

The whole inquiry shows the historical value of these very ancient symbols. When letters were unknown, and when, even after the discovery of alphabets, writing materials were difficult to procure and preserve, thinkers who wished to preserve their ideas, and priests who were anxious to secure the permanence of a correct ritual, were obliged to use forms easily depicted and remembered. Symbols were invented for this purpose, and were not only the precursors of alphabets, but were used even after alphabets had been invented, as in the Akkadian ideographs (Sayce, Hibbert Lectures for 1887, p. 3). By the use of symbols long trains of reasoning could be conveyed in signs easily drawn and easily remembered. Sacred numbers and myths were also adopted as guides to the memory for similar reasons to those which led to the employment of symbols, only that in myths the pleasure arising from a told story added a charm to the symbolical representation. It was the business of teachers to show the inner meaning underlying all these fossilized truths, and hence arose the exoteric or popular and esoteric or scientific lectures of which we read in the history of philosophy.

J. F. HEWITT.

The Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society.

3. MĀDHAVA AND SĀYAṆA.

The following correspondence appeared in the 'Academy' of the 8th and the 15th March, 1890.

Elphinstone College, Bombay, Jan. 30, 1890.

SIR,—The relation between Sāyaṇa, author of the great commentary on the Rigveda, and Mādhava, to whom the work is dedicated, and who is apparently credited with the authorship in the introductory verses, has been matter of controversy. The late Dr. Burnell was the author of an ingenious theory, according to which Sāyaṇa and Mādhava were only two names for one and the same person. I cannot now refer to Dr. Burnell's book (his edition of the *Vaṅśa-brāhmaṇa*, 1873), but quote Prof. Weber, *Indian Literature* (p. 42, note). "Sāyaṇa," Burnell says, "is the *bhoganātha*

or mortal body of Mâdhava the soul, identified with Vishṇu." Prof. Max Müller (*Rigveda*, vi. Preface, p. 25) refers to the theory, but does not pronounce any very decided opinion. He clings, however, to the view that Sâyaṇa was the brother of Mâdhava, the latter living retired from the world, the former being his literary representative.

I do not know if the controversy has proceeded further. But I have lately come upon a statement made by Mâdhava himself which ought, I think, to settle it. Mâdhava is the author of a commentary on the *Parâsarasmṛiti*, which is extant. In the introduction to that work, as it stands in an old copy which I have recently bought for the Bombay Government, Mâdhava gives the following account of his family:

“Śrîmatir jananâ yasya sukirtir mâyaṇaḥ pitâ,
Sâyaṇo bhoganâthaśca manobuddhî sahodarau.”

Prof. Max Müller has already noted (*loc. cit.*) that in the course of his commentary Sâyaṇa describes himself as the son of Mâyaṇa and Śrîmatî (as Prof. Max Müller has the latter name). This confirms our verse, which in its turn puts it, I think, beyond all reasonable doubt that Mâyaṇa and Śrîmatî, or Śrîmatî, had three sons—Mâdhava, Sâyaṇa, and Bhoganâtha. The two latter, Mâdhava says, were his very “heart and soul.” Mâdhava in this Introduction describes himself in the usual way as chief minister of King Bukkaṇa. I may, perhaps, add that Prof. Max Müller’s statement that the author of the commentary refers to the author of the *Nyâya-mâlâ-vistara* as “Bhâshyakâra,” and the inference sought to be drawn, namely, that these two can hardly be the same, should be corrected. The Bhâshyakâra of the passage referred to is obviously not the author of the *Nyâya-mâlâ-vistara*, but Śankarâcârya.

P. PETERSON

British Museum, March 8, 1890.

SIR,—On reading Prof. Peterson’s letter in the ‘Academy’ of to-day’s date, I at once turned to our copy of Burnell’s

Vaṃṣabrāhmaṇa ; and as I noted that the edition, like many other of that eminent scholar's works, was a small one (100 copies only), it occurs to me that possibly other readers of the 'Academy' may be in the same position as the scholars of Bombay, and have no copy of the book at hand.

I may mention, then, that Burnell (*op. cit.* p. ix, note), fully discusses the verse quoted by Prof. Peterson. He declares, rather magisterially, that "*bhoganātha* is certainly not a proper name, and never could be taken as such by any one at all acquainted with Indian practice as regards names." I may be only displaying my obtuseness; but, after several years' special study of Indian nomenclature, I own that I cannot see why *Bhoganātha* should not be a name, when *Bhogavarman* and *Bhogasvāmin* occur as such.

Burnell's next observation goes, I venture to think, too far, as he continues: "It is enough to point out that a single instance of this word being used as a proper name elsewhere does not occur; it must, therefore, be taken as an attributive." . . . He might have spoken with equal confidence as to *bhoga-pāla*, which the dictionaries give only as an ordinary noun; but it occurs as a king's name (*Hamīr-Rāsā* in *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. xlviii. p. 250).

A-propos of dictionaries, I notice that the verse now re-discovered is cited by Böhtlingk and Roth (*s.v.* *bhoganātha*) from Dr. Aufrecht's Oxford Catalogue.

As, however, this subject, which is one of no small bibliographical interest to Sanskritists, has been re-opened, I venture to add two observations.

(1) It is a curious coincidence, at least, that there is extant in Ceylon a Sanskrit medical work, the *Bhaishajya-kalpa*, attributed to a *Māyanna Sāyanna*, who is called "minister" (*mantrī*), and is described as the "crest-gem of the *Māharāja Vīrapratāpa*, who reigned from the Eastern to the Western sea." I have not identified this *Vīrapratāpa*; it might be a title of *Bukka*, of course. The book was partly printed at Colombo in 1885; but I make no apology for quoting a printed book, as the printed Sanskrit literature of Ceylon and South India is practically beyond the reach of

most scholars. Whether Sāyaṇa really prescribed for his patron's bodily, as well as his spiritual, health, I cannot of course say; but it would be strange if it should turn out that there is a Ceylon tradition of Sāyaṇa, as there is of Kālidāsa. Let me also note that the form of the name lends some colour to Burnell's suppositions that Māyaṇa is not the real name of Sāyaṇa's father, and that the original form of the name was Sayaṇṇa. The Sinhalese often confuse the cerebral and dental nasals.

(2) It remains desirable that in catalogues and bibliographies the works of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava should be entered under one heading, with necessary cross-references. This was the plan adopted by my predecessor, the late Dr. Haas; and in the supplement to his catalogue, which I am now printing for the Trustees of the British Museum, I propose to adhere to it, and to include in the same heading the Pañcadaśī.

CECIL BENDALL.