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The first of the two papers that follow contains a short account of a small treatise on rhetoric by the Kashmirian poet, Kshemendra, called the Auchityavichâracharchâ. In examining that book I was extremely interested to find that Kshemendra quotes in its entirety a verse, the last pada of which is quoted in Patanjali’s Mahâbhâshya, and that he gives the name of the author of the verse as one Kumâradâsa. This is the name of one of the authors quoted in the Anthologies of Vallabhadeva and Sârngadhara; and I set out the verses known from these sources to be by this poet in support of the contention that a writer who quotes Kumâradâsa cannot have lived in the second century before Christ. Mr. K. T. Telang, in the course of some remarks on my paper, referred to this part of it as, in the light of accepted facts, pointing rather to the conclusion that Kumâradâsa must be put prior to the accepted date for the author of the Mahâbhâshya than to the conclusion I had suggested. It was in response to this challenge that I drew up the Note on the Date of Patanjali which is appended to this paper. I am induced to publish the paper in its present form chiefly from a desire to animadvert here

1 This is Kshemendra’s own name for the book. Auchityâlamkâra, the name by which it is referred to in my paper, probably came into use as a convenient short title.
very briefly on the reply\textsuperscript{2} from Dr. Bhandarkar which that Note has elicited.

The Note was negative in its character, and its main contention is not I think misrepresented if I describe it as an attempt to show that there is nothing on the record inconsistent with some considerably later date for Patanjali than the second century before Christ.

Goldstücker, I knew, had maintained that two passages in the Mahābhāshya taken together proved that Patanjali lived after the overthrow of the Maurya Dynasty in the third century B.C., and at the time of certain events to which he himself refers as events of contemporary history, and which, according to Goldstücker, must be taken to have occurred in the middle of the second century before Christ. If Goldstücker's contention were correct, there was of course an end at once of mine: and my first care was to examine again independently the passages he relies on. It will be seen that I claim to show that Goldstücker misunderstood the grammatical import of the passage in which the supposed reference to the Maurya Dynasty occurs, and that I contend that, with his wrong translation disappears all reason for seeing in the passage any reference to a dynasty at all. Dr. Bhandarkar admits the first of these conclusions, but dissents from the second. He holds that the grounds for taking Maurya as the name of a dynasty that was extinct in Patanjali's time still remain. "The contrast between a royal dynasty and common people [which was Goldstücker's ground] is not that ground: but there is another ground which Professor Peterson has lost sight of, and which consequently has been neglected in his translation."

Bhandarkar proceeds to give my translation, and to show

\textsuperscript{2} The Date of Patanjali. A Reply to Professor Peterson; by Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, M.A., &c.
where it is, as he takes it, incorrect. For convenience of reference I give below the passage in dispute, my translation, and Bhandarkar’s criticism: and will state here what I have to urge in reply. This I will do briefly.

3 Mahabhashya on Pāñ. V. 3, 99. अपवय इत्युत्पत्रं तत्रं दं न सिद्ध्यति | "किं कारणम् मौर्योधार्याथिभिः प्रकटिताः | मूनिचामु न स्यात् | यास्वेताः संप्लति पुराभृतात्मू महिष्यति ||

"In that case [if अपवय is to be part of the rule] the following expression is not obtained [i.e. must be declared to be bad grammar, while as a matter of fact it is in common use, and so it is the correctness of the śūtra that is in peril.] रक्तस्वेती विशाल: “A Skanda in act to shoot.” “Why?” “It is for gain that the Mauryas make images.” तासू न स्यात् “Let it be admitted that so far to them the rule कन्या लुप्त should not apply, but that the affix ka should be used. यास्वेताः संप्लति पुराभृताः: But whatever images among these even, are from the beginning intended for worship and not for sale, तासू महिष्यति to them that rule will apply, and the affix ka will be barred.”

Professor Peterson rejects the reading विशाल: before रक्तस्; why, I do not understand, unless the reason be that it goes against the translation which he has worked himself into believing to be correct. विशाल: he translates by “in act to shoot” and his authority is a certain explanation of the word with a second-hand quotation in support from a commentary on the Amarakośa, contained in the St. Petersburg Lexicon, and copied from that as a matter of course by Monier Williams. But Böhtlingk and Roth have not found a single instance of the use of the word in that sense in the whole extent of the literature which they have examined. Still Professor Peterson thinks Patañjali has used it in that sense. But after all what Böhtlingk and Roth and Monier Williams say is that विशाल expresses “an attitude in shooting”; and not “one in that attitude”; so that if the sense is to be admitted here at all, रक्तस्वेती विशाल: would mean “Skanda who is an attitude in shooting,” which of course will not do. Patañjali, however, uses the word as expressive of a certain god who is always mentioned together with Skanda. Under Pāñ. VIII. 1. 15, he gives द्रव्य रक्तस्वेती विशाल: along with द्रव्य पर्वतना-रद्दी as an instance of a copulative compound of the names of things or persons always mentioned together, which admits of the use of the word Dvanda or “pair” instead of Dvan, or “two.” It is clear from this that Patañjali himself means to speak of them as two individuals always associated together, and forming a pair, and the dual also expresses that they were two.
And first of my "Skanda in act to shoot." My authority was not Monier Williams, nor was it the mere explanation of the word in the St. Petersburg Dictionary. Like other

Now Professor Peterson's translation of Skandaḥ Skandakā: prakāśana: is "It is for gain that the Mauryas make images." "Make" is present tense while the original prakāśana: is past tense, that being the past passive participle of the causal of kṛṣṇ. Again prakāśana: means "devised," "planned," "used as means," and not simply "made." A closer translation of hiraṇyagṛhiṇi: than that we have in the expression "for gain" ought to be given, for an important point is involved in that. Patañjali applies several times the expression abhinām hiraṇyagṛhiṇi "seek for gold" to kings, and the presumption it gives rise to is that here too those to whom he applies it must be kings. In the last sentence Professor Peterson's translation of the nominative ētya: by "among these" is wrong. It is only the genitive ētya: or the locative ētya: that can be so translated. Similarly śaṅkarīti cannot mean "from the beginning" as the Professor takes it to mean; it can only signify "now," "in these days," &c.

The sense of the passage is this. Pāṇini lays down a rule that the termination ka which is appended to the name of an object to signify something resembling that object (स्त्रवः), provided that something is an image (पतिकृतः), is dropped (कः लघुः), when the image is used for deriving a livelihood (श्रेयीचार्यः) and is not vendible (अपयोः). Now Patañjali raises this question. The addition of the condition that the image should not be vendible renders such forms as Śivaḥ, Skandah, Viśākhah, grammatically not justifiable (स्त्रवः—विवाह इति.). He must here be taken to mean that these forms are current, and that the description "not vendible" is not applicable to them. "Why not?" (किम् कारणम्), he asks. "Because the Mauryas, seeking for gold or money, used images of gods as means" (पौर्णम्—प्रकाशिताः). Here the author must be understood to say that the description "not vendible" is not applicable to the images now called Śivaḥ, Skandah, and Viśākhah, because such images were sold by the Mauryas. They are therefore vendible objects, though as a matter of fact they are not for sale, and though the selling of such images of gods is discreditable. It is the act of the Mauryas that has rendered them vendible objects. Hence the termination cannot be dropped in accordance with the rule, and they should be called Śivakah, Skandakah and Viśākhakah, but they are called Śivaḥ, Skandah, and Viśākhah. "It may be (म्वेदत) that the rule about the dropping of ka is not applicable (न स्त्रवः) to them, i.e. to those (तत्) images of gods which were sold by the Mauryas. But as to these (एताः) [viz. those called by the names Śivaḥ, Skandah, and Viśākhah, the correctness of which is in
students I am under constant obligation to both these dictionaries. But I endeavour also to use my own judgment; and if Bhandarkar will turn to the word वैशाख in the St. Petersburg Dictionary, I think he will agree with me that Böhtlingk and Roth supply, with their explanation, sufficient evidence

question] which (या:) are at the present day used for worship (समांत पूजायथो:) the rule is applicable to them (नासु माविभयति).” That is, the termination ka should be dropped in their case and the forms whose correctness was questioned are correct.

The forms are correct, because they signify images of gods which are now worshipped and are not vendible. They were thought to come under the class of vendible objects because such images were used by the Mauryas for raising money; but the vendibility of some does not make those that are worshipped vendible, and consequently the names of those images do come under Pāṇini’s rule and drop ka. In understanding the passage thus I have set aside Nāgojibhatta’s comment which I think can be shown to be wrong. He appears to me to say that the words Śivah, Skandah, and Viśākhah express images sold by the Mauryas, and as such they are vendible objects and consequently should have the termination ka, i.e. the forms should be Śivakah, &c., and not Śivah, &c., as given in the Mahābhāṣyā which are incorrect, while those, which, in conformity with Pāṇini’s sūtra drop ka, are such as express images, intended for that sort of worship which immediately after their manufacture brings in gains and enables a man to earn his livelihood. Now this makes no difference as to the province or operation of Pāṇini’s rule; but that the passage itself has been misunderstood by Nāgojibhatta appears to me clear. He interprets संवतित पूजयथः as “bringing in gains immediately after manufacture,” which interpretation is far-fetched, as are those of all commentators when they do not understand the point and still wish to explain a passage somehow. He also neglects the the word एता:. But the great mistake he makes is his forgetting that when Patañjali supposes an opponent and makes him raise an objection by the expression न सिद्धविलि, “this is not justifiable by that rule,” he very generally makes him object to the rule by bringing forward correct forms which that rule does not explain. Eventually, he interprets the rule in such a manner that those forms also are explained by it. In accordance with my interpretation this is exactly what is done here by Patañjali. If the passage were put in the form of a dialogue between the Doctor (Siddhāntin) and his opponent (Pārvapakshin), it would stand thus:—

Op. Pāṇini inserts the condition that the image should not be vendible, Then, the forms Śivah, Skandha, Viśākhah are not correct according to his
that that word is used in the sense I have endeavoured to fix on विशाख here. I do not understand the force, in Bhandarkar’s mouth, of the appeal to the fact that my authorities, such as they are, do not recognize a corresponding use of the adjective विशाख. They do not. But if विशाख स्थानम् is used of an attitude in shooting it would not, I think, be easy to show why विशाख might not be used as an adjective to a word signifying an image as indicating that attitude. It would have been well if I had given the precise reference; but I had these quotations in view when considering the passage, and I may therefore fairly, I think, dissent from the remark that my authority is “a certain explanation of the word with a second-hand quotation in support from a commentary on the Amarakośa, contained in the St. Petersburg Lexicon, and copied from that as a matter of course by Monier Williams.” On another small point too here Bhandarkar does me some wrong. He does not understand why I reject the reading शिव: before स्कल्स:; “unless the reason be that it goes against the translation which” I have “worked myself into believing to be correct.” It would be a legitimate retort to say that Bhandarkar reads Chandragupta-sabha, against Kielhorn, in the note on Panini I, 1, 68, because the omission of that word might be fatal to the edifice Bhandarkar

rule. [These forms express images of those gods, and should have the suffix ka.]

Doc. Why?

Op. Because the Mauryas, desirous of raising money, used as means the images of gods [i.e. they bartered them; and these are such images, and consequently belong to the class of vendible objects].

Doc. Those images may not come under the rule [because they bartered them, and consequently they may not drop ka]. But these [viz., those in question], which at the present day are used for worship, come under the operation of the rule [and consequently the ka is dropped].

3 They quote two passages from the Harivaṇṭha पौर: पद्माकामके मा वैशाखवनास्थितो महीम् 6235; and वैशाख स्थानमासाय, (said of Baladeva).
has raised upon it. But Bhandarkar gives his authority for the reading he prefers. And so did I. It will be seen that since writing my paper I have ascertained that the Alwar MS. of the Mahabhashya also omits चित्र: I can add now that, having been given an opportunity by my friend the Honorable Rao Saheb Visvanath Narayan Mandlik of consulting the fine copy of the Bhashya with Kaiyyaţa's Pradîpa in his private collection, I find that there too the reading is स्त्रेष् न सिद्धाति स्कन्द विशाखाति. We have thus the India Office Photozincographic copy of Kaiyyaţa, this one of the Rao Saheb’s, the Alwar MS. of the Mahabhâshya, and one of Kielhorn’s MSS. all testifying to a reading which is not to be rejected so lightly as Bhandarkar thinks. And if the reading I prefer turns out ultimately to be that which the weight of evidence shows to be correct, Bhandarkar’s attempt to refer the following एताः: (nominative plural) to these words will fall to the ground. It would seem then that my critic is here as much exposed, to say the least, to the danger of unconscious bias as I can be.

Neither the right reading however, nor the exact interpretation of the phrase [चित्र?] स्कन्दी विशाख शित is, as it happens and as I was careful to point out, material to the first point at issue. We are agreed here as against Goldstücker that the phrase contains instances, or an instance, of a form which as denoting an image is prima facie incorrect under the rule. Let it be admitted then, for the sake of the argument, that the instance put forward is not the word skanda, in such a context as shall show it is the name of an image of the god, and not the god himself, that is meant, but three names heaped together, which we are to understand from the general tenor of the whole passage to be the names of images. The question is as to what the next words mean, and here I join issue directly with my critic.
We are dealing here with images or idols which are profitable all of them for a livelihood, but which may or may not be for sale. This last distinction is a perfectly intelligible one, and I do not understand why Bhandarkar should insist as he does, that the vendible character of certain images must be taken to be due to some mysterious action taken with regard to them by the Maurya kings, or what grounds he has for maintaining that these images and these images alone are referred to in the words Śiva, Skanda, Viśākha. Idols have been sold from the beginning and are sold now: and the supply will doubtless continue so long as the demand shall last. Nor is there anything discreditable in the idol-makers' profession per se. Such names of idols then as Śiva, Skanda, Viśākha are for the matter in hand colourless. They do not of themselves tell us whether the objects of which they are the names—that is idols in general—are panya or apanya, vendible or not vendible, much less whether such particular idols as may by a forced construction be supposed to be referred to, are those the Mauryas dealt in or not. What then is it that raises the presumption, which it is necessary to notice, that all idols are in their nature vendible? The answer to this query lies in the phrase मौधेहिरण्याधिनिर्मिति: प्रकल्पिता: Does this mean, as I take it, "It is for gain that the Mauryas make images," or, as Bhandarkar believes, "The Mauryas seeking for gold or money used images of gods as means."

I will first repudiate the charge that I commit here the schoolboy error of rendering a word that denotes past time by a word that denotes present time. There is no restriction to time present, past or future in my English sentence, any more than there is in the Sanskrit so-called "past passive participle" प्रकल्पिता. The Mauryas, it may be, had made, were then making, and would continue to make images, but that is not
PREFATORY.

Patanjali's assertion here. What he says is that in making images they do not act from disinterested motives. They are in search of gain. In view of Dr. Bhandarkar's misapprehension on this point I should prefer now to translate "images are made by the Mauryas for gain," and I am confident that the so-called past passive participle in Sanskrit is the proper translation of "made" here, and that the use of the present would convey an entirely different meaning. But I do not repudiate my first translation, which is merely a more idiomatic rendering of the same thing. I traverse directly Bhandarkar's contention that the use of प्रकृतिपति: throws the whole action, as far as Patanjali is concerned, into the past. प्रकृतिपति: denotes no more than that the action of making is to be conceived as completed. It has not that note of time which Bhandarkar sees in it. But while refusing to admit that the action in this sentence must belong to past time I will not fall into the opposite error of maintaining that it must be present. Bhandarkar may be right even if he has not, as I think he has not, any warrant for being so positive. The speaker may very well be referring to some notorious action of past time when lust for gain (हिंसकसावाधिश:) led the "Mauryas" into paths to them forbidden. For if the "Mauryas" turned images into a source of profit it would surely seem to follow that images must be vendible things. Not being then of the class to whom such manufacture and sale is not forbidden the "Mauryas" may have trafficked in idols. Or love of money may have led the "Mauryas" to commit the heinous sin of selling idols that had once been consecrated. Nay the "Mauryas" may have been the then Paramount Power, and as such dealt with idols as the English Government deals with opium. Any one of these things may be. None of them, in my view, must be.

For who were these "Mauryas," whose connection with
images raises a presumption that images as a class, not certain images as Bhandarkar would understand, are vendible? The fact of course is that we do not know. I can only say that the context appears to me to lend very strong support to Nâgoji-bhaṭṭa’s assertion that they are idol-makers, and that, whether that be so or not, I can discover in the same context absolutely no reason for taking them to be the Maurya kings, whether of the third century before Christ or of the sixth century after Christ. That Patanjali in other places speaks of kings too as actuated by desire of gain is hardly conclusive.

I admit that प्रकृतिपति: is a difficult word. But it is as difficult for Dr. Bhandarkar as it is for me. And while I believe that it can mean ‘made’ or ‘made and sold,’ I doubt whether it can mean ‘used as a means to that end, namely making money,’ which appears to be in effect the construction sought to be put on it.

In my construction of एसा: I am fully supported by Kâiyyaṭa and Nâgojibhaṭṭa, neither of whom refer that word to the beginning of the paragraph. I do not think it can, in accordance

---

5 To make this clear I give Kâiyyaṭa’s note and Nâgojibhaṭṭa’s gloss upon it:—

Kâiyyaṭa: यास्तेनात हिति। या: परिसूचय गृहानुद्भूमिति तारित्वमेव:। यास्तु विक्री-यस्ते तासु न भवति। दिशकान्तीक्षणिणी हिति।—Nâgojibhaṭṭa: भौतिकर्मेनुसस्मात: प्रेषिताः। विक्री-बित्तिति चंदोंतस्तातां पृथिव्याऽसल प्रेषिताः। तत् प्रत्ययवणमेति वदन्यूत्तस्तस्दहारणं दशायति। भवेदिद्वादि। यास्तेनात हिति। ॥ संधितिवृज्ञायोः। संघाति स्तनिमित्तमकारमेव हनुमनिका या पृथ्वी आदिकामलेन तदश्री इस्थितस्वाधृ:। या: परिसूचिति। यास्तु मृत्यु पृथ्वी: शिष्टस्तातं शिष्भंदुस्त्रेषु: सत्तेन साद्वदुस्त्रेषु मद्यित्वभावाः। एवं चिन्तेन्धिन प्रहन्यस्। How Kâiyyaṭa understood the passage is not, to my mind, open to question. His short note deals only with the clause यास्तेनात:, which, according to Bhandarkar refers to the beginning of the paragraph. And his meaning is that the case of images made by Mauryas with an eye to gain must be finally disposed of in re this rule, according as they are either taken from door to door that service may be held and a “collection” made, or sold. I believe
with the ordinary rules of construction, be referred farther back than the अर्थ: of the preceding clause. And I feel sure that it would have been made to stand before, and not after the adversative particle तु if it had the meaning Bhandarkar now ascribes to it. I will, to lighten the argument, accept Bhandarkar's dictum that यास्ते: cannot mean 'whichever of these.' But substitute for एता: its antecedent अर्थ:, and we get the simple meaning 'whichever images.' As I do not believe that Patanjali is drawing any distinction between images dealt with by the Mauryas and any other class of images, the point is not, in my judgment, a material one.

that Kaiyayata construes यास्ते: as I do, "But whichever being these" that is "But whichever of these": and that his nominative to अर्थती is मौग्यः. I can only note here that in the India Office MS. Nagojibhatta seems actually to read न (i.e. the Mauryas) after या: परिवर्ण in Kaiyayata.

The meaning of Nagojibhatta's comment too appears to me to be quite clear, and to be moreover perfectly relevant to the "province of operation of Pāṇini's rule." "We must," says Nagojibhatta, "understand the word वेक्ते: after गकक्तिताः: The images referred to are therefore vendible, and the occasion for the suffix ka presents itself. In the two clauses that follow, beginning respectively with भेव: and यास्ते: Patanjali first (भेवपि नास्य न स्थानू) accepts the proposition that the occasion for the suffix has presented itself, and, secondly (यास्ते: धार्मिकं पुजार्थ: तास्य भक्यमात्र) shows how nevertheless his rule is not of none effect. The phrase समानं पुजार्थं: in this clause requires separate explanation: and it is explained as meaning images destined from the beginning for such lucrative worship as shall yield a livelihood. Lastly, the mention of this second class of images (या: परिवर्णति) suggests a final remark which may be necessary to avoid all misapprehension. Images are not exhaustively divided into those which are hawked about from house to house that the owner may levy a religious toll, and those which are sold right off. There are images which are exposed to neither indignity, but are set up and remain for worship and for worship only. With regard to these Nagojibhatta holds that the condition precedent of the suffix is absent. These images are not things made in the likeness of the god. They are the god himself.
Kaiyyata explains संसाति पूजाय: by या: परिगृङ्ख गृहाः भ्रमस्तन्ति and Nāgojibhaṭṭa’s Note is संसाति स्वान्तासमकालमेवः फलजनिका या पूजा जीविकामहस्तेन तत्थयोः. I follow respectable authority then in taking संसाति to refer not to the time of speaking “now,” “in these days,” but to the time of manufacture “at the time,” “from the beginning.” If the time of speaking is the same as the time of manufacture the distinction is one without a difference. I do not dispute however that Nāgojibhaṭṭa may be wrong, and that the sense may be ‘now.’ In that case the meaning will be that even images which have been objects of barter, if they have ceased to be such, and are now objects of worship only, must be held to have acquired the quality of apāṇyatva.

Bhandarkar has pointed out that he himself published a translation of this passage in 1873, “in accordance with the native commentators” when he also stated that Goldstücker’s interpretation was wrong. I greatly regret that Bhandarkar’s translation, although the paper which contains it is among the references I gave, escaped my notice at the time I was writing my paper. I have referred to it now, and am bound to say that in 1873 Bhandarkar had already silently corrected the worst of Goldstücker’s mistakes. In other respects however Bhandarkar’s version of 1873 is very defective, a fact which in fairness should not be lost sight of when comparing my version with that with which Bhandarkar has now followed it. In 1873 Bhandarkar took Patañjali to mean that Pāṇini’s rule is arbitrarily set aside in the case of images sold by the Mauryas, so that forms not valid are nevertheless in use. “What Patañjali means to say is that the termination ka should be applied to the names of the images sold by the Mauryas, according to Pāṇini’s rule; but the rule is set aside in this case, and the wrong forms Śiva, Skanda, and Visākha are used.” This is a capital error, as Bhandarkar now sees. That it is in accordance
with the native commentators is a view of it due I believe to a misapprehension of Nāgojibhaṭṭa's meaning, from which Bhandarkar has not yet shaken himself free. I should be more than human if I refrained from adding that in 1873 Bhandarkar gave to the phrase ताक्ष न स्वात् precisely that reference which he now seeks to give to the admittedly converse phrase वास्तेवाः; and that एता: he naturally then took in the sense he refuses to admit for it now. "It may not be dropped in those cases (i.e. the proper forms must be Śivaka &c.) says Patanjali, but it is dropped in the case of those images which are now used for worship." I think it must be admitted that if I have done nothing else I have at least led Bhandarkar to reconsider his own view of Patanjali's meaning, and that to some purpose.

So much for the Maurya passage. Its importance, as I have pointed out, lies in the fact that what I maintain to be a mere hypothesis, not proved, if not incapable of proof, with regard to the persons meant, led Goldstücker, and has led others, to look for Patanjali's date soon after the third century before Christ. With regard to the other passages I do not think that I can usefully add anything to what will be found in the following paper. My own contention was that Patanjali had been discovered to quote Kumāradāsa, that Kumāradāsa is the author of verses of a character precisely similar to verses which we can assign to dates ranging from 600 to 1000 A.D., and that in these circumstances it was difficult to believe that Patanjali really lived in the second century before Christ. These considerations appear to me to be unaffected by Bhandarkar's elaborate hypothesis as to what Patanjali must have meant by the illustration "Arunad Yavanah Sāketam," while as for Pushyamitra and Chandragupta I have pointed out that the existence of two princes of these names reigning at about the same time

*Bhandarkar's translation of 1873 is in the Indian Antiquary, vol. II., p. 95.*
is better guaranteed for the fourth century after Christ than for the third before Christ. I am far from saying that Patanjali must be taken to be referring to my pair of princes. I think the whole argument a most unsafe one, which affords no sufficient warrant to scholars to treat the subject as a closed book.

One more word about Pāṇini. It is not I think the case that I have anywhere sought to bring Pāṇini down to the sixth century after Christ. What I have said is, that if Pāṇini wrote the verses ascribed to him in the anthologies he certainly did not live in the sixth century before Christ. The evidence that he did write those verses appears to me to be accumulating, though I have never attempted to say that it is yet sufficient, ὡς ἄπανθ' ὃραν καὶ πάντ' ἄκοινον πάντ' ἀναπτύσσοντες χρόνος.\(^7\)

I cherish the hope that one day I may hold in my hands the Pāṭalavijaya, or the Jambavatīvijaya of the 'Mahākavi' Pāṇini. Nor will I much grudge the prize to my friend Bhandarkar in view of the effect the prāṣasti may possibly have upon him. If the book be found, I do not at all anticipate that it will turn out to be written in an archaic style.\(^8\) What appears to me on a

---

\(^7\) This is Aufrecht's quotation when giving (from the Saduktikārṇāmṛita) the fine verse attributed there, and in other anthologies, to the Bhashyakāra; यथावि स्वत्तभावन दशैौन्त्यसद्धिमेधीत \। तथापि जनूनदोषायिते तैतत्सि या कृष्ण: ||

\(^8\) "Should the entire work be discovered and found as a whole to be written in an archaic style, there will be time enough to consider its claim to be the work of Pāṇini; but at present we must reject that advanced on behalf of these artificial verses."—Bhandarkar’s paper.

Pischel has recently suggested that the Pāṭalavijaya may turn out to be a grammatical poem of the same kind as the Bhaṭṭikāvya. The suggestion is not in harmony with the verses that have been recovered; and itself rests on a misapprehension of the reference to the Pāṭalavijaya in Nami’s commentary on Rudrāṭa. As the matter is of some importance, and as I myself am disposed to attach a special significance to Nami’s reference to Pāṇini, I will give the passage here from the Bombay Government Palmleaf copy, (No. 53 of Kielhorn’s Coll.) and from the Paper copy secured by me for
review of the whole case to be probable is that Pāṇini was one of several grammarians who, late in the study of the subject, applied
the Government of Bombay. Nami is discoursing on the precise significance of the word साध्र in the following canon of Rudráta:

अव्ययाभिनंत्र ज्ञान सुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसदां नस्त्रायत्
कृतार्दशममभूण समतिविक्ये मयुष्ठीत

And his Note is

साध्रमहानमवस्तनिरारायणसुकुमार्याँ संदर्भातसे नातिरात्रायणसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भातसुकुमार्यां संदर्भात

For क्वृतार्दशमममभूण समतिविक्ये मयुष्ठीत

क्वृतार्दशमममभूण समतिविक्ये मयुष्ठीत

Pischel sees in Nami's words here a statement to the effect that great poets use ungrammatical forms in order to impress on their readers the importance of not doing so, which would not, it may be remarked in passing, be a very nice adaptation of means to ends. But Nami does not say this.

What he says is that by the use of the word साध्र here his author intends to exclude apāsabdās or ungrammatical forms, and that Rudrātā returns to this subject to lay stress upon it, although it might be considered to have been already disposed of by what he said about vyuṭpatti, in view of the fact that even great poets sometimes slip in this respect. (As when Byron writes 'lay' for 'lie,' a mistake which I observe a good English scholar has taken upon himself lately quietly to correct in editing an English Anthology for Indian students. It may be doubted whether Byron would have thanked him.)

Namiśādhu's short roll of offenders—all of them by his own statement mahākavis—has only four names in all, Pāṇini, Bhartṛihari, Kalidasa, and Bharavi. I have spoken of the peculiar significance I am disposed to attach to Nami's reference to Pāṇini. I confess I think that he purposely heads his list with two, Pāṇini and Bhartṛihari, whose eminence as grammarians makes their conduct to the pedantic mind all the more anomalous. In any case the dilemma is obvious. Namiśādhu must be added to the list of learned men witnessing to a poet, and a great poet, Pāṇini, who either needed not to be distinguished from the only wearer of that name known to these later days, or was in their minds not distinguishable from him. In the former alternative how has this second Pāṇini dropped into utter oblivion: in the second is there any good reason to suppose that men like Kshemendra and
themselves to consolidate and perfect the system of Sanskrit grammar, that the archaisms on which stress is laid are due to the fact that he was dealing with older documents, great part of which he incorporated, that the superior excellence of his grammar was early apparent, and has never since been effectively challenged, but that he was also a poet, and a great poet, writing as a poet in the poetical language of his day. What that day was—how far Pāṇini will eventually have to be brought down from the date now accepted for him, or how far it may be, on the contrary, advisable to push into remoter antiquity the lyric poetry of Northern India—is a question which we have no adequate means now of determining. Let us then wait.

To the paper which is the subject of this Preface I have added a second paper in which I gave the Society a fresh transcript and a translation of the inscription at Kansa near Kotah. This inscription is dated in the Malwa era which I have shown to be identical with the Vikramāditya era, and to have been in use under that name before 544 A.D. In reading and translating the inscription I received great assistance from Dr. Bhagvanlal Indrajit and from Dr. Bhandarkar, to whom I desire to offer my best thanks.

Bombay, 25th August 1885.

Namisadhu, identifying the poet with the grammarian, could have been in error.

Nami’s exact date is still uncertain. Kielborn gives Samvat 1176 as the date of the Palm-leaf Manuscript. I have shown that the verse from which this is taken really gives Nami’s date for the composition of his work. Our palm-leaf MS. may be the first copy of the work. The reading differs in the two MSS. The Palm-leaf MS. has

For प्रसाधिति here the Paper MS. reads प्रसाधिति. Nami therefore wrote this book either in Samvat 1176 or in Samvat 1125.
ON THE AUCHITYALAMKARA OF
KSHEMENDRA,
WITH A NOTE ON THE DATE OF PATANJALI.

In the course of a visit paid recently to Rājendrasūri, a Jain religious teacher at the time in Ahmedabad, I noticed that his list of books, which he kindly let me look over, contained an entry Auchityālaṃkāra. Bühler, in his review of my First Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts (Indian Antiquary, January 1884) pointed out that I had omitted from my list of the known works of the Kashmir poet Kshemendra a small treatise on rhetoric called Kavikantabhāranaṇam, our first copy of which Bühler himself obtained. "An examination of my apograph of this manuscript by Mr. J. Schönberg," Bühler goes on to say, "has shown that it contains, besides the Kavikantabhāranaṇam, another small treatise on Alamkāra called Auchityavichāracharchā." Rājendrasūri's Auchityālaṃkāra turned out to be the work here referred to: and through his courtesy in lending it I am able to offer in the following paper a short account of the valuable data for the history of Sanskrit literature which, within very small compass, it offers in rich profusion. A more extended notice of the book itself, and of the Kavikantabhāranaṇam, which here also, as in the previous case, is presented in the same manuscript, I hope to give in my forthcoming Third Report. From the fact just alluded to it is perhaps to be conjectured that the two books were generally regarded as supplementary the one to the other.

A word of preface is perhaps desirable as to the importance to us of a work like this. The poet Kshemendra tells us himself that one of his books, the Samayamāṭrikkā, was finished during the reign of king Ananta, in the 25th year of the Kashmirian cycle = A.D. 1050 (Bühler's Report, p. 46). He was a most learned and voluminous writer, and, what is more to our purpose, he invariably give his references when quoting illustrations of the breach or observance of the rhetorical

1 Mr. Schönberg has since published an account of the Kavikantabhāranaṇam. Wien, 1884.
rules he is discussing. We obtain from him then many names of Indian poets and their works, for all of which we get Kshemendra’s own time as a lower date, after which they cannot have flourished or been written. Kshemendra’s favourite method, as has been hinted, is to give first one or more examples of verses which comply with his rule, and to follow with one or more examples of verses which do not. It must be said for him that he deals out praise and censure as a true critic who is no respecter of persons. In more than one instance indeed he illustrates the two sides of the canon he is dealing with by different verses from the same work of his own. These verses by Kshemendra himself are not included in the analysis which follows.

I. AMARAKA. 1. आमराजामात्रिकीति. Böhtlingk 1035, from Amaruśatakam. गतनवयः सहस्रासमय: । यद्विष्णु न्यायविविध:।

2. गतनवयः यदि नाम निदितितमहो संतासिस केः त्वारा विविष्णु प्रकारं तिष्ठतु न्यायविविहारम्यावमुखः।

“If you must go you shall go; but why so soon? Turn and stand while I gaze on your face. Your life and mine are but two drops of the water that will rush out of the bucket when it turns the top of the wheel: and when that is done who can say whether you and I, in the lives to come, shall ever meet again.”

शर्का may also mean a waterclock, when the figure would resemble our one of the ‘sands of life.’ But I think प्रवाह shows that the sense is as I have indicated. It would be curious if the same figure underlies a common English colloquialism.

This verse is quoted also in the Kavikanṭhābharaṇaṃ (Schönberg, p. 14). Our two examples show that this poet Amarakā is not to be distinguished from the author of the Amurusatakam. Aufrecht (Z. D. M. G. 27, 7) thinks Amaru was the original form afterwards sanskritized into Amaru.

II. Bhāṭṭa Induraṇa. 1. आदर्श चारी परिति: काव्य यारा, प. 453 (Calc. Ed. 1876). गतनवयः सहस्रासमय:।


3 In both Manuscripts read दिनानि in the Kavikanṭḥābharaṇaṃ, and प्रवाह in the book before us. Professor Bhandarkar suggests पल्ल्वि ‘moments.’
III. Srimad Utpalaraṇa. अहो वा हारे वा. Böhtlingk 844, from Bhartrihari.

IV. Karpatika.

1. श्रीतिनायुपितस्य नामभविष्यति तयार्थे मन्नतः
   भांतीतः: ऋषिनायुपितस्य धमनः भृघुमरक्षेत्र ये।
   नद्रा काव्य विभावतः देहता सत्यवच हृदं गता
   सत्याव्रतप्रतिपालितेऽवस्था न श्रीयते शाखरी।

   "As I sat perishing with cold, and plunged like the moon in Māgha (the moon surrounded by clouds) in a sea of thought, the fire sank low, and my blistered lips and hunger parched throat were of no avail to keep it alight. Sleep has left me and gone like an insulted wife: and the night, like land given to a good holder, is no whit spent."

   This is the verse which Kalhana in the Rājatarangini (III. 181), puts into the mouth of the poet Mātrigupta, who is there said to have composed it impromptu, in reply to the king's enquiry as to why he alone of all the palace servants was not asleep. Its appearance here is noteworthy. Kshemendra in another passage of this small book quotes Mātrigupta by name. It is impossible, I think, to say whether we are to take Karpatika as the real name of the author of one of the works which are summarised for us in the Rājatarangini or as a synonym of Mātrigupta, referring to his condition as a suppliant for the king's favour. The verse occurs also in Vallabhadeva's Subhāshītavali, where it is ascribed to Mātrigupta, with the much better reading श्रीतिनायुपितस्य नामभविष्यति 'dried up with cold like a peaspod.'

   V. Kalidasa. 1. अत स विप्यवायत्वाचार्या. RV. IV. 70. 2 इर्मुलम् Vikram. Act II. इर्मुलम्बुवस्तुप्रायार्यालिन्यार्: मलयवाप्तालोप्लित. Both good readings.

3. इह निबलसति में: शेखर: क्रियाधारणा
   इह विनिहितभारा: सागरा: सम चान्ये।
   इर्मुलम्बुवस्तुप्रायार्यालिन्यार्यां
   धराणवेल्लाप्लैव स्थानमस्तिधिधानाम्।

   The heading to this verse is यथा कुन्तेश्वराचार्ये कालिनयस्य. I have not found the verse in any known work of Kalidasa, and can only suppose that Kunteśvaradātyam is the title of a lost work by the prince of Indian poets. 4. इर्मुलम्बुवस्तु प्रायार्यार् KS. VIII. 87. Kshemendra's testimony to the authenticity of the eighth canto. इर्मुलम्बुवस्तुप्रायार्यालिन्यार्यार्: 5. क्रिया प्रमो संहर KS. III. 72. 6. जातं बंधे: Meghadūta V. 6. Cf.
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note on No. 4. 5 लक्ष्यकामा: 7. बालेतुवक्षानि. KS. III. 29. 8. वर्षप्रकारेः साति. KS. III. 28.

VI. KUMARADASA.

1. आयो विजसहिति ृद्धिपुगुच्छं स्वसन नवसंगमसीरिः वहहं।
अरुणकरोऽभ्यं वरसातु सम्यवस्तिः कुकुलः ll

Böhtlingk 562, from Ind. Stud. 8, 414, where it was quoted from Aufrecht. MS. विजसहिति. As long ago as 1859 Aufrecht, in his edition of Ujjvaladatta’s Commentary on the Uṇādi Sutras, pointed out that the fragment of a verse वरसातु सम्यवस्तिः कुकुलः: given by Ujjvaladatta in his comment. on I. 82, occurs also in the Mahābhāshya, in the note on p. I, 3, 48. (Kielh. Ed. p. 283.) Aufrecht at the same time gave the whole verse as he found it quoted by Nārāyaṇa on Kedārabhaṭṭa. The discovery that Kshemendra quotes this verse and assigns it to Kumāradāsa will one day I hope prove a valuable datum for the Mahābhāshya itself. Unfortunately we do not yet know Kumāradāsa’s own date. But the following verses by him are quoted in the Sāṅgadharapaddhati and Subhāshitavali; and are presented here as, with the present example, presenting strong internal evidence that a writer who quotes Kumāradāsa cannot have lived at the date now widely accepted for Patanjali.

1. पदयन्ति मन्यथायाणपति;
शतनी विधां न निरीक्षय चक्षः।
करुः विधात्रा हि कृतो कथ तां
विर्यातः तद्यथा स्रुव्योहितवित्वकः ll

From Aufrecht, Z. D. M. G. 27, 17. 2 बालेनाय विदुङ्छ Aufrecht, who points out that it occurs in the Amaruṣatakam. 3. ब्र:प्रकर्षांपुष्पचीयमान.
Cited by Aufrecht.

4. शिशुवर्गमधुहिनि नासने चरति शीतमःहिति सत्यः।
मनसिद्ध: प्रववेश विबद्धिमहादृष्टिना विवृत्तांनः ll

“When the wind blew cold with showers of icy spray, Love took fright, and fled for shelter to the heart of the forsaken lover where the fire of sorrow burned.” Quoted and translated by Aufrecht, who compares the Anacreontic μεσονυκτίος ποτ’ ἄρσας.

5. श्रोत्वा विवेकान्य विद्वानशास्त्राणं संस्मारकत्वं कार्यसारी ।
ऋषिविक्रतो निश्चय इव वर्तस्य वसुपलक्षेऽव धनस्य वार्तं ll

“The wandering Sun has gone to the South country and there scattered his rays: now like a poor priest (who with the hope of alms in his heart has been holding out his hand to every passer-by) he goes to
the North country to repair his beams (goes to the rich man's house to get wealth.)" This last example is from the Subhāṣitāvali. It has a very modern ring.

VII. Mālava Kuvalaya.

1. कुमारसमनस: कुंकुम पुष्पोंमैरलत्सा हुना
   मनोति च घिरे मुख्तीमे किरति न कोकिला: ।
   अय च सवितु: श्रीरामसानु लुनाति मरीचोिे
   न च जरुरतामालबेल्ते कूदकोदहरिनी॥

VIII. Gauda Kumbhakāra. 1. लौँगलेन मर्मतिमान्वलितः. A description of Hanumān crossing the straits.

IX. Gangaka.

1. स कौरुस प्रेमान्: प्रणयपिपासकम्चलिति
   विजातीकरणा द्वारस्मलनुमयं वो मुक्ख्दां ।
   बराधुतं शुभ विशिष्टि मुख सुराविशे
   निरलल्प्यापारा शुभनाविधिनः पंच विशिष्ठः ॥

Kshemendra quotes this verse as a praiseworthy āsirvachanam by "My own teacher Gangaka."

X. Chandaka.

1. कुंश: क्राण: िंग: अवत्णिकल: पुष्चिरहितः
   हुष्टा शालो रुखः पितारकपालाणितगतः: ।
   ब्रजे: युनिकितः कुगिरिशुलतानतुः
   शृगामयैव श्वा तमपि मदयालेष मदनः ॥

Böhtlingk 1895 from Bhartrihari.

2. कुण्डनांव गति………पायाल्व व: क्रेशाः । 3. खंगालिसर्याः.

4. इत्यथ भाग्यपपलेनु न मे प्रतिष्ठा
   देवं नियम्यात्म जायं च पराजायं च ।
   एषां में रघुनारेश तस्म प्रतिष्ठा
   प्रश्यति यज रिपयो जयां ह्यानाम् ॥

"In battles Fortune goes now here, now there, and for them I will not answer. Fate gives victory and defeat to whom she will. This one thing I promise, that when I go down into the fight the enemy shall not look upon my horses' backs."

XI. Dipaka. 1. अय विरहविचित्रे. 2.पुण्य प्राने. Böhtlingk 4102
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from Bhartṛihari. a सितपरशुलचापािकपालीं. b भृगोपकंट. c मृत्यु. 3. इवांगिरसिरितांतवरकरोऽ।

XII. DHARMÂKÎRTI.

Of this poet Aufrecht writes as follows in the sixteenth volume of Weber's Indische Studien:

"Dharmâkîrti is one of the oldest writers on Alâmkâra. A work of his, called Baudhâraksanâgati, is mentioned by Subandhu in the Vâsavatâ (p. 205, ed. Hall). In all probability he is the Buddhist philosopher of that name who according to Wassiljew wrote a commentary on Dinnâga's Pramâñasamuchchaya, as also the work Pramânapravartika, Pramânâvîniśchaya, and Prasannapâda. A half verse by the philosopher Dharmâkîrti is quoted in the chapter of the Sarvdarsânamsamgraha that deals with Buddhism. Ānandavardhâna quotes Dharmâkîrti in the Dhvanîyâloka: the Sârgadharapadâddhati gives one, and the Saduktikârânâmritam eight of his verses."

Six of the verses referred to here will be found in Aufrecht's paper. A seventh is the verse लावण्यद्रविषेण्यवधृत, which, as Aufrecht notes, had already been given by Böhtlingk from the Kuvalâyânânda, without, of course, any author's name. Kshemendra in the book before us is now found to corroborate the statement of the Saduktikârânâmritam as to the authorship of this verse, and so far to corroborate generally the statements of the Saduktikârânâmritam as to the authors cited.

लावण्यद्रविषेण्यवधृत: न गणितः किशोरो महान्मीकुऽतः ।
रसस्थिन्द्रा सुखल जनस्य कसतमिचालवरा: गिनितः।
एवापि स्वयमेव तुययरणारुचाराकी हता
कौशर्येन्द्रति वेघसा विनिहितस्तन्नथस्तु तन्नता। ॥

"He recked not of the store of beauty he spent on her or of the toil he took: he made her a fire of torment for people who were dwelling at their ease: she herself is doomed to sorrow as one who can never find a mate: say, what did the Creator propose to himself when he made this woman?"

The verse is quoted in censure of the employment of the word तन्नता.

6रशी कुऽतः. So also Aufrecht. Böhtlingk आर्धितः।
7 Böhtlingk रसस्थिन्द्र चरति जनस्य हद्यवे. So also A with चरति for चरते।
8 A and B स्वयमातुपरमणावाद।
9 B. तन्नता।
which Kshemendra says has nothing to recommend it but the jingle with the words नवु लुवैः. The poet should have used some such word as चूत्तवः: This shows that the reading of our book (and of the Sād- 
ukti) is undoubtedly the right one, as may be said also, I think, 
of the other variants presented.

Other two verses—अमीयं प्राणां तथा असातो नापुष्पयाः:—which in the 
Skms. are ascribed to Dharmakirti “belong,” says Aufrecht, “to Bhar-
trihari. Their appearance in the anthology under Dharmakirti is to be 
accounted for on the theory that the compiler of the Saduktikar-
nāmāpyam took them from Dharmakīrti’s book on rhetoric without 
troubling himself to trace them further.”

Kshemendra in this book assigns six verses which now stand in 
Bhartṛihari’s Satakas to other authors, and claims at least one for 
himself, a state of things which makes us hesitate to accept Aufrecht’s 
theory here. The alternative theory, that the book which passes under 
Bhartṛihari’s name is a late compilation, deserves renewed considera-

XIII. BHĀṬṬA NĀRĀYĀNA. 1. महाप्रलयसनसन्भवित. 2. श्री शरण. 
Both from the Veṇīsāṁhariā.

XIV. PARIMALA.

1. आहारं न करोति नान्दु पिथरति स्वेण न संस्करते | 
शेषे यसिकवघु मुक्तायपङ्कतां पेवसे || 
व्यासवेश्चरं प्रताश्रितिकारणाममन्त्रयस्तन्तराः 
मन्ये मालविशी गुरुर्परतिकार्तान पापस्त्रयते ||

“He neither eats nor drinks, and he abjures the society of woman 
he lies on the sand, puts from him all worldly pleasures, and courts the 
hottest sun. Oh Lion of the House of Mālva, it seems to me that 
this Gūrjara King is doing penance in the forests of Mārwār that, he 
may be found worthy to touch the dust of your feet.”

2. तत्र स्थितं स्थितिमता वरदेव वैवा- 
दुर्योजन ते चक्रोऽवित्तमिद्धवहानि || 
उष्काविनि स्तनते हृदरेश्चराणां 
हारान प्रदत्तेष्यति तथ भवव्यत्सापः ||

“There, O good king! thy servant got a footing, as fate would have 
it, and there he remained so many days, curious at heart—there, 
where thy fame sets dancing the pearls on the quivering breasts of 
the deer-eyed women.”
3. The silly Gurjara Queen, as she wanders terror-struck in the forest ever and anon casts her eyes on her husband's sword to see if there be no water (धारा) there, bethinking herself in her heart how often in the days that are gone she has heard the bards say 'Great king, the hosts of your foes have gone down in the battle through which your sword's edge (धारा) swept.'

4. "O Hill of the River of Love, O Crest Jewel of Kings, O Home of all Goodness, O Milky Ocean of Cleverness, O Lover of Ujjayini, O thou that Wert a living God of Love to young women, O Kinsman to all the Good, O Brewer of the Nectar of the Arts, where O King, art thou gone: wait for me."

These verses show that Parimala's lost poem probably present an almost contemporary record of one of the earlier struggles between the sovereigns of Malwa and Gujarāt.

I will only conjecture here that the theme of the poem was that expedition in Gujarāt despatched by Tailapa, under a General of the name of Barapa, "against Mūlarāja, the founder of the Chaulukya dynasty of Anahilapattana, who for some time was hard pressed, though according to the Gujarāt chroniclers the General was eventually defeated with slaughter."  

The striking verse in the Kavyaprakāśa राजचाज. मलयā न पारमैति म (p. 450, Calc. Ed. 1876) wears every appearance of being from the same work, for which we should be on the look out.

XV. Parivrajaka.

1. तनो न तद्व वयमेव तसा
  भोगा न तुक्ता वयमेव तुक्ता: ||
  जसा न जीणो वयमेव जीणाः-
  स्त्रेण न याति वयमेव याति: ||

This seems a better form of the verse which Böhtlingk, No. 4631, भोगा न तुक्ता: gives from Bhartrihari.

---

*Bhandarkar: Early History of the Dekkan, p. 59. See also the Bās Māla, Cap. IV. to which Bhandarkar refers.*
XXVI. Bhaṭṭa Prabhākara.

This poet is already known only from Aufrecht’s citation from the Śāṅgadharapaddhati of what is surely one of the prettiest compliments to beauty even a poet ever devised.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{चा हृदा चैर् वा हृदा} \\
\text{मुषिता: समेव ते।} \\
\text{हर्षं हतमेकेरा-} \\
\text{मन्येयां चक्रुयोः: फलं।}
\end{align*}
\]

“She spoils indifferently those who see her and those who see her not: these lose their hearts, those might as well have never had their eyes.”

1. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{विग्नात्वमविपिन्य} \\
\text{वृत्तां वर्ते एव भि वर्यो रोमाणितं:} \\
\text{विभिन्न प्रतिपादं किमपरं रामायं तस्ये नामो} \\
\text{वश्स्माः विपुस्तकाः तत्तमिं याचैव चास्त्त गतम्।}
\end{align*}
\]

XVII. Śrī Pravarasena. Two verses are quoted, which both occur in this writer’s Setubandha. I, 2, and III, 20.

XVIII. Bhaṭṭa Bāna. Three verses by Bāna, the author of Kādambarī, are quoted. Two of these, 1. जयद्रुपदं: and 2. स्तनबुंधं, are from that book, and call for no remark. But the third is of extraordinary interest for us. It is the verse

3. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{हारी जलाँद्रवसम निलनीहलानि} \\
\text{प्रलेखकरमुच्यस्म्हीलानंहास:।} \\
\text{वस्येन्धनानि सस्तानि च चन्दनानामि} \\
\text{निर्याःमनेप्यं कथे स मनोनाशमि।}
\end{align*}
\]

which now stands in the Amaruśatakam (No. 98). In his note Kshemendra tells us that this verse is part of a description of the state to which Kādambarī was reduced by the absence of Chandrāpiḍa. It would appear then that Bāna, in addition to the work known to us, treated the same theme, or part of the same theme, in verse: and with this clue we can assign to their place in such a composition more than one of the verses cited by Bāna in the later anthologies.

XIX. Bhaṭṭa Bhallata.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{सच्चर्यास्मात्मातं भनुरिं मुखद्विपाचेयत} \\
\text{शिशका सा विजिताड्युना प्रतिज्ञ सत्तंगलमा गति।}
\end{align*}
\]
The use of singing or music as one of the weapons of the hunter is often referred to. Aufrecht quotes ten verses by this poet from the Śārṅgaddharapaddhati.

XX. Bhavabhuti. 1. पुरा बच चान्त: पुलिन. Uttara R. Act. 2. योयमथ: पताकाे ते Uttara R. Act. IV. 3. वृद्धास्ते न विचारणीचिरिता: Uttara R. Act. V. a तिभक्ति वर्चसः. $ युवः खीरमने. γ अक्रौलस्मान्यायप इद्याध्युनिपने. In the heading to the second of these examples the poet is in both MSS, called Bhavabhupati.

XXI. Māgha.

बुधविज्ञानकरण न अक्षः न पीवणे काव्यवर: विपासिते: ।
न विचारणा केननिधुरुण्यं कुलं
हिंदुयभवभूत नियंत्रला: कला: ।

"The hungry cannot feed upon grammar, or the thirsty satisfy themselves with the nectar of poetry. No man ever exalted his house by learning. Get money. Learning leads to nothing." Note in the Sīsapālavadha. Böhtlingk 4484, from the Subhāshitārṇava.

XXII. Mātri-gupta.

नायं निधागुखसरस्वाभिषेकः
कीर्तिकपोटलकालततु: शाशंकः ।
भाषात् माय तविर्विवित्वुपरिपरिपरी
हास्त्यस्मांत्यु: ॥

Note that Kshemendra would seek to distinguish between Māтри-gupta and Kālidāsa. Compare Max Müller 'India: what can it teach us?' p. 133.

XXIII. Rājaputra Muktāpiḍa.

नीवर्षपसरामयुटिकर्षणेऽवद्वित: वैशवे
पीतं ढलन सरोजप चूरुन्त्रे होमाव्रथश्यं पयः ।
ते कृत्ता महामंडलविलयव्याह्योत्तरग्रां गजे
सौऽकेंद्र सभं च पद्यवित्तुदृश्ये स्थीतं तापसः ॥

"From afar the hermit gazes with mingled love and fear at the mighty elephant, whose throat is encircled by swarms of bees heavy laden
with the juice that exudes from its temples, and remembers how this is he whom at first he nourished with the tender tops of the rice-plant, and who drank from a leafy cup the milk that was over from the sacrifice.”

XXIV. Yasovarmadeva.

Yasovarman, according to Aufrecht (Z. D. M. G. 36, 521) wrote a drama, Rámabhýândaya, which is cited by Abhinavagupta.

XXV. Bhāṭṭa Laṭṭana.

Rājaśekhara was perhaps not such a rake as he professes to be. The verse may go to show that similar autobiographical couplets, of which tradition has preserved a great many, may oftener be genuine than is sometimes supposed.


XXVII. Mālava Rudra.

Given as by Bhāṭa in the Subhāshithalahārāvali.
2. Aufrecht writes the name of this poet Malavarudra. But compare Mālava Kuvalaya and Gauda Kumbhakāra above.

XXVIII. Śrī Vakra.

1. This one verse is so far all that has been found of a poem—by a poet himself also otherwise unknown—which must contain a contemporary account of one of the early leagues of the Hindu princes against their Musalman invaders. Compare what has been said above of Parimala’s lost work. Jālāntara here is I presume Jullundur.

XXIX. Varāhamihira.

“The waning moon enters the orb of the sun at each month’s end, and having there renewed his fires goes each day further from his helper: nay, when his fulness comes, as come it will, vies in the eastern sky with the setting orb of day. Verily, verily the cold-blooded man never leaves off his ingratitude and his meanness.”

Given in Vallabhadeva’s Sabhashitâvali as by Dhârâdharâ.

XXX. Bhagavân Maharshi Vyâsa.

“Doubtless woman is a pleasant thing and wealth too: but life abides no longer than the glance shot from the corner of her eye by a love-sick girl.”

Böhtlingk 6733, from the Subhâshitârṇava, with मनोरमा: कामा: in a.

XXXI. Śyâmala. The only Śyâmala we know of is the Śyâmala who was Bâṇa’s cousin. Hall’s Vâsavâd. Introd. p. 41.

To the twelve compositions by Kshemendra which were already known to Schönb erg, in his paper on the Kavikanthābhairana, added other eight, which he found quoted or referred to in that book. His list is as follows—

13 Śāśīranā,  
14 (Padya) Kādambari,  
15 Chitrabhārata,  
16 Lāvanyavatī,  
17 Kanakajananī,  
18 Deśopadeśa,  
19 Muktāvali,  
20 Amṛtataranga.

Three of these are quoted in our book also, where the Chitrabhārata is called a Nāṭaka, and the Lāvanyavatī and the Muktāvali are called Kāvyas. In addition the following new names occur, Avasarasāra, Baudhāvadānalaṭā, Nīlīlāṭā, Munimatamīṁāṇaśa, Lalitaratnamalā, Vinayavalli, Vātsyāyanasūtrasāra. Of the books in the earlier list the Chaturvargasamgraha is the only one quoted under the same name.

I should make some small amends to the Society for a dull paper if I could adequately describe the scene where I got this book, and the impression that scene made upon me. In an upper chamber of a by-street in Ahmedabad were gathered over a hundred of the common people, listening eagerly to their word of life, as that was communicated by Rājendrasūri to his more immediate disciples. A little company of women sat apart, but not so as to be out of hearing of the teacher.

At the end of our conversation a young Rajpoot, a rich young man as I could judge from his dress, who had been an intent observer of all that passed between his teacher and myself, rose from the crowd, put his folded hands to his head, and told me in his own language that he had one request to make to me. Between Rajendrasûri and another teacher then in Ahmedabad there were vital differences—as to the kind of garments men desiring salvation should wear, and as to whether in the evening hymn they should recite the three verses only, or four. Would I undertake to solve his doubt?

I put him off with a jest which I have sometimes regretted since. But I came away with new wonder at the strangeness of human life: and, as I hope, with fresh sympathy for all of the one family who in every place are thus feeling after God, if haply they may find Him.
Note on the Date of Patanjali.

"Patanjali's date, B.C. 150, may now be relied on."—Bhandarkar in his Early History of the Dekkan, p. 7. So too Kielhorn, though he was more directly concerned with the question of the authenticity of the text of the book, maintains that "we are bound to regard the text of the Mahābhāṣya as given by our MSS. to be the same as it existed about 2000 years ago." (Indian Antiquary, IV., p. 107, and V., p. 241.) I will state very briefly why I think the question must still be regarded as open. Kalhana's verse:

चंद्राचार्यादिनितित्वम्यात्र तत्त्तमावतापम्।
प्रबर्तितं महानाग्न्य स्त्रे च व्याकरणं कृतम्॥

Rājātarangīṇī, I., 176 (p. 7, Calc. Ed., 1835), appears to me to have exercised what can only be described as a pernicious influence on this controversy. In itself it contains no indication that Kalhana so much as had Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya in his mind when writing the passage. But if we grant, for the sake of argument, Prof. Weber's contention (Ind. Stü. 5, 165), that the transaction Kalhana is referring to is clearly the same as that spoken of in Bhartrihari's Vākyapadiya, and grant also, under the same reserve, that it follows that Kalhana here is speaking of Patanjali's work, the verse even then cannot bear the weight which is sought to be put upon it. It is not open to us to quote Kalhana as corroborating Bhartrihari's statement, when it is clear that, writing in the 12th century, he is, if he is referring here to Patanjali at all, dishing up for us and doctoring a story which he must have got directly or indirectly from Bhartrihari or from the same sources as Bhartrihari. Still less is it justifiable to transfer to Kalhana the credit that would attach to any statement made in the Vākyapadiya as to the date at which this mysterious transaction took place. It is Kalhana, and not Bhartrihari, who here seems to connect Abhimanyu of Kashmir with Patanjali's commentary: and I do not understand why so much weight should be attached to this one statement, occurring as it does in a part of the Rājātarangīṇī which, as Buhler puts it (Report, p. 59), is full of improbabilities.
and absurdities. A similar reasoning holds good of Kalhana’s second verse:

राजतरंगिणी IV., 487 (p. 58, Calc. Ed.)

I notice that Max Müller (Note, p. 335), suggests a doubt as to whether Kalhana is here referring to Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya. But if we grant that he is, here too his statement must be checked by the passage in Bhartrihari. And as soon as that is done it becomes at once apparent that on Kalhana alone rests the responsibility of dividing the story as it stands in Bhartrihari into two parts and separating the two by centuries. Bhartrihari tells us that to Chandra and his school was due the revived study of the Mahābhāṣya. Kalhana puts Chandra in the first century, for Abhimanyu’s greater glory, and as he cannot ignore the fact that something of the kind occurred in the reign of king Jayāpiḍa (A.D. 755-783), he invites us to believe that twice in the history of Kashmir did the king of the country interfere to set the Mahābhāṣya on its feet again. Of the two passages the second appears to me to be far more deserving of credit than the first: and the विनेत्र (which need not be construed with स्वमंडले)¹ refers to the state from which Chandra had (recently?) rescued the book, not to a state into which it had been permitted in Kashmir to fall centuries after his benevolent activity.²

¹ As for example Kielhorn does. “The King having sent for interpreters [reading with the Paris edition याचकायाने] brought into use in his realm the Mahābhāṣya, which had ceased to be studied’ (in Kashmir, and was therefore no longer understood).” Indian Antiquary, V., p. 243. It may be worth noting that पावत्यति is the ordinary expression in the case of the first patron of a book. Thus for example in the colophon to a MS. of Hala in my possession Sātavāhana is called the प्रवृत्त of the Kālāpa grammar. Our word therefore should be translated, as Kielhorn does here, or as Max Müller in his Note, p. 335, “introduces”; and this verse in itself does not suggest that what Jayāpiḍa did was to “re-establish” (Max Müller, p. 334) the Mahābhāṣya.

² In his reply to this paper Professor Bhāndarkar takes this sentence to mean that I understand Kalhana to put Chandra in Jayāpiḍa’s reign, and that I accept that as a fact on Kalhana’s authority. This of course leads straight to the absurdity of Bhartrihari’s having mentioned a fact which took place 105 years after his death. As my words have been made matter of public comment I must leave them as they were written. But I take this opportunity of saying that, for my own part, I entirely repudiate the construction Bhāndarkar puts on them. I am concerned here only with what Kalhana’s meaning
Better texts of the Rājātarangini, and a careful collation of the two verses, as they ought to be read, with Bhartrihari would, I think, strengthen this position. I have little doubt that the Parvata of Bhartrihari's verse is, as Max Müller suggests, no other than the hill of Chittore, which was a centre of learning for the southern country, (Compare my First Report, p. 47). I think it is not impossible that the words नमस्त्वशंक्तम् तस्मात्सामस्यम्, which from the crux of Rāj. I., 176, conceal Bhartrihari's own phrase पञ्चतास्यम्ह लक्षणः. If Kielhorn's conjectural emendation दक्ष्ये इसान्नतरत्सा कम्यम् be ever confirmed, it will become still more obvious that the two verses have one and the same origin. They will then almost textually agree.

But if we are thus really dependent on Bhartrihari's statement which contains no note of time, we are entitled to range further than Goldstücker and Bhandarkar do in their search for events and names which will suit certain passages in the Mahābhāṣya itself, where Patanjali, as they hold, is referring to contemporaneous or recent history. I will not discuss the question here as to whether these instances really do, in Goldstücker's words, "concern the moment at which Patanjali wrote." (Pan., p. 230.) I think it is forgotten in that argument that Patanjali could trust to the practical acquaintance with the language or literature which his pupils possessed, much as an English grammarian might without risk of confusion illustrate after having given the rule, our past and present by two such phrases, as "In six days God made Heaven and Earth," and "This people perishes with hunger."

Four passages in all, so far as I know, have been adduced from the Mahābhāṣya itself as supplying definite chronological data for the time of Patanjali. The first is the note on Pan., v. 3, 99. Goldstücker, it is true, who brought this passage to light, did not contend that it proves more than that Patanjali did not live before the first

---

3 Goldstücker treated this subject in his 'Pāṇini: his place in Sanskrit Literature,' pp. 227-238. The references for Bhandarkar are Indian Antiquary, p. 291, II., pp. 59, 69, 94 and 238.
king of the Maurya dynasty, who was Chandragupta, and who lived 315 B.C.; or, possibly, "if we are to give a natural interpretation to his words," that he lived after the last king of this dynasty, or, in other words, later than 189 before Christ. If the passage stood alone then, and there were no such thing as cumulative effect in arguments of this kind, the inference sought to be drawn from Patanjali's note on Pān., v. 3, 99, might be allowed to pass without challenge. But it will not be denied that this suggestion as to a date before which Patanjali may not be supposed to have lived, when taken in connection with a date (Abhimanyu's time), removed from it by two centuries only, and regarded, on what grounds we have just seen, as a date after which he may not be supposed to have lived, has done much to strengthen the conviction that here or hereabout we must look for the time of Patanjali. Yet I think it can be shown, beyond all manner of doubt, that this passage has nothing whatever to do with the matter in hand, and that, as far as it is concerned, we are as free—or shall I rather say hampered?—with regard to the upper date to be assigned to Patanjali, as I have contended we still are with regard to his lower date.

Pānini's rule is नीविड़कायः चाप्रमः. On which the note is अप्रमः इदुच्चये तत्रेकं न सिद्ध्यति। शिव: स्वर्यः विद्याख इति। फि कारणः। स्वेयं: हिरण्यार्थिनिमित्ता: प्रकल्पिता:। नवेवन। ताशु न स्यान। यास्बेवता: संग्रीत्य पूजार्थाः। तासु: भविष्यति। Goldstücker's explanation of this passage is as follows:—"If a thing," says Pānini, "serves for a livelihood, but is not for sale, it has not the affix ka." This rule Patanjali illustrates, with the words 'Siva Skanda Viśākha,' meaning the idols that represent here divinities, and at the same time give a living to the men who possess them, while they are not for sale. And 'why?' he asks. 'The Mauryas wanted gold, and therefore established religious festivities.' Good. Pānini's rule may apply to such (idols as they sold); but as to idols which are hawked about (by common people) for the sake of such worship as brings an immediate profit, their name will have the affix ka."

"Whether or not," Goldstücker goes on to say, "this interesting bit of history was given by Patanjali ironically, to show that even affixes are the obedient servants of kings, and must vanish before the idols which they sell, because they do not take the money at the same time that the bargain is made—as poor people do—I do not know."

In the rest of the passage Goldstücker draws his inference in words that I have already given.
Could Patanjali have thus anticipated the *super grammaticam* story? I thought not; and it was my conviction that there must be some mistake here which led me to examine closely the passage Goldstücker quotes. As a result, I think I can show that Goldstücker misunderstood and mistranslated that passage from top to bottom. I need hardly say that it requires all the courage Max Müller recommends thus to challenge that mighty and indignant shade. But I have put Goldstücker's explanation fairly before the reader. I will now say how I understand the passage. If I am right my translation will, I think, justify itself: and I shall, I hope, be judged to have done some small service with regard to a question on which much depends. अर्थयङ्कृत and बयति then tells us that a doubt is about to be suggested with regard to the word अर्थयङ्कृत occurring in the śūtra under comment. "Sīva, Skanda, Viṣṇu, " are not three words illustrating Pāṇini's rule. They form the clause or sentence referred to by the इदम् preceding. For न तत्रते न सायति is the doubt of which we have been forewarned, and must be translated: "In that case [if अर्थयङ्कृत is to be part of the rule] the following expression is not obtained [i.e., must be declared to be bad grammar, while, as a matter of fact, it is in common use, and so it is the correctness of the śūtra that is in peril.] But if श्चः: श्चः शिवाय; or श्चः: शिवाय: as Kaiyāṭa, as I think rightly, reads, be an expression that prīmā facie throws doubt on the correctness of the śūtra, we must look in it for an indication that the Skanda of this passage is an idol, and not the god of that name. श्चः: in itself cannot be a form of doubtful authority. The doubt is as to whether in a particular connection the form श्चः: should not be used. The word we are in search of can neither be श्चः: nor श्चः: It must, therefore, be शिवायः: and we have next to see whether that word, when used as an adjective to श्चः:, of its own force suggests that the reference is to an image or representation, as when we talk of a sitting Madonna or a sleeping Venus. But a reference to any dictionary will show that such a meaning is one of the best authenticated senses of the word शिवायः:. श्चः: शिवायः: means, "A Skanda in act to shoot," and that is the phrase given here as affording an example of a form which apparently under this rule would have to be condemned. "Why?" (किं कारण sc. न सायति), "It is for gain that Mauryas make images." The Skanda in act to shoot must be an image: and as it is notorious that images are vendible things it ought not to be possible to speak of a श्चः: शिवायः: but only of a श्चः: शिवायः:.

So far the doubt. And now the Doubter answers himself. भवेत "Good."
Vendible images made by the Mauryas are, as a class, by the operation of the word अपूर्वे in this sūtra, taken out of some of the categories of things falling under the general rule which enjoins the omission of affix ka. तासु न स्यायु “Let it be admitted that so far to them the rule कनो युप should not apply, but that the affix ka should be used.

यास्त्रेिता: संप्रति पूजायथा: But whatever images among these even, are from the beginning intended for worship and not for sale, तासु भविष्यति to them that rule will apply, and the affix ka will be barred.”

The extent of the difference between Goldstücker’s explanation of this passage and that now offered may be gauged by the last clause here, “and the affix ka will be barred,” which stands for Goldstücker’s “their names will have the affix ka.” But Kaiyyaṭā puts beyond all dispute the question, as to what is the subject of the clauses तासु न स्यायु and तासु भविष्यति, when he says, यास्त्रेितावरुणे तासु न भविष्यति विभक्तियन्त्र्य-कौपीट इति. The न स्यायु of Patanjali means that the word in question should have the affix : the भविष्यति that it will not.

Two points in this explanation require a further note, though fortunately any judgment with regard to them does not affect the argument. I have so far not met with any native support for the particular construction put above on the words स्यायु विशाखः. That— with or without शिव:—these words refer to the clause immediately preceding, and not to the sūtra, and contain therefore a form or forms whose currency throws doubt upon the sūtra, I believe to be certain. But the shastris I have been able to consult—in particular Mr. Rājrām Śāstrī, the learned grammarian attached to Elphinstone College—agree in thinking that the context of the whole passage is sufficient to show that idols are meant here: and they take the three words Śiva, Skanda, Viṣṇu, in the current acceptance of three names of images. That theirs is an old view is shown by the way in which the passage is treated in the Siddhānta Kaumudi, where विशाखः is quietly dropped, and वायुः substituted for it. I put forward that part of my explanation therefore only tentatively, and am quite prepared to find that there I am wrong. It might have been the more prudent course to hold it back: but I confess I believe it is right, and am unwilling to abandon it.

The India Office photozincograph of Kaiyyaṭa and one of Kiellhorn’s MSS. omit शिवः. ⁴Kaiyyaṭa’s own note on this passage is attached to the phrase यास्त्रेिता: संप्रति पूजायथा: । तासु भविष्यति in which, as Nāgojībhāṭṭa puts it, Patanjali “indicates an example for the sū-

⁴ As does also the MS. of the Mahābhāṣya in the Alwar Library.—[Note added when publishing.]
ON THE DATE OF PATANJALI.

The quotation just made from Kaiyyaṭa will illustrate the other point on which a doubt may be entertained as to the correctness of the translation I have given. What is the subject of अद्वितित in Kaiyyaṭa’s sentence? Goldstücker supplied “common people,” whom he next contrasted with the royal dynasty of the Mauryas. But is it not the Mauryas themselves who are here represented as setting apart for purposes of peripatetic worship some of the images they make? I believe that to the present day the makers of idols contrive that their profession shall pay the same double debt. That seems to me the more natural construction: and so also in Patanjali’s note यास्वेता: seems to me to mean “whichever among these.” I do not however dispute that एवता: here may refer to images in general (अर्थ:;) and not to images made by Mauryas (पौर्णकारिपताचा:;) or that अद्वित्ति may mean “people wander” and not “they wander.”

I will only add that संग्रहति पूजाया: must be taken as two words, though both Goldstücker and Kielhorn (Ed., p. 429) take them as one. संग्रहति does not qualify पूजा, and there is no question here of “such worship as brings an immediate profit” (Goldstücker’s translation). What is insisted on is that the affix ka will be barred in all cases where the images have from the beginning been meant for worship and not for sale. Compare Nāgojīḥāṭṭa’s gloss—

संग्रहति पूजाया: | संग्रहति स्तवन्नृणान्तकात्मकः फलजनिका या पूजा जीविकाः प्रस्तवन तद्यथा इत्ययस्तसाह | या परिस्रज्यति.

There is, therefore, I contend, no such contrast between the Mauryas and common people as Goldstücker discovered in this passage: and
with that vanishes the only foundation for his belief that the Mauryas intended here are the dynasty of that name. They are a guild or caste of idol-makers, as Weber pointed out was apparently Nāgojībhāṭṭa's explanation. (Compare Weber, Indische Stüdien, p. 150). I ought to add that Weber also noted that अस्थाि: must not be translated, as Goldstücker does, by "religious festivals." I am not quite certain how far Weber intends his translation to be a correction of Goldstücker's. I notice that he puts, "Auf diese passt die Regel nicht," for Goldstücker's "Pāṇini's rule may apply to such." But he does not, as in the other case, call attention to this as a correction: though, if it is meant for a correction, it is a very important one. I mention the matter, because I am of course anxious to yield priority to a scholar eminent no less for his fairness than for his learning and achievements for any part of the foregoing explanation which he may see reason to claim as his own.

Of the three remaining passages in the Mahâbhâṣya which are relied on, that cited by Bhandarkar इस पुष्पपिन्च्याजयम:—is I think the only one which, as matters stand at present, really concerns us. Goldstücker it is true has shown that Patanjali illustrates a vârttika of Kâtyâyana according to which the imperfect should be used when the fact related is 'out of sight, notorious, but could be seen by the person who uses the verb,' by the two clauses अहंपयावन: साकेतं। अहंपयावव: माधयमिकाब “the Yavanas besieged Ayodhya: the Yavanas besieged the Mādhyamikas.” To these two passages the doubt I have hinted above as to the validity of the major premiss in this argument appears specially applicable. Is it not a perfectly reasonable view to suppose that the vârttika is illustrated by clauses which, taken along with it, serve their purpose apart altogether from the time at which the grammarian lived? To suppose in other words that the user (प्रयोक्ता) whose relation to the time and circumstances of the action is specified is not necessarily, or even probably, Patanjali. Is this not indeed just what Nāgojībhāṭṭa means when he says that we are to gather from the clause itself that the speaker is contemporaneous with the action—अहंपयासकारणुतुल्यकाल: प्रत्यत्वेत इति बाध्यम.

But further discussion of this point here may well be waived in the absence so far of any information as to the events referred to. Havoc has already been made of Goldstücker's Buddhist sect of Mādhyamikas: and we do not know either that the 'Yavanas' besieged 'Sāketa' in the time of Menanders, or that they did not besiege that city more than once in the centuries that followed. In the case of Bhandar-
kar's example it seems to me to be more probable than not, that the whole context—the illustration itself—regard as open to the same reasoning as the other two—points to the conclusion that Patanjali lived at the time, and perhaps at the court, of Pushpamitra. But if that be so there were more Pushpamitras, or Pushyamitras, than the king who reigned in the second century before Christ, there was a Pushyamitra, who lived at the time to which recent speculation appears to the present writer to be slowly but surely referring Patanjali. In the Bhitari Lat inscription it is mentioned that Skandagupta, "the son of Kumâragupta, who was the son of Chandragupta, who was the son of Samudragupta, who was the son of Chandragupta, who was the son of Ghatotkacha, who was the son of Mâharâja Śrî Gupta," the founder of the later Gupta dynasty, conquered Pushyamitra *समुद्रितकरणकोपमुद्यमिन्तं च जिख्या. This point has been hitherto obscured from the fact that in Bhao Daji's revised translation of this inscription, published in the tenth Volume of our Journal, p. 59, 'Pushya' is, perhaps by a printer's error, enclosed in brackets as if it were doubtful or conjectural. It is not so in Bhao Daji's own transcript which follows: and Dr. Bhagvanlal Indraji, to whom I owe this reference, and who it was that obtained the transcript on which Bhao Daji worked, assures me that the reading is clearly as I have given above. (Bhao Daji read *समुद्रितकरणकोपमुद्यमिन्तं रूहीत्या*) The Pushyamitra against whom Skandagupta had to move all his forces, and employ all his treasure, must have been a formidable opponent: and it seems to me that it is open to any one who admits that Patanjali is referring to a living Pushyamitra to prefer this one to that.

---

5 I can only refer here to the discovery that Kshemendra does not distinguish between Pānini the grammarian and Pānini the poet, and to the evidence adduced by Max Müller from the works of the Chinese pilgrim I'tsing, Note, p. 347; and my Reports I. p. 39, and II. p. 61.
AN INSCRIPTION FROM KOTAH:

I took the opportunity of a recent visit to Kotah in Rajputana to examine and take a fresh rubbing of the inscription at Kansua, near that town, of which I now offer a revised transcript and translation. Attention was first called to this interesting and important memorial of antiquity by Colonel Tod, who published a translation in an Appendix to Vol. I. of his Annals of Rajasthan. Dr. F. Kielhorn contributed to Vol. XIII. of the Indian Antiquary a transcript of the original text, with a short abstract of the contents. I hope it may be permitted to as warm an admirer as Tod's Book ever had to say, what is indeed the bare truth, that on this occasion the translation given to him by his shastris presents hardly a single feature in common with the original. Dr. Kielhorn's transcript had already made so much clear. But the inscription is of a nature to warrant a full translation: and as my rubbing supplies a considerable number of corrections it does not seem superfluous to give, along with the version which follows, a revised transcript.

Kielhorn has pointed out that the alphabet used in this inscription is essentially the same as that of Dr. Bühler's Jhâlrápâthin inscriptions published with facsimiles in Vol. V. of the Indian Antiquary. A difference which Kielhorn draws attention to is that in the Kotah inscription middle long a "is denoted by a wedge-shaped sign placed after the consonant, not by the sign placed above it." It has to be added that the wedge-shaped sign in question is hardly, or rather not at all, distinguishable in form from another wedge which both in the Jhâlrápâthin and in the Kotah inscriptions is a constituent part of the signs for the letters ज and ज. In the eighth line of Dr. Bühler's facsimile of the first Jhâlrápâthin inscription the word सत्यभवन्नत्तन्त्रवत्त्तत्वला supplies in close juxtaposition the syllables द्वत्र and द्वत्र. It will be seen that both have the wedge. The second character differs from the first in that there the wedge is drawn out from the thin end by a curve above the line into the "diminutive trident," as Bühler calls it, which is the ordinary sign for middle long a in the Jhâlrápâthin inscriptions. For the letter ज compare the word तन्त्र in the second line of the same facsimile, where, however, the wedge has got to look like a mere continuation of the top line.
The wedge then being already a constituent part of the sign for ज and र in this alphabet a difficulty arose when, as here, it came to be used also for middle long a. The alphabet, as it previously existed, indicated the expedient made use of in the Kotah inscription. While after other letters long a is written by the simple wedge, after ज and र the wedge is drawn out in a curve going above the line, though not to the same extent as in the older inscriptions.

The only other characters which appear to call for remark are those for middle short and long i. The two are differentiated, as in other Sanskrit alphabets, not by the relative position each occupies to its consonant, nor by any material difference in the shape of the sign, but by the direction, to the right or left, the curve takes from the initial point, which is, as a rule, somewhat thicker than the rest of the character. The neglect of the distinctions I have noticed has, I think, led Kielhorn to correct रणi V. 3 into रणि, विक्रता V. 4 into विक्रट, and स्पटि V. 9 into स्पटी. In all three cases the right reading would appear to be on the stone.

This inscription is dated in the 796th year of the Lords of Mālava. It is probable that the Jhālrāpāṭhan inscription, which is dated in the 747th year of an unnamed era, is to be referred to the same method of computing time. The slight difference in the alphabet to which attention has been drawn is of the kind that might develop in the fifty years which, on this hypothesis, would separate the two. Neither the Śivagaṇa of our inscription nor the Durgagaṇa of the Jhālrāpāṭhan inscription is spoken of as a sovereign monarχ.1 and when we find one spoken of as ruling at Kotah, under a Maurya Emperor, in the year 796 of the Lords of Mālava, and the other referred to as ruler in the year 747, of a town only seventy miles to the south, which has always been very closely connected with Kotah, it seems natural to suppose that “Durgagaṇa,” and “Śivagaṇa,” are of the same stock. If this be so, it is to be noted that the want of any reference on the Jhālrāpāṭhan inscription speaks of an era which at the time had wide and undisputed currency.

1 Differently Kielhorn, who carries the line of Maurya Emperors given here from Dhavala through a Chirantana to Śaṅkuka, who was the father of the Śivagaṇa of our inscription. A reference to either transcript will however show, I think, that it is the friendship existing between Dhavala and Śaṅkuka which is referred to, and that chirantana is not a proper name at all.
It can be shown that this era of the Lords of Malwa is no other than that now known as the Vikramaditya era, and that it was in use under this or some such similar name before 544 A.D., the year in which, according to Mr. Fergusson's ingenious theory, the Vikramaditya era was first invented.

When I was at Jhâlîrâpâthân I was told by the Brahmans of that place that they could trace their lineage back to a body of immigrants from the west country, part of whom halted at Dâsapura, while their own progenitors pushed seventy miles further to the east, and finally settled where I found their descendants living. Dâsapura, they added, was the old name of the village now called Mandosar near the station of that name on the Rajputana-Malwa Railway. It will be seen that this identification, which is an important one, was confirmed by the inscription about to be referred to. Dâsapura as the name of a town in Malwa occurs in the Hitopadesa.

I knew that the village of Mandosar contained an old inscription which was probably of very great importance: and what I heard from the Jhâlîrâpâthân Brahmans did not diminish my anxiety to make out a visit to the place. Unfortunately that proved impracticable at the time. I was able however to supply Pandit Bhagvanlal with funds for the journey: and he has put me in possession of his rubbing and transcript.

The Mandosar inscription refers to a temple built by a guild of weavers, immigrants from the Lât country, who had been hospitably received at Dâsapura, whither they had been attracted by the report of the virtues of the then ruler of that town, Bandhuvarman, son of that ornament of kings, Viśavārman. But while Bandhuvarman

---

2 I heard of it from Dr. Bhagvanlal, who got his information from Mr. J. F. Fleet, into whose hands a rough copy, made at the time by an engineer employed in the construction of the Railway, was finally put. The inscription is an extremely quaint one, and I should much like to publish it in full. But my friend Mr. Fleet, who has since obtained his own facsimile, destines the inscription for his forthcoming Gupta volume: and in deference to whatever may be his rights of treasure-trove in the matter I willfully refrain from doing more now than adducing what is necessary to the matter in hand. The chronological speculations above are however my own.

3 The word I have translated ruler is pârthiva. If the names of all the rulers of Dâsapura ended in varman (compare our Śivagaṇa and Durgagaṇa above) we may have here a clue to the Pârthīvo Bantivarman at whose court the Mudpuruâkâshâsa was written.
ruled over Daśāpura, the Earth "with the four seas for her girdle, and Meru and Kailasa for her fair great breasts," was under the sway of Kumāragupta. And this temple was erected—

मालवानं गणस्थित्वा योति शतचतुर्दशे ।
चिन्तवन्यात्विकाव्यानां—

"when four hundred and ninety-three years from the establishment [in the country?] of the tribes of the Mālavas had passed away." Whether gaṇasthiti here has the meaning I have suggested for it may be matter of future discussion. I think it will not be disputed that in any case we have here the same era as that of our Kota inscription. What is the era in the 494th year of which Kumāragupta was ruling the wide earth? This is a question to which I take it there can be but one answer. It is the era now known as that of Vikramādiya.

This can perhaps be most effectively demonstrated by beginning at the end, and assuming for the sake of argument what I desire to prove. Kumāragupta then, let us take it, was reigning in the year 494 of the Mālava era, that is, of the Vikramādiya era, that is, in the year A. D. 438. Kumāragupta's earliest and latest known dates, in the era of his House, are 98 and 129, that is, the years A. D. 407 and 448. On our hypothesis then the Mandosar inscription falls easily within the time at which Kumāragupta is known to have been reigning: and there is no other era known to us which will give us the same result. The Mālava era and the Vikramādiya era are therefore one and the same.

It is taken for granted in the above that the initial year of the Gupta era is A. D. 319. But with Oldenberg and Bhandarkar I hold that no apology is required for such an assumption. Those who still hesitate may rather fairly be challenged to show how any other theory of the Gupta era can be made to fit in with the Mandosar inscription.

Mr. Fergusson attempted to get rid of the chronological difficulties attaching to King Vikrama of popular story, by the theory that the astronomers who calculated for the monarch who was Kālidāsa's patron, an era to be called after his name, took as the date round which it should pivot A. D. 544, "the year in which the great battle of Korur was fought," but called that year Samvat 600, not Samvat 1, of the new method of reckoning. While the theory, as so expressed, must now, I think, be abandoned, it remains quite possible that Fergusson's solution of the chronological difficulties referred to may nevertheless "turn out to be in the main correct." But in that case what happened
was not that Vikramāditya's astronomers were so careful to provide a reckoning for past, as well as for present and future time, as Ferguson's theory would make them out to be. Either Vikramāditya was personally concerned in restoring, not establishing, the old era of the kings of Mālava: or the common people forgot in his glory all the other kings who had ever ruled that land. In or after his time the years took their name from him, as July took that new name from Divus Iulius.

It must not be put out of sight, however, that we may any day discover that Vikramāditya, as a name of the Mālava era, is older than it has yet been found to be, and that Bühler is right in still holding to the belief that the Vikrama era, "which begins 56 B.C. was really established by a king of that name who lived before the beginning of the Christian era." That is the natural explanation of the name, and, as not unfrequently happens, it may ultimately turn out to be the correct one.

To come back to our inscription, the year in which it is dated corresponds, if the foregoing be correct, to A.D. 740. Of the two villages set apart for the maintenance for ever of the temple, the name of one, Chaoni, can be seen close to Kotah, in the map of the Trigonometrical Survey. I have not been able to identify the other. It would be interesting, and is perhaps possible, to trace the fortunes of an endowment so solemnly set apart.

TRANSCRIPT.

Om namah śivāya om

1. 

Nāma: sāttakalaśāsarakarētvārē 

namo gṛhśrīmātāsattastalāṃbhāyā Ātmanām

2. Āśvatthama-pūrṇakāra: kavaccyaparimāhīna-rūpahā: 

pratikṣa- 


śrīdāmśa bhūgam: kavaccaśaśrīdāmśa bhūgam: rājya jñānānandā: rājya pravāhāc- 

śrīnām Šrīnāmājāvatā: pānītū Śrīnāmājāvatā v: ||

4 As Tribhuvanamalla had again to do in 1182 A.D. when the Śaka era had for the time in its turn displaced the older method of computation. See references given by Max Müller, ‘India: What can it teach us?’ p. 285, note 1.


Verse 1. a namāsakalō. sic.
3. An inscription from Kotah.

4. Line 2 ends.

5. The distinction between द and द is very clearly seen in the four syllables ज्याज्याज्याज्याज्या.

6. Verse 3. a-फ़ामः-Kielhorn फ़ामः, corrected into फ़ामः. b-सू-K. सू, corrected to सू. The distinction between द and द is very clearly seen in the four syllables ज्याज्याज्याज्याज्या.

7. a-इ मात्रप्रकाशितभ्रमण्यमति-K. इ मात्रप्रकाशितभ्रमण्यमति. Verse 5. a-जवनि is throughout so written.—विद्वानः-K. (विद्वानः) घातां,—γ-Read with K., हस्तायमहेमु-Verse 7. a-समस्त-K. समस्त, δ-Read, with K., पश्चास्मां. Verse 9 a. Visarga is wanted after रहर्ष. K. reads it, but says it is very indistinct. My rubbing, which does not show it, may be defective. But compare two other cases of an omitted visarga in the next line. β-Read विद्वानः. धतुर्कृत्य-K. corrects.
10. कोपाकुण्ड में कुम्भविगलमुक्ताफलालंकृतः
स्त्रीतास्तुतिर्पाणिता अयि मुहयोनायितेन स्वयं।
उत्तारीति पंक्तिः पुनः प्रिच्छेतेऽशिरोंिनि विभिन्नते।
विश्रामित्वा विशृणिता रणसुवर्त्ता प्रकटान तालः।
†Line 7 ends.

11.इत्यं तस्य चिन्तनानि द्विजवर्तस्तुपायायायम्।
प्राप्तिमे तर्कस्य कर्तव्यम्। पाठ्याया प्रश्नसुर।
स्तुतायापि रणागणि विलसितं सांपुरवत्तिः हिव्यः।
स्वयंवर्तितनितं समरसंदिः। प्रत्येकाः प्रायः।

12.शाश्वार्थं इत्र प्राप्तसंदेशां ग्रेहितसंज्ञानी।
धृतसेव विपुद्भक्तरन्न न्यायाय स्वतः सतः।
प्रामाण्यं प्रमतः ———— वस्तुदर्शसंस्कृतं तस्य
[रूपिणार्थं] गतः प्रयासः श्रीसकुककाश्यो त्रृपः।

13.हेक्ष्णानि नाम तस्यासुद्धशिपी विचित्रज्ञाः।
तत्स्यं तस्यामध्वीरः सूचिः कःतुगुणावृतः।

14.ब्राह्मणी रूपवां वर्ता श्रीमान विबधिगणि सुः।
विवर्तय गुरूनः स गणो वेन तद्भरता गतः।

15.खार्रापातदत्तु विवधक्षेत्रमालिंगोंद्रवं
उव्यासद्वं वकापकुद्धर्मोऽन्तरयानी।
नाराजमययानाकल्कश्रीमोहनात्त्वकाश्वयः।
प्रीतमत्वम् रणे स्तविवर्तयायनाश्चेतिं।

16.ज्ञात्वा जनम जनावियोगमरणेश्चैर्वैगीविविं
स्वायत्यायवयेश्व योग उचितो लोके प्रसिद्धः सताः।
लेनेंपर्यं भवनं धमालमना कार्यितं
यदुविव समस्तलोकपुयो नाम करः कल्यां।

निश्चेति जिन्हा; and reads सत्तितुष्टि (“the इ very indistinct.”)—Read स्वमध्वायताः। K. स्वतिभवायताः वर्कायताः। γ Read वर्कायताः। K. विकर्जयायि। 
β नरेन्द्राति। K. (लिङ्ग)। ताः। Compare my translation. Verse 10. γ Read उनासीदिक्षां which is K.’s reading of the stone. —Correct, with K., δिशं ।
β गुरुः: त्वासिः। सिच्छ। Verse 11. a K. विज्ञाशि (स्वेयय) शाप्य। ध्र गुरुः: पाण्डः। The stone is injured here. δ ग्रहित is throughout, the inscription written हृष्य।
Verse 12. a K. मुहार्दः। β Read धर्मसेवेन K. थर्मसेवेन। δ K. तपस्य [रूपतिकश्च]तः।
Verse 13. a K. ‘Anusvāra or uncertain,’ β K. [सुनुः] कःतुगुणाः [कः]।
Verse 14. γ K. सागरः। Verse 15. γ Read नाराय। K. नारा(रूपम)। धित्र। —K.
रफस्यः। δ K. प्रत्येकाः। —K. भैरवाधितश्च। Verse 16. a K. अधितः: corrected into अधितः। The correct form is quite distinct, तो being written as in Jain MSS. ताः, except that two wedges take the place of the two lines.
γ K. corrects यः into यदः। Compare my translation.
17. गुप्तवाणोकसमीरेन सुभासुक्तकुलुकान्तेरः
काले मतविलोकणः हुकुमाते व्याहुखर्दिलुण्डः।
जातिपक्षुकुमारणकरणे नादरंगितं सरे
कुर्ते त्रिवनं नवस्थय दुसिता तेनेह कृष्णाश्म।।

18. कालेर्वशेखरसुक्तमानं ततुवलनकस्मिनुक्तकुलुकानां
कान्तानां हस्तमाने कुकुकलसतीकान्तिसंगमां
ारण्यायोभिमुखच्चिन्तित्वाविनिर्मिताभ्यंकरणां
धूमंगेरवर रथोद दुस्स्वरुपांशुवास्ये प्रेमबन्धः।।

19. मोहातिरक्षंकुरारंकाराध्यायाः।
संयोगे कुकुकुं याथाः बुधचत्तित पथिकांगना।।

20. धूपाधिग्रंथीपार्थे खण्डकुटिलेतुतृः।
शास्त्रीये क्षणा नीमि मन्त्रां चोपिनप्रक्रृ।।

21. पालब्रह्म नन्दः सदैः स्वाय भूमिरियं भिे।
एवं कुमे ते धर्मपार्थे नृसः योनि शिवायं।।

22. संसारसागरं घोरं अनेन धर्मस्वेतुः।
तारस्यक्षमसूः नृसें जन्याचार्यानेच च।।

23. वाकसागरां पृथ्वीं सनायं च सकातानाः।
वायुसिन्धुपेषे भागुस्तादिकीसङ्गिर्विविधः।।

24. संसारसरस्ताथायेनं सप्तचक्रवर्त्याँ।
समभिमालेवशानां मन्त्रसे जूहेंः कुर्ते।।

25. अलुक्तः दुर्यवारी च सिवण्णितः सता।
कालरूपकोशवारणः धार्मिकः बौद्धितः।।

26. दृष्टः प्राङ्गुच्छ विश्वासत्यम्युभ्रतः पुरावर्तः।
दवो अयास्मिन्तविमयेन गोचरी कांगः।।

27. उस्कीपं शिवानांगेन द्विधिविवय सूनुः।
सूनुः महासुमेधवेनः हुलोच्चवधः।।

28. भोका भयी कुठा तथा मौलिन्द्रसुधांतः।
कृष्णसतो गुप्तानुव्रस सूरयासरोचण पण्डकः।।

29. एतस्कण्यायाभमं ज्ञातव्या सत्वयापहरं हुम ।
कृत ति महार्वें शम्भोः भृगविमालितवेच्छेन।।

30. यत्तहीं अर्थशालीं मायाहीं तु यज्ञव।
तस्यस्य साधुस्चतेन मर्यणयेयं श्रुद्धस्वह।।
†Line 16 ends

TRANSLATION.

Om! Adoration to Śiva! Om!

1. Adoration to Śambhu through Whom it is that we are able to cross life’s whole sea, Whose is the Hand let down to us that are all fallen in the Pit of Darkness.¹

2. May Śambhu’s matted locks protect you—locks that delight by conditions (moods) wide apart: for here they are bright as the White Land with the countless rays of the moon falling upon them, there dark with the heavy folds of the Monarch of Serpents that lie ever upon them: here hot with the flashes of his eye, there cold indeed with the plashing waters of the Daughter of Jahnu.²

3. May Śambhu’s matted locks protect you—locks whose ornaments are ever intermingling: for over all of them there lie the quivering rays of the moon that are blended with the lustre of the jewel in the Great Serpent’s hood: and in some places they are streaked with the smoke-encircled tawny tongues of flame from the fire of his eye, in others dashed with the pearly drops of spray thrown up by the River of the Gods.

Verse 29 a. He first wrote यत्तहीनमय्यः.—Read with K. पृष्ठः.

¹ अभिंसपत is given by Böhtlingk (Smaller Dictionary) as a word for which no reference was available. हृतलम्ब्य is the same as हस्तालम्ब्य a word which B R explain as meaning “that which the hands lay hold of.” I have suggested another way of taking the word. Compare the verse which B R refer to:

१ दुर्गे: संसारमाणि महमणयतं व्याह्यां दुर्विवहायः
अवाप् कर्मणूर्गमे अलि नियततामालित् हस्तालम्ब्यः।
इत्येव संगमाभ्यं यतिनिर्बिमध्यं मानसे शुद्धदुद्रशः
भर्मैं चिन्तं विधेयं नियमततमितुर्णणं वाच्छता सिद्धीसशंष्यम्।।

² Śiva wears the Moon as his crest jewel, and the serpent Sesha coils its folds over his head, through his matted locks the Ganges finds a path as it descends from heaven to become an earthly stream.
4. May Sthanu's Head protect you. It is a lake whose lotus charms
the eye. That lotus is the great braid of hair: and the mud to which
it clings loosely is the great serpent that ever lazily swims on the
water of the heavenly Ganges. It is a lake where the moon's rays
quietly shining, appear like many lotus stalks seen between the white
skulls that are its lotus-flowers.

5. Lo He begins to dance and his toes keep measure with the
beat: he has bound together the weight of those locks that are reddened
with the tongues of flame from the flashing fire that has its home in
his deep-sunk eye: he has put straight the moon's orb that is bright
with its nectar-like rays: and with his two hands he has pulled tight
the serpent from whose knotted face the fire of the poison is up-
springing. May this Sthanu protect the world.

6. The Maurya line is seen to be like the deep (noble) sea: it
illuminates the world with the moon of its crest-jewel (the moon as its
crest-jewel) is the refuge of great princes (great serpents): it is able to
protect kings (mountains) that are in pain and trouble through fear of
the destruction of their forces (wings): to it come armies (rivers) from
far and wide: it is bright with all manner of precious possessions
(jewels): and in it fortune dwells.

7. The kings of that line—like World Elephants—greatly glad-
dening good men with the light of their faces bright with gifts (the juice
that exudes from the temples of elephants)—exalted in their pride,
roam at large over the earth* confidently and undaunted of heart:
praised too for their friendliness (bhadra, a kind of elephant) and
- - - ? they are glorious for their race, more glorious for their
virtues.

8. Such were these kings and they reigned over the whole earth.
And among them there arose king Dhavala, himself, by reason of his
fame, as resplendent (dhavala = white) as his name.

9. Through their own faults heaped up in the sight of all men
from day to day by sins of thought, word, and deed, this king's enemies
were by him at once conquered and made kings (wandering beggars)
like evil spirits naked and ever hungry, with new terrors appearing
each day, they wander by night from door to door of the stranger.

10. Not once or twice did he the mighty and valorous one by his
own right hand adorn over again the fields of fight—deserted of timid

---

3 Literally "like a lake charming by means of the lotus," &c. It is no easy
to render this style into English in a way that shall not be absolutely
unreadable.
men with the severed heads of his enemies for lotuses torn from their stalks, though these fields were already adorned with the pearls that had fallen from the elephant temples he had cloven asunder in his wrath, and garnished with broad streams of blood.

11-12. Now a king Śrī Śaṅkuka by name had long been this man's intimate and dear friend. Though a brahmin this Śaṅkuka bore arms and took such joy in them that he was a very vessel of acceptable offerings to the King of the Dead. He was famed for his virtues. Even now the spirit-haunted fields of fight, full of the murmurs of the rivers of the blood of his foes slowly drying up speak of his pastime in the courts of war. To Dhavala Śaṅkuka was what the meaning is to the significant word, what the Path of the so-called Triad (the three Vedas) is to the Law. He was pure at heart and a very Root of Good Conduct - - -?

13. He had a lawful wife, by name Denginī, of the people of the twice-born. She bore to him a son—a hero, who paid due respect to merit.

14. King Śivagaṇa, glorious, handsome, liberal and fortunate. Surely he was once (in a previous birth) that gaṇa (host) of Śiva since he became now his devotee.

15. Not once or twice did he wrestle, pleased at heart in the field of war, the field made frightful by the noise that issued from the open ends of the throats of the headless corpses that were their own funeral pyre, on which they burnt with the flame lit by the flashes of fire that rose from their arrows as it was cloven by the sword stroke—the field where the spirits of the dead saw with pleasure the blood vomited by the fowls of the air as they rose in terror from the faces gashed by the arrows that still adhered to them.†

16. But the good know assuredly that life is full of all manner of troubles—old age, bereavement, and death—and that 'one thing only is needful' here: therefore did this man cause to be built this temple of the Most High God, to but look on Whom is for all people to wash from their bodies the stain of Time.

17. When aśoka-trees in flower perfumed the air, when the mango was in blossom, and East, West, North, and South were beset with swarms of drunken and staggering bees, when Love spoke only of the

* The birds were wounded or frightened: and the spirits of the air get blood to drink without having to go further.
coquettish glances of women folk, here in the hermitage of Kaṇva this man piously built a fair House for Śiva.

18. At the time when women, brought face to face with their lovers, with a laugh bend low and half close their eyes, as they think of all they show on breasts laid bare by the motion of the swing, and speak the love they feel only by their knotted brows.

19. And when those whose lords are absent, let fall a tear as they mark how all round them the place is adorned with mango-trees on which the drunken bees are humming.

20. For incense, perfumes or light, and for repairs, two villages Sarvātka and Chaoni, have been assigned in perpetuity.

21. Let all kings whose this land may be maintain this gift: if they do so for righteousness sake assuredly they will come to Śiva's, heavenly home.

22. This is a Bridge of Righteousness over which assuredly such one may transport himself and his parents across life's awful sea.

23. His fame shall endure as long as the earth with her seas, hills, and groves, as long as the sun and moon shall burn.

24. When 795 years of the kings of Mālava had gone this temple of Śiva was built.

25. The architect was Aśabdagaṇa (?)—a man free from avarice, kindly spoken, and always a true worshipper of Śiva.

26. The writer here is Gomika's son Raupuka, a man clever, wise, modest of heart, devoted to his guru, kind spoken.

27-8. Śivanāga, Dvāraśiva's son engraved this: Devaṭa, Bhaṭṭasurabhī's son composed with faithful heart these verses that are bright as the scriptures, and full of the nectar distilled from the moon on His crest. And the virtuous Naṇḍaka, Krishna's son, was the Sūtradhāra here.

29. Forasmuch as the hermitage of Kaṇva is blessed and able to take away all sin: therefore in it has been built this temple of Śambhu, whereby that one's merit and fame shall increase.

30. Whatever mistakes there may be in the joinings or words or mātrās these I pray the learned of all time kindly to forgive.

---

* B R give this as a meaning of अन्न्य for which no reference was available.