

South India in the VIII Century — Hui-ch'ao's description re-examined —

by JAN YÜN-hua
(McMaster University, Canada)

Like the papers published in recent time by the author, the present article is another sequel from my studies on *Hui-ch'ao wang Wu-l'ien-chu-kuo Chuan* or *Hui-ch'ao's Memoirs of a Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of India*¹. The original text of the Memoirs was written by a Korean monk named Hui-ch'ao, after he completed his pilgrimage to India and returned to the frontier city of T'ang China, An-hsi (Kucha). It is a personal reminiscence composed in the winter of 727 A. D. After a missing of centuries, a fragment of the Memoirs was rediscovered by Professor Paul Pelliot (1878—1945) from the cave temple of Tun-huang in Kan-su province of China.

Since Paul Pelliot published his report of discovery in 1908, a number of books and articles have been brought out during the last few decades. Of these contributions, textual readings made by late professors Lo Chen-yü, HANEDA and TAKAKUSU are important. The studies carried out by FUJITA Toyohachi and other scholars revealed true significance of the Memoirs in many aspects². The translations of the work into European languages made by Dr. W. FUCHS and others enabled more historians to approach Indian history and Central Asian studies through the information made by Hui-ch'ao³. These

¹ This article is a tract from the author's forthcoming book, *On Hui-ch'ao's Memoirs of a Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of India*, being an English translation and study of the *Memoirs*. Other sequels published recently in the form of articles are (a) "Hui-ch'ao and His Works: A Reassessment", *Indo Asian Culture*, XII/3 (1964), pp. 177—190. (b) "Some New Light on Kuśinagara from 'The Memoirs of Hui-ch'ao'", *OE*, XII/1 (1965), pp. 55—63. (c) "West India According to Hui-ch'ao's Record", *Indian Historical Qrtly.* XXXIX/1—2, pp. 27—37. (d) "The Korean Record on Vārāṇasī and Sārṇāth", *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal*, IV/2 (1966), pp. 264—272. (e) "Some Fresh Reflections on Yaśovarma of Kanauj and Muktapīḍa of Kāśhmīr", *Journal of Indian History* XLV/i (April, 1967) pp. 161—179.

² Earlier contributions on the *Memoirs* made by the Chinese and Japanese scholars have been enlisted by Dr. W. FUCHS, in his work "Huei-ch'ao's Pilgerreise durch Nordwest-Indien und Zentral-Asien um 726", *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. Phil.-hist. Klasse* v. 22 (1938), pp. 428—9. A recent survey on the subject has been made by Prof. KOH, Byong-ik, "Hye-ch'o Wang-o-ch'on-ju-kuk-ch'ou yongu saryak", ("An Historical Outline of the Studies on the Memoirs of Hui-ch'ao"), in *Bul-kyo-huk ron-mon-gil (Essays on Buddhism)*, Dr. PACK, *Sung-yu Festschrift*, (Seoul, 1959), pp. 301—16. I wish to express my thanks to Professor J. Sram, who has kindly sent me a useful bibliography on the studies of the *Memoirs* when I was in India.

³ Apart from Dr. FUCHS, *op. cit.* Professor SRAM has also published a paper, "Hyo-ch'o's Pilgrimage to India", *New Orient*, No. 4 (1961).

early contributions have laid a very useful foundation for further enquiry; nevertheless, the progress made in the field of Indology during recent years, requires us to investigate the *Memoirs* in the new light that came out in the progress.

In the course of my studies, I found certain information contained in the *Memoirs* are very reliable and valuable. There are a few quotations, which seemed doubtful at first glimpse, but proved to be true when the study was completed⁴. There still remain some passages in the *Memoirs*, which contrast with other authentic statements, yet, I think, it is too early to discard these parts of the *Memoirs*. The reason is that in history often arise such complications that certain things, though contrary to the general tendency of the age, yet actually happened. This situation can be easily and clearly proved by the current events of the world to which we are confronted every day. With this experience and view in mind, let us see how authentic and valuable is Hui-ch'ao's description of South India.

The original text of Hui-ch'ao's record on South India is clearly distinguished in three parts: the first part concerns with descriptions of the place and his impression, which is followed by a note on Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna and the sacred temple; and lastly, a poem which expresses Hui-ch'ao's deep feeling of home-sickness. In the present paper, my attempt is only concentrated on the first part of Hui-ch'ao's writing on South India, namely, his report on the country during the VIIIth century A. D. This is because, as I feel, his description is very helpful to the historians who work on the area, of which our knowledge is still scant and fragmental. Regarding the other two parts, especially the problem relating to Nāgārjuna and the temple, there exist more complications and confusions, which require more space to deal with. I, therefore, prepare to discuss those problems at an other occasion.

Following his travel to Central India, the Korean monk proceeded to the south. He informs us that the conditions of South India at the time of his visiting were as follows:—

"From Central India, travelling south for three months and odd, I arrived at the place where the South Indian king was staying. The king has eight hundred elephants. His territory is very broad: it reaches to the South Sea in the south, the East Sea in the east, the West Sea in the west, and adjoins the borders of Central India, West India and East India at the north.

Costumes, food and customs here are similar to those of Central India, but the languages are slightly different. The country is hotter than Central India. The products of this country are cotton cloth, elephants, buffalos and yellow cattle. Sheep are fewer. Camel, mule and ass are not available. There are rice-fields, but no production of sorghum and millet. Other things like floss and thin silk goods and so forth, are not produced in the whole of India.

⁴ For example, see my paper, *op. cit.*, *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal*, IV, pp. 271—2.

The king, the chiefs and the common people hold high reverence towards the Three Jewels (i. e. Buddhism). Here are plenty of temples and monks. Both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna are prevalent⁵."

Where was this South India the Korean monk visited during the first quarter of the VIIIth century A. D.? According to most scholars, the country was the Chalukyan kingdom of Bādāmī, the powerful dynasty of the Deccan high plateau, which occupied a dominant position in South India during that period⁶. The territory of the kingdom as described by Hui-ch'ao is most corresponding to other sources. For example, in the epigraphical records, the Chalukyan rulers often claimed themselves as "Pūrvā-parāmbunātha" or "the Lord of the East and the West Oceans", "Chaturudadhimekhalopārjitarāyaśrī" or "the Lord who has acquired the sovereignty of the [whole earth] girt about by the four oceans". In an inscription of Vikramāditya I, the Chalukyan king who reigned between 655—681 A. D., the king was recorded as "Ambudhitrayanivāritaśāsana" or "the Lord whose rule is bounded by the Three Oceans", which indicates South India, bordered by the Bay of Bengal, Arabian Sea and Indian Ocean⁷. This statement is exactly identical with the words of Hui-ch'ao, who informs us that the territory of South India reaches to the South Sea (i. e. Indian Ocean) in the south, the East Sea (the Bay of Bengal) in the east and the West Sea (Arabian Sea) in the west.

Of course, at the time of Hui-ch'ao's travel, Vikramāditya I was no more: but his grandson, Vijayāditya, (reigned between 696—733 A. D.) was still on the throne. We learn from epigraphical sources that the Chalukyas had a very strong sense of family bond, a king often referred to his father or grandfather in his inscriptions. And, therefore, the claim attributed to Vikramāditya was probably continuously followed up by his successors⁸.

In the record of Hsüan-tsang, the Chalukyan kingdom was mentioned under the title of *Mo-ho-la-ch'a* or Mahārāstra. Though there is no discrepancy about the identity of these two names, for long time, there have been disputes about the capital of that country. According to Indian sources, especially epigraphical and archeological findings, the capital city of the early Chalukyas was Bādāmī of Bijāpur District. The city visited and described by Hsüan-tsang was, however, not Bādāmī. Amid various proposals,

⁵ Translated from the original text in Chinese from Dr. FUCHS' edition, *op. cit.* pp. 460.

⁶ Apart from JOUVEAU-DUBREUIL's *Ancient History of the Deccan*, (translated into English by V. S. S. DIKSHITAR, Pondicherry, 1920), there are more new works in the field. The most outstanding new contributions are *The Early History of the Deccan*, ed. by G. YAZDANI, (London, 1961); and *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. III — *The Classical Age*, ed. by Dr. R. C. MAJUMDAR, (Bombay, 1954).

⁷ A more comprehensive study on the dynasty was made by Dr. G. C. RAYCHAUDHURI of Calcutta University, but the work still remains unpublished. I am grateful to D. RAYCHAUDHURI for giving me the opportunity of reading his Ms. and allowing me to quote passages from his work, *The History of the Western Chalukyas*, p. 45. Also cf. R. C. MAJUMDAR, *op. cit.* p. 243.

⁸ For examples about the family affection among the Chalukyan kings, see Dr. D. C. SRICAR's contribution in R. C. MAJUMDAR, *op. cit.* pp. 246 ff.

the prevailing suggestion is that the city of *Mo-ho-la-ch'a* mentioned by the Chinese Buddhist Master of Law, was Nāsik or its neighbouring region.

Commenting these problems, professor FUJITA writes:

"The visit of Hui-ch'ao to the country [of South India] should have taken place at the time of Vikramāditya I, who conquered and occupied the capital city of Pallavas, thus revenging the defeat of his grandfather inflicted by the Pallavas. Scholars all agree that the capital city of the country is identical with the present town of Nāsik and its neighbouring region".⁹

The genealogy of the Chalukyan rulers is very clearly testified by epigraphical sources of the dynasty. The lineage and dates of the kings reigning during the period between the visit of Hsüan-tsang and the travel of Hui-ch'ao are as follows: Pulakesin II (610/11—642), Vikramāditya I (655—81), Vinayāditya (681—96) and Vijayāditya (696—733) . . . As Hui-ch'ao's visit took place sometime during the middle of the twenties of the VIIIth century, the country was then, in any case, under the rule of Vijayāditya. Vikramāditya I reigned in the period of 655—81, forty years and odd earlier than the date of Hui-ch'ao's travel to the country, it is absolutely impossible to place him as contemporary to the Korean monk. Consequently, the suggestion put forward by FUJITA now requires a drastic revision¹⁰.

The identification of Nāsik with the capital of Mahārāstra as referred to by Hsüan-tsang was originally made by FLEET and BURGESS¹¹. This suggestion has been widely accepted by many scholars. For instance, in his excellent chapter of *"The Geography of Deccan"*, Dr. H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI stated that "the evidence of Yuan-chwang (i. e. Hsüan-tsang) suggested that in the early Chalukya period the king had a residence at Nāsik¹²". In recent years, there are, however, scholars who expressed their doubt about the correctness of this identification. Dr. D. C. SIRCAR, for example, writes:

"This city (i. e. capital of *Mo-ho-la-ch'a*) is said to have been 1000 li, (i. e. about 167 miles from Bharukachchha or Broack) while the actual distance between Broack and Bādāmī is about 435 miles. It has accordingly been suggested that the pilgrim refers to Nāsik on the Godāvarī (about 128 miles from Broack) which may have been the temporary residence of the Chalukya king when he was conducting military operation against Harsha-vardhana. The suggestion, however, is not entirely convincing as the operations against Harsha are mentioned in a record of A. D. 634—35, while Hiuen Tsang (i. e. Hsüan-tsang) visited Mahārāstra about six years later. Does the pilgrim refer to Ellora which seems to have been the capital of the earlier imperial Rāshtrakūtas and may have been a secondary capital of Chalukyas of Bādāmī? It may be pointed out that Ellora has a river to its west, but Nāsik has none¹³."

⁹ Quoted and translated from FUJITA Toyohachi, *E-chō-den Shaku* (Ch'ien's edition, Peking, 1933), pp. 17b—18a.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.* notes Nos. 6 & 7.

¹¹ Cf. *Indian Antiquary*, XII, p. 113 and XXIII, p. 28.

¹² YAZDANI, *op. cit.* p. 62.

¹³ R. C. MAJUMDAR, *op. cit.* p. 239 fn. 2.

The view mentioned above has strongly denied the identification of Nāsik with the city described by Hsüan-tsang. The mentioning of distance between the city and Broach, especially the position of the river seems very reasonable; but it is still too early to say where was the capital or "secondary" or "temporary" city which the Chinese Buddhist Master of Law visited and described. Unless more evidences, both archeological and literary, can be found, the problem of identification would remain inconclusive. Apart from the distance and the size, the identification of Ellora itself still stands without an all agreeable solution¹⁴.

The situation of the place is not the main concern of this paper; and as far as we are concerned, the problem is whether the place witnessed by Hui-ch'ao is or is not the same place referred to by Hsüan-tsang?

According to Fujita, the city mentioned in the travels of Hsüan-tsang is identical with the place referred to in the *Memoirs* of Hui-ch'ao. He further accepted the identification of Nāsik as the place. However, when we read the *Memoirs* carefully, we were able to find out that the Korean monk had used different words about the places he had visited. For example, when he talks about Kuśinagara, he says that "the city (*ch'eng*) is desolated"¹⁵. He described Kanauj, the great capital of Central India as "*Chu-ch'eng*" or "Residential City" of the Central Indian king¹⁶. The same term was also applied to the capital of West India¹⁷. But when he writes about South India, he chooses the term of "*chu-so*" or "the place where [the king was] staying"¹⁸. Here, the key word *ch'eng* (city) is significantly omitted.

In this connection, the travels of Hsüan-tsang may be recalled and compared with the *Memoirs* of Hui-ch'ao. In the record *Hsi-yü-chi*, Hsüan-tsang and Pien-chi chose the words of *Kuo ta tu-ch'eng* or "the great capital of the country"¹⁹ to describe the capital of Mahārāṣṭra. The distinction of the terms mentioned in the *Memoirs* on the one hand, and those used by Hsüan-tsang on the other hand, is very clear. This clearly indicates that the place where the King of South India was staying during the time of Hui-ch'ao's visit was a different residence. The absence of the word *ch'eng* or "city" suggests that the place might be without walls, perhaps a small Indian town or even a camp in a village. Further, the term is much different from the words of

¹⁴ For instance, Dr. G. C. RAYCHAUDHURI, *op. cit.* inclined to think that "Ellora or Elapura is probably Yellapura in Karwar", p. 117.

¹⁵ Cf. S. BEAL's translation, *The Buddhist Record of the Western World*, (Popular edition), pp. II, 255, also my paper, *op. cit.* OE, XII, p. 55.

¹⁶ For the original version in Chinese characters, see Dr. FUCHS *op. cit.* p. 458c, which Dr. FUCHS rendered into German as "*Residenzstadt des Königs von Mittel-Indien*", p. 433.

¹⁷ FUCHS, *ibid.*, pp. 438, 460; also my paper *op. cit.* *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XXXIX, p. 30.

¹⁸ For original Chinese terms, see FUCHS, *op. cit.* p. 460, which he rendered into German as "*Residenz des Königs von Süd-Indien*", p. 437.

¹⁹ S. BEAL, *op. cit.* p. II, 255. For the Chinese characters compare *Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü-chi*, ch. XI, (Ming ed. Peking reprint, 1955), p. 12a. See also WATTERS T. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, (London, 1905), p. II, 239.

Hsüan-tsang and Pien-chi, and, therefore, the place described by Hui-ch'ao was not the same city the Chinese Buddhist Master of Law visited and described before.

As far as Indian tradition goes, we are told by a most distinguished historian that, "Besides the principal imperial cities the kings of the Deccan had other 'minor seats of power or temporary places of residence'. The great capital was called *rājadhānī*, but apart from this, another term, *nelevīdu*, was also often mentioned. Though literally, the latter means a 'fixed camp', yet according to FLEET, the term is also coupled with the term *rājadhānī*, which would mean a 'permanent capital' rather than a temporary residence"²⁰.

Keeping this information in mind, let us now see the traces of the *nelevīdu*s of Vijayāditya, the ruling king of Chalukya at the time of Hui-ch'ao's visiting. According to an epigraphical record, during the fourth year of his reign or about 700 A. D., the king once had a camp at Rāsenā-nagara, which has been identified with present Rasin in the Ahmadnagar District of Mahārāstra. The place might be the headquarter of a district (taluk) in the Rāshtrakūta age. Another inscription informs of his camp at Elapura (Ellora) about the tenth year of his reign or 706 A. D.²¹ But all these encampments are dated in the early years of his rule. We still have no evidence about his "residence" at the place when the Korean monk visited the country. Unless more findings come out into the light, this problem cannot be satisfactorily solved. The place of Ellora as suggested by Professor D. C. Sircar, though it seems more reasonable than that of Nāsik, yet when the passage of "the mountain lying in the east of this country" . . . is taken into consideration, it again becomes uncertain. This is because the mountain has been identified with Ajanta, which is situated at the north of Ellora²².

Scholars all agree that Vijayāditya began his reign from July 696 A. D.²³ He was regarded as the longest and most prosperous ruler of the Chalūkyan dynasty of Bādāmī. He is also described by some historians as the 'most peaceful' king amongst the rulers of his lineage. Though the dates of his reign are clearly recorded, yet when one looks for more information about him, one would discover that the epigraphical findings, although they bear definite dates and events, are fragmental and inconsistent. A leading historian sighed in his writing that "the number of Vijayāditya's inscriptions is not as great as one might expect from the length of his reign"²⁴. It is under these difficult circumstances that the information furnished by Hui-ch'ao becomes more precious and requires more attention.

²⁰ "The Geography of the Deccan", by Dr. H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI, in G. YAZDANI, *op. cit.* p. 62.

²¹ See F. KIELHORN, "A List of Inscriptions of South India from about A. D. 500", *Epigraphia Indica*, VII (1902—3), appendix. See also YAZDANI, *op. cit.* p. 227.

²² T. WATTERS, *op. cit.* p. II, 240.

²³ *Ibid.*, note No. 6.

²⁴ K. A. Nilakanta SASTRI, "The Chalukyas of Bādāmī", in YAZDANI, *op. cit.* p. 227

According to Hui-ch'ao, the king of South India had eight hundred war elephants. The number of elephants' corps mentioned in the *Memoirs* usually indicates the military strength of the Indian kings. Comparing the figure of the South Indian king with those of other Indian powers at that time, we find that Vijayāditya stands in the second place among his contemporaries. Only the king of Central India, Yaśovarman of Kanauj, was more powerful. The elephants' corps possessed by the rest of kings, such as the kings of West India (Valabhi) and of North India and even the ruler of Kashmir, were all lesser than those of the king of South India²⁵.

Previously, our knowledge about the military strength of Vinayāditya was extremely scanty. Except a Pallavan inscription which recorded a rough estimate of "several lakhs" as the figure of army led by Vinayāditya, at the time when he fought against Paramēśvara-varman I, the king of Pallava, there is no other figure whatsoever available. But the epigraphical source however, is neither directly connected with Vijayāditya's reign, nor from an objective viewpoint²⁶. If we compare this with the information given by the *Memoirs* of Hui-ch'ao, the definite figure mentioned in the latter becomes more significant. This indicates that, though the reign of Vijayāditya was "peaceful", nevertheless, peace was actually maintained by strong military force. This military strength was inherited by his successor, Vikramāditya II, and it was with this background that Vikramāditya conquered the South Indian kingdoms. Without the accumulation and preparation by the father, it would have been difficult for the son to undertake his great expeditions to the south.

There is another interesting point of which Hui-ch'ao informs us in his *Memoirs* related to the religious conditions of South India. In the *Memoirs*, Hui-ch'ao stated that the king, the chiefs and the common people hold high reverence towards the Three Jewels or Buddhism. How far is this true?

In the past, epigraphical sources only claimed that the family God of the Royal family of Chalukya was Vishnu, the great God of Protection of Hinduism. This claim was testified by the use of *Varāhalānchhana* or Boar Crest as the sign of their power, and *Varāha* on their seal, and the invocation of the *Varāha avatāra* at the beginning of their royal records. The early Chalukyas also used the epithet *Parama-bhagavata* which is, again, connected with God Vishnu²⁷. Though some of the kings of this dynasty are known to have patronised the Śaivas and the Jains, and one or two of the later rulers of the house might even have adopted these two religions as their faith, yet none of the sources suggest or claim that the Chalukyas of Bādāmī gave support to Buddhism²⁸.

²⁵ See my paper, *op. cit. Journal of Indian History* (1967) p. 169, and *Indo Asian Culture*, XII, p. 184.

²⁶ The inscription is a victory monument of the Pallavan king's defeat of Chalukya. And, therefore, there is high possibility that the words might be extravagant. See *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XXVIII, pp. 63—64.

²⁷ D. C. SIRCAR *op. cit.* pp. 233, 235 ff.

²⁸ G. C. RAYCHAUDHURI, *op. cit.* Ms. 119. Also, D. C. SIRCAR, *op. cit.* p. 246, fn. 4.

In the travels of Hsüan-tsang, the Chinese Buddhist Master of Law, it is only recorded that Buddhism and other religions were co-existing in the country. Nevertheless, he did not give any reference to indicate that the Royal family revered Buddhism²⁹. On this respect, the statement of Hui-ch'ao may be regarded as the first Buddhist claim of the Chalukyas' support of the religion.

Was Vijayāditya really "holding high reverence towards the Three Jewels"? There is no any other source to testify the claim made by the Korean monk. Contrarily, archaeological evidences relate him to Hinduism. Apart from the forementioned evidences of Vishnu as the God of the royal family, Vijayāditya also built a magnificent temple of Śiva at Pattadakal in Bijāpur District³⁰. The temple was called Vijayēśvara, directly connected with the personal name of the king himself. An undated stone inscription unearthed from the same place, registers a joint donation from his father and Vijayāditya himself to the image of Anantaguna, another title of Vishnu³¹. Amongst his relatives, his mother, the queen of Vinayāditya, set up the images of Brahmā, Vishnu and Śiva, the trinity of Hinduism, at Vātapi³². His daughter-in-law, the chief queen of Vikramāditya II, built the great temple of Śiva under the name of Lokeśvara at Pattadakal³³. All this clearly proves that the royal family's religious faith was Hinduism, or more specifically, Vaishnavism and Śaivism, although some of the members may have made donations to Jain teachers.

Under these circumstances, one can only understand the statement of Hui-ch'ao in the light of Hsüan-tsang's words. The Chinese Buddhist Master of Law stated that "the people [of Mahārāstra], fond of learning, honour both the heterodox and the correct [doctrine of Buddha]". This may indicate that the royal family held a tolerant attitude towards all religions despite of their own faith in Hinduism³⁴. Except few, most of Indian rulers usually gave religious autonomy to their people during the ancient period. A more remarkable fact can be detected from the words of Hsüan-tsang if his statement is carefully re-examined. It is very significant that he has used the word "heterodox" (*hsieh*) preceding the word "correct" (*cheng*) when he describes the religious conditions of South India. This is a hint that the royal house of early Chalukya was not Buddhist, though they tolerated the religious activities of Buddhism.

Regarding the religious conditions of Buddhism in South India, the statements made by Hui-ch'ao more or less agree with those of Hsüan-tsang. Both of them noted that Buddhist monasteries and monks were there, and both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna Buddhism were prevalent in the country.

In another place of the *Memoirs*, when Hui-ch'ao talks about Central India, he noted that "the costumes, languages and articles of the five regions of India are all similar. Only the dialect of village folk in South India . . . is

²⁹ *Ibid.*, fn. 19.

³⁰ D. C. SIRCAR, *op. cit.* p. 246.

³¹ K. A. Nilakanta SASTRI's contribution in YAZDANI, *op. cit.* 227.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 225.

³³ D. C. SIRCAR, *op. cit.* p. 247.

³⁴ *Op. cit.* fn. 19. For the Chinese words *hsieh-cheng* or "heterodox and correct . . .", see *Ta-t'ang Hsi-yü-chi*, *op. cit.* XI, p. 12 b.

different. The official class is not different from that of Central India"³⁵. This statement exactly agrees with the opinion of many historians of our own age. It is now recognized by Indian historians that the political unity achieved by the Gupta empire and the high development of Sanskrit language itself, resulted in a cultural unity of Indian civilization. From linguistic viewpoint, for example, a leading historian writes: "The languages of Northern India and Mahārāshtra in the Deccan are clearly dialects of Sanskrit or some idiom closely akin to it"³⁶.

The difference of dialects spoken by the village folk between Deccan and Central India, reflects another aspect of historical reality of Indian culture: the progress of Sanskritization in the Deccan region was not so thorough. On this point, the *Memoirs* indicate that at the time of Hui-ch'ao's visiting to the land, Sanskrit language although already used in official circles had not yet penetrated into the root of South Indian society; among the village folk the local dialects still prevailed. In fact, many of the local languages of the Chalukyan kingdom linguistically belonged to the Dravidian group. Although these languages received strong influence and impact from Sanskrit, they were still able to retain their own identity. Even in the heydays of Sanskrit literature in South India, the development of local language and literary works continued. As a result of this situation, the South Indian languages eventually developed their own system and remain valid till the present time.

Scholars of Indology may easily argue that there must exist a number of linguistic as well as other differences between North and South India, and the situation could not have been as simple as the Korean monk describes. This is the real limitation of the *Memoirs*, and no one can deny it. The reason for this limitation is, as I have noted in my previous article that on the one hand, Hui-ch'ao only visited one part of the Chalukyan kingdom, and on the other hand, the Korean monk has suffered a great deal from his linguistic inadequacy³⁷. However, such shortcomings are common in many old records, the *Memoirs* of Hui-ch'ao are only one of them. Moreover, despite of this, the *Memoirs* are still very important to the studies of Indian history and of Central Asia. This is not only because it gives some valuable and concrete information, but also because the age we are dealing with is regarded as the 'dark period'. Under such circumstances, the *Memoirs* of Hui-ch'ao still yield very useful evidences to our effort and knowledge.

³⁵ See FUCHS, *op. cit.* pp. 459 a, 434.

³⁶ K. A. Nilakanta SASTRI, *History of South India*, (Bombay, 1952). p. 71. See also R. C. MAJUMDAR, *op. cit.* pp. 291 ff.

³⁷ Cf. my paper, *op. cit. Indo Asian Culture*, XII, pp. 186 ff.