CHAPTER X

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

I. Rural Economy

The economic system in Bengal has always been based on land tenure. That this was so in ancient times is definitely proved, among others, by reference, in a large number of inscriptions, to *pustapālas*, a class of officers who were attached both to the villages and other administrative units right up to the District headquarters. It is quite obvious from epigraphic records that these officers maintained permanent registers about different plots of lands, in which were carefully noted boundaries, demarcations, titles, sales and other transactions etc. It seems to be also quite clear that the main object of such elaborate system was to ensure the realization of land-revenues due to the Government.¹ There was nothing special in this, for we learn from Kauṭilya’s *Arthāśāstra* that the Government appointed an official called *Gopa*, with jurisdiction over five or ten villages, whose duty is defined as follows:

“By setting up boundaries to villages, by numbering plots of grounds as cultivated, uncultivated, plains, wet lands, gardens vegetable gardens, fences (vāṭa), forests, altars, temples of gods, irrigation works, cremation grounds, feeding houses (*sattrā*), places of pilgrimage, pasture grounds and roads, and thereby fixing the boundaries of various villages, of fields, of forests, and of roads, he shall register gifts, sales, charities, and remission of taxes regarding fields.

“Also having numbered the houses as taxpaying or non-taxpaying, he shall not only register the total number of the inhabitants of all the four castes in each village, but also keep an account of the exact number of cultivators, cow-herds, merchants, citizens, labourers, slaves, and biped and quadruped animals, fixing at the same time the amount of gold, free labour, toll and fines that can be collected from it (each house).”

“He shall also keep an account of the number of young and old men that reside in each house, their history (*charitra*), occupation (*ājīva*), income (*āya*), and expenditure (*vyaya*).”²
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An elaborate system of supervising the work of the Gopas was devised in order to ensure that they did their duty, and maintain their accounts and registers in a proper manner.

The epigraphic records in Bengal indicate that a similar system of maintaining detailed registers prevailed in Bengal, though, unfortunately, these records have not reached us.3

There are also clear indications that the organisation of villages into well-defined administrative units, such as existed in ancient India, was also prevalent in Bengal. This has been noted in the preceding Chapter in connection with administration. A fairly good picture of the village is supplied by the early inscriptions discovered in Bengal. A typical instance is furnished by an inscription dated in the second regnal year of Lakshmanasena (C. 6) which refers to the donated village as follows, beginning with the boundaries: "To the east, the river Ganges, half boundary; to the south, the temple (maṇḍapa) of Leaghadeva, another boundary; to the west, the orchard of pomegranates, another boundary; to the north, Dharianagara, another boundary,—measuring 60 bhū-dronas and 17 umānas, according to the standard of nala consisting of 56 cubits, prevalent in that region, and yielding annually 900 purāṇas, at the rate of 15 purāṇas to the droma, along with forest and branches, land and water, pits and barren land, betelnut and cocoanut trees, .......as well as with grass pūti plant and grazing land...."4

The area of the village as well as the income derived from it is also given in other records (C. 5, 7). Villages must have been of various sizes. There are references to Pāṭakas (C. 13, 16) which probably meant small villages from which the modern Bengali word Pāḍā, denoting a particular quarter of a village, seems to have been derived. It appears from these records that "the villages usually consisted of certain well defined parts, viz., village settlement or habitat (vāstu), arable land (kṣetra), and natural meadow-land (go-chara), which provided pasture for live-stock. The expression ṭrīṇa-pūṭi-go-charaparyantah, mentioned in most of the Pāla and Sena land-grants, suggests that the pasture-ground produced various kinds of grass, and was usually located in a corner of the villages or along the village boundaries. Apart from these, most of the villages also contained pits and canals (garta and nālā), which might have served the purpose of drainage, barren tracts (ushara), tanks, reservoirs and temples, besides cattle-tracks (go-patha or go-mārga) and ordinary roads and paths. A few villages are also stated to have been in
possession of woodlands or jungles, where the common folk probably went to gather their fire-wood and litter. It is thus clear that the various types of land, attached to the village, were not only distinguished and classified from the point of view of their usefulness to man, but were organised for exploitation according to certain system and customary practices so as best to satisfy human needs.\textsuperscript{8}

We have no definite knowledge of the system of land-tenure in Bengal in ancient times. Such problems as the ownership of land, the fixity of tenure, the respective rights possessed by the actual cultivator, the owner by gift or purchase, and the State, have been discussed in the preceding chapter. In particular, attention may be drawn to the \textit{akshaya-nivi-dharma} as well as to the system of sale and gift of land for pious purposes, and the details of the boundary marks, either natural or by such devices as permanent marks by chaff and charcoal\textsuperscript{7} or pegs (\textit{kilaka}) of beautiful design\textsuperscript{8} referred to in epigraphic records.

Though it is not possible to give a definite and comprehensive account of the nature of lands, conditions of tenure etc., the following data supplied by the epigraphic records in Bengal throw a good deal of light.\textsuperscript{9}

As regards the inscriptions of the Gupta and other pre-P\u0141\u0131la records, the most complete description is given in Ins. No. A. 10 about the nature of the lands. It comprises the following items:—

revenue-free (\textit{samudayab\u0192hya}),
untilled (\textit{aprahata})
fallow land (\textit{khila kshetra}).

These terms evidently refer to the unappropriated waste lands lying on the outskirts of the settled villages. As these lands, at the time of being made over to the assignees, were required to be severed according to specified measures,\textsuperscript{10} it is clear that they had, before this time, formed part and parcel of the unappropriated waste. Whether such lands after their disposal continued to be revenue-free, cannot be definitely ascertained. The probability is that they became subject to a progressively increased taxation till the normal rate was reached.

As regards conditions of the sales, these lands were contemplated or declared to be held—
according to the custom of non-destruction of the principal 11 (Ins. No. A. 4)
in perpetuity, according to the custom of (non-destruction of) the principal (A.6),
with the right of perpetual endowment, and according to the custom of non-destruction (as above) 12 (A. 7),
in perpetuity, according to the custom of non-destruction (as above), and without the right of alienation 13 (A. 8),
with the right of perpetual endowment (A. 10).

It would thus appear that the conditions of tenure are more or less the same in all the early inscriptions, namely, the alienations in every case are perpetual, but non-transferable, and the State reserved its right to the unappropriated waste to such an extent as to deny even the possessors the right of alienation of their holdings. Similar information is supplied by the later Grants.

"The known Grants of the Pāla kings, which are made with regard to whole villages and in favour of Brāhmaṇas or religious foundations, usually mention that the land is granted—

'with the rent of temporary tenants' (uparikara) 14 'with the (immunity from) penalties for the ten offences' (dāsāparādha or dāsāpachāra), 'with the police-tax,' 15 'with immunity from all burdens,' 'with the prohibition of entrance by irregular and regular troops,' 'with exemption from all taxes,' 'with all revenues due to the king,' 'according to the maxim of the uncultivable land', 'to last as long as the Sun and the Moon shall endure'.

In connection with the above the resident cultivators are ordered to pay to the donee the following specific taxes besides others not mentioned:—kara and pindaka (EP. Ind., IV, No. 34), bhāgabhogakara and hiranṣya (IA, XV, p. 306; JASB, LXIII, pt. I, p. 39; JASB, 1900), kara and hiranṣya (IA, XXI, p. 256). In some of the above Grants (IA, XV; JASB. 1900; Ep. Ind. XIV, No. 23) the bhāgabhogakara and hiranṣya are mentioned in the list of revenues assigned in general terms to the donee. To the above one of these Grants (JASB, 1900) further adds the item 'with exemption from the king's enjoyment of the three jewels' (ratnatrayarājasambhogawarjita). This term has not yet been properly explained, but it may refer to some kind of royal contribution from the villages in support.
of the Buddhist faith which, as is well-known, was professed by the Pāla kings. In the above list kara is apparently an abbreviation of the more usual bhāgabhogakara, which probably means the king's grain-share, or the contribution in kind paid by the villagers.\textsuperscript{16} The term pindaaka is identified by Kiellhorn \textsuperscript{17} with bhāgabhogakara, but it more probably stands for the hiranyā (or the contribution in cash)\textsuperscript{18} of other inscriptions. The kara and the hiranyā are evidently singled out because they were the two most important taxes on the villages.

"The clauses in the Grant No. B. 97 include the items that the land 'is to be exempted from all burdens,' that it 'is not to be entered by the irregular and regular troops,' that it is 'to be exempted from all taxes,' and that it is 'to last as long as the Sun and the Moon etc., shall endure.' In the same connection the resident cultivators are ordered to pay to the donee the customary kara tax and all other revenues (pratyāya).

"The Grant No. B. 77 contains the clause that the land is granted—
'with mango and jackfruit trees, with betelnut and cocoanut trees,'
'with remission of penalties for the ten offences,' \textsuperscript{19}
'with the police-tax (chauroddharaṇa),'
'with the immunity from all burdens,
'with the exemption from entrance by irregular and regular troops,'
'with the immunity from all taxes,'
'with all revenues consisting of the king's grain-share and the taxes in cash,' \textsuperscript{20}
'to last as long as the Sun and the Moon shall endure,'
'according to the maxim of the uncultivated land', "

More or less the same clauses occur in the Grant No. B. 88.
The religious grants of the Pālas and their contemporaries thus continued to be made, more or less on the same conditions as before. "They were perpetual and hereditary, and were not only revenue-free, but also carried with them the assignment of the royal revenue from the villages. Again, the heads of revenue and the other charges imposed upon the villages would seem to have been the same as in earlier times. They comprise not only the older grain-share (bhāgabhogakara), the tax in cash (hiranyā) and the
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police-tax, but also the more recent fines imposed on villagers for committing any of the ten crimes (dākāparadha) mentioned above. It would appear from the title of one of the officers mentioned in the grant of Dharmapāla (B. 2) viz., ‘the officers in charge of the sixth’ (shashṭhādhikṛita), that the grain-share used to be levied at the old traditional rate. The mention of the officer called baulkika in most of the Pāla Grants points to two well-known sources of revenue coming down from earlier times, viz., the tolls and customs duties.”

The epigraphic records which supply the above data refer to lands granted for some specific and pious purposes. But such lands must have formed only a small portion of the agricultural land of Bengal. The express provision for exemptions from obligations of various kinds in the above Grants necessarily implies that the ordinary land-owners or cultivators were subject to these obligations, or at least to many of them, unless specifically exempted by the condition of their holdings. Special interest attaches to two of these obligations, namely (1) parihrīta-sarva-pīdā translated above as ‘immunity from all burdens and (2) entrance by irregular and regular troops (achāṭabhaṭa-prāveśya).

The first expression was translated by Dr. N. G. Majumdar as immune from all kinds of forced labour, but as Dr. U. N. Ghoshal observes: “This unnecessarily restricts the sense, since the burdens comprised in this term are shown by the earlier illustrative examples to include many other items of oppression as well.”

As regards the second, it has been suggested that bhaṭa refers to “certain services which the cultivators had occasionally to render to an army such as provisions of quarters and supply of provisions or labour. The exact purport of the other term chāṭa is not known, but is was evidently of the same nature and might have included the provision of food on the occasion of a king or high official visiting the locality and ‘milk-money’ i.e., the perquisite paid on the occasion of the birth of a prince, marriage of a princess etc. These were not regular taxes, but customary dues paid on specific occasions. On the other hand, the land-grants indicate that the possession of land carried with it certain inherent privileges. These included the right to everything under the ground and above it, such as mines, salt, wood, bush and trees including fruits. The right may have extended to the use of adjoining water, i.e., tanks or rivers and fishing therein.”

22
As regards the system of agriculture we have no special information regarding Bengal. As mentioned above, the lands are classified as fertile, i.e., cultivable, and those that are unsettled, uncultivated and fallow (*aprada, aprahata and khila*). There is no doubt that since remote antiquity paddy was cultivated as the staple food crop of the people. Most of the other food grains and fruits which are known today were also grown, and some of them are incidentally mentioned in the records. ‘Paddy plants of various kinds are mentioned in the *Rāmcharita*, and inscriptions of the Sena period refer to “smooth fields growing excellent paddy,” (C. 14) and “myriads of villages, consisting of land growing paddy in excessive quantities” (C. 9). Kālidāsa’s *Raghuvaṁśa* (iv. 37) affords us a glimpse into the method of rice cultivation. Describing Raghu’s conquest of the Vaṅgas, the poet remarks that Raghu uprooted and replanted them (*uṭkhāta-pratiropita*) like rice plants. Rice, as is well known, is sown in three different ways—broadcast, by drill, and by transplantation from a seed-bed where it has been broadcast sown. Of these the third method is, as a rule, the least risky and the most profitable. That it was known and practised in this province at least as early as the fifth century A.D. seems clear from the aforesaid statement of the great Sanskrit poet. The different processes of reaping and threshing also appear to have been similar to those prevailing at present. The *Rāmcharita* (*Kavi-praśasti*, v. 13) refers to the threshing floor where the ‘reaped crops were spread out and threshed by means of bullocks which went round and round over them.’

‘Another food-crop cultivated was probably sugar-cane. The classical author, Aelian, speaks of a kind of honey expressed from reeds which grew among the Prasiosi. Lucan says that the Indians near the Ganges used to quaff sweet juices from tender reeds.24 Suśruta (45, 138-40) mentions a variety of sugar-cane called *paunḍraka*: and most commentators of Sanskrit lexicons agree that it was so named because it was grown in the Paunḍra country (North Bengal). These statements, taken together, naturally suggest the inference that certain species of sugar-cane were cultivated in Bengal from very early times. It is also not improbable, as a writer has pointed out, that from the term *paunḍraka* have been derived such modern Vernacular names as *paunḍā, paunḍā, punḍ, etc.*—a celebrated variety of sugar-cane cultivated in almost all parts of India.25
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"Besides the above, contemporary records mention a variety of other crops grown in different parts of Bengal. These include malabathrum and spikenard, mentioned in the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea among the exports of this province. These were obviously of an excellent quality, and were grown on an extensive scale in the Eastern Himalayas. Another cultivated crop appears to have been mustard. The Vappaghoshavāta Grant of Jayanāga of the 7th century A.D. (A. 32) mentions the existence of a sarshapayānaka (mustard-channel) in the Audambarika-vishaya of Karṇasuvarṇa. Further, epigraphic records, ranging from the eighth to the thirteenth century, tell us that betel-nut palm (guvāka) and cocoanut (nārikela) were extensively grown up and down the land. Betel-vines were also cultivated in the form of plantations (barojas) and formed, under the Sena kings, a source of revenue to the State (C. 16). Cotton was also cultivated to feed an important industry of the province. Fruits like mango (āmra), bread-fruit (panasa), pomegranate (qālimva), plantain, bassia latifolia (madhūka), date (kharjura), citron (vīja) and figs (parkati) were also widely cultivated."

There are references in the epigraphic records to various kinds of measurements, but it is not easy to understand them properly. Some general ideas of it have been given in the preceding chapter (p. 322).

II. Urban Economy

In spite of undoubted bias or emphasis on rural life, towns also formed an important feature in the economic life of ancient Bengal. In particular the towns that grew up along trade-routes by land and water, and a few like Tāmarlipti that served as good harbours on or near the sea-coast, played a very important role in the economic life of Bengal. There were many towns that were originally established for political or administrative reasons (such as Puṇḍravardhana, Gauḍa) and gradually developed for that very reason, as important centres of trade and business.

In addition to Tāmarlipti, Puṇḍravardhana, Gauḍa or Lakshmanāvati, Vikramapura, Karṇasuvarṇa, Pushkaraṇa, Koṭivarsha, Vardhamāna, Navyāvakāśikā, Pāchchanagarī, Jaya-Karmānta, Priyaṅgu, Rohitāgiri, Paṭṭikera, Meharakula, Vijayapura, Trivenī, Nadiyā, Suvanagrāma, Saptagrāma etc. figuring prominently in
political history, we have reference to many other towns in old records. The Greek writers of the first and second century A.D. refer to the royal city of Gange, a market town on the Ganges, and the Ceylonese Chronicles refer to Vaṅganagara and Siṅhapura. The first two cannot be identified but the last may be identified with Singur in Serampore Sub-division of the Hooghly District. The Grant of Vainyagupta (A. 14) refers to the royal residence of Kṛipura and the naval port of Chūḍāmaṇi.

There were also some big monastic establishments which developed almost into towns. The Somapura (Pahārpur) and Raktamṛttikā (near Karṇasuvanḍa) Vihāras, whose ruins have been excavated, give us some idea of these big establishments which were probably not, unlike the temple cities of South India like Mādurā, Śrīraṅgam, Rāmeśvaram etc.

In addition to the large number of cities specifically mentioned in the records, there must have been many more, of which no memory has been preserved. In any case there is hardly any doubt that the town was an important factor in the economic development of Bengal, as elsewhere, and more or less possessed the same characteristic features. “Both literary and epigraphic evidences make it clear that whereas the rural population was mainly dependent on the soil and its produce, the towns, although not perhaps wholly divorced from agricultural activity, tended to serve a wide variety of functions, commercial, industrial, political, judicial and military. But in contemporary estimation the most distinctive characteristic of the towns was their comparative richness and luxury. The Rāmācharita (III. 31-32) refers to Rāmaa, founded by Rāmapāla, as “a city of rows of palaces” and as possessing “an immense mass of gems”. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī (IV. 422) mentions the “wealth of the citizens of Puṇḍravardhana.” The Deopara Inscription of Vijayasena (C. 2) draws pointed attention to the simplicity of the (village-dwelling) Brāhmaṇas in contradistinction to the luxury of the townsfolk. “Through the grace of Vijayasena”, runs the epigraph, “the Brāhmaṇas versed in the Vedas have become the possessors of so much wealth that their wives have to be trained by the wives of the townspeople (to recognise) pearls, pieces of emerald, silver coins, jewels and gold from their similarity, respectively, with seeds of cotton, leaves of Śāka, bottle-gourd flowers, the developed seeds of pomegranates and the blooming flowers of the creepers of pumpkin-gourd.”
III. Crafts and Industries.

Though agriculture formed the most predominant feature of Bengal’s economy, various arts and crafts were also developed in the course of time. Some of these, whose existence may be proved by definite evidence, are noted below, though there must have been many others of which no record has survived.

A. Textile Industry

Bengal achieved great fame for her textile industry in remote antiquity. This is testified to by the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya which includes the following among the best varieties available in India.

1. White and soft fabric (dukūla) manufactured in the country Vaṅga (Vaṅgaka)
2. That of Pauṇḍra (Pauṇḍraka) manufacture is black and as soft as the surface of a gem.
3. Kshauma manufactured in Pauṇḍra (North Bengal).
4. Patroṇa of Pauṇḍra.
5. Kārpāsika (cotton fabrics).

As regards the last, Vaṅga is enumerated as one of the seven regions in India which produce the best variety.

Kshauma probably denoted linen of coarse variety, the finer form being known as Dukūla manufactured in East and North Bengal (Pauṇḍra), both of which were distinguished centres of textile industry from very early times,—before, and probably long before, the beginning of the Christian Era.

The nature of Patroṇa is not known. It is generally taken to be a type of ‘wild silk’. “Amara (II.VI, 3. 14) defines it as ‘a bleached or white kaustabha,’ while the commentator says that it was a fibre produced by the saliva of a worm on the leaves of certain trees. According to Kauṭilya, nāga tree, likucha (artocarpus lakoocha) Vakula (mimusops elengi) and vaṭa (ficus bengalensis) were the sources of these fibres. The author adds that patroṇa was produced in three regions. viz., Magadha, Pauṇḍra and Suvarṇakudya. It is significant that wild silk of the best quality is still produced in these districts.”
It would thus appear that silk, linen and cotton fabrics had all attained a high degree of excellence in Bengal even more than two thousand years ago.

Bengal maintained her reputation for textile industry throughout the ancient (and medieval) period. The *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, written by a Greek sailor who visited the coastal regions of India from the mouths of the Indus to those of the Ganges in the first century A.D., refers to the "Muslins of the finest sorts" exported from Bengal. The high reputation of Bengal for textile industry is also testified to by the Arab writers. The Arab merchant Sulaiman wrote in the ninth century A.D. that there was 'a stuff made in this country (Ruhmi, located in Bengal) which is not to be found elsewhere; so fine and delicate is this material that a dress made of it may be passed through a signet-ring.' Sulaiman adds that it was made of cotton, and that he was not speaking from hearsay, but had himself seen a piece of it. According to Marco Polo, who visited India in the thirteenth century, Bengal still plied a lucrative trade in cotton goods.\(^4\)

**B. Other Industries**

Reference has been made above to the cultivation of sugar-cane. That it was exported from Bengal in large quantities is mentioned by Marco Polo.

The manufacture of salt is referred to in several epigraphic records (B.77, 88, 92).

The existence of several arts, crafts and industry, and the high level of excellence to which they reached, are proved by the numerous finds of pottery of various sizes and designs, terracotta plaques with beautiful figures engraved thereon, metal works of various kinds, specially weapons of war\(^5\) and images of bronze or octo-alloy, as well as stone images, to which reference will be made in the chapter on Art. Jewellery also formed one of the most distinguished branches of craft and industry. Epigraphic records as well as literary works testify beyond doubt to the fashion of the rich to use gold and silver dishes and ornaments made of pearls and precious stones and metals for personal adornment. Inscription No. C. 2 mentions 'flowers made of precious stones, necklaces, ear-rings, anklets, garlands and golden bracelets,' worn by the wives of the king's servants, and the jewellery worn by the temple girls. No. C. 5 refers to necklaces
of pearls worn by ladies of royal blood. The Rāmcharita (III. 33-34) mentions "Jewelled anklet-bells," "charming ornaments set with diamonds, lapis lazuli, pearls, emeralds, rubies and sapphires," and "necklaces with central gems and pure pearls of round and big shape." According to the Tabagāt-i-Nāsīrī "golden and silver dishes" were used in the palace of Lakshmanaśena.38

Various other arts, crafts, professions and industries are casually referred to in literature and epigraphic records, among which mention may be made of workers in wood and ivory, and others of comparatively minor importance, such as conchshell-workers, braziers, goldsmiths etc.

Many of the minor professions may be traced in the various castes and sub-castes in Bengal, for many of the so-called mixed castes, outside the pale of the primitive four castes of Brāhmaṇas, Kshatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, were really formed by the transformation of organised guilds of these crafts, professions and industries into social groups. Reference may be made to the growth of the following castes, among others, by this process, namely florists, garland-makers, carpenters, masons, painters, braziers, goldsmiths, blacksmiths potters, weavers, oilmen, barbers, cloggers, butchers, distillers of wine etc.

The so-called "thirty-six" castes of Bengal, which must have evolved before the end of the Hindu period, are living testimonies to the industrial and professional organisations known as trade and craft guilds which are referred to in the early Smṛiti literature. Their existence in Bengal is proved by the expressions prathama-kulika, prathama-kāyastha, mentioned above37 in connection with local administration, for these can only refer to the chiefs of an organised profession. Of particular interest and significance is the description of Rāṇaka Śūlapāṇi, who engraved the Deopara Inscription (C. 2), as Varendra-Śīlpigoshhi-Chuḍāmaṇi. This refers to an organisation of artisans covering a big area like Varendra. If the interpretation of Rāṇaka, as given above 38, be accepted, it would prove the high status and dignity of the chiefs of such organisations.

IV Trade and Commerce

Though details are lacking, there is sufficient evidence of a brisk trade which resulted from the growth of different types of industry, facilities of transport afforded by the river-systems, and the luxuries
of urban life referred to above. There are references to officials for collecting tolls (śaulkika), and supervisors of marts and markets (ḥatṭa-pati). The principal centres of inland trade were obviously the towns. Navyāvakāśika was a rendezvous of merchants and businessmen (A. 18, 20-22), and so was Koṭivarsha (A. 6-10). According to the Kathāsaritsāgara, Puḷravardhāna had a great market-place and its streets were lined with shops. Villages also were often centres of trade and business. Inscriptions mention a haṭṭa or market (A.7), haṭṭikā (B. 2) which, according to Kielhorn, means “market dues”, and grant of village with its market place (sa-haṭṭa) (B. 92), while C. 22 speaks of shops (haṭṭiya-griha) and big markets (haṭṭa-vara) in some of the donated villages.

Though the rivers and canals of Bengal were the chief routes of internal trade, there were land-routes also connecting different parts of the Province. These are referred to by foreign travellers like Fa-hien and Hieun-Tsang, and mention is made of ‘rāja-patḥa’ or public highway passing by a village in an Inscription (C. 19). Remains of two ancient embanked roads have been discovered near Dhanora.39

Curiously enough, we have more positive evidence of foreign trade of Bengal. This is mainly due to the fact that the oversea trade of a large part of North India passed through Bengal and its well-known ports at the mouths of the Ganges. Strabo, the great Greek geographer and historian, who wrote his famous ‘Geography’ between A.D. 17 and 23, refers to the “ascent of vessels from the sea by the Ganges to Palibothra,”40 and his information is probably derived from Megasthenes (fourth century B.C.). We learn from a number of Jātaka stories that merchant and businessmen took ships at Banaras, or lower down at Champā (modern Bhagalpur), and then either made coasting voyage to Ceylon or crossed the Bay of Bengal to Suvarṇabhūmi being “for many days without sight of land.” We learn from the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea that Bengal maintained an active oversea trade with South India and Ceylon in the first century A.D. The commodities exported, according to this authority, were malabathrum, Gangetic spikenard, pearls, and muslins of the finest sorts. These were all shipped from a ‘market-town’ called Gange (probably the same as Tāmrālipītī), and carried in vessels described in the Periplus as ‘colandia’. The Milinda pañha, an early Pali text, also mentions that trade was carried on from Vanga across the sea to many countries.42
The most important port in ancient Bengal was undoubtedly Tāmralipti. The modern town of Tamluk, which roughly represents the old site, is on the right bank of the river Rūpnrāyaṇa, about twelve miles from its junction with the Hooghly. As pointed out above (p. 6), the courses of these rivers have shifted frequently, and in early times the port of Tāmralipti was not unlikely situated on the Sarasvatī or another branch of the Ganges. It appears from the accounts of Chinese pilgrims—Fa-hien, Hiuen Tsang, and I-tsing—and Danqjin’s Daśakumāra-charita, that it was the place for embarking for Ceylon, Java and China (in the east), and the land of the Yavanas (in the west). The Kathāsaritsāgara, a later work, also refers to people embarking on ships at Tāmralipti for going to Kaṭāha in the Malay Peninsula. This famous port is mentioned in the Mahābhārata and the Bṛihatsaṁhitā and various synonyms of it are given in Hemachandra’s Abhidhānachintāmaṇi. Its existence in the second century A.D. is proved by reference in Ptolemy’s Geography. According to a story preserved in the Daśakumāracharita, the prince of Tāmralipti used to commit piracy near the port, and once, with a fleet of one large and several smaller boats, attacked a Greek (Yavana) vessel. Such piracies were not unknown in other parts of India also.43

The port on the Ganges referred to in the Periplus has been identified with Tāmralipti by Schoff who observes: “By the town of Ganges is probably meant Tāmralipti, the modern Tamluk (22°18’ N., 87°56’ E.), which gave its name to the Tāmrparṇi river in the Pāṇḍya kingdom, and to the island of Ceylon. This was the seaport of Bengal in the Post-Vedic and Buddhist periods, being frequently mentioned in the great epics. It was the port of the “Bangālis, who trusted in their ships,” who were conquered by the hero of Kālidāsa’s Raghuvaiśa. Here it was that Fa-hien sojourned two years, after which he embarked in “a large merchant vessel, and went floating over the sea to the south-west......to the country of Singhala.”44

As regards malabathrum which was exported from this port, Schoff remarks that this was brought from the Eastern Himālayas, the greatest source of its supply, according to the Periplus.45 This would indicate inland trade of Bengal with the North-eastern frontier regions also. This is also proved by the import of silk from China to the Ganges and thence exported to Tamil lands. Ptolemy refers to the Sabarai living near the Ganges whose country produces diamonds.
The oversea trade from Tāmralipti followed different courses. The first was a voyage along the eastern coast of the Bay of Bengal right up to Malay Peninsula, and then through the Malay straits, or across the narrow isthmus of Kra, to South-east Asia as far as China. The second was a coastal voyage to Paloura near modern Chicacoile and then right across the Bay of Bengal to the opposite coast. The third was a voyage along the eastern coast of India to Ceylon, and then turning north along the western coast to the mouth of the Indus, or across the Arabian Sea from some point in South India to the ports in Arabia and Eastern Africa.

Reference has been made above to the overland trade-route from Bengal to the northern and north-eastern regions in connection with the import of Malabathrum. We possess definite evidence about two such routes. One of these connected Bengal through Kāmarūpa (Assam) with China. This is proved by the statement of Chang-kien, the Chinese ambassador to the Yue-chi country in 126 B.C. that when he was in Bactria he was surprised to find silk and bamboo which came from the Chinese provinces of Yunnan and Szechwan. On inquiry he learnt that the caravans carried these products from southern China to Afghanistan through India. This route evidently continued in use till the ninth century A.D., and was joined by another from Annam. For the itinerary of Kia Tan (785-805 A.D.) describes the land-route from Tonkin to Kāmarūpa, which crossed the Karatoynā river, passed by Punḍravardhana, then ran across the Ganges to Kajangal, and finally reached Magadha.46

It was by this route that the noted commodities of Assam like textile, sandals and agaru were carried through Bengal to other parts of India.

Another overland route passed through the Himalayas across Nepal, Sikim and Chumbi Valley to Tibet and China, which formed the great highway followed by the Buddhist pilgrims of northern Asia on their pilgrimage to India. The import of Malabathrum and other commodities mentioned above might have been carried on through this route also. Towards the end of the Hindu period, large number of horses were also imported into Bengal along this track. Referring to the town Karbattan (also called Kar-pattan or Karambatan), which was situated somewhere at the foot of the Himalayan range, the Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī says:

"Every morning in the market of the city, about fifteen hundred horses are sold. All the saddle horses which come into the territory
of Lakhnauti are brought from this country. Their roads pass through the ravines of the mountains, as is quite common in that part of the country. Between Kāmarūpa and Tibet there are thirty-five mountain passes through which horses are brought to Lakhnauti.  

The most frequented overland route must have followed the Ganges, having more or less the same alignment as the Grand Trunk Road, the extent of which right across the whole of North India up to Pāṭaliputra (Patna) is vouched for by Megasthenes (4th century B.C.). The Kathāsaritsāgara refers to merchants travelling from Punḍravardhana to Pāṭaliputra. When I-tsing, left the seaport of Tāmralipti in 673 A.D. “taking the road which goes straight to the west,” hundreds of merchants accompanied him to Bodh-Gayā. We learn from a rock inscription of Udayamāna (8th century A.D.) that merchants from distant places like Ayodhyā used to frequent the port of Tāmralipti for purposes of trade. These western routes were the principal highways of communication between Bengal and the rest of Northern India, both for purposes of trade and military expedition.
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CHAPTER XI

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

I Sanskrit Literature

1. Growth and Development of Sanskrit Literature.

It can hardly be expected that anything that may be properly called literature existed in Bengal before the Aryan culture was imposed upon, or adopted by, the people at large. At least no evidence is available to this effect, though it is not unlikely that individual Aryans settling in Bengal, who may be regarded as pioneers of Aryan civilisation, introduced Aryan language and literature among a small section of the upper classes in Bengal.

Evidence for the introduction of Aryan language in Bengal is furnished by the epigraphic records mentioned in connection with the political history, which are all written in Aryan language and script. The oldest of these is a fragmentary record (A. 1-A) in six short lines inscribed on a stone plaque found at Mahasthan (Bogra Dt.). It is written in Prakrit language, in the Brāhmī script of about third century B.C. It is not till after about six hundred years that we come across the next epigraphic record. It is a short Sanskrit inscription in three lines engraved on Susunia Hill, near Bankura (A. 3), recording the installation of an image of Vishnu during the reign of Chandravarman, who probably flourished in the fourth century A.D. While these certainly indicate a knowledge of Prakrit and Sanskrit, on the part of at least a small section of the people in Bengal, they do not convey any definite idea of the growth and evolution of Sanskrit literature in Bengal.

Of far greater importance are a large number of land-grants found in Bengal (Nos. A. 4-12, 14, 18-23) which may be referred to the period between A.D. 434 and 600. These are all written in prose and show a far greater acquaintance with Sanskrit Literature, but their literary value is not very great.

But the later epigraphic records of Bengal from the beginning of the seventh century A.D. are sometimes written in a high-flown kāvya style which leaves no doubt that Sanskrit literature was developed
in Bengal (cf. A. 27, 36). This is fully confirmed by the testimony of Chinese pilgrims, who refer to the Buddhist and Jaina monasteries and Brāhmanical temples in Bengal as centres of learning. Fa-hien (5th century) spent two years at Tāmralipti (Tamluk in Midnapore Dt.), studying and copying manuscripts. Hiuen Tsang (7th century) refers to numerous seats of learning and highly praises the people for love of learning. I-ting's evidence is of particular interest. For he specifically states that he learnt Sanskrit in Tāmralipti.

We have thus plenty of evidence for the prevalence of Sanskrit and Sanskritic learning and culture in Bengal from the fifth century A.D., if not before. Though we have no direct or definite evidence of Bengal's contribution to the development of Sanskrit literature, we possess an indirect evidence of great value in this respect. This is furnished by the following verse in the Harsha-Charita by Bānabhaṭṭa (7th century) describing the peculiarities of poetic style in the different parts of India:

"In the North plays on words are mainly admired, in the West it is only the sense; in the South, it is poetical fancy; in Gauḍa pomp of syllables (Gauḍesh-vakshara-ṣambarah)." Though not very complimentary to the Bengali poets, it certainly proves the independent growth of Sanskrit poetry in Bengal to such an extent as led to the evolution of a characteristic style of its own.

It has been held by many that the disparaging remark of Bānabhaṭṭa is due to a partisan spirit, as owing to historical reasons mentioned above (p. 52) Bānabhaṭṭa had supreme contempt for Bengal. But the very fact that in this passage Bāṇa was describing the peculiar literary excellences in the four different regions of India, all of which are not to be found together in any one region, he was paying compliments to the poets of Bengal for their wealth of vocabulary.

(This view finds some support in the references to the poetic styles of Gauḍa and Vaidarbha by Bhamahā and Daṇḍin. Bhamahā lived towards the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 8th century A.D., and Daṇḍin was his junior contemporary (first half of the 8th century). Both of them regard Gauḍī and Vaidarbhi as the two most important modes of poetic expression, but while the former regards the Gauḍī as superior to the other, the latter regards Vaidarbhi as the standard and the Gauḍī differing from it in some essential aspects and not unoften indulging in bombast and prolixity. But whatever
we may think of these views, it seems to be quite clear that by the seventh century A.D., a distinctive literary style had developed in Bengal which the literary men all over India had to take note of. It is to be noted that according to Vāmana, who flourished in the 9th century, the name of the recognised literary diction like Vaidarbhī or Gauḍī was derived from its prevalence in the particular locality. Thus, though the Gauḍī-ṛiti became later more or less a general technical term to denote a particular style not confined to Gauḍa or Bengal, its origin is to be traced to this particular region. This undoubtedly implies that Bengal was a great centre of the development of Sanskrit literature.

But, unfortunately, this very reasonable inference is not supported by the actual remains of literary works produced by the Bengalis. The epigraphic records refer to the high accomplishments of individuals in various branches of Sanskrit literature, such as Vedic literature (with specific reference to Vājasaneyī Sāṁhitā and Kauthuma recension of the Sāmaveda), Vedānta, Pramāṇa, Āgamas, Niti, Jyotisha, Mīmāmsā, Tarka and Vyākaraṇa. (B. 8, 20, 40, 50, 66). The inscription of King Harivarman’s minister Bhāṭṭa Bhāvadeva (B. 90) describes the scholastic attainment of the latter. It is said that this Brāhmaṇa of Rājāh was prominent among the exponents of the Brahmādvaita system of philosophy and conversant with the writings of Bhāṭṭa (i.e., Kumārila); he was an antagonist of the Buddhists and refuted the opinions of heretic dialecticians (v. 20). He was proficient in Siddhānta, Tantra and Gaṇita, and had special keenness for Astrological Science (Phalasaṁhitās). He himself composed a book of Horoscopy (Horāśāstra) and was thus a second Varāha (v. 21). He wrote a treatise of Smṛiti as well and superseded the texts that were already in the field (v. 22). Following Bhāṭṭa he also wrote a guide to Mīmāṁsā philosophy. He was well-versed in other subjects also such as Arthaśāstra, Ayurveda, Astraśāstra and so forth (v. 23). It is said in the colophon to the Haricharita Kāvyā of Chaturbhuja that the Varendra Brāhmaṇas of the time of Dharmapāla were experts in Śruti, Śārīrti, Purāṇa, Vyākaraṇa and Kāvyā.

Some of the inscriptions exhibit literary talents of a high order, but very few literary works of a date earlier than 10th century, may be ascribed to Bengali authors on sufficiently authentic testimony. We may, therefore, turn now to a discussion of some literary works attributed to Bengali authors.
2. Sanskrit Texts Attributed to Bengali Authors

(Bengali authorship has been claimed for several literary works on very doubtful or insufficient evidence) A brief reference is made to some of them. A few Upapurāṇas, evidence for whose Bengali authorship rests on more reasonable grounds, will be mentioned in Chapter XIII.

A. The Hastv-āyurveda, a treatise dealing with the disease of elephants in the form of a dialogue held in Champā between king Romapāda of Aṅga and a sage named Pālakāpya, has been assigned by MM. Haraprasād Sāstrī to 5th or 6th century B.C. This date is highly improbable, and even the name Pālakāpya is regarded by many as fictitious. But "it could not have been redacted at a very late period, inasmuch as the encyclopaedic Agni-purāṇa, some of whose Sāstric sections have to be dated earlier than the 10th century, tells us that its chapter on the Gaja-chikitsā is based upon Pālakāpya's narration to King Romapāda of Aṅga. It is not improbable that Kālidāsa alludes to Pālakāpya when he makes Sunandā, during the Svayamvara of Indumati (Raghu. vi. 27), describe the king of Aṅga as one "whose elephants are trained by Sūtra-kāras." Pālakāpya's present work is written not in the form of Sūtra but in Kārikā with occasional prose exposition, somewhat in the manner of Bharata's Nātya śāstra, but since Bharata has also been called a Muni and Sūtra-kāra, a similar allusion to Pālakāpya is not improbable. If this presumption is acceptable, then Pālakāpya's treatise on elephant-science, like Bharata's work on Dramaturgy, must be taken as embodying a traditional compendium, which was redacted in Aṅga or in some place on the banks of the Brahmaputra, some time before Kālidāsa, in the name of a legendary sage, who first systematised the science and in the form and diction of an ancient śāstra. The present text is an extensive compilation of 160 chapters, covering 700 pages in the printed edition, and is divided (after medical works) into four Sthānas or sections, namely, Mahā-roga (Principal diseases, 18 chapters), Kshudra-roga (Minor diseases, 72 chapters), Salya (Surgery, 34 chapters) and Uttara (Therapy, Bath, Dietics etc. 36 chapters). The science to which Kautūhya refers when he speaks of elephant-doctors, and which at one time must have possessed considerable importance in India, is now nearly lost, and its technicalities have become obscure, but Pālakāpya's earliest authoritative contribution to the subject
deserves mention as presumably an eastern production of great interest.\textsuperscript{11}

The earliest definite reference to this work occurs in Kahiravāmin’s commentary on Amarakośa (11th century). It is, however, very doubtful whether the author of the present work, even if we assume that it is a modern version of an old text, lived within the boundaries of Bengal, as defined in this volume.

B. Chandragomin, the Buddhist author of Chāndra Vyākaraṇa and the founder of the Chāndra School of Sanskrit Grammar, is regarded as a Bengali, mainly on the basis of Tibetan tradition. It, however, makes no distinction between the grāmmarian, the philosopher (author of a work on Logic named Nyāya-Siddhyāloka), and the Tāntric writer of the same name who, according to Bstan-hgyur, wrote no less than thirty-six esoteric texts, and is also said to have written some Sanskrit stotras (hymns), a drama, and a religious kāvyā, entitled Śishya-lekha-dharma. According to the Tibetan tradition Chandragomin was born in a Kṣhatriya family in Varendra.

The Chāndra-Vyākaraṇa is undoubtedly a much more important work than the others attributed to him or his name-sakes. The date of its composition has been fixed between 465 and 544 A.D. by B. Liebich on the strength of the passage ‘Ajayad Jartta Hunām, by emending Jartta into Gupta. This is at best very doubtful. On the whole it is very difficult to accept the theory that the grāmmarian Chandragomin was a Bengali.

C. Some have tried to show that Viśākhadatta, author of the Mudrā-Rākṣhasa, Bhāṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, author of the Venī-Saṅhāra, Murāri, author of Anarga-rāghava, Subandhu, the author of Vāsavadatta, and Nītivarman, author of Kīchaka-vadha, were sons of Bengal. There is hardly any evidence in the case of the first four,\textsuperscript{12} while that of the fifth, though plausible,\textsuperscript{13} cannot be regarded as particularly strong, far less conclusive.

D. (Kshemīśvara, the author of Chaṇḍa-kauśika has also been claimed to be a Bengali on the ground that he lived in the court of a king Mahipāla, who drove away the Kānṭākakas. MM. Harā Prasād Śāstṛi identified the king with the Pāla King Mahipāla who fought with the army of Rājendra Chola. But far more plausible is the identification of Mahipāla with the homonymous Gūrjara-Pratīhāra ruler who fought with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Indra III.
In any case it is very doubtful whether Kshemīśvara was born in Bengal. \(^{14}\)

3. **Sanskrit Texts Written by the Bengalis**

A. **Kāvyas**

("The only writer who can be definitely assigned to Bengal is Gauḍa Abhinanda, who is known to us from stray quotations of his verses in the Sanskrit anthology of Śārīgadhara, but the question of his date and identity is not free from difficulty. He has been identified with Abhinanda, son of Jayanta and author of the Kādambarī-kathā-sāra, on the ground, chiefly, that the author of this metrical summary of Bāṇa’s prose romance describes one of his ancestors as a Gauḍa; but the evidence is obviously not conclusive, and none of the anthology verses ascribed to Abhinanda or Gauḍa Abhinanda is traceable in this work.\(^{15}\) There is, however, no chronological obstacle in the way of the proposed identification. The author of the Kathā-sāra informs us that his fifth ancestor, Śaktisvāmin, flourished under Muktāpiṭa of the Karkoṭa dynasty of Kashmir towards the end of the 7th and the first half of the 8th century; and as the poet Abhinanda, son of Jayanta, is mentioned and quoted by the Kāshmirian Abhinavagupta towards the end of 10th century, his date may be fixed at about the first half of the 9th century.\(^{16}\) The Abhinanda of the anthologies could not have been of a much later date, having been quoted in the Kavinda-vachana-samuchchaya which cannot be assigned to a period later than the 10th century; but it is not clear if this Abhinanda is identical with Gauḍa Abhinanda, who is cited (along with Abhinanda without the descriptive term Gauḍa) in the Śārīgadhara-paddhati.

"These Abhinandas are probably to be distinguished from Abhinanda, the author of Rāmācharita (cf. p. 117), who describes himself as the son of Śatānanda, and probably also from Abhinava-pañcīti, also a Gauḍa, whose Yogāstha-saṁkshepa in six Prakaraṇas and forty-six Sargas is noticed by Weber (Berlin Cat. No. 643) and who is described in the colophon to the work as tarkādiśvara-sāhityāchārya-gauḍamaṇḍalālāmkāra-krīimat. The problem of identity is complicated by the fact that the editor of the Rāmācharita makes a plausible case of its author having belonged to Gauḍa on the basis of the identity of his patron Yuvarāja..."
Hāravarsha, son of Vikramaśīla, with Devapāla son of Dharmapāla.  

The identity has been questioned by Dr. S. K. De, but strongly supported by N. Das Gupta.  

The Rāmācharita is a Kāvya based on the Rāmāyana (from the middle of Kishkindhyā-Kāṇḍa to the end of Yuddha-Kāṇḍa) but with some additions and alterations in order to glorify the character of Rāma.

(The only Kāvya that is known to have been written in Bengal by a Bengali during the period covered in this volume is the Rāmācharita of Sandhyākara Nandī, to which reference has been made above in connection with the history of Ramapāla of the Pāla dynasty. MM. Haraprasād Śāstrī discovered the unique manuscript of the Kāvya in Nepal (now preserved in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta.) His description of the book has been quoted above.

The author belonged to a very respectable family.  

His grandfather was Pināka Nandī and his father, Prajāpati Nandī. The author was not only a poet, but a linguist. As Rāmapala was Rāma, so the poet calls himself Kalikāla-Vālmīki.

But by far the most important contribution of Bengal to the poetic literature in Sanskrit is the Gītā-govinda of Jayadeva. All that we definitely know of the personal history of Jayadeva is that he was the son of Bhojadeva and Rāmādevī (variants, Rādhādevī, Vāmādevī), and Padmāvatī, mentioned in several verses of the Gītā-govinda, was probably the name of his wife.  

His birth-place was Kendubilva, which is generally identified with Kenduli, a village on the bank of the Ajay (Birbhum District), where an annual fair is still held in his memory on the last day of the Bengali month of Pausha. It may be reasonably inferred from the mention of the appropriate Rāgas and Tālas of the various songs in the poem that Jayadeva was well-versed in music. As a matter of fact some popular legends describe him as a wandering minstrel.

According to well-established traditions, Jayadeva was one of the ornaments of the court of Laksmanasena. This is supported by the fact that the Sadukti-karṇāmrīta, an anthology of poems compiled by Śrīdharaḍāsa during the reign of this Sena king, contains verses of Jayadeva, and an inscription dated Samvat 1348 (A.D. 1292) quotes the famous Daśāvatāra-stuti (hymns to the incarnations of Vishnu) in the Gītā-govinda.

"The work is not a Stotra of praise but a poem which deals with a highly erotic episode of Kṛishṇa’s vernal sports in
Vṛindāvana. It is divided into twelve cantos, in the form, but not in the spirit, of the orthodox Kāvya. Each canto falls into sections, which contain Padāvalīs or songs, composed in rhymed moric metres and set to different tunes. The theme, which is developed in this novel operatic form, is simple. It describes the estrangement of Rādhā from Kṛṣṇa, who is sporting with other maidens, Rādhā’s sorrow, longing and jealousy, intercession of Rādhā’s companion, Kṛṣṇa’s return, penitence and propitiation of Rādhā, and the joy of their final reunion.²⁸

The wide reputation of the Gītā-govinda all over India is proved by the existence of more than forty commentaries in different parts of India, including one by Mahārāṇa Kumbha of Mewār, and more than a dozen imitations of this extraordinary poem. It is universally regarded as a “rich source of literary and religious inspiration of Medieval India... not only as a great poem, but also as a great religious work of medieval Vaishnava Bhakti.”²⁷ Two poems ascribed to Jayadeva, in praise of Hari-Govinda are incorporated in the Ṛādigranth of the Sikhs.

In the introductory part of his poem Jayadeva has paid high tributes to poets Dhoiyī, Umāpatidhara, Govardhana and Śarana. These four along with Jayadeva may be regarded as the five ratnas (jewels or literary men) of the court of Lakṣmaṇasena who has been compared with Vikramāditya by Dhoiyī.²⁸ Though stray verses of these four poets and a long inscription of Umāpatidhara No. C. 2) are known, none of their poetical works are known with the exception of Pavana-dūta by Dhoiyī, who has been described as king of poets by Jayadeva, and the ‘Āryā-sapta-sati’ which is generally attributed to Govardhana mentioned above.

The Pavana-dūta of Dhoiyī is one of the dūta-kāvyas—more than fifty in number,—which ‘derive their impetus, but not inspiration’, from Kālidāsa’s Megha-dūta:

“The work is noteworthy in taking up, without being a Charita, an historical personage, namely, the poet’s patron Lakshmanaśena, as the hero. The poet makes Kuvalayavatī, a Gandharva maiden of the Malaya hills, falls in love with the king during the latter’s career of conquest in the south, and send the south-easterly wind as a messenger. It is an elegant poem of 104 verses, but of no greater merit than most poems of its kind.”²⁹

The Āryā-sapta-sati, written on the model of Hāla’s Gāthā-
sapta-śati, contains more than 700 isolated verses of predominantly erotic character arranged alphabetically in Vrajaśī. Govardhana attains “a measure of success, but the verses, moving haltingly in the somewhat unsuitable medium of Sanskrit Āryā metre, are more ingenious than poetical, and lack the flavour, wit and heartiness of Hāla’s miniature word-pictures. But the work achieved the distinction of having inspired the very interesting Hindi Satsai of Vīharīlāl, which holds a high rank in Hindi poetry.”

The Sadukti-karṇāmṛita refers to one Umāpati as having composed a Kāvyā called “Chandrachūḍācharita” now lost. He may be the same person as Umāpatidhara, but of this we have no positive evidence. He was also probably the author of two inscriptions (C. 12, 13) besides No. C. 2 mentioned above.

About the same time when the poets mentioned above graced the court of Lakshmanaṣena in Bengal, another great poet, Śrīharsha of all-India fame, and author of the Naishadha-charita or Naishadhīya, lived in the court of the ruler of Kānyakubja (Vijaya Chandra or Jayachandra or both). Unfortunately, there is a very sharp difference of opinion among scholars regarding his merit as a poet as well as his native place. As regards the second point, there is a large body of opinion that he was a son of Bengal, though this is denied by some. Since much has been written on both sides, and this is a vital point in a history of Bengal, the whole question has been discussed in detail in an Appendix to this chapter.

Dr. S. K. De expressed the following view about the quality of Śrīharsha’s epic:

“The only Mahākāvyā which need detain us is the Naishadhacharita of Śrīharsha, not so much for its intrinsic poetic merit as for the interesting evidence it affords of the type of enormously laboured metrical composition which was widely and enthusiastically favoured. The work is regarded as one of the five great Mahākāvyas in Sanskrit; it is undoubtedly the last masterpiece of industry and ingenuity that the Mahākāvyā can show, but to class it with the masterpieces of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and even Māgha is to betray an ignorance of the difference between poetry and its counterfeit.”

Somewhat later he wrote: “Śrīharsha claims originality for his work (viii. 109) as that of ‘a traveller on a path unseen by the race of poets’; but as a poem his work displays more learning than real
poetry. An elaborate and pedantic production of twenty-two cantos, it spins out and embellishes only a part of the simple and attractive epic story of Nala and Damayantī out of all recognition; but the concern of the undoubtedly talented master of diction and metre is not so much with the poetic possibilities of the theme, as with the display of his own skill and learning so characteristic of later decadent poets. The work has been regarded as one of the five traditional Mahākāvyas and has been favoured by a section of learned Indian opinion, but it would be an acquisition of dubious value to Bengal if its Bengal origin were finally proved."\(^{32}\) This view was strongly denounced by D. C. Bhattacharya who referred to the view of Keith; an extract from the latter's work is quoted below:

"The Naishadhiya unquestionably has a definite interest in the history of Sanskrit literature, for it exhibits the application to the charming episode of the Mahābhārata, familiar to all students as the Nala, of the full resources of a master of diction and metre, possessed of a high degree of skill in the difficult art of playing on words, and capable of both delicate observation of nature and of effective expression of the impressions thence derived. Indian taste shows its appreciation of him beyond question in naming him a Mahākavi as the successor of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, and Māgha, nor need we doubt that to any of these critics the Nala would have seemed insufferably tame compared to the work of Śrīharsha. As one enthusiastic of modern times \(^{33}\) says, 'all mythology is at his fingers' ends'. Rhetoric he rides over. He sees no end to the flow of his description."

After referring to some deprecatory views about the Naishadha-charita Keith observes:

"Yet it is fair to admit Śrīharsha's cleverness; his power of double entendre receives perfectly fair use in the recast of the famous scene in which Damayantī sees before her five men apparently exactly alike and cannot decide which is her lover...Nor, again, is it possible to deny that the transition in the last canto from the description of night to that of the moon is gracefully effected....

"Though on the whole we must condemn the elaboration of Śrīharsha and his excessive use of Yamakas and rime, he was certainly capable of elegance and skill in the use of language."\(^{34}\)

Though the Naishadha-charita deals with the episode of Nala..."
and Damayantī described in the *Mahābhārata*, "the contents of cantos vi, vii, xv, xix-xxii, as well as the greater portion of xvii are matters not to be found in the epic. A whole canto of 109 verses is devoted to a description of the heroine’s entire bodily charms, beginning from the top of the head to the toe of the feet! The panegyric of the Vaitāliya occupies the whole of canto xix (67 verses), while Damayantī’s Svayamvara extends over five cantos. The poem ends with the married bliss of Nala and Damayantī."

Referring to the poetic treatment of the Nala story which forms the theme of the *Naishadha-charita* Dr. S. K. De observes:

"The simple epic story is perhaps one of the most romantic and pathetic to be found in any literature, but Śrīharsha confines himself, significantly enough, to the lighter side of Nala’s career. The concern of the undoubtedly talented master of diction and metre is not with the possibilities of the story itself, but with the possibilities of embellishing it, disproportionately in twenty-two cantos, by his forensic and rhetorical fancy with a pedantic mass of descriptive matter, supposed to be indispensable in the Mahākāvya. The Svayamvara of Damayantī, for instance, takes only a few lines in the Epic, but Śrīharsha devotes to it five long cantos (x-xiv) of more than five hundred stanzas. It is the most gorgeous and elaborate description of its kind in Sanskrit; but it is not the question of magnificence and proportion alone that is here significant. To present to Damayantī the five Nalas, or rather the real Nala and the four divine suitors who have assumed his form, is a task of no small difficulty; in Śrīharsha’s opinion, the task is worthy of Sarasvati, the goddess of learning, who is made to undertake it; for each of the eighteen verses must have a twofold meaning, overtly applying to Nala, but characterising at the same time one of the four gods who also pose as Nala. For the sake of uniformity and impartiality, even the verses which describe the real Nala are also made to possess double meaning; and in the closing stanza, the address is capable of five interpretations, one for each of the dissembling gods and the fifth for Nala himself. The situation is ingenuously conceived, and the display of marvellous punning is not altogether out of place; but it certainly sets a perplexing task to poor Damayantī, to whom the verses perhaps would not be intelligible forthwith without a commentary...."
"At the same time it must be said to Śrīharsha’s credit that even if his Damayantī is conventional, he shows considerable skill in the general picture of Nala’s character depicted with its conflict of the emotions of love and honour. Despite laboured language, there are animated and quite witty speeches and dialogues, and not a little of remarkable epigrams and wise reflections. There can also be no doubt about Śrīharsha’s extraordinarily varied learning and command of the entire resources of traditional technique, even though the learning tends towards the obscure and the technique towards the artificial. His metrical skill is also considerable; he employs about twenty different metres in all, which are mostly short lyrical measures, the Mandakrānta, Śikhariṇi and Srādgāra occurring only rarely; but his predilection towards harsh and recondite forms of words and phrases does not always make his metres smooth and tuneful."

Śrīharsha was the son of Śrīhira and Māmalladevi. “In one of the four additional verses found at the end of the poem, the genuineness of which, however, is not beyond question, it is said that the poet received honour from the king of Kānyakubja. As this assertion agrees with the story recorded in Jaina Rājaśekhara Sūri’s Prabhanda-kośa (composed in 1348 A.D.), it has been held\(^{36}\) that Śrīharsha probably flourished under Vijayachandra and Jayachandra of Kanauj in the second half of the 12th century. This date is not unlikely in view of the fact that Chāndupāṇḍita’s commentary on the Naishadhī is dated 1297 A.D. and itself refers to a still earlier commentary by Vidyādhara. But K. T. Telang\(^{36}\) and R. P. Chanda\(^{36}\) question the trustworthiness of Rājaśekhara’s account, and suggest the 9th or 10th century as the date of Śrīharsha.”\(^{37}\)

Śrīharsha was not only a poet but also a logician and philosopher. Some indication of this is given by the canto xvii of the Naishadhī charita which is in reality a philosophical dissertation, somewhat irrelevantly introduced in the epic poem. But his fame as a philosopher rests upon his Vedantic treatise, Khaṇḍana-Khaṇḍakhaḍyā, which is still regarded as “a classical work of Indian dialectics.” Other works attributed to him are two philosophical treatises, namely Sihaīrya-vichāra Prakāraṇa and Īśvarābhīsandhi, and a lexicon, Dvīpapakosa. He also composed three royal panegyrics, namely Śrī Vijaya-praśasti (in honour of Vijayachandra, King of Kanauj), Gauḍorvīśa-kula-praśasti\(^{37}\) and Chhindra-praśasti.

In epilogue-stanzas at the end of each canto the Naishadhā-charita
mentions the author's parentage, and contains reference to his literary works, *Arṇava-Vivaraṇa, Śivaśakti-siddhi and Navasāhasārika-charita*, in addition to those mentioned above. It is also stated that Śrīharsha was patronised by the king of Kāṇyakubja and that his work was appreciated by the Kashmirian scholars (iv. 123, v. 138, ix. 160, xvii. 222, xviii. 154, xxiii. 151, vii. 109, 110, xvi. 131, xxii. 26).

The *Sadukti-karṇāmrīta*, to which reference has been made above more than once, is an anthology of poems, 2370 in number, composed by 485 poets. Some of these verses were composed by the Sena Kings, Vallālasena, Lakshmanasena and Keśavasena. How many of the other poets were inhabitants of Bengal cannot be ascertained. It was compiled (1206 A.D.) by Śrīdhara-dāsa, son of Vaṭūkādāsa, a friend and courtier of Lakshmanasena. Śrīdhara-dāsa was *Mahāmāṇḍalika* of this king.

Reference may be made to an earlier anthology, *Subhāśita-ratnakoṣa* by Vidyākara, probably a Bengali. It was probably compiled in the twelfth century A.D. A fragmentary manuscript of it was published under the title *Kavīndra-vachana-samuchchaya*. The first section of the work is called *Sugata-Vrajaḥ* which has been taken to indicate that the author was a Buddhist. Six hundred and twenty-three verses are common to *Subhāśita-ratnakoṣa* and *Sadukti-karṇāmrīta*. But the former contains some verses of poets who are otherwise unknown. It also includes a verse of Kshemīśvara. As no other anthology contains his verse, this fact is regarded by some as lending support to the view that Kshemīśvara lived in the court of the Pāla King Mahipāla and not the Gurjara-Pratihara king of that name (see p. 354). It has been suggested that the poems of a large number of Bengali poets, particularly with names ending in 'oka' (Anigoka, Lalitoka, Siddhoka etc.) not otherwise known, are included in this anthology.

B. Logic and Philosophy.

(The oldest philosophical work written by a Bengali is undoubtedly *Gauḍapāda-kārikā*. It contains 215 memorial verses and was probably entitled *Āgama-sūstra*.) According to tradition the author Gauḍapāda was the pupil of Sūka and teacher's teacher (parama-guru) of the great Śaṅkarāchārya. (Many, however, hold that
Gauḍapāda was not a personal name but merely a descriptive epithet, indicating that he was an inhabitant of Gauḍa (Bengal). This seems more reasonable, as the author is also referred to as Gauḍāchārya. As the work is said to have been actually quoted by some early commentators of the Mādhyaṃkika School (c. 750 A.D.), its antiquity goes back to the seventh or eighth century A.D., and this is fully in accordance with his relation to Saṅkarāchārya mentioned above, as there are good grounds to believe that the latter lived at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century A.D. It is held by many that the Gauḍapāda-kārikā prepared the groundwork upon which Śaṅkara built up his great structure of Advaitavāda.

According to Dr. S. Radhakrishnan the Kārikā “is an attempt to combine the whole negative logic of the Mādhyaṃkika with the positive idealism of the Upanishads.” The philosophical doctrine of the Kārikā has also been described as a curious blend of pre-Śaṅkara Vedānta and Mādhyaṃkika Śūnyavāda. “The work consists of four parts of varying length, called, respectively, Āgama (29 verses), Vaitathya (38 verses), Advaita (48 verses) and Ālāta-sānti (100 verses).

It has been shown that the fourth section, in particular, the authorship of which has sometimes been questioned, is indebted to early Buddhistic philosophical works for its words, arguments and images; and, considering the early prevalence of Buddhistic schools in Bengal this is not surprising. Gauḍapāda is also credited with the authorship of commentaries, respectively on Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s Saṃkhya-kārikā and the Uttara-gītā; but while the latter work is of no great merit, the former appears to be largely based either upon the earlier Māthara-writtī or upon an unknown source which Māṭhara also utilised. The hypothesis of two Gauḍapādas has also been advanced; but there is nothing in these two commentaries which militates against their traditional ascription to the author of the Kārikā.”

To a somewhat later date belongs the famous Nyāya-kandali commentary of Śrīdhara Bhaṭṭa on Praśastapāda’s Padārtha-dharmasamgraha Bhāṣya on the Vaiśeshika-sūtra. From the concluding verses of this work we learn that Śrīdhara was the son of Baladeva and Abhokā (v.i. Abhokā, Ambokā, Achchokā) and belonged to Bhūriśreshṭhi in Dakṣiṇa-Rājāhā, which has been identified with the village of Bhursut, near Burdwan. The work was written at the instance of one Pāṇḍudāsa, and is dated in Śaka 913 (or 910) which is equivalent to 991 (or 988) A.D. From references in the work
itself it appears that Śrīdhara also wrote Advaya-siddhi (p.5) Tattvasaṁvādinī (p. 82); Tattva-prabodha (p. 146) and a Saṁgraha-liṅka (p. 159); but none of these works, which are concerned apparently with Vedānta and Mīmāṁsā, has come down to us.\footnote{45}

Abhinanda, the Gauḍa, son of Jayanta, mentioned above (p. 355), is reputed to be the author of four or five philosophical works including Yoga-Vākṣītha-saṁkshepa. Reference has already been made (p. 361) to the philosophical works of another poet Śrīharsha, the author of Naishadha-charita. The Sarva-darśana-saṁgraha of Mādhavāchārya (1350 A.D.) refers to Pūrṇānanda Kavi Chakravarti of Gauḍa who refuted the Māyā-vāda of Saṅkara in Tattva-muktāvalī or Māyāvādaśāntadūshanī.\footnote{46}

C. Mīmāṁsā and Dharma-śāstra (Ritualistic literature)

Mīmāṁsā is the logic of the Dharma-śāstra, and most of the Smṛiti writers were renowned scholars in the Mīmāṁsā.

The study of this subject in Bengal is referred to in inscriptions and is also indicated by performances of Vedic Sacrifices mentioned in epigraphic records beginning from the 5th century A.D. (Nos. A. 6-10).

Both the Mīmāṁsā schools of Kumārila (Bhaṭṭamata) and Prabhākara (Vṛihatī or Gurumata) flourished in Bengal. The oldest Bengali writer is Saṅkaranātha who probably flourished in the seventh century A.D. He composed a Paṁchikā on the commentaries—Laghvī and Bṛihatī—of Prabhākara.

\'Hālayudha in his Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva says that although Bengal paid little attention to the Vedas, she studied Mīmāṁsā. He himself wrote the Mīmāṁsā-sarvasva which is now lost. The subject is actually represented in this period by only one work, namely, the Tattātīta-mata-tilaka, of Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa, which exists only in fragments. The study of the Vedic ritual is similarly evidenced by a single extant work composed by Nārāyaṇa, son of Goṇa and grandson of Umāpati. It is a commentary, entitled Prakāśa, on Keśava Miśra’s Chhāndoga-parīṣiṣṭa.\footnote{46a} Nārāyaṇa is usually referred to the reign of Devapāla but some writers place him in the thirteenth century.\footnote{47}

Bengal, however, produced a rich crop of Smṛiti or Dharma-
śāstra literature. Some old writers "are quoted and criticised by the Bengal authors, Jimūtavāhana, Raghunandana and Śūlapāṇi, and are therefore conjectured to have flourished in Bengal before the 12th century A.D. In his Kāla-viveka, Jimūtavāhana mentions Jitendriya among writers who dealt with the subject of auspicious time (kāla) appropriate for ceremonies, and quotes in several passages his very words. Jitendriya's views on Vyavahāra and Prāyaśchitta are also quoted in the Dīya-bhāga, and the Vyavahāra-māṭrikā of Jimūtavāhana, as well as in the Dīyatattva of Raghunandana. It would seem, therefore, that Jitendriya's lost work was fairly comprehensive in its scope; and as only these Bengal writers, and no other, quote him, the supposition that he flourished in Bengal in the first half of the 11th century is not unlikely. The other forgotten author, Bālaka, is known entirely from references by Jimūtavāhana, Raghunandana and Śūlapāṇi, who discuss his views mostly on Vyavahāra and Prāyaśchitta, Jimūtavāhana going even to the length of sometimes punitively ridiculing them as childish (bāla-vachana). If the Vāloka mentioned six times in his Prāyaśchitta-prakaranya by Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa, also a Bengal writer, be the same as our Bālaka, then his date would be anterior to 1100 A.D. There is also another Dharma-śāstra writer named Yogloka who is known similarly from the references made by Jimūtavāhana and Raghunandana. He appears to have treated the subject of Vyavahāra and composed a long (Bṛihat) and a short (Laghu) treatise on Kāla. He is quoted mostly for the purpose of being refuted, but since Jimūtavāhana refers to old (purātana) manuscripts of Yogloka's work, he might have been even an older author than Jitendriya and Bālaka."

Next in point of time is Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa to whom reference has been made above (p. 210). He is described "as prominent among the exponents of the Brahmādvaīta system of philosophy, conversant with the writings of Bhaṭṭa (Kumārila), an antagonist of the Buddhists and heretic dialecticians, well versed in Artha-śāstra, Ayurveda, Astraveda etc., proficient in Siddhānta, Tantra and Gandita, and called the second Varāha because of his special keenness for Astrology and Astronomy, having himself composed a work on the Horā-śāstra. He is said to have also composed a work on the Dharma-śāstra, which superseded the already existing texts, and, following Bhaṭṭa (bhaṭṭokta-nītyā), to have written a guide to Mīmāṃsā in one thousand nyāyas. This is
entitled Tautātīta-mata-tilaka and is known from a fragmentary manuscript in the India Office Library. It discusses the Tantravārttika of Tautātīta or Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, the fragment covering only Pūrva-mīṁāṁsā-sūtra ii. 1. Bhavadeva’s works on Dharmaśāstra, however, are better known. These are, so far known, three in number, and respectively embrace the three important branches of Achāra, Vyavahāra and Prāyaśchitta. The work on Vyavahāra or judicial procedure, called Vyavahāra-tilaka, is now lost; but it is known from citations in the Vyavahāra-tattva of Raghunandana, the Vīramitrodaya of Mitra Miśra and Daṇḍa-viveka of Vardhamāna. The other Dharmaśāstra work is the Prāyaśchitta-prakaraṇa which deals in six chapters with the modes of expiation for various sins and offences. The first chapter (Vadha-parichchheda) concerns itself with the murder of men and women and slaughter of animals; the second (Bhakṣhyābhakṣhya-p.) treats of forbidden food and drink; the third (Steya-p.) discusses various kinds of theft; the fourth (Agamāgamana-p.) is occupied with sexual union with forbidden persons; the fifth (Saṁsarga-p.) is devoted to such topics as taking of improper gifts from outcasts, contracting of forbidden marriages, sale of forbidden food and contact of untouchable persons; while the sixth chapter (Kṛichchhra-p.) concludes with the discussion of expiatory rites and penances. It gives a fairly full treatment of the subject and cites more than sixty authorities. The reputation which the work enjoyed is indicated by the respect with which it is cited by such Smṛiti-writers as Vedāchārya, Govindananda and Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. On the Śāmaedic rites and ceremonies relating to the Saṁskāras, Bhavadeva wrote Chhāndogakarmāṇushihāna-paddhati, also variously called Daśa-karma-paddhati, Daśa-karma-dīpikā or Saṁskāra-paddhati. Its contents are devoted to Kushāṇḍikā, Udīchya-karman, Vivṛha, Garbhādhāna, Pūnisavana, Simantonnayana, Śoṣhyantī-homa, Jāta-karman, Nīshkramaṇa, Paushṭika, Anna-prāśana, Putra-mūrdhā-bhigṛhaṇa, Chūḍā-karaṇa, Upanayana, Samāvartana and Sālā-karman.49

Bhavadeva, as mentioned above, belonged to the end of the eleventh and beginning of the 12th century A.D.

The next (almost contemporary) important writer was Jimūta-vāhana, a leading authority of the Bengal School of Dharmaśāstra. His date must be placed between the Śaka year 1014 (=1092) to
which he refers, and the middle of the 15th century A.D., as he is quoted by the eminent Śrīti writers of that period. Various dates have been proposed between these two extremes, more or less agreeing to the last part of the eleventh and the beginning of the 12th century A.D. The latest view is that of P. V. Kane, placing Jīmūtavāhana between A.D. 1100 and 1150.

"Of Jīmūtavāhan's personal history not much is known. In the colophons of his works he is described as Pāribhadriya Mahāmahopādhyāya, while at the conclusion of his Vyavahāra-mātrikā and Dāya-bhāga, he informs us that he was born of the Pāribhadra family (kula). It is said that this name belongs to a section of Rājāhnyā Brāhmans, still called Pārihāl or Pāri-gāṇī. An astronomical reference in his Kāla-viveka (p. 290) appears to support the inference that Jīmūtavāhana belonged to Rājāhā.

Of Jīmūtavāhana's three works, all of which have been printed, the most well known and important is his Dāya-bhāga, which is the basis and paramount authority on the Hindu law of inheritance, partition and Strī-dhana in Bengal, except in cases where the Mitākṣarā, from which it differs in some fundamental points, is applicable. The work is widely known through Colebrooke's English translation and has been often printed in Bengal. Its popularity and importance are indicated by the large number of commentaries which exist, including one by Raghunandana who has utilised it also in his own authoritative works. The work defines and discusses the general principles of Dāya or inheritance and proceeds to the exposition of father's power over ancestral property, partition of father's and grandfather's property and division among sons after father's death. It then deals with the definition, classification and devolution of woman's property (Strī-dhana), after which it treats of persons excluded from partition and inheritance on grounds of disability, of property which is impartible, of the order of succession to sonless persons, of reunion, of partition of coparcenary property concealed but subsequently discovered, and of settlement of partition disputes by the court. It is a work of great learning and acuteness, and freely criticises a large number of authorities, ancient and modern, some of whom are not known otherwise.

His Vyavahāra-mātrikā, as its very name implies, deals with judicial procedure. Its importance is evidenced by references to it
by Raghunandana and Vāchaspāti Miśra. It divides the subject into four Pādas, with an introductory exposition (Vyavahāra-mukha) dealing with the eighteen titles of law, the function and qualification of the judge (Prādyvivāka), the different grades of court and the duties of the Sabhyas. Of the four stages of Vyavahāra, the first (Bhāśā-pāda) deals with the plaint (Pūrva-paksha) of the plaintiff (Arthin) and with surety (Pratibhū); the second (Uttara-pāda) treats of the four kinds of reply (Uttara) by the defendant (Pratyarthin); the third (Kriyā-pāda) is devoted to proof or burden of proof (Kriyā) and various kinds of evidence, human (Mānushi) and divine (Daivi), the author purposely omitting the divine which consists of trial by ordeal; and the fourth (Nirṇaya-pāda) concludes with the topic of the decision and order of the court. The work abounds in quotations, calculated as about six hundred in number, and proves the learning and dialectic abilities of the author. Jimūṭavāhana’s third work, Kāla-viveka, declares in its second introductory verse its object of elucidating the topic of Kāla or appropriate time for particular ceremonies, which has not been properly understood and treated by previous writers, seven of whom are directly mentioned in one verse. It deals accordingly with the question of appropriate season, month, day and hour for the performance of religious duties and ceremonies, the determination of intercalary months, the suitability of lunar and solar months, and the auspicious time for various festivals, including the Kojāgara and the Durgotsava. The work shows the same skill and learning of the author and abounds in quotations, references and criticisms of previous authors, while its reputation is indicated by its wide recognition by such later writers as Raghunandana, Śūlapāṇi, Vāchaspāti Miśra and Govindānanda.

Unfortunately the works of most of those who preceded Jimūṭavāhana and Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa are now lost and only known from citations by later writers. These formed a galaxy of scholars, all belonging to Bengal and flourishing within a century before Jimuta-vāhana.

"There were several others. Dīkshita, once mentioned by Raghunandana in the Malamāsatattva, is quoted 18 times, once as an authority of equal rank with Bhojadeva (p. 290). He comes after both Yogloka (p. 280) and Jitendriya (p. 78). Sambhrama Bhaṭṭa is quoted 9 times including a long note of his on 'Dvīrāshāqha'
(pp. 240-53): he preceded Jitentriya (p. 255). Andhuka is quoted 10 times: two of his observations are fortunately noted by Jīmūtavāhana, one in Kārtika 952 Śaka (p. 51) and the other in 955 Śaka (p. 119: vide verification in IHQ., III, p. 573). Śaṅkhadharma, quoted 7 times, was the author of a (Sṛiti-) Samuchchaya (p. 310): he is also cited in the Hāralatā and by Śūlapāṇi, Raghunandana and other Bengali authors, but is unknown in Mithilā. So also Dhavala, who is quoted 7 times. The works of all these writers are now entirely lost, being superseded by the great work of Jīmūtavāhana.

"Govindarāja is one of the greatest authorities in the Dharmasāstra literature of India. Besides the Manuṣikā, long available in print, he is the author of a treatise, Sṛitiṃaṇjarī, which is the earliest Nibandha so far discovered."\(^{62a}\) Govindarāja has been respectfully referred to by Jīmūtavāhana and Aniruddha. Among other Sṛiti writers of this period, claimed for Bengal, may be mentioned Mahāmahopādhyāya Chandra of the Prabhākara School, Śrīkara, a notable writer on Mīmāṃsā, whose Sṛiti work is now lost, and Jikana, author of a comprehensive Sṛiti treatise, referred to by Bhavadeva.\(^{62b}\)

The Brāhmaṇical ritualistic writings flourished during the Sena period, as, after a long spell of dominance of Buddhism during the Pāla rule the need was felt of Dharmasāstras prescribing the orthodox Hindu rules guiding the daily life of the people and their pious duties and ceremonies.

"The earliest of these appear to be the Hāralatā and the Pitri-dayita of Aniruddha, both of which have been considerably used as authoritative by Raghunandana. The first work deals with the observance of impurity (Aśauca) consequent upon birth and death, its duties and prohibitions, the period for which it is to be observed, the persons who are exempted from observing it, and other relevant topics. The second work, intended for the Sāmavedic followers of Gobhila, is concerned chiefly with rites and observances connected with Śrāddha or funeral ceremony; but it includes a treatment of general duties like Mouth-washing (Āchamana), Teeth-cleansing (Danta-dhāvana), Ablution (Snāṇa), Daily prayers (Sandhyā), Offering to Pitrīs and Viśva-devāḥ (Tarpaṇa and Vaiśvadeva), the periodical Pārvaṇa-Śrāddha, as well as a eulogy of gifts. Both the works are in prose and contain a large number of passages quoted from old and new writers. The closing verse of the Hāralatā tells us
that Aniruddha was a resident of Vihārapāṭaka on the bank of the Ganges and that he was versed in the doctrines of Bhaṭṭa (Kumārila). The colophons to the two works supply the further information that he was Dharmādhyaksha or Dharmādhikaraṇī (Judge), as well as a great teacher (Mahāmahopādhyāya) of Champāhaṭṭi, from which place a section of Varendra Brāhmaṇas derive their designation.\footnote{63}

There is hardly any doubt that he is identical with the “Aniruddha who is extolled by Vallālasena in his Dāna-sāgara not only as a scholar far-famed in the Varendrī land for his piety and knowledge of the Veda and Smṛiti, but also as his own Guru from whom he learnt the Purāṇa and Smṛiti and at whose instance his own work itself was written. This would place Aniruddha’s literary activity about the middle of the 12th century.\footnote{65}

Vallālasena himself composed five works namely, Āchāra-sāgara, Praśīṣṭhā-sāgara, Vrata-sāgara, Dāna-sāgara and Adbhuta-sāgara, of which the last two alone have survived.) Vallālasena himself states that the Dāna-sāgara was written by him under the instruction of his Guru Aniruddha, and there is no reason to doubt it, even though in the opinion of Raghunandana (15th century) it was written by Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa himself. The work is, as its name implies, an extensive digest, in seventy sections, of matters relating to gifts, the author himself informing us (v. 53) that he has dealt with 1375 kinds of gift. It deals with the merits, nature, objects, utility, times and places of gift, bad gifts and prohibited gifts, rites and procedure connected with the making and accepting of gifts, the sixteen kinds of great gifts (Mahādāna) and the large number of lesser gifts, together with an enumeration of the Purāṇas and their extent.

“The Adbhuta-sāgara is an equally extensive work on omens and portents, their effects, and means of averting them. It is divided into three parts according as the portents are celestial (appertaining to stars and planets), atmospheric (such as rainbow, thunder, lightning and storm) and terrestrial (such as earthquake).”\footnote{66}

It is explicitly stated in the opening verses of this work that it was begun in Śaka 1089 (1168 A.D.), but was left unfinished and completed after his death by his son Lakṣhmaṇasena. Although these verses are not to be found in the incomplete India Office Mss., they occur in a large number of other manuscripts, and there is no reason to doubt their genuineness. In the text of the Adbhuta-sāgara itself we find references to two dates, Śaka 1082 and 1090. These dates have
been of great help in fixing the dates of the Sena Kings which had long been a matter of dispute.

The most important writer of the period on this subject is Halāyudha. The opening verses of his work Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva gives us the following particulars of him and his family. "His father Dhanañjaya, of the Vatsa-gotra, married Ujjvala, and became a Dharmādyaksha or Judge. Halāyudha had two elder brothers, Iśāna and Paśupati. The former wrote a Paddhati on the rites relating to the Ahnika or daily devotional observances of Brāhmaṇas ( śl. 24) ; while the latter also wrote a Paddhati on Śrāddha and kindred topics ( śl. 24), as well as another on Pāka-yajña ( śl. 43). In his early years Halāyudha was appointed a Rāja-pāṇḍita ; in youth he was raised by king Lakṣmaṇasena to the position of Mahāmātya, and in mature years he was confirmed as a Dharmādhikāriṇ or Dharmādyaksha ( śl. 10, 12, 14)."

The Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva is a work of great repute in Bengal. Halāyudha informs us that he wrote this work because he found that the Brāhmaṇas of Rājha and Varendra did not study the Veda and therefore did not know the Vedic rites properly. Its main object is to supply a guide, meant for the Śukla-Yajurvedic Brāhmaṇas of the Kārṇa-sākhā, to a knowledge of the meanings of the Vedic Mantras employed in the daily (Āhnikā) rites and the periodical domestic (Grihyā) ceremonies known as Saṁskāras. Accordingly it deals in forty sections with the various daily duties, such as the morning ablution, prayers, hospitality, the study of the Veda, and daily offerings to the Pitrīs, and then proceeds to the treatment of the periodical Āchāras including the ten sacraments of a Brāhmaṇa's life. As every such rite involves recitation of the Vedic Mantras, their explanation (Mantraprāshya) forms the chief feature of the work."

Halāyudha composed several other works, namely Mīmāṁsāsarvasva, Vaiṣṇava-sarvasva, Śaiva-sarvasva and Paṇḍita-sarvasva, but none of these has survived. He is probably to be distinguished from several other authors of Dharmā-sāstras bearing the same name as well as the lexicographer, grammarian and prosodist Halāyudha, the author of Abhidhāna-raina-mālā and the Kavi-rahasya.

Gupavishṇu, to whom Halāyudha acknowledges his indebtedness, was also a great writer on Vedic ritual. His birth-place is put by some in Bengal but others in Mithilā. His work Chhāndogya-
mantra-bhāṣya is a commentary on selected Vedic mantras, about four hundred in number, used in the Gṛhya rites of Śāmaveda. Guṇavishṇu probably flourished shortly before Halāyudha.

D. Grammar and Lexicon

Reference has been made above to Chandragomin. Several others, such as Jinendrabuddhi (c. 8th century), the Buddhist author of the commentary on Pāṇini’s Ashūdhyāyī, called Kāśikā-vivaraṇa-Pañjikā, better known as Nyāsa, Maitreyarakshita, who wrote a commentary on the above as well as the Dhātu-pradīpa (c. 11th or 12th century), based on Pāṇini’s Dhātupātha, Buddhist Purushottamadera, author of the Bhāshāvṛitti (12th century), a commentary on Pāṇini’s Ashūdhyāyī, and Śāraṇa, the author of Durghatāvṛitti, are claimed to be Bengalis, but there is no conclusive evidence in support of such claims. As regards Purushottama the main arguments are: the failure to distinguish the two letters b and v; use of the phrase ‘lekhako nāstitoshakāli,’ commonly used by Bengali scribes; the mention of the river Padmāvatī (which is probably the famous Padmā river in Bengal) while explaining Pāṇini’s Sūtra 6-2-110; and the statement of Śrīśhīṭdhara, a late commentator of Bhāshāvṛitti of the 17th century, that Purushottama was a contemporary of Lakṣhmaṇasena and wrote the work under his direction.70

As regards Śāraṇa the only argument is identity of the name with that of the famous poet in the court of Lakṣhmaṇasena mentioned above.

There is indirect evidence that some lexicographers flourished in Bengal before the 11th century A.D., for Kshirasvāmin (latter half of 11th century) refers to Gauḍa lexicographers, but no individual author is mentioned. There is one Purushottama who wrote four lexical works, namely Trikāṇḍaśeṣa (a supplement to the Amarakosha in three parts), Hāravali (dealing with synonymous and homonymous words not in common use), Varnadeśanā (a prose text containing a number of differently spelt words), and Dvirūpakosha (a list of words spelt in two different ways).71 He is identified with the homonymous grammarian mentioned above. An argument in support of his being born in Bengal may be found in his specific reference to the confusion between different
letters like kṣh and kh, due to the similarity of pronunciation of the characters employed by the people of Gauḍa.78

There is, however, no doubt that the famous lexicographer Sarvānanda was a son of Ārthihara, a Vandyaghaṭṭya Brāhmaṇa of Bengal. He wrote a commentary, called Tīkā-sarvasva on Amarakosha. He himself supplies the date of his writing 1081 Śaka (=1159-60 A.D.)—a rare thing among Indian writers. He was acquainted with a commentary called Daśa-ṭīkā (daśa-ṭīkā-vid); and in his painstaking work not only earlier commentaries but nearly two hundred works and authors are cited. It is in no way inferior to the commentary of Kṣīrasvāmin, and is interesting for the number of Deśī (mostly Bengali) words cited in it,79 exceeding 300, some of which are still in use in Bengal, in some cases in a slightly amended form.80 Although Sarvānanda mentions a large number of Purāṇas he never refers to the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa.

E. Medical Literature.77

The study of medicine always held a high place in ancient India and was elevated to the rank of Vedic study, as the term Āyurveda implies. According to Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese traveller of the 7th century, it ranked as the first of the four Vedas and was included in the curriculum of young students in India irrespective of caste or religion.81 It was one of the principal subjects of study in the Vikramaśīla monastery, and Bengal may justly feel proud of her contribution to this literature. It was cultivated by the Brāhmaṇas, and Tāṇtriks, apart from the Vaidyas, the professional caste of physicians in Bengal; even Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa, mentioned above, is said to have been proficient in the science of medicine.

The oldest medical writer of Bengal is generally believed to have been the well-known Mādhava, son of Indu Kara, the author of a learned work on pathology and diagnosis called Rug-viniśchaya, or simply Nidāna, N. Das Gupta has claimed not only Mādhava, but also his father Indu, as writers on medical literature. But as Dr. S. K. De points out, while reasonable doubts may be entertained about the Bengali origin of Mādhava, there is no ground to identify his father with Indu, the commentator of Ashṭāṅga-hṛidaya of Vāghhaṭa.

The following account of Mādhava’s Nidāna is given by N. Das Gupta:
Mādhava’s Nidāna, alias Rug-viniśchaya or Gada-viniśchaya, is an exposition of pathology, exclusively devoted to the diagnosis of diseases, without any practical suggestions for remedies, and was written, as he declares in an introductory verse, for the neophytes and half-witted students. There is no room for doubt that the work is more or less a conspectus of the Charaka- and Sūkrutā-Saṁhitās which, amongst others, are frequently cited, but it has proved to be a very useful work, a sort of a vede-mecum, to the students of Āyurveda, and one who has not mastered it thoroughly is hardly considered, particularly in Bengal, competent for the profession. Further it ranks, as his commentator Vijaya Rakshita gives us to understand, as the first book of its kind produced, and his method of treatment was followed by many later writers. It is supposed to have also been largely availed of by Dṛjēhavala of Kāśmīra in his Revision of the Charaka-Saṁhitā, but what is more essential to note is that it was one of the medical works that were translated into Arabic for the Califs of Baghdad, Mansur (753-774 A.D.) and Harun (786-808 A.D.).

“The first half of the eighth century, therefore, forms the lower limit of Mādhava-Kara’s date, but we may conveniently place him in the seventh century...”

“One more work, viz., the Paryyāya-ratnamālā, is attributed to the authorship of Mādhava-Kara, and this treats of ‘foods, drinks, baths, habitation, diurnal duties and other subjects of hygiene, including also the names of a number of medicines arranged in classes.” It is characteristic of this work that it contains a good many words from the then current popular speech as names of medicinal plants, herbs, and other substances, which for the most part are still known by those names in Bengal...”

“The cognomen ‘Kara’, the extensive use of his writings, specially his Nidāna, in Bengal, and the occurrence of the (Bengali) deśi words in his Paryyāya-ratnamālā—constitute together a cogent reason to surmise that Mādhava-Kara was a Bengali.”

On the last observation Dr. S. K. De comments as follows:—

“It is true that mediaeval Bengal developed peculiar names, surnames and titles, but it is hardly safe to rely on these indications alone; and traditional ascriptions do not always constitute safe guides.

There is, for instance, no strong ground to assign Mādhava, author of Rug-viniśchaya (or Nidāna) and his father Indu Kara to
Bengal. The arguments based chiefly on the cognomen-Kara and on the extensive use of his work in Bengal are hardly conclusive for a definite statement. The existence of Devanāgari MSS. of Mādhava’s work and of non-Bengal commentaries, as well as the fact that the work was known to Ṭṛilabhala of Kashmir, undoubtedly shows that it was used outside Bengal, and had great influence on the Vaidyaka literature, not of Bengal alone but of India. It should be noted that there is uncertainty about the form of the name. Some commentators, no doubt, give it as Mādhava-Kara, but in the work itself the name occurs as Mādhava only. It is doubtful if -kara (assuming it was a part of the name) was a cognomen at all; for his father’s name, Indu Kara, is intelligible in itself, and need not be explained as a Bengal cognomen. A similar name is Bhāṇukara, where it is not a cognomen, for this author, who compiled the Rasika-jiavanaugh, never belonged to Bengal.778

N. Das Gupta refers to several other Vaidya writers quoted in Śrīdharadāsa’s anthology, mentioned above. Dr. De observes;

‘It is, moreover, not clear if Aruṇadatta, Vijayarakshita, Niśchala-Kara and Śrikaṇṭhadatta really belonged to Bengal. We have no proof except the doubtful indication of respective cognomens and the popularity of their works in Bengal; and the conclusion must be regarded as non sequitur.’779

“It is, however, beyond doubt that Chakrapāṇidatta, the well-known commentator on Charaka and Suśruta, belonged to Bengal. In his compendium of therapy, entitled Chikitsā-saṅgraha, he informs us that his father Nārāyaṇa was an officer (Pātra) and superintendent of the culinary department (Rasavatyaadhikārin) of the king of Gauḍa, that he was a kuśna of the Lodhravali family and that his brother Bhānu was an Antaraṅga or a learned physician of good family. The commentator Sivadāsasena Yaśodhara, a Bengal writer, who belonged to the 16th century, explains that the king of Gauḍa was Nāyapāla. If this is so, Chakrapāṇidatta should be placed in the middle of the 11th century. Besides older authorities the work professes to draw upon the Siddha-yoga of Vṛinda, which in its turn follows the order of diseases and treatment of Mādhava’s Rug-viniśchaya. Besides being an authoritative work on the subject, it possesses importance in the history of Indian medicine for marking an advance in the direction of metallic preparations which had been introduced from the time of Vāgbhaṭa and Vṛinda. Chakrapāṇidatta also wrote a commentary on Charaka, entitled
Āyurveda-dīpikā or Charaka-tātparya-dīpikā, in the introduction to which he mentions Naradatta as his preceptor. His commentary on Suśruta is entitled Bhānumatī. Two other useful works of his are Śabda-chandrikā, a vocabulary of vegetable as well as mineral substances and compounds, and Dravya-guṇa-saṁgraha, a work on dietics.”

The above account of Dr. S. K. De may be supplemented by the following observations of N. Das Gupta.

“To Chakrāpani is attributed the authorship of the Chikitsāsāra, on medicament and therapeutics, which is otherwise known as the Gūḍha-vākyā-vodhaka. Two other well-known productions of his are a glossary (nighañṭu) of various drugs with explanations of their properties, and a vocabulary, bearing the title of Śabda-chandrikā, of vegetables and mineral substances, with an elaborate list of compounds, both in medicine and diet. The Nighañṭu, which is known as Dravya-guṇa-saṁgraha, has a commentary upon it by the same Śivadāsa. Besides, he is credited with elucidations of the Suśruta-saṁhitā, in his Bhānumatī, and of the Charaka- in his Āyurveda-dīpikā, which is probably mentioned as Charaka-tātparya-dīpikā in one MS. There is a work called Sarva-sāra-saṁgraha by a Chakrapāṇi-Datta, who may be he or a later name-sake of his.”

As noted above, Chakrāpanidatta may be said to have introduced a new era in the Āyurveda world, by great advancement in the direction of metallic preparations. The age in which Āyurvedic medicine really consisted of ‘herbs and simples and a few readily available products of the mineral kingdom,’ had already passed away. As Sir P. C. Ray observed: “Since the days of Vāgbhaṭa metallic preparations had begun slowly to creep into use, and at the time of Chakrāpani and his predecessor Vṛinda, they had so fully established their claims that they could no longer be ignored. Thus we find from the tenth century downwards every medical work more or less recommending compounds of metals which can only be synthetically prepared.”

The next author of note is “Sureśvara or Surapāla, who wrote a glossary of medical botany, entitled Śabda-pradīpa, in which he gives an account of himself. His grandfather and father were, respectively, Devagaṇa, who was a court-physician to king Govinda-chandra, and Bhadreśvara, who served in a similar capacity to king Rāmapāla (called Vaṅgeśvara). He himself was physician to king Bhīmapāla, and should from these accounts be placed in the first
half of the 12th century. He also wrote a *Vṛikṣhāyurveda* on a
similar subject, and a *Loha-paddhati* or *Loha-sarvasva* on the medical
use and preparation of iron.*

The last writer is Vaṅgasena, the author of the *Chikitsā-sāra-
saṅgraha*. He must have flourished in or before the 12th century
as profuse quotations from his work are found in Hemādri’s *Āyurveda-
rasāyana*. “Vaṅgasena says that the original place of his residence
was Kāñjikā, which appears to be the same as Kāñjivillī, in Rādhā,
from which Nārāyaṇa, the author of the *Chhāndoga-parīśishṭa-prakāśa*,
hailed. From internal evidence of his book it is also suggested
that he was a Bengali, while the nature of the name he bears also
points to the same conclusion.”

F. *Astronomy and Astrology*

One of the greatest scholars in this subject was Śrīnivāsa, “the
famous author of the *Śuddhādīśīpikā* and the greatest authority on
Astronomy and ‘judicial’ astrology. He wrote the *Gaṇitachūḍāmaṇi*
in 1091 Śaka (1159/60 A.D.) on the evidence of Sarvānanda. His
*Śuddhādīśīpikā* is up till now the standard book on the subject of
auspicious time and astrology and is commented upon by a galaxy of
Bengali scholars—Saubhari, Chandrakara, Rāghava, Govindānanda,
Kṛishṇānanda, and Mathurānātha, to name only a few. Like Aniruddha
he was respectfully engaged by Vallāla and his son Lakshmāna to
write for them the *Adhūtasāgara* as stated in verse 8 of the Intro-
duction—a magnificent eulogy by the royal patrons of one of the
greatest scholars of the age. The *Adhūtasāgara* was begun in
1090 Śaka (1168 A.D.) and finished after the death of king Vallāla.
Śrīnivāsa’s eminence at the royal court can be inferred from the
fact that he was cited by his contemporary Halāyudha in *Brāhmaṇa
sarvasva* (*J.A.S.B.*, 1915, p. 334).”

II. *Buddhist Sanskrit Literature.*

(A special type of Sanskrit literature flourished in Bengal during
the Pāla period, due mainly to the development of a new type of
Buddhism* to which detailed reference will be made in the chapter
on Religion. Here it will suffice to give a short outline of its
broad features.
Buddhism under the Pālas differed essentially from what it was even in the time of Hiuen Tsang in the seventh century A.D. There was no trace, not only of ancient schools of the Hinayāna system, but even of the pure form of Mahāyāna. (What we find instead were forms of mysticism that had developed out of the Mahāyāna. These were known as different yānas and loosely called Buddhist Tantra (Rgyud) as opposed to the Buddhist Sūtra, because they teach esoteric doctrines, rites and practices in “an highly obscure and perhaps symbolic language.” The leaders of this movement, which perhaps originated in Bengal and, later, spread to the different parts of India, are celebrated in Buddhist tradition as Siddhas or Siddhāchāryas, whose traditional number is eighty-four. (This mystic Buddhism had assumed three important forms namely, Vajra-yāna, Sahaja-yāna, and Kālachakra-yāna.) The first laid stress on ceremonials which had only mystic implications, while the second represented a more advanced stage of that mysticism which dispensed altogether with ceremonials. Kālachakra-yāna, which, according to Tibetan sources, was introduced into India from outside during the Pāla period, attached, like the other two, great importance to the practice of Yoga, but laid special emphasis on the time factor, the muhārta the tīthi, the constellation etc. But all the three had the same goal, namely Mahāsukha or perfect bliss.37 Tāranātha tells us 38 that during the reign of the Pāla kings there were many masters of magic, Mantra-Vajrāchāryas, who claimed to possess various Siddhis and demonstrated it by performing miraculous feats.

An extensive literature in Sanskrit on the basis of these mystic cults (yānas) grew up in Bengal during the Pāla period, or perhaps even somewhat earlier. Unfortunately, the Sanskrit works are mostly lost and are preserved only in Tibetan translation in the Bstan-lgyur. The birth-place of only some of the authors is definitely mentioned in the Tibetan texts, and the chronology of them can be fixed more or less definitely only in some cases. Further, we have very little knowledge of the different yānas with which these texts deal. Subject to these handicaps we may proceed to give a short account of this literature.

The books were meant purely and exclusively for a limited sectarian purpose and possess little that is of general or literary interest. (“Apart from their technical or esoteric terminology, they are often written with an entire disregard for grammatical or
They never pretend to be academic, but declare that their object is to be intelligible without much grammatical or literary preparation. Most of these works consist either of stotras of varying lengths to Tārā, Avalokiteśvara, Mañjuśrī and other personages of later Buddhist pantheon, or of theurgic texts, called Sadhanas and Vidhis, of esoteric devotion, doctrine and practice. Some of them are also texts of magical ritual or completely dedicated to magic, even to black magic. Nevertheless, with their characteristic deities, Stotras and Saṅgītīs, their Mantra, Mudrā and Maṇḍala, and their Dhāraṇī, Yoga and Samādhi, they present a phase of Buddhist Tantra, closely allied to the Brāhmaṇical, which possesses considerable interest and importance in the history of mediaeval religious cults. As such, they have not yet received as much recognition as they fully deserve in the history, at least, of the mediaeval culture of Bengal.¹⁸⁹

This is perhaps due mainly to a wide-spread feeling among the educated classes today that this entire Tantric literature, like that of other religious sects, such as Śaiva or Śākta, represents a state of depraved morality in society. Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitra described it as “reeking of pestilent dogmas and practices”.⁹⁰ According to H. P. Śāstri, the Tantra works discard asceticism and teach enjoyment of the senses;⁹¹ Benoytosh Bhattacharya uses stronger language and stigmatises them as specimens of the worst immorality and sin”;⁹² while Moriz Winternitz is frankly puzzled at what appears to him to be an “unsavoury mixture of mysticism, occult pseudo-science, magic and erotics” couched in “strange and often filthy language.”⁹³ While conceding that Buddhist Tāntrism is more than a pagan system of rites and sorcery, even a discerning and well-informed critic like L. de la Vallée Poussin would attribute to it “disgusting practices both obscene and criminal.”

But some scholars, both European and Indian, differ from the above assessment of Tantra. Sir John Woodroffe’s attempt to put the Tāntrik literature on a high pedestal is well-known. Dr. S. K. De, at a later date, expressed the following view which is perhaps now slowly gaining ground: “It must be said”, says he, “that, whatever may have been the state of affairs in later times and in certain writers of the decadent schools, there is nothing to support the view that the Vajra-yāna doctrines in their origin encouraged sexual rites and obscenities. Magic, mysticism and theurgy were undoubtedly at their basis, but it should be recognised that all
Tāntric works of the higher class, whether Buddhistic or Brāhmaṇical, present their mystical doctrines in an equally mystical language, of which a literal understanding would be unwarranted and misleading. They speak of unknown methods and ideas of spiritual realities. The symbolical language is sometimes called saṃdhā-bhāṣa, which being intentional (ābhirāyika), is meant to convey something different from what is actually expressed. There is also an apparent sex-symbolism here, as in other mediaeval religious systems, which expresses fervent spiritual longings or strange theological fancies in the intimate language and imagery of earthly passion. This mode of thought and expression, no doubt, borders dangerously upon sense-devotion and sexual emotionalism, but it is only an aspect of that erotic mysticism which is often inseparable from mediaeval belief, and need not be taken as implying sexual licence." In addition to these general observations it may be remarked that as these books are preserved mainly in Tibetan translation, they possess little literary interest and a brief reference to the more important writers, whose birth-place may be located in Bengal with a tolerable degree of certainty, must suffice for our present purpose.

Reference has been made above (p. 354) to Chandragomin and his thirty-six miscellaneous texts. They include not only mystic Stotras in praise of Tārā, Maṇjuśrī and other personalities of later Buddhist hagiology, but also works on Tāntric Abhichāra (such as Abhichāra-karman, Chamū-dhvaṁsopāya, Bhaya-trāṇopāya, Vighna-nirāsakapramathanopāya) as well a few magical tracts apparently of a medical character (such as Jvara-rakṣā-vidhi, Kusṭha-chikitsopāya). Only a single work of the great Māhāyānist scholar Śīlabhadra, namely Ārya-buddha-bhūmi-Vyākhyaṇa has been preserved in Tibetan translation.

To Śāntideva three Vajra-yāna texts are assigned in the Bstan-hgyur. But whether he is identical with the well-known author of Sīkṣā-samuchchaya and Bodhicharyavatāra or the Mahāyānist teacher, Śāntideva, of the 7th century, it is difficult to say. The Tāntric Śāntideva, according to Tibetan sources, was born in Zāhor which is located by some in Bengal. According to some tradition Śāntideva had another name Bhusuku, but his identification with the homonymous author of the Dohās in the Vernacular, to be mentioned later, is uncertain. Equally uncertain is the identity of Śānti (Śānta)-rakshita, mentioned in the Bstan-hgyur as the author of three Tāntric works. According to Sumpa he belonged to the
royal family of Zahor. He may or may not be the same as the Mahāyānist logician and scholar Śāntarakshita who was a high priest and teacher at Nālandā, and the author of Tattva-saṅgraha, a learned work on the earlier philosophical system, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist, which exists both in Sanskrit and Tibetan translation, with a commentary written by his pupil Kamalaśīla.\textsuperscript{100} He does not appear to be definitely distinguished from the Vajrayānist Tāntric author Śāntarakshita who is associated with Padmasambhava of Uḍḍiyāna\textsuperscript{100a} as his brother-in-law and collaborator, but the two may not be identical. He also wrote Vāda-nyāya-vṛitti-vipaṃchitraḥ\textsuperscript{101} and Madhyamakālaṃkāra-kārikā (the latter with his own commentary),\textsuperscript{102} which are available only in the Tibetan version. His reputation must have travelled beyond the limits of India, and he is said to have visited Tibet at the invitation of king Khri-sron-De-bstan and assisted him in building the first regular Buddhist monastery of Bsām-ye on the model of the Odantapuri Vihāra of Magadha.\textsuperscript{103} He is said to have worked for thirteen years in Tibet, and, along with Padmasambhava and his own disciple Kamalaśīla, laid the foundation of Buddhism in that country.

With regard to Jetārī, the next important writer, the Tibetan tradition\textsuperscript{104} appears to distinguish a senior and junior sage of that name. The senior or Mahā-Jetārī belonged to Varendra, where his father Garbhapaśa lived at the court of king Sanātana.\textsuperscript{105} He is said to have received from Mahāpāla the diploma of the Paṇḍita of Vikramaśīla Vihāra, and instructed Dīpaṃkara Śrījñāna in the Buddhist lore. The younger Jetārī\textsuperscript{106} was a Buddhist Tāntric sage of Bengal, who initiated Bodhibhāgya and gave him the name Lāvanyavajra. It is possible that the three learned works on Buddhist logic, preserved in Tibetan,\textsuperscript{107} belonged to the senior Jetārī, while the junior Jetārī was responsible for eleven Vajrayānist Sādhanas also preserved in Tibetan.\textsuperscript{108}

Dīpaṃkara Śrījñāna, the alleged pupil of Jetārī, appears to have been a very industrious and prolific writer, to whom the Bstan-hgyur assigns about one hundred and sixty-eight works\textsuperscript{109} of which a large number consists of translations. They are mostly Vajrayānist works known as Sādhanas\textsuperscript{110} (Rgyud), but Sūtra (Mdo) works, also listed in the Bstan-hgyur under his name, presumably deals with the general doctrines of the Mahāyāna. Haraprasād Śāstrī is probably right\textsuperscript{111} in distinguishing two Dīpaṃkaras, but there might have been
more Dīpankaras than two. Of these, Dīpankara Śrījñāna, who is also designated by the Tibetan title of Atiśa, certainly belonged according to the Tibetan tradition, to Bengal. Sumpā informs us that Dīpankara was a high priest both at Vikramāśīla and Odantapuri, and that he was known also by the honorific epithet of Jovo (=Prabhu). He visited Tibet, lived, travelled, and worked there for some time, and the large bulk of his original and translated writings testify to the assistance he rendered not only in propagating Tāntric Buddhism but also in rendering Indian works accessible in Tibetan.

Jñānaśrī-mitra, described as a central pillar of the Vikramāśīla vihāra at the time of Chanaka of Magadha, was born in Gauḍa. He first joined the Śrāvaka school, but afterwards became a Mahāyānist and came to Vikramāśīla about the time when Dīpankara Śrījñāna left for Tibet. He wrote a work on Buddhist logic, called Kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva-siddhi which exists in Tibetan, and must have attained considerable reputation to be mentioned by Mādhava in the 14th century in his Sarva-dārśana-saṅgraha. He should be distinguished from Jñānaśrī, of whom ten Vajrayāna works exist in Tibetan.

Of the minor Buddhist writers, mostly Tāntric, who in all probability flourished in Bengal during these centuries, it is not necessary to give a detailed account here; for their writings appear to be of the same character and possess no distinctive interest. Among these may be mentioned Abhayākara-gupta, who has more than twenty Vajrayānist works preserved in Tibetan, but four of these are also available in Sanskrit. He is described as a Buddhist monk of “Baṅgala” born in a Kshatriya family at Jhārikhanḍa in Orissa; he flourished in the reign of Rāmapāla as Pañjita of Vajrāsana and Nālandā, becoming a high priest of Vikramāśīla, according to Sumpā Mkhana-po, at the time of Yakshapāla’s dethronement by his minister Lavasena. Divākarachandra, described as belonging to Bengal in the Bstan-hgyur which includes one Herukasādhana and two translations of his, was, according to Sumpā Mkhana-po, a disciple of Maitrī-pa, and lived in the reign of Naya-pāla, but was driven away from Vikramāśīla by Dīpankara. Kumārachandra, described as “an avadhūta of the Vikramapuri Vihāra of Bengal in Eastern Magadha,” is responsible for three Tāntric Pañjikās (commentaries) preserved in Tibetan; Kumāra-vajra, also described as belonging to Bengal, was mostly a translator,
who has only one independent work on the Heruka-sādhana. Dānasīla, similarly described as belonging to Bhagala in Eastern India and to the Jagaddala vihāra in the east, is mentioned as a translator by Sumpā. He has about sixty Tantric translations in Tibetan to his credit, but there is also a brief Pustaka-pāṭhopāya, translated by himself into Tibetan, on the mode of beginning the reading of a book. Putali (or Putuli, Puttali), mentioned as a Buddhist Tantric sage of Bengal, wrote a Vajrayānist work on Bodhicitta, but Nāgabodhi (or Nāgabuddhi ?), who is said to have been born "in Śibēra in Bangala" and who served the later Nāgārjuna as a disciple when he was working alchemy in Pundravardhana, left thirteen Tantric works now preserved in Bstan-hgyur. It is not clear if Ṭaṅkadāsa (or Daṅgadāsa) was a native of Bengal, but he is described as a Vṛiddha-kāyastha and contemporary of Dharmapāla of Bengal; he wrote at the Pāṇḍubhūmi vihāra a commentary, called Suviśāda-sāmpuṭa, on the Hevajra-tantra. But Prajñāvarman, who is credited with two commentaries and two translations of Tantric texts, is distinctly assigned to Bengal. There are, however, some Buddhist Tantric writers who worked in Vihāras situated in Eastern India, but there is no direct evidence that they were natives of Bengal. They are: Bodhibhadra of the Somapuri-vihāra, Moksha-karagupta, Vibhūṭichandra of Jagaddala-vihāra, and Śubhākara, also of the Jagaddala-vihāra. Of these Moksha-karagupta wrote a work on Logic called Tarka-bhāṣā and may be identical with the commentator of the same name on the Dohā-kośa in Apabhraṃśa. Vibhūṭichandra has a total of twenty-three Tantric works, of which seventeen are translations, including translations of two works of Lui-pā. Similarly, Vanaratna, who is mostly a translator, is vaguely described in the Bstan-hgyur as belonging to Eastern India, but Sumpā Mkhan-po informs us that he visited Tibet from the monasteries of Koki land. Of some writers, again, we can infer their place of origin only indirectly from their works. Thus Kambala or Kambalambara-pāda, to whom six works chiefly on Heruka-sādhana are credited in Tibetan, wrote also a collection of Dohās, called Kambala-gītikā, apparently in proto-Bengali; and one such Dohā (No. 8) occurs also in the Charyācharyā. To this class belong several writers, but about some of them we have more definite information. These are Kukkuri-pāda, Śavari- (or Śavara)-pāda, Lui-pāda, Krishṇa-pāda and others; but since these writers, to whom Vajrayānist works are credited in the Bstan-hgyur, are also...
counted among the eighty-four Siddhas and connected with popular Tāntric cults, especially the Mahāmāyā, the Yogini-kaula and the Nātha cult, all of which possibly developed further out of Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna, it would be better to take them up separately.

With these so-called Siddhāchāryas we enter upon a somewhat new phase of Bengal Tāntrism, although most of these thaumaturgists present a medley of doctrines, which had probably not yet crystallised themselves into well-defined or sharply distinguished cults. The Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna as offshoots of Mahāyāna, were never at any stage separated by any clear line of demarcation. The same remarks would apply also to the various closely allied, perhaps concurrently existing, and presumably popular cults, which became associated with the names of the Siddhāchāryas and the Nātha-gurus, and which (whatever might have been their origin) show a clear admixture of Buddhist ideas and claim as their teachers recognised expounders of Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna. We have in consequence a curious confusion, in the various traditions, between the early teachers of the different but closely related cults. We have, for instance, the traditions of more than one Śavara, Lui-pā, Saraha and Kṛishṇa, just in the same way as we have traditions of more than one Śāntideva, Śāntirakshita or Dipaṅkara; while Lui-pā has been equated with Mānānātha or Mātisyendranātha, who is one of the acknowledged founders of both Yogini-kaula and Nāthism. The difficulty is here perhaps greater than that of distinguishing between Mahāyāna and Vajra-yāna writers, where they might have been confused by similarity of names, and where, since the one system developed out of the other, it was not inherently impossible for a Mahāyānist to be a Vajrayānist. But in this case, as also sometimes in the other, it is not always possible to assume two or more sets of teachers having a common name or a common belief. To explain this confusion, therefore, one should presume a syncretic tendency, not unusual in the history of religious cults, to assimilate and identify the teachers in the different groups. This tendency must have been facilitated by the fact that these cults, collectively, called Śahaja-siddhi in their origin were not probably sharply differentiated, having developed under the same conditions and possibly out of the same source or sources. In the case of Nāthism especially, which was perhaps more popular than academic, this tendency of assimilating the recognised teachers of Buddhist Tāntrism is not unintelligible. Whether Nāthism in its origin was a form of Tāntric Buddhism
which transformed itself into Tántric Śaivism or whether the process was otherwise, need not be discussed here; but it is clear that it assimilated rites and tenets from various sources, its curious legends belonging to no regular order. In the same way it appropriated, or rather assimilated, its own Gurus to Vajrayānist teachers of repute, on the one hand, and to Śiva and his disciples, on the other.

One of the characteristics of Sahaja-siddhi is that it repudiates Mantra, Maṇḍala and other external means and modes of Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna, puts emphasis on Yogic practices and cultivation of mental powers, and accepting their terminology, places different interpretations on such fundamental concepts as Vajra, Mudrā etc. The lands where this phase of Tántrism was the most wide-spread, and perhaps where it originated, were Bengal and Assam. Most of the teachers, therefore, belong to these countries, from which their teachings must have spread in divergent forms to Nepal and Tibet; but the traditions concerning them became overlaid, obscure and confusing, and their works present a medley of Buddhism and Hinduism. The religious aspect of the question is not our concern here, but we shall give a brief survey of the important works and authors connected with these cults.

Kukkuripāda (or Ṓpā), one of the eighty-four Siddhās, is mentioned by Tibetan tradition as a Brāhmaṇ of Bengal who introduced Mantra-yāna (Heruka-sādhana) and other Tantras from the land of Daṇḍinī. This somewhat obscure account probably refers to the introduction of the cult of Mahāmāyā, with which his name is traditionally associated, and which, judging from the titles of the works, appears to form the theme of at least three out of his six Tántric works in the Bstan-ḥgyur. He is also credited with two vernacular Dohās in the Charyācharya (Nos. 2, 20). Another early Siddhāchārya is Šavari- (or Šabara) -pāda, of whom it is recorded by Sumpā-po that he was a huntsman of the hills of “Baṅgala,” who with his two wives, Loki and Guni, was converted by Nāgārjuna during the last residence in that country. The Tibetan sources, again, place him as a contemporary of Lui-pā, making him even a preceptor of Lui-pā in Tántrism. Two vernacular Dohās of Savari are also found in the Charyācharya (Nos. 28, 50). It is probable, therefore, that he was connected with the new cults, although ten Vajrayānist works are assigned to him in the Bstan-ḥgyur. He appears to be the same as Šavariśvara, some of whose works in the Bstan-ḥgyur are concerned with Vajra-yoginī.
Sādhana, which king Indrabhūti of Oḍiyan and his sister Lakshmikara made popular. But the most important name of this group is perhaps that of Lui-pā. He is credited with four Vajrayānist works in the Bstan-hgyur, of which one called Abhisamaya-vibhaṅga is said to have been revealed by him directly to Dipamkara Śrījñāna in order that (according to the colophon to the text) the latter might help its Tibetan translation. He was, therefore, in all probability an older contemporary of Dipamkara and belonged to the end of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century. Two of his vernacular Dohās are given in the Charyācharya (Nos. 1, 29); but Haraprasād Śāstri speaks of an entire collection called Luipāda-gśitikā. It is through these vernacular Dohās that he probably became one of the earliest founders of the Tāntric religion found in the Dohā-kośas. The Tibetan tradition mentions him as the Ādi-siddha, thus making him occupy the same position as the Indian tradition would ascribe to Mīnanātha or Matsyendranātha. It has been pointed out that the Tibetan translation of the name Lui-pā means Matsyodara or Matsyāntrāda; and Sumpā Mkhan-po makes him, as the Indian tradition makes Matsyendranātha, a sage of the fisherman caste. The Tibetan sources, again, place Lui-pāda in Bengal, while all the Indian legends of Matsyendranātha are connected with the seashore of Eastern India. The published Sanskrit texts of the school claim Matsyendranātha as the founder of the Yoginī-kaula system, while Tāraṇātha believes (Geschichte, p. 275 ff) that Lui-pā introduced the Yoginī cult. On these, among other grounds, Lui-pā has been equated with Matsyendranātha, legendary fisherman of Chandradvīpa, who is the starting point of a new system of Tāntric thought and practice, connected with the Yoginī-kaula, Haṭha-yoga and Nātha cults of East Bengal and Kāmarūpa. Even if the identification is not accepted, it will certainly strengthen the suggestion, made above, of the tendency towards syncretic assimilation of the teachers of the various cults.

The homage paid by the Kashmirian Abhinavaguptā in his Tantrāloka would place Matsyendranātha earlier than the beginning of the 11th century; and if he is identical with Lui-pāda, his probable date would be the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th century. As the reputed founder of the new school of Sahaja-siddhi, he is connected with a series of teachers, whose writings are preserved mostly in the Apabhramśa and the vernacular, and who,
as such, properly falls outside our province. But in its earlier stages the Sahaja-siddhi represented by these teachers starts apparently as a deviation from the Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna; while in these cults are to be found the sources of the Nātha cult, which calls itself Śivaite but which shows greater affinity with the Buddhist than with the Brāhmaṇical Tantra. All the reputed Siddhāchāryas are, therefore, found credited with Vajrayānist works in the Bstan-hgyur. The only exception is perhaps Matsyendranātha, if he is not the same person as Lui-pāda; but we have a work on the Bodhichitta by Mīna-pāda, who is described as an ancestor of Matsyendranātha. The cult must have been introduced early into Tibet and Nepal, where Matsyendranātha came to be identified with Avalokiteśvara, while in India his apotheosis occurred by his assimilation to Śiva. There are some works, however, which profess to have been revealed (avatārīta) by Matsyendranātha. Five of these texts, written in Sanskrit, have been published from old Nepali manuscripts; and if the manuscript of the principal longest text, entitled Kaula-jiñāna-nirṇaya, belongs to the 11th century (as its editor maintains), it must be taken as the earliest known work of the school. According to this work, Matsyendranātha belonged to the Siddha or Siddhāṃrīta sect, primarily connected with the Yogini-kaula, the chief seat of which was Kāmarūpa. Although the word Kula in Brāhmaṇical Tantra is often synonymous with Śakti, it is undoubtedly related here to the five Kulas of the Buddhist Tantra, representing the five Dhyāni-Buddhas; while the word Sahaja is equated with Vajra as a state to be attained by a method of Yoga called Vajra-yoga. There is, thus, a very considerable admixture of Buddhist Tāntric ideas and practices with those of the Brāhmaṇical Tantra.

The next great Siddha of the school is Gorakshanātha who is described in most of the accounts as a disciple of Matsyendranātha. The legends, which must have originated in Bengal and spread in divergent forms to Nepal, Tibet, Hindusthan, the Punjab, Gujarat and Mahārāṣṭra, connect him and other Nātha-gurus with the Gopīchāndī legend, with the Yogī sect of the Punjab, and the Nātha-yogīs of Bengal. Perhaps he did not, as some of the legends suggest, strictly conform to the traditions of the Mantra-yāna; and it is no wonder that in Nepal and Tibet he is considered to be a renegade, whose Yogīs passed from Buddhism to Śaivism simply to please their heretic rulers and gain political favours. Of Goraksha-
nātha no work has been found, unless he is identical with the Gorakṣa of the Bstan-hgyur, who is responsible for one Buddhist Tāntric work. If his alleged disciple Jālandhari-pāda, who figures in the legends as the Guru of Gopīchānd, is the same person as Mahāpaṇḍita Mahācārya Jālandhara, Ācārya Jālandhari, or Siddhācārya Jālandhari-pāda of the Bstan-hgyur then he might be taken as the author of four Vajra-yāna works, including a commentary, called Śuddha-vajra-pradīpā, on Hevajra-sādhana, the original being assigned to Saroruhavajra.

To the other Siddhācāryas of the Sahaja-siddhi, some of whom are also Gurus of the Nātha cult, numerous Buddhist Tāntric works are assigned in the Bstan-hgyur. Both Indian and Tibetan traditions make Virūpa (or Viru-pā) a disciple of Jālandhara; but the latter tradition also appears to mention more than one Buddhist Tāntric sage of that name, of whom a junior and a senior Virūpa are distinguished. One of these Virūpas was born in the east at “Tripura” (Tippera ?) during the reign of Devapāla. The distinction, however, is not clear in the Bstan-hgyur, but it ascribes ten Vajra-yāna works to Ācārya or Mahācārya Virūpa, and two collections of apparently vernacular Dohās and Padas (Virūpa-pada-chaturāśiti and Dohā-kośa) to Mahāyogin or Yogiśvara Virūpa. Tilopa or Tailika-pāda, another Siddhācārya, is made by Tibetan sources a contemporary of Mahipāla of Bengal, and one of these traditions makes him a Brāhmaṇ of Tsāttigōn (Chittagong ?), who was converted under the name of Prajnābhadra. Besides four Vajra-yāna works, a Dohā-kośa of his is preserved in Tibetan. Tilo-pā’s disciple Nāro-pā or Nālo-pā is also assimilated to well-known Buddhist Vajra-yāna teachers. He is said to have succeeded Jetāri as the north-door Paṇḍit of Vikramaśila as an adept in the Buddhist Āgama, and left the monastery in the charge of Dipamkara in his seventieth year to become the high priest of Vajrāsana (Bodhgayā). One account makes him son of king Śākya Subhaśāntivarman of the East (Prāchya), while another believes that he was the son of a Kashmirian Brāhmaṇ, and became a Brāhmaṇical Tirthika Paṇḍita and then a Buddhist Siddha under the religious name of Jīnānasiddhi or Yaśobhadra. As he appears to be identical with Nāḍa, described in the Bstan-hgyur as Śri-mahāmudrācārya, and with Nāḍa-pāda, described in the same work as Mahācārya and Mahāyogin, he should be credited with nine Vajra-yāna Sādhanas, some of which concern Heruka and Hevajra, as well
as two Vajra-gitiṣ and a Pañjikā on Vajra-pada-sūra-samgraha which last work, it may be noted, was undertaken at the request of Vinayaśrī-mitra, a Bhikshu of Kanaka-stūpa Mahāvihāra of Paṭṭi-keraka in Kashmir.

Another important Siddhāchārya is Kṛishṇa or Kṛishṇa-pāda, known also by the Prakrit form of the name as Kāṇhu-pā. There must have been, as Haraprasād Śāstrī rightly conjectures, several Kṛishṇas or Kāṇhus. The Bstan-hgyur mentions as a senior Kṛishṇa, a Kṛishṇa from Orissa who was a translator, as well as a Kṛishṇā-chārya and a Kṛishṇa-vajra. One Indian Kṛishṇa, again, wrote at Somapuri-vihāra, which was situated in Bengal. It is difficult to say which of these authors should be (if at all) identified with Kṛishṇāchārya or Kāṇhapā of the Sahaja-siddhi and the Nātha cult who is regarded as a disciple of Jālandhara-pā. According to Tāranātha, however, Kṛishṇāchārya, disciple of Jālandhāri, belonged to Pādyanagara or Vidyānagara in the southern country of Karna, but another Tibetan account informs us that his birthplace, as well as place of conversion, was Somapuri. Eleven vernacular Dohās are given in the Charyācharya under the names Kāṇhu, Kṛishṇāchārya-pāda, Kṛishṇa-pāda and Kṛishṇa-vajra, as well as cited under one or other of these names in its Sanskrit commentary. A Dohā-kōva in Apabhramśa by Kṛishṇāchārya also exists in the original and has been published.

The problem of the identity of Saraha or Saraha-pāda, the next important teacher, whose other name is given as Rāhula-bhadra, is equally difficult. Sumpā Mkhan-po describes him as a ‘Brāhmaṇ Buddhist sage’, born of a Brāhmaṇ and a Dākinī in the city of Rājñi in the eastern country. He was well versed in both Brāhmaṇical and Buddhistic learning and flourished in the reign of Chandana-pāla. He is said to have converted Ratnapāla and his ministers and Brāhmaṇs, and to have become the high priest of Nālandā. He learned the Mantra-yāna from Chove Sukalpa of Ojivisa (Orissa)), but afterwards visited Mahārāṣṭra where he united in Yoga with a Yogini who approached him in the guise of an archer’s daughter. After having performed the Mahāmudrā with her, he became a Siddha and went by the name of Saraha. It is also recorded that he used to sing Dohās of Buddhism as a means of conversion. In the Bstan-hgyur there are about twenty-five Tāntric works assigned to him including more than half a dozen concerned with Dohākōva-giti and Charyā-giti. An Apabhramśa Dohā-kōva
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(with a Sanskrit commentary\textsuperscript{204}) connected with his name has been published; and four of his Dohās occur in Chāryācharya\textsuperscript{9} (Nos. 22, 32, 38, 39), where he is called Saraha-pāda. Cordier is probably right\textsuperscript{205} in his suggestion that there were several Sarahas, who are described in the Bstan-ḥgyur variously as Mahābrāhmaṇa, Mahāchārya, Mahāyogin or Yogīvara, as belonging to Oḍiṣiyā\textsuperscript{206} and also as Mahāśavara and once as a descendant of Kṛishṇa,\textsuperscript{207} but it is difficult to distinguish them. Tāranātha, however, distinguishes two Sarahas, one of whom, the junior, was otherwise called Śābāri,\textsuperscript{208} while the other was named Rāhulabhadra.\textsuperscript{209} It is likely that the Siddhāchārya Saraha, to whom the Dohās can be legitimately ascribed, was a different person from Saraha-Rāhulabhadra,\textsuperscript{210} the Vajrayānist author of the Sādhanas, and that both are to be distinguished from Saroruhabajra, also called Padmavajra, who is known in the history of Buddhist Tāntrism as one of the pioneers of Hevajra-tantra and as the Guru and Paramaguru respectively of Anangavajra and Indrabhūti of Oḍiṣiyā.

Of those minor personalities of this group, who probably belonged to the east, only a brief mention may be made here. It is not clear if all of them belonged to Bengal. Garbhārī-pā or Garbha-pāda, popularly called Gābhur Siddha,\textsuperscript{211} wrote a work on Hevajra and a Vajra-yāna commentary; Kila-pāda,\textsuperscript{212} described as a descendant of Lui-pāda, is credited with a Dohāchārya-gītikā-dṛṣṭi; Amitābha\textsuperscript{213} commented upon the Dohā-kośa of Kṛishṇavajra; Karmāri, Karmāra or Kamari, a descendant of Viṟūpa, was the author of one Vajra-yāna work,\textsuperscript{214} Viṇāpāda, also a descendant of Viṟūpa, but described\textsuperscript{215} as a Kshatriya prince of Gahura who was fond of the Viṇā,\textsuperscript{216} wrote works on Vajraśākini and Guhyasamājā, as well as one Dohā (No. 17) given in the Chāryācharya\textsuperscript{2}; Kaṅkana, a descendant of Kambala-pā, composed one Dohā to be found in the Chāryācharya\textsuperscript{9} (No. 44) and a Chāryā-dohākośa-gītikā\textsuperscript{217}; Dārika or Dāri-pāda,\textsuperscript{218} also a Mahāsiddha, variously described as a disciple of Lui-pā and Nāropā, was responsible for twelve Vajra-yāna works in the Bstan ḥgyur\textsuperscript{219} and one Dohā in the Chāryācharya\textsuperscript{9} (No. 34)\textsuperscript{1} and Dharmapāda (also called Gupṭaripāda),\textsuperscript{220} a descendant of Kṛishṇa, has twelve Vajra-yāna works in the Bstan ḥgyur and two Dohās in the Chāryācharya\textsuperscript{9}. None of their works, except the Apabhramśa Dohās mentioned, is available in print, and exists only in Tibetan.

It will be seen that Bengal had a very large share in the cultivation and spread of this peculiar and prolific Buddhist and allied
Tāntric literature, which in all probability received encouragement from the Buddhist kings of the Pāla dynasty. But it is remarkable that with the advent of the Sena kings, who had Vaishn̄avit̄e leanings, this literature and culture went underground for all time. We hear of no suppression or persecution of Buddhism under the overlordship of the Senas, but it was probably a part of their policy to encourage Brāhmaṇical studies as a reaction against the Buddhistic tendencies of the Pāla kings. There cannot be any doubt that under the new regime of the Sena kings, non-Buddhistic Sanskrit literature and culture in Bengal received a fresh impetus. This might have partly been also a result of the general revival of Sanskrit learning, probably under similar circumstances, in Kashmir, Kanauj, Dhārā, Kalyāṇa, Mithilā and Kaliṅga.

III. Vernacular Literature

The evolution of different Indian vernaculars from the one common parent language, known as the Vedic or early Sanskrit, passed through different stages in different parts of India. The first stage is represented by the Middle Indo-Aryan—Pāli, Prākrits and Apabhraṃśa—which were current during the period from 500 B.C. to 1000 A.D. During the last 500 years of this period the Prākrits were gradually replaced by Apabhraṃśa and its later phase Laukika or Apabhraṃśa (Avahāṭṭha) out of which were slowly born the New Indo-Aryan speeches, the Bhāṣā or Vernaculars, such as Bengali, Hindi, Maithili, Nepāli, Assamese, Oriyā etc. “Definite eastern or Magadhan characteristics appear to have developed in the entire Aryanised area of Assām, Bengal and Bihar during the closing centuries of the first millennium A.D. Bengali, Assamese and Oriyā formed a very closely connected group, and these languages showed the greatest amount of agreement among themselves. By A.D. 1000, judging from the specimens of Bengali, Assamese and Oriyā that we have at about this date and a little later, these languages had become fully established, although relationship between Bengali and Assamese was a little closer than between these two and Oriyā. Thus A.D. 1000 may roughly be taken as a convenient date for the development of the New Indo-Aryan stage in the history of the Aryan speech. About this time, the Bengali language was fully characterised, and Oriyā was also characterised with a few special peculiarities, while Assamese remained still much closer to Old Bengali.”
The total output of Bengali literature before the end of the Hindu period is not, however, very large. Besides the Charyā-padas to which detailed reference will be made later, the extant specimens of Bengali language that may be dated prior to the final extinction of Hindu rule in Bengal in the 13th century A.D. comprise

1. A few old verses and lines in the Mānasollāsa, a Sanskrit Encyclopaedia composed about 1130 A.D., in the section dealing with music.

2. A few lines and verses in the Prākrit-paṅgala (c. A.D. 1400) and other early Sanskrit texts.

3. Some place-names and personal names in the epigraphic records of Bengal from the fifth century A.D. downwards.223

4. A number of words found in Sarvānanda's commentary on Amarakośa.224

Thus the Charyā-padas may be regarded, practically, as the only extant specimen of Bengali literature during the Hindu rule in Bengal.

The manuscript of the Charyā-padas was discovered in Nepal by the late MM. H. P. Śāstri in 1907. It was edited by him along with three other texts of a similar nature, also found in Nepal, and published by the Bangiya Sāhitya Parishad under the title "Bauddhagān O Dohā" in 1916.225 (The Charyā-padas are collected in a text entitled Charyāchārya-Viniśchaya226 with a commentary in Sanskrit by Munidatta. The songs were fifty in number, but only 46 verses and a part of another are found in Śāstri's text, the rest being known only from the Tibetan translation. There was also another verse, but it was not commented upon by Munidatta.227

These songs were composed by the Siddhāchāryas or followers of the esoteric cults—the various yānas developed out of the Mahāyāna mentioned above. Naturally there is not much of literary flavour except in a few, as the sole object of the author was to expound their doctrines in a mystic language intelligible only to the initiated.

Dr. S. K. Chatterji rightly observes:

"The subject-matter of these Old Bengali Charyā-padas is highly mystical, centring round the esoteric doctrines and erotic and Yogic theories and practices of the Sahajiyā school of Buddhism. The Sanskrit commentary on the Charyās, being itself in a highly technical jargon, does not help to make the sense of the text wholly clear to
modern readers, though it quotes extensively from a similar literature which is mostly in Sanskrit."²²⁸

Elsewhere he remarks:

"The Charyā-padas cannot be accorded a very high place from literary point of view, though occasionally they breathe a true poetic spirit and are marked by beauty of expression, fine conception and imagery, and a deep sensibility and emotion. (Their main value and importance are linguistic and doctrinal.) They are, however, good lyrics written in a variety of metres. These lyrics were evidently meant to be sung, for the manuscript gives the names of the rāgas against each. But the main characteristic of these verses is their religious and emotional appeal which found a fuller development in later Bengali literature in the Sahajiyā songs, Vaishnavī paddas, Śākta hymns, Bāul songs, etc. The Buddhist Charyā-padas may, therefore, be regarded as the prototypes or precursors of these later forms of literary development in Bengal."²³⁹

(The main interest of the songs, however, centres round the fact that they represent the oldest forms of Bengali language so far known to us.) The language has also been claimed to be the oldest form of Assamese, and Oriyā, because some words specially belonging to these occur in the songs. But the general view is that the songs are really written in the one common language, then current in Eastern India, from which the Oriyā has been formed into a distinct language in the 13th and 14th, and Assamese in the 16th and 17th centuries. Dr. Chatterji has successfully demonstrated that the common language represents the oldest form of Bengali.²⁴⁰

The fifty songs collected in the Charyācharya-Vīśchaya represent the composition of 23 or 24 poets whose names are mentioned at the end.²³¹ Among these, sixteen poets have only one song each, three poets two each, one has got three, and another has got four. But Kāñhapa has thirteen and Bhusukupa, eight songs to his credit. In addition the commentary includes a song of Minarātha.²³²

(The date of these Charyā-padas has formed a subject of keen dispute. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji refers them, mainly on linguistic grounds, to the period between 950 and 1200 A.D., and this view is generally accepted. But Dr. Sahidulla, relying on Nepalese and Tibetan traditions, referred the older poets to the 7th century A.D. and this opinion is also shared by some.)
main argument of this group has been summed up as follows by Śri Sukhamay Mukherji in an unpublished article: 'The age of the language is not necessarily the age of the poets also. That popular songs recited from mouth to mouth and copied from one manuscript to another gradually undergo material linguistic changes is proved by several instances. It has been pointed out that the language of an eighteenth century Ms. of Śri-Krishṇa-Vijaya by Mālādhara Basu is much more modern than that of the 15th century when it was composed.'

This writer has discussed the date of some of the poets of these songs on the basis of clues obtained from Tibetan sources. He has drawn up a succession-list of the Siddha Gurus, 14 in number, beginning from Saraha-pā and ending in Dīpaṅkara Śrijñāna who certainly lived in the first half of the 11th century A.D. (see p. 138). He, therefore, places Kāṭha-pā, the eighth Guru, Lui-pā, the third Guru, and Saraha-pā, the first Guru, respectively, between 850-900, about 750, and 700 A.D.

He finds support for his views in the tradition that Lui-pā flourished before Śāntarākṣita and was a Kāyastha in the court of Dharmapāla, and Kāṭha-pā was the Paṇḍita-bhikṣu of Devapāla at the Somapura-Vihāra. He, therefore, concludes that as Saraha-pā was the author of four songs, the antiquity of these goes back to the 8th century A.D., and thus supports the view first propounded by M. Sahidullā. But even if we accept this view, based merely on Tibetan tradition, the fact remains that the language of the Charyā-padas, as we have them now, probably represents the form of Bengali language current in the 10th-12th century A.D., though the language very nearly took this form two hundred years earlier. (Dr. Sukumar Sen) the latest writer on the subject, who had all along upheld the theory of Dr. S. K. Chatterji, has changed his view, and held, in 1966, that the original language of the Charyā-padas may go back to 7th-8th century, and the date of their composition may be placed between the commencement of the 8th and the middle of the 11th century A.D.328)
APPENDIX I

WAS ŚRĪHARSHA, AUTHOR OF NAISHADHA-CHARITA, A BENGALI?

The problem was first discussed in some detail by the late Professor Nilakamala Bhattacharya, and he concluded, mainly from internal evidences in the Naishadha-charita, that its author was unmistakably a native of Bengal. His grounds for such definite conclusion may be summarised as follows:

1. Use of the word ‘ulūlu’ (Naishadha XIV.51) and the express statement of the standard commentator, Nārāyaṇa, that this is a musical sound uttered by the women of Gauḍa during the festivals of marriage etc., and the poet simply referred to the usage of his own native land.

2. Use of the conch-bangle by the bride in XV. 45 and its breaking as characterising the beginning of widowhood in XII, 35. In the former case, again, Nārāyaṇa clearly states that it was a custom in Gauḍa at the time of marriage. Prof. Bhattacharyya came to learn after investigation that this ‘is characteristic of Bengal alone’ (p. 171).

3. The tying of the hands of bride and groom with a kuśa blade in XVI. 14. Here, also, Nārāyaṇa comments, that it was a local custom. The usage was prevalent, as the late Prof. Bhattacharyya learnt from investigation, ‘in Bengal only’ (p. 172).

4. Some other customs, which are collectively specialities of Bengal alone, such as the painting of the floors with rice powder, niceties of fish and flesh in marriage feasts, etc. (pp. 172-74).

5. Śrīharsha wrote a panegyric of the family of a Gauḍa king as stated in VII.110.

It can be justly argued here that it is much more probable for a native of Bengal to migrate from a royal court of Bengal to Benares under the king of Kānyakubja than for a native of Kānyakubja to do so from Benares to Bengal.

6. Prof. Bhattacharyya has cited many examples of the poet’s indiscriminate use in alliteration of (i) the three sibilants, (ii) the two nasals (ṅ and n), (iii) ba and va, (iv) ja and ya.
and (v) *ksha* and *khya* (pp. 185-87) to show that the poet’s ‘mother-tongue was Bengali’.

D. C. Bhattacharya, who endorsed the view of Professor Nilkamal Bhattacharya on these grounds, added two more references in the *Naishadhacarita* in support of it. In XVIII. 103 the poet uses the word *Udyabhāskara*, and according to Chāṇḍu Paṇḍita it is a kind of camphor ‘found in Gauḍa’ (Handiqui, Tr. of the *Naishadha* p. 540). In XXII. 53 the interesting word *Laladhamba* is used. Chāṇḍu Paṇḍita explains it as the ‘top’ with which the boys play in Gauḍa (Handiqui, loc. cit., P. 489). Isānadeva, another old commentator, also states that it was used in Gauḍa. Nārāyaṇa is more explicit and says it is called *Bhramaraka* in Gauḍa. The discovery of this familiar name of a ‘top’, still universally current in Bengal, in the *Nāishadha* is, in Bhattacharya’s opinion, the most convincing of all the evidences pointing to the Bengali origin of the poet.

D. C. Bhattacharya further cites some external evidence.

The commentators Chāṇḍu Paṇḍita (1297 A.D.), Isānadeva and Nārāyaṇa believed that the poet belonged to Bengal. In the Harihara-prabandha of the *Prabandhakosha* of Rājaśekhara Sūri it is definitely stated that Harihara was a descendant of Śrīharsha, who was a native of Bengal. Vidyāpati categorically states in the *Purushaparākshā* that the poet was a native of Bengal and went to Vārānasī to have his great poem examined by scholars. Vidyāpati does not claim him for his own land Mithilā, nor does he make him a native of Kanauj, though he was fully aware of his connection with the court at that place. Vāchaspati Miśra II, the celebrated Smārta of Mithilā, attempted to prove his scholarship in Indian logic by a bold refutation of Śrīharsha’s *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakāhādyā* in the *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*. At the end of this Śrīharsha is contemptuously referred to as a ‘Supine Gauḍa’ (*Uttāṇa-Gauḍa*). All this volume of evidence, read along with the poet’s clear statement of receiving high honours from the king of Kānyakubja, found both in the *Naishadha* and *Khaṇḍana*, points to only one conclusion, viz. he was a native of Bengal and a resident of Vārānasī in the dominion of the latter king. We are not aware that any of his commentators or any other writer ever stated the converse, viz. that he was a native of Kānyakubja and a resident, for some time at least, of Bengal.837

Dr. S. K. De refuted some of the above arguments. He observed:

“Śrīharsha’s Bengal origin need not follow, as Nārāyaṇa in his commentary thinks, from his use of the word *ulūlu* as an auspicious
sound made by women on festive occasions. Apart from the fact that the word appears to be as old as the Chhāndogya Upanishad (iii. 19.3), K. K. Handiqui (op. cit. pp, 541-42) has shown that it is not an exclusively Bengali custom, being found in writers who had no connection with Bengal, especially in some Jaina writers of Western India. Murāri uses the word in connection with Sītā's marriage (iii. 55), but his Maithili commentator, Ruchipati Upādhyāya, explains it as a South Indian custom. The Southerner Mallināth, on the other hand, believes it to be a Northern custom! Similar remarks apply to the reference (XV. 45) to the custom of wearing conch-bangle, which is also mentioned in the Mahābhārata (Virāṭa xi. 1) and the Kādambarī. The argument based on the Gauḍī Riti does not carry much weight, but more relevant if not definitely conclusive, is the indiscriminate use in alliteration and chiming of the three sibilants, the two nasals \( n, \eta, ba \) and \( va, ya \) and \( ja \) as sounds of equivalent value, Rhetoricians, however, permit such interchange in verbal figures.\(^{938}\)

Dr. De concluded that the evidence for regarding Śrīharsha as a Bengali is not conclusive, but some plausibility is afforded by the Praśasti composed by him for some unnamed king of Gauḍa. With reference to the two passages in the Mahābhārata and the Kādambari mentioned by Dr. S. K. De in the extract quoted above, D. C. Bhattacharya observes:

"These two passages, as Prof. Bhattacharya correctly stated, do not refer to marriage customs at all. In the former (Virāṭa xi 1) it was not a new bride but Arjuna who appeared before the king of Virāṭa in lady's ornaments including a pair of gold bangles 'upon conch'. In the latter, pieces of lotus stalks in a hermitage are likened to pieces of conch-bangles slipping down from the ankles of the goddess Sarasvati, the poet being quite oblivious of the inauspicious nature of the concept. We should add here that Mahāśvetā in her austerities is described as wearing, among others, bark as garment, sacred thread and 'pieces of conch' in her wrist. So the references are quite contrary to the custom mentioned in the Naishadha."\(^{939}\)

D. C. Bhattacharya's view on the date of Śrīharsha may be quoted in this connection. He refers to a well-founded tradition that Śrīharsha was the son of a contemporary rival of Udayana, and then observes:

"Śrīharsha was born, therefore, about 1075 A.D., and wrote
most of his works in the reign of Govindachandra of Kanauj, though he might have lived long enough to witness the reign of Jayachandra. According to an unverified statement (found in Nyāyakosha, 1893, Introd., P. 4 f.n.) one Bhūdeva wrote a commentary on the Naishadha at the request of the king of Kānya-kubja in the year Yugmāśhtāṅkairnirukte Šaka-nṛipatisame (V. P. Dvivedi reads Yugmāśchāṅkaiḥ in the introduction to Nyāyavārtika, Chowkh, 1916, P. 160) If it is taken as genuine, the word ‘aṅka’ must be a symbol for the figure 10 instead of 9. It was then Vijayachandra, the son of Govindachandra, who must have requested a scholar of his court to write the commentary apparently in the lifetime of Śrīharsha in the year 1082 Saka (1160 A.D.), a rare sort of tribute paid to the greatest poet of the century.”
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According to the verses not only pious and learned Brāhmaṇas but many Śrēṣṭhins lived there (bhūrśrēṣṭhī), evidently added by way of explaining the origin of the name. The village was a famous one and is mentioned in Kṛiṣṇa-miśra’s Prabodha-chandrododaya (II. 7).
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See M. Chakravarti in JASB. 1915, pp. 320-21. Śāstrī (Cal. III. XV), argues that since the Pāribhals were reduced in status by Vallālasena, Jīmutavāhana could not have paraded his being a Pāribhadrya unless he flourished before Vallālasena.

It appears that these three treatises were meant to form a part of an ambitious work on Dharma-śāstra called Dharma-ratna; hence the colophons read iti dharma-ratna dāya-bhāgaḥ (or kāla-vivekaḥ as the case may be). The ignoring of this fact has led to inaccuracies in the description of Jīmutavāhana’s works in some catalogues of manuscripts. Thus, the Dharma-ratnas mentioned in Mitra, Notices, v. 297-98, No. 1974 and in M. Cat. vi. 2385-88, Nos. 3172-74 are respectively the Kāla-viveka and the Dāya-bhāga.

Jīmutavāhana does not quote or mention the Mitākṣharā of Vījāvānēśvara, but he appears to know the doctrines of the school.
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The work was edited by Bharat Chandra Śiromaṇi with seven commentaries, 2 vols., Calcutta 1863-66. In some editions, as for instance in that of Jīva Nānda Vidyāśāgar, the work is divided into sections, but there is no such division in the MSS.
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Ed. Asutosh Mookerjee in Memoirs of ASB. II, No. 5, Calcutta, 1910-14. This name of the work is given in the first introductory verse, and is found in later citations; but colophons name it variously as Nyāya-mātikā or Nyāya-ratna-mālikā.

For references, see M. Chakravarti and Kane in the works cited.
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For these words, cf. the Journal (in Bengali) of the VSP., B. S. 1336 (1929 A. D.) Part II. The following may be given as specimens: Kadkach, Kali, Ghol, Topar, Dayuk, Parasu, Hariyál, Vediyā, Rasayun (Rasun), Khopyaka (Khopā), Khqkki (Khidi). Dr. S. C. Banerji, op. cit., p. 262.

This section is based principally on an article by N. N. Das Gupta (IC. III, 153-160) and Dr. S. K. De’s comment on it (IC. IV. 273-76).
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For Silabhadra, see above, p. 78.

This place Zahor is conjectured in turns to be Lahore and Jessore in South Bengal (Waddell and Sarat Chandra Das) and Sabhar in East Bengal (H. P. Śāstrī). The suggestion (IHQ. 1935, pp. 143-44) that Zahor is in Raḍhā is hardly convincing. A. H. Francke (Indian Tibet, II. 65, 89-90) has with great probability identified it with Mandi in North-Western India (see Bāgchi in IHQ. 1930, pp. 581-82).

Pag Sām Jon Zang, Pt. I, pp. cxlvii, 120. The tradition is given also in Śāstrī’s fragmentary biography mentioned above. But Tār. 249 believes that Bhūśuka (sic), whom he does not identify with Śaṇideva, was a contemporary of Dīpankara bṛjīśana and therefore a much later teacher.

Sarat Chandra Das is here (see p. ci) uncertain about the location of Zahor, but in JBTS. I (1893), p. 1 ff. he believes that Śaṇīrakshita was a native of
Gauḍa, which opinion has been repeated by Benoytosh Bhattacharya and others.

There is no definite evidence that Kamalaśīla belonged to Bengal; but he is described as a contemporary of Lui-pa.

Waddell, *Lamaism* (London 1895), p. 379 ff. The name of the place Uddiyāna is also given in the forms Oḍḍiyāna, Oḍiyāna, Odiyāna and sometimes as O-rgyan or U-rgyana; but it has not yet been definitely located. B. Bhattacharya, following H. P. Śāstri, has identified it with Orissa, and drawn far-reaching conclusions about Buddhist Tāntric centres in Orissa. But this is only a conjecture; and Orissa is often mentioned as Odivisa in the Tibetan works. In *JBRS*. 1928, p. 34, however, B. Bhattacharya believes that the place was in Assam. There is great probability in the identification proposed by Sylvain Lévi (*JA*. 1915, p. 105 ff; see F. W. Thomas in *JRAS*. 1906, p. 461 note) with the Swat valley in North-western India, the people of which, even in Hiuen Tsang's time (Watters, I. 225), made "the acquaintance of magical formulas their occupation." See the question discussed by P. C. Bagchi and N. Das Gupta in *IHQ*. V. 580-83, xi. 142-44.


104 Tār. 204-5, 213. See *Wint.-Lit*. II. 375.

Sarat Chandra Das (*JBTS*. I. 1-31) gives an account of Śāntirakshita's activities in Tibet. He is said to have visited Tibet in 743 A.D., erected the monastery of Bsam-ye in 749 and died in 762 A.D. This has been accepted by B. Bhattacharya (introd. to *Tattva-saṅgagraha*, p. xiv f.) and Phanindranath Bose (*Indian Teachers of Buddhist Universities*, Madras 1923, p. 124). Cf. *infra*. Ch. XIV.


Tār. 230-33. Sumpā, however, believes that Jetārī was born of a Yoginī whom Sāṁśāna kept for Tāntric practices.

Sumpā, *op. cit.* pp. xcvi, 112.

105 *Hetu-tattva-upadeśa*, *Dharmadharmaviṇīchaya* and *Bālāvatāra-tarka*. See S. C. Vidyabhusan, *op. cit.* pp. 337-38. There are also two other Sūtra works of Jetārī in Bstan-hgyur, viz., *Bodhi-pratideśana-vṛitti* and *Sugata-māhāvīrāhauṅga kārka* (see Tār. 327).


The *Rgyud* section, according to M. Shahidullah's calculation, contains 96 *Rgyud-hgrel* 36 and *Mdo-hgrel* 36. Śāstrī's index of Cordier's summary of *Rgyud-hgrel I-LXX* gives over 100 Tāntric works, of which about 40 are translations.

On the characteristics of the Sādhana and of Vajra-yāna literature in general see L. de la Vallee Poussin in *ERE*. loc. cit.; *Wint.-Lit*. II. 387-92. Most of the published Sādhanas, as in B. Bhattacharya, *Sādhana-mālā*, 2 vols., *GOS*. Nos. XXVI, XL1 (1925, 1928) and elsewhere, are very short, but some are fairly long; they are generally written in indifferent Sanskrit prose, with verse Mantras, some being entirely in verse. On Dhāraṇīs see Winternitz, *op. cit.* pp. 380 ff. The Saṅghītis introduce the Buddha in an assembly of the faithful.

110 *BGD*. introd., p. 22.

111 Besides Dipamkara Śrītēṇa, the *Bstan-hgyur* has preserved numerous works under the names Dipamkara, Dipamkara-chandra, Dipamkara-bhadra, and
Dīpankara-rakshita, who were probably not all identical. Dīpankara-bhadra is mentioned also by Tāranātha (Geschichte, pp. 257, 264; Edelst. p. 95) as belonging to Western India. To Dīpankara Śrījñāna Atiṣa is also ascribed a Charyā-giti (Cordier, p. 46).


Op. cit. p. xlvi. 118; also xxxvi, 95; Tār. 243. Dīpankara Śrījñāna appears also to have been connected with the Somapuri-vihāra where he translated Madhyamaka-ratna-pradipa of Bhāvaviveka (Cordier, op. cit. III. 299).

Cf. supra. p. 138; infra. Ch. XIV.

Tār. 214 f; Sumpā, op. cit. pp. xcviii, 118, 120.


These are: Kāla-chakravatāra (Śāstrī-Cat. I. 161; MS. dated 1125 A.D.), Paddhati commentary on Buddha-kapāla-tantra (ibid. pp. 163-64, MS. finished at Vikramaśīla in the 25th year of Rāmapāla’s reign; Cordier, III, p. 212), Vajrāvali-nāma-mandalopāyika (ibid. pp. 153-61) and Uchchhushma-jambhalasādhanā (Śāstrī, Nepal Catalogue, ii, p. 205=No. 152, in the Sādhana-samuchchaya).

Sumpā, op. cit. pp. xcxxviii, 63, 112, 120, 121; Tār. 250 f. Edelst. p. 109 f. Tāranātha believes that his father was a Kshatriya, and his mother a Brāhmaṇa. He was well versed in Hindu Śāstras of the Tantras of the Tīrthikas before he was converted, but studied the Buddhist Tantras in Bengal later on. S. C. Das in JASB. 1882, pp. 16-18, gives a slightly different account of Abhayākaragupta from Tibetan sources. He states that Abhayākaragupta was born in the middle of the 9th century in Eastern India near the city of Gauḍa, went to Magadha, became a priest to king Rāmapāla and, by his learning and other accomplishment, came to preside over the Vikramaśīla vihāra. He died before Rāmapāla abdicated in favour of his son Yakshapāla, and was succeeded by Ratnākarāśaṅti at Vikramaśīla. In the Bstan-hgyur Abhayākaragupta is described as an inhabitant of Magadha (Cordier, II. 71, 255). See IC. III. 369-72.

He appears to be different from Abhaya-paṇḍita, to whom about 108 Tāntric works are assigned in the Bstan-hgyur.

Cordier, op. cit. p. 319; also pp. 83, 92 for the works.

Op. cit. pp. xlvii, 119, where the name is given as Devākara-chandra. See Tār. 244.

A Pāka-vidhi by Paṇṭita-Śrī-Divākarachandra is noticed in Śāstrī, Nepal Cat. II. 43-44; cf. P. C. Bagchi, Dohākosa, p. 8. (colophon), where the MS. is dated in 1101 A. D. He may be identical with Devākara-chanda, also chiefly a translator (5 works in Tibetan), or Devākara (two translated works, Cordier, p. 181), both of whom are described as Indian Upādhyāyas (Cordier, pp. 176, 181, 217, 277), but he may be different from Divākara-vajra (4 works, Cordier, pp. 47, 48, 328, 329), who is described as a Mahābrāhmaṇa.

Cordier, op. cit. p. 160; for the works see pp. 73, 169.

Ibid. p. 33.

Ibid. p. 188, also, p. 63. Has Bhagala any connexion, as Rāhula Sānkriṭiyāyana suggests, with modern Bhāgalpur? Or is it another form of Baṅgala or Bhaṅgala by which Tāranātha and Sumpā mean Bengal? Tāranātha believes
(Geschichte, pp. 204, 226) that Dānaśīla was a Kashmirian, and lived in the time of Mahīpāla of Bengal.

137 Cordier, op. cit. p. 33.
139 See S. C. Vidyabhusan, op. cit. pp. 340-41; also IHQ. 1927, pp. 856-68 for a description of the work.
139 Sumpā, op. cit. pp. lxxiii. 130. He is regarded as one of the 84 Mahāśiddhas; he was a cūdra of “Bhaṅgala” (Grūnewedel, op. cit. p. 216), with which Rāhula Sāṅkrityāyana's description (p. 225) agrees.
139 Cordier, op. cit. p. 245, (Bodhi-rhiṭta-vāyu-charaṇa-bhāvanopāya).
139 Sumpā, op. cit. pp. xii, 90; Tār. 86 f. 105. The Siddhāchārya Nāgayodhi (Grūnewedel, op. cit. p. 214), a Brāhmaṇa of Western India and disciple of Nāgarjuna, is probably the same person (Rāhula Sāṅkrityāyana's description agrees). For his works see Cordier, pp. 137, 138, 142, 143, 167, 207, 209, 245.
139 Sumpā, op. cit. pp. v. 144; Tāranātha, Edelst. p. 100.
139 Cordier, op. cit. pp. 3, 4, 298. He hailed from Kāpāṭya in Bengal (Cordier. III. 399).
139 Ibid. p. 98; two works. He may be the same as Bodhibhadra of Vikramaśīla vihāra mentioned by Tāranātha (Geschichte, pp. 259 f.).
139 Ibid. p. 293. He should be distinguished from Subhākaragupta of Magadha, pupil of Abhayākaragupta and high priest of Vikramaśīla, who flourished in the reign of Rāmapāla (Sumpā, op. cit. pp. cxxii, 120; Tār. 252, 261; S. C. Vidyabhusan, op. cit. p. 346).
139 S. C. Vidyabhusan, op. cit. p. 346.
139 Cordier, op. cit. p. 219.
139 Cordier, op. cit. pp. 19, 21, 23, 49 50, 126, 142, 178, 302, 365. Śāstrī, Nepal Cat. ii. 244, notices an Amṛti-karṇīka commentary of Vibhūtichāndra, in Sanskrit, on Nāma-saṅghīti according to Kālachakra-yāna. On Vibhūtichāndra see N. N. Dasgupta in IC. V. 215-17.
140 Ibid. pp. 17, 77.
140 For Buddhist Tantra in eastern Koki land, see Tār. 267.
140 BGD. introd., p. 27. On the legends of Kambala, who is counted as one of the Siddhas, see Grūnewedel, in the work cited, pp. 175-76.
140 BGD. Tāranātha (Gesch. 188, 191 f. 275, 324; Edelst. 53 ff.) connects Kambala with Uḍḍiyāna and associates him with Lalitavajra and Indrabhūti in the exposition of Hevajra. Sumpā (pp. x, 90, 94), believes that Kambala was a contemporary of Āryadeva. Rāhula Sāṅkrityāyana makes Kambala a disciple of Vajraghaṇṭa of Varendra (flourishing under Devapāla, c. 810-50, A.D.), but belonging to Orissa.
140 On the distinction, which however is not sharp, between Mantra-yāna and Vajra-yāna, see Wint.-Lit. II. 387-88. Also P. C. Bagchi in Ch. XIII. infra.
140 With our present available materials the exact relationship of these various cults cannot be determined, but there can be no doubt that whether Buddhist or Brāhmanical, they were intimately related, and their teachers figure indiscriminately in more cults than one. In addition to the authorities cited above, all the Tibetan legends about the Siddhāchāryas will be found in Dī

See infra Ch. XIII.

See Gopal Haldar, Gopichānd Legend, in PTÖC. VI (1933), p. 277.

Sumpā. op. cit. pp. vi. 113, 135, 145; Tāranātha (Edelsteinmine, pp. 104 f.) adds that he taught the Tantras to Padmavajra, from whom they were handed down in succession to Tilli, Nārō and Sānti! The strange name Kukkuri-pā is explained by Sumpā by the legend that Kukkuri-pāda united in Yoga in the Luminī grove with a woman who was formerly a bitch. The same work (Sumpā Mkhon-po, pp. vi, 108, 145) speaks of a Kukurādāsa (=Kukurājā?) also called Kukurāchārya as a Buddhist Tāntric sage, adept in Yoga and a great preacher, who was a lover of dogs!

Tār. 275. According to Grünewedel, op. cit. p. 176, Kukhuri was a Brāhmaṇ of the eastern land of Kapilāsakrū; according to Rāhula, a Brāhmaṇa of Kapilāvastu and Guru of Mīna-pāda.

One of these, Mahāmāyī-sādhana-pāyika, is available in Sanskrit in Sādhana-māla, II. 466-68 (No. 240).

He is probably identical, as Cordier suggests (p. 109), with Kukura-pā or Kukura-rāja of whom eight Tāntric texts on various deities (Vajrasattva, Vairochana, Heruka etc.), are given in the Bstan-hgyur. This perhaps confirms Sumpā Mkhon-po’s statement that he introduced various kinds of Tantra. See Tār. 188-89.

Op. cit. pp. cxxi, 90. Elsewhere (pp. cxxi, 124) it is said that Śavari belonged to the hill tribe called Śavara. In Tāranātha the name is given as Śavari. The legends of Śavari who is regarded as one of the 84 Mahāsiddhas are given in Grünewedel, op. cit. pp. 149-50.

See P. C. Bagchi, introd. to Kaula-jñāna, p. 27. Rāhula makes Śabara-pā disciple of Saraha and Guru of Lui-pā, his place of activity being given as Vikramaśila.

Sumpā, op. cit. pp. 124, 135; Tāranātha, Edelsteinmine, pp. 20,23. The relationship of the earlier Siddhas to one another in spiritual lineage is differently given in different traditional accounts. Their chronology, therefore, depending on their mutual relationship, is equally uncertain. On the question of the confusion of Śavari, Mahāśavara and Saraha, see below under Saraha.

Cordier, op. cit. pp. 57, 58, 128, 198, 235, 296, 326, 335. Some are available in Sanskrit also, in Sādhana-māla, II. 384-88 (Siddha-śavara), 456 (ibid).

But he is probably different from Mahāśavara, by which name Saraha (Rāhulabhadrā) is also known (Cordier, op. cit. p. 221, 248, also p. 39). See below.

Advayavajra, who belonged to Śavara-sampradāya (Cordier, p. 45) has about 22 works translated in the Bstan-hgyur, but some of his works are also available in Sanskrit. Twenty-two small Vajrayānist tracts of his are edited by H. P. Ēāstrī in the Advayavajra-samgraha. Also in Sādhana-māla, I. 47; II. 424,
490. His other name or title, Avadhūti-pā, probably indicates his connexion with the Avadhūti sect of Sahaja-siddhi, and this appears to be supported by his commentaries on the Dohā-koṣa (ed. P. C. Bagchi, JL. XXVIII). Excepting his connexion with the Śavara-sampadāya, there is no direct evidence that he belonged to Bengal. One Adavyavajra, however, without the title Avadhūti, but called a Brāhmaṇa, appears to have come from Bengal (Cordier, p. 250).—Rāhula makes Avadhūti-pā a disciple of Śanti-pā.

M. Shahidullah, op. cit. p. 19, would explain the colophon differently, while H. P. Śāstri thinks that Dipāmkara helped Lui-pā in writing this work. But see P. C. Bagchi, Kaula-jñāna', introd., p. 28.

M. Shahidullah (op. cit. p. 22), following Sylvain Lévi and Tāranātha, would place him much earlier in the 7th century. From Marāṭhi sources Matsyendranātha's date would be the end of the 12th century (S. K. Chatterji, op. cit. p. 122; D. R. Bhāndarkar in IC. I. 723-24). But see P. C. Bagchi, loc. cit. for a criticism of these views. The approximate dates assigned by B. A. Saletoré to Ādinātha, Gorakshanātha and others from South Indian tradition (Poona Orientalist, I. 16-22) do not conflict with our tentative chronology.

His Tattva-svabhāva-dohākoṣa-giti-kā-dṛiṣṭi (Cordier, p. 230) is the same as Dohā No. 29; see IHQ. 1927, pp. 676 ff.

BGD. introd., p. 21.

Cordier, op. cit. p. 37; also P. C. Bagchi, op. cit. pp. 22-23; Ṭār. 106 (Shiefner's note); Grünwedel, op. cit. p. 143, f.n. 2.


But according to Rāhula, Lui-pā belonged to Magadha and was in his youth a scribe or Kāyastha to king Dharmapāla (769-809 A.D.); he was a disciple of Śabara-pā, who in his turn was a disciple of Saraha. That some of the teachers of these cults belonged to lower castes (probably an indication of their Buddhistic origin) is suggested by the names as well as the legends. Cf. the names Jālāndhara (fisherman), Tānti-pā (weaver), Ḫāḍi-pā (sweeper), Tilipā or Telipā (oilman) etc. But the names need not always imply caste, for Jālāndhara and Tilopā are described as Brāhmaṇas, ))).

Cordier, op. cit. p. 33. But Sumpā makes him (p. cxli) an employee of the king of Uḍḍiyāna; Tāranātha (Edelst. 20) makes him a scribe of Samanta-sūbra, king of Udyāna in the west; Rāhula describes him as a scribe of Dharmapāla and gives his place of activity as Magadha! See on this point P. C. Bagchi, IHQ. 1930, p. 583. H. P. Śāstri (JBORS. 1919, p. 509) informs us that Lui-pā is even now worshipped in Rādhā and Mymensing. Wassilijev (note to Ṭār. 319) states that Lui-pā was born in Ujjayinī, while in Grünwedel, loc. cit. he is said to have lived under Indrapāla at Śāliputra (near Pāṭaliputra). In Tāranātha's opinion, Lui-pā was a contemporary of Āsaṅga.

The equation was first suggested by Grünwedel. op. cit. Cordier (p. 33) hesitates to accept the identification. See also Levi-Nepal, i. 353, note 4. Tāranātha (Edels. pp. 120 f.) distinguishes Lui-pā from Mīna, but he also distinguishes between Mīna and Machchhindra.

Ed. KS. I. 7 (vol. I, p. 25). In spite of conflict in the legendary accounts, the names Mīnāna and Matsyendranātha belong probably to the same person.
Cordier, op. cit. p. 237; the work is named Bāhyāntara-bodhichitta-bandhopadeśa.

For a resume of the legends of Matsyendranātha see Chintaharan Chakravarti in IHQ. 1930, pp. 178-81. The Yogini-kaula cult must have been closely connected with Hātha-yoga; for some of the Āsanas and Mudrās in Hāthā-yoga are expressly named after Matsyendranātha, and its tradition claims him as the first teacher of Hātha-yoga after Ādīnātha (i. e., Śiva). In the Tantrasāra of Kṛishṇānanda, Mīnānātha or Matsyendranātha is connected with the worship of Tārā.


For an able treatment of the legend in its various forms, see Gopal Halder in the work already cited. On Gorakshanātha as a deified protector of cattle, see JL. XIX. 16 f.

Levi-Nepal. I. 355 ff.; Tār. 255; BGD. 16. Goraksha has been identified (see note to Tār. 323) with Anāṅgavajra, but this may be an instance of the attempt to assimilate him to the well-known Vajrayānist writer Anangavajra, who was a disciple of Padmavajra and preceptor of Indrabhūti of Uḍḍīyāna. This Goraksha may be the Goraksha mentioned in Bstan-hgyur.

A Sanskrit Jñāna-kārikā, in three Paṭalas, said to have been revealed by Gorakshanātha, is mentioned in Sāstrī, Nepal Cat. I. 79-90: this has been included by P. C. Bagchi in the work cited above, where the name of the teacher occurs as Mahā-machchhīndra-pāda (p. 122) and not as Gorakshanātha. A Sanskrit Goraksha-samhitā of late quasi-Hindu origin is supposed to embody his teachings. Also a Goraksha-siddhānta (ed. Gopinath Kaviraj, Part I, SBS). The vernacular productions of the Goraksha school are of very late origin, and it would not be critical to assign any of them to the teacher.

Called Vāyu-tattva-bhāvanopadesa (Cordier, op. cit. p. 237). To his alleged disciple Chaurāṅgin also is ascribed a work of the same name.

Jālandhari (variant Jālandhara) is sometimes mentioned as a disciple of Indrabhūti of Uḍḍīyāna, while some popular legends identify him with Hāḍi-pā of the Gopīchānd story. According to Grünwedel, (op. cit. p. 189), Jālandhari was a Brāhmaṇ of Thaṭa land, while Tār. 195, makes him a contemporary and Guru of Kṛishṇāchārya, and connects him (Edelst. 62 ff) with the Gopīchānd legend of Bengal as Hāḍi-pā. According to the accounts of Tāranātha and Sumpā, his real name was Siddha Bālapāda, but he was called the sage of Jālandhara, a place between Nepal and Kashmir, where he lived for some time. The Nagara Thaṭa was in Sindhu, where Jālandhara was born in a family of Śūdra merchants. He visited Uḍḍīna, Nepal, Avantī and Chaṭi-grāma in Bengal where Gopīchānd, son of Vimalachandra, was the king. See JASB. 1898, p. 22. In Rāhuḷa’s account Jālandhara is described as a Brāhmaṇa whose disciples were Kaṇha-pā and Mastysendra. His Guru is called Kūrma-pā.


Ibid. pp. 75, 78.


Ibid. pp. lxxii, 102, 104, 109, 112. Tār. 162 ff. makes the senior Virūpa a disciple of Jayadeva paṇḍita (the successor of Dharmapāla) and a fellow-student.
of Śaṅtideva. He mentions (p. 205) the junior Virūpa as a Siddhācārya. Virūpa is connected with various forms of Vajra-yāna sādhana and mentioned as the preceptor of the Mahāsiddha Ğombi-Heruka. Elsewhere (Edelst. 31) Tāranātha believes that Virūpa appeared thrice in this world! According to Cordier (op. cit. p. 30), and Grünwedel (op. cit. 147-48), Ğombi-Heruka was a Kṣatriya king of Magadha and exponent of Hevajra-siddhi (8 works in Bstan-hgyur). See Edelst. 34-35.

181 Sumpā, loc. cit.; Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 145.
182 Cordier, op. cit. p. 223. H. P. Ğāstrī (BGD. introd., p. 28) adds two others, viz., Virūpa ĝītikā and Virūpa-vajra-ĝītikā. But are these Pada-collections or Sangitīs? One Dohā of Virūpa occurs in the Charyācharya (No. 3). For his Vajra-yāna works, see Cordier, op. cit. ii. 57, 125, 176, 177, 182, 223 224, 230.
183 The name is given in various forms: Tilipā, Tillipā, Tillapa, Tilapa, Tilopa, Tailopa, Tellipā, Telopa, Teli-yogī. It is explained by Sumpā, fancifully, by the legend of his having joined in Yoga with a Yogi who used to subsist in her early life by pounding sesame (tila) ! Did he belong to the Teli caste?
184 Tār. 226; Sumpā, op. cit. pp. xli, 128.
185 Cordier, op. cit. p. 43, assigns a Sahaja work alternately to Tailakapāḍa alias Prajiñābhadhra. It is possible that all these teachers had a popular name, as well as a Buddhist devotional name. There is another Siddhācārya Tailakapāḍa (Cordier, p. 79) who hailed from Odīyāna. According to Grünwedel (op. cit. p. 170), Tilopa lived in Vishṇunagara and attained Mahāmudrā-siddhi. In Rāhula’s list Telopa is described as a Brāhmaṇ disciple of Padmapāja and master of Nāro-pā.
186 Cordier, op. cit. p. 223. Ed. P. C. Bagchi (Sanskrit text in Dohā-kośa, JL. XXVIII. 41-52, also pp. 1-4). The Vajra-yāna works are mentioned in Cordier, op. cit. pp. 43, 79, 223, 224, 239, 244.
187 Sumpā, op. cit. pp. iv, 18, 45, 115, 117 (called Narota-pā). On pp. lxvii, 118 the name of the place where Nāropā practised Tantra is given as Phullahari to the west of Magadhā. According to Grünwedel (op. cit. p. 168), Nāra was by caste a wine-seller, and lived in Sālaputra in East India. Tāranātha, however, believes that he was a Kashmirian Brāhmaṇ and agrees with Sumpā’s account in his Edelst. 74 ff.; see also his Geschichte, pp. 239 ff., 244 ff., 249, 328.
188 Cordier, op. cit. pp. 16, 68, 70, 87, 92, 97, 125, 130, 132, 238, G. Tucci (J.R.A.S. 1935, p. 677) speaks of another work of Nāropā which he discovered in Nepal. It is a Sanskrit text, called Sekoddeśa-ṭikā on initiation according to Kāla-chakra. In Grünwedel, (op. cit. p. 168), Nāro, Nāro-pā, Narota-pā, Nāḍa, Nāḍa-pāḍa appear to be the same person who was also known as Jūna-siddhi or Yaśobhadra.
189 Cordier, pp. 220, 224. BGD. introd., p.33 assigns to him a Nāḍa-paṇḍita-ĝītikā.
190 Cordier, op. cit. p. 68. This might refer to the Nāḍa-pāḍa of Kashmirian origin.
191 Ibid. p. 159, called Mahāmāhopādhyāya; the junior Kṛishṇa is mentioned at p. 82.
192 Ibid. p. 82. He may be the same Kaṇha as is mentioned by Sumpā (pp. v,
110) as a Buddhist Tāntric sage who was born in a Brāhmaṇ family of Orissa (Oḍyāna ?) and was initiated by Jálandhara; see also pp. lvii, 135, where the name is given as Kāṇha or Kāṇhāyā.

186 Ibid. p. 227, where he is called a Mahāyogin and a Dohā-kośa is assigned to him. He may be the same as our author. Also pp. 94, 101. Altogether three works are mentioned under his name by Cordier.

184 Ibid. p. 166.

185 To them altogether sixty-nine Buddhist Tāntric works are ascribed in Bstan-hgyur. Some of these have been preserved also in Sanskrit in Nepal, e. g., Vasanta-tila (Cordier, p. 38; Kṛishṇa) = the same in Śastra's Nepal Cat. II. 199 (incomplete); Kurukulla-sādhana (Cordier, p. 94; Kṛishṇavajra) = the same in Sādhana-samuchchaya (Nepal Cat. II. 201) = Sādhana-mālā, pp. 372-78; Yoga-ratna-māla Pañjikā on Hevajra, (Cordier, p. 67; Kṛishṇa or Kāṇhupāda) = Nepal Cat. II. 44; Śastra-Cat. i. 114.

186 Edelst. 69. M. Shahidullah takes it to be Orissa. Tāranātha (pp. 195, 197) distinguishes between a senior and a junior (Tār. 211, 234, 258, 275, 244) Kṛishṇācharīya. The junior, in his opinion, was responsible for Tantra works on Sambhara, Hevajra and Jamāntaka; he belonged to the Brāhmaṇa caste and was also a writer of Dohās.


188 Kāṇhu. Nos. 7, 9, 40, 42, 45; Kṛishṇācharīya-pāda, Nos. 11, 36; Kṛishṇa-pāda. Nos. 12, 13 (?), 19; Kṛishṇavajra, No. 18. In No. 36, Jálandhari is mentioned with respect as a master. In Rāhula's list, Kāṇha-pā appears as a disciple of Jálandhara, a Kāyastha living at Somapurī during Devapāla's reign (c. 810-850 A. D.). S. K. Chatterji (op. cit. pp. 120-22) identifies Kṛishṇācharīya with Kāṇhu-pāda.

189 BGD. 123-32 (Kṛishṇācharīya-pāda); in M. Shahidullah, op. cit., with the Tibetan version, pp. 72-122; in P. C. Bagchi, Dohā-kośa, cited above, pp. 121-136, also pp. 24-28. S. K. Chatterji (HB. p. 386) placed the Dohā-writer Kṛishṇācharīya at the end of the 12th century, on the ground that the Cambridge University Library MS. of the Hevajra-pañjikā by Pañcītācharīya Ūrī-Prishṇa-pāda is dated in the 39th year of Govindapāla (=c. 1199 A. D.), presuming our author's identity with this Kṛishṇa-pāda.

200 Op. cit. pp. xxvii, 84, 85; Grünwedel, op. cit. pp. 150-51, as one of the 84 Siddhas.


203 BGD. 77-132 (called Sarovajavāra; 32 Dohās); in M. Shahidullah, op. cit. pp. 123-234; P. C. Bagchi, op. cit. pp. 52-120, also pp. 5-9, 28-32.

204 The commentator Adyavajavāra calls his author Sarovajavāra, Saroruhaha and Saroruhavajavāra. This Adyavajavāra is probably a later writer, different from the Vajrayānist author of the same name, who is also called Avadhūti-pāda (see f.n. 158 above). He belonged to Ārādeśa in Bengal (Cordier, op. cit. pp. 232, 250)—Saroruhaha is distinguished from Saraha by Taranātha in both his works. In Rāhula's list, Saraha occurs as the Ādi-Siddha, having three dis-
ciples Buddha-jñāna, Nāgārjuna and Śabara-pā, which Śabara-pā in his turn is mentioned as the Guru of Lui-pā. Saraha further figures as a Brāhmaṇa of Nālandā, flourishing in the reign of Dharmapāla (c. 770-810 A.D.).


Ibid. p. 375. Tāranātha (Edelst. 10) believes that Rāhulabhadra, with whom he identifies the younger Saraha, was born in Oḍiviṣa. He makes Lui-pā a disciple of this sage.


Cordier, op. cit. p. 232. Cf. Tār. 66. The Siddhāchārya Rāhula, according to Grünwedel (op. cit. p. 189) was a Śūdra of Kāmarūpa.

Edelst. 20; cf. Tār. 105.

Tār. 66, 73, 105. Rāhulabhadra is given as an alias of Saraha in Cordier, op. cit. p. 64 (Vajrayoginī-sādhana).

Cordier, op. cit. p. 225; he is probably the same as Garvari-pāda, p. 78; one work each in Cordier. His place of activity is given as Bodhinagara, by Rāhula.

Ibid. p. 234. Called also Kila-pā or Kirava. According to Grünwedel (op. cit. pp. 208 ff.), he belonged to the royal family of Grāhara, with which description Rāhula appears to agree.

Cordier, op. cit. p. 277.

Ibid. p. 241. Grünwedel, op. cit. p. 188, informs us that Karmāra was a blacksmith of Sāliputra in Magadha, and was also known as Kampa. In Rāhula’s list Karmāra-pā also appears as a blacksmith of Sāliputra.

Cordier, op. cit. 238. In Rāhula’s list Viṇā-pā is a disciple of Bhadra-pā and a prince of Gauḍa.

Sumpā, op. cit. pp. cxviii, 125.


Tār. 127, 177, 249, 278; Grünwedel, op. cit. p. 215. He is said to belong to Sāliputra in the times of Indrapāla. See also BGD. 30.


Ibid. p. 241. BGD. introd., p. 250. He is probably different from Dharmadāsa mentioned by Sumpā (op. cit. pp. xxxiv, 99), who was born in many countries and erected a temple to Mañjughoṣha. In Rāhula’s list Dharmapā and Gūṇḍari-pā are distinguished. Dharmapā according to Grünwedel (op. cit. p. 190), was a Brāhmaṇa of Bodhinagara.

The labours of Haraprāśād Śāstrī and others have made it clear that Buddhism did not entirely disappear but lived, and is still living, in a disguised form in Bengal. The theory of its being persecuted out of the land, therefore, is hardly maintainable.

HCIP. V, p. 358.

Ibid., pp. 358, 360.

Above, p. 373, f.n. 74.

MM. H. P. Śāstrī regarded the language of all the four texts as Bengali, and added the words “Hājār Bachharer Purāṇa” (in Bengali language, meaning ‘thousand years old’) before the title of the book. But only the Charyā-padas
are written in Bengali, the language of the other three being \textit{Apabhramsa-Avahat\ṭha}.

\footnote{This is the name given by H. P. Ātrī, but Dr. Sukumar Sen thinks that the correct name is \textit{Charyāścharya-Viniśchaya}, and the proper name of the book should be \textit{Charyākosha} or \textit{Charyāgīti-Kosha} (\textit{History of the Bengali Literature} (in Bengali) 1959, Vol. I. p. 59).}

\footnote{The commentator has quoted a Bengali verse composed by Mīnanātha while explaining one of the \textit{Charya-padās} (No. 21). \textit{Ibid.} p. 60.}

\footnote{\textit{HB}, p. 384.}

\footnote{\textit{HCIP}. V. p. 359.}

\footnote{This common parent language is regarded as old Bengali by most scholars. For Dr. Chatterji’s views, cf. the above quotations and his book \textit{“Origin and Development of Bengali Language and Literature.”}}

\footnote{It is just possible that the name mentioned is that of the author’s guru and not of himself. This is suggested by the addition of honorific pā (pāda) to the name. Some names may be pseudonyms or names of castes (Sukumar Sen, \textit{op. cit.} 60-61).}

\footnote{Recently Rāhula Saṁkritiyāyana has discovered \textit{Charyā-padas} of three new poets who probably belonged to a later period than those mentioned in \textit{Charyā-charya-Viniśchaya}. \textit{Ibid.} 67.}

\footnote{\textit{Charyāgīti-padāvalī} (in Bengali), 2nd Edition, 1966, pp. 7-8.}

\footnote{This Appendix is principally based on an article by D. C. Bhattacharya in \textit{IHQ}, XXII, pp. 144 ff.}

\footnote{In the \textit{Sarasvati Bhavana Studies}, Vol. III, pp. 170-92. The summary given below is taken from \textit{IHQ}. XXII, pp. 144-5.}

\footnote{See above, p. 228.}

\footnote{\textit{IHQ}. XXII, 145-6.}

\footnote{\textit{NIA}. II. 266.}

\footnote{\textit{IHQ}, XXII. 144-5.}

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 147.}

The following corrections should be made in the above footnotes, on p. 399:

1. Add, at the end of footnote 9: The class of literature known as the Upapurāṇa will be discussed in an Appendix to Chapter XIII—Religion.

2. The footnote marked 11 should be read as footnote 10.

3. For the footnote 11 substitute the following: