

EXTRACTS
FROM
SOME OF THE LETTERS FROM SCHOLARS,

— TO —

PRAKTANA-VIMARSA-VICHAKSHANA

R. NARASIMHACHAR, M. A., M. E. A. S.

EXTRACTS

FROM SOME OF THE LETTERS FROM SCHOLARS

— TO —

PRAKTANA-VIMARSA-VICHAKSHANA

R. NARASIMHACHAR, M. A., M. R. A. S.

Dr. J. F. Fleet, C. I. E., LONDON.

13th June, 1901.

I am glad to have your letter of the 12th ultimo, and shall always receive with pleasure any similar comments and remarks from you, though it may not be always that I shall be able to utilise them quickly. I intend next autumn or winter to thoroughly revise both the text and translation of the long inscription at Ablur, and also the introductory remarks in which I shall make certain improvements from the two Puranas themselves, and then re-issue it in the *Indian Antiquary*; and your notes will come in very usefully then. The same journal, the *Indian Antiquary*, would be a very convenient means for you to publish any Notes, commenting on my work in the same way, which you would like to see issued more quickly than would usually be the case if they were only communicated in letters to me. I see that you are interested in the history of the Kanarese language and literature, as well as in the political history. Could you not give us some papers on that in the *Indian Antiquary*?

12th December, 1907.

I have read with interest your Annual Report for the year ending 30th June, 1907. I had not seen any of the Mysore Reports for a long time before that. I am glad to learn that, though Mr. Rice has retired, the research work has not been stopped; and I hope that it will go on for a long time under your charge: there must be a great deal still to be done!

It occurs to me to send you a copy of a sketch of the results of Epigraphic Researches in Mysore which I wrote in 1905, and which you may perhaps not have seen.

23rd October, 1908.

I have read with appreciation your Annual Report for the year ending 30th June, 1908. The Sântara copperplate grant, page 6, and the Châlukya record, page 8, are particularly interesting.

I agree with you that the reputation of Bûtuga II is now cleared by your improved reading *bisugeye kalan=âgi* and your translation of it: and I feel quite glad, for his sake. The injustice originated through Mr. Rice's translation, 'by stealth,' and reading, *kallan*. But it may also be remarked that Kittel's Dictionary has omitted to give *bisuge* the meaning 'a howdah': from that Dictionary one might infer, if anything, that Bûtuga killed Râjâditya 'on the chess-board,' when they were playing chess.

Dr. Barnett, the Head of the Department of Oriental Books and Manuscripts at the British Museum, is making a catalogue of the Kanarese books there. Can you kindly answer the enclosed query, which he asked me to send to you, about Châmarâja? Please write to him direct at the Museum: he takes much interest in many things, and I should like you to be in communication with him.

26th March, 1909.

I was glad to have your note on Bûtuga II. It will duly appear in the April number of the J. R. A. S.

Your discoveries at the site of a supposed ancient city near Chitaldroog are very interesting. In connection with the coins, you will require to see Professor Rapson's recently issued Catalogue of the Andhra Coins.

13th May, 1909.

By all means send me, for the J. R. A. S., your note on the expression *Dattaka-sûtra-vrittêh pranêtâ*: it will be inter-

DR. J. F. FLEET, C. I. E.

esting. And I will probably give at the same time some comments by myself on the expression *Kirâtârjuntyasya panchadasa-sarga-tikkâkâra* which is applied to Durvinîta. It means "author of a commentary, not on 15 sargas of the *Kirâtârjuniya*, but on the 15th sarga of that work,"—the one which contains all the alliterative and otherwise peculiar verses.

29th October, 1909.

I have read with interest your Annual Report for the year ending 30th June, 1909 ; and hope to find time to give a short notice of it somewhere or other. But, before I do that, I should like to know something more about the date, S'aka 380, which you quote from the *Lôkavibhâga* ; page 31.

22nd September, 1910.

I received your two Notes on the Dattaka-sûtra and the Keladi Kings of Ikkeri and Bednur. They will be published in the J. R. A. S. I have also had your article on the Chalukya Genealogy according to the Kannada poet Ranna. This is a useful article. I hope that you will edit in the *Epi. Ind.* the new set of Ganga plates, dated in A. D. 828, which you mentioned in your letter of the 10th March. It should be an interesting record.

6th October, 1910.

I am much obliged for the copy of your Annual Report for 1909—10, which I have read with interest. You have given a full note on the *Lôkavibhâga* in para 115. So a note such as I suggested, in my last letter, for the J. R. A. S. will not now be needed. But you might with advantage give us, for that Journal, a Note on anything further that you can find out about the Prâkrit *Trilôka-prajñapti*, which is quoted in Simhasûri's work.

27th June, 1911.

I was glad to receive your note of the 6th April, and shall look forward with interest to learning from your next Annual Report more details about the newly discovered records which you mention. As regards the date of S'aka 380,—

you said in one of your notes that the Lōkavibhāga in its 6th prakarana quotes "a few" Prākṛit verses from the Trilōkaprajnapti: and you sent me one of those verses. Will you kindly send me a transcription of *all* the few of them? I shall then write a note on the question of this date: I am inclined to think, on the whole, that it may be accepted.

22nd March, 1912.

I duly received the copy of your Annual Report for 1910-11, and read it with great interest. I am looking forward to seeing your text and translation, with a facsimile, of the new copperplate record of Durvinīta.

16th May, 1912.

I presume that you always send copies of your Reports to the Director-General of Archaeology and to Mr. Venkayya, as a matter of courtesy, for their information. If so, you might very well ask to have your discoveries included in their annual accounts of new inscriptions, &c.

As regards the record of Durvinīta, it occurs to me to add this. It may quite possibly establish the existence of a Ganga King named Durvinīta. But it will not prove anything beyond what is recited in itself. And even if it should recite and establish all the early pedigree which I regard as fictitious, it would not thereby establish the authenticity of certain records, asserting that pedigree, which are palpably spurious.

7th February, 1913.

I am much obliged for the copy which you sent me of your Annual Report of 30th June, 1912. I found much interesting reading in it. It is unfortunate that the date for which it is made up seems to prevent any notice of it in the Director-General's "Annual" for what is more or less the same year. But there should be no difficulty about its being noticed in the "Annual" for the *next* year: you should try and get that done.

The new record of Durvintta is of course an interesting document, and rather a puzzling one. On the side of its being a genuine early record, there are, of course, the points which you have stated in your Report. But there are other points in it, and about it, on the other side, too. The question is a complex one, requiring much thought. I cannot, at present, make up my mind about it in either direction. It is much to be hoped that you may ere long succeed in making some discovery which might be conclusive one way or the other. The Humcha inscription is of not the slightest value for that early period. Can you point to any inscriptions, except the copperplate grants of the Ganga series, which present the title *Mahâdhirâja*? I know of only one instance of its use, in a Valabhi record; and it seems to be not certain even there.

4th April, 1913.

Your two Notes are appearing in the April number of the J. R. A. S. I contemplate making some remarks on them in the number for July or October. I do not purpose entering into the question as to whether the record on the Gumma-reddipura plates is, or is not, a genuine one. The present point is that, for palæographic reasons, it was certainly not written before about A. D. 650; that is, at least a century later than the time to which you refer it: and it may easily have been written even a century later still. A similar remark applies to the Melekôte plates of Mâdhavarman; your Report of 1910, §47.

In connection with the Melekôte plates I would say, incidentally, that it is very inconvenient that you should have adopted the style "Mâdhava III" to denote Madhava son of Vishnugôpa: he is properly Mâdhava II; and styling him otherwise only introduces a quite unnecessary complication. The Humcha and similar inscriptions are of no value for the early history, and for assigning the name Mâdhava to the original ancestor Konganivarman of the copperplate record. His son was Mâdhava I, as far as the copperplates go; ~~as far as~~

Mādhava II was the son of Vishnugōpa: and that is the nomenclature which ought to be restored now.

This, by the way, leads me to mention another inconvenience in your writings; namely, the use of such references as "Tumkur 23," "Nagar 35." They may seem explicit enough to *you*, knowing Mysore and its divisions by heart. But they do not help other people to turn up with any ease the *volume* in which a particular record is to be found. The volume should always be stated.

Also, when any entire volume comes to be re-edited, the *taluks* should be re-arranged, so as to stand in *alphabetical order*. It might well be thought that the present arrangement was adopted in order to make it as difficult as possible (instead of easy) to turn up a particular record even when the volume is known!

I shall look forward with interest to your next Annual Report; hoping that that, too, may bring forward some new discoveries which are likely to be useful.

Meanwhile, there are four dated stone inscriptions of Sripurusha:—EC, 3, TN. I of his 1st year; EC, 10, Kl. 78 of his 26th year; Kl. 6 of his 28th year; and Mb. 80 of his 42nd year. Lithographs have been published of (1) and (3): but they are not *facsimiles*: they have been touched up by hand. Plates of (2) and (4) have not been given at all. I wish you would take these four records in hand, and give us critical texts and translations of them, with absolute facsimiles such as those which you have been giving in your recent Reports. The facsimiles are much wanted, for palæographic purposes.

As to the form *khādga*, with the long *ā*, which figures in several other plates also, can you quote the authority of any grammar or *kōsa* for it, and also for the variant *khālgā* which appears elsewhere?

VINCENT A. SMITH ESQ. M.A.

30th April, 1913.

In my last note I asked you to edit the four dated inscriptions of Sripurusha. To these I would add the inscription, mentioned in your Report of 1910, §54, which records the death of S'ivamâra II in battle against the Râshtrakûtas: this is decidedly of interest. As regards the Siragunda inscription, there is no good reason for thinking that Nirvinîta is Avinîta. His name being Avinîta, why should he be called anything else?

In your Report of 1910, §55, you proposed to place the epitaph of Arishtanêmi and that of Prabhâchandra about A. D. 800. But in each case the characters are older than those on the Melekôte and Gummareddipura plates, which you refer to about A. D. 400 and 550. These arrangements will not answer, at all: the dates are wrong on both sides. The two Dindikarâjas cannot be identical.

Vincent A. Smith Esq., M. A., OXFORD.

12th December, 1908.

I am pleased to learn that research is being so actively and efficiently conducted under you.

7th October, 1909.

I have read your Report with interest. It records an immense amount of hard work done in a scholarly fashion much to the credit of the Department as organized by the Government of His Highness. I note that you are bringing out a second edition of *Sravana Belgola*. I possess the old edition and a set of the *Epigraphia Carnatica* which will be much enhanced in value by the publication of the General Index, which must be a task of great complexity. I have some experience in Index making and know what it means.

The discovery of the initial date of Simhavarman Pallava as A. D. 437 is a welcome standpoint for Pallava history. Your discoveries also add to the information about the obscure Andhra coinage and justify the expectation expressed

by me that researches in the Native States would help to clear up the subject.

I am now engaged in preparing *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*. I observe that on page 2, para 10, you refer to sculptures of the Bûchêsvara temple at Koramangala as 'wonderful works of art' of the 12th century. If you took photographs, I should be glad to receive copies. I am trying to collect photographs of the works of art of all periods. Mysore is the only country in which it was customary to record the names of sculptors. If you possess or control spare photographs of any objects of conspicuous artistic merit I shall be very pleased to receive them.

Congratulating you on your very satisfactory Report, I remain &c.

4th January, 1910.

I am much obliged for your letter of 9th December and for the four beautiful photographs of Mysore temples. I hope to be able to publish one of them if not two.

2nd October, 1910.

I have read with much interest your Report for 1909-10 and all the paragraphs you mark are notable. I am publishing the photograph of the Nuggihalli temple in my book.

Your most remarkable announcement is that of the discovery of Bhâsa's plays. Hitherto only a few petty fragments were known which are noticed and quoted in M. Silvain Levi's treatise *Le Theatre Indien*, Paris, 1890. Complete plays by a predecessor of Kâlidâsa are of high importance. I note also your verification of Simhavarman's date. You are doing good work.

19th November, 1911.

Your Report for 1910-11 is full of interesting and novel matter. I do not understand how a soldier could be using a telescope (page 8) in the 12th century in India. Such a thing was not known in Europe till centuries later, although

Roger Bacon in the 13th century knew something about it. Did you take a photograph of the sculpture? It would be interesting to have photographs of some of the *signed* images of good artistic quality—also of some of the portrait statues. The *madanakai* figures too I should like to see. Clearly Mysore possessed a remarkable school of sculpture, which deserves attention. Elsewhere the names of artists are very rarely recorded.

Are the coloured panels (page 5) coloured sculpture or only painted? If the Talgunda temple (page 18) is really of 2nd century, it deserves more notice.

I am much obliged to you for sending me such an interesting report.

3rd December, 1912.

Your Report for 1911-12 contains much valuable matter and I have made notes of sundry things that concern me.

I should be glad for you to pay more attention to individual works of art. All Survey Reports are full of views of temples, but the sculpture has been much neglected. For instance (page 2, para 8) you mention the magnificent portrait statuette of Kanthirava, but you do not seem to have taken a photograph of it. I should like a photograph of that very much, as well as of some of the other numerous portrait statues and metallic images mentioned in your report.

The habit that the Mysore sculptors had of signing their works is of special value to the historian of art. But nobody yet has taken the trouble to publish a single signed work, much less to study the styles of individual sculptors. **In that direction much might be done,**

25th January, 1913.

I am in receipt of four photographs which are very interesting. For photographing statues in dark places, use magnesium wire flashes or a portable electric lamp. Consult Mr. Marshall for process.

The *madanakai* figures are charming. I am much pleased to receive the artists' signatures. The telescope is a surprise. The principle of the instrument was known in Europe to Roger Bacon, who died about 1294, but the instrument was not in practical use until 1608, in Holland (*Encycl. Brit.* latest edition). You might follow out the hint given by the sculpture: is there any mention of the subject in Sanskrit literature?

I am not in strong health, but if I can I shall write something about your excellent work, which deserves more publicity.

22nd February, 1914.

I am pleased to see that you have acted on my suggestion and have devoted attention to the individual sculptures. It is interesting now to be able to examine and compare the works of Mallitamma and Baichoja.

The Report is full of matter and well arranged. I have marked many passages.

Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, C. I. E., OXFORD.

1st November, 1909.

I have read your Report with very great interest, and congratulate you on your successful work. May I suggest that you should publish the *Ainûli* plates *Kirtivarnan II* in the *Indian Antiquary*?

I dare say you have seen Professor Rapson's new Catalogue of the Andhra and W. Kshatrapa Coins in the British Museum. As the coins which you have discovered appear to

modify his opinions, it would be well if you were to publish a paper in the Indian Antiquary discussing the points at issue.

On page 31 I notice a very interesting date, viz., 380 Saka. Could you tell me something more about the work *Lôkavibhâga*? Who is Simhasûri? I cannot find any mention of a Jaina pontiff of that name and date; at least, not in any of the *pattâvalis* published in the Indian Antiquary.

Your Report has interested me so much that I should like to ask you to be so kind as to send me also copies of previous years' Reports, if you can spare them.

27th December, 1909.

I thank you for your letter of the 9th December, as well as for the two copies of your Report for 1906-7 and 1907-8

With regard to the verse quoted by you on page 31 of your Report for 1908-9, I agree that the reading of the verse as printed by you is quite correct, if it is construed as you do; and I accept your construction. As to the *Lôkavibhâga*, any further information that you may be able to procure, will be very welcome.

In your Report for 1906-7, on page 15, para 59, you describe a medical manuscript, called *Kalyânakâraka*. As you probably know, I am making special researches into ancient Indian Medicine. The manuscript, therefore, particularly interests me. Would you kindly inform me whether it would be possible for me to obtain the loan of the manuscript?

10th April, 1910.

The last mail brought me your most interesting and welcome letter of the 24th March, together with the quotations referring to Charaka, Susruta and Nimi in the work called *Kalyânakâraka*. It was most kind of you to send me the extracts so promptly. May I now venture to ask you for some further information, for the work discovered by you promises to be most valuable in Indian medical research,

In your Report for 1907 (page 15, § 59) you say that the author of the *Kalyānakâra* is a person called Ugrāditya. Would you kindly quote for me the particular passage in which the name Ugrāditya occurs? You say that Ugrāditya was a contemporary of the Râshtrakûta king Nripatunga (815-877) and of the Eastern Chalukya king Kali Vishnuvardhana V. This statement seems to be based on the hypothesis that both portions, the metrical as well as the prose, were written by the same person, and about the same time. What grounds have you for that hypothesis?

In your letter of the 24th March, you say that "the following *modern authors* are condemned as flesheaters." Among these "modern authors" Charaka is included. This is a rather important point. Would you kindly quote for me the original Sanskrit of the passage? In your previous letter of the 3rd February you say that "the work is said to be abridged from *Prânâvâya-mahâgama* written in the Mâgaḍhi language. This is another important point. Would you kindly quote the original Sanskrit of the passage which contains that statement?

I hope I am not wearying you with all these questions. It seems to me that you have struck on a rather important work with respect to the history of old Indian medicine.

13th June, 1910.

It was most kind of you to enter so fully into the arguments which I placed before you regarding the identity of Vishnurâja and Ugrāditya. I have not got the previous correspondence with me to refer to, but from what you now explain, I think I see clearly that my arguments and identification are not tenable. They were, indeed, based, as you rightly say, on the meagre information supplied previously. I am all the more grateful for the fuller information now supplied. My present impression is that it quite proves that the *Ashtânga* referred to by Ugrāditya is not (as I had suggested) the

Ashtānga-sangraha of Vāgbhata, and that your identification of the Vishnurāja is most likely to be correct.

As the *Kalyānakāraka* is a Jain medical work, I am all the more anxious to secure a copy to enable me to study it more thoroughly and compare it with the works of Brahmanical medical science.

3rd October, 1910.

I have read your Report for 1909-10 with very great interest, as I do all your reports which contain items of new discoveries. That discovery of the Saka date 380 is of very peculiar interest. I suppose the astronomical data bearing on it, will now be tested also by European savants.

11th December, 1911.

Allow me to congratulate you on this Report (for 1910-11) of very successful work, which I have perused with much interest, especially the paragraphs to which you drew my particular attention. I am very glad to notice (§144) that Dr. Fleet has now accepted your discovery of the early Saka date.

22nd September, 1912.

I beg to acknowledge with cordial thanks the off-print on your article Bhāmaha and Dandin. Your argument as to Dandin's living under Narasimhavarman II seems very convincing.

20th December, 1912.

I always look forward to your Reports with particular interest on account of the notable discoveries which they so often contain. An instance, in your present Report, are the Gummareddipura copper plates to which you draw my attention. From their appearance they seem to be obviously genuine; and if so they are most important, because they would prove the existence of Durvinīta. Hitherto, as Dr. Fleet (to whom I referred the point) informs me, Durvinīta was only known from various records on copper which are said to be unmistakably spurious and date from the 9th or 10th century.

The crucial point, therefore, is to establish the genuineness of these new copper plates.

I must say that the appearance of the characters as seen on your facsimile *does* suggest genuineness; but it will be necessary to compare them closely with the characters of records of the same period. I have no such records at hand just now; and therefore can say nothing more about it, but to express a hope that your record may eventually prove itself to be genuine.

There is another point which puzzles me. You say that the record is not dated; but you argue that Durvinîta must have lived in the first half of the 6th century. You say that Durvinîta placed his daughter's son (*i. e.* his grandson) Jayasimha-Vallabha on the throne, and you suggest that the reference here is to Jayasimha, the grandfather of Pulakési I. I do not see where the synchronism comes in. Pulakési I's date is generally taken to be about 550 A. D.; his grandfather (*i. e.*, Durvinîta's daughter's son) Jayasimha would be about 500 A. D.; and his grandfather (Durvinîta) would be about 450 A. D., that is, about the middle of the 5th century.

As to Ugrâditya, you are quite right. My statement in the Introduction to the Bower manuscript arose through a misunderstanding. In the connection in which the statement occurs, the absence of the name does not really matter much. Still my statement may be misunderstood; and I shall take the first suitable opportunity to correct it publicly. I am glad that you have drawn my attention to it.

29th April, 1914.

Your letter of the 4th April is of uncommon interest to me. You will see from the footnote appended by me to stanza 36 (of the Bower manuscript), that at the time of editing, I failed to discover its name and identity. It is of very great interest therefore to learn that you seem to have discovered other instances of the occurrence of this very rare metre. You

will have noticed that Dr Fleet (Editor of Gupta Inscriptions) did not recognize the Tusam inscription (page 270' to which you refer as an instance of stanza 36, as being metrical at all. He says (page 269) that "the inscription is in prose throughout."

The matter is well worth further research; and I would suggest that you should elaborate your discovery in a paper to be contributed to the Indian Antiquary. My time is so fully occupied with archaeological research in connection with Sir A. Stein's discoveries, and with ancient Indian medicine that I cannot afford to devote any time to the problem raised by you. And it seems to me only fair that the credit of elaborating and publishing your discovery should rest with yourself.

Dr. E. Hultzs, Halle.

4th. November, 1894.

I had thought hitherto that the exigencies of the metre had prompted the composer to place the *cha* before *râjyam tadīyam*, and I had connected *tam* with *satrum*. But your suggestion solves the difficulty in an admirable manner, and I have not the slightest doubt now that *Tancha* is meant for *Tanjai* or *Tanjâ-ûr*, *i. e.* *Tanjore*. As I have remarked in *Epi. Ind.* Vol. I. p. 362, we must exercise caution in using that verse for historical purposes, as, in an inscription published by Dr. Fleet in the *J. Bo. As. Soc.*, the same verse occurs in the description of the reign of Sangama of the *first* Vijayanagara dynasty, from whose "office copy" it was borrowed by the court-poets of the second dynasty.

1st April, 1909.

Many thanks for your two interesting Reports and the plate of lead coins. I have noted your correction *abhanga-garuda*, which is perfectly convincing.

24th March, 1910

I regret to find that I have not yet acknowledged the receipt of your interesting Report for 1908-09, which contains

many valuable discoveries, as the mention of Dindika, the new Mahârathi coin, the date of the *Lôkavibhâga* &c. I am glad to learn that you are bringing out a second edition of the Belgola volume and an Index volume.

As Dindika is mentioned at Sravana Belgola, we must take Dindika in the Udayêndiram plates to be the actual name of the son of Sivamâra and Prithivîpati not as his name, but as a general epithet. My mistake, along with that noticed by Venkayya in *Epi. Ind.* IX, 87, goes back to Foulkes.

14th July, 1910.

Thanks for your letter. You may be right regarding the two readings in the *Lôkavibhâga*. At any rate the sense remains the same in both cases. The new Mahârathi coin is very interesting.

16th October, 1911.

I find that I have not yet thanked you for the copy of your Report for 1909-10, which as usual is very full and interesting. I hope you will discover still more of those fine lead coins at Chitaldroog which still remain puzzling. Perhaps Mr. Rapson will be able to make out the legends when more copies of them turn up. The Svapnavâsavadatta is a great find.

25th January, 1912.

I find that I have not yet acknowledged receipt of the copy of your very interesting Report for 1910-11. It was specially valuable to me because I know at least a few of the antiquities which you are describing by a personal visit, viz., Halebid, Belur, Belgami and Talagunda. Of the sculptures at the two former places I possess a few photographs. These temples deserve to be photographed and published in full, which would of course be a laborious and expensive undertaking. The new Kadamba grant is a valuable discovery, likewise the Virakal at Nêralige, which enabled you to correct the rendering of the A'takûr stone.

29th May, 1913.

Many thanks for your valuable article which I ought to have acknowledged long ago. It is specially interesting to me as it makes it unnecessary to place Mâgha after Jinêdra, although I believe, with my late friend Kielhorn (see J. R. A. S. 1908, 500), that Mâgha, verse II, 112 does *not* refer to any work called Nyâsa, but that *nyâsa* there means nothing but "supplying". The oldest commentator on Mâgha, Vallabh-dêva, already says *Nyâsò Jinêdra-kritah*. So the belief that Mâgha alluded to Jinêdra existed already about A. D. 900. With best thanks for your last interesting Report, I am &c.

R. Sewell Esq., ROEHAMPTON, SURREY.

6th. March, 1909.

I was greatly interested in your Annual Report, and intended to examine your facts carefully, but for several months I have been engaged in chronological work and have had to abandon historical work for the time. I will, however, try to find time to go carefully into your disentanglement of the intricate Vijayanagar chronology at the period of which you treat.

I am trying to piece together the entire history of South India from the inscriptions—in which Mysore is particularly rich.

3rd October, 1909.

I have to send you my best thanks for copy of your most interesting Annual Report for 1908—9. I have been too busy of late on chronological work to be able to continue historical studies, but in a few days I hope to be able to resume them; and then I shall go carefully into your facts. I shall be extremely obliged if I may be favoured with *all* your Annual Reports, as they are most valuable.

It is a great pleasure to me to see the constant and rapid advance made in epigraphic studies in South India. and the

interest in them which is taken by gentlemen like yourself and Mr. Venkayya and so many others.

3rd December, 1910.

Your Report for 1909—10 is most interesting and I hope I may always be favoured with copies of your Reports.

I hope you will not mind my making one remark. There have been so very many forgeries of ancient date, relating to early Ganga kings, on copper plates found in Mysore, that I always examine with peculiar care copper-plate grants of professedly very early date from that country. Professor Kielhorn has declared "spurious" almost every copper-plate grant from Mysore earlier than the reign of Bûtuga I (A.D. 887). Now the characters of the Melekôte plates of Mâdhava III look to me far more modern than those of the Manne plates which you date in A. D. 828. Yet the Melekôte plates profess to belong to about 400 A. D. I only suggest this for your consideration.

17th March, 1912

The new inscriptions are most interesting, but I have had no time as yet to give them the careful study they demand.

1st March, 1914.

I have been working at South Indian History, with reference to the inscriptions, for several months, and all your information will be a great help. Have you any definite information as to *how* and *why* the Pândyas of Uchchangi became rulers of Nolambavâdi, and why the former Pallava rulers disappeared shortly before A. D. 1079?

Dr. J. Burgess, C. I. E., L. L. D., EDINBURGH.

15th November, 1911.

I have read parts of your Report for 1910—11, but have not yet had time to examine the whole. The Plate No. I is specially interesting and well reproduced, and one only wishes there had been more of the same class.

The paras you direct my attention to, I have read, but without photographic illustrations it is difficult to grasp the details of the descriptions, so as to follow them very satisfactorily. Indeed in all archaeological work, full and accurate illustrations are indispensable to convey right comprehension. Very elaborate and lengthy descriptions arranged with studious care, may sometimes supply the want, but only occasionally, and at great expense of labour.

Mr. Rice's plans in the *Epigraphia Carnatica* are very useful as giving *general* ideas of the arrangements of the different temples—which could hardly have been conveyed by any descriptions. What the architect and archaeologist requires are—more detailed plans such as only a trained architectural surveyor can produce, with measured drawings of pillars, ceilings, doors, and other details, and photographs on a good scale of the buildings from the chief points of view. If you have seen the volume on the "Antiquities of Northern Gujarat" published in the Bombay Archaeological Survey, 1903,—it will give you a good idea of what I mean: but it is to be remembered that all the drawings were laid down to twice and three times the scale shown in the published plates, and reduced by photo-lithography; and the photographs were all taken on 8" by 10" plates or 10" by 12" and reduced.

I found Part II of your Report very interesting. Thanking you for your kindness and wishing you all success in your arduous but most interesting work, I remain &c.

23rd February, 1914.

You have got up the Report exceedingly well and the photographs are admirably printed and very helpful. I have read a large portion of the Report, which, to me is most interesting.

As it does not deal in any detail with the plans and elevations—or Architecture of the temples, which is properly regarded as a principal department of Archaeology,—it

might be stated either on the title or in the introduction, that this Report treats only of the Iconography, Epigraphy, and Numismatics of the district under report. Of course, I realise that unless you had an associate thoroughly trained in Architecture it would be very difficult to secure plans &c of real architectural value; and without them, though architectural views might otherwise be of real use—disjointed from plans, they would be comparatively little value.

As the work is in English and you have introduced a considerable number of technical Sanskrit terms, it would be most helpful to the ordinary reader if you appended a list of these with a clear indication of how they are applied.

I make these remarks with the view of assisting you in this important work. The note you give in para 132 certainly deserves attention. I suspect the sculpture is either a late insertion or the supposed "telescope" is meant for something else.

L. Rice Esq., C. I. E.

27th February, 1895.

I have to thank you very much for the thorough manner in which you examined the proof of the Pampa Bhârata and for your valuable suggestions, many of which have been adopted. Further proofs of the work, as they are printed, will be forwarded to you for suggestions. I hope now with your aid the work can be published with some approach to accuracy, though no manuscripts that are altogether trustworthy have been obtained as a guide, notwithstanding every effort to procure one.

15th December, 1895.

How is the work you were preparing on Kannada Literature getting on? I should be very glad to have the information you may have gleaned on the subject in order to make use of it, so far as space admits, in the new edition of the Gazetteer.

26th February, 1896.

I have to thank you very much for the notes you have sent me on Kannada Literature.

21st July, 1896.

I return, with many thanks, your valuable notes on Kannada Literature. I hope that you will kindly keep me informed of any further discoveries you may make in the subject.

1st March, 1898.

I think you mentioned lately that you had finished writing the lives of Kannada authors to the end of the 13th century. I should be very much obliged if I could see it, in order to correct and supplement what information I have acquired.

5th December, 1907.

I was glad to receive a copy of your Annual Report and read it with interest. You were fortunate in being able to get at those inscriptions at Melkote. It has always seemed strange that more information was not available there about Ramanuja. What has now been discovered is therefore of importance in that connection. The statement in the Kondajji inscription that Somesvara went from Kannanur to Dorasamudra in 1252 is just what I wanted to find out. I concluded that he had done so, but there was no direct statement anywhere to that effect.

18th September, 1908.

I am writing to thank you for sending me a copy of your Annual Report. It contains a great deal of interest to me. You have been fortunate in having discovered so many new inscriptions. The number altogether in Mysore now is something astonishing.

7th January, 1909.

I have to thank you for your letter of the 17th December and the description of the coins and other articles found by

you at Chitaldrug. You have been very fortunate in obtaining these ancient relics. They are certainly of interest and may prove valuable.

29th April, 1909.

I was very pleased to see from the R. A. S. Journal that you had probably discovered the right meaning of the phrase *bisuge* &c in the Atakur inscription. It always seemed to me questionable whether the inscription could possibly speak as if in approval of an action said to have been done like a thief.

10th June, 1909.

You have been lucky in finding so many new inscriptions in and about Sravana Belgola. What I am most interested in is of course those which are like the Bhadrabahu and early ones published in my book. I should especially like a copy of the one in Sanskrit found near the Kattale-basti.

30th September, 1909.

Your Annual Report came by last mail and I find it is full of interesting items. The inscription at Sravana Belgola which contains the name of a king Dindika will probably prove of value.

It is astonishing what a number of inscriptions you have found. The number seems endless. Congratulating you on your success at Chandravali and other places, I am etc.

13th October, 1910.

I was very glad to get the copy of your Annual Report, which shows that you have been successful in gleaning some new items of interest and value. The plates of Madhava III are of special interest on account of their being a grant to a Buddhist—the only inscription that has been found in Mysore of that character.

The correction in the Udayendiram plates mentioned in para 55 is no doubt justified. But I see no necessity for identifying the Dindika of those plates with the one in the Sravana Belgola inscription lately found. The letters of the latter, like those of the Bhadrabahu inscription, correspond closely with those of the Kavadi stone (Sorab 523) of somewhere about 400, and the phrases being separately grouped, with a space between, is common to these two, stamping them as of the same period, in addition to the resemblance in the characters.

The Tamil Chronicle brings in a Dindika after Madhava III and as connected with him. The Sravana Belgola Dindika is more likely this one, if any other evidence can be found for him.

7th December, 1911.

I am much obliged for the copy of your Annual Report and astonished to find that so many new inscriptions continue to be found. Of special interest to me are the Ganga plates received from the Residency. The Ganga plates of Durvinita which you mention are, as you say, of considerable importance.

21st December, 1911.

I am very much obliged for the trouble you have taken about the two Coorg inscriptions, the transliteration, translation &c of which I have received with your letter of the 30th ultimo.

25th April, 1912.

I am glad to hear you have got some new inscriptions at Talkad. Many thanks for the correction in T. N. 3. I had no one to help me properly with the Tamil inscriptions at the time that was copied. You have no doubt saved me from many mistakes in that matter, and I much appreciate your help in respect of the Tamil inscriptions.

18th September, 1912.

I was very glad to receive yours of the 29th August with facsimiles of the Gummaredipura plates of Durvinita. I agree

with you that Vijaya in D. B. 67 and 68 cannot be relied on as cyclic years. But the dates deduced from them cannot be far out, for we have the date 466 for Avinita in the Mercara plates. The date 550 for Durvinita seems somewhat too late. The name in the Hebbur plates is clearly Brihatvritah. But the passage in the new plates shows what was intended. Nirvinita is certainly more equivalent to Avinita than to Durvinita. But it was the little son of the latter who was put on the throne, as stated in Cm 50. The emendation about Jayasimha-Vallabhanam in Nr 35 seems correct in grammar. But it was taken as a mistake. The proposal to identify him with the first Chalukya seems very risky. Neither the Gangas nor the Chalukyas ever claim any connection in that way that I know of. It is true that Vallabha is used sometimes for the Chalukyas, but this was later I think.

19th December, 1912

Many thanks for the copy of your Annual Report. It contains much of interest and importance.

I am glad to read that you have been able to complete the text of so many inscriptions in different places which were imperfect in the printed versions. It is dangerous to neglect any portion however unimportant it may seem at the time, as even apparently trivial items sometimes furnish valuable clues.

6th November, 1913.

I am sending a few lines to congratulate you on the title you have received from H. H. the Maharaja. I think your work quite deserved to be recognised and I am glad the Mysore Government have now given you this mark of appreciation. You have been fortunate in making some rather valuable and important archaeological discoveries as well as literary contributions, and I hope you continue to take an interest in this work.

I am hoping to receive a copy of your Annual Report

for this year that I may be kept informed as to what is going on in archaeological research. The number of inscriptions seems to be quite inexhaustible.

26th February, 1914.

I am much obliged for the copy of your Annual Report, which contains much of interest to me. The illustrations are remarkably well done.

I am glad that you were able to visit Kittur but it does not seem to have resulted in any important discovery. I am afraid the renovations you speak of have removed ancient records that would have been of interest.

I have since had reason to doubt whether the Kongâlvas disappeared at once with the Cholas. But they did not long survive, and from what you say seem to have held parts of Hole-Narsipur in addition to Yêlusâvira-sîme and Arkalgud.

9th April, 1914.

I see a report that you are to be appointed as Professor of History in the University of Madras. If it is true, I am very glad on your account and heartily congratulate you. If the history of Southern India is to be your speciality the work you have been doing in the Archæological Department ought to have specially qualified you to deal with it. Several important contributions to the history of Southern India have been made by our department. The discovery of the Asoka edicts was of course of rare value. And I am glad to tell you that a well-known writer on Indian History has informed me that he has changed his views about Chandragupta and agrees with me.

Wishing you all success in your new work, I am, &c.

21st March, 1914.

As regards Arittonêmi I agree that he may not have been the actual sculptor, but he may have been the designer and promoter of the work.

I wrote to you about the appointment as Professor of History before I received your letter. I do not know if you have finally refused it. I suppose you have reasons for wishing to remain in Mysore.

Mr. Krishna Sastri has found another valuable old Ganga copperplate at Penugonda. It is astonishing how our information about the early Gangas is accumulating.

Professor E. J. Rapson, M. A., CAMBRIDGE.

17th December, 1908.

I am most interested in the account of your discovery of Roman silver and Andhra lead coins at Chitaldrug. I hope you will publish somewhere a full account of your discovery, with illustrations of *all* the varieties found both Roman and Andhra, and, if possible, also illustrations of the pottery. These discoveries of objects, which can be dated, found in association are most important historically; and if I can help you in regard to the publication of your article either in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society or elsewhere I shall be most happy to do so.

I have now finished my Catalogue of Andhra Coins in the British Museum: and I will ask the authorities there to send a copy for your acceptance. I deal at length there with some of the varieties found by you. As you point out, Dr. Hultsch's reading of the Mahârathi's coins (Nos. 1--3) may have to be revised in the light of your new specimens. There are said to be two other specimens in the Museum at Bangalore. I wonder whether by means of a comparison of all these you will be able to establish the true reading.

I may say, by the way, that if your Roman coins were actually found with these, it will settle a point which I leave doubtful as to their date.

23rd December, 1910.

I have not replied sooner to your letter in the hope that I might be able to make some useful suggestion as to the

attribution of the Mahârathi coin of which you were kind enough to send me photographs. I regret to say that I cannot throw any further light on the inscription. It is plain, as you point out, that we have here a coin of some Mahârathi who is otherwise unknown, and I can only hope that in the course of your excavations you may be fortunate enough to find other specimens. At present I cannot offer an opinion which would help in any way towards the solution of the problem.

27th March, 1914.

I have read your Report for 1912-13 with much interest.

Professor Sten Konow, KRISTIANIA.

22nd August, 1911.

Many thanks for your Report for 1909—10, which I have read with the greatest interest. I should wish that you would publish Simhasûri's Lôkavibhâga.

8th January, 1912.

I have read your Annual Report for 1910-11 with great interest. It is an important work which you are carrying on in the State, and I congratulate you on the result of the last year.

7th May, 1913.

Many thanks for your Report, which contains much useful matter and which I have read with great interest.

22nd April, 1914.

I have read your Report for 1912-13 with great interest. Your work is careful and reliable and does you great credit. I think it is an excellent idea to include reproductions of images in the Report, and I sincerely hope that you will continue doing so in future.

F. W. Thomas Esq., LONDON.

1910.

I read your Report for 1909 at once, and found that it contained a great many interesting matters set forth in a quite satisfactory manner. I hope that future reports will be no less successful and valuable,

You may be interested to hear that the American gentleman, Mr. J. B. Andrews, mentioned on page 9 of your report, was personally known to me. Since his return to Europe, he has unfortunately died.

7th October, 1910.

Your Report seems to me very methodically drawn up, and the texts and translations of the inscriptions are valuable both for Sanskrit and Tamil scholarship and for the history of Southern India.

May I mention that it would be very acceptable if you could kindly supply a copy of these reports for the India Office Library?

I should like also to mention, if you will allow me, that I am greatly interested by the discovery of a manuscript of a drama by Bhâsa, an interest which will no doubt be shared by all students of Sanskrit literature. If you could kindly procure me a loan or a copy of the manuscript, I should greatly appreciate your help.

I hope shortly to be able to send you a copy of a paper which I have just published in the Journal of the French Asiatic Society.

21st December, 1912.

As yet I have not had time to peruse your Report for 1911—12 carefully; but I have read the sections to which you call attention in your letter, and I agree that they are of considerable interest. The inscription of Durvinîta is of especial value on account of its literary references, and it will no doubt hereafter play a part in discussions relating to dates.

Dr. L. D. Barnett, LONDON.

5th December, 1908.

I am exceedingly grateful to you for your valuable information. When our catalogue of Kannada books is published, I hope that you will accept a copy.

We have a number of works by the late Maharaja Krishna-râja, *viz.*, the Jnânayôgatarangini, Bhâgavata-purâna, Mahâbhârata, Anubhavarasâyana, Tattvanidhi, Sankara-samhite and Nijadîpikâsirôratna. I should be grateful if you would tell me whether I am right in classing all these works together under the same author. The work "Kanyâ-vîtantu" is something of a puzzle to me; would you kindly inform me whether it is a translation from the English?

I must apologise for troubling you with so many questions; but you will realise how important and difficult it is to get accurate information here.

13th February, 1909

Please accept my most grateful thanks for the valuable information which you have furnished with such ready kindness. I am very interested to know the difference between the three Krishnas. The authorship of the Tattvanidhi is quite clear. The book, which is a Sanskrit encyclopædia, was published in Bombay (1902) with the statement on the titlepage that it was composed by the Maharaja Mummadi Krishnarâja of Mysore, who was born S'aka 1717, as is stated in the prefaced genealogy of the Maharajas.

21st October, 1909.

Pray accept my sincere thanks for your kindness in sending the interesting report of your work. I must congratulate you on the success of your labours.

The argument for the differentiation of Sâyana-Mâdhava is very important, and I hope that you will put together your results soon in the form of an article in the J. R. A. S. For many years we have followed Burnell's conclusions in identifying Sâyana, Mâdhava and Vidyâranya, in what is, I fear, an *andha-paramaparâ* and I should be glad to have the facts readjusted.

7th October, 1910.

Your Report is a most interesting record, and it is

gratifying to see the materials for Indian history accumulating thus.

12th April, 1912.

I find your Report a most interesting and valuable record, and congratulate you on the success of your researches.

But this time you will, I hope, have received the Telugu Catalogue which we have recently issued.

21st May 1912.

I have written this day to the Director of the Museum asking him to send you the Tamil Catalogue.

We have received in the Department of Printed Books the Reports for 1908-09, 1909-10 and 1910-11 which you were so good as to send. It will be considered a great favor if you will send any other numbers, both previous and subsequent to these dates.

2nd May, 1913.

Your Archæological Report is especially interesting on account of the inscription of Durvinita, which Dr. Fleet mentioned to me some months ago. I observe with great pleasure that you are making good progress in preparing a revised edition of the volume of Sravana Belgola inscriptions; the work is badly needed. I wish you all success in your archæological and literary labours, and shall be glad to see the second volume of your Karnataka-Kavi-charite, for which I made unsuccessful inquiries last year in Bangalore.

5th March, 1914.

As always, I find your Report full of interest and valuable matter. As an instance, I may mention that the person named Anati who is mentioned in the inscription of the Jain figure on plate V appears to be the same as a certain Anati of Hangal whose name is found on a little bronze in the Museum here.

I look forward with much interest to the publication of many other works by you.

16th April, 1914.

I am very greatly obliged to you for your correction of my mistake in the interpretation of the word Anati. It is very kind of you to take the trouble to explain the matter so carefully, and I am therefore tempted to repay your kindness by asking for another. Can you throw any light on the titles Heri-sandhivigrahi and Lâla-sandhivigrahi which appear on the inscriptions?

10th June, 1914.

I am very greatly obliged to you for your information on the question that I raised. At one time I had an idea that *heri* was to be connected with *peri*, *per*, in the same sense as *mahâ*; but as I could not find any instances of the word occurring with initial *p* in old Kannada documents, I abandoned the notion. But the cases that you mention are strongly in favor of your view, and I am grateful to you for having brought them to my notice.

In an unpublished inscription from Yewur I recently found the phrase "divâlichara-dhavalam." May I ask your opinion as to the meaning?

E. B. Havell Esq. LONDON.

26th May, 1911.

The information given on page 10 of your Report regarding the names of sculptors is especially interesting to me. If it is possible I should be very grateful for any photographs you could send me of their work as there is at present a great deficiency of material for fixing the dates of Indian sculpture.

I am sending you herewith a copy of the annual report of the India Society. You will notice on pages 6-8 the steps which the Society is taking for obtaining a photographic record of the work of *living* Indian architects. The Society is shortly going to address the Government of Mysore on the subject and we hope that your Department will give us the same assistance in collecting material as that which has already been promised us by the Government of India.

We are anxious to get similar material relating to Indian painters and sculptors who still carry out Indian artistic traditions—i. e., those who have not been taught in European Schools or imitate European artistic methods.

12th January, 1912.

I am very much obliged for your most interesting Report. I am glad to see that you continue to give details regarding the names of sculptors; but for artistic purposes it is necessary to have photographs to illustrate the works of these artists. I should be very grateful if the Mysore Government could let me have any interesting ones, especially of the 10th and 11th centuries, as I am collecting material for a History of Indian Sculpture. The 12th century sculptures in Southern India are not as a rule of great merit; the best period was the 10th and 11th. Could you let me have any photographs of the sculptures you describe in para. 38 or in the Bangalore Museum?

12th November, 1912.

I am extremely obliged for the excellent photographs, some of which will be very useful illustrations for my projected History of Indian Sculpture. Unless the photographs of the 13th century represent sculpture of exceptional merit I do not think they will serve my purpose.

22nd May, 1913.

Your Report for 1912 is, as usual, very interesting and contains much valuable information regarding your important researches. I should be very glad if you could let me have copies of the following photographs in your list (page 28), namely:—Nos. 61, 63, 68, 69 and 79 as material for my History of Indian Sculpture; and if you have in your office any photographs of sculpture belonging to the 10th and 11th centuries I should be very grateful for them, as this is the most important period in the South of India, at least the period for which material is most difficult to get.

I am sending separately for your kind acceptance a copy of my last publication—a little book of essays on artistic and industrial questions which may interest you.

20th March, 1914.

Your last Annual Report is even more interesting than the previous one. The illustrations of sculpture are very valuable and attractive. Plate VII, No. 3 seems to me to belong to the best period of South Indian bronzes, *i. e.*, about the 10th and 11th centuries.

28th April, 1914.

Very many thanks for the very interesting photographs. I am very glad to have them for my collection as they are most useful for the study of Indian Sculpture.

Professor F. Lacote, Lyon.

13th July, 1908.

Your kind letter caused me much pleasure. I am very grateful to you for the pains you have taken. It was to be presumed that the result of the researches in the *matha* of Srîngêri would be negative. One must not be surprised if Oppert took a copy suscribed Brihatkathâsâra for a work separate from the Kathâsaritsâgara. Nevertheless your statement removes my doubt about it. I quite agree with you on the genuine name of Sômadêva's work, *Brihatkathâsârasangraha*, or *Brihatkathâsaritsâgarasârasangraha*. In an **Essay** on the Brihatkathâ which I am printing now, I explain this point, I think, conclusively.

I hope to be able to send you my **Essay** shortly, as a token of my esteem and of my gratitude.

27th September, 1912.

(Translation of a French letter.)

I thank you very much for having sent me your article on Bhāmaha and Dandin. The discovery which you announce at the same time is very interesting. It shows beyond doubt the existence of Sanskrit versions of the Brihatkathâ anterior to all those we know. It is through them that the Brihatkathâ has become known; they have supplanted the original in Paisâchi. I believe that the Slôkasangraha of Budhasvâmin is based on another Sanskrit version older, for the Slôkasangraha shows by the side of traits relatively modern traces very curious of archaism.

I have the pleasure to inform you that the chapters 10 to 28 of the Slôkasangraha are actually in the press and will soon be issued out.

Accept, dear sir, with many thanks the expression of my best regards.

M. Jules Bloch, POONA AND PARIS.

28th February, 1908.

I find in the papers review of your last Archaeological Report. May I trouble you to ask you how and where I could get a copy, as I am anxious to see it, first, of course for my own benefit, and also probably to review it in some French oriental journals, among which the "Bulletin" of the "Ecole d'Extreme Orient" (Hano:—Tonquin), of which I am a member. May I also take this opportunity to ask you whether it would not be possible to have the archaeological and epigraphical reports for Mysore distributed free to the "Ecole" which is a public institution?

23rd April, 1908.

May I ask your advice about a research a friend of mine, a French Sanskrit scholar, is asking me? He is engaged in

studying the *Brihatkathâ* in its different versions. In Oppert's Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Madras Presidency is mentioned as being in the *math* of Srîngêri (Opp. II, 4576) a *Brihatkathâsârasangraha*. If one could know some details about the manuscript, it would help very much. I suppose I may safely apply to you, as knowing the value of such researches, for the information. The French scholars and the Paris Asiatic Society would, I am sure, feel deeply their indebtedness to you.

17th May, 1908.

Thanks for your kind note. I shall inform my friend at home that you are kindly taking this trouble for him.

Have you published or are you to publish anywhere further particulars on Ravishênâchârya's *Padmacharita* (Mahârâmâyana) mentioned in your Report for 1906-07 ?

1908.

Let me thank you for having taken the trouble of asking for information at Srîngêri. Let me hope, also, that this is not the last time our people will be in communication with you; and it would be a pleasant feeling for me in particular, if through me, French scholars would get new friends on the spot.

May I recall you how welcome your subsequent Reports would be here. I do not know whether you send them to our "Société Asiatique"; anyhow I know more than one scholar who would like to have them. I speak only of official Reports now; but if you had time enough for writing articles or books about questions concerning either Sanskrit or Canarese, please let it know to some of us.

Professor J. Jolly, WURZBURG.

9th October, 1906.

The copy of *Kautilya Arthasâstra* has arrived to-day. I feel much obliged to you. I hope that you will allow me to

appeal to your kindness again, in case I should require some other manuscripts.

24th May, 1911.

I have been reading your Report for 1910 with much interest. I take a special interest in your discovery of a medical work coming from the 12th century A. D.

Dr. Fortescue, LONDON,

6th April, 1912.

We have long been anxious to procure a copy of the Report of the Archæological Survey of Mysore. Hitherto we have failed to obtain the book through our usual agents. I therefore venture to write to you to ask whether copies of the work are for sale, and if so, whether you could send one to the Museum for purchase or could tell me where I can get one.

M. M. Haraprasada Sastri, M. A., C. I. E., CALCUTTA.

1st May, 1911.

I have read through your Annual Report for 1910 with great interest. You are doing valuable work in Mysore.

The date of Sankaracharya has not yet been proved by any positive fact. In your Report you speak of a Balavarma in 812 A. D.—*i. e.*, about the time when Sankaracharya flourished, and he mentions in his Bhashya IV, 3, 4 of Balavarma as being near to him. May not this be a positive proof of Sankaracharya's date?

16th January, 1912.

I am greatly interested in your letter published in the last issue of the Indian Antiquary giving references to manuscripts in which Subandhu is mentioned and not Vasubandhu. My letter on the subject will perhaps appear in the next issue.

Thanking you very heartily for defending me against the attacks of my old friend Dr. Hoernle, I remain &c.

18th July, 1912.

I have read with very great pleasure your Report for 1910—11. It throws much light on the history of Southern India of all periods. But what I am especially interested in is the period of confusion after the battle of Tallicot and it is to that period that your report gives much valuable information. The two new Kadamba kings add to our knowledge of the history of the early centuries of the Christian Era.

I am much interested in an especial branch of research, namely, the position of ancient Kshatriyas after their effacement, if not extirpation, by the Nandas, in the 4th or 5th century B. C. The effacement or extirpation applied only to the Nanda Empire and not to Southern India. Do you find Kshatriyas there? The Pallavas claim descent from Asvatthâma, a Brahman. The Kadambas were Brahmans. The Chalukyas, I believe, belonged to the same Gotra as the Kadambas. Do they not call themselves Manavya-gotras and Haritiputras? In the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries there seems to have been an acute controversy as to who should be called a Kshatriya. Under the circumstances it would be very interesting if you can by the way give the reputed caste of every dynasty of kings, ancient and modern, that you come across in making your researches.

Whatever the young Bhandarkar may write on the subject of Subandhu and Vasubandhu, it is extremely gratifying to me that a scholar of your calibre agrees with me.

12th October, 1912.

I have read with great interest and pleasure your Annual Archæological Report. Unfortunately I have not studied the local history of Mysore with as much care as you have done. Still it was a very entertaining and interesting reading and I have noted many historical facts from the Report.

Very recently I have received your paper on "Bhamaha and Dandi." You have put down Dandi in the latter end of

the 7th century. But I have a different idea. Dandi speaks of a mixed language or mixed Sanskrit. Now Professor Senart speaks of a mixed Sanskrit at the end of his work entitled "Inscriptions of Priyadarsi." This is a curious language, some words are purely Samskrit and some purely Prakrit. Yet the language has a literature, both in prose and poetry. In early Gupta period the language ceased to exist and even to be known. If Dandi flourished in the end of the 7th century, how could he speak of this along with Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramsa? In one place he says "misram tu nâtakâdi." The commentators say that Sakuntala and other works are meant in which there are sentences either in Sanskrit or Prakrit. But this would not make *misra* a language. I believe in the earlier centuries of the Christian Era the drama which was very popular used to be written in the mixed language within the comprehension of all, high and low.

I do not know whether you think that the Dandi of Dasakumaracharita and the Dandi of Kavyadarsa are one and the same person.

V. N. Narasimha Iyengar, ESQ., MYSORE.

23rd November, 1909.

It makes me very proud to know how thorough your work is, and that in a quiet and unobtrusive way. You are covering up past faults and omissions. As an Indian and a fellow-Vaishnava, I am delighted with your success. Although I am out of the running, I have not quite outlived archæological interest. To the vigour and energy of the European, you add the regard for minutiae, which characterizes Indian researches.

8th April, 1912.

I have to thank you cordially for a copy of your last Report. The amount of patient and intelligent research of which it is evidence is beyond all praise; and I feel quite

proud of your continuing far more intelligently and accurately the work of the Antiquary in Mysore. I heartily wish you every success in your excellent work, and trust it will receive due recognition from the Government, whose reputation for liberality and enlightenment men like you serve to justify and confirm.

14th April, 1913.

Your latest Report fully sustains the value of your scientific and detailed research, and the Madras Mail has already given it a coveted column. Although at one time, I had dabbled a little in antiquarian topics, I can scarcely hope to fully realize your splendid labours, continued year after year for such a long time.

Our experience brings it home to our hearts that the most valued things of this world do not usually fall to the lot of the most deserving. Fame, gold, political honors and worldly prosperity seem to strike out a particular plane, from which the best and most deserving people are perversely excluded. It would be futile to enquire into the why and wherefore of this incongruity in Nature's arrangement.

Although you have not yet secured the highest prizes of your service, I am convinced that you have fully earned and collared the peace and satisfaction, which come from the consciousness of duty well done with a whole-hearted devotion and indefatigable perseverance.

25th March, 1914.

Your Report for the last official year is a record of much honest labour intelligently bestowed on a field, which is so chary of yielding showy results. But you have evolved out of apparently jejune materials, a very instructive narrative of by-gone times and events, of which any one in the employ of our Government may be proud.

Profit and honor seldom reach the most deserving; but your record is a monument of the most painstaking and patient labours, and justifies in a way the title conferred on you by our gracious sovereign. I heartily beg to congratulate you.

The description of the Nuggihalli temple and carvings is most instructive. I had written some accounts of the same in certain random notes a few years ago, and suggested to the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan that the temple should be included among those ancient monuments which should be preserved, in pursuance of the belated change of policy in the Supreme Government. The presence of the figures of Durga, Vinayaka, &c., in the midst of the carvings in Vaishnava temples seems to have struck you as rather *bizarre*; but if you refer to the Pancharâtra Samhitas, their presence is enjoined in all notable temples. It is one of the unsolved riddles of our pantheon that even in the everlasting Vaikuntham, the prototypes of later creations are made to subserve the grandeur and *aplomb* of Nârâyana's Darbâr.

Is your appointment to the University of Madras true, and shall Mysore lose you?

Rai Bahadur Pandit Hira Lal, B. A., NAGPUR.

19th November, 1912.

I wonder whether you saw the "Times of India" Weekly Edition of the 30th October. There is an article in it on the temples of Somanathapur and Arsikere and the writer acknowledges his indebtedness to your admirable reports. I enclose a cutting from the same in case you have not seen the paper.

1913.

I am extremely obliged to you for your very interesting Report which I have read with much pleasure. Your numismatic plate has helped to the identification of certain coins kept in the Museum here, which were labelled as belonging to unknown dynasties. They were Tippu's coins and as they

MON MOHAN CHAKRAVARTI ESQ., M.A., B.L., M.R.A.S. 41

had no names of kings, they were a curiosity here. [As^{II}] am interested both in Epigraphy and Ethnography, I was much pleased to find some ethnographic notes interspersed in your Report, for instance the Hiridevate sacrifices and the Hema-dramma worship by the Holeyas.

Mon Mohan Chakravarti Esq., M.A., B.L., M.R.A.S. CALCUTTA.

30th April, 1911.

I find your Report for 1909-10 stuffed with interesting and suggestive information. I have been delighted to read your description of Somanathapur Kesava temple.

It would be interesting to know the grounds on which the Melekote copper plate of Mādhavavarma is dated *circa* 400 A. D. Mr. Rice's grounds are not always satisfactory, and South Indian inscriptions of the 4th or 5th century are extremely rare.

We know so little about the actual taxes levied in later Hindu times, that the Kannada inscription of Vallāla-Deva becomes of importance as supplementing the Conjeeveram inscription.

The Sanskrit inscription of Ranga-Rāya I speaks of having defeated the Utkala king. It is curious that though the inscription is dated 1584 A. D., the Hindu kingdom of Orissa had been conquered and absorbed by the Muham-madans in 1568 A. D. The fight with the Orissa king, if not a hyperbole, must therefore have taken place some time before 1568 A. D.

14th May, 1911.

Many thanks for the two excellent photographs of the Kesava temple at Somanathapur. They bear out the high praise given to the temple by Fergusson and you.

By the bye, the name "Chalukyan" does not commend itself to me. The Chalukyas had very little to do with this

style, so far as I know, most of the specimens not going back beyond the 11th century A. D. Besides, the names of other sub-divisions of Indian Architecture are all territorial, and not dynastic, such as North-Indian, with sub-classes, Orissan, Bengali, Benares &c., and Dravidian. Why should not this style have also a territorial name, say Mysorean? It is in Mysore and the adjoining district of Bellary, that the finest and the best-preserved specimens of this style have survived, though of course some of them may be traced as far north as Warangal.

In the interesting description of the excavations at Chandravalli (para 12 of 1908-09) the discovery of a number of glazed pottery is announced. This discovery appears to me of importance. For there is an impression in North India that the manufacture of glazed tiles &c. was imported into India from Persia in the Muhammadan times. From your finds, it would seem that Glazing was known at least in the Andhra period (2nd to 4th century A. D.). In fact glazing was a very old art known to the Chaldaeans, Assyrians and Egyptians, and from the Egyptians to the Phœnicians, and from the Assyrians to the Persians. Consequently there is no reason why this art should not have been known to the Indians from an ancient time. One would like to have more details about these glazed pieces, the compositions of the glazing, the colours used, the modes of preparation &c.

In para 70 of 1908-09, an interesting inscription of the 13th year of Rājendra-Chola I is quoted. Now the two Tirumalai well inscriptions of the 12th year of the said king stopped at the conquest of Gangai, while the Aprameya temple inscription adds the conquest of more territories, which therefore took place not earlier than the 12th year inscriptions. It would add to the interest of students if the 13th year inscription can be fully published, and the difference thus clearly shown. By the bye, is the name of this temple, Aprameya, connected in any way with the general of Rājarāja, Aprameya, mentioned in the Kaliyūr Canarese inscription of Saka 928?

As regards the copper plates of Melekote, what I mean to say is that so many early copper plates of these Western Gangas have been declared spurious, that any other plates of this dynasty purporting to be very old will be received with caution unless supported by strong grounds. The inscription is in Sanskrit only, and Sanskrit inscriptions of the tract belonging to the 4th century are very rare. Hence it is the more necessary to discuss the grounds of considering it to be 400 A. D., and of critically examining its genuineness.

D. R. Bhandarkar, Esq., M. A., POONA.

15th March, 1908.

Many many thanks for a copy of your Annual Progress Report which is very interesting. We Hindus are generally charged with want of critical faculty and lack of zeal for any work. But if we get more Hindu antiquarians like yourself, the Europeans will soon have to change their opinion.

21st February, 1910.

Your correction about the "Jōla country" is perfectly welcome, and I shall take an early opportunity to correct myself in that respect. Your remark regarding the Sapādalaksha country is particularly interesting. I know of only one country which had this name. I have shown in my paper on the Chitorgadh *prasasti* that this can only be the northernmost portion of the Jodhpur State. May I ask with what country you propose to identify Arikēsari's Sapādalaksha?

I am highly thankful to you for having brought another Brahmakshatra family to my notice. So the Kadāmbas were, I think, Brahmakshatras, though this is not expressly said in any inscriptions. Their progenitor was certainly a Brāhmana. Kindly let me know whether you know of any other instances of Brahmakshatra families.

14th May, 1910.

Kindly excuse me for troubling you a little. I am just now trying to know something about the early history of the

Kadambas. Will you kindly re-read for my sake Shikarpur Taluk inscriptions Nos. 178 and 186 and carefully compare them with the Kargudari record published in *Ind. Ant.* X, p. 249? Do they imply that the Kadambas originally came from Ahichchhatra and that this place was in the Himalaya regions? Will you also kindly inform me what other royal families in the South came from Ahichchhatra?

30th May, 1910.

Very many thanks for your favour of the 25th instant, which was interesting in more than one way. Kindly allow me to put you further queries on the same subject.

You state that Shikarpur 186 clearly says that not finding Brahmanas in the south even after close search, Mayûravarma proceeded without delay to Ahichchhatra, brought 32 families of Brahmanas, and settled them in Tâlgunda. This, you argue, cannot mean that Ahichchhatra was his birth-place. Now, I need not tell you that Mayûravarma has, in a Tâlgunda inscription, been called Mayûrasarma and spoken of as belonging to a Brahmana family. Here then there were in South India Mayûrasarma and his caste-fellows, who were Brahmanas, if we suppose that the Kadambas were an indogenous family of Mysorean origin. How then did the necessity arise for importing Brahmanas from the north? The reply, in my opinion, is that the Kadambas were themselves originally of Ahichchhatra and came along with the Brahmanas who emigrated from there. The expression Banavâsipuravarâdhîsvara only means that Banavâsi was the place where the Kadambas were first settled in the south and established their power, and does not mean that Banavâsi was their original habitat.

I cannot say whether the Kargudari inscription implies that Ahichchhatra was in the Himalayas. But the Bhairanmatti record does, I think, imply that Ahichchhatra was in some island on the Sindhu or Indus, *i. e.*, somewhere in the

Himalayas (*Epi. Ind.* III, p. 230). Kindly let me know what you think about it. Ahichchhatra has no doubt been identified by Cunningham with Râmnagar in the Bareilly district, United Provinces. But I take exception to this identification. For Hieun Tsang distinctly tells us that it "is naturally strong, being flanked by mountain crags." This description does not at all suit the position of Râmnagar which is on the Gangetic plains and agree with the Kargudari and Bhairanmatti inscriptions, which imply that Ahichchhatra was in the Himalayas. These are some of my arguments in brief. And I shall be obliged by your kindly letting me know what you think about them.

11th August, 1910.

The three or four instances you have so kindly cited of Brahmakshatras in the south have been given in my paper on the "Foreign Elements in Hindu Population." A copy of the paper will be sent for your kind acceptance. I shall be highly obliged by your favouring me with criticism on it.

1st February, 1911.

I am sending a copy of my paper on the "Foreign elements in the Hindu population," which has appeared in the January number of the *Indian Antiquary*, for your kind acceptance. In the February number appears your article on Ranna, which is very useful and interesting. I hope this will be followed up by a great many others from your pen that will be equally interesting. The same number contains also a small note by Mr. V. A. Smith who accepts the earliest Saka date found by you.

9th May, 1911.

Your Report for 1910 is very interesting, and you are probably aware that your discovery of the manuscript of *Svapnavâsavadatta* &c. has already been hailed by Mr. V. A. Smith in a short note that he has contributed to the *Indian Antiquary*. I am immensely glad to find that you are showing to European scholars that Indians also can do critical and

of mine who has taken a deep interest in India during the 25 odd years he has resided here, went on Sunday to Sravana Belgola, Halebid and Belur and I lent them the Report, and they tell me it added immensely to the pleasure and interest of their trip. I hope myself to take it with me on some of these fascinating pilgrimages for which the Mysore State affords such golden opportunities.

V. P. Madhava Rao Esq., C. I. E.

26th February, 1913.

I know the excellent work you are doing in the field of Archæology. You know how highly I appreciate the value of your original research and the light you have thrown on hitherto obscure passages in some of our older inscriptions.

8th July, 1914.

I thank you for kindly sending me a copy of your Report for 1912-13. The photographs are excellently printed and it will enhance the interest of the Reports if they become a feature of future annual Reports also.

I hope that there is better appreciation of the really valuable work you are doing.

I also read with much interest appreciative notices of the Report in the *Madras Mail* and the *Times of India*.

T. Ananda Rao Esq., C. I. E.

22nd September, 1910.

I herewith return with many thanks and after persual the papers which you left with me the other day. They are very learned discourses and reveal minute research work.

Colonel Sir Hugh Daly K. C. I. E., C. S. I.

26th January, 1914.

Thank you very much for the exceedingly interesting notes about the seals and for all the trouble you are so kindly taking in connection with my curios.



SUPPLEMENT.

Vincent A. Smith Esq., M. A., OXFORD.

22nd December, 1914.

Your Report for 1913-14 is excellent, like its predecessors, but better. Your Reports contain an immense quantity of novel and interesting matter on various subjects, and I have taken note of many things. I have begun an article for the *Indian Antiquary* on Architecture and Sculpture in Mysore which will direct attention to your work. It is impossible now to address the general public on such matters. All attention is concentrated on the deadly war, and journals have no space for antiquities. I propose to devote some labour to recording in a readable form some of your valuable observations on the subjects named. Some other time I may notice other topics. Meantime I wish you success and trust that before the New Year is out happier times may be in sight.

Dr. L. D. Barnett, LONDON.

18th December, 1914.

It was very kind of you to take so much trouble in investigating the words *divâticharadhavalam*; they occur in an inscription at Yewur which will shortly be published in the *Epigraphia*, but nothing depends on them. I am obliged to you for your correction of my mistake in the *Antiquities*. Little mistakes like that will creep in, and one must say *kshamantu sâdhavah*. I shall look forward with great interest to your paper on Sâyana; the subject urgently needs new treatment.

Your Report maintains its usual high level of accurate scholarship, and is full of interesting and valuable material.

Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, C. I. E.

19th December, 1914.

Your Report for 1913-14 is beautifully printed and illustrated, quite a model of what such Annual Report should be; and I have read it with very great interest.

I was also much interested in what you say about that rare metre in the Bower Manuscript. I am afraid, I have not got with me just now Kielhorn's article to which you refer. But even so, I still think it would be well for you to write a short note to the Indian Antiquary to report your discovery of the same metre in Bhîmabhatta's *Râvanârajuniya*. As you say, that metre has been discovered elsewhere, and those verses are on record; but the point is that every *fresh* instance of discovery should be on record. How else can a student of metrics know of the existence of the fresh instance? He may or he may not discover it for himself, but the *previous* discovery by yourself should be on record. It is only right that *you* should have the credit of it.

F. W. Thomas Esq., LONDON.

10th December, 1914.

Kindly forgive my long delay in writing to thank you for so kindly sending me a copy of your Report for 1912-13. This year has been full of preoccupations, and during the last few months the thoughts of every one have been forcibly averted from such matters.

I have given myself the pleasure of perusing a good part of the Report, which is extremely full of valuable matter, archæological, epigraphical, historical, and numismatic. The photographs are excellent, and the readings of inscriptions highly welcome. As a student of Jainism, I am glad to see how large a portion of your researches relates to Jain monuments. I am sure that you will receive many evidences of the appreciation which both the matter and the scholarly character of the Report must evoke.

Concerning your paper on *Bhâmaha* I shall write again.

Sir George Grierson, K. C. I. E., PH. D., CAMBERLEY, SURREY.

31st December, 1914.

I have read your Report for 1913-14 with great interest, and I would congratulate you on the numerous finds that you

have made. I would also add my voice to the chorus of appreciation with which the illustrations in your former Report were greeted. The photographs in the present Report will I am sure be equally welcomed. Some of the sculptures are very beautiful, and special interest attaches to the fact that you have been able in so many cases to identify the names of the sculptors. This is really an important addition to the history of Indian art. The particulars about living sculptors are also most interesting, and I sincerely trust that every encouragement will be given to these men, so that the tradition of genuine Indian art be not allowed to disappear.

E. B. Havell Esq., LONDON.

2nd January, 1915.

I have been reading with very much interest the Report in which you summarise the results of your valuable researches for the year 1913-14. It is as usual full of interest. I should be very much obliged if you would kindly let me have copies of the photographs reproduced in Plates iv 2, and v 2, 4 and 5 which are especially fine as works of art and interesting archæologically. May I suggest that the architectural value of the Report would be enhanced if you sometimes gave *plans* of the temples and other buildings to show the general arrangements of the interior, and also the orientation of the shrine. The importance of the latter point I allude to in my new book on Indian Architecture of which I send you a prospectus. You will see that I dispute the accuracy of all of Fergusson's classifications such as "Dravidian", "Chalukyan" &c I am quite sure that when the Silpa-sâstras have been properly examined my contentions will prove to be correct, and I am glad to say that one of the Government of India scholars now studying here has taken up the translation of the Mânasâra.

In para 26 you give some very useful information relating to some Silpi which might be followed up. If you could get the man to lend the manuscript it might be photographed page by page.

Dr. J. Burgess, C. I. E., L. L. D., EDINBURGH.

6th January, 1915.

I have to acknowledge with hearty thanks the receipt of your Report for 1913-14. The illustrations, especially of the sculptures, are of great interest to me. You mention that a monograph on the more important temples of Mysore is in preparation which will contain the ground plans of these monuments. But it must appear to all students of Indian Archæology that it is a great inconvenience to have to consult two different works on the same subject and dealing with the same buildings. Would it not, be much better to have the Architecture and details of style &c treated along with the Iconography and Epigraphy of the same buildings, with the Numismatics appended? Many archæological and other works are published from time to time as the joint work of two separate authors and this arrangement presents great advantages to the student of the subject. It is a pity such a method was not followed from the first, but even now it seems most desirable that such a combination of effort should be attempted. You might think over it and see whether it could not be carried out in future.

I havenot been able as yet to study the details of your publication, which seem, at first sight, to be most interesting.

Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy, BRITFORD, SALISBURY.

19th December, 1914.

Your Report for 1913-14 is a record of excellent work and I am much interested in the sculptures illustrated. I am sending you my recent 'Catalogue of Bronzes in the Colombo Museum' which you may find of use. May I ask to be supplied with your Reports regularly in future?

R. Sewell Esq., ROEHAMPTON, SURREY.

18th December, 1914.

My best thanks to you for kindly sending a copy of your last Report, which is very interesting. I am sure that the

Nandi plates of the Ganga king Mâdhava I (Plate IX) are by no means so early as A. D. 240. They look to me more like 9th or 10th century A. D.

The photographs of sculpture are very interesting. A copy of Professor Jouveau-Dubreuil's "Archeologie du Sud de l'Inde" may be of use to you. It is a most interesting book, and must be in the hands of every archæologist of South India—richly illustrated, showing all the details of architecture and sculpture at different periods.

L. Rice Esq., C. I. E., HARROW ON THE HILL.

22nd October, 1914.

I hope you will send me a copy of Your Report as soon as ever you can. For I am greatly interested in learning that more early Ganga plates have been discovered, the full particulars of which are contained in your Report. It is really astonishing that such records should still be turning up. I hope what have been found will throw fresh light on some obscure questions.

With the revision of the Gazetteer, and the other items of work that you mention, your hands will be full for some time, and I must congratulate you on being able to keep the Archæological Department going.

24th December, 1914.

I have received the copy of your Annual Report for 1913-14. The illustrations are excellent and you are fortunate in having such good artists.

The early Ganga plates are somewhat disappointing, as they do so little in helping us with regard to information regarding the beginnings of the Gangas. The kings in the Chikballapur plates are clearly a branch line. There is so much to notice in the Report that I cannot deal with in the short time I have had it. But cannot the Perbânan of D. B. 32 be made into Per-Bânan? This would correspond with Brihad-Bâna perhaps. The records about the Nandi hill and temple are very interesting.

F. E. Pargiter Esq., OXFORD.

22nd January, 1915.

Pray accept my warm thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy of your Annual Report for 1913-14. The paragraphs to which you have drawn my attention are specially interesting, while the whole Report brings all kinds of new matter before one.

Let me wish you all success in your researches and studies during this year.

Lord Curzon of Kedleston, LONDON.

22nd December, 1914.

Lord Curzon acknowledges with many thanks the very interesting Archaeological Report from Mysore and is glad to see such good work being done.

V. N. Narasimha Iyengar Esq., MYSORE.

10th February, 1915.

Pray accept my best thanks for kindly sending me a copy of your last Report. I must cordially congratulate you on the sterling and permanent nature of your strenuous labours so conscientiously performed, evidently without a thought of the gallery or lime light.

V. P. Madhava Rao Esq., C. I. E.

13th February, 1915.

I have glanced through your Report for 1913-14 which promises to be as interesting and instructive as its predecessors. The photographs are excellent.

T. Ananda Rao Esq., C. I. E., BANGALORE.

19th February, 1915.

I am reading your Report for 1913-14 with much interest. The interest of the Report is very much enhanced by the photographs which you have inserted. I have not seen the previous Report for 1912-13, and would very much like to see it if you can conveniently spare a copy.

Wishing you all happiness and continued success, I am &c.

