

PART CCCXLVI.

(VOL. XXVII.)

DECEMBER, PART II., 1898.

G. Bühler

THE

INDIAN ANTIQUARY,

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

IN

ARCHÆOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, &c., &c.

Edited by

RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE, C.I.E.,

LIEUT.-COLONEL, INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

CONTENTS.—IN MEMORIAM GEORG BÜHLER.

	PAGE		PAGE
1. GEORG BÜHLER, IN MEMORIAM, by M. WINTERNITZ, Ph.D., Prague.....	337	9. A NOTE ON THE FACTS OF BÜHLER'S CAREER, communicated by PROF. H. JACOBI and others	367
2. GEORG BÜHLER, 1837-98, by the Right Hon. F. MAX MÜLLER, Oxford	349	10. BÜHLER AS A COLLECTOR OF MSS., by PROF. ERNST LEUMANN, Strasburg	368
3. ON PROFESSOR BÜHLER, by C. H. TAWNEY, C.I.E., London	355	11. BÜHLER AND THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY, A NOTE, by JAMES BURGESS, C.I.E., LL.D., Formerly Editor.....	370
4. PROFESSOR BÜHLER, by CECIL BENDALL, London	357	12. A NOTE ON DR. BÜHLER, by PROF. MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, U. S. A.	371
5. GEORG BÜHLER, IN MEMORIAM, by A. A. MACDONELL, M.A., Ph.D., Oxford	359	13. NOTES ON BÜHLER, by PROF. REYS DAVIDS, London	372
6. PROFESSOR J. GEORG BÜHLER, by PROF. A. KAEGI, Zürich	360	14. IN MEMORIAM G. BÜHLER, ON SOME SWAT LANGUAGES, by GEORGE A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S., Simla	373
7. A CONTRIBUTION ON BÜHLER, by PROF. F. KNAUER, Kiew	363	15. A NOTE ON BÜHLER, by PROF. J. JOLLY, Würzburg	382
8. AN APPRECIATION OF BÜHLER, by EMILE SENART, Membre de l'Institut, Paris	364	16. IN MEMORIAM GEORG BÜHLER, A POSTSCRIPT, by R. C. TEMPLE, EDITOR	383

Plate: — Georg Bühler, 1837-1898.....to face p. 337.

The Index, Contents and Title-page to Vol. XXVII. will follow in due course separately.

BOMBAY :

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS, BYCULLA.

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.

LONDON: LUZAC & Co.

LEIPZIG: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ.

BOMBAY: EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS.

PARIS: E. LEROUX.

NEW YORK: WESTERMANN & Co.

BERLIN: A. ASHER & Co.

CHICAGO: S. D. PEET, Esq., Ph.D.

VIENNA: A. HOLDER & Co.

[All Rights Reserved.]

Annual Subscription in advance, Rs. 20.

*37th 9
Prof. Kaegi*

Subscriptions for the years 1894, are overdue to the amount of Rs. 118; 1895, Rs. 140; 1896, Rs. 200; and 1898, Rs. 807. It is specially requested that these outstandings may be cleared off without further delay.

Subscribers in Europe are requested to pay their Subscriptions to the Superintendent, Education Society's Press, Bombay.

Papers and correspondence for the Journal from contributors in India or anywhere else, should be addressed to the EDITOR, care of the Education Society's Press, Bombay.

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS.

Contributors of Articles to this Journal will greatly oblige the Editor if they will leave the upper half of the first sheet of manuscript blank, for the convenience of the Editor in entering instructions to the Press regarding titling, style of printing, submission of proofs, etc., etc. Such instructions, when sent separately, are liable to result in confusion and delay.

Contributors will also greatly lighten the task of the Editor, as well as lessen the cost of composition and correction, by observing the following suggestions:—

1. In preparing copy, please leave a margin of at least three inches on one side. The revision of a crowded manuscript is excessively troublesome and laborious. When the last sheet of the article has been finished, the last footnote or other interpolation added, and the last subtraction made, please number the folios consecutively with the natural numbers from 1 to the end.

2. Write plainly, especially proper names and foreign words. If foreign characters are to be employed, let them resemble as closely as possible the type in our fonts. If Roman or Italic characters with diacritical points are used, see that the points are distinct and rightly placed. Words to be printed in Italics should be once underscored. Words to be printed Clarendon type may be once underscored with blue pencil. Type-written copy always needs to be carefully revised, with especial attention to mechanical faults and to the punctuation.

3. Indicate paragraphs clearly by a wide indentation at the beginning; or, if the break is an after-thought, by the usual sign (¶). Begin all larger divisions of an article on a fresh sheet of paper. It is hardly necessary to say that the proper construction of paragraphs is far more than a matter of external appearance.

4. Punctuate the copy precisely as you wish it to appear in print. Double marks of quotation (" ") should be used for actual quotations; single marks (' ') for included quotations, definitions, and the like.

5. In citing the titles of books, give the title in full where it first occurs. In subsequent citations, the work may be referred to by the significant words of the title; but abbreviations which may not be at once understood are to be avoided, and, above all, entire uniformity should be observed throughout the article. Where some conventional system of citation is in general use, as in the case of the Vedas and the Brahmanic literature, the established custom of scholars should be followed. Titles of books will be printed in Italics; titles of articles in periodicals, in quotation marks, with the name of the periodical in Italics. But the well-established method of abbreviating the titles of the Journals of the five principal Oriental Societies (*JA.*, *JAOS.*, *JASB.*, *JRAS.*, *ZDMG.*) should be adhered to.

6. It is desirable, for reasons of economy as well as good typography, that footnotes be kept within moderate limits. References to footnotes should be made by brief series of natural numbers (say from 1 to 10), not by stars, daggers, etc. As to the method of inserting footnotes in the copy, good usage differs. A way convenient for author and editor and printer is to insert the note, with a wider left-hand margin than that used for the text, beginning the note on the line next after the line of text to which it refers, the text itself being resumed on the line next after the ending of the note. But if the note is an after-thought, or if it is long, it is well to interpolate it on a fresh sheet as a rider.

7. Contributors are requested to kindly remember that additions and alterations in type, after an article is printed in pages, are in many cases technically difficult and proportionately costly, the bill for corrections sometimes amounting to as much as the first cost of composition; and that such alterations entail a most trying kind of labour, not only on editors and compositors, but on the authors themselves as well; and they are accordingly advised that a careful preparation of their manuscript in the manner above indicated will save both the Editor and themselves much unnecessary trouble.

Remittances, correspondence relative to Subscriptions, and notices of change of address to be sent to—

The Superintendent,
Education Society's Press,
Bombay.

Notes and Queries will always be gladly received and inserted in the *Indian Antiquary*.

Nekr B 83



GEORG BÜHLER, 1837-1898.

*J. Löwy, Photo., k.u.k. Hof-Photograph,
Weihburg-gasse 31, Vienna.*

W. Griggs, repro.

GEORGE BÜHLER.

IN MEMORIAM.

BY M. WINTERNITZ, PH.D.

ON the 16th of April, 1898, the terrible news reached Vienna that Hofrath Dr. J. G. Bühler, C. I. E., Professor of Sanskrit and Indian Antiquities in the University of Vienna, had met his death by drowning in Lake Constance. He had left Vienna on the 5th of April to spend the Easter vacation with his wife and son, who were staying with relations at Zürich. Tempted by the unusually fine weather, he broke his journey at Lindau on Lake Constance, to enjoy two days' rowing before proceeding to Zürich. On the 7th of April he hired a small boat, and returned to the Hotel towards evening. On Good Friday the 8th April he hired another boat again — a small rowing boat, ominously called 'nut-shell' by the natives — to take another trip across the lake. He was last seen about seven o'clock in the evening. Those acquainted with the locality believe that he must have lost an oar and, in attempting to recover it, over-balanced the boat, and so was drowned. Next day the boat was found floating on the lake bottom upwards, but no one knew who 'the old gentleman' was that had been seen in the boat the night before. While his servants in Vienna believed him to be in Zürich with his family, his wife thought that he had been unexpectedly detained in Vienna, though she was not a little distressed at receiving no reply to her letters. A few days passed before the proprietor of the Hotel, in which the Professor had been staying, communicated with the police. Enquiries were set on foot, and at last, on the 15th of April, it was ascertained that the occupant of the boat was Hofrath Bühler of Vienna. The body has never been recovered.

Readers of this *Journal*, in which so many of Dr. Bühler's discoveries have been published, need not be told what an irreparable loss Sanskrit scholarship and Indology have suffered by the death of the great scholar who seemed to be quite indispensable as a guide and worker in the field of Indo-Aryan research. Many of the readers of this *Journal*, too, were friends and pupils of the deceased; need they be told of his untiring readiness to help, of the noble unselfishness with which he sacrificed any amount of time to those whom he had enlisted as co-workers in any branch of the science which was all in all to him, or of his wonderful enthusiasm as a teacher? Yet a short sketch of the life-work of the eminent scholar and master whom we have lost, may not be unwelcome to readers of this *Journal*, which owes so much to him.

Johann Georg Bühler was born at Borstel near Nienburg in Hanover on the 19th July, 1837. He was a student at the University of Göttingen where he took his doctor's degree in 1858. His master was the famous linguist and folklorist Theodor Benfey, and Benfey was always very proud of his pupil, while the latter was attached to him as long as he lived, in the sense that a Hindu pupil is attached to his *Guru*. I remember (it was about a year after Benfey's death) Bühler saying that he did not agree with Benfey's theory, according to which the Buddhist fairy tales were the oldest source from which all Indian fairy tales were derived, but that he did not care to write anything in opposition to his old teacher.

The first articles published by Bühler were concerned with questions of Comparative Philology and Vedic Mythology. They were published in *Orient und Occident* (1862 and 1864), edited by Benfey:—an essay on the god Parjanya, an article on the etymology of *θεός*, etc. A paper 'On the origin of the Sanskrit Linguals' appeared, in 1864, in the *Madras Literary Journal*. But before long his enthusiasm turned more and more to the study of Sanskrit as an independent branch of knowledge, and no longer a mere handmaid to Comparative Philology. It was this enthusiasm which awakened in him a strong desire to go out to India, and in order to form connections for achieving this purpose, he went to England in 1859. Here he continued his studies in the libraries of Oxford and London, entered into relations with Prof. Max Müller, and held for a short time the post of Assistant Librarian at the Royal Library in Windsor. After three years he returned to Göttingen, to take up an appointment at the University Library.

But he had not been there very long when at last an opportunity seemed to offer itself for the fulfilment of his greatest desire. At that time he was determined to go to India at any cost, and (as he often told his pupils, when he wished to encourage them to go out to India) would have gone out as a merchant's agent, had no better chance offered itself. Thus, when he was told that there was an opening in the Education Department in India, he did not stop to consider the circumstances connected with the appointment in question, but started at once for India, and when he arrived in Bombay, he found that the post which was promised him was not vacant! Happily, however, in those days European scholars were constantly wanted in the Educational Department. He became acquainted with Sir Alexander Grant, then Principal of the Elphinstone College in Bombay. Sir Alexander had already done much for education in India, and was particularly anxious to raise the standard of Sanskrit studies in the College. It was through his exertions that in December, 1862, Ragoonath Shastri was sent from the Poona College to Bombay, to teach Sanskrit, and he soon succeeded in obtaining for Bühler an appointment as Professor of Oriental Languages at the Elphinstone College.

In his *Report* to the Director of Public Instruction, Bombay, for the year 1862-63, Sir Alexander Grant refers to Bühler's appointment and adds: 'Dr. Bühler seems in every way well qualified for the duties of his chair. He reports that as Sanskrit studies have been only just started in the college, the standard is as yet low. This will be doubtless remedied by his exertions in the course of time, and we are now in a position to assert that every student in college will be regularly grounded in either Sanskrit or Latin. I need not point out to you the importance of this step from an educational point of view.' In his next *Report* (1863-64) Sir Alexander, after referring to the services of the Professors in general, adds: 'Dr. Bühler especially seems to me to deserve mention for the cordial way in which he has thrown himself into the work of the College. Not only as a man of learning, but also as a practical educationist, he has been a great acquisition to our staff.' He not only taught Sanskrit, but also Comparative Philology and Latin, occasionally also Ancient History. He paid great attention to the College Library, to which many standard Sanskrit works were afterwards added through his exertions. In every way he worked hard to make the Natives acquainted with European methods of research and with the results of Oriental studies in Europe, but at the same time he was aware of the great value, which the traditional learning of Native Paṇḍits may have for the progress of Sanskrit studies, both in Europe and in India. In one of his first *Reports* on his college work he recommends to Government the appointment of 'one of the thorough-bred Shâstris of the old school,' both as a help to the advanced students and as an assistance to the Professor. 'The Shâstris,' he says, 'are the representatives of the traditional knowledge of Sanskrit, and in the present state of Sanskrit studies their services are by no means to be underrated.' It was his constant effort to combine the advantages of classical European education with those of the traditional Hindu methods of teaching. That India has produced such scholars as Bhândârkar, Shankar Paṇḍit, Telang, Apte, and others, and that these men, who have acquired and made so excellent a use of European methods of criticism, have been educated in the Bombay Presidency, is to a very great extent due to the beneficial influence of Bühler and it must be said later on also of Kielhorn.

In the *Report* of the Director of Public Instruction, Bombay, for the year 1865-66, reference is made for the first time to the plan of publishing 'A Collection of Sanskrit Classics for the Use of Indian High Schools and Colleges' under the title **Bombay Sanskrit Series**, to be edited under the superintendence of Profs. Bühler and Kielhorn. Although, in the first instance, intended for the use of schools in India, the excellent editions of standard Sanskrit works published in the *Bombay Sanskrit Series* have become of the greatest importance for the progress of Sanskrit studies in Europe. We need only compare the beautiful editions of Sanskrit texts, published in this Series, with the carelessly printed and (excepting a few laudable exceptions) utterly uncritical editions published in the *Calcutta Bibliotheca Indica*, to see how beneficial the influence of men like Bühler and Kielhorn has proved also in this

respect. Bühler himself took his share as an editor in this Series by publishing excellent editions of some books of the *Pañchatantra*, of the first part of Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracharita*, and other important texts.

From 1870 Bühler acted as **Education Inspector** in the Northern Division of the Bombay Presidency. If we read his *Annual Reports* on his work in this capacity, as they are printed in the *Reports of the Department of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency* (1870-1880), we can get an idea of the zeal and enthusiasm with which he devoted himself to his official duties, ever anxious to raise the standard of education in the district entrusted to his administration. Bühler's services were fully appreciated by the Education Department, and when, in 1880, he retired from the service, the Director of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency, in his *Report* for the year 1879-80, referred to Bühler's work in India in the following words: 'His Excellency in Council will take this opportunity of expressing his great regret at the loss which the Department has sustained by the retirement from the service of Dr. Bühler, whose zealous labours have done so much to lay the foundation of a sound popular education in Gujārāt, while he has no less distinguished himself by his successful exertions in the collection of some thousands of manuscripts in Central India, Rājputāna, the Panjaub, Kashmir, etc., as well as in this Presidency; in the preparation of standard works on Hindu Law and literature, and in adding to the stock of philological and archaeological lore. By his influence as a Teacher in Government Colleges and Examiner in the University of Bombay, he has not only kept alive an interest in Sanskrit, but has extended the study of that language, and raised the standard of Oriental Scholarship throughout the west of India.'

Bühler's great and important travels for the **Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts** began in 1866, and the *Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Bombay Presidency* for the year 1866-67 contains an highly valuable report by Bühler on discoveries made on his tour to the Southern Maratha Country in search of Sanskrit Manuscripts. The Director of Public Instruction, referring to Bühler's labours during this tour, says: 'By conversing fluently in the Sanskrit Language with Brahman Shastris at the various places which he visited, he succeeded to a great extent in inspiring confidence and in allaying the prejudices of persons who were at first unwilling to show their sacred volumes to an European.'

This search for Sanskrit MSS., for which, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Whitley Stokes Government had made an annual grant of 25,000 Rupees, now occupied Bühler for many years. With untiring zeal and energy he searched the libraries in many parts of India, and discovered most valuable and unexpected treasures. And his investigations, carried on with no less enthusiasm than knowledge of his subject, led to discoveries in all branches of Indian literature. Indeed, some entire branches of literature were brought to light by him for the first time.

Thus, before the days of Bühler, our knowledge of the highly important **literature of the Jainas** was very scanty indeed, although the members of this sect had for centuries displayed an extraordinary literary activity, and the most valuable collections of Sanskrit and Prākṛit MSS. were hidden away in the old and rich libraries of the Jaina monasteries. Bühler was the first to start a systematic investigation of these 'treasuries of Sarasvatî' as the Jainas call their libraries. The Library of Jesalmer, searched by Bühler in 1874, was the first Jaina library, which a European was allowed to search. It was no easy matter to be admitted to these jealously guarded treasures. The monks and ministers in Jesalmer tried, by every possible means, to prevent the inspection of their library, and it required not a little patience and tact and diplomacy on Bühler's part to enable him to examine all the MSS. in it. But his labour was amply rewarded. For not only was this library rich in valuable MSS. both of the religious literature of the Jainas and of profane Brahmanical literature, but these MSS. also proved to be of high antiquity. Before the year 1873 no MSS. were known in India to be older than the 15th century. In 1873 Bühler had discovered MSS. dated as early as A. D. 1258, and here in Jesalmer he was delighted to find MSS. of a still earlier date, some going back to

A. D. 1100. It is of course well known now that since then much older Sanskrit MSS. have been discovered in Nepal, Japan, and Kashgar.

Throughout his travels in search for Sanskrit MSS. Bühler paid special attention to the Jaina MSS., and it is through his exertions that numerous specimens have become accessible to European scholars in the libraries of London and Berlin, as well as in Indian libraries. Thus it is, that we are now comparatively well informed about the history and the religious system of a sect, of which hardly anything was known thirty years ago, is chiefly due to Bühler's efforts. For his discoveries and collections of MSS. led to the excellent works of Profs. Albrecht Weber, Hermann Jacobi, and Ernst Leumann, in the department of Jaina religion and literature. It is no small comfort to know that Bühler's labour will not be lost, and that in this branch of Hindu literature these scholars will continue the work, which he had inaugurated with so great success.

The general results of Bühler's indefatigable labours in the search for MSS. are found in numerous Government Reports and Catalogues;—e. g., in his *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. contained in the Private Libraries of Gujarát, Káthiáwád, Kachchh, Sind and Khándeś*, published 1871-73, in the annual reports for the years 1870-80 of the Royal Asiatic Society on the progress of Oriental learning (generally reprinted in the *Indian Antiquary*), in many of the volumes of the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, and in the easter volumes of Weber's *Indische Studien*, we constantly come across references to new discoveries made by Bühler, — discoveries of works pertaining to all branches of Indian Literature, which were either altogether unknown before, or of the re-discovery of which scholars had long given up all hope. These labours reached their climax in the famous *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Kásmir, Rájputána and Central India* (Bombay, 1877), a very mine of information about almost every point of Sanskrit Literature. Details were given here about numerous works which had hitherto been entirely unknown, and about authors whose very names had never been heard before.

To mention only one instance, it is in this *Detailed Report* that we first hear of Kshemendra, the Kásmir poet and polyhistor whose numerous works, though of small value as works of art, are of the greatest importance for the history of the contemporaneous literature and especially also for the history of the Hindu epic literature. It is impossible to write a history of Indian literature now-a-days, without constantly referring to Bühler's *Detailed Report*, which contains not only names and titles, and brief notices of numerous works and authors, but also most valuable discussions on the literary and historical importance of the discovered MSS.

For Bühler was not only a successful discoverer and zealous collector of MSS., but he was also most eager to use his discoveries for literary and historical investigations. Though he never grudged the treasures, which he had discovered, to other scholars, and though he was ever ready to place any MSS. he had found at the disposal of scholars in Europe or India, who were anxious to edit texts or to avail themselves of the new MSS. for literary purposes, — he also took his share in the laborious task of editing texts, and above all he never lost sight of the one great aim he had in view, to bring light into the dark ages of the ancient history of India, and to disentangle the chaos of the history of ancient Hindu Literature.

How often have we heard complaints about the unsatisfactory state of history in India! We are told that, as regards the history of ancient India, we have nothing but fables and legends, no real historical facts at all; that, with an enormous mass of literary compositions, we have no chronology in these works that could be depended on. Well known are the words of the great American scholar, W. D. Whitney, that 'respecting the chronology of this development, or the date of any class of writings, still more of any individual work, the less that is said the better,' — that 'all dates given in Indian literary history are pins set up to be bowled down again.' All these complaints, which twenty years ago were still fully justified, are

now-a-days greatly exaggerated. That this is the case, that Sanskrit Literature is no longer the chaos it was, that one or two 'pins,' at any rate, stand so firmly rooted that they cannot be 'bowled down' again, that the hope at least is justified that, instead of the chaos of Indian history and literature, we shall some day have a cosmos, — is in no small measure due to the efforts of Bühler himself and of a considerable number of pupils and fellow-workers who had gathered around him.

Bühler never felt satisfied with what is called 'inner chronology,' which is based on a comparison of the contents of the different literary compositions and in this way tries to establish a kind of chronological sequence of the works, — a proceeding in which too much scope is left to individual opinion. One safe historical date which could be depended on was worth more to Bühler than a volume full of more or less convincing arguments as to might-bes. But how were such firmly established historical dates to be obtained? If not from works of literature yet from monuments of stone and metal. Bühler was fully aware of this, and with his characteristic enthusiasm he devoted himself to the task of searching for, deciphering, and interpreting inscriptions, and no one was more eager than he was in turning these inscriptions to account for historical, geographical, and literary purposes. The results of these investigations are recorded in numerous papers in the *Indian Antiquary*, the *Epigraphia Indica*, and other *Oriental Journals*, and we owe to them many important chronological data, not only about the political history of India, but also concerning many Hindu authors and works of literature, and light is thrown by them on the history of entire branches of literature, as well as on the history of certain religious systems. In a most important paper on Indian inscriptions and the age of the **Kāvya Literature** (*Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstpoesie*, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1890) Bühler has shown, in one particular instance, how much valuable information concerning the history of the classical Sanskrit literature may be gathered from the inscriptions. The fact that from the literary works themselves the so-called Kāvya Literature cannot be traced back further than the 6th century A. D., led to Prof. Max Müller's famous theory of a 'literary interregnum' in India, and a 'Renaissance of Sanskrit literature,' beginning about 400 A. D. and reaching its highest development in the 6th century, but Bühler showed in this paper that the irrefutable testimony of inscriptions proves a much higher antiquity of the Kāvya Literature, that it was developed not after but before the beginning of our era, and that a 'literary interregnum' probably never existed in India. In the new edition of his work *India, what can it teach us?* (published in 1892), Prof. Max Müller readily acknowledged that, in view of the arguments of his friend Bühler, the theory of the 'Renaissance promulgated by him could not be upheld any longer without considerable modification.

But it is not only with regard to the history of classical Sanskrit literature that Bühler's epigraphic discoveries and researches have led to new and important results, they have also thrown a flood of light on many dark points in the history of religious movements in India. The sect of the Jainas, whose literature (as already mentioned) has only become properly known by Bühler's discoveries, has, also by the investigations of the same scholar, received its due position in the history of religious systems in India. Not so very long ago, Jainism used to be looked upon as a mere offshoot of Buddhism, but Bühler succeeded in proving, by the indisputable testimony of inscriptions, that the Jainas were in early times (as they are now) an important sect, independent of and contemporaneous with that of the Buddhists; that both Jainism and Buddhism arose about the same time in the same part of India — a fact which is of the greatest importance, not only for the history of Buddhism, but also for the history of religious movements in the east of India during the 6th and 5th centuries B. C. The results of Bühler's investigations, which are laid down in a series of articles on the authenticity of the Jaina tradition (in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, 1887-90) have been fully borne out by further researches of Profs. Jacobi and Leumann. Bühler himself has given a clear and popular account of the Jaina religion and of the historical importance of the Jaina sect, in a paper

read before the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna, entitled 'Ueber die indische Sekte der Jaina' (1887).

It is well known that the writings of the Jainas, apart from their intrinsic value as religious writings and their bearing on the history of religion, are of the greatest importance for the history of Indian literature and civilisation in general. For the Jaina monks, much like the monks of the Middle Ages in Europe, did not content themselves with the study of their own sacred literature, but devoted themselves as eagerly to the study of various branches of learning, and we owe to them many excellent works on grammar and astronomy, besides both original compositions and commentaries on works of poetry. In his important paper, 'Ueber das Leben des Jaina-Mönchs Hemachandra' (*Denkschriften der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, 1889), Bühler has given us an account of the life and works of a famous Jaina monk, who distinguished himself in the profane sciences, especially as a grammarian and lexicographer.

By his labours in connection with Jaina literature, Bühler was led to the study of Prakrit and we owe to him many valuable contributions to Prakrit grammar and lexicography.

But all this pioneer work, to which Bühler was led by his epigraphic researches, and which would have been enough to make the reputation of any scholar, was with him only a small part of his work. His chief aim, which he never lost sight of, was always the elucidation of the political history of ancient India. I need only refer to his epigraphic and historical investigations reported in numerous articles and papers found in the *Indian Antiquary*, in the *Epigraphia Indica*, in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, in the *Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna*, and in some volumes of the *Archæological Survey of India*. Especially to the famous Edicts of King Aśoka he devoted no end of time and patient labour, and how much he has done for the decipherment and correct interpretation of these important inscriptions is well known to all who take an interest in the history of ancient India.

But no less important than the inscriptions seemed to him the few, but all the more valuable, historical works of the Hindus — the historical romances and chronicles — as well as the accounts of Chinese and Arabian travellers on India. In 1874, when searching the library of Jesalmir, he discovered an old palm-leaf MS. which (to his great delight) contained the *Vikramāīlkadevacharita*, a chronicle composed by the Jaina Bilhāṇa. He started at once to copy the whole MS. He had not much time to spare, but together with his friend Prof. Jacobi (who was his companion during this tour) the whole work was copied within seven days. An edition of this work, with a valuable historical introduction, was published by Bühler soon after in the *Bombay Sanskrit Series*. Another historical work, the *Rājatarāṅginī* or the Chronicles of the Kings of Kaśmir, also attracted his special attention. In his famous *Detailed Report* he devoted to this work a long discussion, in which he dwelt on its importance for the history of India, and pointed out the oldest MSS, which, later on, formed the basis for Dr. Stein's excellent edition of this work. Professor Sachau's edition and translation of *Alberūni's* famous account of India excited Bühler's liveliest interest, and when the translation was published, he devoted to it a review of 30 pages in the *Indian Antiquary* (1890), pointing out the eminent importance of this work for the History of India.

All this was only intended as a kind of preliminary work for the great scheme which he had in his mind for years — to write a connected history of ancient India. That this scheme was not to be carried out, is probably the most deplorable loss, which Indian studies have suffered by the untimely death of the eminent scholar, who — with his wonderful historical instinct, his critical tact, his accuracy, and his ever unbiased judgment — was the very man to write a history of India. And it is a fact only too well known that a history of ancient India, based on secure epigraphic and literary dates, is one of the greatest desiderata of Indology.

His intimate acquaintance with manuscripts and inscriptions naturally made Bühler a first rate authority on all questions of palæography. When Prof. Max Müller published the famous specimens of ancient Indian writing found in Japan, he requested Bühler to discuss the palæographical importance of the new finds, and his palæographical remarks form a most valuable appendix to the texts edited by Prof. Max Müller (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Aryan Series, 1, 3). Only three years ago Bühler published a most valuable contribution to the history of Indian writing in his essay 'On the Origin of the Indian Brāhma Alphabet' (*Indian Studiese* No. III., *Sitzungsberichte* der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, 1895), — a second revised edition of which, together with two Appendices on the Origin of the Kharoshṭhī Alphabet and of the so-called Letter-Numerals of the Brāhmī (with three plates), appeared almost simultaneously with the distressing news of the author's death. And two years ago he published, as part of his *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*, a most exhaustive treatise on Indian palæography (*Indische Palæographie*, with seventeen tables and map) of which an English translation, happily still written by Bühler himself, is now in the press and will be published before long.

But there is hardly any branch of Indian Philology and Archæology, in which Bühler has not done pioneer work, on which his extensive knowledge has not thrown new and unexpected light. It is true that his writings are more concerned with classical Sanskrit literature than with the Veda, yet we owe to him most important discoveries of MSS. belonging to the *Atharva-veda* and to the *Yajur-veda*, and he took the greatest interest in all questions of Vedic philology. He sympathised with those Vedic scholars who (like Prof. Ludwig or Prof. Pischel) see in the *Veda*, first of all, a product of the Indian mind which can only be rightly understood in connection with the rest of the Indian literature. But above all he was interested (and here we see again the historian) in the history of the Vedic schools, and he never ceased to hope that with the help of inscriptions it would be possible to gain information about the development of the different Vedic schools, their spread over various parts of India, and their age, — and in time also about the vexed question as to the age of the *Veda* itself, *i. e.*, of individual Vedic works.

These questions as to the age and geographical distribution of the Vedic schools were discussed by Bühler on several occasions in connection with his investigations into the history of the Indian Law-books, — a branch of Sanskrit literature in which, again, we owe to Bühler real pioneer work. Beyond the law books of Manu and Yājñavalkya and some modern Commentaries and Digests, little was known, before Bühler, about the oldest legal literature in India. To Bühler (whose labours in this direction have been most successfully continued by Prof. Jolly) we owe our acquaintance with the most ancient Hindu law books, the *Dharmasūtras*. As early as 1867 he wrote his important introduction, *Sources of the Hindu Law*, to Sir Raymond West's *Digest of the Hindu Law of Inheritance, Partition, and Adoption*, of which a third edition appeared in 1884. In this introduction he gave, for the first time, a concise but complete survey of the Hindu law literature. In 1868 and 1871 he published an edition of one of the oldest Hindu law books, the *Aphorisms on the Sacred Laws of the Hindus*, by Āpastamba, — the first critical edition of a work of that kind. A second edition of this work appeared a few years ago (1892-94) in the *Bombay Sanskrit Series*. For Prof. Max Müller's *Sacred Books of the East* he translated the oldest and most important Hindu law books in two volumes *The Sacred Laws of the Āryas* (Vols. II. and XIV. of the series; a second edition of Vol. II appeared last year). These translations were chiefly made from MSS. discovered by Bühler himself. Editions of the texts have since been published by various scholars. The introductions to these two volumes contain highly important investigations concerning the age of the works translated, and their relation to one another. In 1886 Bühler translated the law book of Manu, the most popular of all Hindu law books, for the same series (*The Laws of Manu*, Vol. XXV. of the *Sacred Books of the East*). This volume contains not only an excellent translation of the work, but also extensive extracts from the numerous commentaries, and

Appendices illustrating the relation of the *Manusmṛiti* to other Hindu lawbooks. And it also contains a most valuable introduction of 133 pages, in which he not only continues his investigations into the history of the Hindu law books, but also enters into discussions on some of the most important chronological and historical questions touching almost every department of ancient Hindu literature.

Amongst other things he discusses in this introduction the relation of Manu's law book to the **Epic literature of the Hindus**, and for the first time grapples with what is perhaps the most difficult problem in the history of the Indian literature, — the chronological and literary problem of the gigantic Hindu epic, the *Mahābhārata*. In dealing with this question he again evinces his eminently historical instinct. Here, too, he was utterly dissatisfied with the 'inner' criticism and the vague hypotheses defended by Prof. Holtzmann and other scholars. Eagerly he sought for epigraphic and literary documents from which any secure dates as to the history of the Hindu epic could be obtained. In his *Contributions to the History of the Mahābhārata* (published together with Prof. Kirste's paper on Kshemendra's *Bhāratamañjarī* in the *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, 1892) he has shown how, by the patient study of inscriptions and by a comparison of other branches of literature, the dates of which are more or less approximately known, it is possible to bring light even into this darkest of all problems in the history of ancient Hindu literature. He was most anxious to interest his pupils in this much neglected branch of Sanskrit literature. It was on his suggestion that my articles on the South-Indian recension of the *Mahābhārata* were printed in the *Indian Antiquary*, and the last letters of the deceased which I received from him during the last months preceding his death, are an eloquent and melancholy proof to me of the great and lively interest he took in all questions of *Mahābhārata* criticism. In this department of Indology his loss will be felt by no one more painfully and more acutely than by the present writer, whose first thought in all his Indological studies has hitherto always been, 'what will Bühler say?'

We are often told that to make discoveries is merely a matter of luck, and some people might think it was just Bühler's good luck which enabled him to make so many important discoveries, which in their turn led to his fruitful labours in all departments of Indian research. Now it may be called 'luck' that at the time when he was in India there were still so many unknown treasures hidden in Indian libraries. But surely no one was better qualified than Bühler to unearth these treasures.

First of all, he was stimulated by an enthusiasm for his particular line of research, of which only he can have some idea who has ever seen him, standing with sparkling eyes and almost childlike delight before some impression of a difficult inscription from which he had succeeded, after patient and often renewed attempts, in reading the correct Sanskrit words. This enthusiasm was the main spring of the zeal and energy with which he pursued his researches. Moreover, he had acquired a thorough knowledge of the languages, in which he could freely converse with native scholars, on whose assistance he had greatly to depend in his travels of research. But above all it was his **hearty sympathy and tact** which won him the **love and affection of the Natives** and, whenever wanted, their ready help and co-operation. He counted among his friends members of all classes of the native population, among learned Brāhmans, as well as among the Jaina monks. He tells us (in a German paper read at the Vienna Oriental Museum in 1883,¹ describing his 'Journey through the Indian desert') how much of his success in searching Jaina libraries he owed to his intimate friendship with the **Śrīpūj Jinamuktisūri**, the head of a portion of the Kharatara-Gachchha. He was never tired of mentioning, in words of grateful recognition, any services rendered to him by Paṇḍits. I need only refer to the kind and hearty words of friendship which, in the very first pages of his *Detailed Report*, he devotes to **Paṇḍit Rādhākishn**, who had brought him the first MSS. of his Kaśmir collection, and how carefully he mentions every one of the Native scholars, whose assistance had been of any use to him during his search for MSS. in Kaśmir.

Readers of this *Journal* will remember the beautiful obituary which (*Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XVII., 1888) he devoted to his lamented friend Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl Indrāji, — a scholar whose excellent contributions to Indian epigraphy and archæology would probably have been lost to the European world of learning, if it had not been for Bühler, who translated into English the papers written in Gujarati by his friend. With a kindly and sympathetic interest, and at the same time with that strict accuracy and conscientiousness which characterizes everything written by Bühler, he gives in this obituary a full account of all that Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl has done for Indian history, epigraphy, and archæology. In stirring words he refers to the noble character of this scholar, and then proceeds to describe his own relations to him, — how they sat together for hours, working and conversing about problems of Indian history and archæology, but frequently also about the social, political, and religious conditions of modern India. 'His amiable, frank character,' (he concludes) 'his keen intelligence, and his extensive learning, made him very dear to me. I shall never forget the pleasant days, when I used eagerly to look forward to the announcement that the Paṇḍitji had come; and I sadly acknowledge now, as I have done already on special occasions, that I have learnt a great deal from him.'

Never have I heard from Bühler any of those slighting and disparaging remarks about the character of the Natives, which one hears so frequently from people who have spent a few months, or may be years, in India without ever making the least attempt to become really acquainted with any class of Natives. When he spoke of the people among whom he spent so many years of his life, it was always with words of just appreciation of the good he had found in the Native character, and words of kindly and grateful remembrance of the services they had rendered him in his scientific pursuits. An incident, which occurred during his stay near Jesalmir, and which he relates in the above-mentioned paper on his *Journey through the Indian Desert*, may show how he surmounted even serious difficulties by the tact and shrewd common-sense, with which he respected and even adopted the religious prejudices of the Natives. One day it happened that a cow was found in the neighbourhood of his camp, ransacking the fodder stores of the camels, and one of the camel-drivers threw a stone to frighten the cow away. Unfortunately he hit her leg. Now, since cows are sacred in Rājputāna, this offence created a great stir. The owner of the cow appeared greatly excited, and stoutly refused to accept any recompense offered him for the damage done. The cows, he said, he loved like his family, and nothing short of corporal punishment inflicted on the offender would satisfy him. The minister of the Rawal, who had hurried to the spot, also insisted on the same demand. The camel-driver was to receive a hundred strokes. Bühler refused to endorse such a sentence, and a whole day passed in futile negotiations with the local officials. At last Bühler hit on a new plan. When the minister of the Rawal came again, Bühler offered to inflict on the camel-driver a heavy fine, and to use the sum for a pious work. To this the people agreed. If a certain amount of fodder were bought, and spread out on the spot of the accident to give the cows of Jesalmer a solemn feast, the atonement would be considered sufficient. Bühler at once promised to do this, and imposed on the offender a fine of twenty rupees, with which he bought five camel loads of hay. These were spread out outside the camp, and for three days all the cows of Jesalmer assembled for a solemn pasture. The wounded cow soon recovered, and the incident, which otherwise might have led to serious disturbances, had no further consequences. It even proved useful, inasmuch as it raised Bühler's authority in the eyes of the people, who were impressed with his sense of justice, since he had offered such a suitable *prāyaścitta* for the horrible offence committed. The Śrīpūj, too, heartily approved of Bühler's action saying, 'You have acted rightly, now the people know that you respect their prejudices.'

Personal contact and frequent exchange of ideas with native Paṇḍits, were considered by Bühler as indispensable for the progress of research. It was on this account that most of his contributions to Indology were written in English, that he wished his pupils to do the same,

that he insisted on articles relating to India being written in English for the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, and that he persuaded even the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna to print in its *Proceedings* papers in the English language, — as he once said to one of his English friends, ‘not to save you trouble, but for the good of those in India.’ His friendly relations with the Natives of India enabled him to find many things which no other European could have found; they also enabled him to gain an insight into the inner life and thought of the Indian people, such as only few Europeans, though they may have spent years in India, have been able to obtain. And it was this intimate acquaintance with Hindu modes of thought and with the inner life of the Hindus, which made intercourse with Bühler, and above all his academical teaching, so very inspiring and so extremely instructive.

In fact, what was said of Benfey, that ‘his inspirations were more wonderful than his science,’ applies even in a greater measure to Bühler, Benfey’s great pupil. It was impossible for any one, whatever special department of Indian research he might be interested in, to converse with Bühler even for half an hour only, without gaining from him new points of view and many new inspirations. How much more must this apply to those who (like the present writer) have actually had the good fortune of sitting as pupils at Bühler’s feet? When in 1880 the Indian climate affected his health and he had to leave India, he was speedily appointed to the chair of Sanskrit and Indology in the University of Vienna, and with unabated energy he devoted himself to the duties of his chair. Even when teaching the elements of Sanskrit, he was inspired by the same enthusiasm as that with which he pursued his important archaeological and epigraphic researches and worked out the most difficult problems of Indian history. It was a real pleasure to attend his ‘Elementary Course of Sanskrit.’ The same practical method of teaching the elements of Sanskrit, which he and Prof. Bhândârkar had, with such great success, used in Indian Colleges, was introduced by him in the University of Vienna. For this purpose he published, in 1883, a practical handbook for the study of Sanskrit, — his *Leitfaden für den Elementarkursus des Sanskrit*. When I began the study of Sanskrit in 1881, he was just printing this *Leitfaden* for use at his own lectures; and how we rejoiced at every new sheet that came from the press! An English translation of this *Handbook*, under the title *Sanskrit Primer*, was published in America by Prof. Perry (Boston, 1886). His ‘Elementary Course of Sanskrit’ was followed by the reading of easy texts, and never shall I forget the happy hours when I read with Bühler the immortal *Nalopākhyāna*. When we had surmounted the initial difficulties of the study of Sanskrit, he began to initiate us into the different branches of Sanskrit literature by reading with us specimens of the ornate style of classical Sanskrit poetry and poetical prose, e. g., Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī*; we were introduced to Pāṇini by the reading of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, to the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, by Vāmana’s treatise, to Hindu philosophy by the *Vedāntasāra* and the *Tarkasamgraha*, to the drama by Kālidāsa’s *Mālavikāgnimitra* to the *Veda* by reading a selection of hymns with Sāyaṇa’s commentary, to the *Dharmasāstra* by the interpretation of the *Mitāksharā*, and at the same time he lectured to us on Sanskrit Syntax, on Indian History, on Epigraphy, on the history of the Hindu law books, etc.; and both within and without the lecture room he took the greatest personal interest in every one of his pupils: like a true Indian *Guru*, he was as a father to his disciples, who will cherish his memory with unceasing gratitude.

As Professor in the University Bühler was also anxious to make Vienna a centre of Oriental studies. With this end in view he became one of the Editors of a literary and critical supplement to the *Monatsschrift für den Orient*, edited by the Vienna Oriental Museum, in which he published several important reviews (1884-86). Shortly before the Congress of Orientalists held at Vienna in 1886, he founded, together with the other Professors of Oriental languages at the University and with the assistance of Baron von Gautsch who was then Minister of Public Instruction, the Oriental Institute of Vienna University. I still remember the proud satisfaction and delight, with which he walked through the two rooms of the University devoted to this Institute, and how pleased he was to see his pupils working in it.

It was in the same Oriental Institute, where soon after the newly founded **Vienna Oriental Journal** was edited, in which (from 1887) he published many valuable contributions to Indian history, epigraphy, archæology, lexicography and other branches of Indology.

As a **Member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna** he not only added many valuable papers to the *Proceedings* of the Academy, but he also took every opportunity of urging the Academy to support Sanskrit studies by grants of money for scientific purposes: — *e. g.*, only a few years ago, for the edition of a series of highly important texts, the *Sources of Sanskrit Lexicography*.

Nevertheless, friendly relations to India and England suffered no interruption. We meet his name in every volume of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, and he often sent communications to Mr. Cotton's *Academy*, and to the *Athenæum*. And readers of this *Journal* know only too well what his loss means to the *Indian Antiquary*.

As a representative of Vienna University, he regularly attended the **International Congresses of Orientalists**, and in the meetings of the Indian Section he always took a prominent part, in fact the part of a leader, — a part in which he will be sadly missed at the next Congress to be held at Rome. It is in no small degree owing to his initiative and his great influence that the various resolutions proceeding from the Indian Section of the Congresses, and addressed to the Governments of India, have led to substantial results, and helped on the progress of archæological and epigraphic research in India. At these Congresses it became clear that Bühler held the position of a **recognised leader among the Sanskrit scholars of Europe**, a position which he did not assume from any ambition on his part, but which was tacitly granted him as a matter of course. That this was the case is due as much to his personality as to his great scholarship. For it is characteristic of Bühler that while he won the love and respect of the Natives to so great an extent, he enjoyed at the same time the friendship and regard of Englishmen in India, both of scholars and of high officials. In Europe, too, he had, by his tact and shrewd knowledge of the world, made many friends and won influence, not only in the learned world, but also in high and influential circles. In this respect also Bühler's loss to Indian studies is irreparable. For he never used his influence but in the interest of Science.

And it lies in the nature of our studies, that for their advancement the quiet labour of the student alone is not sufficient. We want, not only pioneers willing to work in the field of archæological and epigraphic research, but also large sums of money to enable them to undertake long journeys, to make excavations, and so on, and to make their discoveries generally accessible by costly publications; we want not only patient scholars willing to edit voluminous texts, but also large sums of money, again, to make the publication of such texts possible. All this can only be done with the help of Governments, Academies, and learned Societies. Bühler was the very man to work in this direction in the interest of Science. He had connections in influential circles both in India and in England, in Austria and Germany, and he knew how to interest persons in his cause, who are otherwise difficult to approach in anything relating to a branch of knowledge, which is still anything but popular. But by his energy and his wonderful knowledge of men he succeeded in carrying his point, where many another would have failed. Though he was a German scholar in the true sense of the word — industrious, patient, and accurate, — there was yet something of the practical Englishman in him. He was a true scholar, yet his world was never limited to his study. He was a man of the world in the interest and for the benefit of Science.

And while he possessed those qualities which enabled him to exercise influence, he was ever ready to help and to advise. No one, — whether he was a friend or pupil of his, whether a well known *savant*, or a young Sanskrit scholar just writing his 'doctor's dissertation,' applied to him in vain for help and advice; and I know many who call themselves pupils of Bühler, who have never attended a single lecture of his. He who wanted to edit a text applied to

Bühler for MSS. He who wanted to do archæological or epigraphic work, turned to Bühler for inscriptions and, it may be, for ways and means to go out to India. He who wanted information about any difficult point in Indian research, turned (it seemed the most natural thing) to Bühler for advice. Thus he will be missed by every Sanskrit scholar and Indologist; but his nearer friends and pupils feel without him as if cast adrift.

Bühler's leadership among Indologists, though it had long been an understood fact, was to find its outward expression in the great work, which occupied him during the last years of his life, and which was to be the crown of his life-long labours in the field of Indian research, — in his *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*. Upwards of thirty scholars of various nationalities — from Austria, England, Germany, India, the Netherlands, and the United States — had joined Bühler, in order to give, according to an elaborate scheme which he himself had worked out, systematic treatises on all the different branches of Indology, and thus for the first time to render a complete account of the present state of our knowledge of India in a concise survey of Indian philology, literature, history, antiquities, religion, sciences, and art. Bühler had not only planned the whole work, enlisted his collaborators, and undertaken the general editorship, but he had also reserved for himself the treatment of some of the most difficult subjects. He had the satisfaction of seeing the great undertaking started by the publication of several excellent contributions.² But only one of his own contributions was he allowed to see completed, — that on Indian palæography which has already been mentioned. He had also promised to treat, together with Prof. Jolly and Sir Raymond West, on sociology, clans, castes, etc., and on economics, tenures, commerce, etc.; and how he would have brought his extensive knowledge of modern Indian life to bear on these subjects! Together with Dr. Stein, he had intended to treat the subject of geography, with which he was so familiar, both by his journeys extending over so many parts of India and by his epigraphic researches. But above all, his plan, which he had carried about for so many years, of writing a Connected History of India, was to be accomplished in this work. He had promised to treat on the literary and epigraphic Sources of Indian History, and on the 'Political History from the earliest times to the Mahomedan Conquest, with a chapter on Chronology.' That he has not been spared to accomplish this task, is undoubtedly the greatest misfortune that could have befallen Indian studies. It is one comfort to know that the *Encyclopedia* which has been started so auspiciously is to be continued, Prof. Kielhorn having undertaken the editorship of the work in succession to Bühler. And there can be no doubt that men like Prof. Kielhorn, Dr. Hultzsch, and Dr. Fleet will be able to take up the work on Indian history, which Bühler left undone, that Prof. Jolly, Sir Raymond West and Dr. Stein will be able to accomplish the task in which Bühler was to assist them, and that they will do so in the spirit of their departed friend; but surely these scholars, and in fact all those who are still engaged in any work in connection with the *Encyclopedia*, will feel the loss of Bühler most deeply, and miss him most frequently and most painfully.

What enabled Bühler to so eminently become the leading spirit of such an undertaking as the *Encyclopedia*, was the fact that he was one of the few universal Indologists (a term recently applied by Bühler to the veteran Sanskrit scholar Prof. Weber) who are still living. With the advance of Indian studies it has become well nigh impossible for any one scholar to

² The following Parts have been published up to the present date, *i. e.*, under Bühler's editorship:—

- | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|---|
| Vol. | I., | 3, b. | The Indian Systems of Lexicography (Koshas) by Th. Zachariæ (in German). |
| " | I., | 6. | Vedic and Sanskrit Syntax by J. S. Speyer (in German). |
| " | I., | 11. | Indian Palæography (with 17 plates) by Bühler (in German). |
| " | II., | 3, b. | Coins (with plates) by E. J. Rapson (in English). |
| " | II., | 8. | Law and Custom by J. Jolly (in German). |
| " | III., | 1, a. | Vedic Mythology by A. Maedonell (in English). |
| " | III., | 2. | Ritual Literature, Vedic Sacrifices and Charms by A. Hillebrandt (in German). |
| " | III., | 4. | Sâmkhya and Yoga by R. Garbe (in German). |
| " | III., | 8. | Buddhism by H. Kern (in English). |

master all the different branches of Indology, and the period of specialisation (which by a sad necessity must come in every branch of knowledge) has set in. Bühler fully recognised the necessity of specialising, but he also saw the danger of carrying specialisation too far, and he often warned his pupils against limiting themselves too much to one special branch of research. He himself never forgot and often took occasion to point out, how the various branches of Indology, and the different periods in the history of Indian civilization are most intimately connected.

Nor did he ever lose sight of the relations existing between the various nations of the East and the different branches of Oriental studies in general. Although he limited himself, in his writings, as much as possible to those departments of knowledge which were his particular domain, yet his view reached far beyond the limits of India, and the history of Indian civilisation was to him but an act in the great drama of the History of Mankind.

Bühler's clear-sightedness in questions of detail, his far-sightedness in dealing with great historical problems will be missed for years to come. We shall miss again and again his noble character, his great and influential personality, his inspiration, his advice and his help. And all that he might still have produced, is lost, — irretrievably lost! He who has been a leader of men, a trusty guide, has been taken from us! He is gone, and it merely remains for us to cherish his memory by continuing the work which he had so much at heart, to the best of our power and by building on the solid foundations which he has laid; for, though he is no longer with us, his life-work will remain for ever, — *na hi karma ksháyate*.

GEORGE BÜHLER, 1837-98.

BY THE RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER.¹

It is not often that the death of a scholar startles and grieves his fellow-workers as the death of my old friend, Dr. Bühler, has startled and grieved us all, whether in Germany, England, France, or India. Saṅskṛit scholarship has indeed been unfortunate: we have often lost young and most promising scholars in the very midst of their career; and though, Dr. Bühler was sixty-one years of age when he died, he was still so young and vigorous in body and mind that he made us forget his age, holding his place valliantly among the *πρόμαχοι* of the small army of genuine Indian students, and confidently looking forward to many victories and conquests that were still in store for him. By many of us he was considered almost indispensable for the successful progress of Saṅskṛit scholarship — but who is indispensable in this world? — and great hopes were centred on him as likely to spread new light on some of the darkest corners in the history of Saṅskṛit literature.

On the 8th of April last, while enjoying alone in a small boat a beautiful evening on the Lake of Constance, he seems to have lost an oar, and in trying to recover it, to have overbalanced himself. As we think of the cold waves closing over our dear friend, we feel stunned and speechless before so great and cruel a calamity. It seems to disturb the regular and harmonious working of the world in which we live, and which each man arranges for himself and interprets in his own way. It makes us feel the littleness and uncertainty of all our earthly plans, however important and safe they may seem in our own eyes. He who for so many years was the very life of Saṅskṛit scholarship, who helped us, guided us, corrected us, in our different researches, is gone; and yet we must go on as well as we can, and try to honour his memory in the best way in which it may be honoured — not by idle tears, but by honest work.

Non hoc praecepium amicorum munus est, prosequi defunctum ignavo questu, sed quae voluerit meminisse, quae mandaverit exsequi.

¹ Reprinted from *J. R. A. S.*, 1898.

A scholar's life is best written in his own books; and though I have promised to write a biographical notice for the *Journal* of the Royal Asiatic Society, in which he took so warm and active an interest, I have to confess that of the personal circumstances of my old friend, Dr. Bühler, I have but little to say. What I know of him are his books and pamphlets as they came out in rapid succession, and were always sent to me by their author. Our long and never interrupted friendship was chiefly literary, and for many years had to be carried on by correspondence only. He was a man who, when once one knew him, was always the same. He had his heart in the right place, and there was no mistaking his words. He never spoke differently to different people, for, like a brave and honest man, he had the courage of his opinions. He thought what he said, he never thought what he ought to say. He belonged to no *clique*, he did not even try to found what is called a school. He had many pupils, followers, and admirers, but they knew but too well that though he praised them and helped them on whenever he could, he detested nothing more than to be praised by his pupils in return. It was another charming feature of his character that he never forgot any kindness, however small, which one had rendered him. He was *krītajña*, *memor facti*, in the real sense of the word. I had been able, at the very beginning of his career, to render him a small service by obtaining for him an appointment in India. He never forgot it, and whenever there was an opportunity he proved his sincere attachment to me by ever so many small, but not therefore less valuable, acts of kindness. We always exchanged our books and our views on every subject that occupied our interest in Saṅskṛit scholarship, and though we sometimes differed, we always kept in touch. We agreed thoroughly on one point — that it did not matter *who* was right, but only *what* was right. Most of the work that had to be done by Saṅskṛit scholars in the past, and will have to be done for some time to come, is necessarily pioneer work, and pioneers must hold together even though they are separated at times while reconnoitring in different directions. Bühler could hold his own with great pertinacity; but he never forgot that in the progress of knowledge the left foot is as essential as the right. No one, however, was more willing to confess a mistake than he was when he saw that he had been in the wrong. He was, in fact, one of the few scholars with whom it was a real pleasure to differ, because he was always straightforward, and because there was nothing astute, mean or selfish in him, whether he defended the Pūrva-paksha, the Uttara-paksha, or the Siddhānta.

Of the circumstances of his life, all I know is that he was the son of a clergyman, that he was born at Borstel, 19th July, 1837, near Nienburg, in the then kingdom of Hanover, that he frequented the public school at Hanover, and at 1855 went to the University of Göttingen. The professors who chiefly taught and influenced him there were Sauppe, E. Curtius, Ewald, and Benfey. For the last he felt a well-deserved and almost enthusiastic admiration. He was no doubt Benfey's greatest pupil, and we can best understand his own work if we remember in what school he was brought up. After taking his degree in 1858 he went to Paris, London, and Oxford, in order to copy and collate Saṅskṛit and chiefly Vedic MSS. It was in London and Oxford that our acquaintance, and very soon our friendship, began. I quickly recognized in him the worthy pupil of Benfey. He had learnt how to distinguish between what was truly important in Saṅskṛit literature and what was not, and from an early time had fixed his attention chiefly on its historical aspects. It was the fashion for a time to imagine that if one had learnt Saṅskṛit grammar, and was able to construe a few texts that had been published and translated before, one was a Saṅskṛit scholar. Bühler looked upon this kind of scholarship as good enough for the *vulgus profanum*, but no one was a real scholar in his eyes who could not stand on his own feet, and fight his own way through new texts and commentaries, who could not publish what had not been published before, who could not translate what had not been translated before. Mistakes were, of course, unavoidable in this kind of pioneering work, or what is called original research, but such mistakes are no disgrace to a scholar, but rather an honour. Where should we be but for the mistakes of Bopp and Burnouf, of Champollion and Talbot?

Though Bühler had learnt from Benfey the importance of Vedic studies as the true foundation of Sanskrit scholarship, and had devoted much time to this branch of learning, he did not publish much of the results of his own Vedic researches. His paper on Parjanya, however, published in 1862 in Benfey's *Orient und Occident*, Vol. I. p. 214, showed that he could not only decipher the old Vedic texts, but that he had thoroughly mastered the principles of **Comparative Mythology**, a new science which owed its very existence to the discovery of the Vedic Hymns, and was not very popular at the time with those who disliked the trouble of studying a new language. He wished to prove what Grimm had suspected, that Parjanya, Lit. Perkunas, Celt. Perkons, Slav. Perun, was one of the deities worshipped by the ancestors of the whole Aryan race, and in spite of the usual frays and bickerings, the main point of his argument has never been shaken. I saw much of him at that time, we often worked together and the Index to my *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* was chiefly his work. The important lesson which he had learnt from Benfey showed itself in the quickness with which he always seized on whatever was really important in the history of the literature of India. He did not write simply in order to show what he could do, but always in order to forward our knowledge of ancient India. This explains why, like Benfey's books, Bühler's own publications, even his smallest essays, are as useful to-day as they were when first published. Benfey's edition of the Indian fables of the *Panchatantra* produced a real revolution at the time of its publication. It opened our eyes to a fact hardly suspected before, how important a part in Sanskrit literature had been acted by Buddhist writers. We learnt in fact that the distinction between the works of Brahmanic and Buddhist authors had been far too sharply drawn, and that in their literary pursuits their relation had been for a long time that of friendly rivalry rather than of hostile opposition. Benfey showed that these Sanskrit fables of India had come to us through Buddhist hands, and had travelled from India step by step, station by station, through Pehlevi, Persian, Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, and the modern languages of Europe, till they supplied even Lafontaine, with some of his most charming Fables. Benfey was in many respects the true successor of Lassen in calling the attention of Sanskrit scholars to what are called in German the *Realia* of Sanskrit scholarship. He was bold enough to publish the text and translation of the *Sāmaveda*, and the glossary appended to this edition marked the first determined advance into the dark regions of Vedic thought. Though some of his interpretations may now be antiquated he did as much as was possible at the time, and nothing is more painful than to see scholars of a later generation speak slightly of a man who was a giant before they were born. Benfey's various Sanskrit grammars, founded as they are on the great classical grammar of Pāṇini, hold their own to the present day, and are indispensable to every careful student of Pāṇini, while his *History of Sanskrit Philology* is a real masterpiece, and remains still the only work in which that important chapter of modern scholarship can be safely studied.

Bühler was imbued with the same spirit that had guided Benfey, and every one of his early contributions to Benfey's *Orient und Occident* touched upon some really important question, even though he may not always have settled it. In his article on *θεός*, for instance (*O. u. O.*, Vol. I. p. 508), which was evidently written under the influence of Curtius' recent warning that *θεός* could not be equated with *deus* and Skt. *dēva* without admitting a phonetic anomaly, he suggested that *θεός* as well as the Old Norse *dǫ́lar*, 'gods,' might be derived from a root *dhī*, 'to think, to be wise.' Often as we discussed that etymology together — and it was more than a mere etymology, because on it depended the question whether the oldest Aryan name of the gods in general was derived from the bright powers of Nature or from the more abstract idea of divine wisdom — he could never persuade me that these two branches of the Aryan race, the Greek and the Scandinavian, should have derived the general name for their gods from a root different from that which the other branches had used, *viz.*, *div*, 'to be brilliant,' and from which they had formed the most important cluster of mythological names, such as Zeus, Jovis, Diespiter, Dia, Diana, etc. I preferred to

admit a phonetic rather than a mythological anomaly. If I could not persuade him he could not persuade me, *et adhuc sub judice lis est!*

Several more etymologies from his pen followed in the same journal, all connected with some points of general interest, all ingenious, even if not always convincing. In all these discussions, he showed himself free from all prejudices, and much as he admired his teacher, Professor Benfey, he freely expressed his divergence from him when necessary, though always in that respectful tone which a Sishya would have observed in ancient India when differing from his Gurn.

While he was in Oxford, he frequently expressed to me his great wish to get an appointment in India. I wrote at his desire to the late Mr. Howard, who was then Director of Public Instruction in Bombay, and to my great joy got the promise of an appointment for Bühler. But, unfortunately, when he arrived at Bombay, there was no vacancy, Mr. Howard was absent, and for a time Bühler's position was extremely painful. But he was not to be disheartened. He soon made the acquaintance of another friend of mine at Bombay, Sir Alexander Grant, and obtained through him the very position for which he had been longing. In 1865 he began his lectures at the Elphinstone College, and proved himself most successful as a lecturer and a teacher. His power of work was great, even in the enervating climate of India, and there always is work to do in India for people who are willing to do work. He soon made the acquaintance of influential men, and he was chosen by Mr. (now Sir) Raymond West to co-operate with him in producing their famous *Digest of Hindu Law*. He supplied the Saṅskrit, Sir Raymond West the legal materials, and the work, first published in 1867, is still considered the highest authority on the subjects of the Hindu Laws of Inheritance and Partition. But Bühler's interest went deeper. He agreed with me that the metrical **Law-books of Ancient India** were preceded by legal *Sūtras* belonging to what I called the *Sūtra* period. These *Sūtras* may really be ascribed to the end of the Vedic period, and in their earliest form may have been anterior to the Indo-Scythian conquest of the country, though the fixing of real dates at that period is well-nigh an impossibility. When at a much later time I conferred with him on the plan of publishing a series of translations of the Sacred Books of the East, he was ready and prepared to undertake the translation of these *Sūtras*, so far as they had been preserved in MSS. Some of these MSS., the importance of which I had pointed out as early as 1859 in my *History of Ancient Saṅskrit Literature*, I handed over to him; others he had collected himself while in India. The two volumes in which his translation of the legal *Sūtras* of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vasishṭha, and Baudhāyana are contained, have been amongst the most popular of the series, and I hope I shall soon be able to publish a new edition of them with notes prepared by him for that purpose. In 1886 followed his translation of the *Laws of Manu*, which, if he had followed the example of others, he might well have called his own, but which he gave as founded on that of Sir William Jones, carefully revised and corrected with the help of seven native commentaries. These were substantial works, sufficient to establish the reputation of any scholar, but with him they were by-work only, undertaken in order to oblige a friend and fellow-worker. These translations kept us in frequent correspondence, in which more than one important question came to be discussed. One of them was the question of what caused the gap between the Vedic period, of which these *Sūtras* may be considered as the latest outcome, and the period of that ornate metrical literature which, in my Lectures on India delivered at Cambridge in 1884, I had ventured to treat as the period of the Renaissance of Saṅskrit literature, subsequent to the invasion and occupation of India by Indo-Scythian or Turanian tribes.

It was absolutely necessary to prove this once for all, for there were scholars who went on claiming for the author of the *Laws of Manu*, nay, for Kālidāsa and his contemporaries, a date before the beginning of our era. What I wanted to prove was, that nothing of what we actually possessed of that ornate (*alanṅkāra*) metrical literature, nor anything written in the continuous *śloka*, could possibly be assigned to a time previous to the Indo-Scythian invasion. The

chronological limits which I suggested for this interregnum were from 100 B. C. to 300 A. D. These limits may seem too narrow on either side to some scholars, but I believe I am not overstating my case if I say that at present it is generally admitted that what we call the *Laws of Manu* are subsequent to the *Sāmayāchārika* or *Dharma-sūtras*, and that Kālidāsa's poetical activity belongs to the sixth, nay, if Professor Kielhorn is right, even to the end of the fifth century p. Ch., and that all other Saṅskṛit poems *which we possess* are still later. Bühler's brilliant discovery consisted in proving, not that any of the literary works *which we possess* could be referred to a pre-Gupta date, but that specimens of ornate poetry occurred again and again in pre-Gupta inscriptions, and, what is even more important, that the peculiar character of those monumental poems presupposed on the part of their authors, provincial or otherwise an acquaintance, if not with the *Alaṅkāra Sūtras* which we possess, at all events with some of their prominent rules. In this way the absence or non-preservation of all greater literary compositions that could be claimed for the period from 100 B. C. to 300 A. D. became even more strongly accentuated by Bühler's discoveries. It might be said, of course, that India is a large country, and that literature might have been absent in one part of the Indian Peninsula and yet flourishing in another; just as even in the small peninsula of Greece, literary culture had its heyday at Athens while it was withering away in Lacedaemon. But these are mere possibilities, and outside the sphere of historical science. There may have been ever so many Kālidāsas between 100 B. C. to 300 A. D., but *illacrimabile premuntum nocte*. The question is, why were literary works preserved, after the rise of the national Gupta dynasty, in the only ways in which at that time they could be preserved in India, either by memory or by the multiplication of copies, chiefly in Royal Libraries under the patronage of Rājahs, whether of Indian or alien origin — and why is there at present, as far as manuscripts are concerned, an almost complete literary blank from the end of the Vedic literature to the beginning of the fourth century A. D.?

The important fact which is admitted by Bühler, and was urged by myself, is this — that whatever literary compositions may have existed before 300 A. D., in poetry or even in prose, nothing remains of them at present, and that there must surely be a reason for it. Here it was Bühler who, in the *Transactions* of the Vienna Academy, 1890, came to my help, drawing my attention to the important fact that among certain recently published ancient inscriptions, eighteen of which are dateable, two only can with any probability be proved to be anterior of what I called the four blank centuries between 100 B. C. to 300 A. D. (See *India*, p. 353). There occur verses which prove quite clearly that the ornate style of Saṅskṛit poetry was by no means unknown in earlier times. The as yet undeveloped germs of that ornate poetry may even go back much further, and may be traced in portions of the Brāhmaṇas and in some Buddhistic writings; but their full development at the time of these Saṅskṛit inscriptions was clearly established for the first time by Bühler's valuable remarks. So far we were quite agreed, nor do I know of any arguments that have been advanced against Bühler's historical views. There may be difference of opinion as to the exact dates of the Saṅskṛit Gīrnār inscription of Rudradāman and the Prākṛit Nasik inscription of Pulumāyi, but they contain at all events sufficient indications that an ornate, though perhaps less elaborate style of poetry, not far removed from the epic style, prevailed in India during the second century A. D. All the evidence accessible on that point has been carefully collected by my friend, and reflects the greatest credit on his familiarity with Saṅskṛit *Alaṅkāra* poetry. But the fact remains all the same that nothing was preserved of that poetry before 300 A. D.; and that of what we actually possess of Saṅskṛit Kāvya literature, nothing can for the present be traced back much beyond 500 A. D. We must hope that the time may soon come when the original component parts of the ancient epic poetry, nay, even the philosophical Darśanas, may be traced back with certainty to times before the Indo-Scythian Invasion. It is well known that the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purānas* are mentioned by name during the *Sūtra* period, and we cannot be far wrong in supposing that something like what we possess now of these works must have existed then.

Bühler was full of hope that it might be possible to fix some of the dates of those popular works at a much earlier time than is assigned to them by most scholars. I was delighted to see him boldly claim for the Veda also a greater antiquity than I had as yet ventured to suggest for it, and it seemed to me that our two theories could stand so well side by side that it was my hope that I should be able to bring out, with his co-operation, a new and much improved edition of my chapter on the Renaissance of Saṅskṛit Literature. I doubt whether I shall be able to do this now without his help. The solution of many of the historical and chronological questions also, which remain still unanswered, will no doubt be delayed by the sudden death of the scholar who took them most to heart, but it is not likely to be forgotten again among the problems which our younger Saṅskṛit scholars have to deal with, if they wish truly to honour the memory and follow in the footsteps of one of the greatest and most useful Saṅskṛit scholars of our days.

These chronological questions were, of course, intimately connected with the question of the date of the Saṅskṛit alphabets and the introduction of writing into India, which produced a written in place of the ancient mnemonic literature of the country. There, too, we had a common interest, and I gladly handed over to him, and for his own purpose, a MS. sent to me from Japan that turned out to be the oldest Saṅskṛit MS. then known to exist, that of the *Prajñāpāramitā hṛidaya-sūtra*. It had been preserved on two palm-leaves in the Monastery of Horiuzi, in Japan, since 609 A. D., and, of course, went back to a much earlier time, as the leaves seem to have travelled from India through China, before they reached Japan. Bühler sent me a long paper of palæographical remarks on this Horiuzi palm-leaf MS., which forms a most valuable Appendix to my edition of it.² Thus we remained always united by our work, and I had the great satisfaction of being able to send him the copy of Aśvaghosha's *Buddhacharita*, which my Japanese pupils had made for me at Paris, and which, whether Aśvaghosha's date is referred to the first or the fifth century A. D., when it was first translated into Chinese, represents as yet the only complete specimen of that ornate scholastic style which, as he had proved from numerous inscriptions, must have existed previous to the Renaissance.³ Thus our common work went on, if not always on the same plan, at all events on the same ground. We never lost touch with each other, and were never brought nearer together than when for a time we differed on certain moot points.

I have here dwelt on the most important works only which are characteristic of the man and which will for ever mark the place of Bühler in the history of Saṅskṛit scholarship. But there are many other important services which he rendered to us while in India. Not only was he always ready to help us in getting MSS. from India, but our knowledge of a large number of Saṅskṛit works, as yet unknown, was due to his *Reports* on expeditions undertaken by him for the Indian Government in search for MSS. This idea of cataloguing the literary treasures of India, first started by Mr. Whitley Stokes, has proved a great success, and no one was more successful in these researches than Bühler. And while he looked out everywhere for important MSS. his eyes were always open for ancient inscriptions also. Many of them he published and translated for the first time, and our oldest inscriptions, those of Aśoka, in the third century B. C., owe to him and M. Senart their first scholarlike treatment. This is not meant to detract in any way from the credit due to the first brilliant decipherers of these texts, such as Prinsep, Lassen, Burnouf, and others. Bühler was most anxious to trace the alphabets used in these inscriptions back to a higher antiquity than is generally assigned to them, but for the present, at least, we cannot well go beyond the fact that no dateable inscription has been found in India before the time of Aśoka. It is quite true that such an innovation as the introduction of alphabetic writing does not take place on a sudden, and tentative

² *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, 1884.

³ The text of the *Buddhacharita* was published by Cowell in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, the translation in my *Sacred Books of the East*.

specimens of it from an earlier time may well be discovered yet, if these researches are carried on as he wished them to be carried on, in a truly systematic manner. In this field of research Bühler will be most missed, for though absent from India he had many friends there, particularly in the Government, who would gladly have listened to his suggestions. One may regret his departure from a country where his services were so valuable and so much appreciated. I have not dwelt at all in this place on the valuable services which he rendered as inspector of schools and examiner, but I may state that I received several times the thanks of the Governor of the Bombay Presidency, the late Sir Bartle Frere, for having sent out such excellent scholars as Bühler and others. Unfortunately his health made it imperative for him to return to his own country, but he was soon so much restored under a German sky that he seemed to begin a new life as Professor at Vienna. If he could not discover new MSS. there, he could digest the materials which he had collected, and he did so with unflagging industry. Nay, in addition to all his own work, he undertook to superintend and edit an *Encyclopædia of Indo-Aryan Philology* which was to be a résumé up to date of all that was known of the languages, dialects, grammars, dictionaries, and the ancient alphabets of India; which was to give an account of Indian literature, history, geography, ethnography, jurisprudence; and finally, to present a picture of Indian religion, mythology, philosophy, astronomy, mathematics, and music, so far as they are known at present. No one knows what an amount of clerical work and what a loss of time such a superintendence involves for a scholar who has his hands full of his own work, how much reading of manuscripts, how much letter-writing, how much protracted and often disagreeable discussion it entails. But Bühler, with rare self-denial, did not shrink from this drudgery, and his work will certainly prove extremely useful to all future Indo-Aryan students. One thing only one may regret — that the limits of each contribution are so narrow, and that several of the contributors had no time to give us much more of their own original work. But this is a defect inherent in all encyclopædias or manuals, unless they are to grow into a forest of volumes like the *Allgemeine Encyclopædie der Wissenschaften und Künste* by Ersch, begun in 1831 and as yet far from being finished. Under Bühler's guidance we might have expected the completion of his *Encyclopædia* within a reasonable time, and I am glad to hear that his arrangements were so far advanced that other hands will now be easily able to finish it, and that it may remain, like Lassen's *Alterthumskunde*, 1847-1861, a lasting monument of the lifelong labours of one of the most learned, the most high-minded and large-hearted among the Oriental scholars whom it has been my good fortune to know in the course of my long life.

ON PROFESSOR BÜHLER.

BY C. H. TAWNEY, C.I.E.¹

THE death of Professor J. G. Bühler, came as a terrible shock to his numerous friends in England. It appears that he left Vienna on the 5th of April, 1898, to pay a visit to his wife and son, aged sixteen years, who were staying with relations at Zürich. He broke his journey at Lindau on the lake of Constance. Being an expert oarsman, he was tempted by the fine weather on Good Friday, the 8th April, to take a trip alone in a small rowing boat down the lake. He was last seen about 7 p. m. on that day. It is surmised that he lost an oar and in attempting to recover it, overbalanced the boat, which was apparently very crank, and so was drowned. The boat was found floating bottom upwards, but no one had any idea who had been in it. As Professor Bühler had evidently intended to surprise his family in Zürich with his visit, and had therefore given no hint of his movements, they continued to correspond with him at his address in Vienna and were much distressed at receiving no answer. Meanwhile the proprietor of the Hotel in which he was staying, finding that he did not return, communicated with the police, and enquiries were at once set on foot. It was not ascertained that the occupant of the boat was Professor Bühler of Vienna, until the 15th April, when the melancholy tidings reached his wife in Zürich. The body has never been recovered.

¹ Reprinted from Luzac's *Oriental List*.

Professor Bühler was born at Berstel near Nienburg in Hannover. He was educated at the University of Göttingen and studied Saṅskṛit under Professor Benfey, for whose scholarship he always retained an enthusiastic admiration, and took his Doctor's degree in the year 1858. He passed many years in the Bombay educational service (1863-1880), and thus came to acquire great familiarity with Gujarāti and Marāṭhī and also the power of speaking Saṅskṛit fluently, an accomplishment which impressed considerably the *paṇḍits* of lower Bengal. The famous Saṅskṛit scholar Mahāmahōpādhyāya Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna carried on an animated conversation with him in Saṅskṛit in the hearing of the writer of the present notice.

Professor Bühler possessed a sympathy with Indian thought and feeling, and a knowledge of native customs and the obvious everyday facts of native life, which removed him from the list of dryasdust Saṅskṛit Scholars, and entitled him to be styled rather an **Indianist of a very wide range of acquirements**. While in Bombay, he paid great attention to the study of Indian Law. Of this the book, which he brought out in connection with Sir Raymond West in 1867 and 1869 on the Hindu Law of Inheritance and Partition, is an abiding monument. He subsequently returned to this study and produced the Sacred Law of the Āryas as taught in the schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vasishṭha, and Bandhāyana, in the Sacred Books of the East Series (Oxford, 1879, 1882). In 1886 he translated the Laws of Manu for the same series.

Professor Bühler was well read in Saṅskṛit Philosophy, though we cannot call to mind any work that he wrote in connection with the orthodox systems. In *Belles Lettres (Kāvya)* he was thoroughly at home. It was a pleasure to hear him unravel the intricacies of a difficult stanza, constructed, as too many Saṅskṛit stanzas are, for the express purpose of displaying the recondite learning of the author. In this field he edited four books of the *Panchatantra* in the Bombay Saṅskṛit Series, which was originally brought out under the superintendence of himself and Professor Kielhorn. Of these books many editions have appeared. He edited for the same series the first part of the *Dasakumāracharita* of Daṇḍin. The second part was edited by Professor Peterson. Professor Bühler considered the style of this author in the admittedly genuine portions, as the highest flight of Saṅskṛit prose.

In 1875 he edited the *Vikramānkaḍevacharita* of Bilhaṇa, a historical work written in ornate Saṅskṛit, from a single MS. copied by himself and Professor Jacobi in seven days. This brings us to the distinguishing feature of Professor Bühler's Saṅskṛit scholarship. No one has done more for the elucidation of the **Hindu period of Indian History**. By means of his papers on Indian inscriptions in the *Indian Antiquary* and elsewhere he has established the history and chronology of that period on a secure basis. Of the knowledge thus acquired he made a memorable use in his article on the "Indische Kunstpoesie" which appeared in 1890. In this paper he shews from an examination of dated inscriptions and other sources, that the ornate style of classical Saṅskṛit poetry and poetical prose was in full bloom in the second century of the Christian era. The wide-reaching consequences of this demonstration are at once apparent. In fact this short paper revolutionised the views of Saṅskṛit scholars with regard to the date of important branches of Indian literature. Other historical writings of Professor Bühler are his pamphlets on the *Sukritasankīrtana* of Arisimha, on the Jaina monk Hemachandra and the *Navasahasānkacharita*, the latter brought out in co-operation with Professor Zachariae.

His knowledge of **Jaina literature** and of living Jaina teachers was extensive. It may be assured that his love of history gave him a particular sympathy with Jainas, as some of the best mediæval chronicles of India appear to have belonged to that "Darśana." His short treatise "Ueber die Indische Secte der Jaina," which appeared in 1887, is perhaps the best account of that somewhat neglected sect. It is much to be regretted that it has never been translated into English.

The ripest fruit of his epigraphic studies is to be found in his English pamphlet on the origin of the Indian Brahma Alphabet, in which he derived those characters from the most

ancient North Semitic letters, and his contribution on Indian Palæography (with nine tables) to the *Indo-Aryan Encyclopædia*. The latter treatise is so complete that it is difficult to imagine that it can be ever superseded or supplemented. His loss as editor of this *Encyclopædia* will be widely felt. He was most active as a decipherer of Indian inscriptions to the last, and took a lively interest in the archæological investigations of Doctors Hultsch, Führer, Waddell and others.

Professor Bühler was a most painstaking teacher. He taught the Sanskrit language in Vienna even from the Alphabet, the letters of which he drew on a black board for his less advanced class. He was always ready to help any serious student, and averse sometimes to having his assistance acknowledged. In fact, his distinguishing moral quality was unselfishness. He was perhaps hardly conscious himself to what an extent he carried this virtue. His manners were genial and unassuming. He was always in his element in the society of cultivated Englishmen. Before devoting himself to the classical language of India, he had been thoroughly disciplined in Greek and Latin. He was well acquainted with the modern languages of Europe and particularly with English. He could read with ease the most difficult English authors, and composed fluently in that language. It was these qualities that enabled him to give such a powerful impulse to Sanskrit scholarship both in India and Europe. Nor was his influence confined to the old world. He certainly counted among his pupils one native, at least, of the United States. His work will long survive not only in the books that he has written, but in the interests and capacities that he has created and trained.

PROFESSOR BÜHLER.

BY CECIL BENDALL.¹

EVERY practical student of Indian learning must have heard with consternation of the death, by a boating accident in the Lake of Constance shortly before Easter, of Hofrath Johann Georg Bühler, Professor of Sanskrit at Vienna, and for many years a prominent member of the Bombay Educational Service.

Born in 1837 at Berstel in Hanover, he studied Sanskrit under the leading Sanskritist of the last generation, Theodor Benfey. Bühler was Benfey's joy and pride. I remember Bühler once describing to me his embarrassment because old Benfey insisted on kissing him on a public occasion. Bühler made early acquaintance with England, visiting this country for the study of Indian MSS., working for a time in the library of Windsor Castle, and also assisting Prof. Max Müller in the index to his *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*. In 1863, mainly through the influence of the last-named scholar, he joined the Bombay Educational Service, holding successively the Professorship of Sanskrit at Elphinstone College, Bombay, and an Inspectorship of Schools in Gujarât. He did excellent work in both capacities.

It is due to the critical scholarship and personal influence of men like Bühler and Kielhorn that the best native scholarship of the "Bombay side" is at least half a century ahead of the rest of India. And yet the rulers of India have decreed that native instruction in Sanskrit is strong enough to run alone, and the race of such European teachers is to become extinct! One wishes there were a few men on Indian Councils capable of feeling the force of remarks like those of Böhlingk (the greatest living lexicographer) on the last Sanskrit dictionary by Bengali scholars. But to return to Bühler. In his educational tours he collected and published statistics of private libraries of MSS. These researches culminated in his great tour in Kasmîr in 1875, where he made discoveries of unprecedented importance in the literary history of India. Returning to Europe in 1880, he was at once appointed to the Chair of Sanskrit at Vienna, which he occupied till his death.

¹ From the *Athenæum*, No. 3678, April 23, 1898.

His chief works were the *Digest of Hindu Law* (1867-76), written in conjunction with Sir Raymond West; *Manu*, translated with a masterly introduction (Oxford, 1886); and texts and translations of Apastamba and other minor jurists. He also edited several important texts in lexicography and historical romance, besides useful works for educational purposes. Of his contributions to periodicals a few only can be mentioned. The chief are to be found in the *Vienna Oriental Journal* (mainly founded, and largely edited, by him) and in the *Indian Antiquary*. He frequently wrote in the *Journal* of the Royal Asiatic Society, of which he was an honorary member and also an active supporter. Amongst his other articles I may note: 'Die Asoka- Inschriften'; 'Ueber das Leben des Hemachandra' (1889); 'Ueber die Secte der Jaina' (1887); 'Die indische Inschriften und das Alter der Kunstpoesie' (1890); and his 'Indian Studies,' written in English, though published in Austria, "not to save you trouble," as he once told me, but for the good of those in India. The crowning work of his life was to have been the *Encyclopædia of Indo-Aryan Research*, designed and edited by him, of which some account has already been given in the *Athenæum*, No. 3593. Of his great published contribution to this, 'Indische Paläographie,' it is impossible for me to speak without gratefully recording the generous acknowledgment (as charming as it was characteristic) of the work done by others who had preceded or aided him in any line of research. During his visit to London in 1897, and also up to his death, I believe, he was mainly engaged on the ancient geography of India. I fear however, from what he told me, that he had made but little progress with what might have been his greatest work, the pre-Muhammadan history of India. He would have gathered together in this his numerous and brilliant contributions to the *Epigraphia Indica*.

Bühler had the true nature of a scholar — accurate, incisive, critical in his own work helpful, kindly, stimulating to others. His tact and *savoir-faire* made him a natural leader of men on occasions like congresses of Orientalists, where, indeed, his familiar figure will be very greatly missed. His genial, hearty manner made him equally popular and influential with scholars and with men of the world. In all senses he made the best of both worlds.

GEORG BUHLER.

IN MEMORIAM.

BY A. A. MACDONELL, M.A., PH.D.

I FEEL that the various able and full obituary notices of Prof. Bühler which have appeared, leave hardly anything for me to say. But I am glad to have an opportunity of saying that little as a small tribute to the memory of one whose abilities and achievements I have admired ever since I began the study of Sanskrit, now nearly twenty-four years ago, under his old teacher, Theodor Benfey. Never since then has the death of any scholar produced on me the impression of an irreparable calamity, till the papers last Easter announced the news that Bühler, a solitary sculler on a Swiss lake, had mysteriously disappeared beneath the waves in the evening twilight of Good Friday. All the eminent Sanskritists, Benfey, Stenzler, Whitney, Roth, who have died within this period, were all old men, ranging in age from about seventy to eighty years, and had accomplished their life's work. Bühler, on the other hand, was only sixty and, though he had already achieved so much, was really but entering upon what would have been the most important epoch of his career. Quite a short time before his death he expressed the opinion that he would require ten years to finish his chief work, for which his past life had only been a preparation. It was at least fortunate that he lived long enough not only to plan, but to see carried out to a considerable extent, the greatest enterprise yet undertaken in the field of Sanskrit scholarship, his *Encyclopædia of Indo-Aryan Research*. His organising ability, his practical talent, his intimate knowledge of modern India, and his keen interest in all departments of Sanskrit learning, singled him out

as the man best fitted for the accomplishment of this task. Having had the good fortune to spend seventeen of the best years of his life in India, he owed much to native learning; but he richly repaid the debt by doing more than any other scholar to reveal to the Indians of to-day the history of their past.

Years before I made his personal acquaintance I had heard much about Bühler from Benfey, who often spoke with pride of the achievements of his distinguished pupil. I can still remember some of the very words Benfey used in describing the circumstances of Bühler's appointment at Bombay. It was not till 1883, some three years after his return to Europe, that I first met him. Since then I had every two or three years opportunities of frequent personal intercourse with him at successive Oriental Congresses, especially at Stockholm, London, and Geneva, as well as on the occasion of his visits to England. In August 1887 I came across him by accident in the street at Lucerne. It was then I learnt that, as his wife was a Swiss lady, he was in the habit of spending a considerable part of his vacations in Switzerland, and of taking hard rowing exercise on the Swiss lakes after his exhausting labours at Vienna. His fondness for this form of exercise, which he indulged in for the sake of his health, was destined to bring about his untimely death. Since 1893, when he asked me to contribute to his *Encyclopædia* the part on 'Vedic Mythology,' I also had occasion to correspond with him a good deal in connexion with that work. These opportunities furnished sufficient data, I think, for forming a fairly correct estimate of his character. He struck me as having a peculiarly scientific cast of mind. But with this was combined an intellectual enthusiasm which caused him to be perpetually on the watch for whatever was calculated to promote Indian studies in every direction. Though of a thoroughly matter-of-fact temperament, he was not altogether lacking in sentiment. This betrayed itself in the emotion with which he used to speak of what he owed to the teaching and inspiration of Benfey. The special interest he seemed to take in the pupils of his old *guru* doubtless sprang from the same source. His high-mindedness always deterred him from doing or saying anything against those to whom he felt he owed a debt of gratitude. Nor did he stoop to personal controversy. But had he ever been unjustifiably attacked, his aggressor would probably have had cause to repent his temerity. For Bühler, as he told me himself, kept a record of the blunders which he found in the work of other scholars, and which he might have felt compelled to refer to in self-defence.

One quality which especially distinguished Bühler was that power of concentration which enables a man to devote weeks or even months of intense application to the decipherment of an inscription without the certainty of any tangible result. Such labour, though sometimes apparently fruitless, serves to sharpen and strengthen the mental powers, and it is only those who are capable of it who can hope to become really great scholars. This quality was possessed in an eminent degree by Benfey, and was undoubtedly fostered by Bühler, in his turn among pupils such as Dr. M. A. Stein, who has done such valuable archæological work in Kashmir. The *paramparā* of teachers becomes really fruitful by the cultivation of such qualities and the propagation of scientific method and accuracy, rather than by the formation of schools, which by their very nature must suffer from one-sidedness. Thus Bühler's death is to be deplored not only as a direct loss to learning, but also because of the indirect disadvantage resulting from the premature removal of a great trainer of scholars. Altogether Bühler came near to the ideal of what a Saṅskṛitist of the present day should be. Like Colebrooke, the great founder of Saṅskṛit scholarship, he combined with universal learning and untiring industry, distinguished practical ability. This enabled him to acquire a vast knowledge of the concrete data of modern Indian life, a knowledge particularly valuable to scholarship in a country which has experienced for three thousand years a continuity in literature and civilization which is unparalleled in any other branch of the Āryan race. Bühler thus became capable of understanding and illuminating the intellectual and social history of India as a whole to an extent which will hardly ever be equalled.

PROFESSOR J. GEORG BÜHLER.

BY PROFESSOR A. KAEGI, ZÜRICH.¹

ALL the newspapers have reported the tragic end of the famous Indologist Hofrath Dr. J. Georg Bühler, Professor in the University of Vienna. No one can help feeling the deepest sympathy with his relatives, whose sad bereavement has been rendered all the more painful by the melancholy circumstances attending his death. But not only the relatives and numerous friends of the departed, but also Sanskrit scholarship itself has suffered the heaviest and most unexpected loss — a loss that is simply irreparable. For Georg Bühler was more than 'an eminent Sanskrit scholar'; he held and has held for years the undisputed position of a leader of Indian philology; he was the scholar who at the present time was the leading spirit of all researches relating to ancient India. May I then, as a grateful admirer of the wonderful man, be permitted to devote a few lines to his memory?

Bühler was born in the parsonage of Borstel near Nienburg on the Weser, and educated at the grammar school of Hannover, where H. L. Ahrens and Raphael Kühner were amongst his teachers. At Easter, 1855, he proceeded to the University of Göttingen to study Classical and Oriental antiquities, and found there such eminent teachers as Hermann Sauppe, Ernst Curtius, Theodor Benfey, and Heinrich Ewald. After having taken his doctor's degree he went, in the autumn of 1858, to France and England, where he devoted three years to the thorough study of Vedic MSS. in the great libraries of Paris, London, and Oxford. In England he became acquainted with Professors Max Müller and Theodor Goldstücker who assisted him in many ways, and for a time he held the post of assistant librarian in Her Majesty's library at Windsor Castle.

In October, 1862, he returned to Göttingen with the intention of qualifying himself as a University lecturer. But in November he was offered a professorship at the Sanskrit College in Benares, the principal seat for the study of Brahmanical philosophy, and while the negotiations about this appointment were being carried on, he was invited to take the newly created chair of Oriental languages at the Elphinstone College in Bombay. Bühler gladly accepted the offer, and began his work at Bombay in the spring of 1863. His very first lectures on Sanskrit, Prakrit and Comparative Philology, and still more the zeal and energy with which he threw himself into the educational work at the college, making new practical arrangements for instruction in the philological department and procuring a library of books and manuscripts to be used by students and teachers, could not fail to attract the attention of the authorities, who very soon began to employ the young scholar in the Educational Department in other ways also.

As early as 1864 Bühler, together with Sir Raymond West, then judge at the Bombay High Court, was appointed by the Governor of Bombay Presidency, to compile a **Digest of Hindu Law**, which was to take the place of the *Sâstris* (native scholars versed in the customary law), who until then had acted as legal advisers at the lower courts.

During the summer of 1866 he was employed at Poona as superintendent of Sanskrit studies, and in the winter of 1866-67 he travelled, by order of the Government, through the Marâṭha and Kânara countries, in order to **search** the Brahmanic libraries for **important manuscripts**. As the result of this very first journey Bühler brought home more than 200 old manuscripts, among them many rare and until then quite unknown works, and he lost no opportunity in pointing out to the authorities the necessity of a systematic investigation of the old libraries.

Two years more of quiet teaching and study followed, till, early in 1869, Bühler was appointed Acting Educational Inspector for the Northern Division of the Bombay Presidency (Gujarât and neighbourhood), being thereby charged with the administration and superintendence of all elementary and secondary schools of a territory extending over about 56,000 square miles, with five millions of inhabitants. For many years afterwards the administration of the lower and secondary Anglo-Indian schools in that province was Bühler's principal task, which he undertook at once with that

¹ Translated from an article published in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*.

incomparable energy so characteristic of him to the very end. First of all, he was anxious to develop and improve the colleges for a higher and more general education of native teachers, and then new school-books were procured and new regulations introduced; wherever possible, new schools were founded, the existing schools carefully classified, systematic annual inspections of all colleges and schools were arranged, and finally, through Bühler's initiative, the salaries of teachers at secondary schools were considerably raised, and the masters at the lower schools were given opportunities of earning an annual increase of their salaries by especially good work. We may form an idea of Bühler's extensive activity in this administrative work from the fact that when he entered on his office in 1869 there were in the province 730 schools with 47,800 scholars, while at the end of his term of office in 1880 the number of schools had risen to 1,763 with 101,970 scholars.

However, while his time and energy were to such an extent placed at the service of the Administration, Bühler yet found it possible to render his official work, especially his inspections of schools and colleges (of which occasionally he used to give most interesting and vivid descriptions), at the same time fruitful in the highest degree for scholarly purposes. When he entered on his office as Educational Inspector he obtained from the Government, which had already become aware of the important results of his first journey in search of MSS., the order and authority to search all libraries within reach in the province for MSS. and to acquire for the Government any works of importance. Consequently, during his tours of inspection he communicated, in all the larger towns, with the learned Paṇḍits, and enlisted agents who had to hunt up the libraries, carry on negotiations with the owners, and to compile lists of MSS. He soon found out that the number of books and libraries was enormous, and that more especially the Jainas possessed exceedingly rich treasures of MSS. As these efforts of Bühler were crowned by such unexpected results — during his very first year of inspecting he had succeeded in purchasing upwards of 200 important old MSS. and in acquiring catalogues containing something like 14,000 titles of works of the Brahmanical literature alone — he was commissioned to undertake several tours to different parts of India as far as Kashmir and Nēpal, and from all these tours he returned with valuable treasures of MSS. and inscriptions (on stone, copper-plates, coins, etc.). Especially famous became his tour to Kashmir, when he discovered and acquired not only a great number of hitherto unknown Brahmanical works, but also an almost complete collection of the sacred books of the Digambara Jainas. Besides the purchases for the Indian Government Bühler also bought, with the permission thereof, large and systematic collections of MSS. for European libraries. Upwards of 5,000 MSS. have since those years become generally accessible to scholars, apart from numerous corrected copies of Sanskrit works, which he privately procured for scholars of all countries.

That Bühler in spite of his extensive practical work should have found it possible still to devote himself to literary pursuits in such an eminent degree, has always been a matter of surprise. His very first greater work, the *Digest of Hindu Law*, published by order of the Governor of Bombay (1867 and 1869) became a standard. From numerous law-books, which at that time mostly existed in MS. only and had to be collated for the first time, and from information gathered from the mouths of Shāstrīs versed in the customary law, West and Bühler compiled a codex of the law of inheritance, partition, and adoption, which has since been repeatedly edited, translated into the vernaculars, and enjoys great authority throughout the whole of India.

Next Bühler, whose school-books for Indian colleges have already been mentioned, founded, together with Kielhorn (then Professor of Sanskrit in Poona, and now in Göttingen) the *Bombay Sanskrit Series* — an undertaking which was intended to give young native scholars an opportunity of learning European methods of criticism in editing texts, and to procure cheap and good editions of Sanskrit standard works for use in Indian schools and colleges. Bühler himself published in this collection the *Pañchatantra*, Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracharita*, the historical romance *Vikramādikadeva-charita* of the 11th century which he himself had discovered, the ancient law-book of Âpastamba, and others. His catalogues of MSS. and his well-known *Reports* are of great scientific value, and his epigraphic researches in connection with the famous edicts of King Piyadasi-Âśoka and other Indian inscriptions have marked a new epoch and led to new results of the highest importance.

His literary activity became still more extensive and fruitful, when, in 1881, after leaving the Indian Civil Service, he took the chair of Sanskrit in the University of Vienna. Partly through his instruction, by which he trained a number of younger scholars, still more by his numerous publications and his extensive connections both in the East and in the West he became more and more **the centre and the chief promoter of Indological studies in Europe** — a fact which came out clearly enough at the Congress of Orientalists held in Vienna in 1886. With untiring and never failing courtesy and with an unselfishness that was truly surprising, he placed the vast stores of his experiences and studies, as well as the rich treasures of his MSS. at the disposal of his fellow students, and by his numerous connections with the leading authorities in India he was able to procure for European and American scholars anything they might want for their work, if it could at all be had from India.

To mention even only the most important of **Bühler's larger works** or of his numerous articles in different journals both of Europe and India, would of course be impossible here. Of his books, I will only mention that he translated for Max Müller's *Sacred Books of the East* five of the most important law-books, amongst them that of *Manu* — this alone a volume of 760 pages, including important introduction and notes. Of his smaller essays also I will mention only one. In his book *India, what can it teach us?* (London, 1883) Max Müller had expressed the startling view that the whole of the Indian literature, as far as it is not Vedic or Buddhistic, was written in the time *after* the Turanian (Indo-Scythian) invasion of India, *i. e.*, *after* the second century of the Christian era. The Veda, he declared, was evidently a wreck saved from a general shipwreck; everything else that has come down to us — epic literature, law-books, works on grammar, poetry — was merely a late reflowering of a new life sprung up under more favourable circumstances: it was '*renaissance literature*.' This hypothesis, of course, created a great sensation and called forth lively discussions. Most scholars opposed or doubted this theory without however (considering the great uncertainties prevailing in all questions of Indian chronology) being able to refute it entirely, others were led away by Max Müller's fascinating argumentation, until Bühler took up the discussion with his splendid and methodical essay on the Indian inscriptions and the age of the Indian Kāvya literature (*Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, 1890, Vol. 122). Starting from some recently discovered inscriptions, eighteen of which bear perfectly certain dates which are fully discussed by Bühler, he refutes in this essay Max Müller's arguments one by one, and establishes besides a number of secure dates.

Again in the discussion which has lately been revived and has excited such great interest, as to the age of the Veda, Bühler has taken the most sober and moderate view of the question.

About six years ago Bühler conceived the plan of editing an **Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research** on a grand scale — a work which was, as it were, to crown his life-long efforts for the general development of Indology. Within a very short time he succeeded in securing the co-operation of about thirty scholars from different parts of the world — from America, India, England and the continent of Europe. With youthful zeal he set to work himself, and twice the Austrian Government granted him a year's leave of absence for the purpose of devoting himself entirely to his work in connection with the *Encyclopedia*. Besides the *Palaeography*, published in 1896, he intended to treat of the Antiquities, Geography and History. Especially in the last mentioned part he hoped to be able to bring out new and unexpected results. Only a short time ago he explained to me with his cheerful enthusiasm, how he was going once for all to refute the general talk about **the Hindus** lacking the **historical sense** — and now all at once this terrible blow, this sudden and cruel destruction of all hopes and schemes! And what might we not have expected from a man so full of vigour and energy! His capacity, his love of work and his power of work seemed simply unlimited — and now! It is true, we may hope that at least the *Encyclopedia* (to say nothing of his other schemes) is so firmly established that it can safely be carried out to the end. But the parts which he was to work out himself will never be accomplished by any one, as he would have done it. "If there ever was a man," writes the Nestor of German Sanskritists, Professor Albrecht Weber in Berlin, "whose loss can be called irreparable, it is Georg Bühler." Of him it may be truly said: "He has lived for all ages!"

P.S. — While I was writing the above, a newspaper came to my hands, in which a Vienna correspondent reported rumours circulating in Vienna as to a voluntary or violent death of Hofrath Bühler. The correspondent added that indeed no tangible proofs of either the one or the other hypothesis are forthcoming, and that Bühler's nearest Vienna friends "deny most positively the very possibility of a suicide committed by Bühler from ethical or philosophical motives" — and surely they are right. Whoever has known Bühler ever so slightly, must certainly arrive at the same conclusion. I knew him for nearly twenty years, since August 1878, and from that time to the very last I have had frequent intercourse with him both personal and by letters, and I venture to assert most emphatically that with him "a tendency to the negation of the pleasures of existence" or any kind of Buddhist mysticism is entirely out of the question, and the hypothesis of a suicide is absolutely groundless. Nor is there any foundation for the hypothesis of a violent death, of a crime, it being entirely uncalled for in view of the facts which have come to light. Boating was Bühler's favourite sport, and he often liked to practise it, particularly after hard work. Already on the 7th of April he had made an excursion from Lindau, and after his return in the evening was seen engaged in cheerful conversation with other visitors at the Hotel. On Good Friday the 8th he was induced by the beautiful spring weather to stay one day longer, "in order to make a longer excursion," as he was heard saying. After having drawn up a telegram to his wife, 'Come to-morrow,' which was afterwards found in the Hotel, he started in the afternoon in one of those long and narrow boats, the oars of which lie so lightly on the outriggers, that they are lifted even at a great distance by the wash of a steamer, if they are not held tightly as soon as the waves approach. Now Bühler was seen from the banks rowing forward and backward for some time on one and the same spot after 7 o'clock in the evening. Next day the empty boat was found floating on the lake with *one* oar, while the other oar was found at some distance from it. In the opinion of experienced people living near the lake it is highly probable that he lost one oar, which he tried to secure again, and in trying to catch it he, being a stout man, fell overboard. By this natural and simple hypothesis the terrible accident becomes perfectly plain and intelligible.

A CONTRIBUTION ON BÜHLER.

BY PROF. F. KNAUER (KIEW).

In the case of Bühler I hardly know which to admire most: the greatness of his learning and mental power, or the greatness of his mind and character. I do not think I can honour his memory better than by quoting a few extracts from his letters addressed to me, and by adding an account of an incident which shows the great scholar also as a man of rare human qualities.

On January 2nd, 1891, he writes:—"I think, we shall before long become acquainted even with older temples of the Brāhmans. The excavations of Mathurâ, Ahicchatrâ and Sravastî will no doubt considerably modify our views about the religions of India."

On March 3rd, 1893:—"The [London] Congress was one of the finest and most successful. A great deal of useful work was done: some of the papers were very important; Cowell's speeches the most important of all."

On June 6th, 1893:—"The work (*Mānavagrihyasūtra*) is one of the most interesting of its kind." And with reference to new discoveries:—"The brutal facts are now demolishing the finest theories concerning the age of Sanskrit literature, which a so-called criticism has derived from 'inner' reasons. But what we have learnt until now is only the beginning, we may look forward to far more startling discoveries, and I am afraid, of all that has been considered as the correct thing during the last forty years not much will stand the test of time. Our salvation is in the pick-axe and the shovel and in paying more attention to Hindu tradition."

On June 22nd, 1893:—"The worthy Bhatṭjis never cared much for the state of their *Mantras*; they always felt like that famous priest who baptised *nomine patris filie et spiriti sancti*, and it did not matter in the least. The Samskâra has its effect with a nonsensical *Mantra* just the same as with

a correct one." — "In support of your quite correct view that the *g ṛihyāni karmāni* are older than the *śrautāni*, I should also like to point out that the tariffs for the latter were much too high to be ever carried out completely."

In Vol. I. of the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, 1887, Bühler had published an article on the elliptic use of *iti* and *cha*, which was to a certain extent directed against myself, inasmuch as I had, in my edition and translation of the *Gobhilaṅgrihyasūtra*, taken a different view from that of the Hindu commentators which Bühler defends in his paper. I considered it my duty to oppose Bühler in a special article. With some misgivings — for I was an admirer of Bühler and could ill spare his help and advice — I wrote to him pointing out my objections. And what was his reply? "As to *iti* and *cha* it does not matter. I shall return to the subject on some other occasion. All I ask for, if anybody wishes to enter upon a controversy with me, is that the tone should always be that of polite society." A few days later he writes: — "The fuller the discussion the better." I do not know what impression my article published soon after in the *Festgruss an Otto von Böhtlingk* had made upon him; but when I announced to him my intention to come to Vienna in the summer of that year 1888, he invited me to stay with him. Of course, I did not like to trouble him. But when I came to Vienna, he frequently invited me to his house, and we met every day in the Oriental Institute. With the heartiest kindness he placed everything that could be of any use to me at my disposal, and assisted me with his advice and help with an unselfishness shrinking from no sacrifice that was truly touching. What could it be that induced the wonderful man to be so exceedingly kind to me? His personal acquaintance I had only made in 1886 at the Vienna Congress of Orientalists and, of course, then only very superficially, as he could not pay much attention to a beginner in those eventful days which taxed all his energies. I had not been his pupil, and was already a professor. Neither personally nor in literary matters could I be of any service to him; besides I had attacked him in public. Were these not reasons enough for him to receive me, in 1888, with cool reserve and to grant me only such favours as he could not deny me for decency's sake? Far from that, he fully opened to me the rich stores of his learning and allowed me a deep insight into his world of ideas, which proved a lasting gain to myself. It was clear that Bühler considered no one as too unimportant whom he thought capable of contributing in any way to the progress of learning, and that he tried to help and assist any such person to the utmost of his power. At the same time he had a charming manner of placing himself on a level, as it were, with those below him, so that even the humblest became inspired with courage.

On the 10th of July, 1896, he wrote to me on some other occasion: — "This I should like now to substitute in the place of former conjectures, and you may print and criticise it as much as you like." And in his last letter to me he writes to thank me 'heartily' for the 'splendid' work (my edition of the *Mānavagrihyasūtra*), although in this work I had repeatedly made critical remarks directed against him. **Bühler was free of all touchiness in questions of scholarship**, and granted to everybody the full liberty of his own opinion, nay, he seemed to experience a certain pleasure in meeting with views differing from his own, if only they were expressed judiciously. One might think that such a feature should be a matter of course in any scholar, particularly in one who has everything at his command and can afford to be superior to little weaknesses. However, experience teaches that this is not so and that even men of the greatness of a Bühler are not always proof against 'gnatbites' received in literary warfare, in consequence of which they become disagreeable (though it may be only for a short time). Bühler, however, was a lion without fear. He was a truly great scholar, an extraordinary character, an exceedingly keen observer of human nature, and a wise educator in matters of learning. Honour to the memory of a master!

AN APPRECIATION OF BÜHLER.

BY EMILE SENART, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT.

WHEN I agreed to add a few words to the notice that Dr. Winternitz was writing on the life and works of Bühler, I only considered, with my old sympathy for the *Indian Antiquary*, my affectionate admiration for the eminent scholar whose loss has left us an irreparable void.

Since I have read this touching memoir however, I feel the rashness of my promise. With the accuracy of a thoroughly well informed witness, and the pious fervour of heart-felt devotion, the writer reviews the entire life and work of the master, bringing into prominent relief the originality and importance of his rôle. Nothing further would therefore remain for me to say, were I not eager to accept the opportunity that is offered to me to add to such numberless expressions of homage and sincere regret the tribute of the high and respectful esteem that is felt by his French fellow-workers for this indefatigable pioneer of Indianism.

In spite of the fact, that, but for a friendly exchange of correspondence, I only made the personal acquaintance of Bühler a few years before his death, I cannot forget that having followed the same course of studies under the same "Guru," there existed, if I may be allowed the expression, a bond of common origin between us. When I began the study of Sanskrit, under the direction of Benfey, I remember what high expectations that clear-sighted judge had already formed of the distinguished destiny that awaited the man, still so young, whom he loved to proclaim his most remarkable pupil. Bühler himself never failed to acknowledge on his part, with fervent gratitude and faithful sympathy, the value of his instruction and the encouragement of such flattering predictions. Benfey was not only singularly suggestive in his teaching, and his conversation; he was not only an admirable grammarian and linguist. One of the first, he had fully perceived, beyond the mere linguistic interest that had first excited the attention of the West to the study of Sanskrit, the attraction which was offered to the highest curiosity of the mind by the insight into the past history of India and the development of its life, religious, political and social. He was the first who ventured to sketch a general view of it in his famous article, which appeared in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopædia*; and so he was certainly most influential in the course which his pupil's ideas early adopted. Bühler wanted to study India in itself, and for itself, and to trace, before all else, chronological, and positive data as given by its literature, and monuments. With this object, he decided to seek, in the familiar intercourse of the country itself, in its scholastic traditions, in a methodical research for manuscripts and documents, the information that this great work required.

It was to himself alone, however, to his own perseverance and ardour, to his enormous capacity for work that he was indebted for the success that so largely crowned his plan. Always distrusting specious deductions and brilliant generalisations, he showed in his whole aspect that harmonious fusion of qualities peculiar both to the German and the English mind to which Dr. Winternitz has so happily alluded. Varied and profound science, decided precision, unflinching tenacity, a practical knowledge of both men and affairs, nothing was wanting to make him, not exactly the leader of a certain school, but what was even better, a diligent leader of workers, or, as I may express it, a *chef d'atelier*, endowed to a striking degree, with authority and power. Such he showed himself in India, where he succeeded in making enthusiastic fellow-workers of several Natives, as well as of those of his own countrymen whom he attracted and imbued with his enterprising spirit, and still more so in Europe when he returned to Vienna and there founded a course of teaching which proved so fruitful. By the current use of Sanskrit, by certain ways of teaching — and even by certain habits, of mind, he used some coquetry to maintain the stamp of his long and affectionate familiarity with the Hindu world.

Thanks to the high position he enjoyed both with the Administration of the British Government, as well as with the Indianists of the East and West, he became under all circumstances, the natural intermediary between India and Europe, and he never refused his aid, whenever it was required, either by men or by useful enterprises. Of this I had a striking proof during the latter part of his life, the memory of which is all the more agreeable to me,

as it recalls a circumstance which gave me the opportunity of offering him a few days' hospitality and of enjoying his society more intimately. The Eleventh Congress of Orientalists having brought Bühler to Paris, where a number of other celebrated Indianists were also assembled, I thought it a duty to take advantage of the occasion for the realisation of a desire I had for some time entertained. The project in view was the organisation of an International Association, the object of which would be to further, by all means, archæological investigations in India. That Bühler should take a warm interest in the project at once, will not seem surprising. His enthusiasm, however, was not displayed only in promises. This was proved by the zeal by which he obtained the patronage of important personages, whose aid and assistance was essential to the success of the plan. He also, in a most precise and practical spirit, drew a sketch for the future working of the Association and kept up strenuously, to his death, the active correspondence which was entailed by our common interest in the undertaking. To him is certainly due, in a large measure, the valuable and powerful intervention of our eminent friends, Lord Reay and Sir Alfred Lyall, which secured for the project, the favourable disposition of the Indian Government. His loss is certainly a fatal blow to the new Association. May his memory protect it!

The least attentive observer would perceive, that in Bühler the man of work and of thought was also the man of action. Both his words and appearance, as well as an indescribable air of promptness and decision, showed it at first sight. He never indulged in reveries — in vague speculation, or in the frail adjustment of conjectures. In a field of research, where the uncertainty of chronological bases or the rarity of positive statements, as well as the national quietism and mystic disposition, opens so large an area for hypothesis, it remains a striking honour in his career that he devoted himself by a determined effort conscientiously and indefatigably to the conquest of facts, even when slightly prominent, and the fixing of dates even though secondary or provisional. It was a logical consequence of this frame of mind, that the Vedic Literature for him held a less prominent place than the epigraphic matter, that, in the study of law the genealogy of books and schools were of greater importance to him than the analysis of institutions. Even in the investigation of religious antiquities he was more busy in testing the tradition than in expatiating upon the systems.

From the first and until the end of his life, Bühler followed with undeviating firmness the path he had traced out for himself after due reflection. He has accomplished his task. He has accomplished it with *éclat*, for, with the clearness of purpose that was one of his chief characteristics, he had chosen his line in the direction of his most prominent faculties, and to it he devoted such a power for work, a vigour and an ingenuity of mind as never failed. All these brilliant qualities were at their best when the fatal accident occurred for which we shall long remain inconsolable.

In France, it revived among us sad memories, as a similarly cruel and unforeseen catastrophe had just ten years before deprived a fellow-worker and contemporary of Bühler of his life. In some respects one may say that Bergaigne, by the turn of his mind, by the direction of his favourite studies, presented a living antithesis to Bühler. But he also was cut off at the very moment when he seemed almost to have reached the crowning point of his labour, at an age when many fruitful years appeared to be still in store for him. Two masters, so widely different in their lines of work, are thus brought together for us by a common fatality which seemed to cling to their common studies. We had long been eager to manifest our high respect for the science and services of Bühler. Our Academy had considered it an honour to number him among its correspondents. While recalling a loss so near to our hearts, his tragic end, has, even for those who only knew him through his books, added a thrill of intimate emotion to the regrets which naturally accompany the premature death of a powerful worker.

His mind was of an unceasing activity and ever awake. His learning, admirably suggestive, was never taken unawares. A rich fullness of culture, a wide store of remembrances animated his conversation, which was at once solid and lively. All those who have had the good fortune to know Bühler personally will retain a faithful memory of a man, obliging, without any display — who softened by unvarying uprightness and true benevolence the commanding authority of a vast science and of a very decided turn of mind. As to the scholar, his useful impulsion is sure to survive him long, and his name will remain inscribed in the first ranks of the golden book of Indian studies.

A NOTE ON THE FACTS OF BÜHLER'S CAREER.¹

JOHANN GEORG BÜHLER, son of a clergyman, was born on the 19th July, 1837, at Borstel, a village near Nienburg (county Hoya, Hannover). The first part of his education was domestic, after which he was sent, in the spring of 1852, to Hannover, to complete the course of the Lyceum under the well known scholars H. L. Ahrens and R. Kühner. In 1855 he matriculated at the University of Göttingen and studied classical philology and archæology under K. F. Hermann, Schneidewin, E. Curtius, H. Sauppe, and F. Weiseler, and oriental philology under Th. Benfey, and H. von Ewald. Having taken his degree as Ph. D. in that summer of 1858, he went to Paris in October, 1858, thence to London in June, 1859, where he accepted in May, 1861, the post of Assistant to the Librarian of the Royal Library at Windsor, which in October, 1862, he exchanged for a similar one at the University Library at Göttingen.

He was nominated Professor of Oriental Languages at the Elphinstone College in Bombay on the 10th February, 1863; in December of the same year, Fellow and Examiner of the University of Bombay; in March, 1864, a Member of the Commission for the Publication of a Digest of Hindu Law; in June, 1864, Professor of Ancient History and English at the Elphinstone College. In January, 1866, he was promoted to the post of Acting Superintendent of Sanskrit Studies and Professor of Ancient History and English at the Deccan College, Poona, and was sent on a tour of research in the Southern Marâṭha and Kanara country during the cold seasons of 1866-69. He then returned to Bombay as Professor of Oriental Languages and Ancient History at the Elphinstone College, and was advanced, on the 20th December, 1868, to the post of Educational Inspector of Guzerat and Officer in charge of the search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency. He was sent on special duty to Rajputana from December, 1873, to March, 1874, and to Kashmir and Central India, from July, 1875, to April 1876. His health failing, he was pensioned on the 12th September, 1880, and accepted the professorship of Indian philology and archæology in the University of Vienna in October, 1880. He was Corresponding Member of the German Oriental Society (1871), of the American Oriental Society (1873), of the Berlin Academy of Science (1878), of the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen (1883), of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna (1883), of the Petersburg Academy (1893), of the Institut de France (1887), and of the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes at Paris. He was an Ordinary Member of the Imperial Academy of Science in Vienna (1885), of the Société Asiatique at Paris, of the Asiatic Society at Bombay, and of the

¹ Communicated by Prof. H. Jacobi and others.

Gujarat Vernacular Society. He was an Honorary Member of the American Oriental Society (1887), of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1895), of the Imperial Russian Archæological Society, and of the Anjuman-i-Punjab.

He was appointed a Knight of the Prussian Order of the Crown (III Class) in 1872, a Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire 1st January, 1878, and Comthur of the Order of Franz-Josef, and was nominated K. H. Hofrath in 1889, and Honorary LL.D. of Edinburgh in 1885.

Literary Works.— He wrote his Inaugural Dissertation on the Affix *tys*, Göttingen, 1858. He contributed papers to:— Benfey's *Orient and Occident*, Journal of the Philological Society (London), 1859-1863; Journal of the Bombay and Bengal Asiatic Societies and of the Madras Literary Journal, 1863-1867; to the *Indian Antiquary*, 1872-98; to the *Epigraphia Indica*, 1888-1898; to the *Vienna Journal für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1886-95. Together with Sir Raymond West he published the *Digest of Hindu Law Cases*, Part I., Bombay, 1867, Part II., 1869, second edition, 1878, third edition, 1881. He edited the *Panchatantra with English Notes* (Nos. 1 and 3 of the Bombay Sanskrit Series), 1868, second edition, 1881, third edition, 1881, fourth edition, 1891; the *Āpastambīya Dharmasūtra*, Bombay, 1868-71, second edition, 1892-94; a Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. from Guzerat, 1872-73; the *Daśakumāracharita with English Notes*, Bombay, 1873, second edition, 1887; the *Vikramānkacharita with an Introduction*, Bombay, 1875; a Detailed Report of a Tour in Kashmir, Bombay, 1877; the *Pāyalachchhînāmamālā*, Göttingen, 1878; the *Sacred Books of the Aryans*, Vol. I., Oxford, 1879 (second edition, 1897), Vol. II., 1883; *Leitfaden für den Elementarcursus des Sanskrit*, Wien, 1883; *Indische Palæographie* (in the *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*), Strassburg, 1896; *Inscriptions from the Caves in the Bombay Presidency in 'Dr. Burgess' Archæological Reports or Western India*, Vols. IV. and V., London, 1883; *Erklärung der Aśoka Inschriften in the Journal of the German Oriental Society*, 1883-93; *Palæographic Remarks on the Hriñji palm-leaf MS. in the Anecdota Oxon.*, Aryan Ser. I, 3, 1884; *The Laws of Manu*, translated, S. B. E., Vol. XXV., 1886; *Translations of the Dhauli and Jaugada versions of the Aśoka Edicts in Archæological Reports for Southern India*, Vol. I., 1887.

His publications in the "Schriften der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften" are the following:— (a) *Über eine Sammlung von Sanskrit und Prakrit Handschriften*, 1881; (b) *Über das Alter des Kaśmīrischen Dichters Śmadēva*, 1885; (c) *Über eine Inschrift des Königs Dharasena von Valabhī*, 1888; (d) *Über eine neue Inschrift des Gujara Königs, Dadda II.*, 1887; (e) *Über eine Sendraka Inschrift*, 1887; (f) *Über die Indische Secte der Jainas*, 1887; (g) *Über das Navasāhasānkacharita des Padmagupta*, 1888; (h) *Das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemachandra*, 1889; (i) *Über das Sukṛita-saṃkīrtana des Arisimha*, 1889; (j) *Die Indischen Inschriften and Das Alter der Indischen Kunst Poesie*, 1890; (k) *Indian Studies No. I.*, *The Jagadūcharita of Sarvāpanda*, 1892; (l) *Indian Studies No. II.*, *Contributions to the History of the Mahābhārata*, 1892; *Indian Studies No. III.*, *On the Origin of the Brahma Alphabet*, 1895 (Second edition, 1898).

BÜHLER AS A COLLECTOR OF MSS.

BY PROF. ERNST LEUMANN, STRASSBURG.

It is generally not known or scarcely noticed to what an extent the history of any science is dependent on the local distribution of its materials. When a town or country shows some predilection for this or that branch of research we are, at first, inclined to find the reason in some local or national instinct, or in the efficacy of the teaching and writings of some scholar, who may be considered to be the 'local genius.' And this inclination is strengthened by the undoubted facts that there are such things as local 'schools' of science as there are of art, and that nationalities do tend towards different standards in science and art. This does not,

however, explain how it is that — to turn to Indian research — Denmark has only produced Pāli scholars (Westergaard, Fausböll, Trenckner, Andersen), that Northern Buddhism is chiefly cultivated in Paris (Burnouf, Feer, Senart, Lévi, Guimet), and that other branches of Indian studies are more or less equally confined to particular seats of learning. The real explanation lies in the dispersion of the materials. Rask furnished Copenhagen with a splendid collection of Pāli manuscripts which roused the interest of Danish scholars, just as Hodgson sent to Paris an excellent collection of the writings of the Northern Buddhists as preserved in Nepal. So the famous general Saṅskṛit Library of Chambers went to Berlin and found there an indefatigable interpreter in Weber, while the India Office and the Bodleian have become seats of Indian philology through the manuscript libraries of Colebrooke and Wilson. In later years also Cambridge received a series of manuscript treasures from the enlightened activity of Daniel Wright, with the consequence that two Cambridge scholars (Cowell and Bendall), have made them their special study. Now on the same level with those great collectors of manuscripts who, by bringing or sending over to Europe their treasures, have founded there different seats of Indian Wisdom, we have to mention Bühler. Indeed, he not only equals Rask, Hodgson, Chambers, Colebrooke, Wilson, and Wright as a collector of manuscripts, but far surpasses, them all. And therefore, had he done nothing else for Saṅskṛit Philology, he would be one of its greatest promoters, — one of those whose activity most decidedly and most happily determine the progress of Indian Research. On this fact we insist all the more, as the general public, in appreciating scholars, is inclined to overlook merits of the kind described. Well written books, like fragrant flowers, chiefly attract the general attention and also in a titanic publication (like Murray's or Littré's or Grimm's *Dictionary*), which looks like a majestic oak in the park of literary and scientific productions. But who thinks of the roots hidden in the ground, which furnish the elementary materials for stems, branches and blossoms? Who longs to hear of the pioneer work, which furnishes the materials for those publications that the general reader may use or enjoy?

But let us, nevertheless, inquire in what way Bühler has been an **unparalleled collector of Indian manuscripts**. Between 1863 and 1866 Bühler bought for himself about 300 manuscripts, which in 1888 he presented to the India Office, and the zeal and ability exhibited in bringing together this small but remarkable collection induced the Bombay Government to secure Bühler's services in that line. And so between 1866 and 1868, Bühler was specially deputed to explore the native libraries in the South Marāṭhā and the North Kāṅarā countries, and obtained for Government about 200 manuscripts which were deposited in the Elpinstone College; and in 1868, when a regular and most important 'Search for Manuscripts' was instituted by the Government of India, Bühler became the head of the Bombay organisation, which up to 1880, when he left India, has bought for the Deccan College Library 2,363 manuscripts. Besides all this, between 1873 and 1880, Bühler asked for and received on several occasions permission to send over to Europe such texts on sale as were already well represented in the Government Collection. Among the European Libraries it is particularly that of Berlin which unhesitatingly grasped this splendid opportunity of adding to its stock of Indian manuscripts; and thus it came about that nearly 500 manuscripts, partly presented and partly sold, have, through Bühler, found their way to Berlin.

By mentioning in each case the exact or approximate number of manuscripts acquired we only mean to give a general idea of the enormous extent of new materials that we owe to Bühler's activity in India. A considerable part of the texts represented were entirely unknown before, many of them were brilliant discoveries due only to Bühler's exceptional energy and sagacity and to his profound learning. Thus he rescued two whole branches of literature from oblivion, *viz.*, the Kashmiri branch which comprises Vedic and Saṅskṛit texts and the extensive Prākṛit and Saṅskṛit literature of the Śvetāmbara Jains. Who would, thirty years ago, have thought that India still contained so many unknown literary documents? And who would have found them or even looked for them, if Bühler had not gone out, of his own

accord, to India, as an adventurer of philological research — comparable in this respect only to Anquetil Duperron and Czoma Körösi ?

The majority of those five hundred manuscripts which Bühler sent to Berlin belong to the literature of the Svetâmbara Jains. This has had the effect that Jain Philology is comparatively much cultivated in Germany, while in England and France, where the scholars are still greatly absorbed by the occupation which their rich stores of Buddhist manuscripts affords, no effort has yet been made to deal with Jainism. First of all Weber devoted to the new materials ten years of his life, as the fruits of which he brought out — not to speak of smaller publications — his *New Catalogue* (three 4to volumes of 1,364 pages) and his *Sacred Literature of the Jains* (an English translation of which was published in the *Indian Antiquary*). Klatt also was won for the new branch of study by the materials, as well as by Bühler personally (when on leave in Europe in 1878); and with a remarkable skill and assiduity he selected from the new literature all that tended to yield chronical and bibliographical facts. What Klatt contributed and what later on by ill fate he was prevented from contributing to Indian Research may be inferred from a Note in a former volume of the *Indian Antiquary* (1894, p. 169, note 2). A few years after Klatt, Leumann began, as a student in Berlin, his Jain investigations, transferring them afterwards to Strassburg where he tried to complete Bühler's work in that line by procuring for his University Jain manuscripts not represented as yet in the Berlin-Bühler Collection.

But Bühler founded the German Jain Philology not only through Berlin. In 1873-74 Jacobi had accompanied Bühler on one of his tours and had acquired with Bühler's consent and friendly support a manuscript collection of his own, containing chiefly Jain texts. It is well known how much Jacobi has fertilized this collection, and what valuable editions and translations of Jain texts he has brought out and furnished with most instructive introductions — not to mention the independent papers in which he has dealt with Jain subjects.

As to the impulses which Jain Philology received in India from Bühler we might refer to many, but confine ourselves to record here only what certainly is the chief and most promising impulse. Bühler imparted his desire of discovering or uncovering all that is hidden or unknown in Jain Literature to Peterson, his successor in Bombay, who has been so fortunate as to be able to enter sanctified temple libraries, which, in spite of all exertions, were closed to Bühler. Peterson has indeed been continuing Bühler's work in the 'Search for Manuscripts' very much to his credit, and his endeavours well supplement those of the highly accomplished scholar, Bhandarkar, who naturally favours the Brahmanic literature, though, like Weber, he has temporarily been induced to devote himself also to a very earnest perusal of Jaina texts.

We have dealt here somewhat at length on the position which Bühler holds towards Jain studies through his search for manuscripts. But his search claims to be of nearly the same primary importance in regard to the study of Indian Law and Custom. And further, all the other branches of Indian Learning have received new impulses and gained new prospects through the materials that have become available through Bühler. So, once more, we may state fairly that Bühler would have marked an epoch in Indian Philology, — he would, indeed, have remodelled it by giving it a new and larger base, even if he had done nothing else than securing for scientific investigation the three thousand manuscripts that we owe to him.

BÜHLER AND THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

A Note

BY JAMES BURGESS, C.I.E., LL.D., FORMERLY EDITOR.

WITH Professor Dr. J. G. Bühler, I became acquainted immediately on his arrival in Bombay as Professor of Sanskrit in the Elphinstone College, and during the next ten years we met occasionally at the rooms of the Bombay Branch of the Asiatic Society and at the University

examinations. But it was in 1871-72 that we became intimate. The Bombay Asiatic Society was then publishing little, and at long intervals; and it occurred to me that, by using the grant it had from Government for the publication and inviting papers from many men able to contribute such in the numerous branches of Oriental research, the Society might publish every quarter, if not every second month. This proposal I brought formally before the Society's Managing Committee, urging it as a duty to use the funds granted for publication in this way, and pointing out the extent of the field. But the Secretary, Mr. Jas. Taylor (who had formerly been in the firm of Smith, Elder & Co.), pooh-poohed the proposal as chimerical. This led me to promise to attempt what the Society declined, and towards the close of 1871, I wrote to all the scholars I knew in India, asking whether they would support a monthly magazine on the plan of the programme of the *Indian Antiquary*. I had an immediate and encouraging response from several, including Dr. Burnell, Mr. Beames, Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar, Prof. Blochmann, Dr. Bühler, Mr. T. W. Rhys Davids, Mr. F. S. Growse, and others. Thus the *Journal* was commenced. Dr. Bühler sent me his first paper "On the Chaṇḍikāśataka of Bāṇabhaṭṭa" in March 1872, and it appeared the following month. From that date we started a correspondence which continued more or less regularly till the time of his lamented death. To the *Indian Antiquary* he was a warm friend and frequent contributor, and, during the thirteen years I edited it, I never appealed to him in vain when I wanted a paper: he commended it to his friends; and though so liberal a contributor, he insisted on paying his annual subscription for it, — thereby testifying practically his anxiety for its success.

From 1885 our correspondence continued quite as regularly as before, and touched mostly on chronology, ancient geography, palæography and epigraphy. From the latter part of 1888 till 1894, his contributions to the *Epigraphia Indica* were also frequent and extensive. During all these years we had much personal conference, meeting in Vienna, Edinburgh, London, Paris, and elsewhere, and I always found him the same, — full of information drawn from all sources, enthusiastic about everything connected with Indian history and antiquities. His judgment was remarkably accurate and his knowledge of human nature instinctively clear, while his energy, wisdom and tact ensured success in whatever he undertook, and rendered his opinion one of great weight in any matter he expressed it upon. He was a true and valued friend as well as an accomplished scholar. His loss for the ancient history of India seems almost irreparable.

A NOTE ON DR. BÜHLER.

BY PROFESSOR MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

PROFESSOR BÜHLER was an almost perfect embodiment of what might be called the pragmatic scholar. His work was full of action, but in all his varied activity he never lost sight of the highest scholarly ideals. He gave freely to all that came of his advice and help. Whether it was necessary to search obscure catalogues for notices of manuscripts; to engage the co-operation of the Government officials in India; or to stir up a dreamy Paṇḍit to the point of answering a letter, or parting with a manuscript in his possession; in all these and many other contingencies you might count upon his help given in the most cordial fashion. Yet how far was he from becoming the agent and business-man of others: he always remained the master. With all his wonderful grasp of the realities of India, and Indian life and history he never lost patience with the pains-taking closet-work of the philologist that is needed to secure a firm foundation for the reconstruction of the past. He was an ideal philologist: philologist and historian in one. Every Indian scholar, that is not a mere tradesman, is something of an historian, but the force of most of us is spent at the door of historical inquiry. To edit and translate, to restore and decipher, these are certainly important and unavoidable tasks; most of us are so busy with such labours as to be at times in danger of not 'seeing the forest for the trees that

are in it.' Bühler was in an eminent degree both common labourer and architect: it is hard to say where he will be missed most. As a searcher and finder of manuscripts, as a promoter of archæological inquiries, and as a decipherer of inscriptions he had no rival. But he was even greater when he stepped out, as it were, from the intricate maze of his knowledge of details and turned to works of generalization: when he helped to digest Hindu Law; when he presented his unrivalled essays on Indian Palæography; when he conceived and guided the first attempt at a connected Encyclopædia of Indian Philology; above all when he propounded and solved in his own clear-headed way questions in literary history and chronology. It is but the soberest truth to say that just such a man we shall not count as one of us again, that his loss will never be quite repaired. Western scholarship owes him a debt of lasting gratitude; India may fitly deplore the loss of perhaps her truest historian.

By way of adding something to the record of his extraordinary activity in India, I may be permitted a quotation from a letter of his, written scarcely two months before his untimely death (dated February 22nd, 1898). He is speaking of the unique manuscript of the Kashmirian *Atharva-Veda*, the so-called *Páippaláda Qháká*, which was sent to the late Professor von Roth by the British authorities in India, and is now in the possession of the library of the Tübingen University: "If, as I presume, you will print a history of the manuscript, I would ask you to mention that Sir William Muir decided on my advice to despatch the MS. to Professor von Roth. On its account I had to travel from Indor to Calcutta in February 1876, because Sir William Muir did not know what to do with the ragged volume. I pointed out to him that in the first place it stood in need of a bath; this it got in Sir William's bathroom. After that the MS. looked quite fresh, and Sir William handed it to me to have it mended by the Native book-binders. The repairs lasted for nearly a week."

NOTES ON G. BÜHLER.

BY PROF. RHYS DAVIDS.

AFTER reading the strikingly able paper by Dr. Winternitz I feel that it is only possible to add one other proof of the all-round nature of Professor Bühler's enthusiasm for knowledge of all things that had to do with the history of India. When I first knew him he had scarcely read a line of Pali. But he soon afterwards became a member of the Pali Text Society, and also (this does not always follow) read the books himself. He became as keen about the issue of each new volume as if he had been a mere Pali scholar. And the last time he was in my study he said — we were talking about Privat-docents — that no one should be appointed a University teacher for Sanskrit unless he was at home also with Pali, and *vice versá*. He was interested chiefly in what could be gained for Indian lexicography, and the history of social institutions. But I confess I was amazed to find — knowing how very busy he was, how many other interests he had had for so long a time — that he should have been able to make time to read so much in these new texts. His articles on Pali subjects in the *Vienna Journal*, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, and in the *Indian Antiquary*;¹ the great importance attached by him to *Pitaka* evidence in the opening pages of his *Indische Palæographie*, and such notes as that in his *Manu*, p. xci., show the object he had in view. And I know from personal conversation, that he was meditating other papers of a similar kind.

It is perhaps important to point out, as regards the subject of 'inner chronology,' that no one was more skilled at drawing conclusions as to the comparative chronology of two or more books from a careful comparison of their contents, than precisely Bühler. The introductions to his translations of *Manu* and *Ápastamba* are elaborate examples of the importance and value of such comparisons, and of the right method to be followed in making them. It would be amply clear from them alone that it was not the use of 'inner chronology' as a means of investigation, that Bühler objected to, but the

¹ See, for instance, *ante*, 1894, pp. 148-154, 242, 247.

wrong use of it — the drawing of conclusions too wide, and too absolute from insufficient data ; a reliance on comparisons of isolated passages, instead of including all the passages relating to the same point ; a limitation of the comparisons to one or more points, omitting other matters also available for chronological purposes, and so on. The conclusions reached by Bühler, on grounds of 'inner chronology,' in the two essays referred to, are stated, not only once, but on several instances, in quite positive terms. They have obtained the assent of those of his fellow-workers most competent to judge of them. And 'inner chronology' used in the like judicial spirit, based on the like wide and accurate knowledge, guarded by the like painstaking industry, will always form an important element in our attempts to elucidate the history of Indian thought and institutions. That is the test : — do the conclusions arrived at by the method of inner chronology gain the assent of other scholars ?

I venture to hope that this is really about what Dr. Winternitz would himself say : and would express the thanks we must all feel to him for having, with so much judgment and insight, shown us the varied sides of the activity of the great scholar whose personal qualities, and whose enthusiasm for the cause, so endured to all of us that we feel his loss as that, not only of a master, but also of a personal friend.

IN MEMORIAM G. BÜHLER.

ON SOME SWAT LANGUAGES.

BY GEORGE A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., PH.D., I.C.S.

WHEN the Editor of the *Indian Antiquary* honoured me by inviting me to be one of the contributors to the Bühler Memorial Number, I felt some hesitation in complying. I could but offer a tribute of affectionate remembrance to him who I knew both as a guide and as a friend, and I knew that any poor halting, words of mine would be inadequate to express what I felt and what I wished to say while others, more able and better qualified than I, would adorn these pages with eloquent tribute to his worth. On second thoughts, I gathered courage, and it seemed to me that the best offering which I could make to his memory, would be of the first fruits of an undertaking whose inception owes much to his advice and encouragement.

It was in 1886, at the Oriental Congress held in Vienna, that I first met Bühler, and discussed with him a project, which had long occupied my mind, for holding a **Survey of the languages now spoken in India**. Encouraged by him, I laid the proposal before the Congress itself, and a resolution, strongly supported by him, was passed urging on the Government of India the advisability of undertaking the investigation. I avoid writing of the warm friendship which dated from those days, or of the close correspondence enriched by the treasures of learning ungrudgingly poured forth which continued through the next eleven years. Suffice it to say that, largely due to his personal efforts and to his advice, the preliminary operations for the **Linguistic Survey of India** were commenced some two and a half years ago. One of the last occasions that we met was when I read to the Aryan Section of the Paris Congress of 1897 the progress report of these preliminary steps, and I still seem to see him sitting on the dais as Vice-President and to hear the words of encouragement with which he welcomed the story of what had been done. A day or two afterwards we parted, never, alas, to meet again. Early last May I learned that the project had been finally sanctioned, and was on the point of writing to him to tell him the joyful news, when the sad and much belated tidings of his death reached us in Patna. Never can I forget what I owe to him. True were the words of my Paṇḍit when I told him of it, '*Mahābhānur astan gatō 'sti,*' a great sun *had set*, and had left many without the light which they could hardly spare.

So I venture to dedicate to his memory some of the earliest results of the Linguistic Survey of India, because it was an inquiry in which he had continually taken an exceeding interest, and because these very results illustrate points on which he laid special stress in his correspondence with me.

With his full concurrence, it was determined to delay the publication of the section of his *Grundriss* which was to be devoted to the modern vernaculars of India till after the completion of the Survey. Surprises, he was sure, were in store for us, and, unless we postponed the production of the section on the 'Tertiary Prakrits,' there would be danger of its being out of date almost as soon as it was issued. How true this was, the subsequent progress of the Survey has shown, and of the two specimens which I now proceed to give, one illustrates these surprises.

Gujarî and Ajarî.

One of the most well-marked dialects of Rajputana is Mêwârî, spoken by the Chauhân Rajputs of Mêwâr. It is one of the great West-Central group of Indo-Aryan languages to which belong Eastern Panjâbî, Gujarâtî and Standard Hindî, and forms one of the connecting links between these last two languages. Closely connected with it is Mârwarî, spoken in the neighbouring state of Mârwar. The grammars of both will be found in Mr. Kellogg's work, and need not be described here.

More than eight hundred miles from Mêwâr, across the Indian Desert and the entire Panjab, beyond the North-West frontier of India, lies the Swât valley, inhabited principally by a Puṣhtô-speaking population. There are, however, two Muhammadan tribes, the Gûjars and the Ajar, who speak an Indian, and not an Iranian, language. The Gûjars are cowherds, and the Ajar, who are closely connected with them, tend sheep. The former are a well known tribe, and seem to be at home right through the hill country north of the Panjab, though strongest in the North-West. They are also numerous 'along the banks of the upper Jumna near Jagâdri and Buriyâ, and in the Saharanpur District, which during the last century was actually called Gujarât. To the east they occupy the petty State of Samptar, in Bundelkhand, and one of the northern districts of Gwâlîôr, which is still called Gûjargâr; but they are more numerous in the Western States, and especially towards Gujarât, where they form a large portion of the population. The Râjâs of Riwarî to the south of Delhi are Gûjars. In the Southern Panjab they are thinly scattered, but their numbers increase rapidly towards the North, where they have given their name to several important places, such as Gujranwâlâ, in the Rechna Duâb, Gujarât, in the Chaj Duâb, and Gûjar Khân, in the Sindh-Sâgar Duâb. They are numerous about Jehlam and Hasan Abdâl, and throughout the Hazâra District; and they are also found in considerable numbers in the Dardu Districts of Chilâs, Kôli, and Pâlas, to the east of the Indus, and in the contiguous districts to the east of the river.'¹ Regarding the Gûjars of the Panjab, I have not as yet received any certain information, except that, the language-specimens, received from the District of Muzaffarnagar on the east bank of the Jamna show several points of connection with the language spoken by their brethren of Swât. The Gûjars of the rest of the Panjab Himalayas, and those of Kashmîr are reported to speak a language of their own, but specimens of it have not yet been received. We must therefore content ourselves for the present with that spoken by those who are the most western and the most northern of all the Gûjars with whom we are acquainted. This brings us to the surprise already alluded to. The language of the Swât Gûjars is practically identical with Mêwârî, spoken, more than eight hundred miles away, in Rajputana. As might be expected they have borrowed a portion of their vocabulary from the neighbouring Puṣhtô and Panjâbî, but the grammars of Swât Gujarî and of Ajarî, on the one hand, and of Mêwârî, on the other, are to all intents and purposes identical. This will be manifest from the following notes and specimens. It is an interesting fact that, both with the Gûjars and the Ajar, one of their septs is known as 'Chôhân.' I am indebted to Major H. A. Deane, C.S.I., for all these specimens.

¹ Cunningham, *Arch. Sur. Rep.* ii., 61, quoted by Crooke in the *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, s.v. Gûjar.

GUJARATI SKELETON GRAMMAR.

I. — NOUNS.		II. — PRONOUNS.				III. — VERBS.			Irregular Past Participles—
A. — Substantives — (a) Masculine. (1) Ending in ó — Sing. Plur. Nom. ghóy-ó ghóy-á Obl. ghóy-á ghóy-á		I	Thou	He	We	You	They	A. — Auxiliary and Verbs Substantive — Pres., hai, for all numbers and persons. Past. Masc. Sg., thó, Pl. thá; Fem., thá, for all numbers and persons. B. — Finite Verb — Infinitive, — mār-an. Pres. Part., — mār-té. Past Part., — mār-ió. Pres., — mār + personal endings, Future, — mār + personal endings + gó. Def. Present, — mār + personal endings + hai. Imperfect, — mār + personal endings + thó. Past, — mār-ió. Perfect, — mār-ió hai. Pluperfect, — mār-ió thó. Personal endings.	
(2) Others — Nom. báp báp Obl. báp báp (b) Feminine. Nom. dhá dhá Obl. dhá dhá		Nom. hã	tú, tó	oh, wah	ham	tam	vé		
Genitive Terminations. Masc. Dir. kó ká Obl. ká ká Fem. Dir. kè kè Obl. kè kè		Ag. māñ	tañ	usá, us	ham	tam	un, uná		
B. — Adjectives — (1) Ending in ó — Masc. Dir. changó changá Obl. changá changá Fem. Dir. changé changé Obl. changé changé (2) Others — Do not change.		Gen. mairó	tairó	us-kó	maháró	tháró	un-kó		
		Dat. maná	taná	us-tah	ham-tah	tam-tah	un-tah		
		Possessive, — apñó; obl., apñá; fem., apñé; own.							
		Near Demonstrative, — gó, this; ag, isá, is; Pl., yé, obl., in.							
		Relative, — chi, who or what.							
		Interrogatives, — kaun, who?; obl. kas; ká, what?							
		Personal endings.				1	2	3	
		Sing. ...	ã	ai	ái	dí			
		Plur. ...	ã	õ	ã	ã			

The following points may be noted in regard to the grammar of the specimens : —

I. — NOUNS.

The Agent case is generally the same as the Nominative. Indeed the use of the Agent with the Past tense of a Transitive verb appears to have almost disappeared.

In the case of nouns in *ô*, the oblique form singular usually ends in *â*, but sometimes, probably owing to careless speaking, the direct form is used ; thus, *ghôrô kô*, of a horse, instead of the more correct *ghôrâ kô* ; *mandô* (for *mandâ*) *kam mâ* ; *mairô báp kâ*, for *mairâ báp kâ*. Sometimes, under the influence of Panjâbî, the oblique form ends in *ê*. Thus, when the younger son speaks to his father, the narrative says, correctly, *apnâ báp tah kahiô* ; but when the elder son answers his father, the Panjâbî idiom, *apné báp tah*, is incorrectly used.

On the other hand, the influence of Panjâbî sometimes makes these nouns have the direct form in *â* instead of in *ô*. Thus *us kâ* (for *us kô*) *barô pût patîi mâ thô*.

Amongst the postpositions may be mentioned *mâ*, in ; *kanah*, with. The postpositions *tah* and *nah* are borrowed from Pushtô. They are used indiscriminately to mean both 'to' and 'from.' Thus, *îhâr tah â-jâ*, come to this place, and *îhâr tah jâ*, go from this place.

The following are examples of the correct use of the direct and of the oblique forms : *mairô pût môyô thô* (Hindî, *mérâ pût muâ thâ*), my son was dead ; *apnâ mâ tah* (Hindî, *apné mâl sê*), from his own property ; *changâ admî* (Hindî, *changê admî*), good men ; *is kâ pairâ mâ* (Hindî, *is kê pairô mē*), on his feet ; *apnâ dôstâ kanah* (Hindî, *apné dôstô sâth*), with (my) own friends ; *changî trîma* (Hindî, *changî strî*), a good woman ; *is kî angulî mâ* (Hindî, *is kî angulî mē*), on his finger.

The use of the word *yakô*, one, a, appears to be irregular. I have noted,—

Yakô báp, a father ; *yakô báp kô*, of a father ; but *yaké îhâr*, in a certain place.

Yakâ dhâ, a daughter ; *yakâ changî trîmat*, a good woman ; *yaké dhê kô*, of a daughter.

II. — PRONOUNS.

The proper form of the Agent of *hû* is *mâ*. Thus : *mâ tairo khazmat kiô hai* (Hindî, *mâ nê êrî khidmat kî*), by me thy service has been done. But *hû* is sometimes substituted for it. Thus : *thû mârîô*, I killed, instead of *mâ mârîô*, by me killed,

An example of the Agent of the second person is *tâi nê ditô hai* (Hindî, *tû nê nahî diyâ hai*), by thee has not been given.

So for the third person *usâ banđiô* (Hindî, *us nê bāđâ*), by him was divided ; *us kahiô* (Hindî, *us nê kahâ*), by him it was said ; but *oh* (not *us* or *usâ*) *uîhiô* (Hindî, *wah uîhâ*), he rose.

III. — VERBS.

In the conjugation of verbs, note the peculiar way in which the Present Definite and Imperfect are formed. Here the verb exactly follows the Mêwârî custom. To form these tenses, the auxiliary verb is added, not to the Present Participle, but to the various persons of the simple Present Tense. Thus : *mârû*, I beat ; *mârû hai* (not *mârtô hâi*), I am beating ; *mârû thô* (not *mârtô thô*), I was beating. Other examples are *karû hai*, I am making, used as a present subjunctive, (that) I may make (merriment with my friends) ; *karû thô*, I was making. Irregularly influenced by Panjâbî are *diyâ nâ thâ*, (anyone) was not giving ; *chalâ nâ thô*, he was not going ; *charâ thô*, he was grazing.

The Present Participle is used to form a Habitual Past. Thus : *khaiô*, he used to eat ; Plural Masculine, *khaiâ*, they (the swine) used to eat.

In the Simple Present, which is also used as a present subjunctive, there are some irregularities observable in the specimens. In *ham khushâlî karû*, *khushâlî hû*, the first person plural is used for the first person singular. Panjâbî is responsible for *khâ-lâi*, and *hê jâyâi*, and also for *khâi* (they eat), in which last the singular is used for the plural,

As already observed, the use of the Passive construction of the Past Tense of Transitive verbs appears to be dying out. The Agent form of the personal pronouns is still usually employed before these tenses, but all traces of the Agent case have disappeared from the noun. The feeling for Gender, too, is very weak. Thus we have *mai tairô* (instead of *tairô*) *khazmat kiô* (instead of *ki*) *hai*, I have done thy service; so we have *jili kiô*, instead of *jili ki*, he shouted.

Specimen I. — Parable of the Prodigal Son in Gujarî.

Yakô admî kâ dô pût thâ. Nanđô pût apnâ báp tah kahiô chi, 'ai báp,
 One man of two sons were. By-the-young son his-own father to it-was-said that, 'oh father,
manâ apnâ mâ tah banđô dai-lai.' Usâ dwanyam pah apnâ mâ banđiô.
 to-me thy-own property from share give.' By-him both on his-own property was-divided.
Kâi đê pachhâ nanđô pût harkuj yakê-đhâr kar-kê đur đês tah giô. Ut
 Some days after young son everything (in) one-place having-made far country to went. There
isâ apnâ mâ mandô kam mã udâ-liô. Chi habbâ mã wajhêr-liô,
 by-him his-own property bad works in was-wasted. When all (his) property was-finished,
oh đês pah yakô barô gâhat âyô, oh saurô hô-giô. Oh giô, oh đês mã yakô
 that country on one great famine came, he straitened became. He went, that country in one
khân kanah naukar hô-giô. Usâ apnâ pađđi tah dai-gâliô, chi 'mandah zinâwar
 chief with servant became. By-him his-own field to he-was-sent, that '(you) unclean animal
châr-lai.' Oh apnâ-minah-pah oh bhô khâđô, chi zinâwar khaitâ, hađô kauņê điyâ na
 graze.' He his-own-desire-on that straw would-eat, which animals eat, but any-one giving not
thâ. Chi sâl mã hô-giô, isâ kahiô chi, 'mairô báp kâ katnâ naukar changô
 was. When senses in became, by-him it-was-said that, 'my father of how-many servants good
đuk khai, hũ bhakô marũ. Hũ uđhũgô, apnâ báp tah jâwũgô, us tah kahũgô chi,
 food eat, I hungry am-dying. I will-arise, my-own father to will-go, him to will-say that,
'ai báp, hũ tairô bhî gunâghar hai, Khudâe kâ bhî gunâghâr hai. Is kô lâyiq nî,
 "Oh father, I thy a'so sinner am, God of also sinner am. Of this worthy not-I-(am),
chi tairô pût hô-jâwũ; kho apnâ naukarâ mã manâ ghal-lai." Oh uthiô, apnâ
 that thy son I-may-become; but thy-own servants among me put." He arose, his-own
báp tah âyô. Yô lá đur thô, chi apnâ báp isâ đahô, tars isâ kiô,
 father to came. He yet far was, that by-his-own father to-him it-was-seen, pity on-him was-made,
isâ bhajiô, ghâra-gharai hô-giô, isâ chômiô. Pût is tah kahiô chi, 'ai
 to-him he-ran, embracing took-place, him-to it-was-kissed. By-son him to it-was-said that, 'Oh
báp, hũ Khudâe kâ bhî gunâghâr hai, tairô bhî gunâghâr hai. Is kô lâyiq nî chi
 father, I God of also sinner am, thine also sinner am. This of worth not-I-(am) that
tairô pût ho-jâwũ.' Us kâ báp apnâ naukarâ tah kahiô chi, 'changô chirô
 thy son I-may-become.' By his father his-own servants to it-was-said that, 'good dress
lai-đô, is tah ghal-lêô yakâ angrî is kî angrî mã kar-lêô, paņê is kâ pairâ mã kar-lêô. Áđ
 bring, him-to put-on one ring him of finger on put, shoes him of feet on put. Come
chi, đuk khâ-lai, khushâl hô-jâyâ is sawab tah chi, yô mairô pût môyô thô, jîntô hôyô
 that, food we-eat, merry become, this reason for that, this my son dead was, living become
hai; gum giô thô, lab-liô hai.' Wê khushâl hô-giô.
 is; lost become was, recovered is., They merry became.

Hun us kâ barô pût pađđi mã thô. Chi oh âyô, ghar tah nairô hô-giô, gît nachan kâ
 Now him of elder son field in was. When he came, house to near became, songs dancing of
awâz suniô. Yakô naukar tah bôliô, usâ pachhiô, 'yô kî chhâ hai?'
 sound was-heard. One servant to (he) called, to-him (by-him) it-was-asked, 'this what matter is?'
Us kahiô, chi, 'tairô bhâi âyô hai, tairô báp khairât kiô hai, chi usâ
 By-him it-was-said, that, 'thy brother come is, (by)-thy father feast made is, as him
rôgh jôr lãđô-hai. Oh rus-giô andar chalâ na thô. Báp is ka
 sound-and-well (by-him-it)-has-been-found.' He sulked within going not was. Father him of

nakriô, isâ minnat kiô. Is apné báp-tah zawáb mã kahiô chi, came-out, him-to entreaty was-made-by-him. By-him his-own father-to answer in it-was-said that, '*daikh, hitná machh múdah maî tairô khazmat kiô hai; héchare tairô bê-amri* 'see, so-much long time by-me thy service been-done is; ever thy disobedience *nî kiô hai. Bhî taî manú yakô lailô nî ditô hai, chi hũ apná dostâ kanah* not-by-me done is. Still by-thee to-me one kid not given is, that I my-own friends with *khushálî karú-hai. Har-kade chi tairô yô pút áyô, chi tairô mã kachnî pah* merriment might-make. As-soon-as when thy this son came, by-whom thy property harlots on *uqáyô-hai, taî us pah khairát kiô.' Us kahiô, chi, 'pút, tá nit mairô* wasted-has-been, by-thee him on feast made.' By-him it-was-said, that, 'son, thou always me *kôp hai, á mairô harkuj tairô hai. Yô munásib thô, chi ham khushálî karú, khushál* with art, and my everything thine is. This proper was, that we merriment make, merry *hũ, táchi yô tairô bhái môyô thô, jêmtô hóyô hai; gum giô thô, ládô hai.'* be, because this thy brother dead was, alive become is; lost become was, recovered is.'

A Fable in Gujarî.

Yakô jákat har dî mhôsã gã chára-thô, parbat mã grã tah dúr. Yakô dî One boy every day buffaloes cows used-to-graze, mountain in village from far. One day *khã pah jilî-kiô chi, 'bagyâr áyô hai.' Grã ká lók warnakriô, chi bagyâr* joke on it-was-shouted-by-him that, 'wolf come is.' Village of people went-out, that wolf *khadêr-lai. Chi lók aprîá, bagyâr na thô. Jákat tah iná pachhñô kiô; us* should-drive-off. When people arrive, wolf not was. Boy from by-them enquiry was-made; by-him *chahiô chi, 'hũ chhã karũ thô.' Lók ghar tah pachhã giô. Dújã dî yakô parró áyô.* it-was-said that, 'I joke making was.' People house to back went. Second day one leopard came. *Jákat jilî-kiô chi, 'warhûrî-dêo; parró áyô hai.' Lók kahiô chi* By-the-boy it-was-shouted that, 'come-running; leopard come is.' By-the-people it-was-said that *'yô kûp kahai,' kaunê na giô. Parró-nê jákat khá-liô. Chhã mã kûrya,* this(-boy) lie tells,' any-one not went. By-the-leopard boy was-devoured. Joke in lying, *jákat mar-giô.* boy died.

Gujarî Numerals.

Êk, êkô dô tîn châr pañch chhê sat aṭh nãũ dâh yârã bârã terã chaudahã pandrã sohã
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
satarã aṭharã unî bî êk té bî dô té bî, etc. dah té bî yârã té bî, etc. chawé êk té chawé, etc.
 17 18 19 20 21 22 30 31 40 41
dah té chawé or pañjah yârã té chawé, etc. saṭh êk té saṭh, etc. dah té saṭh, etc. châr bî
 50 51 60 61 70 80
êk té châr bî dô té châr bî tîn té châr bî châr té châr bî, and so on dah té châr bî yârã té châr bî
 81 82 83 84 90 91
bârã té châr bî and so on, up to unî té châr bî sau,
 92 99 100.

A Folk-Tale in Ajarî.

Êk jaṇô dhâkâ mã bakrî chârâi thô. Êk dî paṭ mã maikhû labh-liô. Us One man mountain in goats grazing was. One day rock in a-honey-(comb) was-found. By *nê kahiô chi, 'hũ kap-liyũgô,' khô hath us kô ná apriô, kiô-jê thâr saurô té* him it-was-said that, 'I will-cut-it-off,' but hand him of not reached, because the-place narrow and *aukhô thô. Mhẽ wuh grã tah áyô, dârá liô, té paṭ tah giô; us kô* difficult was. Then he village to came, gunpowder was-taken-by-him, and rock to went; it of *hêt dab-chhõriô chi ag lá-kê paṭ uqá-chhõrũgô, té maikhû habbâ kaḍ-liyũgô.* beneath it-was-buried-(by-him) that fire applying rock I-will-blow-up, and honey all will-extract.

Mh̄ palitah nah ag lá-ké bais-rakió. Mh̄ đaz h̄yóđ, par phut-giđ, — jañđ
 Then fuse to fire applying he-sat-down. Then explosion became, rock burst, (the)-man
udá-chhórió. Ut maikhú kó armán m̄ mar-giđ.
 was-blown-up. There honey of longing in he-perished.

Gârwi.

The modern Indian language with which Bühler's name is most closely connected is Kâshmîrî. The first scientific account of that language appeared in his famous Kashmîr report, and during the years of our intercourse, he was never tired of dwelling on its importance for the linguistic history of India. At length, some three or four years ago, at his earnest solicitation, I took up the serious study of this interesting form of speech, and have been amply rewarded. Similarly, the late Dr. Burkhard's papers on the Musalmân form of Kâshmîrî, which are now appearing in these pages, were undertaken at his suggestion and with his assistance.

One of the result of these studies has been the establishment of the existence of a North-Western group of Indian languages, all closely connected, and extending from Karachi, in Sindh, through the Western Panjab, into Kashmîr. The Linguistic Survey, thanks to the kindness of Major Deane, the Political Officer at the Malakhand, has brought forward two more languages, also spoken in the Śwât country, which belong to the same group. They had been previously described by Colonel Biddulph, but their affinities had never been established. Their names are Gârwi and Tôrwalî. They closely resemble each other, and, in this paper, I shall only give some grammatical notes, and two of the specimens which I have collected of the former. Other specimens have also been utilised in preparing the notes, but considerations of space forbid their being printed here.

Gârwi is the language of the Ga wârê, a sept of which tribe is named Bashghar, a fact which has led Colonel Biddulph to erroneously call the language 'Bushkarik,' and to call the entire tribe 'Bushkar.' The language is closely connected with that of the Tôrwal, who inhabit the Śwât and Panjkôrâ Valleys lower down than the Gawârê. It is evidently of Indian origin. Regarding the Gawârê, Colonel Biddulph says,²—

"Bushkar is the name given to the community which inhabits the upper part of the Punjkorah Valley, whence they have overflowed into the upper part of the Swat Valley, and occupied the three large villages of Otrote, Ushoo, and Kalam. They live on good terms with their Torwal neighbours, and number altogether from 12,000 to 15,000 souls The Bushkarik proper are divided into three clans, the Moolanor, Kootchkor, and Joghior. They say that they have been Mussulmans for nine generations, and the peculiar customs still common among the Shins do not exist among them The Bushkar dialect approaches more nearly to modern Punjabi than any other of the Dard languages; but in some respects seems to show some affinity to the dialects of the Siah Posh."

With reference to the above remarks, the conversion of the people to Islâm began in the time of Akhûn Darwêza, about three hundred years ago, and has been carried on up to within the last century. Gârwi, like the other languages of the Śwât Kôhistân, has one remarkable peculiarity. The verb, except in the Future Tense, and in the Imperative mood, does not distinguish between the various persons. In some of these languages, *e. g.*, Gârwi (as described by Biddulph under the name of Bushkarik) even number is not distinguished. On the other hand, throughout the conjugation of the verb, the distinction of gender is carefully maintained. Thus, in Gârwi, the present tense of the verb "to be" is, masculine, *tú*, feminine, *túi*. According to the gender of the subject, each of these words means, I am, thou art, he, she, or it is, we are, you are, they are, as the context may require.

It is not possible to form a complete grammar from the specimens, but the following instances of grammatical forms show that the language is closely connected with Kâshmîrî.

² Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh, p. 70. A brief notice of Bushkarik Grammar is given in Appendix E. of the same work.

I. — NOUNS — *Declension.*

	Sing.	Plur.	Similarly.
Nom.	<i>bab</i> , a father	<i>babú</i>	<i>dúí</i> , a daughter.
Gen.	<i>bab-ā</i>	<i>babú-ā</i>	Genitive, <i>dúí-ā</i> : but Nom.
Dat.	<i>bab-ki</i> or <i>-ka</i>	<i>babú-ki</i> or <i>-ka</i>	Plur. <i>dúí</i> .
Loc.	<i>bab-mē</i>	<i>babú-mē</i>	A good man is <i>ak rān mēsh</i> .
Abl.	<i>bab-mā</i> , from a father	<i>babú-mā</i>	A good woman is <i>ak rain ís</i> .

II. — PRONOUNS —

I, *ya*; of me, *má*, *mā*; Obl. form, *mai*; We, *má*; our, *mó*.

Thou, *tú*; of thee, *chhā*; Obl. form, *tai*; Ye, *thá*; your, *thó*.

He, that, *ashí*; his, *asā*; Obl. *ás*; they, *tum*; their, *tasā*; by them, *tama*.

Other forms are *sah*, he; *tasā*, his; *tas-ki*, to him; *tan*, by him. 'This' is *eh* or *ā*.

III. — VERBS —

(a) Verbs Substantive —

Pres. — *thú*, *thó*, (masc.); *thí* (fem.); for both numbers and all persons. Used once to mean 'was.' 'The elder son *was* in the field.'

Past — *ásh*, *áshó*, *áshú*; fem. *áshí*; for both numbers and all persons: used once to mean 'is,' 'what matter *is*?'

I may or shall be, *hóm*; he became, *hú*; be (Imperat.) *hó*; to be, *hógé*; being, *hóg*.

(b) Finite Verbs —

Chañdó, to beat.

Chañdósh, beaten; so, *múrsh*, dead; *chhárósh*, lost: *gat*, gone.

Imperative,—*chañd*, beat. Other examples are, *da*, give; *giya*, bring ye; *sháwa*, *shá*, clothe ye; *yá*, come (? 1st person, plural); *chó*, go.

Present, — *chañánt*, I beat, for all persons and both numbers. Other examples are *khánt*, I would eat; *maránt*, I am dying; *kharánt*, thou art defiling; *wánt*, it comes; *gránt*, thou bandiest: *bachánt*, I go.

Imperfect, — *chañánt ásh*, (I, etc.) was (were) beating.

Past, — (a) Transitive Verbs — Passive construction — With Masculine Object, — *mai chañdá*, I beat (him); *partálú*, (he) sent (him); *kér*, (he) made; *liṭh* (he) saw (him); *gas*, (he) caught (him); *manó*, he said; *budh*, (he) heard (a sound); *laṭh*, (he) found (him). With Feminine Object, — *kéth*, thy (father) has made (a feast), (I) did (not disobedience) to thee; *déth*, thou didst (not) give (a kid); *gis*, (he) caught (her); *khég*, (he) ate (her).

(b) Intransitive Verbs, — *gá*, (I, etc.) went; *yá*, *yág*, (he) came; *itiath*, (he) arose; *bág-chhóre*, (he) ran up (to him); *núkas*, (he) came out.

The following are apparently Past Participles used as Past Tenses; — *khiáshṭa*, they ate; *karésh*, I might do (merriment, fem. obj.); *diásh*, (he) gave; *bachash*, (he) went; *púásh*, they were drinking.

Future, — *ya chañdam*, I shall beat; *chhóm*, I will go; *ya manam*, I shall say; *karam*, I will make; *ya póham*, I will understand.

GĀRWĪ.

Specimen I. — The Parable of the Prodigal Son.

Ak mēsh-ā dū pūt ashū. Lakōt pūt tanī bab-ka manō, 'mai-ki māl-mē tanī
 One man-of two sons were. Younger son his-own father-to said, 'me-to property-in my-own
ḡah de.' Tan tanī māl duēra dāh-kér. Kidī dōs pat lakōt pūt
 share give.' And his-own property (on)-both (he)-divided. A-few (some) days after younger son
harkihā jama kēr, dēor utan-ki gā. Tatī bāg tanī māl lāl kar anchān-kér.
 everything together made, far country-to went. That place his-own property bad act dissipated.
Swā māl khlās-kér, tatī utan-mē giān qāhat yāg, ta tī tang hū. Sah gā tatī
 All property finished, that country-in big famine came, and he straitened became. He went that
utan-mē khān-sah naukar hū. Tan tanī khér partalū sūr chār. 'Āi sūr
 country-in chief-with servant became. And his-own field sent (him) swine graze. 'Which swine
khāshā, ya pa khānti; kami na diāsh. Pata khid-mē yā, manō, 'mā baba
 are-eating, I also will-eat;' anyone not gave (him). Afterwards sense-in came, said, 'my father-of
kitī naukar thō, rēn giā khān, ya būthō marānt. Ya itīānt, tan bab-ki chōm,
 how-many servants are, good food eat, I hungry am-dying. I will-rise, and father-to will-go,
tas-ki manam, "O bab, ya Khudāe gunāhgār chhā gunāhgār. Atē lāyiq na kō chhā
 him-to will-say, "O father, I of-God sinner thy sinner. So worthy not (am) that thy
dūt hōm, naukar-mē mai hisāb-kar." Sah itīath, tanī bab-ki yāg. Sah
 son be, servants-among me reckon." (And) he rose, his-own father-to came. (And) he
paḡka ashō tanī bab liḡ, rahm kēr, bāg-chhōré, mār-mē gas, khlōl-kér.
 afar was his-own father saw (him), pity did, ran-up (to him), embrace-in caught (him), kissed (him).
Pūt manō, 'O bab, ya Khudāe gunāhgār, chhā gunāhgār. Atē lāyiq na kō chhā pūt
 Son said, 'O father, I of-God sinner (am), thy sinner (am). So worthy not (am) that thy son
hōm.' Bab tanī naukar-ki manō, 'rān jāma giya, as shāwa; angusir angir shāwa; kōsh
 be.' Father his-own servants-to said, 'good dress bring, him clothe; ring finger put-on; shoes
khur shū. Yā, giā khāe, khushāl hōe. Tithī mā ēh puḡ mūrsh, jāndō; chhārōsh
 feet put-on. Come, food eat, merry be. Because my this son dead, revived (is); lost
lāḡ. Tama khushālī kēr.
 recovered (is). They merriment made.

Mōt tasā giān pūt khēr-mē thū. Séh yāg, shiḡ-ki niār hū, sarōd nēḡah awāz
 Now his elder son field-in was. (When) he came, house-to near was, music dancing sound
budh. Ā naukar-ki awāz-kér, tapaus-kér, 'kē chhal āsh?' Tan manō, 'chhā jā yāg
 heard. A servant-to called, inquired, 'what matter is?' He said, 'thy brother come
thōn; bab khairāt kēth, tithī rōḡh jōr lath.' Séh bājāg hū, shikī na
 is; father feast has-made, because whole well found.' (Then) he angry became, inside not
bachash. Bab nūkas, minat kēr. Tan jawāb-mē bab-ki manō, 'bēr, atē bār mūdah
 went. Father came-out, entreaty made. He reply-in father-to said, 'lo, so long time
chhā khizmat kēr, hēcharē chhā bé-amrī na kēth. Tai mai-ki ā sūr na dēth, mai tanī
 thy service I-did, ever thy disobedience not did. Thou me-to one kid not gave, I my-own
dōstān-sah khushālī karēsh. Kāi sāt ā pūt yāg, chhā māl kachānāi-rā kharāb-kér,
 friends-with merriment might-do. Which time this son came, thy property harlots-on wasted,
tai khairāt kēr.' Tan manō, 'O pūt, tū hallal mai-sah bai, mā harkai chhā. Āi
 thou feast did.' He said, 'O son, thou always me-with livest, my everything thine (is). This
munāsib ashū, mā khushālī kēr, khushāl hū, tithī chhā āi jā mūrsh, jāndō;
 proper was, we merriment did, merry become, because thy this brother dead, alive (is);
chharōsh, lāḡ.
 lost, recovered (is).'

Specimen II. — A Folk-Tale.

Al bór ashú, aké chhél áshí. Á ús-rá ú púđsh. Bór rat ashú, chhél túđ
 A tiger was, a goat was. A spring-at water were-drinking. Tiger above was, goat below
áshí. Bór manó chhél-ka, má ú ká kharánt? *Chhél manó, 'ú chhđ bám-té*
 was. Tiger said goat-to, my water why do-you-make dirty?' Goat said, 'water thy, side-from
wánt, ya túá thí. Chhđ ú kiki khar karam?' Bór manó, 'tú bár lál thú, mai-sah
 comes, I below am. Thy water how dirty can-I-make?' Tiger said, 'thou very bad art, me-with
bét gránt. Mai-ka izhgár manó. Ya tai-sah póham.' Ái manó, tóp
 words dost-bandy. Me-to liar say (call). I thee-with will-understand.' This saying, a-jump
kér, chhél gis, swa khég.
 (he)-made, goat caught, whole devoured.

Al đú thá chór panj shó sat aih num dash úeyá bál thó chónđ panjáh shóhr satáh aítáh anb'sh
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
b'ish dashób'ish đúb'ish dashódúb'ish íhab'ish dashóthab'ish chór'b'ish dashóchór'b'ish panjb'ish.
 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100.

A NOTE ON BÜHLER.

BY PROF. J. JOLLY (WÜRZBURG).

WHILE referring for details to a comprehensive biography to be published elsewhere, I beg to send you for the *Indian Antiquary*, to which Bühler during the last quarter of a century has devoted so much of his time and energy, a few lines in illustration of the personal views and character of a revered friend older than myself. In all the obituary notices hitherto published it has been pointed out correctly that Bühler's surprising universality made him the born leader of such an enormous undertaking as the *Encyclopedia*. But I do not find the fact mentioned anywhere that Bühler had planned a similar work many years ago. As he told me in 1878 and later, he had made arrangements with Nikolaus Trübner, the well-known London publisher, for the publication of a bulky work on *Indian Antiquities*, destined to replace Lassen's *Indische Altertumskunde*, which work was then fast becoming antiquated. His epigraphic researches, and other works in which he had meanwhile become engaged, compelled him to lay aside his plan for some future time. Then old Trübner died, and it was reserved for his nephew, Karl J. Trübner of Strassburg — the founder and publisher of the *Encyclopedias* (*Grundrisse*), who has rendered such signal services to nearly every branch of philology — to secure Bühler as the Editor of the *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research*, without knowing anything of his deceased uncle's plan.

Let me quote one more instance of Bühler's "distinguishing moral quality of unselfishness" (Tawney). In connection with his extensive preliminary work for the *Digest of Hindu Law*, he had collected ample materials for critical editions of the law-books of Baudháyana, Gautama, Vishnu, Vasishtha and Nárada, but he handed them over to myself and other junior scholars to help us in the editing of those texts. Thus at all times and in everything he would care for the cause of science only; and the inspiration which he disseminated in every direction has contributed no less to the progress of learning than his own pioneer work exhibited in so many publications. But for him, many important works would never have been written or printed, many old inscriptions would never have been excavated, many temple and private libraries in India would never have been searched for MSS.

It is well known that Bühler afforded a splendid proof of his generous liberality by the presentation of his private collection of MSS. (consisting of 128 valuable old MSS. and 193 modern copies) to the India Office Library in London, in 1888. He also presented to the Royal Library in Berlin a collection of 177 MSS. in 201 volumes.

IN MEMORIAM GEORGE BÜHLER.

A POSTSCRIPT.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

It has been a melancholy pleasure to me, after much correspondence and with the effective assistance of Dr. Winternitz, to compile this memorial number of the *Indian Antiquary* in honour of my genial friend and invaluable guide and co-operator of so many years. It is natural that, when called upon, many fellow-workers should have come forward with their parting appreciation of one who was not only a matured scholar and a safe master, but also always a kindly friend, a generous opponent and a fair fighter, thinking in all controversies not so much of himself as of the right of the cause he fought for. It is natural also that the conductor of this *Journal*, which he helped from its very commencement, as we have already heard from Dr. Burgess, continuously up to his sudden death 26 years later (I had to publish his last contribution uncorrected for the press, and from the other side of the world, from Yokohama and San Francisco, in ignorance of the calamity that had overtaken my friend, I "wrote letters to the dead" about projected contributions), should desire to go out of the usual course to do honour to the memory of one who had conferred so many benefits with such unstinted, unselfish lavishness on the studies it serves to forward. Indeed, those who have been able to assist me in this undertaking have esteemed their pious labours to be a privilege; so do I in my turn esteem it a privilege to have had the right to indite this postscript as a last testimony, however inadequate, to the worth of the mutual friend, who was also the actual master and teacher of so many of us.

I have been able to set before the reader a goodly array of writers for this special number, but it will be readily understood that for individual reasons many who would gladly have come forward with friendly articles or notes have been prevented from doing so. From these I have had kindly expressions of sympathy and regret at inability to actively assist. The venerable scholars, O. von Böhtlingk and A. Weber, pleaded age and infirmity, and generous and appreciative letters were sent by Lord Reay, Sir Raymond West, Drs. Whitley Stokes and Fleet in England, and from Profs. Garbe, R. Pischel and Hillebrandt among others on the Continent of Europe.

Abundant information has already been given as to the main facts of Bühler's career:— his services to Comparative Philology and to Indian Studies of a very wide range; mythology, Vedic and Sanskrit; Indian literature, ancient and modern, Sanskrit, Pali, Jain, Buddhist, legal, Belles Lettres; geography, chronology, epigraphy, archæology, palæography; history and philosophy, ancient and modern, religious, political, epic; grammar, lexicography, philology, law:— his many works, culminating in the great *Encyclopædia* unfinished at his death:— his efficiency as an official, a teacher, an organiser:— his exceeding skill as an Oriental and European linguist:— his many fine personal qualities, knowledge of human nature, tact and skill in bringing to the fore the better instincts of those with whom he was in contact:— his knowledge and energy as a collector of MSS. and his large-hearted generosity in their disposition:— his power of making and keeping friends.

There is, indeed, nothing for me to add to the long catalogue of Bühler's capacities and works accomplished, beyond making good one small deficiency, which after all it properly lies with me to supply, a list of his 85 contributions to this *Journal*, though it cannot be a full measure of the work he did for it, owing to his never-ending kindness in looking over and improving on the work of others less gifted and less completely equipped.

Bühler's Contributions to the *Indian Antiquary*.

1872.

1. On the Chandikasataka of Banabhatta.
2. Note on MSS. of the Atharvaveda.

3. Note on Valabhi.
4. On the Vrihatkatha of Kshemendra.
1873.
5. The Desisabda Samgraha of Hemachandra.
6. Abhinanda, the Gauda.
7. On the Authorship of the Ratnavali.
8. On a Prakrit Glossary entitled Paiyalachhi.
9. Pushpamitra or Pushyamitra ?
1874.
10. Letter : on the Bhandar of the Osvai Jains of Jesalmer.
1875.
11. The Author of the Paialachhi.
12. A Grant of King Dhruvasena of Valabhi.
13. A Grant of King Guhasena of Valabhi.
1876.
14. Sanskrit MSS. ; extract from the Preliminary Report.
15. Inscriptions from Kavi (2 papers).
16. Two Inscriptions from Jhalrapathan.
17. Grants from Valabhi.
18. A Grant of Chhittarajadeva, Mahamandalesvara of the Konkana.
19. Analysis of the first seventeen Sargas of Bilhana's Vikramankakavya.
1877.
20. Further Valabhi Grants.
21. Note on Pandit Bhagvanlal Indrajī's " Ancient Nagari Numerals."
22. A New Grant of Govinda III., Rathor.
23. Three New Asoka Edicts.
24. Eleven Land-Grants of the Chaulukyās of Anhilavad.
25. The Rajatarangini ; extract from official report.
1878.
26. The Digambara Jainas.
27. Additional Note on Hastakavapra-Astakampron.
28. MSS. of the Mahabhashya from Kasmir.
29. Gujara Grants No. II. ; The Umeta Grant of Dadda II.
30. Additional Valabhi Grants, Nos. IX.-XIV.
31. The Three New Edicts of Asoka.
32. Note on the Inscription of Rudradaman, translated by Bhagvanlal Indrajī Pandit.
1879.
33. An Inscription of Govana III. of the Nikumbhavamsa.

1880.

34. Inscriptions from Nepal (with Bhagvanlal Indrajī).
35. Valabhi Grant No. XV.

1881.

36. Sanskrit Manuscripts in Western India.
37. A New Kshatrapa Inscription.
38. Note on the Dohad Inscription of the Chaulukya king Jayasimbhadeva.
39. Note on the word Siddham used in Inscriptions.
40. Forged Copper-plate Grant of Dharasena II. of Valabhi, dated Saka 400.

1882.

41. Inscriptions from the Stupa of Jagayyapetta.
42. On the Origin of the Indian Alphabet and Numerals.
43. Valabhi Grants No. XVII. ; Grant of Siladitya II., dated Sam. 352.

1883.

44. The Dhiniki Grant of King Jaikadeva.
45. Rathor Grants, No. II. ; Grant of Dhruva III. of Bharoch (with Dr. Hultzsch).
46. Grant of Dharanivaraha of Vadhvan.
47. The Ilichpur Grant of Pravarasena II. of Vakataka.
48. On the Relationship between the Andhras and the Western Kshatrapas.
49. An inscribed Royal Seal from Wala.

1884.

50. The Recovery of a Sanskrit MS.
51. Prof. Peterson's Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS.
52. Two Sanskrit Inscriptions in the British Museum.
53. Transcripts of the Delhi and Allahabad Pillar Edicts of Asoka.
54. Dr. Bhagvanlal Indrajī's Considerations on the History of Nepal.

1885.

55. A Note on a Second Old Sanskrit Palm-leaf MS. from Japan.
56. The Banawasi Inscription of Haritiputa-Satakamni.
57. Notice of Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar's Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Circle.

1886.

58. Valabhi Inscriptions, No. 18 ; a New Grant of Dharasena IV.
59. Beruni's Indica.

1887.

60. The Villages mentioned in the Gujarat Rathor Grants Nos. II. and IV.

1888.

61. Gujara Inscriptions, No. 3 ; a New Grant of Dadda II. or Prasantaraga.
62. Pandit Bhagvanlal Indrajī.

1889.

63. Some Further Contributions on the Geography of Gujarat.
 64. The Bagumra Grant of Nikumbhallasakti, dated in the Year 406.
 65. Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency during the Year 1883-84.

1890.

66. Texts of the Asoka Edicts on the Delhi Mirat Pillar and of the Separate Edicts on the Allahabad Pillar.
 67. Note on Harshavardhana's Conquest of Nepal.
 68. Alberuni's India, Ed. Edward C. Sachau.

1891.

69. The Barabar and Nagarjuni Hill Cave Inscriptions of Asoka and Dasaratha.
 70. The Date of the Græco-Buddhist Pedestal from Hashtnagar.

1892.

71. The Dates of the Vaghela Kings of Gujarat.

1893.

72. Asoka's Sahasram, Rupnath and Bairat Edicts.

1894.

73. The Roots of the Dhatupatha not found in Literature.
 74. Note on Prof. Jacobi's Age of the Veda and Prof. Tilak's Opinion.
 75. Bulletin of the Religions of India (Dr. Morison's Translation).

1895.

76. The Origin of the Kharoshthi Alphabet.

1896.

77. Epigraphic Discoveries in Mysore.
 78. A New Kharoshthi Inscription from Swat.
 79. The Sohgaure Copper-plate.
 80. A New Inscribed Græco-Buddhist Pedestal.
 81. Apastamba's Quotations from the Puranas.

1897.

82. The Villages in the Gujarat Rashtrakuta Grants from Torkhede and Baroda.
 83. The Origin of the Town of Ajmer and of its Name.
 84. A Jaina Account of the End of the Vaghelas of Gujarat.

1898.

85. A Legend of the Jaina Stupa at Mathura.

To this last paper I was obliged to add a footnote to p. 54 of the volume for 1898, the very last page of the *Indian Antiquary* on which it was destined that Bühler's handiwork should appear:—"It is right to add that Dr. Bühler, my personal friend for many years and the greatest friend and supporter that the *Indian Antiquary* ever possessed, had no opportunity of seeing this, his last article, through the press."

And now, with thanks to those who have helped in this act of piety, I conclude these last words in memory of the universal scholar, whose loss our generation will not see replaced.

Bombay Education Society's Press,
Printers, Lithographers, Book-Binders, Engravers, &c.,

BYCULLA,

(Opposite the Byculla Railway Bridge).

(The Profits from the Press go to the support of the
Orphans in the Byculla Schools.)

LETTER-PRESS PRINTING

By Steam Machine and Hand Presses, neatly and
promptly executed.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, REPORTS, CATALOGUES,
CIRCULARS, BILL HEADS, CARDS, &c.,
In English and all the Vernaculars.

LITHOGRAPHIC PRINTING.

BOOKS, CIRCULARS, NOTE HEADINGS,
DRAWINGS, MAPS, PLANS, &c.,
Skillfully Lithographed.

ADDRESSES ON PARCHMENT AND VELLUM
Beautifully Illuminated.

BOOKBINDING.

LIBRARY AND LAW BOOKS, ATLASES
AND MUSIC,

Bound in first-class style in Russia, Calf, or Morocco.

ALBUMS MADE TO ORDER.

LEDGER AND ACCOUNT BOOKS,

For Bankers, Merchants, Insurance and other
Companies, in style and durability equal to those
of the best London Houses.

Maps carefully and neatly mounted.

STATIONERY.

PAPERS OF THE BEST QUALITY

Always in stock in large quantities.

Drawing Papers, Cards, File Boards, Copying
Books, Memorandum Books, &c.

INVITATION AND VISITING CARDS PRINTED.

Monogram Dies stamped in every colour.

India Rubber Stamps supplied.

&c. &c. &c.

Published Monthly, Price 8 annas.

THE INDIAN TRAVELLER'S GUIDE, con-
taining the Special Time and Fare Tables
of all the Indian Railway Companies, Steam Boat
and Dâk Companies, Bullock Trains and Transit
Companies; the Routes between the principal
towns of Northern, Central, and Western
India, &c.

WITH A COLOURED MAP OF INDIA.

BOMBAY:

Printed and Published at the "Bombay Gazette" Steam Press

Agents: *Bombay*, Watson & Co., Thacker & Co.;
Poona, Treacher & Co., Phillips & Co.; *Deolalee*,
Cursetjee Dossabhoj; *Calcutta*, Wyman & Co.;
Madras, Higginbotham & Co.; *Allahabad*, Kellner
& Co. (Railway Station); *London*, G. Street,
30, Cornhill; Gordon and Gotch, St. Bride Street,
Ludgate Circus, E. C.

PUBLISHED quarterly under the authority
of the Government of India as a Supple-
ment to the Indian Antiquary.

EPIGRAPHIA INDICA

and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India.

Edited by DR. E. HULTZSCH,
Government Epigraphist.

192 pp. and 24 plates annually.

Annual Subscription in advance for four numbers,
Rs. 8 or 12s., including postage.

Messrs. **LUZAC & Co.'s List,**

Official Agents and Publishers to the India Office.

LONDON.

Cappeller's Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Roy,
8vo., cloth, pp. viii. 672. Reduced price, 10s. 6d.

ROSEN (L.)—*A Modern Persian Colloquial
Grammar*, containing a short Grammar, Dia-
logues and Extracts from Nasir Eddin Shah's
Diaries, Tales, etc., and a Vocabulary. Cr. 8vo.,
cloth, pp. xix., 400. Price, 10s. 6d.

HALCOMBE (C. J. H.)—*The Mystic Flowery
Land.* Being a true account of an Englishman's
Travels and Adventures in China. With notes
by the author and numerous Illustrations.
Second Edition revised. 8vo., cloth, pp. xxx., 226.
Price, 7s. 6d.

"The book is one from which all may learn,
but it is eminently suited to the 'general reader,'
and its attractions are much increased by forty-
one illustrations. The fact that it has achieved
a second edition shows that it has already been
received with favour and we think that, in its
present form, it should meet with a yet more
hearty welcome."—*Sheffield Daily Telegraph.*

VAMBERY (A.)—*The Travels and Adventures of
the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reis in India,
Afghanistan, Central Asia, and Persia during the
Year 1553-1556.* Translated from the Turkish
with notes. 8vo., cloth, pp. xviii., 125. Price, 5s.

Letchimey: a Tale of Old Ceylon. By
Sinnatamby, with Photographic Plates and Illus-
trations. 4to., pp. iii. 54. Price, 5s.

"It is an interesting and characteristic tale of
old times, prettily illustrated and bound, and will
be read with pleasure both by young and old."—
Indian Magazine.

YATAWARA (T. B.)—*Ummaga Jâtaka (The
Story of the Tunnel).* Translated from the Sin-
halese. 8vo., cloth, pp. vii. 242. Price, 10s. 6d.

UHLENBECK (C. C.)—*A Manual of Sanskrit
Phonetics.* In comparison with the Indo-Ger-
manic mother-language, for students of Germanic
and classical philology. 8vo., pp. 115. Price, 6s.

LUZAC'S ORIENTAL LIST containing Notes and
news on, and a Bibliographical List of, all New
Publications on Africa and the East. Published
monthly. Annual subscription, 3s. Vols. I. to
IX. (1890-1898) are still to be had (with Index)
at £2-15s. Current bound Vols., 5s. each.

LUZAC & Co., 46, GREAT RUSSELL STREET,
(Opposite the British Museum),
LONDON, W. C.

Published by order of Her Majesty's Secretary
of State for India.

GOVERNMENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF WESTERN INDIA.

THE CAVE TEMPLES OF INDIA.—By J. FER-
GUSSEON, D.C.L., C.L.E., F.R.S., V.P.R.A.S., & JAS.
BURGESS, LL.D., F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S., &c. Super-ri.
8vo, mor. glt. top, pp. xx. and 536, with Map, 99 plates
and 76 woodcuts. £2-2s.

REPORTS.—Super-royal 4to., half morocco, gilt
tops. By JAS. BURGESS, LL.D., F.R.G.S., &c.

Vol. I.—Report of the First Season's Operations
in the Belgaum and Kalâdgi Districts, 1874.
With 56 Photo. and Lithographic Plates and
8 Woodcuts. £2-2s.

Vol. II.—REPORT on the ANTIQUITIES of
KATHIAWAD and KACHH, 1874-75.—242 pp., with
74 Photograph and Lithographic Plates. £3-3s.

Vol. III.—REPORT on the ANTIQUITIES of the
BEDAR and AURANGABAD DISTRICTS, being the Re-
sults of the Third Season's Operations, 1875-76.
With 66 photo. and lithographic plates and 9
woodcuts. £2-2s.

LONDON: BERNARD QUARITCH, Piccadilly.
BOMBAY: THACKER & Co., LIMITED.

Vol. IV.—The BUDDHIST CAVES and their
Inscriptions, with 60 plates and 25 woodcuts.

Vol. V.—The Caves of Elura and the other
Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India,
with 51 autotype and other plates, and 18 wood-
cuts. The two vols. Price £6-6s.

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

NOTES on the BAUDDHA ROCK-TEMPLES of
AJANTÂ, their Paintings and Sculptures, &c., by
J. Burgess, LL.D. Demy 4to., pp. 112 with 31
plates. Rs. 5.

THE AMARAVATI and JAGGAYYAPETA BUDDHIST
STÜPAS, by J. Burgess, LL.D., C.L.E. Sup. roy.
4to. pp. 132, with 69 autotype and lithographic
Plates of Sculptures and Inscriptions. (Madras
Survey): LONDON: Trübner & Co. 1887. £3-3s.

BOMBAY: Thacker & Co., Ltd.
MADRAS: Higginbotham & Co.

4to. Demy, with Illustrations.

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY;

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH
In Archæology, Epigraphy, History, Literature,
Languages, Folklore, &c., &c.,
Vol. XXVIII. begins with Part 347, for Jan. 1899.

VOLS. I. TO XIII.; EDITED BY DR. J. BURGESS.
One complete set—Vols. I. to XIII. bound
in cloth, Rs. 315 (£24) nett. Carriage extra.
Vols. III. to XIII. in cloth, Rs. 200 (£15) nett
and carriage. A few copies only.

Vols. IV. to XIII. in cloth, Rs. 163 (£12-5s.)
nett and carriage.

Vols. V. to XIII. (9 vols.) in cloth, Rs. 135
 (£10-5s.) nett and carriage. Single Volumes,
not bound, Rs. 16 (24s.) each and carriage.

Vols. I., II., and III. not sold separately
and very scarce.

Vol. IV. Rs. 30 (45s.), a few copies.

Separate parts, if in stock, Re. 1-10 to Rs. 3.

WANTED TO BUY:—Vol. I. (1872) of the
Indian Antiquary, complete, bound or unbound,—
offered Rs. 25.

Also loose parts for Feb., July, and August of
1872 (Vol. I.), and Jan., Feb., and March of 1873
(Vol. II.),—offered Rs. 2 each part.

Apply to MANAGER, Education Society's Press.

VOLS. XIV. TO XX.; EDITED BY
DR. FLEET AND LT.-COL. TEMPLE.

Vols. XIV. to XX., not bound, Rs. 20 each,
including carriage.

VOLS. XXI. ONWARDS; EDITED BY
LT.-COL. TEMPLE.

Vols. XXI. to XXVII., not bound, Rs. 20
each, including carriage.

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ,

Official Agent to the India Office, to the Asiatic
Society of Bengal, etc., etc.,

LEIPZIG, GERMANY.

Has the honour to inform Oriental Scholars that
the large and valuable Library of the late

Professor George Bühler of Vienna

has been purchased by him and incorporated with
his own extensive stock of books relating to the
East. Mr. Otto Harrassowitz is now preparing a
catalogue of *Professor Bühler's Library*, which is
expected to be the richest catalogue ever publish-
ed on *Indian Epigraphy, Archæology, Philology,
Sanskrit Literature, etc., etc.* This catalogue will
be sent gratis on application. Oriental Scholars
desirous to receive the catalogue, are respectfully
solicited to send their addresses.

Mr. Otto Harrassowitz will be glad to receive
also orders for books, which are not announced
in his catalogues. Commissions of any kind may
be entrusted to him, and will be always attended
to with care and promptness.

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ,

Leipzig.

Oriental Bookseller.

WORKS BY LT.-COL. R. C. TEMPLE.

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE SOUTH
ANDAMANESE LANGUAGE. By E. H. MAN
AND R. C. TEMPLE. *Out of print.*

LONDON:—Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

THE LEGENDS OF THE PANJAB. In
Monthly numbers, from August 1883. Vol. I.
bound. Rs. 18. Vol. II. bound Rs. 15.

LONDON:—Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co

BOMBAY:—EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS.

Price to Subscribers Re. 1 per part. Vol. III.
All issued except the final part.

A DISSERTATION on the PROPER NAMES
OF PANJABIS. *Out of print.*

BOMBAY:—EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS.

LONDON:—Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

PANJAB NOTES AND QUERIES. A
Monthly Periodical. Edited by Lt.-Col. R. C.
TEMPLE and Messrs. DAMES and CROOKE,
Vols. I., II., III. and IV. *Out of print.*

ALLAHABAD:—PIONEER PRESS.

LONDON:—Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

WIDE-AWAKE STORIES; A Collection of
Tales told by little Children between Sunset and
Sunrise in the Panjab and Kasmir. By F. A.
STEEL and R. C. TEMPLE. *Out of print.*

LONDON:—Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

	Page.	1 col.	½ col.
One insertion.....	Rs. 17-8,	Rs. 9-1,	Rs. 4-12
Two insertions	„ 28-0,	„ 14-8,	„ 7-4
Three „	„ 35-0,	„ 18-8,	„ 9-8
Six „	„ 52-0,	„ 28-0,	„ 15-0
Twelve „	„ 100-0,	„ 52-0,	„ 27-0

Short advertisements: 1st insertion 2 as. per
line; 2nd and following 1½ as.; 12 insertions in
succession Re. 1 per line.

Though the circulation of the *Indian Anti-
quary* is necessarily limited, its subscribers are
almost exclusively such as advertisers generally
wish to draw the attention of to their advertise-
ments, and the terms for insertion, given above,
are very moderate. Application should be
made to the Publisher, Education Society's
Press, Byculla, Bombay. All payments must
be made in *advance*.

Zentralbibliothek Zürich



ZM03412627