

if one can find God by wearing wooden beads, I will put a log round my neck. So in the proverbs of social ethics in this Hindoo collection, we have "Learning, king, creeping plant, woman—these reckon upon no caste or creed; whoever keeps near them they always cling to him." We are warned to keep clear of horny, canine, and feline beasts, and of a drunkard, a king and a woman. We are told that "Woman, land, and riches, all three are roots of quarrel," and that "A woman's wiles no one knows—after killing her husband she will herself become *suttee*"—Triyá charitra na jane koe, khasam márke sattí hoe. *Bis dat qui cito dat* finds a parallel in "Turt dán mahá kalyán"—ready gift is a great virtue; "Sab ko ek lakri hánkná," is tarring with the same brush—"all with one stick driven." In another vein, but equally characteristic is the metric:

Prit na jáne pí kí ját,
Nind na jáne túti khát,
Bhukh na jáne bésá bhát,
Piyás na jáne dhobi ghát.

"Love enquires not about the beloved's caste,
Sleep cares not if the bed be broken,
Hunger will not refuse stale rice,
Thirst minds not the laundry water."

"Living in huts and dreaming of palaces," and "Never having seen a mat, dreams of a bed," are also curiously characteristic; while "Jaisá doge, waisa paoge," is as near to "As you sow, so you shall reap," as "Jab tak sáns, tab tak as," is to "Dum spiro, spero"—and that is very near indeed. Borrowing money, picking quarrels, fostering conceit, encouraging hope, fighting against fate, indolence, "bluffing," ambition, covetousness, humility, foolishness, all find here their appropriate aphoristic condemnation, and proverb *con* jostles proverb *pro* with the same delightful inconsequence as in our English sayings. Here is an instance *pro*: Huqqá Har ká ládlá, rakhe sab ká mán; Bhári Sabha men yún phire jas Gopin men Káñh—"The pipe is the beloved of God and pleases every one; it moves in the assembly like Krishna among the milkmaids;" and here is an instance *con*: Huqqá se hurmat gaí, gaí lāj sub chhút; Sab ká jhúthá piyat hain, gaí hiye kí phút—"With the smoking of pipe honour departs and modesty forsakes; they smoke it defiled by all so blind of mind do they become." But we have quoted too much already; for the rest we must refer the reader to Mr. Manucha's book itself, which may be studied with no little pleasure as well as profit.—[*Times of India*.]

New Books.

Archaeological Survey of India. The Sharqi Architecture of Jaunpur; with Notes on Zafarabad, Sahet-Mahet and other Places in the N.W. Provinces and Oudh. By A. Führer, Ph.D. With Drawings and Architectural Descriptions by Ed. W. Smith. Edited by Jas. Burgess, Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India. (Trübner, London.)

Fergusson distinguishes thirteen separate styles of Indian Saracenic Architecture, every one of which would in his opinion deserve a monograph. The Sharqi Architecture of Jaunpur (1394-1486 A.D.) represents one of these styles, and the historian of Indian Architecture adds that the Mohammedan buildings of Jaunpur are hardly surpassed by those of any city in India for magnificence, and by none for a well-marked individuality of treatment. It is this style which Dr. Burgess has chosen for the subject of the first instalment of his new series of Archaeological Reports, and for describing which he has been able to secure the assistance of such able and trained collaborators as Dr. Führer and Mr. Ed. W. Smith. Dr. Burgess, according to his own statement, has contented himself with the modest task of uniting the archaeological and architectural labours of his assistants into one connected account, and of supervising the printing. It will be permitted to conjecture, however, that Dr. Burgess has devised the whole plan of the work under notice, and has throughout directed the labours of his assistants.

Of the 73 plates, which form the most prominent feature of this Report, almost one-half relates to the Jámí Masjid, one-third to the Atala Masjid, and the remaining ones to the Lál Darwáza Masjid and other buildings of minor importance. The plates are extremely well finished, and they do not only convey a very fair general idea of the buildings, but they abound in ground plans, and upper plans, sections, panels, details of pillars, of screen roofs, etc. A future historian of Indian Architecture will find his task very much facilitated by these careful and reliable reproductions of the Jaunpur antiquities. Besides the plates, Mr. E. W. Smith has supplied accurate architectural descriptions, especially of the Atala Masjid. The materials thus furnished for an elucidation of various difficult points connected with the origin and development of the Jaunpur style are highly valuable for the history of Architecture generally.

The bulk of the letterpress is by Dr. Führer, whose detailed and tasteful account of the history of Jaunpur and its buildings is very pleasant reading. Dr. Führer has succeeded in collecting no less than forty-six inscriptions during his tour in 1886, the majority of which belong to Jaunpur. He was naturally obliged to a great extent to go again over ground already trodden, and we are not sufficiently acquainted with everything that has been printed elsewhere on the subject of the Jaunpur antiquities to be able to say precisely how much is new in Dr. Führer's account of Jaunpur. His is certainly the most comprehensive account hitherto published of that remarkable place.

He was quite right too in embodying in his part of the work the inscriptions, including those already printed, especially the Persian and Arabic ones; and we have to congratulate Dr. Führer on his acquirements in a new field, his first laurels having been gained in the field of Sanskrit and Pāli scholarship. In several instances he was able to give better readings of the inscriptions than those published by Sir A. Cunningham. The longer Sanskrit inscriptions only have been reserved for publication in the *Epigraphia Indica*, that well-known storehouse of Indian Epigraphy. The names and dates recorded in the inscriptions afford a reliable starting-point for all the questions of monumental archaeology connected with Jaunpur.

The hostile dynasties of Delhi and Jaunpur, in spite of the short duration of the Sharqi greatness, were rivals in architecture as well as in power. Nothing can be more original, in the Jaunpur style, than the lofty propylon with sloping walls hiding a single dome and supplying the place of a minaret. As for the domes, we quite agree with the joint authors of the work under review that there is very little evidence of the Buddhists having ever built domes anywhere, and that the first employment of domes and their adjuncts as an imposing part of a range of buildings belongs to the Pathān architects of Jaunpur. A careful examination of the pillars in the Atala Masjid has yielded the result that it contains but few pillars of undoubtedly Hindu origin (Plates xxi.-xxiii.), whether they may have previously belonged to a Buddhistic, a Jaina, or a Brahmanical temple. Although, therefore, there is historical evidence to show that the Atala Masjid was erected on the site of an ancient temple of Ataladevi, the result of the present researches tends to corroborate Fergusson's view that nearly the whole of the present building is really Ibrāhīm's work. If there should have been Buddhist cloisters, it is evident that no part of them was left untouched by Ibrāhīm. The Lāl Darwāza mosque contains a comparatively large number of genuine Hindu pillars, and the important dated Sanskrit inscription found on one of them proves that pillar, and with it probably many others, to have been brought from an old Benares temple; but the design of the building is decidedly Saracenic. The curious masons' marks, a full collection of which is exhibited on two plates in the work under notice, are evidently due to Hindu workmen, but it is difficult to decide whether the pillars so marked were re-used by the Mohammedan builders of Jaunpur, or made at the time of the construction of the mosques for the places now occupied by them. Judging from analogous cases in Greek architecture, we would suggest that the 'masons' marks' might be due to the owners of the quarries used for erecting the pillars and buildings. No doubt the workmen employed by the princes of the Sharqi dynasty were natives of India, as may be gathered from their Devanāgarī inscriptions, and this fact may be taken to account for the use of the old Hindu ornaments in Mohammedan buildings. On the other hand, the present investigations seem to support the view taken by Sir A. Cunningham when he questions the truth of Fergusson's remark that "nine-tenths at least

of the pillars in these mosques" were *not* taken from Hindu shrines, but made for the purpose.

The most important among the various problems concerning the monumental archaeology of Jaunpur, we mean the origin of its curious blending of the Hindu and Saracenic styles, has been finally solved in this handsome and beautifully illustrated volume.

Dr. Führer has not confined his investigations to Jaunpur, but has visited and described several other towns of his district, which is equally rich in Islamitic and in Buddhistic remains, including as it does the original home of Buddhism. His visit to Sâhet-Mahet has enabled him to collect a number of lac and clay seals, inscribed in the Gupta character, and two copper coins, apparently of the Suṅga dynasty. Dr. Hoey's Buddhistic Sanskrit inscription from Sâhet-Mahet is extremely interesting, as it proves the continued existence of Buddhism in Magadha down to the thirteenth century. The original slab is at present in the Lucknow Museum, of which Dr. Führer is the Curator, and he was enabled in consequence to supply a valuable facsimile of it. In other respects, however, his annotated edition and translation of the inscription in question agrees almost word for word with Professor Kielhorn's paper on the same inscription, in the *Indian Antiquary* for March, 1888, pp. 61-64, and we do not see why Dr. Führer has nowhere referred to the paper of his predecessor. The text, as printed by Dr. Führer, is not faultless; thus in line 1-2, *read ashta, niyama, sākyasimho, sa tvām, gtvānavāpnām*. As regards the name of the locality mentioned in the inscription, Dr. Führer is probably right in spelling it Ajāvriṣha rather than Jāvriṣha, the former name making better Sanskrit than the latter. But as for his proposed identification of Ajāvriṣha with Śrāvastī, are we to believe that the latter name, which was still in use in the times of Hiouen Tshang, should have been dropped during the Middle Ages and revived again in modern times?

There is every reason to believe that Sâhet or Sēt, the first part of the name, has been derived from Śrāvastī or Sāvasthi, through the various intermediate forms pointed out by Sir A. Cunningham, the discoverer of the place, see *Journ. As. S. B.* vol. xxiv. p. 253. Moreover, though the slab containing the inscription has been found at Sâhet-Mâhet, the stratum in which it was discovered is said to indicate that it had been placed in a restored building.

Bhuḷa Tāl would be even more important for the history of Buddhism than Sâhet-Mâhet, if it could actually be proved to have been Kapilavastu, the birthplace of its founder. Dr. Führer has inspected all the places supposed to be identical with the sites referred to by Hiouen Tshang, but a careful examination of them has caused him to embrace the opinion of those scholars who have rejected the attempted identification of Bhuḷa Tāl with Kapilavastu. The true site of Hiouen Tshang's Kapilavastu remains to be sought, but even this negative result is important, especially as it is based on evidence collected on the spot. It may not be out of place to mention here that Dr. Führer, as noted by Prof. Bühler in the *Vienna*

Oriental Journal, has recently excavated at Mathurâ a number of highly interesting Jaina inscriptions and sculptures.

Whoever cares for the progress of Indian Archaeology must wish that Dr. Burgess may soon be able to go on with this excellent new series of Reports, the first volume of which may indeed be said to be 'exhaustive and final on the subjects treated' in it.

J. J.

[We append to the above notice, which deals with Dr. Führer's work from an epigraphic and philological point of view, an excellent article by an architectural authority, Mr. W. H. White, which we take the liberty of reprinting from "The Journal of Proceedings of the Royal Institute of British Architects," vol. vi. New Series, No. 17, p. 377.]

Dr. Burgess, the Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India, is to be heartily congratulated upon the first volume of the new Series of Reports begun after the reorganization of the Archaeological Surveys in Upper India some five years ago. This volume, presented last April, is an eminently business-like production, of practical value to the architect and archaeologist—which could not always be said of earlier Reports—and possessed of many attractions from the historical and the artistic points of view, rendering the book instructive and interesting to the educated public in general. To use Dr. Burgess's words:—"The bulk of the letterpress is by Dr. Führer, whose trained and varied scholarship is a sufficient guarantee for its accuracy and research. The architectural descriptions of the buildings were prepared by Mr. Smith. My work has been to unite these into one connected account, to supervise the printing, and pass the drawings through the press." In so uniting the two sets of materials the editor has, no doubt, controlled individual expressions of opinion by his own wider experience as an expert, and so added to the authority of the work. The plates have been produced by various processes at the Survey of India Office, in Calcutta.

The first chapter of this volume is devoted to the history of Jaunpûr from the beginning of the fourteenth century to the close of the sixteenth century, and is mainly an account of the Sharqi dynasty; its later history is continued in the second chapter. The buildings of Jaunpûr described and illustrated are the great bridge over the Gûmtî, an excellent view of which forms the frontispiece of the volume; the Atala Mosque, the Khalis Mukhlis and Jhanjhri Mosques, the Lâl Darwâza Mosque, the City Mosque, and some minor mosques and tombs. The plates, seventy-three in number, are no mere sketches, but architectural plans, sections, elevations and details, drawn to scale, and quite fit to put into competent workmen's hands for execution. It is to be regretted that no geometrical drawings are given of the great bridge of Jaunpûr, described as "its most useful if not its most beautiful buildings"; the smallness of the staff of draughtsmen allowed by the Government probably prevented Mr. Smith from securing these and other desiderata in the time at his disposal. From the inscriptions, cut in Persian upon the grey sandstone of the Bridge, and

translated by Dr. Führer, it appears that "this magnificent building and splendid foundation was successfully completed . . . in the reign of the great king, emperor, high representative of the emblem of Royalty, shadow of God, the great conqueror . . . Akbar"—described as "Bâdshah" in this inscription, and as "Abûl Ghâzi" instead of "Abûl Fath." Again, that "this lofty bridge was completed under the superintendence of the great Shaikh, just to men, Khwâja Shaikh Nizâm-i-Nizâm-ad-dîn . . . and under the guidance of the unparalleled architect Afzal Âlî Kâbulî." And again, that "Khân Khânân Munim Khân, the generous, built this bridge by the grace of God. He is named Munim ['one who confers benefits'] because he is gracious and merciful to the people. His *Sirât-al-mustaqîm* ['the established path' of the Muhammadan to Paradise, the 'narrow' path of the Christian] leads the thoroughfare towards the gardens of Heaven. You will find its date if you will deduct the word '*bad*' from '*Sirât-al-mustaqîm*'"—the value of the letters of this word is 981, and the value of those of "*bad*" is six—thus: 981 — 6 = 975 A.H. = 1567-68 A.D. The story of the origin of the great bridge is that Akbar during a boating excursion saw a poor widow on the bank of the river, lamenting loudly she could not be ferried over; and the Emperor, having taken her over, ordered boats to be stationed at the landing-place for the future, adding some remarks disparaging to local rulers who had preferred to build mosques rather than bridges; and with such effect that Munim Khân soon after pledged himself to erect a bridge to mark the place of Akbar's adventure with the widow. Munim Khân's munificent gift measures some 330 feet within the inner faces of the abutments; it has ten arches, the four central arches being of perceptibly wider span than the others, and the piers are 14 feet in thickness. The neighbourhood appears to have been peculiarly fortunate in respect of bridges, for which the unused materials prepared for Munim's great bridge over the Gûmtî, another bridge was built, in 1569, over the Sât, eight miles west of Jaunpûr, carrying the 'Allâhâbâd road at a height of twenty-five feet above the winter water-level, and reached by embankments of approach on either side. An earlier bridge, 10½ miles south-east of Jaunpûr, was built in 1510, by Jalâl, son of Sikandar [Alexander] Lodi: it has nine pointed arches, and carries the Banâras road over the Sât to Jalâl pûr.

The Fort of Jaunpûr is an irregular quadrangle on the north bank of the river Gûmtî: its external walls are of considerable height, and an eastern gateway, its main entrance, is described as resembling "one of the great propylons in front of the masjids [mosques]; the walls batter, and the general design is the same." The Jaunpûr propylons are exceptional in India. A "photo-etching" is given of the gateway and its loop-holed bastions, which have many affinities to the mediæval fortifications of Western Europe.

The Mosque of Ibrâhîm Nâib Bârbak in the Fort is also referred to, with a desire principally as I understand it, to correct technical inaccuracies respecting it in previous Reports issued under the direction of General Cunningham, whose post Dr. Burgess has