

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD,
LUCKNOW BENCH, LUCKNOW

O.O.S. NO.4 OF 1989
(R.S.NO.12 OF 1961)

The Sunni Central Board of
Waqfs, U.P. and others

Plaintiffs

Versus

Gopal Singh Visharad
and others

Defendants

Date: 22. 4. 2002

STATEMENT OF P.W.28
DR. SITA RAM RAI

I, Dr. Sitaram Rai. Age about 72 yrs Son of Late Hiranand Rai Occupation - Director (Retired), Archaeology, Govt. of Bihar, Patna, resident of 295, Nehru Nagar, Patna -800013, solemnly affirms and state on oath as under:

I did my B.A. in 1951 and M.A. in 1953 from Patna University. My subjects in B.A. were History, Sanskrit, Hindi and English. My subject in M.A. was Ancient Indian History and Culture. Epigraphy and Numismatics was my Special Paper. My subject for Ph.D. was Decipherment and Historical Study of a Palmleaf Manuscript from Tibet an unknown Mahayan Text (9th and 10th Century AD.). I got the Ph.D. from Patna University. I was on the post of Director in Department of Archaeology, Government of Bihar for 13 years and retired from that post in March, 1988. In 1956 I joined Nagarjun Excavation Project, Andhra Pradesh under

the Archaeological Survey of India and after two years I was appointed as Member Research in K.P. Jaiswal Institute under Govt. of Bihar. My assignment was to supervise the work relating to archaeology. In 1962 the Govt. of Bihar established a Directorate of Archaeology and Museum, and I was transferred to that Directorate. My designation in the Directorate was Exploration and Excavation Officer. Excavation was the work related to my job, since I joined A.S.I. At that time I was associated with the excavation done under Nagarjun Konda Excavation Project. As soon as I started service under the Govt. of Bihar the work relating to Vaishali excavation was assigned to me. Besides these excavation works, I was continuously involved with excavation work directly till 1988. In all I was associated with the works of excavation of 12 places, out of which 3 Excavation Reports have been published. These are Vaishali Excavation Report, Lota Hill Excavation Report and Karlen Excavation Report, in addition to it, Kmmhar, Karan Chaura, Taradeeh, Katarn Garb, Balraj Garb etc. Apart from these excavation reports, my three epigraphy were published at the time, when Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology was being compiled. This encyclopedia was edited by Shri A. Ghosh, Ex-Director, A.S.I. had worked with Dr. R. Subramaniam, Ex-Superintendent Archaeological Law, Archaeological Survey of India, Dr. Neel Rattan Banerjee, Director (Retired) National Museum, New Delhi, Dr. Sounder Rajan, Additional Director, Archaeological Survey of India and Late Hari Vishnu Sarkar, Joint Director General, Archaeological Survey of India in the field archaeology.

Even after retirement, I have been associated with the field archaeology. Even now I am attached with the excavation work being carried out in Pandav Garh., Samastipur, under the aegis of K.P. Jaiswal Research

Institute. I had also been working on the post of Professor Ammerites for learning of Indian Culture in Valauda Mahavihar. The reports, which I had mentioned published, have been written by me. Besides this the book entitled 'Suvaranvamavadan' has been published. It is based on my Ph.D. thesis. 'Guide to Vaishali Museum' written by me has also been published. In addition to it I have written many articles, which had been read out in a number of conferences. Most of my articles are related to Ancient India and archaeology.

I can read all the three languages, English, Hindi and Sanskrit. I had also knowledge of Maithili Language of Bihar. I have knowledge of Brahmi, Kharosthi, Greek and Devnagari script. I am connected with Epigraphy and Paleography from the days of student life till today.

I had written an article entitled 'Ayodhya in Literature and Archaeology', which had been published in Indian Archaeology since Independence. This book had been published by Association for the History and Archaeology 'ASHA'. My article is at Paper No. 199 C/2 (Objection about its presentation was raised by learned advocate Shri M.M. Pandey, reply to which will be given later). Paper No. 199 C/2 is the article written and published by me and I had read out this paper in the Conference of 'ASHA' at Kurukshetra held in 1995. The facts revealed by me in this article, to my knowledge, are correct and there had been no change in it since then. In my view the gist of my article and a point in it is that on the basis of all the evidences the birthplace of Rama had never been a point of dispute at any time. I had written another article entitled Mathura in Literature and Archaeology' and I had read this paper in the second Conference of 'ASHA' held at Aligarh. Later it was published by 'ASHA' in 'Region and Archaeology' book. It is

Paper No. 199 C 2/2 (Shri M. M. Pandey raised objection to it, which will be replied later). This article to my knowledge is correct till today. The sources I had referred in the above two articles include Valmiki 'Ramayan', Tulsi Das' created Ramcharitmanas, Atharva Ved and Purans etc, which I have studied.

Being a student of archaeology, I can say that at the disputed site there had never been no Ram Janam Bhoomi Mandir or any other temple. So the question of demolishing a temple and constructing a mosque in its place does not arise. I had read about the excavation work done near the disputed site in 'Indian Archaeology - a Review' of 1976-77. On the basis of archaeological evidences it has been established that in the 13th century Turkish people were living with Hindus all over the area including the disputed site. The 14 Black Pillars, which I had referred in my article Paper No. 199 C 2/1 were not load bearing but decorative and were placed afterwards by bringing from some other place. These pillars were not fixed with the foundation but were placed on the surface. In my above article I had referred about that epigraph which is said to be found after the demolition of Babri Masjid To my mind it cannot be of 12th century, as I have mentioned in my article. My source of it was the article of Smt. Sudha Maliya entitled 'Bolte Pashan' published in 1993 in journal named 'OJASWANI'. The alphabets, which I had referred in my article, were not in that form in the 12th Century. They came in that form later and its base is that the Devnagari script took its origin out of the 'Brahmi' script, which is the oldest one.

During the 12th Century the place where present Ayodhya is situated was known as Avadhpuri or some other name and till 16th Century it was clearly known as Avadhpuri. Tulsi Das wrote Ramcharitmanas in Samvat

1631 Vikrami, 1574 AD. Ayodhya has been described as Avadhpuri in Ramcharitmanas. In my opinion temple has been mentioned as Hindu religious place from the 20th Century. Before it, temples were known as 'Devayatan' or Devalaya. Some of the names of God Vishnu are - Hari, Vishnu, Deves~ and Pramatra etc. Vishnu has thousands of names. But if Hari is used as synonym of Vishnu then word Vishnu is not used with it. If Hari and Vishnu are used together then, it can be the name of a person not that of God Vishnu. I can say on the basis of archaeological evidences that God Rama was not worshipped in Ayodhya in 12th Century and neither any temple of God Rama was in existence during 12-13th Century in Ayodhya. When Tulsi Das wrote Ramcharitmanas, he was living in Panchgang Ghat in Kashi and not in Ayodhya. But it is correct that Tulsi Das left for Avadhpuri Ayodhya on the very day he started writing Ramcharitmanas. In Tulsi Das' Ramcharitmanas no particular place in Ayodhya has been mentioned as a birthplace of Rama. It has also not been mentioned in the Ramcharitmanas that a mosque was constructed after demolishing the temple. Shri Narhari Das, the Guru of Tulsi Das had been living in Kashi.

The Ayodhya described in Valmiki's Ramayana does not correspond with the present Ayodhya. The main variations between both the Ayodhyas are in Valmiki's Ramayana, the length of Ayodhya has been mentioned as 12 'Yojan' and the breadth as 3 'Yojan' whereas the Ayodhya is only spread in 4-5 sq. kilometers. Ordinarily 1 Yojan is equal to 8 miles, whereas the writer has considered 1 Yojan equal to 2 ½ miles. So the area of present Ayodhya and the area of Valmiki's Ayodhya were totally different. First of all the Valmiki's Ramayana comprising 6000 couplets was written in about 1st Century. The present Valmiki's Ramayana is having 24000 couplets.

Ayodhya has been described as Mythical city, very first in Atharva Ved. The creation period of 'Atharva Ved' is considered as 10 B.C. to 8 B.C. It is correct that Lord Budha was considered the incarnation of Vishnu. His period is considered 5 B.C. He died at the age of 80 years in 487 B.C. Description of Ayodhya is also found in Buddhist books. But even that Ayodhya too is different from present Ayodhya. Ayodhya has been mentioned as situated on the bank of river Ganges in the very first Boudh book 'Samyukt Nikaya'. This book has been taken as written in the 1st Century B.C. The Chinese Philosopher Hieun Tsang came to India in 7th Century. He has written about Ayodhya that it is situated in the Southeast bank of river Ganges at a distance of 600 lees (192 kilometers) from Kannauj. Lord Buddha and Lord Mahavir were contemporary. Lord Mahavir was the 24th Teerthankar of Jain religion and Jain Dharma was rightly preached during his time. Ayodhya has also been described in Jain religious book 'Vividh Teerth Kalp' and in that also the length of Ayodhya has shown as 12 Yojan and breadth as 9 Yojan which does not correspond with the present Ayodhya.

Lord Rama is also known as Rama, Ragha, Vishwamrtra Priya and Kaushalya. According to Archaeology an article found all of a sudden has its importance, provided its date of finding, place of finding and its in-situ photography at the time of finding is available. In the absence of all these things articles found all of a sudden have no archaeological importance. If any petrograph has been found pasted in a building for a quite long time it might have some left particles of Mortar or plastic etc.

Prof R.S. Sharma was my teacher. He was Professor of History in Patna and in University of Delhi. I know him. He too has written two articles on Ayodhya. I know Prof

Suraj Bhan, Prof Subeera Jaiswal, Prof D. Mandal and Prof Suresh Mishra, all the four. I know Dr.S.K. Gupta very well. He has worked with me in Nagarjun Konda Excavation. I have heard that he has written a book on Ayodhya, but I have not gone through it. He has written an article entitled 'An open letter to Prime Minister'. He has no connection with epigraphy and Paleography, nor he has any knowledge of Sanskrit language.

(Cross-examination on behalf of Mahant Param Hans Ram Chander Das, Defendant No.2, by Shri Madan Mohan Pandey, Advocate)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

Archaeology was one of the subjects in my M.A. I have not obtained any Degree or Diploma in Archaeology. During the days of my student hood, there was no arrangement for Degree or Diploma in Archaeology. I am aware of the existence of Institute of Archaeology. When I did my M.A. the Institute of Archaeology was not in existence nor there was any arrangement for doing degree or diploma. The School of Archaeology was established when I came in service, which later was known as Institute of Archaeology. Volunteerily said, I had gone to School of Archaeology for teaching.

Question: Was Archaeology a paper in M.A. or not when you did your post graduation?

Answer: When I was a student Practical Knowledge in Archaeology, Epigraphy and Numismatics was taught in Ancient Indian History and Culture.

In Paper-1, Archaeology was taught with Ancient Indian History. At that time arrangement to teach

Archaeology as a separate subject was not in existence. Epigraphy and Paleography were also taught in Archaeology. It is correct that Archaeology is one of the best sources to know Ancient History, but there is literary source, traditional source to know it. It is correct that history is divided in different periods; one of it is Pre-history, Proto-history and History. To my knowledge written history pre 6th Century B.C. is not available. I have written history of India after 6th Century B.C. is only available. Volunteer that till this day the Harrapa Indus Valley script has not been deciphered. If that is deciphered there the period of written history will be altogether different. It is correct that where written history is not available, then the source to know that period is only Archaeology. Similarly, to know the culture of Harrapa period, the source is Archaeology. To know the period before Ashoka, we have both the sources, written literature and Archaeology. Inscriptions prior to Ashoka period are not available. Only Harrapa period script is available which has not been deciphered. 'Dhampad' is available in Devnagari script. But for the first the time, initially it had been written in clyonic script. To know the history of pre Ashoka period, Budhist literature and Vedic literatures are available. Vedic literature means 'Sanhita' 'Brahiman' 'Aranyak' and 'Upanishad'. Theology is not covered under Vedic literature. I consider travelers account as a source of history. It is true that Epigraphy and Paleography are the sources to know history. Paleography only denotes how old is the alphabet. It is to know the alphabet whereas Epigraphy is to know what is written. Epigraphist should not have only the knowledge of Paleography but he should have knowledge of language besides the knowledge of script. It is also a fact that he should know the concerned language so that he could understand the contents.

Numismatics is also a source to know the history. This is also called as Mudra (money) Shastra.

Question: Can you tell as how many types of coins are found in Numismatics?

Answer: The types of coins so far found under the Numismatics are made of gold, silver, copper, lead, Potin. During the early period coins containing symbols were casted.

It is not correct to say that there are only two kinds of coins, one comprising some statements and other containing the symbols i.e. king and queen etc. I have already said that symbolic coins were found only during the early period, which only shows that these coins were not issued by an emperor. If a symbol of any emperor is found on the coin it will be taken into account that the coin has been issued by that emperor. Coins bearing symbols of Swastik and Sun have also been found but those coins cannot be associated with the period of any emperor. Scribed coins in plenty have also been found. Symbolic coins were issued in the beginning and later scribed coins were found. It is correct the scribed coins are related to the ruling period of that emperor. Inscribed coins are found from Indo-Greek and Kushan period.

Question: Whether both verbal and written sources are included in the literary source of history?

Answer: In the literary source only written sources are included. Verbal things come under the traditional sources.

The period, during which Veds and Upanishads were put in black and white, they were considered the historical sources of that period. According the information available

so far none of the written Veds are found prior to the 10th Century AD. They were conserved through 'Sruti' and 'Smriti'. Historians of pre 10th Century period took it as their historical sources but it has no cognizance.

Question : Whether it will be correct or not to say that the date from which Veds became available in written form, the historians accept it as Sruti, Smriti or Vedic form?

Answer : Till any thing in form does not come before the historian, they are unable to take it as evidence. As an historian, I recognize any of the verbal Vedic literature as a part of tradition and not as source of history.

Question : Whether it is correct or wrong to say that the historians recognize 'Sruti' and 'Smriti' as oral tradition of pre-written literature and work, taking it as a source of history?

Answer: In view of the present historical scenario this fact is not included in, the writing of the history.

The Valmiki Ramayana was written prior to Ashoka period. Then said that the early period of Valmiki Ramayana was in pre-Ashoka period. In our view more than thousand years would have been spent in the creation of Valmiki Ramayana. Nowhere it has been mentioned that how many persons combined together have created the Valmiki Ramayan. So I am not in a position to tell you who is the writer of Valmiki Ramayana. I have read Valmiki Ramayana. Ayodhya has been mentioned in it, which I have already revealed in my above statement. In Valmiki Ramayana it has been said that Auyodhya is situated at a distance of 1½ Yojan from river 'Saryu'. But the direction

has not been indicated. It is correct that temple of God Rama is there in the Valmiki Ramayana. Description of worship, prayer and rest etc. had been mentioned in Ayodhya temple by him. In the 'Bal Kand' of Valmiki Ramayana the birth of, His accompanying Vishwamitra and the death of Tarika and his visit to Janakpur from there and his participation with Vishwamitra to Dhanush Yagyan and his meeting with Parshuram have been described. It is correct that in Bal Kand of Valmiki Ramayana, the birthplace of God Rama has been mentioned therein. But in the beginning, the Valmiki Ramayana contained 6000 couplets, which were later increased to 12000 and then to 24000 couplets. No particular time of the increase in couplets has been mentioned so I cannot tell how many couplets were when and by whom added to it. The social situation depicted in Valmiki Ramayana shows that it appears to have been written in three different periods. Some say that it may be five different periods. The thousand years, which I have mentioned about the writings of Valmiki Ramayana includes these three or five different periods. The last period of it is of Gupta period. Ashoka period begins from 269 B.C. and lasts in 187 B.C., which includes his sons and grandsons. It is also correct that description of worship by Rama in Shri Narain Vishnu Temple has been given in the Valmiki Ramayana. I agree with whatever is written about Rama in Valmiki Ramayana as a myth but not as in the form of history. I take it as a myth and do not consider it as an authentic book for history. It is a mythical book. I have also read Kalidas' literature, which comprises Meghdootam, Abhigyan Shankmtalam, and Raghuvansham etc. Ayodhya and God Rama have been mentioned in Raghuvansham. It is also a fact that in the epic Raghuvansham by Kalidas, Ayodhya has been described as the birthplace of God Rama and situated on the bank of river Saryu. The period of its writing

is Gupta period. It means it was written in 4th or 5th Century B.C. At present I do not remember whether there is description about King Aditi or not. In Raghuvansham there is mention of God Rama, his father Dashrath and Aj, Dileep and Raghu. The word 'ghat' has no mention in Raghuvansham. The Yagyan for getting issues organized by king Dashratha has been mentioned in Raghuvansham. It is also a fact that it has been described there that when God Rama took birth in Ayodhya, at that time the Gods welcomed him by playing 1rumpets. It is also a fact that it has description about the birth of Lava and Kusha, and also of their living in Kushawati and Saravati and the disappearance of Rama in river Saryu. It is also a fact that the birth of God Rama in Auyodhya, his rule and his dynasty are fully described in the epic Raghuvansham.

I know about 'Puranas'. It is correct that there are 18 Puranas. The writing period of Puranas is from 400 A.D. to 19th Century. I have knowledge of Veds and I have gone through them. The Veds are four in number. First is Rig Ved then Sam Ved, Yajur Ved and Atharva Ved respectively. I had studied Atharva Ved. It contains general topics as place, spot and the social status of people etc. Ayodhya has been described as a mythic city in Atharva Ved.

Question: In Atharva Ved, Ayodhya Puri has been addressed as a city of Gods and the same has been described as 'Devanam Puri Ayodhya'?

Answer: In Atharva Ved, Ayodhya has been described as a city of Gods, which is having nine sections and having eight gates, to me all these are mythic. As an historian I do not accept Atharva Ved as an authentic book of history.

Question: Do you consider Atharva Ved as an authentic book from Theological or Vedic viewpoint or not?

Answer: The social facts of that time mentioned in the Atharva Ved are considered as historical sources. I do not consider it as an authentic book from Theological or Vedic view.

Rig Ved is the oldest Ved. The scholars have taken its writing period not prior to 1500 B.C. I have also studied Rig Ved. It contains mantras about worship of Gods and nature. There is no Vedic hymn on God Vishnu. There is no description of geological or social conditions. Sam Ved comes after Rig Ved. Its writing period is considered as 1200 B.C. It contains musical and religious rites. There is no description of temple in it, because at that time there was no mention of temples and the articles used in it were also not available at that time. It is wrong to say that in Rig Ved there is description of God and Goddesses of Hindus and their place of living and then it is said that there is no 'Hindu' word in it, as such there is no question of their description in it. The Rig Ved starts with the prayer of Agni, which do not have the word 'Sanatan'. When Agni came in existence, it was for all i.e. for our whole society. So it is worth worshipping by all. It is correct that the followers of Sanatan Dhanna consider Agni as a God. Sam Ved comes after Rig Ved.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

22.4.2002

Typed by the Stenographer typed in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation to this for further cross-examination, be present on 23.4.2002.

Sd/-

22.04.2002

Dated : 23.04.2002

The Statement of P.W.28 Dr. Sitaram Rai in continuation of his statement dated 22. 4. 2002 begins with taking an oath:

The writing period of Sam Ved is considered from 12 B.C. to 10 B.C. I have not studied Sam Ved. What is written in it, I will not be in a position to tell you. The writing period of Yajur Ved is said to be between 11th Century B.C. to 10th Century B.C. I have not studied it too. So I cannot tell what is written in it. It is a fact that the Sanatan Dhanna followers believe that Veds were created by God. In Rig Ved there is description of river Saryu and of its water. I do not recall presently in what context it has come there. (On this point the Learned advocate cross-examining the witness, drew attention of the witness to the following hymn given in paper No. 289 C1/29 submitted. along with original suit No. 5/89)

'Ma wo rasnitam kubha krmnam wa sindhurni reermat,

Ma wa paristhatsaru purishinysme etstmanmstu wa.'

On this point the learnedadvocateof Plaintiff Shri Zaffaryab Jilani raised objection that this has not been proved yet, so this question cannot be raised. This point will be replied later.

The witness after reading the above Vedic hymn replied that I agree with the meaning in this book. The hymn written on the same page is:

'Tri sapt sarstra nadu mahirapo vanapatinparvatau agnimrityo,

Krishamnsritinsayam sadhasth aa rodram
rudreshuruderae hawamahed

Sarswee sam sindhururmimirmaho maheervasa yantu
vakshanee,

Derirapoo matara sudeatanwo ghritwatpau
madhwnanno archit.'

The witness after reading it replied that the meanings of last two hymns written in this book, I do not agree with them. In my views and in the views of other scholars the rivers mentioned in the hymns may have its origin in Punjab and Iran also. I will have to study the hymns to tell the meanings and that I cannot tell you at present. It is correct that the origins of these rivers have not been mentioned in the hymns. It is also a fact that at places Saryu has been shown as river Ghagra. It is also a fact that the existence of Saryu and Ghagra is found in Avadh region but it has nowhere mentioned that the existence of river Saryu is from Rig Ved. But, in the existing circumstances it can be presumed that river Saryu remained in existence from the days of Rig Ved.

There are 18 Purans i.e. Vishnu Puran, Bhagwat Puran, Skandh Puran, Brahmand Puran etc.

I have studied all the Purans for context and reference purposes. I do not agree with the view that Purans were written between 9th and 10th Century. According to me and other scholars Purans had been written during Gupta period i.e. 4th B.C. to 16-17th B.C. I have not come across of any source indicating that all the Purans were written together and were completed together. But all the Purans were completed by 17th and 18th Century. It is true that there is mention of Ayodhya in the Purans, for example Ayodhya has been mentioned in Vishnu Puran, Garud. There is no mention of Ram Janam Bhoomi in any of the Purans. I have read Skandh Puran. I have read 'Ayodhya Mahatamya'

Chapter in it. In this chapter the site of Ram Janam Bhoomi has not been indicated. In my view it will not be correct to say that in Ayodhya Mahatamya Chapter the boundary of Ram Janam Bhoomi and its position has been given. On this point the learned advocate drew attention of the witness to couplet 14 to 25 of Paper No.107-C 1/75 (On this the advocate of Plaintiff Shri Zaffaryab Jilani raised objection that the paper has not been proved and, as such permission to ask question thereon should not be given. Reply to it will be given later on). After reading the above couplet the witness said that I have understood its contents and said that boundary of Ram Janam Bhoomi has not been clearly demarcated in it and afterwards said that boundary has not been given in it. The learned advocate again made the witness to read line 18-19 of the couplet and after reading it the witness said that the boundary of Ram Janam Bhoomi has not been clearly demarcated. There is no mention of all the four directions, which is necessary for the boundary. It is true that in the couplets Pindarak, Vighneshwar, Vashishth and Lomesh are mentioned in the above couplets. After listening first line of the 18th couplet from the learned advocate cross-examining, the witness replied that from this place one has to go towards, Eshan direction for Janam Bhoomi. The meaning of 'Pravartate' is that one who goes. The meaning of 'Vighneshwar purva bhage' is that on the eastern side of Vighneshwar. 'Vashishth uttare' means on the Northern side of Vashishth. 'Lomsath Paschime' means on the Western side of Lomesh. 'Jamnasthanam tathati' means from there to Jamnasthan. What I have said above indicates about the visit towards Janmasthan and not the clarity of its boundary. 'Tat' means from there. It will be wrong to say that 'Tat' means 'is'. I do not remember quite now whether mention of Panch Hari Mandir is there in Ayodhya Mahatamya or not.

In India the traditional source of temples on archaeological basis are found from 3rd B.C. But at that time these were not known as temples.

It is correct that the existence of temples is found from 3rd B.C. and it is also a fact that there had been three types of temples, Nagar type, Besar type and Dravid type. It is also a fact that Nagar type temples are found in North India Dravid type in South India and Besar type in Central India. The temples at present in Orissa the oldest temples of them are found in Bhubaneshwar, which are of 9-10th B.C. Khajuraho temples are of Chandel period of 10th and 11th Century. Temples of Jagannath Puri Orissa are 10th, 11th and 12th Century. The temples those are at present in Orissa or the remains of the temples, none of them are of more than 300 years old. I am acquainted with the epigraphy of Kanndanda in Faizabad. I do not remember it at present. Perhaps it is of Gupta period. Temple has been mentioned in Karmdanda epigraphy. But I have already said that the locality of Ayodhya had been submerged between 5th B.C. to 10th B.C. I had seen Kanndanda epigraphy 40 years back, so I do not remember at present whether it has mention of Ayodhya temples or not or there may be. The Ayodhya referred by Hieun Tsang that was 600 lee (192 kilometers) away from Kannauj situated on Southeast bank of river Ganges. I do not remember at present whether Hieun Tsang has mentioned about temples of Ayodhya in his travel description or not but I do remember that Ayodhya has been referred in it, as I had already said above.

I have studied Mahabharata for reference purposes. There is mention of Rama as a great archer. The historians had determined the period of Mahabharata from 950 B.C. to

400 AD. I did not find description of Ayodhya in Mahabharata. There are Brahm Puran and Agni Puran. Ayodhya is not only the salvation place in Purans but seven other places are said so which includes Auyodhy, Mathura, Gaya, Kashi, Kanchi, Avantika and Dwarawati. Sruti and Smriti both are separate books. Sruti means Vedic books, which were kept in memory after listening. This question does not arise that in Bihar during excavation coins connected with Rama and Ramayana were found. Over the wall made of lime in Afasgarh temple figures of Rama, Laxmana and Sita were painted which are now washed away.

Question: Whether at Afasgarh in Bihar State, some archaeological remains had been found on which the story of Rama is described and which were related to 10th and 11th Century?

Answer: On the walls of Afasgarh temple of 7th Century, figures of Rama, Laxmana, Sita and Hanumana were painted which are not there now. These figures were not of 10th and 11th Century but were of 7th Century.

The archaeologists take this temple of 7th Century, because epigraphy of that period had been found and its name was the Epigraphy of King Aditya Sen of Afasgarh. When I was associated with the archaeological excavation work of Nagarjun Konda in Madhya Pradesh by that time I did not find anything related to Rama, because that place was concerned with the Budha religion.

I did not find any archaeological remains which were related to the incidents of Rama and Ramayana and connected with the 3rd Century. I know about, but I had never been there. To my knowledge, I do not know whether

there is information about Rama in the remains found from there. I have no information whether sculptures relating to Lord Rama were found in Ajanta and Ellora. Except Ayodhya, no epigraphy of archaeological view has come before us and neither I have information about it. I do not know about the epigraphy of Gazipur relating to Lord Rama and his temple, I do not know that any such epigraphy has been placed in the Calcutta Museum, having description of archer God, which the archaeologists consider of 1st Century. I know the epigraphy of inner pillars. That is of Gupta period. I do not remember presently whether it has mention of any God or Goddess. I do not have any knowledge of the epigraphy of Kaushambi relating to Vishnu temple.

I had been to Ayodhya many times. First time, when I was of ten years old, I accompanied my father and lastly I went in 1988. I had already told that I belong to Vaishnava family. Members of my family go there and I had gone with them. People neither visit the disputed site nor were taken to that site, then said I had gone even at the age of ten years, I did not remember. Then said that I had never gone to disputed site. I had not done any excavation work in North India near Ayodhya. I know about the excavation done by Dr. B.B.Lal in Ayodhya during 1976-77 and that was done near disputed site. Dr. B.B. Lal had done excavation near the present disputed site. I do not know about the measurement of disputed structure. So it is not possible to say at what distance from the disputed structure Dr. B.B. Lal had done the excavation. I had read the report of Dr. B.B. Lal. His report was published in Indian Archaeology - A Review of 1976-77 and I agree to it. The report had been published in Indian Archaeology - A Review of 1976-77 with photographs. The so - called reports of afterwards are concocted.

Question: What do you mean by the so called report?

Answer: By saying the so called report, I mean that the report being shown after a decade of publishing the report in Indian Archaeology of 1976-77. If you say clearly about a certain report, I think that is the so-called report.

Question: As per your knowledge how many Reports on Dr. B.B. Lal's excavation work in Ayodhya had been published in the Indian Archaeology - A Review?

Answer: As per my requirement to know about the facts on Ayodhya, I have read the original Report of Dr. B.B.Lal in Indian Archaeology - A Review, 1976-77 and have covered all the important points. I have no information except this. I have no information about the publication of any epigraphy in the Indian Archaeology-A Review except that of 1976 - 77.

I have information about other reports relating to excavation done in Ayodhya of the disputed site other than Prof B.B. Lal's Report of 1976-77, such as Encyclopedja of Indian Archaeology edited by A. Ghosh and Indian Archaeology - A Review 1979-80. The later published Report is in connection with the excavation work done in 1979-80. This excavation was done by the Archaeological Survey of India under the direction of Prof B.B. Lal. This excavation was done in Ayodhya, but it is not clear at what site it was done. To my knowledge the excavation was not related to disputed site. The persons involved in the excavation, their names have been given in the Report, but I do not remember their names at present. Prof. B.B. Lal often used to visit to see the excavation work but he did not

continuously remained present at the excavation site all the time.

Full report of Prof. B.B. Lal's archaeological excavation work in Ayodhya has been published in Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology. To my mind no work except Prof. B.B. Lal's excavation work (1976-77) had been done on the disputed site. In Ayodhya Prof. B.B. Lal carried out excavation work at 14 places concerning Ramayana. One of the sites is known as Nandigram. To my knowledge Nandigram is at some distance from Ayodhya. I am not sure that the distance is 16 kilometers or not. I might have read the distance of Nandigram from Ayodhya in the Report but I do not remember it.

From Archaeological angle an epigraphy found in a certain condition, which includes patrograph also, cannot be important. A patrograph has the importance only when it can be identified by date or place. If a patrograph contains, the name of the person who was asked to construct it, the person who constructed it, date, place and objective, then it has the importance. The script of patrograph can determine the date but exact date cannot be determine. Only period can be determine. The date of epigraph cannot be determined by the patrograph containing the name of a ruler or the period of his ruling. The inscription of name and period of a ruler on the pattograph can be considered while comparing the facts of that period. The so called Patrograph relating to disputed land, I have expressed some of my views in my article (199 C 2/1), I have not seen that patrograph physically but have seen its picture and on that basis I have expressed my views. In my article, I have also written that it is said that the pattograph has been recovered from the debris of the disputed structure. At the time of writing my above article, I had seen the partial

photograph of patrograph in the article written by Sudha Malayya and published in the journal named 'Ojaswini' and on that basis I had expressed my views. I had not seen the full photograph of the patrograp, stampage or decipherment thereof. I had considered it necessary to see the full photograph of the patrograph at the time of writing the above article but due to the means available with me, I could not see the full photograph.

Question: Because you were in a hurry to write the article, therefore you did not consider it necessary to see the full photograph and wrote the article without obtaining full information?

Answer: There was no such thing. I was not in a hurry for writing the article. I being fully satisfied on seeing the partial photograph and on the basis of other information wrote the article.

I had written my both the articles - 'Ayodhya in Literature and Archaeology' and 'Mathura in Literature and Archaeology' at two different times. The second article I wrote in 1996 and it was published in 1999. In this article I have not given any description or reference of the disputed site of Ayodhya. I had mentioned Rama and Ramayana in that article. I had not written any other article or book on disputed structure except the article on Ayodhya. It is not correct to say that I had written any article on the basis of article of Sudha Malayya published in the journal known 'Ojaswini'. I have used the news published in the newspapers as the source of my article in addition to the article published in 'Ojaswini' and the photograph. I have not mentioned any other source in my article except the article of Sudha Malayya. It is needless to say that I being a student of archaeology and history take the newspaper as

the base of my source material. But for my satisfaction I go through the news published in the newspapers. It is true to say that Sudha Malayya is an historian and an Epigraphist. Then said Sudha Malayya is not an Epigraphist. I am a student of Epigraphy. I cannot claim myself that I am expert in it. Paleography had developed gradually and I agree to it. It is correct to say that the form of Paleography itself changed slowly and they had developed gradually of their own. It is wrong to say that Paleographers on the basis of development of Paleography spell out the meanings of it according to their own views. The patrography brought out of the debris of Ayodhya is inscribed in Devnagari script. I can read, write and understand the Devnagari script. I can read and understand the Devnagari script written in 11th and 12th Century. I did my Ph.D. research work on the manuscript of 9th and 10th Century brought from Tibet. The patrograph of which partial photograph I had mentioned and written my article after seeing the same, on that I had not read about the rulers of Gaharwar, but in my subsequent study of the above patrograph there is the mention of King Chandra Dev of Gaharwar. It is correct to say that rulers of Gaharwar ruled during 11-12th Century. I have read that it has been written on the above-mentioned patrograph that in Ayodhya, there was a temple of Vishnu Hari. It is not correct to say that for the authentication of a patrograph, the contents alone are not important and its recovery etc. is not important. To see the authentication of a patrograph, the same can only be treated as authenticated if it contains the name of a person who asked to construct it, his period of ruling, objective and place and also has the description of comparison of contemporary event. It is wrong to say that the contents of a patrograph are more important than the mode of recovery.

Before writing my article I had read in many other articles that there were pillars in the disputed structure. I had seen the photographs of the above pillars, before writing my article. At this point of time I cannot say where did I see the photographs of these pillars. (The witness after seeing his article said) There were in all 14 black basalt pillars. In my article I have not mentioned the location of those pillars in the disputed structure and nor I know about it. I know that those pillars contained some figures, but I do not know the names of the God and Goddess shown in the figures. I have also no information that the pillars contained figures of pinnacles and pitchers. I had referred Ramcharitmanas in my article. I had referred Janam Bhoomi in my article but not Ram Janam Bhoomi. There is no mention of word Ayodhya in Ramcharitmanas, so the question of birthplace of Rama in Ayodhya does not arise. In Ramcharitmanas Avadhpuri has been stated-as the Janam Bhoomi not as Ram Janam Bhoomi and neither it has the description of a particular place of Janam Bhoomi. In Ramcharitmanas it has been stated that Rama was born in Avadhpuri. There is only one line about Janam Bhoomi in Ramcharitmanas which is "Janam Bhoomi mam puri suhawan, uttar dishi bah saru pawan". The Janam Bhoomi here means the entire Avadhpuri. I can say that in Ramcharitmanas, Tulsidas made Rama to speak these lines. It is correct to say that in Tulsidas' Ramcharitmanas, there is description of Rama from his birth to childhood, his character, his exile and his kingdom. It is also correct to say that the Avadhpuri of Ramcharitmanas is at present considered Ayodhya. People think it as Ayodhya.

It is a fact that Dr. S. P. Gupta is an Archaeologist. Dr. B.P. Sinha of Patna is my teacher. I have come to know that Dr. B.P. Sinha has recently written an article on Auyodhy, but I have not seen it. I am not aware of Dr. B. P.

Sinha's writing a number of articles on Ayodhya since 1980. I know Dr. K.P. Ramesh, Epigraphic, Archaeological Survey of India. He has not been the Director General of A.S.I. It is true that he was Director, Epigraphy. I recognize Dr. K.P. Ramesh as an Epigraphist. I personally know Dr. M.M. Katti. He was Assistant Director Epigraphy in A.S.I. I know Dr. Thakur Prasad Verma of Banaras Hindu University. He also knows me. He is Historian and teaches Epigraphy but he is not an epigraphist of that category as is Dr. Ramesh or Dr. Katti. I have heard the name of Prof. Davendra Swamp. I have not met him. He was a Professor of History in University of Delhi and has now retired from service. I know Dr. Y.D. Sharma. He is posted as Joint Director in A.S.I. It is absolutely wrong to say that I have neither made any study about the disputed site nor done any research work. It is also wrong to say that I had prejudicially expressed my views without "seeing the petrograph. It is also wrong to say that in order to give mis-information in my article I had tried to separate the present Ayodhya by showing area and boundary of Ayodhya. It is also wrong to say that at different times Ayodhya had been called by different names as - Saket, Kaushalp, Visakba, Ajudhiya and Avadhpuri etc. It is also wrong to say that knowing all the above facts I have given wrong statement.

Verified the statment after reading

Sd/-
Sitaram Rai
' 23.4.2002

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court. In continuation, be present on 25.4.2002 for cross-examination.

Sd/-
23.04.2002

Dated : 25.04.2002

(In continuation of 23.04.2002 P.W.28, Shri Sitaram Rai's statement with oath begins)

(Cross-examination on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara, Defendant No. 3 by Shri R.L. Verma, Advocate)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

The study of archaeology and ancient literature is necessary to know the ancient Indian History. Literature is one of the sources to know the ancient history but that is not the basic source. Archaeology is the original source to know the ancient history. Archaeology is the basic source to know the ancient Indian History. Literature covers the ancient books, travel descriptions of the foreign tourists and the relations of foreign envoys to India. Religious books also come under literature. There are no separate religious books in the Vedic literature, but in all the books there are discourses on religion. I do not agree that the religious literature can be divided into two parts i.e. Brahmin literature and Non - Brahmin literature. Buddhist literature also comes under it. Vedic Sanatan Dharma is not separate but all are covered under the Sanatan Dharma. Sanatan Dharma does not denote Hindu. During Vedic period there was no such word as Hindu. During that period there was no Sanatan Dharma, but was Vedic Dharma. To know Vedic Dharma study of Vedic literature is necessary. It is correct that Sruti is also a base to know the Vedic Dharma. I do not agree with the fact that Smriti is God given. Veds are under Sruti. Smritis are not the source of Vedic Dharma. As a student of ancient history, in my opinion, the writer through his own vision might have written something and that began to be called Smriti. Those

writers are called 'Rishis' as Manu Smriti, Yagyavalkya Smriti etc. Commentaries are also covered under the ancient literature and that too will be treated as a source of history. Traditions can also be a source to know the ancient India provided those traditions are given in the Veds. Puranas are not the basis to know the Vedic literature. Ramayana and Mahabharat not only in my opinion-but also in everybody's opinion are epics. Epics are not Smriti and similarly 'Puranas' are not covered under Smriti. I do not inclined with this fact that an historian brought out some historical facts only on the basis of Sruti and Smriti and it will be treated as authentic. To know the Vedic history, the facts written in Vedic literature will have to be compared with the existing archaeological evidences of that time and the result arrived thereby will be the authentic history. Where archaeological sources are not available history cannot be created on the basis of Sruti and Smriti alone. The main basis of archaeological sources is the articles found in excavation. After separating the articles found in excavation we would get epigraphy, coins, commodities of art and other articles made by clay, copper and other metals. There is no correct base other than excavation to know the ancient history.

Question: Whether an ancient monument or an ancient pillar will be a source to know the ancient history for an archaeologist?

Answer: Ancient monuments and ancient pillars bearing a definite date, place and time can be taken as historical material.

Temples also come under the ancient monuments. If in the epigraphy of a temple, the date of concerned dynasty or a ruler is inscribed then the ruling period of that ruler

can be verified. To know about Veds, knowledge of Vedng is necessary. Vedng means the Kalp, Education, Grammar, Astrology and the Vilupta Chhandas. I do not agree that grammer and astrology determine the particular period. All the Vedic literature has mention of Nakshatras and Rashis (zodiac signs) but I do not agree that the entire Vedic literature is full of 'Nakshatras'. I have heard the name of Western Vedic scholar Jacobee. I do not know whether he has determined the period of Rig Ved 3000 B.C. or not. I acknowledge Lokmanya Tilak as Vedic scholar and a mathematician. Yes I do have heard his name. Lokmanya Tilak has calculated Veds on the basis of Nakshatras, but that is not authentic and I do not agree with him. There is no era known as Vedic period in the history. Maxmullar had said that it is impossible to determine the period of Veds, but to me it is wrong. To my mind the writing period of Valmiki Ramayana cannot be determined on the basis of Rashis (zodiac signs) and Nakshatras.

According to Rig Ved, 'havans' were performed through 'mantras'. It is not correct to say that havans done by chanting mantras, that process is called 'pooja'. That can be a part of Pooja but not the full Pooja. It is correct that there is reference of Yagyana and Havan in Rig Ved but I did not find the description of a temple in it. Pooja and Havan both can be performed with and without idol. Rig Ved contains name of certain Gods.

To know about the grammar in ancient days, I have read about Panini. It is also correct that he had cited other grammars of earlier periods. I am not sure whether he had mentioned about Vashishta Muni or not. He might have mentioned. We consider the period of Panini 5th Century B.C. I cannot determine the period as Vashishtha as Panini has said nothing about him. It is not correct correct to say

that Valmiki Ramayana is an objective book. I am not inclined to accept that Valmiki Ramayana is an objective book only for Hindus and Sanatan Dharma. Valmiki Ramayana is divided in Sargas. I do not remember their numbers at present. Valmiki Ramayana is based on the story of Rama. 'God Rama' is the hero of the story. The story from the birth of Rama till his last days is given in the Ramayana. It is said that before starting writing Ramayana the first couple, which came out of the mouth of Valmiki, was "Ma Nishad - - - - -". It is wrong to say that the first word, which broke out from the mouth of Valmiki "Ma" is for the visual shape of Saraswati. There is no mention in the Valmiki Ramayana that at the time of birth of Rama, Kaushalya asked the God who appeared in Vishnu guise, to leave that guise and come as a child. I have not read in Valmiki Ramayana that thereafter mother Kaushalya used to go the temple for daily pooja. It is correct that there is mention of Ikshabaku Kings and their hundred sons. Bhagvad Geeta is silent about the Ikshabaku King. Ramayana period is called Treta Yug. It is a file that there is mention of Veds in Veds. Not four Veds. It is correct to say that Dwapar Yug came after Treta Yug. I do not remember that God said to Jamwant that in Dwapar Yug I will take my birth as Krishna in the family of Yaduvanshis and will destroy the sinisters and will have duel fight with you and then give you my appearance. There are two different opinions about the writing time of Mahabharata and Ramayana. Most of the people take Ramayana earlier than Mahabharata. It is true that metal 'Arch' gives perception of worship. It is also a file that worship of Indra has been mentioned in Rig Ved. It is also comet that in Rig Ved there is description of purchase and sale of idols of Indra in exchange of ten coins.

It is a fact that the scholar known as parzitar has taken 1600 B.C. as the period of Rama. It is wrong to say that Acharya Balram Shastri on the basis of zodiac and Nakshatras determined Rama's birth 1 crore 84 lakh and 51 thousand years back. According to Vedic literature one 'ahoratri' of Gods is equal to 365 days of mankind or one solar year is equal to 360 days, but I do not believe in it. It is wrong to say that by multiplying 360 by one solar year we get on year of Gods. It is not possible because after calculating the excess years the multiplication, which we will get, cannot prove the truth.

Fahiyan the Chinese pilgrim came to India during Gupta period. The Gupta period is determined between 4th and 6th Century B.C. The above mentioned Chinese pilgrim came to India during the regime of Chandra Gupta II. The area of Gupta regime was spread from Anuganga to Prayag, Saket and Magadh. There is no mention of the capital of Chandra Gupta II. I do not remember exactly but the Chinese tourist Fahiyan remained in India for several years, which was about 10 years period. I do not remember presently whether the Chinese tourist Fahiyan had gone to Saket and Prayag nor not. It is difficult to say, on which side of Ganga, Prayag was situated during the period of Chandra Gupta II. Anuganga is called the bank of Ganga. By Saket I do not mean Ayodhya but it is a big area and Ayodhya city would be a part of it. I do not find the length and breadth of 'Saket Mandal' in any literature. I had read in 'Bhavishuotar Puran' that Saket was famous as a Mandal during Chandra Gupta n regime. The following couplet in this regard has been given in the above Puran:

'Anugang Pryagamcha Saket Magadhanshyataya

AetanJanpadam sarvam bhokhshante Guptvansja'.

It is not correct to say that during Gupta period Saket was called as Kaushal. I cannot say whether during Gupta period Ayodhya was known as Kaushal Raj or not. It is wrong to say that during Gupta period, Chinese tourist Fahiyen visited only the historical places. I agree that the Chinese tourist Fahiyen traveled from Pushyakalawati in West to Tamralipit in East. It is also correct to say that Fahiyen in his reminiscences has widely appreciated the Indian society, donations, worships and hospitality. Kaushal was a district during 6th Century and not a kingdom. It might be possible that Ayodhya would be a city of Kaushal district. It is difficult to say that Ayodhya was a city in Kaushal district or not. Ganga is originated from Gangotri. Without seeing the blueprint it cannot be send that Prayag city was situated on the Southern side of river Ganga or not. I cannot say on which side of Ganga, Bharadwaj Ashram is situated between Prayag and Ayodhya. The Ganga is in the east of Ayodhya. It is also a fact that river Saryu flows in the north of Ayodhya.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

25.04.2002

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . In continuation of this for further cross-examination, be present on 26.04.2002.

Sd/-

25.04.2002

Dated : 26.04.2002

(Statement of P.W. 28 Shri Sitaram Rai begins on oath in continuation of his statement dated 25.04.2002)

River Saryu at some places is also known as Ghagra and Ghargra. I cannot explicitly tell the origin of Ghagra. I know one Vashishtha who was the Kul Guru of Lord Rama. I will not be in a position to tell you that Kul Guru or Vayakaran both were one or two different persons. Because there is no specific mention of these two. I have read Skandh Puran. I take Ayodhya Mahattnya as post Babri Masjid, so I have not paid attention to it. I have read that Ayodhya is situated on the Sudarshan Chakra of God Vishnu, but I do not accept it. There is a mythical saying that Vashishtha Muni brought river Saryu, but I do not accept these things as these are not logical. I do not remember presently whether the origin of this river was Mansarovar or not. It is also correct that it was later known by the name of Banganga, but it is not relevant in the Present context. I agree that the rivers change their beds. I have not calculated the situation at the site of Ayodhya of my own, it is written in the Ramayana that Ayodhya is situated at a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ yojan from river Saryu. I have also mentioned this fact in my article (paper No. 192 C-2/1). According to my article the area of Ayodhya is 12 yojan long, 3 yojan wide and at a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ yojan from river Saryu. I have shown it in my article by converting it into kilometers and miles. I have not considered the length of Auyodhy, therefore, I have not mentioned it in my article. The context in which I visited Ayodhya is not related to my article. (You have said that I am from Vaishnav family. I used to go to Ayodhya with my family in a close car and return back in the same manner there from). I used to go to Ayodhya with the pure religious favour. I used to visit

Ayodhya because my family also was used to go there. I went to Ayodhya lastly at the age of 60-62 years. I never tried to know with what thkind of feelings my family had been going to Ayodhya. I had been to Ayodhya for more than twenty times. I did not stay there. There I had never taken darshan by visiting the temple. I had been watching it from outside by sitting in the car. I do not remember at present whether in Ramcharitmanas, Tulsidas has written that the Samadhi of Dashrath was at Bilwahari Ghat or not. I had read Guptar Ghat. I do not remember at present that in the west of Guptar Ghat there is Ghemuwa Ghat or not, but I had read it. I had never read anything in written, which says that the distance of Bilwahari Ghat from Ghemuwa Ghat is 48 kilometers. I had gone to Ayodhya from Kashi by rail.

Question: Did you try to know that Ayodhya is still at a distance of 48 kilometers or not from East-West of Bilwahari Ghat and Ghemuwa Ghat?

Answer: I have definitely tried to know the present length of Ayodhya and still I had not found it 48 kilometers long.

Question: Whether at the time of writing this article and even till today have you tried to know the length of Ayodhya and the length in each direction?

Answer: I have made every effort to know the length and breadth of Ayodhya and on the basis of authentic books found on archaeological basis, I had written the same in my article.

I had tried to know the length and breadth of Ayodhya from the authentic books and maps thereon and have

mentioned the same in my article on that basis. Whatever I had written in my article, I had consulted the prevalent blue-print and available maps and also seen the maps of A.S.I. prepared for archaeological sites. I had not given reference of Atlas and maps in my article. (You have said that you had given the same distance of Ayodhya as has been given in Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology, edited by A. Ghosh about the details of present distance of Ayodhya). It is correct that no map is appended with Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology but the blue-print of archaeological sites have been prepared by those people and taking that the basis, the distance of Ayodhya has been mentioned.

Question: There are maps of 14 sites of Ayodhya in the Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology, but there is no map of Ayodhya as a whole. Is this correct or not?

Answer: It is correct that in the Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology those sites have not been fully marked, where the excavation work has to be undertaken. But before excavation of any site, full survey map of the region is prepared and only excavation of the selected sites on the basis of exploration is undertaken. Full details are given in the survey maps prepared before the excavation.

Map of whole Ayodhya is on the scale. I had seen that map. I do not remember the direction to which length of Ayodhya had been shown on the scale. I had mentioned the length of Ayodhya according to that scale in my article, which is very small but I had not measured it. I had read that there is Nandigram near Ayodhya. But in which

direction it is, I cannot tell you, as I had never been to Nandigram. I had heard and read about river 'Tamsa'. I had seen it on geographical map. I cannot tell you, in which direction Tamsa river is from Saryu river. Tulsidas has mentioned river Tamsa in his Ramcharitmanas. It is correct to say that according to Ramayana and also Manas, Rama went to exile towards Southern direction of Ayodhya. At present, I do not remember whether first stay of Lord Rama was on the bank of river Tamsa or not. At present I do not recollect that the distance between Saryu and Tamsa is of 12 kilometers or not because distance in kilometer has not been shown in Ramayana and if it is at all there, it might be in Yojan not in kilometers. I had written my article (Paper No.199 C-2/1) with full confidence and satisfaction and in that I did not consider it necessary to judge the distance between Saryu and Tamsa. 'Manorama Sthal' had been the part of Ayodhya or not this I cannot tell you, but I will only say that King Dashratha organized 'Putresthi Yajana' for getting a son, but I cannot quote the site clearly. I did not consider it necessary and I am still of the same view that the Manorama Sthal had become famous due to the 'Putresthi Yajana' organized by King Dashratha and due to that it is famous till today for '84 Kosi Parikrama'. River Manorama is a part of river Saryu this may have probably been found written but I did not pay attention to it.

Question: Is Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi still at a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ Yojan from Manorama Sthal which is on the bank of river Manorama and where King Dashratha organized 'Putresthi Yajana'?

Answer: It has not been mentioned in any authentic book, therefore, I did not pay attention to it.

It might have been mentioned in the Manas that the Manorama Sthal is on the north side of Ayodhya, but due to lack of distance, I have not paid attention to it. I have seen the location of Ayodhya in the light of description given in Ramayana. I have used both the modes of transport i.e. on foot and by motor. I did not find and point to start with to find the location, because the present Ayodhya is situated on the bank of river Saryu, whereas the Ayodhya of Ramayana period was situated at a distance of 1- ½ Yojan from river Saryu.

Question: Whether you had carried out on-the-spot inspection of the area, i.e. length and breadth of present Ayodhya for writing the article?

Answer: I had clearly visualized the area of present Ayodhya in the light of location and area given in Valmiki Ramayana.

Question: Whether your estimate was based on reading books in close room or you had carried out on the spot inspection of length and breadth or on the basis of your experience or with some measurement?

Answer: My estimate was based on my self-wisdom and also on the basis of authentic book i.e. in the light of the details given in Ramayana and on the basis of my personal inspection of the concerned spots.

I had myself visited all the parts of Ayodhya. I had gone from North to South and East to West on the spot. I am presently not in a position to reveal the distance of Ayodhya in my visit. I kept on wandering in Ayodhya

continuously for 5 days. Only at night I used to go back to Gonda. It took me 5 days to visit the entire Ayodhya.

On this point the Learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the witness to line 6, from bottom of his article Paper No. 199 C-2/1----- "The Saryu in course of two thousand five hundred-given in the epic?" and asked wherefrom he has written the same. The witness replied, 'I have taken its account from a date given in Ramayana. Saryu has been written in Ramayana and if we take the date of Ramayana as 500 B.C. then the period comes to 2500 years. On that basis I had written 2500 years in my article. Because river often continues to change its bed, so I had presumed it like this. On this basis I had written in my article that the river Saryu would have changed its course in 2500 years. After seeing Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology and Indian Archaeological Review, I had written that Ayodhya is at a distance of about 5 square kilometers. I had verified this fact in my on the spot visit.

Question: Whether at the time of on-the-spot inspection, you did not find that in the 5 kilometers area of Ayodhya about 8000 temples have also been covered?

Answer: The main objective of my article and my visit to Ayodhya was not this, so I did not pay attention to it.

I know the incident that Shravan Kumar had been killed from the arrow of King Dashratha, who had gone to bring water for his blind mother and father. This has been written in both Ramayana and Manas. It is correct that the place is called Shravana area. The location of that place is

not known to me immediately. Then said, that I have no knowledge how the place can be identified. Because the aim with which I was visiting Ayodhya, in that it was not necessary to find out Karmdauda So I do not try to find it out, where is Karmdauda. About petrography, I knew about it earlier than my writing the article. The aim of my visit was to quote correct facts in my article. The facts I had revealed in my article, it was my aim to write them truthfully.

Question: Whether your aim to visit Auyodhya was to collect information on the basis of literature, archaeology and knowledge?

Answer: Keeping in view the developed form of Ayodhya, I had studied the concerned literature, which was my aim of writing the article.

As Karmdauda epigraphy was not required in the present article as such I did not consider it necessary to visit there. It does not appear logical as the 'Chaurasi Kosi Parikrama' of Auyodhy, which is still prevalent, which covers around 30 Yojan area. Therefore, I had not kept it in mind. It is correct that Hieun Tsang visited during the reign of Harshvardhana. It is also correct to say that during the reign of Harshvardhana, Baudh religion was fully developed. I do not recollect at present whether Kaushal was wider his rule or not. I do not remember the distance of Ayodhya from Kannauj, but I definitely tried to find it out. I am not in a position at present to tell the distance of Prayag from Kannauj, as I do not remember it at present. I do not know the distance of Ayodhya from Kannauj, so I will not be in a position to confirm whether the aerial distance of Ayodhya from Kannauj is 195 kilometers or not. Banganga was recognized as Saryu, this fact has not been mentioned anywhere.

Question: I am to say that without going through any location or seeing scale of the map you have narrowed down Ayodhya to 4-5 kilometers in your article?

Answer: I totally disagree with your above observation. In my article I have given my opinion on the basis of full wisdom and the authentic books and on logical basis.

Lord Buddha passed away in 487 B.C. His age was 80 years at that time. He began preaching the religion at the age of 30, as such Boudha period started from that time. Literary material, to know the history was available before the start of Boudha period.

Mahavir was the contemporary of Lord Buddha. Ramkatha has been described in Boudh and Jain literature but it is not in detail. I had not studied the book 'Kalpana Mandika' written by Budhist poet Kumar Lal. Glimpses of Ramayana have been described in Mahakavi Ashwa Ghosh ~ Sanskrit book 'Budhcharitam'. The Glimpses of Ramayana have also been given in Baudha's 'Dashrathjatak Katha' but not the full Ramayana. Jain poet Vimal Suri has also desccribed Ramkatha in the book entitled "Paumchritam" (in Prakrit language), but I had not studied that book. I accept this fact that Ramkatha was earlier than the Boudha and Jain period. The Jain literature 'Vividhteerth Kalpam' is in Prakrit language. t has also the glimpses of Ramkatha. It is correct that it contains details of various pilgrim places of India. There is a reference that Krishna was born in Mathura in the prison of, but it is wrong to say that he was brought to Vrindaban immediately after the birth, but he was brought to Gokul i.e. Nandgram. Gokul and Vrindaban both are not near to each other, but are on opposite sides, one on one bank of river Yamuna and the other on the other side of the river. I agree with the fact that the childhood, fun and frolic of Lord Krishna were;

limited to Gokul and Vrindaban. Vrindaban is recognized as pilgrim of Karkhi Vaishnava. I also have the knowledge that Kashi is situated on the Trishul of Lord Shiva, but this fact does not hold good over the balance of wisdom I agree that according to mythology Kashi is the city of Lord Shankar. Kashi is the pilgrim centre of Hindus. It is not correct to say that it has been written in Manas that:

"Shiv drohi mam das kahawaye - te pranee sapne nahin bhawei." But it is like this: "Shiv drohi mam das kahawaye - te oar sapne nahin bhawei." He himself has said 'pranee' means all the creatures whereas 'oar' means only male. It is correct that Swami Ramananda was the founder of Ramanandi Sampradaya. Then said there was none known as Ramanandi Sampradaya, but Ramananda himself belonged to Vaishnav Sampradaya. I have no knowledge whether Ramananda was the contemporary of Adi Shankracharya or not, because I have not read about it. Swami Ramananda was the preacher of Vaishnav Sampradaya. Those who worship Vishnu as their deity are called Vaishnav. Those who treat Rama as their deity because of his incarnation of Vishnu are called Rama Karkhi Vaishnava and I also belong to the same community. I have no knowledge of the organization constituted by Swami Ramananda that of Sadhus and Vairagis known as 'Ramanandi Vairagis'. I have also no knowledge that Swami Ramananda established a monastery of Ramanandi Vairagis in Kashi.

I have information about Ramanandi Vairagi Sadhus. I have not that much information where the monasteries of these Ramanandi Vairagis are located. It has been written in Ramcharitmanas that Tulsidas started writing Ramcharitmanas from Avadhpuri but he has not mentioned the name of any specific place. I have read it in literature and also heard that when Tulsidas took birth he uttered 'Ram-Ram' from his mouth and that is why he was called by

the name 'Rambola'. There is also a story that at the time of birth, Tulsidas appeared as of 5 year old and had all the 32 teeth in his mouth. I have not read like that Shankarji came in the dream of Tulsidas and encouraged him to write Ram Katha in Avadhi. It is correct that there is a saying that Hanumanji came personally before Tulsidas and encouraged him to write Ram Katha in Avadhi. I have no information where Hanumanji appeared before Tulsidas, but I have information that at one place the Katha was being held and at that spot Hanumanji appeared before Tulsidas. The Ashram of Narhari Das, the Guru of Tulsidas was at Panchganga Ghat in Kashi. It is true that Tulsidas was contemporary of Abdur Rahim Khan Khana, who was in Akbar's regime. Tulsidas has written in Ramcharitmanas that he has written Ramcharitmanas for his self-pleasure. I do not know whether Narhari Das belonged to Ramanandi Vairagi Sampradaya or not. I have no information that Swami Ramananda perpetuated Vishisthadevta Darshan. It is correct to say that according to Vishisthadevta Darshan, the people of Ramanandi Sampradaya treat Rama as their deity. It is true that three branches - Shaiva, Vaishnava and Shakya are continuing from the mythological age. I do not agree with the fact that Vaishnava only to worship idol, but they might be worshipers of 'Nirakar Brahma'. It is true to say that there is mention in Valmiki Ramayana that Rama said to Laxmana, after conquering Lanka, that our motherland is favourite to me than the golden Lanka, because the motherland where we took birth is more favourite even than the heaven (Api swammayee Lanka na mey ruchyate Laxmana, Janam Jamnabhumischa swargadapi gariyasee). In view of this couplet, the present Ayodhya cannot be treated as the birthplace of Rama, but the Ayodhya mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana will be treated as Ayodhya. According to Ramcharitmanas, Saryu flows in the north of Avadhpuri. It is wrong to say that Narahari Das

told the story of Rama to Tulsidas and instructed him that in Ramcharitmanas the theme of the story will be limited to Rama's character. Tulsidas in Ramcharitmanas has described the Ram Katha in his own style according to various shastras. I, in my article have given 16th B.C. as the period of Rama on the basis of historical and mythological stories. I, in my article have stated that if mosque was constructed after demolishing the temple, Tulsidasji must have definitely mentioned about it in the Ramcharitmanas. I, on the basis of this fact have mentioned in my article that Tulsidasji could have mentioned about it in his book. In the story of Rama from his childhood to last days in Ramcharitmanas of Tulsidasji, it could have been mentioned that mosque was constructed after demolishing the temple and this could have been part of the epic.

In India the study of archaeology started from 1781. The archaeology, from the point of study can be divided into three periods, but not on the basis of individual names. Archaeology is a part of history. As I had stated above, people have started studying archaeology as an independent subject from 1781. It is correct to say that Stone Age is between the Copper age and Iron Age. It is correct to say, and as I had mentioned in my article that articles of copper were also found in the excavation of Ayodhya but those copper articles does not indicate the Copper age, as articles made of copper are available at different levels.

Question: For collection of evidences, archaeology is a disciplined system but it is difficult to reach the conclusion?

Answer: I do not agree to it.

I also disagree with it that there is no word like 'definite' in archaeology. I also disagree with the fact that calculation of period always keep on changing and it can be

changed with the findings of new remains. I do not agree with S. P. Gupta's opinion that calculation of period always keep on changing. For example from the Harappan exploration of Dhawlabees in Gujarat, our entire calculation has gone back by 1000 years. The finding of new things can' bring difference in the calculation, but it is not rational to say that it always keep on changing. If an Archaeologist wants to write point wise comments on the Report of another Archaeologist, he will have to keep before him the entire Report. The Archaeologist will first have to explore that place before undertaking the excavation work. Survey, photographs etc. all are included in exploration. The difference between exploration and excavation is that under exploration all aspects of the concerned areas are examined from the survey and exploration point of view before starting the excavation work. Excavations are carried out through scientific methods and Reports are prepared point wise. The description what I gave at page 115 of my article, at the time of giving details, Prof. B.B. Lal' s entire Report which was available by that time and published in A.S.I. Review 1976-77 and 1979-80 and in addition to it the encyclopedia was before me. As I had already seen the Survey Report and concerned maps, so I did not think necessary to place them at that time before me, and whatever I had written in my article, I did not require the Survey Report and the maps. I had referred Ashrafi Mahal in my article on the basis of Prof. B.B. Lal's Report. While writing my article I had seen the photographs of the disputed structure and the photographs of excavation carried out there. Being ignorant of the direction I cannot tell presently whether excavation work was carried out in the West of disputed structure or no, but I have written my article on the basis of excavation work carried by Prof. B.B. Lal. On the basis of Prof. B.B. Lal's, I had written in my article that there was no inhabitation in Ayodhya during 5th

to 10th Century. There is no mention of any specific place. Being a student of archaeology I do not believe that there had been devastation at times. It is correct to say that Chandra Gupta II was conferred with the title of Vikramaditya. I disagree with the saying that the same Chandra Gupta II had established Ayodhya. I have no knowledge of the formation of an authentic committee or a Board on the decision of archaeologists. To my knowledge there is no association known as Bharatiya Puratatwa Sarvekshan Mandal, then said that to my knowledge there is a Central Advisory Board of Archaeology under A.S.I. If on any stone, in which the stone of Kasauti is also included, certain poses, pictures and dresses are engraved, then it can denote that contemporary period in which those dresses were in use.

Question: On the pillars of Kasauti (there is a shape of tribhangi lady having saree below the waist and only having Kanchaki in the picture) if such a dress is cited from any kingdom in any literature, can it give the knowledge of that period?

Answer: It is wrong to say.

Sungvansha started from 187 B.C. King Pushya Mitra established Sungvansha. I had not read that Pushya Mitra constructed a petrograph at Ranupali or not, but I have the information that King Pushya Mitra constructed a petrograph at some place. I do not remember that contents of that petrograph. It is correct that on the above petrograph it has been mentioned that the above king protected Ayodhya from Yavanas but I have no knowledge whether the petrograph was found from Ayodhya or from some other place. I have not seen that petrograph in Ayodhya. I have not seen where it was constructed in Ayodhya. During Gupta period Ayodhya was not known as Saket, but there was a division known as Saket, in which Ayodhya was situated. It is wrong to say that idea arose to

me for writing of the above article only after the demolition of the disputed structure. In fact, I was collecting and studying information and facts relating to disputed land and structure since 1977. My study remained continuous and on the basis of that study I wrote the article. It is correct that it took me 17 years to complete the process. I have written my article as a student of archaeology and for my own knowledge sake. The objective given in Gita was before me while writing the article. It is wrong to say that I had written my article on the persuasion of Romilla Thaper, Subeera Jaiswal, Bipin Chandra etc. It is absolutely wrong to say that I am in the habit of giving misinformation by concealing the actual facts. It is also totally wrong to say that due to prejudice, I criticize literature and archaeology.

(Cross-examination on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara, Defendant No.3, by Shri Ranjeet Lal Verma, Advocate - Cross-examination concluded)

Verified the statement after reading:

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

26.04.2002

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this for further cross-examination be present on 29.04.2002.

Sd/-

26.04.2002

Dated : 29.04.2002

(In continuation of 26.04.2002, Statement of P.W. 28, Shri Sitaram Rai starts after taking the oath).

(Cross-examination on behalf of Shri Umesh Chandra Pandey, Defendant No. 22, by Shri Veereshwar Dwivedi, Advocate).

XXX XXX XXX XXX

I have used A.D. in my article (199 C 2/1), which means in the days of our Lords. A.D. stands after the death of Christ. B.C. is for before Christ i.e. before the birth of Christ. I will not be in a position to tell the period of Christ. I cannot tell exactly how long Christ remained alive. I have no information about it, so I cannot tell you on the basis of imagination that he died immediately after birth or died after 40-50 years. In my calculation of time period, I have calculated it before or after the death of Christ.

Question: As an historian, do you add the lifetime of Christ for calculating the time or not?

Answer: I do not take into account the lifetime of Christ for my historical study.

C.E. means Christian Era; I have heard of it but have not brought it in practice. I do not use B.C.E. before Christian. It is wrong to say that due to some special obligations, I do not use it. According to me, my calculation of period is rationale.

Question: Do you consider your calculation of time as true?

Answer: My calculation is rationale. You have said whatever is seen is true and I accept it in the same form.

Question: Have you seen that petrograph on which you have written the article?

Answer: The epigraphy of the petrograph, which I had published in my article, I had first seen its partial photograph, but now one day or two days ago I had seen its full photograph, but not seen the petrograph. The petrograph, which I had seen in photograph, was not before me. The context given by me in my article after seeing the photograph was true context. It is correct to say that the said petrograph was photographed and a part of that photograph was published in the book on the basis of which I had written my article.

Question: The partial photograph of the above petrograph published in a book; did you consider it as genuine one?

Answer: The part photograph published in the book had been the true source of my study. The partial photograph which I have mentioned in the article, the entire article is not based on it. Only a part of that article is based on it. It is wrong to say that I am putting of pretexts in replying your questions. As per my wisdom, I give correct reply to your questions.

It is true that I had mentioned Atharva Ved in the above-mentioned article, where I had written that Ayodhya had been first of all mentioned in Atharva Ved. There is

discussion on city of Gods in Atharva Ved, which in my article I have mentioned as mythical city of Gods. I had read English translation of Atharva Ved. I had read Sanskrit and I know it, but as I was satisfied with the English translation of Atharva Ved, I therefore did not read Sanskrit. Hindi meaning of city of Gods is "Devtaon ki Nagri". I have not read that Ayodhya has been personified in Atharva Ved. I have nowhere read the English translation, and then said I have not read on this subject. Then said it is not recollected who had done the English translation, which I had read. For reference purposes, I had read other Veds also. I have also seen the original books and also the English translation. Rig Ved's translation by Griffith, I had read. The English translation of Atharva Ved was read, when required which was the part of entire Atharva Ved. I had read Valmiki Ramayana from beginning till end.

Question: Whether after reading the Valmiki Ramayana from beginning till end you had reached yourself to this conclusion that two chapters (Kands) were added later?

Answer: After reading the Valmiki Ramayana from beginning till end and studying the Sanskrit literature, I had given considered conclusion in my article. I had read Meghadootam, Abhigyan Shakuntalam, and Hitopadesha. These books are after Valmiki Ramayana. Two chapters in Valmiki Ramayana were added later, this fact has been written in the History of Sanskrit Literature. This fact is not written in the above - mentioned Sanskrit literature.

The books relating to History of Sanskrit Literature which I read includes, History of Indian Literature by Winter Niz, History of Sanskrit Sahitya by Baldev Upadhyaya, History of Sanskrit Literature by Macdonald and Keith. The writing periods of these books are given in it. I do not remember at present but this much I remember that these were of 20th Century. It is wrong to say that I am giving mis-statement and giving facts without my knowledge and memory. In my article I had referred both the words i.e. reference and context. To my knowledge reference means the source of citation and context means topic. Tome, reference and context both are different words, but these are complement to each other. It is wrong to say that contents and reference are synonym to each other. If any historian has used both the words as synonym and it has no adverse effect on the meaning then that will be treated as correct. In view of the above, if I had used both the words as synonym in my article, then those will be treated as correct. It will be wrong to say that I am free to use both these words as synonym. As a student of History I take both these words separate. The reference in which I had used these words in my article that I had explained above. It is wrong to say that I was suffering from prejudice. I know from childhood the length of a Yojan. Already said that since belonging to Vaishnava family. Ramayana was often discussed and so Yojan also was always discussed.

Question: Did you give the length of a Yojan in your article on the basis of this information?

Answer: It is absolutely wrong to say that only on the basis of this information I have given information about Yojan in my article. It is also not fair to say that the length of Yojan, which I gave in my article earlier, was incomplete. The length of

Yojan, which has been given in the Comprehensive Dictionary, I had given that information after reading it.

Question: Have you been able to ensure correct measurement of Yojan till today?

Answer: After due consideration the length of Yojan what I have given in my article is definite according to me.

Question: On the basis of this definite information, did you mention that the length of a Yojan is from 2½ miles to 9 miles?

Answer: As per my definite information and for the information of readers, I had mentioned that one Yojan's length is equal to 2 ½ to 9 miles but in my article I had considered it exactly 2 ½ miles and that I have written in my article.

It is quite wrong to say that the length of Yojan is based on my presumption. It is also wrong to say that on the basis of presumption, I had written my article. Ayodhya is also a point in my article. The translation of title of my article "Sahitya Evam Puratatva main Ayodhya" is right. It is wrong to say that the article is suffering from prejudice. Similarly it is wrong to say that the length of Yojan has also been calculated biased basis.

It is correct to say that river Saryu was first of all used in Rig Ved.

Question: Whether it is correct to say that as per faith Ved, is the knowledge of God, which was bestowed upon the Rishis?

Answer: I am not inclined to agree to it. According to me, Veds were written by the Rishis.

Question: Do you agree or not that in the olden days the Rishis imparted knowledge to their pupils, who sat nearby them on the ground, who after hearing learnt it by heart?

Answer: I do not agree with it. To my mind the couplets of Veds were composed by Rishis and were told to their pupils subsequently and the result derived by hearing the Guru is called Upanishad. It is correct that Upanishad means to sit down nearby. I do not agree with the fact that after hearing and memorizing, whatever the Rishis and Munis had written is called Sruti and Smriti, but it is only called Sruti. I accept the existence of Veds as a student of history. It is correct that in the chronicle order Rig Ved is the first Ved and Atharva Ved is the last Ved.

Question: Whether the description of river Saryu in Rig Ved and Ayodhya in the Atharva Ved has no value for you as a student of History?

Answer: It is wrong to say that as a student of history the description of river Saryu in Rig Ved and Ayodhya i.e. city of Gods in Atharva Ved are meaningless in my article.

The description of river Saryu in Rig Ved and Ayodhya in Atharva Ved is meaningful. The Rishis, with the objectives of the subject had written above things. It means to express their views whatever they considered suitable~ they put it in black and white. I know that Rishis in the wake of their meditation, created the couplets of Veds.

Question: Have you been able to understand the thoughts of those Rishis who motioned river Saryu in Rig Ved and Ayodhya i.e. city of Gods in Atharva Ved?

Answer: To my mind where river Saryu has been mentioned in Rig Ved, the Rishis keeping in view the geographical context had written the same. So far the point of discussion of the city of Gods (Ayodhya) in Atharva Ved is concerned, there the Rishis had imagination of a heavenly Ayodhya, where inhabitants were Gods alone.

The initial writing period of Valmiki Ramayana is under dispute. The concluding period is said 1st -2nd Century of Christian era. I had mentioned the writing period of Atharva Ved in my article, which according to me is considered 1000 to 800 B.C. In my statement I had already stated the writing period of Rig Ved, which is considered 1500 B.C. To my mind the present name Ayodhya had been named after Mughal period. The name Ayodhya has come after 17th -18th Century. The Mughal period started from 1526 and ended in 18th Century. As a student of history I know present Ayodhya in Faizabad district, which is situated on the bank of river Saryu. It is correct that I have mentioned Dashrathi Ram in my article. The Rama, which I discussed according to Shashtras, was the son of King Dashratha. According to Shashtras it is known to me that

Dashratha was the King of Ayodhya. I know Bhargava Rama, but in Valmiki Ramayana this Bhargava Rama had been mentioned after Rama. It is true that Bhargava Rama is also known as Parasu Rama. In Ramkatha, I had read that. In Valmiki Ramayana after Rama the series of his name have been described and in other books Rama has been placed after Parasu Rama. I had read it in weapons to Dashrathi Rama. I had also read Bahama. It is correct to say that he comes after Dashrathi Rama in the chronicle order. This fact is partially true that as per Hindu faith he took three incarnations, but among the popular ten incarnations Ba1rama is not included out of these three. I have not heard the name of Chandrahari, Purnahari. I have heard Chakrahari but not Dhannahari. I do not remember the name of Guptahari. I had written Vishnuhari in my article. I am not confident whether I heard the name of Billawahari or not. I had not read the name of Saptahari. I had not read about Saptahari. I do not remember whether I had read it or not. I have not heard that all the above names are the forms of Vishnu. I had been to Ayodhya and Faizabad several times. I had seen Guptar Ghat. I do not know whether it is also known as Guptahari Ghat. It is true that according to tenet of Hinduism God Rama disappeared at Guptar Ghat. The synonym of Rama is not Vishnuhari because Vishnu and Hari both are the separate names of Vishnu and the name Vishnuhari can be the name of a human being and not of Lord Rama. As I am not known to Vishnuhari name, therefore, I cannot tell who named Vishnuhari. It is correct that in the photo of Petrograph, which I had mentioned in my article, the name of Vishnuhari had been used. I have heard Sitaram from the childhood, when my naming ceremony took place. I do not think Sitaram as myself as half male and half female. As Sitaram word is used in the society, so it is my thinking that this name has been named by the society. The photograph of

the petrograph and the photograph which were the basis of my article, its date was 17th -18th A.D. which I had mentioned in my article Whether the name of Vishnuhari was used as Vishnuhari in 17th and 18th, I have no knowledge of it. It is possible that the name Vishnuhari might be in use before 17th -18th Century, because the people had been using one word by merging two names. I had read and heard the name of King Chander Dev of Gaharwal dynasty. As a student of history and archaeology I had not heard the name of Chandrawati Tamrapatra.

It is wrong to say that I am concealing the fact that I had read Chandrawati Tamrapatra epigraphy and this is also wrong to say that I am doing so because it has been mentioned in that Tamrapatra that in 1150 A.D. King Chandra Dev offered jewellery made of diamond to Vishnuhari Temple of Ayodhya. I had not read any description of King Chandra Dev's arrival to Ayodhya. Similarly I had not read of his going to Kashi had read about King Chandra Dev in a book entitled 'Bharatiya Lipi Mala' written by Gauri Shankar Harishchander Ojha. I do not remember whether in that book there is any mention of the Chandrawati Tamrapatra or any petrograph or epigraph relating to King Chandra Dev. The epigraph, which is related to King Chandra Dev, I had mentioned it in my article. I do not remember in memory about that epigraph. That epigraph was in Devnagari script and Sanskrit Language and that was of late 10th century. In the above-mentioned book it has been recorded that the epigraph is related to late 10th century. The date has also been mentioned there. I accept that the above named Shri Ojha was the well-known scholar of Sanskrit and paleography. I do agree that his articles and book had been adopted for reference by all the archaeologists and historians in their writings. Such a reference has also been made by Dr.

Chandrika Singh Upasak, a historian and archaeologist of Banaras, and also by other scholars, whose names I do not remember at this time. It is wrong to say that I am giving wrong statement on this point.

I had read the name of Guru Govind Singhji. I do not know whether Guru Govind Singhji had written Ramkatha or not. I had read that two sons of Guru Govind Singhji were sacrificed. It is a historical fact. As I am not a student of medieval history, so I cannot say on the subject whether Guru Govind Singhji had written about the sacrifice of his two sons or not. I do not think if Guru Govind Singh had not written about the sacrifice of his two sons, then it will be treated that his sons were not sacrificed. As Tulsidas has not mentioned about Ram Janam Bhoomi in Ramcharitmanas, then Ram Janam Bhoomi had not a support of the facts. As I had not considered the birth of Rama as historic, I therefore, did not try to find out where Rama took birth. The story of incarnations, are totally imaginary to my mind and therefore, I take Dashratha, Aj and Raghu as imaginary figures and on the same basis I take Lava and Kusha as imaginary characters. It is hypothetical to say that Lava established Sarawati and Kusha established Kushawati kingdoms. It is true that both Sarawati and Kushawati had been mentioned in Boudh books. I do not know whether Kushawati and Sarawati had a reference in books earlier than Budha's. The kingdoms had no reference in the traditional stories. I therefore, do not take that these kingdoms were ever established. As a student of history and archaeology, I had tried to find out the name of the person who established Sarawati and Kushawati kingdoms but evidences were not available. Being a student of history I heard in childhood that in Bihar, King Janak ruled over Mithila, but it is an imaginary story. As a student of archaeology the initial archaeological

evidences of Chitrakoot are not available with me and therefore, I am unable to tell when Chitrakoot came in existence. Due to lack of archaeological evidences, I cannot say that the place called 'Kaikeyi' was in Kashmir. As a student of history, I have read about 'Rishyamuka Parvat', but which of the mountains had been recognized as 'Rishyamuka Parvat' that I do not know. As we are seeing Lanka in its present form, therefore, as a student of archaeology the question of gathering information about it does not arise. All the names referred to above, I had tried to gather information about them from archaeological viewpoint, but I could not get evidences about them so far. I belong to Bihar State. But there is no place known as Janakpuri in Bihar. Mithila region is in existence in Bihar. I have literary information of the fact that the king of Mithila was Sirdhwaj Janak and the king of Ayodhya was Dashratha. It is correct to say that Sirdhwaj Janak was also known as 'Videh Janak'. I know that Videh Janak looked after and brought up his daughter Sita. It is also true that being the daughter of Janak she was also known as 'Janaki'. This fact is also true on literary basis that according to prevalent traditions Sita chose Rama as her groom in the 'Swayamvar'. I have also information that after marriage Ramchandra along with Sita and his brother Laxmana was sent to exile. According to the archaeological evidences it has not been proved so far that where that forest existed where Ramachandra lived in exile. It is true on the basis of literature that during exile Ramchandra traveled from Chitrakoot to 'Rishyamook Parvata'. I have heard the name of Setubandh Rameshwaram as a student of history and have also seen it. The Setu or bandh being not in existence in Rameshwaram, there is no question of seeing it. I still study archaeology and history. I had earned knowledge in marine archaeology. Surely I had studied it. I had learnt that through marine archaeology, the existence

of see-sunken Dwarkapuri is being explored. But evidences on it are still not available. The archaeological evidences relating to Dwarkapuri's existence beneath the sea are still not available. I do not remember the name of that archaeologist or the organization engaged in the discovery of existence of Puri. I have no information about the evidences found in the discovery of Puri. It is wrong to say that since I have not seen the evidences found, relating to Puri, I am therefore, saying that I have no information about the above evidences. You have said that you are in touch with the officials of archaeology engaged in Puri and you on the basis of information supplied by them said that so far no evidences had been found. I can tell you one name among those officers. His name is Mohd. K.K. Superintendent Archaeologist, Patna (now Agra). It is wrong to say that the above named officer may not have concern with marine archaeology at Puri. I had not heard about N.A.S.A. I had not tried to find out that the photo of Setubandh Rameshwaram had been taken through Satellite and such a photograph had been telecasted. As the action had been undergoing on the basis of 'imaginary facts', I had no information about the organization known as N.A.S.A. had taken the above photographs. This is correct to say that the full form of N.A.S.A. is National Aeronautic Space Agency. I do not know that it is an American Organization. As taking a photograph of Setubandh Rameshwaram through Satellite was on imagination, I therefore, did not try to find out that the above named organization N.A.S.A., by taking the photograph through satellite had published it in the magazine. In the literature, whether it is Ramcharitmanas or Ramayana, the discussion on Setubandh Rameshwaram is hypothetical; on that basis I consider it imaginary. It is wrong to say that I, being prejudice on the subject, am giving mis - statement. It is not true that I am taking it imaginary because it has been described in Ramayana or

Ramcharitmanas, but it is true that the story of Setubandh Rameshwaram is hypothetical. It is correct to say that the story of Setubandh Rameshwaram is since imaginary as such the photographs of Setubandh Rameshwaram published in many magazines are also imaginary.

Question: Whether the photo, which you had mentioned in the article written by you, is actual and not imaginary?

Answer: The photographs on which the words are inscribed, on the basis of which I had written my articles are based on facts and not imaginative.

Unfortunately I had not written any other research article, which would have been based on the photo of photographs. As I could not get the effective means before writing the article concerning the disputed site, so I could not see the original epigraph. It is wrong to say that I was in a hurry to write the article that is why I had written the article, but I had written the article with my hard work lasting for 17 years. There was no reason to see the epigraph 17 years ago, which took me to write the article. It is wrong to say that this epigraph was in my knowledge 17 years ago before the publication of my article.

I do not agree with this contention that if the petrograph found from the ground, its clay goes decay due heat and air. I had studied original petrographs of king Ashoka. The original petrographs of king Ashoka were prepared in 19th and 20th Century and I had studied those in the beginning of 1954-55 and I wrote my article in this connection in Nineties. These were all petrographs. By petrographs I mean the matter written on a stone not on pillars. When I saw those petrographs for the first time in

1954-55, those were cleaned by removing the dust from them. I agree that the words may sometimes get damaged during the process of removing the dust of the petrograph. It is also correct that at the time of process of removing the dust, the engraved words may be damaged.

Dr. Sudha Mallaya is the scholar of paleography, but I had not read any of her articles. It is correct that Dr. Ajay Mitra Shastri was my friend but he is no more in this world, he was the scholar of Sanskrit and not of paleography. It is correct that he was a learned scholar of Sanskrit language. I know Dr. Thakur Prasad Verma. He has met me even today. Dr. Thakur Prasad Verma is a good epigraphist or not, this I cannot tell you because I had seen none of his work or articles. To my knowledge Dr. T.P. Verma was the Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture in Archaeological Department, Banaras Hindu University. As my work field and the work field of Dr. Verma were different so I could not get any chance to do any research work with him. It is correct to say that the work field of Dr. Verma had been Epigraphy and Paleography whereas my work field had also been Epigraphy, Paleography and Archaeology. But Dr. Verma was not engaged in Archaeology. As I was in Govt. service, I had been - doing the fieldwork, whereas Dr. T.P. Verma was teaching in Banaras Hindu University. That is why I am saying that our work fields were different. I got experience in field archaeology about Ayodhya, which had been referred in Ramayana. I had studied the excavation done at Janam Bhoomi-Babri Masjid site, Hanuman Garhi and Sita ki Rasoi and studied the material found there from. This is my experience of field archaeology. It is correct to say that under field archaeology, the study of articles found during excavation and writing articles thereon is not enough but something else also is involved in the field archaeology. In my study the articles found during excavation carried out

at disputed site, Hanmnan Garhi and Sita ki Rasoi, I. had written the article on that basis. All those are covered under the field archaeology. Prof B.B. Lal had carried out excavation work at more than 14 places relating to Ayodhya referred in Ramayana. I was not satisfied with the excavation of 3 places. The reality is this that I had studied all the excavation done by Prof B.B. Lal, published in the Encyclopedia and after its study I had written my article. I had descended Nandi Gram excavation carried out by Prof B.B. Lal. I agree that Nandi Gram is a place concerned with Ramayana. I have never gone to Nandi Gram area. I had knowledge of Nandi Gram and knew its distance, but at present I do not remember.

I had information about the place known as Ranopali. I also know that it is near Ayodhya. I had heard about a temple at that place. I also know that the name of Dhan Dev had been marked at the gate of that temple in the epigraphy. This epigraphy had been published in the book as 'Ayodhya Inscription of Dhan Dev'. I do not remember the contents of that epigraph. It is correct that earlier it was in the memory but not now. It is not because I had forgotten the contents of that epigraph as it was not an important epigraph, but I had forgotten it due to the passage of time and my busy schedule. I know about Karma danda epigraph of Faizabad, but what are its contents that I had forgotten at present. It is not correct to say that the epigraph is not in my memory because it was related to the character of Rama in Ramayana. It is correct that Ram Chandra was also known as 'Dhanush Dhari'. It is correct that word 'Sarangini' in Sanskrit had been used for 'Dhanush Dhari'. I do not remember that due to this fact Dhanush Dhari Rama has also been called Sarangini Vishnu. I had not read it anywhere. As I do not remember the contents of Kanna danda epigraph, I cannot say it contains reference of

Sarangini Vishnu or not. I have no information that at Bhitari in Ghazipur district, there is any mention of Vishnu or Shri Rama, so I cannot tell the recovery date of that petrograph. I knew the time of recovery of epigraph of Karma danda and Ranopali, but I do not remember now.

It is wrong to say that in order to conceal the correct things I am depending upon the notion of forgetting the facts.

Verified the statement after reading .

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

29.04.2002

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further cross-examination be present on 30.04.2002

Sd/-

29.04.2002

Dated : 30.04.2002

In continuation of 29.04.2002, Statement of P.W. 28 Shri Sitaram Rai, starts after taking the oath.

The distance of disputed site from trenches laid down by Prof. B.B. Lal for Ramayana site is not in my memory but those were near the disputed site. Nandi Gram is about at a distance of 16 K.M. from disputed site. Nandi Gram is included in the disputed site. I had mentioned in my article that Prof. B.B. Lal laid down trenches within the perimeter of 4-5 K.M. of the disputed site was correct. It is true that Nandi Gram is situated at a distance of 16 K.M. from Auyodhya. I am not telling a lie on this subject. I had not referred Nandi Gram in my article, because I did not consider it necessary. Not only me but according to others also Nandi Gram is included in Ramayana site. I had heard the name of Guru Nanak Dev. Guru Nanak Dev's period was about 15th Century. I had not read whether Guru Nanak Dev had been to Ayodhya or not because it was out of the context of my study. I also have no information whether Guru Nanak Dev, after going to Ram Janam Bhoomi in Ayodhya, had seen Ram Chandra. I have not studied Sikh literature. I had no information whether Guru Teg Bahadur and Guru Govind Singh after visiting Ayodhya had met Ram Chandra or not. I had heard the name of Nam Devji. I do not know whether he was earlier or contemporary or afterwards of Guru Nanak Dev, because I had not studied that period, Medieval History was not my subject. It is wrong to say that I had not at all read the history of medieval period, as medieval history had not been the area of my work, so I had not properly studied it. It is also wrong to say that I had studied it improperly. It is wrong to say that I had studied the period of Babar in Medieval History. I had said wherever the context was required I had read it

and seen it. I had studied Ayodhya in literature and Archaeology keeping in view the context of Ayodhya.

Question: Should I take, because of it, you did not read Sikh literature concerning Ayodhya?

Answer: It is absolutely wrong to say that due to this reason, I had not read Sikh literature concerning Ayodhya. I was busy in my other work; I therefore, could not pay attention to it. I had used the words 'other work' just now. By saying so, I mean the facts whatever I had mentioned about Ayodhya in my article. It is wrong to say that

I did not give importance to Sikh literature in my article but did not think it proper in the present context to include it in the article. It is totally wrong to say that I am telling a lie on this point. As I had not studied Sikh literature properly, so I will not be in a position to tell whether description about Ayodhya is there in the Sikh literature or not. I had not read in any book at any point of time that Ayodhya was named from Awadhपुरी to Ayodhya. I have not read after Mughal period during 17th -18th Century that Ayodhya was first of all called Awadhपुरी. The sources of 17th -18th Century, which I found according to them, present Ayodhya was known as Awadhपुरी. The old Ayodhya was in Kaushal District at that time. The Ayodhya was in Kaushal District, which was 12 Yojan long, 3 Yojan wide and at a distance of 1½ Yojan from river Saryu. I cannot tell that territorial limit of Kaushal, presently. The area of Kaushal was spread around the present Ayodhya, but I cannot tell you its territory. From the material available so far, it is not clear from it how long the name of old Ayodhya remained in use. The books I had referred in

this connection, I had mentioned their names in the article. To know about Ayodhya I had studied Atharva Ved, Valmiki Ramayana, and Samyukta Nikaya in Boudh literature, Travel Descriptions of Chinese Pilgrim Hieun Tsang, Different Teerth Kalp in Jain literature etc. It is correct to say that in Jain literature it has been mentioned that the first Teerthankar of Jain, Aadi Nath Rishabh Nath was born in Ayodhya. I had read in history about the life of Aadi Nath alias Rishabh Nath. As it has not been proved on the balance of history, therefore, I and other students of history and archaeology like me do not pay attention to it. Those are the people who read and understand history on the basis of archaeology. They all are the students of archaeology and history as I am. It is absolutely wrong to say that as no archaeological evidences were found about Guru Govind Singh, Guru Teg Bahadur, Nam Dev and Aadi Nath, I therefore, did not pay attention to study their period. The fact is that the names mentioned above, out of them only Aadi Nath and Rishabh Nath had archaeological proof and keeping this fact in mind, I had given the above statement, all the rest were historical persons and therefore they were out of the study limit of archaeology. It is wrong to say that I believe on the historical aspect of these persons and do not believe on their archaeological aspect. I do not only recognize Rishabh Nath out of the above persons from archaeological point of view but already said about rest of the persons that they were historical persons of medieval period. It is quite wrong to say and it is also literally wrong that I am in the habit of telling a lie. I always speak the truth. I had not read the medieval history relating to Rama.

(You had said that you had read the written description of medieval period relating to Rama).

It is correct to say that under the medieval descriptions, the narrative portion relating to Rama is not concerned with history. It is wrong to say that I had treated it as historical in my article.

Question: The medieval descriptions about the character of Rama, which you had read, should I take them non-historical?

Answer: In the medieval source, whatever I had read about the character of Rama is not historical, but true so far the basis is concerned.

Question: What is the period of King Mool Dev, Vayu Dev and Vijaya Mitra?

Answer: On the basis of archaeological sources, King Mool Dev, Vayu Dev and Vijaya Mitra are considered of the 1st Century B.C. The sources of their Kingdoms are not available explicitly. I had mentioned them in my article because from the stratified layers of the concerned excavation, these numismatics were found. I had already said in my above statement that I have also studied Numismatics.

Question: Are you Numismatic also?

Answer: I had not claimed that I am a numismatic but I had studied numismatics and it was my special subject in M.A.

On this point the learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to first five lines of the last paragraph of Paper No. 199 C-2/1D. The Witness after reading those lines said, whatever I had

written in those lines, is correct. My views in the above article are on the basis of archaeological research. My view that Ayodhya was re-occupied in 11th Century is based on archaeological source. I had written in my article that at the time of construction of Babri Masjid, Tulsidas was of 31 years age.

This fact I had written on the basis of a medieval source. It is wrong to say that the source was not of medieval period. It is of medieval period.

Question: Should I take that for writing your article you had not studied the medieval history but relied upon medieval sources?

Answer: It is absolutely wrong. For writing this article whatever the sources were available at that time, I had seen them.

I had got medieval history, but the source relating to Tulsidas, wherever I found, I used it.

I had heard the name of Dr. K.B. Ramesh. He is known as an Epigraphist and Paleographer. I had not read his view about the photo of alleged petrograph. On this point the learned advocate, cross-examining the witness, drew attention of the Witness to last paragraph of his article Paper 199 C-2/1 (F). The Witness read it and said that the words K, Ta, Ra, Ba, Sa and Ha used in context, its script is of not before the 18th Century. The form of script seen at the petrograph seems to be of not before 18th Century, according to me. The script of alphabet 'Ka' had a difference in 11th -12th Century and 18th Century. The difference is that during 11th -12th Century the form of

alphabet' Ka' was lengthier and in 18th Century it was made round.

Question: Do you know any Petrograph of 11th and 12th Century, with its address, in which alphabet' Ka' had been used?

Answer: I had seen the epigraph of 11th and 12th Century, but cannot tell you the name of any particular petrograph at the moment. The petrographs of the last phase of Paul period, all are of 11th and 12th Century. This type of script had also been found on the stone statues of that period.

Paul period is of kings of Paul dynasty. It was from 8th Century to 12th Century. I had not seen the petrograph of 18th Century. But I had seen the authentic available book on epigraphy, having century wise table of script on the basis of different epigraphs and had come to the conclusion as per my wisdom and included the same in my article. I had heard the name of a magazine "Itihas Darpan". But I had not gone through it. I had heard the name of "Bharatiya Itihas Sankalan Yojna Samit". I doubt I had heard the name of Shri Moropant Neelkanth Pingle, but do not recollect presently. I had heard the name of Prof. B.R. Grover. He was also my friend. I know Prof. K. V. Raman, K.S. Lal, Dr. Y.D. Sharma and K.S. Ramachandran. These all were in A.S.I. I know Dr. S.R. Rao also. Most of them are Archaeologists and some are Historians. I do not know whether all the above named persons are in the Editorial Board of the magazine "Itihas Darpan" or not. I know Dr. T.P. Verma. He is Paleographer and Epigraphist.

To my knowledge the well established Paleographer and Epigraphist of this time is B.N. Mukherjee of Calcutta University. Prof. K. V Ramesh is also well known Epigraphist, but he is an expert of South Indian epigraph. Prof. Mukherjee is the expert of ancient epigraphs found in North India. T.P. Verma was the Professor of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology in Banaras Hindu University. I had not read any of his work so I cannot put forward my views in this connection whether he is an established Epigraphist and Paleographer or not. I have heard the name of Mr. M.N. Katty. He too is Epigraphist and Paleographer but he is concerned with the South Indian script. The basis of the photograph on the photo of which I had written my article is in Devnagari script. I think that script is all over recognized as Devnagari script and to say Nagari alone will make the people to understand it. To my mind there is no conclusive difference between Devnagari script and Nagari script. But to make people understand the name Devnagari is rational.

Question: Is it true that Devnagari script and Nagari script is one and the same thing or there is difference in it?

Answer: The answer of this question has already been reflected in my above statement. It is wrong to say that I am unable to reply in brief, because such a question does not arise. To me Devnagari script and Nagari script is one.

The difference is only in the name of both. (On this point the cross-examining learned advocate drew the attention of the Witness to inner pages No.69 and 70 and attached Table No.1 Col.4 of Itihas Darpan, submitted with other original case No.5/89, paper No.254 C 1/3, enclosed,

therewith). The Witness saw it and said I do not agree with all that been written in it. I do not agree whatever had been written by hand. I will express my consent or disagreement about the remaining portion of the things at time of answering the questions. What ever had been written in paragraph 3 of page 69 in the light of which I have been asked to see Table 3 and 4, I disagree with them Similarly I disagree with paragraph 2 of page 69. It is totally wrong to say that due to prejudice I am disagreeing with the facts. To say it that I have no knowledge of epigraphy is totally wrong. I had mentioned the name of the then best paleographer of his time, Gauri Shanker Hira Chander Ojha. He was connected with paleography. Now he is dead.

I had written in my article about the black basalt pillars of disputed structure. When I saw those pillars at that time it was not my aim to write the article. I do not recollect when did I see them and after deliberations with other scholars and of my own wisdom, I had written the article. I had written in my article on the basis of photograph of those pillars and the stone pillars given in the article of Prof. Sudha Malliya. I do not remember at present whether the picture of the pillars was in black and white. I had seen the pictures engraved on those pillars but I am unable to describe them as due to my losing memory. I clearly remember that the figure of 'Ballari' was engraved on the pillars. I do not remember other I had come to know from the article of Sudha Mallaya and other sources that these pillars were fixed in the disputed structure. Black Basalt and shiest stones are two different stones but I am not a geologist. I therefore, cannot tell you the difference in both the stones. I cannot reply this whether there is any difference or not between the load bearing and life of these both the stones. The black basalt stone has definitely the load bearing capacity. Not only by seeing the photographs,

as I had said earlier, I have seen those stones and on that basis I am saying black basalt. I was about 30, when I saw those pillars. At that time I was working as Archaeological Officer (Exploration and Excavation Officer) in Govt. of Bihar. I was MA. at that time. It is wrong to say that I had never visited the disputed building. During my childhood, as had been mentioned in my statement recorded at page 38, that I had been to Ayodhya a number of times. I had not stayed there. I had never entered the temple and had darshans. I had been watching from outside by sitting in the car is correct. It is wrong to say that I am telling a lie on this point.

I had read Auyodhya Mahatamya in Skandha Puran and had mulled over it. The date of publication of the Skandha Puran which I read was 1910; but not the period of its writing. About the writing of Skandha Puran I had read other books relating to it. The Skandha Puran in which I read the Ayodhya Mahatamya, the name of its publisher was printed as Kshamendra - 1910. It is wrong to say that I am telling a lie on this point. It is correct that the author, publisher and editor of a book are often different. I do not remember at present whether its editor was Kishan Chander Khemraj Shresthi or not.

I had determined the date of writing of Skandha Puran on the basis of details of Ayodhya Mahatamya in it. The writing period of Ramcharitmanas is Samvat 1631 (1574 A.D.), which has been written in Ramcharitmanas itself. In addition to the study of Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas, I had studied Ramkatha in Buddhist Book Dashrath Jatak and Ramkatha written by Father Kamil Bulke. I had read original Dashrath Jatak and not the commentary written thereon by Subeera Jaiswal. Dashrath Jatak has been written in Pali language. It is wrong to

presume that I would have not read the Dashrath Jatak written in Pali language. I had not read Ramkatha in any book other than Ramcharitmanas, Valmiki Ramayana Buddhist Book Dashrath Jatak and Ramkatha written by Camil Bulke. I do not remember now when Father Camil Bulke wrote Ramkatha. Only this much I know that he wrote this book in 20th Century. It might be definitely his research work. It is my thinking that historians consider this book as his research work and I too am of the same opinion. I did not find it necessary to refer that book in my article. The aim and objective with which I had been writing the article, I had sufficient material relating to that. I therefore, did not consider it proper to have a reference of Ramkatha of Father Camil Bulke. It is wrong to say that due to difference of opinion I had not referred his book. It is also totally wrong to say that I had given references of only those books in my article with which I disagreed. The objective of my writing the article was to find out the existence of Ayodhya in literature and archaeology and the sources, which I had referred, were sufficient to my objective. I do not exactly remember the writing period of 'Bharatiya Lipi Mala'. But according to my memory it might have been the end of 19th Century or the beginning of 20th Century. I am of the opinion that there is no other better book on paleography than the Bharatiya Lipi Mala. There is one other book written by George Hooler known as 'Indian Paleography'. We can put it in comparison with Bharatiya Lipi Mala. I had given reference of the couplet of Ramcharitmanas in paragraph 2 of my article Paper No.199 C 2/1(F) in the context of the character of a king. Tulsidas had depicted the character of the king of that time in the couplet and depicted the character of 'Dwij' i.e. Brahmin. In this context I had given the literal meaning of word 'Prajasan' at S.No.30 on page 122, as cruel to his people, is wrong. So far I remember Tulsidas has used this word

in 'Uttarkand' while describing Kali. So far I understand there is no other meaning of the work 'Prajasan' than the above. I agree with this contention that by separation of the constituents in a conjunct word it is Praja+Dban+Aasan. Because there is no possibility of conjunction of more words in any grammar, I think there is no question of conjunction in word Sitaram because it is itself a compound word. It is totally wrong to say that in paragraph 3 on page 199 C-2/1 (H) of my article, had written on the basis of presumption that the pillars of Babri Masjid were only for the decoration purpose and were fixed by importing from outside. I often used to go to Masjid in Patna when I was a Director, Archaeology and said I used to go to Temple and similarly to Church and GID1.Idwara. I do not remember the manner of such Temples where decoration pillars were fixed. The Masjid I had seen, my viewpoint to see them was not to see the decorative and non-decorative pillars, although I used to visit Masjids as an archaeologist. I used to go because it was the responsibility of the Government to repair the old Masjids. It is totally wrong to say that in ancient buildings, repair of pillars was not required. I therefore, did not see the pillars. I kept concern only with that portion of the building, which required repair. It is wrong to say that after inspecting the whole building I used to decide which part of the building required repair. It is also wrong to say that before my visit I had in mind before hand which portion has to be repaired. It is also wrong that before inspecting the building I used to decide before hand the portion to be repaired. It is totally wrong to say that I am giving wrong statement_in regard to above facts. I surely tried to find out where from the decorative pillars Galban, placed in Babri Masjid had been brought. But I was sure in my mind that it was not possible for me to find out the place. As I had already stated in my article that to my mind the importing of those pillars is on the basis if they

would have been constructed at the time of construction of the building, it might have been constructed with the foundation and would have been load bearing. It is also wrong to say that I had reached at the definite conclusion that those decorative pillars were not of any temple. It is also wrong that I was confident enough that the above said pillars were of a Masjid. It is also wrong to say that I had reached at a definite conclusion that the said pillars were of some big palace. To my mind the above pillars were not of the disputed building but it might be possible that they belonged to a small building, perhaps it may be Masjid, Mandjr or a small palace. In all there were 14 pillars. I got this information from the local residents of Ayodhya that pillars similar to the above mentioned decorative pillars, were fixed in a graveyard, which was at a distance of ½ kilometer from Ayodhya.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

30.4.2002

Typed by the stenographer in the open court. As dictated by us .In continuation of this for further cross-examination be present on 01.05.2002.

Sd/-

30.04.2002

01.05.2002

(In continuation of 30.04.2002, statement of PW 28, Shri Sitaram Rai starts after taking the oath).

The local people were the wayfarer of that time. I did not think necessary to see the pillars of graveyard; I therefore, could not see them. Those pillars have been described in the article of Dr. R.S. Sharma entitled "Ayodhya Issue", which had been published in the proceedings of World Archaeology Congress, 1998 (organized in Croatia). I had read it only yesterday after my statement about pillars in this court that has also been written in that article. In that article there has been reference of the pillars not only fixed in the disputed building but also those lying in the graveyard. Perhaps there is reference of 2 pillars fixed in the graveyard. It is wrong to say that I am misleading on this point.

It is wrong to say that at the time of my first appointment, Dr. RS. Sharma was in the Selection. It is also not fair to say that at the time of my appointment in Archaeological Survey of India Dr. R.S. Sharma was a member of the Selection Board. It is absolutely wrong to say that some idols were found missing when I was holding the post of Exploration and Excavation Officer under Govt. of Bihar. I had heard the name of Shridhar Basudev Sohani. He was Lokayukt of Bihar. Idols were not found missing during my tenure. It is quite wrong to say that after the 'alleged theft of idols~ any search team was constituted. In this connection, I would like to clarify that under the Antiquity and Art Treasures Act, any private individual can keep the archaeological remains with him after registration. Under this Act Dr. S.B. Sohani S/o Srinivas Rao, I.A.S. applied for registration of certain archaeological remains

and when Dr. Sohani retired from the post of Lokayukt, he took those archaeological remains with him to Poona. Dr. Sohani returned the same archaeological remains to Govt. of Bihar on loan with the condition that a gallery will be opened in his name. It is wrong that 20% was deducted from my pension. It is correct that Govt. of Bihar had decided to make a deduction of 5% from my pension but those orders were repealed by the court directions. Today I am getting full pension. Orders to deduct from my pension were passed on the basis that I did not stop Dr. Sohani from taking those antiques with him. As I have said he had applied as Lokayukt for the registration of archaeological remains under the rules, as such the question of my stopping him did not arise and I was charged with false allegation. I started my Ph.D. thesis under Dr. Altekar. After his death I completed it under Dr. R.S. Shanna. My selection was done on the basis of recommendations of Director of Archaeology and Museums, Bihar Public Service Commission. Dr. R.S. Sharma was as an Expert Member in that Selection Board. I am acquainted with Dr. R.S. Sharma from my M.A. studies i.e. before 1953. It is wrong to say that he had obliged me on more than one occasion. As Dr. Sharma was my teacher so as his student I feel obliged to him. My Ph.D. thesis is not on Pali but it was on Palm leaf manuscript written in Sanskrit. I had done decipherment of those palm leaves and studied them in detail but did not do the translation thereof. I have not done any work on iconography. The excavation report, which I had written, I have written in a separate chapter on the facts found about iconography. Besides my above thesis, in the excavation report of epigraphy I had written a separate chapter on the seal sealing of epigraphs; and had also gone through them.

Question: Have you done any exclusive work on Epigraphy or not?

Answer: My thesis is my work on epigraphy, which is in a form of a book. My thesis is my exclusive work on epigraphy. The Excavation Report, I said is related to epigraphy.

Question: Is it correct to say that till today you have not seen the original petrograph?

Answer: It is correct that I had not seen original petrograph including stone, but I have seen its correct photograph in original form. It is correct that initially at the time of writing the article I had seen part photo of its photograph, but have seen its full photo during the course of statements.

I had written my article paper 199/C-2 in 1955. As I had said earlier tills article was published in 1996. It is collect that the book in which my article was published its editor was Prof K.M. Shrimali. I have no knowledge whether Prof Shrimali believes in Marxists ideology or not. Prof Shrimali is a professor in Delhi University. It is wrong to say that Prof. Subeera Jaiswal and Prof. Shrimali both were professors in the same institute. I know Shri Suresh Chander Mishra but I do not know his work place. Mr. R.S. Sharma has now since retired. R.S. Sharma was professor in Patna and Delhi Universities. I do not know if Prof. Sharma is of Marxist ideology. I had already said that I am Vaishnav and I do not think on these subjects. I know Prof. Romila Thaper. I do not know about her present whereabouts. She was earlier a professor in Jawahar Lal Nehru University, Delhi. I had heard the name of Prof. Suraj Bhan. I also know him He is an archaeologist. It is correct that he is a respectable archaeologist, but I do not remember whether he had also worked in Archaeological

Survey of India like myself. Prof. Athar Ali was a professor in Aligarh University. I know Prof. Irfan Habib Sahib. He too was a professor in Aligarh University. I know Prof. D.N. Jha. He is professor in Delhi University. I being a student of History and Archaeology, I do not know the meaning of 'Group of Independent Historians'. I had said a right historian and archaeologist expresses his views on the basis of factual sources as such he never remains independent.

Question: Should I take all the archaeologists and historians as dependent historians?

Answer: All the historians and archaeologists depend upon factual sources they are not self independent

Question: Do you keep Dr. Swraj Prakash Gupta Dr. Thakur Prasad Verma Prof. Devendar Swamp and Ajay Mitra Shastri in the list of reputed historians?

Answer: I keep these people in the category of historians and archaeologists.

I do not agree with the saying that none of the excavation is final. Some excavations remain incomplete; the students place them in this category, which are likely to take final shape in a passage of time. There were 6000 couplets in Valmiki Ramayana in the beginning, which were raised to 12000 and then 24000. In my opinion 2 chapters of Valmiki Ramayana were written at a later stage. As I had already said my views on this are based on the opinion expressed by the earlier scholars. It is correct that Valmiki Ramayana had a description of length and breadth of Ayodhya. The area of territory of Ayodhya which I had

written in my article is on the basis of Valmiki Ramayana, I had mentioned it after all round comparison of the area of present Ayodhya and the both do not correspond with each other. The area i.e. length and breadth of Ayodhya given in Ramayana is upto a limit, thus the question of taking it correct or incorrect does not arise. I had not said the area mentioned in Ramayana is incorrect. But I had mentioned that the length and breadth of Ayodhya given in Ramayana does not correspond with the length and breadth of Ayodhya situated in District Faizabad. I do not know the number of books with the title Ramayana I had gone through, but I only know one or two names at present viz. Valmiki Ramayana Anand Ramayana Ayodhya Ramayana etc. I do not remember presently the contents of these Ramayanas. But they contain discussion on Rama. There are some facts about Rama in them. I do not remember at present whether Ayodhya had been referred in these three books or not. I cannot say clearly at present that apart from these three Ramayanas, except Manas and Valmiki Ramayana, I had read any other Ramayana, which contains the name of Rama, Dasrath, Sirdhwaj Janak or Ayodhya. I had read the number of Ramayanas written but I do not remember their number this time. I do not know whether any Ramayana had been written outside India or not. I am Vaishnav and the characteristic quality found in the incarnation of Vishnu I adore them. I do not take the story in the gospel form of truth. There is a temple in my house and I myself had gone to many temples. I had gone to many Vaishnav temples and Vaishnav Mandir is in my house. There is Ramavtar Mandir in my home. My family members offer Pooja in it. As I live in Patna and the Mandir is in my village, I therefore, could not go there. I go to temple for Pooja. My village has a Vaishnav Mandir for all which is in village Ghazipur in District Samastipur. I often used to go there. As a historian I treat every Vaishnav Mandir an

important one. From the viewpoint of being a historian, I had observed craftsmanship of Vishnu temples, but I am not an expert on it. It is correct that the Mandir consists of a Main Gate. On the frame and main gate of Vaishnav Mandir there are no figures depicting romance and love. I had heard the name of Shalbhanjika. Shalbhanjika is that picture in which the lady representing the Goddess of Wealth is seen plucking leaves of a tree. It is correct that the hand of the lady in Shalbhanjika is raised upward. Its literal meaning is a lady plucking the leaves of a Shal tree. In Hindu mythology water has been considered the synonym of life. It is correct that on the main gates of Vaishnav Mandirs and on the gates of other temples and elsewhere, the pitchers filled with water are seen engraved. It is known as 'Puran Ghat', which is also known as 'Puran Kalash'. It is also correct that leaves or lotus is engraved on this Puran Ghat. The name of 'Yaksha' is not in Hindu religion. I do not know whether this name is in other religions i.e. Muslim, Jews, and Parsi etc. Yabha is known as the God of water. At places he has been shown as the protector of water and at places he has been shown as a servant of 'Kuber'. Being a Vaishnav, I consider 'Shesh Nag' as the load bearer of the earth. Yaksha is not the load bearer of the earth. At places creepers are also depicted over lotus.

Question: Do you consider in a temple where the pictures of Yaksha on stone pillar Puran Ghat having Amrapallava or pinnacle have been shown creepers and the picture of Shalbhanjika have been depicted such type of stone pillars are in the existence of a temple?

Answer: I am not inclined to accept that such type of stone pillars are in existence in temples alone. It

is correct that they might be in existence in temples.

I know the Mudra of Padmasana. I do my Pooja in that posture. In the posture of Padmasana both the legs are bent from knees in a sitting position after placing the legs on the thighs. This is called Padmasana Mudra.

On this point the learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to pictures No.186 and 187 of the colour album compiled by U.P. Police Organisation. Viewing it the Witness said though the picture is visible but the Mudra of Padmasana is not visible in it. It may be in that Mudra but due to the effect of growing age the vision of my eyesight has gone down. Seeing pictures No. 163, 166 and 167 of the same album the Witness said there is some picture on the portion containing red colour, but the figure is not clear. It is clear that this figure is engraved on the stone part. The witness after seeing pictures No. 141, 142, 143, 146 and 147 of the same album replied that some portion of these pictures, appear to have been coloured by red colour. It is correct that it contains some engraved figures. Pictures No. 146 and 147 of the album are similar. What has been engraved is not clearly visible in it. In picture No.141 of the album, to my opinion, the posture of dance had not been engraved. It may be possible that the left leg may be down and the right leg be bending, but is not clear. The photograph does not contain writing on stone pillars, but by seeing the photographs, it can be presumed that these may be stone pillars. Wooden pillars are similar to it. It is correct that some of the pillars of the above pictures clearly show the picture of 'Ghat'. Ghats are clearly shown in pictures No. 146 and 147. The creepers are not clearly visible in pictures No. 141, 142, 143, 146 and 147. It might be

possible that the creepers may be engraved thereon but the same are not visible to me. The Witness after viewing pictures No.139 and 144 of the same album said that in Picture No.144 something hanging is visible in the picture; but nothing is visible in picture No. 139. I am not in a position at all to make out, what the picture is as its upper part is broken.

Question: You must have definitely seen such pillars in the Masjids of Patna?

Answer: I have not seen such a pillar in Masjids anywhere in Patna.

After seeing picture No.145 the Witness said on the upper part of this picture it is not clear what had been engraved. I cannot say whether anything had been engraved or not on the upper portion, because it is not clearly visible. After seeing pictures No.115, 120, and 121 of the same album the Witness said in picture No.120 and 121 on the lower portion, figure of 'Puran Ghat' is shown. But no figure is clearly visible in picture No.115.

The learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention the Witness to picture No. 100 of Black and White picture album compiled by Uttar Pradesh Archaeological Organization. After viewing the picture the Witness said I do not find any figure sitting in the Padmasan posture, the upper part of the figure had been broken and I do not see the Mudra of Padm engraved therein. Pinnacle (Kalash) is visible in picture No.102 but other engraved figures are not visible to me. In picture No. 96 some design has been engraved but I cannot name it. There may be the figure of Puran Kalash engraved on the stone pillar and it may be possible that the figure may be of

something else. The engraved pictures in picture No. 95 are not clear, I therefore cannot say that the figure is of Puran Ghat or of a dancer. I do not find clearly the picture of stone pillar in Picture No. 76 and I cannot therefore clearly say that these might be trunk of the elephant and his eyes in the upper portion, but the figure of Puran Ghat is not clearly seen in this picture. I do not see clearly the trunk of the elephant has been shown touching the upper part of the Ghat. I do not see Puran Ghat on stone pillars in pictures No. 63 and 66. I agree that all the pillars referred to above, have some figures engraved thereon.

I do not know there is anything known as 'Chadya' in temples. I have not read the meaning of 'Chadya' as 'Chajja' in ancient history. But it is correct that 'Chadya' has been used for 'Chajja'. I know 'Amlak' are made in Mandirs. I disagree with this that Mandirs are incomplete without 'Amlak'. On the top of trunk like temple (Shundakar Manillr) the round shape chakra is called Amlak. I cannot tell you the literary meaning of 'Amlak', because I had not studied the subject. Although Amlak is in the category of archaeology but this subject did not come as a special part of my study. It may be possible that the meaning of Amlak is the figure of embolic fruit cut in two parts. I do not concur with the view that Amlak are the necessary part of the Vaishnav Mandirs. Volunteer that there are temples without Amlak. It is correct to say that Amlak may be there in Vaishnav temples. I have not seen Amlak fixed in any Masjid.

The learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew the attention of the Witness to pictures No. 50 and 54 in the album of colour pictures of disputed structure compiled by the U.P. Archaeological Organisation. The Witness after seeing the pictures said Puran Ghat was not visible in it but Puran Ghat was visible in picture No. 54. No

figure is clearly visible in picture No.49 but in picture No.53, some figure is visible, which I cannot name, because the same is not clear. I do not find like pillar basis in Paper No.118C-I/36 presented with O.S. No. 5/89. I find remains of broken bricks seen in it. Two-Four stone pillars are seen in Picture No.118 C-I/37. These pillars are of some building. It is also correct to say that these may be of some temple. I agree with the four stone pillars of paper No.118C-I/41 and the connotation given therein. Paper No.118C-I/42 may be the photograph of some Hindu God or Goddess or the Baudh God and Goddess. After seeing picture in Picture NO.118C-I/42, said that some picture is definitely visible in it but these are the same figures, which had been already discussed I do not concur with it. I cannot say whether Paper No.118C-I/43 bears the picture of Amlak of any temple or not because the picture has been given without scale in a non-archaeological manner. It is correct to say that this picture is also like Amlak but it may be the photograph of something else. I am unable to tell that the photograph. in Picture No.118.C-I/44 might be of some temple or may not be, because these have been photographed in non-archaeological manner. The three pictures shown on the right side of Picture No.118C-I/45 are of stone blocks but I do not agree with the description given about these pictures. Because these also had been photographed in non archaeological manner.

On all the three pictures of Picture No.118.C-I/45 in the left side pictures, some designs have been drawn, but I am unable to say whether these designs are of stencil technique or not. On the right side of these picture, two pictures of some design like picture are there but what the ornament is, that is not clear. I cannot say that the pictures on page No.44 and 45 may be or may not be of stone blocks of any temple. The pictures on page No.118.C-I/46 may be of stone block of a temple or the frame of a house.

It may be of the frame of a temple. It is correct to say that idols have been seen engraved on both these pictures. I am not seeing clearly whether 'Karand Mukut' has been shown on the head of both the idols or not. I do not know what the Karand Mukut is. I do not know that the photos of gatekeeper on the gates of temples wear Karand Mukut or not. For photographing a picture in an archaeological manner the scale, background, angle and the light are the main basis. By angles I mean the photo of the object should be photographed in such a manner that the photo may come in a good background. As scale had not been given in the above pictures, therefore, these above mentioned shortcomings have occurred while taking the photographs. It is wrong to say that I am giving false statement on this point. It is also wrong to say that all these pictures are clear & from archaeological point of view.

The learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to other original Case No.5/89, Paper No.286.C.I, enclosed therewith and the album submitted therewith to Picture No. 13, 14, 20 and 21. On the admissibility of this album, on behalf of Defendant No.4 and 5 (other original case No.5/89) Shri Jilani and Shri Mustaq Ahmed respectively raised objection, because it has not been proved so far. The reply of the objections will be given later. On seeing it the Witness said in picture No.1 3, the human figures are being seen in destroyed condition. In picture No.14, I am not seeing the human figure lifting the stone. The figures in this picture are destroy so nothing is visible in it. It is correct to say that 13-14 stone blocks contain figures. I cannot say clearly that these figures are on the stone blocks of a temple. These stone blocks may be of some other building. I cannot say that these figures are of some Masjid or not. It is quite wrong to say that these stone blocks are of Masjid. Picture No.20-21 is not of Masjid. In picture No.20 the human

figure is not dear but some figure is there. I do not find Puran Ghat in it. In picture No.23 Puran Ghat is not being seen. The legs of some lady are visible. The destroyed breast of a lady is seen, but it is not clear. I do not remember whether I had seen such a stone block in any Masjid. In pictures No.27 and 28, the photo of Amlak does not seem to be appeared clearly. Puran Ghat is visible in picture No.25. One picture is seen on it but it is not possible to say that it is of a dancer or some one else. It is also not clear that the picture is in Nritya Mudra. As the figure is destroyed so its Aasan is not being known. After seeing pictures No.25 to 60 the witness said these photographs may be of some temple or some building I cannot reply it exactly that these photographs are of stone blocks fixed in a temple or not.

I had not read any book of Prof R.S. Sharma with the title 'Videgh Madhav'. I do not know whether Prof RS.Sharma had written the story of Videgh Madhav' in any book. I had heard about the story of Videgh Madhav. It is the story of the time of Satpath Brahmin I agree with it that the story contains the travel description of Videgh Madhav. His journey started from river Saraswati to river Sadaneer. This story is from 6th B.C. to 8th B.C. It is correct to say that this is his journey from West to East. As I had not read the description of his journey from beginning till end, therefore, I am unable to reveal whether he came across to Ayodhya during his journey, which he had described in it. The persons named Videgh Madhav were the representatives of Aryans and with the objective of making Aryans they traveled from West to East. I cannot say whether Prof. R.S.Sharma had narrated the journey of Videgh Madhav or not. It is wrong to say that in order to conceal the details about Ayodhya I am showing my ignorance about the knowledge of whole journey. I had revealed as much as I knew. It is wrong to say that the

description of journey of Videgh Madhav is only of 800 B.C. But I said it was between 800 B.C. and 600 B.C.

I know Districts Basti and Gorakhpur are adjacent to Ayodhya. I have heard about Balia. I have heard about the places known as Sahgaura, Narhan and Khairadeeh. It is correct to say the all these three places are near river Saryu and Ghagra. As I had not visited these places and even after reading about them it is out of my memory whether these are on the north or south side of river Saryu. As a student of archaeology I have this knowledge that excavation work was carried out at these places. How old were the inhabitation in these places, had been established through Radiocarbon-dating method.

I do not remember now the area where dating of inhabitation had been done on the basis of above method. I do not recollect whether it had been found in the dating done by above, that the locality in these areas was in 15 B.C. This much I know that cultivation was done in that area. It is correct to say that radiocarbon dating was done at the level of excavation in village Chirand in Bihar State. According to that survey the inhabitation in that village came in existence during the last phase of Neo Stone Age. The date of neo-stone age had been determined different at different places. The radiocarbon-dating of neo-stone age of village Birad had not been done. As such the dating level of that place, in view of the level of above-mentioned dating, had approximately been considered as 1600 B.C.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

01.05.2002

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated. In continuation for further cross-examination be present on 02.05.2002

Sd/-

01.05.2002

02.05.2002

(In continuation of dated 01.05.2002, the statement of P.W. 28, Shri Sitaram Rai begins with oath)

I had read the dateing on the upside layer and on that basis I had predicted the minimum date. It might be before that, I had no information whether any excavation work had been carried out in District Pratapgarh. I did not go to archaeological site in Balia and Gorakhpur. I had personally gone to Chirand excavation site and my article on this in Encyclopedia. I could not go to archaeological site in Balia and Gorakhpur because I did not find an opportunity to go there and I was busy in other examination work. From 1962-63 to 1972-73 excavation took place in Chirand. My above statement is correct.

I had seen the temples when I went to Ayodhya. As a student of archaeology I had tried to find out the most ancient temples in Ayodhya. At present I cannot reveal name of any other temple except Hanumangarhi temple. Nobody has revealed that Nageshwar Nath temple is the oldest temple in Ayodhya. I had no information about it earlier. I cannot say that the temple of Hanumangarhi was the oldest one from the archaeological point of view. I had gone to see the temple of Lomesh, but had not entered in it. People standing outside told me that it was Lomesh temple. I had seen Vighneshwar temple from outside. I had also visited Swargadwar. My family members told me that it was Sargat Dwar. I had not seen the temple of Kanak Bhawan. I had not enquired the local priest of that place about temples, but there was a Sadhu in Hanumangarhi temple, who used to live in a temple of my village, I had enquired from him. His name was Kishori Saran Dasji. He is no more now. I also know that there is a University in

Faizabad. People told me about Post Graduate Degree College in Ayodhya. I did not get a chance to visit the Post Graduate Degree College or see the Professor of History of the University in Faizabad to get information about the temples of that place. It is wrong to say when I had gone to Ayodhya my family members and Kishori Saran Dasji only told me about the temple of that place.

Question: Whether it may be presumed that while living in Ayodhya you had asked none except your family members and the said Kishori Saran Dasji about the temples in Ayodhya?

Answer: It is correct that I had not enquired from anybody else because I was satisfied with the information that I had gathered and I had seen in support of my facts.

It is totally wrong that I was not doing local factual verification. I had seen the trenches and pits near the disputed site. After going there, the Archaeological Survey of India staff posted there told me about it. It is possible that the staff may be Technical Assistant. No Officer of Archaeological Survey of India was present there when I went there. I knew that officer personally; therefore, the question of enquiring about him does not arise. Shri K.B. Sounder Rajan was the Excavation Officer in 1976-77. I went here in 1977. I had gone there between November and April. I do not remember at present the depth of that pit in 1976-77. Those pits were near the disputed site but I cannot quote the distance. I will not be able to tell the distance even by guess. I had seen from outside the disputed building. I do not remember what was there in the north side of the disputed building. Similarly I do not remember what was in eastern and southern sides. I cannot

tell the height of disputed building just now. I cannot tell you what was there in East, West, North and South of disputed building. I cannot tell whether there were any buildings of temple, roads, graveyard, fields etc. near the disputed building. It is quite wrong to say that I had not gone to disputed building. I had not visited there in official capacity but in a personal capacity I had visited the disputed site. My above statement is related to my visit in 1976-77. I had been traveling on foot and by transport. Though I was using the mode of transport, when required, I used to get down and travel by foot.

I had heard the name of Parjitar. Volunteer said that Paljitar is a surname. I have heard the name of F.E. Paljitar. He had written a book entitled 'Ancient Indian Historical Traditions'. The date of publication of the book is not in my mind and at this time I also do not remember the century and year of its publication but I had made a reference in this regard in my article and also mentioned the year of its publication in my article. Full name of Parjitar is Mr. F.E. Parjitar and the title of his book is 'Ancient Indian Historical Tradition'. I had specially referred it in my article relating to Mathura. The writers and books I had referred in my article, I did not consider treating them a logical base on this issue in my article. I had mentioned in my article on Ayodhya what Paljitar had said. I had referred his thoughts in my article. I had mentioned his thoughts in last and in one paragraph on page 114 in my article on Ayodhya. It is correct that in that paragraph I had only mentioned his opinion and therefore, did not show his name in the reference. It is correct that in that paragraph of my article I had not referred the name of Mr. Parjitar. It is also correct that my article on Ayodhya and the article on Mathura were published in the same magazine in two different issues. These were published in the proceedings

of different conferences of the organization known as ASHA. So far I recollect the organization named ASHA was established in 1944. It is wrong to say that I had written my article on the instance of R.S. Sharma, without conducting archaeological studies and wrote them according to his wishes. I do not write any article or book at the instance of anyone. Beside this magazine my article had been published in number of magazines during my life, while I do not remember correctly but I can tell the names of some of them as Journal of Bihar Research Society, Marg, Proceedings of All India Oriental Conferences, Proceedings of Indian History Congress, Numismatics Chronicles etc. My articles of Numismatics had also been published.

Mr. Parjitar in his article relating to Ancient Indian Traditions has given a family tree, which determines the period of Rama. It is totally wrong to say that it does not correspond with what I had prepared. It is correct that I had taken the names given in that family tree as imaginary. The time I had calculated on the basis of that family tree, it confirms that the names shown therein are imaginary. It is not a study of archaeology and that is why I had clearly mentioned it in my article, if Rama is treated as a historic person then on the basis of family tree prepared by Mr. Parjitar after examine the facts the conclusion arrived at, proves the actual facts. To my knowledge none else had prepared such a family tree. I had not read about the family tree prepared by someone else.

Question: Do you think it imaginary to have a temple of such as Rama's birthplace?

Answer: It s absolutely wrong.

I had never heard the name of Salar Masood. I have not been to Behraich. I had visited Barabanki. I had heard about the name of Saptarishi in Barabanki but do not remember at present. I am not a student of medieval history, which I had already said. I do not know whether Salar Masood was with Mohamad Ghazni while demolishing the Somnath temple. I had heard the name of Babar, Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir, Shahajahan and Aurangzeb. These all were Sultans and Rulers of Hindustan. It is correct that these all were ruling over Hindustan. It is correct that Akbar got land reforms done through Todarmal. I had heard the name of Abul Fazal. Babar was the Mughal Ruler, who ruled over Hindustan. I had not read especially about him, as Medieval Indian History was not my scope of work. I only know that Babar was a religious Mughal ruler. Babar was of Islam religion. It is wrong to say that on this basis I am saying .trim a religious king, it is only by study about his religious tendency. I had studied his tendency after reading the work done by him. I had read in many historical books relating to Babar about his religious tendency. It is wrong to say that I do not consider those books as the books of medieval period. I know that Babar did not impose Jazia Tax. I have the information that Akbar first of all abolished the Jazia Tax. I know that Jazia Tax was imposed only on Hindus. I do not know whether Babar used to take liquor and opium. I do not consider it a religious act to drink liquor and take opium. If somebody takes in the form of medicine then it is proper and according to religion. Babarnama is in Turkish language, therefore, I could not read it. Babarnama has been translated into English. I do not know the name of its translator. About the character of Babar I had read in the History book in school named 'Bharat Ka Itihas' and so far I recollect the name of the author was Tarani Prasad Sinha.

Question: Did you read about the religious character of Babar in the same book?

Answer: Whatever I had read about Babar in this book on that basis I had decided his character.

In addition to it I had read similar things about Babar in the other history books of lower classes. I have no information when Babar fought with Rana Sanga and at that time he uttered 'Tauba' and said he will not take liquor now. It is not correct to say that I have only knowledge that Babar attacked Hindustan and he ruled over it. The death of Babar took place in a natural way not in any war or battle. I had read in history books that his son Humayun was ill, he walked around his bed and prayed to Allah that the disease of Humayun may come to his body and Babar's health may go to him. Thereafter he gradually fell sick and died. This thing I read in my school history book. I take that book of that category and not an advance book on the subject. It is absolutely wrong that I am by habit speaking lie on this subject. It is wrong to say that I had fully studied Babar but I am deliberately concealing those facts.

I have no knowledge whether Babar ever visited Ayodhya. I had no information whether any ruler of Mughal period ever visited Ayodhya or not. The disputed Masjid was constructed in 1528 during Babar's rule; but I do not know whether it was constructed by his order or not. I had not done the archaeological study of the disputed Masjid because it was not the subject of my special study.

I know about the publication of magazine 'Antiquity'. This does not relate only with archaeology but it is concerned with the entire history, which includes archaeology too. I had not read Prof. B.B. Lal's report on

excavation of the disputed site. I do not know whether it has been published or not in the 'Antiquity' magazine relating to excavation.

I had not read any comprehensive report of Prof. B.B.Lal on excavation of disputed site other than that published in the Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology. In my opinion it was his whole report. According to Parjitar, the period of Rama comes around 1600 B.C. I agree that at different times at different levels the proof of inhabitation had been found. I agree with this fact that the archaeological evidence of inhabitation found through stratified layer and on that basis the dates of inhabitation are found. If the excavator finds any sign on it, he continues the excavation till he finds sign of virgin soil. I had not read about the excavation of Pratapgarh, therefore I am not in a position to tell you on what basis the earlier excavation there was stopped and after resuming the excavation, the inhabitation prior to 1600 B.C. was found therefrom I had heard the name of History Congress. I had participated in many of its conferences. The proceeding of Indian History Congress has been regularly published and I know it. I had heard about Bharatiya Itihas Sankalan Yojana Samiti. I had heard about the journal named Itihas Darpan published by the Samiti but I had not read it. I had no information whether king Akbar ever visited the disputed structure site in Ayodhya. I have the information that the idol of Ram1ala was placed there before the demolition of disputed structure but I do not know about the Kirtan held there. I. was aware of the year when the idol of Ramlala was placed in the disputed structure but I do not remember it at present. It is not correct to say that this fact was insignificant in my view. I had said that I did not get a chance. I had not written any book or article about any place or subject relating to archaeology, which I had not

seen myself. I had read the article of Ajay Mitra Shastri on disputed premises, which was read out in the World Archaeology Congress, Croatia 1998. My article was published before that. I had read Dr. S.P. Gupta's 'An Archaeologist's Open Letter to Prime Minister' which was related to disputed site. I had not read the article of Dr. T.P. Verma, relating to so-called petrograph. I had information that he had written an article on the subject. I had got this information after writing my article. I had discussed the books and articles, in my article which were published, prior to my writing the article. I had given their references in the end of my article. I had not heard the name of a historian known as Shri Ram Sharma and then said I had no information. I had heard the name of Vincent Smith. He too was an historian. I had not mentioned his name in my article. I had heard the name Navil I.C.S. who had got published the Gazetteer. I had not read the Gazetteer of Navil which is related to Faizabad. I had not read the Gazetteer published relating to Faizabad and Barabanki. I had heard the name of Joseph Triphenthar but not heard about him. I had not gone through any writing of Lenin. For the study of literature the travel description of tourists is a source. I had not read the travel description of any other foreign traveller except the Chinese traveller. There was no hurdle in studying them. It is correct that traditions are also the sources for the knowledge of history. I had said that if it is logical, then I do not agree with it that it has been coming from traditional days that Lord Rama was born in present Ayodhya. The birthday of Lord Rama has been celebrated on 9th day of Shukla Paksha of Chaitra, from traditional days. I do not know since how long this tradition is continuing. It is wrong to say that my family members following this tradition had been visiting Ayodhya. Ayodhya has become not a birthplace but a place of pilgrimage. That is why the people come here. It is called

'Mokshadayak Teerth'. I do not agree with the fact that it is known as Mokshadayak Teerth because God Rama took his birth as an incarnation of Vishnu. It is also wrong to say that it is the Ravana was born here. People consider it as a place of pilgrimage because as the incarnation of Vishnu, it is the field of activities of Rama. According to me all the people treat this place as salvation place not because of Janmasthan, but there are other reasons to treat it as salvation place. One of the reasons among them is where ever the qualities relating to Rama are narrated, all the pilgrimage places come there themselves. To my knowledge Setubandh Rameshwaram and Chitrakoot are not in this category, because these both the places are not in the list of 'Mokshadayak'. This I accept that people place Mathura too in the list of 'Mokshadayak'.

(Cross-examination of Veereshwar Prasad Dwivedi on behalf of Defendant No.22, Shri Umesh Chandra Pandey concluded)

(Cross-examination on behalf of Defendant No.13 by Shri Satya Dev Singh, Advocate)

xxx xxx xxx xxx

My subject in B.A was Ancient History. Archaeology was also taught at that time with Ancient History. It is correct to say that at that time there was no arrangement to teach the Archaeology separately. Now Archaeology is a separate subject and it is being taught as a separate subject. The study of Archaeology in different Universities started at different time. I had read British Archaeologists Mr. Kanigham, Mr. Marshal and Mr. Wheeler. I had not read any book written by Mr. Kanigham on Babri Masjid -; Ramjanambhoomi and not read any article written by

Marshal on Ayodhya. I had not read any book and article written by Kanigham on Babar. The ruling period of Babar falls under Medieval Indian History. I had read about Babar but not much. It is true that from the side of his father Babar was from Taimur family and from his mother's side he belonged to Changaze Khan family. It is correct that Taimur and Changaze both were Mangol. I do not know whether the Mangol word became Mugbal later on. It is wrong to say that Babar was not Muslim. To know Babar, archaeological evidences are not required. One can find in any book of Indian History that Babar was a Muslim. I do not know whether he was a Sunni or Shia Muslim. I do not know whether Babar's son Humayun was from his Shia wife. I had no particular knowledge about medieval history. I had no information how many Masjids were constructed by him. I had no knowledge whether Babar himself had ever, constructed Masjid anywhere or not.

I have read Atharva Ved only in the context of Ayodhya. I have not read full I have not read Vedic Sanskrit. I know that Vedic and Sanskrit used in literature are different. I had not read Ayurved so I do not know the mantras mentioned therein, according to which all the Veds appeared at one time. I do not know whether the name of Atharva Ved has been mentioned in Ayurved or not. I had not read the full mantra relating to Ayodhya in Atharva Ved because in its English translation I had only read that Ayodhya was one of the mythical cities of Gods. I had read the English translation of Rig Ved, translated by Griffith. From that I derive out that Veds are the part of history. I had also read the English translation of Atharva Ved, but do not remember the name of its translator. I had not read Ayurved and Sam Ved because these were not required in connection of my work. I had read Rig Ved and Atharva Ved in connection of my work. I had not studied all the Veds. I

had read English translation of Atharva Ved for reference and in the context of writing my article and also to the chronical period of history. There is no specific chapter on chronical period in Atharva Ved. I had read Rig Ved for reference and in it also there is no specific chapter to know the chronical period. I had read Agni, Indra, Vishnu, Saraswati etc. to know about them as per my requirement to write an article. I had also read 'Brahman' for reference purposes. I had not read the context of Ganga and Yamuna in Veds, but had read river Sindhi I had not specifically read the name of Rishis like Vishwamitra, Zamdagni, Gautam, Bhardwaj, and Parashara etc. I cannot tell you the verbal meaning of these names.

My Ph.D. Degree is on Baudh literature. This research work of mine had no connection with the story of Ayodhya. But my research work does had connection with the paleography of the petrograph recovered from so called Ayodhya. The script related to Brahmi is the paliograph recovered from the so-called petrographs of Ayodhya and my research work is also connected with the manuscript emerged out of Brahmi alphabets. The results achieved after the excavation of archaeological sites reveal that no human being lived there in Ayodhya between 5th to 10th Centuries. It means it was deserted. From the archaeological point of view, no such evidence had so far been found which could prove who established the present Ayodhya. The reasons of Auyodbya being remained deserted during 5th to 10th Century, archaeological evidences are not available. May be it had become deserted in a ntural way. There are no archaeological facts available to show the name of the person, king, Nawab or emperor who re-established Ayodhya. The proof of any evidence is not available as to why the present Auyodbya was inhabited or made to inhabit during 10th Century. It can be presumed but archaeological evidences are not

available. I think the increase in population may be one of the reasons and the other reason is the land of Ayodhya being fertile. I do not know the present distance between Ayodhya and Faizabad cities. I had not seen both the cities from this angle. There is some vacant land between the both. The two reasons, which I had mentioned about the inhabitation of Ayodhya, I do not think there is any other reason due to the lack of evidence to assess the inhabitation of Ayodhya city. The presumption is also based on the conclusion of any evidence and thereafter that prescription takes the shape of facts. It is correct that I had mentioned in my article that Tulsidas started writing Ramcharitmanas in Ayodhya on a particular date. Tulsidas in his Ramcharitmanas used the word 'Prakasa' it means that particular date and time, when he started writing Ramcharitmanas. Prakasa "Prasaran" and not "Prakashan" (Publication). Tulsidas in his Ramcharitmanas has written that on the basis of many Puranas, Nigam, and Aagam and also on the basis what has been written in Valmiki Ramayana and elsewhere in other books I am writing the story of Rama in the language of common people for my own satisfaction. It is correct to say that Tulsidas while writing Ramcharitmanas has used Ramayana, Purana, Nigam and Aagam etc. for reference purposes.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Sitaram Rai

2.5.2002

Typed the stenographer in the open court as dictated us. In continuation of this for further cross-examination be present on 3.5.2002..

Sd/-

2.5.2002

3.5.2002

(Statement of P.W. 28 Shri Sitaram Rai in continuation of 02.05.2002 started after taking the oath.)

It is correct that I had described this fact in my article that Tulsidas first used to live in Kashi and after coming to Ayodhya he started writing Ramcharitmanas. It is mentioned in the Ramcharitmanas that Tulsidas writing Ramcharitmanas on Shukla Navami of Chaitra but in the whole Ramcharitmanas he had not shown it anywhere that according to earlier recognition Ramchandra was born on that date. I consider the character of Rama as an imaginary. So the question of deciding his date of birth does not arise. Why did Tulsidas mentioned this date in the Ramcharitmanas, he had not given reasons thereto and I too not find any rationale filets to find it out.

Question: Whether there is any relation or not between act and reason?

Answer: Many acts are based on reasons. But for some acts, reasons are not necessary.

I stablise myself in accordance to circumstances and facts. Some acts are done without reasons. I convey my work according to my requirement Tulsidas has written 'Bandau Pratham Mahisur Chama'. It may be possible that he had written 'Je Bin kaj dahiney banye' which I do not remember this time. It has been written in Valmiki Ramayana that Manu himself established Ayodhya and he was its first king. It is also correct that it has been written in Valmiki Ramayana that he ruled over it in the same manner as Indra ruled over Amravati. It has been written in

the Ramayana that Dashrath was from the family of Manu but I take all these to the same family.

Question: You do not take it correct that first of all Manu established Ayodhya and ruled over it, Dashrath and Ram were from the family of Manu and Ram possesses the splanderness of Manu and Adam because you do not have any archaeological evidence?

Answer: Not only from these reasons, but there is lack of scientific reasoning. It is not proved on the footing of reasoning.

I had referred the Ayodhya of which I had information, in my article (No.199-C 2/1). Immediately I have no knowledge of such Auyodhya where Saryu is flowing on its north. My article 199-C 2/1) page 118 in the couplets it might have been written by Tulsidas keeping in view the Awadbpuri because the word Ayodhya has not been used in it. The same Awadhpuri has now been known as Ayodhya. At that time its name was not Auyodhya. Besides this the Ayodhya about which I had written I had given the names of the rivers on the bank it is situated and its distance therefrom and the directions in which it is situated along with its reference, I had given in my article. Except this article I had written no other article with the title Ayodhya. Besides this I had not written any article on Awadhpuri. I, in this article, had written about the Ayodhya of Valmiki Ramayana the Ayodhya of about which the Chinese pilgrim Hieun Tsang has written and the Ayodhya mentioned in Jain books.

Question: You had mentioned various Ayodhyas in your article only with the intention that this Ayodhya is not that one where Lord Rama was born?

Answer: To say this is absolutely wrong. I only with the above intention had mentioned the various Ayodhyas in my article.

It is correct that on the basis of-mythological stories Ayodhya was the capita] of Kaushal Rajya. I do not agree that the Kaushal Rajya comprised with the various areas of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Nepal, because I had no knowledge of its geographical position. I do not have information whether during the rule of King Dashrath, Vindhya Pradesh i.e. Madhya Pradesh was included in Kaushal Rajya or not I have no information whether on the southern side of Ayodhya and near the Vindhya Hills. King Kalvya was the ruler, who is considered the maternal grand father of Lord Rama. Because I had not read this, and if it is there that too for me is an imaginary character. In Valmiki Ramayana I had read that God Rama had two sons named Lav and Kush. But to me it is also an imaginary. I do not agree with it, that the Historian is influenced by someone, and he then writes the History.

Question: Whether it is correct to say that Indian Archaeologists in their excavations and surveys in Eastern Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have shown their miserliness in determining the period of archaeological sights and hose who observed such miserliness was considered an extraordinary scholar during British role and this tendency remained prevalent till many decades after Independence and these scholars have been insulting the Indian culture taking it as an.

imaginary and they determined the dates in their own arbitrary manner and they fed it before the public by saying it a scientific system?

Answer: It is totally wrong to say so.

I had the information only when I received the court summons 3-4 days ago in regard to this suit. I had not talked with anybody before coming to this court for witness. Before receiving the summons, I had no knowledge why I had been summoned to the court. I do not know the date of lodging the suit till today. So it is wrong to say that I had written his article after lodging the suit. I had already revealed in my statement that I had made up my mind to write the article in 1977 about the seven Mokshadayi pilgrimages concerning salvation. I had started from Ayodhya and till now I had reached to Kashi. It is wrong to say that till this day I had written articles only on disputed sites. It is totally wrong to say that I had written this article with aim to make proof in the suit. I do not know whether there had been any information to Plaintiff or his Advocate about this article prior to my coming to this place. It is also wrong to say that I have been asked to write this article and that is why I have been asked to appear as Witness. It is also wrong to say that I declare every authentic fact as imaginary or mythic.

(Mahant Dharmdas, Defendant No. 13. On his behalf, Cross-examination by Shri Satya Dev Singh, Advocate concluded).

(Cross-examination on behalf of Plaintiffs and others. Original Suit No.5/89 by Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey , Advocate).

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

It is correct that I had written in my article that there is no mention of Auyodhya in Ramcharitmanas and the same I had deposed in my statement. On this point the learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to line 2 of Doha No.26 page No.603 of Shri Ramcharitmanas Paper No.258 C-1/4 submitted with other original Suit No.5/89 and said that Ayodhya had been mentioned in it. What do you want to say in this regard? The Witness saw it and replied that Awadhpuri is correct here in place of Ayodhya. The word Ayodhya had been inserted here in the later manuscript. It is correct that in 'Chaupai' of this publication Ayodhya has been mentioned and Awadhpuri has not been used. In addition to it I am to request that in this publication instead of 'Sopan' the word 'Kand' has been used whereas it is not in original Ramcharitmanas.

Question: Did you read the original manuscript of Ramcharitmanas

Answer: I had seen the Ramcharitmanas published on the basis of original manuscript but not seen the original manuscript.

It is correct that Paper No.258 C-1/4 is not based on the original manuscript. The published second copy of this book is authentic or not this much I do not know but the logical fact in Ramcharitmanas is that it is Awadhpuri in place of word 'Ayodhya' and 'Kands' have been mentioned therein on the basis of Ramayana.

It is correct that Dohas and Chaupais are written on the basis of matras given in grammar. Every line of a

Chaupai contains 16 matras. It has 16 matras, then it is correct Chaupai.

(On this point the learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to the second Chaupai below Doha No.26 on page 603 of Paper No.258 - I/4 of Ramcharitmanas submitted aalong with other original suit No.5/89). The Witness after seeing it said it contains 16 -matras. It is correct that as per grammar this Chaupai is right. I in my article and statement had said that the use of word Mandir started after the writing of Awadhpuri is correct here in place of Ayodhya. The word Ayodhya had been inserted here in the Ramcharitmanas. Before it the word Mandir was in use but that was not used for the home of God and Goddesses but was used for the home of human being. There can be 'Nrip Mandir' but that too for the home of mankind. It is correct that Hari means Valmiki. The Hari Mandir may be Vishnu Mandir at present but if it is said in 15th or 16th century then it's meaning ill be the residence of a person known by the name Hari. I do not know the date of fight between Rama and Ravana in Lanka, because it is hypothetical. The writing period of Ramcharitmanas has been given in the Manas itself.

The learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to 5th Chaupai of 4th Doha on page No.465 of said Ramcharitmanas submitted along with other Original suit No.5/89. The Witness after reading it said it is correct that Hari Mandir has been mentioned in the line. As I had said all the Mandirs mentioned in these tines has meaning of residence of human beings, only one Mandir can be mentioned as Dev Mandir. I had not read Rudrayamal Whenever I used to go to Ayodhya, I was accompanied by my father, mother, uncle and aunt etc. I had never entered into any discussion with my family members that there are many imaginary things in the

Ramayana. I do not think the present Ayodhya as an imaginary city. The present Ayodhya has recently been recognized as one of the seven Mokshadayaki places of salvation, it is not a place of virtues. To my mind it has been recognized as a place of Mokshadayaki salvation during near about 18th century. On the basis of study I had determined and arrived to a conclusion of the date of pilgrimage place Mokshadayaki Ayodhya as a place of salvation. In the book Teerth Prakash written by Mitra Mishra of 1615 to 1645 AD there are the names of 14 Teerth places in Ayodhya as mentioned in Skandh Puran. Ayodhya is not one of them. Chaukhamba has published it and the date of publication is not in my mind at present, perhaps it may be 1917. The second book has been published by Shri P.B. Kane and the date of its publication would be near about 1973. I do not remember correctly at present. Chaukhamba is not the name of any place but it is an organization which is in Banaras and publishes the books of Sanskrit. The 'Teerth Sthar means a place where the people visit to earn spiritual reward. I had not read Rudrayamal so I cannot tell you the date of its publication. Not only on the basis of above book but I had read Ayodhya Mahatamya and also on the basis of archaeological sources, I had reached the conclusion that Ayodhya became a pilgrimage place due to the popularity of Ramcharitmanas. I had not read reference of Mandir in the form of temple in Valmiki Ramayana. To me Narayan means a place where man lives and the meaning of Shri Narayan is Vishnu.

On this point the learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the witness to couplet 1 to 7 of Sixth Sarga on page No.192 of Shrimad Valmiki Ramayana presented with paper No.261 C-1/1 to other original suit No.5189. The Witness after reading it said, it is

not clear from it that in the Shri Dev Mandir, Shri Narayan was worshiped. The Witness after seeing couplet No.3 and 4 on the same page said the word Mandir has not been used in it. It is correct that in this book in the translation of couplet word Mandir has been used. I myself had admitted it in my statement that word Ayodhya had been used in Valmiki Ramayana. It is correct that it has been written in these books that God Vishnu is being worshiped by different names in different times. It is correct that even today in India God Vishnu is worshiped by different names in different parts. It is correct that out of the thousand names of Vishnu Ram is one of them. Although I have not counted the number but Ayodhya is the center of Ram Bhakhats, therefore, their number may be more there. The historical facts are mainly as under:

The Ramcharitmanas of Tulsidas presents the knowledge of his time, the time of writing the book and the social conditions of that time etc. In Ramcharitmanas Tulsidas has depicted the character of Rama for his self-satisfaction and that depiction is the ideal of Tulsidas. The characterization of Rama is not historical. I treat Rama Chandra as a character of an epic. As I said the character of Rama was Imaginary so the question does not arise whether, to me he was 'Purushottam' or not. In my heart there is no devotion towards Rama but has a sense of reverence to his characteristic qualities. It is wrong to say that I accept the character of an imaginary person. It is correct that Ramcharitmanas had no historical importance except the three things, which I have stated above. I do not know when at the age of 10, I visited Ayodhya at that time my parents told me or not that it was the birthplace of Rama Chandrajī. My parents brought me with them not with any specific purpose but only to keep me with themselves. At the age of 10, I was a student of primary school. In 1988

when I came to Ayodhya with my family members' at that time the aim of my visit was to study about Ayodhya. It is correct to say that by 1988 I had the knowledge that the present Ayodhya is not Ayodhya which has been described in Valmiki Ramayana. At that time I went to Ayodhya with a view to collect facts about Ayodhya. So far my family members are concerned their aim was to travel and take Darhsan in Ayodhya. They went to Ayodhya to see all the world sight seeing places. I do not know the name of the places where they used to go for sight seeing. They used to come back after their free walk and I used to remain busy with my work. There were no discussions about Ayodhya and places in Ayodhya between my family members and me because my objective and the objective of my family members were different therefore, we did not discuss. My family members and myself, we all are Rama Bhakt Vaishnav. It is correct that Vaishnav people worship Rama and Krishna according to their wishes. It has been said 'Jaki rahi bhavna jaisi, Prabhu murati dekhi tin taisi'. It means all do the bhakti according to their wishes. I do not agree with this contention that according to Vaishnavs' view point the importance is of idol. It is correct that those who worship idol are called Sagun Upasak. I do not agree with this that all the Vaishnavs are Sagun Upasak. I cannot tell the date from which the 'Vaishnav Mat' started. But so far I recollect its period the period of Rambhakt Vaishnav started from the time of Swami Rama Nand (10th Century). I do not agree that there is any particular way propounded for the pooja of Rama. I do not know whether the founder of Vaishnav Sect had discussed about Nirgtm Vidhi or not and said about Nirguna Upasaka or not. That much I had read in Kabir Sahitya (Beejak) and heard from the mouth of Seers. Those who follow Kabir are called Kabir Panthi and Kahir Panthis are also known as Vaishnav, as I was taught in childhood that God is kind and judicious. I will place both

the words Sagun and Nirgun. It is wrong to say that I am not Rambhakta. The Ayodhya about which I had written my article, Prof B.B.Lal had written an article about the same Ayodhya, which was published in Encyclopedia of Archaeology. I do not agree fully with the above article of Prof. B.B. Lal, but most of the facts mentioned therein had become base of my article and I agree only with those facts. I had not read any article of any other writer except Prof. B.B. Lal's above article before I wrote my article. It is absolutely wrong to say that I had written my article only because I had no reverence for Rama.

To my knowledge the ground floor building of the disputed site had an architectural importance. In architecture the method of building construction design and the building method of that time and other technical terms are included and this archaeological importance was from architectural view. The architectural importance has special place from archaeological point of view. The 14-pillars, which I had referred earlier had archaeological importance. The excavation done so far, the archaeological importance of anything found outside the disputed site, has not been proved. It was necessary to carry out excavation around the disputed building, so the excavation work had been undertaken.

Question: To know about the constructed pillars at the disputed site and the pillars outside the building, whether excavation was necessary or not?

Answer: To know about the pillars of the disputed building it was not necessary to undertake excavation below the building.

To know about the archaeological importance at northern and southern walls, it was not necessary and this is my opinion about the eastern and western walls also. I went to the disputed site in 1988. As I had already seen the excavation work of disputed site, I therefore did not pay attention to the place in 1988 where the excavation was done

In 1988 I had not inspected the site of excavation because I had already earned the knowledge about it. I had gone to disputed site in 1977. In 1977 I had seen the construction done at the disputed site. I had only prepared notes relating to excavation work and was satisfied with them and after seeing the disputed building I did not think it necessary to prepare the notes.

It is correct that when I was in service under the Govt. of Bihar my area of Govt. work was limited to Bihar only but my research work was beyond Bihar, because for research work there was no restriction in Govt. service. I therefore, remained studying the research work and I completed the work relating to my Ph.D. during my service. The Masjids, which I had inspected things my service tenure, none of them had the idol of God or Goddess and I had not seen the picture of any idol or Baraha Devta. I had said in my view, there is no Baraha Devta.

(On this point the learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to the Pictures NO.9 and 10 in the black and white album compiled by U.P. Archaeological Organization Department.) After seeing it the Witness said there is no figure visible in Picture No.9 but a figure of some animal is visible in Picture No.10. But to say that there is figure of Pig in Picture No.10 is not

clear. I cannot imagine whether this picture can be of any other animal other than pig or not.

(The learned advocate cross-examining the witness drew attention of the Witness to Picture No.13, 14, 15 and 16 of the colour album compiled by the D.P. Archaeological Organization.) After seeing the picture the Witness said no picture is clearly visible in Picture No. 13 lagayat 16. Then said an animal like figure is visible in Picture No.16 but the animal is not clear in it. I cannot say whether it is the picture of a pig or not. It is correct to say that in the above picture an animal like figure is visible. I do not remember if I had seen or not the picture of any animal in a Masjid.

From the archaeological point of view in India, we find the signs of construction of buildings in Maurya period i.e. before the 3 B. C. Besides this the archaeological pictures of buildings are also seen in 3 thousand years before Christ in the Indus Valley civilization. In the beginning, buildings were constructed by Kachhi Geeli Mittee (unbaked wet soil) and thereafter use of unbaked bricks started and afterwards pucca bricks began to be used in construction of buildings. I do not agree with this that the do not agree with this too that only by taking out the bricks from the Kaccha wall the adhesive soil will get detached from it. The Association named ASHA in whose magazine I had got my article published, is a Registered Society. This magazine is available on sale in the market. I do not remember the price of this magazine. The magazine owned by the association ASHA is being published by ASHA. I am also a member of this Association. I do not know whether Dr. S.C. Mishra is also a member of this Association or not. I do not know whether Dr. Sushil Srivastava is its member or not. Prof. Suraj Bhan is a member of this Association. I do not recollect whether Ms. Subeera Jaiswal, Shri S.Gopal,

Romilla Thapar, R.S. Sharma, Shri B.N.S. Yadav, Shri D.P. Aggarwal, Shri S.C. Bhattacharya and N.C. Ghosh are the members of this Association or not. I do not know this too, whether Sarvapalli Gopal Bipin Chander, Sarvsachhi Bhattacharya, Harivansh Mukhetjee, K.N. Panikar, R.Champak Laxmi, Satish Aggarwal, B.D. Chattopadhyaya, and R.N. Verma, are the members or not of the above Association. I have no information, whether the articles of Prof. R.S. Sharma, are published only by the People Publishing House or not. I had seen his books being published by other publishers also.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/

Sitaram Rai

03.05.2002

Typed by stenographer in the open court as dictated by us.
In continuation for further cross- examination, be present
on 13.05.2002.

Sd/-

3.5.2002

13.05.2002

Before the Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional
District Judge/Special Duty Officer, High Court,
Lucknow

P.W.28 Shri Sitaram Rai

The Special Full Bench of the Honorable High Court
Allahabad, Lucknow Divisional Bench, Lucknow appointed
the Commissioner vide orders passed on
21.03.2002/03.05.2002 in other original suit No.4/89
(Original Suit No. 12/61 - The Sunni Central Board of
Waqfs, U.P. and others Vs. Gopal Singh Visharad and
others)

(In continuation of 03.05.2002 cross-examination of P.W.
28, Shri Sitaram Rai by Shri Ved Prakash, Advocate begins
after taking the oath)

I do not know whether the above named persons had
constituted an Association named Center for Historical
Studies or not. I do not know whether some of the above
named persons had constituted an Association with the
name Tracks of Time or not. I had the original printed copy
of Paper No.199 C-2/1 and 199 C-2/2 in which my articles
are printed. The original copy in which my articles have
been published is with me. I had not seen the price in it. It
may be possible that for writer that may be a
complementary copy without price print. I had seen both
and it is with me. Because I was not charged any cost, I did
not try to find it out. After seeing Paper No. 199 C-2/1 the
Witness said it is photocopy of Print and Paper No.199 C-
2/2 is also the photocopy of print. The summon which I got,
I was not asked to bring anything with me. The suit of

which I am a Witness, I had never had any discussion with its plaintiffs that the article is with me. I do not know any Officer or staff member of Sunni Central Board of Waqf. I had a talk only with Shri Zaffaryab Jilani who is present here in the court and is an Advocate of the suit. I had met Shri Jilani Sahib after coming to Lucknow. I had come to Lucknow at the time when I got summon for the first time in this suit and at that time I first met Jilani Sahib. I do not know who had proposed my name for witness in this case. I do not know Mohammad Sidiqee alias Hafiz Mohamad Sidiqee, Plaintiff No.2. I also do not know Zia-u-din Sahib, Mohd. Hashim, Maulana Mahfurzur Rahman, Mohammad Ahmad and Farooq Ahmad. After my receiving the summons, Shri Jilani Sahib rang me up at my home. I was not at home at that time. He told my family members the context of the summon. My family members told him that he would reach the court on scheduled date. I had not given my telephone number to Jilani Sahib. He himself might have obtained it. Before receiving the summons, I was not aware that I had to appear for witness in this case. I had never revealed about my article Paper No.199 C-2/1 and 199 C-2/2 to Plaintiffs and Shri Jilani Sahib. After receiving the summons, I came and met Shri Jilani Sahib and he saw my article also. It was Sunday when Jilani Sahib saw my article and the case started on Monday perhaps it may be 22nd April 2002.

Question: When you received summon of this case did you know in what context you have to give your witness?

Answer: When summon was served at my home, immediately thereafter Jilani Sahib had a talk with my family members and the factual position was made known to them and after my return to

home, I had to come to Lucknow in the context of this summon, therefore, I was made known. Factual position means in what context I have come here to give witness.

Question: After receiving the summons did you know in what context you have been called for witness?

Answer: After receiving the summons I was fully aware from my family members in what context I have been asked to come to Lucknow for giving witness.

In the context means to me the, context in which I am giving witness. When I met Jilani Sahib at that time I was only introduced to him. Other people are also sitting here but I do not know them. It was my first face-to-face introduction. I had shown all the papers, which I had in my possession to Jilani Sahib.

It is not to say that whom so ever I see from my eyes I believe that he is the genuine one and which I do not see from eyes I take it as an imaginary.

Question: Will you treat the man as an imaginary whose family tree is available?

(On this question the learned advocate of Plaintiffs Shri Abdul Mannan raised objection that the question is irrelevant and out of context).

Answer: The family tree of a person is if available on the basis of authentic historical facts that cannot be imaginary and the family tree which is concocted will be treated imaginary.

Question: Did you read in any book that Dashrath's son Shri Rama was imaginary person?

Answer: After going through the Ancient Indian Historical Traditions of F.F. Parjiter, which he completed on the basis of epics and Purans, Dashrath's son, Rama appears to be an imaginary person.

None of the Indian writer had made such a mythical family tree. All agree to it. Professor R.S. Sharma, Dr. Yogendra Mishra, Dr. B.P. Sinha, who passed away a week ago, all agree to it. Dr. D.C. Sarkar also accept the above thing. I do not remember the names of the History Books of the above named persons in which they had written the above facts but it had he base for determining the date of historical writings. It is wrong to say that the books of the above writers were written in Nineties or there after but these were written earlier. All the books had been written in the 20th Century but I do not know when. It is wrong to say that with a view to misrepresent Rama these books were written in Nineties in a planned manner. I consulted the book written by Parjiter Sahib in 1953. It is wrong to say that I give much importance to foreign writers over Indian writers. What is proper in my mind I treat it proper and what is improper I take it improper. I take Rama as imaginary and the incarnation of Vishnu too as imaginary. So I do not search for that thing. I had not heard about the writer with the name Avadhvasi Bhoop alias Sita Ram, before today.

Question: Did you see the book written by Avadhvasi Bhoop alias Sita Ram with the title Ayodhya Ka Itihas, which was published by Prayag Hindustani Academy U.P. in 1932?

Answer: This being not proved historically people do not place it in the list of genuine Historical list. For this reason, the question of my seeing it does not arise.

Question: Can you quote the name of any such genuine historian who in his book had written that the facts written by Avadhvasi Bhoop alias Sita Ram in his book Ayodhya Ka Itihas, published in 1932 are wrong?

Answer: This is not such a book that after seeing it any genuine historian may write it, because I am just seeing inside of this book the son of Dilip, who is known Raghu elsewhere is written with other name in the book. So it is not even of that category that someone may comment on it.

Question: Did you read the name of Dilip Devergh Bahu, Raghu, Aj, Dashrath, Shri Ram Chandra, Kush, and Atithi etc in any book?

Answer: I had read these names in epics and Purans and considered them as imaginary.

I have not read about Christ. It is not my work field. Mohammad Sahib is an historic personality. It is wrong to say that Christ is not an historical personality. Samvat is after his name.

Question: Was Mahatma Gandhi an imaginary figure?

(On this the learned advocate of the Plaintiffs Shri Jilani raised objection that by asking such improper question the

time of the court is being wasted and Father of the Nation is being insulted)

Answer: This question is not at all relevant. Who does not know the father of nation Mahatma Gandhi, Marx and Lenin are out of my work field but their names are not imaginary.

Question: Had you gone through the Gazetteer published by the Government regarding the disputed site before establishing your opinion?

Answer: The facts, which had been written in my article and the objective with which I had written the article, the study of Gazetteer was not required for writing it.

Question: In your opinion for making free and frank opinion is it not necessary to read both in favour and against articles on the subject and their writers?

Answer: It is totally wrong that for giving impartial advice, the articles written in favour and against should be given without reading them, but for the fulfillment of the objective of the articles, the facts required to be written after taking both the facts given in favour and against in my mind.

When I visited the site I had not seen the stone with the figure of Pig but it is shown in the photo here.

Question: If the picture of a pig has been drawn on a stone of a building complex and the Muslims say it a Masjid then in your opinion efforts were made to

construct Masjid at that place by demolishing a temple. Is it correct?

(On this the learned advocate of Plaintiffs Shri Zafaryab Jilani raised objection that it was a compound question and was hypothetical which should not be permitted).

Answer: It is totally wrong and I disagree with it because the residential sign of any type whether it is of Mandir or Masjid, anybody can place it by taking from anywhere.

I know Dr. Sushil Srivastava by name. I am not acquainted with him. I had not read his book the 'Disputed Mosque'. It is wrong to say that for greed of money I had written this article with malafide intention. I had already said that I started writing this article in 1977.

Question: You had not read the important books, articles relating to disputed site and Shri Rama and also the eminent writer and with malafide intention you had come for witness and wrote the article?

Answer: It is quite wrong to say rather for writing my article I had consulted all the meaningful and factual facts and read the evidences and completed my article.

(On behalf of Plaintiff Suit No.5/89 the Cross-examination by Shri Ved Prakash, Advocate and Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate concluded)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

(Hindu Maha Sabha Defendant No.10 and Shri Ramesh Chandra Tripathi, Defendant No.17 on their behalf, the Cross-examination by Shri Hari Shankar Jain and on behalf of other Defendants, the Cross-examination put forward earlier had been adopted)

(On behalf of Defendant No.20 the Cross-examination of Shri S.P. Pandey, Advocate and others Cross-examination put forward earlier had been adopted)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

(Cross-examination on behalf of Rajendra Singh, Plaintiff, Suit No. 1/89 by Shri Putu Lal Mishra, Advocate begins)

I am totally theist and have faith in God. It is correct that my article, which was published in 1997, I started writing it in 1977 at that time Prof. B.B. Lal started excavation in Ayodhya under his Archaeology of Ramayana Site Research. This anxiety rose in mind before 1977 but by that time none of the Archaeological facts were available to us. Before 1977, I was anxious for other archaeological subjects on which I wrote articles. Among them were Journey of Rama in Bihar, Itinerary of Chinese Pilgrims in Bihar, Journey of Buddha in Bihar etc. It is' absolutely wrong to say that I had written on the above subjects in an official capacity. I had written it on the basis of personal research work. All the above three articles had been published in the Comprehensive History of Bihar. I do not remember the date and year of their publication. But all these three articles were published before 1977. Apart from these three articles many other articles of mine were published viz. there are three to four articles in Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology. Several articles in Journal of Bihar Research Society, I had written many

articles in Numismatic, Chronicle, then said one or two articles. There is one article in Marg also etc. The article on Ayodhya was published in 1996, and none other had been published except that only a small reference had been given in Journey of Rama in Bihar. The way through which Rama travelled, the important places falling on the way, I in that article viz. Journey of Rama in Bihar had recognized those places on the basis of history and archaeology. If we see the historical background of modern Bihar, Magadh, Mithila, Rajgirah and Vaishali are in it. People say that the Ashram of Vishwamitra as per tradition was near about the present Buxar. But according to archaeological survey no evidence of that time in this connection had been found. By evidence, I mean archaeological remains. In Buxar survey were conducted on the bank of river Ganga and present uphill and the spots were then selected. For archaeological excavation ancient uphill, ruins, other remains of building, and the residential signs on the bank of rivers are important. I had surveyed that place on the basis of facts given in Ramayana but due to lack of archaeological evidence I could not reach the conclusion and at last I had to accept that it is imaginary. I, in my article had tried only to identify the present name of the places given in Ramayana. As per tradition people think the Ashram of Vishwamitra in Buxar, but those people had not prescribed its boundaries. As per popular sayings Tarka was killed at that place. Mareech and Subahu who used to disturb the Yagya of Vishwamitra and with whom Rama fought is the same place as per popular saying. The Ashram of Gautam Rishi and the place of Ahilya are also covered in my article. As per popular saying the place of Ahilya is in the north-east of river Ganga. Then said it was less towards north and more towards east. The so-called Janakpuri is now in the Tarai of Nepal near Joynagar. The geographical position of Mithila has been depicted in the following lines:

'Ganga bahati j anik dakshin disi, Puray Kaushik dhara,
 Paschim bahati Gandaki, Uttar Himwant Bal vistara.
 Kamla TriYug, Ghemura, Bagmati Kritsara,
 Madhya bahati Laxman Pravirati Se Mithila vidyagara.'

These lines are the extracts from Chanda Jha's book. Its contents in brief are that in the North there is the King of mountains Himalaya, in the South the sacred river Ganga, River Kosi in the east and River Gandak is in the west. I do not agree with this that as per popular saying this whole region was under King Janak. According to popular saying out of the above area people consider the present Darbhanga, Madhubani and Samastipur Districts, it is the Mithila of King Janak. The capital of King Janak according to people was Janakpuri, which at that time was in Bihar (then Mithila). That Janakpuri is now within the territory of Nepal. The area of Avadh is under Kaushal. The boundaries of Mithila and Kaushal are not clear according to historical point of view and popular sayings. The Ashram of Vishwamitra was not in Mithila province. At one place the northern banks of river Ganga are concerned with the boundaries of Mithila. That place even today is called Vidyapati Nagar, because Vidyapati died there. River Ganga is on the southern side of Vidyapati Nagar. From that place the distance of Buxar is about 200 kilometers or more. The place in the southern side of river Ganga, which I had surveyed as Vishwamitra Ashram from the archaeological point of view is at a distance of 200 K.M. a bit south and more in west from Vidyapati Nagar. The area of river Ganga is about 10-15 kilometers wide towards south. After taking a bend from south towards west the distance from there will be about 200 K.M. It is difficult to say that in Ramayana era the river Ganga used to flow at the same place where it flows presently, because within

300 years the discussions regarding flow of Ganga's waves are found different in different literature. As during Mauriyan period Patliputra had been described on the bank of river Ganga, but after 200 years during Sunga period Patliputra had been written established on the bank of 'Shoun'. 'Anu Shoun Patliputram'. It is the nature of every river that it can change its flow at times. In Patliputra where Ganga used to flow 500 years ago, it is still flowing there. On the basis of study I can say that in Varanasi Ganga is flowing at the same place where it was flowing in 200 B.C. I am not talking this on the basis of assumptions. Whenever, a river changes its flow the civilization falling on its way is submerged. On archaeological basis I had not got the information that the place, where it was said, the Ashram of Vishwamitra, that place may have submerged due to change in the flow of river Ganga or may have gone down the earth. It is correct that the civilization, which had been submerged due to the change of flow of Rivers, the remains of such a civilization are often found again after the change in the flow or the place becoming dry.

Verified the statement after reading.

Sd/-
Sitaram Rai
13.05.2002

Typed by the Stenographer in an open court as dictated by me.. In continuation for further cross-examination. be present tomorrow 14.05.2002

Sd/-
Narendra Prasad
Commissioner
13.05.2002

14.05.2002

Before: Shri Narendra Prasad, Commissioner, Additional
District Judge/Special Duty Officer, High Court
Lucknow

(In continuation of 13.05.2002 statement of P.W. 28, Dr.
Sitaram Rai, begins after taking oath.)

Kashi is very old city of India and Gangaji flows on its bank. Prayag is famously known as Teertharaj Prayag from the medieval age. Before that Prayag was known as an important place. In Ramcharitmanas Prayag has been called as Teertharaj. Since 200 B.C. Kashi and Prayag are located at the same place where they were then. I know the place where river Saryu meets with river Ganga, because it meets with Ganga near Chapra. It is difficult to tell the origin of river Saryu because it has been discussed in Rig Ved. Amongst the oldest rivers of India Ganga and Saryu had been discussed, Yamuna has been discussed in the form of Kalindi in olden age. I cannot tell you about the oldest cities located along with the bank of Saryu, because Ayodhya, which has been referred in Valmiki Ramayana, that had been said at a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ Yojan from Saryu. People treat 1 Yojan as minimum $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles and maximum 9 miles and it has a reference in the Dictionary. Where people treat one Yojan as $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles there the meaning of $1\frac{1}{2}$ Yojan will be $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles. The Ayodhya, which is situated on the bank of river Saryu in Faizabad, there the oldest signs of human inhabitation are not found prior to 700 B.C. A city is how much old to know it in the history, archaeology is one of the most effective means. Ayodhya is situated in the south of Saryu. In the north of Ayodhya the river Saryu is flowing adjacent to it.

Question: What is the period of Ramayana in history?

Answer: I had considered the characters of Ramayana as an imaginary. If we see in the context of history the period of Rama will be atleast 1600 B.C. If we put Rama in that period, we do not find any sign of human inhabitation at that place. So to consider this point will be only hypothetical.

Almost all the historians and archaeologists are unanimous over fixing the period of Ramayana. The period of Mahabharata has been calculated as 9th Century, as mentioned in the Political History of Modern India by Hemchander Rai Choudhary. The Historians are accepting it at present. The Historians had not mentioned the time limit of Mahabharat period. I had taken the above decision after reading Wintemeez, History of Indian Literature, Macdonel and Keith's History of Sanskrit literature and Baldev Upadhyaya's Sanskrit Sahitya ka Itihas. Except Baldev Upadhyaya, all are the scholar of history. Besides these historians there are number of historians on the Ancient India. The four time-periods mentioned in the Indian Literature are SatYug, Treta, Dwapar and KaliYug.

Question: The time period, which you have mentioned, when each of them started and ended?

Answer: As I do not take this calculation scientific, I therefore, did not pay attention to it.

I had read this that Indian literary figures, Indian culturists and historians treat SatYug before Treta according to chronological order, but I do not believe because I do not think it scientific. It is correct that it has been written that Rama appeared in the Treta Yug.

Similarly it is correct that Shri Krishna was born in Dwapar Yug. Krishna was born in Mahabharat period.

Question: In the chronological calculation, in the Indian Literature the Ramayana period and Shri Ram are in the same period?

Answer: The word Ramayana is formed from Rama itself: therefore it will be wrong to understand it without Rama.

Question: Similarly in chronological calculation Mahabharata and Shri Krishna are synonym to each other?

Answer: I do not accept this statement, as the information about Mahabharata could not have been possible without Shri Krishna. He is one of the key figure of Mahabharata.

Shri Ram and Shri Krishna had been accepted as incarnations of Vishnu by the people, and in Indian literature, but it is not according to History. In Indian culture Shri Rama has been accepted as the incarnation of Vishnu, but people had not same opinion about Shri Krishna, as the name of Baldev (Balram) is also associated with him. Some people treat Shri Krishna as the incarnation of Vishnu and some of Baldev.

Question: In Bihar which places you had surveyed other than Vishwamitra Ashram in connection with the research of places concerned with Shri Rama and what was the period during which you surveyed the places?

Answer: The character of Rama, which had been described in Valmiki Ramayna, I had conducted survey of the places where he visited in Bihar, Vishwamitra's Ashram to Giridwaj (Rajgirah), Vaishali, Ahilya Sthal (Ahiyari) and Janakpuri in Nepal. This took me about five years from 1958 to 1962-63.

The place about whose survey I had mentioned, I am the resident of that place. I had full knowledge of its culture from my childhood, so there had been no difficulty in conducting the survey. I had fully surveyed it. From the Spiritual point of view that entire Mithila Pradesh is full with devotion of the characteristic qualities of Rama and Sita. I am not inclined to agree that in Mithila Pradesh also every auspicious deed is performed with the benedictory prologue of Rama and Sita, because in every function or Sanskar starts with the pooja of Ganesha. Not only this, in Ramcharitmanas, Tulsidas, the absolute devotee of Rama too started his work with Shri Ganesha. There are many songs, which contain the name of Rama and Sita. I knew the song named Sohar, which is sung at the time of birth of a child. In Mithila, Sohar is more prevalent in Maithali language in which the virtues of Rama and other Gods are sung. There is nothing important. In the Sohar songs, which are prevalent there, the virtues of Laxman, Bharat and Satrugan are prominently sung. It is correct that many matrimonial songs had been composed by keeping Rama and Sita as symbolic and are also SIB1g. On this occasion king Dashrath and king Janak are also made symbolic and songs are sung, but are not prevalent. The songs related to Parvati and Shankar are more prominent than it. I had not got the boundary of Avadh laid down at that time. It has not been found in Ramcharitmanas, where it has been mentioned Avadh-puri at number of places. To know the

culture of Avadh and its history it is necessary to have the knowledge of its boundaries but due to the lack of available material on it, we feel helpless, but I am still engaged in this direction. I, in my article paper No. 199 C-2/1 had written that Avadhpuri is identified from present Ayodhya. It is correct that in Ramcharitmanas Rama while addressing his Banar friends, the description about Avadhpuri has been given which is as under:

'Ehan Bhanukul Kamal Diwakar, Kapihin Dikhawat Nagar Manohar.

Sun Kapeesh Angad Lankesha, Pawan Puri Ruchir Yeh Desa.

Jadepi Sab Vaikunth Bakhana, Ved Puran Vidit Jag Jana.

Awadhpuri Sam Priya Nahin Sou, Eha Prasang Jane Kou; Kou.

Janambhoomi Mam Puri Suhawani, Uttar Disi Bah Saryu Pawani.

Ja Majjan Te Binahin Prayasa, Mam Sameep Nar Pawahin Basa.'

In Mithila people like to name their children after the name of God and Goddess. But now in the present age modernization had also affected there. Now people are naming their children apart from the name of Gods like Saurabh, Gaurav, and Surabhi etc. This tendency has developed after independence. My parents would have named me after the name of Sita Ram. It would have been in their mind and that is why my name is Sitaram. At that time i.e. contemporary to our time, the children were named after the name of Gods and great personalities. The names were called making them a base or synonym of those names, which were in all more than 50%. The names connected with Rama would have been 10%. I had not followed it totally while naming my children. I had followed

it partially. I named one of my children as Vijaya, as he was born on Vijayadashmi. Ashwani Shukla Dashmi, the day on which we perform pooja is called Vijayadashmi. It is correct and it is prevalent that on the day of Vijayadashmi Rama conquered Ravana. That is why the day is called Vijayadashmi. I had named one of my children Amitabh. The person possessing unlimited light is called Amitabh. One of the names of Gautam Buddha is Amitabh. It is useless to say that if I would be in a position, my name would not be Sitaram, because the right to name a child lies in his parents. The name of my father is after the name of Vishnu. I kept myself busy with the archaeological excavation and survey work within Bihar from 1958 to 1988. Ayodhya is not in Bihar or within the Bihar State. I had served Govt. of India from 1956 to 1958. I had been associated with Nagarjuna Konda excavation Project, Andhra Pradesh from 1956 to 1958 under Archaeological Survey of India. It is not related with Ayodhya or Ramayana period but it is related with Buddhist religion. The rulers of Nagarjuna Konda were of Ichavaku Dynasty. But it is difficult to say that the Ichavaku Dynasty was related to Rama or not. I had gone to Ayodhya for the first time in 1977 in connection with the archaeological survey and the objective of my visit to Ayodhya was that B.B. Lal has been doing the survey of the sites related to archaeology in Ramayana. It raised anxiety in my mind that I should also see Ayodhya from that angle. As I had been acquainted with Ayodhya from early childhood and I am Vaishnav and Ayodhya had been counted as Sapatpuri, from this point of view I wanted to know about Ayodhya in the light of literature and archaeology as what is the factual position. I had started my study but could not complete it by that time. I had studied N.L. Dey's book, perhaps its name is Geographical Dictionary on Ancient Sites and had read the extracts from Valmiki Ramayana at places. I had studied about Ayodhya

in Kalidas's Raghuvansham and I had been reading Ramcharitmanas regularly. In this context I used to consider Awadh-puri as Ayodhya. This much I had studied earlier. I had not mentioned N.L. Dey's above book and Kalidas' Raghuvansham in my article because I did not find it necessary to refer them.

Question: For preparing the above article or for seeking archaeological information or for extracting information about the on going excavation work in Ayodhya, when did you visit Ayodhya after 1977?

Answer: I do not remember bow many times I had gone to Ayodhya after 1977. But whenever I had gone there every time one thing bound in my mind, what facts are missing from my article regarding Ayodhya and I had always remained alert in that matter for fulfillment of my aim. It is correct that before my going to Ayodhya in 1977 the Ayodhya Excavation Report 1976-77 by B.B. Lal for previous year had been published in Indian Archaeology –

A Review and I had seen it. After reading it I had noted the important points in my notebook. I had paid my personal visit to Ayodhya in 1977 and whenever I went there the visit was in my personal capacity. I think I remained from 3-4 days in Ayodhya but went back to Gonda in the evening for stay. Because there were difficulties in the night stay in Ayodhya so I used to come and go from Gonda. I cannot tell you the distance between Ayodhya and Gonda and I used to travel by train. In this connection I never took any surveyor with me to Ayodhya. I had only talks with the persons connected with Ayodhya in

Archaeological Survey of India. During these three-four days my endeavour was to gather information how old are the oldest ruins in Ayodhya. As far numbers are concerned I cannot tell you how many ruins I had seen in Ayodhya. But I paid my attention to Hanuman Garhi, Sita Ki Rasoi and Babri Masjid area to see the antiquity of the oldest buildings there. The question of marking any ruins of buildings or site did not arise, because the objectives of my article were not fulfilled by it. The information, which I gathered from the excavation, carried out by Prof B.B. Lal that was seen sufficient at that time.

As I used to come to Ayodhya during holidays as such permission from higher officer was not necessary. The date on which I came to Ayodhya in 1977 is not known to me. I had not carried out any excavation work in Ayodhya, so permission in this regard was not necessary. I had studied for my research work and for it permission is not required. The village and where the disputed site is situated, are not known to me.

One cannot predict from seeing the disputed site that it was on any ruin. The surface of the disputed site was alike the surface of other sites, as it did not appear very high. I had seen the disputed sight from South, though I had gone around, while taking round I had not paid attention to see that the surface all around was same, because my attention was on the excavation site. I cannot tell the direction of the way to reach and return from disputed site. The point from which I was seeing the building of the, disputed site was visible from there and my attention was on it, not on the surface. I had not paid attention on the length and breadth of the trenches that had been referred by Prof B.B. Lal. I cannot tell the number of trenches he had mentioned in his report. He had mentioned

the south side trench of the disputed site in his report which has concern with my article. The numbers of trenches were not the aim of my article; I therefore, did not pay attention to it. Trenches were rectangular. The distance of trenches from the disputed site is not in my memory. I had not prepared the site plan of the trenches because it was not required for my article. I had not gone for excavation, but gone for measurement and I had a tape with me, which was of 6 meter. Besides it I had an excavation knife. Zareeb and Gunia were not required. So I did not take them.

Whether there were any ruins near the disputed site, I did not care to see it because it was not the aim of my article. I agree with this that from the archaeological point of view every ruin has its importance. It is a famous popular saying that ruins can tell you how prestigious was the building. (Khandhar hee bata sakte hain ki imarat kitnee buland thee). To understand any ruin first of all survey is carried out. Thereafter for collecting full information excavation work is done and the result derived from the excavation on that the excavator put forward his opinion in the form of history. I had not gone to Manjha, Tarai, or the river valley, which is near the river Saryu in Ayodhya, because it was not the objective of my article. I had visited Ayodhya with my family members several times after 1977. The objective of my family members was pilgrimage. I accompanied them but my aim was for myself I had never carried out excavation or measurement of the disputed site in Ayodhya, because I had got the report of accredited archaeologist in this regard, which was sufficient for my article. In the light of B.B. Lal's Report, I had no other intention except the study of that site. It is wrong to say that I was much qualified than Dr. B.B. Lal from archaeological point of view, and for that reason I wanted

to test the validity of his report. I cannot think of it because Prof. B.B. Lal was higher officer than me and was like my teacher. Prof. B.B. Lal was far better than me in both archaeological ability and post. I did not think necessary to comment on Prof. B.B. Lal's report in my article and only for fulfillment of my aim I had taken material from it. I had seen the excavated trenches of Prof. B.B. Lal. I did not find any fault in them in the light of the report. None of the true student of archaeology go by presumptions, but he after seeing it derives out his conclusion.

Question: The trenches that have been excavated by Prof. B.B. Lal, being under surface, what type of archaeological signs the trenches gave of disputed site (ruins)?

Answer: The reply of this question is clear in Prof B.B. Lal's report. He had drawn out clearly the blue print of human inhabitation, cultural sequence to upper surface, so the question of making any presumption or otherwise does not arise which I had mentioned in my article.

I had mentioned about petrograph in my article. That petrograph is in Devnagari script, which was in vogue in 17th -18th Century and that is the conclusion of my study. I totally disagree with it that only philologists are competent to determine the period of a script.

Question: Up to what level you had studied Devnagari script in Linguistic and where from you did it?

Answer: The study of linguistic is not in any script but it is the study of words derived from different

scripts. I had studied Sanskrit language and I had studied comparative philology.

For example in Sanskrit for 'Ratri' 'Naktam' is used and in German it is called 'Nakht'. So the study of words derived and gone out from different languages is called the study of linguistics. Paleography is a different subject from which people get knowledge of gradual development of the script. Paleography is at some places taught in B.A. it is invariably in M.A. also. To my knowledge it is being taught in all the reputed Universities of India as Calcutta University, Patna University, Banaras Hindu Vishwavidyalaya etc. I had obtained M.A. degree with Epigraphy from Patna University and my Ph.D. is also in Epigraphy.

Question: For establishing opinion about the script of a petrograph, analysis of its individual alphabets is required. Your article Paper No.199 C-2/1 does not contain the scientific explanation of the alphabets, why it is so?

Answer: When I wrote my article and the material regarding epigraph, which was available with me, I had fully studied it and after getting conclusion there from, I had mentioned it in my article. I had just seen individual alphabets of full epigraph and my decision till now is the same what I had mentioned in my article. I had studied those words and my study about this is still going on.

The black stone, which I had mentioned in my article, I had seen them after 1977 only. When did I see the exact date is not remembered by me. I had written 14 as their number. The 14 black stone pillars were fixed within the building. Where these were fixed that I do not recollect. In my opinion, they were from outside and not the part of disputed structure. If those black stones are removed, it

does not affect the building in any manner, because those were put over the surface. To determine the period of those pillars, I had studied them but those pillars were not contemporary of the period of construction of disputed building, so I kept them separate. The pillars are older than the construction of disputed building. It is wrong to say - that I had never visited the disputed site and it is also wrong to say that I have not done any archaeological survey or investigation in this regard. It is totally wrong to say that my article had been written to nullify the available archaeological evidences. It is also wrong to say that I had written the article with malafide intention. It is also wrong to say that I had connection with plaintiffs and in order to allow them undue benefit I am giving my statement in connivance with them.

(Shri Rajendra Singh S/o Late Gopal Singh Visharad, Defendants other original suit No.1189 on his behalf Cross-examination of Shri Puttu Lal Mishra, Advocate begins in continuation of 13.05.2002 and concluded)

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-
Sitaram Rai
14.05.2002

The Cross-examination of Witness P.W. 28, Dr. Sitaram Rai concluded by all the Plaintiffs. The witness is discharge .

Sd/-
Narendra Prasad
Commissioner
14.05.2002