Chapter III

WRITINGS – A BRIEF SURVEY

During his four decade long research career, GB dealt with variety of subjects from Dharmaśāstra to palaeography and from religion to epigraphy. In this chapter a summary of his writings is presented, which demonstrates his contributions to various branches of Indology.

1. Dharmaśāstra

GB worked with Raymond West¹ on the Digest of Hindu Law in which he searched each and every Sanskrit citation. He wrote for the book an exhaustive Introduction on the sources of Indian Law, which included meticulously drawn conclusions about the chronology of the texts and the actual practices and regional preference given to one text over the other. He discussed with eminent Shastris more than 2500 legal suits involving domestic matters like inheritance, partition. His Digest was meant to replace these Shastris from lower courts of justice. This work, which witnessed three editions during his lifetime, was translated into Marathi, Gujarati and Kannada. In 1868 he edited with critical notes the Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra which was published in the B.S.S. He then translated Āpastamba, Gautama, Vasiṣṭha and Baudhāyana Dharmasūtras which formed a part of the famous series, Sacred Books of the East. The other important contribution of GB to the Sacred Books, ‘The Laws of Manu’ translated with extracts from seven commentaries was published in 1886. This epoch-making book is since being referred to wherever Manusmṛti finds a place.

As mentioned by JOLLY GB had collected a rich manuscript-material concerning the law-books of Gautama, Baudhāyana, Viṣṇu, Vasiṣṭha and Nārada and thought of critically editing them. Later he entrusted his materials to the

¹ Sir Raymond West (1832 to 1912) M.A., I.C.S., Bar-at-Law, Bombay High Court Judge. He was a scholar and jurist, well versed in Roman Law and comparative jurisprudence.
young scholars for their editions of those works (THITE 2010: 159 fn. 5; JOLLY 1899: 5 fn. 1).

(A) A Digest of Hindu Law

This comprises three books, each devoted to a different subject, viz. Inheritance, Partition and Adoption. GB co-authored the first two books with Raymond WEST. He did not participate in the last part published in 1884 comprising discussion on Adoption apparently due to the inconveniently great geographical distance between the two authors, and of GB from the Shastris (1884B: iv) who were an indispensable part of the work.

During the early period of the British rule, Shastris, expert in the Dharmaśāstra, were employed in the courts to help to make decisions according the Hindu Laws. By the two acts constituted in 1859 and 1864 their services were discontinued. The Digest was meant to replace these Shastris from lower courts of justice.

The method to prepare the Digest was to put questions relating to legal suits to the Shastris, discuss with them about their decisions and the authorities quoted by them in support of their opinion. It was of immense importance to draw the right conclusions from the discussions with these Shastris regarding the actual practice followed while applying the doctrines of the Dharmaśāstric texts. GB

---

2 “By Bombay Regulation II. of 1827, a Hindū law officer [i.e. a Shastri] was attached to the Saddar Adālat, and one to each Zilla Court, and questions of Hindū Law were disposed of in accordance, generally, with the responses of these officers.” (WEST 1884: 2-3).

3 “The functions of the Hindū, as of the Mahomedan law officers were virtually set aside by the new Civil Procedure Code Act VIII. of 1859; and by Bombay Act IV. of 1864, supplementing (General) Act XI. of 1864, the sections of the Regulation relating to the Hindū law officers were repealed” (WEST 1884: 3).

4 “The common law system – a system of law based on recorded judicial precedents- came to India with the British East India Company. Following the First War of Independence in 1857, the control of company territories in India passed to the British Crown. Being part of the empire saw the next big shift in the Indian legal system. Supreme courts were established [at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in 1862] replacing the existing mayoral courts. These courts were converted to the first High Courts through letters of patents authorized by the Indian High Courts Act passed by the British Parliament in 1862. Superintendence of lower courts and enrolment of law practitioners were deputed to the respective high courts. ... Coding of law also began in earnest with the forming of the first Law Commission. Under the stewardship of its chairman, Thomas Babington MACAULAY, the Indian Penal Code was drafted, enacted and brought into force by 1862”, vide http://www.barcouncilofindia.org/about/about-the-legal-profession/legal-education-in-the-united-kingdom/ accessed on 29/04/2014 at 12.27. Similarly, as a part of new developments it was decided by the Government to prepare a Digest of Hindu Law to replace Shastris possessing the knowledge of the old Śastras.
discussed with eminent Shastris more than 2500 legal suits involving domestic matters like inheritance and partition. He wrote for the book an exhaustive Introduction on the sources of Indian Law, which included meticulously drawn conclusions about the chronology of the texts and the actual practices and regional preference given to one text over the other. In this book we find a detailed discussion about the answers returned by various Shastris to every question related to the domestic matters. Each of the answers collected became the basis of an actual decision (West 1884: 3). A study of the Sanskrit sources of law, of their character and teachings was indispensible as a foundation for a true mastery of the then prevailing practical law (West 1884: 9).

While enumerating the sources of law GB first discusses about the authorities of the Hindu Law as prevailing in the Bombay Presidency. He enlists the following texts for the same (1884B: 9-10):

1. The Mitākṣara of Vijnāneśvara
2. The Mayūkhas of Nilakanṭha, especially the Vyavahāramayūkha
3. The Vīramitrodaya of Mitramiśra
4. The Dattakamīmāṁsā of Nandapanḍita
5. The Dattakacandrikā of Kubera
6. The Nirṇayasindhu of Kamalākara
7. The Dharmasindhu of Kāśinātha Upādhyāya
8. The Saṁskārakustubha of Anantadeva
9. The Dharmāsāstras or the Smṛtis and Upasmṛtis which are considered to be Ṛṣivākyāni together with their commentaries.

He then discusses the relative position of these works to each other. The region-wise importance of various texts has also been enumerated (1884B: 10-11).

GB infers that Vijnāneśvara must have lived during the latter half of the eleventh century and since he was an inhabitant of the city of Kalyāṇa in the Cālukya dynasty and a contemporary of the most powerful Cālukya king Vikramānka his book was adopted as the standard work in Western and Southern India, and even in the valley of the Ganges (1884B: 17).
Regarding the age of Aparārka GB asserts that he must have reigned and wrote during 1140-1186 CE (1884B: 18). KANE places him between the period 1115-1130 CE (1930: 680). GB then discusses about the contents of the Vyavahāramayūkha and its age (1884B: 19-21).

GB notices the high esteem in which Nīrṇayasindhu is held in the regions of Maharashtra (1884B: 23). It was composed during 1611-1612 CE. Regarding the relative chronology of Anantadeva, author of the Saṃskārakaustubha and the author of the Nīrṇayasindhu, GB thought that both were contemporaries (1884B: 24). However KANE asserts that the literary activity of Anantadeva must be assigned to the third quarter of the 17th century (1930: 452).

GB has enlisted the names of 88 Smṛtis excluding the collections of Smṛtis and extracts from them (1884B: 27-28). He renders his opinions about the value of the Indian tradition, extent of its trustworthiness, and its flaws while discussing about the origin and history of the Smṛtis (1884B: 29-30). According to him the general assertion of the tradition that these works belong to the same class of writings as the Śrauta and Grhyaśūtras, and that in some cases they have been composed by the authors of such Śūtras, is in the main correct but the tradition is untrustworthy in details regarding the names and times of the authors. He thinks that “the ancient history of India is enveloped in so deep a darkness, and the indications that the Smṛtis have frequently been remodelled, are so numerous, that it is impossible to deduce the time of their composition from internal or even circumstantial evidence” (1884B: 30). While GB states that the tradition neglects to distinguish between the various classes, into which the Smṛtis must be divided, KANE considers such divisions gratuitous. He holds that the fashion of dividing Hindu works into schools and assigning them definite territorial limits started with COLEBROOK and strange results have flowed from this (KANE 1946: 878).

The editors of the Digest agree with the views of MAX MÜLLER who considers the Dharmaśāstras in verse to be mere latter versification of ancient Dharmasūtras (1884B: 31).
GB divides versified texts of Dharmaśāstra into following four groups:

1. Metrical redaction of Dharmaśūtras and fragments of such redactions.
2. Secondary redaction of metrical Dharmaśāstras.

GB then elaborates on the school system in the Vedic tradition, position of the Dharmaśūtras in the Vedic literature, lost Dharmaśūtras and the lost mass of Vedic literature in general. After considering how the Smṛti literature must have risen from the Dharmaśūtras he discusses the relative chronology of the various Dharmaśūtras. He records the traditional views which place Baudhāyana earlier in chronology than Āpastamba and Hiranyakesīn. Among the latter two Āpastamba is older. He states that Gautama is older than Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha, and Gautama is the oldest Dharmaśūtra. Though the oldest mention of the Āpastamba branch is in inscriptions dating to the 4th c. CE, from the internal evidence he thinks that it cannot be younger than the 5th c. BCE and hence the works of Baudhāyana and Gautama must be even older.

GB has addressed the question of comparative age of the texts composed in prose style and the verse style of composition where he concludes that “we never find a metrical book at the head of a series of scientific works, but always a Śūtra, though at the same time, the introduction of metrical handbooks did not put a stop to the composition of Śūtras (1884B: 42-43)”.

GB explains how Manusmṛti must have originated from Mānava-Dharmaśūtra quoted in the Vasiṣṭha-Dharmaśūtra. KANE, though appreciates GB’s attempts to answer questions related to Manusmṛti and Mānava-Dharmaśūtra, strongly rejects the arguments in favour of origin of Manusmṛti from a Śūtra called Mānava-Dharmaśūtra.

After discussing the age of various Smṛtis, GB also deals with minor Smṛtis and states that they are not forgeries as supposed by his predecessors and contemporaries, but extracts from more extensive treatises.
(B) The Sacred Laws of the Āryas:
For MAX MÜLLER’s Sacred Books of the East GB translated four Dharmaśūtras into English, namely those of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vasiṣṭha and Baudhāyana. Previously in 1868 he had worked on the Āpastamba-Dharmaśūtra for the Bombay Sanskrit Series (Nos. XLIV and L) and had edited the Sanskrit text with critical notes, indices and extracts from Haradatta’s commentary.⁶

(1) Āpastamba-Dharmaśūtra
According to OLIVELLE out of the four Śūtras edited by GB, the best edited is the Āpastamba (2000: xvi).

The Dharmaśūtra originally formed an integral portion of the whole Kalpaśūtra and it is not a later addition (1879Ia: xii). GB holds that it is the work of the same author who wrote the remainder of the Kalpaśūtra (1879Ia: xii-xiii). On the basis of repetition of a Śūtra with an irregular grammatical form, \textit{ṛvē} for \textit{ṛvye}, in both the Śūtras, the Śrautasūtra and the Dharmaśūtra, he asserts that they belong to the same author. GB has shown that there are cross-references between the Gṛhyasūtras and Dharmaśūtras of Āpastamba pointing to a common author of the two. He also thinks that the entire Kalpaśūtra, including the Śrautasūtra, is the work of one author. According to OLIVELLE (2000: 4 fn. 5) the grounds for this conclusion rest on thinner evidence and it is already rejected by OLDENBERG.

(2) Gautama-Dharmaśūtra
GB endorses views of MAX MÜLLER that this text is a manual belonging to Śāmaveda (1879Ia: xlv-xlviii) and that the author was a Śāmavedin (1879Ia: xviii). But he is not sure about whether it belongs to the Gautama Carana (1879Ia: xviii). He tries to prove that the Gautama-Dharmaśūtra is older than the Baudhāyana. But as has been shown by KANGLE and rightly pointed out by OLIVELLE that arguments for the priority of Gautama can be used equally well to show that he is chronologically later (OLIVELLE 2000: 6 fn. 8). GB holds that the

⁶ Though the title page of the said edition claims to include a translation of the text it seems to have missed coming into light.
Gautama-Dharmaśāstra may be safely called as the oldest of the existing works on the sacred law (1879Ia: liv).

Rejecting the possibility of major interpolations or alterations GB points out that it is too methodically planned and too carefully arranged to admit of any very great changes (1879Ia: lv). GB thinks that Gautama knew an ancient work on law which was attributed to Manu and that it probably was the foundation of the existing Māṇava-Dharmaśāstra (1879Ia: lvii).

GB used for his edition a MS. bought at Belgaum for the Government of Bombay (now in the Bhandarkar Institute’s Collection) and a MS. borrowed from a Shastri from Pune (1879Ia: lvii).

(3) Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra
His translation of Vasiṣṭha and Baudhāyana was published in 1882. Regarding Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra he enquires whether it belongs to Vasiṣṭha and to theṚgvedins?

He accepts MAX MÜLLER’s views about the Māṇava-Dharmasūtra in following words:

“It seems indisputable that the author of the Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra knew a treatise attributed to a teacher called Manu, which like all other Dharmasūtras, was partly written in aphoristic prose and partly in verse. The passage furnishes therefore, the proof for Professor MAX MÜLLER’s conjecture that our metrical Manusmṛti, like all the older works of the same class, is based on the Dharmasūtra of a Vedic Sūtra-carana” (1882Ib: xix-xx).

Since the early Sanskrit inscriptions invariably place Manu's name first (1882Ib: xx) he infers that in ancient times Manu's name had as great a charm for the Brahmana teachers as it has for those of his day, and that the old Māṇava-Dharmasūtra held that dominant position which the metrical Manusmṛti actually occupied in the Middle Ages and theoretically occupied in his days.
GB concludes about the section on secret penances that it is not simply a later addition intended to supply an omission of the first writer, but that, for some reason or other, it has been remodelled (1882Ib: xxiv).

Regarding the age of the Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra GB clearly states that with the exception of the quotations, the Vasiṣṭha-Dharmasūtra contains no data which could be used either to define its relative position in Sanskrit literature or to connect it with the historical period of India. The only ascertainable fact in his opinion is that the Sūtra belongs to a Carana settled in the North India (1882Ib: xxvii).

(4) Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra
GB opines that Baudhāyana was more ancient than Āpastamba and Hiranyakesin (1882Ib: xxxv) and probably he was an inhabitant of the eastern coast (1882Ib: xliii). He adduces a southern origin of the Baudhāyanīya school (1882Ib: xlii).

(C) The Laws of Manu:
This is one of the most referred works of GB. He stanchly adduces the theory first put forth by Max Müller that the Manusmṛti is based on a Dharmasūtra of the Mānavas. He tries to differentiate and to show the old and the new parts of the work (1886K: lxvi-lxiii). The new parts comprise the additions made to the Dharmasūtra by the editors of the metrical version. He makes some conjectures regarding the sources from which the additions must have been made. Then he discusses about the position of Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā among various recensions and its probable date.

Opposing the view of a gradual textual evolution GB proposed the unitary authorship of the text (OLIVELLE 2005: 6-7; 1886K: xcii). As for the age of the Manusmṛti, GB discusses relative chronology of various Dharmaśāstra texts.

This epoch making book was since being referred to in many works wherever Manusmṛti finds a place.7

---

7 “Georg Bühler’s translation and study, (which) has remained the standard for over a century, …” (OLIVELLE 2005: 3).
(D) Miscellaneous:
Other than the above mentioned works GB wrote a number of articles on Indian Law. In ZDMG GB and BÖHTLINGK seem to have a raging discussion (raging on BÖHTLINGK’s part) regarding GB’s Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra. BÖHTLINGK strongly condemns GB for trusting Haradatta, the commentator of Āpastamba. Among GB’s other articles on Indian Law the article on the Wergeld is interesting (See for details section IV.D.6).

In his very first article dealing with Dharmaśāstra written in 1864, GB tries to draw support from the Dharmaśāstric texts and especially from the Vedas against before-puberty marriage of girls then prevalent in the society. The article was first read in a monthly meeting of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society on 9th June 1863, within four months of his stay in India. He attempted to prove that the laws enjoining the early marriages of girls are opposed to the practice of the Vedic age and therefore not binding, even for an orthodox Hindu (1864f: 139). Here he makes an attempt to seek for the authority of the Vedas to draw attention towards a folly in the society. He certainly considered himself to be descended from the Aryan stock (GOUGH 1878: 50). There seems an attempt in this article to show that something which was righteous for the then European mind and society is found in the Vedas, the most authentic transmitters of the uncontaminated tradition of the Aryas. It should be remembered that this was almost 27 years prior to the infamous Phulomnee case, the age of consent debate and the consequent emendation in the Age of Consent Act in 1891 (CHAPALGAONKAR 2009: 447).\footnote{It seems, however, that the Act was never taken seriously by the subjects and the enforcing authority.}

In an article on the age of the author of the Mitākṣarā he adduces it to be latter half of the 11th c. CE. Vijñāneśvara lived under the protection of and wrote for the Cālukyan king Vikramāditya. He was one of the most powerful kings. His empire embraced the greater part of Southern and Western India. Hence, GB concludes, Mitākṣarā came into general use and high repute in the said region. In another article GB presents results of collation of the MSS of
Yājñavalkyasmṛti (BORI MSS No. 358-362/1875-76) done by KIRSTE and an index of various terms.

2. Sanskrit and Prakrit Grammar and Lexicography

(A) Prakrit Lexicography:
In 1873 GB discovered the Deśināmālā of Hemacandra. A MS dated Sārvat 1587 of the text was lent to him for a transcription (BORI MS. No. 184/1872-73). He wrote a short notice in the IA of 1873 about the newly discovered text and the general scheme and importance of it. Within a period of six months he found another lexicographical work titled Pāiyalacchīnāmālā of Dhanapāla (BORI MS. No. 185/1872-73) notice of which also appeared in the June issue of the same journal. GB edited the Pāiyalacchīnāmālā with critical notes, an introduction and a glossary for the ‘Festschrift’ of Theodor BENFEY in 1878. He discusses the term ‘Deśi’ in detail (1878p: 77-78) and points out that many tatsama and tadbhava words are listed by Dhanapāla as Deśī (1878p: 78). It can be inferred that Hemacandra used Pāiyalacchī for his commentary while in his text he follows a different authority (1878p: 79). GB also infers that Dhanapāla wrote some other Prakrit Kośa besides Pāiyalacchī to which Hemachandra’s quotations refer (1878p: 80). At the end GB declares that he must reserve a fuller enquiry regarding the real nature of the “so-called Deśi-words” for the introduction to Hemacandra’s Deśikośa, which Pischel was going to edit in conjunction with GB (1878p: 79). At first GB had plans to edit the work of Hemacandra himself (GOUGH 1878: 134) however it seems that due to lack of time and leisure, he handed over to PISCHEL the MSS of the text procured by him and decided to confine himself only to a historical introduction. GB was also to supply a Glossary for the said work. Though the work was planned it is not known whether it was finished. PISCHEL published his edition of the text in 1880 under the B.S.S. The part consisting GB’s introduction and a Glossary was perhaps never published.9

9 The edition was revised with a Glossary by Paravastu Venkata RAMANUJASWAMY in 1938 and published by the Bhandarkar Institute. There is another edition of PISCHEL’s work published from Calcutta.
(B) Sanskrit Grammar and Lexicography:
GB wrote a notice about the Yādavaprakāśa’s Vaijayantī in ÖMO in 1884. He then published a partial analysis of its contents and some extracts from it. GB concludes that the author was an ascetic from South India.

PISCHEL thought the age of Pāṇini to be not older than 5th-6th c. CE. From this PISCHEL infers that Pāṇini stands not at the beginning of the grammatical literature but at the beginning of its final development. GB refutes these views of PISCHEL in an article titled “Hiuen Tsiang's Angaben über das Alter Pāṇini's”. GB argues that though Hiuen Tsang narrated some legends pertaining to Pāṇini they contain negligible historical element in them. Had Pāṇini preceded Hiuen Tsang only by one or two hundred years then Hiuen Tsang should have come to know at least some historical information about the former. GB affirms that Indians anticipate events that happened a hundred years ago, as “within the memory of man”, and in the hometowns of authors who lived two hundred years ago, you get better informed than that backdates the same three to four thousand years. Consequently, he considers Hiuen Tsang’s statement against the assumption of PISCHEL’s determination of the time of the grammarian (1885i: 225).

In his article on the peculiar meaning of the particles iti and ca GB points out the correctness of the traditional view that they also mean, depending upon the context, ‘and so forth’, ‘and the like’ (1887a: 13-20).10

Another epoch-making article on Sanskrit grammar by GB is titled “The Roots of the Dhātupāṭha not found in Literature” (1894r: 141-154, 250-255; 17-42, 122-136).11

As far as his other activities are concerned through the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (i.e. the Imperial Academy of Sciences and now the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften) GB initiated a project for editing “the Sources of the Indian Lexicography”.

His contributions to the Sanskrit and Prakrit Lexicography can be summarised in brief as follows:12

---

10 For more details see Chapter IV.
11 For details see Chapter IV.
(1) Catuṣka (Text: Pañcatantra)

P: A hall resting on four pillars or a Maṇḍapa.

MW: A quadrangular courtyard (used for receiving guests)

GB: The Cauka or four-cornered figures are meant, which are drawn in white chalk, or formed of wheat or rice, round the seat or dining-place of honoured guests at festive occasions (1891Ca: 72).

Source: MOLESWORTH's Marathi dictionary cauka; S.P. PANDIT.

Argument: "...it is, at least now, not customary to erect Maṇḍapas simply for reception of guests."

Remarks: P and MW are not in concord with the expression Racitacatuṣkā.

(2) Praṣasti (Technical meaning of)

P: An edict

MW: An edict, eulogy

GB: (only) eulogy or eulogistic inscription; “Edict” is not correct. Edict is a Śasana (1888j: 86-91).

Source: Khaṇḍa-Praṣasti, Kumāravīhāra-Praṣasti and many such works.

Argument: In literature short laudatory poems are commonly called Praṣastis.

(3) Uttarāyaṇa and Dakṣiṇāyaṇa


MW: Uttarāyaṇa - the progress (of the sun) to the north; the period of the sun’s progress to the north of the equator; the summer solstice. As both P and MW equate Uttarāyaṇa with summer solstice they do not do it in the case of Dakṣiṇāyaṇa.

GB: The winter solstice and the summer solstice (1888j: 90-91).

Source: Inscription of Dharanīvarāha of Vaṭṭhavāṇa dated “pausā sudi 4 uttarāyaṇe” (1883b: 190-195);

---

12 Abbreviations used only for the present section: P = Petersburg Dictionary, MW = Monier Williams Dictionary.
Argument: “The Uttarāyaṇa-day is the first day of the sun’s course towards the north [printing mistake corrected] and falls in the month of Pauṣa [i.e. in winter]. The day called Dakṣiṇāyana, on the other hand, is the first day of the sun’s course towards the south and falls in the month of Āṣāḍha [i.e. in summer]” (1888j: 90-91).

Note: Solstice is the farthest conjectural point from the equator to which the sun touches. Each year, the summer solstice is reached by the sun on the 21st of June, while the winter solstice on the 22nd of December. According to the ‘mixed calendar’ (having both lunar and solar considerations) used in India, these two points are reached in the months of Āṣāḍha and Pauṣa respectively and they are called Viṣṭambha and Avaṣṭambha (THAKUR 1977: 683-684). The sun’s journey from Viṣṭambha to Avaṣṭambha is Dakṣiṇāyana and thus Uttarāyaṇa is perceived vice versa. The solstices and the Ayana are conceptually different. However, considering the implication of the term Uttarāyaṇa in the inscription and the mention of the month Pauṣa, GB stands vindicated for his translation ‘winter solstice’, as against the meaning offered by P and MW.

(4) Bhrūṇa, Bhrūṇahan, Bhrūṇahatyā, Bhrūṇahanana

P: An embryo; Bhrūṇahan - the destroyer of a Brāhmaṇa.

MW: An embryo, a very learned Brāhmaṇa; Bhrūṇahatyā – the killing of a learned Brāhmaṇa.

GB: A learned Brāhmaṇa. Derives from the Vedic root bhur meaning to move quickly, to be active (1888j: 182-185).

Source: Baudhāyanasūtra; Haradatta’s commentary on the Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra.

13 THITE has suggested a new term Ayanabindu as a Sanskrit translation of the word solstice. GB calls it Uttarāyaṇa-day.
Remarks: Both the dictionaries accept the meaning Brāhmaṇa at only a few places and otherwise render the meaning as an embryo, while GB argues 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.

(5) Dharmavahikā (occurring in Prabandhas)

P: N. A.
MW: N. A.
FLEET: The name of a town. (Grant of Bhīmadeva II, IA 1890: 112.)
Source: Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅga; Grant of Bhīmadeva II mentioned above.
Argument: Gujarati Vahikā; Marathi Vahī; Hindi and Panjabi Vahī; Marvadi Vaṇī (Khātāvaṇī). All from the root vah to mean vehicle (of accounts).
Remarks: “Indian kings used to keep regular accounts of their charitable gifts….”
The word does not find place in the lexicographical works like Indian Epigraphical Glossary (SIRCAR 1966) and Contributions of Sanskrit Inscriptions to Lexicography (TEWARI 1987).

(6) Drśṭam (occurs at the beginning of inscriptions)

BHAGWANLAL and FLEET: Drśṭam (No explanation about the possible meaning)
KIELHORN: Om, Om
GB: Seen (1892af: 9)
Explanation: It is a remark to denote that the copy of the grant has been seen and endorsed. (See section IV.2)
(7) Kuṭila alphabets (The nomenclature)

PRINSEP: Kuṭila alphabets (used the term for the first time based on a wrong interpretation of an expression in the Dewal Praśasti)

FLEET: Kuṭila (expresses doubt)

OJHA: Kuṭila (No arguments for the nomenclature, SIRCAR 1965-66: 50)

GB: North Indian type of Nāgarī (1892au: 76; JANERT 1961: 69)


(8) Āgama (Vākyapadiya II.1-6)

GOLDSTÜCKER: A document or a manuscript

WEBER: A text

STENZLER: Überlieferung (tradition)

KIELHORN: Traditional knowledge

GB: The tradition or the traditional interpretation of the Śāstras.

GB confirms the meaning contended by KIELHORN by consulting “the most learned grammarians in Benares, Indore, and other parts of India” (1877b: 71). There was a long debate between WEBER, KIELHORN and STENZLER about the meaning of the word Āgama in a Bhartrhari’s verse (KIELHORN 1876: 244). With the help a MS. of Bhartrhari’s commentary on the Mahābhāṣya preserved in the Berlin library GB could further substantiate KIELHORN’s view. Bhartrhari himself explains the word as Pāramparyenāvacchinna upadeśaḥ (1882d: 653-654).

(9) Siddham (Frequently stands in the beginning of ancient inscriptions)

STEVENSON: To the Perfect one.


GB points out that the word is used as a maṅgala in the Mahābhāṣya. He refers to KIELHORN’s edition of the text and BHANDARKAR’s article (1876: 346) for the same.
3. Catalogues of Manuscripts and Reports on Manuscript-search

In September 1863 GB wrote a review on two catalogues of MSS in the Library of the Board of Examiners in Chennai, then Madras and commented on the part related to Sanskrit MSS. The catalogues were not systematic and displayed gross errors. There were numerous works ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya, Rāmānuja, Madhvācārya with the commentaries of their disciples. GB has following remarks about the importance of the collection:

“Many of these works are at present unique, and should the time come ... when the now neglected last stage of the religious development of India, shall again engage the attention of Oriental scholars, we shall have to look to the collection of Madras chiefly for further information on the history of the fall of Hinduism” (1864h: 77).

While writing this he perhaps believed that the division into sects is the “last” stage of the religious development of “India” and that it was the “fall” of Hinduism. Here it seems that he was certainly looking from the view point of a Western, Christian scholar who did not have an in depth acquaintance with the system called Hinduism. For a Christian might view due to the influence of the history of his own religion, existence of many sects as a last stage of development. In contrast with this remark of 1863, his epoch making article written in 1887 on the Jainas “Über die indische Secte der Jaina”, displays a thorough cognition about the Indian religious systems.14

A survey of GB’s reports of searches of MSS is already summarised in the previous section (Section II.2-2.2). His reports contain detail information on MSS, interesting accounts of the places visited as also an acknowledgment to the persons who helped him in one or the other way and his interaction with them.

(A) The Catalogue of Private Libraries:

In November 1868 the Searches of MSS were instituted by the Government of India. It was proposed under the scheme “to prepare uniformly all procurable unprinted lists of the Sanskrit MSS in Indian libraries, and to send them to the

14 See Chapter IV.
various learned Societies of Europe, and to individual scholars in Europe and India, with an intimation that the Government will carefully attend to their suggestions as to which of the MSS. therein mentioned should be examined, purchased, or transcribed” (GOUGH 1878: 9). Accordingly GB and KIELHORN were entrusted to prepare catalogue of MSS from the unprinted lists of various private and individual libraries. GB prepared catalogue of MSS which consisted survey of libraries of Surat, Ahmadabad, Baroda, Broach and many other towns of Gujarat, the towns of Kathewad such as Bhavnagar, Sihor, Junagadh etc. The catalogue also contained lists from Hyderabad in Sindh, the Royal collection of Bhuj, the libraries of Khandesh, which GB calls highly interesting and the libraries in the Nashik district.

The catalogue is a result of survey of MSS carried out “partly by paid agents, partly by the Śāstrīs of the native courts, and partly by schoolmasters and other employees of the Educational Department” (1871F: iii). It was published in four fascicles divided subject-wise. The first fascicle contains MSS of the Vedic and the Śūtra literature, the second lists Poetry, third has Grammar, Glossaries, Alamkāra, Metrics and Dharma while fourth enumerates Darśanas and the other technical sciences.

According to GB, the catalogue would be useful to enable Bombay Sanskritists to gain access to a very large number of good MSS (1871F: iv). He offers to procure copies of the MSS for any Sanskritist who might apply to him. The rates of the copyists were, for simple copies Rs. 2.50-3.00 and for ‘corrected’ ones Rs. 4.00-5.00 per 1000 Ślokas.

GB has stated his general remarks about the extent and the scope of the literature obtainable through these MSS as also he commented on the rare and important works. GB takes Sarasvatipurāṇa to be a modern fabrication (1872Fa: ii). Through the catalogue several new works, especially relating to the Atharvaveda have come to light (1871F: viii). The second fascicle lists 120 such works which were unknown till then (1872Fa: viii).

GB declares some of the Mahātmyas like Dākora-Māhātmya and Sābharamatī-Mahātmya as of recent origin (1872Fa: ii). He calls Naiṣadharacarita as the most worthless of all the Mahākāvyas (1872Fa: iv).
Though the catalogue is now almost obsolete from the point of view of getting access to the MSS listed, nevertheless a peep in the history of various collections and MSS literature extant in the 19th c. can be gained. There is a possibility that during the past hundred years some of the MSS might have reached to a nearer or larger public MSS repository or Oriental Research Institute in the region.

(B) Extracts from the Reports:
GB was first to explore MSS libraries in India on such a wide geographical area. He was the first European to be able to enter into the Bhandars of the Jainas. Obviously European scholarly world was enthusiastic about his discoveries and curious to know about any developments on that front. Extracts from his reports were published from time to time in various journals like _Orient und Occident_, _Indische Studien_ and most often in the _Indian Antiquary_. WEBER informed the readers of his _Indische Studien_ and other German journals about GB’s accounts and results of his searches by publishing extracts from the letters written to him by GB (WEBER 1874, 1876). The discovery of the Vikramāṅkacarita and GB’s accounts of Kashmir tour were mostly noticed.

(C) The Reports 1872-73 onwards: GB’s reports written 1873 onwards are the most important ones. He found numerous new works, rare and old MSS during 1872 to 1876. The lists of MSS for 1873-74 and 1875-76 also contain along with the basic information about each MS. the name of the place where it was procured.

His detailed narration about the Rājputānā tour “Eine Reise durch die indische Wüste” appeared in the _Österreichische Rundschau_ in 1883.

(D) Kashmir Report: This epoch making report of GB’s ten months tour to Kashmir became famous and is still considered to be important due to the academic discussions therein as also from the point of view of history. Beginning with this report the later reports in search of MSS became more and more exhaustive and full of lengthy academic discussions. Published in 1877 as an Extra
Number of the *JBB(R)AS* the report is divided into three sections: GB’s personal narrative, an account of the Kashmiri Brahmans and an account of the MSS purchased. The three sections are under “Part I - Kashmir”. As the title suggests GB intended to write similar detailed account of his tour to Rājputānā and Central India in the consecutive part of the number which perhaps never appeared. The importance of the report can be stated in the following words of JOLLY:

“The important Kāshmīr Report contains, besides the MSS-list, also detailed investigations on the age of the works discovered by B. [GB] and extracts from the same, B. also brought forward a lot of new material for the criticism and explanation of the Rājatarāṅgini and pointed out, as STEIN, in his worthy edition of this work has remarked, the way for the work still to be carried out” (THITE 2010: 162 fn. 3; JOLLY 1899: 7 fn. 3).

(E) A Journey through the Indian Deserts (*Eine Reise durch die indische Wüste*): This nineteen page long article printed in the Fraktur script gives enchanting account of GB’s experiences during his visit to various towns in Rājputānā, now Rajasthan. GB believed that Rajasthan is a true representation of ancient Indian social and cultural conditions, as described in the ancient Sanskrit literature. Therefore he suggests that those who want to study Indian history should see with their own eyes what the conditions really are. He was eager to visit the country because there was an opportunity to explore the life in the princely states which were not fully under British control and hence have not exposed more to the Western culture (1883h: 518). JACOBI accompanied him on this tour. Right from bad drinking water to beautiful temples and from the system of Huṇḍī to a stonemason in Abu GB gives glimpse of everything connected to his journey which was made on camels.

(F) Two Lists of Sanskrit MSS. together with some remarks... (1888m: 530-559):
This article of GB is important due to a number of reasons. It is GB’s own account and personal narration about the situations at the beginning and early
stage of the searches of the MSS. GB presented his personal collection of MSS to the India Office Library. He narrates in detail how this collection was formed. The list of GB’s first collection made during 1866-68 for the Bombay Government which remained unpublished has been presented in this article.

Another important feature of this article is GB’s statement about the MSS sent through his agency to various European libraries. The exact dates and numbers of resolutions of the Indian Government, sanctioning such mediation by GB, are specified in the article when MSS were supplied on request to a library. GB clarifies his role in the activity, which removes or at least lessens the intensity of the doubts posed by the later scholarly world about his integrity.

4. Poetic Literature

(A) Pañcatantra
To produce cheap and useable textbooks for the Bombay-Colleges the Bombay Sanskrit Series was established by GB and KIELHORN. GB edited the first number of the series beginning with a simple text but which is important for the students, the Pañcatantra. He edited all the Tantras except the first one which was taken up by KIELHORN.

This is a popular edition of the text with notes. There is no introduction to any of the editions and it is not clear on which MSS or printed edition the text is based. The notes are in such a way that they should be useful for the students. According to GB Mahilāropya, name of a town which occurs in the Pañcatantra is probably the town called by Ptolemy ‘Maliarpha’, now called Mayilpur, near Madras (1891Ca: 75).

Afterwards when GB became first Professor of the Oriental Languages and Antiquity at the Vienna University, the Pañcatantra was an important part of the Sanskrit teaching at the University.

Regarding the connection of the Jātakas with the Pañcatantra, he did not believe the theory to be true that the Pañcatantra must have originated from a Buddhist source. At the 42nd meeting of the German Philologists he presented his views on this topic (1893m: 504). However, as he once said to WINTERNITZ, he did not write separately on the topic since it was the theory of BENFEY, his
revered Guru, that all Indian tales were derived from a Buddhist source (WINTERNITZ 1898: 337).

(B) Śrīharṣa and Harṣavardhana:
GB read before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society a paper “On the Age of the Naiṣadharacarita of Śrīharṣa” in which he showed that the author of the Naiṣadharacarita belonged to the latter half of the 12th c. CE. Here he refutes arguments put forth in the IA by scholars like K. T. TELANG and GROWSE. TELANG opined that Śrīharṣa must have lived during 9th-10th c. CE. Regarding F. HALL’s assertion of occurrence of a quotation from the Naiṣadhīya in the Sarasvatikaṅṭhābharaṇa, GB concludes that HALL’s statement must either be based on a mistake or on an interpolated copy (1875c: 281).

GB confirmed through the firm MS. evidence the conjecture of F. E. HALL about the author of the Ratnāvalī that he is not, as supposed by H. H. WILSON, King Śrīharṣadeva of Kashmir, but Śrīharṣa of Kanoj and that consequently, the play dates, not from the 12th, but from the 7th c. CE (1873e: 127).

(C) Daṣakumāracarita
The edition of the Daṣakumāracarita was published under the B.S.S. (No. X). GB edited the first part in 1873 while the second was edited by PETERSON in 1891 (No. XLII, Ucchvāsa 4-8). GB used six MSS and two printed editions. Both are students’ editions and not the critical ones.

(D) Caṇḍikāṣataka
GB acquired a MS. of the Caṇḍikāṣataka, which ascribed the poem to one Śrīvaṇa. As no great poet of this name is known, GB concluded on the basis of a Jaina commentary which ascribes Caṇḍikāṣataka to famous poet Bāṇa, that the original word Śrī Bāṇa must have been incorrectly spelt as Śrīvaṇa (1872c: 111). He subjoins text and translation of some of the first Ślokas and the concluding one of the Caṇḍikāṣataka to his article (1872c: 112). At the end he rendered the legend about Bāṇa and Mayūra and could explain from Caṇḍikāṣataka why the story of Bāṇa’s self-mutilation must have arisen (1872c: 115).
(E) Brhatkathā
GB recovered Kṣemendra’s Brhatkathā by procuring a MS. of the text in 1872-73. In an article in the IA he compares it with Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara. The Lambhakas of Kṣemendra and Lambakas of Somadeva have been compared. He also tried to throw some light on the age of Kṣemendra (1872d: 307). The comparison of the two Kathā works is done in order to check whether anyone of the works is based on the other or has made use of the other. The result of his exercise is that he arrives at the negative answer and could confirm that both the authors independently remodelled a Prakrit original. GB opines that the recovery of Kṣemendra’s work furnishes a powerful instrument for determining the exact contents of the old Paiśācī Brhatkathā. He further hopes that:

“The old Vṛihatkathā once being reconstructed, we shall further obtain important results for the history of those works, which like the Pañcatantra, the Vetālapaṅcavimśatī are embodied in it. For Guṇādhya’s Vṛihatkathā possessed certainly a higher antiquity than the Persian or Mongolian translations of those fablebooks” (1872d: 309).

(F) The age of the Kashmiri poet Somadeva
H. H. Wilson conjectured that Somadeva, the author of Kathāsaritsāgara wrote during 1059 – 1071 CE or somewhat earlier. GB contends the conjecture on the basis of four MSS of the Kathāsaritsāgara present in the Government Collection of MSS in the Deccan College (now in the Bhandarkar Institute). From the four MSS he cites the last verses of the work which render the genealogy of Somadeva’s patron Harṣadeva. From these verses and the verses from the Rājataraṅginī he concludes that when Somadeva wrote Harṣadeva was a grown up person but still did not hold the throne. He finally adduces that Somadeva must have written sometime between the beginning of Kalaśa’s rule in 1063-1064 and the death of Anantadeva and Sūryamatī in 1081-1082 CE.
(G) Āpastamba's Quotations from the Purāṇas:

The question regarding the antiquity and authenticity of the Purāṇas possess considerable importance for the history of Indian religion and literature. In the first edition of his translation of the Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra GB had stated that the Purāṇas are, though not identical with, yet not altogether independent of, the Purāṇas which are mentioned in the Vedic works (1896f: 323). He seems to account for the opinions of his predecessors and senior contemporaries like Wilson and Max Müller on the issue of chronological placement of the Purāṇas. While Wilson places them in the 8th-9th c., MAX MÜLLER opined that the Purāṇas might contain materials, though much altered, of the Purāṇa mentioned in Vedic literature (MAX MÜLLER 1883: 88).

In his article on the Āpastamba's quotations from the Purāṇas GB points such quotations from the Āpastamba which prove that the language of the ancient Purāṇas was closely allied to that of the Vedic texts (1896f: 327). According to GB the quotations are sufficient to prove that existing Purāṇas are connected with the homonymous works, mentioned in Vedic literature (1896f: 327). Finally he concludes that it is not possible to trace the history of extant Purāṇas beyond 600 CE (1896f: 328).

GB also wrote about authors like Abhinanda and his works, the Rāmacarita and the Kādambarikathāsāra (1873a: 104). He deals with the history of Kashmir and particularly the Karkoṭa kings (1873a: 104-105). He then adduces evidences for the identity of Karkoṭa king Muktāpiḍa with Lalitāditya and shows that the two names belong to the same person (1873a: 106).

His epoch making article about the antiquity of Indian artificial poetry and the article about the history of the Mahābhārata have been discussed in detail elsewhere in the thesis (See Section IV.5.A and IV.5.B respectively). The other subjects dealt with by GB include the Rasikasamājīvinī of Arjunavarman (1893l: 92-95).
5. History and Geography

(A) History

GB work contributes towards history of India. Such miscellaneous articles on political history which are not directly related to a historical Kāvyā or editing of an inscription have been discussed under here. He also edited an article of BHAGWANLAL on the history of Nepal (1880a, 1884f, 1885k).

(1) The Sātavāhanas and the Western Kṣtrapas:

On the basis Pandit BHAGWANLAL’s researches on the antiquarian remains at Sopārā, GB expresses some conjectures in his article “On the Relationship between the Andhras and the Western Kshatrapas” (1883j: 272-274). BHAGWANLAL indentified the name of the father of Gautamīputra Yajñaśrī as Vāsiṣṭhīputra Sātakarnī. With this identification GB tallies the Kanheri inscription no. 11 which tells about the queen of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Sātakarnī. She is descended from the race of Kārdamaka kings and she is a daughter of a great Kṣatrapa king. Only the initial character ‘Ru’ of the name of this Kṣatrapa king has survived and there is a space for only one character which is mutilated. As the Junagadh inscription states that a Sātakarnī king was a relative of Rudradāman GB thinks that this Ru stands for Rudra and who is no one else than Rudradāman himself. Thus he draws conjectures that Vāsiṣṭhīputra might be a son-in-law of Rudradāman and then Yajñaśrī must be his grandson.

Further he enumerates evidences to show that Gautamiputra Sātakaṇī conquered Nahapāna and his son-in-law Uṣavadāta before the 14th year of his own reign (1883j: 273).

As is evident from KHARE (1951, facsimile reprint 2010: 194, 198), historians have confused Vāsiṣṭhīputra Sātakarnī with Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi. However, MIRASHI (1981: 57-58, 85-86) addresses this issue and attests the find of GB. BHANDARE has dealt with this topic through numismatic finds and has reached the same conclusion as GB.

---

15 This is pointed out to me by S. L. BAPAT.
(2) Some Chronological considerations:

1. Gupta-Valabhi Era

Regarding origin of the era GB held that it was established in the year 318-319 CE; the view held also by BHANDARKAR as against that of FLEET who believed it to be 319-320 CE. GB tried to rebut views of FLEET, who holds that the Gupta-Valabhi era is related with the Licchavis and that it has no connection with any particular important event. GB opines that the era is not related with the Licchavis and that it marks the coronation of Candragupta-I. He emphasised that the Gupta era is identical with the Valabhi Samvat (1891j: 215-229). KIELHORN supported GB’s views (RAU 1969: 648-649; KIELHORN 1892: 107-108).

From the study of various inscriptions KHARE (1951, facsimile reprint 2010: 53-54) holds the era as the Gupta-Valabhi era (having no connection with the Licchavis), but he takes its beginning in 319-320 CE (past year).

2. Vāghelā kings

GB wrote an article about an inscription of 1275 CE of the Vāghelā king Sāraṅgadeva to rebut BHANDARKAR’s views about the dates of the Vāghelā kings which were, according to GB, based on untrustworthy sources like Pravacanaparākṣā. The inscription was found at Khokhra in Kacch by Rao Saheb D. P. KHAKAR.

(3) STEIN’s Researches:

GB’s contributions to the Jaina religion and history are not limited to insutional studies he was also a mediator in discovery of at least one temple of great antiquity. Hiuen Tsang noticed a Jaina temple to the south-east of the town Singhapura in Punjab, where Lord Mahāvīra paid visit. CUNNINGHAM discussed the geographical identification of Singhapura but he could not discover any Jaina ruins at the possible site. GB, therefore, kept urging many of his friends who resided in Punjab to examine ancient sites for the purpose. On GB’s suggestion STEIN made a trip to Ketas, discovered the Jaina temple and could locate the site of ancient Singhapura. GB gave account of STEIN’s journey translating it into English from STEIN’s letter in German dated 28 December 1889 (1890e: 80).
GB gives a detailed and interesting account of STEIN’s researches in Kashmir. STEIN explored some historical sites and temples in the valley. GB presents translation of extracts from two letters of STEIN (1891e: 345-348).

GB informs the readers of WZKM about the condition of Sanskrit studies at Lahore after STEIN’s appointment as the Principal of the Oriental College (1888l: 271-272). He informs that STEIN has undertaken the reorganisation of the instruction in Sanskrit and has induced the Lahore University to sanction new standards for the examinations framed on the model of those of the Bombay University. GB also obtained through STEIN’s efforts a printed rough catalogue of MSS collected by the order of Maharaja Ranjitsingh.

(B) Geography
Residing in Austria might have posed difficulty for GB to get the required tools i.e. Trigonometrical Survey Maps, Toposheets etc. essential for identification of places mentioned in inscriptions. That must be the reason why he has not identified more number of places as compared to the number of inscription he studied or edited.

He wrote three separate articles on identification of villages mentioned in Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Gujarat Cālukya grants. They contribute towards the ancient Geography of Gujarat.

Villages in various Grants:
BHAGWANLAL identified Kāyāvatāra with Kavi in Gujarat. GB refutes this identification on the ground that Kavi is called Kāpikā in an inscription of Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda IV. Instead he proposes that the Kāyāvatāra might be identified with the modern Kārvān.

The following is a brief survey of the results presented by GB through his three articles17:

---

17 Though the old style of transliteration has been replaced with the current one, the original transliteration has been maintained in ancient as well as modern names. The modern place names might have undergone some changes in their spellings which have not been considered here. All the places are now in Gujarat state.
(1) A Grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruva III found at Bagumra. (1887m: 100-101):
Ancient Name => Modern Name
Mottaka => Mota in Surat district
Pārāhaṇaka => Parona
Moivāsaka => Mowacchi
Khaurāchhaka => Kharwāśa
Trennā => Ten (app. 2 miles west of Bardoli)
Bhadrapalī => Bardoli (original prakrit Bāraḍapallikā)
Karmāntapura => Kamrej: Kamaṇeya, Kārmaṇeya or Kammanijja
in Gurjara, Cālukya and Rāthor inscriptions
Kuṇḍiravallikā and
Jonandhā => Not traceable

(2) Rāṣṭrakūṭa (Rathod) Grant of Kṛṣṇa II of Ankuleśvara A.D. 888.
(1887m: 100-101):
Variavi => Variao
Kaviṇhasādhi => Kosād
Valachha => Varachha
Uttarapadhaṇāka => Utrān

(3) Cālukya grant No. 4 published in IA (1877) 197.
(1889k: 176-178):
Sāmpavādā => Sāmpawārā
Śeṣadevati => ?
Phūmacāḍī => Phechari (Taluka Vīramgām)
Hāṁsalapura => Hasalpur (Taluka Vīramgām)
Khāṁbhila => Khambel
Ādhiyāvādā => Ādvārā
Doḍiyāpāṭaka => Doriwārā
Ītīḷā (Indīḷā in grant 3) => Indla
Kāḷharī => Kāḷrī
Vahicara => Bechar
FLEET suggests that Gambhūtā might be Cambay. GB rightly refutes the suggestion and shows the following derivation for Cambay:

Stambhatūrtha (occurs in Prabandhas and inscriptions) => Skambhatūrtha => Kambhaitthta (Prakrit) => Kambhāyat (modern) => Cambay (Anglicised).

(4) Cālukya grant No. 10 in IA (1877) 208.

(1889k: 178):

Bhāṁśara  =>  Bhākhar
Kuralī  =>  ?
Dāsayaja  =>  Dāsaj
Tribha  =>  Tarabh
Araṭhaura  =>  Aithor (Athor)
Uṁjhā  =>  Unjha
Kāmbalī  =>  Kāmbli
Rājapurī  =>  Rajapur
Kūḷāva[saṇa]  =>  Jhulāsan
Dāṅgarauā  =>  Dāṅgarwa
Caṁḍāvasaṇa  =>  Charāsan
Indrāvaḍa  =>  Idarād
Āhīṛāṇā  =>  Irānā
Sirasāvi  =>  Sarsāo
Naṁḍāvasaṇa  =>  Nandāsan
Uṁtau̯yā  =>  Utwa
Kuṇyala  =>  Kiol
The Viṣaya Pathaka included the districts south-east of Sidhpur, and the Daṁḍāhī Pathaka those east of Kaḍī.

(5) Gujarat Rāṣṭrākūṭa grants from Torkheḍe and Baroda.

(1897j: 39-40):
In this article GB tried to identify the places mentioned in the Torkheḍe grant of the Gujarat Rāṣṭrākūṭa Govinda (FLEET 1894-95: 53-58) and Baroda grant of the Gujarat Rāṣṭrākūṭa Dhruvarāja II (HULTZSCH 1885: 196ff).

Sīharakkhī => Serkhi, near Baroda (identified by FLEET)
Govaṭṭanaka => Kotna, north-west of Baroda, near Serkhi
Badarasiddhi => Borsad in the Kaira Collectorate

Badara+Siddhi => Bor+Sidh*  (*still occasionally used - GB)
Puśilāvilli => ?; Place now occupied by a village called Kopra
Kaśahrrada => Kāsandra (from Prakrit Kāsadraha)
Veṭhcā nadi => Khārī river
Voṭivrdraka => Barodra (?)
Catuhṛarī => Chosar
Āsilāvalli => Aslālī
Vinhucavalli => Vinjhol

6. Historical Poems
The discovery of four historical poems viz. Vikramāṇkadevacarita, Gauḍavaha¹⁸, Prthvīrājavijaya¹⁹ and Kīrtikaumudi must be credited to GB’s efforts. Out of these he edited Vikramāṇkadevacarita. He received a MS. of another historical poem titled Jagaḍucarita in 1876 which he edited in 1892.

¹⁸ Edited by S. P. PANDET.
¹⁹ Edited by J. MORISON, one of GB’s students, in WZKM VII.
Georg BÜHLER’s Devanāgarī handwriting
(Last page of the manuscript of Vikramāṅkadevacarita copied by Georg BÜHLER and Hermann JACOBI. This copy is deposited in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, and bears the accession number ‘50 of 1873-74’.)
(A) Vikramaṅkadevacarita:

The Vikramaṅkadevacarita of Bilhaṇa edited by GB for the first time with the help of a copy of a single manuscript was published in the Bombay Sanskrit Series in 1875. He wrote a detailed introduction dealing with the history of Cālukyan dynasty as depicted in the Kāvyā. In the introduction he has delineated important features of Sanskrit historical Kāvyā literature and has shown the way to deal with it in a manner that authentic historical information can be easily extracted. It is a quintessential example of GB’s method of studying a somewhat newer branch of literature in the right context with catching the right purport. From this point of view the introduction is very much important. However, he did not deal with the poetical aspect of the text in detail. He focused particularly on the historical information.

(1) The Discovery of the Manuscript:

GB on a tour in search of Sanskrit MSS in Rajasthan during the winter season of 1873-1874 discovered a MS. of Vikramaṅkadevacarita in Jaisalmer in a Bhandar belonging to the Osval Jainas. It was a palm-leaf MS. written, as per GB’s conjecture, towards the end of the 12th c. (1874c: 89). It was very carefully written, and still more carefully corrected and annotated. The corrections were very old. Realizing the importance of the text and not being allowed to take away the MS. GB with the help of JACOBI, who was accompanying him on that tour, copied by hand in seven days all 18 cantos of the text written on 158 folios. GB copied 11 cantos and 34 Ślokas (75-108) of 18th canto, while JACOBI copied 6 cantos and 1-74 Ślokas of the 18th canto. It must have been a difficult task in the wake of the fact that the MS. was written in the Jain Devanāgarī characters of the 11th century and in a few places the ink was rubbed off and the letters

---

20 This was done by Shastri Murari Lal NAGAR in 1945.
21 Book Notice of the Vikramāṅkacarita by the ed. in IA V (1876) 325.
22 Canto No. V, VI, XIV-XVII, XVIII 1-74.
23 The complete copy in the handwritings of GB and JACOBI, containing 185 foolscap pages is well-preserved in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Acc. No. 50/1873-74) and is well-preserved. See plate.
About the style of writing of GB and JACOBI: They have not written the manuscript in the traditional Indian style i.e. without leaving space in between the words. GB seems to be quicker in copying than JACOBI. Further, he seems to write 10-11 letters at a stretch with a single dip of the holder into the ink.
which had become indistinct had to be make out with a strong magnifying glass (1875H: 45).

(2) The Importance of the Text:

The Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa were known till then exclusively through their inscriptions and the discovery of the Kāvya marked a remarkable progress for the study of history of this branch of the Cālukyas. The author was not only a contemporary of the Cālukyan king but was his Vidyāpati i.e. the court poet. According to GB Vikramāditya Tribhuvanamalla ruled from Kalyāṇa (Kalyāṇī) from 1076-1127 CE.

The text is also important from the point of view of the history of Kashmir. Along with the description of important buildings and temples in Pravarapura, it gives notices of kings of Kashmir and their sons who apparently were the contemporaries of Bilhana; the king Anantadeva, his son Kalaśa and Kalaśa's son Harṣadeva (1875H: 8). On analysing the Kāvya GB arrived at the conclusion that the king Ananta’s accession to the throne must have taken place in 1028 CE and his death in 1080. The reign of Kalaśa lasted from 1080-1088 while he was a nominal ruler since 1062 CE (1875H: 20).

The Kāvya is not only important for the political history but also for the literary history of India. It can be asserted from it that the poet Śrīharṣa existed before Harṣadeva of Kashmir (1875H: 10 fn. 3). Up to the discovery of the Vikramāṇkadevacarita, Bilhana was known to Sanskritists as the author of Bilhanaṇapañcāśikā, a small erotic poem (1875H: 6). The discovery led to information of many important aspects relating to Bilhana's personal history. GB has translated into English the verses giving account of Bilhana and his family (1875H: 10-16; Verse No. XVIII.70-108). Bilhana left his country sometime between 1062 and 1065 CE and wrote in around 1085 CE the Vikramāṇkadevacarita at his advanced age. Thus his travels and literary activity fall in the third and fourth quarters of the eleventh century (1875H: 23).

The Kāvya helped to verify the description and history of Kashmir as narrated in the Rājatarāṅginī. GB cites references to the Ślokas from the Rājatarāṅginī which are parallel to the Ślokas in the Vikramāṇkacakarita. The
number of verses from Rājatarāṅgīṇī comparable or parallel to Bilhaṇa’s account is more than ten excluding the VII canto from Rājatarāṅgīṇī, as the whole canto gives the history also mentioned by Bilhaṇa in the XVIII canto of his work.

(B) Navasāhasāṅkacarita:
The paper titled “Ueber das Navasāhasāṅkacharita des Padmagupta oder Parimala” was written in collaboration with ZACHARIAE. It is a short account of a then unknown Mahākāvyya based on a single MS. preserved in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London. The first 20 pages of the article were contributed by ZACHARIAE (1888o: 583-603) and the last 27 by GB (603-630). The article was translated into English by May S. BURGESS and was published in the IA. ZACHARIAE commented about the MS., the author, his time and his work including quotations from the poem appearing in other Sanskrit texts. GB commented about the historical aspect of the poem.

On comparing the historical data supplied by the Kāvyya (e.g. the relation of Vākpatirāja with his brother Sindhurāja, BURGESS M. 1907: 170) with the legends mentioned in Prabandhas or Caritas GB draws interesting conclusions about the trustworthiness of the latter class of literature as compared to the historical Kāvyas. According to him:

“Padmagupta’s narrative completes and extends the information about the inscriptions, and shows more plainly than these, that the historian cannot trust to the Prabandhas and Charitas, can only make use of them with great caution. The Prabandhas are founded exclusively on the tradition of the bards and the Jaina monasteries, in which Muṇja and also his nephew very soon became mythical personalities. Whoever seeks to combine the statements of the inscriptions with the narratives of the Prabandhas will find a mixture of truth and fiction, in which contradictions are apparent” (BURGESS M. 1907: 159; 1888o: 604).

GB shows that Padmagupta’s poem is little more reliable than the above mentioned Prabandhas and Caritas. He assigns greater credibility to the
historical Kāvyas composed by the contemporary court poets than the
Prabandhas based on the bardic tradition.

GB draws the following historical information from the
Navasāhasāṅkacarita. The age of Vākpatirāja I can be ascertained as around 895
CE. Vairisimha’s reign may have begun about 920 CE (BURGESS M. 1907: 167).
According to GB Padmagupta’s account leaves no doubt that Vākpatirāja II was
the son of Harṣadeva. He is identical with Utpalarāja, (Navasāhasāṅka, the hero
of the poem), Muṇja (recognized by F. E. HALL) and Vākpatirāja-Amoghavarṣa
in the land grants (BURGESS M. 1907: 168). GB adduces that Vākpatirāja II must
have reigned during 974 CE to 994/996 CE (BURGESS M. 1907: 170).

GB gives account of various poets, about their patrons and tries to decide
age of many poets which fall during the age of Vākpatirāja.

The method applied by GB while drawing historical data is not to depend
on the details of any legend, still to examine the historical truth of the basic data
supplied by a historical Kāvyā with the help of other sources e.g. He states:
“the narrative is adorned with so many touching scenes, and so many
verses, which the imprisoned king said to have composed, under
different circumstances, that its legendary character is unmistakable.
The details are therefore not depended on. But that Tialapa II killed
Vākpatirāja-Muṇja is correct, as two Cālukya inscriptions mention
this famous deed” (BURGESS M. 1907: 170).

GB asserts that Padmagupta’s seemingly fanciful legend rests throughout upon a
historical basis (BURGESS M. 1907: 171) and that here and there perfectly
prosaic details appear in Padmagupta’s poems (BURGESS M. 1907: 172).

(C) Sukrtasāmkīrtana:
The Sukrtasāmkīrtana was brought to light by GB during 1879-80 when he
discovered a MS. of the text. The Mahākāvya is about the deeds of Vastupāla the
minister of Vāghelā king Vīradhavala from Dholkā and his son Visaladeva. For his article which appeared in *SBKAW* GB used three MSS, all procured by him.24

GB discusses in detail the character and the structure of the work, the author and his time, the history of the Cāudās and Caulukyas, Vastupāla’s pilgrimage to Śatrūnjaya and Girnār, buildings and sacred structures built by Vastupāla and his military activities. GB also gives excerpts from Rājaśekhara’s Prabandhakośa and from the Sukṛtasamkīrtana.

The Mahākāvyya comprises eleven Sargas with 553 verses. Five verses at the end of every Sarga do not belong to the author but originate from Amarapandita. According to GB both the poets are not great experts as far as their knowledge of meter and grammar is concerned (1889d: 3). Rājaśekhara has stated some information about Amarapanaḍita in the thirteenth section of his Prabandhakośa. GB opines that the author, Arisiṁha, belonged to the Jaina sect and that he must be a Rājput as his name and his father’s name, Lāvanyasirintha, ends in Sinha.

Arisiṁha has enumerated genealogy of the Cāpotkāta or Cāudā dynasty (1889d: 8). GB compares the historical information contained in the present poem with the other historical sources like Prabandhas and the Kīrtikaumudī of Someśvara (1889d: 8-10). GB reiterates the fact that the court-poets often sought for the intervention of the God at turning points in the fortunes of their heroes (1889d: 23).

From an inscription in the Vastupālavihāra, GB concludes that the Sukṛtasamkīrtana must have been written before the 3rd of March 1232 CE (1889d: 36). On comparing the list of Vastupāla’s buildings with the ones enumerated in the Kīrtikaumudī GB infers that the latter text must have been written before the Sukṛtasamkīrtana.

**(D) Jagaḍūcarita:**
The Jagaḍūcarita of Sarvāṇanda is a historical romance from Gujarat. It is of later origin as compared with the other such poems of its class. It was probably

24 (1) MS. No. 302 of his collection donated to the India Office Library in 1888, (2) BORI MS. No. 415/1879-80, (3) BORI MS. No. 411/1880-81.
written in the second half of the fourteenth or at the latest in the beginning of the fifteenth century. The other point of deviation is that its hero was not a king or a minister “but a simple merchant who did much for his native town by rebuilding its walls, and for Gujarat by alleviating the widespread distress during a terrible famine in A. D. 1256—58” (1892av: 1). The Jagaḍūcarita, which in the colophons is called a Mahākāvyā, contains seven Sargas, with 388 verses.

GB examines every event in Jagaḍū’s life narrated by the author on the grounds of practicability e.g. GB finds that the long list of kings, to whom Jagaḍū is said to have made presents of grain from his stores, is grossly exaggerated (1892av: 38).

Unlike the Vikramāṅkadevacarita or Navasāhasāṅkacarita, GB deals in detail with the poetical aspect of the text. The reason seems to be that the poet was a Jaina, though conversant with the norms of the Sanskrit poetics due to want of natural talent tries merely to imitate the classical style of composition.

“His Jagaḍūcharita is nothing more than a metrical exercise in a foreign language and in a style, strange to him. ... In order to make his work rasika and to make it look like a real Brahmānical Kāvyā, he carefully avoids all allusions to Jaina legends and doctrines and substitutes those of the Brahmans” (1892av: 2).

GB has critically evaluated Sarvāṇanda as a poet. The discussion (1892av: 2-4) shows how well read GB himself was with regard to the Sanskrit poetics, grammar, metrical science etc. He could delineate major types of Kāvyā-Doṣas from the poem.

The following is his observation about the compositions of medieval Sanskrit poets:

“As is very commonly done by the late Sanskrit poets, especially if they are Jainas, Sarvāṇanda employs a not inconsiderable number of rare Sanskrit words, or of common Sanskrit words with unusual genders and meanings, and a few Prakrit or foreign words which have been transliterated into, and made to look like, Sanskrit” (1892av: 3).
There is not much data procurable from the poem for the political history. In such case question arises why GB chose to edit this poem and wrote such a detailed article on it. The reason lies in the fact that the poem is quite different in its subject matter, and moreover, because, GB’s close acquaintance with the Gujarati language makes him the best fitting scholar to do so. The poet is not very good at Sanskrit and influence of Gujarati on his Sanskrit is more than evident. GB mentions as many as 25 instances where Gujarati language has influenced Sarvāṇanda’s Sanskrit. GB also gives a list of 28 ‘real’ Sanskrit words which deserved to be mentioned, as some do not appear in the Kośas and the standard dictionaries, and use of some is not sufficiently illustrated by quotations. There are many Sanskrit words, coined out of Prakrit or foreign words. GB mentions five out of them including Garjanesa for the king of Gazni and the ruler of Delhi (1892av: 5). Sarvāṇanda calls him Mojadīna (1892av: 20). Though GB has not mentioned the name of the ruler, it can be inferred that he was none else but Mu’izz-ud-Din Muhammad alias Shahabuddin Ghori, who was originally ruling Gazni and established the Ghurid rule in India shifting his capital to Delhi in the last decade of the 12th century. This is clearly anachronistic on Sarvāṇanda’s part.

While describing reactions of various rulers on the news of Jagadū’s death he mentions a ruler named Arjuna (1892av: 22). GB infers that this Arjuna must be the Vāghelā king who was the successor of Viśaladeva and ruled during the last few decades of the 13th c. CE. However GB further adds that if it is the Vāghelā king Arjuna meant here, then Viśaladeva’s reference in the verse 39 is wrong. For, in that case, Jagaḍū’s brothers cannot have continued to grace Viśaladeva’s court after Jagaḍū’s demise” (1892av: 22 fn. 1; 68 for the verse). GB calls Mudgalas as Moghuls (actually Mangols) who raided India during the 13th c. CE, and states that like the terms Yavanas or Tāmras Mudgalas, according to the Jaina authors, were all western invaders especially

25 This would be another example of anachronistic description which, in fact, concords with GB’s observation that in Sanskrit Kāvyas various rulers are placed anachronously in a single event or at a same period of time e.g. Kālidāsa mentions the Pārasikas, the Huṇas and others while describing the digvijaya of Raghu (supposedly based on Samudragupta’s digvijaya). See Chapter IV.
the Musalmans (1892av: 5-6). SHOKOOHY, after A. K. MAJUMDAR, specifically identifies these Mudgalas of the Jagaducarita with the Mangols who campaigned into India under Jalalluddin Mangubisti Khwarazmshah in 1224 CE (1991: 9).

(E) Other Articles:
GB wrote articles on such subjects like origin of Ajmer or a spurious Kāvya Pṛthivīrājarāsa. The 5th Sarga of the Pṛthvīrājavijaya gives the story of how the town of Ajmer came into existence. GB presents this information from a German article written by one of his students J. MORISON in WZKM Vol. VII. The origin of town is not of antiquity as is supposed by the sources like Hammīra-Mahākāvya dating from 14th c. onwards. Ajaya the 20th Cāhamāna king was the founder of Ajmer, who was the great grandfather of Pṛthvīrāja Cauhāna. GB assigns more credibility to the Pṛthvīrājavijaya Kāvya for it was composed during the reign of Pṛthvīrāja II or in the last quarter of the 12th c. CE (1897i: 164) and its account agrees with that of the inscriptions (1893i: 94).

In the article about Pṛthvīrājarāsa he compares it with the Pṛthvīrājavijaya and suggests that the Rāsa had better be left unprinted. According to him, “it is a forgery as Marārdhān of Jodhpur, and Śyāmaldas of Udaipur, have said long ago” (1893i: 95).

GB has illustrated through an article on the end of the Vāghelās of Gujarat that not only historical Kāvyas but the compositions like Tirthakalpa may prove useful from the point of view of history. The Thirthakalpa or Kalpadṛipa of Jinaprabha (BORI MS. No. 1256/1886-92) narrates with exact date the account of the fall of Gujarat by the expedition of the youngest brother of Aladdin. The event took place as per the said Kalpa in Vikrama Saṁvat 1356 (1897b: 194-195).

7. Epigraphy
Epigraphy in India was at the zenith of its ‘creative period’ during the last few decades of the nineteenth century and GB played a leading role in it.

26 The history of Indology has been classified by Thite in three periods, Creative, Classical and Decadent Period. The Creative Period, are those early infancy years of the science when new
GB had studied Archaeology in the University of Göttingen under F. WIESLER and to uncover India’s ancient past, was his main aim since the beginning. However, he inclined towards Sanskrit and textual studies at first, and did not turn towards actually working on material evidences before 1875. The discovery of the historical epic Vikramāṅkadevacarita in 1875 was a turning point in GB’s academic pursuit, after which he turned to ‘tangible’ historical documents – stone inscriptions, copperplates, caskets etc.

His debut articles on the Valabhī grants caused the birth of a competent epigraphist who had to his credit 159 articles, long and short, written on numerous inscriptions (including the articles of BHAGWANLAL that he translated from Gujarati to English) during the last twenty-three years of his life. His discourse on Indian palaeography was a result of his experience and insight in decipherment.

GB must also be credited for faithful as well as lucid translation of the texts of inscriptions. This was a result of his meticulous study of the ancient and the modern languages as well as his first hand experience of India, the birthplace of these inscriptions. It will be useful to cite a couple of examples in this regard.

1. The expression regarding the donee Brahmanas of the Chammak (Ilichpur) plates: brahmaghna-caura-pāradārika-rājāpathyakārī-prabhṛtinām saṅgrāmam kurvatāṁ anyagrāmeśv anaparāddhānām has been rightly translated as “(the king shall allow the village to be held by the Brahmanas, if) they do not commit treason against the Government … and if they are not guilty of offences of slaying Brahmanas committing theft, adultery, or acts prejudicial to the King, or engage in frays with other villages” (1883m: 247).

2. The expression ayaṁ somakuṇḍakā-grāmo brāhmaṇa-vāmarathyena kūtaśāsanena bhuktaka iti vicārya regarding the claim of Vāmarathy, has been translated as “having considered that this village of Somakuṇḍakā has been enjoyed by the Brahman Vāmarathy on the strength of a forged edict” (1892az: 74).

texts, new epigraphs and other such material is being discovered continuously. Every branch is new and yet taking shape into its definite form. Because of inevitable constraints the research is not perfect and there remain some lacunae. In the Classical Period researchers try to work on these lacunae and try to reach the perfection which sometimes tends to the level of hair splitting. The Decadent period sees many difficulties and limitations for the original research due to lack of new findings, confined scope for new work areas etc.
Both the tricky cases, though short in length, are indicators of the ability of GB as the translator.

After he retired to Vienna, he was rather re-tyred by his friends in India, namely James Burgess, L. Rice, J. F. Fleet and others, by supplying him with rubbings and photographs of new stone inscriptions and copperplates. Scarcity of epigraphists as against the large number of discoveries of inscriptions was a major factor in this cross-continental supply of materials to GB. However, owing to this, he could handle almost no original material, which contributed to some of the lacunae that crept in his work. Nevertheless, the penchant for decipherment and publication of new material that he bore, worked two-way: the materials being sent to him in quick succession and the publication of the same in reciprocal manner.

An attempt is made here to enumerate the salient features of GB’s contribution to the field:

(1) The Sohgaura Bronze-plate:

This important bronze-plate, brought into light by one HOEY in 1894 and published by him along with V. A. SMITH and HÖRNLE the same year\(^{27}\) (1894: 84-88) remained unnoticed till 1896 when GB wrote an article interpreting the plate in detail for the first time (1896k). Since then a few scholars like FLEET (1907: 509-532; 1908: 187-188, 822-823), BARUA (1930: 32-48) and JAYASWAL (1933-34: 1-3) attempted to solve the riddle which this small plate poses. While these scholars do not deviate much from GB’s interpretation of the main theme of the plate, the reading, translation and interpretation of other details in the text and of the symbols vary tremendously.\(^{28}\) This lack of unanimity adds to the special status that this plate bears in Indian Epigraphy due to its age, text, use of symbols, orthography and even mode of casting.\(^{29}\) The words which have been identified by GB as names of various grains to be stored in the store-houses have been interpreted as names of towns by FLEET, as varied commodities like fodder,

\(^{27}\) HÖRNLE’s identification of the manufacturing procedure as sand mould casting is agreed upon by GB.

\(^{28}\) See for a history of interpretation BARUA (1930: 36-48)

\(^{29}\) See for details BARUA (1930: 33-36)
wheat, ladles, yoke-pins etc. by BARUA, and once again as names of towns by JAYASWAL adding two more towns to the earlier count of three.30

As regards the use of the symbols GB did not interpret them in combination with the text as has been done by the later scholars. The credit for identifying the symbols as emblem of the cities on the line of symbols occurring on the coins and thus recognizing their significance other than that of mere religious symbols is due to FLEET. GB has interpreted the ‘warehouses’ as partitioned pavilions, the two trees as deciduous leafy tree and leafless one and the ‘Caitya’ symbol as mount Meru. The mount Meru interpretation may not be accepted by all scholars. However, he has rightly pointed out that the spoon-like figure on the plate is not a spoon but a handled mirror which was supposed to be auspicious and has been carved on Jaina caves. It may be affirmed now, on the basis of the archaeological evidence that was not available to GB, that there were no spoons of such shape as this in ancient India. Though it may be contested whether that figure is a handled mirror or not, its identification as spoon is certainly not confirmed archaeologically.

On palaeographic grounds GB has ascribed the plate to the times of the Mauryas and this was held by the other scholars too. GB also looks at this as an evidence for the assumption that already in the third century B. C. the use of writing was common in the royal offices and that the knowledge of written characters was widely spread among the people (1896: 148).

30 Translation given by various scholars
GB: The order of the great officials of Šrāvaṇa, (issued) from (their camp at) Mānavasitikata: - These two storehouses with three partitions, (which are situated) even in famous Vanāsigrāma require the storage of loads (bhāraka) of Black Panicum, parched grain, cumin-seeds and Amba for (times of) urgent (need). One should not take (any thing from the grain stored).
FLEET: Notice for all the three great roads for vehicles! At the junction, (named) Manavasi, of the three roads, in actually (the villages) Dasilimata and Usagama, these two storehouses are prepared for the sheltering of loads of commodities of (i.e., from and to) Tiyavani, Mathulā, and Chanchu, -- to meet any case of urgent need, but not for permanent use!
BARUA: The order of the High Functionaries of Šrāvaṇa! These two storehouses, (which are situated, one) in Mānavāsitaśrīmanta (and the other) in Usagrāma, (the provisions of) fodder and wheat, (and) the loads of ladles, canopies, yoke-pins and ropes are used in (times of) urgent need (these are) not to be taken away.
JAYASWAL: The order of the Mahāmātras of Šrāvaṇa (issued) from the Manavasiti camp. Only to the tenants, only on the advent of drought, these (the) dravya store-houses of Trivēṇī, Mathurā, Chāṇchu, Mōdāma, and Bhadra are to be distributed (discharged); in case of distress they are not to be withheld.
(2) Aśokan Edicts:
Out of the 169 articles GB wrote on inscriptions, the major chunk of 53 articles comprises those on the edicts of Aśoka. As regards Aśokan inscriptions, his contribution, as far as the number of writings is concerned, can only be compared with SENART (b. 1847 - d. 1928) among his close contemporaries. In the words of MAX MÜLLER “our oldest inscriptions, those of Aśoka, in the third century B. C., owe to him and M. SENART their first scholar-like treatment” (1898: 354).

It seems that GB could avail more resources than some other scholars e.g. SENART. (For a scholar like his nature, I think, it is more likely that he must have always tried to secure newer and better rubbings.) He rarely used an eye-copy while at a number of times he used rubbings and impression or paper-casts forwarded to him by FLEET (GB 1893: 299), CUNNINGHAM (GB 1877: 149), or BURGESS (GB 1889: 273). For instance, SENART’s edition of the Kālsī text is based on CUNNINGHAM’s eye-copy of the inscription while GB published both the text and a translation from a rubbing supplied by CUNNINGHAM (GB 1883: 87; 1886: 127), and a revised version of the text of edict XIII from an impression prepared by BURGESS (GB 1889: 162ff.; HULTZSCH 1925: xi). He got improved copies in case of a number of edicts and then reedited these edicts a number of times (HULTZSCH 1925: xi-xiv); some as many as seven times (e.g. Jaugaḍa).

The following table will show in numbers his writings on different types of Aśokan edicts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aśokan sites</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Edicts found before GB’s death (1898)</th>
<th>Edicts found after GB’s death (1898)</th>
<th>GB on all edicts found at the site</th>
<th>GB on select edicts found at the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Rock Edict Sites</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be gleaned from the above table that he investigated all the minor rock edict sites (6) discovered during his life time. More than fifty percent Major Rock Edicts (7) have been found before 1898 and except Sopārā edict no. 8, he wrote articles on all the edicts. Out of 12 Pillar Edicts 11 have been discovered before 1898 and except Kaushāmbi he again investigated all the edicts.

The Author of the Inscriptions:31

PRINSEP first identified the author of the inscriptions, i.e. Devānampriya Priyadarśin, with the Maurya king Aśoka (HULTZSCH 1925: xxx). When GB's first article on the topic titled "Three New Edicts of Aśoka" about Sahasrām, Rūpanāth and Bairāṭ edicts was published in 1877 (149-160) the number of Aśokan edicts discovered and the material published about these edicts was scanty. There were writings by scholars like COLEBROOK, PRINSEP and WILSON about the edicts of Dhaulī, Gīrīnār and Toprā. A few scholars, still in 1877, were not inclined towards the opinion that the author of the inscriptions is Aśoka (GB 1878: 142). GB strongly argued for the identity of the author of the edicts with Aśoka (1877: 149-160 and 1878: 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. Now we may wonder why such a simple fact was doubted by the scholars then. But in the words of PRINSEP "Like

---

31 This section stands devoid of the new opinion expressed by scholars, represented by Ashok Aklujkar, who believe that many of the Aśokan edicts are Buddhist 'clerical' copies of the 'original' texts and not engraved by the imperial order (Aklujkar’s lecture in the year 2012 delivered at the Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal, Pune).
GB's writings on Aśokan Inscriptions  
(Based on FALK 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edict</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Rock Edict Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahraura</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmagiri</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>WZKM 7: 29-32</td>
<td>1894/95</td>
<td>EpInd 3: 134-142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatinga-Ramesvara</td>
<td>1894/95</td>
<td>EpInd 3: 134-142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddapur</td>
<td>1894/95</td>
<td>EpInd 3: 134-142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock Edict Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhauli</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>ZDMG 39: 489-508</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>ZDMG 41: 1-29</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>ASI- S.India: 114-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment I of Rock Edict 13</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>WZKM 8: 318-320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaugada (Cont.)</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>ZDMG 37: 572-593</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>ZDMG 40: 127-142</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>ZDMG 41: 1-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaugada (Cont.)</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>ASI-S.India: 114-131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalsi (Khalsi)</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>ZDMG 37: 87-108</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>ZDMG 37: 253-281</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>ZDMG 37: 422-434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalsi (Khalsi) (Cont.)</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>ZDMG 37: 572-593</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>ZDMG 40: 127-142</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 447-472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalsi (Khalsi)</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>ZDMG 43: 273-296</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 447-472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Edicts 13-14</td>
<td>1890a</td>
<td>ZDMG 44: 702-704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Edict 12</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>EpInd 1: 16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edict</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allahabad</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>IA 13: 306-310</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>ZDMG 45: 144-159</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>ZDMG 46: 54-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allahabad (Cont.)</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 245-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schism/Kosambi Edict</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>IA 19: 122-126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Edict</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>IA 19: 122-126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araraj</td>
<td>1891a</td>
<td>ZDMG 45: 144-159</td>
<td>1892a</td>
<td>ZDMG 46: 54-92</td>
<td>1894a</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 245-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbini</td>
<td>1897b</td>
<td>AKAW 34: 1-7 See Buhler 1897b: 4</td>
<td>1898/99</td>
<td>EpInd 5: 1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirath</td>
<td>1890b</td>
<td>IA 19: 122-126</td>
<td>1891a</td>
<td>ZDMG 45: 144-159</td>
<td>1892a</td>
<td>ZDMG 46: 54-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirath (Cont.)</td>
<td>1894a</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 245-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandangarh</td>
<td>1891a</td>
<td>ZDMG 45: 144-159</td>
<td>1892a</td>
<td>ZDMG 46: 54-92</td>
<td>1894a</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 245-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigliva</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>WZKM 9: 175-177</td>
<td>1898/99</td>
<td>EpInd 5: 1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchi</td>
<td>1894b</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 366-408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topra</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>IA 13: 306-310</td>
<td>1891a</td>
<td>ZDMG 45: 144-159</td>
<td>1892a</td>
<td>ZDMG 46: 54-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topra (Cont.)</td>
<td>1894a</td>
<td>EpInd 2: 245-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cave Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barabar Caves (Full text)</td>
<td>1891b</td>
<td>IA 20: 361-365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagarjuni Caves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full set of inscriptions</strong></td>
<td>1891b</td>
<td>IA 20: 361-365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>1891b</td>
<td>IA 20: 361-365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>1891b</td>
<td>IA 20: 361-365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>1891b</td>
<td>IA 20: 361-365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
most other inventions, when once found it appears extremely simple" (1837: 566ff. after HULTZSCH 1925: xvi)

The Date of the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa:
There are various opinions of scholars regarding this issue, such as the Buddha attained Nirvāṇa in the following years before the Common Era: 1097 (Fa-hien), 638 (BHAGWANLAL), 541 (the Jaina tradition), 482 (FLEET), 481 (FERGUSSON), 478 (CUNNINGHAM), 388 (KERN), etc. (KHARE 1951: 100) GB, combining the inscriptive and literary evidence has given a bracket of eleven years between 483 and 472 BCE (1877g). His comments on RHYS DAVIDS’ placement of the event at 410 BCE, seems to be too personal (1878q). In the last years of his academic career, he fixed this date to 477 BCE (1895g: 177). It is generally believed today that consensus may be reached on the date as 487 BCE.

As regards the Barabar and the Nagarjuni hill caves, GB does not hesitate to assign them to the Ājīvikas or to the Vaiṣṇava ascetics (1891k). This opinion of his certainly is contestable.

Interpretation of some important terms:
(1) Rājūkas: The Land Surveyors: One of the important and widely accepted interpretations given by GB is of the word Rājūka. With his ingenuity 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 (GB 1893: 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) Samāja: GB propounded that the word Samāja means "assembly" or "a gathering on festivals of the Gods" (1883a: 93-94). With the evidence of Nashik inscription no. 14 of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, where the words Utsava and Samāja are used side by side to mean "festivities/celebrations" and "festive-
“As a result of the personal examination of all the sites, the comparison with modern practices, and by evidence, we now know that Aśoka had his first text [minor rock edict] placed exactly where people gathered to celebrate their basic cults. He must have known about the orgiastic nature of these activities. This in turn adds a new dimension to the text itself: it is not only Buddhist by nature but also serves to oppose folk-religion by its very presence at centers of popular cults … Thus, what today appear to be rather hidden places for a text of pro-Buddhist propaganda were in their time the most adequate spots to reach huge crowds during religious activities that Aśoka wanted the people to give up.” (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.
(3) Ayaputa:
Unlike the general belief that ayaputa (āryaputra) is an invocation of the husband, GB takes it to mean the son of the king, i.e. the prince (1898f: 75).

(4) Brāhmaṇibhya:
He takes this as a compound of brāhmaṇa and ibhya (vaiśya) (1898f: 76).

Palaeography of the Edicts:
GB identified that the last letters of the Siddapur edicts (1893j) are inscribed in Kharoṣṭhī alphabet and that the last sentence gives the name of the writer (1894/95: 134-135).32 In continuation with the previous work on this issue he gives the reading of the line as “paḍena likhitam narekapili”, where the last word is to be read in the reverse order as lipikareṇa (1897f). He insisted, on palaeographical grounds, that local varieties of the Southern alphabet existed in the times of Aśoka, and that hence this alphabet must have had a longer history. He also pointed out that not only in Aśokan period but also in later times too, a close connection is observable between the letters of the epigraphical documents from Gujarat or Kathiavad, and those from the south of India (1894/95: 135). The chief peculiarities exhibited by the alphabets of the edicts have been included in the plates in his Indian Palaeography (1896: Plates I, II, IX).

Some of his insightful conjectures were used by the later scholars, like that of ALSDORF to support their arguments. ALSDORF cites GB’s remarks about the writer of the Siddapur inscription, his North-Western origin and the opinion, supported by GB’s observation of the then prevalent situation, about the transfer of the subordinates along with the governors. He thus refutes MEHENDALE’s argument about North-Western origin of the text (ALSDORF ?: 21-22).

GB has also termed the script of the Bhattiprolu inscription as pertaining to the Southern Maurya alphabet. From the letters appearing therein, he believes that the edicts were all issued from the same office and that importance was attributed to the writings of the royal clerks at Pātaliputra to influence the

32 He reads it Paḍa while ALSDORF reads it as Capaḍa (p. 22) (I had referred to this article in the library of the University of Göttingen in a bunch of old articles of which the acc. no. is no longer available to me).
copyists in the various provinces and to induce them to imitate the shapes of the letters used at the headquarters (1892ad: 522 col. 1).

Votive Sanchi Inscriptions:
Impressions of in all 456 votive inscriptions (378 from the first Stūpa and 78 from the second) were made over to GB by BURGESS and FÜHRER. GB meticulously deciphered these inscriptions, mostly ending with the mention of the name of the donor in genitive case and the word dānam (1894s and 1894d). He has given the Sanskrit forms of the names of people and villages and has given indexes of the names of the months, the nuns, the names of male and female donors other than monks and the geographical names occurring in the inscriptions, arranged in Roman alphabetical order. His observation on the basis of the palaeographic diversity, that the inscriptions furnish additional evidence for the fact that the Buddhism survived in India very late time, long after the period when stupid legends allege it to have been drowned in a deluge of blood, stands remarkable (1894d: 366). This material that he has produced is indeed valuable for the ancient Buddhist geography of India. The insighted researcher also recognised a couple of inscriptions from the site which need to be read from below rather than in the usual fashion. He suggests that they were incised on the pillars after the pillars were erected and thus this unusual phenomenon has occurred (1891g: 231).

The Graeco-buddhist Pedestals:
GB has improved upon the reading of the inscription appearing on the pedestal from Hashtnagar. He suggests that the date of the same, viz. Sarīvat 274, 5th day of Bhādrapada, does not belong to the prevalent Śaka Sarīvat (274 = 352 CE). However, he does not propose any alternative (1891l). This date might originate from the last Nanda king, taking the pedestal to 51 BCE. A second proposal

33 Doubts have been raised about the genuineness of the inscriptions made over to GB by A. A. FÜHRER.
34 Khāravela in his Hāthīgumphā inscription refers to this era.
can be if this date begins with the enthronement of Aśoka, in which case the pedestal will date around 5 CE.35

A second pedestal found by M. A. STEIN, is dated by GB as belonging to the second century CE on palaeographic grounds and he has proposed to date the adjoining Gāndhāra sculptures in the context of the said pedestal (1896a: 312).

The Sātavāhana inscriptions:
The eye-copy and rubbing of the Jaggayapetta inscription made over to GB by BURGESS has facilitated him in tracing the evolution of the Brāhmī script (1882a) and to comment rather in a light mood that “the mason has done his best to show off his skill in making the letters ornamental and their form artistic”.

While interpreting an inscription of Yajñāśrī Gautamīputra (1892ac), he differs with Bhagwanlal, who interprets the expression Vasasatāya as ‘in the century’. Giving the correct reading as Vasasattāyāḥ, he prefers the interpretation of Burgess as ‘existence of the power of the king’.

Interpreting the Nāneghāṭa inscription of Nāganikā (1883n), GB derives the Sūtra texts and the various names of sacrifices referred to have been performed. Mirashi, after him, claims that “The Nāneghāṭ inscriptions, which belong to the oldest historical documents of Western India, are in some respects more interesting and important than all the other cave inscriptions taken together” (Mirashi 1981, Part II: 5). He and others have considerably revised the genealogy of the Sātavāhanas. Shobhana GOKHALE has identified from the donations in the multiples of 17, the sacrifice concerned as Vājapeya.36

It is observed that the names of the aristocratic personalities of the Sātavāhana dynasty that were incised on the back wall above the positions of the heads of the destroyed statues that GB could happily decipher have got mutilated within the last century (1883n: 64).

GB’s readings of thirty inscriptions of Kanheri are published in the same volume. However, LÜDERS in his list of Brāhmī inscriptions (1910) furnished a

35 The date with reference to Aśoka seems more probable due to the Buddhist nature of the pedestal and it concurs better with the conjecture of GB. He takes the pedestal contemporary to the time of Kaniska or Huvīśka.

36 Gathered from the various lectures delivered by her and informal discussions with her students.
list of 51 inscriptions from the site, out of which he reported 19 as undeciphered. Gokhale, in 1973, was successful in deciphering 18 of them and she improved upon some of the readings of GB having the advantage of a first-hand visit to the site (GOKHALE 1991: 4).

Inscriptions of the Kṣatrapas:
As is evident from his other writings, GB had a special affection towards Gujarat. He translated into English BHAGWANLAL’s Gujarati article on the famous Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman and gave an additional note (1878o: 263). An identification of the places and the areas described in the inscription was attempted therein. EGGELENG’s work on the said inscription has been praised by GB over that of BHAU DAJI. GB also differs with Burgess in the identification of ‘Niṣāda’. He claims that the word should be Niṣadha, name of any one of the several districts in India bearing that name.

GB also edited an inscription found at Gunda (1881a) dating Saṅvat 102, and informing that Rudrabhūti, the ruler, caused to construct a tank in the village named Rasopadra.

As a fitting tribute to his friend Bhagwanlal, GB edited his material regarding the Mathura ‘Lion Capital’ (1894c). This interesting sculpture bears in all 18 small inscriptions named ‘A’ to ‘R’ by GB. He calls the script Bactro-Pāli or Ariano-Pāli. Giving the genealogy of the Satrapas, he rightly identifies their proper names as barbaric, in spite of the inscription being in an indianized language.

The ‘longest inscription’ in Swat (1896b) was found at Kaldarra by WADDELL. It denoted the construction of a tank by Thera Nora, the son of Dati, for the worship of all snakes. GB identifies the names Dati and Nora as having a foreign look. He does not forget to bring out the close connection of snake worship and Buddhism and further informs that any big spring in Kashmir is named ‘-nāga’, and ‘-nāgin’ stands at the end of the names of the small ones. He further observes that large lakes also bear a similar form at the end of their names. In an additional note on the inscription (1896e), he corrects WADDELL’s reading of the word Pu(š)karaṇe as Pu(š)karaṇī.
Prākrit Grant of Śivaskandavarman (1892af: 2-10):

This peculiar find was handed over to GB by Burgess. He observed that there are various irregularities of script and language in this grant, which except the last verse, is in Prakrit close to Pāli. Interestingly he translates ‘Bhaṭṭiśarman Kolivālabhojaka’ as Bhaṭṭiśarman, the Ināmdār of Kolivāla. This stands in testimony of his understanding and love of the current Indian languages. The Pallava rulers were certainly not Buddhist and it was a matter of astonishment for the contemporaries of GB how the inscriptions of rulers like Sātavāhanas and Pallavas are in Prakrit. On this he rightly observes:

“the use of Prākrit in the older inscriptions is not due to the influence of Buddhism, but that in the early times Prākrit was the official language of the Indian kings while the use of Sanskrit was still confined to the Brahmanical schools… The language (Sanskrit) was not unknown to the persons who composed the text (from the imprecatory verses)... The results of the recent epigraphical and linguistic studies are most unfavourable to the theory that there was in India once a golden age during which kings, priests, and peasants spoke the language of Pāṇini. They rather tend to show that the classical Sanskrit is a Brahmanical modification of the or a northern dialect, elaborated by the grammatical schools, which very slowly and in historical times gained ascendancy throughout the whole of India and among all educated classes” (1892af: 5).

LEUMANN, has stated that Prakrit inscriptions always present particular difficulties, and has praised GB for his sagacity exhibited in removing most of them connected with this grant (1894: 483).

Another example of such inscription may now be cited in the form of the Washim plate of Vindhyāśakti II which came to light in 1939 (SHASTRI 1997: 39). Convenient incorporation of non-Sanskrit languages for expressing the
details of the grant can be seen in various later inscriptions, e.g. the celebrated Aihołe Praśasti.

An insightful decipherment of inscriptions ‘from below’ (1891g):
Several brief votive inscriptions had come to light from Amarāvatī, Mathura, Sanchi and Nadsur, by the explorations carried out by CUNNINGHAM, FLEET, HULTZSCH and FÜRER. While deciphering the Mathura inscription no. 7 of CUNNINGHAM, GB realised that it makes no sense if read in the usual manner from top to bottom and illustrated that the stonemasons have occasionally committed such a freak in much earlier times (1891g: 230). As regards one of the Nadsur inscriptions made over to him by FÜRER, he cautiously states that it is to be read from below but he would differ giving his version as his photographs were not distinct enough to allow a reading with certainty (1891g: 232).

Vākāṭaka: Ilichpur (Chammak) Grant of Pravarasena II:

The Ilichpur [Elichpur] Grant or the Chammak copperplate grant was only the second Vākāṭaka copperplate charter published till then, the first one being the Seoni [Sivanī] charter published by JAMES PRINSEP in 1836 (PRINSEP 1836: 726-731). Besides, a mutilated stone inscription from Ajanta Cave 16 was known. GB was not the pioneer to work on the Ilichpur charter. It was transliterated by BHAGVANLAL INDRAJI and published by BURGESS in his Notes on the Bauddha Rock-Temples of Ajanta (BURGESS 1879: 54-57).37 Perhaps in view of the necessity of further work on the same, Burgess entrusted the work to GB.38 Besides giving a revised transliteration and translation of the charter, GB dealt in detail with its orthography and language, and a number of problems of Vākāṭaka

---
37 The existence of two separate lines of the Vākāṭakas, namely Nandivardhana and Vatsagulma was established as late as 1939 when Y. K. DESHPANDE and D. B. MAHAJAN read an article on the Basim plates of Vindhyaśakti II at the Indian History Congress, Second Session, Calcutta, Dec. 1939 (Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Third Session: 449 ff. [=MIRASHI/MAHAJAN 1952: 137]).
38 Seemingly in the form of facsimiles of the plates (GB 1883: 239, fn. 2).
chronology and history. He rejected the identification of the Vākāṭaka ruler Vindhyaśakti as Kailakila Yavana made by BHAU DAJI (BHAU DAJI 1865: 65) and affirmed with reference to the Ajanta inscription that the said ruler was of indigenous origin. According to GB, the Vākāṭakas hailed from the northern or central part of India, which is today accepted by most of the later scholars except a few. His interpretations of the word Vākāṭaka is not based merely on etymology. However, relying on the metronymic practice of the Rājputs, he took Vākāṭaka to be the name of the country and of the ‘Rājpūt’ clan ruling it. This interpretation is now proved to be far-fetched and anachronic. In taking the Vākāṭakas to be Kṣatriyas who assumed the Vedic Viṣṇuvṛddha gotra as per the prevalent practice, he seems to have ignored the fact that only Brahmins are held qualified to perform the Brhaspatisava mentioned in the charter.

GB rightly dates the grant to the fifth century CE on palaeographic grounds and gives the genealogy of the dynasty on the basis of Ajanta inscription. Though the date is not wrong, the genealogy is no longer acceptable. However, the credit must be given to GB for a much more precise date compared to his contemporaries, namely FLEET and KIELHORN who placed the Vākāṭakas in the 8th century CE. (KIELHORN, F. 1894-95: 260). He accepts the Vākāṭaka boundaries as presumed by CUNNIGHAM (Report IX 1879: 121. Not 123 as stated by GB), but states that the capital Bhāndak (Pravarapura) has no etymological connection with the name Vākāṭaka. His interpretations of the term Vaijayika Dharmasthāna and the existence of a number of Senapatis in the course of a few months should be seen as a proof of GB’s insight. He saw Mahārājādhirāja as a personality greater than the Vākāṭakas but refrained from identifying him with the Gupta dynasty. Though he has deciphered the beginning of the present grant as Om, he has corrected it as drṣṭam in the Hirahāḍagalli (?) charter of Pallava ruler Śivaskandavarman (GB 1892: 9-10) after having

---

39 He has literally translated the whole charter except the expressions (i) apāramparagogobalivardda, (ii) avarāsanavarmmāṅgōra, (iii) alavanakliinakrenibanaka and (iv) sakliiptopaklipta. They have been interpreted later by MIRASHI (MIRASHI 1963: 14).

40 Some scholars have postulated the theory of a South Indian origin (see SHASTRI 1997: 150f for more details).

41 To follow THITE (Tachikawa Felicit. Vol. 2004: 503-507; Kalichakra 2008) this may be taken merely a ‘claim’ of the king to have performed the sacrifice and not a faithful record.

42 See fn. 2 above. For the latest genealogy see SHASTRI 1997: 212.
inspected the original plates of the grant and has interpreted for the first time that it denotes ‘seen’— a remark that the draft of the charter has been approved. Along with its usual meticulous nature, the translation of the charter done by GB also holds the beauty of the language, eg. the statement atitānekarājadatta.... na kīrtayāmāḥ is rendered beautifully as “and in this document which procures at least spiritual merit we do not mention the care and protection bestowed (by us) on grants made by various former kings, in order to avoid boasting of meritorious actions performed (by us).”

It is also remarkable that GB refrains from passing any adverse judgement against the donee Brahmanas who were threatened that the grant would be confiscated if they were found indulged in offences against the state or the subjects.

The Valabhi Grants:
An epigraphical masterstroke of this great scholar played in the form of the eighteen Valabhi inscriptions that he brought out and discussed during 1875-1893. It will be no exaggeration to call this period ‘creative’ for the history of Valabhi in the light of the fact that the number of Valabhi inscriptions known till date stands at 105.

Except editing the texts and providing translations, GB has made several observations with regard to the plates. His chief observations on the plates may be enumerated as follows:

He doubts if it will appear strange to the Europeans that the daughter of Dhruvasena’s sister (Dhruvasena I) should have been a Buddhist while her uncle was staunch Vaiṣṇava (1875a: 107).

He identifies the officers named Dhruvādhisikhas as the modern Dhruvas, tax collectors and Sthanādhisikhas with Thānādārs (1876d: 204).

Vassalage of the king Dharasena I (in fact the dynasty) to some unidentified mighty empire is reckoned by him (1877d: 9). On the basis of the date of the plate, viz. 589 CE, it may be observed that this mighty emperor was a successor of the Guptas and the predecessor of Harṣavardhana.
The officer Divirapati has been identified rightly as a Kārkūn, i.e. writer/accountant/chief clerk/secretary (1877d: 10). It may be noted that the term Kārkūn (Superintendent) that continued to be used till the early colonial period in India, has lost its glory and today the word denotes merely a petty clerk. GB further identifies the officers Vartmapāla and Pratisaraka as guards of the road and that of the gate respectively and claims that such officers existed even during his time. However, he does not explain the meaning of ‘Kāthebarīka’, a new class of officers (1878b).

GB’s identification of the ruler Śilādiya VI Dhruvabhaṭa with Tu-lu-po-po-tu of Hiuen Tsang stands in testimony of his all-round consideration of the historical evidence (1878b).

Specifying the Gupta era as the one employed by the Valabhi rulers for their records he nods to Al-Beruni’s statement that it began in Śaka 241, i.e. 320 CE (1886h).

As regards the inscribed royal seal from Walā (1883c: 275) GB observed that it palaeographically matched with the grants of Dhruvasena I. His idea of getting the details of Brahmana castes through the names of donees appearing in the respective grants (1893a) seems to have been carried knowingly or unknowingly by scholars of the field, Nirmala KULKARNI of the S. P. Pune University being one of them.

Inscriptions of Harṣavardhana:
GB edited two inscriptions of Harṣavardhana, found at Madhuban (1892az) and Banskhera (1896-1897a), dated regnal year 25 and 28 respectively, which indeed were path-breaking discoveries.

The Madhuban plate that referred to a spurious copperplate of an earlier date is unique in its contents. GB has excellently translated the plate refraining from saying anything against the Brahmana Vāmarathya who had reportedly claimed his right on the village Somakuṇḍakā on the strength of a forged grant. He has dealt with the genealogy of the Vardhanas in detail and has observed that
unlike the popular belief Harṣa was a Śaivāite and not a Buddhist. He affirms again that the epigraphic alphabet of India lag behind those appearing in MSS.\footnote{This opinion was expressed by him in his article on the Umeta plate (1878f). However, that should be treated null and void since it was based on a spurious inscription.}

The Banskhera plate was secured by FÜHRER fortunately, when he ‘unfortunately’ could not bring to light any new inscriptions in the Indo-Nepalese region. The said plate closed with the fanciful signature of the donor, ‘svahasto mama mahārājādhirājasrīharṣasya’ in the so called shell characters. GB has meticulously observed that the medial i in the syllable dhi here consisted of more than a dozen separate strokes, and the ā of jā had seven strokes. He wonders “If the great poet-king really did sign all official documents in these letters, he must have been a most accomplished penman and his conquest of India must left him a great deal of leisure” (1896d: 81).

GB has, however, not commented on the ironical absence of the royal endorsement on the Madhuban plate where it would be deemed necessary, and its impressive presence on the Banskhera plate, which perhaps was laid as a practice by Harṣavardhana.

The Bagumra Grant of Nikumbhallaśakti, year 406 (1889c):
Identifying rightly the era used in this particular grant with the Cedī era, GB dates it to 654-655 CE and establishes the relation of the Sendrakas with the Cālukyas of Badāmī. Observing that the names of the Sendraka ruler ended with ‘~śakti’, he expresses the importance of the publication of several other grants of the Sendrakas that were possessed by BHAGWANLAL. However, he does not seem to have been able to accomplish this during his lifetime.

The Lakkhā-Mandal Praśasti (1892bd):
GB denotes the contains of this Praśati, merely a eulogy and no donation, of the rulers from Senavarman to Candragupta. He rightly refrains from dating the Praśasti exactly and proposes in his usual conservative manner, “in conclusion, I may add that this inscription very forcibly inculcates the necessity of our abstaining
from identifying every Chandragupta who may turn up in literary or epigraphic documents with the Maurya or the Gupta king of that name” (1892bd: 12).

The Baijanātha Praśastis (1892be):
Dealing with the two Baijanātha Praśastis located in the Kangra district, GB has described the temple and the deities there in the form of Liṅgas. He seems to be excited by the fact that the said inscription pertains to the Śāradā script and discusses in detail the palaeography of the inscriptions. He identifies the places given in the inscriptions and deals with the genealogy of the ruler Lakṣmenacandra in detail (1892be: 97-102).

He reads the date of the first inscription as [Jyeṣṭha] Śukla 1, Sunday, year 80 of the Saptarśi Saṅvat, which corresponds to 13th May 804 CE. GB complains that it was a Tuesday on the 13th of May. It may be suggested, however, that the two damaged letters denoting the name of the month could also be read as Caitra, Pauṣa or Prauṣṭha. The date Śukla Pratipadā of all these three months occurred on Saturday. Interestingly, the same Tithī of the month of Māgha occurred on a Sunday (PILLAI 1922: Vol. 2, 10-12).44

The Grant of Dharanīvarāha of Vādhvān (1883b):
This grant, dated Śaka 836, belonging to a feudal dynasty of the Cālukyas, did not possess any historical details except genealogy. The decipherment of this grant, however, was remarkable since it was partially done from a paper rubbing and partially from an impression created by beating thin lead strips onto the surface of the plate.

Rāṣṭrakūta Inscriptions:
GB dealt with the Rāṣṭrakūta inscriptions in three articles (1876f, 1877a, 1883k). In the first article he propounded that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Gujarat were vassals of

---

44 Information received from Shreenand L. BAPAT, who stated that missing one day in conversion of a Tithī into a common date is normally condoned while deciphering inscriptions and Persian and Moḍi documents. In the absence of the facsimile of the inscription, and in view of GB’s reading as ‘Jyeṣṭha’, one should be more inclined to imagine the Mātras on the first letter of the name of the month. Thus though the date of Māgha in that year occurs on the prescribed day, it would stand as a weaker proposal in comparison with the first three.
those of Malkheda (Mānyakheṭaka). In the second one he adduced that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Dantivarman was none else but Dantidurga. The third article proved to be more important through which Karka III was indentified with Amoghavarṣa. Needless to say, that all these articles bear a meticulously prepared text and interpretation of the plates.

Inscriptions of the Cālukyas (Sōlakīs) of Anhilvāḍ (1877c):
A ‘hoard’ of eleven copperplate inscriptions was accessed by GB though Sir T. Madhavrao, the then Divan of the Baroda state. A list of these inscriptions is as follows:
Ins. 1: dated 1043, Māgha Vadya 15, Sunday, of Mūlarāja.
Ins. 2: dated 1086, Kārttika Śuddha 15, of Bhīmadeva.
Ins. 3: dated 1263, Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 2, Sunday, of Bhīmadeva II.
Ins. 4: dated 1280, Pauṣa Śuddha 3, Winter-solstice, of Jayantasiha.
Ins. 5: dated 1283, Kārttika Śuddha 3, Thursday, of Bhīmadeva II.
Ins. 6: dated 1287, Āśāḍha Śuddha 8, Friday, of Bhīmadeva II.
Ins. 7: dated 1288, Bāḍrapada Śuddha 1, Monday, of Bhīmadeva II.
Ins. 8: dated 1295, Mārgaśīrṣa Suddha 14, Thursday, of Bhīmadeva II.
Ins. 9: dated 1296, Mārgaśīrṣa Vadya 14, Sunday, of Bhīmadeva II and of queen Śūmaladevī.
Ins. 10: dated 1299, Caitra Śuddha 6, Monday, of Tribhuvanapāladeva
Ins. 11: dated 1317, Jyeṣṭha Vadya 4, Thursday, of Siddharāja

In order to bring the details of the Sōlakī dynasty, GB has referred to Sanskrit as well as Persian sources right up to Āin-i-Akbarī. He has also referred to a text Rāsamāla which mentions the Sōlankī rulers in good details. He equates the name Cālukya with Sōlankī (Gujarati) and the Maharashtrian surname Cālke.

As regards the Dohad inscription of Jayasīṁhadeva (1881d), GB identifies the first part of the inscription up to the 8th line, which is dated Vikrama Saṁvat 1196, with the consecration of the image of Śrī Gogānārāyaṇa-
deva, while the second part, dated Vikrama Saṁvat 1202, is meant for the worship of the deity.\textsuperscript{45}

GB also has to his credit the Vadnagar Praśasti of the reign of Kumārapāla dated Vikrama Saṁvat 1208.

The Dabhoi Inscription (1892ag):
This Praśasti pertaining to Vīradhavala, made over to GB by Burgess, was composed by Someśvaradeva, the composer of the Kīrtikaumudī. In the introduction to this Praśasti GB has narrated the history of expeditions of Shihabuddin Ghorī (1178 CE), Kutbuddin Aibak (1194 and 1196 CE) and the establishment of permanent Mohammdan garrison in Gujarat at the end of the 12th century.

Inscriptions having bearing upon the authenticity of the Jaina tradition:
Inscriptions from Mathura as mentioned above were made over to GB by FÜHRER. GB, who was the pioneer in propounding that the Jaina tradition is separate from the Buddhist one, made full justice to these inscriptions on the one hand and to the authenticity of the Jaina tradition on the other. He found out several Gaṇas, such as Koṭṭiyaka, Sthānikīya, Ucchenāgarī, Bambhalijja from these inscriptions (1890h). As regards the relation of the Vaiśṇava, the Śaiva and the Jaina tradition, he propounded as follows (1890f):

(1) Śaivas were closer to Jainas as compared to Vaiśṇavas.
(2) Goddess Sarasvati was worshiped by the Jainas as well.
(3) A Caitya is a funeral monument constructed in the honour of a teacher or a prophet and it is necessarily not a temple.

Such insights of GB seem to have got eclipsed by the controversy that arose around FÜHRER and was taken to have reflected on the relation of the two.

\textsuperscript{45} This completion of the inscription at an interval of six years may be compared with the ‘Cauryānśī’ inscription at Pandharpur, dated Śaka 1195-1199, in which donations have been recorded in the order they were received (Tulpule 1963: 168-170).
The Nepalese Inscriptions (Translated) (1885k):

GB’s respect and affection for BHAGWANLAL is clearly evident from his translation of the exhaustive Gujarati article on the Nepalese inscriptions. GB informs that the Nepāla (Nevāra) Saṁvat originated in 879 CE. The twenty-three inscriptions included in this article range from Nepāla Saṁvat 386 (1265 CE) to Vikrama Saṁvat 1878 (1822 CE). A list of the inscriptions for ready reference is as follows:46

2. Jayavarman’s inscription incised during the reign of Mānadeva: Saṁvat 413.
5. Inscription of Śivadeva.
6. Inscription of Arāhuvarman: Harṣa Saṁvat 34.
8. Inscription of Vibhuvarman: Harṣa Saṁvat 45.
10. Undated Inscription of Jisṇugupta.
11. Undated Inscription of Jisṇugupta.
13. Inscription of Śivadeva: Harṣa Saṁvat 143.
17. Inscription of Siddhinṛṣimha of Lalitapaṭṭan: Nepāla Saṁvat 757, Phālguna Śuddha 10, Thursday.
18. Inscription of Paśupatimalla of Kathmandu: Nepāla Saṁvat 769, Phālguna Śuddha 6, Sunday.

46 Since the original article does not pertain to GB, it is preferred here not to write in details on it.
(22) Inscription of Princess Yogamati: Nepāla Saṃvat 843, Māgha Śuddha 2.
(23) Inscription of Queen Lalitatripurasundari: Vikrama Saṃvat 1878.

A list of other inscriptions GB worked on is as follows:
(a) Two (Stone) Inscriptions (on a single slab) from Jhālāpāthan (1876i: 180-183): (1) Inscription of Durgagona dated Vikrama 746 = 690 CE; (2) A mutilated inscription transcribed but not translated.

(b) Inscription from the gate of Girnar, revised and translated (1876g).
(c) Vastupāla Tejapāla’s inscription on the Western door of a temple dated Vikrama 1288, Phālguna Śuddha 10 (1876j).

(d) The Cintra Praśasti of the reign of Sāraṅgadeva, originally published by Charles Wilkins (1892at).

(e) Śrīdhara’s Devapattana Praśasti (1894l).

(f) Inscription of Govana III of the Nikumbhavamsa, Śaka 1075 (1879a). GB concludes here that the Nikumbhas were feudatories of the Yādavas.

(g) Two British museum inscriptions dated Saṁvat 781, Kārttika Śuddha 13 and Saṁvat 783, Caitra Śuddha 5 (1884h).

(h) The Banawasi Inscription of Hārītiputra Sātakamni (1885j).

(i) The Peheva inscription from the temple of Garibnāth (1892bc).

(j) An inscription of Toramāṇa Śāha (1892bb).

(k) The Taxila plate of Patika (1896-1897b).

(l) Somanāthapattan Praśasti of Bhāvabhṛhaspati, edited by V. G. OZHĀ and introduced by GB (1889l).

…And here GB nods!
We have seen earlier that GB had a habit to take the exhibits at par, no matter from where they came and how they appeared, which sometimes resulted into proving him gullible. This, however, was not the fault to be found only in him but in a number of Indologists of the ‘creative period’, who were naturally
excited to publish the material they received without rigorous examination.\footnote{Fleet (1901) has enlisted 61 inscriptive records already published and found to be spurious in his critical evaluation of them.} Such cases pertaining to GB cited by Fleet are as follows:

(1) The Dhiniki Grant of Jáikadeva (1883l): From the rubbings available to him GB had realised that this grant having two plates measuring 9.75” by 5” was the smallest in western India and that the plates were so thin that at places the punch has completely gone through the sheet and altogether the work was done by an unskilful man, unaccustomed to delicate work. He observes that “the official who composed the text of the grant did not use the old format current in Gujarat but for some reason or the other invented a new one” (1883l: 152) and that the seal of the plate was also unmatching. He has also realised that the language of the plates is not quite grammatical Sanskrit, the copyist of the plates is careless and hasty, and the details of the donees family have not been given satisfactorily. GB has gone to the extent to say: “A few years ago most epigraphists would have unhesitatingly condemned the Dhinikī śāsana on account of the modern appearance of its characters as a forgery of the 11th or 12th century…[In view of the discovery of the Horiuzi MSS and a few copperplates] it is no longer possible to fall into such an error. On the contrary, it must be conceded that an alphabet closely resembling the modern Devanāgarī was in general use certainly during the 7th and 8th centuries, and probably at a much earlier date…” (1883l: 151).

The date of the plates is given as 794 Vikrama Sarīvat, Kārttika New-moon, Sunday, Jyeṣṭhā Nakṣatra, Solar eclipse = Sunday, 16 November 738 CE. It is interesting to note here that the solar eclipse occurred on the Āśvina amāvāsyā. GB, however, has tried to understand it as – “It is well known fact that grants were rarely written on the day when the donation was made, permits us to explain the error with respect to the eclipse…the Kārkūn forgot to give the two dates separately, and thus made the same muddle as the writer of the Morbi plate, who asserts that the grant was made on the fifth day of the bright half of Phālguna, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun” (1883l: 153).
In view of the above it is phenomenal that he refrains from declaring the plates clearly as spurious. Further, this article was to be continued for giving remarks on the Vikrama, Valabhi and the Gupta eras, however, it has not been continued for unknown reasons.

(2) The Umeta grant of Dadda II and the ‘forged’ Valabhi grant of Dharasena II: In his article of 1876 on the inscriptions from Kavi, GB remarks that the Umeta grant is apparently the prototype of a forged Valabhi grant ascribed to Dharasena II (1876e: 110 fn.). Thus he assumes both the grants to be forgeries. However, in his separate article on the Umeta grant he declares it to be genuine (1878f). In 1881 he alters his view regarding the spuriousness of the grant of Dharasena II and adduces his articles on the grants from Kavi and Umeta as the reason for this alteration (1881g: 277). Astonishingly enough, all proofs of the grants being spurious have been enumerated by him in his writing as follows: In 1881g: (a) The Nandī on the seal is standing and facing right; (b) There are mistakes in the genealogy; (c) Numerous mistakes of spelling; (d) The closing statement of the minister and the date is unmatching; and finally (e) The closing statement of the king himself ‘Svahasto ’yaṁ mama Śrīdharasenadvāṣya’ does not resemble the usual style in which the name of the king is never mentioned.

Raising the matter in 1888 again, he further remarked that Bhagwanlal’s argument of the grants being spurious is not agreeable and Fleet’s statement inconclusive (1888i: 188). These statements on the part of GB certainly do not go with his usual appositeness.

(3) The date of the Aihoḷe Paśasti: The date of the famous Aihoḷe inscription was not settled still by 1876 due to a misreading: the word ‘pañcāṣatsu’ occurring in a second verse of the portion of the date had been misinterpreted by Fleet and it the date of the inscription was taken to be 3735 years of the Bharatas, (three thousand) 550 of the Kali age and 506 years of the Śaka kings (FLEET 1876: 73, after GB 1876f: 152). GB has tried to explain this erroneous reading by saying that the Śaka year should be taken the Vikrama year, and in that case it would be another instance of an early use of the Vikrama era! However, later on the date
was settled as 3735 years of the Bhārata war and 556 years of the Šaka era, both exactly matching with 634 CE (GOKHALE 1975: 182).

(4) Two Grants of Dadda IV (1898-1899b):
These two grants offered to the Brahmana Śūrya of the Bhāradvāja Gotra and the Mādhyandina recension of the Śukla Yajurveda, who lived in Kṣirasara, are meant to record the donation of fields in the villages, Suvarṇapallī and Kṣirasara respectively. They bear the same date, Saṃvatsara 392, Vaiśākha Pauṇḍimā, recorded differently on each of them as Vaiśākha Śuddha Pañcadaśī and Vaiśākha Pauṇḍimā respectively. The composer of the plates apparently is the same but there is a remarkable palaeographic difference in them. While the first plate exhibits the normal Western variety of the Northern script, the second one has button like shapes at the top of every letter. GB takes a note of this but tries to justify the difference as “these men apparently care for exactness not more than the modern Kārkūns, since we see here that the same writer, though working according to an older office copy, permitted himself to introduce small changes in two documents which he drafted on the same day” (1898-1899b: 38).

GB could have very well doubted in the light of differences cited above, why two separate charters were issued by the same donor to the same done on the same day. There are inscriptional instances of making a number of donations by a donor to a done in a single charter, which would save the material and the labour for the state. From the above discussion there seems to be a good ground to term the second charter as doubtful, if not spurious.

(5) In his article (1876a) on the inscription of Chittarājadeva Mahāmanḍaleśvara of Koṅkana that was reportedly given on the solar eclipse that occurred on Šaka 948, Kārttika Śuddha 15 = 1026 CE. GB comments here that the solar eclipse is to be read as lunar. He also reported that a similar discrepancy has occurred in the Morbi plates deciphered by Bhandarkar in 1872 (IA 2, 258). Actually, the year Šaka 948 had both the solar and the lunar eclipses in the month of Kārttika (PILLAI 1922: Vol. 3, 55).
In his article entitled “Further Valabhi Grants” (1877d), GB has observed that the inscription of Śilładitya V, dated year 441, Kārttika Śuddha 5, bears mistakes in a great number. It may further be observed on the basis of the large number of inscriptions of Valabhi discovered till date that this inscription is doubtful due to variation in writing and provision of a separate box for the closing statement, ‘svahasto mama’ of the king. Similarly in his article “Additional Valabhī Grants, Nos. IX-XIV”, he observes regarding the grant of Guhasena dated year 240 that its genealogy did not match with the usual one (1878b). However, he further comments that it was quite premature to solve that problem. — These two are the cases of GB’s hesitation, or rather modesty, which prevented him from doubting the genuineness of the records concerned.

8. Palaeography and Numismatics

(A) Early Writings of GB: 

The first ever writing of GB dedicated to the subject of Palaeography is a Postscript appended to the article of BHAGWANLAL INDRAJI, which GB translated from Gujarati into English. BHAGWANLAL attempted to settle the exact signs for 40, 50, 60 and 70 occurring in various ancient inscriptions and to explain the origin of the ancient Nāgarī numerals. GB was convinced about the correctness of BHAGWANLAL’s views that the Nāgarī numerals are aksharas or syllables. GB argues in his postscript that it can be proved by a statement of Malayagiri in his commentary on the Sūryaprajñapti where Malayagiri uses the word Šabda instead of Aṅka for a Nāgarī numeral sign denoting four (1877e: 47-48).

The two conjectures expressed by GB about the probable origin and explanation of the Nāgarī numerals are interesting. Firstly since the signs for the Anunāsika, Jihvāmūliya and Upadhāmānīya are used to denote certain numbers he suggests that the Nāgarī numerals were invented by Brahmanas, not by “Vāniās”, nor by Buddhists who used the Prakrit language. Secondly and more importantly he expresses a possibility that the Nāgarī numerals may be traced back to one of the ancient Brahmanical schools, or caraṇas, and to their practice of using certain Padas and syllables as code (or Saṃjñā) in various grammatical operations or processes (1877e: 48). From the closely resembling variants of
character-numerals found in the Jaina MSS, tracing them to one single origin, at least in case of MSS, seems probable.\(^{48}\)

In furthering his views expressed in the Postscript he wrote an article in 1882 wherein he stated that the numbers consisting of separate signs for the units, the tens, the hundreds, and the thousands, are all syllables, which are pronounced as such. GB supplies various arguments e.g. the letter śu used in Kṣatrapa inscriptions for 100 which should be otherwise letter su as in earlier Maurya Brāhmī. Since sa and śa are pronounced interchangeably, sign for su was replaced by śu. Thus though the form of alphabet remains the same the sign for 100 i.e. su differs from the earlier writings. It in turn proves that the numeral signs are pronounced as syllables (1882c: 269-270). He even concludes that the signs for 1, 2 and 3 i.e. one horizontal line, two and three horizontal parallel lines respectively, are too intended as symbols for vowel u; Hrasva u, Dīrga u and Pluta u (1882c: 270).

Later, however, he gave up Bhagwanlal’s hypothesis in favour of the Egyptian Hieratic figures since the similarities between the two are quite striking (1904M: 82). Scholars are still divided on the issue, among the theories of foreign and indigenous origins. However, the real concrete proofs are wanting on both the sides (Salomon 1998: 60).

GB discusses how the ancient Indian alphabet owed its development to the grammatical schools of the Brahmans. As far as its age is concerned he states that the Brāhmī alphabet was an old institution in India about 300 BCE. His arguments for its age are:
(1) The enormous extent of its territory.
(2) It must have been generally known among the higher classes (and even the lower classes like stonemasons).
(3) The alphabets of the Mauryas and the Andhra (Southern Brāhmī) alphabets are derived from a common source. He shows that the Maurya sign is not the parent of the Andhra sign.

\(^{48}\) See the tables of variants in H. R. Kapadia 1936: Appendix IV, 17-24.
(4) The Brahmanical grammarians have developed the Maurya and Andhra alphabets and brought them into the shape in which we first find them. He adduces for this:

1. Differentiation of the nasals found in the alphabet.
2. Existence of the three sibilants.
3. Careful system of short and long vowels.
4. Invention of \( la \).

GB believes that like the Indian alphabets, numerical system too came from a foreign country, for which, he did not supply any definitive evidence (1882c: 270).

(B) Indian Palaeography (Indische Palaeographie):

*Indische Palaeographie* published in 1896 as the second part of the first volume of the *Grundriss* marked the culmination point of GB’s researches (and his life so to say). It accompanied 9 plates of alphabetical characters and numerals, 8 tables of explanatory transliteration. The *Grundriss* has produced classics in Indian studies and GB led its foundation with the Indian Palaeography which stands at the foremost position both chronologically and treatment-wise. He has done a very detailed and systematic study and hence even though till now many new inscriptions have found this treatise still stands indispensible to study Indian Palaeography.

The English version of this work was made by GB himself which remained only in MS. form due to his untimely death. Steps were taken to publish it under the direction of KIELHORN. But due to many reasons eventually it had to be abandoned. FLEET took the initiative in 1902 and was successful in publishing it in 1904 as an appendix to the *IA* (FLEET 1904: 1). It is an English version and not a literal rendering of the German original. It is not a revised version as well, though there are some new passages.\(^49\)

\(^{49}\) There was only English text without the plates and tables. Moreover it was not in the book-form. When copies of the Indian Antiquary became rare, its reprint was brought out as the first issue of a quarterly journal “Indian Studies: Past and Present” that was established to reprint rare monumental works. But this was again without plates. In 1959 for the first time the English
Beginning with the antiquity of writing in India and the origin of the oldest Indian alphabet GB has covered every topic ought to be treated under the head Indian Palaeography. He holds that the antiquity of writing can be pushed back to the 8th c. BCE when probably North-Semitic alphabets were introduced in India. He adduces that the popular Brāhmī contained since the third century BCE only 46 letters (instead of usual 50 or 51) and it was adapted to the wants of the Sanskrit language. He presents a minute and exhaustive study of the two major oldest available scripts in India, Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī and the region-wise and time-wise varieties of Brāhmī. The numeral notations of both the scripts also have been dealt with in detail. The external arrangement of inscriptions and MSS., writing materials, libraries and writers are the subject of his early area of expertise. He deals with all these subjects most eruditely.

With respect to connection between the two scripts, GB had to fight hard the similarity between Brāhmī ‘ṣ’ and Kharoṣṭhīṣthi ‘ṣ’ that Cunningham had spoken first. GB has to derive ś from the Phoenician shin.

It should be noted here that the Indus Valley Civilisation was unknown to GB, so as the Indus script, since it came to light more than twenty years after GB’s death.

SALOMON describes Indische Palaeographie as “a work of such a stature that, although inevitably outdated, it continues to be a useful and important reference work even to the present day” (SALOMON 1998: 221).

(1) The Origin of Brāhmī:
GB had presented an exhaustive study of Brāhmī first in 1895 through his epoch making treatise “On the origin of the Indian Brāhma Alphabet”. At the beginning he discusses the literary evidences for the antiquity of writing. According to him the literary evidences point to the common use of writing in India during the 5th and perhaps in the 6th c. BCE (1898N: 53). The palaeographic evidences for the antiquity of the Brāhmī lipi prepare a

version in its proper book-form along with the reproduction of the plates and tables was published by the same journal (CHATTOPADHYAYA 1959: iv).
foreground for his main thesis of the derivation of the Brāhma letters from the most ancient North Semitic signs.

GB adduces that the Brāhmī letters closely agree with or are most easily derivable from the old types of the North-Semitic alphabet, which shows the same type from Phoenicia to Mesopotamia. The introduction of the prototypes of Brāhmī letters lies between the beginning of the 9th c. and the middle of the 8th c., or about 800 BCE (1898N: 84). Based on archaeological evidences, F. R. ALLCHIN affirms this view in the following words:

“… archaeological evidence has recently been obtained to show that the Brahmi script began to be used in Sri Lanka at least a century and a half before the start of the Mauryan rule in Magadha, and perhaps as early as three centuries before that event. We have long admired the brilliant analysis of Buhler … who reached the conclusion that the Indian script had been first introduced into South Asia by merchants around BC 800” (ALLCHIN 1995: 209).

According to ALLCHIN, archaeologists in India neglected to obtain absolute dating for the finds, including inscriptions, from this period. He condemns that they instituted no problem-oriented research designed to investigate the question of antiquity of Indian script. It is remarkable that Deraniyagala’s excavations at Anuradhapura have revealed Brahmi inscriptions on potsherds scientifically dated at least to the 4th-5th c. BCE, if not earlier (ALLCHIN 1995: 211). The antiquity of Brahmi in Sri Lanka adduces a possibility of use of the script in Northern India at least two centuries prior to that date i.e. during the 7th c. BCE and the age of the prototype Brahmi can be safely pushed back to the 8th c. BCE.

The North-Semitic alphabets are compared with the earliest forms of Brāhmī. SALOMON recapitulates the destiny of GB’s theory of Semitic origin in the following words:

“The theory of a Semitic origin for Brāhmī, on the other hand, does have a strong, if not entirely conclusive, body of concrete evidence in its favor. The derivation along the lines worked out by GB, has been generally adopted by Western scholars … But in South Asia, as we
have seen, the Semitic hypothesis is not widely accepted, though there too some scholars, notably A. H. Dani in his influential work Indian Palaeography, have cautiously supported some form of Semitic derivation. … the shortcomings of GB’s presentation do not necessarily discredit the Semitic hypothesis itself” (1998: 29).

Though GB’s theory is not fully acceptable to modern scholars, nevertheless the conditions laid down by him for such a study are important:

1. The comparison must be based on the oldest forms of the Indian alphabet and actually occurring Semitic signs of one and the same period.
2. The comparison may include only such irregular equations, as can be supported by analogies from other cases, where nations have borrowed foreign alphabets.
3. The comparison must show that there are fixed principles of derivation (1898N: 53).

GB has explained in detail how changes were made to the North-Semitic alphabets to form Brāhmī signs. He has explained derivation of each of the 22 Brāhmī characters out of the Semitic. Though his derivation of some signs is more or less convincing, in a few cases it seems farfetched and in other few it is hardly convincing e.g. derivation of na from Nun or ca from Tsade. However as Salomon rightly points out, GB’s theory of Semitic origin was not completely refuted:

“Part of the problem is that, despite the defects in GB’s methodology and data, no one since him has undertaken a comprehensive and careful paleographic re-examination of the Semitic hypothesis” (Salomon 1998: 29).

From GB’s point of view the Brahman ‘schoolmen’ have framed the ‘Brāhma’ alphabet but as far as the introduction of Semitic signs in India is concerned he thinks that it must be due to the merchant class. Brahmans possessed since very early times the system of oral instruction for preserving their literary composition. So it was the merchant class who most urgently
wanted a means for perpetuating the record of their daily transactions (1898N: 88). However, the historical and chronological considerations pose problems to this theory. According to Salomon Paleographically and even historically the Aramaic derivation of Brāhmī is plausible:

“The palaeographic ramifications of this theory, however, have not yet been fully worked out. Historically and chronologically too, the Aramaic theory is much preferable to the Phoenician derivation. The widespread use of the Aramaic language and script as a lingua franca throughout the Near East and the Iranian world and as a bureaucratic language of the Achaemenian empire provides a ready explanation for its influence in India, in contrast to GB’s weak historical, geographical, and chronological justifications for a Phoenician prototype” (Salomon 1998: 28).

(2) The Kharoṣṭhī script:

1. The Name Kharoṣṭhī:

In 1892, on the basis of Buddhist Kharoṣṭhī and Jaina Kharoṣṭhī GB termed it as "Kharoṣṭhī" on the supposition that the word means 'the writing (lipi) of the country of the (wild) asses and of the camels' i.e. of the Panjab. However, in 1894 he declared that it is safer to adopt Kharoshthi (i.e. Kharoṣṭhī) suggested by the Chinese translation "ass-lips" (1894p: 193 fn. 1). He acknowledges Terrien de Lacouperie for this finding (1898N: 23). Later some scholars including Hultzsch (1925: xi) gave the credit of restoring the term Kharoṣṭhī to GB (Falk 1993: 85). GB states that he accepts this derivation from the name of its inventor, who is said to have been called Kharoṣṭha or "Ass-lip", because the

---

50 Harry Falk has discussed in detail (1993: 84-85) how the indigenous name Kharoṣṭhī was restored by the scholars. Till 1882 the script used to be called by various names as Bactrian Pāli, Indo-Bactrian, Ariano-Pāli, Bactro-Aryan (due to its occurrence on the coins of Bactrian kings) or Gandharian (due to the region where it was in vogue). Gabriel Devéria writing under pseudonym "T. Choutzé" firstly pointed out that there is a mention in the Chinese texts, of two non-Chinese scripts one of which is written from right to left and is invented by Kharôchta. In 1886-87 a French scholar, Terrien de Lacouperie stated with the help of a Chinese encyclopedia and Chinese translation of the Lalitavistara that the indigenous name of the script termed by scholars as Bactrian, Indo-Pāli et al is in fact Kharôsti invented by a person Chinese translation of whose name is "Ass-lips". See also Salomon 1998: 50-51.
ancient Hindus have very curious names—apparently nicknames like Šunahšepa, Kharījāṅgha etc. (1898N: 113-114).

SALOMON points out that the term Kharoṣṭhī is by no means certain. Since the word was very likely not originally Sanskrit or even Indic, variations in spelling may have arisen from different Sanskritizations of the original name of the script (1998: 50). Albert LUDWIG proposed a derivation from an unattested Aramaic harūṭhā. GB showed his willingness to accept this as an alternative (1898N: 114 fn. 1; SALOMON 1998: 51).

2. The Origin of Kharoṣṭhī:
The originals of the Kharoṣṭhī letters are, according to GB, to be found in the Aramaic inscriptions, incised during the rule of the earlier Achaemenian kings (1898N: 98). Its connection with the Semitic scripts, particularly Aramaic, was evident to scholars from an early period but it was worked out by GB in a definitive manner in his “The Origin of the Kharoṣṭhī Alphabet” in 1895 (1895h) (SALOMON 1998: 52). However, SALOMON does not seem to agree fully with GB regarding the derivation of retroflexes as secondary derivatives within Kharoṣṭhī (1998: 53).

Since GB used Aramaic forms from widely differing periods and places to derive the Kharoṣṭhī characters, he was severally criticized by HALÉVY on methodological grounds (SALOMON 1998: 53), the methodology which was actually against GB’s own set up standards (1898N: 100).

3. Age of Kharoṣṭhī:
GB calls Kharoṣṭhī ephemeral alphabet which was in vogue during 4th c. BCE to 3rd c. CE. The knowledge of its existence was preserved by the Buddhists much longer even in 7th c. CE (1959M: 34-35). GB ascribes the origin of the script to the early Achaemenian era i.e. around 5th c. BCE. Though SALOMON expresses doubt about this view and accepts it only provisionally after discarding views of other scholars like HALÉVY and FALK who assign it to 330 BCE and 325 BCE respectively, finally accepts it to sometime in the 4th, or possibly the 5th c. BCE (SALOMON 1998: 46). Similarly, SALOMON’s views about the upper limit for the
use of the script concord with GB’s except that SALOMON allows a period of another century or more for its occasional use (1998: 47). On the basis of the available epigraphic evidences and bilingual coins GB accepts CUNNINGHAM’s view that the Kharoṣṭhī always held only a secondary position by the side of the Brāhmī alphabet even in Northwestern India (1898N: 92). But this view, according to SALOMON, is “no longer valid in light of subsequent discoveries which have enhanced our understanding of the important historical and cultural role of this script” (1998: 48).

According to GB Kharoṣṭhī is not a Pandit’s, but a clerk’s alphabet since it has an imperfect vowel system, employs anusvāra for a parasavāra and substitutes single consonant for double ones (1895h: 288). GB thinks that the discovery of the Khotan MS. makes it very improbable that there existed another form of Kharoṣṭhī which was more complete like Brāhmī (1959M: 35).

To sum up, in the words of SALOMON, “[GB’s] cogent theories on the origin of Indian scripts which, if not universally accepted, have also never been completely refute” (1998: 221).

(C) Palaeography of MSS:
(1) Horiuzi Palm-leaf MS.:
Due to a Chinese-Sanskrit vocabulary it was first struck to MAX MÜLLER that there might be Sanskrit MSS still extant in Japan (1881: 1). He then brought to light with the help of Japanese students and scholars six Sanskrit texts discovered in Japan. One of the MSS found in the Horiuzi monastery contained two texts Prajñā-pāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra and Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-dhāraṇī. Max Müller edited these texts in collaboration with Bunyiu Nanjio in 1881 under the series Anecdota Oxoniensia published with an Appendix by GB elaborating on the palaeography of the MS.

In this 33 page-long appendix GB points out the importance of the MS. Its age is proved around 6th c. CE by the external evidences and the MS. strongly proves that palm-leaf MSS can survive for more than 1300 years. The characters used are identical with the contemporary MSS from Nepal but differ from the inscriptions and show an advanced stage of development than the
The name Brāhmī assigned to the Aśokan script is attested by mention of it by the Japanese writer (1884d: 67-68). GB presented a detailed and comparative examination of the characters of the Horiuzi palm-leaves (1884d: 73-95). It was GB’s conjecture since 1878 that in the 10th c. at least, the characters used for the literary purposes differed from those employed for official documents (1878f: 61). Now from the relation of the Horiuzi alphabet to those used in the Nepalese inscriptions GB concludes that the epigraphic character did not keep pace with those used for literary purposes, but remained for a long time more archaic, and were gradually modified by the influence of the letters employed for purposes of every-day life (1884: 88).51

(2) Bower MS.:
At first GB called this birch-bark MS. as Mingai MS. as it was found in the ruins of ancient city of Mingai near Kashgaria. Later he accepted the name given to it by HÖRNLE on its discoverer’s name Lieut. Bower. The MS. was not available to GB. He made his investigations with the help of the facsimiles of two folios no. 3 and 9 published in the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. IX, 1890, Plate III). Both GB and HÖRNLE through independent research assign the MS. to the 5th c. CE. GB suggests that detailed investigations will compel to push the earlier limit further back than 400 CE. The alphabets of this MS. resemble the North-Western alphabet. It contains a page showing the same characters as the Gupta inscriptions (1891n: 105).

GB discusses in detail the contents of the two folios. Fol. 3 contains a Buddhist snake-charm composed in the Southern India. The language is incorrect Sanskrit mixed with Prakrit forms. GB also notes that this small piece contains a dozen words and meanings not traceable in the dictionaries (1891n: 106). The article contains text and translation of the two folios. At the end, to make the matter more legible he suggests to soak the leaf in the water and dry afterwards.

51 Also see 1891a: 308-309.
(3) The Kashgar or Weber MS.
A collection of MSS was found at Kashgar, a westernmost city of China. There were two collections of which one came to Kolkata and the other was added to the collections of the Library of St. Petersburg. HOERNLE gave a full account of the MSS that came to India in the JASB (Vol. LXII). GB made some remarks on the contents and palaeography of the MSS. According to HOERNLE the age of the MSS is not later than the end of 7th c. or the beginning of 8th c. CE and some portions may even date back to 5th c. CE. They contain several Sanskrit texts.

The first section contains, according to HOERNLE, a Nakṣatrakalpa belonging to the Atharvaveda while GB states it to be belonging to the Sāmaveda (1893g: 263). The translation of some portion of the text has been given which differs from HOERNLE’s translation. The script has been termed as the Central Asian Nāgarī by HOERNLE.

On the basis of the following observations and inferences based on these observations GB concludes that the MS. must have been copied from a south Indian original (264-265):
1. The leaves bear the numbers on the first page
   => The South Indian MSS bear folio numbers on the first page i.e. on the recto side as against the practice in the North India to use verso side or the second page for pagination.
2. The word vaiśvadaivatam is wrongly copied as vaiśyadaivatam
   => In southern characters ya can easily be mistaken for va and vice-versa.
3. Ahirbudhnya is read as Ābhivṛddhi
   => (a) To mistake hi for bhi is only possible in Grantha, and the Devanāgarī transcripts of Grantha MSS.
   => (b) va is substituted for ba which is usual in the North India.
4. Aja Ekapāda is read as Āryamākalpa
   => aja is taken to mean Prakrit ajja i.e. ārya. pā can be easily mistaken for lpa. In southern characters e is open at the top which may resemble mā.
5. In viṣṇudaivatam, kṣa is substituted for śa which is again common in North India.
From the above GB also infers that the Weber MS. may have been derived from a Southern MS. not directly but at second hand (265). The palaeography suggests relatively older age. The figure for 10 exactly resembles that in the Nanaghat inscription. There is use of single or double dots for interpunction which is common on the oldest copperplates and occasionally has been the cause of the erroneous insertion of Visargas in the transcripts (266).

The second section is in a variety of the North-western Gupta characters, as per HOERNLE, and contains, according to GB, a metrical composition related to Śaiva tantra. The sections from 3 to 5 and 7 and 8 contain charms of various kinds while section 6 bears a Sanskrit metrical Kośa. Section 9 is a medicinal treatise in some unknown language interspersed with Sanskrit words.

GB compares the contents of eight leaves of the WEBER MS. with the fragments of PETROFFSKI MS. deposited in the library of St. Petersburg and published by S. von OLDENBURG.

(D) The Kharos̱hṭẖ Inscriptions on the Indo-Grecian Coins:
GB tried to explain in his article on the above mentioned subject the probable causes of mistakes in reading the Kharoṣṭhī letters on the Indo-Grecian coins. He expounded that the short upward strokes, which in the Aśoka edicts are used for marking the ends of the verticals, appear on coins as small detached lines or dots close to the end of the verticals of ka, ta, da and ra which can be mistaken for vowel signs (1894p: 195). He further affirms that in all epigraphic work, as long as inexplicable words and forms seem to come out, the readings are wrong. He illustrates how some signs on coins appear as closely resembling and in turn cause mistakes in reading (1894p: 197). He states that he distrusts all eye-copies and relies on the originals or purely mechanical productions (1894p: 198). He attempted to give the following corrected readings of the names of kings appearing on the Indo-Grecian coins published earlier in GARDNER’S Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings in the British Museum and VON SALLET’s Nachfolger Alexanders des Grossen (1894p: 198-202).
Agathokles = Akathukreyasa
Antialkidas = Aṁtiālikitasa and Atialikitasa
Apollodotos = Apuludatasa, Apaladatasa, Apaladadasa
Artemidoros = Atrimitorasa
Diomedes = Diyumedasa
Dionysias = Diunisiyasa
Eukratides = Erukratitasa
Heliokles = Heliyukreyasa, Heliyakreysa
Hippostratos = Hipustratos
Menandros = Mena(m)drasa or Mena(m)dasa (the readings are doubtful)

He also read five of the titles and epithets (1894p: 202-204) appearing on the coins and thus corrected some of the misreadings of Gardner. The inscription on the Agathokles’ triangular coin hindujasame or hidujasame has been read by him as hitajasame (Sanskrit hitayaśomāṇ) or hiraṇasame (Sanskrit hiranyāśramāṇ) (1894p: 206-207).

9. Jaina Literature

Investigations into the Jaina Religion:
“The sect of the Jainas, whose literature has only become popularly known by Bühl’s discoveries, has, also by the investigations of the same scholar, received its due position in the history of religious systems in India” (Winternitz 1898: 341) are the words of Winternitz which rightly point out GB’s contributions to this field, made through a series of articles on the authenticity of the Jaina tradition (1887h, 1888h, 1889i, 1890f).

(A) Über die indische Secte der Jaina:
This is an epoch making treatise from GB’s pen. While the western scholarly world was divided on whether Buddhism was an offshoot of Jainism or vice-versa, GB affirmed with solid inscriptive evidence that the two were independent contemporary religious entities. Jacobi, who had shown this independently through textual evidence, was in a way supported and superseded by GB.
Till the late 19th century there were many misconceptions among the western scholars regarding the Jainas. Scholars of the first generation like COLEBROOK, STEVENSON and THOMAS believed that Buddha was a disloyal disciple of the founder of the Jainas. H. H. WILSON, WEBER, and LASSEN held and it was generally accepted by the scholars for many years that the Jainas are an old sect of the Buddhists.52

GB proved the antiquity of the Jainas to the time of Buddha. The essay title “Über die indische Secte der Jaina” was read at the anniversary meeting of the Imperial Academy of Sciences on the 26th May 1887. It was then published in its annual publication (BURGESS 1903: III) and was translated into English by BURGESS in 1903.

GB, following the contemporary academia, believed at 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. During his tours in connection with the search for manuscripts he examined Jaina literature extensively (BURGESS 1903: 24). He also came in contact with many Jaina ascetics. Through some Digambara Jainas at Delhi and Jaipur he learnt that the Digambaras were called since the ancient times as Nirgranthas53 (1878n: 28). This seems to have led him to rethink over the issue. Finally after the observation of the fact that the Buddhists recognise the nigantha and relate of their head and founder as a rival of Buddhas and mention that he died at Pava 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. Once this identification was done it also became possible to recognise that the king Aśoka mentions the sect in his edicts and that it was of such an importance as to mention it separately (BURGESS 1903: 39-40). JACOBI reached the same result independently by another course (BURGESS 1903: 24).

52 All seems to be mere textual studies. There seems to be no ‘Field Work’ which actually induced GB to think on the correct line.

53 “In older times the Digambara ascetics used to go naked, and from this custom they derive the names Digambara, Nirgranthas, Nagnātas. Now they make a compromise with the spirit of the times and the British law. ... the pañḍits wear the usual dress of the country, and even the Bhaṭṭārkas cover themselves with a chaddar, which they put off when eating. At their meals they sit perfectly naked, and a pupil rings a bell to keep off all the strangers (1878n: 28).

(In independent India Digambara-Jaina ascetics seemingly follow their old tradition.)
GB and JACOBI showed that Jñātiputra or nātaputta a contemporary of Buddha mentioned in the oldest Buddhist texts is identical with Vardhamāna Mahāvīra (1878q: 143 fn. 5; BURGESS 1903: 29).

In 1884, at the International Congress of Orientalists in Leiden BHAWGANLAL INDRAJI first recognised the true names of the King Khāravela and his predecessors and showed that Khāravela and his wife were patrons of the Jainas. The antiquity of the Jainas was decisively proved by the large number of dedicatory inscriptions at Mathura which belonged to era of Indo-Scythian kings and came to light during the early eighties of the 19th c. In the inscriptions GB recognised the names of the schools of the Jainas, many of which are mentioned in the Kalpasutra. He not only stated that the division amongst the Jainas must have taken place long before the beginning of the common era but also argued that the tradition of the Svetāmbara really contains ancient historic elements, and by no means deserves to be looked upon with distrust and that the suspicion that the tradition of the Jainas themselves is intentionally falsified is not correct.

Before he obtained the vast amount of inscriptions during 1889-1891 excavated at Mathura by FÜHRER (JANERT 1961: 43 fn. 2) there were already some inscriptions excavated by A. CUNNINGHAM and the copies published in 1873. With the help of these inscriptions he showed the authenticity of the Jaina tradition and the antiquity of the Jaina sect. That was possible because of the three factors. He came to know from the Digambara Jainas that they are called Nirgranthas the name with which he could recognise the mention of Jainas in the Buddhists scriptures; he then combined this conjecture with the inscriptional data which he also compared with the Jaina canons like Kalpasutra.

(B) Über das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemacandra:
GB was the first to draw the attention of scholars to the works of Hemacandra (1088-1173 CE) the famous Jaina monk, grammarian and lexicographer and brought forward their importance for the history of Indian literature. In 1878 K. FORBES gave an account of the life of Hemacandra based on the Prabandhacintāmaṇi in his Rās Mālā which contained many anecdotes. A kind of supplementary article to FORBES’ work was contributed by BHAU DAI to
It was GB who for the first time presented a critical and exhaustive study of the life of Hemacandrācārya. His monograph “Über das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemacandra” appeared in the Denkschriften der kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in 1889. The sources for his study were Prabhāvakacarita, Prabandhacintāmaṇi, Prabandhakoṣa and the Kumārapālacarita.

In his thorough treatment to the subject GB throws light upon KumāраПāla’s conversion to Jainism including Hemacandra’s own account of it and the consequences of the event. He also deals with the relation between Hemacandra and Jayasimha-Siddharāja.

Jina Vijaya Muni has brought forward some of the lacunas of GB’s monograph (1936: XI). The Kumārapālapratibodha of Somaprabhācārya was unknown to GB. Hence he could not deploy this reliable and historically important treatise for his work. GB had taken notice of the Moharājaparājaya Nāṭaka but, according to Jina Vijaya Muni, he did not himself go through this work. Moreover, the material on which he had to rely was then only in the form of MSS which were not completely accurate and thus it had its limitations.

This popular essay presents GB’s enchanting experiences and observations of Indian religious practices, gatherings, recitations etc. at various temples, Jaina monasteries, towns, streets, in India. His interactions with a Gujarati Sheth Maganbhai and Acārya Jinamukti Sūri are specially enumerated. The experiences at the discourses of Jinamukti Sūri which he attended in an Upāśrāya at Ahmedabad have been picturesquely narrated.

He opines that the similarity of the Jaina edification with the people in the West is great. There is a difference only in one point that “it lacks the feeling of unlimited reverence, with which the Western people are satisfied by their God-services” (1894g: 231).
His other contributions contain an account of Digambara Jainas (1878n) and an article on “A Legend of the Jaina Stupa at Mathura” (1898b, 1898a) which is the last article of his life appeared in the IA.

10. Miscellaneous

GB was a versatile scholar and an erudite researcher. As a student, he had studied Archaeology along with classical languages. His multifaceted scholarship enabled him to encompass variety of subjects with his research.

(A) Greek Grammar, Comparative mythology and linguistics

GB’s doctoral dissertation was about a Greek suffix.\(^{54}\) He continued to deal with comparative linguistics and mythology in his early writings. In one of his articles about the Vedic God Parjanya he tried to prove that Parjanya is not personified rain but personified cloud. GB shows that Sāyaṇa always explains Parjanya by Megha, the commentaries of Śatapatha and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa and even Amarakośa illustrate it by cloud. He derives the word Parjanya from the root \(sphurj\) where the original form is \(sparj\). He relates the Lithuanian word \(perkunas\) with \(parjanya\) and compares Lithuanian, Slavic, Italian folk Gods with the Vedic Parjanya (1859b). He delivered lectures on the God Savitṛ and his relation to the Greek Poseidon at the Philological Society of London (THITE 2010: 156-157 fn. 1; JOLLY 1899: 2 fn. 4). His writings on Greek, Gothic and Latin etymologies appeared in the Orient und Occident, the Journal edited by BENFEY.

(B) Vedic Literature

Though in the beginning GB’s writings were concerned with the comparative philology and Vedic mythology later his contributions to the Vedic studies were confined more or less to the MSS of the Vedas and the history of Vedic schools. Schroeder had tried to show that the Maitrāyaṇīyas were originally called Kālāpas or Kalāpins. GB adduces this view by citing a passage from

---

\(^{54}\) As I have no knowledge of Greek language it is not possible for me to give account, not to speak about commenting, on the writings related to Greek Grammar.
Divyāvadāna where an explicit statement confirms the connection of the two (1887i: 345).

(C) Buddhism:
GB points some instances of occurrence of Buddhist sects in inscriptions (1892ab: 597-598). GB uncovers the style of quoting a Brahmanical source in Saṁyutta Nikāya and other Buddhist texts where Sanatkumāra appears in front of Buddha to reveal a Gāthā. The Gāthā which said to be uttered by Sanatkumāra has its parallel in a story of sage Atrī in the Mahābhārata. GB points out also the differences in these parallel verses (1897e: 585-588).

(D) Archaeology:
The most important writing of GB in connection with Archaeology is his twelve page long review on past and future archaeological explorations in India.

After BURGESS, there was a kind of chaos and confusion in connection with the Archaeological Survey of India and it ceased to exist as a central body. The publication of survey reports virtually ended. In each and every field the results were lagging behind and voluminous quantity of work was to be done. Opinions and proposals were called from the local governments, scholars from the Royal Asiatic Society and TAWNEY, GB and FLEET.

GB’s remarks which appeared in 1895 in the JRAS are significant from the point of view of history of Archaeology in India. GB takes a review of past and present archaeological explorations which highlight the necessity of the continuation of the work. He then indicates the direction in which it ought to be carried on (1895f: 651). An account of work done till date with regard to archaeological survey of various sites, monuments, epigraphy, inscriptions, their copies, coins etc. has been presented in brief. He names three sites which must be excavated on priority basis - Patana, Mathura and Takṣaśilā. According to him Patana or Pātañaliputra is the most important historical site in the whole of India. His expectations proved to be right as is shown by the later excavations at Pātaliputra by L. A. WADDELL (1892-1899), P. C. MUKHERJII (1897-1898), D. B. SPOONER (1912-1916), J. A. PAGE and M. GHOSH (1926-1927), K. P. Jayaswal
R. Institute (1951-1955), B. P. SINHA and L. A. NARAIN (1955-1956) (GHOSH 1989, Vol. II : 334-336). Similarly, Taxila was excavated vigorously by Sir John MARSHALL from 1907 to 1912 and an extensive report was brought out by him in three volumes in 1932. Mathura, as is well known, was already under excavation by FÜHRER.

(E) Publications for Students:
GB and KIELHORN played a vital role to enhance the state of Sanskrit education in the new education system introduced by the British Government. During his tenure as a Professor at the Elphinstone College GB edited a book for the use of High School students containing selections from the Nalopākhyāna, Rāmāyaṇa and Pañcatantra (1888E).55

GB was the first Professor to be appointed to the chair of Ancient Indian Philology and Archaeology in the University of Vienna. He introduced the practical method of teaching elementary Sanskrit, which he and BHANDARKAR had used in the Bombay Presidency. For this purpose he published in 1883 a practical handbook for the study of Sanskrit titled “Leitfaden für den Elementarcursus des Sanskrit” (WINTERNITZ 1898: 346). An English edition based on it was published within three years by Edward PERRY in America. The striking feature of this book is that it not only introduces the language but it also conveys the culture which this language embodies. e.g. “agnir-udadhau tiṣṭhati”, “viṣṇum-ṛṣir-yajati nṛpāya” (1883J: 10), “ṛṣir-adhunā pāṇinā jalam-ācāmati” (1883J: 12). One encounters such examples at the beginning itself, where along with the grammar and vocabulary students may get familiar with the ideas, history, rituals expressed by them. Such sentences one finds seldom even in BHANDARKAR’s First Book of Sanskrit published in 1864.

The book is still used in some German Universities to teach basic Sanskrit.

55 The glossary was prepared by Vishnushastri Pandurang PANDIT.
(F) Reviews:
GB reviewed and recapitulated thirty-six titles (including notices). A few of his reviews are as exhaustive as extending up to thirty-one pages (1890(a)). The following is a brief overview of a few review articles:

(1) Āpate’s English-Sanskrit Dictionary
While reviewing V. S. Apte’s English-Sanskrit dictionary he suggests that a revision is necessary for the modern terms and European scientific ideas for which there are no corresponding words in Sanskrit e.g. the word monotheist has been rendered as *advaitavādin* and pantheist as *viśvadevāvādin*. Here GB rightly points out that actually an Advaitavādin is indeed a pantheist (1885(c): 98). This shows how well he understood a concept like *advaitavāda* pertaining Indian philosophy.

(2) Winternitz, Āpastambīya Grhyasūtra:
GB approves of the principles adopted by Winternitz while editing the Āpastambīya Grhyasūtra (1888(a): 85). He delineates the features and importance of the text, the peculiarities of its language and the orderly arrangement of the subject matter and brevity. Winternitz chiefly relied on the commentary of the Haradatta following the method of his revered teacher, GB.

(3) S. P. Pandit, Gauḍavahā:
GB wrote two notices of S. P. Pandit’s edition of the Gauḍavahā, a Prakrit historical poem. In the second notice he examines in detail the contents of the Gauḍavahā and S. P. Pandit’s treatment of it. He not only agrees with Pandit but also adds to his arguments on the point that the poem must be considered merely the prelude to a very large lost poem (1888(d): 330). GB reviews the title in an exhaustive manner; more so because the subject dealt with a historical Kāvya.
(4) SACHAU Edward, Alberuni’s India:

The book-notice of Alberuni’s India is a separate essay in itself. Very considerable proportion of Al-Beruni’s statements and quotations has been verified with Sanskrit literature by the author of the book, E. C. SACHAU.

GB tries to give Sanskrit correspondents to some mere conjecturally explained and difficult Sanskrit terms. He compares unpublished or untranslated Sanskrit works with the quotations in the ‘Indica’ e.g. SRVDHV a Sanskrit work repeatedly quoted by Al-Beruni is explained by SACHAU as Savadhara or Śrotavya. GB renders it as Sāroddhāra.

The following are further such examples:

RAHVNRAKRN = Rāhunirākaraṇa
Kashmirian king Muttāi = Muttāpiḍ (A Prakrit form for Sanskrit Muktāpiḍa)

The names of various Vratas/Festivals:
Harbāl = Hāritālikā-Vrata
Gāihat = Kapilā-Ṣaṣṭhī
Dhruvagṛha = Dūrva-Aṣṭamī or Dūrvāṅkura-Aṣṭamī
Parivartī = Parivartinī-Ekādaśī

GB enumerates about a Kashmiri recension of Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa in detail which was perhaps used by Al-Beruni along with another text which he confuses with the former. GB adduces that the Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa used by Al-Beruni is the Kashmiri Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa. He cites with English translation twenty-two passages from the Sanskrit text along with the Arabic rendering of it by Al-Beruni. He also supplies exhaustive notes to explain the connection between the original Sanskrit and Berūni’s rendering. He gives a long list of deities mentioned in the MS. of the Viṣṇudharmottara and their corresponding names of deities in the Indica. He also constantly comments at various occasions on peculiarities of Al-Beruni’s style of converting the Sanskrit words into Arabic. Probable Sanskrit verses which might be expected to be the

56 The MSS used by GB were procured by him in 1875-76 from Kashmir. The MSS were lent to him from Pune. BORI MS. No. 89-91/1875-76.
originals of some of the Al-Beruni’s verses have been quoted. He infers that Al-Beruni had before him a MS. which was incomplete and contained only the first Kāṇḍa. Curiously enough he thinks that Al-Beruni did not take help from any Pandit but tried to make out the sense of the Purāṇa on his own (1890(a): 408). On the contrary with regard to the shorter Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa Al-Beruni did not read the text himself but was perhaps informed by a Pandit about its contents (1890(a): 408). GB agrees with Sachau’s view that Al-Beruni’s informants must be Vaiṣṇavas but differs on the point of religious conditions in India during Al-Beruni’s time. GB shrewdly explains that Śaivaites do not reveal their teachings to foreigners contrary to the Vaiṣṇavaites who are more open (1890(a): 407-408 fn. 90). At the end of the discussions GB tries to delineate features of Al-Beruni’s translation and his “method of translating”. The words at the end of the review illustrate his ardent love for the subject: “Will not one of the Indian Universities set this investigation as a subject for a prize-essay? ... and a young Indian Sanskritist would do with such an investigation much better, for himself and for his science, than by ‘bringing up’ so and so many Kāvyas and Śāstras” (1890(a): 409-410).

(5) The Orion and the Age of the Veda:
A note on Professor Jacobi’s Age of the Veda and on Professor Tilak’s Orion is a curious piece of work. He agrees with the views of both the scholars that the Kṛttikā-series is not the oldest arrangement of the Nakṣatras known to the Hindus, but that the latter once had an older one, which placed Mrgaśiras at the vernal equinox (1894(a): 239). GB concludes from the evidences put forth by Tilak and Jacobi that some of the Hindu rites and sacrifices existed even before the time when the Kṛttikā-series was invented, and were settled long before the year 2000 BCE (1894(a): 245).

The review is also interesting from the point of view of history of Indology. The thesis was envisaged by B. G. Tilak and Jacobi simultaneously but independently. The former scholar sent his paper to the Ninth International Oriental Congress. The committee of the Congress forwarded the paper to GB to seek his opinion on the question whether to publish it in the Transactions or not.
(1894(a): 239). GB gave his affirmative opinion and endorsed the paper with a remark to print it in full. However, due to want of funds only an abstract could be published (1894(a): 239; TILAK 1892: 376-383). JACOBI was working in the same direction on the subject and he coincidently discussed the theory with GB only six weeks before TILAK’s MS. reached Vienna. JACOBI’s essay was published in the Felicitation volume in honour of ROTH (JACOBI 1895: 68-74).

(G) Obituary:
There is one obituary written by GB and that is after BHAGWANLAL INDRAJI’s untimely demise (1888k).57 It stands as an important memoir of the scholar written by his close friend. According to DHARAMSEY GB’s obituary of BHAGWANLAL is perhaps the best evaluation of his work (2012: 67 fn. 2). It is among the very few authentic records on life and career of BHAGWANLAL.

There is also a letter of condolence written after the death of W. D. WHITNEY (1898d).

This vast amount of material, that GB left behind him in the form of his books articles and edited works, stands in testimony of his path-breaking and painstaking research activity.

57 See for the details Chapter IV.