AN EARLY ATTESTATION OF THE TOPONYM *ḌHILLĪ*

RICHARD J. COHEN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

It is Ernest Bender who introduced me to Jaina Studies. Of the many things he taught me, most useful is his insistence that the various competing traditions that compose Indian history be treated equally. It is this approach which led me to Apabhraṃśa literature, and to the realization that it might contribute to our understanding in a number of areas, viz., linguistic change, literary rhetoric, story motifs, and, somewhat surprisingly, historical documentation. It should be clear from what follows that investigations into the vast untapped corpus of Jaina secular literature—written in Apabhraṃśa between the ninth and fourteenth centuries—will reward the efforts of those who subscribe to the notion that India's so-called little, heterodox, or folk traditions help us to understand more fully India's complex cultural nexus.

THE *PĀSAṆĀHACARIU*[1] IS A HAGIOGRAPHY of the twenty-third Jaina *tīrthaṅkara*, Pārśvanātha. It was written in Delhi in A.D. 1132 by the Agravāla Digambara poet, Śrīdhara, for a patron, a wealthy, influential merchant, Ṇaṭṭala Sāhu. The text is composed in a stylized literary form of western Apabhraṃśa, often used during this period by Digambara Jainas to make available the exemplary lives of the twenty-four *tīrthaṅkara*s in an accessible, entertaining form.

A number of passages in the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* are of historical interest, especially regarding the history of pre-Islamic Delhi and the Tomara dynasty. It was not the intention of Śrīdhara to record for posterity the accomplishments of the Tomara kings, nor architectural aspects of their capital city. Rather, his was a commission to weave the glorious career of Pārśvanātha into an entertainment, using the beguiling rhetoric of a familiar language, mixing a didactic story with occasional verses extolling the virtues of his patron. As is often the case with literature of this variety, we find the author prefacing the main story with preliminary remarks. They give information concerning provenance, the political, social, and economic situation, and discuss the relation between the author and his patron. It is upon this information that I intend to concentrate. The text contains other information that requires attention, but which I must set aside for another time—issues relative to the study of Apabhraṃśa language and literature in general, and the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* in particular.

The decline of Pratihāra imperial power during the last half of the tenth century A.D. created a political crisis in North India. Epigraphical and literary evidence attest to the rise of regional dynasties such as the Caulukya in Gujarat, the Cauhāna in Rajasthan, the Paramāra in Malwa, the Gāhaḍavāla at Kannauj-Varanasi, and the Candella in Bundelkhand. The historical record is, however, strangely silent regarding the Tomara. Evidence suggests they did not possess sufficient power to compete with the above-mentioned dynasties. It is likely at one time or another they were either feudatories of the Gāhaḍavāla and/or Cauhāna, or at least ruled with their assent.

The first inscription of Candradeva Gāhaḍavāla (ca. 1091–1103 A.D.), issued at Candrāvatī in 1091, mentions that the king "protected" the sacred places of Kāśī, Kuśika, Uttara-Kośala and Indrasthānīyaka. The legendary Indraprastha, located within the city of Delhi, is very likely the Indrasthānīyaka of the inscription.[2] There are two Cauhāna inscriptions which allude to the fact that Vigraharāja IV (also called Vīsaladeva) held sway over the territory between the Vindhyas and the Himalayas, and had captured Ḍhillikā (Delhi) and Āsikā (Hānsī).[3]

[1] All references to verses from the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* of Śrīdhara are found in my unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, occasionally with slight changes to translations, entitled: *The Pāsaṇāhacariu of Śrīdhara: An Introduction, Edition and Translation of the First Four Sandhis of the Apabhraṃśa Text* (University of Pennsylvania, 1979).

[2] See *Epigraphia Indica*, 9: 302–5; also, R. Niyogi, *The History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty* (Calcutta, 1959), 45–46.

[3] See, F. Kielhorn, "Delhi Siwalik Pillar Inscriptions of Visaladeva: The Vikrama Year 1220," *The Indian Antiquary*

It is significant that the many raids conducted in North India by Maḥmūd of Ghazni, his descendants, and later by Muḥammad ibn Sām (Muḥammad Ghūrī) were directed at territories held by the Caulukya, Cauhāna, and Gāhaḍavāla. Delhi remained untouched until the centers of real power had been neutralized. The selection of Delhi by Muḥammad ibn Sām and his slave, Quṭb-ud-dīn Aibak, as the center of Paṭhān administration in India was not a *de facto* recognition of Delhi's historical preeminence as the seat of Hindu political power, but a practical decision based upon the city's central geographical location with respect to the conquered Hindu territories and its convenient proximity to the previously annexed Panjab, with its capital at Lahore, and to the homeland, Afghanistan.

Early historical writing on the Tomara of Delhi by James Tod,[4] Alexander Cunningham,[5] J. D. Beglar,[6] Carr Stephen,[7] Vincent Smith,[8] and H. C. Ray,[9] is based largely upon legendary evidence and secondary sources. Since the discovery of the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* and its recognition as a primary historical source, several scholars have utilized it to substantiate idiosyncratic theories.[10] Others, most notably those who do not consult the work of scholars written in Hindi, remain unaware of the text. This is disturbing, because it suggests there is a widening gap between Western scholars, who routinely read and research in one of the Western languages, and the growing number of Indian scholars who are working exclusively in Hindi. There is an additional problem, however, and it involves everyone, whether they write in an Indian language or another. It arises from our lack of knowledge concerning the history of Apabhraṃśa literature: authors, the corpus of texts, and the circumstances under which they were written. The lack of an authoritative Apabhraṃśa etymological dictionary encourages the idiosyncratic theories mentioned above, while discouraging substantive research requiring the methodical reading and study of unworked materials.

In the limited space available here, I shall concentrate on a group of verses found in the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* of Śrīdhara which have been responsible for bringing the text to the attention of scholars. They are extremely important from an historical point of view. The verses are in the introductory section of the text, where the author describes the circumstances under which he received his commission, including references to the city of Ḍhillī, its fort and marketplace. The following text is crucial for our purposes:

1.2.14 *hariyāṇae dese asaṅkha-gāme / gāmiyaṇa-jaṇiya-aṇavaraya-kāme //*
1.2.15 *para-cakka-vihaṭṭaṇu siri-saṅghaṭṭaṇu jo suravaiṇā pariganiuṃ / riu-ruhir'āvaṭṭaṇu paviulu paṭṭaṇu ḍhillī-ṇāmeṇa ji bhaṇiuṃ //*
1.3.1 *jahiṃ gayaṇa-maṇḍal'ālaggu sālu / raṇamaṇḍava-parimaṇḍiu visālu //*
1.3.2 *goura-siri-kalas'āhaya-payaṅgu / jala-pūriya-parih'āliṅgiyaṅgu //*
1.3.3 *jahiṃ jaṇa-maṇa-ṇayaṇ'āṇandirāiṃ / maṇiyara-gaṇa-maṇḍiyā-mandirāiṃ //*
1.3.4 *jahiṃ caudisu sohahiṃ ghaṇa-vaṇāiṃ / ṇāyara-ṇara-khayara-suhāvaṇaīṃ //*
1.3.5 *jahiṃ samaya-karaḍi ghaḍaghaḍahaḍanti / paḍisaddeṃ disi vidisi viphuḍanti //*
1.3.6 *jahiṃ pavaṇa-gamaṇa-dhāvira-turanga / ṇaṃ vārirāsi-bhangura-taranga //*
1.3.7 *paviulu aṇaṅga-saru jahiṃ vihāiṃ / rayaṇāyaru saiṃ avayariu ṇāiṃ //*
1.3.8 *jahiṃ tiya-payaṇeura-rau suṇevi / hariseṃ sihi ṇaccaï taṇu dhuṇevi //*
1.3.9 *jahi maṇaharu rehai haṭṭamaggu / ṇīsesa-vatthu-sañciya-samaggu //*
1.3.10 *kātantaṃ piva pañjī-samiddhu / ṇava-kāmiṇi-jovvaṇam'iva saṇiddhu //*
1.3.11 *suraramaṇiyaṇu va varaṇetta-vattu / pekkhaṇayaram'iva vahu-vesavantu //*
1.3.12 *vāyaraṇu va sāhiya-vara-suvaṇṇu / ṇāḍaya-pekkhaṇayaṃ piva sapaṇṇu //*
1.3.13 *cakkavai va vara-pūapphalillu / saccuṇṇu ṇāiṃ saddaṃsaṇillu //*
1.3.14 *dapp'ubbhaḍa-bhaḍa-toṇu va kaṇillu / saviṇaya-sīsu va vahu-gorasillu //*

43: 215–19; and Akshaya Keerty Vyas, "Bijholi Rock Inscription of Chahamana Somesvara: v.s. 1226," *Epigraphia Indica* 26: 84–112.

[4] James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* (London, 1914), I: 206–10.

[5] Alexander Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey of India*, I: 132–84; and *Coins of Mediaeval India* (reprint, Delhi, 1967), 80–85.

[6] J. D. Beglar, "Delhi," in *Report for the Year 1871–72, Archaeological Survey of India*, IV: 1–91.

[7] Carr Stephen, *Archaeology and Monumental Remains of Delhi*, 1–37.

[8] Vincent Smith, "The Iron Pillar of Delhi," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1897): 1–18.

[9] H. C. Ray, *The Dynastic History of Northern India*, second edition (New Delhi, 1973), 1145–52.

[10] See Daśarath Śarmā, "Dillī kā Tomar (Tamvar) Rājya," *Rājasthānī Bhāratī* 3, nos. 3–4: 17–26; Brajkiśan Cāndīvāl, *Dillī kā Khoj* (Dillī, 1965), 17b1-49; Hariharnivās Dvivedī, *Dillī ke Tomar* (Gvāliyar, 1973), *Kīrtistambh (Kutubmīnār)* (Gvāliyar, 1980).

1.3.15 *pārāvāru va vitthariya-saṅkhu / tihuaṇavaï-guṇa-ṇiyaru va asaṅkhu //*

1.3.16 *ṇayaṇam'iva satāraü saruva-sahāraü paura-māṇu kāminiyaṇu va / saṅgaru va saṇāyaü ṇahu va sarāyaü ṇihaya-kansu ṇārāyaṇu va //*

1.4.1 *jahiṃ asivara-toḍiya-riu-kavālu / ṇaraṇāhu pasiddhu aṇaṅgavālu //*

1.4.2 *ṇirudala-vaṭṭiya-hammīravīru / vandiyana-vinda-paviiṇṇa-cīru //*

1.4.3 *dujjaṇa-hiyay'āvaṇi-dalaṇa-sīru / duṇṇaya-ṇīraya-ṇirasaṇa-samīru //*

1.4.4 *valabhara-kampāviya-ṇāyarāu / māṇiniyaṇa- maṇa-sañjaniya-rāu //*

In the region of Hariyāṇaü which has numerous villages, and whose inhabitants are ever happy, there is the large city called Ḍhillī, favored by Indra, destroying hostile armies, a mass of wealth, boiling the blood of the enemy. The immense fort, adorned all around with bastions and encircled by a water-filled moat, touches the vault of the sky, the radiant pinnacle of its city-gate brighter than the sun. The buildings, studded with gems, delight the minds and eyes of the public. Dense forests, which beautify the entire area, are a source of pleasure to the birds and city-dwellers. Here rutting elephants loudly clash, splitting the air with their noises, and galloping horses, swift as the wind, are like ocean waves about to break. The wide Anaṅga Lake resembles the ocean; the peacock, its body trembling, dances with delight, hearing the tinkling sound of women's anklets.

The fascinating marketplace glitters with a collection of every commodity. Like the Kātantra grammar, it abounds in *pañjī*s[11] and is friendly like the youthfulness of a young girl. It possesses precious cloth like goddesses, numerous guises like a public spectacle, eloquent speech like a grammar and connoisseurs like the performance of a drama. It possesses the best betel-nut as a general has the advantage of superior troops.[12] It possesses an honest appearance as one full of truth possesses the six systems of philosophy. It is filled with grain as the quiver of a proud, excellent warrior is filled with arrows, and many milk preparations as the well-trained student with the sweetness of eloquent speech. Like the ocean, its size is vast, immeasurable like the multitude of virtues of a Lord of the Three Worlds.[13] It is radiant like the eyes, enchanting like a lake, very capricious like a woman in love, full of elephants like a battle,[14] colorful like the sky, and has struck *kansa* like Nārāyaṇa.[15]

[Here is] where the famed King Anaṅgapāla [ruled]. He cut off the head of the enemy with his excellent sword, crushed and destroyed the Hammīra warrior, and distributed cloth to the groups of bards. As the plowshare breaks the ground, so he broke the heart of the wicked. He was the wind driving away the cloud of evil conduct. The weight of his pillar caused the Lord of the Snakes to tremble.

Scholars have failed to note that the references to "Hariyāṇaü" and "Ḍhillī" are the earliest of their kind in literature. An undated, fragmentary *praśasti* written in Sanskrit, now in the Ajmer Museum,[16] manifestly belonging to the reign of the Cauhāna ruler, Arṇorāja (ca. A.D. 1133–51), alludes to the fact that the king conducted a military campaign in the land of "Haritānaka." If this is the original form of the name, it may be explained as *Harita+āna+ka*; but one must allow for the possibility that it represents a Sanskritization of the Apabhraṃśa form *Hariyāṇaü* < **Hariyāṇaka*. The form "Hariyānaka," with the dental nasal in place of the retroflex, actually occurs in the Sanskrit Pālam inscription of 1276,[17] while "Hariyāna," minus the pleonastic suffix *-ka*, is attested fifty-one years later (1327) in the Sanskrit Sāravala inscription during the reign of Muḥammad ibn

[11] A Sanskrit grammar composed by Śrī Śarvavarman. The pun is on the word *pañjī*, meaning both 'commentary' and 'account-book'. Cf. Skt. *pañjī*, *pañjikā* "a perpetual commentary which explains and analyses every word, a book in which receipts and expenditures are entered."

[12] *varapūapphalillu* (cf. Skt. *varapugaphalavat*) is a pun: 'possessing the best betel-nut', and 'possessing the advantage of superior troops'.

[13] It is possible Śrīdhara intended a pun here, whereby *tihuaṇavaï*, cf. Skt. *tribhuvanapati* 'lord of the three worlds, a Jina', is doubled with a reference to the contemporary Tomara ruler of Delhi, who according to Hariharnivas Dvivedi, was Tribhuvanapāla (A.D. 1130–51), later known in his reign as Vijayapāla. See *Kīrtistambh*, 160, 162, 164, and *Dillī ke Tomar*, 247–52.

[14] A three-fold pun is possible: Apabhraṃśa *saṇāyaü* may be construed as a *tadbhava* of Skt. *sanādāḥ* 'possessing loud noises', *sanāgāḥ* 'possessing elephants', or *sanyāyāḥ* 'possessing logic'.

[15] The pun is made possible by the decayed state of Apabhraṃśa phonology, but is almost impossible to render in English. Apabraṃśa *kansa* is derivable from both Skt. *Kansa*, the demon whom Nārāyaṇa (Kṛṣṇa) slayed, and Skt. *kānsya* 'a bell', the sound of which fills the market.

[16] See Dasarath Sharma, *Early Cauhan Dynasties* (Delhi, 1975), 49–51, and 204.

[17] Rajendralal Mitra, "Note on the Palam Baoli Inscription," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 43: 104–10.

Tughlak.[18] Both the Pālam and Sāravala inscriptions stipulate that before the coming of the Afghans, Hariyāna(ka) was ruled by the Tomara and then the Cauhāna.

The origin and etymology of the name *Ḍhillī(kā)* presents special problems. The Iron Pillar of Meharaulī near the Qutb Mīnār in Delhi, which stands before the Kuvvat-ul-islām Mosque constructed by Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak in 1191–92, carries an inscription in Gupta Brahmī characters, mentioning a ruler by the name of "Candra." Vincent Smith argued that, due to the shape of the Brahmī characters, the style of the pillar's capital, and the content of the inscription, Candragupta II had the pillar constructed ca. A.D. 413, and that his son, Kumāragupta I, in order to commemorate his father's victories, had the inscription engraved posthumously no later than 415. Smith further suggested that the original site of the pillar, mentioned in the inscription as "Viṣṇupadagiri," was at or near Mathura. It is certain the pillar does not stand on its original site, for the inscription states that it was set up on a hill or mountain. It was probably brought to and erected on the site where it now stands by the Tomara ruler, Anaṅgapāla II, around A.D. 1052 to commemorate the founding of his capital, Lāl Koṭ, at Ḍhillī. The basis of this inference is a short inscription found on the south-east face of the pillar cited by Cunningham as "Samvat Dihali 1109 Ang Pāl bahi."[19] A reproduction of the inscription has neither appeared in print, nor have scholars, save one, ever questioned Cunningham's transliteration. Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni reported the inscription to read "Sammat Dhilli 1109 Amgapala vadi."[20]

Admittedly, Sahni's transliteration, like Cunningham's, is unscientific, but there is no avoiding the issue of the different spellings "Dihali/Dhilli" and "bahi/vadi." Before considering this point, however, a remark on the syntax of the line is in order. Syntactically, the line is confused. That the name of the city intervenes between "Saṃvat" and the date "1109," and that "Aṅgapāla" (Anaṅgapāla) is not inflected suggest that little care was given to the engraving of the inscription and that it is unlikely the inscription was meant to be "official." This is also borne out by the garbled spelling of the ruler's name. What may have happened, as H. Dvivedi has suggested,[21] is that an artisan, associated with or present at the pillar's erection, is responsible for the inscription. If this is the case, then the spelling "Dihali" may be an illiterate attempt at "Ḍhillī," the spelling which occurs for the first time in the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* and which is attested in later contexts, also with the pleonastic suffix *-kā*. Sahni's "Dhilli" probably stands for "Ḍhillī," but there is no way of knowing, barring inspection of the inscription, whether he personally corrected the spelling or whether it is a faithful reproduction of what exists on the pillar.

The etymology of the word *Ḍhillī* cannot be conclusively settled from the available data. If Cunningham's reading, "Dihali," is correct, the etyma *dehalī* 'threshold' and *dehuḍī/dehuḍḍ(h)ī* 'mound, threshold' are of possible interest.[22] A popular etymology for Ḍhillī is found in a number of legends, all of which essentially depend upon the same motif.[23] Anaṅgapāla II, wishing to erect the pillar on an appropriately auspicious spot, consulted a brahmin. The brahmin selected a location, claiming that the pillar would come to rest on the head of the King of Snakes (Vāsuki), thus guaranteeing the permanence of the ruler's dynasty. After erecting the pillar, Anaṅgapāla doubted the brahmin's claim and had it dug up. He found the lower end of the pillar soaked with the blood of the snake. The king had the pillar replaced in the hole, but due to his lack of confidence, both the pillar and his kingdom were thereafter considered *ḍhilla*, that is, 'loose'. It was further prophesied that in time the city would be ruled by the Cauhān and after them the Paṭhān. That the name of a capital city would be derived from a word meaning 'loose' is, of course, unlikely. The reference to the historically factual succession of the Cauhān and Paṭhān as rulers of Delhi identifies the account as a popular story dated substantially later than the suzerainty of the Tomara.

Cunningham's translation of the inscription—"In Samvat 1109, or A.D. 1052, Ang (or Anang) Pāl peopled Dilli,"[24]—brings us to the question of the two

[18] J. Eggeling, "Inscription in the Delhi Museum," *Epigraphia Indica*, I: 93–95.

[19] *Archaeological Survey of India*, I: 151. I have quoted verbatim Cunningham's transliteration of the inscription. A. L. Basham says the pillar was originally erected at Ambālā. See *The Wonder That Was India*, second edition (New York, 1963), 221–22.

[20] "Appendix III(b): Modern Inscriptions on the Iron Pillar," in J. A. Page, *An Historical Memoir on the Qutb, Delhi* (Delhi, n.d.), 45.

[21] Op. cit., 238.

[22] See R. L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London, 1973), 374–75.

[23] See Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey of India*, I: 171–75.

[24] Op. cit., 151.

readings *bahi/vadi*. Dvivedi, who was apparently unaware of Sahni's version of the inscription, rightfully criticizes Cunningham's translation of "peopled" for *bahi*. He suggests that *bahi* is connected with *vahana* 'carrying, bearing', and that the inscription records the year Anaṅgapāla transported the pillar from some distance, perhaps Mathura, and set it up in its present location.[25] Sahni's rendering of *vadi* for *bahi* is interesting from a semantic point of view in that it can be compared to Sanskrit *vadi* 'the period of days belonging to the dark half of the month', often used in conjunction with the date of an inscription. Such an explanation is tenuous, however, since *vadi* is invariably associated with, and directly follows the name of, a particular month. One must conclude that the inscription is incomplete, and based upon its grammar, it would appear to be an attempt by an unauthorized individual to record in the contemporary vernacular the association of Anaṅgapāla with the erection of the pillar.

It comes as no surprise that Śrīdhara calls the city "favored by Indra." The Yamunā River flood plain, especially near Purāṇa Qila, has been known since early times as Indraprastha, 'Indra's Place'. References to the city "destroying hostile armies," and "boiling the blood of the enemy," allude to the Muslim Paṭhān armies which during this period were launching numerous raids deep into Hindu territories. The city obviously represented an alluring target, also a formidable one.

The chapter (stanzas 1.3.1–16) that follows the reference to Ḍhillī is devoted to a description of the city, or more specifically, the walled fortification popularly known as "Lāl Koṭ," the remains of which are still partially visible encircling the Qutb Mīnār complex just north of Meharauli village.[26] The first half of the chapter offers a general account of the city and its fort while the latter is specifically concerned with the character of the market.

The poet observes that the fort (*sālu*), which touches the vault of the sky, is wide (*visālu*), fitted-out all around (*parimaṇḍiu*) with bastions (*raṇamaṇḍava*), its mass encircled by a moat (*parihā*) filled with water; the radiant pinnacle of the city-gate (*goura*) is brighter than the sun. The buildings (*mandirāiṃ*) are studded with gems, the wide Aṇaṅga Lake appears like the ocean, and thick forests abound.

At this point it is appropriate to discuss a theory recently put forward by Hariharnivas Dvivedi in his book *Kīrtistambh (Kutubmīnār)*. Dvivedi's idiosyncratic theory owes its origins to a misreading of *Pāsaṇāhacariu* 1.3.1. He would render *jahiṃ gayaṇamaṇḍal'ālaggu sālu / raṇamaṇḍava-parimaṇḍiu visālu* in Hindi as *jahāṃ (jis ḍhillīpaṭṭan meṃ) gagan maṇḍal ko chūtā huā viśāl 'śāl' nirmit hai, jo cāroṃ or raṇamaṇḍal (koṭ) se ghirā huā hai* ("Where a tower touching the vault of the sky is constructed, surrounded on all sides by a fort"). Dvivedi, strategically, does not gloss Apabhraṃśa *sālu*, but supplies the Hindi word *śāl*, and provides a footnote in which he quotes Sanskrit, Prakrit and Hindi lexicographers, who characteristically offer a number of slightly differing glosses.[27] The point is that these glosses involve etyma which are essentially different. Dvivedi takes his pick, selecting the Hindi word *sālār* 'staircase', and makes the connection with the Qutb Mīnār, which of course has an inner staircase. This leads him to posit the theory that the Qutb Mīnār is the *sālu* mentioned in *Pāsaṇāhacariu* 1.3.1, and that Anaṅgapāla constructed the "Victory Tower" (*kīrtistambh*) later modified by Aibak and Iltutmish. The remaining part of Dvivedi's Hindi translation further unveils his intention to read the verse to his purpose. This can be seen in his translation of *raṇamaṇḍava-parimaṇḍiu* as *raṇamaṇḍal (koṭ) se ghirā hai*. There is no reason to construe *raṇamaṇḍava* as *raṇamaṇḍal* when it is clearly *raṇamaṇḍap* 'bastion', the translation to be "fitted-out all around with bastions." The word *sālu* obviously refers to the "fort," makes best sense in the context, and, furthermore, is glossed as such in Sanskrit and Prakrit lexicons, where the semantic field revolves around such notions as 'wall, rampart, fort' (cf. Skt. *śāla*, Pkt. *sāla*). My purpose in detailing

[25] Dvivedi, *Dillī ke Tomar*, 238; and *Kīrtistambh*, 155–56.

[26] Although the name "Lāl Koṭ" is not used in the *Pāsaṇāhacariu*, enough documentation exists to be fairly certain that indeed the fort built by Anaṅgapāla II was known by this name. See Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey of India*, I: 151. A map outlining the configuration of the walls of the fortress is in J. D. Beglar, Plate I, following p. 265.

[27] To be fair to Dvivedi, I supply verbatim the contents of his footnote: *gṛhair viśālairapi bhūri śālaiḥ—Āpṭe ne is śabd kā arth 'atyant ucc tathā bhavy' kiyā hai. Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo meṃ ise 'bhitti rahit ghar' kahā hai. Hindī Śabdasāgar meṃ 'sālār' ko sīḍhī yā sopān kahā hai. Sālua kā arth kamalakand bhī hai jo lambā aur bhītar se polā hotā hai. In sab arthoṃ par vicār karane par śrīdhar ke 'gayaṇa maṇḍalā laggu sālu' kā āśay hai 'ati uttuṃg śaṃku ke ākār kā kā sopānyukt nirmāṇ', arthāt, dillī kā kīrtistambh. Esāmī isī stambh ko svarg kā vṛkṣ (tūbā) kahatā hai.* See *Kīrtistambh*, 194, note 1.

Dvivedi's flawed theory is to highlight the urgent need to explore more fully Jaina secular literature, written especially between the seventh and fifteenth centuries, and to develop methodologies which will aid in its interpretation.

The results of the archaeological investigations carried out at Lāl Koṭ by Cunningham, Beglar and Stephen are essentially in accord with Śrīdhara's remarks. Cunningham and Beglar disagreed on the over-all size of Anaṅgapāla's Lāl Koṭ, but both concurred that the western fortification wall, which today can be traced northward from Adham Khan's tomb (belonging to the reign of Akbar) to the Fateh Burj (Victory Tower), then due east through the Sohan Burj (Brilliant Tower) up to the Sohan Gate, is certainly part of the original fort.

The general features of this wall are of interest. Composed of large-sized rubble stones, the wall is thirty feet thick at the base, fifteen at the parapet and sixty in height. Spaced at eighty feet along the wall, one sees the circular bastions to which Śrīdhara refers, forty-five feet in diameter. The Fateh Burj is eighty feet in diameter, and the Sohan Burj is largest at one hundred feet in diameter. Approximately three hundred feet east of Sohan Burj is Sohan Gate, now but a gap in the wall. According to Beglar, there were a total of five gates in Lāl Koṭ. One is tempted to identify Śrīdhara's reference to the city-gate whose "radiant pinnacle was brighter than the sun," with the Sohan Gate (cf. Skt. *śobhana* 'bright, radiant'). The wall is protected by a moat (also referred to by Śrīdhara), varying from eighteen to thirty-five feet in width. Roughly twelve hundred feet due east of the western wall and one-quarter mile north-west of the Kuvvat-ul-islām Mosque one can still see Śrīdhara's Anaṅga Lake (Apa. *Aṇaṅga-saru*), presently known as Anaṅgatāl.

Śrīdhara has taken advantage of the particularly interesting characteristics of the marketplace in order to devise a string of stanzas which display his skill at composing simile and word-play. The resulting picture leaves the reader with a clear impression of the market's appearance and flavor and, interestingly enough, closely resembles the features of the contemporary Indian market. Nothing of the market's architectural design is given, nor do any remains of the area seem to exist today. Śrīdhara's fascination with the market may come from his association with Ṇaṭṭala Sāhu, the merchant-patron, and the fact that the poet himself, belonging to the Agravāla community (a caste predominantly mercantile in occupation) must have resided within the confines of the market when he composed the *Pāsaṇāhacariu* at Delhi.

In stanzas 1.4.1–4, we find Śrīdhara's often misunderstood reference to "King Anaṅgapāla." Since no verb is expressed, the problem of deciding whether Anaṅgapāla was a contemporary of the author or antedated him arises. Indeed, there are two schools of thought. Dasaratha Sharma, and more recently Rajaram Jain, express the opinion that an Anaṅgapāla was the ruler in A.D. 1132, when Śrīdhara composed the *Pāsaṇāhacariu*. In doing so, Sharma differentiates between Anaṅgapāla II, who constructed Lāl Koṭ, and an Anaṅgapāla III, contemporary to Śrīdhara. Cunningham also assumes the existence of an Anaṅgapāla III, but for different reasons.[28] His theory is based upon king-lists of the Tomara dynasty found in two manuscripts from Kumaon and Garhwal. It should be noted that other king-lists exist which do not corroborate Cunningham's Kumaon-Garhwal manuscripts. The *Pṛthvīrājarāso* of Cand Barḍāī, which has been proven to be highly interpolative and of rather late date (c. 16th century A.D.), also assumes the existence of an Anaṅgapāla, ca. 1130–60. Although the line of succession of the Tomaras is not clearly established, and, in fact, may not be settled until more primary data are available, it is obvious that the king-lists date from a period considerably posterior to the actual end of the Tomara dynasty at Delhi. Hariharnivas Dvivedi,[29] who has researched the problems of Tomara dynastic succession, concludes that there is no basis to assume the existence of an Anaṅgapāla III, and conclusively argues that a ruler by the name of Vijayapāla (ca. 1130–51), also known as Tribhuvanapāla, was the king contemporary to Śrīdhara.

Why Śrīdhara chose to mention Anaṅgapāla II (ca. 1051–81), a king who ostensibly died over fifty years before him, is a question which Dvivedi has also addressed. From the *Kharataragacchabṛhadgurvāvali*,[30] a text which documents the activities of the Kharataragaccha's spiritual leaders, Dvivedi finds evidence to suggest that when Delhi was visited by Jinadattasūri and later by Jinacandrasūri (between ca. 1151 and 1166), the attitude of the Tomara ruler, Madanapāla (ca. 1151–66), toward the Jaina community was less than accommodating.[31] This situation may have also prevailed during the reign of Vijayapāla, father of Madanapāla, and influenced Śrīdhara's decision not

[28] Cunningham was unaware of the *Pāsaṇāhacariu*. See *Archaeological Survey of India*, I: 141–55, and *Coins of Mediaeval India* (reprint, Delhi, 1967), 84.

[29] *Dillī ke Tomar*, 76, 247–51.

[30] Edited by Jinavijaya Muni, Singhi Jain Grathmala, vol. 42 (Bombay, 1956).

[31] *Kharataragacchabṛhadgurvāvali*, 85–95.

to mention the contemporary ruler. It is also possible that the name of Anaṅgapāla II found its way into the text because the poet was occupied with a description of the very city that Anaṅgapāla II is credited with building.

By the time of Śrīdhara, Anaṅgapāla II must have been somewhat of a legendary figure. Śrīdhara credits him with having "cut off the head of the enemy," and having "crushed and destroyed the Hammīra." The title "Hammīra" is almost certainly an Indian corruption of the Arabic *amīr* 'a commander or noble', and it is an historical fact that the Yamīnī rulers of Ghazni used the title. It is entirely possible that Anaṅgapāla II dealt successfully with a Paṭhān threat to his kingdom, led by the contemporary Ghazni ruler, Zahir-ud-daulah Ibrahim (1059–99), the grandson of Maḥmūd.

Śrīdhara makes an interesting remark concerning Anaṅgapāla II in stanza 1.4.4a: *valabhara-kampāviya-ṇāyarāu*. There are two possible translations of the compound *valabhara*, i.e., "weight of army" (cf. Skt. *bala-bhara*),[32] or "weight of the post" (cf. Skt. *vala-bhara*), and consequently two interpretations of the half-stanza. The reference to Ṇāyarāu "King of Snakes," is significant, especially in light of the legend discussed earlier concerning the Iron Pillar and Anaṅgapāla II. The inferred relationship between Anaṅgapāla II and the King of Snakes, however, is diametrically opposed to the relationship which occurs in the legend. Here Anaṅgapāla II "caused the King of Snakes to tremble." What caused the King of Snakes to tremble is hidden in the enigmatic compound *valabhara*, i.e., "the weight of (Anaṅgapāla's) army," or "the weight of (Anaṅgapāla's) post (= pillar)." Given the connection of Anaṅgapāla II with the Iron Pillar, one would favor the latter interpretation. The ultimate value of stanza 1.4.4a, however, lies not in solving the meaning of *valabhara*, but in recognizing that as early as A.D. 1132 a legend involving Anaṅgapāla II and the King of Snakes existed. It lends support to the thesis that Śrīdhara's reference to Anaṅgapāla should not be taken as a reference to the contemporary Tomara ruler of Delhi. It also suggests that the theme of the legend was reversed at some later date, used as a popular explanation for the downfall of the Tomara, and at another level reflects the profound social, religious, and political changes which followed the seizure of North India by the Afghans.

[32] The character *va* represents either *va* or *ba* in the orthography of the manuscripts.