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The

I have the honour to submit the following report of the tours I made through Central India and Rajputana in the beginning of 1905 and that of 1906 in accordance with the Resolutions of Government, Nos. 2321 and 660 in the Educational Department, dated the 14th December 1904 and 12th April 1905, respectively.

2. A copy of the first resolution reached me during the Christmas holidays of 1904, but it was February before I could be relieved of my duties at College. So I started on my tour in February soon after I was relieved.

3. The place I was most anxious to visit first for several reasons was Jaisalmer. It lies in the midst of a sandy desert, ninety miles from the nearest railway station, a journey usually done on camel back. Dr. Bühler, who had visited the place in January 1874, had remarked about "the tedious journey and the not less tedious stay in this country of sand, bad water, and guinea-worms," and the Resident of the Western Rajputana States, too, whom I had seen in January 1904, had spoken to me of the very tedious and troublesome nature of the journey. Dr. Bühler, I was told, did not stay much over a week there. The principal Jaina bhandar (library attached to a Jaina temple) at the place was one far-famed for its manuscripts. The promise given by the persons in charge of it to open it for my inspection of the manuscripts should, it was advisable, be availed of at the earliest opportunity, for fear they might change their mind. And unfortunately the detailed account of his tour through Rajputana, which Dr. Bühler had intended giving to the world during 1880-81, seemed to have been lost altogether, not having been published up to the time of his death in 1898. "I have prepared," he wrote in his report of 8th June 1880, "a detailed report on my tour in Rajputana during the winter of 1873-74, together with notices of the more important books which I bought then," and he added that he trusted he would be able to print it during that year. But the list in tabular form of the manuscripts purchased and the copies made during 1873-74, published along with Dr. Kielhorn's Report for 1880-81, is

* His letter to the Editor, Indian Antiquary, about the famous bhandar there, when he and Dr. Jacobi had already worked therein for six days, is dated 29th January 1874, from Jessalmer (Vol. III, pp. 89-90). His letter presented by Weber to the Berlin Academy is dated 14th February from Bikanir (Indian Antiquary, IV, p. 81). The tedious journey from Jaisalmer to Bikanir must have taken some days, and he might have been in Bikanir for a few days before he wrote the latter letter.
all that has appeared of the detailed report that was thus stated to have been actually prepared. For these reasons a visit to Jaisalmer and an examination of the manuscripts in the chief bhandar there I regarded as the most difficult, urgent and important part of the work I had been deputed to do. That being done, the rest, I felt, would be attended with comparatively much less difficulty.

4. But, as stated in paragraph 11 of the report of my preliminary tour, dated 9th April 1904, the Resident, Western Rajputana States, had asked me to give him a fortnight's previous intimation to allow of proper transport arrangements being made for me.* I could give the intimation only when I was free to start on my tour and did so. The interval between the date of the intimation and that of starting for Jaisalmer I utilised in visiting Indore and Ujjain. The latter place was just then free from plague. It had been affected with plague both at the beginning and at the end of my preliminary tour. And when once a place has had the plague, especially one like Ujjain, there is no knowing when it would be visited by the epidemic again. So the earliest possible opportunity of visiting it had to be taken, and there was also some little work left to be done at Indore.

5. Between the date of my getting the first Government resolution and the date of my being relieved of my duties at College I looked about for an assistant or assistants, whom I was allowed to engage. As stated in my letter, No. 31 of 12th July 1904, I had hopes of being able to engage Shastri Ramhandra Dinanath†, whose knowledge of Jaina literature is so extensive and who has had such a long experience of manuscripts work with Drs. Bühler, Kielhorn, Peterson and Bhandarkar. But on account of a domestic difficulty he had to decline, and I could not get any other Shastri from this part of the country to accompany me. At last I was told of a Pandit in Rajputana who was once keeper of a state collection of manuscripts and had made a catalogue of it as well. From his certificates and from his having done practical work in connection with manuscripts I thought he would do very well and so I engaged him. I afterwards discovered that he shared to the full the carelessness and want of accuracy in respect of such work as he had to do, so frequently complained of by scholars engaged in the work of the search for Sanskrit Ms. In addition to that, however, he was not very sound in his Sanskrit spelling though he had studied Sanskrit grammar. He had also the general characteristic of Pandits from his part of the country of being unable to distinguish between the palatal, lingual and dental sibilants. But such as he was, I had to make the best use I could of him.

6. Having thus engaged him just when I was about to start I could not act on the suggestion of Dr. Kielhorn, referred to in paragraph 3 of my previous report,‡ and send him on before me to do

---

* This long notice even, by-the-bye, I found to my annoyance and discomfort to have been insufficient on my return journey. The transport arrangements on that occasion were far from satisfactory.
† The Shastri, I learnt the other day, died three or four months ago (29th June 1907).
‡ In paragraphs 3 and 5 of that report "Dr. Bühler" is a mistake for "Dr. Kielhorn."
preliminary work. I set him to do that sort of preliminary work after I finished my first tour towards the end of April 1905.

7. At Indore I examined four new collections, to which I could not get access on the former occasion. Of only one there was the usual worthless list and the collection consisted mostly of printed books. One was not well looked after and was very poor. A third one was small but good, and the fourth was an important one.

8. Some of the more important manuscripts I came across were those of—

- **Vilomasamhitâ (Vâj.)**
- **Sâmavidhânabâhshya by Sâyaña.**

Rishabhagâna.

Prâtisâkhyaadipikâ (rules relating to *svara* and *samâskâra* in the Veda) by Sadâsîva Agnihotrin. In a Ms. found in another collection the authorship was attributed to a son of this author.

- **Kâtyâyana-âsûtra-sûtra-bhâshya by Kâśinâtha Dikshita.**
- **Kâtyâyana-âsûtra-paddhati by Miśra Vaidyanâtha.**
- **Apatnikâdhâna by Govinda Dikshita.**
- **Ahitâgner Dâhanirñaya by Bhaṭṭâ Râma.**
- **Ratnagumpha—Agnihotra-prâyaścittas.**
- **Yajñadipikâ-vivarna by Bhâskara.**
- **Varṇaratna-dipikâsikshâ by Amareśa.**
- **Śrâddhā-chhâgabhâshya.** There is a commentary on Kâtyâyana’s Snâna-sûtra by Yâjñika Chakrachudâmaṇi Chhâga.
- **Yajurvidhâna (Mâdhy.).**
- **Sûktânukramaṇi by Jagannâtha.**

Agnihotra-prayoga-rakshâmaṇî by Râmachandra Dikshita, son of Bharadvâja Ananta Somayâjin.

Vâjapeyapaddhati by Râmakrîṣhṇa *alias* Nânâbâi, son of Dâmodara Trîjâthin.

- **Yajña-tantra-sudhânidhi—Udgâtri-prakaraṇa.**
- **Āsvâlâyana-âsrutasûtravrittâ by Devatrâta.**
- **Durâhāsikshâ by Appaya Dikshita.**
- **Khûdimgrîhyasûtra with Rudrâskandâchârâya’s commentary.**
- **Tâṇḍâlakshaṇasûtra (Sâmav.).**
- **Kalpânupadasûtra (do.)**
- **Paîchavidhasûtra.**
- **Drûhyâyana-âsruta-sûtrîya Audgâtrasomasûtra.**

Commentary on the Vedâṅga Jyotisha by Sesha.

Trîsthâlini—Gayâprakaraṇa by Râmabhaṭṭa Akûta.

Lalitâstavaratna by S’âmkarâchârâyasvâmin

Râmâyânasâtrasamgraha by Śrînivâsâchârâya.
Chaturvarga-chintâmanî—Parisêsha-khanda—Ishtápurtadharmanirâ-paâña and Sarvdevatâpratishtä-karmapaddhati (Pratishtä—Hemâdri).

Parvanirñaya by Gañapatî Râvala.
Pratishtâhollôsa by Śivaprasâda.
Kâlamâdhavakârikâ—vyâkhyaâna by Vaijanâtha-bhâtta-sûri.
Prâyaśchittendushekharâ by Kaśînâtha.
Smrîti-darpaôa by Sarasvatî-tûrthâ. Date of Ms. S’aka 1444 (Chitrabhanu).

Dattakakrama—Samgraôa by Śrîkrîshna Tarkâlamkâra-bhattâchârya. Śuddhipadapûrvaka-chandrikâ (Śuddhi-chandrikâ) by Vinâyaka (alûs Nanda Paûdita), son of Dharmâdhibhârika Râmapandaôita.
Dharmaśâstra—sudhâniidhi—Śrâddha-chandrikâ by Divâkarabhaîtta.
Saînîyâsa-paddhati by Viśvēsvara Sarasvatî.
Hirañyakesâlya Âgnînukha.
Hirañyakesâlya—Smârta-prayogaratna by Vaisampâyana Mahesaba-hâtta.
Parâsarasmrîti-vîrviti, Vidvanmanoharâ.
Smrîtyarhasâra copied in Samvat 1454.
Nâmabandha-s’ataka by Bhavadeva paûdita. Laudatory stanzas in which the names of Uîyâs, Yugas, etc., are interwoven.
Śîvacharîta by Haradatta.
Gâthâsaptaâsatî with a commentary by Kulabâlaladeva.
Champûkâavya by Samarapûngâva.
Mahâbhâshya-pradîpa-prakâsâ by Nilakañthha Dikshita, son of Nârâyana Dikshita and grandson of Achchâ Dikshita, brother of Appaya Dikshita.
Paribhâshendusekharañâti Sarvamaîngalâ.
Kâvyaprasatî—Kâvyâ—dipikâ.
Do. by Sâmbasaîva, son of Sûryanârâyana Adhvârinda and grandson of Dharma Dikshita.

A commentary on Tattva-samâsa.
Mîmâmēâ—kutûhala by Kamalâkara.
Copy of S’lokavârtika written in S’aka 1466 (Jaya.)
Nyâyasudhâ copied in Sam. 1683.
Nârâyana-pranishadbhâshya by Sâyana.
A few Vallabha tracts.
Śivabhaktirasâyana by Kaśînâtha.
Śivasûtra—vârtika by Varadarâja, who seems to have been called Krishtadâsena also.*

* Mayâ Varadarâjena sâyâ (?) mehâpañcarakam Śrikshemendvarâjanirûttaṁ (ta?) vyâkhyaânâdîvânumôrînâ kritinâ Krishtadâsena vyânîtitaṁ kapyâhijrasyâ.
Brahmasūtrārthasamgraha by Sāthāri, probably the same as the teacher of Sīvakopamuni, the author of Vedānta-sūdhā-rahasya (Hall's Contribution, p. 96).

Sīvasiddhāntaśekhara by Kāśīnātha.

Copy of Saptapadārthiṭikā, Mitabhāshiṇī, written in Śaka 1500.

Anumānanaṃsāra.

Upamāna-saṃgraha by Pragalbha.

Sābda-bodha-prakāśikā by Rāmakiśora.

Bṛihattarkapraṃkāśa—Śabdaparichchhedā.

Anumiti-nirūpaṇa with a commentary, both by Rāmanārāyaṇa.

(S'iva-Shaṃmukhasamvāde) Ugraratha-S'antikalpa-prayoga.

9. When I visited Ujjain in 1905 the upanayana (sacred-thread ceremony) and marriage seasons were in full swing. On that account there were a few collections I was not able to see then. So I paid a very short visit to the place again the next year. During the two visits I examined about fourteen collections. There were rough lists of four or five of them only. About six or seven of them seemed to be properly looked after by the owners. One contained some very old manuscripts but was in perfect disorder, the leaves of hardly a single manuscript being all together. The owner, a very old man, was for that very reason not very willing at first, from a sense of shame, to show me the manuscripts. Another collection had been at the mercy of rats and white ants. Of one bhandar in a Jaina upāsraya (a halting-place for Jaina itinerant priests) I was able only to see the list as the key was not forthcoming. But the manuscripts, to judge from the list, were very ordinary ones. Of another collection, which was famed to be a very rich one, a list was shown to me, and I noted down a number of manuscripts for examination. But only a very few of them were slyly brought to me at my lodgings. He who brought them has, I was told, been secretly selling most of the manuscripts, and a very small remnant, it is believed, of the original large collection has been left behind. Two of the collections examined contained some very old manuscripts.

10. During the course of my first visit I was told that lists of some of the collections at Ujjain had been made by order of the Gwalior Darbar the previous year, and, it was believed, they were meant for me. I tried through the Resident to get them before my second visit, but I got them only after my return to Bombay at the end of my second tour. Along with them were also received lists from Mandsaur and several other places of less note. Those from Ujjain are only two or three in number and none of them would have been of much use even if I had received them earlier.

11. The following works may be mentioned as being some of the more noteworthy:

Herambopanishad.
Pancikaraṇopanishad.
Shaḍāṅgavyākhyā by Bhavadeva.
Commentary on Maṇḍalabrahmaṇa by Śāyaṇa.
Ashtādhyāyibrāhmaṇa-bhāshya by Śāyaṇa.
Many works of sacrificial literature.
Sarvānukramanika-paribhāshodahāraṇa.
Āpastambasūtra-vṛtti by Vishṇubhaṭṭa. In the colophon Chaṇḍāpa is mentioned as the author.
Commentary, by Vināyakabhaṭṭa Upādhyāya, on Śaṃkara’s Śaṃkhepasāra (relating to vedocchāraṇa).
Chāṭurjñāna.
Commentary on Baudh.-Kalpasūtra by Śāyaṇa (I. O.* p. 51a). In the introductory verses the Ms. I saw reads ब्रह्मचर्यमीमाः and ब्रह्मचर्यमीमाः in place of ब्रह्मचर्यमीमाः and ब्रह्मचर्यमीमाः of the I. O. Ms.
Āśvalāyana-Grihyasūtra-bhāshya by Devasvāmin Siddhānta (tin ?).
Baudh.-Śvargadvāreshṭi-prayoga by Dhuṇḍhirāja.
Baudh.-Kapālakārikābhāvadipikā by Nārāyaṇa Jyotiśa.
Sādasyatattvavidpa by Vāsudeva Drivedin, son of Śripati.
Agnihotrkarmamāmsa.
Agnishtomopodghāta by Drāvīḍa Rāmachandra.
Baudh.-Bṛhaspatisavakarika by Govinda.
Kuṇḍamāla by Jagadīśa.
Commentaries on Mūlyādhyāya by Bālakṛishṇa, son of Viṭṭhala, and by Dīkshita Kāmadeva.
Commentaries on Āśv.-Śrautasūtra by Devatrāta and Siddhāntin.
Baudh.-Chayanasūtra-vyākhyā (Mahāgnisarvasva) by Vāsudeva Dīkshita.
Baudh.-Śulvasūtra-dipikā by Dvārakānātha Yajyan.
Baudh.-Śrautasarvasva (inc.) by S'esha Nārāyaṇa.
Taitt.-Svarasiddhānta-chandrikā by Śrīnivāsa.
Sāmasūtra-vṛtti (inc.).
Baudh.-Śrautasūtra.
Bhāradvājasūtra-paribhāshā.
(Rigvediya) Pauṇḍarika-hautra-prayoga.
Hautraloka by Śivarāma.
Āśvalāyanasūtra-anuṣāri Prayoga by Vishṇugūḍhbasvāmin.
Daśarātra-prayoga by Vishṇugūḍhbasvāmin.
Pāraskara-grihyasūtra-vivarana by Rāmakṛishṇa.
Commentary on Paraśurāma-kalpasūtra by Rāmesvāra.

* Eggeling’s India Office Catalogue.
Lagnikārikā by Vishnusarmaṇa.
Āgniṇukha (Satyāśhādi and Āpast.):
Bhāradvāja or Pārīvesha-sūtra.
Pratījñāsūtra-bhāshya, Jyotsnā.
(Yajuh-) Sāmpradāyika Chātrumāsya-prayoga.
Śānasūtra-bhāshya by Yājñika Chakrachudāmaṇi Chhāga.
Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra-bhāshya and (Yaj.) Śrāddhadipikā by Kāśyapīdikshita.
Hautraprayoga by Nārāyaṇa aliaś Vyaṅkaṭesa.
Kapālakārikā-bhāshya by Maudgalyā Mayūresvara, son of Purushottama and grandson of Gopālopaṇḍhyāya.
Dārśapūrṇamāsapaḍārthadipikā by Kāṇva Śamaraṇabhaṭṭa, son of Nārāhari, grandson of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and surnamed Veṇūraja.
Kātyāyanaśrantaśūtrapaddhati by Padmanābha.
Several manuals relating to Pauṇḍarika.
Prayogadīpā by Devabhadra, son of Balabhādra.
Ishtakāpūraṇa-bhāshya (Kāt.) by Ananta.
Chayanapaddhati by Nārāhari of Utkaladeva.
Ādhānādiehāturūmāsyaṇaprayoga (Kāṇva).
Vishṇuḥṣapatiṭhotravivaraṇa by Rāmabhādra.
Gaṇapati-sahasranāma-vyākhyā by Nārāyaṇa. Date of Ms. [Saka] 1636, Jaya.
Samskāra-ratnamāla-bhāshya by Gopinātha.
Smṛiti-kauṣṭubha—Rājadharma.
Dinakaroddyota—Vyavahāra.
Kālanirṇayadipikā by Nṛsiṃha, composed in [Saka] 1331, Virodhin.
Āchāraraṇa by Lakṣhmaṇabhaṭṭa.
Mātrigotriṇirnaya by Laugākshi.
Dārśapūrṇamāsapravayogas by Govinda S'īśa and Anantadeva.
Manusmrītiṭīkā, Manubhāvārtha-chandrikā or-dīpikā, by Rāma-
chandra.
Anālabukāyāḥ Karmakaranavīchāra.
Dānabhāgavata by Varṇikuberānanda.
Dvārmaṇiḥsīlaṇa-dattakanirnaya by Viṣvaṇātha.
Dattakakutūhala by Daivajña Purushottama Pauḍita.
Padmapadmanīprakāśa (Dharma)—an extract. Śāstradīpā (Dharma).
Prayogasāra by Viṣvaṇātha.
Muhūrtamārtanda-ṭīkā by Chāturūmāsavāyājin Anantadeva.
Śaṃdhyā-vivaraṇa by Rāmāśrāma.
Vidyāgopālacharanā-śrānapaddhati by Chidānandanaṇaṇa aliaś Lakṣmahita.
Prayāschittachintāmaṇi (inc.).
Prāṣādapratishṭhā by Mahāśarman.
Jñānadipikā (Prayās'ch.) by Śamkarāchārya.
Dāmodarapaddhati (Dh.)
Dānavākyasamuchchaya by Yogisvarā.

Rūpanārāyaṇīya by the king of kings, Udayasimha. Rūpanārāyaṇa seems to have been a biruda (title) of Udayasimha, as it was one of the many birudas of Pratāparudra Gajapati, in whose name the Pratāpamārtanda was composed. There are many princes of Mithilā having alternative names ending in Nārāyaṇa, one of the alternative names being Rūpanārāyaṇīya (Duff's Chronology, p. 305). There is a Ms. of the Rūpanārāyaṇīya in the Oxford Library of which the date given by Dr. Aufrecht is 1530 A. D. The terminus ad quem of the date of composition must, therefore, be 1530 A. D.

Gāyatri-vivriti by Prabhūtāchārya.

Āchāra-dipikā by Nārāyaṇa, son of Dikshita Govinda.

Pratāpamārtanda by Pratāparudra Gajapati, son of Purushottamadeva Gajapati, and adorned with such birudas as Rūpanārāyaṇa. One of the birudas is navakotikārakatkakalavaragesvara. Hall seems to have had Kerala for Kala or to have misread Kala and he did not know what to make of varaga (Contribution, p. 174). Kalavaraga is, I believe, Kulbarga.

Dānapradipa by Bhaṭṭa Mādhava. King Rāghava of Karaṇa in Gujarat had invited the author's ancestor, Vāsudeva, an Audichhya of Tōlakiya jāti from Dadhivāhana. The line of Vāsudeva's descendants was: Narasimha, Didha, Rāma, Vishṇusarmaṇa, Bhaṭṭa Mādhava.

Grihyapradipakabhashya by Nārāyaṇa Dvivedin, son of Śrīkṛishṇaṇi and grandson of Śripati.

Śmartollāsa by Śivaprasāda Pāṭhaka, son of Nimbājī and living in Pushkarapura. Composed in Śaka 1610 or 1690 (Khagonripati). There is a Pratishtollāsa by the same author noticed above (p. 4) and a Śrautollāsa in Kielhorn's Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Central Provinces.

Dharmasāstrasudhānidiḥ (see p. 4)—Prayāsčittamuktāvalī by Divākara, son of Bhāradvāj Mahādeva Bhaṭṭa.

Śamskārāgaṇapati, kāṇḍas I and II, and Śrāddha-gaṇapati.

Kānyavāṅṭhābharaṇa—Aupaśanavidhi by Vājasaneyin Ananta-bhaṭṭa.

Parvaninaya by Gaṅgādhara, son of Pāṭhaka Śrīrāmachandra and grandson of Harisamkara.

Rudrakalpadruma by Anantasēva, son of Uddhava.

* This and similar figures refer to the numbers of the extracts in App. II.
Svanubhūtināṭaka by Paṇḍita Ananta, son of Tryambaka Paṇḍita.

Date of Ms. Samvat 1705.

Gadāyāravinda-vajayantī by Gopinātha, son of Veṇi-paṇḍita and grandson of Dharmādhikārīn Nanda-paṇḍita.

Bhāvavilāsa by Rudrakavi.

Viśvesalahari by Kaṇḍarāja.

Hitopadesaṭakī by Gokulachandra.

Hanumānārakṣatakī by Rāghavendra, composed in the year (era not mentioned) 1530.

Vṛitta-muktāvalī by Mallāri.

Kāvyaprakāśadīpīkā.

Kāvyaprakāśatīkā, Kāvyālarasāvivekīnī, by Re (or Pe)hladeva, son of Padmanābha and grandson of Nṛsimha. The Ms. is very old.

Kāvyaprakāśatīkā by Sarasvatītīrtha (or Narahari).

Chhandahkaustubha by Vidyāvibhūṣaṇa.*

Chhandahkaustubha by Rādhā-Dāmodara, with a commentary by Vidyāvibhūṣaṇa.*

Mimāṃsārthaprāddīpa by Kāṇva Śamkara Śukla.

Aṅgatevanirukti (Mīṃ.) by Murāri.

Mayūkhamālikā by Somarātha.

Mimāṃsārtha-prakāśa by Keśava, son of Ananta and grandson of Keśava.

(Sureśvara-)Vārttikasāra, also called Vedaṇtopanishad (Burn. Tanj. p. 95a).

Mahāvākyavivarana, Antarnishṭhāshtaka and Pañchadasopanishad-rahasya by Rāmachandra.

Nandikesvara-kārikāvivaraṇa.

Kaivalyopanishaddīpikā by Vidyāraṇya.

Commentaries on Vākyasūlha by Brahmanandabhārati and Śamkara.

Laghuvākyavṛittiṭīkā.

Vivekasārāṭīkā, Vedaṇtavallabha by Lakṣmī-Rāma Dvivedin.

Pākhandaṃukhamardanachāpeśīkā by Vijayaaraṇāṃchārya.

Bhagavadbhaktivilāsa by Gopālabhaṭṭa.

Adhikārasamgraha by Venkaṭanāṭhārya with a commentary, Bhāva-prakāśīnī, by Śrīnivāsa.

Viśisṭhādvaṭtaita-rājakalantā by Śrīnīvāsaṇaṇa.

Bhikṣugīta. Consists of two leaves only and begins: Dvija uvācha | Nayam jano me sukhadhuhkhaḥetūḥ.

Siddhāsiddhāntapaddhati by Gorakshanātha.

* These were seen in two different places on two different days. The names have been given as taken down in my notes. See pp. 45 and 57 also.
Ashtāṅga-ṭikā by Arṇudatta.

Simhasuddhānidhi (med.) by the king of kings, Devisimha, of Bundelakhandā, son of Bhāratashāha and of the family of Kāśitāja.

Yogapayonidhi (med.) by Mahesabhaṭṭa.

Śāṅgadhara-samhitā with a commentary by Kāśinātha Vaidya.

Sudarśanasamhitāyām Pārvatīśvarasamvāde Ugrastravichāra.

Yauvanollāsa by Umānandaṇātha.

Mrityulāṅgalavidhi (Maṇtra).

Ratnadipikā by Chandesvara.

Nartananiṁaya by Pundarika Viṭṭhala of Karnāṭaka. At the end the author mentions Rāgachandodaya as his work.

12. After finishing what work I could get at Ujjain on the first occasion I left for Jaisalmer. In the previous August (1904) the state Dewan had written to me to say that the Śvetāmbara Jaina Conference proposed cataloguing the Jaina Bhandars in Jaisalmer in a tabular form, of which he enclosed a copy, and to ask me if I had any suggestions to make. Assuming that the Conference would publish the catalogues made for them, I suggested the addition of such extracts from the beginning and the end and even from the body of the works as would contain historical information. But the project of cataloguing fell through at the time on account of differences of opinion between the representatives of the Conference and the members of the Jaina community in Jaisalmer. On my going to Jaisalmer, however, I found that an agreement had been arrived at and that a manuscript list, in tabular form (without the suggested extracts), of most of the manuscripts in the principal bhandar had already been made, but that further work had again been stopped on account of some fresh disagreement.

13. Within an hour after my arrival at Jaisalmer I set to work. I saw the Dewan and he immediately sent for a Pandit with a taste for reading and study, who, in previous years, when more liberal counsels prevailed, had easy access even to the closely guarded great bhandar and could even borrow manuscripts therefrom. He knew well what collections of Mss. there were in the place. On coming he made out the following list of these for me:

1. The badda (big) Bhandar of the Jainas underneath the ŚambHAVANĀTHA temple (in a dark underground cellar).
2. The Bhandar belonging to the Āchāryaguchchha (sect).
3. The Bhandar in the big Upāśraya of the Kharataraguchchha.
4. The collection in the house of Thiruśāha.
5. The Bhandar in the Upāśraya of the Tapāguchchha.
6. The Bhandar in the Upāśraya of the Loṅkāguchchha.
7. The collection belonging to the Taloṭike Vyāsa.
8. The state Bhandar in the Akshayavilāsa Palace.
10. The collection belonging to Vastapāla Purushita.

14. Here for the sake of comparison it would be interesting to note the following account of Jaina libraries in Pātañ given by Dr. Bhandarkar in his report for 1883-84 (p. 1): "Each Gachchha or sect of the Jainaas residing in a city possesses a halting place called Upāṣraya for their itinerant priests, and each of these Upāṣrayas is provided with a more or less extensive library. This library is the property of the Gachchha and is in the charge of the prominent lay-members of the sect. When, however, a priest makes an Upāṣraya his permanent residence, the library is always in his charge and practically he is its owner."

15. The Upāṣrayas and the libraries attached to them are often named after the street or ward in which they are situated. But Jaisalmer is a small city and has not got many streets or wards and it will be seen that in the above list the Upāṣrayas are named after the Gachchhas. No Jaina priest* permanently resides at present in the Sāmbhavanātha temple. But some years ago such a one was practically the owner of the library underneath it, and, being a great friend of the Pandit, who drew up the above list, allowed him free access to the library. At present the Bhandar is entirely in the charge of the Panches (or trustees). In the case of such Bhandars at Jaisalmer and elsewhere I generally found that each Panch (or individual trustee) put on his own padlock and kept his key, so that the Bhandars could not be opened unless all the keys were brought together. Under these circumstances it would happen that a Bhandar could not be opened even if there should be a single dissentient Panch against that being done, unless his padlock were to be forced open. This very nearly happened to me twice in connection with the big Jaisalmer Bhandar. It was not because any of the Panches had any objection to my, or rather Government work, as they called it, being proceeded with, but because one of them was strongly against the continuation of the Conference work. The Pandit deputed by the Conference to do the cataloguing had offered to help me and I had accepted his offer, but the particular Panch objected to his presence, while the others were strongly in his favour. On such occasions I was again and again reluctantly obliged to trouble the Dewan. He, however, in spite of domestic trouble and affliction and pressure of his regular official work, very readily rendered all the help he could on these special occasions, as well as generally with regard to the whole of my work throughout my stay in Jaisalmer. During

---

* The term by which such priests are generally called is Jāti or, its Sanskrit form, Yati. Yati primarily signifies one who lives a life of detachment from the world. But not a few of the present Jatis lead a life of the world, having wives and children and practising usury. Only the sacrament of marriage they do not go through. Enlightened Jain laymen have consequently begun to make a distinction between such Jatis or Yatis and those who do live a life of detachment. The latter they distinguish by the term Sādhus. The regard shown for both cannot be the same, though those of the former class still command more or less influence.

Another fact may be mentioned here. Some of the Jaina Yatis, I found, were Vaishnavas or Worshippers of Vishnu. It has been noted that in Eastern Hindustan the Jainaas are popularly divided into Vaishnavas and non-Vaishnavas (Ind. Ant. XVI, p. 164).
the last few days of my stay he had to go to Jodhpore to see the Resident. But even then the Mahomedan gentleman who acted for him, Mr. M. Niyyzali, did me the same willing service. The Dewan knew the men he had to deal with and before he wrote to me to say that I could be allowed to see the big Bhandar he had taken the precaution to get a joint agreement to that effect signed by all the Panches.

16. A few days before my arrival at Jaisalmer there had gone there on leave a gentleman who was a native of the place but a servant of the Karachi Municipality. It was represented to me that his influence was likely to be of much use to me in my work at the place. But the period of his leave was very nearly over and he was to leave soon. The Collector of Karachi, however, at my request granted him as president of the Municipality, a few days’ extension of his period of leave. So he, the Jaina Conference Pandit, and the other local Pandit mentioned above continually helped me in various ways. Hardly any one of the servants of the State knew where the State collection of MSS. was or whether there was any State collection at all. But the last of the three Pandits just referred to was sure that there was one and it was ultimately discovered in a wooden box that had not been opened for years. Of course the collection is not a very big one, nor very valuable from a literary point of view, as containing any rare manuscripts. There was one Bhandar I was allowed to see which had last been opened for the inspection of Dr. Bühler more than thirty years ago and had remained locked up ever since.

17. The first of the Bhandars in the above list Dr. Bühler in his Abstract Report for 1873-74 (Gough’s Records, p. 117) speaks of as being under the temple of Parisnath. But it is really underneath the temple of Sambhavanātha, the two temples being so built as to touch one another and to appear to be but two parts of one temple. The Sambhavanātha temple was built in Samvat 1464 or A.D. 1438, while Vairisimha was on the throne, as appears from an inscription in the temple. Of this and other inscriptions which my Pandit and I came across in Jaisalmer I have given short accounts in an Appendix attached to this report. Unfortunately, not expecting that any such inscriptions would turn up in my way while I was engaged in search another kind, I had not provided myself with materials for taking impressions. Consequently I had the inscriptions read and copies taken by my Pandit and the others who helped me; and some of them had to be read under great difficulties. Most of the copies had to be made while I was engaged otherwise and were consequently not done under my supervision. There seem to have been a few slips made in them, but the short abstracts I have given are, I feel sure, correct.

18. It is unnecessary to say that I set to work with the big Bhandar first, the very next day after my arrival. In the absence of a list I should have been obliged to examine each and every manuscript in this collection. This would have been a work of some months. Dr. Bühler, however, in his abstract report for 1873-4 does say (Gough’s Records, p. 118) that with the assistance of Dr. Jacobi he looked over every manuscript in the Bhandar, besides collating a portion of the
Raghuvamsa and copying with their own hands the whole of Bilhana’s Vikramanakdevacharita. But I doubt whether he was shown all the manuscripts, which are nearly 2,200 in number. In fact the following account he gives of the Bhandar is very decisive on the point:—

"According to an old list, which was prepared about 90 years ago by a Yati, the Brähijñānakosa contained then 422 different works. It is clear, however, from what I observed, that the list is made with great carelessness, and the number of books which existed at that time amounted to from 450 to 460. . . . At present there is only a remnant of what was at one time a splendid collection. The Bhandar still contains about 40 pothës or bundles of well-preserved palmyra MSS., a very great mass of loose and broken palmyra leaves, four or five small boxes full of paper MSS., and a few dozen bundles of paper leaves torn and disordered."

There is, of course, as here stated, a very great mass of loose and broken palmyra leaves and also some bundles of paper leaves torn and disordered. But the library is decidedly far richer in complete manuscripts written both on palm and paper leaves. The explanation of why Dr Bühler did not see all the manuscripts lies very probably in the following fact recorded by him:—"The Panch of the Osval, to which the great Bhandar belongs, is very tough, and requires frequent admonitions from the Rawal."† After showing a part of the collection the Panch might have represented that that was all or that all the rest was a mass of broken leaves.‡ The reason might have been a disinclination to lay open all the treasures or want of patience or both. It does require a great deal of patience to sit out day after day in doing unpaid-for work in which one is not interested, such as that of handing out manuscripts and watching their inspection by others. I must, therefore, consider myself as being laid under great obligations by the Jatis and other persons in Jaisalmer and elsewhere who helped me in this way. The constant fear of seeing them lose their patience has sometimes made me do my work a little less completely than I should have liked to do.

19. An ancient catalogue of the Bhandar of, now, more than 120 years ago has already been referred to in the above paragraph from Dr. Bühler’s account. But on the morning of the day on which I was to commence work the Conference Pandit informed me that he had made a new list of most of the collection. A copy of it, he told me, had been sent to the Conference authorities at Jaipur and another was kept in the Bhandar. Accordingly the first day I examined the manuscripts that were to be still catalogued and borrowed the copy, lodged in the Bhandar, of the new list. After my work at the Bhandar that day was over I sat up until the small hours of the morning and went through the list and put down the numbers, names, &c., of a little over 200 manuscripts, certain particulars relating to which I wished to verify myself. Of Brahminical works the list gave no information.

* Ind. Ant., IV, p. 82. † Ind. Ant., III., p. 90.
‡ Even after my examination of the Bhandar I was told that there was a hollow pillar which contained many other MSS, not seen by me. The case cited by Peterson (Fourth Report, p. 2) of the closing up of a collection with a brick wall is worthy of note.
beyond the mere numbers and the names and the fact that they belonged to another Darśana (i.e., to the followers of another religion than the Jaina), the concern of the Conference being Jaina literature alone.

20. The inspection of the manuscripts had to be done under the continued supervision of two Jatis, one belonging to the Āchārya and the other to the Kharatara Gachchha, who resided in the Upāstrayas of their own Gachchhas, and under the intermitted supervision of one or more of the Panches. For the convenience of the Jatis the work had to commence every day not earlier than about noon, and to make sure that it might commence at that hour I had to begin sending to them, from about half an hour before the time, messengers kindly placed at my disposal by the Dewan. The Jatis had, moreover, to cook and have their second meal before sunset, and so not very long after I had commenced my day's work they would begin coaxing me off and on to finish. But I always stuck on as long as I could. After I had gained a little of their confidence they kept outside the underground cellar a few things I wanted to have copied, and my Pandit and I worked at them before and after the usual working hours.

21. As regards the condition of the collection, the mass of loose and broken palmyra leaves and of torn and disordered paper-leaves, referred to above, show plainly enough that age and want of due care have done their work here also. To this result the very unwieldy length of some of the palm-leaf manuscripts must have contributed not a little. Each palm-leaf manuscript (containing one work or more), tied up between its wooden boards, is again tied up in a cloth bag and a number of such bags are rolled up in a thick piece of cloth and the bundle again tied with a string. These bundles, however, are not arranged in order, as they differ in length, and are stowed away in stone cases suited to their lengths. Each bag had a number on it. But in the case of a god many there were two numbers, one the old one left unscored and the other the new number given by the Conference Pandit. Hence there was some confusion, and some of the manuscripts I wanted to examine did not appear to turn up. Probably the wrong or old numbers were read out to me in their case, whereas the numbers noted down by me were the new ones. Amongst those that did not turn up there were some of which I wanted only to verify the dates, because they were so old. Dr. Bühler mentions a manuscript of Samvats 1160 as the oldest manuscript he saw in the Bhandar (Gough, p. 117). But according to the new list there are at least seven older than that, the dates being Samvat 924, 1005, 1120, 1127, 1139, 1144 and 1155. Of these I verified the dates 1127 and 1139. Of two the dates in the list escaped me when I went through the list, and I did not note the manuscripts down for inspection. Two did not turn up and of one, that bearing the date Samvat 924, a Ms. of Daśāvaiṅkālikā with Haribhadra's commentary, I could not easily find the date.

22. Among the notable manuscripts, I saw one of Vastuṭpālaprasaṭsti (a poem in praise of Vastuṭpāla) by Jayasimha Kavi. It begins with an account of the Chaulukya Vamsa (dynasty of the Chau-
Mularaja is spoken of as having subdued Kachehhapa (cf. Sukritasamkirtana, II. 6) and been rendered glorious during the strife with Sindhuraja (probably of Malava) and being served by kings of the Dekkan of thirty-six royal families. On Bhimadeva's accession Sri (royal dignity personified) is represented to have given up her embrace of king Bhoja, speech to have forsaken his mouth and the sword his hand. Jayasimha Siddharaja's horses are mentioned as having thrown up dust on to the face of the woman in the shape of the fame of the Malava king (cf. Sukr. II. 34). Kumarakapala is stated to have supported the Jaina religion, put Arnapura (of Sambhar) into a fright, to have seized Kunika (cf. Sukr. II. 41-3 and Kirtik. II. 47-8) and glorified the Destroyer of Sbara (the god Siva who burnt up the god of love with fire). The last probably alludes to the rebuilding of Somnath. Bhimadeva II. laid on the Chaulukya Lavanyaprasada the duty of raising up his glory. The latter's son, Virdhavala, asked Bhimadeva to recommend to him a minister. Bhimadeva recommended Vastupala and Tejaipala, who held under him the office of Srikarasa (probably that of chief secretaryship) and transferred their services to Virdhavala (Sukr. III. 57, 59). In doing so he gave a genealogy of the two. It is the same as that given in Somevra's Surathosa (Dr. Bhandarkar's Report for 1883-84, p. 21) and in Somevra's Vastupalaprasasti in Tejaipala's temple on Mount Abu (Kirtikaumudi, Appendix, pp. 1-10). At Kirtik. III 51-2 it is stated that Lavanyaprasa had thought of these two ministers himself. But the account given in Arismha's Sukritasamkirtana, Canto III, agrees pretty closely with the one given here. There Kumarakapala, "grandfather" (great-uncle) of Bhimadeva II, appeared to the latter in a dream and advised him to take Lavanyaprasa as the supporter of his kingdom and make him lord of all (sarvesvara) and to crown Virdhavala as heir-apparent. When Bhimadeva the next morning made this proposal to the father and the son they agreed and the latter asked Bhimadeva to recommend to him a mantrin (minister), which Bhimadeva did in the manner stated in this prasasti (Buhler's Das Sukritasamkirtana, pp. 42-6). Of the ancestors of the two brothers, Soma, the Prasasti tells us, did honour amongst divinities only to Tirthakrid, amongst stores of learning only to the gur Haribhadra and amongst masters only to Siddhesa (Sukr. III. 50). Haribhadra may be the same as the author of Tatttraprabodha (about Samvat 1225) and the Haribhadra mentioned in verse 70 of Somevra's prasasti, and Siddhesa is of course Jayasimha Siddharaja. When Virdhavala marched against the Maravas (Marvad princes) Vastupala forded the sea of the forces of the Yadu Sinhana. He built the Indramandapa in front of Nabhaya, which is the ornament of Satrumjaya. Many other similar works of his are referred to, such as the building of big lakes on a ledge of Satrumjaya and in Pdadiptanagari and Arkapalitakagrama and of temples on the Ujayanta mountain, restoration of the temple of the Lord of Sambhala, in which there were idols of Nabhaya and Neminartha not fashioned by hands. Once Tejaipala informed his elder brother of a Kavya (verses) recited by Suri Jayasimha (i.e., the author of the prasasti himself) to him when on one occasion he visited
Bhrigupura (Broach) to do honour to Suvarata. In that Kāvya the poet prayed for 25 golden staffs (Kalyāṇadaṇḍa), in place of bamboo ones, for the temple of Suvarata. These Vastupāla granted and for the gift Vastupāla and Tejāhpāla are glorified in the rest of the prāṣṭāti. The production of the whole poem is due to that gift. In the last verse Jayasimha gives his own name and speaks of himself as a bee devoted to the lotuses of the feet of Suvarata.

23. Another noteworthy manuscript was that of the play Hammīramadamardana (humbling of the pride of Hammīra) by Jayasimha, tied up between the same wooden boards as the above. The name of the work occurred in the old list shown to Dr. Bühler; but he did not find the manuscript itself. The late Mr. N. J. Kirtane, who chanced upon a manuscript of Hammīrakāvya by Nayachandrasūri and edited the work, took it to be the same work as that mentioned in the list. But now that the manuscript has been recovered it is evident that the two are not the same. Nayachandrasūri's work is a Kāvya (poem) in glorification of Hammīra. The present work is a quasi-historical* play, the subject of which is the humbling of the pride of another Hammīra. The details given about the author, in the introduction, are as follows:

There was formerly in Bhriguṇagara a Sūri (Jaina teacher) by name Virasūri, devoted to the feet of Suvarata. He had as pupil a poet named Jayasimha who was Agastya to (who dried up) the sea of the intellects of rival poets and whose feet were resorted to by hundreds of Sitāmbara (Śvetāmbara Jaina) ascetics. He composed the play, which was the fame incarnate of Viradhavala, who was the Kalpataru (wishing-tree) in the forest of the Chulukya race. The play was filled to the full with the nine rasas (sentiments).

At the end the play is dedicated to Vastupāla and there is an identical stanza† in both the above prāṣṭāti and this play.²

24. From these details it is possible to identify the author of the play with that of the prāṣṭāti noticed above. The date at the end of the manuscript is Samvat 1286 which may be the date of even the composition of the play.² I have got a copy made and myself compared a large portion of it with the original. But the reading of the manuscript has been no easy matter. The work not being all in verse like a Kāvya, metre has been of very little use in that respect. Further, most of the prose is Prakrit and that increases the difficulty. To add to all this, though the leaves of the manuscript are perfectly well preserved, at least half a dozen leaves are rendered altogether illegible, through the ink having faded in some cases and through the leaves being thoroughly blackened by the rubbing of the ink in others.

25. A short abstract of the play would not be uninteresting. The play is represented as being acted on the occasion of the Bhimes-
vara fair at Stambhatirtha, which is the kundāla (an ear ornament) on the right side of the face of the river Mahi. Jayantasimha, the lion who
sports in the forest of the family of Vastupāla—of course Vastupāla’s
son (Kritik. App. p. 6)—has commanded the performance of a
play full of the nine rasas (sentiments) for the delectation of people
who had been nauseated by witnessing the performance, by actors
from all parts, of the prakāranas (plays) made up of Bhayānaka
(sentiment of terror) alone; and the present play is represented as being
acted in pursuance of those commands. The Sūtradhāra (the
principal manager) congratulates himself on the happy conjunction of
circumstances on the occasion of the performance. The actors
are excellent 6, Jayantasimha Sachiva (minister) is one of the specuta-
tors, Lord Vīradhavala (the hero) is the abode of valour and glory
and the poet is Jayasimhasūri of wonderful faculty. After the
introduction Vīradhavala and Tejāhpāla are introduced on the stage
engaged in conversation. The former heaps praises on Vastupāla and
the latter on Vīradhavala. In the course of this, which is a sort of
mutual adulation, Vīradhavala refers to the cleverness Vastupāla
displayed on a previous occasion. The army of the Yadu king had
marched from afar and put Śrisimha, lord of Lātadesā, in fear.
The frightened lord of Mālava too had weakened the power Śrisimha
derived from the help of a circle of friends by, I suppose, leaving him
in the lurch. Under these circumstances, Vastupāla had by his
cleverness succeeded in converting Śrisimha, who had been made a foe
before, into a friend of Vīradhavala 7. Vīradhavala refers also to
Vastupāla’s foiling the attempt against him of Samgrāmasimha
(also elsewhere named Śaṅkha), who was son of Sindhurāja and nephew
(brother’s son) of Simha, the lord of Lātadesā. On that occasion
Samgrāmasimha remembering his paternal enmity had drawn with
him the commanders of Simhaṇa and was following the footsteps
of Vīradhavala, while Vīradhavala was engaged in chastising the
Maru (Marwad) kings. Then the present situation is referred
to. King Simhaṇa has marched against him, having absorbed in
the sea of his forces numerous kings. He has been set on to do so by
the son of Sindhurāja, whose former hostility has been rekindled by the
discomfiture caused by Vastupāla. On another side the Turashka
warrior has marched against Vīradhavala, shaking the earth with his
vast army. On another side yet the king of Mālava has begun to
march against him, burning hosts of enemies 8. Out of this situation in
which he is thus pressed on all sides he trusts to Vastupāla’s intellect
alone, he says, to see him safe. Vastupāla then enters. He praises the
energy and diligence in the king’s affairs shown by Lāvanyasimha, son of
Tejāhpāla. Lāvanyasimha, he says, has sent out secret spies who have
already won the confidence of the Sāmdhivirāhikas (ministers of peace and
war) of the hostile kings. He further states that the spies serving as the
only eyes to the hostile kings, the kings have become puppets to be managed by strings. There is further mutual adulation,
in the course of which Tejāhpāla refers to the valour displayed by
Vīradhavala during the fight at Pañchagāma. Then Vīradhavala
announces his intention of marching against Hammiravira at least,
since the other hundreds of hostile kings were being quieted by the
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minister by the exercise of his intellect alone. Vastupâla consents, but advises him against pursuing a fleeing enemy for reasons based on prudence. Then he tells him to start at once and ally himself with the lords of Maru before they have joined the Mlechchha Chakrâvartin who is close at hand. And thus, he adds, the Mlechchha Chakravartin too would be foiled simply by his intellect being overpowered by the fear due to Viradhavala being so close. So saying he whispers something into the ears of his brother Tejahpâla, probably to say that even here he has so arranged it that Viradhavala would meet with success without the shedding of blood. By this time it is midday and the first act closes here. A long interlude follows in which Lavanyasimha (son of Tejahpâla) enters on the stage. It is nearly evening then and he reveals in a description of the evening scene. After he has done he turns to the present situation. On account of Vastupâla expediting the march, the kings of Marudeśa, into whose provinces the Mlechchha king’s forces are marching at their will, entertaining hopes and fears, have at once allied themselves with Viradhavala. The names of the kings are Somasimha, Udayasimha and Dhârâvarsha. So also has Bhîmasimha, the jewel in the parted hair of Surâshâtrâ, (province of Sorath personified as a woman), hastened to gather, as it were, the ripe fruit of the tree of the love of Viradhavala, the son of Madanadevi. Then Lavanyasimha alludes to the success that Vastupâla’s plans are meeting with. The kings of Mahitaṭa and Lâṭadeśa, Vikramâditya and Sahajapâla, had before formed a coalition and seceded when Viradhavala was pressed by the Yadu king. But there is now a split between them and each is vying with the other in trying to gain the heart of Viradhavala, and, the big rivers having joined the ocean of Viradhavala’s forces, the rivulets also are doing the same.

Lavanyasimha expresses surprise that the two spies he had sent to put a stop to the march of the king of the Dekkan and the Mâlava king have not yet returned. Just then enters one of them, Nipûnaka. Here a whole leaf has become almost wholly illegible. Passing over the leaf, we find Nipûnaka in the midst of his explanation to Lavanyasimha of the stratagem by which he and the other spy, Suvega, managed to take in Simhâna. Nipûnaka had given Simhâna to understand that the forces of Hammira were laying waste the environs of the Gurjara land and that Viradhavala had gone against them by forced marches. Simhâna thought that a fitting opportunity to attack Gujarat. Nipûnaka says that he persuaded him of the advisability of desisting for the present and attacking Viradhavala when he had exhausted himself against Hammira and of staying for the present where he was, i.e., at the head of the roads leading to the Gurjara and Mâlava des’as. Simhâna accordingly, he adds, had begun enjoying himself on the bank of the Tâpî or Tapanatanayâ. Next he reports how he and Suvega brought about a separation between Simhâna and Samgrâmasimha. He had previously got a horse marked with the name of king Devapâla presented to Samgrâmasimha. Suvega then allowed himself to be caught with a letter on his person looking at first like blank paper but disclosing the written letters on exposure to the sun. The letter purported to be from Devapâladeva to his Mandaḷes’vara.
(tributary chief), Samgrāmasimha, asking him to accept the jewel of a horse he had sent him, and commanding him not to move from his camp until by a sudden unexpected march he (Devapāla) had engaged in battle "this king" who was entering the Gūrjara land. It purported to further advise him that he should then make of his sword a boat to cross over to the other side of the ocean of the enmity caused by the killing of his father. Then Nipuṇaka, who was fully in the confidence of Simhaṇadeva, was asked to ascertain the truth about the horse. He went outside and had Samgrāmasimha informed that Simhaṇadeva was wroth against him. He then came back to Simhaṇadeva and informed him that the horse was marked with the name of the king of Mālava. (Devapāla is thus shown to have been the name of the Mālava king.) Samgrāmasimha fled away through fear. And Simhaṇa, says Nipuṇaka, has now marched against Mālava and Deva-pāla has advanced to meet him. Then both Nipuṇaka and Lāvaṇya-simha start to inform Viradhavala and the interlude ends.

In the second act Vastupāla enters on the stage. He indulges in a long description of the moonlight night. He rejoices to have learnt (from Suvēga) of the split between Simhaṇa and Samgrāmasimha and thinks that the former would be powerless to destroy without a guide belonging to that part of the country, which the latter was. Then he praises Samgrāmasimha very highly, refers to a previous victory of his over the army of Simhaṇa, by which he put into shade the vismayarasa (sentiment of wonder or astonishment) which had previously been witnessed on the Revā (Narmadā) when Rāvana's pride was checked by Arjuna (Kārtavīrya); and adds that with presents and sweet words he is seeking an alliance. Just then word is brought in that Samgrāmasimha has marched in great haste against Stambhatirtha. Vastupāla, incensed at this treachery, at once sends for the officer (Bhuvanaka) who has come to treat with him on behalf of Samgrāmasimha, and forces under Sūrapāla and others are at once prepared to march for the relief of the place. Bhuvanaka comes in, sees the preparations and hears Vastupāla threaten that he would make the sea red by its embrace of the Mahī dyed with blood. He wonders how the news of Samgrāmasimha's march has got abroad and, struck with amazement at the quickness of the preparations, denies the fact. He says that his master has marched to the Gūrjara camp to join Viradhavala and allay the itching of the arms of the Turuskas and Turanās. Resolved that that would be the right course for his master to follow, he inwardly determines to send word secretly to him to do accordingly. "Whichever it be," says Vastupāla with a look full of meaning "you had better hasten your master" and discharges him. Then turning to Nipuṇaka he learns that Nipuṇaka left Samgrāmasimha intent on crossing the great river Mahī. Vastu-pāla then makes up his mind to arrange for the protection of Dhavalaka and to march towards Stambhatirtha.

In Act III Viradhavala and Tejahpāla come on the stage. It is morning and Viradhavala indulges in long descriptions of the morning.

* Or Suvēga? There is no stage direction except this "Nipuṇakaṃ prati" to show that either is on the stage.
scene. Viradhavala refers to the son of Sindhuroma having become his friend. He is waiting for news of Jayatala, the ornament on the forehead of the Medapradhrithi (Mewad land), who had not joined him and against whom Hammira has marched. That very moment comes in the required news. The spy Kamalaka brings in word about the burning of the whole of Mewad by Hammira's warriors. He gives a long and harrowing account of the sack. At last, he relates, dressed as a Turushka, he raised a cry "Run away, Viradhavala is come". Then the Turushkas began to run away in all directions and the people pressed forward to see their saviour. In their midst Kamalaka dropped his assumed Turushka garb and told them that Viradhavala was at the very heels of Hammira's forces and the more eagerly the people pressed forward the more quickly ran away the enemy. Then remarks Viradhavala that all his enemies except the Mlechchhas have been won over by the intellect of his minister. To this Tejahpala replies that Vastupala has laid plans for taking in Hammira also in the same way.

After this there is an interlude in which two spies in Turushka dress are introduced, viz., Kuvalayaka and Sighraka, the two being brothers. The latter relates that by Tejahpala's direction he had gone to the Khalip, the lord of Bagdad and other provinces and sovereign over the whole race of the Mlechchhas, representing himself to be a messenger of king Khaparrakhana. He told the Khalip that Milachchhikara through arrogance did not obey even the Khalip's orders. The Khalip put into his hands an order directing Khaparrakhana that Milachchhikara should be put into chains and sent to the Khalip. The order was taken to Khaparrakhana. He turned against Milachchhikara. In the meanwhile Sighraka secretly informed Milachchhikara's son of the steps that were being taken against his father, and the son has sent Sighraka off in haste to inform his father. Sighraka is consequently at that moment going to Milachchhikara in order to make him miserable by the information he is about to give him.

Milachchhikara with his minister Goripapa is introduced in Act IV as possessed by feelings of anxiety, anger, despondency and shame. He is consulting with his minister with reference to the news he had about Khaparrakhana. Suddenly there is a great noise behind and a cry that some soldiers are coming fast slaying all about them. Immediately are heard a hasty enquiry as to where Milachchhikara is and Viradhavala's call for him. Milachchhikara and his minister run away. Viradhavala enters and he is disappointed at his enemy having escaped death at his hands. Long praise of Viradhavala by Dvarabhatta (a bard who has accompanied him in military dress) follows. He then has Tejahpala called in. A dialogue follows in the course of which Viradhavala speaks of his not intending to pursue such a coward as Hammira, who was frightened at his name only, being already half unnerved by the schemes of Vastupala. It is midday when the act ends.

In Act V comes Kaichukin (overseer of women's apartments). He is in Dhavalaka and waiting for news to confer Viradhavala's queen Jayatalladevi. He gets news that Hammira having been put to
flight, Viradhavala has started back for Dhavalaka. Then enter Vira-
dhavala and Tejahpāla in a Naravimāna (earthly balloon). On their
way they see, describe and praise: the Arbuda mountain; the hermitage
of Vasishtha near it; the city of Chandrāvatī, the capital of the
dynasty of Paramāras brought into existence by Vasishtha; the river
Sarasvati which enters the earth as if to destroy the hells that exist
in spite of her purifying presence; the place where near its eastward
flowing waters dwells Bhadramahākālā (god Śiva) in the vicinity of
Siddhapura; the capital of the Gūrjara kings (Anahilapatattana) with
its lake the Siddhasāgara (generally called Sahasralinga); and the
city of Karṇāvatī on the Sābhramati, to the music of the drum of
whose waves dances Lakshmī on the stage of the lotuses of the hands
of Lavaṇaprasādā. At last they come to Dhavalaka. Viradhavala
stays in a garden outside the city to await an auspicious occasion
for triumphant entry into the city. He there meets his Vidūshaka
(jester) and his queen. The queen is called here Jaitradevi. When
the time for the entry arrives Vastupāla and Tejahpāla come out
riding. The latter tells Viradhavala that the former has by his clever-
ness made the Hammirāvira Milachchhikārā inclined to make peace.
Milachchhikāra's two gurus (preceptors), by name Radī and Kadi,
after gaining for him from the Khalipa the favour of being seated
on the throne, were coming by sea along with the Khalipa’s minister
Vajradīna. They were captured and imprisoned in Stambhatirtha
and in order to ransom them Milachchhikārā has made an alliance for
life. Then they enter the city. On entry Viradhavala getting into
a temple of Śiva praises the god. The god manifests himself and
asks what boon he might confer and the play ends with the conferring
of the boon asked. Then there follow two stanzas, a small part of
which has been lost. They contain a dedication of the play to Vastu-
pāla.

Thus the victory over Hammira is represented as a triumph of a
scheming policy.

26. The following are the historical personages (besides Viradhava-
la, Vastupāla, Tejahpāla and Jayasimha, the author) introduced as
characters or merely mentioned in the play:—Madanadevi (mother
of Viradhavala); Jayataladevi or Jaitradevi (wife of Viradhavala);
Jayantasimha (son of Viradhavala); Lāvanyasimha (son of Tejahpāla);
Khalipa of Bagdad; Hammira Milachchhikārā; Simha, king of
Lātades’a; Śaṅkha or Sangrāmasimha,* son of Sindhurajā and nephew
of the Simha just mentioned, and Maṇḍales’vara of Devapāla of
Mālava†; Simhaṇa; Devapāladeva, king of Mālava; Somasimha,
UDayasimha and Dhārāvarsha, kings of Marudes’a; Bhīmasimha of
Surāśṭra; Vikramāditya of Mahītaṇḍ; Sahajāpāla of Lātades’a; and
Jayatala of Mewad.

* That these are two names of the same prince is clear from Kṛṣṇ. iv. 66, 72 and
v. 41. There is nothing in the Sukr. opposed to that. Dr. Bühlcr, however, takes
Śaṅkha to be an ally of Sangrāmasimha (p. 36).

† At least so represented in the fictitious letter.
27. Many of these names are already known to the history of Gujarat, occurring as they do in Kirtikaumudi and similar accounts of the period. The names, Simha and Sahajapala of Lâtâdesa are new. The latter is referred to by Lâvanyasimha when speaking of a past event as well as in connection with the events dealt with in the play. The name Simha is referred to by Viradhavala in connection with a past event only. They were probably two different names of the same individual. A king of Lâtâdesa is referred to in Kirtik. IV. 57, though the name is not specified. Samgrâmasimha's blood relationship to this Simha and perhaps also his political relationship to Devapâla of Mâlava we learn from the present play. He is spoken of as having pitrivaitra (hereditary feud) towards Viradhavala and nijapitrivadhavaitra (enmity due to the killing of his father) towards Simhaṇa also. In Kirtik. (IV. 68) his own emissary is represented as praising his bravery highly, and here high praise of him is put into the mouth of Vastupâla. Devapâla-deva is mentioned in two inscriptions at Udepur and in the Harsauda inscription (Ind. Ant., XIX. 24 and XX. 83, 310). He seems to be the same as the father of Jaitugi, in whose reign Asâjhara composed his commentary on his own Dharmamrita in Samvat 1300 (Dr. Bhandarkar's Report, 1858—84, p. 105). One of the Udepur inscriptions gives him the date 1286 Samvat and the present play about the same. The Marwad princes are mentioned in the Kirtikaumudi, but their names are not specified. We have here the names of three of them. Of these Dhâravarsa is mentioned in the Chaturvimsâtiprabandha; and Udayasimha is mentioned as king of Jâvalipura of the Châhumâna family, Aśvarâja sâkhâ (branch), and son of Samarasingha and grandson of Ketu. So also is Bhimasimha of Surâshtra mentioned therein as Bhimasimha of Bhadresvara. Vikramâditya of Mahîtaṭa is a new name. In Kirtik. (IV. 57) a Godrahanâtha (lord of Godraha) is referred to and Ghughula, who reigned at Godraha in Mahîtaṭa, is mentioned in Chaturvimsâtiprabandha (Kirtik., pp. xxiii—xxiv). Jayatala of Mewad seems to be Jaitrasimha. The two forms, Jayataladevi and Jaitradevi of the name of Viradhavala's queen show that Jaitra and Jayatala are interchangeable. Samvat 1270 occurs as a date of Jaitrasimha on a pillar in the temple of Ekâlingaji in Mewad (Bhavnagar Inscriptions, p. 93).

28. In Canto IV of the Kirtikaumudi are described an impending conflict of Lâvana-prasâda and Viradhavala with Simhaṇa of the Deccan and the way in which they were encountered by foes on all sides. The details given by Somesvara appear to agree with the events referred to by Viradhavala in Act I of the present play as having happened in the past, and the date of the Ms. is 1286 Samvat (or A. D. 1230).

29. And who is the Hammira? From all the details given he seems to be a Turk and the name Hammira a transformation of Amir. Hammira or Hamvira, a name given to either Sabuk-Tigin or Mahmud of Ghazni in the Mahoba inscription, is a similar instance. The story about the way in which the Hammira is tricked into seeking peace as given in the play is but a version of a story of which two different versions are already known from the Chaturvimsâtiprabandha and

* Father-in-law of Viradhavala's son, Virama. See supplementary note.
Merutunga’s Prabandhachintamani (Kirtik., pp. xxiv-xxv). The latter does not specify the name of the person on whom the trick was practised but simply calls him Mlechchhapati Suratrâṇa (Sultan, the lord of the Mlechchhas). The other does specify the name as Suratrâṇa Mojadaina. But this name can never be made to correspond to Milachchhiṅkâra, the name given in the play. The emperor of Delhi meant in the play is, I am disposed to think, Sultan Shamsu-d-dunyâ wau-d-dûn Abu-l-Muzaffar Altamsh or in short Sultan Shamsu-d-dûn. He came to the throne of Delhi in 1210 A. D. and died in 1235. On account of the marks of intelligence evident in all his actions he had been elevated to the rank of Amir-Shikâr (chief huntsman) by Kutbudûn-dûn and I believe Milachchhiṅkâra is a transformation of Amir-Shikâr (Elliot and Dowson’s History of India, Vol. II., pp. 320—8). There does not seem to have been any Muizzû-d-dûn ruling at the time between A. D. 1206 and 1240 and Viradhavala reigned from 1233 to 1238. The date of Râjasékharâ’s Prabandhachaturvimsati is 1405 Samvat and that of Merutunga’s work is Samvat 1361. Jayasimha’s is a contemporary work and he is likely to be more correct as to the person on whom could possibly be practised, if practised at all, any such trick as has been mentioned above.

30. The name Lâvanyasimha as that of Tejâlapâla’s son suggests a surmise. The name occurs in Kirtikamundi and elsewhere also. Arisimha, the author of the historical poem Sukritasamkirtana, is mentioned in the Prabandhakosha of Râjasékharâ as having been first introduced to Visaladeva by Amarachandra, his pupil in poesy. But, says Dr. Bühler in his paper on the poem, when an Indian poet praises his hero’s liberality in the way in which it is praised in this poem, he does so either in gratitude for favours received or in hopes of receiving them, and that it is clear from one passage that the singer had been liberally rewarded by Vastupâla (p. 7)*. Arisimha must, therefore, have presented himself at court while Vastupâla was still in power. But Vastupâla lost his high position soon after Visaladeva’s accession and died in Samvat 1298. Consequently Bühler thinks that the statement made by Râjasékharâ is doubtlessly incorrect, viz., that Amarapandita and through him Arisimha first came to the court at Dholka during the reign of Visaladeva (circa Samvat 1296-1318). The reason does not seem to be a very strong one. In connection with the date of S’riharsha, the author of the Naishadhakâvyâ, Bühler himself says that Râjasékharâ who wrote in the middle of the 14th century might be expected to obtain trustworthy information regarding a person who lived about the time of Kumârapâla (A. D. 1143-74)†. Much more, therefore, can he be expected to have obtained trustworthy information about a later person who lived about the time of Visalâ-

* The passage he thinks most convincing is II. 53 (54 is a misprint):—

श्रीकृति प्रकृतिविश्वविद्वान निरंतरानु पुस्तकायम नदिकिनचनता विरताः।
मनवेर देवशचसापि तथा पा(प्र)याति न प्रातिैविविश्वातिनिकृतमुरुषापि तेषांशु।

deva (A. D. 1238-61). Secondly, even when Vastupāla ceased to be in power he must have been very rich and in a position to reward poets. Merutunga in his Chintāmāni speaks of his having rewarded Someśvara at that time (p. 268, Ramchandra Shastrin’s edition). But may not Lāvanyásimha, the father of Arisimha, be the same as the son of Tejahpāla, and Arisimha consequently a grandson of Tejahpāla? When Vastupāla expecting his own death was about to start for S’atrumjaya he called about him, says Rājaśekhara, his son Jayantaśimha and Tejahpāla with his putra or putras (son or sons) and pautra or pautras (grandson or grandsons) (Bühler’s Das Sukr., p. 6, note 2). So Tejahpāla had a pautra and if Arisimha should have been such a one, Bühler’s doubts would not be justified, even if Vastupāla had not been in a position to reward poets after his loss of power. And it would perhaps make it more explicable why Amarachandra composed the last four stanzas of each canto of the Sukritasamkīrtana, which have very little close connection with what precedes and the first three of which generally contain direct praises of, and invoke blessings on, Vastupāla and the fourth praises Arisimha’s poetic skill. The passage cited in a footnote on the previous page is from Amarachandra’s portion. Arisimha might have accepted the patronage (a permanent appointment and a high salary which latter was soon after doubled) of Visaladeva after Vastupāla lost his power or had even died, and perhaps just because he was related to Vastupāla so closely he might not have sought it and happened to be introduced by his pupil Amarachandra.

31. Among other notable manuscripts existing in the Bhandar the following may be mentioned:—

A copy of the Bhaṭṭikāvyya, the colophon at the end of which reads: Iti Valabhiśastavya-Śri-Śvāmīśūnvar Bhaṭṭibrāhmaṇaśya kṛitaṃ Rāmakāvyam samāptam (see Trivedi’s Bhattṭi, Introdn. p. xvii).

Chakrapāṇīvijayakāvyya by Lakshmīdhara. The copy in the Deccan College Collection, 73/74, No. 28, must be a copy of this Ms. In the introduction the author states that in the Gauḍas there is a village called Bhaṭṭakosala of members of the Sāndilya kula (family), the dwellers in which are devoted to the service of Kesiya. In that family were born Naravāhana Bhaṭṭa, Ajita, Vaikuṇṭha, Śrīstambha and Lakshmīdhara, each succeeding one being son of the preceding. The author seems to have flourished at the court of a Bhojadeva15. The subjects of the cantos are such as these:—Bālivānana, Hara-prasādana, Uḍhāvārṇana, Kārtikeya-Yuddha, &c.

A commentary on the Karpūranaśīra, called Karpūrakusuma, by Premarāja, who was the son of Prayāradāsa, the ornament of the Sahigila family in the solar line16. The Ms. is dated Samvat 1538.

A copy of Chaṇḍapāla’s commentary on Damayanti-Champū dated Samvat 1484.

Dharmanemeru’s commentary on Raghuvamsa.

Raghuvamsaṭīkā composed in Samvat 1164 by Ratnagani.

A copy of Halāyudha’s Kavirahasya with Ravidharma’s commentary dated Samvat 1216.
A copy of Karpūraprakaraṇa in which the compiler is mentioned as a pupil of Vajraśekharasūri.

Chandrādītakāvyā by Jimbūnāgakavi. MS. dated 1342 Samvat.

Commentary on Gītā-Govinda by Jagaddhara called Sūradipikā.

A Virāhinīpralāpa by Keli consisting of five stanzas only.

Vijayaprāśastikāvyā. I saw the name in the list made for the Jaina Conference. But unfortunately the manuscript was not found when I wanted to see it. There is a mahākāvyā of that name by Harsha, the celebrated author of the Naishadhiya which has not yet been discovered.

Similarly there was a Bhartrihari-charita also mentioned in the list which did not turn up.

Vyākaraṇa composed in Samvat 1080 in Jāvālipura by Budhiṣāgara, the favoured one of Vardhamāna, and Jinesvara. Wishing to do good to the world, he wrote Pañchā-granthi (work of that name or five works). The name of the work would, from certain words in the beginning, seem to be Sābdalakshmalakṣaṇa16. There is another work of his in the collection called Pramāyalakshmalakṣaṇa. In Abhayadeva's commentary on Haribhadra's Pañchāsākhyaprakarana Buddhīṣāgara is spoken of as Sābdāliakshmapratipādakāh. (Ind. Ant. XI, 248a).

Sambandhoddityota by Rabhasa-pandi. The work treats of Kāraka-sambandha. The subject, therefore, seems to be grammar and not, as has been believed, Vedānta.

Commentary on Udbhata'āmkāra, Udbhata'āmakārasarasamgraha, by Kamūkaṇa Pratibandurā17. (Bühler's Kasm. Rep., p. 63). The copy in the Deccan College collection, 73/1, No 64, must be a copy of this Ms. The author was pupil of the Brahmin, Mukula, whom he praises highly in the introduction and at the end.

Kalpalatāviveka, a supplement to Kalpapallava, a commentary on the Kāvyakalpalatā. The Viveka is also accompanied by a commentary18. One of the Mss. is dated Samvat 1205, i. e., 1149 A. D. But this would seem to be incorrect, as the author of the Kāvyakalpalatā flourished "about the middle of the 13th century" (see Dr. Bhandarkar's Report, 83/4, p. 6).

Jayadeva's Chhandah'sāstra. This is in the form of Sūtras. Date of Ms., Samvat 1190 or 1134 A. D. Jayadeva's work is one of those mentioned as having been studied by Jinavallabha who lived at the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. (My abstract of Sumatiqāt's Lives of certain Yugapradhānas or Jaina pontiffs, in Dr. Bhandarkar's Report for 82/83, pp. 47 and 228). There is a commentary on it by Harshaṭa, son of Bhāṭṭa Mukulaka. No. 72 of the Deccan College collection of 73/4 must be a copy of the Ms., that there is in this Bhandar, containing both the text and the commentary.

Chhandovichiti by Virahānka. It is in Prakīrtī. There is also a commentary on it by Gopāla, son of Chandrapāla. The text is at the end called Kahasidābhachchhanda and the commentary Kṛitasiḍhavivriti.
A Chhandomus'asana by Jinesvara with a commentary by Muni-
chandrasuri.

Another Chhandomus'asana by Jayakirtisuri.

Vyaktiviveka. The same as is noticed by Burnell at p. 58a of his
Tanjore catalogue. The first line given there is not complete. The
first word is annundhantarbhavaya instead of annundhantasya. So the
object of the author is to prove that vyajjanas the process by which
a sense is implied or suggested is nothing but inference. The author
is spoken of as a pupil of the great poet Syamala and a son of Sri-
dharsha19.

Rajasekhara's Kavyamimamsa, Adhikarana I, Kavirahasya. Kavya-
mimamsakara is mentioned by a commentator on the Saktantala (Oxf.
Cat. 135a.). A fragment of the first Adhikarana has been discovered
at Anhilwad Patan (Peterson's Fifth Report, p. 10). The Ms. in the
Jaisalmer Bhandar is not in a perfect state of preservation. In the
beginning the author says: "We shall consider kavya in the manner
the divine Svayambhu taught it to Srikanttha, Parameshthin, Vaikuntha
and others of his sixty-four pupils, who could come to birth at will.
Amongst them was Kavya-purusha, son of Sarasvati. Him Prajapati
set to promulgate the Kavya-vidya (poetics) by giving him a divine eye.
He taught it to the celestials at great length in eighteen Adhikaranas.
Of them Indra studied Kavirahasya, Suvarnazartha the Ritinirnaya,
Prachetas the Anupasika, Yama the Yamakas, Sesha the Sabdaslesha,
PulastyA the Vastava, Aupakalyana the Aupamya, Parasara the Atri-
sha, Utathyaa the Arthaslesha, .........., Nandikesvara the Rasadhik-
kara, Vishapa the Devadhikarana, Upamanyu the Gupapa adanika.
Then they composed works, each one treating of his own division.
But being thus spread out the vidya (science) was to some extent lost.
So the whole has been abridged and set forth in eighteen Adhikaranas.
Then the Prakaranas and Adhikaranas are enumerated. Sastrasam-
gha (the first Adhyaya), Sastranirdesa, Kavyapurushothpati,
Padavakyaviveka, Pathapratishtha, .........., Vakyavidhis, Kavivi-
sesa, Kavicharyya, Rajaclaryya, Kakuupakraatha, Sabdarthahara-
opathyA, Kavismaya, Desakdloivibhaga and Bhuvanyaksa make up
the first Adhikarana, Kavirahasya. "Of the Sutra there will be a
bhagya", promises the author. He is Rajasekhara of the Yadavara
family and he has treated of the Kavyamimamsa, abridging the
extensive views of the Munis5o. The date of the Ms. is 1216 Samvat.
This date and the fact that the author belonged to the Yadavara
family make it not unlikely that the author was the same as the
celebrated dramatist Rajasekhara. This may be one of the dramatists'six
prabandhas mentioned in the beginning of Ballarambayana, unless
by the word prabandhas dramatic or poetical compositions only are
intended.

A copy of the Kavyaprakasa by Rajaaraka Mammata and Alaka
made at Aranhikataka in Samvat 1215 during the reign of Maharak-
dhraga Paramabhattara Kumaraal, who had obtained a boon from
the lord of Uma. One additional epithet given to Kumaraal here
is, nijabhujavikramaranayanagamayinjita-Sakambharibhupala, i.e., who
had by the valour of his arms conquered the King of Śākambhari (Sambhar) on the field of battle. The Sambhar King is of course Arṇorāja (see Bo. Gazetteer, Vol. I., Pt. i, pp. 154ff.) and the victory over him is thus shown to have been won not later than Samvat 1215 or 1159 A. D.21

Nanditākhya(dhyā?)-Prākritachchhandhandovṛitti by Ratnachandra, pupil of Devāchārya of the Māṇḍavyapuragachchha (Pet. III, p. 224.)

A portion of a commentary on Brahmasiddhi. The words at the end are: Tritiyakāndam | Brahmasiddhiḥ kārikāḥ samāptāḥ

Tattvapravadhasiddhi-siddhāijana by Harihara, son of Bhāṭṭa Meghadeva Misra.

Śarvasiddhāntapraves'aka, a small work dealing with Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Jaina, Sāṃkhya, Baudhā, Mimāṃsā and Lokāyatika doctrines.

Dharmottaratiṣṭpanna (i.e., commentary on Dharmottarāchārya’s Nyāyabindu) by Mallavādyāchārya.

Tattvasamgrahapāñjakā by Kamalasila. The subject is Nyāya.

Yogasudhāānidhi by Yādavasūri, the subject being Jyotisha.

Commentary on Varāhamihira’s Laghujātaka by Matisāgaropādhyāya.

A leaf of a Ms. of Samgītasāstrasarvasva by Hridayesā. The leaf contains the Samjñāparibhashas.

Karmavipāka by Gargarishi with a commentary. The Ms. was written in Samvat 1295 in Nalaka while Jayatūṅgideva was reigning by an inhabitant of Chitrakūṭa, who was devoted to Jīnesvara of the line to which Jīnavallabha belonged32. This Jaitūṅgideva must be the Mālava prince.

A copy of Munichandrasūri’s commentary on the Anekāntajayapatākāvṛitti composed in Samvat 1171.

Hitopades’āmrīta in Māgadhī composed in Samvat 1310 while Visaladeva was reigning.

A copy of Vimalasūri’s Padmācharita made at Bhrigukachchha in Samvat 1198 during the reign of Vijayasiṃhadeva. In a verse at the end the date of composition is given as 536 after Mahāvīra’s nirvāṇa.

A copy of Nemichandrasūri’s Prithvīchandracharitra made in Samvat 1225. The work was composed in Samvat 1131. The author seems to be the same as the Nemichandra who stands 39th in the Tapāgachchhapaṭṭāvalī in Klatt’s Records.

A Ms. of the Sāndhasāatakāvṛitti by Ajitasimha of the Chandragachchha dated Samvat 1171.

A copy of a commentary on Gargarishi’s Karmavipāka made in Samvat 1227.

Haribhadra’s Pañchasamgraha, Upadesapadaparakaraṇa and commentaries on Laghukshtreṣamāra, Saṃgrahāninīṭra, and Jivābhi-
gamālhyayana. In a verse at the end of the Laghukshetrasamāsvṛtti pañchāśiṭika year of the Vikrama Samvat is given as the date of composition, where pañchāśiṭika must be taken to mean 550.

Haribhadra’s Upadesaṇapada with a commentary by Vardhamānasūri. One Ms, dated Samvat 1193, another Samvat 1212.

Copy of Haribhadra’s Sāmarādityacharita dated Samvat 1240.

Lalitavistara by Haribhadra.

Haribhadra’s Kuvalayamālā. Ms, dated Samvat 1139.

Chandrprabhacharita composed in Samvat 1133 by Siddhasūri, who probably is the same as the guru of the guru of the Siddhasūri who wrote the Brihatkshetrasamāsvṛtti in Samvat 1192.

Commentary on Haribhadra’s Dharmabinduprakaraṇa.

Nanditikā, Durgapadavyākhyā, by Chandrasūri. Ms, dated Samvat 1226.

Siddhasena Divākara’s Sāmmatīśuṭra with the commentary of Abhayadevasūri, pupil of Pradyummansūri, Khaṇḍas I and II.

Umāsvātī’s Praśamaratī with Haribhadrāchārya’s Avachuri. Ms, dated Samvat 1185.

Umāsvātī’s Tattvārtha with the Bhāshya of Nāgaravāchaka. Nāgaravāchaka is another name of Umāsvātī himself (Pet. III, App. p. 84 and II, p. 79).


Chaityavandanasūtra with a commentary. The commentary composed in Samvat 1174 by Yaśāprabhasūri.

Samgrahaṇī with a commentary. The commentary composed in Samvat 1139 by Śālibhadra who may be the same as is mentioned at Pet. V, App. p. 53, line 3 from bottom. The Ms. is dated Samvat 1201.

A copy of a Prākritī Paṭṭāvalī by Jinaṇattasūri made in Samvat 1171 at the great city, Pattana, during the reign of Jayasimhadeva.

Dharmavidhiprakaraṇa by Nannasūri. Ms. dated Samvat 1190.

Copy of Abhayadeva’s Vipaśṣūtraavṛtti dated Samvat 1185.

Samvegarāṅgasūlā of Jinaṇchandrasūri, pupil of Buddhaśāgarasūri. Date of Ms. Samvat 1203.

Aṅgavidyā.

Mahāpurushacharitra by Śīlāchāya, pupil of Māsadevasūri. The Ms. is dated Samvat 1127.

32. By the side of this big Bhandar the other collections in the place were of not much importance. Two of them contained a few palm leaf Mss, along with paper Mss, and two others were in utter disorder. The following are some of the more important Mss. I noticed therein:—

Laghukhāgavata by Gauvāmin.

Bṛihadvāmanapurāṇa.
Three cantos of a Jagatsimhayasomahâkâvyâ written in honour of Jagatsimha, son of Karû of Mewad, in emulation of Śriharsha's Naishadhâya, by Bhaṭṭa Madana, son of Śri Krishṇa.

A palm-leaf copy of Haravijaya, dated Samvat 1228.

Durvâśalparâjaya, a play, by Kâśinâṭhakavi, relating to devotion to Vishnu (Śrivishnubhaktipradhâna). The Sûtradhâra is represented as putting it on the stage at Mathurâ.

A Ms. of the Laṭâkamelanaprahasana dated Samvat 1602.

Kumârâsambhavatikā by Lakshmîvallabha.

A recent copy of a compilation of Subhâshitas. The compiler's name is not given nor the names of the authors of the verses quoted. But the poets who are believed to have formed the nine jewels at the court of Vikramâditya are enumerated and a stanza from each is quoted. The nine stanzas are as follows:

1. Dhanvantari:—Mitram svachehhataya, etc. This occurs anonymously in the Subhâshitaśârṅgadhara, &c.

2. Kshapanaka:—Arthi lâghavamutthito nipatanam kâmâturo lânhchanam, &c.

3. Amara:—Nîrthrûmbhujâm matirguṇâvatam hrîraṅganânâṁ dhriti—

4. Sâṅku:—Dharmâ prâgeva chintyâh, etc. This occurs in Śârṅgadhârapadhati among verses quoted from Râjanîtis, Smrîtis, Bhârata and Râmâyana.

5. Vetalabhâṭṭa:—Kârpañyena yasâḥ krudhâ guṇachayo dambhena satyam krudhâ, &c.

6. Ghaṭâkarpâra:—Mûrkhe sântastapasvî keśitipatiralaso matsaro dharmasîlo, &c. This verse does not occur in the Ghaṭâkarpârâkâvyâ.

7. Kâlidâsa:—Strînâm yauvanamarthînâmanugamo râjñâh prâtâpah satâm, &c.

8. Varâhamîhira:—Vîdvân salpadi (sâmsâdi?) pâkshikaḥ pariṇato mânâ daridro grihi, &c.

9. Vararuci:—Utkhâtãn pratîropayan, etc. This is quoted anonymously by Vallabhadvâpa and amongst those extracted from Râjanîtis, &c., in the Śârṅgadhârapadhati.

Raghūṭikâ by Dharmamuru.

Kâtantravistara by Karṇâdevopâdhyâya Śrîvardhamâna.

A Liṅgânuṣâsana by Durgottama with commentary.

Kâvyaprâkâśatikâ by Bhavadeva Miśra. It was composed in Śaka 1563, Lakshmâna Samvat 524, in Paṭṭana on the banks of the Ganges while Shah Jehan was ruling the earth. The author was son of Miśra Śrîkrishnadeva and pupil of Bhavadeva Tâkhkura.

Bhagavadgîtâmritatarâṅgini (Pushtîmargîyâ).

A copy of Târûkikachûḍâmaṇi's Prâmâṇamaṇjarî, dated Śaka 1335 and Samvat 1470.
A Jātaka by Paramahamsa Parivrājakāchārya Vāmana.
Parāśāratulya by Gaṅgālīhara.

Phalakalpalatā, a vārshika phalagrantha, by Nṛisimhakavi of Gurjaramanḍala.

A copy of Jyotishamaṇīmālā. The colophon at the end and the verses immediately preceding read as follows:—

Samvachchabhāvrugadvadichandra 1240 samaye chāshādharmāse sita' pakshe panchami sukravārararbhe saubhāgyayogānvite udīyō (audichyo?) Harināthavamsatilakastasyatmaja[h] Kes'ava[s] tasya svātmajāTrīkamasya pāthānātma(ā)rthe cha kṛtā mudā Iti Śrī Kes'ava virahitāyām Jyotishamaṇīmālāyām Gorajalagnādhikāre ashtādasama stakāha 18 Iti Śrī Maṇīmālā samāptaṁ Samvat 1750 varshe, &c.

There seems to be some confusion about this Jyotishamaṇīmālā. There is a work of that name mentioned at pp. 209-10 of Notices of Sk. Mss., Vol. X. There is no author's name given in the Ms. Yet Dr. Aufrecht would seem to identify it with the Jyotishamaṇīmālā at p. 305 of the Bikaner Catalogue (Catal. Catal. Pt. II, p. 44). But the extracts given in the notices would appear to make the identification impossible. The work I saw would seem to be identical with the one in the Bikaner Catalogue. The wording of the verses giving the date of composition is identical, with only one difference, that instead of the letters gāṅga occurring in the latter (Bik. Ms.) we have gādei in the former. In the former, therefore, the date of composition is shown to be earlier by 400 years than in the latter (Samvat 1240 instead of 1640).

There is a Jyotirmānīmālā in Dr. Peterson's Ulwar Catalogue (No. 1783) which he identifies with the Jyotishamaṇīmālā in the Bikaner Catalogue, but Dr. Aufrecht does not think the identification to be correct (Catal. Catal. Pt. II, p. 201). There are, however, certain circumstances which would identify it with the present Jyotishamaṇīmālā. The author and the author's father are Kes'ava and Harinātha in both cases. And the work in both cases ends with gorajalagnādhikāre ashtādasama stābaka. Should, therefore, the Ulwar work be identical with the one seen by me, it must be identical with the Bikaner work. But the extract given above and that corresponding to it given in the Ulwar Catalogue differ so widely as to go against the identification of the first two. Only a comparison of the contents of the manuscripts would settle the point.

A commentary by Adiśarman on his own Jātakāmrīta.

Laghujātaka Vārtikavivarapatiṭṭā by Matīśgaropāthiyāya.

Jayachandrikā by Jyotisha Sivadeva. Ms. dated Samvat 1598.

Commentary on Samarasimha's Karmacakraśa by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa Sāmudrīka.

Daivajñāvilāśa by Kaṁchhayālārya.

Ballālasena's Adbhutasagāra.

Hitopadesa (medicine) by S'rīkaṇṭha Sambhū.
Vâgbhata's Sâristhâna with Arunadatta's commentary.

Tantramahârâvâna.

A palm leaf Ms. of Tilakamañjari which, I was informed, had been utilised for the edition of that work in the Kâvyamâlâ.

Sûkshmarâthavîchârâyâra by Jinavallabha.

Pârvanâgu's Ātmânusâsana.

Jinâsâkatapanañjikâ by Sambasâdhu.

Syâdisâbadasamuchchaya by Amarachandra, pupil of Jinadattasûri. The author seems to be identical with that of the Kâvyakalpalata.

Samayasaranatâka, with a commentary called Adhyâtmatarañgini composed by Subhachandra in Sâmvat 1570.

Saptavyasanakathâ by Somakârti.

Nyâyasarañtikâ, Nyâyatâtarparyadîpikâ, by Vijayasimhasûri.

Dharmaratnakaranatâka by Vardhamânachârya.

Samgrahaniñtikâ and Saptatattvikriti by Malayagiri.

A commentary, composed in Sâmvat 1174 by Dhanadeva, on Nava-tattvaparakarana with bhâshya by Jinachandraganji. The latter was afterwards called Devagupâchârya.

Siddhasenasûri's Pravachanasaroottaravritti.

Dharmopades'amalâ by Jayasimhaçârya.

Darsânastattaravritti.


Bâlandhâtras commentary on Asâda's Vivekamañjari.

Malayagiri's commentary on Kshetrasamâsâ.

Añgavidyâ.

Nalâyana.

Jinayugalacharita by Jayasimhasûri.

Dharmaratnavîrît, Siddhântasaumgrahabhâshâ, by Sântisûri. The palm leaf Ms. is dated Sâmvat 1369.

Harivikramacharita-mahâkâvyâ by Jayatilaka, pupil of Châritratrabhasûri.

Bhâshyatrayavârtika by Jñanavimalasûri composed in Sâmvat 1454.

33. At Jaisalmer I came across a Ms. of a Kharatarapattavali (a spiritual succession list of the Kharatar sect of the Jainas) of which I have got a copy made. It seems to have been composed by one Kshamâ-kalypa,* and goes down as far as the 70th and last name (Jinaharsha) in Klatt's list, without any particulars, however, of the holder of that name.† It would seem that it was composed during the pontificate of

* For the following words occur at the end of the account given of 44. Jinadatta: श्रीजिनिद्वैललमुण्डोऽ गुणोऽ गुणविग्नम मया क्षमादिकलयणमुनिनन्द वेखितः। कुमस मुक्तिसिक्षेत तत्कल्लुः सुरचायायि न क्रमः। 1
† The words relating to him are simply — तत् सतितिमाः श्रीजिनिनहर्षः वृद्धः । 1
Jinaharsha, i.e., not earlier than Samvat 1856. The paṭṭāvalī con-
tains a few particulars in addition to those given by Klatt. A
few of them are given in the information extracted by me from the
Rishimandala-prakaraṇa-vṛtti for Dr. Bhandarkar’s Report for 1888-9
(pp. 150-153). It will be noticed that from 41. Jinachandra onwards
every fourth name in Klatt’s list is Jinachandra and that from the
43rd, Jinaabhavalla, every subsequent name begins with Jina. The
present paṭṭāvalī gives the reasons. Jinachandra (No. 41) became
very great and so Padmāvatī appeared to him and ordered that every
fourth Achārya on the paṭṭa should bear his name34. Similarly the
orders of Sāsanadevatā were the cause of the other practice35.

34. I shall give a few noteworthy particulars given in the present
paṭṭāvalī. Mahāvira lived in the house for 30 years. After 2.
Jambū the following 10 attainments of certain mental powers and
degrees of spiritual growth disappeared from this earth:—(1) Manah-
paryāyajīna, (2) paramāvadhijnāna, (3) pulākalabdi, (4) āhāra-
kaśāra, (5) kshapakaśreṇi, (6) upāsamaśreṇi, (7) jinakālpaṁārga,
(8) parihāravā śuddhi ?sūkṣmasamparāya-yathākhyātāchārīrāni,
(9) kevalajīnāna and (10) siddhigamana. From 18. Chandra the Kula
came to be called Chāndra Kula. Hence in the Kharataragachchha
it has been the practice on the occasion of the brahaddikṣā to teach
the newly initiated that theirs is kotikagāna vayari (vajir) sākṣa and
chāndra kula. A story is told as to how the 84 gachchhas originated
with the pupils of 38. Uddyotana. Vardhamāna was Uddyotana’s own
pupil and Uddyotana had given him the achāryarāda and sent him away
on a religious excursion. But Uddyotana had 83 other pupils, not his
own but those of 83 other sthāvāras. On one occasion noticing a happy
conjunction of stars he said that at that juncture the man, on whose-
soever head he would place his hand, would become famous. The 83
pupils pressed him for the favour which was granted and those 83
also became achāryas with separate provinces. Thus there came to be
84 gachchhas. In connection with the building of a temple of
Nīshabhadeva on Arbudāchala (Mount Abu) during Vardhamāna’s
time, it is related that the Brāhmaṇas claimed the tīrtha (holy place)
as their own and had to be satisfied with money before the temple
could be built. An elaborate account is given of the conflict at
Anahillapura between Jinesvara and Buddhīṣṭāgara on the one hand
and the Chaityavāsins on the other. The Chaityavāsins in consequ-
ence of their defeat got the name of “Kumvalāh,” Jinachandra,
the author of the Samvegaraṇgaśālā, is mentioned as having been
received with great festivities at Delhi by Maujadinā Suratānā36.
The excessive self-mortem which Abhayadeva subjected himself to
was, it is stated, in atonement for the sin incurred by having brought
in all the nine rūpas (Srīrāga i.e. love and others) on the occasion of a
religious discourse. A long account is given of Jinadatta, and it is
stated that on one occasion he extracted out of certain yoginis (female
beings endowed with magical powers) seven boons on seven conditions,
two of which boons were that he who would utter the name of Jina-
datta would not be troubled by lightning, etc., and a layman of the
Kharatara gachchha going to Sindh would become rich. The yoginis
also gave the precaution that the leaders of the Kharatara gachchha
who were not in full vigour should not stay at night in Delhi, Ajmer, Bharuchchha, Ujjain, Multan, Uchchha and Lahore. On one occasion in his time certain Brāhmaṇas are mentioned as having thrown a dead cow in a Jinachaitya at Vṛddhanagara and spreading the report that the god of the Jainas was a killer of cows. Then Jinadatta put life into the cow and she went into a temple of Sīva and fell dead on the idol of the god there. In Vikramapura he once saved not only the Jainas but also the Māheśvaras (a sect of worshippers of Śiva) from an epidemic and consequently many Māheśvaras were converted. In the time of the Jinachandra (No. 49), who died in 1376 Samvat, the gachchha received the appellation of Rāja-gachchha also. Jinakuśala set up at Jaisalmer an image of Chintārṇaṇī Pārśvanātha made to Jasadhavala’s order. That explains why in the two inscriptions from the Jaisalmer temple of that Pārśvanātha, of which I have given an account in appendix I, the paṭṭāvali begins with Jinakuśala. His pupil, Vinayaprabha, composed the Gautamarāsa for the prosperity of his brother. Even now, it is stated, Jinakuśala is well known in the world by the name of “Dādōji.” The cause given of the origin of the Vṛgadakharatara sākhā during the time of Jīmodaya is the anger of Dharmavallabha who had at first been made āchārya, but was replaced by another on account of his faults. By the curse of Jīmodaya there cannot be more than nineteen yatis in the sect and as soon as there is a twentieth he dies. An account is given of Jinavardhanasūri’s breach of the 4th vrata (vow of celibacy) and of the way in which his place was given to Jīnabhadra. He also interfered with the position of an image in the Pārśvanātha mandira at Jaisalmer. So some sādhus took the lead and called for opinions of, and summoned, the members of the gachchha from all places to Bhāmpasolagrama. A pupil of the last preceding Jīnarāja, by name Bhaḍan, was fixed upon and Sāgarachandragāyra taking advantage of a combination of seven “bhakāras” (letter “bh”) had him placed on the paṭṭa with proper ceremonies. The seven “bhakāras” were those in Bhāmpasolanagrama, Bhāpaśālikā gotra to which the nominee belonged, Bhaḍaun his original name, the Bhaṇṇī nakshatra (constellation), Bhadrakāraṇa (the astrological division of a day called Bharda), Bhāṭṭarakapada and Jinabhadrastūri the new name given to the nominee. But Jinavardhanasūri, though thus displaced and omitted from paṭṭāvalis, has his name perpetuated in the two inscriptions in the Pārśvanātha temple at Jaisalmer at least as long as the inscriptions last. Under his direction the temple was completed and its pratishtā (consecration) made. And the Sāgarachandra who was principally instrumental in Jinavardhana being supplanted may be the one mentioned in the second of those very inscriptions. Jinahamsa (No. 59) is said to have been imprisoned for some time at Dhavalapura by the Pātisāhi at Agra at the instigation of some tell-tales but afterwards released and received into favour. Rāula Māladeva is mentioned in connection with the conferring of the Sūripada on Jinachandra, No. 61, in Samvat 1612 at Jaisalmer. So here is one name more to be inserted in the list of Rāulas based on the inscriptions at Jaisalmer. Reference is made to this Jinachandra having established in opposition to Dharmasāgara.
and others the truth of the fact that Abhayadeva did belong to the Kharatara gachchha. This Dharmasāgara must be the same as the author of the Pravachanasparikšā noticed by me previously (Dr. Bhandarkar’s Report for 1888-84, pp. 151 and 155). Dharmasāgara, however, represents Jinahamsa as being his contemporary and the date of his work is 1629 Samvat. This does not agree with the date of Jinahamsa as given in this pāṭṭāvali and in Klatt’s “Extracts.” Akbar gave Jinachandra (No. 61) the title of Yugapradhāna and at Akbar’s desire Jinasimha was declared his successor. In Samvat 1669 Jinachandra got revoked an order passed against all Jainas by Salema Patisāhi because one Yati whom he favoured for his singing, etc., happened to talk in secret to Salem’s wife.

35. My first tour ended with the work at Jaisalmer. I then sent my Pandit on to Bikaner. He was a man from that part of the country and I thought him best qualified to collect information as to the existence of collections of Mss. in that part and to persuade people to show them and let him make rough lists of them. He was fully employed in that work until the time he joined me when I started on my next tour.

36. The first place I visited during my second tour was Udaipur. In January 1904 the Resident, Mewar, had informed me that the Mewar Durbar reported that there were collections of Sanskrit Mss. in the State Library at Udaipur and that I could inspect them. In the April following I got further information from him about private collections existing in the place. Towards the end of that year again he wrote to me that he had found out “privately” that there were in Udaipur valuable collections of Sanskrit Mss. in the libraries he therein mentioned. He, however, added that it would not be advisable for me to visit Udaipur then owing to a severe epidemic of plague that was raging there at the time. Knowing that there was no certainty when plague might revisit it and expecting that my work would be done most satisfactorily where the Resident himself took so much interest in it, I determined to visit Udaipur first and wrote to the Resident accordingly. A day or two before the middle of December 1905 he wrote to me to say that the Mewar Durbar had been informed of my intended visit. And yet when I reached Udaipur on 15th January 1906 and made enquiries I found that no orders had been received from the Durbar for letting me see the State collection. The Dewan, whom I was advised to see, did not even know that there was any such collection at all. The Resident and the Durbar were on tour at the time. But with the help of a friend, Mr. Gaurishankar Ojha, himself a keen antiquarian, and the Police Superintendent of the place my work of examining the private collections was satisfactorily done. And the necessary orders of the Durbar too arrived in the end and I was able to see the State collection also.

37 Here I examined eleven collections including the one belonging to the State. The biggest one was the State collection. It is well preserved and in good order, but as the Mss. are kept on open shelves they are easily accessible to rats and mice. One private Jain
collection and another in a Jaina Bhandar were also well preserved. The others had not been properly looked after. Two of them at least must have been good collections at one time. There was a list of the State collection and of two or three others.

38. Among the MSS. I saw, the following might be noted:—
Āsvalāyanasūtra-vṛitti by Traividyavṛiddha Tālavṛinta-nivāsin.
Haradatta's Comentary, Mitāksharā, on Gautama-dharmasūtra.
Ms. dated Saṃvat 1645.
Devimāhātmyakaumudi by Rāmakṛishṇa.
Bhagavati-padyapushpānjali.
A Purāṇānukrāmānīkā giving the names and short abstracts of the Purāṇas.

(Smṛitiprabandha-) Saṃgraha-sīloka by Gaṅgārāma Jaḍin.

The Kṛtyakalpataru by Lakshmīdharā noticed by Peterson at pp. 108-111 of his report for 1882-83. As he surmises in his Index of Books appended to his Report for 1884-86 the heading Kṛtyaratnākara in the previous report is an error.

Commentary on Mādhava's Kālanirnayakārikā by Bhaṭṭa S'amba, son of Bhaṭṭa S'amkara, who was son of Bhaṭṭa Nilakaṭha.

Vīramitrodaya—Paribhāshāprakāśa. It has since been published in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series. In it are enumerated the 22 prakāsas of which the whole Vīramitrodaya consists. Besides the Paribhāshā I saw here the Lakshaṇa and Pājāprakāsas. In the Sarasvatī-bhāndara of His Highness the Maharājā of Bikaner I saw all, except Jyotih, Karmavipāka, Chikitsā and Prakīrṇa, i.e., the fourteen noted as available in the "Preliminary Note" attached to the edition of the Paribhāshāprakāśa and four out of the others.

Paraśurāma-pratāpa, a nibandha, composed by Sābājī Pratāpa-rāja, of the Jāmadagnya-Vatsa gotra, who was honoured by Nizam Shāh, the king of kings. Pratāpa's father was Padmanābha.
Vārṣṭi—samhīta treating of Karmans.
Vaishnāvadharma-surādramamānjari by Saṃkarshaṇaṣaṭaraṇa.
Tithinirṇaya by Chakrapāṇi.
Vairāgyapañchaśatikā (50) by Kalakalopanāmaka Somanātha-kavi.
Sabhyalakaraṇa by Govindabhaṭṭa, an anthology in which the names of the authors quoted are given.

Prabodhachandrodaya-kaumudī, a commentary on the Prabodhachandrodaya, by Sadātmamuni. A genealogy is given at the end. But the last leaf of the Ms. but one, which contained a part of it, was missing. The original name of the commentator before he became a Samnyāsin was Gadādharā.28 The date of the Ms. was Saṃvat 1571 and S'aka 1436.

Raghuṭikā by Dharmameru, pupil of Muniprabhaṇa.
Samvadasundara. Contains the following nine very short dialogues:—S’aradapadmayoh, Gaṅgeyagunija-yoh, Dāvidryapadmayoh, Lokalakshmyoh, S’imhihastinyoh Sanandanyoh, Godhūma-chānakyoh, Pañchānāminda-rbāyām, Mrigamadachandanyoh, Dāna-nilatapobhāvānām.

Commentary on Vidvadbhūshaṇa by a pupil of the author of the original.
Sārāsamgraha, an anthology, by S’ambhudāsa.
S’ravaṇabhūshaṇa by Narahari.
Hariharabhūshaṇa-kāvya by Gaṅgārāmakavi.
Subhāshita-sārasamgraha by Miśra Thakura, son of Miśra Purushottama.
Pāṇimiya-dvāraya Vijñaptilekha—Achsamlī and Halsamī. Manorathakavi’s commentary, Vibudha-chandrikā, on Nalodaya.
Anarghyārghava-pānchikā by Vishṇu, son of Muktināthārya. A very old copy.
A commentary, Pañdakumudi, by Nemichandra, on Dhanamjaya’s Dvi-dhādana or Rāghava-pāndaviya. Nemichandra was a pupil of Devanandin who was an antevāsin (a pupil in close attendance on his preceptor) of Vinayachandra-pāndita. The copy of Rāghava-pāndaviya by Nemichandra in Bühler’s collection of 1872-73 (No. 154) is in reality a copy of this commentary.
S’rīngārata-rāngīṇī by Sūryadāsa.
Sāmkaramiśra’s commentary on Gitagovinda.
Kātantra-laghuvrītī by Bhāvasena Traividya.
Shādēbhā-shāvīchāra (Sanskrit and five Prakrits).
A commentary on Sārasvata by Tarkatilakabhāṭāchārya, younger brother of Mohanamadhusūdana and son of Devārika, a Brahman of Mathurā, of the Datta family. At the request of some pupils of his he put aside the commentary on the Vaiśeṣhika ātrātras which he had commenced, and wrote this in 1672 (Samvat) in the city of Tōda while Jehangir was on the throne. He is thus the same as the author of the Kālamādhavīya-vivarana in Rajendralal’s Notices, VIII. 283-4, which was composed in 1670 (Samvat). The Ms. is dated Samvat 1691.

A Vāgbhaṭālamkārvritti composed by Vāchaka Jnānapramodaganī in Samvat 1681 during the reign of Silemasāhi and Navakoṭṭapati Gajasimha. Rājā Gajasimha of Mārvād or Jodhpur was reigning at the time.
Laghukāvyaprakāśa, without the author’s name, in which the kārikās (metrical portion) only of the Kāvyaprakāśa are explained and not the explanatory prose also.
Mañjārvikāsa, a commentary on the Rasamañjarī, by Gopālāchārya, son of Nṛsimhāchārya of the Kaundinya gotra. His other name was Bopadeva. (Stein, pp. 68 and 271-3.) The date of composition is given as Yngarandhravedadharonīganyemgirovatsare. Randhra means
nine and so the date is 1494 and not 1484 as given by Stein. The era is not specified. But the name of the cyclic year, Angiras, shows that it is the S’aka era. So the era of the date of Stein’s Ms. also must be the S’aka era, since the date is 1514.

Commentary on Chhardomāṇijari by Vamśivadana.

Hemachandra’s Chhardonūs’asana with his own commentary.

Sārvālamkārasamgraha (or Alamkārasamgraha) by Kaviśvara Amritānanda or Amritānandayogin. King Manma the ornament of both the Chandra and Sūrya-kulas, son of king Bhakti, requested the author to treat together, for his benefit, in an easy manner all the different subjects of Alāṃkāra literature which had been previously treated in separate treatises. There are two Manmas known in the line of the Chiefs of Konamaṇḍala, viz., Manma-Choḍa II. and Manma Satya II. or Manma Satti. The former was a son of Beta, a name sufficiently close to Bhakti to be sanskritized into it. The date of Manma-Choḍa II is somewhere between A.D. 1135 and 1153.

Kāvyanirūpaṇa by Rāmakavi. The instances given are the author’s own and they refer to a king named Rāmasimha or Rāmabhārī.

Rasarādmākara by Gaṅgādhara, son of Vatsarāja and younger brother of S’rīrāma.

Brahmamāṃśā-bhāṣṭya by S’rīkantaṭhaśivāchārya.

Ātmārka-bodha by Govindabhaṭṭa, son of Viṣvanātha bhaṭṭa.

Brahmavāodbodha, called Paramārtha-bodha in margin, by Mukundamuni, pupil of Rāmaṇātha who was a pupil of Harinātha. The author composed it, being requested with bent head by Jaitrapāla, that he would make the quintessence of knowledge intelligible to children.

Samkṣepaśāriraṇa with a commentary by Agnīchit Purushottama Mīśra, pupil of Rāmatīrtha.

Kṛishṇaṭavaṭāṭajītika, S’rutisiddhānta-māṇjarī. (Nimb., Sys.)

Audumbhari Samhitā by Udumbararshi, pupil of Nimbārka.

Gītātātparya by Viṭṭhala Dīkhita.

Bhaktirasābdhi-kauṭikā by Gaṅgārāma, son of Bhagavaddāsa and grandson of Govindādāsa.

Bhāvārthadīpikā by Gaurikānta Mahākavi.

Lakshaṇasamuchchaya giving definitions of various terms.

Tarkabhashavivarāṇa by Mādhavabhāṭṭa, who is spoken of as an antevāsin of Prakāśaṇanda.

A Ms. of Varāhamihira’s Samhitā, dated Samvat 1557 at Jodhpur during the reign of Mahārāva S’rī Sūryamalla.

Bṛhajjātaka-tīkā, Keralī. The Ms. was incomplete and I could not find the author’s name. The commentary begins या हो रचित ब्राह्मимिहिराचारण.

Amarabhūṣaṇa composed, not by Amarasimha as stated in Peterson’s Ulvar Catalogue (p. 73), but in his name as shown by the extract at p. 16 of the same catalogue. The author as stated in the verses at
the end is Mathurâtma. In verses which are very incorrect, at least in the Ms. I saw, Amarasimha's genealogy is given as follows: Râñâ Udayasimha, S'aktivsimha, Bhâñasimha, Pûrañâ, S'âvala?, Mohvama, and Amaras'â. The Ms. belonged to Mahârâñâ Yuvânsimha and is dated Sañvat 1591 and S'âka 1756. Yuvânsimha seems to be the same as Javânsimha of Mewâd (A. D. 1823-38).

Siddhânta-Kauñatubha.

Lalla—Golâdhyâya; and Româsa.

Mîlânâ-siddhânta composed by Viśvanâthamîstra in S'âka 1534.

Siddhântasundâra—Gañitâdhyâya by Jñânarâja, son of Nâgânâtha. Ms. dated S'âka 1542.

Siddhântabodhaprakâsa (Jy.) by Jagannâtha Daivajña.

Lîlâvati-prakâsa by Vârûhamâna, dated Sañvat 1666.


Trikâlajñânavîsâvaprayakâsañhadâmânî by S'iva.

Yogasamuchchaya by Gañapatî. The author was son of Vyâsa Mahottama, who was son of the Brahman Malladeva.

Chañḍîsaparyâ-krama-kalpavallâ by S'rinivâsa.

Rûpâvatâra and Rûpamânḍana by Sûtradhâra (architect) Mayañâ. I found these and the following Mss. of works on architecture in the possession of a descendant of the architect. His name is Champâlal. He has got in his possession a copper plate, stating that Mayañâ had been specially called from Gujarat by Mokalâna, because there was no Sûtradhâra (architect) at the Mewâd Durbar, and granting him a village, etc. The plate is dated Sañvat 1462. Mokalâna is of course the same as Mokol who supplanted his brother in A.D. 1398. Mayañâ is said to have built Kumbhalâgada and Nâtha, his brother, to have built Chitrakûta.

Vâstumâñjari by Sûtradhâra Nâtha, son of Kshetra, who is thus the brother, just referred to, of Mayañâ.

Uddhâradhorañi by Sthapati Govinda, son of Mayañâ.

Kalânidhi (archit.) by Sûtradhâra Govinda.

Dvâradîpikâ by the same.

Grihavâstusâra by Thakkura Pherû, son of the Parama-Jaina Chandra of S'ridhamkalasa family. Composed in 1372 (Sañvat?) in Kamânapura. The work is in Prakrit.

Pramâña-mañjari (archit.) by Malla, the architect of Bhânurâja, the ornament of the dynasty of Munjâ and Bhoja. Nânâvidha-kunda-prakâsa by Malla, son of the architect Nakula. Nakula was the protégé of Bhânurâja, the lord of Saummeladurga. Bhuvanadevâchâryyokta Aparâjitapriñchhâ.

Vâsturâja by the Sûtradhâra Râjasimha.

Kshîrârñava by Viśvakarman.
Kundoddyotadarśana by S'amkarabhaṭṭa, son of Nilakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa. It is a commentary, called Bhāskara, on the Kundoddyota of the author's father and was composed in 1728.

Commentary by Viśvanātha, son of Śrīpati Dvivedin, on his own Kundaṛatnākara.

Vāstutilaka. The names of the author, his father and grandfather are given in the colophon. But the colophon is very incorrect and only the father's name is clearly given as Keśavāchārya.

Viś'vavallabha by Miś'ra Chakrapāṇi of the family of the Brahmans of Mathuā. It treats of digging wells, planting gardens, &c., and was written at the desire of Pratāpasimha, eldest son of Udayasimha of Mewād. The date at the end, Samvat 1634, may be the date of composition even.

Asaḍa’s Upadeśakandali.

Laghusamghapataṭṭaka by Jina vallabha.

Maraprasamādhi (Jaina). Ms. dated Samvat 1542.

Upadeśataranāgini (J.) containing stories.

Prabodhachintāmani by Jayadekhara composed in Samvat 1402.

Sthānāṅgamūla-sūdhi-vivarāṇa composed in Samvat 1246 by Devachandra, the younger brother of Abhayadevasūri. A spiritual genealogy of the author is given at the end.

39. During my stay at Udaipur I went off for a day to Nāthhadvāra, a place sacred to followers of Vallabha. I had heard of two collections there, one belonging to the Chief Maharaj of the place and the other to a minor Maharaj. I was able to see the first. But the second, I was told, would not be accessible. The collection I saw was well ordered and properly looked after. As was to be expected it contains many works belonging to the Vallabha sect. The following are some of the works I saw in it:

Sārasamgraha by Sambhudāsa.

Mrigāṅkaśatakā by Kaṅkaṇakavī. A Kaṅkaṇakavī is quoted in Vallabhadeva’s Subhāṣitāvali and in Sūktikarnāṁrita.

Romāvalīśatakā by Rāmachandrabhaṭṭa Datta.

A Birudavali by Akabariya Kālidāsa.

A Ms. of Kālambari in which the name of Bāna’s son is given as Pulinda, instead of Pulina as given in Stein’s Mss. (p. 299). My attention had been previously drawn to this name by Mr. Gaurishankar, who had noticed it in a Ms. in the Victoria Museum at Udaipur.

Vyaktivivekaṭikā. A genealogy is given of the king in whose name it was composed. On this side of the Sarayū there was a Yo (Go?) raksha or Nārāyaṇa pura. There reigned (1) Amarasimha; (2) Vikramasimha, son of (1); (3) Tejahsimha, son of (2); (4) Saktisimha, son of (3); (5) Jayasimha, son of (4), who at the head of the battle with two Suratrāṇas (Sultans) justified his appellation of simha (lion); (6) Rāmasimha, son of (5); (7) Chāmunḍasimha, son of (6), who conquered the Yavana king of Ayodhiyā and looted the treasure
of the Patshah of Delhi. Another name of his was Rudrasimha and also, it would appear from a defective line, Khangaraja. He came to be called Akalaghana (a cloud not restricted to a particular season) from his showering gold at all seasons. It was, who got the commentary written that his name might survive. It is called Tilakaratna and also Akalaghana.

Mimamsakarikah by Vallabha.

Jaiminisutrabrashya by the same.

Ichchha'ama's Commentary, Bhishyapradipa, on Vallabha's Anubhashya.

Another commentary by Purushottama, son of Pitabara.

Vedantadhikaranamala by the same, which of course must be in accordance with Vallabha's Bhishya.

Vedantakanmudi by Vallabha.

Manamanohara by Valdivagisvara, son of Vagisvaracharya. There are quotations from this author and this work in the chapter on Jaimindasana in the Sarvadarshanasmarga and elsewhere. (Hall, p. 44 and Oxf. Cat. 245b and 247a). The Ms. is dated Samvat 1547.

Paramanandavilasa (Med.) by Paramananda, son of Balabhadra.

Turanga-parikshah by S'irangadhar.

Asvashstra by Jayadatta.

Ratnaparikshah by Agastya.

Some Ms. from this collection had been lent out and so I did not find the work mentioned as Utprekshavallabha in the list.

40. From Udaipur I proceeded to Bikaner. To my enquiries through the Political Agent of the place on the former occasion I had received the reply, as mentioned in paragraph 57 of my previous report, that there were no private collections or public Rhandars of Sanskrit Ms. in the State but only the State Library. And as the Sanskrit Ms. in the library were believed to have all been included in the Catalogue compiled by Rajendralal, I had come to think that there would be no use in my visiting the place. But the Pandit at Elphinestone College, who belongs to that part of the country, had informed me that in addition to the Ms. catalogued by Rajendralal, there were a great many others in the State Library. Besides, Bikaner is frequently mentioned, in the Paṭṭāvali from Jaisalmer noticed above, as a place from which pressing invitations to visit were received and accepted by several Jaina high priests. It was a place, therefore, where the existence of Jaina Bhandars could very well be expected. The Pandit, moreover, whom I had specially engaged was a man from Bikaner and he had assured me that there were many other collections of Ms. in the place. Hence as already stated above I had sent him thither after my return from Jaisalmer. In the course of his work there, besides making a fairly complete copy of the list he had made of the State collection when he was previously in charge of it, he made rough lists of 16 other collections more or less big. Only three out of these sixteen were Brāhmaṇa collections.
All the others were Jaina. My Pandit, however, brought me names of Brahmans who, he knew or was told, did possess manuscripts but whom he had no hopes of being himself able to persuade to let him see their Mss. and make lists of them. On my reaching Bikaner an officer was told off by the Durbar to take me round to the possessors, or persons in charge, of all the collections that had been and could be discovered, to induce them to let me see them and to render all other help that would be necessary for my work. There were no difficulties raised in the case of the Jaina collections except in one or two cases. Elsewhere even Jainas have not rarely been denied permission to see the Mss. in the Bhandars. Some of the owners here had been to Bombay at some time or other and had been infused with more liberal ideas than usual. Amongst the Brahmans things were not so easily managed. And yet even here, through the assistance of the State, almost all who were a little reluctant at first did ultimately yield. It is, however, not unlikely, that some may not have shown all their manuscripts. Enquiries were made of all Brahmans, in whose case there was even the least likelihood of their possessing Mss. It is, therefore, not very likely now that any one possessing them has been overlooked.

When the Jaisalmer Dewan wrote to me that the Panches of the big Bhandar at the place had agreed to let me inspect their Mss, he stated that I should have to go to the temple to do so, as the Mss. would not be allowed to be taken out. I believe he thought that I should have been better pleased had I been saved the trouble of having to go to the temple. But seeing and examining Mss. in their places was what I had been doing previously in all cases, except in two at Indore, and counted upon having to do it in all subsequent cases. The inspection would not have been so thorough otherwise. In pursuance of this course I went wherever I was invited to go and being a Hindu and a Brahman I could be admitted to the innermost parts of private houses. I had accordingly not unfrequently, especially at Bikaner, to work in the dirtiest and most uncomfortable places imaginable, squatting for hours together in a position so often feelingly described by copyists at the end of the copies of Mss. they make.* But I had the satisfaction of having done my work as well as I could.

In addition to the 13 Jaina collections of which lists had been prepared, I came to know of three more afterwards. The names, of Brahmans likely to possess Mss., which were submitted to me were fifty-one. Of the Jaina collections I was not able to see one, as the person in charge, I was informed, had gone abroad with the key. In the case of another the person in charge showed me a part but owing to illness he said he could not show me the rest. He said he had more, but added that he alone could interfere with them. Of the fifty-one names of Brahmans, six were struck out as the persons denial having any Mss. at all. In a few cases there were only women living in the house and they could not be prevailed upon to bring out their

* Bhagavadgita

\[\text{and adhāňśiḥāḥ \textit{i.e.} with the back, waist, and neck broken or bent and with the head hanging downwards.}\]
manuscripts. I visited the houses of about forty. Only in a very few of these cases I discovered that the collections of MSS. were of any importance. The work most frequently met with was the Bhāgavata and of it a person had often more copies than one. The Jaina collections were generally well preserved and three of them in such good order also, as to make it possible for any particular bundle being found out without much search. Two of these latter and a third not in such good order were considerably large. One contained very old MSS., some being even 500 years old or more.

41. I shall now notice the more noteworthy MSS. out of those I came across in all the collections except the one belonging to the State, to which I shall refer afterwards. They were:

Laghustavaṭikā by Laghuvāchārya.
A copy of Nirṇayasindhu dated Samvat 1703.
Vyavahārasāra, an abridgment of Yājñavalkya.
Prāyaschittasāra by Dinakara, son of Umāāmakrishṇa.
Mahotsavamālikā of Vishṇu, according to Vallabha’s doctrines, by Gokulachandra, son of Bālakrishṇabhaṭṭa of the Ātreyā family.
Pātraṣuddhi (Vall.) by Dvārikesa, son of Mathurānāthisuṛi.
Laghukārikās treating of Samskāras by Vishṇusārman.
Navagrahamakha Vasishṭhokta.
Vishṇupūjanapaddhati by Haridviṣa.
Raghuvamsaṭikā by Guṇavinayagaṇi.
Raghukāvyadipikā, Samdehavishaushadhi, by Mahopādhyāya Krishna Bhatta. MS. dated Samvat 1518.
Raghuvamsaṭikā, Tattvārthadipikā, by Navanita, son of Kripārāma.
Raghukāvyadurghata-samgraha by Rājakundā. The author seems to be the same as the one who has similarly explained certain difficult passages in Kirata.
Raghuvamsaṭikā, Pañjikā, by Anandayatīvallabha. Date of MS. Samvat 1667.
Raghuvamsakāvyavṛitti, Arthālabāpanicā, by Samayasundara.
Vāsavadattāṭikā by Dikshita Nārāyaṇa, son of Sāvitri and Viśvarūpā. Copied Samvat 1723.
Śiśupālavadhī Sāratikā by Vallabha.
Subhāśīta-muktāvalī by Vyāsa Haraji. The date is Samvat 1731, which may be the date of even the compilation.
Durvāsahparājayanāṭaka noticed above.
Mudrādipikā, commentary on Mudrārākshasa, by Graheśvara.
Karṇāṃritaṭikā by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa.
Sevanabhāvanā by Haridāsa.
Dushtadamanā, with commentary by Bhāṭṭa Kṛṣṇa Hosimha, son of Rāmeśvara Bhāṭṭa of Janasthāna.
43

Kalikântâkatu-kâta by Râmâkrishnâ.
Ritusamhâra-flatâ by Amarakîrtisâri.
Bhartriharitikâ by Nâtha, son of Pushkara Vyâsa.
Dâmayantîvivaraṇa by Chândapâla.
Prakâśavarsha’s Commentary on Kîrâta.
Chandrabijayaprabandha by Mândanâmâtya, the ornament of the Sîrîmâla family.
Râmâkritprasâasti with commentary by Janârdana.
Râmânpâta by Thakkura Somesvara.
Râmachandrasâvatâra by Hanumân. Towards the end well-known verses from Bhartrihari such as those beginning with lobhâshed, daunmantrâyân, &c., occur. This would seem to be an extract from Khaṇḍaprasâasti.
Nemidutakâvya by Kavi Jhanjhana with a commentary by Paiidita Gunavijaya. The poem consists of a number of stanzas, each containing the last line of some stanza of the Meghadûta.
Anyâpadesasâta by Maithila Madhusûdana of the Ujatî family.
Kalaâkâshâta.
Mûrkhasâta.
Meghadûtâtikâ, Śîringârasadâlîpikâ, by Kamalâkara, son of Chaturbhujâ and Mâhlâyî. He salutes Paṇḍita Gaṅgâdhara and S'eshanriśimha.
Commentary on a Kâlidâsa’s Vidvadvinoda, Vidvajjanâbhîrâmâ.
Nalavilâsanâta by Râmachandra. Date of Ms. Samvat 1516. The Sûttradhâra refers to Murâri, the author of Anargharâghava.
Kumârasambhavavritti, Arthâlâpanikâ, by Lakshmîvallabhâgani.
Naishadhatikâ by Gadâdhara, son of Dhîra and of the Śaṇḍilya gotra. The commentator gives an account of the author which might be compared with Râjasâkhbara’s as summarised by Bühler (J. B. B. R. A. S. X, 82-5). In Vârânasî there was a king, Govindachandra. Śîrharsha, who wrote the Khaṇḍana (Khaṇḍanakhândakhâdya), was the ornament of the Pandits at his court. He had neglected Śâhitya (belles lettres) and devoted himself to Pramâna (philosophy). Some jealous persons thinking highly of themselves for their knowledge of Sâhitya used to slily exchange significant glances with one another whenever he entered the court. On one occasion he found them out and on enquiry learnt the cause. So he wrote the Naishadhacharita, the pre-eminent abode of the sentiment of Śîringâra (love), and took it to the king. The king was pleased and granted him two seats at his court, one amongst those learned in Tarka (philosophy) and the other in those learned in Śâhitya and accordingly two tâmbûlas (presents of betel-leaves) also. Harsha obtained another name, that of Kavipaṇḍita. When he undertook to write the poem he took the help of the Chintâmaṇimantra to decide what hero he should select and was inspired to take up Nala.57 Râjasâkhbara has made him a contemporary of Jayantachandra. Gadâdhara places him earlier by half a century, if by Govinda-
Chandra he means the grandfather of Jayantachandra and not some one long before that date, of whom we know nothing as yet. (J. B. B. R. A. S. X, 37; Ind. Ant. II, pp 72-3 and J. B. B. R. A. S. XI, pp. 279-287).

Naishadhakavya with Vidyadharas Commentary.

Lakshmi ivisa's commentary, Mugdhabodhini, on the Meghabhyudayakavya of Sāyamkeli. Mānakka is generally believed to be the author of the Meghabhyudayaka. May Sāyamkeli be another name of his?

Vṛcchavanakāvya with commentary.

Commentary on Jambūnāga's Chandradūta.

Sanvādasundara noticed above.

Sa'dalakṣaṇa by Vararuci.

Śārasvatasārāṭikā, Mitākṣharā, composed by Harideva in 1769.

Śārasvatasūtrāvatṛitti by Tarkatilaka noticed above.

Madhyakaumudīvilāsa composed in Śivarājadhāni by Jayakrīṣṇa, son of Raghunātha, son ofGovardhana of the Maunikula.

Prakriyāsāra by Kāśīnātha.

Dhātumāṇjarī by Kāśīnātha.

Sa'bādabhūṣaṇa by Nīlakantha, pupil of Bhāṭṭoji Dikshita, and son of Sūkla Janaūdāna and grandson, on the mother's side, of Vatsāchārya.

Laghubbhāṣhya—the five Samdhis. By Raghunātha, son of Vishyakara. Raghunātha studied Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya and other sāstras with Bhāṭṭoji Dikshita and wrote the present work in Vṛiddhanagara.38

Vṛittidīpikā by Maunin Śīkrīṣṇa (same work as No. 2027 in Rajendralal's Notices).

Āpasābdakhandana by Bhāsarvajña.

Guṇakītttvashoḍhaśikā-sūtra (in accordance with Pāṇini) with commentary. The original was written by Guṇapāṇinaya, pupil of Jayasoma-sūri, while Jināsimha was on the Paṭṭa (Pet. IV. Ind.).

Vākyaprakāśa by Udayadharmā. Date of composition Samvat 1507.

Shatkarakaparicchedhāda by Mahopidnyāya Ratnarājāni.

Pāṇiniyaparībhāṣā-sūtra by Vyādi (3 leaves).

Pāṭrīkāvyākaraṇa by Chandā.

Mādhavyakārikāvivaraṇa by Tarkatilakabhaṭṭāśhārya.

Parībhāshavṛtti, Lalitā, by Prabhūśottama.

Sundaraprakāśasabdārṇava (Unadisālhana) by Padmasundara, pupil of Padmācārya. Date of Ms. Samvat 1618. (Pet. IV. Ind.).

Ratrāvali, commentary on Śaivasvaparībhāṣāḥśānyāvātārasūtra, by Dayārāta, pupil of Jinaharshaśūri.

A Ms. of Daungrasimhakātantravrīttīṭikā on which a tippanaka was written in Aṇahillavāṭaka, in Samvat 1389 while Alp Khan was reining, by Guṇakīrtī, pupil of Viśāsūri, for Śālibhadra. This Alp Khan was brother-in-law of Sultan Alauddin and father-in-law of
the latter's son, Khizr Khan (Elliot and Dowson III pp. 157 and 208). The ṭīkā is by Muni Pradyumnasūrya, pupil of Devaprabhasūrya, who was pupil of Dharmasūrya of the Chāndrakula and also of Dharmasūrya's pupil, Padmaprabha.59 This author is the same as that of Vichārasaṁ- prakaraṇa (Pet. IV, Ind., p. lxxx).

Prabodhachandra (Gr.) by Gatakalaṅka, son of Rāmakrishṇa.

Uktirātanākara (Shaṭkārakodāharana) by Sādhusundararaṇa.

S'lokayojanopāya by Nilakanta, son of Sūri, who was son of Padmākara Dikṣhitā. Consists of 30 stanzas on constructing.

S'abdaprakāśa by Mādhavārāṇya.

Nīvyakasamālā and Māṇikānāmālā by Saubhāri.

Ekākṣharaṇā namālā by Vararuci.

Sāhityaśaṅkupadaṃtropa saṁvarākāśa (enlarged) by Karnasimha, son of the king of kings, Sūrasimha. These were princes of Bikaner in A.D. 1631 and 1613.

Vṛttaratnadāvatī by Chiramjiva.

Bhavadeva's commentary on Kāvyapraṅgāsa noticed at Jaisalmer.

Kāvyaprakāśaṭāṭikā, Sāradipīkā, by Vāchaka Guṇaratnanaṇa, pupil of Vinayavasamudraganaṇi who was pupil of Jinaṁāṇikyaśūrya.

Rasachandrikā by Viśvesvara, son of Lakshmīdhara.

Prajñātipatigalantikā by Chitrasenabhatta.

Vṛttaratnakaravṛtti, Sukavihṛdayāvanandini, by Sulhaṇa. Ms. dated Samvat 1560.

Commentary on Chhandahasundara or Pratāpakautuka. Both the text and the commentary by Naraharibhaṭṭa, son of Svayambhubhaṭṭa and pupil of Vidyārāṇya. Gives stanzas exemplifying the different metres and is called a stotra.

Prajñātipathchhandahkosa by Ratnasēkhaṇa.

Vṛttasārā by Pushkara Miśra, son of Nṛśimha Miśra. The whole consists of two leaves only.

Vidyābhūṣaṇa's commentary on Chhandahkauśṭubha by Rāhlā- Dāmodarakaṇi.

Vāgbhaṭilaṃkārāṇṭikā, Jñānapramodikā, composed by Vācharachārya Pramodagaṇi in Samvat 1681 at Lavera, when Gajasimha was on the throne. This Gajasimha is that of Marvad.

Pātaṇjala-chamatkāra by Chandrachudā, who had learnt the essence of Yoga from Prabhākara.

Adhikaraṇakaṃudī by Rāmakrīṣṇa.

Guruchandrodayakaṃudī by Rāmanārāyaṇa.

Ashtottarasahasramahāvākyarātnavalī compiled from the 108 Upanishads by Rāmāchandra, pupil of Vāudevendra Sarasvati.

Advaitasūdha, a commentary on the Sārasvatopanishad which is also called Raghuvamsa. It is by Lakshmanā Pandita, son of ... ttaṇḍu, an ornament of the Brahmanājāśāni family. The author was
kindly regarded by Uttamaslokatirtha mahāmuni. An attempt is made therein to interpret the Raghuvamsa so as to yield a Vedantic meaning.10

_Bhagavadbhaktivilāsa_ by Gopālabhaṭṭa.
_Tattvanirnaya_ by Varadarāja.
_Harivyāsadeva’s commentary on Nimbāditya’s Daśaslokī._
_Vedāntasiddhāntadipikā_ by Vanamālin.
_Pramāṇasamgrahaṇī, Comm. on Anandatīrtha’s Sadāchārasmṛti._
_Rānanārāyaṇa’s Tattvasambodha._
_Bhaktihamsa-vivṛti, Bhaktitarāṅgini, by Raghuṇātha._
_Sāṅdilyasamhitā (Bhakti)._ 
_Khaṇḍanakahpaṇḍkhādyatikā, Vidyāsāgara, by Ānandapūrṇa, pupil of Abhayānanda. The commentator’s surname was Vidyāsāgara._
_Viśiṣṭādvaita-siddhānta by Śrīniwasādāsānandāsā, pupil of Veṇkiṭa-chārya._
_Vijñānānandakā with a commentary, Padavyākhyā, by Mukunda Parivrajaka._
_Upadesāpaṇḍchaka with a commentary by Bhūdhara._
_Vivekasāra by Rāmendra._
_Nyāyapradipikā by Rānadaśā, pupil of Udāśināchārya Brahmadāsa._
_Nyāyāvatārasūtra by Siddhasena Divākara._
_The last leaf only of Tarkabhāṣāvīvarāṇa composed by Subhāvijaya in Samvat 1665._

Commentary on Tarkabhāṣā by Murāribhaṭṭa, son of Gaṅgaḷhara. Date of Ms Samvat 1652. In another Ms. the author is called Muravairin, which is the same as Murāri._
_Vidyādarpāṇa (Ny.) by Haripradasā._
_Tarkalakṣaṇa by Maṇḍikaṇṭhahāṭṭāchārya._
_Sarasvatītīrtha’s commentary on Varadarāja’s Tarkīkaraksha._
_Commentary on Nyāyaśāra, Nyāyamālādipikā, by Jayasimhasūrī, pupil of Mahendrasūrī._
_Commentary on Anandānuḥbava’s Tarkadipikā by Advayāraṇyamuni, pupil of Advayāśramapājyapāda. Date of Ms. Samvat 1622._
_Nyāyapradipā by Gopikānta._
_A Ms., dated Samvat 1631, of Saśādharā’s Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa._
_Very old copies of such astronomical works as Siddhāntasya-romanī, and medical works such as Sūtra, Ātreya-sambita, Bhāvaprakāṣa, Charaka and Ashīṭāṅgahridaya and Āruṇadatta’s commentary on it._
_Vriddhagāgiyajyotiḥśāstra._
_Grahabhāvaprakāṣapāṭikā by Bhaṭṭotpala._
_Varshatanta or Nilakanṭha-tājika composed in Saka 1500 by Nilakanṭha, son of Ananta and grandson of Chintāmaṇi of the Garga gotra.
Karaṇakutūhalakṛti by Padmanābha.

Commentary on Rāma's Samarasāra by his younger brother, Bharata.

Tiṅkā-sāra-samuchchaya, containing comments on the different cyclic years. The author quotes from Rudravāmin's Suklaṅkā. The Ms. bears the date Samvat 1322. Whether it is that of composition or of mere copying cannot be said.

Jātakārāṇava by Varāhamihira.

Śaunakīyavivāha-patāla copied in Samvat 1588 when Humayun the Mongol was reigning at Agra.

Malayendusūri's commentary on Mahendrasūri's Yantra-rāja.

Commentary on Śripati's Jātakapaddhati by Kṛishṇa Daivajña, son of Ballāla Daivajña.

Nilakanṭha's Samjñātantra.

Prasānavali by Jadabharata, pupil of Muni Mādhavānanda.

Budhasimhasarmaṇa's commentary, Prasodhanī, on his own Grahanādāra.

Amṛitakumbha written by Nārāyaṇa, son of Rāma, in Samvat 1582.

Samvatsaratotsavākālanirṇaya by Purushottama.

Lilāvatītiṅkā by P拉萨urāma.

Lilāvatītiṅkā by Moshadeva, son of Suvarṇakāra Bhimadeva.

Sāmudrika by Durlabhārāja, son of Amarasimha.

Śāṅgadharadīpikā by Ādhamalla.

Pathyāpathya-vibodha by Keyadeva.

Kautukā-Chintāmaṇi by Pratīparudrārīva.

Kulapradīpa. Vidyākanṭha, who was the sun to the lotus of Śivamata (body of doctrines of the Śaiva school), having studied it of Śrīrāmakanṭha and teaching it to the author, asked the latter to write a plain and short exposition of the doctrines, such as would be useful to all. The author expresses the wish that the Kaulas would read the work and be happy.

Śivārchanachandrikā by Śrīnivāsa in 46 Prakāsas.

Kaula-khaṇḍana by Gauḍa Kāśīnātha-dvija.

Paṁchāyatana-prakāśa (Mantra) by Chakrāṇi.

Laukikanyāya-samgraha. Same work as No. 3139 in Rajendralal's Notices. Only in the colophon the author's name is here given as Raghunāthadāsaṅjika.

Bālachandraprakāśa (Dh., Jy., Med., &c) by Visvanātha, son of Padmanabhā. Caused to be written by king Bālachandra, son of the king of kings, Rāya Dhola.

Śyainika śāstra (hunting) by Rudradeva.

Asamalāṇa-sāmanānusrita-Śāstra by Virabhadra, in which the author treats in Āryā metre the subjects in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra.
A Ms. of the Jayamangalā, commentary on the Kāmasūtra, bearing in two or three places the following colophon: Ityaparājunaḥ Śalabha-mallarāja-Nārāyaṇa-Chaukuva-chudāmaṇi-mahārājādhi-āja-srimal-Visaladevasya Bhāratibhāṇḍāgare Śrī-Vātsyāyaniya-Kāmasūtra-tikāyām Jayamangalābhidhā: āyām &c. Of the same import was the colophon of the Ms. of the commentary used by the author of the English translation of the Kāmasūtras published at Benares for the Hindoo Kama Śāstra Society (Schmidt's Ind. Erotik, pp. 24-5). The colophon of Weber's Berlin Ms. No. 2238, and of Rajendralal's Ms. No. 2107, is as follows: ity Aparājuna Jvalamallarāja Nārāyaṇa-mahārājādhi-āja Chaukuvaḥchudāmaṇi Śrī Mahimalladevasya bhārati, &c. All this would seem to indicate that it is very likely that the commentary was composed for Visaladeva. There is no Chaulukya king called Mahimalla, unless that was a designation of Visaladeva. Visaladeva reigned from A. D. 1243 to 1261 and the 13th century is the latest date assigned by Schmidt to the author of the commentary.

Vinodasamūriticārā. Manuscript old.
Sammatīṭikā by Abhayadēva, pupil of Pradīyummāṣūri (Pet IV. Ind.).
Vāsuṭāja-charita by Vardhamāna, pupil of Viśayāsinhasūri.
Upamitalhaṃvaprapāṇchākathā by Śiddha, pupil of Haribhadra.
Dharmaratna-karandaka with commentary. Both by Vardhamāna, pupil of Abhayadeva. Commentary written in Samvat 1172 in the village of Dāyikākūpā devoted to King Jayasimha.
Lakṣmīvallabha's commentary on Uttaḥśāyanasūtra.
Kalpakirāṇa-valivākhya composed by Dharmasāgaragāni in Samvat 1628.
Pushpanāṭvachūrī. Date of composition Samvat 1512.
Ekībhāvastotratikā by Vālirāja.
Somakirtīyāchārya's Pradīyummacharita. The date of composition was illegible.
Siddhāntāroddhāra by Kamalayanopādhyaśya, pupil of Jinaḥarsha-sūri of the Khārataragachēhha.
Jaimatīya Rāmaḥarchitṛa by Hemāchārya.
Vid. Alayāstāṇa by Jayavallabhakavi.
Nyāyārthaḥmaṇjhūshikānyāsa. Both the text and the commentary are by Hemahamsagāni.
Siddhahemachandrābhīdhāna-Sabdānusārama-dvyāśraṇayavṛitti by Abhayatilākagāni, pupil of Jinesvarasūri.
Commentary on Vidagdhamukhamāṇḍana, by Naraharibhāṭṭa.
Jñārāṇḍara, a Dhyānasāstra extracted by Āchārya Subhachandra from Jinaḥapati-sūtra.
Jaina Tarkabhasha by Yasovijayagāni.
Stālāṅgavṛitti by Meghaśājamuni.
Somāṣatakaprakāraṇa by Somaprapāṭhārya.
Prabodhchintamani-kavya by Kavi Jayasokhara.
Suktisreuti by Gunavijaya Mahopadhyaya.

Uttarabalahya navritti, Sukhabodha, composed by Nemichandrasuri in Samvat 1120. There is a Nemichandra about that date in the Tapagachchha patijavalis.

An Avachuri, on Prasamarati, by Haribhadrasuri, pupil of Manadeva. Date of composition Samvat 1185.

Udayasimhasuri's Vritti on Jina Vallabha's Pindavisuddhi. Date of composition Samvat 1235.

Vicharasamgraha, drawn like nectar from the ocean of the Agamas in Samvat 1443 by Kulamandana of the Tapagachchha (Pet. IV. Ind.).

Meghaduta or Nemijinacharita by Vikrama, son of Sanga. Utilises by way of Samasya the last lines of the stanzas in Meghaduta.

Visamvlasataka by Samayasundara. Treats of differences as regards Sutras and Vrittis.

Upadesaratnakara by Munisundara Suri (Pet. IV. Ind.).

Srngaravairagya-target, by Satarthavrittikara Somaprabha, with commentary, Sukhabodhika, by Nandalala.

Dvijavadanachapeta (a Vedankusa) by Haribhadrasuri.

Dvijavadanachapeta, Vedanaks, by Hemachandra. Contains extracts from Puranas, Dharmasastras, Vivekavilasa, &c., for teaching Dharmasarvasva (quintessence of right conduct).

Commentary on Vidagdhamukhamaudana by Tarabhidhakavali living in Sivarajadhani.

Commentary, on Prakrit Vijjala, by Ratnadeva. Composed in Samvat 1393.

42. I now come to the State collection at Bikaner. It was very satisfactory to see that the MSS. were well preserved and arranged. Any bundle that was required could be picked out easily. And I was informed that His Highness the Maharajah intended to house them in a still better place when the building that was being then erected for this among many other purposes would be completed. I have already mentioned the fact of my having been informed that there were many manuscripts in the collection not included in Rajendralal's catalogue. I found the information to be correct. The additional MSS. were not purchased after the catalogue was made. They were not produced for cataloguing by the person then in charge, perhaps because he felt suspicious about the fate of the manuscripts that were being catalogued. I shall here notice only a few of such as do not appear in the catalogue:

Srutsuktablaskhya by Karnataka Linganabhatta.
Katyayanastra turabrabbashya by Anantadeva.

Ahalalahari by Jai Mahapatra. This is No. 474 in Rajendralal's Catalogue. But the date of composition, which is Samvat 1635, is not given there.

n 173-7
Prayaśchittapradipikā by Kesava. The name of the author is taken from the word Kesāvī in the margin. The author states that (Apastamba’s) Prayaśchittaprapāṭhaka was expounded by Bhāskarāya in 200 stanzas in accordance with Dhūrtasvāmin and that he himself carrying the verses in his mind is giving out their sense for easy understanding. Bhāskarāya’s work must be the Apastambaprayaśchittasatadvaṣī noticed by Burnell at p. 276 of his Tanjore catalogue and the Bhāṣya, referred to in the Satadvyā, must be Dhūrtasvāmin’s.

Parāśaraṭikā, Vidvanmanchara, by Nandapāṇḍita.

Mādhavakāril āvyākhyāna by Śambabhaṭṭa, son of Bhaṭṭa Śaṃkara, who was son of Nilakaṇṭha.

Niti, Rajadharma, Vyavālāra, and Kālakāṇḍas of Lakshmīdhara-bhaṭṭa’s Krityakalpaṭataru.

A copy, dated Sam. 1556, of the ParasuRāma-pratāpa noticed above.

Govindamānasollāsa or Mānasollāsa by Govindalatā. Devāditya was minister to king Harasimha of Karṇaṭa-vamśa. His son was Ganesvāra, devoted to Viśeśvāra, the minister, who was his elder brother, as Lakṣmaṇa to Rāma. The introduction, which gives this information, further proceeds, it would seem, to state that this Ganesvāra was made a Mahāsāmantya (or great feudatory) over the province of Aṅga by the Kings of Mithilā. His son was Govinda. It would not be very difficult to determine who this Harasimha was. There is one Harasimha of Nepal who is spoken of as Karṇaṭa-chudāmaniriva in one of the Inscriptions from Nepal, published by Bhagvanlal in Vol. IX of the Indian Antiquary (p. 188), though according to modern Nepal VamsĀvalis or lists of dynasties he comes immediately after the Karṇaṭaka dynasty. And in the next inscription, where he is called Harisimha, he is mentioned as having dug tanks in Mithilā and settled Neṣāṅa (pp. 190—1). The date assigned to him according to the Vamsāvalis is 1524 a. d. There is a Harasimha of Mithilā, son of Bhāveśa, in whose reign a work called Rātrikāra was written by Chaṇḍesvāra in a. d. 1314 (Hall’s Sāmḥhya-pravachana-bhāṣya, p. 36.) These two and the present one are identical.* There is another Harasimha, son of Bhāveśa, mentioned in Sanmiṣṭa Miśarū’s Vivādachandra (Oxf. Cat., p. 296a). Govindamānasollāsa is quoted in Malamāsataṭṭva by Raghunandana Bhaṭṭachārya, who lived between A. D. 1451 and 1612.

Śrīṅgārasarasi by Miṣṭra Bhāva, son of Miṣṭra Lāṭakā. Describes in verse the different objects connected with Śrīṅgāra.

Padyamuktāvāli by Govinda Bhaṭṭācārya, son of Rudranyāyavichaspati Bhaṭṭācārya.

Sūktimuktāvāli by Viśvanātha, son of Vidyānirīśa Bhaṭṭācārya.

Sukṛita-kalolini, i. e., Praśasti of Vastupālānvaya by Udayaprabha. Begins with Chāpotkaṭa Vanarāja, Yogarāja, etc.

Eight Ashṭakas such as Hamāśaṭṭaka, Mayūrāśṭṭaka, Gajāśṭṭaka.

Subha-hitaratnākara by Umāpati Paṇḍita, son of Nirmalanātha.

* see Supplementary Note.
Commentaries on Hāla’s Gāthāsaptāsāti by Kulanāthadeva, Pramukhasukavi and Mādhavabhaṭṭa, son of Maṇḍala Bhaṭṭa. The last one was set to write the commentary by Krisñadāsa of the Miḥira family.

Commentary on Dusbtadamana. Kavindrachaudrodaya. This is the same work as No. 815 in Rajendra-lal’s Notices. There the compiler’s name is given as Vidyānīḍhī Kaṇḍra. This is not correct as will be seen from the verses beginning “Śrīmatakāśī” in the extracts given by Rajendra-lal himself and from the last line but one of the account given by himself, under the heading, viṣhayāḥ, Krishna is the compiler. Vidyānīḍhī (or Vidyānīḍhī) Kaṇḍra Ācārya Sarasvati is the author in whose praise the verses contained in the composition were written by different poets from Kāvī, Prayāga and many other places. There is also another work in praise of him in this State Collection called Sarvavidyānīḍhī-Kaṇḍra-ācārya-Sarasvatīnīḍhī Lākhuvijayaśekhandhaṁpustakam and there is also a commentary on it. The subject of these praises is the author to whose credit stand KaṇḍraKalpa Iruma, Hamadutakavya; etc.

Jagadābharana by Jagannātha-pandita.
An Abhaiakas’itaka.
Commentary on the Amaraśataka, Samjivani, by Arjunavarmadeva, son of king Subhaṭavarmman of Bhjakula.

Other commentaries on the same by Nandikesā and Anavemabhūpālā.

Sundaris’ataka by Utprekshāvallabha Gokulabhaṭṭa. Written in Samvat 1648 while Akbar was living at Lahore and ruling the earth. The poem is published in Kāryamālā, Pt. IX, from a Ms. dated Samvat 1653. The verses giving the date of composition do not, however, occur there.44

Adharas’ataka by Śaiva kavi Nilakānta, son of Śukla Janārdana and Hirā, grandson, on the mother’s side, of Vatsāḥārya and pupil of Bhaṭṭa Maṇḍana (same as Ośthas’ataka, Weber’s Berl. Cat., p. 171). The author seems to be the same as that of the Šabdāsobhā noticed above (p. 44).

Virahinimanovinoda with the commentary, Padamitraprakāsikā. Both by Vinaya (or Vināyaka?) kavi.
Śringārasamjivani by Haridevamīśra, son of Gauripati, who was son of Nilamanī.
Śringārapaṇchāsikā by Vānivilisa Dikshita.
Chaurapāṇchāsikā with Bhavesvara’s commentary.
Gitagovindatikā, Śāhityaratnakumārī, by Śahakamalikara, son of Aṅgānātha and Mhāʿā. The Ms. bears date Šaka 1578.
Krisñapagita by Somanātha, like Gitagovinda and later.

Nalavil/isai ataka and Nirbharaḥbhimavīyāyoga by Rāmāchandra kavi, pupil of Ācārya Hemachandra.
Commentary on Anargharāghava, Rahasyādarśa, by Devaprabha.

Liṅgadurgabhādhanātaka (with virarasa or the heroic sentiment predominant and sānti or the sentiment of tranquillity subordinate) by Dādambhāṭṭa or Paramānanda.

Kamsavadhāṭṭa by Viśeṣvara, son of Śesha Kṛṣṇa, which latter is probably the same as the author of the play.

Ushāniruddhanātaka by some king of Kāśi called Lakṣhmīnātha. Narottama and Kāśinātha are mentioned as his predecessors on the throne.

(Vibhāvana-?) Kusunāvachayalilānātaka by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

A number of Prahasanas (farces), such as Prāsaṅgika, Sahridāyānandana, Vibudhamohana, Adbhutatararāṅga, all by Harijīvanamiśra, son of Lālamīśra, who was son of Gauda Vaidyanātha Miśra. The Adbhutatararāṅga was written by order of the king of kings, Rāmasimha. A Mās. of the author's Vijayapārīṭa (Rajendralal’s No. 129) is dated Samvat 1730. So the Rāmasimha cannot be the one who was on the throne at Jodhpur in A.D. 1750.

Kālīkāntākutūhalaprahasana by Rāmakrishṇa, son of Tripāthin. Kalyāṇakara. Seems to be the same as Kalikāntākutukanātaka noticed above.

Gaurīdigambaraprahasana by Saṃkaramiśra.

Commentaries on Kādambari by Bāla-kṛṣṇa and Soma-Yājūika Mudgala Mahādeva.

Commentary on Vāsavadattā by Prabhākara.

Guṇamandāramāniṣārī by Raṅganātha.

Sitāmaṇimaṇiṣārī by Rāmānandavāmin.

Gopālavilāsa by Madhusūdanayāti.

Mukundaviṣā by Raghūttamatārtha, pupil of Purushottamatārtha. Kṛishṇalilāmāritalaharī by Daivajña Raghuvīra Dikshita, son of Viṭṭhala Dikshita.

Bhagavatprāsadhacharita by Dāmodara, son of Yamunā and Viṣvavānātha, and a commentary on it.

Chaḍiśatatakāṭikā by Dhanaśvara, son of Brāhmaṇa Somanātha or Somēśvara of Daśakurajñāti.

Rituvarṇanākāvyā by Durlabhā with commentary. Date of Mās. Samvat 1625.

Udārārāghava by Mallāri.

Rāmacharitākāvyā by Raghūttama.

Bhramaradūtakāvyā by Nyāyavāchaspati Bhaṭṭachārīya.

Gojālarāya’s Yamakamahākāvyā, Rāmachandrodāya, with his own commentary.

Lakṣmīnātha Paṇḍita’s Rāghavapāṇḍavaśiṣṭikā.

Commentaries on Nalodaya by Gaṇēṣakavi and Sarvajñāmuni (Padārthapraṭikāśiṅkā).
Sataslokikavya by Rakshasa Manishin with a commentary by Saktakaumubin Rishyasringa.

Commentaries on Naishadha by Vidyadhara and Pundita Lakshmana (Gudhahrthaparakshikā).

Pratinaishadhakavya by Nandanandana. Composed in Samvat 1708 while Shah Jahan was on the throne.

Raghuvamsa idurghatochchhaya by Rājakundā.

A Padāvali of which the Ms. is dated Samvat 1649. The compiler simply calls himself a Djivābandhu. He has gathered together verses (with names of the authors) relating to the god Mukunda by poets other than Jayadeva and Bīlvalamāṅgala.

Vākyabhelavichāra by Anantadeva.

Vākyapadiya-vākyakandaṭikā by Puṇyarāja.

Prayuktākhyanatamaṇjari. The author says he has collected the roots in use from the wonderful Akhyātachandrika of Bhaṭṭa Malla.

Ekārthākhyaatapaddhati by Bhaṭṭa Malla.

Vṛttamuktāvali and Vṛttamuktāvalitarala by Mallāri. Alamkāratilaka by Bhāṇudatta.


Śrīnāratilakaṭikā, Rasataraṅgini, by Gopālabhaṭṭa, son of Dīvīḍa Haribhaṭṭa.

Kavikutūhala by Kaviḍhaureya Mallāri.

Saḥsālālikaraṇasidhāntaparāja (Mim.) by Bhaṭṭa Ṣaṁkara, son of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa.

Paṇchhapāḍīkāṭikā by Anandapūrṇa or Vīṇyāsāgara. He seems to be the same as the Vīṇyāsāgara, who is the author of a commentary on the Khāṇḍana-khaṇḍakhādyā.

Vedāntapraṇikāhāra by Kūrma.

Sūktimuktāvali (relating to Advaitavidyā) by Lakshtamaṇa, son of Dattasūry and favoured of the Mahāmuni Uttama-lokatirtha.

Vishṇubhardtichandrodhayam composed by Nrisimhāraṇyamuni in Śaka 1347.

Gītārthāvivarāṇa by Viśvesvaratirtha, pupil of Vidyādhīrājatirtha.

Satyanāthayati's Abhinavagadā directed against Apyadikshita's Mādhvamukhamardana.

Kanḍārathasāyatana by Miṣra Saṁkara, who therein says that he wrote what his father Bhavanātha told him. Date of Ms. Śaka 1551.
Nyāya-chaṇḍrīkā by Mādhvyandina Kesava, son of Ananta and grandson of Kesava.

Sāmuḍrikatilaka by Durlabhāraja. Ahilla of the Prāgradvā family was minister to Bhimadeva. His son was Rājapāla and grandson Narasimha. Narasimha's son was Durlabhāraja who was made mahattama by king Kumāraqāla. His son, Jagaddeva, is also mentioned. Kumāraqāla was on the throne from A.D. 1143 to 1172.

Rasaratna-pradipa (or dipa) by Rāmarāja. The author belonged to the line of Tāka princes of Kāśṭhā. A genealogy is given. It commences with Harichandra. Harichandra's son was Sādhāraṇa. Sādhāraṇa had three sons: Lakshmanasimha, Sahajāpāla and Madana. The eldest Lakshmanasimha is not referred to as having been on the throne. In this family was born king Ratnapāla and his son was Rāmarāja. The present work was written at the desire of king Sādhāraṇa. This must be some other Sādhāraṇa than the one mentioned above, probably an elder brother of Rāmarāja. The author gives a list of the works consulted in verses identical with those in Rasarājalakshmī (Oxf. 321a, Drishtīvemam, &c.), with Kakachandr, samsrīti for Susruta and śākyāgamam for śāktāgamam 15. The last Tāka prince of Kāśṭhā known hitherto has been Madanapāla. The present work gives the names of two more princes in that line after him. But how many rulers there were between Madanapāla and the first of these two is not stated.

Samgitaratnakarātikā, Suilhākara, by Simha Bhūpāla. The colophon at the end of this work corresponds exactly up to "virachi" with the colophon I found at the end of the Ms. of Rasārṇavasudhākara, I saw in this collection 16. So both the Rasārṇavasudhākara and the Samgitaratnakarātikā, Suilhākara, are evidently attributed to the same royal author. About the former work Burnell in his Tanjore Catalogue (where it is called simply Ra-ānava) says:—"The nominal author is said to have been a Tanjore Prince of the last (18th) century."

Śrīṅgārāhāra by the Mahārajādhirāja Hammira. The author says he compiled the book collecting together the views of those, who knowing gita, vādyā and nyūtya (singing, music and dancing) wrote about them. Amongst such writers he mentions Brahmā, Īśa, Gauri, Bharata, Mātaṅga, Śārdūlaka, Kāsyapa, Nārada, Visākhila, Dantila, Naudikesa, Rambha, Arjuna, Yāṣṭika, Rāvana, Durgasakti, Anila and others, Kohala, Aśvatara, Kambala, king Jaitrasimha, Rudraṇa, kings Bhoja and Vikrama, Keśideva the sole king of the world, Simhaṇa, king Ganaṇati, and Jayasimha and other kings 17.

Samgitamakaranda by Veda or Vedabudha, son of Ananta, who was son of Dāmodara. This Dāmodara may be the author of the Samgitadarpāna.

Samgitarasarakalikā by Śuddhasuvarṇakāra Mośadeva. A very old copy. There is noticed above a Lilavatītikā by Suvarṇakāra Mośadeva.

Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍanaṭikā, Viṭikā, by Gaṇrikānta Sārvabhaumabhattaṭārya.
Vidagdhhamukhamanḍanaṭīkā, Śravaṇabhūṣaṇa, by Narahari.

43. After my return from tour, through the kindness of the Political Agent and the Bikaner Darbar, I got a loan of a Ms. of the Śribhāṣya from this State collection for the edition of that work in the Bombay Sanskrit Series.

44. From Bikaner I proceeded to Hanumangad (or Bhatner) which belongs to the same State. Here my assistant met with an accident while getting on to the back of a camel and thenceforward for a few days he was not able to help me at all and not very actively during the rest of the tour.

45. Writing in 1872 A. Cunningham said he had previously seen in the fortress there a room ten or twelve feet long and about six feet broad half filled with manuscripts, from among the topmost of which he picked out a palm-leaf manuscript and found it dated Sāṃvat 1200 i.e. A. D. 1144 (Gough’s Records, p. 82). When Bühler visited the place in 1874 he did not find the collection of old palm-leaf manuscripts. He was, however, shown a large library, containing about 800 manuscripts (Gough, p. 119). What I saw was a large box filled with paper manuscripts, some tied up in pieces of cloth, others loose, and all in disorder. The fort is dilapidated. The people, who lived inside, have had plots allotted them outside and have come to live there. The place in the fort, where I saw the box of manuscripts is also dilapidated and deserted. The heir to the manuscripts is a young boy who, I believe, is studying at Patiala.

46. Some of the manuscripts I saw here were:

Dharmatattvakalāṇidhi (Dh.) by king Prithvichandra (or Prithvichandradeva), son of Nāgamalla. The copy was made in Sāṃvat 1530 while Prithvichandradeva was on the throne. The author has a long tale of birudas (titles).

Canto V of the Kumārapālacakarita by Jayasimhasuri of the Krishnārshiyagachchha. This then is the poem referred to, by Nayachandraśuri in his Hammirakāvyya, as written by his teacher Jayasimhasuri (Kirtane’s edition, p. 6 of Introduction and p. 132 of the Text).

Śrīnāgaradarpaṇa by Padmasundarakavi, by a study of which the author expected Akbar to be able to gratify his wife (Mudrāvatī?).

A copy of Pañchatantra made in Sāṃvat 1429, while Firuz Shah Taghālak was on the throne.

Sārasamgraha (Med.) by Śiva Vaidya of Gauda jāti, son of the Dvija Yājnīka Śrīdhara and Hāṃsi.

Mss. of Lilāvatikathāvritti, Ballālascna’s Adbhutasāgara, Vasudeva Hīndi (Khanda 1), Kiranāvali (Ny.), Śyāmasakuna, Kukkoka’s Ratirahasya and Sulhaṇa’s commentary on Vṛttaratanākara dated respectively Sāṃvat 1461, 1516, 1557, 1614, 1623, 1634 and 1644.

47. Nagaur in Jodhpur territory was the place I next proceeded to. Here I saw nothing of importance. There were two Jaina Collections
I had come to know of. One I saw. It was a small collection containing ordinary Jaina scriptures and commentaries and other books. Of the other collection the key was with a Sripujyanāda who went away ten or fifteen years ago, nobody knew whither. A Brahman had a few manuscripts. But they were very ordinary ones.

48. Thence I went to Alwar. The reply I had received from the State to my enquiries in November 1903 was similar to that received from Bikaner. But still I was assured by one or two Pandits that there were in Alwar a few private collections of manuscripts in addition to the one belonging to the State. And I was not disappointed. I saw the State Collection. It was in proper order and seemed to be properly looked after. It also appeared that good use was made of it by the many Pandits I came across at that place. Through the influence of a Pandit, whose acquaintance I had previously made at Bharatpur, and by the help of the Pandit who was directed by the Chief Memer of Council to take me round I was able to see the collections here without the slightest difficulty. It struck me that the owners of manuscripts here did not seem to have the least prejudice against showing them. Probably it is because they have realised the useful nature of the work of the search for manuscripts, having had a practical instance of it in the catalogue of the State Collection published by Peterson, and have ceased to entertain suspicions of any sinister motives in the work. In fact one Pandit, who has passed certain Sanskrit Oriental Titles Examinations of Punjab University, had sufficient confidence in me to lend me a copy of Rāmānuja's Śrībāṣṭyā for the purposes of the edition which has been undertaken for the Bombay Sanskrit Series. I examined six collections here, all of them belonging to Brahmins. All the collections were on the whole well preserved and ordered.

49. The following are some of the noticeable manuscripts:

Chākṣushopanishad.

Agnibrāhmaṇa (Saṃav).

A copy of Gobhilaśyaśutra dated Samvat 1640.

Pāraskaragrihyakārikā by Reṇukāchārya.

Lāṭyāyanasrautasūtrasabhāṣya by Rāmakṛishṇa Dikshita.

Karṇavijāka by Krishnadeva composed in Samvat 1132 when Durgasimha was king of Nandabhadra, whose queen was Ambikā and minister Karṇakaṇṭhira. The author's father was Padmanābha Vīṣṇu.

Nalodaya with a commentary by Miśra Prajñākara Maithila.

Amaruṣātaka with a commentary by Jñānānaṇa or Śrīla Śrī Ravi-

chandra (same work as No. 2893 in Rajendralal’s Notices).

Commentary on Gitagovinda by Maithila Krishṇadatta. The original is explained so as to apply to Śiva.
Padyāmrītasaroṣa by Lakshmana, son of Rāmāchandra of the Kāśyapa gotra.

Rasakalpadruma (Anth.) compiled by Chaturbhuj Misra. The authors’ names are given. It was compiled at the desire of Sayasta Khân in 1705.

Amarakośa with a commentary, the Budhamanohara, by Mahādeva, who obtained the title of Vedāntin from Svayampakasatīrtha.

Premasampuṭa (kāvya) composed in 1606 by Visvanātha Chakravartin. It relates to the amours of Rādhā and Krishna.

Amarakośa with a commentary, the Budhamanohara, by Maliadeva, who obtained the title of Vedāntin from Svayamprakāśatīrtha.

Vivekamārtanda of Gorakshanātha.

Yogākhyāna by Yājñavalkya, called Yājñavalkyopanishad in the colophon.

Premājattanika by Rasikottamga.

Chāmatkāra chintāmanī with commentary by Dharmesvara Mālaviya.

Sūryaśiddhānta with Chandesvariya Bhāshya.

Siddhāntasindhu (Jy.) by Nityānanda composed by Shah Jehan’s orders.

Charakavyākhyā Chakradattiyā.

50. From Alwar I proceeded to Rājgarh, belonging to the same State. At Alwar I had got the names of the persons at Rājgarh who owned Sanskrit manuscripts. These I had previously communicated to the Hākam of the place and the arrangements he had made were so complete that I could go out and commence work immediately on reaching my lodgings. The collections were not big and only four in number. Two of them were well preserved. But there was hardly any order.

The following Mss. may be noted:—

Anandavrindāvanachampū by Kesava.

Sārasamgraha by Śambhūdāsa, anthology not Dharma.

Kāvyakāustubha. An incomplete copy.

Vṛttaratanakaratiṅkā by Śrīkaṇṭhaśūri.

Vṛttarāmāniyamāṭā by Trimala.

Mandsaur was the place I visited next. Here I saw four collections, all Jaina. One of them belonged to a private individual and was all in ruins. The other three belonged to Digambara temples. The Digambaras, I had known before, objected to leather being admitted into their temples, though Śvetāmbaras did not mind binding their books in leather or enclosing them in leather cases and keeping them thus enclosed in their temples. Here I found that they objected to wool also. I was not allowed to touch the books in the temples as I was wearing woolen clothing. A man, sitting beyond the carpet on which I was sitting, held before me the manuscripts I wanted to see. One collection mostly consisted of recent copies specially made. I saw a copy of Jaimendrayākaraṇa in it and in another a Tattvavārttī (Karaṇānuyoga), called Sarvārthasiddhi, by Fūjyapādasvāmin, and a Kathākosā by Brahmanemidatta, pupil of Mallibhūṣaṇa. Beyond these there was not much that was noticeable.

52. At Salemabad in the Kishangad State, I had heard, there was a gāḍī (spiritual throne) of Nimbārka and that works belonging to Nimbārka’s school of Vedānta would be found there. Through the State officials I got a list sent me of the manuscripts there. The collection seems to be poor in the number of manuscripts. Among the manuscripts are:

Several works of Kesāvabhaṭṭa of Kaśmīr, such as Vaishnavadharma-mimāṃsā and Bhūchakradīgvijaya.

Nimbārka’s Bhāṣya on the Vedāntasūtras.

Vedāntakaustubha by Sṛṇivāsaḥārya.

Brahmasūtrabhāṣya by Bhāskarāchārya.

A life of Kesāvabhaṭṭa of Kaśmīr.

Purushottama’s Vedāntaratnanañjūṣṭa and Vedāntasuradruma.

Nimbārkapradūrbhāva.

Harivyāsadeva’s Siddhāntaratnāvali.

Nāradapañcharātra.

53. From several places I received lists, mostly through Captain Luard. They were from Dewas (Senior Branch), Jaora, Rampura, Rajigad (C, I.), Ajaigad, Suthalia, Jhabua, Rutlam, Multhan and Bharatpur Agency. In asking for these lists it was stated that they should include only manuscripts and of Sanskrit works only and that the authors’ names should be given, whenever they could be ascertained. There was hardly any list in which the directions were all carried out. Astrology and modern works on medicine seem to be in the greatest favour.
The following may be noted:

Dewas (Senior Branch).

Kumārapālāprabhanda, composed in Sāmvat 1492 by Jinamāṇḍana, pupil of Somasundara.

Rasikajīvana by Gadādhara-bhāṭṭa.
Śīkandara-sāhitya by Raghunātha-misra.
Nāradapañcharittra.
Vāchārāmbhaṇa by Nṛsiṃhāsranāma.
Vaisishṭhasiddhānta.
Sūryasiddhāntabhāṣya by Raṅganāthāra.
Jayottischarandrārkaruchī by Rudrabhāṭṭa.
Pañchachakshī by Vaṅgāravihīra.
Vaidyabhāskarodaya by Dhanvantari.
Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra by Bhojadeva.
A Kīranavali by Haradatta.

Rampura.

Suvṛttatilaka.
Alaṃkārabhedanirṇaya.
Sāhityasūkshmasaraṇī with commentary.
Bhāṣabhūshaṇayutā Upamāvīlāsa.

54. At the end of my tour I called upon Captain Luard. The Agent to the Governor-General, Central India, had written to say, as mentioned in paragraph 65 of my previous report, that Captain Luard expected that he might be able to persuade the Jains and others to assist me in my search. Moreover on reading my previous report Captain Luard had himself written to me to say that the search on which I had started was more or less his child and he would like him to grow at least into youth. I, therefore, wanted to know how far he had succeeded in persuading owners and keepers of manuscripts to help in the search, so that I might continue my work with the proffered help. He said he regretted he had not met with the success he had expected.

55. Here, therefore, the special purpose for which I was deputed to go on tour ended. As a result of my search during the present two tours and of the preliminary one, I am persuaded that there are some very important collections which deserve to be catalogued and have their catalogues published, especially as they are not likely to disperse. Firstly there are the State Collections at Rewah, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Kishangad, Bundi, Kotah, Udaipur, Bikaner.

56. The State Collection at Jaipur I refer to is not the one which was shown to me as such (paragraph 37 of my previous report). I feel sure that there must be another and a far more important one, as I have already hinted in the paragraph of my
previous report, just referred to. Pandit Râ dhâ râ shã na in his letter to the Viceroy of 10th May 1868, which was the origin of the institution by Government of the search for manuscripts, says that "the rarest books were collected by the liberal ancestors of the former (Mahâ râja of Jaypur), from the time of Râja Mân Siâh." Whitsell Stokes in his note on the letter refers to "lists of the collections in State Libraries," such as that lately procured by the Political Agent at Jaypur." (Gough, pp. 1 and 3). Peterson in his Report for 1882-83, p 45, says that he spent three days in going as carefully as possible over the library and considered the time too short for doing anything else than making a hurried note of books to be added to our lists of desiderata. The library I was shown could not be the library thus referred to. In his next report Peterson also added that the Jeypur Durbar had cordially acceded to the suggestion to catalogue the library made in his previous report and that the work must have made considerable progress.

57. Part of the Bikaner State Collection has been catalogued. But it would be desirable to supplement Rajendralal's Catalogue with one of manuscripts not included therein.

58. I had to report previously that the State Collection at Jodhpur was not at all in good order. But now the Jodhpur Durbar has resolved to set it in order and have it catalogued. The senior member of the Mehekma Khas some time ago asked for my views on the point and I have communicated them to him.

59. Then there are certain Jaina bhandars that are worth being made better known: the big one at Jaisalmer, one at least, if not more, of those at Bikaner and one at Jodhpur. The one at Bikaner that I mean is at present in the hands of a Jaina layman and he had to fight hard at court to prevent its going into another's hands, as he was sure that thereby it would have dispersed and been destroyed. He has already been sounded and is willing to accede to the proposal to catalogue his Mss. when it should be actually made. The big bhandar at Jaisalmer, I am hopeful, the trustees can be prevailed upon to allow to be catalogued. But it would not be so easy to persuade them to so facilitate matters, that the work of cataloguing would be allowed to go on without a hitch for a reasonable length of time every day. With the help of the Dewan, however, and some of the trustees who seemed to me to be very amenable to reason, that too may very likely be managed. And lastly the Brahman Collection in the temples at Kotah should also be catalogued. The form of catalogue I have already suggested in paragraph 66 of my previous report.

60. With reference to the Jaina Collections, however, there is one question to be considered. There has been a great deal of activity recently going on in the Jaina community and they are having catalogues made of such Jaina Collections as it can get access to. Should the community make such catalogues and publish them, it would be superfluous for the Government to do so. I, therefore, made enquiries of the Secretary, Svetambara Jaina Conference,
about the Conference’s intentions in making the catalogues. I asked him (1) whether it was true that, as I had been told, the object was simply to ascertain what Jaina works were available at what places and to make complete collections, at three different places, of all such as were extant; (2) whether the Conference intended making lists of all Jaina bhandars at all places and not only of those at Patan and Jaisalmer; (3) whether it intended publishing all or any of the lists that would be made; (4) whether the lists would take note of the Brahman works existing in the bhandars; and finally (5) whether the lists, either published or simply made and kept in manuscript, would give only the names of the works and the authors, the numbers of the leaves, lines and letters, and the age or would also give such extracts from the manuscripts as had been given in Petersen’s list of the Sāntinātha Bhandar. The following is an extract from his reply:—"We have learnt that most of our valuable ancient works have been hidden in old times in such Bhandars and that the trustees or persons in possession of those Bhandars are averse to open them and to restore the damaged works. We have tried and made lists of the Bhandars at Jaisalmer and Patan and our Pandits are now engaged in making lists of other Bhandars. On making lists of the several Bhandars we intend comparing them all and seeing which book requires our immediate attention for its restoration. We have a mind to have copies of the works which are not in circulation at present, so that in future we may not be in need of again opening the Bhandars. We are trying to have a central library or so. This scheme is not yet ripe, but we hope in course of time to have it realised. As regards printing the lists we will decide after we have got all the lists and, so far as at present I can tell, we shall most probably have the lists printed." From this it seems that the object of the Conference is not a literary one in general but concerns itself with only the extant Jaina literature, sacred as well as profane. Accordingly the lists of the big Bhandar at Jaisalmer that I saw made on behalf of the Conference contained remarks with reference to each of the manuscripts as to the necessity of its being restored and as to the urgency or otherwise of the restoration. And further, in the case of almost all Brahman works only the names were given with no other information but that they were anyadarśanīya. The lists contained no extracts. Under these circumstances catalogues of Jaina Collections also will have to be made and published on behalf of Government.

61. There are a few more things I have to report. They relate to my first tour and the report dealing with it. At Indore on that occasion I had seen a number of old manuscripts belonging to a Paṇāṅkika in the service of the Shrimant Sardar Kibe Saheb. The Paṇāṅkika had then been recently carried off by plague. The manuscripts consequently practically belonged to the Sardar and he made them over some time ago to the Bombay Asiatic Society.

62. In paragraph 13 of that report I have referred to my being informed that manuscripts belonging to three or four Shastris at
Indore, who had died of plague, were being secretly sold and probably not to persons who would be interested in preserving them. I wrote to the Dewan Saheb, urging upon him the desirability of seeing what he could do to prevent such destruction. I do not know if in the midst of other affairs of the State he has been able to keep in mind my suggestion.

63. I had noted a copy of Śūlapāṇi's commentary on Yājñavalkya at Indore and one of Nāradasmrīti with Kalyāṇabhaṭṭa's commentary at Bundi. Professor Jolly of Würzburg, who has made Dharma one of his specialities, noticed them and asked me to get copies made of them for him, saying at the same time that the results of my tour seemed to him very important. Writing again he said that he would duly point out the importance of the discovery of the Ms. of Śūlapāṇi in a paper he intended writing on the commentaries on Yājñavalkya. By the kindness of the owner of this manuscript and of the Bundi Darbar I obtained a loan of both and sent copies of them to the Professor. I may mention that the owner of Śūlapāṇi did not even know that he had it, when I went to him to borrow it.

64. Of similar service has my report been to another scholar. Whenever I noted down in the report the existence of portions of Baudhāyanaśrautaśūtra, a complete copy of which has been hitherto wanting, I had in my mind Dr Caland of Utrecht, who is engaged on an edition of the Śūtra. He specified the portions for want of which he could not proceed with his work and asked for a loan of the original manuscripts containing them or at least copies of them. Not only he personally, he added, but the whole scientific world that had an interest for the study of Sanskrit, would be much obliged to me, if I could procure them for him. Fortunately some of the owners at Dhar, Gwalior and Ujjain were liberal-minded enough to lend them and I was able to send the originals themselves to him through the India Office. They have been duly returned. Some of the manuscripts, Dr. Caland says, "were indeed of the greatest importance." There are still some other parts for which he would like to have additional materials. The three persons at Gwalior who had one or more of these died soon after my visit to that place. I have tried hard, but so far without success, to get these for him.

65. The manuscript of Vikramavilāsa in the State Collection at Gwalior, to which I referred in paragraph 50 of my previous report, I was at last able to get through the kindness of the Darbar and the Resident. I made use of the pṛاستasī in it in a paper I read before the Bombay Asiatic Society on the occasion of its centenary.

66. Since the date of my last report I have received a list of Javan Singh's Collection at Kishangad referred to therein in paragraph 47. The list does not contain anything of much importance.

67. In paragraph 50 I have referred to the fact that a manuscript shown me at Shahpura (Rajputana) as one of Pāvaña's Bhāshya on Yajurveda turned out to be one of Mahidhara's Bhāshya on the Vāja-sancya-Saṁhitā. I have since noticed in a list from Rewah, received
through a friend, the entry: Vedabhāṣṭya by Rīvana-Mahīdhara. This shows that Mahīdhara's Bhāṣṭya on the Yajus is taken by some to be the Rāvaṇabhāṣṭya on that Veda.

68. I have again to thank the Political Officers with whom I came in contact for their uniform courtesy and to the Maharajah of Bikaner also who seemed to take much interest in my work. To the Honourable the Agent to the Governor General, Rajputana, and the various Darbars in Rajputana I am extremely obliged for exemption from the vexatious inspection by Customs Officers.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

SHRIDHAR R. BHANDARKAR,
Professor of Sanskrit.
APPENDIX I.

Inscriptions at Jaisalmer.

No. I.

From the Chintâmanî-Pârśvanâtha Temple.

The inscription is intended to be a praśasti of the festivities in connection with the consecration, etc., of the temple. Most of it is in prose. A long genealogy is given of the S'reshthins (merchants) who built the temple, who were of Ukeśa varna and Raṅkânvaya. The notable pilgrimages of some of their ancestors are mentioned with their dates. Then a Kharatara paṭṭâvali is given from Jinakusâla to Jinarâja and Jinavardhana is mentioned as being on the Paṭṭâ at that time. It was Jinavardhana, who had the pratishtâ (consecration) of the temple built by the S'reshthins performed and also that of the idols therein in Saṃvat 1473 during the reign of Lakshmaṇarâja. The praśasti was composed by Jayasāgarâṇâi.

No. II.

From the same.

This is wholly in verse. The first two stanzas are devoted to the praise of Pârśvanâtha and the third one to that of Jaisalmer. Then a genealogy is given of king Lakshmaṇa. The kings of the dynasty are mentioned as belonging to the Yadukula. The genealogy given begins with Jaitrasimha. Jaitrasimha’s sons were Mûladeva (or Mûlarâja) and Ratnasimha, who righteously protected the earth as Lakshmaṇa and Râma did of old. Ratnasimha’s son was Ghaṭasimha who like a lion tearing up the elephants in the shape of the Mlechchhas forcibly wrested their Vapradari from them. Mûlarâja’s son was Devarâja; Devarâja’s son was Kehari and the latter’s son was Lakshmaṇa. The last one receives general praise in six stanzas in which it is stated that he worshipped the feet of Sûrîśvara, Sâgarachandra. Then a paṭṭâvali of the Chândra Kula from Jinakusâla to Jinarâja is given. By the advice of Jinarâja the building of the temple was commenced by the Kharatara samgha during the reign of Lakshmaṇa and by his orders Sâgarachandra in Saṃvat 1459 (Nârâyanvariṃ) placed the idol in the innermost sanctuary (garbhagriha). Under the direction of Jinavardhana the temple was completed in Saṃvat 1473. Then the city which has got such a temple, the king in whose reign it was built, the Samgha who built it and those who would see it in future ages are all congratulated on their good fortune. The Jina temple is called Lakshmaṇa-vihâra. The praśasti was composed by Sadhu Kirtirâya.

No. III.

From the same.

This refers to the setting up of an idol of Pârśvanâtha in the temple in Saṃvat 1493 during the reign of Vayarasimha.
No. IV.

From a temple of Lakshminarayana.

In this Jaisalmer is spoken of as an invincible city of Vanigvises (merchants) and as ruled over by princes of the Yadava dynasty. Then a genealogy is given from Jaitrasimha to Lakshmana, omitting the Ratnasimha and Ghatasimha of inscription No. II. Lakshmana's son, Vairisimha, got the pratisheda of the temple made in the Vikrama Samvat 1494 (atita or past) and Bhaitika Samvat 813 (pravartamdana or current). Then exactly the same genealogy as above is given again in prose from Raula Jataisha and it is stated that the Paachya-yatanaprasada was pratishedita (consecrated) by Vairisimha for the prospering of all desires and for pleasing Lakshmikanta.

No. V.

From the Sambhavanatha Temple.

(Jhe temple underneath which is the big Bhandar).

Jaisalmer is herein praised as being acknowledged even by powerful Mlechchha kings to be difficult to capture even for thousands of enemies. Then is praised the family of the Yadu kings. A genealogy of the vamsa (dynasty) in prose follows, beginning with Raula Sri Jaitasimha, with Raula Sri Dudo interposed between Ratnasimha and Ghatasimha. Kehari is here called Kesari. The genealogy ends with Vairasimha. A paatvali of the Kharatara Vidhipaksha of the Chandra kula (a sect of the Jainas) follows, beginning with Vardhamana. It mentions a few facts, literary and others, in connection with many of the names, most of which facts are well-known. The following may be noted:—

That Jinadatta (the successor of Jinavallabha) had the title Yugapradhana given him by Ambikadevi. This is referred to in Jayasagara's commentary on Jinadatta's Samdehadolavali.

The paatvali ends with Jinabhadra. Jinavardhana has been omitted, naturally for the reason given in Kiatt's Onomasticon (page 34). Jinabhadra's character, learning and teaching are praised. By his advice Viharas (temples) were built and idols put up in various places and in places like Anahillapataka, the Vidhipaksha Sradha-sangha formed treasures of pearls of knowledge (libraries). His feet, the inscription says, are worshipped by the kings Vairisimha, Tryambakadasa and Kshitindra.

A genealogy is then given of the builders who were of the Chopad gotra, Ukesa vamsa. In Samvat 1487 they performed a pilgrimage to Satrumjaya and Raivata and made the Paucha-myuddayana in 1490. By the advice of Jinabhadra they built this temple in 1494 during the reign of Vairisimha. The festivities in connection with the pratisheda took place in Samvat 1497, when Jinabhadra put up 300 idols of Sambhavanatha and others, Sambhavanatha being the Mularayaka among them. Vairisimha took part
in the festivities. Then a wish is expressed for the victory, throughout the three worlds, of some Jinakūśala Munindra of the Kharatara Vidhipaksha. The Prāṣasti was composed by Vāchanāchārya Soma- kuṇjara, pupil of Vāchaka Jayaśāgara.

No VI.

From the same.

This contains the Kharatara paṭṭāvali referred to, in my report on the Śvetāmbara Jaina Mss purchased for Government in 1883-84, as mentioned in Dharmaśāgara’s Pravachanaparikshā (Dr. Bhandarkar’s Report for 1883-84, page 152). It goes down to Jinabhadrā, omitting Jinavardhana. The inscription states that a tapahpattikā was put up by the advice of Vāchanāchārya Ratnamurtigaṇi in Sāmvat 1595, while Jinabhadrā was on the patta and Chāḍhigadeva on the throne.

No. VII.

From the Śāntinātha Temple.

This is an inscription mostly in Gujarāṭi prose. Towards the end there is one sentence in Sanskrit prose and two Sanskrit verses. In the beginning also there is one Sanskrit verse. The performance of pilgrimages and building of temples are recorded in the inscription. It contains the following genealogy:—Rāula Chāḍhigadeva, Rāula Devakarṇa, Rāula Jayatasimha. The last is mentioned as being on the throne in Sāmvat 1583 and Luṇakarṇa as being heir-apparent. Devakarṇa is mentioned as ruling in Sāmvat 1536, in which year it seems the pratīṣṭhā of this temple was made. Jayantasimha is referred to as being on the throne in Sāmvat 1581 also.

No. VIII.

From the temple of Mahādeva.

It records the building of the temple by the queen of Rāula Bhūmasimha, son of Mahārāula Harirāja, in Sāmvat 1673 (atika), S’aka 1538 and Bhāṭika 993 (pravartamāṇa).

No. IX.

From the temple of Gīridhārīji.

It records that the temple of Purushottama was built in Sāmvat 1852 or S’aka 1717 (pravartamāṇa) by Mahārāula Mūlarājaji. The inscription is partly in Sanskrit and partly in a dialect of Hindi.

No. X.

From the temple of Hanumān.

It records the building of six temples by Mahārāva Mūlarājaji in 4898 of the Yudhisṭhīrā era, Sāmvat 1854 or S’aka 1719.
The above inscriptions along with a pättivali noticed in the report give some information and a few definite dates relating to the Mahârâvals of Jaisalmer as shown in the following list:—

1. Jaitasimha or Jaiitrasisimha.
3. Ratnasimha, son of 1 (does not occur in the list at pages 290-1, Duff’s Chronology).
4. Dûdâ (in No. V only).
5. Ghaṭasimha, son of 3.
8. Lakshmana, son of 7, Samvat 1459, 1473.
9. Vairisimha or Vayarasimha, son of 8 (No. IV), Samvat 1493, 1494 (Bhatîka Samvat 813), 1497.
11. Devakarna, Samvat 1536.
13. Luṇakarna, probably a son of 12.
14. Mâladeva (Baladeva in Duff’s Chronology), second son of 13 (Tod), Samvat 1612.
15 Harirâja.
16. Bhîmasimha, son of 15, Samvat Vikrama 1673, or Bhatîka 993.

25. Mahârâvala Mûlarâja, Samvat 1852, 1854.

The Râvals or Mahârâvals of Jaisalmer belonged to the Bhaṭṭi tribe and seemed to have sometimes used an era which they called Bhatîka era and which was later than the Samvat era by 680-1 years.

- In only three of the above inscriptions the genealogy begins with Jaiitrasisimha, viz., Nos. II, IV and V. In No. IV, however, the names of Ratnasimha and Ghatasimha are altogether omitted, probably because they were not in the direct line from Mûlarâja, Ratnasimha being his brother and Ghaṭasimha his nephew.

Ratnasimha has been omitted from the list of the Jaisalmer Mahârâvals at the end of Prinsep and of Duff’s Chronology. But No. V distinctly says that Ratnasimha was king and No. II that Mûlarâja and Ratnasimha enjoyed the earth as did Lakshmana and Râma of old. According to Tod’s account, however, both Mûlarâja and Ratnasimha fell together in 1295 a. d. during the siege of Jaisalmer by Ghorî Allâuddin’s army.* Very likely, though Ratnasimha was not actually crowned, he might have been regarded as joint king, as the comparison in No. II to Râma and Lakshmana would seem to indicate.

* Rajasthâna II, p. 228.
Out of the three inscriptions above referred to Dūdā or Dūdū is mentioned only in V. His name, however, occurs in the list at the end of Prinsep, though not in Duff’s list. Dūdū was not in the direct line, but was elected Raval some years subsequent to the fall of Mūlarāja and Ratnasimha.

From Tod’s account we know that Devarāja was carried off by fever during the siege in which his father fell. So his name appears neither in Duff’s list nor in that in Prinsep. Of the above inscriptions only No. V speaks distinctly of his having been a king. The other two simply say he was son of Mūlarāja. These two inscriptions, however, speak in the same terms of also some of those who, it has never been doubted, were actually on the throne.
APPENDIX II.

1.—दानवाक्यसमूह.
पुराणामवाक्यानि परामृष्य वुधः सह।
हतो योगीश्चरेणायं दानवाक्यसमूहः॥

2.—प्रतापमालंड.

श्रीम् प्रीटप्रतापवित्रितिजत् सूपारचक्कुदामणिमरमीचिमंजरीनीराज्ञितचरणकरनथ्र
श्रीममहराजाधिराजसुदेशमाधवपति मन्दनाधिरसचनदीराजपकनाधितः
कम्हानंदेशसुन्तरिकपारं करलकलस्वरुपारणे प्राणिति
शष्णता कराराज्ञितसुभाषितमानापोदकदुस्तरस्वागराधितिनम्नसक्कलन
समदृढ़नीरसनावाचरणविदमकर्रुमुकहसुरकरीमि कौमदीमुद्धासुधा
करसुकदशाख्विशिष्यादसदाधिव्याप्तमत्विचाराचतुरीमभक्ति-वितांभितांतरमहाजनारीमप्रतापसृगापरिवर्तिनौ वताराचितांमणिदिन
करलशाखाकलस्महराजाधिराजश्रीमप्रतापसृगापरिवर्ति॥ प्रतापमालंडामिथि समय
विनियये॥

3.—सिंहसुधानिधि.
The Colophon reads: श्रीकाशीराजकुउकसम्याकसम्प्रदायप्रतापमालंड
dयुंचुरंकंकड़लंकसम्याकसम्प्रदाय श्रीमहराजाधिराजशाहतुनन्तम् श्रीराजाधिराज
dयु देवसिंहसुधवस॥

4.—वस्तुपालप्रशास्ति.
क्षब्धः कम्भपि सुपुराजप्रादशोभितः।
अम्बरोचितसुधोपन्यासः प्रयः प्रयः इ।
कीतंसोमसुधा मुतानि वचुरासंडानि रेजः सुधा
कुंडानीव नव त्रिविषपदेह स्वापनि मिनुव विभी।
स्त्रानागचतुर्किका इत सदा सावससागरात्मक्ष—
त्रिशालाब्जुकलियाधिकरणसुजयांजन वेषः बस्मि: इ इ||

* * *
...भाषीकृतिराक्षसमूहमुनितीः।
яхापते जाते हुतवृतिभिः मोङ्नुपवते-
हर: श्रीरामं गौ: करसितक्षता युक्तमुच्छतुः॥ १३॥

* * *
तत्तैःकृतिनित्रसमुहमिताक्षोदकरणमावः-
क्षमामृत्रितितितिविनामुखपरिश्रेष्ठाय पारस्करः।
छिद्रासंजगदायन कर्पुरोषवात्स्त्रमांडः-
छिद्रासिधरगायकपे तुगात यस्य क्षणाबिलिकु:॥ २०॥

* * *
जैनं परसुरामचकार शहसाराणोरासम ( म । ) वृत्तान-
द्रागीः कुकुम्माग्रहीदापि गुणचके समरभचिनिः...२९॥

* * *
अग्रोजगांगावतं कलकक्षमहासाहसिकं जुटकथे
श्रीराजवर्णप्रासत्स व्यतुन्त स निजस्वोङ्गमार्धपुः...२३॥

* * *
श्रव्वचच्चत्तर कंतिकामधवतस्ते ( i.e. वीरचन्द्रेन ) पारिवः।
श्रीमान् भानीं मुद्रा वाचमुर्वाच श्रवणामृतम्॥ २९॥

* * *
श्रीमण्डेती निजश्रीबारणपदवर्त्तापृष्टी प्राति( प्राति! )थोगा-
दुःख्य दास्यभि विश्वं जयतु नवनवं धाम तन्नत्रभित्रम्॥ १०॥
इत्युस्मत् प्रतिपूणर्य श्रीवर्षकालिय ती।
श्रीमण्डुमुनि दत्ती वित्तमात्मभावमिनः॥ ११॥

* * *
कीर्तिकशमित्तप्पमंनमः: सों इलजनि तस्य तुनुजः।
सिद्धराजगुणमुर्वणमाजः संस्नो विश्वदर्पणकल्यः॥ ४४॥
दकुल्धारणां गुणागुणपरिश्रानीविचिति मनमहे
तस्य प्रैतिसादनःमणमणः थोनाङ्व निविताः।
देवस्तीर्यक्षेत्र केवलनिधि [ तु ] विचारिणां गुढ़ः
मुरिः: श्रीहरिमद्र एव गुणधि: सिद्धेश एवाधिः॥ ४५॥

* * *
वीरश्रीवी(व! )धारिन कीर्तिके सिद्धाध्यान्नार्यानव
जेतू यात्रायि जसूडपुरानंकरुपयः पीछः।
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7.—हर्षीरमदुरम्दनः

सविस्मयितवः। संहै ते जजःपालः। अत्र महामायमःििियाणनिपतस्म कतिपयाः
संजीवितचाचकास्य तजीतिचाचमुःतरिति वज्ञस्वर्णशास्यकृतीर्बिव वते मन्नसि।
यथादा।

दुर्गक्षट्याकोटकोट्युपदीमहीरालेनामार्याः
नस्ति महीमालवर्णववस्यिधुबककाताहाय्याहत।।
श्रीसिद्धोनेन निर्पेये माये क्रतकारिपु वार्देदिशायिनाथः
प्रवाहेनुपुष्टितस्वरूपगितजनजङ्गकातालोपि मैत्री।।

8.—हर्षीरमदुरम्दनः

सचमकाचिरकांप। अहों महायजयनास्य विकस्मविकारितवरि कांपित
सुधुसन्भिरवेशं। यथादा। मधु मधुसंस्वद्विजविष्रवप्रमे तत्पत्तुवैस्वमवुम
सराभिकोषपर सिद्धराजस्तुज्ञनानो कार्देशाविष्रवस्यस्तुवेस्य सएसागर
सिद्धराजस्तुज्ञनानो कार्देशाविष्रवस्यस्तुवेस्य सएसागर
वतानन मन्नस्यन्देश नस्ति औत्तमनायत सिद्धिविजीक्षेत। सोऽर्दशास।।
कोचकुलेरनि सचिचे न शंकायथसो सिद्ध गाण्डर्द्वस्त्रास्मात।।
लेषं क्षणोदद्रभावेनतामायस्तु सचिचे द्वाम्चली बहु कस्मात।।

अधुना तु सचिवपतितवरिचानमप्राञ्चवववष्पववार्येव संहै जनितो
स्वायो अस्मातः प्रति प्रणाणार्य प्रणाणेभ्रुत् बलायविर्मनानकम्मुद्रादभूः।
श्रीसिद्धमूल्यात्। इस्तु स्वस्तीविततुराचमु वचनचलचाचक्षुरेऽकारिपि
प्रणाणनकारिपि। इस्तु दस्तरत्वज्जोतववानरतव उक्तालिनिकुलः कुलिरको
तुक्तीवक्रोक्षिणभुः जत्तोि मातमहीर्दुरम्दन्त। प्रणाणोऽक्षेत। इस्माक्षमाकसिहृ
सवासिप संक्तस्ववः।।

* Karmadhar, of दू—तं and प—क्षं.
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9.—ह्यूमियरमदमदैनः

तेजः। देव महीसङ्गमो मृदु म[* :] सतवपा वकः प्रपंच वच्यायः। पंचग्रामसाग्रामपंकः स्त्रियनबनयनय पथः सीक्षणमात्र दिनकेणाणाविष्ट्रयामी निजरसनां स्फुर्णार्निर्बिंदुः। स्थायिकमिति तर्पणांगिन मुग्धामणि वलुपांगिन प्रार्थः। तदगतिर तत्ततिमित्र प्रसन्ननिनिर्बिंदुः सहस्राणि खंडजनां मम ह्यूमियरवीर प्रार्थ प्रायणप्रयतः।

10.—ह्यूमियरमदमदैनः

तदिद्दानि म्लेच्छचक्रवत्तिनमपमध्यबौद्धस्तितनमपनुप्रविष्ट एव महपतीदुरुस्तो-करोदतु देशस्तितनमस्तरां गृष्णम्। तद्यमति भवतामीषः प्रभेय नरबुद्धां विघटनीय इति तेजःपालस्य कृणः एवमेवः।

11.—ह्यूमियरमदमदैनः

पुरुषोत्तमद्विवेद्यां महतिभरत्तिश्योऽणी दीर्घतेत महदीनोपि प्रमुखपारः। तथां। म्लेच्छश्रवणविवि देशबे स्त्रियम्लेच्छश्रवणविवि तातकारितया प्रयाणकर्य मृत्युमर्देष्टि सारिः तया निर्तियामाश्चायां च पार्श्वदेशः महदीनवेद्यां महदीनवेद्यां श्रीश्रीकर्त्तवयं। तदिद्दानि।

श्रीसोपर्सहोदयसिः ह्राराबेंर्मोतिमेहः हेदानाथः।

dिशोष्ठ जेतु स्तुतमार्कादिसिः स्मीतेशमहाप्रमुनः॥

अवः च आंशाय बुद्धवाचसांसर्गोऽक्रमयः मनदीदेन्दनस्य प्रेमपादपास्य परिधानपर्ययन्ते फलः कल्प्यतुमिव त्व्रितितर्मार्गायम् झराभामासुः मुराराममहसिः। श्रीभीस्वेतः। भविष्यः। अहो बुद्धान्तमतिक्यावतिका संप्रतिस्फली सम्।

यतदा मद्दर्शस्त्रवर्धार्धस्य वर्धकमेव सोमायमार्बितव्या संहतावेश स्फुरृती चिन्तकाव्-
व्यश्चार्बाधीविवि हुसंदे महीतदापि ग्राहदेशाधिनती विकमादिव्यसहजार्जनानि लाभियः। मेदिकंका यथाक मित्रां क्रियात्। तदिद्दानीमध्यवयवनममध्यहोऽसाहावे इङ्ख्याक्यम् तथें सहायसमदेशाधिपदर्मा जनायः।

उदयानां मृस्ताना सत्यमेवान्ति नित्यधिमितीहिमीमितिविषयः।

कौटिसंतोः। सर्वत्रः सुधुमद्राहिस्योऽषि प्रायस्मद्यविषय।॥
12.---हिंदीयस्मयदर्दन.

स्त्रिम श्रीमहाराजेरवासाहिनी संग्रामसिध्धेश्वर श्रीरामराजनाथ। अभन्न-भिन्ननिष्ठुरश्रीतिर्दशकराणं लक्ष्मी प्रहरिपीढ़ितमयस्तुः। तथा तु सत्यमात्र फरक क्षण क्षणयथालयम्। यदा गुरुराध्यात्मक प्रविष्टातिसम प्रतिद्वन्द्वेन न्याय वा यज्ञकस्त्रिकागमनं समसंगमं संगमवर्यम्। तरां भिन्निष्ठत्वसघारार्गोत्तरणाय तत्री करणायं कर्त्याणां इति।

13.---हिंदीयस्मयदर्दन।

सत्रिमश्च च। सुमारुकनाराधिकारंदेन विचारितं संग्रामसिध्धेश्वर सिद्धनैतिकोऽदेतेन प्रमोददेवीभारोपिताः सः। स खण्डोऽतिदेवीमाणारं विनाय न विनाय विनायुः। तक्षिरक्षिरस्मीयार्थार्थाय द्वीपार्थाय तस्य वाचमोचर: संग्रामसिध्धेश्वर जगार्थविनिर्जितं तथा चरित्राय।

अन्यन्तर युद्धशालाय न श्रीरामं सीमस्तुरस्तुरस्तुर्मन्त्रं योद्धारूढः बलीः च प्राणचतुः जाति प्रस्तुतः। चैव तथा विशुद्धाजननेइ तादृश्यो च जानं च चैव तथाय विवधाति विश्वरक्रमाभूता गवुश्रृं:।

सानुक्षरण च।

हस्तद्रव्य वित वाहूकोविद्विषः श्रीशर्मोस्थितिश्च, दृष्टान्तावर्मरे मुन्द्रयस्तुः श्रीसंघरुपान्ति ( नू? )।

रविवेंद्र विहृतोपि विमुखम्ययस्तु श्रीमाणान्तग्राहे-श्रीरामकित्वाइकं देवायं ( ये नमुना) नारायणसंवर्तायिने।

सापसंप्रयति ततो विनिष्ठा: समाधानंसद्ध संवर्तावारं जयंति जयंति जयंति।
14. —हभोगमदम्येनः।

तेन पुनः प्रतिपाध्येताय पुरावाषयेऽपावसृष्टिसम्बन्धतपेयमाणकपियविद्व मद्यमस्त-द्रव्यों विद्वानीद्विगृहीताधे ज्ञातं विकारी हैिक्षणी तदवस्य हभोगमहासिद्धेः। विनवर्ती निवेदितुमयापि न कोपे दूः समुपीतः।

15. —चक्षुपाणिभिजयकाव्यः।

पुनानुि पादांतपदद्विन्द्रवीमतरन्नमस्तविशिष्टस्तो ( विषयः ) वः।

तदाहतकार्यदुःसरामारसितद्वितीयोऽकेतनापणः।

प्रामोद्ये शाक्तिप्रमुंखेऽद्वारानां नामेनुिद्वितकोविशलाहः।

गणेि नैयोगिश्च याप्रसुतितवेदः केशवपादेशावः।

तदनानुिण्यथाईव विरोचनविश्वं भाटी नरवाहनः।

शुद्धः समस्यमयतया स्पितानि श्रुङ्खंतराणीव बर्ताति यस्य।

देवो विक्रशाविन कद्यपास्य तत्स्थाति नाम ब्रम्हसु भूतः।

व्रीमयस्य ज्ञातस्यपशूरिः परो्यस्यायां भाद्र समस्तलेखः।

आधुनितः प्रशासितः सैंकटनामानन्दकृतिविश्वः।

असुत षुष्ठः स ब्रम्हस्य विवाहातोऽथाम तुतः सुतामा।

नवोपनीतामि पाविनेष्ट्रेषुणाणि न क्षमते शब्देति।

झारिन्यं समयाति ब्रम्हस्य श्रीदेशं इत्येऽ हि यस्य नाम।

व्रतं शत्तिन्द्रकार्यकं धारा तिति जाडशेषावक्यकः।

क्षमीभें नाम तदीयसुनानुप्रविशः सुचनस्य क्षयः।

क्षेत्रविभीमानि विनापि कार्ति कर्ता हरें। नरार्त्माधिनेनिति।

चंद्रावधानपरायणेऽव कुष्युः यस्य न नीरा गृः।

श्रीमोजेनेवदृष्टिराजितायं तथा समाप्तचंद्रश्रीनिशायां।

विनापि सुद्राभित्वाद्वेषः हरेकुर्वं हरेकर्तकर्तुः।

वा कर्तुः काव्यमिदं तदीय जितं यद्याधिक्विजविन्दवः।

भाषायिनस्तुहिमस्य शर्स्तमन्दापि सुधायाम: क्रि न दिवासहः।

उदारस्वरेऽसुहृतः प्रजानां प्रजापति किर्त्वेदपारिवर्भबः।

ब्रम्हस्य त्वं दनुभाषराणि विचारिकर्तन विजिरादिराजः।
16. Buddhisågara's Vyåkarana, शब्दिक्षमलक्षणः.
Part of leaf 1 is torn. The first few words are:

नवा प्रवद्वो कल्पपूर्णपत्रवान-क्षत्रव कल्पकापुढ़कद्रोहे

End:— श्रीभुदिन सागराचार्याः प्राधायो महादेवेऽ।

पांचावयो स चाकायो (प्रत्यः) जागदित्वतविभिषयः || 2 ......

श्रीविजयमाधित्यनर्मद्रोहात् साधीति यति सपा[स]हस्ते।

श्रीविकाजातिपुरे तदायं द्विवं मथा सतसहस्तल्यं || 19 ||

17.— उद्विद्याचार्यकारसाधनः.

Beg.:— विद्वद्यानुकृतकारद्विगत्र विविधया।

प्रतीत्वेदुराजिन कायालिंकारसंग्रहः ||

End:— महाश्रीप्रतीति दुराजिन जन्त्रिविचारामुद्विद्याचारकरसाधनसहह्यु्तौ

प्रेक्षाधायः ||

भीमासारामप्राचार्यपुस्तकमित्रायोत्कलमानिक्यक्षणशा

साहित्यश्रीपुराणेकुकममयोः सौरिपादङ्गमेधातुः।

श्रद्धा सौजन्यमार्गोऽर्जुनमुकुलान्तीतवल्यालकाशैतु

कायालिंकारसरि लघुविद्वेदमानांकाणः श्रीदुराजः।

18.—कल्पनर्ताविवेचः.

Beg.:— वघ्न्वेन विवृत्त दुराजिन मन्द्रुधिममिश्रापि।

किलेता कल्पनतायं तस्य विवेयकिमार्णमुः।

सूर्यवंयद्रमसार्विति

End:— श्रीर कल्पनर्त्रशेषे कल्पनाविवेचे नौौंकारनिन्यो नाम चतुर्यः

परिश्रेर: समाल: || 60 || श्रीर समालः कल्पनाविवेचकाम्भित्वः कल्पनर्त्रशेषः।

कल्पनर्त्रमार्णाः न ये कल्पनाः विदुः। कल्पनर्त्रशेषे निम्नतस्तदिक्षीतः।
अपर इति। एकासिमिन्त्रगोऽ कुटेकपरिवर्तं संग्रामोऽहंतुतया
श्रयं पेवन्यः।
पद्मकल्पशिवासितं कर्मणुतात्तिरुरं विरीहे स्रिंधे।
शेषध्वजो विजयतं चेष्टायुधं प्रतिपालकायोः।

19.——व्यक्तिविवेकः।
अनुमानान्तरमें स्वर्गयथै भवने: प्रागाष्ट्रितं। व्यक्तिविवेकं कुर्क्ते प्रणामम्
माहिमापरवाचं। मु[(हृ)] क्वियमारसदुशाश्मदति मे प्रशतो नास्तेवेन तजगति सर्वंहोरं
यतु...॥ श्रीधरस्यान्नमुर्ग महाकावः रथाकाध्यबिष्णुः। व्यक्तिविवेकं विदयः

20.——काव्यमीमांसा।
Beg:—अथतः काव्यं मौलिकिष्यमहे यथोगदिर्दशं श्रीकंठः (ठ ठ) पर्मेष्ठि—
कूलालंकारन्तुप्रस्तयं शिष्यं भवावनम् स्वंयोरखश्राङ्गरिथयं स्वांतिवाक्षिरः।
वेषु सारस्वतेऽं और्त्रीयसामापि वंशं। काव्यपुरुषं। आसीतं तं च सर्वसममयविदं
दिन्येन चक्षुया | portion containing a letter broken off | दितिनं शूरुः— कुत्तरतान्त्रिनीं प्रजानु हितकार्यत्वं प्रजापति: काव्यविचारवर्तनावी
प्राप्तकं। शौच्दशाश्चितकरणी दिन्येः: काव्यविवेचं [portion broken off]
सात्तंचं प्रोचाचं तं च कविध्वस्तं सहस्त्रं समान्नात्तुं। उ — कुमुक्तिगाहं,
शिरितिर्यं धुर्येनाम: अनुप्राकशं प्रतेता यमे यमकानि...दः। शब्रेष्यं
शेषं: वास्तवं पुरुस्तं: औषयस्नायकायन: अतिशं पराशारः अर्वं केनपुलथं
उद्योगार्कारिकं .........करीक्षणि दुःखतं:। रामाध्यृक्तिकं बंदरमेकरः।
देवाधिकारं विष्ण:। गुणोत्तरनिक्यपुनमुन्य: ...कृ पूज्यं श्रेयश्चार्ण्य विर—
वच्यांचुरः। इत्यकारं च प्रकृतिवाचारत सा करिचुबिचिथिदे। इतीं प्रयोगकर्क—
गतिति सक्षिप्तसङ्क्षेपणन्तःवाप्त्यें अश्वद... (शाबिक ?)।}$

---

( स्तं प्रथममातिकरणमी यादिः।)
इति पुनःतथार्थायो व्याक्त्यां भाष्यं महत्वपति ||
समासव्यस्तिप्रमम: सैठ शिष्यविहिताय न:
विशे.... पुश्त्री प्रथमेन तु उप्ययसी ||
इत्य न: कालमुगः कालाक्षणविकारणं ||
इत्य सा कालमुगः मीमांसा यत्र वागुवः:
वागुवः न स जानाति..... यस्यमां ||
*यथावर्तमां: संक्षिप्त मुनीनाम मतबिन्दरं
व्याकरोत्कायम्यमीमांत्रं कबिद्वृतो राजसेवः: ||
कालमुगः सयायं कविरहस्य प्रथमिकरणे प्रथमोध्याय: शाखस्यं प्रधः: ||
End: इति राजसेवःकालमुगः कविरहस्य प्रथमिकरणे
कालमुगः नम समीक्षा अद्यादशोध्याय: || समां चेंदर कविरहस्य
प्रथमिकरणग्रंथवादशोध्याय: ||

* Explained at top as यायायाद्रुकोलिप्नः:

21.—कालमुगः।

इति राजानकमम्मटालकि: संय १९१९ आविन शुद्धि १४ तु अभेद
श्री मदनहित्याङकसे समस्तराजावलीविधिजितमहाराजाधिराजपरमम्मटालक—
उभयप्रबलवचार्यप्रसादप्रेमप्रतापप्रतिमूर्त्तकम्मटालकम्मटाल—
श्री कुमारपालवकल्याणविज्ञायायशे...... दिखापितः

22.—कमेठिपाकः।

संवत १९१९ वर्ष अभेद श्रीमतकर्तके समस्तराजावलीविधिनितमहाराजा—
धिराजश्रीमत्विलिपिदेवकल्याणविज्ञायच नव शाहप्रावहन रंचो श्रीमधुकरे सवर्मुद्राव्या—
पाराप्रायस्तत्त्वस्फूर्तितिवर्तकः कल्य व्यक्तिभी सन्तुक्तुकत्वाकारणाश्रीकृष्णानन्दकल्याणविज्ञायायशे......
राजसेवः कालमुगः श्री श्री कुमारपालकल्याणविज्ञायायशे......

* कमेठिपाकः केलिता
23. — पुष्करसंग्रहायकृति.

पुष्करसंग्रहायकृति वृत्तियां समाकलनः।
रचिता वुष्करसंग्रहायकृति श्रीहरिभ्रान्ती:॥
पूर्णार्थिककारणं विकासतो व्रजति शुक्रांचयः॥
शुक्य शुकाचरे पुष्यं शरयं च नक्ते॥...

No. 397 of the D. C. Collection of 1880–1 reads पूर्णार्थिक and शुक्रांचरे for पूर्णार्थिक and शुक्रांचरे for शुक्रांचरे.

24. — खतरपियावली.

तथा नुवरिकदा दिश्यिनगरे समाकलस्त्रत संदिशिवतिविशिष्टार्थ प्रागुक्त-निक्रियादर्शमणात् संप्रारतिविशेषन मौजीदीनसुंचापणे प्रेमोगोपालः कदः स्तथा
भन्दाल्पूणेन निवासः कारिक्स्तदारी धनपालः श्रावको बस्व्य वर्तिसाहिना बहु महासं दशस्तश सरीषीयायः इति गोपनस्यांग्रा कृता तदर्दिनियायः श्रावका जिंने
नमामि वा जिनचनद्रयुक्ते नमामि नाभिमित्त प्रतिभावतो बस्मुः एवंकिता: श्रीजिनचनद्रयुक्तो महाप्रभुका जातास्तदेव च पदार्थया प्रवण्यौपूर्यदेव चच्चुर्तिपूर्णे सादिशयं जिनचनद्रति नाम दाताभिमित्त तत् एवंसे व्यवस्था जाता

25. — खतरपियावली.

तथा श्रासनमदेवतावचनार्थत पवाचार्योऽस्मि नामन आदी सुप्रभावस्य जिन्दगीस्य
स्थापना प्रकटा

26. — खतरपियावली.

एकदा श्रीउद्योगवस्तूर्य महाविद्यां श्रुतकीयापार्थ विद्याय अर्थां व्यवस्थितिः
तिसंतस्यानां ६३ स्वविदाणां व्यवस्थितिश्रुत्य: पञ्चार्थ समागतालातुः श्रीगुहः
सदृशं पाठायातेः सम... अथ श्रीउद्योगस्वरूपिनीश्वरितिशिष्यार्थिवर्ण्यः मालवके
केदारान्तिपण सार्ळा शरुः केव पश्चिममेवसाध्यक्षे गणमरोपिनीश्वरिति
शिक्षणायोऽस्मि निप्पतत्स्त्रतेऽध्यात्मजमे आकाशे रोहिणीश्रवकमेवे बुधुरुपमति-
प्रेमेश्वरितिविपन्न क्षुभुक्तकान्त सांप्रदायिको विवेचन विवेचने यतो यथार्थ महत्त्वे हि:
कियऱ्ये स प्रसिद्धिमातृ भव्यतीलि अकौत्त्र युक्ता ज्ञानीलांणि शिक्षेश्वरं स्वामिन्
वर्यं महत्त्या शिष्यान्: सो युक्तमाः शिक्षागुणसं ततासतस्तुपरि क्यों कान्ता वस्ति:
कियां ततो युक्तभिक्षु वाल्मीकीमाणित्या तत्सदृशे शिष्यां काव्यं ग्रुम्ब आनीय दर्ते गुज्यमिति तत्थूँं संत्रिविशा श्शिते [ : ] शिष्याणां
मस्तोऽन्त निशिपति .....अये ते ज्ञानीतिर्यं शिष्यां आचार्यंद्व प्राध्युपुरक स्वामिरं
चक्षुः: अनैषक: सनिश्च्यं वर्धेमाणसूरे: १ ज्ञानीतिष्ठ इष्टेनद्वीपः: शिष्या: ६२
एवं चचतुर्याति ५४ ग्यायः: संजाताः:

27.—खरात्रप्पछावकी.
तथा जेसमेखलगरे जयचब्जकारित्यविष्टामणिश्चर्चनाप्रतिशा कुता

28.—प्रबोधचन्द्रोदयकृमुखी.

29.—काळस्वरुपवचारी.

श्रीदति

श्रीदति*नय्यागुरुशिप्रेञ्जकतमुनि
कालमुनाणिहृ: प्रकाशितशङ्करीशनेषु १ १
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३०.—संबंधकारसंग्रह।

उद्यानक्षण — सुभौमदिगमाल।
भिक्षुभिमिपति: शास्ति शिवाद्रावन्यस्यपु: || ३ ||
तस्य गुजायमहा — द्रविष्यांकितः।
सोमपूर्वकुलोत्सो महिलो ममभूगति: || ४ ||
स कदाचिच्चसमाधि का-(द्वारा)कापर्यांतरे।
अपूर्वःदृढःतांभदमहरण कथीधर्मस || ५ ||
वर्णशुद्धि काल्पुक्ति रसान्य भावानेतरम्।
नेत्येदानमदीक्षारान्त दोपानिप च तदुपान्त || ६ ||
नायत्वर्मां रूपकोपस्यका — भिक्षा अपि।
चाट्रप्रवचनेदर्श विकृणाँक्ष्टततः च || ७ ||
सचिक्षेत्र कथय सचीक्षेय स भावितः।
--- नाथिनेपत्यमुवांदस्योगिना || ८ ||
तन्त्रीतीतितान्यथावात्मेशन कृपयद — ||
--- कित्ये सम्यक् सर्वाङ्कारसंग्रह: || ९ ||

३१.—रक्षणप्राकर
श्रीमद्भजनकदिविदर्शस्मृति: श्रीमद्भजनकदिविदर्शस्मृति: स्मारतिविद्योदयः।
32.—अगमरूपणः

श्रीराधाराजाभिखाराजगोत्रिक्षणप्रारम्भवादकयोगारिनामपूर्वकचतुरंदनानिधिविद्योऽदेशः

रशिकमहाराजश्रीअमरसिंहजी पूतामातुसारेण अमरमूर्णग्रन्थेऽसाधारण-प्रकरणम् पंचदशम्: || मतिमहासारे कृष्णपवे तिथी दुः मीमांसारे विष्क्षितं व्याख्यानमादिरभट्टजी श्रीमहाराज एस्प्रीति रामणी पुस्तकपठनांतः संवत् 1891 शाहे 1796 राज्य श्री महाराणामुक्तानिधिजीकस्य

33.—प्रमाणमण्डली

पुंजामोलाचं चन्दनस्य प्रजुन्दश्वरिकीकरं पंडनस्य नानाजुनमातुसारेण प्रमाणमण्डलीः || श्रीभागुराजस्य नरेशारी मद्दं शुद्धिली प्रजुन्दश्वरिकां पचारा || || इति स्वत्तारमहादिरि प्रमाणग्रन्थां आयुत्वाचिकारवत्वाः.
34. — नानाविचि कुंडप्रकार.

श्रीमचेदुर्गापिंवमानुराजः ( इ ) प्रसादप्रत्र नकालाभिधानः।
शिशुपुलस्तय चक्कार शान्तं महंः सतः यः प्रणायकप्रत्रः।
इति श्रीपारशरशिवीलिनकालाभिधानं विद्वानाविचि कुंडप्रकारः समातः।

35. — विश्वचक्षुः

Beg. :-श्रीराधनः द्रव्यमोक्षराज्ञुपमं गतवा गुरुपरिपत तत्त्वं कथयामि श्रव्यतः।
ज्ञानं जलस्थायं तदाध्यायं जिनं दुमाणामिपि रोणायचं॥ १॥
अद्वैते वसुधारापिता बद्वा ( जा ! ) तत्र धराेमधे शुचं शेषितिः शकाभिषितपति वददा;- पुनर्मोचितः।
श्रीयमास्स्वलोकजयंमनकुलमामण्मणः- परापतिः।
लेक्षितां सुनिगुणं यसोपि वितं दिरमंदे गीते॥ २॥
अद्वैते बिश्कुमतः- प्रतितमढोमेरोक्षेद्दुङ्खमृदुहस्तवः प्रियस्तोविविधः।
सुन्मानानिकंदानामः गुणिनिरराजनं नेदपटे।
रामं महिषलक्षशः सममन्दतुको मानान्तो नृसिंहः॥ ३॥
भूभोकस्वयं रशी धरान्तिः जगतः।
गायति गुणिनं- शशथुङ्गोऽन्नीक्तराणिः॥ ४॥
यक्यादिपुष्यम् विनितिपवक्रुः- कोदिशिकसुज्ञानविन्ध्यामामानं।
तत्स्वरूपिनं ततुभोगरस्मा प्रतिविशक्तिस्वतवितपः॥
गुणिद्वारो जगतीता दुर्गार्तत्तवत्तिरिज्ञमलितंनिन्दः॥ ५॥
शुद्धाभ सद्योपि पुराणवाच भारामपूर्तिः सत्तिते (ड़ां)।
दि:पापकारशिविग्रहितेऽरुति यशसकरणि॥ ६॥
आरामपूर्तिः च कारिताम देवलावानीति हरे;- प्रसादात्।
गुणदेराशायणमसंस्ते तीतीशाननपुणेन॥ ७॥
तदनारुछोद माधा (ढूँ?),सविधादेहः- श्रीराधकारीण।
(इ) स्वरुपाय व्यवस्थितिः वृथतत्त्वनिः वूच्छतमं च॥ ८॥
नारदस्त्रतिरष्ट्रं निर्देशं सारस्तं गार्यमं सर्वस्तु।
श्रीमंशकोशादिसंस्ते तहैर्द्वृत्तमुभवः सह तद्विधि च॥ ९॥
36—व्यक्तिविचित्रकथिका।

सरथवरि मूसारि यो(गौ)रख्मुखवरि।
भाटि वर्मिनुप्रवास नारायणपुरस्तुतिम् प्रकाशितम्
दिक्पालसतियुक्तिकोष्ठिमत्स्वरूपम्
खकिस्रुठि जननानिकावनम्
हितानिकावनप्रतिकाल्पोधयाः
हितार्थभावस्वरूपम्
नामानुष्यानिकवृत्तिः
हितार्थभावामो

समरहतस्विपक्षी लीला दुःख्य।
बदनाजितसारोजः प्रक्षिपाकांतमोजः
तस्मादिकसिद्ध ह्यविनिपो जातो गुणामोहिनियः
श्रीवैद्यथपरमचतुर्धमहितो धर्मो वायुमानिक।
शाकाचिनि सनभाजि येन जनके स्तनांकनात्मकः
भूत्ताका जितपूर्वीरागरासी प्रातामभावाचिन्या
तस्मात्सीत्वेऽगन्यो नविकानिचयो गाम्बृतिविशुद्धीः
स्तेन्त्सिद्ध हिति तितीयशात्सितं नृविपादायुक्तः
हितििशिविरि विपक्षानितानित्र्यात्सृष्टिधात्युते:
काठांताक्रमण ज्वालितसुदिने नामस्तिरामसर्वः
शक्तिसिद्ध हि तथ तदानस्तिपांसद्गत्वंगृहमनः
लीलया द्वार[द्व]हिनयिनः क्षमाचारिविहिताधिगतमवसनः
तत्रूसुधीवरिषिदेवनृप्तिनिपती महीविभवभो
लीलानितिश्रीविवर्द्धिणं सर्वत्र जितानितिविजयः
तेनःस्वरूपत्वाद्रवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-भजनानानितियो सः
"तर्किन" भक्तिमेधम धनविवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-भजनानानितियो सः
"तर्किन" भक्तिमेधम धनविवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-भजनानानितियो सः
"तर्किन" भक्तिमेधम धनविवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-भजनानानितियो सः
"तर्किन" भक्तिमेधम धनविवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-�जनानानितियो सः
"तर्किन" भक्तिमेधम धनविवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-भजनानानितियो सः
"तर्किन" भक्तिमेधम धनविवर्द्धिणं मधुमेधमो-भजनानानितियो सः
विद्यार्थयः कुभित्रिविश्वद्रुकुमथवे युर्यगुप्तायुगम् संपुन्गे।
सिद्धाभिधानं निकोऽविजुः कथमात्वत् मूर्यकत्वं स स्मृतिं।
पुरुषस्तम्य च रामसितहर्ष्यतः संकौकायं योग्यिः।
जातः किम् वश्यूरं यथा किमसी स्वर्गात्क्रोणम्।
हेलोऽयुः सत्यस्तुपुष्पगो भवति किम् देवो रघुरामाणि
रघुं [नाम]यः वम्बृव युश्य जगतान्तर्गतिः ब्रह्मकृष्णदाम्।
वराङ्गनारातिधियाः स्यंयंकः कुलधियाः।
श्रीयोपपद्धमुष्पणो निरस्तस्यदृश्याः।
तस्यद्विनिमोक्तमुण्डकः।
शृः सुन्तवागः स्निविं बैयाप्रधतः स्ततः
स्तस्तम् यथायतिधित्रसानगतिमांवापुर्क्षेण संजो जयी।
ज्ञाति सम नतुरुपिज्ञवश्वरुप्स्वर्गाभिविवशानां।
वारदेशी चतुर्भान्तः।
आग्रातां कुर्पुणावेन विधिधारासा चतुर्भान्तः।
दम्ब्यक्ष्मा चपालिता नानवप्राप्तवक्ष्मान्दाय।
प्रकोशारामनसे(ते)चित्रकीर्ति वहुशा रणायनवर्षणोऽग:।
सूते कीर्तिपियोहोथा शतस्यक्ष दशमन गुणः।
प्रसतुता।
वांचिकान्यन्यः मरणस्तत्कपीर्यकारः।
योभुभुजेन्दुः हेमधुष्ठया सत्यपिताकाव्याविनिग्रहितं।
स्मृयितम् वेदरतित्वा द्रवायुः कृष्णवाणिकप्रमृत्रिकाः।
भारीमुक्तामुक्तामाति विविखतविकिशिक्षकांसंकोऽ।
अतिवप्यारुपरीं जाननरपरिव स्माधुवादवम् सूर्यम्।
स्तम्भं चिन्ता(वाँ)सङ्गरिवद्वियारिफलयं-अन्विनार्द्रीश्रीप्रयगः।
दयान्तराश्चाप्रायतिपरिवतेुणिताश्रिप्रियोऽः
दिल्लीश्च(शालिरः)कीर्तिनाग्रीकुसमुखुतत्वाधुष्ट्रांकोत्तमसुपृति।
पश्चात्ताक्रान्तिवाली कल्याति कल्या प्रसुतुत(?) चेमघेने
पंचास्यस्य हस्तिमुखः कालेया रंकुभंगः।
कृत्रुकानादिपिण्यं न्यायावागोप्तवक्ष्मान्दुभिः।
कस्यकस्य न वा वासींदगं वकनकृष्णः।
तेजोचाकुंडुकृतमि: प्रसरणपद्भावने[जैल]के बीसवेंगद्वनि।
बहादूर यस्य कीर्ति: स्थनायति श्रुयया खेपपुरवैहार्याति।
ਪ੍ਰੋਦੜਸ[ਤਾ]ਤ ਪ੍ਰੰਤਾਰਕੀ ਕਾਲਾਮਾਸਕਾਰੀ ਧਰਮਸਾਹਿਤ ਛੋਤਾ।
ਪੰਦ੍ਰੋਤਾ ਗੋਰਕਸ ਨਮੁਨੀਆਂ ਪੁਰਾਤਨ ਗੌਰਹੀਂ ਮੋਹਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ।
ਲਾਲ ਨਵਾਂ ਨਵਾਂ ਨਵਾਂ ਨਵਾਂ ਨਵਾਂ ਮੂਹਾਂ ਜਹਾਂ ਸਹਿਂਦ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਲਤਾ।
ਧਾਨਾ ਕਾਲਵਸਿਨ ਸੰਪ੍ਰਸਤਕੀ ਮੌਲਾਵੀ ਨ ਜਾਣਤੇ।

ਬਾਗਯਾਸੰਖਸਾਰਕਾਜ਼ਰਜਾਣਤੇ ਯੇ ਵਰਜ ਵੇਗਦੇਤੇ

[ਲੇਖ]ਜੀਵਨਵਿਆਖਾਰੀ ਹੋਣਾ ਸਾਲਾਦੀ ਨਾਉਟਿਆ ਦੀਆਂ।
ਪਾਦਰੀ: ਪਰਸੁ। 

ਇਹ ਯਹ ਬਿਚਾਰੇ ਹੋਣ ਦੁਰਆਂ ਦੁਰਆਂ ਮਹਿਮਾਕੇ ਨਿਰਕੁਤ।

ਗ੍ਰੇਂ ਵਿਧੀਵਿਰਕਾਖੀ ਵਿਚਾਰਕਾ ਅਰਨਸਕੀ ਆਧਰ ਇਤਿਹਾਸ ਨੈਪੁਸਤਕ ਕੁਤੀਨਾ।

ਕਲਾਵਸਿਨ ਸੀਦਸ਼ੋਦਭੁਆਂ ਸੀਦੀਤਨ ਸੀਦੀਸਾਦ ਦਾ ਸੀਦੀਸ਼ਾਦਤ ਕਰਨਾ।

ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ ਸੀਦਾ

ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ 

ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ 

ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ 

ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ 

ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ 

ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ ਪ੍ਰਸੂਰਾਖ


c

37—ਨੈਪ੍ਰਸੁਦੀਕਾ।

ਇਸ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਦ੍ਰਸਤ ਵਾਰਾਣਸੀ ਗੌਰਵਚਾਰਕਾ ਨਾਮ ਰਾਜਾ ਬਸਤਵ ਵਧਾਲੀਦਸਮੋਧੇਕੇ।

ਹਰ ਸਾਧਾਰਣ ਵਧਵ: ਪ੍ਰਸਤੁਤ ਦੁਰਕੁ ਹੀਡਾਤਿ: ਸਧੁਸਤਾਨੀ।

ਤੁੱਤ ਚ ਸਤਵੋ ਸ੍ਰੀਵੇਣ: 

ਪ੍ਰਿਆ ਕੁਤੂਹਲ ਨਤੀਜ਼ਾ ਧੰਤਨ। 

ਤੇਜਾ ਨਹਿ ਵੁਪ੍ਰਵਾਸ ਤਰਦਬ ਮੁੱਖ ਮੁੱਖ

ਪ੍ਰਤਾਰਕਾ ਸੁਨਾਇਦਾਤ ਸੌਖਣੀ ਮਾਨਿਆ ਸਾਹਿਤ ਸਾਹਿਤ ਸਾਹਿਤ

ਨਿਕੈਤਵਚਾਰਕਾ ਪਾਣਾ ਸਾਹਿਤ ਵਧਾਲੀਦਸਮੋਧੇਕੇ।
38—रघुमाध्य.

Beg :-...

End :-

39—कात्यायिनिक.

शिष्यहितायकारात्मकविनिर्देशकारीन वैद्य शास्त्रिणि।
किंचिंतिः पद्यात्मकः ुर्ध्वस्वरूपः || 2 ||
चार्देशक्रो नृपक्रमब्रतवर्धनो वैनेद्रभम प्रसु-  
रासीद्र श्रीप्रसुभरमसुराष्ट्रसुरश्च तु विषयतः।  
तत्पशुप्रधानो विनेविनातकः  श्रधान्ध्रारोदितः  
प्रधानतः सुकृति गुणकिलियः पद्यप्रमोनामकः ॥ १ ॥  
आतै सूरिसमातम्भनमः [ः] शिष्यस्ताभोऽभिनुः  
श्रीदेवप्रसुभरमसुराष्ट्रश्चार्यायनिम्नः ।  
तेषाः शिष्यव्यो नितिंतज्ञामा प्रशुभरसुररिविनः  
स्पष्ट वृत्तिमये तनोतिन्तिरा वीराय मुखाधिनः ॥ २ ॥  

40—अष्ठेणसुधा।  

परम्परारो श्रीमद्वृत्तमहोक्तीभें मुनिप्रकाशाक्षीक्षितक्षेत्रब्रत्नार्थि  
वनकुरसुरिवस्त्रक्षणवंदिविरचितविना रचयिता परवर्षकालस्तोत्रविष्कर्द्या-  
हयायं अद्वैतसुधालयायं  

41—कुलपदीपः  

……….. मुरंद्रपरमार्थराहं व्यथिजिन।  
श्रुतवा श्रीरामकांठारिवश्चत्तकमल्कोपेन्द्रप्रीभाषाय  
श्रीविशारांदन्तकस्मदमुपादिशानावरंदेवका मां  
सप्तार्थमत्र बली विरचय विकृति कस सर्वपलोकः……  
ब्रह्मतापराकहे श्रव्य समस्तागमस्मार्तवृत्त।  
कुलपदीपाल्पिमिनिवंबं बिलोक्य कौला: सुखिनो मधवूः ॥  

42—प्रायश्चितपदीपिका।  

व्यासायतो महाकाव्यं प्रायश्चितपद्वाङ्क [ःः]।  
शत्रुपेन श्रीकालो हृदिकार्यनुसारतः ॥  
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43—गोविंदमानसोड़यासः

एतत्समन्वन्ति नृपशिरः श्रेणिमणिमंगरी—
मेघस्योतिरसीमरंजितपदः कणांदंवंशाकुःः |
जागरात् प्रांतिपक्षमकः द्रामाध्यंतंसतापदोः |
राजश्रीहरसिह एव सकलद्वैःणिमुतामगोः: || १ ||

एतनमंग्री निखिलनृपत्तिश्रीणिमंगरुदी नीयोः
देवादिः सकलमाहिमस्यानामसौदीशोः: |
प्रस्योद्विच्छिन्नकिलदस्तिमाविच्छिन्नविशोभीः |
द्विभिद्वेदं त्रिदशायुवतः: कापि त्वश्चमिहितेने || २ ||

अस्याम्भूजो जयति निर्भक्कोट्तरपुरुषसशिक्षकीमर्मरसादः |
धीमातुरः गणन्यव इति प्रतिप्राध्यम्भोकिरनानुकंतः यत्रादिपाद्रीरष्ट्रीः || ३ ||

वषेष्व मंजित्विमणियो विजयिनि श्रीमाजी वीरेश्वरे |
निःस्वमहाकृष्टिभूषित्यशाश्वात्वातिविनोवधिया |
वृः: किं रजेशे दृढ़यांकस्मिकार्थिकारिणि |
श्रीभासु: नलक्षणाय चारुते लोकोऽर्तं स्थापित || ४ ||

श्रीमानेश महामहेशकी(मल) महाराजाधिराजो म (लैंस) हा—
सामतिवित्तिंक्तस्वर्यः शुभरस जन्मदुः: |
चकेन स्वप्नाय्यामितिभं: सत्याग्रायस्यिति (तिः: ) |
प्रोढ़नकस्म मुदैःद्वयो दोषिलंभस्माभित || ५ ||

तत्स्वालक्षेण गुणिना नयसागरेण गोविंददुर्विकितिना हरिकोकरेण |
येनामुना जयताजननारुनां लोकत्रयं चवाहित चवलेखिनाशोभी: || ६ ||

गोविंदमानसोड़यासमुदायित्वनमानितनीपात्र
कुष्म तत्समन्वित प्रणायं मधुभुद्वन्त || ७ ||
44—खुद रीशातकः।

Beg:-...विरचयांति उद्पेक्षावलयमः सुकवि:
End:-सकलभावने नानावकल्यामपुरस्ये प्रदेशकैं(तैं!)दौ ||

शास्त्रकविरमृति महीमतीन्द्रपलनं || २७ ||
बणुवेदसरसांशके १६१८ वर्षै वैशाखःशुक्रशंभर्ग्रहाः ||
गोकुलभाविशिष्टं संवृंभ खुदरीशातकं ||
इति श्रीगोकुलभाविशिष्टं...

45—रक्षरत्नप्रदीपः।

यस्यावनविमललम्बवगणः प्राणायति नाम नगरी यमुनातानाते।
यस्या नरेन्द्रतिलकी हरिरंद्रानामा डाकान्येककुमुदः द्वितीयो बसुमूव ||

यस्यालमः: द्वितिपितांजगाति प्रविद्धः साधारणो रणविशिष्टाणां जातेन: ||
तिस्थानरामेष्यामि जगद्विरूपेण रिखतं च पुराणकरोप्रातापातु ||

यस्यालमुक्ताय इसम विदित: जयविंति ज्यायाम(न)यं समिति वधकनाथसिंहनामा।
शत्रुविचित्र रक्षकानु (त्रि)एकामिनीनां वर्गो विलोकनसुयो ददर्ये निदावः ||

श्रीमान्यरः: सहाजपाल इति श्लोकन्द्राक्रमः स्वयं सुकविलोचनमर्माः।
श्रीणामः नृणां हददर्यांकोकाणाः तुलयुताग: स्वयं माति गुरी: सदा यः ||

यक्षीकालांतिविशिष्टाः बचसों विवाहाः हरिकावली दुःस्त्वतिपाठतःकांनाः।
केठे जनविदानेनाभी मनसी नरेंद्रो यक्षीकालांतिनां विहितकहरामस्य: ||

वंशेय (ष !) विश्वचित्रो नृपरत्नपालः प्राणवेश्युतः कविरक्षिप्न्येष्मिन् ||
वस्मादःसुतनयो विनयांवरासिः श्रीरामराज इति रस्पत्य श्रायाः च ||

साधारणक्षेत्रायते: शुभ्रियोगयोगातः संग्राम सेवाकर्म सख रामराजः।
नानामयोधतमसं प्राणायतथ रथयो स्वं रकौति कुतुम्भार्थरत्नायः ||

इति श्रीसूरागर्म शिवकपस्त्र श्रीकाचूर्देशाये।
वेरा सूरतमहोदयं जयविराणविभावमवतीत।
व्याहि संसृतसूरभीमानद्रायं स्वभ्यंदरक्षयागमां
श्रीदामोदराधुनमृदयंविद्यानागाध्रानाताः ||
गीति वांश नृसं ज्ञावा शाखाणि थि: कताह्यावः ।
तन्मतमाद्वैतिकित्यति शाखें प्रसवनंकीरं ॥ २ ॥
ब्रजश्रीगीतिँयथि मरतो मंतंगः शास्त्रक: कस्मपनारदी तु।
विशाखि: देशिवनिदिवशों रंभाजुंनी वाहिकराजनार्यी ॥ ३ ॥
दुर्गीकाच्चनिकादस्तमः: कोहङ्गोदशकत्वंबला विपः ।
जेतासिंहवृत्तिथः हद्वद्वो भोजविक्रममुरुणी तथा ॥ ४ ॥
अजगेकम्भीपालः कैशषेशोऽवम (दु?) सिद्धः: ।
गणपत्यनीसशथ जयपिशाहपदः (हद्वद्वो?) नृसः ॥ ५ ॥
अन्यो(न्येर?)पि तार्थिकस्यस्ये ये तेषी: कतानिइह चुक्षिपराणी ।
शाखाणि रत्नाकरद्रम्यकारणम् (सः) चुक्षिपराणी जनिस्त्रं ॥ ६ ॥
समौति तेषेष: परिवृद्धि सारं सुविवृत्ततंत्राध्यक्षकायः ।
शृंगारहरार्यमिदं सुशाल्य कथितं हम्मीरमहीपहेन्द्रः ॥ ७ ॥
मनोरिणाबिन्दुद्वषयः कृतमयनमर्क्कृति। प्रशस्तिस्मय वश्येन्द्र प्रतिष्ठारितिमहः कठिनाः।

तत्र श्रीचन्द्रशर्मशृणुदारासादातिभक्षः सं. १४२५ वर्ष श्रीदेवराजपुरक (कठक) तत्विकिर्ति यानान्तरवः काम इति।

तत्र श्रीरामराजसुधारतीहरि श्रीवासोद्धरकपन्हरितरकमनीयकीर्तिविविधत्वः।

तत्र श्रीनराजसुधारसुप्रदेशसंग्राहमकरसत्यपीय संवातसंघपालपन्हको। अतः श्रीनरेवतीरौ

श्रीकृष्णदामदराविजयपिनि सं. १४७३ वर्ष रामरुदित १५ दिने तै: श्रीलिङ्ग प्रदेशः द्वारकेश्वरीभिः प्रागुकायवासाते श्रीश्री भक्ति वर्धनसिद्धावानः सन्दर्भकारितवालः।

प्रतिष्ठायः सह ज्ञनविवाप्रतित्यां कारितवं इति।

समस्तवर्त्तम परममद्विपः परं पुरं जेसलमेहनम यदाह सर्वास्मानित क्षमाः। कृत्तिकुञ्जाय इति जीवकारसः।

तत्रामुखवाक्षः यदुकुलक्ष्मोहासितांबदवंचः।

दोरीश्चाकानंतचण्डाहितं नरपतय:। फुफळा भूमित:।

चेमाचार्य लेखः। श्रुतिरसिद्धेतः। पीयते। तवहथे-स्तपूणः विश्वमार्णः कुतुम्भे। यतो नायते नैव रितं।

तत्र कमादद्विगुदमारसभेः।

श्रीलिङ्ग शक्तिहरनराज इति प्रतितिः।

चित्रछठ शारणा० पुनामिनिभाजनः।

बजः नेत्रारितवहार्य बज्जारः।

तस्य प्रशस्ती तन्यावभूतः श्रीस्वामिदेवायु च रूपसिद्धः।

नायकेन युक्त तथा सर्वः। कथा पुरा। लक्षणं रामराज्यैः।

श्रीरत्नसिद्धस्य महिदहवस्य बुधु। पुनः वहसिद्धानः।

श्रीस्वामिदेवायु चलादारायधिरामविभः।

श्रीस्वामिदेवायु चलादारायधिरामविभः।

मुनि। श्रीस्वामिदेवायु चलादारायधिरामविभः।

श्रीस्वामिदेवायु चलादारायधिरामविभः।

मुनि। श्रीस्वामिदेवायु चलादारायधिरामविभः।
तदृशः निर्माणशिल्पवृत्ति: परिलक्षणः प्रयुक्तावृत्ति:।
पराक्रमकार्यांपरिदृश्यः श्रीकेशारी कृष्णप्रणाली समाधान:।
तस्याविस्मयः सूक्ष्म: श्रीगुप्तरूपः।
श्रीविक्रमरूपः शिक्षितपतिपुरुषः।
शास्त्रानीपि यथावथरूपः न्यायकार्यानुसा न्यायाधिकरणारूपः।
एतत्तुल्लन्ति मनसा तत्त्वस्व यन्त्राये अद्वितीयमविद्यापञ्चानां कदाचितं॥ ॥
तथा स्रुतिमार्गमितंनद्यायः न दीननवे निर्लोकवैध:॥ ॥
पुनः प्रजा पालनमेति किलियथ श्रीदक्षः शक्तिमदेश एव॥ ॥
यथानुगततः भौतिक नर्विंदेनयथ वर्णपदः।
व्यासाक्षेपायः या इत्यां न माणिन्यं कदाचित्वात्॥ ॥
गांगमहार्वचकारपरमादलावधावः य सागरचन्द्रकङ्कः।
युक्त सः भेजे तात्तेदं करतः सूरीस्त्राह्नसागरचन्द्रपरावरः॥ ॥
प्रासादेवाचारयामर्गेश्वालमतायामि शुक्तासर्वदेवः।
सादशः कुलेनोद्र्शमार्यशेत्येश्वरात्मानेन शासनिः सूर्यभाले॥ ॥
इत्यतः। चान्त्रे कुछे वत्तिनः...॥ ॥
तत्स्य श्रीजिनराजसूरसिंहरायिदेशः सम्बयोऽः
रामे शक्तिमदेशविजयमिनि प्राचार्याविद्याविद्याय।
अहिद्दंपुरंगे खंतः श्रीचतुर्भुजः।
प्रासादे जीत्युगवस्य बिश्वाधराय विक्षणानामाधिपति॥ ॥
१४५८ नवायनबाद्विद्ममित्य बर्त्तिनित्यश्च श्रीजि राजसूर:।
अयायणामग्नेत्वं विश्व मुनिद्वारा: सागरसाधार:॥ ॥
ये चकु...॥ ॥
तेषां श्रीजिनराजसिंहादित्यापराधिशाशा देशारामादेशः।
श्रीसंघो गुह निर्दिष्टमात्स्यिनीलिङ्गमधुरांकोपः।
सपूर्णिहस्तावासूङ्क वर्तरसाधारानुवर्णिनि
द्विगांवधियमानीपतितत्तं संस्कर्य विक्रमादि॥ ॥
अनेको विष १५ संकेत १६६२ । वन्ध तत्त्वगमः...॥ ॥
श्रीदक्षरिविद्वयमिनि हयतो जिनाल्यः।
श्रीनादीचन्द्रमानवः वासुभवानुसारः॥ ॥ ॥...
स्वर्ण श्रीमणकोशा...... सं १४९२ वर्ष कालगणवंति प्रतिपदादिने श्रीमण
पार्श्वनाथायंवं सुपरिमित्राचारण: प्रतिष्ठितं पूजनीयाथं श्रीसंज्ञासहंते न: राजा।
श्रीनरेन्द्र-शताश्रयजां स्थापितं......
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स्वर्ण श्रीगणेशाय नमः || स्वर्ण श्रीजयोम्युदयथ || ददतुः वं: ..., || २
श्रीमणश्रीमणमूलनाम नगरं पृथ्वीः परं मंडनं
भोग्य यादवमुखमुलभित्र नवं चालजसविद्वेषः।
श्रीपार्श्वनाथपरिष्ठितं स्वाकारशुद्देनृपैः
नानाविद्वानविशेषिणां विश्रमं तथेऽपि परस्तावर्तिः || ३ ||
समाधिशीतलसन्धिः यथकृतज्ञानमोहानिवार्तेणुषु-
स्त्र्यायामूलपृवितराजो गजाति सूक्तिद्वितीय देवराजो नूराम:।
तद्रेष्टा यादवेन्द्रः समहदस्यवी केदारेन्निन्न: चन्दन:।
श्रीमणमहामाजिमां: समाननं तत्। स्वर्णश्च: स्वर्णश्च:। || ४ ||
विक्रमस्य तनावाद। विराज्ये वैरिसिन् इति विहृतं: सदा।।
वेन देवमधवं प्रतिष्ठितं राज्यवृहा (द्रवयं?) विक्रमशुद्धे:। || ५ ||
बेदाभिरविद्वृत्तं वर्षितश्चुऽतुष्ये माधवस्य च पक्षे
षष्ठयो श्री सुकृतार्जुनमिन्नद योहि (१) इंद्री तु मेवे।
मुप: श्रीविरसिन्हः स(सु?!)रवस्यनेनकारणस्यप्रतिष्ठा-
स्वर्णश्रीविरसिन्हंत्विशेषिणां विष्णुविष्णूर्वनायुगम:। || ६ ||

संवतः श्रीविरसिन्हसमाप्तितसंवतः १४९२ वर्ष माहिने संवतः ८९ वर्ष: महादीयमने
महाराजाधिराजश्रीविरसिन्हवत्सिन्हबांदिकेशराज-
क्षे मुखराजसिंहवत्सिन्हबांदिकेशराज श्रीलक्ष्मणतूंतुवृक्षों चचप्राय बैंडीमा-
तः प्रसादसवमहाराजाधिराजश्रीविरसिन्हं सर्वकालसमुद्यायं श्रीमणकालक्ष्मीयायं
पंचापत्तमासाद: प्रतिष्ठितं: ||


ततोभुत के सारी राजा के सारीब पराक्रमि।

वेदिराश्रणसंहारं यद्ध गरासिदोऽद्वया || १ ||

श्रीमन्तेरीजःसिद्धमेश्वरभवमुखः श्रीलक्ष्मण। भूपति-

विश्वक्रमणविस्ताराणाशरणः श्रीलक्ष्मणसंहारं।

दानाशयकरहितां सकलं लोकं व्यवाहारक्रमं

यो विवं नृगद्वःगणिपि यशसा श्रीवासिव्यान्यां न्यायत। || २ ||

तद्विभार्तसिद्धाश्रयोऽश्रविश्रणां यु( यु? )सत्त्रप्रतापः।

श्रीवर्षसिद्धाश्रयोऽश्रविश्रणां सारंतिमि निर्ययः || ३ ||

हतं। चेतनुके श्रीवर्षांतर...तत्स्यं।

ये सिद्धाश्रयाचार्यसहर। यानान्याह बantiumः।

सल्ये श्रीलक्ष्मणेष चैर्वित: श्रीस्वरूपायो मुनिः।

वेश्यः शय बितनीति शासनसुची श्रीसंवदेत्तियति

वेशम् सार्वजनिनमालावचनं पेश्यधुतं सहंगं || ४ ||

श्रीउवःजंत्वतचरणेषुप्रमाणं [ ] समृद्धश्रेष्ठः।

स्थानेनु च वेशमुपदेववाक्यामात्रःश्रीमयं,श्रीवर्षचार्यः। || ५ ||

अप्रसंहिताश्रयप्रमुखाशीत्यानेन आश्रयांतिकः।

श्रीशास्त्रकथा भिष्मप्रकाशं संहं || ६ ||

श्रीमन्तेरीजःनिदिवसनिधानप्रकाशकान्तिकाः महाराजः।

पाठ्यं च विशिष्टत्वक्रममुखः अपि मुनिनां || ६ ||

कमलप्रकाशमुखमात्रविचारसाध्यनेन।

परपश्चमुनिनामापि वैष्णवाचकांति: क्रियते || ६ ||
चत्र धार्मिक विकासाची साधनांतून राज्यातील दिनांक १ (१) पाहिले।

चेंगण चरणद्राध्यात्मक प्रणयते मधुमुख || ७

श्रीमंत मळकूट राजाने सिद्धांतकार पद्मार्थाने।

श्रीजिनमदश्राहार्यांना विज्ञाने ते गणाधरे! || ८

इति श्रीमुद्धरावङ्गनाथके। इत्यादि। श्रीमानुशंशमेंळोय।.....

इत्यादि परिवारोर सांस्कृतिक रूपाने शास्त्रैश्वरिके।

कुर्बग धर्म दार्शनिक इत्यादि नित्य थाने। १. ॥

विज्ञानविद्याचं दुसरसंस्कृत शास्त्रिक विश्वासने याचा।

शास्त्रविद्याचं दुसरसंस्कृत शास्त्रिक विश्वासने २. ॥

पंचमुद्धरावङ्गनेन चत्रेन कसरि नावी पुनः।

चत्रैः भाषांच्या मिश्रितार्थे धर्माचारके। ३. ॥

अथ संवत् १९९३ वर्षे श्रीचित्राशिरालाभाजे श्रीजिनमदश्राहार्यामुक्तिप्रदेशे

नवीन: प्राचार: कारित:। तत: संवत् १९९३ वर्षे कुंकुमात्रिकामिनी: सधेऽ

वासन्यपर: सहस्राकारे। तत: श्रीजिनमदश्राहार्यान्य प्रतिष्ठानां सापि: शिवाय: कारित:।।तत: च महादीप: श्रीजिनमदश्राहार्यान्य: श्रीसंस्कृत विषयाच्या प्रतिष्ठानान् २०० प्रति

हर तत्त्वाद धर्माश्रितेऽपि: मार्गाश्रितेऽपि: प्रतिपादित:। तत्र संस्कृत विषयास्वलया सापि: राजवंशवर्गाना विद्वान: विविधाश्रितेऽपि: परिपादित:। राजवंशवर्गाना

प्रतिष्ठानाद्वारे स्वस्तविषयाश्रितेऽपि: सत्यमान: सत्यमान: सत्यमात्र तत्त्वाद संस्कृत विषयाश्रितेऽपि: श्रीमान्: प्रतिपादित:। राजवंशवर्गाना

प्रतिष्ठानाद्वारे स्वस्तविषयाश्रितेऽपि: सत्यमान: सत्यमान: सत्यमान: सत्यमात्र तत्त्वाद संस्कृत विषयाश्रितेऽपि: श्रीमान्: प्रतिपादित:। राजवंश

प्रतिष्ठानाद्वारे स्वस्तविषयाश्रितेऽपि: सत्यमान: सत्यमान: सत्यमान: सत्यमात्र तत्त्वाद संस्कृत विषयाश्रितेऽपि: श्रीमान्: प्रतिपादित:। राजवंश
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CORRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

P. 8, l. 12, the words "India Office" should be substituted for "Oxford."

Udayasimha (p. 22).

The Jāvālipura with which this Udayasimha is connected has been identified with Jabalpur (Bo. Gazetteer, I. i. p. 203.). But it seems to be too far from Dhokla and I am inclined to identify it with Jhalor and this Udayasimha with the one who is connected with Śrīmāla or Bhinmal in Inscriptions VII-IX, XI and XIII, Bo. Gaz. I. i. pp. 474 ff. The references to Śrī-Jāvala and Śrī-Jāvalipura in Nos. V and XIV in the same series would seem to favour the first identification. The name of the prince, his father's name (Samarasimha) the dynasty (Chāhumāna in Inscript. XI11), the date (Sam, 1262, 1274, and 1306 in the Inscriptions) and the identification of Jāvālipura with Jhalor, if correct, would favour the second identification.

P. 39, l. 7 from bottom, the words "In the Sarayavār country" should be substituted for: "On this side of the Sarayū"; and the following words should be added at the end of the para. on p. 40: —"Udayasimha, the author of the Bāpanā-ayaṇīya (p. 8), and the author of the Jayamādhavāmānasollāsa would seem to belong to the same dynasty as is mentioned in this work (I. O. Cat. pp. 550-1 and Dr. Bhandarkar's Report for 1881-2, p. 2, para. 5)."

Govinda-Mañasollāsa (p. 50).

The (Smṛiti-) Ratnākara by Harasimha's minister, Chandes'vara, is divided into seven parts. In these and in Kṛtya-chintāmanī by the same author there are mentioned several particulars about Harasimha and Chandes'vara (I. O. Cat. pp. 410-4 and 511-2 and Rāj. Nos. 1842, 1921, 2036, 2069, 2384 and 2398). Harasimha is spoken of as Mithilāhipa, Kārnātavamsodhava, Kārnātabhūmipati and Kārnātādhipa. Devāditya had been his minister and is referred to as having lived in Tirahbuktivishaya (Tirhut). Devāditya's son was Mahāśāmdevihigrahika Thakkura Vireśvara and Vireśvara's son was Mahāśāmdevihigrahika Thakkura Chandes'vara. Chandes'vara is called Mithilādhipamantrindra, Nepālākhilabhūmipālahayin and Nepālākhilabhūmipālaparikhā. The date Saka 1236 (a.d. 1314) which occurs is not given by the author at any rate as the date of composition of the Ratnākara or any part thereof, but as that of Chandes'vara's performing tulādāna (weighing himself against gold and distributing that gold). From this account it will be seen that the author of Govindamānasollāsa was a cousin of Chandes'vara, being a son of Vireśvara's younger brother Ganeśvara.

There is no agreement amongst chroniclers as regards the name of Harasimha's father. It is variously given by different authorities as Śakrasimha, Karmasimha, Bhūjālasimha. Hall gives it from the
Ratrākara as Bhavesā. But it does not occur in the extracts that I have seen published from MSS. of the different parts of the work. Should the Harasimha mentioned by Sanmišra Miśarā be the same as this Harasimha, the father's name given by him also is Bhavesā. But the names he gives of Harasimha's successors do not agree with those given by Sylvain Lévi (Le Népal, II. p. 226). His Harasimha seems, however, to be identical with, at any rate, the Harisimha, son of Bhavasimha or Bhavesvāra occurring in the Genealogical Table of the Thākur Dynasty, compiled from the Pāñjas of Mithilā, at p. 196, Ind. Ant. XIV. According to that table one of his sons was Narasimha or Darpanārāyaṇa and one of the latter's sons by his second wife was Chandrasimha. This Chandrasimha is also mentioned by Vidyāpati in his Durgābhaktivaraṅgini. The Narasimha, at the requisition of whose queen, Dhiramati (or, according to the Vivādacchandra, Dhirà), Vidyāpati wrote his Dānavākyāvali must be this Chandrasimha's father. (See I. O. Cat. pp. 874-6 and Rāj. No. 1830.)