavaḷi°* (frag. 8), which are Old-Śaurasenī, and in *(pa)rvatāḷim* (frag. 62), which probably belongs to the same dialect. Moreover, the *ḷa* is the regular representative of *ḍa* between vowels in Pali, and it thus appears that it formed part of the consonantal systems of most of the Old-Prakrit dialects. I think it can be shown that in Sanskrit, also, the *ḷa* was far more widely used than is commonly supposed, and that in several cases the neglect of the evidence furnished by the inscriptions has led to wrong etymologies. But a discussion of this question lies outside the scope of the present paper.

THE 256 NIGHTS OF ASOKA

BY J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

[N] an article entitled "Vyuthena 256", published in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1911, part 1, pp. 119-26. M. Sylvain Lévi has reopened the subject of that record of Aśoka which we have, in various recensions, at Sahasrām, Rūpnāth, and Bairāt in Northern India, and at the Brahmagiri hill, Siddāpura, and the Jaṭṭiṅga-Rāmēśvara hill in Mysore. He has taken us another step towards the right understanding of the record, by showing that the words *miśā* and *amīśā*, which stand in one of the opening clauses, cannot mean *mṛishā*, 'in vain, wrongly', and *amṛishā*, 'not in vain, not wrongly', and do not represent the ablatives of *mīśa*, 'false appearance, fraud, deceit', and its converse *amīśa*, but stand for *miśā* and *amīśā*, Pāli forms of the Sanskrit nominatives plural *mīśrāḥ*, 'mixed', and *amīśrāḥ*, 'not mixed'. But we cannot agree with him in taking the word *ḍēva* in the same clause as denoting 'kings': in a record of Aśoka *ḍēva* can only mean 'a god'.¹ Nor can we agree with him in his interpretation of the general purport of the record.

Our reasons for differing from M. Lévi will be made clear farther on, where I shall show the real meaning of the crucial word which gives the solution of a problem which has perplexed us for more than thirty years. It is necessary to notice first a proposal which he has made for explaining why the number of nights mentioned in this record in connexion with Aśoka is exactly 256. His case on this point is as follows.

¹ Compare Professor Hultzsch's remarks, p. 1114 below.

The Buddhists divided their year into three seasons, each consisting of four months: Hēmanṭa, the cold season; Grīṣhma, the hot weather; and Varṣhā, the rains. And their canon prescribed that the fully admitted members of their Order, the monks and nuns, should spend three out of the four months of the rainy season under shelter in a settled abode: filling out the rest of the year by wandering about the country, without any fixed residence, supporting themselves by collecting alms.

M. Lévi has laid down (*loc. cit.*, p. 120) that the Buddhists, less concerned than the Brāhmanṣ with astronomical exactitude, had preserved an ancient year of 360 days, divided into 12 months each consisting of 30 days and subdivided into two half-months each of 15 days. He has adduced two statements as proof of this. He has cited a Buddhist tale, the Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna, not unjustly described by him as "an encyclopædia of Buddhist science", as summing up the calendar by saying that "30 days and nights make one month: 12 months make one year". And he has cited (p. 121) a work entitled Kālākālasūtra, characterized by him as a "veritable religious calendar", in respect of which he tells us that it names the three seasons as "winter, spring, and summer" (*sic*); that it defines them as each comprising eight *quinzaines*, which term has been used by him here as denoting a period of fifteen days;¹ and that it takes the *quinzaine*, the half-month, as its unit of time. He has reminded us that it is in fact the half-month which regulates the life of a monk. He has observed that, measured in this unit, the 256 nights of Aśoka give exactly 17 elapsed half-months and so account for all but one, the last, of the 18 half-months which were to be spent in the wandering mendicant life. He has understood our

¹ In accordance, of course, with its literal meaning, 'a fifteen', apart from its conventional use to denote a fortnight, a period of fourteen days and nights.

record as teaching that everyone, high or low, must adopt that life if he wished to attain heaven. And he has taken it as showing that Aśoka, in mentioning to his subjects his 256 *vivāsas* or "nights which he had spent away from home" (see p. 119), was pointing out to them that he was only preaching what he himself practised: he was conveying to them that he himself had led the wandering mendicant life of a monk for seventeen out of the eighteen prescribed half-months; and he addressed them at the beginning of the last half-month, without waiting till the completion of the full term, because he wished to speak to them in the actual character of a wandering monk, before the arrival of the time when he would return to his fixed place of abode, where, without doubt, M. Lévi has said, the secular life would receive him again.

This proposal, advanced by M. Lévi, naturally commands attention. But, well as it may read, it does not stand examination.

There is no question about the existence in India of an ancient year of 360 days, divided into 12 months each of 30 days. It is well established. It was a Brāhmanical sacrificial year, known as the *sāvāna* year, from *su*, 'to press out the Sōma-juice for libations in making sacrifices'. It was not a lunar year: because no lunar period is measured by 360 days. It was, therefore, either a purely artificial year or a very vague solar year.¹ And in either case it appears to have been bound to the course of the seasons, somewhat roughly, by the intercalation of an additional month of 30 days in every fifth year, or of a period of 35 or 36 days in every sixth year.

¹ It is in fact defined in the Nidānasūtra as a sidereal solar year, based on an understanding that the sun travels through each of the 27 *nakshatras* or divisions of the ecliptic in $13\frac{1}{3}$ days: but we may fairly conjecture that this definition, which is of course not correct, is only an *ex post facto* explanation. For my reference to the Nidānasūtra I am indebted to an article by Mr. R. Shamasastry, which I have seen in manuscript, on the general subject of the Vedic calendar.

This ancient year of 360 days has by no means died out even yet. It is treated in the astronomical books: it is used in the astrology for the purpose of determining the "lord of the year" and the "lords of the months":¹ it is probably still used to regulate Vedic sacrifices: and it has given its name to the civil day,—the day running from sunrise to sunrise,—which is known both as the *sāvāna* day and as *bhū-divasa*, 'the earth-day, the terrestrial day'. But it was a Brāhmanical sacrificial year. And, even if it was ever used as a practical reckoning for other purposes and as a calendar year, which we may well question,² the books and the inscriptions make the point abundantly clear that, from before the time of Aśōka, the calendar year of all sects and classes, used for general purposes both religious and civil, was the synodic lunar year.

It is the lunar half-month, the period technically known as the *paksha*, which regulated the life of the Buddhist monks. And the Kālākālasūtra, if it speaks of this period as a period of 15 days, only says what might be expected, though the statement is not exactly accurate.³ The synodic lunar year of the times with which we are concerned contained 18 *pakshas* of 15 days against 6 *pakshas* of 14 days,—the proportion rising to 20 against 6 in the year with the intercalated month; with the result, in any term of years, of a great preponderance of *pakshas* measuring 15 days, which is, indeed, the case in the later calendar also, in which the *paksha* may

¹ In this case without any rectification by intercalation.

² Even apart from the special nature of the *sāvāna* year, there is a great difference in calendrical value between (1) a year of 360 days adjusted annually by an addition of five or six days at the end of it, as was done by the Egyptians, and (2) a year of 360 days in which any rectification was deferred for at least five years, when the error had amounted to not less than an entire month.

³ M. Lévi tells me that the Kālākālasūtra is known only in a Chinese translation, and that the expression rendered by him by *quinzaine* is "10 + 5 days".

consist of 14, 15, or 16, or occasionally of even only 13, days. It would be only natural to define a *paksha* for general purposes as a period of 15 days; and it is in fact so defined in the Kautīliya-Arthaśāstra:¹ but there would be no intention of implying, and no one conversant with the calendar would infer, that a term of *n pakshas* would measure 15*n* days.

The statement in the Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna, that "30 day-and-nights are one month: 12 months are a year",² is neither peculiarly Buddhist nor exclusively ancient: it runs through the later books also. In the work which we are citing, it is made in the course of a long and interesting passage which treats of the *nakshatras*, the *muhārtas*, the length of the daytime and the night at different times of the year, the divisions of time, the measures of distance, and various other connected topics.³ It is found twice: first in a table of the divisions of time from the *takshana* up to the year (beyond which this work does not go);⁴ and again in another table which gives them from the *nimēsha* up to the year.⁵ The statement is a purely astronomical definition. It is

¹ Ed. Shamasastry, p. 108:— P.ñchadaś=āhōrātrāḥ pakshaḥ |
dvipakshō māsaḥ |

² The words are:— Trīmśad=ahōrātrāny=ēkō māsaḥ | dvādaśa māsaḥ
samvatsaraḥ.

³ See the Divyāvadāna, ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 638 ff. The Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna was translated into Chinese in the first half of the third century. A. D.: see M. Lévi, loc. cit., p. 120; and Cowell and Neil, op. cit., pp. 655-9. We want very much to know exactly how much of the text of the astronomical, etc., part of the work, as we have it in Sanskrit, stands in the Chinese translation: and any Chinese scholar who would enlighten us on this point would confer a great favour on all who are interested in the Hindū chronography and astronomy.

⁴ Op. cit., 644, lines 9-13. From the details that are given, the *takshana* of the Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna works out to $\frac{1}{3}$ of a second.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 645, lines 3-6. The value of the *nimēsha*, 'a twinkling', varies according to different authorities: here it works out to $\frac{4}{5}$ of a second. Another table (op. cit., 644, lines 20-2) gives the divisions from the *akshinimēsha*, 'the twinkling of an eye', up to the *muhārta* (48 minutes): here the *akshinimēsha* works out to $\frac{2}{3}$ of a second.

correct for both the solar year and the lunar year treated astronomically.¹ But it does not apply to either of them as a calendar year: nor does it set up a calendar year of 360 days: it has no more bearing on the calendar than has our legal definition of the lunar month as a period of 28 days,² or our customary rendering of the term *pakshu* by 'fortnight'.

In the period to which our record belongs, the calendar year, the synodic lunar year, was treated as always measuring 354 days as consisting of twelve months, and 384 days when an extra month was intercalated.³ To the intercalated month there were always assigned 30 days. The other months were arranged to consist of 30 and 29 days alternately: and there were assigned only 14 days to the third and seventh *pakshus* of each of the three seasons of four months. It is thus easily reckoned that 17 *pakshas* or half-months measured not 255 but only 251 days, or perhaps 252 days in a year of thirteen months. And so the particular significance attached

¹ In the earlier Hindū astronomy the solar year measured 366 civil days: in the later astronomy it measures $365 \cdot 25$ such days + x (a small fraction which varies according to the particular authority). In both cases it was divided astronomically into 12 equal parts (mean solar months, the use of which existed in India long before the introduction of the signs of the zodiac) each = $\frac{366}{12}$ or $\frac{365 \cdot 25 + x}{12}$; also (to match the division of the ecliptic into 360 degrees, which, again, was in use long before the introduction of the signs) into 360 equal parts (mean astronomical solar days) each = $\frac{366}{360}$ or $\frac{365 \cdot 25 + x}{360}$.

In the lunar reckoning the unit is the mean synodic lunar month: this was taken at 29·51612 . . . mean civil days in the earlier astronomy: in the later astronomy it measures 29·53058 such days + y (a very small fraction which varies according to the particular authority). In either case, the astronomical lunar year measures 12 of these units; and the unit is divided into 30 equal parts or mean lunar days, technically called *tithis* (the *tithi* is the time in which the moon in her monthly course increases her distance from the sun round the circle by twelve degrees).

² *Blackstone's Commentaries*, 23rd ed., vol. 2 (1854), p. 178.

³ In the present calendar, which is regulated by true instead of mean or uniform time, the lunar year of twelve months consists of 354 or 355 days, and the year of thirteen months consists of 383, 384, or 385 days.

by M. Lévi to the mention of the 256 nights —namely, that Aśōka selected as the occasion of his address the beginning of the last subdivision of his absence from home on tour as a monk— does not exist. The number could not be explained from any such point of view, even with the solar year: this year was treated as always consisting of 366 days; and 17 half-months in it would be 259 or 260 days.

It has been necessary to say this much in order to bring out the point that the specification of 256 nights in connexion with this pronouncement of Aśōka has no relation to the calendar: the 256 nights do not mark any division or total of subdivisions of the year, either lunar or solar. But it could hardly be denied that it has some very particular significance: otherwise, why should use have been made of an expression which conveys no definite idea as to an exact period without some kind of a mental calculation, instead of the plain words “somewhat more than eight and a half months”?

The real significance of the 256 nights is found in an interesting coincidence the nature of which I have pointed out on previous occasions.¹ The coincidence exists, unchanged. But we have to note some corrections in the literal interpretation of the record and the chronological application of it. We must take the matter step by step: and I must recapitulate some things already said in previous papers: but I will do so as briefly as is practicable.²

¹ See my article entitled “The Last Words of Aśōka” in this Journal, 1909. 981 ff., and my note bearing the same title in 1910. 1301 ff.

² In order to avoid the necessity for several notes, I may say here that anything previously advanced by me which is distinctly opposed to anything said here is to be treated as cancelled.

The topic of the record is *parākramā*, 'energy, exertion, zeal, diligence' in the study and practice of morality and religion.¹ And the pronouncement of Aśōka begins thus:²—

"Thus saith Dēvānaṃpiya :—(*There are*) two and a half years and somewhat more, during which I, who am an Upāsaka, did not display much zeal for one year. But (*there is*) one year, with the balance (*of that period*), during which I, who have betaken myself to the Saṅgha, have displayed much zeal: and during this time gods and men, who had not (*previously*) mixed in Jambudīpa, have now been made mixed. For this is a result of zeal: and it is not to be reached by high rank (*alone*): for even the great heaven may be attained by a lowly person who displays zeal."

The first point to be noted is that Aśōka, when he made this pronouncement, was an Upāsaka, a lay-worshipper; that is, an ordinary secular adherent of some sect, not belonging to the clerical class of it.³ A Buddhist

¹ See my remarks in this Journal, 1909, 989 ff. : and compare Professor Hultzsch, pp. 1115–16 below.

² We have six texts of the record: they represent two if not three recensions of it: and they have to be used to supplement and explain each other. Our chief guides are the texts at Sahasrām, Rūpnāth, and the Brahmagiri hill, and after them the Siddāpura text: the Bairāt text is much damaged; and the Jaṭṭiṅga-Rāmēśvara text is quite fragmentary. On the comparative merits of the published reproductions of the Brahmagiri text, which is in some respects the most important of them all, see my remarks in this Journal, 1908, 815, note 2, and 1909, 1012.

For the Rūpnāth text, reference may be made to this Journal, 1909, 1013: but the reading given by me there may be susceptible of improvement in a few minor details.

As regards the translation of the opening clauses, the words "for one year" are supplied by the Brahmagiri and Siddāpura texts. On that point and on the use of *sumi*, 'I am', see Professor Hultzsch in this Journal, 1910, 145. For the passage about the gods, men, and Jambudīpa, see his note, p. 1114 below, and some remarks on it by Mr. Laddu.

³ There is a question as to whether the Rūpnāth text describes him as a Sāvaka, Śrāvaka, a disciple, rather than as an Upāsaka: see this Journal, 1909, 1011. But the word is marked so clearly as *upāsake* in the Sahasrām, Bairāt, and Siddāpura texts, that I think that we must take it to have been used in the other texts also. The detail, however, is immaterial: the point is that Aśōka was not a monk.

Upāsaka was one who had pronounced the formula:—“I take my refuge in the Bhagavat (Buddha), and in the Dhamma (the Faith), and in the Saṅgha (the Order).”¹ And he was one who had not relinquished the household life; in the sense that he had not become entitled, as a fully admitted monk, to lead the wandering mendicant life, nor, apparently, to wear the yellow robe. At the same time it is highly probable that Aśōka, in the circumstances in which (as we shall see) he was living, assumed the garb of the sect to which he had attached himself: and that would account for the statement of I-tsing about an image of Aśōka dressed as a Buddhist monk.²

The record does not actually state the sect to which Aśōka had attached himself as an Upāsaka: nor does it name the Saṅgha, the Order, to which he had betaken himself. But the clue is furnished by the Bhabra edict. Aśōka, addressing a Saṅgha which is plainly the Buddhist Saṅgha, there says:—“Ye know, Sirs!, how great are my reverence and favour towards Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha: everything, Sirs!, that was said by the Blessed Buddha was truly well said: and that, Sirs!, which would appear to me (*to be referred to by the words of scripture*): ‘Thus the true religion will be of long duration,’— that I feel bound to declare.”³ And the edict goes on to mention by name certain texts, unmistakably Buddhist, which the king commends to the monks and nuns for constant study by them.

Aśōka, then, at the time when he made the pronouncement embodied in our record, was an Upāsaka, a lay-worshipper, of the Buddhist faith. In view of this, the reference to gods, men, and Jambudīpa, is perhaps to be explained as a confession of belief in the tenet that the

¹ See this Journal, 1909. 1012.

² Takakusu, *Records of the Buddhist Religion*, p. 73.

³ See this Journal, 1908. 494; and Professor Hultzsch in 1909. 728.

Buddhas come down from the celestial city Tushitapura, and become incarnate, not in any of the other three continents, but in Jambudvīpa, India: and, we may add, in the Madhyadēśa, the Middle Country, but in any particular city thereof according to individual choice.¹ Or there is perhaps an allusion to a habit which the Buddhist gods had—particularly the gods of the Tushita and Trayastriṃśa heavens—of coming down to the earth and mingling freely with mankind.² Or, again, Aśoka may have meant to say that by his zeal he had made Jambudvīpa an ideal Buddha-country, in which there was no practical difference between gods and men.³ Possibly,

¹ See the Nidānakathā, in the Jātaka, ed. Fausböll, vol. i. pp. 47, 49, line 3 ff.

² Sometimes they were sent as messengers, in fact as “angels”: for instance, a sculpture at the Bharaut Stūpa bears the label:—“Arhaddagupta, a son of the gods, having descended, announces to the great assembly the (*approaching*) conception of the Blessed One:” see *Ind. Ant.*, vol. 21, p. 233, No. 80. Again, the nymphs of the Trayastriṃśa heaven were sometimes sent to tempt ascetics: see, e.g., the story of Alambusā and Isisīṅga, Jātaka, No. 523. And, when Duṭṭhagāmaṇi of Ceylon lay dying, a god came from each of six heavens, with a chariot, seeking to induce the king to repair to his own abode: Mahāvārāsa, ed. Geiger, 32, 63 f.; Turnour’s translation, p. 198.

In connexion with the Trayastriṃśa gods, the following passage seems interesting: Mahāparimibbānasutta, this Journal, 1875, p. 70 f.; translation, SBE, vol. 11, p. 31 f. When Buddha had arrived at Vāsāli on his last journey, the Licchhavis came out to greet him, riding in magnificent vehicles and arrayed in various clothes and ornaments. Seeing them, Buddha said to the monks who were with him:—“O brethren!, such of you as have never seen the Tāvātimsa gods, gaze upon this company of the Licchhavis, behold this company of the Licchhavis, compare this company of the Licchhavis, even as a company of the Tāvātimsa gods!”

The Buddhist books frequently mention *dēva-manussa-lōkō*, “the world of gods and men”, and *paṇḍa sa-dēva-manussā*, “the population of gods and men”: see, e.g., Mahāparimibbānasutta, this Journal, 1876, p. 232; and Suttanipāta, pp. 14, 32, 48, 100, and verses 1047, 1063.

³ This is a detail in the description of Sukhāvati, the Land of Bliss, the abode of a former Buddha, Amitābha, which is sketched as an ideal Buddha-country in the larger Sukhāvativyūha; SBE, vol. 49, part 2, p. 42:—“And in that world there is no difference between gods and men, except when they are spoken of in ordinary and imperfect parlance as gods and men:” compare pp. 12, 62. This work belongs, of course,

however, some text may be found hereafter, giving a quite specific explanation.

The next point is that, since Aśōka was a declared Buddhist when he made the pronouncement embodied in this record, the record belongs to quite a late stage in his career.

We know from the 13th rock-edict that Aśōka's thoughts were first directed towards the cultivation of *dharma*, *dhamma*, morality in general and the duty of a good king, by the miseries that attended the war by which, in the ninth year after his anointment to the sovereignty, the Kalinga countries were added to his dominions. But the 7th pillar-edict, framed in the twenty-eighth year, shows that he was then still treating all the various sects with the impartial toleration and encouragement which furnish the special topic of the 12th rock-edict; and that, even if he had then begun to have any leaning towards the Buddhists in particular,¹ he had at least not yet identified himself with them. Our record therefore dates from at any rate not earlier than the twenty-eighth year.

Against this position, arguments have been based on a passage in the 8th rock-edict which says:—"In times gone by, the kings went forth on pleasure-tours, on which there were hunting and other similar amusements: this

to the Mahāyāna school: but the idea may well have been an early one. The term used in the work for a "Buddha-country" is *Buddha-kshētra*. The text, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, 1883, p. 42, of the passage quoted above in translation, runs:— Na cha tatra lokadhātau dēvānām vā manushyānām vā nānātvam = asty = anyatra saṃvṛiti-vyavahāreṇa dēva-manushyāv = iti saṃkhyām gachchhanti.

¹ The possibility is suggested by the occurrence of the word *saṃgha* in this edict for the first time: but there is nothing really definite in it: see this Journal, 1908. 493, note. I think, however, that there are extraneous indications that Aśōka did favour the Buddhists from a fairly early time.

king Dēvānāmpīya-Piyadassi. being ten-years-anointed, went to *saṃbōdhi*: therefore (*there is now*) this touring for *dhamma*.”¹

The argument, based on the use of the term *saṃbōdhi*, ‘true or perfect knowledge’, is that this passage, taken with that in the 13th rock-edict, shows that Aśoka felt a preliminary call to Buddhism in the ninth year after his anointment to the sovereignty, and was definitely converted to that faith in the eleventh year. But there is really nothing in it. The use of the term *saṃbōdhi* is not in any way peculiarly Buddhist.² There was also a Jain *saṃbōdhi*.³ There was general *saṃbōdhi* too.⁴ And the passage means simply that Aśoka had then, in the eleventh year, realized fully the propriety of cultivating *dhamma*, and of adopting the course indicated by the subsequent context of the passage, which explains the nature of the said *dhammayātā* or touring for *dhamma*: it says:—“On this touring for *dhamma* this is what takes place: the interviewing of Bāmaṇas (Brāhmaṇas) and Samaṇas, and the making of gifts to them; the interviewing of Elders, and the distribution of gold to them; the interviewing of the people of the country-side; the inculcation of *dhamma*: and the making of inquiries about *dhamma*.”

As has been indicated above, the topic of our record is the inculcation of zeal, energy, or diligence in the study

¹ For the text of this passage according to the Girnār version, reference may be made to this Journal, 1908, 488; 1909, 1007. My suggestion, made on the latter occasion, that *saṃto* denotes Buddha as “the Tranquil One” and that in the words *saṃto ayāya saṃbōdhiṃ* we have a metrical quotation, is cancelled (see note 2 on p. 1097 above).

² It is not even the only Buddhist term: *bōdhi* and *bōdha* were used in just the same sense.

³ I need hardly do more than point to the fact that Buddha and Saṃbuddha were appellations of the Jain Tirthankaras: see, e.g., the Kalpasūtra, ed. Jacobi, §§ 16, 123.

⁴ See this Journal, 1908, 489.

and practice of religion, as the means whereby even the humblest person might attain heaven. The record does not inculcate a general adoption of the wandering mendicant life. It does not even mention that life. But it does recommend the practising of something which it calls *vivāsa*: Aśōka says:—"And by this same token, as long as your food lasts you should make *vivāsa* everywhere."¹ And the postscript added to the record by the persons who drafted it refers to Aśōka himself as having made *vivāsa* when he uttered his pronouncement. We have to determine next what this *vivāsa* was.

The passages which mention Aśōka as having made *vivāsa* use a verb *vivas*, and present the past participle in *ta* in the Pāli forms *vivutha*, *vyutha*, *vyūtha*; the verbal noun *vivāsa*: and the participial form *vivutha* used in the neuter in the sense of *vivāsa*. They run thus:—

Sahasrām:—Iyañ cha sāvane vivuthēna duve sapaññā lāti-satā vivuthā ti 200 50 6.

"And this address (*was delivered or composed*) by him

¹ When I went out to India (in 1867), one of the first sights shown to me was that of a man, reported to me to have been a wealthy merchant, who had withdrawn from the world to spend his remaining days in the practice of religion. He was living in the upper part of a small edifice of laterite bricks and chunam, or some such materials, about seven feet high, on the fore-shore at Bombay. The edifice consisted of a pedestal supporting a small square cell in which there was just room enough for him to sit crouched, with his knees drawn up to his chin. Three sides of this cell were built in: and he sat with his face away from the fourth side, over which there hung a screen which could be lifted up so as to see him and touch his back. And he remained there all through the daytime, engaged in meditation; coming out for a short time at night to eat whatever food might have been placed for him on the ground near his cell. How long he lived thus before the end came, I do not know.

I do not suggest that this style of life was adopted by Aśōka or by any people following his injunctions. But it is obvious that anyone applying himself to the *vivāsa* (explained farther on) which Aśōka recommended, could not work to support himself, but must depend on voluntary contributions: and that his *vivāsa*, or his life, must come to an end with any failure of supplies. We must, I think, take *āhāle*, = *āhārah*, in its most customary sense, 'food'.

(Dēvānāmpīya)¹ who made *vivāsa*: the *vivūthas* (*were*) two hundred and fifty-six nights (*and in figures*) 256.²

Rūpnāth:—Vyūthēnā sāvaṇe kaṭe 200 50 6 sata vivāsā ta (*for ti or II*).²

“(This) address was composed by him who made *vivāsa*: the *vivāsas* (*were*) 256.”

Brahmagiri:—Iyaṇi cha sāvaṇe sāvāpīte vyūthēna 200 50 6.

“And this address was delivered by him who made *vivāsa* 256.”

The words *vivāsa*, *vivūtha*, etc., are understood to be formed from *vi* + *vas*, ‘to dwell’, and have been applied by Dr. Thomas as meaning that Aśōka was travelling about on a religious tour by way of a contrast with the pleasure-tours of his predecessors; by M. Lévi as meaning that he was making the nine-months tour as a wandering mendicant monk; and by me as meaning that he was living away from home in religious retirement. But there is a little difficulty which has been overlooked.

The Sahasrām text tells us distinctly that the *vivāsas* of Aśōka were “256 nights”: it uses, as Dr. Thomas showed, the word *lāti*, = *nātri*, ‘a night’. And it is easy for us, with that text before us, to know that nights are intended, though they are not mentioned, in the other texts also. But persons reading those other texts had no such guide: the Sahasrām version was not available to them. There is nothing on the surface in those texts to show what the number 256 was intended

¹ This name, an appellation of Aśōka, is to be supplied in each text, from the opening clause of the pronouncement.

² The word *sata* for *satā* = *śatāni* may be regarded as more or less redundant: by literal translation the text would mean “256 hundreds”. But this usage is a frequent one in at any rate the later records: we have a pointed analogy in the Törkhēle record of A.D. 813, in *śahvatsara-śatāni* 735, for *śahratsarāḥ* 735: see *Epi. Ind.*, vol. 3, p. 54, text line 2.

Regarding the possibility that the final *tu* may be a mark of punctuation, see this Journal, 1909. 1004.

to denote. It might suggest days: it might suggest years: or, with *vivas* taken in any way in the idea of 'to travel' or 'to dwell away from home', it might quite reasonably suggest *yōjanas* or some other measure of distance. In short, the Rūpnāth and Brahmagiri texts are, on the surface, so wanting in particularization that it is not surprising, on the whole, that Dr. Thomas, who first broached the idea of a nine-months tour but had not at that time recognized the word *lāti*, 'nights', interpreted the record as saying that Aśōka, in the course of a missionary or propagandist tour of that duration, made "256 changes of abode".¹

There must, in fact, be something inherent in the meaning of the terms *vivāsa*, *vivatha*, etc., as used in this record, to give at once the required indication of nights to readers of the Rūpnāth, Brahmagiri, and similar texts. And we find the explanation in a line of a Buddhist verse which I quoted in a discussion of this record some years ago, but have recalled only recently. When the aged Piṅgiya, having learnt from Buddha "the way to the other shore", had returned to his own preceptor, Bāvāri, the latter asked him how he could endure to stay away from Buddha. Piṅgiya replied:—"I am not away from him, even for a moment:" and added:²—

Passāmi nam manasā chakkhunā va
 rattindivam brāhmaṇa appamatto |
 namassamāno vivasēmi rattiṃ
 tēn=ēva maññāmi avippavāsam ||

Following Dr. Fausböll, I took the third line of this verse as using the causal of *vi + vas*, 'to dwell', in

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, 1908, p. 22. Subsequently, in his article "Les Vivāsah d'Aśoka" in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1910, part 1, pp. 507-22, he showed us that we have the word *lāti*, 'nights', in the Sahasrām text: and on this occasion he corrected his rendering into "256 days passed by Aśoka away from his home" in the course of a religious tour.

² Suttanipāta, ed. Fausböll, p. 208, verse 1142.

the sense 'to cause to pass away', and as meaning "worshipping I spend the night".¹ Professor Kielhorn, however, pointed out that the line uses the causal of *vi + vas*, 'to shine', and that the words mean "worshipping I cause the night to grow light", or in other terms "I worship the whole night, until the night grows light (i.e. till daybreak)".² But the sense remains the same; and we may render the verse thus:—³

"With diligence, O Brāhmaṇ!, night and day,
I see him in my mind, as with an eye:
Adoring him I spend the livelong night:
And so, methinks, I do not leave his side!"

This use of *vi + vas* supplies at once what seems to be wanting in the Rūpnāth and Brahmagiri texts. We see now that, as used in this passage, *vivāsa*, and *vivutha* as a noun, mean in themselves, without the accompaniment of any word for 'night', 'spending a night in worship'; or putting it conversely, they mean 'a night spent in worship': and the participle *vivutha*, *vyūtha*, *vyūtha*, as an adjective, means 'one who has spent a night in worship'. And we can now translate the three texts:—

Sahasrām:—"And this address (*was delivered or composed*) by him (Dēvānaṃpiya)⁴ who spent nights in worship: (*his*) nights spent in worship (*were*) two hundred and fifty-six nights (*and in figures*) 256."

Rūpnāth:—"(*This*) address was composed by him who spent nights in worship: (*his*) nights spent in worship (*were*) 256."

¹ This Journal, 1904, 29.

² *Ibid.*, 364.

³ Dr. Fausbøll's translation, SBE., vol. 10, part 2, p. 201, verse 19 (1141), runs:—"I see him in my mind and with my eye, vigilant, O Brāhmaṇa, night and day; worshipping I spend the night, therefore I think I do not stay away from him." The word translated by 'vigilant' is *appamādō*: but it is customary to render *appamāda* by 'diligence'. After *chakkhūnā* the text has *va*, = *iva*: not *cha*.

⁴ See note 1 on p. 1104 above.

Brahmagiri:—"And this address was delivered by him who spent 256 nights in worship."

This meaning of the crucial terms *vivāsa*, *virūtha*, etc., puts matters in a clear light. It goes far towards explaining why this period in Aśoka's career was not stated in months, though it amounted to somewhat more than eight months and a half. And it dismisses the idea that the record speaks of Aśoka as travelling, either as a monk leading the wandering mendicant life, or as a king conducting a propagandist campaign or making a *dhammayātā*, a state progress for the general purposes of morality and religion.

So far, then, the position is that, when Aśoka at some time quite late in his career made the pronouncement embodied in this record, he had spent 256 nights in worship as a Buddhist Upāsaka or lay-worshipper. But it is still to be made clear why the number of the nights mentioned as having been so spent by him is precisely 256, and, in fact, why this period, running to so long a time, was stated in nights at all. And we have still to get round the difficulty that no ancient Indian king could adopt even such a course as that, and continue to hold the reins of government in his hands or hope to recover his throne again if he had temporarily absented himself from his duties, any more than he could live or even pose as a wandering monk for eight and a half months without losing his sovereignty. We must note some more points before we can understand the case fully.

Not only was Aśoka's address published at places in his own dominions, but also it was sent out to foreign parts and published there. This was done in accordance with a wish expressed by him in the address itself:—*Anṭā pi cha jānāntu*: "and let the very ends know it!;" or, as

Professor Hultsch has preferred to say :—“ And let even (*my*) neighbours know it !”¹

It was thus sent to a place named Isila in the northern part of the territory now known as Mysore, where it was incised on rocks at the Brahmagiri hill, at Siddāpura, and at the Jaṭṭiṅga-Rāmēśvara hill.² It was sent there by the high officers of a province in Aśōka's dominions, and was intended, no doubt, for the special information of a Buddhist settlement located at or near Isila : and the officials who sent it naturally transmitted it, if only as a matter of courtesy, through the local officials of the State in whose territory that place was situated. This we learn from a preamble attached to the Mysore texts, which says :³—“ From Suvanṇagiri, in the name of the Prince and the High Ministers, the High Ministers at Isila are to be asked whether they are in good health, and are to be thus informed :” and so it introduces the address itself, which begins :—“ Dēvānaṃpiya issues a precept.”

We can hardly doubt that the Suvanṇagiri thus mentioned as the place whence the address was sent out was also the place where it had been delivered, and was in fact the place where Aśōka had passed the whole of the 256 nights spent in worship. And it is easily located. It is one of the hills, still known as Suvanṇagiri, Sōnagiri, surrounding the ancient city Girivraja just below Rājagriha, Rājgīr, in the Paṭṇā District, Behār, in almost the very heart of Aśōka's dominions.⁴

For the rest, in this connexion, if Aśōka was alive and reigning when the communication was sent to Isila, it is surely strange that it was sent in the name of some of his officials instead of going in his own name.

¹ This Journal, 1910. 1310.

² For the exact positions of these places, see this Journal, 1909. 997 f.

³ For the text of the preamble, see this Journal, 1909. 995. For the force of *vachanēna*, “ in the name of”, see *ibid.*, 996.

⁴ See, fully, this Journal, 1909. 998.

Finally, we know from the *Dīpavaṃsa*,¹ endorsed by its commentary the *Mahāvaṃsa*,² that Aśōka was anointed to the sovereignty 218 years after the death of Buddha; meaning, of course, not exactly on the 218th anniversary of the death, but at some time in the year 219 current (218 expired): also, that he reigned for 37 years. This latter statement, again, we naturally interpret as meaning, not 37 years to a day, but 37 years and some additional time not amounting to more than about six months.

These figures take us on into the year 256 current, which would be cited in the usual manner as the year 255 (expired). And 256 days from that point carry us into the year 256 (expired).³

We can now straighten out the whole matter, and see the course of events, as follows; amending as shown on p. 1111 below the chronological table given by me in this *Journal*, 1909. 28: 4—

Somewhat more than two and a half years before the time when Aśōka delivered the address embodied in our record, he became an *Upāsaka* or lay-worshipper of the Buddhist faith. This was when he had been reigning for about 35 years and 3 months from his anointment to the sovereignty, and in the year 253 expired after the death

¹ Ed. Oldenberg, 6. 1; 5. 101.

² Ed. Geiger, 5. 21; 20. 6. For the point that the *Mahāvaṃsa* was written as a commentary on the *Dīpavaṃsa* see this *Journal*, 1909. 5, and note.

³ This is the position whether we accept or reject my view (see this *Journal*, 1909. 22, 26) that Buddha died on *Kārttika śukla 8* (instead of the full-moon day of *Vaiśākha*) and Aśōka was anointed to the sovereignty on *Jyāishtha śukla 5*.

⁴ We have to split up the "two and a half years and somewhat more" of our record into (1, at the beginning) one year, (2, at the end) 256 day-and-nights, = eight and a half months and five days, and (3, in the middle) the remainder, = ten months and a little more.

of Buddha. After a year of no special activity, he then, in the year 254 expired, when he had reigned for about 36 years and 3 months, became zealous in the study and propagation of the faith to which he had formally attached himself. Some ten months or so after that, in the year 255 expired, when he had reigned for 37 years and about one month, he followed a not infrequent custom of ancient Indian rulers, and abdicated, — apparently by his own hand installing his grandson Daśaratha as his successor,¹— and withdrew from the worldly life to spend his remaining days in religious retirement.² He selected as the place of his retreat the hill Suvarṇagiri, Sōnagiri, on or near which there would seem to have been a headquarters settlement of the Buddhist Order. And there, a little more than eight and a half months later, this address was delivered by him to members of the Order gathered round him in quiet on the 256th night after his withdrawal from the world and in the year 256 expired after the death of Buddha.

In this we find the real significance and interest of the 256 nights. The agreement in the figures of the nights and the years is no accidental coincidence. It is one the possibility of which was foreseen from not long before the time when it might occur, but which could only come about in a certain happy contingency; namely, provided that the royal recluse, who had reigned for thirty-seven years and was therefore well advanced in life, should survive long enough: and we can well realize the eagerness and anxiety with which the event was awaited, when the time had once drawn near enough to give the reason for reckoning out exactly in nights the time which Aśōka had

¹ See this Journal, 1908. 484 f.

² The custom of ancient Indian rulers to which I refer is thoroughly well established. For historical and literary instances already cited, see this Journal, 1909. 983 f.; 1910. 1307, note 1. As further literary instances, we may now conveniently quote the cases of Pāṇḍu and Dhṛitarāshtra: see pp. 684, 686, above.

Years of the era of the death of Buddha on Kārttika śukla 8.		Years of the anointment of Aśōka on Jyaishṭha śukla 5.
237 ended Kārttika śu. 7, B.C. 246		
	←	19 ended Jyaishṭha śu. 4, B.C. 245
253 ended Kārttika śu. 7, B.C. 230	←	35 ended Jyaishṭha śu. 4, B.C. 229
		Aśōka became a Buddhist Upā-saka at about 35 years and 3 months, in B.C. 229.
254 ended Kārttika śu. 7, B.C. 229		
	←	36 ended Jyaishṭha śu. 4, B.C. 228
		Aśōka became a zealous Buddhist at about 36 years and 3 months, in B.C. 228.
255 ended Kārttika śu. 7, B.C. 228	←	37 ended Jyaishṭha śu. 4, B.C. 227
		Aśōka abdicated and passed into religious retirement at the hill Suvarṇagiri, Sōnagiri, at about 37 years and 1 month, in B.C. 227.
256 ended Kārttika śu. 7, B.C. 227		
		Aśōka made his last pronouncement at Suvarṇagiri, Sōnagiri, 256 nights after his abdication and 256 years after the death of Buddha, at about 37 years and 10 months, in B.C. 226.
	←	(38 ended Jyaishṭha śu. 4, B.C. 226)
257 ended Kārttika śu. 7, B.C. 226		

spent in seclusion.¹ The address was delivered by him on the 256th night because, by living through that night, he was completing in his retirement one day for each complete year that had elapsed since the death of the founder of the faith which he had adopted, and the permanence of which he sought to ensure.

Further, the topic of the address is an expansion of the last words of Buddha himself:—"Work out your salvation by diligence!"² We can hardly doubt that this, too, was no mere coincidence, and that we have here the latest formal pronouncement, if not actually the last words, the dying speech, of Aśōka, too,³ delivered in imitation of the last

¹ It was probably at some time towards the end of the eighth month that the coincidence which might occur was recognized.

² See this Journal, 1909. 1015 f.

³ Dying speeches are not altogether unknown. For another highly interesting one, that of Duṭthagāmaṇi king of Ceylon (died about B.C. 85. roughly), see the Mahāvamsa, ed. Geiger, 32. 16-62; translation by Turnour, pp. 194-8.

pronouncement of Buddha, and reduced to writing and published just after his death by the high officers of the province within the limits of which he passed away, who added the final clause mentioning the 256 nights.

It may be observed in conclusion that we can point, not merely to the locality, but perhaps to the actual abode in which Aśoka ended his days. We may find it in a cave-temple on the hill Suvarṇagiri, Sōnagiri (see *Ind. Ant.*, 1902. 71), measuring forty feet by fifteen, which in 1820 contained a Jain image and a stone couch, and was occupied, probably with a view to the same end, by a Vaishṇava ascetic of the class known as Bairāgīs.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

A SECOND NOTE ON THE BHABRA EDICT

In his *Inscriptions de Piyaḍasi*, vol. i, p. 26, M. Senart pointed out that the dialect of the Girmār version of Aśōka's edicts exhibits a large number of instances in which the letter *r* has not, as usual in Prākṛit, been assimilated to a preceding or following consonant. Nobody seems to have noticed the fact that a few similar cases occur in the Bhabra edict. As a reference to the facsimile in the *Journal Asiatique*, 8^e série, vol. ix (1887, part 1), p. 498. will show, we find there *Pr[i]yaḍas[i]* in line 1, *prasāde* (l. 2), *surve* (l. 3), and *abhipretam* (l. 8). In the last instance the *r* is expressed by a horizontal dash which makes the *p* look like *h*. In the same way the *r* is marked in *aparakaraṇamhi* (hitherto read *apa^c*) at Girmār, edict xii, l. 3, which looks exactly like *aha^c*. The same horizontal dash, but added *before* the other component of the group, I find in [A]ṁdhra at Girmār, edict xiii, l. 9, and it is affixed at the bottom in *dhruvo*, edict i, l. 12. In the same line the reading seems to be *trī*, not *tī*. In the rock-edicts at Jaugada I have noted the following similar cases: *drakhati*, edict i, l. 2; *Piyaḍrasine*, *ibid.*, l. 3; *s[a]ratra*, edict ii, l. 4; *drasayitu*, edict iv, l. 3; and *prativedayanantu*, edict vi, l. 2.

I avail myself of this opportunity for proposing a conjectural restoration of the Queen's edict at Allahabad. After the two words *she nāni* in l. 4 (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. xix, p. 126) the impressions which are in my hands appear to read [*he*]raṁ . . . [*na*] . . . which may be the remainder of the two words *heraṁ vinati*. If I am right the third sentence of the Queen's edict would have to be translated

as follows :—“ Thus is the request of the second queen, the mother of Tivala, the Kāluvāki.”

E. HULTZSCH.

A FOURTH NOTE ON THE RUPNATH EDICT

Thanks to the united efforts of various scholars, the riddles which the quaint and ambiguous wording of this edict has propounded to posterity are being solved gradually. A recent part of the *Journal Asiatique* (Jan.-Feb., 1911) contains an article by M. Sylvain Lévi (pp. 119 ff.), in which he discusses the meaning of the fifth clause of the Rūpnāth edict. He shows that *misā* cannot correspond to the Sanskrit *mṛishā*, the Prākṛit equivalent of which is *musā*, but must mean *miśrāḥ*; and he arrives at the conclusion that the word *devā* does not refer to either gods or Brāhmanas, but to kings. His revised rendering (p. 125) runs :—

“ The kings who up to this time had never mingled (*with men*) in Jambudvīpa have now been made mingled (*with them*).”

M. Lévi's explanation of *misā* is sure to meet with general acceptance, and, on the strength of it, the translation of *devā* by “ Brāhmanas ” must be given up. The meaning “ kings ” may appear to suit the context, but communications made to me in private letters by M. Barth and Dr. Fleet make me unable to accept it. The word *deva* is not used anywhere else in the Aśoka edicts except in the title *Devānaṃpriya*, where it certainly does not mean “ a king ”, for which the word *vājā* is regularly employed. Consequently it may be presumed that *devā* in the Rūpnāth and cognate edicts refers to the “ gods ”. I would therefore translate the Rūpnāth passage as follows :—

“ Those gods who up to this time had been unassociated (*with men*) in Jambudvīpa have now been made associated (*with them*).”

The corresponding passage of the Sahasrām edict—in respect of which the Mysore edicts are very helpful, in dissolving the compound *misam-deva* into *misā devēhi*—would run thus:—

“Men in Jambudvīpa who up to this time had been unassociated with the gods have (*now*) been made associated with the gods.”

The Mysore edicts would read as follows:—

“But men in Jambudvīpa who up to this time had been unassociated (*are now*) associated with the gods.”

Although these three passages admit of a close translation, their actual bearing remains at first sight obscure. Luckily the different versions supplement and explain each other. It will be observed that the second and third passages mention both “men” and “gods”, while the Rūpnāth edict speaks only of “gods”. The actual purport of the three passages seems to be this, that at the time of the Rūpnāth edict (*dāni* = Sanskrit *idānīm*) Aśōka had become convinced that, as he expresses it later on in the same edict, “even a lowly person may attain even the great heaven if he is zealous.”

In his partial translation of the Rūpnāth edict M. Lévi agrees with M. Senart in taking *etiya athāya* (l. 3) in the sense of “for the following purpose” (p. 125). Bühler, Dr. Fleet (this Journal, 1909, p. 1014), and Dr. Thomas (*Journal Asiatique*, x^e série, vol. xv, 1910, part 1, p. 510) were of opinion that the next sentence represents the text of an address (*sāvane*, l. 3) delivered by Aśōka himself on a previous occasion, and quoted succinctly by him here. But a glance at the parallel passages collected by Dr. Thomas himself on the next page (511) will suffice to show that M. Senart was right, and that here, as well as in l. 5, the word *sāvane* refers to the *whole* of the Rūpnāth edict itself.

I do not find myself able to agree with M. Lévi when he follows Dr. Thomas in assigning to the verb *pakamati*

in the Rūpnāth edict the meaning of "travelling about". In explaining doubtful words we ought to rely on parallel passages of the edicts themselves, whenever we can quote such, rather than on the language of the *Vinayapitaka* or any other extraneous guide. As pointed out by Dr. Fleet in this Journal, 1909, pp. 989-93. *pakamati* must be understood as a synonym of the *palakamati*, "to exert one's self, to be zealous", which stands as its equivalent in the Sahasrām and Bairāt versions. The correctness of Dr. Fleet's view is established by the following similar passage of the tenth rock-edict (Girnār, l. 4):—

dukaram tu kho etam ehludakena va janena usaṭena
va añatra aḡena parāk[r]amena savaṃ parichajitpā.

"But it is indeed difficult either for a lowly person or for a high one to accomplish this without great zeal (*and without*) renouncing everything."

This reminds us very strongly of the Rūpnāth edict (l. 2 f.):—

no cha esā mahatata p[ā]potave khudakena pi pa[ka]-
mam[i]nenā sakiye pi(vi)pule pā(pi) svage ārodheve (*real*
ārādhete).

"And this cannot be reached by (*persons of*) high rank (*alone*); (*but*) even a lowly person may attain even the great heaven if he is zealous."

Finally, I would suggest a fresh explanation of the word *vālata* in l. 4 of the Rūpnāth edict. Bühler (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. 22, p. 305) took it to be a corruption of *paratara*. The assumption of a violent change of this description becomes unnecessary if *vālata* is explained as an equivalent of *vāratah*, "in consequence of an occasion," i.e. "where an occasion presents itself." If, as proposed by Bühler, the syllable *ve* is supplied at the end of the preceding word, the translation of the whole sentence and of the next one would be as follows:—

"And this matter must be caused to be engraved on

rocks where an occasion presents itself. And it must be caused to be engraved on stone pillars (*wherever*) there are stone pillars here (*in my dominions*)."

E. HULTZSCH.

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

Professor Hultzsch kindly showed me his note on this obscure passage and informed me of the different views regarding its rendering. His translation, as it now stands, leaves some words still obscure. I would suggest for those ambiguous words a more definite meaning, which, I believe, is free from objections, and will remove the obscurity of the passage in question.

There are two other versions of the Rūpnāth edict which are sufficiently well preserved to help us in understanding the right meaning of this passage. The three passages are:—

(a) Rūpnāth : या इमाय कालाय जंबुदिपसि अमिसा देवा
ऊमु ते दानि मिसा कटा

(b) Sahasrām : ए ते लेन जंबुदीपसि अमिसंदेवा संत
मुनिसा मिसंदेव

(c) Brahmagiri : इमिना च कालेन अमिसा समाना मुनिसा
जंबुदीपसि मिसा देवेहि

The important words are देवा and मुनिसा, and they admit of different interpretations.

I think the gods referred to by Aśōka are no others than the ancient Hindū gods, the Buddhist gods being only a few of those gods retained by the followers of the Buddha, assigning to them an inferior and modified position. Aśōka was at first a follower of Brāhmaṇism, and though later on he showed himself more inclined to the Buddhist teaching, he never preached any sectarian exclusivism. It is therefore more natural to take the word देव in its usual meaning of the Hindū gods than to

see in it the meaning of the deified teachers or gods of other sects. This meaning will further be supported by the interpretation of the word **मुनिसा**.

I humbly beg to differ from Professor Hultzsch, who appears to take the word **मुनिसा** to mean "men in this world". If we supply the word **मनुष्यैः** in (*a*) before **अमिसा** and **मिसा**, as we must, the passage would, according to him, mean that Aśōka made the gods associated with men, which they were not before. This meaning, I think, cannot be attributed to Aśōka, who recognized all the sects and the moral principles of all of them, because this recognition on his part shows that he did not mean to say that the doors of heaven were newly opened for men by him and that before his time men could not get to heaven. In connexion with this, it may further be noted that the position of the word **जंबुदीपसि**, which is immediately connected with the word **मुनिसा** only in (*c*)—where, too, it comes *after* **मुनिसा**—cannot help us in defining the meaning of **मुनिसा**. The word **जंबुदीपसि** is only a locative of place, and means nothing more than "in Jambudvīpa" or perhaps "in my kingdom". Since the men who were made by Aśōka associated with the gods were not ordinary men, the question comes who then could they have been? I think they were the previous Buddhas, and possibly the great teachers of other sects as well. They were not associated with the gods before his time by the different rival sects, and he claims as the result of his zeal in preaching against **परपासंडगरहा**, "the censuring of other doctrines," and **आत्मपासंडपूजा**, "the laudation of one's own doctrine," a mutual recognition of the gods of the rival sects. The Rūpnāth edict simply says that the gods were unmixed before his time, and they were made mixed by him; i.e. before his time the different sects recognized only their own gods or deified teachers, and consequently had unmixed gods, but through his non-sectarian zeal the

rival sects were made by him to recognize the gods of one another (cf. rock-edict 12). The translation of the Rūpnāth passage would therefore be :—

“In Jambudvīpa the gods (*of the well-known Hindū pantheon*) who up to this time had not been associated (*with men like Gautama and others*) have now been made associated with them (*by me through my non-sectarian zeal*).”

In conclusion I may state that the sentence referred to by Professor Hultzsch to determine the purport of this passage does not affect my translation. On the contrary it supports my view that Aśoka's zeal was non-sectarian, and that he simply repeated his conviction that the doors of heaven were open to all who were pious, whether they were of high rank like the Brāhmaṇas and Śramanas or of low rank like the Śūdras and Śrāvakas, whether they were rich or poor.

In obscure passages like this, वादे वादे जायते तत्त्वबोधः, and I offer this interpretation with the hope that if it does not meet with general acceptance it will at least lead to further discussion on the points raised by me.

T. K. LADDU.

BRIHASPATI AND TISHYA

It was impracticable to include in the July number my remarks on Mr. Keith's comments, given therein at p. 794 ff., on my previous note on Brihaspati and Tishya. I therefore say now what I should have liked to say then.

It is the case that the regents of the *nakshatras* have not been selected on astronomical lines, and that only Jupiter among the planets properly so-called (that is, excluding the sun and the moon) is open to be treated as one of these regents. But there cannot be anything unscientific in deciding that Jupiter is the regent of the *nakshatra* Tishya, if a good reason for doing so is shown.

That, however, is just where the crux is. It must first be shown that the Brihaspati of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa, 3. 1. 1. 5, and the Ṛig-Vēda, 4. 50. 4. is the planet Jupiter or its regent. But I must agree that I have not proved this point, if the space-relation which seemed to me to belong to the word *abhi* in the first-named passage may not be pressed. And Mr. Keith has certainly shown good cause for denying to *abhi* in this passage an independent prepositional value, and for finding the compound verb *abhi-sam-bhū* with the meaning 'to attain possession' of such-and-such a thing, and so 'to become lord' of it, which sense it has in those of the other passages indicated by him which I am able to see in their original texts. I can only say that, in taking *sambabhūca* as the verb and *abhi* as an independent word, I followed the text as given in the edition available to me.

The question of the Tishya of the Rig-Vēda, 5. 54. 13, which I identify with the star-cluster which some writers have called "the historic Praesepe", stands quite apart from the question of the identity of the Vedic Brihaspati with the planet Jupiter. Mr. Keith says that my case here rests on a wholly unnatural translation of the verse just mentioned. I gather that his objection is based more on logical than on grammatical grounds, though it embraces both, and that its essence is that the spirit of the Vēda requires a comparison, not a contrast; so that, instead of my "wealth which does not disappear as Tishya does disappear from the sky",¹ we must understand "wealth which disappears not, just as Tishya does not disappear from the sky".

I contend that a contrast may be as appropriate as a comparison, and that we must be guided by circumstances in dealing with any particular passage. Here, the object

¹ The literal translation, as the words stand, is "not, which, disappears, Tishya, as, from the sky". I have slightly altered my rendering so as to avoid the future or subjunctive ("wealth which will not disappear") to which Mr. Keith has objected.

of comparison or contrast, as the case may be, is mentioned as Tishya; and we must consider what we can determine as to the nature of Tishya.

Mr. Keith apparently rejects Sāyana's explanation that Tishya is the Sun,¹ but only observes that it must be "some bright constellation": he does not point to any particular constellation.

Max Müller translated (SBE, 32. 326), on the same lines with Mr. Keith, "such thousandfold wealth as never fails, like the star Tishya from heaven", and suggested (ibid., 331) that Tishya "ought to be a star which does not set". Apart from any other objections, this would limit our field of choice of the star to circumpolar regions not farther than about 35° from the north pole: and it is difficult to find in that part of the heavens any orb sufficiently notable to provide the comparison.

Others, it seems, have proposed to take the Tishya of this passage as being the same with the Avestic Tishtrya, which is identified with the Pahlavī and Persian Tishtar, Tīr, and so with Sirius. And Sirius, though it is not a star which does not set, is certainly a very notable object in the sky in India, though by no means uniquely so, and (except of course in cloudy weather) does not disappear from sight when it is above the horizon.

This latter proposal may well seem to have something substantial in it. But, without offering any opinion on the possibility of a connexion between the names Tishya and Tishtrya, I will only say that I cannot accept the identity of the two objects if Tishtrya is Sirius. Apart from the point that Sirius has its own well-established name, Lubdhaka, 'the hunter', at any rate for the astronomical period, the name Tishya is too thoroughly well connected from a very early time —apparently at

¹ Suggested, I imagine, by the well-known *sahasrāṅṣu*, 'thousand-rayed', as an epithet of the sun, along-side of the word *sahasra*, '(wealth) a thousandfold'.

least the eighth century B.C.— with the *nakshatra* which is otherwise known as Pushya, for me to be able to take it as denoting anything but the *nakshatra* even in the R̥g-Vēda, ̥. ̥4. 13. For it to have this meaning here, we need not think that the Vedic Hindūs already had the full list and system of the *nakshatras* when the verse was composed, or credit them with any scientific astronomy. But their writings seem to show plainly that they watched the skies more or less closely: and individual stars and groups of stars, with their surroundings, must have become objects of attention long before the time when they were selected to mark the monthly course of the moon. The *nakshatra* Tishya distinctly either consists of or includes the star-cluster Praesepe, or else consists of three stars which make an area which embraces that object. Praesepe is liable to disappearances which were a subject of attention by the Greeks and Romans from at least the fourth century B.C. There could, surely, be nothing unnatural in even a Vedic poet likening wealth to anything evanescent, transitory, or fugitive, —(did not Solomon say that “riches certainly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle toward heaven”?),— and expressing a hope that the wealth to be given to him might not behave in the same fashion. And in view of its nature, which makes it become lost to sight not only when the sky is cloudy but even when the atmosphere is not quite clear, Praesepe may be fairly characterized, I think, not simply as liable to occasional disappearances, but as the “notoriously unstable” thing which, Mr. Keith says, is needed to justify the contrast. instead of a comparison, which I propose in the interpretation of the verse.

J. F. FLEET.

RATANAPUNNA : YADANABON : MANDALAY

Mention has been made on p. 793 above of the Pāli Ratanapunnā, = Sanskrit Ratnapūrṇa, 'full of jewels or precious things', which becomes in Burmese Yadanabon, as the literary and official name of Mandalay, which city was founded by King Mindōn Min, who moved the seat of government to it from Amarapura, immediately on the south.

Sir Alfred Irwin tells me that this name of the city is notified in inscriptions in raised letters on wooden signboards affixed to the twelve gates of the city. The notices are identical, except for the names of the gates: and he has given me the text, transcription, and translation of the notice at the east gate, as follows:—

Text

- 1 ထက္ကရပ် ၁၂၂၁ ခု ကဆုန်
- 2 လ ပြည့် ကျော် ၆ ရက် နေ့
- 3 ညသို့ ၃ ချက် တိ ကျော် ၇ ရက်
- 4 တနင်းလ နေ့ အဝင် ၄ နာရီ
- 5 ၂ ဝါဒိ အချိန် တည် ရတနာပုံ
- 6 ရွှေ မြို့ တော် ကြီး ဦး ထိပ် တံခါး

Transcription

- 1 Thaggayit 1221 ku Kason
- 2 labyigyaw 6 yet ne
- 3 nyin 3 gyet ti gyaw 7 yet
- 4 Taninla ne awin 4 nayi
- 5 2 pad achein ti Yadanabon
- 6 Shwe Myo Daw Gyi U Teik Taga

Translation

The Head Top Gate of the Great Golden Royal City, the Heap of Precious Things, founded after three beats

[3.0 a.m.] on the night of the 6th, at 4 *nayī*, 2 *pad* [1 hr. 48 min.] of the entry of Monday the 7th, day of the waning moon of Kason in the year 1221.

The details of the date given in this notice answer to Monday, 23 May, A.D. 1859. On the other hand, the Sāsanavaṁsa says (p. 151 f.) :—“ And then our virtuous king, when the Sakkarāj (*year*) 1219 had arrived [in A.D. 1857], founded in the neighbourhood of the hill named Mantala the royal place named Ratanāpuṇṇa, just as Mandhātar founded Rājagaha and Sudassana founded Kusāvati.” Putting the two statements together, we may infer (I suppose) that the general plan of the city was laid out and operations were begun in 1857, and the founding of it was completed in 1859 by the installation of the gates at about dawn on 23 May.

The “hill named Mantala” seems to be “Mandalay hill”, an isolated hill, within the cantonments, which rises to a height of 954 feet from the level plain on which the city stands.

Whether the name Ratanāpuṇṇa, Yadanabon, was given to the city as only a literary and official name from the first, or whether the intention was that the city should actually bear that name, and, if so, in what circumstances the name Mandalay came to be substituted, is not apparent. However, the interesting point is that the name was given, and that we have in this fact a survival, to even modern times, of a fancy which led the Burmese of bygone days to attach Pāli appellations to their principal cities and territorial divisions, and in various cases to select names which were already established and had become famous in India. As a result we have in Burma and its neighbourhood literary names of places and districts such as Ayuddhaya, Ayuttaya, or Yôdayà (= Ayôdhyā), Dvārāvati, Kōsambī, Mahāratt̥ha, Mahimsakamaṇḍala (= Mahisha-maṇḍala), Sunāparanta, Suvanṇabhūmi, Vanavāsī, and

Yōnakaratṭha : for details and other instances see Mr. Taw Sein Ko's translation of the Po-u-daung inscription, in *Ind. Ant.*, 22. 4; a note by Sir Richard Temple, *ibid.*, p. 28, where, in addition to mentioning Ratanapuṅṇa, Yadanabon, he has given Ratanapura and Ratanasiṅgha as analogous names of Āva and Shwêbô; Mrs. Bode's introduction to her edition of the Sāsanaśāstra; and a note by Dr. Burgess on "Fabricated Geography" in *Ind. Ant.*, 1901. 387.

J. F. FLEET.

SAUNDARANANDA KĀVYA, VIII, 35

In this recently discovered work of Aśvaghōṣa—see the excellent edition contributed by the discoverer, Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstri, to *Bibliotheca Indica* (No. 1251, 1910)—the verse viii, 35 reads as follows:—

वचनेन हरन्ति वर्ण [sic for र्णि ?] ना
निश्चितेन प्रह[र]न्ति चेतसा ।
मधु तिष्ठति वाचि योषितां
हृदये हालहलं महद्विषम ॥

The last two lines are known as part of a verse of Bhartṛhari (i, 82), which in the *Subhāṣitāvalī* (3380) is attributed to Kālidāsa and Māgha jointly.

मधु तिष्ठति वाचि योषितां
हृदि हालाहलमेव केवलम् ।
अत एव निपीयते ऽधरो
हृदयं मुष्टिभिरेव ताड्यते ॥

Peterson in his note to the verse remarks that the verse recurs in the *Pañcatantra*, *Textus Ornatiore* (ed. Hertel, *Harvard Oriental Series*, i, 145), and also with the beginning अमृतं वदनेषु योषितां, in the *Kuvalayānanda* (ref. not given). Aufrecht's indexes refer to *Subhāṣitāmuktāvalī*, xvi, 2, where the reading is nearly as in

the *Kuvalayānanda*; and Böhtlingk cites (*Indische Sprüche*², ad 4677) further *Subhāṣitārṇava*, 170, and a verse **सुमुखेन वदन्ति वल्लुना** (*Ind. Spr.*² 7124 = *Puñca-tantra*, ed. Kosegarten, i, 202-3), in which the two lines **सधु . . .** are also contained. I need not dwell upon any minute variations of lection.

The composite character of the verse will be felt by the reader, when his attention is called to it: and, in fact, the **अत एव** "it is for this reason that" confesses that the two preceding lines are a quotation.

The ascription to a joint authorship is to be credited, therefore, to the *Subhāṣitāvalī* as a true tradition. But, as the first half-verse is plainly original in the passage of the *Saundarananda*, we must substitute for Kālidāsa the name of Aśvagoṣa and perhaps replace Māgha by *kaścit*.

F. W. THOMAS.

DRAVIDA PRANAYAMA

How it came to mean "a circuitous or devious mode of speaking or acting" (*JRAS.*, 1911, p. 513).

I have seen many a Brahmin of the Tamil country perform his morning and evening ablutions and say his prayers. Before applying his right-hand fingers straight and direct to the nose to commence the act of *prāṇāyāma*, he moves them round his head (producing a sort of clapping sound with the middle finger and the thumb) and brings them back to their normal position, apparently an unnecessary preliminary to the act of *prāṇāyāma*, which is, hence, humorously described as *śiro-veṣṭana-prāṇāyāma*; and I have also heard many a Nambūtiri Brahmin of Malabar frequently use the expression in his witty references to the customs, manners, and ceremonies of the foreign Brahmins or the Brahmins of the other side of the Western Ghats. These two classes of Brahmins

regard each other as though they were sprung from different stocks, and the divergences in their customs, manners, and ceremonies are many ;¹ and even the knots of their sacred strings are differently made.

K. R. V. R.

MALABAR.

June 1, 1911

SCRAPS FROM THE SHADDARSANA

It seems almost presumptuous to ask that another instalment of what some may regard as *airy nothings* may find a local habitation in a Journal renowned in the *haft iqlīm* as a repository of *solid* learning : and yet, on the other hand, may not the vivid contrast tend to enhance the lustre of the latter? This aspect of the case deserves consideration, and may help to reconcile our learned readers to the presence of what might otherwise arouse resentment. That deeply interesting material abounds in the old writings from which these scraps have been collected is undeniable ; but the trouble is that the quarrying of it is in the hands of an enfeebled septuagenarian !

Almost the whole of what is presented below was gathered from the *Vedāntakalpataruparimāla* of Appaya Dikṣit, published in the Vizianagram Sanskrit Series in 1895-8.

9. The dictionaries assign three meanings to the word **पटवास**, viz., “tent,” “petticoat,” and “perfumed powder” ; but there is another of a much less prosaic character. In *Bhāmatī*, 1. 1. 4 (p. 101 of the *Bib. Ind.* ed.), the announcement to a father of the birth of a son is described as **पटवासोपायनार्पणपुरःसरम्**, an expression which the author of the *Kalpataru* explains thus : **सिन्दूररञ्जितपुत्रपादाङ्कितः पटः पटवासः स खलोपायनमुपहारो लाटानां प्रसिद्धः ॥**

¹ JRAS., July, 1910, p. 632.

This is slightly amplified in the *Parimula* (p. 142):
**लाटदेशे पटवासप्रदर्शनपुरःसरं पुत्रजननवात्तां वाचैव स्फुटं वदन्ति
 वात्ताहाराः ॥**

In this connexion, then, *paṭavāsa* is a cloth bearing the impression of a new-born son's foot, which, for this purpose, has been smeared with red lead (?), and its ceremonious presentation to the expectant father is said to have been a custom peculiar to the people of the Lāṭa country. What district bore that name it is difficult to say; but from the fact of its being mentioned in I-ting's *Record of the Buddhist Religion* together with well-known provinces of Western India, and from its inclusion in a similar list in *Bṛihatsaṅhitā*, lxix. 11, we may reasonably assign it to some part of the west coast. (See Dr. Takakusu's notes on pp. 9, 137, and 217 of his translation of the *Record*.)

Amalānanda, to whom we are indebted for the former of the two definitions, was himself a native of Nāsik in Western India; and we may perhaps claim the author of the *Vedāntasīkhāmaṇi* as a Westerner, since he, too, mentions the **पुत्रपादांकितपटप्रदर्शन** as a joy-producing ceremony. (See Bombay ed. of 1901, pp. 307-8.)

Before leaving this subject I would point out a mis-lection in the passage of the *Bhāmatī* from which I have quoted, where the author clearly intends to show that a *Dravida* witnessing the birth ceremony there described, in the house of *an Ārya whose language he did not understand*, would nevertheless appreciate its significance by beholding the beaming countenance of the father to whom the announcement was made. We should therefore certainly read **अविदितार्थजनभाषार्थो द्रविडः** "a Dravīḍa who does not understand the language of the Āryas", instead of the unmeaning **अविदितार्थजनभाषार्थो द्रविडः**, which we find in the text of the *Bib. Ind.* ed. and in that of another to which I referred.

10. Anyone who will take the trouble to look up the

river हरिद्रा in the St. Petersburg lexicon will find that it was inserted there on the authority of a statement in an essay of Colebrooke's, where he describes an inscription on copperplates found at Bednūr in the Mysore State. These purported to be the record of a grant made by the ancient northern monarch Janamejaya during an expedition to South India, where "he performed a sacrifice . . . at the confluence of the rivers Tungabhadrā and Haridrā". Inasmuch as the aforesaid king is believed to have flourished thousands of years ago, the supposed grant was naturally regarded as "unauthentic"; but the otherwise unknown Haridrā was rightly admitted to the St. Petersburg and Monier-Williams' lexicons as a genuine stream.

Proof of the existence of a river of that name is incidentally furnished by Dikṣit (a native of South India) in a passage on p. 146 of the *Parimula*, where, in order to show that a figurative expression is intelligible even if it contains terms which are unfamiliar, he declares that a man who had no knowledge of the Haridrā, yet, on hearing someone speak of a herd-station on that river, would at once perceive that that was the name of a particular stream and that the herd-station was on its bank. He puts it thus :—

न च तथापि प्राक् शक्यसंबन्धित्वेनाज्ञातस्यापूर्वत्व वाक्यार्थस्य लक्ष्यत्वं न युज्यत इति वाच्यम् । प्राग्विज्ञातहरिद्रानामकनदीविशेषेण हरिद्रायां नद्यां घोषविशेष इति श्रुते वाक्ये नदीपदसमभिव्याहारेण तदानीमिव हरिद्राशब्दस्य नदीविशेषशक्तिग्रहणेन नदीलिंगात् तत्संबन्धित्वेनानुमितस्य तीरस्य . . . लक्ष्यत्वोपपत्तेः ॥

There is no mention of the Haridrā in any English work on ancient or modern India to which I have had access, but it is probably one of the numerous rivulets which feed the Tungabhadrā, and may now be known by another name.

11. Those who are interested in the dice-play in vogue in ancient India will find a good deal of information regarding it on pp. 211-13 of the *Parimala*. The author treats of it under the heads of *laukika* and *vaidika*, each of which is fully explained.

12. Dikṣit was evidently a man of profound learning, and, like Vācaspati Miśra some centuries before him, had a thorough grasp of all the systems of philosophy, orthodox and heretical. The Mīmāṃsā would seem to have been a special favourite, and on every possible occasion he pours forth his knowledge to such an extent that one would often suppose the *Parimala* to be an exposition of the *Pārva* rather than of the *Uttara* Mīmāṃsā: Thanks to the Benares editions of Kumāriḷa, it has been possible to verify the thirty quotations from his treatises; but it is otherwise in the case of the citations from Guru (i.e. Prabhākara) and his great exponent Śālikanātha, whose writings have been very imperfectly preserved.

About five years ago, in response to an inquiry of mine regarding the identity of a निबन्धनकार, who is quoted on pp. 195, 308, and 623 of the *Śāstradīpikā*, Professor Gangānātha Jhā (our greatest authority on Mīmāṃsā) sent me the following information: "The *nibandhakāra* referred to by the oldest writers on Mīmāṃsā is perhaps the same as the *vr̥ttikāra* spoken of in the *Shavarabhāṣya*. The name of this writer is probably Bhavadāsa, who is mentioned in *Śloka-vārtika* (p. 21). As a rule, only works dealing directly with the *sūtras* in their natural order are called *nibandhas*, other kinds of treatises being called *prakaraṇas*. So this *nibandha* must be a commentary on the *sūtras*."

On p. 128 of the *Parimala* a *nibandhana* by Guru is cited, and we must therefore assume it to be his *Bṛihatī* (mentioned in par. 7 of these "Scraps"), which is an exposition of the *sūtras* "in their natural order": then on pp. 148, 149, and 573 there are references to

a निबन्धनटीका, which in the last instance is expressly assigned to Guru. It is hardly likely that Prabhākara wrote a *ṭikā* on his own *nibandhana*, and we may perhaps assume that the compound is a *karmadhāraya*, and that the *Bṛihatī* is indicated as before. On p. 148 there are two quotations from Śālikanātha's *Rijuvimalā*, and the first of these being preceded by the words उक्तं हि निबन्धनपंचिकायामृजुविमलायाम्, it looks as if this, too, may be a work dealing directly with the sūtras of Jaimini. But of that I have at present no means of judging. On the next page Dikṣit quotes a verse which I have traced to Śālikanātha's *Prakarṇapancikā*, better known as *Śālikā*; and to the same source, according to the author of the *Tattvadīpana* (a commentary on *Pancapādikāvī-rarāṇa*), we must assign the verse कृतितत्साध्यमध्यस्थः, etc., which is quoted on p. 121 of the *Parimala* and on p. 32 of the *Dīpana*. It is not traceable, however, in the Benares edition of the *Śālikā*. In like manner a verse which Dikṣit himself, on p. 187, attributes to the *Taittirīyavārtika*, is not to be found in the Ānandāśrama edition of that work, nor can I trace that on p. 331 of which he makes Manu the author. There is much more of interest in relation to books and quotations that might be drawn from the *Parimala*, but lest it should weary the reader I will mention one only. On p. 562 the first line of a verse is quoted thus: विशेयं नाभिधा गच्छेत् क्षीणबुद्धि-र्विशेषणे इति न्यायात्, and with शक्तिः for बुद्धिः it is cited in the same manner in the early part of the *Kāvyauprakāśa*. The first half of the line is found, too, in Abhinavagupta's comment on the *Dhṛanyāloka* (p. 16). Can anyone tell us who was the author of it? I have tried in vain to trace him.

13. On p. 475 Dikṣit quotes the mantra beginning with the words प्रजापतिर्वरुणायामनयत्, and it may save somebody's time if I point out that it forms the opening part

of TS. 2. 3. 12. 1. I found to my cost that Professor Bloomfield had overlooked it when compiling his Vedic Concordance.

14. In the *Kalpataru*, p. 485. l. 10, Amalānanda makes use of the word घटिकास्थान. In the *Parimāla* this is slightly modified and explained thus: घटिकास्थानानि पुण्यत्रैत्रविंशति गोदावरीतटादिषु प्रसिद्धाः ॥ There is nothing to show how this meaning was arrived at, and it is doubtless an instance of the nyāya रुढिर्योगमपहरति.

I hope that on some future occasion I may be permitted to bring forward some points of interest from the Nyāya-darśana.

G. A. JACOB.

AN AHOM (SHAN) LEGEND OF CREATION (FROM AN OLD MS.)

I saw in the Journal two years or more ago an Ahom (Shan) cosmogony text, literal translation word by word, followed by a free translation with comments; all by the hand, I think, of Dr. G. A. Grierson. I have not the back numbers of the Journal here in camp with me and cannot give the exact reference. The translator professed that he had no extensive knowledge of the Shan language, and that he leaned on a Hindu, who had been deputed by the Government to learn the Ahom dialect, for his interpretation of the text. I pay no disrespect to Mr. Grierson's great learning when I say that no accurate or satisfactory translation of a difficult MS. can be obtained in that way. He himself would be the first to admit it.

Recently, through the good offices of the Governments of Burma and Bengal, I have received copies of the Ahom MSS. with translations by Golap Chandra Barua. Among them is a translation of this cosmogony. That the latter has a good knowledge of modern Shan is seen from his

translation of more recent Shan compositions. With his translation of this cosmogony, however, I am far from satisfied. The translation is too free and abounds in paraphrases. I think I can improve upon the two translations given, but do not flatter myself that I can reach perfection. The cosmogony is old and has apparently suffered at the hands of careless transcribers. At this distance there is no means of determining the *tones*, and to know the tones is as essential in translating a Shan MS. as it is to know the letters that spell out the words. Not infrequently a word may have two or more meanings according to the tone intended. Sometimes the tone can be determined from the context, sometimes it cannot. In the latter cases no certain translation is possible. These tones can be recovered only from the now Hinduized Ahoms of Assam, if indeed they have not forgotten them themselves.

As to the date when this cosmogony was first written I cannot venture a conjecture. The literary style is that of a badly written summary which can scarcely be said to have any style at all. It is as though the writer had taken down in as few words as possible the more important points of a long foreign legend which he did not fully understand. In paucity of thought and baldness of style it is like a child's first letter—"I am well. I hope you are well. I have a cat." All this in striking contrast with the modern Shan writer's skill in spinning lines and weaving sentences. I see here an interlacing of Hindu and Shan mythology. Indra, the sovereign god of the universe, comes at once before the footlights. He has here his Hindu character—not the petulant storm-god sending storms and thunderbolts for every peccadillo, as seen in modern Shan literature. The crab-dragon-elephant world-upholder is also from the Hindu. They were made by the creative word of God. This again is a Hindu conception. Then we have another source of creation.

the celestial eggs. This is quite in harmony with Shan traditions. It is probable that this cosmogony was first written when the Hindu mythology was new to the Shans, and imperfectly understood, and when the art of writing had not attained its present perfection.

That the Ahoms (Shans) of Assam had an alphabet when they conquered that country early in the thirteenth century of our era is now known as a practical certainty. How soon thereafter this cosmogony was written, I would not pretend to say. I place it, however, at a very early period. The language used as well as the thoughts expressed indicates this. My Shan assistants, one a Hkamti Shan of Northern Burma close to the border of Assam, and the other a Burman Shan of Eastern Burma, could both read easily some of the more modern Ahom MSS. as soon as they became familiar with the form of the letters, which differ in some respect from their own. But when they came to this cosmogony they tripped over nearly every word.

It is curious that the spider-myth with the threads of his web interwoven to form the firm sky is also found among some of the American Indians of Arizona and New Mexico (U.S.A.). The American Indians may have come originally from what is now Eastern China or Korea, not so very far from the early home of the Shans. I think Mr. Grierson said in his comments on this cosmogony that it was also a Babylonian myth. Among the Buddhist Shans of Burma the legend has been forgotten, if indeed they ever heard of it at all. The local cosmological traditions are borrowed, through Buddhism, from India. And now for my tentative translation of the cosmogony itself.

Thus it was in the beginning :
under the sky (or heaven) there was no place ;
neither was there anyone to rule the world.
There was only a great body of surrounding water.

Not yet was there the sky (heaven) called the abodes above ;
neither had anyone joined the heavens overshadowing the
world.

All things were in a condition empty and chaotic ;
there was not even the beginning of night and day ;
no one gleamed to illuminate the sky,
or to give light to the world,
for day and night were void.

The winds blew and there were storms.
Into the storms the God, Sao-Ing (Indra), entered.
Then the God dwelt in the sky (or heaven) :
he dwelt in the sky by himself alone.
He had a mouth to utter sounds (speech).¹
How long ago that was is now unknown.

Afterward the God awoke (or aroused himself) ;
opening his eyes he saw the empty world of gloom.
All below the sky was in confusion ;
empty regions of the sky were round about the world.
There were no spirits, male or female, nor men.
The God said : " I dwell alone ; it is not good ;
I dwell in the sky with no one with me ;
I dwell alone with none to help me :
there is no one to speak of my glory."

Then the sovereign God (Sao-Ing), with bowed head, thought
within his heart ;
he contemplated within himself (lit. in his belly),
and said, " There shall be innumerable worlds."
From meditation he brought forth bright words,
like clusters of flowers drooping from their stem.
These brightly beaming ones came forth afar,
radiantly from his heart came forth afar as shining gods.
They waited for the word of the sovereign God to instruct
them.

¹ The translation before me says, " He had no mouth to speak. He had no head, no name, no arms, and no hands." But his name has already been given, and a few lines below " he opened his eyes ", " he thought in himself " (lit. in his belly). That Indra was a huge paunch is an indecorous and unnecessary supposition.

Asking for instruction they bowed before him every one.
 We know not (said they) when the sun shall rise (i.e. we know not anything).

At that time the sovereign God gave them their forms :
 Then one became a world-crab spread out below,
 below upon the water where he dwelt.

Unknown is the size of his mighty bulk.

One became a world-dragon coiled upon the crab.

One became a male elephant of shining tusk placed on the dragon.

One became a mighty mass of white rock in the north (Mount Meru).

Again, one became a world-crystal about the sky.

Coming forth from it nothing could be seen :
 there was darkness without even an insect.

Again, one became an immense diamond glittering :
 unknown its immeasurable size, attaining (equal to) the world,
 exceeding anything in the world in size.

At that place (the top of the diamond)
 the sovereign God dwelt alone.

Again, one became a great male golden spider.

Letting fall his excrement it became
 the dust of the earth before the sky.

Going back and forth his web-form became the firmament,
 and the highest part his throne.

The web of the golden spider interwoven became the sky,
 thick and strong as the dwelling-place of men.

There there were to be innumerable countries
 and rulers (abodes of spirit-kings).

In all the vault of heaven no one ruled,
 it was without a king,

like a dense wilderness silent of men (desolate).

There were only mountains of vapour and ice everywhere.

Thereafter the God said, " I know there are eggs ;

I know not what spirit or brahman caused them to be."

They are suspended from the sky like honeycomb.

Then the world was desolate, with no ruler in the expanse,
 the sky suspended like a swarm of bees.

The web of the golden spider interwoven
 became the sky round about the earth.
 In this sky were the golden yolks (eggs),
 and the yolks (eggs) spread out (extended) afar,
 afar they appeared in brightness, suspended like bees
 living under eaves protected from the wind.
 They made a rumbling sound,
 they buzzed like a swarm of bees.
 Then the God caused the golden eggs to have young (be
 fertile).
 There would come from the eggs world-rulers called kings,
 who would shelter (protect) as rulers the peoples of the world.
 The God saw the mass of white rock in the north,
 ascending taperingly toward the sky.
 He put the eggs at the brow of the mountain above the sky,
 and sent Hsai-hpa (the god of light or heat) to cover them.
 He hovered over them years and months without ceasing,
 warming them for ages, but they rumbled on
 like the trumpeting of elephants.
 They rumbled day and night incessantly,
 with noise enough to make mountains fall into valleys from
 fright.
 Because *nam pu lawk*,¹ life's elixir, had not been
 sprinkled on the eggs, they were firm.
 Therefore the eggs never hatched to become men (rational
 beings).
 Hsai-hpa with his heat could not hatch the eggs.
 He left them and came to a distant world,
 a world of ice like ponds frozen solid.
 The ice chilled and killed the golden spider.
 He (his blood) became *nam pu lawk*, life's elixir,
 and his body (himself) became one of royal race (of gods),
 dwelling in the brahman heavens.

¹ In both of the translations referred to these words were translated "ambrosia", which is quite good, but I prefer "elixir", as coming perhaps a little nearer the meaning here: *nam*, "water"; *pu*, "grandfather" or "old age"; *lawk*, "to shed as a skin"; a serpent, for instance, is supposed by the Shans to renew its life when it sheds its skin. Hence, the meaning is clear: "the life-renewing liquid."

He came bringing *nam pu lawk* during three full years and a period (or four years).

He came down to administer *nam pu lawk* to the golden eggs, that they might hatch and become kings to rule over all worlds.

The celestial eggs hatched every one, and the brood of kings dwelt in harmony like flakes of snow, taking their refuge in a cave (of Mount Meru). Afterward the gases rising from the eggs became wind, blowing through the sky at will.

The hot exhalations shattered and became fire, which was blown away and fell from the sky.

The eggs hatched and became kings, great rulers were they in the celestial cave.

The vapour of the eggs became a cloud who came into the sky as a lord of wind (a sky-god).

The blood of the eggs became water in the height above the sky, it became water darkening the sky.

The gods were radiant as shining gold, brightly shining in the sky :

they of the golden eggs beamed radiantly in the north.

Through the whole sky they shone brightly.

The God, Sao-Ing, sent them forth,

they of the celestial eggs came forth in splendour.

This, because *nam pu lawk* had been administered to the eggs from whom came the jewels incomparable (the gods).

The winds no one yet controlled :

backward and forward they blew beneath the sky.

Of all the water no one had yet made rivers ;

it was a vast revolving depth above the sky.

All the drift of cloud and vapour no one yet controlled.

They floated about in the midst of heaven.

The shells of the eggs broke and became birds.

They flocked together according to their kinds.

In that former time no one had given them names or dominion ; they dwelt within a cave (of the mountain).

Thereafter the God came down and gave them their names and reign.

Speaking to all who came from the golden eggs, he said :
 " I name one of you the lord of all space ;
 the queen of the air shall be thy mate.
 I give you life's elixir to lengthen your life.
 I give you great riches that you may not want.
 Long ago I sent the golden spider
 whose web overcast became the sky.
 Below in the seven worlds (of men and spirits)
 thou shalt have thy sway.
 There the winds for ever blow.
 The glorious moon and sun I give to thee
 to shed their light in every place.
 I give innumerable shining ones, the moon and stars.
 All together I give to thee. Swiftly and ceaselessly shalt thou
 pass through the world.
 Thou shalt come to the realms below the brahman heavens.
 Coming free in the sky overcast thou shalt choose thy
 dominion.
 I shall establish kings to rule in all the world.
 I shall cause the race of men (to be created) everywhere to pay
 thee tribute.
 Go thou to every country to receive their homage.
 I send thee to hold sovereign sway in every place.
 Thou shalt be lord and all peoples shall be thy servants.
 In every country are great riches that they may not want."

To one (he said), " I name thee lord of the golden rocks ;
 thou shalt reign in splendour with the queen of gems for
 thy wife.
 You came from the very heart of the golden eggs.
 Go thou to rule the desolate water-world.
 As a hidden king choose a good country for they reign,
 I give thee the waters of the north ;
 over the rivers shalt thou have dominion.
 All things below the water shall minister to thee.
 Thou thy dark world shalt rule,
 and innumerable peoples shall pay thee tribute."

To one (he said), " I name thee, golden yolk-egg celestial, the
 lord of life's origin, and appoint thee to rule in splendour ;

the queen of *nam pu lawk*, of life's continuance, shall be thy mate.

Thou shalt rule over the spirit-world,
 over the spirit-world shalt thou have dominion,
 I give thee great riches, the clear sky and the wind,
 the lightning and the golden thunderbolts,
 the rain and the clouds—over them thou shalt rule.
 I will go before thee to create man.

Thou shalt be lord of all beneath the sun.
 I give thee all countries of spirits and of Shans (men).
 They shall deliver all to thee to rule for ever.
 You all, when the golden eggs hatched, became kings and queens.

I want you as rulers to mutually assist one another.

“One of you I name elder brother moon-god, reigning in splendour.”¹

I give thee for thy wife the queen of the clouds.
 Thou the glorious moon and stars shalt rule.
 Thine is a kingdom of great glory.

I give thee the whole realm of the sun
 and *nam pu lawk*, the life-renewing elixir,
 to lengthen life for thousands of years.

With long ears hearken and know my words—
 I give a drum whose beats shall resound afar.
 One end is of silver and one of gold.

I give a flying horse saddled and bridled.
 Thou shalt circle the world in radiant flight,
 daily coming and going in splendour.

Every fifteenth day thou shalt cast off thy shield, be full.
 Then wilt thou decrease in size
 and after thirty days begin a new lunation.

Changing from the darkened moon thou shalt increase again.
 Let all the heavenly ones revolve without collision.

Daily will your positions be changed.

¹ I have written these names as descriptive phrases rather than as proper names with capital letters and literal translations as: Ai-Lang-Don-Hseng-Hong-Saw-Hpa-Lai-Nang, “Elder-Brother-House-Moon-Gem-Illustrious-Spoon-Celestial-Reigning,” which is too Oriental, and in English may mean much or nothing and is ugly to boot.

The younger I name the lord of glory (the sun).
 To thee I give the queen of mist.
 Thou shalt enter the overcast and rumbling sky.
 I give thee the precious *nam pu lawk*, life's renewer,
 to lengthen life for thousands of years.
 To thee also I give a flying horse saddled and bridled.
 Thou shalt ride forth in splendour with thy glittering shield.
 Thou shalt go down at evening-time, and riding through the
 firmament quickly encompass the great mountain and
 rise again.

Rising early thou shalt send thy light to all.
 Every year shall thy course be changed ;
 six months southward, six northward, thy course shall be.
 Neither of you (moon and sun) shall dash against the other."

To one (he said), " I name thee the lord of the sky-circle ;
 and the queen of light shall be thy wife.
 Thou shalt rule the wind blowing
 back and forth beneath the sky.
 I give thee the three royal drums of the resounding wind.
 Thou shalt dwell at the sky's horizon in the north.
 If the wind is silent beat the drums,
 then will the wind blow swiftly.
 I will cause the god of snow and vapour to be under him.
 The wind shall resound everywhere
 to give comfort to all living things.
 If there is no wind to give them strength they suffer,
 they repine in weakness, and hold no converse together.
 Thou shalt give the air to be within their hearts
 that they may breathe and live.
 Through the air men shall understand one another's words.
 With thy elixir thou shalt make the trees ever green.
 Thus shall all beings on the earth be blessed."

To one (he said), " I name thee the lord of dreams,
 with the queen of echoes for thy mate.
 You both clad in royal robes must not be indolent.
 The dream-spirits of men innumerable I give to thee.
 Thou shalt dwell in the western sky (as the god of night) ;
 over against thee there will be men everywhere."

To one (he said), "Thou the youngest shall reign in the world
of men.

I make thee king of a hundred umbrellas

(a great and glorious king) of wide rule.

Now having created you all I will return

to the highest part of heaven to live there for ever.

I will look down upon your abode (the earth) ;

there rule and trouble me not.

At the beginning of the year you must sacrifice an elephant
and offer bulls and buffaloes to the gods.

And now farewell."

The great God returned to heaven,

and the kingly race of men

with upturned faces saw him depart.

Disliking to obey they transgressed his words,

for the God had departed from them.

Thereafter for all coming time they dwelt firmly

(the present order became firmly established).

W. W. COCHRANE.

THE DATE OF BUDDHADASA OF CEYLON FROM A CHINESE SOURCE

The Chinese pilgrim Fa-Hian after leaving Chang'an took five years to arrive at Mid-India. He resided there for six years, and it was three years more before he arrived at Tsing-chow (Beal, *Buddhist Records*, vol. i, p. lxxxiii). Of these last three years he spent two years in Ceylon (loc. cit., p. lxxix), and about 337 days on his adventurous voyage home from that island to Tsing-chow (loc. cit., pp. lxxx seqq.). His arrival in Ceylon may therefore be placed shortly after 411 A.D., since he left Chang'an in 399 A.D. (loc. cit., p. xii).

Unfortunately he does not tell us the name of the reigning king of Ceylon, but we may be able to identify him satisfactorily from Fa-Hian's description of a few notable events which took place during his stay

there. He tells us that the "tooth-relic" was always brought out in the middle of the third month, and after being carried in procession to the Abhaya-vihāra it was there exhibited to the people for ninety days, after which time it was replaced in its receptacle in the city (loc. cit., pp. lxxv-vi).

This is the first point of importance. Fa-Hian was in the island after the tooth-relic had been brought over from India, in the ninth year of King Sri Maghavarna according to the Mahāvamsa (Wijesingha, *Mahāvamsa*, p. 154). The pilgrim goes on to tell us that "Forty *li* to the east of the Abhaya-vihāra is a mountain, on which is built a chapel called Po-ti (Bōdhi); there are about two thousand priests in it. Amongst them is a very distinguished Shaman called Ta-mo-kiu-ti. The people of this country greatly respect and reverence him. He resides in a cell, where he has lived for about forty years. By the constant practice of benevolence he has been able to tame the serpents and mice, so that they stop together in one cell, and do not hurt one another" (Beal, loc. cit., p. lxxvi).

This is the second fact, and is of greater importance than the former, since we read in the Mahāvamsa—"In the reign of this rājā [i.e. Buddhādāsa] a certain priest, by name Mahā Dhammakathī, translated the Suttas (of the Piṭakattaya) into the Sinhala language" (Wijesingha, loc. cit., p. 158, with his correction of note 7). It is very probable that Ta-mo-kiu-ti is to be identified with Dhammakathī. This identification has already been noticed by Mr. Wickremasinghe (*Ep. Zeyl.*, vol. i, pt. iii, p. 83), but he has made no use of it in his note on the Sinhalese chronology (*Ep. Zeyl.*).

Lastly, Fa-Hian, talking about the Mahāvihāra, says that whilst he was in Ceylon ("at this time") the king "desired to build a new vihāra for this congregation of priests", and he describes the ploughing of the

boundaries and the presentation of the land to the monks (Beal, loc. cit., p. lxxvii). The *Mahāvamsa* (p. 158) says that Buddhadāsa "built at the Mahāvihāra the parivēṇa called Mōra", and provided for it in every way. We thus see that Fa-Hian's visit to Ceylon is probably to be placed in the reign of Buddhadāsa: that is, of course, if we find that the dates of that monarch's reign include the years 411-13 A.D. Dr. Fleet has shown (JRAS., 1909, p. 351) that the accession of Buddhadāsa is placed by the author of the *Mahāvamsa* at 870 years 3 months 10 days after the Nirvāna of Buddha.

If we take the date 544 B.C. as the initial point for this part of the *Mahāvamsa*, we get the date 328-57 A.D. for his reign of twenty-nine years. This does not agree with Fa-Hian's date at all.

On the other hand, if we accept Dr. Fleet's theory (loc. cit. supra, pp. 323 seqq.) that 483 B.C. is the initial date, we get 389-418 A.D., which suits the date of the pilgrim. I therefore think that we may assume on good grounds that the Chinese pilgrim Fa-Hian visited Ceylon during the last years of King Buddhadāsa, for whom we may accept the date of 389-418 A.D. until we have definite proof to the contrary. More important still is the additional evidence which we thus obtain that, for the earlier part of the *Mahāvamsa*, the date of 483 B.C. is to be regarded as the date of Buddha's Nirvāna.

EDWARD R. AYRTON.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

DIALOGUES OF THE BUDDHA. Translated from the Pali of the *Dīgha Nikāya* by T. W. and C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS. Part II. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, translated by various Oriental Scholars and edited by T. W. Rhys Davids. Published under the patronage of His Majesty the King of Siam. Vol. III.) pp. viii and 382. London: Henry Frowde, 1910.

Under the editorship of the late Professor Max Müller and the patronage of that enlightened Buddhist king, the King of Siam, the first volume of the Sacred Books of the Buddhists—a highly welcome sequel to the great series of the Sacred Books of the East—was published in 1895. A second volume, containing the first part of the *Dialogues of the Buddha*, translated by Professor T. W. Rhys Davids, followed in 1899. As no more was heard since of this series of translations, which had promised to become so useful a help to the study of Buddhism, we had given up all hope of its ever being continued. Thus it is that the second part of the *Dialogues of the Buddha*, now lying before us, comes as a most pleasant surprise, and Professor and Mrs. Rhys Davids are to be heartily congratulated on the completion of this second instalment of the translation of the *Dīgha Nikāya*. Nothing indeed seems to me, at the present stage of Buddhist researches, more needful than good scholarly translations of the principal texts of Buddhism. And certainly nobody could be more competent to give us exactly such translations as are needed than the two scholars to whom we owe already so much of our knowledge of Buddhist texts, and who combine true scholarship with an enthusiastic love of their subject.

The *Dialogues of the Buddha*, translated in this volume,

are among the most interesting and valuable of the whole collection of the *Dīgha*. The volume begins with No. xiv, the *Mahāpadāna-Suttanta*, which is translated "The Sublime Story", but which I should prefer to translate "The Great Discourse on the Wonderful Feats (of the Buddha)". This Sutta is of great historical importance, for it proves that the whole Buddha myth was already fully developed at the time of the composition of this Sutta and of the compilation of the *Dīgha Nikāya*. Here we find the dogma of the six Buddhas, forerunners of Gotama Sakyamuni, who lived in different ages, who had all the same miraculous birth, showed the thirty-two signs of a great man, and were owners of the Seven Treasures. The thirty-two signs are enumerated in full detail. Every one of these Buddhas has three palaces, every one has three visions of Old Age, Disease, and Death, and a fourth vision of a Holy Life, every one conceives the *Nidānas*, enters the homeless state, thinks of keeping the True Religion¹ to himself, but is persuaded by god Brahman to preach this Religion to all that have ears to hear, turns the Wheel of the Law, visits the Heavens of the gods—in short, the Buddha legend with nearly all its details was not only known to the author of the *Suttanta*, but even transferred to every one of the six predecessors of Gotama as a *dhammatā* or "natural thing" in the life of every Buddha. I believe with the translators that all these theories are considerably later than the Arahāt ideal. But if so, shall we not have to revise our hypotheses about the date of the *Nikāyas*? According to the translators "we find in this tract the root of that Biraṇa-weed which, growing up along with the rest of Buddhism, went on spreading so luxuriantly that it gradually covered up much that was of value in the earlier teaching, and finally led to the downfall, in its home in India, of the ancient

¹ I do not think that we can find a better translation for *Dhamma* than "Religion" or "True Religion".

faith". But is it really only "the root of that Bīraṇa-weed" and not rather the "Bīraṇa-weed" itself that is to be found in the Mahāpadāna-Suttanta?

While this Sutta is more important for the history of Buddhist literature, the next one, No. xv, the Mahā-Nidāna-Suttanta, or "Great Discourse of Causation", is a discussion on one of the most important points in Buddhist teaching, the doctrine of Paṭiccasamuppāda, in which the translators see one of the greatest steps in the progress of philosophic thought. This is very different from Professor Deussen's¹ view, who sees in it only a late and insignificant dogma of the school. But however high or however low we may estimate this theory of Nidānas, certain it is that in view of the prominent place the doctrine is given in all the books, it must belong to early Buddhism, and it seems to be—whatever its merits may be—the philosophy of early Buddhism.

But by far the most important of all the Suttantas in this volume, and, indeed, in the whole Nikāya literature, is the Mahā-Parinibbāna-Suttanta, "The Book of the Great Decease," as Professor Rhys Davids translates, or "The Great Discourse on the (Buddha's) Passing Away", as I would rather translate. This Sutta has already been translated by Professor Rhys Davids in vol. xi of the Sacred Books of the East (1881). But it is needless to say that a new and revised edition of the translation of such an important text is by no means superfluous. The Introduction and notes contain also many new contributions to the study of this most valuable text, in whose history so many points remain still to be cleared up. In fact, if we could write the history of this one Sutta it would be the history not only of the Dīgha Nikāya, but probably of the whole Tipiṭaka. As the very suggestive list on p. 72 shows, there are no less than thirty-one different passages of the Sutta, making up nearly the

¹ *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, i, 3, p. 163 f., 1908.

whole of the text, which recur in other books of the canon. If we could find out the exact mutual relation of these texts, we should gain a very good insight into the compilation or composition of the books from which they are taken. Certain it is that the different pieces of the mosaic forming the Suttanta belong to different ages and stages in the development of Buddhism. Putting aside all those parts which do not refer to the Parinibbāna itself, it is, I believe, not difficult to distinguish at least five strata of literary development in those paragraphs only which refer to the legends of the Buddha's last illness, his decision of passing away at the end of three months, and his death.

In ii, 21-6 (the paragraphs are those of the new translation in the present volume) the story of the Buddha's first illness that befell him in Beḷuva is told. Here the Buddha addresses to Ānanda those beautiful and remarkable words in which he says that "the Tathāgata has no such thing as the closed fist of a teacher, who keeps something back", and that "the Tathāgata thinks not that it is he who should lead the brotherhood or that the Order is dependent upon him", and that he did not think it necessary to leave any instructions concerning the Order, but that his followers should be "lamps unto themselves". In this wonderful dialogue the Buddha speaks to Ānanda entirely like a human teacher to his pupil, without the least trace of a half-god or of a Rsi about him.

This is quite in keeping with v, 13-14, where we read how Ānanda stood leaning against the lintel of the door and weeping at the thought of his master passing away, whereupon he is called in by the Buddha, who kindly addresses to him the words: "Enough, Ānanda, do not let yourself be troubled: do not weep! Have I not already, on former occasions, told you that it is in the very nature of all things most near and dear unto us that we must divide ourselves from them, leave them, sever ourselves

from them ?" etc. Spirit and tone in the two passages are the same. But it seems to me impossible that the same author who wrote these two passages in which there is so much warmth and feeling, and in which the Buddha is so entirely human, with nothing of the superhuman, whether half-god or thaumaturg, about him—that the same author should have written the paragraphs iii, 7–12 and 34–41, in which the Buddha, after having fixed the time of his death at the end of three months, boasts of his Iddhi powers that enable him to remain in the same birth for an æon, and upbraids Ānanda—more after the fashion of an angry Ṛṣi of old than as it behoves a Buddha—for not having taken the hint thrown out by him, and asked the Master to remain in this life for an æon. This tradition is probably not much older than that of the Council of Rājagaha in the Cullavagga, where Ānanda is reproached by the Sangha for not having asked the Master to remain in this life to the end of the Kalpa. A much older tradition is that recorded in iii, 48–51, that the Buddha, like a yogin (see for instance Bhīṣma in the Śāntiparvan), was able to fix the time of his death, but where nothing is said about his being able to live for a Kalpa. A mere expansion, in fact only a silly multiplication, of the feat related in iii, 41, are the paragraphs iii, 42–7, where Buddha tells Ānanda that he has thrown out the suggestion of his being able to remain in this life for an æon on no less than fourteen former occasions (nine times at Rājagaha and five times at Vesāli). Finally, the paragraphs iii, 13–33, where the eight causes of an earthquake, the eight kinds of assemblies, the eight positions of mastery, and the eight stages of deliverance are enumerated, are clearly interpolated from the Aṅguttara Nikāya.¹ The interpolation in this case is all the more

¹ For the two last Suttantas of the Dīgha Nikāya, which are entirely in the style of the Aṅguttara Nikāya, see Mrs. Rhys Davids, above, pp. 556–60.

evident, as the beginning of iii, 34 joins perfectly well with the end of iii, 12.

Moreover, there can have been no fixed canon of sacred books in existence when the dialogue of ii, 21-6 was written, in which Ānanda says that he had taken comfort from the thought that the Master would not pass away until at least he had left instructions as touching the Order, and in which the Bhikkhus are told to be "lamps unto themselves" and to rely upon no other refuge but the Dhamma. On the other hand, the sermon on the "Four Great Authorities" (iv, 7-11) presupposes a canon of Suttas and Vinaya texts, and such expressions as *bahussutā*, *vinayadharā*, and *mātikādharā*, which can only mean "learned in the Suttantas, versed in the Vinaya texts and in the Summaries" (whether the latter be the sources of the Abhidhamma texts or already actual Abhidhamma texts), presuppose even a threefold canon, a kind of Tipiṭaka.¹ And the passage vi, 3 ("when I am gone, Ānanda, let the Order, if it should so wish, abolish all the lesser and minor precepts") can only have been put into the mouth of the Master by adherents of a sect who actually wished to abolish some of the minor rules of the Order.

Again, the passage ii, 21-6 certainly excludes any kind of Buddha-worship. A teacher who is made to say that he does not even want to be a leader of the brotherhood can hardly have yet become an object of worship. On the other hand, in the "Mirror of Truth" (*dharmmādāsa*), taught in ii, 8-9, we find the beginnings of a Buddhist worship, a kind of litany which is still recited at the Pātimokkha.² And the well-known final passages of the Mahā-Parinibbāna-Sutta refer to the worship of Buddha relics and the erection of stūpas. Thus the Mahā-

¹ See Copleston, *Buddhism*, p. 45 f.

² See Herbert Baynes in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlands*, x, 242 ff., 1896.

Parinibbāna-Sutta is very probably a late and enlarged version of a very old and much shorter Parinibbāna-Sutta. But all this is typical for the composition or compilation of the whole Dīgha Nikāya, and even of the whole Tipiṭaka. In the whole collection and in every one collection (for all books of the canon are collections) we shall have to distinguish several strata of Buddhist thought and literary activity, separated from each other probably by centuries. Only a very small portion of the Mahā-Parinibbāna-Suttanta can belong to the earliest stratum of Buddhist literature, and its final redaction must have taken place at a comparatively late date, as late as any of the latest parts of the Pali canon.

Nor can any of the other Suttantas in this volume be referred to the earliest literature of Buddhism. Both No. xvii and No. xviii, the Mahāsudassana-Suttanta and the Jana-Vasabha-Suttanta, are (as the translators have already pointed out) mere expansions of passages in the Mahā-Parinibbāna-Suttanta. No. xvii is a regular Jātaka. The Jātaka No. 95 in our Jātaka Commentary is only a short summary of the Suttanta or, as there are some textual differences, of a slightly different version of the Suttanta. No. xix, the Mahāgovinda-Suttanta, is also a Jātaka. All these Suttas, as well as the two following ones, No. xx (Mahāsamaya-Suttanta) and No. xxi (Sakkapaṇha-Suttanta), are mythological. They lead us into the worlds of the gods, and are meant to show that the very gods owe all their heavenly bliss only to their having been good Buddhists in some former life, and that even the highest gods know how to appreciate the religion of Buddha. The most interesting of these Suttantas is No. xxi, "The Questions of Sakka." It must have been as edifying to the Buddhists of old as it is curious to us moderns to read how Sakka, the king of the gods, hardly ventures to approach the great Buddha, wherefore he first sends the

heavenly musician Pañcasikha to soften the heart of the Exalted One (which the said musician, strangely enough, does by a love-song) : to see how Sakka, after being introduced by Pañcasikha, is received by the Buddha in a very kind but condescending manner : how Sakka learns that it is only through the religion of the Buddha that the highest states may be attained : how the god's questions are answered by the Master, and the king of the gods, having acquired all the happiness of a pupil of the Buddha, finally, in an outbreak of highest enthusiasm, pays homage to the Supreme Teacher. The translators, comparing the Buddhist Sakka with the Vedic Indra, conclude that "it is evident that Sakka and Indra are quite different conceptions". No doubt they are if we think of the Indra of the Vedic hymns. But the Buddhists were probably not the first to degrade the king of the gods. Indra is a menial of Śiva in the Śaiva legends, and of Viṣṇu in the Vaiṣṇava legends. Compare the Pañcendropākhyāna in the First Book of the *Mahābhārata*, where Indra is treated with irony approaching to contempt by god Śiva and punished for his want of respect towards the latter. But even in older Brahmanic myths and legends, e.g. the Nahusa myth (*Mahābhārata*, v, 11-17), Indra has to flee from Vṛtra, whereupon Nahusa takes possession of his throne, which Indra indeed afterwards regains, but not without the help of Viṣṇu, and only because Nahusa has offended the great Rṣi Agastya. In another Brahmanic legend, when Indra raises his arm to fling his thunderbolt against the Rṣi Cyavana, the god's arm is paralysed by the latter, and he is frightened to death by the monster Mada (Intoxication) created by the same Rṣi. And in more than one Epic and Pauranic myth Indra is humbled by one or other of the great Rṣis. In the Kṛṣṇa legend, too, it is Indra who gets the worst of it when he sends down a storm to punish Kṛṣṇa, and this hero holds up the mountain Govardhana like an umbrella

to protect himself and the cowherds against Indra's showers, whereupon Indra humbly acknowledges the supremacy of Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu. And just as Sakka is made to sing the praises of the Buddha in our Suttanta, so is in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa a hymn to Śrī put into the mouth of Indra. It is, I believe, rather this Epic and Pauranic than the Vedic conception of Indra that should be compared with the Sakka of the Buddhist texts.

As literary compositions these mythological Suttantas are rather inferior. In this respect the two last Suttantas of this volume rank higher. No. xxii, the Mahā-Satipaṭṭhāna-Suttanta, is a well-finished dialogue. But it is only an expansion of the tenth Sutta of the Majjhima-Nikāya, and is therefore called the "Great Discourse on the Setting-up of Mindfulness". The last Suttanta in this volume, the Pāyāsi-Suttanta, is one of those few dialogues in the Nikāyas which are not mere discourses of the Buddha, only interrupted now and then by words of approval or by a "yes" or "no" of the interlocutor, but real dialogues that may well be compared with those of Platon. But the question is whether this dialogue is originally Buddhist. Professor Leumann¹ has fully discussed the Jaina parallel to the Pāyāsi dialogue, the legend and dialogue of Paesi, and has already pointed out how curious it is that the Buddhist Thera Kassapa should defend the soul-dogma against the unbeliever Pāyāsi. I also believe with the same scholar that in many respects the Jaina version of the story is the better of the two. Certain it is that the dialogue is not only perfectly in accordance with the Jaina teaching, but that the questions of Paesi are also logically connected with the introductory legend. For Kesi (corresponding to the Kassapa in the Buddhist Suttanta) is here said to be *ahohiya* and *annaḷvī*, that is, "near the goal" and "believing in

¹ Actes du 6ème congrès internat. des Orientalistes, tenu en 1883 à Leide, iii, 2, 467 ff.

soul (*jīva*) as different (*anya*) from body". It is a pity that the translators do not refer to the Jaina parallel at all.

Thus everything tends to show that the Dīgha Nikāya is by no means one of the earliest and most original productions of the Buddhists, but that on the other hand it is one of the most important works for the history of Buddhist literature. All students of Buddhism and Indian literature will therefore be thankful for this new contribution to our knowledge of these texts. For we have here not only translations of sometimes very difficult texts, but also introductions and notes which are full of suggestive remarks on points of Buddhist teaching and on literary questions. May we not have to wait too long for the third and final volume!

M. WINTERNITZ.

COMPENDIUM OF PHILOSOPHY, being a Translation now made for the first time from the Original Pali of the *Abhidhammattha-Sangaha*, with Introductory Essay and Notes by SHWE ZAN AUNG, B.A. Revised and edited by Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS. pp. xxvi and 298. London: published for the Pali Text Society by Henry Frowde, 1910.

This book is the result of the joint labour of a Western philosopher and Pali scholar, Mrs. Rhys Davids, and a Burmese Buddhist scholar, Shwe Zan Aung, B.A. Mr. Aung has had the advantage of studying Abhidhamma or "philosophy"¹ under the learned monks of Burma. Burma has always been a seat of Abhidhamma learning. "Bhikkhus from Ceylon come now, as in days of old, to

¹ Mrs. Rhys Davids now considers "philosophy" to be the best translation of the term *Abhidhamma*. And if, as I think, *Dhamma* is best translated by "religion", *Abhidhamma* may well be taken as equal to the "philosophy of religion".

study philosophy under the Theras of Burma, so renowned are the latter for proficiency in this subject." But Mr. Aung is also versed in Western philosophy, and, besides, his whole manuscript has passed through the hands of Mrs. Rhys Davids, who had also written a translation of her own of the *Abhidhammattha-Sangaha* and sent it to Mr. Aung, who collated it with his own translation. Thus the translation now before us is, in the best and fullest sense of the words, the result of Eastern and Western effort combined.

The work here translated is "a primer of psychology and philosophy" which, as we are informed by Mrs. Rhys Davids, has been studied in Ceylon and Burma for probably eight centuries. It is ascribed to a teacher named Anuruddha, who is said to have lived earlier than the twelfth and later than the eighth century A.D. In Burma it is "classed under a group of classical summaries, or compendia, entitled *Let-than*, or *Little-finger Manuals*, nine in number, and having, most of them, an exegetical literature belonging to each work". This compendium has been commented on more than any of the others. It treats of the same subject-matter as Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhi-magga*, but has a different object in view. The *Visuddhi-magga* is ethical in its end, while the *Abhidhammattha-Sangaha* is psychological. "The two works are thus to some extent mutually complementary, and as such still hold the field as modern text-books for students of Buddhism in Buddhist countries." The text was published in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* as early as 1884 by Professor Rhys Davids.

To the ordinary Western reader it will seem strange that these endless dry and terse categories, filling page after page, interrupted only by mnemonic summaries in which the subject-matter is still further condensed, should be termed "philosophy", and stranger still that a book consisting of hardly anything but dry lists and summaries—the

merest skeleton of a system—should rank as one of the most important treatises on philosophy in Buddhist countries. In fact, I much doubt if the book itself would convey any meaning to a Western mind had not Mr. Aung himself, in a well-written Introductory Essay (pp. 1–76), given a brief résumé of the teaching contained in the Compendium, and added numerous explanatory notes to his translation. But even so, it needs such a sympathetic student of Buddhist thought as Mrs. Rhys Davids to discern in this crudest outline of a system a psychological and ethical philosophy which after all deserves to be placed side by side with the best efforts of the great thinkers of the world.

The Editor herself anticipates “that the cursory reader, even if not unversed in our own psychological method, will not get past a feeling of repulsion and impatience”. But I am sure this feeling will give way to a feeling of respect for these earnest, if somewhat pedantic, Buddhist thinkers, when that cursory reader has read the Editor’s Preface, especially her fine remarks (pp. xvii–xxiv) on the merits of the Buddhist way of analysing mind, on the close alliance between psychology and ethics in Indian philosophy, on Buddhist “mysticism”, and on the parallelism between Herakleitean and Buddhist philosophy.

While the Editor’s Preface will probably be to most Western readers (as it was to the present writer) the most intrinsically interesting part of the book, the Appendix (pp. 220–85), which contains Mr. Aung’s extensive notes on some of the most important technical terms of Buddhist philosophy, will be found extremely useful by all students of Buddhism. More especially I would point out the very lucid and highly instructive discussions on the vexed question of the *Paṭiccasamuppāda* and on the true meaning of the term *Samkhārā*. Three useful indexes add to the usefulness of the volume, for which both the English editor and the Burmese author deserve our best thanks, and on

the publication of which the Pali Text Society is to be heartily congratulated.

M. WINTERNITZ.

THE VEDAS AND THEIR ANGAS AND UPANGAS. Vol. I. By BEHARI LAL, B.A., Shastri, M.R.A.S. Lahore, 1910.

The alternative title of Mr. Behari Lal's work, *The Thesaurus of Knowledge Divine and Temporal*, indicates not inadequately the purpose with which he has written. We are all familiar with the strange works found in old libraries which expound all science, human and divine, in the light of the Bible, and which in each generation reinterpret the holy scripture to make it conform with the ideas of the day. So Mr. Behari Lal reinterprets the *Rgveda*, and finds in it the tenets of his own creed, which seems to us to be allied to that of the Bhāgavatas: he believes in the reality of matter, of the individual soul, and of a personal divinity, and all these he finds in the *Rgveda* as properly interpreted.

Proper interpretation necessarily involves the throwing to the winds of philology and of native tradition alike, and the resort to mysticism. We must satisfy ourselves with mentioning but a few of the author's conclusions: there is no human or animal sacrifice in the Vedas; ¹ *ālabheta* means *upayun̄jīta*, i.e. using in a proper way to acquire merit, i.e. giving it away; *aradyati* denotes the marking with colour of the limbs of the animals given; *māṃsa* means bran, not flesh; the legend of Śunaḥśepa means that the individual soul supplicates the Almighty God to save him from bondage. On the other hand, ² there is held to be no trace of ancestor-worship in the Vedas, but transmigration ³ is essentially a part of the Vedic belief, as it is of Mr. Behari Lal, and its existence is proved and its ultimate acceptance by the Western world,

¹ pp. 309-402.

² pp. 253-308.

³ pp. 429-52.

as by Pythagoras, is asserted. It is right to add that the author is well acquainted with the texts with which he deals, and might have done good work had he accepted more orthodox principles of interpretation.

It is hardly necessary to say more as to the work, but as a second volume is promised, perhaps we may remind the author that Professor Max Müller was professor, not at Cambridge but at Oxford.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

HISTORY OF CASTE IN INDIA. By SHRIDHAR V.
KETKAR, Ph.D. Vol. I.

This volume is based on a thesis presented for the degree of Ph.D. at Cornell University, and is deserving of the favourable decision given by the authorities there. It is one of the most lamentable results of the present methods of University teaching in India, that students there are not incited to interest in the history of their own country. So far as the examinations deal at all with the literature or history of India they lay stress on the grammatical and literary side rather than on the critical methods of historical inquiry, just as they used to do in England half a century or more ago. They are a test of memory rather than of thought or method. It is encouraging to find a student trained in the semi-German methods of an American University producing such work as the essay under review.

This volume is the first of an intended series of volumes, each one to be devoted to some particular aspect of the question of caste. In this first volume the evidence of Manu is collected and discussed, and a somewhat discursive introduction gives us glimpses of the author's views. This method seems awkward. In discussing any historical problem so large and intricate it would be much more convenient to have begun at the beginning. The author

himself has seen this, and excuses his method by the plea that the law book of the Mānavas is authoritative on the matter of caste. But is it always so—for the periods before and after it reached its present shape, as much as for its own period? Is it not probable that, like all other ancient and sacred codes of custom, it also was the outgrowth of a school rather than the work of a single author, and contains phrases and paragraphs of very different dates? The author, indeed, admits as much quite early in the book, only to ignore it afterwards. He uses Manu as a homogeneous work, and supposes that the author of it was a Magadha Brahmin, who wrote it between 227 and 320 A.D. This date, in his opinion, is that of the earliest period at which certain tribes mentioned in Manu can have been known in the valley of the Ganges. But that would only give us, not the date at which the text as we now have it was actually constituted, but only a *terminus a quo*. The latest editor of the existing text may, for all that this argument shows, have lived a good deal later—at any time during the period in which the tribes were thus known. And though on p. 96 he uses expressions in Manu as evidence for “his time and his locality”, on p. 52 he blames authors who do not use Manu (and the epics and the dramas) as evidence of customs current many centuries before it (or the epics or the dramas) were written.

The introduction has many acute observations, but the above is not the only inconsistency. At p. 29, when comparing (most properly) European customs with Indian, the Swedes and the Germans are called civilized nations. But on p. 23 another nation, generally acknowledged to be quite their equals in civilization, are mocked at as “casteless barbarians”.

Again, on pp. 90–100, we have a well-considered and convincing argument that no one of the four *varnas* (lit. “colours”) was a caste in the technical sense of the

term. Yet on p. 5 the Brahmins are called a caste, and the many hundred castes into which they are really divided are called sub-castes. Our author attaches very great importance to the exact use of the terms involved. He discusses the exact usage of each native word (*jāti*, *varṇa*, *saṃskāra*, *dharma*, etc.). He gives a definition of the Anglo-Indian word *caste* (which, as is well known, does not correspond to any native word), and yet in the use of this term, so important in the discussion, his practice is not in agreement with his own definition.

After the introduction the author gives us in succession a summary of the views expressed by Manu on each of the most important considerations to be considered in the history of caste. So far as I know, this has not been done before, except in a fragmentary manner. It is here quite well done, and at sufficient length; and the treatment will give permanent value to the work. The writer is apparently a young Marāṭha Brahmin. It is a disadvantage that his work is mainly apologetic of the orthodox position, but it is also an advantage to us to have the Brahmin views on this important matter so ably and uncompromisingly expounded. We shall look forward to the later volumes, especially those in which the periods earlier than Manu are to be treated.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

HEBRÄISCHES UND ARAMÄISCHES WÖRTERBUCH ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT. Mit Einschaltung und Analyse aller schwer erkennbaren Formen, Deutung der Eigennamen sowie der masoretischen Randbemerkungen, und einem deutsch-hebräischen Wortregister. Von Dr. phil. und theol. EDUARD KÖNIG. 8vo; pp. vii, 663. Leipzig, 1910.

In the Index to Part I of his *Lehrgebäude* Professor König compiled an almost complete Hebrew vocabulary. To supplement this, and thus to convert it into a real

dictionary, was but one step. Students of Hebrew will be grateful that this step was taken, as it resulted in the production of a work the distinguishing features of which are terseness and reliability. It represents the final stage of the same author's studies, which aimed at following up the intrinsic (*logisch-psychologische*) connexion between the various modifications in the meanings of words. This method, the author considers, furthers the progress of Hebrew lexicography, as well as of semasiology in general. He also remarks in his preface that he thought it his duty to pay attention to the demand for the explanation of the proper nouns in the Old Testament, a demand incompletely responded to in previous works of the same kind. This was to be supplemented by a critical treatment of the multifarious questions connected with Hebrew lexicography. A higher aim than this cannot be conceived, and although no one perhaps is better fitted to achieve it than the author, it cannot be denied that the difficulties still to be overcome are enormous, particularly as regards the first item. The obscurities in the original meaning of Hebrew words are frequently so great that they are almost impenetrable. The development of word meanings does not always proceed on strictly logical lines. The original meaning of Hebrew roots is in many cases entirely lost, whilst the cognate languages are of little or no aid to their recovery. How, then, is the logico-psychological method to be applied? In spite of all this one cannot but agree with the author that a Hebrew dictionary cannot be compiled without constant recourse to the other Semitic languages to their widest extent, and Arabic in particular. Unfortunately it is not unnecessary to lay some stress on this need, as there are still occasional voices raised, even in academic circles in this country, which declare an isolated study of Hebrew possible.

As to the arrangement of the work one can only applaud the author's system. Obscure forms, in which the Hebrew

language abounds, are inserted in the places assigned to them by their initial letter in the alphabetical order of the articles, but they are accompanied by references to their roots. No one will, of course, expect finality in this respect, as the derivations of very many of these will remain a matter of dispute. Needless to say that this also applies to the meaning of many words the etymology of which is free from doubt. This will best be illustrated by the few stray remarks following here.

והתאיותם No. xxxiv, 10, which the author derives from $\sqrt{\text{אווה}}$, is probably a denominativum of **אווה**, and therefore only indirectly connected with that root; **אזור** is not "belt" (*Gürtel*) in general, but "a tight-fitting loin-cloth (إزار)", see Robertson Smith in JQR. iv, p. 289; **אשכנול**, which Professor König derives from **שכל**, seems to be an enlarged form of **אשך** (analogous to **גבעול**). The resemblance is obvious. This derivation might also throw some light on the meaning of the disputed word **זמורה** (Ezek. viii, 17), which König takes to signify "a branch", against Gesenius-Buhl. A further parallel is given by the expression **אשישי ענבים** (Hos. iii, 5), and thus reveals a whole concatenation of ideas and actions connected with Baal-worship. **גלולים** has scarcely anything to do with $\sqrt{\text{גלל}}$, but is probably contracted from **געלולים**. Is not the first syllable of **רביונים** mutilated from **דמן**, Arab. **دمن**? Professor König's somewhat hesitating derivation of **דר** from **דוה** is not encouraging. The word must have some connexion with Arabic **ثدى**. Lagarde's derivation of the verbal stems of **הלל** from Arab. **حلال** can hardly be assailed. Even the Pō'el **הולל**, conveying the idea of (mentally) blinding, belongs to the same group. It is therefore not obvious why the author has divided this paragraph into two separate ones. Whether **מבול** is derived from **נבל** as König does, is, to say the least, doubtful. May it not be taken as contracted from

מבולל? The author's remarks on רהק and מרחפת are thoroughly acceptable. This root is probably identical with Aramaic פרח and פני, "to fly."

The author himself will not expect that the student agrees with all he says, but he is suggestive and stimulating on every page of his book. This in itself is a merit of no mean significance.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

INITIA AMHARICA. An introduction to spoken Amharic. By C. H. ARMBRUSTER. Part I: Grammar. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.—Part II: English-Amharic Vocabulary, with Phrases. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.

The series of works treating of Amharic, the chief commercial language of Abyssinia, has, together with the increased interest which European states take in the Empire of the Negus, considerably increased in past years.

Among the publications of recent years on this subject one of the most important is that by Armbruster, who, having lived in the Sudan for many years, had there and in Abyssinia many opportunities of studying the living language on the spot. Thus he was able to collect material about the Amharic language which had never been gathered before, and could give as examples for rules many sentences which he had heard spoken by the natives themselves.

These great advantages resulting from Armbruster's practical knowledge of the language are confronted by some few disadvantages resulting from the same fact. Many a correct and valuable example has not been very clearly explained from a linguistic-historical point of view, many a grammatical rule has not been sharply enough defined. (For details I refer to my discussion in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1911, coll. 73 seq.)

As a concession to the practical employment of this work, the author has handled material in various parts of the book which it would have been better to collect under one heading. But this defect is of little consequence compared with the many advantages of this work, and we owe great thanks to the writer, who, during seventeen years service in the Tropics, untiringly devoted his few leisure hours to scientific observations and work, and we congratulate him on the great success which the two volumes of the *Initia Amharica* have had.

In a short introduction the writer tells us, in a few words, how the Amharic language has spread, of its dialects, and the historical place it occupies among the Semitic languages. Then he gives us, in the very instructive paragraphs 3-8, a very detailed description of the phonology of the language. In these paragraphs there are numerous excellent data which he has collected. I was very pleased to observe that Armbruster, without having any knowledge of my work, arrived at the same results as I did in my "Proben aus Amharischem Volksmunde",¹ supported by many observations of the pronunciation of Aleka Taje, formerly lecturer at the Oriental College, University, Berlin.

The treatment of the nouns and verbs, and many examples, will be especially welcome to those who are beginning to learn Amharic without having any previous acquaintance with a Semitic language. Detailed tables show how, for instance, the suffixes are attached to the different forms of the nouns and verbs. In like manner Armbruster gives numerous paradigms for the forms of the regular and irregular verbs, and all the verbs being repeated in an appendix of about 200 pages in length this is perhaps an exaggeration of attention to the subject.

The science of the accentuation is especially difficult,

¹ In "Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen", tome x, Berlin, 1907.

because, as in the Italian language, the accent seems to glide over the whole word with equal stress, and it requires keen observation to comprehend the correct accentuation of the word and sentence. If Armbruster, when showing the accentuation, sometimes gives rules engendered by his own observations, which do not correspond with observations made by others and myself, this must be attributed to peculiarities of dialect formerly unknown to us, and in this he has rendered us a great service. Here I should like to mention one. In the provinces of Godjam and Matsha the relative sentence has the plural form of the noun. In Amharic one generally says "he who has gone" = *jahēda*, "those who have gone" = *jahēdu*, but in both the above-mentioned provinces Armbruster has also heard *yahēdotsh* for the latter (i.e. the plural ending of the noun; cf. man = *sau*; men = *sauotsh*).

Armbruster's treatment of the syntax is wholly sufficient for practical purposes. With regard to the position of the difficult parts of the sentence, it must be remarked that the examples given by him are not always taken from the language of the educated, but from everyday colloquial language.

The very exact manner in which Armbruster gives his transcription is particularly advantageous. These are not merely circumscriptions of the written words, but on the contrary render every word exactly as it is heard. Hereby all the variations of the seven series of the vowels of the Amharic and its consonants are distinguished with great accuracy.

It is gratifying to remark a similar delicate accuracy in the second volume of the *Initia Amharica*, the English-Amharic dictionary. This work serves a purely practical purpose, and hereby discharges its duty exceedingly well. Almost every word necessary for everyday language and correspondence is contained in the book.

A great number of phrases taken from the living

language have been added to the list of words. Here, too, we are in many cases made acquainted with dialectical peculiarities.

The third volume of the *Initia Amharica*, which handles the English–Amharic conversation, is in the press, and will, it is to be hoped, appear before long.

In conclusion, I should like in the name of all our colleagues to thank again the writer for his excellent work, and to express the hope that he may in future continue to enrich our science with many an interesting work.

EUGEN MITTWOCH.

BERLIN.

August, 1911.

DIE ALTEN SEIDENSTRASSEN ZWISCHEN CHINA UND SYRIEN.

I. Von ALBERT HERRMANN. Heft XXI: Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie. Mit einer Karte. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1910.

This brochure of 130 pages is a contribution to one of those bypaths of research full of interest to the student of bygone times, whether his favourite study be history or geography, and, in this case, fascinating to the Sinologist as well. Herr Herrmann well says that "in der Verkehrsgeschichte des Altertums hat kaum ein Handelsprodukt eine so hervorragende Rolle gespielt wie die Seide". So valuable was silk in those olden times that it was described both in old Rome and ancient China as worth its weight in gold.¹

Aristotle appears to have been the first to notice the silkworm in Western literature (*Hist. Anim.*, v, 19 (17), 11 (6)), which he describes with fair accuracy

¹ Vide Hirth's *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 225 and n. 2, where he cites "Vita Aureliani, c. 45, in *Scriptt. Hist. Aug.*, quoted by Friedlaender, l.c., vol. iii (5th ed., 1881)," and also alludes to the *Shuo-wén* (see Wylie, p. 8).

considering his vague knowledge of the creature. That there was a large trade in silk between the East and the West is well attested by the veracious Chinese historians. By the trade in this commodity the Chinese doubtless first acquired (B.C. 120) their knowledge of the distant countries of Ta-ts'in (Syria) and T'iao chih (Babylonia). The Parthians and other nations were the intermediaries between the Chinese and the inhabitants of the countries named above in this trade, and certain products of these Western nations reached China as the result. One of the few foreign words in the Chinese language (the sum-total of these till just recently was only 282) is due to this intercourse with Parthia. It is the name of one of the products thus obtained, viz. benzoin, which is described as Parthian.

No book on this ancient intercourse would be complete without at least reference to Chang Ch'ien and Pan Ch'ao of the two Han dynasties. Our author in his transliteration of Chinese names follows the French spelling of M. Chavannes and renders these as Tschang K'ien and Pan Tschran. Chang Ch'ien was "the first explorer of Western countries about 120 B.C." He introduced foreign hemp into China. The other famous traveller, the general Pan Ch'ao (at the close of the first century), despatched Kan Ying on a mission to Syria; but the latter only reached the coast of the Persian Gulf, where he was dissuaded (probably by the employers of Syrian ship-owners) from proceeding further, and thus giving information to their merchants as to the price of silk in China, on which such enormous profits were being made. The Hou-han-shu tells us this profit was 10 per cent., and the Chin-shu that it was 100 per cent.

It is impossible to notice all the subjects touched upon in this pamphlet, but amongst them are such as the reasons for the late contact between the Chinese and the civilization or culture of the West, the beginning of

the inter-Asian intercourse, the faults incident to the first commercial intercourse of the Chinese and the consequences, the historical works of Ssü-ma Chrien, the Annals of the former and latter Han dynasties, and other Chinese works.

Our author refers to Dr. Stein's researches and discoveries in Turkestan, where he obtained about 8,000 MSS. and documents, or portions of such, in nearly twelve different writings and speeches. Doubtless, as the full results of these and other archæological discoveries are made known, our knowledge of these ancient commercial routes and dealings will be further increased.

J. DYER BALL.

LES DERNIERS BARBARES : CHINE, TIBET, MONGOLIE.
Par le Commandant D'Ollone. 5^e édition. Paris:
Pierre Lafitte & Cie, éditeurs, 1911.

This book is one of the results of the "Mission D'Ollone". The Mission D'Ollone is one of those scientific expeditions which our French neighbours know so well how to equip and send out to add to our knowledge of things but partially known or wholly hidden from Western ken. The author was the leader, but he was ably assisted by three of his compatriots—two lieutenants (since promoted to captaincies) and a quartermaster of the Army (now a sous-lieutenant). These were the principal members, and they were accompanied by Annanites and Chinese. Being so military in its personnel, the approval of the Minister of War was obtained; and, on the other hand, to prevent umbrage from what might be considered too much of a military character to a scientific expedition, the Mission was put under the official patronage of the French Geographical Society. Financial aid was forthcoming from le Ministère de l'Instruction and that of the Colonies, as well as from the Government of Indo-China and a couple of learned societies.

Thus armed and provided, three years (1906-9) were spent in exploration, travel, and research. After two months in Cambodia, Cochin-China, Tonkin, and the borders of Kwang-tung, they proceeded to Yunnan, and here, as an instance of the great and rapid changes that are taking place in China, it may be noted that this journey took the party sixteen days on horseback, though now, on rail, on a different route, it can be accomplished in two.

Travelling into unknown regions, scaling precipitous heights, diving into deep valleys, discovering customs of the aborigines, bringing to light Lolo and Miao Tsz books, finding subterranean rivers, shooting rapids, tramping on foot, riding on horseback, astonishing the unsophisticated natives with the marvellous performances of automatic fire-arms, making friends with savages, with infinite tact surmounting opposition by craft meeting craft, ferreting out the history of these primitive tribes, travelling with the Dalai Lama, attacked by Tibetans—what more could travellers hope or wish for?

All this is written in a pleasant style, and the accounts of little-known people afford much pleasure in the perusal—in short, this is a most interesting book of travel.

All the members of the mission braved dangers and undertook tasks that might well appal the ordinary man. As one instance of their perseverance under difficulties the leader at one time set himself for half a month to try to gain an insight into the Lolo writing. A Lolo taught him, but he spoke no French, so another Lolo interpreted the first one's knowledge into Chinese and then an interpreter turned the latter into French. The Frenchman sums up the result of such a mode of study by saying, "Mais j'avoue qu'il demande une certaine dose de patience!" One would think so indeed.

Our French author agrees with Baber in describing the Lolos as a fine race physically. Of them he says, "C'est

un peuple qui jouera un rôle dans les destinées de l'Orient."

Strange that in the midst of the Chinese Empire the aborigines are able to enslave Chinese to labour for them. The feudal system is in vogue amongst these tribes, and the Commandant describes their social systems, with their nobles, serfs, and slaves.

No book about a country, it has been remarked, is complete without pictures, and nowadays that the sun is enlisted on the traveller's behalf to be his artist, we get life-like bits which the skilful eye of the *voyageur* has detected as typical of the scenes which pass before his eyes, relieved by groups or single figures of the inhabitants, true to life as well. This book is beautifully illustrated with finely executed peeps of the country traversed, and the natives in their peculiar dress and their houses and temples.

Our author had less difficulty in taking photographs than some travellers have. In fact, the Lolos were eager to pose before the camera. He ascribes this to the pains which he took to explain the matter to them, and says he has found his plan effective in both Africa and Asia. But this does not appear to take into account the superstitious fear which no amount of explanation will overcome. For example, we have a distinct remembrance of the introduction of photography into China, and how this dread possessed the souls of not a few, who feared that a presentment of themselves on the photographie plate would detach one of the seven animal spirits they possessed, and this, thus abstracted from them, would prove disastrous.

The Commandant appears to have formed a just estimate of Chinese character, institutions, and the state of the country, and a truthful idea of these is revealed every now and then. For example, "En Chine tout est délabré, mais presque rien n'est vieux."

What does the author mean by saying that the last

emperor of the Ming Dynasty ("le dernier empereur de la dynastie des Ming") fled to the Hang Yi fu in Kwei Chow and made it his capital at the Manchu conquest? The last emperor committed suicide at Peking when all seemed lost.

It may be noted that the goddess "Avalokiteçvara" on p. 211 is the same deity as "Kwan-yn, Déesse de la Miséricorde" on p. 223. The two are identical now in Northern Buddhism, whatever may be thought of the idea that they may have been of separate origin. (*Vide* Eitel's *Handbook of Chinese Buddhism*.) While in a critical vein, it may just be remarked that one misses an index, which the size of the book and its importance demand.

The ill-fated Lieutenant Brooks was met by the author, in these wilds of China, shortly before his tragic end.

Dr. Stein's interesting and important discoveries in Turkestan, it is noted, have been followed up by the French in the person of M. Pelliot, whom our author likewise met.

But it is impossible in a short review to notice all the salient points of interest in this work which merit attention, such, for instance, as the wonderful sculptured rocks, and many other things which, with an eye open for what is new and strange, our author describes.

We await with interest the publication of the full results of this mission — geographical, topographical, philological, ethnographical, etc. These results are thus summed up: "8,000 kilomètres d'itinéraires, dont 2,700 absolument nouveaux; 2,000 photographies de types, costumes, monuments, paysages caractéristiques; plus de 200 mensurations complètes; 46 vocabulaires de dialectes non chinois; 4 dictionnaires d'écritures indigènes jusque-là inconnues ou indéchiffrées; 32 manuscrits lolo; 225 inscriptions relatives à l'histoire, en chinois, sanscrit, tibétain, mongol, mandchou, arabe, lolo; les monographies à peu près introuvables de 42 villes, de nombreux objets

de collection, armes, utensiles, poteries, monnaies, peintures, etc. . . . enfin des observations abondantes. L'ensemble de nos documents ne pourrait être présenté en moins de sept volumes, dont la publication est déjà commencée."

J. DYER BALL.

A CHINESE-ENGLISH DICTIONARY IN THE CANTONESE DIALECT. By Dr. ERNEST JOHN EITEL. Revised and enlarged by IMMANUEL GOTTLIEB GENÄHR, of the Rhenish Missionary Society. Hong - Kong: Kelly & Walsh.

The Cantonese is one of the most important of the languages spoken in China, and is not simply a dialect of a standard language, as the word dialect, which usage and custom has linked with it, might lead one to suppose. It is the standard language itself of a population falling not far short of that of Italy, and has a number of distinct dialects of its own.

It is the speech of the larger number of the inhabitants of the Canton or Kwong Tung Province, which contains a population of well on for thirty-two millions. Nor is its use confined to the one province, for it is spoken in some parts of the neighbouring Kwong Si Province, and there are also numerous Cantonese to be found scattered over different parts of China, while the great majority of Chinese who emigrate to our British Colonies and to foreign lands are natives of the Kwong Tung Province.

Cantonese has traces (as some of the other Chinese languages also have) of the ancient speech of China, still preserved and in daily use in some of its sounds. Our first intercourse with the Chinese was with the speakers of this language, as for many long years Canton was the only port where trade with foreign nations was permitted. It was not, however, till after many years of intercourse that a Cantonese-English Dictionary was prepared. The

author was Samuel Wells Williams, LL.D., who was afterwards Secretary of Legation and Chargé d'Affaires for the United States at the Court of Peking. It was based on a small Chinese lexicographical work, and was a great boon to all students of Cantonese.

It was an octavo volume of 728 pages; but the limitations of typographical work in China at that time necessitated the use of poor paper, which tore easily, and there was not a sufficiently small fount of type readily available to be used for the phrases given as examples, or the exigencies of space prevented its employment. This latter especially was a great drawback. The definitions were also all put one after the other in a mass, followed by the examples, with no attempt to classify them; but notwithstanding these inconveniences the book was a most useful one. After fifteen or twenty years it was difficult to obtain a copy, and two or three times the original price, if not even more, was paid for one, and students considered themselves fortunate to obtain the book at even such an enhanced price.

Twenty-one years after the issue of this "Tonic Dictionary", as it was called, a German Sinologue prepared an enlarged and revised Cantonese-English Dictionary, which he described as essentially a new dictionary based on Kang Hi's Imperial Dictionary and Dr. Williams's Tonic Dictionary. Progress had been made in the study of the Chinese language during the nearly quarter of a century between the publication of the first Cantonese-English Dictionary and the completion of the issue of the second; and notably during that period the monumental work of the Rev. James Legge, D.D. (late Professor of Chinese at the University of Oxford), on the Chinese Classics had been produced, as well as Sir Thomas Wade's *Tzū Erh Chi*, and these were largely availed of by Dr. Eitel for examples of the classical use of words and for official and documentary Chinese. A small fount of Chinese type

was employed in the body of the dictionary for the phrases quoted and examples given. Dr. Eitel also used an excellent plan of dividing these examples into Classical, Mixed (i.e. words that were in use in both the book-language and in everyday speech), and Colloquial. The book was in these and in some other respects a great advance on the earlier work.

The disposal of the whole edition, the added knowledge of Chinese, the new terms being rapidly introduced into the language, have all combined, after more than thirty years, to render an enlarged and new dictionary of Cantonese necessary. The first part of this has now appeared.

The reviewer has known all the authors who have had a share in the making of this dictionary in its different editions. Dr. Williams was a diligent student of Chinese, an ardent reader of Chinese books, and possessed a good knowledge of Chinese idioms. After retiring from China he became Professor of Chinese at Yale. Dr. Eitel was a classical scholar of Chinese and an expert in Chinese Buddhistic terms. Mr. Genähr knows the language of the books well, is a good Chinese scholar, and also speaks Cantonese like a native, having learned the language in his youth. It need therefore scarcely be said that each has been well qualified for the arduous task, and the result of all these past and present labours is a masterpiece of lexicographical work. As the second surpassed the first, so the last excels its immediate predecessor.

The enlargement alone has been considerable, as the half, all that has been yet issued, is more than twice the size of the one of 1877, which was a large octavo of about 1,100 pages, whereas A to O in the present volume takes 696 pages quarto. As an instance of the additions made in some cases we may note that under the word fung, "wind," the former dictionary had only half an octavo page, while in Mr. Genähr's dictionary nearly

a page and a half of the quarto size is taken up with examples, etc. In short, 20,000 new entries have been made in the whole work.

As an improvement it may also be noted that, where necessary, definitions are given, as, for example, in the case of *fung-shui*, dismissed in the old dictionary with the single word "geomancy", while Mr. Genähr gives us eleven lines conveying in a condensed form an account of what *fung-shui* really is and means to the Chinese.

The jumbling together of classical terms, ordinary book-language words, and colloquial phrases in the first dictionary was remedied in the second, as the examples given were separated into the three above divisions; but still there was a confused mass to meet the eye, as everything was crushed into one paragraph.

The present dictionary follows what might be styled the ground-plan employed in Professor Giles's Mandarin Dictionary, for each phrase and sentence quoted is given a fresh line, to the great advantage of the student. Mr. Genähr has done well in accepting two new divisions for his examples, viz., book phrases which are not used in conversation, and technical for the phrases, mostly those introduced of late years, from the employment of foreign science, arts, and manufacture. Many of these words have been borrowed from the Japanese or invented by the Chinese themselves, for the language gives exceptional facilities for the making of new words, excelling the German by far in this respect.

When the dictionary is completed facility in finding the words in the body of the book, after looking them up under the radicals at the end, will be found in the plan, also adopted from Professor Giles's Dictionary, of giving each character a number. A further number under each character also refers to that dictionary, so that much time and labour will be saved in this reference by those wishing to consult it and who do not know Mandarin.

It is impossible with the space at our disposal to point out all the excellences of this latest interpreter of the Chinese to the foreigner, and it may appear almost invidious to call attention to defects in this admirable work. But it does seem a pity that a misleading orthography of some of the Chinese sounds should be still retained in this splendid book, and further that the extended knowledge of the whole system of tones in Cantonese (which adds much to the beauty of the language and its comprehension), and which has been attained of late years, has not been availed of to the full. In the former respect Mr. Genähr unfortunately glories in copying the Great Master Confucius, who was "a transmitter and not a maker" (*Confucian Analects*, vii, 1), and is waiting till a perfect system is devised by someone to represent Chinese sounds by an English spelling. In the meantime he gives good advice on the subject. He says: "Let the beginner . . . not follow the pronunciation given in dictionaries or handbooks if he finds such to clash with that of his teacher, provided he has a good one, but copy the latter. The correct pronunciation must be learned from the lips of a Chinaman, no matter how good or bad a dictionary or a handbook may be."

The mistake of the old dictionary in describing the variant tone of the upper even as a middle tone has not been corrected. It is higher than the upper even and not midway between the upper and lower even, as erroneously described. Professor Parker's statements about this and other variant tones are thoroughly reliable.

J. DYER BALL.

LA GRANDE ARTÈRE DE LA CHINE: LE YANGTSEU.
Par JOSEPH DAUTREMER. Paris: E. Guilmoto, 1911.

The intending reader must not be misled by the title of this book. It is not with the river itself that it is chiefly

concerned, but with the commerce of that vast tract of country known as the Valley of the Yangtse. This is a big enough task in itself, yet M. Dautremer attempts to crowd into the 295 pages an account of the history, religions, commerce, industries, government, and racial characteristics of the Chinese nation; and, moreover, he deals in a final chapter with guilds, secret societies, and the Tai-p'ing Rebellion. The result is disappointing. So far as his commercial information goes—and apparently this is the *raison d'être* of the book—it may be found in a more complete and, in many instances, more up-to-date form in the admirable Trade Reports issued by the Imperial Maritime Customs. Nor does the author make any useful or novel additions to the existing extensive literature devoted to Sinology.

The most interesting passages are those in which he touches on matters which he had peculiar opportunities of studying while Consul in China. For instance, in discussing the history of the foreign concessions at Hankow, no one is better qualified to describe the vicissitudes of what is now the French Concession, since it fell to the lot of M. Dautremer to take the leading part in establishing his country's claim to this area. When Hankow was opened as a treaty port in 1861, settlement areas were granted both to Great Britain and to France, but, beyond erecting a consulate, the French took no steps to avail themselves of their full rights until about thirty-five years later.

There follows an appreciation, tempered with criticism, of the part played in the development of Hankow by the late Chang Chih-tung. To the initiative of this famous Viceroy—great reformer and patriot but disastrous financier—were due the various enterprises that have placed Hankow in the front rank of the world's centres of commerce. The Pai-Han Railway, the Han-yang Arsenal and Ironworks, factories at Wu-ch'ang for cotton, silk, and sewing-needles, and the germ of the railway that

some day will join Hankow to Canton are all part of the legacy he left to Central China. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the first item on this list. By the completion of the Pai-Han Railway the heart of the Empire was brought not only within two days' travel of the metropolis, but also within three weeks of the capitals of Europe.

International intrigues and jealousies, such as inevitably accompany undertakings in China which require the help of foreign loans, much embarrassed some of the Viceroy's reforms. In this respect the Pai-Han Railway was no exception, and no doubt its inner history would make interesting reading if our author does publish it, as he hints he may.

It is instructive to learn reasons why French commerce is not more successful throughout the world and in China in particular—

“On peut donner beaucoup de raisons de notre effacement : la vraie est, je crois, que nous ne sommes pas négociants, nous ne sommes pas commerçants, nous sommes des terriens et des guerriers, et la preuve en est dans nos occupations coloniales ; nous y restons toujours, comme les Espagnols, une manière de conquistadores. A cela s'ajoute le manque de persévérance, de patience, et la peur de risquer. Enfin la plaie de la France, au point de vue du commerce extérieur et du développement des affaires avec l'étranger, c'est l'économie avare qui sévit sur toutes les classes de la population. Cette fureur d'économiser qui nous rend riches chez nous, brise l'esprit d'entreprise et d'initiative personnelle. Aussi, tandis que des pays moins riches que le nôtre, comme l'Allemagne et le Japon, prennent dans les affaires du monde une place de plus en plus considérable, nous reculons.” (pp. 270-1.)

Few observers of Chinese life will agree with the caricature presented on p. 26—

“Si le Japon est le paradis des enfants, on ne peut en dire autant de la Chine ; aussi, dans ce dernier pays, les enfants craignent, mais n'aiment pas leurs parents. Ceux-ci les élèvent en vue de la continuité de la famille, non pour eux-mêmes et pour les rendre heureux. La tendresse n'est pas le fort du Chinois . . . En Chine on voit d'affreux petits magots empaquetés dans plusieurs couches de vêtements, avec des visages graves, presque mélancoliques ; ce n'est pas étonnant, personne ne leur sourit jamais.”

For me, during two years spent in China, the children always possessed a peculiar charm. Their quaint ways and air of happy contentment made them objects of never-failing interest, and what struck me forcibly was the affection lavished on them by their parents. But, in order to bring an authoritative contradiction to M. Dautremér's statement, I will quote from an essay on this subject by a distinguished writer long resident in the country. He says—

“They are highly intelligent, quick to see the merry side of things, brimful of healthy animal spirits, and exceedingly companionable. . . . On the whole it may be said that Chinese children are neither better nor worse, neither more or less delightful, than the children of the West, and that child-nature is much the same all the world over. Among their most conspicuous qualities are their good-humour and patience. Chinese children bear illness and pain like little heroes Another interesting characteristic of Chinese children consists in the fact that good manners very often appear, at first sight, to be innate rather than acquired.” (R. F. Johnston, *Lion and Dragon in Northern China*, pp. 245-53.)

Le Yungtseu bristles with inaccuracies. To pick out a few: the statement (p. 13) that “il est généralement admis que les Chinois sont venus des environs du Tarim” is certainly an exaggeration. Nor is it in accordance with the opinion of the best authorities to state that “la fabrication du cloisonné et de l'émail a toujours été très florissante en Chine” (p. 44). There is good proof that *cloisonné* was first introduced from the West as late as the thirteenth century, and also that the Chinese learnt the art of painted enamels some four hundred years later through imitating examples of Limoges ware brought by the early French missionaries. On p. 202 the author commits an anachronism of not less than two and a half centuries by associating Kublai Khan with the date 1552; and his reiterated statement that the tea trade with Great Britain has ceased scarcely tallies with statistics published by the Chinese Customs which give a total of 129,269 piculs exported to this country during the year 1910, and show

that after the Russians and Americans we are the largest receivers of China tea.

There are eight reproductions of photographs, and a map comprising Central and Southern China, entitled "Provinces Chinoises riveraines du Yangtseu". The photographs are excellent, but it is difficult to see what connexion some of them bear to the letterpress. For instance, the frontispiece is the well-known view of the Hunchback Bridge at the Summer Palace, near Peking, and is here not very appropriately described as "type de pont chinois". The next picture is one of an ornamental *p'ai-lou* from the same source, and it is labelled "Monument élevé à la mémoire d'une veuve fidèle". Several textual errors that might cause confusion are to be found; for instance, "Hankeou" for Houkeou (p. 3), "Siao-Kou-Chou" for Siao-Kou-Chan (p. 8).

In conclusion, it is only fair to the memory of the late Mr. Archibald Little to correct the very incomplete and misleading history of steam navigation of the Upper Yangtse to be found on pp. 6, 7. The first stage in this history should be recorded as taking place in 1889, when Mr. Little arrived at Ichang with a stern-wheeler—the *Kuling* of about 500 tons. It was his intention to fulfil the condition imposed by the Chefoo Convention of 1876 that Chungking should be opened to foreign trade as soon as "steamers have succeeded in ascending the river so far". However, after six months spent in futile endeavour to overcome the opposition of the Chinese authorities, and in vain appeals for the support of the British Government, the scheme had to be abandoned. The Chinese effected a sort of compromise by buying the *Kuling*, and for many years she was employed running between Hankow and Ichang.

In 1895 the Treaty of Simonoseki formally converted Chungking into an open port, and thus were removed many of the obstacles that had rendered the first attempt

abortive. Mr. Little was not slow to return to the project nearest his heart. First having enlisted the sympathy of the then British Minister at Peking, he ordered to be built in Shanghai a twin-screw steamer having a speed of 9 knots. In this vessel—called the *Leechuen*—he left Shanghai on January 15, 1898, and exactly one month later started from Ichang on the memorable voyage that opened the Upper Yangtse to steam navigation. Chungking was reached in eleven steaming days, or, including delays, in exactly three weeks. Unfortunately it was necessary on several occasions to call in the aid of trackers. Failure to carry out the voyage entirely under the vessel's steam is to be explained by the insufficient power of her engines, and by the fact that the season was the one least favourable for fighting the rapids.

However, next year Mr. Little established beyond question his claim to the honour of being the first to demonstrate the navigability of the Upper Yangtse by a cargo-carrying steamer, for in June, 1899, he succeeded without help in reaching Chungking with the paddle-steamer *Pioneer*, taking only eight days over the trip. This historic vessel now figures on the river as H.M.S. *Kinsha*, having been bought and converted into a gunboat by the British Government at the time of the Boxer rising. Thus the *Pioneer* was given no opportunity of proving a commercial success as a freight carrier. Disaster quickly overcame the next merchant steamer that attempted to negotiate the rapids. The German ship *Suihsiang* left Ichang on December 27, 1900, and got no further than forty miles before she was wrecked and her captain drowned.

After this catastrophe the river above Ichang was left to the foreign gunboats until October 19, 1909, when the SS. *Shutung* reopened the mercantile steam navigation of the Upper Yangtse. With a large freighted flat in tow she succeeded without mishap in reaching Chungking in

sixty-five steaming hours. Since then the *Shutung* has continued to ply between the two ports to the great profit of her owners. It is a noteworthy fact that this last enterprise was initiated by Chinese, and was financed by them.

W. PERCEVAL YETTS.

MISSION FRANÇAISE DE CHALDÉE. Nouvelles Fouilles de Tello, par le Commandant GASTON CROS, publiées avec le Concours de LÉON HEUZEY, Membre de l'Institut, et FR. THUREAU-DANGIN. Première livraison, publié sous les auspices du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts et de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Fondation E. Piot). Paris: Leroux, 1910.

In this publication of 104 pages and five plates we have an interesting account of the latest discoveries at Lagaš, with an indication of the present state of the ruins. There is no doubt that the late M. de Sarzec, when acting as French consul at Bagdad, made a most important discovery when he came upon these ruins, which have been well and systematically excavated, and one realizes what noteworthy primeval show-places Turkey will possess when the ruins of the old foundations of Babylonia have been properly worked out *and protected*.

The great value of this particular site is that it contains remains dating from the pre-Sargonic period, going back, possibly, as far as 4000 years B.C. This is probably due to the state of Lagaš having early lost its political influence, whereby the importance of the capital disappeared, though the place may have remained the head-quarters of a political resident. The palace, however, with its massive brick masonry, evidently continued, even then, still habitable, and that and the other buildings were preserved, throughout the centuries, practically as Gudea had left them. But the work of Commandant Cros is best

summarized upon the indications of M. Léon Heuzey's Preface.

Deep soundings have been effected in the palace-mound (A) to determine the relationship of the early constructions of Ur-Bau and Gudea with the much more modern Adad-nadin-aḫe dynasty; the north and north-east part of the terrace of the mound of the "Maison des Fruits" has been cleared, revealing stairways, sloping canals, and reservoirs, with a series of early objects of historical interest. Upon the west slope of the tablet-mound (V) remains of constructions revealed themselves, together with a number of interesting pieces belonging mainly to the time of Gudea and the kings of Ur. Finally, another mound, occupying a central position in the ruins, has been attacked, and its exploration has resulted in several interesting finds.

Descriptions of the objects figured are given, one of the most interesting being that entitled "La Pêche de Gilgamès", which represents a nude or tight-clad and belted figure carrying, at the end of a stick resting on his right shoulder, a crab, and, suspended from his left hand, two fish. This bearded and ringletted figure, which is common on the cylinder-seals, I should prefer to call, as Heuzey does once, simply "the Babylonian Hercules", until proof that he is really to be identified with Gilgamesh comes to light.

M. François Thureau-Dangin gives, with his usual thoroughness, copies and translations of some of the inscriptions found—the tablet recording the destruction of Lagaš; that referring to the Elamite incursion in the time of En-e-tarzi; and the inscription of Arad-Nannar, the great minister and chief of Lagaš during the reign of Gimil-Sin of Ur, under whom he held the governorship or chieftainship of many cities which are enumerated. The summation of results is by Commandant Gaston Cros (who gives also extracts from the diary of the diggings) and the description of the antiquities by M. Heuzey. The

heliogravures are perfect, and reproduce the carved shell portrait of King Ur-Nina; the alabaster bas-relief of the fisherman returning with his catch: the beautiful but mutilated female head with blue fillet round the forehead and blue eyebrows; several heads of statuettes, one being a bearded deity with horned hat; and views of the regions of the stairways and the reservoirs.

It is a work of considerable interest and value, and a welcome addition to our knowledge. Noteworthy as a discovery are the deposits of dried fish, illustrating not only the numerous tablets referring to offerings of fish (mostly published by M. Fr. Thureau-Dangin—cf. also the *Amherst Tablets*, vol. i, No. 1, and Mr. Harding Smith's tablet in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1905, p. 76), but also the statements of Herodotus concerning the fish-eaters of Babylonia.

T. G. PINCHES.

DIE GÖTTERNAMEN IN DEN BABYLONISCHEN SIEGEL-CYLINDER-LEGENDEN, zusammengestellt und bearbeitet von Dr. JOSEPH KRAUSZ, mit zahlreichen Beiträgen von Professor Dr. FRITZ HOMMEL. 8vo. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1911.

Though these inscriptions have attracted a certain amount of attention, and all Assyriologists recognize their value, no satisfactorily classified study of them, such as has been done for the proper names in the contract-tablets, has hitherto appeared. The present work of 128 pages (including the indexes) therefore fills a gap in the subject of Babylonian linguistics and archæology.

The commonest formula of these cylinder-inscriptions is that which gives the name of the owner, that of his father, and then the god whom he worshipped. There are many departures from this arrangement, however, one of them being given on p. 3, quoted from a cylinder in the

de Clercq Collection: "Banilum, servant of the goddess Nin-Eanna, son of Kušala," instead of "Banilum, son of Kušala, servant of Nin-Eanna", but this is not the usual arrangement of the clauses. A similar order of wording occurs in the case of No. 122 of the same publication, quoted, in part, on p. 10, as one of the examples which describe the owner as being servant of two gods, and not one only.

The classification of these little inscriptions enables us to become acquainted with the facts—social, departmental, and mythological—which are to be learned therefrom. Whilst some give the name of the man, his father, and the god whom he worshipped, others have the names of gods only (generally two, but sometimes more), and several bear short invocations. Interesting are the inscriptions of the common type which show the deity as patron of the family: "Dagan-abi, son of Ibni-Dagan, servant of Dagan" (p. 25); "Libit-Sin, son of Sin-tayar, servant of Sin and the goddess Nin-gal" (p. 31). Does this also exist in the case of the quotation from the de Clercq Collection, No. 237 (p. 30), where the formula "Sin-tabal, son of Zinû, servant of Sin" occurs? As is generally accepted, Sin is derived from *Zuen*, the transposed Sumerian *En-zu*, and *Zinû* (given in the genitive form *Zinû*) shows the original spelling with *z* instead of *s*, and the name itself would find its parallel in *Marluku*, "he of Merodach." An index of names of gods, and another of the persons, adds to the value of the book. Among Professor Hommel's notes may be especially mentioned that upon *Martu* or *Amurru*, on pp. 56-8. There is no doubt that the connexion between Babylon and the West (*Amurrû*) goes back to an exceedingly early date, and Hommel regards the west-Semitic influence in Babylonia as being possibly Chaldean or east-Arabian—perhaps even east-Tigritic Aramaic.

There is sometimes a certain amount of inconsistency in

the readings, which the addition of the original text of the inscriptions might have obviated—and it would certainly have added to the value of the book. Nevertheless it is an exceedingly useful monograph.

T. G. PINCHES.

CH.-GUILL. JANNEAU. UNE DYNASTIE CHALDÉENNE: LES ROIS D'UR. Paris: Geuthner, 1911.

The discovery, several years ago, of large numbers of tablets at Lagaš belonging to the period of the kings of Ur from the time of Dungi to that of Ibi-Sin, has satisfactorily perfected our knowledge of the history of that period, though many doubtful points have to be cleared up, notwithstanding the lists of year-dates found at Niffer and published by Professor H. V. Hilprecht. It is to throw light on certain points of the history of this period that the present little book of 61 pages has been written.

The importance of the kingdom of which Ur was the capital at this time is emphasized by the fact that Ur-Engur (or Sur-Engur), king of Ur, the father of Dungi, bears not only the title "king of Ur", but also calls himself "king of Kengi-Ura", or, in Semitic, "Šumer and Akkad." What were the exact boundaries of this tract at the time is doubtful, but in all probability it covered about the same extent of country as the Biblical Shinar or ancient Babylonia. The same titles are given to his immediate successors, and the small texts quoted by the author testify to the reality of their claims. From the documents quoted M. Janneau gives the following as the names of the minor rulers (*patesis*, or, better, *iššakē*) under the kings of Ur:—

- Ur-abba, during the reign of Ur-Engur,
- Lukani, from the year x until the 29th year of Dungi,
- Lu-andul, from the 29th to the 32nd year of Dungi,

Ur-Lama I, from the 32nd to the 40th year of Dungi,

Alla, from the 40th to the 41st year of Dungi,

Ur-Lama II, from the 41st year of Dungi to the 3rd of Bûr-Sin.

During this period Gudea and his son Ur-Nin-Girsu flourished, but the latter was not invested with the title of *iššaku* of Lagaš until after Dungi assumed divinity in his 24th year. Interesting notes concerning this deification, as well as that of Gudea, are given.

All the points referred to are supported by quotations in the footnotes, which add much to the value of the work. Several texts with transcriptions into the Assyrian character and into modern script, and translations, are given, and there is a complete translation of Hilprecht's colophon dates. Though the book is not extensive, the author deserves thanks for his very suggestive work, and likewise the publisher for the enthusiasm with which he furthers Assyriology and similar subjects in France. The book is dedicated to M. Aristide Briand, and has a characteristic introduction by the Rev. Professor V. Scheil, the first translator of Hammurabi's Code.

T. G. PINCHES.

LES CIVILISATIONS PRÉHELLÉNIQUES DANS LE BASSIN DE LA MER EGÉE. Etudes de Protohistoire orientale, par RENÉ DUSSAUD. Avec 207 gravures et 2 planches hors texte. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1910.

In this interesting account of the researches around the Ægean and their results, we have a very useful handbook, and the numerous pictures furnish a serviceable foundation for comparison with the art of the nations around. The degree of civilization which the peoples of Crete, the Cyclades, Cyprus, and the mainland of Greece had attained in those prehistoric times was considerable, and their art had reached a very high level. The same satisfactory

progress, however, had likewise taken place on the Asiatic mainland—more especially Babylonia—as far back as 2,500 years B.C. and even earlier. The great difference between Babylonian art and that of the Ægean, however, was that whereas the former never attained to classic excellence, the latter developed into that school which produced the masterpieces of ancient Greece. With regard to Assyrian art, that was cut off after it had reached its highest point, when the kingdom was brought to an end by the attacks of the Babylonians and the Medes; but for that the artists of Assyria might have attained a renown second only to that of Greece and Rome.¹

In the numerous pictures in the work now before us the reader is struck with the number of forms and the variety of their ornamentation, together with the vigorous action of the human figures, contrasting with the products of Babylonia and Assyria, in which poverty of form and ornamentation is a characteristic. Possibly this is to be explained by the fact that the Assyrians were scenic artists rather than decorators.

Comparing the architecture with that of Babylonia and Assyria, the arrangement of the rooms in the palaces would seem to have been much more elaborate, and also more practical. There was a much greater regard for privacy, and some of the chambers were entirely shut off, instead of being accessible from a courtyard, or by passing through another room or rooms. It seems also probable that the houses in the Semitic states referred to were rarely more than ground-floor high (the Babylonian houses of more than one story, mentioned by Herodotus, were probably late), but the porcelain plaques from Cnossos show houses of one or two stories, the latter having

¹ It is a satisfaction to note the author's statement that it was in Britain that the art of Greece was first acknowledged to be superior to that of Rome, and that this country has done a good share of the work in the matter of exploration in the Mediterranean district of which he treats.

a very familiar appearance notwithstanding the absence of windows flanking the central door.

Certain of the engraved or chased metal cups show battle-scenes, and offer excellent material for comparison with the sculptures of a like nature found at Nineveh. The vegetation, though very like that shown on the Assyrian bas-reliefs, is not by any means so detailed, and therefore not so natural. On the other hand, the fighters advancing to the attack do so in a much more lively manner, and brandish their arms as they advance. In view of the excitability of the Arabs and others on such occasions, it may well be asked whether the ancient Assyrians were so methodical in their attack as the reliefs found at Calah, Khorsabad, and Nineveh show them to be; but it is not impossible that the success of the Assyrians may have been due to those very characteristics of coolness and method which apparently made, with them, war into a pageant, and the subduing of enemies to the service of Aššur into a gigantic religious ceremony.

Evans's discoveries at Crete have naturally brought Ægean art and civilization into a much greater prominence than they enjoyed before, and a visit to the collection in the Ashmolean at Oxford shows better than anything what its real nature was. With certain phases of Ægean art are bound up, moreover, many religious problems, and the question of emblems connected therewith. The attitude of the priestess in the act of adoration reminds us of the divine figure adoring so often found on the cylinder-seals of ancient Babylonia, in which the owner is sometimes shown led into the presence of his god. The double hatchet, concerning which much has been written, is traceable to Assyria. The doves on the temples or shrines have their analogies in those found by the Germans during their excavations at Babylon in the temples of Nin-mah, goddess of reproduction, and Ninip, one of the gods of war.

It is an excellent handbook upon the subject and deserves to be studied. Of special interest are the chapters upon navigation, the race, the language, and Minoan writing.

T. G. PINCHES.

CATALOGUE OF THE COLLECTION OF COINS ILLUSTRATIVE
OF THE RULERS OF DEHLI UP TO 1858 A.D. IN THE
DEHLI MUSEUM OF ARCHAEOLOGY. By R. B.
WHITEHEAD, I.C.S. 1910.

This Catalogue is descriptive of the collection of coins now placed on view in the new museum in the Dehli Fort: some 406 specimens selected and arranged to illustrate the history of the rulers who have reigned in that capital city from the time of the Tomara Rajas (A.D. 970-1003) to the end of the Mughal dynasty in 1858.

The purpose in view in making, arranging, and exhibiting the collection is in every way to be commended, and might with advantage to extension of knowledge of local history be followed in other centres; and it has been carried through very ably by Mr. Whitehead, an expert in the subject. The collection is, as the author claims it to be, sufficiently large and representative, and the descriptions are so carefully made that a reading of every one of them has disclosed but two small typographical errors.

Each section of the book, i.e. pre-Muhammadan, Pathan Sultans, Mughal Emperors, has an introduction giving a short account of the dynasty represented, its currency, and the inscriptions found on the coins. The whole forms a very useful handbook on Dehli coinage illustrating history. There are, however, no plates nor figures of the coins in the text.

O. C.

NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(July, August, September, 1911.)

I.—GENERAL MEETING OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

June 13, 1911.—Sir Mortimer Durand, Director, in the chair.

Mr. Birbhadra Chandra Chowdhury was elected a member of the Society.

Six nominations were approved for election at the next General Meeting.

Dr. A. Berriedale Keith read a paper on "The Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama".

A discussion followed, in which Professor Barnett, Dr. Thomas, and Professor Hagopian took part.

II.—PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS.

I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Bd. LXV, Heft ii.

Meinhof (C.). Das Ful in seiner Bedeutung für die Sprachen der Hamiten, Semiten, und Bantu.

Smith (V. A.). The Monolithic Pillars or Columns of Asoka.

Krenkow (F.). Tabrizi's Kommentar zur Burda des Ka'b ibn Zuhair.

II. RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI. Vol. IV, Fasc. i.

Lammens (H.). Ziād ibn Abihi, vice-roy de l'Iraq.

Blochet (E.). Etudes sur le Gnosticisme musulman.

Griffini (E.). Lista dei MSS. arabi, nuovo fondo della Bib. Ambrosiana di Milano.

III. VIENNA ORIENTAL JOURNAL. Vol. XXV, No. i.

Hertel (J.). Einzelbemerkungen zu den Texten des Pāncatantra.

Winternitz (M.). Bemerkungen zum Tantrākhyāyika.

Rhodokanakis (N.). Zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.

Inostrancev (K.). Arabisch - persische Miscellen zur Bedeutung der Himmelsgenden.

Vol. XXV, No. ii.

Christian (V.). Ergänzungen und Bemerkungen zu Sa, S, S^bi, und S^c.

Hertel (J.). Die Geburt des Purūravas.

IV. T'OUNG PAO. Vol. XII, No. iii.

Maspero (G.). Le royaume de Champa (suite).

Liétard (A.). Essai de dictionnaire Lo-lo Français dialecte, A-hi (suite).

Saussure (L. de). Les origines de l'astronomie chinoise (suite).

Haenisch (E.). Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte Chinas unter der Gegenwärtigen Dynastie.

V. DER ISLAM. Bd. II, Heft ii-iii.

Prüfer (C.) and M. Meyerhof. Die aristotelische Lehre vom Licht bei Ḥunain b. Ishāq.

Hartmann (R.). Die Herrschaft von al-Karak.

Kahle (P.). Islamische Schattenspielfiguren aus Egypten.

Sarre (F.). Zu Josef von Karabacek's "Riza i-Abbasi".

Mittwoch (E.). Zu Josef von Karabacek's "Riza i-Abbasi".

Seidel (E.). Medezinisches aus den Heidelberger "Papyri Schott-Reinhardt".

Jacob (G.). Fortleben von antiken Mysterien und Alt-Christlichem im Islam.

Herzfeld (E.). Die Qubbat al-Sakhra, ein Denkmal frühislamischer Baukunst.

Becker (C. H.). Neue arabische Papyri des Aphroditofundes.

Bell (H. I.). Translations of the Greek Aphrodite Papyri in the British Museum.

VI. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.
Vol. XXXIII, Pt. v.

- Legge (T.). Legend of Osiris.
Pinches (T. G.). Babylonian Inscriptions.
Wiedemann (A.). Notes on some Egyptian Monuments.
Sayce (A. H.). Notes on an Unexplored District of
Northern Syria.

VII. TIJDSCHRIFT VOOR INDISCHE TAAL-LAND EN VOLKENKUNDE,
Deel LIII, Af. 1-2.


- Krom (N. J.). Avis concernant la restauration méthodique
d'anciennes constructions monumentales.
Kern (H.). Pakabou.
Rinkes (D. A.). Les Saints de Java. Seh Siti Djenar
devant l'inquisition.
— Rapport concernant Mamoudjou.
Pleyte (C. M.). Le date sur le Batou-Toulis près de
Buitenzorg. Documents se rapportant au Sounda pré-
historique.
— Matériaux relatifs à l'histoire du pays soundanais dit
le Préanger.

Deel LIII, Af. 3-4.

- Krom (N. J.). Gedateerde Inscripties van Java.
Rinkes (D. A.). Die Heiligen van Java. iii. Soenan
Geseng.
Goldie (W.). Het een und ander over oudheidkundige
monumenten in de xxvi Moekims in Groot Atjeh.

VIII. NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE, 1911, Pt. ii.

- Rabino (H. L.). Coins of the Shāhs of Persia (cont.).



ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

- Ahmad**, Abdul 'Aziz. Asif al Lughat. 8vo. *Haidarabad*,
A.H. 1324. *From the India Office.*
- Annandale**, N. Freshwater Sponges. (*Fauna of British India.*)
8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the India Office.*
- BENGAL DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Vol. xxvi: Midnapore. 8vo.
Calcutta, 1911. *From the Government of Bengal.*
- Binyon**, L. The Flight of the Dragon. (*Wisdom of the East*
Series.) Cr. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Publisher.*
- Brandstetter**, Dr. R. Gemeinindonesisch und Urindonesisch.
8vo. *Luzern*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- BURMA DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Thayetmyo, A vol. 8vo. *Rangoon*,
1911. *From the Government of India.*
- CENTRAL PROVINCES DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Buldana, A vol.; Drug,
A vol. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1910. *From the Government of India.*
- Chavannes**, Éd. Divination par l'écaille de Tortue dans la haute
antiquité chinoise. Pamphlet. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911.
From the Author.
- Coomaraswamy**, Dr. A. K. Indian Drawings. 4to. *Broad*
Campden, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Selected Examples of Indian Art. Fol. *Broad Campden*,
1911. *From the Author.*
- CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM SEMITICARUM. Pars i, tomus ii, fasc. 4, with
volume of plates. 4to. *Paris*, 1911. *Purchased.*
- David**, Mme Alexandra. Le Modernisme Bouddhiste et la
Bouddhisme du Bouddha. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911.
From the Author.

- EASTERN BENGAL DISTRICT GAZETTEERS.** Vol. iii: Tippera, by E. J. Webster. 8vo. *Allahabad*, 1910.
From the Government of India.
- Field, C.** Mystics and Saints of Islam. 8vo. *London*, 1910.
From the Publishers.
- Gerini, Colonel G. E.** Catalogo Descrittivo della Mostra Siamese alla Esposizione Internazionale di Torino, 1911. 8vo. *Torino*, 1911.
From Colonel G. E. Gerini.
- Gunasekara, A. M.** Comparative Grammar of the Sinhalese Language. 8vo. *Colombo*, 1891. *Purchased.*
- Harder, E.** Arabic Chrestomathy. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the Publisher.
- Hodson, T. C.** The Nāga Tribes of Mānipur. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the India Office.
- Jastrow, M.** Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens. Lief. xvii. 8vo. *Giessen*, 1911.
From the Publishers.
- Jones, Daniel.** The Pronunciation and Orthography of the Chindau Language. 8vo. *London*, 1911. *From the Author.*
- Klippel, E.** Études sur le Folklore Bédouin de l'Égypte. Pamphlet. 8vo. *Le Caire*, 1911.
From the Author.
- Knudtzon, J. A.** Die El-Amarna-Tafeln. Lief. xiii. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1911.
Purchased.
- Kühr, J. R. Razoux.** Dutch Justice in Java. Pamphlet. 8vo. *Batavia*, 1911.
From the Author.
- Le Coq, A. von.** Sprichwörter und Lieder aus der Gegend von Turfan. Baessler-Archiv, Bd. i, Beiheft. Fol. *Leipzig*, 1910.
From the Publisher.
- Lévi, S.** Quid de Græcis Veterum Indorum Monumenta Tradiderint. 8vo. *Paris*, 1890.
Purchased.
- Macaulay.** Essay on Warren Hastings. Edited by V. A. Smith. Small 8vo. *Oxford*, 1911.
From the Publisher.

- Macdonald, D. B.** Some Aspects of Islam. 8vo. *New York*, 1911.
From the Publishers.
- MADRAS GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL MSS. LIBRARY. Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. Vol. vii, by M. Rangacharya. 8vo. *Madras*, 1909.
From the Madras Government.
- Markham, Sir Clements.** Early Spanish Voyages to the Strait of Magellan. (*Hakluyt Society.*) 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From the India Office.
- Mischlich, A.** Lehrbuch der Hausa-Sprache. 8vo. *Berlin*, 1911.
From the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen.
- Mitra, S. M.** Life and Letters of Sir John Hall. 8vo. *London*, 1911.
From Mrs. Alicia Simpson.
- Müller, F. W. K.** Uigurica, ii. 4to. *Berlin*, 1911.
From Dr. A. von Le Coq.
- Narasimhiengar, M. T.** Brahmanic Systems of Religion and Philosophy. Pamphlet. 4to. *Madras*, 1911.
From the Author.
- PATROLOGIA ORIENTALIS. Tome vi, fasc. 3-5; tome vii, fasc. 5. 8vo. *Paris*, 1911.
Purchased.
- PENNSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY. Eckley B. Coxe, Jun., Expedition to Nubia. Vols. i-v, by C. N. Woolley and others. 4to. *Philadelphia*, 1909-11.
From the Publishing Committee of the Expedition.
- Pinches, T. G.** The Newly Discovered Version of the Story of the Flood. Pamphlet. 8vo. s.l., s.a. *From the Author.*
- Platts, J. T., & Ranking, G. S. A.** Grammar of the Persian Language. 8vo. *Oxford*, 1911.
From the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.
- Radau, H.** Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to God Nin-ib. (*Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. ser. A, vol. xxix, pt. i.*) 4to. *Philadelphia*, 1911.
From the Publishing Committee of the Expedition.

- SAHITYA PARISHAD PATRIKA. 9 Nos. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1316-18.
- SAHITYA PARISHAD PANJĪKA. 6 Nos. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1312-17.
From the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad, Calcutta.
- Seidel, A.** Wörterbuch der deutsch-japanischen Umgangssprache.
8vo. *Berlin*, 1910. *From the Publisher.*
- SELECTIONS FROM THE SĀTĀRA RĀJĀ AND THE PESHWAS' DIARIES.
VII. Peshwā Mādhavrāo, i. Vol. ii. Edited by B. P. Joshi.
8vo. *Poona*, 1911.
- SIAMESE BOOKS published on the occasion of the Cremation of King
Chulalongkorn. Dukkanipātājātaka, Pañcakanipātājātaka.
Navakovad, The Parittain, Ton Paññati. 5 vols. 8vo.
Bangkok, 129. *From the Vajirāñāna National Library.*
- SITA RAM. From Sepoy to Subadar. Translated by Lieut.-Colonel
Norgate; 3rd ed. by Lieut.-Colonel D. C. Phillott. 8vo.
Calcutta, 1911. *From Lieut.-Colonel D. C. Phillott.*
- Spooner, D. B.** Handbook to the Sculptures in the Peshawar
Museum. 8vo. *Bombay*, 1911.
From the Curator, Peshawar Museum.
- Stöner, H.** Ein brahmanisches Weltsystem, usw. Baessler-
Archiv, Bd. i, Heft iii. Fol. *Leipzig*, 1911.
From the Publisher.
- UNITED PROVINCES DISTRICT GAZETTEERS. Vol. ix, Etawah; vol. x,
Manipuri; vol. xxxvi, Gahwal. 8vo. *Allahabad*, 1910 and
1911. *From the Government of India.*
- VAZIR OF LANKURAN. A Play in four Acts, translated from Persian
into Urdu and edited with notes by Maulavi Md. Yusuf
Ja'fari and Lieut.-Colonel D. C. Phillott. 8vo. *Calcutta*,
1911. *From Lieut.-Colonel D. C. Phillott.*
- Wolff, K. F.** Die Germanen als Begründer der europäischen
Kultur. Auflage 1. 8vo. *Bozen*, 1911. *From the Author.*

INDEX FOR 1911

A

- Abacus in use in India, 514-21.
 Abbā Salāmā, 744.
 al-'Abbās b. al-Ḥasan, 659.
 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, 636 ;
 adjusts coinage, 639.
 Abu Idrīs, Kādi, 636.
 Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Muḥammad,
 coins of, 781.
 Abu-l-'Abbās Abd Allah b. al-
 Ḥasan, Kādi, of the Shawārib
 family, 669.
 Abū Shākir, al-Makīn, etc., 758.
 Abu 'Ubayd Ibn Ḥarb, Kādi, 664.
 Abyssinia in sixteenth century,
 745.
 Afghani-tan coins in Sei-stan, 784.
 Aggaḷanimmaḍi, Kadamba prin-
 cess, 522.
 Aḥkām Sulṭāniyya of Māwardi,
 635-74.
 Ahom legend of Creation, 1132-42.
 Ahom (Tai) MSS. from Assam, 921.
 Ākhyāna theory as to Vedic
 hymns, 980 seqq. ; essentially
 dramatic, 985 ; theory as to the
 Sunahśepa legend, 988 ; theory
 as to Purūravas tale, 990 ; and
 R̥gveda, viii, 100. 992 seqq.
 Ākhyāna theory and hymn to the
 Maruts, 994 seqq.
 Alchi, wall paintings from
 monastery at, 145.
 Ali Baba and Forty Thieves, Arabic
 text, 219.
 'Ali b. Jahm, poet, and Mazālim,
 657.
 Alphabet, recent theories on the
 origin of, 963-97.
 Amalananda's Vedānta-kalpataru,
 509-13.
 AMEDROZ, H. F., The Mazālim
 Jurisdiction in the Aḥkām
 Sulṭāniyya of Māwardi, 635-74.
 Anatomical drawings, ancient
 Indian, from Tibet, 207.
 Ancient historical edicts at Lhasa,
 389-435.
 ANDERSON, J. D., The Origins of
 Bengali, 524-8.
 Animism in Shan States, 924.
 Anniversary meeting of the Society,
 879-902.
 Apophthegmata Patrum, 740.
 Arabian Nights, lost MSS. of, 219 ;
 projected edition of Galland's
 MS., 219.
 Arabic text of Ali Baba newly
 discovered, 221.
 Aramaic alphabet in unknown
 language of East Turkestan,
 161.
 Aragāwi, saint, 744, 750.
 Archeological exploration in India,
 1909-10, 127-58.
 Argistis, Vannic ruler, 51.
 Arjūrāja (Chāhamāna), date of,
 156.
 Āryabhata, born 476 A.D., astro-
 nomer of Pāṭaliputra school,
 113.
 Āryabhata's system of expressing
 numbers, 109-26.
 Āryabhata's system of cosmical
 periods, 486 seqq.
 Āryabhatīya, 113 ; its commentary,
 named Bhatadīpikā, 113.
 Āryāshata, name for Bhaṭa-
 dipikā, 114.
 Aśoka and the 256 nights,
 1091-1112 ; no connexion with
 calendar, 1097.
 Aśoka introduced Bnddhism into
 Tibet, 921 ; as an Upāsaka, 1098 ;
 anointed twenty-eight years after
 death of Buddha, 1109.
 Aśoka's Fourth Rock Edict, 785.
 Aśokavarman, 521.

- Astronomy (Hindu) applies to itself
Greek principles, 488.
- Astronomy in Vedas, 514-18.
- Aśvamēdha sacrifice, 686.
- Atisha, records of, 144.
- Atwin Moktaw Pagoda, 154.
- AYRTON, E. R., Date of Buddha-
dāsa of Ceylon from a Chinese
source, 1142-4.
- B
- Bābar-nāma, passage judged
spurious in Haydarābād MS.,
65-74.
- Bādūrayā, 660.
- BAILEY, Rev. T. GRAHAME, Kānaurī
Vocabulary: Kānaurī-English,
315-64.
- Bakkār, Kāḍī. 663.
- Bālāditya, Guhila king, 156.
- Basavappa, 188; controversy as to
his adoption, 188-9.
- Bashahr, treaty with Mughals in
1650, 146.
- Bashgali, classification of, 1-47;
relationship to other Aryan lan-
guages, 2 seqq.; position within
the Aryan family, 40-7; note by
Dr. Grierson, 195.
- Bengali, the origins of, 524-8.
- Berens tablets from Tel-loh,
1044-53.
- BEVERIDGE, ANNETTE, Bābar-nama:
a passage judged spurious in
Haydarābād MS., 65-74.
- Bhabra Edict, second note on,
1113.
- Bhagavat = Adorable, 727.
- Bhagavat = Blessed, 738.
- Bhagavat, translation of the term,
194.
- Bhagavat and Bhakti, Epic use of,
727-38.
- Bhāgavata system, creed of, 951.
- Bhāgavat-śāstra, 935-61.
- Bhakti, Epic use of, 727-38;
animals may have, 732; affection
rather than faith, 738; birth-
place of, 800-1.
- Blāmātī, 510.
- Bhitā, archaeological exploration
at, 127-41; finds of Mauryan
epoch, 128 seqq.; finds of Suūga
period, 130; finds of Kushaṇa
period, 131.
- BLADEN, C. O., Early Use of
Buddhist Era in Burma, 209.
— Fourth Text of the Myazedi
Inscriptions, 365-88.
- Bonpo temple found at Lamayurn,
144.
- Brahmagupta's system of cosmical
periods, 486 seqq.
- Brāhmī script, lingual /a in,
1081-9.
- Bṛhaspati, its identity with
Jupiter, 794 seqq., 1119-22.
- Buddhacarita fragments in Stein
Collection, 770-2.
- Buddhadāsa of Ceylon, date from
a Chinese source, 1142-4.
- Buddhavarman, 521.
- Buddhism in the Shan States,
917-34; among the Tai, 919 seqq.;
derived by Shans direct from
India or Mongolia, 923.
- Buddhism predominant in Tibet in
eighth century, 417.
- Buddhist dead, disposal of, in
China, 699-725.
- Buddhist era in Burma, early use,
209-17.
- Buddhist finds at Sahribahlol,
141-3.
- Buddhist monastery excavated at
Rāmatirtlam, 153.
- Burial rites for Buddhists in China,
697-725.
- Burma, early use of Buddhist era,
209-17.
- Bushell Bowl, 1022 seqq.; example
of Greater Seal character, 1025.
- C
- Cap of Vairocana, 702.
- Ch'an-tung posture adopted by
Chinese Buddhist priests prior
to death, 700.

- Ch'a-po-ho-lo, old capital of Vriji or Mithilā, 203.
- Chātsū, epigraph of new Guhila dynasty, 156.
- Chandappa, Keladi king, 190; patron of learning, 190.
- CHAVANNES, E., L'Inscription funéraire de Ts'ouan Pao-Tseu, 75-108.
- Chhargāon, Nāga statue. 150.
- Chia-sha, article of Buddhist attire, 701.
- China, disposal of Buddhist dead in, 699-725.
- Chinese riddles on ancient Indian toponymy, 437-45.
- Chinese writing in the Chou dynasty, 1011-38.
- Ch'ing-shui, place of Tê-Tsung treaty, 407; identified as modern Ts'ing-shui, 408.
- Chitramāya-Pallava, 523.
- Chou dynasty, Chinese writing in, 1011-38.
- COCHRANE, W. W., Ahom Legend of Creation, 1132-42.
- COBRINGTON, O., Coins collected by Sir A. H. McMahon in Seistan, 779-84.
- awarded gold medal of Numismatic Society, 825.
- Coins collected by Sir A. H. McMahon in Seistan, 779-84.
- COWLEY, A., Another Unknown Language from Eastern Turkestan, 159-66.
- Creation, an Ahom legend of, 1132-42.
- Cremation in China only for priesthood, 700; in Tibet, 725.
- Cuneiform inscriptions of Van, 49-63.
- Cuneiform tablets from Tel-loh, 1039-62.
- D
- Dalai Lama's seal, 204-7. 528-30, 822-5.
- Dance in Veda, 998.
- Dantivarman-Mahārāja, 523.
- Dantivarman, 522.
- Dasabalasūtram MS. in Stein Collection, 1063-4.
- Daśagītikasūtra, preliminary section of Bhatadīpikā, 114.
- Dattaka, date of, 185.
- Dattaka-sūtra, 183, 186.
- DAVIDS, T. W. RHYS, Does Al Ghazzali use an Indian Metaphor? 200.
- Dharmapada in Stein Central Asian Collection, 759.
- Dhātupāṭha, 509.
- Documents Sanscrits de la seconde collection M. A. Stein, 759-77, 1063-79.
- Drama, Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian, 979-1009; origin of Indian, 1007.
- Dravida Prāṇāyāma, 1126.
- Dried priests in China, 709-25; gilded, 715; antiquity of custom, 716.
- Ḍṛiṣṭivisha, serpent, 522.
- Drying as preservative for Buddhist dead in China, 709-25.
- Durgarāja on Pushkar epigraph, with date, 156.
- Durvinita, imaginary Gaṅga king, 187.
- E
- Eastern Turkestan, unknown languages, 159-166, 201, 447-77, 497-501.
- Ebsoy, Coptic saint, 750.
- Ekāyana, name of Bhāgavat-śāstra, 935.
- Embaqom, translator of Abū Shākir, al-Makīn, etc., 758.
- Epic use of Bhagavat and Bhakti, 727-38.
- Ēru, Babylonian goddess, 528.
- Ethiopic Senkessār, 739-58; MSS. of, 741 seqq.; translated from Arabic, 742.
- Ewostātēwos, 744-50.

- F
- Fa-Hian, arrived in Ceylon, 1142 ; tooth-relic in Ceylon at that time, 1143 ; Buddhadāsa king then, 1143.
- FLEET, J. F., Āryabhaṭa's System of expressing Numbers, 109-26.
- Dattaka-sūtra, 186.
- Standard Height of an Indian Man, 208.
- Buddhist Era in Burma, 216.
- Kaliyuga Era of B.C. 3102. 479-96, 675-98.
- Brihaspati and Tishya, 514-18. 1119-22.
- Use of the Abacus in India, 518-21.
- Kaṭapayādi System of expressing Numbers, 788-94.
- Mahishmaṇḍala, 816-19.
- The 256 Nights of Aśoka, 1091-1112.
- Ratanapūṇṇa : Yadanabon : Mandalay, 1123-5.
- FRANCKE, A. H., The Dalai Lama's Seal, 528-30.
- Frog-hymn of Rgveda, 997 : claimed as dramatic by v. Schroeder, 997 ; merely a rain-spell, 997.
- Fu, spiritual and temporal ruler of the Lahu, 926.
- Fu-fang, sacred Buddhist houses of the Lahu, 926 ; at Mong Hka, 927.
- G
- Gabra Manfas Qeddis, 750.
- Gadla Hawāryāt, 750.
- Gandhara copper coin of Samanta Deva in Seistan, 784.
- Gaṇitapāda, section of Bhaṭṭadīpikā, 114.
- Garimā, saint, 744, 750.
- GAUTHIOT, R., La langue et l'écriture inconnues des documents Stein-Cowley, 497-507.
- General meetings of the Society, 265, 581, 879, 1191.
- GERINI, Colonel G. E., Chinese Riddles on Ancient Indian Toponymy : Nan-ni-hwa-lo, 437-45.
- al-Ghazzali and an Indian metaphor, 200.
- GOEJE, DE, La Fondation, 229.
- Gōlapāda, section of Bhaṭṭadīpikā, 114.
- Gold Medal (Public Schools) Presentation, 903.
- GOVINDACARYA, A., The Pāñcarātras or Bhāgavat-śāstra, 935-61.
- Græco-Bactrian copper coin from Seistan, 784.
- Greater Seal character, introduced in China, 1018 : Bushell Bowl a fine example, 1025.
- Greek astronomy received in India circa A.D. 400, 488.
- GRIERSON, G. A., A Case of Hindu Syncretism, 195.
- Note on Dr. Konow's article on Bashgali, 195.
- Birthplace of Bhakti, 800-1.
- Language of the Kanibojas, 801-2.
- Tākri Alphabet, 802-3.
- Guhila dynasty, a hitherto unknown, 156.
- GUIDI, I., The Ethiopic Senkessār, 739-58.
- Gunaparyantastotra, fragment in Stein Collection, 1064-7.
- Gupta script, three species in E. Turkestan, 448.
- Gupta script of Central Asia, 760.
- H
- Hadā'ik, 674.
- al-Hajjāj adjusts coinage, 639.
- Harasnāth temple in Sikar, 148.
- Harding Smith tablets from Telloh, 1053-62.
- Hariri on Maẓālim, 663.
- al-Hārith b. Ma-skīn, 663.
- Harsha-varadhana, date of death, 203.
- Haydarābād MS. of Babar-nāma, passage judged spurious, 65-74.

- Héro and Rao, 528; on coin of Huvishka, 528.
 Hilf al-Fuḡūl, 637.
 Hindu astronomy, 479-96; receives Greek principles *circa* A.D. 400, 488
 Hindu syncretism, 195.
 HIRSCHFELD, H., Recent Theories on the Origin of the Alphabet, 963.
 Hmawza, archæological finds at, 154.
 HOERNLE, A. F. R., Note on the Unknown Languages of Eastern Turkestan, 201.
 — The Unknown Languages of Eastern Turkestan, II, 447-77.
 Honan inscribed bones, 1025 seqq.; relics of diviner's craft, 1027; writing on, 1029 seq.
 HOPKINS, E. W., Epic Use of Bhagavat and Bhakti, 727-38.
 HOPKINS, L. C., Chinese Writing in the Chou Dynasty, 1011-38.
 Hsö Hkan-hpa, Mao chief, 921.
 Hsuan, Chou king, 1018 seq.
 HULTZSCH, E., Sāñchi Edict of Aśoka, 167.
 — Aśoka's Fourth Rock-Edict, 785.
 — Second Note on Bhabra Edict, 1113.
 — Fourth Note on Rūpnāth Edict, 1114-17.
 Huvishka, statue with inscription of reign, 150.
 — Héro on coin of, 528.
- I
- Ibn al-Dā'i, 672.
 Ibn al-Zayyāt, 658.
 Ihya of al-Ghazzali, 201.
 I-mon hsün, Ngai-lo kmg, 919.
 India, archæological exploration, 1909-10, 127-58.
 Indian anatomical drawings from Tibet, 207.
 Indian drama, not evolved in the Vedas, 1003; origin in popular religion, 1007; late appearance, 1007; first mentioned in Mahābhāṣya, 1008.
 Indian man, standard height, 208.
 Indian toponymy, Chinese riddles in, 437-45.
 Inscribed bones from Honan, 1025 seqq.; relics of diviners' craft, 1027; writing on, 1029 seqq.
 Inscriptions at Siddhalingamaḍam re-copied, 157.
 Inscriptions, Vannic, at Armavir, 49-60; funéraire de Ts'ouan Pao-Tseu, 75-108; Brāhmī and Kharōshthī at Khalatse, 143; Mōrā slab, 151; at Sakrāi, 156; at Jiñ-mātā, 156; Brāhmī, at Madura, 156; Vatṭeluttu, 156; Myazedi, 365-88; Lhasa Treaty Edict, 389-435; Vēlūrpaḷaiyam copperplate grant, 521-4; Triplicane, 523; Early Chinese, 1011-38.
 IRVINE, W., The Khatur or Khattar Tribe, 217.
 Isila, Aśoka's address sent to, 1108.
 Itihāsa, name for dialogue hymns in Veda, 979 seqq.
- J
- JACOB, Colonel G. A., Scraps from the Śaḍḍarśana, 509-13, 1127-32.
 Jahāngīr mentions Kator country, 218.
 Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, 511.
 Jayavāsuda, house of, at Bhiṭā, 137; archæological finds in, 137 seqq.
 Jiñ-mātā (Jaipur) inscription of the Chāhamāna Prithivīrāja I, 156; of Arjorāja, 156.
 Jupiter, regent of nakṣatras, 794 seqq., 1119.
 Jyōtrividābhāraṇa, 682.
- K
- Kāḷi and the Mazālim tribunal, 635-74.
 Kābir, Caliph, and Mazālim, 657.

- Kālakriyāpāda, section of Bhaṭṭa-dīpikā, 114.
 Kāleb, 744.
 Kali age, 676, 688; and its connexion with death of Kṛishṇa, 688.
 Kaliyuga era of B.C. 3102, 479-96, 675-98; is Hindu Iron Age, 480; opinions as to starting-point, 676 seqq.; inscriptions dated in, 679, 689; division into six eras, 681, 694.
 Kamhojas, language of, 801-2.
 Kānaurī - English vocabulary, 315-64.
 Kang, burial tub, 705 seqq.
 Kanthonzindaung Pagoda, 154.
 Ka-p'i-li River and Country identified as Kamla and Kapila country, 203.
 Karunandaḍakkan inscriptional date in Kaliyuga era, 691.
 Kaṭapayādi system of expressing numbers, 788-94.
 Kaw-mu, Lahu temple, 927.
 Kehari Singh of Bashahr signs treaty with Mughals, 146.
 KEITH, A. B., Irregular uses of *me* and *te* in Epic Sanskrit, 177-9.
 — The Planet Bṛhaspati, 794-800.
 — Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama, 979-1009.
 Keḷadi Rājas of Ikkēri and Bednūr, 188-93; further details of, 189.
 Khadalik, find-place of Stein Collection, 761.
 Khalatse, Brāluni and Kharōshthī inscriptions at, 143.
 Khatur or Khattar tribe, 217; not to be identified with Kators of Chitral Valley, 218.
 Khawarizm Shah, coin of, 784.
 Khuastuanift from Tun-huang, 277-314.
 Kien-t'o-wei = Old Gandak, 203.
 Kirātārjuniya, 187.
 KIRSTE, J., Hēro and Rao, 528.
 Kitāb al-Awā'il, 658.
 Koh-lo-fēng, Ngai-lao king, 919.
 Koxow. STEN, Notes on the Classification of Bashgali, 1-47.
 K'ri Sroñ /de-btsan, Tibetan king, 390.
 Kṛishṇa, death of, 686.
 Kṛita age in Hindū astronomy, 495-6.
 Kulōttuūga I rebuilt Siddhaliūga-maḍam temple and re-copied old inscriptions, 157.
 Kumāravishṇu, 521.
 Kuntala Sātakarni, 186.
 Kushaṇa period, finds at Bhitā, 131.
 Kyan-Sit Fu, 926.
- L
- LADDU, T. K., Genitive-Accusative in Marāṭhī, 819-21.
 — Rūpnāth Edict, 1117-19.
 Lahurace, 925; originally Buddhist, 925-9; ruled by *fu*, 926; characteristics of, 929; known as Lolos, 930.
 Lālibalā, 745, 750.
 Lamaists and disposal of the dead, 725.
 Lamayuru, Bonpo temple at, 144.
 LE COQ, A. v., Dr. Stein's Turkish Khuastuanift from Tun-huang, 277-314.
 LESNÝ, V., Genitive-Accusative in Marāṭhī, 179.
 Lesser Seal character, 1025.
 Lhasa, temple of Jo-k'añ, 389.
 Lhasa, treaty edict inscriptions, 389-435; bilingual form, 389; three known translations, 389; Tibetan version examined, 390 seqq.
 Limes, explorationalong the ancient Chinese, 159-66; document discovered in wall, 159-66, 497-507.
 Lingual /a in Northern Brāhmi script, 1081-9.
 Lissu, Shan tribe, 932; no written character, 932.

Lo River, 411.
 Lo-lo, Shan race, 930 seqq. ; written character resembles Indo-Pali, 932.
 Lopāmudrā considered as drama, 997.
 LÜDERS, H., Lingual *ṛ* in Northern Brāhmī Script, 1081-9.
 Lung Mountains, 409.

M

- MACDONALD, D. B., Lost MSS. of the Arabian Nights and projected edition of Galland's, 219.
 McMahon, Sir A. H., collection of coins from Seistan, 779-84.
 Madhava II, Gaṅga king, 186 ; existence not proved, 186.
 Madura, Brāhmī inscriptions, 156 : Vaṭṭeluttu, 156.
 Mahāyānasūtra, fragment in Stein Collection, 1077-9.
 Mahendra, 522.
 Mahishmaṇḍala, 809-19.
 Ma'mūn and Mazālim court, 657.
 Mandalay, its names of Ratana-puṇṇa and Yadanabon, 1123-5.
 Manichæan confession-prayer found at Tun-huang, 277-314.
 Maṅṣūr, levied taxes in kind, 639.
 Mao kingdom, 920 seqq.
 Mao Shan kingdom, 919.
 Marāṭhī, genitive-accusative in, 179, 819-22.
 Mari Tōṅṭadārya, Viraśaiva poet, 193.
 MARSHALL, J. H., Archaeological Exploration in India, 1909-10, 127-58.
 Maruts, hymn to, and Ākhyāna theory, 994 seqq.
 Mathurā school, sculptures, 149-53 ; Nāga and Yaksha cults, 150.
 Mauryan finds at Bhīṭā, 128.
 Māwardi, his Aḥkāma Sulṭāniyya, 635-74.
 Mazālim jurisdiction in the Aḥkāma Sulṭāniyya of Māwardi, 635-74.
 MAZUMDAR, B. C., Udānam, 197.
Me and *te* in Epic Sanskrit, 169, 177.
 Mêng T'ien introduces Chinese ink, 1022.
 MICHELSON, T., Irregular Uses of *me* and *te* in Epic Sanskrit, 169.
 Mirpur Khāṣ, archaeological finds at, 146-8.
 Mitani gods, 42-7.
 Mong Hka, *fu-fang* at, 927.
 Mōrā, slab inscription, 151 ; temple at, 151 ; images found at, probably of the Pāṇḍava brothers, 151-2.
 Mosos, Shan tribe, 930.
 Mu-Tsung treaty, 390 ; Mongolian account of, 405 ; ceremony at *r*Me-ru, 407.
 Muhtadi, Caliph, and Mazālim jurisdiction, 638, 657.
 Muḥtadir and Mazālim court, 657.
 Mūla-veda, 936.
 Myazedi inscriptions, fourth text, 365-88 ; script Indian, 366 ; language one of Burma, 380 ; locality possibly Prome, 381.

N

- Na'akueto La'ab, saint, 750.
 Nāga-worship in ancient Mathurā, 150.
 Nāgadēva, house of, at Bhīṭā, 132 seqq. ; archaeological finds in, 132 seqq.
 Nagaropamasūtra, fragments in Stein Collection, 772-7.
 Naksatras, borrowed by Indians, 796 ; Jupiter as regent of, 794 seqq., 1119.
 Nan-chao king, first historical home of Shans, 918.
 Nandivarman I and II, 522.
 Nandivarman III, copperplates of, at Velūrpalaiyam, 521-4.
 Nan-ni-hwa-lo, 437-45 ; identified as Nahrwāla in Gujārāt, 438.
 Nārada-Pāñcaratra, 941.
 NARASIMHACHAR, R., Dattaka-sūtra, 183.
 — Keḷadi Rājas of Ikkēri and Bednūr, 188.

- Narasimhavarman I and II, 522.
 Nawra'ta, king of Burma, 919.
 Ngai-lao, king, 918 seqq.
 Nilāmaravata, 511.
 Nimruz, coins of kings of, 783.
- NOTICES OF BOOKS—
 Aiyangar, K. V. R., History of India, pt. i, 251.
 Armbruster, C. H., Initia Amharica, 1163.
 al-'Asqalānī, Tahḍīb at-Tahḍīb, 853.
 Aung, S. Z., & Mrs. Rhys Davids, Compendium of Philosophy, 1154.
 Bādarāyaṇa, The Search after God, 236.
 Bell, G. L., Amurath to Amurath, 873.
 Bender, H., The Suffixes *mant* and *vant* in Sanskrit and Avestan, 254.
 Brandstetter, R., Sprachvergleichen Charakterbild eines Indonesischen Idiomes, 862.
 Brown, R. Grant, Half the Battle in Burmese, 543.
 Carpenter, J. E., Digha-Nikāya, vol. iii, 556.
 Chailley, J., Administrative Problems of British India, 231.
 Cœdès, G., Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Latins, 536.
 Coomaraswamy, A. K., Mediaeval Sinhalese Art, 839.
 Cros, G., Mission française de Chaldée, 1182.
 Dautremet, J., Grande Artère de la Chine, 1176.
 Davids, T. W. & C. A. F., Dialogues of the Buddha, pt. ii, 1145.
 Derenbourg, H., Oumāra du Yémen, 244.
 D'Ollone, H., Les Derniers Barbares, 1168.
 Dussaud, R., Civilisations pré-helléniques dans le Bassin de la mer Egée, 1187.
 Eitel, E. J. & I. G. Genahr, Chinese-English Dictionary in the Cantonese Dialect, 1172.
 Fuller, Sir B., Indian Life and Sentiment, 253.
 Geyer, R., Beiträge zum Diwān des Ru'bah, 237.
 Hannah, Ian C., Eastern Asia, 868.
 Herrmann, A., Die Alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien, 1166.
 Hodson, Lieut. V. C. P., Historical Records of the Governor-General's Body Guard, 248.
 Hooker, Mary, Behind the Scenes in Peking, 246.
 Ilurgronje, C. Snouck, Michael Jan De Goeje, 843.
 India, Archaeological Survey, vol. xxxv, Akbar's Tomb, 850.
 Janneau, Ch. G., Une Dynastie Chaldéenne: Rois d'Ur, 1186.
 Johnston, R. F., Lion and Dragon in Northern China, 531.
 Kane, P. V., Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanūtha Kavirāja, 848.
 Kētkar, S. V., History of Caste in India, vol. i, 1158.
 König, E., Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, 1160.
 Krausz, J., Gotternamen in den Babylonischen Siegelcylinder-Legenden, 1184.
 Lal Behari, The Vedas and their Angas and Upangas, vol. i, 1157.
 Lloyd, Rev. A., Shinran and his Work, 242.
 Lorenzo, G. de, India e Buddismo Antico, 865.
 Margolis, Max L., Manual of Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud, 563.
 Milne, Mrs. L., Shans at Home, 546.

- Moin-ud-Din, M., History of the Taj and the Buildings in its Vicinity, 250.
- Myhrman, D. W., Sumerian Administrative Documents, 571.
- Nederlandsch-Indie, Rapporten van de Commissie voor Oudheidkundig Onderzoek op Java en Madoera, 861.
- Paṭhamanī Suddhammawatī, Gawampatī, Rājādhīrāt, 554.
- Poebel, A., Babylonian Legal and Business Documents, 573.
- Radau, H., Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to the God Nin-ib, 576.
- Ross, E. D., Alphabetical List of Titles of Works in the Chinese Buddhist Tripiṭka, 560.
- Schönfeld, K., Das Sāntiśataka, mit Einleitung, kritischem Apparat, Übersetzung, und Anmerkungen, 257.
- Schroeder, L. von, Wurzeln der Sage vom heiligen Gral, 261.
- Seidenstucker, K., Pali Buddhismus in Uebersetzungen, 867.
- Stenz, G. M., Beiträge zur Volkskunde Süd-Schantungs, 55.
- Sykes, Major P. M., The Glory of the Shia World, 239.
- Thureau-Dangin, Fr., Inventaire des Tablettes de Tello, 568.
- Valentine, W. H., Modern Copper Coins of the Muhammadan States, 856.
- Wālī, Abdul, Quatrains of Abū Sa'īd s. Abu Khaur, 827.
- Weiger, L., Bouddhisme Chinois, tome i, 562.
- Whitehead, R. B., Catalogue of Coins in the Delhi Museum of Archaeology, 1190.
- Wielenga, D. K., Schets van een Socmbaneesche Spraakkunst, 541.
- Wilson, C. E., Maṣnavī of Jalālu'd-Dīn Rūmī, book ii, 858.
- Zekī Bey, Ahmad, Mémoire sur les moyens propres à déterminer en Égypte une renaissance des lettres Arabes, 241.
- Numbers, Āryabhaṭa's system of expressing, 109-26; origin unknown, 125.
- Numbers, Kaṭapayāda system of expressing, 788-94.
- Nur al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī, 661.
- Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭikā, 511.

O

OBITUARY NOTICES—

- Ferguson, D. W., 269.
- Hervey, D. F. A., 909.
- Rogers, A., 270.
- 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, Caliph, 636.

P

- Pādma-tantra, 940.
- Paez, history of, 744.
- Pāñcarātras or Bhāgavat Śāstra, 935-61; is Vedic, 939; meaning of term, 940; antiquity of, 950.
- Pāṇḍava war, 686.
- Pañtalēwon, saint, 744-50.
- Parakēsarivarman-Uttama-Chōla, inscriptional date in Kaliyuga era, 692.
- Paramādīśvara, author of commentary on Āryabhaṭīya, 113.
- Paramēśvaravarman II, 522.
- Parāntaka, Pāṇḍya king, inscriptional date in Kaliyuga era, 690.
- Parāntaka I, Chōla king, inscriptional date in Kaliyuga era, 691.
- PARITER, F. E., Rīgveda, X, 86, 803-9.
- Parkham statue, 149.
- PINCHES, T. G., Tablets from Tel-loh in Private Collections, 1039-62.
- Planet Brhaspati, 794-800, 1119-25.
- Planets mentioned in Vedas, 514-18.
- P'o-lon Shan, mountain range, 410.
- POUSSIN, L. DE LA V., Documents Sanscrits de la Seconde Collection M. A. Stein, 759-77, 1063-79.

Praesepe and Bṛhaspati, 798, 1120.
 Priest-kingship, origin in Tibet, 417.
 Prithvirāja I (Chāhamāna), date of, 156.
 Pulakēśin II, inscriptional date in Kaliyuga era, 689.
 Purānas and the Kaliyuga era, 678.
 Purūravas and Ākhyāna theory, 990 seqq.
 Pushkar epigraph, gives name and date of Durgarāja, 156.
 Pyu, funeral urns of, found near Hmawza, 155.

R

RAJA, K. R. V., Dravida Prāñyāyāma, 1126.
 Ral-pa-chan, Tibetan king, 390.
 Rāmātirtham, Buddhist monastery excavated at, 153.
 Rao on coin of Huvishka, 528.
 Ratanapūṇṇa : Yadanabon : Mandalay, 1123-5.
 Raṭṭavā, Guhila queen, 156.
 Recorder Chou, 1025.
 RICE, L., Mahishamaṇḍala, 809-16.
 Rigveda, x, 86, 803-9.
 Rigveda, viii, 100, and Ākhyāna theory, 992 seqq.
 Rosary, late in Buddhism, 703.
 Rūpnāth edict and 256 nights, 1091-1112 ; a late edict of Aśoka, 1101 ; fourth note on, 1114-19.

S

Saddārśana, scraps from, 509-13, 1127-32.
 Saddhārmapūṇḍarīka MS. in Stein Collection, 1067-77.
 Sahrībahlol, archæological finds at, 141-3.
 Saiyad Sālār Mas'ūd as curer of leprosy and blindness, 195.
 Sakrū, inscription at, dated Samvat 879, 156.
 Salām, addition to the Senkessār, 751.
 Samuel of Waldebbā, 750.

Sāmvāda, name for dialogue hymns in Veda, 979.
 Sāndli edict of Aśoka, 167.
 Sāṅḍilya, 948.
 Sanskrit documents in Stein Collection, 759-77, 1063-79.
 Sarduris, Vannic ruler, 51.
 Śatapañcasatkastotra, fragments in Stein Collection, 762-69.
 Śatlakopa, 949.
 Saundarananda Kāvya, viii, 35, 1125-6.
 SAYCE, Rev. Professor A. H., Cuneiform Inscription of Van, pt. viii, 49-63.
 SCHRADER, F. O., The term Bhagavat, 194.
 SCOTT, Sir J. G., Buddhism in the Shan States, 917-34.
 Seal of Dalai Lama, 204-7, 528-30, 822.
 SEDGWICK, L. J., Genitive-Accusative in Marathi, 821-2.
 Seistan, Sir A. H. McMahon's coins from, 779-84.
 Senkessār, the Ethiopic, 739-58 ; MSS. of, 741 seqq. ; translated from Arabic story of, 742, 756.
 Shaḍakshari, Sanskrit author, 190 seqq.
 Shahs of Persia, coins of, 784.
 Shan States, Buddhism in, 917-34.
 Shan-lien = the River Bagmati, 203.
 Shang-Chieh-tsai, Tibetan minister in 783 A. D., 429.
 Shans, original home, 918.
 Shuo Wen, forms of Chinese writing in, 1019 seqq.
 Siddhalingamaṇḍam temple, 157 ; inscriptions of, 1070-1118 ; re-copied at, 157.
 Sijistan, coins of governors of, 781 seqq.
 Simhavarman, 522.
 Simhavishnu, 522.
 Singyidaing Pagoda, 154.
 Śivarāja, Chāhamāna prince, 156.
 Skandaśishya, 521.
 Śrī-Praśna-Samhitā, 941.

- Standard height of an Indian man, 208.
- Stein Collection, Sanskrit documents, 759-77, 1063-79.
- Stein MSS. from Eastern Turkestan, 447-77.
- Stein-Cowley documents, la langue et l'écriture inconnues, 159-66, 497-507.
- Stone drums, inscriptions of, 1019.
- Sudās hymn in R̥gveda, 1006.
- Sulaimān b. Wāhb, vizier to Muhtadī, 638.
- Śunahśepa legend, 988 seqq.
- Suīṅga period, finds at Bhūṭā, 130.
- Suparnādhyaīya considered drama, 1001-4.
- Suvaṇṇagirī. Aśōka passed 256 nights at, 1108.
- Svanetian vocabulary, 589-634.
- Synaxaria of Coptic-Alexandrine Church, 739; translated into Ge'ez, 740; in existence in fourteenth century, 740.
- T
- Ta'āmera Māryām, 751.
- Tablets from Tel-loh in private collection, 1039-62.
- Tāhirids, coinage of, 780.
- Tai, their literature, 917; breaking up of, 919; Buddhist religion among, 919; alphabet, 923.
- Takla Hāymānot, 744, 750.
- Ṭakrī alphabet, 802-3.
- Tali-fu branch of Tais, 919.
- Tantrākhyāyikā, 511.
- TAW SEIN Ko, Buddhist Era in Burma, 212.
- Taxation under the Caliphs, 638.
- Tel-loh tablets in private collections, 1039-62.
- Tê-Tsung, emperor, 389 seqq.; treaty, 390 seqq.; ceremony at Ch'ingshui, 391.
- THOMAS, F. W., Saundarananda Kāvya, viii, 35, 1125-6.
- Thumal, stewardess of Muḩtadir, 657.
- Tibet, ancient Indian anatomical drawings, 207.
- Tibet, archaeological finds in Western, 143-6; pre-Buddhistic finds, 144; wood-carvings from, 145.
- Tibet, disposal of dead, 725.
- Tibetan invasion of India, 747 A. D., 203.
- Tibetan version of Lhasa Treaty Edict, 399 seqq.; language of classical period, 394.
- Tirukkāṭṭupalli, village, 522.
- Tishya, 514-18.
- Tishya and Brhaspati, 795 seqq., 1119-22.
- TORREY, C., Newly Discovered Arabic Text of Ali Baba, 221.
- Touen-houang, Grotto of Thousand Buddhas, 761.
- Triplicane inscription, 523.
- Ts'ouan Pao-Tseu, inscription funéraire, 75-108.
- Tun-huang, Turkish Khuastuanift found at, 277-314.
- T'u-po-ho-lo, 203.
- Turkestan (Eastern), unknown languages, 447-77; another unknown language, 159-66, 497-507.
- Turkish Khuastuanift, 277-314.
- Two hundred and fifty-six nights of Aśōka, 1091-1112; no connexion with calendar, 1097; coincide with 256 years after Buddha's death, 1110.
- U
- 'Ubaid Allah b. Sulaimān, vizier, 659.
- Udānam, 197.
- Udānavarga, in Stein Central Asia Collection, 759.
- Universal Races Congress, 229.
- Unknown languages of Eastern Turkestan, 159-66, 201, 447-77.
- V
- Vācaspatimiśra, 511.
- Vairocana, Cap of, 702.

- Van, Cuneiform inscriptions, 49-63.
 Varadarāja, 512.
 Vāntā-mālā, 945.
 Vātsyāyana, 184.
 Vedānta-kalpataru of Amalānanda, 509-13.
 Vedas, planets in, 514.
 Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian drama, 979-1009.
 Vedic astronomy, 794-800, 1119-22.
 Vedic drama, 1001.
 Veil of the Five Buddhas, 702.
 Vēlūrpalaiyam plates of Nandivarman III, 521-4; Tamil in Grantha characters, 521.
 VENKAYYA, V., Vēlūrpalaiyam Plates of Nandivarman III, 521-4.
 Vikramāditya I. copper - plate charter of, obtained from Gadval, 156.
 Vīrakūrcha, 521.
 Viṣṇugōpa, 522.
- W
- WADDELL, L. A., Tibetan Invasion of India, 747 A.D., 203.
 — Seal of Dalai Lama, 204, 822.
 — Ancient Indian Anatomical Drawings from Tibet, 207.
 — Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa, 389-435.
- Walatta Pētros, saint, 751.
 Walāyat-al-Mazālim, 635-74.
 WALSH, E. H., Seal of the Dalai Lama, 206.
 WARDROP, O., English-Svanetian Vocabulary, 589-634.
 War-lông, Lahu New Year feast, 931.
 Western Tibet, archaeological finds in, 143-6; wood-carvings from, 145.
 Wu Chuan Tiug, date of, 1018.
- Y
- Yadanabon, name for Mandalay, 1123-5.
 Yajñēśvara, temple of Śiva, 522.
 Yajurveda, originally a prose text, 987.
 Yaksha worship in ancient Mathura, 150.
 Yathemyo, excavations at, 154.
 YERTS, W. P., Disposal of Buddhist Dead in China, 699-725.
 Yudhishthira twice ascended the throne, 684.
 Yunnan, inscription of, 75-108.
- Z
- Zar'a Yā'qob, 750.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

FOUNDED MARCH, 1823

CORRECTED TO JANUARY 20, 1911

22 ALBEMARLE STREET,
LONDON

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

PATRON.

HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING.

VICE-PATRON.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENT.

1910 T. H. THORNTON, C.S.I., D.C.L.

COUNCIL OF MANAGEMENT FOR 1910-11

PRESIDENT.

1908 THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD REAY, P.C., G.C.S.I., LL.D.

DIRECTOR.

1910 SIR RAYMOND WEST, K.C.I.E., LL.D.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

1905 PROFESSOR SIR ROBERT K. DOUGLAS.

1910 THE RT. HON. SIR H. MORTIMER DURAND, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I.

1907 G. A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. ret.

1909 W. IRVINE, Esq., I.C.S. ret.

HONORARY OFFICERS.

1910 CODRINGTON, O., M.D., F.S.A. (*Librarian*)

1910 FLEET, J. F., C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. ret. (*Secretary*)

1910 KENNEDY, J., Esq., I.C.S. ret. (*Treasurer*).

ORDINARY MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

1907 AMEER ALI, THE RIGHT HON. SYED, C.I.E.

1910 BARNETT, PROFESSOR L. D., Litt.D.

1910 BLAGDEN, C. OTTO, Esq.

1908 BROWNE, PROFESSOR E. G., F.B.A.

1908 DAMES, M. LONGWORTH, Esq., I.C.S. ret.

1910 ELLIS, A. J., Esq.

1907 GASTER, M., Ph.D.

1909 GUEST, A. RHUVON, Esq.

1907 KEITH, A. BERRIEDALE, B.C.L.

1909 LYALL, SIR CHARLES, K.C.S.I.

1909 MACDONELL, PROFESSOR A. A.

1910 MARGOLIOUTH, PROFESSOR D. S.

1907 PARGITER, F. E., Esq., I.C.S. ret.

1909 SEWELL, R., Esq., I.C.S. ret.

1908 THOMAS, F. W., Ph.D.

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 Street, S.W.

COMMITTEES

FINANCE.

SIR C. J. LYALL.
DR. M. GASTER.
W. IRVINE, Esq.
A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, Esq.

LIBRARY.

DR. M. GASTER.
T. H. THORNTON, Esq.

ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND.

PROF. MACDONELL.
DR. M. GASTER.
A. G. ELLIS, Esq.

INDIAN TEXTS SERIES.

DR. G. A. GRIERSON.
R. W. FRAZER, Esq.

MEDAL.

SIR ARTHUR WOLLASTON.
DR. M. GASTER.
W. IRVINE, Esq.
T. H. THORNTON, Esq.

HONORARY AUDITORS, 1910-11.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, Esq. (for the Council).
WILSON CREWDSON, 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.

- 1902 HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING, K.G.
1882 FIELD-MARSHAL HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF
CONNAUGHT, K.G.
- 1909 *ABU-ALI, Saiyed, *Rais, Agra, U.P., India; c/o Messrs.
Thomas Cook and Son, Ludgate Circus, E.C.*
- 1902 *ADERS, Dr. Walter Mansfield, 3 *Hall Road, N.W.*
- 1890 ADLER, Elkan Nathan, M.A., 15 *Cophall Avenue, E.C.*
- 1909 *AGARWALA, Rai Girdhari Lal, *Vakil, N.W.P. High
Court, 18 Edmondstone Road, Allahabad, U.P.,
India.*
- 1910 *AHMAD DIN KHAN, Khan Bahadur, *Attuché, British
Consulate General, Meshed, via Askabad, Trans-
caspia, Russia.*
- 1900 *AHMAD, Aziz - uddin, Khan Bahadur, *Magistrate,
Fyzabad, Oudh, India.*
- 1909 *AHMAD, Maulavi Kamaluddin, M.A., *Provincial
Educational Service, E. B. & A.; Superintendent,
Government Madrasah, Chittagong, Eastern Bengal,
India.*
- 10 1910 *AHMAD, Moulvi Sayyid Makbul, *Fatehgahr, U.P.,
India.*
- 1907 *AHMAD, Shah Moniruddin, *Barrister-at-Law, Mahalla-
Chowhatta, Bankipur, Patna, India.*
- 1908 *AHMAD, Sofiullah Saifuddin, *Sub-Deputy Collector,
Silchar, Assam, India.*
- 1902 AINSLIE, Douglas, *Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.*

- 1903 *AIYANGAR, S. Krishnaswami. *Chamarajendrapet, Bangalore, India.*
- 1908 *AIYANGAR, S. Kuppaswami, *Private Secretary to H.H. Kerala Varma, C.S.I., Dikshitar Street, Fort, Trivandrum, Travancore, South India.*
- 1906 *AIYAR, K. G. Sesha, *High Court Vakil, Trivandrum, Travancore, South India.*
- 1905 *AIYAR, S. Ramanath, *Registrar, Kanjirapalli, South Travancore, South India.*
- 1874 *†AKAMATZU RENJO, Rev., *Nishi Hongwanji, Kioto, Japan.*
- 1907 *ALI, A. F. M. Abdul, M.A., *Deputy Magistrate and Collector, Eastern Bengal and Assam, Netrokona, Mymensingh, India.*
- 20 1907 *ALI, Mahomed Anwar, *Barrister-at-Law, Gorakhpur, U.P., India.*
- 1907 *ALI, Mahomed Azhare, *Provincial Service, Sudder Tehsil, Azamgarh, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *ALI, Muhammad Asaf, *c/o Messrs H. S. King & Co., 65 Cornhill, E.C.*
- 1908 *ALI, S. Raza, *Assistant Opium Agent, Basti, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *ALI, Saiyid Aijaz, *Deputy Collector, P.O., Nadbai, Bharatpur State, Rajputana, India.*
- 1907 *ALI, Syed Ibtai, *Editor and Proprietor, "Naiyiri Azam," Moradabad, U.P., India.*
- 1909 ALLAN, J., M.A., *British Museum, W.C.*
- 1880 ALLEN, H. J., *10 The Norton, Tenby, S. Wales.*
- 1904 *ALVAREZ, Justin C. W., *H.B.M. Consul-General, Tripoli of Barbary, via Malta.*
- 1901 AMEDROZ, H. F., *48 York Terrace, N.W.*
- 30 1904 *§AMPER ALI, The Right Hon. Syed, C.I.E., *The Lambdens, Beenham, near Reading.*
- 1909 *AMMA, Thekkay Kuruppath Kalyani, *Trichur, Cochin State, Madras, India.*
- 1907 *ANDERSON, J. D., I.C.S. (ret.), *Mostyn House, Brooklands Arenue, Cambridge.*
- 1910 *ANTHONY, H. M., *Ministry of Finance, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1888 *ARNOLD, T. W., *Professor of Arabic, University College, London, 21 Cromwell Road, S.W.*

- 1910 *AYRTON, E R., 62 *Edith Road, W. Kensington, W.*
- 1909 *AYYANGAR, T. R. Srinivasa, 308 *Aiyavaiyar Lane, West Main Street, Tanjore, South India.*
- 1910 *AZIZ, S. A., c/o *Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 65 Cornhill, E.C.*
- 1867 †BABBAGE, Major-General H. P., *Mayfield, Lansdowne Place, Cheltenham.*
- 1905 *BADRE, Muhammed, *University Union, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 40 1903 *BAILEY, Rev. T. Grahame, M.A., B.D., *Wazirābād, Panjab, India.*
- 1883 *†BALL, James Dyer, Hong-Kong C.S.(ret.), 23 *Lancaster Avenue, Hadley Wood, Middlesex.*
- 1910 *BANERJEA, Babu Ras Bihari, *Santi Cootir, Bally, Bengal, India.*
- 1910 *BANERJI, Babu Rakhil Das, *Indian Museum, Calcutta, India.*
- 1907 *BANERJI, Mrs. Nolini, c/o *A. R. Banerji, Esq., I.C.S., Prime Minister, Cochin, South India.*
- 1910 *BARNES, Warren D., *British Resident, Kuala Lipis Pahang, Malay Peninsula, via Penang.*
- 1904 §BARNETT, Lionel D., Litt.D., *Professor of Sanskrit, University College; British Museum, W.C.*
- 1890 *†BARODA, His Highness Mahārāja Sayaji Rao Bahadur, G.C.S.I., Gaekwar of.
1888. HON. 1895. BARTH, Auguste, 10 *Rue Garancière, Paris, France.*
- HON. 1906 BASSET, René, *Professor of Arabic, Algiers.*
- 50 1881 *†BATE, Rev. J. Drew, 15 *St. John's Church Road, Folkestone.*
- 1873 †BAYNES, A. H., *Fitzwalters, Northwood, Middlesex.*
- 1885 *BAYNES, Herbert, 19 *Albany Mansions, Albert Bridge Road, S.W.*
- 1901 *BEATSON, Surgeon-General W. B. (late *Bengal Medical Service*), *Vicarsgrange, Eastbourne, Sussex.*
- 1907 *BEAZLEY, Professor C. Raymond, D.Litt., *The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham.*
- 1908 *BECHER, Robert Arnolds, *H.B.M.'s Consul, Goa; Marmugao, Goa, Portuguese India.*

- 1901 BELL, Miss Gertrude, 95 *Sloane Street, S.W.* ;
Rounton Grange, Northallerton, Yorks.
- 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.*
- 60 1904 *BEVIR, Edward Laurence, 2 *Rue Mésangère, Avenue*
des Balives, Valence-sur-Rhône, France.
- 1882 *†BHABHA, Rev. Shapurje D., M.D., 8 *Drakefell Road,*
St. Catherine's Park, S.E.
- HON. 1885 BHANDARKAR, Professor Ramkrishna Gopal, C.I.E.,
Ph.D., *Sangamaśrama, Poona, Bombay, India.*
- 1909 *BHATTACHARYA, Babu Bisiswar, *Assistant Settlement*
Officer, Faridpore, Bengal, India.
- 1888 *BILGRAMI, Syed Ali, *Khairatabad, Hyderabad, Deccan,*
India.
- 1895 §BLAGDEN, C. Otto, *Redcourt, Champion Hill, S.E.*
- 1897 *§BLUMHARDT, Professor James Fuller, *Woodlands,*
Gerrard's Cross, Bucks.
- 1909 *BLUNT, E. A. H., I.C.S., *c/o Secretariat, Allahabad,*
U.P., India.
- 1861 *BLUNT, Sir John E., C.B., K.C.M.G., *Union Club,*
Malta.
- 1902 *†BOBBILI, Maharaja Sri Rao Sir Venketasvetasveta-
chalapati Ranga Rao Bahadur, K.C.I.E., *Maharaja*
of, Vizagapatam, South India.
- 70 1895 BODE, Mrs. M. Haynes, Ph.D., 44 *Torrington Square, W.C.*
- 1908 *BOSE, Babu Charu Chandra, 35 *Kally Prasad Dutt's*
Street, Calcutta, India.
- 1909 BOSE, N. N., 14 *St. Mark's Crescent, Regent's Park, N.W.*
- 1903 *BOWEN, Rev. John, *St. Lawrence Rectory, Wolffs Castle,*
Pembrokeshire.
- 1898 *BRIGGS, Rev. W. A., M.D., *Chieng Rai, Laos, via*
Moulmein and Raheng, Burma.
- 1900 *BRÜNNLE, Dr. P.
- 1907 *BROWN, R. Grant, I.C.S., *Deputy Commissioner,*
Kindat, Upper Burma.
- 1889*†§BROWNE, Edward Granville, M.A., F.B.A., *Pembroke*
College, Adams Professor of Arabic; Firwood,
Trumpington Road, Cambridge.

- 1907 *BRUNTON, Chisholm Dunbar, *Les Charmilles, Joui-les-Tours, Indre et Loire, France.*
- 1908 *BÜCHLER, Dr. A., *Jews' College, London; 27 College Crescent, S. Hampstead, N.W.*
- 80 1906 *†BURDWAN, Maharaja Dhiraj Bijay Chand Mahtab of *The Palace, Burdwan, Bengal, India.*
- 1866 *†BURGESS, James, C.I.E., LL.D., *22 Seton Place, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1897 *BURN, The Hon. Mr. Richard, I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay, Groome & Co., Bombay, India.*
- 1908 *BUX, Hafiz Mahomed, *Member of Middle Temple; Downing College, Cambridge.*
- 1881 *†CAIN, Rev. John, *Dumagadam, S. India.*
- 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, D.Litt., *11 Marston Ferry Road, Oxford.*
- 1900 *CARUS, Dr. Paul, *Open Court Publishing Co., 378 Wabash Avenue, Chicago, U.S.A.*
- 90 1888 *CASARTELLI, The Right Rev. L. C., *Bishop of Salford, St. Bede's College, Manchester.*
- 1897 *CAVE, H. W., *5 Sussex Square, Brighton.*
- 1907 *CHADHA, Trijogi N., *Downing College, Cambridge.*
- 1899 *CHAKRAVARTI, Mon Mohun, *14 Palmer's Bazar Road, North Entally Post Office, Calcutta, India.*
- 1877 *CHAMBERLAIN, Basil Hall, *c/o Lloyds Bank, Law Courts Branch, 220 Strand, W.C.*
- 1895 *†CHAND, Diwan Tek, *Deputy Commissioner, Gurgaon, Panjab, India.*
- 1909 *CHAND, Pandit Uday, M.A., *Settlement Officer, Riasi, Jammu and Kashmir State, India.*
- 1908 *CHO, Maung Ba, *Pleader, 20 Merchant Street, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1910 *CHOWDHURY, M. Roy, *Zemindar, P.O., Shyampur, Rungpur District, Bengal, India.*

- 1885 *†CHURCHILL, Sidney, *H.B.M. Consul General, Naples, Italy.*
- 100 1882 CLARKE, Sir C. Purdon, C.S.I., *17 Penyicern Road, Earl's Court, S.W.*
- 1904 *CLEMENTI, C., *Hong-Kong, China.*
- 1899 *CLOUGH, Mrs. E. Rauschenbusch, *40 Shepard Street, Rochester, New York, U.S.A.*
- 1900 *†COCHIN, H.H. the Raja of, *K.C.S.I., Cochin, South India.*
- 1907 *COCHRAN, Alexander Smith, *Yonkers, New York, U.S.A.; H5, The Albany, Piccadilly, W.*
- 1910 *COCHRANE, Rev. Wilbur Willis, *Missionary, Hsipur, Northern Shan States, Burma.*
- 1910 *†CODRINGTON, Humphrey W., *Ceylon Civil Service, c/o The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Colombo.*
- 1877 §CODRINGTON, Oliver, M.D., F.S.A., *HON. LIBRARIAN, 12 Victoria Road, Clapham, S.W.*
- 1909 *COHEN, Samuel J., *11 Peter Street, Manchester.*
- 1908 COLDSTREAM, W., *I.C.S. (ret.), 69 West Cromwell Road, S.W.*
- 110 1905 *COLSTON, E., *Burma Civil Service, The Secretariat, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1909 *COLTON, Miss Elizabeth S., *23 Park Street, Easthampton, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1910 *CONYBEARE, Frederick Cornwallis, M.A., *University College, Oxford.*
- 1901 *§COOK, Stanley A., *26 Lensfield Road, Cambridge.*
- 1906 *†COOMARASWAMY, Ananda K., D.Sc., F.G.S., F.L.S., *Norman Chapel, Broad Campden, Gloucestershire.*
- HON. 1893 CORDIER, Prof. Henri, *54 Rue Nicolo, Paris, France.*
- 1904 *COSTA, Alessandro, *46 Via Quirinale, Rome, Italy.*
- 1888 COUSENS, Henry, *Late Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Holly Cottage, Milford, Surrey.*
- 1879 *CRAIG, W., *Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.*
- 1882 §CRAWFORD AND BALCARRES, *The Right Hon. the Earl of, K.T., F.R.S., Haigh, Wigan.*
- 120 1905 *CREWDSON, Wilson, J.P., F.S.A., *Chairman, Japan Society of London, Southside, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Sussex.*

LIST OF MEMBERS

- 1893 *CUNNINGHAM, Sir A. F. D., K.C.I.E., *Baynton House, Westbury, Wilts.*
- 1909 CURZON OF KEDLESTON, The Right Hon. Lord, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., F.R.S., *Hackwood, near Basingstoke, Hants.*
- 1908 *DAICHES, Dr. Samuel, *Professor, Jews' College, London ; 2 Summerfield Avenue, Kilburn, N.W.*
- 1891 *†D'ALVIELLA, M. le Comte Goblet. *Rue Faider 10, Brussels, Belgium.*
- 1884 §DAMES, M. Longworth, I.C.S. (ret.), *c/o Messrs. King & Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1909 *DANDOY, Georges Ghislain, *St. Xavier's College, 11 Park Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 1905 *DAS, Babu Jogindra Nath, *Zamindar and Rector, Khalipsur High School, Khulna, Bengal, India.*
- 1907 *DAS, Hon. M. S., C.I.E., *Cuttack, Orissa, India.*
- 1899 *DAS, Babu Ram Saran, Rai Bahadur, M.A., *Manager, Oudh Commercial Bank, Fyzabad, India.*
- 130 1904 *DAVAR, M. B., M.A., Ph.D., *89 Gilder Street, Grant Road, Bombay, India.*
- 1894 *†DAVIES, Rev. T. Witton, B.A., Ph.D., D.D., *Professor of Semitic Languages, University College of North Wales, Bryn Haul, Bangor, N. Wales.*
- 1910 *DAVIS, Lady, *20 Basil Mansions, Knightsbridge, S.W.*
- HON. 1908 DELITZSCH, Dr. Friedrich, *Professor of Oriental Philology, University of Berlin ; 135 Kurfürstendamm, Halensee, Berlin, Germany.*
- 1908 *DESIKA - CHARI, T., *High Court Vakil, Cantonment, Trichinopoly, Madras, South India.*
- 1896 *DEUSSEN, Professor P., *39 Beseler -allee, Kiel, Germany.*
- 1909 DEVONSHIRE, His Grace the Duke of, P.C., *Devonshire House, Piccadilly, W.*
- 1904 *DEWHURST, Robert Paget, M.A., I.C.S., *Gonda, Oudh, U.P., India.*
- 1908 *DHANINIVAT, Mom Chow, *Government House, Ayuthia, Siam.*
- 1882 †§DICKINS, F. V., C.B., *Seend Lodge, Seend, Melksham, Wilts.*

- 140 1908 *†DIN, Malik Muhammad, *Irrigation Officer, Bahawalpur State, Panjab, India.*
- 1904 DOBRÉE, Alfred, 11 *Palace Street, Buckingham Gate, S.W.*
- 1894 *D'OLDENBURG, Serge, Ph.D., *Professor of Sanskrit, The University, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- 1910 *DOMINGO, Alfred William, *Public Works Department, Shillong, Assam, India.*
- 1874 *§DOUGLAS, Sir R. K., VICE-PRESIDENT, *Emeritus Professor of Chinese, King's College, London; Acton Turville, Chippenham.*
- 1888 *DOYLE, Rev. James, *Diocese of Mylapore, San Thomé, Madras, India.*
- 1910 *DRAKE-BROCKMAN, D. L., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. T. Cook & Son, Ludgate Circus, E.C.*
- 1896 *DUFF, Miss C. M. (Mrs. W. R. Rickmers), 3 *Maximilianstrasse, Innsbrück, Austria, Tirol.*
- 1907 §DURAND, The Right Hon. Sir Henry Mortimer, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., VICE-PRESIDENT, 42 *Montagu Square, W.*
- 1896 *DUTT, Babu Kedar Nath, *Bhakti Vinōda; Satasan Bhajankuti, Puri P.O., Orissa; Swarupganj P.O., Nadia; 181 Maniktala Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 150 1907 *DUTTON, Mrs. Blanche Eleanor, *Hinton House, Alresford, Hants.*
- 1905 *EDWARDS, E., *Oriental Books and Manuscripts Department, British Museum, W.C.*
- HON. 1907 EGGELING, Professor Julius, *The University, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1905 *ELIAS, Colonel Robert, *late 59th Regiment, Rendham Barnes, Saxmundham, Suffolk.*
- 1905 ELIOT, Sir Charles, K.C.M.G., C.B., *Vice-Chancellor University of Sheffield; Endcliffe Holt, Endcliffe Crescent, Sheffield.*
- 1907 ELLIOTT, Sir C. A., K.C.S.I., *Fernwood, Wimbledon Park, S.W.*
- 1897 §ELLIS, Alexander George, *Assistant Librarian, India Office, S.W.*

- 1907 *ENTHOVEN, R. E., I.C.S., *Yacht Club, Bombay, India.*
- 1904 *ETTINGHAUSEN, Dr. Maurice L. *Possartsstrasse 2.
Munich, Bararia*
- 1902 FANSHAWE, Herbert Charles, C.S.I., *72 Philbrach
Gardens, Earl's Court, S.W.*
- 160 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, Haidarabad, Dekkan,
India.*
- 1909 *FAZLUL-KARIM, Muhammad. *Subdivisional Magistrate.
Patuakhali, Bakarganj, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- 1902 *FENTON, Ferrar, *8 Kings Road, Mitcham, Surrey.*
- 1877 *†FERGUSON, A. M., *Frognal House, Hampstead, N.W.*
- 1901 *FERGUSON, J. C., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co.,
9 Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1907 *FERRAR, Captain M. L., *Lyallpur, Panjab, India.*
- 1881 *FINN, Alexander, *British Consulate General, Valparaiso.
Chili.*
- 1887 FINN, Mrs., *The Elms, Brook Green, W.*
- 1893 *FINOT, Louis, *Directeur adjoint à l'école des Hautes
Études, 11 Rue Poussin, Paris xvi^e, France.*
- 170 1877 §FLEET, J. F., C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. (ret.), Hon.
SECRETARY, 8 Leopold Road, Ealing, W.
- 1909 FOSTER, William, *Registrar and Superintendent of
Records, India Office, S.W.*
- 1910 *†FRAMURZ JUNG, Nawab Bahadur, *Revenue Commissioner.
H.H. The Nizam's Service, Haidarabad, Deccan.
India.*
- 1907 *FRASER, Charles I., *c/o Messrs. Howell & Co.,
6 Nakahamamachi, Hakodate, Japan.*
- 1907 FRASER, Lovat George, *The White House, Slough.*
- 1886 §FRAZER, R. W., LL.B., I.C.S. (ret.), *London Institution,
Finsbury Circus, E.C.*
- 1897 *FRERE, Miss M., *7 Camden Place, Regent Street,
Cambridge.*
- 1909 *FRIEND-PEREIRA, J. E., *Extra Assistant Commissioner
and Subdivisional Magistrate, Goalpara, Assam
India.*

- 1899 *GAIT, Edmund Albert, C.I.E., *Census Commissioner for India, Simla, India.*
- 1910 *GANGULY, Rai Bahadur Priya Lal, *Registrar, Office of the Military Secretary to H.E. the Viceroy of India, 12 Parsee Bagan Lane, Calcutta, India.*
- 180 1881 *GARDNER, Christopher T., *H. B. M. Consul, Amoy, China.*
- 1890 §GASTER, M., Ph.D., 193 *Maida Vale, W.*
- 1865 †GAYNER, C., M.D.
- 1906 *†GEIL, William Edgar, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., *Doylestown, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*
- 1895 *GERINI, Colonel G. E., *Albenga, Cisano sul Nera, Italy.*
- 1910 *GHATAK, S. C., M.A., *Deputy Magistrate, Sylhet, E. B. & A., India.*
- 1902 *GHINE, Mounq Ohn, C.I.E., *Fair View, 1 Lancaster Road, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1908 *GHOSH, Wopendranath, *Deputy Collector and Magistrate, Cuttack, Orissa, Bengal, India.*
- 1893 *†GIBSON, Mrs. J. Young, LL.D., *Castlebrae, Cambridge.*
- 1910 GILLESPIE, J., *The Homestead, Elsworth Road, South Hampstead, N.W.*
- 190 Hon. 1893 GOLDZIEHER, Professor Ignaz, vii *Holló-utza 4, Budapest, Hungary.*
- 1900 *GONDAL, H.H. the Thakur Sahib, G.C.I.E., *Gondal, Kathiawar, India.*
- 1884 *†GORPARSHAD, Thakur, *Talookdar of Baiswan, Aligarh, India.*
- 1909 *GOVINDACHARYA, Śrīmān Alkondavilli, Svāmi, 1050 *Viceroy Road, "Vedu Griham," Mysore, India.*
- 1911 *GRAHAM, W. A., *Minister of Agriculture, H.M.'s Siamese Civil Service, Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1893 *GREENUP, Rev. Albert W., D.D., *The Principal's Lodge, St. John's Hall, Highbury, N.*
- 1884 §GRIERSON, George A., C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. (ret.), *VICE-PRESIDENT, Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey.*
- 1852 *†GRIFFITH, R. T. H., C.I.E., *Kotagiri, Nilgiri, South India.*
- Hon. 1890 GUBERNATIS, Conte Comm. Angelo De, 11 *Via San Martino, Rome, Italy.*
- 1897 §GUEST, A. Rhuvon, 14 *Bedford Square, W.C.*

- 200 HON. 1898 GUIDI, Professor Ignace, 24 *Botteghe Oscure, Rome, Italy.*
- 1910 *GUNAWARDHANA, W. F., *Department of Public Instruction, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- 1910 *GUPTA, Basant Lal, *Professor of Science, Reid Christian College, Lucknow, India.*
- 1910 GUPTA, Krishna Gobinda, C.I.E., *India Office, S.W.*
- 1901 *GUPTA, Rājani Kanta Das, *Assistant Surgeon, General Hospital, Chittayong, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- 1894 *GURDON, Major Philip R. T., I.S.C., *Officiating Commissioner, Gauhati, Assam, India.*
- 1910 *GYI, Maung Maung, *Resident Excise Officer, Myingyan, Upper Burma.*
- 1883 *HAGGARD, Sir W. H. D., K.C.B., *H.B.M. Minister Resident and Consul-General to the Republic of the Equator.*
- 1902 *HAGOPIAN, Professor G., 25 *Chesilton Road, Fulham, S.W.*
- 1910 *HAIG, Rev. J. S., *Tullibody by Stirling, N.B.*
- 210 1898 *HAIG, Lieut.-Col. T. Wolseley, I.S.C., *H.B.M.'s Consulate, Kerman, Persia.*
- 1902 *HALID, Halil, *Teacher of Turkish, Cambridge University, 31 Bateman Street, Cambridge.*
- 1909 *HALLIDAY, Robert, *Christian Mission, Phrapaton, Siam.*
- 1904 *HANSON, Rev. O., *American Baptist Mission, Bhamo, Upper Burma.*
- 1911 *HAQUE, Wali ul, *Sub-Inspector of Schools, Daud Nagar, District Gaya, Bengal, India.*
- 1906 *HARCOURT, Henry, I.C.S., *Deputy Commissioner, Jhang Punjab, India.*
- 1902 HARDCASTLE, Miss A. L. B., *Waterloo Hotel, Wellington College, Berks.*
- 1910 HARLEY, A. H., M.A., *British Museum, W.C.*
- 1907 *HASAN, Khair Bahadur Sayid Aulad, *Inspector of Registration, Eastern Bengal and Assam, Dacca, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- 1908 *HASSIB BEY, H.E. Mahmud, *Editor and Proprietor, Arabic Review of Reviews, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 220 1909 HAVELL, E. B., I.E.S. (ret.), 7 *St. Edmund's Terrace, Primrose Hill, N.W.*

- 1834 *†HEMING, Lieut.-Col. Dempster.
- 1907 HERRINGHAM, Mrs., 40 *Wimpole Street, W.*
- 1900 HERTZ, Miss H., 20 *Avenue Road, N.W.*
- 1880 *HERVEY, D. F. A., C.M.G., *Westfields, Aldeburgh, Suffolk.*
- 1908 *HIBATULLAH AZIMABADI, M., *Lower Bazar, Ranchi, Bengal, India.*
- 1901 *HILL, Rev. J. R., *S.P.G. Mission, Banda, U.P., India.*
- 1911 *HILLAS, Harry G., *c/o Ministry of Finance, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1885 *†HIPPISELY, 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.*
- 230 1909 *HLA, Maung Po, A.T.M., *Extra Assistant Commissioner, Bassein, Burma.*
- 1907 *HOBART, R. C., I.C.S., *Acting Joint Magistrate, Rai Bareli, Oudh, U.P., India.*
- 1897 *HODGSON, Mrs. Brian, *Pasture Wood House, Abinger, Dorking; Villa Himalaya, Mentone; 53 Stanhope Gardens, S.W.*
- 1900 *§HOERNLE, Dr. A. F. Rudolf, C.I.E., 8 *Northmoor Road, Oxford.*
- 1881 §HOEY, William, M.A., D.Litt., 11 *Linton Road, Oxford.*
- 1897 *HOGG, Hope Waddell, *Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature, Manchester, 30 Brook Road, Fallowfield, Manchester.*
- 1906 *HOLM, Frits V., *c/o Danish Consulate, New York City, U.S.A.*
- 1865 *†HOLROYD, Colonel W. R. M., *c/o National Bank of Scotland, 37 Nicholas Lane, E.C.*
- 1889 HOPKINS, Lionel Charles, I.S.O., *The Garth, Haslemere.*
- 1908 HORNELL, William Woodward, *Indian Educational Service, Carlton Lodge, 36 Larkhall Rise, S.W.*
- 240 1908 *HOSAIN SHAH, Sultan Sayyid Saadat, *Barrister-at-Law, Magistrate, 1st Class, Jamui, E.I. Railway, Monghyr District, Bengal, India.*

- 1892 *HOUGHTON, Bernard, *Deputy Commissioner, Sagainy, Burma.*
- HON. 1902 HOUTSMA, Professor, *The University, Utrecht, Holland.*
- 1909 *HUMPHRIES, Edgar de Montfort, I.C.S., *United Provinces, India.*
- 1907 *HUSAIN, Qazi Talammuz, M.A., *Principal, Arabic College, Lucknow, India.*
- 1908 *†HYDE, James H., 11 *East Fortieth Street, New York City, U.S.A.*; 18 *Rue Adolphe Yvon, Paris, France.*
- 1893 *INNES, John R., *Straits Civil Service, Singapore.*
- 1879 §IRVINE, W., I.C.S. (ret.), VICE-PRESIDENT, *Holliscroft, Castelnaud, Barnes, S.W.*
- 1908 *IYER, M. V. Subramania, *Pleader, 434 Kakatope Street, Madura, India.*
- 1906 *JACKSON, A. V. Williams, LL.D., Litt.D., *Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages, Columbia University, New York City, U.S.A.*
- 250 1901 *§JACOB, Colonel G. A., *Oakridge, Redhill, Surrey.*
- 1878 *JARDINE, Sir John, K.C.I.E., M.P., 34 *Lancaster Gate, W.*
- 1901 *JARDINE, W. E., C.I.E., *Neemuch, Central India.*
- 1881 *†JAYAKAR, Lieut.-Colonel Atmaram S. G., *Khar Road, Bandra, near Bombay, India.*
- 1883 *†JAYAMOHUN, Thakur Singh, *Magistrate and Tahsildar of Seori Narayan, Bilaspur, Central Provinces, India.*
- 1906 *JAYASWAL, Kashi Prasad, *Barrister-at-Law, Mirzapur, U.P., India.*
- 1910 *JHAVERI, Hirachand L., *Jain Commercial School, Elephant Buildings, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay, India.*
- 1900 *JINARAJADASA, C., *ex Dr. Weller Van Hook, 103 State Street, Chicago, U.S.A.*
- 1882 *†JINAVARAVANSA, Rev. P. C., *Buddhist Bhikshu (formerly His Excellency Prince Prisdang), Dipaduttama Ārāma, Kofahena, Colombo, Ceylon.*

- 1909 *JOHNSTON, Edward Hamilton, *Midnapur, Bengal, India.*
- 260 1904 *JOHNSTON, Reginald Fleming, *Secretary to Government, Wei-hai-wei, China.*
- HON. 1904 JOLLY, Professor Julius, *The University, Wurzburg, Bavaria.*
- 1908 *JOPP, Charles Henry Keith, M.A., I.C.S. (ret.), *Reader in Marathi, 16 Linton Road, Oxford.*
- 1909 *KALIPRASANNA VIDYASAGAR, C.I.E., *Rai Bahadur, Bandhab-Kutir, Dacca, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- 1907 *KANJIKA, Rajendra Narayan Bhanja Deo, *Raja of, Kanika, Orissa, Bengal, India.*
- HON. 1899 KARABACEK, K. u. K. Hofrat, Professor J. Ritter von, *Vienna, Austria.*
- 1900 *KARKARIA, R. P., *Tardeo, Bombay, India.*
- 1909 *KEITH, Alan Davidson, *Professor of English, Rangoon College, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1900 §KEITH, Arthur Berriedale, M.A., B.C.L., *75 Albert Bridge Road, S.W.; Colonial Office, Downing Street, S.W.*
- 1891 §KENNEDY, James, I.C.S. (ret.), HON. TREASURER, *51 Palace Gardens Terrace, W.*
- 270 1895 *KENNEDY, Miss Louise, *Fairacre, Concord, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1909 *KENNEDY, Pringle, M.A., *Muzaffarpur, Bengal, India.*
- 1890 *KERALA VARMA, His Highness, C.S.I., *Valeyukoil Tamburam, Trivandrum, Travancore State, Madras, India.*
- HON. 1878 KERN, Heinrich, *Professor of Sanskrit, Utrecht, Holland.*
- 1908 *KESTEVEN, C. H., *Bengal Club, Calcutta, India.*
- 1908 *KIN, Maung Ba, (2), *Provincial Civil Service, Pauk, Upper Burma.*
- 1909 *KINCAID, C. A., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. Alex. Fletcher & Co., 39 Old Broad Street, E.C.*
- 1884 *KING, Lucas White, C.S.I., LL.D., F.S.A., I.C.S. (ret.), *Professor of Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani, Dublin University; Roebuck Hall, Co. Dublin, Ireland.*

- 1902 *KING, W. Joseph Harding, 25 *York House, Kensington, W.*
- 1884 *†KITIS, Eustace John. *Eversleigh, Heene, West Worthing, Sussex.*
- 280 1908 *KLIPPEL, Ernest. *Mataria, near Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1894 KLICHT. Rev. A., *Thorshill, Hind Head, Haslemere.*
- 1904 *KOLASKEK. Manges-h Bal, *Barrister. Jagannath Bungalow, Gurgaon, Bombay, India.*
- 1910 *KONG, T'ien Cheng, *World's Chinese Students Federation, E 562 Burkill Road, Shanghai, China.*
- 1906 *KRENKOW, Fritz. 20 *Dulverton Road, Leicester.*
- HON. 1909 KÜHN, Geheimer Rat Professor Ernst, Ph.D., *Hess-strasse 5, Munich, Bavaria.*
- 1909 *KULANDASWAMI, R. P., *Headmaster, St. Joseph's High School, Tricandrum, Travancore, South India.*
- 1909 *KUNDANANI, M. A., *Barrister-at-Law, Blue Cottage, Haidarabad, Sind, India.*
- 1910 *LADDE, Pandit T. K., 25 *Lyndeuoode Road, Cambridge.*
- 1911 *LAL, Bihari, B.A., *Shastri, Gunjipura, Jabalpur, C.P., India.*
- 290 1904 *LAL, Hira, *Extra Assistant Commissioner, and Assistant to Superintendent Imperial Gazetteer, Central Provinces, Nagpur, C.P., India.*
- 1904 *LAL, Hon. Munshi Madho, *Chowkhumba, Benares, India.*
- 1901 *LAL, Dr. Munna, *Civil Surgeon, Bara Banki, Oudh, India.*
- 1908 *LAL, Rai Brij Behari, *Provincial C.S., Munsif, Chandausi O.R., Moradabad, U.P., India.*
- 1910 *LAL, Shyam, M.A., LL.B., *Deputy Collector, P.C.S., Nawabgunj, Cawnpore, India.*
- 1902 *LANDBERG, Count C., *Chamberlain to H.M. the King of Sweden and Norway, Akademi-strasse 11, Munich, Germany.*
1880. HON. 1902. LANMAN, Charles R., *Professor of Sanskrit, Harvard University, 9 Farrar Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1884 *†LANSDELL, Rev. H. H., D.D., *Morden College, Blackheath, S.E.*

- 1908 *LATIEF, QUAZI Abdul, *Editor, Darussaltanat and Urdu Guide, 16 Ismail Madan's Lane, Calcutta, India.*
- 1874 LAWRENCE, F. W., *Hillcote, Lansdown, Bath.*
- 300 1901 *LEADBEATER, C. W., *c/o The Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras, India.*
- 1900 §LEE-WARNER, SIR W., G.C.S.I., *Eaton Tower, Caterham Valley, Surrey.*
- 1907 LEECHMAN, George Barclay, *50 Campden House Court, Kensington, W.*
- 1899 LEGGE, F., *6 Gray's Inn Square, W.C.*
- 1896 *LEIGH, Colonel H. P. P., C.I.E., *Grosvenor House, Bath.*
- 1878 *†LEPPER, C. H.
- 1910 *LESNÝ, Dr. V., *Ujézd 595, Prag^{III}, Bohemia.*
- 1880 †LE STRANGE, Guy, *Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1890 *LEVESON, Henry G. A., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. T. Cook and Son, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1885 †LEWIS, Mrs. A. S., LL.D., *Castlebrae, Cambridge.*
- 310 1897 *LINDSAY, Rev. James, M.A., D.D., B.Sc., *Annick Lodge, Irvine, Ayrshire, N.B.*
- 1908 *LLOYD, Rev. Arthur, *Lecturer in the Imperial University and Naval Academy, Tokyo, Japan.*
- 1879 *LOCKHART, Sir J. H. Stewart, K.C.M.G., *Commissioner, Wei-hai-wei, China.*
- 1906 *LOWBER, James William, Ph.D., Litt.D., *113 East Eighteenth Street, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.*
- 1895 *†LOWELL, P., *53 State Street, Boston, U.S.A.*
- 1904 *LUARD, Major C. Eckford, M.A., *Indian Army, Superintendent of Gazetteer, Indore, Central India; c/o Messrs. Grindlay, Groome, & Co., Bombay, India.*
- 1909 *LÜDERS, Professor Dr. H., *20 Sybelstrasse, Charlottenburg, Berlin, Germany.*
- 1899 §LYALL, Sir Charles James, K.C.S.I., LL.D., *VICE-PRESIDENT, 82 Cornwall Gardens, S.W.*
- 1889 †§LYON, H. L. Thomson, F.S.A., *34 St. James's Street, S.W.*
- 1910 *MACARTNEY, C. H. H., *Foxhold, Crookham, near Newbury, Berks.*

- 320 1898 *MACAULIFFE, M., I.C.S. (ret.), 10 *Sinclair Gardens, West Kensington, W.*
- 1906 *McCARRISON, David Lawlor, *Madras Club, Madras, South India.*
- 1908 *MACCORMICK, Rev. Frederick, F.S.A. Scot., F.R.S.A.I., *Wickwaraine Wood Rectory, Wellington, Salop.*
- 1900 *MACDONALD, DUNCAN B., *Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.*
- 1882 *§MACDONELL, ARTHUR A., M.A., F.B.A., Ph.D., *Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Fellow of Balliol; 107 Banbury Road, Oxford.*
- 1887 *McDUGALL, William, *British Consulate, Kermanshab, Persia, via Russia.*
- 1910 *MACGILLIVRAY, Rev. DONALD, M.A., D.D., 143 *Szechuen Road Extension, Shanghai, China.*
- 1901 *MACKENZIE, A. St. Clair, *Professor of English and Logic State University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A.*
- 1894 *MACLAGAN, E. D., *Secretary to Government of India, Revenue and Agricultural Dept., Simlu, India.*
- 1909 MACLEOD, Roderick H., I.C.S. (ret.), *Barrister-at-Law, 34 Longridge Road, Earl's Court, S.W.*
- 330 1906 *McMAHON, Colonel Sir A. Henry, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., *Foreign Department, Government of India, Calcutta.*
- 1907 *McMINN, Charles W., I.C.S. (ret.), *Bhim Tal, Kumaon, U.P., India.*
- 1908 *MAHESHWARY, Girdhari Lal, *Barrister-at-Law, Chief Court, Amritsar, Panjab, India.*
- 1909 *MAHFUZ, Syed Abu Muhammad, M.A., *Member of Her Highness' Judicial Committee, Ali Manzil, Bhopal, Central India.*
- 1909 *MAJUMDAR, Dr. Binoy Lal, *Assistant Surgeon, Patua-khali, Backergunge, E. Bengal, India.*
- 1908 *MAJUMDAR, Priya Krishna, M.E., M.I.M.E., *Barrister-at-Law, Islampur, Murshidabad, Bengal, India.*
- 1906 *MANN, Fairman Rackham, *Staff Surgeon, R.N., H.M.S. Excellent, Portsmouth.*
- 1889 *MARGOLIOUTH, Rev. D. S., *Professor of Arabic, 88 Woodstock Road, Oxford.*

- 1902 *MARKS, Rev. John E., D.D., "*Burma*," *Ashburton Road, Croydon.*
- 1904 *MARSDEN, E., *Indian Educational Service, 12 Ellerdale Road, Hampstead, N. W.*
- 340 1901 *MARSHALL, J. H., C.I.E., *Director - General of Archaeology, India, c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54 Parliament Street, S. W.*
- 1896 *MARZETTI, Charles J., *Hillside, Tandridge, near Oxted, Surrey.*
- HON. 1908 MASPERO, Professor Gaston, *24 Avenue de l'Observatoire, Paris, France.*
- 1888 MASTER, John Henry, *Montrose House, Petersham.*
- 1908 *MAUNG, Maung Thein, *163 Clive Road, West Dulwich, S. E.*
- 1904 *†MAWJEE, Purshotam Vishram, *14 Hummam Street, Fort, Bombay, India.*
- 1898 *MAXWELL, W. George, *Straits Civil Service, Singapore.*
- 1905 *MAZUMDAR, Babu Bijaya Chandra, *Pleader, Sambalpur, C.P., India.*
- 1906 *MAZUMDAR, Babu Kedar Nath, *Mymensingh, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- 1894 MEAD, G. R. S., *16 Selwood Place, Onslow Gardens, S. W.*
- 350 1907 *MEADEN, Rev. H. Anderson, *St. Peter's Parsonage, Stornoway, N. B.*
- 1910 *MEHR - UD - DIN, Mahomed, *Public Works Officer, Bahawalpur State, Panjab, India.*
- 1906 *MEHTA, Bhaskarrao Vithaldas, M.A., *c/o Lalubhai Samaldas, Esq., 99 Apollo Street, Bombay, India.*
- 1899 *MESTON, James Scorgie, I.C.S., *Secretary to the Government of India, Finance Department, Calcutta, India.*
- 1898 MIESEGAES, Herman, *37 Porchester Terrace, W.*
- 1863 *MILES, Colonel Samuel B., *Bombay Staff Corps.*
- 1911 *MILLER, A. B., *Official Trustee of Bengal, 8 Kensington Park Gardens, W.*
- 1897 *MILLS, Laurence Heyworth, M.A., D.D., *Professor of Zend Philology, 218 Ifley Road, Oxford.*
- 1909 *MILNE, Mrs. Leslie, *c/o J. W. Barty, Esq., LL.D., County Buildings, Dunblane, N. B.*
- 1908 *MISRA, Pyare Lal, *Barrister-at-Law, Nagpur, C.P., India.*

- 360 1899 *MISRA, Ramshankar, M.A., *Officiating Magistrate and Collector, Ghazipur, U.P., India.*
- 1903 MITRA, S. M., *47 Warrington Crescent, Maida Vale, W.*
- 1909 *MITTER, Muralidhar, *Subdivisional Officer, Public Works Department, Kolhapur, India.*
- 1909 *MITTER, S., Rai Bahadur, *Divan, Chhatarpur State, Bundelkhand, Central India.*
- 1874 *MOCKLER, Major-General E., *Guernsey.*
- 1905 *MODI, E. M., D.Sc., LL.D., D.Litt., *Meher Buildings, 3 Bellasis Bridge Road, Tardeo, Bombay, India.*
- 1882 *†MOHANLAL VINUCLAL PANDIA, Pandit, *Gorepārā Mohallā, Muttra, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *MOITRY, Manmatha Nath, *Zemindar, Serampur, Bengal, India.*
- 1908 *MONAHAN, F. J., I.C.S., *Commissioner Assam Valley Districts, E. B. & A., c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1900 MOND, Mrs., *The Poplars, Avenue Road, N.W.*
- 370 1901 MONTEFIORE, Claude, *12 Portman Square, W.*
- 1877 §MORRIS, Henry, *Eastcote House, St. John's Park, Blackheath, S.E.*
- 1909 *MORRIS, Thomas Walter, I.C.S., *Bulandshahr, U.P., India.*
- 1881 MORRISON, Walter, *77 Cromwell Road, S.W.; Malham Tarn, Bell Busk, Leeds, Yorks.*
- 1909 *MORSE, Charles J., *1825 Asbury Avenue, Evanston, Ill, U.S.A.*
- 1882 *†MORSE, H. Ballou, *Chinese Imperial Customs, Briarside, Ewell, Surrey.*
- 1907 *MORTON, Captain S., *Inspector of Signalling, Imperial Service Troops, Meerut, U.P., India.*
- 1890 *MOSS, R. Waddy, *Didsbury College, Manchester.*
- 1906 *MOUNG, MOUNG, *40 Phongyi Street, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1910 *MOURBANJ, Maharaja Sriram Chandra Bhanj Deo, *Baripada, via Rupsa, B.N.R., Orissa, India.*
- 380 1882 *MUKERJI, Phanibhusan, *Inspector of Schools, Presidency Division, Bengal; 57 Jhowtolah Road, Ballygunje, Calcutta, India.*
- 1895 *MÜLLER-HESS, Dr. E., *Professor of Sanskrit at the University, Berne; 47 Effingerstrasse, Berne, Switzerland.*

- 1906 *MUNRO, Neil Gordon, M.B. and C.M. (Edin.), 70c
Settlement, Yokohama, Japan.
- 1908 MURRAY, John, M.A., D.L., J.P., F.S.A., 50a *Albemarle Street, W.*
- 1898 *MYSORE, H.H. the Maharaja Sri, Sir Krishnaraja Wadiar Bahadur, G.C.S.I., *The Palace, Bangalore, South India.*
- 1910 NAIRN, Rev. J. Arbuthnot, *Head Master, Merchant Taylors' School, E.C.*
- 1909 *NARANG, Gokul Chand, M.A., *c/o Messrs. T. Cook and Son, Ludgate Circus, E.C.*
- 1907 *NARASIMHACHAR, R., M.A., *Officer in charge of Archæology in Mysore; Malleswaram, Bangalore, India.*
- 1906 *NARASIMHIENGAR, M. T., *East Park Road, Malleswaram, Bangalore, India.*
- 1909 *NARIMAN, G. K., *Chief Interpreter, Chief Court, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 390 1898 *NARTSOFF, Alexis de, *Tambov, Russia.*
- EXT. 1910 NASIR-UL-MELK, H. E. Sir Abul Kasim Khan, G.C.M.G., *Teheran, Persia.*
1877. HON. 1895. NAVILLE, Edouard, D.C.L., *Professor of Egyptology, Geneva University; Malaguy, near Geneva, Switzerland.*
- 1901 NEILL, J. W., I.C.S. (ret.), *Professor of Indian Law, University College, London; Chartley, Camberley, Surrey.*
- 1860 *†NELSON, James Henry, M.A., *Cuddalore, Madras, India.*
- 1900 *NEVILL, Henry Rivers, *Joint Magistrate, Benares, U.P., India.*
- 1895 *NICHOLSON, R. A., Litt.D., 12 *Harvey Road, Cambridge.*
- HON. 1890 NOLDEKE, Professor Theodor, *Strassburg, Germany.*
- 1910 *NOMANI, Ahmed Hosein, B.A., *c/o Hazeer Fazal Ruh, Kanhauli P.O., Muzaffarpur, B.N.W.R., Bengal, India.*
- 1906 *NORMAN, H. C., *Professor of English Literature, Queen's College, Benares, India.*
- 400 1903 *NOYCE, W. F., K.-i.-H., *Barrister-at-Law, 65 Park Road, Pazundaung, Rangoon, Burma.*

- 1910 O'CONNOR, J. E., C.I.E., *Francisco, Church Road, Upper Norwood, S E.*
- 1906 *O'CONNOR, Major W. F., R.A., C.I.E., *H.B.M.'s Consul-General, Sriraton, c/o The Foreign Office, Calcutta, India.*
- 1900 *OLETEL, F. O., *Superintending Engineer, Cawnpore, U.P., India.*
- 1908 *OH, Maung Ba, A.T.M., *Judicial E.A.C., 67 Crisp Street, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1901 *OHYANI, E. H., *Kikoluti, Higashi Rokujō, Simogio, Kyoto, Japan.*
- HON. 1908 OLDENBERG, Professor Hermann, *Nikolausberger Weg 27-29, Göttingen, Germany.*
- 1888 OLDEAM, Brigade-Surgeon Charles Frederick, *The Lodge, Great Bealings, Woodbridge, Suffolk.*
- 1900 *OMAN, Professor J. Campbell, *7 Coniston Road, Muswell Hill, N.*
- 1907 *ON, Maung Tun, *Township Judge, Ta-pun, Zigon, Tharvaccaddy District, Lower Burma.*
- 410 1900 *OSTROG, Count Léon, *Rue de Suède, Constantinople, Turkey.*
- 1907 *OUNG, MOUNG MAY, "*Elgin House,*" *1 Pagoda Road, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1907 *PAGE, Rev. W. Sutton, B.D., *Serampore College, Serampore, Bengal, India.*
- 1909 *PAIRA-MALL, M.D., *38 Berkeley Road, Crouch End.*
- 1902 *PARASNIS, Dattatraya B., *Happy Vale, Satara, Bombay Presidency, India.*
- 1893 *§PARGITER, F. E., I.C.S. (ret.), *12 Charlbury Road, Oxford.*
- 1905 *PARKER, The Hon. Mr. Justice Frederick Hardyman, *Roseau, Dominica, Leeward Islands, West Indies.*
- 1900 *†PARLA KIMEDI, The Raja of, *Parla Kimedi, Ganjam, Madras Presidency, India.*
- 1909 *PARLETT, Harold G., *H.B.M. Consul, Dairen, Japan.*
- 1909 PENNY, Rev. Frank, *Madras Chaplain (ret.), 3 Park Hill, Ealing, W.*

- 420 1905 *PETERSEN, F. G., *Abbildsgaardsgade, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
- 1890 *PFUNGST, ARTHUR, Ph.D., 2 *Gärtnerweg, Frankfurt, Germany.*
- 1909 *PHILBY, HARRY St. John Bridger, I.C.S., *Panjab, c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., Bombay, India.*
- 1906 *PHILLOTT, Lieut.-Colonel D.C., Indian Army, *Secretary to the Board of Examiners, Calcutta, India.*
- 1874 *|PHYA RAJANATTAYANUHAR, His Excellency, *Private Secretary to the King of Siam.*
- 1908 *PILLAI, A. R., *University Union, Edinburgh.*
- 1908 *PILLAI, K. G. Gopala, 47 *Forrest Road, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1909 *PILLAI, PERUMANA Narayana, *Kayangulam, Travancore, South India.*
- 1909 *PILLAI, S. Bavanandam, *Officer in Charge, Intelligence Department, Madras City Police; Saravana Vilas, Chapel Road, Fepery, Madras, South India.*
- 1909 *PILLAY, Laurence, *Mandalay, Upper Burma; Common Room, Middle Temple, E. C.*
- 430 1903 *PILLAY, T. Ponnambalam, *Excise Commissioner, Quilon, Travancore, Madras, India.*
- 1881 §PINCHEs, Theophilus G., LL.D., 38 *Blomfield Road, Maida Hill, W.*
- 1895 PITT, St. George Laue Fox, 48 *Glebe Place, Chelsea, S. W.*
- 1893 *§PLUNKETT, Lieut.-Colonel G. T., R.E., C.B., *Belvedere Lodge, St. Mary's Road, Wimbledon.*
- 1893 *POUSSIN, Professor Louis de la Vallée, *Professeur à l'Université de Gand, 150 Avenue Molière, Forest Bruxelles.*
- 1907 *PRASAD, Narsingh, M.A. *Vakil High Court, Gorakhpur, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *PRASAD, Pandit Ganga, M.A., *Deputy Collector and Magistrate, Deoria, Gorakhpur District, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *PRASAD, Rai Debi, *High Court Vakil, Cawnpur, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *PRENDERGAST, W. J., *Professor of Oriental Languages, Nizam's College, Haidarabad, Deccan, India.*
- 1905 *PROCTOR, Henry, *H.M. Stationery Office, Westminster, S. W.*

- 440 1910 *PRU. Saw Hla, 52 *Cambridge Gardens, Notting Hill, W.*
 1909 *PURI, Mukand Lal, *Ereter College, Oxford.*
 1909 *PYARAI Lal, *Zamindar of Barotha, Vidyasagar Dépôt, Aligarh, U.P., India.*
- HON. 1901 RADLOFF, Professor Dr. V., *The University, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- 1910 *RAHMAN, Hakim Habibur, *Physician, Rahmatganj, Dacca, India.*
- 1909 *RAI, Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Banke, *Nawal Goswami, Katra-Nil, Delhi, India.*
- 1909 *RAJA, Kodungallore Rama Varma, *Special Palace Officer, Trippunithura, Cochin State, India.*
- 1899 *RAM, Lal Sita, *Deputy Collector, Lucknow, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *RAMANATHAN. P., *Manonmathi Vilas, Chintadripet, Madras, India.*
- 1874 *†RAMASWAMI, Iyengar B., *Bangalore, Madras, India.*
- 450 1891 *RANKING, Lieut.-Colonel G. S. A., I.M.S., *Beech Lawn, Park Town, Oxford.*
- 1869 †RANSOM, Edwin, *24 Ashburnham Road, Bedford.*
- 1888 §RAPSON, E. J., *Professor of Sanskrit, 8 Mortimer Road, Cambridge.*
- 1908 *RASHAD, A. M., M.A., *Deputy Magistrate, Daltonganj, E.I. Railway, Bengal, India.*
- 1907 *RAY, Mallinath, B.Sc., *Subordinate Civil Service, Sub-Deputy Magistrate, 12 Holwell Lane, Calcutta, India.*
- 1887 *REA, A., F.S.A. Scot., *Superintendent Archæological Surrey Department, Southern Circle, Madras, India.*
- 1892 §REAY, The Right Hon. the Lord, P.C., G.C.S.I. G.C.I.E., LL.D., *PRESIDENT, Carolside, Earlston, Berwickshire; 6 Great Stanhope Street, Mayfair, W.*
- 1897 *REICER, J. N., Ph.D., *21 Fabriksgatan, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1879 RICE, Benjamin Lewis, C.I.E., *7 Kenton Road, Harrow.*
- 1910 *RICHARDS, F. J., M.A., I.C.S., *Collector and Magistrate, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore, S. India.*

- 460 1910 *RICHMOND, E. T., *Ministry of Public Works, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1892 †RIDGING, Miss C. Mary, 30, *Windsor Court, Moscow Road, Bayswater, W.*
- 1893 *†RIDGING, Rev. W. Caldecott, 4 *Clifton Terrace, Chapel Ash, Wolverhampton.*
- 1902 *RIVERS, W. H. R., *St. John's College, Cambridge.*
- 1872 *†RIVETT-CARNAC, Colonel J. H., C.I.E., F.S.A., I.C.S. (ret.), *Schloss Rothberg, Rougemont, Switzerland; 40 Green Street, Park Lane, W.*
- 1907 *ROBB, George, *Egyptian Civil Service, Science and English Master, Khedivial Training College, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1910 *ROBERTSON, Rev. Alexander, M.A., *United Free Church Mission, 1 Staveley Road, Poona, India.*
- 1882 *ROCKHILL, H.E. the Hon. W. W., *United State Ambassador, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- 1905 *ROSE, H. A., I.C.S., *Ludhiana, Panjab, India.*
- 1894 *ROSS, E. D., Ph.D., *Assistant Secretary, Home Department, Government of India.*
- 470 1891 *†ROUSE, W. H. D., Litt.D., *Head Master of Perse School, Cambridge.*
- 1909 *ROY, Rai Kunja Lal, *Zemindar, 91¹ Musjid Bari Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 1910 *ROY, Parames Prasanna, P.C.S., *Deputy Magistrate and Collector, Mymensingh, E. B. & A., India.*
- 1891 †ROY, Robert, 2 *Brick Court, Temple, E.C.*
- 1900 *RÜFFER, M. A., M.D., C.M.G., *President of the Sanitary, Maritime, and Quarantine Board of Egypt, Minical, Ramleh, Egypt.*
- 1908 *RUSSELL, R. V., I.C.S., *Superintendent, Gazetteer of Central Provinces, Mandla, C.P., India.*
- 1906 *RUSTAMJI FARIDGOONJI, *Commissioner, Nagpur, C.P., India.*
- 1872 *†RUSTOMJI, C., *Jaunpur, India.*
- 1903 *SA'ADJUNG, Nawab, *Bahadur, Barrister-at-Law, Civil Judge, Residency Bazaar, Haidarabad, Deccan, India.*

- HON. 1887 SACHAU, Kgl. Geheimer Regierungsrath, Professor Eduard, *Director of the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Berlin, Germany.*
- 480 1909 *SAGGU, Mahomed Khairuddin. *Common Room, Lincoln's Inn, W. C.*
- 1904 *SAID-RUEFE, Rudolph, 39 *Bromham Gardens, South Kensington, S. W.*
- HON. 1908 SALEMANN, Professor C., *Director, Asiatic Museum, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- 1899 *SANDHURST, The Right Hon. Lord. P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., 60 *Eaton Square, S. W.*
- 1892 *SANKARANĀRĀYANA, P., 34 *Broadway, Madras, India.*
- 1895 *SARAWAK, H.H. the Rance of, *Grey Friars, Ascot.*
- 1891 *†SARDA, Har Bilas, B.A., *Guardian to H.H. the Maharawal of Jaisalmer. Ajmere, India.*
- 1908 *SARKAR, Suresh Chandra, M.A., *Deputy Magistrate and Collector, Ranchi, Bengal, India.*
- 1904 *SARRUF, Dr. Y., *Editor of al-Muktataf, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1902 *†SASSOON, David. *Malabar Hill, Bombay, India.*
- 490 1907 *SASTRI, A. Mahadeva, *Curator, Government Oriental Library, Mysore, India.*
- 1910 *SASTRI, C. N. Ananta Ramaiya, M.A., *Malayalam Pandit. II. II. the Maharāja's College, Tricandrum, S. India.*
1880. HON. 1906. SATOW, The Right Hon. Sir Ernest M., G.C.M.G., Ph D., *Beaumont, Ottery St. Mary, Devon.*
- 1874 †§SAYCE, Rev. A. H., *Professor of Assyriology, Queen's College, Oxford; 8 Chalmers Crescent, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1870 *SCHINDLER, General A. Houtum, C.I.E., *Teheran, Persia.*
- 1905 *SCHRADER, Friedrich Otto, Ph.D., *Director, Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras, India.*
- 1910 SCOTT, Edward J. L. Litt.D., 24 *Terrapin Road, Upper Tooting, S. W.*
- 1885 SCOTT, Sir James George, K.C.I.E., *Late Superintendent, Southern Shan States, 10a Clarendon Court, Maida Vale, W.*
- 1903 *SEATON, E. H., *Principal, Nizam's College, Haidarabad, Deccan, India.*

- 1903 *SEDDON, Charles Norman, *c/o Messrs. King, King, & Co., Bombay, India.*
- 500 1906 *SEDGWICK, Leonard John, I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay, Groome, & Co., Bombay, India.*
- 1867 *†SELM, Faris Effendi, *Constantinople, Turkey.*
- 1887 *SELL, Rev. Canon E., K.-i.-H., *Church Mission House, Egmore, Madras, India.*
- 1908 *SEN, Bankim Chandra, *Barrister - at - Law, The Anandamoha, Bundel Road, Chittagong, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- HON. 1892 SENART, Émile, *18 Rue François 1^{er}, Paris, France.*
- 1898 *SESHACHARRI, V. C., *High Court Vakil, "Vasanta Vilās," Mylapore, India.*
- 1877 §SEWELL, R., I.C.S. (ret.), *Mansfield Lodge, 4 Bristol Gardens, Roehampton, Surrey.*
- 1909 *SHAMASASTRY, R., *Librarian, Government Oriental Library, Mysore, India.*
- 1909 *SHARMA, Pandit Goswami Brajanath, *7827 Shitla Street, Agra, U.P., India.*
- 1906 *SHARMAN, Gulab Shanker Dev, *Private Secretary to H.H. the Maharain Sahiba of Bettiah, Allahabad, India.*
- 510 1905 *SHARPE, James William, *Woodroffe, Portarlinton Road, Bournemouth.*
- 1895 *SHAWE, F. B., *The College, Bishop's Stortford, Herts.*
- 1910 *SIMON, Professor Dr. Richard, *Giselastrasse 29¹, Munich, Bararia.*
- 1910 SIMPSON, Mrs. Alicia, *14 Cadogan Court, S.W.*
- 1906 *SINGAL, Thakur Shiam Sarup, *Rais; and Agent to Messrs. Ford & Macdonald, Amritsar, Panjab, India.*
- 1911 *SINGH, Hon. Tikka Sahib Ripudaman, *Sahib Bahadur, Nabha, Panjab, India.*
- 1902 *†SINGH, Raja Pertab Bahadur Singh, *C.I.E., of Tiraul, Partabgarh, Oudh, India.*
- 1907 *SINGH, Sardar Kahan, *Nabha State, Panjab, India.*
- 1907 *SINGH, Sardar Sundar, *Ramgarhia, Bunga Ramgarhian, Amritsar, Panjab, India.*
- 1909 *SINGH, Sardar Udham, *Asa Multani Lane, Gujranwala, Panjab, India.*

- 520 1908 *SINHA, Gur Prasad, *Barrister at-Law, Partabgarh, U.P., India.*
- 1909 *SINHA, Kumar Ram Pratap, *Deputy Collector and Magistrate, Moradabad, U.P., India.*
- 1895 *†SINHA, Kunwar Keshal Pal, *Raio Kotla, P.O. Narki, Agr. U.P., India.*
- 1907 *SINHA, Vishwanath Sahay, *Barrister-at-Law, Orderly Bazar, Benares Cantonment, India.*
- 1900 *SKEAT, W. W., *Romeland Cottage, St. Albans, Herts.*
- 1904 *SMITH, Miss A. A., *22 Harley Road, South Hampstead, N.W.*
- 1883 *SMITH, Vincent A., M.A., I.C.S., *116 Banbury Road, Oxford.*
- HON. 1909 SNOUCK HURGRONJE, Professor C., *Witte Singel 84a, Leiden, Holland.*
- 1907 *SOANE, E. B., *Mahammerah, Persian Gulf; c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W.*
- 1910 *SOVANI, V. V., M.A., *Professor of Sanskrit, Meerut College, U.P., India.*
- 530 1910 *SPOONER, D. B., Ph.D., *Superintendent Archaeological Survey, Frontier Circle, Peshawar, N.-W.F.P. India.*
- 1910 *STAËL-HOLSTEIN, Baron A. von, *4 Tučkora Naberežnaya, St. Petersburg, Russia.*
- 1861 *§STANMORE, The Right Hon. Lord, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., D.C.L., *Red House, Ascot.*
- 1907 *STAPLETON, H. E., *Indian Educational Service, The Club, Dacca, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- 1909 *STARK, Herbert A., *Additional Assistant Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, Writers' Buildings, Calcutta, India.*
- 1904 *STEEL, Mrs., *23 Homer Street, Athens, Greece.*
- 1887 *STEIN, Marc Aurel, C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt., D.Sc., *Indian Archæological Department, Merton College, Oxford.*
- 1906 *STEPHENSON, Major John, I.M.S., *Jail Road, Lahore, India.*
- 1905 *STEVENS, George F. A., *Tabriz, Persia.*
- 1901 *STEVENSON, Malcolm, *Ceylon Civil Service, Mannar, Ceylon.*

- 540 1906 *STOKES, H. G., I.C.S., *Under Secretary, Home Department, Government of India.*
- 1904 *STRONG, MRS. S. A., 58 *New Cavendish Street, Portland Place, W.*
- 1900 *STURGE, P. H., M.A., *Professor of History, Nizam's College, Haidarabad, India.*
- 1909 *SUBBAIYA, K. V., M.A., *Lecturer in English, Government College, Rajamundry, Madras Presidency, India.*
- 1909 *SUBHAN, Khan Bahadur A.K.M. Abdus, *Senior Deputy Magistrate and Collector, Faridpur, Eastern Bengal, India.*
- HON. 1892 SUMANGALA, H. Sri, *Pradhana Nāyaka Maha Thero, Principal of Vidyodaya College, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- 1893 *†SIVASTI SOBHANA, H.R.H. Prince, *Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1895 *†SYKES, Major Percy Molesworth, C.M.G., *H.B.M. Consul-General and Agent to Government of India in Khorasan, Mesbed, via Ashkabad, Transcaspia, Russia.*
- 1910 *TABARD, Rev. Father A. M., *The Cathedral, Shoolay, Bangalore, S. India.*
- 1875 *†TAOORE, Rajah Bahadur Sir Sourendro Mohun, C.I.E., *Mus. D., Calcutta, India.*
- 550 1896 *TAKAKUSU, Jyan, Ph.D., 207 *Motomachi, Kobe, Japan.*
- 1897 *TALBOT, Walter Stanley, *Srinagar, Kashmir, India.*
- HON. 1910 TALLQVIST, K. L., *Professor of Oriental Literature, Fabriksgasse 21, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1909 *TANCOCK, Captain A., *Indian Army, 31st Panjabis; Little Waltham Rectory, Chelmsford, Essex.*
- 1897 *TATE, George P., *Indian Survey Department, Oak Cottage, Mussoorie, U.P., India.*
- 1893 *TAW SEIN KO, K.-i.-H., *West Moat Road, Mandalay, Burma.*
- 1883 TAWNEY, C. H., C.I.E., *Oatlands Grange, Weybridge, Surrey.*
- 1894 *TAYLOR, Arnold C., *Uppingham, Rutland.*
- 1879 *†TEMPLE, Colonel Sir R. C., Bart., C.I.E., *The Nash, Worcester.*
- 1898 *THATCHER, G. W., M.A., *Camden College, Sydney, N.S.W.*
- 560 1904 *THEIN, Maung Ba, *Subordinate Judicial Service, A 1 36th Street, Rangoon, Burma.*

- 1905 THIRTLF, James William. LL.D., 23 *Borthwick Road, Stratford, E.*
- 1898 §THOMAS, F. W., Ph.D., *Librarian, India Office, S.W.*
- 1906 *THOMAS, Mrs. F. W., *Filston, Shoreham, Kent.*
- 1907 *THOMPSON, J. Perronet, I.C.S., *Divisional Judge, Hoshiarpur, Panjab, India.*
- HON. 1909 THOMSEN, Professor Dr. Vilhelm, *St. Knuds Vej 36, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
- 1880 *†THORBURN, S. S., *Bracknell House, Bracknell, Berks.*
- 1881 §THORNTON, T. H., C.S.I., D.C.L., HON. VICE-PRESIDENT, *10 Marlborough Buildings, Bath.*
- 1901 THURN, Sir Everard im, K.C.M.G., C.B., *Suva, Fiji.*
- 1859 *†TIEN, Rev. Anton, D.D., Ph.D., *Professor of Turkish, King's College (London University), 25 Maresfield Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.*
- 570 1903 *TILBE, Rev. H. H., Ph.D., *Upper Alton, Illinois, U.S.A.; American Baptist Mission, Riverview, Ahlone, Burma.*
- 1895 *†TRAVANCORE, H.H. Maharaj Raja Sir Bala Rama Varma Bahadur. G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
- 1884 TROTTER, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry, K.C.M.G., C.B., *18 Eaton Place, S.W.*
- 1902 *TSAIN, Moung, *Pegu, Burma.*
- 1900 *TUCKWELL, Rev. John, *1 Onslow Gardens, Muswell Hill, N.*
- 1909 *U, Maung Ba, *Township Judge, Pa-an, Thaton District, Burma.*
- 1908 *Û, Maung Mya, *Barrister-at-Law, Henzada, Burma.*
- 1882 *UDAIPIER, H.H. Fateh Singhji Bahadur, Maharana of, *G.C.S.I., Rajputana, India.*
- 1902 *VAID, Narmadāshankar Popatbhai, *189 Gilmore Place, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1902 *VAIDYA, Visvanath P., *121 Meadow Street, Fort, Bombay, India.*
- 580 1907 *VAIDYESVARA MUDHALIYAR, Srimān Muttusvāmi Sivānandhi, *Bharathakhandā Pradhakshani, "Dharmāsrama," 89 Cheku Street, Colombo, Ceylon.*

- HON. 1898 VAJIRANĀNA, H.R.H. Prince, *Pavaranivesa Vihāra, Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1901 *VARMA, A. R. Rajaraja, *Superintendent of Vernacular Studies, H.H. the Maharaja's College, Trivandrum, S. India.*
- 1909 *VARMA, Sukaleva Prasad, *c/o Messrs. Thomas Cook and Son, Ludgate Circus, E. C.*
- 1910 *VASU, Babu Nogenra Nath, 20 *Kantapuker Lane, Bagh Bazar, Calcutta, India.*
- 1884 *†VASUDEV, Mādhav Samarth, R. R., B A.
- 1883 VERNEY, F. W., M.P., 12 *Connaught Place, Hyde Park, W.*
- 1899 *VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA, Satis Chandra Āchārya, *Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Calcutta, India.*
- 1907 *VIDYARATNA, Pandit Krishna Pada, *Professor of Sanskrit, Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, Orissa, Bengal, India.*
- 1905 *VOGEL, J. P., Ph.D., *Archæological Surveyor for Panjab and United Provinces, c/o Indian Museum, Calcutta, India.*
- 590 1899 *VOST, Lieut.-Colonel W., I.M.S., *Saharampur, U.P., India.*
- 1908 *WACKERNAGEL, Dr. Jakob, *Professor of Comparative Philology, Gottingen University; Hoher Weg 12, Göttingen, Germany.*
- 1892 *†WADDELL, Lieut.-Colonel L. A., C.B., C.I.E., LL.D., I.M.S., *The Kite's Nest, Hastings.*
- 1873 §WALHOUSE, M. J., 28 *Hamilton Terrace, N.W.*
- 1909 *WALI, Maulavi Abdul, *District Sub-Registrar, Manbhūm, Purulia P. O., B.N. Railway, Bengal, India.*
- 1908 *WALLESER, Professor Dr. Max, *Kehl a. Rhein, Germany.*
- 1907 *WALSH, E. H. C., I.C.S., *Commissioner's House, Bhagalpur, Bengal, India.*
- 1908 *WARREN, William Fairfield, 131 *Davis Avenue, Brookline Station, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1907 *WATSON, H. D., I.C.S., *Hissar, Panjab, India.*
- 1900 *WEIR, T. H., B.D., 64 *Partick Hill Road, Glasgow, N.B.*

- 600 1892 § WEST, Sir Raymond, K.C.I.E., I.L.D., DIRECTOR,
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, B-ulah Hill, S.E.*
- 1906 *WHITEHEAD, R. B., I.C.S., *Assistant Commissioner,
Civil Lines, Delhi, India.*
- 1893 *WHITEHOUSE, F. Cope.
- 1905 WHITWORTH, G. C., *Crowhurst, College Road, Norwood,
S.E.*
- 1899 *WICKREMASINGHE, Don M. de Zilva, *Indian Institute,
Oxford.*
- 1908 *WILLIAMS, J. P. C., 103 *Clive Street, Calcutta, India.*
- 1909 *WIN, Maung Tun, *Subdivisional Officer, Monywa,
Upper Burma.*
- HON. 1896 WINDISCH, Geh. Rat Prof. E., 15 *Universitäts-
strasse, Leipzig, Germany.*
- 610 1910 *WÖLKER, Mrs. Elaine, *Rotherbaum Chaussi 91,
Hamburg, Germany.*
- 1876 †§ WOLLASTON, Sir Arthur N., K.C.I.E., *Glen Hill,
Walmer, Kent.*
- 1896 *WOOD, J. Elmsley, 4 *Glenisla Gardens, Edinburgh, N.B.*
- 1907 *WOODLEY, Rev. Edward Carruthers, *The Parsonage,
Danville, Quebec, Canada.*
- 1909 *WOODS, Professor James H., Ph.D., *Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.; 2 Chesnut Street,
Boston, Mass.*
- 1906 *WOOLNER, A. C., M.A., *Principal, Oriental College and
Registrar, Panjab University, Lahore, India.*
- 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, The Hon. Mr. H. Nelson, I.C.S., *c/o Messrs.
King, King, & Co., Bombay, India.*
- 1910 YETTS, W. Perceval, *Surgeon R.N., Junior United
Service Club, Charles Street, S.W.*
- 620 1899 *YULE, Miss Amy Frances, *Tarradale House, Tarradale,
Ross-shire, N.B.*

- 1895 *YUSUF-ALI, Abdullah ibn, I.C.S., M.A., LL.M.,
c/o Messrs. King, King, & Co., Bombay, India.
- 1908 *ZAN, Maung Aung, K.S.M., *District Judge, Myaungmya,
Burma.*
- 1909 *ZAW, Maung Kyaw, *Drawing Master, Government High
School for Europeans, Maymyo, Upper Burma.*
- 624 1910 *ZEKI BEY, Ahmed, *Second Secretary, Council of
Ministers, Cairo, Egypt.*

Honorary Members.

- 1895 Mons. A. Barth, *Paris*.
 1906 Professor René Basset, *Algiers*.
 1885 Professor Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, *Poona*,
Bombay.
 1893 Professor Henri Cordier, *Paris*.
 5 1908 Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, *Berlin*.
 1907 Professor Julius Eggeling, *Edinburgh*.
 1893 Professor Ignaz Goldziher, *Budapest*.
 1890 Conte Comm. Angelo De Gubernatis, *Rome*.
 1898 Professor Ignace Guidi, *Rome*.
 10 1902 Professor Houtsma, *Utrecht*.
 1904 Professor Julius Jolly, *Wurzburg*.
 1899 Professor J. Ritter von Karabacek, *Vienna*.
 1878 Professor H. Kern, *Leiden*.
 1909 Professor Ernst Kuhn, *Munich*.
 15 1902 Professor Lanman, *Cambridge, Mass.*
 1908 Professor Gaston Maspéro, *Paris*.
 1895 Professor Ed. Naville, *Geneva*.
 1890 Professor T. Nöldeke, *Strassburg*.
 1908 Professor Hermann Oldenberg, *Göttingen*.
 20 1901 Professor Dr. V. Radloff, *St. Petersburg*.
 1887 Professor Eduard Sachau, *Berlin*.
 1908 Professor Carl Salemann, *St. Petersburg*
 1906 Sir Ernest Satow, G.C.M.G.
 1892 M. Émile Senart, *Paris*.
 25 1909 Professor C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Leiden*.
 1910 Professor K. L. Tallqvist, *Helsingfors*.
 1909 Professor Vilhelm Thomsen, *Copenhagen*.
 1892 Sumangala Mahā Nāyaka Unnānsē, *Colombo, Ceylon*.
 1898 H. R. H. Prince Vajirañāna, *Bangkok*.
 30 1896 Professor Windisch, *Leipzig*.

Extraordinary Member.

- 1910 H. E. Sir Abul Kasim Khan, G.C.M.G., *Nasir-ul-Mulk*,
Teheran.

Note. The number of Honorary Members is limited by Rule 9 to thirty.

LIST OF LIBRARIES AND SOCIETIES

SUBSCRIBING TO THE
JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

- ABERDEEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 ABERYSTWITH. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF WALES.
 ADYAR LIBRARY. Adyar, Madras.
 ASTOR LIBRARY, New York.
 ATHENÆUM CLUB.
 BANGKOK. VAJIRANĀNA NATIONAL LIBRARY.
 BENARES. QUEEN'S COLLEGE.
 BENARES CITY. SRI YASHO VIJAYA JAINA PATHASHALA.
 BERLIN. ROYAL LIBRARY.
 10 BIRMINGHAM. CENTRAL FREE LIBRARY.
 BOLOGNA. ROYAL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 BOSTON. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 Breslau. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 BRIGHTON. PUBLIC LIBRARY. (H. D. Roberts, Chief Librarian.)
 BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.
 CAIRO. INSPECTION LIBRARY OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION.
 CAIRO. KHEDIVIAL TRAINING COLLEGE.
 CAIRO. KHEDIVIAL LIBRARY.
 CALCUTTA. IMPERIAL LIBRARY.
 20 CALCUTTA. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATION IN BENGAL.
 CALCUTTA. PRESIDENCY COLLEGE.
 CALCUTTA. SANSKRIT COLLEGE.
 CHESTER, PA. BUCKNELL LIBRARY.
 CHICAGO. JOHN CRERAR LIBRARY.
 CHICAGO. HIBBARD EGYPTIAN LIBRARY, Western Theological
 Seminary.
 CHICAGO. NEWBERRY LIBRARY.
 CHICAGO. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 CHRISTIANA. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 CINCINNATI. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 30 CLEVELAND. ADELBERT COLLEGE LIBRARY.
 CLEVELAND. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 COLUMBIA COLLEGE LIBRARY, New York.
 CONNEMARA PUBLIC LIBRARY, Madras.

- CONSTITUTIONAL CLUB.
 COPENHAGEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 CORNELL UNIVERSITY, Ithaca, New York.
 DARMSTADT. GROSSHERZOGLICHE HOFBIBLIOTHEK
 DETROIT. PUBLIC LIBRARY, Michigan.
 EAST INDIA UNITED SERVICE CLUB.
 40 EDINBURGH. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 EDINBURGH. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 ERLANGEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 FLORENCE. BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE.
 GENEVA. BIBLIOTHÈQUE PUBLIQUE.
 GLASGOW. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 GÖTTINGEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, HOME DEPARTMENT.
 HAGUE. ROYAL LIBRARY.
 HALLE. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
 50 HAMBURG. STADTBIBLIOTHEK.
 HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY.
 JABALPUR. GOVERNMENT COLLEGE.
 JENA. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Manchester.
 JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, Baltimore.
 JUNAGADH COLLEGE, Kathiawad.
 KIEF. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 KYOTO. INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.
 LAHORE. CENTRAL MUSEUM.
 60 LAHORE. PANJAB PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 LEIPZIG. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 LIVERPOOL. INSTITUTE OF ARCHEOLOGY.
 LONDON LIBRARY.
 LUCKNOW. PROVINCIAL MUSEUM.
 LUND. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 MADRID. BIBLIOTECA DEL ATENEO.
 MANCHESTER. FREE REFERENCE LIBRARY.
 MARBURG. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 MELBOURNE. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 70 MUNICH. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 MYSORE ARCHEOLOGICAL OFFICE, Bangalore.
 NAPLES. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE. LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.


- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 NEW YORK CITY. LIBRARY OF THE TANTRIK ORDER IN AMERICA.
 OXFORD. THE INDIAN INSTITUTE.
 OXFORD. QUEEN'S COLLEGE.
 PARIS. BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU MINISTÈRE DE LA GUERRE.
 PARIS. BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE.
 80 PARIS. INSTITUT DE FRANCE.
 PEABODY INSTITUTE, Baltimore.
 PESHAWAR. ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, FRONTIER CIRCLE.
 PHILADELPHIA LIBRARY COMPANY.
 PITTSBURGH. CARNEGIE LIBRARY.
 PITTSBURGH. WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
 PRAG. DEUTSCHE UNIVERSITÄT.
 PRATAP SINGH MUSEUM, Srinagar, Kashmir.
 PRINCETON. THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
 RICHMOND. WESLEYAN COLLEGE.
 90 ROSTOCK. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 ST. PETERSBURG. IMPERIAL GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY.
 SEATTLE. UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARY.
 SHILLONG. PUBLIC LIBRARY, ASSAM.
 SIMLA. DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF EDUCATION IN INDIA.
 SOUTH KENSINGTON. SCIENCE MUSEUM.
 STOCKHOLM. ROYAL LIBRARY.
 STOCKHOLM. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 STRASBURG. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 SYDNEY. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
 100 TOKYO. IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LITERATURE.
 TOKYO. SHŪKYŌ-DAIGAKU LIBRARY, Omotecho, Koishikawa.
 TÜBINGEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 WASHINGTON. CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 WÜRZBURG. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
 105 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 sending him their names to be added to the above list.

SUMMARY OF MEMBERS

	Resident Members.	Resident Compounders.	Non-resident Members.	Non-resident Compounders.	Library Members.	Honorary and Extraordinary Members.	Subscribing Libraries.	TOTAL.
1906	86	22	313	65	12	29	72	599
1907	80	19	313	68	7	31	82	600
1908	94	16	326	67	4	30	85	622
1909	90	15	367	66	1	30	88	657
1910	92	14	395	62	1	30	96	690
Deaths	5	2	5	1	13
Resignations	5	...	10	2	17
Elected since	82	12	380	61	1	30	94	660
	7	...	48	2	...	1	11	69
Transfers	89	12	428	63	1	31	105	729
	+3	...	+2	+1	+6
	-2	...	-4	-6
Jan. 20, 1911	90	12	426	64	1	31	105	729





1/11. 2

Central Archaeological Library,

NEW DELHI. 24631

Call No 891.05 J J R A S.

Author - 1911

Title - *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*

Borrower No. | Date of Issue | Date of Return

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.