

### Anzeigen.

PAṆḌIT DĪNANĀTHA VIDYĀLAṆKĀRA. *The Vivāda-ratnākara, a treatise on Hindu Law by Chaṇḍeśvara*; edited by —. Calcutta, 1885—1887. *Bibl. Ind.*, Nos. 549, 550, 588, 592, 599, 619, 630.

The learned editor of this useful and important work, in the Sanskrit Preface prefixed to it, refers to the fact that Chaṇḍeśvara, the author of the Vivādaratnākara, made a present of his own weight in gold to an assembly of Brahmans in the year rasaguṇabhujachandraiḥ sammite śākavarshe, i. e. A. D. 1314. This statement has been taken apparently from the Praśasti to the Vivādaratnākara (pp. 670, 671). It had been used previously, as a means of fixing the date of that compilation, in Rajkumar Sarvadhikari's volume of Tagore Law Lectures, published in 1882. Mr. Sarvadhikari, referring to a 'Sanskrit College MS.', quotes it from Chaṇḍeśvara's Preface to his work, whereas the present edition of the Vivādaratnākara, which is founded on three good MSS., has it at the close of the work only. This no doubt is its proper place, but the reading *uttarah Somanā-thah* (p. 671) requires to be changed into Mr. Sarvadhikari's reading *uttaram Somanāthāt*, the meaning being that the liberal act in question took place 'north of Somnath', which place has not been identified. Chaṇḍeśvara was the prime minister of king Harasimphadeva of Mithilā (Tirhut), the renowned conqueror of Nepal, and Mr. Sarvadhikari has collected from other sources evidence tending to show that the reign of that monarch falls in the early part of the fourteenth century. The predecessors again from whose works Chaṇḍeśvara has

drawn or whose opinions he objects to, are all of them standard writers of the earlier centuries of the middle ages of India. Thus e. g. he mentions Asahâya, Medhâtithi, the earliest Commentator of Manu, Vijñâneśvara's Mitâksharâ, Halâyudha, and Lakshmîdhara's Kalpataru. We may note here by the way that Mr. Sarvadhikari has fallen into an error when he places Lakshmîdhara 'between Chanḍeśvara (1314 A. D.) and Mâdhava (1361—1375)', and when he makes out Chanḍeśvara to have been contemporaneous with Pratâpa Rudra, the author of the Sarasvativilâsa. Lakshmîdhara, as pointed out by Mr. Sarvadhikari himself, is frequently referred to in the Vivâdaratnâkara, and the Pratâpa Rudra, who wrote the Sarasvativilâsa, has been identified by Mr. Foulkes in his edition and translation of the Dâyabhâga section of that work, with the Gajapati King of Orissa, who reigned in the beginning of the sixteenth century A. D. Nor is Mr. Sarvadhikari right in referring the composition of the Madanapârijâta to the year 1231, and in identifying that work with the Pârijâta quoted by Chanḍeśvara.<sup>1</sup>

The Vivâdaratnâkara is one of the most comprehensive works of its kind, and simply invaluable as a collection of numerous Smṛiti texts never published hitherto. Together with other works of the Mithilâ school, which is among the earliest law schools of India, it has been used very largely by the writers of the Bengal school, as may be seen e. g. from COLEBROOKE'S Digest. The print under notice does much credit to the care and industry adhibited by the editor. The text as printed by him is readable throughout, and we have noted a comparatively small number of misprints only. A MS. preserved in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal has served as the principal foundation of this edition, but the editor has noted likewise the more important *variae lectiones* of two other MSS., and has added explanations of his own of a number of rare and obscure terms.

<sup>1</sup> See, on this point, the Introduction to Professor BÜHLER'S MANU, S. B. E. xxv, p. cxxv, note 2.

For the Smṛiti texts quoted in the Ratnākara, the editor might have availed himself advantageously of the printed editions of the Smṛitis and of other Dharmabandhas besides the Ratnākara. The following are some of the corrections suggested by adopting this method. P. 46, text of Kātyāyana, for *abhyarditena* read *abhyarthitena*. P. 53, Manu, for *kṛitavyayaḥ* read *kṛito vyayaḥ*; see Manu VIII, 166. P. 55, Brihaspati, for *ujjāmādīkam* in the text and Commentary, read *uddhārādīkam*. P. 69, Kātyāyana, for *viṇmātrasaṃjñā* read *viṇmātraśāṅkhā*. The former reading is supported by the Commentary however. P. 196, Nārada, for *avīkshitam* read *avikshatam*; see Nārada-smṛiti IX, 2 (P. 160). The Commentary explains *avīkshitam* by *aparīkshitam*. This shows that the reading *avīkshitam* is not a mere misprint; but the other reading is required by the sense and corroborated by the Viramitrodaya, COLEBROOKE'S Digest and other Lawbooks. P. 209, Manu, for *śūnyāṃś cha vanagocharān* read *anyāṃś cha vanagocharān*; see Manu VIII, 260. P. 345, Kātyāyana, for *naraḥ* read *nṛpaḥ*. P. 354, Viṣṇu, for *grihakudyaḍyupajño* read *grihakudyaḍyupabhettā*; see Viṣṇu V, 108. P. 354, Viṣṇu, for *na cha tān yajyāt* read *na cha tāñ jahyāt*; see Viṣṇu V, 114. P. 356, Yājñavalkya, for *vṛikshakshudrapaśūnām* read *vṛishakshudrapaśūnām*; see Yājñavalkya II, 236. The clause *kshudrapaśūnām* shows that *vṛisha* is the true reading, though Chanḍeśvara must have read *vṛiksha*, as may be gathered from his gloss on this text. P. 360, Yājñavalkya, for *ashtaśato* read *ashtaḡuno*; see Yājñavalkya II, 239. P. 443, Hārta, for *sūtrasavanam anishtvā nāvaset* read *aṇusavanam ishtvā vaset*. P. 446, Nārada, for *svabhagaṃ* read *subhṛīsaṃ*; see Nārada-smṛiti XII, 88 (P. 185). P. 615, Nārada, the second and third lines seem to be wrong and to have been inserted by an interpolator; see Nārada-smṛiti XVI, 7 (p. 215).

J. JOLLY.