

DS
401
.G79
v.12
no.2

B 1,021,483

JOURNAL OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY
VOL. XII
1945
NO. 2



Digitized by

Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

~~\$4.00~~

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. XII

JULY, 1945

No. 2

EDITED BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

CONTENTS

Articles :

Indology in Russia (G. N. Roerich) 69
Mainamati and Lalmai Finds and the Kingdom of Paṭṭikerā (T. N. Ramachandran) 99
Linguistic Medium of the Savāstivāda School— An Introduction (Anukul Chandra Banerjee) 102
Reviews of Books : 106

Endowment of Chinese Cultural Scholarships by the Government of China at the Calcutta University : 112
Progress of Indological Scholarship in France : 112
Learned Societies in France : 114
Exhibition of Afghanistan antiquities at the Calcutta University : 114
Editorial Notes : 116
Select Contents of Oriental Journals : 118

Published by—

THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY, CALCUTTA

Agents outside India—

Messrs. LUZAC & CO., 46, Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1.

• *Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s. 6d., including postage*

Greater India Society (Established 1927)

Aims and Objects

1. To organise the study of Indian Culture in Greater India (i.e. Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia) as well as in China, Korea, Japan and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges, and Universities of India by instituting a systematic study of those subjects and to take proper steps to stimulate the same.
4. To popularise the knowledge of Greater India by organising meetings, lantern lectures, exhibitions and conferences.

Membership Rules

1. The annual subscription payable by members is Rs. 12/- only. Members are entitled to receive the publications of the Society at concession rates and copies of the Journal of the Society free of cost.
2. Resident members may have access to the Society's collection of books, pamphlets and periodicals etc. on application either to the Honorary Secretary of the Society or the Librarian, Calcutta University. The Society's collection is housed, by arrangement with the Calcutta University authorities, in the University Library.

Officers and Members of the Managing Committee, Greater India Society, 1945

President—Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookerjee, M.A., D.Litt. Bar-at-Law.

Vice-Presidents—Rao Bahadur K.N. Dikshit, M.A., O.C. Gangoly, Esq.,

Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, D.Litt.

Hony. Secretary—Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.

Hony. Jt. Secretary—Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A., D.Litt. (Paris.)

Other Members of the Committee—Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D.; Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, M.A., D.Litt. (Lond.); Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, M.A., D.Litt. (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (London.); Mm. Vidhushekara Bhattacharyya; Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (Leiden); Dr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D.; T. N. Ramachandran, Esq., M.A.; Dr. B. C. Law, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

Published twice a year, in January and July. Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d.—inclusive of postage. Volumes I-XI already published.

1140442-234

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Subscribers are respectfully reminded that their subscriptions to the J. G. I. S. for vol. xii cease with this number. They are therefore earnestly requested to remit their subscriptions for vol. xiii at an early date to the undersigned.

35, Badurbagan Row,
Calcutta,

Manager,
Greater India Society.

... widely read in ancient Russia were the "Acts of St. Thomas in India", an apocryphal version translated from the Greek. Well-known was the "Legend of the Kingdom of India", which became popular in Russia since the XIII-th century, and preserved its popularity among the Russian peasant masses till the XIX-th century. The "Legend" gives a description of the tropical nature of India, its inhabitants, fabulous riches and an account of the country's theocratic ruler. To the same cycle of legends belongs the Legend about the fabulous kingdom of Belovodye (lit. "White Water"), said to be inhabited by Christians, which became popular among the Russian Old Believers in the XVII-th century. Throughout the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries bands of Old Believers went in search of it, visiting

DS
401
. G74
v.12
no 2

Greater India Society (Established 1927)

Aims and Objects

1. To organise the study of Indian Culture in Greater India (*i.e.* Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia) as well as in China, Korea, Japan and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges, and universities of India and abroad, and to promote a scientific study of those subjects

Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, M.A., D.Litt. (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (London.); Mm. Vidhu-sekhara Bhattacharyya; Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (Leiden); Dr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D.; T. N. Ramachandran, Esq., M.A.; Dr. B. C. Law, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

Published twice a year, in January and July. Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d.—inclusive of postage. Volumes I-XI already published.

1140440-234

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. XII

JULY, 1945

No. 2

Indology in Russia

G. N. ROERICH

Early Indo-Russian cultural relations remain shrouded by an impenetrable veil. Our information is exceedingly scanty and for some of the periods non-existent. Stray finds of Buddhist images in the burials of the South Russian steppes attest the presence in the pre-Mongol period of nomad tribes, probably of Central Asian Turkish origin, professing Buddhism. We have little information about cultural contacts prior to the XV-th century. India for a long time remained a favourite theme of fables and tales, many of which belonged to the so-called Alexander Cycle, and had penetrated into Russia through Byzantium, Irān and the Arab World. Thus in the Russian Primary Chronicle (XIth cent. A. D.) mention is made of the "rakhmans -pious men" (PSRL, I, 6; V, 85). Under 1352 A. D. the Novgorod Chronicle (PSRL, IV, 61) speaking about the "black death" (plague), adds that "this pestilence came from the Indian countries, from the City of the Sun". Widely read in ancient Russia were the "Acts of St. Thomas in India", an apocryphal version translated from the Greek. Well-known was the "Legend of the Kingdom of India", which became popular in Russia since the XIII-th century, and preserved its popularity among the Russian peasant masses till the XIX-th century. The "Legend" gives a description of the tropical nature of India, its inhabitants, fabulous riches and an account of the country's theocratic ruler. To the same cycle of legends belongs the Legend about the fabulous kingdom of Belovodye (lit. "White Water"), said to be inhabited by Christians, which became popular among the Russian Old Believers in the XVII-th century. Throughout the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries bands of Old Believers went in search of it, visiting

Eastern Turkestan, Mongolia, Tibet, and even India and Indo-China.¹ To the XIIIth century belongs the Russian version of the "Story of Alexander's conquest in India" (the so-called "Alexandriya").² Mention should also be made of the "Story of Barlaam and Joasaph, the Indians", the famous Christian Life of Buddha.³ In the XVth century Russia obtained first-hand information about India and the Indian peoples. In 1466 A. D. Athanasius Nikitin, a merchant from Tver, joined the embassy sent by Ivan III to Shirwān. Nikitin after visiting Shirwān, continued his journey and sailed across the Caspian to Māzandarān, from where he visited Rayy, Kāshān and Yazd. While in Persia, he heard about the profitable Indian trade, and decided to visit India. He embarked at Ormuz, and sailed for India, where he first disembarked at Diu and then at Chaul. After spending some time at Bīdar, Nikitin made a tour of the Bahmanī dominions. He returned to Russia through Persia and Trebizond, his journey having lasted about six years (1466-1472). Nikitin died in Smolensk, and though his journey was barren of results, his unfinished diary is still a valuable source of information, and compares favourably, in the opinion of Professor Minayev, with that of Nicolo Conti. In the XVIth century Russia's knowledge of India was still scanty, and when in 1532 Khwāja Husain, an envoy of Sultan Bābur, arrived in Moscow, the authorities in the Russian capital hesitated to conclude a treaty, and suggested a trade agreement. In 1676/7 Muhammad Yūsuf Kasimov, a Russian Tartar, came to Kābul and intended going to Delhi, but failed to obtain the necessary permit. In 1695, in the reign of Peter the Great, a Russian merchant Semen Malinkov was deputed to visit India. He travelled through Persia and in 1696 disembarked at Surat. Malinkov visited Agra and Delhi, and was received by Emperor Aurangzeb. On his return journey, he revisited Persia, but died at Shirwān, without leaving behind any notes on his journey. Inspite of the failure of these repeated attempts at establishing direct trade relations with India, many in Russia must have possessed direct information about India from Indian traders and artisans, who resided in Russia in the XVIIth century. In the XVIIth century an Indian

1 "Bukhtarminskiye Staroobryadtsi", Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Leningrad, 1930, pp. 36 ff. G. T. Khokhlov, "Puteshestviye ural'skikh kazakov v Belovodskoye tsarstvo", Imp. Russian Geographical Society. St. Petersburg, 1903.

2 M. N. Speransky. "Indiya v staroy russkoy pis'mennosti", "Symposium in honour of S. F. Oldenburg", Leningrad, 1934, pp. 465 ff.

3 P. Alfārīch: "La Vie Chrétienne du Buddha", J. As. X, pp. 269-288. *Les Ecritures Manichéennes*, II, pp. 216 ff.

colony was established in Astrakhan on the Volga estuary, and Indian traders sailed up the Volga to Yaroslav and Tver. A local Astrakhan chronicle⁴ says that the first traders from Armenia, Persia and India came to Astrakhan about 1615/6 in the reign of the Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich. The same chronicle adds that in 1625 a caravanserai for Indian traders was built in Astrakhan by order of the Russian voevoda Prince Semen Prozorovsky. The Indian colony consisted of traders, artisans (metal workers and weavers) and occasional sādhus, who must have come to Astrakhan from Bākū, the city's Fire Temple being known to Indian sādhus as Baṛī Jvālāmukhī, and which till recently was a well-known place of pilgrimage.⁵ In the "Memorandum Book" of the Secret Chancery we read under 1665 about the despatch to Astrakhan of a messenger with a letter addressed to the voevoda Prince Odoevsky instructing him to send to Moscow "Indian artisans". In the same year Prince Odoevsky was commissioned to depute to India an Astrakhan trader to invite Indian weavers to come to Moscow.⁶ From legal documents preserved in the Astrakhan Provincial Archives, and studied by Professor Pal'mov, it appears that some of the Indian traders could speak Russian, and even read and write (Pal'mov, *ibid.* p. 172). The Astrakhan Archives contain information on the arrival in Astrakhan of "Indian religious men."⁷ Many of the Indians settled in the region, married and became subjects of the Russian Tsar. George Foster, who undertook in 1782-4 an overland journey from Bengal to England, speaks in his "*Travels*" (p.303) about a "small society of Hindoos" in Astrakhan: "The Hindoos also enjoy at Astracan very fair indulgence; nor could they in the most celebrated places of worship in India, perform their rites with more freedom. They are not stationary residents, nor do they keep any of their females in this city; but after accumulating a certain property they return to India, and are succeeded by other adventurers. Being a mercantile sect of their nation, and occupied in a desultory species of traffic, they have neglected to preserve any record of their first settlement, and subsequent progress in this quarter of Russia; nor is the fact ascertained with any accuracy by the natives of Astracan. In the karavansara allotted to them, which is

4 N. N. Pal'mov: "Astrakhanskiye Arkhivi", *Zapiski Instituta Vosto-kovedeniya*, II, 4. Leningrad, 1934, pp. 162-182.

5 According to Professor V. V. Barthold, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, p. 609, fire-worship was introduced into Bākū in the XVIII-th century by Indians and Indian Parsees. The other Jvālāmukhī is situated in Kāngra.

6 Pal'mov, *ibid.* p. 164 ff.

7 Pal'mov, *ibid.* p. 180 ff.

commodious and detached, they make their ablutions and offer up their prayers, without attracting even the curiosity of the Christians; and they do not fail to gratefully contrast so temperate a conduct with that of Persia, where their religion, persons and prosperity, are equally exposed to the attacks of bigotry and avarice."⁸

In the middle of the eighteenth century the famous Russian scientist Mikhail Lomonosov was instrumental in organizing the first Polar expedition to Spitzbergen which had as its object the finding of a sea passage to India.

The first Russian translation of Sanskrit text was the translation of the *Bhagavad-Gītā* published in 1787 by the eminent Russian Rosicrucian and publisher N. I. Novikov. The Russian translation did not represent a direct translation from the original Sanskrit, but a Russian rendering of the English translation by Ch. Wilkins (London, 1785).

At the end of the eighteenth century a Russian musician Gerasim Lebedev came to England on the staff of the Russian Embassy. After a stay in England, he embarked for India, and spent there twelve years (1785-1797), working as a clerk at Fort William. His rôle in the renaissance of the Bengali theatre is well-known. He founded a theatre in Calcutta which performed plays written by Lebedev himself in Bengali, as well as plays by European dramatists which Lebedev translated. He applied himself to the study of Sanskrit, and on his return to England, published in 1801 his "*Grammar of Pure and Mixed East Indian Dialects with Dialogues*". On his return to Russia, he cast the first Devanāgarī type in St. Petersburg by command of the Emperor Alexander I. In 1805 he published in Russian a survey of the religious and philosophical systems of India, entitled "*An impartial survey of the systems of Brahmanical East India*" ("*Bespristrastnoye sozertsaniye sistem vostochnoy Indii bramgenov*").

The beginning of Sanskrit studies in Russia is closely linked with the name of Count S. S. Uvarov. In 1810 this enlightened statesman, while serving on the staff of the Russian Embassy in Paris, drafted with the assistance of Klaproth a Memorandum on the founding of an Asiatic Academy in St. Petersburg ("Project d'une Académie Asiatique"), the programme of which was to include the teaching of Sanskrit. When later Count Uvarov became Minister of Public Instruction and President of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, he began to carry out his project. One of his first tasks was to establish

⁸ D. B. Diskalkar, "Hindus in Afghanistan, Persia and Russia in 1783", *Journal of the Greater India Society*, vol. IV, fasc. 2 (July, 1937), p. 148 ff.

a chair for the teaching of Sanskrit in St. Petersburg. Great difficulties had to be overcome, for Sanskrit scholars were not to be found in Russia, and young scholars had to be trained to enable them to occupy the chair of Sanskrit. Count Uvarov selected Robert Lenz (b. 1808-d. 1836), a student in the University of Yuryev. Lenz was sent to Germany to study Sanskrit under the famous Franz Bopp in Berlin. While in Berlin, Lenz published in 1833 the first critical edition of Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvāsi-Urvāsia fabula Cālidasi*", with a Latin translation of the text after the Calcutta edition of 1830. This was followed in 1834 by "Apparatus criticus ad Urvāsiam", Berlin. After completing his studies in Berlin, Lenz went to Oxford and London, where he met E. Burnouf. He returned to Russia in 1835 and was appointed adjunct of the Academy of Sciences, and Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology. He did not however succeed in establishing a school of Russian Indologists, and died in 1836.

The work of Lenz was continued in Kazan and Moscow by Professor Pavel Yakovlevich Petrov (d. 1876), the teacher of a number of Russian philologists and linguists, and among them Professor F. Korsch, F. F. Fortunatov and V. F. Miller. Pavel Petrov after graduating from the Moscow University in 1832, continued his studies of Oriental languages, both in Moscow and St. Petersburg, where he studied Sanskrit with Lenz. In 1836 Petrov published a translation into Russian of the *Sitāharāṇa* episode of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Book III), with a glossary and a grammatical analysis. This work was recommended by the academician Ch. D. Fraehn (1732-1861) to Count S. S. Uvarov. Fraehn suggested that the young scholar should be sent abroad to continue his Sanskrit studies. Petrov was accordingly given a scholarship and sent to Berlin to pursue his studies of Sanskrit with Fr. Bopp. The latter suggested to Petrov to proceed to England, where facilities for the study of Sanskrit were greater than in Berlin, and where he could avail himself of the large collections of Sanskrit MSS in Oxford and London. Petrov's trip to England did not materialize, though he was able to spend some time in Paris and examine the local collections of Indian MSS. In 1841 Petrov returned to Russia, and was appointed to the chair of Sanskrit at the Kazan University, one of the oldest seats of Oriental learning in Russia. Between 1852 and 1875 Professor Petrov occupied the chair of Sanskrit at the University of Moscow, and greatly fostered the study of Sanskrit in Russia. His interests were many. Besides the ancient Indian epics, he was interested in Sanskrit drama, proposed to translate Kalhana's,

Rājatarangiṇī, and even study the spoken languages of India, as well as Avestan.

In St. Petersburg the teaching of Sanskrit was continued by Professor C. Kossowicz, the author of a well-known book on ancient Persian inscriptions—"Inscriptiones Palaeo-Persicae Achaemenidarum". Petropoli, 1872. In 1846 he published in the periodical "Sovremennik" ("The Contemporary") a translation into Russian of the three acts of Kṛṣṇamīśra's *Prabodhacandrodaya*, which was followed by a translation of the whole drama published in 1847 in the "Moskovskiy Sbornik" (Moscow Symposium"). In 1849 Professor Kossowicz published in the periodical "Moskvityanin" (The Moscovite) his translation of the *Mṛcchakaṭikā*.

From the very beginning of Sanskrit studies in Russia, the study of the classical language of ancient India was closely linked with the study of Buddhism, specially its later phase—the *Mahāyāna*. All along the Asiatic borders of Russia, the Russian Empire was in daily contact with powerful and warlike Mongol tribes, professing Buddhism, and the importance of the study of the Mongol language and Tibetan was early recognized. Most of the Russian Mongolists were attracted to the study of Buddhism, a tendency which was strongly pronounced in the valuable scientific work done by the Russian Orthodox Mission in Peking, which was started in 1716, and officially recognized by the Treaty of Kyakhta in 1728. The first authentic information on Buddhism was obtained by the Russian academician Pallas, who in his "Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten ueber die Mongolischen Voelkerschaften", II. St. Petersburg, 1801, gave an excellent account of Buddhist cosmogony, mythology, iconography and hierarchy, as well as the contents of several Buddhist texts in Mongol and a Biography of Buddha. A short life of Buddha was given by the Russian traveller Timkovsky ("Puteshestviye v Kitay, cherez Mongoliyu v 1820 i 1821 godakh"). St. Petersburg, 1824, vol. II, pp. 409-433).

The first half of the XIX-th century saw the appearance of a number of eminent scholars in the fields of Indology and Buddhology, and the allied fields of Sinology and Tibetology. Rev. Hyazinth Bichurin, the Father of Russian Sinology, left a number of important works on the history and geography of China, Tibet, Turkestan and Mongolia. In this field he was a forerunner of Bushell, Ed. Chavannes and W. W. Rockhill. Among his works on the history and geography of Central Asia, we shall mention his valuable "*Istoriya Tibeta i Khukhunora*" ("The History of Tibet and Kukunür"), 2 volumes, St. Petersburg, 1833, containing translations of

the chapters of the Chinese Dynastic Annals relating to Tibet and the Tangut (Hsi-Hsia) kingdom, and excerpts from the T'ung-chien kang-mu; his "*Istoriya o narodakh obitavshikh v Sredney Asii*" ("History of Central Asian tribes"), 3 volumes, St. Petersburg, 1851, containing translations of the Chinese Dynastic Annals; his "*Opisaniye Tibeta*" ("Description of Tibet"), St. Petersburg, 1828) and the valuable "*Opisaniye Jungarii i Vostochnago Turkestana*" ("Description of Jungaria and East Turkestan"). St. Petersburg, 1829). Towards the end of his life Bichurin began the study of Mongol, and published two articles on Buddhism—"The Exposition of Buddhist Religion" (*Russkiy Vestnik*, No. 3. St. Petersburg 1841) and "Buddhist Mythology" (*Russkiy Vestnik*, No. 7, pp. 136-160).⁹

In 1800 Isaac Jacob Schmidt (1779-1847) came to Sarepta from Amsterdam to become a member of the local Moravian Mission. He was placed in charge of the trading activities of his Mission, and in his capacity of trade agent made several trips to the camps of Kalmuck princes in the steppe country of the lower Volga (between 1804 and 1806). Having become a Russian subject (Yakov Ivanovich Schmidt), he applied himself to the study of Mongol and Tibetan. In 1829 he was elected Member of the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences. The Russian Academy of Sciences was already in possession of a large collection of Oriental MSS and books. To house this collection the Asiatic Museum was founded in 1818.¹⁰ The Tibetan collection of the Academy of Sciences was considerably enriched by the acquisition of the large collection of Tibetan MSS and xylographs made by Baron P. L. Schilling von Canstadt in 1830 in Buryat-Mongolia.¹¹ This collection included a number of MSS indexes of the *bKa'*gyur and *bsTan-'gyur*, prepared* by Buryat lamas under the supervision of Baron Schilling von Canstadt. In 1845 one of these indexes was edited by Schmidt ("*Index des Kandjur*". St. Petersburg, 1845). Besides several important works in the Mongol field, Schmidt wrote a number of essays on Buddhism. In the *Mémoires de l'Académie de St. Petersburg* we find his "*Ueber einige grundlehren des Buddhismus*". In 1834 he published an article entitled "*Ueber die*

9 S. A. Kozin: "*Ueber die unveröffentlichen Arbeiten d. H. Bitschurin*", *Monumenta Serica*, III (1938), pp. 628-44.

10 Ch. D. Fraehn, *Vorlaeufiger Bericht*, St. Petersburg, 1819.

11 A part of Schilling von Canstadt's collection is preserved in the Library of the Institute in Paris. See J. Bacot, "*La collection tibétaine Schilling von Canstadt à la bibliothèque de l'Institut*, *J. As.* 1924, pp. 321-349.

sogenannte dritte Welt der Buddhaisten", and "Ueber das Mahājāna und Pradschnāpāramitā der Buddhen" (*Mémoires de l'Académie*, vols. III and IV. 1815-37). In 1846 he prepared in collaboration with O. N. Boehtingk (1815-1904) a Catalogue of Tibetan xylographs in the collection of the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences. Mention must also be made of Schmidt's "Tibetan Grammar" (St. Petersburg, 1839), and his "Tibetan-Russian Dictionary" (St. Petersburg, 1843), both of which were largely based on A. Csoma de Kó'r's "Tibetan Grammar" and "Tibetan-English Dictionary"¹²

The great Russian Mongolist Osip Mikhyalovich Kowalewsky belongs to the same period. In 1824 he was sent to Kazan to study Oriental languages, from where he proceeded in 1830 to Buryat-Mongolia and Peking, where he continued his studies with Mongol and Tibetan lamas residing in the Lamaist monasteries of the Chinese capital. His great "*Dictionnaire Mongol-russe-français*" in three volumes (Kazan, 1844-46-49),¹³ based on the polyglot dictionaries printed in Peking, gives the Sanskrit and Tibetan equivalents of many Mongol words and philosophical terms. His "*Mongol Chrestomathy*" in two volumes (Kazan, 1836-7) includes a number of Buddhist texts accompanied by commentaries.¹⁴ In 1833 on his return to Russia, Kowalewsky was appointed to the chair of Mongol at the University of Kazan. In 1855 the chair of Mongol was transferred from Kazan to St. Petersburg, and was entrusted to Professor Golstunsky.

In 1844 the Asiatic Society of Bengal presented the Russian Emperor with fourteen rare books in Arabic, Sanskrit and Tibetan, which were later deposited in the Asiatic Museum.

A pupil of Kowalewsky was the great Russian Buddhologist Vasiliy Pavlovich Vasilyev (1818-1900). In 1840 Vasilyev was sent to the Russian Orthodox Mission in Peking for the study of Chinese and Tibetan languages, and spent there ten years, till 1850. In Peking he was able to study Tibetan and Tibetan exegetical literature with Tibetan and Mongol lamas, and lay the foundation of his extraordinary wide knowledge of Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhist texts. Although not a Sanskritist, his publications include a number of works on Buddhological subjects. It is a matter of deep regret that the greater part of his works in the field of Tibetology remains un-

12 A Grammar of the Tibetan Language. Calcutta, 1834. Essay towards a Dictionary, Tibetan and English. Calcutta, 1834.

13 Kowalewsky's Dictionary was reproduced by Henri Vetch, Peking, in 1934.

14 The same is true of A. Popov's "*Mongol Chrestomathy*", Kazan, 1834.

published, being preserved in the Archives of the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences,¹⁵ and among them a "Tibetan-Russian Dictionary" and a *Tibetan Grammar*. Vasilyev's great work on Buddhism, which earned him world-wide fame, has been translated into French and German (V. P. Vasilyev: "Buddizm; ego dogmati, istoriya i literatura", vols. I-III, St. Petersburg, 1857-69; "Der Buddhismus; seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur". St. Petersburg, 1860. A French translation by Comme, Paris, 1865). The third volume of his "Buddhism" contains his Russian translation of Tāranātha's *rGya-gar čhos'-byun*, or "*History of the Buddhist Doctrine in India*". Important for the study of Tibetan literature is Vasilyev's article "Die auf den Buddhismus bezueglichen Werke der Universitaets-Bibliothek zu Kasan" (*Mélanges Asiatiques*, II, St. Petersburg, 1855, pp. 347-386). In 1895 Vasilyev published the chapters on Tibet and India from the large "*Universal Geography*" or '*jam-glin rgyas-bśad* by the bTsan-po Nom-un qan bsTan-'dzin čhos-kyi Ni-ma, also known by the title of Minjul qutuztu (Vasilyev; "*Geografiya Tibeta*", St. Petersburg, 1895).

Y. I. Schmidt's place in the Academy of Sciences was taken by the Indologist and Tibetologist A. A. Schiefner (1817-1879), who became a Member of the Academy in 1854. A. A. Schiefner published a number of essays on Tibetan Grammar and Lexicography. He also edited several Tibetan texts and Catalogues of the rapidly growing Tibetan Collection of the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences. Thus in 1859 he edited a vocabulary of Buddhist terms in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Mongol ("*Buddhistische Triglotte d. h. Sanskrit-Tibetisch-Mongolisches Woerterverzeichniss*". St. Petersburg), brought back by Schilling von Canstadt, and representing an abridged edition of the well-known Buddhist polyglot dictionary. In 1868 he edited the Tibetan text of the *rGya-gar čhos'byun* by Tāranātha (1575-1635), which was followed by a translation of the chronicle in 1869 ("*Tāranātha's "Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien"*". St. Petersburg, 1869).¹⁶ Schiefner was interested in Buddhist folklore literature, and his collection of Buddhist fables and

15 M. I. Tubiansky, "Preliminary report on the MS legacy of V. P. Vasilyev and V. V. Gorsky", DAN, 1927, p. 64. S. A. Kozin, "Bibliographical survey of the published and unpublished works of the Academician V. P. Vasilyev", IzAN, 1931, pp. 759-774, A. I. Vostrikov, "S. F. Oldenburg and the study of Tibet", *Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, IV (1935), p. 69.

16 Schiefner's German translation follows closely on the Russian translation by Professor V. P. Vasilyev, which appeared in 1869.

tales appeared in London ("Tibetan Tales derived from Indian Sources", London, 1906).

The growth of the St. Petersburg school of Indology is made apparent by the compilation of the monumental "St. Petersburg Sanskrit Dictionary" in seven volumes, published by the Academy of Sciences between 1855 and 1875, and compiled by O. N. Boehltingk (1815-1904) and the great Vedic scholar Rudolf Roth. O. N. Boehltingk also published an abridged edition of the same Dictionary between 1879 and 1889, which was likewise published by the Academy of Sciences ("Sanskrit Voerterbuch in kuerzerer Fassung", in seven parts. St. Petersburg, 1879-89. This Dictionary was reprinted by Messrs Markert and Petters, Leipzig, in 1923-25),

To the same period belongs the eminent Russian Sinologist, the Archimandrite Palladius Kafarov, who headed the Russian Orthodox Mission in Peking in 1849-59, and again in 1864, author of the Chinese-Russian Dictionary in two volumes, invaluable for the study of Chinese Buddhist texts. The Memoirs of the Russian Orthodox Mission contain two of his articles on Buddhism—"Life of Buddha" ("Zhizneopisaniye Buddi"), *Trudi clenov Ross. Dukhovnoy Missii*, I. Peking, 1909, pp. 222 ff. & "Istoricheskiy ocherk drevnego Buddizma", *Trudi*, II, pp. 57-99.

Professor C. Kossowicz was succeeded at the University of St. Petersburg by the great Russian Indologist and Buddhist scholar Professor Ivan Pavlovich Minayev (1840-1890).¹⁷ Professor Minayev began his Sanskrit studies with Professor Kossowicz, and at the same time attended the Chinese classes given by Professor V. P. Vasilyev, from whom he inherited a deep interest in Buddhism. After graduating from the University of St. Petersburg, Minayev spent six years abroad, studying under Fr. Bopp, Steinthal, Weber and Benfey. He resided in Paris and London, and pursued his studies at the Bibliothèque Nationale and the British Museum. On his return to Russia, he was appointed to the chair of Sanskrit at the University of St. Petersburg in 1869. In the same year he published his *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*. This was followed by his Pāli Grammar ("Ocherk fonetiki i morfologii yazika Pāli", St. Petersburg, 1872). This work was translated into English ("Pāli Grammar, London. 1882) and French ("Grammaire Pāli", Paris. 1874). In 1874/5 Professor Minayev made his first journey to India, and made

17 A short biographical sketch of Prof. Minayev by Miss A. Schneider appeared in the *Indian Hist. Quarterly*, vol. X fasc. 4 (Dec. 1934). pp. 811-826.

a prolonged stay in Ceylon, after which he visited Bihār, the Nepalese borderland, and Almora in the Himalayas. His impressions were vividly told in his "Sketches of Ceylon and India" in two volumes, St. Petersburg, 1878. Besides pursuing his Buddhist studies, Professor Minayev collected folktales and his collection of popular tales was subsequently published in a volume entitled "Indian Tales", containing 47 tales and 25 legends collected in Kumaon (St. Petersburg, 1875).

In 1880 Professor Minayev visited India for a second time. This time he travelled through Hyderābād, where he visited the cave-temples of Ajanṭā and Ellora, and then went on to Golkonda, Lahore and Delhi. In 1886 he again revisited India, and this time he spent some time in Darjeeling, and journeyed to Burma and Mandalay. His planned fourth overland journey to India through Afghaniṣṭān did not take place. The greater part of Professor Minayev's published works deals with Buddhism. In his "Buddhism. Izsledovaniya i materyal'nyi (vol. I, fasc. 1 and 2. St. Petersburg, 1887), he questioned the authenticity of the Pāli Canon, and upheld the antiquity of the Northern tradition (this work was translated into French and published in the *Annales du Musée Guimet*: "Recherches sur le Bouddhisme". *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'études*, vol. IV. Paris, 1894). The second fascicle of the work contains Minayev's edition of the *Mahāvyutpatti* (a second edition of Minayev's *Mahāvyutpatti* was prepared by Professor N. P. Mironov and published in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, vol. XIII), and the *Mañjuśrī-nāmasaṅgīti*. The Sanskrit texts edited by Professor Minayev include the *Śiṣyalekha-dharma-kāvya* of Candragomin (*Zapiski* of the Oriental Section of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, IV, 1889, pp. 29-52), the *Suprabhātastotra*, a hymn in praise of Buddha (*Zapiski*, II, fasc. 3, pp. 236 ff.) and the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* by Śāntideva (*Zapiski*, IV, 1889, pp. 153-228; a second edition appeared in 1890 edited by Professor S. F. Oldenburg). Among the Pāli texts edited by Professor Minayev, we find: the *Chakesadhātuvarṣa* (*JPTS*, 1885, pp. 5-46), the *Gandhavarṣa* (*JPTS*, 1886, pp. 54-80), the *Anāgatavarṣa* (*JPTS*, 1886, pp. 33-53), the *Simāvivāda-vinicchaya-kaṭhā* (*JPTS*, 1887, pp. 17-34), the *Kathāvatthuppaṭṭakarana-āṭṭhakathā* (*JPTS*, 1889, pp. 1-199). Throughout his journeys in India and Ceylon, Professor Minayev had collected an extensive collection of Indian MSS, a catalogue of which has been compiled and edited by Professor N. P. Mironov in 1918. Besides his interest in Buddhist India, Professor Minayev was deeply interested in the historical geography of the Indian borderland and Central Asia. Thus in 1878 he published a monograph entitled "Description

of the countries of the Upper Amu-daryā". St. Petersburg, and in 1881 gave a commentary on the "Travel beyond the Three Seas" of Athanasius Nikitin ("Old India", St. Petersburg, 1881). Professor Minayev also published an edition of Marco Polo accompanied by his commentary (posthumously edited by Professor V. V. Barthold. St. Petersburg, 1891). Throughout his scientific career Professor Minayev stressed the importance of the study of contemporary India and of the living languages of India. Thus he collected materials for a Newārī Dictionary which were later edited by A. Conrady ("A Sanskrit-Newārī Dictionary", from the writings of the late I. P. Minayeff, prepared for print by Aug. Conrady, ZDMG, vol. 47, pp. 539-573). His views on the problem were defined in his well-known speech at the Annual Convocation of the University of St. Petersburg in 1884 ("The study of India in Russian Universities"). Professor Minayev died at the early age of 49, leaving many of his works unfinished. His work and traditions were continued by a band of brilliant pupils. In 1879 Alexey Putyata, a pupil of Professor Minayev, published a translation of Kālidāsa's *Sakuntalā*. In the second half of the XIX-th century and the beginning of the present, Indology made rapid progress in Russia, thanks to the labours of a number of brilliant scholars, among whom we find Professor S. F. Oldenburg, Fedor I. Stcherbatkoy (often written Stcherbatsky), Baron A. D. von Staël-Holstein, N. D. Mironov, D. Kudryavsky, V. F. Miller, Fedor I. Knauer and others. In 1890 the study of Sanskrit was made obligatory for students of the Slavic and Classical Departments of the historical-philological faculties of Russian Universities. To meet the growing demand for text-books on Sanskrit, Professor V. F. Miller and F. I. Knauer published a Sanskrit Manual ("Rukovodstvo k izucheniju Sanskrita", St. Petersburg, 1891), and Professor D. Kudryavsky a Sanskrit Reader with Grammar (Yuryev, 1903).¹⁸

To Professor Sergev Fedorovich Oldenburg (1863-1934) belongs the merit of being not only an eminent Indologist, but also the inspirer and organizer of Oriental research in Russia. A pupil of Professor Minayev, S. F. Oldenburg was like his teacher attracted to Buddhism, and distinguished himself in the fields of Buddhist Art, archaeology and folklore. After completing his studies at the University of St. Petersburg, where he attended lectures by Professor

18 Other works by Prof. Kudryavsky: "Izsledovaniya v oblasti drevne-indiyskikh domashnikh obryadov". Yuryev, 1904 ("Researches in the domain of ancient Hindu domestic rites"); "Hitopadeśa-dobroye nastavleniye. Sbornik drevne-Indiyskikh razskazov". Yuryev, 1908.

Minayev and V. P. Vasilyev, Oldenburg was sent abroad and spent three years in Germany, France and England. His first work was devoted to the Indian folklore, in which he analysed the contents of two Buddhist collections of edifying tales—the *Bhadraṅkalpāvadāna* and the *Jātakamālā* ("Buddiyskiye Legendy". I. *Bhadraṅkalpāvadāna*, *Jātakamālā*, St. Petersburg, 1896). The problem of Indian folklore was the subject of numerous articles published by him in the *Zapiski* of the Oriental Section of the Russian Archaeological Society, and other Russian periodicals. He was early attracted to the study of Buddhist Art and identified some of the scenes on the famous Bharhut stūpa and many of the sculptures of Barabudur in Java ("Notes on Buddhist Art", *Zametki o budd. iskusstve. O nekotorikh skulpturnikh i zhivopisnikh izobrazheniyakh budd. Jātak. Vostochnye Zametki*, St. Petersburg, 1895). Professor Oldenburg was also interested in the great Indian epic—the *Mahābhārata*. His studies in this field did not form the subject of a large work, except for a short article on the *Mahābhārata* in Buddhist literature (*Zapiski*, X (1897), p. 195 ff), which was later printed in the *Revue de l' Histoire des Religions*.

One of his greatest achievements, which earned the Russian Academy of Sciences a well-deserved honour, was the founding in 1897 of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, a series devoted to the publication of Buddhist texts and monographs on Buddhist subjects. The series comprises thirty volumes (up-to 1937), and it is hoped that with the end of the War its publication will be resumed by the Academy. Perhaps his greatest contribution to Oriental learning was his archeological exploration of Eastern Turkestān, and his participation in the organization of Russian scientific exploration of Central Asia. Russian explorers were the first to report the existence of extensive ruined sites on the northern and southern fringes of the Taklamakan desert. The great Russian explorer of Central Asia N. M. Przhevalsky in the account of his Fourth Central Asian Expedition (N. M. Przhevalsky: "Ot Kyakhtī na istoki Zheltoy Reki", St. Petersburg, 1888, pp. 353 ff., 356, 365 ff) described ruined sites in the vicinity of Charchan-daryā. Professor Minayev in his review of Przhevalsky's book (*Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction*, vol. 264, pp. 168-189) stressed the importance of archaeological exploration along the ancient caravan route from Khotan to Lob-nür. The botanist Regel, who visited Eastern Turkestān in 1879, was the first to report on the existence of ruined cities in the Turfān oasis. In 1889-90 the brothers G. and N. Grum-Grzhimaylo visited Turfān and gave a detailed account of the ruins of Idikut-shahri, mentioned the Buddhist cave temples of Sengim-

aghīz and the ruined Buddhist temple near Lukchun ("Opisaniye puteshestviya v Zapadnyi Kitay", vol. I. St. Petersburg, 1896). Further information on the ruined sites of Turfān was obtained by Capt. V. I. Roborovsky and Lt. P. K. Kozlov during their expedition of 1893-95. The explorers discovered the cave-temples of Toyuk-māzār and the ruins of Yār-khoto ("Trudí ekspeditsii Imp. Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva," vol. I. St. Petersburg, 1899). Professor K. I. Bogdanovich, a geologist attached to the Tibetan Expedition of General M. V. Pevtsov in 1889-90, also mentions ruined sites in the Tārim Basin (*Trudí Tibetskoy Ekspeditsii*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1892, pp. 151-160). In 1898 the Russian Academy of Sciences sent out an archaeological expedition headed by Dr. Dmitri A. Klementz to Turfān. The expedition investigated the ruins of Yār-khoto (W. of Turfān City), the ruins of some ancient temples situated East of the modern town of Turfān, the ruined sites of Idikut-shahrī, Astāna, Sengim-Aghīz, Murtuk, Toyuk-māzār. Surkhāb and the ruins of a Buddhist vihāra south of Lukchun. The scientific results of the expedition were published in a monograph entitled "*Turfān und seine Alterthuemer. Nachrichten ueber die von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1898 ausgeruestete Expedition nach Turfān.*" Fasc. I, St. Petersburg, 1899. Professor Oldenburg from the very beginning of the archaeological exploration became deeply interested in the antiquities and the MSS remains from Eastern Turkestān. In 1893 the Russian Academy of Sciences received from the Russian Consul-General in Kashghar N. F. Petrovsky a collection of MSS discovered in the sand-buried ruins south of the Taklamakan desert. Professor Oldenburg published a preliminary notice on a Prākrit MS of the Dharmapada, belonging to the Petrovsky Collection ("Predvāritel'naya zamečka o buddijskoy rukopisi, napisannoy pis'menami kharoṣṭhi," St. Petersburg, 1897). His large work on the subject, though ready for print, has not been published. Collections of antiquities and MSS from Eastern Turkestān have also been received from Monsieur N. N. Krotkov, the Russian Consul-General in Urumchi, the provincial capital. The general interest aroused by the archaeological discoveries of Eastern Turkestān led to the formation of an "*Association Internationale pour l'Exploration de l'Asie Centrale et de l'Extrême Orient*", proposed at the XII-th International Congress of Orientalists held in Rome in 1899. The Russian Section of the Association was established in 1903 under the chairmanship of Professor V. V. Radlov, the eminent Turkologist. Professor Oldenburg, as Vice-chairman of the Section, contrib-

buted greatly to its scientific activities and the despatch of scientific missions to Central Asia and the Far East. In 1900 he published a Notice on the organization of an archaeological expedition to Eastern Turkestan (*Zapiski* of the Oriental Section of the Russian Archaeological Society, vol. XIII (1900), p. ix ff.). Oldenburg also participated in the organization of the expeditions of P. K. Kozlov to Eastern Tibet in 1900-1, and Southern Mongolia and Amdo in 1906-8, during which the eminent Russian explorer made his remarkable discovery of the Tangut ruined city of Khara-khoto in the Etsin-gol basin. The excavation of this ruined site yielded a large collection of Tangut (Hsi-hsia) MSS. most of which contained Buddhist texts, written in the Hsi-hsia script, adopted since 1037 A.D. This unique discovery proved the existence of a literary Tangut language, akin to the dialects of the Tibetan North-East, into which most of the Buddhist Canon had been translated between the XII-th and XIV-th centuries A.D. The large collection of Buddhist paintings and drawings brought back by P. K. Kozlov from Khara-khoto, were studied by Professor Oldenburg in a special monograph, in which he stressed the importance of the finds for the history of Tibetan Art ("Matériaux pour l'iconographie bouddhique de Khāra-khoto", *Memoirs of the Ethnographic Section of the Russian Museum of the Emperor Alexander III*, II, Petrograd, 1914).

Professor Oldenburg was also instrumental in sending two Buryat-Mongol scholars mGon-po skyabs Tsibikov and Badzar Baradiyn to Central and North-Eastern Tibet (Amdo). Professor Tsibikov's expedition was organized by the Russian Geographical Society, and lasted three years (1899-1902), during which Tsibikov visited Central Tibet, and resided for some time in Lha-sa. The Preliminary Report of his expedition appeared in the *Journal of the Russian Geographical Society* (vol. XXXI, fasc. 3 (1903), pp. 187-227; an English translation of the above appeared in the Smithsonian Report for 1903, pp. 727-746. Washington, 1904). The Detailed Report of Professor Tsibikov's journey was published in a large volume by the Russian Geographical Society in 1919 ("Buddhist Palomnik u svyatín' Tibeta". Petrograd, 1919), and contains by far the best description of the temples and monastic establishments of Lha-sa, Tashi-lhun-po and bSam-yas. Badzar Baradiyn's journey in 1905-7 on behalf of the Russian Section of the International Association for the study of Central and Eastern Asia, covered Mongolia and North-East Tibet (Amdo), where he spent some time in the large monastery of bLa-bran bKra-sis 'khyil (founded in 1710). Professor Oldenburg gave a Preliminary Report on the journey in the *Bulletin of the Russian*

Section of the Association for the study of Central and Eastern Asia (No. 8, 1908, pp. 17-21). Baradiyn's Report was published in the *Journal of the Russian Geographical Society* (vol. XLIV, fasc. 4, 1908, pp. 183-232. See also Badzar Baradiyn : "Statuya Maitreyi v Zolotom khrame v Lavrane", *Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XXI, 1924).

In 1906-07 Professor Oldenburg participated in the organization of the archaeological expedition of N. M. and M. M. Berezovsky, who excavated and photographed a number of ruined sites in the district of Kucha.

In 1909-10 Professor Oldenburg headed a Russian Archaeological Expedition to Eastern Turkestan, during which he investigated the ruined sites in the neighbourhood of Shikchin in the Karashahr district, the Turfan oasis (Yār-khoto, Old Turfan, Idikut-shahri, Astāna, Sengim-agħiż, Bezeklik, Chikan-ko'l, Toyuk-māzār, and Sirkip), and Kuchā (Subāshi, Simsīm, Kīzīl-kargha, Kumtura and other localities). Oldenburg himself called this expedition—an "archaeological reconnaissance". Before leaving for Eastern Turkestan, Professor Oldenburg consulted Professor Gruenwedel, and determined with him the areas in which the Russian expedition was to work in order not to interfere with the work of the German expedition. However when Professor Oldenburg's expedition arrived in the field, the Russian scholars discovered that the sites allotted to the Russian expedition had been already excavated by the German expedition under von Le Coq.¹⁹ The results of the Russian expedition were published in a large volume entitled "*Russkaya Turkestanskaya Ekspeditsiya 1909-1910 goda*" (St. Petersburg, 1914). In 1913-14 Professor Oldenburg led a second archaeological expedition to Eastern Turkestan. The task of this second expedition was to explore and make a complete photographic survey of the famous cave-temples of Tun-huang in Western Kansu. The results of this expedition are deposited in the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad, but the Scientific Report has not been published.²⁰

Professor Oldenburg also participated in the building of the Buddhist Temple in St. Petersburg, which was solemnly consecrated in 1913. This temple, built in Tibetan style, was begun in 1910. The building was supervised by a Committee consisting of Professor V. V. Radlov,

19 F. I. Stcherbatsky, "S. F. Oldenburg kak indianist", *Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, IV (1935), p. 26. This volume dedicated to the memory of Professor Oldenburg contains several articles by Professor A. N. Samoylovich, I. Y. Krachkovsky, V. N. Alekseev and A. I. Vostrikov.

20 S. F. Oldenburg, "The caves of the Thousand Buddhas" (in Russian), "Vostok", I (1922), pp. 57-66.

chairman, mkhan-po cha-ma Nag-dbañ-Do-rje. Professor V. L. Kotwicz, Professor S. F. Oldenburg, Professor N. C. Roerich, Professor A. D. Rudnev, Professor F. I. Stcherbatsky, Miss Alexander Schneider and the architect Baranovsky. At the suggestion of Professor Stcherbatsky the Committee proposed to purchase in India a complete Indian temple and to rebuild it in St. Petersburg, but the first World-War put an end to these plans.

In 1916 Professor Oldenburg was appointed Director of the Asiatic Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences. In 1930, after the transfer of the Museum's collections to the newly created Oriental Institute of the new institution, and until his death in 1934 he acted as planner and organizer of Oriental Research in Soviet Russia. His manifold official duties prevented him from publishing some of his larger works. Most of his articles written between 1917 and 1934 represent reports on the organization of scientific explorations and Oriental research in general, a work with which he had selflessly identified himself. To this period belongs his article on the Gandhāra sculptures in the Hermitage Museum which appeared in the *Zapiski* of the College of Orientalists, vol. V (1930), pp. 145-186.

The death of Professor Fedor Ippolitovich Stcherbatsky (b. 1866) during the fateful winter of 1941 of the Leningrad seige, was a cruel loss to science. After graduating from the University of St. Petersburg, where he studied Sanskrit and Pāli with Professor Minayev and Oldenburg, Germanic under Professor F. A. Braun and Slavonic under Jagiō, Stcherbatsky proceeded to Vienna in 1888, and studied Sanskrit Poetics (*alampkāra*) with Buehler. These studies resulted in two monographs, one in German—"Ueber das *Haihayendracarita*", and one in Russian on the Indian Theory of Poetry—"Teoriya poezii v Indii" (St. Petersburg, 1899). In 1902, after attending the International Congress of Orientalists in Rome, Stcherbatsky went to Bonn, and read Indian Philosophy with Jacobi. From that date his interest centres on Indian Philosophy, and particularly on Buddhism. In 1903 Stcherbatsky published his first important work on Buddhist Logic and Epistemology—"Theory of Knowledge and Logic in the Doctrine of later Buddhists" ("Teoriya poznaniya i logika po ucheniyu pozdney-shikh buddistov", Part I, St. Petersburg, 1903; Part II, St. Petersburg, 1909). This fundamental work which contained a Russian translation of Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and its Commentary by Dharmottara, as well as an exposition of the stand of Buddhist Logic, appeared also in German ("Erkenntnistheorie und Logik nach der Lehre der spaeteren Buddhisten", Munich, 1924) and in French in the *Annales du Musée Guimet* ("La Theorie de la Connaissance et la Logique chez les

Bouddhistes Tardifs", Paris, 1926). In 1910-11 Professor Stcherbatsky made a long sojourn in India, studying Sanskrit with Indian pandits in Poona, as well as visiting Calcutta and Darjeeling, where he met the thirteenth Dalai Lama, then in exile. In 1918 Professor Stcherbatsky was elected Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences. His next important work was his monograph "*The Central Conception of Buddhism and the meaning of the word DHARMA*" (*Royal Asiatic Society Prize Publication Fund*, vol. VII. London, 1923), in which he expounded the Hinayānistic stage of Buddhism. This was followed by his "*The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*" (Leningrad, 1927), invaluable for the study of Buddhist Monism, represented by the *Mādhyamika* school. In 1935 appeared his monumental "*Buddhist Logic*" in two volumes (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, vol. XXVI. Leningrad, 1930, 1932), which represents an English version of his earlier work on the subject, completely rewritten and greatly enlarged. This work will for a long time remain the foundation of further studies in this difficult, but essential branch of Buddhist philosophic literature. Besides these works, Professor Stcherbatsky published and edited a considerable number of Tibetan and Sanskrit texts in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, some in collaboration with foreign scholars and his own pupils. The *Bibliotheca Buddhica* includes his edition of the Sanskrit text and Tibetan translation of Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* with the Commentary by Dharmottara (*Bibl. Buddhica*, vols. VII and VIII), the Sanskrit text of the *Nyāyabinduṭīkāṭīpanī*, a commentary on Dharmottara's *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* (*Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XI, fasc. I), the Tibetan text of Dharmakīrti's *Saṃtānāntarasiddhi* with Vinītadeva's Commentary, and a commentary by the well-known Mongol scholar Nag-dbañ bsTan-dar Lha-rams-pa of Alashan (b. 1758) (*Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XIX, fasc. I-II). Dharmakīrti's *Saṃtānāntarasiddhi* and Vinītadeva's Commentary were translated by Professor Stcherbatsky into Russian, and published in the series "*Pamyatniki Indiyskoy Filosofii*" ("Monuments of Indian Philosophy"), edited by the Russian Academy of Sciences ("*Obosnovaniye chuzhoy odushevленности*", St. Petersburg, 1922).

Professor Stcherbatsky also collaborated in the large international undertaking concerned with the editing of Vasubandhu's *Abhidharma-kośa*. The edition of the *Abhidharma-kośa* was to be undertaken by a group of scholars who met in Paris in the winter of 1912. The edition of the Tibetan text of the *Abhidharma-kośa*, the *kārikās* and the *bhāṣya*, was to be undertaken by Professor Stcherbatsky and Professor L. de la Vallée Poussin (the first *koṣasthāna* and the greater part of the second of the *kārikās* and *bhāṣya* have been edited by

Professor Stcherbatsky in the *Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XX, fasc. I-II). An edition of Yaśomitra's *vyākhyā* was to be prepared by Professor S. Lévi (the first *kōṣasthāna* was published by Professor Stcherbatsky and Lévi in the *Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XXI, fasc. I; fasc. II ed. by Professor U. Wogihara and Professor Stcherbatsky in 1931). An edition of the Uighur version of the *Kośa*, discovered by Sir Aurel Stein, was planned by Sir E. Denison Ross. The Japanese scholar Professor U. Wogihara was to give an edition of the Chinese translations of Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang. Since then a French translation of the *Abhidharma-kośa* was published by Professor L. de la Vallée Poussin (Paris, 1923-31, six volumes), and a systematic exposition of the philosophy of the *Kośa* by Professor O. O. Rosenberg ("Problem ī *Buddiyskoy Filosofii*", Petrograd, 1918). Russian and English translations of the text of the *Abhidharma-kośa* by Professor Stcherbatsky and Rosenberg were also foreshadowed.

In 1929 Professor Stcherbatsky published in collaboration with his pupil E. E. Obermiller the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the *Abhisamayālamkāra-Prajñāpāramitā-updeśa-śāstra* (*Bibl. Buddhica*, XXII), and thus inaugurated the systematic study of the vast *Prajñāpāramitā* literature undertaken by the Buddhist Institute of the Academy of Sciences, a work continued for some time by E. E. Obermiller.

Professor Stcherbatsky's last work, which likewise appeared in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* (vol. XXX, 1936), was a translation of Asaṅga's *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga-śāstra*, a work belonging to the third and last stage of Buddhist philosophic thought.

Mention must also be made of several articles by Professor Stcherbatsky, such as his "Contribution à l'histoire du matérialisme aux Indes" ("Vost. Zapiski", vol. I, Leningrad, 1927, pp. 1-9), "Ueber die Nyāyākānikā des Vācaspatimisra und die indische Lehre vom kategorischen Imperativ" (Beitäge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festgabe Hermann Jacobi, Bonn. 1926, pp. 369-380), "The 'Dharmas' of the Buddhists and the 'Guṇas' of the Sāṃkhyas" (The Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. X, fasc. 4 (1934, pp. 737-760), and "The Doctrine of the Buddha" (BSOS. vol. VI, 4, pp. 867-896). Professor Stcherbatsky also published a translation of the *Daśakumāracarita* by Daṇḍin in the Journal "Vostok" (Petersburg, 1923).

Professor Stcherbatsky was deeply interested in the remarkable discoveries of Sanskrit MSS in Tibetan Monasteries by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in 1934 and 1936,²¹ and hoped to arrange the publica-

21 R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana, "Sanskrit Palm-Leaf MSS in Tibet", JBORS, XXI, 1.

tion of the discovered MSS in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*. Let us hope that this work will be carried out, now that Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana has been invited to join the staff of the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences. Before his death in the winter of 1941, Professor Stcherbatsky was planning a translation of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārtika*.

In 1928 the *Academy of Sciences* inaugurated a *Buddhist Institute* and Professor Stcherbatsky was appointed to direct the scientific work of the new institution, assisted by E. E. Obermiller. In 1930 the *Buddhist Institute* was affiliated with the Oriental Institute of the *Academy of Sciences*.

Till his death in 1941 Professor Stcherbatsky continued to occupy the Sanskrit chair at the University of Leningrad.

In the person of Baron A. A. von Stael-Holstein, who died in Peking in 1937, Russian Indology lost another of its distinguished scholars. Born in 1871 at Testama, near Pernau in Estonia, he studied Sanskrit and Indian literature at the Universities of Yuryev (1894-6) and Berlin. His doctoral thesis was devoted to the second part of the *Karmapradīpa*. After a brief period of study at Oxford and Bonn, he entered the Russian Foreign Service, and was appointed secretary of the Imperial Russian Consulate-General in Bombay (1903-4). He related his researches in India in a paper entitled "*Puteviya vpechatleniya iz Indii*" contributed to the Journal of the Russian Geographical Society (vol. 40 (1905), pp. 557-83). After his return to Russia, he was appointed Assistant Professor of Sanskrit in the University of St. Petersburg, and participated in the work of the Russian Section of the International Association for Exploration of Central and Eastern Asia. He journeyed to Central Asia, and like many of his colleagues devoted much of his time to the study of Buddhism and Central Asian problems. Thus he published several articles dealing with the Tokharian problem ("*Tocharisch und die Sprache II*" Izv. Imp. Akademii Nauk, 1908, pp. 1367-72; "*Tocharisch und die Sprache I*" Izv., Imp. Ak. Nauk, 1909, pp. 479-84; "Was there a Kusana race?", JRAS, 1914, pp. 79-88; "*Kopano und Yuehshih*", SPAW, XXI (1914), pp. 643-650), in which he advanced the opinion that the name Tokharian should be applied to the so-called "Language II" of the Central Asian MSS, which had been spoken and written in the region of Khotan in Eastern Turkestan. Now a Tibetologist and a Chinese

pp. 21-43; "Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf MSS in Tibet", JBORS, XXIII, 1 (1937), pp. 1-57.

scholar as well, he dedicated himself to the publication and reconstruction of Sanskrit texts with the help of extant Tibetan and Chinese translations of Indian originals. In 1913 he published a reconstruction of the Sanskrit text of the *Gaṇḍīstotragāthā* of Aśvaghoṣa with the help of the Chinese and Tibetan versions (*Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XV, 1913). In 1916 he was sent on a scientific mission on behalf of the Russian Academy of Sciences to Japan. In 1917 he settled in Peking, and in 1922 was appointed Professor of Sanskrit at the National University of Peking. During his residence in China, Baron von Stael-Holstein was able to complete his edition of the Sanskrit MSS of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, a Mahāyāna sūtra of the *Ratnakūṭa* class, discovered in the vicinity of Khotan ("The *Kāśyapaparivarta*, edited in the original Sanskrit, in Tibetan and in Chinese", Shanghai, 1926). In 1913 this was followed by an edition of Sthiramati's Commentary on the *Kāśyapaparivarta* in Tibetan and Chinese ("A Commentary to the *Kāśyapaparivarta*" Peking, 1933).²² In 1927 he was appointed Director of the newly formed "Harvard Institute of Sino-Indian Research, a position which he held till his untimely death in 1937. The first volume of the Series published by the Institute ("Harvard Sino-Indian Series") contains Professor Fr. Weller's "Index to the Tibetan translation of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*" (Harvard-Yenching Institute, Cambridge, Mass. 1933). In 1929 Baron von Stael-Holstein was appointed Professor of Central Asian Philology at Harvard University. While in Peking, Baron von Stael-Holstein was assisted by the Russian Mongolist Professor B. I. Pankratov.

In connection with Russian researches in the field of Northern Buddhism, mention must be made of the work of the Russian Mongolists Professor A. M. Pozdneev and Professor B. Y. Vladimirtsov. Professor Pozdneev (1851-1920) was the author of a well-known work on the Buddhist Monasteries and Clergy in Mongolia ("Ocherki bīta buddhiyskikh monastīrey i buddiyskago dukhovenstvā." St. Petersburg, 1887),²³ which still remains the only exhaustive work on the subject. In 1880 he published a monograph on the Grand Lamas of Urga ("Urginskiye Khutukhī", St. Petersburg). Mongol Buddhist texts are included in his "Mongol Reader" (St. Petersburg, 1900), and his "Kalmuck Reader" (Petrograd, 1915). Professor Pozdneev also published in 1897 the Account of a journey to Tibet undertaken

22 For a fuller bibliography, see *Monumenta Serica*, vol. III (1938), fasc. I, pp. 286-289.

23 A chapter from Pozdneev's work on the Buddhist Monasteries in Mongolia, was translated into German by W. A. Unkrig "*Dhyāna und Samādhi im mongolischen Lamaismus*" (Hannover, 1926).

by Bāza Bāzši, a monk of the Dundu-khurul of the Bāza Do”rbo principality of the Astrakhan Kalmucks, in 1891-94 (“*Skazani o khozhdennii v Tibetskuyu stranu Malo-Do”rbo”tskago Bāza-bakshi*” St. Petersburg, 1897). Professor Pozdneev also edited the Mong text of the “Journey to Tibet” by the Buryat lama blo-bzañ Mi-skyoc which was to be published by the Academy of Sciences. In 1892- Professor Pozdneev undertook an extensive journey throughout Outer and Inner Mongolia, and his “Diaries” published by the Russian Geographical Society under the title of “Mongolia and the Mongols” (“*Mongoliya i Mongoli*”, vol. I, 1896 ; vol. II, 1898) contain much valuable information on Buddhist monasteries and monuments in Mongolia and the Sino-Mongolian borderland.

The great Russian Mongolist Professor B. Y. Vladimirtsov (1884-1931), historian and philologist, devoted many of his works to Buddhism. He was particularly interested in Buddhist folklore and literature. In 1921 he published the Mongol text and a Russian translation with an exhaustive commentary of a number of tales from the *Pañcatantra* (“*Mongol’skiy Sbornik rasskazov iz Pañcatantra*”, Petrograd). This was followed in 1923 by a translation of the *Siddhi-kūr*, a Mongol version of the *Vetālapañcavimśatikā* (“*Volshebnīy Mertvets*”, St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1923). Professor Vladimirtsov edited in 1929 the Mongol text of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* of Śāntideva, translated into Mongol by Kun-mkhyen čhos-kyi ’od-zer (*Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XXVIII). To Tibetan Buddhism were devoted his articles “Buddhism v Tibete i Mongolii” (St. Petersburg, 1919), “*Mila-ras-pa’s Lyric poetry*” (“*Iz liriki Milaraibi*”. “*Vostok*”, II, pp. 45-47), “A magic tale” (“*Rasskaz o volshebstve*”. “*Vostok*”, II, pp. 55-57), the “*Tibetan-Mongol Dictionary Li-si’i gur-khañ*” (*Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Sciences*, Leningrad, 1926, pp. 27-30), and “*The Mongol bstan-’gyur*” (*ibid*, pp. 31-34). Important for the study of the Indo-European languages discovered in Eastern Turkestan is his article “*Mongolica I*” (*Zapiski* of the College of Orientalists, I, pp. 305-341), which studies Central Asian loan-words in Mongolian. Professor Vladimirtsov’s work at the University of Leningrad is continued by Professor S. A. Kozin, who has to his credit a number of extremely valuable works on Mongol folklore and epic literature (“*Geseriada*”, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935 ; “*Jangar*”, Moscow-Leningrad, 1940).

A number of Buddhist texts in Mongolian have been published in Urga (now Ulān Bātor Khoto) in Mongolia by the Mongol Scientific Committee. Among the books on Buddhist subjects printed in Urga mention can be made of the *Burqan Šigemuni-yin čedig orusibai*

xa Do (a translation into Mongol of L. N. Tolstoy's "Life of Buddha" by ("Sher the well-known scholar Ts. Jamtsarano), and the "Foundations of *Buddhism*" in Russian (Ulān-Bātor Khoto, 1926).

Buddhist texts in the Uighur language, discovered in considerable numbers in Turfān, have been studied by Professor V. V. Radlov, the eminent Turkologist (1837-1918). In 1910 he published an Uighur version of the well-known story of Buddha's meeting with the merchants Trapuṣa and Bhallika (*Tiśastvustik*, *Bibl. Buddhica*, vol. XII), the XXV-th chapter of the Chinese version of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* (*Kuan-śi-im Pu-sar*, *Bibl. Buddhica*, Vol. XIV, 1911), and in collaboration with Professor S. E. Malov the Uighur version of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (*Bibl. Buddhica*, XVII). Radlov's translation of the Uighur text was published with an introduction by Professor Malov (*Bibl. Buddhica*, XXVII), who in 1910 was sent on a scientific mission to Eastern Turkestān and Kansu by the Russian Section of the Association for the Exploration of Central and Eastern Asia. Fragments of Buddhist texts in Uighur, brought back from Turfān by Roborovsky, Klementz, Krotkov and Oldenburg, have been edited by Radlov in a volume entitled "*Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler*" (Leningrad, 1921); this edition was completed after the author's death by Professor Malov, who also published Uighur MSS brought back by the expedition of Professor Oldenburg ("*Uigurskiye rukopisniye dokumenti ekspeditsii S. F. Oldenbunga*", *Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, I (1932), pp. 129-151). A general exposition of Buddhism, its doctrine and history was given by I. A. Podgorbunsky who drew his information mainly from Buryat and Mongol sources ("*Buddizm*", Irkutsk, 1902). A number of studies on Buddhism were published by members of the Russian Orthodox clergy, some of them polemical in character. Suffice it to mention Archibishop Nilus' "*Buddizm*" (St. Petersburg, 1858), Methodius' "*The Buddhist Creed or Lamaism*" (*Buddiy-skoye mirovozreniye ili lamaizm*", St. Petersburg, 1902), and Archimandrite Guriy's monograph on Mahāyāna Buddhism, based on information collected by the author in the Kalmuck steppe, and translated by W. A. Unkrig into German ("*Der Buddhismus des Mahāyāna*", "*Anthropos*", vols. XVII-XVIII-XIX, 1922-24). A monograph on Indian asceticism was given by V. Kozhevnikov ("*Indijskiy Asketizm v do-buddijskiy period*", *Bogoslovskiy Vestnik*. Sergiyev Posad, 1914).

Since the end of the last century the Russian general public has evinced considerable interest towards Indian philosophy, art and literature. The poet Baltrušaitis gave a beautiful rendering into Russian of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. The names of Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa and

Svāmi Vivekānanda became familiar to many. A good Russian translation of the English version of the "Gospel of Rāmakṛṣṇa" ("Pravozvestiye Ramakrishnī". St. Petersburg, 1914) appeared in 1914, and Russian translations of Svāmi Vivekānanda's lectures were numerous. Vereshchagin and Nicholas Roerich dedicated many of their canvases to Indian subjects. Russian poets also felt the spell of Indian literature. Already the poet Zhukovsky (1783-1852) gave a Russian translation of the rightly famous poem of Nala and Damayanti ("Nal' i Damayanti").²⁴ The Russian symbolist poet Constantine Balmont translated into Russian Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* ("Zhizn' Buddī"). Moscow, 1913, with a preface by Professor S. Lévi), and the dramas of Kālidāsa with the assistance of Professor Oldenburg ("Kālidāsa. Dramī". Moscow, 1916), with an introduction by Professor Oldenburg on Kālidāsa and his work. The volume contains translations of the Śakuntalā, Mālavikāgnimitra, Vikramorvaśī and the elegiac poem *Meghadūta*). In 1914 Professor Pavel Ritter translated Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* ("Oblakovestnik", drevne-indiyskaya elegiya Kālidāsi, Kharkov, 1914), and in 1928 gave a translation of Daṇḍin's Daśakumāracarita ("Pokhozhdeniya desyati yunoshey", Kharkov, 1928; also by the same author "Daṇḍin and his Daśakumāracaritā" (in Russian). Kharkov, 1898). Russian translations of the works of Rabindranath Tagore are numerous, and some of them of a very high order, as for example Tagore's *Gītāñjali*, beautifully translated into Russian by the poet Baltrušaitis.

After Minayev, Russian scientific missions to India were few. The Russian archaeologist Victor Goloubev (now Member of the *Ecole Française de l'Extreme-Orient*) completed in 1906-7 a photographic survey of the Ajantā frescoes. The photographic record is deposited at the Musée Guimet in Paris.²⁵ In 1914-1918 a Russian Ethnographic Expedition directed by A. M. Merwarth and L. A. Merwarth, and organized by the Russian Academy of Sciences, worked in India and Ceylon. Professor Merwarth made a special study of the South Indian languages, and published in 1929 a Grammar of colloquial Tamil (Leningrad, 1929).²⁶

24 *Mahābhārata* III, 52-79. Zhukovsky's Russian translation was made from a German rendering of the poem.

25 V. Goloubev: "Peintures bouddhiques aux Indes", *Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque de vulgarisation*, vol. XL (1913); "Ajantā, les peintures de la première grotte", *Ars Asiatica*, X. Paris, 1931.

26 See also A. M. Merwarth: "Le sujet de Sakuntalā dans le drame Malabarien populaire", *Vost. Zapiski*, I. pp. 117-131. L. A. Merwarth, "Obryadoviye ubori Kashmirsikh brakhmanov", *Sbornik Muzeya Antropologii i Etnografii*, vol. VI. Leningrad, 1927, pp. 165-209.

Speaking of recent times two names deserve our attention: Professor O. O. Rosenberg and Dr. E. E. Obermiller. The lives of both of them were cut short by fatal illness, but their contribution to science was great. Professor Rosenberg (1888-1919) studied Sanskrit and Chinese at the University of St. Petersburg. He also read Sanskrit with Professor Jacobi in Bonn, and Japanese with Professor Lange in Berlin. After graduating in 1910, he decided to specialize in Buddhist philosophy, the study of which he had begun under Professor Stcherbatsky at the University of St. Petersburg. In 1912 he was sent on a scientific mission to Japan to study Japanese Buddhist tradition, with special reference to Vasubandhu's *Abhidharma-kośa*. The results of a four years' stay in Japan were considerable. He published a Vocabulary of Buddhist terms under the title of "*A Survey of Buddhist Terms and Names arranged according to radicals with Japanese readings and Sanskrit equivalents, supplemented by addition of terms and names, relating to Shinto and Japanese History*," Tokio, 1916. Rosenberg suggested an alphabetical arrangement of Chinese characters, and published in 1916 a dictionary entitled "*Arrangement of Chinese characters according to an alphabetical system with a Japanese Dictionary of eight thousand characters and list of twenty-two thousand characters.*" Tokio, Kobunsha. In 1916 Rosenberg returned to Russia, and two years later presented to the University of St. Petersburg his Doctoral thesis—"Problems of Buddhist Philosophy", which was published by the University under the title of "*Problemi buddiyskoy filosofii*" (Petrograd, 1918), and represents a first-rate contribution to our knowledge of Buddhist philosophy, with special reference to the dharma-theory, overlooked by so many modern students of Buddhism. A German translation of Rosenberg's work appeared in the "*Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus*" edited by Professor M. Walleser ("*Die Probleme der Buddhistischen Philosophie*", Heidelberg, 1924). In the same Series appeared his essay on modern Buddhism in the Far East—*Die Weltanschauung des modernen Buddhismus im fernen Osten*"(Heft 6, Heidelberg, 1924), representing the German translation of his Russian lecture "*O mirosozertsanii sovremennogo Buddhizma na Dal'nem Vostoke*" (Petersburg, 1919, read at the First Buddhist Exhibition held in St. Petersburg in 1919. Appointed Professor at the University of St. Petersburg, Rosenberg died the same year, leaving many of his works unfinished.

Dr. E. E. Obermiller (1901-1935), a pupil of Professor Stcherbatsky, during the eight years of his scientific life produced a number of remarkable works, thanks to his extraordinary command of Sanskrit

and Tibetan. Dr. Obermiller undertook several journeys to Buryat-Mongolia, and was able to benefit by the advice and assistance of Buryat-Mongol learned monks, who introduced him to the intricate field of Tibetan exegetical literature, and the method of philosophical disputation adopted in the monastic colleges of Tibet and Mongolia. This collaboration of Russian scholars with Mongol scholars is a characteristic feature of Russian researches in the domain of Northern Buddhism. Obermiller's first work was the compilation of two extremely useful Indexes to Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's *Nyāyabinduśikā* (*Sanskrit-Tibetan Index, Bibl. Buddh.* vol. XXIV; *Tibetan-Sanskrit Index, Bibl. Buddhica*, XXV). He collaborated with Professor Stcherbatsky in editing the Tibetan texts of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* (vol. XXIII, 1929). In 1931-2 he published in the "Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus", a translation of the "*History of the Buddhist Doctrine*" (*bDe-bar gśegs-pa'i bstan-pa'i gsal-byed čhos-kyi 'byuñ-gnas gsuñ-rab rin-po-čhe'i mdzod-čes-bya-ba*, vol. XXIV (Ya) of the Collection of Works of *gSuñ-'bum*) by Bu-ston Rin-čhen-grub (1290-1364), one of the best known works of Tibetan historiography ("Bu-ston's *History of Buddhism*", Part I. Heidelberg, 1931; Part II. Heidelberg, 1932)²⁷. In 1931 he gave a translation into English of the *Uttaratantra* of Maitreya-Asaṅga ("The Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle of Salvation, being a Manual of Buddhist Monism. The work of Ārya Maitreya with a Commentary by Āryāsaṅga"; Translated from the Tibetan by E. E. Obermiller, *Acta Orientalia*, vol. IX, 1931, pp. 81-306). The other works of Dr. Obermiller were chiefly concerned with the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature. He gave a general exposition of the Doctrine of the *Prajñāpāramitā* according to the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* in *Acta Orientalia*, vol. IX (1932-3). This was followed by a detailed analysis of the eight principal subjects and the seventy topics of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* published in the *Calcutta Oriental Series* ("Analysis of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*" fasc. I. *Calcutta Oriental Series*, No. 27, 1933; fasc. II. *Calcutta Oriental Series*, No. 27, 1936; fasc. III. *Calcutta Oriental Series*, No. 27, 1943). In 1937 appeared his edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the *Prajñāpāramitāratnaguṇasāmcayagāthā*, published posthumously in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* (vol. XXIX. 1937). Many of Dr. Obermiller's articles appeared in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* of Calcutta: "The Account of Buddha's Nirvana and the first councils

27 See Obermiller: "Bu-ston's History of Buddhism and the Mañjuśrī-mūlatantra". *JRAS*, 1935, containing corrections of reconstructed Sanskrit names in the translation of the "History of Buddhism".

according to the Vinayakṣudraka" (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. V, 3); "*A Study of the Twenty Aspects of Śūnyatā*" (*IHQ.* vol. IX, 1933); "*Nirvāṇa according to the Tibetan tradition*" (*IHQ.* 1934), and "*On the meaning of the term Śūnyatā*" (*Journal of the Greater India Society*, July, 1934).²⁸

Looking at the modern period one notices a considerable swing of interest from the traditional fields of Sanskrit and Buddhism towards Sanskrit belles-letters, modern Indian languages and literature. However the old tradition did not exhaust itself, and there are signs that it will again reassert itself. Among the scholars of this period one name stands foremost—Professor A. A. Barannikov (b. 1890), elected to the Academy of Sciences in 1939. In the early days of his scientific career Professor Barannikov did not escape the Russian traditional interest in Buddhism, and at least two of his early articles deal with Buddhism and Buddhist Art ("*Zabaykal'skiye datsani*" (Buddhist Monasteries in Buryat-Mongolia), *Materyal' po Etnografii*, vol. III, fasc. I. Leningrad, 1926, pp. 123-31; "*Statuetka dokshita iz Sobraniya Khara-khoto*" ("An image of a drag-gśed from the Khara-khoto Collection"). *Materyal' po Etnografii*, vol. III, 2, pp. 113-4. In recent years Professor Barannikov has given us several manuals of Hindustani: "*A Grammar of Hindustani*" (Leningrad, 1926). "*Modern Hindustani Prose*" (Leningrad, 1927), "*Modern Hindustani Prose*" (Leningrad, 1930), and "*A Manual of Hindustani*". In 1937 Professor Barannikov published an excellent translation of Lallū jī Lāl's *Prem Sāgar* with an exhaustive introduction on the author, the modern Indian languages and the evolution of Hindi ("*Legendī o Krishne*", vol. XXV. Leningrad-Moscow, 1937). Professor Barannikov has also completed a translation into Russian of Tulsi Das' *Rāmāyaṇa*, which is in the process of publication. Among the articles by Professor Barannikov we may mention the "*Synonymic repetition in Hindustani*" (in Russian, *Vost. Zapiski*, I. Leningrad, 1927, pp. 71-91), "*On the dialect of the Gypsies of Belgorod*" (*Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de l'USSR*, 1929, pp. 121-128), "*Saptasaroj Prem Chanda*" in the "*Symposium in Honour of Professor S. F. Oldenburg*" (Leningrad, 1934, pp. 73-83), "*Problems of Hindi prose*" (In Russian, *Zapiski* of the Oriental Institute, vol. VII, 1939, pp. 203-54), etc. Among Professor Barannikov's pupils we must mention Professor V. Beskrovniy, one of the leading authorities on modern Indian languages in the USSR.

28 For a fuller list see Professor Stcherbatsky's *Obituary Notice* of Dr. E. E. Obermiller in the *IHQ.* vol. XII, 2 (June, 1936), pp. 380-2.

Among the works of this period one must mention Boris Larin's translation of some Rg-Veda hymns, which appeared in the periodical "Vostok" (Leningrad, 1922), a translation into Russian of Kālidāsa's greatest kāvya the *Raghuvamśa*, by Professor Igor Serebryakov. Prof. R. I. Shor's study of the different recensions of the *Vetālapañcavimśatikā* (in "Symposium in honour of S. F. Oldenburg", Leningrad, 1934, pp. 611-25), and his article on the Vedic aorist (in the "Symposium in honour of Professor N. Y. Marr", Leningrad, 1935, pp. 433-51). The great Russian Arabist Professor I. Y. Krachkovsky wrote on the cultural influence of India on Arabic culture in the VIII-th century ("Un fragment de rhétorique indoue en reproduction arabe", *Vost. Zapiski*, I, pp. 26-37).

As stated above, the collections of MSS and books belonging to the Asiatic Museum were transferred in 1930 to the newly created Oriental Institute (*Institut Vostočovedeniya*) of the Academy of Sciences, and all Oriental research became centralized under the guidance of this new institution. The unique collections of MSS and Oriental books belonging to the Institute have been saved from destruction during the siege of Leningrad by a band of heroic and self-denying men and women. One of the major undertakings of this Institute is the translation into Russian of the whole *Mahābhārata* undertaken by Professor V. I. Kalyanov, the publication of which will be eagerly anticipated.

The tradition of Professor Stcherbatsky is being maintained by Professor M. I. Tubyansky (b. 1893) and Professor Andrey I. Vostrikov. Professor Tubyansky's interests lie in the field of Indian philosophy and Bengali. In 1922 he published a volume on Bengali literature ("Obraztsi bengal'skoy literatury". Petrograd, 1922). His edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Nyāyapraveśa* with the Chinese, Mongol and Tibetan versions was to be published in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*. He was also preparing for publication in the same series an edition of the Chinese version of Dignāga's *Nyāyadvāra*, and a translation of the important *Grub-mtha' čhen-mo* by 'jam-dbyan bzad-pa (1648-1722).

Professor A. I. Vostrikov has been Professor Stcherbatsky's chief assistant in recent years. His interest lies chiefly in the field of Buddhist Logic. He has undertaken several journeys to the Buddhist monasteries of Buryat-Mongolia, and collected on behalf of the Oriental Institute Tibetan and Mongol xylographs. In 1935 he contributed an important article on the *Nyāyavārtika* of Uddyotakara, and the *Vādanyāya* of Dharmakīrti to the *Indian Historical Quarterly*.

(vol. XI, 1, 1935, pp. 1-31). Important for Tibetan bibliography are his "Corrections and critical remarks on Dr. Johan van Manen's contribution to the Bibliography of Tibet." in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* (vol. VIII, part 1 (1935), pp. 51-77). Professor Vostrikov collaborated with Professor N. N. Poppe in editing Buryat-Mongol chronicles ("*Letopis' Barguzinskikh Buryat*", *Trudī Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, VIII. Leningrad, 1935). Translations of Vācaspatimīśra's *Nyāyavārtikatātparyātikā* and his *Tattvabindu* were scheduled to appear in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, as well as the Tibetan text of the *Pramāṇavārtika* of Dharmakīrti.

For a long time the only books on Indian History in Russian were Z. A. Ragozin's "*History of India*" (St. Petersburg, 1905), concerned mainly with the Vedic period, and Dr. E. S. Schmidt's "*History of India*" in the well-known "*History of Mankind*" of H. Helmolt (vol. II. St. Petersburg, 1909, pp. 341-505). Professor Krimsky's "*History of Persia and her literature*" (Moscow, 1914-7, pp. 159-226) contains a chapter on the history of Ancient India and discusses at some length the Persian literature of the Mogul period. Since the discovery of the Indus culture the inclusion of Ancient India in textbooks on the History of the Ancient East has become imperative. In 1941 Professor V. V. Struve (b. 1889) published a "*History of the Ancient East*" (Leningrad-Moscow, 483 pp.), which includes Ancient India and China.²⁹ It is a matter for great gratification that the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences has undertaken the publication of a "*History of India*", for the absence of a scientific work on this subject is a big gap in Russian historiography.

Political conditions have adversely affected the archaeological exploration of Central Asia since the first World War. Much important work has been done in the excavation and preservation of monuments belonging to the Muslim period in the Central Asian republics of Uzbekistān, Turkmenistān and Tajikistān. Numerous sites belonging to the Buddhist period still await the spade of the explorer in the old Bactrian kingdom, Buddhist Sogdiana. In 1922 M. G. Vecheslov made a tour of Afghanistān and prepared a survey of Buddhist sites ("*Arkhеologicheskiye pamyatniki v Afganistane*", "*Afghanistan*", Moscow, 1924). The exploration of Buddhist sites in Tajikistān has been inaugurated by an archaeological expedition led by Professor B. Denike in 1927, sent out by the Museum of Eastern Cultures in Moscow, during which A. S. Strelkov discovered a Buddhist *stūpa* and fragments of Greco-buddhist sculptures in

29 Prof. V. F. Minorsky: "*Oriental Studies in the U.S.S.R.*", p. 82.

limestone in the neighbourhood of Termez (B. Denike, "Termez". in "Noviy Vostok", No. 22 (1928), pp. 208 ff; A. S. Strelkov, "Buddhist monuments in Termez" in "Kul'tura Vostoka" ("Oriental Culture"), Museum of Eastern Cultures, Moscow, 1928).

The cultural links between the countries of the Amu-daryā basin and the north-western borderland of India have long ago interested Russian scholars. Sarmatian and Indo-Scythian antiquities were studied by Professor M. I. Rostovtsev—a subject which merits further attention on the part of the historian of India's North-West ("Receuil d'études dédiées à la mémoire de N. P. Kondakov, Prague, 1926, pp. 239-57). Another important work scheduled to appear shortly is Professor K. Trever's study of the Kushān period.

The recent excavations by Professor Sergey P. Tolstov of ancient sites in Khwārazm have furnished us with a wealth of new data, which point to close cultural relations between Khwārazm and the North-Western borderland of India during the Kushān period (S. P. Tolstov's article in "Vestnik drevney istorii", IV (1938), pp. 120-45). Professor Tolstov's large work on Ancient Khwārazm was scheduled to appear in 1945. The excavation work will be resumed in the spring of 1946.

We have attempted to give a brief survey of the work done by Russian scholars in the field of Indology. We have seen that much of this work had been devoted to the study of Northern Buddhism, and that in recent years a sound foundation had been laid for the study of modern India, her languages and literatures. Geographical proximity and historical ties made Russian scholars devote particular attention to the study and exploration of Central Asia (Turkestan, Mongolia, Tibet), a region which throughout the first millennium A. D. had been a cultural province of a Greater Indian cultural whole, and many parts of which still preserve a priceless heritage of Indian culture and thought.

Mainamati and Lalmai Finds and the Kingdom of Pattikera.

T. N. RAMACHANDRAN

In August-September 1943 the find of brick structures and images of terracotta material in the course of trench diggings at Mainamati, six miles west of the town of Comilla, was brought to my notice by the Collector of Tippera District. An inspection was immediately arranged and a survey of a part of the area along the Mainamati and Lalmai ranges conducted. The results obtained in the course of my brief survey are sufficiently indicative of the importance of the area to archaeologists. The importance of the discoveries will be best known and a valuable contribution made to the history of Bengal when excavation of the area is undertaken.

Five miles to the west of Comilla rises a low hill range with an average height of 90 feet above sea-level and 40 feet above the level of the surrounding plains. This low hill extends from Mainamati in the north to Lalmai Railway Station in the south, for a distance of about 10 miles, north to south, and is called Mainamati range near Mainamati and Lalmai range further down where it widens. To the west of the range lies Tripura State. The hill is called *Lālmāi* (*Rohitāgiri*) from the fact that it is made up of slightly micaceous, yellow-coloured sandstone and ferruginous concretions, which when decomposed colour the top of the hill brick-red.

Like its geological importance the Lalmai area affords sufficient interest to the archaeologists. The plains are studded with what appear to be entombed ruins, a supposition which proved to be nearly correct in an area four miles to the south-west of Comilla where the Central Public Works Department cut through a few mounds and extracted a large number of bricks from well-planned structures. The Collector's report regarding the diggings in the military area gave me high hopes of archaeological discoveries at Mainamati, as the name 'Maināmatī' is in Bengal history and religion sufficient to conjure up a vista of archaeological wealth.

'Maināmatī', the name by which the village and the adjoining hill are known to-day, recalls the name of Queen Mayanāmatī (Madanāvati), the wife of Māṇikcandra of the Candra dynasty that ruled in Bengal in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D. Many ballads are

popularly sung in Bengal in which the queen and her son Gopīcandra figure. According to Tāraṇāthā and some of these ballads, Gopīcandra was a ruler of Mṛikula (now known as Meharkula in Tippera District).

In the old Bengali *Caryā-padas*, that deal with the mystical esoteric doctrines and Yogic theories and practices of the Buddhist Sahajayāna, we find an interesting hierarchy of Siddha poets who are Matsyendranātha, Gorakh-nātha, Jālandhri-pāda or Hāḍi-pā and Kānha-pā, the last mentioned assignable to the end of the twelfth century. Kānha-pā's Guru was Jālandharipāda or Hāḍi-pā, himself a disciple of Gorakh-nāth. Queen Maināmati was Gorakh-nāth's disciple, while Hāḍipā figures in the legend cycle of her son Gopīcānd, which speaks of Gopīcand's unwilling renunciation, while young, of his kingdom and his wives, Adunā and Padunā, at the request of his mother Maināmati, who by dint of her Yogic powers had come to know that he could not otherwise be saved from premature death, and also how he left his home as a disciple of Hāḍi-pā, a Guru of low caste, who is Gorakh-nāth's disciple. The Sahajayāna of the *Caryāpadas* relates to mystic Buddhism like Vajrayāna. While in Vajrayāna ceremonials were emphasized, in Sahajayāna ceremonials were dispensed with, though the goal of both was the same, viz., *Mahāsukha*. The prevalence of the Sahajayāna in Maināmati is attested to by an inscription of the thirteenth century A.D. engraved on a copper-plate found at Maināmati which records a grant of land in favour of a Buddhist monastery built in the city of Paṭṭikerā by Rañavaṅkamalla Harikāladeva in A.D 1220 in the seventeenth year of his reign. This record also speaks of a superior officer of the royal groom as practising the Śahajadharma in Paṭṭikeraka¹.

The Kingdom of Paṭṭikerā.

Paṭṭikerā was the capital city of the kingdom of that name mentioned in Burmese Chronicles as Pattiikkara or Pateikkara, a name that may be traced back to the eleventh century A.D. A *parganā* of Tippera District which extends to Mainamati hills is still known as Pāṭikārā or Paiṭkārā and in older documents as Pāṭikerā or Paiṭkerā. This helps us to look for Paṭṭikerā of the copper-plate in this *parganā*. Of particular interest is the evidence furnished by an inscription of the seventh century A.D. referring to a royal palace or residence at

1 *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. IX, p. 282.

Karmānta, the modern Badkāmtā, 12 miles west of Comilla and 6 miles west of Mainamati in Tippera District. Later records, such as the Baghaura inscription of the time of the Pāla king Mahipāla (eleventh century A.D.) and the Mehar copper-plate of Dāmodara-deva (1234 A.D.) establish the connection of Samataṭa with the modern Tippera District. In Samataṭa was situated the principality or the kingdom of Paṭṭikerā, whose existence according to recent finds at Mainamati can be traced as far back as the eighth century A.D. Coins similar to certain symbolical coins of the Candra dynasty of Arakan, who had their capital at Wethali in Arakan from 788 to 957 A.D., and terracotta plaques with representations of Arakanese and Burmese men and women were found at Mainamati. These throw light on the relations between India and Burma in the eighth to the tenth centuries A.D. In the coins the name of the principality is given as *Paṭṭikera*, while the Burmese Chronicles refer to this kingdom as Patikkara, the country of Kalas or foreigners which bounded on the west the kingdom of Anoratha (1044-1077 A.D.). They refer also to a king 'Pateikkara of the kingdom of Marawa'. The references in the Burmese Chronicles imply that this kingdom was an independent State during the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D., when the Pāla and Sena kings were ruling over Bengal. An intimate intercourse between this kingdom and the kingdoms of Burma is proved by these Chronicles, and inter-marriages in the royal families between the two countries were also common. Paṭṭikerā princes and princesses figure in the romances and tragedies in Burmese annals, poems and melodramas, and the name of the Burmese king Kyanzittha (1084-1112 A.D.), Alaungsithu and Narathu are well known. Indian Buddhism was welcomed by Kyanzittha who built the Ānanda temple at Pagan after the temples of the Indian mainland. The Ānanda temple is described as the best creation of Indo-Burmese art. Harikāladeva Rañavaṇkamalla, who in 1220 A.D. was presumably ruling as an independent king, appears to have been a feudatory chief, who along with two other ruling families with name-endings-*deva* came to power after the collapse of the Sena sway in the thirteenth century A.D. Strangely enough we do not hear of the principality of Paṭṭikerā after Harikāladeva; only the name survives in the modern *parganā* of Pāṭikārā or Paiṭkārā. Probably it was absorbed in the growing kingdom of the Deva family.

Linguistic Medium of the Sarvāstivāda School— An Introduction.

ANUKUL CHANDRA BANERJEE

From the Chinese and the Tibetan translations as also from the manuscript fragments discovered in Central Asia, Nepal and very recently at Gilgit in Kashmir, and from quotations found in the *Lalitavistara*, *Divyāvadāna*, *Mahāvastu*, *Abhidharmaśā*, *Mādhyamakavṛtti* and from such other texts, we know that the Sarvāstivādins as well as the Mūlasarvāstivādins employed Sanskrit as their literary medium¹. Prof. Winternitz's view is substantially to the same effect. He adds further that the Sarvāstivādins who had their sphere of activity extending from Kashmir to Mathura and were responsible for the introduction of Buddhism into Central Asia, Tibet and China, had canons of their own, although no complete copy is available up till now². The Theravādins, the followers of the orthodox school, assert that the Pāli canon preserves the original words of Buddha. This traditional belief of the Theravāda school has been challenged by the veteran scholars of the Buddhist Sanskrit literature, such as Gruenwedel, Petrowsky, Kremenz, Pelliot, LeCoq, Hoernle, Sylvain Lévi, L. Poussin and others, on the basis of the discovery of the numerous Sanskrit manuscript fragments in Nepal, Eastern Turkestan and the neighbouring regions³. The manuscripts discovered in Central Asia up to this day have been amply proved to be fragments of the texts belonging to the Sarvāstivāda and later Mahāyāna schools⁴. We have no complete copy of the Sanskrit Tripitaka still available to us. But with the find of the manuscripts and also from quotations in the various Buddhist Sanskrit texts like the *Mahāvastu*, the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Lalitavistara*, it has been shown that the Sarvāstivāda school had a Tripitaka of its own⁵.

1 See *A complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons*, ed. Hukujū Uji and others; Cordier's *Catalogue*, Pts. II & III; B. Nanjo, *A complete Catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka*; Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan; Gilgit Manuscripts*, ed. N. Dutt, vols. I-III.

2 Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II, pp. 231, 232.

3 Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of the Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, p. 16ff.

4 N. Dutt, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools*, p. 239.

5 Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of the Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, pp. 4-52, 166-175 and Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II, p. 232 ff.

The existence of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts was quite unknown to scholars in India and abroad before 1824. The credit for the discovery of the manuscripts goes to Brian Houghton Hodgson⁶. It was he who first discovered Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts⁷, amounting to 381 bundles, in Nepal. This new find of manuscripts proved that there were Buddhist canons preserved in a language other than Pāli and created a stir in the world of Buddhist scholarship. The traditional belief that all the Buddhist canons are preserved only in Pāli was first shaken thereby.

The canon of the Sarvāstivādins was no doubt written in Sanskrit. But the texts such as the *Prātimokṣasūtra*⁸, the *Lalitavistara* and other manuscript fragments of Āgamas amply prove that their canon is a revised version of an older canon and composed in a language not always conforming to the rules of Sanskrit grammar. This is called "Buddhist Sanskrit" or "Mixed Sanskrit" i.e., partly Sanskrit and partly Prakrit (or Middle Indian dialect) assimilated to Sanskrit⁹.

As regards this language, it may be observed here that there was a class of Buddhist writers of Sanskrit who paid more attention to meaning than to correct form. "It regards as well as disregards the elementary canons of grammar, metre, and even vocabulary. A sweet melody seems to be its chief aim, and for this it is ready to sacrifice every other essential condition of a language"¹⁰. And the consequence was that their writings abounded in grammatical and other irregularities. These consist in the use of

(1) Corrupt words, (2) Irregular pauses, (3) Words with no case-endings, (4) Words with wrong case-endings, (5) Elision of vowels and consonants, (6) Sandhis not sanctioned by the rules of grammar, (7) Sonants for surds and vice-versa, (8) Locative for ablative, or genitive for dative, (9) Reflective voice (*ātmanepada*) for active voice (*parasmaipada*) and vice-versa, (10) Singular for

6 See R. L. Mitra, *Nepalese Buddhist Literature* (Preface) and C. Bendall, *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts* (Preface) for biography and works of Hodgson.

7 These manuscripts were presented to various learned bodies such as the (Royal) Asiatic Society of Bengal (Calcutta), the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (London), the Bodleian Library (Oxford), the Societe Asiatique, the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris).

8 Two versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* are now available—one belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school and the other to the Mūlasarvāstivāda.

9 *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. II, ed. N. Dutt, Introduction, Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II, pp. 226 ff. R. L. Mitra, *Nepalese Buddhist Literature*, Introduction. K. Regamey, *Three Chapters from the Samādhīrāja Sūtra*, Introduction, p. 14, *L'indo-aryān du vēda aux temps modernes*, Paris, 1934. p. 9.

10 *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. II, ed. N. Dutt, p. viii.

plural and *vice-versa*, (11) Neuter for masculine and *vice-versa*, (12) Interchange of S, S and S, (13) Interchange of dental n and cerebral η, and (14) Diverse forms of pronouns¹¹.

Of the above list, the verbs display the greatest Middle Indian elements. This may be illustrated by the following instances:

(i) The use of verbs which do not conform to any fixed rule and as such have irregular forms—mostly due to the predilection for abbreviation, e. g. *deśenti* for *deśasyanti*, *darṣeti* for *darśayati*, *prārathenti* for *prārathayenti*, *janenti* for *janayanti*, *bhoti* for *bhavati*, *bhonti* for *bhavanti*, *bheṣyati* for *bhavisyati*, *codenti* for *codayanti* and the like.

(ii) the use of लट् (indicative), 2nd person, plural for लोट् (imperative), 2nd person plural, e.g., *vijānatha*.

(iii) the use of aorists with Prākṛtic inflexions, e.g., *upagarnī*, *bhavayī*, *kṣipī*, *avacī*, *prekṣī* and the like.

(iv) the use of *tvāc* for *lyap*, e. g., *Paryāpunitvā*, *pravrajitvā*, *niṣevitvā*, etc.

Since the exploration of the manuscript fragments of the Sanskrit *Sutra* and *Vinaya* texts in Eastern Turkestan and neighbouring regions, the Buddhist researchers in the field have been anxiously expecting the discovery of further materials to confirm the assertion of the previous scholars. Fortunately, the manuscripts very recently discovered at Gilgit have fulfilled the high expectations of the scholars. It is a matter of gratification that the Gilgit manuscripts explored so far have restored almost half of the Sanskrit *Vinaya*. Besides the Sanskrit *Vinaya* texts, they contain several other manuscripts not belonging to the Sanskrit canonical literature. There is no room for doubt that all these manuscripts belonged to the Sarvāstivāda school which became most influential and wide-spread in the post-Āśokan period, particularly in the Kushan times.

An analysis of the history of Sanskrit Buddhism reveals that the prevalence of Prakrit in this literature is due mainly to the fact that Prakrit was the literary medium for a long period. It is an agreed fact that Buddha discarded Sanskrit as a medium for the propagation of religion and the consequence was that Sanskrit came to the background for the time being. King Āśoka, too, whose enthusiasm for the cause of Buddhism is too well-known to be mentioned,

11 To illustrate some of the above, let us cite here the utterances of the Blessed One in verses from *Mūlatantra* :—

सुचन्द्रं सर्वबुद्धाणां देयं नित्येष्ववस्तुकम् शिष्येभिष्ठ गुरुणाश्च भाष्यादुहितपुत्रकम् ।
गन्धो भवति मेदिन्यां तोये रूपं रसोनिले वायौ स्पर्शोक्तरं शब्दं धर्मधातुमहानभे ॥
गन्धधूपादिदीपेभिः खानपानादिवाससैः पूजयित्वा सदा मुद्रां गुरोददतिसत्सूतः ॥

caused edicts to be incised in his vast empire. These edicts extol the ideal life and the fruit of meritorious acts and they are undoubtedly in Prakrit. There is no room for doubt that in the Pre-Buddhistic days Sanskrit was the literary medium of the people in North-Western India, and the inscriptions of Aśoka which were primarily meant for appealing to the hearts of the people, could not in the long run produce the desired result. The reason lies in this that people still had a leaning towards Sanskrit. Sanskrit, although for the time being it had receded to the background, recovered from the shock and with the revival of Brahmanism under the Gupta dynasty regained the lost position. We find an exactly similar state of affairs even in literary works. The existing Sanskrit works were changed into Prakrit and many original works in Prakrit were also composed. But a reverse tide came as a result of which Prakrit works were changed into Sanskrit as we find in the *Mahāvastu*, the *Lalitavistara* and the like¹². It is also evident from the fragments of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, *Udānavarga*, *Dharmapada*, *Dirghāgama*, *Madhyamāgama*, *Saṃyuktāgama*¹³, as also from the *Lalitavistara*, *Divyāvadāna*, and other works that the Sarvāstivādins adopted Sanskrit as the language of the school. The *Vibhāṣās*—the originals of which are lost but extant in Chinese and Tibetan—composed in the Council of *Kaṇīṣka*, were very likely in Sanskrit.

Thus we see that the Sarvāstivādins had a Sanskrit canon of their own and adopted Sanskrit as their literary medium. Both the Tibetan and the Chinese versions of the *Tripiṭaka* testify to the above fact. It is akin to the Pāli Piṭakas in contents but the lists of Nikāya Sūtras and Vinaya Chapters are different. This is probably because both the versions, Pāli and Sanskrit, sprang from a still older canon, the canon in the Māgadhī dialect, which was very likely employed by Buddha in his religious discourses. The later texts now available of this school such as the *Divyāvadāna*, *Avadānaśataka*, *Abhidharma-kośavyākhyā* and the like, are all in pure Sanskrit¹⁴. A critical study of the texts published already under the caption “*Gilgit Manuscripts*” also reveals the same fact. Further, the Sarvāstivādins, it will be remembered, had their sphere of activities in Mathurā, Gandhāra and Kashmir, where Sanskrit was prevalent, which extended later on to Central Asia, China and Tibet.

12 Keith, *A History of Sanskrit literature*, pp. 14-15, Dr. N. Dutt, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools*, p. 276.

13 Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, pp. 36-46.

14 The verse-portions are of course in Gāthā-dialects—the Gāthās being cited by way of authority. The same thing may be said of the other Mahāyāna works such as the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka Sūtra*, *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* and the like—the prose in correct Sanskrit and the Gāthās in mixed Sanskrit.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

THE AGRICULTURAL AND HUNTING METHODS OF THE NAVAHO INDIANS. By W. W. Hill, Published for the Department of Anthropology, Yale University, Yale University Press, 1938. pp. 194, Plates 4, Figures 12. Price 2. 50.

The material for this study was collected during the summer of 1933 and between July 1, 1934 and July 1, 1935. The information was collected from 43 informants of both sexes inhabiting the different parts of Navaho habitat. The author does not give any reason for selecting these persons as informants. He has also not stated his knowledge about the language of the Navaho. Employment of five interpreters perhaps indicates that he is not acquainted with the language of the people.

The book is divided into six chapters viz. Introduction, Agriculture, Agricultural Ritual, Hunting, Non-Ritual Hunting and Conclusion. In the Introduction the author deals with the location and extent of the Navaho territory which "comprises approximately 25,000 square miles of territory situated roughly between 108° and 111°45' north latitude, and 34°55' west longitude." (Unfortunately the other longitude is not mentioned). This region forms a part of the Colorado Plateau province. The climate of the Navaho region is semi-arid. The mean annual rainfall ranges from 12· 80 inches to 4· 96 inches at different parts of the reservation and the maximum annual range of temperature at different stations varied from 109° to 127°. Navaho economic life is adjusted to these climatic factors. The author also gives in the Introduction a short resumé of the seasonal and daily life of the people. The Navaho have two primary seasons, summer and winter, and twelve months with an occasional thirteenth month to correct the lunar calendar.

In the chapter on Agriculture the author gives a very lucid and detailed account of the different methods of cultivation, the types of implements used, the different kinds of crops produced and how they are stored and utilised. He also mentions that non-food plants like cotton and tobacco were never grown by the Navaho but were utilised from wild sources. The four most important cultivated food-crops are corn, melons, squash and beans. "Peaches and wheat were introduced into the Southwest by the Spanish, and diffused to the Navaho on the aboriginal level from the Pueblos." These two crops considerably influenced the economy of the Navaho. Wheat matured early in summer and thereby eliminated the want which the people felt at this time owing to shortage of

stored food. It was an off-season crop. Moreover wheat could be produced at a higher altitude which increased the total area of cultivable land and at the same time released land in lower altitudes for cultivation of other crops.

Ritual and practical processes of agriculture have been interwoven into a highly integrated whole. Success or failure in agriculture does not depend so much on individual efforts or environmental factors, as on correct performance of the rituals. Corn, the most important cereal food of the tribe, is held in great veneration. One of the informants states that "corn is just the same as a human being, only it is holier." "When a man goes into the corn field he feels that he is in a holy place, that he is walking among Holy People....." The magico religious sanction for agriculture lies in such mythological beliefs and they find expression in the chants recited at different stages of agricultural operations and in observance of the various taboos.

Hunting is widely practised for supply of meat to the family. As an economic pursuit it is second to agriculture. Deer and antelope were the most important game animals. Besides these two, the Navaho also hunted the rabbit, prairie dog, porcupine, mountain sheep, elk, squirrel, and turkey. The eagle and the bear were killed only for ceremonial purposes. Before the introduction of guns, bows and arrows were the weapons for hunting. Arrow heads are now-a-days made of iron but formerly they used to be fashioned out of the tip of the wooden shaft. The Navaho employ different methods of hunting. "Deer were stalked, tracked, shot from ambush, surrounded by fire, trapped in pit falls and run down. Antelope were stalked, impounded, and run down. Elk were tracked. Bears were enticed from their dens in winter and clubbed. Most small animals were shot, or caught in dead fall traps."

In hunting, rituals play a very important part. In fact there are two broad divisions of hunting based on the performance or non-performance of rituals. "Deer, antelope, bear and eagles were ritually hunted." Animals like buffaloe, elk, mountain lion, wolf, etc. were hunted without ritual. "The Navaho believed that although the hunters killed the game, the game did not die but eventually returned to its "own country." "The game are like human beings, only holier. They are like the Holy People." These beliefs supplied the mental background of the various observances and ceremonies connected with hunting. Navaho culture is overburdened with rituals from our standpoint but to them it appears to be quite normal. This is due to the perfect adjustment of the ritual and practical sides of life. The author has very ably shown the integration of these two sides in agriculture and hunting.

This is also found in other departments of life. Even contact with white culture has not changed the religious life of the people though in certain cases it has changed their material life.

The author's suggestion that rituals have two functions in Navaho life, appear to be very plausible. Wherever and whenever the Navaho feels that his practical knowledge is inadequate, he tries to compensate it by means of rituals. The second function of ritual is to provide occasions for relief from the every day humdrum life.

In the last section of the book the author has tried to show the relation of Navaho culture with its neighbouring cultures primarily in respect of agriculture and hunting. So far as practical procedures of agriculture are concerned the Pueblos and the Navaho have the greatest number of similarities. But not so in rituals. In hunting again the Navahos are more nearly related to the people of the Great Basin and Plateau and not to the Pueblos. In the opinion of Dr. Hill "the material and economic culture of the Navaho is fundamentally that of the Great Basin, but shows a definite influence from Plains culture in some past time. Upon this fundamental Great Basin culture generalized Pueblo traits form a superficial layer."

We congratulate the author on his very clear exposition of the culture traits surrounding agriculture and hunting among the Navaho. Some of these traits are found in almost the same shape among the Pre-Dravidian tribes of Chota Nagpur and in the folk rites performed by the unmarried Hindu girls of Bengal. Dr. Abanindranath Tagore, the reputed Indian artist, has tried to show this similarity in his book on the *Vratas of Bengal*. The chants which our little girls recite in course of these Vratas find parallels in the chants of the Amer-Indian tribes. A comparative study of the folk rites of Bengal and the rituals of these Amer-Indian tribes may reveal interesting laws of culture growth.

T. C. Das

CHANDRAGUPTA MAURYA AND HIS TIMES. (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1940-41). By Radha Kumud Mukherjee, pp. xiv + 414. University of Madras, 1943.

The course of lectures comprised in this volume, says the author in his Preface, is intended "to fill up a gap in our knowledge of ancient India" in the shape of furnishing a comprehensive account of the life and times of "India's first historical emperor." In this attempt, it must be admitted, the author has attained a considerable measure of success. Some idea of the scope of this work may be formed from the headings of its successive chapters: I. Origin and Early Life, II. Conquests and Chronology, III. Administration: Ideals; Divisions (a rather odd combination), IV. The King, V. Ministers: Rules of Service, VI. Administrative

Departments and Officers, VII. Land System and Rural Administration, VIII. Municipal Administration, IX. Law, X. The Army, XI. Social Conditions, XII. Economic Conditions. Three appendices, of which two deal with Cāṇakya and Candragupta traditions from Buddhist and Jaina sources and the third traces the parallelism between Asoka's edicts and Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* bring this volume to a close.

While congratulating the author on the industry and patience with which he has marshalled his material from the most varied sources literary as well as archaeological, we may be permitted to make a few remarks. The author has freely used the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya as his most important source-book for the state of administration, society and religion in Candragupta Maurya's time. But there are, as is well known, certain fundamental differences between the polity of Kauṭilya's work and that of Candragupta's empire as described by Megasthenes. The Kauṭilyan State is still, as in the older *Arthaśāstra* part and parcel of an international State-system, thus falling far short of a single empire uniting the then known Indian world, except the extreme south under a single sway. The official nomenclature of the Kauṭilyan administration, both central and local, is widely different from that known to Aśoka's inscriptions and traceable no doubt to the times of his grandfather. The type of administrative organisation, again, as illustrated by Kauṭilya's Boards of Judges and his staff of single officers in charge of the civil and military administrations differs markedly from that set forth in Megasthenes and at a later date in the Aśokan epigraphs. The author, in his anxiety to hunt up points of agreement between Kauṭilya and Megasthenes, systematically slurs over these essential differences. On page 48 the author quotes the famous lines of Matthew Arnold ("The East bowed low before the blast" etc.) as correctly expressing the Indian attitude towards Alexander's invasion. It is difficult to reconcile this statement with the author's detailed account (pp. 39-42) of the sturdy fight put up by the republican peoples of the Punjab against the mighty invader. While describing the extent of cession of territory by Seleucus to Candragupta (p. 60), the author would have done well to consider the criticism of the late Vincent Smith's view by W. W. Tarn in his recently published work *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. In describing "the traditional framework of Ancient Indian polity into which the Maurya empire had necessarily to fit itself", the author observes (p. 77) that "Ancient India was built up as a vast rural democracy," and again (p. 84) that "the ancient Hindu monarchy was a limited monarchy under the

very conception of the State". The value of these somewhat hasty generalisations has been discussed by the present reviewer in another place (*Beginnings of Indian Historiography and other Essays*, pp. 135-144). The author renders (pp. 86-87, 121) *rājūka* of Aśoka's inscriptions, *rāṣṭriya* of Rudradāman's Girnar inscription and *rāṣṭramukha* and *rāṣṭrapāla* of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* as 'provincial Governor.' As the present reviewer has sought to prove elsewhere (*op. cit.*, pp. 62-67), these dignitaries were definitely of lower rank than the governors of provinces. On p. 154, the author quotes a statement of Megasthenes (in Diodorus' version) to the effect that "husbandmen pay a land-tribute to the king besides paying a fourth part of the produce of the soil." But unhappily he is completely silent about Megasthenes' account in the alternative version of Strabo, viz. that husbandmen till the land on condition of receiving one-fourth of the produce. An exhaustive discussion of the problem presented by these somewhat contradictory statements has been attempted by the present reviewer in another place (*Hindu Revenue System*, pp. 167-171). On the page last quoted (p. 154), *bali* of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* is incorrectly translated as 'a general land-tax,' the correct rendering being an agricultural cess. The panel of judges in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* is said (p. 244) to consist of "six judges, three who are specialists in the law and three *amātyas*." The correct translation, according to Ganapati Sastri's explanation, would be 'three judges of the rank of *amātya*'. The author's tendency to omit important references, e.g. to the Candragupta Basti at Sravana Belgola (p. 65), to the *Mahābhārata* passage giving the full complement of an army (p. 269) and to the Golakhpur hoard of silver punch-marked coins (p. 345) cannot but be regarded as very unfortunate, as also his neglect to refer to the views of previous scholars on important topics such as the significance of the references to *bhāga* and *bali* in Aśoka's Rummimdei inscription (p. 155).

The Vedic *nishķa*, according to the author (p. 340), stands for a coin, but it might as well mean a metallic ingot. The author quotes (pp. 347-349) Allan for the statement that two classes of silver punch-marked coins (viz. his classes II and VI) were 'the coins of the Maurya empire'. Allan's view, however, has been rendered out of date by the discoveries of fresh hoards of these two classes of coins on the Taxila site, of which the respective dates are given as c. 317 B.C. and c. 248 B.C. We know now that Allan's class VI coins are pre-Mauryan, while his class II coins are of the Mauryan times.

In describing the art of this period (p. 358f.), the author is unaccountably silent about the architecture of Candragupta's

imperial palace at Pataliputra described by the Greek writers and the excavation of its ruins by the late Dr. D. B. Spooner. On the contrary, the author lists a series of eleven colossal stone statues which he confidently says (p. 359) "are admittedly pre-Asokan and perhaps pre-Mauryan". But apart from the fact that none of the reputed authorities has so far traced them beyond the Maurya period we have to remember that a recent writer has given good grounds for pushing their date to the times of the Bharhut Stupa or thereabout (See Nihar-Ranjan Ray, *Maurya and Sunga Art*, p. 48f.).

The book is enriched with two plates illustrating what the author calls "typical Maurya punch-marked coins." But as they comprise a miscellaneous assortment of bent bar silver coins (now generally held to be pre-Mauryan) and punch-marked silver coins of different varieties (of which one has been just shown to be pre-Mauryan), the accuracy of the author's nomenclature may very much be doubted. It is again unfortunate that the author fails to give any reference to the coin-types of his plates. The value of the book would have been enhanced by the inclusion of one or two historical maps, the want of which cannot but be deeply regretted.

U. N. Ghoshal.

Endowment of Chinese Cultural Scholarships by the Government of China at the Calcutta University

To encourage the study by foreign nationals of Chinese language, literature, history and culture, the Ministry of Education of the National Government of China endowed last year a series of five scholarships each tenable in the under-mentioned Universities: (1) University of Chicago, (2) University of Columbia, (3) Harvard University, (4) Yale University, (5) Michigan University, (6) Princeton University, (7) Oxford University, (8) London University, (9) University of Calcutta, (10) Visva-Bharati University. The Syndicate of the Calcutta University, while gratefully accepting this generous offer, has recently appointed four scholars whose names with the subjects of their research are mentioned below:

Ajit Ranjan Bhattacharyya	...Taoism and Indian Thought
Dr. Anukul Chandra Banerji	...Some Aspects of Buddhist Culture from Chinese Sources
Krishnalal Chatterji	...National Movement in Modern China
Jinananda Bhikkhu	...Mission Activities between China and Greater India

Progress of Indological Scholarship in France

Through the kindness of Mlle. Suzanne Karpeles, General Secretary of The Buddhist Institute and Curator of the Royal Library of Cambodia, who reached Calcutta in January last, we are in a position to announce a number of important publications by French scholars in recent times. Professor L. Renou has published two works on Sanskrit grammar: *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit* (three volumes) and *La Durghāṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva* Text and French translation, (vols. 1-4 already published, vol. 5 in the Press). Other works undertaken by the same scholar are: *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* in French translation (vol. 1 in the Press), (ii) *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* in French translation (in the Press), (iii) *Littérature sanscrite répertoire alphabétique* (alphabetical index of Sanskrit literature) (already published), (iv) *Manual des Etudes indiennes* (vol. 1 in the Press).

Recently Professor Jean Filliozat has been making important

contributions to the study of Indian medicine. His works include *Magie et médecine* Paris 1945; *La formation de la médecine indienne* (in the Press); and *Les doctrines essentielles de l'Ayurveda et la médecine grecque* (in the Press). Other works from his pen are *Bibliothèque nationale. Catalogue du fonds Sanscrit (manuscrits)*, (1st fascicule) Paris 1941, and *L'Inde Classique, Manuel des études indiennes* (avec M. Renou), vol. I. (in the Press). The field of Indian archaeology is going to be enriched by a translation of the edicts of Aśoka from the pen of Professor Jules Bloch. As regards Pali studies mention may be made of the forthcoming publication of an edition de luxe of the *Dīgha Nikāya, Suttas 1-13*; (Pali text established by the Tipitaka Commission of the Buddhist Institute of Cambodia, French translation by Jules Bloch, Jean Filliozat and L. Renou) under the auspices of the Institut de Civilisation Indienne of Paris University. In the sphere of Outer India, the place of honour belongs to the work called *La vieille route de l'Inde. de Bactres à Taxila* (Part I already published. Part II in the Press) by Professor A. Foucher, forming the long-expected Volume 1 of the *Mémoires de la Délégation française en Afghanistan*. We note also with interest that the posthumous work of the late lamented J. Hackin will be published in a joint English and French edition with the aid of Warburg Institute of London. Mention may be made in this connection of Professor Filliozat's work *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens de médecine et de magie*.

Among works on Art and Archaeology of south-east Asia special mention may be made of *L'Art Khmer, les étapes de son évolution* by the late lamented Gilberte de Coral Remusat (1940). Two other works by the same scholar on Khmer decoration and the fantastic animals of the Far East are going to be published posthumously. In South-east Asia the French School of the Far East was able, in spite of the difficulties of the Great War, to publish two volumes of its *Bulletin*, namely, *BEFEO*, tome xli. Fasc. 1-2, (Hanoi 1941 and 1942), *Ibid*, vol xlvi (Hanoi 1943).

A very important work by George Coedès called *Histoire Ancienne des Etats Hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient* was published from Hanoi in 1944. We have lastly to mention a work on the Comparative Architecture of India and the Far East by Henri Marchal, of which vol. I was published in 1944 and vol. 2 is in the Press.

U. N. G.

Learned Societies in France

To the kindness of Mlle. Suzanne Karpeles we also owe the following information about the present condition of the learned societies in France dealing with Indology and connected topics.

The Société Asiatique of Paris, thanks to its energetic President, the late Professor Paul Pelliot, was able to continue its activities throughout the period of German occupation. It held its monthly sessions as usual and brought out the *Journal Asiatique*, although provisionally under the changed title of *Mélanges Asiatiques*. At the Sorbonne, at the L'Ecole des Langues Orientales, at the Collège du France, the courses relating to India and Indian expansion in the Asiatic world were continued without interruption.

At the l'Ecole du Louvre the courses of lectures connected with the Chair of Indianism comprised during the four years of German occupation the following topics: (1) Indian architecture, (2) Buddhist and Brahmanical sculptures of Ancient India, (3) Buddhist and Brahmanical sculptures of Indo-China and Insulindia, of Tibet, Afghanistan, and Central Asia. During the session 1945-46 the programme of lectures has been arranged to cover the arts influenced by India, viz. those of Campā, Java, Central Asia, Tibet, China and Japan. M. Philippe Stern is to take up the important course on Campā. His great work *L'Art du Campa (ancien Annam) et son évolution* was published secretly from Toulouse in 1943.

The Musée Guimet, which was closed since 1st September 1939, is gradually re-opening its halls to the public, the priority for removal of precious collections from their places of safety having been given to the Musée du Louvre. It is a great relief to learn that the entire collection of the Musée Guimet has been preserved intact almost by a miracle.

U. N. G.

Exhibition of Afghanistan antiquities at the Calcutta University

[Mr. Devaprasad Ghosh, M.A., P.R.S., Curator, Asutosh Museum of Indian Art has sent us, at our request, the following report on the exhibition of Buddhist and Moslem antiquities of Afghanistan held in the Asutosh Museum, Calcutta University in January 1946, under the auspices of Mr. Ahmad Ali Kohzad, Director of the Kabul Museum. The Managing Committee of the Greater India Society takes

this opportunity to join with Calcutta University in thanking Mr. Kohzad and the Afghan Government for making it possible to arrange this exhibition.]

"Indians have forgotten that Afghanistan once formed part and parcel of India proper. As an important province of the Maurya Empire, as the seat of the Indo-Bactrian and Kushan dynasties and later of the Shahi kings, Afghanistan continued to be an integral part of India for centuries together till it was overrun by the Muslim conquerors. Even in the Mughal period, as a frontier province it was a hot bone of contention between the Mughal Emperors of Delhi and the Persians.

"Significantly enough, Mr. Ahmed Ali Kohzad, the Head of the Afghan Mission, who recently came to Calcutta in connection with the Bi-centenary Celebrations of Sir William Jones at the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, said that the ancient name of Afghanistan was Ariyana. It is well known that in those far off days Jalalabad used to be known as Nagarhara, Begram (80 miles north of Kabul) as Kapiśa, all typical Sanskrit names. Even now the entire country is dotted with ancient ruins of monumental sculptures and Buddhist stūpas, which were noted by the eminent Chinese pilgrim Huen-Tsang in the 7th century A. D. Some of these stūpas in the Kabul Valley have been unearthed by a French Archaeological Mission with remarkable results.

"The Afghan Mission brought down with them a fair and representative collection of art and antiquities of ancient and mediaeval Afghanistan, now preserved in the Central Museum of Kabul. A small but very interesting exhibition, displaying the objects which have never been seen in India before, was organised at the Asutosh Museum of Indian Art, University of Calcutta. Although it remained on view from the 15th to 19th January only, it aroused keen interest among students, educationists and art-lovers as evinced by the eager crowds of people.

"Illustrating the Islamic as well as the Pre-Islamic periods the collection consisting of about 100 exhibits could be divided into specimens of art objects representing three epochs of art in Afghanistan. The first consisted of Buddhist stucco figures from Hadda, discovered by M. Hackin, belonging to the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D. They were undoubtedly the finest products of the Gandhāra school of art, as Hadda had been geographically and artistically the heart of ancient Gandhāra. Some of the heads of Buddha and Bodhisattva, often painted were distinguished by rare charm and delicacy. Others represented ethnic types, scarcely different from those prevailing now

in modern Afghanistan. A unique marble image of Sūryya, the Sun-god attracted considerable attention in the exhibition. It was dated about the 5th century A. D. but on stylistic grounds should be placed earlier. In any case, aesthetically and iconographically it was an intriguing piece.

"Of the metal objects, the Hellenistic bronzes from Begram, showing Hercules and other Greek classical figures, of about the beginning of the Christian era, illustrated the earliest phase of Gandhāra art.

"The second group consisting of bronzes from Ghazni exhibited here, showed for the first time to connoisseurs that the art of bronze casting in the Islamic period (11th-13th centuries A. D.) had attained its highest point at Ghazni.

"The third group of the collection revealed the beautiful manuscripts containing brilliant miniatures from the Timurid period of Herat. The illuminated pages were resplendent with the calligraphy and painting of some of the greatest masters of mediaeval Afghanistan. Of the 35 manuscripts some related to the Timurnamah, the Bustan of Sa'di, the Diwan of Hafiz, the Khamseh of Nizami and prayers of the 4th Caliph. A few paintings from the Akbarnamah, envisaging the best traits of the Jahangir school of Mughal Painting, were not the least important exhibits of the Section.

"We are indeed thankful to the Government of Afghanistan for providing us the rare opportunities of understanding the dominant role played by Afghanistan in the field of art and renewing the age-long cultural contact between India and Afghanistan."

D. P. Ghosh

Editorial Notes

The Managing Committee of the Grater India Society conveys its most sincere thanks to Dr. B. C. Law, the well-known Buddhist scholar and philanthropist for his kind donation of Rs. 1200/- in aid of the publication of the Society's Journal. Dr. B. C. Law has further encouraged the Society by kindly agreeing to become a member of its Managing Committee with effect from the last year.

* * * * *

The Managing Committee of the Society is very thankful to Messrs. G. Basu & Co. (Incorporated Accountants and Auditors), Calcutta for the trouble they have taken in auditing the Society's accounts for the years 1941-1944 in an honorary capacity.

* * * * *

The earnest thanks of the Committee are due to Dr. N. N. Law, one of the foundation members of the Society, for his making the annual donation of Rs. 100/- for the current year.

* * *

Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, Officiating Government Epigraphist for India, has kindly sent us an English rendering of a letter received by him from Dr. J. Ph. Vogel who wrote it on the 10th November 1945 from his home address near Leiden. We quote in translation the following extracts from this letter with Dr. Chhabra's permission :—

".....You may have already learnt that a rumour about my death was unfounded. Three years ago my brother J. Th. Vogel died and an announcement of his death in the papers has possibly been the cause of this misunderstanding. Even in America an obituary notice has appeared.....

"The Kern Institute has also remained intact, though in the month of December last year (1944) some bombs exploded quite near the building. But luckily not a single book has been lost or damaged. The Institute could gladly resume its activities but for the want of coal and paper." (Sd.) J. Ph. Vogel.

"I still regularly read Hindi with students and hope to publish a Dutch translation of Prem Chand's *Sapt Saroj* "

The letter speaks for itself. While sincerely apologising to the veteran scholar for the premature publication of his obituary notice in the last number of our Journal, we welcome with great satisfaction the news that he is hale and hearty after the terrible years of the Great War. We wish him many years of strenuous literary activity in the future. We take this opportunity of expressing our sense of high relief at the fortunate escape of the Kern Institute from the ravages of the war. We wish the Institute a long continuance of its useful career. Meanwhile we extend our cordial welcome to the latest number of the *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology* published by the Kern Institute, copies of which have just reached India.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,

Vol. xi, Part 2 (1945)

Bailey, H. W.—The Khotan Dhammapada.

Thomas, F. W.—Some Notes on Central-Asian Kharoṣṭhī Documents
(I Document No. 661 : 1. *Hinajha* etc.; 2. The dynastic appealation *Vijaya*; 3. Source and date of No. 661; 4. Persons named in No. 661, 5. Language and script of No. 661; 6. Some particular words. II. Piro, Pirova, Pirovala. III. Buṇṇime, Bhoti, Avasama, IV Śilpoga, V. Paṭṭa Paṭṭa.

Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,

Vol. XXXV, part 2, 1945.

Paranavitana, S.—Brahmi Inscriptions in Sinhalese verse.

The Jaina Antiquary, Vol. ix, No. 2. 1943.

Upadhye, A.N.—On the latest Progress of Jaina and Buddhist Studies.

Printed and published by J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press, Ltd.,
9, Panchanan Ghosh Lane, Calcutta.

Journal of the Greater India Society

Issued twice every year, in January and July. It is the only *Journal* in India concerned with the investigation of Indian cultural influences on foreign lands. Besides a large number of original articles from the pen of distinguished authorities, both Indian and foreign, it contains reviews of books and select contents of Oriental Journals in English and Continental languages. A limited number of the back issues of the *Journal* (Vols. I-XI) are available for sale.

Contents of J. G. I. S. Vol. XII, No I, pp. 1-68

In Memoriam—The Late Dr. J. Ph. Vogel (Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra); Three more Yūpa Inscriptions of King Mūlavarmaṇ from Koetei (East Borneo) (Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra); The status of *Dhimmīs* in Muslim States, with special reference to Mughal India (M. L. Roy Choudhury Sastri); The *kris* of the first Muslim Sultan of Malacca in the Collection of H. H. the Maharaja Gaekwad of Baroda (Dr. H. Goetz)

Some Works by U. N. Ghoshal

A History of Hindu Political Theories from the earliest times to the end of the seventeenth century A. D. (2nd edition, Oxford University Press, 1927). **Rs. 8/-**

Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System (University of Calcutta, 1929). **Rs. 5/8/-**

The Agrarian System in Ancient India (University of Calcutta, 1930). **Rs. 2/8/-**

Ancient Indian Culture in Afghanistan (Bulletin of the Greater-India Society, No. 5. Calcutta, 1928). **Re. 1/-**

Progress of Greater Indian Research, 1917-1942 (Publication of the Greater India Society, No. 14. Calcutta, 1943). **Rs. 4/-**

The Beginnings of Indian Historiography and other Essays (Calcutta, 1944). **Rs. 8/-**

A History of Hindu Public Life Part I. Period of the Vedic *Saṃhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas* and the older *Upaniṣads*. Calcutta, 1945. **Rs. 6/-**

A History of Hindu Public Life. Part II. The Pre-Maurya Period. [In preparation]

Enquire at—37, Badurbagan Row, P. O. Amherst Street, Calcutta.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE
Greater India Society

BULLETINS

1. **Greater India**—By Dr. Kalidas Nag (to be re-issued).
2. **India and China**—By Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi (to be re-issued).
3. **Indian Culture in Java and Sumatra**—Revised and enlarged edition. Part I, *Text*—By Dr. B. R. Chatterjee; Part II, *Inscriptions*—By Dr. N. P. Chakravarti and Dr. B. R. Chatterjee. **Rs. 2.**
4. **India and Central Asia**—By Dr. N. P. Chakravarti (to be re-issued).
5. **Ancient Indian Culture in Afghanistan**—By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal **Rs. 1.**

PUBLICATIONS

1. **Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East**—Vol. I, **CHAMPA**—By Dr. R. C. Majumdar. **Rs. 15.**
2. **Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East**—Vol. II, **SUVARNADVIPA**—By Dr. R. C. Majumdar. Part I—Political History, Part II—Cultural History **Rs. 10 each.**
3. **Hindu Law and Custom**—(Only authorised English translation of Dr. Julius Jolly's *Recht und Sitte*)—By Dr. B. K. Ghosh. **Rs. 10-8**
4. **Social Life in Ancient India** (Studies in Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*)—By H. C. Chakladar. **Rs. 4.**
5. **Pratima-mana-laksanam** (Sanskrit and Tibetan)—By Prof. P. N. Bose. **Rs. 4.**
6. **Indian Literature in China and the Far East**—By P. K. Mukherji. **Rs. 3.**
7. **Indian Colony of Siam**—By Prof. P. N. Bose. **Rs. 3-8.**
8. ब्रह्मर भारत (Hindi edition of Bulletin No. 1.) (To be re-issued).
9. ब्रह्मर भारत (Bengali edition of Bulletin No. 1.) **Rs. 1.**
10. **Indo-Javanese History** (Only authorised English translation of Prof. N. J. Krom's *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*. With up-to-date notes by Dr. Krom)—By Himansu Bhushan Sarkar, M.A. (*In the Press*)
11. **Progress of Greater Indian Research** (1917-42)—By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal. **Rs. 4.**

GREATER INDIA STUDIES

1. **Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali**—By Himansu Bhushan Sarkar, M.A. **Rs. 6.**
2. **Travels of Tibetan Pilgrims in the Swat Valley**—By Prof. G. Tucci. **Rs. 4 or 8 shillings.**

To be had of the Manager, **GREATER INDIA SOCIETY,**
35, BADURBAGAN ROW, P.O. AMHERST STREET,
CALCUTTA.

