

Quarterly

Vol. XVIII. Part I

THE
JOURNAL
OF
ORIENTAL RESEARCH
MADRAS

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

September

1948



त म सो मा ज्यो ति र्ग म य

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE
MADRAS

1950

Annual Subs., Inland, Rs. 8.

Foreign, 14 Shillings

Each part separately Rupees Two, Postage inclusive

CONTENTS

VOL. XVIII]

[PART I

PAGES

Vedic Studies: IV. *Śuṣma*:

A. Venkatasubbiah ... 1—15

Śabara and the Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Darśanas:

G. V. Devasthali ... 16—24

Udayana's Criticism of the Sāṃkhya:

Hem Chandra Joshi ... 25—31

The Vṛttikāragraṇtha

... 31

The Hanumad Viṃśati of Lakṣmīkumāra Tātācārya:

G. Harihara Sastri and V. Raghavan ... 32—38

The Country of Sapādalakṣha:

N. Lakshminarayan Rao ... 39—42

The Bee-and-Spring Maxim:

P. B. Desai ... 43—44

Dominions of the Śulṅkīs of Orissa:

Dines Chandra Sircar ... 45—48

New Facts about the Bhauma-Karas:

Dines Chandra Sircar ... 49—51

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute:

... 52

Book Reviews

... 53—62

Obituary

... 63—64

Supplements :

Tolkāppiyam-Pōruḷ-Kaḷaviyal:

P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ... 71—78

Avantisundarikathāsāra:

G. Harihara Sastri ... 57—64

Kuppuswami Sastri Memorial Volume (*concluded*) ... 121—136

VEDIC STUDIES: IV. *SUŚMA*

BY

DR. A. VENKATASUBBIAH

(Continued from Vol. XVII, p. 204)

Maruts. When it is quite plain to every one that the Maruts are come to the sacrifice of Agastya to receive offerings there, Indra pretends to think that they are on their way in the sky, hastening like a falcon (cp. v. 2 c: *śyenāñ iva dhrajato antarikṣe*) to the sacrifice of another, more favoured, sacrificer; and he even asks them maliciously: (v. 2 d): "Will you deign to tell us by what means, with what great hymn, we humble people can induce you to remain and partake of our simple sacrificial offerings?"

sanīlāḥ 'having the same nest'=having the same abode. Geldner (RV. Über.) however interprets it as 'of equal birth'. Regarding the expression *kayā matī sam mimikṣuḥ*, compare 5, 58, 5: *svayā matyā marutaḥ sam mimikṣuḥ* 'the Maruts were joined with their own song of praise (i.e., were themselves singing)'.

With *arcanti śuṣmam* in pāda d, compare *śuṣam arcati* 'sings loudly a hymn of praise' in 1, 9, 10. The reference here is to the song which the Maruts are always singing. Compare 1, 19, 4: *yā ugrā arkam ānṛcuḥ*, 'the powerful (Maruts) who sang songs'; 1, 38, 15: *vandasva mārutaṁ gaṇam tveṣam paṇasyum arkaṇam* 'worship the host of Maruts, fierce, shouting, singing'; 1, 166, 7: *arcanty arkam madirasya pītaye* '(the Maruts) sing a song in order to drink the intoxicating drink'; and 1, 85, 8: *arcanto arkam janayanta indriyam adhi śriyo dadhire pṛśnimātarāḥ* 'they who had Pṛśni for mother and are singing songs, making a loud sound, put on ornaments'. The last-mentioned of the above passages states not only that the Maruts sing songs, but also that they make a sound like Indra, that is, a loud sound. In other words, the Maruts sing their songs loudly, and without doubt, it is this loud sound that is referred to in 1, 37, 4 and 1, 64, 10 explained below and

and in 5, 54, 12: *svāraṇti ghōṣaṃ vitatam ṛtāyavaḥ* and other similar verses.

- (18) 1, 165, 4: *brahmāṇi me matāyaḥ śaṃ sutāsaḥ*
śuṣma iyarti prābhṛto me adriḥ |
ā śāsate prati haryanty ukthe-
mā harī vahatas tā no accha ||

“Pleasing to me are spells, hymns and pressed (Soma-) juices. The loud sound rises up, the pressing-stone is made ready for me. The hymns wish (for me), cherish (me); these two horses carry us to them”.

The ‘loud sound’ mentioned in pāda *b* is evidently that made by hymns and spells, by the pressed Soma juice, and by the pressing-stones. See regarding them Vol. XVII. p. 197 above.

In pāda *c*, I look upon *ukthā* as a nominative, subject of *āśāsate* and *pratiharyanti*. These verbs are almost synonymous, and I understand *mām* as object after them. Compare in this connection the expression *uśatīr matayaḥ* in 10, 43, 1: *acchā ma indraṃ matayaḥ svarūdaḥ sadhrīcīr viśvā uśatīr anūṣata* ‘my bright hymns that go together, longing, have all cried loudly towards Indra’; 5, 44, 14: *agnīr jāgāra tāṃ ṛcaḥ kāmāyante* ‘Agni has awakened; the ṛks love him’; and 10, 116, 8: *prāyas-vantaḥ prati haryāmasi tvā* ‘we cherish thee with pleasing offerings’.

- (19) 1, 64, 10: *viśvavedaso rayibhiḥ sāmokasaḥ*
sāmmiślāsaḥ taviṣibhir virapśinaḥ |
astāra iṣuṃ dadhire gabhastyor
anantaśuṣmā viśakhādāyo naraḥ ||

“The heroes, the archers, knowing all, having wealth, united with splendours, mighty, making an incessant roar, and having excellent *khādīs*, carried an arrow in their hands”.

This verse is addressed to the Maruts. Concerning the roar made by them, see p. 1 above. Compare also the epithets *tuviṣ-vāṇi* and *tuviṣvaṇas* ‘noisy, making a loud sound and *stanayadamāḥ* ‘of thundering speed’ that are applied to them in 1, 166, 1: *aidheva yāman marutas tuviṣvaṇaḥ* 6, 48, 15: *tveṣaṃ śardho na mārutaṃ tuviṣvaṇi*; and 5, 54, 3: *stanayadamā rabhasā*

udojasaḥ. See also Bergaigne 2, 373 and Pischel's observations in Ved. St. 1, 222.

(20) 8, 20, 3: *vidmā hi rudriyānām*
śuṣmam ugrammarutām śimivātām |
viṣṇor eśasya mīlhuṣām ||

"We know well the mighty roar of Rudra's sons, the impetuous bounteous Maruts (and) of the swift Viṣṇu".

(21) 1, 37, 4: *prā vaḥ śardhāya ghr̥ṣvaye*
tveṣadyumnāya śuṣmīṇe |
devāttam brahma gāyata ||

"Sing the god-given song to the wild troop, fiercely valiant, roaring".

This verse is addressed to the Maruts.

(22) 1, 52, 4: *a yaṁ pr̥ṇanti divi sadmabarhiṣaḥ*
samudraṁ na subhvaḥ svā abhiṣṭayaḥ |
taṁ vṛtrahatyē anu tasthur ūtayaḥ
śuṣmā indram avātā ahrutapsavaḥ ||

It is difficult to ascertain the import of this verse, owing to the fact that the nominatives contained in it are all adjectives. In the first half-verse, Sāyaṇa understands after *sadmabarhiṣaḥ* the word *somāḥ* (Soma juices) and makes it the subject of *āpr̥ṇanti* while *subhvaḥ* is interpreted by him as *nadyaḥ* forming the *upamāna* of *somāḥ*; *svāḥ* is, according to him, an attribute of *subhvaḥ* and *abhiṣṭayaḥ* (*ābhimukhyena gamanavatyāḥ*) of *ūtayaḥ* (*marutaḥ*) in the second half-verse. According to Grassmann (RV. Über.) and Geldner (RV. Über.) however, the subject of *āpr̥ṇanti* is *abhiṣṭayaḥ*, and the words *sadmabarhiṣaḥ*, *svāḥ* and *subhvaḥ* are attributes of it, while Ludwig makes *subhvaḥ* the subject and regards the other words as its attributes.

Similarly, in the second half-verse, Sāyaṇa understands the word *marutaḥ* after *ūtayaḥ* and makes it the subject of *anutasthuḥ*, while *śuṣmāḥ* (*satrūnām śoṣayitāraḥ*) is construed by him as an adjective of *marutaḥ*. Geldner, on the other hand, who interprets *śuṣmāḥ* here as 'Kräfte' (powers, forces), construes it as being in apposition to *ūtayaḥ* which he makes the subject of *anutasthuḥ*. He likewise interprets *abhiṣṭayaḥ*

also in pāda b as 'forces' and observes in his note that 'the succours and forces of Indra are personified here and represented as his lifeguardsmen'.

Oldenberg (*RV. Noten*) opines that a word meaning 'Stärke (forces, powers)' should be understood after *subhvaḥ*. He also construes *divi* with *sadmabarhiṣaḥ* and interprets the expression as 'whose *barhis* is the seat in heaven'.

Now, *subhvaḥ*, one of the adjectives in the first half of our verse occurs in the first stanza also of this hymn (1, 52):
tyam su meṣam mahayā svarvidam śatam yasya subhvaḥ sākam
irate | atyam na vājam havanasyadam ratham endram uvṛtyām
avase suvṛkṣibhiḥ. Pāda b of this stanza too has been explained differently as 'for whom a hundred helpers arise at once (Grassmann), 'with whom a hundred strong men march out at the same time' (Ludwig), 'whose hundred powers bestir themselves at the same time' (Geldner), and as *yasya indrasya śatam śata-samkhyākāḥ subhvaḥ stotāraḥ sākam sahaiva yugapadeva irate stutau pravartante | yad vā | yasya indrasya ratham śatam subhvaḥ śata-samkhyākū aśvāḥ sākam saha irate gamayanti* (Sāyaṇa). When one bears in mind however that the expression *sākam irate* occurs again in the RV in 9, 69, 6 (*matsarāsaḥ prasūpaḥ sākam irate*) which speaks of the movement of the pressed Soma juices, that the epithet *subhū* is applied to the Soma juice in 9, 79, 5: *evā ta indo subhvām supēśasam rasam tuñjanti prathamā abhiśrjyaḥ*, and that the word *śata* too is used in connection with Soma juice in 1, 30, 2: *śatam vā yaḥ śucinām sahasram vā samāśirām | edu nimnam na riyate* "To whom a hundred streams of pure Soma juice, or a thousand of Soma juice with admixture, run, like (water) to low ground" (note the parallelism of *śatam riyate* with *śatam irate*¹), it becomes plain that *subhvaḥ* in 1, 52, 1 refers to the Soma juice, and that the meaning of the stanza

1. Compare also the epithet *śatadhāra* 'having a hundred streams' that is applied to Soma in 9, 85, 4: *sahasrañṛthāḥ śatadhāro adbhuta indrāyenduh pavate*; 9, 86, 11: *abhikrandan kalaśam vājy arṣati patu divaḥ śatadhāro vicakṣanaḥ* and 9, 96, 14: *vṛṣṭim divaḥ śatadhāraḥ pavasva*.

is: "Glorify well that goat, winner of light, to whom a hundred streams of lovely (Soma) run at the same time. With hymns of praise would I turn (towards us) for protection Indra, the chariot-fighter, who speeds like a horse racing for the prize". It also becomes equally plain that, in 1, 52, 4 too, the epithet *subhvaḥ* refers to Soma juices as opined by Sāyaṇa.

Another epithet occurring in our verse, *ūtayaḥ*, is used by the poet in two other verses of the same hymn (1, 52), to wit, in v. 5: *raghvīrīva pravāṇe sasrur ūtayaḥ*, and in v. 9: *yan mā uṣaḥpradhanā indram ūtayaḥ svar nṛṣāco maruto madann annu* in juxtaposition with *marutaḥ*. The epithet *ahrutapsavaḥ* too that is used in pāda d of our verse occurs in but one other stanza of the RV, namely, in 8, 20, 7: *svadhām annu śrīyaṁ nāro māhi tveṣā amavanto vṛṣapsavaḥ | vāhante ahrutapsavaḥ* where it is an epithet of the Maruts.

It thus becomes plain that in our verse too the epithets *ūtayaḥ* and *ahrutapsavaḥ* refer to the Maruts as opined by Sāyaṇa. I therefore translate the verse as follows:

"Whom (that has a wide capacity) like the ocean, his dear helpers, lovely (Soma juices), placed on the sacrificial straw, fill in heaven, by him, Indra, there stood, when he killed Vṛtra, his helpers (the Maruts), who were making a loud sound, were unconquered, and had uninjured bodies".

Concerning the epithet *sadmabarhiṣaḥ*, compare the epithets *barhiṣad* and *barhiṣthā*, both signifying 'placed on the barhis' that are applied to the Soma juices in 9, 78, 1: *madhumanta indavaḥ . . . barhiṣadaḥ* and 3, 4, 22: *madamā gahi barhiṣthām*. Compare also 8, 49, 3: *ā tvā sutāsa indavo madā | ya indra girvaṇaḥ | āpo nu vajrinn anv okyaṁ saraḥ prṇanti śūra r dhase* "O Indra that rejoicest in praises, the juices of the pressed Soma that are intoxicating, fill thee for making gifts, O carrier of the thunder-bolt, as, O hero, the waters fill their home-lake", in which *indavaḥ* forms the subject of *āprṇanti*.

Samudram na in pāda b is a *luptoṣamā*. As already pointed out above, Sāyaṇa interprets *subhvaḥ* as *nadyaḥ* and makes of it a *pūrṇoṣamā*; Geldner supplies a word signifying

'rivers' after *samudraṃ na* and refers to '5, 85, 6; 2, 35, 3; 3, 46, 4, etc.,' in support. It is not clear from the translations of Grassmann and Ludwig how they filled up the *upamā*. For my part, I am inclined to supply a word like *uruvyacasam* after *samudraṃ na*; compare the simile *samudraṃ na . . uruvyacasam* in No. 1 explained above and the passages cited there.

Regarding *abhiṣṭayaḥ* 'helpers', compare 9, 61, 22 *sa pavaśva yā āvithendram vṛtrāya hantave | vavrivāṃsam mahīr apāḥ* "Become clear (O Soma) that didst help Indra to kill Vṛtra who was confining the great waters" and the numerous other similar verses in which Indra is said to have killed Vṛtra with the help, or in the company, of Soma, or in the intoxication produced by drinking Soma. There are five such verses in hymn 1, 52 itself, namely, 2 (*jarhṛṣāṇo andhasā*) 3 (*madavṛddhaḥ; pāprir andhasaḥ*), 5 (*made asya yudhyataḥ; dhṛṣamāṇo andhasā*), 10 (*made sutasya*), 14 (*made asya yudhyataḥ*).

The epithet *śuśmāḥ* 'making a loud sound' is appropriate to the Maruts whose help to Indra, when he fought with Vṛtra, consisted principally in their loudly encouraging him by (1) singing hymns of praise, and (2) shouting other words of cheer. Compare 8, 89, 3: *prā va indrāya bṛhatē maruto brahmā rcata | vṛtram hanati vṛtrahā śatakratur vajreṇa śataparvanā*. "Sing loudly, O Maruts, a hymn to mighty Indra, so that he, that has a hundred powers, the slayer of Vṛtra, may slay Vṛtra with the thunder-bolt of hundred joints"; 5, 29, 2: *anu yad im maruto mandasānam ārcann indram pāvivāṃsam sutasya | ādatta vajram abhi yad ahiṃ hann apo yadvir asṛjat sartavā u*. "When the Maruts sang loudly the praises of Indra who had drunk of the Soma and was intoxicated, he took up the thunder-bolt; when he slew the Ahi, he set free the great Waters to flow".

(23) 6, 27, 4: *etat tyat ta indriyam aceti*

yenāvadhīr varaśikhasya śeṣaḥ |

vajrasya yat te nihatasya śuśmāt

svanāc cid indra paramo dadāra ||

“Then was seen this thy well-known Indra-strength by which thou slewest Varasikha’s offspring, when, by the mere loud sound of the thunder-bolt hurled by thee, O Indra, the highest (world) was rent”.

The loud sound of the thunder-bolt is referred to in 2, 11, 9-10: *Indro mahām sindhum āśayānam māyāvinam vṛtram asphuran niḥ | arejetām rodasī bhiyāne kanīkradato vṛṣṇo asya vajrāt || aroravīd vṛṣṇo asya vajrah*. “Indra cast out the wily Vṛtra who was confining the great river. The two worlds trembled, frightened by the loud-sounding thunder-bolt of this bull. The thunder-bolt of this bull roared”. Compare also the epithet *svarya* ‘making a loud sound’ that is applied to the Vajra in 1, 32, 2: *tvāṣṭāsmāi vajram svaryām tatākṣa* and 1, 61, 6: *asmā id u tvaṣṭātakṣad vajram svajastamam svaryām ranāya*.

(24) 2, 17, 3: *adhākṛṇoḥ prathamam vīryam mahad yad asyāgre brāhmaṇā śuśmam airayaḥ | ratheṣṭhena haryaśvena vicyutāḥ pra jīrayaḥ sisrate sadhryaāk pṛthak ||*

“Then didst thou perform thy first valiant deed when at the beginning, thou didst let out a roar with thy spell. Delivered by (Indra) who has bay horses and sits in a chariot, the swift waters rush forward together impetuously”.

As shown above (Vol. XIV. 164 ff.), Indra sings a spell of truth loudly in order to shatter the mountain-prison of the Waters and liberate them. The words *brahma* and *śuśma* here refer to this shout and this spell of truth.

(25) 2, 17, 1: *tad asmai navyam āṅgirasvad arcata śuśmā yad asya pratnathodīrate | viśvā yad gotrā sahasā parivṛtā made somasya dṛmhitā ny airayat ||*

“Sing, like the Āṅgirasas, a new hymn to this (Indra) so that his shouts may rise as in the past, when, in the intoxication caused by Soma, he, in a moment, shattered all the solid mountains (and set free) what had been confined”.

Airayat, in pāda d, has for object, not only *gotra* but *parivṛta* also. Similar constructions are found in 3, 30, 21:

ā no gotrā dardṛhi gopate gāḥ 'break open for us the mountains (and set free) the cows, O lord of cows'; 4, 16, 8: apo yad adrim puruhūta dardah 'when thou didst shatter the mountain (and set free) the Waters, O thou that art much invoked'; 7, 27, 2: tvam hi dṛḥā maghavan vicetā apū vṛdhi parivṛtaṁ nā rādhaḥ 'open, O thou that art liberal and wise the solid mountains (and set free) the wealth enclosed in them'.

(26) 2, 12, 13: dyāvā cid asmai pṛthivī namete
 śuṣmāc cid asya parvatā bhayante |
 yaḥ somapā nicito vajrabāhur
 yō vajrahastaḥ sā janāsa indrah ||

"Even heaven and earth bend before him; the mountains are frightened at even his loud shout; the Soma-drinker, who is seen with the thunder-bolt in his arms, with the thunder-bolt in his hands, he, O ye people, is Indra".

Compare 1,63,1 explained below. Compare also the epithet *saṁkrandana* 'roarer' that is applied to him in 10,103,1 (*saṁkrandano nimīṣa ekavīrah*) and 2 (*saṁkrandanenānimīṣeṇa jiṣṇunā*) and the epithet *svarya* 'roaring' which is used in connection with him in 1, 62, 4 (*svarenādrim svaryo nava-gvaiḥ*) that has been explained above (XIV. 230) and in 4,17,4: ya im jajāna svaryam suvajram.

(27) 2,12,1: yō jātā eva prathamō manasvān
 devo devān krātunā paryabhūṣat |
 yāsya śuṣmād rodasī abhyasetām
 nṛmāsya mahnā sā janāsa indrah ||

"He, the first god, wise, who, being just born, helped the gods with his strength, of whose shout heaven and earth were afraid, on account of the greatness of his strength, he, O ye people, is Indra".

(28) 1,63,1: tvam mahāñ indra yō ha śuṣmair
 dyāvā jajñānaḥ pṛthivī ame dhāḥ |
 yad dha te viśvā girayaś cid abhvā
 bhiyā dṛḥāsaḥ kiraṇā nājan ||

“Great art thou, O Indra, who being born, set heaven and earth in commotion by thy roars when all beings, even the firmly-established mountains, trembled with fear like particles of dust”.

(29) 4, 21, 7: *sa*tra *yad* *im* *bhār*varasya *vr̥ṣṇaḥ*
*si*ṣakti *śu*ṣmaḥ *stuvate* *bhār*āya |
*gu*hā *yad* *im* *au*śijasya *go*he
prā *yad*dhiye *prā*yase *ma*dāya ||

“When, at the same time, the roar of the bull Bhārvara accompanies (him) for the victory of the praiser, when, in secret, in the hiding-place of Auśija, (he is destined) for impelling, for running, for the intoxication (of the fight)”.

This verse occurs in a hymn addressed to Indra. Its import is obscure; and I have here mostly followed the translation of Geldner (RV. Über.), which implies reading *yad hiye* instead of *yad-dhiye* favoured by the Padakāra in pāda d.

(30) 17, 12: *ki*yat *svid* *indro* *ad*hyeti *mātu*ḥ
*ki*yat *pitur* *janit*ur *yo* *jajā*na |
yo *asya* *śu*ṣmaḥ *muhukair* *iyarti*
vāto *nā* *jūtaḥ* *stanayad*bhir *abhra*iḥ ||

“How much does Indra think of his mother, how much of his father, he who engendered (his father), when along with crowds, he lets out a loud roar, like the wind speeding with thundering clouds?”

muhukair ‘with crowds’; see Ved. Stud. 3, p. 188; the reference here is to the Maruts and other followers of Indra. The question ‘how much does he think’ is a rhetorical form of stating ‘he does not think at all’. Regarding the loud sound made by Vāyu, compare the epithet *krandad-iṣṭi* ‘who speeds with a loud sound’ that is applied to him in 10,100,2: *prā* *vāy*ve *śuci*ṣe *krandad*iṣṭaye.

(31) 6, 61, 2: *iyam* *śu*ṣmebhir *bisakhā* *ivāru*jat
sānu *giri*nām *tavi*ṣebhir *ūrmibhiḥ* |
*pārā*vatagnīm *āvase* *suvṛktibhiḥ*
sarasvatīm *ā* *vivāsema* *dhītibhiḥ* ||

“With impetuous roaring waves, this (river) has, like a digger of roots, broken the ridge of mountain with well-cut hymns,

we invite for protection Sarasvatī, the destroyer of the Pārāvata people ”.

This verse is addressed to the river Sarasvatī. With *śuṣmebhir ūrmibhiḥ* in the first half-verse, compare 10, 68, 1: *giriḥrajo nōrmayo mōdāntaḥ* ‘roaring like waves that shatter the mountain’. *bisakhāḥ* is a hap. leg.; it is explained by Yāska (Nirukta, 2, 24, 1) as a compound of *bisa* and Durga paraphrases it as *bisa-khānakaḥ*. Though this explanation has been adopted by Böhtlingk and Roth (in the PW), Grassmann and Ludwig, I feel very doubtful about its correctness. Regarding the word *Pārāvataḥnīm*, Ludwig points out (IV, 176) that the Pārāvata people are mentioned in 8, 34, 18 and in Tāṇḍya MBr. 9, 4, 10. Yāska however explains (l.c.) the word as *pārāvāra-ghātīnīm* ‘injuring the near and further banks’.

(32) 5, 10, 4: ye agne candra te girāḥ
śumbhantyaśvarādhasaḥ |
śuṣmebhiḥ śuṣmiṇo nāro
divas cid yeṣāṃ brhat
sukīrtir bodhati tmanā ||

“The men, O bright Agni, who, adorn hymns for thee which are accompanied by gifts of horses, the men who make a loud sound by means of hymns (and) whose fame more expansive than heaven even, is awake by itself ”.

The verse consists of two relative clauses only, and is a continuation of v. 3: *tvam no agna eṣāṃ gayam puṣṭim ca vārdhaya | ye stomebhiḥ pra sūrayo nāro maghāny ānaśuḥ* “Multiply, Agni, for our sake the house and prosperity of these people, of the liberal givers, who, with hymns, have obtained wealth”.

Girāḥ śumbhanti te ‘adorn hymns for thee’=fashion polished hymns for thee and adorn thee with them, or, shortly, fashion fine hymns for thee. The expression recurs in 5, 39, 5: *tasmā u brāhmavāhase . . girāḥ śumbhantya ātrayaḥ* and 8, 6, 11: *aham pratnena manmanā girāḥ śumbhāmi kaṇvavat*; and similar expressions, with the root *añj* instead of *śubh* are used in 1, 61, 5: *indrāyārkaṃ juhvā samañje*; 1, 64, 1: *girāḥ*

sāmañje vidatheṣv ābhuvah and 5. 54, 1: *prā śardhāya mārutāya svabhānava imāni vācyaṃ anajā parvatacyute*.

It is the opinion of Oldenberg (SBE. 46, p. 389) and of Grassmann (RV. Über.) that *aśvarādhasaḥ* is masculine plural, qualifying *ye*; and they translate the first half-verse as 'they who adorn prayers for thee, O bright Agni, the givers of horses' and 'who, O bright Agni, adorn hymns for thee as one adorns horses'; similarly, Sāyaṇa too regards the word as masculine plural, but explains it as *aśva-dhanāḥ*. For my part, I believe that *aśvarādhasaḥ* is an epithet of *giraḥ* and means 'that are accompanied by gifts of horses', that is, 'which are accepted by the deity and rewarded by a gift of horses to the praiser'; compare 6, 53, 10: *utā no goṣaṇīm dhiyam aśvasām vājasām utā | nṛvat kṛṇuhi vītaye* "For the sake of enjoyment, make our hymn a winner of cows, horses and wealth, a bringer of a man (-child)". 1, 182, 4: *vācam-vācam jaritū ratninīm kṛtam ubha śamsā nāsatyā vataṃ mama* 'make each hymn of the priest get a recompense of jewels, aid my praise, O Āśvins'; 2, 34, 6: *kartā dhiyam jaritre vājapeśasam* 'arrange that the hymn of the priest be adorned (with gift of) wealth'. In fact, it is the prayer of the poet here that Agni should confer horses on the priests and make their fame wide-spread. Compare 10, 11, 7: *yās te agne sumatim marto akṣat sahasaḥ sūno ati sa prā śṛṇve | iṣam dadhāno vahamāno aśvair ā sa dyumān amavān bhūṣati dyāu* "O Agni, son of strength, he who offers a good hymn to thee acquires great fame; possessing food, being carried by horses, mighty, he passes the days in glory"; 8, 103, 4-5: *marto yās te vaso dāsat | sa vīram dhatte agna ukthaśamsinam tmanā sahasrapoṣiṇam | sa dr̥lhe cid abhi tr̥ṇatti vājam arvatā sa dhatte akṣiti śravaḥ* "O, bright Agni, the person who makes gifts (of oblations, sacrifices, etc.), to thee will get a son that will sing hymns of praise (in sacrifices) and will, by himself, maintain a thousand people; he breaks open wealth accompanied by a horse even in solid forts and he acquires imperishable fame", and 4, 8, 6, *te rāyā te suvīryaiḥ sasavāṃso vi śṛṇvire | ye agnā dadhire duvāḥ*. "They who have worshipped Agni have, after winning

(wealth), become renowned by their riches and abundance of sons”.

Instead however of saying *kuru giro aśvarādhasaḥ* and *kuru nr̥bhyāḥ sukīrtim*, the poet has preferred to employ the figure hysteron proteron (*akramātiśayokti*; see *Kuvalayānanda*, §. 13, v. 41) here, and said that the priests' hymns were accompanied by horses and that their fame spread beyond the sky.

Br̥hat (*sukīrtiḥ*) = *br̥hatī* (*sukīrtiḥ*): *br̥hat* occurs in many RV passages as an epithet of *śravaḥ* 'fame' (see Grassmann s.v. *br̥hat*). But the expression *sukīrtir divas cid br̥hat* does not mean 'glory (shining) more than even the sky' as Oldenberg thinks¹ (SBE. 46, p. 389), but 'glory wider (i.e., more wide-spread) than even the sky'. That is to say, the *sāmānya-dharma* is not 'shining mightily', but 'spreading widely (*viśtrīyatvam*)'. Compare 10, 62, 9: *sāvarṇyasya dakṣiṇā vi sindhur iva paprathe* 'the fame of Sāvarni has spread as (wide as) the ocean' and 1, 126, 2: *śataṁ rājño nādhmānasya niṣkāṇ chatam aśvān prayatān sadya ādam | śataṁ kakṣivān asurasya gonām divi śravo 'jaram ā tatāna* 'A hundred gold pieces, a hundred horses, did I, Kakṣivān, receive in one day as present from the king who was craving (fame), a hundred cows from the mighty one. He has (by this gift) extended his unaging fame in heaven (i.e., so as to fill heaven)" and the term *br̥hac-chravāḥ* 'of wide-spread fame' that is used as an epithet of Indra's chariot and of the gods in 1, 54, 3 and 10, 66, 1. Compare also *yaśobhir asyākhilaloka-dhāvibhir vibhīṣitā dhāvati tāmasī maṣī* (*Subhāṣita-ratna-*

1. Oldenberg (l. c.) translates *bodhati tmanā* as 'awakes by itself'; Grassman (RV. Über.) thinks that *bodhati* has a causative sense and translates the second pāda of our verse as 'whose singing of praise with vigour awakens the heavens to devotion', construing *divaḥ* as accusative plural; Ludwig regards *bodhati* as locative singular (of *bodhat*) and translates the half-verse (II, p. 334) as 'the men are strong indeed, they whose fame is like that of high heaven itself to the observing', regarding *br̥hat* as equivalent to *br̥hataḥ*. Sāyaṇa explains the half-verse as: *śuṣmīṇaḥ balavantāḥ santāḥ śuṣmebhiḥ śuṣmaiḥ svakīyaiḥ balaiḥ sattvaiḥ śatru-śoṣakā bhavanti | yeṣāṁ tvat-sambandhināṁ stavāṁ kurvatām divas cid ākāśād api br̥hat br̥hatī sukīrtir bhavati | sarva-dig-antarāḷa-vartini kīrtir bhavatīty arthaḥ | evaṁ-vidham tvām Gayāḥ | tmanā ātmanā svayam eva bodhati bodhayati.*

bhāṇḍāgāra, 1911, p. 140, v. 14); *svairam carantīm api ca trilokyām tvat-kīrtim āhuḥ kavayaḥ satīm nu* (*ibid.* v. 16); *trijagad-aṅgana-laṅghana-jāṅghikais tava yaśobhir atīva pavitrītaḥ* (*ibid.* v. 18); *āste dāmodarīyām iyam udara-darīm yā 'dhiśayya trilokī sammātum śaktimanti prathima-bharavaśād atra naitad-yaśāmsi* (*ibid.* p. 144, v. 83) and other similar verses in which the fame (*kīrti* or *yaśas*) of kings is described as pervading or transcending the three worlds (*i.e.*, earth, heaven and the under-world or *pātāla*).

Bodhati tmanā 'is awake by itself' means 'endures or flourishes when all others have perished'; it is thus synonymous with the terms *akṣiti* and *ajara* that are used in 8, 103, 5 and 1, 126, 2 explained above. It is interesting to note that, in classical Sanskrit literature the verb *jāgr* 'to keep awake' which is a synonym of *budh*, is used in similar circumstances. Compare *kṣitipa kim api citram jāgarūke 'pi yuṣmad-yaśasi śaśi-kadambe tvat-pratāpe 'rka-bimbe | nayana-kuvalayāni tvad-dviṣat-kāmininām api ca vadana-padmany āsu yat samkucanti* (*Subhāṣita-ratna-bhāṇḍāgāra*, 1911, p. 144, v. 6); *satyam sā bahu-rūpiṇī samabhavat siddhi-svarūpā bhavat-kīrtiḥ śrī-raghu-vaṁśaratna vimalā jāgarti viśvodare |* (*ibid.* p. 125, v. 138); *adhyābhāraḥ smarahara-śiraś-candra-śeṣasya śeṣasyāher bhūyaḥ phaṇasamucitaḥ kāya-yaṣṭi-nikāyaḥ | dugdhām-bodher muni-culukana-trāsa-nāśābhyupāyaḥ kāya-vyūhaḥ kva jagati na jāgarty adaḥ-kīrti-pūraḥ* (*ibid.* p. 141, v. 35 = *Naiṣa-dhīyacarita* 12, 57).

Regarding *śuṣmebhiḥ śuṣmiṇaḥ* in pāda c, compare *vājebhir vājinivatī* in 1, 3, 10, *krātubhiḥ sukrātuḥ*; *dakṣaiḥ sudakṣaḥ*, *vṛṣatvebhir vṛṣā*, *dyumnēbhir dyumni* in 1, 91, 2; and *vasūnām vasupate* and *gōnām gopate* in 10, 47, 1 and other similar constructions. The first word in these expressions is more less expletive; see *Ved. Studien* 1, 10 and the verses that are introductory to Veṅkaṭa-mādhava's scholium on Adhy. 2, Aṣṭaka 4 of the RV (pp. 55, 56 in part 1 of Dr. Raja's edition). *Suṣmebhiḥ śuṣmiṇaḥ* is equivalent to *śuṣmiṇaḥ* and means 'singing loudly, making a loud sound'.

(33) 7, 7, 2: ā yāhy agne pathyā^u anu svā^u

mandro devānām sakhyam juṣānaḥ |

ā sānu śuṣmair nadāyan prthivyā

jambhebhīr viśvam uśadhag vānāni ||

“Come, O Agni, along thy ways, thou that art lovely, enjoying the friendship of the gods, making the ridge of the earth resound with thy roars, consuming with thy jaws all the forests.

(34) 10, 142, 6: ¹ut te ¹śuṣmā ¹jihatām ¹ut te ¹arcir
¹ut te ¹agne ¹śaśamānasya ¹vājāḥ |
¹uc ¹chvañcasva ¹nī ¹nama ¹vārdhamāna
¹ā ¹tvādya ¹viśve ¹vasavaḥ ¹sadantu ||

“May thy roars rise high, O Agni, thy flame and thy speeds when thou art active in the worship of the gods. Waxing, do thou rise high and bend low; may all the Vasus sit by thee”.

(35) 10, 3, 6: ¹asya ¹śuṣmāso ¹dadṛśānapaver
¹jehamānasya ¹svanayan ¹niyucbhiḥ |
¹pratnebhīr ¹yō ¹ruśadbhīr ¹devatamo
¹yō ¹rebhadbhīr ¹aratīr ¹bhāti ¹vibhvā ||

“Who, bright, effulgent, most godlike shines with (his) old, gleaming, singing (flames), the roars of him whose felly is visible, who presses swiftly forward, sounded in teams”.

Śuṣma has the sense of *tejas* in the following passages,

(36) 10, 147, 1: ¹śrāt te ¹dadhāmi ¹prathamāya ¹manyave
¹han ¹yad ¹vṛtram ¹nāryam ¹viver ¹apaḥ |
¹ubhe ¹yat ¹tvā ¹bhavato ¹rodasī ¹anu
¹rejate ¹śuṣmāt ¹prthivī ¹cid ¹adrivaḥ ||

“I place trust in thy anger which was foremost when thou didst smite the strong Vṛtra and release the Waters, when the two worlds followed thee, O wielder of the thunder-bolt, and when even the earth trembled before the thunder-bolt”.

Compare 2; 11, 1: *arejetām rodasī bhiyāne kanikradato vṛṣṇo asya vajrāt* (cited on p. 6 above) which describes the earth and heaven as trembling before the thunder-bolt. I interpret *śuṣma* here as *tejas* ‘sharp weapon; i.e., thunder-bolt’; the meaning ‘roar’ too, however suits the context here.

(37) 6, 3, 8: dhāyobhir vā yujyebhir arkair
 vidyun nā dauidyot svebhiḥ śuṣmaiḥ |
 śardho vā yō marutām tatakṣa
 ṛbhur nā tveṣo rabhasāno adyaut ||

“He (Agni) who shone like lightning with loud-sounding flames that supported (him) and were yoked (to his chariot), or, who, like an artisan, chiselled the host of Maruts, shone brightly and impetuously”.

This verse is addressed to Agni, and the meaning seems to be, ‘whether he is drawn by his flames or whether he is fashioning the Maruts, Agni shines brilliantly’. But the meaning of *dhāyobhiḥ* is uncertain and so is the import of pāda c.

(38) 10, 113, 1: tam asya dyāvāprthivi śacetasā
 viśvebhir devair anu śuṣmam āvatām |
 yad ait kṛṇvāno mahimānam indriyam
 pītvī somasya kratumān avaradhata ||

“With the All-gods, heaven and earth, being of the same mind, aided that weapon (*viz.*, Vajra) of his when he went manifesting his Indra-might, drank the Soma juice and grew strong”.

Śuṣmah = *tejah* ‘sharp-edged weapon’. Compare 4, 16, 7: *apō vṛtram vavrivāmsam parāhan prāvat te vajram prthivi śacetāḥ* “thou didst kill off Vṛtra who was confining the Waters; the earth, being of the same mind (*i.e.*, being in sympathy with thee), aided thy thunder-bolt” and note the occurrence in this verse also of the adjective *sacetas* and the root *av*. The words *kṛṇvāno mahimānam indriyam* refer to the killing of Vṛtra and the freeing of the Waters.

In the other RV passages in which the word *śuṣma* occurs, the meaning *bala* suits the context well, and in some of them, the meaning *tejas* also.

SABARA AND THE NYĀYA-VAIŚEŚIKA DARŚANAS.*

BY

DR. G. V. DEVASTHALI, H. P. T. College, Nasik

In an article published in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,¹ discussing the date of Śabarasvāmin, I have shown that he is acquainted with Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Piṅgala; and that his acquaintance with Patañjali is doubtful. Subsequently² I have also shown that even if Patañjali is accepted as being a contemporary of and as such known to Śabara, we have definite evidence to show that he was not looked upon by the latter as an authority on grammar, a position of honour that he has been enjoying for nearly two thousand years. In what follows I propose to discuss the relation between Śabara on the one hand and the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika darśanas* on the other.

Even a casual reader of the *Śābara bhāṣya* on Jaimini's *sūtras* will not fail to notice that Śabara in several places therein has referred to the *padārthas* of the *Vaiśeṣika darśana* by their names. And there are at least two places in that *bhāṣya* where one finds a clear echo of these *padārthas*. Thus at MS. I. 3. 30 while defining the terms *ākṛti* and *vyakti* Śabara writes: '*Dravyagunaḥ karmanām sāmānyamātram ākṛtiḥ, asādhāraṇaviśeṣa vyaktiḥ*'. MS. X. 3. 44 is the other place where we get a similar echo.³ *Samavāya*

*Paper submitted to the Classical Sanskrit Section of the 15th All-India Oriental Conference, Bombay.

1. It was read at the Hyderabad session of the All-India Oriental Conference and was subsequently published in the Silver Jubilee Volume of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

2. In an article entitled '*Some Positive Data for the Date of Sabarasvāmin*' which I read at the Darbhanga session of the All-India Oriental Conference and published in the Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute, Vol. VI, part 3, pp. 231-240. Also in my article '*Sabara and Patañjali*' which is to appear in The Prof. Gode Number of The NIA.

3. Cf. 'यथा शतमाभ्यां दीयतामिति एकजातीयानां शतं न भिन्नजातीयानाम् । यथा द्रव्यं गुणः कर्मावयव इत्येवमादीनाम् ॥'

S. B. on MS. X. 3-44

is mentioned in several places¹ not only by the Śābara in his *bhāṣya*, but also by Jaimini in his *sūtra*. The same is true of *abhāva*. Nor are the *nyāya* terms wanting. For we do find Śābara using the terms *hetu*, *liṅga*, *saṃyoga*, *saṃavāya*, and *pratijñā*, besides the highly technical terms like *nigrahasthāna* and *niḥamaṇa*. But at the same time we find Śābara using the expressions *lakṣaṇa*², *pratyayita puruṣa*³, and *vyati-
saṅga*⁴ where a *naiyāyika* would use the expressions *liṅga*, *āpta*, and *saṃyoga* respectively. And this he does inspite of his acquaintance with the *nyāya* terms. This indifferent attitude towards the technical terms of *nyāya* on the part of Śābara, inspite of his acquaintatance with them, may perhaps be taken as being indicative of the fact that he lived at a time when the *nyāya-vaiśeṣika terminology* as we now have it from the extant works of Gautama and Kaṇāda was not yet definitely fixed. It may, therefore, be worth while to take up such passages from Śābara's *bhāṣya* on Jaimini's *sūtra* as show his acquaintance with the *nyāya-vaiśeṣika systems* and compare them with the corresponding portions from the works of Gautama and Kaṇāda, and also the commentary of Vātsyāyana on the former.

Let us first consider the passage where Śābara has used the expression *nigrahasthāna*⁵. There the point under dis-

1. Of all the places where this term occurs in the *Śābara Bhāṣya*, MS. XII. 1. 1 is the most striking; for, there we find Śābara paraphrasing it. This passage is discussed below.

2. Cf. 'लक्ष्यते येन तल्लक्षणम् । धूमो लक्षणममेरिति हि वदन्ति ॥'

SB. on MS. I. 1-2.

3. Cf. 'यत्तु लौकिकं वचनं तच्चेत् प्रत्ययितात्पुरुषात् इन्द्रियविषयं वा अवितथमेव तत् ॥' SB. on MS. I. 1-2

4. तन्तुव्यतिषङ्गजनितोऽयं तन्तुव्यतिषङ्गविनाशात् विनश्यति ॥

SB. on MS. I. 1-21.

5. This passage occurs in the *Vṛttikāra-grantha* as follows:—

'नन्वाकृतिः साध्या अस्ति वा न वा इति न प्रत्यक्षा सती साध्या भवितुमर्हति रुचकः स्वस्तिको वर्धमानक इति हि प्रत्यक्षं दृश्यते । व्यामोह इति चेत् न । न असति प्रत्ययविपर्यासे व्यामोह इति शक्यते वक्तुम् । असत्यप्यर्थान्तरे एवञ्जातीयको भवति प्रत्ययः पङ्क्तिः यूथं वनम् इति चेत् न असम्बद्धमिदं वचनमुपन्यस्तम् । किम् असति वने वनप्रत्ययो भवतीति प्रत्यक्षमेवाक्षिप्यते वृक्षा अपि न सन्तीति । यद्येवं प्रत्युक्तः स माहायानिकः पक्षः । अथ किमाकृतिसद्भाववादी उपालभ्यते सिद्धान्तान्तरं ते दुष्यतीति वनेऽसति वनप्रत्ययः प्राप्नोति इति एवमपि प्रकृतं दूषयितुमशक्नुवतस्सिद्धान्तान्तरदूषणे निग्रहस्थानमापद्यते ॥'

cussion is the existence or otherwise of *ākṛti*, which according to the *mīmāṃsaka* is the real import of a word. He argues that it is a matter of direct perception and as such requires no further proof for its existence. The Buddhist, however, demurs; and declares that the direct perception of the *ākṛti* which the *mīmāṃsaka* speaks of is only a delusion or *vyāmoha*. For, this perception is like that of *pañkti*, *yātha*, or *vana*, which arises inspite of the fact that over and above the trees etc. which alone we perceive there, there is nothing tangible which can be taken as being denoted by these words. This argument, however, is refuted by Śabara by pointing out that if by this argument the Buddhist merely wants to show how by assuming *ākṛti* as being selfevident the *mīmāṃsaka* is vitiating one of his other *siddhāntas* (*viz.* that direct perception arises only if the object of perception is existing or *sat*), then he is only exposing himself to *nigrahassthāna*. For instead of trying to refute the objection that is levelled against his position by the *mīmāṃsaka* or directly giving a lie to the proposition set forth by him here, the Buddhist is only trying to silence him by trying to show that the present assumption would vitiate some of his other assumptions. Now looking to the *Nyāya sūtra* we find Gautama speaking of no less than twenty-two *nigrahassthānas*¹; and defining one among these as *Svapākṣe doṣābhyupagamāt paraṣākṣe doṣaprasaṅgo matānujñā*². Thus we see that the *nigrahassthāna* called *matānujñā* occurs when a disputant, instead of directly refuting the objection hurled against him by his opponent, merely tries to silence him by hurling a counter-objection against some view held by the latter. In the passage from the *bhāṣya* of Śabara referred to above we find that the Buddhist is doing exactly this; and thus it is clear that he, therefore, is exposing himself to the type of *nigrahassthāna* which Gautama calls by the name of *matānujñā*. Now here, though Śabara has not given us the exact name of the type of *nigrahassthāna* to which the Buddhist is exposing himself, he has yet clearly shown his acquaintance with the idea of *nigrahassthāna* as we find it in the *nyāya-sūtra*. This by itself, however, cannot prove very definitely that Śabara was or was not acquainted with the extant *nyāya-sūtra* and the *bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana on it,

1. Cf. *Nyāya-sūtra* V. 2. 1.

2. Cf. op. cit. V. 2, 20.

unless some very convincing piece of positive evidence is adduced to that effect.

Now we take up the other passages where Śabara has given us definitions of various technical terms of the *nyāya* and the *vaiśeṣika darśanas*. Thus Śabara declares that MS. VII. 1. 12 is a *nigamana sūtra*; and defines *nigamana* as 'Pratijñāyā hetoś ca punarvacanam'. Gautama's definition of *nigamana* is *Hetvapadeśāt pratijñāyāḥ punarvacanam nigamanam*¹. Here again we find a close similarity between the definition of *nigamana* as given by Śabara and that given by Gautama. And yet it is clear that they are not identical with one another. Another technical term a definition of which has been suggested by Śabara in his *bhāṣya* is *samavāya*. While commenting on the opening *sūtra* of the last chapter of Jaimini's work, Śabara paraphrases the term *samavāya* occurring in that *sūtra* by *ekadeśakālakarṭṛtva*. Thus *samavāya* according to him means *ekadeśatva*, or *ekakālatva*, or *ekakarṭṛtva*. We do not find the term *samavāya* directly defined in the *nyāya-sūtra* of Gautama; while the *vaiśeṣika-sūtra* defines it as '*Ihedam iti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayorḥ sa samavāyah*'². This definition, we see, is quite different from the one given or suggested by Śabara in the paraphrase referred to above. Here then Śabara would seem to be drawing for his definition of *samavāya* on some source other than the *Nyāya* or the *vaiśeṣika sūtra*.³

Another technical term that we have to consider here is *karma* which has been defined in the *vaiśeṣikasūtra* also. Commenting MS. II. 1. 15 Śabara has given us a definition of *karma* in the words: '*Yad āśrayam deśāntaram prāpayati tat karmetyucyate*'. Now Kaṇāda's definition of *karma* is: '*Ekadravyam saṁyogavibhageṣu anapekṣakāraṇam iti karma*'

1. Cf. op. cit. I—1. 39

2. Cf. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, VII. 2. 26

3. It is interesting to note that no such explanation of the term *samavāya* has been given in the *Nyāya-kośa* (of Jhalakikar and Abhyankar); and yet we do find that it was known as such to Śaṅkarācārya as can be seen from the following extract from his *bhāṣya* on Brahmasūtra, II. 2. 17:

‘गुणादीनां द्रव्याधीनत्वं द्रव्यगुणयोरयुतासिद्धत्वादिति यदुच्यते तत्पुनरयुत-
सिद्धत्वमपृथग्देशत्वं वा स्यादपृथक्कालत्वं वापृथक्स्वभावत्वं वा ।

*lakṣaṇam*¹. It is evident that whereas Kaṇāda is here giving us a scientific definition of *karma* Śabara has given us only a general description thereof.

The definitions of *vyākṛti*, *ākṛti*, and *jāti*, offer yet another point for comparison between Śabara on the one hand and Gautama and his commentator on the other. It may in the first instance be noted that the *mīmāṃsaka* would make no distinction between *ākṛti* and *jāti* as is done by the *naiyāyika* (and even the *vaiśeṣika*). Thus the *naiyāyika* after a long discussion² concludes that the exact import of a word is not merely the individual, or the universal, or the configuration taken singly, but all these together³. The *mīmāṃsaka*, on the other hand, holds that it is *ākṛti* (which is according to him synonymous with *jāti*) alone and not *vyākṛti* that is primarily denoted by a word. Let us now compare the definitions of these terms as given by these authors. Śabara defines *vyākṛti* and *ākṛti* in the *ākṛtyadhikaraṇa*⁴ in the following words: ‘*Dravyaguṇakarmaṇām sāmānyamētram ākṛtiḥ asādhāraṇaviśeṣa vyākṛtiḥ*’. According to Gautama *ākṛti* is nothing but the peculiar arrangement of the various parts of the thing concerned, and is indicative of *jāti* (or *sāmānya*) and also the indicatory marks thereof⁵. *Jāti*, on the other hand, is defined by him as something that engenders (or yields) some common perception,⁶ so that Śabara’s *ākṛti* would seem to correspond to the *jāti* of Gautama. But the expression *ākṛti* would also seem to include the *avayava-saṁsthānviśeṣa* or configuration when we find Śabara declaring, for example, that it is not possible to make a *śyenaavyākṛti* though *śyena ākṛti* one may possibly make, so that the text

1. Cf. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* I. 1. 17

2. op. cit. II. 2. 60—67

3. Cf. ‘व्यक्याकृतिजातयस्तु पदार्थः ॥’ op. cit. II. 2. 67.

4. Cf. MS. I. 3. 30-35; the definitions occur in SB. on MS. 1. 3. 30

5. Cf. ‘आकृतिर्जातिलिङ्गाख्या ॥ op. cit. II. 2. 69, which Vātsyāyana explains by

‘यया जातिर्जातिलिङ्गानि च प्रख्यायन्ते तामाकृतिं विद्यात् ॥’

6. Cf. ‘समानप्रसवात्मिका जातिः ॥’ op. cit. II. 2, 70. which Vātsyāyana explains by

‘या समानां बुद्धिं प्रसूते भिन्नेष्वधिकरणेषु...तत्सामान्यविशेषो जातिरिति ॥’

'*Śyenaṛitam cīvīta*' becomes plausible only on the assumption that *ākṛti* is the exact import of a *śabda*.¹ Thus it would appear that the conception of *ākṛti* of the *mīmāṃsaka* has been split up into two viz. *jāti* and *ākṛti* by the *naiyāyika*. This would suggest again the priority of the former over the latter. From all this, therefore, it may be observed that Śabara shows a general acquaintance with the rudiments of the *nyāya* and the *vaiśeṣika* systems, but not with the extant *sūtra* works of these systems.

This impression thus gathered is again strengthened when we take into consideration the definitions of the *pramāṇas* viz., *pratyakṣa* and *anumāna* as given by Śabara in what is known as the *ṛttikīra-grantha*.² *Pratyakṣa* has been defined by Jaimini himself in MS. I. 1. 4 as '*Satsamprayoge puruṣasya indriyāṇām buddhijanma tat pratyakṣam*' which roughly corresponds with '*Indriyārthasamnikarṣotṭpannam jñānām*' occurring in the definition³ of *pratyakṣa* as given by Gautama. But the latter, not being satisfied with this, has added three more expressions viz. *avyapadeśyam*, *avyabhicāri*, and *vyavasāyīkām*. This is enough to show that Gautama's definition which is more complex and rigid is later than that of Jaimini. But the difference is still glaringly clear when we come to the treatment of *anumāna* in the works of Śabara on the one hand and that of Gautama on the other. Of course, Śabara knows that *anumāna* and all the other *pramāṇas* are *tathārthavaka* or based on *pratyakṣa* as Gautama also has declared it⁴. But the definition of *anumāna* as it is given in the *ṛttikīra-grantha* by Śabara is '*Jñāta-sambandhasya kadeśadarśanād ekadeśāntare*' *samnikṛṣṭe* *rthe*

1. Cf. 'इयेनचितं चिन्वीतेति वचनमाकृतौ संभवति यद्याकृत्यर्थः इयेनशब्दः । व्यक्तिवचने तु न इयेनव्यक्तिरूपदयितुं शक्यत इत्यशक्यार्थ-वचनादनर्थकः ॥ SB. on MS. I. 3-33

2. This is a résumé of the earliest known commentary on the MS. I. 1. 3-5 by an author whose identity is as yet not definitely proved. This commentary or *ṛtti* as it is otherwise called, is all lost but for this résumé of only a fraction thereof which Śabara has given us in his *bhāṣya*.

3. Cf. op. cit.. I. 1. 4

4. Cf. प्रत्यक्षपूर्वकत्वाच्चानुमानोपमानार्थापत्तीनामप्यकारणत्वमिति ॥'

SB. on MS. I. 1-4,

buddhi'. Gautama also in his *sūtra*¹ describes *anumāna* as being *tatpūrvakī* and Vātsyāyana explains it by '*Tatpūrvakūṃ i'yaṇena līṅgalīṅginoh sambandhadarśanam līṅga-darśanam cābhisambādhyate, li galīṅginoh sambaddhāyor darśanena līṅgasmṛtir abhisambādhyate, smṛtyā līṅgadarśanena cāpratyak, o'rtho'numīyate*'. When we came to the divisions of *anumāna*, we see Gautama giving us three of them while Śabara is content with only two². The divisions according to the former are *pūrvavat*, *śeṣavat*, and *sāmānyato'rṣṭa*, while the latter gives the names of his divisions as *pratyakṣatodrṣṭasambandha* and *sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandha*. From these names one might think that the *pratyakṣatodrṣṭasambandha* of Śabara should cover the first two divisions of Gautama so that both these modes of divisions would ultimately tally. And the impression thus gathered is not altogether falsified by a study of the illustrations of these divisions as offered by these authors. In fact the explanation of the term *sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandha* as given by Vātsyāyana confirms the view that the remaining two divisions, differing as they do from the *sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandha*, must be *pratyakṣatodrṣṭasambandha*. For Vātsyāyana states in clear terms that the *sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandha anumāna* occurs when the *sambandha* between the *līṅga* and the *līṅgin* is *apratyakṣa* and when the *līṅgin*, which also is *apratyakṣa*, is inferred from the similarity of the *līṅga* with some *artha*. The very fact that the *sambandha* between the *līṅga* and the *līṅgin* is *apratyakṣa* in the *sāmānyatodrṣṭa* variety of *anumāna* is enough to show that in the other types of *anumāna* it must be *pratyakṣa*. This, in other words, means that the remaining types of *anumāna* must be *pratyakṣatodrṣṭasambandha*.

Let us now compare the illustrations of the divisions as given by these authors. The *Sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandha* is illustrated in the *vṛttikāra grantha* as follows: '*Sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandham yathā Devadattasya galipūrvikām deśāntarapṛāptim upalūḥyādītyagatismaranam*'. Vātsyāyana's illustration is almost identical, though not identically worded. He

1. Cf. op. cit. I. 1. 5: 'अथ तत्पूर्वकं त्रिविधमनुमानम्—पूर्ववत्, शेषवत्, सामान्यतोदृष्टं च ॥'

2. Read: 'तत्तु द्विविधं-प्रत्यक्षतोदृष्टसंबन्धं सामान्यतोदृष्टसंबन्धं च ॥' वृत्तिकारग्रन्थ

writes: 'Sāmānyatodrṣṭam—Vrajyāpūrvakam anyatra drṣṭasyānyatra adarśanam iti Tathā cādīyasya, tasmād astyapratyakṣāpyādītyasya vrajyā iti'. As for the *pratyakṣatodrṣṭa*, the *ṛttikāra grantha* has the following: '*Pratyakṣatodrṣṭasambandham yathā—dhūmākṛtidarśanād agnyākṛtivyijñānam*'. Vātsyāyana, however, has two illustrations for the two divisions of Gautama viz. *pūrvavat* and *śeṣavat*. Before giving the illustrations he tells us what is meant by these terms respectively. Thus *pūrvavat* is that in which the effect is inferred from cause, while *śeṣavat* is just the opposite of it.¹ According to a second explanation² offered by Vātsyāyana the former is based on the invariable concomitance previously experienced as existing between two things, the perception of one of which leads to the inference of the other; while the latter may be described as inference by elimination. Broadly speaking these two divisions of *anumāna* may be said to correspond to the deductive and inductive processes respectively. It is, however, interesting to note that after having first illustrated all the varieties of *anumāna*, Vātsyāyana offers his second explanation of the terms *pūrvavat* noticed above in the words: '*Pūrvavad iti yatra yathāpūrvam pratyakṣabhūtayor anyataradarśanacānyatarasyāpratyakṣasyānumānam yathā dhūmenāgniriti*'. One cannot but be struck by the close similarity of this view and the illustration of the *pūrvavat* with that of the *pratyakṣatodrṣṭasambandha* occurring in the *ṛttikāra grantha* referred to above. And the fact that Vātsyāyana is giving this as an alternative explanation shows that such a view about the *pūrvavat* must have been prevalent prior to his day.³ It may thus be observed

1. Read: 'पूर्ववदिति यत्र कारणेन कार्यमनुमीयते ।' and 'शेषवत् तद् यत्र कार्येण कारणमनुमीयते ।' (वात्स्यायनभाष्य on न्या० सू० I. 1-5)

2. Cf. 'अथ वा पूर्ववदिति यत्र यथा पूर्वप्रत्यक्षभूतयोरन्यतरदर्शनेनान्यतरस्याप्रत्यक्षस्यानुमानं यथा धूमेनाग्निरिति शेषवद् नाम परिशेषः स च प्रसक्तप्रतिषेधेऽन्यत्राप्रसङ्गात् शिष्यमाणे संप्रत्ययः ॥'

3. It may be observed that in addition to the two views about the divisions of *anumāna* mentioned above there is a third view also stated in the *Nyāya-vārtika*. According to it the three divisions of Gautama may be otherwise described as *kevalānvayi*, *kevalavyatireki*, and *anvayavyatireki* respectively. Of these the first and the last correspond to the two divisions spoken of by Śabara while the second would correspond to a different *pramāṇa* altogether viz. *arthāpatti* which according to the *niyāyika* is only an inference of the *vyatireki* type.

that the *vr̥ttikāra grantha* and hence Śabara is as well, more likely than not, earlier than not only Vātsyāyana but also Gautama whose division of *anumāna* is evidently more elaborate than that occurring therein.

Here it may be interesting to note that Īśvarakṛṣṇa in his *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*¹ also speaks of the three divisions of *anumāna* saying that *anumāna* is said to be *trividha*. The earliest known commentary on it—recently reconstructed² from the Chinese translation thereof by Paramārtha³—names these varieties exactly like Gautama and illustrates them almost on the same lines as Vātsyāyana. This would show that Śabara must be much earlier than not only the commentator but also the author of the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*.

Before, however, we express any such definite view we should take into consideration some other passages containing discussions on certain topics such as *the exact import of śabda*⁴ and *the eternity of śabda*⁴ which are common to both the *mīmāṃsā* on the one hand and the *nyāya-vaiśeṣika* systems on the other. It is only after a careful study of these and other similar passages that we may be able to appraise accurately the exact nature of the relationship between Śabara on the one hand and the *nyāya-vaiśeṣika* systems on the other. For the present, therefore, we must rest satisfied with the moderate conclusion that Śabara is no doubt acquainted with the *nyāya-vaiśeṣika* terminology and tenets, though his acquaintance with the *sūtras* of those systems and the earliest commentaries on them cannot be definitely proved.

1. Cf. 'त्रिविधमनुमानमाख्यातम् । तल्लिङ्गलिङ्गिपूर्वकम् ॥'
सां. कारिका 5.

2. It has been reconstructed and edited with Introduction, Notes and Appendices by N. Aiyaswami Shastri, and published as No. 7 of the *Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series*, Tirupati (1944).

3. Paramārtha belongs to the middle of the 6th century A.D.

4. These topics are discussed at *Nyāyasūtra* II. 2. 13-70 and MS. I. 3. 30-35 and MS. I. 1. 6-23.

UDAYANA'S CRITICISM OF THE SĀMKNHYA*

BY

HEM CHANDRA JOSHI, M.A.,

(*Department of Sanskrit, St. Andrew's College, Gorakhpur*)

It is admitted by all the orthodox schools of philosophy that an individual's personal life is determined by his own deeds. These deeds do not, however, determine the course of his life directly. His good or bad deeds produce a quality in the agent in him called his *Adṛṣṭa*. It is this *Adṛṣṭa* which regulates his retributive experience. The deeds leave a further trail behind. They create impressions or *Saṁskāras* in the agent which urge him to perform similar good or bad actions in the future as well. Now both the *Naiyāyikas* and the *Sāṁkhya*s admit that the agent is the substratum of the *Adṛṣṭa* and the impressions. While the *Sāṁkhya*s believe that the self or the spirit is inactive and that it is the *Buddhi* or the Intellect which is the agent and the seat of the *Adṛṣṭa* and the impression, the *Naiyāyikas* led by *Udayanācārya* hold that the Self is both the agent and the substratum of the *Adṛṣṭa* etc. For the *Sāṁkhya*s it is an error to entertain the idea that the spirit is the agent. In fact, according to them the notion of the spirit as 'doer' or 'kartā' is incompatible with its liberation and is the cause of its bondage. This they call the error of 'bhedāgraha' or the 'non-apprehension of the difference'. The *Sāṁkhya*s dissociate agency and consciousness. For the *Naiyāyikas*, however, this is not so. For them it is quite justified, rather this is the only right view that the spirit be looked upon as the 'doer'. The bondage of the self is due not to its sense of *Kartṛtva* but to its ignorance of the true nature of the objective world and of itself.

Udayanācārya in his *Nyāyakusumāñjali* refutes the view of the *Sāṁkhya*s which is as follows:—

The self is neither a cause nor an effect. Consciousness is its nature. It is inactive. *Prakṛti* is the primordial element. It is the First Cause and non-sentient. *Mahat*, *Ahaṁkāra* etc. are its evolutes. It is for the Experience or the

* Paper submitted to the Religion & Philosophy Section of the 15th All-India Oriental Conference, Bombay.

'bhoga' and the Liberation or the 'apavarga' of the Puruṣa. The Spirit or the Puruṣa is, however, not of the nature of being bound by the various objects. For that would discount any possibility of his freedom. Nor can it be said that it is in the nature of Prakṛti to bind the Puruṣa, for being eternal then, it would always bind him. Thus once again would be precluded any chance of his freedom. Similarly all the objects like the jar etc. are not for him. For we find that while we can perceive an object before us we cannot do so if the same be screened by a wall. This brings in the mediacy of the different senses. At such times, as pointed out before, our optical sense does not come into direct contact with the object concerned. This means that though our Spirit is all-pervading we can perceive only those things which are introduced to us by our sense-organs. The senses do not, however, explain all the phenomena of knowledge. At times one fails to perceive an object, say a melodious sound, though his auditory sense is in direct touch with it. To explain this fact, a further link has to be admitted, viz., the Manas. It is only when our Manas is connected with a particular sense that the presence of an object is felt. Nor is this all. In dreams one sometimes identifies himself with a tiger etc. On such occasions he does not look upon himself as a man. This brings to us another element of human psychic apparatus, viz., the Ahaiṅkāra or the Ego. There yet remains another kind of experience. In dreamless sleep the functions of the Ahaiṅkāra or the Ego become dormant and yet the physiological functions of the body like respiration, etc. continue. Therefore, that which persists throughout the three states of waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep and which is the seat of impressions and the Adṛṣṭa, is called the Antaḥkaraṇa or the Buddhi. It becomes the limiting adjunct of the Spirit. It is insentient and is the Agent in us. But due to the error of "non-apprehension of the difference" it is looked upon as conscious. Likewise the Puruṣa, which is inactive and the passive spectator of the empirical drama, is erroneously looked upon as Agent.

Indeterminate knowledge is the function of senses; determinate knowledge is that of the Manas; conceit of the Ahaiṅkāra and the determination to do something belongs to Buddhi. In fact, this Buddhi has three aspects; affection by the Puruṣa (पुरुषोपराग), affection by the objects (विषयोपराग) and entering into activity. We have the feeling—"this has to be done by me",

इदं मया कर्तव्यम्. Here this affection by the Puruṣa, 'by me' is unreal due to the non-apprehension of the difference just like the affection of the face reflected in a mirror. The fact is that the 'agency' belongs to the Buddhi and not to the Puruṣa which by its nature is inactive. Similarly consciousness is innate in the Puruṣa and not in the Buddhi. This position is erroneously reversed in our experience. 'This' or 'idam', the affection or the modification of the 'Buddhi' by the object through the channel of the sense organs is real like the dimness of the mirror imparted to it by the breath. The function of the Buddhi consequent upon these two affections is also real.

Jñāna or knowledge is the affection of the 'Buddhi' by the object. The coming into contact of this with the affection of the 'Buddhi' by the Puruṣa is Upalabdhi like the coming into contact of the face reflected in a mirror with its dimness. Now the eight dispositions 'Sukha, Duḥkha, Rāga, Dyeṣa, Icchā, Prayatna, Dharma and Adharma' belong to the 'Buddhi' being experienced as co-existing in it. Consciousness is not innate in Buddhi for the latter is subject to modifications.

The criticism of the above view of the Sāmkhyas is contained in the following Kārikā of the Nyāyakusumāñjali (I-XIV) :—

कर्तृधर्मा नियन्तारश्चेति च स एव नः ।

अन्यथानपवर्गः स्यादसंसारोऽथवा ध्रुवः ॥

What regulate the individual's retributive experience are the attributes of the Agent. According to our view the Agent is conscious. Otherwise there would be either no liberation or no bondage. Dharma and Adharma as attributes of the Agent regulate the individual's retributive experience. No one can question this view. To explain briefly, Dharma and Adharma can be thought of as attributes either of the objects or of the Agent. The first view is untenable. For the objects being common to all and the spirit being all-pervading, all the objects will be experienced by all the subjects in the same way. Hence, unless the 'Dharma' and 'Adharma' become attributes of the self and thus bring about a distinct characteristic in it we cannot explain its peculiar experiences. According to the Naiyāyikas the Agent is a conscious entity. That is Self itself is the Agent. This is substantiated by our mental perception or 'mānasa pratyakṣa' 'चेतनोऽहं करोमि' 'I, as possessed of consci-

ousness, do this'. That is, consciousness and agency are experienced as co-existing. Udayana puts it thus कृतिचैतन्ययोः सामानाधिकरण्येन अनुभवात्। The Sāṃkhyas say that this sort of feeling is an error of the non-apprehension of the difference. According to them while the Self is experience, conscious and inactive, the 'Buddhi' is insentient and active. Due to an error we think that the Self is the Agent and that the Buddhi is sentient. But the Naiyāyikas say that this contention is baseless whereas their view which is based on 'pratyakṣa', than which there is no mightier pramāṇa, is the only right one. Nor is this experience ever sublated.

If it were said that there is an inferential proof of its untenability, i.e., Buddhi is not sentient because it undergoes modification like a jar, बुद्धिर्न चेतना परिणामित्वात् षट्पत् the same could be said against its agency also. "The Buddhi is not an Agent and it undergoes change". Thus the Buddhi would be neither sentient nor Agent. The Sāṃkhya might argue that in our experience जानन्नहं करोमि, the Buddhi, as the substratum of knowledge, is also experienced as the seat of action.

ज्ञानाश्रयस्य (बुद्धेः) कृत्याश्रयत्वेन अनुभवात् ।

and thus the above-mentioned inference advanced by the Naiyāyikas does not compromise his position. This also will not do, as the same defence can be advanced by the Naiyāyikas too. That is, in the mental perception which takes the form चेतनोऽहं करोमि, a conscious entity figures also as the seat of action. If it were said that the Agent cannot be sentient as it is an effect of an insentient entity, viz., the Prakṛti, and thus the position taken that the Agent is conscious is contradicted, the inference is fallacious. Firstly, there is no authority for maintaining that the Agent is an effect. We as Agents are not effects. A newly born baby, who is quite innocent, spontaneously clings to the breast of its mother. This shows that in its former life it knew that clinging to and sucking one's mother's breasts appease one's hunger. This is seen in all the new born babies. This establishes the beginninglessness of the Agent. The aphorism of Gautama वीतरागजन्मादर्शनात् propounds the same doctrine. Moreover if all the characteristics of an effect were supposed to reside in the cause also, attachment etc. will also have to be admitted in the Prakṛti. Thus the same will have to be called Buddhi and not Prakṛti, because of

being characterised by the eight qualities of 'sukha', 'duḥkha' etc. If these qualities are said to exist in the Prakṛti in a subtle form, then consciousness also will have to be taken to exist in the Prakṛti in a subtle form. Thus the inference that Buddhi is insentient because it is an effect of insentient Prakṛti, does not hold good. Moreover there will arise the contingency of the objects like jar etc. also being possessed of consciousness. The qualities Rāga etc. will also have to be admitted as residing in jar etc. Thus the Sāmkhyavāda leads to all sorts of absurdities. Therefore we should accept that an effect having a particular jāti comes from a cause possessing another particular jāti and not that all the characteristics in a cause are reproduced in the effect also.

Besides all this, there is another major difficulty if we adopt the Sāmkhya view of things. The fact of the bondage and the liberation of the individual becomes hard to explain. The Sāmkhyas explain that because the Self thinks itself to be the Agent which in fact it is not and also because the Buddhi which is insentient by nature takes itself to be sentient, there is bondage. When, however, both come to realise their true nature, freedom for the self is assured. This view is beset with many difficulties. If the buddhi be eternal there can be no possibility of liberation with the Puruṣa. What is there to prevent the 'Buddhi' from associating itself with the Puruṣa? Thus says Udayana:—

यदि च बुद्धिर्नित्या अनिमोक्षप्रसंगः । पुंसः सर्वदा सोपाधित्वे
स्वप्नेणानवस्थानात् ॥

If it be perishable it must have a beginning. A positive entity which is perishable must have an origin. Thus what was the determining factor prior to its origination as some determining factor of the individual's retributive experience there must have been. It cannot be Prakṛti for it is uniform for all. In this way there can be no 'creation' or 'bondage' of the self.

If the above difficulty is to be surmounted by saying that the residual impressions of the prior and still prior 'Buddhis' persist in the Prakṛti and thus the Prakṛti, though uniform by nature, ceases to be so, this goes against the basic principle of the Sāmkhyas. For to say that even after the disappearance of Buddhi its attributes, viz., the residual impres-

sions persist, is contrary to the doctrine that there is complete identity between the attribute and its substratum.

It will not do to argue that Buddhi exists in a subtle form and does not disappear and thus it can retain the residual impressions. For thus there can be no everlasting freedom. A free spirit can still undergo bondage. It cannot be held out that there is no such possibility of re-bondage as this Buddhi is not competent to rebind the Puruṣa. There being no vāsanā left now the Puruṣa need not have any apprehensions from the Buddhi. If it still be said that there is no need to postulate two different categories as Prakṛti and Buddhi and that the same Buddhi with competence remaining in a dormant state be called Prakṛti, there will then be no need to assume even other categories like Ahankāra etc. The same Buddhi with different functions can be called by different names, in the same way as the vital air is given different names according as its functions undergo variations. The cessation of the activity of the Buddhi due to the cessation of its competence is freedom and its association with vāsanā or residual impressions is its competence. Therefrom proceeds creation.

Thus the Sāṃkhya being absolutely defeated tries to find fault with the Naiyāyikas. He says that if the Self is admitted as substratum of knowledge, action etc., its immutability is violated. The Self will be associated with different attributes and there being no absolute identity between the attribute and its substratum, the Self will be undergoing transformation all the time. This objection is not worth its salt. The Naiyāyikas maintain that there is absolute difference between the attribute and the substratum. This difference becomes patent when we take the following cases:—

I know.

I knew.

I shall know.

Here the knowledge refers to the past, present and future periods and yet the subject 'I' persists and its immutability is not violated. The fact of two things having the same substratum does not necessarily imply identity between the two. This 'having the same substratum' or सामानाधिकरण्य may mean any of the following, 'being expressed by the same word' (समानशब्दवाच्यत्वम्), 'figuring in the same cognition' (एकज्ञानगोचरत्वम्), 'subsisting in the same time' (एकाधिकरणत्वम्), 'the

relation of the container and the contained' (आधागधेयभाव), 'the relation of the attribute and the substratum' (विशेषणविशेष्यभाव) and 'mere relation' (संबंधमात्र). Some of these are possible only when there is absolute difference and some when there is identity. Thus the immutability of the Self is not compromised.

This finally establishes the Naiyāyika view.

THE VṚTTIKĀRAGRANTHA

Regarding footnote 2 on p. 21 of the article on *Sābara and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, where Dr. G. V. Devasthali says that the Vṛttikāra is "an author whose identity is as yet not definitely proved", attention may be drawn to the Journal of Oriental Research, Vol. I, pp. 283-286, where Dr. A. Sankaran shows in an article entitled 'Vṛttikāragrantha' that this Vṛttikāra is Upavārṣa.

V. R.

THE HANUMAD VIṂŚATI OF LAKŚMIKUMĀRA TĀTĀCĀRYA

BY

SRI G. HARIHARA SASTRI AND DR. V. RAGHAVAN

The family of Tātācāryas took a leading part in popularising Śrīvaiṣṇavism in South India, particularly in the post-Rāmānuja period. Tradition, as set forth in the Prapan-nāmṛta,¹ has it that Śrīsailapūrṇa or Periya Tirumalai Nambi, the founder of this family, taught the Rāmāyaṇa to Śrī Rāmānuja, his nephew; the name Tātācārya, by which his descendants are known, was first borne by him; he was daily bringing water for bathing God Veṅkaṭeśa at Tirupati from the Ākāśagaṅgā on the same range of hills at some distance; once to test him, God Veṅkaṭeśa took the form of a young boy in thirst and requested him to give away the Abhiṣeka-water he was carrying; as God in the form of the young boy addressed Śrīsailapūrṇa as Tāta (father or grandfather), he came to be known from that time as Tātācārya.² Śrīsaila was held in high esteem by the Śrīvaiṣṇavas and a shrine was also dedicated to him in the Tirupati temple. His son Kurukeśa or Saṭhakopācārya wrote the commentary called the Āraiyi-rappaḍi on the Tiruvāymoḷi.

Siṅgarācārya, i.e. Narasimhācārya, and his younger brother Śrīraṅgācārya, the sixth descendants from Kurukeśa, were specialists in the exposition of the Rāmāyaṇa. They settled at Ēṭṭūr (Kṛṣṇa Dt.) and are said to have freed the Vijayanagar emperor Virūpākṣa of the harassment caused

1. See Gopinatha Rao, *EI.* XII, 1913-14, pp. 162-3 and Sources of Vijayanagar History, Madras University, pp. 72, 73, 77. The Prapan-nāmṛta was itself written by a pupil of the grandson of Lakṣmikumāra Tātācārya.

Besides, we have on the history of this family the Tātayārya-vaibhavaprakāśikā in ms. (see Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library, D. No. 10549 which is unfortunately fragmentary) and the Lakṣmikumārodaya by a descendant of the family, Raṅganātha Tātācārya of Kumbhakonam (Printed, Grantha, Kumbhakonam 1912).

2. For the story, see canto 3, Lakṣmikumārodaya. Verse 5 in the Inscription below alludes to it.

by the ghosts of persons murdered by him. They also won over the king to Rāma-bhakti and Śrīvaiṣṇavism with their exposition of the Rāmāyaṇa.

The ninth in descent from these two brothers was Pañcamatabhañjanam Tātācārya, a contemporary of Vādhūla Doḍḍayācārya or Mahācārya, author of the Caṇḍamāruta, and of Appayya Dīkṣita. According to the poem Lakṣmīkumārodaya, this Pañcamatabhañjanam Tātācārya was the second of the three sons of Kandanūr Śrīnivāsa Tātācārya who was nineteenth from Nāthamuni; his elder brother was Veṅkaṭācārya, and younger brother Sundarācārya; 'Pañcamatabhañjanam' was a title gained by him in his scholarly controversy in which he defeated his opponent.

The youngest brother Sundarācārya had a son named Tātācārya whom Goddess Lakṣmī herself is said to have nursed, thus giving him the name Lakṣmīkumāra.¹ This Lakṣmīkumāra Tātācārya was adopted as his son by his junior paternal uncle Pañcamatabhañjana Tātācārya.² He was thus an younger contemporary of Appayya Dīkṣita and is the same Tātācārya who is associated with the hymn Nigralāṣṭaka composed by Appayya Dīkṣita. A number of inscriptions mention him as the guru of Veṅkaṭapati I (1585-1614 A.D.), as having officiated at his coronation and honoured by the king by the offer of the whole kingdom. He held the office of the superintendent of temples in the kingdom, Śrī-Kārya-dhuraṁdhara, with a number of dependents under him. Inscription 354 of 1919 tells us that he built the vimāna of gold at Śrī Veṅkaṭeśa temple at Tirupati;³ he weighed himself against gold and silver and made use of that money for service at Śrī Varadarāja's temple at Conjeevaram (363 of 1919); at Conjeevaram again, he repaired the Puṇyakōṭi-vimāna built by Kṛṣṇadevarāya, constructed a vimāna of his own named Kalyāṇakōṭi for goddess Lakṣmī (363 of 1919 and 653 of 1919), made various vāhanas for the deity in gold and silver

1. See Lakṣmīkumārodaya, Canto 10, verse 64.

2. But Sri Sadhu Subrahmanya Sastri, in the Tirupati Devasthanam Epigraphy Report, 1930, p. 313, argues on the basis of inscriptions at Tirupati and Conjeevaram that Pañcamatabhañjanam Tātācārya and Kōṭikanyādānam Tātācārya are probably identical.

3. Śaka 1492 (?)

and founded an agrahāra for Brāhmins. He gave liberally to the poor, particularly for celebrating marriages of their daughters, which earned for him the title 'Koṭikanyādānam.'¹ He dug also the tanks Tirtha-samudra and Tāta-samudra (Ayyaṅgār-kulam) with the latter of which we are concerned here. (475 of 1919; 64 of 1923).

On the banks of this tank Tātasamudra, Tātācārya built a temple for Hanumān, composed a hymn called the Hanumad-vimśati on the deity and caused it to be engraved on the walls of this temple. A copy of this hymn is found in the Mackenzie Manuscripts (Miscellaneous inscriptions, No. 50, p. 252), Oriental Mss. Library, Madras. This inscription is identical with No. 93 of 1923 (ARE. Madras), described as found on the west wall of the Āñjaneya temple at Ayyaṅgār-kulam (Tātasamudra). This was the original, but the hymn was re-engraved on the north, west and south walls of the shrine of the Goddess (Tāyār) in the Varadarāja temple, Conjeevaram (ARE. Madras 651 of 1919), as also on the east and north walls of the 'rock' and the outermost gopura, right of the entrance. The hymn itself is but a modest effort, and its repeated engraving at Conjeevaram gives us an idea of the importance enjoyed at that place by this great Ācārya.

The text as recovered from the copy in the Mackenzie records has a few gaps and corruptions and these have been restored by collating this text with those found in the inscriptions 93 of 1923 and 651 of 1919. 93 of 1923 which is the original of the Mackenzie copy is in clear and bold Grantha characters. The latter epigraph which is also in a Grantha characters, but not so clear or bold as in the previous one, is in the Goddess-shrine in the Varadarāja temple. In two places, this text itself shows gaps, and at the end, it does not carry the two verses (23 and 24) found in 93 of 1923 and its Mackenzie copy, which are clearly an extraneous addition.

In some of the verses, the hymn refers to the tank as called after Goddess Lakṣmī also, Ramā-taṭāka. A reference to the poem Lakṣmīkumārodaya shows that the tank Tāta-

1. According to the second of the two additional verses bearing on the Kalyāṇa-koṭi-vimāna built by this Tātācārya, found in 93 of 1923 and the Mack. copy of the Hanumad-vimśati, the place got the name Kalyāṇa-koṭi because of the numberless marriages celebrated there. See below text, last verse.

samudra¹ had a pavilion in the centre within which was a well, Vāpī, called after Goddess Lakṣmī; this explains how the same tank is referred to both as Tātasamudra and Ramā-taṭāka.

Our thanks are due to the Govt. Epigraphist, Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, and Sri H. K. Narasimhasvami of his department for permitting and helping us to consult the estampages of the two above mentioned inscriptions.

॥ लक्ष्मीकुमारताताचार्यकृता

हनुमद्विंशतिः ॥

*¹ २गुणाभिराममिन्दिराकुमारतातवारिधि-

प्रसिद्धिमद्रमातटाकतीरसीन्नि मारुतिम् ।

मुदाधिरुह्य माधवो वृषाचलस्थलादपि

प्रकल्पते निकाममत्र पालनाय देहिनाम् ॥ १ ॥

अधिरुह्य रघूदहो हरिं प्रागरिशिक्षाम³कृताधुना तु सोऽयम् ।

कृततातसमुदतीरकेलिं तमधिष्ठाय तनोति दीनरक्षाम् ॥ २ ॥

कर्मानुरुह्य वृषभूभृति यः करोति

नृणां हितानि स तु तन्निरपेक्ष एव ।

यत्सर्वमिष्टमिह पुण्यति वेङ्कटेश-

⁴स्तद्वैभवं किल रमात्मजतातन्निधोः ॥ ३ ॥

1. According to this poem, Tātācārya was inspired to dig this tank by the episode of the lake of Pañca-apsaras in the Rāmāyaṇa.

* Numbers (I), (II). etc. refer to the pieces of the estampage-sheets in Ins. 651 of 1919.

2. Both Ins. have at the outset स्वस्तिश्रीः ।

3 Mack. copy corrupt and broken here; reads-मुधुक...सोऽयम् ।

4. त indistinct in Ins. 651 of 1919, (How Brock et al.)

क्रीडासरः किमपि तातसमुद्रनाम

लक्ष्म्याः प्रसन्नलघु(III)शीतलमर्पयन्त्याः ।

अन्यद्विधेयमनवेक्ष्य ¹सुतानमुष्याः

प्राप्त्यै मुरारिरवति प्लवगाधिरूढः ॥ ४ ॥

श्रीशैलपूर्णमवति स्म घटाम्बुदृष्टो

यः पूर्वमञ्जनगिरौ स पुमानिदानीम् ।

स्थित्वा समीरमुवि पाति रमाकुमार-

ताताम्बुराशिमुदितो जनमैन्दिरेयम् ॥ ५ ॥²

हरिः पुरा मामधिरूढ्य दारुणं

चकार कर्मेति समीरज(IV)न्मनः ।

शुचं निराकर्तुमिवाश्रितः स तं

शुभं नृणां सौति रमासस्तटे³ ॥ ६ ॥

शौरे रमातनयतातसमुद्रतीरे

भावस्तटादपि भवात्मजपुष्करिण्याः⁴ ।

⁵सन्तन्वते हि पुरु(Ia)षाः समदर्शिनोऽपि

प्रायेण सूनुषु निजेष्वपि पक्षपातम् ॥ ७ ॥

1. Mack. सता-

2. Śl. 5. Añjanagiri=Tirupati Hills. Sa Pumān refers to God Viṣṇu. The first half refers to the incident in the life of Śrīśailapūrṇa, the ancestor of the Tātācārya family, which has been mentioned above; Śrī Śailapūrṇa offered but a pot of water; his descendant however offered a whole tank. Aindireya jana=Lakṣmikumāra Tātācārya.

3. टे effaced in Ins. 651 of 1919. The dāruṇam karma referred to in lines 1 and 2 is the battle in Laṅkā.

4. Skandapuṣkarinī, the sacred tank at Tirupati on whose banks God Venkaṭeṣa stands.

5. Ia North wall.

श्लाघ्यतरक्षीरभृतोः श्रीतातसमुद्रयोरियान् भेदः¹ ।

निद्राति तत्र नित्यं श्रीपतिरनुकूलमस्य जागर्ति ॥ ८ ॥

²फणिसरसीतटभागादधिको ल(II a-b)क्ष्मीसरस्तटाभोगः ।

गजवरदः किल तस्मिन् कीडति हरिश्च सर्ववरदायी ॥ ९ ॥

रामचन्द्रोदयारम्भे यस्सुवेलातिवर्तनम् ।

चक्रे समुद्रस्तं वन्दे श्रीसरस्तीरपावनिम् ॥ १० ॥

केसरिप्रमदागर्भजन्मनापि विनिर्ममे ।

सिंहिकाविजयो येन स श्रीसरसि मोदते ॥ ११ ॥

तटसीमनि तातसिन्धुबन्धोरमितं क्रीडति भाग्यमञ्जनायाः ।

अकरोत्सहसा यदक्षशिक्षां नियमेनैव निजेन बाहुधाम्ना ॥ १२ ॥

नमत रमाकमलाकरलहरीपरिवाहसरणिवास्तव्यम् ।

हरिसार्वभौममानतभरणोद्यतशौरिभारधौरेयम् ॥ १३ ॥

(III a-b)

निजतनुकनकाद्रिमेल्य नाथे विहरति वल्लभया समं प्रहृष्टे ।

हरिरवति जगन्ति तातसिन्धोरधितटमात्मसुभृत्यता³नुरूपम् ॥ १४ ॥

चतुर्भुजः श्रीसरसीहरीन्द्रहस्तेन दत्ते वरमाश्रितानाम् ।

यदर्थिने⁴ भृत्यमुखेन दानं प्रायः प्रभूणां प्रकृतिस्वभावः ॥ १५ ॥

इदं⁵ प्रकर्षाय हरेर्यदार्तान् संरक्षति श्रीसरसीहनूयान् ।

महेश्वराणां महते गुणाय प्रकल्पते भृत्यजनप्रभावः ॥ १६ ॥

(*IV a-b)

श्रीसूनुतातगुरुसिन्धुतटाञ्जनेये संप्रत्यशेषजनतावनजागरूके ।

लक्ष्म्या हरिर्विहरते सततं यदेष⁶ सीतावियोगदिनक्लृप्त⁷तपोविलासः ॥ १७ ॥

1. Śleṣa alamkāra. Kṣīra=milk and water ; Śrī-tāta-samudra=Ocean who was father of Śrī, i.e., from which Śrī arose, and the tank Tātasamudra.

2. Mack. फणिपति which is hypermetric.

3. Mack. हृद्यता । 4. Mack. अर्थिनां.

5. Mack. प्रहर्षाय *(IV a-b) on South Wall.

6. Mack. य एष. । 7. Mack. कूप

प्रायस्तुल्यः¹ पादुकायामिहापि न्यासस्सीतानायकाङ्घ्रेस्तथापि² ।

धात्रीरक्षां सा ततानेति किं वा लोकान् पाति श्रीतटाकाञ्जनेयः ॥ १८ ॥

इन्दिरासुहृदभेदभावनासन्ततेरिव तदात्मतां वहन्³ ।

तन्तनीति कमलासरस्तटीगन्धवाहतनयो जनावनम् ॥ १९ ॥

नारायणीयेन महो⁴भरेण नटत्प्रकर्षो⁵ जगतां त्रयाणाम् ।

करोति रक्षां कलशब्धिकन्यासरस्तटीमारुतिसार्वभौमः ॥ २० ॥

कसारितेजोभरवैभवेन संसारिणामेष तनोति⁶ रक्षाम् ।

रमासरस्यां⁷ रघुवीरसेनानासीरसीमामटसार्वभौमः ॥ २१ ॥

इतीन्दिरातटाकतीर⁸वायुसूनुर्विशतिं

रमाकुमारतातयायेनिर्मितां पठन्ति ये ।

धनं यशो बलं सुतानरोगतायुषी सुखं⁹

¹⁰लभेयुगेव मानवाः कृपाभराद्रमापतेः¹¹ ॥ २२ ॥

यथा हरिर्मासुरपुण्यकोट्यां यथा च गौरी वरकामकोट्याम् ।

तथा महोदरकुमारतातकल्याणकोट्यां कमला समिन्धे¹² ॥ २३ ॥

कुर्वन्ति¹³ ब्राह्मणानां तु कल्याणशतमन्वहम् ।

तस्मात्कल्याणकोटीति सत्यनामा प्रकाशते ॥ २४ ॥

शुभमस्तु हनूमद्विंशतिः

1. Mack. -लः

2. Mack. सितानायकरङ्घ्रेः

3. -तेरिव तदात्मतां वहन् missing in Ins. 651 of 1919.

4. Mack. मनो

5. Mack. प्रहर्षः

6. -सरिणामेष तनोति missing in Ins. 651 of 1919.

7. Mack. सरस्थः

8. Mack. सूनु

9. Mack. अरोगतायुरक्षयम्

10. लभेयुः ungrammatical.

11. The text in the epigraph 651 of 1919 ends here; that in 93 of 1923 and the Mack. Copy has two more verses, which are evidently added by another at the time of engraving this original.

12. Mack. कमलाविलासः

13. कुर्वन्ती in 93 of 1923. Ungrammatical.

THE COUNTRY OF SAPĀDALAKSHA

BY

N. LAKSHMINARAYAN RAO, *Ootacamund.*

The Kannaḍa poet Pampa of the 10th century A.D., while giving the genealogy of his patron Arikēśarin II in his work *Vikramārjunavijaya* states that Yuddhamalla I, an early ancestor of Arikēśarin, was the ruler of the Sapādalaksha country.¹ This fact is also recorded in the undated Vēmulavāḍa inscription of Arikēśarin II² and in the Parbhani copper-plate grant of Arikēśarin III dated Śaka 888 (=A.D. 966).³ Where was this country? The object of this short note is to ascertain its location by means of evidence afforded by epigraphy, though attempts have already been made to identify it on historical considerations and literary testimony.

Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri in his valuable paper on the Chālukyas of Vēmulavāḍa⁴ has, in his masterly way, dealt with the genealogy of this line of kings and the part they played in the history of the Deccan. In the course of his discussion on the territory over which these rulers held sway he has suggested that the Sapādalaksha country which Yuddhamalla I was governing might be Śākambharī, i.e., Sāmbhar in Eastern Rajaputana, to which the name of Sapādalaksha is usually applied. Since this tract was far removed from parts of Hyderabad connected with the activities of this family, he would assume that Yuddhamalla was governing Sapādalaksha as a subordinate of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Dantidurga who, he believes, should have captured Eastern Rajaputana during his campaigns in the north. Thus it is the memory of this adventure, according to Professor Sastri, that was carefully treasured in the annals of the family.

1. *Vikramārjunavijaya* or *Pampa Bhārata* (Karnataka Sahitya Parishad edition, 1931), Canto I, v. 16.

2. *J.A.H.R.S.*, Vol. VI, pp. 169 ff. and plate.

3. *Sources of the Mediaeval History of the Deccan* by G. H. Khare, Vol. II (1934), pp. 34 ff. and plate.

4. *Journal of the Madras University*, Vol. XV, No. 2 (1944), pp. 101 ff.

Dr. N. Venkata Ramanayya has also discussed this question in his learned article on the Rāshtrakūṭa conquest of Sapādalaksha.¹ After pointing out that there were a number of territories in India which went by the appellation of Sapādalaksha, he avers that the only country which would be appropriately called by this name in the 9th century A. D., the period in which Yuddhamalla I of the Vēmulavāḍa branch of the Chālukyas flourished, was Śākambharī. He thus accepts the identification proposed by Professor Sastri.

Long before these savants took up this question for consideration, my Assistant, Mr. M. Venkataramayya, had started an enquiry into it, though indirectly, while trying to locate the region of Aśmaka mentioned in early literature, both Hindu and Buddhist, as well as in inscriptions.² He came to the conclusion that Aśmaka whose capital was Pōdana and Sapādalaksha in which apparently this place was situated were to be looked for round about the Nizamabad and Karimnagar Districts in the Hyderabad State. He based this surmise on the statement of Śrutasāgarasūri who, in his commentary on the Sanskrit *Champū-kāvya*, *Yasastiloka* of Sōmadēvasūri, a court poet of Baddega, the son of Arikēsarin II, explains that the chief or prince Aśmantaka figuring in the latter work was the resident of the mountain region of Sapādalaksha.³

I had to study this problem in connection with my work on the inscriptions of Vēmulavāḍa which I copied some time ago and which I am editing for the Hyderabad Archaeological Department. One of these records which is in the Kannaḍa language affords a definite clue for locating this territorial division. It refers itself to the reign of the Chālukya king Tribhuvanamalla, *i.e.*, Vikramāditya VI and is dated in Chālukya-Vikrama year 8, Rudhirōdgārīn (=A.D. 1033-4). His feudatory *Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara* Rājāditya is stated therein to be governing a portion of the Savalakkhe province and Chabbi twenty-one-thousand district from the *nelevidu* of Lēmbulavāḍe which is described as the *rājadhāni*.⁴

1. *Dr. Kunhan Raja Presentation Volume* (1946), pp. 113 ff.

2. *J.O.R.*, Vol. XII (1938), p. 264.

3. *Yasastilakam* (*Kāvya-mālā Series*, No. 70), 1916, p. 188.

4. *Savalakkheya bhāgamumaṁ Chabbiy-irppattondu-sāsiramumaṁ dushṭa-nigraha-śiṣṭa-pratipālanadiṁ paripālīsuttum rājadhāni Lēmbulavāḍeya nelevidiṇo sukha-saṁkathā-vinōdadiṁ rājyaṁ-geyyuttum=irddu.*

This statement makes it clear that Savalakkhe, which is but a Kannaḍa rendering of Sapādalaksha, was within easy reach, for purposes of administration, of Lēmbulapāṭaka. Now it is wellknown that Lēmbulapāṭaka is no other than Vēmulavāḍa in the Karimnagar District of the Hyderabad State, the find-spot of the inscription under reference. It is thus evident that the country of Sapādalaksha was situated not far from the Karimnagar District. In this connection it is worth remembering that both the Kannaḍa poet and the Sanskrit inscription of Arikēsarin II at Vēmulavāḍa glorify the fact that Yuddhamalla I, the lord of Sapādalaksha, had his elephants bathed in wells filled with oil at Pōdana (Pampa spells it Bōdana). This would show that Pōdana, *i.e.*, modern Bodhan in the Nizamabad district was included in the dominions of Yuddhamalla; and, be it noted, Nizamabad and Karimnagar are adjacent districts. According to the inscription of Vikramāditya noticed above, Rājāditya was also governing Chabbi twenty-one-thousand, which was obviously in the neighbourhood of Sapādalaksha. The Parbhaṇī plates of Arikēsarin III register a grant of the village Vanikaṭupula situated in Rēpāka twelve, a sub-division of Sabbi one-thousand.¹ This same district of Sabbi one-thousand is mentioned in the Daulatabad plates of the Western Chālukya king Jagadēkamalla II which tells us that the division of Ātkūru seventy was included in it.² In the Palampet pillar inscription of Kākatiya Rudradēva,³ Rēcherla Rudra is stated to have built temples at Ātukūru after which this division seems to have been named and it has been identified with a place of that name about ten miles north-east of Warangal.⁴ We learn from the Anmakonḍa inscription of Kākatiya Prōla⁵ that Vikramāditya VI conferred the district of Sabbi one-thousand on Tribhuvanamalla Bēta, one of the ancestors of Prōla. The late Mr. H. Krishna Sastri who has edited this inscription is of the opinion that Anmakonḍa and Warangal might have been included in the Sabbi-sāyira district. Mr. G. H. Khare identifies Rēpāka mentioned in the Parbhaṇī plates of Arikēsarin III as the headquarters of

1. See text-lines 40-1.

2. *Hyderabad Archaeological Series*, No. 2, p. 8, text-line 70.

3. *Hyderabad Archaeological Series*, No. 3, p. 11, text-line 200.

4. See map published in the monograph.

5. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IX, p. 258.

Rēpāka twelve in Sabbi one-thousand with a village of the same name in the Karimnagar District.¹ Sabbi-sāyira was evidently a smaller division in the bigger province of Chabbi twenty-one-thousand referred to above. If this surmise is correct, part of the Warangal district on the south-east may be said to have been situated in this province besides a portion of Karimnagar. It can therefore be taken as established beyond doubt that Savalakkhe (Sapādalaksha), mentioned along with Chabbi twenty-one-thousand in the Vēmūlavāḍa Kannaḍa inscription, comprised at least the central and eastern portions of the present Hyderabad State, *i.e.*, Nizamabad and a major portion of Karimnagar districts, though its actual extent and boundaries cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.²

1. *Sources of the Mediaeval History of the Deccan*, Vol. II (1934), p. 35. There are two villages of the name Rēpāka in the Karimnagar District.

2. As already pointed out, Mr. Venkataramayya had thrown out a hint indicating this identification.

THE BEE-AND-SPRING MAXIM

P. B. DESAI, Ootacamund.

The gift portion of an inscription from Dōṇi,¹ Muṇḍargi Pēṭhā, Dharwar District, contains the following passage; 'adarkke *ali-vasata-nyāyam* chakravarttiya sēse modalāgi sarbba-bādhā-parihāra—'. It means, 'the gift-land should be exempted from all impositions, such as the sovereign's levy, etc., according to the maxim of '*ali-vasata-nyāya*'. A similar passage is met with in a similar context in another inscription² from the same village; it is like this; 'ant=ā-tōṭakkam keygam=*ali-vasata-nyāyam* chakravarttiya sēse modalāgi sarbba-bādhā-parihāra—'. This extract again refers to the exemptions on the garden and the field, which were the subject of the grant, and cites the maxim of the *ali-vasata-nyāya*. One more epigraph which was originally at Kukanur in the Kōpbal District, but later on removed to the Madras Museum,³ has the following clause in the same context, 'śrī-sāsirvargge pādapūjeyam goṭṭu siddhāya bhattāya *vasata-nyāyam*=embu=omduṁ vāgad=ent=ā-sarvvābādhā-parihāra—'. Its purport will be like this: 'the land was bestowed upon the illustrious One Thousand (representatives) after worshipping their feet and it was exempted from one and all impositions such as *siddhāya* and *bhattāya*, according to the maxim of *vasata-nyāya*'.

It is clear from the above extracts that they contain reference to a *nyāya* or maxim which is one and the same in all the three cases, though only a portion of it has been retained in the last passage, evidently through the ignorance of the composer or the engraver. The maxim is *Ali-vasata-nyāya*; and as this seems to be a slightly corrupt form, its correct version should be 'Ali-vasanta Nyāya'. I have not come across any more references to this *nyāya* in the epigraphical literature. It is further interesting to note that this *nyāya* seems to be

1. *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy*, 1927-28, Appendix F, No. 7.

2. *Ibid.*, No. 78.

3. *S. I. I.*, Vol. IX, part I, No. 162.

new and hitherto unknown in Sanskrit literature also.¹ Its literal translation would be 'the bee-and-spring maxim'.

What is the interpretation of this *Nyāya*? 'When the flowers blossom in spring the bees come and take away the sweet honey. Similarly, many are the claims on the yielding land in the form of several dues collected from it. But the gift land is to be exempted from all these'. This interpretation suits the context in all the cases under reference.

The three inscriptions containing the above references are dated in A. D. 1080, 1098 and 1093 respectively and their provenance shows that they are confined to a small region of Karnāṭaka comprising the adjoining areas of the Dharwar District of the Bombay State and the Kopbal District of the Hyderabad State. It is really strange that this interesting maxim should have been current in the specified tract in a particular period only and that it should have otherwise remained unknown. Kukanūr was a great centre of Sanskrit learning in the mediæval age and its One Thousand Mahājanas were reputed for their scholarship as revealed by the contents of a good many epigraphs found in this place.² The credit of preserving and giving currency to this maxim which must have been in use once in Sanskrit literature, probably goes to these learned men of the great *agrahāra* of Kukkanūr (modern Kukanur).

-
1. I have ransacked available notices of the *nyāyas* in Sanskrit literature and also consulted some learned Sanskrit scholars.
 2. These inscriptions are unpublished and form part of my private epigraphical collection.

DOMINIONS OF THE ŚULKĪS OF ORISSA

BY

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, *Ootacamund*.

The inscriptions of the Śulkī rulers of Orissa have come mostly from Dhenkanal and a few from the neighbouring localities such as Talcher and Hindol. Their dominions thus appear to have comprised the Dhenkanal area together with some of the adjoining regions. The kings of this family assumed subordinate titles and epithets such as *Rāṇaka* and *Samadhigata-ṣaṇcha-mahāśabda*, although in some records these are found along with the imperial titles *Mahārājādhirāja* and *Parama-bhaṭṭāraka*. The use of a combination of feudatory and imperial titles and epithets appears to point to the fact that the Śulkī kings were semi-independent rulers owing nominal allegiance to an imperial family. As regards the identity of the overlords of the Śulkī kings, the Dhenkanal inscription of Śulkī Raṇastambha,¹ which is probably the earliest epigraphic record of the family, seems to give us a clue. This is the only record of the family dated according to an era, all other inscriptions of the Śulkī kings being either undated or dated according to the regnal reckoning. The date of the Dhenkanal plate of Raṇastambha was read by H. P. Sastri as the year 33, while D. R. Bhandarkar suggested 203. I am inclined to read the date as the year 103. Whatever, however, be the correct reading of the date, there is little doubt that the era, to which it has to be referred, is the same as that used in the records of the imperial rulers of the Bhauma-Kara family of ancient Orissa. This no doubt points to the fact that the Śulkīs owed allegiance to the Bhauma-Karas who had their head-quarters at Virajas and Guheśvara-pāṭaka both possibly being different names of modern Jajpur on the Vaitaraṇī river in the Cuttack district of Orissa. The feudatory position of the Śulkīs suggests that their dominions could have hardly comprised wide regions of Orissa, not to speak of any territory outside Orissa. The Jārā-grāma grant² of Raṇastambha, however, has been taken to

1. H. P. Sastri, *J. B. O. R. S.*, Vol. II, pp. 397-400; D. R. Bhandarkar, *A List of Inscriptions of Northern India*, No. 1697.

2. H. P. Sastri, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 168-171; D. R. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, No. 1696.

prove that the dominions of the Śulki kings of Orissa included wide areas of south-west Bengal as far as the Bhāgīrathī or the Hooghly river.

As regards the village, a portion of which was granted by Śulki Raṇastambha in favour of a Brāhmaṇa named Pāchuka (not *Pauchuka* as read by Sastri), Sastri says "The land was granted in the district of Jārā and in the village of Jārā in the Rāḍha country. There is such a village in the district of Hughli bordering on the district of Midnapur both of which belong to Rāḍha or Western Bengal. It is still the abode of a number of well-to-do families of Brāhmaṇas. But it would be worth investigating how the Śulkis came to acquire land in this part of the country. There is an influential body of cultivating middlemen in Midnapur who call themselves Śukli and trace their origin to a place called Kedālaka. But Raṇastambhadeva, the donor, was a Śulki and his capital was Kodāloka. Can there be any connection between Śulki and Śukli and between Kodālaka and Kedālaka?"¹ It must be admitted that Sastri offered the suggestion in a considerably guarded language, although, as will be shown below, his contention that the village of Jārā was situated, according to the inscription, in the Rāḍha country is absolutely unwarranted. It is, however, an unfortunate feature of Indian historical research that an unwarranted suggestion, casually offered by one writer, is passed by a follower of his as an undoubted and established historical truth. This has happened also in regard to the above suggestion of Sastri, which has been represented by R. D. Banerji in his *History of Orissa*² as a fully established fact. Banerji begins with the passage. "As proved by my teacher Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Hara Prasād Śāstrī," and concludes "The Śulkis therefore belonged to Northern Orissa which once contained the modern district of Midnapur." Thus according to this author, it was already "proved" that the Śulki dominions extended at least from the Cuttack district of Orissa up to the Midnapur and Hooghly districts of Bengal.

We quote below the relevant passage of the Jārāgrāma grant of Raṇastambha to show the nature of the evidence that has been taken to prove the above theory

1. *J. B. O. R. S.*, Vol. IV, pp. 168-9.

2. Vol. I, pp. 125-6.

about the extent of the Śulkī dominions. Lines 15-19 of the inscription read: *viditam=astu bhavatām Jārā-khaṇḍe Jārāgrāme pūrva-dakṣhiṇa-diśābhāge Chakalika-bhūmi chatur-simā-paryanta pūrva-diśe Stambhakāra-kshetra-sima utara-diśe Āhāra-Dakṣhiṇādi-sima paśchima-diśe joḍa-sima dakṣhiṇa-diśe Chinta-bhūmi-sima ete chatur-simā-paryanta Rāḍhā-maṇḍale Tellamgala-bhaṭṭa-grāma-vinirgata-Kaśyapa-gōtra*°, etc. Any careful student of Indian epigraphy will at once notice from the passage quoted that the donee (the Brāhmaṇa Pāchuka) belonged to a Kāśyapa-gotrīya family that originally hailed from the *Bhaṭṭa-grāma* called Tellamgala which was situated in the Rāḍhā maṇḍala and that Rāḍhā-maṇḍala itself had nothing to do with Jārāgrāma in the Jārā khaṇḍa. As a matter of fact, in the charters of early Indian kings, the name of the district precedes that of the village included in it, and is not put, as in this case, after describing the boundaries of the land granted. Of course the seventh case-ending in *Rāḍhā-maṇḍalē* must have led Sastri to take this expression with *Jārā-khaṇḍe Jārā-grāme* mentioned earlier rather than with *Tellamgala-bhaṭṭa-grāma*°; but there are innumerable cases of *sāpeksha samāsas* of this kind in epigraphic literature.¹ Numerous other records of the Orissa region have exactly similar passages; e. g., *Śrāvastyaṁ Mukṭāvathi-grāma-vinirgatāya* in the Kalibhana plates² and *Rāḍhāyāṁ Vallikandara vinirgatāya* in the Sonapur plates³, both belonging to the Somavamśī king Mahāśivagupta I Janamejaya. There is no doubt that the donee Pāchuka was a Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇa settled in Orissa. We have similar other cases of Brāhmaṇas migrating from Rāḍhā or Rāḍha in South-west Bengal and flocking to the courts of ancient Orissan rulers.⁴

A very interesting fact about these Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇas is that often they are represented as students of a Veda other than the Sāmaveda. It is well known that all Rāḍhīya

1. Cf. *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, pp. 175-7, 179, 278, 406, etc. and notes.

2. *I.H.Q.*, Vol. XX, p. 247 and note 6.

3. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XI, p. 94. B. C. Majumdar read the passage wrongly as *Rāḍhāphamvallikandara*°, took it to be a place name and identified it with modern Rehrakhol in Orissa.

4. Cf. e. g. *Ep. Ind.*, loc. cit.; Jurerpur plate of Devānanda edited by me in the *Ep. Ind.* (in the press), etc.

Brāhmaṇas now claim to be students of the Sāmaveda and this is supported by the traditions recorded in the Bengal *Kula-pañjikās*. This evidence in regard to the unreliability of the *Kula-pañjikās* and modern traditions as sources of the social history of ancient and medieval Bengal may now be added to the points raised by me elsewhere¹ in connection with the problem in question.

1. *Select Inscriptions*, loc. cit., pp. 498-500.

NEW FACTS ABOUT THE BHAUMA-KARAS

BY

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, *Ootacamund*.

About the end of May 1950, I received for examination a copper-plate inscription from Mr. C. M. Āchārya, the learned Vice-Chancellor of the Utkal University, Cuttack, through the Registrar of the said institution. On examination, it was found that the inscription records a charter of king Śubhākara II of the Bhauma (called Kara in the later records of the family) dynasty of ancient Orissa. The king of this name is known from two copper-plate grants so far published. The first of these is the Hindol plate which was originally published by Pandit Binayak Misra in the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, Vol. XVI, pp. 69-83. A revised text of the inscription was later published by the same scholar in his *Orissa under the Bhauma-Kings*, Calcutta, 1934, pp. 12-20. Unfortunately even this corrected text of the inscription, as published by Pandit Misra, is not completely free from errors. The Hindol plate now belongs to the Utkal University's valuable collection of antiquities and I had an opportunity to examine it a few months ago through the kindness of Mr. C. M. Āchārya. The second of the two inscriptions of the king is the Dharakota plate published originally by Mr. Satyanārāyaṇa Rājaguru in the *Journal of the Andhr Historical Research Society*, Vol. IV, pp. 189-94. A portion of the record has been quoted by Pandit Misra in his book referred to above (pp. 21-22). The text of this record is remarkably similar to that of the Hindol plate. The year of the issue of the two records was also the same—year 103. The Hindol plate is dated in the year 103 Śrāvaṇa śudi 7, while the Dharakota plate has the date, year 103 Bhādrapada śudi 7. The second charter was thus issued only a month later than the first grant. An interesting palaeographical peculiarity of the number 103 written in the two records is that while the Dharakota plate writes it as 100+3, the Hindol plate puts it rather unusually as 100+0+3. The cypher used in the Hindol plate between the unit and hundred symbols no doubt indicates the absence of the ten element in the number and is due to the influence of the decimal notation which was gradually becoming popular in other parts of India even before the days of the Bhauma-Karas of Orissa. It is interesting to note in this connection that the new copper-plate record under discussion

exhibits the same palaeographical peculiarity in writing the year of the date. The grant is dated in the year 100; but it is written as 100+0. The present charter was issued about three years before the Hindol and Dharakota plates.

In a paper contributed some years ago to the *Journal of the Kalinga Historical Research Society*, Vol. II, pp 103-05, I discussed the history of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty of ancient Orissa. It is now well known that Śubhākara, otherwise called Simhaketu (or Simhadvaja) and Kasumahāra II, was the son of Śāntikara I (*alias* Gayāḍa I and Lalitahāra I) of the Khaṇḍagiri cave inscription (Misra, *op. cit.*, p. 10) and the Dhauli cave inscription of the year 93 (*loc. cit.* p. 11) who was the son of the celebrated king Śubhākara I. The Hindol and Dharakota plates describe king Śubhākara as the son of king Śāntikara I by the queen Tribhuvanamahādevī who is said to have been the ornament of the Nāg-odbhava-kula probably meaning the Nāga family. It is also wellknown that, owing apparently to the untimely death of king Śubhākara, his mother Tribhuvanamahādevī ascended the throne and ruled the Bhauma-Kara dominions for several years during the minority of her son's son Śāntikara II (*alias* Gayāḍa II and Loṇabhāra or Lavaṇabhāra). The Dhenkanal plate of Tribhuvanamahādevī (*loc. cit.*, pp. 23-31) herself gives some additional informations about the family in which the queen was born. It says that queen Tribhuvanamahādevī, also called Siddhagaurī, was the daughter of the illustrious Rājamalladeva who was the *Dakṣiṇ-āśā-mukha-tīlaka* meaning probably the ruler of a territory in the south. This southern king named Rājamalla belonging to the Nāgodbhava dynasty has not been identified satisfactorily.

The most interesting point in the description of king Śubhākara who issued the charter under discussion is that he is here represented as the son of Śivakara II, first son of Śubhākara I and the elder brother of Śāntikara I, from the queen Mohinīdevī belonging to the Bhavāna-vamśa (possibly a royal family of which the progenitor was a ruler named Bhavāna). This new information is a very valuable addition to our knowledge of Bhauma-Kara history. It seems to show that Śāntikara I was succeeded sometime before the year 100 by his elder brother's son Śubhākara II, born of the queen Mohinīdevī, and that this Śubhākara II was succeeded shortly before the year 103 by Śubhākara III who was the son of

Śāntikara I himself from the queen Tribhuvanamahādevī. It may however be suggested that the issuer of the present charter was the same king who later issued the Hindol and Dharakota plates and that he was actually the son of Śivakara II from Mohinīdevī but was adopted as a son by Tribhuvanamahādevī between the years 100 and 103 when he was on the throne. I cannot support the alternate suggestion mainly because the adoption of a ruling monarch by one of his female relations looks unusual and because the unpopularity of the institution of adoption in the Bhauma-Kara family seems to be clearly demonstrated by the accession to the throne by no less than four widowed queens (*viz.*, Tribhuvanamahādevī, Gaurīmahādevī, Vakulamahādevī and Dharmamahādevī) and a princess (Daṇḍimahādevī). It should also be remembered that the draft of the present charter is remarkably different from those of the Hindol and Dharakota plates which however resemble each other. It is hoped that new discovery of Bhauma-Kara records will soon show conclusively whether Śubhākara II of the present charter is identical with the issuer of the Hindol and Dharakota plates or, as is more probable, those two records were issued by a different king named Śubhākara III.

In the copper-plate grants of the kings of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty, the name of the reigning king's mother is usually mentioned. This practice has luckily made known the names of the queens of many of the Bhauma-Kara rulers to the students of ancient Orissan history. Unfortunately no copper-plate inscription of king Śāntikara II, son of Śubhākara II or III, has as yet been discovered. Thus the name of the mother of Śāntikara II and the queen (probably chief queen) of Śubhākara II or III remains unknown. The charter of Śubhākara II under discussion mentions the *rājñī* Nṛiṇṇādevī, as a result of whose representation the king made the grant in question in favour of certain Brāhmaṇas. There is little doubt that Nṛiṇṇādevī was a queen of Śubhākara II. But it is not possible to determine in the present state of our knowledge whether Nṛiṇṇādevī was the chief queen of king Śubhākara II and whether she was the mother of king Śāntikara II, son and successor Śubhākara II or III. This fact is likely to remain unknown until a copper-plate grant of king Śāntikara II is brought to the notice of the students of ancient Orissan history and epigraphy.

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE

A meeting of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute was held, jointly with the Madras Saṁskṛta Academy, on the 27th February, 1950, at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore, Madras, to felicitate Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Madras, on his appointment as Professor of Sanskrit at the Teheran University, Iran.

Sri Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer presided. An Address in Sanskrit and a Souvenir in the form a silver plate inscribed with a Sanskrit verse conveying the best wishes of the Institute and the Academy were presented to Dr. Kunhan Raja.

After prayer, Dr. V. Raghavan read the Address. Sri Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer presented the Address and the Souvenir to Dr. Kunhan Raja. Speeches were then made by Sri Alladi Krishnaswami Iyer, Pandit R. Subrahmanya Sastri, Prof. K. A. Nilakantha Sastri, Prof. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai and Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer praising Dr. Raja's work in the cause of Sanskrit and emphasising the cultural significance of the new appointment which Dr. Raja had accepted.

Dr. Kunhan Raja replied to the felicitations.

BOOK REVIEWS

ART AND THOUGHT BY K. BHARATA IYER. Luzac & Co., London. £3. 3. 0.

If there was one single scholar to whom, more than to any body else, the world owes its understanding of Indian art, it was Dr. Ananda Coomaraswami. Indian art, the study of its spirit and aesthetic, naturally took him to Indian philosophy and Indian modes of life and social patterns, and during his last years he was an active exponent of a school of thought, which had gained many notable adherents and which believed in the supreme validity of the twin doctrines of perennial philosophy and traditional life, belief in which, as he showed in a number of his last days' writings, was common to the heritage of all the old world peoples.

It is appropriate that a volume of studies intended to honour this savant is entitled *Art and Thought*. The volume was organised by Sri K. Bharata Iyer, and unfortunately, it became a Memorial Volume too, for Dr. Coomaraswami passed away while the book was still with the printers.

There are forty contributions of varying length and excellence in this Volume. They are drawn from different countries, America, Europe and India, and deal with different aspects, and topics relating thereto, of the traditional cultures of Christianity, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism, and of art and archaeology. The Volume is enriched by a number of illustrations, a portrait of Coomaraswami, and a very useful chronologically arranged bibliography of the writings of Coomaraswami.

First comes the series of articles which are nearest to the dominant theme of Coomaraswami's expositions, the value of traditional life and art. To this section belong: the article 'Concerning Forms in Art' by F. Schuon which concludes that for all traditional art the end is the bringing of the artist back to his divine Essence; that of I. Burckhardt 'Principles and Methods of Traditional Art' which bases itself on the doctrine that traditionally, art and craft are identical, symbolically they correspond to a divine activity, and they are 'ritual' in character; 'From Art to Spirituality' by F. de Marquette, which summarises the teachings of Indian aesthetics the understanding of

which in the West is described as one of the most important cultural events of the last century; 'A craft as a means of Grace and a means of Realisation' by A. Messinesi which asks the question 'what possibilities are offered to a craftsman born in a modern world, an expanding desert of secularism and profanity, for integrating his life through the practice of a craft?' and answers by a narrative of the history of the author's own conversion to the traditional view; the article of R. B. Greys which, enquiring about the validity of Indian handicrafts in this industrial era, shows how industrialism speeds up entropy on this planet, destroying life in its quantitative as well as qualitative aspects and hopes that Indian handicraft and peasant life will resist and survive; 'on the Aesthetic Attitude in Romanesque Art' by M. Schapiro which sets forth the prevalence of such a religious view of art in old cultures other than the Indian too; S. E. Lee's paper 'Los Urthona and Blake's Illustrations to Dante' which expound Blake's faith in the *Philosophia perennis*; the excerpts from Al-Gazzali on Beauty made by R. Ettinghausen which disproves the prevailing notion about Muslim art being secular; A. M. Ludovici's 'India and the Western World' which is alive to the damage caused by the impact of the West on India and agrees with Coomaraswami's observation that "India's recovery depends on the re-establishment of a standard of quality"; and 'Active Tradition of the East and West' by Alberts Gleizes which demonstrates, in Coomaraswami's own manner, identical traditions in religious art-representations in Hinduism and Christianity.

Next comes a series of articles on the significance of certain symbologies in India, China, Arabia, etc. Here, mention may be made of Sanskrit Letters as Mystical Symbols in later Buddhism outside India by L. Scherman; the Magic Ball and Golden Fruit in Ancient Chinese Art by A. Salmony; the Motive of Three Fish with a Common Head (in China) by C. Schuster; Cosmic Symbolism of the Dragon Robes of the Ch'ing Dynasty by S. Camman; the Mysteries of the Letter Nūn in Arabic, meaning fish which Rene Guenon relates to the flood legends and Matsya-avatara in Hinduism, 'the most direct heritage of the Primordial Tradition'; and 'Dūrohaṇa and the Waking Dream' by M. Eliade who interprets the staircase and ascension to heaven,

Among articles more directly concerned with religion and philosophy are C. G. Jung's article on Eastern Meditation, S. Radhakrishnan's on Science and Religion, and Miss Horner's Wayfaring.

In art-criticism we have E. Schroeder's essay on Moghul painting in which the author endeavours to suggest the hitherto overlooked feature of a Hindu-Muslim synthesis such as is more clearly perceptible in religion and literature, and the article on Problems of Rajput Art by H. Goetz.

Of value on the plane of archaeological research, the contribution of Coomaraswami to which was rich and authoritative, the following may be noted: Two Mesopotamian Seals (Miss A. Getty), Buddhist Art of Bāmiyān in Afganistan (B. Rowland), the Gupta Temple at Devagarh, (V. S. Agrawala), Tibetan Book Covers (G. Tucci), Painting of a Jain Pilgrimage (W. N. Brown), and Chinese Ritual Bronze Vessels (Miss F. Waterbury).

N. Roerich, under the caption 'Chāndogya Upanishad' sings a rhapsody on India.

V. R.

ORIENTALIA NEERLANDICA, A. W. SIJTHOFF, LEIDEN.

This is a volume of Oriental studies in about 500 pages contributed to by members of the Netherlands' Oriental Society on the occasion of the twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Society in 1945 and published in 1948. The volume is, as the Preface rightly points out, 'a living proof that oriental scholarship in the various aspects is still alive in the Netherlands'. There are on the whole thirty-five papers covering the fields Egypt, Africa, Middle-East, Islam and Christianity, India, Indonesia, China and Japan; most of the contributions are in English, and of some at least in other languages, an English summary is given.

A. De Buck of Leiden opens the volume with an examination of the word H'PJ which has been taken to mean the Nile but which means, according to him, more properly 'inundation'. P. Van Der Meer of Amstrdam fixes the reign of Menes of Egypt at about 2400 B. C. The African rock-paintings and their relation to Egyptian art-products form the subject of the next paper by W. D. Van Wijnagaarden of Leiden. The exaltation to which the King was raised in

Egypt too is discussed by L. J. Cazemier in his paper 'Did the Egyptians of the Ancient Empire Possess a Soul?' The grammatical question of localism in African languages is elaborately discussed by H. P. Blok of Leiden. The word Azazel in the old Testament which remains a 'crux interpretum' is examined by W. H. Gispen of Amsterdam. The study of P. A. H. De Boer of Leiden of Exodus XXI. 7-11 show how a Hebrew slave girl had to be treated by her master; and the biblical paper by J. Simons of Leiden discusses the territory inhabited by the Joseph-tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh. Urim and Tummin of the Old Testament were, according to J. Schooneveld, abstract nouns, became later material objects consulted for future happenings and in judiciary cases, and together formed a complete name for the priestly oracle. J. H. Kraemites writes on Islam and Democracy.

In the group of papers on Indological subjects, Faddegon points out the affinities in the alphabet-arrangements in the Semitic and Sanskrit. H. Kraemer of Geneva, by a detailed analysis of the writings of Benoy Kumar Sarkar, shows how Indian research scholarship has a natural tendency to allow national patriotism to detract from the disinterested value of the investigation; an account is then given of the founder of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and pioneer of Indological studies, Sir William Jones; with illustrations from sculpture and citations from literature, Vogel describes the motif in Indian art called Vyālaka, the peculiar animal referred to in Tamil temple architecture as Yāli; P. H. Pott describes a Tibetan painting from Tun-Huang on the western frontier of China; J. Gonda of Utrecht has a valuable paper criticising the prevailing notions about the humorous or mimic-dramatic nature of the so-called secular and satirical hymns of the R̥gveda like those on the Frogs and the Gambler; K. De Vreese draws the full picture of the ancient Indian dice (vibhīṭaka) game; and H. J. De Zwart of Utrecht has some fresh comments to make on the Ūrvaśī-Purūravas hymn.

On the help that the Munda language group offers for a study of the Indonesian languages, F. B. J. Kuiper of Leiden has a detailed paper. R. A. Kern of Leiden shows by a re-examination of the references to Ho-Ling that it could primarily mean only Java, though one of the references warrant identification with Malaya. F. H. Van Naerssen points out the circumstances under which the earliest phase of the Hindu-

Indonesian Culture-contact should have developed. G. W. J. Drewes's paper on a manuscript with mystical poetry (suluk) from Cherbon deals with a phase of Javanese culture after the introduction of Islam.

The possibility of scribal errors in ancient Chinese texts is illustrated by J. J. L. Duyvendak of Leiden. Tjan Tjoe Som of Leiden offers a new interpretation of some passages of the Chinese classics. F. Vos, Leiden, presents a translation of a Japanese text on Knighthood; an illustrated article by C. C. Kriegër, which concludes the volume, points out the western influence on modern Japanese painting.

This is a well-printed and well-produced volume.

V. R.

K. N. DIKSHIT MEMORIAL VOLUME. Deccan College Research Institute, Poona.

Volume VIII of the *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*, Poona, has been dedicated as a Memorial Volume to the memory of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, the well-known scholar who was Director-General of Archaeology for many years. The Volume opens with a list of words and phrases, rather characteristic of the epic, gathered by Dr. S. K. De during his work on the critical edition of the Udyogaparvan of the Great Epic. Prof. P. K. Gode writes on the mounted bowmen on Indian battlefields from Alexander to Panipat. Mm. V. V. Mirashi gives a detailed account of three ancient dynasties of Mahākosala who reigned successively at Śrīpura from A.D. 380 to A.D. 650. Dr. I. J. S. Tarporewala has a note on the metre of a Gāthā in the Avesta. Sri R. S. Panchamukhi contributes a paper, together with rough sketches, which could have been well substituted by photos, on the sculpture of the many temples at Pattadakkal near Badami. Dr. E. D. Kulkarni gives a section—on expressions of comparison—from his study of epic syntax in the critical Mahābhārata edition. Sri G. S. Ghurye's Notes on Hindu Costume is a veritable minor thesis in 75 pages on a highly interesting theme; it surveys all the important poetic and dramatic works and treats in a classified manner with the different articles of dress for both men and women. Making a detailed review of the incidents of the Surat Episode of 1759, Sri T. S. Shejwalkar shows the deficiencies of the policy of the Peshwas, and the

need to revise one's opinion about Maratha Power in the 18th century. On the meagre finds of coins, both punch-marked and Roman, from Indian megaliths, Sri G. N. Das has a short note. The pre-historic finds in Bellary are described by Sri B. Subba Rao who carried out an exploration of that area under the direction of Dr. Sankalia. Sri N. J. Shende surveys the nature and position of Br̥haspati in Vedic and Epic literature. Supplementing Sri Gode's findings on the glass-bangles, Dr. Sankalia writes a note on the antiquity of these bangles which according to him are only about 600 years old and spread more probably under Muslim influence. Sri V. T. Gune's critical analysis of about 155 Modi Mahazars is again a minor thesis extending to 140 pages. Nominal compounds in Pāli which have not received their due attention are studied by Sri G. V. Davane on the basis of the text of the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta. Of the thousands of small units or settlements within a given District area, Sri Y. S. Mehendale examines, as a sample, the place-names ending in *wadi* in the Ratnagiri District alone. Mrs. Karve has little support in her attempt to read into the incident of Sitā's abandonment the belief that twin children and adultery went together.

V. R.

PRINCIPAL KARMARKAR COMMEMORATION VOLUME. Sri S. V. Dandekar, Principal, S. P. College, Poona 2. Rs. 12.

After a brilliant record at College, Sri R. D. Karmarkar dedicated his life to higher education in Poona by joining the New Poona College scheme, later the Sri Parasurambhau College, of which he retired as Principal. During a very active life, he not only edited a number of Sanskrit classics, but took part in such diverse activities as the University Training Corps where he rose to the position of Lt.-Col. and commandant of the Officers' Training Corps. The present volume was presented to him by pupils, friends and admirers on his retirement from the S. P. College in 1948 and contains valuable research papers from various scholars. Besides a portrait of the professor and a foreword by Mm. P. V. Kane, the volume carries two Marathi accounts of the Professor and his life and activities. The Volume includes also three articles in Marathi and two in Sanskrit.

In the leading English article, Dr. S. K. Belvalkar rightly emphasises that the Karma, Bhakti, and Jñāna of the Gītā do not form a trichotomy, but a triune-unity. Prof. Gode's

paper to this volume deals with rope-manufacture in India between B. C. 300 and A. D. 1900. The short note of Mr. Goetz draws attention to the minor vestiges ancient Indian painting in the Caitya hall at Bhājā (2nd century B. C.), Kārle (1st century B. C.) and in a Vihāra hall at Kanheri. Sri N. A. Gore describes briefly the Subhāṣita Khaṇḍa of Gaṇeśa Bhaṭṭa, a late anthology available in a manuscript in the Rajapur Sanskrit School. Prof. N. P. Gune's Indo-Aryan and Hittite gives an account of the Hittite language, one of the earliest members of the IE language family, its discovery, the work on it by different pioneers and its leading features. The work of a Jain Hindi poet of the 17th century A. D. is set forth by Kamta Prasad Jain. Dr. B. Kakati tackles the interesting but difficult question of the doctrine of irrefusability of the love-initiative from a woman found in certain places in the Purāṇas and suggests the only possible answer of amalgamation of the practices of some of the non-Āryan tribal groups. Dr. A. P. Karmarkar argues that the first Purāṇa, on the deluge-story, must have been written by Vyāsa soon after the great Bharata war. Prof. D. G. Koparkar considers the circumstances under which word-lists, gaṇas, in the Gaṇapāṭha attached to the Aṣṭādhyāyī went on growing and gives an analysis of one of them, the multi-gendered gaṇa Ardharācādi in the various stages of its amplification. Dr. E. D. Kulkarni, the author of a Bombay University prize-essay on the 'Influence of Sanskrit Literature on Modern Indian Languages', in a brief epitome of his findings, shows the need for the study of Sanskrit by the votaries of all vernacular literatures. It is interesting to learn from Dr. Mahdihassan that the very popular word 'Cutchery' supposed generally to be of Muslim origin, is really from the Chinese Kuan-Chih-Li meaning 'office-residence'. Dr. M. G. Mainkar finds the Rāmānujīya-interpretation of Bhakti-passages in the Gītā more natural than the Śāṅkara-interpretation. Prof. M. R. Majumdar describes an illustrated manuscript of a Gujarati poem on the Kṛṣṇa-exploits. The Peshwa's relations with Jaipur Rulers as shown by the Peshwa Daftar selections engage the attention of Dr. M. M. Patkar. Dr. A. D. Pusalkar reviews ideas on the concept of Race and points it out as the basis of modern wars. Two notes of Dr. Sankalia present with sculptural illustrations the superstition of the holding of the winnowing basket and Śitalādevī and the long

purse, *vāṁśvī*, which is tied round the waist for safety. Examining the 230 cases of the word Brahman in the Atharvaveda, Dr. N. J. Shende arrives at the conclusion that it means the magical act and the mysterious power arising out of this act in the priest and pervades the man and the universe. Dr. Upadhye brings to light the existence of a Prākṛt imitation of the Meghasandesa, the Bhṛṅgasandesa, in a fragmentary manuscript in Trivandrum. Sri M. V. Vaidya of the B. O. R. Institute considers some questions relating to the extent of the Great Epic, with special reference to the significance of the Parva-samgraha figures. Dr. K. N. Watave contends that the Sthāyi-bhāva in the Rasa doctrine is, in terms of modern Hormic psychology, 'Sentiment' and not 'Instinct' as Wadekar had held.

The facile Sanskrit writer, Sri Raghunatha Sastri Patankar of the Rajapur Sanskrit College contributes a Sanskrit essay on Sanskrit grammar, and D. B. Paranjpe, a short Sanskrit article on Goddess Jvālāmukhī and the Jvālāmukhī Hill in the Punjab. The three Marathi articles deal with Gotra (N. G. Chapekar), Advaita as the purport of the Vedānta Sūtras (D. V. Joag), and the linguistic, grammatical and literary flaws in the text of the Gītā (G. K. Modak).

V. R.

THE PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE OF VEDANTA AND RAJAYOGA, by Sabhapathy Swami. Chaitanya Prabhu Mandali, Mahim, Bombay.

Sri T. K. Rajagopala Iyer, Retired Accountant-General, a Life Member of the K. S. R. Institute, is not only a keen student of philosophy, but a practical sādha who has undergone initiation and practice under the guidance of proper gurus. Some years ago, he brought out in Sanskrit and Tamil a book of hymns on Gaṇeśa from the unpublished Mudgala Purāṇa. A forthcoming publication of his is 'Hidden Treasure of Yoga'. The present work is one which he has cherished for long and which he has used in his forthcoming book. The Philosophy and Science of Vedānta and Rājayoga by Sabhapathy Swami was originally published in 1883 by Sri Siris Chandra Vasu, and from a rare old copy with Sri T. K. Rajagopala Iyer, the Chaitanya Prabhu Mandali of Bombay, at the instance of the founder Swami Krishna Chitanya and through the generosity of Sjt. M. K. Desai, has issued this new edition of that work.

Sabhapathy Swami, as the book says, was a native of Madras, who felt the call for higher life, tried Buddhist priests and fakirs and finally had a message to go to Agastyasrama in the southern hills. After some penance and a further revelation at a shrine seven miles south of Madras, he reached Agastyasrama, found his guru there, and spent with him seven years. After becoming a Brahmajñāni thus, Sabhapathy Swami came back to the world to help people to the spiritual path and lectured and wrote in Tamil. He then went to the Himalayas, had the company of Siddhas and the darsan of the Lord on Kailasa; this last vision of his is enshrined in a hymn of his on Siva.

This book gives in brief the teachings of this Swamiji which are based on the Upanishadic Vedānta which believes in the doctrine of the individual spirit becoming one with the Infinite Universal Spirit. It sets forth the method by which communion could be gained, advocates Rajayoga, and discounts Haṭhayoga. Being the writing of one who had been in active Sādhana and had gained realisation, the work is replete with practical data, and is thus not a mere disquisition on philosophy. The Rājayoga chakra in the body according to the founder of this school Agastya is given in a picture. The proceeds from the sale of this book are to be devoted to the furtherance of the mission of the Chaitanya Prabhu Mandali.

V. R.

UTTARAKHANDAYATRA. By Prof. S. P. Bhattacharya, 41/45, Russa Road, Tollygunge, Calcutta, Re. 1-4.

The author, Sri Siva Prasad Bhattacharya, is a Sanskrit Professor of Calcutta, well-known to students of Alaṅkāra Śāstra as the editor of the Alaṅkāra Kaustubha of Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin and other works. A traditional type of scholar, the Professor who is orthodox in his personal life, undertook several pilgrimages along with members of his family, and the present volume presents a collection of the Sanskrit poems which he composed while he was on his religious trek. The poems in this collection refer to the holy spots in the north, particularly the Himalayan shrines along the course of the celestial river Gaṅgā. The verses emanate both from a feeling of devotion and a sense of appreciation of the natural beauty of these sacred spots, and are couched generally in a simple diction. A large variety of metre is employed

successfully, though occasionally an Anuṣṭubh or Upajāti limps from a now common North Indian lapse (p. 19, verse 4, second pāda; p. 26, verse 2, last pāda).

V. R.

MANORAMA. Edited by Ananta Tripathi Sarma, M.A., P.O.L., M.C.A., Siromani Press, Berhampur, Ganjam.

We welcome this new venture in the form a Sanskrit Monthly. The number received by us, which is Vol. I., No. 3, opens with a selection of Subhāṣitas; then the editor continues his history of the art of writing in India; the same author gives also a further instalment of his history of the Alāṅkāra Śāstra; the issue carries a further list Sanskrit synonyms for English terms from the political and administrative spheres; Sri Sarvesvara Sarma writes on Śākaṭāyana; there are a number of minor poems and a portion of a Mahākāvya, Rādhāvilāsa published serially; and a lady Sri Sītā Devī contributes an one act play called Araṇyārodana. While the contents are varied and interesting, this effort at a new Sanskrit journal suffers obviously under the same handicap as others of the kind, of very limited resources; as support increases, the printing and get-up may be expected to improve.

V. R.

OBITUARY

Dr. D. R. BHANDARKAR

The well-known historian and archaeologist, Dr. Devadatta Ramakrishna Bhandarkar passed away at the age of 75 on 30th May, 1950 in Calcutta.

Son of the distinguished R. G. Bhandarkar, D. R. Bhandarkar passed his M. A. in Pali and Paleography. Before this, in 1897, he wrote a brief survey of ancient towns and cities of Māhārāṣṭra in the Pre-Muhammedan period for the Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji Gold Medal and Prize of the Bombay University, and published research papers in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. He was then attached to the Census Officer, Bombay, whom he helped in writing the sections on Religion and Sect and Caste and Tribe in the Census Report. He was also Hony. Asst. Supt. of Ethnography, Bombay, and in 1902, wrote a monograph on the Āhirs. In 1904, he was appointed Asst. Archaeological Surveyor, Bombay Circle, and was responsible for the Lists of Ancient Monuments in Rajputana. His findings at this time regarding the antiquity of the Lakuliśa sect were very well received. His work on the Āhirs, Gurjaras and Guhilots took the shape of the 'Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population' which he delivered as the Bhagavanlal Indraji lectures in 1904 at the Bombay University; this was published in 1911 in the Indian Antiquary of which he became in this year Joint Editor with Sir. R. Temple; the same year saw him taking charge of the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey.

In 1912 he was awarded the Sir James Campbell Gold Medal by the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic society. He did some important excavations at Besnagar (ASI. An. Rep. 1913-14, 1914-15). In 1917, Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee took him to the Calcutta University as the Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture, along with which chair, he was holding also charge of the Archaeological section of the Indian Museum, Calcutta. In 1921, he received the honorary degree of Ph. D. from the Calcutta University. He was on the Board of Trustees of the Indian Museum and was connected also with the Govt. Historical Records Commission. In 1936, he retired from University and Government service.

Among the series of Carmichael Lectures he delivered at the Calcutta University are 'Kingship and Democratic Institu

tions of Ancient India', 'Indian Numismatics' (1921), and 'Aśoka' (1923). Under the Manindra Chandra Nandy Foundation at the Benares Hindu University, he delivered in 1925, the lectures on 'Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity'. Under the Sir William Meyer Foundation at the Madras University, he delivered the series of lectures 'Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture' in 1938-39.

His 'List of Inscriptions of Northern India', *Epigraphia Indica*, Appendix to Vols. XIX-XXIII, which was a revised edition of the earlier list published by Keilhorn, took him ten years. Till his death he was working on the revised edition Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions.

He was connected with and honoured by many research societies and conferences.

V. R.

R. A. SASTRI

Sri Anantakrishna Sastri, familiarly known all over India and abroad to manuscript-enthusiasts as R. A. Sastri, passed away on 15th July, 1950 at a ripe old age.

The late Sastri was responsible for manuscript collection work in the Adyar Library, the Oriental Institute, Baroda, the Punjab University Library, Lahore, the Visvabharati, Santiniketan, and lastly, the University Mss. Library, Trivandrum. Small collections of Mss. had been made by him for several other institutions also, including the Madras University. Sanskrit Mss. were his passion till the end of his life, and it is this that led him to move actively, behind the screens, authorities at different University centres and bodies for the starting of work on a New Catalogus Catalogorum of Sanskrit Mss.

As a scholar, he had edited a number of works, the *Lalitā-sahasranāman* with Bhāskara-rāya's Commentary, the *Kavīन्द्रācārya* List, the *Agniveśya gr̥hya*, the *Pāśupata Sūtras* etc.

A man of amazing energy, he had not only toured the country up and down every year, but had gone abroad on a tour to see the North Pole (described by him as the *Mahāmeruyātrā*) and the midnight Sun. A worshipper of Śakti, he claimed many disciples among highly placed persons, foreigners and such distinguished personalities as the late Maharajah Sayaji Rao of Baroda.

V. R.

Dr. E. S. KRISHNASWAMI IYER

We are very sorry to record the passing away at Bangalore on June 7th '50 of Dr. E. S. Krishnaswami Iyer who was a Life Member of the Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute.

Note 2.—*Parivurru-meliyinum* means, according to *Iḷampūraṇar*, “when the friend is on the point of yielding out of compassion” and according to *Naccinārkkiniyar*, “when he becomes emaciated”. The former meaning suits better with what follows.

How many are the ways in which the lover’s friend intercedes?

101. பாங்கர் நிமித்தம் பன்னிரண் டென்ப.

Pāṅkar nimittam paṇṇiraṇ ṭ-enṇa.

There are twelve occasions in which the lover’s friend intercedes.

Note 1.—*Pāṅkar-nimittam* may be taken as *anmoli-t-tokai* meaning “the union of the lover and the lady-love through the lover’s friend”. But in the *Iḷampūraṇam* it is taken to be a *vērrumai-t-tokai* and *nimittam* is an *ākupeyar* meaning *nimittam āka-k kūṭum kūṭam*.

What are they?

102. முன்னைய மூன்றுக் கைக்கிலைக் குறிப்பே.

Munṇaiya mūṇṇuṅ kaikkilai-k kuṛippē.

The occasions during the last three (among the eight kinds of marriages) come under *kai-k-kilai*.

103. பின்னர் நான்கும் பெருத்திணை பெறுமே.

Pinnar nāṅkum perun-tiṇai perum-ē.

The occasions during the first four (among them) fall under *peruntinaṇai*.

104. முதலொடு புணர்ந்த யாழோர் மேன்
தவலருஞ் சிறப்பி னைந்திலம் பெறுமே.

Mutaloṭu puṇarnta yāḷōr mēna

Taval-aruṇ cirappi n-ai n-nilam perum-ē.

The occasions during *kaḷavu* which is the type of *gāndharva* which is said to be of the best type arise in the five regions of spotless importance.

Note 1.—*Pāṅkar-nimittam* should be taken in these three *sūtras* from the *sūtra* 101.

Note 2.—It seems to me that the above three *sūtras* may be taken to be one *sūtra* explaining the twelve occasions where in the lover’s friend intercedes. They are those that happen during the last three of *eṭṭumanṇal* noted in the first *sūtra* of

this chapter, *Āsura*, *Rāksasa* and *Pāisāca*, which belong to *kaikkilai* type, and those in the first four *Brāhma*, *Prājāpatya*, *Dāiva* and *Ārṣa* which belong to *peruntiṇai* type and those in *kaḷavu* which is of five kinds according to the five regions. But *Iḷampūraṇar* takes them as three *sūtras* and *Naccinārkkiniyar* as two.

Note 3.—*Ai-n-nilam* according to *Iḷampūraṇar*, refers to *kaḷavu*, *uṭan-pōkkū*, *irkilatti*, *kāma-k-kilatti* and *kātar-parattai* and according to *Naccinārkkiniyar*, *mullai*, *kuriñci*, *pālai*, *marutam*, and *neytal*. In *Iḷampūraṇam* there is the refutation of what is stated in *Naccinārkkiniyam*. If the *Iḷampūraṇam* text is correct, *Naccinārkkiniyar* should have taken the view of the predecessors. *Naccinārkkiniyar*'s view seems to be correct.

105. இருவகைக் குறிபிழைப் பாகிய விடத்தும்
காண வகையிற் பொழுதுநனி யிகப்பினும்
தானகம் புகாஅன் பெயர்த் தின்மையின்
காட்சி யாசையிற் களம்புக்குக் கலக்கி
வேட்கையின் மயங்கிக் கையறு பொழுதினும்
புகாஅக் காலப் புக்கெதிர்ப் பட்டுழிப்
புகாஅ விருந்தின் பகுதிக் கண்ணும்
வேளா ணெதிரும் விருப்பின்¹ கண்ணும்
²தாளா ணெதிரும் பிரிவி னானும்
நாணுகெஞ் சூலைப் விடுத்தற் கண்ணும்
வரைதல் வேண்டித் தோழி செப்பிய
புரைநீர் கிளவி புல்லிய வெதிரும்
வரைவுடம் படுத்தலு மாங்கதன் புறத்தும்
புரைபட வந்த மறுத்தலொடு தொகைஇக்
கிழவோன்³ மேன வென்மனார் புலவர்.

Iru-vakai-k kuri-pilai-p p-ākiya v-iṭattum
Kāṇā vakaiyir polutu-naṇi y-ikappiṇum
Tāṇ-akam pukāṇ peyarta l-inmaiṇi
Kāṭci y-ācaiṇi-kaḷam-pukku-k kalaṅki
Vēṭkaiṇi mayāṅki-k kai-y-arū polutiṇum
Pukāa-k kālai-p pukk-etir-p paṭṭuli-p
Pakāa viruntin pakuti-k kaṇṇum
Vēlā ṇ-etirum viruppiṇ kaṇṇum
Tālā ṇ-etirum pirivi nāṇum

1. விருப்பின் (இளம்.); விருந்தின் (நச்.)
2. தாளான் (இளம்.); வாளான் (நச்.)
3. கிழவோன் (இளம்.); கிழவோள் (நச்.)

Nāṇu-neñ c-alaippa viṭuttar kaṇṇum
Varaital vēṇṭi-t tōḷi ceppiya
Purai-tīn kiḷavi pulliya vetirum
Varai-v-utām paṭutal-u m-āṇkatan purattum
Purai-paṭa vanta maruttaloṭu tokaii-k
Kiḷavōṇ mēṇa v-enmaṇār pulavar.

Learned men say that the following are the occasions when the lover speaks: When he fails to meet the be loved at the assigned place both day and night, when he feels the time heavy in her absence, when he stands helpless befooled by his disappointment on going to the assigned place eager of seeing her and not prepared to return home without going there, when he is treated as a guest when he is met though in an inopportune moment, when the lady expects presents from him, when he perseveres to meet her during separation, when he leaves her on seeing her worried through her modesty, when he is addressed by the lady's friend with surest words to prepare for the marriage, when he agrees to propose for the marriage and when his proposal for the marriage is not agreed to.

Not 1.—This *sūtra* deals, according to Iḷampūraṇar, with the sayings of the *lover* and according to Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, with the sayings of the *lady-love*. Both have given illustrations from literature in support of their views.

106. காமத் திணையிற் கண்ணின் ம வஞ்சும்
 காணு மடனும் பெண்மைய வாகலின்
 குறிப்பினு மிடத்தினு மவ்வது வேட்கை
 செறிப்பட வாரா வவன்வயி னான.¹
Kāma-t tiṇaiyir kaṇṇinru varūum
Nāṇu matan-um peṇmaiya v-ākalin
Kuṛippinu m-iṭattinu m-allatu vēṭkai
Nerippaṭa vārā v-aval-vayi n-āṇ-a.

Since shyness and credulity are in the nature of women, the amorous desire in women under *kaḷavu* is not clearly expressed, but is to be understood from suggestion and position.

Note 1.—The meaning given above belongs to Iḷampūra-
 ṇar. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar splits the *sūtra* into three sentences.

1. Cf. *Drṣṭvāitān bhāvasaṃyuktān ākārān inḡitāni ca*

Kanyāyāḥ samprayōgārtham tāṃstān yōgān vicintayēt (*Kāma-sūtra* 3, 3, 43.

The meaning, according to him, is this:—Since the shyness and credulity of women make their appearance in their youth, they are suggested from their eyes in *kaḷavu*; amorous desire is seen in its nature during the conjugal union of lovers and they are not visible on other occasions.

107. காமஞ் சொல்லா காட்ட மின்மையின்
ஏமுற விரண்டு முன்மென் மொழிப.
Kāmañ collā nāṭṭa m-inmaiyin
Ēm-ura v-vaṇṭu m-uḷa-v-eṇa molipa.

Since eyes do not but suggest her amorous desire, both of them, they say, do exist to delight (the lover).

Note 1.—Since conjugal union never happens without exchange of words, both of them—shyness and credulity—appear with change of form.

Note 2.—*Nāṭṭam* means according to *Ilampūraṇar*, eyes and according to *Naccinārkkiniyar*, happening. *Ēm* means, according to the former *delight* and according to the latter *confusion*.

108. சொல்லெதிர் மொழித வருமைத் தாகவின்
அல்ல கூற்றுமொழி யவன்வயி னுன்.
Col-l-etir molita l-arumai-t t-ākalin
Alla kūrru-moli y-aval-vayi n-āṇ-a.

Since it is rare that lady-love expresses her amorous desire, we see only her apparent refusal.

Note 1.—The above is the meaning given by *Ilampūraṇar* *Naccinārkkiniyar's* meaning is this:—Since it is not rare for the lady-love to express her amorous desire to her friend without feeling shy and credulous, we find such sayings of the lady-love addressed to her friend.

Note 2.—The meanings given by *Naccinārkkiniyar* for the *sūtras* 106 to 108 are far-fetched. The prose-order taken by him is laboured.

109. மறைத்தவற் காண்ட மற்காட் டுறுதல்¹
நிறைத்த காதலின் சொல்லெதிர் மழுங்கல்
வழிபாடு மறுத்தன் மறுத்தெதிர் கோடல்
பழிகீர் முறவல் சிறிதே தோற்றல்
கைப்பட்டுக் கலங்கினும் காணுமிக வரினும்

1. Cf. *Sammukham na viṣṣate...rucyam ātmanō aṅgam apadēśēna prakāśayati* (*Kāmasūtra*, 3, 3, 25-6).

இட்டுப்பிரி விரங்கினு மருமைசெய் தயர்ப்பினும்
வந்தவழி பெள்ளினும் விட்டுயர்த் தழுங்கினும்
நொந்துதெளி கொழிப்பினு மச்ச ரீமனும்
பிரிந்தவழிக் கலங்கினும் பெற்றவழி மலியினும்
வருத்தொழிற் கருமை வாயில் கூறினும்
கூறிய வாயில் கொள்ளாக் காலைபும்
மனைப்பட்டிக் கலங்கிச் சிதைந்தவழித் தோழிக்கு
நினைத்தல் சான்ற வருமறை புயிர்த்தலும்
உயிராக் காலத் துயிர்த்தலு முயிரசெவ
வேற்றவரைவு வரினது மாற்றுதற் கண்ணும்

கெறிப்படு காட்டத்து நிகழ்த்தவை மறைப்பினும்
பொறியின் யாத்த புணர்ச்சி நோக்கி
ஒருமைக் கேண்மையி னுறுகுறை தெளிந்தோள்
அருமை சான்ற காலிரண்டு வகையின்
பெருமை சான்ற வியல்பின் கண்ணும்
பொய்தலை யடுத்த மடலின் கண்ணும்
கையறு தோழி கண்ணீர் தடைப்பினும்
வெறியாட் டிடத்து வெருவின் கண்ணும்
குறியி னெப்புமை மருடற் கண்ணும்
வரைவுதலை வரினும் களவறி வறினும்
தமர்தற் காத்த காரண மருங்கினும்
தன்ருறி தள்ளிய தெருளாக் காலை
வந்தவன்¹ பெயர்ந்த வறங்கள நோக்கித்
தன்பிழைப் பாகத் தழீஇத் தேறலும்
வழுவின்று நிலைஇய வியற்படு பொருளினும்
பொழுது மாறும் புரைவ தன்மையின்
அழிவுதலை வந்த சிந்தைக் கண்ணும்
காமஞ் சிறப்பினு மவனளி சிறப்பினும்
எமஞ் சான்ற வுவகைக் கண்ணும்
தன்வயி னுரிமைபு மனெவயிற் பரத்தையும்
அன்னவு முளவே யோரிடத் தான.

Maraintavar kāṇṭa rarkāṭ t-urutaḷ
Nirainta kātāl r col l-etir malunṅkal
Valipātu maruttan marutt-etir kōṭal
Paḷi-tir muruval ciritē tōrrol
Kai-p-paṭṭu-k kalaṅkinum nānu-mika varinum
Itṭu r-piri v-iraṅkinu m-arumai-cey t-ayarppinum
Vantavali y-ellinum viṭṭuyirt t-aḷunṅkinum
Nontu-teli v-olippinu m-acca-niṭinum
Pirintavali-k kalaṅkinum peravali maliyinum

Varun-toliṛ k-arumai vāyil kūṛiṇum
Kūṛiya vāyil kollā-k kālai-y-um
Maṇappaṭṭu k kalāṅki-t citaintavali-t tōḷikkū
Niṇaittal cāṇṛa v-arū-marai y-uyirital-um
Uyirā-k kālat t-uyirital-u m-uyir-cela
Vēṛru-varaivu varin-atu māṛṛutar kaṇ-ṇ-um
Nerippaṭu nāṭṭattu nikaḷntavai maraiṇṇum
Poriyṇ yātta puṇarcci nōkki
Orumai-k kēṇmaiṇi n-urū-kurāi telintōḷ
Arumai cāṇṛa nāl-ironṭu vakaiyṇ
Perumai cāṇṛa v iyalṇiṇ kaṇṇum
Poy-talai y-aṭutta maṭaliṇ kaṇṇum
Kai-y-arū tōḷi kaṇṇir tuṭaiṇṇum
Veri-yāṭ ṭ iḷattu veruvṇiṇ kaṇṇum
Kuriyi-n-opṭumai maruṭar kaṇṇum
Varaivu-talai varinunṇ kalavari v-urṇum
Tamar-tar kātta kārāṇa marunṇinṇum
Taṇ-kurī taḷḷiya teruḷā-k kālai
Vantavaṇ peyarnta v-arūn-kalā nōkki-t
Tan-ṇiḷai-p p-āka-t taḷi-t tēṛal-um
Valu-v-inṇu nilaiya v-iyar-ṇaṭu poruḷiṇ-um
Polutu māṛum puraiṇa t-aṇmaiṇiṇ
Alivu-talai vanta cintai-k kaṇṇum
Kāmaṇ cirappiṇu m-avaṇ-aḷi cirappiṇ-um
Ēmaṇ cāṇṛa v uvakai-k kaṇṇum
Taṇvayi n-urimai-y-u m-avaṇ vayir parattai-y-um
Anna-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-ōr-iṭat t-āṇ-a.

The lady-love has her sayings on the following occasions totally or partially. When she sees him without his seeing her,¹ when she stands in such a position as to be seen by him, when she stands still before the lover through excessive love without telling him anything,² when she (apparently) refuses to yield to him, when she yields to him after refusal, when she lightly exhibits harmless smile,³ when she is in bewilderment though

1. *Naccinārkkiniyar*'s meaning is this:—When she sees him on his departure from her so long as he is within the range of her view.

2. *Naccinārkkiniyar* adds though she wants to accuse him of his attachment to harlot.

3. *Naccinārkkiniyar*'s meaning is this:—When she lightly exhibits her joy to her friend on her being free from accusation.

in the company of her lover, when she is unnerved through extreme shyness, when she fears separation though at a short distance, when she feels sorry on being prevented from going out or on his failing to meet her on account of strict watch, when she derides him on his standing before her, when she explicitly tells him her sufferings bemoaning, when she does not listen to his promise on account of her suffering, when the obstacles bringing her fear prolong,¹ when she is in bewilderment on his separation from her, when she is in ecstasy on meeting him, when her friend tells her of the improbability of his coming on account of obstacles, when she does not take it into her head, when she reveals her situation to her friend on being chained to her house and consequently being put to much worry, when she says that she will die if he does not come to her rescue: when she consoles herself that she was responsible for his non-coming on her non-trying to make her parents change their minds if they arranged for the marriage with another, on her concealing her mind from others, on her being in eight amorous states with magnanimity consoling herself about the separation from her lover through her love for him for which fate is responsible, on hearing the rumour of his mounting himself on palmyra stalks, on her friend removing her tears, on the priest expressing his views of her being possessed of Skanda, on her bewilderment about her mistaking the assigned place, on approach of the lover's request for marriage on *kaḷavu* being on the point of becoming public property, on her relatives keeping her under check, on his going back with disappointment without knowing that she is under check and consequently is unable to meet him at the assigned place; and when she tries to misinterpret his true words, the inconvenient time and place of his arrival, his extreme attachment towards her, his attempt to please her and his exhibiting his extreme delight due to his attachment towards her, by referring to her unsullied state towards him and to his connection with a harlot (which is imaginary).

Note 1.—This *sūtra* may be sub-divided into three parts:—the first part consisting of lines 1-14, the second part of lines 15-29 and the third part of lines 30-36.

Besides,

2. *Naccinārkkiniyar's* meaning is, when she prolongs her fear to reveal the fact even to her friend.

110. வரைவிடை வைத்த காலத்து வருந்தினும்
வரையா நாளிடை வந்தோன் முட்டினும்
உமையெனத் தோழிக் குரைத்தற் கண்ணும்
தானே கூறங் காலமு முளவே.

Varai-v-iṭai vaitta kālattu varunt inum
Varaiyā nāl-iṭai vantōṇ muṭṭinum
Urai-y-eṇa t tōlik k-uraittar kaṇṇum
Tāṇ-ē kūruṇ kālam-u m-uḷa-v-ē.

There may be opportunities for the lady-love to volunteer her saying when she suffers before the lover goes to her to marry, when he meets (her friend etc.,) before her marriage and when she requests her friend to relate the real situation (to her parents, lover etc.).

Note 1.—*Um* in *kālam-um* suggests that such occasions are rare.

Besides,

111. உயிரினுஞ் சிறத்தன்று காணே காணினும்
செயிர்தீர் காட்சிக் கற்புச்சிறந் தன்றெனத்
தொல்லோர் கிளவி புல்லிய கெஞ்சமொடு
காமக் கிழவ னுள்வழிப் படினும்
தாவி னன்மொழி கிழவி கிளப்பினும்
ஆவகை பிறவுக் தோன்றமன் பொருளே.
Uyirinuṇ cīrantanru nāṇ-ē nāṇinum
Ceyir-tīr kāṭci-k karpu-c-ciran tanr-eṇa-t
Toḷōr kiḷavi pulliya neṇcamoṭi
Kāma-k kiḷava n-uḷavali-p-paṭinum
Tāvi naṇ-moli kiḷavi kiḷappinum
Ā-vakai pira-v-un-tonrruman pōruḷ-ē.

Even if the lady-love goes (of her own accord) to the residence of her lover or says such words free from guilt on the strength of the saying of the ancients that shyness is superior even to life and chastity is superior even to shyness, such things come under *aka-p-pōruḷ*.

What are the occasions when the lady love's friend has her say?

112. காற்றமுக் தோற்றமு மொழுக்கமு முண்டியும்
செய்வனை மறப்பினுஞ் செலவினும் பயிவ்வினும்
புணர்ச்சி யெதிர்ப்பா டுன்றறுத்து வருஉம்
உணர்ச்சி யெழினு முணர்ந்த பின்றை
மெய்வினும் பொய்வினும் வழிநிலை பிழையாது

वत्से ! मा भूद् विषादस्ते सम्पन्नस्ते मनोरथः ।

दिव्यरूपं पुरेव त्वं भर्तारमनुवर्तसे ॥ १५१ ॥

साम्बो मम सुतः क्रीडन् जरितारिमृषिं पुरा ।

हंसाकृत्या सरस्तोये क्रीडन्तं बिसतन्तुना ॥ १५२ ॥

शशो निगलयित्वासौ मुनिना जननान्तरे ।

निगलस्पर्शि मद्भक्ते चरणद्वन्द्वमस्त्विति ॥ १५३ ॥

स राजवाहनो नाम भूत्वा दैत्यविपत्तये ।

भर्तारं तव दुःखार्तं मर्त्यत्वान्मोचयिष्यति ॥ १५४ ॥

बहूनां जन्मनामन्ते तत्सहायः स ते पतिः ।

अग्निवर्णरथप्राप्त्या भवेदग्निरथाह्वयः ॥ १५५ ॥

अवन्तिसुन्दरीत्यास्ते यज्ञवत्यपि तत्प्रिया ।

ललामश्रीरिव स्त्रीणामवन्तिनृपतेः सुता ॥ १५६ ॥

अयं चूडामणिस्तस्मै कुमाराय प्रदीयताम् ।

नैव स्युर्मानुषा दोषा यस्मिन् मौलिगते नृणाम् ॥ १५७ ॥

इत्युक्ता हरिणा साहं प्रत्यागत्य पुरीमिमाम् ।

उत्तारिता वसन्तीह त्वयैवमनुगृह्णता ॥ १५८ ॥

इत्युक्त्वा तं मणिशफरुकाद् रत्नमुदघृत्य धाम्ना

न्यक्कुर्वाणं धुमणिमकरोन्मण्डनं तच्छिखण्डे ।

यत्रामुक्ते नरकभिदुरः कौस्तुभस्येव भासा

दीप्येवेन्दोः शिर इव हरस्याङ्गमस्याबभासे ॥ १५९ ॥

हृदयमेत्य सविभ्र^१महाविलं-

^२भितसखिस्मरणाख्यमहाविलम् ।

^३गतमियेष रिपूतमहाविल-

म्बितमयं च विहाय महाविलम् (?) ॥ १६० ॥

अथापृच्छय प्रीत्या परवति गते तत्र मिथुने
 पृथग्भूय प्रायादुदधिसदृशो दैत्यविवरात् ।
 कुमारः प्रीतात्मा जगति जनितानन्दमुदर्यी
 चरन् मित्रान्वेषी दिशमिव शशी मालवपुरीम् ॥ १६१ ॥
 ॥ इत्यवन्तिसुन्दरीकथासारे पञ्चमः परिच्छेदः ॥

॥ अथ षष्ठः परिच्छेदः ॥

अथासौ पथि गच्छन्तं पुरुषं नगराद् बहिः ।
 अद्राक्षीत् संनिकृष्यासौ मित्रं पुष्पोद्भवोऽभवत् ॥ १ ॥
 न जहर्ष तथोदन्वानिन्दौ तद्दर्शने यथा ।
 कुमारः परिरभ्यैनं पप्रच्छ सुहृदां गतिम् ॥ २ ॥
 ततो बद्धाञ्जलिः सर्वानुक्त्वा कुशलिनः सखीन् ।
 स कथामित्थमारेभे विविक्ते वक्तुमात्मनः ॥ ३ ॥
 देव ! त्वय्यनिमित्तेन प्रलीने दीनमानसाः ।
 मत्वा बिलगतं कृत्वा तद्द्वारे देवरक्षितम् ॥ ४ ॥
 यथाप्रवेशं निर्याणं नैव स्याद् बिलवासिनाम् ।
 इत्यालोच्य वयं सर्वे प्राद्रवाम दिशो दश ॥ ५ ॥
 संवत्सरान्ते चम्पायां सङ्गमः समयश्च नः ।
 सोऽप्यहं विन्ध्यशैलस्य पश्चिमं भागमभ्यगाम् ॥ ६ ॥
 तत्रैकं पुरुषं वप्रात् पतन्तं पश्यतो मम ।
 आसीन्मनसि निर्वेदाद् भाव्यं प्राणमुचामुना ॥ ७ ॥
 शक्यं गगन एवैनं गृहीत्वा परिरक्षितुम् ।
 शोकहेतुं ततो हर्तुं यावत्सामर्थ्यमुत्सहे ॥ ८ ॥
 इत्याकलय्य सद्यस्तं दोभ्यामालिङ्ग्य धारयन् ।
 तालवृन्तानिलाम्भोभिर्जातप्राणमभाणिषम् ॥ ९ ॥

भद्र ! कस्तव निर्वेदो यः प्राणव्ययकारणम् ।
इत्युक्तः स तु सखेहं मामालोक्येदमभ्यधात् ॥ १० ॥

कृतं तात ! न साध्वेतद् दग्धदेहस्य रक्षणम् ।
मयापि श्रुतिशास्त्रादौ^१ कियानपि कृतः श्रमः ॥ ११ ॥

किं तेनायजहरैकं दयिताविरहज्वरः ।
तदहो ! बलवानेष स्नेहः किं न करोत्यसौ ॥ १२ ॥

तथा हीन्दुमतीहेतोरजं प्राणैर्व्ययूयुजत् ।
प्रमदरायै रुरुणाप्यायुषोऽर्धमदापयत् ॥ १३ ॥

इत्थं सर्वाभिभाविन्या स्नेहशृङ्खलानया ।
कृशीकृताः कियन्तो वै महान्तो मयि का कथा ॥ १४ ॥

कोऽस्य दुश्चरितं वक्तुं शक्तः कल्पशतैरपि ।
हस्तप्राह्वाण्यसत्यस्मिन् प्रायो मुक्तिफलान्यपि ॥ १५ ॥

इत्युद्वेगवचः श्रुत्वा महतीयमहो ! व्यथा ।
कस्य हेतोरपि त्वस्मिन् प्रतीतिः पितरीव मे ॥ १६ ॥

मम्येवं चिन्तयत्येका जरती पुर एव नौ ।
क्रोशन्ती चरणाभ्याशं गत्वा सत्त्वरमब्रवीत् ॥ १७ ॥

परित्रायध्वमत्रैषा तरुणी बहुविह्वला ।
सुखोचिता चितारूढेत्याकर्ण्याभ्यपताव ताम् ॥ १८ ॥

तथावस्थां चितारूढादाहृत्य शिशिरे क्वचित् ।
चिरं निरूप्य सैवेयं सुव्रतेत्यब्रवीत् स ताम् ॥ १९ ॥

अथोत्तस्थौ तयोस्तस्मिन्नतर्क्यस्तदवस्थयोः ।
विरहानलमुद्वेलः प्रसह्य प्रीतिसागरः ॥ २० ॥

स संभ्रमान्ते सन्तापे शान्ते मामित्यभाषत ।
भद्र ! भद्रः प्रयासस्ते फलितः श्रूयतां कथा ॥ २१ ॥

१पद्मोद्भवस्य नामाहं पुत्रो भूत्वा वणिक्पतेः ।
 समुद्रयायी नष्टायां नावि द्वीपान्तरं गतः ॥ २२ ॥
 तत्रैनामुपलभ्यान्यजन्मनि प्रिययामु^२या ।
 रममाणश्चिरायास्या वसामि स्म पितुर्गृहे ॥ २३ ॥
 श्रुत्वा पुष्पपुरीवार्तां तत्रागन्तोः कुतश्चन ।
 उदारं नावमारुह्य प्रायां बन्धुदिदक्षया ॥ २४ ॥
 घोरमारुतभग्नायां मग्नायां नावि नाविकैः ।
 दुर्दिनाभ्रितदिग्भागेर्म(गे म?)ग्रं मग्नोऽस्मि चार्णवे ॥ २५ ॥
 अनया च सहापन्नसत्त्वया मातरं त्विमाम् ।
 तं पोतलवमालम्ब्य प्लवमानामलक्षयम् ॥ २६ ॥
 अमूभ्यां लहरीवेगाद् दूरीभूतान्तरेऽचिरात् ।
 आलिलम्बिषमाणे मथ्यतीतं दृष्टिगोचरम् ॥ २७ ॥
 कं न निःस्नेहयत्याशा यतोऽहं तदवस्थया ।
 वियुक्तोऽप्यनया देहं नाजहां जीवनाशया ॥ २८ ॥
 मया तु प्लवमानेन मत्स्यपृष्ठाधिरोहिणा ।
 दैवाद् द्वीपान्तरं गत्वा तस्मिन्नेकाकिनोषितम्^३ ॥ २९ ॥
 अनीये नाविकेन स्वं पोतमारोप्य केनचित् ।
 बालिद्वीपं ततः सर्वामुर्वीमन्विष्टवानिमाम् ॥ ३० ॥
 शरदः षोडशान्विष्य ग्रामं ग्रामं वनं वनम् ।
 पुरं पुरं च नैराश्याद् भृगौ देहमपातयम् ॥ ३१ ॥
 राक्षितोऽस्मि त्वया सेयं दृष्ट्वा गर्भस्य का कथा ।
 इत्याकुलोऽहमित्युक्ते जगाद् जरती च सा ॥ ३२ ॥
 वत्स! मददुहितेयं त्वद्विरहेण जहात्यसून् ।
 कथमप्यर्णवोत्तीर्णा प्रासूत तनयं वने ॥ ३३ ॥

¹वन्यसत्वमिया बालमालम्ब्याग्निं विचिन्वती ।
महिषाभिहता मोहं गताहं बोधिता चिरात् ॥ ३४ ॥

दृष्ट्वा द्विजवरं कञ्चिन्न बालं व्याकुलीकृता ।
आनीये तेन यत्रासावास प्रसवविह्वला ॥ ३५ ॥

दुःखार्ता तदवस्थां मामालोक्य व्यथिता भृशम् ।
अदृष्ट्वा च सुतं मत्तः प्राङ्मर्तुमियमुद्यता ॥ ३६ ॥

संस्तभ्यैनां मुनिर्वाग्भिः कल्यां कृत्वौषधैश्च माम् ।
स जगाम चिरं स्थित्वा विद्यार्थी रुचितां दिशम् ॥ ३७ ॥

मुनेरनुव्याहरणात् पुरावां हंसरूपयोः ।
विरहः षोडशाब्दानां विगमे च समागमः ॥ ३८ ॥

चक्रवर्तिसखः सूनुर्भावीति ²त्वदुदीरितम् ।
स्मारयन्त्या मया चैषा शरदः षोडशात्ययात् ॥ ३९ ॥

साद्य त्वद्दर्शनालाभान्निराशा विवशा वने ।
चितारूढा वराकीति ब्रुवत्येव रुरोद सा ॥ ४० ॥

अथाकथयमित्थं वां पुत्रवार्ता निशम्यताम् ।
स तस्मिन् महिषं हत्वा कुमारः करिणा हृतः ॥ ४१ ॥

सिंहभीत्या द्विपोत्क्षिप्तः कपिनोत्पीड्य पातितः ।
येन व्यवहरत्येषा ³जनस्तत्पुष्पभाजने ॥ ४२ ॥

स तं गृहीत्वा जीवन्तं निस्संज्ञेयमिति क्षणात् ।
अदृष्ट्वा जननीं निन्ये वामदेवाश्रमं मुनिः ॥ ४३ ॥

वसुमत्या सहामात्यैर्वसतः पितुराश्रमे ।
सकाशं राजहंसस्याप्यनायि स ततोऽमुना ॥ ४४ ॥

वर्धितस्तत्र भूभर्त्रा सुमत्यादिसुतैः सह ।
दिग्जयायाद्य गच्छन्तं राजवाहनमन्वयाम् ॥ ४५ ॥

तस्मिन् बिलगते देवे तमन्विष्य भ्रमन् वने ।
पित्रोर्वा पादयोर्वर्ते पुत्रः पुष्पोद्भवोऽप्यसौ ॥ ४६ ॥

इत्युदीर्य ततः पित्रोर्मज्जनं हर्षाश्रुनिर्झरे ।
तदानन्दमयं ताभ्यां सहानैषं दिनं वने ॥ ४७ ॥

अर्थसाध्यां तयोर्वृत्तिं मत्वार्योपायचिन्तया ।
श्रीमण्डलमथालिख्य हुत्वार्मिं विजने वने ॥ ४८ ॥

प्रारोहप्रतिमाप्राणिक्षितिगन्धशिलादिभिः ।
आशङ्कितनिधौ देशे विविधैर्निधिलक्षणैः ॥ ४९ ॥

साधनैर्वर्तिकाभिश्च प्रत्यूहशमनैर्जपैः ।
यथाविध्यहमारभ्य प्रकृष्टं वसु दृष्टवान् ॥ ५० ॥

तावदस्युहते सार्थे साहाय्यं कुर्वतो मम ।
सार्थवाहेन तत्रासीत् सख्यं सवयसा सह ॥ ५१ ॥

भग्रे दस्युगणे ^१भस्त्रास्वारोप्य प्रचुरं धनम् ।
सार्थेन सह संप्राप्ता विशालां नगरीं वयम् ॥ ५२ ॥

सार्थवाहगृहं प्राप्तेष्वस्मासु सुहृदः पिता ।
प्रागेव श्रुतवृत्तान्तः पुत्रवन्मामपूजयत् ॥ ५३ ॥

अस्मात्पितृप्रणामाय स्वसुतां बालचन्द्रिकाम् ।
आजुहाव ततः कृत्स्नं ज्योत्स्नामयभूद् गृहम् ॥ ५४ ॥

लावण्याम्बुमयी गात्रे काळकूटमयी दृशोः ।
लीलामयी पदन्यासे सा कन्या समदृश्यत ॥ ५५ ॥

तत्रस्थानां च सोत्प्राशं निपेतुर्बहुशो दृशः ।
तस्यां मयि च सारूप्यात् कुसुमेषोरिवेषवः ॥ ५६ ॥

तस्यां गतायामेकान्ते सार्थवाहः स मे सखा ।
अवोचन्मां तु विज्ञाय त्वदन्वेषणतत्परम् ॥ ५७ ॥

श्रूयतां गुह्यामुण्डीचण्डीवाग्देवतात्मसु ।
अधीती बञ्जुलाद्येषु शकुनेषु चतुर्ष्वहम् ॥ ५८ ॥

मन्त्रवद्विरूपकान्तैरेभिर्भाव्यार्थशंसिभिः ।
राजवाहनमन्वेष्टुं परीक्ष्य प्रयतावहे ॥ ५९ ॥

इति श्रुत्वा परीक्ष्यैतदुपश्रुत्याद्यनुक्रमात् ।
तदानुगुण्यसन्तुष्टः स्थितोऽहं सुहृदा सह ॥ ६० ॥

स्मरज्वरविनोदाय क्रीडानलिनकं गतः ।
अदूरे गिरमश्रौषं हा! हतास्मत्पितृन्तरम् ॥ ६१ ॥

त्वरितोपसृतः कान्तामद्राक्षं बालचन्द्रिकाम् ।
आक्षिपन् पाशमप्राक्षं किमित्युद्धन्धनोन्मुखीम् ॥ ६२ ॥

प्रत्यभिज्ञाय मां बाला निगृह्याभिदधेऽत्रपा ।
दयित! श्रूयतामस्य व्यवसायस्य कारणम् ॥ ६३ ॥

इहाम्बुविहृतिव्याजान्महासेनसुता हता ।
ततः प्रभृति कन्याभिर्जलक्रीडा न लभ्यते ॥ ६४ ॥

सख्यास्त्ववन्तिसुन्दर्याः क्रीडादर्शनदोहलम् ।
राज्ञे विज्ञापयिष्यन्ती स्वयमेवाहमभ्ययाम् ॥ ६५ ॥

चण्डवर्मानुजेनाहं दृष्ट्वा दारुणवर्मणा ।
तस्याप्रियमिया तस्मै पितृभ्यां चास्मि दित्सिता ॥ ६६ ॥

तदहं मृत्यवे दातुमात्मानमियमारभे ।
इत्थं भूयोऽपि तत् कर्तुं प्रवृत्तामित्यभाणिषम् ॥ ६७ ॥

प्रिये ! मैवं दुरात्मासावुपायेन निहन्यताम् ।
त्वदन्तरङ्गभूता ते ब्रवीतु पितरौ सखी ॥ ६८ ॥

व्यक्तं देवतयाविष्टा कयाचिद् बालचन्द्रिका ।
सा किलातुल्यजातीयं हन्यादस्याः करस्पृशम् ॥ ६९ ॥

इत्यनेनैव मूढात्मा न चेदेष विरंस्यति ।
सैव ब्रवीतु कन्येयं नेया तद्गृहमन्यथा ॥ ७० ॥

तस्मिन् देवतया ध्वस्ते स्वजनो विक्रियेत वा ।
तथेति च ततः पित्रा नीतायां त्वयि तद्गृहम् ॥ ७१ ॥

स्त्रीभूत्वैनं दुरात्मानं हनिष्यामि रहस्यहम् ।
इत्यभ्युपगमयैनां सख्या च समगंस्यहम् ॥ ७२ ॥

सा मयोक्तं तथा चक्रे मदनार्तः स दुर्मतिः ।
अन्ववध्नात् प्रियां पित्रा नीता तद्गृहमेव सा ॥ ७३ ॥

तत्सखी नाम भूत्वाहं नारीनैपथ्यकर्मणा ।
अभ्यन्तरं प्रविश्यैनं मर्माघातैरमारयम् ॥ ७४ ॥

स दैवतहतः पापः कन्यादूषक इत्यलम् ।
ख्याते जगति सौहार्दात् कन्यां मल्लमदात् पिता ॥ ७५ ॥

इत्यानुषङ्गिकं प्राप्य त्वदन्वेषणकारणम् ।
उद्यतस्यास्य लब्धं मे देवदर्शनदौहृदम् ॥ ७६ ॥

इत्थं निशम्य दिष्ट्येमौ दृष्टौ नः पितराविति ।
कुमारे कथयत्येनं परीयुर्गुरवश्च ते ॥ ७७ ॥

यथार्हमभिवन्धाथ श्वशुरौ पितरावपि ।
कुमारः सह तैः प्रीतः स्यन्दनेनाविशत् पुरीम् ॥ ७८ ॥

स तां सतां जन्मभूमिं सम्पदां सम्पदास्पदम् ।
जगामोज्जयिनीमुर्व्यां ललामश्रियमुज्ज्वलाम् ॥ ७९ ॥

तत्रोपरचितं रम्यं रत्नोद्भवगृहं गतः ।
पुरुषान् सुहृदोऽन्वेष्टुं विससर्ज नृपात्मजः ॥ ८० ॥

ततः कदाचिदाचरुयौ बालचन्द्रिकया सह ।
पुष्पोद्भवस्ते दासीयं संदिष्टा राजकन्यया ॥ ८१ ॥

ममास्मिन्ना^१दरारब्धे भाविन्युदकदा^२निके ।
उत्सवे तव सान्निध्यं भर्त्रा सह भवत्विति ॥ ८२ ॥

ఓమ్

Sri D. RAMALINGA REDDY, M.A., EX. M.L.A.—

శ్రీ॥ శే॥ మహామహాపాధ్యాయ కుప్పస్వామి శాస్త్రిగారు—
ఎమ్.ఎ., ఐ.ఇ.యస్.(1880—(1943).

(దుప్యూరిరామలింగా రెడ్డి ఎమ్.ఎ., బి ఎన్.డిన్. పాలిటిక్సు
ఫెల్లో అడ్మినిస్ట్రేషన్, యమ్.యల్.ఎ., అడ్వకేట్).

శ్రీ శేషులగు యన్. కుప్పస్వామి శాస్త్రిలవారు మన భారత
దేశమునకును, సంస్కృతలోకమునకును దిలకమువంటివారు. వీరు
1943 సంవత్సరమునఁ గాలధర్మముదిరి. దీనిచే నీదేశమునకే కాక
సంస్కృతవాఙ్మయమునకును మితిమీరిన నష్టమేర్పడినదనిన నతి
శయోక్తిగా నేరదు. ఇంతియకాక వీరి మరణము వీరితోఁబరిచయముగల
వారికిని, వీరి శిష్య సంతతికిని దీరని దుఃఖముగలిగించినది.

శ్రీ శాస్త్రిలవారి జీవిత చరిత్రమనేక సద్గుణములతో విలసిల్లి
వీరి దీక్షితకు మఱితవన్నె వెట్టినది. నిక్కముగ నవీన కళావిలసిత
మగునీ భరతఖండ మొకపండిత రత్నమును గోల్పోవుటఁగడుం గను
శోచనీయము.

శాస్త్రిగారు ముప్పదియేడు వత్సరములధ్యాపక వృత్తియందే
తమజీవితమును సార్థక్యమొనరించుకొనిరి. వీరి పాండిత్యము నర్వజనాద
రణీయమైగంభీరమై యతి శయించినది.

శాస్త్రిమనభ్యాసమగుచో విషతుల్యమనిపెద్దలసాంప్రదాయము.
అట్టిశాస్త్రి మొకదానినైనను జక్కగ నధ్యయనముఁజేయుటయే మిక్కిలి
గొప్పతనము. అట్లయిననాలుగు శాస్త్రిములలో సర్వంకషమగు
పాండిత్యముగడంచిన వీరి వైదగ్యము మిక్కిలి ప్రశంసనీయము. ఇంతియు
కాక సువర్ణమునకు సౌరభములవడినటుల నీశాస్త్రిపరిచయముతోఁబాలు
సాహిత్యమునయిత మలవడియుండుటమిక్కిలి ముదావహము.

కనుకనే వీరిని కంచికామకోటిపీఠాధిపతులగు శ్రీమచ్ఛంకర
జగద్గురువర్యులు “దర్శనకళానిధి” అను బిరుద మొసంగి గౌరవించిరి.

అలంకార శాస్త్రమందు విశేషించి సిద్ధహస్తలగుట సామాన్యుల కలవికాని “ధ్వన్యాలోకము” మున్నగు గ్రంథములను సులభముగ గ్రహించునట్లొనరించి విద్యార్థిలోకమునకు వీరాదర్శకులైరి. కాశ్మీర దేశమునకుఁజెందిన “ఆనందవర్ధన” “అభినవగుప్త” యను మహాకవులచే విరచింపబడిన ధ్వన్యాలోక లోచనములను గ్రంథములు, దక్షిణదేశ మందలి పండితలోకములో మిక్కిలివాఙ్మయిఁజెంద లేకపోయినవి. ఈ వ్యాప్తిదోషమును బాపఁదలంచిన పీఠంతుకు మున్నెయుండిన కాముడీ వ్యాఖ్యకు “ఉపలోచన” మను వ్యాఖ్యానము స్వయముగ విరచించి లోకమునకెంతయో మహాఽపకార మొనరించిరి.

ఈ కావ్యాత్మను గురించి మొదటినుండియు వివిధ మతములుండి ననుశ్రీ శాస్త్రులవారు వానినన్నిటిని గ్రోడీకరించి సర్వమత సమన్వయ ముగ నుండునటుల—

శ్లో॥ ఔచితీమరుధావంతి
సర్వే ధ్వనిరసోన్నయాః
గుణాలంకృతికీతీనామ్
సయాశ్చన్మజువాఙ్మయాః ॥

అనెడు తమ మతమును ముక్తకంఠమునఁ బ్రకటించి విద్వత్లోక మునకుఁ జిరపరిచితులైరి.

మదరాసు అణ్ణామలై విశ్వవిద్యాలయములందలి ప్రాచ్య బిరుదము (Oriental Titles) లను శీర్షికక్రొడ సంస్కృత ద్రావిడ బాషలకుఁ బ్రత్యేకకౌరవమును గలిగించిరి. వీనికై శిక్షాప్రణాళిక (Syllabus) నేర్పరచి తదనుకూలముగ బాఠ్యగ్రంథములను (Text-Books) నిర్ణయించుటలో సభిక శ్రద్ధ వహించినవారు శ్రీ శాస్త్రుల వారే.

మదరాసు దొరతనము వారి ప్రాచ్యలిఖితగ్రంథాలయము నందుఁ దమ పరిశీలనా నైపుణ్యము చే స్వయం కృషిసల్పి సంస్కృతాంధ్ర ద్రావిడ కణ్ణటక కేరళాద్యముద్రితగ్రంథములకు వివరణపట్టికలను బ్రకటించి విద్యాలోకమునకు మేలొనఁబూర్చిన వారైరి.

లేకున్న నీతాళపత్ర గ్రంథములన్నియుఁ జెదల పాలుఁగావలసినదే కదా !

శాస్త్రులవారు, తమ చిరుత ప్రాయమునందే మైలాపూరు సంస్కృత కళాశాలకు బ్రధానోపాధ్యాయులుగా నియమింపబడి తత్కళాశాలనువృద్ధి కిదెచ్చిరి.

తంజావూరి మండలములోని తిరువాడి యందలి రాజావారి సంస్కృత కళాశాలకును బ్రధానోపాధ్యాయులుగ గొంతకాలమువఱకుండి దానినికూడ మహోన్నతదశకుదెచ్చిరి.

వీరి శాంతభావమత్యద్భుతము. మందబుద్ధులగు శిష్యులు సయితము వివేకసంపన్నులై గురువర్యుల పాండిత్యపటిమను బ్రకటింపజేసిరి. సజ్జనుడగు శిష్యుడు గురువుల ప్రతిష్ఠకు వన్నెదెచ్చునని కాళిదాసె ప్రస్తావ వశమున నిర్వచించెను. గురు శిష్య సంయోగమే ఉపాసనకు ముఖ్యమైనదని ఉపనిషత్తులుద్ఘోషించుచున్నవికదా! ఈ యనుభవమును శ్రీ శాస్త్రులవారియొద్దజేరిన ప్రతి శిష్యునకు ననుభూత విషయమైయున్నది. అట్టివారిలో నేనొకడనైయుండుట నా పూర్వ పుణ్య విశేషమనవలయును.

దొరతనము వారిచే నొసఁగబడిన మహామహోపాధ్యాయ చిరుదము శాస్త్రులవారి నధిగమించి చరితార్థమయ్యెను.

భారత విజ్ఞానాభివృద్ధికి సర్వ ప్రయత్నములుగావించిన శ్రీ మహామహోపాధ్యాయ కుప్పస్వామి శాస్త్రుల వారాధునికులలో నగ్రగణ్యులు.

అందును వీరు సంస్కృత భాషకుఁగావించిన సేవ అపారము.

వీరి పేరు ప్రతిష్ఠలీ ప్రదేశమందేకాక దేశదేశాంతరములవఱకు వ్యాపించినవచుట నిర్వివాదాంశము.

వీరు గావించిన ప్రాప్తశ్చిమ భాషా తత్వశాస్త్ర పరిశోధనా విధానములు (Indo-Germanic Philology) నిదర్శనములు.

సహృదయులు, శ్రీ శాస్త్రుగారికి మనశ్శాంతి గలుగునట్లు దేవుని బ్రార్థించుటతో విరమించక భాషా వాఙ్మయముల సేవ దేశారాధనమునకుపయోగ పడునట్లు నిరంతరము గొనసాగింతురుగాకని మిక్కిలి విశ్వసించుచున్నాడను.

PANDIT SRI H. SESA AYYANGAR,
Rtd. Lecturer in Kannada, Madras University.

ಪಂಡಿತ ಎಚ್. ಶೇಷಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್
(ರಿಟೈರ್ಡ್ ಕನ್ನಡ ಲೆಕ್ಚರರ್, ಓರಿಯೆಂಟಲ್ ರೀಸರ್ಚ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್)
ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ

ಮದ್ರಪುರೀವಿಶ್ವಕಲಾ |
ಭದ್ರಭವನದೊಳಗೆ ದೇವಭಾಷಾಚಾರ್ಯಂ ||
ಭದ್ರಮನಂ ವರಸುಗುಣಸ |
ಮುದ್ರಂ ಯಸ್ ಕುಪ್ಪುಸಾಮಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಯ ಧನ್ಯಂ ||
ಗೀರ್ವಾಣಭಾಷೆಯೊಳ್ ಮೊದ |
ಲುವಿದ ಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯಮಾಂತು ಬಳಿಕಮದೆತ್ತಂ ||
ಪರ್ವಿರ್ಪ ಹೂಣಗಿರೆಯೊಳ |
ಗುರ್ವಂ ಪಡೆದಾಂತನಲ್ತೆ ಪಿರಿದುಂ ಜಸಮಂ ||
ಜನಿಯಿಸಿ ಸದ್ವಿಜಕುಲದೊಳ್ |
ವಿನಿತ ದ್ವಿಜವರ್ಣವಿಹಿತ ಕರ್ಮಕ್ಕಾಮಂ ||
ಎನಿಸಿರ್ಪ ಮಾಮಾಂಸೆಯೊ |
ಳೆನಿಸಿದನತಿನಿಪುಣಪಂಡಿತಂ ಬುಧತತಿಯೊಳ್ ||
ಸ್ವಕಪರಭಾಷಾದ್ವಯದೊಳ |
ತಿ ಕುಶಲತೆಯನಾಂತನಂತುಟಧ್ಯಾಪಕರೊಳ್ ||
ವಿಕಟಯಶಂ ಪ್ರಭುವರರಿಂ |
ಪ್ರಕಟಿತನಾದಂ ಮಹಾಮಹೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯಂ ||
ಯತಿವರ್ಯರೊಸೆದು ಸಲೆ ಕುಲ |
ಪತಿಯೆನೆ ದರ್ಶನ ಕಲಾನಿಧಿಯು ಮೆನೆ ಬುಧವರ್ಯರ್ ||
ಕ್ಷೇತಿಸುತ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಾಚ |
ಸ್ವತಿಯೆನೆ ವಂಗೀಯರಾಂತನತಿಯಜಸಮಂ ||

ಮಹಾಮಹೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯ ಬಿರುದಾಂಕಿತರಾಗಿ, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆನ್ಸಿ ಕಾಲೇಜು
ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಯಸ್. ಕುಪ್ಪುಸಾಮಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರೀಗಳವರ
ಪ್ರಥಮ ಸಂದರ್ಶನವು ನನಗೆ 1928ನೆ ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಲಭಿಸಿತು. ಅಂದು ಅವರೊಡನೆ
ಒಂದೆರಡು ಘಂಟೆಗಳಕಾಲ ನಡೆಸಿದ ಸಂಭಾಷಣದಿಂದಲೇ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್
ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರೀಗಳವರ ನಿಶಿತತರವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷಾಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವು ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು
ಪರವಶಮಾಡಿತು. ಅವರು ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತುತ್ತತುದಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಂತೆ
ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಮಾಮಾಂಸಾಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ
ಪಂಡಿತೋತ್ತಮರಾಗಿದ್ದುದು ಅಂದು ನನಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು
ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಇವರು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗಿದ್ದುದು ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲದೆ
ವಿದ್ವತ್ಪ್ರಪಕ್ಷಪಾತಿಗಳೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದರಿಂಬುದು ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಯಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣದೇಶದ ಗಣಪತಿ ಅಗ್ರಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತಮ ವೈದಿಕ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣವಂಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಿಸಿ ಬಾಲ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸ್ವಜಾತ್ಯುಚಿತವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಲಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದರು. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಶಾಲೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಮೂಕವಿಂಶತಿ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಹಲವು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಶ್ಲೋಕಗಳು ಕಂಠಗತವಾಗಿತ್ತೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬರುವುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಯೂ ಹರಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನೂ ಕಲಿಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿನಿವೇಶವುಂಟಾಗಲು ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ M.A. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೇರ್ಗಡೆಹೊಂದಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲ ತಿರುವೈಯಾರ್ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಧಾನೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಬಳಿಕ ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಕಾಲೇಜನ್ನೇ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಆ (ಕಾಲೇಜ್) ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ತುಂಬಾ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದರು. ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಇವರ ಉಭಯಭಾಷಾಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯದ ಪರಾಕಾಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಇವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆನ್ಸಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿತು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಪಾಠಪ್ರವಚನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಶಿಷ್ಯರನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಪಾರಂಗತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲೇಜ್, ಹೈಸ್ಕೂಲ್, ಲೈಬ್ರರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕೃತರಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಲೆಕ್ಷಕರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರ ಶಿಷ್ಯರಲ್ಲದವರಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇವರ ಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯಮಹಿಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅರಿತ ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿ ಸಾರ್ವಭೌಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಮಹಾಮಹೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪಂಡಿತರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಹವಾದ ಬಿರುದನ್ನು ದಯಪಾಲಿಸಿತು. ಇವರ ಮೀಮಾಂಸಾಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಶ್ಲಾಘಿಸಿದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಾಮಕೋಟಿ ಶಂಕರಾಚಾರ್ಯರುತಿಗಳು ಇವರಿಗೆ ದರ್ಶನಾಚಾರ್ಯ ಎಂಬ ಬಿರುದನ್ನಿತ್ತು ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಸನ್ಮಾನಿಸಿದರು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇವರು ಹಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಶಿಷ್ಯರನ್ನು ಶಿಕ್ಷಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದದರಿಂದ ಗುರುವರ್ಯರು 'ಕುಲಪತಿ' ಎಂಬ ಋಷಿವರ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಹವಾದ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನೂ ದಯಪಾಲಿಸಿದರು.

ಹೀಗೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಖ್ಯಾತಿ ಹೊಂದಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧ ಪಂಡಿತೋತ್ತಮರೂ, ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕಾಗ್ರೇಸರರೂ, ವಿದ್ವತ್ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತಿಗಳೂ ಆದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಗಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಭಾಷಾವಿಮರ್ಶನ(ಓರಿಯಂಟಲ್ ಲಾಂಗ್ವೇಜ್ ರೀಸರ್ಚ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್) ಶಾಖೆಯೊಂದನ್ನು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲು ಕಾರಣ ಭೂತರಾಗಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷೆಗೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾನ ದೊರಕುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಇದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ವಿಷಯ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವಿಶೇಷವನ್ನೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಗೊಳಿಸುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕಪದವಿಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತರಾದ ಮೇಲೂ ಅಣ್ಣಾಮಲೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಹಲವುಮಂದಿ ಶಿಷ್ಯರನ್ನು ಪಂಡಿತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಯಶಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಿದರು. ಇವರು ಪ್ರಖ್ಯಾತ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರೂ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕಾಗ್ರೇಸರರೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಶಮದಮಾದಿ ಸದ್ಗುಣಗಣಗಳಿಗೂ ಆಕರವಾಗಿದ್ದು ಸುವರ್ಣಪುಷ್ಪಕೈಸುವಾಸನೆಯು ದೊರಕಿದಂತೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಶೋಭಾಕರವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಗಳವರು ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಪ್ರಧಾನರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದ, ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ, ಸಹೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ, ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಸೌಹಾರ್ದಸೌಶೀಲ್ಯಗಳಿಂದ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಶಿಷ್ಯ ಕೋಟಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಾಯೋಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಪ್ರೀತಿಗೆ ಪಾತ್ರರಾಗಿದ್ದುದು ಇವರ ಸುಗುಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಗುಣವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಖ್ಯಾತ ಪುರುಷರ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷಾಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಭಾರತೀಯ ಭಾಷಾವಿದರಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶಕಾಗ್ನೇಸರರಾದ, ಪಾಶ್ಚಾತ್ಯಪಂಡಿತರೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಶ್ಲಾಘಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದು ಇವರ ಅನಿತರ ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯ ಮಹಿಮೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ವ ತೋರಿಸುವವಾಗಿ ಮುಕ್ತಕಂಠದಿಂದ ಉದ್ಘೋಷಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು.

ಇಂಡೋಜರ್ಮನ್ ಫೈಲಾಲಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ (ಭಾಷಾಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದ) ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನರಾದ ಪಂಡಿತರೇ ಇಲ್ಲವಾಗಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಪಂಡಿತೋತ್ತಮರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷ ಸ್ಥಾನವೇ ದೊರಕಿದ್ದುದು ಇವರ ಯಶೋವಿಶೇಷಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಭೂತವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಕೀರ್ತಿಶೇಷ ರಾದ ಇಂತಹ ಪಂಡಿತರ ಅಗಲಿಕೆಯು ನಮ್ಮಾಭಾರತ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಡೀ ಪಾಶ್ಚಾತ್ಯ ಪೌರವ್ಯಾಪ್ತ ವಿದ್ಯಾವತ್ಪ್ರಪಂಚಕ್ಕೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿಷಾದವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅತಿಶಯವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಜಗಜ್ಜನ್ಮಾವನಲಯಲೀಲನಾದ ಭಗವಂತನ ಇವರ ಅತ್ಯಕ್ಕ ಶಾಂತಿಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹಾರೈಸುತ್ತಾ ಪುಸ್ತಕವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಮುಟ್ಟಿಸಿರುವೆನು.

K. RAMA VARMA, B. A (Hons.) B. T., M. Ed., Lecturer
Govt. College, Chittur, Cochin:—

“വസ്ത്രേണ വപുഷാ വാചാ വിദ്യയാ വിനയേനച” എന്നിങ്ങനെ വകാരപഞ്ചകമാണ് വ്യക്തിവൈശിഷ്ട്യത്തിന്റെ അടിസ്ഥാനമെങ്കിൽ അവയെല്ലാം തികഞ്ഞ ഒരു മഹാപുരുഷനാണ് നമ്മുടെ ഗുരുപാദങ്ങൾ— ശ്രീമാൻ മഹാമഹോപാധ്യായ വിദ്യാവാചസ്പതി എസ്. കപ്പുസ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രികൾ. ആഡംബരത്തിന്നല്ല, ആചാരത്തിന്നുവേണ്ടി മാത്രം വളർത്തപ്പെട്ട ശിഖ., വിശാലഹാലം, കനത്ത പിരിയം, തെളിഞ്ഞ കണ്ണ്, ഉത്തംഗനാസം, മാംസളകുപോലം, വളർച്ചമുഖം, ആജാനാപാഹുകൾ, മേടൂരഭീഷുകാര്യം, നിറഞ്ഞ വിദ്യ, കവിഞ്ഞ വിനയം, കനിഞ്ഞ നോട്ടം, പ്രശാന്ത ഗംഭീരഭാവം—ഈ ഗുരുനാമനെ മദിരാശിയിൽ മൈലാപ്പൂരിലുള്ള കപാലേശ്വരക്ഷേത്രനടയിൽ തന്നെയുള്ള അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ വസതിയിൽ വെച്ചാണ് ഞാൻ ആദ്യമായി കണ്ടത്. സംസ്കൃതം ഐച്ഛികവിഷയമായെടുത്ത് ഓണേർസിനു പഠിക്കുവാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിരുന്ന ഞാൻ ആദ്യം പ്രവേശനം നിരസിക്കപ്പെട്ടതുമൂലം ഉണ്ടായ ഇച്ഛാഭംഗത്തോടുകൂടി ശാസ്ത്രികളെ നേരിട്ടുകണ്ട് വീണ്ടും അതിന്നു പരിശ്രമിക്കണമെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചാണ് അവിടെ ചെന്നത്. ഇൻറർമീഡിയറിനു പഠിക്കുന്ന കാലത്ത് എറണാകുളത്തെ രാജകീയ കലാലയത്തിന്റെ സുവർണ്ണജൂബിലി പ്രമാണിച്ച് നടത്തിയ പ്രദർശനത്തിന്നു ഞാൻ എഴുതി തയ്യാറാക്കിയിരുന്ന “കൌമുദി” എന്ന ഒരു സംസ്കൃതഖണ്ഡകാവ്യവും കയ്യിൽ എടുത്തിരുന്നു. അദ്ദേഹത്തെ കാണുവാൻ ഒരു തടസ്സവും ഉണ്ടായില്ല. പലവലിപ്പമുള്ള അനേകം പുസ്തകങ്ങളുടെ മദ്ധ്യത്തിൽ തനി നാടൻ മട്ടിൽ ഒരു പായയിൽ ഇരുന്നുകൊണ്ടു പല വിഷയങ്ങളെക്കുറിച്ചും പരിശോധനകൾ നടത്തുന്നപോലെയാണ് എനിക്കു് അദ്ദേഹത്തെ കണ്ടപ്പോൾ തോന്നിയത്. ആ വിജ്ഞാനഭാസ്കരന്റെ മുഖിൽ ഒരു മിന്നാമിനുങ്ങുപോലെ ഞാനും നിലകൊണ്ടു. ആഗമനോദ്ദേശം ചോദിച്ചപ്പോൾ കാര്യം ചുരുക്കിപറഞ്ഞ് എന്റെ ഖണ്ഡകാവ്യം അദ്ദേഹത്തെ കാണിച്ചു. അവിടവിടെയായി ആകാശത്തിലെ ഭാഗങ്ങൾ അല്പനേരം കൊണ്ടു പരിശോധിച്ചതിന്നുശേഷം “നാളെ ഫീസുകൊണ്ടു കോളേജിലേക്കു വന്നോളൂ” എന്നിങ്ങനെ അസന്ദിഗ്ദ്ധമായ സ്വരത്തിൽ എന്റെ ആഗ്രഹം സാധിപ്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു പറഞ്ഞു. അന്നുമുതൽ ആ ഗുരുനാമന്റെ പേരിൽ എനിക്കുള്ള ഭക്തിയും എന്റെ പേരിൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പുത്രനിവൃത്തിശേഷമായ വാത്സല്യവും ഉത്തരോത്തരം വർദ്ധിച്ചുവന്നു.

ഗുരുനാമന്റെ നിദ്ദേശമനുസരിച്ച് ഞാൻ പിറ്റേ ദിവസംതന്നെ പ്രസിഡൻസി കോളേജിൽ സംസ്കൃതം ഓണേർസിനു ചേർന്നു. സംസ്കൃതം ഓണേർസിന്നു പഠിക്കേണ്ടതായ വിഷയങ്ങളുടെ വൈവിധ്യവും പുസ്തകങ്ങളുടെ വൈപുല്യവും കണ്ടപ്പോൾ ഞാൻ അല്പം ഒന്നു അവരാനു. അവയുടേ കാരോന്നം അഞ്ചാറുകൊല്ലം പഠിച്ചു തീരൂ. അങ്ങനെയുള്ള വ്യതികം പുസ്തകങ്ങൾ മൂന്നു കൊല്ലത്തിനകം പഠിച്ച് എല്ലുപ്പത്തിൽ സൺ

ഉണപിറം കയറുവാനുള്ള ഒരു മാർഗ്ഗം യൂനിവേർസിറ്റി നിശ്ചയിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതായി കണ്ടപ്പോൾ എനിക്കു അതുതന്നെ ഭയവും ഉണ്ടായി. പിന്നീടാണ് അതിന്റെ ഉള്ളകളികൾ മനസ്സിലായത്. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ പരീക്ഷയെ സംബന്ധിച്ചേടത്തോളം സംസ്കൃതഭാഷയെപറ്റി കാര്യമായ അറിവൊന്നും ആവശ്യമില്ല. എല്ലാ പുസ്തകങ്ങൾക്കും ഇംഗ്ലീഷിൽ അനുവാദങ്ങളുണ്ട്. അതു നല്ലവണ്ണം പഠിച്ച വിഷയങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഇംഗ്ലീഷിൽ എഴുതിവെച്ചാൽ ഒന്നാംതരം മാർക്ക് കിട്ടും. നേരേമറിച്ച സംസ്കൃതം ഓണർസല്ല, സംസ്കൃത ഭാഷയെപറ്റി അല്പം പരിജ്ഞാനം സമ്പാദിക്കേണ്ട, സിലാന്ത കൌമുദി കാര്യമായി പഠിക്കേണ്ട, സംസ്കൃതത്തിന്റെ ഉപന്യാസങ്ങളും കവിതകളും എഴുതുവാൻ പരിശ്രമിക്കേണ്ട, പരീക്ഷക്കടലാസ്സുകളിൽ മൂലഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ ഉദ്ധരിച്ച് പ്രതിപാദനങ്ങൾക്കു പൊലിമ കൂട്ടേണ്ട, എന്നിങ്ങനെയൊക്കെ ശുഭഗതിയിൽ ആലോചിച്ച ആ വക വികൃതവേഷങ്ങൾക്കു ഒരു വെട്ടുകയാണെങ്കിൽ എന്നെപ്പോലെ വെറും ഒരു മൂന്നാംക്ലാസ്സ്! എന്റെ സ്വന്തം സിദ്ധമായ അഭിനീവേശം കൊണ്ടാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ വിഷയം സ്വീകരിച്ചത്. സംസ്കൃതഭാഷയേയും സാഹിത്യത്തേയും കുറിച്ചുള്ള താല്പര്യം നിമിത്തം ഞാൻ അന്ന് ഓണർസ് അധ്യേതാക്കളിൽ ആരും ചെയ്യാത്ത തരത്തിൽ അഷ്ടാദ്ധ്യായി തോന്നിക്കുക, ഗദ്യരൂപത്തിലുള്ള ഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ പദ്യരൂപത്തിലാക്കി ചമക്കുക, സാഹിത്യസമാജങ്ങളിലും മറ്റും സംസ്കൃതത്തിൽ ഉപന്യാസങ്ങളെഴുതി വായിക്കുക എന്നിങ്ങനെ പല സംരംഭങ്ങളിലും ഏർപ്പെട്ടു. പരീക്ഷകന്മാർക്കുണ്ടോ ഈ വക നോട്ടം. എന്നാൽ ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള സംരംഭങ്ങളിലെല്ലാം എന്റെ എല്ലാ അദ്ധ്യാപകന്മാരും പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു സ്നേഹപൂർവ്വമായ പ്രധാനാദ്ധ്യാപകനും എനിക്ക് ഏപ്പോഴും സദുപദേശങ്ങളെക്കൊണ്ടും മറ്റും വേണ്ട പ്രോത്സാഹനം തന്നിരുന്നു. മൂന്നാംകൊല്ലത്തിന്റെ അവസാനമായപ്പോഴേക്കും എനിക്കുണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള വാത്സല്യം ഉള്ളിൽ ഒതുങ്ങാതെ പ്രത്യക്ഷമായും പരോക്ഷമായും, ക്ലാസ്സിലും പുറമേയും, വാക്കുകൊണ്ടും പ്രവൃത്തികൊണ്ടും അദ്ദേഹം പ്രകടിപ്പിച്ചിരുന്നു. പരീക്ഷാഫലം വന്നയടുത്തെ വെറും ഒരു മൂന്നാംക്ലാസ്സ് മാത്രമാണ് എനിക്കു കിട്ടിയതെന്നു അറിഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്നുണ്ടായ മനോവേദന ഞാൻ പിന്നീടു നേരിട്ടുകണ്ടപ്പോൾ എറിക്കുറിയുവാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞു. ഗൽഗക്ഷേരത്തോടുകൂടി “പരീക്ഷാഫലത്തിൽ എനിക്കു യാതൊരു കാര്യവുമില്ല. കാര്യങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഇങ്ങനെയെന്നു ചേർന്നു. ഏതായാലും ഇതു കയ്യിലിരിക്കട്ടെ” എന്നു പറഞ്ഞു സ്വമനസ്സാലെ എഴുതിയുണ്ടാക്കിയ ഒരു സട്ടിഫിക്കററ് എനിക്കു തന്നു “വിദ്യാനേവ വിജാനാതി വിദ്യാജ്ഞപരിശ്രമം” എന്നും ചൊല്ലി എന്നെ സമാശ്വസിപ്പിച്ചു. ഭൌതികാവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കു ഉപകരിക്കാവുന്ന സർവ്വകലാശാലയിലെ ബിരുദക്കടലാസ്സിനു എന്തു വില! ഗുരുകുലത്തിലെമ്പോഴെയെ ടീഷ്കാലപരിചയത്തെ ആസ്പദമാക്കി ആ ഗുരുനാഥന്റെ അനുഗ്രഹത്തിന്റേയും വാത്സല്യത്തിന്റേയും പ്രത്യക്ഷോദാഹരണമെന്നോണം സ്വമേധയാ തന്നനുഗ്രഹിച്ച ആ ഒരു സട്ടിഫിക്കററാണ് ഇന്നും എനിക്കു സർവ്വകാര്യങ്ങളിലും ഒരു പ്രചോദനമായി തീർന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്.

ഇത്രയും പറഞ്ഞതുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ യൂനീവേർസിറ്റി പരീക്ഷകളെ അപലപിക്കുകയല്ല, ആ ഗുരുനാഥന്റെ സ്വഭാവവിശേഷത്തെ സോദാഹരണം സമർത്ഥിക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളത്. പ്രാചീനാധ്യയനരീതിയിൽ വിഷയക്കുറവും തലസ്തരിപാണ്ഡിത്യവുമായിരുന്നു ലക്ഷ്യങ്ങൾ. എന്നാൽ വിഷയവൈവിധ്യവും ഉപരിപ്ലവജ്ഞാനവുമാണ് ആധുനികാധ്യയനരീതിയുടെ സ്വഭാവങ്ങൾ. പ്രാചീനരീതിയിൽ ഗുരുക്വത്തിലിരുന്നു സംസ്കൃതം പഠിച്ച് എന്താണു ഒരു ശാസ്ത്രപരിചയം സമ്പാദിച്ചതിനുശേഷം ആധുനികരീതിയിൽ സ്തുളകളിലും കോളേജുകളിലുമായി പഠിച്ച് എം. എ. ബിരുദം നേടിയ അദ്ദേഹത്തിൽ രണ്ടു രീതികളിലേയും ഗുണങ്ങളായ വിഷയവൈവിധ്യവും തലസ്തരിപാണ്ഡിത്യവും പ്രത്യക്ഷപ്പെട്ടിരുന്നു. ഉപരിപ്ലവന്മാരുടെ പേരിൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു കേവലം അവജ്ഞയായിരുന്നു, സംസ്കൃതത്തിന്റെ അക്ഷരജ്ഞാനം മാത്രം സിദ്ധിച്ച ഉന്നതപരീക്ഷകളിൽ ബിരുദം നേടി അറിവില്ലായ്മയെ മറയ്ക്കുവാൻവേണ്ടി ഗവേഷണങ്ങളെന്ന വ്യാജേന അടിസ്ഥാനരഹിതങ്ങളും സ്വകപോലകല്പിതങ്ങളുമായ ചില നിരർത്ഥകസിദ്ധാന്തങ്ങളെ മുക്തകണ്ഠം നിർദ്വജം പ്രോപ്പീക്കുന്ന ചില ആധുനിക പണ്ഡിതന്മാരുടെ ആഭാടങ്ങളെ സംസ്കൃതസാഹിത്യകേസരിയായ അദ്ദേഹം കേവലം ശിവാഭതം പോലെ പുച്ഛരസത്തോടെയാണ് വീക്ഷിച്ചിരുന്നത്. അഗ്നികണ്ഡത്തിൽ ശലങ്ങളെന്നപോലെ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ വിജ്ഞാനതേജസ്സിൽ അവരുടെ സിദ്ധാന്തങ്ങൾ ദഹിച്ചുപോകും. അക്കൂട്ടരെ അദ്ദേഹം ഇൻററക്ട് പണ്ഡിതന്മാരെന്നാണ് വർണ്ണിക്കാറുള്ളത്. വിഷയസൂചിയില്ലെങ്കിൽ അവർക്കു പാണ്ഡിത്യവും ഇല്ല. നേരേമറിച്ച വിഷയവിചിന്തനം ചെയ്ത് പുച്ഛപരങ്ങളെ മനസ്സിലാക്കി ശാസ്ത്രസിദ്ധാന്തങ്ങളെ കരതലാമലകംപോലെ കണ്ടറിയുവാൻ അഭ്യസിക്കുന്നവരാണ് അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ കണ്ണിലുണ്ണികൾ. അവർക്കു വേണ്ട സഹായങ്ങളും പ്രോത്സാഹനങ്ങളും അദ്ദേഹത്തിൽനിന്നു എന്നും ലഭിക്കും.

പ്രാചീനരീതിയിൽ ശാസ്ത്രാഭ്യാസം ചെയ്ത് പ്രഖ്യാതിനടിയ പണ്ഡിതാഗ്രേസരന്മാർ ഭാരതഭൂമിയിൽ ധാരാളം ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു, ഇപ്പൊഴും ഉണ്ട്. പക്ഷെ അവർക്കെല്ലാം ആ ശാസ്ത്രങ്ങളിൽ പുറുപക്ഷസമാധാനങ്ങളെക്കൊണ്ടു അമ്മാനമാടി മററുള്ളവരെ അത്ഭുതപ്പെടുത്തുകയല്ലാതെ ശാസ്ത്രേതരങ്ങളായ ലൗകികവിഷയങ്ങളെപറ്റി സരളമായി പ്രതിപാദിക്കുവാനോ ഏഴുതുവാണോ ഉള്ളസാമർത്ഥ്യം വളരെ വീരളമാണ്. എന്നാൽ ആധുനികരീതിയിൽ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസം സിദ്ധിച്ച ഇദ്ദേഹത്തിനു ശാസ്ത്രവിഷയങ്ങളിലെന്നപോലെ മറ്റു ലൗകികവിഷയങ്ങളിലും പ്രസംഗിക്കുവാനും ഏഴുതു വാനും ഉള്ള പാടവം അന്യാദൃശം തന്നെയായിരുന്നു. സാഹിത്യമഹാരണത്തിൽ സവ്യസാചിയെപോലെ സംസ്കൃതവും ഇംഗ്ലീഷും തുല്യപ്രാഗത്ഭ്യത്തോടുകൂടിക്കൈകാര്യം ചെയ്യുവാനുള്ള പ്രാവീണ്യം അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്നെന്നും വേറെതന്നെയാണ്. ഭാഷാശാസ്ത്രത്തിൽ (Philology) അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ അഭിലാഷരൂപ പാശ്ചാത്യഗവേഷകന്മാർക്കുകൂടി മാർഗ്ഗദർശകങ്ങളായിരുന്നു.

അദ്ധ്യാപകൻ എത്രതന്നെ യോഗ്യനായാലും അദ്ധ്യേതാക്കളുടെ കഴിവു കണ്ടറിഞ്ഞു അതിന്നു യോജിച്ച വിധത്തിൽ അദ്ധ്യാപനം നടത്തുകയല്ലെങ്കിൽ ആ പ്രയത്നം തീരെ വിഫലമാണ്. ഈവിധയത്തിൽ ഗുരുനാഥന്റെ സാമർത്ഥ്യം പ്രത്യേകം പ്രസ്താവ്യമാണ്. യാസ്തന്റെ നിരൂപണം ഓണേർസ് അദ്ധ്യേതാക്കൾക്കു ഒരുപാറുപുസ്തകമാണ്. അതു ഞങ്ങളെ ഒരു അദ്ധ്യാപകൻ പഠിപ്പിച്ചു. പക്ഷെ മീമാംസയിലെ മറ്റൊരു ഒരു പ്രകൃതം വന്നപ്പോൾ നിരൂപണത്തിലെ ഒരു വിഷയത്തെപ്പറ്റി ശാസ്ത്രീകൾ ഞങ്ങളോടു ചില ചോദ്യങ്ങൾ ചോദിച്ചു. ആരും സമാധാനം പറഞ്ഞില്ല. ഗ്രന്ഥം പഠിച്ചിട്ടില്ലെന്നു അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്നു മനസ്സിലായി. അതിന്റെ നിദാനമെന്തെന്നും അദ്ദേഹം ക്ഷണത്തിൽ ഊഹിച്ചു. ഗ്രന്ഥത്തിലെ പ്രതിപാദനരീതി അറിയാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണ് ഞങ്ങളുടെ ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടെന്നു കണ്ടപ്പോൾ ആ ഭാഗത്തെക്കുറിച്ച് പറഞ്ഞു മനസ്സിലാക്കി. ക്ഷണത്തിൽ വിഷയങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഞങ്ങൾക്കു വിശദവുമായി. അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ അദ്ധ്യാപനസാമർത്ഥ്യം അന്നു എന്തെന്നു ആശ്ചര്യഭരിതനാക്കി.

പ്രാചീനഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ പ്രകാശിപ്പിക്കുകയല്ലാതെ സ്വയം ഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ എഴുതി പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തുക അദ്ദേഹം ചെയ്തിരുന്നില്ല. എന്നാൽ ഇന്നത്തെ ലോകത്തിൽ “ഉദ്യൈരുച്ചരിതവൃന്ദൽ കിഞ്ചിദജാനതാപി പുരുഷേഷണ, മൂഢാ വിശ്വസ്യന്തേ വിദ്യഷാമപി സംശയോ ഭവതി” എന്നാണല്ലോ മര്യാദ. അതുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെയായിരിക്കാം അന്തസ്സാരമുള്ള അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്നു അത്തരം സംരംഭങ്ങളിൽ ആസക്തിയില്ലാതിരുന്നത്. ഒരിക്കൽ അധികൃതന്മാർ, സ്വന്തം കൃതികൾ വല്ലതും എഴുതി പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ടോ എന്ന് അദ്ദേഹത്തോടു ചോദിച്ചു എന്നും പ്രശസ്തപദങ്ങളെ അലങ്കരിക്കുന്ന പണ്ഡിത വരേണ്യന്മാരായ തന്റെ ശിഷ്യന്മാർ തന്നെയാണ് തന്റെ കൃതികൾ എന്നു അദ്ദേഹം സമാധാനം പറഞ്ഞുവെന്നും കേട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. ശ്രീമാൻ ചിന്ന സ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രീകൾ, ഡാക്ടർ സി. കുഞ്ഞൻരാജാ മുതലായവരെല്ലാം അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ശിഷ്യന്മാരാണ്. ലേഖനത്തിന്റെ ടൈപ്പുതെ ഭയന്നു് ഞാൻ അവരുടെ സംഖ്യയെപറ്റിയോ യോഗ്യതകളെ പറ്റിയോ കൂടുതൽ എഴുതുന്നില്ല.

ആ കൂട്ടത്തിൽ ആ മഹാപുരുഷന്റെ ശിഷ്യനാകുവാനുള്ളഭാഗ്യം സിദ്ധിച്ച ഒരു വ്യക്തിയാണല്ലോ ഞാനും. എന്നാൽ പലകാരണങ്ങളാലും അദ്ധ്യയനകാലത്തിനുശേഷം ധാരാളമായി അദ്ദേഹത്തെ കാണുന്നതിനും ആ വഴിക്കു കൂടുതൽ വിജ്ഞാനം സമ്പാദിക്കുന്നതിനും എനിക്കു കഴിഞ്ഞില്ല. ആ വിജ്ഞാനഭാസ്കരൻ അസ്തമിച്ചുപെങ്കിലും അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പ്രകാശം അന്തേവാസികളായ താരാഗണങ്ങളിൽ പ്രതിഫലിച്ചു് രമ്യമായൊരു ഇന്നത്തെ അന്തരീക്ഷത്തിലും മാർഗ്ഗദർശിയായി തീരുന്നുണ്ടു്. അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ആത്മാവിന്നു നിത്യശാന്തി ഭവിക്കട്ടെ. അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ സ്റ്റോരകമായ ഈ ഗവേഷണകേന്ദ്രം ഉത്തരോത്തരം സർവ്വോൽകൃഷ്ടവൺ വർത്തിക്കട്ടെ. ഗുരു ചരണാരവിന്ദേഭ്യോ നമഃ

Mahakavi VALLATHOL NARAYANA MENON,
Poet-Laureate, Cheruturuthi, Cochin:—

സദസ്യക്കുടുംബം, വെച്ചേറെ നമസ്കാരം;

അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനാ വിശേഷിച്ചും!

ഇയിടയിൽ, വളരെക്കാലമായി കണ്ടിട്ടില്ലാത്ത ഒരു പരിചിതൻ എന്നോടു ചോദിച്ചു:— ‘വയസ്സെത്രയായി?’ ഞാൻ ചിരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു, ‘മുപ്പതു മുപ്പത്തഞ്ച്’ എന്നു മറുപടി പറഞ്ഞു. ഇതു പ്രഷ്ടാവിനെ അത്ര വിശ്വസിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. 50-55-ായി എന്നാണ് ഞാൻ കരുതിയതു്’ എന്ന ദ്രേഹം അക്കം തിരുത്തിയപ്പോൾ, ഇരുപതോ പതിനഞ്ചോ മുന്തിക്കിട്ടിയല്ലോ എന്നുഞാൻ ആശ്വസിച്ചു. എന്നാൽ, ഈ അടവു്—വയസ്സു കുറച്ചു പറയൽ— ഇനിമേലിൽ നടക്കുകയില്ല. ഈ മാസം 17-ാംന- ഇവിടെ മ്യൂസിയം ഫാളിൽ എനിക്കു ഒരുപഹാരം തരാനായി ചേർന്ന സാഹസ്യ സദസ്സിൽവെച്ചു് ഗവണ്മെന്റ് വക്കീൽ ശ്രീ: കുട്ടികൃഷ്ണമേനോൻ എനിക്കെഴുപതായി വയസ്സെന്നു പ്രസംഗിച്ചു വിട്ടു; അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനായിരുന്ന ഫൈക്കോട്ട് ജഡ്ജി ശ്രീ: ഗോവിന്ദമേനോൻ അതിന്നുതുല്യമായി വിധിയും പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു കളഞ്ഞു! രണ്ടുപേരും എന്റെ ഉറ്റ സ്നേഹിതന്മാരാണെന്നും.

അങ്ങിനെ എഴുപതുക്കാരെന്നു പ്രഖ്യാപിക്കപ്പെട്ട കിഴവൻമേരിക്കരയിൽനിന്നു സ്വസ്ഥാനത്തേയ്ക്കു തിരിച്ചിട്ടു പത്തുനാൾ തികയുന്നതിന്നുമുമ്പേ, വീണ്ടും നാനൂറോളം നാഴിക പിന്നീടു് ഇവിടെവന്നു ചേർന്നതിൽ നിങ്ങൾക്കു അതുതമോ, അനുകമ്പയോ തോന്നേണ്ടതില്ല: ആർ വാർത്തയെക്കുറിച്ചു മുമ്പേ നിർമ്മാണമടഞ്ഞ കപ്പുസ്വാമിശാസ്ത്രികളെക്കുറിച്ചു എനിക്കുള്ള ഗുരുക്കേരി വിശേഷം ഒരു മൃദുലപാശമെന്നപോലെ, അനായാസമാവണമെന്നു്, എന്നെ ഇങ്ങോട്ടുകയ്യിച്ചതു്! ആ പാശത്തിന്നു്, രണ്ടു വിഭാഗം രണ്ടുതരം—ഈ മാസത്തിന്റെ ആദിയിൽമാത്രം പരിചയപ്പെട്ട ഡാക്ടർ രാഘവൻ, ചിരന്തനമിത്രമായ ഡാക്ടർ കുഞ്ഞൻരാജാ എന്നിവരുടെ—സ്നേഹനിബന്ധം പിരിമുറുക്കവും കൂട്ടി. അങ്ങിനെ കപ്പുസ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രീ ഗവേഷണസമിതിയുടെ സമ്മേളനത്തിൽ സംബന്ധിക്കുക എന്ന അവശ്യ കർത്തവ്യത്തിൽ എന്നെ പ്രവർത്തിപ്പിച്ചു ഇവരിരുവരിലും എനിക്കു് അകൈതവമായ കൃതജ്ഞതയുണ്ടു്.

ചില സംവത്സരങ്ങൾക്കുമുമ്പു മൈസൂരിൽ നടന്ന ആരംഭജന്മകാരിയൻറൽ കോൺഗ്രസ്സിന്നു ഞാനും ക്ഷണിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരുന്നു. വിശാലരമണീയമായ തത്സമ്മേളനശാലയിൽ പ്രവേശിച്ചപ്പോൾ എന്റെ ദൃഷ്ടിയെ ഒന്നാമതായാവർജ്ജിച്ചതു്, മുൻവരിക്കുസാലകളിൽ തോട്ടത്തൊട്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ചിലരുടെ ഏകരൂപമായ വേഷവിധാനമാണു്. ഒരുതരം കസവുതലപ്പാവു്; നടുനൊറ്റിമേൽ വെടിയ ഗോപിക്കുറി, ഇടയിലിടയിൽ സ്വണ്ണവട്ടോടും നടുവിൽ കൊത്തുപണിയുള്ള പൊൻപോളുകൊണ്ടു പൊതിഞ്ഞ വലിയ രുദ്രാക്ഷത്തോടും കൂടിയ രുദ്രാക്ഷമാല കഴുത്തിൽനിന്നു ഞാനുകിടക്കുന്ന മാവിടവും മികച്ച കസവുവേല ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ചുക്കുന്ന സാൽവകൊണ്ടുള്ള ഏ

റാപ്പ്; വെളുത്ത പാളത്തൊടുപ്പ്—ഈ അസാധാരണവേഷന്മാർ അന്നത്തെ മൈസൂർ മഹാരാജാവിന്റെ ആ സ്ഥാനപണ്ഡിതന്മാരാണെന്ന്, അന്വേഷണത്താൽ എനിക്കു മനസ്സിലായി: അവർക്കു ജംഗിയേറിയ ഭവനങ്ങളും, സുഖമായ കാലക്ഷേപത്തിനുവേണ്ടുവോളം ശമ്പളവും മഹാരാജാവു കല്പിച്ചു കൊടുത്തിരുന്നു. പണ്ടത്തെ ഭാരതരാജാക്കന്മാർ പണ്ഡിതന്മാരേയും കവികളേയും യഥാർഹം പൂജിച്ചുപോന്നിരുന്നുവല്ലോ; അതിന്റെ ഒരു ചെറിയ അവശേഷം അന്ന് മൈസൂർ രാജധാനിയിൽ കാണുമാറായി! ചില വിഷയങ്ങളിൽ പഴയ രാജാക്കന്മാരുടെ ഒരു നേരിയ ഹരയയ്യുണ്ടായിരുന്നു, ആ മഹാരാജാവിന്നു. മഹാരാജാവിന്റെ സംസ്കൃതഭാഷാഭക്തിയിൽ പൊന്നും പട്ടം ചാർത്തിക്കൊടുത്ത ഏകാദശഭദ്രന്മാരാണെന്നു തോന്നും, ആ പതിനൊന്നുപേരെ കണ്ടാൽ.

ആ കണ്ണാടകീയരായ ശാസ്ത്രകോവിദന്മാരും ഒന്നമ്പരക്കുമാറ് ഒരു പ്രഭാഷണം സഭാമണ്ഡപത്തിൽ ആരംഭിച്ചു. അതിന്റെ ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ വെളുത്തുന്തിയ തലപ്പാവും കാൽമുട്ടോളമെത്തിയ വെള്ളക്കുപ്പായവും ധരിച്ച ഒരു തേജസ്വിയായ ദ്രാവിഡബ്രാഹ്മണനായിരുന്നു. അദ്ദേഹം സ്വഭാഷയായ തമിഴിൽത്തന്നെയാണ് സംസാരിക്കുന്നതെന്നത്രേ, ബധിരനായ ഏനിക്കു ആദ്യം തോന്നിയതു്. എന്നാൽ, ഒരു സമീപീനമായ സംസ്കൃതപ്രസംഗമായിരുന്നു അതു്. ആ ഭാഷണധാരണി ഇടുകാറ്റിൽ ഓളം തുളുമ്പുന്ന കാവേരീനദിപോലെ അങ്ങിനെ ഒഴുകിക്കൊണ്ടിരുന്നു. സദസ്സിലെങ്ങും ഒരു അനിച്ചുപനിയമായ ബഹുമാനവും ശ്രദ്ധയും വ്യാപിച്ചു. അഹോ ആരാണീ ഭൂലോകവാചസ്പതി? നമ്മുടെമഹാമഹോപാധ്യായൻ കല്പസ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രികൾ തന്നെ!

അതിന്നു മുമ്പും പിമ്പും ഞാൻ അദ്ദേഹത്തെ കണ്ടിട്ടില്ല; അന്നും അദ്ദേഹത്തെ സമീപിച്ചു വന്ദിച്ചാൻ അവസരം കിട്ടിയതുമില്ല. ആ സന്ദർശനം ആദിമവും അന്തിമവുമായിരുന്നു. തഞ്ചാവൂർ ജില്ലയിലെ ഗണപത്യഗ്രാമം മേ, 1880 ഫിബ്രുവരിയിൽ കല്പസ്വാമിയുടെ ജനനത്താൽ നിനക്കു കൈവന്ന ധനുതയിൽ ഒരംശം കേരളത്തിന്നുമില്ലെന്നില്ല. ഒരുകാലത്തു ശാസ്ത്രികളുടെ തറവാടു് ശങ്കരാചാര്യരുടെ നാട്ടിലായിരുന്നുവെന്നു ശാസ്ത്രികൾ തന്നെ പറയാറുണ്ടു്. അതേ, ചിരന്തനമായ വേഴ്ചമൂലം താൻ തമിഴുനാടിന്നു കൊടുത്ത ഒരു ശ്രേഷ്ഠസന്താനമാണു് കല്പസ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രികളെന്നു മലനാടിന്നു ഒട്ടൊക്കെ അഭിമാനിക്കാം. ഇദ്ദേഹവും, രണ്ടുമാസത്തിന്നുമുമ്പെ മൂതിയടഞ്ഞ കേരളമഹാകവി ഉള്ളൂർ എസ്. പരമേശ്വരയ്യരും ഒന്നു കൊല്ലത്തിലാണ് (1905) താനും, എം. എ. പരീക്ഷയിൽ വിജയം നേടിയതു്.

എം. എ. പരീക്ഷയിൽ ജയിച്ചതോടുകൂടി, ഇന്നത്തെ മിക്ക പരിപ്ലവകാരണപോലെ, പൂണ്ണകാമതപം കൊള്ളുകയല്ല ശാസ്ത്രികൾ ചെയ്തതു്; അദ്ദേഹം ധീരന്തരപരിശ്രമംകൊണ്ടു വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യത്തെ വളർത്തിപ്പോന്നു. ഇംഗ്ലീഷിലും സംസ്കൃതത്തിലും വളരെ വളരെ ശാസ്ത്രഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ അദ്ദേഹം അവഗാഢമായി വായിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഏതൊരു സദ്ഗ്രന്ഥവും കീട്ടിയൊൽ വായിക്കാതിരിക്കയില്ല; വായിച്ചതു മറക്കുകയുമില്ല. കേരളത്തിലെ

കൈക്കൂട്ടങ്ങൾ രാമവാരിയക്കൊത്ത (അരന്തററാണിന്നു മുമ്പു മരിച്ചു) മേ
 ധാശകനിയും ഗ്രഹണനൈപ്പുനിയും കശാഗ്രബുലിയും കപ്പുസ്വാമി ശാ
 സ്ത്രികൾക്കു കൂടെ പിറപ്പായിരുന്നു. അസാധാരണമായ വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യം വിഭ
 വത്തിനൊത്തതാണ്. ഒന്നിലധികം സംസ്കൃതകോളേജുകളിൽ പ്രിൻ
 സിപ്പാൾ സ്ഥാനവും പ്രസിഡൻസി കോളേജിൽ സംസ്കൃതാധ്യാപക
 പീഠവും അലങ്കരിച്ചതാണ് ശാസ്ത്രികളുടെ ശിഷ്യസമ്പത്തു്. ഇന്നു ദക്ഷിണ
 ഭാരതത്തിലുള്ള പല പ്രസിദ്ധ പണ്ഡിതന്മാരും കാളേജുകളിലുള്ള എം. എ.
 ഓരും ഇദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ശിഷ്യരത്രെ. അങ്ങിനെ ആ മഹാൻ വേണ്ടുവോ
 ളും സ്വന്മാദിച്ചു. വേണ്ടുവോളം ദാനവും ചെയ്തു. പഠിക്കുക പഠിപ്പിക്കുക
 എന്നിവ മാത്രമാണ് അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ യാവാജീവകൃത്യങ്ങൾ. ശിഷ്യവാ
 സഭ്യത്തിലാകട്ടെ, ഒരു ഋഷിതന്നെയായിരുന്നു ശാസ്ത്രികൾ. പഴമയുടെ
 ആഴവും പുതുമയുടെ പരപ്പുമൊത്തതായിരുന്നു ശാസ്ത്രികളുടെ വിജ്ഞാന
 സമൃദ്ധി; അതിന്റെ തിരമാലകൾ—പ്രശസ്തങ്ങളായ പ്രഭാഷണങ്ങളും ഉപ
 ന്യാസങ്ങളും—എളുപ്പത്തിൽ എണ്ണിത്തീക്കാവുന്നവയല്ല.

മദിരാശി ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഗ്രന്ഥാലയം ഇത്രയും ഉന്നതമാക്കപ്പെട്ട
 ത് ശാസ്ത്രികളുടെ ഗ്രന്ഥസംഭരണശീലത്താലത്രേ: ക്ലററററുടെ നില
 യിൽ അദ്ദേഹം പണിപ്പെട്ടു തിരഞ്ഞു കണ്ടുപിടിച്ച പ്രാചീനസംസ്കൃത
 ഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങളുടെ സംഖ്യ ചെറുതല്ല. അദ്ദേഹം പ്രസിദ്ധീകരിച്ച വിവരണസ
 ഫിതമായ ക്യാറ്റലോഗ് നിങ്ങൾ കണ്ടിട്ടുണ്ടാകാം. മണ്ഡനമിശ്രന്റെ
 വീരമവീവേകം, ബ്രഹ്മസിദ്ധി എന്നിവയെ ശാസ്ത്രികൾ ശുദ്ധിപ്പെടുത്തി
 അച്ചടിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടില്ലായിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ ആ മഹാഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങളുടെ പേർപോലും
 നാം കേൾക്കുമായിരുന്നുവോ? വീവേകിയായ വിപശ്ചിത്തു, ഗുണവാനായ
 ഗുരു, ലോകദർശിയായ ലേഖകൻ, പ്രഗൽഭനായ പ്രഭാഷകൻ, ഗരിഷ്ഠപ്രയ
 തനായ ഗ്രന്ഥസ്വാദകൻ എന്നിവരെല്ലാം കപ്പുസ്വാമിശാസ്ത്രികളിൽ
 കടികൊണ്ടിരുന്നു! മദിരാശിസംസ്കൃതംഅക്കാഡമി, ജണ്ണൽ ഓഫ് ഓറിയ
 ന്റൽ റിസർച്ച് എന്നിവയുടെ സ്രഷ്ടാവും സർവ്വകലാശാലയിലേ പെരരസ്കൃ
 ബിരുദങ്ങളുടെ വ്യവസ്ഥാപകനും മറററരുമല്ലല്ലോ.

സ്വഭാഷയായ തമിഴിനെ തഴപ്പിക്കുന്നതിലല്ല, അമരഭാരതിയെ പ്രച
 റിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിലാണ്, ശാസ്ത്രികൾ ശ്രദ്ധ ചെലുത്തിയത്: അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്നു
 റിയം, എല്ലാ ദേശീയഭാഷകളുടേയും തായ്വേർ സംസ്കൃതമാണെന്നും;
 കൊമ്പുകളിലല്ല, കടയ്ക്കുലാണല്ലോ നനയ്ക്കേണ്ടത്. ഗൈർവാണിറാണിയു
 ടെ അന്യോദ്ദേശമായ കൗടായുത്താലത്രേ, ഭാരതത്തിലെ ഭാഷകൾ സമൃദ്ധിനേ
 ടിയതു്, നേടുന്നതു്, നേടുവാൻ പോകുന്നതു്. “ബുദ്ധൻ സ്വാശയങ്ങളെ
 പാലിഭാഷയിൽ വെളിപ്പെടുത്തിയതിനാലാണ്, അവയ്ക്കു് ക്ഷിപ്രപ്രചാരം
 സിദ്ധിച്ചതു്; എന്നാൽ, അതോടൊപ്പം സംസ്കൃതത്തേയും പ്രചരിപ്പിക്കേ
 ണ്ടിയിരുന്നു.” എന്ന വിവേകാനന്ദവചനം തുലോം അർത്ഥവത്താകുന്നു.
 “ആശയങ്ങളെ നാട്ടുഭാഷയിൽ പഠിപ്പിക്കണം; അതോടൊപ്പം സംസ്കൃ
 താധ്യാപനവുമുണ്ടാത്തണം.” എന്നത്രെ സ്വാമിയുടെ അഭിപ്രായം. സംസ്കൃ
 തഭാഷയല്ലാതെ മറററന്നുമല്ല ഭാരതത്തെ ഭാരതമാക്കിയതു്. ഭാരതീയങ്ങളാ

യ സദ്ഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾക്കും സംസ്കാരങ്ങൾക്കുമായി മറ്റു രാജ്യങ്ങൾ കൈമല
 ത്തിക്കാട്ടുന്നതിൽ അതുതമൊന്നുമില്ല. ഇരുപതോളം സംവത്സരങ്ങൾക്കു
 മുമ്പു ഇന്ത്യയിൽ വന്ന് ആരംഭം താമസിച്ച്, സ്വരാജ്യമായ അമേരി
 കയിലേക്കു തിരിച്ചുപോയ ഡാക്ടർ വിൽഡ്കാൻറ്—ഇദ്ദേഹം കൊള
 മ്പിയോ സമൃദ്ധകലാശാലയിലെ തത്ത്വശാസ്ത്രാദ്ധ്യാപകനായിരുന്നു—സൂ
 യോക്കിൽവെച്ചു പ്രസംഗിച്ചതിലെ ചില വാക്യങ്ങൾ ഞാൻ നിങ്ങളെ കേ
 രപ്പിക്കാം:— “യൂറോപ്യൻ ഭാഷകളുടെ മാതാവായ സംസ്കൃതഭാഷയു
 ടെ ഗുഹം തന്നെ, ഇന്ത്യയാണ്. നമ്മുടെ ഭാഷയുടേയും തത്ത്വചിന്തയുടേ
 യും മാതാവും ഇന്ത്യതന്നെ; ഗ്രാമപഞ്ചായത്തുകൾ മൂലം, പ്രാചീനയൂറോ
 പ്യന്റേയും അമേരിക്കയുടേയും പ്രജാധിപത്യത്തിന്റെ ഊററില്ലവും, ഇന്ത്യ
 തന്നെ. ഭാരതഭൂമാതാവ് ഒരു തരത്തിൽ നമ്മുടെതൊലും മാതാവാണ്!”
 ആ അമേരിക്കൻ തത്ത്വജ്ഞാനി ഇന്ത്യയുടെ പ്രീതിക്കുവേണ്ടി ‘ഭംഗീപറ
 ണ്തതല്ല ഇത്’. പരിഷ്കൃതരാജ്യങ്ങളിലെല്ലാംതന്നെ അഭിജ്ഞാനങ്ങൾ
 ക്കു ഭാരതത്തേയും അതിന്റെ മൂലഭാഷയായ സംസ്കൃതത്തേയും കുറിച്ച്
 വലിയ ബഹുമാനമാണുള്ളത്.

എന്നാൽ, നമ്മുടെ ചില ഉല്പത്തിക്കൾ—അഥവാ ഉല്പത്തിസ്തംഭം ന
 ടിക്കുന്നവർ—സംസ്കൃതത്തിന്റെ നേരെ കണ്ണുരുട്ടാൻ തുടങ്ങിയിട്ടുണ്ട്!
 ഒന്നരണ്ടു കൊല്ലത്തിനുമുമ്പു ഒരു സാഹിത്യശീരോമണിക്കാരൻ എഴുതിയി
 രുന്നു, അരുപതുകൊല്ലത്തേയ്ക്ക് സംസ്കൃതപഠനം നിർത്തിവെയ്ക്കണമെന്ന്;
 ഡിഗ്രിയോടൊപ്പം തനിക്കു ഉദ്യോഗം ലഭിച്ചില്ല എന്ന ഒരു പ്രധാന കാര
 ണം. തൊഴിലില്ലാത്ത കൈവിരലുകൾ ഇതിലപ്പുറവും എഴുതിയേക്കാം; എ
 ന്നാൽ കൊററില്ലാത്തതിൽ കോപിച്ചു സ്വന്തം പുര ചുട്ടെരിപ്പാൻ പന്തമെ
 ടക്കുന്നവർ ഒരു സാധാരണ മനുഷ്യനായിരിക്കുകയില്ല. കൊല്ലംതോറും ആ
 യിരക്കണക്കിൽ പുറത്തിറങ്ങുന്ന ബിരുദധാരികളെയെല്ലാം ഉടനടൻ ഉദ്യോ
 ഗത്തിലിരുത്തുക സാധ്യമാണോ? ഇയ്യടയിൽ ഒരു വകുപ്പിലേയ്ക്കു ഇരുപ
 ണ്തഞ്ചു ഗുരസ്ഥന്മാരെ എടുപ്പാൻ നിശ്ചയിച്ച പരസ്യംചെയ്തു മടീരാശി ഗ
 വമേങ്ങിനു മുമ്പായിരം എം. എ ബി എ. ക്കാരുടെ ഹരജികൾ കിട്ടിയെ
 ന്ന പത്രത്തിൽ കാണുകയുണ്ടായി.

ലജ്ജയുണ്ടെങ്കിലും, പരമാർത്ഥം പറയാതിരുന്നുകൂടല്ലോ: ഇന്ത്യക്കു തന
 തായി സംസ്കാരമൊന്നുമില്ലെന്നും, എല്ലാം ഈജിപ്തിൽ നിന്നോ മറ്റോ വ
 ന്നിറങ്ങിയതാണെന്നും ഉപനുസിപ്പാൻ തുവച്ചെടുത്ത ഒരു വമ്പിച്ച ചരിത്രാ
 ന്വേഷകനും എന്റെ നാട്ടിലുണ്ട്; ആ വിപ്ലവം ആലോചിച്ചിറങ്ങിയിരു
 ണ്തി പുഷ്പാൻ പുറത്തുവരാനും ചിലരുണ്ട്. അവരുടെ ഒരു മഹാകവി,
 ‘ഭടയുടെ പന്തോലച്ചുരുളുകൾ—ആശ്വഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ—പെരക്കിയെടുത്തു’
 തിയിലെറിയണമെന്നുകൂടി നീട്ടിനീട്ടിപ്പാടിയിരിക്കുന്നു! മഹാകവേ തന്റെ
 ടമുള്ളവർക്കൊക്കെ അറിയാം, ആ ഓലക്കീറുകൾ അനശ്വരങ്ങളാണെന്നും;
 കത്തിപ്പടന്ന് വിദേശീയാക്രമണത്തിൽ നിന്നുപോലും സ്വപ്രഭാവത്താൽ
 രക്ഷപ്പെട്ടവയാണെന്നും! മൂങ്ങകൾക്കിഷ്ടമല്ലെങ്കിലും, സൂര്യരശ്മികൾ വെളി
 ചും വിരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കും.

പ്രിയ ഭ്രാന്താക്കളെ, സ്വഭാഷകൾക്കു വെറുപ്പും പരപ്പും വളർത്തുവാൻ നിങ്ങൾ അഭിലാഷിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ? സനാതനങ്ങളായ സംസ്കാരങ്ങളെ സംരക്ഷിക്കേണമെന്നു നിങ്ങൾക്കു തോന്നുന്നുണ്ടോ ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ, നമ്മുടെ ഈ സൂര്യപുരുഷനെ അനുവർത്തിച്ച സംസ്കൃതപ്രമാണത്തിൽ അങ്ങേമാറ്റംവരെ പരിശ്രമിക്കുകയേ പോംവഴിയുള്ളൂ. സംസ്കൃതത്തിൽ ഒരു സ്ഥൂലജ്ഞാനമെങ്കിലും വേണം, ദേശഭാഷാസാഹിത്യത്തെത്തന്നെയും ശരിക്കുസപരിപാർ. വാല്മീകിവാണിയുടെ വരം കിട്ടിയതുകൊണ്ടല്ലയോ. കമ്പരും തുളസീദാസനും തുകാരാമനും മറ്റും രാമചരിതത്തെ അതു അന്തസ്സിലും ചന്തത്തിലും ഗാനം ചെയ്യുവാൻ ശക്തരായത്? ആധുനികദ്രാവിട മഹാകവി സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യഭാരതിയും പൊതുജനങ്ങളിൽ രാജഭക്തിയെ പ്രോജ്ജ്വലിപ്പിച്ചതു, സംസ്കൃതത്തിരികൊണ്ടുതന്നെ. ഭാരതിയുടെ ഭാസുരങ്ങളായ കൃതികളുടെ കയ്യെഴുത്തു പ്രതികൾ ഫോട്ടോവിലെടുത്തു കറുപ്പുചംഗളാവിൽ വെപ്പാൻ മദിരാശിഗവണ്മെന്റോലോചിക്കുന്നത് അത്യന്തം അഭിനന്ദനാർഹമായിരിക്കുന്നു.

“ഭാഷാവിഷയത്തിൽ ഇന്ത്യയോടു കിടനില്ക്കുന്ന ഒരു രാജ്യമില്ല: യൂറോപ്യൻ വ്യാകരണത്തിന്റെ പിതാവായ അരിസ്റ്റോട്ടലിന്റെ കാലത്തിന്നെ തുറയോ മുമ്പുതന്നെ ഭാരതീയവ്യാകരണം പൂർണ്ണമായെ പ്രാപിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.” ജെ. എൻ. ഫാക്ഫാർ എന്ന ചിന്തകന്റെ പ്രസ്താവമാണിത്. ഫിമാലയാപർവ്വതംപോലെ അക്ഷോഭ്യമായ ഒരു വ്യാകരണം ലോകത്തിലുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ, അതു സംസ്കൃതഭാഷയുടെതാണെന്നു ആരും സമ്മതിക്കും. എന്നാൽ വ്യാകരണങ്ങളെ വകവെക്കുന്നതും, നിലങ്ങളെ തിരസ്കരിക്കാതിരിക്കുന്നതും, പദ—പദാർത്ഥങ്ങളെ പരിചിന്തിക്കുന്നതും വാക്യങ്ങളെയഥേഷ്ടം വളയ്ക്കുതിരിക്കുന്നതും ഒരുതരം അടിമത്തമാണെന്നതെ, ചില പുത്തൻകൂറുകാരുടെ ഭാവം. ഒരു കോളേജുപ്രഫസർ—ദേശഭാഷാധ്യാപകനാണെങ്കിലും സംസ്കൃതവ്യാകരണമൊക്കെ തൊണ്ടതൊടാതെ വിഴങ്ങിയ വിരുതനാണെന്നു ഞാൻതന്നെ ഉദ്ഘോഷിച്ചുപോരുന്ന ഒരു ‘സാഹിത്യകുശലൻ’—സ്വാർത്ഥഭരിതപം എന്നൊരു പദം സൃഷ്ടിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. ആ കുശലന്റെ പ്രാമാണികത്വം വിശ്വസിച്ചു മറ്റൊരാളെത്തുകാരൻ അതു പകർക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. എന്തുകൊണ്ടുപാടില്ല, ഉദരംയ്യോദികളുടെ പന്തിയിൽ സ്വാർത്ഥം ഭരിക്കും ഇരിപ്പിടം കൊടുത്തുകൂടെയോ? പണ്ട് ഒരു വിദവാൻ ‘ഇഷ്ടപാത്രം’മെന്നൊക്കുമെങ്കിൽ (അസ്താകം എന്നതിന്നു പകരം) അസ്താത്രണമെന്നൊക്കുമെന്നു വാശി പിടിച്ചുപോൽ; ആ വൈയാകരണവർണ്ണ പുനർജന്മനിർമുക്തനായിട്ടില്ലായിരിക്കാം!

നിങ്ങളെ ചിരിപ്പിക്കാനല്ല, ഇന്നേത്തേ സംസ്കൃതപഠനത്തിന്റെ അസഹനീയമായ അസാമഞ്ജസ്യം തെല്ലൊന്നു സൂചിപ്പിക്കാനാണ് ഞാൻ ജ്ഞിവിടെ പറഞ്ഞത്. വിശുദ്ധമായ വ്യുല്പത്തിയും വിചാരശീലത്വവും ഉള്ളവർക്കു പഠിപ്പു പഠിപ്പല്ല; അത്തരം പഠിപ്പുകൊണ്ടു ഒരു കല്പസ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രികളെ നമുക്കു വീണ്ടും കിട്ടുകയുമില്ല. ഇന്ത്യയുടെരാഷ്ട്രഭാഷയായി ഫിനി നിർദ്ദേശിക്കപ്പെട്ടത്, സംസ്കൃതത്തിന്റെ തർക്കാലികസ്ഥിതിക

രതിമാത്രമാണ്; വാസ്തവത്തിൽ സംസ്കൃതമെന്നാണ്, ഈ ആചാരാഭ്യത്തിന്റെ പൊതുഭാഷയാകേണ്ടതു്. ഭരതനാട്യകൊണ്ടെങ്കിലും അതു സാധിക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണം അത്യുജ്ജ്വലമായിത്തീരണം, നമ്മുടെ സംസ്കൃതപ്രചാരണയത്നം. ഇതിൽ നമുക്കു ഗവർണ്ണമന്ത്രിയുടെ സാഹായ്യം വേണ്ടുവോളമുണ്ടാകുമെന്നുറപ്പിക്കാം: നമ്മുടെ വിദ്യാഭ്യാസമന്ത്രിയായ ഈ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ ഒരു മാസത്തിനുമുമ്പു മലബാറിൽ വെച്ചു് ഇക്കാര്യം തുറന്നുപറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നു; നിസ്സഹായതാഭയം ഒരിക്കലും നമ്മെ ബാധിക്കേണ്ടതില്ല.

ഗ്രന്ഥസംഭരണപദ്ധതിയിലും ശാസ്ത്രികളുടെ കാലാടകളെ നാം മുറയ്ക്കു പിന്തുടരണം. തെന്നിന്ത്യയിൽത്തന്നെയുണ്ടു്, ഇനിയും ഒട്ടേറെ ശ്രേഷ്ഠഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ മറഞ്ഞുകിടക്കുന്നു. മധുരാവിജയമെന്ന മധുരകാവ്യത്തിന്റെ പ്രണേതൃയായ ഗംഗാദേവിയായാൽ, 'ചതുസ്സപ്തതികാവ്യോക്തി വൃത്തവൈദ്യസംപദേ' എന്ന വിശേഷിക്കപ്പെട്ട അഗസ്ത്യഭട്ടന്റെ എഴുപത്തിനാലു സംസ്കൃത കാവ്യങ്ങളിൽ ബാലഭാരതമെന്നു വെളിച്ചത്തു വന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഇതു പോലെ അജ്ഞാതനാമാക്കളുടേയും ഉത്തമഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ എത്രയെത്രയുണ്ടായിരിക്കില്ല? നമ്മുടെ പുഴുസമ്പത്തുക്കളെ എണ്ണിനെയെങ്കിലും നാം കൈവശപ്പെടുത്തുകതന്നെ വേണം. ഇതിൽ ഇറങ്ങി പ്രവർത്തിപ്പാൻ നമ്മെ തികച്ചും യോഗ്യപ്പെടുത്തുന്നവയല്ലയോ, ഇന്ത്യാ പ്രധാനമന്ത്രി ജഗൽപൂജ്യനായ ജവഹർലാൽനെഹറു്, രണ്ടു മാസങ്ങൾക്കുമുമ്പു ചെയ്ത ഒരു പ്രസംഗത്തിലെ ഈ വാക്യങ്ങൾ:—“ഭാരതത്തിന്റെ വമ്പിച്ച നിധിയും പാരമ്പര്യവും എന്താണെന്നു എന്നോടു ചോദിച്ചാൽ സംസ്കൃതഭാഷ എന്നായിരിക്കും എന്റെ ഉത്തരം.....അതിനെ പോഷിപ്പിക്കുകയും, വിസ്മൃതമായ മായ അതിന്റെ അടിയിൽ പൂഴ്ന്നുകിടക്കുന്ന സാഹിത്യത്തെ ആരാഞ്ഞെടുത്തു് വെളിക്കൊണ്ടുവരികയും ചെയ്യാൻ പണ്ഡിതന്മാരെ ഏല്പെടുത്തണമെന്നു് എനിക്കാഗ്രഹമുണ്ടു്.”

കുപ്പസ്വാമി ശാസ്ത്രികൾ ജീവിച്ചിരിക്കെ, അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ജന്മനക്ഷത്രം കൊണ്ടാടുന്നതിൽ കൂടാതെല്ല, ശ്രാദ്ധദിനാരാധനത്തിൽ ചേരാനാണ്, മന്ദഭാഗ്യനായ എനിക്കു സംഗതിവന്നതു്. അഥവാ ശാസ്ത്രികളെപ്പോലെയുള്ള ശാശ്വതപ്രതിഷ്ഠാരെസ്സംബന്ധിച്ചേടത്തോളം ചാത്തവും പിറന്നാളും ഒരുപോലെതന്നെയെന്നു സമാധാനിക്കാം. സ്വർഗ്ഗതനായ ഗുരോ കനിഞ്ഞനുഗ്രഹിച്ചാലും: അങ്ങയെ അനുസ്മരിച്ചാരാധിക്കുന്ന ഈ സമിതിസാരസ്വതജ്യോതിസ്സിനാൽ പ്രശോഭിക്കുമാറാകട്ടെ!

വള്ളത്തോൾ.

FOREWORD

In this small volume are gathered together the appreciations of the many friends and admirers including pupils of the late Sri Kuppaswami Sastriar. I first came into contact with him in the office of Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar who indented on his superior knowledge of the Mimamsa for the interpretation of Smṛti texts. I have seen him in the Senate of the Madras University fighting for the causes he had at heart. I have seen him at closer quarters in the Annamalai University where we were both members of the Senate and Syndicate together. It is only now that I realise that he was six years younger than myself. I always paid him the respect due to a senior in age. That he was senior was an impression produced, I think, by the depth of his learning.

The combination in him of the Pandit's depth of learning with the most modern methods of research was so obvious a feature of his, that it receives mention in many appreciations here. I have heard him discourse in Samskrit with easy intelligibility, very rare in one of his deep learning.

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar used to remark that one of his profound learning could and should have produced many books. He has repeated it in his appreciation included in this volume. It is not perhaps in the tradition of a *Kulapati* to write books but only to teach all day long a vast number of pupils and be an exemplar to them. Till the end he believed that he would die an octagenarian and would perform the last offices to the mother who unfortunately survived him. Had he the length of life in retired leisure he hoped for he might have had time to write books. As it is, the Chronological Index prefixed to this volume and the appreciations of his many pupils show how active and strenuous his life has been.

He had done a great deal for Samskrit in his time, but even he would not have been able to stem the tide of opposition to Samskrit that is now in evidence.

The condition of *Samskrit Education* to-day is only a test of our love for Samskrit. True lovers of Samskrit in and out of the Samskrita Academy and Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute may yet do much to foster the cause of Samskrit education. If the cause of Samskrit education languished and failed, it will be our fault. We the members of the Academy and the Institute owe it to the memory of Sri Kuppuswami Sastri to promote Samskrit study.

T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRI,

PRESIDENT,

Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute.

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.

O. 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," 12th 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:

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

DR. 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 PROF. D. S. SARMA.

DEWAN BAHADUR K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI.

PROF. P. N. SRINIVASACHARIAR.

SRI N. RAGHUNATHAN.

SRI T. CHANDRASEKHARAN, M.A., LT.

SECRETARIES:

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

PROF. A. SHANMUKHA MUDALIAR, M.A.

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

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN:

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA.

VICE-CHAIRMAN:

PROF. K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.

MEMBERS:

RAO SASTRI S. VAITYAPURI 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.

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

EX-OFFICIO:

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

PROF. A. SHANMUKHA 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.

PUBLISHED BY K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR, K.S.R.I., MYLAPORE, MADRAS.