

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

**OU\_172591**

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

## NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS.

Contributors in India are requested to be so good as to address papers and correspondence to the EDITOR, care of the British India Press, Mazgaon, Bombay.

Contributors in Europe are requested to be so good as to send their manuscripts and corrected proofs to SIR H. C. TEMPLE, BARR, C.B., C.I.E., F.S.A., c/o Lloyd's Bank Ltd., Cox's and King's Branch, 8, Pall Mall, London.

Contributors of Articles to this Journal will greatly oblige the Editor if they will leave the upper half of the first sheet of manuscript blank, for the convenience of the Editor, in entering instructions to the Press regarding titling, style of printing, submission of proofs, etc., etc. Such instructions, when sent separately, are liable to result in confusion and delay.

Contributors will also greatly lighten the task of the Editor, as well as lessen the cost of composition and correction, by observing the following suggestions:—

1. In preparing copy, please leave a margin of at least three inches on one side. The revision of a crowded manuscript is excessively troublesome and laborious. When the last sheet of the article has been finished, the last footnote or other interpolation added, and the last subtraction made, please number the folios consecutively with the actual numbers from 1 to the end.

2. Write plainly, especially proper names and foreign words. If foreign characters are to be employed, let them resemble as closely as possible the type in our fonts. If Roman or Italic characters with diacritical points are used, see that the points are distinct and rightly placed. Words to be printed in Italics should be once underscored. Words to be printed in Clarendon type may be once underscored with blue pencil. Typewritten copy always needs to be carefully revised, with especial attention to mechanical faults and to the punctuation.

3. Indicate paragraphs clearly by a wide indentation at the beginning; or, if the break is an after-thought, by the usual sign (§). Begin all larger divisions of an article on a fresh sheet of paper. It is hardly necessary to say that the proper construction of paragraphs is far more than a matter of external appearance.

4. Punctuate the copy precisely as you wish it to appear in print. Double marks of quotation (" ") should be used for actual quotations, single marks (') for included quotations, definitions, and the like.

5. In citing the titles of books, give the title in full where it first occurs. In subsequent citations the work may be referred to by the significant words of the titles; but abbreviations which may not be at once understood are to be avoided, and, above all, entire uniformity should be observed throughout the articles. Where some conventional system of citation is in general use, as in the case of the Vedas and the Brahmanic literature, the established custom of scholars should be followed. Titles of books will be printed in Italics; titles of articles in periodicals, in quotation marks, with the name of the periodical in Italics. But the well-established method of abbreviating the titles of the Journals of the five principal Oriental Societies (*J.A.*, *JAOS.*, *JASB.*, *JRAS.*, *ZDMG.*) should be adhered to.

6. It is desirable, for reasons of economy as well as good typography, that footnotes be kept within moderate limits. References to footnotes should be made by brief series of natural numbers (say from 1 to 10), not by stars, daggers, etc. As to the method of inserting footnotes in the copy, good usage differs. A way convenient for author and editor and printer is to insert the note, with a wider left-hand margin than that used for the text, beginning the note on the line next after the line of text to which it refers, the text itself being resumed on the line next after the ending of the note. But if the note is an after-thought, or if it is long, it is well to interpolate it on a fresh sheet as a rider.

7. Contributors are requested to kindly remember that additions and alterations in type after an article is printed in pages, are in many cases technically difficult and proportionately costly, the bill for corrections sometimes amounting to as much as the first cost of composition, and that such alterations entail a most trying kind of labour, not only on editors and compositors, but on the authors themselves as well, and they are accordingly advised that a careful preparation of their manuscript in the manner above indicated will save both the Editor and themselves much unnecessary trouble.

---

Remittances relative to Subscriptions to be made payable to—

**The Proprietors,  
British India Press,  
Mazgaon,  
Bombay, No. 10.**

and notices of change of address, to the  
SUPERINTENDENT.

---

Notes and Queries will always be gladly received and inserted in the *Indian Antiquary*.

## KĀTHAKA UPANISAD.

TRANSLATED WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES  
BY PROF. JARL CHARPENTIER, UPSALA

*Kāthaka* (or *Kaitha*) *Upaniṣad* is one of the best known amongst those often sublime and sometimes rambling texts known as Upaniṣads. Together with the *Chāndogya* it has perhaps a claim to the foremost rank among them all. It has already been many times translated into various European languages.

It apparently belonged to that famous collection of fifty Upaniṣads which the unhappy Prince Muhammad Dārā Shukōh caused to be translated into Persian. For, we find it in Anquetil Duperron's well-known collection<sup>1</sup> as No. XXXVII, with the bewildering name *Kiouni*<sup>2</sup>. Otherwise, the oldest translation into a European language, as far as I can find, is the German one by Poley, *l. c.* p. 113 sqq. (1847)<sup>3</sup>. Other German translations are those by Bohtlingk<sup>4</sup> and by Professor Geldner<sup>5</sup>, as well as one of the three first *vallis* by the late lamented Professor Hillebrandt<sup>6</sup>. There are English translations by Max Müller<sup>7</sup>, by Whitney<sup>8</sup>, by Hume<sup>9</sup> and perhaps still others<sup>10</sup>. Further, our text has been translated into Italian<sup>11</sup>, and twice into Swedish<sup>12</sup>. There may be translations into other languages, too, but in that case they have, unfortunately, escaped me.

Of all these translations that by Anquetil Duperron can scarcely claim more than historical interest, though we know, thanks to the researches of Dr. F. O. Schrader<sup>13</sup>, that his work is still not without importance for the constitution of the text of certain minor Upaniṣads. Poley's translation, on the contrary, still seems to be quite good. Certain emendations of the text were suggested by Bohtlingk and Whitney. Some of them, of course, are quite useful, but the majority seem to the present writer far too violent to be acceptable; and it may be said, with all due respect to Whitney, that his endeavours in the line of text-emendation were not always very happy. Hume's translation makes easy reading, but it is simply an imitation and modification of that by Whitney. However, amongst all the translations known to me there is one which stands out far above the others in penetration and clearness, *viz.*, that by Professor Geldner, the foremost living interpreter of the Vedas. I gratefully confess that I owe very much to this excellent piece of work, and it is only with great diffidence that I have ventured, upon various points, to differ from him. Several excellent suggestions are also found in the translation of Hillebrandt which, however, is unfortunately incomplete.

Of literature on this Upaniṣad, outside the works already quoted, there is little enough to be mentioned here. A few years ago Madhva's commentary on it was edited by Dr. B.

<sup>1</sup> *Oupnek'hat (id est, Secretum Tegendum)*, Tom. II (Strassbourg 1802), pp. 299-127.

<sup>2</sup> Anquetil himself explains this by the words: 'Samskroticē, *Khnihi, magpus, magni momenti* : vel, *Kāmanā, animi motus, aliquid intendere*' which is, of course, impossible. Weber, *Ind. Stud.* II, 195, gives no explanation. I can, unfortunately, find no probable explanation. No. XXXVI in Anquetil Duperron's collection is the *Kena*, which is there called *Kin*. However, Colebrooke (cf. Poley, *Abhandlung ueber die heiligen Schriften der Indier*, p. 70) mentions the *Kena* as the 37th of the Atharvan Upaniṣads. Is it possible that *Kiouni* is simply a misunderstood rendering of *Kena*?

<sup>3</sup> On L. Poley cf. Wirthsch, *Geschichte der Sanskritphilologie*, I, p. 94 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* (further on quoted—SB) 1800, p. 127 sq.; cf. *ibid.* 1891, p. 85 sq.

<sup>5</sup> In Bertholet, *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch* (1908), p. 202 sq.

<sup>6</sup> *Aus Brahmanas und Upanisaden* (1921), p. 116 sq.

<sup>7</sup> *SBE*, vol. XV, p. 1 sq.

<sup>8</sup> *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, XXI (1890), p. 88 sq.

<sup>9</sup> *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads* (1921), p. 341 sq.

<sup>10</sup> There is at least a translation by Roer which, however, I have not been able to see.

<sup>11</sup> F. Belloni-Filippi, *La Kāthaka Upaniṣad tradotta in Italiano*, Pisa 1904.

<sup>12</sup> A. Butenschøn, *Kathaka Upaniṣad*, Stockholm, 1902, and the late Professor K. F. Johansson in *Främmande Religionsurkund*, II, 163 sq.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Minor Upaniṣads*, vol. I, p. xv sq.

Heimann<sup>14</sup>. We ought, of course, to be very grateful for every publication of that sort; but the *real* interpretation of the text gets little help from those Vedantic commentators—whether Śaṅkara or anyone else—who constantly interpret it according to their own philosophical tenets. Further, there is a short paper by Hillebrandt<sup>15</sup> containing a few emendations to our text and another by Professor Sieg<sup>16</sup> of the same nature. The present writer always felt the highest consideration for the excellent services rendered by Professor Sieg to Vedic interpretation; but he feels sorry to say that, with perhaps some very slight exceptions, he finds the suggestions of the professor concerning our Upaniṣad entirely out of the question.

[ When writing the above article I was, unfortunately, unaware of the article on the *Kāthaka Upaniṣad* by Dr. Faddegon in the *Mededeelingen der Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 55, Serie A, No. 1* (1923) But as our aims seem to differ widely this has perhaps not done much harm. The excellent work by Professors Belvalkar and Ranade, *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol ii, came into my hands only after this article had gone to print. ]

The word *Upaniṣad* has generally been interpreted as 'secret session' and 'secret teaching, secret doctrine.' This interpretation apparently was known already to Anquetil Duperron, who translated it by *secretum legendum*; and has been endorsed by Bohtlingk-Roth, Max Muller, Deussen and others. There can, according to my opinion, be no doubt whatsoever that this is the correct interpretation. It is quite true that the verb *upa-ni-ṣad-* occurs in very few passages, but when we find it in *AV*, xix, 41, 1, in the connection *tapo dikṣām upaniṣeduh* it is quite correctly rendered by Whitney-Lanman<sup>17</sup> by 'sat down in attendance upon'. In *Śat. Br.*, xi, 2, 3, 7, we find the following words. *ghṛtaṃ tanvānān ṛṣiṇ gandharvā upaniṣeduh* 'the Gandharvas sat down in attendance upon the seers who were sacrificing ghee'. Besides there is not much difference between *upa-ni-ṣad-* and *upa-sad-*, the meaning of which cannot be doubtful. It means 'to sit down near someone,' viz., in order to worship or honour him, to ask him for something, etc. Cf., e.g., *RV*. i, 72, 5; iii, 14, 5; vi, 1, 6, *Taitt. S.*, ii, 5, 1, 2; *MBh.*, vii, 5852; *Raghuv.* xvii, 22; *Kāthāsarits*, 108, 21, etc.<sup>18</sup> We may also remember the meaning of *upa-viś-* and the use of this verb especially in the dramatic literature. The preposition *upa* itself and its use in compounds like *upendra*, etc., also indicates the real meaning of *upa(-ni)-ṣad-*.

The noun *upaniṣad* consequently means 'the sitting down (of the pupils) near (the Guru),' viz., in order to partake of his teaching. But apparently this word was not used in connection with the ordinary teaching of the Vedic hymns or the Yajus formulas, which was nowise carried out in secrecy. It was a technical term denominating those sessions of the Guru and his pupil(s)<sup>19</sup> during which secret doctrines, such as those of Brahman-Ātman, of

<sup>14</sup> *Madhvas Kommentar der Kāthaka Upaniṣad*, Halle a S 1922.

<sup>15</sup> *ZDMG*, lxxvii, p. 579 sq.

<sup>16</sup> *Aus Indiens Kultur, Festschrift für Richard von Garbe* (1927), p. 129 sq.

<sup>17</sup> *Atharva Veda Translation*, p. 963.

<sup>18</sup> Cf also the meaning of *upaniṣadn* in *Śat. Br.* IX, 4, 3, 3.

<sup>19</sup> The Upaniṣads, it will be remembered are generally in the form of dialogues between two persons, a teacher and a pupil. Thus, e.g., the *Kāthaka*, where the acting persons are only two, Yama and Naciketas, or the dialogues between Uddālaka and Śvetaketu in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, etc. Cf. in modern times, e.g., the interviews of Prince Muhammad Dārā Shikōh with the ascetic Bābā Lāl Dās (M. M. Huart of Maesgnon, *J.A.*, 1920 : 2, p. 285 sq. *Revue du monde musulman* lxxiii, 1 sq.). Mogul pictures give us a good illustration of these *upaniṣads* between teacher and pupil.

*karman*, etc.—the main tenets of the Āranyakas and the Upaniṣads—were imparted.<sup>20</sup> It was used then to denominate those doctrines themselves and finally the collections of texts in which those doctrines were preserved. Thus *upanīṣad* by and by got its later meaning of 'secret doctrine' in general. There is absolutely nothing queer or bewildering in this development of the various meanings of the word.

Curiously enough the late Professor Oldenberg did not agree with this clear and indubitable explanation of the word *upanīṣad*.<sup>21</sup> According to him the verb *upa-ni-ṣad-* should have exactly the same meaning as *upa-ṣ-*; and consequently *upanīṣad* would mean 'reverence, worship.' This worship, however, according to Oldenberg, was not the worship of the teacher, but that of Brahman-Ātman, and of other things held in reverence by the doctrine of the Upaniṣads. In spite of the great authority of Oldenberg, this is quite wrong. For, if *upanīṣad* meant what he suggests, then it could, of course, only be applied to the lonely meditation of the *yogī*, the *samādhi* or *samnyāsa* and in no case whatsoever to the interviews between a teacher and his pupil. Moreover, the way in which Oldenberg wants to translate, in some passages, the word *upanīṣad* is clearly out of the question. We are quite prepared to admit that *upanīṣad* might, at times, mean something like 'reverence' but then it simply denotes the respectful attitude in which the pupil sits down next to his Guru in order to receive the secret doctrine from him.

Quite recently a Polish Sanskritist, Dr Stanislaus Schayer, has tried to establish still another meaning of the word *upanīṣad*.<sup>22</sup> According to him *upanīṣad* 'is the equivalence between two magical substances to be arrived at during the act of *upāśana*.'<sup>23</sup> From this original meaning of the word he derives the following secondary senses: (1) 'secret formula of equivalence, secret knowledge in general'; (2) 'equivalence, substitute,' and (3) 'general interdependence between two substances, mutual interdependence, condition'. Besides transparent mistakes such as the curious misunderstanding of Pāṇini i, 4, 79, or the entirely wrong explanation of Pāli *upanīṣā*, Dr. Schayer's paper contains translations which are apparently sheer absurdities. Thus as concerns *upa-ṣ-*,<sup>24</sup> when simple sentences like *AV. X, 10, 26: vaśām mītyum upāśate* 'they adore the barren cow as Death' or *Śat. Br. X, 6, 3, 12: satyam brahmety upāśīta* 'with the thought "truth is Brahman" one ought to worship it' are translated in the following way: 'sie umwerben (!) die Kuh als den Tod' and 'die Wahrheit ist das brahman, so muss man (die Wahrheit) umwerben (!)'. One could scarcely hit upon anything more erratic in the way of translation. And in the same way the author treats the word *upanīṣad*. In *Śat. Br.*, xii, 2, 2, 13 we read: *ahar itī sarvaṃ samvatsaram saīṣā samvatsarasyopaniṣat*, which, of course, means 'the day is the whole year, that is the secret meaning of the year.' In the same way *sāmnām upaniṣat* in *Chānd. Up.*, i, 13, 4, means 'the secret (mystic) meaning of the *sāmans*'; of Dr. Schayer's 'equivalence' there is not the slightest trace anywhere.

These examples picked out quite at random sufficiently prove that the hypothesis of Dr. Schayer is untenable. There need not be the slightest doubt that *upanīṣad* has the

<sup>20</sup> We know, of course, that such sittings were strictly secret. Cf. e.g., *Brh. Ar. Up.*, iii, 2, 13, where the great Yājñavalkya takes Artaḥhāga Jīratkārava by the hand and leads him away to a place where they could speak between four eyes. 'And what they spoke of, that was *karman*, and what they praised, that was *karman*.'

<sup>21</sup> *ZDMG.*, 1, p. 457 sq.; cf. *Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus* (1915), pp. 37 sq., 155 sq., 348 sq.

<sup>22</sup> *Rocznik, Orientalistyczny wydziałe Polskie towarzystwo Orientalistyczne*, vol. III, (Lwów 1927), p. 57 sq.

<sup>23</sup> This definition is not quite an easy one. It is, however, founded on the extremely artificial and topsy-turvy explanation of *upa-ṣ-* suggested by Dr. Schayer.

<sup>24</sup> On *upa-ṣ-* in the Upaniṣads cf. Senart, *Florilegium Melchior de Vogt's* (Paris 1909), p. 575 sq. His explanation of *Upanīṣad* is, however, out of the question.

meaning long ago adopted by Max Müller, Deussen, etc.<sup>26</sup> Amongst the innumerable problems presented by Indian sacred lore this one at least can be counted as solved.

As is well known, the different Upaniṣads are counted as belonging to different Vedas, the vast majority consisting, of course, of Ātharvāna Upaniṣads. But there seems to be some doubt about the position of the *Kāthaka* within the sacred lore. No doubt Anquetil Duperron<sup>26</sup> described it as 'ex Atharban Beid desumptum,' and Colebrooke enumerated it as the 35th and 36th *upaniṣad* of the Atharva-Veda. Still, he seems to have had some doubts about that, as he tried to ascribe it both to the Yajur-Veda and to the *Pañcaviṃśa-Bṛāhmaṇa* of the Sāma-Veda,<sup>27</sup> for which latter suggestion there is certainly not the slightest reason. According to Colebrooke, however, Śaṅkara and Bālakṛṣṇa should have commented upon it as belonging to the Atharva-Veda, an assumption which has been eagerly endorsed by Weber<sup>28</sup>. The consensus of the older authorities seems to be that the *Kāthaka* is in reality an Upaniṣad of the Atharva Veda.

This opinion, however, seems not to be too well founded. I do not lay much stress upon the fact that the contents of our Upaniṣad is not much like that of the Ātharvāna Upaniṣads in general. For, if the *Kāthaka* did really belong to the Atharva-Veda it would undoubtedly be the oldest of its species, and we would thus have no precedents from which to judge the contents of the earliest Ātharvāna Upaniṣads. But the name, *Katha* or *Kāthaka*, is certainly inexplicable as that of an Upaniṣad belonging to the fourth Veda.<sup>29</sup> For, there cannot, of course, be the slightest doubt that this name *Katha* is identical with that of the old sage Kaṭha, to whose school<sup>30</sup> belonged that branch of the Yajur-Veda happily preserved to us with the name of *Kāthaka-Saṅhitā*. Judging from the name our Upaniṣad ought undoubtedly to belong to that branch of the Black Yajur-Veda.

In this connection we may perhaps draw attention to the fact that certain verses of our Upaniṣad are wholly or partly identical with verses from other Vedic texts. Of these the verse 4, 9 is nearly the same as *AV. X, 8, 16*, but at the same time its first line is identical with the first line of *Bṛh. Ār. Up. i, 5, 23*. Verse 2, 5 is—with the exception of one single word—identical with *Mund. Up. 2, 8*<sup>31</sup>, but it is also identical with verse 7, 9 of the *Maitr. Up.*, a text said to belong to the Black Yajus. Verse 2, 23 is entirely identical with *Mund. Up. 2, 3*, while 5, 15 tallies with *Mund. Up. 2, 10*, but also with verse 6, 14 of the *Śvet. Up.*, a Black Yajur-Veda text. Of other coincidences verse 2, 20 tallies with *Taitt. Ār. X, 10, 1* and with *Śvet. Up. 3, 20*, while 5, 12—13 = *Śvet. Up. 6, 12—13*, and 6, 9 = *Śvet. Up. 4, 20*. Finally, parts of the verses 4, 10—11 make up the verse found in *Bṛh. Ār. Up. iv, 4, 19*, and verse 6, 14 = *Bṛh. Ār. Up. iv, 4, 7*. In this enumeration I have not included the passages in our text borrowed from the *Rig-veda* nor the verses 6, 16—17, which are apparently a later addition.

<sup>25</sup> I have not taken into consideration here the suggestion of Mr. M. R. Bodas, *JBRAS.* xxii, p. 69 sq., that *upaniṣad* should mean 'sitting down by the sacrificial fire,' as it is unnecessary and partly wrong.

<sup>26</sup> *Oupnekhat*, vol. II, p. 299.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Poley, *l.c.* p. 70.

<sup>28</sup> *Ind. Stud.* II, p. 195 sq.

<sup>29</sup> Is it possible that the unexplained name *Kiouns* in Anquetil Duperron's text (cf. *supra* p. 201, n. 2) has any connection with the attribution of our Upaniṣad to the Atharva-Veda?

<sup>30</sup> That School is called *Kaṭhāḍī* by Pāṇ. iv, 3, 107, and is there mentioned together with the *Carakāḍī* another school of the Black Yajus. There are the *Prācya-Kaṭhāḍī* and the *Kaṭhāḍī-Kaṭhāḍī*, and they are also mentioned together with other schools which need not be named here.

<sup>31</sup> The *Muṇḍaka*, as is well known, is supposed to be the oldest existing Upaniṣad of the Atharva Veda;

On the whole, the most numerous coincidences are with texts belonging to the Yajur-Veda, and we may conclude from this that our Upaniṣad most probably belongs to that Veda and to that *Śākhā* of it which is known as the *Kāthaka*.

The story of Naciketas is found also in the *Taitt. Br.* iii, 11, 8, 1-5, a text which must undoubtedly belong to an older period than our Upaniṣad. We are told there that Uśan Vājaśravasa<sup>32</sup> gave away all his earthly goods, and that his son, young Naciketas, three times asked his father to whom he wanted to give him<sup>33</sup>. At last the father answered him: "To Death I give thee." And when the boy started for the abode of Death a certain (divine)<sup>34</sup> voice talked to him, advising him to arrive at the house of Death while he was absent. There he was to stay fasting for three nights. When Death, having returned, asked him: "What hast thou eaten the first night?" he was to answer: "Thy offspring"; and likewise concerning the second night: "Thy cattle," and concerning the third: "Thy good actions." Death, apparently scared out of his wits upon hearing this terrible news, now speaks to him: "Hail to thee, O venerable one!" says he, "choose a boon"—"Then may I living go to my father"—"Choose a second one"—"Tell me the eternal reward of sacrifice and good works"<sup>35</sup>, thus he replied. Then he told him about this Nāciketa fire. Then forsooth his sacrifice and good works gave abundant fruit. . . . "Choose a third one," he said "Tell me how to ward off (*apajits*)<sup>36</sup> recurring death", thus he replied. Then he told him about this Nāciketa fire. Then forsooth he warded off recurring death.

This story tallies only partly with the *Kāthaka Upaniṣad*. According to the latter text Uśan Vājaśravasa—otherwise the famous Uddālaka Āruṇi—gave away all his earthly goods as *dakṣiṇās*.<sup>37</sup> His young son Naciketas<sup>38</sup>, when he saw the sacrificial cows being led away, was seized by longing for the heavenly worlds<sup>39</sup> and spoke a verse concerning those cows, which is not to be found in the Brāhmaṇa. Three times he asks his father to whom he is going to give him, until finally the father answers: "I give thee to Death"<sup>40</sup>.

There must be something like a gap in our present text at this point, for the connection is apparently broken and can only be restored hypothetically. Anyhow, it is quite clear

<sup>32</sup> On him cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.* ii, p. 201 sq. and *infra*.

<sup>33</sup> That the father, after having given everything else away, should at last have to give even his own child undoubtedly reminds us of the stories of Hariścandra and of the Buddhist Vessantarajātaka (*Jātaka* 547; *Jātakamālā* 7 etc.) But the situations are, of course, entirely different.

<sup>34</sup> Thus the commentary

<sup>35</sup> *ieṣṭpūrtayor me 'kṣitīm brāhi*. The *Bibl. Ind.* edition incorrectly reads *me kṣitīm brāhi*.

<sup>36</sup> The commentary reads *apaciti*, probably only by misprint.

<sup>37</sup> That probably, though not necessarily, means that he had been celebrating a *Sarvamedha*. Cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritualliteratur*, p. 151.

<sup>38</sup> The name is difficult, and the various explanations suggested are unsatisfactory. The Indian analysis *Na-ciketas* (: *cit-*), which was endorsed by Böhtlingk, *SB.* 1890, p. 129 vs, of course, without any value whatsoever. But Professor Wackernagel in his *Altind. Gramm.* ii 1, 50 has quite correctly pointed out that *naci-* is the form of *nakra* to be used as the first part of a compound. There is no word *ketas*, but it would probably be found to have the same meaning as *ketu*. Thus *naci-ketas* would mean about the same as *makara-ketu* or *makara-dhvaṇa*, well-known epithets of Kāma. The son of Uddālaka Āruṇi, of course, is *Śvetā-ketu* (cf. Professor Lüders, *Festschr. Windisch* p. 228 ff.); it is, anyhow, remarkable that both names, *Naci-ketas* and *Śvetā-ketu*, seem to end in the same way. *Nakra*—though probably originally a colour-name—can, however, not be identical with *Śvetā*.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *infra*.

<sup>40</sup> Hillebrandt, *Aus Brahmanas und Upanishaden*, p. 116, thought that we might find here an obliterated trace of a *puruṣamedha* in connection with the giving away of all wealth. To me this seems fairly probable, but it cannot be proved satisfactorily.

that in the next lines we find the young Brahman in the realm of Death, nay, even in the very palace of Yama, for whose wishes he at once asks. I have hesitatingly attributed the verse 1, 6 to *Mṛtyu* suggesting that he be the bailiff of Yama; but I willingly admit that this is perhaps not strictly necessary, and that possibly Naciketas and Yama are the only speakers in the whole Upaniṣad.<sup>41</sup> Of the (*daivī*)*ṛk* known to the Brāhmaṇa there is not the slightest trace in our text, nor is it necessary to assume its presence; the whole thing is probably the pure fancy of an author who had before him some verses very much like 1, 5-9 of the Upaniṣad.

Naciketas himself announces that he, a Brahman, enters every house<sup>42</sup> like Agni Vaiśvānara, the guest of all mankind, and proudly exhorts Yama to fetch him water. And he adds a sententious verse to remind the King of Death of the risks he is running by having had a Brahman in his house (for three nights, as we get to know from verse 1, 9) without offering him food. Yama, in real fright, now offers him to choose three boons. Naciketas first of all wishes that his father may greet him joyfully when he returns to his house.<sup>43</sup> Then he wants to know about the fire that leads to heaven, and Yama explains to him the Nāciketa-fire, though we do not get to know its secret. This part, which Professor Geldner<sup>44</sup> has quite aptly called the *karmakāṇḍa* ends with verse 1, 19. Thus far also goes the Brāhmaṇa episode, though there Naciketas in his third wish wants to know how to evade *punarṁṛtyu*; and this is also done by means of the Nāciketa-fire.

It is extremely probable that there was an old story—possibly in metrical form—of a young Brahman by name Naciketas, who was taught by Yama how to build the fires in a way that leads to the heaven of the Vedic gods. And by worship (*upāsana*) of, and speculation upon, that fire he would also be able to ward off renewed death, *i.e.*, to obtain immortal life in the heaven of bliss and sensual pleasures.<sup>45</sup>

But in his third wish—*punarṁṛtyor me 'pajitim brāhi*—there was the point of start for a real Upaniṣadic treatise. In verse 1, 20 of our text Naciketas is made to ask what is the fate of the dead—not the dead in general, but the *muktāḥ*, as Rāghavendra and Deussen have already stated—but Yama does not want to reveal his great secret. He offers the boy all that any living man would set his heart's desire upon, last of all lovely girls and sensual pleasures; but Naciketas is steadfast, and at last Yama is forced to answer his question, and thus to explain the Brahman-Ātman question. But he does not do it very willingly, and Naciketas time after time<sup>46</sup> has got to exhort him to keep to the point.

Thus there begins in 1, 20 the real Upaniṣad, the *jñānakāṇḍa*<sup>47</sup>, which consists of the whole of our text up to 6, 15, a verse that ends with the words *etadvad anuśāsanam*.<sup>48</sup> Most interpreters have thought that the original Upaniṣad finished with Valli 3, and that 4-6 were later additions. But even here Professor Geldner has seen more clearly and pointed out that there is a considerable stop after 3, 15<sup>49</sup>, but that the Upaniṣad by no means ends there. He seems to me to be wrong only in that, following Rāghavendra, he attributes verse 4, 3 to Naciketas, which is unnecessary and does not improve the sense of the passage.

<sup>41</sup> That this is the case in what is really the Upaniṣad (*viz.* from 1, 20 to 6, 15) is quite regular, cf. *supra* p. 202 sq.

<sup>42</sup> It is possible that a verse like 1, 7 was known to the author of the Brāhmaṇa as the words *paraśa mṛtyor gṛhān* in III, 11, 8, 2 seem to be a misinterpretation of *gṛhān* in our text.

<sup>43</sup> This wish really comprises two, *viz.*, that the father will be able to greet him, and that he himself will return to life. For there is no reason whatsoever for doubting that Naciketas, when he arrives at the house of Yama, is physically dead.

<sup>44</sup> *Vedische Stud.*, iii, p. 154 n.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. *AV.* iv, 34, 2 *etc.*

<sup>46</sup> Cf. 2, 14; 5, 4, 14.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Geldner, *l.c.* iii, p. 154 n.

<sup>48</sup> The verse 6, 16, was taken from the *Chānd. Up.* viii, 6, 6, and put in here by someone who had totally misunderstood the word *granthayaṣ* in 6, 15. The greater part of 6, 17 is taken from *Svet. Up.* iii, 13. Finally 6, 8 is a sort of late patch-work with wrong grammatical forms, and apparently added at a later time.

<sup>49</sup> 3, 15-16 are apparently later additions in an epic style.

By making this short comparison between the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* passage and the Upaniṣad we can, I think, see how the later one has originally been built up.

The *Kāthaka* is counted by Deussen and others as belonging to the second period of the greater Upaniṣads which, however, tells us nothing about the time of its origin. Oldenberg long ago<sup>50</sup> found that metrically it is pre-Buddhist; and Professor Stcherbatsky recently<sup>51</sup> seems to take this quite for granted. However, to say that its metre is "pre-Buddhist" can only mean that it is in general more ancient-looking than the metres occurring in the oldest Buddhist texts, as e.g., the *Sutta-Nipāta* and others. But of their age we know nothing—only that they did probably exist at the time of Aśoka (c. 250 B.C.). To me it appears that the surroundings are entirely the same that we meet with in the old Buddhism. The question put to Yama in verse 1, 20 is exactly the same as that repeatedly put to the Buddha, viz., "does the Tathāgata survive after death, or does he not survive?" In 5, 11-12 *duḥkha* and *sukha* seem to have the same sense of 'unrest' and 'rest' that they have in Buddhist philosophy, as proved by Professor Stcherbatsky; *sānti* is just as well Buddhist as Upaniṣadic, etc. It thus seems probable that our text belongs to about the same time as the oldest Buddhist texts—perhaps the fourth century B.C.—and that it originated in the same spiritual surroundings as did those works.

Oldenberg once<sup>52</sup> pointed to the great similarity between the scene where Yama tries to evade the third question of Naciketas by offering him land, wealth, cattle, women and sexual pleasures, and the well-known one where Māra tries to divert the Bodhisattva from his designs on Buddhahood by tempting him with all the goods and pleasures of this world—amongst others with his three lovely daughters. There is not the slightest doubt that these scenes are closely connected with each other. But at the bottom of them both is the old Indian idea of the holy man who is becoming a danger to the gods, and whose holiness they try to destroy by appealing to his carnal desires.<sup>53</sup>

Naciketas, the Brahman boy who overcomes the resistance of Death, is the male counterpart of the divine Sāvitrī, who by her wise words induces Yama to release the soul of her dead husband Satyavān and give him back to life. Nothing better can be said for him than this, that in him and Sāvitrī Sanskrit literature has perhaps created its most sublime figures.

With these perfunctory remarks I turn to the text itself. It need scarcely be pointed out that I do not lay claim to any very startling discoveries. I venture to think that in a few passages I have perhaps succeeded a little better than previous interpreters—that is all.

(To be continued.)

<sup>50</sup> *ZDMG.*, xl, p. 57 sq.

<sup>51</sup> *Central Conception of Buddhism*, p. 68.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Buddha*, 5th ed., p. 60 sq.

<sup>53</sup> The Apsarasae such as Monakā, Urvaśī, etc., are well known as being the tools of the gods in these unavoury endeavours of theirs.

## SOME LITERARY NOTES ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GOVINDALĪLĀMṚTA.

By CHINTAHARAN CHAKRĀVARTI, M.A.

THE *Govindalīlāmṛta* is a fairly popular Sanskrit Kāvya among the Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal. It deals, as its name implies, with the amours of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. Its popularity is attested by the fact of its having been translated into Bengali verse as early as 1610 A.D. by Yadunandana Dāsa. Numerous manuscripts of it found and noticed or described by various scholars in notices, reports and descriptive catalogues of Sanskrit MSS. in different parts of the world point to the same fact. But curiously enough there has been a good deal of confusion among scholars with regard to its authorship. Thus one set of scholars attributes it to Raghunātha Dāsa<sup>1</sup>, while another is inclined to suppose Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa as its author.<sup>2</sup>

All this confusion seems to have arisen out of a verse which occurs, *mutatis mutandis*, at the end of every canto. At the end of the last canto it runs as follows :—

श्री चैतन्यपदारविन्दमधुपश्रीरूपसेवाफले  
दिष्टे श्रीरघुनाथदासकृतिना श्रीजीवसंगोद्गते ।  
काव्ये श्रीरघुनाथमट्टवरजे गोविन्दजीजामृते  
सर्गोयं रजनीधिलासवज्जितः पूषस्त्रयोविंशकः ॥

“ This the twenty-third canto, full of nightly amours, in the *Govindalīlāmṛta* which is the fruit of waiting on Śrī Rūpa, the bee, as it were, of the feet-lotus of Śrī Chaitanya—which was directed by the scholarly Raghunātha Dāsa—which resulted from the companionship of Śrī Jīva—which originated from the boon of Śrī Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa, is complete.”

Evidently the verse does not name the author of the work, but only refers to persons through whose inspiration and help the author undertook and finished his work.

But this should not lead one to suppose that the name of the author is not mentioned at all in the work. It is true we have got no colophon proper to this work, where we could expect the name of the author. A verse however in the last canto of the work (xxiii. 95) definitely refers to the author. It runs.—

पदारविन्दमृङ्गेन श्रीरूपरघुनाथयोः ।  
कृष्णदासेन गोविन्दजीजामृतमिदं चितम् ॥

“ This *Govindalīlāmṛta* was composed<sup>3</sup> by Kṛṣṇadāsa who was a bee to the feet-lotus of Śrīrūpa and Raghunātha.”

This leaves scarcely any room for doubt as to the authorship of the work. But this is not the only place where Kṛṣṇadāsa is referred to as the author of the book. He is distinctly mentioned as the author by Yadunandana, both in the beginning and at the end of his metrical Bengali translation of it. The commentary *Sālnānandavidhdyint* on it, as contained in the published edition of the work, also attributes it to Kṛṣṇadāsa in the introductory verses.

As a matter of fact the book is quite well-known, among the Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal, as the work of Kṛṣṇadāsa. The edition of it, in Bengali characters, published from Berhampur (Murshidabad) bears his name as the author. And it is a matter for gratification that of all

<sup>1</sup> Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency for 1887-1891, No. 394; *Ibid* for 1891-1895, Nos. 494, 495, 496; *Descriptive Catalogue of Sans. MSS. in the India Office*, vol. VII. No. 3878.

<sup>2</sup> Report on the Search of Sans. MSS. in the Bombay Presidency for 1884-87, No. 350; *Descriptive Catalogue of Sans. MSS. in the Library of the Calcutta Sans. Coll.*, vol. X. No. 32; *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, R. L. Mitra, vol. II, No. 571; *Descriptive Catalogue of Sans. MSS. in the Bikaner State Library*, No. 488.

<sup>3</sup> A more literal translation of the verse would be :—‘ This nectar of the amours of Govinda (i.e. selected stories of his amours) was collected, etc.’ But this is tantamount to saying that the work was composed by Kṛṣṇadāsa.

published catalogues the *Descriptive Catalogue of Sans. MSS. in the Ulwar State Library* (p. 38) rightly attributes it to Kṛṣṇadāsa<sup>4</sup>.

This Kṛṣṇadāsa seems to be identical with Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, the well-known author of the *Chaitanyacharitamṛta* (a Bengali metrical work on the life-story of the great Vaiṣṇava reformer of Bengal, viz., Chaitanya), which, by a statement of the author himself, was composed in 1503 S.E. (=1581 A.D.)<sup>5</sup> He came after the celebrated companions of Chaitanya viz., Rūpagosvāmin, Jīvagosvāmin, Raghunātha Dāsa and Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa and held them, as did all later Vaiṣṇava Masters of Bengal, in high respect. This accounts for his reverential mention of them in the *Govindāślīlāmṛta*.

### THOMAS CANA.

By T. K. JOSEPH, B.A., L.T.

(Continued from page 165.)

6. *Thomas Cana finds the crucifix in Malabar.*—Roz (1604) says that Thomas Cana found the Christians of Paru (Parur) wearing wooden crosses round their necks. This point appears therefore to rest on an ancient tradition. [Cross, but not crucifix.]

7. *No ordained ministers in Malabar.*—This is suspect. In Land's *Anecdota*, the Christians of Malabar are several times represented as being without priests and leaders, i.e. at the persecution of Mānikka Vāchakar (the date of which appears to be 293—315), and before the arrival of Thomas Cana. Cf. Mingana, *op. cit.*, 43. Mingana (*ibid.*, 18) has, however, found that "during the Patriarchate of Shaḥlūpha and Pāpa, say about A.D. 295-300, Dūdi (David), bishop of Baṣrah, on the Persian Gulf, an eminent doctor, left his see and went to India, where he evangelised many people." [No one knows which part of India.]

In document IV. l. 4 we are told that there were clergy in Coromandel, but that they neglected Malabar. We have some idea that long before A.D. 345 there was at Mylapore a monastery of 200 monks, and that therefore the abandonment of the Christians in Malabar is an exaggeration. The church of Kuravalsangad claims to be of the year 335<sup>120</sup>.

Before A.D. 363 Yōnān was Abbot of a monastery of St. Thomas in India, near (or below) the black island (Syr. : *gāzartā ākāmātā*). It had 200 monks. The island was near the town of Milon, six days from Maron, and got its wine from Persia. It had date-trees and palm-trees and crabs of enormous size. It was the see of a bishop. The inhabitants of Milon fished for pearls. Brother Pāpa sailed to it from Mesopotamia, and it was constantly visited by solitaries from Mesopotamia. Mingana does not know (*ibid.*, 18—22) where to locate it. His efforts to place it in an island of the Persian Gulf are not convincing. He would not mind if it had been at Mylapore, since the place of St. Thomas' tomb in India had a monastery and a church<sup>121</sup> of vast size before A.D. 594. Precisely. There is room for it in India as early as 363, close to St. Thomas' tomb, near the 'black sand' island, (Karumanal, a village on

<sup>4</sup> In recording this Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*, vol. II, Supplement, curiously makes Kṛṣṇadāsa the son of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa. The statement however lacks any corroborative evidence.

<sup>5</sup> Yadunandana, at the end of his translation of the *Govindāślīlāmṛta*, and the *Saddānandavidhyānt*, the Sanskrit commentary on it, in the introductory verses identify the two authors, and there is no reason why we should reject that identification.

<sup>120</sup> This claim is not supported by any document. In fact the dates for the Malabar churches in the Catholic Directory are mere guesses in most cases. We know how in Bishop Lavigne's time these dates were arrived at for the purpose of the *Directory*—from mere tradition in most cases.

<sup>121</sup> In spite of Medlycott's arguments in his *India and Thomas*, (London, 1905, pp. 74-79) I think that the church and monastery that Theodore saw some time before A.D. 590 were in Edessa *in civitatem quam Syri Aedissam vocant: in supra dicta igitur urbe, in qua beatos artus diximus summatos.* (*Ibid.*, p. 80, note).

the coast near Madras), near Milon<sup>123</sup> (Meilan ? Mayila-pur). Mylapore had a fishery of pearls at a much later date, it had cocoanut-trees, and at least wild date-trees<sup>123</sup> yielding liquor and sugar; its crabs of enormous size may have been sea-turtles. If that were so, that monastery of 200 monks should have existed at least 100 years before, say, in A.D. 220-30, when the *Acts of Thomas* was composed in Edessa. The first monks must have known at Mylapore people who had known there the Apostle Thomas or his immediate successors, the priest Sifur and the deacon Prince Vizan. We thus reach down to St. Thomas himself at Mylapore. Mylapore is Calamina. It was Calamina for Bar Hebraeus in 1246-86, and the Mount of India on which St. Thomas preached and was killed was for Bar Hebraeus near Calamina. It was Little Mount. Had we not this proof, we would have sufficient proof from Malabar that St. Thomas died and was martyred at Mylapore. The whole of the Malabar tradition<sup>124</sup> supposes it, and that tradition, as we now see, was inherited by the present Christians from those who lived in Malabar before<sup>125</sup> the arrival of Thomas Cana in A.D. 345.

The existence of a monastery of St. Thomas at Mylapore is borne out by what we find in Ittûp's *History* (Malayalam, Kottayam, 1869, pp. 81-82). After the death of St. Thomas and before the arrival of Thomas Cana in 345, two of the 72 disciples of Mâr Augin (Agwin, Augin), named Šâbôr and Šabri Yêsu, came and looked after the church (of Malabar and Mylapore ?). They were students of the great college on the hill north-east of the town of Šaibîn (Nisibis ?). These details are found in the genuine records still kept at Antioch in the archives of the Patriarch. Šâbôr died here. Šabri Yêsu returned to his own country of Besanaherim, and wrote and kept in the college an account of the Church founded by St. Thomas in Malabar. Thus Ittûp, in extracts translated by Mr. Joseph.

I believe that the names Šâbôr and Šabri Yêsu belong to A.D. 825<sup>126</sup>, while the rest seems to belong to c. A.D. 363. Ittûp, I learn from Mr. T. K. Joseph, mentions (p. 95 of an edition of his work, dated 1896) two bishops Mâr Šâbôr and Mâr Aprôt who came to India from Babylon in A.D. 825, in the ship of the merchant Šavaris. This Šavaris is no other than Sabir Išô or Yêsu. Some call him Bârêsu; others Job; others Towrio and Thor. The names which Ittûp should have had for the much earlier period are, I think, Yônân and Zâdoê, contemporaries, and successive abbots of the monastery of St. Thomas in India near (or below) the black island. Yônân had met in Egypt Mâr Augên or Agwin, writes the historiographer Zâdoê, Yonan's successor. And we know that Agwin died on the 21st of Nisan, 874 of the era of the Greeks, i.e. April, A.D. 363. On the Convent of Eugene, see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.*, t. I. 524. It is said that Augin came from the Nitrean Desert in Egypt with seventy disciples to Nisibis and founded near it, on Mount Izlâ, a monastery where he gathered 350 monks. Many believe that monasticism for both sexes existed at an even earlier date in East Syria. Cf. Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches*, 42-43, 110. Crowds of monks came daily from India, Persia, and Ethiopia to St. Jerome in Palestine (A.D. 386-420). The pilgrim lady Sylvia (Ætheria) already speaks of the many pilgrims from Armenia, Persia, India, Ethiopia and Egypt who came to

<sup>123</sup> Milon, six days from Maron. The name Milon seems to be derivable from Malarpha (the old form of the name Mylapore, also called Mayilai).

<sup>124</sup> The date-trees of Mylapore are not real date palms, but palmyna palms, yielding "liquor and sugar", i.e. toddy and a kind of dark-red sugar of big crystals, called *panakkalkanam* in Malayalam.

<sup>125</sup> The extant versions of Malabar tradition do say that St. Thomas lies buried in Mylapore. These are but 400 years old. And from these to infer that in, say, A.D. 150 Malabar tradition said that it was St. Thomas the Apostle himself that lay buried in Mylapore—if there was any tomb at all there at that time—is not reasonable. From the tradition of 1500 to that of 150 is a far cry indeed. We do not know at all what Malabar or Mylapore tradition about the Mylapore tomb was in A.D. 100, 200, 300, 400, or 500. We know Cosmas (535 A.D.) has not a single word about St. Thomas in Malabar.

<sup>126</sup> We do not know for certain whether before 345 A.D. the Malabar Christians regarded St. Thomas as their apostle or not. Certain versions of Malabar tradition do indeed say that it was Thomas Cana who introduced Christianity into Malabar. Malabar tradition is a hopeless muddle.

<sup>127</sup> Sabor and Sabri Yêsu are regarded by Ittup as quite different from Sabor and Prodh of 825 A.D.

the Holy Places (c. 383-388). In the Life of Barlaam and Josaphat (5th-7th century) we read that India had its monks in imitation of Egypt. Cf. Migne, *PL.*, 73; 445.

8. *The Bishop of Antioch coming after another bishop.*—This must be wrong. Our writer stands alone here. Thomas Cana is here made to bring the two bishops in turn. The first time the bishop appears to be he of Oruoy or Edessa with his party of colonists, in which case there is no reason for bringing still another bishop from Antioch. The only apparent reason is that our author, confusing Oruoy with Antioch, felt the need of bringing a bishop from both places.

9. *The Dareoygul (Dhariyaikal)*<sup>127</sup>.—This is explained by our writer (*op. cit.*, p. 192) as meaning "those who were unmoved," i.e. the Christians of only 8 families, out of an original 64, who persevered during the persecution of Mānikkavāchakar; 96 out of 160 families, he contends, apostatised outright from the beginning and became known as 'Munneygramaacar,' or "the disciples of Mānikkavassel." In the list of the 18 castes by whom the Christians were to be judged (cf. his note to p. 194 *op. cit.*) we have "the head Munnigraummumatcheen or Manikavassel's disciples, Sooders or Nairs." There seems to be indeed among the Malabar Christians<sup>128</sup> a tradition that these are apostate Christians. Was this Mānikka Vāchakar possibly a Manichean? There would seem to have been a vast apostasy in Malabar, if we are right in identifying with King Antrayos<sup>129</sup> (Andrew) of Cranganore the deacon-king Xanthippus—Xenophon of Sandaruk-Andrapolis-Andranopolis, converted by St. Thomas at the first town in India<sup>130</sup> where he landed, i.e., the king at whose court the marriage feast took place.

10. *The Cotaycoyle.*—Might these not be the Christians of Parur, also called Parur Kōṭṭakkāyal, and corruptly Kutkayel in Land's *Anecdota*? There is a touch of tradition here. Roz (1604) states that the first Christians found by Thomas Cana were those of Parur.<sup>131</sup>

The Angelica must be the Tamil *anjili-maram* (*Artocarpus hirsuta*, Lam.): a wood of great value on the Western Coast for ship-building, house-building, etc. Cf. *Hobson-Jobson*, s.v. *angely-wood*<sup>132</sup>.

The following list<sup>133</sup> of privileges said to have been granted to Thomas Cana is taken from an anonymous MS. by a missionary, who in or after 1676 was living at the Carmelite Church of Anjicaimal (Ernakulam). His name, I suggest, is Fr. Matthew of St. Joseph, who

<sup>127</sup> The Dareoygul are Tarisāykkal, literally orthodox Christians. The term Tarisa Church occurs in the Quilon copper-plates of c. 880. According to John de Monte Corvino (c. 1300) the Christians of China too were called Tarsa. In Malayalam songs and prose accounts of the 17th, 18th centuries the term Tarutāykkal is applied to all Christians—those of Malabar, of Mylapore and even the Portuguese. It was a synonym for the Latin word 'Christiani,' which has displaced the old term Tarutāykkal. 'Unmoved' is not the true sense of the word. It is from a Syriac word meaning orthodox. Tartary Christians too were Tarsas.

<sup>128</sup> The old men among the Hindu Manigramakkars themselves admit that their ancestors were Christians.

<sup>129</sup> The spurious song of 1601 stands alone in giving the name Andrew to the king of Cranganore.

<sup>130</sup> Most other authorities say that Andrapolis or Sandaruk was outside modern India altogether.

<sup>131</sup> Parur and Cranganore are very close to each other. Cotaycoyle is Kōṭṭakkāvil, Parur.

<sup>132</sup> Angelica is *ānāiti*, *Artocarpus hirsuta*, which yields durable timber used for a variety of purposes. It may be called the teak of the lowlands.

<sup>133</sup> Most of the privileges in this list correspond to those in footnote 100. No. 6—White cloth spread on a carpet is a seat of honour used even now at marriage feasts. Only the chief elders can sit on it. No. 12—Fr. Monserrate wrote from Cochín in 1679 of "the custom existing in this Malabar that there is no pollution between these Christians and the Nayres, nor penalty of death, if there be marriage or friendship, whereas, according to the custom of the land, there is, if they communicate, stay, or marry with either castes higher or lower than custom allows to them." (*Ind. Ant.* for July, 1927, p. 130). No. 13—*Cheremellas* resembles Malayalam *Chermangalam* in sound. The Malayalam word means gong, but its derivation is not known. From *atambore* comes the Malayalam word *tampēre* a kind of drum.

helped Van Rhee de on his *Hortus Malabaricus*, Amsterdam, 12 vols., 1676-1693. Cf. Sloane MS. 2748-A, British Museum, fol. 7r.

- (1) They may, the women as well as the men, crown themselves in the manner of kings.
- (2) They may play every kind of instruments.
- (3) They may ride on elephants on their feasts.
- (4) They may light and carry in their hands candles at all their feasts.
- (5) They may use big royal fans, in the manner of very great lords at their feasts and wear every sort of ornament and apparel.
- (6) They may in their feasts and solemnities use white clothes and sit on them.
- (7) They may in the streets walk on white cloths, like noble and privileged persons.
- (8) In their feasts they may give shouts and signs of joy and jubilee, and also grant permission to other Gentios to do the same
- (9) In the journeys and processions of the feasts they may fire *espingardes* in sign of joy.
- (10) They may use every kind of jewels and ornaments of gold and silver and silk.
- (11) They may enjoy every royal privilege.
- (12) They may enter all houses of noble Nair families, converse with them, and travel with them, which is not granted to any other castes.
- (13) They have all the privileges, permissions, liberties and powers for celebrating and solemnising in public all the day and night feasts, with bells, great and small, with drums and trumpets (*atambores e chermellas*), processions and preachings, with greater freedom than in Europe, without any fear, but with very great respect and esteem.

The same writer says of the Naddi<sup>134</sup> (fol. 5v): "They are a caste of hunters, and have no other occupation; they go about with their bows and arrows, and are obliged to accompany the Nairs, Gentios<sup>135</sup> and Christian hunters."

He also lays stress on a great apostasy in Malabar in the time of a Namburi sorcerer, 'Changalajari' or 'Changara chiari' (Śaṅkarāchārya)<sup>136</sup>, whom he confuses with Māṅkka Vāchakar, but places before the arrival of Thomas Cana. Three hundred royal families<sup>137</sup> remained Christian and faithful under persecution. He states also that the very Hindus affirmed there was an image of Our Lady in the pagoda called Tir Corunfa<sup>138</sup> belonging to the king of Upper Cranganore (fol. 10r.).

11. Among four castes of Chitties we have the Mullia Chitties. Did these come from Mayilā (Mylapore)? We have also the Pullivaula Chitties. May we compare Pullivaula with Pahlava or Pallava? I find in a relation by Fr. Andrew Lopez, S.J. (1644) that at Ramanancor (Fishery Coast) there were Christians of Palavali caste, with whom the Paravers fraternised. Had these been won back from among the people who at Bepar (Vaipar) and Bembar (Vembar) were Hindus in 1604, though they considered themselves of ancient Christian caste? In 1644 there were Christians at both Vaipar and Bembar: 850 and 1300 respectively.

<sup>134</sup> Naddi is for Nāyāti, a hunting low caste.

<sup>135</sup> Nairs too are Gentios, Hindus.

<sup>136</sup> This writer of 1676 took the heretic preacher to be Śaṅkarāchārya of the 9th century. It may be by a similar mental process that others took him for the famous Māṅkka Vāchakar of the Tamil land. The heretic preacher may have been a Manichæan, wrongly identified with Māṅkka the Saivite fanatic, and Śaṅkarāchārya the great reformer of Hinduism in Malabar.

<sup>137</sup> 'Royal families' here perhaps reflects the appellation Māppiḷa for the Syrian Christians, which Gouvea (1690) translated as sons of Kings (*Jornada*, fol. 4v.).

<sup>138</sup> Tir Corunfa stands for Tiru Kurumpa, Sanskrit Śrī Kurumbā, the goddess Kālī, who was represented to this missionary of 1676 as Our Lady. Gama and his companions went to 'Mass' in a Hindu temple in Calicut, 1498. Castenhada's *Historia*, p. 57; *Roteiro*, Hak. Soc., p. 54.

12. *The list of Bishops.*—This list of Bishops is a remarkable document. Most of the names and dates for 825–1500 are not found in our European authors. The list must however be far from complete. Did all these bishops come from Antioch, as stated? In other words were they all Jacobite?

'Mar Sabore Ambroat' of A.D. 825 is Mār Šābōr and Mār Aprôt (Prodh, Pirût, etc.). The name of the merchant 'Towrio' is a misspelling of Sowrio, Šavaris, Šabir Išô. Correa (1870) has strangely enough 'Apreto and Thor' (*Lendas da India*, I. 594).

Fr. Bernard of St. Thomas (*Brief Sketch of the History of the St. Thomas Christians*, Trichinopoly, 1924, pp. 13, 19) has a similar list, to be compared with the Conancode MS. As he refers to Le Quien (II. col. 1275) for Mār Šābōr and Mār Prôdh, his date for them, A.D. 880, must be that of Le Quien. Fr. Bernard mentions that all these bishops were sent by the orthodox Patriarch of Antioch (pp. 12, 13, 19). [But see *infra* for Jacobite and Nestorian bishops.]

He next names: 988: John; 1056: Thomas; 1122: John III, who went to Rome in 1122 (perhaps the Jacob, 1122, of the Conancode MS.); 1231 (*sic*): Joseph; 1235: David; 1295: Paulos; 1301: Jacob; 1407: Jaballaha; 1490: John (add: and Thomas, who returned to Mesopotamia soon after, but returned in 1504); 1504: Thomas, Jaballaha, Jacob, and Denha (for these four see also Mingana, *op. cit.*, 41–42). Our list shows that the bishops appointed to India did not uniformly take the name Thomas, contrary to what certain writers have suggested.

Raulin (*Hist. eccles. Malabaricæ*, Rome, 1745, p. 435) adds: John II. in 890.

For Jacob in 1321, see Mingana, *op. cit.*, p. 69, where he is styled in Codex Syr. Vat. N. XXII: "Bishop Mar Jacob, Metropolitan and director of the holy see of the Apostle St. Thomas, that is to say our director and the director of all the holy Church of Christian India." Was he an Indian? Zechariah, son of Joseph, son of Zechariah, a deacon, who wrote the above in 1301, in a colophon, at the Church of St. Cyriacus of Shingala (Cranganore), calls himself a disciple and one of the relatives of this bishop.

"In A.D. 1000 there resided at Cranganore a bishop named John. In a historical Syriac work it is written that he resuscitated his servant, *se*, the sacristan of the church of Cranganore. Gouvea says that Fr. Roz, Archbishop of Cranganore, read this in the aforesaid book. S. Giamil (*Genuinae Relationes*, Romae, 1902, p. 436) states that the book is still in the Vatican Library." Cf. R. P. A. Kaliancara,<sup>139</sup> *Defensio Indici Apostolatus Div. Thomae Apostoli*, Cochin, 1912, pp. 28–29. 'Gouvea' is a mistake for 'de Souza', *Oriente Conquistado*, Pte. II. Conq. I, Div. 2, 16. We have quoted elsewhere the very words of Roz. The Mar Johannan of A.D. 1000 is no doubt the Johannes, Metropolitan, of A.D. 988 in the Conancode MS.

Do Couto, *Da Asia*, Dec. 12. c. 5 (t. 8, Lisboa, 1788, p. 288), writes of Mar Johannan: "After the death of these Chaldeans [Mar Xabro and Mar Prodh], they sent to Babylonia asking for Bishops, as they had no facility to send to Rome, because through the death of these there was left to them only a Deacon, who assumed the work of a priest, thinking he could do so, since all were so ignorant. Receiving this message, the Greek Patriarch provided them with an Archbishop, called Mar Joanna, and the two Suffragans, his Coadjutors and future successors. This Chaldean Archbishop arranged the Chaldean Breviary which this Church used until now, and he made his residence at Cranganor. By the death of this Archbishop and these Bishops, (P. 289) there succeeded another, called Mar Jacob, who had also come from Babylonia; he governed many years, and died about the year 1500." Do Couto's last date cannot be correct. The story of the single deacon who assumed the work of a priest is also told about A.D. 1490. It is possible however that at times the priesthood had practically died out in Malabar. From a report by Mesopotamian bishops, who came to Malabar in 1555 and visited the Syrian Churches during two years and a half, we learn

<sup>139</sup> R. P. A. Kaliancara is a fictitious name. The author died a few years ago.

there were only 5 priests left. Cf. Fr. Bernard, *op. cit.*, p. 32. By 'Greek Patriarch' do Couto understood a Nestorian Patriarch. According to him the Greek Patriarch who sent Mar Xabro and Mar Prodh was a Nestorian.

John de' Marignolli met the Patriarch of the St Thomas Christians (c. 1348), but whether at Mylapore or in Malabar or at Bagdad, which he also visited, is not stated.

Gouvea (*Jornada*, 1606, fol. 76r) states that, in the Church of Diamper in which the Council of 1599 was held, lay buried a Nestorian bishop.<sup>140</sup> He does not however give his name or his period. He only remarks that Diamper had been the see of some Nestorian bishops. In 1599 they showed still at Diamper some of the things which had belonged to the said bishop, among them a very short and narrow bed on which he slept for penance. "Going to sleep on it one night, he did not rise for Matins." Possibly, his name is still remembered at Diamper, and his grave shown.

Le Quien, quoting many weighty authors (Tom. II, Paris, 1740, pp. 1086-87-88) says that the Patriarch of Antioch used to appoint 'Catholicoses' who had not the title of Patriarch, although they were in authority above the Bishops, and that these Catholicoses were consecrating Bishops to govern the above-mentioned countries [India, Persia, etc.]. The same Le Quien in the same place says that in A.D. 1000 the Nestorian Patriarch Abraham II, of Babylon sent up a petition to the Caliph of Bagdad, stating that a Catholicos under the Patriarch of Antioch was during night time consecrating bishops for the territories under his jurisdiction. Thereupon the consecrating Catholicos and the consecrated bishops were seized and imprisoned. A letter of Peter, Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch in communion with Rome, written about 1050 A.D. to Dominic of Graden, throws further light on the subject (Le Quien, *ib.*). The Patriarch claims that his actual jurisdiction extends to the far East, including India, that he appoints Catholicoses for Babylon, and other regions, and that these Catholicoses have supervision over several bishops, but that they do not take the title of Patriarch. Cf. Bernard of St. Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 12. Nilos Doxopatros, notary of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who wrote (c. A.D. 1143) a history for King Roger of Sicily, states that the Patriarch of Antioch still appoints and sends a Catholicos to Romogyris<sup>141</sup> in India. Cf. Germann, *Die Kirche der Thomaschristen*, Gütersloh, 1877, p. 163, n. 1. Several Portuguese writers note that at times Jacobite bishops as well as Nestorian bishops came to India before the arrival of the Portuguese. [Has Peter in communion with Rome, c. 1050?]

We have purposely included this list of bishops in this study. It must prove that Malabar itself can help in the reconstruction of its Christian history. If in 1820 the Syrians could look back 1000 years, up to A.D. 825, it was possible for them, who never passed from barbarism into civilisation, to do the same in A.D. 825, and to reach down to St. Thomas himself. Chronology was a tradition in the East. It had a cult for genealogies. In 1599, Menezes met a man in Malabar who was 123 years old, and who could give not only the years, but the months and days he had lived. He had scored on sticks the days and the months and the years. (Gouvea, *Jornada*, fol. 108r.) Our list ought to stimulate further research in Malabar for the period 825-1500. For the earlier period we look for help chiefly to Mesopotamia. A considerable amount of facts and dates has been gathered already for the period 300-825. More must exist. Even here Malabar can help, when it can give us in a MS. of c. 1700, discovered by Mr. T. K. Joseph, the dates 293 for Māṇikka Vāchakar's persecution of the Christians of Kāvēripattānam, and 315 for his coming to Quilon. [In spite of Menezes', Van Goens' and Tippu's holocaust of Malayalam and Syriac MSS. it is extremely gratifying to see that several valuable historical records still survive among us in Malabar. They have yet to be published.]

<sup>140</sup> Perhaps Mar Sapor or Mar Prodh of A.D. 825.

<sup>141</sup> Romogyris seems to be formed from (Ko)ṅgaloṛe (Cranganore) by aphesis, mutation of *l* into *r* (the reverse of lambdacism) and the addition of a Greek suffix. Cerebral *ř* is by Europeans sometimes represented by *r*

## NEW TYPES OF COPPER COINS OF THE SULTANS OF GUJARÁT.

By C. R. SINGHAL.

IN 1923, while cutting a passage through the hill north-east of Marole near Andheri railway station in Salsette for laying the Tansa Pipe Line, the labourers of the Tata Construction Company discovered a copper vessel measuring four feet two inches in circumference and one foot in height. Half of this vessel was filled with coins covered with such a thick layer of verdigris that it was a difficult task to make out anything from them. This vessel was removed from its find spot to Vakola on the east of Santa Cruz, where it remained for sometime with Mr. Master, who was acting as an Agent to the Tata Construction Company.

I have seen the exact spot where these coins were found. The vessel containing coins was found at a depth of about four feet from the surface of the elevated rock which was being cut for making a passage for the Tansa Pipe Line. Round about this spot, there are hills and jungle, and no traces of earlier or present habitation are found. The present village of Marole is also at a distance of about two-and-a-half miles from this place. It is very strange that a big hoard of coins like this should be found in such a solitary place. It does not seem to be the work of thieves, as the vessel with coins is too heavy to have been carried away by them from a distant place and been buried in this hilly area; nor was the intrinsic value of the coins so great as to induce them to undertake such an enterprise. There is, however, a small stream with flowing water just at the foot of this hill; and as I was told by the representative of the Tata Construction Company that there are some old bridges a little higher up on the east, it is not unlikely that the site may have been very near to some trunk road connecting Gujarát with the Deccan. How and under what conditions the treasure was buried remains a mystery all the same.

Mr. H. B. Clayton, I.C.S., the Municipal Commissioner of Bombay, communicated this information to the Museum authorities, and was kind enough to offer this find to the museum if it had any numismatic importance. Three of these coins sent by him for examination were found to be of the Sultáns of Gujarát. It was expected that such a big hoard of coins was sure to reveal some new dates and types of the coins of the Sultáns of Gujarát, and accordingly I was deputed to bring the whole find, intact with its receptacle, on a bullock cart from Vakola to the Museum.

As stated above, these coins were covered with such a thick coating of verdigris that it was not possible to decipher the inscriptions and assign them to any king. Besides some of them had stuck together in the form of big lumps which could not be separated without endangering the surfaces of some of the specimens. After some difficulty the services of a chemical assistant were made available, and the work of scientific cleaning and decipherment etc., could then be taken in hand in right earnest.

This find, consisting of about 6100 coins, is presumably the largest and one of the most important finds of the coins of this dynasty. In the first instance the collection was roughly examined, and coins were separated according to different Sultáns of Gujarát. Next more detailed and minute examination was made, when the dated were separated from the undated; and ultimately those bearing new dates and representing new types were separated for purposes of publication.

About half a dozen scholars have written learned articles on coins of this dynasty, but Indian Numismatists will ever remain grateful to the late Dr. G. P. Taylor, who published his scholarly and exhaustive article on the coins of the Gujarát Sultanat in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1903.

Incidentally it was noticed by me that Mr. E. E. Oliver had contributed an article to the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (vol. LVIII, 1889, pp. 1-12), wherein he described thirty-two coins of the Sultáns of Gujarát. Coins No. XI to XIII are assigned to Mahmúd Sháh I of Gujarát, while really they are of Mahmúd Sháh and Kalim Ullah of the Báhmani Dynasty, as pointed out by Dr. Taylor in his article. Coins No. XVI and XVII are described by him as doubtful. Dr. Taylor also made a negative statement to the effect that they are not of the

Sultāns of Gujarāt. These coins belong to the Nizām Shāhi dynasty of Ahmadnagar. Recently in 1926, Professor S. H. Hodivala has contributed a learned article on the unpublished coins of the Sultāns of Gujarāt to the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*.

The coins which will be described in this paper are believed to be altogether new types and have not been published anywhere so far. This find consists of coins of the Sultāns of Gujarāt from Ahmad I to Bahādur Shāh, but it is specially rich in the coins of Mahmūd I to Bahādur Shāh. The coins of Ahmad I and Bahādur Shāh found in this hoard bear dates 843 and 941 A.H., respectively. Therefore these coins cover a period of about a century. As the coins of Bahādur Shāh are of so late a date as 941 A.H., it is, therefore, believed that this hoard of coins was buried in the earth somewhere in the closing year of Bahādur Shāh's reign. This hoard also contains a large number of specimens of Muḡaffar Shāh II, out of which the dated coins are of 930 A.H., the last two figures written in the reverse position. Besides it may be interesting to note that one coin of Firūz III, Tuḡhlaq, (752-790 A.H.), two coins of Ḥusan Shāh of Jaunpur (863-881 A.H.) and one coin of Shāh-i-Hind (published by Dr. G. P. Taylor in *Num. Suppl.* No. 33) are also found in this hoard.

I am not in a position to explain how these coins got mixed with this hoard of the coins of the Sultāns of Gujarāt. The presence of these four coins may be the result of some oversight. It would not be safe to make any more definite suggestion.

The new types which I am going to describe belong to Mahmūd Shāh I, Muḡaffar Shāh II and Bahādur Shāh.

From the historical point of view, the coins of Mahmūd Shāh I are the most important, as they appear to extend the period of Mahmūd Shāh's reign to 919 A.H.

#### Coins of Mahmūd Shāh I

Coins of Mahmūd Shāh I bearing the date 919 A.H. have not been noticed so far. All the historians and other learned authorities say with one voice that Mahmūd I reigned up till 917 A.H.=1511 A.D. In the *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol I, part 1, 1896, pp. 248, there is the following statement:—

"From 1508 Mahmud remained at his capital till his death in December A. D. 1513 at the age of sixty-seven years and three months, after a reign of fifty-four years and one month." Now the year 919 A.H. began on the 9th March 1513 A.D., and Mahmūd died in December 1513 A.D., i.e. nine months later. The coin, therefore, corroborates the statement in the *Gazetteer* and extends the period of Mahmūd's coinage right up to the year of his death, i.e. up to 919 A.H. There is one more important coin of this Sultān which has on it the mint town Muhammadābād. Dr. Taylor says in his article, on page 317, "In silver the issue must have been considerable—my cabinet contains some thirteen specimens—but I have never found a single copper coin bearing the name of this mint." Silver coins of this Sultān of the later dates are found; copper coins have been noticed of dates up to 911 or 912 A.H. only, but this hoard contains coins of all the years from 911 to 919 A.H., except 918.

#### Coins of Muḡaffar Shāh II.

There are four new types in the coins of Muḡaffar Shāh II. The interesting coins are those which bear *خدا اللہ عالم* below the name of Muḡaffar Shāh. In one case the legend is written in such an unusual way that it becomes altogether inexplicable. Silver coins with this legend are found, but I have not come across any copper coin bearing it. Dr. Taylor has described one silver coin of Muḡaffar Shāh II with *خدا اللہ عالم* as legend (*vide* No. 50, page 333 of his article). But he says "this coin may be Muḡaffar Shah III, to whom it is assigned in the British Museum Catalogue, Muhammadan States, No. 440." I have seen a photograph of the coin in the British Museum referred to by Dr. Taylor, and I am of opinion that both these coins belong to Muḡaffar Shāh II, as the coin which I have got is more or less similar to them.

#### Coins of Bahādur Shāh.

The coins of Bahādur Shāh are very important in as much as they contain about eight new varieties not published so far. Muhammadan numismatists, I believe, will be

delighted to see these coins as they present quite a new way of inscribing the legends. Some of the coins bear the same inscription on the obverse and reverse, while others have obverse of one type and reverse of another type. This may be the result of the illiteracy of the workmen who were employed to strike these coins. These coins will be fully described in the catalogue given below :—

CATALOGUE OF COINS.

**Mahmūd Shāh I.**

No. 1. 214 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 919.

Obverse. Same as T. 22.

Reverse. Same as T. 22, but 919 as date.

Coins of this date are not known so far.

No. 2. 216 grains : Mint Muḥammadābād : A.H. (9) 15.

Obverse in circle.

محمد آباد

السلطان

شاه شاه

محمود بن محمد

Reverse. Same as T. 22, but [9]15 as date.

Copper coins with Muḥammadābād as mint town have not been found so far.

No. 3. 141 grains : Mint ? : A.H. ?

Obverse in circle.

السلطان

شاه

محمود

Reverse. Same as T. 26.

**Muḡaffar Shāh II.**

No. 4. 220 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 929.

Obverse in circle.

مظفر (شاه)

۹۲۹

خلد (المر ملكم)

Reverse. Same as T. 44.

No. 5. 219 grains : Mint ? : A.H. ?

Obverse in circle.

(السلطان)

مظفر

بن محمد

Reverse. Same as T. 44.

No. 6. 217 grains : Mint ? : A.H. ?

Obverse in circle.

(السلطان)

مظفر

بن محمد

Reverse. Same as T. 44.

Copper coins of Muḡaffar Shāh II with خلد المر ملكم have not been described up till now.

Coin No. 6 is similar to No. 5 but it presents the strange way of writing ملكم المر . This coin proved difficult to decipher because the upper stroke of د is joined with ل, thus giving a strange appearance.

No. 7. 220 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 930.

Obverse in circle

السلطان  
مظفر شاه  
٩٠٣  
خدا اللہ ملکہ

Reverse same as T. 44.

In the date the last two figures are inscribed in the reverse position. I have got about 90 coins in which the date is inscribed in this fashion.

Bahâdur Shâh.

No. 8. 216 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 938.

Obverse in circle.

ذی قعدة  
بمصر  
السلطان

Reverse same as T. 52, but date 938.

In this coin Mugaffar Shâh is inscribed at the top while Bahâdur Shâh is in the middle.

No. 9. 219 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 933.

Obverse in circle.

السلطان  
بمصر

Reverse, Illegible.

This is altogether a new type. The inscription on the reverse is very complicated. These coins range in dates from 932 to 934 A.H. These coins may be the earliest specimens of Bahâdur Shâh.

No. 10. 145 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 932.

Same as above.

This is a smaller specimen.

No. 11. 218 grains · Mint ? : A.H. 934.

Obverse in circle.

السلطان  
بمصر  
شاه شاه  
٩٣٤

Reverse same as T. 52.

The inscription on obverse is written in a different way altogether.

No. 12. 218 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 93X.

Obverse same as above.

Reverse.

السلطان  
بمصر  
قطب الدين  
(وزیر)

The reverse of this coin is same as T. 52 but it bears ابوالمظفر السلطان in the place of الفضل ابو

No. 13. 219 grains : Mint ? : A.H. 93X.

































Both reverse impressions.

One is same as the illegible reverse of No. 9 above.

The other is same as reverse of T. 52.

No. 14. 219 grains : Mint ? : A.H. ?

Obverse and reverse same as reverse of T. 52.

NUMBER OF COIN	OBVERSE	REVERSE	NUMBER OF COIN	OBVERSE	REVERSE
1			9		
2			10		
3			11		
4			12		
5			13		
6			14		
7			15		
8			16		



No. 15. 216 grains : Mint ? : A.H. ?

Obverse and reverse same as obverse of coin No. 11 above.

No. 16. 218 grains : Mint ? : A.H. ?

Both obverse impressions.

One is same as obverse of No. 9 above.

The other is same as obverse of No. 11 above.

Coins Nos. 13 to 16 may be considered as mistakes in minting.

[NOTE.—Professor S. H. Hodivala, the well-known authority on Gujurât numismatics, on reading the above article in the first instance, made several comments, which were referred back to the author. Omitting points that have been settled or which are not of essential importance, the issue of the correspondence may be briefly summarized below for the benefit of our readers.

Professor Hodivala considers the most important point to be the question of the date of the death of Mahmūd I. He has examined six specimens of the coins which Mr. Singhal reads as of 919 A.H., and thinks that the figures on three of these (written in the reverse order) not improbably stand for 914. The *Bombay Gazetteer*, he suggests, is at best a second-hand authority; and the statement therein is, moreover, discounted by the fact that the compiler has not quoted the source of his information, in view of the discrepancy of two years from the date found in the most accredited Persian histories, such as the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, *Tārīkh-i-Firāshī*, *Murāt-i-Sikandarī* and *Murāt-i-Ahmadī*. He points out that while there are Mahmūd I coins of 917 and, as now described, of 919, there are none of 918; and he also draws attention to the fact that two copper coins of Masaffar II are registered by Mr. Nelson Wright (*Indian Museum Catalogue*, II, Gujurāt, Nos 57 and 58) which are clearly dated in 918. He thinks it would be hazardous to base on these coins a theory for upsetting the accepted chronology of the two reigns concerned. Prof. Hodivala also pointed out that the phrase *خالد المر ماکر* is a common adjunct on the silver coins of Masaffar. Mr. Singhal says as to this that he only referred to the peculiar way in which the letters were inscribed, and to the fact that, though found on silver coins, copper coins with this legend had not hitherto been described.

To Professor Hodivala Mr. Singhal's coin No. 8 is the most interesting of those described, as he finds the style or script very similar to that of the 'Shāh-i-Hind' coins, of which he possesses a large number of specimens, on some of which the margins, which have hitherto defied decipherment, can be read without much difficulty, and about which he has been preparing a paper to show that they were struck, not by Babur or Humāyūn, but by Bahādūr.

Numbers 13 to 16 Mr. Hodivala would prefer to class as freaks.—JOINT EDITOR ]

### BOOK-NOTICE.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1924-25. Edited by J. F. BLAKISTON. 12½ × 9½; pp. xiii, 270; 43 Plates. Calcutta, 1927.

Mr. Blakiston, who edits this report, fitly prefaces it with a feeling reference to the great loss sustained by the Department in the untimely death towards the close of the year of that distinguished archaeologist, D. Brainerd Spooner.

Section I contains a summary of the conservation work (including repair), which forms so essential a part of the functions of the department, carried out during the year. Due attention is being paid to the protection from erosion and other destructive agencies of important inscriptions. Under this head we notice a reference to exploration work beneath the Tughlaq mausoleum at Tughlaqābād, which has shown that the graves within are the real sepulchres, and that there is no crypt beneath, as had been thought.

Section II deals with exploration and research. At Taxila substantial progress was made in the excavation of the older city on the Bhir Mound and of the later Scytho-Parthian city of Sirkap under the supervision of Sir John Marshall, who records an important find of 1167 silver coins, mostly punch-marked Indian issues, including some in the shape of oblong-bent bars from 1½ to 2 inches

in length, but also 3 Greek coins of special interest and a well worn *siglos* of the Persian empire. Two of the Greek coins are of Alexander the Great and one of Philip Aridaeus. Apart from the fact that this is the first recorded find of such coins in India, the discovery helps to confirm previous conclusions as to the period when Indian punch-marked coins were in circulation and to fix the date for the upper strata of buildings on the Bhir Mound. Among other interesting antiquities found at these sites may be mentioned 18 copper coins of Kadphusa I and 2 of Azes II, and 4 terracotta "votive tanks," recalling those in use in ancient Egypt as far back as the third dynasty. Exploration conducted by Mr. H. Hargreaves on mounds near Sibi, Kuchlak, Saranan and Mastung in Baluchistan indicated that the sites had been occupied for a considerable time before and after the Christian era; but it seems unlikely that the remains can throw any light on Indo-Sumerian history or art.

The chief interest of the report, however, undoubtedly lies in the further details afforded of the work being carried on at Mohenjo-daro in the Larkana district of Sind and at Harappa in the Montgomery district of the Panjab, which reveals to us the existence of a prehistoric civilization on the plains of the Indus comparable with that of Sumer

and of Elam, and carries us back all at once to a period as far anterior to the times of Cyrus the Great as his age lies from us. The site at Mohenjo-daro, covering an area of about a square mile of rolling mounds, seems to have lain originally on the western bank of the Indus, which has since shifted its channel further to the east. "Wherever trenches have been sunk in these mounds," writes Sir J. Marshall, "the remains have been disclosed immediately below the surface of a finely built city of the Chalcolithic period (3rd millennium B.C.) and beneath this city of layer after layer of earlier structures erected successively on the ruins of their predecessors." The buildings exposed in the uppermost stratum comprise temples and dwelling houses constructed of kiln-burnt and sun-dried bricks. The houses are bare of ornament, but "remarkable for the excellence of their construction and for the relatively high degree of comfort evidenced by the presence of wells, bath-rooms, brick flooring and an elaborate system of drainage, all of which go to indicate a social condition of the people surprisingly advanced for the age in which they were living," that is to say in the transition stage between the stone and copper ages. They were using stone knives or scrapers of the crudest types, yet were familiar with the working of copper, gold, silver and lead and probably of mercury also, and were engraving seals "in a style worthy of the best Mycenaean art." On these seals we find the tiger, elephant, rhinoceros and various other animals, delineated but not, as it seems, the horse, which Sir John suggests was probably imported into India at a later date by the Aryans. The inscriptions on these seals are all in the pictographic script of the period, and have yet to be deciphered. Among the mass of antiquities so far recovered mention may be made of two striking paste stamp seals, one with a "Brahmani bull" (*bos indicus*) device in relief and another with a representation of the sacred fig tree (*Ficus religiosa*), as the details of the leaves clearly show. The handsome and well preserved painted vase, 2 ft. 5 in. in height, found at site D and the other pieces of painted pottery at once suggest comparison with the painted pottery from Susa and that recently discovered by Mr. Langdon at Jemdet-Nasr in Mesopotamia. It is noteworthy that among the finds registered during the season, which we are told far exceeded the total recorded in a single season at any other site in India, were 177 shell objects, indicating an extensive use of sea-shells for purposes of inlay as well as for personal ornaments. At the present time Mohenjo-daro must be some 200 miles from the sea by the shortest land route, and making allowance for the advance of the deltaic coast-line in the course of five millennia, the ancient city must have lain about as far from the mouth of the Indus by river. A maritime connexion at least is clearly suggested, though there be yet no definite evidence of intercourse with Sumer and Elam by sea, as Professor Sayce has pointed out.

At Harappa, in the Montgomery district of the Punjab, some 460 miles away, by the side of an old

bed of the Ravi (or was it in ancient times a still more important river) have been found remains of very similar character, generally speaking. Attention was first drawn to this site by Masson in 1826, and five years later by Burnes. Cunningham examined the site in 1853, 1856 and 1872-3, and it was in his report for the latter year that the famous 'Harappa seal,' the first of the 'Indo-Sumerian' seals to be found, was described and illustrated. We are told that several previously unknown sites in this vicinity have been revealed by an experimental aeroplane survey along some fifty miles of the old bed of the Ravi.

Important as are the finds recorded in these pages, much more has been discovered during the three years that have since elapsed, as we gather from an account communicated to the *Times* newspaper, especially at Harappa, where antiquities have been found of a type even earlier than those obtained so far at Mohenjo-daro. It would be difficult to exaggerate the value from the point of view of the history of early civilization of the discoveries already made at these two sites and of those likely to follow when adequate staff and funds are available to conduct operations on a scale commensurate with their importance. Scholars are becoming impatient for a comprehensive and up-to-date report on discoveries that must mark an epoch in the history of archaeological research, and necessitate a complete re-adjustment of previous views on the so-called "Aryan" civilization of India. Long cherished beliefs are indeed being shattered, and old theories revolutionized, and we begin to realize that archaeological exploration is still more or less in its infancy. All interested in the subject will also eagerly await the results of the exploration and excavation work recently carried out by Sir Aurel Stein in Makran, the Gedrosia, inhabited by Ichthyophagi, of Arrian, where will probably be found traces of one at least of the lines of intercourse by land between ancient Sumer and Elam and the Indus basin.

In Section III, which deals with epigraphy, attention is drawn to several important inscriptions either discovered or deciphered during the year. Progress is being made with the publication of the *South Indian Inscriptions*. We would welcome similar work in some of the northern provinces. Under *Miscellaneous Notes* in Section VIII a description is given of a Mathura image of the Nāga Dadhikarna of the Kushāpa period, and a new find is recorded of 15 Andhra lead coins from the Guntur district, some of which are of Gautamīputra Śātakarni and Vāsūthīputra Pulumāyi. The numerous plates are excellently produced. What we chiefly miss in these annual reports are maps showing the position at all events of the principal sites where exploration has been carried out, in relation to the surrounding country or to geographical features marked on the available Survey sheets.

C. E. A. W. OLDHAM.

## NOTES ON THE SEVEN PAGODAS.

### I.

#### A VISIT TO THE SEVEN PAGODAS—FIFTY YEARS AGO.<sup>1</sup>

[1875.]

By SIR RICHARD C. TEMPLE, Bt.

I have at last been able to accomplish an object I have long cherished—that of visiting the celebrated remains known to Europeans as the Seven Pagodas, and to the natives of Madras as Māvalivaram. As so much has already been written about these remains, it may seem superfluous to write anything more on the subject now, but it must be remembered that many years have elapsed since any account has been given of the Seven Pagodas, and some, though not many, changes have taken place in the contour of the country, and in the remains themselves. The late Captain Carr, as late as 1868, in editing the admirable papers of his predecessors in the examination of the remains, in his *Descriptive and Historical Papers relating to the Seven Pagodas*, gives no special account of their state at that time, and I am not aware of the existence of any later papers. Therefore, practically speaking, no account has been given of them since the dates at which his predecessors wrote. Of these, Mr. Chambers wrote in 1788, Mr. Goldingham in 1798, Dr. Babington in 1828, Mr. Braddock in 1840, Messrs. Mahon and Taylor, and Sir Walter Elliot in 1844 and Mr. Gubbins in 1853. Of the different accounts given, that of Mr. Chambers was written from memory; that of Mr. Goldingham is strictly what he has named it, *Some Account of the Sculptures at Mahabalipuram*, and is of little use in guiding the visitor; that of Dr. Babington is strictly scientific; and it is not till we come to Mr. Braddock's *Guide to the Sculptures, Excavations and other remarkable Objects at Mamallaipur*, with the notes of Mr. Mahon, Mr. Taylor and Sir Walter Elliot, that we come to an account of these ruins that will really guide the visitor who has but a limited space of time to give to their exploration. Mr. Gubbins' account, again, is chiefly limited to scientific and archaeological discussion, and so may be classed in the same catalogue as that of Messrs. Chambers, Goldingham and Babington. So we may say that, in visiting the Pagodas with such lights as we have, we are visiting them by the light of 35 years ago [in 1875]. Not that that is not quite sufficient for those who can spare some days to the exploration of the place, so admirable is it; but the visitor who has only a day or so—or, as in my case, only one clear day—to devote to that purpose, will find that he will be somewhat puzzled by the descriptions given him. These considerations have emboldened me to give an account of my experiences during my short visit.

By what means visitors in former years used to reach the Seven Pagodas I have not discovered, but at the present day [1875] the best mode of reaching them is by boat through the Southern Canal; leaving Madras near the Adyar Bridge, and arriving at Māvalivaram at a short distance from the Temples in from 9 to 12 hours; the distance being 28 miles. If the journey be made by night—and, especially, if by a moonlight night—it will be found to be a very pleasant one. For those who are not overcome by the enervating habits which the climate and customs of Madras so quickly produce, I do not think it necessary to take a tent, as shelter from the sun and the dews can be procured in a *manṭapam* in the immediate neighbourhood of the remains; nor do I think it necessary to carry much in the way of food, as, although there is no bazaar in the place, fowls, fresh eggs, milk and rice can be easily procured, as well as cocoanut milk: and the water of the place is excellent. All liquor that may be required must of course be taken with one. I may add that those who wish to see all that can be seen, and have only one day to spare, must be prepared to go out a great deal in the sun, and that, unless their own knowledge of Hindoo mythology and sculpture is such as to render it unnecessary, they should not go there without a previous

<sup>1</sup> From the *Madras Times*, 4, 6, 9 Feb. 1875.

careful perusal of Captain Carr's book.<sup>3</sup> If they do, I may confidently state that they will not be disappointed in all they see.

For the reasons above given, I will here follow Mr. Braddock in his clearly-written and in every way admirable description of the Seven Pagodas, following also Colonel Mackenzie's plan of Mamallapur made in 1808, which, for all practical purposes, is as useful now as it was when made. The Southern canal runs almost parallel with the coast, or N. and S., and the boat stops at a point almost opposite the quarries marked in Colonel Mackenzie's map, which are distant from the canal, I should say, about 100 yards. These quarries are still worked, and the difference between the old and modern style of working the rocks, which will be presently referred to, can here be seen. The canal runs along what is marked as the Eastern boundary of the "Marsh," (still in existence), shown in Colonel Mackenzie's map. The visitor should land, if possible at daybreak, and take a path running due east or at right angles to the canal, leaving the quarries on his right. To the south or right of the quarries are some small rock-cut temples, which will hereafter be referred to. These he had better leave alone for the present, and keep straight on passing through a grove of palms till he comes to the low hill of granite rocks on which the sculptures are cut. He should then keep to his left, and resist the temptation to examine what he may see on the way till he reaches the Sudra village, (not shown in the map), to the north of the hill. The reason I urge this is, that Mr. Braddock commences his examination from the north, and the various sights are carefully numbered in the map, and in his account so as to correspond exactly from north to south. Moreover, I hold that, without this or some such account, it would be useless to try and make a satisfactory examination of the ruins in a limited time. As I have no desire to reproduce Mr. Braddock's account in my own words, I will leave the intending visitor to his guidance, merely pointing out to him where changes have taken place, and any remarks Mr. Braddock has made which may be inapplicable to the place now, or which may be calculated to mislead the reader who has never seen the ruins before.

Before proceeding further, I will remark on the variety of the names given to the place. I will not enter into the origin of the name "Seven Pagodas"—already discussed at length by several writers—but will merely point out that, as far as the number of temples is concerned, it is a misnomer. There are not now—and probably never were—"Seven Pagodas;" and the visitor must not expect to meet with anything likely to give him such an idea. With regard to the native names of Mavalivaram, Mahabalipuram, Mamallapur, Mammallapuram, I may mention that the first is the ordinary local name for the place; that the second is also a common native name for it, arising, like the first, from an apparently erroneous idea that Bali was worshipped here, whereas—as I think Mr. Gubbins has pointed out—the worship of Bali was confined to the West Coast. The next two names have been taken from inscriptions found on the rocks there, and depend on reading the inscription with two or one "l"—a trifling discrepancy which makes a vast difference as to the meaning of the word, and in the speculations based thereon. These names are subject to slight alterations, depending on whether their Sanscritic or Tamilian form be used. One name known for the place among the Brahmans of Madras, viz., Mahabalishwaram or Mavalishvaram has apparently escaped the notice of Captain Carr and his predecessors. This name meaning the temple of "the great god Bali" or of "the great powerful god" is identical with the well-known Mahabaleshwar, of the Bombay Presidency: but it has no interest attached to it beyond the resemblance.

To return to the examination of the temples. The visitor will find a well-kept modern-looking shrine close by the village above-mentioned, and immediately beyond the northern termination of the hill. This is Mr. Braddock's No. 1, and was in his day a "dilapidated

<sup>3</sup> *Descriptive and Historical Papers relating to the Seven Pagodas on the Coromandel Coast.* Edited by Captain M. W. Carr, Madras Staff Corps. Printed for the Government of Madras by Caleb Foster, Madras, 1869.

temple " with its " roofing exposed to the weather," " completely overshadowed with trees, which had taken root in the walls, and whose branches, forcing their way through the joints of the stones, had contributed much to its dilapidation and present ruinous appearance." All these picturesque growths have disappeared. It now stands by itself, is entirely repaired, and used as a place of worship. An old Brahman, apparently the " oldest inhabitant " of the place, whose age was computed at 90 years, though I should say 80 was the number nearest the mark, said it was repaired about 10 years ago. His name was, as far as I can recollect, " Hiyam-Ragwar Chary," and he told me that he had given much information to Captain Carr—a statement which, judging by what he seemed to know, was very far from being correct. He also said that the images originally in this temple were taken away to England. I may mention here that no statement of a local man can be received as true unless backed up by good authority, and for this fact there is none that I am aware of. Mr. Braddock says nothing on this subject. No. 2, (I am referring, and shall subsequently refer, to Mr. Braddock's numbering, which will be found to correspond with the numbers in the copy of Colonel Mackenzie's maps in Captain Carr's work) or the image of the Monkeys will be found now to be entirely exhumed. Lord Napier, the late Governor of Madras, had it dug out of the sand, and placed on a stone bed, about four years ago [in 1875]. It is joined to its bed or pedestal by rough shell *chunam*. I may here mention that all my information comes from the Brahmans living in the place, and, as above stated, must be only taken as true with certain reservations. I am open to correction on these points and shall be glad if I have misstated facts.

The next object Mr. Braddock refers to, or No. 3, is the curious rock named locally " Krishna's Pat of Butter." This is on the *Eastern* face of the hill, and some little distance from the Monkeys, or No. 2. This numbering is, I think, a mistake, and likely to lead to confusion, because No. 4 is on the *Western* face of the hill, and close to the Monkeys. If the visitor bears this in mind, No. 4 will be easily found. In examining No. 4, I found great difficulty in discovering one object mentioned by Mr. Braddock. He says after describing the three large excavated niches to be found here, " The rock faces the north-west ; and to the right or south of it is an imperfect representation of Durga eight-headed and trampling under foot the head of Mahishasura." It was the word " south " that misled me, to which may be added the imperfection of the representation. I kept going to the south face of the rock, whereas the figures were eventually found adjoining the niches above-mentioned, so closely as to form part of them. I may say that the local Brahmans on this, as on many other points, were utterly unable to give any information or assistance. One's idea of Durga in connection with Mahishasura is a picture full of action, whereas this representation is of a still upright figure of Durga standing on a buffalo's head (Mahishasura). There is a well-sculptured picture of the same subject in No. 19, which is full of life and action. I may here remark that some modern, and apparently wanton, blasting operations have well nigh destroyed these valuable remains. A few yards to the right and south-west of No. 4—and not mentioned by Mr. Braddock—are some partially sculptured rocks called by the Brahmans " Bhima's cooking place." The work on this and on many other unfinished sculptures gives us an idea as to the ancient mode of preparing the rock for sculpture, *i.e.*, of cutting it into a vertical plane. Apparently they first drove in lines across each other about a foot apart, so as to leave squares between them deep enough to enable them to split off the intervening square ; this tedious process is now changed for the modern drilling of square holes in the required line about an inch deep and a few inches apart, and then splitting the rock vertically by gunpowder. All over these rocks will be found traces of recent quarrying as the stone is still used for the purpose of building temples in several places in the neighbourhood.

Passing on to No. 8, Mr. Braddock remarks that in his day the deity-stone (Ganesa) was worshipped every Friday : such is still the case. Of No. 9, there is nothing new to

describe, excepting to note the ignorance of the Brahmins connected with the place at the present day. In Mr. Chambers', Mr. Goldingham's and Dr. Babington's time, the Brahmins seem to have known something of the stories connected with the sculptures; to say nothing of those mentioned by Mrs. Graham in her account in the early part of this [19th] century: now they may be safely said to know nothing. With regard to this subject, the invariable employment of the Sanscritic form of the names of the deities to whom these sculptures refer, in all the accounts here mentioned, is likely to puzzle the visitor, and to render it almost impossible to understand the local Brahmins' accounts, as they invariably employ their Tamil names: also the use of the Sanscritic form of the words referring to the various parts of the sacred objects renders it difficult to explain what is required to be shown, as uneducated people are well known to be unable to understand a word unless pronounced exactly as they pronounce it. Thus, though there is no great difference between the Sanscrit "*simha* or *singha*," and the Tamil "*singham* or *singam*" (a lion), or, as they pronounce it at Mawaliwaram, "*simham*,"<sup>3</sup> the use of the word *simha* is totally unintelligible to the Brahmins. Again, I could find no one who knew where the Dolotsava *manṭapam* was, though it was immediately shown me on asking for the Uriadi *manṭapam*. On the right side from the entrance of this excavation, an incident during the Vāmana (5th) Avatāra of Vishṇu is portrayed; the Brahmins knew nothing in explanation thereof but the bare story. On the left side is a representation of the Varāha (3rd) Avatāra of Vishṇu, about which the Brahmins' account differs greatly from Mr. Braddock's. They say that the figure on Vishṇu's knee is Bhūdevī (the Earth) whereas Mr. Braddock<sup>4</sup> says it is merely a woman. But, of course, Mr. Braddock is far more likely to be correct than they are. Draupadi's bath (No. 10)—a rough irregular cistern sunk in the rock, is now quite dry—a fact which struck me as rather curious at this time of year (January). No. 11, representing Arjuna's Penance, may be considered one of the show-sights of the place, certainly, it is one of the most prominent. The figures are still clear in many places, and some of them are admirably carved. The figures of the native mermaids, if one may call them so (half woman—half serpent), in the cleft of the rock, are good. Lord Napier had the front of this sculpture cleared away to the depth of some eight or ten feet, so as to show the whole of it; at the foot of the excavation lies part of the broken tusk of one of the elephants in the sculpture. Lord Napier endeavoured to leave it fastened in its place, but without success. The tusk was broken in the days of Dr. Babington.

I must now mention what I consider the most disagreeable object at the Seven Pagodas. With the laudable object of keeping the sand from again filling up the excavated space in front of this sculpture, some one—who it was I did not care to enquire—has caused the sides of it to be bricked up, and railings to be placed round the top. But how has this been done? Bright and very modern *chunam* has been used to fasten the bricks, and the railings are in the most approved European style (blackened) with bright-white *chunamed* brick posts, after the manner of railings round a second-rate bungalow compound! The whole appears to be about as much in keeping with its surroundings as those trumpery shrines or baldachini, so common in continental cathedrals, are with the noble buildings they disfigure.

To the left of this specimen of modern European art is a *chunam*-mill (if one may use the expression) quite new, and used when they are repairing the modern temple close by. This is immediately in front of another excavation (No. 12) in the rock beside Arjuna's Penance. This is now used as a place for holding *chunam*, three receptacles of brick for which were built in its verandah about four years ago [in 1875]. It is still used also, during wet weather, as a shelter for cattle—a purpose to which it was put in Mr. Braddock's days. The bricks used in constructing the *chunam* receptacles above referred to were obtained from the foundations of ancient buildings—a custom common in this place, as has been

<sup>3</sup> This is merely the Sanskrit word with a Tamil affix.—S.K.    <sup>4</sup> Braddock is wrong in this case.—S.K.

previously mentioned by Mr. Gubbins. Going southwards to the left, the visitor will come to the part edifice, part excavation, known now as Krishna's *mantapam*, but formerly as Krishna's choultry. This is immediately in front of the street of the Aggirāram or Brahman village, one side of which is formed by the modern temple. The figures in this excavation, which are indistinct and bad, are covered by an opaque or chalky light-blue mould formed by leakages through the rock. There are also abundant signs of its having been used as a choultry, for which purpose, I am told, it is still used occasionally. No. 14 on the top of the hill above the last mentioned object is a very handsome and solid structure. Had it been finished—for, as Captain Carr thinks (a supposition very likely to be correct), it is the commencement of a *Copuram*, it would certainly have been the most commanding object in the place. Even in its present state, though not more than 10 feet in height, it is, from its position, the first seen object from a distance, except the small finished temple (No. 18) standing on a higher point not far distant. This temple (No. 18) is difficult of access, and its visitors will be required to bring forth their climbing capabilities. Captain Carr says "the Brahmans call this the Arakkennai<sup>5</sup> temple as one *ollock* (about 1½ gills) of oil used formerly to be expended daily for lighting it." I can only say that this name is now apparently utterly unknown, as none of even the older Brahmans seemed to have heard of it, or to recognise it even written down for them in Tamil. On the south-eastern face of the outermost rocks is a much worn representation of Arjuna's Penance. The figures on the right (north) side have, according to the Brahmans, been covered with *chunam*; but when, they do not know. The truth of this story is borne out by the fact, beside that such is not likely to have been the case, that a substance very like *chunam*, as far as I can judge, is peeling off the rocks in several places, and can be easily pcked away with a stick.

The examination of the objects strictly belonging to the hill had now taken me four hours (from 6 till 10), of what I may safely term hard work. I therefore returned to the Mantapam above mentioned (of which anon), to rest and to take some food. I had yet before me the famous monolithic temples or *rahas*, to the south of the hill, and the temples on the sea shore, about 400 yards from the hill to the east. Of these, the former are considered by some the most valuable remains, and the latter the most interesting in the place.

As soon as I could get the Brahmans together again, I proceeded at about midday to examine the monolithic temples lying about a mile to the South of the hill. These temples run North and South, and are cut from rocks standing in what is now heavy sand. The walk thither in the sun was very hot and heavy, as, except in the immediate neighbourhood of the village, the whole place is covered with sand. The Eastern or sea face of the monoliths is much more imbedded in sand than the Western face. I shall still adhere to Mr. Braddock's numbering in remarking on these temples.

Close to No. 20 still stand the Lion and the Elephant, exactly in the state in which they were found by Mr. Braddock. The sand has encroached upon them not at all during these 35 years. The Brahman Bull, on the Eastern side of the temple, was in Mr. Braddock's day covered with sand as far as its head and neck. Lord Napier had it dug out—or rather had the sand dug from round it, so as to expose the whole of it—but since then the sand has again encroached upon it, and now only the head, hump and top of the back are visible. The whole piece of sculpture seems to be in some danger of being buried altogether unless taken care of. I would suggest that an excavation something like that in front of the Arjuna's Penance, above referred to, be made here.

Mr. Braddock remarks with regard to No. 9 (Ganesa's temple), which is a rock-cut temple similar to these, that it is "ornamental according to a style of architecture wholly different from that of this part of India in the present day. The tope is elliptical and bears considerable resemblance to the Gothic style." It seems to me to be odd that he should

<sup>5</sup> This is really Alakkennei; also called Olakkennei as now.—S.K.

not have remarked that the roof of the largest of these monoliths (No. 23), known locally as Bhima's Ratha, is identical in shape with that of No. 9, being in the form of an elliptical or Gothic arch. No. 24, the southernmost temple, is that which has attracted most attention from scientific visitors, on account of the inscriptions found on it, good reproductions of which will be found in Mr. Goldingham's and in Dr. Babington's accounts. The visitor will experience considerable difficulty in finding his way to the upper galleries of this temple. Mr. Braddock in speaking of similar remains—(No. 7) about half a mile to the west of the hill and north-west of these monoliths—appears rather to detract from their value as being unfinished and less elaborate than these, but it seems to me to be well worth the while of the visitor to see them, though not in the order given by Mr. Braddock—for reasons given below—as there are no signs such as basement, loose rocks, etc., now left of these finished monoliths to show at a glance that they are such, whereas the unfinished bases of the others show very clearly how they were made. As the monoliths marked No. 7 are half-a-mile west of the hill, and consequently are far nearer the Canal than the other objects of interest, I would advise the visitor to take them last of all on his way back to his boat in the evening.

The visitor must now be prepared to encounter a hot and wearying walk across the sands to the temples by the sea, distant, in a North-easterly direction, about a mile from the monoliths, and a quarter of a mile due east of the Brahman village. The sea washes quite up to the outer wall of the largest of the two temples, and may be seen breaking at a short distance out over some hidden rocks. This is the site of the supposed "Wave-covered city of Bali," which, if it existed at all, has suffered as much at the hands of modern archaeological science as ever it did from the sea. On the roof of No. 26 may be seen two beams of wood, apparently as old as the temple itself, the remainder of the beams having been removed. The Brahman said that they are of sandal wood. The sight of these beams reminds one of the wonderful woodwork to be seen at the Caves of Karli; this, however, is somewhat exposed to the weather, whereas the Karli woodwork is in an exceptionally protected situation. The large *lingam* in this temple was broken, according to local tradition, by an English officer some 80 years ago [in 1875], who took away the top of it—an act of vandalism one finds it hard to forgive. Traces of *chunam* still remain in various parts of these buildings, which are protected from further encroachment by the sea by the piling up of a quantity of large stones on either side. No. 27, a sculpture of Mahishasura, is now washed at the base by every tide.

Going westwards towards the Brahman village about 150 yards due west of the last mentioned temples near the large tank, I saw a *lingam* and *yoni* lying on the ground. They had been dug up out of the sand close by from a depth of about 3 feet by some boys about a year ago [in 1875]. They were as usual, of basalt, well carved and polished and in a good state of preservation. Lying near them, and taken from the same place, was a rough and coarse piece of granite sculpture, representing apparently Siva, with four arms, seated. There are two smaller figures over either shoulder of the principal one. The stone is 3½ feet long and 2½ feet broad. The *lingam* is 2 feet in length, and the *yoni* 2½ feet long from lip to back, and 2½ feet broad. Passing on to the Dolotsava or Uriadi *manṭapam*, I noticed that its *kalasa* or pinnacle was of brick, and much decayed. This *manṭapam* stands on the eastern side of the street running north and south, and connecting the Brahman with the Sudra village. On the western side of this street, and immediately opposite the *manṭapam*, is the commencement of the Gopuram of the modern temple, never finished and very like in appearance to the foundations (No. 14) above mentioned, though not so handsome. This street is bounded on the north by a street running east and west along the Sudra village, leading to the northern end of the sculptured hill, and immediately opposite the termination of the first-mentioned street is the Gangana *manṭapam*, at which I put up. But of this presently, passing into the outer court of the modern temple through the unfinished

Gopuram, I saw a quantity of sixteen-sided pillars and roofing stones lying about. These were said to come from a small ruined temple on the right of the outer court, and from a small four-pillared *mantapam* in front of the inner court of the large temple. The Brahman said that the ruined temple above referred to was destroyed by the weight of a banyan tree growing on its roof about twenty years ago [in 1875], which broke through the roof and brought much of the wall with it. It is undergoing repair by slow degrees, but I should say that its prospects of surviving for many years are limited, as I remarked that some roots of plants had already found their way between the interstices of the newly-laid stones. A small well-carved image of Vishnu on a slab of granite was found in this temple, and is now set up outside it. The face and attitude are of the ordinary Buddhist type so common in Burmah; and it is only by the liberal distribution about the sculpture of the marks peculiar to Vishnu that the identity of the figure is proved.

It was now past 3 p.m. and I had seen everything that Mr. Braddock had described, and, though I had been unable to visit the objects of interest noticed by Mr. Taylor and Sir Walter Elliot, which lie at some distance from the village, I felt that I had done enough for one day, and that I might now legitimately take some rest. I therefore retired to the *Ganana mantapam*. This *mantapam* was built some sixty years ago [in 1875] by a wealthy man, and the stones used in its construction were, according to the Brahmans, taken from the temples and buildings about. Three of these stones are inscribed, but the inscriptions are very faint. One of them is about 4 feet from the ground, the other two are immediately under the roof. The inscription I saw is in Tamil, but is too faint for a hasty reading. While sitting in this *mantapam* I collected some forty old coins from the boys of the village. They say that they find them at a place called Cassimode about a mile distant. They are found in the sand during wet weather, but not, as far as I could understand, on the sea shore itself. But how far these statements are true, I am not in a position to judge. I may mention however that three of these coins I bought were *cash* (much worn) issued by the East India Company, bearing date of about 100 years since. Captain Newbold says, in favour of his argument of the existence of a submerged city here, that Chinese and other coins are often washed ashore during storms; but I should be sorry to assert that the coins shown me hardly supported this theory. All the coins brought me were of copper.

An incident illustrative of the native character occurred here. The old Brahman above mentioned had stumped about after me everywhere, always turning up about ten minutes after I had arrived at any point requiring lengthy examination. How the old man managed to do so I don't know, as my wanderings covered a considerable space of ground. In the end he, of course, begged for some money, and I gave him a rupee in consideration of his great age and the exertion he had undergone, not to mention the wonderful tales he insisted in relating about every place I visited. The village Munsiff afterwards told me he was the rich man of the place, and worth Rs. 10,000 prudently stored in the Madras Bank.

A little to the east and south of this *mantapam*, on a mound covering the ruins of an old temple, is a large basalt *lingam* in the open air opposite seven rough iron sculptures in granite of some village gods. These are from 2 to 4½ feet in height: the *lingam*, which is partly hidden in the ground, is said to be 9 feet in length. At about 5 p.m. I started for my boat, taking the monoliths (No. 7) above-mentioned on my way. I was accompanied by a rabble of hungry Brahmans, two of whom had instruments—I won't say of music—with which they kept up a disagreeable discord, in the desultory manner peculiar to the natives, until my departure. One of these produced a sound something like the drone of a bagpipe, and the other was played with notes sounding somewhat like those of a flute out of tune. They said they were playing English airs, but I can't say I recognised them. During my journey back to Madras, the wind was in my favour, and I consequently arrived at the Adyar Bridge at about three in the morning, having experienced a pleasant ending to a very pleasant and interesting trip.

## II.

## NOTES ON THE SEVEN PAGODAS.

By R. GOPALAN, M.A.

This celebrated group of monolithic and structural monuments by their proximity to Madras has been visited more often by travellers and visitors than any other single group of monuments in India. There exist as a result numbers of descriptions of the monuments in this locality, some of which, such as the paper of William Chambers on the "Sculptures and Ruins of Mavalivaram" and that of J. Goldingham were published in the *Asiatic Researches* as early as the close of the 18th century. The more prominent among the visitors to the place in the first half of the 19th century were Colonel Colin Mackenzie, whose collection includes<sup>6</sup> detailed plans of the monuments as well as a description of the sculptures, and Messrs. Babington, Braddock, Taylor, Elliot and Gubbins, whose impressions have been published in the account of the place published by Captain Carr in 1868 entitled *Descriptive and historical papers relating to the Seven Pagodas*. Since then many others have visited the place including Feigussou, Burgess, and the members of the Archaeological Survey and those of the Epigraphical Department. Descriptions of the monuments here and notices of the epigraphs appear in the *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, *The Cave Temples of India*, *South Indian Inscriptions* (vol I), *the Epigraphia Indica* (vol. X), and the *Annual Reports of the Superintendent for Archaeology and Epigraphy* (Southern circle). An interesting descriptive paper on the monuments of the place with plan and details appeared in vol 26 of the *Madras Journal of Literature and Science* (pp 82-232) from the pen of Lt.-Col. R B Branfill, G.T.S; Prof Jouveau-Dubreuil in his *Archæologie du Sud de l'Inde* has an interesting chapter on the evolution of these monuments and their age (675-112). More recently a hand-book dealing with the monuments was published by Mr. Coombes with numerous illustrations. The monuments and their iconographical interest formed the subject of a learned paper by Dr Vogel in the pages of the *Annual Survey of the Director-General of Archaeology*. (1913). To these accounts may be added the account on the *Antiquities of Mahabalipur* by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, embodying the impression of his visits and examination of the monuments there in 1917 (*Indian Antiquary* for 1917).

The monuments at the Seven-Pagodas are situated on the sea-shore about 35 miles south of Madras and about 5 miles north of the old Dutch settlement of Sadras. The place is popularly known as Mahābalpuram, Māvalivaram and Mahābalēsvaram, and is familiar to European visitors as the Seven Pagodas. How the visitors arrived here in early times is unknown. Presumably they took the high road from Chingleput to Tirukkalukunram, which is about 9 miles in length and reaches Mahābalpuram from the latter place. This road must have evidently existed in the seventh century A D., in the days of Narasimhavarman I, the Mahāmalla, and is apparently alluded to by the well-known Chinese pilgrim Huen-Tsang, when he described the city of Kānchī as extending to the coast. An alternative to this route which is sometimes preferred is the boat-journey, which can be done from the Adyar bridge near Madras, through the Buckingham Canal and lasts about ten hours or so. One can also nowadays reach the Seven Pagodas in a few hours by motor from Madras, taking the Chingleput-Tirukkalukunram route. By whatever means the journey is pursued the visitor may rest assured that there are enough monuments to compensate for any trouble or inconvenience he may have to undergo to reach the place.

<sup>6</sup> Col. Mackenzie visited the monuments in 1816 and has left a collection of 87 drawings of the sculpture of the place which are now in England.

**BOOKS RECEIVED :—**

Origin of the Pindaris, preceded by historical notions on the Rise of the different Maratha States.

The Vaitaranu, vol. III, No. 1, September 1928

The Maha Bodhi, vol. XXXVI, No. 9, September 1928.

Federated India, vol II, Nos 34, 35, 36, 37.

The Journal of the Oriental Research, Madras, Quarterly, vol II, part II

Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. 80, No. 6.

Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological Dept. for the year 1927

Epigraphia Indica, vol. XVI, part VIII, October 1922

Nagan Pracharini Patrika, vol. 9, No. 2.

**PAPERS ON HAND :—**

Hindu and Non-Hindu Elements in Katha Sarit Sagara, by Sir R. C Temple.

Origin of Caste System in India, by the late S. Charles Hill.

Burma an Outline of her early relations with India and the Colonies, by Niharmanjan Roy.

The Decline of Orissa, by Prof. R. D Banerjee

William Irvine and Maharajah Ajit Singh, by Bisheshwarnath Rou.

The Power of Magic in Bengal, by Biren Bonnerjee.

Note on Archaeological Explorations in Waziristan and Northern Baluchistan, by Sir Aurel Stein.

The Mission of George Weldon and Abraham Navarro to the court of Aurangzeb, by Harihar Das, M.A.

Notes on Hobson-Jobson, by Hodiwala.

Vedio Studies, by A Venkatasubbiah, M.A., Ph.D.

The Early Development of the Government of the Presidency of Fort St. George, by C S. Srinivasachari, M.A.

Materials for the Study of Garo Ethnology, by Biren Bonnerjee

Sir William Norris and the Jesuits, by Harihar Das.

**PUBLICATIONS OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE**

**THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE**

Vol. LV, Part I, January to June, 1925.

with Plates  
and Illustrations in the text.

Price 15/- net.

General Agent: FRANCIS EDWARDS,  
83a, High Street, Marylebone, London, W.1.  
OR THROUGH ANY BOOKSELLER.

**MAN**

A MONTHLY RECORD OF  
ANTHROPOLOGICAL SCIENCE

Price 2s. net monthly,  
or 20s. per annum prepaid.

**SUPPLEMENTARY PUBLICATIONS**

OF THE

**ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE**

**OCCASIONAL PAPER No. 6.**

Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East: Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt, and their Earliest Interrelations.

By H. FRANKFORT, M.A.

With Plates I.—XIII. Price 10s. 6d. net.

**PUBLISHED ON BEHALF OF THE COLONIAL OFFICE.**

The Tribal Markings and Marks of Adornment of the Natives of the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast Colony.

By CAPT. C. H. ARMITAGE, C.M.G., D.S.O.

23 Pages, with Plates I.—XVI. Price 3s. net.

To be obtained from—

**THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE,**

50, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.









JUST OUT

THE  
**SAURASENI AND  
MAGADHI STABAKAS  
OF RAMA-SARMAN  
(TARKAVAGISA)**

*With Six Plates*

BY

SIR GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E.

Demy 4to, 56 pages, Rs. 2.

To Non-Subscribers, Rs. 4.

APPLY TO

THE SUPERINTENDENT,

*"Indian Antiquary."*

*Mazagon, Bombay 10.*

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY  
1872—1921

**INDICES**

OF THE

*First Fifty Volumes*

COMPILED BY

MISS L. M. ANSTREY

**VOLUME I**

*PART I: Index of Authors*

and their Contributions Demy 4to, 50  
pages, Rs. 2. To Non-Subscribers, Rs. 4.

**VOLUME II**

CONTAINING

*PART II: Subject Index*

AND

*PART III: List of Illustrations*

with classified headings and cross-references  
Demy 4to, 100 pages Rs. 4. To Non-  
Subscribers, Rs. 5.

**School of Oriental Studies.**

(University of London)

London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C. 2.

The School is a recognized School of the University of London. Instruction is given in Arabic, Turkish, Persian Hindostani, Chinese, Japanese, Swahili, and other important languages of the East and of Africa, as well as in the religions and literatures of the countries concerned. Special facilities are offered for Merchants, Missionaries, and others. Lists of Public Lectures and all particulars may be obtained from the Director.

Special arrangements are also made for intensive courses

**THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.**

**RATES FOR ADVERTISEMENTS.**

	Full-page.	Half-page.	Quarter-page.
One month ..	Rs. 25	Rs. 14	Rs. 7-8
Three months ..	.. 70	.. 39	.. 20-0
Six months ..	.. 130	.. 65	.. 35-0
Twelve months.	.. 240	.. 125	.. 65-0

Short advertisements are inserted at Rs. 2-8 per inch, single column, for one month.

The *Indian Antiquary* is circulated throughout India, the United Kingdom and the Continents of Europe and America, its subscribers are exclusively such as advertisers generally wish to reach through the medium of a high-class Journal of Oriental research and literature, and the terms for insertion, as given above, are very moderate. Applications should be made to the Publisher, British India Press, Mazgaon, Bombay.