Chapter IV
INSIGHT AND INVESTIGATION

1. India and the Historical Consciousness

Till the last century, it was an affirmed truth, and in recent years a debatable ‘fact’, that the Indians\(^1\) do not have a sense of history or a historical consciousness. Many scholars have recently set up a counterargument to prove that there were historical records in some form or the other which account for the sense of history in ancient India.

It is well known that history is the aggregate or a record of past events.\(^2\) History as a discipline that records and interprets past events is of recent origin even in the western countries. It would be a naïve approach to look for the history as a disciple or for its parallel in the past. A wiser and balanced approach would be to consider history in its first two meanings i.e. it is the aggregate of past events and it is a record or narrative description of past events. In the following discussion history is taken to mean in these two senses only. Similarly it is not necessary to restrict oneself to the Hegelian concept and scope of the history which is too narrow to ‘think’ and in itself a Vadato vyāghāta (TRAUTMANN 2012: 193-196). It can be gleaned from GB’s writings and the scheme of the Grundriss that his concept of history was certainly broader. While unveiling the political history was at the centre, history of religion, literature, sciences were parts of his studies.

(A) Historical Consciousness:

Non-availability of ‘historical’ records or accounts is not an adequate evidence to prove the non-existence of historical consciousness. Trying to prove the

\(^1\) Here and in the discussion that follows the word Indians means people from the Indian subcontinent in ancient and medieval times.

existence of historical consciousness on the basis of existence of historical literature in the past is actually supporting a direct relation between the two things and thus missing the germ of the problem. There is no direct and simple answer to the question. It is a more complex one.

The historical sense plays a role in three aspects –

(1) Documentation of the past events.

(2) Preservation of the tangible and intangible past.

(3) Historical approach while interpreting the Śāstras.

(1) Documentation:
1. Events
Documentation of past events is merely one of the attestations of historical consciousness of an individual or a society. A comparatively small number of historical texts, in form of Kāvyas, Prabandhas, Caritas etc., have come down to us. This is because that a number of works may have been lost in time; according to Arvind SHARMA due to the vicissitude (2003: 223) and according to GB due to non-popularity and thus discontinuity in copying and recopying of MSS.

2. Family Lineage
Documentation of genealogy was and is of great importance in India. Though the motives are of at times religious and spiritual nature, the family history is preserved most consciously in the Varṇśāvalis, at the pilgrim places etc. The epigraphs of ancient rulers which is one of the most authentic tool to unearth the history of India, bore the genealogy of the donor Kings and the donees.

(2) Preservation:
Preservation of various historical objects, monuments etc. belonging to ancient times were in eroded condition when recovered from oblivion. In so unsettled a country like India, as far as foreign invasions are concerned, no wonder that the heritage in form of monuments, architecture remained neglected. The copperplates were preserved with care because they were of practical importance. Even forgeries were made. The western part of India especially
Gujarat and Rajasthan were and are rich as regards to MSS. The preservation of ancient texts through oral tradition can be regarded as the greatest achievements, which is not generally recognized as one of the activities to preserve the past and that too with so much care. Similarly, though so many works must have lost in time a major portion of literary sources has come down to us through the writing and copying activities of at least more than a thousand year. Writing commentaries with the help of earlier commentaries and consulting the living Pandits and thus preserving the original text is also an important part of preserving the history of the concerned text. (Details below.)

Traditions, customs, rituals, folk-lore, art, religion and languages all contribute to history in a broader sense. The historical linguistics would hardly exist and survive without dealing with Sanskrit and Prakrit languages. In this sense India has preserved not only her own history but has contributed to preserve customs of other such groups which are now a part of the Indian community and has preserved an era of the most ancient times.

(3) Historical approach towards interpreting and analyzing Śāstra:
The history is an art as well as a science. Indian tradition does not count Itihāsa under Śāstra or philosophy or technical science. Even while treating the Śāstras authors are inclined towards structural analysis rather than historical as has been rightly pointed out by TRAUTMANN (2012: 202). GB has noted that “the tradition is utterly untrustworthy in the details regarding the names and times of the authors, and the immediate causes of their composition” (1884B: 29).

If the complete writings of GB are analysed it would be evident that GB considered all the three aspects mentioned above while judging the historical sense which Indians possess. Consequently he fully trusted the literary and commentarial traditions of the country for interpreting the texts. This will be elaborated further in this thesis. He frequently corroborated contemporary customs prevalent in the country with the ancient society and culture. He strongly believed that there is continuity in the culture and the observations of
the present society can guide us to solve the problems of the past which he has done successfully.

(B) Historical Perspective:
As has been discussed above historical consciousness is depicted in various aspects of life of ancient Indians. Consciousness means awareness. Perspective is different than awareness or knowledge. It reflects a way of regarding situations or topics etc. It can be defined as the appearance of things relative to one another as determined by their distance from the viewer.

The question whether the Indians possessed any historical consciousness or not, need to be dealt with a sympathetic and pragmatic viewpoint in the true sense. Imposing today’s ideas of history on the past may mislead a student or researcher. GB could deploy the sources of Indian history in the right direction to reconstruct the past the reason is, in my opinion, that GB understood the Indian perspective of history.

(1) Timelessness:
For Indian people, in hindsight, the relative appearance of various past events is not linear. Hence, the chronological relation of events to one another, appears drastically different. Thus, there is the legend of nine gems, where nine brilliant men from history gather together in the court of Vikramāditya.

(2) Indians regard past events with poetical perspectives:
In his interesting article titled “‘In the Guise of Poetry’ - Kalhaṇa Reconsidered” while refuting SCHNELLENBACH’s argument SLAJE has shown that though the Rājatarāṅgini certainly represents the true history writing in India at the same time it is also a Sanskrit Kāvyā with Śānta as its prime Rasa, composed according to the strict norms of the Kāvyāśāstra prevalent at that time (SLAJE 2008: 207-243). This poetical perspective of ancient Indian authors is not limited to the structure of the poem but has its effect on over all expression of the history.

GB was very much aware of this style and was able to infer the ‘correct’ historical facts from the poetical descriptions. For instance there is an expression
in Samudragupta’s Praśasti that his glory had gone up to heaven. Fleet deduces from it that the inscription must have been composed after Samudragupta’s death. However, GB refutes this supposition with the help of ample similar examples from the classical Sanskrit literature and shows how this interpretation is wrong (Ghate 1970: 6; 1890d: 6). In his article on the Harṣāvardhana’s conquest of Nepal (1890b: 40-41) he has pointed out a sentence from Harṣacarita, otherwise a simple sentence describing an act of Śiva, but in typical word-play style of Bāṇa it confirms the conquest of a Himalayan region by king Harṣa. GB uses this to support the data from other inscriptional evidences which point towards Harṣa’s conquest of Nepal. Scholars except Levi and Ettinghausen have accepted his conjecture (Majumdar 1962: 113 fn. 1).

GB refuted Max Müller’s theory of renaissance and showed that there existed artificial i.e. classical ornate poetry as early as at least second c. CE. Similarly he showed that Praśasti Kāvyas and court poetry were in vogue at that time. That means there must have existed historical Kāvyas and narratives which were not fortunate enough to reach to us.

History not only comes in the form of poetry and prose but also in Campū form (Ghate 1970: 34) like the Samudragupta Praśasti which is in prose as well as in poetry.

It is necessary to understand the peculiar nature of the historical literature to deduce the historical facts presented by it.

1.1. Approach towards Historical Kāvyas

(A) Trends in Approaching the Historical Kāvyas:
There are two distinct broad views on the Indian historical literature. The early Indologists anticipated the discovery of systematic historical account of India. With the disappointment generated after discovering the historical literature it was concluded that there was no historical literature nay in fact, there was no historical consciousness among Indians and specially, the Hindus lacked a sense of history. On the other hand post-modern scholars have criticized this approach. They do believe that there existed literature in India which can be termed as historical; though they slightly differ about the exact nature and scope of such a literature.
Arvind SHARMA thinks that the Hindus did possess a sense of history but the very evidence for the fact may have been lost on account of historical vicissitude (2003: 223).

Scholars who consider Indian historical texts as ‘historical writings’ have tried to place them into the framework of post-modern historiography (SCHNELLENBACH referred to in SLAJE 2008: 209) while SLAJE has argued that “although pre-modern India had seen the development of ‘true’ history writing, the intrinsic motivation and the concomitant incentives were not always exactly the same as in Europe.” (SLAJE 2008: 239). He has rightly evaluated Kalhana’s Rājatarāṅgini in accordance with the model established by the Mahābhārata and the Dhvani theory of the Kāvyasastra pointing out the limitations of cross-cultural investigations such as done by SCHNELLENBACH. He demonstrates that “reliable historiography may even come guised in poetry, inspired by soteriological purposes” (SLAJE 2008: 239).

GB, who himself discovered four historical Kāvyas,³ did definitely expect discovery of historical literature and has predicted that “the Hindus did, and do still, possess many historical poems, and that with a little patience they will come out.” (1877b: 64). Some scholars quote a sentence from GB’s letter to NÖLDEKE⁴ that “you are a little out of date with your notion that Indians have no historical literature”⁵ (ALI 2013: 240 from TAWNEY 1901: v after JOLLY 1899: 13-14). However GB did not expect in any way the historical Kāvyas as a systematic record of historical events as was conceived by the contemporary Europe. GB gives a special treatment to this literature. He not only points out the shortcomings of such Kāvyas but also the importance that they still possess from the point of view of history. He enumerated the peculiarities of such Kāvyas in the following words:

---
³ Vikramāṅkadevacarita, Gauḍavaha, Prthivirājagīvijaya, Kīrtikaumudī.
⁴ Theodor NÖLDEKE (1836-1928)
⁵ JOLLY originally says: “»Mit Deiner Idee, dass die Inder keine historische Litteratur haben, stehst Du auf einem veralteten Standpunkte«, kann er [GB] schon 1877 an NÖLDEKE berichten. »In den letzten 20 Jahren sind 5 ziemlich umfangreiche Werke gefunden, die von Zeitgenossen der beschriebenen Ereignisse herrühren, 4 davon habe ich gefunden. [Vikramāṅkadevacarita, Gauḍavaha, Prthivirājagīvijaya, Kīrtikaumudī]. Ich bin noch mehr als einem Dutzend auf der Spur«” (JOLLY 1899: 13-14).
(B) Peculiarities of Historical Kāvyas:

(1) Conventional Descriptions:

GB notes “The hero or heroes are painted all white and their enemies all black. Āhavamalla and Vikrama have no more individuality than Rāma, Duṣyanta or Purūravas. They are simply perfections and their enemies are entirely contemptible and wicked” (1875H: 4).

It is worth quoting how GB refutes arguments placing Kālidāsa in the 6th c. CE depending on the mention of Huṇas by Kālidāsa. It also depicts his understanding of this type of literature.

“Indian poets, even when describing triumphs of historical kings, their very master and patrons, are frequently quite inaccurate in their geographical and ethnographical accounts, and instead of giving actual facts, they take their stand on the traditional accounts in the epics, Purāṇas and other older works that describe digvijayas. … If we look into his [Kālidāsa’s] works more carefully, we shall find that they contain much that points to his having made use of the sources mentioned above [Mahābhārata, Bhuvanavinyāsa in the Purāṇa-s] … It [the digvijaya of Raghu] also mentions, side by side with peoples like the Pārasikas (verse 60) and Yavanas (61), the Huṇas (68) and Kambojas (69), which can never justly belong to the time of the poet, not even to a single period of time whatsoever.” (GHATE 1970: 93-94).6

GB further illustrates examples from other Kāvyas where Vākpati makes Yośovarman conquer Pārasikas when the Persian empire was no longer in existence, Bilhana makes the king Ananta conquer non-existent Śakas and Anant’s son Kalaśa conquers Strī-rājya and visits Alakā city.

The conventional poetical norms flood the composition with descriptions of four seasons, mountains, rivers etc.

---

6 Mixing of semi-historical data (probably based on Samudragupta’s Praśasti at Allahabad) with the mythical one has been attempted by Kālidāsa e.g. The southern rulers mentioned in Raghuv’s digvijaya do not appear when Rāma had to reside in the forest and had to invade Rāvana.
(2) Poetical Description:
The poetical treatment most of the times makes the work verbose. GB complains “had Bāna avoided the abuse of similies, heaped one on the other, into which his admiration of Subandhu lead him, his Harṣacarita would comprise about 3000 ślokas instead of 4800. Bilhaṇa, on his part might have compressed the subject matter of his cantos VII-XIII into a very small compass if he had been willing to spare his readers the hackneyed descriptions of the four seasons and the inventory of the charms of Vikrama’s bride Candaladevi.” (1875H: 3-4 fn. 1).

GB has very critical views about the hackneyed descriptions in the Kāvyas. However he appreciates the real Kāvyya element. Sometimes the poetic description is very picturesque. GB praises one of the descriptions in the following words - “… the manner in which Samudragupta was ordained by his father to be his successor … It is not possible to have a more concise and a more graphic picture of the situation. There is not a word which is unnecessary and one believes as if he sees the scene with his own eyes, .... This verse is one of the best productions the Indians have given us, in the domain of miniature portraits, which is their forte.” (GHATE 1970: 42).

(3) Exaggeration:
Though this is one of the greatest drawbacks of poetical treatment it is also the easiest veil to uncover. For instance in the Vikramāṇkadevacarita Bilhaṇa assures boldly in the case of every expedition undertaken by the Cālukyas against the Colas, that the latter were utterly extinguished, though shortly afterwards he has to confess that fresh movements of the hereditary foe forced the Cālukya prince to repeat the process of annihilation (1875H: 4). It is evident in this case that in spite of the ‘stylistic’ exaggeration in expressions and the consequent contradictions the author has not twisted, tampered, conceal or falsified the historical data.

(4) No Exactness and Details:
“Another grave defect which arises from the poetical treatment of historical subjects, is that the intervals between the events narrated are rarely given with
exactness. The same carelessness, which is shown about time, prevails also with regard to the description of the minor personages mentioned. Bilhaṇa gives the names of the kings with whom Vikrama came into hostile or friendly contact in a few cases only and Bāṇa is often guilty of the same neglect. Finally the characters suffer as much as the events.” (1875H: 4). The heroes do not possess a distinct character not to speak about the minor personages.

(5) Based on Historical Facts:
GB remarks that though Indians are inclined to change the historical events of the most recent past, for purely poetical reasons, into myths the seemingly fanciful legends rest upon historical basis (BURGESS M. 1907: 171; 1888o: 628). He has shown with examples that the main facts mentioned in such Kāvyas are historical e.g. the facts of Vikramāditya’s life mentioned in the Vikramāṅkacakarita are historical. He asserts that the facts related to Vikramāditya and his family agree mainly with those obtained from the other sources. They may with proper care be used to rectify and to complete the information gained elsewhere (1875H: 5). He points out that Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita not only contains all the main facts given in corresponding portion of Hiuen Tsang’s (Hsüan-tsang) narrative but it also adds many details and corrects the Chinese traveler’s account on many points. GB has shown in case of every historical Kāvyā edited or commented upon by him that the authors certainly drew on historical sources or tradition which in the main points were trustworthy (1892av: 35).

(6) Important for the Literary History:
The Caritas furnish also important contributions to the literary history of India. Bāṇa devotes nearly two Ucchvāsas to his personal affairs and mentions incidentally many famous writers. Hence his work is important for the history of Sanskrit literature. Bilhaṇa gives the eighteenth canto to a description of his country, Kashmir, and to an account of its rulers, of his family and of his own adventures (1875H: 5).
(7) Historical Kāvyas more reliable than the Prabandhas:

GB assigns greater credibility to the historical Kāvyas composed by the contemporary court-poets than the Prabandhas based on the bardic tradition (BURGESS M. 1907: 159). The Prabandhas are founded exclusively on the tradition of the bards and the Jaina monasteries, wherein the kings very soon became mythical personalities. If the statements of the inscriptions are combined with the narratives of the Prabandhas we will find a mixture of truth and fiction, in which contradictions are apparent.

GB finds that Padmagupta’s poem Navasāhasāṅkacarita is little more reliable than the Prabandhas. That means he assigns greater credibility to the historical Kāvyas composed by the contemporary court-poets than the Prabandhas composed later in time based on the bardic tradition.

Reasons of discontinuity:

GB while understood the peculiar characteristics of the Indian historical literature he was also aware of the system and channel through which the literature has now reached us. According to GB “the reason of scarcity of such Kāvyas, lies not, therein, that the rulers of India found no contemporaries willing to chronicle their deeds, but therein that nobody cared to preserve historical works from destruction or to make them easily accessible by copying and recopying the original MSS” (1875H: 2). The scribes or their patrons were reluctant to copy a historical composition. The want of popularity (1875H: 3) is one of the reasons for laying this class of literature in the oblivion. The class entrusted with reading, using and copying MSS was more interested in the religious, ritualistic and philosophical texts. GB, with his usual discernment, analyses the psyche of the scribes and readers of historical Kāvyas, which adversely affected recopying of their MSS.

(C) Psyche of the Scribes:

(1) Greater liking for Fictions:

GB, probably due to his acquaintance with the Pandits of his time, remarks that “the Pandits have a greater liking for the wonderful legends of the heroic age
and for the marvelous stories of the kings. They have lifted them out of the sphere of matter-of-fact history and transferred to the regions of fiction.” (1875H: 1). This obviously restricts the popularity and eventual transmission of such texts which bear historical records.

(2) Attraction towards Mythical Characters and the “Happier Yugas”:
Why literate classes preferred fictions over chronicle? The reason stated by GB is that for them Rāma, Arjuna, and Nala are as much historical personalities as Śivāji the Great or Bājī Rāo Peshvā. But they appear so much more interesting to him, because their deeds are more marvelous and they are surrounded by the halo of sanctity that encircles the happier Yugas in which they are supposed to have lived (1875H: 1-2). It is, therefore, according to GB, no wonder that countless copies of Naiṣadhiyacarita should exist all over India, while, hitherto historical compositions are rare to obtain (1875H: 2).

(3) The conventional descriptions make them all the same:
Typical descriptions must have not attracted readers’ attention and mind unless the language and the poetic elements are exceptionally well.

(D) GB’s method of dealing with such Kāvyas:
(1) Remove the Kāvyam/ mythic element:
While extracting historical information obviously conventional descriptions of seasons, journeys, marriages, fanciful descriptions, exaggerations have to be ignored but at the same time poetic tools like divine intervention etc. should be looked at with suspicion as is done by GB in the Vikramāṅkadevacarita. There the god Śiva appears frequently to guide the hero, nay actually to save the hero when he comes into combat with the moral law. In such cases the historical facts are not shunned but presented with the help of poetic tools in such a way so as to justify the deeds of the hero.
(2) Consider the Style of the Author:
Inferring correct historical fact from a poetical description is necessary which requires knowledge of the style of the author e.g. the description of Harṣa’s conquest of Himalayan region in the Harṣacarita and the use of homonymous words therein. See Chapter IV.

(3) Check the historicity with the help of other corroborative evidences.

(4) If the poet is contemporary or nearer to the events in time then the possibility of authenticity increases.

1.2. Trust in the Tradition
Documentation of past events is one of the attestations of historical consciousness of an individual or a society. Similarly, to preserve or trying to preserve a tradition having cultural value; be it oral, textual or of any kind, through documentation of some sort must be considered as one of the manifestations of historical consciousness. This concept can be gleaned from GB’s writings, especially through his treatment of the commentaries while editing various texts.

The word tradition can be explained as an inherited pattern of action or thought i.e. a specific practice of long standing. With regard to the transmission of the ancient Sanskrit literature, there existed three types of traditions, namely oral tradition, written or MSS tradition and the tradition of commentarial works embodied in the first two. GB believed that, there lies some truth in the memories of past preserved through these traditions. Unlike the other contemporary western scholars, he was more inclined towards trusting the traditional account - of an event, a person or a text.

In this section, GB’s views on Sanskrit commentaries and literary tradition in general will be enumerated and the importance of his approach will be highlighted.
(A) GB’s Approach:
GB asserts that generally old commentaries are nearer to the original treatise in time than the oldest MSS of the text available to us. Hence they are a trustworthy tool for textual criticism. To express it in his words a text enjoys the “protection of commentary”. He doubts the genuineness of many passages from Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra because the work remained for a long time without the protection of a commentary (1882Ib: xxxv). His concern was that no older commentary based on the living tradition of the Baudhāyanīyas was available (1882Ib: xlv). In his opinion such texts, which are not protected by a commentary, have been liable to changes and some portions from them may be easily lost in course of transmission of the texts (1878: 80).

At times, against the views of his contemporaries he adheres to the opinions expressed by the commentators (1886K: xciv). While editing the Vāsiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra he states that Krṣṇapāṇḍita’s commentary shows considerable scholarship, and has been of great value to him and that he has followed him mostly in the division of the Sutras (1882Ib: xxviii).

Justifying his trust in the commentators, he adduces the scholarship and ability of commentators and appreciates the trustworthy qualities present in their writings. Features of such commentaries have been elucidated by him in detail. Following are his views about Medhātithi’s commentary on the Manusmṛti, which are cited here in full to point out GB’s reflections:

“As its title, bhāṣya, indicates, it is not a gloss which paraphrases every word of the text. Its aim is to show the general sense of Manu’s dicta, to elucidate all really difficult passages, and to settle all doubtful points by a full discussion of the various possible interpretations, and of the opinions advanced by others. In carrying out this plan Medhātithi displays a great amount of learning and not inconsiderable ability. He carefully uses a number of more ancient commentaries on Manu, and shows a full acquaintance with the śāstras requisite for the successful explanation of his text, with Vedic literature, grammar, Mīmāṃsā, the Dharmasūtras and...
other Smṛtis, Vedānta, and the Mahābhārata. At the same time he avoids the common fault of Sanskrit commentators, — an undue copiousness in quotations which bear only remotely on the subject under consideration. Moreover, he frequently enhances the value of his explanations by illustrating Manu’s rules by instances taken from everyday life, a point which most Hindu writers on law and on kindred subjects entirely neglect. Finally, he frequently takes up a much more independent position towards his author than the other commentators dare to assume.” (1886K: cxix). “His copiousness in quoting the opinions of his predecessors makes his work extremely important for the student of the history of the Manusmṛti and of the Hindu law” (1886K: cxx).

Here, the following peculiarities can be gleaned, which are more or less generally possessed by the commentarial works of ancient India.

1. Copiousness
2. Use of ancient commentaries
3. Use of older MSS
4. Access to old living traditions
5. Requisite knowledge of the Śāstras

Because of such characteristics commentarial works become an authentic source of knowledge for the history of original texts. Their presence is of very much importance, especially for the ancient Indian literature where other philological and material tools are despairingly scanty. It is not surprising that GB, a historian at his core, gives an upper hand to the history of text rather than mere and pure grammatical approach for settling the correct readings in a text.

GB displays faith not only in the commentarial tradition but also in the traditional knowledge or floating knowledge, so to say, of texts. He was very much convinced about the insightfulness of Sanskrit Pandits. Following remarks are worth noting:

---

7 GB himself worked on more than 2500 legal suits for the *Digest of Hindu Law*. 
“To give a translation without having recourse to conjectural emendations was impossible [for me], as a European philologist is unable to avail himself of those wonderful tricks of interpretation which permit an Indian Paññit to extract some kind of meaning from the most desperate passages” (1882Ib: xxviii).

Of course, his faith is far from a blind following. He is well aware that this tool needs to be used with due caution. One must be aware of the flaws that these works tend to possess. He refuses to mention Krṣṇapandita’s interpretations at times wherever he finds them opposed to logical rules of interpretation (1882Ib: 83 fn. 35). He discerns between good commentators from a bad ones. In the translation of the Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra, he has stated exclusively that though the commentary of Govinda was of much importance for the translation, he cannot place him in the same rank with Haradatta, the commentator of Āpastamba and Gautama (1882Ib: xlv). Frequently he makes it a point to note the opinions of commentators both in cases where he agrees with them and where he differs from them (1882Ib: xxviii). This fact about GB’s writings makes him a “faithful transmitter” of the traditional texts. He gives, in a way, philological and scientific expression to the literary tradition.

Two instances can be cited as illustrations of the correctness of GB’s methods.

(1) In his article titled “A disputed meaning of the particles iti and cha” (1887a: 13-20) the objections against the interpretations of the indigenous commentators of the words iti and ca have been refuted. The traditional view about the meaning of these words is that they also mean, depending upon the context, ‘and so forth’, ‘and the like’. Majority of European Sanskritists had doubted or denied this meaning and the standard Sanskrit dictionaries have omitted it. There was no tool to settle the matter before the works of Hemacandra came to light through GB’s efforts. He deployed it to point out the usage of these words in that particular sense, adduced by the author himself through his own commentary
(1887a: 14-15). He has shown through various examples that the traditional viewpoint is correct. At the same time he did not forget to state that it would be improper to assume that the commentators must be right in each individual case. As the particle *iti* is used in many different ways, their statements are always ought to be subjected to a careful examination (1887a: 16).

(2) The word *bhrūṇa* denotes two meanings in Sanskrit, an embryo and a Brāhmaṇa. The Petersburg dictionary and the Monier-Williams’s dictionary which follows it do rarely accept the meaning Brāhmaṇa and that too with hesitation; and otherwise render the meaning as embryo. GB argues in his “Lexicographical Notes” (1888j: 182-185) on the basis of Baudhāyana-Grhyasūtra and Haradatta’s commentary on Āpastamba (1888j: 182) that the latter meaning is comparatively rare. He cites many references from Brāhmaṇas and particularly from Dharmaśāstra texts where the meaning embryo is utterly impossible and the word *bhrūṇa* needs to be translated as a Brāhmaṇa. He derives the word from the Vedic root *bhūr* meaning “to move quickly, to be active”.

(B) GB and Böhtlingk:

From the above discussion it is evident that GB had not only studied the texts minutely but while doing so he also had cautious openness towards varied viewpoints. This approach of GB stands in contrast with the attitude of Otto Böhtlingk. For example according to Böhtlingk Haradatta cannot make any claims of authority in matters of language since he lacks the European critical attitude. He thinks that GB reveres Haradatta to the extent, that he follows him unquestioningly (Böhtlingk 1885b: 517). While indulged in his cavalier attitude Böhtlingk missed to note that GB had examined the commentaries carefully and that he did not hesitate to state if and where the commentary is not useful. GB did not even shun accepting that he is not certain about correctness of

---

8 *iti*:

1. Meaning *ādī - apatyam ity anviktā niyatā lingavacanāh, itiṣābdasyādyarthatvād apatyodayo niyatāh! Liṅgānuśāsana VIII.1 (1887a: 14).
ca: cakāro ‘nuktasamucchayārthah tena cānteṣv adhyarcaḥ, adhyarcam ity api! Liṅgānuśāsana V.12 (1887a: 18).
his translation (1879Ia: 56 fn. 14). BÖHTLINGK gives excessive importance to grammatical correctness of language. As has been stated by OLIVELLE he substituted his notions of grammatical rectitude for manuscript evidence and totally disregarded the possibility of dialectical variants and Prakritic forms in Āpastamba’s work (2000: 470). On the other hand, for GB, along with language, what else has importance was the minute observation of literary tradition. Boasting of European critical attitude is hardly traceable in his writings. OLIVELLE approves completely GB’s method of following Haradatta while he appreciates the meticulous commentator in the following words:

“..... he [Haradatta] was everything that BÖHTLINGK was not: a man who was scrupulously faithful to the text he received from the tradition, who compared different manuscripts and oral traditions and noted carefully variant readings, who consulted the works of previous commentators, and who carefully preserved for future generations even readings that he regarded as faulty. I think BÜHLER was right in taking Haradatta as a reliable guide in reconstructing the Dharmasūtra, especially because the sources Haradatta used predate the oldest extant manuscripts by perhaps as much as 400 years.” (OLIVELLE 2000: 471)

GB’s views, though opposed by many of his contemporaries, are subscribed to by the latest scholarship (OLIVELLE 2000: 470-471 and numerous references to GB in his Manu’s Code of Law 2005).

(C) Faithful Transmitter:
OLIVELLE has shown in his ingenious article Unfaithful transmitters Philological Criticisms and Critical Editions of the Upaniṣads how neglect of texts received from manuscript material, an outrageous practice of emendations not based on manuscript evidence and tampering the texts as result of philological hubris can cause to create a new and unfaithful textual transmission that misleads later scholars (1998: 173-187). He argues that native commentators and theologians did not, as often assumed, carelessly or deliberately change the received texts to suit their doctrinal or grammatical tastes but it is the modern philologists who
are often guilty of changing the texts to suit preconceived notions of correctness, whether grammatical or otherwise (OLIVELLE 1998: 182-183).

In fact, commentators like Haradatta preserve even unusual forms for modern scholarly scrutiny (OLIVELLE 1999: 569). Regarding the sources of Haradatta OLIVELLE arrives at the same conclusion as drawn by GB that Haradatta consulted men acquainted with oral tradition of the Āpastambīyas. GB’s remark in this connection that “no ingenuity of interpretation can convert Śiṣṭas into palm-leaves” (OLIVELLE 1999: 570; GB 1892D: vii-viii) is the most illustrious one.

OLIVELLE remarks that there has been among western scholars a pervasive mistrust of ancient Indian interpreters and commentators. Early scholars were confident -- to modern eyes, overconfident – of their ability to uncover “original” meanings through philological acumen unmediated by native gloss or comment (1998: 173). However, this is not true in case of GB as is evident from afore said examples.

OLIVELLE has pointed out regarding Die Kritischen Ausgaben of the Upaniṣads that none of these used manuscript material. There is no evidence that even a thorough search for manuscripts was ever undertaken (1998: 174). In GB we find an exception. The earlier sections of the present thesis describe the major role played by GB in collection of MSS. With an in depth analysis of the writing tradition, through not inconsiderable number of MSS; and understanding its limitations as also its indispensability has allowed GB to approve of the MSS evidences and to use these sources to the fuller extent.

GB edited Āpastambīya-Dharmasūtra and Daśakumāracarita critically. GB’s translations of the four Dharmasūtras published under the Sacred Book of the East, though based on MSS do not contain the texts. Out of his complete writings, the said two editions are the critical editions in the real sense. Thirteen MSS were used for the Āpastamba. Detailed critical apparatus has been given recording all the variant readings along with the views of the commentator. For the Daśakumāracarita six MSS and two printed editions were used. His practice is to put conjectural emendations in the notes and not in the main body of the text. In case of Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra he even declares explicitly that he
alone is responsible for the title Kaṇḍikā given to the small sections since MSS do not specify any title (1882Ib: xlv fn. 3). This shows his concern to preserve the tradition with utmost care without slightest tampering.

From the above discussion it can be safely concluded that, to use OLIVELLE’s term, GB was a faithful transmitter as far as the literary tradition is concerned. He was a faithful transmitter in many other matters which will be shown in the next sections of the thesis.

2. Tracing ideas back to the Context

What an archaeological context to the artefacts is the past cultural context to a custom, or to an idea to be meaningful and to be able to narrate the story of the past. Take an artefact out of its context and you reduce that artefact to no more than a mere remain. The information about its maker is gone. Similarly without the use of an appropriate context the information about a word, concept or custom is gone. For example, with so much material unearthed, since the stratum of the evolution and development of the script to which the Indus script belongs is unknown the script still, after more than 100 years of its discovery, remains in the dark.

Taking into consideration the context in which certain custom, usage or idea has originated can help to understand its purpose and meaning, and thus can serve as a significant tool to unravel some of the mysteries of the past. Such a thought process is visible in some ingenious discoveries by GB. He was able to postulate the context in which, for instance technical terms, came to be in use. Such a context can be textual, material, linguistic, social etc.; i.e. related to any aspect of culture.

It can be seen how “tracing ideas back to the context” has helped GB to interpret an unknown feature occurring in some inscriptions. At first he took the word *dṛṣṭam* occurring at the beginning of a Vākāṭaka copperplate grant as a sign of good omen and translated it as *Om* (1883m: 245)⁹. This view was based upon PRINSEP’s facsimile of Siwanī plates which reads *O Om Siddham*. Dr.

---

⁹ Probably the facsimiles were made over to him and not the original plates (1883: 239 fn. 2).
BHAGVANLAL INDRAJI and FLEET read the word occurring in the beginning of the Ilichpur and Siwanī grants as *drśam* though they did not interpret the purpose of occurrence of the seemingly unrelated word. GB tried to show that, though the resemblance of the letters in the two documents to *drśam* is indisputable, they must be read *om om* or *o om*. However, in his article titled “A Prakrit Grant of the Pallava king Śivaskandavarman” published nine years after the said Vākāṭaka grant was published, GB changed his view after having inspected the original plates (1892af: 9-10) and has proposed a logical meaning and reasoning about the matter. He interpreted for the first time that it denotes ‘seen’— the note indicating that the copy of the grant given to the donees had been *seen*, and was endorsed by the minister or by the keeper of the records (1892af: 9). This ingenious interpretation is certainly a result of seeing the word in the context of the charter and postulating the official procedure of issuing such plates. To develop such an insight the Digest of Hindu Law must have played a major role in GB’s career.

(A) The Digest of Hindu Law:
It is already propounded that the Digest of Hindu Law was a kind of training part in GB’s career which helped him to develop an insight into the subject and methods. During this work he must have found new avenues and methods of research, particularly suitable for Indian studies.

Raymond WEST, the co-author of the book explains how Hindu law should be studied:

“To be correctly apprehended the Hindū law, like other systems of law, must be studied in its history, and in its connexion with the religious and ethical notions of the people among whom it has come to prevail.” (1884B: 8).

(B) Interpretation of Concepts:
Studying the concepts in their history, or studying the history of concepts is an indispensable tool to unearth the meanings of the past. Evidently, concepts are expressed through words and digging their forgotten meanings from oblivion is a
task of great skill and ingenuity. Like the word *drṣṭam* GB has tried to explain many words and concepts. Some of them are as follows.

(1) Rājūkas - The Land Surveyors:
One of the important and widely accepted interpretations given by GB is of the word Rājūka. He has shown that the two dialectical forms Rājūka and Lajūka are derived from Rajjūka, and that this is an abbreviation of rajju-grāhaka, ‘rope-holder’, which occurs in the Jātaka (1893b: 466-467). Basically Rājūkas were the land surveyors. The Rajjūka originally ‘held the rope’ in order to measure the fields and to assess the land-tax. Thus the word became the designation of a revenue settlement officer.

(2) Vaijayika Dharmasthāna:
GB translates the word Vaijayika Dharmasthāna which usually appears in the copperplate Grants of the Vākāṭakas as “victorious office of justice” and adds in the footnote that “it is not only the ministry of justice, but the office where all business relating to justice, spiritual matter and charities is transacted” (1883m: 246). MIRASHI states that the Vijayadharmanā should be taken as the capital of the ruler (1957: 226) while he defines it as “historical place of religious worship” (1963: 14). SHASTRI argues that the term Dharmasthāna refers to court of justice (1997: 4), and that the expression Vaijayika preceding it, is merely honorific. GB’s interpretation seems logical though he does not try to explain the word Vaijayika. MIRASHI thinks that since the Tirodi plates of Pravarasena II are not issued from the capital, i.e. Pravarapura, they omit the word Vaijayika Dharmasthāna (1933-34: 170). However, this does not hold true with the recently found Khāṃḍvī copperplate of the same ruler (BAPAT 2010: 14, 16, also see 21 fn. 94). It is not issued from the Pravarapura and still deploys the word Vaijayika Dharmasthāna. It is evident that GB’s interpretation is more probable which takes into consideration the broader (and typically Sanskrit) meaning of the word Dharma, as also the context of the procedure related to issuing of such Grants.
(3) Senāpati:
Both the Siwanī and Ilichpurs grant are dated in the eighteenth year of the reign of Pravarasena II, in the month of Phālguna and Jyeṣṭha respectively. On the former the Senāpati Bappadeva is mentioned, and on the latter the Senāpati Khatravarman. GB thinks it improbable that Pravarasena had in course of a few months two different commanders-in-chief. Thus he states that the term Senāpati denotes here the commander of the troops in the district where the village granted lay, and should be translated by ‘military governor’ (1883m: 241).

(4) Devānām priya:
From the context GB tries to ascertain the currents of thought and through them the evolution of certain usage of a word in a language. The quintessential example is his reflections on the much discussed term occurring in the Aśokan inscriptions, “Devānām priya”.10 While presenting a counterargument to RHYS DAVIDS, who thinks that the Jaina Āgamic term Devānuppiya suggests its use by Jaina kings, GB makes it clear that the Jaina Devānuppiya has nothing to do with the self-given title of kings and states that it is frequently used as a polite form of address in the Jaina Āgamas by superiors speaking to inferiors. He delineates his views in the following words:

“It seems to me that the royal title, the Jaina mode of address, and the Brahmanical use of Devānām priya to denote ‘an idiot’ are caused by three entirely different currents of thought, and that a derivation of the one from the other is very improbable. … The early Indian kings, who elsewhere are declared to be incarnations of deities, called themselves ‘dear to the gods’ in order to indicate their divine right. The early Jainas employed it as a form of polite, or rather humane address, recommending thereby the person spoken to, to the protection of the gods, - ‘you who may be dear to the gods.’ … The later

10 A few scholars, still in 1877, were not inclined towards the opinion that the author of the inscriptions is Aśoka (1878q: 142). GB strongly argued for the identity of the author of the edicts with Aśoka (1877g: 149-160 and 1878q: 141-160) on various logical grounds. Though some of his interpretations were disapproved, e.g. the word Vivutha means Buddha and Satavivāsa refers to Buddha’s death, the other arguments and the identification was accepted by later scholars.
Brahmans, finally, called idiots by this name, because such persons were considered to stand in the particular keeping of the gods” (1878q: 144 fn. 8).

(5) Religions of Indians:
In his epoch making article on the Jainas “Über die indische Secte der Jaina” while discussing about the goal of the Jainas GB uses the expression ‘Religionen der Inder’\(^{11}\) which has been translated by BURGESS as ‘religions of the Hindus’. The expression is interesting because the word religion is used as synonymous to the word sect. The western idea of religion is synonymous to Indian sect, or creed. With this expression GB displays his knowledge of the fact that the concept of religion equates more to the various sects of the Hindu-Dharma than to the Hindu-Dharma itself. This shows his ability to understand the ‘foreign’ concepts by abolishing the predetermined frameworks.

3. Ethnographical Approach and Continuity in Culture
(A) GB’s Approach
(B) Deliberate Efforts
   (1) The Digest of Hindu Law
   (2) Educational Inspector
   (3) Ancient and Modern Languages
(C) 19th Century India: GB’s Account
(D) Conclusions drawn from Observations
(E) Conclusion
(F) Limitations of such an Approach
(G) Importance

\(^{11}\) Dieses höchste Ziel sieht der Jainismus, gleich allen auf die philosophische Speculation gegründeten Religionen der Inder, in dem Nirvāṇa oder Moksha … (1887: 5).
(A) GB’s Approach:
We have seen earlier, GB’s opinion regarding Haradatta, the commentator of Āpastambha, that he must have consulted men acquainted with oral tradition of the Āpastambīyas (1892D: vii-viii). GB further remarks that no ingenuity of interpretation can convert Śiṣṭas into palm-leaves. This remark, I think, illustrates his own views about the methods of research which he followed and endorsed. His reliance on the living tradition and the commentarial works is notable.

KIELHORN stated in 1869 that the old generation of profound Shastris was dying out fast. The philosophical literature and the Sūtra literature needed to be explained by the oral instruction. Many of these works, KIELHORN added, although accompanied by commentaries, are almost unintelligible without the help of the tradition embodied in, and kept up by, the Shastris (GOUGH 1878: 55). GB went one step ahead. He not only studied with the Shastris the traditional Śāstras but also tried to imbibe the “Hindu modes of thought” through getting acquainted with “the inner life of the Hindus”. These words are of WINTERNITZ, the greatest pupil of GB:

“And it was this intimate acquaintance with Hindu modes of thought and with the inner life of the Hindus, which made intercourse with BÜHLER, and above all his academical teaching, so very inspiring and so extremely instructive.” (1898: 346).

Though it is difficult to ascertain the details of this acquaintance, extent of his “reach” and particularly exact details of its process, it can be said with certainty that GB made deliberate efforts to reach to the “inner life”, customs, beliefs, religion, philosophy and psyche. The following views of his, and it should be noted that they are in context of not less a technical subject like Sanskrit Grammar, clearly point towards his approach in this regard.

“Though Professor WESTERGAARD’s and Geheimrath von BÖHTLINGK’s works contain a good deal that helps, the task is nevertheless one of considerable magnitude, and it requires a thorough acquaintance with the Hindu system of grammar, as well as with the Hindu ways of thought, which differ considerably
from those of Europeans. Such an enquiry will solve nearly all the doubts regarding the history of the Dhātupātha ...” (1894r: 142).

(B) Deliberate Efforts:
As a young researcher GB was desperate to visit India and was determined to achieve this aim at any cost. Even to become a merchant’s agent would have had been acceptable to him (WINTERNITZ 1898: 338). Later he not only encouraged his students to go to India but helped many in this direction; recommended to get a position in India or likewise.

While GB acquired MSS, studied ancient languages, literature and scripts etc. he also tried to closely observe and study the life of contemporary Indians. He used every opportunity for the purpose. He travelled a lot, visited numerous small towns and cities, learnt two of the modern Indian languages, made friends from every class of the society including Jaina ascetics, worked with Shastris and Pandits, and governed a team of clerks and headmasters. Through every mean he tried to know the Indian society, culture and religion. This helped him in turn to develop an insight into the Indian psyche, of which literature, art, philosophy, religion and culture are merely external manifestations.

(1) The Digest of Hindu Law:
The Digest of Hindu Law was a kind of training part in GB’s career which helped him to find new avenues and methods of research suitable for Indian studies. GB discussed with eminent Dharmaśastravid more than 2500 legal suits involving domestic matters like inheritance and partition. They used to discuss only in Sanskrit (THITE 2010: 158 fn. 2; JOLLY 1899: 3 fn. 3). The discussions were important to know the relative position of Dharmaśastric works to each other which only a practitioner Shastri was able to tell. The regional variations with respect to the Law have also been studied. Learning grammar of Sanskrit and being able to read law texts is not sufficient, how these were applied in practice is important. These discussions must have developed in him ethnographical approach towards Indological research. The methodology of the

---

12 I think, this is also true in case of treatises related to Medicine, Astrology etc.
*Digest* is the very methodology he later adopted in his further researches. Since he must have realised how the traditions are still very much alive and rooted deeply into the society. More importantly, the ancient mind is still accessible through the present one. A living creature is being examined from various angles of language, literature, inscriptions etc.\(^{13}\)

(2) Educational Inspector:

Instead of continuing the ‘static’ job of a Professor he accepted the position of Educational Inspector in the Bombay Presidency. To travel extensively, to interact with the native people, to know their life and culture, and to collect MSS were the chief objectives which he achieved during the next ten years. He states in the letters written during 1869 to 1874 to NÖLDEKE\(^{14}\):

“My domain is extremely large, larger than the entire Bavaria, and I have for my 5½ million residents now about 600 schools…primary schools, continuation-schools, Sanskrit-schools, Progymnasia, School-teachers-training-schools, Industry-schools, and others. I have to organize all these schools, monitor, construct buildings, prepare accounts, procure books, appoint teachers, dismiss, give grants and punish. For this I have 6 sub-inspectors and an office of 8 clerks and accountants…Salary 1361 Rs. (per month), rank of a Lieutenant Colonel…I have been traveling since 15th November until today (12th April) and have patrolled 1100 miles and God knows how many schools inspected, and examined…I now use this opportunity to communicate intimately with all possible social classes. A year among the people has fitted

---

\(^{13}\) The following are my conjectures. He must have realised that there is a little deviation in the life style of ancient and contemporary Hindus. There is some sort of unchangeability or immutability in the Indian thought process. There is a unity in diversity. He must have perceived the role of Brāhmans in moulding the ancient society, the role played by Dharmśāstric texts and Sanskrit language in general, and also the limitations of all the afore said forces in shaping the ancient past. This revelation must have had occurred over some period of time. These are just my conjectures regarding GB. The apprehension and discernment depicted in his writings points to such a possibility.

\(^{14}\) The letters to NÖLDEKE are deposited in the University Library, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Germany, Accession No. (Signatur): Md 782 A 36.
Letter written by Georg BüHLER to Theodor NÖLDEKE, dated 12 April 1872

English rendering of lines 6 to 13 of ‘p. 7’: A year among the people has fitted me in the Sacred Sanskrit literature and culture more easily than 6 in Bombay. I now use this opportunity to communicate intimately with all possible social classes. (Provenance: Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Germany, Accession No.: Md 782 A 36.)
me in the Sacred Sanskrit literature and culture more easily than 6
in Bombay.”

(3) Ancient and Modern Languages:
After arriving in India, GB learnt Sanskrit as a living language. He could
converse in Sanskrit with Shastris. He knew many Sanskrit verses by heart and
had learnt to recite them in the typical traditional way (THITE 2010: 157 fn. 3;
JOLLY 1899: 3 fn. 1). The Director of Public Instruction says about GB’s first
MSS search tour in 1866-1867: “By conversing fluently in the Sanskrit
Language with Brahman Shastris at the various places which he visited, he
succeeded to a great extent in inspiring confidence and in allaying the prejudices
of persons who were at first unwilling to show their sacred volumes to an
European” (WINTERNITZ 1898: 339).

He also learnt Marathi till the extent that he occasionally conducted
exams of Bombay University for that subject (THITE 2010: 157 fn. 3; JOLLY
1899: 3 fn. 1). He knew Gujarati very well (THITE 2010: 161-162 fn. 2; JOLLY
1899: 6 fn. 2) and could converse with people in Gujarati. This must have helped
him to go closer to the people; for to know a language is to know a culture. On
his tour to Kashmir he also began to learn Kashmiri language. He was interested
in old Kashmiri songs and was accompanied by a Kashmiri singer during his
excursions. An expert in the language was to assist him in his Kashmiri studies
(1877b: 18).

He has used this knowledge frequently – e.g. in his famous article on the
roots of the Dhātupāṭha (1894r: 144), for indentifying villages mentioned in the
inscriptions (1897j: 39-40) etc.

---

15 Mein Bezirk ist ungeheuer gross, grosser als ganz Bayern, und ich habe für meine 51/2
Millionen Einwohner jetzt etwas über 600 Schulen . . . Primärschulen, Fortbildungsschulen,
Sanskritschulen, Progymnasien, Schullehrerseminarien, Industrieschulen u. a. Alle diese Schulen
habe ich zu organisiren, zu überwachen, die Häuser zu bauen, die Rechnungen zu führen, die
Bücher zu beschaffen, die Lehrer anzustellen, zu entlassen, zu belohnen und zu strafen. Dazu
habe ich 6 Unterinspektoren und ein Bureau von 8 Schreibern und Buchhaltern . . . Rang eines
Oberstlieutenants . . . Ich bin seit dem 15. November bis heute (12. April) unterwegs gewesen
und habe 1100 Meilen abgeritten und Gott weiss wie viele Schulen inspizirt und examinirt . . .
Ich benütze nun die Gelegenheit, mit allen möglichen Ständen intim zu verkehren. Ein Jahr unter
den Leuten hat mir über die heilige Sanskrit-Litteratur und -Kultur mehr Lichter aufgesteckt als
6 in Bombay (JOLLY 1899: 6 fn. 2). (The last two sentences have been quoted by JOLLY in the
reverse order.)
He opines that “no Sanskritist can afford to leave the modern vernaculars out of the range of his studies, if he wishes really to understand the ancient language” (1894r: 150). He has demonstrated in the article on the Dhātupāṭha usefulness of the Mahārāṣṭrī and of the modern Gujarati in cases of many verbs like śṛṅkha or śīṅgh and ṣat (1894r: 148-149).

(C) 19th Century India: GB’s Account:
GB resided for almost seventeen years in India during 1863 to 1880. Out of these seventeen years, he spent almost thirteen to fourteen years in such works which involved travelling. Interacting with people remained his highest priority. A vivid description of some aspects of the 19th c. India can be found in his writings. Though the picture is not complete, some idea about the society can be gathered from it. His writings, particularly those on the Dharmaśāstra texts, throw light on some features of the life of learned Brāhmaṇas during the early British rule. The fact which should be borne in mind is GB travelled mostly in the Western part of the country. That means the observations made by him are of the Western India. For the Indian society the third quarter of the 19th c. was a period of beginning of reforms in every aspect of life. Especially Maharashtra was one of the chief centres of action in that direction.

GB describes the traditional education system which had by then started diminishing. Young students went from one teacher to the other, learning from each what he knew. As in the olden times the pupil must stay with his teacher, until he has learnt the subject which he began with the teacher (1879Ia: 27 fn. 14). In connection with the Brahmjayāṇa or daily recitation of the Veda GB has noted that this rule is usually not observed completely. At the daily Brahmjayāṇa Brāhmaṇas mostly recite, ‘Veda-offering,’ one particular formula, which symbolically comprises the whole Veda. He added further -

“A few learned Brāhmaṇa friends, however, have assured me, that they still recite the whole of their Śākhā every year according to this rule of Āpastamba.” (1879Ia: 43 fn. 23).
This information is quite trustworthy and correct. By ‘Veda-offering’ GB means a recitation where the first one or two lines of the Saṁhitā, Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka, Upaniṣads and Vedāṅgas are recited which symbolises recitation of the ten major texts of a Śākhā. According to THITE there are still a few Brāhmaṇas who recite the whole of their Śākhā every year and thence they become expert in recitation and know all the above mentioned texts by heart. GB’s observation that Brāhmaṇas also have Laukika Gotras like other castes is also correct (1879Ia: 126 fn. 15).

He talks about the Sabhā of learned Pandits which is very similar to the one depicted in the Śrīkaṇṭha-vacara of Maṅkha. He calls it “one of the chief modes of social intercourse among the learned” (1877b: 51). He confirms the description given by Maṅkha as faithful and true. He had attended many such Sabhās. He even knows typical phrases usually heard in such Sabhās like amuṣya vidyāgandho ‘pi nāsti (1894r: 152). We know from his Reports how he used to call Sabhā in order to meet the learned Brāhmaṇas and Jainas in various towns, to inform them about the search of MSS and to explain the Government’s intention behind such an investigation of their ancient languages, Śāstras and the MSS. On such occasions discussions among the Brāhmaṇas used to take place in the typical traditional manner of Pūrvapakṣa and Uttarapakṣa.

The description in the Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Bilhaṇa’s travel from Kashmir to the Cālukyan capital in the south brings up the life of 19th c. Pandits and their wanderings from one princely state or a seat of learning to another (1875H: 17-18). GB states that after finishing the education young Pandits began the wandering life which they are fond of. “In our days, too, wandering poets and Pandits may be met with all over India. I have received visits from such men, who came from the Punjab and from Oude [Awadh]” notes GB (1875H: 17). They hold disputations and compose poetry extempore for the delectation of the princes. Every small princely state has its Pandit who has right of inheritance over the seat. Still all learned visitors would get customary Dakṣiṇā. Thus these states were resorts for the ancient lore and language. One can imagine how royal families and officials must have contributed in preserving the ancient literary

16 Discussion on 18th June 2014.
heritage of India. There was also a dark side to this picture where many bitter complaints reached GB about jealousy shown by the hereditary Royal Pandits against the wanderers. As regards the duration of the tour, according to GB, if a Pandit is from the North India and takes a rout from Rajasthan to reach Mumbai via Baroda and also includes renowned places of pilgrimage in his tour then the tour lasts five or six years.

There was a strange practice in the Kashmir region prevalent among Kashmiri Pandits, which ought to be borne in mind while dealing with the ‘complete’ Kashmiri MSS. It became known to the westerners through GB. He was told that if the original MS is damaged or incomplete then the scribes simply complete the text from their own knowledge. GB was asked by his friends, while he was on his tour for search of MSS in Kashmir, if the new copies to be made for him were ‘to be made complete or not’. GB convinced his friends of the evil of the practice. A specimen of such a restoration made in the Nīlamatapurāṇa has been appended by GB to the report of the Kashmir tour (1877b: lv-lx). In this connection GB remarked that in India “the Pandit has little respect for the sacredness of the ancient texts.” At the same time he did not forget to append that “that sentiment is in Europe, too, of modern growth” (1877b: 33). Here he refers to the scribes and Pandits who tampered the texts for their convenience. His was critical about the method of working of Pandits. He says –

“Even in the present day Indian Pandits rarely use any of the scientific apparatus, of which European scholars avail themselves. Indexes, dictionaries and “Collectanea”, such as are at the service of the Europeans, are unknown to them. They chiefly trust to memory, and work in a happy-go-lucky sort of way. Even when writing commentaries, they frequently leave their quotations unverified or entrust the verification to incompetent pupils” (1894r: 253).

As regards the castes, he mentions Mahār-s as village or town messengers in Maharashtra (1879Ia: 68 fn. 28) and that they reside outside the village in a Vāḍī (hamlet) with the other outsider castes like Ḍher (should be Ḍhor) and
Māṅg. He has mentioned wearing of sacred Brahmanical thread by certain subdivision of Sutārs. He considers it as a remnant of the ancient tradition. GB also knew customs like sending of coconut by a Kṣatriya as a symbol of proposal of marriage and acceptance of that coconut means acceptance of such a proposal (1886K: 82 fn. 35).

Many of GB’s observations come only as passing remarks. Sometimes GB mentions some vernacular words without specifying the language. For instance, a cry of a solitary jackal is considered as bad omen and in such case the study of the Veda is prohibited according to the Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra. Here GB has noted that the ekasṛka, ‘solitary jackal’, is considered to be the constant companion of a tiger or panther. Its unharmonious cry is, in the present day also, considered to be an evil omen. GB notes that he is called Bālu or Pheough in modern times (1879Ia: 38 fn. 17). In old Marathi Bhālū (not Bālu) is an old female jackal while in Gujarati it is Varu. The word Pheough is not traceable in MOLESWORTH’s Marathi dictionary as also in Gujarati dictionaries. The word Bālu seems related to south Indian languages and Pheough is perhaps Bengali.17

GB tries to compare even minute prescription by the Dharmasūtras with the modern customs or remnants of such customs. For instance while stating the prescription made by Āpastamba that both hands should be used in conveying the water to the mouth, GB has noted that this agrees with the custom now followed, which is to bend the right hand into the form of a cow’s ear, and to touch the right wrist with the left hand while drinking (1879Ia: 54 fn. 3). He might have inquired with his friends or colleagues about modern state of such a practice and/or he must have possessed a great observation skill since this requires really a minute observation. Today this practice is followed by many people particularly while accepting ‘Prasāda’, a part of the solid or liquid food offered to the God during Pūjā and given out among the devotees after the Pūjā.

There is a proverb in Marathi Dātī tṛṇa dharane which means to profess submission or to acknowledge subjection. The literal meaning is to hold grass in between one’s teeth. The origin of the proverb can be traced back to a rule stated

---

in the Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra that in battle it is a sin to slay men who declare themselves to be cows or Brāhmaṇas. Such persons become inviolable on account of the sacredness of the beings they personate. GB has stated that historical instances were narrated to him where conquered kings were forced to appear before their victors, holding grass in their mouths or dancing like peacocks in order to save their lives (1879Ia: 226 fn. 17-18). During his travel in Western India across Gujarat and Rājaputānā (now Rajasthan) where there were many princely states, it is quite possible that he might have heard such instances somewhere in those states.

At one place he states that Indian cows do not allow themselves to be milked, except when their calves stand by (1886K: lxiv fn. 2). This information, however, is not altogether correct according to professional milkmen.

GB has not stated in many cases his source of information. There are always regional variations in customs thence giving source or at least its region would have helped to construe the picture of India through GB’s eyes. One can realise at the end that it is easy for anyone born significantly later in time to charge earlier authors with improper or inadequate documentation and subsequently to question the existence of historical consciousness in them.

One passing remark of GB is very important and gives a glimpse of how well GB understood the contemporary Indian Society. In the Introduction of the Digest he has substantiated views of MAX MÜLLER regarding the origin of the Dharmāṣṭra from the Dharmasūtras. Since the Dharmaśāstra texts elaborate more on various Ācāras and are more puritanic than the Dharmasūtras GB has called attention of the readers towards the point that this discovery by MAX MÜLLER is “important for the Hindu who wishes to free himself from the fetters of the Ācāra” (1884B: 31). This remark by GB, stated separately in a paragraph, indicates that he had not restricted himself only to philological and historical inquiry but that he was well-informed about the ongoing activities of religious reforms and changing outlook of the concurrent Indian society on the matters pertaining to the religion.

GB arrived in India in 1863. It was the period of beginning of reforms in many arena of life in Western India particularly in Maharashtra. Many ‘Native’
scholars had inclination towards social reform movements, nay, they took active part in such movements, such as S. P. PANDIT, GB’s intimate friend, had started schools for girls in Gujarat for promoting female education. Social reforms and religion were closely connected. Prârthanâ Samâja, established in 1867 in Mumbai, was a movement for religious and social reforms. They were monotheists but beyond religious concerns their primary focus was on social and cultural reclaims. GB’s contemporary Sanskrit scholar and his successor in the search of MSS, R. G. BHANDARKAR was, since 1853, closely connected with the precursor of Prârthanâ Samâja, the Paramahaâmsa Sabhâ. And as such BHANDARKAR was one of the founder members of the Prârthanâ Samâja. The above remark of GB indicates that he was certainly aware about new unrests in Indian society and that these remarks were directed towards and made for such Hindus who were trying to bring religious reforms as a means to social reforms.

(1) Views about the Vedas:

Though, except for comparative mythology and a review article GB has not discussed topics related to the Vedas in any of his articles, it seems, like all other Sanskrit vânimaya, for Vedas too he relies on the Hindu tradition. He states that he stands on the side of those who consider the Vedas to be Indian books, and interpret them as such. It is not clear what did he mean by “Indian” books but certainly he endorses the authority of the tradition in connection with the Vedic studies. He uses the following euphemistic words – “The older school has rendered most important services chiefly by its successful war against the omnipotence of the Hindu tradition. But it is just this success that has caused its chief weaknesses” (1894r: 146 fn. 10).

As against the views of the contemporary Western academia he believed that the Rgvedic hymns were not intended to be songs for devotion but as pure magical formulae. “As far as Veda is concerned I consider the usual view about the nature of the Rgveda, as a kind of song book for devotion to be entirely incorrect. I believe that Indians are still correct that the hymns are just
“Mantras” i.e. magical formulae which should force the gods to the gift”\textsuperscript{18} writes GB in a letter to NÖLDEKE. (THITE 2010: 161-162 fn. 2; JOLLY 1899: 6 fn. 2).

(2) MSS Libraries in India:
Gujarat and Rājaputānā were richer collections of scriptures than the southern part of the Bombay presidency. GB describes these libraries in the following words:

“Hidden in subterranean vaults under the temples and sometimes concealed with great ingenuity, these collections have escaped the many dangers to which libraries have been subjected in so unsettled a country as India has been until very lately” (1875H: 3).

Many manuscripts libraries were in the hands of people who did not know Sanskrit at all. However some of the best pieces in the Government collection, e.g. the MS. of the Rgveda (BORI MS 5/1875-76) come from such sources (1877b: 28). The scholarly experience tells us that even today especially regarding private collections the situation continues to be the same. GB has mentioned that the local Pandits were just as ignorant about the contents of such libraries as he himself was and it was of much trouble even for them to extract manuscripts from these gartas (1877b: 28). GB noted that all the Sanskrit-speaking Pandits, as well as some of the traders and officials in Kashmir, possessed large or small libraries. He has listed the names of 22 Pandits who were stated to be the possessors of the most considerable collections (1877b: 27-28). However GB was not contented with the list of MSS received from the possessors of MSS. He rightly points out that “it is a very common practice among Brahmans to leave out, when they are asked to show their treasures, all works which they consider particularly important, and to reveal their existence only after a prolonged acquaintance with the inquirer” (1877b: 28).

\textsuperscript{18} “Was den veda anbetrifft, so halte ich die gewöhnliche Ansicht von der Natur des Rigveda, als einer Art Gesangbuch zur Erbauung, für ganz falsch. Ich glaube die Inden haben doch Recht, dass die Hymnen eben »Mantras« i. e. Zauberformeln sind, welche die Götter zum Geben zwingen sollen” (JOLLY 1899: 6 fn. 2).
GB mentions one incident, which cannot be regarded as common but certainly is a darker side of the picture. He heard of a work which, after being considered to be lost was recovered from a manuscript found by a Pandit in the ceiling of his house, to which it has been nailed in order to keep the rain out (1877b: 30).

(3) Kashmir:
GB presented a very picturesque description of 19th century Kashmir in his famous report of the tour to Kashmir. In a letter to the Government GB proposes that Jammu should also be visited during the tour to Kashmir, as a part of MSS collection of the King of Kashmir was said to be preserved there. He has described efforts being taken by the King to give impetus to Sanskrit learning in the state (GOUGH 1878: 122-123). GB described Kashmiri Brahmans in a separate section of the report. He informs that there were about 24000 Pandits in Srinagar in 1875.

“The Brahmans or Pandits, as they are usually called, are the only natives of Kaśmīr who have preserved their ancient faith, while all the other castes have embraced Mahommedanism. Their number, probably, does not exceed 40,000 to 50,000. … Unlike the Brahmans of other parts of India, they form one single community. … all Kaśmīrian Pandits call themselves simply Kaśmīrikas, and consider themselves to be a branch of the Sārasvatas. This is so much more remarkable as originally they came from different parts of India.” (1877b: 19)

GB rendered detailed description about the Ācāras and Vyavahāras prevalent amongst the Brahmans including the norms regarding inter-marriage between various sections of the Brahman community wherein his acquaintance with the Nāgara Brahmans of Gujarat and their customs is revealed (1877b: 20-21). He devotes number of pages to interesting accounts of Sanskrit learning in the Valley, various sects, practices of worship and even Abhicāras. With his close acquaintance with the Sanskrit pronunciation of Kashmir-Brahmans GB points
out the general mistakes found in Kashmiri MSS due to the influence of the Kashmiri language (1877b: 26). GB was impressed with poetical compositions of a Pandit to the extent that he called them surpass Śrīharṣa and Bāṇa’s compositions (1877b: 26). He mentions the activities of another Pandit and appreciates his scientific spirit of inquiry into the history Kashmiri (1877b: 27).

GB visited Khunmoh the native place of poet Bilhana to compare Bilhana’s description of it with the reality. He noted:

“Khunmoh is inhabited by a mixed population of Musalmans and Brahmans, or “Pandits”. The latter possess not the slightest remnant of Sanskrit learning. They are either traders whose ‘classical language’ is Persian, or pujārīs who ‘do’ for the pilgrims visiting Harśēvara. ... Upper Khunmoh shows remnants of an ancient temple, and a little south of Lower Khunmoh begin the famous saffron fields. On comparing these actualities with Bilhana’s description of the home of his youth, I was greatly struck with the faithfulness of his memory and the appropriateness of his description” (1877b: 5).

Many references show that GB interacted even with boatmen to collect information on various places and their history. He states Kashmir was famous for paper industry introduced there as late as by Emperor Akbar (1877b: 29).

GB was fortunate to get in touch with the Indian culture of the 19th century, which preserved stray fragments of ancient culture, the real object of his study. His account of the contemporary Kashmir and Kashmiri Pandits stands to be valuable since the Pandits are almost extinct from the valley today.

(D) GB’s Conclusions:
While describing the indefatigable impact of the Mahābhārata on the Indian society V. S. Sukthankar termed it as “the content of our collective unconscious” and “our past that has prolonged itself into the present” (1945: 439). GB’s approach towards contemporary society reminds these words of Sukthankar. GB believed the traditions to be the past prolonged into the
present. This presupposes continuity in the culture. GB often seeks explanations of past events or expressions from parallel contemporary customs. For this he accepts ethnographical approach towards research.

Ethnographical research is a kind of research where observations are made of a group of people or society by living amongst them. The researcher works as an observer participant. Such methods are used for cultural and sociological studies. GB’s impressions of India reflect the role of an unbiased observer participant. He deployed his long experience in India to serve the Indological researches. To substantiate textual and epigraphic evidences GB transferred his reflections of concurrent culture to philological framework. These features of his research can be explained with the following instances, where GB has applied his knowledge of the ‘present’ to the events and society of the ‘past’.

(1) Samāja:
While interpreting the word Samāja occurring in the edicts of Aśoka he states it probable that it has the same designation what the word Melā has in modern Hindi. He also states it probable that very often the Samājas were used for immoral purposes.\(^{19}\) In support of this he shows how several sayings from various Dharmasūtras prohibit students of Vedas to visit such Samājas and further states that perhaps on the same grounds Aśoka prescribes not to arrange or to take part in the Samājas. It is interesting to compare this interpretation with the personal examination of all the Minor Rock Edict sites by Harry FALK and his interpretation as to why remote appearing places were selected to inscribe Minor Rock Edicts. He arrives at the similar conclusion that Aśoka had his first text placed exactly where people gathered to celebrate their basic cults and he must have known about the orgiastic nature of these activities (2006: 57). Thus it is possible to interpret the word Samāja as the gatherings pertaining to folk-religion where orgiastic activities take place along with other activities.

\(^{19}\) He has not stated the source of his information.
(2) Catuṣka:
While discussing the word Catuska occurring in the 4th tantra of the Pañcatantra GB’s attention drew towards the fact that the meanings of the term rendered in the two dictionaries (Petersburg and MONIER-WILLIAMS) are not probable. The Petersburg interprets it as a hall resting on four pillars or a Manḍapa, while according to the MONIER-WILLIAMS it is a quadrangular courtyard (used for receiving guests). However, GB notes that “it is, at least now, not customary to erect Manḍapas simply for reception of guests” (1891Ca: 72). It cannot be a ‘courtyard’ in the context in which the word is used in the Pañcatantra. There the compound word Racitacatuṣkā is an adjective, which means the one who has formed or prepared the Catuska. Hence GB takes resort to a custom, conveyed to him by his friend S. P. PANDIT, of drawing in white chalk or forming with wheat or rice a cauka or four-cornered figures round the seat or dining-place of honoured guests at festive occasions.20 This explanation fits to the context very well.

(3) Govindarāja:
His knowledge of Marathi, Gujarati languages and people supports his arguments quite frequently besides make them seem effortless and non-artificial. For instance, when it was proposed by many scholars like JOLLY, allured by the termination rāja, that Govindarāja, a commentator of Manu and the author of manutikā should be identified with Govindacandra, a prince of Varanasi or a king of Kanoj of the same name, GB rightly expounded with various evidences that the identification is not correct. Govindarāja Bhaṭṭa must be a Brāhmaṇa and cannot be a Kṣatriya prince. Further GB’s knowledge of Marathi and Maharashtrian culture adds to the list of arguments. He rightly points out that Govindarāja is the equivalent of Govindrao, a name very common among the Maharashtrian Brāhmaṇas (1886K: cxxvii).

---

20 Even today this custom is observed.
(4) Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra – Incongruent Portions:
His explanation about the incongruent portions (chapter XXI, XXIV, XXVII and XXVIII) in the Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra is based on his knowledge of habit, described above (IV.3.iii), of Kashmiri Pandits to restore the lost portions of MSS from the available fragments and from their memory or from the other related texts (1882Ib: xxiv-xxv).²¹

(5) Baudhāyana-Grhyasūtra – Initiation of a Rathakāra:
In connection with the Baudhāyana-Grhyasūtra where it is mentioned that a Rathakāra should be initiated in the rainy season, GB connects the Rathakāra with the modern Sutār or carpenters. As Āpastamba omits the Rathakāra while stating rules for initiation of different Varṇas and as this agrees with the system in the modern society, GB concludes that the exclusion is an offshoot of a later doctrine and that this difference in the views of Baudhāyana and Āpastamba may be used as an argument for Āpastamba’s posteriority to Baudhāyana. Another observation noted by GB is that certain subdivisions of the Sutārs actually wear the Brahmanical thread, and, in spite of the adverse teaching of the Śāstras, find Brāhmaṇas willing to perform the ceremony of investiture for them (1882Ib: xxxviii-xxxix). This is a remnant of an older tradition in GB’s view. On this basis he, here, seems to connect the word and the caste Sūta, which is related with the Rathas i.e. Chariots, to the word and the caste Sutār which means a carpenter. Since Āpastamba lays down stricter and more puritanic views than Baudhāyana, GB concludes against the orthodox view which regards Baudhāyana’s work as later than Āpastamba’s. KANE, however, does not agree with GB (KANE 1930: 20-32). It seems that GB always tries to add to the arguments evidences other than mere textual ones.

(6) Das Wergeld:
Thus while discussing ancient history and literature GB compares the ancient contexts more than frequently with the concurrent contexts, people and ideas. The

²¹ He uses the term ‘cooked’ for such MSS. Cooked here seems to be a literal translation of the word Saṃskṛta.
quintessential example of this approach is the article on Wergeld. Commenting on Dharmãtsra I.9.24.1 of Āpastamba GB expresses his difference with Haradatta’s explanation of the word vairanyātanārtham. The Sūtra is: “He who has killed a Kṣatriya shall give a thousand cows for vairanyātana”, i.e. expiation of his sin according to Haradatta. Some other commentators interpret the term as ‘in order to remove enmity’. GB prefers the latter opinion. He proposes to translate the Sūtra as “he who has killed a Kshatriya shall give a thousand cows (to the relations of the murdered man) in order to remove the enmity” (1879: 78 fn. 24.1). GB later wrote a separate article on the subject, which was published in the felicitation volume of ROTH (1893: 44-48). He has interpreted the Sūtra based on a living tradition, which he happened to know during his travel in Rājaputānā. In the article it has been enumerated, in detail how the custom was still followed in the border areas of the Bombay presidency and Rājaputānā. Regular and strict accounts were maintained of the murders and injuries of cattle, of men and also of robbed women. At the end of a certain period the accounts were settled between the two parties, tribes or villages by paying compensation as per the number of excessive men and cattle murdered or injured (1893: 44-45). GB has also cited from Colonel Tod’s account, examples of munḍ-kāṭī or compensations against murders and from Sir Alfred Lyalls’ account of Border Pañcāyat, which means a meeting of arbitrators, under the presidency of one or two English officers to inquire into and settle cases of raids and to award compensations (1893: 45). GB further propounds that Rājaputānā is the region where old customs and legal institutes have been best preserved, which were remodelled later by the Brahmanical Smṛtis (1893: 46). With the contemporary examples GB adduces that since the compensation is paid to the families of the murdered or injured person the term vairanyātanārtham does not stand for ‘Prāyaścitta’ but means ‘to remove enmity’. Though there is no concrete evidence to answer the question whether in ancient India the King retained the compensation-money or used to give it to the families of the killed ones, GB affirms that vairanyātanārtham points to the second assumption. Thus GB has deployed accounts of a

22 Here, GB recognises a ‘remnant’ of the law permitting composition (compensation ?) for murder in ancient Greece and Teutonic nations (1879: 78).
contemporary custom as an important evidence to settle a textual problem related to the ancient Indian law.

(7) Antiquity and Authenticity of the Jaina sect:
Like many other contemporary scholars e.g. WEBER and LASSEN, GB believed in the beginning that the Jainas are an old sect of Buddhists and even thought that he recognised the Jainas in the Buddhist school of the Sammatiya. However, during his tours in connection with the search for manuscripts he had to examine Jaina literature extensively (BURGESS 1903: 24) and he also came in contact with many Jaina ascetics. Through some Digambara Jainas he learnt that the Digambaras were called since the ancient times as Nirgranthas (1878n: 28). This seems to have led him to rethink the matter. Finally after the observation of the fact that the Buddhists recognise the Nigantha and mention their head and founder as a rival of Buddhas, who died at Pāva where the last Tīrthaṅkara is said to have attained Nirvāṇa, he inferred that these Nirgranthas must be none other than the Jainas and that the Jainas and the Buddhists sprang from the same religious movement. Jacobi reached the same result independently through his textual study (BURGESS 1903: 24).

(E) Ethnographical Approach to Indology (or Ethno-Indology):23
Ethno-archaeology is understood as a branch of archaeology that studies contemporary primitive cultures and technologies as a way of providing analogies and thereby patterns for prehistoric cultures.24

On the lines of Ethno-archaeology, Ethnographical approach to Indological studies -- “Ethno-Indology” is a method where contemporary Indian culture is studied with an object to know about ancient Indian society and culture. It is evident that the term Indology is to be considered here as the Classical Indology and not the Modern Indology. It is an approach to Indology that facilitates to study contemporary Indian society and culture as a way of providing analogies for ancient Indian culture and thereby solving the riddles in

23 Axel MICHAELS, according to Thomas OBERLIES, has initiated a regular use of this term.
Indology, especially where the material evidence is scanty. Thus, it can be said that GB followed the path of Ethno-Indology which was his self-developed approach towards investigation.

It can be seen from the above instances that the success of this method depends on a clear and unbiased perception of the “other” where abolishing predetermined frameworks is absolutely necessary.

(F) Limitations of such an Approach

(1) GB has assumed that there is continuity in culture. No change especially after Muslim conquest was taken into consideration. Thence the logic behind this may lead to strange results in some cases.

(2) Even if we assume some continuity in culture, regional variations also play a role, e.g. as long as we do not know with certainty the region where the present version of the Pañcatantra was composed it is of little use to explain certain unknown words like racitacatuṣkā with the help of customs prevalent in Maharashtra.

(3) There is no preferential order of evidences for drawing inferences that GB seems to adopt while drawing conclusions through ethnographical approach. Sometimes he neglects literary tradition and draws conclusions based on feeble evidences. For instance, he disregards Kumārila’s view that Baudhāyana is later than Āpastamba and concludes the contrary on the basis that a subdivision of the caste Sutār wears the sacred thread. Here he presumes two things at a time that such a custom must be of antiquity and the prohibition prescribed by Āpastamba must be a later modification. Sometimes the conclusions based merely on ethnographical research neglecting the literary sources at hand do not seem to be convincing.

25 For a detailed discussion see (KANE 1930: 20-32) wherein KANE concludes as follows: “Therefore hardly anyone of the circumstances relied upon by BÖHLER as indicating a later age for Āpastamba is conclusive or convincing.” (KANE 1930: 30).
(4) Such an attempt has many restrictions today. In modern times society has changed like never before. “A year among the people has fixed me in the holy Sanskrit-literature and -culture more easily than 6 years in Mumbai” are the words of GB which today seem more or less redundant because comparatively the 19th c. Bombay had much more of first hand Sanskrit culture, people, resources than a 21st c. town in India. Sanskrit phrases and idioms are long out from modern dialects. Rituals and Ācāras as per ancient scriptures are not a part of life as it was a hundred years ago.

(G) Importance:
Despite of the above mentioned lacunae, GB’s approach carries certain weightage. His observations substantiate his arguments and other evidences. The remarks based on his own experiences are important for posterity. It shows that this could be one of the approaches and is important to understand and study the culture holistically.

After analyzing this aspect of GB’s approach, it would be interesting to examine one short note published in the IA which resembles in style, analysis, argumentation and presentation with GB’s. This is a letter dated April 13, 1876 published in June 1876 under the section “Correspondence and Miscellanea” (B. 1876: 188-189). The author here is mentioned merely as B. It is written to propose a better translation of one of the attributes of Malharrao Holkar ‘Bhogibhogātapatraḥ’ in an inscription situated near Ahalyābāī ghāṭ at Maheshwar. One Raoji Vasudeva Tullu of Indore originally published its translation in the previous volume of the IA (TULLU 1875: 346-348). He has translated the term as “(the one) having an umbrella white as the skin of the snake”. B. interprets it as “having expanded hood of a snake for his umbrella” (B. 1876: 188). He seems familiar with the popular tradition associated with the Holkar family and his interpretation corresponds to it. There was a popular legend regarding Malharrao Holkar according to which a serpent expanded his hood (Bhoga) over the face of the shepherd-boy Malhārī to protect him from the Sun, when he was sleeping at noon while grazing his flock of sheep. The author
points out with the help of Benfey’s dictionary that Bhoga means hood. GB always tries to give literal translation of a Sanskrit text. Even in case of copperplates and inscriptions it can be seen that he had mostly tried to give an honest translation. Here, the author B. too seems stringent about the translation and points out the defects in the previous translation.

Thus, the letter B. used for the author’s name, use of the lore to substantiate the argument as also the reference to Benfey’s dictionary makes one imagine GB’s authorship.

4. Synergistic Approach

Synergy stands for working together of two things (muscles or drugs for example) to produce an effect greater than the sum of their individual effects. Synergistic approach of GB seems to look for cooperation between various groups of people, which he followed and promoted to realise the goal of progress of science. He combined through his researches and academic activities the knowledge and efforts of various Shastris, Pandits, Indigenous scholars, British officials and Western scholars. He tried to combine the traditional knowledge and modern techniques of criticism.

(A) Shastris and Pandits: (Importance and impetus given to them)

It is natural that since the days of Filippo SASSETTI (1540-1588) Europeans interacted with traditional Pandits and learned from them. 26 To transcribe a whole new world of the “other” into the conceivable terms a transcriber or a mediator is required. Studying a language is not just studying its grammar. To know a language is to know the culture which it manifests. Thus GB considered personal contact and frequent exchange of ideas with native Paṇḍits as indispensable for the progress of research (WINTERNITZ 1898: 345). GB was of the opinion that the Shastris were the representatives of the traditional

---

26 Filippo SASSETTI (1540-1588) stayed in India for five years, 1583-1588 CE. He died in Goa in 1588. He was the first to point out the similarities between some words in Sanskrit and European languages.
knowledge of Sanskrit, and their participation should not be underrated (WINTERNITZ 1898: 338). KIELHORN has expressed it in the following words:

“The philosophical literature of India comprises many difficult works, written on a method which requires not only that they should be read, but that their concise sentences should be explained by a full oral instruction. Many of these works, although accompanied by numbers of written commentaries, are almost unintelligible without the help of the tradition embodied in, and kept up by, the Śāstrīs” (GOUGH 1878: 55).

In the late 1860s, after almost fifty years of British rule in the Western India and with the introduction of modern education system the state of traditional learning had started diminishing. In his report of the tour on search of MSS in the year 1868-69 KIELHORN expressed great concern about the state of Sanskrit learning in the Southern part of the Maharashtra. He suggests some measures to save the traditional knowledge.

“The race of the old profound scholars is evidently dying out fast. ... this tradition being merely oral, is likely to die with the generation. In order to guard against its total loss, the traditional explanation of the scientific literature of India ought to be fixed in writing; otherwise, in the present neglect, it will pass away with this generation of Śāstrīs” (GOUGH 1878: 55-56).

KIELHORN suggested to the Government to spend a part of the sum assigned for the preservation of Sanskrit literature “on encouraging young Native scholars” to collect and publish as much of the traditional learning as they can gather from the best Shastris (GOUGH 1878: 56). KIELHORN and GB both worked in this direction. They encouraged Shastris to write such works which would be useful for the study of various branches of Sanskrit literature. The works of Chintamani Shastri THATTE, Bhimacharya JHALAKIKAR and his younger brother
Vamanacharya can be cited as instances.\(^{27}\) THATTE edited the Amarakośa under the superintendence of KIELHORN (THATTE 1877). Bhimacharya JHALAKIKAR was a Sanskrit teacher at Elphinstone College, Bombay (JHALAKIKAR 1893: 4). He prepared a Nyāya lexicon, which was first published in 1874, “to afford the encouragement and assistance to the study of the Nyāyaśāstra” under instructions from GB and KIELHORN (JHALAKIKAR 1893: 3). In this lexicon a combination of traditional learning and western method of presentation can be seen. Vamanacharya was a teacher of Alāmkāraśāstra and Vyākaraṇa at the Deccan College, Poona. His edition of Kāvyaprakāśa was prepared under the instructions of KIELHORN and R. G. BHANDARKAR and was published firstly in 1889 (JHALAKIKAR V. 1889: Title page). In an article GB refers to Vamanacharya as his Shastri (1875c: 281). For that article of GB Vamanacharya prepared a complete alphabetical index of the verses quoted in the Sarasvatīkāṇṭhābharaṇa and then compared every line of the printed copy of the Naiṣadhiyacarita with the index.

GB held very high view and respect for the Shastris because of their learning.

“In this part of India, still significant traditional knowledge and of Indian antiquity is available. The people divide themselves in Vedīs and Śāstrīs. The Vedīs mostly studied one Veda, i.e. they learn the text of the Saṃhitā to recite, without understanding it, …. As against this, the Śāstrīs, learn the Prose-literature, and these are people who know very much. My Śāstrī who is not at all a very great scholar, knows the entire Pāṇini by heart, knows every verbal form, and knows whether the roots make Ātmanepada or Parasmaipada” (Letter to NÖLDEKE 1863) (THITE 2010: 157-158 fn. 3; JOLLY 1899: 3 fn. 1).

\(^{27}\) Vāmanācārya and Bhīmācārya Jhalikar had studied Sanskrit in traditional manner. They originally hailed from Karnataka region and studied Nyāya at Sangli under Bhikuśāstri Godbole who was originally from Pune (ABHYANKAR K. V. 2006: 38).
Shastris used to assist the Bombay scholars in various ways viz. preparing indexes, glossaries, transcribing MSS, copying extracts from MSS, collating MSS or preparing classified list of MSS for the reports on search of MSS. During the searches of Sanskrit MSS instituted by the Government several Shastris were appointed to catalogue various libraries. They were taught the modern principles of cataloguing.

(B) Combined traditional knowledge and modern criticism

GB was actively involved in making Indian students acquainted with European methods of research. The Bombay Sanskrit Series was founded by him and KIELHORN in 1865-1866. According to JOLLY this enterprise was begun in order to give an opportunity to the young Indian scholars to learn the methods of critical edition and to produce cheap and useable textbooks for the Bombay-Colleges (THITE 2010: 159; JOLLY 1899: 4). GB himself published two numbers in the Series within a year or so. Up to 1878 about twenty volumes were published and besides both the founders, Shankar P. PANDIT, R. G. BHANDARKAR, Kashinath T. TELANG, Abaji V. KATHAVATE participated therein. The excellent editions of the standard Sanskrit works published under the series became of the greatest importance for the progress of Sanskrit studies in Europe. According to WINTERNITZ, “That India has produced such scholars as BHANDARKAR, Shankar PANDIT, TELANG, APTE, and others, educated in the Bombay Presidency, is to a very great extent due to the beneficial influence of GB and it must be said later on also of KIELHORN” (WINTERNITZ 1898: 338).

GB imbibed the traditional knowledge himself. As has been stated earlier after arriving in Bombay he studied various Śāstras and learnt to speak Sanskrit as a living language. He studied Dharmaśāstra under Vinay (Vinayak?) Shastri DIVEKAR, and KIELHORN learned the Vyākaraṇa under Anant Shastri PENDHARKAR (DHARAMSEY 2012: 31-32). GB tried to combine the advantages

---

28 The glossary for GB’s Third Reading Book (1888E) was prepared by Vishnushastri Pandurang PANDIT.
29 1868 Pañchatantra ed. with Notes, IV and V. 1868 Āpastambhiyadharmasūtra.
30 This may sound a sweeping generalization, however if we compare volumes of B.S.S. with the volumes of Bibliotheca Indica the flawlessness and accuracy of the earlier will not go without struck.
of European education methods with those of the traditional Indian methods of teaching. He recommended to the Government appointment of a “thorough-bred Shastri” educated in the traditional system of schooling as a help to the advanced students and as an assistant to the Professor (WINTERNITZ 1898: 338). This approach and his efforts in this direction gave opportunity to many Shastris to work as a Sanskrit teacher in colleges like Elphinstone and Deccan where modern system of education was adopted and being cultivated. In GB’s reports on search of MSS one comes across names of many Shastris who worked as his assistants; Martanda Shastri, Narayana Shastri, and Vamanacharya JHALAKIKAR to name a few (1877b: 34).

Passing references to Shastris and Pandits who helped GB in one way or the other are numerous. e. g. Keshavaram Pandit, the possessor of the codex archetypus of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī (1877b: 7), Pandit Candram son of Tutaram, who compiled the MSS of Nāgārjunacarita for the use of GB (1888m: 532, 552).

(C) Indian friends:
We come across names of various scholars who came in contact with GB. He had, it seems, frequent contact with many Indian researchers. However very scanty information is available in this respect. In case of Shastris and Pandits, only their names remain inscribed in GB’s writings, but their stories have lost in time. Whatever scanty information is available as also the number of names of Indians frequently met with in GB’s writings is enough to prove his constant contact with them. For instance, Vallabhji ACHARYA (1840-1911 CE), the curator of the Watson Museum in Rajkot published his readings of several inscriptions with the help of GB (DHARAMSEY 2012: 36-37). The Bhavnagar State Archaeological Department was established in 1881 under Vajeshankar Gourishankar OZA. He published his readings of some inscriptions in various journals with GB’s help (DHARAMSEY 2012: 37).31

31 (1) The Vadnagar Prasasti of the reign of Kumarapala (with Vajeshankar G. OZHÄ), EpInd 1 (1892) 293-305. (2) The Somnāṭhpattan Praśasti of Bhāva Bṛhaspati (by Vajeshankar G. OZHÄ, with an Introduction by GB) WZKM 3 (1889) 1-19.
(1) Maharajas:
Maharajas of various princely states and Political Agents in these states also played a very important role in the search of MSS. It is evident from the Reports that GB had contacts with many such Political Agents and had occasion to meet the Maharajas of Jodhpur, Jesalmer, Bikaner and Kashmir. In Jodhpur, the Maharaja most liberally allowed him access to his extensive library, which contained about 1,800 Sanskrit manuscripts, a large collection of printed Sanskrit books, and several hundred manuscripts chiefly in Hindi and Marwari (GOUGH 1878: 117).

GB’s view of co-operation and mutual benefit is also evident from following recommendation made by him to the Government:

“I have also to bring to the notice of Government the readiness with which the Maharaja of Jodhpur, the Maharaja of Jesalmir, and the Maharaja of Bikanir have opened to me their own libraries, and have exerted themselves to prevail on their subjects to do the same. I beg respectfully to recommend that their readiness in this respect may be acknowledged by the presentation of valuable Sanskrit works published or patronised by Government, such as Professor MAX MÜLLER’s edition of the Rigveda” (GOUGH 1878: 120).

GB shared intimate friendship with two Indian scholars: Pandit BHAGVANLAL INDRAJI (1839-1888 CE) and Shankar Pandurang PANDIT (1840-1894 CE).

(2) BHAGWANLAL INDRAJI (7th November 1839 – 16th March 1888):
BHAGWANLAL holds an important position amongst GB’s Indian friends. GB played a key role in BHAGWANLAL’s academic life while he in turn was benefitted from the experience and knowledge of BHAGWANLAL. BHAGWANLAL was in service of Dr. BHAU DAJI.

---
32 See DHARAMSEY Virchand (2012), Bhagwanlal Indraji The First Indian Archaeologist: Multidisciplinary approaches to the study of the past, Darshak Itihas Nidhi, Vadodara, xxiv, 504.
Dr. Bhau Daji Lad was a physician by profession and was very successful with a lucrative practice of his own. He was not only an Indological enthusiast but an active participant in the Indological researches. He had privately appointed Pandits and Shastris to assist him in his pursuits. A young Gujarati Brāhmaṇa from Junagadh joined his services in 1861. He was Bhagwanlal Indraji.

Bhagwanlal was born at Junagadh in Kathiavad in 1839. His initial education was in a traditional school, where he learned Sanskrit. He acquired a fair knowledge of Sanskrit Literature but he cared little for the study of the Śāstras. Instead, he felt attracted towards the history of Gujarat. When he was a boy, he used to pay visits to the Girnar rock where edicts of Aśoka and the inscriptions of Rudradāman and Skandagupta exist. At the age of fifteen he studied their characters with the help of a copy of Prinsep’s tables and tried to use transcripts of the earlier epigraphists, to decipher their contents. He was able not only to read every letter of the Rudradāman inscription, but to point out omissions and inaccuracies in Prinsep’s copy. These attempts came to the notice of Mr. Kinloch Forbes and he recommended the young amateur to Dr. Bhau Daji, who was looking for a Pandit, able to assist him in his epigraphic researches.33

Bhagwanlal used to prepare eye-copies and rubbings of documents and inscriptions. But more importantly, while working under Bhau Daji he received a good training in the method of treating inscriptions. He travelled enormously and visited almost every important site in the Northern India along with Nepal and even Shahbazgarhi. He copied numerous known inscriptions, discovered several new ones and made their transcripts and translations in Gujarati. His almost 13 years’ service with Bhau Daji ended with the death of the latter in 1874.

After his masters death Bhagwanlal suffered and faced social problems and a sort of rejection from the scholarly world. As has been later described by GB “the seclusion in which he had been kept from all contact with European Sanskritists, his precarious worldly position, and his inability to express himself in English, prevented him from coming forward at once” (1888k: 294).

33 Bhagwanlal never worked as GB’s Pandit. Falk has mistaken him to be so (1993: 119).
At this juncture in life BHAGWANLAL met GB. This meeting paved a way out for him. BHAGWANLAL, aware of GB’s proficiency in Gujarati language, was looking for an opportunity to meet him. He met GB in July 1875 just when GB was about to start for his Kashmir tour for the search of MSS. GB wrote afterwards:

“My journey to Kashmir prevented my paying at once serious attention to this affair. But when, after my return, he came again, showed me the drawing of his plate, and explained to me his theory [about Ancient Numerals], I felt such an admiration for his ingenious and important discoveries that I offered to put his notes into shape and to get an article published” (1888k: 294).

The article was published in the Indian Antiquary in 1877 (1877e: 42-48). On GB’s suggestion some other western scholars also helped BHAGWANLAL in preparing papers in English. Thus his five papers were published in five months succession. He was then conferred the Honorary Membership of the Asiatic Society, the first Indian to receive such an honour. The proposal was seconded by GB. GB had also tried to secure a job for BHAGWANLAL after BHAU DAJI’s death. This shows how BHAGWANLAL’s proximity with GB was crucial in the development of BHAGWANLAL’s career. GB played a key role in presenting BHAGWANLAL to the scholarly world.

Some scholars like FALK call BHAGWANLAL GB’s “Pandit” (FALK 1993: 119). He was not GB’s “Pandit” in any sense. In fact, GB has translated five articles of BHAGWANLAL from Gujarati into English. All the articles were published bearing BHAGWANLAL’s name as the author. Wherever GB wanted to give his opinions and remarks on the subject he did so in a separate note appended to the article.

GB offered to translate BHAGWANLAL’s important material procured from Nepal into English. But since the material was collected with the grant from Junagadh Darbar received by BHAGWANLAL as BHAU DAJI’s Pandit

---

34 ... uebersetzte G. Bühler einen Artikel seines Pandits Bhagvänläl Indrají….; die er wie sein Lehrer phantasievoll…; [emphasis mine]
BHAGWANLAL “did not have a clear title to dispose of the documents according to his liking” (1885k: Preface). GB wrote to the Darbar and to BHAU DAJI’s son and succeeded in obtaining the permission. He also petitioned the Bombay Government for a special grant to meet the expenses of the publication. Finally BHAGWANLAL’s exhaustive article “Inscriptions from Nepal” was published in the Indian Antiquary (1880a: 163-194) and separately in a book form in 1885. It is remarkable that GB writes the preface to this separate book seemingly ‘on behalf’ of BHAGWANLAL (1885k: Preface). All this effort by GB stands in testimony of his unassuming affection towards BHAGWANLAL.

GB was also benefitted with BHAGWANLAL’s knowledge as is clear from some of the footnotes in his articles published during that time, which refer to the suggestions made by BHAGWANLAL.35 GB’s first article on Aśokan inscriptions was based on a cloth copy of the Bairat inscription prepared by BHAGWANLAL (1877g: 157; DHARAMSEY 2012: 139-140). GB wrote in the obituary “of the social, political, and religious life of modern India, especially in the Native States, he gave me more trustworthy accounts than almost any other of my numerous Hindu acquaintances ... ” (1888k: 297).

BHAGWANLAL confided in GB more than in any of his other friends. They shared intimate friendship which lasted till former’s death. GB wrote about his close friend in the following words in his obituary:

“His amiable frank character, his keen intelligence, and his extensive learning, made him very dear to me. I shall never forget the pleasant days, when I used eagerly to look forward to the announcement that the Panditji had come. I gladly acknowledge that I have learnt a great deal from him” (1888k: 297).

GB and other friends of BHAGWANLAL put forward a proposal to install in his name, a prize at the University of Bombay.

According to DHARAMSEY, GB’s obituary of BHAGWANLAL is perhaps the best evaluation that exists of his work (2012: 67 fn. 2). Today GB’s memoir

---

35 GB seems to have adopted opinions of BHAGWANLAL at not a few places. Also see SENART 1891: 231 fn.9.
of BHAGWANLAL, remains an important source among the very few authentic records on life and career of BHAGWANLAL.

Lastly, it would not be out of place to deal with a farfetched inference drawn by DHARAMSEY, who says that “GB would send his papers to BHAGWANLAL before publication, including those written in German” (2012: 407). He rests this inference on GB’s remark in an article that “when I sent my German paper on this inscription to the late Dr. BHAGWANLAL, he informed me that…” (1889c: 267). The said German paper was published in 1887. GB must have sent this published German paper to BHAGWANLAL just for his information, from which BHAGWANLAL could definitely read the Devanagari matter.

(3) S. P. PANDIT (1840-1894):
Shankar Pandurang PANDIT hailed from the princely state of Sawantwadi, which is today in the Maharashtra state. He was also a close friend of GB. He completed his M. A. in 1865. After working in Mumbai for some time in 1868 he began teaching in the Deccan College in Pune. He then served in varied administrative capacities such as Deputy Collector, Income Tax Collector, Oriental Translator and finally Administrator of the princely state of Porbandar in Gujarat. GB knew PANDIT since 1863 and used to meet him almost every day while he was in Gujarat in 1870s. GB handed over the MS of Gauđavaho, discovered by him in Jesalmer, to PANDIT for editing. PANDIT’s edition was published in 1887.

In eighteen letters36 which GB wrote to R. ROTH during the period 20th October 1877 to 22nd January 1890 GB frequently mentions S. P. PANDIT. In a letter dated 11th July 1889 GB requests ROTH to recommend the name of PANDIT for the Honorary Doctorate of Tübingen University in return of similar favour done earlier by GB at ROTH’s request in case of ASA Dastur Hoshang.37

---

36 I am immensely indebted to Dr. ZELLER of Tübingen University who generously supplied me transliteration of the said eighteen letters on which she has been working in connection with the project of Letters related to the Petersburg Dictionary.
(b) ASA, Dastur Hoshang Jamasp, a Parsi priest and scholar (26.04.1838-23.04.1908), came from a famous Parsi priest family and in 1884 became the third Dastur (High Priest) in Poona. He was also a professor of Oriental languages at the Deccan College and in 1886 received an honorary doctorate from the University of Vienna. His main work is a Pahlavi-Pazend glossary.
The letter further tells us that GB and PANDIT were close friends. GB states that since his return to Europe he had this wish to recommend PANDIT’s name for the title. He asserts that because of PANDIT’s self-sacrificing devotion towards science and many achievements in the field he is worthy of such an honour. The other reason given is rather very humane. GB states that the award is also valuable in PANDIT’s view especially since his rival R. G. BHANDARKAR has been bestowed with such an honour. GB supplements the letter with a brief CV of PANDIT.

As he handed over the MS of Gauḍavaho to S. P. PANDIT with similar generosity and selflessness handed over some other MSS of newly discovered works procured by him to other scholars for editing, e.g. the MS the Pāia-lacchīnāmālā was given to PISCHEL.

Even when Indian scholars themselves sometimes did not care to mention most important contributions by their Pandits GB always made it a point to mention the names of persons who helped him even in a smallest way.

(D) Western scholars:

(1) Franz KIELHORN:
Among his Western colleagues the foremost name is of KIELHORN. There are many similarities in their careers. GB studied at Göttingen and KIELHORN taught in that University later. Both came to India around the same period of time in the early 1860s. They worked in Pune and Mumbai. GB worked in the Deccan College for some time where KIELHORN served for almost eighteen years. Both collaborated in many activities like B.S.S., search for MSS etc. They jointly founded the B.S.S. In case of Searches of MSS while GB could travel extensively and collected numerous MSS, the MSS were placed in charge and under the care of KIELHORN at the Deccan College. For the Searches the Bombay presidency was divided between them, Northern part to GB and Southern Maharashtra and the Northern Karnataka to KIELHORN. However at the very early stage of the searches KIELHORN realised that the parts of Gujarat and Rājaputānā are far richer with regard to the number of MSS libraries and the

---

38 R. G. BHANDARKAR received the honour in 1885 from the University of Göttingen.
number of MSS preserved in them. Hence he decided to concentrate on establishing a good MSS library with the MSS collected under the project.\(^3^9\) KIELHORN took over after GB’s death the responsibility to edit the series of *Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research* founded by GB. KIELHORN dedicated his *Grammar of Sanskrit Language* published in 1888 to GB with the words of remembrance of the days spent together in India.\(^4^0\) After noting this long association, one might expect some memoir or an obituary written about GB by KIELHORN. But surprisingly there is none.

(2) Whitley STOKES:

Whitley STOKES was the Secretary to the Council of the Governor-General for making Laws and Regulations (Legislative Council) (GOUGH 1878: 1), a Legal Member of the Viceroy’s Council and an expert in finance\(^4^1\). He was also a Celtic scholar (1883h: 517). He helped GB in his early days of struggle to secure copies of MSS in the Madras Government Collection. He obtained for GB the permission of Government to take copies of its treasures, and found with great difficulty a Brahman able to transcribe from the Dravidian alphabets into Devanāgari (1888m: 531).

He proposed to the Indian Government a detailed scheme for the search of Sanskrit MSS\(^4^2\). Though Pandit RADHAKRISHNA appealed and induced the Government to initiate the programme (GOUGH 1878: 1) STOKES can justly be called as the founder of the whole enterprise and there is enough ground to believe that GB was his inspiration in this. STOKES was a friend of him (1888m: 531). GB knew STOKES and perhaps developed friendship with him since when he was in London (THITE 2010: 156; JOLLY 1899: 2). In his proposal STOKES not only quotes GB and refers to his tour for the search of Sanskrit MSS in Southern


\(^4^1\) http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1879/may/22/committee-first-night#S3V0246P0_18790522_HOC_107 (accessed on 30th October 2013).

\(^4^2\) See his "Note" dated 6th August 1868 in GOUGH 1878: 1-7.
Mahratta (Southern Maharashtra) and Canara (Karnataka) but also asseverates that the proposed plan agreed completely with the plan drawn by GB (Thite 2010: 160 fn. 1; Jolly 1899: 5 fn. 2).

“I speak with confidence as to the practicability of the scheme; for, in its leading features, it is identical with that lately framed by Professor Bühler, which has resulted hitherto in obtaining from the Southern Mahratta Country and Canara alone the originals or copies of nearly two hundred valuable codices” (Gough 1878: 1-7).

Also, the method adopted for collecting MSS during 1864-68 by GB, as described later in 1888 in an article (1888m: 530-532) matches for most of the part with the scheme proposed by Stokes in 1868.

(3) A. A. Führer: Führer’s case, being different from the other western scholars, has been dealt with earlier.

(4) Others:

It seems that among his senior contemporaries GB was more close to Weber. Weber was one of the scholars to whom he wrote frequently from India. There are around 84 letters written by GB to Weber preserved in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin. Weber informed from time to time readers of his Indische Studien and other German journals about the activities of and discoveries by GB.

Nöldeke was a close friend of GB since the days when they were studying in Göttingen. They were frequently in touch. Their communication through letters, which were later used by Jolly for writing GB’s short biography (Thite 2010: 155; Jolly 1899: 1), is now preserved in the Library of the University of Tübingen.

Burgess and Fleet were GB’s well-known collaborators in his epigraphical researches.

GB played a leading role at the International Congresses. He helped many scholars to procure positions in India. From the available evidences it is
not possible to ascertain whether he supplied MSS to individuals. He certainly sent to European libraries with a due permission from the Government of India, MSS of such texts which are already well represented in the MSS procured for the Government.

Through his influence GB was able to draw the West closer to the East. He was a kind of mediator. Like he opened the doors of Bhānḍārs and Maths which were like a vault similarly he opened the minds of the East and the West.

It is remarkable that while conducting his activities GB was able to win the respect and affection of the people around him irrespective of their varied identities and interests.

(E) Preference to English language:
Since frequent exchange of ideas with the Indians was considered by him as indispensable for the progress of research he deliberately chose to write in English instead of German. It was on this account that most of his contributions to Indology were written in English. He also wished his pupils to do the same. Hence he insisted on articles relating to India being written in English for the Vienna Oriental Journal and persuaded even the Academy of Sciences at Vienna to print in its proceedings papers in the English language (WINTERNITZ 1898: 345-346). He once said to one of his English friends, “not to save you trouble, but for the good of those in India” (WINTERNITZ 1898: 346). If one knows the language-pride in Europe then (s)he would be able to understand how radical GB’s attitude and approach was. Participation of those people is essential about whom or whose past a story is being narrated, a theory is being propounded or a research tool is being developed and thus whose history, literature and culture are the objects of investigation. This not only widens the scope of research but also increases the possibilities of substantiation of the results. Thus GB acted as a sort of bridge between the two worlds. In this way GB was able to draw the West closer to East and to make the East more open towards the new techniques, science and thoughts.
5. Against the positive and emphatic conclusions on the basis of weak evidence

Drawing conclusions on the basis of silence is the most suitable technique for those having preconceptions. However it can be seen in the history of Indology that sometimes even scholars with scientific approach and who otherwise follow critical methods have at once jumped to the positive and emphatic conclusions on the basis of silence. GB was against such a practice and tried to rebut the theories based on negative or feeble evidences. Here follow three illustrations of GB’s successful refutation of theories propounded by three different scholars. The refutation has left its own mark on the history of Indology.

(A) The Antiquity of the Indian Artificial Poetry

GB wrote an exhaustive article titled “Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kunstpoesie” as a reply to some of the theories propounded by Max MÜLLER in *The Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature*. The most controversial among them was that the Indians did not show any literary activity during the 1st c. BCE to the 3rd c. CE in consequence of the inroads of the different foreigners and that the real period of the bloom of artificial poetry (and also the age of Kālidāsa) is to be placed in the middle of the 6th c. CE (MAX MÜLLER 2003: xx-xxi).

The ‘Renaissance Theory’ invited hot discussions in the scholarly world. It was anachronic on MAX MÜLLER’s part to impose on the literary activities in ancient India the idea of Renaissance which became popular during the 19th c. in Europe. Moreover, a break or a dark period is a precondition for the concept of renaissance. And the very idea of any sort of break in the literary activities has been refuted here by GB. He proved successfully with the help of Gupta inscriptions (FLEET 1888) and some other inscriptions having absolutely certain dates that during 1st c. CE to 5th c. CE a Kāvyā-literature must have existed and the Vaidarbha–style of poetry reached the recognition before the middle of the

---

43 Appended as a “Note” (1883: 281-366) to the first edition of *India, What can it teach us?*, a course of lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge, specially intended for the candidates for the Indian Civil Service.
4th century. GB also points out, in a general way, the significance of the study of inscriptions for the Kāvyā literature.

(1) Inscriptions, Poetry and Poetics: A Concordance
GB gives a list of 18 inscriptions (GHATE 1970: 8), out of which he discusses four in detail. GB shows that the concepts and modes of expressions found in the Praśastis are very much identical and frequently met with in the classical Kāvyā literature. GB proves that during 350-550 CE court poetry was zealously cultivated in India (GHATE 1970: 8). He asserts that the Girnār Praśasti makes probable the existence of the Kāvyā style, even in the first c. CE (GHATE 1970: 78) and that there also existed an Alāṅkāraśāstra in the second century (GHATE 1970: 63). Though he finds the language of the Girnār Praśasti similar to that of epics he argues that the style is classical (GHATE 1970: 56-57). He also holds it probable that Vatsabhaṭṭi knew and made use of the works of Kālidāsa (GHATE 1970: 80).

The idea of the foreign invasions, such as those of Śakas and Kuśānas, being considered as a cause for the so called dark age was entirely ruled out by GB with the following arguments: (a) The area under foreign rule was not more than a fifth part of India, (b) The descendents of the foreign conquerors immediately began to bear Indian names, (c) The Indian systems of religions and arts enjoyed a high prosperity, (d) “The invaders were far inferior to the Indians in point of civilisation and culture, and the natural result was that they could not escape the influence of the Indian civilisation, but were themselves Hinduised.” (GHATE 1970: 83-86).

On various convincing grounds GB refutes all the evidences put forth to establish the age of Kālidāsa as 6th c. CE. Regarding mention of Hūṇas by

44 I have used the 1970 reprint for the present study.
45 The opinions of GB and MAX MÜLLER are very much counterpointing in this regard. MAX MÜLLER used only literary sources and did not consider inscriptional evidences in the manner in which GB has done. Moreover, MAX MÜLLER seems to have considered the lack of evidence (i.e. non-availability of any Kāvyā belonging to that period) as a proof for the lack of activity and conceived of the ‘Renaissance Theory’ on the European model. This resembles the construal of Samudragupta as Napoleon of India by V. A. SMITH (SMITH 1906: 251). GB who seemingly relied only on the first hand evidence did not approve of any such model on the basis of cross-cultural comparison or construal.
Kālidāsa, GB records his observation about how Sanskrit poets, instead of giving actual facts, describe Digvijayas on the model of the epics, Purāṇas and other older works. He also points out the discrepancy, where Kālidāsa anachronistically mentions (Raghuvaṃśa IV.60-61, IV.68-69), side by side peoples which can never belong to a single period of time (Ghate 1970: 94). He states, on the basis of more concrete evidences, that the year 472 CE is to be fixed as the upper limit for Kālidāsa (Ghate 1970: 3).

(2) Aftermath:
MAX MÜLLER withdrew the ‘Renaissance’ note while publishing the second edition of the book in 1892. He admits that on several points his views had been considerably modified (Max Müller 2003: xix). Still, he tries further, to rationalize his stand stating that he presumed for his theory the “literary works which we actually possess” (Max Müller 2003: xxi). His confession that he had “put forward one or two opinions, chiefly in order to provoke opposition and controversy” (Max Müller 2003: xxi) is not convincing. Ironically enough, further in the same write up he himself presents the proof of the literary activity during the so called dark period by announcing the discovery of the Buddhacarita of Ásvaghosa.

If we consider the logical treatment to the subject given by GB, there is a tremendous scope to believe that GB’s article must have played a major role in the withdrawal of the ‘Renaissance Theory’. Strangely enough in 1898 MAX MÜLLER defended his theory still in an article in GB’s memoriam (1898: 349-355).

WINDISCH again in 1917 endorsed MAX MÜLLER’s views to keep the topic alive (Thite 2008: 522). SIRCAR pointed out that the beginning of Kāvya literature may be pushed back a little further on the basis of the few other epigraphic evidences (Ghate 1970: i-ii).

There was only one argument possible to stand against GB’s conjecture and its logical representation that such classical literature pertaining to the

---

46 In the preface of the second ed. MAX MÜLLER addresses GB quite frequently.
47 Before MAX MÜLLER, WINDISCH spoke about a “Period of Brahmanical Renaissance”. He thought at that time only of the renewed strengthening of the Brahmanism against the Buddhism. (Thite 2008: 516 fn. 1).
period 1st c. BCE to 3rd c. CE is not extant except in inscriptive form (the only criticism that MAX MÜLLER was able to make). However, the discovery of the works of Aśvaghoṣa and the Bhāsanāṭakacakra with the age of Bhāsa supposed to be not later than the 2nd c. CE established the fact that the classical Sanskrit literature did exist during the above said period.

However, this confirms that a very vast amount of literature has been lost in time. What GB said in the introduction to his edition of Vikramāṇkadevacarita regarding the scarcity of real historical Kāvyas holds true for the entire class of literature. Along with the other reasons he states it probable that actually nobody cared to preserve the literature from destruction or to make them easily accessible by copying and recopying the original manuscripts (1875H: 2). This seems to be quite natural if we consider the stereotype character acquired by this literature even in the 5th c. CE. During the medieval period development of regional languages and literatures must also have contributed to divert the zeal of copyists.

As the only certain date known till 1890 was that of Bāṇa, this article of GB marked a tremendous progress for the history of the Indian poetry. It became possible to mark the age of the Kālidāsa on the map of the history of Sanskrit literature with some certainty. It will be interesting to note the changed scenario after 1890. In 1880s scholars like SCHROEDER (1887: 313), LEUMANN (1883: 285) accepted the ‘Renaissance Theory’ without any inhibition while MACDONELL who made considerable use of SCHROEDER’s work (MACDONELL 1899: vii) presents a gist of GB’s entire article in similar words rendered in English (MACDONELL 1899: 319-325). WINTERNITZ has referred to GB’s article at as many as seven places in the third volume of his ‘Geschichte’ (1920: 44, fn. on 13, 33, 38, 45, 375, 389). It can be safely inferred that by the end of the first quarter of the 20th c. the entire debate seems to have come to an end. LIENHARD mentions GB’s views with following addition “We also have numerous examples of the rich muktaka poetry that flowered at the same time - something that was not known in BÜHLER’s day” (1984: 170).
(B) The History of the Mahābhārata (MBh)

In his exhaustive article titled “Contributions to the History of the Mahabharata” (1892ak: 1-58) with J. KIRSTE GB has refuted Adolf HOLTZMANN’s conjectures who propounded that the MBh was ‘forcibly turned into a legal work or Dharmaśāstra on the second revision of the poem’ [by the Brahmans] (1892ak: 177). GB also proved that the testimony of the inscriptions is fatal to various conjectures, which HOLTZMANN put forward (1892ak: 188ff.) regarding the gradual development of the MBh.

R. G. BHANDARKAR first brought in the role of inscriptions to deal with the history of the MBh in a paper read at the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1872 (BHANDARKAR 1875: 81-92). He discussed a large number of data from literary works and inscriptions, which bear on the antiquity of the MBh. He elucidated principal testimonies from the 5th c. BCE to the 14th c. CE for the existence of the epic in the antiquity. In 1892, on the similar lines GB discussed in his article further literary and inscriptive data which not only prove the existence of the MBh during the first centuries of Common Era but also show that the text with hundred thousand Ślokas was already regarded as a Smṛti at that time. This was disastrous for HOLTZMANN’s interpretations. With the firm evidence of an inscription from Kamboja (1892ak: 25) he also proves that the Mahābhāratapāṭhana was a custom, prevailing about 600 CE not only in parts of India, but in all countries where the Hindu religion had reached. He argues that its spread over so wide an area clearly indicates that in the 7th c. it was not of recent origin, but must have existed at least during several centuries before that time.

GB shows in detail that Kumārila, the author of the Tantravārttika, who lived in the early 7th c. CE, quotes numerous passages from almost all the Parvans of the MBh, which to him was a great Smṛti expounded by Vyāsa (1892ak: 5-24). The land grants belonging to the 5th-6th c. CE have also been discussed in which Adhyāyas of the XIII Parvan dealing with the merits of gifting are quoted as sacred texts. The most important result of this article was

---

48 With the word “history” history of the text is meant and not the historicity of the events narrated in the text.
49 Adolf HOLTZMANN Junior (1838-1914).
that it could prove that around 500 CE the epic was essentially not different in content and volume from the work as it is available now.

After Bhandarkar’s article in 1872, it was generally understood and accepted that the epic is older at least than the other classical “artificial” poetry. Within the twenty years till 1892 GB did not find it necessary, it seems, to deal with the MBh on the basis of the inscriptive data. GB seems to have made it a point to refute Holtzmann exhaustively and immediately. This is evident from the fact that his 58 page long article was published in the same year when Holtzmann’s Zur Kritik und Geschichte des Mahābhārata was published. In the article at the beginning itself he states that the article is only a part of the results of his researches. While this must not be false, there is a possibility that he wanted to refute Holtzmann’s conclusions immediately and hence seemingly did not wait to complete his survey. GB refrained from writing on the subject thereafter since a few substantial evidences were seemingly sufficient to refute Holtzmann.50 From Winternitz’s obituary reference to GB it appears that the article was written with a single aim to refute Holtzmann’s conjectures.51

GB always tried to rest his studies on perfectly datable sources as is evident from the present article.

50 The other reasons might be that Holtzmann’s other conjectures were only "Glaubenssache" while his survey of the subject was comprehensive and exhaustive.
51 (a) “Here, too, (regarding the history of the MBh) he was utterly dissatisfied with the ‘inner’ criticism and the vague hypotheses defended by Prof. Holtzmann and other scholars. Eagerly he sought for epigraphic and literary documents from which any secure dates as to the history of the Hindu epic could be obtained” (Winternitz 1898: 344).
(b) From the above discussion it is safe to assert that considering GB’s approach towards the subject, there is a need to study under a fresh light the generalised inferences drawn by Adluri and Bagchee (2014) regarding German Indologists’ approach towards the MBh. It will not be out of place to note in this respect that GB himself was a son of a pastor and most probably a protestant. (The survey of German Indologists done by the two scholars in this regard does not include GB.) Moreover, GB’s greatest pupil, greatest admirer and one of the students inspired by him to study the epic, was a Jew, namely Moriz Winternitz.
(c) Apart from the above mentioned article which is his literary contribution to the MBh studies, GB also led the field in a different way. As a teacher he induced many of his students to pursue the epic studies. According to Winternitz he was most anxious to interest his pupils in this much neglected branch of Sanskrit literature (1898: 344). Two of his students, J. Kirste and Cartellieri are the joint contributors of his article while Dahlmann put forth some new ideas (1895), though untenable and refuted by Winternitz (JRAS 1897: 713-759). Winternitz also wrote an exhaustive article about the South-Indian recension of the MBh (1898: 67-81, 92-104, 122-136 and 344) on GB’s suggestion (Winternitz 1898: 344).
(C) The Roots of the Dhātupāṭha:

KANE has severely criticized the western scholars for propounding many sweeping and unwarranted theories based on flimsy data. One of the major points of the condemnation is that they do not attach due importance to the fact that a vast literature in Sanskrit has perished beyond recovery and what we now have is a mere fraction of what once existed. Secondly, they forget or ignore that much of the literature that survives is religious and not intended to be a historical and bearing full treatment of any topic (KANE 1958: 481). GB, over six decades before KANE, has put forth the same argument while rebutting WHITNEY’s view that more than a thousand of total roots listed in the Dhātupāṭha are false and interpolations of later grammarians and that this attaches a taint of falsity to the Hindu system.

In 1893 W. D. WHITNEY wrote an article “Review of Recent Studies in Hindu Grammar” wherein he questions the reliability of Sanskrit grammatical tradition. He takes for granted that among the roots contained in the Dhātupāṭha a thousand or twelve hundred roots are false and declares that there is a shade of unreality over the subject of voice-conjugation. His argument was that the Dhātupāṭha contains a very large number of verbs, which are not traceable in the accessible Sanskrit literature and which therefore must be false. WHITNEY’s argument is clearly based on an absence of evidence which cannot duly be taken as evidence of absence. GB highlights the fact that “only a small portion of the Vedic literature, known to Pāṇini and his predecessors, has been preserved, and that of the ancient laukika Śāstra, the Kāvyā, the Purāṇa, Itihāsa and the technical treatises only very small remnants have come down to our times.” (1894r: 252). He asserts in this regard that scholars like WEBER and BENFEY have already called attention to the fact that a very large proportion of the roots of the Dhātupāṭha is Prakritic in form (1894r: 145). The inscriptional Prakrit has preserved numerous forms older than the classical Sanskrit and some older than the Vedic dialects. It has also been proved with examples that many untraceable words and meanings do actually occur somewhere in the ocean of the existing Sanskrit literature (1894r: 148). He went further to show that the forms older than those commonly current in classical Sanskrit have been preserved even in
the modern Indian languages (1894r: 150). He demonstrates the usefulness of the Mahārāṣṭrī and Gujarati in case of verbs like Śṛṅkha or Śīṅka and Śat. He also takes into consideration a possibility that learned poets and commentators might have written according to the Dhātupāṭha, but the representatives of the Sanskrit verbs preserved by the Mahārāṣṭrī and modern vernaculars have certainly not been taken from the Dictionary of Sanskrit roots. Various forms of the verb Brūdati or Vruḍdati majjane have been illustrated occurring in the Jaina Prabandhas, the Śrīkaṇṭhacarita and Jonarāja’s commentary on it, the Baijanātha Praśasti and the Hemacandra’s grammar. He shows how the roots vṛudd, buḍ are used universally in the modern dialects in the sense of ‘to submerge’. He adduces that every root of the Dhātupāṭha, which has a representative in one of the Prakrits or in one of the modern Indian languages must be considered as genuine and as an integral part of the Indo-Aryan speech.

GB arrives at the conclusion that Pāṇini’s Sūtras are the final redaction of a number of older grammatical works and same must be the case with his Dhātupāṭha. And if it is a compilation from various works dating from different centuries and composed in various parts of India, then there is no wonder that it should contain many verbs which had already in Pāṇini’s time become obsolete and isolated (1894r: 253). He states it probable that the Dhātupāṭha must have attained its peculiar form because of the following factors: (1) the great length of the period during which its materials were collected, (2) the enormous extent of the territory from which the grammarians drew their linguistic facts, and (3) the great diversity of the several sections of the Indo-Aryans inhabiting this territory (1894r: 252).

It would be appropriate to elaborate here the features and difference between the approaches followed by WHITNEY and GB. WHITNEY takes into account only Vedic literature while GB has vast amount of Sanskrit and Prakrit literature and tradition in front of him. WHITNEY considers Pāṇini as the founder of a grammatical tradition while GB sees him as the apex. In his opinion Vyākaraṇa had a long prehistory. WHITNEY not only doubts the grammatical

52 Like some modern Sanskrit poets who use while composing modern dictionaries edited by western scholars in which GB has pointed out several lacunae.
tradition, but he blames the later grammarians for uncritical interpolations and opines that there is a taint of falsity attached to the Hindu system. Summarily, GB not only attacks Whitney’s conjectures but also condemns the use of such strong language in scientific discussions as Whitney has deployed in the article (1894r: 142).

Max Müller and Whitney were great names of their age. There is always a danger, as pointed out by Kane, that even conjectures, not to speak about approbatory opinions, of former scholars may be treated as valid conclusions by later writers (1962: 1531). GB was not carried away by the aura of these prestigious names and tried to guard the later scholars against the influence of their views.

(D) GB’s method:
Like a true scholar having scientific blend of mind, nāmūlaṁ likhyate kincid was the chief motto of GB and nāmūlaṁ jāyate kincid was his strategy. Other scholars particularly in the above cases opt for the easy answers which the limited evidences present to them. On the other hand GB questions the available sources and seeks for their history. He identifies the sources, prioritizes and construes them in the right context. Taking a right approach towards sources has a vital role. Thus his research is mūlagāmin i.e. root-oriented while others have fruit-oriented or phalagāmin approach. 53 Moreover he draws his evidences from multiple disciplines while restricts their interpretation to the Indian context avoiding any cross-cultural comparison whatsoever. Winternitz has following expression in this regard:

“Bühler never felt satisfied with what is called ‘inner chronology’ .... - a proceeding in which too much scope is left to individual opinion. One safe historical date which could be depended on was worth more to Bühler than a volume full of more or less convincing arguments as to might-bes. But how were such firmly established historical dates to be obtained? If not from works of literature yet from monuments of stone and

53 Thite classifies Vedic studies as mūlagāmin and phalagāmin (2012: 177-178).
BÜHLER was fully aware of this, and with his characteristic enthusiasm he devoted himself to the task of searching for, deciphering, and interpreting inscriptions, and no one was more eager than he was in turning these inscriptions to account for historical, geographical and literary purposes” (WINTERNITZ 1898: 341).