

There is, however, an intimate connexion between the *Abhidhânaratnamâlâ* and the *Abhidhânacintâmani*, beyond the mere name. Not only do whole distichs and verses agree with one another, and differ from Amara, but there is also in both an identity of tetrastichs, and this to an extent which cannot be explained by the supposition that both have borrowed from the same source. Again, we find that both attribute to many words the same gender in opposition to the *Amarakosha*. But if we are called on to determine the relative priority of Halâyudha and Hemacandra, we must be guided in our decision by the following circumstances. Halâyudha's vocabulary is not only less copious, but his style is much more simple, and his explanations enter more into detail. To use whole distichs and verses in order to define a single word, is quite unusual with Hemacandra, who, on the contrary, endeavours to cram into one verse as many synonyms as possible. Farther, we find that in technical divisions Hemacandra is acquainted with more developed, and therefore later, systems. For example, the different kinds of feminine actions produced by the sentiment of love, technically called *hâva*, are limited by Amara to six, and by Halâyudha to nine, while Hemacandra knows ten. In the physiological distinction of elephants, Halâyudha does not exceed the number of three, whilst Hemacandra adds a fourth. The *Ratnamâlâ* is divided into five, the *Cintâmani* into six chapters. Homonyms are treated by Halâyudha very briefly, whereas the *Nânârtha* of