

Quarterly

SEP 1946
THE

Vol. XVI. Part I.

JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH MADRAS

(Founded by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A.)

September

1946



त म सो मा ज्यो ति र्ग म य

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE
MADRAS

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE

1948

Annual Subs., Inland, Rs. 8.

Foreign, 14 Shillings.

Each part separately Rupees Two, Postage inclusive

CONTENTS

VOL. XVI.]	[PART 1.
	PAGES.
Vīṇāvāsavadatta, Act VII Edited by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja ...	1—6
The Language of Rāmacaritam by L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar ...	7—19
The Concept of Prauḍhokti in Alaṅkāraśāstra by K. A. Subramania Iyer ...	20—31
A Quotation in the Locana of Abhinavagupta by Dr. V. Raghavan ...	32—33
A Note on the Reign of Khottiga by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri ...	34
A Textual Note on Bṛhatkathākośa by B. Ch. Chhabra ...	35
The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute—Third Founda- tion Day Celebrations—Address by Dr. Chhabra ...	36—49
Cultural History from the Periyapurāṇam V. Vidvan M. Rajamanikam Pillai, B.O.L., L.T., M.O.L. ...	50—57
“Sanskrit as Lingua Franca” H. E. Dr. Kailas Nath Katju, M.A., LL.D. ...	58—60
Book Reviews ...	61—67
Obituary Notices ...	68—70

VIṆĀVĀSAVADATTA

ACT VII

EDITED BY DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA.

The first Three Acts of this rare drama appeared in the years 1927 to 1931 of this Journal serially, and it was later issued as a separate book as Madras Oriental Series No. 2. The fourth Act was later edited by me in this Journal in 1936. Acts V and VI appeared in the Bharatiya Vidya, Singhi Special Number, in 1945. The seventh Act is now published again in this Journal. The eighth and last Act will appear as the next instalment.

Th collected verses from the drama, found in a manuscript, are given separately at the end of the Act. The original manuscript is much mutilated and corrupt, and so it is not possible to give either a full or continuous or correct text. What is available in the manuscript is given here.

॥ वीणावासवदत्तम् ॥

॥ सप्तमोऽङ्कः ॥

वास¹—दिअं² । स हि भवदो आआय्यो³ भविस्सदि त्ति तक्केमि । [दिवम् (?) ।
स हि भवतः आकार्यो भविष्यति इति तर्कयामि]

राजा—एवमेव मे मनोरथः ।

वास—अंब अलं दानी⁴ एदेण [अम्ब अलमिदानीमेतेन]

राजा—तथा ।

वास—हंजे इमं दाव गहूण [हञ्जे इमां तावद् गृहाण]

काञ्चनमाला—भट्टिणि तह [भट्टिनि तथा] (वीणां गृहीत्वा उपविशति)

साङ्कृत्यायनः—(आत्मगतम्)—देवी⁵ गमनविघ्नं देवस्य कुर्यात् (प्रकाशम्)
को नु खल्वयमतीव मुखरः ।

राजा—मत्तविलासो नामायं डिण्डिको राज्ञा मे दत्तः⁶ ।

साङ्कृ—किमयं जानाति (राजा किंचिद्विलम्बति⁷) मत्तविलासो नाम ननु त्वम् ।

1. This I conjecture to be the words of Vāsavadattā.

2. This is how it begins after the break, which extends to eight folia in the original palm-leaf manuscript.

3. आ आ य्या

4. Written अलन्दाणीं

5. देव

6. दत्तम्

7. विलम्बयति

विदू—होदु । एसो दाव मत्तो [भवतु । एष तावन्मत्तः] (नृत्यति)
 राजा (आत्मगतम्)—अहो नु खल्वकृत्रिममस्या रूपलावण्यम्¹ । कुतः—

गात्रेषु देव्या निपतत्यतुल्यश्रीमत्सु² दृष्टिर्मम³ यत्र यत्र ।
 ततस्ततोऽसौ महता श्रमेण श्लेषावबद्धेव⁴ पुनर्ह्यपैति⁵ ॥ १ ॥

वास—(आत्मगतम्) इच्छामि तं ज⁶ पेक्खिदुं । एदेण उण पेक्खन्तेण
 विघ्नीअदि [इच्छामि तं प्रेक्षितुम् । एतेन पुनः प्रेक्षमाणेन विहन्यते]

विदू—होदि एसो दाव मज्झममत्तो [भवति एष तावन्मध्यममत्तः] (नृत्यति)
 साङ्कृ—अहो सविशेषम् ।

विदू—अहं खु णच्चामि । देवीए उण चक्खू अत्तहोदो मुखे इणच्च [अहं खलु
 नृत्यामि । देव्याः पुनः चक्षुः अत्रभवतो मुखे नृत्यति]

राजा—मुखनेत्रशिखाद्विजाधरभ्रूजघनोरुस्तनमध्यपाणिवर्जम् ।⁷
 कथितेक्षणहासतश्च⁸ देव्या रतिमिश्रा⁹ क्षरतीव कामधारा ॥ २ ॥

विदू—भोदि एसो दाव अदिमत्तो [भवति एष तावदतिमत्तः] (नृत्यति)
 काञ्चु—(आत्मगतम्)—भट्टिदारिआ ण तस्सि चित्तं देदि¹⁰ । [भर्तृदारिका
 न तस्मिन् हृदं दधाति]
 विदू—भ भवदि किमणं णच्चामि [भगवति ! किमन्यनृत्यामि]

1. लामण्यम्

2. निपतत्यतुल्यं श्रीमन्ध

3. दृष्टिः मर्म

4. श्लेषावबद्धेव

5. पुनर्ह्यपैति

6. ज not clear ; perhaps अ=च

7. Vatsarājaprabandha writes द between खा and जा and scores the letter ; and has पन्नस्य for वर्जम्

8. त Missing.

9. रतिमात्रा in Vatsarājaprabandha

10. देहि

साङ्कृ—अलमलम् । परिश्रमः स्यात् ।

राजा—(आत्मगतम्)—व्यक्तं देव्या रुधिरमधरम्¹.....

साङ्कृ²—(विलोक्य)—अये प्रविष्टो वत्सराजः ।³

वास—(राजानं दृष्ट्वा आत्मगतम्)—ण पारइस्समहमिह ठादुं [न पारयाम्य-
हमत्र स्थातुम्] (साङ्कृत्यायन्या⁴ सह तिरोऽभूत्)

भर—देव आगम्यताम् (सर्वे उपसर्गन्ति)

काञ्चनमाला⁵—(आत्मगतम्)—भट्टिदारिआ एरिसं पुरिसं सविसेसं पेक्खिअ
अणमत्ता भविस्सदि [भट्टिदारिका ईदृशं पुरुषं सविशेषं प्रेक्ष्य अनवहिता (?)
भविष्यति]

भर—उक्तं मया पूर्वमेव राज्ञोऽभिप्रायः । एष खलु देवस्तवाचार्यः ।

साङ्कृ—कोऽन्यो देव्या गुरुर्भवितुमर्हति⁶ विना वैदेहीपुत्रात् ।

भर—देव एषा ते शिष्या । प्रतिगृह्यताम् ।

राजा—प्रतिगृहीतमात्ममङ्गलं च ।

भर—अद्य खलु गुणवन्नक्षत्रम् , तस्मादद्यैव वीणा प्रारब्धव्या⁷ इति
महारাজेनाज्ञापितम् । सर्वदेवतापूजा पुर्यां चोत्सवः कर्तव्यः । तद्गन्तव्यं मया ।

राजा—यथा भवानाह ।

भर—देव तथा (निष्क्रान्तः)

काञ्चु—देव कल्पितानि यथार्हण्यासनानि । उपविशतु देवः ।

राजा—स्थीयतां भगवति⁸ ।

साङ्कृ—उपविश्यताम् । एषा ह्युपविष्टा । (उपविशति)

वास—हृदि (काञ्चनमालामाश्रयति)

राजा—भद्र आस्यताम् ।

1. Here there is again a long break of one folio in the ms.

2. The stage direction about the King's entry is also missing.

3. But the king was on the stage, already.

4. साङ्कृत्यायिन्य ।

5. काञ्चु

6. गुरुर्भवितु

7. प्रारब्धा

8. भगवती

साङ्कृ—वत्से अनुवर्तनीयं ननु गुरुवचनम् ।

वास--अम्ब तथा (उपविशति)

राजा¹—वीणा तावदानीयताम् ।

काञ्चु--देव तथा (निष्क्रान्तः)

विदू--मं कोऽपि ण भणादि इह उवविस² त्ति । होदु । अहं³ एव⁴ अत्ताणं भणामि—भो मत्तविलास उवविस (इत्युपविश्य) भो णिम्मक्खिआ दाणिं उहुपस्सिआ सवुत्ता [मां कोऽपि न भणति इह उपविश इति । भवतु । अहमेवात्मानं भणामि—भो मत्तविलास उपविश (इत्युपविश्य) भो निर्मक्षिका इदानीं उहुपस्सिआ (?) संवृत्ता ।

राजा—भगवति !

लज्जा विलासो विनयं मृदुत्वं कान्तिर्वपुः श्रीर्नवयौवनं च ।

अत्यर्थमुद्रिक्ततयानुरागात् स्थितान्यहंपूर्विकयेव देव्याः ॥ ३ ॥

साङ्कृ—सदृशमुक्तं देवेन । गुणव....⁵मया विज्ञातं⁶ अनुरक्तया⁷ तया भवितव्यमिति ।

विदू--किं दाणिं तए कज्जम् [किमिदानीं तया कार्यम्]

विदू--भो संपत्ता ह आवासं [भो संप्राप्ताः स्म आवासम्]

राजा--वयस्य ।

संदर्शनं प्रत्यहमङ्गनानां पुंसामतिस्नेहविवृद्धिहेतुः ।

लब्धं च तद्द्वारमचिन्त्यमस्मात् प्राप्तामिवाहं दयितामवैमि ॥ ४ ॥

(निष्क्रान्तौ⁸)

इति सप्तमोऽङ्कः

1. राजा not in ms.

2. इह विस

3. अं

4. एव

5. A few syllables missing

6. विज्ञाता

7. Space for a letter blank between क्त and या.

8. निष्क्रान्तः

The following verses from this Act are seen in the Vatsarāja-prabandha:—

देव्याः पूर्वं रूपशोभामृतेन व्याकृष्टत्वादूद्रष्टुमुद्रिक्तकर्षा(र्णा) ।

गत्वा गत्वा चेतसा सार्धमेनां दृष्ट्वा दृष्ट्वा दृष्टिरभ्यागतेव ॥ १ ॥

धाता ध्रुवं कुपितवानतिरूपगर्वादेवासुरोरगौ(गपु)रादिवधूजनेभ्यः ।

यं(नो)चेदमर्षपरवान् स कथं नु नाम यत्नादिमा.....जेद(?)सपत्नशोभाम् ॥

लज्जा विलासो विनयं(यो) मृदुत्वं - - वपुश्रीर्नवयौवनं च ।

अत्यर्थमुद्रिक्तयानुरागात् स्थितान्यहंपूर्विकयेव देव्याः ॥ ३ ॥

(see verse 3)

विष्णोर्जयत्यरुणताम्रतलस्य पादो यः प्रोज्झितः सललितं त्रिजगत् प्रमातुम् ।

क्वापि प्रविष्टरुचिराङ्गुलिरावभासे वैदूर्यसंक्रम इवाम्बरसागरस्य ॥ ४ ॥

चतुरुदधिजलाम्बरां - - फलभरपिञ्जरशालिमालिनीम् ।

चिरमवतु नृपो हताहितां हिमगिरिविन्ध्यपयोधरां धराम् ॥ ५ ॥

यथा यथा पश्यति भीतभीतं दृष्ट्वा स्वपक्षमान्तरगूढया माम् ।

तथा तथा मे क्षरतीव धैर्यं विलीयमानं मदनानलेन ॥ ६ ॥

परस्परविवृद्धहार्द्र(र्द)रससम्पदद्वा(?)श्मनां

प्रवृद्धनवयौवनोदयविदाहिनां कामिनाम् ।

(मनो)रथमहारथं मदनसारथिः सादरं

समागमपुरीं परां नयतु कान्त - - मुत्सवाम् ॥ ७ ॥

रुचिराङ्गुलिपल्लवाः स्पृशन्तो मधुधाराः कपिलाः क्रणतन्त्रीः(?) ।

भ्रमतां निवहन्ति तुण्डलीलां बकुलाः पिञ्जरपञ्जरे शुकानाम् ॥ ८ ॥

गात्रेषु देव्याः (see verse 1)

मुखनेत्रशिखा (see verse 2)

THE LANGUAGE OF RĀMACARITAM *

BY

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

(*Maharaja's College, Ernakulam*)

Three editions of the work called 'Rāmacaritam' have been printed so far. The University of Madras published several years a text containing 717 verses ; as this edition contains no introduction, little is known about the provenance of the manuscript or manuscripts forming the basis. The poet Uḷḷūr S. Parameśvara Iyer had published in 1916 the text of 30 paricchēdas with a very helpful introduction and useful notes. Uḷḷūr's scholarly observations provided the impulse for the further study of the work. In 1931 there appeared what was described as the full text of the work in the Travancore Cit-rōdayamañjarī series. Three manuscripts appear to have been used here, but no attempt has been made to define the text after subjecting the mss. to a scrutiny on the basis of prosodies or metrics. Subtle points of phonology, relating particularly to the transitional stage of the evolution of the west coast speech from the parent language, cannot be solved in the absence of such a definitive text. The study of morphology is a little easier, especially if care is taken to envisage only illustrations common to the mss. and repeatedly occurring in them.

An examination of the morphology of the text reveals four sets of forms:

* The system of transliteration adopted in this essay is that of the M.L.J. Press with the following symbols representing west coast sounds:

nd (Tam. *nr*)—the alveolar group formed of the nasal and the plosive.

tt (Tam. *rr*)—the long alveolar plosive.

n—the blade—dental nasal phoneme of Old Tamil and Malayāḷam, to be distinguished from the point-alveolar *ṇ*.

I have analysed elsewhere the language of Old Mal. texts published after my E(volution) of M(al.) M(orphology) came out. These texts are Kauṭaliyam Bhāṣā, Dūta-ākyaṃ, Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam, Uttara-rāmāyaṇam and Dēvimāhātmyam.

(a) Old forms which may have been purely "traditional" or "conventional";

(b) "ancestral" forms which the west coast speech "inherited" from the "parent" language and retained for brief periods in the transitional stage;

(c) west coast developments which disappeared in the later growth of the speech (may be, at different stages in different instances); and

(d) developments that have continued down till today.

Those forms which have fallen into disuse in Middle Tam. colloquials and which never struck root in Mal. (as shown by the examination of contemporary and later texts) are certainly Tamilisms employed out of deference to literary conventions. To this group would belong features like the following:

(1) sandhi changes, as in *idaṛku*, *nīṇayanē*, *oṇḍēr*, *varuṇan-rica*, *ticagaḍōrum*, *mēttaram*, *pottūṇ*;

(2) Tense-forms, with the augment-*an-*, like *molindanan*; and old forms like *pōyiṇār*, etc.;

(3) Prohibitives like *ilaikkaṇmin*.

Those Middle Tamil forms which do not have direct cognates in Early Mal. and which occur sporadically in the earlier texts may also be regarded as "Tamilisms" introduced in deference to literary convention. To this group would belong forms like *adukku*, *ceyyākkāl*, *ariyāmal*, etc.

Then there are "ancestral" forms appearing side by side with forward west coast developments in Old Mal. texts, as in *Ramācaritam*. I think it would be incorrect to lay down on the strength of an observation in the fourteenth-century *Lil*. ["pāṇḍyabhāṣāsārūpyam bāhulyēṇa 'pāṭṭ' iti kēraḷabhāṣāyām"], that all such instances were foreign to the west coast at this stage and that the west coast speech was "born full-fledged" like *Urvaśī* from out of the sea.

In this connection one may have to envisage the importance of another observation of *Lil*., viz. that "the low castes of Kerala make use of cōḷabhāṣā forms like *māṅgā*, *vandān*, etc." The probability of many of these older forms existing side by side with forward developments in different parts of the country can certainly not be ruled out in the earlier transitional stages.

The marking-off of the categories (a), (b), (c) and (d) enables the student of Malayalam to "place" this work among

Old Malayālam texts already analysed and fixed chronologically. Ancillary as the evidence of language certainly is (especially in the circumstances that obtained in the past in Kerala), it cannot be altogether neglected. If Rāmacaritam shows quite a respectably larger number of linguistically earlier features than say, the fourteenth-century Līlātilakam, it could not have been due to the mere accident of a supposedly regional or communal dialectic variation. Nor would the theory stand, which ascribes the work to a comparatively recent date on the ground that it is composed in a "frontier"—dialect or "mixed" speech; for in the first place such a "frontier"-speech cannot be traced anywhere, and secondly many of the features mentioned below are undoubtedly Old Malayālam as evident from comparisons with other old Malayālam works.

1. Old nominal bases now no longer in use inherited from the "parent"-speech whether as part of tradition or as active forms in early stages: *allal*, *attal*, *amar*, *aḍal*, *aṇṇal*, *aṇṇa* 'fool', *iḍaṇṇeru*. *iṇḍal*, *igal*, *icai*, *uvavi*, *kōṭṭal*, *marakkalam*, *pagali*, *maiya*, *māttam*, *māṇbu*, *mārvu*, *parava*, *paḍiṇṇāyiru*, compounds like *ār-amudu*, *oṇḍēr*, *ēdilar*, *veṇṇiṇam*, *vīyaṅgōḷ*, *celuṇḡaḷal*, *muṇḡiḷar*, *val-l-āli*, *valliḍi*, *vallariṇṇar*.

Characteristic west coast developments: *cemmu* (cf. Tam. *cemmai* and *cemmal*), *pēḍi* 'fear', *vā* 'mouth' (cf. Tam. colloquial *vā*), *pūvu* (cf. Middle and Modern Tam. colloquial *pūvu*), *muḷuvan* (cf. Tam. *muḷuvadu*), *cēl* (cf. Tam. *ceyal*), *vāḍil* (cf. Tam. *vāyḍil*).

2. The second case ending is generally *e* (cf. Tam. colloquial *e*) but manuscripts evidence hesitancy between *e* and *a* which latter was perhaps a slightly frontalisised, weak-accented *a*.

3. "Separation" (or "absence of union") is associated with the third case endings *oḍu* and *ōḍu*, as in *uyiroḍu tala vērupaḍutti*, *aḍuttavarōḍum vēṛāyi* (cf. EMM, p. 8). Although no express provision exists in Tolkāppiyam for this use of the third case, there are instances like the Tolkāppiyam sūtra *murrugaramoḍu poruḷ vērupaḍāadu* ... and Middle Tam. instances like *numarōḍu piriyādu*.

4. As for the fourth case, the new ending-*u* (after-*n* and-*in*) appears commonly beside older-*n-u-kku* and-*in-u-kku*. Older forms of the type of *endiṅku*, *aḍiṅku* (without the augment-*u*) appearing in Kautāliyam are absent here.

5. The fifth case endings are locatives (or place-denoting words) followed by *ninnu* (cf. Virac.)

The ancient *in* appears in *adiṇum mēlē* with a fifth case force.

Similarly, *-il* in *adil param, kūṭṭattil ērē* is the fifth case-*il* mentioned in Nannūl.

-in-il (constituted of the augment-*in* and *il*) appears only with a seventh case force in this text: *viravinil, tikkinil, kaluttinil, maṇattinil*. This is a descendant of older-*in-in* used in certain Old Tamil texts with the fifth case signification, generally speaking, and rarely with a seventh case force under the influence of the newly popularised and locative post-position-*il*. Tolkāppiyam prohibits the use of the augment-*in*-before the fifth case ending-*in* but already Kuṟundogai shows *kaḷattinīn*) and Pattuppāṭṭu has *tappinīn valāadu* (both with a fifth case force), while Kalittogai evidences a seventh case signification also for the ending which came (under the influence of-*il*) to be regarded as-*in-il* (in sandhi-affected positions).

in-il is used in many Middle Tamil texts (and in modern Tamil poetry) only with a seventh case force, but in the earliest stages of the west coast speech, it seems to have been used with both the fifth case (comparisinal) and seventh case meanings. Kautāliyam has *kilēdinil nān-maḍaṇṇu, hāni-vannadinil nānmaḍangu* in the fifth case, *adinil tiyiṭṭu, śatruvinil*, etc. in the seventh case.

6. *uḍe* is most common, but (*n*) *de* and (*in*) *de* are not met with, and *uḍaya* is rare. Some miss. show-*iḍe* where *i* represents a neutralized, weak-accented sound with no lip-rounding. Kautāliyam has *uḍaya, uḍe* and *iḍe* (*i* being a centralised, weak-accented *u*).

7. *il, -kal (-in-gal > ingal)* and both the "rigid" and "loose" postpositions appear for the seventh case: *uḷ, iḍai (iḍa), uḍē, micai (mica), mēl, kīl, pakkal*, etc.

-attu in the instances *teruvattu* and *naḍuvattu*, where this augment is not normal in post-Tolkāppiyam Tamil, may be compared to-*attu* in Tolkāppiyam instances like *veyilattu, paṇi-y-attu, vaḷi-y-attu, mala-y-attu*.

Another 'archaism' in the west coast speech is furnished by *kilakku nāṭṭu cellumbōḷ* which has come down to the present day in constructions like *kōlikkōṭṭu cennu*, where the geminated

ttu (without any seventh case affix proper) denotes the locative meaning. Old Tamil had such constructions, as in *kāttu-c-celba-v-eṇba* [Kurundogai].

The association of a locative force in *agamē pōyī*, *āgāsamē paṛannu*, *teruvē naḍannappōl* is due to the analogy of words like *muṇbē*, *kilakkē* where the emphasis-denoting *ē* was popularly associated with the locative idea.

8. *eḍō*, the sambōdhana word, peculiar to the west coast, denoting familiarity without contempt, exists in this text beside *eḍā* and *eḍī* (cf. Middle Tam. forms <Old Tām. *ēḍā* and *ēḍī*),

The following Tolkāppiyam types of vocatives are absent in Mal.: *naṅgāy* (of *naṅgai*), *pārppīr* and *kariyīr* (of *pārppār kariyar*), *tōṇṇāl* (of *tōṇṇal*), and vocatives with *alabedaī*.

The change of *-an* to *-ōy* is represented in literary instances like *kulattiṇu karayāy--uḷḷōy-ē* and *śūraril muṇb-uḍayōy*; *rāmā-v-ō*, *taṇayā-v-ō*, *rāmaṇ-ē* and the use of *-ē* in *-uḷḷōy-ē* are all later than Tolkāppiyam usage.

9. The directive ending *-ēkk* is not common; the only instance available is *ividekku*. Forms with *-il-ēkku*, *-iṅgal-ēkku* *att-ēkku* do not appear, although the terminative expletive *ē* is found in *nagarattilē*, *taṇayilē*, *agattē*. *adilkk*, appearing often in this text, is perhaps an incipient directive without *-ē*.

The qualificatory *ē* is also very rare; there is one instance: *kīlilē ttolilgaḷellām pēcinapoludu*. Directional words like *kilakkē* are sometimes coupled with *viśeṣyas*, as in *kilakkē-ttica*. cf. Kauṭaliyam.

10. Directives with—*nōkki* (cf. instances like *hastināpuri nōkki-p-pōṇar* in the prose portion of the Middle Tam. text Perundēvaṇār's Bhāratam) and *āmmāru* appear: *vaḍakkunōkki*, *maṇmēl-āmmāru* and *kilakkin-vādilkkalāmmāru-peṭṭu*, as a directive ending, occurs in *mēlpeṭṭu*, *kīlpeṭṭu* (cf. Tam. *mēl-paṭṭu* and *kīlpaṭṭu*) and in *purattūtṭu* (for the *ū* of which, cf. EMM, p. 15.)

11. *Curuṅ-ida-mār* 'women with slender waists' (with the plural ending *mār*) the old plurals *palava* (*pal* and *pala*) and *cilava*, (*cila*), *av* and *iv*, *āṇ-gaḷ* and *peṇ-gaḷ* (later *aṇuṇṇaḷ* and *peṇṇuṇṇaḷ* in view of the semantic alteration suffered by *āṇ-gaḷ* and *peṇ-gaḷ*) and traditional forms like *nālvar* and *eṇmar*.

12. In the use of augments in nominal inflexions, the following may be noted.

iḍam-oḍu, *kuṇam-oḍu*, *aṛam-oḍu*, without the augment *-att* illustrate a usage which is as ancient as Tolkāppiyam Eḷuttu.

The augment *-in-* is often used in the inflexional forms of bases with *-i*, *-a* and consonants, in the second and third cases: *cadi-y-in-āl*, *cīda-y-in-e*.

The non-rational plurals *ava* and *iva* take on always the augment *-(a)tt-* but *ellā-y-ilum* evidences a west coast development in which the augment is left out. This *ellā-y-ilum* is often heard today beside *ellāttilum*.

Kōvil-kku, *viralkku*, *kaḷalkku*, *kāḷkku*, without the augment after bases having final *-l*, are unusual in modern language.

13. Noteworthy old forms among pronouns are *ñāññal* (both as nominative, and as an 'oblique' stem as in *ñāññal-il*), *nimmil* (*nim-* being the oblique stem of the second person plural), *emmil* (*em* being the oblique stem of the first person plural pronoun), and *eṅgaḷ*.

nim- and *em-* are purely traditional forms; *nim-* may be compared to Old Tam. *num-*; and *em-* to Old Tam. *em-*,

eṅgaḷ has its counterpart in Middle Tam., while *ñāññal* (and *ñāññal*) evidence *ñ-* as a west coast peculiarity.

14. Old verb-bases that form part of the "inherited" stock but that have now gone out of use: *iḷai-kk-*, *orumanapp-eḍ-*, *ond-*, *kīlar-*, *kaḍāṭ-*, *kōl-*, *kudar-*, *cāḍ-* 'to attack', *ceru-kk-cepp-*, *tāṭ-*, *tuyar-*, *pēc-*, *pudai-*, *ṭugal-*, *mett-*. *mīl-*, *vagai-* 'kai meṭṭa mara-kk-', *pōr kiḍai*, etc.

Early west coast "developments" (structural, semantic or both), that have fallen into disuse today: *iḍ-*, *uḷar-*, *ēg-* 'to order', *kīlai-kk-* (as in *kīlaiṇṇā nāvinōḍum* with gasping, weakened tongue), *ceññ-* 'to be reddened', *tiḷkk-* (modern *tikk-*), *naññ-* 'to consider deeply', *kēl-*, *karer-*, *piḍipeḍ-* and *vēr-iri-kk* used as transitives.

Developments that continue to exist till today: *aḍar-*, *uḷavāg-* (for all persons and numbers), *orumbed-*, *kuḍai-*, *tall-*, *teḷi-kk-* 'to drive chariot, cattle etc.', *ṭagar-* (cf. Tam. *peyar-*, and *pagir-*) *pēḍi-kk-* 'to be afraid' *cemmu-var-* 'to be beautified or sanctified, (which exists in modern *cemmōrttu* of christians).

15. The so-called "defective" verbs belong to different categories: (a) Kuṛippuṇai bases iike *uḷ*, *al*, *il* and *val*; (b) *terinilai* bases showing only a limited number of verb-forms from the beginning, like *vall-* and *ol* (or *oll-*); (c) old verb-

bases, of which only certain forms were popular in later stages of speech-evolution, like *ar-*, *ir-*, *mig-*, *pōl-*, *eṇ-*.

In Rāmacaritam, apart from *uṇḍu* and *uḷḷa*, the old forms *uḷaṇ*, *uḷaḷ*, *uḷar*, *uḷaṇ-āyāṇ*, *uḷar-āyār*, *aṇiṇṇ-uḷaṇ* are met with.—One instance of *ilēṇ* (in *kaṇḍ-ilēṇ*) is available but *alēṇ*, *alāy*, *alaṇ* are not available. There are the participles *illādu* and the west coast development *illayādu*, *allādu* and *allayādu*, the conditional *illāygiḷ*, *illayāygiḷ*, *allāygiḷ* and *allay-āygiḷ* (beside older *allāl* and *allāgiḷ* and *allāyil*); *illayāygiḷ* and *allayāygiḷ* were perhaps formed under the influence *illa-y-āg*—and *alla-y-āg*.

The old participle *aṇri* is, in compounds particularly, represented in this text by *eṇḍi* (and *enni*), while *iṇri* appears as *iṇḍi* (*inni*), *eṇḍi* (*enni*) and also as *iṇḍi* (*inni*), the long *ī* in the last-mentioned being due to the analogy of west coast *īla* isolated from forms like *kiṭṭīla* < *kiṭṭīlla* < *kiṭṭi-y-illa*.—Kauṭ, shows *eṇḍi* for *aṇri* numerous but *iṇri* is only *iṇḍi*. The works of the Paṇikkars show *eṇḍi* (*enni*) both for *aṇri* and *iṇri*. Possibly, the course of change was that *a* of *aṇri* was first changed to *e* through a frontalized weak-accented stage and that later (through confusion between *aṇḍi* and *iṇḍi*) the *e* was transferred to *iṇḍi* also. Dissimilation was perhaps also operative here in the change of *i* to *e*. The form *enni* (*yē*) was very common down till the New Mal. period. It represented *aṇḍi* and *iṇḍi* alike. To-day, *enniyē* is an archaism (often appearing in poetry).

allā and *illā* have been used in Mal. also as bases of forms with negative tense-endings annexed to them: *allāṇṇu*, *allāyum*, *illāṇṇu*, *illāyum*.

Similarly, *arudu* (the *kuṛippuvinaṭi* non-rational singular of *ar*) has given rise to west coast forms like *arudāyinnu* (negative present finite), *arudāṇṇu* (neg. past), *arudāyum* (neg. fut.), *arudāyvaṇ* (neg. participle).

val- as a *kuṛippuvinaṭi* base underlies forms like *vallavaṇṇam* 'in some manner' (for the roots of the semantic change, cf. Old Tamil *vallāṅgu* and *valla-v-āru*), *valladum* 'something', *vallavarēyum* 'some persons' and the negatives (*colla*) *vallēṇ*, *vallōm*, *vallādu* 'not being able', *vallāyma* 'inability'.

vall- as *terinilai* verb-base is represented by *kīḍaṇṇaḷ*, *vallinḍidūmīlla*,

cf. Kauṭaliyam instances like *valli* 'having learnt', *valluma-vaṇ*, and *vallīla* in a citation of Lil.

Examples of forms of *vall-* are available in Old Tam.: *vall-i*, *valluvōṇ* (Kurundogai) *vallumōr*, etc.

The forms of *val-* and of *vall-* sometimes govern accusative objects both on the west coast and in Middle Tamil.

ol- (or *oll-*) is also a "defective" *terinilai* verb-base, represented in Mal. by negative forms like *ollāññu*, *ollādē*, *ollāda*, *uḷollāda bhūmi*; and the prohibitive-*ollā* which continued down till the 19th century. This text has many instances of *ollā*. Tam. has *olluvadu* (Puranāṇ.), *olvai* (Kurundogai), *olvadu* (Kurund.), *ollum*, and the negatives *ollān*, *ollāy*, *ollēn*, *ollār*, *eṇmar*, *eṇmōṇ*, *eṇmadu*, *eṇmēdam* (*eṇnumēdam*) represent old forms of *en-* in the present text.

16. The type of *vaḷar-kk-*, *uyar-kk-* exists here beside that of *vaḷartt-* and *uyartt-*

17. Tense-forms with and without personal endings occur. The expletives-*idu* and *-udu* are also common.

The personal endings (with the augment-*aṇ-aṇ-*) *-aṇ-eṇ*, *-aṇ-ai*, *-aṇ-aṇ*, and those like *vaṇaṅginar*, *toḍaṅginan* appear to be Tamilisms.

The *y* of the second person singular ending *-āy* is often elided: *maṇannā*, *uḷavā*, *kaṇḍā*.

-aṇ as the personal ending for the first person future singular is quite frequent: *kaḷavan*, etc. (see below).

18. The present tense ending is *-ind-*. There are no instances showing *g-ind-*.

19. *āyinēn*, *pōyinār*, *āyiṇa*, *āṇa*, *pōṇa* are old forms.

Past stems like *tāṇṇ-* (< *tālṇn*-< *tālnd-*) *iṇṇ-*, *vāṇṇ-*, and *amiṇṇ-* occur.

The mss. show *kudaṇ-i-* and *kudaṇ-nnu-* as the past stems of *kudaṇ-*; similarly the older *eḷuninn-* and *eḷunētt-* appear side by side. The possibility of scribal interference cannot be ruled out here.

The occurrence of non-palatalised and palatalised stems like *vaitt-* and *vaicc-* has to be explained (as in other instances of the existence, side by side, of old forms and new developments) as due to the fact that both sets of forms may have been current in parts of Keraḷa in the transitional stages; cf. observations made *supra*.

20. The future with *-um* is used only for the third person non-rational singular and plural and third person rational

singular. For other persons, tense-forms with personal endings occur: First person: *konnīḍuvan*, *olippan*, *uraippan* [with the singular ending-*an* corresponding to Middle Tam. -*an* and old Tam. -*al*.], *ariyittu-kolṽōm*, *oḍukkuvōm*, *igal kiṭṭuvōm* [with the plural ending -*ōm*, also Middle Tam.]; second person: *kolṽāy*, *ulavā(y)*; *ilavāy* third person "rational" plural: *eṇmar*, (*emmar*), *uḷar-āvar*.

21. The mss. show besides *a* and *e* for the final vowel of the infinitives, a long *ā* also, particularly in pausal positions: *kaṇ-puṇal tuḷumbā*, *uraceyyā*.

cey-y-arudu, *cey-y-ā*, and *cey-y-ollā* are common; the elision of *a* of the infinitive is noteworthy. Old Tam. shows the first type in instances like *oḍukku-arum-*, *tunṇ-aruñ-curam*, *eṇṇ-ariya*, etc.—Negatives like *ceyyām-alla* also occur in this text.

22. The Relative Participles in constructions like the following are miniature predications and they have assumed their present function as the result of original non-rational plural predicates having been prefixed as *viśeṣaṇas* to their subjects: *civandaṇa muḷigaḷōḍum*, *ceydaṇa toḷilgaḷ* [where original past forms appear as relativals], *tūyō cilava* [where an original *kuṛippuvinaḷ* participial predicate *tūyava* is contracted to *tūyō* and used as a relational], *naḍamaḍuvō cila kēkinam* [where a future participial does the duty of an adjectival]. Campu constructions like *pāriccō cila pāragaḷum*, *karaññō piḷagaḷum* where minor predications are effected through the prefixing of past participials which were originally predicates belong to this category. *Dūtavākyam*, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam*, *Dēvimāhātmyam* and *Uttararāmāyaṇam* Gadyam show this type of construction with the present, past and future forms. The earlier Kauṭ. has forms in the future only: *āvō*, *ceyvō*, etc. (as predicates).

These forms appear as participial subjects also: *hastigaḷāvō kāḷingāḍigaḷ*. If the analogy of *av-v-āvō* < *av-v-ava* (*a* *o* on account of the bilabial, and lengthening of *ō* owing to emphasis) was active here, *ceyvō*, *āvō*, etc. of Kauṭ., were from non-rational plurals *ceyva* etc. (cf. Old Tam. *ceyba*, Middle Tam. *ceyva*) which were at once finites and participials.

23. Another type of west coast constructions in this text is furnished by illustrations like the following in which the relative participles (with final *a* elided) are followed by *oru*

(or *ōr*) and non-rational nouns (as *viśēṣyas*): (*nīla-p-*)*pōyoru* (*cōriyōḍu*), *connoru* (*nēram*), *eluvoru* (*nēram*).

In later stages of the west coast speech, both singulars and plurals, rationals and non-rationals came to be used as *viśēṣyas*. Though theoretically the combinations of past relative participles and *oru* are possible in Tamil, such combinations are non-existent in the literary dialects; on the other hand, the usual type of construction is the combination of the non-rational participial noun and *oru* (or *ōr*) followed by non-rational (very rarely, rational also in Middle Tamil) *viśēṣyas*. Thus Tam. type is represented in this text by instances like *mikkadōr tuyaram*, *muluttadōru cūlamuḍayōr*, *paḍarudaḍōr*, etc. There is no future relative participle as such in Tamil, and the west coast combinations of the type seem to have been due to analogy. The Tam. counterpart is of the type of *ceyvadōru*.

24. The concessive *ond-ēṇum* beside *ēṇṇāṇum* is noteworthy. Both—*āṇum* and *ēṇum* exist in Middle Tam., and I consider them to be modifications of *āyiṇum*.

25. Neuter future participial nouns with a gentle hortative force (as in Middle Tam. colloquial and in Kanaḍa): *koḍupṭudē*, *tirivudu*, *pūvūdu*.

Participial nouns show *-adu*, *-idu*, *-udu*, *-ūdu* (for future forms like *ōḍūdu*, and analogically for others) and *-īdu* (for forms like *kittīdu* < *kittī-y-adu*, and by analogy for *taruvīdu* and *ceyvīdu*).

The types of *koḷvavar* (cf. Tam. *koḷbavar*) and *ceyyum-avan* (cf. Tam. *ceyyumōṇ* and *ceyyumavan*) find representation here numerously.

26. Except in a few old forms like *ñāṇ uḷēṇ*, *collavallēṇ*, *aḍiyēṇ*, *aḍiyēṇṇāl*, *iruvirum* 'you two', this text shows only third personal appellatives: *vallōr*, *pollār*, *ollār*, *munṇēvar*, *kiḷakkēdu*, *annanāḍayāl*, *mencollāl*, *alagudu*.

27. The old "indeterminate" negative tense-forms with personal endings appear: *oṭṭēṇ*, *tērāy*, *aliyāṇ*, *tōḷadu*, *ariyār*, *ariyōm*, (*iva*) *cōpiyā*.

Unequivocal instances of tense-forms with *-ā* only (without personal endings) are *ceyḍadu pattā* and *uḍambu caliyā*. The form (*nī*) *aṛiyā* may be due to elision of *y* in *aṛiyāy*. The following instances in which the subjects are singular in form though capable of being interpreted as plural in meaning (accor-

ding to the spirit of an Old Tamil rule laid down in Tolkāppiyam) mark a transition stage which helped forward the association of negative forms (without personal endings) with singular subjects and then with rationals too: *kaṇṇīr nillā*, *vāṇāḷ cellā*, *nayanam ilagā*, *tuyaram vārā*, *uvavi curuññā*.

28. Other west coast forms: *ceydilla* (cf. Middle Tam. *ceydilen*, etc.), *vannilla*, *uṇarñilla*, *kandilēṇ*. Future negatives like *kolgilla*, *kūrugilla* and *ceygilla*.

ceyga-y-illa (denoting the future): cf. the Middle Tam. collocations *ceygai-y-illai* and *ceygai-y-uṇḍu* (common in the Vaiṣṇavite commentaries): *irikka-y-illa*, *uraikkayillē*, *moḷiga-yillē*.

ceyvilla (denoting the future): the Middle Tam. counterpart shows only *ceyvadillai*, but collocations formed of *ceyvu-kāṇbu*, *naḍappu* with *illai* are possible in Tamil. *ceppuvilla*, *varuvilla*, *kāṇmilla* are Mal. instances.

29. Negative forms with tense-affixes annexed to bases with *-ā*: *arudāyinnu* is the only instance here. Kauṭal. shows no instances of this type at all.

There are non-finite forms in this text: *aliv-illāyum-oru māyam*, *illāyumbōḷ*, *aṇiv-illāyvāṇ*, *ceṇukk-arudāyvāṇ*, *viḍāy-vadu*, *koḍāyvadinṇu*.

pōr ilaikk-aṇ-miṇ looks like a Tamilism.

30. Miscellaneous.

(i) *aḷavu* and *-aḷaviḷ* for denoting '(measure of) time', besides *-aḷavum*, *-aḷam*, *-aḷa*, *-oḷam*, and the development *-ōḷam*, all meaning 'till' 'up to the time when'. The hesitancy of forms continued down till the period of the Paṇikkars.

(ii) *adē-y-um-alla* (cf. a similar form in Kauṭ.) shows a restrictive *ē*. In modern *adē*, on the other hand, *ē* originally was restrictive, then became an emphatic particle without special reference to things restricted, and then faded out into an expletive.

The difference between *tēṇṇam ē* and *pirinilai ē* becomes conspicuous only when the contexts bring out the restriction or exclusion prominently. Since emphasis is always on negation (or exclusion) of the opposite of what is posited, the element of exclusion is always inherent in emphasis. This is why Neminādam regards *pirinilai ē* as a branch of the category of *tēṇṇam*.

(iii) The mss. show *ittana*, *ittina*, *ittira*, *attana* *attina*, *attrē*; *orikkāl* (cf. Tam. *orukkāl*) and *orikkal*.

(iv) *allō*, *allē* and *allī* (as in *ill-allī*, *all-allī*) are all here.

(v) The help-verb-*id-* appears as such when associated with past stems having final-*u-m* as in *cenn-id-*, and as-*id-* when associated with past stems having-*i* as in *tōnnid-*. Analogy has given rise to forms like *cenn-id-* also. Certain mss. show *collittu*, etc. where counter-analogy has been active (cf. Middle Tam.)

(vi) *madi* 'sufficiency' 'satisfaction' is perhaps the meaning in two contexts: *madi vannudilla*, and *uḍal muluppu madi-y-illa*, *madi* has other meanings in *madi keṭṭ-*, *madiye-nniyē* (*madi-y-illāda viravōḍu* 'with incalculable haste,' *madi-y-illā vidavagaḷ* 'widows besides themselves (with grief), *ennullil-idum-attal madikku ninnudilla* 'the sorrow accumulating in my heart could not be contained.) The collocations *madi-y-āg-*, *madi var-* and *madi pōr* 'to be sufficient' and the word *madi* used alone for 'enough' are not to be found here. *madi pōnnu*, *madi vannu*, *madi-y-āyi* were originally used as intransitive constructions with *madi* as subject but later became associated together as compound verbs with other words as subjects, as in *madi pōrum ninnude viḷayāṭṭam* (KR) and *madipōrum ninnude vīryaṇṇal* (E).

The occurrence, frequency or absence of grammatical types in long texts like *Rāmacaritam* and *Kauṭaliyam* do provide a presumptive value for their antiquity. If these texts, along with the fourteenth century *Lil.*, are examined together comparatively, the perspective emerges that *Rāmacaritam* has linguistic features neither so old as those of *Kauṭaliyam* nor so "late" as those of *Lil*. Here are the relevant data:

<i>Kauṭ.</i>	<i>Rāmacaritam</i>	<i>Lilātilakam</i>
Fourth case forms	- <i>n-ku</i> , - <i>in-ku</i>	
like <i>eṇku</i> , <i>endinṅku</i>	absent.— - <i>n-u-kku</i>	only- <i>n-u</i>
beside <i>marattinukku</i>	- <i>in-u-kku</i> beside	- <i>in-u</i>
and <i>marattinu</i>	- <i>n-u</i> and - <i>in-u</i>	
Fifth case <i>in-il</i> ,	<i>in-il</i> only in	
also used in the	the seventh case	no- <i>in-</i>
seventh case		- <i>il</i> at all
Sixth case <i>uḍaya</i>	only- <i>uḍe</i> and	<i>uḍe</i> ,
and <i>uḍe</i> , <i>iḍe</i>	rarely- <i>iḍe</i>	<i>iḍe</i> , - <i>n-d-e</i>
Rarity of qualificatory <i>ē</i>	Rarity	Frequency

Present tense

endings <i>g-ind-</i> and <i>-ind</i>	only <i>-ind-</i>	<i>-ind-</i>
No negative tenses with tense-affixes annexed to neg. base with <i>-ā</i> .	<i>arudāyinnu</i> , <i>arudāyvān</i> <i>illāyum</i> , etc.	<i>tārayum-ō</i> , etc.
Old Indeterminate negative finites with personal endings <i>ceyvidoru</i> type	Beginnings of Nega- tive finites with <i>ā</i> . <i>ceyvorū</i> beside <i>ceyvi-</i> <i>doru</i>	<i>pirāṭṭi tārā</i> Both types

Other details roughly fit into the above picture. So, one has to "place" Rāmacaritam somewhere between the period of the language of Kauṭaliyam and that of the linguistic evolution of the native elements of the maṇipravāḷa envisaged by Līlātilakam and reflected in early works like Uṇṇinīlisandēśam.

THE CONCEPT OF PRAUDHOKTI IN ALANKĀRAŚĀSTRA

BY

K. A. SUBRAMANIA IYER,

Professor of Sanskrit, University of Lucknow.

In the development of any system of thought, fine distinctions play an important part. This is as true of the alaṅkāra-śāstra as of any of the darśanas. In the Dhvani system, for example, certain fundamental distinctions are made and one has to understand the full implication of these distinctions if one wants to understand the system at all. The distinctions between अविवक्षितवाच्य and विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्य ; असंलक्ष्यक्रम and संलक्ष्यक्रम ; शब्दशक्त्युद्भव and अर्थशक्त्युद्भव ; वस्तु, अलंकार and रसादि ; अभिधामूल and लक्षणामूल ; अर्थान्तरसंक्रामित and अत्यन्ततिरस्कृत ; अभिधा, लक्षणा and व्यंजना, all these distinctions are fundamental in the Dhvani system. Another distinction which is mentioned in the earliest work on the Dhvani system, namely, the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, is that of the suggestive element in poetry into स्वतः संभवि and प्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न. What is the basis of this distinction and how is it related to the other distinctions and principles of the Dhvani system?

Before answering this question, let us consider the distinction between वस्तु and अलंकार. By 'vastu' is meant any plain unvarnished idea or thought or statement. It may or may not be thought or statement of an actual fact existing outside the mind. The essential thing about it is that it is just a plain thought or statement. When we just say something about something else, we are giving expression to 'vastu'. It does not matter whether what we say is positive or negative, whether it is true or false. Both affirmations and negations would come under 'vastu'¹. It is easy to see that a good proportion of our statements in everyday life and those of poets in their poems give expression to 'vastu'. This can be illustrated from the works of any Sanskrit poet. "King

(1) स च विधिनिषेधाद्यनेकप्रकारो वस्तुशब्देनोच्यते

Locana on Dhvanyāloka, p. 50 (Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 135),

Dilīpa and Queen Sudakṣiṇā touched the feet of Vasiṣṭha and Arundhatī who, being pleased, gave them their blessings¹. This is a good example of 'vastu'. It just states facts or presents certain things as facts, without adorning them in any way. The poet here has not used his imagination or fancy to beautify these facts in any way. "While the divine sage Aṅgiras was speaking thus, Pārvatī, seated near her father with her bent head counted the lotus-petals with which she was playing". So says Kālidāsa in his Kumārasaṁbhava² and the whole of it is 'vastu'. It is not necessary to go to poetry to find examples of 'vastu'. No matter in what language we speak, we are most of the time giving expression to simple thoughts or understanding simple thoughts from the words of others. Usually we express them in sentences consisting of two or more words, but this is not a necessary condition. What we understand when somebody says 'yes' to our question is as good a 'vastu' as any which we may understand from a long sentence consisting of many words.

What 'vastu' is can be better understood if one contrasts it with 'alaṅkāra' or a picturesque idea or statement. An idea which has been made picturesque in any way by the fancy or imagination of the speaker is an 'alaṅkāra'. Ideas become picturesque when they involve some kind of striking comparison or contrast between any two things in the world. Thus when Kālidāsa, after having first declared his own inadequacy to the task of describing the exploits of the kings of the solar dynasty says that perhaps he would be able to accomplish it by following the path made for him by earlier poets as the thread enters the diamond through the hole made by the borer,³ he is giving expression to an idea made picturesque by the striking comparison which it contains. It required the imagination of

- (1) तयोर्जगद्गतुः पादान् राजा राज्ञी च मागधी ।
तौ गुरुगुरुपत्नी च प्रीत्या प्रतिनन्दतुः ॥

Raghuvamśa, I. 57.

- (2) एवं वादिनि देवर्षौ पार्श्वे पितुरधोमुखी ।
लीलाकमलपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती ॥

Kumārasaṁbhava, VI. 84.

- (3) अथवा कृतवाग्द्वारे वंशेऽस्मिन् पूर्वसूरिभिः ।
मणौ वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः ॥

Raghuvamśa I, 4.

a Kālidāsa to see the resemblance and it is the resemblance which makes the idea picturesque. One can quite see the difference between this and a plain unvarnished idea such as the one given before. For an idea or a statement to become picturesque, it is not always necessary that it should involve comparison or contrast between two things. In what is called वक्रोक्ति, there is a deliberate misunderstanding of the question followed by a witty answer. The question: "Who in the world made your heart so hard?" (दारुणा) evokes the answer: "We have heard that the heart is made of the three guṇas, but not that it is made of wood (दारुणा)¹. This idea does not involve any comparison or contrast between any two things in the world. With all that, there is in it a certain picturesqueness or विच्छित्ति,² as our writers sometimes call it and विच्छित्ति is just what is lacking in a mere 'vastu'. The mere addition of a significant epithet as in परिकर,³ the presentation of a relation of cause and effect as in काव्योलङ्कार⁴ and कारणमाला⁵, of some inner contradiction or incongruity as in विषम⁶ and असंगति⁷ can also

(1) अहो केनेदृशी बुद्धिदारुणा तव निर्मिता ।

त्रिगुणा श्रूयते बुद्धिर्न तु दारुमयी कचित् ॥

Alaṅkārasarvasva, p. 221. (Nirṇaya Sāgar Edition).

(2) अलंकारो विच्छित्तिः इत्येव खलु वस्त्वलंकारयोर्विभागकक्ष्या । यदा जातिगुणादिकोऽर्थो वैचित्र्यविरहालौकिकभावेन व्यवस्थितस्तदा वस्तुमात्रमुच्यते । तदेव सविच्छित्तिकमलंकार इति ।

(Saṁpradāya pradarśinī on Kāvyaaprakāśa, Vol. I, p. 152
(T. S. S. Edition).

(3) सुधांशुकलितोत्तंसस्तापं हरतु वः शिवः ।

(Kuvālayānanda, p. 71. Nirṇaya Sāgara Edition).

(4) जितोऽसि मन्द कन्दर्प मच्चित्तेऽस्ति त्रिलोचनः ।

(Ibid, p. 127).

(5) नयेन श्रीः श्रिया त्यागस्त्यागेन विपुलं यशः ।

(Ibid, p. 17).

(6) केयं शिरीषमृद्वङ्गी क तावान् मदनज्वरः ।

(Ibid, p. 105).

(7) अहो खलुजङ्गस्य विचित्रोऽयं वधक्रमः ।

अन्यस्य दशति श्रोत्रमन्यः प्राणैर्वियुज्यते ॥

(Ibid, p. 102).

have a picturesqueness which would entitle it to the name of अलंकार. The 'vicchitti' which distinguishes an 'alaṅkāra' from 'vastu' is the result of the poet's poetic gift, his 'pratibhā'. An idea possessing 'vicchitti' is प्रतिभानिर्वर्तित. That which does not possess it is लौकिकभावेन व्यवस्थितः, "as it is in the world", The poet's imagination has done nothing to it.

Both these things, 'vastu' and 'alaṅkāra' can be the first or the second or the only meaning of a passage. Both can be conveyed by अभिधा or by व्यञ्जना. When they are conveyed by अभिधा and are the first meanings of a passage they become responsible for conveying the second meaning. They are then said to be व्यञ्जक and the second meaning which they suggest is व्यङ्ग्य. Thus there are four possibilities: (1) both the व्यञ्जक and the व्यङ्ग्य meanings are 'vastu' (2) both are alaṅkāra (3) the first is वस्तु and the second alaṅkāra and (4) the first is alaṅkāra and the second वस्तु. In their capacity as व्यञ्जक, i.e., when they happen to be the first meaning of a passage, the śāstra makes a further distinction. They can be either स्वतःसंभवि or कविप्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न. It is this distinction which we have now to grasp. We saw above that 'vastu' is something in the production of which the poet's imagination does not play a great part. It is a simple unvarnished idea. It presents a thing as it exists in the world and not as the poet's imagination shapes it. How then can it be कविप्रौढोक्तिसिद्ध? This is one question. Secondly we saw above that 'vicchitti' is the very life of an 'alaṅkāra' and 'vicchitti' is the result of the influence of the poet's imagination. It is always कविप्रतिभानिर्वर्तित. And yet an 'alaṅkāra' can also be स्वतःसंभवि or कविप्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न. How is this possible? Is there any difference between कविप्रतिभानिर्वर्तित and कविप्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न? Apparently not. Consider how Mammaṭa explains प्रौढोक्तिमात्रात् सिद्धः । He says: कविना प्रतिभामात्रेण बहिरसन्नपि निर्मितः Thus there is a close connection between the two ideas. But there must be some difference too, because an alaṅkāra which is always प्रतिभानिर्वर्तित is sometimes not प्रौढोक्तिमात्रनिष्पन्न.

To understand these distinctions it is necessary to see what meaning has been given to the word प्रौढोक्ति by the different

writers who have used the word and who have given illustrations of it. The word is used in different contexts in the śāstra of which the following three are noteworthy:—

1. It is one of the alaṅkāras recognised by such writers as Jayadeva, Appayya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha.

2. It is used by Ruṃyaka (or Maṅkhaka) while he is explaining the views of Bhaṭṭanāyaka on poetry.

3. It is used in Dhvanyāloka, Kāvyaaprakāśa and other works explaining the Dhvani system in connection with the explanation of the nature of the meaning which is suggestive (व्यंजक) in Dhvani.

1. It is only in comparatively later works that प्रौढोक्ति is recognised as a separate 'alaṅkāra'. Jayadeva in his Candrāloka, Appayya Dīkṣita in his Kuvalayānanda and Jagannātha in his Rasagaṅgādhara do so and their definitions of it substantially agree. For Jayadeva, it consists in attributing to something a capacity which it does not possess. "Growing on the banks of Kālindī, the Sarala trees are dark."¹ For Appayya Dīkṣitā, the essence of it is to declare something as the cause of a peculiarity while it is really not so. "Hair which is dark like tamāla trees growing on the banks of the Kālindī"². In both these examples, the darkness of the trees is attributed to the fact of their growing on the banks of the Kālindī. This is just a free statement of the speaker and does not correspond to reality. Jagannātha, with his passion for analysis and accuracy, puts the whole thing thus: For him, it consists in imagining a relation with something known to possess a certain attribute in order to explain the presence of that attribute elsewhere. To explain the reviving and compelling qualities of the king's glances, the poet says that they have been made of drops of nectar mixed with medicinal herbs. Nectar possesses reviving properties and medicinal herbs possess compelling qualities. As the king's

(1) प्रौढोक्तिस्तदशक्तस्य तच्छक्तत्वावकल्पनम् ।

कलिन्दजातीरुहाः श्यामलाः सरलद्रुमाः ॥

Candrāloka, p. 53 (Gujarāthi Printing Press Edition).

(2) प्रौढोक्तिरुत्कर्षाहेतौ तद्वेतुत्वप्रकल्पनम् ।

कचाः कलिन्दजातीरतमालस्तोममेचकाः ॥

Kuvalayānanda, p. 135 (N. S. Edition).

glances possess both, their mixture is conceived of as the material out of which the king's glances were produced. This particular relationship of material and product does not exist outside the poet's mind. It is his invention.¹ Jagannātha adds the significant remark that the peculiarity in one thing which is due to contact with something else must be suggested and not expressed. Otherwise the whole passage would become an example of समालंकार.² The only thing which we have to note in the treatment of this ālaṅkāra by these three writers is that, according to them, the speaker makes a statement which does not correspond to facts. He makes a bold statement, प्रौढा उक्तिः । Hence the figure is called प्रौढोक्तिः ।

This is certainly an old meaning of the word, even when it is not used as the name of an ālaṅkāra. In the Alaṅkārasarvasva, the author sums up, in a very brief manner, the views of Bhaṭṭanāyaka on poetry. He says that Bhaṭṭanāyaka who had declared the व्यंग्य which he accepts through प्रौढोक्ति to be only an element in poetry maintains that it is the व्यापार which is the most important thing in poetry, words and meanings being subordinate.³ What is meant by accepting व्यंग्य through प्रौढोक्ति? On this point, there is an interesting remark of Jayaratha, the commentator of Alaṅkārasarvasva. He says that प्रौढोक्त्या means: "without defining it". The प्रौढत्व of a statement consists just in this that it accepts something as true

(1) कस्मिंश्चिदर्थे किञ्चिद्धर्मकृतातिशयप्रतिपिपादयिषया प्रसिद्धतद्धर्मवता संसर्ग-
स्योद्भावनं प्रौढोक्तिः ।.....

मन्थाचलभ्रमणवेगवशंवदा ये

दुग्धांबुधेरुदपतन्नणवः सुधायाः ।

तैरेकतामुपगतैर्विविधौषधीभि-

र्धाता ससर्ज तव देव दयादृगन्तान् ॥

(Rasagaṅgādhara, p. 671, N. S. Edition 1939).

(2) अत्र च धर्मिविशेषसंसर्गातिशयो धर्म्यन्तरगतो यद्यागूरणविषयस्तदैवाय-
मलंकारः । वाच्यवृत्त्या तत्प्रयुक्तत्वेनाभिहितश्चेत् समालंकारस्यैव विषयः ।

(Ibid. p. 671).

(3) भट्टनायकेन तु व्यंग्यव्यापारस्य प्रौढोक्त्याभ्युपगतस्य काव्यांशत्वं ब्रुवता न्यग्भा-
वितशब्दार्थस्वरूपस्य व्यापारस्यैव प्राधान्यमुक्तम् ।

(Alaṅkārasarvasva, p. 10. Nirṇaya Sagara Press).

which cannot be defined.¹ Apparently, Bhaṭṭanāyaka was one of those who held that Dhvani or व्यंजना may exist, but it is undefinable and therefore does not come within the range of speech. Anybody who undertakes to speak about it and define it and describe it is indulging in प्रौढोक्ति, he is talking about something which he does not know very well, he is making a bold statement, प्रौढा अक्तिः। So the meaning which we saw before can be traced here also.

But it is the use of the word in the context of Dhvani with which we are really concerned. The first suggestive meaning of a passage can be, first of all, a वस्तु or an 'alankāra'. Each one of these can be स्वतःसंभवि or प्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न. If the thing described can have an existence outside the speaker's mind also and is not merely a creation of his mind it is स्वतः संभवि. If otherwise, it is प्रौढोक्तिनिष्पन्न। In the verse सजेहि सुरहिमासो etc. the main idea is that the spring merely gets ready, but does not deliver cupid's arrows whose targets are young ladies and which consist mainly of mango blossoms.² This way of putting it or this statement (उक्ति) that spring, the arrow-maker, merely gets ready for Cupid the archer, but does not deliver the arrows in the form of flowers is particularly capable (प्रौढा or कुशला) of conveying the suggested meaning that love is just coming into being and will gradually increase in intensity. The basic idea, free from all embellishment by the poet, is that in spring mango blossoms come out together with tender leaves. But this idea has not got the same suggestiveness. It had to be transformed by the speaker's imagination and the transformation consists in making spring चेतन (though it is really अचेतेन) cupid an archer, flowers into arrows and young ladies into targets. Ānandavardhana gives another verse where a similar

(1) कैश्चिदप्यस्य वागविषयत्वादलक्षणीयत्वमुक्तमित्याह भट्टनायकेनेत्यादि । प्रौढोक्त्येति । न पुनर्लक्षणकरणेन । अत एवोक्तेः प्रौढत्वं यल्लक्षयितुमशक्यं तस्याप्यभ्युपगमः ॥

Ibid. p. 10.

(2) सजेहि सुरहिमासो ण दाव अपेइ जुअइजणलक्खमुहे ।

अहिणवसअआरमुहे णवपल्लवपत्तले अणङ्गस्स शरे ॥

Dhvanyāloka, p. 235 (Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 135).

idea is expressed, but without this प्रौढोक्ति: "Once the spring begins, all of a sudden appear longings of lovers together with mango-blossoms."¹ What is suggested in the previous verse by the प्रौढोक्ति of the poet is here openly stated (रागवतामुत्कलिकाः) and that accounts for the comparative dullness of this verse. As Abhinava puts it: शब्दस्पष्टेऽर्थे का हृद्यता ?² Even though the basic idea has been transformed by the प्रौढोक्ति of the poet, there is no 'alaṅkāra' here. On this point, there is agreement among all writers. The verse in question is an example of the suggestiveness of वस्तु, but प्रौढोक्तिसिद्धवस्तु. In the other examples of the same thing given in the Dhvanyāloka or other works on Alaṅkāraśāstra, there is usually a description of something non-human acting like a human. In one of these examples, the lover, on seeing the parrot bite the red 'bimba' fruit, asks the beloved "On what mountain did this parrot perform austerities and of what kind and for how long that he should now be able to taste the fruit red like your lips"³. Here also the idea of a parrot performing austerities on a mountain is a product of the speaker's imagination and there is nothing corresponding to it outside his mind. With all that, it has not become an 'alaṅkāra'. But it is clear that such bold statements (प्रौढोक्ति) presuppose a certain amount of प्रतिभा on the part of the person who makes them. These statements are, therefore, not only प्रौढोक्तिनिन्न, they are also प्रतिभानिर्वर्तित. We have seen how some bold statements came to be recognised as 'alaṅkāras' in later times, those in which something which is not a cause is presented by implication as a cause. In the examples which we have just now considered, this has not taken place and that is why this प्रौढोक्ति is not an alaṅkāra. It only brings about a

(1) सुरभिसमये प्रवृत्ते सहसा प्रादुर्भवन्ति रमणीयाः ।

रागवतामुत्कलिकाः सहैव सहकारकलिकाभिः ॥

Dhvanyāloka, p. 528 (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 135).

(2) Ibid. p. 528.

(3) शिखरिणि क्वनु नाम कियच्चिरं

किमभिधानमसावकरोत्तपः ।

तरुणि येन तवाधरपाटलं

दशति विवफलं शुक्लशवकः ॥

Dhvanyāloka, p. 138 (K. S. S. 135)

'vastu'. But this may only be the convention of a particular culture. Such bold statements may be looked upon as an 'alaṅkāra' or figures of speech in another critical tradition.

We have seen that an idea is looked upon as प्रौढोक्तिसिद्ध if it is merely the product of the speaker's imagination and has nothing corresponding to it outside his mind. If, in addition to being such a product, it also assumes one of the forms which have been recognised as alaṅkāras, then it becomes प्रौढोक्तिसिद्धालंकार. One of these forms is called उत्प्रेक्षा, the essence of which is that in it the speaker makes an imaginative interpretation of reality. Nowhere is the play of the speaker's fancy or imagination so clear as in उत्प्रेक्षा. And yet even an उत्प्रेक्षा can be स्वतःसंभवि or प्रौढोक्तिसिद्ध. The following example will make this clear:

(1) "When he rose to embrace her, her pride (māna) as though afraid of being squashed, quietly slipped out of her heart".¹

(2) "Hail to the Poetic Muse, seated on the lotus of the poet's mouth, who, as though to mock at Brahmā, presents a different world altogether."²

In both the above examples, there is on the part of the poet, a fanciful interpretation of a natural fact. In the first example, the disappearance of pride under the circumstances mentioned is the fact which is interpreted. In the second one, the deviation from reality of the poet's creation is the fact which is interpreted. In both, the interpretation is such that there cannot be anything corresponding to it in reality. Pride being afraid of being squashed can only be a poet's fancy. The Poet's Muse wishing to mock at Brahma is equally so. Both these ideas have the form of interpretation (संभावना). They are, therefore, both प्रौढोक्तिसिद्धोत्प्रेक्षा. But such an imaginative interpretation may yet have some reality corresponding to it. When the lover says: "Your feet are red as though

- (1) गाढालिंगणरहसुज्जु उग्मिद्धए लघुं समोसरइ ।

माणंसिणीण माणो पीलणभीअ त्व हिअआहिं ॥

Kāvya Prakāśa, p. 141. (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona).

- (2) जाटेरं व हसन्ती कहअणंबुरुहबद्धविणिवेसा ।

दावेइ भुअणमण्डलमणं विअइ जअइ सा वाणी ॥

Kāvya Prakāśa, p. 142 (B. O. R. I., Poona).

through constant stamping on the ground"¹, we can see that even outside the poet's fancy feet can become red through constant stamping. It is clear that only he who has 'pratibhā' is capable of producing a beautiful interpretation of a natural fact, but when it is allied to fancy, the result is an interpretation which has nothing corresponding to it in reality. It is not only उत्प्रेक्षा which can be the product of प्रौढोक्ति, Rūpaka can also be one. When the poet says to his patron, the king: "Your sword, the snake which takes a delight in drinking milk in the form of the lives of your simple enemies",² the identification of sword and snake can only be a product of fancy and it has assumed the form of a Rūpaka. The identification of two things which are different from each other is the essence of Rūpaka and it is only natural that the poet's 'praudhokti' should play a part in it. The alaṅkāra Hetu can be प्रौढोक्तिसिद्ध too. "The necklace, being of a good jāti, does not budge".³ The necklace is made of pearls of good quality (jāti). This is identified with the idea of belonging to a good caste ('jāti') and is given as the reason for not budging. Such a reason can only be the fancy of the poet. But sometimes the 'hetu' can be स्वतःसिद्ध. "As I am born in this world, it is clear, O Purāri, that I did not worship you in my previous existence. Please excuse me for the sin".⁴ Here not worshipping Śiva in the previous existence is presented as the cause of the sin. It is not a mere fancy of the poet. That one who is not 'mukta' may be born again in this world is an accepted idea and the poet is only making use of it.

In all the examples given above, one can see that the concept of प्रौढोक्तिसिद्ध differs from that of स्वतःसंभवि on the one hand and from that of कविप्रतिभानिर्वर्तित on the other. This is the position which is accepted by most writers. The only exceptions are Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra, who see प्रौढोक्ति even in स्वतःसंभवि and developing this idea, they virtu-

- (1) रक्तौ तवांग्री सततं भुविविक्षेपणाद् ध्रुवम् ।
(Kūvalayānanda, p. 32, N. S. Edition).
- (2) मुग्धारिप्राणदुग्धाशनमसृणुरचिस्त्वत्कृगणो भुजङ्गः ।
(Rasagaṅgādhara, p. 171 (N. S. Edition, 1939).
- (3) विसुद्वजार्ण चलइ से हारो ।
Kāvya prakāśa, p. 160 (B. O. R. I.).
- (4) Kāvya prakāśa, p. 678 (B. O. R. I. Edition).

ally do away with the distinction between प्रतिभा and प्रौढि while explaining the alaṅkāra called Jāti (another name for स्वभावोक्ति. Hemacandra points out that the pratibhā of a poet is like निर्विकल्पप्रत्यक्ष. It sees the distinctive features and characteristics of a thing and the description of these as seen by the poet constitutes what is called 'Jāti'. Besides these distinctive features objects have also common ordinary features (सामान्य) but a description of these alone would not constitute poetry. They are really the अलङ्कार्य, the thing to be adorned. So, even when a thing is described as it is in the world, the poet has to describe its distinctive features and not its common features. It requires the imagination of a poet to see them. For one who is not a poet, these distinctive features are as good as non-existent. If what is called स्वतःसंभवि वस्तु stands for these distinctive features of an object, perceptible only by a sensitive mind like that of a poet's, then it is also the product of the poet's 'pratibhā', it is कविप्रतिभानिर्वर्तित. It is this pratibhā which is called कविप्रौढि and it plays a part, not only in seeing the actually existing distinctive features of a thing (स्वतःसंभवि वस्तु) but also in creating purely imaginative features. The distinctive features of an object, visible only to a gifted poet, constitute its स्वभाव and their description is what is called स्वभावोक्ति. For Hemachandra what is called स्वतःसंभवि वस्तु is this स्वभाव and therefore, it is the product of कविप्रौढि. In this way of looking at things, the distinction between प्रौढि and प्रतिभा disappears. The earlier 'ālaṅkārikas' had made a distinction between the gift of being able to see actually existing distinctive features of a thing and that of creating imaginative features. For Hemacandra, this distinction is not sufficiently important for making a distinction between प्रतिभा and प्रौढि. In putting forward this new way of looking at things, he quotes some verses from the Vyaktiviveka of Mahimabhaṭṭa, where the recognition of स्वभावोक्ति as a distinct alaṅkāra is justified. Mahimā explains स्वभाव as the distinctive features of a thing visible only to a poet.¹ Hemachandra

(28) कविप्रतिभया निर्विकल्पकप्रत्यक्षकल्पया विषयीकृता वस्तुस्वभावा यत्रो-
पवर्ण्यन्ते स जातेर्विषयः । एवं च “अलङ्कारकृतां येषां स्वभावोक्तिरलङ्कृतिः ।

applies this definition of स्वभाव to the distinction between स्वतःसंभवि and प्रौढोक्तिविद्. Mānikyacandra does no more than repeat the words of Hemacandra on this point. According to both, the principle of प्रौढोक्ति will explain all the suggestive meanings of poetry and there is no need for dividing it into three as the early Dhvanivādins do or even into two as some writers like Jagannātha Paṇḍita do.

अलंकार्यतया तेषां किमन्यदवशिष्यते ॥ इति यत् कैश्चित् प्रतिपादितम् तन्निर-
स्तमेव । वस्तुनो हि सामान्यस्वभावो लौकिकोऽर्थोऽलङ्कार्यः । कविप्रतिभासंभवि-
शेषविषयस्तु लोकोत्तरार्थोऽलङ्करणमिति । तथा चाह 'उच्यते वस्तुनस्तावद्
द्वैरूप्यमिह विद्यते । तत्रैकमन्यसामान्यं यद्विकल्पैकगोचरः । स एव सर्वशब्दानां
विषयः परिकीर्तितः । अत एवाभिधीयन्ते ध्यामलं बोधमन्यलम् । विशिष्टमस्य
यद् रूपं तत्प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः । स एव सत्कविगिरां गोचरः प्रतिभाभुवाम् ॥ यतः
“रसानुगुणशब्दार्थचिन्तास्तिमितचेतसः । क्षणं स्वरूपस्पर्शोत्था प्रज्ञैव प्रतिभा कवेः ।
सा हि चक्षुर्भगवतस्तृतीयमिति गीयते । येन साक्षात्कारोऽप्येव भावस्त्रैकाल्यवर्तिनः ।
अस्य स्वभावस्योक्तिर्या सालङ्कारतया मता । यतः साक्षादिवाभान्ति तत्रार्थाः
प्रतिभार्पिताः ।

A QUOTATION IN THE LOCANA OF ABHINAVAGUPTA

Dr. V. RAGHAVAN

In his Locana on Uddyota One of the Dhvanyāloka, p. 48, N. S. Press edn., p 245, KSRI. edn., Abhinavagupta makes the quotation 'गामश्च पुरुषं पशुम्.' While preparing the Index to the KSRI. edn. of the Dhvanyāloka with Locana etc., (Uddyota One), I gave for this the reference 'Atharvaveda 8.7.11', where such a line occurs. The identification caused some difficulty and I was not quite satisfied with the reference to Ath. V. 8.7.11 which alone I could give then.

I have now been able to find the source where from Abhinavagupta must have quoted it. It is in the course of his commentary on the expression 'वाच्यवाचकसंमिश्रः शब्दात्मा काव्यम्' in Ānandavardhana's text that Abhinavagupta quotes this passage. Abhinavagupta's characteristic mano-dharma comes into play here, and he interprets the original as meaning that all the four are called Dhvani, the Vācya, Vācaka, their Sammiśra or the Vyaṅgya that results from the union of Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc., and lastly Śabda or Śabdana, i.e. the Vyañjanā vyāpāra.

“वाच्यवाचकसहितः संमिश्र इति मध्यमपदलोपी समासः । 'गामश्च पुरुषं पशुम्' इतिवत् समुच्चयोऽत्र चकारेण विनापि । तेन वाच्योऽपि ध्वनिः, वाचकः शब्दोऽपि ध्वनिः, * * संमिश्रितः (or संमिश्र्यते) विभावानुभाव-संवलनयेति व्यङ्ग्योऽपि ध्वनिः * * शब्दनं शब्दः शब्दव्यापारः * * सोऽपि ध्वननाद् ध्वनिः । * *

For such an interpretation, the word 'ca' would appear to be necessary to join the expressions वाच्यवाचकसंमिश्रश्च शब्दात्मा च । But Abhinavagupta says that there are expressions giving a cumulative sense even without the use of 'ca' and it is to illustrate this that he cites the expression 'गामश्च पुरुषं पशुम्' with the explanation इतिवत्समुच्चयोऽत्र चकारेण विनापि ।

In view of the point involved in this illustration I think it is from the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and a verse quoted there. In that Abhinavagupta is making his citation. In Pāṇini 2.2.29

चार्थे द्वन्द्वः and the Vārttika thereon चार्थे द्वन्द्ववचनेऽसमासेऽपि चार्थसंप्रत्ययादनिष्टप्रसङ्गः, Patañjali says:—

चार्थे द्वन्द्ववचनेऽसमासेऽपि चार्थसंप्रत्ययादनिष्टं प्राप्नोति ।

अहरहर्नयमानो गामश्वं पुरुषं पशुम् * ।

वैवस्वतो न तृप्यति सुराया इव दुर्मदी ॥

Keilhorn's edn., Vol. I. p. 431.

* This line is quoted anonymously in Kṣīrasvāmin's Nīpātā-vyayopasargavṛtti (Madras MS) also.

A NOTE ON THE REIGN OF KHOṬṬIGA

BY

PROF. K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI

It is well-known that in the reign of Khoṭṭiga the Rāṣṭrakūṭa capital Mānyakhēṭa was raided and plundered by the Paramāra king Harṣa Siyaka. A clause in the celebrated Śravana Belgola Epitaph of Mārasimha II, the Ganga Feudatory of Khoṭṭiga, states that Mārasimha protected the emperor's camp on this occasion. Fleet read it as follows¹ :—

Bhuja-baḷa-paripālita-Mānyakhēṭa-pravēṣita-
cakravarti-kaṭakasya

and translated into "Who by the strength of his arm protected the encampment of the Emperor, when it was located at the city of Mānyakhēṭa". He added a note under the word "Pravēṣita" saying: "Mr. Rice's text has "Pravēṣita, which of course, at once suggested pravāsita 'expelled (from Mānyakhēṭa)'. The real reading is quite clear". The lithograph accompanying Fleet's edition clearly shows the reading 'pravāsita' and, pace Fleet, I prefer the emendation 'pravāsita' to 'pravēṣita'. For the latter would mean that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa camp was made to enter Mānyakhēṭa, but Mānyakhēṭa was the capital of the kingdom and the regular residence of the Emperor. Fleet's translation that the encampment was located at Mānyakhēṭa does not do full justice to the word. It may be suggested indeed that Khoṭṭiga was compelled to confine himself within the walls of Mānyakhēṭa by the invading Paramāra armies but then Mārasimha is said to have successfully protected the Emperor's camp which is exactly what no one was able to do to Mānyakhēṭa which on that occasion had to be abandoned to the enemy and was thoroughly plundered by him. So we have to assume that as a result of the Paramāra invasion the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king was compelled to abandon his capital and remove his camp to some place further south where Mārasimha was able to stabilise the defence. Pravāsita, 'expelled', seems therefore to be the correct reading of the word.

A TEXTUAL NOTE ON BRĤATKATHAKOŚA

B. CH. CHHABRA, Ootacamund

Ācārya Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathākośa* is a collection of 157 edifying stories that glorify the Jaina faith. The work dates from 932 A. C. Its language is Sanskrit and composition metrical throughout. Here and there it quotes a verse from elsewhere by way of illustration. Verse 78 of the tenth story, entitled *Somaśarma-Vāriṣeṇa-sthirikaraṇa-kathānaka*, is one such quotation. In the printed text,¹ it reads:

*Yān=īha dattāni purā narendrair
dānāni dharm-ārtha-yaśaskarāṇi |
Nirmālya-vat saṁprati mānitāni
ko nāma sādhuḥ punar ādadīta ||*

The third line of this stanza is plainly a misfit here. It does not make a good sense. Possibly the reading given in the available manuscripts was doubtful, and the editor obviously had no means of restoring the correct text here. The verse in question, it may be pointed out, occurs in its correct form in many an old copper charter, along with other exhortative stanzas customary to land grants.² The genuine reading of the third quarter, as found there, is *nirmālya-vānta-pratimāni tāni*.

It may readily be recognised that the word *vānta* was elusive in the manuscripts. The context of the story will further show that whatever aptness of the quotation there is depends solely on this very word *vānta*, meaning 'vomited' or 'matter vomited', as without it the verse will be altogether out of place in its present setting. The story aims at conveying the horrid feeling of repulsion by painting a picture of a boy indulging in the eating up of vomited food (*chardi-bhakṣaṇaka*) and that is what occasions the quotation.

1. Dr. A. N. Upadhye's edition, No. 17 of the Singhi Jain Series, Bombay, 1943, p. 16.

2. See, for example, *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXII, p. 85, verse 41; Vol. XXVI, p. 203, text line 42.

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE THIRD FOUNDATION DAY

The Third Foundation Day Celebrations and the Annual General Body Meeting of the Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, were held on Thursday 21st August, 1947, at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore, Madras. A distinguished audience was present. In the unavoidable absence of Prof. M. Hiriyanna, Sri. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriar, President of the Institute, presided. Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, Government Epigraphist, Ootacamund, delivered the Foundation Day Address.

At the General Body Meeting held earlier on the day, the Annual Report, the audited statement of Accounts and the Budget for the coming year were presented by the Secretaries. Duly moved and seconded by Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri and Sri T. Chandrasekhara Dikshitar, the Annual Report, Accounts and Budget were adopted.

Rao Bahadur K. V. Krishnaswami Iyer then moved the following resolution:

“Resolved that this meeting condemns the dastardly attack on our distinguished Vice-President, Sachivottama Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, and prays for his speedy recovery to normal health.” Sri N. Ragunatha Aiyar seconded and the resolution was passed.

Sir T. R. Venkatarama Sastriar then moved the following condolence resolution from the chair:

“Resolved that this meeting records its great sense of sorrow on the death of Sri T. R. Seshadri Sarma, former Librarian of the Institute,

Sri T. R. Vriddagiri Sarma, a Fellow of the Institute.

Sri B. Sitarama Rao, a Fellow of the Institute,

and Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar, a Vice-President of the Institute,

and begs to express its high appreciation of the valuable services rendered by them to the Institute and cause of oriental learning.

The resolution was passed, the members standing.

On the motion of Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, duly seconded by Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama

Aiyar, the following resolution was passed raising the annual subscription of the Journal of Oriental Research by Rupees two.

“Resolved that the annual subscription of the Journal of Oriental Research be raised to Rs. 8 (Foreign 14 shillings) from volume XVI onwards, in view of the increased cost of printing and paper.”

On the motion of Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, the existing office-bearers were re-elected for another term with the addition of Dr. Rm. Alagappa Chettiar, D. LITT., LL.D., Bar-at-law, as a Vice-President.

Sri V. Swaminathan, B.A., G.D.A., R.A., who had audited the accounts of the Institute, was then thanked for his free service and re-elected auditor for the coming year.

The Third Foundation Day Celebrations then began with the singing of prayer.

Dr. V. Raghavan then read messages received for the success of the function:

Dr. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Shrimat Pant Saheb Pratinidhi Raja Saheb of Aundh, Srimati Sophia Wadia, and Raja Bahadur S. Aravamuda Aiyangar sent their best wishes for the success of the function.

Messages were also sent by the following Research Scholars and Sanskrit Professors: Dr. B. C. Law, Prof. G. H. Bhatt, Baroda, and Prof. M. Lakshminarasimhiah, Mysore.

The greetings of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute were conveyed in a message from its Secretary, Mm. Dr. Umesh Misra. Dr. R. N. Dandekar sent the following message on behalf of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona: “We are happy to see that the Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute is doing excellent work in the field of Sanskrit studies and feel no doubt that your Institute will soon occupy an eminent place among academic bodies of the country.”

Along with his message, Sri K. Nilakantan of B. G. Paul & Co. sent a donation of Rs. 1,000 to the Institute from his sister, wife of the late D. Balasubramanya Iyer. This and her further promise to effect improvements to the Sri Chandrasekarendra Sarasvati Mantapa where the Institute is now housed were applauded by the gathering.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar read the report of the work of the Institute for 1946-47. A consolidated Report of the work of the Institute from its inception in 1944 upto 1947, containing audited statements of accounts and a list of the Patrons, Fellows and Life Members of the Institute was published on the occasion of Third Foundation Day.

Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastriar then welcomed the gathering and requested Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra to deliver the Foundation Day Address.

Foundation Day Address

Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra delivered the Foundation Day Address, first in Sanskrit and then in English.

Om

Sarasvatyai namo namaḥ

“ Jayati sa bhagavān Kṛṣṇo
jayat-īyam Bhāratī bhūmiḥ |
Tadanu ca jayati jagatyām
śrī-Kuppusvāmiśāstriṇaḥ Kīrtiḥ ||

“ Bālye yena girām avāpi vibhavo mātāmahasyāntikāt
paścād yastam avardhayac ca nitarām ācāryaśuśrūṣayā |
Yasy āvardhata sarvadaiva bahuśo dedīyamānopyasau
Kuppusvāmiśubhābhidham śrutadhanam dhanyam
namasyāmi tam ||

पूज्य सभापतिमहोदय !

उपस्थिताः भगिन्यो भ्रातरश्च,

बहोरयं हर्षस्यावसरः यदत्र वयं अद्य श्री. K. S. R. I. इत्याख्यायाः
साहित्यगवेषणपरायाः समितेस्तदीयं वार्षिकमुत्सवं मानयितुं समवेताः स्मः ॥

स्वनामधन्याः पुण्यश्लोकाः, कुलपतयः, विद्यावाचस्पतयः, दर्शन-
कलानिधयः महामहोपाध्यायाः श्रीकुपुस्वामिशास्त्रिणः संस्कृतभाषायाः
परमा भक्ता आसन्निति तेषां प्रीत्यर्थं तामेव देववाणीमधिकृत्य संस्कृतज्ञानां
युष्माकं किञ्चित् वक्तुं धृणोमि ॥

या सास्माभिः सुचिरमाकाङ्क्षिता चातकैर्मधमालेव चोदीक्षिता सा
स्वतन्त्रता गत एव सप्ताहेऽस्मान् संप्राप्ता । तां सभाजयतामस्माकमद्यापि

गृहे गृहे हर्षोत्सवाः प्रवर्तन्ते । स्थाने खलु राष्ट्रस्य एतदामोदविजृम्भणम् । परन्तु इतोऽग्रेऽस्माभिः किं कर्तव्यं तदपि किञ्चित् विमर्शनीयम् । स्वतन्त्रता-प्राप्तेः समकालमेवास्माकं यः कार्यातिभारः समापतितः, तं निर्वोदुमधुनैव सर्वैरेवास्माभिः संभूयोत्थातव्यमुद्योक्तव्यं च । बहुविधं खलु तत्कार्यं यद्वाष्ट्र-मुद्धर्तुमुन्नमयितुं च करणीयम् । तच्चास्माभिः यथायथं विभक्तव्यम् । विभज्य चाग्रमत्तैर्निष्पादनीयम् । सर्वोऽपि स्वं स्वं कार्यं साधु संपादयेच्च । तत्र तावदि-दमवधारणीयं यदस्माकं राष्ट्रमिदानीं यत्किञ्चिदपि निर्माणात्मकं कार्यमनुष्ठातुं उद्यच्छति, तत्सर्वमस्माकं प्राचीनामार्यां संस्कृतिं पुरातनीं सम्यताम्, अवेक्ष-माणमाद्रियमाणं चैवारभ्यते । तदेतच्छुभलक्षणम् । योऽसावस्माकं शाश्वत उपालम्भ आसीत् यदेते पाश्चात्यसम्यताभिभूताः पण्डितमन्याः नवयुग-भावानुप्राणिताः, स्वकीयां भव्यां संस्कृतिं नाभिजानन्ति, प्रत्युत तामवधीरयन्ति, उपेक्षन्ते, तृणाय मन्यन्ते चेति तस्यास्योपालम्भस्य कारणानि, सम्प्रति विली-यमानानीवाभान्ति ॥

तच्चाप्यनुकूलं निमित्तम् । प्रेक्ष्यतां तावदस्माकं राष्ट्रियो ध्वजः । तत्रेदं सम्राजोऽशोकस्य धर्मचक्रं पुनराघूर्णमानमिवाभाति । तदौपम्येनेव सर्वा अपि क्रियाः इतः प्रभृति प्राचीनमस्माकं धर्मं पुरस्कृत्यैव वर्तिष्यन्त इति निश्चप्रचम् । तदित्थं युष्माकं संस्कृतज्ञानाम् अथवा अस्माकं संस्कृतज्ञानां पुष्कलः खलु कार्यभार आपतितः । यूयमेव हि प्राचीनसंस्कृतनिधेर्गोप्तारः । यूयमेव पन्थानं प्रदर्शयितुं शक्ताः ॥

तत्रैका मे प्रार्थना । अनेन राष्ट्रस्याभ्युदयेन सममेव संस्कृतभाषायाः पुनरभ्युदयोऽपि ध्रुवं भावी । तत्र युष्माभिः तस्या अध्यापनं तथाकारं सुकरं रुचिकरं च विधातव्यम् यथा बाला अपि मन्दमतयोऽपि तस्या अध्ययने स्तोकमपि क्लेशं नानुभवेयुः । विदितमेव युष्माकं यथा अस्माकं प्राचीनेषु ग्रन्थेषु शब्दाडम्बरो नैव विद्यते । सर्वत्रार्थस्यैव गौरवमुपलभ्यते । निदर्शनतया छान्दोग्योपनिषदि श्वेतकेतोरुपाख्यानं स्फुरति मे । तत् कीदृशि सरलायां भाषायां वर्णितमस्ति । तस्य सरलता मामेकं तस्य खण्डमत्रोदाहर्तु-मुपच्छन्दयति । तद्यथा—“न्यग्रोधफलमत आहर (इति) । इदं भगवः (इति) । भिन्धि (इति) । भिन्नं भगवः (इति) । किमत्र पश्यसि (इति) । न किञ्चन भगवः (इति) । तं होवाच, यं वै सोम्यैतदणिमानं निभालयसे, एतस्यैव सोम्येषोऽणिमः एवं महान् न्यग्रोधस्तिष्ठति । श्रद्धत्स्व सोम्य (इति) ।” एवंकारं

यदास्माकं भाषा सुगमा ललिता च भविष्यति तदा सा कस्य कौतुकं
नाधास्यति । कस्य वा मनो नाकर्षयिष्यति । कस्य वा हृदयं न प्रवेक्ष्यति ?
नूनं तदा सेयं सुरभारता पूर्ववत् स्वत एव प्रचरिष्यति । तैर्युग्माभिः
तथाकारं प्रयतितव्यं तथाकारं प्रयतितव्यम् इति ॥

“Worthy President, Ladies and Gentlemen !

It is very pleasant indeed to meet for a celebration like this in an atmosphere surcharged with the lingering fragrance of the great national rejoicings over the Independence that is ours now. Just a week ago, this very night, the shackle of India's bondage was finally snapped and India declared independent. India is free. We Indians are free now. As cool breezes, refreshing showers of rain and glorious sunshine are in the nature, even so are now the sweet fruits of freedom available to all of us, to those who struggled, suffered and sacrificed for freedom, and to those who would 'only stand and wait', and even to those who would scoff at the freedom movement or actively oppose it. Liberty is smiling benignly at all of us without distinction. It is, however, one thing to attain freedom, and another to retain it and enjoy its blessings for ever to the fullest extent. The first step in that direction is at once to banish bag and baggage disease, squalor, poverty and ignorance from our midst, and to restore in their stead health, cleanliness, plenty and knowledge. When these sound foundations have been laid, we have to raise the superstructure of a courteous and most refined society, a nation of which each individual is progressive and yet self-denying, thereby making a magnificent contribution to the well-being of the whole human race. That I call peace, lasting and complete. India is not a stranger to these fine things of life. She has partaken of them to her heart's content, and has made even others partake of them. But

Sukhasy=ānantaram duḥkham

duḥkhasy=ānantaram sukham |

Cakravat parivartante

duḥkhāni ca sukhāni ca ||

or as Kālidāsa puts it :

Nīcāir gacchaty=upari ca daśā cakranemikrameṇa ||

‘Good and evil, weal and woe, joy and sorrow follow each other in rotation.’ Happily for us, the wheel has now taken the upward turn. The tide has turned in our favour. And we

have to make the best of it. And that is where cultural institutions like the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute come in. I shall presently have occasion to demonstrate what an important part such institutions play in the nation-building activities. It is therefore but meet that this celebration should have followed so close on the heels of the grand national jubilation.

We are gathered here to honour the revered memory of a worthy son of India, that great Indologist of world-wide fame, Kulapati, Vidyāvācaspati, Darśanakalānidhi, Mahāmahopādhyāya Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri, by celebrating the third anniversary of the foundation of the Research Institute that has been named after him. It is a very great honour indeed on such an occasion to be called upon to address a distinguished gathering like this. And if that honour has fallen on a total stranger like me, it is to be attributed not to any outstanding merit or ability of the stranger, but to the magnanimity and large-heartedness of the organisers of the function, especially of Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, the President of the Institute, and of Dr. V. Raghavan, one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Institute. I have had the privilege of knowing the two last-named personally, though not yet very intimately. It was from them that I received the call for delivering this Foundation Address. The royal ascetic Bhartṛhari must have had such personages in view, when he remarked :

Paraguṇaparamāṇūn parvatikṛtya nityam
nījahṛdi vilasantaḥ santi santah kiyantaḥ!

‘Seeing just a particle of virtue in others, they make a mountain of it and take delight in doing so. Rare indeed are such benevolent souls.’ Otherwise, what virtue is there in me to deserve the honour so graciously conferred on me? As for my acceptance of it, it is more of an obedience to a command, an obedience with alacrity and humility. I am grateful to the Governing Body of the K.S.R.I. for affording me such an excellent opportunity of associating myself with all of you in paying homage to the Kulapati.

My tribute to one who held Sanskrit so dear and whose life was dedicated to the promotion of Sanskrit learning would have been purer and more appropriate, were it couched in that divine language. And I would certainly have loved to address you in Sanskrit. In fact, when I received the call I took it for

granted that I was expected to talk to you in Sanskrit itself. But I was later disillusioned and was advised to adopt this, at present more familiar, medium of English for obvious reasons.

I may add here that on further consultation with Dr. Raghavan this morning, my wish was partly granted, and, as a consequence thereof, I have had my way by thrusting a brief speech in Sanskrit on you before beginning this address.

The privilege of coming into personal contact with the Mahāmahopādhyāya was denied me, but I conceived a sort of hero worship for him as early as 1926, when I first had the pleasure of seeing him. This happened in Calcutta. The occasion was the Akhila Bhāratavarṣīya Saṃskṛita Sāhitya Sammelana (All-India Sanskrit Conference), which was presided over by the Mahāmahopādhyāya himself. The conference was attended by a large number of representatives, scholars and students from various provinces of India as also from some neighbouring countries. I was then a student of Sanskrit. I followed the deliberations of the Conference with zealous interest. The thing that impressed me most and excited my admiration was that the entire proceedings were conducted through the medium of Sanskrit. The presidential address, which was in pure, fluent and melodious Sanskrit, was a literary treat. Even as a junior student, I could appreciate and enjoy it. I was seated next to a monk from Nepal, with whom I could not talk except in Sanskrit. And we talked quite a lot. I then realised the greatness and universality of Sanskrit and wondered why the Indians were so loath to adopt it as their *lingua franca*.

To an up-country lad that I was then, the name Kuppuswami sounded rather strange, and for that very reason it stuck fast to my memory. Even to this day, I do not know what the Dravidian word *Kuppu* means, but my boyhood's fancy explained it in its own way and to its own satisfaction. It recalled to my mind the Hindustani term *Kuppu* which means 'a large leathern vessel for holding oil or ghee'. And by the association of ideas, I began to look upon the bearer of the name Kuppuswami as a vast repository of Sanskrit learning. Was he not that? Was I wrong in my estimation of him? He *was* that. I was not wrong.

The literary career to Professor Kuppuswami Sastri started from his very infancy. It is said that even at the

tender age of three he learnt the entire Mūkapāñcaśatī, comprising 500 stanzas, from his maternal grandfather, and used to recite them with ease. This affectionate gift from the *mātāmaha* surely carried with it the blessings of the Goddess, whose praises the child sang in reciting those stanzas. That was a decent capital to start with. It multiplied itself manifold as the young learner grew in years. Before he was twenty, he had, we are told, mastered such abstruse branches of our ancient learning as Kāvya, Nyāya, Vedānta, Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa. He had become an exponent of them. It was truly a prodigious attainment for a young man in his teens. Nor was his modern education neglected. He passed the Matriculation examination in 1896 at the age of sixteen. Four years later, in 1900, he graduated with Philosophy as his special subject. At this stage there came what I should call a crisis, which happily did not end in a tragedy as, alas, it often happens in India—I wish it would not happen hereafter ! The young man with such high attainments and promise accepted a petty job of a clerk in the Board of Revenue, possibly under the pressure of circumstances. Would it not have been a thousand pities had the young scholar been allowed to continue as clerk? His hard earned wealth of learning would have simply been cast to the winds. Even if the clerk had risen to the position of a Member of the Board of Revenue, the loss to the scholarly world would have been colossal. Our prayer is always: *tejasvināv-adhitam-astu* 'Whatever we have learnt, may that shine forth!' And how can it shine forth, when we take leave of it when it is just time for it to shine forth? I dare say, even in this gathering there may be some whose talents have been misplaced, who have willynilly been doing a job ill suited to their achievements. But no such thing in the case of our hero. He was constantly guarded by the Goddess Whose favour he had won even as a child. Thanks to the passing illness of the clerk's mother, which was a blessing in disguise, the crisis was averted before it could prove harmful. The clerk must attend on his ailing mother, but he was refused leave. Stung by this callousness, he gave up the job and rushed home.

Hamsāḥ śuklikṛtā yena
śukāś-ca haritikṛtāḥ |

Mayūrās=citritā yena
sa te vṛttim vidhāsyati ||

‘Why should you worry about your livelihood? He Who has made the swans white, has made the parrots green and has made the peacocks variegated, will surely look after you.’ And then there is the assurance from the Lord himself:

Nahi kalyāṇakṛt kaścit

durgatiṃ tata gacchati ||

‘A right-doer never comes to grief.’

I have taken the liberty of enlarging upon this, seemingly insignificant, episode in the life of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri, because, for me, it does have a significance, and a tremendous one at that. In my own life I have had a similar experience. It seems to me that mothers have mysterious ways of benefiting their children. In my case my mother’s death proved a turning point in my life. But for that event, I would not have been what I am today. I would have been a shop-keeper to day, not knowing even Hindi, let alone Sanskrit and the rest.

To continue our hero’s exploits, after resigning the clerical post, his mother restored to health, he struggled for a more independent living. He started studying law, but somehow did not qualify himself as a lawyer. Instead, he wound up this new venture by becoming a Master of Arts, in 1905. His studies in law stood him in good stead during his life thereafter. By this time he had established his reputation as a great Sanskrit scholar and teacher, and soon his merits gained due recognition. He became the Principal of the Mylapore Sanskrit College and was there from 1906 to 1910. From 1910 to 1914 he was the Principal of the Trivadi Sanskrit College. Thereafter he became the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at the Presidency College and Curator of the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, which exalted post he held till 1935 when he retired from the Government Service. This period of thirty years was the most productive of his activities. South India is already famous for its traditional Sanskrit learning, and the Professor added lustre to that glory. He combined in himself a Pandita of the hoary tradition, a modern educationalist and a research-worker. He took a leading part in the activities of the University of Madras so far as they related to the teaching of Sanskrit and research in the oriental subjects. Most of the Sanskrit scholars in South India at present, I understand, have been his pupils. The

prevailing elaborate system of examinations in Sanskrit at the University of Madras with their carefully thought out curricula is mainly his creation. He was connected with several other universities in the country in various capacities. Equally intimate was his association with the All-India Oriental Conference and the All-India Sanskrit Conference as well as with the premier religious institutions. All these and the Government of India, in recognition of his meritorious services, honoured him with befitting titles and distinctions. The courses of lectures he delivered, the articles he published and the works he wrote and edited, a list of which you may find elsewhere, all testify to the amount and quality of the research work he turned out. Apart from this, there was a band of research workers whom he diligently guided. He was throughout an inspiration to others. The Oriental Research Institute of the University of Madras owes its existence largely to his energies. The results of all these activities are published in the fourteen volumes of the Journal of Oriental Research, of which he was the founder and the editor, and which set a high standard for the type of journalistic enterprise.

It is not my purpose to present here a precise account of the Professor's activities, backed by facts and figures. My humble attempt is to read the message his life imparts to us. From the brief outline given above, he stands out as a torch-bearer of India's ancient culture which requires to be revealed to each one of us in its full glory, to be studied, imbibed and re-lived by every Indian. By his own example, he has shown that India's past is not a thing to be despised, it is something to be proud of, and, adapted to modern conditions, it enriches and ennobles us so as to raise us in the estimation of the world. So, my friends,

Uttiṣṭhata jāgrata prāpya varān nibodhata! 'Rise, wake, and secure your glorious heritage!' Let us carry the torch, lit and passed on to us by our leader. Let us carry it to every nook and corner and dispel the gloom of ignorance.

It was to fulfil this mission that the friends and admirers of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Kuppaswami Sastri established a research institute and named it after him, of which we are now celebrating the third anniversary.

The leading personalities, themselves deeply learned and steeped in the ancient Indian culture, that are the sponsors and

patrons of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, are a guarantee of both its soundness and its excellence. Its Governing Body and Research Committee include scholars of eminence. One of its aims and objects is to publish the works, lectures, articles and other writings of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya S. Kuppuswami Sastri, of which the following have already seen the light of the day: (1) Chapter I of his edition of the Dhvanyāloka, (2) his lectures on Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit, and (3) his lectures on Compromises in the History of Advaitic Thought. Another token of esteem that the Institute has shown to the late Mahāmahopādhyāya is that it has revived and taken over the Journal of Oriental Research, which had to be suspended owing to the paper scarcity and other restrictions during the war. Its fifteenth volume has just been completed, with the issue of its fourth quarter. It has, however, to gather momentum to come to the standard set by its originator.

Speaking of the high place that Sanskrit has occupied, from the very beginning, in our Aryan culture, I may as well touch upon the part it has played also in what we call Greater India. In fact, this is an independent subject and Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri was to have given us a talk on Sanskrit in Greater India this evening. It is greatly to be regretted that he is too unwell to come here. I shall therefore fill up the gap, with a few observations. We shall no doubt all miss the learned, authoritative, informatory and detailed talk which Professor Sastri would have given us; but thinking that something is better than nothing, I may give you a scrappy account.

The name Greater India applies to those lands and islands outside India proper, especially those lying in the far east, that came into cultural contact with the Aryans from India and maintained that intercourse for centuries on end. This movement might have started much earlier, but in the case of most of the countries of Greater India, we have evidence that the Indians went there in the early centuries of the Christian era. They settled there, married the native girls, and made those lands and islands their homes for ever. The Aryan culture was then at its peak and whosoever came into contact with it was naturally imbued with it—got absorbed in it. The Aryans who then migrated from India took with them their culture and spread it far and wide. Those were the days when arts,

science, trades and governments were in very flourishing conditions in India, and these were all strung, as if it were, on Sanskrit, their transactions were carried on through the medium of Sanskrit. The same happened with the Aryans who migrated from here. The spread and popularity of Sanskrit in those far off countries and its influence on their native languages is abundantly clear from the inscriptions, both on stone and metal, and the literary works, that are found there in their hundreds and thousands. By way of illustration, I would mention a few.

In the eastern part of the island of Borneo, we have discovered seven inscriptions incised on stone Yūpas, recording in chaste metrical Sanskrit the charities performed by ruler Mūlavarman by name. The charities consisted of thousands of cows, heaps of sesame seeds, lamps, etc., which we find enjoined in the Manusmṛti. These inscriptions are assigned to the 4th century A.C. Of a little later date are several inscriptions on rocks, in the western part of Java, which belong to a King called Pūrnavarman. They are the earliest composed in equally chaste Sanskrit. The earliest of this category are perhaps the stone inscriptions of a King Bhadravarman in Campa, *i.e.*, Indo-China. This is with reference to the earliest records. Late ones are numerous and quite lengthy ones and in point of time they extend to the tenth century. About this time, the indigenous languages also make their appearance in such documents, as is the case in India also. Side by side, the literature also flourished. In Java, for instance, we have Javanese versions of Sanskrit works like Mahābhārata. I have in my possession a copy of its Ādiparvan. I have also a copy of a manuscript of the Bhagavadgītā in Sanskrit, as it reached Java in those days. It is interesting; further it is much smaller in extent, only a hundred ślokas or so. The work is worth further investigation. There are works in old Javanese such Nāgarakṛitāgama, Pararaton, Arjunavivāha, Smaradahana, Vṛittasañcaya, Amaramālā *etc.*—some versions, some commentaries and some adaptations of our Sanskrit works—Time does not permit a further elaboration of this most interesting subject.

With the advent of freedom, this Institute is bound to receive ever increasing support and stimulus from the public in its undertakings, and the demand on it for more and manifold production must correspondingly be high. The nation is

keenly alive to its fine heritage and is determined to profit by it. Already the Dharmacakra is once more in our midst, on our banner and on our hearts, the wheel of Law that was set in motion, two thousand and five hundred years ago, by the Śākyasiṃha, Gautama, the Wheel that kept revolving down the centuries, in the times of Aśoka, Samudragupta and Harṣa. The nation is out to revive old traditions, and the institutions like our Institute have to shown her the way, to light her path and guide her. We have to run our administrative system once more in our own way, on our own pattern, in our own language. The same thing in respect of our education, our pursuit of modern sciences. For all this our first requisite is a proper terminology. The Indologist has a great task to accomplish. But you will see that there is nothing wanting. You have simply to unravel, to lay bare, these past treasures that are hidden in the ocean of Sanskrit literature. There you will find everything that you require to suit your purpose. The cultural wealth for which we are thirsting now is to be found there in abundance, in our own Vedas, Vedāṅgas, Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, Upaniṣads, Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Purāṇas, Smṛtis, Kośas, and the vast classical literature, the Buddhist and Jaina scriptures, and last but not least, the thousands of ancient inscriptions on stone and metal. I assure you that a peep in to this vast store-house will open your eyes. During the last century and a half, Western scholars first, and scholars of own country later, have time and again drawn our attention to this our opulence. But it was of no immediate concern to us, so we did not pay much heed to it. Many, alas, turned away from it in disdain. But the time has now come, when we have got to take stock of our bequest, our property and possessions.

I am glad to observe that the work has already been started in many a sister institute in the country as also by certain scholars individually. The University of Nagpur, for instance, has resolved to adopt Hindi as medium of instruction, from 1949, if my information is correct, and for that purpose they have secured the services of an eminent linguist and Indologist in the person of Dr. Raghuvera who, with a band of scholars working under him, is busy compiling dictionaries—mind you, not a dictionary, but dictionaries; for, in this modern age of specialisation, we require a separate dictionary of terms

peculiar to each and every branch of art and science. And Dr. Raghuvera is doing that. His dictionary on Chemistry is already out. And where is he drawing his material from? All from the Sanskrit literature, of course. If you listen to a discourse by him on the subject and see the way he is doing his job, you will, I am sure, yourself remark: Sanskrit is not dead; it is we who have all along been dead to Sanskrit.

Owing to reasons of health, Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri could not be present to give his discourse on Sanskrit in Greater India.

Vidwan M. Rajamanikkam Pillai, B.O.L., L.T., M.O.L., then delivered a speech in Tamil on the Cultural History from the Periyapurāṇam. An English version of the lecture appears elsewhere in this issue.

Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar then proposed a vote of thanks.

CULTURAL HISTORY FROM THE PERIAPURĀṆAM.

VIDVAN M. RAJAMANIKAM PILLAI, B.O.L., L.T., M.O.L.

Vivekananda College, Madras.

INTRODUCTORY.

The Periyapurāṇam deals with the lives of the sixty-three Nāyanmārs who flourished approximately for about six centuries from 300 to 900 A.D. Śekkiḷār, the author of that illustrious work, flourished in the first half of the 12th century A.D. Thus though there is an interval of about 300 years between the date of the author Śekkiḷār and the last date of the Nāyanmārs, we may yet take that Śekkiḷār who was the Grand Vizier of the Imperial Chola, Anapāya, depicts mainly the trend of events and cultural movements characteristic of the age of the Nāyanmārs. As such, one can safely assume that the cultural aspects dealt with in the Periyapurāṇam are the same as those evident during the glorious Pallava Period.¹ In other words, by a reference to the Periyapurāṇam, one can definitely have a view of the nature and character of the culture that existed in Tamil Nad between 300 to 900 A.D.

SOCIAL ORGANISATION.

In the TAMILIAN society of that age, we find a social hierarchy with the Brāhmins, the kings, the merchants, the peasants and other occupational groups, corresponding to the various rungs of the social ladder. Though these distinctions were in existence, yet so far as religious and social spheres of human activity were concerned, there was a 'unity in diversity.'

The Brāhmaṇas: The Brāhmins were held in high esteem by the Tamil monarchs, and those who were well-versed in the Vedas were given grants of small villages which went by the name of 'Brahmadeya. These Brāhmin villages were singularly marked out by the various names they bore like

1. Vide my thesis for M.O.L. "A Critical Study of Śekkiḷār and His Historical Material."

'Brahmapuri' ¹ 'Brahmadeśam,' 'Aharam' or 'Agrahāram,' 'Mangalam,' 'Caturvedimangalam,' 'Pudūr' or 'Putūr.' These villages were brilliantly administered by the Brāhmins themselves residing there. For example at Tiruvaṇṇainallūr, Tillai (Chidambaram) and Seignyalur (சேய்ஞ்ஞலூர்), we find administrative courts or offices under the guidance of the Brāhman intelligensia of those localities. These courts rendered justice after hearing the various cases that came up to them.² Most of the Brāhmins were well versed in Sanskrit, but it should also be noted that some Brāhmins like Tiruṅṇāna Sambandar were not only masters of the Tamil language but were also adepts in composing hymns in Tamil.

Kings : In Tamil Nad, there is no separate caste like 'kṣatriya', as we find in the north. Hence we find emperors or kings of kings like the Cēras, the Cōlas, the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas, as well as petty tributary chieftain clans like the Kurumbars, the Kallars, the Malaivāṇars or Mountain-dwellers. But in all these royalties, one could find the six *aṅgas* of kingship existent.

Merchants : During the age of the Nāyanmārs, Kāraikkāl, Negapatam, Kāvērip-pūm-paṭṭinam and Mailāpūr flourished as emporiums of sea-borne trade. Merchant magnates lived in these cities ³ and carried on a prosperous trade with Ceylon, East Indies and other lands overseas. Inland trade was also carried on vigorously; the merchants were sufficiently trained in the use of weapons so as to guard themselves and their merchandise from the attacks of pirates and robbers; they possessed almost all the weapons of warfare usual to the warrior.⁴

Peasants : These people were engaged in agriculture and they formed the backbone of the country. They enjoyed the unique privilege of giving their daughters in marriage even to Kings. Saint Tirunāvukkaraśar belonged to this Vellala group. At first he embraced Jainism and for about fifteen years strove hard in mastering their religious scriptures

1. 'Berhampore' of today is only a corruption of 'Brahmapuri.'

2. Tadut-tātkaṇḍapurāṇam, St. 49-64. Tiruṇilakaṇṭapurāṇam, St. 30-34; Cāṇḍeśarpurāṇam St. 40-43.

3. Vide the Purāṇams about Kāraikkāl Ammayyār, Amar Nītiyār, Saṁbandhar and Iyarpahaiyār.

4. Iyarpahaiyārpurāṇam, St. 14-24.

and even received the title of 'Dharmasēnar.' But, if such a great protagonist of Jainism were to embrace Śaivism later, due to the marvellous fascinating influence of his eldest sister¹ Tilakavadiyār, one can very easily deduce how much that lady must have been well-educated and well-endowed with moral calibre. Of the 63 Nāyanmārs, 13 are Brāhmanas, and on a par with them we find another 13, all Vallālas by birth; from this, is it not clear that Vallāla Nāyanmārs also attained a high level of mental and moral development as the Brāhman Nāyanmārs?

Other Occupational groups: The other occupational groups also were well-informed and well-educated; e.g., Nanda, a paraiya, was able to attain a position of equal eminence among the enlightened society of well-educated and well-informed Brāhmanas, as is attested by his Purāṇam. Note in this connection that untouchability was prevalent during Nanda's days. The Bānars who were adepts in the arts of musical symphony, were also to a certain extent treated as inferiors in days gone by but, we find Sambandar, a Brāhman, treating Tirunīlakāṇṭa-Yāzhp-pāṇar and his consort with the greatest respect and courtesy; from this, it is crystal clear that in religious spheres, when one attained the height of perfection, caste-distinctions held no sway.

2. WOMEN AND MARRIAGE.

During the age of the Nāyanmārs, women enjoyed an equal status with that of men. The cordial treatment accorded to the Nāyanmārs of both sexes by their devotees and their worship bear witness to this equality. Besides, the religious services and temple services rendered by them also point to this same direction. But one should not forget the fact that this enjoyment of an equal status by women in those days was solely due to their own making, because they had reached the heights of culture, moral code and religious life. Take for example, Kāraikkāl Ammai, the emerald of the merchant community. She was capable of reciting hymns in divine ecstasy, which brimming full with 'Bhakti' found a place in the Śaiva Tirumurais. We have already mentioned how Tilakavadiyār was able to make her brother Appar embrace Śaivism and one should not forget that Appar was

1. Tirunāvukkaraśar Purāṇam, St. 39-69.

the most highly cultured individual in religious scriptures of those days. Similarly, Maṅgayakaraśiyār, the Pāṇḍya Queen, tried to convert her husband, Kūṇ-Pāṇḍya, to Śaivism with success. The wife of Tīrunīlakaṇṭa-Yāzhp-pāṇar followed her husband in his sojourns with Sambandar to places of pilgrimage and kept company with him. Do not all these above statements indicate the high status that the women-folk of our land enjoyed during the time of the Nāyanmārs! It is not exaggeration to say that Śaivism reached the height of its pre-eminence solely due to the unstinted co-operation rendered by these illustrious women to their consorts.

Some of the women-folk dedicated their lives for the uplift of religion and remained in maidenhood for ever;¹ some even wore the yellow robe and became nuns; most of them enjoyed the privilege of marriage, if they wanted to lead a married life.²

In those days, wives used to mount the funeral pyre along with their dead husbands; in other words, self-immolation was prevalent. This can be attested to by the act of self-immolation by Appar's mother when her husband died.³ Leaving this apart, we find wives abhorring their husbands even to the verge of untouchability if they were to perpetrate debauchery or adultery.⁴

Marriage Rites: The would-be bridegroom, of his own accord, used to send 'the elders' to his ladylove's house for betrothal.⁵ Or the parents of the bridegroom used to approach direct the bride's parents for fixing the marriage.⁶ If both the parties were to agree, then only the auspicious day for the marriage would be fixed. When deciding a marriage, greatest attention was focussed on the integrity of character of the bridegroom concerned. In spite of such scrupulous scrutiny and care, the husband of Karaikkāl Ammaiṃyār went astray and spoiled her conjugal affection.⁷ Sambandar's marriage was celebrated according to Vedic

1. Sambandar Purāṇam, St. 1117 ; Kalikkamar Purāṇam, S. 220.

2. *Ibid* St. 260.

3. Appar Purāṇam St. 28

4. Tīrunīlakaṇṭar Purāṇam, St. 5-6.

5. Appar Purāṇam, St. 23. Sambandar Purāṇam. St. 1162.

7. Kāraikkāl Ammaiṃyār Purāṇam, St. 31.

rites, Sundarar's weddings were nothing but 'love-matches' and were celebrated in temples; one should not forget that Sundarar was an Ādi-Śaiva or Gurukkal. This Ādi-śaiva married a dancing girl and a Vellāla girl; nay one, Kotpuliyaṛ, a Vellāla, entreated this Ādi-Śaiva to marry his two daughters. Then again one Śivaneśa Ceṭṭiyār requested Sambandar to marry his daughter. From all such incidents, it can be safely concluded that great importance was not attached to caste-distinctions among the Śaivites of those days, so far as marriage was concerned. Leaving this apart, one can also find another custom that existed *viz.*, that a betrothed girl used to immolate her own self or agreed to lead the rest of her wretched life in widowhood if her betrothed husband were to predecease her.¹

3. Political Institutions.

Kingship:—As already stated there is no separate kingly caste like the Kṣatriyas in Tamil Nad. Succession to the kingship was purely hereditary either for the imperial throne or for the tributary chieftaincy. In case there was no heir of the royal blood, then the ministers and the state subjects would let loose the trained royal elephant (புல்லேட்டை) with a garland in its trunk. The elephant in its sojourn would pitch upon the proper man to the 'gadi' by garlanding him and carrying him on its back. This strange custom, seemingly superstitious, can be attested to by the incident that Mūrti Nāyanār, a merchant, was in this way installed as a Pāṇḍya ruler.²

The King ruled the country very well, bestowing the greatest attention upon his subjects. He tried his best in alleviating the distress of his subjects which might occur in any one of five ways, *viz.*, by his own self, by his courtiers, by foes and by wild beasts.³ The King devoted the greatest attention to the promulgation of his own religion; he punished those who resisted his religious views. Moreover, certain Kings like Guṇadharan and Neḍumāran began to show a fanatical hatred towards their old religion itself, after their

1. Appar Purāṇam, St. 32-34.

2. Mūrti Nāyanār Purāṇam, St. 27-42.

3. Nakarac cirappu, St. 36.

convesion to a new one, viz , Śaivism. Thus on the whole, we can say that the King followed the rigours and disciplines enjoined by his religious tenets and punished offenders against them with a stern severity. If the King died, some of the members of his militia also perished with him.¹

Popular Institutions.

Cultural Centres:—A peep into the Periyapurāṇam shows that during the time of the Nāyanmārs Tirup-pādiripuliyūr figured as a stronghold of Jainism and centre of spiritual learning and culture. It was in a Jain monastery there that Appar studied all the Jain scriptures and received the title of 'Dharmasena'. Similar Jain centres were found at Tiruvārūr, Tiruvottūr and Tiru-Mailāpūr, and these also served as torch-bearers of culture and learning. So also the place 'Bodhimangai' flourished as a seat of Buddhist learning. The city of Kāñci was famous as the repository of four religious cults viz., Vaiṣṇavaism, Śaivism, Buddhism, and Jainism. Appar also testifies to this aspect by eulogising Kāñchi as a city of unbounded culture (கல்வியில் கரையிலாத காஞ்சிமாநகர்). In those days, the Pali, the Sanskrit and the Tamil languages held high sway among the people's minds and this fact can be proved by the utterances made by eminent luminaries like Buddhadatta and Hiwen-Tsang.

Monasteries :—Attached to the temples were the monasteries which imported religious instruction and fostered religious education. The student in the monastery received religious as well as general education of a wide nature. Further, these monasteries served also as lodges for the Samayācāryas like Appar and Sambandar during their religious tours. Such monasteries as those existed in various places like Tiruvizhimizhalai, Tirumarugal, Tirumaraikkāḍu and Tiruppuhalūr.

Village Administrative units:—Reference was already made to the existence of village courts and assemblies. Only those who possessed the requisite qualifications of learning, culture, good behaviour and experience were eligible for membership in the assembly. In the 'Grāma sabhā', all the documents pertaining to that village were preserved and guarded in an apartment set apart for that purpose; and this

went by the name of 'Arantarukāppu'. In every Grāma Sabhā, there was an accountant. All cases were decided after fully hearing the parties to the suit, the documents pertaining to the suit, and the witnesses involved.¹ For the crimes committed by youngsters the parents were held responsible.² Similar to these legal codes which were in existence, we can also infer the existence of forest laws, specifying the rules for the game of hunting.³

4. RELIGION.

During the age of the Nāyanmārs, Jainism, Buddhism, Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism thrived in Tamil Nad. The Digambara sect of Jainism was wielding a very high influence, as a result of which Śaivism was not able even to lift up its head. Later Appar was able to make Toṇḍai-Nāḍu a Śaiva Nāḍu; and similarly Sambandar was able to spread Śaivism in Paṇḍya Nāḍu, after defeating the Jains and Buddhists in Samayavāda or religious discussions. Those who suffered defeat sought gallows of their own accord or were sent to the gallows.⁴

Among the Śaivites there were diverse sects like (1) the Kāpālikas (2) Pāśupatas and (3) the Kālāmukas. The followers of these sects were mainly immigrants from the north; they spread their religious customs and practices in Tamil Nad and had their own monasteries in some places.

There were about 300 temples in Tamil Nad dedicated to Śiva and festivals were celebrated in them. Of these Śaiva temples, those at Chidambaram and Tiruvārūr were held in the highest esteem by Śaiva devotees.

5. OTHER DETAILS.

Chidambaram and Kāñci were big cities. Places like Tiruvaṇṇainallūr were only villages. Besides such cities and villages, there were the *ceris* or the habitats of the Paraiyas,

1. Taḍut-tāt koṇḍa Purāṇam.

2. Caṇḍeśar Purāṇam St. 43.

3. Kaṇṇappar Purāṇam St. 86.

4. The sculptures in Vaikuṇṭha Perumāl Koil, Kāñci, attest to a similar treatment accorded to those who suffered defeat in the Samayavāda against Vaiṣṇavism. (Vide Dr. Minakshi's Administrative and Social Life under the Pallavas).

the hunters and the Paravars. Reference to any city like Kāñci or Cidambaram in the Periyapurāṇam will give the reader an idea of the structure of a typical 'city' during those times; similarly, reference to any sanctified village with its temple in the Periyapurāṇam will give an idea of the structure of a typical 'village' during those times. In this connection it is very interesting to note that Geddes, the famous expert himself, vouchsafed for the fact that the structure of the city of Kāñci must have been planned by well-skilled town-planning architects.

The Periyapurāṇam also refers to minute details like the kinds of dress, ornaments and weapons worn by the people of those days; it makes reference also to the excellence of the fine arts like music and dancing. These details are borne out by the authentic testimony of the exquisite specimens of art at Sittannavāśal and the marvellous sculptures of the Kailāśa-nātha and Vaikuṇṭaperumāl temples at Kāñci.

CONCLUSION

To understand really the cultural and social life of the Tamils of the Pallava period and after, one must necessarily refer to the Tirumurais, the Nālayira Divya Prabandham and the Periyapurāṇam. Of these three, the last mentioned is of utmost utility, as it helps us a great deal in reconstructing the history of the period and in studying the social and cultural advancement of the people of that age. To conclude, let us pay our humblest homage to that great savant of Tamil Literature Śekkiḷār for having bestowed on Tamil Nad such a gem 'of purest ray serene' as the Periyapurāṇam.

“SANSKRIT AS LINGUA FRANCA”.*

H. E. DR. KAILAS NATH KATJU, M.A., LL.D.

Governor of Orissa and Chancellor, Utkal University.

I

“ I would strongly recommend that just as English was the official language in the Law Courts and under the Government of India Act in the different Legislatures and in Government administration departments, so also the Indian national language-Rashtra Bhasha—should be made the Official language to the same extent. Unless you do so, I see great difficulties in the development of an Indian national language as a vehicle for exchange of ideas and for national communion and intercourse. The aim should be not merely knowledge, but also the acquisition of proficiency in the national language by the largest number of people imaginable.

“ That brings me to the very difficult question of what the national language should be. I know this is very delicate ground and I must tread it cautiously with great discretion. The labours of learned men, literateurs and poets have built up provincial languages which have great traditions behind them. Leaving Hindi and Urdu aside, the modern Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya, Tamil and Telugu and other languages have cultural treasures of which their inheritors are justly proud. This is just the problem which I would like this eminent Board to consider in its dispassionate and far-sighted wisdom.

“ As a layman, if I were bold enough to hazard an opinion, my first impulse would be to consider the claims of Sanskrit as our national language. Sanskrit is the mother of all the provincial languages of India, which do not derive their inspiration from Arabia and Persia. Provincial vocabularies have drawn vastly upon the storehouse of Sanskrit words and phrases. And then all people do Sanskrit reverence. All our sacred books on law and religion, and all our literature and text books on Art and Science and Medicine and technical subjects such as architecture are in Sanskrit. The adoption

* Extracted from H.E. Dr. Katju's Inaugural Address to the Inter-University Board Meeting at Cuttack on 1-12-47 and his Convocation Address to the Utkal University on 3-12-47. Reproduced here by H. E.'s kind permission.

of Sanskrit will not raise any Provincial jealousies. Indeed it will be widely welcomed because Sanskrit is already so familiar. Every year an ever-growing number of people, boys and girls, read Sanskrit in Schools and Colleges. The script of most of the provincial languages is based on variations of Devanagari in which Sanskrit is written and Devanagari is well-known throughout India. The Sanskrit starts, therefore with definite advantages in its favour. But then it is said that Sanskrit is not a living language; it ceased to be a spoken language centuries ago, and it is said it will be impossible now revive it; I am not so sure of that myself, but of course I am not competent to pronounce an opinion upon this matter. I have heard many people talking and speaking in Sanskrit with the greatest ease and confidence. Then it is said that Sanskrit is difficult to learn and to impart knowledge of. I am not sure of that either. But these are all points worthy of your careful consideration. I am sure, however, of one thing that if Sanskrit were to become gradually the language of our superior law courts, of our Laws and Regulations, of our State Documents, of our great State Departments, it will make a wonderful appeal to and raise enormous enthusiasm among the vast teeming millions of this country, and be in itself a powerful unifying factor in our national life. It will forge a link with our ancient culture, and the wider diffusion of Sanskrit as a national language will in its turn prove a powerful instrument for the development of the great provincial languages in India. The progress will be smooth because all sense of rivalry and jealousy will be completely absent.

“If what I plead for is not feasible or is not practical politics, then you will have to choose between other languages, not only for the purpose of intercourse in the market places of India, but for intercourse among learned men, as medium for instruction in arts and sciences, for drafting laws and regulations, and for conducting legal proceedings and debates in our supreme law courts and Legislatures. A national language must be rich in its contents, must, by its allusions, its similies and metaphors be capable of arousing a sense of national pride in those who use it. The question of script is an important factor and the fact that the Devanagari script is already familiar to the vast masses of population through their Sanskrit literature is one of prime importance. In Madras and Malabar, in Utkal and Bengal, in Gujarat and Maharashtra,

Devanagari script is equally loved everywhere and any other script would be regarded as a strange innovation."

II

"We must acquire proficiency in the use of the national language to the same extent as we have endeavoured to do with English language. In this connection I have already elsewhere drawn attention to the merits of the Sanskrit language and its suitability for adoption as our national language. I was speculating as to what would happen if there was no active effort on behalf of the State for the propagation and enforcement of any particular language as the national language. What would be left as the linguistic tie between the different parts of the country? The answer to that question is not in doubt. The Sanskrit language is the only cultural bond between vast masses of Indians. It is the language which is being increasingly studied in our Pathshalas, schools and colleges, and a man from Madura and Rameswar, in the South well-versed in Sanskrit does not find himself a complete stranger in Prayag or Kashmir. It seems to me that the difficulties in the acquisition of Sanskrit are very much exaggerated. In fact, Sanskrit possesses the most scientifically constructed rules of grammar and these rules once mastered make the command of the language fairly easy. Its vocabulary is vast. Its literature in arts and sciences, mathematics and astronomy and medicine is magnificent. And it has further the great merit of being the mother of all provincial languages in India. I am convinced that the development of Sanskrit will lead automatically to the great encouragement and development of all the provincial languages of India.

BOOK REVIEWS

Further Sources of Vijayanagar History. 3 Volumes. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Dr. N. Venkataramanayya. University of Madras. Rs. 7 each.

The Department of Indian History in the University of Madras has enriched further the literature on South Indian History by publishing in three volumes the "Further sources of Vijayanagar History."

The laudable work begun by the late A. Rangaswami Sarasvati has been very ably completed by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, joint authors of the "Further Sources", selected and brought together from Sanskrit, from the South Indian Vernaculars and from Persian. The main work done by the Vijayanagar Scholar, Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, has been helped by Prof. K. A. Nilakantha Sastri with the English translations of Sanskrit extracts and pertinent passages from works in Dutch, written by Macleod and the Dagb Register etc.,

Of these three volumes of "Further Sources" the first volume is entirely devoted to a Summary, in fact a veritable compendium, of the History of Vijayanagar written by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, and the second volume contains the extracts about 253 in number written originally in Persian, Canarese, Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam and Sanskrit. A majority of the extracts are in Telugu, and only about 70 are in other languages, of which 7 are from Persian, 17 from Canarese, 6 from Malayālam, 18 from Sanskrit, and 22 from Tamil.

Dr. N. Venkataramanayya has added another feather to his cap by the compilation and publication of the very valuable source-material and by making most of it available for the first time to all scholars engaged in research in the History of Vijayanagar and laid them all under a deep debt of gratitude. These three volumes now published further embellish his name and fame, richly deserved, which he had already established by the publication of the "Studies in the Third Vijayanagar Dynasty," "The City and the Foundation of Vijayanagar", "The Muslim Expansion to the South", and last but not the least, the editing and publication of the "Velugōṭivārivamśā-

vali"—works embodying his patient labours over a number of years which eminently fitted him to undertake the work under review. The work "Further Sources" is really an achievement which its authors may be rightly proud of.

The sources in this work fall, broadly speaking, into four distinct categories, namely, chronicles, literary works, inscriptions, taken particularly from the Mackenzie Manuscripts which have not yet been published, and Cātus. The kingdom of Vijayanagar was specially fortunate in having many chronicles in vernacular, a kind of unclassical historical literature, both general and local, like Kēraḷa Paḷama in Malayālam, Kōyilolugu, Karṇāṭadēśarāyakkalincaritram, Rāmappayyam Ammānai in Tamil, and Rāyavācakam, Vijayanagara Sāmrajyām, Karṇāṭarājyavṛttāntam, Narapativijayavṛttāntam and Rāyadurga-araśara-varṇśāvali, etc., all in Telugu, accounts very valuable in their own way which are either local tracts, or accounts of reigns of kings, or general accounts of the kingdom and its kings. One or two of these in Telugu were published long ago in the Telugu journal Bhārati by the Doctor himself, and a few by the late J. Ramayya Pantulu, one of the pioneers of Historical research in the Telugu country, in the Journal of the Telugu Academy. Besides these chronicles there are some beautiful poems describing the valour and exploits of Gani Timmā Nāyaka, Kasturi Rangappa Nāyaka, and Yācama Nāyaka, a few of the noted chiefs of the Vijayanagar period, and the lineage of the Toṇḍaimāns of Pudukkoṭṭa which was first published in the Journal of the Telugu Academy long ago. These poems are very valuable to us in as much as they furnish a good deal of historical information about these chiefs which is either not available otherwise, or which goes to corroborate the evidence already known to us.

It is not unreasonable to expect a short critical review of the four kinds of extracts, discussing therein, if possible, their date and nature of composition, their authorship, and other peculiarities if there are any. Of these Rāyavācakam is a short account about the reign of Kṛṣṇadēvarāya. It was already published in the form of a book by the Telugu Academy, Cocanada. Of course I am not unaware of the fact that it is difficult to ascertain the date and authorship of these chronicles. I do not know what Kēraḷa Paḷama is; similarly, about Haridāsa and his work Irusamaya-

vilakkam, little is known to the students of history. At least a short introductory note at the beginning of an extract taken from each such particular source would have been very helpful to the student. I am aware of the fact that the first chapter of the valuable introduction has dealt with the general nature of the sources. Therein the development of the *prasaṣṭi* and *birudugadya* into a chronicle in Telugu has been shown. I do not know if this was the case in Tamil and Malayālam languages. Except tracing the growth of the chronicle nothing more has been said about the extracts. Some extracts have been taken from *kaḍitam*s also. The student of history should know what a *kaḍitam* is. It would have been proper if some explanation of the term was given in the first chapter, what it means, how it was prepared, kept and so on.

It is interesting however to note that the date of composition of Rāyavācakam, one of the many Telugu chronicles, is given. It is said, perhaps for good reasons which are mentioned, "that the Rāyavācakam must have been written sometime after the foundation of Bhāgnagara, i.e., after A.D. 1581."

Similarly, a short account of the Telugu literary works from which extracts were taken into this collection, would have also been of great value. The reader of these "Further Sources" knows neither about the authorship, nor about the date of composition of a great many of these works from which extracts were given. Many extracts were taken from works either printed and published already, or from those copies of which are either preserved in the Mackenzie Manuscripts or noted in the Triennial and Descriptive Catalogues of the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library. No references are given generally to published works; but references are given to unpublished works as to their sources. Owing to some discrepancies in noting these references it is not quite possible to know which of the works have been already published and which are not.

A note about the Kumudvatīkalyāṇam seems to be necessary; for, this work has been brought to light for the first time now. Its existence is not known till now to any of the scholars or students of Telugu literature. There are no copies of this work either in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library or in the Tanjore Palace Library. Not even its

name is found in the Catalogues of any of the Manuscript Libraries. Only one copy and that too an incomplete one consisting of only three or four *āśvāsas* and not the whole work, is preserved, strangely to say, in the Adyar Library, Madras. Ananta, the author of this work is a later member of the Maṭli family, a descendant, probably a grandson if I remember right, of the Maṭli Chief, Ananta, the author of the Kākutstha Vijayam, and a vassal of Veṅkaṭapatidēvarāya II. The Siddhavaṭam inscription of this latter Ananta is dated in Śaka 1527 or A. D. 1605. A short general account about these Telugu works would have enabled the reader to understand properly and assess the value of the material used.

The whole of the first volume is, as stated already, a short account of Vijayanagar primarily based on the extracts given in the Second Volume. The author has utilised other Sources also, chiefly inscriptions, Muslim histories and Dutch records in writing this account. This account is very valuable as it contains very many new facts which were unknown till now to students of the History of Vijayanagar. Robert Sewell's *Forgotten Empire* more or less stops with the battle of Rākṣasa Tangaḍi (Talikōṭa). What was stated therein about the Āravīḍu dynasty is very little. Father Heras brought his account to a close in his work, the *Āravīḍu Dynasty of Vijayanagar*, with the reign of Veṅkaṭapatidēvarāya II. Now Dr. Venkataramanayya has given a complete account of the Āravīḍu dynasty of Vijayanagar till the end of the reign of Śrīraṅga III, the last Vijayanagar ruler. Hence we can unhesitatingly say that we have here for the first time a complete history of Vijayanagar, for which we have to thank the author.

Dr. Venkataramanayya's account develops itself into a regular history, particularly in the latter half rather than in the early one. The treatment of the reigns of early kings is very concise and meagre and the treatment of those of later kings is much elaborate. Of course, the latter portion of the account shows how the author has mastered the subject; he is now the proper Scholar to undertake to write the History of Vijayanagar.

Dr. Venkataramanayya has thrown, by his discussion on some of the knotty problems, a good deal of light in his introduction. Some of his opinions may not be conclusive, but

undoubtedly they are very helpful to promote further research. Particularly, the author has very ably and thoroughly discussed the great battle of Rākṣasa Tangaḍi. The author has added many valuable footnotes correcting the dates and explaining and elucidating a number of other things which enhance the value of the work.

Though the number of extracts is very great it may not be all exhaustive. There may remain some more which patient research may yet bring to light. In fact there are some. However, it may not be possible to ransack all the Source-material. Judged by the number of extracts in these volumes one will not fail to appreciate the work that the authors have done.

As stated before, a great number of the Vijayanagara chronicles are in Telugu. The language in which they were written is the Spoken dialect of the later Vijayanagar period in the Telugu country. The spoken Telugu language has much changed since then. Some of the words in these chronicles have become obsolete; the meaning of some of them is not known; some words are now used in a different meaning. There are many words in these extracts which have dropped out of current usage. Any attempt to explain such terms means a regular study of this language, the spoken Telugu current in those times. These extracts from the chronicle thus open a new vista of linguistic and philological research, which some of the Telugu linguists may well take up in earnest in the interest of the Telugu language.

M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA.

Pañca-prakriyā of Sarvajñātman with the commentaries of Ānandajñāna and Pūrṇavidaymuni. Edited by T. R. Chintamani. M. A., Ph. D. University of Madras. 1946. Price Rs 2/8-.

This is a short manual of Advaita Vedānta by Sarvajñātma Muni, who is a well-known exponent of the doctrine. The work, as indicated by its title, is divided into five sections. The first of them deals with the different kinds of meanings which a word may have (*śabda-vṛtti*), and shows how the suitability of these meanings depends upon the context in which the word is used. The reason for beginning the work with a consideration of this topic is the fact that the Vedānta system, as acknowledged by all its adherents, is based essentially

on the Veda, which is a form of verbal testimony. The next three sections treat of what are described as 'the great sayings' (*mahāvākyas*) of which *Tat tvam asi* is a familiar example, and point out how they should be interpreted in the light of the preceding discussion of word-meanings. The last section is devoted to the elucidation of the ideas of bondage and release. Dealing thus with the fundamentals of Advaita and being written in a simple style, the book will be of particular value to those who begin the study of the doctrine.

There is prefixed to the Sanskrit text a very interesting Introduction in English. It discusses chiefly two questions, the date of the author and the identity of one of the commentators, viz, Ānandajñāna. The discussion of the former question is much the more important of the two. It has been held since, at least the time of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the author of the *advaita-siddhi*, that Sarvajñātman was a direct pupil of Sureśvara; but the editor was all along contending that this tradition concerning the relation of Sureśvara and Sarvajñātman could not be correct. Here he brings to our notice fresh evidence, which all but finally establishes his contention. It is the citation in this work (p. 69) of a passage from the *Iṣṭasiddhi* whose author is known to have flourished considerably *after* Sureśvara.

Before concluding this review, it is our melancholy duty to refer to the very sad demise of the editor a few months ago, and the great loss caused thereby to Sanskrit scholarship. Dr. Chintamani had a genuine interest in Indological research. He was a frequent contributor to Journals and his contributions always evoked wide interest. He had a close knowledge of unpublished manuscripts in the various public libraries in South India and has edited several of them, some like the *Prakaṣārtha*—a commentary on Śaṅkarācārya's *bhāṣya* on the Vedānta Sūtra—being of great importance to students of ancient Indian thought. He would surely have brought to light more works of the same type had he been spared; but that was not to be. He was only about 45 years old when he passed away.

M. H.

Critical Word-Index to the Bhagavad Gītā. By Rao Bahadur Prahlad C. Diwanji, Retd. Judge, Bombay. New Book Co., Ltd. 188/190, Hornby Road, Bombay. Rs. 12-0-0.

Busy as he had been as a member of the Judiciary of the Bombay Presidency, Mr. P. C. Diwanji has been an active research scholar and author throughout his official career, and during his present period of retirement too, he is continuing his research pursuits despite his advancing age. Besides some legal works, he has produced a few literary pieces too in Gujarathi. In the field of Sanskrit research, he is well-known for his many papers on Philosophical problems and classics and for his editions of the Siddhānta Bindu and Prasthānabhedā. Recently he has been pursuing the intensive study of the text and recensions of the Yogavāṣiṣṭha.

The book under review is a substantial production of his, having been compiled with great care and diligence. It is a complete Index Verborum and Dictionary of the Gītā, giving in a compact form the complete critical text-material of the Gītā with all the variant readings of the Vulgate, the Kasmirian version and the differences as found in the several well-known commentators.

The work is in three parts, Primary Word-Units, Secondary, Tertiary and Quaternary Word-Units, and consolidated Index of the Primary and Subsidiary Word-Units. Under each head, there are two sections, noticing separately the Vulgate and Kasmirian recensions. In the Primary word-unit Index, a word is given, described grammatically, rendered into English and provided with reference to the place or places of its occurrence. Sometimes, the note on the meaning and significance of a word is found in some detail. In an Introduction, he explains the origin, need and plan of this Index of the Gītā.

Sri P. C. Dewanji deserves the thanks of all Gītā-students for this most valuable compilation.

V. R.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

DR. T. R. CHINTAMANI.

It is with deep regret that we have to record here the pre-mature demise of the well-known Sanskrit scholar, Dr. T. R. Chintamani of the Sanskrit Dept. of the Madras University.

Dr. Chintamani hailed from a family devoted to Vedic and Vedantic studies, two of his near kinsmen being the well-known Pandits Sri T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and Sri Venkatesvara Dikshitar. A student of the late Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, Dr. Chintamani passed out of the Sanskrit Dept. of the Presidency College, Madras, with medals and prizes. He then worked on Semantics as a Research student in the Madras University, and later worked for some time in the Adyar Library and Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore. He was then appointed Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit in the Oriental Institute of the University of Madras, which post he held till his sad demise on 24th August, 1947.

As examiner and member of Boards of studies, he was connected with most of the South Indian Universities. A member of Oriental Conference Committee for some time, he also presided over its Indian Philosophy section at its recent Nagpur Session. He was actively connected with the Sanskrit Academy, Madras, the Ranade Library, Madras and the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras. For several years, he was intimately connected with the Journal of Oriental Research.

Dr. Chinamani wrote many articles in Research Journals, but his concentrated work was mainly on the editing of Sanskrit works from manuscripts. Editions of the following works stand to his credit:—

1. Uṇādi Sūtras in various recensions—4 Vols.
2. Prakāṭārthavivarāṇa—2 Vols.
3. Nānārthasaṁgraha of Ajayapāla
4. Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja
5. Sāhityaratnākara of Yajñanārāyaṇa
6. Raghunāthābhyaudaya of Rāmabhadra

7. Sarvatobhadra of Rāmakaṇṭha
8. Śārīrakanyāyasaṅgraha
9. The Kauṣītaka Gṛhya Sūtras with Bhavatrāta's Commentary
10. The Pañcaprakriyā of Sarvajñātman with two commentaries
11. Vyavaharāśiromani

In the J. O. R., Madras, he published the following notes, articles and editions of fragments and short works:

1. Date of Śrīkaṇṭha and his Brahmanīmāmsā
2. Note on the authorship of the Uṇādi Sūtras
3. Fragments of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka
4. „ Mātṛgupta
5. Note on the Cārvāka system
6. „ Manoratha
7. „ Mahodadhi and Mahāvra
8. „ Date of Tattvasamāsa
9. „ „ Sāmkhyapravacana Sūtras
10. „ „ Māgha
11. Skandasvāmin's commentary on Nirukta
12. Works of Prabhākara
13. Śrī Śātyāyana Brāhmaṇa
14. Date of Śaṅkarācārya and some of his Predecessors
15. Mahratta Hill Fortresses
16. Lakṣaṇaratnāvalī of Appayya Dikṣita
17. Amarakhaṇḍana of Śrī Harṣa
- 18-19. Adhikarana Saṅgati and Adhikarana Mañjarī of Citsukha (with T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar)
20. A commentary on Amarakośa
21. Subhūticandra's commentary on Amarakośa
22. Vidyāvinoda Nārāyaṇa's „ „
23. Pramāṇalakṣaṇa of Sarvajñātmān-unfinished (with T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar).
24. Fragments of Sumantu Dharma Sūtras
25. Citrapaṭa of Appayya Dikṣita
26. Fragments of Kāśyapa Dharma Sūtras

For his Doctorate, he wrote a thesis on the Literary History of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā, two instalments of which appeared in print in the J. O. R. He had also collaborated with the late Mm. Prof. Kuppaswami Sastri in his edition of Dhvanyāloka (Ud. I).

He contributed also some papers to some of the Oriental Conference sessions and some Commemoration Volumes. Among his contributions in other Research Journals may be mentioned his two contributions in the *IHQ*, Calcutta, the Yuddhakāṇḍa Campū of Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita and Brahmānanda Yati's Brahmasūtra Bhaṣyārtha Saṁgraha.

RAO BAHADUR C. R. KRISHNAMACHARLU.

Rao Bahadur C. R. K. Charlu, Retired Epigraphist for the Government of India, who had been ailing for sometime, passed away on the evening of August 1931 at the age of 60 at his residence in 18, Ramanujam Street, Thyagarayanagar.

Mr. C. R. K. Charlu made his mark in research by originality and insight. Besides the numerous inscriptions which he edited for the *Epigraphia Indica* and the Hyderabad Archaeological Department, he made valuable contributions to the interpretation of ancient Indian History. He wrote a monograph on the 'Cradle of Indian History', in which he drew pointed attention to the mass of historical material that lay embedded in our Puranas. Besides his published works, he left behind two manuscripts, the Telingana Inscriptions, and the Mahabharata Index, ready for the press.

DR. M. H. KRISHNA.

On 23rd December 1947, Dr. M. H. Krishna, Director of Archaeology, Mysore passed away, at Mysore. He was also for several years one of the Secretaries of the All-India Oriental Conference.

Prize for Book on Hindu Culture and Religion in Tamil

A Prize of Rs. 1000 will be awarded to the person who writes a book which will be an incentive to young boys and girls taking interest in Hindu Culture and Religion.

The book should be in Tamil and be suitable for reading by boys and girls between the ages of 12 and 16.

The manuscript should be written on one side of the paper only and the number of pages of the manuscript should be such that when printed it will extend to about 128 pages of Demy Octavo size.

Two copies of the manuscript should be submitted so as to reach the undersigned on or before the 1st October 1948.

All manuscripts received will be examined by a Board consisting of the following gentlemen:

1. Sir S. Varadachariar
2. Dewan Bahadur K. Sundaram Chettiar
3. Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar
4. Sri C. K. Subrahmanya Mudaliar
5. Dr. V. Raghavan

The selection by the Board for the award of the Prize will be subject to the approval of His Holiness Sri Sankaracharya Swamigal of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham of Kumbakonam. The selection so approved will be final.

The manuscript selected for the prize will become the absolute property of the undersigned who will have the rights to translate and print and publish the same.

The rejected manuscripts will be returned to the authors but it would be open to the undersigned to purchase any of them on terms to be mutually arranged.

"AMRITA VILAS,"

MADRAS 10.

14th November 1947.

M. SUBRAHMANYAN,

Accountant General

(Retired).

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

Rs. A. P.

1. **Vibhrama-Viveka** of Maṇḍana Miśra—edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Vedāntālaṅkāra Prof. T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Sanskrit College, Mylapore, Maḍras .. 0 12 0
2. **Vinavasavadatta** (an old Sanskrit drama), edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.), Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras .. 0 8 0
3. **Tolkappiyam** with an English translation, by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi (Vol. I) .. 1 0 0
4. **Tolkappiyam** Do. Do. Vol. II, Part 1 .. 2 0 0
5. **History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil**, by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi .. 6 0 0
6. **Dhvanyaloka & Locana** of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta with Kaumudī by Uttuṅodaya and Upalocana edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.), Sri T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and Dr. T. R. Chintamani, M.A., Uddyota I .. 8 0 0
7. **The Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume** .. 3 0 0
8. **Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit** by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri .. 2 0 0
9. **Compromises in the History of Vedānta** by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri .. 1 4 0
10. **The Primer of Indian Logic** by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri .. 6 0 0

Copies can be had of: The Secretaries,

***The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute,
Mylapore, MADRAS.***

SELECT OPINIONS

Hermann Jacobi, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, 14th December, 1926.—I have perused your new Journal of Oriental Research with great interest. I heartily wish you success in your meritorious undertaking.

L. D. Barnett, School of Oriental Studies, London, 19th December, 1926.—It seems to me to be a good beginning to the enterprise which I hope will be very successful. Some of the matter is very good indeed.

J. Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany, 20th December, 1926.—This evidently is a periodical of great promise, with every chance of success.

Q. Strauss, Professor of Sanskrit, Kiel University, 1st January, 1927.—Being very well pleased with the first number of your Journal of Oriental Research I ask you to enrol me as a subscriber.

Sir Richard Temple, Editor, Indian Antiquary, London, 6th January, 1927.—Your excellent Issue.

F. O. Schrader, Kiel, 9th January, 1927.—I have read with absorbing interest through the first number and find its contents quite satisfactory..... A Journal of this kind has been undoubtedly a need in Madras since long.

Dr. Wilhelm Printz, Librarian, D. M. G. Halle, 14th January, 1927.—..... This fascicle contains many very interesting and scholarly articles: a very pretty start!

"Bombay Chronicle," 22nd December, 1926.—..... The Quality of scholarship displayed is of a high order.

"Indian Review," November, 1927.—We welcome this new Quarterly of Oriental Research..... The influence of Professor S. Kuppaswami Sastri, the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Presidency College, has been ceaselessly exercised in furthering the cause of such learning.....

"New India," 20th December, 1926.—..... The design and the get-up of the Journal is very good, and we recommend the Journal to all lovers of research and scholarship.

"Hindu," 9th February, 1927.—..... The Journal will not merely maintain the high level reached in its first number but frequently transcend itself.

"Madras Mail," 21st January, 1927.—..... The contributions are from persons who have specialised in particular branches and show striking evidence of original work....

Dr. Sylvain Levi, Paris.—..... It deals with so many sides of Indian Science, and in such an interesting way. What I like most in it, is its genuine and regular Indian flavour, its proper 'Rasa'. Many of your contributors, if not all of them, know how to combine Pandit-learning and Western standards.

Dr. H. Luders, Berlin University.—..... I was greatly impressed with the high standard of scholarship, the originality of thought and the soundness of critical methods displayed in your contributions....

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MADRAS.

GOVERNING BODY.

PRESIDENT:

SRI T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRI, C.I.E.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI IYER, LL.D., K.C.I.E.

SIR S. RADHAKRISHNAN.

DR. SIR A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR, LL.D., D.SC.

TRUSTEES:

RAO BAHADUR K. V. KRISHNASWAMI IYER, B.A., B.L.

RAO BAHADUR A. A. VENKATARAMA IYER.

TREASURER:

SRI M. SUBBARAYA IYER, B.A., B.L.

MEMBERS:

RAO BAHADUR G. A. NATESAN.

RAO BAHADUR PROF. D. S. SARMA.

DEWAN BAHADUR K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI.

PROF. P. N. SRINIVASACHARIAR.

SRI N. RAGHUNATHAN.

SRI PROF. T. CHANDRASEKHARAN, M.A., L.T.

SECRETARIES:

SRI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA IYER, B.A., B.L.

SRI PROF. A. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR, M.A.

SRI DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A. PH.D.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN:

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA.

VICE-CHAIRMAN:

PROF. K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI.

MEMBERS:

RAO SAHIB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI.

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, M.A., PH.D.

DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA, M.A., D.PHIL.

DR. A. SANKARAN, M.A., PH.D.

DR. T. R. CHINTAMANI, M.A., PH.D.

PROF. V. A. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, M.A.

EX-OFFICIO:

SRI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA IYER, B.A., B.L.

SRI PROF. A. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR, M.A.

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D. (*Correspondent for the Journal*).

All Communications should be addressed to the Correspondent, Journal of Oriental Research, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras.

PRINTED BY N. RAMARATNAM, M.A., B.L., AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS

55 & 56 MUNDAKANNI AMMAN KOIL STREET, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.—MS. 76.

PUBLISHED BY K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR, KSRI., MYLAPORE, MADRAS.—MS. 394.